U.S. Congress.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 76th CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION

VOLUME 85—PART 2

NOVEMBER 1, 1939, TO NOVEMBER 3, 1939

(PAGES 1159 TO 1398)

WITH

APPENDIX AND INDEX TO PARTS 1 AND 2

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1939

AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

29055

Law
J
11
.R5

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 76th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 1, 1939

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our father in heaven, we bless Thee that there is no love like Thine, and all human love is divine when it has its source in Thee. When in the flood of great waters, when storms climb the sky and unjust criticism rides out against us, then let Thy love break up the clouds and make them beautiful. Forgive us if we have been unmindful of Thy marvelous providence; forgive us if we have longed for easy tasks; forgive us if we have refused to do our utmost in hard and narrow ways: Oh, forgive us all our faults and may we ever learn wisdom from our failures. Illumine our souls that we may know clearly Thy will and have power to fulfill it. We bear at the altar of prayer our most honorable Speaker and all Members of the Congress. In the plentitude of Thy care watch over them each day and give peace. In the Saviour's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SIROVICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may have the privilege of extending my remarks in the RECORD by including therein the encyclical of His Holiness, Pope Pius XII.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a brief table on employment, issued by the United States Civil Service Commission.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARNESS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include a radio address made by me last night over a local radio station.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include an article by George Rothwell Brown, in the Los Angeles Examiner.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

WE NEED A SECRETARY OF THE NAVY—THE NAVY TAKES ITS ORDERS FROM THE PICKET LINE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and to include therein a short editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Constitution declares that "The President shall be Commander in Chief of the Army and the Navy of the United States."

But until recent months the Navy Department had a Secretary, as did the War Department. For many months, due to the illness of Secretary Swanson and since his death because of the failure of the President to make an appointment, the Navy Department has been without an active head.

Does the President think that Cabinet Members are no longer useful or does he prefer to himself perform the duties of the Secretary of the Navy? Or has he delegated that authority to Mme. Perkins, the Secretary of Labor?

This query is prompted by the fact that within a month a picket line in Detroit defied a representative of the Acting Secretary of the Navy and refused to deliver to that representative property of the Navy which was needed in the Government aircraft factory at the navy yard at Philadelphia.

Day before yesterday I wrote the Acting Secretary of the Navy inquiring as to the reason why a picket line successfully resisted the Navy's demand for the return of its own materials. The answer, if one is received, will be spread upon the RECORD.

In the meantime, it might be well for Members of the House to know that some of the people are making inquiries along the same line. To that end I quote an editorial from the Chicago Tribune of October 31:

DON'T TELL THIS TO THE MARINES

The report of Acting Secretary Edison of the Navy Department to the House Naval Affairs Committee on the stoppage of work on navy airplane engines by the C. I. O. strike in Detroit makes strange reading. The Acting Secretary gave the information in response to a resolution of Representative HOFFMAN, of Michigan, inquiring concerning stories that the Navy's defense program had been hampered by the C. I. O. strike against the Bohn Aluminum & Brass Corporation.

Edison replied that the Navy Department had called the attention of the regional director of the C. I. O. to the seriousness of the delay in the delivery of material for which the Department had contracts and the urgent need of the shipment of patterns.

Says Mr. Edison: "The inspector requested that the C. I. O. director instruct his representative in charge of the picket line at the corporation's plant No. 2 to allow a representative to pass through the picket line to pick up Government-owned patterns and ship them on a Government bill of lading. The regional director of the C. I. O. sent three representatives of union local No. 208 to discuss the removal of the patterns with the inspector of naval material. The union representatives were given full access to the files of the Navy contracts. At the end of the discussion the union

representatives stated that as the strike situation stood their answer was emphatically 'no' and that they would not let patterns or inspected castings be removed. No further action was taken by the Navy Department to remove the patterns and castings."

The strike was settled October 8, but during its duration of 41 days the picket line kept the Navy from getting its own patterns out of the plant. The Department bowed to a superior force which the Government itself had nourished into strength. Mr. Lewis already had victories over the Post Office, the Department of Justice, and the Governors of several States. He can now hang up a naval flag in his trophy room. The Navy won't go through a picket line.

When did Mme. Perkins become its secretary?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. THORKELSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein an address delivered by the Most Reverend F. J. Beckman, archbishop of Dubuque, on Sunday, October 29, 1939.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD by printing an editorial from the Detroit News.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein three short letters, my answers thereto, and one brief editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALLEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial on neutrality from the Washington Post of this day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial from the Citizen-Press, of Jackson, Mich.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein certain excerpts from the 1939 mobilization plan.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

NEUTRALITY

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business before the House is the motion to instruct the conferees. Does the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM] desire to yield time?

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. IZAC].

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Speaker, in a city block there sits a madman with a sawed-off shotgun, holding down the fort of his own back porch. As soon as some of his neighbors emerge, he proceeds to pick them off. In another large city we have a mob of gangsters. They proceed to arm themselves with sawed-off shotguns and machine guns and prey on the peace-loving citizens and any groups who would oppose them in their endeavor to gain unjustly what belongs to their neighbors.

Six years ago a gentleman named Adolf Hitler presumed to do that very thing in one of the great nations of the world. You may say that that did not affect us. Ah, but it did, and I shall show you how it did. Six million men were put to work building arms and munitions. Billions of dollars were spent, so that man's nation should be more powerful than any of his neighbors, and inside of 4 years it began to dawn on the neighbors that there must be some ulterior motive behind that activity. Like the gangster, Hitler began to pick off one after another of the peaceful nations. Of course, we had been sending the things that he had to have, raw materials, with which to build up his arms and ammunition plants. We sold them the scrap iron and the oil and the copper and the cotton, and in a very short space of time he was so far ahead of any other nation that those selfsame peace-loving nations decided they had to change their economy. My friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. ALLEN] said yesterday the result was an armed camp. It would be an armed camp for the world. Do you not see the significance of a thing of that kind? Under our present Neutrality Act we provide the arms and munitions before war is declared, and the man who is bent on bringing war and destruction to his neighbors arms himself with our tools, and then declares war, at which time no more arms may be sent by us. It gives him the full advantage. Hitler has taken full advantage of this and when he saw England and France catching up, as they have been during the past 2 years, although he had a lead of 4 years and is far ahead to this very day, then he declared war, so now we cannot ship to anyone else—even to its victims. But it is said we must not take sides because there are 16,000,000 people of German extraction in this country. I am feeling for the German people themselves being led to the slaughter by a madman who happens to be in command at the present time; but if you do not think of that, if you do not worry about the German people or about other nations, then think about our own.

We have always believed in a certain type of national defense—not a large standing army, not great armament. No; we will take it easy; we will give perhaps 10 to 20 percent of the revenue of the Government to the building of national defense. That seems sufficient. In time of trouble, of course, we would build up rapidly, because we have the facilities so to do. But with this new philosophy of force in the minds of the leaders throughout the world there can be but one answer. We likewise must accept that philosophy and arm and build in time of peace. It is likely to be a budget of 50 to 75 percent of the revenue of the Federal Government going for national defense in times of peace just to keep up with that madman who is bringing that kind of conditions on the whole world. That is what I object to. I do not care, if you insist, what he is doing to his own people, or to the people surrounding him, but I am thinking of America. We have to change. Last year, when they denounced the treaty that limited naval armament, what was the result? It meant that we had to spend one billion and a quarter dollars to bring our armaments up to those of other nations—naval armaments alone. Every time someone takes the lead and goes ahead in an armament race we, in self-defense, have to do the same. If we do not, what will the American people say to us? We must represent them and keep abreast of what any one nation can bring against us. Our people expect it of us, and there has been hardly a word against our building up our national defense.

Let us take the moral side of this thing. A few years ago some States denied the right to sell cigarettes within their borders. No cigarettes were to be sold in those States, and what happened? They got out a little machine with a handle on the end, with wheels inside. You would take a cigarette paper, slide it in the machine, pour in some of Duke's Mixture, or some other kind of tobacco, make a few turns of the wheels, and out came a finished cigarette. That is exactly what you are doing today with your arms embargo. You are providing them with all of the ingredients with which they make their own, and still you say that is not immoral but that it is immoral if you put that fuse on the end of the shell and send it to them that way. If that is not asinine reasoning, I do not know what it is. If it is immoral to send implements of war and munitions and guns in time of war, then it is in time of peace.

Our dear friend Mr. Molotov, the right-hand man of Stalin, is sore at us, if you please, because we are not doing things the way Communist Russia would like to have them done. He does not want the arms embargo repealed. But, just the

same, they have been getting the things they need to build up their munitions, and we have been supplying them, and not their neighbors who knew of no designs upon their sovereignty.

When the time comes Russia will declare war, and because of our present law we will not be able to send their victims any help. Russia will not need any then, because they will have built their own factories. All they will want is the raw material.

Take Japan. The same thing is going on there. They can get anything they want from us. Nearly $200,000,000 of imports from us in a year, and still less than 1 percent of that was finished munitions.

My friends, it is so ridiculous to talk about the immorality of sending munitions and at the same time sending them the things out of which they make their munitions—cotton, copper, scrap iron, oil, and the requisite machinery.

I am sorry that we have on both sides of this question men who served in the World War and still view it from opposite poles. It seems to me that we learned certain lessons from the World War, but not all of us interpret those lessons in the same way. However, I believe we are all agreed in one thing, that an army must never again be sent across the seas to iron out the difficulties or to heal the wounds, if you prefer, of the peoples of Europe. Our boys must never again be sent across the seas to show them how to conduct their affairs. We are all agreed on that. But I dislike to hear some of my good friends say, "If you vote to lift the embargo, you are voting to send boys to France." You know as well as I do that no neutrality bill we enact can keep us out of war. That is the function of the mind and the heart of the American people—not of any law we pass. Furthermore, regardless of the law we pass, neither you nor I can say that that will get us into war or will keep us out of war. However, there is one thing that we have been overlooking, and I was glad to hear the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. MARTIN] mention it yesterday. Who are we doing these things for? Molotov, or Chamberlain, or Daladier, or Hitler? No. We are doing these things for the American people. We are trying to give them the law that they want, that will keep them out of war, and at the same time treat all people alike—treat all foreign nations alike. I believe by repealing the arms embargo we will be treating them all alike; and if, as the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] said yesterday, even the Germans can come here and get planes, I have no objection to that. Surely, that is being neutral, is it not, if they can all get planes?

Do not forget this, and our Army and Navy officers constantly remind us of it, unless we build up our manufactures—not just the munitions industry—what does that amount to? Probably 1 or 2 percent of what we need in time of war—but unless we build up our industries to the point where they can take the blueprints and the jigs and the dies and patterns that we give them and make our munitions in time of war, we will not be able properly to defend this country. That was the case in the World War. Ninety percent was done outside of the so-called munitions industry. Practically all the guns that we got came from independents all over the country. You say, "Oh, well, this is to make the munition makers rich." Who are the munition makers? Du Pont made a lot of money and so did Colt and Winchester and the rest of them, but I will tell you there were other people who made a lot of money. The farmers made a lot of money by selling wheat at twice the normal price. Was anything said about our changing economy due to that? As a result, you have the Dust Bowl today. They turned everything into wheatland. They plowed everything—pastures and forest lands—to make more money. We were all profiteering. Do not blame just a handful of munition makers. Now, we need our industries in this country to be in as good position for the turning out of munitions as those of any other country.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. IZAC. In just a moment. If we cannot turn out those things for ourselves, we had better be doing it for other nations, because we are learning all the time. It is our duty to see that this country is adequately prepared in case of another conflict.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia). The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Speaker, there is one other thing I want to mention. That is this matter of letting the foreign nations build their finished munitions and accept from us only oil, scrap iron, copper, and other things that they need. I will tell you one reason why you and I do not want that to happen, because every time a W. P. A. bill comes on this floor you say, "It is terrible that we have so much relief; that relief costs so much in this country."

The reason men are walking the streets is because the raw product can go to those countries but the finished product, that is made in our factories by our workingmen, can no longer be made here under this law of ours. If it is not a sufficient reason to repeal the arms embargo that our men might be given employment that otherwise would go elsewhere, that we may reduce our relief rolls, give our people this work, I can think of no better reason. Yes; they say it is immoral. I cannot see how it is more immoral to let our people walk the streets begging for a crust of bread and taking W. P. A. employment at starvation wages than it is to send munitions that those countries need or of sending the unassembled and nonprocessed ingredients rather than the same products after subjection to a few hours' finishing in a factory.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IZAC. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. Is the gentleman arguing seriously to this House that we should repeal the embargo for the purpose of bringing prosperity to this Nation and furnishing jobs for our men? Is this the purpose of the gentleman's observation?

Mr. IZAC. I am sorry the gentleman construes it in such manner, but I am merely mentioning this as one of the reasons why it is no more immoral to send finished products than it is the ingredients that go into the making of either cigarettes or finished munitions.

Mr. COOLEY. I quite agree with that observation, but I do not agree that we would be justified in lifting the embargo if the only reason that actuated us were that of bringing prosperity to idle people in America.

Mr. IZAC. I do not believe the gentleman is correct in supposing that it would bring prosperity. It would not at all, because there is not enough business to do that; but I say that is one of the things that is a bad result of this embargo. It permits us to send the raw materials—the wheat, the cotton, the things that are produced in the gentleman's district out of the ground, let us say—but it does not permit us to do anything to it in our factories. We cannot cut that cotton up and saturate it with acid and make an explosive out of it; we cannot do any of those things to it. We may send the raw materials there, but that will not give employment to our men. It goes over there, and their people get the employment.

Mr. COOLEY. I quite agree with that part of the gentleman's observation, but I was impressed with the fact that the gentleman was emphasizing the possibility of profits which might inure to the benefit of farmers and idle men in America as well as to munitions makers.

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IZAC. Let me answer first the question of the gentleman from North Carolina and then I will yield.

I should say that we are, unfortunately, able to profit by the misfortunes of other people, because immediately they need goods up go our prices. There is no way under the sun of preventing that. It is a fact that business is better because of the needs of foreign nations for our goods, but we should not differentiate between the manufactured article and the wheat and the cotton as they come from the ground. The demands of belligerents for raw materials will, in itself, cause a war boom, without sending a pound of munitions.

I now yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. PATRICK. The gentleman believes it would be absolute folly for us to try to clothe ourselves with such a position

that we entirely remove ourselves from our social and economic welfare in consideration of a general matter, because the first law of nature is self-preservation. We expect that from all that lives. Let me ask the gentleman, however, following that line of reasoning if thinking of ourselves, as we must if we are intelligent people—if by pursuing this course we cause the makings, the ingredients, as the gentleman calls them, to be assembled at another place, will not that go further than first anticipated and result in factories springing up in Canada and across the ocean that would otherwise naturally be here, factories that will continue to operate after the war is over?

Mr. IZAC. That is the first corollary. Already Canada is erecting plants to the extent of $3,000,000,000, and they are proceeding to assemble the things they can get from this country right now. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time has been consumed on both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia). The gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] has used 2 hours 8½ minutes. The gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM] has used 2 hours 7½ minutes.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my distinguished colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. BARTON] such time as he may desire.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York [Mr. BARTON] is recognized.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARTON. I yield.

Mr. FISH. The gentleman from California [Mr. IZAC] left the impression that Germany had bought up large supplies of war material, ammunition, and arms from the United States in the last 4 years. I hold in my hand a letter from the Secretary of State, Mr. Cordell Hull, who gives these figures for the last 8 or 9 months. These months, of course, were those in which they were most intent on building up supplies. Leaving out some of the letter for the sake of brevity, I quote the following:

> This information you requested is set forth in the following table of war supplies bought of us by these different countries:
> France, $17,258,681.74; Germany, $78,044.52; Great Britain, $27,496,336.07; Italy, $45,613; Russia, $1,552,521.29.

According to these figures of the Secretary of State himself, Germany in the last 8 months has bought only $78,000 worth of war material in America, as opposed to $17,000,000 for France and $27,000,000 for England.

I submit, furthermore, Mr. Speaker, that I doubt if Germany needs a great deal of our war supplies, arms, or munitions of war.

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a brief observation?

Mr. BARTON. I shall be pleased to yield if I may be yielded further time.

Mr. BLOOM. I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BARTON] such time as the gentleman from California consumes.

Mr. IZAC. Here is the answer to my friend from New York. The gentleman has mentioned only the last 8 months. It is true that Germany during the past few months has gotten very little from us and is going to get less; but over a period of 6 years she has received tremendous quantities of oil and scrap iron as well as other things which she needed, not war supplies or so-called arms, ammunition, and implements of war, but ingredients that go into the building up of war supplies. She is now making her own in factories erected all over her country.

Mr. FISH. That is what we are arguing about. We do not make any exception in this bill and we are not concerned with oil and scrap iron, but with arms and ammunition.

Mr. IZAC. I am trying to show the difference, or lack of any, between the ingredients and the finished product. One other thing I failed to mention was the fact that Hitler also by conquest took over about one-half of the munition plants of the world by taking the famous Skoda works in Czechoslovakia and other plants in Austria and Poland. [Applause.]

Mr. BARTON. Mr. Speaker, though I have the honor of membership on the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I plan to speak only a very few minutes. The House granted me the privilege of printing in the RECORD yesterday a radio speech delivered Sunday night in which I tried to present my thinking on the arms embargo in some detail. If there is anything more that I would like to have included in that statement, it was furnished by the argument of the distinguished authority on international law, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHANLEY], who spoke yesterday.

I started reading the Senate debate and I read every speech delivered. I started with as much of an open mind as it is possible for me to have. I started with the assumption that I should vote this fall the way I voted last summer—to lift the embargo. As that debate went on, whether my judgment is good or bad, I was driven to the conviction that the logic and the authorities on international law and the best interests of the American people were all on the side of keeping this embargo, and that only the emotions are on the other side. It seemed to me what the other side is asking is a neutrality law which will allow us to be unneutral, and the chance to help England and France, but only at their own risk and expense.

The gentleman from California has just presented a dramatic picture of a highwayman loose in a city, but I think he should have finished his picture. If I am awakened at night by a disturbance next door and I make up my mind it is only my English neighbor, Mr. Adams, and my German neighbor, Mr. Schultz, fighting over their boundary line, as they have been doing for a great many years, I close the window and go to bed. [Applause.] If, however, I find Mr. Adams being attacked by Mr. Schultz or by a highwayman, who thereafter intends to attack me, then, acting in the spirit of this bill, I call out to Mr. Adams, "If you have $25 and will send your boy over here I will sell you my shotgun." That does not seem to me a noble way of fighting this war, if it is our war. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. Speaker, I have never seen in my life an issue that developed such a cleavage between men and women of equal patriotism and intelligence on both sides. I have never seen an issue that created such strange bedfellows. I had lunch a couple of months ago with one of the great munition makers in this country, one who would be called upon to become a great munition maker if the United States should be drawn into war. He said to me, "Mr. BARTON, I hope Congress is not going to lift that embargo. That is the surest way to get us into war." I asked, "How do you figure that?" He said, "Of course, when we begin supplying arms Germany will retaliate in every possible way by sinking our ships and by the destruction of our plants. It was incidents of that kind that got us into war before."

On Monday there appeared in the newspapers a statement prepared by my friend William Allen White, and signed by 30 spiritual leaders, stating that this is a holy war and the only chance to preserve the teachings of the Prince of Peace is for the United States to make and ship arms and munitions of war. A great munition maker, an international devil, who, if we get into war will be charged with starting the war in the congressional investigations of the future—he is all for keeping the embargo and keeping out of the war; and these spiritual leaders argue that it is a holy crusade and we ought to be in it.

I believe I come from a district in which there is more sentiment for lifting this embargo than probably in any district in the country. I have many splendid citizens who believe with all their hearts that the only security of the United States is to underwrite the victory of England and France; to do it without delay and at any cost.

I have tens of thousands of constituents of foreign birth or heritage, whose roots run back into Europe and who are so outraged by the murderous cruelty of Hitler that they believe we ought to go over there and wipe him off the face of the earth. I sympathize with those emotions. I believe the sentiment for repeal may very probably represent the majority sentiment in my district. I have been down here only a little while and my wife likes it, so it is not pleasant

for me to have to cast a vote which will probably separate me from the public pay roll. [Laughter.]

Mr. Speaker, I have come to the deep conviction that this is not the time for us to make a move in what certainly up to date is the most stupid, the most crazy, the most cockeyed war in human history. [Applause.] This is a war in Europe that is not a war. I wrote a book years ago in my youth called The Book Nobody Knows, This is a war nobody wants. I read in the newspapers that France has already sent 100,000 men back from the western lines. I read that the English people are already grumbling against bureaucracy, which they have nicknamed "controlitis."

We know that when there was a false report of an armistice in Germany the German people went wild with rejoicing until the report was denied. I have said before, and I say now, that the war gives every appearance of a lot of countries that are in something they are desperately anxious to get out of if they only could find a way to get out. When my constituents call me up on the long-distance phone and abuse me for my position and talk to me about this being another World War and lasting for years, I think they are utterly unconscious of the significance of what has happened in the world in the last 10 years.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARTON. I will be very glad to yield if I may finish this statement first.

Some of you may have read a book written by a Spaniard, Ortega y Gasset, called The Revolt of the Masses, which I believe you will agree with me is one of the most significant books published in our generation. It was published in 1926. It does not mention Hitler or Stalin. It was published before they came on the stage. Yet it explains them. Hitler is the creature of the masses and Stalin is the creature of the masses. Every government in Europe today exists by the consent and support of the masses, and when the masses withdraw their support those governments will fall. Every one of those governments is afraid today of its own people. Every one of those governments knows that it is absurd to think that any people are going to stand again for a long war.

I say that the longer we postpone our action here the more the people of Europe will be asking, What is the purpose of this war? What are its objectives? Why cannot our statesmen make as good a peace for us right now as they can make after our cities are crumbled into ruins and millions of our sons are dead?" I say the more they question, the better is the chance for peace, and that in an early peace lies the only hope of civilization in Europe. The only winner of a long war in Europe will not be England and France and it will not be Germany; the only winner will be communism.

My plea is to keep both the embargo and cash and carry. At least, I plead that we do not touch the embargo now at this special session. Let us give the forces of peace over there one more chance to work.

A young American was in my office today, a student of music, who was in Germany when the war started and enlisted in the International Red Cross and worked in both Germany and France. He just came back this morning. He said to me, "If America would quit meddling in this war and advertising this war the people over there would begin to talk peace within 30 days."

I say if there is any chance of that, if there is any chance of their folding up the stupid, bloody business, let us not stand on our shore of the Atlantic and shout to them, "Keep it going just a little longer and we will send over some guns." I say this is the wrong time to give a signal of that sort to Europe.

It is a very solemn thought that a vote now to lift the embargo may possibly be the signal to start the real war. We simply have not facts enough to justify that decision. No lawyer in this House will advise a client to sign a contract with one party to a controversy until the client knows what the objectives of that party are and what, if any, are the secret agreements. I say we ought to ask the Allies now for a clear statement of their terms of peace. I am for the overthrow of Hitler. No man in this House detests him more than I. But when the Allies have overthrown him, whether with the help of our arms or without those arms, on what terms do they propose to dictate peace? Will it be a peace founded on justice, a peace that will endure, or will it be a peace that will last only until another Germany is strong enough to produce another Hitler and start another war?

We have a right to ask these questions and to demand an answer, and we ought to have an answer before we take an action which most of the authorities on international law believe is an unneutral action, an action which, in my opinion, will tend to drive the German people closer to Hitler and closer to Stalin out of a spirit of desperation, an action which, no matter what we say about it on this side, will be regarded by the English and French, as an implied promise, a promise which we have no moral right to imply, because we have no intention of fulfilling it. I wish that this thing could wait. I believe, if it does wait, we will have made the best contribution we can make to the Allies, because we will be in a position to be a friend of all the peoples in Europe who have hated each other through these generations and centuries, a friend who can help them make an honest, a just, and a lasting peace. [Applause.]

I yield now to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. The gentleman during the hearing before the Committee on Foreign Affairs, when his colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] was testifying as a witness favoring repeal of the arms embargo, asked him this question:

> Suppose that we should adjourn here on June 1 with section 1 still on the statute books. Suppose that, on the 2d of June, over the 30,000,000 radios in this country we should hear a broadcast of the bombing of London and the fall of Westminster Abbey and St. Paul's Cathedral, and the screams of women and children, as we would hear them. Do you not suppose the President would call us back here in 24 hours and ask us to repeal section 1?
>
> Mr. WADSWORTH. The pressure on him to do so, I suppose, would be almost irresistible.

Is not that statement true, that if such things should happen the public sentiment would demand the repeal of the arms embargo, and is it not safer to do it now before the war reaches that critical stage?

Mr. BARTON. I think that is a matter of soothsaying and astrology, and not of statesmanship. [Applause.]

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. The question the gentleman asked dealt with soothsaying, then. Why would it not be statesmanship now?

Mr. BARTON. Yesterday another gentleman on this floor, for whom I have almost as much affection as I have for the gentleman from Texas, came to me and quoted that same testimony and said, "Bruce, I believe that testimony was cabled to Europe, and that is one reason the Germans have not bombed the cities over there, because they know it may bring this country in."

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BARTON. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. I want to quote my warm and able friend from Texas, a statement made just a few months ago on this very proposition, and here is what he said——

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Whom is the gentleman quoting now?

Mr. DONDERO. I am quoting the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON]. [Laughter and applause.]

With reference to the arms embargo, he said:

> It discourages war between other countries by our Government refusing to furnish arms, ammunition, or implements of war, and also credit. No war can be successfully carried on without these.

[Laughter and applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia). The gentleman from New York [Mr. BARTON] has consumed 16 minutes.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON].

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I simply want to call attention to the speech which I made and to which the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] referred and from which he quoted a sentence that I uttered at that time,

which was in 1936, when we were considering neutrality legislation. I also stated that such legislation, we hoped, would discourage war between countries, and I will read my exact statement in that regard:

It—

Referring to the arms embargo feature—

sets an example in pioneering in the passage of neutrality legislation which it is hoped that other governments may emulate—

And thereby prevent war, but in view of developments that have happened since then, it is my deliberate judgment, instead of discouraging nations, it has encouraged aggressor nations, and instead of preventing war it has been an incitement to war. [Applause.]

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY].

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I know just as well as you do that not a single vote is going to be changed by anything which I may say or by a prolongation of this discussion. Those, if any, who might be inclined to yield to pressure or to be politically expedient, as well as those who are sometimes opportunists, are confronted by an issue which permits them neither to be opportunists nor to resort to political expediency.

The reaction to the debate which has been indulged in with respect to the issue which now confronts us has once more forcefully corroborated the statement that—

A great nation cannot make up its mind in a moment. What first appeals to its fancy is not likely to appeal to its final judgment, and the severest test of the disinterestedness of the statesman under our system is his readiness to risk unpopularity and defeat in order to protect the people from their first impulse and give them an opportunity to form a real opinion.

Former Speaker Reed's faith was in what he called the deliberate judgment of the people, but he declared that—

The sudden and unreflecting judgment of the noisy who are first heard is quite as often a voice from the underworld.

This distinction is vital, since the cause of democracy has nothing to hope from the statesman who weakly yields to the temptation always to be popular and who panders to the noisy passions of the moment rather than consults the real interests of the people.

THE "UNNEUTRALITY BOGEY"

The attempts to befog the issue by dragging across the trail the suggestion that an act of unneutrality is involved in our exercise of our own sovereignty, according to what we adjudge to be necessary in order to correct a situation and to establish a nonexisting neutrality, will get nowhere. It is hoist by its own petard. Those who are looking for a reason not to support the pending measure may find it as easily in one man's contention as in another's.

As for me, I will not subscribe to any doctrine which involves the surrender of our sovereign rights by submitting to be told by anybody or any government that to legislate as my conscience and my judgment dictate, and, as I see it, for the best interests of my country and its people, is an unneutral act. [Applause.] Who says so? The cold-blooded truth is that the suggestion made by some people to the effect that a sovereign state has no right to determine what constitutes its perfect neutrality by amending, repealing, or revising an existing law, and that in so doing it becomes ipso facto unneutral, is to me ridiculous. Such a suggestion denies to the United States its incontestable attribute and rights of sovereignty. Such attributes and rights I have been taught and have learned to know exist by very reason of the existence of the United States, and as such, and by virtue thereof, may at all times be invoked at any time if and when the United States may be pleased to undertake to so regulate its relations with foreign states as to make them accord with its own view of its own national interests. [Applause.]

THE RIGHT TO BE NEUTRAL

I understand that every sovereign state has a right to be perfectly neutral, and at any time has a right to take such action as in its judgment will accomplish that result. To suggest that it cannot so legislate is to say that it has no right to protect its own interests and may not take such action as in its judgment will keep it out of war. That is absurd. We may differ as to policy and program, but as to our right to determine our own policy and program—as to our right to change our laws to suit our own purposes, I firmly believe that no one who is informed can contend otherwise. Every sovereign state has a right to be perfectly neutral and to determine what in its judgment constitutes neutrality; such right is an essential attribute of its sovereignty and national independence, howsoever such status may be reached by it. To say it is unneutral to exercise our soverign rights, or that we cannot do it without violating neutrality—ipso facto—is to suggest our incompetence. It is to say we are unable to and cannot determine what constitutes neutrality; it is to suggest that we are barred from the exercise of our incontestable rights because heretofore we have acted, such previous action having been had and taken by us by virtue of the very sovereignty, the national independence which once depended upon it, but which it is now suggested we cannot now invoke, exercise, or improve.

As I recall it, a change in an existing statute or status in an undertaking to establish a perfect neutrality has never been held to be and is in itself ipso facto not unneutral. Such a change is a recognized concomitant of sovereignty. It cannot be and never has been rightly construed as unneutral. To so hold is to undertake to deprive the legislating state of all its soverign right to undertake to protect itself and its interest as a neutral. So the argument of those who contend that no change can now be made reduces itself to an absurdity, without argument, if only one will think it through to its logical conclusion.

Now, then, it is very generally contended that the President is right in asserting that the embargo provisions of the existing so-called neutrality law are "most vitally dangerous to American neutrality, American security, and American peace." To say we cannot change it in order to make ourselves neutral is the height of folly. Perfect neutrality requires that we be the ally of none of the contesting powers. Under the existing law Germany is placed in a decidedly advantageous position. As to this statement, there can be no argument. But be it Germany or Ethiopia matters not when we reduce the proposition to the lowest common denominator and forget friends and foes while we seek to be neutral in law, which we cannot be under the existing law, as everybody knows, or should know.

The question of establishing our strict neutral status should be discussed and arrived at with the sole determination to establish that status. We should not play friend or foe against or for ourselves. As Secretary Hull said in his speech of the 25th:

I think that you will find from a careful analysis of the underlying principles of the law of neutrality that this Nation, or any neutral nation, has a right during a war to change its national policies whenever experience shows the necessity for such change for the protection of its interests and safety. I do not mean to be understood as saying that such action may be taken at the behest or in the interest of one of the contending belligerents, it being understood, of course, that any measures taken shall apply impartially to all belligerents.

AN EXERCISE OF SOVEREIGNTY

That status must be determined, as such, by the sovereign legislative power of the United States, and then maintained. To do this will be an exercise of sovereignty. If and when the situation changes, as it may, and further revision, alteration, or amendment of the act may be necessary in order to guarantee our neutrality in law, acting as a sovereign state, we should make such changes as our interests shall require and may then demand.

It is alleged that such a change as is proposed by the act, that is, the establishment of our neutrality under law, benefits certain nations whose position seems to us to be nearest right and most nearly in accord with our ideals and, as a result, contributes to our safety. Well, that is fine if true; and I assume it is true. That the act in itself is preferable to the existing law, "merely as an insulation against war," is accepted as true by a preponderant majority of the

American people; and, if evidence were needed, it is to be found in the incident involving the *City of Flint*. An editorial writer in the Christian Science Monitor covers the situation pretty well when he says:

AMERICA WILL NOT BE DRAWN INTO WAR

Americans intend not to be drawn into the war in Europe. They do not wish to lengthen that war. They do, however, sympathize with the position of nations which are standing against evils which Americans themselves abhor. They do recognize the seriousness of the position of small nations in a Europe in which violence may become dominant unless it is checked by force equal in power. Their determination to stay out of war can be reconciled with their hope for a victory of those nations nearest right only by offering such aid to those nations as will not involve the United States in war.

A GRATUITOUS INSULT

So, for anyone to suggest that for the Congress of the United States of America to so act as to protect the United States and to prevent our involvement in the war, as in our own judgment we may see best to do, is an unneutral act on our part, just does not make sense.

THE "DEADLY PARALLEL" GOBLIN

Then there is another thing, Mr. Speaker, which irks me; and that is all this talk about the "deadly parallel" between the present situation and the situation in 1917. That is pure propaganda and "bunkum."

The bill before us, in its terms and by its very language, refutes such a proposition. The bill makes a comparison as between the situation now obtaining, or which will obtain when the bill becomes a law, and the status quo of 1917 absolutely noncomparable.

The reasons alleged for our being induced to enter the war in 1917 will not and could not exist today under the proposed law as written. Anyone who will take time to analyze and to check up on this statement must, if not emotionally unable to make a fair judgment, agree that it is correct. There is and there can be no intellectually honest statement made to the effect that there exists a deadly parallel, for such is not the truth.

By the very terms of the act, in order to protect the people of the United States and to keep us out of war and to reduce the risk of our involvement in the war, we sacrifice some of those national and neutral rights which we entered the World War and fought for in order to establish and to maintain. You know as well as I do that the proponents of this law have been most severely criticized for the restrictions imposed on American shipping on the basis that such restrictions are unreasonably and unnecessarily drastic. Not so if they keep us out of war.

There are those who contend that a greater Executive discretion in the definition of combat areas would be desirable. Maybe so, but I do not agree. However, these are details. The policy has been defined and, in general, I agree with it.

It was contended in 1917 that we had a right to engage in legitimate commerce. Read the bill and admit, as you will have to do, that scrupulous attempts to avoid the pitfalls of 1917, in an effort to avoid the causes that led us into the World War, have made it impossible under the proposed law for any of those things to happen which then occurred. It follows, therefore, that the proposed law is not, as has been said, a step toward war but a step away from the probability of our being involved in war. I say to you again, there is no deadly parallel.

Under the existing law it would be, as is evidenced by the *City of Flint* incident, as easy for us to become involved in war as it was in 1917. Why, even the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE] admitted, in answer to a question propounded to him in the Senate, that the pending measure goes much further in keeping our ships and our people and our cargoes out of war zones than the present law. The myth that there is a deadly parallel is exploded. There can be but one choice made by those who are governed and controlled by reason rather than by emotion or partisan bias. This is a neutral bill, for under it commerce with belligerent nations is permitted and established on a basis of equality as between the belligerents and withheld altogether so far as shipments in any of our vessels are involved or concerned. The bill as drawn is evidence of the fact that we do not intend to be involved in this war or any foreign war for that matter. Insofar as it is possible for us to see or forecast the future the bill undertakes to prevent anyone else dragging us in.

WE WILL MAKE NECESSARY CHANGES

If events should so associate themselves as to necessitate a change in the law in order to further insure our keeping out of war, we will make such change. We shall send no men to Europe. Congress proposes to protect the United States against involvement in the conflict. Congress is going to pass this law as the one chance of avoiding involvement and in order to relieve ourselves of the just charge of being, under the existing law, an active participant in this war on the side of nazi-ism and communism.

No, Mr. Speaker, there is no deadly parallel and there is nothing unneutral.

The war which we were induced to fight in order to "make the world safe for democracy," taught us an unforgettable lesson, a lesson learned at an awful price, paid therefor in blood and treasure.

It may be that "the war to end wars" was worth all it cost provided the lessons we learned therefrom shall keep the American people out of this and all foreign wars.

NOT FOOLED BY PROPAGANDA

Today the American people are fooled by no foreign propaganda. "That sounds like propaganda," they say. They know they cannot be neutral in thought though neutral in law. They are disillusionized as to their Messianic responsibility to save the world, and more particularly Europe from itself and its never-ending intrigue and power politics. They are saturated with and by the froth and foam and the superficiality of the "window dressing" offered by those who oppose the pending measure. They are neither greatly disturbed nor seriously perturbed by oratorical bombast, emotionalism, and pseudo-patriotic appeals. They know it is not true that America went to war at the behest of the munition makers, and the fathers and mothers and sisters and wives and brothers of the dead who lie in Flanders Field resent that statement as they would the desecration of a grave and the dishonoring of the memory of the dead who gave their all for a cause. [Applause.]

The American people, Mr. Speaker, know they were fooled. They know who fooled them. They can name their debtors, repudiators as they are of their contracts legally entered into by them. They remember and they commend to the careful and thoughtful consideration of those who fooled them once, the statement, significant as of this day, most apropos and applicable to the situation that obtains, that Abraham Lincoln made when he said:

If you once forfeit the confidence of your fellow citizens, you can never regain their respect and esteem. It is true that you may fool all the people some of the time, you can even fool some of the people all the time, but you can't fool all of the people all the time.

By inserting the word "American" before the word "people" wherever it occurs in the above quotation you get a better picture of the status quo.

Charged with the duty of representing and protecting our own people insofar as it lies within my power, I have no right to be swayed by any motive except the preservation of the integrity and welfare of our own Nation as I see it in the light that God has given me in the attempt to perform that duty and that service. I want no war. And because I want no war, I am supporting and propose to vote for a measure which involves the greatest sacrifice ever made in any nation in the history of mankind in order to avoid war. That is a statement which will live long after that which most of us may say with respect to this proposed measure has long been forgotten. It is found in substance in the peroration of a speech made by Senator BARKLEY, of Kentucky. It voices my sentiments. [Applause.]

In my judgment and for reasons too numerous to be recapitulated but which have been stated over and over again, as between the existing law and the proposed law, the passage of the proposed law minimizes the chances and offers less

danger of our going into, or being dragged into, this or any foreign war than does the existing statute.

I cannot see it any other way. I shall vote for the proposed law in order, as I see it, to promote the security and preserve the peace of this country and to protect the lives of the citizens of the United States. [Applause.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT].

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, if ever in the history of our republic the American people needed to exercise cool, calm, and deliberate judgment, that time is now. Because of inherent or inherited sympathies or prejudices, it is exceedingly difficult to keep emotion under control or reason. Unfortunately, the American people are prone to take sides in any conflict. I care not whether it be a dog fight, a boxing bout, a divorce suit, an election, or a war. [Laughter.] It is bad enough when citizens of our country are divided among themselves on domestic issues, but it is much worse when they are divided on foreign policy.

There is no question about which the American people are more concerned at the present time than the way to keep this Nation out of war. We all want peace, but good and intelligent men will honestly differ as to the method by which it can be maintained. Certainly I believe that every Member of this House possesses some character and a little intelligence else he would not be here. All of us are striving for the same goal, namely, to keep this Nation out of war. For that reason I am reluctant to criticize anyone holding opposite views from my own, regardless of how violently I may differ with him. We all may be amateurs, but I do not think anyone should be branded a "faker."

Of course, the question of neutrality is so big, complicated, and intricate that it is difficult to discuss it satisfactorily in the limited time at my disposal. I regret that after 96 Senators have had 4 weeks in which to discuss this measure 435 Representatives are granted only 8 hours, or 480 minutes, to consider it. Because of my limited time I shall appreciate it if I am not interrupted until I have closed my remarks.

May I say at the outset that when the neutrality bill was first presented to the Congress in 1935 I questioned seriously whether or not it was wise for Congress ever to attempt to legislate about this matter. It is just as impossible to legislate neutrality as it is to legislate morality or prosperity, but the undeniable fact is that Congress has legislated; and though I have been a consistent and at times a bitter and uncompromising critic of the New Deal, I voted for the Neutrality Act of 1935, for the amendments to it in 1936 and 1937; and the present law has been in existence for the past 2 years. The bill at the time was debated thoroughly after long and exhaustive hearings and passed overwhelmingly in both the House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States, and was signed by the President. It had the wholehearted support of the Department of State and met with the almost universal approval of the American people. Certainly there was no politics when we passed the bills, because many of the most violent critics of the administration, including myself, voted for it. We passed it at a time when the United States was at peace and when there was no general war in Europe. It became the law of the land when we could think cooly and objectively without passion or prejudice before the outbreak of the present war in Europe. Our neutrality law was enacted not to prevent war in Europe or anywhere else in the world, as some of the proponents of repeal now claim, therefore, how could this law have failed to date? It was enacted, indeed, because we feared a war would break out in Europe, and we wanted to keep America out of any future conflict. Not the prevention of war, but the prevention of our involvement in it was the the sole argument for the passage of the Neutrality Act [applause], and where were all these critics of the act today back in 1935, 1936, and 1937? They were standing in the Well of this very Chamber advocating its passage and voting for it when the roll was called. What has happened since then for them to change their minds? If the act was a good law in peacetime, it should be even a better law now and should not be changed because of the hysteria created by the present conflict in Europe. It is always dangerous to change the rules in the middle of the game, but the mecurial mind of some men in high authority makes it exceedingly easy for them to change the rules at every inning of the game as regards both our domestic and foreign affairs. Why change the rules now? What nation or people have injured us or even insulted or threatened us? Certainly the repeal of the embargo on arms, munitions, and the implements of war at this particular time would be considered an unneutral act. America, as has been well said, "would become the arsenal of one belligerent and the target of another." While aiding and abetting one side we would make ourselves the object of attack by the other side. This would certainly be interference or intervention and not neutrality. If I furnish the bandit the tools with which to crack the safe, I am equally guilty with him of the robbery he commits. I have aided and abetted in the perpetration of the crime.

It was stated on the floor of this House yesterday that one of the belligerents in Europe had several years to buy weapons from us, while its enemies have had only 1 year in which to purchase weapons. Nothing could be more inaccurate. All the belligerents alike before the outbreak of the present conflict in Europe had free access to our ports and our markets, and the truth of the matter is that we sold more of the materials of war to England and France during the past few years than we have to Germany since Hitler took control.

It is not our fault that some nations went to sleep while others were arming. Even Prime Minister Baldwin in 1936 said that Britain was aware that Germany was rearming, but he did not want to make an issue of that in the elections of the campaign of that year lest the Conservative Party would be defeated. All the world has known since we passed the present neutrality law in 1935, and as amended in 1936 and 1937, that in case of war we would not sell arms, munitions, and implements of war to any belligerent. They were warned sufficiently in advance and knew that all were to be treated alike. If the present law is so bad, why in the world did the President ask for it and why did we as representatives of a great and free people pass it?

Certain events have transpired in the past 1 or 2 years to which we cannot blind ourselves. Over a year ago President Roosevelt, dedicating a bridge in Chicago, spoke of economic sanctions and of quarantining aggressor nations. About the same time Anthony Eden made a special mission to the United States, where he was royally received and cordially entertained. Last January the President called his ambassadors to Britain and France, respectively, Mr. Kennedy and Mr. Bullitt, from their vacations in Florida back to Washington to appear before the Military Affairs Committees of the Senate and House in a joint executive session behind closed doors, picturing to us the great peril in which both Britain and France found themselves. Be it said to their credit, they are good salesmen. Later on last spring the President, bidding his friends in Georgia farewell, told them he would be back to see them this fall if we were not in war. Then came the crash of the airplane in California, in which a French pilot was seriously injured and the revelation of secret sales of airplanes to Britain and France was made known to both Congress and the people. Finally came the King and Queen of England themselves, and were wined and dined in our National Capital. No one knows what was secretly discussed between the representatives of the British and American Commonwealths, but there are many "amateurs" in this country who fought in the last war and who deserve something better than the ignominious title of "faker," who naturally wonder what promises, if any, were secretly made. In addition to all these incidents, there were certain notes sent to Europe, and when put together they make a completed picture like a jigsaw puzzle that spells anything but a neutral attitude.

For the life of me, Mr. Speaker, I cannot see how we can now change the rules in the middle of the game for the express purpose of helping one belligerent against another without being branded by any reasonable and just man as taking sides. On its face it is the most unneutral thing we could do. We are not staying out, we are getting in, and it is obvious from the

speeches and communications from all people who now want to repeal the embargo on arms, munitions, and implements of war that they are not neutral but are taking sides, and many of them are honest enough to admit it. They want to employ methods just short of war but such a thing is ridiculous and utterly impossible. [Applause.] We cannot be half in this war and half out. If we cannot deal honestly with other nations, we certainly should not attempt to kid ourselves by calling this a neutrality act. The advocates of repeal do not want to fight Germany; they merely want to slap her face or hand her enemies the weapons with which to destroy her, and this obviously is an act of war, and if we lift the embargo now, we will bring the war to our very shores. Is there any Member of this body so inexperienced, so gullible, so naive, or so "amateurish" as to believe for one moment Germany will not do her best to prevent arms, munitions, and implements of war reaching her enemies from any source whatever? German submarines will not wait until the cargoes approach England and France, but they will lurk outside our own harbors and our own coast lines.

Mr. Speaker, they will not wait until the munitions leave our own shores. Have we not learned from our sad experience in the last war that we shall have more Black Tom cases? Sabotage will be widely practiced, and violence will threaten us in every corner of our land. Remember, Mr. Speaker, that America is a heterogeneous nation, and we are a polyglot people. There are many foreign elements that comprise our citizenry, and if we take sides in the present dispute we must expect buildings to be bombed, subways dynamited, bridges blown up, trains wrecked, ships sunk, water supplies polluted, and the activities of secret agents will be all the more easy because we have 10,000,000 hungry men out of work. I am no alarmist; but who for one moment, in the light of past experience, thinks that this is not likely to happen?

It has been claimed that the present Senate bill before us contains cash-and-carry provisions, but such is not the case, as was ably pointed out yesterday by the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR]. Of course, the Allies may pay cash at the beginning for war materials if we lift the embargo, but as the trade increases and the war is prolonged the lesson of experience has taught us that credit will be extended, and when credit is extended we shall then have an investment in a belligerent country which we will fight to protect. There are just three steps, Mr. Speaker, which will lead us inevitably into war: First, we furnish munitions; second, we furnish money; and, finally, we furnish men. [Applause.]

The most fallacious argument for repeal that has yet been advanced, and the one that lurks in the minds of most of the advocates of repeal, whether openly expressed or not, is that repeal of the arms embargo would help business and put our idle men to work. Indeed, the President himself in his message of September 21 to us suggested in effect that we repeal the arms embargo to help solve the unemployment problem. That was amazing and shocking coming from the Chief Executive of the land. Personally, I do not believe we can ever have prosperity by accepting blood money; and if that term is not suitable, then accept the President's phrase in his Chautauqua speech, "fool's gold," and much as I wish to see the problem of unemployment solved in this country, I do not believe it would be a healthy solution to manufacture arms for sale to other nations to destroy themselves. No Christian country should care to prosper on the misery of others. War profits are unnatural, abnormal, and unsound. At best they are temporary, and are eaten up by the depression and high taxes that inevitably follow in the wake of war.

War is the most profitless enterprise on earth. No one ever wins, and always everybody loses. To be sure, our American people enjoyed a little temporary prosperity at the beginning of the World War 25 years ago. It was nice for our farmers to receive $2.50 a bushel for wheat; it was fine for our laborers in industrial plants and munitions factories to receive abnormally high wages, but it was not half so pleasant when both the farmers and laborers eventually had to go to war to pay for the little prosperity that was so transient in character. The war boom naturally caused overexpansion in both agriculture and industry, and when the war unexpectedly ended, as all wars must, the bottom dropped out of things, and the farmer and industrialist alike went into bankruptcy. Both are still trying to pay off the mortgages plastered on them by the last war.

Mr. Speaker, we entered the last conflict out of high idealism and with unselfish motives. Without pride of power, lust of ambition, or desire for territorial dominion, we staked our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor in a cause which we believed at that time to be high, holy, and just. We transported 2,000,000 men to France, spilled our blood, spent our money, and came out of the fight without a dollar of indemnity and without a square acre of territory. Our Allies even before we entered the conflict, by secret treaty, had already agreed to share the loot and divide the spoils. They even went so far as to promise Japan certain territory of China, though China as well as Japan was fighting with them. And they never gave Italy the territory they promised her. Mr. Speaker, we did not make the world safe for democracy; we did not end war, and the futility of the last conflict along with the iniquitous Versailles Treaty, written in the atmosphere of hate and in the spirit of revenge, which established artificial lines and boundaries arbitrarily cutting up the states of Europe and imposing impossible indemnities on a vanquished foe made Hitler possible and the present war for territory and balance of power inevitable. [Applause.] True, we enjoyed temporary prosperity in wartime but afterward came the deluge, and all that we have received for our efforts has been 10 years of depression, 10,000,000 men out of work, $13,000,000,000 of bad war debts which we will never collect, and 4 cemeteries in France. The only thing we could get out of another conflict would be deeper debts, longer depressions, higher taxes, and more graveyards. We burned our hands once; should we be so silly as to rush back into the fire?

Sir, we who want the embargo on arms, munitions, and implements of war retained do not claim its repeal would immediately lead us into another conflict but we are convinced in our own minds, "amateurish" as they are, and are forcibly told by the consciences that we possess, that repeal would be the first step on the road that leads ultimately to involvement. It is not the last blow that is struck, but the first one that usually precipitates a battle. Woodrow Wilson was a man of high ideals and certainly did not want America to be dragged into the last World War, but the initial steps taken by our Government with all their unpredictable eventualities finally led him against his own will into the conflict. Last Thursday night, Mr. Roosevelt said, "the United States, as I have said before, is neutral and does not intend to get involved in war." Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of all Members to the word "intend." After all, our intentions and motives do not count for as much as the practical and inevitable results of our acts. I repeat, sir, that none of us wants this Nation to go to war nor do we intend for it to go to war, but by taking certain steps—and the repeal of the arms embargo is one of these steps—we shall be led inexorably and inescapably into the heart of the conflict. Are we who honestly and conscientiously believe this way to be branded as "fakers" by anyone who disagrees with us? Personally I prefer to be on the level rather than "just a little bit left of center."

Mr. Speaker, there are some good provisions in the pending Senate bill which should be incorporated in our present law. Certainly our American citizens should not be allowed to travel on belligerent ships nor should our American ships be allowed to travel in the war zone or in waters adjacent to or surrounding the belligerent countries in Europe, unless it is to bring stranded Americans home. Certainly, after spending so much money in developing our merchant marine we should demand that our American ships should have free access to the seas except in those areas that definitely threaten their safety. It is a disappointment, however, that we do not have a definite cash-and-carry plan in the present bill and that such vast discretionary powers have been

granted the President. I do not believe the American people, regardless of politics, want any more discretionary powers voted to any man in the White House whether in war or peace, and if anything, they desire their representatives in Congress to take back many of the excessive powers granted the Executive under the cry of emergency. But whatever good points we have in this bill we could enact without repealing the embargo on arms, munitions, and implements of war, which is the greatest barrier to our involvement. Why mix the good with the bad, and demand that we swallow the bitter with the sweet? Why not retain the embargo on munitions and add to the present law any of these other provisions which would prove to be additional safeguards to our neutrality and security?

Sir, it is neither Pauline boasting nor Pharisaical self-righteousness to say that the United States of America has been more generous and helpful to other nations and peoples than any other government of this earth. To be sure, we are not perfect and have sinned in the past ourselves; but for over a century we have played the role of the Good Samaritan. For many, many years millions of dollars have poured from America from our Christian churches of all denominations to peoples less fortunate than ourselves. Our missionaries have established churches, schools, hospitals, and other benevolent institutions in Asia, India, Africa, and on many islands in the seas. They have taken light where there was darkness and offered hope where there was only despair. The Rockefeller Foundation everywhere has been a boon and blessing to mankind. To Japan, Russia, the Philippines, Puerto Rico, China, and many other places our Government has sent medical supplies, food, clothing, and the necessities of life to people in destitution and want. We fed the Belgians during the World War and took relief to Germany after the war ended. Always, America has tried to help the poor, the weak, and the wronged. Indeed, we have helped our enemies, blessed even those who cursed us—"Blessed and cursed not." Not in a bragging manner but with a humble spirit, we can take pardonable pride in the humanitarianism we have generously shown to the world. After this splendid and enviable record of accomplishment, we are now confronted with the ghastly aspect of this Nation furnishing, not only airplanes, tanks, guns, and ammunition but also poisonous gas and liquid fire to the belligerent powers of Europe. To me, it is a horrible, unnecessary, and unjustifiable business. We are now going to establish a record, not of mercy but of butchery. British, French, and German soldiers will breathe the poisonous gas and face the liquid fire furnished by Americans. No longer will we be known for our pity but for our brutality. We shall discard all sense of honor, decency, and dignity, and revert to the law of the jungle. The law of the tooth and the claw will supplant that of tolerance, equity, and light. Not only the men who sleep in blood-soaked, rain-drenched trenches, who go over the top and crawl on their bellies like snakes through the mud, the muck, and mire under barbed-wire entanglements will breathe this poisonous gas and face this liquid fire, but the millions of defenseless women, innocent children, and decrepit old men in large cities and little towns will suffer the same fate. How it will increase their respect and love for us as a nation and a people to know that these instrumentalities of death were made in the United States of America! I can see mustard gas eating the flesh from the emaciated bones of the starving and dying. I can hear the agonizing cry of men with their eyes burned out by liquid fire, whose mothers and wives and sweethearts back home, whether they be in Britain, France, or Germany, will swear eternal vengeance and pray a curse to rest upon America. Is this the best contribution, sir, that we have to offer civilization to save it from lapsing into a thousand years of barbarism? And yet, so far as I know, the Senate of the United States last week is the first parliamentary body that ever voted its approval of permament legislation of this kind. I do not want to dwell upon the awful misery and indescribable suffering that will result from modern bacteriological and chemical warfare lest some omnipotent and omniscient high Government official will brand me as being a "breast-beating faker" and an "armchair amateur." No breast beating and no words can accurately describe the terrible picture, but the world will know it when this living hell breaks loose.

Some people honestly believe that it would be better to repeal the whole Neutrality Act and return to our traditional policy of international law. The President in his message to us at the opening of this session seemed to be inclined to accept this view, and of course every man is entitled to his own belief. However, it is a well-established principle of international law that a neutral country, after the outbreak of war, cannot change its traditional policy by legislation in order to help one belligerent as against another without becoming unneutral. Therefore we would violate international law itself by lifting the present embargo on arms in order to return to international law. In other words, we would violate the very law we would return to. And, remember this, we had international law in 1917 and it did not keep us out of war then. Our present law has kept us out of the conflict thus far, so why change it now?

Everyone knows, even the "amateurs," that war is expensive business; expensive in men and money, and the aftermath is bad or worse than the war itself. We had better pay for the last war before we enter into another one. [Applause.] In 1917 we could enter a World War when our national debt was little more than $1,000,000,000, but today with a national debt of $41,000,000,000—and if you add the contingent liabilities for which our Government is responsible it is near $46,000,000,000—hanging over us, a war would be suicide. Our present financial structure could not stand the strain. Today we are spending approximately $1,000,000,000 in veterans' pensions and compensation benefits to the soldiers of our past wars, and every year we are admitting 28,000 veterans of the World War to our hospitals and insane asylums. We are spending another billion dollars annually in interest alone on our public debt, half of which was bequeathed to us by the World War and the other half of which has been added since March 4, 1933. The first line of national defense for any nation is its financial solvency. But should we be misled by skillfully prepared and poisonous propaganda to enter this war we could reasonably expect repudiation of the Government's obligation or ruinous inflation. In either instance the disaster would be appalling. But, Mr. Speaker, we would suffer a greater loss than the money we have saved and accumulated through hard work and self-denial over past years. The minute war is declared in this country America becomes a dictatorship overnight. We shall immediately experience the loss of individual liberty, the death of democracy, and complete regimentation of our people under an autocratic dictatorship. It would be highly doubtful after the war ended if the American people ever could regain their freedom. Already the President has more excessive powers granted him under the cry of emergency than were ever given in peacetime to any of his predecessors. Repeal the present arms embargo, make wider and less rugged the path that leads to conflict, and the moment war is declared the last stronghold of democracy on the face of this earth here in our own land capitulates. This is no idle dream nor farfetched theory. In Great Britain the elections to Parliament next year already have been canceled. We do not want that to happen here, but to keep our own liberties as free men and to remain a constitutional representative democracy.

It is fearfully suggested by some that if one of the belligerents wins the present conflict in Europe, America will be her next object of attack. Such apprehension is natural but such a possibility is remote. Whichever side in the present conflict wins will be so utterly exhausted and with the readjustment of its social, political, and economic problems to contend with all the discontented and disgruntled minorities within its boundaries to suppress, it will not be able to attack anyone else for many years to come and certainly not a country 3,000 miles away across dangerous waters which remain a natural barrier in spite of the advancement of science; a country which has 130,000,000 intelligent, patriotic, highly skilled citizens with enormous industrial and commercial output, and which could raise an army of 10,000,000 men and whose every citizen would fight without conscription to the

death in any defensive war. Should we become involved in a conflict now, spend our money and our men in another futile effort to determine the destinies of the different nations of Europe, we would be weak, too, at the end of the conflict. But if we are wise and follow the advice of the Father of his Country and every other great American patriot down to the present time, we will steer clear of the historic hatreds, the entrenched greed, the bitter jealousies, and the rank animosities that have kept Europe in constant turmoil for over a thousand years. We shall remain aloof from their disputes but not indifferent to their miseries, and when the war is ended America, because of her nonintervention and nonparticipation, will be virile and strong, and because of our remoteness and disinterestedness we shall have a moral influence throughout the world which will make itself felt and heard. For our own sake, for humanity's sake, for God's sake, let us save democracy in America and not again send our sons to foreign fields to fight for democracy where it is already dead. [Applause.]

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I listened with interest, as I always do, to the remarks of my friend the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT], who preceded me. The gentleman from Missouri is proceeding upon the theory that this is a vote for war or peace, yet the gentleman himself knows that an act of war under our Government is an act of Congress, and that the Congress of the United States would vote for war only if American public opinion overwhelmingly demanded it. [Applause.]

My distinguished friend talked about a thousand years of barbarism. That is what certain nations of the world are now trying to impose upon the peoples of the world, the attempt to hurl religion and Christianity, and all they stand for, back to the dark days of barbarism.

In last night's papers I read the speech of Premier Foreign Commissar Molotov, of Communist Russia, assailing the arms ban repeal. Molotov spoke officially for Communist Russia, and Dictator Stalin was present on the occasion when Molotov spoke. He spoke to 1,300 delegates controlled by Stalin, spoke in opposition to the repeal of the embargo. Do you think he did that for the best interests of the United States? Do you think he did that for the best interests of religion and the ennobling things for which it stands? Communism is the arch enemy of religion and every ideal for which decent mankind stands. Soviet Russia, in its constitution, states definitely that it is the enemy of religion, communism that would try to stop you and me from exercising our religious conscience, communism that went into Poland only a few weeks ago and took over 13,000,000 of liberty-loving and religion-loving people—Catholics, Protestants, and Jews. Today no churches exist in that part of Poland.

Within the past few weeks there came from Moscow itself the admission that Catholic priests were murdered, with the lying statement that they were resisting the Communist Army. They were murdered in Christian Poland for the same reason that they have been murdered for 20 years in Soviet Russia—priests, ministers, rabbis—because they were messengers of God and doing the work of God on earth. [Applause.]

If we do not repeal the embargo, we are not only helping communistic Russia but also Nazi Germany. The world knows that Nazi Germany stands for the same objective that communistic Russia stands for. Nazi Germany is attempting to dominate all religion, and the domination of religion means its suppression and destruction. Nazi Germany and Communist Russia have clasped hands. They are both in this conflict. They are both the anti-God forces. They are both trying to destroy religion. And yet our existing law brings about results that lend valuable aid and assistance to those world forces of destruction. For that statement made by the official representative of the Soviet—Communist—Government the United States ought to recall its Ambassador. [Applause.] That should be the answer of the United States to this attempt to influence the public opinion of America and this flagrant violation of international law. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, I voted for the embargo in the Spanish conflict. If the Spanish conflict was going on today, I would vote to retain it. I opposed repeal of the embargo when the attempt was made by some sources to repeal it, including the Communist Party of the United States and others.

An official statement of the Communist Party of the United States under date of September 21, 1939, states that it opposed repeal of the present law. In the case of the Spanish conflict these vicious forces favored repeal, because repeal of our law at that time would have helped the Communist element of Spain that dominated the so-called Loyalist Government. Today they are opposed to repeal upon instructions from Moscow and they are opposed to repeal today because the present law lends great aid and assistance to Nazi Germany and Communist Russia.

The Spanish conflict was more than a resort to arms. It was the attempt on the part of the Communists, backed by Soviet Russia, to impose upon the people of Spain a communistic state, with all of its viciousness and ruthlessness. If the so-called Loyalists won, Spain and its people would have become what Soviet Russia is today. It was a question whether Christianity and religion, or atheistic communism should prevail and dominate the life of the people of Spain. It was a question of Christianity and religion, with their ennobling influences, or communism, with its destructive results.

In that conflict I did not think it was for the best interests of the United States, or of religion to have communism win. My vote was based upon the conditions that existed at that time. I did not want the markets of the United States to be open to the Communists. The so-called Loyalists had free entry to our ports; the Nationalist group, under General Franco, did not. I voted for the embargo in that conflict with the intention of our country's having a neutrality policy, the result of which would not bring aid and assistance to the anti-God forces of that conflict.

When the attempt was made during that conflict to repeal the embargo, every clear-thinking person of a religious mind, under the leadership of practically all of the clergymen of all creeds, opposed repeal. They realized that the enemy of religion was trying to obtain control of another nation. They realized that the first attack would be upon religion. They realized the dangers to Christianity and to religion and to mankind. They took the position, as I did, that it was not for the best interest of the United States to have a neutrality policy which lent great aid and assistance to the open and avowed enemies of God and, at the same time, penalized those elements in Spain that believed in and followed His teachings.

Mr. Speaker, I know that no Member of this body intends to favor Communist Russia and Nazi Germany; however, the fact remains that the result of any Member's vote against repeal of the embargo is a vote that aids Communist Russia and a vote that aids Nazi Germany. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, I have in my hand, and I presume every Member received it, a letter from the German Bund, in which it states that this organization is opposed to repeal. Do you think that that organization is for the best interests of our country? Do you think that the Communist Party or communistic Russia is for the best interests of our country? Why, if I entered into this Chamber to vote and I knew the Communists advocated one thing, I could blindly vote the other way, and I know my vote would be for the best interest of our country.

What have we in this present conflict? We have Nazi Germany determined to destroy religion. We have Communist Russia determined to destroy religion. They are now both working together. I will make the affirmative statement that under our present law we are lending valuable aid and assistance to these destructive forces due to the fact we are penalizing the other forces engaged in the present war, forces that are not attacking religion, forces that are not trying to destroy the ennobling influences that religion brings to mankind.

Oh, there is something more in this war than what some have argued. There is the question of religion and Christianity itself being deliberately attacked. Oh, I hear no one

saying a kind word for religious Poland. Do you suppose religious Poland is going to be reconstituted by a Nazi victory or by a Communist victory? Oh, no. I hear few expressing any words of sympathy for those fine people of Poland who are, like you and me, human beings, possessed of a religious conscience—Catholic, Protestant, and Jew—who have seen religion destroyed, temporarily at least, by communistic Russia. Today in that part of Poland dominated and controlled by communistic Russia they cannot go to their churches. They are denied the free exercise of their religion, and today priests, ministers, and rabbis alike are and will be murdered. Oh, that is involved. Do you think an extension of these destructive powers is for the best interests of the United States? That is the question that concerns me.

The neutrality policy of the United States is purely a domestic question. In determining that question, our first and foremost consideration is the best interest of our country. Among the important considerations that enter into that determination are the world conditions that exist from time to time, their effect upon our country and ourselves, and, having in mind the world conditions, the adoption of a policy that will be consistent with the best interests of our country. Certainly it would be unwise, in fact, it would be wrong, to adopt a policy that immediately or ultimately would be contrary to our best interests.

I am hoping that the day will come when religious Poland will again revive so the people of that country can carry on with their liberties and their right to attend their churches as their consciences dictate.

Is it for the best interests of our country—that is the question—to permit a condition to exist here that aids the very forces that would destroy religion and would also destroy democracy? This is not a vote on war. This is a vote of common sense as to what kind of a neutrality policy the United States should have in the light of the existing world conditions.

I, as a Christian, am interested in the situation that exists. I do not want to see religion suppressed in any country. I believe it is necessary that religion, doing its work of God, and in the salvation of souls, must have a free and independent position within the spiritual field. We know that there are enemies of religion, of all creeds that are attempting to deny that right. They are enemies because a dictator who wants to maintain himself permanently in office cannot be assured of permanence as long as there exists alongside of him religion, that is free and independent, where priests, ministers, and rabbis are free to express themselves in performing their duties as messengers of God in their attempt to save the souls of men.

The United States of America is a religious nation. Our Constitution recognizes the omnipotence of God. The Constitution and the Declaration of Independence recognize that all power comes from God Himself, and you and I must ultimately answer to Him for the manner in which we exercise our conscience. If I bow down to the will of those on earth when my conscience tells me the contrary is the proper course to take, in accordance with the truths that I believe in, some day I, as everyone else, must answer to the Maker, and I cannot give the excuse on that occasion that I bowed to the will and demand of persons on earth because I wanted their votes or because I feared political repercussions.

There are many fine people whom I respect and whose opinions I value, but with whom I disagree and honestly so on this question, who fail to realize this fundamental issue, who fail to realize that this war as far as the totalitarian nations are concerned is a war against religion as well as against the other countries engaged in this struggle for other reasons. I do not care for England but I have nothing but contempt for Hitlerism and for Stalinism. [Applause.]

So, Mr. Speaker, I urge upon the Members of this House the consideration of the fundamental question that is involved, the question as to whether or not by the law of our country we shall permit results to flow therefrom that will assist the world forces of destruction; that will assist them to carry on their effort to destroy religion and all of the ennobling influences for which it stands. We cannot ignore the challenge. As Americans we cannot fail to recognize the seriousness of the situation. As Americans we should put our country in a position where the results of our law do not help the anti-God forces of the world and do not penalize those forces that stand for the existence and the permanence of religion, of Christianity, and of democracy. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me the speech made by the gentleman from Massachusetts should have been made to those who are responsible for the recognition of Soviet Russia. The speech of the gentleman from Massachusetts was the most extraordinary one I have heard in the many years I have been in the Congress. It was the most warlike speech that has been made since we declared war back in 1917. If we are to police and quarantine the world for religious motives, we had better have a vote on that question right away.

Mr. Speaker, no one in this body is more in favor of immediate deportation of all alien Communists, Nazis, and Fascists than I am, but, Mr. Speaker, it is none of our business what form of government exists in any foreign land, whether it be communism in Soviet Russia, nazi-ism in Germany, or fascism in Italy, neither is it any of their business what form of government exists in the United States of America. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, let us look at the record, as Al Smith used to say. What are the facts? The facts are that Great Britain and France for 6 months before a pact was made between Germany and Soviet Russia were engaged in trying to make a pact with Soviet Russia themselves. What would have been the position of the gentleman from Massachusetts if England and France had made a pact with Soviet Russia? I submit that no one is more opposed than am I to all dictatorial forms of government, and particularly to communism, but we do not propose sending American soldiers to foreign lands to change different forms of government and to fight different totalitarian states and their ideologies. I again predict that if the German Government is overthrown, they will have communism in Germany, and I regret to say, probably all over Europe. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, there can be no quarrel between me and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] on driving communism and fascism and nazi-ism out of this country, but I understood him to say that those of us who are supporting this Shanley amendment are supporting Nazi Germany and Communist Russia.

I want to say that any intimation that I am in sympathy with either one of those ideologies is so false, so vicious, so repugnant to every instinct of common decency that it would bring a blush of shame upon the brazen cheeks of the foulest fiend that ever howled its hideous course down the sulphurous vales of Hades. [Applause.]

Mr. McCORMACK and Mr. ANDERSON of Missouri rose.

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I want to say to the gentleman that I certainly never stated that with respect to any Member, and the gentleman certainly misunderstood me if he understood it that way.

Mr. RANKIN. I am glad to hear that, for I have always had great affection for the gentleman from Massachusetts.

We are striving to keep this country out of war. I am not questioning the motives of any other Member, and no one has the right to question mine or that of other Members who feel as I do about this all-important issue.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am not only in favor of driving fascism, nazi-ism, and communism out of America, but I have always been in favor of it. If the report of the Dies committe is correct, I am in favor of driving those international Communists forever from the Federal pay roll. [Applause.]

I am in favor of throwing out any man who follows the doctrines of a foreign power that is dedicated to destroying my government. I would raise the American flag high above every bureau of this Government and let the world know that this is still the country of Washington, Jefferson, Adams, Franklin, and Jackson, and those other immortals who have gone before us and who created, dedicated, and defended it in order that it might forever furnish a home for liberty, freedom, and democracy. [Applause.]

I have absolutely nothing for Hitler. He never did but one thing of which I am conscious of approving, and that was when he made it so hot for Bergdoll, the millionaire draft dodger, that he had to come back to the United States and go to jail, where he belongs, and where he ought to have gone 20 years ago. [Applause.]

I have nothing for communism. As soon as I found that Troyanovsky, the Russian Ambassador to this country, was going about over this Nation promoting communism, which was attempting to overthrow this Government and making speeches in favor of a military alliance between my country and Russia, I was in favor of sending him home then on the first boat. [Applause.]

If Fritz Kuhn came to this country and obtained his certificate of citizenship under false pretense, I am for canceling it at once and sending him home. [Applause.]

Let us remember that we men who are trying to save America from this holocaust of war are Americans with an American background [applause], and let me say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that I am a Christian, also. I do not belong to his church; I am a Protestant. I voted for this embargo when the Spanish war was going on, not because I was taking sides in what someone said was a war between Russian Jewish communism and the Catholic Church; I voted for it to keep my country out of that war, and it did that very thing. This embargo helped to keep us out of a war that a certain international element that has no sympathy for Christianity was spending money by the barrel to try to get us into.

I am very glad that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] joined me at that time in helping to keep America out of that conflict. Mr. Speaker, I am pro-British as between Great Britain and any other foreign country. I am especially pro-Scotch. Every drop of blood in my veins comes from either Scotch or English ancestry.

There is not a single human being in my district that I know of who was born in Germany. But I have hundreds, if not thousands, of young men in my district whose blood would be soaked into the soil of Europe if we got into another European war. I have enough humanity in my heart to do what I can, and I have done what I could to keep this country out of this war. I have been subjected to every pressure on earth. I have done what I could to induce the powers that be to intervene and ask for a truce and to bring this useless, senseless war to a close before it really begins, and I shall continue those efforts to the end. [Applause.]

I am supporting the amendment of my distinguished Democratic colleague from Connecticut [Mr. SHANLEY] to hold the arms embargo and at the same time to retain those Senate amendments that would keep American ships and American citizens out of the war zone. The only question with me is, Which is the best way to keep America out of this war? Practically every man who is listening to me today says that he has taken his position because he thinks it is the best way to keep out of war. I admire you for that stand. That one sentiment represents the heartbeats of 99 percent of the Christian people of America. The President thinks that the Senate amendments keeping Americans out of the war zone and keeping our ships out of the danger zone will do more to keep us out of the war than any embargo by itself. I agree with him on that point. But certainly holding the embargo still and holding those amendments put on by the Senate to keep our ships and our people out of the danger zone will "make assurance double sure" by taking a bond of fate that will guarantee that America will stay out of this war.

The war has not really begun, and, in my humble judgment, if this Shanley amendment is adopted, the war will not begin. If we repeal this embargo, we are encouraging Great Britain and France to go on into the war; to start the war, if you please, or to intensify it into a real war. They will do so believing that we are coming in. Will we be treating Great Britain and France as we should, to lift this embargo and encourage them to plunge into probably the most devastating war of all time, unless we are going in, too? They think we are coming in. Already in England they are singing The Yanks Are Coming. Two nights ago on the radio we were told from London that the English had been warned to "pipe down" on that song for the time being, which meant, of course, until the Congress lifted the embargo.

There is an international element that is singing Onward Christian Soldiers. That element wants us to go into the war, but not to protect Christianity. It is about 2,000 years too late for them to wrap the cloak of Christianity about themselves as defenders of the faith.

The people of Europe are appealing for peace. They are not fighting now on the western front. The only places in Europe they tell me that are not blacked-out are the athletic fields on the western front. The boys are playing football at night, and I hope they will keep it up.

Of course, I know the international group that expects to make money out of the war by coining their millions from the blood and tears of the suffering Christian people of the world are bringing every pressure to bear to keep the war going. They are very much afraid that peace will break out in Europe.

They have had the radio ringing with war propaganda for 2 years or more. They have control of the picture shows and have been using them for purposes of war propaganda and forcing their pictures on a helpless public by their system of block booking, by which they got over the one besmirching the United States Senate. By their advertisements they control many of the great newspapers of America that are now saying that we cannot keep out of this war. We can keep out. And, by the eternal gods, we are going to keep out of this war. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, I wish to pay my tribute to the man I believe to be the greatest Englishman of this day and generation, Mr. David Lloyd George, the great Christian leader of England, the great Baptist lay leader of the British Empire, and a former Prime Minister, one who went through all the hell of the World War. He saw all the tragedy and all of the horrors of that terrible conflict; and today, when this international group is clamoring for war and lambasting and abusing Lloyd George, he is rising—

> As some tall cliff, that lifts its awful form,
> Swells from the vale, and midway leaves the storm,
> Though round its breast the rolling clouds are spread,
> Eternal sunshine settles on its head.

He is appealing to the warring nations to gather around the counsel table and bring this terrible catastrophe to a close. I firmly believe that if we adopt the Shanley amendment and refuse to repeal the embargo and accept the rest of the Senate amendments, this war will not last 6 weeks. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, I am not a coward. I am not a pacifist. I hate communism with all the power of my soul. I am a real, old-time Jeffersonian American [applause], but I wish to God that those soldiers on the western front would crawl out of the trenches and say to each other, "If those war-making statesmen, those international bankers, who now control the destinies of Europe, will not ask for a conference to stop this holocaust before it goes any further, then we will stand here and refuse to fight until they do." I would love to see the German soldiers say to Hitler, "Mr. Hitler, you stop this war"; and the English soldiers say to Chamberlain, and the French soldiers say to Daladier, "Stop this war before you start a holocaust that will destroy probably ten or fifteen million of the very flower of the world's young manhood, to say nothing of the helpless women and children who will be killed by high explosives and poison gas."

If we will hold this embargo in the bill and adopt the other salutary provisions inserted in the Senate, we will do more to stop this war than all the attacks we can make upon those countries that we do not like. [Applause.]

Mr. ANDERSON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON of Missouri. The gentleman has been naming a lot of British statesmen. Will you name what statesman it was who said it was perfectly all right for Communist Russia to take a large portion of Christian Poland? Will you tell me why England has not repudiated that?

Mr. RANKIN. I am not going into that. We know it is a scramble for European trade territory and power. We know that Great Britain is preparing to approve the confiscation of Albania by Italy. We know that Great Britain is not going to try to restore that portion of Poland that was taken by Russia. I doubt if they will ever restore the rest of it, regardless of the outcome of the war. That is not what I am driving at. What I am trying to do is to keep my own country out of it, and we can do it by adopting this Shanley amendment and holding the Senate amendments to which I have referred. [Applause.]

The gentlemen on my left do not agree with me ordinarily. This is a matter that has caused me many weary nights. As the world's greatest philosopher once said,

> Between the acting of a dreadful thing
> And the first motion, all the interim is
> Like a phantasma, or a hideous dream:
> The genius and the mortal instruments
> Are then in council; and the state of man,
> Like to a little kingdom, suffers then
> The nature of an insurrection.

I have worried and I have prayed over this question, and I have come to the conclusion that the only course I can take under my oath of office and my conscience is to vote for the Shanley amendment and for the salutary amendments placed there by the Senate of the United States. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, we went through the World War to make the world safe from just what the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] was preaching against a while ago. We were going to make the world safe for democracy. We were going to guarantee the integrity of small nations. We were going to end all wars. In that war we lost hundreds of thousands of men, but the worst of it was we destroyed a generation of young men. We have about 90 hospitals for veterans in America. As chairman of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation I have seen more of the aftermath of that war than probably any other man living. God forbid that we should have another one.

I saw the mother, broken and wrinkled with time and care, turn her sorrow-stricken face toward the chair made vacant by the old fireplace and weep the tears of a broken heart. I saw a father, aged and dependent, leaning upon the staff of decrepitude, "in his face the emptiness of the ages and on his back the burden of the world," bowed down in grief for that son that we were taking by the iron hand of conscription to send to fight on foreign soil. I saw them come back broken in health and divorced from their position in life. They never did get exactly fitted back. Now, are we going to destroy another generation? With them would probably be destroyed a generation of women and children.

Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I read the following description of a scene of battle after these high explosives, poison gasses, and flame throwers, had done their deadly work:

> Chunks of human flesh were quivering on the branches of the trees. * * * A half dozen houses were burning. * * * Mules and horses were pawing in their entrails. * * * The whitewashed church was bespattered with blood and brains. * * * Men were running about howling with insanity, their eyes protruding from their sockets. * * * One woman was sitting against a wall trying to push her bleeding intestines back into her abdomen. * * * A man lay nearby, digging his teeth and his fingers into the ground. * * * A child sat on a doorstep whimperingly holding up the bleeding stumps of its arms to a dead woman whose face was missing.

God deliver the helpless women and children of my country and the helpless women and children of the nations of Europe from such a fate.

This poison gas and these deadly bombs will not all go to England. Everybody with any intelligence knows that they will go to England and Germany and every other country who wants to buy them. Those men who want to coin their money out of the blood of humanity and out of the sacrifice of civilization, would sell those things to anybody on earth who could pay for them. If we pass this measure and leave this poison gas and these high explosives in this bill they will be used not only to destroy innocent women and children in Germany and Austria, but they will be used to destroy innocent women and children in France and in Great Britain as well. And if we are dragged into it, as certain international influences hope we will be, it may then be used to destroy the lives of our own wives and children. Those are the things I am protesting against. For God's sake, let us rise above this petty quibbling, accept the salutary provisions of the Senate bill, hold this embargo, and bring this war to a close before it bursts into the most devastating destruction the world has ever seen. [Prolonged applause.]

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOOK].

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, neutrality and democracy are born in the hearts and the minds of the American people. I might say right now that I intend to vote for the Senate bill, and I shall be proud of that vote. The reason I shall be proud of that vote is because I shall never intentionally cast a vote that will help the enemies of democracy. Communazi-ism, which represents the Godless elements of the earth, is the most dangerous enemy of democracy.

We may talk of poison gas, we may talk of arms and ammunition, but poison gas, arms, and ammunition are being manufactured every day by the enemies of democracy to create all the dread, misery, and inhumonity that has been described during this debate. Yes; they have been stored up for years by the enemies of democracy and are now being unleashed in all their fury against those who believe in the sanctity of God, religion, and the basic principles of freedom.

I shall never be a silent partner to those enemies of democracy. At this time I want to refer to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 84, page 8155, a speech made by the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. BARTON]. I agree with the statements he made at that time. He said:

> I repeat, the operation of the present act does not result in neutrality.
>
> It favors strong nations against weaker nations, and warlike nations against peace-seeking nations. The strong, warlike nations are already armed and supplied with munitions. Under international law the weaker of peace-seeking nations have a right to purchase their means of defense in the markets of the world, our own included. The present law denies that right. As the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] observed in his testimony before the committee, if France had a similar act during the struggle of our American Colonies for independence, that struggle would probably have been lost.
>
> The first question to be decided, therefore, is this: Do we want this session of Congress to adjourn with the present Neutrality Act on the books, knowing that it is not a real neutrality act at all, but is, in fact, a law that makes us a silent partner of nations that have rearmed?

That is the speech of the gentleman from New York, and I agreed with him then. It is a sound argument, just as sound today as it was at the time it was given. I will never, as long as I am a Member of this House, become a silent partner with the enemies of democracy, even though the gentleman from New York has now chosen to join with those who would make us a silent partner of the enemies of democracy. I abhor war; I refuse to do anything that will in any way tend toward sending any of our youth to fight on foreign soil, but I also refuse to aid and abet our enemies. It is manifestly true that the arms embargo does aid and abet those who would destroy our form of government. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLLINS].

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, the repeal of the embargo on arms, munitions, and implements of war presents a question to this body about which honest men may differ. When it was on for consideration in the House last June I

cast my vote against lifting the embargo. Then there was promise of a pacific adjustment of the German-Polish controversy and I was averse to our Government taking a position on that issue that may have prevented a peaceful settlement of it.

I loathe war. I know too much about it, for it has been my responsibility for many years to study and to plan a modern and effective military establishment for our country. I know that war is barbarism at its lowest ebb, that civilization's strength turns to brute force—the wisdom of the ages degenerates into the cunning of the beast seeking to kill and to exist. Because I know this so well I believed last June it would be a mistake for this country to amend its Neutrality Act in behalf of the democracies when such action may have prevented a peaceful settlement of the German-Polish issue.

The situation is changed. War is now on in Europe and to the limits of my ability I propose to keep it there and to keep this country out of it.

I propose to be entirely frank. I hold no brief for England or France. Only too well I know that both of these countries merely want us to help them in another of the wars that have been going on in Europe from the Spanish Succession to the present hour and which will continue about every 25 years apart or until a new crop of boys are reared to military age. I know too well that many of our people feel that we should not miss even one of these wars. I believe, however, that a majority of Americans prefer to stay out of this one—to skip at least every other one. Personally, I feel that our chances of becoming involved in this one will be materially lessened if the democracies are again the victors. For that reason I am now willing to lift the arms embargo and thus make available to them, within the continental limits of the United States, the products of our factories for prosecuting the war—be they airplanes, guns, tanks, armored cars, ammunition, or what not—so long as we continue to maintain an adequate reserve of raw materials for our own needs.

By so doing we promote the chances of victory for the democratic countries, thereby hastening the return of peace. Likewise, we gear up our own industry and make ourselves ready for any unforeseen turn of events.

Of course, we cannot be sure of the outcome, even though the democratic countries do manage to transport such quantities and kinds of our munitions as they may need. We can be sure of this, however, that by stepping up American industry we have promoted our own readiness to stave off any threat to this hemisphere, and there may be such threat should the totalitarian powers dictate the terms of peace and gain territory close enough to the American Continent.

With the world picture as it is today—with all Europe either in actual war or sufferers, or near sufferers, as its consequence—the speeding up of industrial production here is necessary for our own well-being. We posses the best navy in the world. We have done much to modernize all of the components of our Army, which is by no means small in numerical strength, and we are on the road to its complete implementation. Do not be fooled by propagandists here and abroad. We are well prepared for modern war on land, on the sea, and in the air. A highly geared industry producing modern implements of warfare will supply greater matériel demands should the need arise later for expansion of our military forces.

I hate war—and because I do I shall always oppose any move that may lead us into war, including proposals emanating from sources which, for some excuse or another, and always without reason, are continuously advocating military and naval establishments of proportions which no nation that has a will to stay at home and mind its own business needs.

The Congress should make every effort to maintain peace. The American people want an honest, intelligent peace. Perhaps some day the parliaments of the world can get together on how it is to be done. This is the greatest challenge to mankind. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman yields back 1 minute.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, may I ask how the time stands?

The SPEAKER. Of the time consumed today, the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM] has used 1 hour and 9 minutes. The gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] has used 1 hour.

Mr. BLOOM. How does the total time stand, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] in all has used 3 hours 8½ minutes. The gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM] in all has used 2 hours 56½ minutes.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MAAS].

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Speaker, it is extremely regrettable that the neutrality legislation was not disposed of in the regular session of Congress, before a war broke out. I wish I were absolutely positive that I knew the right answer to this most perplexing and far-reaching problem that confronts us. I have never studied a question so intensely, nor weighed all considerations so carefully as I have this legislation. I can only hope that I have arrived at a correct answer. I pray that whatever the Congress may do that it may prove to be the right course.

I have always been opposed to embargoes as an international policy. I view it as an unwise and dangerous method. I opposed the original enactment of this so-called neutrality legislation. I took an active part in the fight to repeal it this June.

I am not now opposing the Senate amendments to the House bill because of any change in opinion on the principle of embargoes.

My reason for voting for the motion to instruct the conferees is because I agreed last June with President Roosevelt and Secretary of State Hull that the embargo should have been repealed then; that to do so once a war had commenced would almost certainly involve us in that war. I still believe this. I still agree with what the President and the Secretary of State believed then. I believe that to make any major change in our Neutrality Act while a war is in progress, when such change is intended to be an aid to one side in that war, against the other side, greatly increases the danger of our becoming involved in that war.

Mr. IZAC. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAAS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. IZAC. Would the gentleman be in favor of it if it becomes necessary and in the interest of the American people?

Mr. MAAS. Oh, of course, I am in favor of voting for anything that is in the interest of the American people.

Mr. IZAC. But the gentleman does not believe this is in the interest of the American people?

Mr. MAAS. I do not believe it is at the present time in our interest.

Mr. FISH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAAS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FISH. The gentleman would be in favor of voting for war if it was in the interest of the American people?

Mr. MAAS. Of course I would.

Mr. DONDERO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAAS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. The gentleman is not in favor of taking any step that will be unneutral and unfriendly to anyone after war has started?

Mr. MAAS. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. PATRICK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAAS. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. PATRICK. How can the gentleman say that having once passed a law, and then two nations in another part of the earth become involved in war, that should freeze us in our tracks, even if that war ran 20, 30, 50, or 100 years? We pass laws in our own right and for our own people and take our own neutral steps. We are not thereby frozen and cannot unshackle ourselves.

Mr. MAAS. Oh, I may say to the gentleman I do not contend for 1 minute we have not the right to repeal this law.

We have the right to make or unmake any law which we have passed. We also have the right to go all the way and declare war, but we should know what we are doing when we do that. The real question is not whether we can change the law, but is it desirable to change the law now that war has broken out?

Mr. ENGEL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAAS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. ENGEL. In my speech a week ago Monday I quoted the Secretary of State, and I want to read now what Ambassador Page telegraphed the Secretary of State regarding this very subject matter.

In December 1914 Senator Hitchcock, of Nebraska, introduced a resolution in the Senate aimed at the exportation of munitions of war to any belligerent. On December 11, 1914, the American Ambassador to Great Britain, Mr. Page, cabled the Secretary of State as follows:

Sir Edward Grey unofficially expressed the hope to me that the bill introduced by Mr. Hitchcock in the Senate will not pass, aimed to prohibit the exportation by private firms of munitions of war to any belligerent.

He calls attention to the fact that this would be special legislation passed while war was in progress, making a radical departure from long-established customs, and for these reasons would be an unneutral act toward the belligerents. This is a telegram sent by Mr. Page, the American Ambassador, to the Secretary of State in 1914 on this question, which represents the English attitude at that time.

Mr. MAAS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, to change the law now is a deliberate, affirmative act of partisanship. It is not only one of those steps "short of war," it is but a step short of a declaration of war, and the one is very likely to follow the other. Such a change in our law now will be such an unneutral act that we may have to ourselves answer for it upon the battlefields before this war is over.

The proponents of repeal say that the present embargo aids Germany and hurts the Allies. This, of course, is not true at all. What they really mean is that our present law does not hurt Germany in the same way that it does England and France, due to the fact that Germany cannot get munitions from us anyway because of the British blockade.

We come as near as possible to having real neutrality now because neither side can purchase munitions from us, and therefore we have no stake in the war.

The Allies knew what our law was when they declared war on Germany in September.

To stimulate a wartime munitions-making industry in this country is a most dangerous thing to do. One side in the war will control the seas and therefore prevent the other side from obtaining munitions from us, while they themselves will depend upon our production to carry on the war. Agents of the side that is denied access to our munitions will try to even things up by preventing the dominant sea power from getting our munitions. The only method possible is to destroy our munition factories and prevent arms and ammunition from ever being loaded on their enemies' ships. This happened before. It will again inflame public opinion in this country, and will be one of the potent causes of our entering the war. Every explosion, regardless of cause, will be blamed upon a belligerent. Soon an outraged public will be demanding our entry into the war. Soon we will be even more intensively propagandized that the Allies are fighting "our" war for us. If this is true, and they are fighting our war, then we should not only immediately repeal all neutrality legislation but we should openly declare war and take our place side by side with France and England. To do less is cowardly. If it is our war, let us get in now and get it over with as quickly as possible. Let us not wait, as we did before, until the Allies are defeated and then have to face a victorious enemy.

But are the Allies fighting our war? In what way are we threatened by Germany if we keep out of this war? Is this then another war to "make the world safe for democracy"? We tried that once. We all know the results. No; I do not believe that the Allies are fighting our war. The cause of this war is the same as the last one. It is a collision of two powerful European commercial competitors. We have no inherent interests in the commercial supremacy of either one.

Ideologies are not involved. It is a commercial war. We lose if we take sides, no matter who wins.

We certainly should have learned from the last war that we will again be holding the stakes and will be the principal losers. We made a noble effort to assist in solving Europe's problems in 1917 and 1918, but all we got out of it was billions in I O U's, which have never been paid and never will be. This might not be so bad, but there was needless sacrifice of thousands of the finest young men of America on Europe's battlefields. We suffered more than any nation in Europe with our post-war depression costing us up to two hundred billions and resulting in unemployment and suffering by millions of Americans over a period of years. Do we want to go through this all over again merely for a year or two of false war prosperity?

My sympathy goes out to the peoples of Austria, Czechoslovakia, and Poland. But bitter experience has taught us that going over there to butt into their wars will not help them. We learned that tragically 20 years ago. I pray that Finland may not suffer the unhappy fate of Poland, but we must know that we cannot change the course of events in Europe by participating in their wars. Both sides will listen to us if we are a powerful neutral, however.

As to the contention that if we let France and England be defeated that we will then have to face a victorious Germany alone, over here, is ridiculous. This was the same argument that helped draw us into the war 20 years ago. We are told that if we let the Allies lose, that Germany will demand and receive the British possessions—Canada, Bermuda, Nassau, and the rest of the British-American islands. If we remain out of this war, conserve our full manpower, our economic resources, and build up our own military might, even a European victor would not dare risk war with us in this hemisphere.

The purpose of this bill before us is not to improve our neutrality law. Its only effect, and I believe its sole purpose, is to enable this Government to intervene in the present war.

Otherwise, why change the law now? Certainly so long as we have an embargo on munitions our peace is not endangered by Germany, Russia, or Italy.

Then are we to believe that we will be threatened with a war by France and England because we will not repeal some law to which they object? Are we to believe that they would risk our friendship? If not, then by whom is our peace threatened by the retention of the arms embargo? How will retaining it get us into war? No one has even offered the slightest explanation of this contention.

What were the motives behind those who advocated an embargo-neutrality law in the first place? They are the very ones now demanding its repeal. Was it a genuine belief that such a course would keep us out of war? Or were they cruelly deluding the people in an effort to capitalize politically upon the popular sentiment to keep this country out of war? Were they dangerously gambling that there would be no war, and therefore no show-down, in their attempt to play up to the popular demand for neutrality?

Or did their calculations miscarry and the effect of the law appear to aid the wrong side, so that now they want to change it?

If Germany controlled the seas, would the proponents of embargo repeal be before us still advocating repeal?

Should Germany gain control of the seas—and well she may with her superior air force and submarines—will not the present advocates of repeal again demand the reenactment of the arms embargo?

How can this, by the widest stretch of the imagination, be considered neutrality?

The intent of this bill is to aid one side as against the other. That is the first step to ultimate active participation in the war. It is the same road down which we went to war the last time.

Our furnishing supplies now means our furnishing men later as surely as it did 20 years ago.

For us to get dragged into war now, a war that does not involve our vital interests, will be fatal, even if we win. Starting with a $45,000,000,000 debt will necessitate repudiation of all public and most, if not all, private debts in order to finance an overseas war.

This can be done only by a dictator. Dictators, once established, must employ drastic methods in order to maintain their power. The pattern for dictators is always the same. Their method is persecution, the arousing of class and racial hatred, the use of intolerance, with the resultant loss of freedom and liberty. All of the Old World bitterness will be transplanted over here. America will be gone, for when this comes about, the last refuge of freedom and liberty shall have perished from the earth; the last hope of the religious and racial minorities shall be crushed for centuries to come; all shall be lost.

This all too likely result may be the price we will pay for meddling in a European war, for the gravest danger in repealing the embargo is the implication it will carry throughout the world. Our own American people may not yet fully realize the consequences, but the peoples of Europe on both sides will interpret repeal as a deliberate, considered act to cast our lot with the Allies against Germany and probably Russia and Italy. Both sides will expect and plan upon our entry into the war. Certainly the recent headlines in London clearly indicate that the British will count upon full participation by the United States when full participation becomes needed.

It will stimulate the present diplomatic fencing, which is accompanied by military scouting, into a full-fledged war. It will permit the supplying of munitions to turn this juggling over there into a terrible, horrible World War—one that will last so long that we will be bound to become involved sooner or later.

Let us not forget that it was our entry into the World War which turned the tide and made possible the victory by the Allies.

It was that very aid which made possible such vindictive and drastic peace terms that Hitler and Stalin became not only possible but a certainty.

If we stay out of the war we will be in a position to mediate the dispute when the war is over and to see that justice is done and to prevent another Versailles, which turned out to be not a peace treaty but a declaration of a future war. If we do take sides, and even if that side wins, it will only result in another Versailles Treaty, with all of its resultant tragedy. The World War, which our aid permitted the Allies to win, was fought in vain.

Let us retain the embargo and conserve all of our resources for our defenses. Let us buy every airplane American factories are capable of producing for our own air defense.

We are not a European nation. But we are a pacific power. In that direction lies our destiny and our danger. Let us not dissipate our manpower, military might, and economic resources in a European war. If we keep out of such wars and turn all of our efforts to building up our own defense, no power on earth—not even a victorious combination in Europe, with the aid of any oriental power—would dare to engage us in a war in this hemisphere. If we do weaken ourselves in an overseas European war we may then become an easy prey to aggression from the Orient.

We cannot get into trouble if we mind our own business and, instead of trying to solve the problems of the world, turn our attention to solving our own urgent problems at home.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] such time as he may desire.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, history is valuable principally because it enables us to chart our course for the future based upon the experiences of the past. Do the results of the World War which we entered in 1917 justify our taking a step that may lead us into another World War in 1939?

For 150 years this country had no neutrality law. Our course in dealing with foreign nations was controlled by international law—whatever that is. The express purpose of the Senate bill is permanently to abandon international law, not to return to it. International law did not keep us out of the World War. After that war our people began to cast about to find a formula that would assist in insulating our country against future foreign wars. This hope, aspiration, and desire on the part of our people came to fruition in the Neutrality Act of 1935. This Neutrality Act was not quickly conceived or hastily arrived at. It was the result of years of study on the part of the peace-loving people everywhere throughout the length and the breadth of our land. Much of the argument being used in the present debate was used at the time the act of 1935 and amendatory legislation was being considered.

The country got along very well under the Neutrality Act of 1935, but after further study and experience it was thought wise to place some strengthening amendments in the law. In 1937 you will recall that the so-called Pittman bill passed the Senate and that the House considered the McReynolds bill, both dealing with the same subject but differing as to method. At that time I reached a conclusion as to what my course in this matter of neutrality legislation should be, and, in the debate on that amendatory bill, on March 18, 1937, I said in part:

> The Pittman bill writes all the rules before the advent of the war. The world is given notice that this country will not in any way attempt to furnish materials of any kind that can be used for war purposes to the warring nations. There can be no misunderstanding. There can be no partiality, and there is no discretion lodged in any agency. I therefore prefer the Pittman bill. This is a far-reaching measure, of course, and some of the implications are not pleasing. Both of these measures provide that we can only do business with any belligerent nation on a cash-and-carry basis. Under no circumstances will we sell any materials of any kind to belligerent nations unless title passes completely in this country and responsibility for removal from the country rests squarely upon the shoulders of the purchaser. It has been said that the passage of this legislation will make the United States the ally of Great Britain in the Atlantic and of Japan in the Pacific, for the reason that these nations control these respective waters, and that if Great Britain is at war she will be able to purchase on a cash-and-carry basis because she will be able to do her own carrying, and that the same will be true of Japan.

It will, therefore, be observed that cash and carry, as proposed in the Senate resolution now before us, is nothing new. In fact, the act of 1937 provided cash and carry for everything except arms, munitions, and implements of war. However, this provision of the law expired by limitation on May 1, 1939. Therefore, if the so-called cash-and-carry provision of the pending resolution is adopted, we will be but continuing the 1937 law. I know of no one who does not favor such action. Why then all this fuss and propaganda about cash and carry? One would think that it was some innovation or new proposal. I hope it is not for the purpose of confusing those who favor the arms embargo. There is no reason why we should not have both cash and carry and the arms embargo. In that same speech on March 18, 1937, I said:

> Again, the opponents of this measure tell us that we are abandoning our time-honored policy of insisting upon the freedom of the seas. There is no question but that the neutrality legislation of a year ago, and as embodied in the pending measure, do abandon that time-honored tradition. Woodrow Wilson said that we entered the World War to make the world safe for democracy. I think we all realize now that we entered the World War primarily because we insisted upon the freedom of the seas, and that the destruction of the *Lusitania* violated that policy, and overnight we were in the midst of the conflagration.
>
> Again that brings us to the question of profit or peace. Had this neutrality law been in effect in 1917, the fact that the *Lusitania* was carrying munitions of war, and American citizens knowingly and intentionally were passengers on the *Lusitania* in violation of our law, then it would not have been the duty of this country to enter the war because of the violation of a policy or a law upon which we insisted. Sad as it is, international law, as has been demonstrated so many times in the past, amounts to little when nations get at each other's throat in a war for supremacy. I reiterate that this neutrality legislation does involve a change of policy. That is what we want. The policies we have been following have led us into war; and while this bill is undoubtedly faulty in many ways, yet it is headed in the right direction and will tend to isolate us from the quarrels of other nations. Yes; it is harsh in some particulars, and there will be complaint on the part of those who want to manufacture war materials for the sake of the dollars resulting. But, by and large, the masses of our people are so opposed to war anywhere in the world that when this law is thoroughly understood it will be accepted with universal accord.

These were my sentiments as given to the House in 1937. Nothing has since transpired to change my views. They are my sentiments today. I came to this session of Congress with an open mind. I have heard the President's message. I have heard the debates. I have studied the arguments. I have not been convinced that it is wise to repeal the arms embargo at this time. Some of those who have participated in this debate leave the impression that the war now going on in Europe is a contest between ideologies. This contention was given much consideration by the House in June 1939 when the battle lines for the present war were forming and when the Bloom resolution was under consideration. In my remarks at that time, in discussing this question, I said:

Mr. Chairman, let us not be misled by propaganda that the impending war in Europe is a conflict between the doctrines of the democracy as against that of the dictatorship. There is nothing further from the truth. If these nations go to war—as now seems likely—form or type of government will not be the issue. These nations will fight for territory, colonies, boundary lines, raw materials, trade, and, last but not least, power. Our boys went to Europe once to make the world safe for democracy, and we know now that was not the issue at all. It does seem that we should have learned our lesson. We contributed our blood and treasure for what we thought was a Wilsonian ideal. We were all sincere, but we know now that it was just another European war. We changed our entire economy. We piled up billions of dollars of indebtedness. We sacrificed of the flower of our young manhood, and because of that World War we are even yet passing through the valley of one of the greatest depressions of all time. Our people are opposed to embarking upon any policy where there is even a remote possibility of repeating our experiences of the World War.

Of course, we have a preference as to the various forms of government obtaining throughout the world, yet we are not the keeper of the world; we are not the policeman of the world. We have enough to do to attend to our own business, make this a better land in which to live, and influence by example rather than by attempted force. Let us quit fussing around in Europe and put our own house in order. For hundreds of years these European territorial and boundary line disputes have raged, and there is no indication that the end is near. Why should we be drawn in? If the pending war develops, it will be but a quarrel over the spoils of the last war. President Wilson was an idealist. He though that the ways of Europe could be changed. Now we all realize the sad truth. We paid a terrible price for this knowledge.

The Neutrality Act of 1935, as amended by the act of 1937, passed the House and Senate almost unanimously, and was accepted in a similar manner by the country. A certain feeling of security prevailed among our people. They felt that their Congress had at least attempted to keep out of foreign war and had written on our statute books law that would be effective in this regard.

That law is upon the books today, the only difference being that the cash-and-carry provisions have been permitted to lapse. The first occasion arising, whereby the value of the law might have been determined, was when the undeclared war broke out between Japan and China. The law was not applied to that war because the President did not see fit to find that a war was in progress. Too much discretion was lodged in the President. When war was recently declared in Europe, the President could not escape, and so we find our neutrality law in full force and effect at this hour. The embargo has been invoked, and we are not shipping these murderous instruments of war to the belligerent nations. Who says that to sell this poisonous gas and these weapons will help keep us out of the war? Who is there among us who can stand on this floor and say that the law is not working well? It has not got us into foreign war. Of course time alone can tell whether or not it will keep us out of war. If we are to change the law let us strengthen it by adding what is good in the Senate bill and keeping the arms embargo. To repeal it now will put us right back where we were in 1914. Who wants to return to that position with all its possibilities? We traveled that route once. Several reasons have been given by the proponents of this resolution why it should be passed:

First. It is contended that the law is unneutral in that it prevents all belligerents from purchasing these arms. It is claimed that the embargo should be repealed so that the Allies might take advantage of their power to "come and get" ammunition in this country to carry on their war. It is admitted that Germany could not avail herself of the assistance of our arsenals if the arms embargo is repealed.

Second. It is contended by another group that it is our duty to assist the so-called democracies in every way possible short of war; that is, our country is a part of the world, the world must be reorganized, and it is our duty as a Nation to participate in the reorganization. It is said that whether we will it or not, we must eventually get into this war unless we render such assistance to the Allies as will make it possible for them to win. In other words, it is our war and must be won by the Allies in Europe or we must fight it out in the Western Hemisphere at a later date.

Third. It is contended that selling all belligerent nations arms and ammunition, as well as other materials, on a cash-and-carry basis, will aid in keeping us out of war.

On the other side, it is held that:

First. The present neutrality law was written in 1935, perfected in 1936 and 1937, when the world was at peace, and was notice to all the world what our attitude would be in the event of a foreign war. To change this law now would be unneutral, partial, and taking sides in an existing war.

Second. It is further held that this would not only be an unneutral act but that it would be considered a partisan and a hostile act by those nations in the war which, because of their physical condition or equipment, could not take advantage of the offer of the United States to furnish munitions and become the arsenal of the warring nations.

At the beginning of the debate in the Senate there was apparently some question as to whether or not the Congress could change our neutrality law at this time without violating international law. As a result the opinion and advice of the outstanding authorities on international law in this country have been sought and obtained. I shall not go into this phase of the matter other than to call your attention to the convincing argument made on yesterday by the distinguished member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHANLEY]. You will remember that he called the roll of these international authorities and, headed by John Bassett Moore, they were of the opinion that to repeal the arms embargo, thereby changing a law written in peacetime, and for the express purpose of assisting one of the belligerents in the war, would be unneutral. Of course, there are those who, by strained construction and labored effort, attempt to justify their position, that because the law, as it now stands, works to the benefit of one side; therefore, in order to be neutral, we must change that law so that it will benefit the other side. This just does not make sense. It does demonstrate how difficult it is to divorce ourselves from our sympathies. The debate in the Senate started out along this line but eventually Senator BURKE, Senator AUSTIN, and others removed the blue goggles, the whiskers, and other camouflage and came out squarely and told the truth as they understood it, and that truth, as stated by them, is that the real purpose of this legislation is to help one side in the conflict. No one can find fault with that sincere position of any Member.

Now we are all agreed that we do not want to get into war. Most of us are agreed that we do not want to take the first step in that direction. Some of us conscientiously feel that to lift the embargo is not only taking the first step but is a promise to take the last step. We feel that the best way to keep out of the war is to keep out of the vestibule to the war. To remove the arms embargo is to widen the road, to increase the chances, and, under certain contingencies, to make necessary the last step—war.

I am not going to discuss the horrors of war. I am not going to talk about the mothers who must make the great sacrifice. The grief and the sorrow that follow in the wake of war are known to all of us. We want to avoid these things. The matter before us today must not be decided from any emotional, partisan, or profit standpoint. We do not want another unknown soldier's grave for an unknown cause. We do not want to profit out of anybody's war. We do not want an economic stake in anybody's war.

We do want to pursue a genuine American course, making the world a better place in which to live. We believe that

this can be best brought about by putting our own house in order and adhering to the philosophy of those who laid the foundation of our Government.

This debate has been pitched on a high plane. Selfishness, greed, and partisan gain have found no place in the argument. It is a question of sincere desire and effort to do the right thing. No Member's motives should be questioned. The responsibility resting upon us is terrific, and we must accept that responsibility with a full knowledge of what goes with it. Of course, there are two sides to any controversial question. Both sides cannot be in the right. In these circumstances, the safest guide to follow is one's individual conscience. We all have that, and democracies will endure and will function as intended just so long as the representatives of the people act honestly, sincerely, and in accordance with the dictates of that conscience.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY].

NEUTRALITY

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, we are all of one mind in wanting to avoid war. Democrats and Republicans, repealists and antirepealists, have this common purpose. No partisan bias governs our action. In considering the legislation now before us our single thought is, How can we best preserve peace for America?

No human being is endowed with the power to foresee the future or to foretell the consequences of whatever action we may take here. We can only express our individual opinions for what they may be worth.

One thing we do know: The decision we have to make is a fateful one, involving momentous consequences. If ever the Congress of the United States needed Divine guidance, it is in this hour.

I realize that as a result of the lengthy discussion of the neutrality issue, not only in Congress but over the radio and in the press and on the lecture platform, there is no new argument that can be offered, either pro or con. These remarks are made, not with the idea of contributing anything new to the discussion but in order to make my position clear and to explain my reasons for having come to the conclusion at which I have arrived.

THE ISSUE

What is the issue before us?

Under the existing Neutrality Act, which was passed in 1935 by an overwhelming vote in both Houses, an absolute embargo is placed upon the sale to belligerent nations of any arms, ammunition, or implements of war. No restriction is put upon the sale of raw materials or foodstuffs, nor upon the transportation of these commodities in American vessels.

In the measure now before us it is proposed to amend the law in two outstanding particulars: First, by abandoning the embargo on the sale of arms, ammunition, and implements of war, and, second, by placing our commerce with belligerent nations on a cash-and-carry basis; that is, by requiring such nations to pay cash for any goods purchased here, whether arms, raw materials, foodstuffs, or other commodities, and to furnish their own means of transportation. In other words, title would be taken by the belligerent nation before the goods leave our shores, and no American vessel would be permitted to carry them to the belligerent country. There are certain exceptions, covering our trade with belligerents not in the immediate war zone, which I pass over.

THREE ALTERNATIVE COURSES OPEN

As I view the situation, we are presented with a choice between three alternative courses:

First. We can retain the present arms embargo without change.

Second. We can adopt the proposed cash-and-carry system in full, and sell not only raw materials and foodstuffs to belligerents on that basis, but arms, ammunition, and implements of war as well.

Third. Or we can retain the present arms embargo, but adopt the cash-and-carry policy as regards raw materials and foodstuffs.

A large body of the American people have been led to believe that the only choice offered is between the arms embargo on the one hand and cash and carry on the other, but the third possibility I have just mentioned is equally open.

The fact is that there is little controversy over the question of adopting the cash-and-carry policy insofar as it might be applied to foodstuffs and raw materials. The only real issue before us is whether we shall repeal or retain the embargo on arms, ammunition, and implements of war.

OPINIONS DIVIDED

The arms embargo was enacted at a time when the world was at peace, and was intended as an aid in preventing this country from becoming involved in any future war. However, one of the grounds upon which its repeal is now being asked is that such action will help to prevent war. Some of those who formerly were the stanchest advocates of the arms embargo are now equally stanch advocates of repeal. This is all very confusing, and makes the decision as to what action to take all the more difficult.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The point the gentleman has just made reminds me of the remark made by Governor Bushfield, of my State, that when we are slightly intoxicated with war hysteria it is a poor time to review or revise what we did when we were sober.

Mr. TREADWAY. I think the gentleman is stating in a very concise and proper way the thought that is in our minds, that if changes should have been made they ought to have been made before war was actually declared and war hysteria existed to the extent it does.

During my entire service in public life it has always been my purpose to represent, to the best of my ability and judgment, the views of those who have sent me here as their Representative in Congress.

Along with other Members I have received thousands of letters and telegrams from constituents expressing their feelings concerning the issue before us. I have carefully analyzed these expressions of opinion and have attempted to ascertain the preponderant viewpoint, giving special consideration to communications which seemed to set forth the true and innermost feelings of the writer.

A common note pervades all letters and telegrams: "Keep this country out of war." "Preserve our neutrality." But there is no unanimity as to the best method of accomplishing this end. Many of my closest friends and advisors—men and women in whose judgment I have great confidence—have given me conflicting advice, some favoring repeal and others opposing it.

Under the circumstances, I must rely upon my own conscience and best judgment, hoping and praying that the decision I make is the right one and in the best interest of my constituents and the country we all love and desire to serve.

WE ARE CONSIDERING NEUTRALITY LEGISLATION

We should, of course, keep in mind that it is neutrality legislation which is under consideration here. Despite the fact that our sympathies and, to some degree, our interests, lie with the democracies, as represented by England and France, we must not, if we are to remain neutral, do anything as a Government which would amount to taking sides or intervening in favor of one belligerent and against the other. It is quite apparent, however, that many of our citizens are openly expressing a desire to do so.

If we are here considering whether we will enter the war on the side of England and France, or whether we shall give them assistance "by methods short of war"—to borrow the President's own phrase—then let us not talk any longer about neutrality. Let us face the issue squarely and without equivocation. Neutrality is not a subject which lends itself to hypocrisy. We are either neutral or unneutral. We cannot pretend one and act the other.

I take it that no Member of this House favors direct participation by this Nation in the present war, though some may

have in mind that we may safely adopt the second course to which I have just referred, namely, of giving indirect assistance to one belligerent. Whether we may do this without ourselves becoming involved in the war is at least questionable. Certainly we would run that risk, and we could not contend that our action even remotely constituted neutrality.

For my part, I do not propose by my vote upon the pending question to give any country an excuse either for declaring war against us or for instituting retaliatory measures which might lead to war. There is no necessity for subjecting ourselves to that hazard.

In my consideration of the proposal for repeal of the arms embargo, I have regarded it solely from the standpoint of neutrality legislation. I have tried to determine in my own mind whether peace would best be promoted by retaining or by repealing the embargo. In arriving at the conclusion which I have reached, I have considered the question of repeal from four viewpoints—moral, economic, legal, and practical. It seems to me that the arguments for and against repeal naturally divide themselves into these categories.

EMBARGO REPEAL FROM THE MORAL STANDPOINT

From the moral standpoint, those favoring retention of the embargo contend that traffic in arms is an unholy business, and that this Nation should not become an accessory to the slaughter of human beings, many of them noncombatants. On the other side, it is contended that if it is wrong to sell arms after war breaks out, then it is equally wrong to sell them in peacetime. It is further argued that the embargo enables aggressor nations to prepare for war during peacetime and then denies to the nation attacked the means with which to defend itself.

There is much to be said upon both sides of the moral phase of the arms-embargo issue. It is difficult to arrive at a decision either for or against the embargo by considering this viewpoint alone. Therefore I pass to the economic phase.

THE ECONOMIC ARGUMENT

One of the economic arguments for repeal of the embargo—made by no less a person than the President himself—is that the manufacture and sale of arms to the belligerent nations would not only give employment to thousands but would also aid our national defense. There is, of course, much to be said in support of this position from the material point of view. On the other hand, there are many arguments which may be made against it. So far as the economic phase of repeal of the embargo is concerned, I am inclined to disagree with President Roosevelt of 1939 and to agree with President Roosevelt of 1936, who said at Chautauqua, N. Y.:

> If war should break out again in another continent, let us not blink the fact that we would find in this country thousands of Americans who, seeking immediate riches—fool's gold—would attempt to break down or evade our neutrality. They would tell you that if they could produce and ship this and that and the other article to belligerent nations the unemployed of America would all find work. They would tell you that if they could extend credit to warring nations that credit could be used in the United States to build homes and factories and pay our debts. They would tell you that America would once more capture the trade of the world. It would be hard to resist that clamor; it would be hard for many Americans, I fear, to look beyond—to realize the inevitable penalties, the inevitably day of reckoning that comes from a false prosperity. To resist the clamor of that greed, if war should come, would require the unswerving support of all Americans who love peace. If we face the choice of profits or peace, the Nation will answer, must answer, "We choose peace." (August 14, 1936.)

A war boom is not a very safe basis upon which to build prosperity. We are still paying the penalties of the last war boom, and should not so soon be forgetting its awful consequences. The opportunity to obtain war profits—fool's gold, as President Roosevelt has called them—is not to me a convincing or compelling argument for repeal of the arms embargo. I pass, therefore, to the legalistic phase of the question.

THE LEGAL STANDPOINT

It is an acknowledged principle of international law that while a nation has the right to alter its neutrality policy during the course of a war, it may not do so when the change affects unequally its relations with the countries at war. This principle was confirmed by our own Government during the last war.

Thus, whatever may be the merits of repeal—considered as an abstract matter—new considerations now enter in because of the fact that war is actually in progress. It is true that we can be equally neutral whether we sell arms to all belligerents or whether we decline to sell them to any country. No one questions our right to have repealed the arms embargo previous to the outbreak of the war, though there are some who might still question the wisdom of such action. But to repeal the embargo at this time, after war has been declared, with the purpose and effect of helping one side, would be unneutral and would constitute an act of intervention definitely exposing us to the risk of war.

As I see it, all the attempted legal justifications for repeal are secondary to the real purpose and perhaps are more in the nature of excuses. As everyone knows, the whole object of the legislation now before us is to give assistance to one side by "a method short of war," which, in my opinion, might lead to war.

THE PRACTICAL STANDPOINT

Mr. Speaker, I am strengthened in my conviction that repeal of the arms embargo would be dangerous when I come to consider the practical aspects of the matter. There are those who, as I have indicated, openly assert that we should repeal the embargo for the definite purpose of aiding England and France, not only for the reason that we have a stake in the preservation of democracy but because the longer the war drags on the more likely we are to become involved.

Of course, if we openly go to the assistance of the Allies, then it cannot be contended that we are any longer neutral. We cannot be neutral and an ally at the same time, nor can we be half in the war and half out. If we become in effect a partner of England and France, we will to all intents and purposes be at war with Germany and must be prepared to accept the full consequences of such action.

Are we ready to take that step? I, for one, am not; and I do not believe the great majority of the American people are yet ready to do so.

Any legalistic or technical justification of our proposed changed neutrality policy will not interest the nations which are affected thereby. It is the practical effect of repealing the embargo with which we must be concerned.

What was the reaction abroad when the President sent his message to Congress demanding repeal? Did any of the present belligerents discuss the details or fine points of the President's proposals? Not at all. Britain and France interpreted the President's message as evidence that we were "coming in again" on their side. Germany interpreted the demand for repeal of the embargo as an indication that we were joining with the Allies.

And what was the reaction abroad when the Senate passed the measure now before us, substantially embodying the President's proposals? The Senate's action last Friday evening brought immediate response from the foreign press, although the reactions were in terms more guarded than before.

In Britain and France repeal of the embargo was declared in newspaper headlines to be "an Allied victory." In Germany it was regarded as giving assistance to England and France. In other words, in all three countries now at war the measure before us was regarded as taking sides, and therefore as being unneutral.

WE CAN STAY OUT OF WAR

When the crisis came last September there was a feeling on the part of many that we would inevitably be drawn in. This feeling was probably a natural consequence of the war hysteria, but it has now died down to a considerable degree. More and more our people are coming to realize that after all there is no necessity of our becoming involved in the war if we make up our minds to stay out of it. I am very strongly of that opinion, and I furthermore believe that we have no need to fear the possible outcome so far as our own future is concerned.

PRESENT WAR MERELY A STRUGGLE OVER BALANCE OF POWER IN EUROPE

Instead of the present war being one of ideologies—of the democracies making a last stand against totalitarianism—as we first thought, it is becoming increasingly apparent that it is really a struggle over the balance of power in Europe. Italy, one of the totalitarian states, is maintaining neutrality. Russia, another totalitarian state, was first courted by England and France as a possible ally, then by Germany, and now is asserting her neutrality. But although not a direct participant in the war, she, too, is playing power politics. Her invasion of Poland has been condoned and justified by the Allies. In the present situation, how can anyone say that the preservation of democracy is the issue in this war?

PARTICIPATION IN WAR MIGHT BRING END OF DEMOCRACY AT HOME

The truth is that if we enter the war with the thought of preserving democracy abroad we may end up by losing it at home. Already there have been rumors of the dictatorial control which would be set up in this country should war come, and it might be difficult to shake off with the restoration of peace. These dangers to our own freedom and liberty were discussed at length during the debate in the other body, particularly by Senator CLARK of Missouri, who on October 23 stressed the plans already made for regimenting industry, agriculture, and labor in the event we become involved, and who referred in some detail to the vast war powers which would be exercised by the President.

This possible threat to our democracy at home makes it all the more clear that war must be avoided at all costs, unless, of course, we are ourselves attacked.

WE SHOULD STRENGTHEN, NOT WEAKEN, OUR NEUTRALITY

The measure as passed by the Senate weakens our neutrality in one direction and strengthens it in another.

It weakens our neutrality by repealing the arms embargo and subjecting us to the risk of war.

It strengthens our neutrality by preventing credits to belligerents for goods purchased here and by denying American vessels the right to carry merchandise of any kind to belligerents in the danger zones. It was the sinking of American ships and the killing of American seamen which was the immediate cause of our entrance into the last war. By preventing all maritime commerce with belligerents in the war zone, we remove this hazard to American peace.

I am in favor of doing all we reasonably can to strengthen our neutrality, but I am opposed to doing anything to weaken it. Why take one step in one direction and another step in the opposite direction? Why not take both steps in the direction of preserving neutrality and insulating ourselves further against war? That is where I stand in the matter. Keep the embargo on arms, ammunition, and implements of war, and enact the cash-and-carry provisions to apply to everything else.

Then we will really be doing something to preserve peace.

Mr. Speaker, there are now in Congress only 41 Members, of whom I am one, who were here in 1917 when the vote was had on the declaration of war against Germany. Twenty-two are Members of the House and 19 are Members of the Senate, although several of the latter were Members of the House at that time. My mind is very clear upon the awful consequences of our participation in that war, and I have earnestly been trying to determine how best to prevent a recurrence of the vote of 22 years ago so that we might escape another such terrible experience.

WE SHOULD RETAIN ARMS EMBARGO TO AVOID RISK OF WAR

After carefully analyzing the evidence and the opinions expressed on both sides of the question before us, my considered judgment is that we will risk war by repealing the embargo, whereas no such risk will occur as a result of its retention. I therefore favor the latter course.

We can stay at peace by keeping out of the present conflict and minding our own affairs. We have many pressing domestic problems to which we could more profitably turn our attention. If we deliberately go about seeking trouble we will find it, and by repealing the arms embargo we would in effect be putting a chip on our shoulder. I do not want this country to go looking for trouble. I have said many times—and I say once more—that I will never again vote to send our boys to fight on foreign battlefields.

In conclusion, let me summarize and make clear my position on the bill now before us: I shall vote to strike from the bill that section providing for repeal of the present arms embargo. On the other hand, I shall support the cash-and-carry provisions if confined to commodities other than arms, ammunition, and implements of war.

If, on the final vote, the question before the House is whether to adopt the bill as amended by the Senate, that is, with the arms embargo repealed and with the cash-and-carry principle applied to all sales to belligerents, including arms, then I shall vote "No," inasmuch as I feel that without the arms embargo the bill would be an abandonment of our neutrality and would nullify the beneficial effects of cash and carry as applied to nonmilitary supplies.

Mr. Speaker, I can think of no more fitting conclusion to these remarks than to repeat Stephen Decatur's toast to our country:

Our country! in her intercourse with foreign nations may she always be in the right; but our country, right or wrong!

[Applause.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein the legislative program adopted by the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

NEUTRALITY

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD].

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday last I occupied 50 minutes of time on the floor of the House, yielding half the time for questioning or reply. If you read those remarks you will find that the questions at the moment went entirely unanswered. Most of the interruptions were rather irrelevant to the questions that had been asked.

I know the great majority on my side of the House will differ with me today. I have in full measure been fighting battles for the Republican Party during the last several years. I greatly desire, and I hope I have, the respect of the entire membership of this House. I have rejoiced in the belief that such was my honest claim. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN], who is so seldom applauded on this side of the aisle, received a great outburst of approval today—I trust that he enjoyed it, and he undoubtedly deserved it. I am not seeking applause on either side, but I desire that my views be respected.

I spent some time this morning reading the debate on the McLemore resolution in 1916. I have close friends here today who were present at that time, and all I can say is, "My God, how they have changed." Certainly we have learned what not to do. Because of the lessons learned in the World War we never would vote to send our boys to European soil to fight, and nearly all proclaim that fact; yet some, in the next breath try to frighten the mothers of those boys by drawing parallels and proclaiming that this is the same first step that will lead us into a foreign war.

I believe that no one could have given greater attention and study to this subject than I have endeavored to do. I cannot believe that repealing the embargo will lead us into a foreign war. It is now time that I declare my conscience, before it shall be stolen from me.

I must live with myself. The words of Daniel Webster would ring in our ears, if we would but listen; in effect, he said, "The ocean rolls between us; we are safe." But are we, one of the nations in the world, to pretend neutrality and express no outraged sympathy for other independent nations now destroyed? Shall morality be entirely disregarded in this instance? Shall a man stand here and say, "I sympathize with democracy, yet I shall vote for something that will bring joy to the countries under the dictatorship"? It is hard,

indeed, to harmonize expressed new points. No man's motive on this floor should be questioned. All should and will seek peace for America. However, we gave notice a year ago that we were to attempt to change our Neutrality Act. Even the administration in power warned the nations that we intended to change it. Changing neutrality in the midst of the now existing situation? Ah! I cannot find refuge in that argument. Shall this Nation, in view of the unpredictable events that have occurred since then, say that we are tied—that we cannot act for ourselves? No; I assert our right as a great nation, and as citizens of a great country, as other nations have always claimed the right, to formulate our own position regarding neutrality as the changed circumstances dictate. Legalistic! All nations seem to have established neutrality legislation simply as their own interests appeared to be affected. That has been definitely established in these debates. Other nations have often changed their neutrality acts during hostilities. Legalistic! This cannot be settled in any such manner. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ALLEN] completely disposed of those arguments, as well as some other inconsistencies.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. Always.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman speaks about the legalistic theory. What about this theory of selling poison gas to kill the civilian population. Is that legalistic?

Mr. GIFFORD. Yes; but the horror and brutality of that was so persuasive to me that I voted against it last June. I did it hoping to keep other nations from war. It was unavailing. When you talk about dreadful offensive weapons, common sense tells us that the greatest of offensive weapons are generally the best and most effective for defense. [Applause.] If enemies are approaching, give us a torpedo to stop them before they arrive. If the morale of one nation is being broken down, shall we deny the right of retaliation to the other party? This is no defense of war. It is inhuman—a brutal, ghastly business. I voted last spring for the embargo because war is inhuman, and I desired to proclaim to the nations of the earth that we so regarded it. But it did not deter them. How vain the effort!

Mr. HOFFMAN. Was not this legislation passed not to keep other nations from going to war but to keep us out of it?

Mr. GIFFORD. It was passed to tell other nations that we would not furnish them with those weapons if they went to war. The act has proved worse than futile.

Now, my good friend—and I hope that I am not breaking with my friends on this side, whose friendship and respect I prize beyond expression—this is the forum in which the greatest and most enduring friendships are made.

Mr. HOFFMAN. You are mistaken about breaking with your friends. We may differ with you, but that does not affect our friendship.

Mr. GIFFORD. I should hope so. Some sharp things have been said, almost verging on the impugning of motives. I make no jingo speech; far from it. Efforts have been made to arouse the mothers to such a frantic state of mind that they fear their boys will be sent to war, and in consequence they bombard us with letters. We have those mothers in mind, and if we believed for an instant that any action on our part would send their boys to a foreign war, we could never recover from the shame of it. Why frighten them with any such declarations? Why force on us such a barrage of letters based on such an assertion? Some of us have no sons, but we may have brothers or sisters with many sons.

This has been a hard decision to make. I do not like to leave the majority of my party. My political mind dreads lest this administration be continued in power because of possible advantages which may be derived from this. I think it would be a calamity—I honestly think so—if domestic conditions as they now exist should still further continue under this administration. But, as I have said, my conscience rejects political opinion in this grave matter. Everyone knows my honest attitude on domestic questions. I could talk at length, but I have had my 50 minutes heretofore. I have listened to and read many powerful speeches and reread some of them several times. To my friend from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], I say, I think very highly of you. You are most persuasive and enlightening, and I have reread your several speeches and carefully considered them, but my mind could not be set at rest by those arguments.

Mr. KITCHENS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield.

Mr. KITCHENS. A great deal has been said in the debate about the use of arms and munitions, the statement being made that we could not afford to be a party to the killing of women and children and helpless people. Does the gentleman agree with me that in this particular case, and even during the World War, such arms and munitions as we furnished were used to prevent the killing of women and little children?

Mr. GIFFORD. I must, of course, agree with the implied statement.

This is a matter of serious moment. It may involve the future of some Members. Some may fear to stand alone. I have had to do it before. Later I was joined by practically the entire congregation. [Applause.]

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH].

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I am certain that the searching attitude of the gentleman from Massachusetts, who has just spoken, exemplifies the honest conviction that is in the heart of each and every Member of this body as he or she attempts to arrive at a reasoned conclusion on this subject. No dogmatic attitude can be adopted in this debate. It is our high resolution to honestly vote as we have the light to see.

I should like at this time to ask the unanimous consent of the House to insert at this point in the RECORD my sincere convictions upon this matter, as expressed in a radio address given last evening over WMAL, from Washington, and carried over the network of the National Broadcasting Co.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

The address is as follows:

The House of Representatives today began actual consideration of neutrality legislation. As a member of the whip organization of the majority party it has been my task, in cooperation with other members, to carefully check and recheck the probable votes for and against the administration plan. It is my personal opinion that the House will concur in general with the Senate action. It appears rather definite that this will be done by a margin of 25 votes.

When efforts were made during the last session of this Congress to modify existing neutrality legislation, the eyes of the world were focused on America to see what course should be determined upon as indicative future American policy in the field of international operators. By its failure to amend or modify the existing Neutrality Act the Congress at that time gave notice to the waiting and watching world that no change would be made in the type of isolation which the Nation had assumed. The counsels of the Nation were divided upon what would be the proper course for America to pursue, and the first session of the Seventy-sixth Congress came to a close with the question of neutrality still uppermost on the agenda of public business—but still unsettled.

AMERICAN POSITION WATCHED

Immediately in the wake of the adjournment of Congress there followed a series of events in Europe which surrounded the subject of neutrality with an even more frightful significance. I am loathe to believe that the failure to enact a cash-and-carry plan at the last session of Congress inadvertently encouraged the ambitions of totalitarian dictators. But I suspect that no little weight was given to the American position in the final decision to plunge Europe into another war. Because of that decision and the awful consequences which have followed from it, the Congress is now in special session for the specific purpose of settling the all-absorbing question of American neutrality.

Perhaps no topic of high public importance has received such profound and widespread discussion as this one. The lines have been sharply drawn. Political and partisan considerations have been eliminated. The alternatives are apparently simple. Yet with this Congress lies the grave responsibility for the choice of the course along which the American policy shall be chartered.

The problem, grievous as it is, should be resolutely met with two factors paramount in mind. First, every proper effort should be made to safeguard against the ever-present danger that this country may be drawn into the European maelstrom. We have no

desire to reassume the role of savior of the world, and we are determined that never again shall American youth and manhood shed their lifeblood on foreign soil. Second, our foreign policy in the aspect of neutrality must be so molded as to truly preserve and safeguard the best interests of America. We must bring ourselves to the grim realization that America's interest in the outcome of the present conflict is not illusory and academic but intense and vital.

The combatants in the European war are the totalitarian aggressors and the democratic defenders. The alternatives in American foreign policy are the retention of the present Neutrality Act, which prevents our shipping arms, ammunition, and implements of war to any nation engaged in war, and the proposed inclusion in that act of a cash-and-carry plan which would open our markets to those who can pay cash for their purchases, and transport them in their own ships. There is no question in my mind that there is any neutrality of thought in America concerning the present war. On the other hand, I believe that the vast majority of Americans are convinced that the neutrality program should be shaped with a discerning realization of the nature of the conflict abroad and an understanding of the character of the combatants. Since the war in Europe is not merely a war among nations, but a conflict between philosophies of government, it is incumbent upon us to choose a course of policy in neutrality consistent with the tradition under which we have lived and prospered as a nation for over 150 years.

NOT USEFUL TO WORLD PEACE

Unfortunately, in the light of present circumstances, and through no fault of its drafters and supporters, our present Neutrality Act has proved to be a failure both as an instrument of strict and impartial neutrality, and as a useful factor in world peace. Our legislative attempt at isolation has unwittingly had the effect of indirectly aiding the well-armed and well-prepared aggressor nations while operating to the detriment of those countries which are committed to the preservation of those principles of government with which America is in hearty accord. We have then the anomaly of a partial neutrality. Our chief task, therefore, is to seek and achieve the best means of preserving a realistic neutrality, and at the same time adopt a policy in accord with American concepts of international law and democratic justice.

Fortunately, we have such a medium at our disposal. The cash-and-carry or title-and-take plan proposed to be inserted as an integral part of our neutrality law minimizes the danger of American involvement in a European war. Foreign purchasers would have to pay for their commodities in this country, take the title thereto in their own names, and transport them in their own ships. The effectiveness of such a plan has for its chief end the insulation of this country against any participation in the conflict. Thus it serves our primary purpose—no American involvement. Furthermore, the provision requiring transport in ships flying the flags of the purchasing nations safeguards against the possibility of American ships becoming objects of marine warfare.

With the embargo on arms and implements of war repealed, our foremost concern should be the protection of American merchantmen from the prowling or blockading fleets of belligerent nations. A provision that any warring nation desiring to purchase any commodities in this country must be prepared, first, to pay cash, and, second, to transport the goods so purchased in its own vessels, should materially allay that concern. The safest neutrality chart will be one drafted on the lines of the law of nations as recognized throughout the world. That law gives a neutral the unquestioned right to sell any item anywhere. With the purchases made in this country, and the transportation effected in ships of belligerents, there is no possibility of American ships being torpedoed as enemies, or their cargoes seized as contraband. An effective cash-and-carry plan will remove an inconsistent embargo upon the segment of our trade consisting of arms and implements of war, and will substitute a policy that will assert and insist upon our rights to trade under international law, and at the same time require the payment of cash on our shores, and the transportation of purchases in ships for which the belligerents bear responsibility.

CASH AND CARRY IS FAIR

An overwhelming majority of the American people wisely want the embargo removed and the cash-and-carry plan enacted into law. The motive behind this desire is not necessarily to favor any one side in the European war, but to remove the United States from an awkward international position which hampers friendly nations in their attempts to stem the very forces which are inimical to all our American principles. What really is at issue is the question of whether we shall free our hands to be ready for any eventuality which may ensue in the future, or whether we shall leave ourselves bound in the fetters that have proved irksome in the past, that will only be more difficult to break in the future, and that may very well precipitate us into a dilemma that could easily be averted if the Nation were free to act in other ways for the conservation of its real interests.

I am firmly convinced that the United States will be better insulated from the heat of the European conflagration by the repeal of the embargo, accompanied by the promulgation of a policy of truer neutrality in the form of a cash-and-carry plan. Our real object is to safeguard the welfare of this country, and I think that a reasoned analysis of the underlying principles of neutrality will inevitably lead to the conclusion that we can achieve it best by adopting a policy which is impartial in theory and fact, and which is calculated to preserve a real neutrality under the mandates of international law. The cash-and-carry plan has all of these characteristics to recommend it, and to my mind they furnish ample argument for its adoption.

Self-interest and self-preservation demand a policy of practical neutrality, a policy which has as its foundation a firm plank of nonintervention, but which at the same time cannot be used as a springboard for international mischief makers.

The choice is obvious. The best avenue to the achievement of our objective is the scrapping of the arms embargo and the adoption of the cash-and-carry plan. In this manner we shall have the satisfaction of exercising our neutral rights under the legitimate rules of international fair play, and at the same time effectuate a true neutrality closely harmonizing with the pattern of our democratic heritage.

Mr. RANDOLPH. There has been, I feel, a minimum of partisanship in the consideration of this vital subject. We honestly differ, but I am certain we all are determined to do everything within our power to keep the United States from entrance into this foreign war. [Applause.]

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE].

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, provision for an embargo on arms, munitions, and implements of war, in the event of a finding by the President of the existence of a state of war between nations or a state of civil war within a nation, is a part of this Nation's international policy, having been enacted by the adoption of joint resolutions by the Congress on three separate occasions by overwhelming votes. The policy of this Government, thus resulting from the action of Congress and its approval by the President, came as a result of a demand on the part of the people of this Nation that the Congress calmly and dispassionately enact legislation that would tend to prevent our involvement in another foreign war. The embargo provisions in existing law were approved by the Congress, the President, and the State Department in 1935, 1936, and 1937, and in slightly modified form by the House when, by a large majority of 41 votes, it amended the Bloom bill this year.

The existing law is again challenged by the administration, and we, as the representatives of the people, are asked to reverse the position taken by the Congress on four separate occasions and to now repeal the arms-embargo provisions and to substitute therefor an all-inclusive cash-and-carry law. The burden therefore rests upon the administration and its spokesmen to establish, to a reasonable certainty, the wisdom and necessity at this time for such a change in our national policy. This the administration has tried to do.

It is my purpose this afternoon to answer some of the arguments that have been advanced, to the end that the judgment and verdict of this great body may be in accord with truth, facts, and reason. I shall attempt no emotional appeal, nor shall I be guided by hysteria, but shall endeavor to place before this body the factual information and testimony that in the light of calm, deliberate reasoning has determined my vote on this all-important question.

I shall vote to retain the arms embargo as written in existing law. I shall vote to reenact the cash-and-carry provisions of the 1937 act. I shall vote against the delegation of further discretionary powers to the President.

Let us therefore carefully examine the principal arguments advanced in support of the contention that we should now repeal the embargo provisions of existing law.

First. It has frequently been contended by the proponents of repeal that the embargo provisions of the present law violate international law. The mere statement, however, of such a contention, unsupported by acknowledged authority, bears slight weight. An examination of the subject discloses that the great weight of eminent authority on international law definitely and distinctly holds that the embargo provision of existing law is not a violation of or contrary to international law. It is almost universally conceded by authorities that the embargo provision is a domestic undertaking by the United States designed to avoid involvements which may lead to war, entirely outside of and supplemental to international law. This fact appears to be almost conclusive and is based upon existing precedent. No one raised the objection that such a provision would violate international law when the subject was considered by the Congress in 1935, 1936, and 1937. On the contrary, it was generally held by the President, the Secretary of State, the

State Department's legal adviser, the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and many others that such action was not objectionable from the viewpoint of international law.

The majority report of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on the Pittman bill states:

It is contrary to the accepted precepts of international law which prescribe that any belligerent may purchase any articles or material in any neutral country. It (the arms embargo) was a voluntary departure from international law by the United States Government.

This argument is fallacious and without validity and is made without citation of reputable authority.

On January 15, 1936, Secretary Hull, testifying before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, as reported at pages 64 and 65 of the hearings, declared as follows:

Our view was that from the standpoint of keeping out of the war no nation has a right to go out and get into a war, no matter who is responsible for it, and then turn around to a friendly neutral and demand of it that it be furnished with the necessary war supplies to carry on the war under penalty of being unneutral. With a view of keeping the country out we felt that nobody can object to a nation carrying on normal trade, but whenever any nation demands of a peaceful nation that it go further and single out and segregate purely war material and war supplies, and feed them out to the warring nations, we said that there is not and never has been any international law or any other kind of law or reason that would compel a peaceful nation to do that regardless of the dangers involved.

At page 135 of these hearings, he further said:

If a nation in good faith thinks it is reducing the chances of being drawn into war by restricting exports of war materials to belligerents, no other nation has a right to question that, much less threaten violence, if it is not supplied with materials which it thinks are necessary.

Senator PITTMAN, chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, in an address before the Academy of Political Science in New York City on April 7, 1937, declared:

Our Government, in my opinion, undoubtedly has the legal right to place an embargo upon the export of any commodity. No one has seriously opposed the placing of an embargo upon the export of arms, ammunition, and implements of war to belligerents.

Dr. John Bassett Moore, America's leading international law authority, at page 176 of the 1936 hearings, cited above, asserts:

As regards the impartial prohibition of the export of arms, ammunition, and implements of war to belligerent countries which is taken over from the neutrality resolution of last year, I have no objection to make on legal grounds. The question of prohibition is one of policy.

Dr. Edwin M. Borchard, professor of law at Yale University, appearing before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on January 29, 1936, urged reenactment of the joint resolution of August 1935, which contained mandatory embargo on arms, ammunition, and implements of war:

The bulk of that act merely confirms existing international law. The embargo on arms, munitions, and implements of war is a measure which has been adopted by various countries from time to time, and is not in the least revolutionary. Dr. Moore has indicated some of the objections to that provision by way of policy, but there is none on grounds of law.

Dr. Edward S. Corwin, professor of jurisprudence at Princeton University, in a letter to the Washington Post dated October 1, 1939, discussing President Roosevelt's contention that "repeal of the embargo and a return to international law are the crux of this issue," asserted:

The fact is that the above argument rests on a mistaken assumption, namely, that neutrals are under a positive obligation to trade with belligerents. The international law to which the President constantly appeals knows no such rule. It does require that a neutral shall not prohibit trade with one belligerent which it permits with the other. It also subjects neutral trade to the hazards to which the rules concerning contraband and blockade shall give rise. But it no more requires a neutral to stand ready to sell to belligerents than it requires a neutral to produce for them. The President's argument subjects neutral interests to an utterly unheard-of servitude in favor of the belligerents, and in the instance it quite gratuitously presents the naval powers with a grievance made up out of whole cloth.

Father Edmund A. Walsh, vice president of Georgetown University, regent of the Georgetown Foreign Service School, and well-known authority on international law and international relations, in a talk reported in the Washington Post October 3, 1939, page 6, characterizes as absolutely false the contention in the Foreign Relations Committee report which I have heretofore quoted. He said:

I protest, as one who has given some attention to international law, against the falsity of the statement in the committee report that any belligerent has the right under international law to purchase any article in any neutral country. That is a misstatement. It is absolutely false. I regret to see the truth abused by people in high places who ought to know better—and probably do know better. If the embargo is to be repealed, let it be done on the merits of the case and not on the basis of any such Machiavellian skullduggery.

Again, testifying before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on May 3, 1939, reported at page 491 of hearings on Senate Joint Resolution 21 and other measures, Father Walsh engaged in this colloquy with Senator Borah:

Senator BORAH. There is no doubt in your mind but what we had the right to withhold the sale of arms?

Father WALSH. Yes; very decidedly. It has been a highly debated question, and I take issue with the school that gives to all belligerents a right to purchase, creating a corresponding obligation to sell. The correlative of the right to purchase is not an absolute obligation on any government to sell, because to sell or not to sell, being a subject of national determination, is a subject for the Government, and there is no public-utility idea by which it has to exercise its franchise and sell or give service. There is no such thing in international law. Therefore I did not mention any international law which would be violated by an arms embargo, though some people hold that. The only obligation is to sell impartially if you sell at all.

Dr. Thomas H. Healy, dean of the Georgetown Foreign Service School and former professor of international law at The Hague, testifying before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on April 27, 1939, at page 340 said:

Today, neutrality, as I see it, is strictly domestic legislation, and that comes under the prerogative of the Congress of the United States. It has little to do with international law and has nothing to do with treaties, except by indirection it might violate one. It is traditional international practice. If a nation feels it is being hurt, it may not question your right, but it may say that, independently of your right, they are going to take action.

Dr. Herbert Wright, professor of international law at Catholic University, testifying before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on May 2, 1939, at pages 404 and 405 declared:

There is nothing in international law, however, to prevent a neutral state, by domestic legislation, from temporarily waiving the exercise of some of its admitted neutral rights to make more remote the possibility of being drawn into a foreign war.

Profs. Charles Cheney Hyde and Philip Jessup, of Columbia University, former legal advisers to the State Department and outstanding authorities on international law, in a letter jointly signed by them in the New York Times on October 6, 1939, had the following to say:

We must challenge the suggestion that international law has ever imposed any duty on a neutral to permit the exportation of munitions of war from its territory, and that accordingly the retention of the embargo is contrary to the precepts of international law. That is not the case and never has been. It is fantastic to call the present arms embargo a violation of international law, and it is misleading to intimate that it represents a departure from that law.

Mr. Green H. Hackworth, Solicitor and Legal Adviser of the State Department, testifying before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on February 5, 1936, at page 298 of the 1936 hearings, declared:

This section has to do with the placing of embargoes on the exportation of arms, ammunition, and implements of war to belligerent countries. There appears to be little or no serious objection to this from any quarter, even from those who tell us that we should have no domestic legislation but should constantly rely on international law. The sentiment of the people seems to be opposed to the furnishing of finished implements of war to belligerent countries.

Secretary Hull, a well-known and ardent champion of international law, championed such a provision when he proposed the draft of a treaty to the Buenos Aires Pan-American Conference in 1936, article VIII of which contained this provision:

Upon the determination of the existence of a state of war between two or more American republics, those of the high contracting parties remaining neutral shall not permit, during the continuance of

hostilities, the exportation from their respective territories of arms, ammunition, or implements of war to any of the belligerents, or to any neutral country for transshipments to, or for the use of, any of the belligerents.

The conference did not adopt a convention containing this language, but I cite the effort of Secretary Hull as clearly indicating that at that time he did not believe an embargo on arms was in conflict with international law but, on the contrary, felt that its extension to all the American republics was necessary as a means of preserving neutrality. It clearly indicated that the Secretary of State at that time was so enthusiastic about an embargo on arms in time of war that he wished to write it into a treaty as applicable to the Americas.

The President himself, on signing the first Neutrality Act on August 31, 1935, said:

I have approved this joint resolution because it was intended as an expression of the fixed desire of the Government and the people of the United States to avoid any action which might involve us in war. The purpose is wholly excellent, and this joint resolution will to a considerable degree serve that end.

In his annual message to the Congress on January 3, 1936, President Roosevelt declared:

As a consistent part of a clear policy, the United States is following a twofold neutrality toward any and all nations which engage in wars that are not of immediate concern to the Americas. First, we decline to encourage the prosecution of war by permitting belligerents to obtain arms, ammunition, or implements of war from the United States.

Again, on approving extension of the time limit on the 1935 arms embargo, President Roosevelt, on February 29, 1936, declared:

By the resolution approved August 31, 1935, a definite step was taken toward enabling this country to maintain its neutrality and avoid being drawn into wars involving other nations. It provides that in the event of the Executive proclaiming the existence of such a war thereupon an embargo would attach to the exportation of arms, ammunition, and implements of war destined to any belligerent country. By the resolution I have just signed, the operation of the August resolution is extended and strengthened.

From the foregoing citations of authority, and none being found to the contrary, is it not reasonable to conclude that the right of this Nation to enact an arms embargo as part of its domestic policy is founded upon and is in accord with known and accepted precepts of international law and that argument to the contrary is not based upon appeals to reason or logic?

The President, in his recent message to the Congress, asserted:

Repeal of the embargo and a return to international law are the crux of this issue.

The chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and other proponents of repeal of the embargo have projected the same argument in various terms. It is based upon the alleged validity of the contention that the arms embargo is contrary to international law. It is apparent, therefore, that with the collapse of the contention that the arms embargo contravenes international law, little weight can be given to the President's suggestion. However, I believe that the suggestion and argument should be pursued further. Since it is apparent that the weight of authority is to the effect that this country did not depart from international law in enacting the embargo legislation, the point at issue in reality resolves itself into the question of whether reliance on international law alone is a sufficient safeguard to assure this country's security from war. This thought ran like a thread through the President's message to Congress and, indeed, is very popular in certain quarters.

Many international authorities hold that reliance solely upon international law is a slender reed on which to rest the country's security from involvement in foreign war. Others, while admitting the undoubted right of this Nation as part of its domestic policy to enact embargo provisions, dispute the efficacy of that policy and favor reliance on international law. They contend that the United States was involved in the World War because this Nation failed to enforce its neutral rights. They object to the United States surrendering neutral rights under international law. We who take a contrary view contend that the attempt to enforce such rights under international law was a contributing factor in our entrance into the World War, and that a similar attitude maintained today will ultimately lead us into the present European war. The Pittman bill does not propose, as the President suggested, a reliance solely on international law, since that measure restricts numerous neutral rights of our citizens and attempts to restrict the rights of belligerents in a manner that they may consider to be a violation of so-called international law. I refer to section 11, which gives the President authority to prescribe rules and regulations regarding the movement of submarines and armed merchantmen in the ports and territorial waters of the United States. I trust that before this debate in the House has ended, serious and sustained study to the possible effect of section 11 will be the subject of further exploration.

Let us impartially examine some of the authorities who have spoken upon the question as to whether reliance solely upon international law will aid us in keeping out of foreign war.

R. Walton Moore, counselor of the State Department and former Assistant Secretary of State, testifying before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on January 13, 1936, said:

I do not see how you can expect to keep out of war if you are going to place your reliance on international law. Lord Salisbury said once, in a cynical way, "International law is what this or that writer thinks of it."

Mr. Green H. Hackworth, legal adviser of the State Department, testifying before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on February 5, 1936, said in reference to the pending bill, which contained an arms embargo:

The present bill, as I understand it, represents a compromise between two extreme groups of thought in this country. The thought of one is that we should have broad legislation which would prohibit all exports and all kinds of trade with the belligerents; the thought of another group is that we should not have any legislation at all, but that we should rely upon international law for the protection and enforcement of our rights. On that point I should only say that post-war settlements have not as a rule been very satisfactory. It is not accurate to say that all these matters can be satisfactorily settled by post-war arrangements. That is a reason why we should try to keep our people out of trouble and try to prevent these claims from arising, if it is humanly possible to do so, because we cannot settle them after the war in a manner that is entirely satisfactory or approximately satisfactory.

Secretary Hull, testifying before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on January 17, 1936, said:

I think we can all agree that in the war of 1812–14 our nationals got us into trouble on the high seas in connection with commerce and other considerations and we went out and fought that war. In 1917 many of us thought that the submarine activities in connection with our nationals who were in danger zones for the purpose of trade and travel, was another factor for which we went into the war and fought. If that is true, it must have some bearing on the action of Congress last August in enacting the Neutrality Act, which presumably was based upon the view that for this Nation largely to become the base of military supplies for any belligerent or belligerents would have a tendency to create an unneutral atmosphere and ultimately help to contribute to drag us into the war. We would therefore tighten up our neutrality by embargoing any shipments of any finished arms, ammunition, and implements of war to any belligerents.

Senator PITTMAN, in an address before the New York Academy of Political Science on April 7, 1937, asserted:

We relied upon international law as justification for our citizens in traveling upon belligerent vessels. We relied upon international law as a justification for supplying the Entente Powers with arms, ammunition, implements of war, and all other materials and supplies essential to the successful conduct of the war by the Entente Powers. We relied upon international law as a justification for the approval by our Government of the sale of bonds of the Entente Powers in our country to enable them successfully to conduct the war. We relied upon international law in opposing the sinking of merchantmen by submerged submarines without notice. We relied upon international law for our declaration of armed neutrality. We relied upon international law for every assertion of our alleged neutral rights. This reliance brought us no benefits or protection and was our undoing. Congress seeks to profit by our experience in the last war that we be able to keep out of the next war. It permits our citizens to sell to belligerents as well as to neutrals any and all products save arms, ammunition, and implements of war. It defines and places an embargo upon the exportation of arms, ammunition and implements of war to belligerents. This is the only embargo imposed. No one has seriously opposed the placing of an embargo upon the export of arms, ammunition, and implements of war to belligerents.

From the foregoing it should be especially noted at this time that Senator PITTMAN contended in April 1937, that this country cannot rely upon international law to keep out of war and specifically pointed out that our shipment of arms and munitions to the Allies was one of the important reasons why the Germans in desperation unleashed their unrestricted submarine warfare and her sabotage of our munitions and industrial plants in this country, which ultimately provoked our declaration of war in April 1917.

Dr. Charles C. Tansill, professor of American History at Fordham University, testifying before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on April 28, 1939, at page 360, said:

I believe that if in 1914 we had had mandatory legislation with regard to an embargo on war munitions it might very distinctly have led America along a path to peace. It is impossible to say whether it would. I think the majority of people would have been in favor of it, and I think it would have very largely stopped some economic ties that were fast forming. When one thinks that in 1916 our exports of munitions to the Allies amounted to $1,290,000,000 worth, it is an economic tie which is very powerful.

The significance of Dr. Tansill's testimony is that it comes from a scholar who has recently completed the most comprehensive, detailed, and documented narration of the events from 1914 to 1917 which led the United States into the World War. In the face of such testimony, therefore, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee rejected the plea of the President that we return to international law and proposed the present Pittman bill, with its restrictions upon our rights as neutrals, along with certain restrictions on belligerents.

It seems quite clear from the statements to which I have referred that reliance upon international law alone would constitute no assured safeguard against our becoming involved in foreign war. The evidence further clearly discloses that the insistence upon our rights as neutrals under international law would definitely lead us toward the path of intervention and war rather than along the path of peace.

Second. Another argument projected by the proponents of repeal and revision of our neutrality laws is "that the present law impairs the peaceful relations of the United States with foreign nations." This argument was advanced by the President at the very beginning of his message to the Congress on September 21. In the absence of any substantiating data to support it little can be said on the subject. Neither the President nor any of his supporters have attempted factually to demonstrate the point. If any government has protested to the United States regarding the arms embargo, that fact has not been revealed by the State Department. Very cordial friendly relations exist between this Government and the French and British. Relations with Germany are cold and strained, but this condition antedates the present conflict. For more than a year tension has existed between the Governments of Germany and the United States. This tension was not brought about, however, because of the arms embargo. On the contrary, it was caused, at least in part, by the critical speeches of the President and members of his Cabinet in reference to Germany's Government and the ultimate calling home of our Ambassador.

Assistant Secretary of War Louis Johnson, speaking at Boston on August 28, 1939, assailed the arms embargo as a breeder of war and asserted that those Senators who prevented its repeal shared responsibility as a contributing factor in the present crisis which threatens the peace of the world. However, as Arthur Krock, in the New York Times of August 31, 1939, commented:

It cannot now be proved that the act of the Senate committee was a factor of any size, or was at all an element, in bringing about the new crisis in Europe. Only Hitler can testify in chief whether it was or not, and until or unless he does so it would seem wiser for the President to abandon this speculation.

It is apparent, in any event, that the speculation of the President and Assistant Secretary of War is beyond the point at issue. Whatever may have been at issue last summer, the question of preventing war is not now present. This country is confronted with a European war which may spread. The issue now is how can this country remain out of that war? So far it has done so. That is the test of the efficacy of the arms embargo.

Certain it is that public clamor in England and France may insist upon repeal of the embargo resulting in alleged benefits to the Allied cause. True it is that public clamor in Germany may demand the retention of the embargo in hopes that their cause may be thus benefited. However, if we as Members of Congress are to be guided in our deliberations by the clamor of irresponsible propaganda emanating from either side, we are departing from the field of neutrality legislation and immediately become engaged in partisanship.

No formal appeal from the governments of any of the nations involved in the European crisis has been revealed by the State Department, because it is apparent that reasonable government heads in those countries realize that the question of retention or repeal of the arms embargo, disassociated from partisanship and expressed desire to aid or hurt one of the belligerents, is a purely domestic problem that under all rules of international law the people of the United States have the right to determine for themselves. The argument, therefore, that the present arms embargo impairs the peaceful relations of the United States with foreign nations completely fails because of a total lack of evidence to sustain it.

Third. Another very popular argument and one which appeals to the emotions rather than the calm judgment of thinking people is the one contended for by the President in his recent address to the Congress that—

The arms embargo discriminates against the British and French and gives an advantage to Germany.

The President advanced this argument by contending that the embargo provision—

Had the effect of putting land powers on the same footing as naval powers, so far as sea-borne commerce was concerned.

Adding that—

A land power which threatened war could thus feel assured in advance that any prospective sea power antagonist would be weakened through denial of its ancient right to buy anything, anywhere. This, 4 years ago, gave a definite advantage to one belligerent as against another, not through his own strength or geographic position but through an affirmative act of ours. The step I recommend is to put this country back on a solid footing of real and traditional neutrality.

Such is the President's argument, and it has been repeatedly and vigorously asserted and reasserted by proponents of repeal. It must be noted at the outset that the nations engaged in the present conflict were not belligerents 4 years ago or even 1 year ago. Moreover, the President's contention is grounded on the assumption that belligerents have "an ancient right to buy anything anywhere." As has been previously pointed out, this assumption on the part of the President has no basis either in fact or in law and therefore his argument becomes pitifully weak with the destruction of his principal premise.

An examination of the authorities on this question clearly discloses that neutral actions toward belligerents, so long as they are applied impartially, must be tested in the light of intentions or objectives rather than by coincidental results flowing from such action. In other words, the determining point is not whether such and such an action caused such a result, but whether such action was deliberately planned and taken to bring about that result. Thus the issue might be narrowed down to the contention that this Government passed an arms embargo with the express or concealed purpose of giving Germany an advantage denied to France and Great Britain. By thus narrowing the argument its absurdity will be immediately detected. When the embargo was first enacted in 1935 and reaffirmed in 1937 the British, French, and German people were on friendly terms. It is obvious, therefore, that the purpose and intent of the Congress of the United States could not have been to take sides in a nonexistent war. We established the 1935 and 1937 neutrality policies with but one thought in mind—namely, to declare to all nations of the world the domestic policy of the United States in the event a war should break out between other nations and to assure to the people of the United States so far as governmental action can give assurance that there would be no repetition of the events which finally culminated in our entrance into the last World War. We served notice

upon the world through those declarations as to what our policy would be, and any nation that thereafter became involved in war did so with full knowledge that that policy would be maintained.

It is now contended, in view of the outbreak of hostilities in Europe, that to maintain that position constitutes an unneutral act, because in the application of the embargo we are allegedly denying England and France the right to purchase arms, munitions, and implements of war which, due to their control of the seas, they could purchase were it not for the embargo. Is it not clear that in the enactment of the original embargo provisions the President, the State Department, and the Congress must have had in mind the possibility of war breaking out between any nations or group of nations and that the fundamental purpose of such legislation was grounded on the demand of our people that we keep the United States out of foreign war? No one disputes this fact. However, it clearly appears that war having broken out with England and France on one side and Germany on the other, ingenious arguments are now being advanced in an attempt to demonstrate that the maintenance of the embargo constitutes an unneutral act.

May I point out at this point the remarks of Hon. Charles Warren, formerly Assistant Attorney General of the United States, a student of neutrality, and, in fact, the father of the present era of neutrality legislation, made before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on January 29, 1936, when he declared:

> I wish to make plain at the outset that I believe that any neutrality legislation now to be passed should be applicable to all belligerents, without discrimination by act of law. Impartiality is the most essential feature of neutrality. But at the same time I must emphasize very strongly, and all legislators must always bear in mind, the fact that the statement that neutrality demands impartiality means simply impartiality in the application of law; it rarely ever results in impartiality in operation. International law imposes certain obligations upon a neutral nation which it must perform with reference to each belligerent in a war; but international law does not impose any obligation on a neutral to see that the performance of these obligations should operate in the same manner on each belligerent. And, in fact, a neutral obligation rarely, if ever, operates in the same manner on each belligerent. The reason for emphasizing this point is that some persons now argue that if an embargo should now be imposed, either mandatorily or discretionally, it might operate unevenly as between belligerents, and hence might drag us into the war. But it must be realized that the lack of an embargo also might, and undoubtedly would, operate unevenly between belligerents and prove a potent source for controversy and friction, leading to possible war. The same thing is true as to any other measure which we may adopt to further protect our neutrality; for instance, prohibition of loans will operate unevenly as to the belligerents, and may injure one belligerent more than the other. It is no argument against the passage of such a measure to urge that it may operate unevenly if, in fact, it will help to protect this country. This point, therefore, must always be borne in mind, namely, that you can never hope to pass any neutrality law which will operate evenly amongst belligerents. If in passing a law you try to balance up what will happen to one belligerent as a result of the law as against what will happen to another belligerent, then you are allowing foreign interests and foreign nations to frame your law.

May I say in passing that in this statement to the committee, Mr. Warren placed his finger exactly upon the issue? Are we to legislate on the subject of neutrality with the interests of the United States as our sole guide or are we to attempt to legislate neutrality by permitting considerations of the possible effect of the law upon foreign nations to become our guide? It seems to me that calm reasoning demands that in the consideration of this question we lay aside all thought as to what its effect might be upon any foreign nation and confine our attention only to thinking in terms of the interest of the United States.

We were not thinking in terms of England, France, Germany, Russia, Ethiopia, or any other nation when this law was framed and because we were calm and unaffected by hysteria, partisanship, or emotion, the embargo was declared to be a part of our national policy by almost unanimous vote. Now that the thing which the law was designed to guard us against has come to pass and the stream of propaganda is beginning to make itself felt in America, we are now urged to depart from that calmly reasoned policy expressed in 1935 and 1937 for the alleged reason that in its operation the arms embargo is not impartial in the effects of its application. To many the very assertion of this argument should be the basis for firm resolution on the part of all Members of Congress to maintain our present position.

As stated by Mr. Hackworth, legal adviser of the State Department, in his testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, on page 289 of the 1936 hearings:

> During the World War, when we had no restrictions whatever, we had complaints. The Central Powers complained bitterly that we were allowing materials to get out to the Allies while Germany and the powers allied with Germany could not get them. Therefore, Germany and Austria-Hungary asked us to place restrictions on exports to the Allied Powers, and we replied that to act at the instance of Germany and Austria-Hungary would be unneutral. So that whether you have restrictions or whether you do not have them you will have complaints from belligerents because they cannot have the same access to our markets. One group will have control of the seas. That group will have complete access to our markets. The other group will be barred. Consequently, whether you have legislation or whether you do not, you will have complaints from belligerents. You cannot play this game of neutrality in a way that will be satisfactory to all parties to a war. Nor can you be charged with unneutrality for taking action, if your action is made to apply equally to all belligerents. That is the criterion with respect to neutrality—that whatever action shall be taken shall apply equally to all belligerents. I think that is as far as a neutral can be expected to go.

Similar expressions may be found in statements made by Prof. Edwin S. Corwin, of Princeton University; Dr. Thomas Healy, dean of Georgetown University's Foreign Service School; and many others, among them being Mr. Robert Lansing, as counselor of the State Department. In a memorandum to President Wilson on December 14, 1914, he declared:

> If one belligerent has by good fortune a superiority in the matter of geographical location or of military or naval power, the rules of neutral conduct cannot be varied so as to favor the less fortunate combatant. To change such rules because of the relative strength of the belligerents and in order to equalize their opportunities would be in itself an unneutral act, of which the stronger might justly complain.

It impresses me as wholly apparent to an impartial mind that whenever we permit the possible operative effect of our neutrality laws on prospective belligerents to become the basis of our consideration, we are no longer thinking in terms of what is best for America but are allowing foreign influences to determine the course of domestic legislation. I am firmly of the belief that maintenance of neutrality as between belligerents with a minimum of danger of exposure to the hazards of involvement in foreign war demands that we stand firmly upon our right to determine our own domestic policy and apply that policy with impartiality toward all nations that might become belligerents, without regard to what the effect might be upon any given belligerent. It thus appears that the argument "that the arms embargo is unneutral" falls of its own weight when viewed in the light of the motives and purposes behind its enactment and the impartiality of its application.

The people of America are composed of citizens having in their bodies the blood of many nationalities and in their hearts ties springing from associations with their homelands. It is not unnatural, therefore, that in times of stress such as the present, despite all caution to the contrary, our people are prone to take sides in any foreign war. As a result of this type of sentiment many intelligent people, viewing the future of democracy with alarm, are making the argument that the arms embargo should be repealed in order to give all possible assistance to the British and French "short of war." This argument in the current debate has not been specifically projected by the President, the Secretary of State, or the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, although I believe it is fair to state that it has at times been implied by them.

Despite all of the camouflage and insincerity that has marked much of the debate on this question, the desire to help England and France is the real reason which motivates many of our people to now demand a change in the neutrality law. Some members of another body have openly admitted that this is the motivating reason, and privately a large portion of those demanding repeal will admit it. Newspaper

writers and commentators assert that this is the real reason and that avoidance of mentioning it specifically has given the debates in another body a touch of unreality and a lack of candor. I think it is safe to say that there are few, if any, men in this Congress who are devoid of private and personal opinions in reference to the present European controversy. We all have our feelings as individuals and, as individuals, we perhaps have a right to give expression to them. But in considering a question so vital as this, I am impressed by the fact that we who are called upon to vote the policy of this Nation must not be motivated by personal feelings, but that we must view the subject through the impersonal eyes of the Government itself and what the Government's attitude should be. Therefore, in this debate I do not propose to picture the horrors of war, or the conflict in ideologies of government abroad, or to undertake to discuss here whether or not this country should assist the British and French with arms and munitions. Opinions on these subjects are personal and should be disassociated from the controlling problem of what our attitude as a Nation should be.

Have we the right as a nation now to change our neutrality law by repealing the embargo which has been laid down impartially against all belligerents and by that action help one of the belligerents and inferentially hurt another? A determination of this question in all fairness must be tested in the light of what is our purpose and what is the influence that now demands this change. The authorities consulted very clearly lay down the rule that a change in a neutral's rules which would result adversely on a belligerent cannot be made during the progress of a war for the purpose of assisting one belligerent to the disadvantage of another. A change demonstrated to be necessitated by domestic considerations alone, irrespective of its unneutral results, might be made with propriety.

The crux of the issue therefore is, What is the purpose now motivating those who seek repeal of the arms embargo? Is it because of some domestic consideration or is it because of a desire to help England and France whip Germany and drive Hitlerism off the face of the earth? Despite all hypocritical evasions to the contrary, I am satisfied from listening to the debates and from extended reading on the subject that the real motivating influence behind the demand for repeal of the arms embargo is a desire to help England and France in their fight to overwhelm Hitlerism in Europe.

It is my studied and considered opinion, therefore, that there having been no assertion or claim of any domestic consideration worthy of attention as a basis for asking repeal of the arms embargo, to now repeal that embargo would constitute an affirmative act of ours in absolute violation of international law and that we as a nation might well be subjected to the threat of a declaration of war on the part of Germany as a result.

I have read with great interest the letter to the New York Times dated September 21, 1939, jointly signed by Drs. Hyde and Jessup, professors of international law at Columbia University, in which letter, among other things, they stated:

> Hence, relaxation of embargoes after the outbreak of war may in fact and in law amount to governmental participation in the conflict. This is obvious if or when the reason for removing a particular embargo is to aid the cause of one or more of the fighting states which will vastly profit from such action because of their command of the seas. In such a situation the neutral purveyor becomes the special support or prop of the favored belligerent, and the government as well as the people of the neutral becomes in reality a participant in the conflict. Such conduct is, under such circumstances, unneutral and is contemptuous of the legal duty which the law of nations imposes upon every neutral sovereign.

On October 6, 1939, these authorities, in response to various comments on their contention, wrote a second letter to the New York Times, in which they asserted:

> We must emphasize the point that we have been far from asserting that any change in a neutral's laws and regulations, effected in time of war, would be a breach of international law. The point, however, that we have sought to stress is that the United States, having before the war forbidden exportation of arms and munitions to belligerents, cannot now permit such exportation without an affirmative governmental act; such an affirmative act, if taken for the purpose of assisting one belligerent side, constitutes a governmental taking of sides which is unneutral and illegal.

Numerous other authorities might be cited to the same effect.

May I refer to a statement made by the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, who on March 2, 1937, said on the floor of the Senate:

> In the first place, any preparation in the nature of restraint against a particular government after war commences is, of course, looked upon as unneutral according to international law.

And again, on March 3, 1937, the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee stated on the floor of the Senate:

> Undoubtedly, if anything on earth would arouse unfriendliness on the part of a belligerent against us it would be discrimination by our Government in favor of its enemy. We are speaking of a time when war exists, not of peacetime, and if Canada were engaged in war with a foreign country, and we were at peace with both of them, we would certainly arouse the intense anger and probably the unfriendly disposition of any country against which we discriminated in favor of any other country.

And again on March 24, 1937, the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee issued this warning to the Senate:

> However, I feel that whenever we allow our sentiments or our feelings with regard to war somewhere else, with regard to who is suffering somewhere else, with regard to the cause of a war, to enter into our own personal case here, we are involving ourselves in disputes and the attempted determination of facts which cannot be determined, and it is a dangerous thing for us to attempt to do.

Similar statements have been expressed by authority after authority and reference might be made to the note sent by Secretary of State Bryan under date of April 21, 1915, to the German Ambassador as a result of complaints made by Germany in reference to the sale of arms or munitions to the Allies, wherein the Secretary of State stated:

> Any change in its own laws of neutrality during the progress of a war which would affect unequally the relations of the United States with the nations at war would be an unjustifiable departure from the principle of strict neutrality by which it has consistently sought to direct its actions.

Of similar import was the note of Secretary of State Lansing sent to the Austro-Hungarian Government under date of August 12, 1915. President Wilson himself repeatedly reiterated similar sentiments, and on February 5, 1936, Green H. Hackworth, legal adviser of the State Department, stated to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee:

> The neutral cannot take such action at the instance of a belligerent, as distinguished from its own domestic policy, without showing partiality and hence becoming unneutral. Belligerent governments have no right under international law to demand that a neutral government shall keep its markets open to them and supply them with the implements of war if the neutral, for domestic reasons, shall decide to the contrary.

It seems very clear, therefore, that in view of our expressed position and policy on neutrality written in 1935, improved and extended in 1936, and continued in force with additional safeguards in 1937, the only way compatible with international law and impartiality of dealing between nations that we can now repeal the arms embargo would be on a basis of a showing of domestic necessity. Clearly, under the authorities, if based upon a desire to crush Hitler and to aid the alleged democracies, it would constitute an unneutral act and might be the basis of a declaration of war against us by Germany and those who might later become associated with her.

It therefore seems opportune for me to suggest at this point that if any Member of the House bases his support of repeal upon domestic considerations, we should at least be privileged as Members of this House to have those considerations now clearly expressed. The only domestic consideration that has been suggested was that of the President himself, who indicated the possibility of profits that might accrue to our people from the sale of war munitions and other materials. I was unable to take his argument seriously in view of his 1936 address at Chautauqua, in New York, when he

cautioned the people of this Nation against that very attitude and pronounced the profits to be made out of the sale of war munitions "fool's gold."

If there is any Member of this House who bases his demand for repeal upon domestic considerations, let him come forward and state what those considerations are, and if his demand is based upon a desire to help England and France, then let him not equivocate or attempt to conceal the issue, but let him stand forth shorn of hypocrisy and sham and tell the people that his demand is founded upon a desire to intervene in this war to the extent of aiding one belligerent as against another. When and if this position is taken, then I believe the application of the law to the situation is clear and that the repeal of the arms embargo based upon such a consideration would constitute a violation of international law and give rise to a possible declaration of war by Germany and those nations associated with her.

If such a controversy should arise, of what moment would it be for the proud patriots who have been shouting into the ears of the people that they would never vote a declaration of war that would result in sending a single American boy to shed his blood on foreign soil? The declaration of war might very reasonably and easily come from the other side, and then we would be craven indeed if we did not stand up and fight. It is to guard against exactly this situation that I shall vote against repeal of the arms embargo in view of the present existence of European war.

Fourth. Another popular argument that is frequently urged as a basis for repeal of the arms embargo is "that the embargo creates an artificial legal distinction among articles of war material and is thus inconsistent and illogical." The President in his recent message to the Congress pointed out that embargo provisions "prevent the sale to a belligerent by an American factory of any completed implements of war, but they allow the sale of many types of any uncompleted implements of war, as well as all kinds of general material and supplies." He further went on to say: "There is an artificial legal difference," citing various articles under embargo and other articles useful in war that may now be exported.

The distinction between arms, munitions, and implements of war, and all other commodities made by our present neutrality laws is not altogether artificial. There are very important and very practical reasons, not to mention also psychological reasons, why finished arms and implements of war should fall into a specific category for special treatment under any neutrality legislation. This fact has long been recognized by the nations of the world, as reflected in many international conferences held by them. How did we arrive at the list of articles now on the embargo list? The Neutrality Act passed August 31, 1935, did not specify what arms, ammunition, and implements of war would be subject to the embargo provision. The legislation at that time gave the President a free hand by asserting that he "shall definitely enumerate the arms, ammunition, or implements of war, the export of which is prohibited by this act." True, the legislation said nothing about an embargo on raw materials, but if, as the President now contends, there is no real difference between sheets of aluminum and airplane wings and between brass tubing in pipe form and brass tubing in shell form, then he had all the authority he needed to place these omitted items on the embargo list. He is the author of the embargo list of which he now complains. When the President first applied the embargo provisions against Italy and Ethiopia on October 5, 1935, he issued a proclamation placing an embargo on a list of articles identical with the list proclaimed by him on September 25, 1935, for the purpose of making effective the provisions of law relating to the new National Munitions Control Board.

Describing that list, the Washington Post on September 26, 1935, said:

> The list proclaimed by the President corresponds closely with several specifications of arms and munitions now in general use, notably the list of arms and munitions included in the embargo in shipments to the Chaco combatants, and the list contained in the draft treaty now before the Geneva Disarmament Conference. This list, originally, was compiled by technical experts from five Government departments, using as guides existing munition lists for embargo and control purposes. It was approved, with some minor changes by the National Munitions Control Board, which recommended it to the President. The President, at any time, may revise or extend the list, either for the licensing system, or when the time comes for proclaiming an embargo should Italo-Ethiopian war materialize.

Thus it will be seen that Congress gave the President in the 1935 law a free hand to enumerate arms and ammunition and implements of war, and that, acting upon the recommendation of experts from five departments, the National Munitions Control Board, consisting of the Secretaries of State, Treasury, War, Navy, and Commerce, proposed the very list which Mr. Roosevelt finally proclaimed. The bold fact stands out that until May 1, 1937, the President had discretionary power to add any article he desired to his list of arms, ammunition, or implements of war. The act of May 1, 1937, however, specifically required the enumeration of those articles previously proclaimed, and provided that the list—

> shall not include raw materials or any other articles or materials not of the same general character as those enumerated in the said proclamations and in the Convention for the Supervision of the International Trade in Arms and Ammunition and in Implements of War signed at Geneva, June 17, 1925.

The idea of the imposition of an embargo on arms and implements of war did not originate with our adoption of the 1935 Neutrality Act but goes back long before that time and was the repeated subject of discussions between nations for years. In all of these domestic and international discussions on the subject there was unanimity of opinion that there was good reason for classifying into a separate category those finished articles primarily and ordinarily used for military purposes in time of war. In other words, there has always been a distinction acknowledged in the law of nations between articles that were of use only in time of war and articles useful both in war and in peace.

Secretary Hull, in a statement before the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate on January 10, 1936, on page 16, stated:

> I have not myself seen any good reason for a complete embargo, except as to the articles mentioned in section 3. That enables this Nation to stand out before all nations of the world as permitting normal trade at all times between this country and belligerents, but definitely drawing the line between this trade and what would be avowedly aid on the part of this country to belligerents to prosecute the war by furnishing abnormal quantities of war materials for war purposes.

As stated clearly by Dr. Healy, of the Georgetown Foreign Service School, before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on April 27, 1939, there is a very clear distinction between munitions and other materials. Dr. Healy testified as follows:

> In spite of similarities between munitions and other materials, there are important practical and psychological differences which warrant a different treatment as provided in the existing law. In the last war Germany drew this distinction and she centered most of her protests against our being a major source of supply of primary munitions to her enemies. Germany made little effort to question our right to ship other materials useful for war. She made a very practical distinction between munitions and other war material. Our answer, that we were giving equal treatment to both sides, made little impression, because then, as now, Great Britain controlled the seas and could obtain the munitions while Germany could not. When Germany's protests went unheeded, in her desperation she resorted to sabotage in the United States and other drastic measures which contributed greatly to our ultimate involvement in the war. President Wilson, in his war speech of April 2, 1917, mentioned this as one of the main causes for us going into the war. It should be noted that the sabotage was directed primarily against munitions and not against cotton fields or oil wells. At this very moment our Government is pressing claims for $50,000,000 against Germany for munition sabotage in New Jersey prior to our entrance into the World War. Similar war-provoking incidents may well be expected if the existing arms-embargo clause is changed. Permitting munitions shipments on a substantial cash-and-carry basis was a leading cause of our involvement in the World War. We did not have any ships; they were carried mostly in foreign ships, and for a while for cash. We gave them credit from then on. The purpose of our neutrality legislation is to remove causes of war involvement. One of the great dangers is that of artificial war booms. An artificial war boom is not so important for well-established peace industries, because they are normally subject to contraction and expansion in accordance with the laws of supply

and demand. They are not solely and exclusively dependent on war trade as such. They can contract and expand without necessarily upsetting the apple cart. But in the case of primary munitions factories, we might be establishing a new and artificial industry, possibly leading to a boom. It probably would, and when the cash ran out there would be great pressure to save this artificial industry, which could survive only through further war sales, and we might have an exact repetition of 1914–17.

There is an actual legal and psychological distinction between arms, muntions, and implements of war, and other materials. If we are now lured by the prospect of profits to be obtained from a boom in the sale of war munitions, we will be treading the same path that we took in the last World War. No one questions the wisdom of the President's warning to the American people as contained in his Chautauqua speech. The overexpansion of war industries in this country would mean temporary profits for a few, but when the war ends it would mean nothing but disaster economically for the Nation as a whole. We propose to ship peacetime materials of all kinds to any Nation that can come here and buy those materials for cash and carry them away in their own ships. We are thus stimulating a peacetime prosperity, and while, as the President finds, there may be slight difference between a brass tube and a completed shell, I for one at least, while willing to sell the brass tube to any belligerent, insist that they adjust their industrial economy so as to convert it into a shell rather than for us to enlarge and expand our peacetime industry into a munitions business so fraught with ultimate danger to our industrial economy. Let us expand our trade not only with belligerents but with neutrals in those articles and materials in which a profit to the Nation will recur in times of peace as well as in time of war. Let us go out and recapture our normal trade relations with neutrals and put our unemployed back to work making peacetime products rather than engaging in the hazardous business of munition making.

There can be no question but that the repeal of the arms embargo and the unlimited sale of American-made munitions to England and France will cause repercussions of hate in the hearts of Germany and her allies, just as occurred in the last World War, and it is natural to assume that Germany will adopt measures of retaliation such as were adopted by her in the last war that may have the effect of dragging us into this war, whether we will it or not. I shall vote to forego the temporary benefits of fool's gold and refuse to take the first step that will involve us in this European controversy. It is conceded that we are woefully weak in this country in every branch of our national defense and that to provide the necessary arms and munitions for our own protection industry can be speeded up to the point of absorbing a considerable portion of our unemployed.

We, as a nation, cannot be certain who our friends will be tomorrow; and it is entirely possible, if the arms embargo is lifted, that we may ship great quantities of munitions to a nation with whom we may be at war a year or two hence. I hesitate to think that bombs manufactured in this country might ever be used to destroy our own people. We have provided for a National Munitions Control Board which has its finger upon the pulse of the munitions industry in this country at all times, and that Board knows from day to day every order that is placed in this country and every shipment that is made, and it is easy for that Board to control through its licensing power unusual and unwarranted shipments of munitions to neutrals intended for transshipment, in violation of our law, to belligerents. The argument that Italy and Russia may purchase arms and munitions, being in a neutral status at present, and ship them to Germany has little weight when it is considered that the Munitions Control Board would immediately know what they were intended for.

There can be little doubt that lifting the embargo on arms, munitions, and implements of war at this time for the purpose of rendering aid to England and France would be an acknowledged unneutral act on our part that would clearly give rise to an intense hatred on the part of Germany and those nations associated with her, and as stated by Senator PITTMAN on April 7, 1937:

> By our unrestrained supply of credit, by our unlimited and unrestrained supply of arms, ammunition, and other contraband of war to the Entente Powers, by our failure to force Great Britain to respect our undeniable neutral rights, we excited the German people and aroused their hatred until they had conclusively determined before we entered the war to engage in war with us, either during the pending contest or after the war was over.

Clearly the record of events demonstrates beyond peradventure of a doubt that many acts of war were initiated against us by a desperate Germany long before our formal declaration of war. Germany made war against the United States because this country had become a participant in the conflict on the allied side and Congress only confirmed formally the existence of that state of war.

How did Germany go to war against America? Recall the 53 major explosions and fires in American plants supplying arms and munitions to the Allies from 1914 to 1917. Thirty-three were in powder plants or on munitions trains. Twelve occurred in gun or shell plants. Seven in chemical plants. One in an airplane factory. Several others in water-front warehouses, and so forth; unrestricted submarine warfare, sinking of ships with loss of American seamen. Surely we have not forgotten those incidents, and certainly the record of those events clearly demonstrates how the unrestricted and unlimited sale of arms, munitions, and implements of war involved the United States in the last World War. We must not take this first step.

To those who proclaim an alleged inconsistency between the prohibition of the sale of arms, munitions, and implements of war and the unlimited or cash-and-carry sale of other materials, may I point out that ever since the Civil War it has been recognized that it is unneutral for a neutral to permit the sale or delivery to a belligerent of armed vessels of war? Congress legislated on the subject as early as March 4, 1909, by making it unlawful to knowingly finish, fit out, or arm any ship or vessel with intent that such ship or vessel should be employed in the service of belligerents. This law, however, did not specifically cover submarines and, of course, being enacted as early as 1909, did not contemplate air bombers. However, President Wilson and his Secretaries of State, Bryan and Lansing, very definitely held that, although the act did not specifically specify submarines, it was the intent of the law to include them within its prohibitions, and accordingly very definitely held that it was our duty in spirit at least to prevent the shipment of submarines in whole or in part to belligerents in the last World War, and very definitely held that it would be a violation of our neutral position to permit the exportation of submarines or their parts.

What is the difference, I ask, between submarines and bombing planes as engines of war? Indeed, there is no practical difference. The Pittman bill, now pending, finds no difference, for in its definitions it provides:

> The term "vessel" means every description of watercraft and aircraft capable of being used as a means on, under, or over water.

Yet, if the arms embargo is repealed, it would be lawful to export bombing planes to the belligerents, but it would be unlawful, under the present construction of the act of 1909, to export submarines or submarine parts. Where is the consistency there? Is that not an artificial legal distinction? Yet it is not proposed to repeal the statute of March 4, 1909, which bans the export of vessels, including submarines. It is apparent, therefore, that the argument that the arms embargo should be repealed because it provides "an artificial legal difference" has little substance to sustain it; that all major legislation consists of compromise between the ideal and that which is practical; that in fact there are very real, practical reasons why arms, ammunition, and implements of war should be treated differently in wartime from other commodities that might be useful in time of war.

And, finally, there are those in this country who entertain avowed or secret hopes that if we can engage in the business of munition making, prosperity will be returned to the Nation and that the domestic problems that have haunted the administration from its inception down to the present time may thus temporarily, at least until after the next election, be

removed. This argument was advanced by the President in his recent address to the Congress.

I prefer to think, as do the leaders of industry in this country, that a great majority of the people of this Nation do not want profits arising from the sale of instruments of death, and that a great majority of the people if they knew the facts would much prefer to forego the temporary benefits that might accrue from a war boom as a small price to pay to insure our nonparticipation in a foreign war.

I know of no one who expressed the sentiment of the people of this country more clearly than did the President himself when he said in his speech at Chautauqua, N. Y.:

> It is clear that our present policy and the measures passed by the Congress would, in the event of war on some other continent, reduce war profits which would otherwise accrue to American citizens. Industrial and agricultural production for a war market may give immense fortunes to a few men. For the nation as a whole it produces disaster. Nevertheless, if war should break out again in another continent, let us not blink the fact that we would find in this country thousands of Americans who, seeking immediate riches, fool's gold, would attempt to break down or evade our neutrality. They would tell you, and, unfortunately, their views would get wide publicity, that if they could produce and ship this and that and the other article to belligerent nations, the unemployed of America would all find work. They would tell you that if they could extend credit to warring nations that credit would be used in the United States to build homes and factories and pay our debts. It would be hard to resist that clamor. It would be hard for many Americans, I fear, to look beyond, to realize the inevitable penalties, the inevitable day of reckoning that come from a false prosperity. To resist the clamor of that greed, if war should come, would require the unswerving support of all Americans who love peace.

Again, speaking before the Inter-American Conference for the Maintenance of Peace at Buenos Aires, Argentina, on December 1, 1936, Mr. Roosevelt said:

> We know, too, that vast armaments are rising on every side and that the work of creating them employs men and women by the millions. It is natural, however, for us to conclude that such employment is false employment; that it builds no permanent structures and creates no goods for the maintenance of a lasting prosperity. We know that nations guilty of these follies inevitably face the day when either their weapons of destruction must be used against their neighbors or when an unsound economy, like a house of cards, will fall apart.

Secretary Hull, in a press release during the Italian-Ethiopian crisis, on October 30, 1935, declared:

> It is my opinion that our citizens will not be disposed to insist upon transactions to derive war profits at the expense of human lives and human misery. In this connection I again repeat that an early peace with the restoration of normal business and normal business profits is far sounder and far preferable to temporary and risky war profits.

I salute those sentiments thus so nobly expressed by the President and his Secretary of State. They, indeed, reflected sound judgment and understanding of the futility of continued prosperity in any nation based upon profits accruing from the manufacture of arms, munitions, and implements of war. They made out the case against those who now clamor that our domestic economy will be strengthened by the repeal of the embargo on arms, and nothing that I can say can add to the force of that argument.

Why this sudden change of heart now? There was no change of heart at the time of the Italian-Ethiopian War or the Spanish Civil War, and our neutrality policy worked for the protection of this Government then. What are the reasons for demanding the change now? A major war between China and Japan has precipitated no demand from the administration for a change in the neutrality law, and a threatened war between Russia and Japan provoked no demand for immediate change in our neutrality policy. Can it be that the age-old propaganda of Britain has found its mark in America at last and that our policy of neutrality is to be determined by the question as to who are the belligerents? If such is the case, and there is ample evidence to support the contention, then we are no longer legislating as Americans for the interests of the United States, but we are allowing foreign governments to dictate and dominate our foreign policy and the course of our legislation. No longer, then, are we neutral. No longer, then, can we proclaim our impartiality as a nation, for to do so would be a pretext and a sham. No longer are we safe from foreign entanglements and alliances. No longer are we safe from involvement in European war.

I, for one, think only in terms of the interests of our people, and being thus motivated I refuse to take the first step that will lead us into the present European war. [Applause.]

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. ALLEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman who just preceded me, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] made this statement, if I understood him correctly—that there is nothing in international law which permits a belligerent nation to purchase arms from a neutral. I say that there is everything in international law that gives a belligerent that right, and which also gives the neutral the right to sell arms and ammunition to a belligerent nation. That right has been recognized by the great statesmen of this Nation for 150 years. It was clearly reiterated in The Hague Conference in 1907, to which this Nation was a signatory and to which those nations which are at war were likewise signatories. In that proclamation at The Hague these words were written:

> A neutral power is not bound to prevent the export or transit, for use of either belligerent, of arms, ammunition, or, in general, anything which could be of use to an army or a fleet.

Therefore, there is everything in precedent and in law to uphold the stand which we proponents of the Senate bill are taking this afternoon.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from New York kindly yield to me for a moment?

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield one-half minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, in order that the record may be kept straight, I made no such statement as the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ALLEN] has charged me with making, but I suggest that he read tomorrow the statement which I made, in my extension of remarks, and if he is a lawyer, and if he is familiar with the quotations of authorities or of the authorities on this subject, he will see what the statement that I wish I had time to make was, and which I would like to make, and it would not be the statement that the gentleman quoted me as having made on this floor this afternoon.

Mr. ALLEN of Pennsylvania. I said to the gentleman, "If I understood him correctly."

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield now to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, the present bill, as amended by the Senate, is undoubtedly the most progressive and complete neutrality measure, contains more safeguards and restrictions than any similar legislation ever enacted by any great power in the history of the world, and I am glad to support it. The cash-and-carry proviso applies to all foreign nations alike without any discrimination and will aid materially in keeping our country out of the European war, which is its main objective. This proviso is now made absolutely mandatory. In that respect it is stronger than the cash-and-carry law of 1937, which, while requiring belligerents to pay cash for war materials as a general proposition, granted to the President the discretion to permit short-term credits, a discretion not granted or permissible under this legislation.

The cash-and-carry law of 1937 also made it lawful for American vessels to engage in commerce with belligerents, subject to certain restrictions. This act will prohibit any and all commerce with belligerents in American vessels in war zones excepting in noncombat zones. It is thereby made possible for our Pacific coast shippers to carry on normal and peacetime operations so long as there is no warfare being carried on in Pacific waters.

In view of the fact that it is generally recognized that the destruction of our ships and the taking of the lives of our citizens in war zones due to submarine warfare was the most direct cause of our involvement in the last European War, it it believed and hoped that through these provisions we have

greatly lessened the danger of our being drawn into the vortex of the conflict now raging in Europe.

The major provisions of the bill as approved by the Senate, and which set forth the policy favored by President Roosevelt and our State Department, are as follows:

First. Belligerents may purchase munitions and all other materials from this country on a "come and get it" and "cash on the barrel head" basis. Title to all goods bought must pass to the purchaser in advance of shipment. A bill of lading would be conclusive evidence of transfer of title. Belligerent governments cannot obtain credit in the purchase of any materials. Private purchasers in belligerent countries can obtain credit on purchases on all articles except arms, ammunition, and instruments of war.

Second. American ships are forbidden to trade with belligerents except with outlying countries far removed from the war zone, such as Australia, New Zealand, Capetown, and countries or possessions in the Atlantic from Bermuda southward. Such exempted trade, however, applies only to general cargoes and not to arms, ammunition, and implements of war. No ban is placed on rail or inland waterway trade with Canada.

Third. American ships are prohibited from carrying passengers to belligerent ports, except those listed in the trade exemptions. American citizens are forbidden to travel on belligerent ships.

Fourth. The President may from time to time define combat areas, and American citizens, vessels, or aircraft are prohibited from entering same.

Fifth. American merchantmen are prohibited from arming themselves, except with small arms and ammunition required to maintain discipline.

Sixth. American citizens are prohibited from dealing in bonds or other obligations of a belligerent government issued after application of the Neutrality Act of the Government.

Seventh. American citizens are forbidden to solicit or receive any contributions for a belligerent, except funds for relief of human suffering.

Eighth. The President is authorized to make rules governing the use of United States ports by belligerent vessels and to prohibit belligerent submarines and armed merchant ships from entering our ports or territorial waters.

Ninth. The National Munitions Control Board, composed of the Secretaries of State, Treasury, War, Navy, and Commerce, is continued in existence. Its duty is to regulate munitions exports through a licensing system.

Tenth. It is declared to be unlawful for a foreign merchant vessel to fly the American flag as a ruse to avoid attack. Any vessel found to be violating the provision will be barred from entering United States port or territorial waters for a period of 3 months.

Eleventh. Heavy penalties, running as high as $50,000 fine and 5 years' imprisonment, are provided for violators of the commerce, combat-area, and financial-transactions provisions.

Twelfth. The act does not apply to "any American republic engaged in war against a non-American state or states, provided the American republic is not cooperating with a non-American state or states in such war."

All provisions of the act except those dealing with Presidential control of the use of ports and setting up the Munitions Control Board become effective only when the President or Congress, by concurrent resolution, declare the existence of a state of war between two or more nations abroad which might endanger the peace and security of the United States.

OUR NATIONAL DEFENSE

This neutrality legislation is intended and designed to keep us out of war so far as that desirable result can be achieved by legislation, and the proposed law is, in my opinion, the soundest and best approach which can be made to the problem. However, recent world events and the experience of other nations furnish abundant proof of the fact that a desire to be neutral and remain at peace does not insure peace or prevent attack by aggressor nations. Therefore I am continuing the course which I commenced in my recent radio address over a national network, and which I intend to pursue vigorously, pointing out the fact that we are not adequately prepared for a war of defense and that we should take immediate action to strengthen and increase our national defenses.

We should augment our land forces, mechanize and motorize our Army, and provide the Army with ample modern equipment—rifles, cannon, antiaircraft guns, tanks, and ammunition—which it does not possess at the present time. We should also provide facilities for the rapid manufacture of these items as required which we do not now possess.

We should provide the strongest and largest air fleet in the world, consisting of bombers, pursuit planes, and all-defensive aircraft, and antiaircraft guns, and fortifications for the defense of our cities.

We should have a two-ocean navy to properly protect our coast lines, of which we have three instead of two, as usually stated, the Atlantic and Pacific, but also the southern coast. In fact, the waters of the Gulf of Mexico and the Caribbean Sea are the most likely focus of attack upon us, according to Acting Secretary of the Navy Edison. Secretary Edison points out that "the hitherto almost defenseless West Indies and the islands stretching from Florida to Venezuela might provide a maze of shelters for raiding submarines or easy stepping stones for invading aircraft."

Let us be so well prepared that no combination of foreign powers in the world would dare attack us. Let us be so well prepared that no combination of foreign powers in the world could attack us successfully.

OUR INTERNAL DEFENSES

While we are preparing against attack from foreign foes we should not neglect our defense against our enemies within. I voted for the appropriation for the investigation by the Dies committee of communism, fascism, nazi-ism, and all subversive movements. I do not approve of all the actions of the committee and realize that it has made errors, which is true of all investigating committees, for they face a difficult task. On the whole, I believe they have brought a disclosure of conditions which must be remedied by legislation. The Democratic national administration, President Roosevelt, and the Democratic majority, as well as the Republicans who have joined with us, are entitled to credit for making this investigation possible, and which should have been made years ago. If the investigation is conducted fairly much good is certain to result and the findings form a basis for well-considered legislation to curb the activities of all subversive movements in our country.

We have certainly established beyond any shadow of doubt our consideration and regard for the welfare and happiness of the masses of our people by enacting the most progressive and salutary labor legislation in the history of our Republic, as well as liberal legislation dealing with all our social and economic problems. However, we have no sympathy with foreign "isms' which a very small group in this country would substitute for Americanism.

At the same time we must in our investigation of conditions and in legislating maintain inviolate our freedom of speech, our freedom of the press, our freedom of assembly, our freedom of religious worship, which are the pillars of our constitutional liberty. I have voted against House measures to establish concentration camps in our country and to curtail the right of free speech and make it possible to convict a citizen or editor of sedition by mere oral testimony of a few personal enemies and without proof of an overt act, both of which measures failed of passage in the Senate. They were clearly unconstitutional and contrary to the decisions of the United States Supreme Court. We have the finest country and the best Government on earth. Let us keep them that way.

OPPOSED TO ADJOURNMENT

Although Congress has been in almost continuous session for the past 3 years, I am, however, opposed to our adjourning at this time.

It is true that our domestic conditions are improving. This is particularly true in my district, due to numerous causes,

and the improvement which commenced at the beginning of the year has steadily increased. The West Coast Lumbermen's Association a few weeks ago stated in regard to the upturn in the lumber industry that "the effect of the European war is a secondary influence in the improvement." As a matter of fact, orders in the 5 months previous to September 1 showed the biggest increase in any similar period in 10 years.

Nevertheless, many of our people have not as yet been absorbed in private industry, although in many communities we have more persons employed at the present time than we had in 1929. Therefore we should go ahead with a meritorious work-relief program and construct many of the P. W. A. and W. P. A. projects, which would be permanent assets to the local communities and thereby furnish jobs to the remaining citizens whom private industry is unable to employ.

We should also take up and consider cost-of-production legislation for the farmers, many of whom have not as yet fully shared in the upward trend which is so noticeable in business and industry. The farmers are entitled to a parity price for their products, and I agree with the viewpoint of the Washington State Grange and the Pomona and local Grange organizations within my district who favor cost of production. We should not compel them to wait until the regular session in January.

In connection with our national-defense program and closely related to it, we should also consider and enact legislation to prevent profiteering by the big manipulators and speculators in the prices of foodstuffs and the necessities of life.

Mr. Speaker, we could accomplish a great deal in the ensuing 6 weeks, and if we did not actually complete action on some of these matters the progress made in considering them would be time well spent and would hasten final action thereon in the regular session. I shall, therefore, for these reasons, oppose adjourning this special session when the neutrality legislation has been disposed of.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. NORTON].

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, with as much dispassion as can be summoned to the consideration of a highly controversial question, I come before you not merely as a Member of this great body, but primarily as an American woman irrevocably committed to the proposition that our country must stay out of war. I know there is an honest difference of opinion as to how this can be accomplished. I believe in the sincerity of those who differ with me. My position has been taken, I may say, after much prayerful and serious consideration. I have been influenced also by my President and the Secretary of State, realizing that theirs is the greatest responsibility and that they are using every possible means to prevent this country from becoming involved in a war. I am also taking into consideration the wishes of my constituents insofar as it is possible to do so. I believe their greatest desire, stripped of all essentials, is to keep this country free, and I say here now that it is mine to preserve the neutrality and peace of the United States and to secure the safety of its citizens and their interests. Reason and logic indicate to me that this can best be done by repealing the present law and supporting the proposed Neutrality Act. I believe it to be a potent weapon for peace.

As I understand the new Neutrality Act, it provides:

First. That it shall be unlawful for any American vessel to carry any passenger or any articles or materials to any state named in such proclamation.

Second. It shall be unlawful to export or transport any articles or materials to any state named in such proclamation until all right, title, or interest therein shall be transferred to some foreign government, agency, institution, or national.

Third. It shall be unlawful for any United States citizen or vessel to proceed into or through any combat area designated as such by the President.

Fourth. It shall be unlawful for any citizen of the United States to travel on any vessel of any state named in the proclamation.

Fifth. It shall be unlawful for any person in the United States to purchase, sell, or exchange bonds, securities, or other obligations of any government of any state named in such proclamation, or to make any loan or extend any credit to any such government, and these provisions shall also apply to the sale by any person in the United States to any person in a state named in the proclamation of any articles or materials of arms, ammunition, and implements of war.

In the main, these five provisions constitute the American concept of a neutrality designed to preserve the peace of the United States and to secure the safety of the citizens and their interests. Taken together, these five provisions embody a policy of nonintervention and a plan for the payment in cash and transportation in their own ships of goods purchased by belligerents. Conceding that we sacrifice some of our constitutional rights of mobility and freedom of action in adopting such a law, it is nevertheless unquestionable that such conduct on the part of a nation and its citizens comes nearer to the achievement of true neutrality than any other expedient devisable by means of legislative enactment. Primarily, then, it is the harmony of the proposed Neutrality Act with the end sought which impels us to accept it as the solution of the issue. It is principally for this reason that I am convinced of the wisdom of the proposed legislation.

There is, however, another aspect of the question which is of vital significance to America as a nation. At the present time, for no purpose of national interest, we are refusing to trade on a commercial basis with nations which stand in need of our products and with whom we have always traded until the invocation of the present embargo. As a result of this embargo, normal markets for products ranging from foodstuffs to armaments are closed to American manufacturers, industrialists, and exporters. There is a consequent adverse effect resulting to American labor. The repeal of the present Neutrality Act and the passage of the proposed resolution already enacted by the Senate will remove this stricture on American industry and trade and advance our domestic welfare. This purpose in itself is obviously a legitimate one under the rules of international law and in no way conflicts with our duty as a neutral. The contention that the new statute will be an economic benefit to one warring nation due to the inability of another warring nation to send ships to buy and carry away the goods which we are perfectly willing to sell on the same terms to both, is without merit in view of the fact that no foreign country or belligerent has the right to determine our policy, or what amounts to the same thing, to prevent us from changing our policy as our national interests require. A neutral nation is under no moral or international obligation to equalize the commercial advantages of belligerents.

Since adequate safeguards against partisan or partial acts are provided by the proposed statute, the American policy of neutrality is effectuated. Since travel on belligerent vessels and in combat areas is prohibited, the protection of American lives is assured. Since the sale of commodities and materials is regulated by the title-and-take plan, under which extension of credit is banned, the protection of American capital is insured and the stimulation of American business is promoted. All of these worth-while objectives can and will be achieved under the recognized sanctions of international law. By reason and logic, therefore, I believe that I have established the premises which support the conclusion that the proposed Neutrality Act should be enacted into law.

Time will not permit further discussion at this time, but let me say that in my capacity as an American woman whose chief concern is to keep this country out of war, I bring to my aid arguments which far outweigh mere analysis and reason. They are arguments drawn from the experience of women through a long and weary history of wars. They are propositions established not by analysis, but by knowledge of pain and comprehension of grief. They are the unanswerable judgments of American womanhood and of her determination that never again shall American manhood spill its lifeblood on foreign soil. We are determined that the ghastly memories of other wars shall never be repeated.

May I say we are greatly disturbed. We pray for a world without wars, where our children can grow up, happy and useful, without that terrible dread of what may happen to us tomorrow. It is my confident belief that the proposed neutrality act will be the means of keeping us free, that America shall remain at peace. This is now and shall continue to be my most fervent prayer.

May I say to my colleagues, as one who went through a World War, who saw all of its horrors, who worked day and night in the interest of our boys, that I would not stand here today and urge that we repeal the present Neutrality Act if it were not my honest conviction that it is the best way to keep us out of war. I sincerely hope that my colleagues, however they may vote today upon the question of the best means to keep us neutral, will join with me in telling the women of America that this Congress, by its vote, will never consent to send American boys to fight in a European war. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 21 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON].

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, it is seldom that I have addressed the House of Representatives on any subject other than matters of taxation or related subjects—matters that emanate from the committee of which I have the honor to be chairman. However, my deep conviction impels me to deviate from my established rule and submit a few brief observations on the pending measure.

I was somewhat surprised at the statement and position taken by my good friend the able Representative from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN], who took the position that if we failed to amend the present neutrality law by repealing the embargo provisions, that failure of action on our part would stop the European war. I cannot believe that that view is shared by any considerable number of the Members of this body. I had not heard that thought advanced before. Neither can I concur in it. In my opinion, it must have strained the imagination or the optimism of the gentleman from Mississippi to have arrived at that conclusion. In my judgment, the action we take on this measure will not weigh a feather's weight one way or the other in stopping or continuing the present war which is now being waged on European soil.

The paramount question for us to consider, the all-absorbing question with me is, What effect will our action have with respect to keeping our country out of that terrible conflict?

I voted reluctantly and with great hesitation for the declaration of war in 1917. I did not do that to make the world safe for democracy, as perhaps some did, or to have any effect whatever as to the type of government that other nations should adopt and maintain. I cast that vote to vindicate the rights of American citizens on the high seas and to show my resentment and what I believed was the resentment of the American people of the continued violation of the rights of our nationals in the sinking of our ships and the murdering of our citizens on the high seas, where they had a perfect right under international law to travel. That is the reason that I voted for the war resolution in 1917.

Mr. Speaker, the enactment of the pending measure repealing the arms-embargo provision of the present Neutrality Act and substituting for it the cash-and-carry plan will, in my opinion, do more to keep the United States out of the present European war than any other action Congress could take at this time.

Before proceeding with my brief remarks in favor of the proposed legislation, it may be well to lay down one or two general and very fundamental aims that motivate, I believe, all Members of Congress, as well as every member of their constituency. The first of these is a universal desire—so strong that it amounts to a primary rule of our national self-preservation—an almost obsession with me—that is to keep America from becoming involved in the present European conflict.

While our soil has not provided a battlefield since the close of the War between the States, the American people are well aware of the horrors of modern warfare. President Roosevelt feels just as strongly as do the American people the revulsion of war and he has, on numerous occasions, given voice to his hatred of the brutal method of settling disputes by armed conflict. Likewise, our Secretary of State, Hon. Cordell Hull, has labored unceasingly for peace and elimination of the economic barriers and restraints which have too often plunged the peoples of the earth into war.

The American people do not need to be told anew that war is a devastating monster to be avoided at all costs short of the loss of national honor and national safety. As to this, we are all agreed, as far as I know.

Moreover, I am convinced that there will be found no differences of opinion among us as to the desirability of our padding our ears to the blandishments and propaganda of those agents of foreign governments who would draw us into the European maelstrom. None of us has been exclusively appointed—nor can we usurp the right—to be the sole protector of American neutrality. And none of us has a monopoly on patriotism or the desire and determination to keep our Nation free of the European conflict. I grant my opponents the same respect, the same belief in their sincerity that I am entitled to receive.

Our duty here is not nearly so complex as some would have us believe. We are not legislating for the benefit of any foreign power. The sole test of the merit of the legislation before us—the sole yardstick by which it can be fairly gaged—is whether or not it is best for the American people. We all want neutrality as far as this purely theoretical state can be achieved by law and we want to bring this about in a way best designed to insure our national safety. Just exactly how this is to be done, however, constitutes our problem and brings about the honest difference of opinion being debated here.

We now have on our statute books a so-called neutrality law. It provides, in brief, that we can ship in American vessels, manned by our own seamen, any article or commodity so long as it does not fall within the narrow confines of the description "munitions and implements of war." The number of Swedish and Norwegian vessels that have been sunk recently carrying cargoes no nearer this description than wood pulp, bears evidence of the ineffectiveness of such a classification.

It may be easily demonstrated that the distinction set out in the existing law between finished implements of war and materials vital to a warring nation is but a shadow and, upon examination, dissolves into air. Cotton is as necessary to a country at war as gun cotton and, in fact, may be readily so converted. Chemicals, copper, and steel are as important as the shells they will soon become after their arrival upon the belligerents' shores. Gasoline and oil for the airplanes and tanks are just as essential as the guns which make them offensive and defensive weapons.

Retention of the present neutrality law would mean simply the supplying of these war essentials in semimanufactured form and thereby depriving our workers of so much badly needed employment. Moreover, and of especial importance, to allow these articles to be carried to the purchaser in American-flag ships would put our nationals into areas fraught with danger where the loss of property and lives which would inevitably follow would furnish such inflammatory incidents as led to our participation in the World War. The case of the American ship *City of Flint* furnishes a graphic instance of just how easily such an incident could and almost certainly would occur.

It would be extremely difficult, if not impossible, to draw a reasonable distinction between groups of exports, as even the articles useful in the ordinary life of a nation may be readily classed as war aids. To do so would simply be an idle gesture, as it would have no binding effect on the belligerents who determine what articles they consider as contraband.

Moreover, to place an embargo upon all exports would bring on economic ruin, and any attempt to prevent transshipment to belligerents, through other neutrals, would be administratively impossible.

The present neutrality law is very uneven and discriminatory in its application. It does not, in any sense, achieve real neutrality, and has the distinct vice of allowing our ships and men to go into the danger zones. Our refusal to sell finished implements of war makes defense virtually impossible for small peace-loving nations that do not have the facilities to manufacture munitions and implements of war. It encourages nations with great military strength to prey on weaker neighbors, who having no great armed might, are debarred from purchasing the weapons with which to defend themselves. Aggressor nations may lay in large supplies of arms and their victims have no way of rectifying their mistaken trust in their own inviolability, and confidence in the protection of treaties and guaranties.

We were told by those who opposed the removal of the embargo, in the last session of the Congress, that it would prevent war, and that as long as it was maintained there would be no war in Europe. These same persons now tell us that unless the embargo is kept intact it will constitute a first step that will lead to our involvement. Their first prediction did little to advance their reputation as prophets, and their opposition, resulting as it did in inaction on this important question, in my opinion, undoubtedly was a contributing factor to the outbreak of war in Europe.

In the meantime, both our great President and our capable Secretary of State warned that a European war was likely, and might break with little notice. They urged that we prepare ourselves by removing from our statutes the present ineffectual neutrality legislation, and replacing it with something along the lines of the pending bill. Persons from every walk of life, without regard to partisan policies and their positions upon other very controversial questions, concurred in this opinion.

Newspaper and syndicated writers who have previously been the most critical of President Roosevelt, are numbered among his strongest supporters on the pending issue. Men prominent in our national life, such as ex-Governor Landon, the titular head of the Republican Party; Hon. Philander C. Knox, his running mate in the last Presidential campaign; ex-Secretary of State Stimson; ex-Governor Al Smith, of New York; ex-Senator Watson, of Indiana, former Republican leader of the Senate; and many, many others are unitedly supporting the President in his efforts to keep our country at peace. Each of these persons consider the pending measure the most effectual means of accomplishing this purpose so ardently desired by each and all of us.

The present Congress at the last session saw fit to delay this matter, and war found us with this dangerous legislation upon our statute books. There seems to be no just ground for continuing this state of insecurity simply because war is now raging. On the contrary, however, that fact alone furnishes a cogent reason for immediate action. It has been argued that to repeal the embargo at this time constitutes a breach of international law. What we are doing, in fact, if the proposed legislation is adopted, is to replace one law of general application with another of equally general application.

Quoting from a recent published letter of ex-Senator Jim Watson, of Indiana, the following pertinent and succinct observations on this point should be of interest:

> Both sides of the controversy are convinced that international law has nothing to do with this proposition. We had the right to pass the Embargo Act and we have the right to repeal it. It is wholly a domestic matter, and we are under no obligations to present the question to any other nation before taking action.
>
> Under international law we have always sold everything we had to sell to other nations that wanted to buy, even in time of war, and our right to do so has never been questioned.

And I commend a further careful study of this letter, especially to the Representatives from the State of Indiana.

The provisions of the proposal are simple. Our men and ships must stay out of the trouble zone. We will sell anything our Nation produces to anyone who will come to our shores, pay cash, take title to the commodity, and carry it away in a non-American ship. That is real neutrality, sanctioned by ancient usage and international law. We are in no way responsible for the geographical location, shipping tonnage, or sea power of the purchasers of our products. We are, however, directly and inescapably responsible to the American national, the American-flag ship, and, above all, to the American people, who would be the sufferers if any army had to be sent abroad to satisfy the hatred which would be engendered by the sinking of American ships with the loss of the lives of our citizens.

This is an important and serious hour in the history of our Nation, perhaps the most momentous since 1917, when we declared war against the Imperial German Government.

In conclusion, I repeat, the controlling desire of all of us is to keep our country from becoming involved in the war in Europe. Our great President and Secretary of State, who have larger official responsibilities and also a better and more thorough knowledge of all factors relating thereto, have urged and recommended the policy outlined in the pending bill.

In my judgment, their position has the endorsement and support of an overwhelming majority of the American people without regard to political affiliations or connections. From North, South, East, and West come conclusive evidence of such support, and it is my studied, deliberate, and confident belief that the enactment of the pending measure will be taking the safest course possible at this time to promote and safeguard the peace, well-being, and happiness of the American people. [Applause.]

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Virgina [Mr. DREWRY].

Mr. DREWRY. Mr. Speaker, the proposed passage of so-called "neutrality legislation" brings on a lengthy discussion as to whether the United States desires to be neutral or unneutral as evidenced by the passage of such legislation. This is confusing. The very attempt to pass neutrality legislation indicates a desire on the part of the Representatives of the people of the country to be neutral, not unneutral. It is futile, if the word "neutrality" means anything, to discuss any desire on the part of the Congress to pass legislation that would be unneutral. Therefore the question resolves itself into a discussion of the terms of the proposed legislation to ascertain whether said phraseology would constitute neutral or unneutral acts on our part.

A consideration of the terms of this legislation should be preceded by a discussion of conditions as they now exist with reference to the United States becoming involved in any war being engaged in by other nations. It should be fully stated and definitely impressed upon all that the people of this country do not want to engage in any war anywhere; that the Representatives of the people in the Congress of the United States do not want this country to become involved in any war; and that those who administer the affairs of the Nation do not want any such involvement. In other words, no one wants war, and this legislation of itself indicates that fact, and further indicates that we are proposing to pass legislation that will evidence our intention of keeping out of war and that we hope it will serve to prevent our getting into war. It might further be said that even the nations now at war and their nationals do not want war, but this statement, based upon the evidence presented to us by the acts of a European nation, if said acts be taken in their full significance, would seem too broad.

War is the use of brute force by a nation to accomplish its purposes, whether its purposes be the taking of the possessions of another state, or the gaining of certain ends desired by the aggressor state. It is the antithesis of arbitration or the settling by peaceful means of differences that arise between nations. As far as I am informed and advised, a certain nation in Europe, Germany, desired territory belonging to others, and by threatening to use armed force, succeeded in obtaining control and possession of two other European nations. The threat of attack did not terrorize Poland into yielding up its territory, and Poland was subjugated by the superior armed force. Other nations, under promise to aid Poland if attacked, were thereby brought into the conflict, and the present war between Germany, on the one side, and Britain and France, on the other, resulted. It cannot be said, therefore, that everyone in the world hates war, for the acts of the aggressor nation clearly indicate that the leaders of that nation desire to obtain by brute force the

possessions of other countries. Thinking in terms of individuals instead of nations, it is the same principle that actuates the thug and the thief to take by brute force what does not belong to them. So far as I know, no other head of a nation, except Hitler, has proclaimed such a theory as the principle that should guide nations in their relations with each other. Hitler, as the leader of the German people, has for many years spent his country's resources in building up a war machine that he might obtain by force what he could not obtain by peaceful arbitration. Weaker nations succumbed to his threats and submitted to his demands, but as time went on it became evident that not only would the possessions of the nations that succumbed to his threats be taken from them, but the liberty and freedom of their citizens as well would be subjected to his mad caprices.

Most men will fight for their liberty and freedom, although they might not fight to hold what they have in the way of material possessions; so the result is war between the aggressor nation and the one that resists. Austria and Czechoslovakia yielded, believing that their liberty would be preserved; Poland resisted, for they had witnessed the complete control of these two countries by Germany. Britain and France are now resisting because they know that promises made will not be kept and that yielding means their complete destruction. The United States must think of itself, and the leaders of the country should be thinking of our position, and we should be ready to protect and defend ourselves from attack from any nation. The United States is further intent upon not committing any act that could be construed as involving us in a war on another continent which is none of our making and with which we have nothing to do at this time. So the question that confronts this country is, how can we best put ourselves in a position to prevent our becoming involved in said war. There are two general theories as to how this can best be accomplished:

The first is to have no neutrality legislation of any kind, but depend upon the precedents established under the principles of international law, in which case every question that arose would be settled on its own merits with the application of these principles and precedents. The principles of international law have been established for hundreds of years and have been found sufficient to cover every case that arises. However, the spirit of the American people causes them to prefer action to inaction, and so there is a demand on the part of many of our people that certain safeguards should be thrown around our activities in the hope that by so restricting some of our rights as a neutral under the principles of international law there would be a better chance to avoid situations which might result in conflicts between the United States and warring nations. Of course, it is fully understood that no legislation passed by this country can affect the principles of international law. As said by the Secretary of State, Mr. Hull:

> The principles of international law as regards neutrals and belligerents have been evolved through the centuries. This Government adhering as it does to these principles, reserves all rights of the United States and its nationals under international law and will adopt such measures as may seem most practical and prudent when those rights are violated by any of the belligerents.

As more fully expressed in a note of the Acting Secretary of State to the Mexican Ambassador, March 8, 1912:

> The duties of neutrality under the law of nations cannot be either expanded or contracted by national legislation. The United States, for instance, has here in excessive caution required from its citizens duties more stringent than those imposed by the law of nations; but those statutes, while they may make offenders penally liable in this country, do not themselves put either these persons or this Government under any extraterritorial obligation. Our own statutes bind our own Government and citizens and those within our jurisdiction. If they impose on us a larger duty than is imposed upon us by international law, they do not correspondingly enlarge our duties to foreign nations.

In a statement made by the Secretary of State on September 14, 1939, he said:

> The Government of the United States has not abandoned any of its rights as a neutral under international law. It has, however, for the time being prescribed, by domestic legislation, certain restrictions for its nationals which have the effect of requiring them to refrain from the exercise of privileges which but for such legislation they would have the right to exercise under international law, such as the right to travel on belligerent vessels, to make loans and extend credits to belligerent governments, et cetera. These restrictive measures do not and cannot constitute a modification of the principles of international law but rather they require nationals of the United States to forego, until the Congress shall decide otherwise, the exercise of certain rights under those principles.

Westlake, International Law, part 2, war, 209:

> On all these enactments it will be one of the matters for our consideration whether any particular provision does not go beyond what neutral duty requires. Whether in fact it does so or not, at least it is certain that no state law of the kind is a declaration to the world of what the state in question deems to be its international duty as a neutral. It is a declaration to its own subjects of the powers which it deems necessary to take over them, whether in pursuance of its own policy or in order to ensure the performance of its neutral attitude.

It must, therefore, be kept in mind that any neutrality legislation by the United States applies only to our own citizens, and simply evidences to the world that the United States will restrict its own citizens by statutes in order to avoid incidents which might possibly occur if such restrictions were not enforced on our own citizens by their Nation. It is merely a voluntary relinquishment of certain rights for that purpose and should impress other nations with our great desire to be neutral. It is better sometimes to voluntarily relinquish rights than to get into difficulty by attempting to enforce those rights.

The other theory carries out this idea, namely, to ask our citizens to forgo certain rights which they possess and do not relinquish except for the purpose of binding our own citizens for a time. These restrictions necessarily cause some loss to our commerce and some interference with the liberty of our nationals, but those who hold to this view think that the price to be paid for these restrictions is less than the damage that would result if we were brought into a conflict by the assertion of our rights under the principles of international law. However, it must be kept in mind that this is a voluntary relinquishment and by no means is intended to admit to the world that we will give up all of our rights in cowardly submission rather than defend those rights. This country, for the 150 years of its history, has been very tenacious of its rights in all of its relations with the other countries of the world, but we have gone much further in this legislation than we have ever gone in puting into this bill the restrictions above mentioned. I do not know that the step is a wise one. If the threats of a madman can get us into a frame of mind that will cause us to relinquish our own rights rather than to fight for them, it may well be that other nations will mark our inclination in this direction, and this legislation may cause actions by belligerents to such an extent that war may be brought on instead of being prevented. However, it seems to be the thought that we proceed with legislation of this kind, and the temper of the American people seems to be quieted to the extent that they ask for instead of resenting such restrictions. If nations misread our attitude and think that we will not fight, regardless of what may happen, they will quickly find that there is a point beyond which our people will not go. I hope that they will read this legislation in the light in which we write it.

In the carrying out of this theory, the present proposed legislation has been presented to the Congress, and while there are numerous restrictions, the main controversy concerning the bill centers around the repeal of the arms embargo. The motives of those who wish to repeal the present embargo on arms were, first, that many thought that the Arms Embargo Act was more liable to get us into war than to keep us out of it; and, secondly, to come back to a sounder theory of international law and to more closely carry out our traditional policy of neutrality. Secretary of State Jefferson, in 1793, said:

> Our citizens have been always free to make, vend, and export arms. It is the constant occupation and livelihood of some of them. To suppress their callings, the only means perhaps of their subsistence, because a war exists in foreign and distant countries, in which we have no concern, would scarcely be expected. It would be hard in principle and impossible in practice. The law of nations, therefore, respecting the rights of those at peace, does not

require from them such an internal disarrangement in their occupations. It is satisfied with the external penalty pronounced in the President's proclamation, that of confiscation of such portion of these arms as shall fall into the hands of any of the belligerent powers on their way to the ports of their enemies. To this penalty our citizens are warned that they will be abandoned, and, that even private contraventions may work no inequality between the parties at war, the benefit of them will be left equally free and open to all.

President Pierce in 1854 said:

In pursuance of this policy, the laws of the United States do not forbid their citizens to sell to either of the belligerent powers articles contraband of war or take munitions of war or soldiers on board their private ships for transportation; and although in so doing the individual citizen exposes his property or person to some of the hazards of war, his acts do not involve any breach of national neutrality nor of themselves implicate the Government.

Secretary of State Fish wrote in 1874:

The exportation of arms and ammunitions of war of their own manufacture to foreign countries, is an important part of the commerce of the United States. In time of war their Government will expect those engaged in the business to beware of all the risks legally incident to it.

In 1885 Secretary of State Bayard wrote:

It is also to be observed that the fact that certain articles of commerce are contraband does not make it a breach of neutrality to export them. There has not been, since the organization of our Government, a European war in which, in full accordance with the rules of international law, as accepted by the United States, munitions of war have not been sent by American citizens to one or both of the belligerents; yet it has never been doubted that these munitions of war, if seized by the belligerent, against whom they were to be used, could have been condemned as contraband.

In 1935 we gave up our adherence to the principles of international law in this particular, which we had followed through the years, and passed the embargo arms provision, but the people of the country, I believe, now have reached the conclusion that it should be repealed. Due to statements made in the course of the debate in the Congress—in both bodies of the Congress—many of our people have the thought that upon the repeal or the failure to repeal the arms embargo depends whether this country will go to war or remain at peace. This is carrying the discussion into a very speculative field. I doubt that either the retention or the repeal of the arms embargo will bring us into war with any other nation, or will keep us out of war, but surely if it is our intention to express to the world our neutrality and our desire to avoid any conflict with any nation, repealing the embargo so that we may be on the firm footing which this country has been in this particular since its beginning, will tend to keep us out of war; when we add to that expression of a desire for peace and neutrality, the further safeguard that we will sell to any nation that comes and buys on our shores and takes its purchases in its own ships to its shores, it would seem that as nearly as possible we have expressed our intention to be fair to every nation and to treat all of them alike. Surely no one would seriously contend that we will get into a war because we agree to sell to anyone who wishes to buy the products of our factories and other materials. It does not seem to me that such a view could be a logical conclusion upon the repeal of the arms embargo.

In conclusion, certain things should be made apparent to all the world, namely, that we do intend to resent any act of aggression upon our nationals or their property by any other nation; that we voluntarily for the time relinquish some of our rights under international law by asking our citizens to forego certain things; that we legislate for our country and for our own security and not because of threats made by any nation against us; and that if cowardly submission means peace, then there will be no peace. [Applause.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. ANDERSON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, today on this floor I heard a very fine speech made by a man who I think is about as well qualified as any who ever sat in this House. I know of no more lovable character or no man better qualified for a seat in Congress than the gentleman from Massachusetts who made the speech I refer to today; but for that speech to go unanswered, or for me to sit idly by and not answer it, would make me feel that I had neglected my duty as a duly elected Member of the House of Representatives.

The gentleman from Massachusetts implied that anyone who voted to retain the embargo was voting on the Communist side and the Nazi side of this issue—that anyone who supported this motion was either lined up with the Communist or the Nazi Party.

I am sorry to hear from back home in my little district where I live that my church priest is lined up with the Communist Party, according to the gentleman from Massachusetts, for here is what he says:

Am absolutely opposed to lifting the embargo on arms and war munitions. Am for strict neutrality.

REV. DANIEL A. DOWLING.

He is a Catholic priest. Here is a telegram from another priest:

Keep present embargo. Sending guns, bullets, and dynamite to belligerents is not the road to peace but to war.

REV. S. J. SCHLATTMANN,
Lemay, Mo.

I am sorry that the Sisters are against God, according to the gentleman from Massachusetts. Here is what they say:

We, Sisters of St. Joseph of Carondelet, 4,000 members, demand the retaining of the embargo.

Sister CECILIA JOSEPH, *Superior.*

Here is a telegram from another branch of the Sisters in St. Louis:

The Sisters of St. Joseph Mother House, St. Louis, 4,000 strong, demand strict neutrality.

Sister ROSE COLUMBA,
Superior General.

And we have here another telegram from a group of church people:

Group of 125 churchmen urge you support such propositions in the coming Congress as will strengthen our neutral positions and keep us out of war.

CHURCHMEN'S FORUM, ST. PETERS EVANGELICAL CHURCH.

And the church people out my way—I am sorry they are not with God, according to John. They say in a telegram:

Do not recall Neutrality Act or arms embargo.

FATHER GASS.

Here is another:

Assembled today at our forty-seventh annual convention, a resolution was adopted that we maintain a genuine, strict, honest neutrality, and urge the retention in our laws of the embargo on the sale of arms, ammunition, etc.

THE CATHOLIC UNION OF MISSOURI.
NATIONAL CATHOLIC WOMEN'S UNION SECTION.
MISSOURI YOUNG MEN'S SECTION.

And we have one from the Young Sodality:

We are in favor of the Neutrality Act remaining as is. Please vote accordingly.

THE YOUNG SODALITY, ST. PIUS CHURCH.

And the Franciscan Fathers of St. Louis—I am sorry they have deserted God:

We heartily support you in fight to keep arms embargo.

FRANCISCAN FATHERS OF ST. LOUIS.

I have a letter here from the Evangelical Church:

HOLY GHOST RECTORY,
St. Louis, Mo., October 27, 1939.

Hon. C. ARTHUR ANDERSON,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. ANDERSON: The issue of neutrality will be before you men in the next few days, and I want to urge you to vote against the repeal. My argument can be simply stated. Repeal means selling arms to the warring forces, and selling arms means war for us. You know it.

For the sake of the mothers and boys who must suffer and carry on the war I appeal to you to keep our present neutrality law, plug up the holes that now seem to endanger our peace, and begin to mind our own business.

Let's make war on the depression and the evils that make the depression.

God bless you and keep you.

Sincerely yours,

LAWRENCE ROST.

I have a letter here from St. Stanislaus Seminary, of Florissant, Mo., a Catholic seminary. They are for retention of the embargo, according to this letter; and the Evangelical Reformed Church, they, too, are against lifting the embargo:

"KEEP AMERICA OUT OF WAR!"

DEAR SIR: As a Christian woman and a member of the Evangelical and Reformed Church of America I, together with 3,000 other women of this denomination in St. Louis and its vicinity, am unalterably impressed with the truth of the statements listed below and beg of you to support them at such time when your voice and vote shall help to determine the future policy of our Nation:

1. A strengthened neutrality law.
2. Maintain the arms and credit embargo.
3. Continued pressure for conciliation, cooperation, and international agreement to solve the problems at the basis of this present world crisis.

(Signed) Mrs. WILMA SOMMERER.

The Chaminade College, a Catholic institution, goes on record against lifting the embargo:

CHAMINADE COLLEGE,
Clayton, Mo., October 29, 1939.

Hon. C. ARTHUR ANDERSON,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: It seems to me that the welfare of our country demands that the embargo on munitions of war be maintained. I am convinced that a repeal of the embargo would be the first step into the war. It still remains to be seen whether the House of Representatives is more representative than the Senate. When common people tried to make their voices heard, their servants in the Senate and in the White House were deaf. The President dismissed the pleas of such people as of little value, because they came from inspired sources. How then can we make ourselves heard? We must place our hope in the House of Representatives.

The Senate vote showed that the party lines were quite intact. Must we infer from this that the rubber stamp is used in so important a matter? We hope our Representatives will not be deterred by the threat of loss of patronage when so much is at stake.

Let me assure you that this communication is my own responsibility and that I need no inspired sources other than those which tell me how to cast a vote for the best interests of our country.

Perhaps you can do your colleagues a service by telling them how it hurts a citizen to be classed as irresponsible by our first public servant, who had to do plenty of inspiring to attain the position he now holds.

Sincerely yours,

WM. SCHNEIDER.

It seems like everybody is out of step but John. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that the gentleman inferred that anyone who would vote to retain the embargo was not an American. I will put my Americanism and my war record against the record of any other Member of this House. The time when you could tell whether an individual was an American or not was in 1916, 1917, and 1918 [applause], and in 1917, long before I was old enough to be drafted I enlisted and went to France to fight against the German forces. I think the best vote and the only American vote is a vote to retain the embargo and to keep the boys back home. Let us retain the embargo and stay out of the European war. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 12 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HARRINGTON].

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, when the neutrality bill was before the House at the last session I voted against the Vorys amendment which placed an embargo on arms.

I also voted, Mr. Speaker, for the amendment of the distinguished Representative from Pennsylvania [Mr. ALLEN], which repealed all so-called neutrality statutes and proposed the return of the foreign affairs of this Nation to the basic principles of international law.

My reasons at that time were the same that prompt my action today. I believed then it was the safest course for the United States to follow. Today I believe the safest course is to retain the arms embargo.

What is the meaning of neutrality? The very heart of it is impartiality. A neutral government is no longer neutral when it moves to enact or repeal laws which may aid one of the belligerents. When it does so, it gives up its position as a neutral and all its right to the benefits and immunities of a neutral. It has deserted impartiality, which is the essence of neutrality.

The Senate neutrality bill is now before us. It proposes to repeal the embargo on arms, ammunition, and implements of war.

We are permitted under the rule to offer certain amendments, and I propose to support the amendment of the able and distinguished gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHANLEY]. However, the issue is raised as to what extent a neutral government may, after the outbreak of a war, adopt new measures or change measures previously adopted.

At the outset I may say that a sovereign state has the right to repeal a law or to enact one. That, however, is not the question. We grant the power to do so, but, by the same process of reasoning, that same sovereign state may, because of its act, be answerable under international law for such action. Certainly a neutral state may elect to exercise its powers, but if its acts violate the rights of other sovereign states under international law, it is then in the light of an unneutral because it has ceased to be impartial.

But to bring us up to date—and briefly.

The act now in force was passed originally in 1935 when the world was technically at peace. There was but one thought then—to give this country what the Congress in its calm, studied, deliberate judgment conceived to be the most secure peace mechanism it could devise to keep us out of foreign entanglements, power politics, and wars.

Again, in 1937, when the world was still technically at peace, the Congress reenacted that law. The arms embargo was once more written into permanent law, and although some of the provisions of the act have since expired, the Congress thought enough of the embargo provisions then to cling tenaciously to them and make them secure.

As late as last June the House once again wrote into the Bloom bill an arms-embargo provision, weakening the present law to some extent, to be sure, but nevertheless maintaining the principle of no arms and munitions of war to belligerents, regardless of declaration of war.

I was not a Member of Congress in 1935, but had I been I undoubtedly would have supported the Neutrality Act. I did support the act of 1937. In the almost 3 years that have intervened, I have changed my opinion considerably. I did not support the act of 1939 as passed by the House nor did I support the arms-embargo provision it contained. The world was then technically at peace, and no action, then, on our part could possibly have been construed as affecting anyone but our own country and its own policies. I was convinced in June and still am, were the situation the same now as then, that a return to international law and a course similar to that pursued by Norway, Sweden, Denmark, and Holland in the last war would be the safest way to keep us out of any war which might break out anywhere. "Freedom of action for America" is the basic philosophy of that policy.

I repeat, I voted for the Allen amendment to repeal all neutrality and return to the principle of international law. I voted against the Vorys amendment to insert the embargo. I voted against the bill.

Why? Because I honestly felt that the best way to keep this country from becoming involved was to scrap all the neutrality laws on the statute books and go back to international law.

Only one consideration is facing us today: The best way to keep us out of war.

Last June the House said to the world: "We think the best way to keep from becoming involved in any war is to keep the arms embargo." We voted to retain it. This embargo principle had been established as a national policy over a period of 4 years, and we reaffirmed it only 90 days ago.

The world was then at peace. Now, great nations are at war. I believe that if we try to change the law now, after war has been declared, we will commit an act of unfriendliness—yes, an act of aggression, if you please, and I would be opposed to the embargo today if a gigantic and cruel war were not in progress. That was my opinion last June and is my opinion today. Change the law then? Yes; a thousand times. Change it now? Ten thousand times no.

Was I alone in my belief last June?

I hesitate to call attention to the statements of the men I am about to quote. Each one of them is a sincere and respected Member of this body. Each one is able. Each one is my friend, and I call attention to their statements now not because I wish to throw their own words in their faces but because their statements are based upon undeniably true premises, reasoned through with irrefutable logic and therefore they have arrived at the soundest conclusions. I suspect that most of them do not agree with my position today; nevertheless, the conclusions they arrived at last June are inescapable.

Let us look at the record.

The distinguished ranking member from Texas of the Foreign Relations Committee [Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON] said:

Let me point out this to the committee that, as I said, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. BARTON] so well said, if war should break out and if conditions should arise under which the American people should demand the repeal of the arms embargo on account of the conditions then existing, repeal after war had broken out would be an unneutral act (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 29, 1939, p. 8324).

The distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ALLEN] said:

The minute we change the existing provisions of any act after warfare has started we have changed the rules in the middle of the game. We have then committed an unneutral act and an unfriendly act toward one of the belligerents. That is a very dangerous possibility and probably would result in war for us. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 27, 1939, p. 8009.)

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. With reference to that quotation, I have examined the RECORD since the statement was made. I said it would be charged or might be charged that we were unneutral. I did not say we would be unneutral.

Mr. HARRINGTON. I quote from page 8324 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 29, 1939. It is possible an error was made.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I checked that.

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished Member from Massachusetts [Mr. HEALEY] said:

For a neutral to alter or change its policies, once a war is in progress, so as to affect unequally one belligerent or another, is contrary to the accepted practices and precedents of international law and may constitute a hostile or unneutral act toward a belligerent so affected.

Let us not be beguiled by the argument that we should not fetter ourselves now but should be free to meet conditions as they present themselves. Once hostilities have begun, therefore, if we repeal the present law prohibiting the shipment of lethal weapons of warfare, it will be too late to enact such a provision again, however desirous it may be for our own peace and security. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 29, 1939, p. 8323.)

In my opinion, one of the most learned authorities on international law in this body is the distinguished Member from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH]. The gentleman from New York said:

It is a dangerous thing for us to write down a rule of conduct binding and inflexible and then to find, as we inevitably will find, when some unexpected and unpredictable crisis overtakes us, that our rule is out of date and worthless; indeed, dangerous; and, finding that change the rule by our own act. The change will inevitably inure to the advantage of one belligerent and the disadvantage of his opponents. We may not intend it so, but it will be so. And when we change the rule * * * when we change a rule that we ourselves have made, after the game starts, then we have done an unneutral act.

I am not speaking about the rules of international law. I am speaking about the rules that we propose to adopt to govern our own conduct, our own rules. When we change those after the conflict starts we are in grave danger of getting into trouble.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that I agreed heartily to the statements made by these gentlemen while the world was at peace and agree with those statements now when we are surrounded by conflict and our only effort must be toward keeping this Nation out of war.

Why are we asked to repeal the present law? To keep us neutral? To keep us out of war? No; absolutely not in my humble opinion, and the debate in another body would seem to prove it conclusively.

We change the law now to help one side as against another, and if that be neutrality, the gentleman whom I have quoted were wrong when those statements were made in June. As for myself, I believe that this action which we now seek to take is wrong. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS F. FORD].

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I am supporting this neutrality measure because I believe that it will help to keep the United States out of war. I am opposed to war on principle, and I am most vigorously opposed to our ever again sending an American army to fight in Europe.

Believing that the arms embargo had proven ineffective and worse, I voted for its repeal at the last session of Congress. I understand the feeling of those sincere citizens who are convinced that those who hate war should vote for an embargo on all war materials and munitions. But I have no sympathy with those supporting the present so-called embargo law. That embargo, limited as it is to arms and ammunition in their finished form, is a mere gesture wholly ineffective as to its proclaimed objective. It permits, for instance, the export of raw cotton to be manufactured into gun cotton, but forbids the export of the manufactured product. It permits the export of iron ore and steel billets to be made into cannon and machine guns, but again forbids the export of the finished articles. It permits the exportation of gasoline and oil, both essential in air warfare, but prohibits the exportation of airplanes. In short, under the present law every kind of raw material that can be used to manufacture munitions and armament can be sold abroad, and sold under conditions that are almost certain to involve us in disputes with belligerent nations patrolling the seas.

Because it is ineffective, discriminatory, and a strong potential cause of our getting into conflict with other nations, I am voting to repeal the present embargo law.

Frankly, there is another argument that carries great weight with me and that is that the present embargo aids Hitler and his Nazi regime; aids the dictators, the aggressors, the despoilers of Poland and of Czechoslovakia; aids the malign ambitions of a man mad with power and with a dream of dominating the world through the destruction of self-governing nations that stand in his way. This is another reason why the present law should be repealed.

As to the neutrality measure now being considered it is my reasoned judgment that it is an honest and carefully worked out attempt on the part of Congress to keep the United States out of war. Wherever our sympathies may be, we all recognize that this is a European conflict and we are most of us determined to keep out of it. To this end we have before us a plan of neutrality that we hope will keep us neutral and at peace.

It is argued that, while the present embargo indirectly benefits Hitler, by lifting it we will indirectly aid France and England and all the independent nations of Europe. This is because the Allies are supposed to control the seas. This is none of our doing. We are being entirely neutral because we make no discrimination as to who or what nation may buy our products. Our ports and markets are open to all nations. They can buy freely if they pay cash and take their purchases away on their own ships. It is no contriving of ours if only England and France are able to do this.

When they pay for the goods and load them on their ships, the landing of those goods at their own ports is their problem, not ours. This is entirely proper under international law. If the ships carrying these cargoes are sunk en route, it is their loss, and we who have sold the goods and relinquished all title and interest in them can have no quarrel with the power that either captures or destroys the cargoes or the ships. Thus we avert the danger of being dragged into war over loss of our ships.

Furthermore, this measure provides that the President shall indicate certain danger zones in which American ships shall not travel. This provision, while it is a relinquishing

of a right which we could legally claim under international law, is generally conceded to be one of the most effective safeguards against our becoming involved in the war.

Since we can be completely neutral under the revised neutrality bill now being considered by the House, and at the same time help to stop Hitler through permitting the sale on a cash-and-carry basis of any and all commodities, I am supporting this plan, which I think is best for the United States and best for the civilized world. [Applause.]

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. LEA.]

Mr. LEA. Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of the enactment of the pending neutrality bill.

The purpose of this legislation is to give greater security to the United States against being drawn into the European war. We attempt to appraise the conditions that confront us, anticipate the most probable reasons that might lead us into the conflict, and so far as possible avoid the situations that might bring us into the war.

This legislation proposes that we prohibit our ships from entering combat zones where the conflict is now raging, and that the President be given power to enlarge these prohibitive zones as the facts may warrant.

It proposes to restrict travel of our citizens into combat areas.

It requires that property intended for shipment into the war zones shall be transferred from American ownership before it is transported. It proposes to restrict loans and credit so that the motive of collecting debts shall not be ascribed as a factor in inducing us into war.

It requires that manufacturers, exporters, and importers of arms, ammunition, and implements of war shall register and will be prohibited from engaging in such business without first procuring a license from the Munitions Board.

The past has demonstrated that the wars into which we have been drawn from the status of neutral to combatant, has been not from the fact of extending credit to belligerents nor from the fact that we sold to them, but from the entry of our ships and our nationals into combat zones.

AMERICA FOR NEUTRALITY

Unquestionably, America wants to stay out of this war. We do not feel that it is our war, and by every honorable means we want to keep it from becoming our war. I would say that the primary consideration now is to keep America in line of duty to our own Nation—not in a narrow, selfish, cowardly sense but in the sense of a clear recognition of duty and responsibility to this country.

We are a neutral nation. The American people are a proud people. They are courageous, have ideals, and where they recognize a duty are willing to sacrifice. If I could, I would not take from Americans one phase of those fine qualities.

We now see no duty that requires us to be a participant in this war. We want to preserve neutrality. It would be in vain that we would ask our Nation to be neutral in thought or not to have convictions and hopes as to the result of this war. The American people as a whole desire the Allies to win, but we are not called upon to abandon our rights as a neutral to become a participant.

We enacted the embargo before this war began. It was not enacted for the purpose of aiding the belligerents in the present war. In practical effect, it is now an aid to Germany, because it tends to deny the Allies military supplies of which, through lack of preparation, they are in need. Its repeal would probably aid the Allies. The substitute legislation now proposed, however, is not entirely preferential to the Allies, because it would withdraw American ships from the war zones and make it necessary for the Allies to use their own vessels for provisions that might otherwise come in American ships. It further restricts trade by provisions that are not in the existing law. However, the legal rights of the present belligerents are equal.

The repeal of the embargo as I see it, would help America. We would help America by relieving it of an arbitrary rule that denies military supplies to a nation regardless of how meritorious may be its claim. We relieve the country of an embargo policy that tends to encourage aggressive wars by crippling peace-loving nations and arming their aggressors. We help America by relieving it of a stupid law that would blindly bind its future conduct where the greatest freedom of action and a prudent and informed judgment reached with knowledge of the facts could better control our important affairs.

NEUTRALITY LAWS

Our neutrality acts of recent years, including the embargo attempt to establish no neutral rights for the American people. We neither create nor violate duties under international law by this legislation. On the contrary, what we have done in these acts is to waive our rights as neutrals and forbid American citizens the rights they have under international law for the purpose of avoiding circumstances which might lead us into war. In other words, we have chosen to refrain from doing what we have a right to do, in order to avoid possible conflict.

International law has no prohibition against the sale of military supplies to a belligerent nation, nor against engaging in commerce with belligerents. Some nation may be displeased with the exercise of our right to trade with its antagonist, but the law of nations has no rule that makes such trade a cause for war.

An embargo which denies our people the right they would otherwise have to engage in such trade is a domestic law enacted or repealed at the will of our Government, without just cause for any other nations to take offense. One Congress temporarily may waive the privilege of our people to exercise their rights under international law, but in so doing we do not prohibit the same or another Congress at a later date from the reassertion of those rights for the benefit of our country. Every man and nation must deal with America recognizing that its Congress has a right and duty to write its laws and change its policy as the interests of our Nation may dictate.

Congress did not consciously write an embargo law for the benefit of any other nation.

EMBARGO OF LITTLE PROTECTION

In the Neutrality Act of 1937 Congress provided for embargoes which prohibited the shipment of arms, ammunition, and military implements to belligerent nations.

Judging by the commerce that took place during the World War, these prohibited materials are estimated to constitute about 13 percent of the war-period cargoes. Probably 87 percent of our commerce in food supplies and other materials would not now be affected by the embargo.

About two-thirds of the commerce of the United States is carried in foreign bottoms. The embargo now applies only to the prohibited materials and does not otherwise prevent ships from entering danger zones.

Warfare, as we see it in Europe, is an economic contest as well as a military contest. Each of the belligerents is seeking to cut off or destroy its enemy's commerce. Submarine warfare is waged against economic supplies as well as against military supplies. The right of belligerents to seize and destroy contraband military materials is so well established that commerce in such articles is far less likely to occasion international trouble than the questionable interference with economic supplies. It is not the policy of the embargo legislation to prohibit the sale of military supplies except to the extent that engaging in such commerce may threaten the involvement of the United States in war. Neither does this problem involve the question of selling implements for the destruction of human life.

Under the present law in peacetime we sell to all who care to purchase; in wartime we sell to all but belligerents.

The facts I have just mentioned demonstrate that the embargo as proposed to be included in the Senate bill would have little practical relation to the protection of American commerce against those circumstances that might provoke war. Evidently the purpose of the embargo was to relieve our country from the menace of transporting these military supplies. The embargo is an inept provision for this bill because what we need to afford our country protection

through the violation of neutral rights is to bar our property, our ships, and our nationals from the danger zones. In order to do that it is not necessary or desirable to prohibit foreign ships from engaging in that commerce where the property, ships, or lives of Americans are not involved.

Under the Senate bill American ships are barred from the danger zones, and our nationals and their property prevented from entering such zones. Those provisions go to the heart of the difficulty without unnecessarily interfering with the transportation of American products by foreign vessels.

The present embargo is directed at only a fraction of our commerce while the protective features of the Senate bill are directed at practically all our commerce where danger may arise.

CHANGE OF LAW

It is argued here that we should not change the rules after the game is in progress. Theoretical reasons and abstractions are resorted to in an endeavor to induce the Members of the House to believe that, superior to our duties to look after America, is the fulfillment of some obligation we owe one of the belligerents in this war. It is claimed we are barred from changing that law until the war is ended.

During the Napoleonic wars we enacted and repealed an embargo while the war was in progress. In 1935 we enacted an embargo while the Ethiopian war was in progress. Later we enacted an embargo when the Spanish war was in progress, and in 1937 we enacted the present embargo while the war in China was in progress. In each of those cases we changed the laws so far as America was concerned, but we did not change international law.

Our responsibilities come from the Constitution of the United States. Our duty, as I see it, is to make and repeal laws as the interest of America requires. The rules of the game so far as America is concerned are written for the American game and not for the game of any belligerent. We enact laws to be in effect until they are repealed and no further. Every citizen of America must deal with his Government with a knowledge that no man has a vested interest in the continuance of the laws of Congress.

It is argued, in effect, that, even though circumstances may change, our neutrality laws should not change during the war.

The war in Europe had not started when we enacted our embargo law. After that war began it was the right and duty of this Congress to determine whether the embargo was proper legislation in view of the new circumstances that had arisen. If Congress is to be deprived of that right, then embargoes are a very dangerous type of legislation that may cripple Congress in its duty to look after the affairs of America. In addition to that, the effort to change the law now before us was in progress when the war in Europe was started.

This bill provides for credit restrictions and zone restrictions which practically all of us support. These provisions restrict the Allies more than Germany. Does that violate neutrality?

It is argued that we are under obligations to the belligerents not to change our law. What are those obligations to the belligerents? It is argued that the repeal of the embargo would give the Allies a source of war supplies that was prohibited by the embargo and Germany has a right to insist that we shall continue to refuse military supplies to the Allies. Can Germany complain against any neutral dealing in war supplies when she is constantly receiving such supplies from Russia, Italy, and other countries?

EXPERIENCE WITH EMBARGOES

This history of our country has made us conscious of the danger of America being drawn into a war between other nations. In the undeclared war with France before 1800, in the War of 1812, and in the World War the United States was first a neutral and later became a belligerent by reason of the transgression of its rights as a neutral.

In 1935 we passed a limited embargo act largely inspired by a desire to prevent our country from embroilment in the war in Ethiopia. Fortunately the war did not develop to the point where our embargo operated to affect either of the combatant parties or our country. In practical operation it was a nullity.

In 1936 a rebellion broke out in Spain, following which we enacted a law making it unlawful to export arms to Spain. It, of course, prohibited shipments to either side of that civil war.

That embargo was the occasion of much agitation in this country. Germany and Italy each for many months declared it was taking no part in that war. At its conclusion, however, forces of Italy and Germany were returned to their countries where they were received with world-wide acclaim. The official heads of those governments boasted of their achievements and enlarged upon the important and effective support by men and materials they had given to the winning side.

Russia gave support to the other side, which was meagerly provided with arms and supplies to support a war.

The effect of our embargo on Spain was to contribute to the result accomplished in Spain, be it good or bad, according to the viewpoint entertained.

In 1937 an undeclared war in China became a conflict of large proportions. The Embargo Act of 1937 provided for a declaration of embargo against belligerents when the President finds that there exists a state of war. No such finding was made and our embargo law did not operate. If put into operation its effects would in all probability have been mischievous instead of helpful. The embargo covers only arms, ammunition, and implements of war. It does not prohibit the shipment of the materials from which armaments are made, nor of commerce that contributes to the support of armies.

Japan is an industrial nation. Its domestic plants were not affected by any menace of attack. It had need for raw materials, but little need for the completed products covered by the embargo. The embargo if imposed would have done little harm to Japan, but it would have placed China in the position of a belligerent and denied her arms of which she was deficient and for which she lacked facilities of manufacture. It would have prohibited the granting of a credit of $25,000,000 provided by the United States through the Export-Import Bank. Great Britain also granted China a credit which would have been a violation of neutrality if the war status had been established.

So while we avoided the consequences of enforcing the embargo in the Asiatic war, it is substantially apparent that the imposition of such an embargo would have been irritating to both belligerents, pernicious in its effects, and served no useful purpose to our country. So as the record stands today our recent experiments with embargoes arbitrarily imposed demonstrates the embargoes either have not applied, or if they did apply produced no result helpful to the United States.

OUR FIRST EMBARGO

The wars between England and France at the close of the eighteenth century led the United States to restrict its commerce to avoid conflict with the belligerents. The country was drifting rapidly toward another war with England when the breach was temporarily healed by the Jay treaty. This was followed by an undeclared war with France. The general effect of the efforts made in the Napoleonic Wars to keep peace by refraining from commerce excited the contempt of each of the belligerents and inspired the friendship of neither. The embargo of 1807 under Jefferson cut our commerce from $108,000,000 to $22,000,000 a year. All our vessels found in French ports were under orders of seizure. It brought economic distress to the country as a whole. Congress finally repealed the embargo.

Adams, the American historian, describing the results of this early embargo, among other things, said—

> Morally, it sapped the Nation's vital force, lowering its courage, paralyzing its energy, corrupting its principles, and arraying all active elements of society in factious opposition to government or in the secret paths of treason.

In 1812 as an outgrowth of this situation President Madison sent a message to Congress in which he asserted that Great Britain "abandoned all respect for the neutral rights of the

United States." The embargo had failed. Congress declared war on England.

WORLD WAR

In 1914 Germany was at peace. She was in possession of her colonies and there was no menace to her boundaries from any source. She had a large navy and a world-wide commerce, with the second largest merchant marine in the world. She had a large gold reserve. She was making notable economic progress.

Not contented with this situation she made intensive preparations to attack her neighbors. Without warning and with powerful forces she cut her way through Belgium toward Paris. After 4 years of war, in which 30,000,000 perished and billions of dollars of property were destroyed, a treaty of peace was signed. It was a treaty written by the victors. It was a dictated peace. Germany had appealed to the sword and she got the verdict of the sword. Her representatives signed the Treaty of Versailles because at that time it was the best thing they could do for Germany, unhappy as the result was to them. The Versailles Treaty was harsh. It was an end to which wars lead. It is an end to which the present war is heading.

In recent years Hitler has denounced the Versailles Treaty as a dictated treaty and has assigned that as a justification for its repudiation. He wants to fight the war over in order that the victors may write another harsh treaty, a verdict of the sword, hoping that he may be the victor to write the treaty. Thus he now invokes the policy he repudiates as indefensible.

When the World War began the average American on the street looked upon it with comparative indifference and with little expectation it would bring war to America. We had nothing to gain by such a war and no purpose to enter it. As the war progressed our rights as a neutral were defied. Finally, through indiscriminate submarine warfare without notice, search, or seizure, American ships were sunk and lives destroyed. The United States entered the war.

America has long been the advocate and supporter of the freedom of the seas and the rights of neutrals. We never engaged in a war which more nearly had the unanimous support of American people than in the World War. The wisdom of our entry of that conflict may be debated, but the moral and legal justification of it from the standpoint of history can never be denied. The sufficiency of our reasons for entering the World War was recognized by Count Bernstorff, Ambassador of Germany at Washington, who, on being granted his passport, said, "I am not surprised. My Government will not be surprised either. The people in Berlin knew what was bound to happen if they took the action they have taken. There was nothing else left for the United States to do."

INDEFENSIBLE AS NATIONAL POLICY

Aggressor nations conceive their plans and long design and prepare for war. Their victims hope for peace. Desiring no war, they are reluctant to prepare for the war they do not desire.

The embargo denies us any right to distinguish between the aggressor and his victim. Some day, alone or in company with other nations, we may reach a decision that we will assume the responsibility in some instances of deciding who is the aggressor and refuse to sell him arms and ammunition for that reason. The responsibility for such a decision may be an unwise one for us to assume, but it would at least have the merit of withholding military supplies on a basis of humanity and justice and not under an arbitrary blind rule that may place the weight of America on the side of injustice and aggression. Before we commit America to a permanent policy of embargoes, let us first commit her to a policy of humanity and justice in the application of those embargoes.

The present situation leads us to the point where we can visualize a blind embargo as operating against one belligerent and through the aid of a silent partner in the cloak of a neutral supplying another belligerent with American arms. No practical method of administration is in sight to prevent such distortion of the administration of the present embargo law. Not only can military supplies be purchased by a neutral who may conceal their transfer to a belligerent, but compliance with the embargo law can be accomplished by supplying its own war implements to a belligerent and substituting purchases from America for itself.

The present embargo denies the sale to our good neighbor, Canada, that involves no peril whatever to transportation to that country.

BELLIGERENT TRADE

An arbitrary policy of refusing to sell to a belligerent in time of war without any distinction as to the circumstances, does not fit in with proper relations to nations with which we are at peace. We should not restrict sales further than are necessary for our own security. We have carried on peaceful trade with all belligerents now engaged in war in Europe. Last year we sold over $1,400,000,000 of American products to England and France and their colonies. We sold over $100,000,000 to Germany.

We can readily agree that no individual thinking only of his own interest has a right to engage in provocative activities that might take our Nation into war, with its burdens and penalties.

On the other hand, we cannot think of our commerce in terms of the few individuals who happen to sell American products. We must measure the importance of trade by its value to our producers, by the national interest, by the labor employment it affords, by the materials for which it provides a market, and by the maintenance of friendly conditions of trade after the war as well as during the war. In this commercial relation America has an important and legitimate interest.

Last year America paid hundreds of millions for the transportation of her international trade in the ships of other nations. The cargo carried in foreign ships represented approximately two-thirds of our total international trade, both in bulk and value. The embargo, so far as it operates, not only prohibits exports in American ships but also in foreign ships. It would probably be safe to assume, by comparison with the peacetime figures, that two-thirds of the goods we embargo would be carried in foreign ships without any menace whatever to American lives or property. The reason for the embargo does not exist as to such transportation. By an embargo on goods we place a greater restriction on our own commerce by prohibiting its shipment on foreign vessels than by our own. The restriction as to foreign vessels would contribute not one whit to our security. Its only effect would be to reduce our commerce, without affording us any protection whatever.

We do not need the embargo on our own ships because, under this bill, they will not enter the danger zones or carry our property or our people. [Applause.]

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FADDIS].

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry indeed to see that the argument on this question has grown emotional. It should have been kept strictly upon a sound, practical plane. When we take action upon the present proposition to amend the so-called Neutrality Act, we must eliminate all other considerations except that of the future welfare of the United States. That is the sole and only point at issue, not whether we will be dragged into a war, not whether we will be assisting Germany, Russia, England, France, Albania, Afghanistan, or any other nation. It is simply a question of what will be the effect upon the future history of this Nation.

We must ignore all social and political prejudices and act in a manner which we believe will be most likely to favorably affect the future history of this Nation. Whatever we do will have world-wide repercussions and will affect the destinies of millions of Americans yet unborn. It is time to lay aside all sham, all subterfuge, all hypocrisy, and all camouflage and call a spade a spade.

We must carefully evaluate the barrage of letters and telegrams which has been poured upon us. Some of them are sincere, but for the most part they are but a part of an attempt to stampede us into following the advice of indi-

viduals who are not elected by the people of this Nation to be our advisors, who have taken no oath of office, who are not responsible to the electorate in any manner, and who cannot possibly be in possession of as much information as a Member of Congress can or should be in possession of before he makes a decision upon this question. It is high time that the Members of Congress took a firm stand against the irresponsible ravings of these dangerous demagogues and the intimidative threats of the heads of organized minorities, both of which influences endeavor, under the protection of the right to petition, to interfere with the orderly, systematic deliberations of a Congress elected by the people every 2 years to legislate for the Nation. We must disregard such unwarranted interference and decide questions according to the facts at hand and our own opinion as to what is best for the general welfare.

The counting of propaganda inspired form letters, post cards or telegrams, or the reckoning of names casually signed to obscure petitions is certainly a poor substitute for the consideration, study, and research which should precede and influence our decision upon any question affecting the public interest. No nation can be competently directed, in either foreign or domestic affairs, by means of irresponsible plebiscites taken in panic and inspired by either emotional or selfish considerations. There are no provisions under the Constitution for this volunteer fourth branch of our Government and it should have no part in the deliberations of men who consider themselves competent. For those who feel themselves to be incompetent, it is of course a different matter.

Let us not overlook the threats of some of the Germans and Russians within our borders who have threatened to resort to sabotage to prevent the products of our industry from reaching France or England in case we do lift the embargo on arms. I hope and believe that there is yet remaining in this Nation enough of the spirit of '76 to cause us to assert our rights to our national sovereignty and give these emissaries of this would-be "invisible empire" the rebuke to which their insolence entitles them. How long are the American people going to allow the hospitality of this Nation to be outraged to the extent of furnishing a harbor for vermin who would even consider sabotage, much less threaten it. Let us hope that it will not require an actual war to awaken us to the dangers of these filthy rats gnawing from within. For one, I express the hope that the first case of sabotage will meet with all the vigilance, promptness, and severity of which our system of justice is capable.

Whatever action we take on this matter will most certainly influence the results of the present world conflict. Let no one be deceived on that score. By our actions we will contribute toward the success either of dictatorship or democracy. We must ask ourselves the question, What will happen to this Nation politically, socially, and economically if the dictator nations win? What if the democracies win? One of the two contending forces will win, and in neither case will the effect upon this Nation be the same. Let there be no mistake about that. We are charged with the preservation and defense of our national welfare, freedom, international rights, and democratic institutions, both present and future, and it is our solemn duty to take whatever measures we deem necessary to accomplish this. We must endeavor to anticipate, as best we can, what will happen and how we will be affected, and upon this must chart a course which we believe will best secure our national interests and follow this course.

We must not hide behind a cloak of hysteria and sentimentality and say that this or that action will drag us into war. We are certainly aware that only the Congress can declare war or appropriate money necessary to carry on a war. We know full well that only in the case of extreme necessity would this body take such action. The real question before us is our national security, and we always have and, I believe and hope, always will resort to any measures, however extreme, to insure this national security. We must not allow a mistaken belief in the magic of so-called neutrality to make us indifferent to our national welfare or safety. This is a new kind of war. It is not being waged purely in the interest of economic considerations. It is a war, one of the primary objectives of which is the extension of a school of political thought. Can we isolate ourselves against such a movement simply by declaring our neutrality? It seems to me that this question has been answered beyond the possibility of a doubt. Has the Dies committee not proven to the satisfaction of this entire Nation that both Russia and Germany have, as nations, endeavored by insidious infiltration to inoculate this Nation with their brand of political thought, when they are well aware that it is incompatible with our laws, our manners, our customs, and our wishes? Have France and England maintained any organizations to correspond to the bund or the Communist Party in this Nation? England and France were only too well aware of the dangers which would result from a Russian army being brought into western Europe. Even in an extremity they saw that the price of an alliance which would make this possible was too great. If such a move would have given them victory, it would have been a Pyrrhic victory. Even at the price of throwing Germany a powerful ally, they refused to expose western civilization to this menace.

Another objective on the part of the aggressor in this war is the acquisition of territory for expanding population and as a source of supply of raw materials. It is all very well to say that Germany should be given colonies. Who is to give them to her? Are we willing to give her some of our territory? If so, just what will we relinquish? Are we willing to see her seize land in this hemisphere to the north or south of us? That is the portion of the globe where land is the most loosely held, raw material most abundant, and having the most favorable climate. Would this not be a challenge to the Monroe Doctrine? Would we in this case either not be forced to defend it or become a second-class power?

The great majority of the people of this country want to stay out of war. They realize, however, that if France and Great Britain are defeated, we, as part of the world, will be exposed to political and economic influences which will be decidedly unpleasant, if not disastrous. Therefore the great majority of the people of the United States want to see France and Great Britain win the war.

The law, as is, carries an embargo on the shipping of arms but none on the shipping of other commodities. American ships may sail the danger areas with cargoes often more essential to the prosecution of war than are lethal weapons. They are exposed to all the dangers which are generally believed to have been the causes of our entry into the last World War. We now have the proposition to substitute a cash-and-carry provision for all commodities and a prohibition against American ships trading with belligerent nations. Personally, I believe in the present proposal we are giving up too many of our rights to the freedom of the seas, but, since France and Great Britain control the seas at the present time and have Germany blockaded, this would favor them. Since Germany was determined upon conquest and aggression, she was, in consequence, well prepared. She has also effected at least an economic pact with Russia and will have access to that vast reservoir of supply. As matters now stand, our law favors Germany. The tighter our embargo the more assistance to Germany, therefore, if we do not repeal this embargo, we are lengthening the war or contributing to a defeat of France and Great Britain, neither of which are according to the desires of the American people. Of course, there are some few of our citizens who, in their intense hatred of England, would willingly see civilization destroyed if only England, too, is destroyed by the catastrophe. Then there are those who are, because of racial or other considerations, pro-German in their sympathies. These two classes, of course, favor the retention of the embargo. By far the greater majority of the American people, however, believe in the precepts of Christianity, which are based upon the golden rule. They believe in the right of the weaker nations to their national identity, the right of the individual to individual identity, and the necessity of laws being based upon justice. They know full well that western civilization is based upon these principles and that, if these principles are replaced by those now being forced upon peoples by the dictators, our civilization will fall. This civilization has brought

to the peoples under its influence those "inalienable rights" which centuries have proven to be necessary to the existence of a free people. There is no length to which the people of this Nation will not go to preserve this civilization once they realize it is in danger.

Mr. Speaker, a vote for embargo is a vote to assist the political forces which have abolished constitutions, abrogated bills of rights, forbade the exercise of free speech, free press, freedom of religion, and, insofar as is humanly possible, has suppressed free thought. A vote for embargo is an expression of belief in the theory that "might makes right" and a belief in the right of the strong to rape the weak. A vote for embargo is an endorsement of a poltical policy which denies the sancity of the contract and seeks to reestablish the old theory that the worker belongs to the state and fasten the chains of serfdom once more around the necks of the workers of the world. A vote for embargo is an assist to an economic policy, which, by means of peon or coolie labor, will drive the commerce of free peoples from the seven seas and out of the markets of the world and reduce the living standards of these peoples to the status of the peon or coolie.

Mr. Speaker, in the interest of isolating this Nation from this present conflict and securing our national safety, in the interest of ending this war as soon as possible, in the interest of the commerce and standard of living of this and future generations, in the interest of freedom, justice, and democracy, in the interest of western civilization, humanity, and Christianity, I hope the House will support the proposed changes in this most unwise legislation. [Applause.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON], who is the only Member of the present Congress who voted against the declaration of war back in 1917. [Applause.]

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, by a vote of 63 to 30 the Senate, on Friday last, approved the administration's neutrality bill repealing the arms embargo and setting up a cash-and-carry system in dealing with the belligerent countries of Europe.

The action of the Senate, if ratified by the House, places this country definitely on the side of the Allied Powers in the European war. I refuse to call it a world war because it is a European war with which we should have no concern. I quote as my authority for this statement Secretary of State Hull, who in a letter dated May 12, 1938, wrote Senator KEY PITTMAN as follows:

MY DEAR SENATOR PITTMAN: I have received your letter of May 3, 1938, enclosing a copy of Senate Joint Resolution 288 "repealing the joint resolution to prohibit the export of arms, ammunition, and implements of war from the United States to Spain, approved January 8, 1937, and conditionally raising the embargo against the Government of Spain," and requesting my comment.

In recent years this Government has consistently pursued a course calculated to prevent our becoming involved in war situations. In August 1936, shortly after the beginning of the civil strife in Spain, it became evident that several of the great powers were projecting themselves into the struggle through the furnishing of arms—

Now get this—

were projecting themselves into the struggle through the furnishing of arms and war materials and other aid to the contending sides, thus creating a real danger of a spread of the conflict into a European war, with the possible involvement of the United States.

Now, you proponents of repeal, digest that.

Secretary Hull goes on to say:

That there was such a real danger was realized by every thoughtful observer the world over.

Twenty-seven governments of Europe took special cognizance of that fact in setting up a committee designed to carry out a concerted policy of nonintervention in the conflict. In view of all these special and unusual circumstances, this Government declared its policy of strict noninterference in the struggle and at the same time announced that export of arms from the United States to Spain would be contrary to such policy.

The fundamental reason for the enactment of the joint resolution of January 8, 1937, was to implement this policy by legislation. This joint resolution was passed in the Senate unanimously and in the House of Representatives by a vote of 406 to 1.

Mr. Hull goes on and says:

In the form in which it is presented the proposed legislation, if enacted, would lift the embargo which is now being applied against both parties to the conflict in Spain, in respect to shipments of arms to one party while leaving in effect the embargo in respect to shipments to the other party. Even if the legislation applied to both parties its enactment would still subject us to unnecessary risks we have so far avoided.

We do not know what lies ahead in the Spanish situation. The original danger still exists. In view of the continued danger of international conflict arising from the circumstances of the struggle, any proposal which at this juncture contemplates a reversal of our policy of strict noninterference, which we have thus far so scrupulously followed and under the operation of which we have kept out of involvement, would offer a real possibility of complications.

Get that. He said that we have been able to keep out of the war over there because we have refused to ship arms to either side.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. KNUTSON. Continuing the quotation, he states:

From the standpoint of the best interests of the United States in the circumstances which now prevail, I would not feel justified in recommending affirmative action on the resolution under consideration.

Our first solicitude should be the peace and welfare of this country, and the real test of the advisability of making any changes in the statutes now in effect should be whether such changes would further tend to keep us from becoming involved directly or indirectly in a dangerous European situation.

Furthermore, if reconsideration is to be given to a revision of our neutrality legislation it would be more useful to reconsider it in its broader aspects in the light of the practical experience gained during the past 2 or 3 years rather than to rewrite it piecemeal in relation to a particular situation. It is evident that there is not sufficient time to give study to such questions in the closing days of this Congress.

Of course, Secretary Hull was 100 percent right in what he wrote to Senator PITTMAN. I am wondering what has caused the administration to change its position on this subject. Is it due to pressure from the international bankers and the munitions makers? Just what is the President's objective and what has he up his sleeve? We are entitled to know.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. Briefly.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Is it not a fact that international bankers and munition makers promote and profit by war, and the records show that our New Deal leader in the White House, Mr. Roosevelt, is an ex-international banker on many fronts, and his family has recently been joined in the holy bonds of matrimony with the munitions house of Du Pont?

Mr. KNUTSON. In an address before the New York Herald Tribune forum on current problems, President Roosevelt, speaking from the White House last Thursday, took to task those who "beat their breasts" and assert that his foreign policy might send this country into war. In reply to the President's unctuous assumption of virtues that I do not feel he possesses, I would commend to him a careful reading of the second, fifth, and sixth paragraphs of Secretary Hull's letter to Senator PITTMAN.

Many of us can remember back to the period immediately preceding our entrance into the World War. Then, as now, President Woodrow Wilson assured us time after time that his foreign policy was designed to keep America out of war. As a matter of fact, he was reelected in 1916 on the slogan, "He kept us out of war."

There is this distinction, however, between Wilson and Roosevelt. Wilson wanted to be neutral but was deceived by our Ambassadors to England and France, also by Colonel House, not to mention a horde of bloodthirsty munition makers and international bankers, while Mr. Roosevelt is openly and avowedly pro-Ally. Therefore, I maintain that the danger of being dragged into war under Roosevelt is infinitely greater than it was under Wilson.

The American people wish to remain neutral. They are determined to stay out of this war at all costs, save at the expense of our national honor and security.

I blame the metropolitan press for creating such false war psychology as we may now have in this country. When the Germans seized the steamer *City of Flint* it was smeared across the front page of every large paper in America. I noticed that the action of Britain in seizing four American ships on the same day was buried in an insignificant paragraph on one of the inside pages. I submit in all fairness that if it is wrong for Germany to seize one American ship it is four times more wrong for Britain to seize four American ships. As a matter of fact, this administration should serve notice on both belligerents that we will not tolerate interference with lawful and orderly commerce. [Applause.]

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE].

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman who just preceded me inferred by his remarks that a fellow townsman of mine had taken his position on the embargo because of the influence of munition makers. I have known Cordell Hull since soon after I knew my own father. I know him to be wise, honest, and big, and that his motives are patriotic and above reproach. I have heretofore had a very high regard for the gentleman who preceded me, but I am frank to say that his manner of questioning the motives and his insinuations as to the purpose of so great a man raises a question in my mind as to the purity of his fairness and the sincerity of his own patriotism. Such things are not proper in a discussion of a matter so vital to the Nation as this question.

Conceivably, I could, perhaps not with the oratory but with equal fervor and enthusiasm decry the horrors of war as I have heard the opponents of the repeal of the embargo do. Perhaps, I could wave the flaming sword, air my pro-British or pro-German attitude and my religious prejudice, but, frankly, Mr. Speaker, I do not think either has any part here, and, therefore, I wish to impose upon you a discussion of the embargo as it particularly relates to our own interests, to our own national defense.

National defense resolves itself, when realistically considered, into two component parts, man power and equipment.

In America we are singularly blessed in the quality of our man power. In courage, in intelligence, in strength, in agility, and in initiative the young American has no peer in the youth of the entire world, but, Mr. Speaker, he cannot successfully fight in modern war with his hands, his head, and his heart alone. The manner of recent successes of mechanized military units causes us to realize that if we pay proper regard to our own national defense, we cannot allow that character of unpreparedness which existed in 1917.

Permit me, if you will, to read briefly from a statement of the Honorable Newton D. Baker, who was Secretary of War at that time. I read:

> In the early months of the war our manufacture of guns was negligible. We bought in Canada a large supply of Ross rifles, an obsolete arm, and used the left-overs of the Spanish War, but still gave some of our recruits initial training in the manual of arms with broomsticks. That we were always able to have enough modern rifles for our men overseas was due to the fact that we were able to buy a British-owned factory built in this country after the World War began, and modified the Enfield, with which the British were armed, to our needs.
>
> We bought revolvers and pistols of every sort, ransacked the museums of city police departments for confiscated concealed metals and weapons, and we got the best our pistol manufacturers could do under speed-up production, but at the end of the war we were still short of the required supply. For months American manufacturers were unable to make heavy ammunition.

Mr. Speaker, military experts predict that the determinative factor in the present European struggle will be the airplane. How will the embargo affect American preparedness in the air? I particularly address my remarks to the gentlemen on my left. In order to answer that question it will be necessary to comment briefly on certain factors.

In the World War in which we engaged we lost 50 percent of our airplanes per month. Our Army experts now predict and calculate that in large-scale operations there will be a loss factor of 30 percent of our planes per month, which means that in the course of 1 year we would have to reproduce our entire air fleet four times. It would mean that if war in all of its fury should break now and find us with 3,300 airplanes, that in the course of 1 year we would have to produce over 13,000 planes to maintain our original strength, to say nothing of other emergencies that might arise. Does not that illustrate and prove that preparedness is essentially that of productive capacity and continuing productive capacity? The statement has been made, "Let us keep all of our airplanes that are made in America at home; do not ship any. Let us keep the embargo and keep all of our products at home." Mr. Speaker, that is short-sighted. In this day of modern invention, the genius of the human mind, scientific and mechanical progress, that would be but to invite the futility of obsolescence.

What can be said of airplanes in varying degrees can be said of other instruments of war.

Of all great nations, we alone do not have a munitions industry capable of supplying an army in action. Our 430,000 men in arms, including the National Guard, are not equipped with the quality and the caliber of equipment, munitions, and implements to successfully engage in modern military combat. If today, and we hope it will never happen, we should be called upon to raise our Army, as it was in the World War, to 4,000,000 men, we would have only 10 percent of the necessary supplies for such an army.

Happily distant though the prospect of the United States being engaged in war appears to be, nevertheless, one sure means to this end being the strengthening of our national defense, it behooves this Congress, it behooves you and behooves me, to consider the effect of the embargo on our industrial readiness and military preparedness to meet that awful eventuality, if it should come to this continent, or to this hemisphere.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GORE. I decline to yield. Our military experts positively assert that to meet our preparedness problem, we must begin with industrial organization for productive capacity of supplies. We must organize for mass production of equipment and supplies. In America, and thank God for this fact, we still depend upon private enterprise, on privately owned factories, to produce our supplies. These factories, these organizations, these industries, cannot afford to install machinery, finance research and experiment, employ and train labor for mass production of the modern implements of war unless they have orders for their products. Orders from other countries would provide valuable experience, and add to the efficiency of our plants. You and I have a duty to encourage such activities, rather than, by our own short-sightedness, to discourage it and drive it from our shores. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 2 minutes more.

Mr. GORE. Can we from a defensive standpoint afford this? Shall we, by an overt legislative act, deprive our Nation of that benefit of properly organized factories and skilled mechanics? My friends, sadly realizing that, throughout the world, war and armed aggression are surging in stark, unreasoning madness, destroying with ruthless abandon the life and the liberty of free and unprotected nations, adequate preparation to defend ourselves against any power, or any reasonable combination of powers, appears to be the most vital and effective means of preserving that peace and that security which we all so unanimously and ardently desire.

Mr. Speaker, I advocate repeal of the embargo because it endangers our international relationships and friendships; it endangers the peace of America; it is a menace, a definite menace, to our own national defensive preparedness and, therefore, to the security and safety of the United States; it is a boon to the aggressor, to imperialism, and contrary to the interest of peace-loving and weaker nations.

Mr. Speaker, whose embargo is this? Whose peace, whose security, are we charged with the responsibility of protecting? Who has the right to repeal this embargo? Does

France, does Germany, does Russia, even though they presume to suggest, have any right to dictate our internal and domestic policy? This Congress and this Congress alone has that right.

Mr. Speaker, in order to establish international justice, to insure domestic tranquillity, to provide for the common defense, to promote the general welfare, and to secure to ourselves and our posterity the blessings of peace and security, I advocate the repeal of this abominable thing. [Applause.]

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to propound a unanimous-consent request.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, after consultation with the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM], and the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH], presuming that there will be two amendments pending tomorrow, an amendment to the motion to instruct and an amendment to that amendment, I prefer this unanimous-consent request: That at 2 o'clock tomorrow the previous question may be considered as ordered on the motion to instruct; that on the amendment to the amendment there shall be 30 minutes' debate and a vote; that on the amendment to the motion to instruct there be 30 minutes' debate and a vote; and then a vote on the main question, the time to be equally divided between the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I am not going to object, I want it understood that, as far as today is concerned, it is understood that debate will run as long as Members wish to remain?

Mr. RAYBURN. As long as anyone desires to stay and to speak.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. There will be no other business transacted tonight?

Mr. RAYBURN. There will be no motions nor any other business proposed by this side.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. I object, Mr. Speaker, to that gag rule.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, there are so many on this side who want to be heard that we should stay here until 7 or 8 o'clock tonight.

Mr. RAYBURN. I have spoken to Members on this side and the chairman of the committee, and they are willing that that arrangement be made.

Mr. FISH. And I understood you would also request that we meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow?

Mr. RAYBURN. Yes. I will make that request later.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I object to that limited debate on this important question.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I object to that limitation of debate on this question. I object.

Mr. RAYBURN. I ask for the regular order, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin objects.

Does the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] desire to yield further time?

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] for the purpose of offering an amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. VORYS of Ohio moves to amend the motion of Mr. SHANLEY to instruct the managers on the part of the House in the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on House Joint Resolution 306, as follows:

Strike out all after "section 2" and insert:

"Whenever the President shall have issued a proclamation under the authority of section 1 (a) it shall thereafter be unlawful to export, or attempt to export, or cause to be exported, arms or ammunition from any place in the United States to any belligerent state named in such proclamation, or to any neutral state for transshipment to, or for the use of, any such belligerent state.

"For the purposes of this section arms or ammunition shall include bombs, torpedoes, submarines, poison gas, flame throwers, liquid fire, and the other articles enumerated in categories I to IV, inclusive, and VI and VII in the President's proclamation No. 2237 of May 1, 1937."

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Ohio 15 minutes.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, with this amendment, Mr. SHANLEY'S motion to instruct will provide the limited embargo provision which we approved last summer. It is confined strictly to lethal weapons. Implements of war are omitted from the embargo provision.

After discussing this with the National Munitions Control Board, two clarifying changes have been made to make more definite the intention of the House as expressed last summer. First, it has been found that the provisions forbidding transshipment to belligerents through a neutral country are workable and practical in time of war, and this provision has been retained.

Second, "arms and ammunition" are defined in terms of explicit, well-understood categories under the proclamation of May 1, 1937, and these categories are all included except category V, covering airplanes generally.

I wish to read category V, which shows what is excluded:

(1) Aircraft, unassembled, assembled, or dismantled, both heavier and lighter than air, other than those included in category III;
(2) Propellers or air screws, fuselages, hulls, wings, tail units, and undercarriage units;
(3) Aircraft engines, unassembled, assembled, or dismantled.

Category III, which is still retained, covers bombing and military planes. I contend that there is no difference between a commercial airplane and a truck or a horse or a bicycle. All of them are means for getting somewhere or carrying something. They are all arms or none of them is. Airplanes in general have been included in the categories in former days because they could easily be put to use in war. You can also easily change a truck horse to an artillery horse. That does not make him an implement of war. I see no reason for hampering our peacetime aircraft industry any more than our automobile industry or our bicycle industry. Therefore this amendment refers specifically to the six definite, workable, understandable categories and omits category V.

It also includes specifically bombs, torpedoes, submarines, poison gas, flame throwers, and liquid fire.

Note also that the President has no power to change this list. It is fixed by Congress in terms of the May 1, 1937, categories. This is a penal law, and its provisions, I believe, should not be left to Presidential discretion.

All raw materials are omitted from the embargo.

Now, the repealists say that it is inconsistent to distinguish between arms and peaceful commerce, but the Pittman bill, which we have before us, and which they defend so zealously, makes that distinction in three different places. In section 2 (c) shipments of arms across our borders are distinguished from other things. In section 7 (a) arms are made subject to selling terms different from everything else; we really require cash for arms. In section 12 arms, ammunition, and implements of war are subject to licensing and special control.

Of course, there is a distinction in law, domestic and international, in economics and in morals, between arms—lethal weapons—and everything else.

In international law arms are absolute contraband. From an economic standpoint the arms business prospers only on mass murder and collapses in time of peace. It is fool's gold. In law, morals, and psychology there is a great difference between the sale of whisky and the sale of a load of corn, even though whisky can be made from the corn. The same distinction applies in the arms traffic.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Yes; gladly.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. In other words, the gentleman's amendment would allow the selling of light wines and beer rather than the selling of whisky? Is that the analogy?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. No; I would not say so.

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. KUNKEL. Had there never been any other distinction between arms, ammunition, and these other products, would not the fact that for the last 4 years we have had such a dis-

tinction in our own law be a distinction that would have to be taken into consideration?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Yes; but more than that, there have been arms embargoes in our laws for over a century, and almost every country on earth has had such laws, especially all the real neutrals—Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Holland, and Switzerland. They have the same foreign policy we have. They forego the arms traffic and engage in peaceful commerce.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Yes; I yield.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I think in fairness it should be pointed out at this point that those nations established an arms embargo as a neutrality measure to conserve their own resources.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. They did it to serve their own interests; and I think that is why we did it.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. FISH. Every one of those nations has stated to me, in writing, through their ministers, that they did it to preserve their neutrality.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I thank the gentleman for that contribution.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I cannot yield further at this point.

Mr. Speaker, I favor the Shanley motion. I am opposed to any change in our neutrality law during time of war. My amendment is an attempt to strike a compromise between those of different views, not a compromise of principle, but to bar the means of murder, lethal weapons, and to carry on all possible forms of peaceful commerce. That is the reason this proposal is made.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. As a matter of information, will not the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Is the gentleman's amendment the same as the so-called Vorys amendment adopted in the House during the last session, or is there a difference? And if there is a difference, will the gentleman explain it?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I have already explained my amendment. I shall be pleased to give the gentleman a copy.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. If the argument be sound that you cannot change the law after a war is started, how can an embargo be modified without doing violence to the argument?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I am very happy to answer the gentleman's question. I think there can now be no further question that any substantial change in our neutrality law to help or hinder any belligerent is unneutral in view of the distinguished authorities we have heard on the floor of this House, among them the gentleman who just raised the question. He has explained, however, that the President notified the belligerents that a change was coming and that this makes the change a neutral act. I believe that Congress only has the power to notify anyone of changes in our laws; and this House last summer, when we thought war was imminent, within a day or so, notified the world by adopting the Vorys amendment that we believed in exactly the kind of arms embargo proposed by this amendment.

Why do we need to sell arms at all? Certainly not for profit. In the first 6 months of this year we sold $20,000,000 worth of arms, but $638,000,000 of other commodities to the countries now at war. The Pittman proposal is that to save the $20,000,000 of arms traffic we forego the right to carry the $638,000,000 of other commodities and jeopardize our entire peaceful trade. Whatever else it may be it certainly is not a proposition for profit.

They say our embargo permits aggressors to stock up before a war, while the victims do not get a chance to prepare. Let us see what the figures show. Germany, preparing for aggression, from 1937 down to the time of our embargo in 1939, ordered arms and ammunition from us in the sum of—it is easy to remember—nothing, zero. How about Poland? Poland knew she was marked for aggression. How much did Poland order or buy from us in arms from 1937 down to the embargo in 1939? This amount also is easy to remember: Nothing, zero. There is no evidence that the allies need our arms for military purposes as has been said. Only a small part of our exports in the last World War was made up of arms and ammunition. We could not supply ourselves when we got in.

I flew only French and English planes during my service overseas. The last speaker has pointed out very cogently, and I hope the House will mark the significance of what he said, the only sensible reason for our changing the law at this time. We are preparing our munitions industry, by educational orders from overseas, so that we can supply ourselves when we go to war this time. That is the real reason for proposing this change at the present time.

Let us not fool ourselves or attempt to fool any other nation. If this is our war, let us declare war and go in. We are a nation of shylocks to expect the boys of other lands to fight our battles for us with arms that they pay for. If, on the other hand, it is not our war, let us not back in by taking sides in the name of neutrality. It would make us as "phony" a neutral on one side as Russia is on the other. What we should do is carry out the policy of the honest neutral, foregoing the arms traffic and carrying on our peaceful commerce, a policy of real neutrality, not phony neutrality.

Our President has said that conditions have not changed since last January. Last summer when we had a chance for a real debate and plenty of time for full consideration, we adopted this amendment and I urge that we not change now in the middle of the war.

Mr. SHANLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. SHANLEY. Do I understand the implication of the gentleman's amendment is that whatever is ruled out of the already frozen categories of the 1925 Geneva Conference will be nonlethal weapons?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. The amendment differs from the present categories in that category 5, which is commercial airplanes, is no longer a part of the embargo and the categories which were last established in 1937 are frozen, and we no longer give the President any power to make them wider or narrower.

Mr. SHANLEY. I remember I criticized the gentleman very ardently on the floor last summer because in proposing this amendment he had not used the categories. Now, I understand he has used all the categories possible but apparently has eliminated category 3.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I have eliminated category 5, which is commercial airplanes, and I have left in category 3, which would cover bombing planes.

Mr. SHANLEY. Category 3 is still in there?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Yes.

Mr. SHANLEY. Is it my understanding the gentleman considers that civilian airplanes are not convertible into military airplanes? I know the gentleman has a profound knowledge of this subject on account of his service during the war in the operation of ships on two fronts.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. They are not convertible any more than a truck is convertible into a tank. It is possible to use parts of a truck to make up a tank. It is possible to take an ordinary horse and make a cavalry horse out of him. It is possible to take a commercial plane and convert it into a military plane, but until it is converted into a military plane it is not in fact a military plane if it was not a military plane to start with.

Mr. SHANLEY. When the 1925 Geneva Arms Conference was in session, there were some who thought that it might be possible to differentiate between civilian and military planes. At that time, in 1925, it was almost impossible to differentiate. The men who manufactured civilian planes knew they could be converted almost overnight into military planes, so that it was felt the distinction was almost about

the same as the distinction that Mr. Hoover and Mr. Lindbergh made. They were unable to cover that in the Geneva Arms Conference. Today I talked with some of the leading manufacturers, and they are convinced, as I was convinced last June, that the airplane industry has come to the point, just as our munitions industry has come to the point, where it can differentiate between a sporting rifle and a military rifle. I have a great respect for the gentleman's view on this question, because he has seen service and he comes from a district which has given him that opportunity. He believes that this will not impair our neutrality in any way?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I feel it will not impair our neutrality, in that it is not a substantial change made during wartime.

This bill passed by the Senate is a "phony" neutrality bill. The new part is not neutral.

The good part is not new; 13 out of 18 provisions are taken from the present neutrality law.

The new bill does not provide cash and carry. On the other hand, the President has full power to make the cash-and-carry principle effective right now under the present law.

The new bill gives the President unlimited power to make American citizens do anything he says, any place on earth, or to get out of the place under penalty of fines from $10,000 to $50,000 and imprisonment of 2 to 5 years, by giving him the power to designate any place on earth as a combat area. Even the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM], the administration's sponsor of this bill, would not stand for this power in his bill last summer and moved to take it out. On the other hand, the President has full power now to restrict shipping in danger zones by Executive proclamation, and said so in his message to Congress.

The whole bill gives the President discretionary powers in 13 places—13 powers to be unneutral, if he desires.

Section 7, the so-called strict "cash" section is "phony."

First. It does not require cash from any buyer from a country at war, unless he is a government agent, or is buying arms. Eighty percent of our exports in the last war were not arms. There is nothing in the new bill to prevent British and French corporations from arranging to buy on credit a billion dollars worth of cotton, steel, trucks, and then selling them to their own governments.

Second. The sleeper in this section which exempts renewals and adjustments of indebtedness existing at the time of the proclamation under the new law, permits any amount of loans that the President and the Allies want to arrange. Warring nations can buy here now on short-time credit under the present law and regulations. The new law contains a repeal of the existing law and if this new law passes, the present law and the proclamation of neutrality under it will be repealed the day the law is signed, and legally the war will stop until the President, acting under the new law, finds it has started and issues a new proclamation. The President can delay a day or a year in issuing his proclamation. In the meantime, with our present law dead and the new law not yet brought to life by a proclamation, the lid is off on foreign loans, for they can be renewed under the new law.

Third. If loans and financing cannot be obtained from private sources there is nothing in this law or any other law to prevent our Government from using the $2,000,000,000 stabilization fund, or the R. F. C. and the Export-Import Bank to finance war purchases by the Allies or by Germany.

And this is what they call the cash-on-the-barrel-head law.

Now, how about carry? Belligerents take it away from our shores in their own bottoms? The new bill does not prevent our ships from going to Canada, Australia, New Zealand, India, South Africa, and they are all in the war. Our ships can go to Holland or Belgium right through the English Channel and the North Sea, loaded with contraband. But they say the President will stop that by invoking the combat-areas provision. He has the power now to warn such shipping to go at its own risk and he has said so. Why does he not use it?

The President has never yet approved publicly the drastic carry provisions of this Senate bill. It may not be necessary to our peace or security for us to get off the ocean just because certain nations want to fight there, but why has he not taken the precautionary steps under powers he now possesses?

The transfer-of-title provision is one of the "phoniest" and funniest parts of this counterfeit bill. The build-up for it is this: If an American ship with an American crew is sunk loaded with cotton going to England, we will not get mad if a Britisher owns the cotton, but will get mad and go to war if an American has a chattel mortgage on the cotton. I have learned that search of the records for 14 years showed only two shipments in peacetime abroad where title was not transferred, and that no sane businessman would think of making such a shipment in wartime, so there is no need for this provision. By one simple regulation under section 3 of existing law, requiring all goods to belligerents to be shipped f. o. b. seaboard, the President could secure both transfer of title and cash now. But this provision, if strictly enforced as written, would prevent an American diplomat from going to his post in England, France, or Germany unless he or she went naked and empty-handed, or got some kind foreigner to take title to his or her baggage and clothes. This certainly ought to keep us out of war.

You say this is exaggerated. Read the bill. You say that there is no danger of abuse of the new powers given the President, and that these powers are needed to keep us out of war. I say he has the powers right now to effect every one of these—cash, transfer of title, carry at your own risk, restricting shipping in danger zones—and he has not used them. Why? The President said in his message to us that he will use these powers for peace "with the repeal of the arms embargo," and apparently not before.

Is this a threat that he will not try to keep us at peace unless we agree to sell arms? I think not. It is because our shipping will not need protection until we start to peddle means of murder.

This is the "phoniest" of all—repeal of the embargo. They say it is a holy war. In the name of the Prince of Peace, we are to furnish gas and bombs to slaughter men, women, and children.

Our present neutrality law, as now administered, helps the Allies in three ways. The President under the law has barred our ports to submarines. Only the Allies can make purchases under the operation of our financial-transactions law—the cash law the President has approved. Our law to prevent the supplying of belligerent ships by ships from our ports hurts only Hitler, for the Allies have bases nearby.

We cannot be blamed for this. It was our law long before this war started, but the new bill enacts all three of these provisions all over again and adds three further aids to the Allies.

First. Any sort of carry provision means that only the Allies can get here to do the carrying, for they control the ocean;

Second. Repeal of the arms embargo is hailed the world over as helping the Allies; and

Third. The combat-areas provision gives the President power to quarantine aggressors. Thus in the name of neutrality we help one side in six different ways.

We cannot claim we did not know this. We cannot deny that "we planned it that way." There is a lull now before the storm. All quiet on our frontier on the Rhine; all quiet for our ships on the ocean; all quiet on the political Potomac; but when this antineutrality law blows things up, we cannot claim we did not know it was loaded. The President has no more intention of taking us into war than he had of taking us into debt 6 years ago, but "phony" spending leads to debt and "phony" neutrality leads to war in spite of good intentions. Suppose, however, in spite of taking sides, we manage to stay out by bottling up our shipping and developing a capacity for duplicity and self-control we have never had before. Then we fool the Allies instead of trying to fool Hitler.

Let us not be "phony."

Let us not try to fool ourselves or Hitler or the Allies. In an era of "phony" wars, "phony" peace, and "phony" neu-

trality let us not help make the world safe for duplicity. Let us have honest neutrality, not "phony" neutrality.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS].

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately I have not been able to attend upon this discussion. I went out of circulation physically last May and I was not here when the House passed the bill which it is now proposed to send to conference. I shall not attempt any general discussion of this important subject which is now receiving your attention. I only want to submit a few observations for your consideration. I know that every Member of the House appreciates the solemnity of this occasion and the tremendous importance of what is being considered. We are all deeply concerned to preserve the peace of this country.

There are a number of things involved in this discussion and determination which I want to mention—two of them of first importance. One affects this country in its relation to the present military controversy in the world. The other is with reference to our responsibility in shaping international law. I do not pose as an international lawyer, but I may make an observation, and I think every international lawyer on this floor will agree with me, that international law is a very involved and a very immature sort of thing. Whether we realize it or not this vote soon to be taken will contribute to the making of international law because that is how international law is made.

Mr. Speaker, we want to prevent this country becoming involved in the present European war. One of the things we have got to be careful about is that we do not deceive either ourselves or Hitler with reference to our not fighting under any circumstances.

I was here during the World War. I have not the slightest doubt that one of the things most responsible for getting us into the World War was the fact that we did not believe we would fight under any circumstances. We deceived ourselves. We convinced Germany of that belief; we deceived Germany; and the result was the provocative acts which led us into the war. I mean to say that that attitude contributed to it. This is our situation now: The sympathy in this country is probably 80 percent against Hitler. That is a factor we have to consider as we sit here. Public opinion, public pulse is the supreme law in America. Of course, sympathy is a sentiment, but it is not very much that separates that sentiment from action when properly stimulated. Let us not be confused about that or overlook that fact in trying to keep this country out of war. The Members who sit on the floor of this House now have a very great responsibility.

I am not trying, as I said, to make a speech, I do not feel physically able to do it just yet, but I want to make one or two further observations for your consideration.

Should it be established as a part of the common law of the world that belligerents may not buy from a neutral implements and munitions of war during war? That is involved in the matter we are now considering. This country is in favor of peace. We know as a general proposition that that nation, which has as its purpose to enter upon an enterprise of conquest to disturb the world's peace, prepares itself for that enterprise before it enters upon the venture. That is just common sense. That goes all the way from the individual highjacker to the nation that wants to highjack another nation.

If it be the policy of this country to deny to a nation that is under the threat of conquest the right to go into the open market and buy there that which is necessary to defend itself, then this country is alining itself not in favor of world peace but on the side of those who are bent on war or conquest, speaking generally.

Let us reduce this to small proportions. Suppose an individual was beset by another individual who was going to rob his home. The man who went in the night to rob got his gun and got himself fixed before he went to rob this man. The same thing is true of nations. So this man who is in peril goes to the hardware merchant in his village and says, "I want to buy a gun. I am being attacked." "Whom are you being attacked by?" He informs the merchant, and the merchant says, "No; I am doing business in this community and I have to remain neutral." I do not believe there is very much difference between that and the position of the nations of the world if we adopt as a part of the common law of the world that you may not sell munitions of war during war.

The next proposition is a concrete proposition: Do we have the right to modify our policy during a war? I have listened to the quotation of authorities, but when the common law of the world—and of course, it is now being made—levels down, when it is established, it will be established, I have no doubt, that a nation may modify its policy as it pleases as long as such modified policy falls within the limitation imposed by international law. I have listened to gentlemen who said that you could modify it provided it was modified for the benefit of the nation that was doing the modifying. That is a distinction too refined ever to be adjudicated at the bar of public opinion among the nations of the world. I venture that prediction. Any nation has a right—and I do not care what these writers now on international law say, because it is common sense—to do whatever it wants to do, whenever it wants to do it, with reference to changing its policy provided the modified policy falls within that which is permitted by international law. In this case it is the sale of munitions to belligerents, which is now permitted by international law.

I have heard a number of statements made here by gentlemen to the effect that they were in favor originally of repealing our legislation with regard to neutrality and depending on and being guided and limited by international law. I wonder what would be the effect if we now should refuse to lift this embargo since the matter is presented. Would not Hitler conclude that the American people had determined from fear, or whatever reason, that regardless of what is happening in the world or may happen, they are going to fashion their policy as he and his friends demand?

It is interesting to note some of the statements made here that if we do this thing or do not do it the war will end quickly or will not end quickly if we lift the embargo. Are the statements correct that if we do not enact this legislation such failure will tend to terminate this war? How? It is being claimed that the change proposed would be operative against Hitler. Then does it mean that if we refuse to pass this law Germany would win quickly? What else could they mean? Is that what they want? What would happen in the world, then, as the result of our contribution?

Let us just face this. Suppose it should be known, suppose it should be fully believed in America, with 80 percent—and I believe that is a safe estimate, I really believe that 80 percent of the American people are against Hitler in their sympathies—suppose it should become a firm conviction of those 80 percent that Germany was about to subjugate England and France. Now, whether right or wrong, the American people visualize Hitler as a soulless, Godless, heartless being. Whether right or wrong—I say, whether right or wrong—they visualize him as the plunderer of little nations that cannot fight back, they see him at the rape of Poland and inviting Russia to participate in the rape, they see him strutting his stuff through the streets of Warsaw. We want peace. I ask you as statesmen, earnest to preserve the peace of this country, What would be the effect, in your judgment and in your honest opinion, if it should become evident that Germany was about to subjugate England and France?

I do not know myself, but I do know that with the propaganda that is being conducted—and I admit it is being conducted—it would be mighty difficult to keep this country out of war if it should be believed and if America should be thoroughly convinced that Germany was actually about to subjugate England and France in part, at least, because though permitted by international law we had denied to belligerents the right to purchase munitions to stop Hitler in his sweep of conquest over the nations of Europe. Does anybody doubt the danger of our swinging from the extreme position which we now occupy to the other extreme. If you

can hold the expression of the sympathy of the American people within the limitation imposed by international law, I mean the general limitations, you will have done a good job and all that Hitler can reasonably expect of this people. I saw many of the people who had been singing, I Did Not Raise My Boy To Be a Soldier, swing to the other extreme and bring pressure upon their Members of Congress to vote for the war resolution. We want peace.

I appreciate very much the opportunity to submit these observations for your consideration. I know there is a good deal of feeling about this matter. That is unfortunate. We confront a mighty solemn and serious responsibility. It is unfortunate that this division is so largely along party lines. Democrats and Republicans, we do not make a very good showing to the country by that character of division. As I stated I have not followed carefully the debates in the Senate or here. I apologize for speaking at all but I thought the observations which I have made might, with some profit at least, be considered by this body. I thank you. [Applause.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] for the purpose of offering an amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, if it is agreeable, I would prefer to use some of my time before I offer my amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 15 minutes.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and to include therein a short editorial on the Dies committee.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and to include a speech on neutrality by the Right Reverend Francis J. Beckman, delivered last Sunday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOEHNE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. BOEHNE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and to include a letter to the Honorable James E. Watson, former Senator from the State of Indiana, appearing in the Evening Star of Monday of this week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

NEUTRALITY

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, it is difficult for me to not agree with my esteemed and learned friend from Texas, Judge SUMNERS, in his interpretation of international law. I do not believe the contention has ever been made that any neutral has no authority under international law to change its own policy at any time it desires. The point, I believe, behind the argument that we should not repeal the arms embargo is, Can we repeal the embargo after hostilities have commenced and still retain our position as a neutral under international law?

Now, in order that I shall not be put in an incongruous position in the debate, the same rule does not apply with respect to legislation concerning the credits and resources of a nation. It is a settled principle of international law that a neutral state shall abstain from supplying belligerents any assistance for the prosecution of the war; and inasmuch as I expect to discuss later on proposed loans by the Export-Import Bank to belligerents, I want to add also that it is quite generally agreed among the experts on international law that if the Export-Import Bank should make a loan to a belligerent government while the United States is neutral such action would constitute a violation of the neutral duties of the United States.

Now, with respect to our loans and credits, it is quite generally agreed among the experts on international law that the neutral state, which in this instance is the United States, may, for the purpose of conserving its own supplies or safeguarding its neutrality, place prohibitions upon the granting of loans or credits by persons subject to its jurisdiction.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there may be a movement in this House to prevent the action which I propose to offer to conserve the cash, credit, wealth, and resources of the American public. That is why I have asked to proceed for a few minutes of my time before offering the amendment, so that the issue may be crystallized before the amendment is offered.

There are two questions confronting the American people today which I think are important.

The first is, Do we want to stay out of the war in Europe? I think that question answers itself. No one, of course, wants to get into any European war.

The second is just as important, and probably more important in its implications than the first question or any other question which has been presented on the floor of this House or the floor of the other body during these debates, and it is this: Do we want the taxpayers' money and credit used to finance foreign wars?

I believe this issue has been somewhat overlooked, and I believe it is the controlling one—whether we furnish the means or the credit, as we did during the last World War, for European countries to carry on the present war. The last World War, in which the United States participated, has already cost the taxpayers of the United States approximately $55,000,000,000. You say that we have protected the people of the United States in that we have passed an act called the Johnson Act, which prohibits loans to countries which owe the United States, and inasmuch as the belligerents to whom we wish to loan are now indebted to the United States, then it follows that the Johnson Act applies, and that there could be no credits and loans to England and France and to other countries that owe us money.

That is true possibly with respect to private loans and credits, but unfortunately it does not apply to loans which might be made by Government agencies. So that there might not be any question about that, I ask that you refer to the Johnson Act, which is Public, No. 151, Seventy-third Congress, and you will find, after providing that it shall be unlawful within the United States or any place subject to the jurisdiction of the United States for any person to purchase or sell the bonds, securities, or other obligations of any foreign country, and so forth, that section 2 of that act has this to say:

> As used in this act the term "person" includes individual, partnership, corporation, or association other than a public corporation created by or pursuant to special authorization of Congress, or a corporation in which the Government of the United States has or exercises a controlling interest through stock ownership or otherwise.

So it is obvious that the Johnson Act does not apply to the use of the exchange-stabilization fund and it does not apply to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation; it does not apply to the Commodity Credit Corporation; and it does not apply to the two Export-Import Banks of Washington, and does not apply to the Federal Reserve banks.

That is the point I particularly want to stress. It does not apply to the Federal Reserve banks and to many members of the Federal Reserve System and nonmember banks in which the Reconstruction Finance Corporation owns the controlling shares of stock.

What shall we do about it? Section 7 of the Senate amendment provides that individuals shall not make loans. It says

"person"; and if I might take the time to read it, in part it provides:

Whenever the President shall have issued a proclamation under the authority of section 1 (a), it shall thereafter be unlawful for any person within the United States to purchase, sell, or exchange bonds, securities, or other obligations of the government of any state named in such proclamation, or of any political subdivision of any such state, or of any person acting for or on behalf of the government of any such state, issued after the date of such proclamation, or to make any loan or extend any credit to any such government, political subdivision, or person.

I understand there was some debate in the other body as to whether that word "person" includes the Federal Reserve banks, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, the Commodity Credit Corporation, or the two Export-Import Banks of Washington. I understand that the Senator proposing an amendment similar to the one I propose today was assured that the word "person" did include these agencies. If that term "person" does include these agencies, well and good; but if there is any doubt whatsoever about it, it is the easiest thing for us, while we have the inclination and the time in the consideration of the bill, to so perfect the bill in that particular that there will be no question about the clear intent of Congress in that respect. To this end I shall offer an amendment to instruct the conferees, taking section 7 of the Senate bill as the base, as follows:

SEC. 7. (a) Whenever the President shall have issued a proclamation under the authority of section 1 (a), it shall thereafter be unlawful for the Federal Reserve banks, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, the Commodity Credit Corporation, the Export-Import Bank of Washington, or any other agency of the Federal Government, or for any person, association, partnership, or corporation within the United States to purchase, sell, or exchange bonds, securities, or other obligations of the government of any state named in such proclamation, or of any political subdivision of any such state, or of any person, partnership, association, or corporation acting for or on behalf of the government of any such state, issued after the date of such proclamation, or to make any loan or extend any credit to any such government, political subdivision, person, partnership, association, or corporation. The provisions of this subsection shall also apply to the sale by any person within the United States to any person in a state named in any such proclamation of any articles or materials listed in a proclamation issued under the authority of section 12 (i).

(b) Whoever shall violate any of the provisions of this section or of any regulations issued thereunder shall, upon conviction thereof, be fined not more than $50,000 or imprisoned for not more than 5 years, or both. Should the violation be by a corporation, organization, or association, each officer or director thereof participating in the violation shall be liable to the penalty herein prescribed.

(c) Whenever any proclamation issued under the authority of section 1 (a) shall have been revoked with respect to any state, the provisions of this section shall thereupon cease to apply with respect to such state, except as to offenses committed prior to such revocation.

(d) This section shall not apply to loans, discounts, advances of credit, and other evidences of indebtedness incident to shipments between the United States and states bordering on the United States as described and provided in subsection (f) of section 2 of this act.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Does the gentleman's amendment include the United States Treasury stabilization fund?

Mr. WOLCOTT. It is my opinion that the words I have used here "or any other agency of the Federal Government" include the use to which the stabilization fund may be put.

Mr. ALLEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes.

Mr. ALLEN of Pennsylvania. Is it not true that under existing law the stabilization fund can only be used for stabilizing the American dollar anyway; it cannot under any circumstances be used to finance foreign loans?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Under the existing stabilization law there is specific authority for the Treasury of the United States to deal in the securities or other instruments of credit of any foreign country.

I do not want to take up the time to look up the language now, but I incorporated it in my remarks which I made in the House on October 19, page 623, in which there is specific authority granted to deal in the securities of a foreign nation.

Mr. ALLEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Briefly.

Mr. ALLEN of Pennsylvania. For the express purpose of stabilizing the American dollar?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Well, what would it be for? For what purpose would you invest in foreign securities but to stabilize the American dollar, because with the pound sterling dropping all around you, the franc dropping all around you, it would be the natural excuse that the stabilization fund would be used for that purpose, but the reason why I suggest in the amendment which I put into my remarks last week, that the Secretary of the Treasury should be prohibited from using this fund for that purpose is because the pound sterling has been pegged by fiat of the British Government, and there is no reason why we should invest in the securities of Great Britain or France for the purpose of stabilizing our dollar. It is done by the fiat of the British and French Governments. So there is no need using the stabilization fund for that purpose.

Now, I think this question of credits is of much more importance even than the question of embargoes. It seems to me that the question of the arms embargo is decidedly secondary to that of credits. England and France will not have very much cash to pay for arms and ammunition, so the cash-and-carry plan will actually operate as an embargo unless they are able to establish credits here. Now, there is no gold in the Treasury earmarked for the use of Great Britain or France. So they have no gold at their disposal, if it is where it should be according to law, with which to pay cash. Now, when their meager cash resources are dissipated where can they go to buy our munitions and our arms? They must get credit. Where? Not from private sources, not from private individuals, because we have stopped that in section 7 of the Senate amendment. They cannot get credit from private persons.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. WOLCOTT. They must go to the only other source available, the agencies of the Government, which are not prohibited by any law which is now on the statute books from making loans.

In offering this amendment it is my purpose to protect the taxpayers of the United States just as we have protected private investors by section 7 of the Senate bill.

Now, there are available for loans to belligerents over $12,000,000,000. There are over $8,000,000,000 available in the Federal Reserve banks. There are $2,000,000,000 in the stabilization fund. There are $1,250,000,000 available in the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. There are $100,000,000 available in the Export-Import Bank and an indeterminate amount available for loans by the Commodity Credit Corporation. Mr. Jesse Jones has said that there is no restriction against making foreign loans by those agencies. I think there should be, so that the American people will not be called upon, against their will, to finance a European war against their wishes. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WOLCOTT: At the end of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] add the following:

"That the managers on the part of the House in the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on H. J. Res. 306 be further instructed to insist upon the following as to section 7:

" 'SEC. 7. (a) Whenever the President shall have issued a proclamation under the authority of section 1 (a), it shall thereafter be unlawful for the Federal Reserve banks, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, the Commodity Credit Corporation, the Export-Import Bank of Washington, or any other agency of the Federal Government, or for any person, association, partnership, or corporation within the United States to purchase, sell, or exchange bonds, securities, or other obligations of the government of any state named in such proclamation, or of any political subdivision of any such state, or of any person, partnership, association, or corporation acting for or on behalf of the government of any such

state, issued after the date of such proclamation, or to make any loan or extend any credit to any such government, political subdivision, person, partnership, association, or corporation. The provisions of this subsection shall also apply to the sale by any person within the United States to any person in a state named in any such proclamation of any articles or materials listed in a proclamation issued under the authority of section 12 (i).

"'(b) Whoever shall violate any of the provisions of this section or of any regulations issued thereunder shall, upon conviction thereof, be fined not more than $50,000 or imprisoned for not more than 5 years, or both. Should the violation be by a corporation, organization, or association, each officer or director thereof participating in the violation shall be liable to the penalty herein prescribed.

"'(c) Whenever any proclamation issued under the authority of section 1 (a) shall have been revoked with respect to any state, the provisions of this section shall thereupon cease to apply with respect to such state, except as to offenses committed prior to such revocation.

"'(d) This section shall not apply to loans, discounts, advances of credit, and other evidences of indebtedness incident to shipments between the United States and states bordering on the United States as described and provided in subsection (f) of section 2 of this act.'"

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT].

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, this amendment is intended to clarify the language of the Senate bill in that the language shall mean just what the Senate intended it to mean; that the agencies of the Government, as well as private persons, shall be prohibited from making loans to belligerents.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STEAGALL].

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, it is true that the matter of credits is a most important part of this legislation. That being the case, it is important that the House understand just what is involved in the amendment just proposed.

I desire first to call attention to an erroneous statement of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT], who just preceded me. He stated that Great Britain and France have no gold in the United States. I am sure the gentleman made that statement inadvertently. I am undertaking now to get authentic figures to show the exact situation and will submit them before I conclude. But France and Great Britain have at this time large quantities of gold earmarked and available for their use in the United States. I will have the figures from the Federal Reserve Board in a minute or two, and I will supply them for the benefit of the House.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at this point?

Mr. STEAGALL. I yield for a question.

Mr. CRAWFORD. As I understand, the gentleman from Michigan said that those two countries had no earmarked gold in the figure quoted by the Treasury of the United States, namely, $17,000,000,000 plus.

Mr. STEAGALL. I do not know the exact amount. I am undertaking to get accurate information about it in order that the House may know the facts.

Mr. Speaker, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan is necessarily useless in certain particulars. The Federal Reserve banks have only limited authority in making loans, or in the matter of rediscounts, or making advances, or in the purchase of securities in the open market. There is no authority in the Federal Reserve banks for the purchase of obligations of foreign governments or for conducting any of the transactions indicated in this amendment.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEAGALL. I yield for a question.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I am informed the gentleman took issue with my statement.

Mr. STEAGALL. I suggest to the gentleman that my time is limited.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I was informed that there was no money, no fund which was earmarked for any one of the foreign countries; and this information came to me this morning from Mr. Bell, of the Treasury Department.

Mr. STEAGALL. We will have all that information definitely in a few minutes.

I have stated the law with respect to the Federal Reserve banks. The same is true of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. The Corporation has no authority to make loans to foreign governments and they do not undertake to make such loans. The only agencies of the Government that are authorized to make loans of this type are the Commodity Credit Corporation and the Export-Import Bank. The Export-Import Bank cannot have outstanding at any time more than $100,000,000 of obligations of any kind, and they have not a dollar available now for loans to anybody. Their funds are exhausted.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. STEAGALL. Because of my limited time I cannot yield.

But, if they had funds available for such loans, it would be ridiculous to treat a $100,000,000 fund as of serious importance in financing of a great world war.

The Commodity Credit Corporation is authorized under recent legislation to sell surplus farm products to other governments wherever they can, and this is the only power they have under that legislation. We provided for the barter of 600,000 bales of cotton to Great Britain in exchange for rubber. We have provided for the sale of an additional amount of cotton not in excess of 500,000 bales and for the sale of other surplus farm products. The only possible field of operation, practically speaking, that the amendment offered by the gentleman could have, would be to prohibit the sale of surplus farm products—surely the House does not wish to do that. I hope not.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEAGALL. Yes; I yield for a question.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Is it not a fact that the Federal Reserve banks can rediscount trade acceptances from foreign sources?

Mr. STEAGALL. Yes; but of the character covered by the amendment. Federal Reserve banks cannot, under the provisions of this bill, receive for rediscount, nor in the form of acceptances, nor for the purpose of making advances, nor by purchase in the open market one dollar of the securities of any foreign government in the world. Under this bill, any member bank that took such securities would take them in violation of the law, and that would automatically exclude them from such transactions with Federal Reserve banks, even if it could be done under existing law.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. The gentleman is talking about the Government, but I am talking about importers and foreign accounts.

Mr. STEAGALL. I am talking about the purchase or acceptance of securities, about any and all forms of transactions that the Federal Reserve bank is permitted to conduct under the law.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEAGALL. For a brief question.

Mr. COCHRAN. I call the gentleman's attention to page 1017 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of October 27, to a colloquy between the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN]. The question involved here is answered fully. Senator GEORGE also spoke.

Mr. STEAGALL. I must ask the gentlemen not to read that in my time.

Mr. COCHRAN. I suggest that the gentleman ask permission to include this colloquy in his remarks, for it shows beyond question that in the Senate bill the word "person" means corporation. Senator PITTMAN said it meant the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and any other corporation.

Mr. STEAGALL. It is true that the bill before us defines "person" to mean partnership or corporation. This language was used in the Johnson Act, but the Johnson Act went further and stated that its provisions did not apply to Government corporations and agencies.

Mr. Speaker, I have not taken the time of the House in the discussion of this bill. I have my own views, as has every Member, and I am sure that my deep anxiety to save our country from involvement in the war in Europe is the same as that of every other Member of this House. In my

view of this matter we have gone as far as we ought to go in denying to the people of this Nation the full exercise of their rights under the law of nations. I am not sure of the wisdom of the provisions of the Senate bill. I certainly do not want to go any further. Mr. Speaker, trade and commerce are the handmaidens of civilization; they are the world's chief instrumentalities for the promotion of peace and good will among nations. If we are to adopt the policy of withdrawing our trade from nations who are involved in war it would be a good thing if every nation in the world adopted the same policy.

Citizens enjoy constitutional protection of the right to bear arms. It is a moral right and it rests also upon considerations of public policy. Unless citizens have the right to bear arms they cannot defend their liberties. And the right to bear arms is of no value without the right to purchase arms. The same is true of nations. The right is indispensable to the freedom of small nations. Any denial of this right must operate in favor of outlaw nations whose chief weapon is force and whose resort for settlement of controversies is war.

If every nation in the world should adopt the policy of complete embargo upon the outbreak of hostilities any nation regarding itself in danger of invasion or attack would have to put its military establishment on a war basis. Every decent nation in the world would have to adopt the standards of any bandit nation that threatened the forces of civilization. Such a rule would convert the world into an armed camp. Nothing could be more dangerous to the peace of the world and the advancement of international morality and decency.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Missouri. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEAGALL. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Missouri. A question was raised as to whether or not there was any gold earmarked for France and England in this country. I just now had a talk with a member of the Federal Reserve Board and he informs me there are $1,070,000,000 earmarked to the various countries, the substantial part of which belongs to England and France. In addition to that, they have $7,000,000,000 in securities which are available for their use.

Mr. STEAGALL. I thank the gentleman from Missouri. I knew in a general way what the facts would show but I did not have the figures. The Federal Reserve Board does not think it desirable to disclose the exact amount to the credit of any individual government, but we know that much the larger portion of this gold is available to Great Britain and France in addition to the enormous holdings of securities in the United States.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] as he may desire.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, being strongly opposed to the extension of credits to belligerent nations in fact to all nations that have defaulted in their obligations to us for money previously advanced I would certainly support the amendment of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] if I had not satisfied myself that this bill already carries language that will do just what the gentleman from Michigan seeks to accomplish by his amendment. The very question arose while the bill was under consideration in the Senate. In the RECORD of October 27, 1939, page 1017, will be found the following discussion. I read from that RECORD:

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, while this matter is being discussed I should like to ask the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations one question regarding this section. On page 21 it is provided that whenever the President shall have issued a proclamation it shall be unlawful for any person within the United States to advance credits to foreign governments. I wish to know whether or not the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations considers that the word "person," which is also defined on page 30 as including corporations, and so forth, is broad enough to include the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and the Export-Import Bank.

Mr. PITTMAN. The word "person" expressly includes corporations, and I therefore take it that it does include them.

Mr. TAFT. In the Senator's opinion, it includes the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and the Export-Import Bank?

Mr. PITTMAN. That is my opinion, and that was the opinion of those who drafted the joint resolution.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I wish to make a short statement. Particularly I wanted to say that my construction of the word "person" is identically the same as that given by the chairman of the committee. I think that is pertinent, because in effect it covers precisely one of the amendments offered by the distinguished Senator from Ohio, which was voted down in this body yesterday. I think the word "person" here does include a subsidiary of the Government, a corporate subsidiary such as the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, or any other corporation which is owned wholly or practically wholly by the Government itself.

Mr. TAFT rose.

Mr. GEORGE. I was merely adding my interpretation of the language, and I particularly wished that it go into the RECORD, because I think it is important.

That convinces me beyond question that loans cannot be made by Government corporations.

Mr. Speaker, to keep this country at peace with the world is certainly the objective not only of every Member of Congress but of the President and the citizens of our country.

Considering the events that ultimately resulted in our entry into the World War, I have concluded, after a most careful study, the enactment of the resolution passed by the Senate will eliminate so far as it is humanly possible to do so, the danger of the United States becoming involved in this terrible conflict.

It has been stated that to amend in any way the present Neutrality Act there is danger of us being involved. On the other hand, it has been charged that if we do not change our present law, there is danger of this country becoming involved.

I do not question the sincerity of either group, but I do say interference with our right to engage in trade and carry in our ships that which we sold, together with the ruthless submarine campaign of Germany, so aroused our people that war was declared in 1917, and we soon found American soldiers on foreign soil. I seek to prevent this from happening again.

What benefits we received as a result of the last war were not worth the sacrifice of one American soldier, because our only reward for our participation in that war was abuse and debts which will not be collected, at least, for generations to come, if ever.

No matter what the final decision of Congress on this question, in my humble opinion that decision will not result in this country becoming involved. On the question of peace with the world, our citizens are absolutely united, but there is a difference of opinion how to best accomplish this objective.

Those of us who, by reason of our official position, are charged with the responsibility of providing a way to keep our country out of war, feel that responsibility keenly.

In seeking the solution, no one who thinks of his or her political welfare is fit to be a Member of the American Congress.

I hope in the end that by my vote I will be able to make some contribution that will prevent one American citizen from losing his or her life.

I have been a loyal supporter of the President, but in this instance my own conscience will be my guide. I follow him today, but if I felt, for one moment, that the President's views upon this important question were not sound, under no consideration could anyone get me to support his recommendations.

The mothers and fathers and the youth of our country naturally are greatly disturbed over the situation abroad, fearing that we might be dragged into the conflict, and our soldiers will be sent to foreign soil. If it will be helpful in any way in relieving their anxiety, no matter what has been said to the contrary, I say now, there is not one person I know of in public life who wants to send an American soldier to foreign countries to fight the battles of others. There is no Member of Congress who wants war, and let it be remembered it is the Congress only that can declare war, because the Constitution so provides.

I reached my conclusion upon this important question feeling the present Neutrality Act undoubtedly will cause this country grief if it is not amended. I say this even though I voted for that legislation.

I am asked by many of my constituents why the embargo should now be repealed. My answer is that it is not an embargo other than in name. While it is unlawful to export or attempt to export arms, ammunition, implements of war, and so forth, from any place in the United States to any belligerent state named in the proclamation of the President, or to any neutral state for transshipment to, or for the use of, any such belligerent state, what disturbs me most is that while we cannot ship arms and ammunition, and so forth, to a belligerent state, we can sell the parts or the material that would enable a belligerent state to manufacture that which we are prevented from selling. The embargo says, and the amendment says, you cannot buy or ship the finished product, but you can buy everything you need to manufacture or assemble arms, ammunition, and other articles covered by the embargo.

It has been said that so-called isolationists desire the embargo to remain. If those who are supporting the retention of the embargo are really isolationists, the legislation they should be advocating would be an embargo that would prevent us from selling anything manufactured or produced in the United States to the countries at war. No one in Congress has made any such suggestion, and no one will. Those in favor of retaining the embargo favor the sending of material of every kind, of food, clothing, of oil, and everything else except that which is specifically mentioned in the embargo to belligerent nations. If a suggestion was made for an embargo on everything we manufacture and produce, the cry would be heard from the four corners of the country that Congress would destroy our industries as well as agriculture.

It is just as necessary to feed and clothe an army as it is to furnish the soldiers with arms and ammunition. Has anyone suggested that we not sell food and clothing to the countries at war?

In the final analysis, statistics show that during the World War only 13 percent of purchases by foreign countries consisted of arms and ammunition and implements of war. In other words, if the embargo in existing law remains and the same amount of purchases be made during this war, there would be no embargo on 87 percent of that which the nations at war might want to purchase from us.

I cannot bring myself to the conclusion where I must admit the sale of anything to anybody will require us to enter this war so long as we make them pay cash for it and, above all, require them to take possession in this country and transport what they buy in their own ships.

Just so long as we enact legislation, which is in the pending resolution as passed by the Senate, that will prevent ships flying the American flag from going into combat zones and our citizens taking passage on belligerent or neutral ships traveling in combat zones, we are not going to get into this war.

In support of this statement, let us look at a situation that exists now. Who can say if the provisions which prevent our ships from entering combat zones had been in existing law, that the *City of Flint* would have been carrying contraband or would have been in waters where it could have been captured by the German Government?

I have continually insisted, and I insist again, keeping our ships out of the combat zone and our citizens being required to travel on their own responsibility if they do travel in combat zones on neutral or belligerent ships, is far more important than any other feature of the pending resolution. Cash and carry—and I mean cash and carry, not credit and carry—is another feature of the bill which I insist upon. Never again do I want to see this country send our gold to foreign nations, no matter what nation it is, other than for the care of helpless and disabled noncombatants which, if necessary, can be done through the Red Cross. Of course, this Nation would not stand in the way of extending some little help to starving children and mothers, no matter whether they be German, English, or French, or the nationals of any other country.

The charge is made, to change the embargo provision now will assist Great Britain and France. Probably so, but who benefits by that paragraph in the law now? On the other hand, Great Britain and France will certainly resent the cash-and-carry provisions. So far as I am concerned, I care not what any nation of the world thinks of our Neutrality Act. I am not thinking of any nation in the world except our own, and it is for the welfare of our own country and our own citizens that I take the position I do.

History tells us one country is no better than the other. History shows that when they had the power, the strong would take what they wanted from the weak, so why should we care in this instance for any foreign country?

Yes, it is true Germany might not like any changes in the Neutrality Act at this time, and it is likewise true that Great Britain and France will not like the cash and carry and other provisions of the law.

The proposed changes in the Neutrality Act will not, however, prevent Russia and Japan from buying and transporting in their own ships anything they have the money to purchase in this country. True, they are not expected under the embargo provision to sell what is named in the embargo to a belligerent, but they certainly can sell that which they produce and that which they have on hand in their own countries to any belligerent, and then restock their supplies with what they purchase in this country. Further, there is nothing in the law, nor will there be anything in the law, that would prevent Russia and Japan, who are not belligerents affected by the President's proclamation, from arranging, if they can, credit to make purchases in this country, including arms, ammunition, airplanes, tanks, and so forth. Will Russia and Japan help Great Britain and France?

Mr. Speaker, the all-important question is not the embargo, not the cash-and-carry plan, or any other plan, but the enactment of a neutrality law that will keep us at peace with the world.

Because the language voices my sentiments, I include as part of my remarks an editorial from The Wanderer, a national weekly published in St. Paul, Minn. It follows:

> The aim of neutrality legislation should be to keep this Nation out of the European conflict. All the measures of such legislation should keep this aim in mind. Anything that might tend to bring us into the war should be carefully stricken from any proposals now before Congress.
>
> Whether war materials or even other materials are bought by belligerents is in itself not so important, so far as the question of keeping the American people out of the war is concerned. True, if the embargo is lifted and such materials may be bought by belligerents, France and England will be aided; because of the blockade Germany would not be able to buy American commodities, no matter of what nature. If the embargo is not lifted, Germany will be indirectly aided because both France and England will find closed markets on American shores. Strict neutrality legislation is, therefore, impossible. This should be recognized.
>
> For this reason the question of keeping the peace aim of neutrality legislation to the fore is of such great importance.
>
> American vessels should not be allowed to carry supplies of any nature to belligerents. If allowed to do so, they will be attacked on the high seas. Such attacks will arouse war sentiment against the belligerent making the attack. All loans, whether long or short term, should be forbidden; if supplies may be purchased on credit, American creditors will want Uncle Sam to guarantee with his guns and the lives of his youth the loans made. Shipments to European ports, even to the ports of neutral European nations, should be carefully controlled and supervised, lest cause for war may be found by any indiscreet acts of ours that are helpful to one of the belligerents rather than to the other.
>
> No matter what neutrality legislation is enacted, one side of the belligerents will be favored more than the other. Because this is so, it becomes a matter of vital importance to preserve as much as possible an attitude of calm and peace among the people of this Nation.

Mr. Speaker, no matter what action is finally taken by the Congress, I pray to the Good Lord it will be for the best interests of our country and our citizens, and that American lives and property will be protected thereby.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CASEY].

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to insert therein a speech by Monsignor Ryan, given over the radio on October 24 on the subject Shall the Embargo Be Lifted?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WHITTINGTON). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CASEY]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McGRANERY].

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. McGRANERY. For a question.

Mr. FISH. I will yield the gentleman an additional half-minute.

Mr. McGRANERY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I presume that because of the interpretation placed upon the word "person" by the Senate, the gentleman from Missouri can have no objection to clarifying the language as it is clarified in my amendment. If it does include the Export-Import Bank, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and these other corporations, what harm is there in saying so? That is all I have done in my amendment.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional half minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McGRANERY].

Mr. McGRANERY. Mr. Speaker, during the last World War, I served in the Air Force of the United States Army; and even in my small role I had a glimpse of the horror of war which will forever remain indelibly impressed in my memory. This recollection is constantly before me and in itself would impel me to do whatever would keep America out of war, whatever would safeguard peace for our country with dignity.

An examination of the RECORD of the months preceding America's entry into the last war disclosed that the United States was drawn into war as a result of Germany's attacks against American vessels and American seamen. It is apparent that the only way our country could again be made to participate in a world conflict would be by the repetition of similar attacks upon American ships bearing American citizens or by the unwarranted searches and illegal delays of our vessels such as they are being subjected to by England at this hour. Therefore, it is imperative that the Congress enact this legislation which would prevent American vessels from entering belligerent waters. Postponement of the passage of this act might mean perhaps another flint on which the spark of war could be enkindled, with consequences too terrible to be forecast at this time.

I shall vote for the present act because I am convinced that its strict prohibition against any American vessel entering belligerent waters and its provision for cash and carry will provide adequate safeguard—indeed, a guarantee against the United States becoming embroiled in World War II.

It is the urgent duty of every Member of this Congress to keep our ships from entering zones of danger. Otherwise, we may be confronted with a situation similar to that of March 1917 when, in the words of Newton D. Baker:

> There was only one thing to do; or two, perhaps—we could yield, or we could fight.

Mr. Baker, with clarity and intensity, set forth the difficult choice that remained to America, once her ships bearing her citizens had been ruthlessly attacked upon the seas.

The United States refused to yield, and so the youths of our great country were sent across the seas to fight. The Gold Star Mothers can tell better than we the epic of the gallant and tragic end that came to many of them upon foreign soil. The naval and Veterans' Bureau hospitals shelter many of those young men who went forth in the full prowess of physical health and who returned to die slowly here at home. Many were saved from either of these two destinies, and of that number some are here on this floor today. I know the decision they will make when they are confronted with the choice of keeping our ships at home or sending millions of our youths to defend the rights of merchant ships who venture into belligerent zones.

I, for one, reiterate my previous statement that I will vote for the act which prohibits American vessels from entering areas of danger, which prohibits American vessels from bringing danger to America.

And I have the heartfelt conviction that this act providing for cash and carry will enable our Nation to be, at least, as neutral as she is today.

Of course, it is true that one who speaks of "neutrality" expresses his own definition thereof.

The present law is commonly referred to as the neutrality law; yet that law unquestionably favors one of the belligerents in the present war.

As it has been said:

> Mr. Speaker, in an aggressive war there can no longer be neutrality. We must stand with the nation that keeps its word, and we must not side, even indirectly, with a nation that, through temper, through ambition, through wrong belief, or for any one of a hundred reasons, violates its pledge and proceeds once again to bring down upon us such an avalanche as 1914 let loose.

In looking at Europe today, do we find any of those nations of such sterling character, with such clean hands as America would be proud to grasp in friendship? History answers this with an emphatic "No," and every signpost indicating the upbuilding of America tells us to keep out of Europe.

It is said that repeal of the embargo and enactment of legislation providing for cash and carry will result in our giving aid and comfort to Great Britain and her Allies.

Mr. Speaker, as an American, as a militant advocate of democracy and a Member of this Congress, I wish to state that I have no desire to plead the cause of the British Empire, which has inflicted a cruel, barbarous, and savage reign of terror upon its unwilling subjects throughout the world, whether they were Irish or Arabian, Jewish or Indian, Egyptian or African. The record of the growth of the British Empire is an unhappy, a shameless tale of aggression; that record of aggression I briefly cite:

	Date acquired	How acquired
BRITISH EMPIRE		
1. DOMINIONS		
England	55 B. C. to A. D. 410	Conquest.
Ireland	1172	Conquest.
Wales	1283	Conquest.
Scotland	1603–1707	Union.
Canada	1627–1763	Conquest.
Australia	1788–1828	Conquest.
Newfoundland	1583	Conquest.
New Zealand	1840	Conquest.
Union of South Africa	1814–1900	Conquest.
2. POSSESSIONS IN EUROPE		
Gibraltar	1713	Conquest.
Malta and Gozo	1814	Conquest.
Ascension Island	1815	Conquest.
3. POSSESSIONS IN AFRICA		
Kenya	1820	Conquest.
Tanganyika	1918	Conquest.
Uganda	1890–96	Conquest.
Zanzibar and Pemba	1890	Conquest.
Mauritius	1810–14	Conquest.
Nyasaland	1891	Conquest.
St. Helena	1673	Conquest.
Seychelles	1814	Conquest.
Somaliland	1884	Conquest.
Basutoland	1884	Conquest.
Bechuanaland	1885–95	Conquest.
Northern Rhodesia	1889	Conquest.
Southern Rhodesia	1889	Conquest.
Swaziland	1894	Conquest.
Southwest Africa	1920	Conquest.
Cambria	1807	Conquest.
Ashanti	1672	Conquest.
Nigeria	1861–1900	Conquest.
Cameroon	1916	Conquest.
Sierra Leone	1787	Conquest.
Togoland	1914	Conquest.
Anglo-Egyptian Sudan	1899	Conquest.
4. POSSESSIONS IN ASIA		
Bahrein Islands	1867	Conquest.
India	1600–1858	Conquest.
Aden, Perim, Scotra, Kuria Muria Islands	1829–76	Conquest.
Ceylon	1796–1815	Conquest.
Cyprus	1914	Conquest.
Hong Kong	1842	Conquest.
Federated Malay States	1874–98	Conquest.
Other Malay States	1885–1914	Conquest.
Mesopotamia	1914–18	Conquest.
North Borneo	1881–88	Conquest.
Brunei and Sarawak	1888	Conquest.
Palestine	1914–18	Conquest.
Straits Settlements	1785–1909	Conquest.
Weihaiwei	1898	Conquest.

	Date acquired	How acquired
BRITISH EMPIRE—Continued		
5. POSSESSIONS IN AUSTRALASIA AND OCEANIA		
Papua	1884	Conquest.
New Guinea	1920	Conquest.
Western Samoa	1919	Conquest.
Fiji Islands	1874	Conquest.
Nauru	1914	Conquest.
Pacific Islands	1893–1915	Conquest.
Tonga	1900	Conquest.
Gilbert and Ellice Islands	1892–1915	Conquest.
Solomon Islands	1893	Conquest.
6. POSSESSIONS IN THE AMERICAS		
Bermuda	1612	Conquest.
British Guiana	1803–14	Conquest.
British Honduras	1798	Conquest.
Falkland Islands	1771	Conquest.
West Indies:		
Bahamas	1629	Conquest.
Barbados	1605	Conquest.
Jamaica	1655–70	Conquest.
Turk and Caicos	1765	Conquest.
Leeward Islands	1623–59	Conquest.
Trinidad	1797	Conquest.
Windward Island	1763–83	Conquest.

Every student of history knows there is a difference of opinion among historians as to exact dates in some instances. I shall be glad, upon request, to provide my authority for the dates which I have submitted. No historian can deny, however, the method of acquisition, as it has been set forth above. It is true that certain authorities use the word "capitulation" or the words "military occupation," or the word "grant," instead of the word "conquest." Nevertheless, all will agree that the method of acquisition was via the route of aggression.

England has maintained a symbol of democracy on the isles of Britain and Scotland—Scotland as set forth previously was acquired by union and not by conquest—but the guaranties of the British Constitution have been confined strictly to those subjects of the British Crown who dwelt on the two favored isles.

It should be recalled that in 1844, on the occasion of Lord John Russell's motion in the House of Commons to inquire into the condition in Ireland, Lord Macaulay said:

> You admit that you govern Ireland not as you govern England, not as you govern Scotland, but as you govern your new conquest in Scinde; not by means of the respect which the people feel for the law, but by means of bayonets and artillery and intrenched camps.

No wonder that as an American my sympathies have never been, and are not now with that British Government which, in the words of the martyred Robert Emmet, is a Government steeled to barbarity by the cries of the orphans and the tears of the widows it has made. Ever since the British invader entered the glorious island of Erin in 1172 and took from the Irish people the lands of their ancestors, the story of English dominion has been written in fire and blood.

The Irish Nation was wrongfully and viciously deprived of its inheritance in that early time. Not content with this outrage, British soldiers drove the people from their homes, and confiscated every farm and every cottage, until in 1611 the Irish were driven from their hearths to find refuge by the roadside or in the hidden mountain caves. But the British soldiers lacked the industry and the skill to till the soil they had stolen, and so gradually the natives of Ireland were permitted to return to those farms to work them almost as serfs. When they had reclaimed many of these farms from the bogs, when the dairies in the Irish hills were once more bright with pans of cream, English absentee landlords demanded enormous rents, with the only alternative, eviction. From 1760 to 1800, the people of Ireland were again maintaining themselves—from their farms, their dairies, their industries. They were self-supporting during those 40 years when the population was twice as great as it is today. Then in 1800 the mailed fist of the British conqueror showed itself again in the act of union, of which Daniel O'Connell said:

> I admit there is the force of a law, because it has been supported by the policeman's truncheon, by the soldier's bayonet, and by the horseman's sword, because it is supported by the courts of law and those who have power to adjudicate in them; but I say, solemnly, it is not supported by constitutional right.
>
> * * * * * * *
>
> No, my friends; the union was begot in iniquity; it was perpetrated in fraud and cruelty. It was no compact, no bargain, but it was an act of the most decided tyranny and corruption that was ever yet perpetrated. Trial by jury was suspended, the right of personal protection was at an end, courts martial sat throughout the land, and the county of Kildare, among others, flowed with blood.

The Green Isle did indeed flow with blood, with the blood of gallant, nay, heroic, Irishmen like Robert Emmet, who died in 1803, whose last plea was for the "emancipation of my country from the superhuman oppression under which she has so long and too patiently travailed." His last protest was against "the yoke of a foreign and unrelenting tyranny."

His protest found his persecutors deaf, and still determined to torture these innocent victims of aggression. One of the most disgraceful periods in the Irish persecution followed shortly. In 1847 came the famine, when 2,000,000 died, when the inhumanity of Britain to Irishmen set a new standard of savagery. Gilbert K. Chesterton, an Englishman born and bred, has described it thus:

> The conduct of the English toward the Irish after the rebellion was quite simply the conduct of one man who tramps and binds another and then calmly cuts him about with a knife. The conduct during the famine was quite simply the conduct of the first man if he entertained the later moments of the second man by remarking in a chatty manner on the very hopeful chances of his bleeding to death. The British Prime Minister publicly refused to stop the famine by the use of English ships. The British Prime Minister positively spread the famine by making the half-starved population of Ireland pay for the starved ones. The common verdict of a coroner's jury upon some emaciated wretch was "willful murder by Lord John Russell."

And that verdict was not only the verdict of Irish public opinion but is the verdict of history—The Crimes of England.

It is not surprising that the men of Ireland became convinced that they could guarantee economic security and cultural opportunity to their children only by freeing themselves from the chains of oppression. Eighteen hundred and sixty-seven saw the Fenians organizing for a free Ireland—and the English soldiery brutally overcoming them. Independence was the prayer of the Irishman. But England, that vaunted democracy, not only failed to heed the plea but ground her heel in contempt upon her Irish subjects. Bullets and destruction formed her answer.

By every peaceful means during the succeeding years Ireland sought liberty. And each succeeding decade saw Ireland more enslaved and more impoverished, until in 1916 came the Easter Rebellion of that group of ardent young patriots led by Padraic Pearse, and the eyes of the world were suddenly focused on the small island where the most brutal atrocities were being perpetrated by the Black and Tans, composed partly of convicts sent by Britain.

I could cite instances of young men whose tongues were cut out, who were tortured, and then killed by the Black and Tans. I could point to the massacres; to the young men jailed or banished because they dared to ask for freedom. But the official report of the American Commission on Conditions in Ireland can more adequately present the facts as they were found by that distinguished membership, including L. Hollingsworth Wood, chairman; Frederick C. Howe, vice chairman; Jane Addams; James H. Maurer; Maj. Oliver P. Newman; United States Senator George W. Norris; Rev. Norman Thomas; and United States Senator David I. Walsh:

> CONCLUSIONS
>
> We find that the Irish people are deprived of the protection of British law, to which they would be entitled as subjects of the British King. They are likewise deprived of the moral protection granted by international law, to which they would be entitled as belligerents. They are at the mercy of imperial British forces which, acting contrary both to all law and to all standards of

human conduct, have instituted in Ireland a "terror," the evidence regarding which seems to prove that:

1. The imperial British Government has created and introduced into Ireland a force of at least 78,000 men, many of them youthful and inexperienced and some of them convicts, and has incited that force to unbridled violence.

2. The imperial British forces in Ireland have indiscriminately killed innocent men, women, and children; have discriminately assassinated persons suspected of being Republicans; have tortured and shot prisoners while in custody, adopting the subterfuges of "refusal to halt" and "attempting to escape"; and have attributed to alleged "Sinn Fein extremists" the British assassination of prominent Irish Republicans.

3. House burning and wanton destruction of villages and cities by imperial British forces under imperial British officers have been countenanced and ordered by officials of the British Government; and elaborate provision by gasoline sprays and bombs has been made in a number of instances for systematic incendiarism as part of a plan of terrorism.

4. A campaign for the destruction of the means of existence of the Irish people has been conducted by the burning of factories, creameries, crops, and farm implements and the shooting of farm animals. This campaign is carried on regardless of the political views of their owners, and results in widespread and acute suffering among women and children.

5. Acting under a series of proclamations issued by the competent military authorities of the imperial British forces, hostages are carried by forces exposed to the fire of the Republican Army; fines are levied upon towns and villages as punishment for alleged offenses of individuals; private property is destroyed in reprisals for acts with which the owners have no connection; and the civilian population is subjected to an inquisition upon the theory that individuals are in possession of information valuable to the military forces of Great Britain. These acts of the imperial British forces are contrary to the laws of peace or war among modern civilized nations.

6. This "terror" has failed to reestablish imperial British civil government in Ireland. Throughout the greater part of Ireland British courts have ceased to function; local, county, and city governments refuse to recognize British authority; and British civil officials fulfill no function of service to the Irish people.

7. In spite of the British "terror," the majority of the Irish people have sanctioned by ballot the Irish Republic, give their allegiance to it, pay taxes to it, and respect the decisions of its courts and of its civil officials.

In 1918, following the principle of self-determination of small nations enunciated by our great and now deceased President, Woodrow Wilson, the Irish people held a general election under British law on the question whether to remain in the Empire or to establish a free and independent government of their own. Eighty percent of the entire voting population of the country voted for an independent government, free from the Empire, and proceeded to establish such a government, which has never been dissolved.

Nevertheless, in the latter part of 1921, after continued fighting for recognition of this lawful government, which was functioning successfully even in its law courts, a truce was arranged, and at a conference in London the Irish representatives were delivered the ultimatum of England, namely, the partition of Ireland and dominion status or the alternative of immediate and terrible war.

Even today the cry for independence is heard, and will continue to be heard until Ireland is as free as Cuba.

Our own experience with England in the light of history has been a most unhappy one. It might be well to refresh the recollection of those whose memories have become somewhat clouded by the interval of time since the World War with the fact that those in high places in the British Government have on repeated occasions offered only gross insults to the United States in recognition of American aid to the Allies of the last World War in men, money, and supplies. The English response to any requests for payment of war debts has been derisively to salute the United States as Uncle Shylock.

I cannot agree with those who would place this legislation on the basis of war or no war. It is my belief that the United States can formulate a foreign policy which is characteristically American and which will safeguard American interests and American ideals in all parts of the world, without fear or favor of any nation or group of nations.

I have every confidence in President Roosevelt's foreign policy and in his determination to guard American interests and to prevent American manhood from leaving our shores to take part in the present war.

With that conviction, I am prepared to vote in favor of the act now under consideration. [Applause.]

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. KEE].

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, since the opening of the special session of Congress I understand there have been something like 600 speeches delivered in the two Houses of Congress upon the subject of neutrality. There have been something like 1,400 speeches delivered over the radio on the same subject during the same length of time.

Mr. Speaker, the issue raised by the pending bill has been before this Congress for many months. It has been debated in this, as well as in another legislative division, long, loud, learnedly, and from every possible angle and viewpoint. It was discussed at length on the floor of this House when it was considered here at the last session and, in my opinion, few if any of the speakers upon the question in either branch of Congress have since that discussion said anything new upon the subject or made any substantial contribution to the argument. We have heard nothing except repetition of the same pro and con statements, couched perhaps in different forms of expression, but still carrying the same stock phrases and meaningless generalities. No wonder that the Members of Congress are weary and the general public is clamoring for more action and less words.

I have not the vanity to think for one instant that any further contribution of mine to this debate will be of exceptional value. Neither do I expect to work any miracles of change in opinion already made up or expressed. I do, however, wish above all things to keep my record in this body clear and consistent. I want my friends and the people whom I represent—men and women of this day and generation and those who may come after—to know that, during this critical time in the world's history, I stood on the floor of this House and made a plea that my country be neutral in the conflict now on beyond the seas—neutral according to the precepts of the founders of this Republic and the precedents we followed during a century and a quarter of our country's history.

It should not be necessary to go into a detailed history of our so-called neutrality legislation. It is perhaps sufficient to recall that the Seventy-fifth Congress at its first session early in the year 1937 passed the present Neutrality Act as an amendment to a former act approved August 31, 1935. It was confidently believed at that time that the measure would accomplish the laudable purpose of its enactment. Changes, however, in world conditions soon indicated the necessity for amendment. The undeclared war in China where the act was not invoked, the civil war in Spain where a special enactment was had to meet the situation, the shifting currents of political action in Europe, all tended to impress upon those who were giving the subject thought and consideration the very obvious fact that, while intended to be neutral, our Neutrality Act was distinctly unneutral; that, instead of keeping us out of war it was more likely to be a very potent factor in dragging us into controversies between nations; and, above all, it daily became more apparent that the act deliberately penalized the weaker nations of the earth and gave direct aid and encouragement to the strong nations which were either planning or actually engaged in acts of aggression and conquest. It became evident to all men who gave intelligent thought to the problem that vital amendments to this act were necessary.

In an effort to correct if possible the partial and unneutral effects of the act, the House Foreign Affairs Committee, of which I happen to be a member, undertook the task of bringing before this House, not a new neutrality act but an amended act, one from which the objectionable features of the present law would be eliminated and to which additional provisions deemed necessary to maintain the neutral status of this Nation in time of conflict between foreign nations would be incorporated. To this end hearings were opened before our committee beginning on the 1st day of April of the present year and continuing until the middle of June.

During this period there appeared before the committee, and counseled with us, men and women from every section of the country, representative of the very highest type of patriotism and devotion. These witnesses had given to the question at issue much time and earnest study, and they gave to the committee their conclusions and the reason for the faith that was theirs. We had for study possibly every volume, treatise, or article ever printed upon the question of neutrality or upon the principles of international law involved in the question. We had before us the history of the past, the record of other years, as well as the vivid picture of current events in other lands where history was being written as we considered the problem before us. So it cannot be said—no man can charge—that there was brought to the floor of this House a half-baked, impetuous, and hastily wrought legislative proposal.

The pending bill does not, as has been so widely and intemperately asserted, repeal the present Neutrality Act. It, in fact, endorses, retains, and reenacts every provision of the present act with but one exception. That exception is the embargo clause. It adds to the present act but two provisions of any grave importance. The only practical difference between the present Neutrality Act and the pending measure is (1) the pending measure repeals the embargo against the shipment of arms and ammunition; (2) the pending act forbids the carriage in American vessels of any passengers, articles, or materials to belligerent states—the present law has no such prohibition; (3) the pending act authorizes the establishment of combat zones into or through which American vessels will be forbidden to pass; the present law provides for no such inhibition.

It should be noted that the repeal of the embargo against the shipment of arms, ammunition, and implements of war is simply a lightening of certain restrictions imposed upon the American people by the present act. All other amendments represent the imposition of additional restrictions. As a matter of fact, the original Neutrality Act and all subsequent enactments and, in truth, any neutrality legislation that this or any other Congress ever wrote or might write into the law, is but a set of binding rules to govern and restrict the actions and conduct of our own people during times of conflict between foreign nations. By such an act we voluntarily divest ourselves of certain rights conceded to us by international law. We cannot adopt nor enforce any regulations as against other nationals, but against our own people only. Each provision of this or any other neutrality act is essentially a domestic regulation, and, instead of enlarging the freedom of our actions, each provision of the law is designed to define, limit, restrict, and curtail rights which under international law we could otherwise freely exercise.

Under the existing Neutrality Act we embargo the export of arms, ammunition, and implements of war, but we do not prohibit the sale and export to belligerent nations of the raw materials out of which the same arms, ammunition, and implements may be fabricated; nor do we bar the shipment of a thousand and one other different commodities essential to warring nations and any of which may at any time by one or more of the belligerent nations be designated as contraband of war. And under the present act these commodities which are not embargoed, may be transported in American ships and over all seas without regard to either zones of danger or areas of combat. It is, therefore, clearly evident that what we are doing under our present law is to merely prohibit the sale of certain commodities, while at the same time we are sending without restriction our ships, carrying other commodities of equal necessity to belligerents, into imminent danger.

The pending act, while lifting the partial embargo imposed by the present law, contains the two stipulations which, in my opinion, are the only two that to any extent will serve to obviate the danger of our being drawn into war by reason of the sinking by belligerent nations of ships under the American flag. First, the pending bill forbids the carriage not only of arms and ammunition but also of any passengers, articles, or materials of every character to any and all belligerent states in American ships. Second, the pending bill provides for the designation from time to time by the President of combat areas into and through which American ships, no matter what may be their cargo or their destination, shall not proceed.

Combined with these two restrictions, we also have in the pending bill a stipulation against the granting of credits to foreign purchasers of any commodities, and a prohibition against shipment of any such commodities until title to the same has been transferred here and vested in some foreign government, agency, or national. These last provisions are also contained in the present act, but they are not consistent with the embargo clause. Because of the embargo, these two provisions are rendered innocuous. It serves no purpose whatever to stipulate against credits or with reference to transfer of title and at the same time embargo sales. If you bar sales you remove the necessity for either credits or transfer of title. On the other hand, the two provisions as to credits and transfer of title are entirely consistent with and complementary to the repeal of the embargo and to the stipulation that all purchased commodities shall be carried away on the ships of the buyers and not upon American vessels.

Let us look into the objections being urged against certain sections of the pending bill. Disregarding as unworthy of serious consideration the intemperate assertions of rabid partisans, let us consider for a moment the objections which have been seriously and honestly urged. Do we hear any waves of opposition to the requirement that title to purchased goods be transferred to foreign agencies before shipment? I have heard none. Do we hear any serious indictment of the combat-area provision? Yes; upon the sole ground that the designation of the zones is left to the discretion of the President. This objection can always be expected.

There are people in this world who object to any delegation of authority to anybody—even to a corner policeman or to an army general—and, if they could, this class of objectors would take away from God himself His discretionary powers and subject Him to the control of a mortal commission. That objection, in my judgment, is either personal or political. Do we hear any objection to the refusal of credits and the requirement of cash for our commodities? I have heard none raised. Is there any objection to the prohibition against carriage of goods to the belligerent nations upon American vessels? Yes; by the shipping interests, and this objection has, at least, a sound basis. Such prohibition undoubtedly calls for a sacrifice upon the part of American shipping; but will anybody seriously contend that this sacrifice cannot much better be made than could the sacrifice called for by war? And so, when we boil the matter down to its logical conclusion, we find that in the consideration of the measure now before Congress the repeal of the embargo is the bone of contention.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I wish to comment upon what to me has been the most remarkable development in this debate. I refer to the change in the attitude of my friend and committee colleague, the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHANLEY], upon this question. Not for a moment nor to the slightest degree would I question his honesty or integrity, for he is one of the most honorable and trustworthy men I have ever known. For this very reason, however, I attribute his present stand to the fact that in his earnest desire to reconcile his conscience to his action—in his effort to be entirely consistent—he has driven himself into an astounding inconsistency; in fact, in order to be straight, he leans backward.

At the last session of Congress, on the floor of this House, the gentleman from Connecticut most earnestly urged that our present neutrality law, including its embargo clause, was in contravention of international law and that our better policy would be to write the entire act off of our statutes. If I then understood him correctly, he doubted the consistency of his giving support to any neutrality legislation whatever, because such restrictive legislation was wrong in principle.

And now we find him vehemently urging the adoption of a more stringent restriction upon freedom of our nationals than can be found in the present law, to which his opposition was then directed.

As a reason for this change of front, my good friend gives it as his personal opinion that, while admitting the embargo to be wrong in principle, yet to repeal it at this time would be unneutral as a "change in the rules after the game has commenced." My answer to that is, that any law wrong in principle at one time is wrong at all times. When the gentleman from Connecticut favored repeal of the embargo, it was not in effect, because there was then no reason for its enforcement. He was then against it because he evidently felt that, should war come, an embargo would be an erroneous policy. Now that the policy is applied, he, in effect, asserts that it would be error to correct the error. Can a wrong be thus made right?

I am afraid that my good friend has been listening to the song of the sirens to my left. These gentlemen who are opposed to repeal do not hesitate to grasp any argument and they are advancing this one about the change of the rules regardless of the fact that they are thereby taking advantage of a wrong for which they alone are responsible.

They argue that the war having commenced, we cannot now consistently revise our neutrality laws. I call your attention to the fact that these same people who advance this argument, with the possible exception of the gentleman from Connecticut, were the ones who were loudest and bitterest in their opposition to a repeal of the embargo before the war commenced. They are the same ones who defeated the proposal at the last session of this Congress. They are the same ones who imposed upon us the necessity of action now. If these gentlemen were in a court of equity they could be estopped by two maxims—one is that "no man can take advantage of his own wrong," and the other, "he who comes into a court of equity must come with clean hands." If our country is today in the inconceivable situation that it cannot modify or repeal a bad law, these antirepealists are responsible for that condition of affairs. The wrong was theirs and the hands that perpetrated the wrong were theirs. Now they advance the most unusual proposition that it is wrong to right a wrong.

Mr. SHANLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEE. I yield for a question.

Mr. SHANLEY. I know the gentleman wants to be fair. I know there were no sirens back in June when I said that if we were going to change the law the time to change was then; that once a war ensued any change, particularly a change that was motivated by a policy of discrimination and not by the desire to complete or effect our neutrality, would be unneutral. I believe the gentleman wants to be fair on that question. There were no sirens then, and the gentleman certainly knows that one of the distinguished leaders of the opposition has never been a siren to me.

Mr. KEE. The gentleman at that time sang the song himself and played his own accompaniment. I recall that distinctly, and I have quoted about what the gentleman sang at that time. Now he is singing another song. Is not that correct?

Mr. SHANLEY. No. The refrain is the same. It still lingers. The refrain is that you cannot use a governmental weapon to change a law which takes a conscious and notorious realization of naval supremacy in order to discriminate, because no man can stand on this floor and give a definition of neutrality, which means abstention, which means nondiscrimination, and say you can simply change that at will to help either belligerent.

Mr. KEE. I will answer the gentleman in this way, that his own amendment changes the law. His own amendment goes farther than the present act.

Mr. SHANLEY. My own amendment makes it more neutral; it adds certain things. It is a prohibitive amendment.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 additional minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. KEE. The plain, unvarnished truth is that in 1935, when our statutes were clear and unencumbered by any attempt at so-called neutrality legislation, we wrote into our laws an unneutral act. We wrote a provision that inhibited us from selling weapons, ammunition, or materials of war for either offense or defense to any nation or nations engaged in conflict. Naturally, and as should have been anticipated, this restriction affected only those nations which needed to purchase commodities of this character and to which the sea lanes to our ports were open. The provision could not affect otherwise than favorably all nations which were fully equipped with war materials or were provided with facilities for their fabrication. As to the nations which were not so equipped, the new provision was unneutral. It denied to them access to the means of defense against the stronger nations of the world. This unneutral effect of our attempt at neutrality became soon apparent. Germany, having completed 10 years of preparation for a campaign of aggression and conquest, looked at our supposedly neutral act and smiled in complete agreement and satisfaction. It gave her a clear field for aggressive action. With her fleet of warships complete, armed and supplied, with the greatest fleet of airplanes ever assembled in the world, with her armies fully trained and equipped with the most modern and up-to-date instrumentalities known to man, with her great munitions plants and arms factories stepped up until they were capable of almost unlimited production, Germany was entirely self-dependent, with no need whatever for anything in the way of war materials that America might produce. Germany's only fear was that the nations against which she contemplated action might secure means of defense from the great republic across the sea, which was the one country alone that had the resources and facilities to fabricate these defensive means. No wonder that Germany smiled in smug satisfaction as she read the sign we had posted on our door, which said in effect to the weaker nations of the world, "no matter how grevious your need, you cannot even buy from us any means for your defense."

We were not under compulsion to put this clause upon our statutes and it was not demanded or required by any condition then confronting us. We are not required to keep it there. When we wrote it into our laws we contravened international law and voluntarily surrendered a right that we, as well as every other nation in the world, had exercised for countless years. We wrote it in as a domestic policy—as a limitation upon the acts and conduct of our own citizens alone—and as such domestic policy and limitation we have every right in the world to write it off at our convenience. By writing it off—by repealing it—we are not changing any rules during the progress of the game. We changed the rule when we adopted the embargo clause, and by repealing it we are merely restoring a recognized rule—one that through all the years down to this day has been followed by every other nation in the world, including the very powers which now offer objections to our return to it.

That we cannot revise or repeal at any time any act established by us as a domestic regulation, is an impossible position to take. Especially is this true when the provision proposed to be repealed was, at the time of its adoption and is now, not only unusual in the annals of history, but is definitely unneutral in its effect—favoring as it does the powerful nations of the world and penalizing the weak. So much for the contention that we are without warrant to change the rules.

The fact that our present embargo is not complete destroys its effectiveness as a war preventive measure. Its application is to the shadow and not to the substance. To be a protection to us it would necessarily have to be applied to all classes of commodities and not to a few. Arms and ammunition are not the sole requirements of belligerent nations. Materials of war, given the broadest definition, cannot possibly cover all essential commodities. Everything necessary to sustain human life—food, clothing, medicine, fuel, shelter—every article useful to man would have to be classed as materials of war and their shipment prohibited if we want to remove from belligerents the temptation to sink

our ships. Confronted with this obvious fact it immediately becomes apparent that it is not the sale of commodities that should be embargoed but the transportation of the commodities in American vessels. Sound reason and necessity demands that we resort to the provision incorporated in the pending bill, to wit, an embargo against shipping instead of one against sales.

The difference between the two methods is vital. If we embargo sales of all commodities we naturally not only put an end to all American shipping to all belligerent nations, but we likewise put an end to the shipment of American goods on ships of other nationals to belligerent nations. On the other hand, if we repeal the embargo on sales but at the same time prohibit carriage in American ships of the articles sold, we do not suspend all of our trade relations, we do not interfere with the commercial shipping and trading rights of other nations, we do not close our ports, but at the price of the sacrifice of a part of the shipping rights conceded to us by international law we insure ourselves against the danger of being drawn into war by the sinking of vessels flying the American flag.

It is admittedly true that the provisions in the pending measure inhibiting the carriage of commodities to belligerent nations on American vessels calls for a sacrifice by American shipping. This hardship, however, is to a large extent lightened by certain amendments inserted in the pending bill by another body of this Congress.

It has been recognized that there are certain important countries and ports, not only in the Eastern but also in the Western Hemisphere politically dominated by or affiliated with belligerent nations, the sea lanes to which are comparatively free from danger. It has therefore been considered that no reason exists for restricting American shipping of ordinary cargoes to these ports and countries. It is trite but true that danger is always where you find it, but it is equally evident that in wartime the greater danger lies in our invasion with American ships of the zones of wartime activities. While it can be stated as a correct interpretation of international law that we are not precluded from permitting our ships to enter all zones, yet we are willing for the sake of security to forego the right as to those seas which are the actual theater of war's great tragedy. We are doing this of our own volition and not under duress. That, however, we are willing to surrender a part of our rights, that we are willing to forego the freedom of part of the seas, that we are willing to impose upon our shipping a heavy burden of restrictions—a burden imposed by no other neutral nations—should not mean that we must surrender all of our rights. It should not mean the enforced retirement from the seas of all ships sailing under the American flag.

To this end the pending bill has been amended in order to leave open to American shipping ocean areas outside of actual danger zones. As designated, these areas include ports west of the sixty-sixth parallel of longitude to the north of us, the ports of South America, the Bermudas, and other sections south of 35° north latitude in the Western Hemisphere, the Tasman Sea between Australia and New Zealand, ports on the Indian Ocean, China and Arabian Seas, the Bay of Bengal, and the Atlantic coast of Africa south of 33° north latitude.

It must be understood that by these amendments to the bill, made by another body, under which American shipping may sail the seas mentioned and carry trade to the ports thereon, we are not assuming any new rights or privileges. On the contrary, we are merely reserving to ourselves the rights we already had and have had under international law since the founding of the Government. By these amendments we merely relaxed to some extent the harsh restrictions the measure imposes, by our own voluntary will, upon American shipping.

This action is not only just and fair to the shipping interests of the country but it is also demanded by the needs of our commercial and manufacturing interests, the necessities of our Latin American neighbors to the south, and the requirements of the peaceful populations of other lands who, to a large extent, are dependent upon American products. Let the belligerent nations control the seas and the sea lanes that they have the power to control and we will stay away from such areas. Let our commerce begin where their power ends.

Up to the present time the American people have stood firm in their demands for what is termed the "freedom of the seas." To us the maintenance of the merchant marine has not only been a matter of national pride but it has been one also of economic necessity. We naturally hesitate to take any steps leading to an abandonment of a time-tried policy based upon established rules of international law. But there is no sound reason why we should insist upon a continuance of this policy when to maintain our right to do so involves the use of force and must inevitably lead us into war.

We must not assume that this act, because it prohibits a number of American ships from trading with belligerent nations and entering dangerous zones will result in putting this shipping entirely out of business. To the south of us is 21 Latin American countries with which our trade relations are improving day by day. Barred from the markets of Europe, to which these nations have heretofore given a greater proportion of their trade, they are naturally turning to America for the commodities they need.

There is no reason why this trade should not be encouraged in every way and developed to proportions far beyond what we have had in the highly competitive marts of Europe. There is every reason in the world to expect that every American ship which will be barred by the pending measure from the European trade will actually find continuous employment in carrying our steadily increasing trade with the countries of South America. There the seas are open and free from danger. There our rights are clearly defined. There can be no possible justification for interference with these rights. Regardless of all eventualities in Europe, the nations of the great western continent are united with us for self-preservation. The countries of the Old World have recognized this union. The doctrine enunciated by Monroe has been firmly established by the insistence of this country through years of test and trial and is backed by all the power of this Nation. In the establishment of this doctrine as an integral part of the laws of nations and in insisting on its recognition, we have never yet failed, faltered, or retreated. We want peace—no people in the world love it more—but if any nation on earth is deliberately seeking war, it need only once insist upon violating the Monroe Doctrine. It will get what it is looking for and without any preliminary argument.

When we sum it all up we stand to lose nothing whatever from our inhibition against sending American ships into dangerous waters. On the contrary, there is promise of immediate gain and the establishment of new and permanent gainful trade relations with our southern neighbors. The prize won for us by this action is, however, far greater than any increase in trade and commerce. The prize is our security against being drawn into the European conflict by the American people's passionate resentment of the sinking of American ships and the killing of American seamen. The avoidance of this danger is the chief accomplishment of the proposed legislation. It should be evident to all men that our danger lies, not in the sale of American commodities, but in the shipment of these commodities upon American vessels through the areas of combat—the zones of danger. [Applause.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CROWTHER] such time as he may desire.

Mr. CROWTHER. Mr. Speaker, I favor and shall support the embargo on arms, ammunition, or implements of war. The existing law was presented and exhaustively debated during a period of comparative world peace. I not only favor the continuance of the embargo on arms, but I believe it should be strengthened.

The supporters of embargo repeal complain of the right to ship cotton and not gun cotton, the right to ship brass tubing and not to ship shells, and so forth, and so forth. If this be an inconsistency then what is the objection to making the embargo all inclusive? The cash-and-carry provi-

sions which were in our law were permitted to expire in May of this year?

The defeat of the amendment to prohibit sale and shipment of poison gas and flame throwers was in my estimation a keen disappointment to people of this country, and I trust we may have an opportunity to vote on this vital question in the House.

Our President, in his speech at Chautauqua, made the following statement:

> It is clear that our present policy and the measures passed by Congress would, in the event of war, reduce war profits which would otherwise accrue to American citizens. Let us not blink the fact that we would find thousands of Americans who, seeking immediate riches—fool's gold—would attempt to break down or evade our neutrality. If we face the choice of profits or peace the Nation will answer—must answer—"We choose peace!"

The President's prediction has become a reality, and we find, as he suggested, the thousands who while decrying war and insisting that we must not take part in it are in the same breath demanding that we make the death-dealing apparatus and sell it to the belligerents on a cash-on-the-barrel-head basis. Remove the smoke screen of alleged neutrality and you have a clear view of a plan to acquire "blood money."

Have we forgotten April 1917? Have we erased from our memory the tragic and appalling holocaust of that last World War? The repeal of the arms embargo destroys the last vestige of neutrality. The substitution of cash and carry does something which I do not believe the American people will tolerate. It will put the dollar sign on the American flag, and I hope and pray that may never be done.

In my humble opinion the surest way to keep out of this, or any other European war, is to retain the embargo. Let this magnificent Republic set an example that will redound to its credit through the ages. [Applause.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] as much time as he may desire.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Speaker, the debate in the Senate on the pending bill has been so thorough and so exhaustive that I hesitate to occupy the floor at this time. On the other hand, this is the gravest and most important question that has faced me during my 5 years in the House of Representatives. I have but one desire and that is to cast a vote that will keep this country from becoming involved in the power politics and boundary line disputes of Europe. We must keep out of that war. The question is, What is best for our Nation—its present and its future? I have personal feelings and prejudices in the European conflict, but I also have a great obligation, and that is to my own country. When I cross the threshold of this Chamber I must lay aside all personal feelings and prejudices and decide the issues on their merits and their effect on the welfare of this Nation.

Since the beginning of the special session it has been my privilege to hear many speeches and read many articles on both sides of this controversy and there are substantial arguments both for and against. Much confusion has resulted from what is known as the cash-and-carry provisions of the Pittman bill. It seems to me that section is an improvement over the House bill, but we should not accept this in lieu of the embargo on articles and munitions of war. In my opinion our Nation would best be protected by the following:

First. A law defining the articles that might be carried by American ships and the destination of these ships.

Second. Legislation in regard to the travel of American citizens on the high seas and in the war zones.

Third. A law which requires a belligerent nation to secure title to a commodity before it leaves our shores.

Fourth, The embargo of arms, ammunition, and implements of war.

There is general agreement as to the first two of these, but serious question as to what is the best course to take in regard to the last two. One would think from reading the press and listening to radio speeches that cash and carry was something new. The facts are, it was a part of our Neutrality Act of 1937 and only expired last May. Had the present administration requested Congress to extend it at that time it would have carried by an overwhelming vote. There are some of us who believe its extension was not requested at that time because the President was desirous of securing a credit section in addition to the regular cash provisions. As the original Pittman bill carried a 90-day credit provision, there is reason to believe that there was some basis for this assumption. Public reaction was so strong against this provision that it was removed by the Senate leadership before a vote was taken. The pending bill carries a cash provision, but let us be honest with ourselves and the citizens of this country. No one believes that if war continues for a year or more and our Nation has profited from a cash munitions trade that we are going to refuse credit to those nations that have made this profit possible. Certainly we would not take their gold and material wealth and then when they were in sore distress selfishly advise them they could not have credit.

The section of this bill dealing with the repeal of the embargo on arms and munitions of war is not only controversial but it is fraught with danger. I shall not state that the removal of the embargo will carry us into the European war, but I do say that it is the first step. By repealing the embargo we retrace our steps of 1914, when the sale of arms, ammunition, and implements of war was the first step toward that war. During that period our decision to sell articles and munitions of war definitely placed us on the side of the Allies and was regarded by them as an entry into the conflict on their side. The reverse situation was true with Germany, and they immediately interpreted our action as an act of war.

Certainly there is great distinction between selling articles and munitions of war and selling food materials and commodities that are used to sustain life. This was proved conclusively in the last war. The historic background of this Nation is based on Christian principles and Christian teachings, and I do not believe that we at this time can justify the sale of bombs, poisonous gas, and lethal weapons to belligerent nations for the destruction of human lives. This is our opportunity to take a definite stand. We did so when we enacted the original Neutrality Act during peacetimes when there was no pressure from any nation or any group. A retention of the arms embargo will serve notice on the world that we have some regard for Christian principles in this country. Our Nation should remain the citadel of peace. When the European conflict ends, either in a stalemate or in victory for one or the other of the groups engaged in war, our country should be in a position to render a real service in the rehabilitation of that section, as well as the establishment of a form of government that will guarantee religious and civil rights to their citizens. Now is the time for us to retain our strict neutrality, and we can be of much greater service to nations at war by remaining neutral than joining them in their conflicts.

Let us not sell our neutrality for war profits.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GRANT] as much time as he may desire.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, every impulse of patriotism, and every consideration of real Americanism, impels me to vote against repeal of the embargo on arms, ammunition, and implements of war.

I am convinced that repeal of the arms embargo, under the circumstances of the hour, endangers the peace of America.

If the United States finally becomes involved in this war, it will be because we wade in one step at a time. I feel strongly that repeal of the arms embargo would be the first step. No nation ever determines upon a policy of war at one gulp. War develops always through a series of steps, through a series of events and policies, each of which gradually conditions the public mind to the hateful attitude which alone can make war.

We have learned at a terrible cost during the last 25 years that the United States cannot make and maintain the peace

of Europe. But we can make and maintain and guarantee and insure the peace of the United States.

This is not our war. It is Europe's war—brewed of age-old hatreds, class conflicts, religious antagonisms, and boundary disputes. Europe is a seething cauldron of diplomatic intrigues and real-estate aggressions. Should we allow ourselves to become involved, America would be in this cauldron for a hundred years to come, and the end surely would be the black-out of representative government and freedom in the United States.

Brutal aggression against the richly flowering independence of Poland by Germany and Russia is spread upon the pages of history as one of the greatest international crimes in human history. The wanton destruction of an independent state revolts the heart and mind of all mankind against barbaric aggression.

America's duty is to relieve and assist the victims of this crime in a substantial and practical way. We can render this assistance only in food and clothing and the materials of shelter, which would instantly be cut off should we go to war. We can only render this assistance through the enormous productive capacity of America at peace.

Furthermore, if we will maintain peace we will continue to hold aloft the beacon light of freedom for all humanity. And so long as that hope lights the skies of Europe there remains a real inspiration toward reconstruction and a new emergence of national independence, national culture, and national vitality. But the minute America should enter the conflict as a military participant all these hopes would die forever, and all of Europe would fall into a war of extermination, which could end only at the threshold of a new Dark Ages—an era of perhaps centuries, in which the whole history of the Continent would be written in two dreadful words, "bloody chaos."

If the world is to be redeemed from its present dreadful plight of international anarchy, it is to be redeemed only by the power and benign authority of international morality. It can never be redeemed by more aggression, more invasion, more destruction, and more anarchy.

Secondly, I oppose repeal because this country took the position officially in 1915 that any change in our neutrality law or policy after the outbreak of war would constitute "a direct violation of the neutrality of the United States."

History records that in 1915 the German Government urged the United States, then neutral, to forbid and prohibit the sale of arms to the Allies. Compliance with this request, bear in mind, would have involved at that time a positive change of neutral policy during the progress of a war. In a letter to the German Ambassador under date of April 21, 1915, Secretary of State William Jennings Bryan said:

> This Government holds * * * that any change in its own laws of neutrality during the progress of a war, which would affect unequally the relations of the United States with the nations at war, would be an unjustifiable departure from the principles of strict neutrality by which it has consistently sought to direct its actions * * *. The placing of an embargo on the trade in arms at the present time would constitute such a change and be a direct violation of the neutrality of the United States.

That same logical argument ought to apply today. It is an accepted fact that the proposed repeal of the embargo "at the present time," would "affect unequally the relations of the United States with the nations at war" and, therefore, it would "be an unjustifiable departure from the principles of strict neutrality."

Americans want no part of the war in Europe. Neither do they want any blood money—any war-boom prosperity, to be followed by another and a worse post-war depression. Above all, we do not want to solve our unemployment problem by sending our unemployed into the trenches, or into the munitions factories to prosper in instruments of death, destruction, black despair for 500,000,000 men, women, and children of Europe.

As an American, and responsive to the pleas and supplications which have reached me from home, I take my stand on the side of the constructive and beneficent forces of peace—against the destructive, demoralizing, and decadent forces of hatred and war.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GILLIE] as much time as he may desire.

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my sentiments—and what I believe to be the sentiments of a majority of my constituents—on the gravest question which has confronted the American Congress since the fatal declaration of war in 1917 .

That question is, Should the arms embargo be repealed? But it might also be stated in any of the following ways:

Should we forsake our traditional neutrality and take sides in a war which is not our war?

Should we engage in the murder business and permit munition makers to reap profits out of the tears, the blood, and the agony of modern warfare?

Should we sell bombing planes, poison gas, and death-dealing weapons to be used in the destruction of women and children and helpless civilian populations?

In other words, should we deliberately adopt a policy that will threaten the peace and security of our beloved America?

Mr. Speaker, during the past 5 weeks I have received no less than 15,000 replies to these questions from peace-loving citizens of my district. What do they say? What do the people want?

Almost unanimously they say: Keep the embargo. We want real neutrality. This is not our war and we should have nothing to do with it. Let us keep the law which makes it a crime to sell instruments of death and destruction to belligerent nations.

It is gratifying to learn that a majority of my constituents agree with the position I took last March when I warned the House that:

> Unless Congress intervenes to strengthen existing neutrality legislation as a counter stroke to the current administration effort to weaken such legislation, the history of the Wilson administration will be repeated.

And also the stand in favor of the embargo which I took in the House last June when I said:

> The price for peace to me seems reasonable. But at its highest, it is small indeed by comparison with the horrible price which war exacts. But the price for peace can be paid in only one currency—the currency of strict, honest, straightforward, sincere, mandatory neutrality.

Mr. Speaker, I repeat the only real question before Congress today is repeal of the arms embargo. Opponents of the embargo have attempted to cloud the issue and deceive the people by declaring that we cannot have cash and carry and the embargo at the same time.

It is clear, to any thinking person, that it is false reasoning to argue that the choice is between the embargo and cash and carry. The two are separate and distinct. We can and should have cash and carry for all general supplies. But we need not at the same time sacrifice such an important safeguard against war as the arms embargo.

The contention that we cannot have both the embargo on munitions and cash and carry for general commodities is a deliberate deception, an utterly foundationless falsehood.

Friends of the embargo pleaded most earnestly for continuance of cash and carry in our neutrality law last May when the administration permitted it to expire. It expired because a Democratic Congress refused to act favorably on Senator VANDENBERG's praiseworthy resolution to continue cash and carry in effect.

Do not therefore be deceived by this false contention. The opposition is not to cash-and-carry, but to the unneutral proposal to authorize what is now strictly prohibited—the shipment of instruments of death to nations at war.

Enemies of the embargo have asked: Why do we need to ban arms exports if we are to have a strong cash-and-carry provision? The question is easily answered.

In the first place, the arms ban keeps us from engaging in the bloody and unholy business of being an arsenal for death-dealing weapons.

Secondly, it is necessary to keep the arms embargo because, as the World War proves, the armaments racket is the one trade which depends most upon war and encourages and prolongs it. It is the one trade best calculated to produce an unhealthy war boom, with all its attendant risks and evils.

Mr. Speaker, I am British-born—a native of Scotland—but I love my adopted country with a zeal that is firm and genuine and my only concern in this critical hour is for her future welfare.

My devotion is so strong that I would not jeopardize her security, or gamble with the lives of her young manhood, by supporting a policy of open—and dangerous—assistance to the side with which it is my natural inclination to sympathize.

Deep down in my heart I believe America can stay out of this war if we have the courage to remain absolutely neutral. But we cannot stay out if we are pro-British, pro-German, or pro-anything but pro-American.

I voted for the arms embargo along with a majority of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle—when the Vorys amendment was passed in the House last June. Subsequent developments in Europe have only served to deepen my conviction that the embargo provides us with the strongest possible peace insurance.

I intend to stick by my guns and again vote against repeal of this safeguard against American involvement in the European war. I hope and pray that my colleagues will have the courage to do likewise.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL] as much time as he may desire.

AMERICA! KEEP OUT OF EUROPE; STAY NEUTRAL; KEEP OUT OF WAR

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I will support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHANLEY] because, in my judgment, it is a safeguard most likely to keep us out of a foreign war. It retains the arms embargo and adopts the cash-and-carry provisions of the Senate amendment which will retain and strengthen our neutrality. We must remain neutral, keep out of Europe, and keep out of war. In the solution of this problem let us consider only what is best to preserve our own peace and security.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is so far reaching and so vital to the welfare of our country that it transcends all party considerations and must be considered free from partisan factors. Our only objective must be what is best for the happiness and preservation of the peace and security of our country. The observations I shall make will be based on that premise.

We are legislating for America, and for no other country, and should therefore be guided by what is best for America. We should not permit our sympathies for European nations, wherever they may lie, to shape our action and involve us in foreign conflicts. Our people almost unanimously believe that we should keep out of foreign wars; that we should not become a party to the present European war; and that we should not, at any future time, send our soldiers overseas to fight on European or other foreign battlefields. I most heartily concur in these beliefs. We should, however, put our own house in order, build up our defenses and our armed forces, our Navy and aircraft to that degree of efficiency that we will be able successfully to defend our people and our possessions against all comers. It should, however, be a force of defense and not of offense.

This legislation now before us has two objectives which are diametrically opposed to one another. They clash with each other. The one is the repeal of the mandatory arms embargo, which does away with our neutrality, and thereby tends to involve us in foreign controversies. The other, the cash-and-carry provisions, and bans on trading, shipping, and intercourse with belligerents, is a safeguard against involvement. These two objectives should not be combined in one bill, because the repeal section is controversial and should be considered separately on its own merits. The other provisions could have been enacted with such modifications as could easily have been agreed upon at the very beginning of the special session, and would have gone a long way toward relieving our country of embarrassing incidents such as that of the seizure of the American ship, the *City of Flint*. In fact, it was proposed in the other body that these provisions of the pending resolution be separated so that the so-called cash-and-carry provisions could have been enacted into law without delay, and the controversial issue—that of the repeal of the embargo—be considered by itself, so that ample time could be given for its solution. However, the administration forces refused to separate the issues, and they are before us now in one measure.

The mandatory arms embargo was enacted in 1935, almost unanimously—63 to 6 in the Senate and 376 to 13 in the House—by a Democratic Congress and signed by the President. The necessity for its passage was forced upon us by our experiences in the World War. We were operating at that time under international law, and we were unable to maintain a neutral position, and as a result were brought into the war as a participant. Our experience, in the loss of American soldiers, the expenditures of vast sums of money, and the utter failure to achieve our objectives, led the American people and the Congress to resolve that America should never again become a party to a foreign conflict—that we should maintain an absolutely neutral position in foreign wars, not take sides, and refuse to sell arms, ammunition, and implements of war to either side, and devote our energies to solving our own problems here in America. As a result, when we were free from war, we enacted the neutrality statute, with this mandatory arms embargo, for the definite purpose of keeping neutral during foreign wars. We had had one bitter experience, and we were determined henceforth to keep out of Europe's wars. We knew the sale of weapons and munitions took us into the World War, and we were determined it should not be repeated.

Arms embargo is a principle recognized in international law and one we ourselves had invoked in times past, and one which many of the nations of the Old World have followed. In the World War our furnishing of arms, ammunition, and implements of war to the Allies was our undoing. It engendered the animosity of Germany and brought on the submarine warfare, involving our ships and citizens, resulting in sabotage in our factories, docks, and terminals, and in the death of many Americans, ultimately leading to a declaration of war. There was fresh in our minds at the time this statute was enacted the memory of the determination of our people that we should not enter that war. Shortly before our entry President Wilson said:

> More than this, proposed at this time, permit me to say, would mean merely that we had lost our self-possession; that we had been thrown off balance by a war with which we have nothing to do, whose causes cannot touch us, whose very existence affords us opportunities of friendship and disinterested service which should make us ashamed of any thought of hostility or fearful preparation for trouble.

In fact, President Wilson's campaign, to a large extent, was based on the slogan that "he kept us out of war." And yet in April following his election the Congress voted to enter the war. We are reminded now, as we discuss this momentous issue, that everyone on both sides of the question are vehement in assuring the Nation that we will keep America out of war and that we will not enter this or any other foreign conflict.

We cannot forget that, notwithstanding we took the same viewpoint before the World War, that nevertheless in a few months we were in the war. We relied upon international law; we failed to maintain a neutral position; we took sides by attempting to furnish the Allies arms, munitions, and implements of war, and as a result Germany retaliated. The so-called incidents took place, American ships were sunk, American property destroyed, American munitions factories sabotaged and destroyed, American docks and ships were blown up, and many American lives were sacrificed. As a result, the feelings of America were aroused and the very ones who a short time before had been proclaiming we would not enter the war, that "he kept us out of war," were urging that the Congress declare war, which it promptly did. Those in the Congress who refused to vote for the declaration of war were held up to ridicule and scorn. Anyone familiar with this history cannot but note the striking similarity between what took place in those fateful days leading up to our entry into the World War and what is taking place today.

It is argued by those who favor lifting the embargo that there is no proof that by doing so, and thus taking sides, and supplying weapons and munitions to one side, that we will be brought into the war. We only know that in the World War we took that course and it put us in the war. In the World War our first step on the road to war was selling arms and ammunition to the Allies. It was followed by credits and then sending American doughboys to the battlefields of France. Will we now take the first step on this road to war, the one we took on the road to the World War, namely, selling to one side arms and munitions? If we do, can we retrace this step, once taken? Congress does not declare war out of a clear sky. Such a declaration is preceded by many steps in a long process. Steps taken by our own Government, accompanied by denials that they are leading to war, but which enmesh us in foreign controversies, may end in war, as they did in 1917. Will we gamble again that we can give up our neutrality by repealing the arms embargo and sell arms and munitions to one side only and still keep out of this war? It may be done, but we are playing with loaded dice and American lives are the stakes. We lost before. Must we take this gamble again?

In order to avoid another catastrophe of this kind in 1935 the Congress enacted a mandatory embargo statute, which it is now proposed to repeal. It was reaffirmed in 1936 and in 1937, and in the latter year the Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN], chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, referring to our World War participation, said:

> We relied upon international law for every assurance of our rights, but the reliance brought us no benefits and no protection, and was our undoing.

When the distinguished Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] referred to this in the other body, in his remarks on October 2, the Senator from Nevada said:

> I take exactly the same position now. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, October 2, p. 68.)

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], in discussing the reason for the enactment of the embargo law, said:

> It would seem that by now the nations of the earth would have learned that war does not pay. We have learned it in America. * * * Having learned our lesson, we are determined to set our house in order so that when the storm breaks we shall be prepared to safeguard as best we can our peace and prevent our involvement, if possible. * * * We will prevent our country or our citizens from selling or furnishing to nations engaged in wars arms, ammunitions, or implements of war, and this bill does just that. It is permanent legislation.

The Secretary of State, Mr. Cordell Hull, referred to the Embargo Act of 1935 as follows:

> The Neutrality Act of last August, in embargoing exports of finished war materials to belligerents, was to keep us out of war.

Mr. Hull also said, in 1936, before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee (p. 42, Hearings):

> We could not see how a neutral could deliberately help to feed the fires and flames of war by delivering the essential materials right straight to the belligerents, helping not only to carry on war but to prolong it indefinitely; and nobody knows much better than we that every day that war is prolonged the danger of the war spreading would be increased, with increased dangers to us of being involved.

The President of the United States himself, in discussing the Neutrality and Embargo Act, said:

> If war should break out again in another continent, let us not blink the fact that we would find in this country thousands of Americans who, seeking immediate riches—fool's gold—would attempt to break down or evade our neutrality. They would tell you, and, unfortunately, their views would get wide publicity, that if they could produce and ship this and that and the other article to belligerent nations, the unemployed of America would all find work. They would tell you that if they could extend credit to warring nations, that credit could be used in the United States to build homes and factories and pay our debts. They would tell you that America would once more capture the trade of the world. It would be hard to resist that clamor; it would be hard for many Americans, I fear, to look beyond—to realize the inevitable penalties, the inevitable day of reckoning that comes from a false prosperity. To resist the clamor of that greed, if war should come, would require the unswerving support of all Americans who love peace. If we face the choice of profits or peace, the Nation will answer, must answer, "We choose peace."

We note by the press that large shipments of bombing planes and other aircraft are now awaiting the passage of the repeal of the arms embargo before shipments to France and England proceed. We may "choose peace" but the answer seems to be "profits."

The Congress knew, and the country knew, that we were led into the World War by reason of our selling arms and munitions to one group of the belligerents and not to the others. There were other causes, also, but supplying arms and munitions to one side only was the first step on the war road and led directly to the destruction of our property and American lives, which followed precipitating a declaration of war.

It is true, we also sold other goods and merchandise, such as foodstuffs, clothing, grain, and oil, but this did not bring us into trouble. The supplying of the arms and munitions to Germany's enemies placed us squarely in an unneutral position; it fed the flames of war, for, indeed, arms, munitions, and instruments of war are the very symbols of war, and any nation furnishing such sinews of war to one belligerent, to the exclusion of the other, is, to that extent, joining in the conflict. It is intervention, and leads, ultimately, to full participation. We found it so in 1917. I fear we will find it so again.

It is now proposed that we repeal this arms embargo and give up our neutral position for the definite purpose of selling arms and munitions to one side and go back where we were prior to the World War, and subject ourselves to the very same influences that forced us, even against our wishes, into the World War. It is now frankly admitted that by repealing the arms embargo we are taking an unneutral position. We are taking sides. As Arthur Krock, editorial writer on the New York Times, has said, it is generally admitted the real purpose of the administration in repealing the arms-embargo statute is to render aid to England and France. He said:

> There has been little official concealment that this is the real reason for the recent unsuccessful attempt to eliminate the ban. It is the actual, rather than the technical, reason which engages the opposition.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN], in charge of this legislation in the other body, very candidly said:

> I simply want to say that I do not think it concerns the United States whether it is neutral or not.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BURKE], a very able exponent of repeal, said:

> I speak no more of the arms embargo as an expression of strict neutrality. It is not that. It checks the belligerents that I want checked. It favors the belligerents I want favored.

On the other hand, the national commander of the American Legion, Raymond J. Kelly, says:

> The voices of more than 1,000,000 American World War veterans united in a common chorus that America must maintain real neutrality—that under no condition shall it be distorted into a deceptive and misleading attempt to take sides behind the scenes.

Whose voices should we follow: Those who urge us to forego our neutrality and take sides with one of the belligerents in this conflict, which may again lead us to war, or those who counsel strict neutrality without taking sides behind the scenes? Which is more likely to promote the peace and happiness of America? Retention of the embargo on arms cannot lead toward war; its repeal may involve us again in war.

As Secretary of State Cordell Hull said in 1936:

> We could not see how a neutral could deliberately help feed the fires and flames of war by delivering the essential materials right straight to the belligerents, helping not only to carry on war but to prolong it indefinitely * * * with increased dangers to us of being involved.

This is the crux of our problem. Shall America give up its neutral position—one which it took in times of peace, after careful and painstaking consideration, for the purpose of being neutral in foreign wars—in order that we may not become involved therein, and for the particular purpose of keeping us out of such conflicts? It is now contended that

we should repeal the arms embargo, make America the arsenal for the Allies, take sides in the conflict for the avowed purpose, as disclosed by the leaders of the repeal movement, to give aid and succor to England and France, to help them win the war.

By so doing we are not only taking sides but we are becoming partners in the project. We are, to that extent, entering the war. We are furnishing, to one side only, the death-dealing agencies that are necessary for carrying on the war. We are not only deliberately helping "to feed the fires and flames of war" but we now propose to furnish flame throwers. Well may we ask, Does the sale of arms, munitions, and poison gas tend toward peace? Will it contribute to our peace, or does the refusal to sell weapons tend to keep us out of the war?

As the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] said, we cannot become the arsenal for one belligerent without becoming the target for the other. We found that literally true in the World War. By giving up our neutral position, taking sides, furnishing arms, ammunition, and implements of war to England and France, to the exclusion of Germany, we will bring the war to our very shores. We are inviting disaster, and it is reasonable to believe that the results will be the same as they were in 1915. May we hope that Germany will stand idly by and permit these shipments of arms to her enemies, without reprisals? Or will she send her submarines to our very shores and seek to inflict upon us the same reprisals she did in the World War? Will it not again result in the destruction of American lives and our entry in this war, a repetition of 1917?

Is it not logical that Germany will take the position our own Secretary of State took in writing to the German Ambassador on April 27, 1915, expounding our own official neutrality doctrine. when the Secretary of State said:

> This Government holds * * * in view of the present indisputable doctrine of accepted international law, that any change in its own laws of neutrality during the progress of a war which would affect unequally the relations of the United States with the nations at war would be an unjustified departure from the principles of strict neutrality by which it has consistently sought to direct its actions.

This position, taken by our own Government, is upheld by the leading authorities on international law. Professors Charles Cheney Hyde and Philip C. Jessup, of Columbia University, on September 20, 1939, in a letter to the editor of the New York Times, in discussing this question, said:

> The question of the hour is whether the United States is today, with its present neutrality law on the books, free, under the law of nations, to remove embargoes in order to help the enemies of Germany. It is believed that the United States has not been free since September 3.

What is our purpose in this undertaking? Is it to protect America and to keep this Nation at peace, to keep it on the road of genuine neutrality, even though at the cost of economic sacrifices? Or is our purpose to aid England and France, regardless of the consequences—to take the steps that in 1914 to 1917 led us into war, for the avowed purpose of giving aid to one group of belligerents? If that is our purpose, and if it is our duty to fly to the aid of England and France, we should indeed repeal the arms embargo, which, as Secretary Hull said, was designed to keep us out of war.

If indeed we are convinced that England and France are engaged in a great moral crusade, that they are fighting our battle, that they are again seeking to make the world safe for democracy, that our first line of defense is on the Rhine, that they are engaged in a war to end war, and that we should go to their aid, then should we not go the whole way? Can we be half in and half out? Let us not take the first step unless we are willing to take the other steps which will surely follow. Let us keep all the way out or go all the way in. There is no middle ground. If it is our fight, which I do not believe it is, and therefore we should go to the aid of England and France, we should not do so with any sordid motives of seeking to profit by the transaction. The cash and carry is a merchandising scheme. Crusades are not fought that way. Our liberty was not purchased that way. If the die is cast, the fight is ours, the crusade is on, and we are partners in the conflict, let us take up the battle in earnest, not with cash registers for profit only, but with guns and men to win our war. As the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] said in this House:

> If this be our destiny, then let us now highly resolve that we shall accept it; but let us accept it courageously, boldly, manfully, with our eyes open. Let us solemnly resolve now to plunge this Nation into this new conflict.
>
> Let us once again become the savior of Europe, the hero of aspiring minorities, the champion of self-determination. Let us wage war again to preserve Europe and make the world safe for democracy. Let us wage war to end war. Then let us resolve that within a quarter of a century we shall do it all over again, and again, and again, until hatred, greed, racial and linguistic animosity and economic desires, ambitions, and covetousness shall have been removed from the European cauldron of war.
>
> In short, let us highly resolve to continue to do so in perpetuity, and let us devise and bequeath that burden to our posterity, so that they, too, may periodically renew the conflict and join the battle, the burden of America, our destiny.

For my own part, I cannot subscribe to this doctrine. It is not our war. We should keep out. America's destiny lies in other paths—paths of peace, not war. The embargo against the sale of arms and munitions was a humanitarian measure. Its purpose was to keep us out of war and not to further the prosecution of wars. Our experience under the operation of the act has not shown it to be ineffective. No arguments have been advanced justifying our surrender of neutrality and the taking of a partisan position. We should not enter the power politics of the Old World. There is no moral crusade involved. The same issues are present in this war as in the wars of old. It is a question of balance of power, territory, and raw materials. It is not a contest in which we here in the Western Hemisphere are directly concerned. It is the same old European war. It is not an American war. It involves no issues vital to our welfare. It is interesting to note a news item which appeared in the Hartford Courant, dated October 29, 1764, 175 years ago. It reads:

> PARIS, August 10, 1764.—Within these last 3 days no less than 18 different couriers have been dispatched to Madrid. All is hurry and confusion at Versailles. Expresses are every moment sent to the different seaports; and if some whispers are to be credited, we are on the eve of a new rupture with the most formidable of our neighbors. This, and the distractions which are but too justly apprehended in Poland, threaten to deluge Europe afresh with blood, and throws an uncommon air of dejection over this metropolis, which was just beginning to recruit from the miseries of the late war.

The same controversy of 175 years ago is being repeated today.

I call attention to the compilation of the wars in which England and France have been engaged in the last 150 years, as set forth in an editorial of the Seattle Star of July 10, 1939. From this it is shown that during this period of 150 years, England was engaged in 54 wars lasting 102 years, or 68 percent of the time, and France was engaged in 53 wars, lasting 99 years, or 66 percent of the time.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the permission of the House to extend in the RECORD at this point a list of these wars in which England and France have engaged in the last century and a half.

The list is as follows:

WARS OF ENGLAND

1778–81	First Mahratta war.
1776–83	North American (and with France).
1780–84	War with Netherlands.
1793–1802	Revolutionary war (with France).
1782–84	First Mysore war.
1790–92	Second Mysore war.
1803–14	War with France.
1815	Hundred Days War (Waterloo).
1801	War with Denmark.
1802–6	Second Mahratta war.
1806	Sepoy revolt.
1810–12	War with Sweden.
1807–12	War with Russia.
1812–15	War with United States.
1814–17	Goorkha war.
1817–18	Third Mahratta war.
1824–25	First Burma war.
1824–25	Ashanti war.
1826	Burma war.
1826	Intervention in Portugal.

WARS OF ENGLAND—continued

1827	War with Turkey.
1832	Intervention in Netherlands.
1838–42	War with Afghanistan.
1840–42	War with China.
1840–41	Egyptian insurrection.
1843–49	Sikh wars.
1845	Intervention in Uruguay.
1845–56	Intervention in Argentina.
1851–52	Kaffir war.
1852–53	Second Burma war.
1854–56	War with Russia.
1856–57	War with Persia.
1856–60	War with China.
1857–58	Mutiny of the Sepoys in India.
1863–64	Ashanti war.
1863–69	Maori war.
1867–68	War with Abyssinia.
1874	Ashanti war.
1878–80	War with Afghanistan.
1879	Zulu war.
1880–81	War in Transvaal.
1881–85	War of the Sudan.
1882–84	Occupation of Egypt.
1885–89	Third Burma war.
1895–96	Ashanti war.
1896–99	War of the Sudan.
1897–98	Intervention in Crete.
1899–1902	Boer war.
1900	Boxer Insurrection.
1901–2	Somali war.
1903–5	Tibet expedition.
1908	War on the northwestern boundary of India.
1914–18	World War.
1919	Afghan war.

(Total for 150 years: 54 wars, lasting 102 years, or 68 percent.)

WARS OF FRANCE

1779–83	War with England (North American).
1792–97	First Coalition War (against Dutch, Rhenish, Italians, Spanish).
1789–1800	Second Coalition War.
1793–1802	War with England.
1793–96	War in Vendee.
1795–1802	Egyptian Expedition of Napoleon.
1791–1802	Insurrection in San Domingo.
1805	Third Coalition War.
1806–07	War with Russia and Prussia.
1809	War with Austria.
1803–14	War with England.
1808–14	War with Spain.
1812	War with Russia.
1813–14	War Against German States (Hundred Days War—Waterloo).
1823	Spanish Expedition.
1827	War with Turkey.
1832	War with Holland.
1834	War with Portugal.
1829	War on Madagascar.
1845	War on Madagascar.
1838–39	War in Mexico.
1830–47	War in Algeria.
1838–40	War in Argentina.
1847	War in Cochin China.
1849	Roman Expedition.
1843–44	War with Morocco.
1845	Expedition to Uruguay.
1854–56	Crimean War.
1859	Austro-Italian War.
1862–64	War with China.
1857–62	War with Annam.
1860	Syrian War.
1861–62	Cochin-Chinese War.
1861–67	War in Mexico.
1860–61	War for Papal State.
1870–71	Franco-Prussian War.
1873–74	War in Tonkin.
1867	War in Rome (against Garibaldi).
1883–85	War with Tonkin.
1884–85	War with China.
1894	War with Tonkin.
1883–85	War on Madagascar.
1895–97	War on Madagascar.
1881–82	War on Tunis.
1893–94	War on Morocco.
1890–92	War on Dahomey.
1890–94	War on Sudan.
1893	War on Siam.
1900	Boxer Insurrection.
1907–12	War on Morocco.
1914–18	World War.
1925–26	Riffian War.

(Total for 150 years: 53 wars, lasting 99 years, or 66 percent.)

An examination of the wars in which these two nations—England and France—have been engaged brings most forcibly to our minds the motives which actuated Jefferson, Washington, and Monroe when they laid down our foreign policy, which we have followed all through the years, with the exception of the one time we cast it aside to enter the World War in an endeavor to settle the controversies of Europe and make the whole world safe for democracy. It is as true today as it was when Washington said:

> Why quit our own to stand upon foreign ground? Why, by interweaving our destiny with that of any part of Europe, entangle our peace and prosperity in the toils of European ambition, rivalship, interest, humor, or caprice?
>
> The nation which indulges toward another a habitual hatred or a habitual fondness is in some degree a slave.
>
> It is a slave to its animosity or its affection, either of which is sufficient to lead it astray from its duty and its interest.

Thomas Jefferson said:

> Our first and fundamental maxim should be never to entangle ourselves in the broils of Europe; our second, never to suffer Europe to intermeddle with cis-Atlantic affairs.

President Monroe wrote:

> In the wars of the European powers in matters relating to themselves we have never taken part, nor does it comport with our policy to do so. * * * Our policy in regard to Europe, which was adopted at an early stage of the wars which have so long agitated that quarter of the globe, remains the same, which is not to interfere in the internal concerns of any of its powers; to consider the government de facto as the legitimate government for us; to cultivate friendly relations with it, and to preserve those relations by a frank, firm, and manly policy.

Daniel Webster, referring to this foreign policy adopted by our young Republic for the purpose of keeping us out of European embroilments, said:

> Sir, I look on the message of December 1823 as forming a bright page in our history. I will help neither to erase it nor tear it out; nor shall it be, by any act of mine, blurred or blotted.

While England and France throughout the years have been engaged in many wars, many of them wars of conquest, we also appreciate the contribution they have made and are now making to civilization. For my own part, my decision in this momentous question now before us will not in any way be governed or influenced by my sympathies with any of the warring nations. We all want to see the democracies throughout the world prevail. We want to see our own ideals of government and justice preserved. We hate dictators. We loathe wars of aggression. We would like to see the nations of the Old World cast off their dictatorial regimes and restore to the peoples of their countries the liberty which we cherish and enjoy. But our duty is at home. We must do the thing that will bring peace and security to America and protect our democracy. We cannot jeopardize that in a futile effort to adjust the ideologies of the Old World, and attempt to force at the point of a gun or bayonet upon the peoples of the Old World our theories of government. They must work out their own destinies, as did we. The responsibility is theirs, not ours.

We want to help them, by our own example, but we cannot convert them to our ideals through war. And I most sincerely believe that we should not attempt to control the destinies of our foreign neighbors by furnishing the sinews of war—death-dealing arms, munitions, and poison gas—that one or more of these neighbor countries may blot out the others.

The proponents of repeal counsel that we should give up this policy which we have followed for 150 years of keeping aloof from foreign entanglements.

They contend that our America, being one of the family of nations, cannot live apart from the world but must join with the foreign nations in resisting aggression and in stamping out injustice and in giving protection to the weaker nations which are being preyed upon by the stronger, that we have a moral duty to perform. I do not believe our moral duty requires us to sell guns, bombs, and poison gas. We joined with the Allies in the World War. It indeed was a crusade to end all wars and to make the world safe for democracy. We now realize how impotent we were to bring about that most desirable objective. Instead of preserving democracy it has completely disappeared from most of the nations of the Old World, and indeed our own democracy would be imperiled by another such conflict. Should we again enter the lists in an endeavor to correct the ills of the

Old World and to bring to their knees the nations now opposing the Allies in the present conflict, we will again learn to our sorrow that our efforts would be misspent. We would only have left bitter memories of bloody battlefields, broken and maimed bodies, wasted lives, and back-breaking taxes and a bankrupt treasury. It is believed America's destiny is to make America safe for democracy and to prove to the whole world that our democracy will work, and by our example and our endeavor help to maintain the peace of the world. Let us keep out of this hotbed of European disputes and seek to solve our own domestic problems.

Another reason advanced by those favoring repeal is that we should develop our trade with foreign nations, particularly with England and France, and to that end should sell arms, munitions, and implements of war, including poison gas, on a cash-and-carry basis, in order to put to work our unemployed and help restore prosperity. It is reasoned that we should not send the materials abroad from which arms, munitions, and implements of war are made, but should make these materials into instruments of war here in our own factories and sell them to England and France and thus give American labor employment. Even the President himself in his message to the Congress on September 21, said:

> From a purely material point of view, what is the advantage to us in sending all manner of articles across the ocean for final processing there when we could give employment to thousands by doing it here.

In the other body it was proposed to impose an embargo against the sale of poison gas and flame throwers. The administration forces, however, overwhelmingly defeated this proposal, giving notice to the world that America, in order to reap profits, is willing to manufacture and furnish to the warring nations of the Old World these most inhuman instrumentalities of death to be visited upon innocent children, women, and other civilians, as well as those actually engaged in warfare. It may be freely admitted that we have many unemployed—perhaps 10,000,000 at the present time. And we have many millions on relief and seeking aid from our Government. However, it is inconceivable that America, a Christian nation, presumably with high ideals and humanitarian instincts, should, in order to make a profit and to furnish jobs to our own people, manufacture and sell these inhuman instrumentalities of death to foreign countries, with which to snuff out the lives of their victims. It should be remembered in considering the proposed inhibition against the sale of poison gas and flame throwers that under this amendment, if adopted, all the nations may buy this nefarious stuff from us. We will be unable to foretell who will be the victims of its use. If the embargo on arms is repealed and we are drawn into the war, our own bombs, shrapnel, and poison gas may be turned upon our own people. General Pershing said with respect to it:

> Chemical warfare should be abolished among nations as abhorrent to civilization. It is cruel, unfair, and improper use of science. It is fraught with the gravest danger to noncombatants, and demoralizes the better instincts of humanity.

The Washington Arms Conference, in 1922, upon the proposal of our own country, adopted a proposition against the use of poison gas and other similar materials. The section reads:

> The use in war of asphyxiating, poisoning, or other gases, and all analogous liquids, materials, or devices, having been justly condemned by the general opinion of the civilized world, and a prohibition of such use having been declared in treaties to which a majority of the civilized powers are parties, the signatory powers to the end that this prohibition shall be universally accepted as a part of international law binding alike the conscience and practice of nations declare their assent to such prohibitions, agree to be bound thereby as between themselves, and invite all other civilized nations to adhere thereto.

If this House approves this measure, as this and other wars progress, the news will be brought to us and to the world that great groups of soldiers and civilians, men, women, and children have been struck down and brought to an excruciating death by means of poisonous gases, bombs, and shrapnel furnished by America. We cannot, I hope, take much satisfaction from these reports, even though we know that jobs have been furnished to some of our unemployed in manufacturing these devilish instrumentalities of death, and that our manufacturers and munitions makers have increased their bank accounts by profits made therefrom.

The following portrayal of a Kansas editor is significant in this connection:

> I don't want to get poison gas in my lungs. I don't want a piece of shrapnel in my stomach. I don't want my legs riddled by machine-gun bullets. I don't want maggots crawling in my brains that have been laid open by a splinter from an aerial bomb. I don't want to die. I am 37 and want to live. I hate those who have brought the United States closer to war today than it was in 1915. I wasn't old enough to fight then, but I was old enough to watch the war hysteria being aroused until it tempted the United States into a ruthless struggle for power in Europe. And I was old enough to see what it cost then and since.

Furthermore, it is conceded that by building up a war boom in the sale of arms and munitions we are only providing a temporary relief, and in the end an economic crash is sure to follow, leaving our industrial and economic structure prostrate as it was following the crash after the last World War.

Mr. Speaker, America can play a significant part in world affairs. It can do so, however, not through the sale of arms, munitions, and instrumentalities of war, and particularly poison gas and flame throwers, but by helping the world to discard war as an instrumentality for settling disputes between nations, and to return to the conference table. Should we not help to outlaw war rather than attempt to further our own economic interests by resort to world traffic in war materials? Is it not better by far that we follow the advice of our forbears and refrain from entering into involvements with power politics of the Old World, and mind our own business, and seek, by mutual cooperation and good will to secure and retain the respect and confidence of all the nations of the world, and to maintain a neutral position in their quarrels and to seek to help as a good neighbor rather than in the role of an enemy and a combatant, purveying instrumentalities of death? Should not America, as a Christian Nation, in this critical hour of its existence, turn from wars in Europe to peace in America?

Rather than furnish lethal weapons, poison gas, and liquid flame to our neighbors overseas with which to visit death and destruction upon their enemies would it not be more fitting for America to heed the supplications of the following prayer which in times past has gone forth from many of the pulpits of America to Him who charts our courses and directs our destinies?

> O God, break Thou the spell of the enchantments that make the nations drunk with the lust of battle and draw them on as willing tools of death. Grant us a quiet and steadfast mind when our own nation clamors for vengeance or oppression. Strengthen our sense of justice and our regard for the equal worth of other peoples and races. Grant to the rulers of the nations faith in the possibility of peace through justice, and grant to the common people a new and stern enthusiasm for the cause of peace. Bless our soldiers and sailors for their swift obedience and their willingness to answer the call of duty, but inspire them none the less with a hatred for war, and may they never for love of private glory or advancement provoke its coming. May our young men still rejoice to die for their country with the valor of their fathers, but teach our age noble methods of matching our strength and more effective ways of giving our life for the flag.
>
> O Thou strong Father of all nations, draw all Thy great family together with an increasing sense of our common blood and destiny, that peace may come on earth at last, and Thy sun may shed its light rejoicing in a holy brotherhood of peoples.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LANDIS] as much time as he may desire.

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, now that Europe is back again at its 1,100-year-old job of war, the primary job of the United States is to keep out of that war. In defending the present neutrality law in 1936, President Roosevelt said:

> We are not isolationists except insofar as we seek to isolate ourselves against war.

We, who are opposed to the repeal of the arms embargo, agree with the President's 1936 statement. We are not isolationists. We are simply against entangling ourselves in Europe's war.

If Great Britain, France, and Germany had waited until 1943 to open hostilities, it would have been exactly 1,100 years since the foundation was laid for today's European war, by the treaty at Verdun in 843. Charlemagne had conquered and ruled as one kingdom what is now Italy, France, and Germany. But following his death and the death of his son, Louis the Debonair, Charlemagne's three grandsons, Lothaire, Charles the Bald, and Louis the German, began fighting for the rule of that kingdom.

Finally, after Louis and Charles had defeated Lothaire, the grandsons signed the Treaty of Verdun, dividing Charlemagne's kingdom. Charles the Bald took France; Louis took Germany; and Lothaire was given Italy and the central Frankish lands which today are known as Alsace-Lorraine. Thus began modern Germany, France, Italy, and the recurrently disputed Alsace-Lorraine and the rich Saar Basin.

Surely a war which began almost 600 years before Columbus discovered America does not call for interference by the United States. Let us look at what has happened during these 1,100 years since the Treaty of Verdun. The world has seen Frederick Barbarossa cross the Alps and subdue Italy; Joan of Arc burned at the stake by the English; Louis XIV invade, seize, and hold lands from the Atlantic to beyond the Rhine; Napoleon of France crush both Austria and Germany, march across Poland to the east, to be checked only by Russia's own destruction of Moscow and by the severe winter. The world has seen Frederick the Great, Catherine of Russia, Bismarck of Germany, and Disraeli of England set up what each was pleased to call a balance of power, meaning that a small buffer state, such as Poland, Rumania, or Austria, was to be used to checkmate the bloody moves of the greater powers. But corruption and greed crept in and unbalanced the scales. So the World War came.

With the Treaty of Versailles, there was another attempt to restore the balance of power. But the treaty makers overloaded the scales with unnatural frontiers and uneconomic divisions. This September the scales toppled over, and there is another European war—just a continuation of the 1,100-year struggle.

No wonder that in his Farewell Address George Washington warned us:

> Europe has a set of primary interests, which to us have none or a very remote relation. Hence, she must be engaged in frequent controversies, the causes of which are essentially foreign to our concerns.

Washington, knowing history, saw the European situation clearly. Saw it as we should see it today. And because Europe's wars are "essentially foreign to our concerns," I, Mr. Speaker, will oppose any and every attempt to drag this country into them. It is my belief that if we repeal the arms embargo we will be dragged into this conflict.

I want America to remain neutral and impartial. I do not want America to take sides and fight. America has no interest in that old quarrel. The United States received nothing from the World War but a several-billion-dollar war debt, thousands of wounded young men, and shiploads of flag-draped coffins.

Arguments for the repeal of the arms embargo are that England and France need our arms, ammunition, and implements of war; that such purchases by these countries will bring prosperity to us. I believe that England and France can supply themselves with arms, ammunition, and implements of war and do so as cheaply as they can buy of the United States. During the World War the Allies had plenty of such supplies. In fact, they furnished the American troops with cannon and airplanes. Not an American cannon fired a shell over the front line, very few American airplanes flew over an enemy trench.

It is true that if the belligerents should all buy from the United States it would create a temporary prosperity, but it would be a false prosperity. A few years after each war ends there is always a financial depression. That was true after the War of 1812, the Napoleonic wars, the Mexican War, the Civil War, the Spanish-American War, and the recent World War. Munition plants that boom during war days must be dismantled when war ends. Airplane factories that build machines for war purposes must be closed when there is no need for planes of this type. And the balloon of false prosperity will be exploded. Men will be thrown out of work and again we will have bread lines, want, and distress. A few will have made millions of dollars. The last World War created 22,000 new millionaires. Millions of average Americans will feel the pinch of hard times, because wartime high prices will prevent their putting aside any of the wartime high wages.

Of course, we know that those who will make money out of the war will not be those who will make the supreme sacrifice if America is drawn into the present European struggle. War mongers, munition manufacturers, and international bankers seldom die on the battlefield. They usually die in bed, surrounded by doctors, nurses, and the comforts of home. But has it come to a point where average America must raise a crop of boys every 20 years to be slaughtered in Europe? In 1917–18 President Wilson told us we were going "to war to end all wars." Yet here is another crop of boys and here is another war to slaughter them, if we permit it.

Let America be an example to the world that a great nation can remain at peace with all the world. Little Switzerland, Holland, and Denmark remained neutral in the last war. They are doing the same in this war. If such small nations find it possible to remain at peace when their back porches overlook the French and German battlefields, surely the United States, over 3,000 miles away, can keep her young men off these same battlefields.

It is not true that our foreign trade will suffer and that labor will lose its wages if we do not repeal the arms embargo. We need not sell arms, ammunition, and implements of war to the quarreling nations. Instead let us sell trucks, automobiles, food, and other nonmilitary supplies in accordance with the present neutrality law, but sell these supplies on a cash-and-carry basis. Our factories will continue to run and our farms continue to produce. We will have a healthy market. We will sell all that the world requires of us. But the truth is that the world, at peace, has required only 7 percent of our produce. We consume 93 percent of all we produce. Hence an increase of over 7 percent—7 cents of every dollar—is, for us, the difference between war and peace. The question then is, Shall we be satisfied with our normal 7 cents on the dollar or shall we attempt to double the amount with arms, ammunition, and implements of war, and in that attempt permit America to be drawn into the European conflict?

I feel that I know the heart of labor, and I am satisfied that not a laboring man wants wages that are to be blood money. Not a laboring man wants to sell his son or the son of his neighbor into the European war for a doubtful increase over the normal 7-percent export trade that America does in peacetimes. Not a laboring man wants to run the risk of the danger of possible sabotage in our munitions plants. Such sabotage could well be the signal for an uprising of all radical elements in America, and we would have a war right here at home—a war quite as horrible as the recent civil war in Spain.

Instead of repealing our present arms embargo let us merely put some teeth into the act. Let us invest in Congress and Congress alone the power to make any decision which might lead to war. Let Congress define all combat areas. That is a power which could easily irk one side and please the other. If American citizens or American vessels insist on traveling among the belligerents, let them understand that they do so at their own risk.

Keeping all these things in mind, shall we then tie our own hands with "help Europe" schemes? Shall we entangle ourselves in Europe's eleven-hundred-year-old quarrel?

I am a veteran of the World War and I fervently believe that we should never again soak Europe's soil with American blood. Let us not scrap our present neutrality law—passed almost unanimously by Congress in the calm of peacetime—

and designed to keep this country out of war. Let us have an army, navy, and air force sufficiently strong to protect our borders from aggression, and then let us stay at home, keep out of all wars, and enjoy the American way of life without foreign entanglements. [Applause.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HARTLEY] as much time as he may desire.

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Speaker, since the President called Congress to special session for the purpose of changing our Neutrality Act, I have received thousands of letters, cards, petitions, and wires on both sides of this most important and controversial issue. I have read every communication sent to me. Never have I given more intensive study and consideration to a problem, for I consider this to be the most vital issue to have faced the Congress during my 12 years as a Member of that body. While I have specialized in other fields during my service in Congress, I believe that the study I have given to this question justifies the positive stand that I have taken.

I regret exceedingly that there are those among my correspondents who felt that I would yield to political pressure, or that I could be intimidated by threats to annihilate me politically.

This problem is far too grave to be affected by political consideration, and, without attempting to be dramatic, may I say I would resign my job before I would vote on this problem contrary to the dictates of my conscience.

This issue, stripped of all excess verbiage, is: Shall the United States supply the belligerents in the current World War with arms, munitions, and all other implements of war? And in a practical sense, in view of the Allies' mastery of the seas, it means shall we change our Neutrality Act so as to become the arsenal of the so-called democracies?

To this end we are being subjected to the same propaganda methods that dragged us into the last World War and continued in relation to the questions of the foreign debts, the World Court, and other European power diplomacy objectives.

Between 1914 and 1917 this campaign to embroil us in war reached its zenith. Recall, for they will now be repeated, the atrocity stories, terrifying in every detail, since proved in large measure to be without authentic foundation. Remember the great moral issue that was drawn at that time between democracy and autocracy. "Save the world for democracy." "Fight a war to end all wars." Recall the appeals to our self-interest:

If you do not fight this enemy of democracy on European soil, you will have to fight it in America.

Remember the flood of trained lecturers who overran the country delivering these very same arguments.

The results that followed are well known. We lost the lives of 126,000 of our finest American boys, tens of thousands more wounded, permanently maimed, disabled, or bereft of reason.

I ask you to take a trip to any veterans' hospital and see these human wrecks of the last World War. Place yourself in my position. Would you cast any vote—I am not even going to say that will—that may involve this Nation in another European war.

The last war has cost us over $64,000,000,000 to date. And we have not finished paying the bills yet.

We fed Europe's starving millions and we loaned them billions, and now we cannot even collect the interest, let alone the principal. Instead, they called us "Uncle Shylock," giving living proof of the old Shakespearean adage, "A loan oft loses both itself and friend."

We also made 23,000 new millionaires in the United States through World War profiteering. The big fellows who make huge profits in wars are anxious to get in the game again. I am opposed to giving these merchants of death a chance to pile up their millions as they did before.

Today history is repeating itself.

The propagandists have already started to work as they did in the World War years, disseminating the same fallacies calculated to lead us into another world inferno.

Let me allude to some of the principal fallacies. They will have a familiar ring. Perhaps you have unconsciously been impressed by some of these specious arguments which have already flooded the country.

First and foremost, now that war rages in Europe, they say the United States will not be able to keep out of it. This argument rests on the false premise that we are bound to take sides with the so-called democracies. Otherwise they predict democracy will be destroyed in the world, and we will be the next marked for extinction; our trade, commerce, and financial relationships would be decimated by the victorious, ruthless dictators. Such assertions assume that if we do not fight in Europe we will be forced to fight here. The answer to this fallacy is plain. If we must fight in self-defense, by all means let us be prepared to make a fight that will insure a smashing defeat of our aggressors. Let us build an Army, Navy, and Air Force not only adequate for our protection but that will command the respect and forbearance of the world. Let us spend billions for self-defense but not one penny to send American boys to death on foreign soil.

Secondly, the claim will be made by these propagandists that we have an obligation to assist Britain and France in their so-called defense of democracy against totalitarianism by every means short of war. There are those who proclaim that civilization is at stake. Well, if such be the case, it should be our role not merely to supply arms and munitions for others who dare to fight, but to give these defenders of civilization the full support of all our resources, including our manpower. To assume any other position would be an act of cowardice. However, I do not for a moment conceive that this is a war of ideology. It is but another page in the bloody history of Europe's continuous fight for the balance of power. Our experience in 1918 should be sufficient proof that this new quarrel is none of our business. I do not believe we can be half in and half out. We should go all the way in or stay all the way out, and I prefer the latter.

I have my sympathies and you have yours, but I conceive that during my 16 years of public life I have never had a more serious or solemn obligation to my countrymen than that which confronts me now—the solemn duty and grave responsibility of keeping America from participating in the present European war.

I do not approach neutrality from the standpoint of being pro-anybody except pro-keeping America out of war. My ancestors came from the British Isles, but I hold no brief for any government apart from the American Government and the American people. I am a sincere believer, as most Americans are, in the American system of individual liberty, free enterprise, and constitutional rights of freedom of religious worship.

With strange inconsistency, it seems to me, the administration recommends that our ships be barred from war zones, loans to both sides forbidden, our citizens prohibited from travel in war areas—may I add that I am in full accord to this point—indeed, every effort save one would be strained to effectuate an appearance of neutrality. Militantly, however, they demand in the name of neutrality one reservation; that one thing is the most dangerous, the most certain to result in trouble; namely, furnishing arms, munitions, and materials of war to the belligerents of one side.

Furnishing one side with the deadly weapons of war is the most definite sort of favoritism, the rankest unneutrality. Does anyone contend that we improve and strengthen our neutrality by supplying either or both sides with tanks, gas, guns, ammunition, and other implements of war with which to kill each other?

To my mind, it is unthinkable that we can escape involvement in the European war, and at the same time advocate intervention. It is real intervention to threaten before or during a war to sell death-dealing instruments to one of the belligerents.

If we start selling munitions on a cash-and-carry basis, and build up a huge industry with only two consumers, this is what is going to happen:

When the cash runs out, rather than lose our customers and dislocate our domestic business structure by allowing the munitions industry to collapse, we will substitute credit for cash.

The next step will be to make loans to the Allies, to protect the credit that has been advanced.

And then, finally, we will send American boys overseas again, just as we did in 1917. That would be a terrible mistake.

Once we set our feet on that path, the result is inevitable. First, make war profits from cash sales, then give credit, then make loans, then send men. You doubt that? Well let me give you a little history from the last war.

During the World War we sold munitions, at first for cash only. The State Department at first declared that to extend credits would be unneutral. The munitions industry was enlarged to meet demands. Only the Allies, who controlled the seas, could buy. Allied cash gave out. Financial interests brought pressure on the State Department for permission to extend credits.

The President authorized Secretary Lansing to give bankers—without quoting him—the "impression" they were free to extend credits. Credits became exhausted. Secretary of the Treasury McAdoo wrote the President—

> To maintain our prosperity, we must finance it.

The President then authorized Lansing to convey "orally" to the bankers the opinion that the Government would take no action if loans were extended. The Allies were threatened with defeat. Our Ambassador to England cabled to the President:

> Perhaps our going to war is the only way in which our present prominent trade position can be maintained and a panic averted.

We went to war.

This experience of the last World War shows that the present proposal to put arms and munitions on a cash-and-carry basis means that once more we take the first step down the road to war. To me it is shocking that the issue has been so posed in Washington that Members of Congress have to choose between the repeal of the arms embargo and a system of cash and carry.

Why is it that no one on the other side of this issue does not want to apply cash and carry to everything except arms and munitions? Less than 2 years ago Senator PITTMAN, the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, stated:

> No one can seriously oppose the imposition of an embargo upon the export of arms, ammunition, and implements of war to belligerents.

Surely the sale of arms and munitions does not strengthen our neutrality.

To the contrary, I charge that the proposed changes are unneutral and deliberately designed to aid Britain and France.

And, this, I repeat, is the first step we are taking to war. I am not among those who believe our frontiers extend to the Rhine.

Is there anyone who will deny that every plant in the United States making arms and munitions will immediately become a target? Do you remember the Black Tom, Kingsland, and Morgan explosions during the last war?

Are we not inviting retaliation?

Picture several booming munitions plants blown up, hundreds of workmen killed. The passions of our people aroused by skillful propaganda. Do you think we will be able to resist the temptation to get into war?

That is the situation invited by the cash and carry of arms and ammunitions.

Cash and carry is of itself a subterfuge. This war cannot be carried out on a cash basis.

At this point I desire to read from a statement by President Roosevelt delivered at Chautauqua, N. Y., on August 14, 1936. Please keep in mind that he was discussing our present Neutrality Act:

> It is clear that our present policy and the measures passed by the Congress would, in the event of war, reduce war profits which would otherwise accrue to American citizens.
>
> Industrial and agricultural productions for a war market may give immense fortunes to a few men; for the Nation as a whole it produces disaster.
>
> Nevertheless, if war should break out again in another continent, let us not blink the fact that we would find in this country thousands of Americans who, seeking immediate riches—fool's gold—would attempt to break down or evade our neutrality.
>
> They will tell you—and, unfortunately, their views will get wide publicity—that if they could produce and ship this and that and the other to belligerent nations the unemployed of America would all find work.
>
> If we face the choice of profits or peace, the Nation will answer—must answer—"We choose peace."

Those were the President's sentiments in 1936. They are mine today.

I know that if and when America goes to war democracy will die in America as it is dying in Europe, and the day of its resurrection will be long postponed.

I believe that if we will we can keep America out of this war. It will require courage, determination, and planning for peace. It will require that we seek our prosperity in peace trade and in supplying the needs of our own people, not by trying to coin other people's blood into our gold.

We are a peaceful people. The plain people of America ardently desire the opportunity under the protection and guidance of their own benevolent Government to find some secure basis for the employment of their abilities, their talents, their labors—to live like normal Americans of generations past, to work, to marry, to raise their children in prosperity and peace. This is their modest appeal to their public officials. I, for one, do not intend to fail them.

America should be ready for any eventuality, however remote, which threatens the security of our ideals and institutions in the future; be prepared to meet any enemy, or any combinations of enemies which may seek to undermine or overthrow our American Government. When the time comes to fight, and it well may, whether it be nazi-ism, communism, or any other ism or power, in defense of American soil, American principles, and aspirations of freedom, equality, and justice, let us be equipped to annihilate such aggressors. Till that day comes, while making ready for any challenge to our rights, let us be tolerant of others, neutral in word and deed, repel all smooth talk or propaganda hostile to our safety, and continue ceaselessly to work to avert war and preserve peace.

As a Member of Congress I conceive it to be my duty to think and act in terms of the well-being of the United States first, last, and always.

I want no vote of mine to cause the youth of America to shoulder a gun in someone else's quarrel.

I want no vote of mine to help create a new generation of Gold Star Mothers.

In closing, may I utter this fervent prayer—that the Congress will, in its wisdom and mature consideration of this grave problem, prevent future generations from condemning or indicting us as having betrayed the trust imposed in us by the American people.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDRESEN].

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I am not surprised at the confusion which exists among the Members of this House and throughout the country over what has taken place here in Congress and in many parts of the world. I marvel somewhat at both American and British diplomacy. England is selling material and war supplies to Russia so that Russia can send those supplies to Germany to kill English soldiers. The President of the United States declared an embargo on the shipment of war supplies to England, Germany, France, Canada, Australia, the British possessions, and Poland. Russia joined Germany in crushing Poland with war supplies furnished by the United States and Great Britain. We have no embargo against the shipment of war supplies to Russia. For the last 18 months the people of this country have tried to get the President to exercise his discretionary power by stopping the shipment of war supplies to Japan so as to end the war in China, but he has refused to do so.

We hear some expressions of alarm today on the part of Members on the majority side about Russia. Mr. Speaker, this measure as it has come over from the Senate is not intended to affect Russia in any manner, either through the United States Government or through Great Britain, because

the administration intends to continue shipping war supplies to Russia as can be done today under a license from the Secretary of State, authorized by the President, and England intends to do likewise.

Now, maybe I am expressing my ignorance here today when I say I cannot understand the diplomacy of either England or the United States. I favor protecting our American ships and our American citizens. I favor the cash-and-carry plan if it is a cash-and-carry plan.

My colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] offered an amendment, and I am supporting that amendment; and I shall speak in behalf of it at this time.

The best reason for the adoption of the amendment was the argument made by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STEAGALL] and also by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN]. The amendment will surely make clear that the Federal Government, through any of its agencies, cannot extend credits to the belligerent nations. Of course, the gentleman from Alabama tried to make it perfectly plain that they could not do it under existing law and that there was no power whatsoever for them to extend credits to these belligerent nations. There are always, I would say, woodchucks in every woodpile, and there is a joker in this woodpile.

In order to make the cash-and-carry provisions of the bill effective, these belligerents will come to the United States for munitions and they are supposed to pay cash "on the barrel head," as the President said. Now, the President does not care where they get the cash, just so they pay the cash for the munitions and other supplies they are able to buy. He does not say they cannot go to the stabilization fund in the Treasury to get the cash. He does not say they cannot go to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation or other governmental agencies or even to the Federal Reserve System.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] seeks to make plain and clear that neither the stabilization fund nor the Federal Reserve nor any other Government agency can extend credit or make dollar exchange available to any belligerent nation.

Now, the gentlemen say this cannot be done anyway. Let us see what Mr. Morgenthau said about it when he appeared before the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures last spring, when he was asking for authority to continue the stabilization fund. He said:

> There also are occasions when rate between the dollar and the currency of a country with small gold holdings is subjected to pressure because of unfavorable political or economic developments. The fund can be employed, and has occasionally been employed in such circumstances, to help stabilize the dollar exchange.
>
> For example, our arrangement with China was just such an operation. There was strong pressure against the dollar-yuan exchange, and China needed dollars in order to strengthen the dollar-yuan exchange rate, thus avoiding additional obstacles to our trade. To eliminate any risk of exchange loss, China agreed to repurchase the yuan at the same rate at which the United States purchased them, and China's promise was backed by adequate gold and silver collateral which was kept on deposit with Federal Reserve banks.
>
> An arrangement of like character was made with Brazil in 1937, but, owing to subsequent developments, the arrangement was not utilized.
>
> A similar arrangement was made with Mexico. We purchased Mexican pesos and in exchange made dollars available. Again, as in the case of China, the Mexican Government agreed to repurchase the pesos at the price we paid for them and deposited adequate collateral with the Federal Reserve banks.

Here is how they propose to work it. When these belligerent countries run out of money and cannot pay cash on the barrel head, they will make an arrangement with Mr. Morgenthau, through his stabilization fund, to sell British pounds or French francs to him. Then they will make an agreement with him that they are to repurchase those francs or pounds at the end of the war for the same price that he paid for them, and then he will provide dollar exchange for the belligerent nations so that they may buy their munitions and other war supplies and comply with the cash-on-the-barrel-head provisions of the bill.

Now, that is all there is to it, and when the gentleman from Michigan offers an amendment to prevent the use of Government credit, I would think that the proponents of this legislation would be ready and willing to grasp it in order to make perfectly clear that the rank and file of the American people will not be called upon to finance this war out of the United States Treasury.

Dollar exchange is what the belligerent nations need in order to pay cash for munitions and other supplies purchased in this country. It is estimated that France and England and their nationals now have approximately $8,000,000,000 in bank deposits and security investments in this country, which includes the earmarked gold of over $1,000,000,000. Wars cost money, and when the available funds are used up they will begin drawing on the stabilization fund and other Federal agencies for credit so as to provide dollar exchange.

Since Secretary Morgenthau has already stated that dollar exchange may be provided by the equalization fund, it is only reasonable to assume that he will extend the facilities of such fund to England and France. Both of these countries have been closely associated with the Secretary in joint operations of their respective currencies. They are all members of the so-called tripartite agreement. The adoption of the Wolcott amendment will prevent the use of this fund to provide credit or dollar exchange for any belligerent nation.

The United States should not be called upon in any manner to stand the cost of the present European war. We paid for the last war in manpower and money. Furthermore, we have already contributed a staggering sum toward the cost of the present war in Europe. The generosity of our Federal administration has no limit when it comes to helping foreign citizens and foreign governments. Since 1934 our Federal Treasury, under orders from President Roosevelt, has purchased nearly $5,000,000,000 in gold from the British Empire. We did not pay them the old price of $20.67 an ounce, which sum was paid to American citizens for the gold that they had on hand in 1934, but generously offered them $35 an ounce for all gold that they could ship into this country. They took advantage of the President's offer, and the Treasury made them a magnificent present of around $2,000,000,000 as a premium for the gold sold to America.

France sold us around $3,000,000,000 in gold and received a premium from Uncle Sam of more than $1,000,000,000. This policy of the New Deal is the reason why both France and England now have such large bank balances in this country with which to purchase war supplies and other products. Yes, the American people have already made their contribution toward paying for the war, and it is the business of Congress to protect our people from future assessments.

The United States Treasury now holds more than $17,000,000,000 in gold, most of which is buried in the ground in the State of Kentucky. This represents nearly 70 percent of the world's supply of gold. Monetary experts predict that in a short time this country will own 90 percent of the world's supply of gold, which will mean that gold will be discontinued as a medium of international exchange. When such time arrives, Uncle Sam will be like King Midas, and our buried gold will lose its monetary value. We will then be driven out of world trade unless we follow the barter system or are willing to permit foreign producers to ship into this country competitive imports in excess of exports. Either program will be detrimental to American producers on farms and in factories.

Section 7 of this bill provides against the sale of foreign securities of belligerent nations to individual citizens of this country and it prevents citizens of this country also from extending credit to foreigners. Yes; they have protected you, Mr. Individual, who buys foreign securities and extends credit, but they have not protected the rank and file of American citizens who pay the taxes to the United States Treasury and they are willing to leave that loophole, or woodchuck in the wood pile, so that our own Government may extend the people's credit and provide dollar exchange to belligerent nations when they run out of American dollars.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Yes.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Is there not another woodchuck in the wood pile? Section 7 is the cash-and-carry provision. Section 7 has a prohibition with reference to the issue and sale of and exchange of bonds, securities, and other obligations of foreign belligerent countries, but subsection (b) of section 7 states that "the provisions of this section shall not apply to a renewal or adjustment of such indebtedness as may exist on the date of such proclamation." The prohibition goes into effect at the time of the proclamation but prior to the time of the proclamation the foreign belligerent countries can issue and sell securities and other obligations without limit and then refinance them after the proclamation has been issued.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That is the trouble with the whole bill. It is founded on the discretionary powers of the President, and the bill does not go into operation until such time as he is moved by some spirit to invoke the provisions of law. Too much discretionary authority has already been vested in the President. The powers delegated to him should be restored to Congress for the welfare of the people. Congress should stay in session to protect our country—not only to maintain neutrality, but to attempt an honest solution of the distressing problems confronting agriculture, labor, and business.

If the House will adopt the Wolcott amendment, the only controversial issue remaining will be the President's demand to lift the embargo on munitions and implements of war. All Members are agreed that this country should remain out of the European conflict. I feel that my colleagues are sincere in whatever stand they have taken for or against the repeal of the embargo. After weeks of sincere deliberation I have come to the conclusion that our neutrality can be best maintained so as to keep us out of the European conflict by retaining the embargo as provided in existing law. I shall therefore vote for the Shanley amendment, and I urge my colleagues to do likewise. I also urge you to vote for the amendment offered by my colleague from Michigan, as an additional safeguard for the welfare of our country. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include a short resolution recently passed by the Thirty-sixth Division Association, at Fort Worth, Tex., and another resolution passed by the Farmers Union of Oklahoma.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I suggest to my colleague from New York [Mr. BLOOM] that he request that all those who have spoken on this bill have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. BLOOM. That request was made yesterday and agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair, for the information of all Members, states that that permission has already been granted.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield now to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD].

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, in view of the discussion which has developed with reference to the more than $1,000,000,000 of gold earmarked in this country for Britain and France, and the several billions of dollars of American securities that they hold which can be converted into dollar exchange, I ask unanimous consent that I may at this point in the RECORD extend my remarks and quote some brief excerpts from a statement made by Secretary Hull before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, dealing with that subject.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ARMS EMBARGO AND FINANCIAL INVOLVEMENT

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, the first thing that the House debate ought to accomplish is to bring forth, and answer, the real motives and reasoning which were involved in the Senate debate but which did not gain ascendency until that debate was closing. Defense of democracy involves dealing with the naked truth, realistically and unequivocally, and above all dispassionately and without blinking any of the facts. It would, in my view, be a tragic mistake to yield to panic and its spawn of hate, and attempt, or encourage other nations to attempt, to crush Hitler by crushing the German people. If we want to eliminate the possibility of a Hitler triumph over the less palpable oligarchies, then Britain and France must be kept from the folly of waging another futile war to the finish against Germany. Thus far Hitler has not attempted to crush democracy. He has now no excuse for extending his blitzkrieg to that end; but he will have such an excuse if war if forced to a showdown that cannot possibly attain the grandiose objectives set for it by those whose judgment is now warped by fear and hate.

Hitlerism is a result of causes that cannot be removed by war. Repeal of the embargo is therefore at best a futile gesture, if we would prevent the spread of autocracy to America. At worst, it is an abdication of democracy by resort to war.

As a matter of keeping out of war and maintaining neutrality, the disposition of the Seventy-sixth Congress has at no time been that changes should not be made in the neutrality law. Only a legislative stalemate over the character of changes could produce that result.

The character of the issues was clearly drawn, however, only at the very close of the Senate debate, when it was admitted that the pending legislation is neither a neutrality bill nor a cash-and-carry bill. The possibility of a stalemate, therefore, exists in the destruction of the argument for the new bill as a measure which will keep us from being drawn into war through financial involvement. This is not affected by the fact that the original law was not a cash-and-carry measure before the provision for title and carry expired last spring; for there has been implicit in the whole program for reenacting and tightening of cash and carry the admission that the arms embargo as a measure for avoiding a war boom and consequent financial involvement might be repealed only if an actual cash-and-carry provision, with teeth in it, is put in its place.

Such a cash provision has been attempted but not actually afforded. Particularly have the exemptions from the requirements for title in foreign shipments, which seemed necessary as to Canadian trade and certain ocean traffic, left gaping loopholes in the provisions of section 7a, prohibiting extension of credit for war trade.

The problem which should be brought before the House, were the administration minded to treat the matter unequivocally, is that of so amending the act (if the arms embargo is to be repealed) as to avoid not merely the development of the "fool's gold" motive in equipping Europe for self-destruction, but rather to prevent the imposition of a collapsible capital credit structure erected upon war orders, so that American motivation cannot become the naked one of war for war's sake. Such a motive will wholly eclipse the objectives of peace and make virtually certain a repetition of the follies of 1917 when plain facts were distorted, even by President Wilson, as a camouflage for our self-deceptive diplomacy. If we are to make war, we must not be in the position of a Shylock who is ignored when the smoke of battle blows away and peace is to be made. America must stop subsidizing the British Empire as a means of defense. We surely must seek to enter into the situation, if at all, as a self-defended, dominant influence for a real and just peace divorced from European power politics. A heroic effort must be made to break the vicious circle of war-causing, boom-causing, depression-causing, tyranny-causing war, and so on, ad infinitum ad nauseam. The menace of dictators cannot be removed by any other course.

At the very start of these financial considerations it must be recognized that we are already financially involved in the

survival of "Sterlingaria"; for assuredly the British scheme of money systems managed through central banks with reserves of gold will be thrown out by a German peace, and with it most of the dollar value of our Kentucky hoard. Our own installation of a central bank in the "Sterlingaria" system has bogged down; witness the plea of the Federal Reserve Board for congressional guidance in its report for 1938, and the authoritative comment on this situation by Professor Westerfield, of Yale, in the Annalist last September, in which he pointed to the "twilight" of the Reserve System.

In the face of this critical situation, with Uncle Sam holding the bag with a 17,000-ton gold brick in it, we find the chairman of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, Senator WAGNER, passing up these crucial issues in Senate debate by a plea that only the pending Senate investigation by his committee, which has been procrastinated for over a year and now has nothing done toward even beginning work months after appropriation was provided, can afford authoritative guidance. The Senator obviously prefers to treat our economic smallpox as if it were a skin disease—prefers to meddle with industrial relations through superficial measures which have proved to be not even palliatives. In the Senate debate, therefore, this critical issue of financial involvement is left "with both feet firmly planted—in the air"; and Congress has only the categorical and evasive opinions of Secretary Morgenthau, which were offered in reply to a query from Senator VANDENBERG, as a guide in shaping a policy to avoid further financial entanglement in the affairs of Europe.

In view of the stringent exchange controls set up by the belligerents, it is clear that financial involvement through war credits could be avoided only by a true cash requirement for all war purchases. Such a proviso was suggested by Senator DANAHER during the closing debate. My colleague from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] has also offered an amendment to section 7a in a similar attempt to tighten the restriction of credit. If there is any other way to avoid loopholes and financial involvement under repeal of the embargo, I cannot see it.

Yet we cannot blink the fact that a strictly cash measure would suppress much trade that apparently need not be suppressed. Even though it be an almost negligible part of our total commerce, why interfere with Canadian trade as it is? Let us not forget, however, that all our foreign trade, even at its peak, has never materially exceeded 10 percent—last year it was less than 5 percent—of our national income, so that, even though we conduct a trade in arms proportionately larger than in 1915–16, which seems not to be in prospect at this moment, such trade will be small in every sense except that of its disastrous effect on our monetary system and the unstable credit structure which that system now permits.

I believe that it is possible to work out a change in our money and banking system which would obviate the development of such dangerous contingencies in our highly capitalized industrial system. But the exigencies of the present situation, which the administration is wholly unprepared to meet, despite huge appropriations for congressional and departmental investigations of the fundamental issues involved, obviously preclude such action at this time. Senator WAGNER'S investigation has not even begun, and Congress can take no early action to obviate the dangerous possibilities of a war trade based on foreign-government contracts. Those results can occur, and doubtless will, even though deliveries be paid for in full with United States money. It is certain that such trade will have repercussions far larger than its own size, for in large measure it must force an internal credit expansion in the form of capitalization which will be many times as large as the resulting war income in terms of foreign trade. Billions in "fool's gold" will thus be injected into our industry and our circulating medium of exchange.

The conclusion is inescapable, therefore, that our present action, to keep from becoming a victim of this war rather than a self-defended and controlling factor in peace, must include the addition of an arms embargo to the bill as the Senate has passed it. Such a provision does, indeed, and most emphatically should, prevent the undertaking and financing, by a large expansion of internal bank credit, of those finishing processes of munition manufacture which cannot be undertaken with our existing capital structure in the heavy industries.

It is precisely such an expansion in capital credit—such an "outlet for savings"—which has been advocated by the Assistant Secretary of State, Dr. Adolph Berle, Jr., and other administration experts, in testimony before the Temporary Economic Committee, as a measure for attaining internal prosperity and employment. Attached to a war boom that kind of expansion will certainly prove disastrous, for has not the Federal Reserve Board warned the Congress that the System is devoid of control over these conditions? Why has the administration persistently ignored this warning and procrastinated not only action but even investigation or any effort to determine a line of action?

Mr. Speaker, in the existing law as well as the Pittman bill which is now before this body for consideration, our economy is placed in the hands of England and France just as it was in the period 1914–19. Again we sow the seeds of future trouble and for which we shall have to pay dearly. We know full well that England and France have the money and they have the ships with which to purchase and transport that which we would make and sell. In saner days that were filled with less emotion than at this hour the Congress more fully recognized the enormities of a war boom. But now emotion is in the saddle and war hysteria is taking hold of our reasoning powers. Even our Secretary of State Hull back in 1936 pointed out to us the dangers, but where is his voice in this crucial hour? With the permission of the House let me here quote the words of the Secretary of State which he made before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in those saner days of 1936, and at which time the Senate was conducting hearings looking forward to strengthening our 1935 neutrality legislation. Mr. Hull said:

> The theory of the Neutrality Act of last August (1935) in embargoing exports of finished war commodities to belligerents was to keep us out of war. Of course, we all know that. That was the primary, paramount, controlling purpose of it. The theory of section 4 in the present bill, relating to embargoing of such abnormal shipments of prime war materials as might take place, is just as much or perhaps more to keep us from being drawn into war as the embargoing of these finished implements of war.

Commenting further Secretary of State Hull said:

> Our view was that from the standpoint of keeping out of the war, no nation has a right to go out and get into a war, no matter who is responsible for it, and then turn around to a friendly neutral and demand of it that it be furnished with the necessary war supplies to carry on the war under penalty of being unneutral. With a view to keeping the country out we felt that nobody can object to a nation carrying on normal trade, but whenever any nation demands of a peaceful neutral nation that it go further, and single out and segregate purely war materials and war supplies, and feed them out to the warring nations, we said that there is not and never has been any international law or any other kind of law or reason that would compel a peaceful nation to do that regardless of the dangers involved.

As has been pointed out, a war boom will create in this country a vested interest in the prosecution of the war—a financial stake in the continuation of the war. We know that at the present time England and France have enormous demand deposits in our banks subject to their check; they have earmarked gold stored in this country; and they and their nationals hold vast equities in our industries; and all of these forces can, at their command, be converted into dollar exchange with which they can purchase our goods. When this fountain of purchasing power is turned loose in our economy the prices of the necessities of life will begin to rise, and there will follow discontent among our citizens whose cost of living will become more burdensome. In due course all war orders will cease to flow to industry in all countries. When the day arrives for the closing down of the industries that have opened, expanded, and been built on the foundation of war orders, economic collapse will be with us, and the equities of millions of people in the common walks of life will again be washed out.

Mr. Speaker, I now ask, Why the changed attitude of the administration? Can it be that the design of the Pittman bill and the proponents of the bill and the supporters of the President have become so imbued with the idea of winning a war for England and France that all thought of protecting the economy of the people of the United States has been set aside? We are mindful that there is a national election only a few months away, and we are realistic enough to know what a high level of business activity will be worth to the party in power at that time. We wonder what weight, if any, is being given to this factor. The business interests of this country since their first flush of wild activity in early September have somewhat cooled off, and there is a marking of time at the moment. This, in itself, is now serving as a brake against rapidly mounting prices. As we have heard so dramatically pointed out on this floor the last few days, the participants in the war are moving very quietly, and major battles are not yet raging. But let the Pittman bill be enacted; let the bombing planes begin their deadly work in earnest and the cannons begin the death roar, with the destruction of whole cities, industrial works, and helpless citizens, and the brakes will be off and we will be on our way to a big war boom.

Unless and until America is forced into an actually defensive war everything possible must be done to prevent the development of a war boom. Our present situation in no sense involves any such contingency as self-defense. Nor is the fate of democracy in Europe now concerned except as Britain and France are forcing such an issue. The existing facts do not warrant any confidence in anyone's ability to defend democracy by such a war. Every expectation from either logic or experience indicates a precisely contrary result. The hope of democracy lies in abandonment of the aggressive use of force to crush a supposedly dangerous theory of government. Let America support no such program if she seeks the survival of liberty and free enterprise.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY].

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, the important question involved in this legislation is a challenge to the finest virtues of our patriotism. It is a question which may involve life and death and perhaps the destiny of our Nation. It, therefore, addresses itself to the true nobility of our souls and to the exalted dignity of our statesmanship and manhood. I hope, therefore, that none of us will permit our decisions to be influenced by narrow prejudices, sinister impulses, or fond partialities.

The unhappy situation which exists in the world today has aroused deep sympathies and likewise hideous passions and other emotions which have caused the minds of our people to be greatly disturbed.

Our people are still devoutly devoted to the high ideals of peace. Our people hate and despise the evil influence which has again involved Europe in another deluge of human blood. I believe that the average American hates and abhors Hitlerism and all that it stands for, but we should permit neither our sympathies nor our passions to cause us to turn our backs again upon our traditional policy of minding our own business.

When the Bloom bill was before the House in the last session of Congress I called it a "tragedy of errors" and a "legislative monstrosity," which I was unwilling to embrace. I was then of the opinion and am now of the opinion that had the bill been enacted into law in the form in which it was then proposed it would have provided a springboard from which our Nation would have plunged into the carnage, the devastations, and the shambles of war.

If we would avoid the vortex of war we must stay out of the vestibule of war. This I have maintained from the beginning and this I now maintain.

We must make a sacrifice for peace, and we are willing to make a sacrifice for peace. We must curtail our commerce and restrict our shipping and the movement of our citizens. We must keep our citizens and our ships and our flag out of combat areas and danger zones, and this the House bill did not do.

Under the bill as amended by the Senate, which we are now considering, neither our citizens nor our ships nor our flag will be permitted in combat areas or zones of danger.

Upon the passage of this bill the world will know that our ships are not engaged in the business of transporting implements of death to nations at war and we will have the satisfaction of knowing that our citizens will not be permitted to ride the seas upon floating arsenals, thereby jeopardizing the peace and security of our Nation.

The Senate has repudiated the House bill and has in effect vindicated the position of those of us who sought to provide safeguards for the peace and security of our Nation when the bill was considered in the House last June.

The Senate has repudiated the House bill and has sent to us a bill every provision of which I am willing to support. This bill now contains a cash-and-carry plan, a plan which I believe will meet with the approval of the American people. This bill more clearly conforms to the ideas and views of the administration as expressed by the President in his speech which he delivered upon the calling of this special session. This bill will keep our citizens out of war zones and our ships out of submarine-infested seas and belligerent ports, and I hope it will enable us to avoid involvement in a conflict in which we have no immediate interest or concern.

I am happy in the thought that we are willing to make a sacrifice of our commerce and restrict the privileges of our citizens and that we will not permit war profits and the allurements of greed to lead us from the pathways of peace.

No law which we may here enact will guarantee either the peace or the security of our Nation. Public opinion reigns and rules above the law and still controls and directs the affairs of our Government. We cannot by law control public opinion, nor can we control the passions of the human race, and neither can we by law or by brute force purge humanity of its less admirable traits and annihilate all of the diabolical passions which animate the breasts of evil and wicked men.

An enlightened public opinion is democracy's best garrison and America is democracy's best hope. Certainly America is the citadel of democracy's greatest triumphs and I am not afraid that democracy will be banished from the earth. Our Nation is rich and great and beautiful and our system of government is the best that the mind of mortal man has yet devised. In it we have faith and to it we will cling and here in America we will continue to enjoy and to intensify the manifold blessings of a great and free government.

Our Nation has learned the supreme lesson which civilization has to teach, the lesson that might does not and cannot make right and that problems should be solved by reason rather than by brute force, and we will not, therefore, permit ourselves to become involved in the controversies between other nations of the world. We should again dedicate this Nation to the noble arts and pursuits of peace which minister to the welfare and progress of our own people. We still have many great problems upon the proper solution of which may well depend the survival, the supremacy, and the perpetuity of our own great system.

I am sure that no one will now contend that the House bill contained a cash and a carry provision as was so generally believed by the people of our Nation. You know and I know that it did not contain either a cash or a carry plan; yet many people thought and believed that the Bloom bill contained a cash-and-carry plan and that such a plan was at that time supported by the administration. I feel certain that everyone now knows that the bill did not contain any such plan but only contained a credit provision which would have permitted the sale of arms and implements of war and other articles and materials to the warring nations of the world upon credit. The bill only provided for the divesting of all American interest in the cargoes to be transported and did not even pretend to contain a cash-and-carry provision which required payment in cash for arms and ammunition and implements of war and other articles and materials, nor did it prohibit or in any way prevent the shipment of arms and implements of war in American ships. There was a provision in the House bill which was often referred to as the

"so-called" cash-and-carry provision, but all of us know that it was neither a cash nor a carry provision, and all of us must know that it was absolutely nothing in the way of a safeguard.

But for the Vorys amendment, the compromised embargo which was inserted in the bill notwithstanding committee opposition, there was absolutely nothing in the bill which would have prohibited either our ships or our citizens from sailing into submarine-infested seas, into combat areas and into the ports of belligerent nations. It was stated to the House at the time we were considering the bill that the bill would have permitted the mixing of babies and bullets and women and weapons and men and munitions on American ships, flying the American flag, and destined for war zones and belligerent ports. This would have led our country into the vestibule and into the very vortex of war.

It is not our job to police the world and we cannot afford to police the world which is today but a temple of tumult and a tower of discord. Our job is to save America and her own institutions to the end that the world may have at least one citadel of democracy in which the torch of freedom will continue to burn. [Applause.]

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include a short editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield now to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF].

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to take the time of the House at this late hour in discussing a phase of this question which it seems to me ought to be discussed before we vote upon the bill. Under the circumstances I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I assume that there is no Member of this body who at this time seriously contends that to repeal the Arms Embargo Act is in itself a neutral act or an act tending to promote the neutrality of this Nation in the present war now going on in Europe. I assume further that the perfectly obvious fact is admitted by all the proponents of the repeal of the arms embargo—that it would be a definitely unneutral act designed specifically to put the United States in a position of taking sides in this armed conflict by favoring one side, England and France, as against the other side, Germany.

It is an amazing spectacle in American history that on a question holding within it perhaps the issue of life or death for millions of our youth, those in high places should within a short period of 12 months completely change their attitudes and contradict themselves utterly and absolutely.

Nothing has happened, Mr. Speaker, to change the situation; no new conditions have arisen to make the Embargo Act any less logical as a measure of neutrality than it was when it was passed. Why, Mr. Speaker, on May 12, 1938, in a letter to the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, which document was placed in the Appendix of the RECORD, page 597, by our distinguished colleague, Mr. KNUTSON, of Minnesota, the Secretary of State said:

> In recent years this Government has consistently pursued a course calculated to prevent our becoming involved in war situations. In August 1936, shortly after the beginning of the civil strife in Spain, it became evident that several of the great powers were projecting themselves into the struggle through the furnishing of arms and war materials and other aid to the contending sides, thus creating a real danger of a spread of the conflict into a European war, with the possible involvement of these United States. * * *
>
> In view of all those special and unusual circumstances, this Government declared its policy of strict noninterference in the struggle and at the same time announced that export of arms from the United States to Spain would be contrary to such a policy.
>
> The fundamental reason for the enactment of the joint resolution of January 8, 1937, was to implement this policy by legislation. This joint resolution was passed in the Senate unanimously and in the House of Representatives by a vote of 406 to 1.
>
> In the form in which it is presented, the proposed legislation, if enacted, would lift the embargo, which is now being applied against both parties to the conflict in Spain, in respect to shipment of arms to one party while leaving in effect the embargo in respect to shipments to the other parties. Even if the legislation applied to both parties, its enactment would still subject us to unnecessary risks we have so far avoided.
>
> * * * In view of the continued danger of international conflict arising from the circumstances of the struggle, any proposal which at this juncture contemplates a reversal of our policy of strict noninterference which we have thus far so scrupulously followed and under the operation of which we have kept out of involvement, would offer a real possibility of complications. From the standpoint of the best interests of the United States in the circumstances which now prevail, I would not feel justified in recommending affirmative action on the resolution under consideration.
>
> Our first solicitude should be the peace and welfare of this country, and the real test of the advisability of making any changes in the statutes now in effect should be whether such changes would further tend to keep us from becoming involved directly or indirectly in a dangerous European situation.

Mr. Speaker, who is there in this Chamber who honestly believes that to repeal the Embargo Act in order to give Great Britain and France added advantages, by reason of British naval power, over Germany, will, in the words of Secretary Hull, "further tend to keep us from becoming involved directly or indirectly in a dangerous European situation"?

Mr. Speaker, I shall let the Members of this House and the people of this country judge for themselves what possible logic or sense or consistency could have persuaded the Secretary of State to write a letter on May 17, 1939, exactly a year from the date of the letter I have just quoted, to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations and the then acting chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House, in which he completely reversed himself, contradicted his previous statements of a year before, and said:

> In considering the present proposals for legislation, we must keep in mind that no matter how much we may wish or try to disassociate ourselves from world events, we cannot achieve disassociation. The simple fact of our existence as a great nation in a world of nations cannot be denied; and the substance of the legislation adopted in this country inevitably influences not only this country, but also other countries. * * *
>
> If we go in for embargoes on exports for the purpose of keeping ourselves out of war, the logical thing to do would be to make our embargo all inclusive. * * *
>
> Our conclusion that embargo on export of arms is undesirable is not new, and experience has confirmed our belief.
>
> For the reasons heretofore stated, it is my firm conviction that the arms-embargo provision of the existing law should be eliminated.

Mr. Speaker, I shall leave it for the distinguished Secretary of State to explain and justify before the people of this country such a complete contradiction of policy and such a complete reversal of position in the short period of 12 months.

I am moved to say, Mr. Speaker, that consistency of either policy or position seems to be the least consideration in this matter of repealing or not repealing the arms embargo.

Back in 1935 and 1936 when the embargo legislation was being considered, Members of both Houses of the Congress stood up and solemnly assured the Nation that in that time of cool sanity and freedom from emotionalism or prejudice or propaganda the only possible course to prevent us from becoming entangled in foreign quarrels and foreign wars was to lay down a law, a course of action, which would govern us and which we could follow when the inevitable time came that foreign conflicts would rage, that emotions would boil over, that propaganda campaigns would be under way, as now, that old prejudices and hatreds would be reawakened, that sanity would be replaced by hysteria, and at that time this Congress by an overwhelming vote said, "This is the course we should follow when hysteria and emotion and prejudice tend to lure us from the path of neutrality."

Why, Mr. Speaker, it was against exactly this time we are now in, it was against these very circumstances which exist today, it was against the very pressures which now are being exerted on the American people and on the Members of this House, that the Congress overwhelmingly adopted the Embargo Act in the first instance and strengthened it in 1937.

Some of the very men who then told us that the embargo on arms and munitions was the only possible way in which to lay a foundation for absolute neutrality and thus remain at peace, I regret to say, now tell us that we must abandon the embargo in order to be neutral.

Back in 1935 members of the Committee on Foreign Relations specifically stated the point in the course of the hearings that the only argument against the embargo at that time was that England with her naval dominance could come to us for arms and munitions while Italy could not. It was specifically stated in those hearings at that time by members of the Foreign Affairs Committee that to fail to pass an embargo act would be such a direct advantage to England, would so obviously help England as to constitute us an ally.

Yet today we are being told, presumably with serious intent to convince us, that the purpose of repealing this Embargo Act is to maintain a position of strict neutrality.

Mr. Speaker, I could fill pages upon pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with statements of different spokesmen, from the President down, proving that there is not the slightest intent on the part of the administration to be neutral in the war now going on in Europe. Let me quote a few excerpts and let us see how neutral they are in spirit and how neutral we will in fact be if we yield to the pressure to repeal the Arms Embargo Act.

At St. Paul, Minn., on October 9, 1936, the President said:

A prosperous world has not permanent room in it for dictatorship or for war.

At Chautauqua, N. Y., on August 14, 1936, the President said:

There are newborn fanaticisms, convictions on the part of certain people that they have become the unique depositories of ultimate truth and right.

At Chicago, on October 5, 1937, the President said:

The peace, the freedom, and the security of 90 percent of the population of the world is being jeopardized by the remaining 10 percent who are threatening a break-down of all international order and law. Surely the 90 percent who want to live in peace under the law and in accordance with moral standards that have received almost universal acceptance through the centuries, can and must find some way to make their will prevail. * * *

It seems to be unfortunately true that the epidemic of world lawlessness is spreading.

When an epidemic of physical disease starts to spread, the community approves and joins in a quarantine of the patients in order to protect the health of the community against the spread of the disease. * * *

War is a contagion, whether it be declared or undeclared.

Again, in a statement published in the New York Times on November 20, 1938, the President said:

The news of the past few days from Germany has deeply shocked public opinion in the United States. * * *

I could myself scarcely believe that such things could occur in a twentieth-century civilization.

Again in a radio address on November 4, 1938, Mr. Roosevelt said:

In other lands across the water the flares of militarism and conquest, terrorism and intolerance, have vividly revealed to Americans for the first time since the Revolution how precious and extraordinary it is to be allowed this free choice of free leaders for free men.

No one will order us how to vote, and the only watchers we shall find at the polls are the watchers who guarantee our ballot is secret.

Again in the same radio address the President said:

If our democracy is to survive, it must give the average man a reasonable assurance that the belts will be kept moving.

Dictators have recognized that problem. They keep the conveyor belts moving—but at a terrible price to the individual and to his civil liberty.

In a speech at the New York Herald Tribune Forum on Foreign Policy, October 26, 1938, the President said:

It is becoming increasingly clear that peace by fear has no higher or more enduring quality than peace by the sword.

There can be no peace if the reign of law is to be replaced by a recurrent sanctification of sheer force.

There can be no peace if national policy adopts as a deliberate instrument the threat of war.

At Kingston, Ontario, on August 18, 1938, the President said:

But there is one process which we certainly cannot change and probably ought not change. This is the feeling which ordinary men and women have about events they can understand. We cannot prevent our people from having an opinion in regard to wanton brutality, in regard to undemocratic regimentation, in regard to misery inflicted on helpless peoples, or in regard to violations of accepted individual rights.

Again in a speech at Treasure Island, San Francisco, Calif., on July 14, 1938, the Chief Executive said:

We fervently hope for the day when the other leading nations of the world will realize that their present course must inevitably lead them to disaster.

Again in a radio address on the occasion of the opening of the San Francisco Golden Gate Exposition, February 18, 1939, Mr. Roosevelt said:

By setting an example of international solidarity, cooperation, mutual trust and mutual helpfulness, we may keep faith alive in the heart of anxious and troubled humanity, and at the same time, lift democracy high above the ugly truculence of autocracy.

In his message to the Congress on January 4, 1939, the President said in part:

Storms from abroad directly challenge three institutions indispensable to Americans, now as always. The first is religion. It is the source of the other two—democracy and international good faith. * * *

There comes a time in the affairs of men when they must prepare to defend not their homes alone, but the tenets of faith and humanity on which their churches, their governments, and their very civilization are founded. The defense of religion, of democracy, and of good faith among nations is all the same fight. To save one we must now make up our minds to save all * * *.

* * * We have learned that God-fearing democracies of the world, which observe the sanctity of treaties and good faith in their dealings with other nations, cannot safely be indifferent to international lawlessness anywhere. They cannot forever let pass, without effective protest, acts of aggression against sister nations—acts which automatically undermine all of us.

* * * Words may be futile, but war is not the only means of commanding a decent respect for the opinions of mankind. There are many methods short of war, but stronger and more effective than mere words, of bringing home to aggressor governments the aggregate sentiments of our own people.

At the very least we can and should avoid any action, or lack of action, which will encourage, assist, or build up an aggressor.

Mr. Speaker, I am content to let the American people judge of the quality of neutrality expressed in these sentiments.

Let me now turn to a few excerpts from statements made by an authorized spokesman of the administration and a member of the President's Cabinet, Henry A. Wallace, Secretary of Agriculture. It is understood, of course, that on a matter of international relations no member of the President's Cabinet would think of speaking without the approval of the President.

In the New York Times of April 9, 1938, Mr. Secretary Wallace is quoted as saying:

It is vital to the peace of us and our children that the Americas turn a stony face to the European dictators who are intent on destroying democracy.

These nations look at the thinly populated Americas with envious eyes. They covet the trade of the Americas and do not scruple to use methods which we in the United States have not hitherto cared to use.

In a radio speech on September 17, 1937, Mr. Secretary Wallace said:

There are leaders in other lands who would like to see the forces of disunity conquer this country. They would like to see democracy fail in order that their own nervous belief in dictatorship might be strengthened. They jeer democracy and say a democratic government acts only when it is too late. In their minds there can be no progress and no unity in a democracy. For them there are no men of good will; there are only men of force.

Again, in an address in New York City February 12, 1939, Secretary of Agriculture Wallace said:

Claims to racial superiority are not new in the world. Even in such a democratic country as ours there are some who would claim that the American people are superior to all others. But never before in the world's history has such a conscious and systematic effort been made to inculcate the youth of a nation with ideas of racial superiority as are being made in Germany today.

He said further in the same speech:

Thus the dictatorial regime in Germany, masquerading as propaganda in pseudo-scientific terms, is teaching the German boys and girls to believe that their race and their nation are superior to all others, and by implication that that nation and that race have a right to dominate all others.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I leave you to judge whether or not those sentiments are reeking with neutrality.

Now let me turn to another authorized spokesman for the administration and quote briefly from his public utterances. I refer to the genial and ordinarily soft-spoken Secretary Ickes, of the Department of the Interior.

Said Mr. Ickes in a radio address on February 22, 1938:

In all parts of the world it [democracy] is beset by two fanatical foes, which have the will to conquer at all costs. Democracy cannot live side by side in the same country with either fascism or communism. * * *

Totalitarianism, either of the right or of the left, is alien to the spirit that dominates the English-speaking democracies of the world. Totalitarianism is subversive of the ideals upon which our democracies are founded.

In a radio address in Chicago on April 3, 1938, Mr. Secretary Ickes said:

Let us make no mistake. Totalitarianism is insidiously boring today from within the temples of our liberty and assaulting it from without.

Again, in an address at Cleveland, Ohio, on December 18, 1938, Mr. Secretary Ickes said:

Recently it has come to be believed by many that we must go back to the Middle Ages to find a pattern into which the political life of the present European dictatorships will properly fit. But this is an insult to the Middle Ages. * * *

* * * To seek a true comparison [with the dictatorships] it is necessary to go back into that period of history when man was unlettered, benighted, and bestial. * * *

Certain sections of Europe today have made it possible for ethnologists and anthropologists to study primitive man without having to sift kitchen middens or attempt to reconstruct a social order on the basis of a human jawbone or a few crude implements used in the daily life of long ago. The intelligence and culture of a humane people, by a sudden and swift revulsion, has been sunk without trace in the thick darkness of preprimitive times. * * * Superstition once more rules the minds of men, and modern dictators have set themselves up as high priests of a more cruel, if a more refined, voodooism.

Mr. Speaker, in these statements I challenge any Member of this House to find a trace of that which we call neutrality, or impartiality, the basis upon which should rest the relations of this country with its foreign neighbors.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me quote from some of the voluminous expressions of the administration's recognized spokesman in another body, one who is the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations of that body.

On October 7, 1937, the gentleman referred to, speaking of Japan's course in China, said:

Our Government can no longer refrain from asserting the facts and publicly condemning Japan.

* * * The President has suggested the method of compelling Japan to desist from its barbarous warfare of destruction. He holds that Japan is disseminating war disease which may involve the world and that Japan should be quarantined as every civilized community quarantines against contagious disease.

The Neutrality Act was never intended to meet such contagion. * * * What is required now is a quarantine to prevent the spread of the war disease and to stamp it out. * * *

Let the civilized governments which are backed by 90 percent of the people of the world ostracize Japan. Let them refuse to have any dealings with the country. Let them refuse to continue any commercial or credit relations with Japan and there need not be a single shot fired. Such action (economic sanctions) is more powerful than the Army and Navy of the United States.

No government can conduct war under such ostracism, in my opinion.

It might be stated in passing that, up to this time, no other nation has approved these sentiments.

On December 23, 1938, this gentleman, speaking in his official capacity, said:

1. The people of the United States do not like the Government of Japan.

2. The people of the United States do not like the Government of Germany.

3. The people of the United States, in my opinion, are against any form of dictatorial government, communistic or fascistic.

4. The people of the United States have the right and power to enforce morality and justice in accordance with peace treaties with us. And they will. Our Government does not have to use military force and will not unless necessary.

On January 5, 1939, referring to the President's message to Congress, this gentleman said:

The President very clearly stated that we had the right, and it was our duty, to refrain from aiding those conquering dictators, and it was equally our duty in every way, except through the use of armed force, to aid democracies in their fight against these dictators.

It is evident to me, and undoubtedly to the President, that the so-called Neutrality Act has not, and probably will not, accomplish this purpose (of aiding the "democracies"). In fact, in some cases it may result in the contrary. If this conception is correct, then some action by Congress is essential.

On January 23, 1939, on the American Forum of the Air, this chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations of another body said that we must—

Resist with every legal means short of war the advance of these dictatorial government toward our country and our neighbors and be prepared to repulse them with armed force if such advance is not stopped.

Again on February 21, 1939, this gentleman said in ridiculing the policy of appeasement:

The policy of appeasement has not only been unsuccessful and ultimately destructive but has been immoral. It is evident that a person can die but once, and the period of life is limited, and that it is far better that he die a few days earlier for Christianity, justice, and liberty than that he live a little longer in cowardice and degeneracy.

The gentleman here was referring to the youth of America. He was declaring, in essence, that he was ready to fight to the last drop of their blood.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman who publicly made these statements for the world to hear is the author of the measure at present before this body for consideration.

Where is any neutrality to be found in these statements?

Let it be understood, Mr. Speaker, that I am not addressing myself to the sentiments which these various spokesmen of the administration have expressed. Let me say to you here and now that I abhor oppression of minorities, suppression of individual rights, and the dictatorial form of government, whether it be rightist or leftist, whether it be somewhere else in the world or in the United States, as much as any Member of this body possibly could. But I am at this time addressing myself to the falsehood in which this measure has been garbed, or the attempt at least to dress it in the attire of a neutrality measure.

It is perfectly obvious to any thinking person that in being asked to repeal the arms embargo the administration has not the slightest intention of achieving that repeal for the purpose of preserving the neutrality of this Nation and this people in the war now going on in Europe.

The expressed purpose, the purpose expressed in the very statements I have just read to you, statements by the President and by authorized spokesmen for his administration, show clearly and plainly that the repeal of the arms embargo is sought, not for the purpose of neutrality, but for the purpose of permitting the administration to involve this Nation in taking sides with certain belligerent nations against their adversaries.

Now, Mr. Speaker and colleagues of the House, if we want to be unneutral and repeal this arms embargo, frankly for the purpose of aiding England and France in their war with Germany, and if we are willing to do that realizing in advance that we are taking the first step down the road to war, then in God's name let us be honest with the American people and with ourselves, and state the fact and take our action in the light of that fact.

If we are willing to ignore the advice of George Washington, if we are willing to repeat the folly of 1917, well and good; let us be honest with the American people and with ourselves and say we are ready to run that risk by repealing the arms embargo.

There comes to my mind an excellent editorial in the Detroit Free Press of September 24, 1939, which so simply and succinctly expresses the facts of the present situation

that I again want to refer to it, although I placed it in the Appendix of the RECORD, page 594. This editorial pointed out that our forefathers came to America because they wanted to live more free, wholesome, and comfortable lives than was possible in feud-torn and quarrel-cursed Europe. They came to America because they wanted to get away from the enmities of the Old World and the barbarous wars which were continuously resulting therefrom.

Then in 1917, this editorial points out, we found ourselves bullied into going back into the old mess and again wallowing in the quarrels of the Old World.

The results of our foolishness were the loss of the lives and limbs of thousands upon thousands of the best of our youth, a war debt of billions of dollars, a moral and economic upset from which we have not yet recovered, and flagrant, and in some cases abusive, ingratitude from those we had aided.

All we did was a total loss. We did not help Europe, but we did injure ourselves grievously and dangerously.

Mr. Speaker, if we are ready to repeat that folly by repealing this embargo act and again messing into the wars of Europe, then in God's name let us be honest with the American people and with ourselves and state plainly what we are doing and why we are doing it, and then prepare in the next session of this Congress to vote many more billions for increased armaments in preparation for our inevitable entrance into the European war.

Let me say that I do not and would not deny to the proponents of this bill the right to urge their case, nor do I question their sincerity in believing that we must take sides in the war in Europe in order to maintain democracy.

I do want to point out, however, that the very first necessary act which this Congress must perform when this Nation goes into war, or even when war becomes imminent, is to adopt a mobilization plan that absolutely extinguishes constitutional democracy in this Nation and sets up a military dictatorship as complete as any dictatorship existing in Russia or Germany or Italy today.

The irony of this whole situation to me is the fact that we even talk about going to war to preserve democracy, all the while knowing that our very first act of war will be to wipe democracy out of the picture in our own country. Not only will democracy be extinguished for the duration of the war, but, Mr. Speaker, the very terms of the 1939 revision of the Mobilization Act recognize that that dictatorship will have to be continued for an indefinite period after the emergency is ended, and preparations are to be made, preparations which will be validated by this Congress at the beginning of the emergency, for the continuance of that dictatorship after the emergency has ended and for so long a time thereafter as the Commander in Chief of the armed forces, the President of the United States, shall deem the continuance of the dictatorship desirable.

The American people would do well to ponder those facts.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I desire to introduce an editorial which appeared recently in the Detroit News. It appears to me to be the finest analysis of the President's address before the opening session of the Congress I have seen. I commend it to the careful consideration of every Member of this House:

ROOSEVELT ON NEUTRALITY

The President's address to Congress contained no single reason for repealing the arms embargo.

That curious fact sums up the significance of the address. Purportedly it gave Congress the President's advice on how the Neutrality Act may be changed to help us remain neutral in the European war. Actually it advised how the act might be amended to help the Allies, without too great risk, in the President's judgment, of American involvement.

This summarization of the message may not sound familiar to readers who failed to give it critical attention. The words "help the Allies" did not appear in it. The idea was conveyed, rather, by such sentences as this:

"We know what might happen to us of the United States if the new philosophies of force were to encompass the other continents and invade our own."

Suggestions of that sort—of American interest in an Allied victory—were repeated in various other ways. The conclusion never was reached that, therefore, we should help the Allies. This too was only suggested, by the device of asserting farther on that the arms embargo is "in my opinion, most vitally dangerous to American peace."

The reader will search the address in vain for an explanation of why the embargo is "most vitally dangerous." There is no explanation, except by referring back to the prior warning of what might happen if the Allies were defeated and the "new philosophies of force" prevailed.

This was to our mind an extraordinary public document in its failure to discuss directly an issue of such importance. Yet we should note in passing that our comment on its evasiveness does not imply doubt of President Roosevelt's desire to keep the country at peace. It was the evasiveness of a man who, convinced that peace can be had only by an Allied victory, still dared not advocate to the country that "neutrality" be formulated with that end in view.

In order to clarify our analysis of the message, it is necessary to review three passages in it that looked like arguments for embargo repeal, but weren't. The President said at some length and in different ways that "returning to international law" in our dealings with belligerents was the best way to remain neutral. (He did not explain why nor take note of any kind of the fact that the embargo, far from abrogating international law, only refrains from exercising some of our rights under it.) He suggested an analogy between the present embargo and the "disastrous" embargo and nonintercourse acts of 1794–1808, which preceded our involvement in the War of 1812. (He did not actually state the analogy, since none exists, the earlier embargoes having been punitive in character and designed, as was the War of 1812, to force recognition of our rights under international law.) He asked "what advantage" would come to this country from refusing a profitable trade in munitions and implements of war. (He did not answer his own question, for there is no advantage except that, as claimed by supporters of the embargo, of helping keep us out of war.)

Let us now state once more the theory on which this assumed advantage of the embargo is based. It is believed that if the trade in munitions is permitted, there will grow up in this country a munitions industry and a whole economic state of affairs dependent on the Allied cause. It is recognized that such a state of dependence will exist anyway by virtue of a prosperous war trade in commodities other than munitions. But it is held that this dependence would be vastly enhanced by a munitions industry, whose products could not conceivably be turned to peacetime uses. Thus it is feared—on the basis of 1914–18 experience—that unless this inevitable community of interest with the Allied cause is discouraged, it will lead gradually to a state of mind favorable to giving military as well as economic aid.

The President failed, as stated, to answer or even mention this theory of the provision of law that nominally was the subject of his message. But he did go far in his remarks to justify the theory, when he suggested the embargo should be repealed to help the Allies. If we accept now that we must give the Allies economic aid to safeguard our own peace and security, will we be prepared later on to let them face defeat? Will we not have conditioned ourselves, mentally and morally, to give them military aid whenever they appear to need it for victory?

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. WHITE] such time as he may desire.

Mr. WHITE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, early in September I issued a statement in which I declared:

Whether or not the United States of America is neutral in time of war depends more upon the conduct of foreign policy than it does on any legislation, no matter how designated, that may be placed upon our statute books.

I pointed out at that time that really objectionable features of our present neutrality law were those sections which gave discretionary power to the President. I did not then, and I do not now, think that the embargo question will either keep us out or get us into war. Whether that is true or not, only the future can prove. Under any circumstances, I do believe that the granting of vague, and in some instances unlimited discretionary power to the President is of the utmost importance in the matter of keeping this country out of war. I also object to back-door credits, subsidized credits through agencies like the R. F. C., the Export-Import Bank, and the stabilization fund. I believe poison gas should certainly be banned. I likewise object to the fact that the Senate bill is open to only very limited revision in the House. However, it is mainly because this bill makes and continues so many grants of discretionary power that I must oppose it. I have found that there are at least 16 specific and direct grants of discretionary power to the President in this bill. Of course, the applicability of virtually the entire bill is made dependent on the President's will in section 1–A. Very little in this bill becomes effective unless the President—

shall find that there exists a state of war between foreign states, and that it is necessary to promote the security or preserve the peace of the United States or to protect the lives of citizens of the United States.

Under that discretionary grant of power the President could close his eyes to the existence of a state of war, just as he did in the conflict between China and Japan, and just as he has done in regard to Russia's invasion of Poland in the present European conflict. Here we are writing what amounts to a blank check for the President in the field of foreign relations, giving him power beyond his constitutional prerogatives in that sphere. We are empowering the President, in his discretion, to apply stringent regulations on shipping and stringent regulations on commercial transactions with certain countries. The President need not apply these restrictions against any country, or, if he wishes, he may apply them against any country that he regards as engaging in war.

In another part of this bill we are giving the President wholly discretionary power to prescribe combat areas and to make whatever rules and regulations he sees fit to govern the passage of American citizens and ships through such areas. There is nothing in the "combat area" section of this bill—section 3—that requires the President to apply his proclamation describing combat areas impartially and equally against all belligerents in a given war.

Again in section 11 this bill gives the President discretionary power to place such restrictions on the use of our ports and territorial waters by submarines or armed merchant vessels. This section contains nothing that would require the President to apply such restrictions impartially and equally against all belligerents. Under the section the President may make special rules restricting the movement of submarines, while leaving armed merchantmen free to proceed as they please. Moreover, the term "territorial waters" is not defined in the bill. Until 2 months ago that term was generally understood to mean a distance of some 3 miles off our coast lines. But since the outbreak of the war in Europe, the President at his press conferences has undertaken to give a new meaning to the term "territorial waters." He has said that American territorial waters extend as far as American interests. Under the inspiration of our Government the American republics last month proclaimed the so-called Declaration of Panama which, in effect, would ban hostilities by any belligerent in an area from 300 to 600 miles off the coast line of the North and South American Continents. Everyone is agreed that the Declaration of Panama is either a meaningless gesture or is a very dangerous undertaking. If this Government is going to police an area from 300 to 600 miles off the American coast lines in the Atlantic Ocean, we are taking on the most gigantic task ever assumed by any nation in history. And yet, under section 11 of this bill and in view of the several statements regarding territorial waters made by the President in his press conferences recently, I am not so sure that we are not giving the President authority in section 11 of this bill to carry out, in part at least, the terms of the Declaration of Panama. If I am wrong about that, if nothing more is meant by the term "territorial waters" in this section than the usual 3-mile area off our coast lines, why is not that definition written into this bill? This is a glowing illustration, to my mind, of the vague and undefined authority which we are giving to the President in this measure.

Now Members of the House may say that the President will not abuse the discretionary authority that we are reposing in him. I am not making that argument. But the President has certain ideas about the relationship of the United States to the present European conflict with which I heartily disagree. I believe that the United States has no place in a European war. I believe that the United States should keep out of war and I do not believe we should even risk getting into war by activities which some may call short of war, but which in the end may well turn out to be a short cut into war.

We do know from the speech which the President delivered at Chicago in October 1937, and in subsequent utterances, that he very definitely believes the United States has an obligation to take a hand against aggressor nations. I do not. We, likewise, know that the President believes this Government should give all assistance possible, short of war, to certain belligerents in the present conflict. I believe that the European conflict is no affair of ours and that we should maintain a strict impartiality and neutrality in regard to it. And it is reasonable to assume that the President will administer the discretionary power granted in this bill in an effort to effectuate the objectives he believes in and which he has made so abundantly clear to us. In this connection I would like to call attention to a letter written to the President under date of November 30, 1935, by his, then, very close adviser, Mr. Raymond Moley, who for several years was head of the New Deal "brain trust." Mr. Moley prints this letter in full in his recent book, After Seven Years. I call to the attention of the Members of the House the following language from Mr. Moley's book:

> Now it requires little demonstration to show that the instruments you are using—that is, the men in whom the delicate execution of the job of preserving neutrality is vested—are, almost without exception, of that school of thought that believes that participation in international coercive movements can save us from war. They are of that mistaken group that guided Wilson along the road, first to war and, beyond that, to bitter disillusion. I say "mistaken" because it was their advice in 1915, 1916, and 1917 which induced us to enter the war to end war and to save democracy, and subsequent events have shown them to be wrong. Apparently they are still firmly in the saddle, some of them in person, some of them through proteges (i. e., as Bingham, of House), others, career men trained under the old dispensation—all of them the intellectual brethren of the naive Lansing with one foot at Broad and Wall and the other at Geneva. They tell us now, in one form or another, that we can stop wars by engaging in wars to stop wars. These are the men designated to effectuate your decisions and to provide you with the information necessary to guide you on a dark and dangerous road. (And no one knows better than you, I am sure, how settled are the policies of the State Department and how they differ from your own progressive principles.)

There are many other interesting things about the foreign policy of this administration contained in the Moley letter that I cannot read to the House on this occasion, but I think Mr. Moley casts a very illuminating light upon the purpose of this administration in the foreign field. His letter demonstrates the danger of blank-check discretionary power to the President under the guise of a neutrality act. And it is for these reasons that I feel that I cannot support the bill passed by the Senate.

The full text of the letter from Mr. Moley to President Roosevelt is as follows:

NOVEMBER 30, 1935.

The PRESIDENT,
Warm Springs, Ga.

DEAR GOVERNOR: I was delighted to have your frank and earnest note of November 23. It gives me the opportunity to speak with equal freedom of matters which I have hesitated to discuss with you and so I shall ask your indulgence for what is going to be, I know, a rather lengthy outpouring. I ask leave to tell you, in this letter, just as I should like to if I were sitting with you, all of the thoughts your note has stirred in my mind.

The issues raised in your letter are of transcendent importance, not only to the country and your party but to your own future. I am concerned with these issues on that level, and not on the basis of personal feeling toward members of your State Department. Instead of these differences arising from the events of 1933, it is more truthful to say that those events arose from these differences of opinion which long antedated that time. I found in the State Department under Stimson, even before my official service began there, an atmosphere foreign, it seemed to me, to the vital spirit which characterized the campaign of 1932. That atmosphere has not changed since Stimson's departure. It closed around me and I had not served in office a month before I knew that it would be intolerable. I escaped with my convictions. Those who were in opposition to what it seemed to me were the interests of progressive thought in this country remained.

They remain.

But, as they labor in the shaping of policies that I deeply and earnestly believe to be dangerous, I have left to me the right to criticize, to oppose, and, if possible, to convince you, too, of the existence of the danger.

Now, I want to speak to you specifically of the Canadian treaty. I have consistently advocated a general reciprocal agreement with Canada in many private conversations with you and with the Secretary of State before my resignation, in printed articles, and in a speech made in Canada after I resigned. I say this to call attention to the record of my belief that we should seek more trade with Canada. Incidentally, I did not, in the editorial about which you wrote to me, discuss the wisdom of a trade agreement with Canada or the specific provisions of the agreement just concluded.

When the existing law on reciprocal trading was before Congress I published a carefully phrased editorial dated March 24, 1934, favoring the bill but indicating my belief that (1) to attempt to carry

out the reciprocal-tariff policy while we adhered to the most-favored-nation principle would lead to serious consequences, and (2) that, in making the treaties, a forum should be provided for discussion "under conditions that conserve the public interest." I have since held firmly to these two beliefs and in the face of that fact I should have been a dishonest journalist had I not spoken my mind once again, even in the face of a popular treaty with Canada.

What troubles me with respect to the present Canadian treaty is the fact that the quotas allowed are "global" and that hence, according to the experts, a certain proportion of the articles admitted will not come from Canada at all but from nations from whom we receive absolutely no quid pro quo on this deal. To that extent, the treaty is not a trade: it is a gift at the expense of American producers.

But as you say, the danger that we will be flooded with imports is avoided by the use of the quota. In other words, economic and political disaster is avoided by the use of the very device which Secretary Hull denounces. If such circuitous calculations must be followed to avoid the effects of adherence to the most-favored-nation principle, why not achieve our ends directly by eliminating the most-favored-nation concessions entirely and by making bilateral agreements in which we give and receive definite and specific concessions in trade limited by quotas?

Why bother at all to maintain the fiction of most-favored-nation treatment, if fiction it is, and then attempt (not altogether successfully) to avert the consequences of such action by the quota device?

The answer is that those in whom you have vested the authority to administer the reciprocal-tariff policy want to achieve a general downward revision of tariffs without congressional intervention—an end which will most certainly injure your administration and split your following. And I might add, in this connection, that it is this intent, this fixed purpose to lower tariffs on the part of those entrusted with the administration of the Reciprocal Tariff Act that makes so dangerous the indirect, roundabout method now being followed. If the act were administered by men of another view, by a KEY PITTMAN, or by a BOB LA FOLLETTE, one might be less fearful; under the present circumstances, apprehension is understandable.

My education on the tariff question goes back a long time, but the conclusions to which it impelled me really crystallized during your preconvention campaign. You will remember that the reciprocal-treaty idea was set forth by you in your St. Paul speech. The position you took in that speech was not only an astute one, politically, but a sound one, from the point of view of economics.

The tariff plank in the Democratic platform was written subsequently without reference to your expressed views. It was so ambiguous that, despite every effort on my part to comprehend it, it remains to this day wholly meaningless to me. I believe that this was your own reaction to it also and that this was the reason why you quite properly carried into the campaign your own tariff policy.

May I add that it seemed perfectly clear to me at the time that the policy you advocated during the campaign could not be carried out if we adhered to the most-favored-nation principle, and that I took it for granted that we would abandon it.

In this connection, you will remember the communications received from Secretary Hull (then Senator), via Mr. Taussig, during the campaign, and the discussion of his suggestions by you, Senators PITTMAN and WALSH, and myself. Your Sioux City speech, which rejected the idea of any general tariff reduction, was the result.

When I served in the Department of State, I found opinion here unchanged with respect to general tariff reduction and adherence to the most-favored-nation principle, and, despite earnest consideration on my part, the arguments in support of this position seemed to me to be completely unconvincing. In fact, in May 1933 I wrote a syndicated article (which you read in advance of publication) expressing my conviction that the London Conference could do little on tariff except to effect an exchange of views.

You will recall the fact, I know, that the general-reduction-by-10-percent idea was introduced into the conference and promptly withdrawn. You will recall further the speech of the Secretary of State addressed to the conference advocating a general lowering of tariff barriers which you and Billy Phillips very considerably amended.

As to the element of secrecy in the consummation of treaties such as the one we have just made with Canada, I must stick to my guns. I made it clear in the editorial to which you refer that I was aware of the "hearings" that are granted, although the Associated Press dispatch which you saw did not.

But, in my opinion, the hearings now granted do not permit sufficiently detailed exploration of the specific points contemplated in reciprocal treaties. To say that if such hearings were granted some of those injured would make outcries so loud as to defeat the treaty is not adequate answer to the objection that interested parties are not given sufficient chance to present their arguments.

The present method does not ultimately prevent the outcries in any case. They only come after the event, rather than before, and then they are the more deadly to you politically because those who emit them can howl that they have not only been injured but that they have had no chance to defend themselves—a charge which always gets public sympathy.

I am not convinced, moreover, that a treaty would be defeated if a fair public hearing were given after initialing and before final Executive action. At that point there might be introduced into the proceedings the admirable device embodied in Senator Norris' bill vetoed by Hoover and endorsed by you in your Sioux City speech in 1932, thus:

"Another feature of the bill * * * contemplated the appointment of a public counsel, who should be heard on all applications for changes in rates before the commission on the one hand for increases sought by producers, often greedy or for decreases asked by importers, equally often actuated by purely selfish motives, or by others seeking such reductions. I hope some such change may be speedily enacted. It will have my cordial approval."

And now since you have made it possible for me to explain my views on this tariff matter I shall take the opportunity to speak of a much more serious question about which I have even graver apprehensions—neutrality. Here the issue is drawn in much the same pattern—conviction on my part that you hold views with which a vast majority of the country agrees, but with respect to which those through whom you are acting are intent upon making a quite different national policy prevail. I have given a great deal of thought to this of late and, while I have occasionally spoken to you of my uneasiness, I have not outlined the circumstances that cause it.

There are, of course, two extreme views with respect to our foreign policy, the one advocating utter isolation, the other complete entanglement. If I were to describe your following realistically, I should say that, on the whole, your most loyal followers lean toward the first point of view. The first ballot at the convention in 1932 was a fair indication of the type of men who were supporting you, and the subsequent enlistment into their ranks of the western progressives reinforced this element of your support. Surely such internationalist advocates as the Baltimore Sun and the New York Times could not be counted as sympathetic supporters. Your domestic policies have accentuated this cleavage—a fact which has warmed my heart and enlisted my enthusiasm.

I realize, however, that you should not take an extreme position and hold dogmatically to it. In this instance, the task is to retain national independence of action but to move so far toward internationalism as is safe and expedient. To do this, however, compels the painstaking pursuit of a hazardous course of action. The success of such an operation requires fine instruments and accurate information. Otherwise disaster may result to the Nation and to your own loyal following.

Now it requires little demonstration to show that the instruments you are using—that is, the men in whom the delicate execution of the job of preserving neutrality is vested—are, almost without exception, of that school of thought that believes that participation in international coercive movements can save us from war. They are of that mistaken group that guided Wilson along the road, first to war and, beyond that, to bitter disillusion. I say "mistaken" because it was their advice in 1915, 1916, and 1917 which induced us to enter the war "to end war" and to "save democracy" and subsequent events have shown them to be wrong. Apparently they are still firmly in the saddle, some of them in person, some of them through proteges (i. e., as Bingham, of House), others, career men trained under the old dispensation—all of them the intellectual brethren of the naive Lansing with one foot at Broad and Wall and the other at Geneva. They tell us now, in one form or another, that we can stop wars by engaging in wars to stop wars. These are the men designated to effectuate your decisions and to provide you with the information necessary to guide you on a dark and dangerous road. (And no one knows better than you, I am sure, how settled are the policies of the State Department and how they differ from your own progressive principles.)

This apprehension concerning your international advisers explains why Congress acted as it did last summer when it rejected section 1 of the McReynolds resolution.

The issue was not new to Congress. In March 1933 John Bassett Moore had written a letter, read in the hearings of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, exposing the irreconcilability of a discriminatory embargo with law, common sense, or peace. Mr. Moore sent a copy of that letter to me.

Despite this warning and despite an obviously overwhelming opposition in the Congress, the State Department urged upon you the advocacy of a contrary course this August. Those who spoke for the Department failed to point out to you that a discriminatory arms embargo is a denial of neutrality—that to commit an act of war in the name of peace is a clear reversion to the notion of wars to end war; and, while there are those who believe in this principle, I venture to suggest that an overwhelming proportion of the country agrees with Congress that it is a notion which is self-contradictory.

It is true, as the Department argued, that the President may, by maladroitness, involve us in war. But the great power of the President does not in itself justify asking that he be invested with a complete and unreviewable determination as to which of two foreign belligerents is right or wrong. Yet one of the very top layers of your advisers on foreign relations—not the Secretary—said in writing that he wanted this power for the President because in an international crisis Congress might not act and thus sacrifice our vital interests. This is a strange doctrine, indeed.

The Pittman resolution was passed in spite of these representations and under it you very properly recognized a state of war between Italy and Ethiopia, pronounced the embargo, and uttered the corollary warning. This was excellent.

But following that a series of pronouncements came from members of the administration which have confused and alarmed me.

Perhaps I can best express my feelings by quoting an editorial that I am publishing this week—issue of December 7:

"Under our form of government Congress determines what national policies shall be and expresses its decisions in the laws it makes. The members of the executive branch of the Government have the duty of enforcing these laws. That is the meaning of their oath of office.

"When a neutrality resolution came up for consideration in Congress last summer, the executive branch of the Government asked for discretionary power in imposing discriminatory restrictions and embargoes on American commerce in case of a foreign war. It asked, in effect, to be allowed to choose between nations engaged in foreign war upon the basis of a moral judgment as to the right and wrong of the quarrel. Congress refused this request and announced a policy of strict impartiality in all relations with reference to warring nations.

"That imposed upon the Department of State the obligation of leaning over backward in carrying out a policy which its duty but not its conviction commanded.

"How is the administration carrying out the neutrality resolution of Congress? Let us look at its record, not legalistically but realistically.

"In Europe the opinion apparently prevails that economic sanctions on the part of the League designed to coerce Italy will be ineffective unless the United States cooperates. Europe does not care a rap—and let us not forget this for a single moment—what name we choose to call our participation in sanctions or what explanations we make as to the reasons for our policy. The thing that Europe cares about is the effect of our decisions.

"The early acts of the Government of the United States in carrying out the neutrality resolution of Congress were correct and sound and raised no issues in Europe. But with the growing disposition on the part of our Government to restrict the export of oil, scrap iron, copper, cotton, and other articles not included in the statutory embargo on arms, ammunition, and implements of war (and this despite the fact that Senator PITTMAN, chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, gave on the floor of the Senate last August 21 a definition of the term 'implements of war' which did not include such articles), the tension in Europe has become acute. It has become apparent that the coercing nations of Europe will move against Italy with respect to such items as these only if the United States takes the lead. More ironic still, it is not certain that they will all participate even if the United States does take the lead. This has definitely made us a determinant factor in the general effort to coerce Italy. The members of the League recognize this situation. Italy must certainly recognize our course of action for what it is—the beginning of an almost inevitable logical sequence of acts which, if carried out, would most certainly end in downright hostility to Italy and which would violate the letter and spirit of the neutrality resolution.

"That we have already as a government passed moral judgment on the issue between the sanctionist powers and Italy seems to me to be obvious. The note sent by the Department of State to the League of Nations on October 26, while it does not name Italy, nevertheless stamps Italy as a wrongdoer, using instead of the term 'League of Nations' the alter ego of the League Covenant, the Kellogg Pact.

"Anyone who knows the subtleties of diplomatic language knows that when we, as a nation, look with 'sympathetic interest' upon the 'concerted efforts of other nations' to coerce Italy, which we euphemistically call an attempt 'to preserve peace or to localize and shorten the duration of war,' we obviously favor such action. There is no use quibbling about language. The meaning is clear.

"To express 'sympathetic interest' and then to stop with the expression is, of course, one thing; but to give utterance to this expression and then to follow it up with actions that have the effect of implementing 'sympathetic interest' definitely puts us into a position of taking sides in the present European situation. It is a departure from the letter and spirit of neutrality. I cannot say with too much seriousness that taking sides in this fashion will almost automatically make us a party to the wider war that might easily develop out of the present small war."

When in the pursuit of my duty as a journalist I find it necessary to disagree with my friends, it hurts. Nothing so hurts as to disagree with you. All I can do in such an instance is to be terribly sure that I am right and as nearly as possible consistent with myself. On these two subjects of the tariff and neutrality I feel that assurance. I am glad of only one thing: That they constitute a small—however important—minority of the public policies which you profess.

When I must disagree with any of them, I share a feeling that the V. P. (Vice President) expressed to me on one occasion last winter. He said, "I love this man in the White House because he is for so many things that I have always hoped for and believed in. And when he does things that I don't believe in, I love him enough to tell him the truth."

Ever with sincere regard and affection,

RAYMOND MOLEY.

Mr. WHITE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks by including as a part of them the full text of a letter from Mr. Moley to President Roosevelt.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PITTENGER] such time as he may desire.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the debates in the Senate and on the House floor. They have been real contributions in connection with this legislation. After listening to the debates and after considering the matter, I intend to vote against the repeal of the embargo provision. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, Congress is now in special session and once again the House of Representatives is debating neutrality legislation. There is much misinformation and much confusion as to the real issues involved in this debate.

A vast majority of the people do not want the United States to take any step that will send American soldiers to European battlefields.

This question is entirely different from the question as to the type of legislation on which we are about to act. The Constitution of the United States says:

The Congress shall have power * * * to declare war * * *.

No other agency of the Government has that power. The only way in which the United States can become involved in war is to have the Congress meet and declare war.

So the question of a declaration of war is not before us at this time. Regardless of other claims and other issues, this Congress is faced with the question of repealing the embargo against furnishing arms, munitions, and implements of war to foreign countries which are engaged in war. That is probably the only issue that confronts us at this time and date.

In 1935 Congress enacted neutrality legislation. Congress enacted neutrality legislation—and an embargo against shipment of arms, munitions, and implements of war has been in force ever since that date. An attempt to repeal it failed at the first session of the Seventy-sixth Congress. Since that time a new World War has developed and it is now in progress, and the countries of the Old World are repeating the performance of 1914 and succeeding years.

After following the debates on this question, I am convinced that a repeal at this time of the arms embargo can have but one effect—it will favor one side of the war controversy in Europe and will act to the disadvantage of the other. I do not let my sympathy guide my judgment in the decision I have to make. If I did, you can assume that my vote would be different. If we have reached a point where we definitely want to line up with one of the belligerents, as against the other, the direct and proper step is to repeal the arms embargo. I cannot believe that we want to do that at this time.

The United States of America, in my opinion, by keeping for the time being entirely out of European conflicts, occupies a position of world dominance and can do more for the cause of lasting peace than it can do by becoming one of the partisans. If we retain the arms embargo we maintain the same situation that has existed since 1935. We favor neither side in the World War controversy. We hate neither of the belligerent people. We are friendly to all belligerent people. Through our executive department we are able to say to the leaders on both sides of the war controversy that the United States stands ready, if either of the belligerents should refuse to do the right thing, to throw its power and influence against that belligerent. In my opinion, the greatest opportunity in its history now confronts this Republic, namely, the opportunity as a neutral nation to help bring peace to the warring powers of Europe. It can do this by remaining neutral. It can do this by a policy that shows no favoritism to friend or foe, but insists that each nation respect the rights of the other. Such an attitude will command respect in the Old World and will accomplish many objectives which the flame and the sword would be required to bring about. To pass legislation at this time destroys the role of peacemaker and definitely makes an alliance between the United States and certain countries engaged in the present World War.

The pending bill has many good features. I would like to vote for some of them. I believe in the cash-and-carry plan

so that all countries in the Old World that want to buy our products should come here, pay for them, and take them away in their own boats.

I also believe that one of the leading methods to prevent this country from becoming engaged in the European conflict is found in the pending bill. I refer to the proviso that American ships shall not trade with belligerents or carry passengers to belligerent ports. If given an opportunity to vote on these measures separately, I would cast an affirmative vote. They are, however, unfortunately tied up with the section of the bill which provides for repeal of the arms, ammunitions, and implements of war embargo law.

I realize that developments in the Old World are significant and that conditions may change from time to time. If they do change, and if new problems arise so that the safety of America is threatened, I reserve the right to vote for new legislation which will meet any such emergency.

If the time comes when any country in Europe threatens the safety of the world, I will not hesitate to vote to repeal all neutrality legislation and to support such new legislation as may be necessary to preserve the principles of freedom and democracy and the safety of our homes, our people, and our country. [Applause.]

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD at this point on the pending legislation.

The SPEAKER. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, my attention has been called to the fact that on yesterday the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH], shortly after I had spoken on the pending legislation, yielded himself 30 seconds in which to quote from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement I had made when the House neutrality resolution was up for consideration at the last session of Congress on June 29.

I am flattered by the fact that anything said in debate by a mere mine-run Member of Congress like myself is noticed and considered worth 30 seconds of the valuable time of the distinguished gentleman from New York. The 30 seconds were consumed in reading the following statement from my remarks on June 29:

> When you pass a neutrality act you fix and publish to the world the rules under which you will play the game and which must remain fixed after the game starts. To change the rules then would be an unneutral act.

Mr. Speaker, I make no apology for or retraction of that statement. What the gentleman did not inform the House of was that it was made in an argument by me for the repeal of the arms embargo before the start of the present war in Europe. It was made in anticipation of the repeal of the arms embargo at that session of Congress. The neutrality legislation, carrying a modified repeal of the embargo, was later passed by the House and sent to the Senate in ample time for final disposition at the last session of Congress.

The reason it was not disposed of at that session was that the leader of the isolationists in the Senate took the position with the President, by whom he had been called into consultation, that there would be no war in Europe in the immediate future, or during the vacation of Congress, and therefore there was no need of amending the Neutrality Act.

Now that the war is on the isolationists argue that it is too late to amend the act by repealing the embargo. This was my point in my remarks on the floor on yesterday in relating the story of the Arkansan who could not fix the leaky roof of his house because it was raining, and who did not fix it before the rain started because it did not need fixing then.

So Congress, threatened with an isolationist filibuster, adjourned leaving the repeal act pending, but with notice to the world that in the event war broke out in Europe Congress would be recalled to resume consideration of the legislation, which is now before the House, and with notice to the world that the arms embargo might be and probably would be repealed. The Senate has already voted to repeal it by a 2 to 1 majority and I have every confidence the House will also vote to repeal it.

Mr. Speaker, in my speech of June 29 I stated 12 reasons why I favored repeal of the arms embargo. The gentleman from New York quoted 4 lines from the second of these 12 reasons. But the first of these 12 reasons renders superfluous the other 11. I quote it from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 29, 1939, page 8245, as follows:

> First. If the present mandatory embargo on arms, munitions, and implements of war favors the dictators, and this is admitted; and if the pending bill favors the democracies, and this is the claim of its enemies, that fact alone is sufficient consideration for my support of the bill. [Applause.] First, last, and all the time, I am for the democracies and against the dictators; and I am for them, neutrality act or no neutrality act.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. PATRICK].

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker and fellow Members, I am not so egotistic as to think, after the long debates that have been extended over this subject, that I could shed any great amount of new light at this hour. But let us consider this sort of legislation. It is important to think why this kind of legislation comes forth in the life of a country which under its Constitution is 150 years old; a young nation.

A people decides to be a nation and go into business. Of course, we could talk of the throes of activity that were gone through with to bring this people into life and pursuits on the earth as a nation. The idea was to come here and do business on a new basis. We call it today "the American basis." We wanted to worship as we felt. We wanted to be a democracy. Now, that meant something to our Nation's makers. It means something to us. We are over here in the Western Hemisphere, and we want to do business as ourselves. I think it is cringing and cowardly, I think it is weak and vascillating and anticonstructive for us to take the position that, because nations on another part of the globe, far removed from us, men may throw themselves into war, and we have to go a step back and alter from that which would be our natural program, or, because they hurl themselves into war, we are frozen in our tracks to stand like a figure carved on a vase unable to amend legislation to take care of ourselves on our own shores.

Let me say, further than that, that the minute a nation gets to playing politics with the world—and an effort is being made here to do that—the minute a nation gets to playing politics with the world to such a degree and extent that it becomes forgetful of its own material development and strength and advantage, that nation has reached the highest point in its natural growth and its travel along the roadway of time. It stands under the zenith in the sky of its existence. That is what happens. If we stand here and permit ourselves to get so far removed from our first duty, from the duty of self-preservation, looking out for No. 1, Nature's first law, that we cannot stand on our own two hind feet and say that we are weaving the whole warp and woof for us, for our folks, and for ourselves, then our best days are behind us. That is not the American way. It never will be the American way so long as we stand stalwart and true for the things that have made America what she is today.

Today we are asked to do what? While we are sending the makings abroad, while nations have armed for years, we are asked to be so forgetful of ourselves that we are to pass legislation or continue legislation that has only been on the statute books for a short time, that will tend to dry up the manufacturing industries in America. We are a "have" nation. We dig our ores from the earth, and we go forth to make and manufacture things. For what? For sale as well as use. That is how a nation does business. That is how we go forward. We make things from the soil. We cultivate the good earth, and we make things to sell to our neighbors, whoever comes here to buy. Who says that America cannot stand on her own hind legs and make her own stuff into her own things at her own doors to sell to whoever may come and buy? Would that be unneutral? How do we know who may have the advantage on the seas? America is not responsible for the advantage on the high seas today or who may have the advantage on the high seas tomorrow. They do not ask what our neutral laws are. We do not pass their laws. If we would take ourselves a little less seriously and our business a little more seriously, we could turn out better legislation for

the people that we represent all over the United States of America. That is what is the matter, but embargoes have been a failure. The history of the embargo is the history of failure. An embargo is but a sieve through which passes everything it pretends to convey.

What will result from this sort of legislation? We shall drive our manufacturing into other nations when we so need it here. Then they ask: "Why not keep our industries humming at home to make our own stuff?" It has to turn over. We do not make a whole bunch of airplanes and store them away. It is an industry—it is a growth and development, the wheels of progress, the spinning spindles, and the activities of a nation's manufacture and other business forces—that stand and turn over day after day until an industry has grown and developed.

It feeds people, keeps them from being hungry, from walking the streets, and looking for jobs; yet here you are being so charitable toward an uncharitable group of nations that you would drive our industry into Canada and Europe, where they will in all probability stay. The worst of it is that nothing is accomplished even then, because if they have the makings, if they can get the makings, as they can regardless of this embargo, they do not give one continental darn about whether or not it is assembled; they can assemble it. So that is what we have done; we have impoverished ourselves, we have endangered our own industry, we have dried up the stream that we need so sorely to have running today, and accomplished absolutely nothing.

Mr. Isolationist is a funny fellow. When his neighbor starts a fight he pulls down the front window shades. Then they get to fighting on the other side of the house; he says he cannot pull the other shades down because the fight has already started. He cannot change the rules after the game has started.

It is said we cannot change the rules during the game. Why, this is not our game; we had nothing to do with starting it. This war may last for 25 or 30 years. Should we be asked to remain neutral or unneutral? As a matter of fact, there is nothing unneutral about it. There is nothing unneutral about looking after our own affairs. They do not gage themselves by what we do here. We ought not even to look, if we are being sincerely neutral, we ought not to look across the seas if we are sincere in our desire for neutrality. And so, as far as that is concerned, we are technically just as neutral as can be; and that is as far as any nation can honestly go. How may we know that next year Germany and her group may not have the advantage on the high seas? Then when they come here and pay cash on the barrel head they can get the goods and carry them home; that is all this proposed neutrality law is.

I was not greatly influenced by the argument advanced by my friend the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]. The fact that he and others find consolation in that viewpoint and vote like that just swells our majority, I suppose, whatever that majority may be. My idea is that if we are sincerely neutral as a nation that is enough, and that we not only have the right, but our duty is to our people; our first duty lies in our taking care of the best interests of the 130,000,000 people that make America. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the St. Lawrence seaway project.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COOPER). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock a. m. tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

NEUTRALITY

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] 7 minutes.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, let me say at the outset that I am in agreement with a statement made by the President of the United States in his message at the opening of the special session wherein he said that the issue involved in this legislation goes beyond any thought or phase of domestic politics. Domestic politics do not belong in and should not in anywise affect this legislation. Each and every Member of this Congress should express his views and cast his vote in accordance with his own convictions as well as his conscience. I believe it is the fervent hope of the Members of Congress that whatever action we take on this resolution may be done with a view that it is for the best interests of the people of our country. And so, although we may differ honestly and fairly in our opinions, such legislation as may be enacted should represent the majority views of this Congress.

I also agree with a further statement of the President wherein he said:

> We must be guided by one single hard-headed thought—keeping America out of war.

It is the will of the great majority of American people and the will of the membership of this House that we stay out of the war that is now raging across the seas.

The principal issue in this resolution, and which has been debated for 5 weeks in the Senate, is whether or not this Congress should reverse its action in 1935, in 1936, and in 1937, when it declared that arms, ammunition, and implements of war could not be sold to belligerents. To repeal the embargo at this time is, in my judgment, an unneutral act. I cannot believe it is either neutral or morally right for this Congress to place its stamp of approval on the manufacture and sale to warring nations for profit, of all kinds of deadly weapons, including bombing planes and poison gas.

Mr. Speaker, I regret that so many of our people have been led to believe that we cannot have the cash-and-carry provisions of this measure if we retain the arms embargo. This is not true. Every Member on this floor knows that we can have every one of the protective provisions contained in this resolution, and at the same time retain the embargo on the sale of deadly weapons of war to belligerent nations. The overwhelming majority of this Congress is in favor of the cash-and-carry provisions of the bill as they apply to nonwar materials. American ships should not be allowed to carry merchandise that may be contraband to belligerent nations. I believe we are also unanimous in the view that no credit should be extended to countries engaged in war.

I am not one who believes that our action on this resolution will be the determining factor as to whether or not our country will be drawn into the quarrels of Europe. The repeal of the embargo, in my opinion, however, is more likely to lead us into that direction. I do not believe we are going to become involved in that catastrophe; but I do think the retention of the arms embargo and the adoption of the protective provisions of this measure will further safeguard our neutrality.

Mr. Speaker, only 2 years ago the Senate voted to retain the arms embargo by a majority of 63 to 6; and, in the House, the vote was 376 to 13. The President supported the legislation and, in commenting upon it in March 1936, said:

> The policies announced by the Secretary of State and myself at the time of, and subsequent to, the issuance of the original proclamation, will be maintained in effect. * * * The result of earning profits not possible during peace, and especially with the result of giving actual assistance to the carrying on of war—would serve to magnify the very evil of war—which we seek to prevent.

Our great Secretary of State, speaking of the embargo on arms and munitions adopted in 1935, said:

> The Neutrality Act of last August, in embargoing exports of finished war commodities to belligerents, was to keep us out of war.

Mr. Speaker, since this act was passed by an overwhelming majority in the calm, cool deliberations of peacetime—what is it that has changed the situation so drastically, so critically—that we must now reverse our policy, that we must now sell weapons of war to belligerent nations? Why is it

that this Congress is not willing to adopt the safety devices and protective provisions of this resolution, and retain the arms embargo? Is there any Member on the floor of this House who can tell us from what source has come this great demand for the repeal of the arms embargo at this time? Who wants it, and why? Oh, I know, and I have said before, that there are plenty of us who want the cash-and-carry features of the bill, but what I am asking here and now, is from what source comes the demand for making our country an arsenal for the warring nations of the world? The struggle in Europe was hardly under way when it was demanded that Congress repeal the arms embargo. The strange thing about it is that no one seems to know the source from which that demand came. Certainly, the people of the United States did not rise and ask that Congress immediately proceed to permit manufacturers and munition makers to get busy and sell for profit the machines of war.

There are some who are in the minority and who want the embargo lifted to stimulate industry in this country. Two years ago, the President referred to this attitude in his remarks, when he said:

> If war should break out again in another continent, let us not blink the fact that we would find in this country thousands of Americans who, seeking immediate riches—fool's gold—would attempt to break down or evade our neutrality.

However, in his message to the special session of Congress in September, he said he could see no objection to our manufacturing and selling implements of war for profit. He said:

> From a purely material point of view, what is the advantage to us in sending all manner of articles across the ocean for final processing there, when we could give employment to thousands by doing it here?

Much of the pressure for the lifting of the arms embargo comes about because of the sincere feeling of a great many of our people who believe it is our duty and obligation to take sides in the present conflict. They argue that it is only fair and right that this country should assist England and France and their allies, and help them win the war.

I have just as much sympathy for England and France in this conflict as anyone else, and am just as much opposed to Hitlerism and Stalinism. But let me call your attention to something, these advocates of lifting the arms embargo tell us they would sell weapons to warring nations just so long as they have the cash with which to buy them. Are we so cold-blooded we are willing to approve the sale of bombing planes, lethal weapons, and poison gas to be used for the wholesale murder, not only of soldiers but of men, women, and children having no part in the combat, so long as the countries that need them are able to "lay the cash on the barrel head?"

If you believe it is our business to furnish munitions and other implements of war to help certain nations win the war, then they should be sold without profit. And we should go all the way and furnish these supplies whether they have the cash or not, just as long as they need them. It is when such nations are unable to pay for their war supplies that they will need them most.

By the terms of this resolution our Government is saying to the nations of the world, "Come to our country and we will furnish you the most deadly weapons that the mind of man can contrive, provided you will pay a profit to our citizens for them."

Do you mean to say that the repeal of a law prohibiting the sale of death-dealing instruments of destruction, furnished for a profit, is a policy in the interests of world peace? Do I understand that the refusal to sell poison gas, bombing planes, and bombs is an act on our part that will lead us into war? No government has a right to approve the sale and profit from instruments designed to create misery and anguish and death to innocent people. To permit it is wrong. I do not want to be a party to it. Do you think we would be contributing to the betterment of mankind? Do you think we need to do it, as some have said, because our battles are being waged and our interests are jeopardized? Then you cannot say to these belligerents that when you have not the money to pay us for your war supplies you will have to carry on our battles. You will have to do it without our help.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this resolution places too much power and authority in the hands of one man. This Congress on other occasions has surrendered many of its responsibilities in the name of emergency to the Chief Executive. Under the terms of this measure, in the time of great emergency we again relinquish additional power and authority, such as were never given to any President in the history of our country.

I further believe the provisions of this measure should be mandatory and not discretionary on the part of the President. In other words, if the law is good at all, then it should become operative when a state of war is known to exist.

Mr. Speaker, I have said I do not believe the United States of America is going to become involved in this war. Our tragic experience of the World War should teach us that we must preserve our neutrality. We lost 40,000 American boys in that war. There were 200,000 wounded, another 100,000 who died of disease, and there are 350,000 now receiving disability allowances and who are entitled to it, by reason of that world catastrophe.

Let the world understand that we will protect our country against all enemies—that we will defend it against any attack of every kind. We will use all our material resources, as well as all our manpower in doing so, if necessary. But we do not belong in the European conflict. We are going to stay out of it.

Mr. Speaker, the time will come when a war-worn and war-torn people—in a world sick and tired of the useless ruthlessness of armed combat—will need a neutral, friendly nation to whom they can turn for help in binding the wounds and assisting them on the path of peace. The only nation that can do it is the United States of America. When that time comes, we can be of the greatest service to humankind and to the world at large, by preserving our neutrality and by maintaining our integrity as well as our ideals of democracy. Mr. Speaker, I earnestly believe it is the sincere hope of every Member of this Congress that whatever action is taken on this measure will be for the best interests of the American people. [Applause.]

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS].

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I want to say some things along a different line from what anybody has spoken yet. I take it that every Member of the House is in agreement on two points: First, he wants to keep America out of war, and second, he wants to save democracy. On the one hand, those who appeal for repeal of the embargo take the position that by repealing the embargo we will be taking a step toward saving democracy. In my opinion the most important thing that needs doing to save democracy is the solution of the unemployment problem in the United States and unless that is done any other contribution we may make is going to be ineffectual. Further, if the embargo should be repealed, the next important duty which should be performed at once by this Congress is the imposition of a stiff tax on the profits of the munitions trade and all war trade in order to prevent a runaway boom in these industries. If that is not done, we will be headed for trouble and will have another war-trade boom, inevitably followed by a disastrous depression, the consequences of which will be serious for democracy.

Mr. Speaker, on the other hand, if this embargo is not repealed, let no one believe that this fact alone will keep America out of war, unless the need of our own people for employment and income is met. That, to me, is the important thing this Congress has to address itself to in connection with these two things. Keeping America out of war can be done best by our keeping so busy with the solution of that problem at home, which is our responsibility, that we will give the people to understand that they have a great hope for the future in connection with the solution of all these problems.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield? I would like to address a question to the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. In section 7 (a), with regard to financial transactions, the gentleman will note that these transactions and extensions of credit are prohibited to any person acting as an agent for any state or political subdivision thereof. My interpretation of that is it would permit these transactions to persons who are not agents of these governments. May I ask the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs if that is his interpretation? If so, does he not think there should be some language placed in this section that would prohibit the extension of credit and financial transactions, not only to persons who are agents of these governments, but to all persons who are residents or citizens of these states, and will he assure us that he will make an effort as one of the conferees to include such language in this section, and does he not think that is desirable?

Mr. BLOOM. I can assure the gentleman that the House conferees, so far as our side of it is concerned, will take that up in conference and present it at the conference and see that everything possible is done about it.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. The gentleman agrees with me it is desirable that such language be included?

Mr. BLOOM. I think something of that kind should be included.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. It would be desirable so there will be no mistake about the intent of the section to prohibit the extension of credit to persons whether or not they are known to be agents of a government or not.

Mr. BLOOM. The only thing I can say to the gentleman is this: I will agree our conferees will present that matter at the conference. We will do everything we can to see that such wording as the gentleman has suggested is placed in the bill.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. The gentleman, I think, agrees that would be desirable and he will try to include it?

Mr. BLOOM. I am not trying to bind myself or anyone else. I say I will present it at the conference, and I can assure the gentleman every consideration will be given and every effort made to see that the suggestion offered by the gentleman is taken.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. I appreciate the gentleman's answer. If the gentleman did not agree with me that it is desirable and highly desirable to have this done, I do not think he would take it upon himself to make the suggestion or to act as a member of the conference committee.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply interested in the matter the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BRADLEY] has presented. It appears to me from what I have been able to gather concerning the matter it is a most important one with regard to these credits.

Mr. DARDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. DARDEN. May I ask the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs if that is not taken care of in the provision which prevents sales to other than states?

Mr. BLOOM. Whether it is taken care of in that section or not, it should be suggested and proposed to the conference. That is all the gentleman is asking. That is all the chairman of your committee is saying he will do.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I may say to the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs that the Wolcott amendment covers that proposition, and if the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BRADLEY] wants to make sure about it he should support the Wolcott amendment.

Mr. BLOOM. I do not agree with the gentleman at all on that.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. If what the gentleman from Pennsylvania has in mind goes through, we could not sell to a Canadian a typewriter on credit. We may go too far.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. I am not concerned with typewriters, but I am concerned about scrap iron, cotton, and some other things which are used in war. I would not want to see an extension of credit to any person whether they were known to be an agent of a foreign government or whether they claimed they were not an agent of that government, because I think it would be equally dangerous. I believe the section should be very clear and explicit with regard to that.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I should merely like to point out in conclusion that, regardless of what one's views may be about the embargo question, many things are contained in this bill of the utmost importance in the protection of the United States against involvement in war. I hope very earnestly that the House will consider the bill as a whole when it comes to the final vote, regardless of what action may be taken on these other matters. Let me reemphasize again, however, that reliance for keeping America out of war cannot be placed in a measure of this kind. America can only stay out of war if Americans keep very earnestly at work at the economic problems of our own democracy. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK].

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, at the outset I wish to say that I certainly endorse the first part of the remarks of my friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS], who just preceded me. I believe he struck the nail squarely on the head when he said our most vital problem is right here at home. Our great task is "over here," not "over there." Our getting into war would frustrate the unfinished task. That, however, is not the matter we are debating here today.

Again I want to agree with the gentleman in that it is quite important that we have a true cash-and-carry provision calling for cash on the barrel head, foreigners' cash not borrowed from us, and not have lurking in this measure some provision which will permit the extension of credits which we do not now see on the surface. We must safeguard against adjustment of old debts upward and thus in effect thereby extending new credit, or permitting it in any other way.

I wish to say, although my time is brief, that I have listened with great interest to the speeches on both sides of this aisle, and I have attributed sincerity to my colleagues on both sides, although our thinking is very, very wide apart. I beg you to credit me with sincerity and patriotic motive.

On June 30 last, I voted for the Vorys amendment, which retained the embargo on guns and ammunition. I would not want anyone to attribute my vote on that occasion to my anxiety to help Hitler or Stalin or Mussolini. I would be very resentful if anyone attributed such a motive to me in that vote. I had quite other motives in the back of my mind last June when I cast my vote on that question in the last session. I voted to add the Vorys amendment to the Bloom neutrality bill without giving it full consideration as a permanent policy, but rather as a protest against our lack of certain legislation limiting profits. Struck with the horrors of munitions profits and believing that one of the imperative demands of our people is a reasonable curb on the coining of blood into profits, I felt that we should have some reasonable and sane legislation to take the profits out of war before opening the door to such blood profits.

After carefully studying this whole situation, listening to debates for the past several weeks, reading every telegram and letter from my constituents, and otherwise sounding out public sentiment in my State, I am convinced that it is the wish of a majority of my people that the arms embargo be repealed. I feel that a majority would favor repeal if that were the sole issue in this measure; but, in view of the fact that there are many other provisions designed to minimize

the chances of our involvement in war, a much larger majority of my people want this measure enacted. Of course, practically all of my people want us to keep out of war. I know, of course, that if it were put squarely to a vote whether we should accept the proposal before us, the Senate amendment, a large majority of my people would favor it, and I shall do so.

Although I voted for the Vorys amendment last June, I feel that I should vote against the Shanley motion now and also the Vorys amendment to the motion at this time before the House. This would be equivalent to voting to lift the embargo.

However, there is one thing in the original motion by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHANLEY] and also the present amendment by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] to which I have given considerable thought—the matter of poison gas. I do not presume under the present rule it will come to an open-and-shut vote on this matter, but if it does I shall vote to retain an embargo on poison gas.

I wish the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs would pay close attention to me now as he did a few moments ago when I presented this matter to him. He said he would make note of it and present it in conference. If there is no opportunity to put the question of keeping an embargo on the sale of poison gas to a straight open-and-shut vote in the House, I do want the conferees to keep that point in mind and retain the embargo on poison gas. I make a vast distinction between arms and ammunition on the one hand, as recognized by international law, and poison gas, which is outlawed.

Many Members have spoken in this debate as if we were now considering a vote either to declare war or not to declare war. That certainly and really is not the question, in spite of the effort to make it appear so. I believe the enactment of the measure substantially as it came over from the Senate will have the effect of keeping us out of war. Keeping this country out of war is my prime consideration. I am positive that 99 percent of our people want us to keep out of war. This bill, substantially as it stands, if enacted, is far more apt to keep us out of war than is our present law.

Many mothers have written to me, "Preserve our sons and do not send them to European battlefields." I want to assure those mothers that I am thinking of our sons, and I am also thinking of our sons' sons. I want this world to be fit for our children's children to live in. I am not defending English or French imperialism. I will not give one American boy to keep the status quo of their ill-gotten gain. However, if we give free run to brute force, if we give a free hand to those madmen of Europe, and if we do not furnish the sinews of war—I am not at all neutral now—to the democracies, when we see that Russia proposes to remain "neutral" and furnish the sinews of war to Nazi Germany, we are derelict in our duty to ourselves, as well as humanity. We would be betraying our faith, breaking our trust to support law and order, if we encouraged this world to be dominated by power and anti-Christian forces as represented by Hitlerism and Stalinism.

It is for the sake of our sons' sons, as well as for the sake of our own sons, that I wish now to use all legitimate means short of war toward saving democracy and peace-loving people for the future. I am not thinking of the fool's gold of war prosperity; I am not considering big profits of munitions makers or any other profiteers; I am not coveting blood money for a depleted National Treasury; but, leaving all these out, I feel that our self-interest requires that England and France be not crushed in this war. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. DARDEN].

Mr. DARDEN. Mr. Speaker, the bill under consideration is one of great importance. The problem, so far as I see it, involves not so much the question of neutrality as the welfare of our own country.

I am satisfied that this Government has the right to lift the present embargo if it so desires. That the law will result in giving an advantage to one group of nations as against another group should not deter us if we are prepared, so far as we are concerned, to put all on an equal basis.

The present law operates to place Germany and Russia at a decided advantage in the war now being waged. I am of the opinion that we have much to fear should that advantage be continued.

The first thought of every one of us is to remain out of war. None of us wants to take a step which would tend to involve us abroad. Whatever may be our sympathies, we cannot afford to plunge the country into a European war. We shall settle nothing by our participation and we shall lose much.

But to close our markets to the democracies of Europe at a time when they are fighting for their lives seems to me dangerous and short-sighted.

Certainly neither England nor France chose to resort to arms save as a last resort. The ruthless aggression of Hitler has reached a point where only armed conflict will save them. They have no choice in this situation. Hitler and Stalin cannot be placated by offers of compromise. Poland, devastated and crucified, was a victim of wanton aggression.

Austria, Bohemia, and Moravia have been overrun and their peoples subjected to the most barbaric and inhuman treatment. Force is again on the march. Tyranny and oppression challenge civilization.

We are being asked to refuse supplies to those nations who because of their hope for a peaceful solution of the problems of Europe refused to turn themselves into armed camps.

Their destruction will mark the beginning of the end of western civilization.

We cannot hope to escape unharmed in such a catastrophe.

I cannot close my mind to what I believe to be the paramount issue in this struggle. Individual liberty has disappeared in Germany and in Russia. It will disappear in all countries subject to their will.

Mankind's struggle has forever been to strike the shackles of slavery from him. The history of our country is the story of a people who would be free. Certainly in this dreadful hour we cannot say to those who value freedom as highly as we do that they shall not be allowed to buy from us those materials which are vital to their very existence.

I cannot bring myself to take such a stand. I intend to vote for the repeal of the present embargo, not only because I believe that such a vote is in the interest of humanity but also because I feel confident that such a step is our surest guaranty against involvement in war. [Applause.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES].

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, In this solemn hour, when the gravest issue in many years is before us, I make this decision, after many weeks of calm deliberation, thought, and study, of the vitally important issues underlying the discussions, as to whether we should repeal or retain the arms embargo. It is my conviction that the war in Europe today is not a battle to defeat or maintain democracy, but rather the continuation of the age-old fight for supremacy of power, the same that has gone on for centuries. It is the old story of new leaders and dictators seeking new powers and domains that have been lost. Europe will likely long continue to face such wars, as other new leaders seek to regain lost ground and, as shown convincingly, in the last great World War, whatever we do, we cannot change this war course in Europe.

Lifting the arms embargo means opening American markets to one set of combatants. This to my mind is a very definite step in taking sides in the present European war.

In discussing this vital issue, I wish to recall the main objective the Congress had in mind in 1935 when it enacted the first Neutrality Act. In that legislation, we believed that one of the most effective ways of staying out of war was to refuse to sell arms and ammunition to countries that resorted to war. Most of the Members of Congress then felt, and still do today, that our unrestricted sale of arms and munitions during the World War was a major reason why we became involved in that conflict. Congress overwhelmingly adopted that resolution and the President approved it. It became the national policy of our Government.

In 1936, Congress again approved an embargo on the selling of arms, ammunition, and implements of war. At that time, the vote in the House was 353 to 27, and so unanimous was the support of the embargo in the Senate that a roll call was not asked. In 1937, Congress again approved an embargo on arms, ammunition, and implements of war in legislation containing other safeguards for our neutrality which are not now in serious dispute. The Senate approved the 1937 legislation by a vote of 63 to 6, while the vote in the House of Representatives was 376 to 13. I voted for that bill.

The President likewise gave his approval to these measures, making them law. In the summer of 1936, the President enthusiastically endorsed such provisions as the arms embargo as "new weapons with which to maintain our neutrality" in time of war abroad. Also on that occasion, the President warned us to be on our guard against those seeking "fool's gold," who would, when war came, attempt to "break down or evade our neutrality."

Secretary of State Hull, who favored the neutrality law, also said at that time: "The theory of the Neutrality Act of last August in embargoing exports of finished war commodities to belligerents was to keep us out of war. Of course, we all know that. That was the primary, paramount, controlling purpose of it." These words, coming from the man who is now the Secretary of State cannot be treated too lightly. He is a man who has had a great experience in the field of international problems.

In recalling this background, I simply desire to emphasize the fact that the arms embargo was adopted, only after the most thoughtful deliberation, with the approval of the President, repeatedly expressed, and with virtually the unanimous support of all parties and factions in Congress and the Secretary of State.

Congress wrote the neutrality code in 1937 with amazing unanimity. The President signed and the country applauded it. Including its arms embargo, it represented our best thought as to what would be best for America in the event of another foreign war. It represented our best thought while we could still think calmly and dispassionately. In this code we told the world what to expect of us in the event of another alien war. We gave the world our notice, and it is certainly not neutrality for us today, because of what our sympathies may be to change the law, to fit some particular nation or group of nations that are presently engaged in war.

The last war cost us 50,510 American boys killed in action, 193,663 wounded, 69,446 who died of other causes, 350,000 who now receive disability allowances at the rate of $36,000,000 a month. It cost us $40,000,000,000. Despite these tremendous losses in lives and financial setbacks, the war to end all wars proved tragically futile and we should not forget those experiences.

I am fearful that the repeal of the embargo will be a direct route to foreign entanglements that may lead to war. I believe we should keep inviolate a neutrality program that was enacted under calm deliberation, without stress or duress.

The administration desires to remove the existing statutory embargo against such sale of arms, ammunition, and implements of war. Such action would create an arsenal here in America for the very purpose of supplying some, and some only, of the belligerents with these materials of war. This, in my opinion, is very definitely taking sides, and no one knows where it will lead us to.

The war in Europe involves the greatest military nations of the world. Its causes are even more remote from American national life than the scene is from this land. This is not our war and it is nowhere near us. How this Nation can promote peace by becoming a munitions factory for warring Europe is a mystery to me. I believe that by changing our present course at the very beginning of this war, we are inviting disaster.

Nobody honestly knows whether or not the lifting of the arms embargo will eventually lead us into war, but there is, however, a strong feeling abroad in this land, in the light of our experience during the World War, that it is a first step and will bring our involvement.

Why should we take the chance? My deepest sympathy lies with France and Britain, but my primary interest is to keep America out of war. The United States today is in the most critical economic condition in its history, and plunging this country into another war, with the tremendous expenditures necessary to carry it on, will ultimately lead us to financial ruin, chaos, and possibly dictatorship.

We should immediately give attention to our own defense needs, and provide sea, land, and air forces with the best in armaments and material, because we know that preparedness is the most effective preventive weapon against the threat of war.

For over 300 years, ever since the landing of the first settlers, the people in this New World have lived, sacrificed, and died in order that they might be free from the entanglements of Europe, and to build here in America a new nation where peace would prevail and where they would be free from the tyrannies of the Old World to which their forefathers were subjected.

We have seen in our day great governments of the world topple overnight. Can we afford in these days to take a chance? Are we unmindful of the great sacrifices our forebears made down through the centuries? If we are not unmindful, let us be on our guard to preserve for ourselves and posterity the great institutions of freedom, liberty, and peace, that they built for us. We can do that best, in the present instance, by retaining the arms embargo. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, for the interest of the Members of the House, I have had tabulated certain information relative to the national defense expenditures of the various major countries of the world, the relative power of Europe's armies, navies, and air corps, and also the total licenses issued and exports of arms, ammunition, and aircraft of both Great Britain and France for the first 9 months of this year.

National-defense expenditures of the world, 1932–39

[In millions of dollars]

	1932	1933	1934	1935	1936	1937	1938 (approximate)	1939 (estimate)
North America:								
United States	667.8	540.3	710.0	911.7	964.9	992.1	1,065.7	1,336
Europe:								
Britain	426.1	455.5	480.6	595.6	846.9	1,263.1	1,693.3	3,500
France	509.2	678.8	582.7	623.8	834.4	909.2	1,092.1	1,800
Germany	253.5	299.5	381.5	2,600.0	3,600.0	4,000.0	4,400.0	4,500
Italy	270.6	241.2	263.7	778.1	916.1	573.4	526.0	550
Union of Socialist Soviet Republics	282.5	309.5	1,000.0	1,640.0	4,002.4	5,026.0	5,400.0	7,300
Far East: Japan	199.1	253.1	271.9	296.2	305.1	1,129.8	1,755.3	1,800
World total (60 countries)	3,783.7	3,962.8	5,031.4	8,776.0	12,976.0	15,468.7	17,581.3	(1)

[1] No estimate.

RELATIVE POWER OF EUROPE'S ARMIES, NAVIES, AIR CORPS

(By Associated Press)

Prime Minister Chamberlain's declaration that Great Britain was at war with Germany came to a Europe girded for conflict with the greatest armament the world has ever known.

For more than a year nations in both hemispheres have been spending a billion dollars a month for arms, and most of the money has been expended by European nations.

The best available estimates on the army, navy, and air strengths of the leading European powers follow:

Country	Men under arms	Naval tonnage	Air strength	
			First line planes	Production rate [1]
Great Britain	600,000 to 700,000	2,079,863	3,000 to 4,000	2,000
France	3,000,000 to 8,000,000	815,531	2,000	1,000
Poland	2,000,000	16,500	1,000	(2)
Germany	2,000,000 to 2,500,000	541,023	5,000 to 8,000	2,000
Italy	1,300,000	717,920	5,000	1,000
Russia	2,000,000	290,589	8,000	1,000

[1] Number of planes per month. Production rate is considered highly important in air strength because of huge losses during conflict. Some experts expected as much as 100 percent a month.

[2] No estimate.

	Small arms								Ammunition					
	Category I (1), rifles and carbines		Category I (2), machine guns, etc.		Category IV (1), revolvers, etc.		Total		Category I (4), in excess of caliber .22		Category IV (2), in excess of caliber .22		Total	
	Licenses	Exports	Licenses	Exports	Licenses	Exports	Licenses	Exports	Licenses	Exports	Licenses	Exports	Licenses	Exports
GREAT BRITAIN														
January 1939					$79	$106	$79	$106	$1,022	$1,019	$6	$19	$1,028	$1,038
February 1939	$24						24		46	46	23	23	69	69
March 1939		$24			60	60	60	84	10	4			10	4
April 1939	54						54		27,000	17	116	100	27,116	117
May 1939		54			34	34	34	88	558	27,536	155	171	713	27,707
June 1939	38				665	473	703	473	28	6	89	23	117	29
July 1939	313	38			45	45	358	83	817	807	22	67	839	874
August 1939	1,000	38		$1,000	56	248	1,056	1,286	190	222	74	49	264	271
September 1939														
Total	1,429	154		1,000	939	966	2,368	2,120	29,671	29,657	485	452	30,156	30,109
FRANCE														
January 1939									182		120		302	
February 1939	50	35					50	35						
March 1939														
April 1939	33	48					33	48		86		63		149
May 1939			$1,000				1,000		228		55		283	
June 1939			210,000				210,000							
July 1939	34						34		43		3		46	
August 1939	35	69					35	69		253		55		308
September 1939														
Total	152	152	211,000				211,152	152	453	339	178	118	631	457
LICENSES REVOKED SEPT. 5, 8, AND 10, 1939														
Great Britain											47		47	
France			210,000				210,000		118				118	

	Aircraft											
	Category III (1), aircraft, combat		Category III (2), gun mounts, etc.		Category V (1), aircraft, noncombat		Category V (2), propellers, etc.		Category V (3), engines, aircraft		Total	
	Licenses	Exports	Licenses	Exports	Licenses	Exports	Licenses	Exports	Licenses	Exports	Licenses	Exports
GREAT BRITAIN												
January 1939	$4,000,000	$1,126,604			$195,000	$1,700	$253,155	$110,279	$22,210	$180,419	$4,470,365	$1,419,002
February 1939	7,115,600	1,692,962			113,866	63,823		104,560			7,229,466	1,861,345
March 1939		1,794,104	$1,970		1,600	208,293	457,841	14,229	1,030,026	14,000	1,491,437	2,030,626
April 1939		2,163,694			51,168	39,038	222,547	2,954	323,348	333,014	597,063	2,538,700
May 1939	200,000	2,585,433			21,600	110,049	205	17,028		4,544	221,805	2,717,054
June 1939		3,435,279			34,800	32,300	23,300	80,608	29,434	6,220	87,534	3,554,407
July 1939		5,421,946			29,800	17,200	43,960	108,164	445	3,776	74,205	5,551,086
August 1939		295,050			215,600	20,061	596	9,945	17,700	107,250	233,896	432,306
September 1939		1,422,800										1,422,800
Total	11,315,600	19,937,872	1,970		663,434	492,464	1,001,604	447,767	1,423,163	649,223	14,405,771	21,527,326
FRANCE												
January 1939		1,250,000	1,620	$500	261,675		305,769			39,246	569,064	1,289,746
February 1939	5,000,000	1,300,000			8,612	261,675		84,056	16,400	274,785	5,025,012	1,920,516
March 1939	4,980,000	1,350,000				9,010	8,136	55,917	550,000	42,236	5,538,136	1,457,163
April 1939		868,850		160			336,560	239,496	32,000		368,560	1,108,506
May 1939	9,492,400	708,880						6,467		147,085	9,492,400	862,432
June 1939	1,159,860	2,493,455			184,400		734,949	15,600	12,954,901	39,907	15,034,110	2,548,962
July 1939	31,523,300	2,629,575			12,275	12,275	1,112,718	5,045	2,771,000	383,665	35,419,293	3,030,560
August 1939		1,638,171	38,249			96,102	993,956	229,944	119,800	1,478,607	1,052,005	3,442,824
September 1939		4,392,766						36,557				4,429,323
Total	52,155,560	16,631,697	39,869	660	466,962	379,062	3,492,088	673,082	16,444,101	2,405,531	72,498,580	20,090,032
LICENSES REVOKED SEPT. 5, 8, AND 10, 1939												
Great Britain	12,275,752		1,970		230,000		1,220,575		952,510		[1] 14,680,807	
France	39,876,294		39,209		91,000		3,087,949		15,111,287		[1] 58,205,739	

[1] Includes licenses issued prior to Jan. 1, 1939.

NOTE.—Data for above table extracted from monthly press releases of National Munitions Control Board.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. HULL] such time as he may desire to use.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, the ostensible object of the proposed legislation is to keep our country from getting into the war in Europe. In the discussion of its purpose of late, much has been said about other angles of the situation, such as our responsibility to assist in again making the world safe for democracies, resist aggressors, and incidentally to profit through the sale of munitions, equipment, and supplies to the end that our long-delayed prosperity may be brought about.

It is said that the embargo provision of the present law is contrary to a just neutrality because it is of advantage to Germany, which for the time does not need our war supplies, and to the disadvantage of Britain and France, which desire the full force of our resources and especially munitions, war planes, and so forth.

To adjust such advantages and disadvantages, it is proposed to repeal the embargo and permit all nations, belligerent or otherwise, to purchase from our great war industries to the full extent for which they can put the cash on the barrel head. It is known and stated that the allied nations, having control of the seas, will thus be able to supply themselves fully, while other nations may not.

Hence by not selling war supplies to any nations at war it is alleged that we have become unneutral and that there is

danger of our being drawn into war on that account. Consequently it is proposed in the present measure to change our neutrality, which is of disadvantage to two of the warring nations, by making it particularly advantageous to those nations. We are to define our policy, not according to what will keep our country out of war from our own standpoint, but to lend the weight of our influence and war power to the nations which desire the change in the form of our neutrality from that of not supplying any of the belligerents to that of supplying those which our Government favors.

In the discussion of the present measure there has been constant mention of our right to determine the form and substance of our neutrality under international law. In fact, it has been repeatedly proposed to repeal the entire neutrality statute and permit the President to determine our war policy under international law, whose provisions are so broad and ill-defined that they are construed by all belligerents in every war to suit their own purposes. It was under those same broad and undefinable provisions that other nations succeeded in drawing us into the World War.

But, until the debate upon the Senate bill opened, there was one principle of international law fairly well defined, understood, and acknowledged, and that was that it was contrary to at least the theory of international law that a neutral country should change the form and substance of its neutrality after a war had begun.

The following statement is from a letter from the Department of State to the German Ambassador on April 21, 1915:

WASHINGTON, *April 21, 1915.*

EXCELLENCY: * * * In the third place, I note with sincere regret that in discussing the sale and exportation of arms by citizens of the United States to the enemies of Germany, Your Excellency seems to be under the impression that it was within the choice of the Government of the United States, notwithstanding its professed neutrality and its diligent efforts to maintain it in other particulars, to inhibit this trade, and that its failure to do so manifested an unfair attitude toward Germany. This Government holds, as I believe Your Excellency is aware, and as it is constrained to hold in view of the present indisputable doctrines of accepted international law, that any change in its own laws of neutrality during the progress of a war which would affect unequally the relations of the United States with the nations at war would be an unjustifiable departure from the principle of strict neutrality by which it has consistently sought to direct its actions, and I respectfully submit that none of the circumstances urged in Your Excellency's memorandum alters the principle involved. The placing of an embargo on the trade in arms at the present time would constitute such a change and be a direct violation of the neutrality of the United States. It will, I feel assured, be clear to Your Excellency that, holding this view and considering itself in honor bound by it, it is out of the question for this Government to consider such a course.

W. J. BRYAN.

That international law seems to be of convenient construction by those interested in construing it to their own purpose is evidenced by the varying claims put forth as to our right to change our policy of neutrality from that of nonsupplying all combatants to that of supplying all combatants who can come and get it and pay for what they get.

Our present neutrality policy was pointed to with no small measure of pride at the time of its enactment. It was described by our President as "new weapons with which to maintain our neutrality."

In an address on international affairs at Chautauqua, N. Y., on August 14, 1936, the President not only emphasized the importance of the legislation passed by Congress to "provide safeguards of American neutrality in case of war," but he went further to dwell also upon the importance of that neutrality in keeping us out of war, and of the dangers to our country of the demands of those who would seek fool's gold through war profits and prosperity.

This address, made in time of peace, when a great conflict abroad seemed far distant, evidenced full approval of the present neutrality law. If there were indications that it would prove to be an unneutral act then, no mention was made of them. And if it was a policy of just neutrality then, certainly other nations as well as our own people had reason to believe that it would not be changed as soon as war started abroad.

I quote that portion of the President's speech of August 14, 1936, relating to the neutrality:

NEW WEAPONS PROVIDED TO MAINTAIN NEUTRALITY

The Congress of the United States has given me certain authority to provide safeguards of American neutrality in case of war.

The President of the United States, who under our Constitution, is vested with primary authority to conduct our international relations, thus has been given new weapons with which to maintain our neutrality.

Nevertheless—and I speak from a long experience—the effective maintenance of American neutrality depends today, as in the past, on the wisdom and determination of whoever at the moment occupy the offices of President and Secretary of State.

It is clear that our present policy and the measures passed by the Congress would, in the event of a war on some other continent, reduce war profits which would otherwise accrue to American citizens. Industrial and agricultural production for a war market may give immense fortunes to a few men; for the Nation as a whole it produces disaster. It was the prospect of war profits that made our farmers in the West plow up prairie land that should never have been plowed, but should have been left for grazing cattle. Today we are reaping the harvest of those war profits in the dust storms which have devastated those war-plowed areas.

It was the prospect of war profits that caused the extension of monopoly and unjustified expansion of industry and a price level so high that the normal relationship between debtor and creditor was destroyed.

WARNS AGAINST PLEA FOR PROFITS FROM WAR

Nevertheless, if war should break out again in another continent, let us not blink the fact that we would find in this country thousands of Americans who, seeking immediate riches—fool's gold—would attempt to break down or evade our neutrality.

They would tell you—and, unfortunately, their views would get wide publicity—that if they could produce and ship this and that and the other article to belligerent nations, the unemployed of America would all find work. They would tell you that if they could extend credit to warring nations that credit would be used in the United States to build homes and factories and pay our debts. They would tell you that America once more would capture the trade of the world.

It would be hard to resist that clamor! it would be hard for many Americans, I fear, to look beyond—to realize the inevitable penalties, the inevitable day of reckoning that comes from a false prosperity. To resist the clamor of that greed, if war should come, would require the unswerving support of all Americans who love peace.

If we face the choice of profits or peace, the Nation will answer—must answer—"we choose peace." It is the duty of all of us to encourage such a body of public opinion in this country that the answer will be clear and for all practical purposes unanimous.

With that wise and experienced man who is our Secretary of State, whose statesmanship has met with such wide approval, I have thought and worked long and hard on the problem of keeping the United States at peace. But all the wisdom of America is not to be found in the White House or in the Department of State; we need the mediation, the prayer, and the positive support of the people of America who go along with us in seeking peace.

ASSERTS WE WILL DEFEND OUR NEIGHBORHOOD

No matter how well we are supported by neutrality legislation, we must remember that no laws can be provided to cover every contingency, for it is impossible to imagine how every future event may shape itself. In spite of every possible forethought, international relations involve of necessity a vast uncharted area. In that area safe sailing will depend on the knowledge and the experience and the wisdom of those who direct our foreign policy. Peace will depend on their day-to-day decisions.

At this late day, with the wisdom which is so easy after the event and so difficult before the event, we find it possible to trace the tragic series of small decisions which led Europe into the Great War in 1914 and eventually engulfed us and many other nations.

We can keep out of war if those who watch and decide have a sufficiently detailed understanding of international affairs to make certain that the small decisions of each day do not lead toward war and if, at the same time, they possess the courage to say "no" to those who selfishly or unwisely would let us go to war.

Of all the nations of the world today we are in many ways most singularly blessed. Our closest neighbors are good neighbors. If there are remoter nations that wish us not good but ill, they know that we are strong; they know that we can and will defend ourselves and defend our neighborhood.

We seek to dominate no other nation. We ask no territorial expansion. We oppose imperialism. We desire reduction in world armaments.

We believe in democracy; we believe in freedom; we believe in peace. We offer to every nation of the world the handclasp of the good neighbor. Let those who wish our friendship look us in the eye and take our hand.

The bill before us, but for the proposed repeal of the embargo provisions, might be considered as strengthening the present law. The restrictions as to credits, the cash-and-carry plan of dealing with nations at war, limitations of the

rights of our vessels to enter war zones and of our people to travel on the ships of warring countries, might serve to keep us out of war, and also protect us from the attempts of war profiteers to enlarge their fortunes at the risk of our involvement in the conflict. Although there are differences of opinion as to the merit of some of these proposals, in the main they could be adopted as amendments to our present law without great controversy were it not for the accompanying provision to repeal the embargo and make our country a war-supply depot for all countries who are in the European war and all others who may enter.

Repeal of the embargo makes possible our participation in the wholesale murder and destruction which as yet is only in the beginning abroad. Whether or not it shall prove to be the first step toward our entry into war, it certainly makes the peace-loving people of our country who abhor war contributors to the war to the extent that we further the bloodshed by materials and equipment, and by the labors of our people who by force of circumstances are engaged in the making of the agencies of death and destruction.

Our people learned fully of the disasters of war in the World War. In the 21 years since its close they have continued to declare that never again shall our young men go overseas to settle international differences. They still so declare, and they demand that not even the first step shall be taken which might involve us to the remotest degree.

All assurances that the present measure will keep us out of war, and that there is no danger of aligning our country with other nations in the conflict, are not satisfying. The previous expressions of our President and many others favorable to the law as it is as a means of maintaining peace fully warrant the fears of the people that repeal of the embargo now would be dangerous. Such fears are not lessened by the attitude of the people of London and Paris, whose confidence that ultimately we shall enter the war on the side of the Allies seems based in large part upon the fact that the Administration is seeking the repeal of the embargo. Evidently they regard that repeal as the first move toward our involvement.

In my opinion, there is no question that our shipments of munitions and war supplies to the allied nations at the opening of the World War in 1914 led to our becoming involved. In 2 years, 1915 to 1917, our sales of munitions to the allied armies exceeded $2,000,000,000. In other ways we gradually approached the conflict and, notwithstanding the assurance of our political leaders that America would not enter the war, we entered it within 6 months after our people had gone to the polls and reelected a President upon the slogan, "He kept us out of war."

There are those who look to repeal of the embargo as a means of profit to our industries and thus to our people. Some seem to believe that the depression may be ended through the war orders of the desperate nations which will buy to the limit. Certainly, our World War experience should warn us against such expediency. One-third our present national debt is owing and the interest upon it is being paid by our taxpayers to the amount of $1,000,000 per day because of that disastrous experience in trying to prosper through the catastrophe of war. Thirteen billion dollars of war debts still are due us, largely from the very nations which are anxiously awaiting the repeal of the embargo that they may again draw upon our industry and resources, notwithstanding the default of their contracts and payments of their debts of the World War. One more such experience in keying our industries to wartime production and the consequences may be, and in my opinion will be, dangerous to our future. It might and probably would lead to an economic collapse which would seriously endanger our Government structure.

Opposition to the repeal of the embargo may be considered not only from the standpoint of the European war. There is another war in China, just as ruthless and destructive as the march of armies into Poland. There has been no embargo enforced even under the present law as to Japan, whose greed and aggression is as great as that of any nation in Europe. Over the protests of our people, the profiteers have continued their trade with Japan, and our money and our materials have been as responsible for the conquest of China and the destruction of innocent civilians, including women and children, there as have all the forces of Japan, which but for the assistance we have rendered them long ago would have been compelled to withdraw from the Chinese provinces.

The sense of outrage has been so strongly evidenced by the American public that there are pending in both Houses of Congress measures intended to place an embargo upon shipments to and from Japan. Our Department of State has given notice that in January next it will abrogate our trade treaty with that country. Undoubtedly, Congress would favor any move to stop our participation with money and goods in support of the brutal march of Japan upon China.

If we pass the measure before us which would permit all nations to arm themselves and carry on wars from our shores, Japan certainly will benefit equally with others. Abrogation of our trade treaty with them would become a useless gesture. We would continue to lend our moral and material support to an instance of aggression as great as any the world has ever known. We cannot thus participate by supplying Europe with equipment with which to destroy itself without continuing to condone the destruction of China by the same form of profiteering.

I am heartily opposed to the repeal of the embargo provision, and I shall so vote. That would be my own judgment and determination as a matter of right and justice under any circumstances. I would rather retire from Congress forthwith than to so vote that I might feel that I was in the remotest degree contributing to the wholesale butchery of war, or that my vote might favor a single step toward our country becoming involved in war. In that attitude I believe that I am honestly expressing the sentiment of a large majority of the people of the district I represent. [Applause]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. JENKS] such time as he may desire to use.

Mr. JENKS of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, it is my solemn conviction that inextricably bound up in the action taken on these proposed amendments to the neutrality law is a decision, as yet, however, remote, either for or against war.

I feel convinced that the rejection of the proposal to repeal the embargo on arms and munitions would immeasurably strengthen the possibility of the United States being kept out of war, and I am equally confident that the acceptance of this proposal would entail and increase the possibility of leading this country into war—first on the economic front, as before, and later with our entire resources, including manpower.

The neutrality law was placed on our statute books in the comparative international calm of 1935 in order to clearly define our policy and guide our action in the unfortunate event of the development of just such a situation as that with which we are confronted today. At the time of its passage, it was almost unanimously acclaimed as a plan in the interests of peace and a safeguard against the involvement of the United States in foreign wars. It served notice on the nations of the entire world that we had adopted the humanitarian principle to refrain from ever again engaging directly or indirectly in mass murder by supplying to warring countries actual weapons and implements of war, the sole purpose of which is the destruction of human life. Because the loss of American lives at sea through submarine warfare was conceded to be the primary factor in drawing us into the last European conflict, there was written into the neutrality law a provision to keep Americans and American ships off the seas and away from the ports of belligerent countries. After carefully weighing our rights as a neutral Nation, it was wisely concluded that it would be safer and less hazardous to abandon the illusion known as freedom of the seas in favor of this precautionary measure that would eliminate the possibility of loss of life and treasure.

Unlike the President, I do not regret that the Congress passed the neutrality law and that he approved and signed it. I only regret that it was not kept intact by renewing and extending the cash-and-carry provision on noncontraband materials and supplies which expired last May; had that been done, there would be no occasion today for quibbling over what our foreign policy in the present European crisis should be. I believe that provision should be restored.

Unfortunately, within 2 years after the passage of the neutrality law its undermining was begun. We all recall the President's speech at Chicago in October 1937, when, for reasons known only to himself, he suggested that the United States should help quarantine the aggressor nations of the world; his address in Canada when he conjured the possibility of the invasion of our friendly neighbor on the north. Nor have we forgotten the flurry over whether the President did, or did not, state to a Senate committee that our first line of defense was in France. Again in his message to Congress of last January he warned that there were methods short of war to bring home to aggressor governments the aggregate sentiments of the people of the United States, all of which indicated that the administration was swerving from a neutral policy of noninterference and was drifting toward meddling in the affairs of foreign governments. Lesser incidents could be enumerated to show that the public mind was being conditioned toward taking sides in the disputes of Europe rather than encouraging the rank and file of our citizens to take a neutral attitude toward them in accordance with the law of the land.

The people of the United States are not indifferent to the trials and tribulations or the wrongs and injustices inflicted on the peoples of other nations. There is no question but that without any official suggestion or pressure the sympathy of the vast majority of the people of this country would be, just as it is, with the cause of the European democracies, but at the same time I contend that on the Administration devolved the responsibility of fostering and maintaining the official neutrality we might have had. In that, we all know now, it has deliberately and completely failed. Instead, the overwhelming majority of our citizens are laboring under a cross-current of purposes—as yet insistently demanding that the United States be kept out of war but at the same time vitally and keenly alive to victory for one side and defeat for the other. And so we must admit that the high hopes for official neutrality that we once entertained have been destroyed which, doubtlessly, is the reason that the representatives of the people are now meeting in special session for the purpose of burying the remains of the structure on which those hopes were built.

Incidentally, we must not overlook the fact that by moving into the poker game of European power politics the attention of the American people has been distracted from the dismal failure of the Administration to solve the problems at home—that unemployment, bankruptcy, relief expenditures, and deficits have been supplanted in the headlines of the daily newspapers of this country by the moves of England, France, Germany, and Italy, and more recently Russia.

In writing into the law of this land an embargo on the shipment of arms and munitions to warring nations, no conviction was held that this restriction would prevent war among other nations, because it was a well-known fact that less than 10 percent of the exports from the United States during the last World War consisted of actual weapons or implements of war. Rather this embargo was based on the premise that we as a nation would not be instrumental in aiding, abetting, or promoting death and destruction among the peoples of other nations. It was a humanitarian principle we had adopted which at the same time served as a symbol of our neutrality in foreign conflicts.

To those who contend that this embargo operates to the detriment of the European democracies, let me point out that the limited amount of war munitions that the United States is geared to supply, beyond its own requirements, would have little bearing on the outcome of the conflict; if the United States is to be an active factor in European defeats or victories, now or at any other time, considerably more than the quota of war munitions we are prepared to supply would be required. But now that war has come, as the chips fall under our neutrality law, let us see the result. England having control of the seas and, with France, having certain financial resources and shipping facilities that the dictatorships do not possess has access to our raw materials and food provisions. Certainly nobody will contend that the availability of our supplies is not an advantage and something of a factor in the success of the countries having access to them. So we see that without tampering with our neutrality law as originally enacted the European democracies, because of their geographical position and superior sea power, have the advantage under that law.

Let us not forget that the arms embargo was adopted some 4 years prior to the outbreak of hostilities in Europe. Having served notice on the world what our policy would be in future conflicts, there is justification for the contention that to alter it now would be unneutral.

Mr. Speaker, the situation today parallels in many respects that of the years 1914–17. The same forces are again opposing each other. Once more a figure has appeared on the horizon whose aims and ambitions must be annihilated. We hear again that democracy must be saved, and there is reechoed, as before, that if the side with which our sympathies lie is not victorious the next target of the dictatorships will be the United States. Fear again is awakening, and once the floodgates of propaganda are thrown completely open, hysteria will again stalk the length and breadth of the land, which is not the least of the driving forces that precipitate the decision to go to war. Let me insert here what ex-President Hoover says in the October 28 edition of the Saturday Evening Post:

> We are again told that unless we join in, western civilization may be destroyed and we will be the next victim. Therefore, eventually, why not now? Aside from the fact that Britain and France with their empires can defend themselves, if they stay on the defense, great wars do not end that way. Great wars often enough end in peace before either side is the victor. When one side is the victor in modern wars it is because the other side has become exhausted. At that moment the victors are but one lap behind in the race of exhaustion. Neither at the armistice in 1918 nor at the end of any other war were the victors or the vanquished ready for or desirous of starting another war. In other words, not even the victor is going to pounce upon a powerful armed neutral. Especially they do not attack 130,000,000 people 3,000 miles overseas who have a capacity of 10,000,000 soldiers and 25,000 airplanes. * * * Beyond all this, when all great wars end, all the peoples take out their sufferings upon their leaders, either by putting them out of office or by revolution. And therefore the whole setting changes. The voice of experience says we should discard these forebodings about being the next victim.

The United States is again confronted with a decision: Shall we for the second time disregard the advice of George Washington who counseled—

> Europe has a set of primary interests which to us have none, or very remote, relation. Hence she must be engaged in frequent controversies, the causes of which are essentially foreign to our concerns. Hence, therefore, it must be unwise in us to implicate ourselves, by artificial ties, in the vicissitudes of her politics or the combinations and collisions of her friendships and enmities. Our detached and distant situation invites and enables us to pursue a different course. * * * Why forego the advantages of so peculiar a situation? Why quit our own to stand on foreign ground? Why, by interweaving our destiny with that of any part of Europe, entangle our peace and prosperity in the toils of European ambition, rivalship, interest, humor, or caprice—

Or the warning of Thomas Jefferson who admonished that—

> our first and fundamental maxim should be never to entangle ourselves in the broils of Europe. * * * I have ever deemed it fundamental for the United States never to take active part in the quarrels of Europe. Their political interests are entirely distinct from ours. Their mutual jealousies, their balance of power, their complicated alliances, their forms and principles of government are all foreign to us. They are nations of eternal wars. * * * On our part, never had a people so favorable a chance of trying the opposite system, of peace and fraternity with mankind, and the direction of all our means and faculties

to the purposes of improvement instead of destruction. * * * Our difficulties are indeed great, if we consider ourselves alone, but when viewed in comparison to those of Europe they are the joys of Paradise. * * * I expect that Europe will again be in a state of general conflagration. What a divine contrast is the calm of our condition to the volcanic state of that. How do our little party bickerings and squabbles shrink to nothing compared with the fire and sword and havoc of that arena of gladiators.

There are those who try to counter the soundness of this advice by the contention that times have changed, that through inventive genius space has been diminished, oceans have shrunk, and tucks have been taken in world maps, but do not let us overlook the fact that at the time Washington and Jefferson voiced their warnings against European entanglements there were still territorial sections of this continent that were under the domination and rule of European governments. Despite the more rapid communication and transportation facilities of our day, Europe was then closer to us than now.

After heeding the counsel of Washington and Jefferson for nearly a century and a quarter, we disregarded it for the first time in 1917 when we entered the World War. The situation in Europe today proves beyond a shadow of doubt that our participation in that war contributed little, if anything, toward the solution of the problems that have grown out of centuries of European diplomatic intrigue and the struggle of power politics, rendering lasting peace on that continent still a bedraggled and forlorn hope.

Mr. Speaker, as I see it, the obligation to define or redefine the territorial boundary lines of Europe does not rest on the United States. Despite anything we can do those lines will continue to shift in blood and smoke until Europe itself finds its own way toward amity and peace.

With a repeal of the embargo on arms and munitions, I say the trend is easily foreseen: First, arms and supplies on a cash-and-carry basis; the floodgates of propaganda thrown wide open, rapidly developing fear and war hysteria; next, pressure for arms and supplies on credit, with the accompanying unwarranted industrial and agricultural expansion; and then, as before, a clamor to sustain the boom and protect the credit and investment, which would eventually entail our entire resources, including manpower.

If the United States again becomes involved in a foreign conflict we will sacrifice and utterly destroy our real mission in world affairs; I believe that the greatest contribution we as a Nation could make toward world stability would be through the preservation of our own democracy, undiluted by the ravages of war, holding steadily aloft the lamp of freedom and the light of liberty. Therefore, let us cling to every safeguard to our neutrality that we have or can devise. Let us perpetuate the humanitarian principle we have adopted of refraining from selling arms and muntions, instruments of death and destruction, to all warring nations. "War is hell." Let us keep out of it; we want none of it. [Applause.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BOLLES] such time as he may desire to use.

Mr. BOLLES. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to this Senate bill for three reasons:

First. It has no clear prohibition against the United States financing much of the war by devious methods—by whipping the devil around the stump. My colleague from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] has gone into some of these facts in detail. I hope to have the privilege of voting "aye" on his amendment barring the use of the funds of the Export-Import Bank or the R. F. C. or any other Government corporation in financing any purchases under this bill in the United States. The Senate gave negative approval—that is, that body voted down two amendments which would make impossible the use of R. F. C., Export-Import Bank, or the manipulation of the two billion stabilization fund to aid purchases of war or contraband materials or commodities in these United States.

These Taft amendments voted down were:

Amendment No. 1:

"(d) Subsection (a) of section 10 of the Gold Reserve Act of 1934, as amended, is amended by inserting therein, immediately after the first sentence thereof, the following new sentence: 'The Secretary of the Treasury shall not at any time hold currency, or bills of exchange payable in the currency of any state named in any currently effective proclamation issued under the authority of section 1 (a) of the Neutrality Act of 1939, for which he has expended more than $20,000,000 from the stabilization fund.'"

Amendment No. 2:

"(b) Neither the Government of the United States nor any agency thereof (including a public corporation created by or pursuant to special authorization of Congress, or a corporation in which the United States has or exercises a controlling interest through stock ownership or otherwise) shall make any loans designed to finance or assist the export of goods, materials, or merchandise of any kind to the territory of any foreign government named in any currently effective proclamation issued under the authority of section 1 (a) of the Neutrality Act of 1939."

Already there had appeared a statement by Mr. Jesse Jones, head of the R. F. C., on September 1. It read:

Mr. Jones expressed the opinion that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation could finance exports of commodities as does the Export-Import Bank, and that neither agency was affected by the Johnson Act forbidding loans to foreign governments in default of war debts. However, he pointed out that all Export-Import Bank transactions are with private enterprises and not foreign governments and that neither the bank nor the R. F. C. has any application from governments.

What is the difference whether a government is aided by the use of these funds, I may ask Mr. Jones, or John Q. Bull, a private citizen buys munitions under this Neutrality Act and receives aid out of the American pocketbook.

This Senate bill opens wide the doors to financing a belligerent in this war. If we are to have cash and carry, we ought to know whose cash it is. I want to know from Mr. Jones or the Export-Import Bank how much gold profit to foreign nations is going to belligerents to support credit. The Senate did not answer those questions, Mr. Morgenthau did not answer them, and we are asked to accept them blindly.

When we do this we are going out to pick figs from thistles and plums from thorn trees. We will be paying again for 20 or more years. I am opposed to any system, any plan, or any legislation that permits profits to be picked in pennies from dead men's eyes.

War is now, always has been, eternally will be, the result of two principal causes.

Greed—to get what others have.

Self-defense—to hold what one has, and get more if possible.

Greed has been the impulse of war. It conquered and enslaved. It hitched human beings to chariot wheels. It looted cities and carried off women and slew the men. It made armies and navies. It stole from savage Indian and cheated him in payments. It tortured and squeezed and trampled, ravaged and raped, steaming its face in the hot blood of a thousand million victims. It died as it lived, perished as it performed, by the sword. It made Alexander weep and filled Caesar with ambition.

Let us expand these two causes of war and see if there is a justification for any war that has been fought if we can visualize the aggressor and the other party to war.

First. Desire for power and territory.

Second. Desire for plunder and loot.

Third. Ambition to rule in place of another.

Fourth. Religious wars.

Fifth. Desire for greater self-expression culminating in revolution.

Sixth. Support of a ruling family in some nation other than the one making wars.

Seventh. No just cause but under treaty contract to become an ally.

Eighth. Desire for trade monopoly.

Ninth. Protection of concessions made by one nation to another.

Tenth. Protection of a nation's interests in another country.

Eleventh. Pique, pride, and egotism.

It is 1900 years since Christ wandered about Palestine scourging the consciences of the vicious, selfish, greedy, covetous, avaricious, thieving, mendacious, murderous, and ambitious humanity he found around him. He trampled with

heavy feet on the law of revenges—an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth—he swept aside the doctrine of blood and preached the doctrine of gentleness. He gave the world a new rule for living. He took the iron and steel of materialism and softened it to malleability. He had blistered the skins of Pharisee and doctrinaire alike. He preached revolution, not retribution, not against the status quo but against mental slavery of fixed formula. He planted flowers of spirituality where had grown the poisonous plants of selfishness. He said that the neighbor was to be loved. I have no idea that Jesus of Nazareth, the carpenter, or Christ, the preacher, wanted war but he knew it was coming. Did he not prophesy the destruction of Jerusalem? He lived in the same atmosphere of conquest his race had encountered for centuries. His own people were enslaved and ruled from Rome. If anything could stop war it was the religion of Christianity. If any text or preachment can stop war it is something above the material; it must be spiritual and measured in terms of giving and not of getting.

I have a letter from a dear friend of mine who says this war overseas is to preserve civilization. If so, God help civilization. You cannot shoot civilization into this world with cannon or machine guns; you cannot achieve it with

Blood gushing warm and wet
Along the glistening bayonet.

You cannot make a new civilization—you may destroy it with deadly gas, its victims to live on in broken body, seeping wounds, destroyed black-spotted lungs, blind of eye, skin warped and distorted, and you here in this House are asked in this Senate bill to vote the sale and shipment of this gas. I shall not.

I have wondered for the last few days, my friends, if the Unknown Soldier, sleeping out there in Arlington, was one who went over the top on some dark night for his "rendezvous with death at some disputed barricade" in apple-blossom time and died from deadly fumes of phosgene or mustard gas.

I here desire unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD category VI and category VII of the President's proclamation of May 1, 1937, naming the taboo poison gases. I ask this since I find it impossible to pronounce the names and if I organized this House into a spelling school none could spell them.

CATEGORY VI

(1) Livens projectors and flame throwers.
(2) a. Mustard gas (dichlorethyl sulfide).
b. Lewisite (chlorvinyldichlorarsine and dichlordivinylchlorarsine).
c. Methyldichlorarsine.
d. Diphenylchlorarsine.
e. Diphenylcyanarsine.
f. Diphenylaminechlorarsine.
g. Phenyldichlorarsine.
h. Ethyldichlorarsine.
i. Phenyldibromarsine.
j. Ethyldibromarsine.
k. Phosgene.
l. Monochlormethylchlorformate.
m. Trichlormethylchlorformate (diphosgene).
n. Dichlordimethyl ether.
o. Dibromdimethyl ether.
p. Cyanogen chloride.
q. Ethylbromacetate.
r. Ethyliodoacetate.
s. Brombenzylcyanide.
t. Bromacetone.
u. Brommethylethyl ketone.

CATEGORY VII

(1) Propellant powders;
(2) High explosive as follows:
a. Nitrocellulose having a nitrogen content of more than 12 percent;
b. Trinitrotoluene;
c. Trinitroxylene;
d. Tetryl (trinitrophenol methyl nitramine or tetranitro methylaniline);
e. Picric acid;
f. Ammonium picrate;
g. Trinitroanisol;
h. Trinitronaphthalene;
i. Tetranitronaphthalene;
j. Hexanitrodiphenylamine;
k. Pentaerythritetetranitrate (penthrite or pentrite);
l. Trimethylenetrinitramine (hexogen or T_4);
m. Potassium nitrate powders (black saltpeter powder);
n. Sodium nitrate powders (black soda powder);
o. Amatol (mixture of ammonium nitrate and trinitrotoluene);
p. Ammonal (mixture of ammonium nitrate, trinitrotoluene, and powdered aluminum, with or without other ingredients);
q. Schneiderite (mixture of ammonium nitrate and dinitronaphthalene, with or without other ingredients).

I am for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut, or as added to by the Vorys amendment. The gentleman from Connecticut is not lured from his honest convictions by pressure from profit-making munition factories in his own State and district. He realizes that there is no aggregate final profit in the sale of war munitions.

This bill is not a neutrality bill, notwithstanding its verbiage and its hypocrisy.

This is a bill of alliance with Great Britain and France. Out of the Senate debate two alone were declarants that this is so. I honor those two men for their honesty. We are passing this bill to aid France and Britain. They know it over there.

I spoke here on the fraudulent neutrality in the Bloom bill. That bill was troubled with pernicious anemia. This Senate bill is suffering from pernicious hypocrisy. It pretends one thing and means another.

I am for neutrality, a neutrality that removes America from the field of war, that keeps American munitions from killing anybody, that holds to our ancient traditions of being true to ourselves. [Applause.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS] such time as he may desire to use.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, from the standpoint of Americanism there is probably no one thing on which our citizens are more unanimous in agreement than that of a policy of strict neutrality on the part of the United States plus a fervent desire and hope that we remain out of any future war. Some of the most able minds in our country may and do differ as to the best means of accomplishing our ideal. Because we may differ as to method, we do not charge them with advocating a United States participation in a foreign war. I refuse to believe that for political or personal reasons, any officer or employee of our Government would wilfully plunge our country into a war.

We know from bitter experience the price of war. From a material standpoint should we be drawn into the present European conflict, we would have everything to lose and nothing to gain. From an idealistic standpoint there is that somewhat shop-worn phrase of "make the world safe for democracy." Now we are fully aware that this new war is being fought to see who shall eventually be the big boss in Europe. Some 20 years ago we sacrificed the lives and health of thousands of the young men of this country and we spent billions and billions of the taxpayers' money, trying to make the world safe for democracy. History tells us that we won that war. If we did win it, I challenge any one to point out some concrete evidence of that fact today. We surely did not win a lasting peace. It is needless for me to enumerate now the pain, suffering, and heartaches that are still with us as a result of that war, and I refer primarily to those of our comrades who made the supreme sacrifice, and to those and their dependents whose bodies and minds have been wrecked as a direct result of participation in that war. In addition we still have a tremendous debt in dollars and cents staring us in the face, which must eventually be paid by that fountain of governmental revenue, the American taxpayer.

We are traditionally a peace-loving nation. We do not want war and we entertain no thoughts of aggression. We are loath to see war in any part of the world and have always gladly offered our good offices with the end in view of a peaceful arbitration of international disputes. There are some who are of the opinion that we should take a more active interest in world conditions, world politics, and the brotherhood of nations, but a great majority of our people favor a policy of minding our own business, avoiding foreign entanglements but always with the open hand of friendship extended to the nations of the world. At the present time

we have no quarrel with any country. Individually we might not approve the tactics, customs, or form of government of some of the nations or peoples who happen to inhabit this globe on which we have the opportunity of spending a few short years. This fact does not, will not, and cannot justify our going to war with them. We well realize that our country, notwithstanding some economic dislocations and the teachings of international reformers, is a land of milk and honey, compared to most other nations. We have a degree of freedom unequaled and unparalleled anywhere. We intend to keep for ourselves and our posterity those blessings of freedom and happiness, and should they ever be endangered by invasion of a foreign power, the 130,000,000 people of our Nation will arise as one in defense.

The American people do not want war, nor do I, and I hope and pray, as does every other loyal American, that we will not ever become involved in another war. If we are to avoid war, we must of necessity remain neutral in the present European struggle. How we may best bring this about is a matter of the utmost importance. Surely we will not contribute to the peace of the world if we manufacture and sell to warring nations the materials with which to wage war. The proposition of an aid to our own economic recovery has been advanced as a justification for the processing of raw materials into implements of war for sale to belligerent nations on a cash-and-carry basis. It is also advocated that we should return to international law which permits and advocates the unrestricted purchase of munitions of war from any nation not a belligerent. I cannot agree with either of these theories. I feel that we may far better employ the talents of our vast industrial empire toward the building up of civilization, rather than the production of instrumentalities designed to destroy it. Since the days of the founding of our Nation, we have continued to build and not tear down or destroy.

Does the balance of power in Europe, or who is to be the greatest nation in Europe, or who is to have certain priorities in Europe concern us so much that we must take sides, or if not openly take sides, then slyly furnish aid and comfort to one side, knowing that the other side may not avail themselves of the same opportunity? Going back to World War days, how much attention was paid to international law? So long as it is convenient for the parties concerned to follow established custom—and that is all international law is—then and only then will such law be followed. It is subject to change without notice, and the only remedy for violation is war or retaliation in kind. As one writer so ably put it, "International law is what war makes it." It is true that from a national-defense standpoint we could go into the production of arms and armament with some advantage to ourselves. We could use the battlefields of the world as a proving ground for the development of the most deadly instruments of war, and it is conceivable that with our system of mass production we could produce better implements of war at less cost than any other nation in the world, especially when consideration is given to the fact that we possess an abundance of certain essential raw materials. There can be no doubt of the advantage to our national defense by the unrestricted sale of war materials. It is also true that American industry would make a nice profit. These profits would not mean a lasting prosperity and would tend to further upset our own economic machinery, just as they did during the World War.

I am not unmindful of the result of embargoes in the past. They always have the effect of denying someone a right they otherwise had. It does seem to me that if the present arms embargo was proper when enacted by the Congress and signed by the President at a time when Europe was at peace, that it would be most desirable now when Europe is at war, for our embargo law did not become effective until war was declared abroad. Such law was on our statute books and constituted due notice to the world of our position at that time. Are we now going to do an about-face in our foreign policy?

Public opinion in my own congressional district, and, after all, it is these good people who have committed to me the duty of voting their convictions in this matter, is almost unanimous in the retention of the present arms embargo, believing that this is the best means advanced so far toward keeping our country out of war. I full well realize that there is no law or action that the Congress may take that will absolutely guarantee our not becoming involved in a war at some date in the future. We can take some comfort in the lessons of the past. We do know that a policy of freedom of the seas, with unlimited commerce in all munitions of war, is probably the quickest and surest way of our becoming involved. It was with this idea in mind that the Congress enacted the arms embargo. Has the situation fundamentally changed? Is it the intention of our Government to merely permit industry to make a nice profit out of war materials, with none of the attendant risks of delivery to foreign shores? Or do we deep down in our own hearts intend to aid France and England with the thought of our own safety and peace of mind in the future?

We have witnessed within the past few years many startling alliances between some of the nations of the world. With these alliances we have no particular concern. In the Spanish war we saw German and Russian fighting against each other. Now they are supposed to be allies, at least for the time being. Japan and Germany, together with Italy, formed an alliance which for the moment bid fair to upset the international apple cart. England and France permitted Italy to destroy the Ethiopian Government. These same two governments are now said to be fighting to preserve the Polish Government. How did Hitler get into power; who furnished him with the necessary credits to rearm Germany? Who permitted him to violate a solemn treaty, which treaty was made possible by the feats of American arms? Who will be allies and enemies 5 years from now, no one can answer. I know one thing, and that is the American public is not going to enter such a picture without a clearer objective than was made known to us during the World War.

It is not my purpose or desire to analyze the foreign political set-up. While we naturally are concerned over a war anywhere on the globe, we cannot and should not take the position of world policeman in order to preserve the peace of the world, regardless of how some of our idealists might feel about the matter. We have witnessed our World War efforts entirely erased from the pages of accomplishment. We should have learned our lesson.

The policy of the United States should be one that avoids hates and loves. It should be one that seeks to maintain the friendship of all established governments, without regard to form, religion, or race. It should be one that definitely prescribes America for Americans, and God pity the foreign power that encroaches on any part of the Western Hemisphere. This policy was laid down by Washington and Monroe and is still applicable today.

If such a policy is reaffirmed by the United States, and I feel certain that in the minds of most of our people and by common custom—excluding, of course, the World War period—we have in effect adopted such a course, then America need have no fear of the future.

Modern commerce, communication, and transportation perhaps might preclude us from adopting a complete isolationist policy. Regardless of what might be said as to the latest thing in mechanized military might, I for one feel that we in the United States are reasonably safe from foreign invasion. True, we must always be prepared to repel an invader, but if all the shipping in the whole world outside the United States were available to an enemy, it would be months before a sizable army could be landed on American shores. Let us as a peaceful nation be not entirely taken in by this war talk. Let us contribute everything we can for peace. I am not a pacifist. As a member of the House Military Affairs Committee I have labored incessantly toward an adequate national defense. I still am prepared to go all the way toward that end. I also intend to do everything I can to make war impossible, either on our own shores or abroad.

The President in his speech to the Congress pointed significantly to the breach in our present law, which permits the

shipment of raw materials to warring nations, but not the finished product. The President drew the parallel between a sheet of aluminum and an airplane, cotton to guncotton, brass tubing in pipe form and brass tubing in shell form, and a motortruck to an armored motortruck. He further made a point of the financial gain to our workers in the processing of implements of war. I, for one, would hate to see our own industrial recovery predicated on the miseries of war. Neither do I want to see my country become the munitions maker for the rest of the world. If history repeats itself we will be infinitely worse off economically when this war is over than we were at the height of the depression brought about by the last World War.

Our people are clamoring for a strict neutrality, and I believe most every Member of both the House and Senate would hesitate to do anything that might be construed as an unneutral act. In this connection it is interesting to turn back a few pages in our own national history and find that in 1914 we had an embargo act. Efforts to change that act after the declaration of war by the European powers in 1914 was then said to be an unneutral act and a violation of international law. The principal exponent of this doctrine was Lord Grey, then Prime Minister of England. However, President Wilson and Robert Lansing, who later became Secretary of State, were of the same opinion. If it was unneutral to change our position then, after war had been declared, it is emphatically just as unneutral to change our position now. This also is the conclusion reached by other able and outstanding American authorities on international law.

It is indeed enlightening to read the public pronouncements of some of the proponents of the present move to lift the arms embargo that were made prior to the enactment of the existing law. In 1935 the President said, and I quote:

> I have approved this joint resolution because it was intended as an expression of the fixed desire of the Government and the people of the United States to avoid any action which might involve us in war. The purpose is wholly excellent, and this joint resolution will to a considerable degree serve that end.

Again speaking on the first Neutrality Act the President stated:

> This Government has for several years observed a definite policy of refusing to promote and encourage the export trade in arms, and of forbidding its representatives abroad from taking any action which might be construed as an effort to increase the sales in foreign countries of implements of war manufactured here.

In his annual message to Congress on January 3, 1936, the President declared:

> As a consistent part of a clear policy the United States is following a twofold neutrality toward any and all nations which engage in wars that are not of immediate concern to the Americas. First, we decline to encourage the prosecution of war by permitting belligerents to obtain arms, ammunition, or implements of war from the United States.

Evidently we are to change our neutrality policy entirely if the action taken by the Senate on the pending measure is confirmed. Perhaps there is a reason for this about face. If so, what is it? Let us have more light on the subject. Let us remain in session in order that all pertinent facts may be fully developed.

Thousands and thousands of words have been written and spoken on both sides of the present proposal. The question of the arms embargo has already been given the most sober thought and consideration on the part of this House. Are we going to be stampeded into an absolute reversal of our most mature deliberation, by this war talk? It is high time that we awoke to the realization that we can do nothing by our entering this new war, to definitely solve the European situation. We must conserve our energies for the future. When the war is over, we will have ample opportunity to practice humanitarian principles. We will probably be called upon to feed the starving, bind the wounds, and contribute to the rebuilding of the warring nations, just as we did during and after the last war. To my way of thinking, one of the most humanitarian things we could do for the unfortunate people of Europe who personally do not want war, is to refuse to sell their governments the implements of war. We should retain the arms embargo in the sincere hope, even if it be a vain one, that such action on our part might in some fashion contribute to the peace of the world.

There are few who will deny that foreign trade is most desirable for the well being of our country. Ours is a land of plenty. We produce more wheat, cotton, and other foodstuffs than we can consume domestically. The nations of the world who are now at war need these commodities. There is therefor a tremendous potential market for our surpluses. However, we still remember some of the lessons of the last war and of the impracticability of insisting upon the doctrine of absolute freedom of the seas, if we are to avoid being drawn into the present European conflict. Suppose an American ship laden with sugar, cotton, or wheat, consigned to Sweden, a neutral country, should strike a mine in the North Sea or accidentally meet with disaster at sea. Clever propaganda could very easily make a U-boat attrocity out of the affair, causing public opinion to at once flare up, and we might have a repetition of 1917-18.

During and immediately preceding the last war we lent millions of dollars to European countries to buy the products of our farms and factories. Victor and vanquished alike were the recipients of our largess. Hardly any of that money has been repaid or ever will be repaid. Where did that money come from? You and I know that it came from the pockets of the American taxpayer. At the start of the World War we had a national debt of one and a half billion dollars; now it is over $40,000,000,000. Regardless of what may be said as to the reckless spending of money during recent years, I would rather double our Federal expenditures for domestic needs than to advance one cent of credit to those European nations who so blithely took the hard-earned dollars from our people and then refuse to recognize their obligations in order that they might continue to prepare for the day when their own hatreds and jealousies would again bring them into another conflict.

Yes; we can profitably sell Europe many different kinds of goods that are not in the category of implements of war. But insofar as I am concerned they will have to come and get it, for I refuse to sacrifice the life or liberty of a single American seaman or one ton of American shipping, and they must lay the cash on the line.

We are a free people and have always enjoyed the right of travel anywhere in the world without restraint insofar as our Government is concerned. However, national emergencies have always laid certain restrictions on a free people. There is a proposal in the present measure which I think is a good one. It is the prohibition against American citizens traveling in war zones. We should use every effort to keep our nationals at home during the present European conflict.

My whole thought and interest in this entire matter is the burning desire for peace and the preservation of our United States.

We must face the undeniable fact that "nobody wins a modern war." America can keep out of war. America must keep out of war. Let us keep our emotions down and our intelligence up. Let us not start on a path that ends with a sentry walking past the tomb of another unknown soldier. [Applause.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield now to the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW].

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I hope that the able, genial, and always courteous and obliging chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs will remain in the Hall while I make my few remarks, because I have a question that I would like to ask him. I am not here to read a speech nor to say how I am going to vote on this measure, but I desire to discuss the measure earnestly. The rule under which we are operating in the House is supposed to be the most liberal rule ever offered under like circumstances. Perhaps it is so far as the opportunity for oratory on the part of the Members present is concerned, but it certainly is not a liberal one when it comes to the possibility of any Member being able to offer amendments. I understand that only three amendments may be offered to the

pending motion to instruct the conferees, and that I may not be recognized for that purpose. Under these circumstances, with all humility and all that sort of thing, I wish to make some suggestions for the conferees when the bill does go to conference. I do that because I have very carefuly tried to study this thing with all of the best interests of my country at heart.

The first question I want to ask the able gentleman from New York, the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, is the same one that I asked him the other day, for which he did not then have an answer. Section 2 (a) of the bill provides that no American vessel can carry anything to any belligerent country and section 2 (c) provides that anything that leaves the ports of the United States, destined to one of these nations named in the proclamation shall have its title transferred to some foreign government, corporation, or individual, or what not. The question I propound to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM] is, in his judgment, does that language or any other language in the bill prevent American vessels from carrying goods classified as contraband, arms, ammunition, and implements of war, the title to which is vested in a foreign government, corporation, or individual, perhaps a belligerent, to a neutral nation for transshipment to a belligerent.

Mr. BLOOM. They are not supposed to be transshipped, but how are we going to know it?

Mr. HINSHAW. That is the question.

Mr. BLOOM. And when the gentleman says contraband, he should please remember that every belligerent country has its own list of contraband.

Mr. HINSHAW. I amend my remarks, to mean those items mentioned in section 12 (i) of the bill.

Mr. BLOOM. As far as shipping goods is concerned, according to this legislation we can ship any goods we want to.

Mr. HINSHAW. On American vessels?

Mr. BLOOM. To any neutral nation. We are not allowed to ship any goods on American ships to any of the belligerent countries. If one of the ships is a carrier of any contraband goods, as the gentleman refers to them, and transships the goods to somebody else—of course, they are not supposed to do it, but you do not want to have it put on the shoulders of the United States to follow every ship that carries goods and to find out where it is going when according to law they are not supposed to do that.

Mr. HINSHAW. The thing that I am vitally interested in and concerned with in this bill——

Mr. BLOOM. Does that answer the gentleman?

Mr. HINSHAW. Not altogether.

Mr. BLOOM. It is pretty good?

Mr. HINSHAW. Yes; that is pretty good, but not good enough. The thing that I am vitally interested in and concerned with in this bill is the fact that during the World War it was perfectly possible and legal for American vessels to carry arms, ammunition, and implements of war to belligerents and to carry passengers on the same vessel. I insist that this measure should contain some provision that will prevent American vessels from carrying arms, ammunition, and implements of war to warring nations and also to carry passengers on the same vessel. I do not see how that can be accomplished under the bill as it stands today.

Mr. ALLEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. Yes.

Mr. ALLEN of Pennsylvania. There is no provision in this bill which would permit an American vessel to carry contraband of war and passengers at the same time.

Mr. HINSHAW. But there is no provision in this bill that would prevent it.

Mr. ALLEN of Pennsylvania. Certainly there is.

Mr. HINSHAW. Absolutely not. I ask the gentleman to show me where.

Mr. ALLEN of Pennsylvania. We have the cash-and-carry provision all through the bill.

Mr. HINSHAW. I am not talking about that. I am talking about some provision that will prevent American vessels from carrying arms, ammunition, and implements of war destined to a belligerent, but to a neutral port for transshipment——

Mr. BLOOM. To a neutral port?

Mr. HINSHAW. For transshipment.

Mr. BLOOM. Oh, no. There is nothing in this bill that says anything about transshipment except that it is not allowed.

Mr. HINSHAW. Yes; I know. There is nothing in the bill that prevents it.

Mr. BLOOM. Under this bill they can send it to any neutral port.

Mr. HINSHAW. That is right. Under the old bill it says you cannot carry it directly or indirectly to a belligerent. That is what I am getting at. If it could be stated in section 2 (a) that they shall not carry anything to a belligerent directly or indirectly, that is something else, but I do not want to limit it that far myself.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Is it not a fact that as far as that is concerned, under the present law, through the control of the Munitions License Board, munitions are not to be carried on American ships?

Mr. HINSHAW. That may be in the present law, but I am talking about this bill that we are going to vote on. I want somebody to show me in this bill where it will prevent American vessels from carrying passengers and arms, ammunition, and implements of war in the hold, consigned, if you please, to a belligerent or an agent of a belligerent, but destined to a neutral port.

Mr. BLOOM. It cannot be consigned to a belligerent nation. I would advise the gentleman to please read the bill and he will find that that is impossible.

Mr. HINSHAW. Will you show me that in the bill? It says in section 2 (c) that the title must be transferred to some foreign government. It does not say that any belligerent government shall be deprived of the right to have goods consigned to it. I want to find that and if I can find that I will be very happy.

Now, Mr. Speaker, because I am unable to offer an amendment to this bill under the rule, I have here what I had intended to be an amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk and ask unanimous consent that it may be read out of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Clerk will read.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HINSHAW respectfully suggests that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on Joint Resolution 306 consider insisting upon the following subsections of section 12, following subsection (i):

"(j) It shall be the duty of the Board to prepare and keep a record of the exports from the United States of the material resources of the United States, to obtain frequent reports from the several administrative agencies of the Government concerning the condition of the supply of material resources, and to render reports at not less than quarterly intervals to the President and the Congress, which shall contain such recommendations for the conservation of the material resources of the United States as the Board may deem advisable. Such reports shall state, in respect to any material resource, that the domestic supply of such resource is inadequate for domestic purposes, or is becoming dangerously depleted, and that, in the opinion of the Board, the export of such material should be limited to quantities which may be stated by the Board, or should be embargoed from export.

"(k) Whenever the Board shall determine that the domestic supply of any material resource named by the Board under subsection (j) is adequate for all domestic purposes, and that an adequate surplus in fact exists, the Board shall so notify the President and the Congress of this condition, and the quantitative adequacy of the supply."

The managers on the part of the House shall be further requested to insist upon the amendment of the title of section 12 to read "National Munitions and Resources Control Board."

Mr. BLOOM. May I answer the gentleman now?

Mr. HINSHAW. Yes.

Mr. BLOOM. Under section 2 (a) it states:

Whenever the President shall have issued a proclamation under the authority of section 1 (a) it shall thereafter be unlawful for any American vessel to carry any passengers or any articles or materials to any state named in such proclamation.

On page 16, section (c), line 1:

Whenever the President shall have issued a proclamation under the authority of section 1 (a) it shall thereafter be unlawful to export or transport, or attempt to export or transport, or cause to be exported or transported, from the United States to any state named in such proclamation, any articles or materials—

And so forth.

Mr. HINSHAW. That is not the whole of it. The rest says "until title has been transferred."

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HINSHAW. May I have 5 more minutes?

Mr. FISH. I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at this point?

Mr. HINSHAW. No. I want to complete my statement, please.

That section which the gentleman just read provides that the title must be transferred before the goods shall be shipped.

Mr. BLOOM. No, no. It does not. I did not read about the title.

Mr. HINSHAW. But there was no period where you stopped.

Mr. BLOOM. If you want, I will read the other part, but what is the use?

Mr. HINSHAW. You will find that section 2 (c) reads as follows:

(c) Whenever the President shall have issued a proclamation under the authority of section 1 (a) it shall thereafter be unlawful to export or transport, or attempt to export or transport, or cause to be exported or transported, from the United States to any state named in such proclamation, any articles or materials (except copyrighted articles or materials) until all right, title, and interest therein shall have been transferred to some foreign government, agency, institution, association, partnership, corporation, or national.

Mr. BLOOM. I would like to have the gentleman, after we adjourn, come to my office, and I will be glad to debate it with him for the balance of the evening.

Mr. HINSHAW. I would be happy to do that.

Now I want to refer to my other suggestion that was just read. My other suggestion has to do with the material resources of the United States. Everybody knows that there is a war on in other parts of the world than Europe, but very few people in the House have considered that that war is in existence. Certainly nobody in high office has found that there is a war over there.

I have suggested the insertion of this subsection into the bill in order that if occasion should arise that the United States would find that it was getting short of scrap iron or gasoline, or a few other things like that, which are national resources, that the Munitions Resources Control Board could so find, notify Congress, and in order to preserve our national resources, we could place an embargo on same. I do not believe the Members of this House have considered what is going to happen under this bill if it passes as it stands, and its effect on the situation in other parts of the world than Europe. It is a very serious situation, and I hope that somebody will give it adequate consideration before the bill is passed.

I have another suggestion in line with the one just made and that is to insert in section 1 (a) the words "or conserve the resources of" after the word "peace" in line — so that it shall read as follows:

PROCLAMATION OF A STATE OF WAR BETWEEN FOREIGN STATES

SECTION 1. (a) That whenever the President, or the Congress by concurrent resolution, shall find that there exists a state of war between foreign states, and that it is necessary to promote the security or preserve the peace or conserve the resources of the United States or to protect the lives of citizens of the United States, the President shall issue a proclamation naming the states involved; and he shall, from time to time, by proclamation, name other states as and when they may become involved in the war.

Those words key into the suggested amendment just read by the Clerk. Even if there is no embargo in this bill and the old one is repealed, these amendments may aid the United States in preserving its neutrality in the Orient. I earnestly commend the idea at least to the serious consideration of the conference between the House and Senate on the disagreement.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include certain quotations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks and include certain quotations, I desire to quote a letter directed to a Member of the other body from my State of California:

WASHINGTON, *October 8, 1939.*

Senator HIRAM JOHNSON,
The Capitol.

DEAR SENATOR JOHNSON: Why is it that so little has been said in the Senate debate about the effect of the propossed repeal of the arms embargo on our relations with Japan? Is it attention so focused on Europe that we have forgotten Asia? Are we planning to help Japan to dominate the Pacific? Do we want to have to go to war to prevent the Pacific from becoming a Japanese lake? Are we not likely to get embroiled with Japan if we fail to treat them fairly, as neutrals, and sell them the munitions they bring cash for?

At present they are at war with China, but as war has not been declared they cannot, under international law, blockade the ports of Shanghai, Tientsin, or Hong Kong. They cannot seize vessels taking munitions to Hong Kong for sale to the Chinese. They have not declared war because under the existing Arms Embargo Act they could not then buy supplies as they have been doing on the Pacific coast.

But, if we repeal the arms embargo and adopt a cash-and-carry plan with regard to airplanes, arms, and ammunition, so as to be able to sell these necessary munitions to England and France, how can we prevent the Japanese from coming to San Francisco, Los Angeles, and Seattle with gold or silk in their hands and buying the munitions they need to crush English interests in eastern Asia and dominate the Pacific?

It is obvious that when we repeal the arms embargo the Japanese will at once formally declare that war exists in China. They can then institute a legal blockade. They can squeeze the British out of the Far East by the use of the airplanes, arms, and munitions which we sell them.

With the British Fleet busy in the Atlantic and the Mediterranean, the Japanese can dominate the sea lanes in the Pacific. Having made friends with Russia so that Stalin is even willing to put to death 300 officers of the army in Outer Mongolia for being anti-Japanese, as was reported in the New York Times last Saturday, she can probably borrow gold from Russia to add to her silk credits and help her keep our munitions factories busy making material to help her drive the British and French out of eastern Asia. Do we want to see that happen? Can we prevent it?

If we deny the Japanese the right to operate under the cash-and-carry plan, while permitting it to England and France, we shall be committing an unneutral act of vitally serious import. All international lawyers agree with Mr. George Rublee that in the sale of munitions it is the obligation of the neutral "to afford equal opportunity to each side." We cannot have one law on the Atlantic coast and another on the Pacific, unless we are willing to be embroiled with Japan.

The British have been advised by their chief authority on propaganda, Captain Rogerson, whose book has gone into a second edition, that "it would be a natural and obvious object" of their propagandists to succeed in embroiling us with Japan, "just as during the Great War they succeeded in embroiling the United States with Germany." Are we going to help them do it?

It has been reported in the press that we—that is, our Government, through Secretary Hull—asked our airplane manufacturers on the Pacific coast not to sell airplanes to the Japanese to be used in killing Chinese, and they have agreed not to do so.

But if Japan declares war on China—and possibly on Australia and New Zealand, where the climate suits them and the unoccupied land attracts them—and we have no embargo on the sale of munitions but offer to sell to all and sundry who bring the cash or credit in their hands, as is provided in the pending legislation, will you please be so good as to tell me how we are going to refuse to sell to Japan when, convoyed by an adequate number of men-of-war, her merchant ships come to our Pacific ports and offer to pay cash for large supplies of munitions?

You know the oriental mind. You have had long experience with orientals in San Francisco and California. Is it your opinion that the Japanese will be satisfied with excuses and Executive rulings when they bring the cash and ask for the goods?

They have been satisfied hitherto because they have been glad to have the administration willing to see no war in China and so

to permit them to buy enough scrap iron to make all the steel they have required during the past year. They have even been willing to forego the advantages of a blockade. But do you think it will be long before they take advantage of the proposed legislation which forces our merchant ships off the routes to China, Australia, and New Zealand, which the author of the present bill so blithely says will not hurt us, monopolize that trade for themselves, and politely insist that we be genuine neutrals and sell to all comers?

As has been pointed out by Senator NORRIS and several of the keenest minds in the press gallery, it is no secret that the object of the present bill is to help Britain and France. But will it really help them to be driven out of Asia?

Russia has long had her eyes on Persia and India. With her new friend Japan, she, too, can bring her gold to our Pacific coast and buy the munitions to help drive the English out of India. Busy as they are in the Atlantic, how can the Allies, Britain and France, spare enough ships to prevent Russia as well as Japan from contributing to the rapid development of our munitions factories on the Pacific coast? As long as Russia was at odds with Japan, her fleet in far-eastern waters was large enough to keep the Japanese from dominating Pacific lanes. But now this is changed—at least for the present. Why do we want to help Russia and Japan? Can the advocates of repeal possibly contend that their bill will not help? Will it not hand over to the Japanese the carrying trade across the Pacific?

It seems obvious that our attention is so engrossed by what is going on to the east of us, and that we are so sure that England and France need what we can sell them once the embargo is repealed, that we are blind to what is going on to the west of us and what is likely to happen when we legally permit Japan and Russia to come and get that which will destroy the Allies in the Pacific.

Would those who favor repeal be willing to adopt an amendment that it shall apply only on the Atlantic and not on the Pacific?

Sincerely yours,

HIRAM BINGHAM.

Mr. Speaker, this is serious business we are engaged in here. The bill under discussion carries wide implications, and yet the debate is distinctly limited in spite of what is called a generous rule. I cannot get and hold the floor to inform the House, and neither can anyone else except the ranking members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and even they are limited. The President says that a mistake was made in enacting the present embargo law, which he heartily endorsed at the time. Now he regrets it. I am neither a prophet nor the son of a prophet, with all respect to my dearly loved father, who celebrates his seventy-second birthday on Friday of this week, but I will lay a bet that the enactment of this bill into law as it stands today will be as heartily regretted unless in conference it be vastly improved over its present condition. I sincerely hope that when the bill goes to conference, where the conferees may do to it almost what they please, that it will be properly amended so that I can conscientiously vote for it.

Mr. Speaker, I have offered the suggestion, which the Clerk has read, because I believe deep down in my heart that unless some provision be made to control the export of materials, some provision that will permit the United States to conserve its resources for our own safety, that we will not have a means, a reason in statutes, to stop the export of material resources necessary to the safety and convenience and necessity of this country. While I am not here debating the rightness or wrongness of shipping scrap iron, it is true that the scrap piles of America are almost cleaned out, and scrap iron is a vital necessity to our own economy and our own national defense.

Mr. Speaker, I have before me the figures showing the tonnage of scrap iron that moved through the Panama Canal west-bound between March 10 and April 10, 1939. It reached the staggering total of 124,341 tons in that 1 month. In addition to that thousands upon thousands of tons were shipped to the Orient from Pacific ports. Mr. Speaker, scrap iron is a national resource. In addition to iron we are shipping millions of barrels of petroleum and its products abroad in all directions, and meanwhile our Navy is trying desperately to try to get hold of oil reserves for our own fleet. We must be insane. Now I read in the papers that Russia would buy from us 10,000 tons of rubber. Sure they would buy rubber from us and then a war on the Pacific could cut off our supply. The world has gone plain nuts and also cuckoo, cockeyed crazy. Shall we join the morons in the dance of death?

Now, Mr. Speaker, earlier in this debate the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ALLEN] advanced one of the really valid arguments for repeal of the embargo. He said, in substance, as I recall, that it was necessary now to preserve the safety and more adequately provide for our national defense by permitting our manufacturers to gear up production facilities for airplanes and other arms and equipment by making and selling them to nations now at war. He pointed out that if the United States had to go to war, we must expect to have destroyed over a thousand planes per month. Think of it. Consequently, we should take these foreign orders.

Mr. Speaker, I shudder to think of losing 1,000 splendid young pilots per month, not considering 1,000 planes per month, at a cost something like $100,000 apiece on the average. But that is not the real story. We have not enough first-class military planes on hand and on order right now to last us 2 months. I say that advisedly. Talk about war; we would not last 2 months in the air.

But, Mr. Speaker, we have a tremendous capacity to build planes in this country; we have a capacity to build 1,000 planes per month in our aircraft factories right now. They are working, many of them, short-handed and one shift per day. I say that if we need planes for national defense let us buy them right now and build up our own air force until we have enough first-class fighting planes to hold off an enemy while we are replacing those we lose. It is rank folly not to do so now. In my district is located one of the greatest aircraft factories in the world, the Lockheed Aircraft Corporation, of Burbank, Calif. This factory builds the fastest and best intercepter pursuit plane built in the world. That plane, the *PY–34*, will rise into the air and climb 5,000 feet per minute and it will cruise—cruise, mind you—at 420 miles per hour. A plane of that type made it from California to New York in a trifle over 7 hours. How many of these ships has our Government ordered? Just 66. Mr. Speaker, we should have at least 10 times as many ships that will do that or better, if possible. If our plants need business to prepare them for war, then let us here in the United States give them the business. That is one of the best ways I can think of right now to successfully mind our own business, which is to stay out of war and be strong enough to keep out.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONNERY] such time as he may desire.

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Speaker, presumably we are here in Washington in special session for the purpose of considering neutrality legislation which will keep America out of war. But after listening to many declarations here in the House during the last couple of days and in the Senate during the last 4 weeks, one cannot but be convinced that we are here for no other purpose than to place weapons and implements of war in the hands of one European belligerent to be used against another. That to my mind is not neutrality. Not only is it not neutrality but it is intervention. If the arms embargo is repealed, then we cannot say that America has not taken definite sides in the conflict abroad.

I have the privilege, Mr. Speaker, of being one of the few Members of this House who served as an ordinary enlisted man in the Army of the United States during the entire period in which America participated in the last World War. I was a sergeant in the Twenty-sixth (Yankee) Division, the first National Guard division to be sent to France, and I served for 19 months there.

I do not parade my war record for the purpose of self-glorification, but rather to impress upon the membership of this House that I can speak about the horrors of war at first hand and that, because of this knowledge of the horrors of war, to try to convey to this membership that we must see to it that there is no recurrence of the days of 1917 and 1918.

My service included Chateau Thierry, the Argonne, and St. Mihiel. I was in the first wave that went over the top on that September day in the St. Mihiel drive, and I still carry with me the very vivid and horrible recollection of seeing enemy shells and machine-gun bullets smash into that first wave, making gaps where my buddies—yes; some of them boyhood chums—had stood. I can remember of saying to

myself on that awful morning, "In God's name, what are we, Americans, doing here in France fighting someone else's battles at such terrible cost?"

And because of those memories, which will always be with me, I cannot subscribe to any legislation such as has been proposed for the repeal of the embargo when I firmly believe that such legislation is fraught with every possibility of other young Americans being sent abroad as we were in 1917. I am determined that they shall not go.

Call me a complete isolationist if you will, but I cannot for the life of me find any plausible excuse, morally or otherwise, for our country to sell to any belligerent any weapon or implement of war, regardless of how great the material gain to our economic condition, as long as there is even the slightest possibility that such weapon or implement might snuff out a life.

We cannot lift the arms embargo and at the same time proclaim to the world that we are neutral. We cannot select through legislation a belligerent we desire to favor, regardless of how our personal feelings lean, and still say we are neutral. We cannot be half in and half out at the same time.

The Lord knows that I have no sympathy for the nazi-ism of Hitler or the communism of Stalin. But this war is not of our making, it is none of our business, and I cannot but firmly believe that we should absolutely stay at home and mind our own business. In the last World War we were propagandized that we should "make the world safe for democracy." And we fell for it. The last 20 years have proven to us how completely we were fooled and how little of democracy was made safe. The slogan is worn out, so let us not be fooled again.

To my mind the whole of Europe or any part of it is not worth the sacrifice of one young American life. Let us legislate to protect those young American lives, insuring that they will not be sacrificed upon the altar of the munitions makers and money-mad profiteers to our everlasting discredit and shame. When this arms-embargo provision comes before us for disposition, I will vote for its retention with the complete realization that I am doing so in the sight of God, of my own conscience, and of the souls of the 130,000 young Americans whose lives were so needlessly sacrificed in the World War.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR].

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. O'CONNOR. As I understand the situation now, no further amendments are in order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COOPER). Any amendment offered now would be in the third degree and not permissible under the rules of the House.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I shall address my remarks principally to the distinguished, affable, popular, and very able gentleman who is chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House.

I do not believe any Member of this House desires to extend or permit the extension of one dime of credit to any belligerent nation, as it is my belief that we all appreciate the fact that the extension of credit to England and France was one of the primary causes for our entry into the World War 22 years ago. As I said on the floor of the House yesterday, I do not want an American citizen to have the right to go into Canada or Mexico, or elsewhere, and consummate a deal whereby we may extend credit to any foreign belligerent nation. I wish the Members of the House to bear in mind that under the provisions of section 7 (a), as written, that very thing may occur and the provisions of the law may be circumvented in that fashion.

This section also contains the following language in lines 9 and 10 on page 23 of the bill, which are extremely objectionable, namely:

Issued after the date of such proclamation.

Now, what is the effect of such language? To bring it down to a practical point of view it means this: That this Government or any citizen may purchase or acquire any and all securities of belligerent nations issued prior to the proclamation made by the President declaring that a state of war exists, thereby assisting and aiding in the financing of the war of belligerent nations. In other words, until such proclamation is issued by the President of the United States under this bill, it is possible that foreign belligerent nations could acquire on credit an unlimited amount of goods and then issue evidence of indebtedness immediately before such proclamation and thereby circumvent the operation of this law. The language referred to should be stricken out of said section, otherwise all kinds of subsisting obligations of foreign countries at war could be dumped and sold into this country and we would again be tied up in a financial way with England and France, which might ultimately cause our boys to be again sent to the shambles of Europe.

I have great faith in the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House and the ranking minority Member of the House, Mr. FISH of New York, both of whom I believe will work to see these objectionable features of this proposed law corrected. As it stands now, it seems to me that so far as extension of credit by the Government and the citizens of this country to the belligerent nations of Europe is concerned, this bill has loopholes large enough through which could be driven a yoke of bulls. Under no circumstances do I want this war financed by American citizens in whole or in part. That is the one thing that we must avoid under any and all circumstances.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself one-half minute to answer the gentleman's question.

Mr. Speaker, I may say to the gentleman from Montana that I thank him for the information. I will read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and give his statement full consideration after reading it.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. GUYER] such time as he may desire.

Mr. GUYER of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, in 5 minutes one cannot adequately discuss neutrality as a principal of international law. But in his answer to protests of the Imperial German Government, Secretary Bryan in 1915 stated the proposition as it should interest us when he said that any change in the law during a war which produced an advantage to one belligerent and a disadvantage to another was an unneutral act. That is precisely what the repeal of the embargo on arms and munitions would be at this time.

Why not be frank and honest and say that the reason for the repeal of the embargo is to enable us to sell munitions and implements of war for the money we can make out of it, for the profit we can wring from the desperate and unhappy peoples at war? Why not say to Germany that we want her to understand that we are neutral and are not furnishing the Allies these weapons of war and other munitions because we want to help them—that would be taking part in the war against Germany. We are simply doing it for the money we can make out of it.

Or, be equally honest and say we are not doing it for the money we can make out of it, but we want to help the Allies. This would be purely unneutral and would be tantamount almost to a declaration of war.

We were told by the President there was such an emergency existed that it demanded the presence of the Congress and that the embargo on arms should be repealed. Whose emergency was it? It was certainly not the one created by Democratic policies which leaves twelve or fifteen million idle men in this country, for the reason that President Roosevelt expressly stipulated that domestic legislation outside of raising the embargo should be left strictly alone.

Was it a British or French emergency? Then it was an unneutral act to change the law during a war for the reason that England and France would reap an advantage from such traffic while Germany would suffer a loss. There could be no better definition for an unneutral act under international law and might easily lead to war. At least it is a step in the direction of war.

Last spring I voted against the repeal of the arms embargo in the opinion that it was a vote for peace, which is the ultimate hope of everyone; and would do so again. For the same reason I voted to deny the President any more power, believing the Congress should keep its own finger on the trigger.

It is not our war, anyway We should keep our hands off of it and our noses out of it.

The important and controlling fact is the attitude and the real intention of this administration. The lamp of experience is the greatest teacher of mankind. Let us look back over our shoulder to 1914. At the beginning of the World War it seemed that Providence had placed in the White House just the man for that crisis—Woodrow Wilson, "too proud to fight." That was not a mere epigram; it was the deep and deliberate conviction of a masterful mind and a sincere heart. He told the people on the screen of every picture show in the country to even think neutral and not to applaud war pictures lest some belligerent think we favored its antagonist. Woodrow Wilson was the cooing dove of peace that November of 1916, in the Presidential election. George Creel, Democratic publicity man, wrote the greatest political advertisement since Caesar wrote his political pamphlet The Gallic War—

> You are working, not fighting;
> You are living, not cannon fodder;
> Wilson kept you out of war.

That elected Woodrow Wilson. What a travesty on truth; what a tragedy of duplicity. One hundred days after the result of that close election was known war with its bloody knuckles was knocking at the door of every American home clamoring for its best blood. A great many people believe Wilson deliberately deceived them; that as bright a man as Wilson was would have known what might happen 4 months after the election.

But assuming that he was sincere and that suddenly after the election he saw the light and plunged the country into war. Might that not happen again? Again we have a President cooing for peace. We heard him on the radio and again in the House on September 21. In the light of what the President has said about "quarantining aggressors," that our "frontiers may be in France," and of his demands for unusual powers for the executive department, I confess I have no confidence in anything he says about peace.

Among Democratic politicians I have discovered a thinly disguised satisfaction that the war has come in Europe. They remember that the last war came when Democratic policies had stretched out huge bread lines and established soup kitchens in every city in the United States. Then the war industries took up the slack in employment and saved the Democratic Party by the skin of its teeth in 1916. Does the President want to cover up nearly 7 futile years of dismal failure in bringing back prosperity by building up a huge war industry for England and France which cannot help but be unneutral and finally end in war?

The argument has been presented that if we do not furnish the Allies with munitions they may be defeated and that then Germany would attack us. Even should there be an Allied defeat, which is next to assuming the impossible, nobody in Europe, particularly Germany, would dare to attempt the task of crossing the Atlantic with an army large enough to make any impression on us with the vast supplies necessary for such an expedition. Such speculation is nonsense. Besides, no one wants to fight us from the Atlantic side; certainly not at this time and especially not after an exhausting war at home in Europe.

Of course, we can get into this war if we want. It is not a private affair, not an exclusive party. I am sure we have been invited. Was the visit of Their Majesties to Washington and to Hyde Park a purely social call? Was the visit of Lord Beaverbook recently at the White House merely an occasion for reminiscences with an old pal?

Is Lord Marley, Deputy Speaker of the House of Lords, making a speaking tour in the United States to enlighten our people in regard to Shakespeare and Bacon or is he here rather to take home the bacon as did Balfour in 1916 and 1917? Is Alfred Duff Cooper, recently First Lord of the Admiralty of the Mistress of the Seas, who just arrived on the steamship *Manhattan* to conduct a lecture tour in America, here merely to enlighten Americans on the flora and the fauna of the British Isles? Is it not openly said here in the Capital that the British Ambassador, Lord Lothian, and the State Department keep the President in constant and instant touch with London?

At any rate we will not lack an invitation to participate in this war, but, having been once sadly burned, our memory may save us from being carried off our feet by propaganda and the war hysteria that so often follows incidents like that of the *Flint*, or more serious affairs. The American people must exercise restraint when these cyclones of emotion and hysteria sweep the country. The Congress must likewise steel itself in firm resistance to pressure that would lead us into a war that we had nothing to do in its creation. It was fathered by the hatreds and grudges that are ages old and utterly foreign to the thinking of our people. These ancient quarrels do not concern us and we should not permit either propaganda or war hysteria to sweep us into some other nation's war.

There are some things that justify us in waging war, as in case of foreign invasion, the abrogation of the Bill of Rights, the right to worship God according to the dictates of our own conscience, and the maintenance of the Constitution.

And we can and must keep out of foreign wars. We did not start them and it is not our duty to stop them. This we should do if we, the Congress, must stay in session until Christmas.

Believing that the repeal of the embargo is the first step, no matter how slight toward involving my country in this suicidal war, I am going to vote against its repeal. [Applause.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois [Miss SUMNER].

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it seems the real reason some Members feel inclined to vote for repeal of the arms embargo is that they think that if Hitler wins he will "get us next."

No conqueror since Caesar has ever succeeded in digesting all of Europe including England. No force, military experts inform us, has ever succeeded in invading a foreign shore if met with reasonable resistance. We have more to fear from an American invasion of Europe than from a European invasion of America.

For years it has been apparent that European affairs were approaching another climax. America has been pursuing a policy of using weapons "short of war" to buttress British strategy. A foreign policy so dependent upon suggestions from Great Britain tends in my opinion logically to lead us toward war every time England goes to war.

It seems to me, moreover, that England is likely to have war more frequently in the future than in the past. Though we have the greatest affection for Great Britan we must realize that that little island which is her seat of government is in a very precarious position, increasingly difficult to defend in terms of modern warfare. Well British statesmen know what may happen unless they use the utmost ingenuity in dealing with their neighbors.

British foreign agents have, no doubt, been doing their best and it is not for us to criticize them. But can we trust them to be the arbiters of American destiny?

Surely it is evident by this time that there would not be an embittered and militant Germany today if there had been ordinary tolerance and justice in the treaty settling the World War. Or if there had been cooperation with the German democracy set up after the war. Or if there had been ordinary diligence against German rearmament after the dictator came to power.

The British did not bother to crush him while he was still easy to crush. Now that he is prepared for war they say to us that even America cannot be sure of peace until he is destroyed.

We are already helping them in many ways "short of war" and now we are asked to ship arms. How much fur-

ther will they urge us to go? Many say that England will win this war, but cannot completely crush Germany without American money and perhaps without all the help of which America is capable.

England has never lost "face" nor territory in a war. Should not we wait until she loses something before we discuss sending arms to help her?

You say that there is no risk to American peace in shipping arms. There was testimony before the Senate committee which investigated the activities of the munitions industry that that industry has influence in the "highest places" in government. That it corrupts public officials. That it stirs up wars. That it once foiled the attempt of a President of the United States to procure world disarmament. That it was an irresistible force drawing us into the World War.

We are asked to assume this risk to help the British program. But what is the British program? All we are told is that it is intended to crush Hitler. But will crushing Hitler exterminate nazi-ism?

Have you read Mein Kampf? It is the campaign literature of the politician, Hitler. It sounds like a garbled version of the German post-war philosopher Oswald Spengler. Mein Kampf is an appeal to sentiments already kindled in the breasts of a people already persuaded that if they become efficient enough they may rise from their knees and achieve for German children of tomorrow as much as British children have today.

Shall we vote to furnish guns to kill people for being induced to believe such political voodoo? Can you reform people by shooting and gassing them? European gossip now is that our "good-neighbor" policy is imperialistic toward South America. Would it improve our national thinking if some nation tried to end the "good-neighbor policy" by sending bombers to destroy us?

The more arms we send the more devastating this war will become. Can we conscientiously send them? What can we show posterity that we have done to prevent this war?

For some time we have held in America almost all the gold in the world. Did we offer to pay Germany to disarm? Germany was underfed. Did we offer to bribe her citizens with food? I am not endorsing our Uncle Santa Claus foreign policy. But it does seem that we have given billions away all over the world except in the one troubled spot where it might have saved a war.

Does that idea seem fantastic to you? Well, to me nothing seems so utterly fantastic as helping people slaughter one another. If I voted to lift the embargo I fear that I should walk the halls at night thereafter, like Lady Macbeth, rubbing bloodstains from my fingers.

If it was wise to try to avoid European involvement in the days when we had a Washington as President, a Franklin acting as roving ambassador to foreign nations, a Hamilton as Secretary of the Treasury, surely it is prudent to preserve American independence of foreign entanglements now that we have not a Washington as President, a Franklin acting as roving ambassador to foreign nations, a Hamilton as Secretary of the Treasury.

While we still followed the example of these national ancestors we came a long way up the path toward civilization. If in this hour of indecision we once more adhere to their great principles I believe that we shall become a greater world force, not toward war, but toward peace and understanding. [Applause.]

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. ALLEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the gentlewoman from Illinois a moment ago prayed for a Washington and a Hamilton at this time. I should like to remind the gentlewoman that Franklin D. Roosevelt and Washington and Hamilton pursued the same course as far as an arms embargo is concerned. I read in the RECORD yesterday a declaration by Secretaries of State Pickering and Jefferson of Washington's first administration in which they insisted on our right to sell arms to belligerent nations. Washington. Jefferson. Henry Clay, Presidents Franklin Pierce, Theodore Roosevelt, Woodrow Wilson, all insisted on our right to purchase arms for our own defense and consistently persisted in their rights under international law to sell arms to foreign belligerents for their own defense. Franklin Roosevelt is following a historic traditional policy.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COOPER). Permit the Chair to announce that the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] has consumed 6 hours and 20 minutes, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM] has consumed 5 hours and 29 minutes. The gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] has used an hour more than the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM].

Mr. FISH. Let me say for the sake of the RECORD, Mr. Speaker, that due to the courtesy of the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM] we reached an agreement whereby, having a few more speakers on our side, the time used now would not be taken into account in considering the final time and we would have the same amount of time tomorrow morning on both sides.

Mr. BLOOM. That has been agreed to and is satisfactory, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ALEXANDER].

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, it is a sad commentary on the ability of this Congress and its importance when we seek as we have been during these 2 days of debate to limit, as we are, the time for debate on so important a measure. At no time in the history of the Nation has there been a more important measure before this House. I for one cannot conceive of trying to cram this thing down our throats under the application of a gag rule which would attempt to dispose of so important a measure in the period of 3 days, and I, for one, can see no reason for this haste.

Who is it that wants this haste? Who are the people that are in such a hurry to get this bill passed? Not I, and probably not any of you. It is the men behind the scenes, a small group of selfish interests, who are pulling the wires, that want to hasten this bill through. I venture to suggest that it is not in the interest of the great masses of American citizens whom you represent to allow this thing to be put over. I for one believe we should remain in session until Christmas, if necessary, or longer, in order to dispassionately and deliberately debate this important question.

As I have read or listened to the debate in the Senate, and as I have listened to the debate here in the House, I have tried to pick out the one point which is most important on which we can fasten our attention and say, "This is the point which must be decided." As I have listened to the debate here on both sides of the aisle, it has seemed to me that the question revolves on whether or not it is in the interest of the United States to go to the aid of England. Those who are proposing the repeal of the arms embargo insist that it is in our interest to do so. I deny the truth and verity of any such statement. Why, the death knell of the British Empire has already been sounded. Do we want to fasten ourselves to the tail of the kite of a rotten, decayed, and dying member of the society of nations?

Do not deny that the death knell of the British Empire has been sounded! It was sounded in October 1935, when Mussolini went across the Mediterranean and down into Ethiopia, then and there thumbing his nose at the great British Navy. It has been sounded on various occasions since then by Hitler, by Mussolini, and by Hirohito in Tokio. It is being sounded every day.

England is already out of power in the Orient. England is going out of power in Europe. Her Empire is disintegrating. India is on the point of revolt. England is submissive to control by Japan in the Orient, and every one of her dependencies is ready to cut loose if they can do so and safeguard their own hide.

Probably the great reason for this situation is that England is bankrupt, bankrupt mentally and bankrupt financially. Have you ever known any individual or nation that could not pay its just debts that was not bankrupt? How many months and years now has it been since England has been

able to pay her just debts to us? Bankrupt! Do we want to fasten ourselves to a dying member of the society of nations, to a bankrupt kingdom? If England is not bankrupt mentally and financially, then I am not standing here in the House of Representatives before you. It is just as true as the fact that I am here.

It has also been suggested that England may be somewhat poverty striken morally, judging from some of the things which have occurred in the British Empire during recent years. In any event, be that as it may, I say she is bankrupt mentally, judging from the mistakes which have been made by the British leadership. During the recent months and years we have been watching her and I venture to say there is no one here but is convinced of the errors that have been committed in judgment and in mental ability by the leadership of that erstwhile great empire as they have gone swiftly and surely down the road to another war.

Do we want to be a province of England? Do we want to be considered to be a colony of such an empire still, or did we cast off from her over 160 years ago? This makes the question, it seems to me: Shall we take the leadership in this year of 1939, a leadership for peace for the world and for the United States, or shall we continue to debase ourselves by attaching ourselves as a follower, as a minor state, to the British kite, which is always a kite for war and not a kite for peace, as history indicates and as has been so well pointed out during the past few days of this debate? Do we want to do that, I say, or shall we take a new leadership, a world leadership, if you will. Instead of being a tail to the British kite, let us use our heads; let us be smart, not emotional; let us be the leaders. Is not that the real question which is facing America and the Members of this Congress today—Whether to be the leader or be led as in 1917? Have we not learned from that lesson? [Applause.]

MAKING HISTORY

We are making history here today and we want to write the record well. History was also made in April 1917 and again on the 11th of November in 1918, then later in the Treaty of Versailles. We all know there is considerable difference of opinion as to the wisdom of some of the history which was written in those years.

How well we write it in November 1939 will depend largely on how much you can extend your wisdom beyond the ordinary, for, make no mistake, this is a great hour and a great problem. No ordinary judgment or wisdom can suffice or serve us now. Rather, we need the wisdom of a Solomon, the wisdom of the ages, of all the best minds of America today—indeed, more than that, we need the wisdom of the Infinite to guide us in order that we shall make no misstep.

So far in the course of this debate very faint has been the voice of wisdom. We have heard some good speeches; yes. We have heard some bursts of loud oratory, but, on the whole, there has been more or less repetition of the arguments used in 1916–17 and again in 1935 to 1938. I might add one exception to that statement, and that is that the best minds, the cleanest, clearest minds, all seem to favor the retention of the arms embargo.

JUST A BUSINESS PROPOSITION

This is a business proposition. All war is and ever has been, and unless we keep that fact in mind we lose sight of a very vital point in our consideration of what to do and how to do it. In much of the debate which has been going on here we have allowed our emotions to take charge of our better judgment; consequently the time put in on this discussion is considerably valueless. But the fellows behind the scenes pulling the wires and giving orders are, I imagine, satisfied and well pleased because we have failed to grasp the real situation while we continue to blind ourselves with their smoke screen of argument on this, that, and the other kind of neutrality legislation.

It is very likely that, as I said in my address here on June 28, when we get all through legislating neutrality, and the administration or the majority has its way, we will find that we overlooked something or that we failed to take into consideration some future event or that we made other errors of judgment and lacked in foresight in our zeal to serve the business interests who are so anxious and intent on lifting the arms embargo and in promoting the cash-and-carry program for the benefit of the British Allies.

It is very apparent that we learned nothing in 1917–19. We are still messing around right where we left off then, seemingly unable to pull ourselves out of the morass of British propaganda and influence. In this matter the President has been taking active leadership.

BIASED DIPLOMACY

But in one extremely important respect President Roosevelt differs from his predecessor Wilson with regard to the conduct of foreign relations: He wants, by deliberate avowal, to follow a biased policy toward the nations of Europe.

Unlike Wilson whose bias was concealed behind a rhetoric of impartiality and was only discovered and exposed after he had carried this country into war, Roosevelt intends to take bias as an indispensable element in policy and to deduce from it a line of conduct for the United States. The bias is to be founded in his private judgment of the relative guilt of the warring nations. He will pick and name the aggressor powers. This incredible procedure prejudges the causes of the opposed powers in Europe in a fashion that makes Wilson's efforts appear like that of an amateur.

The validity of Wilson's bias was not ratified by events. On the contrary, his ignorance, real and feigned, of the actual facts of the outbreak of the war and the secret treaties in which the allied governments had divided the prospective loot of the war, made his bias absolutely fatal to the aims he professed. He committed himself to one side when his aims could only be achieved by the position of impartial arbiter, if at all.

Roosevelt proposes to rule himself out of the picture as impartial arbiter with equal finality, but much earlier in the game. By becoming the avowed partisan of one side, he commits himself to their cause in utter ignorance of their intentions should they win the war. He divests himself of any power to act as a moderating force on the cupidity which will rule their councils when victory has been achieved. The fatal flaw in Wilson's calculations was his misjudgment of the real nature and purposes of the side he came to favor. This is not to argue that he should have aided the other side, as some debaters may assume. It is rather to insist that Wilson achieved the very peak of his insight into the first World War when he came nearest to being neutral and sought to use his good offices to arrange a negotiated peace. On that peak he clearly saw the war as a consequence of—a phase of—power politics in Europe. Roosevelt has never achieved that peak. He has shown no disposition even to struggle toward it. He proposes to begin in the error into which Wilson slipped after many weary efforts to make some sense out of the terrific struggle of 1914–17.

The final verdict on these matters is not yours or mine; it is the verdict of history. It is my guess that if Franklin Roosevelt, through your aid, contrives to incorporate his bias into public policy—even with the support of the liberal war mongers and the plug-uglies of the upper classes—he and you will be condemned by history.

The role of bias in the diplomacy of the United States during the first World War was a fatal role. Those who did most to foster and forward it today stand condemned.

President Roosevelt is bent on following a course which parallels theirs. He complacently ranges himself in the company of Wilson, Lansing, House, and Page. These are the men who sold us down the river in 1917. President Roosevelt threatens to repeat the deal at a time when conditions down the river are worse than ever before.

The argument in favor of a biased American policy toward Europe has its roots in propaganda. The dogma that the United States has a vested national interest in a particular power pattern in Europe was first established in the American mind by British propagandists and their allies during the first World War. It was adopted by Woodrow Wilson

as a basic element in his diplomacy. Its general acceptance today is a triumph of propaganda over common sense, for its unreality was demonstrated by Versailles. At the Peace Conference it was conclusively proved that such a view was a fantastic oversimplification of the real issues in Europe.

Today it is leading to the identification of American interests with the survival of British Tory imperialism and French reactionary imperialism. The only common denominator in this jumble of interests is preservation of the status quo. But on any realistic assessment, American interests can only be realized in a changing world. A static world can only repeat the pattern of peace and war which began to become monotonously familiar in 1914 and now continues.

AMERICANS SHOULD BE NEUTRAL

For myself I do not feel that we should go to the aid of either side in this conflict, nor should we sell munitions and gear our national production to a war economy. What we need rather to do is to take a constructive leadership for peace. Do not forget this is a business proposition. Do not be mistaken or think that it can be solved by restricting business or by half measures, measures short of war. Oh, no; we will not be able to save our own hides thereby. Most certainly it will only be solved by rising above the commonplace, by rising above mere consideration of the surface problems. I do not believe we can afford to be either pro-British, pro-German, or pro-Communist. I imagine if all my ancestors could be paraded out here on the scene before us today it would be found that they are predominantly of British origin. Probably Scotch, with a sprinkling of Dutch, German, and Scandinavian. In other words, I, like most of you, am a mixture of European races. Consequently I feel sympathetic for all of them and their problems and their sufferings in this war. I feel especially sorry and sympathetic for the poor British who really do, without a doubt, need our help; but we must not let our sympathy or emotions sway us in our consideration of this matter. We must only be pro-American if we are to be real patriots.

As I stated previously, we must realize that the British do need our help, that they are bankrupt, that they are not a success, that they are a liability in a world intent on peace. Consequently we cannot afford to follow them further. Rather we must be the leader in order to save our dear British cousins from complete destruction. There is every good reason why we should do this, because we are now the only democracy left on the face of the earth. We are the only nation still able to maintain a representative form of government. We are the only nation where the people want peace, are peace loving, and are able to control the actions of their government along the ways and in the paths of peace.

ONLY BASIS

If the administration forces insist on having their way in this matter and are successful in repealing the arms embargo, I suggest that as a part of the bill before it is finally presented to the President for his signature, that the proponents of repeal should insert a clause, a proviso if you will, to the effect that when we are drawn into the war on the side of the British, as a result of the action of this Congress—notice I say "when" we are drawn in, not if we are drawn in—then we must be permitted to write the terms of the treaty of peace which will some day be written after the wasting of a lot of lives and other valuable assets. Let us not go on further making the same mistakes which we made in 1919 when we allowed the master minds of Britain and France to write the terms of the peace treaty. The fatal results of that error on our part, of our failure to take over and to hold the leadership for peace at that time, is now altogether too apparent to require further argument or discussion.

In the name of the peace of future generations yet unborn, in the name of the present sons and daughters who are about to be again sacrificed on the altar of war, in the name of mothers who are standing with outstretched arms beseeching you to keep America out of war, in the name of democracy and all that it means to the world, and in the name of Christianity, I beseech you for them to put aside partisan, narrow, and selfish sentiment, to rise above the ordinary, the commonplace and to stand for the right as represented by a refusal to repeal the embargo against the sale of supplies and war munitions. [Applause.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RUTHERFORD] such time as he may desire to use.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Speaker, the most important question before the Congress is, Will the repeal or failure to repeal the arms embargo tend to get us into the European war? In deciding this question we must lay aside our sympathies, likes, and dislikes and judge the question solely on its merits and according to the facts as they are and according to international law. The first Arms Embargo Act was passed in 1935 and was amended and passed again in 1937. At that time it was passed almost unanimously in both the House and Senate and was approved by the people of the country. It has been the law of the land for 4 years and is the law of the land today. For some reason the President and others now want the law repealed. They now tell us that the law is very unneutral and will draw us into war unless repealed at this time. Draw us into the war with whom? Surely England and France will not go to war with us if the act is not repealed. Nor will Russia, Germany, or Italy go to war with us if it is not repealed. Neither the President nor any of the proponents of repeal can name a single country that will attack us if we allow the arms embargo to remain as is. We are at peace with all of the world, and by leaving the arms embargo as it is will not change our present situation. We know that if we leave the arms embargo as it is we will not be drawn into the European war, so why repeal it? Do we know what affect the repeal of the law will have? We do not. Then why gamble? Why do something that may draw us into war? As I said before, the arms embargo has been the law of the land for 4 years and is the law of the land today and was the law on September 1 when war broke out in Europe. Can we now change the law and still be on the safe side? International law says no. Secretary Bryan in 1915, with the approval of President Wilson, said:

> This Government is constrained to hold in view of the present indisputable doctrines of international law, that any change in its own laws of neutrality during the progress of the war which would affect unequally the relations of the United States with the nations at war would be an unjustifiable departure from the principle of strict neutrality by which it has consistently sought to direct its actions.

Senator KEY PITTMAN said in 1937:

> It is held by high authority that it is unneutral for a neutral, after war has commenced, to so change its financial and commercial relations with the belligerent so as to take the belligerent by surprise.

Eminent authorities on international law hold and have publicly expressed their opinion that the repeal of the arms embargo at this time would be an unfriendly and unneutral act toward Germany. Under our own interpretation of the law it would be an unfriendly and unneutral act toward Germany and would be a technical declaration of war. As Congressman ENGEL said the other day, "How can we expect Germany or any other nation to continue to observe the rules of international law in the protection of our rights, and how can we condemn them for violating such rules of law, if we, under our own accepted definition of international law, have been the first to violate them?" How can we insist upon our rights when we, in the repeal of the arms embargo—should it be repealed—have been guilty in our own language of an "unjustifiable departure from the principle of strict neutrality" and of an unneutral act under the present indisputable doctrine of international law. To my mind the real threat of war today lies in the repeal of the arms embargo, which under every rule of international law and under our own interpretation of the law, is an unneutral and

unfriendly act. What Germany will do if the arms embargo is repealed I do not know, nor does anyone else, so far as I can learn. I do know that if we repeal the arms embargo we will, under international law, be giving Germany a legal excuse to do whatever she may deem necessary under that circumstance. When she starts to retaliate then there will be a demand that we also retaliate and if we do then we will be in the war. As I said before if we keep the embargo we know that we will remain at peace. If we repeal it now it has every appearance of the first step toward war. The question is, Should we take the chance? I say no, take no chances. [Applause.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. MOTT] such time as he may desire to use.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Speaker, before a cause can be tried in a court of law the parties to the controversy, through their pleadings, are required first of all to join issue, and then the cause is tried and determined upon the issues joined.

The long debate on the neutrality bill, both in the House last June and in the Senate during the past several weeks, has served to perfect what we might call the pleadings in this case. The extraneous, the irrelevant, and the immaterial matters in the controversy have been discovered and eliminated, and as the bill comes back from the Senate to the house of its origin there remains only the main question in controversy, and that is, Shall the arms-embargo provision of our present neutrality law be repealed or retained?

All other controversial matters have been eliminated. The so-called cash-and-carry or title-and-take provisions of the bill before us are no longer matters in dispute. Whether the arms embargo is repealed or retained, we all agree that the cash-and-carry sections of the bill will remain essentially as the Senate has written them, and few of us would want it otherwise.

Likewise there is no dispute here as to any other provisions of the bill. We may not agree with them all in detail but they are all such as to permit the conference committee to adjust the minor differences in a way which will be generally satisfactory to all of us.

As the proposal to repeal the arms embargo now presents itself, we are able to discuss it here almost entirely upon agreed facts. Briefly, those facts are these: Four years ago the United States, in order to help preserve its neutrality in event of future foreign wars and in order to make easier the difficult task of keeping out of those wars, declared by a law intended at the time to be permanent, and gave notice to all the nations of the world, that if at any time in the future any of those nations, or combination of nations, should go to war, the United States would refuse under any conditions whatever to sell them any arms, ammunition, or implements with which to carry on that war. We did that for the purpose of avoiding the occurrence of those incidents which experience has shown to be the principal cause of involving neutral nations in foreign wars.

Now, a major war has broken out in Europe and the individual sympathies of our people are generally on the side of one belligerent, or combination of belligerents, and against the other. And many of these people feel that we should help Britain and France win the war, notwithstanding our established and announced policy of official neutrality, if we can do this without incurring the risk of becoming involved in the war ourselves. And the real question we have here to decide is, first, whether it is possible to do this and, second, whether it is in the best interest of the United States to do it.

Let no one doubt that the desire to help Britain and France and to crush Nazi aggression is the compelling reason underlying the President's proposal to repeal the Arms Embargo Act. To believe otherwise is merely to delude ourselves. And, as the reason underlying any important legislative proposal is just as important as the proposal itself in aiding us to pass intelligently upon the merits of it, let us examine briefly the views of the President upon it. Because the President's numerous public utterances upon this subject contain the entire argument for repeal. A careful search of the RECORD, page by page, will disclose no single argument in debate which the President himself has not already made.

The first announcement by the President of his desire to change our established neutrality policy was made in his Chicago speech of August 5, 1937, only 5 months after he had approved the second Arms Embargo Act, and his views upon this question were further amplified in his message to the Seventy-sixth Congress on January 4, 1939. In the Chicago speech the President announced that it was incumbent upon us as a democracy to take parallel action with the other democracies in stopping the aggressor nations, that our neutrality policy was no longer an effective policy for the United States to pursue in view of the spreading epidemic of world lawlessness, and that the nations which are responsible for spreading this epidemic ought to be quarantined.

In his message to the Congress the President did not deny that our neutrality law, including the arms embargo, would, if maintained, tend to keep us out of war. In fact, his statement on approval of the first Arms Embargo Act that our neutrality policy would be extremely helpful in this regard has never been changed. He did say in his message, however, that our neutrality law, particularly the arms-embargo portion of it, may operate to give aid to an aggressor and deny it to a victim.

Self-preservation, the President said, should warn us that we should not let that happen. He did not go so far as to say that the eastern frontier of the United States was on the Rhine, but he did remind us in that message that distant points at which these aggressors might launch an attack against us are completely different from what they were 20 years ago and that we should take no chances, by any act or omission of our own, to let the aggressors strengthen their position. He admonished us that while we may properly decline to intervene with arms against the aggressors we could not forever let pass these acts of aggression against our sister nations, and he concluded with his now famous declaration that there were methods short of war but stronger and more effective than mere words of bringing home to the aggressor governments the aggregate sentiments of our own people.

The method he selected for accomplishment of this was the bill which shortly thereafter he sent to Congress providing for the repeal of the arms embargo provisions of the 1937 Neutrality Act and the retention of the so-called cash-and-carry provisions of that act. By repealing the arms embargo and retaining the cash and carry we were to be put in a position to help France and Britain by furnishing them arms with which to carry on the war which then threatened between those nations and Germany. We would also be in position to deny these arms to Germany because Germany could not possibly avail herself, under the cash-and-carry provisions of the act, of the privilege of purchasing arms in this country and carrying them away.

Lest anyone should be inclined to disagree, in spite of the President's statements, that this, and this alone, is the purpose of the proposal to repeal the arms embargo, let me inquire of him what would be his position on the proposal to repeal if the situation of France and Britain on one side and the Nazi Government on the other were reversed. Suppose it were the Nazi Government which had the greatest navy in the world and the largest fleet of merchant vessels. Suppose it were France and Britain which had no fleet or whose small fleet, both naval and merchant, was bottled up by blockade in their harbors. Would anyone then advocate repeal of the Arms Embargo Act so that the Nazi Government, instead of France and Britain, might avail itself of the opportunity of buying arms in this country and carrying them back to Germany in its convoyed vessels? Obviously

such a thing would be absurd, and if a proposal were made to repeal the arms embargo under those conditions the proposal would not receive a single vote in either the House or Senate.

Now, naturally, as individuals, we are all sympathetic toward Britain and France in this war, even though few actually believe that these nations are fighting that war for the preservation of democracy or civilization or for the preservation of anything else except the balance of power which they now hold in Europe. Nevertheless, we are sympathetic toward them. As an individual, I am not only sympathetic toward France and Britain, I am prejudiced in their favor and I am prejudiced against the Nazi Government, its rulers, and its program.

But I am not acting in my capacity as an individual citizen here. I am acting in my capacity as a representative of the people in the lawmaking body of our Nation, and in that capacity I have no right, either legal or moral, to allow my individual sympathies or prejudices to influence the considered judgment at which I have arrived in view of all the material facts in this case.

I am convinced now, as I always have been convinced, that if we repeal the arms embargo for the purpose which it is proposed that we should repeal it, we will have taken the first step in a course of conduct which, if the European war continues, may inevitably lead to our complete involvement in it. If we abandon this part of our neutrality policy for the purpose of giving material aid to one of the belligerents in this foreign war, thereby alining ourselves officially and irrevocably upon the side of that belligerent and against the other, we cannot retreat from that position but must go on and continue to give the favored belligerents whatever further aid they may need, even to the extent of repealing all of our neutrality law. I say, Mr. Speaker, that is logically inevitable.

It is absurd to contend that the mere repeal of the arms embargo will be the limit of our aid to France and Britain, once we have taken this step. We say, do we not, that France and Britain are fighting this war to preserve democracy to save civilization from destruction? We even say they are fighting our war, and that unless we are willing to help them by furnishing them with arms and ammunition, that we ourselves may be the next victim of the Nazi dictator. I do not, of course, believe that, but that is the premise from which the argument for repeal proceeds.

The trouble with that argument, Mr. Speaker, is that by it we place our motive on an exalted plane and then proceed to make it ridiculous by providing in the same bill that when we furnish to France and Britain this essential contribution of arms to save civilization, those countries must pay us cash for them, and that if they do not pay cash, we will withhold from them the very help which we have declared it our duty to give them. That proposition is obviously absurd and I feel that those who make it have not seriously thought the matter through.

France and Britain cannot pay cash, at least not for long. And when they cease to be able to pay cash are you then going to deny them the American arms and implements of war which you say they are so vitally in need of? Of course not. When that time comes you will repeal the cash requirement, if you are logical and sincere, and will extend them any credit they may need. When credit will no longer suffice you will take the next logical step. You will repeal the Johnson Act and loan them money with which to carry on war, which, you say, is being fought partly, at least, for our own national preservation. And then, if the time comes, as it did in 1917, when our money and arms alone will not suffice to make the world safe for democracy, will you deny then your Army also? Perhaps you may, but I do not think so. For if you do, then, upon your own premise and your own argument you will have done not only an inconceivably illogical and unconscionable thing but you will have committed a breach of faith such as will shame you forever.

Our safest course, Mr. Speaker, is not to take this first step but to insist upon the declaration and the notice which we gave 4 years ago to all the nations now engaged in the present war; that the United States intends to remain officially neutral in any foreign war not affecting the defense of the United States, no matter what the individual sympathies of her citizens may be; that we will use every means in our power to prevent the occurrence of war involving incidents; that when, if we must, we do engage in war, it will be a war not to maintain or to upset any European balance of power, which is what this war really is, not to remake any distorted maps of the Old World, and not to assist in restoring or creating territorial boundaries for the benefit of any nation, whether it be a democracy or a dictatorship.

No, Mr. Speaker; these must not be the reasons for the United States engaging in war. If, which God forbid, we are ever again called upon to marshal the resources of this Nation and to send forth the armed might of America to battle, let us be sure that battle is to be fought and the sacrifice made in the defense and for the preservation of our own Nation, our own institutions, and our own people. [Applause.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN] such time as he may desire to use.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include at the end of my remarks six tables that have been compiled in connection with my comments on this measure.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, we are all very strongly opposed to war and that should cause great satisfaction on both sides of the aisle.

We have various reasons for taking such a position in opposition to war and I trust that they are sincere on both sides. I have a particular reason, myself, for being very strongly opposed to war. Over in Honolulu the Thirty-fifth Infantry observes Loftus Day. It happened to be my fate to give Lieutenant Loftus the last command he received from mortal man down on the Mexican border. Lieutenant Loftus and I shared the same tent for more than a year and I knew him as one of the finest boys from the State of Texas. We shipped his body back to Laredo, Tex., 21 years ago.

As I see this problem of war and peace, we must prepare for the worst, and then try with all of our might and main to avoid becoming involved in war. That leads me to confine my remarks here at this time to the problem of adequate national defense. I think if I have any criticism to make of the debate, and I will say in passing that I attended every day of the debate in the Senate except one when my committee went to Aberdeen Proving Ground, and I have listened here carefully to the debate—my criticism would be that we have not paid enough attention to the problem of national defense.

The United States is not prepared for war. It is not prepared for a war of any kind. You will recall, all of you, who have read the reports from the maneuvers in New England last summer, that General Drum has told you strongly that we are not prepared for war. We do not have adequate supplies. We talk about preparing for a mechanized war, and still we have only one brigade mechanized. I shall make further reference to that later on. We have a long road to travel, and it is a slow road to travel, to get adequate defense. The War Department tells me that it would take from 1½ to 3 years to bring our defenses up to date after appropriations are made.

We do not know, we cannot tell now, what lies ahead. I say we owe it to the Nation today to do everything that we possibly can to prepare for and to avoid the worst.

I am very much opposed to the sale of arms and ammunition to our detriment, that is, to the detriment of our own national defense. I think we should stay home and mind our own business and build up our own defenses, and use them for defense purposes only. [Applause.] The biggest problem we have facing us in preparing adequately for defense is to do so without precipitating a recession and collapse following the emergency, and every dollar's worth of supplies that you send abroad will emphasize and aggravate that situation.

NEUTRALITY AND NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. Speaker, I have been impressed by the fact that very little time and discussion has been given to the effect of our foreign policy on our national defense. It has been my good fortune to be assigned to service on the Committee on Military Affairs and, because of that service, I have become quite aware of the problem of national defense. I have taken no little pride in the record of the first session of the Seventy-sixth Congress in that field. Service on the Committee on Military Affairs has not only been interesting and most pleasing, but has been as devoid of partisanship as is possible under the system governing congressional procedure. What I say here today with reference to the relationship between our foreign policy and national defense is stated only as my personal view. Many individual members of the committee have been studying problems of national defense and some members have regularly attended the debates of the Senate on our foreign policy, but thus far no work as a committee has been done in this session.

Just as soon as our foreign policy is finally determined, I am sure that every Member of Congress, and the Committee on Military Affairs in particular, will be desirous of giving most careful attention to the bringing of our defenses up to the standard needed for the international situation now confronting us. This work will be of such magnitude and importance as to emphasize the folly of further needless delay of the Committee on Military Affairs in approaching the study of the defense problem. In my own personal opinion, there is a very close relationship between our foreign policy and our national defense policy.

Next to a cordial relationship between our Nation and all foreign nations, our national defense is or should be our first consideration when world affairs are in turmoil. The purpose of our armed forces may be viewed differently by different individuals. In the final test, their function is to protect the vital interests of the Nation and our vital interests shift with the times. Most generally, however, they include the defense of the Nation's territory, the preservation of a maximum of democracy, and the preservation of peace at least of our own Nation. Many other purposes may be enumerated, but most of them are more controversial than the ones named.

National defense may be likened to insurance against the hazard of world conflagration. The wealth of our Nation, which includes the best raw-material supply of the world, and a heavy percentage of the gold, copper, oil, and food supply, is too great to leave wholly to the mercy of aggressor foreign nations, especially in time of turmoil.

The United States is not prepared for a war of any kind. The United States is not even prepared to defend itself. If we were attacked today by a relatively small force, we might succeed in mobilizing a million men overnight, but any skirmish that they might be engaged in within the next year would find them armed with relics of the World War, some of which arms were found obsolete in 1918. Just as in 1917 and 1918 they would have to fight with a motley array of rifles, artillery, and airplanes. Regardless of the outcome of this debate, on the bill now before us, we are called upon by all America to make America strong enough to meet any invasion before it arrives. The ability to turn back an invader before he could reach this country would prevent desolation of any part of it. We should immediately begin gathering a supply of raw and manufactured materials in order to equip, supply, maintain, and subsist an adequate force of men for that purpose.

We do not have adequate supplies of machine guns, automatic and semiautomatic arms, modern artillery, aircraft, and tanks to be sure of successful defense of our Nation. This is not a new experience for America. It has unfortunately been our experience in every emergency we have encountered throughout our national history. We are all equally familiar with the record of unpreparedness as outlined in our history books for each war in which we have been involved. But nothing written in history books has ever impressed me on that point as effectively as my own experience in 1918 of having all Springfield rifles taken from the Thirty-fifth Infantry and Lee-Enfield rifles substituted in their place. These rifles were made by firms "educated" to fill orders for the British. In our characteristic haste in 1918, we could not possibly tool-up our factories to make Springfield rifles, so Lee-Enfields were adapted to use our ammunition and were issued to us.

Probably the civilians thought we were fully armed as infantrymen when we carried those rifles in drill. But any American soldier who attempted in 1918 to go through the record course on the target range with a Lee-Enfield rifle, including its defective extractor, firing pin, and poor sight equipment, knows that we were armed with little more than clubs. In spite of all our war-munitions trade as a neutral during the early years of the World War, Secretary of War Baker stated after the war that "when we began the actual mobilization of the matériel for our participation in the World War there simply were no munitions makers." The American factories were building supplies that were filling the gaps for the Allies, not those which the United States was to need for itself. We not only bought obsolete Ross rifles from Canada, but some troops even used left-overs from the Spanish-American War as well as Lee-Enfields. Had the Government not been able to buy the British-owned Enfield rifle, built in the United States after the war began, we would not have been able to provide even Lee-Enfield rifles for the American troops. We certainly were not prepared for the World War in April 1917, and we still were not prepared when our boys engaged in active fighting some 15 months after war was declared.

Prior to the World War, we had remained deliberately on a peace basis, as Mr. Wilson wanted to take no step which could justify the accusation that the United States had provoked hostilities. Mr. Wilson completely overlooked the fact that the sale of munitions to nations at war might precipitate retaliation by those unable to secure them.

America has never favored a large standing army, but I believe that America today is wholeheartedly in accord with our efforts to bring our Regular Army, National Guard, and Reserve Corps up to full peacetime strength with some moderate increases.

It will take from 1½ to 2 years to adequately equip this force, most of which will be provided by funds voted at the last session of Congress. The present world turmoil has led many to favor the acquisition of adequate supplies for a protective mobilization force of 1,000,000 men under a plan calling for 700,000 active in the Regular Army and National Guard and 300,000 in the Reserve. Even though adequate funds were authorized for this purpose it will take from 2 to 2¼ years to make the matériel after funds therefor have been provided. There are some who see the possible need of a field force of 4,000,000 men and I am informed that such a force cannot possibly be fully and adequately equipped in less than 3 years from the time the funds are made available. Let those who feel that we should sell our munitions abroad ponder carefully whether they really wish to delay our own defense preparation beyond the above time limits.

We know that Great Britain appropriated the sum of $7,500,000,000 for national defense purposes in 1935, 2 years before they made any increase in manpower, and it has taken them about 3 years to get into production on that scale. We know that we must look ahead and anticipate our needs and conserve our own manufactures of munitions. Whether we decide upon a force equal to present authorized peacetime strength or a force of 1,000,000 men or more, almost wholly unequipped with modern weapons, it may be of interest to note that on July 31 an article appeared in News Week, setting out that Poland had then built up the fourth largest standing army in Europe with a peacetime strength of 300,000 and with 2,000,000 trained reserves, their chief asset being the quality of their men as they lacked modern weapons, planes, and tanks. Who are we to talk of selling armament abroad when at present our Army has only one brigade that is mechanized? To leave the Army where it is, is to invite aggression by countries that know full well we cannot successfully defend ourselves against modern mechanized war.

I am told that it will cost us approximately $1,000,000,000 in 2 years to provide adequate equipment for a force of 1,000,000 men. This will be the bill for equipment only. Our total exports of munitions since 1920 equal only about $200,000,000, and our total exports of aircraft for that period equal about $340,000,000, the bulk of the exports of aircraft coming in the last 2 years.

Lt. Gen. Hugh A. Drum has stated that "recent maneuvers reveal our forces to be lacking in almost every essential except energy, aggressiveness, and intelligence" and that "we are not ready for war—we are not even ready for defense."

We can hardly justify the export of munitions, thereby leaving us unprotected and dependent upon some foreign nation for our defense. The volume of our exports of munitions will increase as the war goes on. For example, it increased from less than $10,000,000 in 1914 to as high as $898,000,000 for the year 1917. Now is the time to give every consideration to the building up of our defenses rather than sell a single rifle or the material to make such rifle to any foreign power. So long as we have shortages in our requirements of armament and equipment for a protective force of 1,000,000 men, we should call upon our munition makers to cooperate with us in supplying our needs of critical items, such as semiautomatic rifles, modern artillery, tanks, and so forth, that are not made commercially and cannot be gotten into shape rapidly after outbreak of war. The beginning of the present European war has found both Britain and France well equipped for a war lasting 6 months or more without being dependent upon foreign purchases of munitions, but there is no information available at this time on which we can estimate what Britain and France will really need in the way of munitions in event the war is prolonged. All that we know at this time is that just now their anxiety apparently extends to aircraft only.

At the outbreak of the present European war our airplane factories had on hand orders from foreign countries in the sum of approximately $80,000,000 for military use and less than $10,000,000 for commercial business, and it has been reported in the press that the French and British Governments are ready to place additional orders for 5,750 additional war planes if and when Congress repeals the arms embargo. That Great Britain and France are extremely desirous of securing our aircraft is evidenced by the fact that they have asked our American aircraft manufacturers to complete the unfinished portion of their orders for aircraft despite the embargo.

This situation leads us to speculate as to the purpose of the passage of the bill now under consideration. We know that it must be for one of two purposes—either to sell our munitions and aircraft to England and France and thereby actually engage in the present European war or to make a gesture only for psychological purposes and hope to stop short of war. To me, the sale of armament to one side, when the other cannot possibly take advantage of our offer, is an overt act far different than conserving our supplies for our own use would be. In my judgment, such sale of arms is actual, active participation and is not a method short of war. I have always looked upon the supply of matériel as an integral and essential part of war. If the sale of our munitions is once more undertaken for the purpose of "educating" our munitions makers, it is my belief that we should "educate" our munition makers through bringing our own defenses up to date.

The history of our export trade in munitions and aircraft shows conclusively that it will take twice as much in new munitions and aircraft to supply a force of 1,000,000 men as we have sold abroad during the entire period since 1920.

I have had prepared and have permission to insert in the RECORD six tables that should be of assistance to those of you who desire concrete and authoritative information regarding the history of our export trade to selected nations during various periods up to 30 years. My purpose in having this material compiled is to afford those of you who may be interested therein a convenient reference to such matters as the comparative amount of our total exports of munitions, aircraft, and materials to all countries and especially the break-down of our exports of these items to selected countries of importance in this debate.

In view of some of the remarks made on this floor, it should be enlightening to call attention for instance to the fact that our total exports of munitions to Germany over the entire period from the World War down to July 31 of this year, amount to the amazingly small total of $421,000.

Some of you will no doubt be interested in comparing the exports of heavy iron and steel products to Germany and to the United Kingdom during the period that rearmament of Europe has been in progress. Others of you will be interested to note the extent of our export of heavy iron and steel products to Canada during that period and I am sure that some of you will be particularly interested in such exports to Japan.

You will recognize that table B is only a convenient summary of our total exports of munitions and aircraft during the past 6 years.

I am sure that many of you will be interested to examine table C, setting out the United States Air Corps appropriations for new aircraft, and table D, which sets out the percentage of the United States War Department appropriations used for ordnance.

Tables E and F, setting out the exports of heavy iron and steel products, and cotton, will be of interest in view of the comment of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM] in the debate on October 31.

In closing, I would like to appeal to you to consider our problem one of building up an adequate defense on such a plan as to avoid, insofar as possible, the post-war recession and collapse of our economic structure that we experienced in the years following the World War. We have on one hand the duty to conserve our munitions and aircraft for our own defense and we have the obligation to make our defenses adequate in the least possible time that we can build them and not risk a post-war recession. A sudden increase of our exports of munitions to foreign nations as we experienced in the World War years to nearly $1,000,000,000 per year will not only rob us of our own defense but will aggravate the post-war problem and we are not in condition as a Nation to absorb a post-war crash. Let us avoid another recession from over-expansion and yet build adequate armament for our own use without an unsafe increase in our manufactures of munitions and aircraft. It seems to me that every dollar's worth of munitions and aircraft that we export to foreign countries at this time serves to increase our problem both as to our own

national defense and as to our own actual economic stability after hostilities have ceased. Let us plan our production of armament carefully, conserve our supplies, mind our own business, and preserve our own independent defense. Keeping the embargo while we have it is the safest path to that end.

To my way of thinking that is the only method that will avoid dependence on other nations for defense followed by impoverishment and loss of liberty in the economic chaos of recession following war. Let us guard well that our war boom will not prove to be a war bomb. [Applause.]

The tables are as follows:

Values of domestic exports of munitions and aircraft from the United States to selected foreign countries, 1909–39

[All figures in thousands of dollars]

Year	Value of domestic exports to—											
	Canada		Austria-Hungary [1]		France		Germany		Italy		Russia in Europe	
	Munitions	Aircraft	Munitions	Aircraft	Munitions	Aircraft	Munitions	Aircraft	Munitions	Aircraft	Munitions	Aircraft
Fiscal:												
1909	517		1		49		168		14		8	
1910	543		1		54		105		11		7	
1911	798		1		30		147		24		3	
1912	1,169	39	2		47	8	219	5	12		8	10
1913	1,363	22	3		63	12	239	9	285		8	19
1914	1,156	19	1		31	8	267	16	20		180	66
1915	3,174	97			15,325		15		33	60	1,910	4
1916	12,938	322			83,149	18			9,118	34	48,321	69
1917	44,913	1,519			120,682	132			19,906	16	300,271	38
1918	9,869	3,243			102,804	1,118			53,236	87	55,844	13
July 1 to Dec. 31, 1918	1,900	1,441			72,132	415			20,776	60	122	
Calendar:												
1919	1,274	61			1,011	15			1,102		12,062	
1920	1,895	48			37,666	43	7		211		6,017	
1921	711	53			99		6		8			
1922	810	38			25	28	5		45			
1923	715	25			9	1	26		7	15		
1924	885	23	2		8	14	103	11	6	23		9
1925	833	80			5		13	71	7	1	1	1
1926	348	50	2		22		21		5		1	
1927	742	445	2		2	6	33	81	2	3	1	175
1928	805	1,404			10	7	57	210	3	100	22	155
1929	972	1,773			4	68	24	418	3	135	18	207
1930	567	1,220	6	1	5	22	25	262	5	45	102	542
1931	430	395			4	11	22	29	3	83		506
1932	200	178			5	54	5	192	3	4	20	406
1933	152	64			3	17	9	349	3	21		380
1934	282	189		75	4	197	9	1,762	4	107		3,277
1935	303	399		2	2	155	12	195		790	2	1,020
1936	379	794		64	4	521	9	411		631	1	269
1937	429	1,857		51	24	201	18	1,027		470	23	3,213
1938	484	2,687		11		6,447	15	175		13	48	2,315
1939 through July 31	401	1,561			214	71,453	2	13		23		911
Total	91,957	20,046	21	204	433,492	80,971	1,581	5,236	104,852	2,721	425,000	13,605

Year	Value of domestic exports to—											
	Spain		United Kingdom [2]		Other European countries		China (proper)		Japan		All foreign countries	
	Munitions	Aircraft	Munitions	Aircraft	Munitions	Aircraft	Munitions	Aircraft	Munitions	Aircraft	Munitions	Aircraft
Fiscal:												
1909	4		146		68		5		22		5,162	
1910	6		153		78		7		20		7,727	
1911	9		195		102		14		14		7,679	
1912	6		348		132		38		22	7	8,409	106
1913	4		175	3	394		40	1	30	4	9,240	108
1914	1		198	27	206		8		15	11	9,714	226
1915	104		17,860	725	520	12	3		5	3	50,951	1,541
1916	3,721	108	266,698	6,343	1,290	9	171		526	16	485,146	7,002
1917	4,375		324,131	1,834	927	67	54	13	632	58	898,260	4,136
1918	239		161,432	4,391	1,052	120	94		406	39	454,630	9,084
July 1 to Dec. 31, 1918	67		15,706	7,592	135		219	5	280	41	123,495	9,703
Calendar:												
1919	173		8,305	36	2,821	35	160		214		46,144	3,464
1920	172		327		696	10	142	20	208	6	62,547	1,152
1921	121		201	10	318	21	49		135	15	6,995	473
1922	199		134	2	428	51	10	18	123		8,521	230
1923	7		137	1	639	45	9		41		9,268	434
1924	9		200	79	234	93	16	5	42	47	9,895	798
1925	13		216	87	826	25	45		65	2	10,677	784
1926	9		171		549		30		25		10,505	
1927	12	4	166	43	784	138	21	48	17	78	9,476	1,904
1928	3	19	165	156	1,704	161	15	228	43	136	10,724	3,665
1929	8	50	134	140	303	350	117	718	58	348	10,735	9,126
1930	3	17	132	149	235	256	562	1,134	27	441	6,445	8,818
1931	3	33	169	333	108	484	204	917	13	153	3,897	4,868
1932	4	40	50	57	47	805	53	157	6	366	2,948	7,946
1933	3	7	45	84	88	641	97	1,763	7	339	4,180	9,179

[1] Export figures for Austria and Hungary are combined after 1920.

[2] Figures for the United Kingdom include England, Scotland, and Ireland for the years 1909–37, "Great Britain and Northern Ireland" and "Ireland" for 1938, and "Great Britain" and "Ireland" for 1939 (through July 31).

Values of domestic exports of munitions and aircraft from the United States to selected foreign countries, 1909–39—Continued

[All figures in thousands of dollars]

Year	Value of domestic exports to—											
	Spain		United Kingdom		Other European countries		China (proper)		Japan		All foreign countries	
	Munitions	Aircraft	Munitions	Aircraft	Munitions	Aircraft	Munitions	Aircraft	Munitions	Aircraft	Munitions	Aircraft
Calendar—Continued.												
1934	3	14	103	137	171	1,431	200	3,826	7	320	6,290	17,663
1935	7	211	165	461	206	2,837	104	2,523	6	950	5,652	14,291
1936	----------	119	37	461	270	3,167	15	7,186	4	989	7,255	23,142
1937	----------	443	491	1,729	251	5,790	672	3,962	47	2,484	9,539	39,405
1938	----------	----------	777	28,909	369	5,587	605	8,576	259	8,992	6,338	87,868
1939 through July 31	----------	----------	243	14,413	1,466	6,487	148	523	----------	757	3,262	108,760
Total	9,285	1,065	799,410	68,207	17,417	28,622	3,927	31,623	3,359	16,602	2,311,606	375,876

NOTE.—All the above figures have been computed. For each country, in each category, under the two general headings "munitions" and "aircraft," figures to the nearest thousand dollars were taken from the sources used; thus export figures of less than $500 in each category were not taken into account.

The headings "munitions" and "aircraft" as used in the table for the years 1909–37 include the following categories separately listed in Foreign Commerce and Navigation of the United States:

Munitions—

Firearms: Revolvers, pistols, rifles, shotguns, machine and heavy guns and carriages, parts of guns.

Explosives: Dynamite, nitrocellulose, blasting powder, smokeless and other gunpowder, primers, fuzes, mercury and other fulminates, blasting and percussion caps, cartridges, shells, projectiles empty, projectiles loaded, other explosives including fireworks.

Aircraft—

Land planes, seaplanes, amphibians, gliders, other aircraft and parts, engines, parachutes and parts.

Values of exports given for 1938 and 1939 (since data for these years are unavailable from the source used for former years) are based upon the values of arms which the National Munitions Control Board authorized for export to each country listed during the periods Dec. 1, 1937–Nov. 30, 1938, inclusive, and Jan. 1–July 31, 1939, inclusive. The headings "munitions" and "aircraft" as used in the table for these years include the following categories:

Munitions—

Category I:

(1) Rifles and carbines using ammunition in excess of caliber .22, and barrels for those weapons;
(2) Machine guns, automatic or autoloading rifles, and machine pistols using ammunition in excess of caliber .22, and barrels for those weapons;
(3) Guns, howitzers, and mortars of all calibers, their mountings and barrels;
(4) Ammunition in excess of caliber .22 for the arms enumerated under (1) and (2) above, and cartridge cases or bullets for such ammunition; filled and unfilled projectiles for the arms enumerated under (3) above;
(5) Grenades, bombs, torpedoes, mines and depth charges, filled or unfilled, and apparatus for their use or discharge;
(6) Tanks, military armored vehicles, and armored trains.

Category II:

Vessels of war of all kinds, including aircraft carriers and submarines, and armor plate for such vessels.

Category IV:

(1) Revolvers and automatic pistols using ammunition in excess of caliber .22;
(2) Ammunition in excess of caliber .22 for the arms enumerated under (1) above, and cartridge cases or bullets for such ammunition.

Category VI:

(1) Livens projectors and flame throwers;
(2) (a) Mustard gas (dichlorethyl sulphide); (b) lewisite (chlorvinyldichlorarsine and dichlordivinyl-chlorarsine; (c) methyldichlorarsine; (d) diphenylchlorarsine; (e) diphenylcyanarsine; (f) diphenylaminechlorarsine; (g) phenyldichlorarsine; (h) ethyldichlorarsine; (i) phenyldibromarsine; (j) ethyldichlorarsine; (k) phosgene; (l) monochlormethylchlorformate; (m) trichlormethylchlorformate (diphosgene); (n) dichlordimethyl ether; (o) dibromdimethyl ether; (p) cyanogen chloride; (q) ethylbromacetate; (r) ethyliodoacetate; (s) brombenzylcyanide; (t) bromacetone; (u) brommethylethyl ketone.

Category VII:

(1) Propellant powders;
(2) High explosives as follows:
(a) Nitrocellulose having a nitrogen content of more than 12%; (b) trinitrotoluene; (c) trinitroxylene; (d) tetryl (trinitrophenol methyl nitramine or tetranitro methylaniline); (e) picric acid; (f) ammonium picrate; (g) trinitroanisol; (h) trinitronaphthalene; (i) tetranitronaphthalene; (j) hexanitrodiphenylamine; (k) pentaerythritetetranitrate (penthrite or pentrite); (l) trimethylenetrinitramine (hexogen or T4); (m) potassium nitrate powders (black saltpeter powder); (n) sodium nitrate powders (black soda powder); (o) amatol (mixture of ammonium nitrate and trinitrotoluene); (p) ammonal (mixture of ammonium nitrate, trinitrotoluene, and powdered aluminum, with or without other ingredients); (q) schneiderite (mixture of ammonium nitrate and dinitronaphthalene, with or without other ingredients).

Aircraft—

Category III:

(1) Aircraft, unassembled, assembled, or dismantled, both heavier and lighter than air, which are designed, adapted, and intended for aerial combat by the use of machine guns or of artillery or for the carrying and dropping of bombs, or which are equipped with, or which by reason of design or construction are prepared for, any of the appliances referred to in paragraph (2) below;
(2) Aerial gun mounts and frames, bomb racks, torpedo carriers, and bomb or torpedo release mechanisms.

Category V:

(1) Aircraft, unassembled, assembled, or dismantled, both heavier and lighter than air, other than those included in Category III;
(2) Propellers or air screws, fuselages, hulls, wings, tail units, and undercarriage units;
(3) Aircraft engines, unassembled, assembled, or dismantled.

Sources: U. S. Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce. Foreign Commerce and Navigation of the United States—1909–13, pp. 375–376, 432–434, 496 (figures for years 1909–11); 1910–14, pp. 364–365, 425–427, 489 (figures for years 1912–14); 1914–18, pp. 360, 382, 383, 478–481, 554–556, 611 (figures for years 1915–18); 1921, pp. 310–311, 328–329, 416–419, 486–487, 538 (figures for years 1919–21); 1922, pp. 303–304, 309–312, 319–320, 329, 362–363, 381–384; 1923, pp. 296–297, 314, 344–346, 361–362; 1924, pp. 117–118, 132, 161–163, 175–177; 1925, pp. 115–117, 131, 159–160, 172–174; 1926, pp. 169–170, 179–181; 1927, pp. 164, 176–178, 186–188; 1928, pp. 72–73, 189–190, 199–201; 1929, pp. 174–175, 194–196, 204–206; 1930, pp. 176–177, 197–198, 208–211; 1931, pp. 177–178, 197–198, 209–210; 1932, pp. 172–173, 192, 203–205; 1933, pp. 160–161, 179, 189–191; 1934, pp. 162–164, 182–183, 195–196; 1935, pp. 515–516, 535–536, 546–548; 1936, pp. 138, 177–178, 181–182, 201–202, 215–217; 1937, pp. 389–391, 567, 590, 603–604. U. S. Department of State—Third Annual Report of the National Munitions Control Board (76th Cong., 1st sess., H. Doc. No. 92.) Washington, Government Printing Office, 1939, pp. 58–66; Press Release No. 326, Aug. 11, 1939 (mimeographed), pp. 1–15.

(C. A. Quattlebaum, M. M. Bennett, K. Metz, Oct. 17, 1939.)

Values of domestic exports of munitions and aircraft from the United States to selected foreign countries for the period of European rearmament, Jan. 1, 1934, to July 31, 1939, inclusive

Country	Munitions	Aircraft
Canada	$2,278,000	$7,487,000
Austria-Hungary	----------	203,000
France	248,000	78,974,000
Germany	65,000	3,583,000
Italy	4,000	2,034,000
Russia in Europe	74,000	11,005,000
Spain	10,000	787,000
United Kingdom	1,816,000	46,110,000
Other European countries	2,733,000	25,299,000
China, proper	1,744,000	26,596,000
Japan	323,000	14,492,000
All foreign countries (total United States exports)	38,336,000	291,129,000

United States Air Corps appropriations for new aircraft—Amount appropriated

1920	$3,487,384
1921	7,442,191
1922	5,328,377
1923	3,007,839
1924	2,997,350
1925	4,625,404
1926	4,400,000
1927	6,754,000
1928	9,492,550
1929	11,837,445
1930	18,439,280
1931	17,573,723
1932	15,296,231
1933	11,525,728
1934	8,257,807
1935	10,295,579
1936	22,999,233
1937	33,371,248
1938	34,054,311
1939	32,185,903
1940	149,305,750

War Department, Finance Division, Oct. 25, 1939.

Total appropriations for the U. S. Ordnance Department, compared with total appropriations for the military activities of the War Department, fiscal years 1910 to 1939, inclusive

Fiscal year	Ordnance	War Department	Percent
1910	$10,093,856.00	$115,696,518.61	8.72
1911	9,210,554.60	109,971,367.17	8.37
1912	8,794,475.00	104,845,810.52	8.38
1913	9,001,733.30	115,561,920.10	7.78
1914	9,503,641.00	112,859,212.59	8.42
1915	12,353,432.00	125,514,560.95	9.84
1916	14,947,110.00	113,505,383.29	13.1
1917	324,629,574.50	2,810,397,141.76	11.5
1918	3,103,599,681.86	5,667,356,136.29	54.7
1919	4,199,903,211.67	16,316,503,199.32	25.7
1920	20,805,634.79	813,304,262.20	2.55
1921	22,880,186.06	495,122,339.55	4.62
1922	13,425,960.00	373,019,831.22	3.59
1923	6,859,030.00	270,184,805.19	2.52
1924	5,812,180.00	256,669,118.00	2.26
1925	7,751,272.00	260,246,731.67	2.97
1926	7,543,802.00	260,757,250.00	2.89
1927	9,549,827.00	270,872,055.16	3.52
1928	12,179,856.00	300,781,710.93	4.04
1929	12,549,877.00	317,378,294.00	3.95
1930	11,858,981.00	331,748,443.50	3.57
1931	12,422,466.00	347,379,178.61	3.57
1932	11,121,567.00	335,505,965.00	3.31
1933	11,588,737.00	299,993,920.00	3.86
1934	7,048,455.00	277,126,281.00	2.54
1935	11,049,829.00	263,640,736.00	4.19
1936	17,110,301.00	312,235,811.00	5.47
1937	19,305,977.00	382,787,267.00	5.04
1938	25,373,235.00	409,712,987.00	6.19
1939	158,386,124.00	616,506,771.00	25.68

Source: Ordnance fiscal bulletin No. 2, supplemented by Ordnance Office, War Department, Oct. 25, 1939.

United States exports of heavy iron and steel products[1] to selected foreign countries, 1929–38

[Long tons]

Year	France	Germany	United Kingdom	Canada	Japan	China	Total United States (all countries)
1929	18,104	21,991	66,371	1,234,861	426,974	69,246	3,037,857
1930	7,153	8,325	44,878	820,116	276,740	38,879	1,982,546
1931	8,931	1,094	40,476	420,599	98,886	38,324	968,645
1932	3,703	703	4,700	163,900	191,193	20,885	594,581
1933	6,424	15,469	9,148	139,507	593,207	36,885	1,341,183
1934	2,744	11,964	141,877	254,565	1,249,248	82,401	2,812,847
1935	3,577	4,578	286,461	338,808	1,201,391	75,048	3,063,659
1936	3,836	7,407	380,836	356,119	1,111,722	79,968	3,157,405
1937	30,959	110,012	1,224,144	642,165	2,784,420	157,965	7,580,626
1938[2]	21,045	17,414	497,486	340,011	1,542,563	55,362	4,085,466

[1] Products included: pig iron, not including ferro-alloys; ferromanganese and spiegeleisen; other ferro-alloys; scrap; ingots, blooms, sheet bars, skelp, etc.; iron and steel bars; alloy steel bars; wire rods; galvanized sheets; plates, iron and steel; black steel sheets; black iron sheets; hoop, band, and strip steel; tin plate, terneplate, etc.; structural shapes, plain material; structural materials, fabricated; tanks, complete and knocked down; metal lath; steel rails; rail fastenings, switches, frogs, etc.; boiler tubes; casing and oil-line pipe; seamless black pipe, except casing and oil line; black and galvanized welded pipe; riveted pipe and fittings; cast-iron pipe and fittings; malleable-iron screwed pipe fittings; barbed-wire and woven-wire fencing; plain and galvanized wire; woven-wire screen cloth; wire rope and wire strand; insulated wire and cable; wire, other, and manufactures thereof; wire nails; nails other than wire, tacks, staples; horseshoes; bolts, nuts, rivets, and washers (except track); car wheels and axles; iron castings; steel castings; forgings.

[2] 1938 figure includes iron and steel scrap and all finished and semi-finished iron and steel exports as listed by the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce.

Sources: United States Statistical Abstract, 1932, p. 702; 1934, p. 670; 1937, p. 711; 1938, p. 721. 1938 figures by telephone from Foreign Trade Statistics Division, Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce.

United States exports of cotton[1] to selected foreign countries, 1929–38

[Thousands of bales]

Year	France	Germany	United Kingdom	Canada	China	Japan	Total, all countries
1929	775	1,797	1,831	254	236	1,309	8,044
1930	812	1,687	1,256	182	226	1,020	6,990
1931	914	1,640	1,054	190	429	1,228	6,760
1932	463	1,570	1,344	187	1,112	2,294	8,708
1933	864	1,849	1,492	176	301	1,743	8,419
1934	709	1,318	1,278	270	375	1,846	7,534
1935	373	342	738	225	108	1,524	4,799
1936	681	765	1,410	248	36	1,479	5,973
1937	655	650	1,144	307	14	1,550	5,440
1938	716	654	1,552	246	23	691	5,598

[1] Includes linters.

Source: United States Statistical Abstract, 1938, p. 679.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER].

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the seriousness with which some of the Members of the House approach this issue and their comments about the attendance at this session. I appreciate full well that some people who get the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD have about as much respect for it as they have for a Sears, Roebuck catalog. [Laughter.]

However, I believe there are some people who are concerned about how their Representatives feel on these important issues.

Representing as I do the great State of Ohio, being one of the two Congressmen at Large, I have received well over 40,000 letters and telegrams advising me as to how to vote on this issue. Naturally I am interested in having our constituents know how we feel regarding this matter.

Incidentally I received a telegram that I appreciate more than I can say, and for your information I will read it. This comes from Cleveland, Ohio:

Everybody I know has been after me to wire you about the embargo, but after thinking it over I don't know what to tell you. The best thing I can say is to go ahead and use your own judgment. That is what we are paying you for.

[Laughter.]

Signed: "Michael Volin."

In using my own judgment, this is the way I feel about this situation:

Mr. Speaker, for the past 6 months I have given a great deal of time to a study of all phases of our neutrality legislation. It is my conviction today that neither retention nor repeal of our present arms embargo will guarantee American peace. I sincerely believe that we can keep out of this war if the people of America are determined to keep out. But legislation enacted by Congress in this critical moment of world history will reflect our public opinion. It will not form it. I feel that both the advocates of changes in our neutrality laws and those who wish to keep them in their present form are motivated by a sincere desire to keep us out of war. Our differences are differences of method. Neither side can foresee the future.

No one else on either side of the House of Representatives more thoroughly detests the aims and techniques of Hitler or Stalin than do I. I am as eager for their downfall as any other man in Congress, and I should subscribe to any step which would, in my opinion, hasten the collapse of their program.

Yet, despite my views on dictatorships, I do not believe that the lifting of the arms embargo at the present time will make any material contribution to the objective of ultimate world peace. If there is any lesson which history demonstrates, it must be that the making of war and the encouragement of war leads to no peace. So far as the American people can determine at the moment, the repeal of our arms embargo seems likely to lead to a tremendous slaughter of innocent civilians as well as combatants. No matter upon which nation bombing planes may drop their cargo of death, those who assist the process contribute to that wrong. If for no other reason, the principles of human morality should deter any civilized nation which remembers the horror of war from shipping arms to any other nation.

Retention of the present arms embargo will furnish additional time for our people to determine their ultimate views. Repeal is a definite step in one unretraceable direction. With the war in Europe standing momentarily still, there is no need for any immediate action on our part. It is basically a problem of weighing factors. The arms embargo has become synonymous with American neutrality in fact; repeal has been linked with military and economic participation in the war. Repeal may set in motion a chain of forces which will force our hand. Retention will keep America available as a potential source of mediation or negotiation. I am not willing to shut that door. For me the course which America should pursue at this moment is difficult to determine. Yet I have attempted to frame a program along the lines I have suggested.

First. Congress should remain in session in order to be ready for any emergency in the European conflict.

Second. America should sell no arms to any belligerent nation.

Third. All other goods sold to belligerents should be sold for cash and transported in the ships of the purchasing nation only.

Fourth. American shipping of any kind should be prohibited in the zones of conflict.

Fifth. Private American citizens should be barred from travel in any area of conflict.

I submit this program in the knowledge that no formula can guarantee peace today. But we can and must seek some approach which will minimize our risk. Repeal of the arms embargo ends neutrality. Once that is gone, I believe the path to our intervention in the war will be too clearly charted. I recognize that in this emergency the situation may change overnight. To prepare for danger, I urge Congress to remain continuously in session. But in our preparations for danger I am convinced that we must do nothing to invite it. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HEALEY] such time as he may desire.

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the paramount concern in the minds of all Members of Congress is for the preservation of the peace and security of our Nation and its people. I am just as certain that, when the roll is called on this measure, every Member will be motivated in his vote exclusively by his fixed conviction as to the manner in which this objective can best be served. There can be no doubt in the mind of anyone that it is the desire of the American people, by an overwhelming preponderance, to avoid any steps that may tend to lead us into war and that it is their fervent hope and prayer that nothing may occur to disrupt the sovereign peace of our Nation.

In considering the issue now before us, I feel it to be essential that the paramount objective—the maintenance of peace—should be kept clearly in mind and carefully distinguished from any other considerations that may spring from sympathy or antipathy toward one or the other of the belligerent causes. For it would be only through the sheerest coincidence that we could serve both purposes at one and the same time. Rather is it likely that, in seeking to serve both, we shall serve neither.

The course of American neutrality history clearly demonstrates the danger that results from confusing a neutrality policy designed to promote peace with one designed to serve as an instrument for influencing the conduct of other nations. As examples, we may cite the embargo declared by George Washington during his second term as President of the United States and the embargo policy preceding our entry into the War of 1812. In the former case, the embargo was motivated by a single objective, the maintenance of peace in order that our young and still insecure Nation might not be destroyed in its very inception by a disastrous war. Then, as now, there were active partisans of both belligerents who objected to phases of the embargo which adversely affected the respective nations at war. But because the single objective of peace was unswervingly followed, the embargo succeeded in keeping us free from involvement, despite the fact that at that time we were in the precarious situation of having colonies of both belligerents on both flanks. This policy, of course, involved severe restrictions upon our commerce and a sacrifice of the profits and gains of trade. But it saved this Nation from the inevitable disaster that would have resulted from participation in war at that critical stage of our national existence.

In contrast we may cite the neutrality policy prior to the War of 1812 and the Embargo Act of 1808. Our neutrality policy then involved adherence to the doctrine of freedom of the seas, and when an embargo was adopted its purpose was not for the preservation of peace but to serve as an instrument of economic coercion in an effort to influence the conduct of the belligerents. As such it was an abject failure, culminating in the wavering and vacillating policy that led us into war. These experiences, I believe, shed a great deal of light on the issue that is now before us and demonstrate the danger of a neutrality policy designed to influence and affect the warring nations.

The crux of the controversy now before us rests in whether or not we shall repeal the present embargo on arms and munitions to nations at war. I do not believe that anyone seriously disputes the fact that the lifting of the embargo will favorably affect the Allied Powers and adversely affect Germany. Proponents of this measure, in fact, admit that this is at least one of the objectives of the proposed repeal of the embargo and some state their desire to help the Allied Powers "by means short of war." If this is so, it can hardly be contended that the policy is one of true neutrality. On the contrary, it would appear to be very unneutral and might well be considered by the nations adversely affected as a hostile act. In this view they would have the support and authority of the opinion of President Wilson to Germany, expressed in response to her protest. I quote at this juncture brief excerpts from that letter:

> This Government holds and is constrained to hold, in view of the present indisputable doctrines of accepted international law, that any change in its own laws of neutrality during the progress of a war, which would unequally affect the relations of the United States with the nations at war, would be an unjustifiable departure from the principle of strict neutrality.

The scholarly attainments of Woodrow Wilson in the field of international law entitle his words to great weight. They are particularly entitled to our consideration at this time because they serve as precedent of fixed American neutrality policy on which other nations are entitled to rely.

The present embargo on shipments of arms and munitions was adopted by Congress in 1935. There is no doubt that underlying the passage of this measure was a great feeling of revulsion toward war and its incidents on the part of the American people and a determination that we would have no part in the terrible carnage and destruction that war entails. It was undoubtedly motivated by the great idealism and altruism that is characteristic of the American people, and it was enacted at a time when no nation could contend that it was adversely affected. However, even though it formulated an abstract policy of neutrality, it can hardly be said that this legislation was adopted in an idealistic vacuum. It was evident, even at that time, that there existed abroad many conflicting interests of increasing acuteness and that there was a great likelihood that the growing tension might lead to an early outbreak of hostilities.

It was under those circumstances that the Congress, with a full knowledge of imminent crises abroad, adopted the arms embargo as the best and safest means of guaranteeing us against involvement. It was not a hasty and ill-considered step, but carefully debated on the basis of past history and precedents and with a full realization of its importance. It represents the fixed determination of the American people to remain at peace and their utter abhorrence of the carnage and disaster that are the consequences of war.

It is my belief that there is no midpoint between participation and nonparticipation, nor do I believe that there is any safety in a policy of participation by "measures short of war." History reveals that such a policy, by imperceptible steps and uncontrollable events, is very likely to lead directly to war and armed participation. Moreover, because of the innumerable and complex factors that bear on the successful conduct of war, it cannot be safely said that any type of participation is a "measure short of war." Experience has too often shown that any measures favoring one belligerent against another are likely to provoke an incident that will catapult us into the conflict. There is only one type of true neutrality—that is one which is entirely impartial toward the belligerents and is founded exclusively on considerations of our own peace and security. Once we depart from this firm basis we may well find ourselves caught in a swirl on uncharted seas that will impel us into war. As long as we adhere

to strict neutrality we shall be on relatively stable ground and will be in a far better position to remain aloof from the struggle abroad.

It is contended by advocates of repeal of the embargo that, under the present existing statute, contraband may be carried to belligerents in American ships, and that therefore we are now exposed to the danger of involvement resulting from incidents occurring to our vessels in dangerous waters. I am in the fullest agreement that this is a serious weakness of our present neutrality policy, and I am heartily in favor of the restrictions imposed on American commerce by the Senate bill which will safeguard us against this danger. I fully concur with the view that all trade with belligerents should be subject to the restrictions that the belligerents shall pay in cash, take title here, and, with respect to prescribed zones, carry the cargo in their own vessels.

However, it does not follow as a corollary that, in order to avail ourselves of these safeguards, we should abandon the protection that is furnished to us by the embargo on arms and munitions. We may well adopt these precautions, in addition to those already provided by the present neutrality law.

Of course, this will involve some sacrifice on the part of the American people. It will require them to forego the profits and gains that would result from a lucrative trade in arms and ammunition with the belligerents. However, we are faced with the choice of this sacrifice or the possibility of a far greater sacrifice. The importance of these safeguards is demonstrated by the events which led up to American participation in the World War.

At the outbreak of hostilities in 1914 the United States had no neutrality statute. After proclaiming American neutrality, President Wilson could only plead with the Nation to be neutral "in fact as well as in name * * * in thought as well as in action." It soon appeared that such neutrality was impossible. Because the flag followed them wherever they went, American citizens were free to risk, not only their own safety, but also that of their Nation by trade with belligerent nations. England blocked American trade with Germany and, attempting to meet blockade with blockade, Germany resorted to submarine warfare. This resulted in the loss of American lives and property and had an important bearing on our involvement into a costly and disastrous war. If we are to avoid a repetition of these events, it is essential that we adopt the restrictions on American shipping that are provided in the Senate amendments.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the American people are not only passionately opposed to bloodshed but desire to implement their abhorrence of armed conflict by refusing to furnish to belligerent nations any of the destructive instruments of modern warfare. They do not want to see America converted into an immense arsenal for supplying other nations with the means of creating death and destruction.

The people of this Nation desire to remain free from any involvement in the war abroad. However, even if it were possible to profit from the traffic in arms and lethal weapons with safety, I am sure that they would not desire to prosper from the havoc and desolation that is certain to result from a prolonged conflict. Like war itself, the profits of war breed dangers of an insidious kind. The only safe policy we can pursue is to remain free from any involvement in any of the incidents of war, whether they be on the profit or debit side of the ledger. In so doing we shall not only safeguard the peace and security of America but we shall serve as an inspiring example of democracy at its best in a disillusioned and dispirited world and, by this example, may promote the cause of world peace in its finest and most altruistic sense. [Applause.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH] such time as he may desire.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I should indeed feel remiss in my duty if I did not in this most critical hour of our history rise to amplify some thoughts I have already expressed to the House with respect to the monstrous proposal that is now before Congress. This measure proposes to repeal the arms embargo, and at the same time abandon our maritime rights. We are told these things are necessary to keep us out of war. Aside from the question of the effects of repealing the embargo, this bill proposes nothing less than self-destruction, by our own legislation, the sovereignty of our Nation.

Think of it. In 1917 we went to war, ostensibly to protect and defend our sovereign rights on the high seas. Man after man, in both the Senate and the House, who is on the side of repeal, has emphasized that that was the purpose of our entering the World War. Now, after all the sacrifice we made we are asked to do the unbelievable, give up those rights as a necessary means to keep from going to war. Is it really possible that the American people are expected to give sanction to this?

Can it be that our Government, if this bill passes, has announced to the world that it could not remain neutral without destroying the sovereignty of our Nation?

I am convinced the Congress has not grasped the full meaning of this proposal. I am sure its significance is not appreciated by the people in general. I am just as certain, however, that the thoughtful men and women of this Nation will, in due time, see through this and expose this, to me, the most shameful and unpatriotic act ever undertaken by any government.

Members of Congress, I plead with each and every one of you—let us stop long enough to think of what we are really doing before we vote on this measure.

May it be the will of God that we, as their Representatives in Congress, shall not fail our people and our country in this crucial moment. [Applause.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. THORKELSON].

Mr. THORKELSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, based upon the diplomatic correspondence between the United States and belligerent governments, relating to neutral rights in commerce, in a special supplement to the American Journal of International Law, 1917.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is the gentleman requesting to put that book in the RECORD?

Mr. THORKELSON. No, no.

Mr. BLOOM. Well, you were reading from the book.

Mr. THORKELSON. No. It is based on this book.

Mr. BLOOM. How much of the book do you want to put in?

Mr. THORKELSON. It is these remarks based on international law.

Mr. BLOOM. But how much of the book do you want to put in?

Mr. THORKELSON. It is just these remarks here; about 12 pages.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. THORKELSON. Mr. Speaker, section 2 (c) makes it impossible for an American citizen to collect for merchandise sold to a foreign government, by presenting the claim through the Government of the United States. Subsection (d) makes it impossible for an American citizen to collect insurance, if insured with a foreign company, through the Government of the United States.

Subsection (f), in eliminating (a) of section 2, allows American vessels to carry all merchandise over lakes, rivers, and inland waters. At the end of this same subsection it is permissible for American vessels to carry war materials, when used exclusively by American vessels, aircraft, and other vehicles in any foreign country.

Subsection (g) makes it possible for American vessels to carry contraband of war south of 35° north latitude and north of 35° north latitude, to any port in the Western Hemisphere.

Inasmuch as the sixty-sixth meridian extends from the North Pole to the South Pole, this will include all the Western Hemisphere to the coast of Somaliland in Africa, because the Neutrality Act sets aside the Arabian Sea.

The bill further provides that cargoes may be carried to the Pacific or Indian Ocean, the China Sea, the Bay of Bengal, and the Tasman Sea—the latter to be found between New Zealand and Australia.

Subsection (h) extends the same rights to aircraft, except articles proclaimed in section 12 (i).

Section 2, subsection (i), confirms this because—

Every American vessel to which the provisions of subsections (g) and (h) apply shall, before departing from a port or from the jurisdiction of the United States, file with the collector of customs a declaration of its cargo.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THORKELSON. I yield.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Will the gentleman tell us how it affects Antarctica?

Mr. THORKELSON. To the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] I wish to say that inasmuch as this language is used, "South of 35° north latitude * * * and north of 35° north latitude," it naturally takes in all of the Western Hemisphere, from the sixty-sixth meridian west, between the North Pole and the South Pole.

Mr. Speaker, it is my desire to say that this is a most deceptive piece of legislation, which I ask every Member to study and give serious consideration.

Mr. Speaker, in order that my colleagues may be informed what Great Britain considered contraband during the World War, I quote a list of such materials and articles from diplomatic correspondence between the United States and belligerent governments relating to neutral rights and commerce.

Proclamation, December 23, 1914, revising the list of articles to be treated as contraband of war

George R. I.:

Whereas on the 4th day of August 1914, we did issue our royal proclamation specifying the articles which it was our intention to treat as contraband of war during the war between us and the German Emperor; and

Whereas on the 12th day of August 1914, we did by our royal proclamation of that date extend our proclamation aforementioned to the war between us and the Emperor of Austria, King of Hungary; and

Whereas on the 21st day of September 1914, we did by our royal proclamation of that date make certain additions to the list of articles to be treated as contraband of war; and

Whereas on the 29th day of October 1914, we did by our royal proclamation of that date withdraw the said lists of contraband and substitute therefor the lists contained in the schedules to the said proclamation; and

Whereas it is expedient to make certain alterations in and additions to the said lists:

Now, therefore, we do hereby declare by and with the advice of our Privy Council, that the lists of contraband contained in the schedules to our royal proclamation of the 29th day of October aforementioned are hereby withdrawn, and that in lieu thereof during the continuance of the war or until we do give further public notice the articles enumerated in schedule I hereto will be treated as absolute contraband, and the articles enumerated in schedule II hereto will be treated as conditional contraband.

SCHEDULE I

1. Arms of all kinds, including arms for sporting purposes, and their distinctive component parts.
2. Projectiles, charges, and cartridges of all kinds and their distinctive component parts.
3. Power and explosives specially prepared for use in war.
4. Ingredients of explosives, viz, nitric acid, sulfuric acid, glycerin, acetone, calcium acetate, and all other metallic acetates, sulfur, potassium nitrate, the fractions of the distillation products of coal tar between benzol and cresol, inclusive, aniline, methylaniline, dimethylaniline, ammonium perchlorate, sodium perchlorate, sodium chlorate, barium chlorate, ammonium nitrate, cyanamid, potassium chlorate, calcium nitrate, mercury.
5. Resinous products, camphor, and turpentine (oil and spirit).
6. Gun mountings, limber boxes, military wagons, field forges, and their distinctive component parts.
7. Range finders and their distinctive component parts.
8. Clothing and equipment of a distinctively military character.
9. Saddle, draft, and pack animals suitable for use in war.
10. All kinds of harness of a distinctively military character.
11. Articles of camp equipment and their distinctive component parts.
12. Armor plates.
13. Ferro alloys, including ferrotungsten, ferromolybdenum, ferromanganese, ferrovanadium, ferrochrome.
14. The following metals: Tungsten, molybdenum, vanadium, nickel, selenium, cobalt, haematic pig iron, manganese.
15. The following ores: Wolframite, scheelite, molybdenite, manganese ore, nickel ore, chrome ore, haemitate iron ore, zinc ore, lead ore, bauxite.
16. Aluminum, alumina, and salts of aluminum.
17. Antimony, together with the sulfides and oxides of antimony.
18. Copper, unwrought and part wrought, and copper wire.
19. Lead, pig, sheet, or pipe.
20. Warships, including boats and their distinctive component parts of such a nature that they can only be used on a vessel of war.
21. Barbed wire, and implements for fixing and cutting the same.
22. Submarine sound-signaling apparatus.
23. Airplanes, airships, balloons, and aircraft of all kinds, and their component parts, together with accessories and articles recognizable as intended for use in connection with balloons and aircraft.
24. Motor vehicles of all kinds and their component parts.
25. Tires for motor vehicles and for cycles, together with articles or materials especially adapted for use in the manufacture or repair of tires.
26. Rubber (including raw, waste, and reclaimed rubber), and goods made wholly of rubber.
27. Iron pyrites.
28. Mineral oils and motor spirit, except lubricating oils.
29. Implements and apparatus designed exclusively for the manufacture of munitions of war, for the manufacture or repair of arms, or war material for use on land and sea.

SCHEDULE II

1. Foodstuffs.
2. Forage and feeding stuffs for animals.
3. Clothing, fabrics for clothing, and boots and shoes suitable for use in war.
4. Gold and silver in coin or bullion; paper money.
5. Vehicles of all kinds, other than motor vehicles, available for use in war, and their component parts.
6. Vessels, craft, and boats of all kinds; floating docks, parts of docks, and their component parts.
7. Railway materials, both fixed and rolling stock, and materials for telegraphs, wireless telegraphs, and telephones.
8. Fuel, other than mineral oils. Lubricants.
9. Powder and explosives not specially prepared for use in war.
10. Horseshoes and shoeing materials.
11. Harness and saddlery.
12. Hides of all kinds, dry or wet; pigskins, raw or dressed; leather, undressed or dressed, suitable for saddlery, harness, or military boots.
13. Field glasses, telescopes, chronometers, and all kinds of nautical instruments.

Given at our court at Buckingham Palace, this 23d day of December, in the year of our Lord 1914, etc.

[Consul General Skinner to the Secretary of State]
(Telegram)

AMERICAN CONSULATE GENERAL,
London, January 16, 1915.

Official announcement made by British Government that France adopts lists of absolute and conditional contraband identical with latest British list.

SKINNER.

[Ambassador W. H. Page to the Secretary of State]
(Telegram)

AMERICAN EMBASSY,
London, January 22, 1915.

British Government now informs me that the heading "Copper unwrought" was intended to include all copper in such form as to render it usable for manufacturing purposes. This description being vague, the former heading will be changed in new lists to read: "Copper unwrought and part wrought and copper wire." This is intended to include copper sheets, circles, slabs, bars, pipes, ingots, scrap, rods, plates, solid drawn, tubes, etc., and all grades of copper wire. The word "copper" is deemed to include alloys in which copper is the main ingredient.

PAGE.

[Consul General Skinner to the Secretary of State]
(Telegram)

AMERICAN CONSULATE GENERAL,
London, March 9, 1915.

British Government announces that "All cotton for which contracts of sale and freight engagements had already been made before March 2 to be allowed free or bought at contract price if stopped, provided the ship sails not later than March 31; similar treatment to be accorded to all cotton insured before March 2, provided the cotton is put on board not later than March 16. All shipments of cotton claiming the above protection to be declared before sailing and documents produced to and certificates obtained from consular officers or other authority fixed by the Government."

SKINNER.

[The British Ambassador to the Secretary of State]

BRITISH EMBASSY,
Washington, March 10, 1915.

The British Ambassador presents his compliments to the Secretary of State, and has the honor to transmit herewith 20 copies of a list enumerating certain oils and substances included under the heading "Lubricants" in the British list of articles to be treated as conditional contraband.

CECIL SPRING-RICE.

[Enclosure]

OILS AND SUBSTANCES INCLUDED UNDER THE HEADING "LUBRICANTS IN THE BRITISH LIST OF ARTICLES TO BE TREATED AS CONDITIONAL CONTRABAND"

I. Principal oils used as lubricants:
- Tallow oil.
- Lard oil.
- Neat's-foot oil (including sheep's foot oil, horse's foot oil, and fatty bone oil).
- Olive oil.
- Rape oil (including Colza oil, Ravisson oil, or Black Sea rape oil, and Jamba oil).
- Castor oil.
- Particularly for fine mechanisms—
  - Hazelnut oil.
  - Ben oil.
  - Porpoise oil (including body oil and jaw oil).
  - Sperm oil.
  - Arctic sperm oil.
- Whale oil.
- Rosin oil.

II. Solid lubricants:
1. Graphite (including natural graphite, artificial graphite, Atcheson's graphite, colloidal graphite, deflocculated graphite, "Oildag," "Aquadag," or "Waterdag").
2. Mineral jellies.
3. Tallow (including mutton tallow, beef tallow, and goat and buck tallow).
4. All unctuous bodies which do not flow (or flow extremely slowly) at ordinary temperatures containing—
   a. Tallow mixed with any other oil, fat, or mineral jelly.
   b. Any oil, fat, or mineral jelly containing aluminum soap, lead soap, lime soap, or rosin soap.
   c. Commercial forms of lead soap, lime soap, and aluminum soap.
   d. Any oil, fat, or mineral jelly containing water and an alkali, or containing potash or soda soap (but not including "superfatted soaps" of various kinds).
5. Rosin greases or rosin soaps.

Aluminum soap in oleginous solution is also known as oil pulp, thickener, gelatin, and viscom.

[Ambassador W. H. Page to the Secretary of State. No. 1061]

AMERICAN EMBASSY,
London, March 16, 1915.

SIR: In accordance with the instructions of the Department, and confirming my cablegram No. 1780 of the 13th instant, I have the honor to transmit herewith copies, in duplicate, of a proclamation adding to the list of articles to be treated as contraband of war, dated March 11, 1915.

I have, etc.

WALTER HINES PAGE.

[Proclamation, March 11, 1915, adding to the list of articles to be treated as contraband of war]

GEORGE R. I.:

Whereas on the 23d day of December 1914 we did issue our royal proclamation specifying the articles which it was our intention to treat as contraband during the continuance of hostilities or until we did give further public notice; and

Whereas it is expedient to make certain additions to the lists contained in the said proclamation:

Now, therefore, we do hereby declare, by and with the advice of our Privy Council, that during the continuance of the war or until we do give further public notice the following articles will be treated as absolute contraband in addition to those set out in our royal proclamation aforementioned: Raw wool; wool tops and noils and woolen and worsted yarns; tin; chloride of tin; tin ore; castor oil; paraffin wax; copper iodide; lubricants.

Hides of cattle, buffaloes, and horses; skins of calves, pigs, sheep, goats, and deer; leather, undressed or dressed, suitable for saddlery, harness, military boots, or military clothing.

Ammonia and its salts whether simple or compound; ammonia liquor, urea, aniline, and their compounds.

And we do hereby declare that the following articles will be treated as conditional contraband in addition to those set out in our royal proclamation afore-mentioned.

Tanning substances of all kinds (including extracts for use in tanning).

And we do hereby further declare that the terms "foodstuffs" and "feeding stuffs for animals" in the list of conditional contraband contained in our royal proclamation afore-mentioned shall be deemed to include oleaginous seeds, nuts, and kernels; animal and vegetable oils and fats (other than linseed oil) suitable for use in the manufacture of margarine; and cakes and meals made from oleaginous seeds, nuts, and kernels.

Given at our court at Buckingham Palace, this 11th day of March, in the year of our Lord 1915, etc., etc.

[The British Ambassador to the Secretary of State]

BRITISH EMBASSY,
Washington, March 23, 1915.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I beg to acknowledge the receipt of your informal letter of March 20 in which you are good enough to submit certain observations on the British contraband list.

I have not in my possession any further information than that which I have communicated to you, but I expect before long to receive a uniform printed list as revised up to date and I shall take pleasure in sending you a copy so soon as it arrives.

In the list sent to you on March 10 which reached me by post the term "castor oil" was mentioned under the heading of "Principal oils used as lubricants," which were at that time treated as conditional contraband. According to the telegram, of which a copy was sent to you on March 13, "lubricants" were transferred to the list of absolute contraband and castor oil was mentioned separately. Apart from this and in the absence of information to the contrary I understand that the memorandum interpreting the term "lubricants" formerly listed as conditional contraband is to be considered as still interpreting this term as listed under absolute contraband.

The materials enumerated in articles 11 and 12 of the conditional contraband list appear, as you suggest, to have been transferred to the absolute list, but I am unable at the present moment to state definitely that this is so.

I am taking steps to obtain a clear ruling on these points.

CECIL SPRING-RICE.

[The British Ambassador to the Secretary of State]

BRITISH EMBASSY,
Washington, April 10, 1915.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: With further reference to your letter of the 20th of March I am informed that the interpretation of lubricants, now absolute contraband, is as follows:

Mineral. Including mineral oils, jellies, or greases of all kinds, pure or compounded; graphite, natural or artificial.

Vegetable. Including vegetable lubricating oils and fats of all kinds, and resin greases, and their mixtures.

Animal. Including all animal oils and fats for use as lubricants, and their mixtures.

Fish. Including whale oil (train, blubber, sperm), seal, or shark oil, and fish oil generally.

Mixtures or compounds of any of the foregoing.

It will be observed that the above definition covers all the articles mentioned in the earlier list of lubricants sent to your Department on March 10, and that it is even more comprehensive inasmuch as it includes mixtures and compounds of these articles.

The whole of the "hides" heading (article 12) in the conditional list of December 23, 1914, may be regarded as transferred to the list of absolute contraband. Harness and saddlery (article 11) remain conditional contraband, unless it falls within article 10 of the absolute list of December 23.

I am, etc.

CECIL SPRING-RICE.

Mr. Speaker, I have inserted a list of articles and materials declared to be contraband by Great Britain and France. Other nations that were engaged in the World War formulated a similar list.

There are three volumes of diplomatic correspondence between the United States and the powers engaged in the World War in which information may be had about controversies that finally involved the United States in that strife.

Many of the ships that were lost were sunk by mines that had broken adrift, and there is one table alone that names 146 vessels destroyed by torpedoes and unknown objects.

I am particularly interested in this because we lost four ships which, after reading the report of the officers, I am compelled to believe was carelessness, in that they did not follow direction laid down by German authorities, the country to which these ships were bound.

I shall now insert a short paragraph which is testimony given by the first officer of the steamship *Carib*, and after having quoted him I shall quote a letter by J. Bernstorff. This will explain to a certain point how accidents may happen and for which those who are innocent may be blamed.

We were in the boats about 1 or 1½ hours and were picked up about 12:45 by the German scout boat *Annie Busse* and kept there 48 hours on account of the fog, when we were taken to Wilhelmshaven. The German officers and crew treated us most courteously and even gave up their beds for us. We reached Wilhelmshaven at noon of the 24th and arrived in Bremerhaven at 10 o'clock that night.

G. H. GIFFORD,
First Officer, Steamship "Carib."

[The German Ambassador to the Secretary of State]
[Translation]

GERMAN EMBASSY,
Washington, D. C., March 26, 1915.

(J. Nr. B 4884.)

Mr. SECRETARY OF STATE: Referring to Your Excellency's kind note of the 5th instant about the sinking of the American steamer *Evelyn*, I have the honor to make to Your Excellency the following communication:

The investigation of the *Evelyn* and *Carib* casualties brought to light the fact that the vessels had on board Dutch, not German, pilots. Those pilots appear to have been furnished by the Rotterdam branch of the English Furness Steamship Co. Those pilots, according to the inquiries made, are not competent to navigate German waters. It was found, for instance, that H. Benne, the pilot taken by the steamer *Osmulgu*, who was formerly a Dutch district pilot but is already on the pension list, declared he knew nothing of a certain sailing direction for the German coast, which is enough to show that he is not fit to steer a vessel to Germany. As a matter of fact, he did not ever observe the sailing directions issued by the German Admiralty for the German coast, and it was just luck that saved the *Osmulgu* from the fate of the *Evelyn*.

The master of the *Evelyn* declared that he sailed through the Channel and had a mine pilot along the English coast. It seems that the English officer who came on board with the pilot told him that he should steer not the northern course, but the southerly course below the East Friesian Islands, which was the course taken by the other steamers. Whereupon he steamed for Rotterdam and there took a pilot. On being asked why he had not steered for Listertief, he replied that he had left everything to the pilot.

According to his chart, the casualty occurred 53°52′ N. 6°7′ E. The pilot, who had the looks of an old Dutch fisherman and made a rather unfavorable impression, declared that he had steered that course because he had heard that other ships had taken it. In reply to a question, he said that he had never come with a ship into the German Bay since the war began.

In order to avert further casualties as much as possible I have the honor to leave it to Your Excellency kindly to consider whether it may not be advisable to warn in such manner as may seem appropriate the American steamship companies concerned against applying to the above-mentioned firms for pilots. I make this recommendation all the stronger as there is reason to suspect that the enemy will spare no efforts to expose ships bound for Germany to danger and that influence is possibly brought to bear on the pilot service. I would in this connection again repeat that the course recommended in Nachrichten für Seefahrer, No. 3161/14 North around Scotland to the guiding buoys of Listertief offers the least danger.

Accept, etc.,

J. BERNSTORFF.

Mr. Speaker, this report clearly shows that there was no cooperation on the part of Great Britain to aid in the safe passage of our ships. These ships were bound to Germany with cotton which was allowable during the early part of the war. Had Great Britain been fair and just, such ships would have been advised to proceed north of Scotland, as requested by Germany. What did England do in these cases? She advised the ships to proceed on the southern route to Holland, where pilot was taken aboard with little interest of safe passage of these ships. He steered them through mine fields where all of them were lost but one. No one could be blamed for this except England.

Mr. Speaker, I shall now quote from the London Declaration in order to show that these articles were not adhered to by Great Britain, but changed to suit her convenience.

[Ambassador Sharp to the Secretary of State]
(Telegram)

AMERICAN EMBASSY,
Paris, October 26, 1915.

Following decree published in Journal Officiel today:

Article 1. The provisions of article 57, paragraph 1, of the declaration signed at London, February 26, 1909, relating to naval warfare, shall be applied during the present war, with the following modification to it: Whenever it is established that a ship flying an enemy flag belongs in fact to the nationals of a neutral or an allied country, or conversely that a ship flying a neutral or allied flag belongs in fact to nationals of an enemy country, or to parties residing in an enemy country, the ship shall accordingly be considered neutral, allied, or enemy.

SHARP.

The article 2 was changed in the following manner, to suit the convenience to Great Britain with no regard for neutral rights:

[No. 29338. 10491. Second supplement to the London Gazette of Friday, the 22d of October 1915]

ORDER IN COUNCIL

At the Court at Buckingham Palace, the 20th day of October 1915.

Present, the King's Most Excellent Majesty in Council.

Whereas by the Declaration of London Order in Council No. 2, 1914, His Majesty was pleased to declare that, during the present hostilities, the provisions of the said Declaration of London should, subject to certain exceptions and modifications therein specified, be adopted and put in force by His Majesty's Government; and

Whereas by article 57 of the said declaration, it is provided that the neutral or enemy character of a vessel is determined by the flag which she is entitled to fly; and

Whereas it is no longer expedient to adopt the said article:

Now, therefore, His Majesty, by and with the advice of His Privy Council, is pleased to order, and it is hereby ordered, that from and after this date article 57 of the Declaration of London shall cease to be adopted and put in force.

In lieu of the said article, British prize courts shall apply the rules and principles formerly observed in such courts.

This order may be cited as "The Declaration of London Order in Council, 1915."

And the Lords Commissioners of His Majesty's treasury, the Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty, and each of His Majesty's principal secretaries of state, the president of the probate, divorce, and admiralty division of the high court of justice, all other judges of His Majesty's prize courts, and all governors, officers, and authorities whom it may concern, are to give the necessary directions herein as to them may respectively appertain.

J. C. LEDLIE.

[Consul General Skinner to the Secretary of State]

AMERICAN CONSULATE GENERAL,
London, March 31, 1916.

Order in Council, March 30, proclaims important modifications to declaration of London Order in Council No. 2, of October 29, 1914, providing:

First. British possess right to capture goods as conditional contraband whether carriage to destination "be direct or entail transshipment or a subsequent transport by land."

Second. Presumption of enemy destination if goods are consigned to agent of enemy state, or to order, or if ship's papers do not show who is consignee applies to both absolute contraband and conditional contraband.

Third. Enemy destination presumed to exist if goods are consigned—

"To or from a person who during the present hostilities has forwarded imported contraband goods to territory belonging to or occupied by the enemy."

Fourth. In cases covered by second and third regulations it shall lie upon the owner of the goods to prove innocent destination.

Fifth. And from after March 30, article 19 Declaration London ceases to be in force, neither vessel nor cargo shall be immune from capture for breach of blockade upon sole ground that she is destined to nonblockaded port.

SKINNER.

Now, therefore, His Majesty, by and with the advice of his Privy Council, is pleased to order, and it is hereby ordered as follows:

1. The provisions of the Declaration of London Order in Council No. 2, 1914, shall not be deemed to limit or to have limited in any way the right of His Majesty, in accordance with the law of nations, to capture goods upon the grounds that they were conditional contraband, nor to affect or to have affected the liability of conditional contraband to capture, whether the carriage of the goods to their destination be direct or entail transshipment or a subsequent transport by land.

2. The provisions of article 1 (ii) and (iii) of the said Order in Council shall apply to absolute contraband as well as to conditional contraband.

3. The destinations referred to in article 30 and in article 33 of the said declaration shall (in addition to any presumptions laid down in the said order in council) be presumed to exist, if the goods are consigned to or for a person who, during the present hostilities, has forwarded imported contraband goods to territory belonging to or occupied by the enemy.

4. In the cases covered by articles 2 and 3 of this order it shall lie upon the owner of the goods to prove that their destination was innocent.

5. From and after the date of this order article 19 of the declaration of London shall cease to be adopted and put in force. Neither a vessel nor her cargo shall be immune from capture for breach of blockade upon the sole grounds that she is at the moment on her way to a nonblockaded port.

6. This order may be cited as "The Declaration of London Order in Council, 1916." Almeric Fitzroy. * * * It is hereby ordered that the following provisions shall be observed:

(a) The hostile destination required for the condemnation of contraband articles shall be presumed to exist until the contrary is shown if the goods are consigned to or for an enemy authority, or an agent of the enemy state, or to or for a person in territory belonging to or occupied by the enemy, or to or for a person who, during the present hostilities, has forwarded contraband goods to an enemy authority, or an agent of the enemy state, or to or for a person in territory belonging to or occupied by the enemy, or if the goods are consigned "to order," or if the ship's papers do not show who is the real consignee of the goods.

(b) The principle of continuous voyage or ultimate destination shall be applicable both in cases of contraband and of blockade.

(c) A neutral vessel carrying contraband with papers indicating a neutral destination, which, notwithstanding the destination shown on the papers, proceeds to an enemy port, shall be liable to capture and condemnation if she is encountered before the end of her next voyage.

(d) A vessel carrying contraband shall be liable to capture and condemnation if the contraband, reckoned either by value, weight, volume, or freight, forms more than half the cargo.

And it is hereby further ordered as follows:

(i) Nothing herein shall be deemed to affect the Order in Council of the 11th March 1915, for restricting further the commerce of the enemy or any of His Majesty's proclamation declaring the present hostilities.

(ii) Nothing herein shall affect the validity of anything done under the Orders in Council hereby withdrawn.

(iii) Any cause or proceeding commenced in any prize court before the making of this order may, if the court thinks just, be heard and decided under the provisions of the orders hereby withdrawn so far as they were in force at the date when such cause or proceeding was commenced, or would have been applicable in such cause or proceeding if this order had not been made.

This order may be cited as "The Maritime Rights Order in Council, 1916."—Almeric Fitzroy.

Mr. Speaker, it can readily be seen from this that Great Britain did not confine herself to the Declaration of London, but instituted her own declarations instead, with utter disregard for neutral rights. Great Britain even reserved the right to use neutral flags and to arm her merchant ships, both of these in conflict with the Declaration of London. It was this arming of merchant ships and the use of neutral flags that made it dangerous for underwater craft and finally ended in unrestricted warfare. Had England observed a rightful use of neutral flags this vicious submarine warfare could have been avoided, but England did not do so and her reason probably to utilize losses in ships, as a reason for our entry in the World War on the side of Great Britain and France.

This worked in 1917 but I do not believe it will be successful this time because we are better informed. It is also well to bear in mind in the restriction of trade to neutrals, Great Britain issued the black list on trading houses or business in foreign countries, and when a ship was consigned to one of these black-listed firms, she and the cargo was subject to seizure. Let us not forget the British Chamber of Commerce has already issued a black list on several hundred firms located in South America and other neutral countries. This is for no other purpose except to jeopardize American trade to neutrals, and knowing this, why should we aid the perfidity of Albion?

There are 10 pages of these volumes, naming ships that were bound to Scandinavian countries but captured by the English Navy and taken into English ports where cargoes were seized. It was this that led to reprisals and unrestricted warfare by Germany.

I shall now quote a report of what actually happened when German submarines hailed ships flying a neutral flag or ships that did not fly a flag. Time and space will not permit me to name all the instances in which merchant ships when challenged by German submarines, fired on the undersea craft. I shall, however, cite one case, so that the Members may have a better understanding of this warfare.

Date: January 17, 1915.
Place: Middle Mediterranean.
Nationality and name of the ship: English steamship *Melanie*.

PARTICULARS OF SURROUNDING CIRCUMSTANCES

U — signaled a flush-decked freight steamer with raised forecastle and cabin of about 3,000 tons, sailing under the Dutch flag, to send a boat and have the ship's papers examined. This was done after a while. As *U* —, which for safety's sake had gone under, came to the surface about 1,000 meters away from the steamer near the ship's boat, the steamer opened fire with two guns of medium caliber and machine guns so briskly that the *U* — barely saved herself by speedily submerging. Throughout the action, the steamer displayed the Dutch flag; she bore the name of *Melanie* which is found not in the Dutch, but in the English marine list.

This, Mr. Speaker, is not an act which comes within the law of war as agreed to in the London Proclamation. This ship was flying the flag of Holland, or a neutral flag. She was an armed English merchant ship under a neutral flag. She was hailed by a German submarine who asked to examine the papers, which is strictly within international law, but it was not within international law for this English ship to be camouflaged under a neutral flag and, in addition to that, armed. It was incidents of this sort that led to unrestricted warfare, for many of the undersea craft when challenging what appeared to be a neutral merchant ship were sunk by such ship.

There was no belligerent that violated international rules more than Great Britain; as a matter of fact, it is a habit of Great Britain not to obey or to conform to any international rules, as this correspondence clearly shows.

I shall now cite a case of a Danish ship that was followed by a British warship for 200 miles within the territorial water of the United States:

I, the undersigned, Capt. Charles Moller, master of the Danish steamship *Vinland*, herewith beg to make the following report to the American authorities concerned:

I left New York with my ship on the 10th day of November 1915 at 5 a. m., in ballast, for Norfolk, Va., to load a cargo of coal for South America. At 7:15 a. m. dropped pilot at *Scotland Lightship;* about 8:45 a. m. we sighted what later appeared to be a British warship, name unknown, steering a northerly course toward us. We changed our course immediately in order to get close under land and within the 3-mile limit. When abreast of Sea Girt Light, the warship was bearing down on us, and closing in on us rapidly, and were presently hoisting signals for us to stop. We ignored his signals but proceeded on our course, now only 2 miles off land and still getting closer. We, however, dipped our flag in salutation, which was answered by war vessel, at the same time pulling down his signal, but he did not give up following us. We approached the coast within 1 mile all the way.

At 11:30 a. m., passed Barnegat, 1 mile distant.
At 1:15 p. m., passed Brigantine L. V., on port bow.
At 5:35 p. m., passed Hereford light, 3 miles distant.
At 6:35 p. m., passed McCries gas buoy, close inside.

Near 5-fathom-bank light vessel the darkness and haze setting in forced the British ship to get farther out, whereas we took the channel, keeping close to the American coast. Between Hereford light and McCries gas buoy we again sighted the British warship coming around the light vessel, steering toward us. As it was impossible at this spot to keep within the 3-mile limit, we took the Cape May Channel and anchored inside the breakwater for the night. We left the breakwater for Norfolk at 4 a. m. on the 12th, following the coast within the 3-mile limit all the way. As it was hazy, nothing further was seen of the British warship. We arrived at Norfolk at 8:15 p. m., November 12, 1915.

I have marked out our course on the accompanying chart and also the route of the warship, which was inside the 3-mile limit when ordering us to stop.

My ship is in legitimate trade and was in transit from one American port to another American port, and I hereby make record of the occurrence as it happened within American territory, while at the same time I have asked my Government to protest against what is a violation of the international rules governing the seas.

CHAS. MOLLER, *Master, S. S. "Vinland."*

Mr. Speaker, this will give my colleagues an idea to the extent in which the British Navy interferred with our own coastwise shipping and the further interference with neutral shipping from American to other neutral ports. This unwarrantable interference with our shipping became so obnoxious that this letter was addressed to the British Ambassador by the Department of State.

NO. 1016

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, December 16, 1915.

EXCELLENCY: With reference to Your Excellency's note of the 11th instant in regard to the case of the steamship *Vinland*, in which it is stated that while His Majesty's cruiser did not enter territorial waters of the United States, he "followed the *Vinland* down the coast" from Barnegat Lighthouse to off McCries Shoal Buoy, Cape May, where the commander received orders to return to his "beat," which he did, I have the honor to refer to my informal notes of October 5 and December 22, 1914, and April 16,

1915, calling Your Excellency's attention to the annoyance which His Majesty's cruisers lying off the principal commercial ports of the United States and stopping and searching vessels immediately beyond American waters have given to shipping, both overseas and coastwise, and to the seriousness with which the Government of the United States regarded the hovering of belligerent warships about American coasts and ports.

In reply to my informal notes Your Excellency was good enough to assure me that His Majesty's Government had issued instructions which would prevent further molestation of American commerce in the trade lanes approximate to American waters and to the great ports of the United States. I cannot forbear, therefore, from calling the recent incident in which His Majesty's cruiser practically pursued a neutral vessel bound from one American port to another in ballast for the purpose of loading a cargo of coal for South America, to your Excellency's attention. As His Majesty's Government is aware, this Government has always regarded the practice of belligerent cruisers patrolling American coasts in close proximity to the territorial waters of the United States and making the neighborhood a station for their observations as inconsistent with the treatment to be expected from the naval vessels of a friendly power in time of war, and has maintained that the consequent menace of such proceedings to the freedom of American commerce is vexatious and uncourteous to the United States.

I am constrained, therefore, to request that you lay this matter before His Majesty's Government with the earnest request that instructions be issued to His Majesty's ships to desist from a practice which this Government is convinced has been maintained for long periods at a time and which is peculiarly disagreeable to it and to American traders concerned.

Accept, etc.

ROBERT LANSING.

This diplomatic correspondence should be very enlightening not only to Members of Congress but to the public at large. It is in accordance with past information that has been published since the World War and is, therefore, pertinent at this time because history is now repeating itself.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, there is one more speaker this evening, and we reserve the best until the last. I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SCHAFER].

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend and revise my remarks and to include in the extension brief excerpts from a number of publications and documents in order to expedite adjournment here this evening.

Mr. BLOOM. Reserving the right to object, will not the gentleman be a little more specific about what he is going to put in the RECORD?

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. A few brief excerpts from publications and documents. I may say that the publications will include several verses from the New Testament of Holy Writ. [Laughter.]

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, does any of it deal with Mordecai Ezekiel?

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. I do not intend to discuss Mordecai Ezekiel, the real Secretary of Agriculture, at this time, the same Mordecai Ezekiel of the planned economy that destroyed the cotton business of the South.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I would not have taken the floor at this late hour if it were not for the warlike speech delivered by our New Deal leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK]. He implied that anyone who opposed the repeal of the arms embargo of our existing neutrality law was lined up with the ungodly, bloody, "red" Communist butchers in Moscow.

For years in and out of Congress I have actively opposed and exposed Communist activities in America and I have not changed my position as has the gentleman from Massachusetts, who now favors repealing the arms embargo. I have consistently opposed repeal of the arms embargo in the past and now oppose its repeal as provided in the pending Bloom-Baruch credit-and-carry war promotion bill which our New Deal brethren have disguised in the robes of cash-and-carry neutrality.

Mr. Speaker, our distinguished Democratic colleague the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR], cited the language contained in section 7, subsections (a) and (b).

Under this language foreign nations can, prior to the President's proclamation, issue their obligations in America with the sky the limit, and refinance them under the provisions of subsection (b) after the President proclaims that a state of war exists. Two New Deal leaders, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BRADLEY] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM], admitted that under section 7 financial transactions and extension of credit after the President's proclamation was prohibited insofar as belligerent nations, their political subdivisions, and agents were concerned, but permitted in the case of all persons who are residents of said belligerent nations and their political subdivisions. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] has also pointed out that various Government agencies of our Federal Government could raid the Federal Treasury and give hand-outs and credit to belligerent nations engaged in war. Mr. Speaker, this is not a cash-and-carry measure, but a pure, unadulterated credit-and-carry proposition.

Mr. Speaker, I oppose this bill because it repeals the arms embargo of our existing neutrality law, because it is a credit-and-carry proposition, and because it gives the President too much authority and power.

I do not intend to vote our New Deal fuehrer in the White House the vast discretionary authority vested under this fake neutrality bill. Let us look at the first section of the bill which reads:

That whenever the President, or the Congress by concurrent resolution, shall find that there exists a state of war between foreign states.

Now, can we expect our New Deal President to find when a state of war exists? A bloody war has been raging in China for many months. The Communist forces of "red" Russia have moved in and taken possession of about half of Poland, and our New Deal President has not been able to find that a state of war exists in China or Poland, for he has failed to apply the arms embargo to Japan and Russia as required under our existing law.

Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to vote any more authority to President Roosevelt because I have no confidence in him. When we examine the record, we find that he repeatedly talks one way and acts another. The President promised to cut the cost of government 25 percent, and the records indicate he has increased the annual cost of our Federal Government more than 100 percent. For a number of years he has boasted that our existing arms embargo was a great instrument of peace which would help keep America out of war. He has about-faced again and now demands the embargo repeal in the name of keeping America out of war. Our New Deal President talks one way and acts another. He changes his position like the wind. He reminds me of the man on the flying trapeze. Whenever I study the record of our New Deal President, I am reminded of a speech delivered on January 12, 1848, in the House of Representatives by Abraham Lincoln, then a Representative in Congress. In referring to the President of the United States, Abraham Lincoln said:

The President is in nowise satisfied with his own positions. First, he takes up one, and in attempting to argue us into it he argues himself out of it, then seizes another and goes through the same process, and then, confused at being able to think of nothing new, he snatches up the old one again, which he has some time before cast off. His mind, taxed beyond its power, is running hither and thither, like some tortured creature on a burning surface, finding no position on which it can settle down and be at ease.

Mr. Speaker, this pending Bloom-Baruch bill is a pure unadulterated credit-and-carry war-promotion measure which our New Deal brethren have disguised in robes of cash-and-carry neutrality. It would repeal the arms, munitions, and war-implement embargo of our present neutrality law, and its enactment would be a long step in the direction of dragging our country into another European war.

I am opposed to Uncle Sam's financing, aiding, or abetting wars of foreign nations and supplying them with sinews of war under a cash and carry or any other system.

Foreign governments which are now engaged in war owe our Government more than $11,000,000,000, most of which was handed to them during the last World War Democratic administration, and many billions even after the armistice. This report from the Secretary of the Treasury indicates that on March 1, 1939, Great Britain owed our American taxpayers' Treasury $5,419,388,374.72; Soviet Russia owed $385,372,179.65; France owed $4,160,824,820.69; and Germany owed $1,251,417,749.70.

Mr. Speaker, in view of our national debt which has now passed $41,000,000,000, in addition to many more billions of obligations which Uncle Sam has guaranteed, it is about time that we move to collect the billions of dollars which foreign governments owe us instead of continuing to play Santa Claus to them in a big way.

Mr. Speaker, a great Democratic President, Andrew Jackson, told a foreign debt-defaulting nation to pay its honest debt. He sent a message to Congress asking for the enactment of legislation to collect a French debt by levying on the assets in the United States of the French Government and her nationals. France then paid without any further quibbling.

Mr. Speaker, since our foreign debtor nations have the cash to finance their present and future wars, they should use it to pay their honest debts, which they owe our country. If they do not, we should follow the principle enunciated by President Jackson and foreclose on their holdings in America and the holdings of their nationals, and collect as the New Deal has been collecting from distressed American citizens who, through no fault of their own, are unable to meet their tax, home loan, farm loan, and other payments due our Government.

Let us have a moratorium on the New Deal foreclosures on the homes and farms of our distressed American farmers and home owners, and let the New Deal devote its foreclosure and collection energies and activities to collecting the many billions of dollars which foreign nations now owe our almost bankrupt Federal Treasury, and on which debt they have refused to pay even one penny of the interest.

Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to giving any President of the United States the vast discretionary authority contained in the pending bill. I am particularly opposed to giving such authority to President Roosevelt, who is a former international banker of wide experience and a member of whose family has recently married a member of the war-munitions family of Du Pont, and whose son has been in the business of selling military airplanes to foreign nations.

History reveals that international bankers and munitions makers promote, propagandize and profit by war, while the great rank and file of the people pay, fight, suffer, and die.

When we examine the record, we find that President Roosevelt is far from being a man of peace as he claimed to be when asking for the enactment of the pending bill. His Chicago quarantine speech and his loose talk about aiding one side in every way short of war is certainly not peaceful or neutral. I cannot vote to give an ex-international banker President the vast discretionary authority as proposed in the pending bill. President Roosevelt wrote the foreword of the prospectus for the Federal International Banking Corporation and was hooked up in it with Robert Rowland Appleby, president of the British Empire Chamber of Commerce in the United States. This corporation, according to the prospectus which I have in my hand was organized for the selling of foreign bonds and securities to the American people.

I hold in my hand a photostatic copy of page 31 of the New York Times of September 14, 1922, in which appears an advertisement of a new issue of 600,000,000 German marks floated by United European Investors, Ltd., Franklin D. Roosevelt, president.

This advertisement states—

> The company's facilities and connections enable it to secure attractive and sound investments; the directors will take advantage of the present money stringency in Germany, and of the purchasing power of the mark, which is far greater than is reflected by exchange quotations.

Mr. Speaker, I hold here in my hand a photostatic copy of page 1480 of Poor's Register of Directors, 1929, wherein Franklin Delano Roosevelt is shown as a director of the International Germanic Trust Co.

I now hold in my hand a photostatic copy of a page from the Martindale-Hubbell Law Directory, of January 1933, volume 1, page 754, showing a legal advertisement of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, an investment banker-attorney.

Mr. Speaker, if we give our ex-international banker New Deal President the authority provided in this bill, we can expect to find that it is a long step on the road to war.

I have no more faith in the President's being sincere in his loud protestations that he desires to keep America out of the new European conflict than I had when he claimed to have driven the money changers from the temple of our Government. The records conclusively show that he did not drive the money changers from the temple of our Government, but drove them into it with the help of his Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Morgenthau, the son of an international banker who married the favorite niece of the Lehman brothers, who are among the most powerful international bankers in America.

Mr. Speaker, under New Deal international policies, the interests of our American people are sacrificed for the benefit of internationalists in other lands.

Under the Roosevelt New Deal gold-and-silver policies, the international bankers, foreign owners of and speculators in gold waxed fat when Mr. Roosevelt forced Americans to turn in their gold for $20.67 an ounce or go to jail for 5 years and then imported $10,469,100,000 worth of gold from foreign owners at $35 an ounce, according to the Treasury Department letter of October 26, 1939, which I have in my hand.

In many respects, such as being an apostle of peace, reducing the cost of Government 25 percent, and driving the money changers from the temple, when we examine the facts and the record of President Roosevelt, we find, like Isaac of old, "the voice is Jacob's voice, but the hands are the hands of Esau."

Mr. Speaker, I approach the pending bill from an American standpoint. I am a native-born American citizen, and I owe my first allegiance to our American Government and our American people. I have no personal sympathies for either side of the present European conflict. One of my grandparents came from England, another came from Alsace-Loraine, and two came from Germany. I do not want any carping critic to tell me I am pro this or pro that or anti this or anti that. The only pro that is in me is pro-Americanism, and I do not apologize for it. [Applause.]

It was brought out on the floor of the House today that Mr. Goldenweiser, a Government official, indicated that England and France had almost $2,000,000,000 worth of gold and about $7,000,000,000 worth of securities in the United States which they could use for purchases if the pending bill is enacted.

Since England and France on March 1, 1939, owed Uncle Sam's almost bankrupt Federal Treasury a total of $9,580,213,195.41, they should be called upon to pay what they owe us and use the assets mentioned by Mr. Goldenweiser to do so. I favor a cash-and-carry policy, to wit: Let England and France use those billions which Mr. Goldenweiser says they now have in the United States to repay the billions which they carried away during the last World War.

Mr. Speaker, in view of our national debt, which is now more than $40,000,000,000, in addition to many more billions of obligations which Uncle Sam has guaranteed, is it not time that Uncle Sam moves to collect the billions of dollars which foreign governments owe him instead of continuing to play Santa Claus to them, as he has under the New Deal, and as proposed in the pending war-promotion bill, which has been dressed up as a neutrality measure?

Mr. Speaker, since our foreign debtor nations have the cash to finance new wars, they should be called upon to use it to repay the billions which they owe our almost bankrupt Federal Treasury and which they carried from America

during and after their last World War, when another Democrat-liberal administration was in power. You and I know what a Democrat-liberal is—liberal with other people's money, even though the second, third, fourth, and fifth generations have to sweat and toil to produce it. Uncle Sam should make a demand that our foreign debt-defaulting nations pay their honest debts to him. If they do not, we should follow the advice of Andrew Jackson, that great Democratic President, and foreclose on their holdings and the holdings of their nationals, and collect as the New Deal is collecting from distressed American citizens who, through no fault of their own, are unable to meet their tax, home-loan, farm-loan, and other payments due our Government.

Let us have a moratorium on the New Deal foreclosures on the homes and farms of our distressed American farmers and home owners, and let the New Deal devote its foreclosure-collection energies and activities to collecting the many billions of dollars which foreign nations owe our almost bankrupt Federal Treasury and refuse to even pay one penny interest on.

The New Deal would be rendering a splendid service to our country and our countrymen if they would do so.

Mr. Speaker, our country should not directly or indirectly help either side in the new European conflict. Some say that we should aid the democracies in every possible manner short of war. This war is not a war of democracies. It is a war of power politics which we should keep out of.

France, England, Russia, and Germany are not democracies. The British Empire was built on bloody wars of conquest and oppression. So was the so-called Republic of France. Only a few years ago, the French Government was in the control of a Communist-Socialist coalition under Blum, and the present Premier and Dictator of France, Daladier, was the right-hand man in the Communist-Socialist coalition government of Blum. At that time they made an offensive and defensive alliance with the ungodly, un-Christian Communist butchers in Moscow.

Only a very few weeks ago the British were trying to make a triple offensive and defensive alliance between Russia, France, and England. Only 30 seconds before the Russian bear jumped in bed with Hitler the French frog was in bed with the Russian bear and Johnny Bull was trying to jump in bed with them.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 additional minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. That was the record before the purge in Moscow of Finkelstein, the former Soviet Commissar for Foreign Affairs, who changed his name to Litvinoff. The front-page headline of the July 3, 1939, Washington Post reads, "Russia accepts triple alliance, London reports."

Mr. Speaker, can it be said that Russia was a democracy on July 3, 1939, before the fall of Finkelstein, alias Litvinoff? Why does England and France, who claim to be fighting to preserve democracy, take the position that after the war is over the Russian bear can keep one-half of Poland, which she has taken?

Mr. Speaker, the American people are about fed up with the propaganda which a few months ago was trying to line us up with France, England, and Communist Russia in the name of democracies, and since the fall of Finkelstein has been trying to line us up with France and England against Russia in the name of democracy.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], who has supported the arms embargo in the past, has changed his position and by inference at least now claims that those who still support the embargo are giving aid and comfort to the Communists in Moscow.

His change of front and his alibi will scare and fool no one. I have fought communism in and out of the Halls of Congress. The Communists have actively opposed me in political campaigns and have supported my New Deal opponents. They have picketed my home and threatened my life on numerous occasions because of my opposition to them. I was certainly surprised at the position taken by the New Deal leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]. For his particular benefit let us look at a portion of the record which reveals that the New Deal forces which are behind the pending bill have been coddling the "red" Communist bear. We know that the Communist "reds" in Russia have effaced in blood every trace of justice, liberty, morality, and individual human and private property rights. They have not only repealed the Ten Commandments of the Supreme Ruler of the Universe but have confiscated private and church property, destroyed sacred rights and liberties and lives of millions of people including the clergy and sisters of mercy in order to shackle the people of Russia in bonds of regimented political slavery. Among the leaders in the butchery was Mr. Samuel Ginsberg, alias General Krivitsky, who the New Deal permitted to enter and remain in the United States although he testified before the Dies committee that for 17 years he was a big shot in the Communist intelligence service abroad. Another notable leader in the Russian "red" revolution was Mr. Finkelstein, alias Litvinoff, who until very recently was the Soviet Commissar for Foreign Affairs. This same Mr. Litvinoff came to America shortly after the New Deal got control of our Federal Government and made the arrangements for our New Deal President to recognize Soviet Russia on November 16, 1933.

The New Deal administration in Washington was so impressed with communism as preached and practiced in Moscow that shortly thereafter it commenced to advocate, effectuate, and emulate the planned economy of the Soviet conception of regimented bureaucracy. Shortly thereafter, in early 1934, according to the sworn testimony of the aviation expert, Mr. Anthony H. S. Fokker, before the special Senate committee investigating the munitions industry and the October 1936 issue of the Aero Digest, Mr. Elliott Roosevelt made a deal with Fokker to sell the Communist Russian Government 50 Douglas military airplanes of Lockheed make. Mr. Fokker's testimony revealed that the agreement which he signed with Mr. Elliott Roosevelt was a special agreement for the sale of these planes to Russia, and when questioned concerning why he had signed an agreement for such a large commission of $500,000 to Mr. Roosevelt and $500,000 to himself, Mr. Fokker explained that he had not felt that the prices which it was proposed to charge the Russians for these 50 military planes were at all reasonable and, in fact, he had thought them notably excessive but that he had been persuaded by Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Roosevelt's associate, Mr. Stratton, that Mr. Roosevelt had enough influence with the Export-Import Bank and the Russian Purchasing Commission, then in this country, to swing the deal at that excessive price.

According to an Associated Press dispatch from Washington, President Roosevelt, on November 7, 1938 (the twenty-first "birthday" of Soviet Russia) sent the following cable to President Mikhail Kalinin, of Russia:

His Excellency MIKHAIL KALININ,
President, All-Union Central Executive Committee,
Moscow, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics:

Upon this national anniversary please accept my felicitations and sincere good wishes for the well-being of the people of your country.

Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand a Communist Party campaign document circulated in Wisconsin during the 1938 political campaign. I quote from this campaign document as follows:

A smashing victory for the New Deal nationally and for the Progressive administration in Wisconsin will consolidate the gains of the New Deal and make possible a new push forward.

Every new dealer and supporter of Roosevelt should vote to reelect the Progressive administration in the State, to reelect a Progressive legislature and elect supporters of Roosevelt to Congress and the United States Senate.

Mr. Speaker, this remarkable campaign document was authorized, paid for, and circulated by the Communist Party of

Wisconsin, 744 North Fourth Street, room 329, Milwaukee, Wis., as shown on the document.

Mr. Speaker, Associated Press reports for Tuesday, September 19, 1939, indicate that Mr. Sam Carp, the self-described brother-in-law of Vyacheslav Molotov, Soviet Premier, in testifying before the Dies committee, said that in 1936 he had $100,000,000 of Soviet money to buy two 35,000-ton battleships in the United States, and that he had employed Mr. Preston McGoodwin, a former assistant to Mr. Charles Michelson, the New Deal propaganda commissar of the Democratic National Committee, as a contact man. Mr. Sam Carp also testified that he had employed Mr. Scott Ferris, who was the Democratic national committeeman from Oklahoma, as a lawyer with a $32,000 fee.

Mr. Speaker, these are only a few of the records which indicate that prior to Mr. Litvinoff's demotion as Soviet Commissar for Foreign Affairs the New Deal administration was not very unfriendly to the bloody "red" Communist butchers in Moscow. In view of the record, I for one, resent the attempt of the New Deal spokesman to directly or by innuendo accuse those of us who are opposing the repeal of the arms embargo and the enactment of the pending Bloom bill of giving aid and comfort to the Communists in Moscow.

Mr. Speaker, I resent that implication. I fought these ungodly Communists and I intend to fight them in the future as I have in the past. I do not intend to be swerved from my duty by any false accusations, be they direct or by innuendo. I am just as much of a Christian as the Member who boasted of his Christianity while he denounced us as supporting ungodly Communist forces because we are opposed to the repeal of the embargo. I was born a Christian American, I was raised a Christian American, I still am a Christian American, and when I die I will die a Christian American. I then want the red, white, and blue wrapped around me, the flag which the Government of the United States will furnish because of my 22 months' overseas service in 1917, 1918, and 1919 under that flag when I was doing my bit to help "make the world safe for democracy." [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, when we examine the record we find that we made the world safe for dictatorships and made America safe for Old Man Depression.

Mr. Speaker, let us take care of our interests at home. Our American interests are in America and not in foreign lands. Let us not take sides with foreign belligerent nations.

I am opposed to foreign entanglements and alliances, engaging in wars in other lands, meddling in the affairs of foreign nations, and taking sides in their controversies. I shall oppose sending our boys to fight on foreign battlefields for the benefit of international bankers, munition makers, war profiteers, and foreign countries. The place for American manhood is on top of American soil and not under foreign mud.

I respectfully suggest to my colleague from Massachusetts, who has changed his position on the arms embargo and has defended his change in defense of Christianity as opposed to communism, that Jesus Christ, the Son of God, the Father, said, "Thou shalt not kill." I am opposed to repealing the arms embargo of our existing neutrality law so that America can furnish arms, munitions, and implements of war with which to slaughter people in other lands in violation of the commandment of our Lord Jesus Christ, who said, "Thou shalt not kill."

I ask my colleague from Massachusetts to also remember that our Lord Jesus Christ also said: "No man can serve two masters," and "For as the body without the spirit is dead, so faith without works is dead also."

Mr. Speaker, I choose to oppose the repeal of the arms embargo as I believe such opposition to conform to the works and faith of Christianity, the contention of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] to the contrary notwithstanding. I take this position notwithstanding the highly organized and widely disseminated propaganda of international war monger Sadducees, Scribes, and Pharisees in favor of its repeal and the enactment of the pending Bloom bill.

Mr. Speaker, I shall vote for the Wolcott amendment which replaces some of the credit-and-carry features of this bill with cash-and-carry provisions. I shall vote for the pending Shanley amendment which retains our existing embargo on arms, munitions, and implements of war and shall vote against the pending Vorys amendment to the Shanley amendment, as this amendment will permit the shipment of many implements of war which are included in the arms embargo of our existing Neutrality Act. I know the heat has been turned on and that many Members who a few months ago voted to retain the arms embargo will change their position and that the Wolcott, Vorys, and Shanley amendments will be defeated. I shall then vote against the bill as it is clearly a credit-and-carry war-promotion measure which our New Deal brethren have disguised in robes of cash-and-carry neutrality. I am opposed to making America an arsenal and base of war supplies for any foreign belligerent nation engaged in war. I am particularly opposed to furnishing sinews of war to foreign nations who now owe our almost bankrupt Federal Treasury many billions of dollars and refuse to even pay a penny interest on their honest debt.

Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I shall vote against an early adjournment of this special session of Congress as I am of the firm opinion that Congress should remain in continuous session in order to help in the solution of many highly important domestic and foreign problems which vitally affect our country and our countrymen. [Applause.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the subject of copper in connection with the proposed trade agreement.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein a speech by the Honorable Louis Johnson, Assistant Secretary of War.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHANDLER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I wish to state for the RECORD that the time used tonight by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] will have nothing to do with the allotment of time tomorrow. We will start even as to time at that time. The gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] has used considerable more time than I have, but that is not to be deducted from his time tomorrow.

Mr. FISH. That was a mutual agreement, Mr. Speaker.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 31 minutes p. m.) the House, under its previous order, adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, November 2, 1939, at 11 o'clock a. m.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CRAWFORD:

H. Con. Res. 37. Concurrent resolution calling for the continuous session of Congress until January 3, 1940; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DIES:

H. Res. 321. Resolution for the continuation of the Special Committee to Investigate Un-American Activities; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. FITZPATRICK introduced a bill (H. R. 7614) for the relief of George Schlessinger, also known as H. George Westpfal, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

5851. By Mr. ANGELL: Petition of J. J. Handsaker, of Portland, Oreg., and others, requesting the retention of the arms embargo; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5852. Also, petition of Helen Casati, of Riddle, Oreg., and others, petitioning the retention of the present neutrality law; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5853. Also, petition of F. A. Schumann, of Portland, Oreg., and others, petitioning the retention of the present neutrality law; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5854. Also, petition of Edward A. Williams, of Portland, Oreg., and others, petitioning the retention of the present neutrality law; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5855. By Mr. ASHBROOK: Petition of 2,000 members of the Council of Women Opposed to Participation in Foreign Wars, of Newark and Licking County, Ohio, protesting against the taking of any step whatsoever on the part of our Government which would tend to send American sons to another war on foreign soil; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5856. By Mr. MERRITT: Resolution of the College Point (Long Island) Taxpayers Association, opposing any change in the Embargo Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE

THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 2, 1939

Dr. George W. Truett, pastor of the First Baptist Church, of Dallas, Tex., offered the following prayer:

We make our appeal to Thee, our gracious Heavenly Father, because we understand better and better all the while that every mercy and blessing of life comes directly from Thy gracious hand. Thou art worthy of all gratitude and praise. Rightly has Thy name been called "Wonderful, Counselor, the Mighty God, the Everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace." We would glorify Thee as Lord over all and blessed forevermore. We would hallow Thy name, holy and great, in all the relations and experiences of life. We would make our most grateful acknowledgment unto Thee because of Thy mercies, which fail not unto us, and we have found them to be all-sufficient for us. What shall we render unto the Lord for all his benefits toward us? We would not only take His proffered cup of salvation and call upon His name as long as we live but we would put our trust in Him, remembering his promise that "whoso putteth his trust in the Lord shall be safe"; and we would make proof of our friendship for the great Master by faithfully doing what He bids us to do. We pray, above every other prayer, that Thy kingdom may come and that Thy will may be done in earth as it is in heaven.

In these poignantly troubled days, our Father, we have been made again to drink the wine of astonishment because of the trying conditions, turbulent and terrible, throughout the earth. Clouds and darkness are around about us oftentimes, but we would remember that righteousness and judgment are the habitations of Thy throne and that Thy throne shall not be disturbed. Our prayer is that God shall so rule and overrule in the affairs of our troubled world as that everywhere righteousness shall be vindicated and the holy name of God glorified and somehow our humanity be lifted upward and carried forward.

We pray for our own dear land for which Thou hast been a pillar of cloud by day and a pillar of fire by night. We pray for the President of this country and all who are joined with him in authority. Give wisdom and strength all-sufficient from Thine own infinite self to all those who rule and administer in the affairs of civil government. May they and all the people the land over understand more acutely every day that it is righteousness that exalteth a nation and that sin is not only a reproach but, in the end, wasting and destruction in every instance.

We pray for this great body of men and give deep and devout thanks for them all. May their interests be precious in God's sight.

We are minded now to pray especially for the honored Member of this body who has been called away by the sorrow of the homegoing of his dear wife. May all needed comfort from God be given him and the household, and may all the interests of all these men and their households be precious today and ever in the sight of God. Our prayer is offered in the Great Master's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of Tuesday, October 31, 1939, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

CLAIM OF ANASTASIO A. YLAGAN

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from Anastasio A. Ylagan (postal employee), San Francisco, Calif., relative to a claim against the United States in connection with his removal from the Postal Service in alleged violation of section 43 of the Postal Rules and Regulations, which was referred to the Committee on Civil Service.

REVIVAL OF APPLICATIONS FOR CERTAIN LETTERS PATENT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from Bernard C. Whitman, of New York City, N. Y., enclosing complaint and exhibits pertaining to the matter of Bernard C. Whitman (plaintiff) against Hon. William I. Sirovich, chairman of the Committee on Patents of the House of Representatives (defendant), in re Irving A. Whitman, as trustee of Vincent I. Whitman, for the revival of his four applications for United States letters patent through verified petitions for redress of grievances before the Committees on Patents of the Congress, which, with the accompanying papers, were referred to the Committee on Patents.

MEMORIAL

Mr. HOLT presented a resolution of the Woman's Club of Hurricane, W. Va., protesting against the enactment of any legislation that might directly or indirectly involve the United States in war, which was ordered to lie on the table.

RECIPROCAL-TRADE AGREEMENT WITH ARGENTINA—AGRICULTURAL SURPLUSES

Mr. WILEY presented a letter addressed by him to Mr. John P. Gregg, Committee for Reciprocity Information, Washington, D. C., which was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
October 18, 1939.

Mr. JOHN P. GREGG,
Committee for Reciprocity Information, Old Land Office Building, Eighth and E Streets, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. GREGG: Please incorporate in the records of the current hearings on the proposed reciprocal-trade agreement with Argentina, the following statement as an expression of my views:

I realize that the negotiations with Argentina may offer an opportunity for the United States to garner some of the Argentine trade which in times of peace went normally to Europe.

I realize further that an agreement with this progressive country might strengthen our commercial ties in a manner that might serve as an example throughout the entire Western Hemisphere. In fact, it is apparent that the idea of expanding the Argentine market for our industrial exports is wholly constructive.

It is equally apparent, however, that in order to create this expanded market, it is necessary that we take a larger volume of Argentine exports. These exports unfortunately are largely competitive with our farm products. This is a serious objection unless it can be demonstrated that the resultant increase in domestic industrial activity would be sufficient to expand our domestic agricultural market sufficiently to absorb both this new

load of agricultural imports and a larger domestic agricultural production at better price levels than those established in the current year.

It is inconsistent to raise the industrial export level while materially damaging the agricultural segment of our economic life so that it in turn is reflected in a smaller domestic market for American industry.

It is equally inconsistent for the administration to grant concessions on competitive agricultural imports while it is at the same time paying our farmers to reduce their acreage in similar products.

I believe that it should be possible to negotiate with Argentina so that the concessions granted will not further dislocate our agricultural economy by increasing agricultural surpluses.

I wish to record my opposition to any reciprocal-trade treaty which will serve to further increase the agricultural surpluses in this country.

Sincerely,

ALEXANDER WILEY.

IMPORTATION OF FURS—MINK PELTS

Mr. WILEY presented correspondence relative to the importation of mink pelts under the reciprocal-trade agreement with Canada, which was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEPTEMBER 26, 1939.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: We, the Wisconsin Mink Breeders' Association, are taking the liberty of registering an appeal to you regarding the national emergency which now exists in the fur-farming industry, and particularly in the mink-ranching industry. We do not believe it necessary to point out the fact that the mink-ranching industry in the United States is in a very precarious condition, due mainly to overproduction.

As you will further know, the present state of international affairs makes it necessary for our neighbor on the north, Canada, to seek other markets for her mink pelts than her customary European markets which are now completely shut off. It will probably, therefore, be necessary for the Canadian mink ranchers to market most, if not all, of their crop of 175,000 mink pelts here in the United States.

Most of these mink pelts will be sold at public auction in Canada. American buyers will undoubtedly patronize these auctions, as they have done in the past, and take advantage of not only weakened economic conditions caused by overproduction in the industry itself but to the differences in monetary values between the United States and Canada, which is now approximately 20 percent.

Now, Senator WILEY, it should be quite clear that if this condition should be allowed to occur just what the result will be to American mink ranchers. However, we do not ask a direct embargo against importation of these ranch-bred mink pelts nor a change in duty of such pelts, but we do appeal to you and beg that you use your offices to the end that a fair limit or quota be placed upon such imports from Canada, these figures to be based upon a fair average of Canada's imports of mink pelts into this country during the 5-year period preceding and up to December 31, 1938, as per official records of the United States customs.

We are asking that you use your influence immediately, Senator WILEY, in order to protect our deserving American mink ranchers and their crop of pelts, which will be ready for the market now within a few short weeks.

Very respectfully yours,

PAUL G. BRADY,
Secretary of the Wisconsin Mink Breeders' Association.

HORSTMAN MINKERY,
Manitowoc, Wis., October 11, 1939.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
Chippewa Falls, Wis.

MY DEAR MR. WILEY: I would like to call your attention to the fact that large shipments of mink skins will be made from foreign countries. These mink skins will be dumped on our markets in tremendous quantities, causing fur prices to slump to very low levels and ruining our mink and fur industry, which has grown to be important in our State.

Immediate or decisive action should be taken to put a tariff on mink skins in order to save the industry and keep it on a paying basis.

Mink imports for the first 6 months of 1938 were 631,945 skins—almost three times as many as were raised in the United States in 1938.

It costs from $7 to $9 to raise a mink for pelt. The average pelt sold through the American National Fox and Fur Breeders Association brought $10.04.

Now, with the European war in progress, France and England, no doubt, will not be buying furs. Therefore, they must all be used in this country.

Hoping you will help the fur industry all you can.

Very cordially yours,

LOUIS HORSTMAN.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
October 19, 1939.

Mr. LOUIS HORSTMAN,
Horstman Minkery, 1913 South Fourteenth Street, Manitowoc, Wis.

DEAR MR. HORSTMAN: Thank you for your informative letter. I agree heartily with you that the American mink-pelt market must not be unduly depressed by a dumping of pelts on the American market which might ordinarily have been sold abroad. I have already contacted the State Department on this matter, and the Secretary of State, Cordell Hull, writes:

"I assure you that the Government is watching closely the effects of the European war on our domestic economy. Although it is, of course, not possible to determine at the present time what effect the war will have on the fur trade, or on the trade in numerous other commodities, the Department is glad to receive the views of interested persons in this connection.

"As I am sure you will appreciate in the case of products such as mink furs, which have been the subject of trade-agreement concessions, requests from domestic industries for governmental action along particular lines must also be examined in the light of the pertinent trade-agreement provisions.

"In accordance with the usual procedure, I am having a copy of your constituent's letter brought to the attention of the Committee for Reciprocity Information, which, in turn, will bring it to the attention of all the agencies of the Government represented in the interdepartmental trade-agreements organization. Should your constituent desire from time to time to make available to these agencies any additional information as to the effects of the war on the fur trade, it is suggested that such information be submitted to that Committee at the old Land Office Building, Eighth and E Streets NW., Washington, D. C."

In view of the above letter, I would appreciate any further comments or suggestions you may have to make. I want to do everything possible to assist the fur farmers of Wisconsin.

Very truly yours,

ALEXANDER WILEY.

OXBOW MINK RANCH,
Columbus, Wis., October 24, 1939.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I am writing you at this time to protest the fact that under the Canadian trade agreement raw mink pelts are listed as one of the items on the free list. You probably will know that the mink-ranching industry in the United States is in a very precarious condition at the present time, due mainly to overproduction, and if the estimated crop of 175,000 Canadian-ranch mink pelts are allowed unrestricted entry into this country it will throw the whole industry into a state of chaos, and probably will result in absolute disaster to thousands of our deserving American mink ranchers.

Therefore we appeal to you and beg that you use your offices to the end that a fair limit quota be placed upon such imports from Canada; these figures to be based upon a fair average of Canadian imports of mink pelts into this country during the 5-year period preceding and up to December 31, 1938, as per official records of the United States customs.

Yours very truly,

OXBOW MINK RANCH,
WM. ALTSCHWAGER & SON.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
October 26, 1939.

OXBOW MINK RANCH,
WM. ALTSCHWAGER & SON,
River Road, Columbus, Wis.

GENTLEMEN: Thank you for your letter giving information relative to the effect of the trade-treaty agreements on mink ranches in Wisconsin. I am greatly concerned with this problem and want to do everything I possibly can to assist you.

I have already taken the matter up with the State Department. I am enclosing a copy of a letter received from Cordell Hull explaining the State Department's attitude in this matter.

If, after reading this letter, you have any further suggestions as to how I can assist you, I will be happy to hear from you.

Sincerely yours,

ALEXANDER WILEY.

BERLIN, WIS., *October 27, 1939.*

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We would like to call your attention to the fact that under the Canadian trade agreement mink pelts are on the free list.

The war in Europe has dislocated trade there, so that Europe will not take the Canadian mink from them as usual, neither will there be any mink shipped to them from the United States, as has been the custom for years back; the result is that the trade in the United States will be obliged to absorb the product of Canada as well as our own United States product. In addition to this, there is apparently an overproduction in ranch mink skins, and the market is in very poor shape.

It costs about $10 to raise a mink, and the last sale that we heard about was at Fromm Bros., Hamburg, Wis., at which good quality mink skins brought $7 each. You can readily see that when this year's large supply comes on the market it is going to demoralize the market.

We believe that there should be a tariff on Canadian skins imported into this country, or at least there should be a quota placed on imports based on a fair average of imports from Canada to this country for the last 5-year period.

Wisconsin, as you know, produces a large share of the fur raised in the United States. The silver-fox industry has been badly hurt by the Canadian treaty, and imports from northern Europe and Canada have been several times larger than they were in the past. We believe that Wisconsin was sold out when the Canadian agreement was signed, not alone on furs but on dairy products, and if something is not done for the mink and fur fox farmers hundreds of small ranches will be forced out of business.

We trust that you can do something for your State.

Very truly yours,

TRUESDELL FUR COAT CO., INC.
C. W. SMITH.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
October 30, 1939.

Mr. C. W. SMITH,
Truesdell Fur Coat Co., Inc., Berlin, Wis.

DEAR FRIEND: Thank you for your letter giving up-to-date information relative to the effect of the trade-treaty agreements on mink ranches in Wisconsin. I am greatly concerned with this problem and want to do everything I possibly can to assist you.

I have already taken the matter up with the State Department. I am enclosing a copy of a letter received from Cordell Hull explaining the State Department's attitude in this matter.

If after reading this letter you have any further suggestions as to how I can assist you, I will be happy to hear from you.

Sincerely yours,

ALEXANDER WILEY.

ELA H. ATKINSON

Mr. BYRNES. From the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report back favorably Senate Resolution 193 and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 193) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate to Ela H. Atkinson, widow of John P. Atkinson, late an assistant clerk in the office of Senator AUSTIN, a sum equal to 1 year's compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE TO AUDIT AND CONTROL THE CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE SENATE

Mr. BYRNES, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, reported a resolution (S. Res. 195), which was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, or any subcommittee thereof, be, and hereby is, authorized during the Seventy-sixth Congress to send for persons, books, and papers, to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per 100 words, to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be before said committee, the expenses thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate; and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during sessions or recesses of the Senate.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BARBOUR:

S. 3000. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. FRAZIER:

S. 3001. A bill to prohibit all officers and employees of the United States from receiving any remuneration with respect to the manufacture or sale of arms, ammunition, or implements of war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

S. 3002. A bill authorizing the Bradenton Co., its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across Sarasota Pass where Manatee Avenue, Bradenton, if extended, would cross Sarasota Pass, county of Manatee, State of Florida; to the Committee on Commerce.

THE TEST OF PATRIOTISM—ADDRESS BY HON. FRANK MURPHY

[Mr. SCHWELLENBACH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address entitled "The Test of Patriotism," delivered by Hon. Frank Murphy, Attorney General of the United States, before the National Conference on Civil Liberties at New York City, October 13, 1939, which appears in the Appendix.]

BRITISH PROPAGANDA IN THE UNITED STATES—ARTICLE BY PORTER SARGENT

[Mr. NYE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by Porter Sargent entitled "British Propaganda in the United States," published in Common Sense for November 1939, which appears in the Appendix.]

NONPARTISAN COMMITTEE FOR PEACE THROUGH REVISION OF NEUTRALITY LAW

[Mr. MALONEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter from William Allen White, together with a joint statement of certain clergymen, statements by others, and a list of names of members of the Nonpartisan Committee for Peace Through Revision of the Neutrality Law, which appear in the Appendix.]

NEUTRALITY AND PEACE OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I desire to make a brief statement, and then to ask for a unanimous-consent agreement.

The House of Representatives, which is considering the neutrality joint resolution, will conclude debate on it about 2 o'clock this afternoon. I am informed that thereafter there will be roll calls on three or four motions before the action of the House may be messaged over to the Senate. That means, in all likelihood, that the House will not be in a position to message over to the Senate its action before 5 o'clock this afternoon. It is desirable when that message shall be received, which will presumably announce a disagreement to the Senate amendment and a request for a conference, that the Senate insist on its amendments, agree to the conference, and that the Chair be authorized to appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate. Looking to that end, therefore, I send to the desk a unanimous-consent request, which I ask to have considered at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The request for unanimous consent submitted by the Senator from Kentucky will be read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding the adjournment or recess of the Senate today, the Secretary be authorized to receive a message from the House of Representatives on the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 306) entitled "Neutrality Act of 1939"; that the Senate insist upon its amendments to the said joint resolution and agree to the conference which may be asked by the House; and that the President of the Senate be authorized to appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I do not know that I have any objection, but I think the procedure is rather unusual, in that it provides for the appointment of conferees and for the course which shall be taken prior to the receipt of the message from the House of Representatives announcing the action of that body.

Mr. BARKLEY. The request merely provides that the Chair shall appoint the conferees after the message from the House shall have been received by the Secretary.

Mr. McNARY. Is it not the intention of the majority leader of the Senate that the Senate shall convene tomorrow?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; it is. If the request shall not be agreed to, the Senate will have to recess subject to the call of the Chair, and will be called back around 5 o'clock, in order to do what I am seeking now to do without having to have the Senate reconvene. I will say, in further answer to the Senator from Oregon, that it is my purpose to move that the Senate adjourn until tomorrow when today's business shall have been concluded, so that if there shall be a conference report ready for consideration tomorrow the Senate may be in session to consider it.

Mr. McNARY. Then I understand that the desire of the majority leader is that the conferees may have a conference

and act tomorrow morning, and, as the Senate must act upon the conference report first, that it may pass upon the matter finally at the session tomorrow. Is that the purpose?

Mr. BARKLEY. That is my purpose, I will say to the Senator.

Mr. McNARY. With that full explanation, I am in accord with the action proposed, which seems to be consistent with fair consideration. May I ask the Senator again, Does he anticipate any change in the joint resolution by action of the House?

Mr. BARKLEY. I think not. I cannot, of course, guarantee what the House will or will not do.

Mr. McNARY. Oh, no.

Mr. BARKLEY. But my information is that the House will ask for a conference on the Senate amendments and that motions of one kind or another which may be offered and voted on will not bring about any change to affect a full and free conference between the two Houses on their disagreeing votes on the amendments of the Senate.

Mr. McNARY. And, of course, Mr. President, the proposed agreement would not preclude consideration and final vote on the conference report?

Mr. BARKLEY. Oh, no; not at all.

Mr. McNARY. It would simply hasten its presentation to the Senate?

Mr. BARKLEY. That is correct.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, let me suggest that the House of Representatives have already adopted a resolution requesting a conference. We have that much to go on. As to whether there will be any instructions to their conferees or what further action the House will take, we, of course, cannot tell. We do know, however, there will be a conference, and, as chairman of the conferees on the part of the Senate, I have notified those who will probably be named as conferees that it is expected that the Senate conferees will meet tomorrow morning at 10:30 with the managers on the part of the House.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McNARY. My attention was diverted when the request was first read. Does the proposal contemplate the number of Members who will constitute the conference committee on the part of the Senate?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It does not; it leaves it entirely to the Chair.

Mr. McNARY. May I then make a further parliamentary inquiry, which I hope is not imprudent in any way? Does the Chair contemplate appointing five members, and, if so, how many will be appointed from the Republican representation?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair has not consulted with the Senator from Kentucky or the Senator from Nevada as to that matter, and, in accordance with custom, he would consult them before he appointed the conferees. The Chair does not know what is in the minds of the two Senators whom he has mentioned.

Mr. PITTMAN. The chairman of the conference committee on the part of the Senate, after consulting with a number of Senators—and this is a good time to consult with the leader of the minority—will state that it has been suggested that there be four representing the majority on the conference committee and two representing the minority.

Mr. McNARY. That would be a fair representation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I do not care to be recalcitrant or obstreperous, but I do not favor this method of procedure. I see no reason why the Senate should not come back to its Chamber at 5 o'clock if it wants to conclude the work on the joint resolution this week. I do not believe in such informal methods of doing business. This is the Senate of the United States and not a back-room club somewhere. I object.

Mr. BARKLEY. I will say to the Senator that it is not the first time that this has been done.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is no reason why it should be done now.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, there would be nothing for the Senate to come back for except to do what we are seeking now to do.

Mr. CONNALLY. There is nothing for the Senate ever to come back for except to attend to its business.

Mr. BARKLEY. This is part of its business.

Mr. CONNALLY. I object.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess until 5 o'clock p. m. today.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky that the Senate stand in recess until 5 o'clock p. m. today?

There being no objection, the Senate (at 12 o'clock and 14 minutes p. m.) took a recess until 5 o'clock p. m.

On the expiration of the recess the Senate reassembled, and the Vice President resumed the chair.

NEUTRALITY AND PEACE OF THE UNITED STATES—MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Calloway, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 306), the Neutrality Act of 1939; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon; and that Mr. BLOOM, Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON, Mr. KEE, Mr. FISH, and Mr. EATON were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives disagreeing to the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 306), the Neutrality Act of 1939, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. PITTMAN. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the conference asked by the House of Representatives, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Nevada.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, under the ordinary procedure in connection with the appointment of conference committees, I would naturally be appointed one of the conferees on the part of the Senate. I have spoken to the Presiding Officer, to the Senator from Nevada, and to the leader of the majority, and expressed the hope that because of my enforced rest during the past few weeks I be not named as one of the conferees, but that one of the other Senators who has taken a very prominent part in connection with the consideration of the neutrality joint resolution be named in my place.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair appoints the Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH], and the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, I should like to announce, after a conference with the chairman of the conferees on behalf of the House of Representatives, that there will be a meeting of the conference committee in the Foreign Relations Committee room at 10:30 o'clock tomorrow morning.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 2 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, November 3, 1939, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 2, 1939

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, our Heavenly Father, we praise Thee that Thou art rich in those powers which fructify the human heart, in those voices which mark the path of holy living, and in that tenderness which makes earth brighter and happier. We unveil the cross and most humbly thank Thee for the Christ who made Himself of no reputation, took upon Himself the form of a servant, and gave the great world of humanity a vision of the Infinite heart; we pray that we may see His light slowly gaining on the shade. O Spirit Divine, make us pure in heart and fill our hands with brotherly benedictions. We beseech Thee to inspire us with deep, earnest, and reverent living; to find gems in the hard-beaten pathway; to wring comfort from ungenerous conditions; and to discern the royal way of life. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had adopted the following resolution:

Senate Resolution 194

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES,
October 31, 1939.

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. CHESTER C. BOLTON, late a Representative from the State of Ohio.

Resolved, That a committee of two Senators be appointed by the President of the Senate to join the committee appointed on the part of the House of Representatives to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased Representative the Senate do now adjourn.

The message also announced that pursuant to the foregoing resolution the Presiding Officer had appointed Mr. DONAHEY and Mr. TAFT as members of the said committee on the part of the Senate.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the debate today on the motion to instruct and amendments thereto be equally divided between and controlled by the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include a letter from President Wilson to Senator William J. Stone.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in three particulars: First, Shall free speech be responsible?; second, on the Statue of Liberty; third, on the new Rules of Civil Procedure, and to include a statement of the Assistant to the Attorney General, Mr. Alexander Holtzoff, on that subject. I have been informed by the Government Printing Office that the cost thereof would be $146.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include a radio speech I made last night.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a short newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a review of a book entitled "America's Chance of Peace," by Duncan Aikman and Blair Bolles. About this book a distinguished historian from Oklahoma, Mr. Marquis Jones, has said:

Truly it's a pertinent book. It has taught me more about America's actual position in relation to the war, the factors that may keep us out or may pull us in, than anything else put together that I have yet read.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include a resolution unanimously adopted by the Missouri delegation touching the death of the Honorable Julian Friant, of Missouri, a special assistant to the Secretary of Agriculture, a few days ago.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GEYER of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the W. P. A. situation in Minneapolis.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include a letter from Edward E. Kennedy and also to extend my remarks and include a telegram from Mr. Ross McIntyre, of the Portland Chamber of Commerce.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include a statement from one of the officials of the Department of Labor appearing in the Department Bulletin.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ELECTION TO A COMMITTEE

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following privileged resolution, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 322

Resolved, That E. C. GATHINGS, of Arkansas, be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the standing committee of the House of Representatives on Claims as of June 2, 1939, and shall take rank accordingly.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

PREPAREDNESS OF BELLIGERENTS

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

THE RESPONSIBILITY RESTS UPON CONGRESSMEN

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, during his argument in favor of the lifting of the embargo so that we might aid Britain and France in arming for the World War, the gentle-

man from Texas [Mr. LANHAM] made this statement—RECORD, page 1127:

Here is this great disparity in sinews of war to which we have so contributed through 6 years of preparation on the one hand and 1 year of preparation on the other, and it is an incontrovertible fact that the overwhelming sympathies of the people of the United States are favorable to the belligerents that have had the 1 year to prepare.

Conceding the accuracy of the statement that the sympathies of the American people are with Britain and France, the sad fact remains that if they are unprepared for this war such unpreparedness is the deliberate choice of their people and of their political leaders.

As long ago as November 13, 1936, Jack Beall, writing for the New York Herald Tribune, called attention to the statement of Winston Churchill, when, on November 12, in the House of Commons, Churchill, wartime Minister of Munitions and Secretary of State for War and Air, warned Great Britain that it had entered upon a period of danger greater than any since the German U-boat campaign.

Churchill denied the statement of Prime Minister Stanley Baldwin that at that time the defense situation was "reasonably satisfactory," and Churchill went so far as to demand a parliamentary inquiry to speed up arms production for a time of trouble, which he predicted for 1937.

Baldwin, speaking with—and I quote—"appalling frankness," gave as an excuse for not beginning rearmament sooner the political one that the country was pacifist throughout 1933.

That Beall was correct in his statement that political considerations, the apprehension of the Conservative Party in Great Britain, prevented that country from preparing for the danger of which Churchill then warned it, I quote from the official report of the parliamentary debate on the 12th of November 1936, which took place in the House of Commons.

Among other things, Prime Minister Baldwin said—and I am reading from page 1144:

I put before the whole House my own views with an appalling frankness. From 1933 I and my friends were all very worried about what was happening in Europe. * * * You will remember the election at Fulham in the autumn of 1933, when a seat which the National Government held was lost by about 7,000 votes on no issue but the pacifist. You will remember, perhaps, that the National Government candidate, who made a most guarded reference to the question of defense, was mobbed for it. * * * My position as the leader of a great party was not altogether a comfortable one. * * * Supposing I had gone to the country and said that Germany was rearming and that we must rearm; does anybody think that this pacific democracy would have rallied to that cry at that moment? I cannot think of anything that would have made the loss of the election from my point of view more certain.

And so we learn from the words of the Prime Minister of England himself in November 1936 that, because of party considerations, he did not take the issue of rearmament, of preparation for the threatened danger to the country; that he preferred party success to a campaign for British national security. These being the facts, there is now no excuse for urging that we must make good Britain's failure to prepare if she is not now adequately prepared.

Those who favor repeal minimize the charge that repeal is but the first step of a course which will get us into war. They add to this the thought that Germany may win the war and, if she does, we will be the next victim.

Those who oppose repeal scoff at the idea that, if Germany wins this war, she can or will attack us and we say that, by repeal, the war is brought one step nearer.

We all have our choice. If we who protest the repeal of the arms embargo win and, after the European war is over, Hitler comes to our shores, upon our shoulders rests the responsibility and to us falls the duty and the burden of defending our country.

Equally true is it that if those who advocate repeal prevail, and the husbands and the sons sail away to war, upon the shoulders of those who advocate repeal rests that responsibility, and the loss of the husbands, the fathers, and the sons who fail to return, who return maimed, crippled, and gassed, rests upon those who vote for repeal. From this responsibility there is no escape.

For myself, I choose the lesser risk, and this I do because, hard as it may be, I will not follow my emotions or my friendship into a position which will sacrifice my country, for I owe allegiance to but one land; that is to America.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SHANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a letter from a constituent in the State of Connecticut in defense of her position on the Dies Committee in their exposure of this list.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

NEUTRALITY

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business pending before the House is on the Shanley motion and amendments thereto.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH], in charge on his side, has used 6 hours and 25 minutes. The gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM] has used 6 hours and 25 minutes.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM] is recognized.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON].

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply conscious of the grave responsibility which rests upon the House in passing upon the pending resolution, fraught with interest to every man, woman, and child in the United States. In these closing hours of debate, however, with the limited time allotted me, I shall not undertake to discuss the resolution in its entirety, but shall confine my remarks to the one controversial issue relating to the arms embargo.

There is a great deal of misunderstanding and misapprehension as to what the arms embargo is and the part that it plays in our neutrality legislation, and I want briefly to discuss the questions relating to it.

What is the arms embargo? When was it passed? Why was it passed? How has it worked?

I think I ought to be somewhat familiar with the history of this legislation relating to the arms embargo, since the Foreign Affairs Committee has handled all legislation relating to it, and I was chairman of the subcommittee which wrote the original Neutrality Act in 1935 and have been upon the conference upon the various bills. This enables me to speak with some authority with reference to its background and its history.

For 150 years we had no embargo on arms, but in 1935 we passed the so-called neutrality bill and one of its provisions was an embargo on arms to countries at war, or to neutral countries for reshipment to those at war. In the debate here and elsewhere it has been charged that the arms embargo is a barrier to war; that it is the heart of the neutrality legislation. I challenge the accuracy of both of those statements. The Neutrality Act of 1935 contained six distinct provisions, and those provisions, all except the arms embargo, had to do with questions which might prevent our becoming involved in war. An embargo on arms was placed in that bill and in the subsequent bills amending it, for one paramount reason, to discourage other nations from going to war. As I said in my speech when a former bill was passed to set an example, in the hope that other countries would follow our example and pass similar legislation and thereby discourage and prevent war. We realized, and everyone realizes, that the sale of arms has never involved us in any war. It did not involve us in the World War. It is not the sale of arms, but the delivery of arms and other commodities upon the ocean that has gotten us into war. I have listened to the debate in this House. I have read the debates in the Senate, and I have yet to find a single individual who has pointed out wherein the sale of arms has ever involved us in any war.

How has it worked? I say that it has not worked. It was an experiment. As was said of some other legislation, a noble experiment, noble in theory, but impractical in its enforcement and results. They say we have not been at war; that we have had it on our statute books and therefore it has kept us out of war. I say those who make this claim are wholly in error. The arms embargo has had no relation

whatever to our preservation of peace. Its enforcement has been most difficult. If we had wanted to pass a law that would have been fair and equitable and logical, instead of levying the embargo against only those countries engaged in war, we would have made it applicable to all countries, both in peacetime and wartime. If it was not unneutral to sell arms for 150 years to all countries, it is not unneutral now to sell arms to all countries.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. No; not in the limited time I have at my disposal.

If we restrict it only to countries at war, then the effect will be, as we have found, that it has served not as a neutral act, while apparently neutral in fact, but wholly unneutral in effect, because it has played into the hands of the dictator nations. Instead of preventing war, instead of discouraging other nations from going to war, it has had exactly the opposite effect.

I have to go no further to prove this than to cite the statement of the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHANLEY], who offered the motion that is now pending. He said, while presenting his argument in favor of the motion to instruct conferees to insist on retention of the arms embargo, that, in his candid judgment, if we had passed the legislation at the last session of Congress repealing the arms embargo there would be no war in Europe now. I think the gentleman was right in that statement, and I agreed with him while he was speaking; and if the gentleman was right in that, then why talk about the immorality of arms? Why talk about the people who may be killed and the blood that will be shed by arms, when it was that particular provision of the law—our arms embargo and failure to repeal it—which caused the rape of Poland, caused the death of thousands of patriotic Poles and thousands of Germans and destroyed and devastated Poland, and by this wanton military act gave part of Poland to Russia and the rest to Hitler.

If retention of the arms-embargo provision caused the present European war, which the sponsor of the pending motion admits, then why should we retain it upon our statute books when it has served as an encouragement to war and to the destruction of a sovereign state.

If the law will have that effect, it is unsound; it is unholy; it is unjust. Mr. Speaker, in the hearings before our committee it was disclosed that not only in Europe but also in the Orient the effect of this law, whereby we changed our policy of 150 years and stated we would not sell arms to countries at war, has served as an encouragement to dictator nations and, instead of preventing war, instead of discouraging war, has been an encouragement and an incitement to war. Any legislation that will do that, any statute upon our statute books that will cause that, ought to be wiped out, ought to be repealed, and that without a moment's delay.

But they say, "We cannot repeal it now; it is too late. We should have repealed it at the last session before war started." The attitude of these people who are now fighting repeal of the embargo is well illustrated by the story told yesterday by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. MARTIN] of the man with the leaky roof:

> I can't fit it while it is raining, and when it's not raining it don't need fixing.

We cannot change it now, they say, because the war is started; the whistle has blown; you cannot change the rules of the game after the whistle blows.

My reply is that we are neither the referee nor a participant in the European war, and we do not propose to become either; nor are we proposing to change the rules of the war game in Europe. We are only proposing to regulate the conduct of our own citizens here at home in the United States.

Oh, they say that you cannot change it because it affects countries differently; it will hurt Germany. If they are logical, if they are consistent, they would go further and oppose the cash and carry; but they are for that, but insist on retention of the embargo. Let us see about this. If it be not right under international law to change the rules of the game after the whistle blows, if it be wrong to change the provisions relating to an embargo on arms because it would hurt Germany, is it not equally true that it would be unneutral to France and Germany to change the law by which we would restrict our ships and prevent our ships going to their ports and carrying them goods? What is the difference?

I say that it is inconsistent, it is illogical, and indefensible. No one opposes the cash-and-carry principle and plan upon the ground that that changes the law; they will vote for cash and carry, knowing full well that provision will hurt England and France. I say the argument that to repeal the embargo because it changes the rules during the progress of the game and yet pass new legislation to prohibit our ships from carrying goods to England and France, which will hurt them, is illogical, unsound, and unneutral. If it is unneutral to Germany, it is unneutral to France and it is unneutral to England.

They referred to Secretary Bryan and Secretary Lansing and their actions and correspondence during the World War. I have not time to take this up, but here is Secretary Lansing's position with reference to this matter. The letter written by Secretary Bryan in 1915 was written 8 months after the World War started. It was written in response to a request from one of the belligerents, Germany. Germany wrote the United States and asked us if we would not change our law so as to prevent the shipment of arms to their enemies. This is quite a different case from the present situation. We are proposing to change the law without any request from any belligerent, and there it was a request from one of the belligerents to change the law for their benefit only. Austria-Hungary 2 months later made the same request in writing, to which Secretary Lansing replied. I wish I had time to read the entire reply of Secretary Lansing, in which he defended the traditional policy we had always followed, but time will not permit, and I satisfy myself by reading now but one paragraph:

> There is a practical and substantial reason why the Government of the United States has from the foundation of the Republic to the present time advocated and practiced unrestricted trade in arms and military supplies. It has never been the policy of this country to maintain in time of peace a large military establishment or stores of arms and ammunition sufficient to repel invasion by a well-equipped and powerful enemy. It has desired to remain at peace with all nations and to avoid any appearance of menacing such peace by the threat of its armies and navies. In consequence of this standing policy the United States would, in the event of attack by a foreign power, be at the outset of the war seriously, if not fatally, embarrassed by the lack of arms and ammunition and by the means to produce them in sufficient quantities to supply the requirements of national defense. The United States has always depended upon the right and power to purchase arms and ammunition from neutral nations in case of foreign attack. This right, which it claims for itself, it cannot deny to others.

The gentleman from Connecticut cited eminent international authority upon the proposition that the repeal now would be unneutral and quoted from three international lawyers to sustain this view. In reply to this I call attention to the fact that the New York Herald Tribune sent out a questionnaire to a number of international lawyers in which this question was asked:

> Would the repeal of the arms embargo at the present time constitute, under existing international law, a violation of the neutral obligations of the United States?

Fourteen replies were received from international lawyers of eminence, professors of international law, teachers of international law, and textbook writers of international law. Of these 11 answered that it would not be unneutral, and only three, the ones cited by the distinguished gentleman, said it would be a violation of international law.

Mr. SHANLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I am sorry, but I have not time.

Mr. SHANLEY. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Texas yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I cannot. I would be glad to yield if I had the time, but I have only 15 minutes.

They talk about precedents. I want to cite ample precedents for changing and repealing the embargo in time of war

in our own country's history. In 1807 we passed during the war between France and England a general embargo upon all commodities and in 1809 when the war was still in progress we repealed that embargo, as we are seeking to do now. We also subsequently passed in 1809 an embargo not against France but against England alone and the war was still in progress. When we repeal this arms embargo we are following a precedent which we have set. We are following the advice of the majority of the international lawyers of this country. We are following the advice and the legal opinion of Secretary of State Hull and former Secretary of State Stimson.

Why should we not exercise that right if we believe its enforcement is impracticable and may get us into war. I believe with all my heart that if this war continues and we do not repeal the arms-embargo provision, we are going to be charged with being unneutral in its enforcement because shipment may be made to neutral countries and transshipment had to belligerents.

Since 1935, when the law was passed, we have only twice invoked the arms embargo in two small wars—the Italian-Ethiopian war and the Spanish civil war—and the State Department informs us that great difficulty was had in determining when shipments to neutral nations were not in fact intended for belligerents; and now, with a major war and many countries involved; how much more difficult will its enforcement be? You can very easily conceive, therefore, of the charge being made that we are unneutral in its enforcement because we would be permitting shipments to one neutral and not to another neutral.

Why should we not repeal it if it is best for our own country, if it is best for our own peace, if it is necessary to be fair, right, and equitable? Why not do it?

The United States has always boasted of being fair and of believing in international law and helping the weak; and yet the effect of this law, as has been pointed out time and again, is to permit nations that want to go to war to arm themselves and get ready, then unexpectedly creep upon other nations that are not prepared. They say that the war started on September 3 and now we can do nothing; our hands are tied; we are handcuffed. I call attention to the fact that last spring the President of the United States and Secretary Hull urged that this law be enacted and the arms embargo be repealed; that such legislation was initiated and all countries were placed on notice of the proposed change. We gave the dictator nations notice, but they never gave their victims—they never gave anyone—notice of what they were going to do. We started out to repeal this act in May and the legislation reached the half-way point. We passed a bill in June which the Senate was to consider next January. We did not repeal it entirely but modified the arms embargo by the adoption of the Vorys amendment. I call attention to the fact that we have not up to this time voted on the Shanley amendment. It was only the Vorys amendment upon which action was taken. That was a modification of the arms embargo—to strike out implements of war.

Why can we not change it now? The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] states that it may cause German aggression, it may cause them to sink our ships, but he makes no charge that the cash-and-carry provision, which will hurt England and France, may cause them to commit acts of aggression. If we have the right to change one, we have the right to change the other, and the motive for the change in the legislation should not be dominated by fear of any belligerent, but solely by the consideration of what is fair, what is right, and what is best for our own country. The gentleman from Missouri assumes that we are afraid.

When did it come to pass that a great country, the United States of America, that has always boasted of its independence and its right to make its own laws, shall take dictation from any foreign country, that we should cringe when we have a right to do what we think is for the best interests of our country by changing our laws? [Applause.]

We had a message yesterday which was evidently intended for the House of Representatives from the dictator of Russia, in which he said that the arms embargo should not be repealed. What would they think of us if we should send them word that they must not change their own domestic laws? Is it because of the philosophy and the psychology of neutrality legislation that foreign nations think we are controlled by fear? Is it because we are willing to limit and restrict the rights of our citizens—and I am willing to do that to keep us out of war? We are willing to go that far. But it is going a little too far when we begin to patch up our own domestic laws at a time when we only have a partial neutrality law, and Russia says you better not do it; in other words, "Germany will get you or Russia will get you if you do not look out." That is not my conception of Americanism. That is not my conception of the spirit which should actuate legislation to be passed by the Congress of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I resent—and I think this Congress will resent—any foreign government—England, France, Russia, or Germany, telling us how to pass our own legislation for the conduct of our own affairs and for the benefit of our own citizens. [Applause.]

The people of the United States have spoken on this question. The Senate of the United States has spoken by a vote of more than 2 to 1. Every poll indicates what the American people think about this proposition. It is up to the Congress to carry out the will of the American people, their views, their judgment, and their verdict, not for the sake of other countries but for the sake of America. I will close by admonishing you in the language of Cardinal Wolsey to Cromwell:

> Be just, and fear not: let all the ends thou aim'st at be thy country's, thy God's, and truth's.

[Applause.]

Mr. MICHENER. Will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS] such time as he may desire.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the country is tremendously interested in what we the Representatives of the country are about to do here in Congress. It is comforting to me to believe that the people, while profoundly interested, are not bitterly partisan in any way but on the contrary they are primarily interested in having the right thing done. I find that they are willing to listen to reason about the whole matter. They are definitely set in their judgment that we must stay out of war. They know in their hearts that there is no great question involved in these European controversies. They know that none of the great principles of liberty and justice and freedom that has made our country great is directly involved in these European controversies. In short and most emphatically they want us to stay out of war and to take that course that will most surely guarantee that we will stay out, and to take no step that will lead us into war. It shall be my purpose to respect this unanimous desire of the American people and vote against taking any step that I think will lead to war and for any step that I think will lead away from war. I think that in order to be neutral we must feel a sincere desire to act neutral. When two men are fighting I cannot be neutral if I rush to the aid of one of them and furnish him with a gun with which to kill his antagonist. Therefore, I shall vote to keep the embargo on arms and munitions and I shall favor strict shipping regulations that will keep our people and our ships out of danger zones as much as possible, and I shall favor such cash-and-carry provisions as will guarantee a sane and sensible attitude toward the belligerent countries and at the same time not put such restrictions on our own shipping as to drive it from the sea or from the legitimate lanes of commerce.

I felt that this special session of Congress should not have been called quite so soon. I felt and feel yet that until the various countries of Europe have indicated clearly their definite purposes we should not commit ourselves to any definite program. Until the lines are definitely drawn between the large countries of Europe it will be impossible for us to chart

our course. For instance until Italy has definitely indicated her course we should not indicate our course. In fact if Italy can remain neutral we surely can do so. So long as Russia maintains that she is neutral we surely should not jeopardize our neutrality. In other words there is no great principle of liberty or justice at stake so why jeopardize our people by permitting propaganda to warp our judgments. The people of Europe lay great stress on what we do. If we show by word and deed that we will not become involved in their constant quarrels they will settle down and maybe settle their differences.

I feel strongly that if we remove the embargo from arms and munitions and permit this sale to belligerents we will have taken a long step toward war. I know that it is said that we should have the right to sell to whomsoever we please and whatsoever we please. Yes, we can do that, and to carry that philosophy to its conclusion we can declare war against Germany if we wish to do so. When we sell arms and munitions and air bombers and all other munitions of war to England and France we cannot in good conscience then maintain that we are in fact neutral. It is not a fair argument to say that when we sell to England and France we are also throwing open the door to Germany to do the same thing, for we know that Germany cannot come to get these arms and munitions. With a great majority of the American people my sympathies lie with those countries that are fighting the battles of freedom and liberty as represented by democratic governments, but I do not think that the situation is such that we as a Nation need to intervene in their behalf by a declaration of war or by such economic and commercial assistance as will be tantamount to an open assistance, such as we would undertake if we were at war. It would seem to me that the lessons we learned in the World War are fresh enough in our memories to deter us from any precipitous action. In the World War we furnished first munitions, then money, and then men. We got back nothing but experience. We did not decide or help to decide any important question. We not only failed to assist the democracies but we apparently paved the way for the most fateful setback that democratic government has ever received. We paved the way for dictatorships with their antiliberty and anti-Christian purposes and programs. The World War did more in effect to retard Christianity than all the infidels of all ages have done. Russian communism, like a stealthy cat, is creeping over Europe. Hitler heeding his foolish desire to gain a great place in German history is losing sight of the enemy that he is permitting to come in at the back door. He is letting into Germany an influence that will challenge the best there is in the future generations of the German people—splendid as they are. They will not live with Russian anti-God communism and Hitler will find that it should be much easier for his people to get along with the French and British than with what Stalin represents.

Much has been said in these neutrality discussions about cash and carry. This phrase is a pleasant-sounding phrase. It is alluring in that it implies cash, which is a commodity, which by its scarcity measures the width and depth of depression. It surely has marked the greatest depth in the history of our country the past few years. We should not permit our need for an advance in business or our zeal for financial advantage to jeopardize our peace. We should not measure money against human blood and human happiness. No war ever paid for itself. War is morally wrong and economically wrong, while a few may prosper, many may die. In our great country there is plenty for all if we manage properly. The sweet music of the cash register is drowned out by the blare of the trumpets of war and the shuffling thud of marching young men. Let us be careful of our conduct. The peace and safety of 130,000,000 Americans hangs on our actions. I feel that a removal of the embargo on arms and munitions is a step toward war, and I shall not take it. On the contrary, I shall stand where we are and say to Europe, "You must settle your own personal quarrels. You can do so if you cease your struggle for power."

Mr. Speaker, I have the full approval of my course by my conscience, and I hope by my constituents that I am proud to represent. [Applause.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SECCOMBE] as much time as he may desire.

Mr. SECCOMBE. Mr. Speaker, it is not my purpose in these closing hours of debate to dwell at any length on the provisions of this bill. Every thoughtful Member no doubt has already made up his mind, and in the words of the poet:

He who is convinced against his will
Remains of the same opinion still.

As one who served in the World War and on foreign soil, I know the horrors of war; and while I have no respect for Hitler or Stalin, my chief concern is for the peace and security of America and my desire to see our country remain strictly neutral. I have always had the feeling that our chief concern at this time should be our enemies from within and not so much concern about meddling in the affairs of Europe. If any in this House should have a warm spot in their heart for the Allies, I should be one of them, as my mother and father were born in England and came to America and became citizens and raised a family of 10 children, but I am an American, and I am deeply conscious of the responsibility that rests on my shoulders in the passage of this bill; but I shall vote against that portion of the bill that will lift the embargo on arms and munitions, although I am in accord with that portion of the bill that all other goods sold to belligerents should be sold for cash on the line and transported in the ships of the purchasing nation.

I also am in accord with that part of the bill that prohibits American shipping of any kind in the zones of conflict, as well as to prevent all American citizens from war zones and areas of conflict. Although I personally feel that the only legislation that might be passed that will keep us out of war seems "known but to God," we must respect the opinion of all, and it is my conviction that we all desire everlasting peace and an end to all wars.

I shall also oppose that part of the bill which gives the President further discretionary powers, as I feel that power should be vested in Congress; and I am in full accord with Congress remaining in session to be ready for any emergency that might arise, and I shall vote against adjournment. [Applause.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. JOHNS] as much time as he may desire.

Mr. JOHNS. Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to take up the time of the House to discuss this resolution at length, because on October 19 I spoke here in the House and expressed my views on the pending legislation.

I am just going to quote briefly from two paragraphs of that address and with a few comments, which I feel may be appurtenant to them, I shall not take up further time of the House. In that address I said:

To me the serious situation that presents itself to Congress is whether or not other nations have relied upon our position taken when this Neutrality Act was passed, and whether we now at this time can or should amend this act so as to help either one side or the other, or to place any one of the warring nations, or neutral nations, for that matter, in a different position than they were when the present war was declared in Europe.

After citing a number of authorities to the effect that should we change our neutrality law now, it would be an unneutral act, I said further:

To me there does not seem to be much question but what if we amend this act at the present time and lift the embargo on arms and ammunition so that it may be shipped to the warring nations, that we have committed an unneutral act sufficient to justify a nation that might take exception, to declare war on us for doing so.

I have listened to the debate here in the House on the resolution; I have read practically all of the debates in the Senate, outside of those I listened to personally; and I am more convinced than ever that if we vote to raise the embargo on the shipment of arms and ammunition to belligerents that it may and probably will lead to very serious consequences.

A great deal has been said here about the Communists and about Russia, and at the present time, even before we have acted on this bill, there is a war on now between the White House and Russia. It may be only a war of words now, but sometimes words lead to things more serious after they have been spoken. If we would have taken just one-tenth of the time in trying to put down the propaganda and acts of violence that have been going on in this country for the last 6 years, we would not have a situation facing us such as we have today. It was suggested yesterday by my colleague from Massachusetts that we recall our Ambassador from Russia. If this war of words continues between the White House and Russia, the chances are that we will not have to recall him but he will be sent home and we will be asked to recall our own.

That hard-working Member from California [Mr. VOORHIS] called the attention of the House yesterday to one of the most important things in this country, and that is the unemployment. If we had taken care of the unemployment in this country during the past 6 years instead of having so many on the dole, a good many American citizens would not have had to act as window dressers for communistic organizations in this country. When men are out of employment and hungry they turn to any organization which promises something better, and that is why we have the communistic organizations and the German Bund in this country today.

If anyone questions just what the belligerents are going to think about our repealing the embargo on arms and ammunition, as to whether it will be an unneutral act or not, just let me quote from what the Premier of Russia said in his speech of the 31st of October. I quote:

> In any event our country as a neutral country which is not interested in the spread of war will take every measure to render war less devastating, to weaken it, and to hasten its termination in the interests of peace. From this standpoint the decision of the American Government to lift the embargo on the export of arms to belligerent countries raises justified misgivings.
>
> It can scarcely be doubted that the effect of this decision will not be to weaken war and hasten its termination, but, on the contrary, to intensify, aggravate, and protract it. Of course, this decision may insure big profits for American war industries. But one asks, Can this serve as any justification for lifting the embargo on the export of arms from America? Clearly it cannot.

If anybody questions the purpose of the raising of the embargo, and whether we are going to help one side or the other who are engaged in this conflict in Europe, which is of no concern to us, all they need to do is to look at the Washington Times-Herald for yesterday morning and see the head line which says, "Allies wait repeal for 700 planes. One hundred million dollars worth of ships ready for war as soon as arms embargo is lifted." In New York, Baltimore, and at least three points in California a total of approximately 700 American war planes are in storage or nearing completion awaiting only repeal of the United States arms embargo before being shipped to England and France for use in the European war.

> These planes, the bulk of them bombers, represent approximately half of those ordered by the Allies before the outbreak of hostilities September 3 and are worth about $100,000,000.
>
> In addition, French and British missions are said to be ready to place orders for another 5,750 airplanes, once the embargo is lifted, bringing their total investment to more than $600,000,000. These are the figures given out as regards French and British orders delivered awaiting embargo repeal.

I was tremendously interested in the statement of my colleague from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS], when he gave the example of the man who felt that he was to be robbed and asked to buy a gun, that he was going to be attacked. The hardware merchant asked him by whom, and he told him, and then the merchant said, "No; I am doing business in this community, and I have to remain neutral." Now, I can think of a much better answer that this merchant could have made to the man. He could have said to him, "No; you are deliberately planning to murder a man, and I don't propose to be an accessory to that murder." And applying that same reasoning to America, they can very easily say to England and France, and for that matter, to any other nation wanting to buy arms and ammunition: "No; this Nation, which is considered the most powerful nation in the world, and considered by other nations the most highly civilized, is not going to be an accessory to the wholesale murder of human beings, but we are going to do as all the other less powerful, and perhaps less highly civilized nations of the world are doing, and refuse to sell arms and ammunition to any nation when it is at war."

There can be no objections to selling on a cash-and-carry basis such articles as will sustain life and preserve humanity, such as food, clothing, and raw materials carried in the buyers' own ships, which will only have a tendency to advance and carry on civilization.

Let us, in these final hours of this debate, realize that our entrance into this war may, and perhaps will, be the end of our system of democracy, under which our great institutions have been developing during the last 150 years, and which have made us the greatest nation on earth. The greatest danger that could possibly face us is that of bankruptcy. We became prosperous by staying out of the last war. We brought on our great depression by going into it. When the time comes that it becomes necessary for us to repudiate our obligations or admit our inability to pay them, then our democracy ends. That is the reason that we have the war in Europe today, because at the end of the last war every nation involved in it, practically, was bankrupt, and it became necessary for them to repudiate their obligations. The result of that war was that since 1919 seven democratic nations, with population of more than 700,000,000 people, have fallen into the hands of dictatorship, and we do not need to think very much to realize that when it comes to this new war, that these dictatorships seem to all think alike. Communism sleeps easily with nazi-ism, and those whose views were the opposite a year ago, now see eye to eye.

George Washington gave us some very good advice when he said, "In all of your dealings with other nations, think of your own country first." We may sympathize with the Allies today, and, like my distinguished and beloved friend from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN], may I say to you that every drop of blood that flows in my veins comes from people that are engaged on the side of the Allies today. I may sympathize with them, but I sympathize more with my own country, which needs the best judgment that I can muster at this time. That judgment tells me that we have here at home many unsolved problems; and what we ought to do is to try and solve these problems at home and let Europe solve their own problems without our help. Let us mind our own business at the present time.

We were able under the present neutrality law to stay out of the Ethiopian War; we have been able to stay out of the Japanese-Chinese War; we were able to stay out of the Spanish Civil War; and now let us stay out of this European war and keep the world safe for America when the time comes when we can be of real assistance to all of these warring nations, and we may be able to help them to a fair and just peace when they are through fighting. Let us maintain our high standard of living; and even though it be the last haven of peace and democracy, let us hope that we will be in position where we may offer our assistance in the way of furnishing our resources with proper security to help the warring nations to a just and lasting peace.

I shall vote to retain the present embargo. If we vote to lift it, and it brings this Nation into a war, which, in my humble opinion, it will, I shall be able to live the remaining years of my life with a conscience that will say to me, "You did not by your vote help to destroy humanity by lending your assistance to the killing of human beings."

If the embargo is maintained, America can always say to the rest of the world, no matter how long the war is prolonged, "We did not aid anybody in the destruction that only can come from arms, ammunition, and poison gas." [Applause.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GERLACH] as much time as he may desire.

Mr. GERLACH. Mr. Speaker, we know the definition of neutrality is "the condition of a nation which maintains a

policy of noninterference in conflicts between other nations"; and it is my intense desire to see that this great country of ours retains its neutrality in this present issue which had its beginning long before the present war began on September 1. To legislate neutrality is a difficult task, for true neutrality is absolute neutrality, when a nation abstains fully from any participation or interference in the war being waged; and America cannot have any neutrality if we are to follow the dictates of the President and lift the embargo now in force. Once that is done we shall be participating in commerce with warring nations and so violate the ethics of absolute neutrality, which would eventually mean our being drawn into war, and that seems to be the object of the administration.

I have no faith in the foreign policy of our Chief Executive. How could I have faith in the policy of a President who time and again has proven himself to be at odds with the vital issues at stake? He tells us our frontier is on the Rhine, while you and I well know that our frontier is no farther away than 3 miles east of the Atlantic coast. Again, he says it is up to us to defend the democracies of the world. But I say to you that it is up to us, first and foremost, to save the 130,000,000 people of our own democracy. Who are we to police the world and thereby involve ourselves in foreign quarrels, when we have problems of our own at home to solve?

Once again he voiced, in his famed Chicago speech, his opinion of those nations he termed the "quarantine nations." He mentioned the United States-Japanese Treaty of 1911, whereby abrogation could be made within 6 months if the necessity arose. He finally recalled that treaty, and the 6 months' abrogation period will be up in January 1940. Yet for 2 years he allowed arms and munitions to be sold to the Japanese Government for the express purpose of use in that country's undeclared war with China. I ask you, if he is sincerely for peace, why did he not have the treaty recalled when China was first attacked?

When war did come in Europe on September 1, the Chief Executive did not wait until the regular session of Congress would convene, but he called a special session on September 21 to introduce his ideas on the subject—and they were fixed ideas, as can well be seen. In his speech before Congress on September 21 he pleaded that the embargo be lifted. He declared that the only time we placed an embargo on our shipments was in 1812, and he implied that it caused our War of 1812. But, after careful research into all the records, I find that the embargo was lifted in 1809, 3 years before that war was begun, and, therefore, it could have had no possible bearing on the War of 1812. But such is the way the administration twists the facts to gain its ends.

At that, he did not call in the Japanese Treaty of 1911 until after the Bloom bill was defeated in the Senate. The King and Queen of England were visiting these shores at the time the Bloom bill was brought before Congress, and a Washington newspaper proclaimed that it would be a nice gesture if the House and Senate would pass the bill before the King and Queen left for home. But it failed to pass for the main reason that it delegated to the Chief Executive additional powers 27 times, and 7 more times delegated power to the Munitions Board, which he named. Had the Bloom bill passed and these powers been granted in addition to the already enormous powers held by the President under our Constitution, then Congress would have become merely a rubber stamp. Today we are faced with the Pittman bill, known as the neutrality substitute of 1939. It is, I say to you, only a rechristening of that Bloom bill.

Once more we have evidence of the insincerity of our President. He asked for the passage of the Neutrality Act of 1935 and the subsequent amendments of 1936 and 1937, and now he does an about face with the Bloom bill disguised as the Pittman bill and hopes to have the embargo lifted. This, I am sure, will lead us directly to war. The minute the Neutrality Act is weakened and we trade any war materials with any of the belligerent nations, then we no longer have absolute neutrality. I say that if the Neutrality Act as it stands today is not satisfactory, let us make it so by amending it with the necessary changes, as should be done. Let us do this rather than lift the embargo, which will presage our entry into the war.

There are a number of schools of thought, however, in this connection. There are those persons who say we cannot possibly stay out of the war regardless of the embargo. To them I give as an illustration Holland, Denmark, Norway, Sweden, and Switzerland. From 1914 to 1918, with war all around them on land and sea and in the air, they maintained absolute neutrality. And certain of these countries placed embargoes on the sale of war materials to the countries then at war. If they, when they were in the center of the bloody arena, could stay out of the World War, surely we can stay out of this war, 3,000 miles away from it. And to this school of thought I also say: These countries are the ones who today do not owe us any money, as do the warring nations who have not even paid up their interest.

There is the school of thought which cries that we need the business, that we should sell to the countries at war so that our factories hum with the work of production. To them I only need point to the 21 Latin American countries to the south of us. Our arms manufacturers—all of our manufacturers—could very well widen their South American markets.

Today we have only between 25 and 30 percent of the Latin American trade. The rest goes to European nations, those very nations now at war. There is no reason why we should not have practically all of that trade. For those who think that these countries south of us are only poorly developed wilderness, I ask that they check with their geography where they will find that their combined population is over the 100,000,000 mark. This represents a great deal of trade, and after all, why should we let other nations have that trade when it is we who, in the final analysis, must protect those countries against foreign aggression because of our Monroe Doctrine?

The entire issue is clouded in the maze of propaganda daily being fed to us. The metropolitan newspapers, the movies, and even the radio interests are using propaganda to achieve their aims. But the large manufacturers, the United States Chamber of Commerce, and all other clear-headed, clear-thinking persons are fearful of losing our constitutional form of Government. And we may lose it if we follow the dictates of the Chief Executive and lift the embargo. How can we afford the cost of another war without bringing financial chaos to the best country in the world today? That is what we fear. Another war will cost between fifty and one hundred billion dollars, and that, added to our already staggering national debt of almost $45,000,000,000, would most assuredly tear asunder our financial structure. This would mean the eventual repudiation of governmental stocks and bonds and other obligations. And when this happens, the constitutional form of government our forefathers fought and bled for, will be in grave danger. The founders of our great Nation fled from the selfsame persecution in Europe more than two centuries ago; and there are thousands and thousands of refugees fleeing the same conditions in Europe today. We cannot let it happen here.

What did the World War gain us? We lost in any way you look at it. In the 350,000 dead and wounded we lost the pride of young American manhood. And it has cost us, from the beginning of the war to the present date, almost $100,000,000,000. Yet the few billions of dollars in trade we received during the World War amounts to less than half the amount Congress appropriated for peacetime measures in the fiscal year of 1939–40. That horrible sacrifice of our men, and the mounting total of its cost was said then to have been for the purpose of saving democracy, but I sincerely believe we only saved democracy for bigger and bloodier wars.

I say to you that we should, therefore, keep our Neutrality Act in force and not attempt to lift the embargo. Let us turn our efforts to the strengthening of our national defense.

The last session of Congress voted $2,000,000,000 for this work, but I believe we could spend two or more billions in addition. I will support whatever requests are made by the Army and Navy engineers in order to increase the power of our defense, for I sincerely believe that the best insurance we can have for peace will be a national defense all other nations will be fearful of.

We have Senators and Congressmen, however, who are definitely pro-British and pro-French and who wish the embargo lifted in favor of those countries. I believe them wrong, for I believe that true Americanism is neither pro-British, pro-French, pro-German, pro-Russian, pro-Italian, nor anything but good old pro-American. Yet Senator AUSTIN, of Vermont, publicly admits he wants to aid England and France. He stated in a recent address—and I quote:

> We must make it possible for Great Britain and France to get supplies. We do not need to ask whether the bill is neutral.

Senator BURKE, of Nebraska, declares that the lifting of the embargo would benefit England and France, and that he would want it so. Like the President's "quarantine" speech, and the idiotic statements that our frontier is on the Rhine, and that it is up to us to defend the democracies of the world, it shows us that the administration is not neutral, and that it intends, if possible, to help the Allies by any measures it can. But the administration does not seem to realize that once we sell our war materials to the Allied nations we lay our innocent ships, those of the merchant marine carrying noncontraband, open to the attacks of the enemy. And should one, two, or three American ships be lost, the United States would without question be drawn into the war. It is impossible for us to be just a little bit neutral and not give cause for war, or, at least, the type of reprisal which will cause us to enter the war. We cannot be a little bit neutral and still be honest.

Thus the administration is not honest. It lacks sincerity, and it is using the same tactics that almost ruined us in the World War and are sure to ruin us this time unless we stick to the truth and remain absolutely neutral.

The very purpose of the Neutrality Act—"to preserve the neutrality and the peace of the United States and to secure the safety of its citizens and their interests"—would be defeated with the passing of the Pittman bill and the lifting of the embargo. I assure you that I, representing the Ninth Pennsylvania District in the House of Representatives at Washington, will do all within my power to prevent the lifting of the embargo. I do not want to see the sacrificing of millions of American youth. I do not want to see our monetary structure and our constitutional form of government, which is the finest form of government in the world today, fall to pieces. I do not want to see any foreign "ism" take root and develop here.

So I say to you emphatically that I, as a Representative, will spend every available minute of my time in the endeavor to keep this great Republic of the United States free from the foreign entanglements which would draw us into the war and thence into oblivion.

We and our children must live in the world as we make it, and so America's future is important to all of us. That future depends on our decisions and our actions now; depends on our keeping out of war. And I assure you that my decisions and my actions will always be for a lasting peace. [Applause.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSEN] as much time as he may desire.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, for 6 weeks we have waited patiently for this House to have an opportunity to express its opinion on the proposed repeal of the arms embargo. That is the issue before us. Very few of us here oppose the strengthening of our Neutrality Act through provisions preventing our ships from carrying supplies to belligerents. Very few of us here today wish to see our people finance another World War. We are not as yet finished paying for the last one. But there are many Members here today—the majority, I sincerely hope—who cannot stomach the idea of our great Nation selling instruments of death for fool's gold—instruments of death, not only aimed at destruction of the soldiers of foreign countries with which we are not at war, but, more horrible yet, perhaps destined to carry their ill-fated message to thousands of women and children far behind the lines, messages of death from the people of the United States.

I condemn the proposed repeal of the arms embargo because it casts over our Nation the same sinister shadow that was with us in the years from 1914 to 1917—a belief fostered by the devil and his aides that our Nation could prosper by selling implements of destruction, a belief that our great Nation should shed the blood of thousands of American boys in order to prevent a crash in munitions-sales prosperity, a mistaken belief that we could help preserve democracy by fighting in European quarrels.

To repeal the arms embargo at this time serves notice on the rest of the world that the United States is unneutral; that we are definitely alining ourselves with the Allies. I want personally to see Hitler and Stalin uprooted as much as any man in this House. I want to see communism, fascism, and all kinds of "isms" but Americanism expunged from our beloved country. My immediate family made its contribution to the preservation of democracy in 1917. I am sure we would do so again today if necessary, as all good Americans would do, but with this proviso: For the United States only, on American soil, in defense of our Nation, and not fighting the battles of munition profiteers or to take part in ever-recurring boundary disputes in Europe or elsewhere.

I agree fully with two gentlemen who spoke yesterday, Mr. BARTON, of New York, and Mr. RANKIN, of Mississippi, who stated that we can best serve the cause of peace at this time by refusing to sell the trappings of war. Let us first see if there is actually a war over there. If it does materialize, let us give to the American people the opportunity to say whether or not we shall go to the direct assistance of the Allies. Why boost our country into this war through the back door and have our people wake up to find themselves in it eventually because of the passage by Congress today of the repeal of the arms embargo, because of the destruction today of our own neutrality. Today this war, so-called, is a game of international diplomacy. We always get the worst of it in diplomatic dealings with calculating foreigners. This war may not materialize into a real war if this Congress will show its desire for peace by refusing to encourage belligerents through the repeal of the arms embargo.

Each and every Member of this body wants to do what is right according to his or her views on this very serious question and also wants to keep our beloved country out of foreign entanglements and out of all wars. No man or woman who thought different would be fit for a seat in this place today. I accord to each and every one of you, whether you vote against repeal of the arms embargo or not, the credit for honestly desiring to do what your conscience demands of you.

May I call attention to one part of this bill that, through negative action, permits doing what I am sure that the bulk of the House would vote down if given the opportunity to do so? I refer to the sale of poison gas, which, if the repeal of the arms embargo prevails today, may be sold and shipped to belligerent nations by our munition makers—exported, mind you, from the shores of our great America.

The Senate saw fit to reject the Danaher amendment which had for its purpose the prohibition of the sale and exportation of poison gas from the United States. My only comment on the action of that august body is that I am proud of the fact that neither of the Senators from the great State of Minnesota were numbered among the 56 Senators who opposed this very humane legislation.

Mr. Speaker, any measure which, under the guise of neutrality, carries the damnable provision that permits munitions makers in this country to profit from the exportation of poison gas to belligerent nations—poison gas, the most despised weapon of war devised as yet by the ingenuity of man—out of our great Nation, supposedly dedicated to the preservation and not the destruction of mankind—I repeat, any measure carrying such provision, through negative action or not, does not deserve consideration on the floor of

this House. Any Congressman that votes for the repeal of the arms embargo today, without some perfecting amendment against the exportation of poison gas, may not have to answer to his constituents for that vote, but surely at times his conscience will disturb his otherwise well-deserved rest.

Think of the thousands of women, far back from the front lines, that you may by your vote today condemn to a horrible death, a death wrought in America, the land of the free and the home of the brave.

Death by bullets, shrapnel, or by artillery fire are humane in comparison to that by gas. The former is usually suffered by the soldiers in the front line, the latter has no regards as to whom it cuts down. Shall we here have it engraven on our memories that we have helped to enact legislation which makes it entirely possible for American manufactured poison gas to be dumped in bombs from speeding planes onto defenseless villages? Is this great Nation to descend to inhuman depths and foster the killing of women and children, not even in a humane way, as we would dispose of a crippled animal, but in the worst possible way permitted by the genius of modern invention?

Back home in Minnesota, when at times the rats become too numerous under our corncribs, I have used cyanide gas to exterminate them. I could see this gas, in imagination, as I was performing that necessary work of rodent destruction, slowly creeping down the burrows, heavier than air as it is and like water, finding its level—this same cyanide gas destroying all life as it came into contact with it. Are we in this House today going to pass this bill which makes it entirely possible to see this same thing reenacted, but this time with human beings as the victims, attempting vainly to run away from the approaching death that slowly wends its way down the valleys, choking the lives out of these people just as the cyanide gas choked the rats in our corncribs.

Oh, yes, you say, and think that this is an emotional appeal and is not based upon the hard realistic facts of war. My appeal to the House today, my appeal to you men and women, is based on a hard realistic fact, left to us by the last war—the fact of my brother for 20 long years in a Veterans' hospital with his wrecked mentality; the hard realistic fact of seeing the other 700 boys there suffering at that one hospital the tortures of the damned; and God knows how many American boys are in that same shape today—the number of this particular hospital is 101—suffering because of just such devilish inventions as poison gas and its kindred destroyers. I repeat, my appeal to you is based on just as realistic facts as can be arrayed before me. All I ask of you men and women today is to visit for 1 hour, if you have not already done so, the nearest veterans' hospital before you vote on this bill. Talk to the boys there if they are in shape to talk to you. Look at the living corpses fighting eternally their battles in the last World War. Then, my colleagues, if you still feel like voting for the repeal of the arms embargo, if you are still willing to vote for the exportation of poison gas, all I can say is that you have done your duty as you see it. [Applause.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GROSS] as much time as he may desire.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, on September 28 I publicly declared that I would vote for a cash-and-carry bill. I meant that when I said it, and I still mean it. I made certain reservations at that time, and that was that I would not vote for additional powers to the Chief Executive; and the fact that I had voted for the Vorys amendment on June 30 was serving public notice that I was against sale and exportation of arms, ammunition, and implements of war to belligerent nations.

I now find that the bill passed by the Senate recently is not requiring cash settlement for the goods at all. It is greatly increasing Presidential power and lifts the arms embargo, permitting us to sell poison gas, liquid fire, and all other hellish instruments of war and destruction.

The people of the United States are against the manufacture and sale of these munitions. Mothers everywhere are praying that the arms embargo be retained. British agents and propagandists in America today are doing all in their power to get us involved in this war, to again fight their battles. We have not yet recovered from the effects of the World War and maybe never will, and we ought to profit by our past experiences at this critical time and not be dominated by our emotions or political pressure. We should have but one thing in mind, and that is the peace and prosperity of America.

The bill we passed last summer has 16 solid pages stricken out by the Senate and 18 new ones added, making it an entirely different bill. Therefore, my patriotism and my constituency and my own common sense compel me to vote against the repeal. [Applause.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. HARTER] as much time as he may desire.

Mr. HARTER of New York. Mr. Speaker, the administration is urging repeal of the embargo to keep us out of war, but, at the same time, is not the administration even now planning the expenditure of $5,000,000,000 to network our country for war? If we are going to spend in getting ready for war, why should we not keep the embargo, conserve our factories and our manpower to better accomplish our complete national defense for which we all stand?

Mr. Speaker, while we are discussing the neutrality bill, what is going on in administration circles? Is it not true that while many of the Members of this body are here on the floor urging repeal of the embargo so that war profits will have a broader scope, that the administration is even now setting up this spending program? Is it not true that this spending program contemplates requests of Congress for about $5,000,000,000 for this military network, but to be stated to us for the purpose of retrenching, due to the havoc that meddling will ultimately cause in this country? It is, or is it not true, that this program is a spending program, or is it for defense? I repeat, all of us stand foursquare for truly defensive expenditures.

Is it not true that we are going to be asked to appropriate this money for hospitals to be scattered throughout the country, with the understanding that they will be turned over for the care of our wounded? Is it not true that the administration wants to use that money for housing projects scattered in various places throughout our land, with the understanding that they will be used for barracks for our soldiers? Is it not true that we are to be asked to use that money to build military highways throughout our country, emergency airports, and so on—not for battleships, aircraft, antiaircraft guns, conserving and building up our arms and ammunition supplies, and other similar measures of a defensive nature?

What is the story about this $5,000,000,000 to be asked of us? Why is it not told to us now before we lift the embargo, so that, if it is given, you can levy the taxes on those who make the huge temporary profits as a result of lifting the embargo? Or do we later want to come in and either add the $5,000,000,000 to our already huge Federal debt or collect it from those who are least able to pay and who will ultimately "pay the fiddler" in higher prices for the necessities of life resulting from our action here?

Why do we not tell the American public that the administration realizes full well that lifting the embargo will not conserve our substance, our factories, our man power, and so on, but that greater unemployment will follow the present war with all of unemployment's attendant horrors so well known to this country? Why do we not call the public's attention to our present huge domestic problems and get down to brass tacks in trying to settle those problems rather than lifting this embargo? Is the $5,000,000,000 a cushion for that inevitable fall?

I repeat, we should go after our domestic problems and spend with the idea of building up our defense so that the nations of the earth will know we are prepared and have conserved our substance.

These are questions that should be answered to the rest of us in this body, as well as the public, who will have to pay the bill.

If the administration is not going to come in with any program such as I have asked about—and I am sure others have heard it talked about and read something about it—I hope those in charge will come out now and assure the public that there will be no after effects; that our substance is not being wasted and that there will be no such request for huge sums for the purposes mentioned; that the administration believes lifting the embargo is our best defensive measure and, above all, will permanently solve our crying domestic problems and pay off our nearly $45,000,000,000 debt.

Mr. Speaker, I have heard it said that the bill passed in 1935, amended in 1937, and amendments to which we are now considering should not be called our neutrality bill, as it does not completely represent neutrality, as recognized under the precepts of international law. In this statement I cannot agree, although I will claim that the legislation strays from some of those precepts, and why not?

That question was answered at a time when passion, due to existing war among leading countries of the earth, was absent. It was answered by the Members of Congress passing the Neutrality Act, amended in the same temperate way in 1937. These enactments were well considered at a time of comparative world peace, when the United States and the present three warring nations were at peace, one with the other. After thorough, unimpassioned consideration, with the advantage of experience gained through horrible losses in life and resources, emerged the 1935 act with its amendments following in the same fashion in 1937.

In that legislation we have an embargo clause and we had cash and carry. Today we are considering amendments to our Neutrality Act. If we are considering amendments to a Neutrality Act, it surely is for the purpose of keeping the United States neutral under all circumstances. Today our consideration may, however, be befogged, although it should not. We should start with the premise of "what can best keep the United States neutral during the present and future belligerent outbursts"?

If we are impelled by that sole purpose, casting aside any affection and hate toward other countries or their leadership and sticking solely to that one impelling thought, "what can best keep the United States neutral," then we should, at least in our own minds, be able to come to a definite conclusion.

The Senate amendments are explained as containing cash-and-carry legislation. In examining it I found reasonable "carry" legislation, but I fail to find "cash" legislation, or let us call it "sufficient" legislation against extending credit to belligerents. So many thousands of pages of words have been printed about these amendments, but lack of emphasis, in my mind, has been placed on it's lack of restriction against extending credit to belligerents.

It makes a feeble effort to legislate against dealing in securities of the belligerent governments issued after the date of the President's proclamation naming such government at war. It makes a feeble effort to legislate against extending credit only in regard to sale of arms, ammunition, and the like.

These clauses are so weak that I defy anyone conversant with the legislation to prove to me that it cannot, in each instance, be absolutely circumvented. Does the present legislation put any commodities dealt in with belligerents on a cash basis other than arms and ammunition? It does not, so why call any part of the Senate legislation a cash-and-carry section? Strip it of this misleading description and tell the public that it does not stop merchandise coming from this country reaching a belligerent on a credit basis. The American people want to stop such credit transactions. They think the legislation provides for cash on the barrel head, and that it stops our interest in belligerent securities. Let us go the whole way, and let them know that it does not.

Now, what about the embargo?

It was good enough before our blood pressure had cause to rise because of the present embroilment. It was good enough for the law in 1935—in effect up to the present time—with protection for trade on inland waterways. Surely nothing has honestly happened to make the embargo less beneficial to the neutrality of the United States. That neutrality is our all-controlling objective.

We of the Niagara frontier are confronted with the old St. Lawrence waterway project. Simultaneously, with announcement of the Senate's action, the people of our section were caused to sit up straight in bed when the same paper carried the news that the St. Lawrence Waterway Treaty was "dusted off." It has been dead for a long time, but strangely enough the leaders of Canada, at just this time when the Senate acted favorably, and the House was about to consider the amendments to lift the embargo, decide that they will reconsider and sit down and discuss the matter with our leaders who have always pushed this phantom project. Was it timed to catch some congressional votes for repeal of the embargo—votes that might be affected feeling that the St. Lawrence Waterway Treaty would help their section—or is there some understanding that lifting the embargo will produce favorable consideration of the treaty by the Premiers of Ontario and Quebec? The Premiers of these provinces blocked action before, for which they should have the blessing of the Canadian people, as well as the American people, but why should the change in front happen to come at this psychological moment?

We have heard and read arguments on this legislation for months and should come to our conclusions dispassionately, having the one controlling objective before us: What is best for the neutrality of our land? My decision is to support the arms embargo, and I hope that the Senate amendments, with additional amendments keeping the embargo in our law and making a truly "cash" section are finally adopted as a result of this special session. That, to my mind, is what is now best for the neutrality of our land. [Applause.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE.]

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, however this vote may go, I am sure that when the roll is called it will represent the most heart-searching vote that has been cast in this House since I have been a Member. No one could hear the speeches that were made yesterday and that have been made throughout this debate and fail to believe that every man, when the time comes for him to answer, will be answering the deepest purposes of patriotism and honest conviction that he has. If mistakes are made they will be mistakes of information and not of intent.

With this in mind, I wish to refer to one or two points in the speech of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] which was just concluded.

PRESENT LAW BANS DELIVERY

The gentleman from Texas said that the thing that got us into trouble in the last war was not the sale of arms but the delivery of arms and on that basis proceeded to argue for the repeal of the arms embargo. I wish to call the attention of the gentleman and of the House to the fact that the present law does not permit the transportation or the delivery of arms by American ships.

I call attention to the sentence in the President's address to this Congress at the opening of this special session when he said, speaking of a sixth objective—

> Under present enactments such arms cannot be carried to belligerent countries on American vessels—

And he concluded:

> This provision should not be disturbed.

MERCHANT VESSELS ALSO SUBJECT TO CONTROL

Then what of carrying commodities in American vessels? I wish to call attention also to the statement of the President in that same address to this special session of Congress that the objective of restricting American ships from going into war zones could be achieved by legislation or—and I quote—"substantially achieved by Executive proclamation that all such voyages are solely at the risk of American owners themselves."

Norway did that in the World War, lost 1,000 ships and 900 men, but stayed out. Her shipowners were on their own risk and their men played a risky game for high pay.

I also wish to call the attention of the Members to the list of the emergency powers of the President as cited in Senate Document 133, prepared by the Attorney General in response to the request of the Senate as evidence that ships can be put on their own risk whenever their activities threaten to involve national concern.

The Attorney General cited the act of June 29, 1936, section 712 (d), which authorizes the termination of charters of Maritime Commission vessels "in any national emergency as proclaimed by the President."

The President has proclaimed a national emergency.

The *City of Flint*, about which there has been so much talk, is a Maritime Commission vessel.

As I understand it, the State Department has made no protest over the seizure of the *City of Flint* by Germany; it has only questioned the possible delivery to Russia. The State Department is not going to get excited when a ship is caught doing something that the bill before us proposes to make illegal. The Department knows that by proclamation today any Maritime Commission ship can be asked to surrender its charter.

Further, this same act, as cited by the Attorney General, gives the Maritime Commission authority "to requisition any vessel documented under the laws of the United States" during "any national emergency declared by the proclamation of the President."

Therefore there is no need for new legislation to control our ships or to prevent them from entering a war zone. They can be put on their own risk today or whenever their activities threaten trouble.

I confidently believe that the President in the same purpose and frankness with which he spoke to us would make such a proclamation if we should fail definitely to require it by enacting that provision of the bill before us, about which there is no controversy.

Why, then, repeal the arms embargo?

OUR DANGERS FROM COMMUNISM

The final reason we are asked to repeal the arms embargo is to take a step definitely to affect the outcome of the war now in progress.

Something has been said about communism and the whole field of totalitarian ideology. Evidence brought out by the Dies committee investigating un-American activities—and I may add, personal observation in one instance—convinces me that we do have a job in that regard, but our first job is here in America. And I take this occasion to say that as a member of the Appropriations Committee I favor putting a rider in every appropriation bill to deny Federal salary checks to any person who belongs to any organization that places allegiance to any temporal power ahead of loyalty to the United States. [Applause.]

Our greatest external danger from communism rests in war itself. As the Archbishop of Dubuque said in his national hook-up last Sunday, communism feeds on chaos, and the only hope for communism in America would be to see America exhausted from war.

The Most Reverend Archbishop said:

> The present war is not, in my well-advised opinion, "a holy war." It is propagandized as such by the sinister forces of international communism. The communism anti-Christs want America and all Christian nations to engage in this war. Their agents here will stop at nothing to involve us for well do they realize that a war-exhausted America is the only hope for communism to capture America.

Mr. Speaker, the considered conscience and self-interest of this country by progressive steps in 1871, 1907, 1909, 1915, and 1917 made it a crime to supply cruisers, battleships, and submarines to any belligerent to use against nations with whom we were at peace. It was only a normal development in 1935 to add other arms and implements of war. What morality or self-interest now sanctions lifting the embargo on bombing planes, poison gas, and liquid-fire throwers?

Mr. Speaker, if there be a holy war, a crusade which we should join, let the issue be debated in these Halls. Let no foreign minister tell us our duty, whether he speaks in Moscow or in Washington, in London or Berlin. In European chancelleries we do not have even the small voice that was proposed for us in the League of Nations.

They play a strange game over there—scorning Stalin one day, courting him the next. Why should we mix in that kind of business?

Our natural and traditional policy is to let nations choose their own forms of government and to demand that they let us have ours. If we are to be committed to any cause, let it be done openly by definite determination of our own interests.

Let us not be drawn into any war by the lure of what the President so aptly called fool's gold. Let America, instead, look to her own defenses and devote herself to the development of our country and the protection of democracy at home.

If we take our counsel in these matters from any foreign minister, be he in America or be he in Russia or in England, or anywhere else, we are bound for trouble. They play a different kind of game over there from what we play here. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROBSION].

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen, in 1935 President Roosevelt sponsored and urged the passage of a neutrality bill placing an embargo on the shipment of arms from this country to nations engaged in war. A similar measure was repassed in 1936 and 1937. The act of 1937 provides for an embargo on arms and munitions of war, and that act is now in force and is the law of the land. It was urged by the administration when this measure was passed an embargo on arms was the surest plan to keep us from being involved in another foreign war. Some Members of the House and Senate, when those measures were up for consideration, insisted that we should not pass a neutrality bill in peacetime, but we should wait until war should come. But it was urged by the President and his leaders in the House and Senate that the proper time to pass such a measure was when the world was at peace, and our action would give the nations and the world notice as to our foreign policy.

When war was threatened last summer and there was much propaganda in this country for England and France, and after the King and Queen of England had come to visit us and the President had had his quarrel with Hitler, the gentleman from New York, Mr. SOL BLOOM, brought in the administration's so-called neutrality bill, to repeal the embargo on arms. The House by a decisive majority of Democrats and Republicans retained the embargo on arms and munitions of war and refused to grant the President's request. The bill then went to the Senate. The Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs refused to report out any bill. Congress was called into special session on September 21, 1939, and the administration by spur and lash forced a bill through the Senate repealing the embargo on arms and munitions, and the bill is again before us for consideration.

When the bill was up in the House I spoke and voted for what is known as the Vorys amendment that retained the embargo on arms and munitions of war. Recent developments have strengthened my opinion that the only way for this country to remain neutral, and the surest way to peace is to retain in our law the embargo against the shipment of arms and munitions of war to nations engaged in war. Although England, France, and Germany are now at war the administration is moving heaven and earth to repeal the embargo on arms and munitions.

Some of the administration's leaders insinuate that those of us who vote for the embargo have some sort of leanings toward Germany and Russia. I am fortunate to have the honor to represent a great American district. There is no Russian or Communist living in my district. I doubt if there

is as many as five living in my district who were born in Germany. In at least 5 of the 17 counties in my district there is not a person born in foreign lands. My people know no "ism" except true Americanism. They are of English, Scotch, and Irish descent. We are opposed to communism, nazi-ism, and fascism. We know just one flag, and that is the Stars and Stripes. We recognize but one loyalty, and that is to the United States of America. My constituents are descendants of the patriots of the Revolution, the War of 1812, the Civil War, and the Spanish-American War. They have had a prominent part on land and sea, in the air, and under the sea in every struggle of this country from the Revolution down to the present time. We look upon our form of government and our country as the finest and best that the world has ever produced. We still regard the statesmanship of Washington, Jefferson, Jackson, and Lincoln as the wisest, most unselfish, and progressive that has appeared in the history of mankind. We are a liberty-loving and God-fearing people, still believing that "Righteousness exalteth a nation, and sin is a reproach to any people." [Applause.]

Our colleague, from Massachusetts, Mr. MCCORMACK, condemns the speech of the Prime Minister of Russia made in Moscow the other day and urges the recall of our Ambassador to Russia. I have no sympathy for Russia or her Prime Minister. During the 12 years of the Republican administration following the World War our Government refused to recognize Russia because that communistic Government was doing all it could to overthrow this Government and other governments by force and violence. It remained for Mr. Roosevelt to insist on the recognition of Russia.

The Dies investigating committee of the House declares that there are nearly 3,000 Communists who hold key positions under this Government that are drawing good salaries out of our taxpayers' money. I am more concerned about these 3,000 Communists holding high positions in this Government, and what they are doing and saying to promote communism in this country, and about the activities of the thousands and thousands of aliens that have been permitted to remain in this country, than what some Communist may say in a speech in Russia.

May I suggest that our friend the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] help us to get rid of the Communists in this country.

I have spoken and voted for every measure that has come before the House to restrict foreign immigration and to deport enemy aliens, whether Communist, Nazi, or Fascist. The Dies committee has been and is rendering a fine service to this country. The administration is fighting the work of this committee. Let us aid the Dies committee to ferret out these enemy aliens and all groups that are plotting the overthrow of our Government.

PRESIDENT UNNEUTRAL AND BILL UNNEUTRAL

Under the act of 1937 it is the duty of the President when nations go to war to issue a proclamation warning the American people not to sell or deliver arms or munitions of war to belligerent nations. Some time ago President Roosevelt issued his proclamation that England, France, and Germany were at war, and he invoked the provisions of our Neutrality Act, passed in 1937. Therefore, it is now unlawful for anyone to sell or deliver arms or munitions of war to either one of these nations. Neither Germany, France, nor England can lawfully buy arms or munitions of war in this country.

When the President was urging the passage of these laws in 1935, 1936, and 1937, he insisted that this would be honest neutrality and would keep us out of war. England and France have blockaded Germany, and therefore Germany cannot secure any arms or munitions of war in this country. The President and his leaders have turned right-about face. They now say that in order to be neutral we must repeal our arms embargo, and if we do not we will be unneutral. The word "neutral" or "neutrality" means that you cannot take sides one way or the other, and not assist either party. England and France control the Atlantic. They are not blockaded. They can get to our country with their ships and buy and receive arms and munitions of war if the embargo is repealed. Germany cannot.

I boldly charge that it is the purpose of the President and his administration to take sides in that war and help England and France. He knows that Germany cannot buy any of these war supplies. He knows that England and France are the only parties to that conflict that can buy under the terms of the bill. He knows that if the embargo is repealed that hundreds of millions of dollars of bombing planes, shells, poisonous gas, and other munitions of war will be sold at once to England and France. Germany and the world will know that in repealing this embargo that it is the purpose of this Nation to take sides and help England and France.

Few nations in the history of the world have shown such base ingratitude as England and France have shown to this country. We gave of our blood and our treasure to help them win the other World War. We loaned them billions of dollars. Today they owe us approximately $13,000,000,000. They have ignored their honest debts and taken this great sum from the taxpayers of our Nation. We received nothing from that war—not even gratitude. But, nothwithstanding all of this, personally I prefer to see France and England win the present war in Europe, but I am unwilling to take any step that will lead this country into another European war. I honestly believe that the repeal of the embargo is a step to such another war.

AID ALLIES AND PROFITS

One cannot believe by the wildest stretch of the imagination that to furnish arms and munitions of war to one side is a neutral act. It is unneutral and the repeal of the embargo is not to strengthen our neutrality but it is to accomplish two purposes. This administration favors the Allies, against Germany. The President for 18 months in many speeches declared that in the event of war we would be inevitably drawn into it. He and others have been insisting that we would have to get into the war. He stated at the dedication of the bridge between Canada and the United States:

> In the event Canada was attacked the United States would come to her rescue.

Now Canada is a part of Great Britain and is now in the war.

The President had no right to make such a statement, as Congress alone can declare a war. In the President's message to the Congress for the last several years in urging a great naval and military program, he insisted that in the event of another European war we would be drawn into it. This administration has been getting ready for a war, and I have noticed when the heads of governments have built up a great war machine they are never satisfied until they use it.

The King and Queen were sent to the United States last June to facilitate the repeal of this embargo law and to make the way clear for our participation in the war in behalf of England and France. The English and French people have been watching with great interest the battle over the repeal of the embargo in the American Congress. When the Senate voted the repeal, English and French leaders freely expressed the belief that if the embargo is repealed this meant that the United States was on their side and eventually would enter the war with them.

I am opposed to our country taking sides in that war for France, England, or Germany. Germany and the world will construe the repeal of the embargo as evidence of our purpose to take sides and help England and France. It is not so much furnishing arms and munitions of war as it is the purpose of this nation behind that action. We know that Germany cannot buy any arms and munitions in this country because of the blockade. Her ships cannot reach our ports. To take this action when war is on and under these conditions, there can only be one conclusion reached and that is we desire to help England and France, and make profits out of the war. My position is that this Nation should follow President George Washington's advice, and the accepted foreign policy of this nation up to the World

War, "Friendship for all nations and entangling alliances with none." I am opposed to this Nation taking a hand for any European, African, or Asiatic country. We must mind our own business.

President Roosevelt said when he signed the Neutrality Act of August 31, 1935:

I have approved this joint resolution because it was intended as an expression of the fixed desire of the Government and the people of the United States to avoid any action which may involve us in war.

After the passage of the Neutrality Act of 1936, containing an embargo against the sale of arms and munitions of war to warring nations, he said in his speech at Chautauqua, N. Y., August 14, 1936:

Nevertheless, if war should break out again in another continent, let us not blink the fact that we should find in this country thousands of Americans seeking immediate riches—fool's gold, blood money—would attempt to break down or attempt to evade our neutrality.

They would tell you—and, unfortunately, their views would get wide publicity—that if we could produce and ship this and that other articles to belligerent nations the unemployed of America would all find work.

There is a group in this country that desires repeal of this embargo for profits. President Roosevelt called this seeking for "fool's gold—blood money." He said that the American people, when it came to a question of profits or peace, would choose peace. More than 90 percent of the people in my district are opposed to the repeal of the embargo, according to the letters and telegrams that I have received. Two or three percent are in favor of us helping France and England. Another 2 or 3 percent say it will help business and bring profits. I think President Roosevelt, when he was commending the embargo on arms and munitions of war in his speech of 1936, was right when he spoke of this as "fool's gold—blood money."

No one desires more than I do to see our country prosperous, but I do not want to see that prosperity fished out of rivers of blood and lakes of tears. This Nation has developed the fastest and most powerful bomber in the world. We have also produced poisonous gases and powerful shells. If the Senate bill is passed and the embargo is repealed, we will deliver to England and France hundreds of millions of dollars worth of these powerful bombs, poisonous gases, and shells and other instrumentalities of death. These powerful bombers will fly over towns, villages, and cities and kill and maim noncombatants, women and children, and the aged. The poison gas will be used to sear the lungs and the bodies of thousands of the young manhood of some country. Our great Christian Nation, for profits will become the arsenal for warring nations to prolong wars, to increase the number of deaths, and the destruction of property.

WHAT AEOUT WORLD WAR PROFITS?

In the last World War in 1914, 1915, 1916, and 1917 the American people gleefully went about gathering great profits and dividends through furnishing arms, munitions of war, and other materials to the countries across the sea. There was great rejoicing in this country over what appeared to be our good fortune. In the beginning we were told by the Allies it was a fight to make the world safe for democracy, and a war to end all wars, but they said they had to have war munitions, materials, and supplies to win the war. We furnished those and made enormous profits. Later on they sent a commission and told the American Government they must have huge loans and credits or the war would be lost, and we loaned them huge sums of money and extended to them credits. Later on the Allies sent another commission to our country insisting that they must have our men and ships in order to win the war for democracy, and we were told that unless we got into the war, Germany would come over and get us. Up until that time the people of Europe were furnishing the blood and the tears. We were busy garnering to ourselves this "fool's gold and blood money."

On April 6, 1917, we declared war and then we began to furnish our own money and our own blood and tears. Five million young men were taken from their homes, their schools, their offices, farms, and placed in army camps, and 2,000,000 of them were sent to the hell over seas. We were no longer happy and joyful. Tens of millions of fathers, mothers, husbands, wives, brothers, and sisters were made sad. News came day by day that many of our splendid young men had been killed or had died of disease. American blood and American tears began to flow. After our people had paid enormous taxes we wound up with a national debt of $26,000,000,000. Hundreds of thousands of our finest young men died of wounds or disease; hundreds of thousands of others were disabled on account of wounds or disease; hundreds of thousands have died of wounds or diseases since the war. It made hundreds of thousands of widows and orphans. Our land is dotted with hospitals where there are tens of thousands of veterans of that war, some without eyes, some without limbs, some without minds, and others diseased; and before we are through paying that war will have cost this Nation more than $100,000,000,000. We have hundreds of thousands of disabled World War veterans who are receiving no compensation or other benefits and are dependent upon public charity. Where are the profits? There were no profits in the World War. There are no profits in any war. We paid dearly for the "fool's gold" and "blood money" that we received in 1914, 1915, 1916, and 1917.

Shall we again exchange peace for profits fished out of the blood and tears of the other people? We are paying for our mistake of 1917, and we shall continue to pay for the next 50 years. Before we become involved in another European war we should clean up the last war. We must give more consideration to those who served so splendidly, courageously, and patriotically in the last World War, and their widows and orphans. We must pay the debt of gratitude due them and the great national debt that that war created.

When we entered the other war we had a very small national debt. Today the obligations of this Nation amount to about $50,000,000,000. That is double the sum that we owed when we came out of the last war. If we should be involved in another war, we cannot finance it as we did before by borrowing money. We have already reached the debt limit in this country. We must in the beginning and follow through to the end with taxes so burdensome that the people of this country will not be able to bear them—and I might add that there will be very little of immediate profits should we become involved in another European war. The bills have already been drawn to be pushed through Congress when the emergency arises to take over not only the railroads, but the factories, mills, shops, mines, and almost everything else and everybody in this country. The American people will wake up to find out that the war has not brought profits but that they will have sacrificed their liberties. If we persist in meddling in the centuries-old quarrels and disputes in Europe, we shall bankrupt our own country and lose our own freedom.

MARKETS, LANDS, POWER

They are not fighting in Europe today over religion or forms of government. They are fighting, as they have for a thousand years, for commercial supremacy, territory, and power. Communistic Russia is giving some aid to Germany. England and France did all they could to have Russia on their side. France and England have Mohammedan Turkey, the Buddhists of India, and pagans on their side. There are dictatorships on the side of France and England. England has more than 300,000,000 people that are little above slaves. France is now under a dictatorship. This war started over the German City of Danzig and the Polish Corridor. This city and territory were taken from Germany at the close of the World War. President Wilson objected to it, and told the Allies it would bring on another war, and the war has come. Who wants to send two or three million American boys to Europe to help take Danzig from Germany and give it back to Poland? The various nations of Europe have been fighting over those lands for 800 years. Europe has been fighting over commerce and territory and for power for a thousand years, and they will fight for another thousand years, and on to the end of time. They fight whenever a new generation of boys have grown up. For nearly 150 years, with all their wars and quarrels in Europe, we had no part.

We followed the advice of the Father of our Country. We embraced the notion in 1917 that if we took a hand we could make the whole world free and safe for democracy and we could end all wars. Since that war 15 free nations have become dictatorships, and a majority of these are in Central and South America. We did not make the world safe for democracy. We did not end wars. There have been one or more wars every year since the signing of the Armistice, November 11, 1918.

We must know by this time that those quarrels cannot be settled by us. If we listen to those European nations they will keep us disturbed in peacetime as well as in war. As Washington said, "Why should we forego our detached position here 3,000 miles from Europe?" Why should we be in a quarrel or war every time they are in one? We had nothing to do with the starting of the present war. England and France wanted Poland to hold the territory taken from Germany, and England and France wanted to hold the colonies that she took from Germany. We asked for nothing and received nothing. In fact we did not even receive the thanks of those countries in Europe that we helped to save. But some faint hearts say that if Germany whips England and France she will come over here and get us. That scarecrow worked in 1917, but we should know better now. Germany, with the help of Russia cannot defeat France and England. They have access to the world while Germany and Russia are bottled up. In my opinion the most worried ruler in Europe today is Hitler himself. He begins to realize that he will be defeated and if Germany should defeat France and England no one can believe that she could come over here and attack us. It would require several million men, and it would require at least 7 tons of equipment for every soldier, and they would have to have some friendly place to land, and there would be no such place in the United States. There are not enough ships in the world to bring such an army and equipment to the United States. The sea would have to be free of navies. We have a great Navy. We have great coast defenses and the greatest and fastest bombing planes in the world. Furthermore, Germany, and France and England will come out of this war exhausted. What would Germany's enemies be doing while her military forces were attempting to come to the United States? The United States can take care of any enemy that might be able to come to her shores. It is much easier to defeat our enemies coming 3,000 miles to us than to go 3,000 miles or more to fight them.

I have thought many times since this debate was on how many wonderful American boys went to their death on Flanders fields believing that they were fighting to make the world safe for democracy and to end all wars, when, as a matter of fact, the Allies has already agreed among themselves how they would divide the loot and spoils if they won the war. When the war was over they did not talk about democracy. They were grabbing markets, territory, and power. They showed nothing but hate, selfishness, and greed. They forgot about the slogan for which American boys gave their lives and the American taxpayers gave of their hard-earned money.

The Allies are trying to hold what they grabbed, and those who lost are trying to recover their losses.

I am unalterably opposed to this Nation sending another American boy to fight and die in these foreign lands and on foreign seas. I firmly believe that if we repeal this embargo and take sides in this war in Europe that eventually we will be drawn into that war. We are safe from war until after the 1940 elections. Whoever heard of a person furnishing guns and pistols in a fight, knowing the reason for which they would be used, and keep from being involved in the fight and indicted if someone is hurt? If we furnish these arms and munitions of war it is going to create bitterness. The mothers and fathers of the young men who do the fighting must have a say in this matter. They do not want our country to enter another war to aid the Allies or any other nation, neither do they want us to become the arsenal for the world and seek fool's gold and blood money. Let this Nation mind its own business and not exchange peace for doubtful profits. [Applause.]

JAPAN-CHINA

A war has been going on between China and Japan for about 3 years. It is estimated that 4,000,000 Chinese have been killed, a large majority of whom were women, children, and aged persons. Hundreds of cities and towns in China have been bombed and destroyed. Nanking, a Chinese city of 1,500,000 population, it is said now contains only 9,000 people. It was destroyed by Japanese bombs. Billions of dollars' worth of property have been destroyed in China. The invasion of China by Japan has been the most ruthless and cruel of any attack on any people in all history. Japan coveted Chinese territory. During all of this time our neutrality law had an embargo in it. President Roosevelt for some reason known to himself failed to declare that a state of war existed between Japan and China and issue a proclamation putting into force our neutrality law. Fifty-seven percent of the arms and war munitions used by Japan in overrunning and destroying China were furnished by the United States. Expert military men have asserted that Japan could not have overrun China but for the arms and munitions received from the United States. Why so much concern about what is going on in Europe when the people of this Nation are seeking fool's gold and blood money for helping this ruthless aggressor destroy a great, peace-loving nation that has always been the constant friend of the United States? Of course, the repeal of the embargo will give Japan a free hand to secure more arms and war munitions from the United States to complete the destruction and subjugation of China.

I am for the embargo—and it enforced—so that the cruel and heartless aggression of Japan in China may be brought to an end. This administration put the embargo onto warring factions in Spain and between Italy and Ethiopia. Why this tender regard for Japan?

No one could regret the plight of Poland more than I do. However, I do not overlook the fact that a little over a year ago when big Germany was committing its acts of aggression against little Czechoslovakia, Poland mobilized more than 200,000 of her soldiers and marched into Czechoslovakia and took over 7,000 square miles of her territory. Poland grabbed last year and was grabbed herself this year.

First. I shall vote today for the Wolcott amendment to prevent the Federal Reserve Bank, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and other agencies of this Government loaning money or extending credit to the warring nations.

Second. I shall vote for the Vorys amendment defining what are arms and ammunition.

Third. I shall vote for the Shanley amendment authorizing the conferees to restore the arms embargo in the Senate bill.

Fourth. I shall vote to keep in the bill the cash-and-carry provision so that the bill, when it finally becomes a law, shall retain the embargo on arms and munitions to warring nations, and cash and carry for nonwar and nonmilitary supplies and materials, and shall keep American ships out of the warring zones, so that this Nation may not take sides and be involved in another European war.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. AUSTIN].

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Speaker, during a residence of a few short months in the House I have observed that it is incumbent upon a newcomer to note the fact that it is his first appearance in the Well. This I do, I hope, with becoming humility. But now is the time when all must speak constantly bearing in mind that we are not considering an entry into war or even a declaration of war.

In the following I have not the self-assurance to believe that I may add one iota to the voluminous verbiage or sophistications which too often during the last few weeks have been let loose upon the world—not only here and there, but also in the daily press, in the utterances of the great and the near great who have for fleeting moments been privileged to play leading parts in our national life, in the emana-

tions of our columnists and radio commentators, in the daily conversations of the man on the street, in the intimate exchange of home talk of the families of our land, in the millions of words that have been written to us in both branches of the Congress—words written sometimes in hate, but most often as a tragic expression of fear. No; I shall not try to add to what has already been said. But I do have the temerity to attempt to debunk this situation, strike off its dissembling coverture, and view it shorn of sham and pretense which have been gathered on its journey.

Thus presented for our action, can we not apply our consideration in the light of cold reason and logic? Is it not possible for us to have known facts and reasonable assumptions, weigh the evidence, and thereby reach rational conclusions which shall guide us in arriving at a safe and sound course of action? I confess that this is an ambitious and perhaps presumptuous task—but let's make a try.

First of all there are certain fundamentals, almost axiomatic, which must be accepted as the substructure upon which we are to build. The first is that Europe suffers and has suffered from a disease called war, which from time to time has become quiescent and then has presented acute exacerbations. This latter condition is now existent. Such has been the history of this unfortunate area ever since the legions of Ancient Rome brought the early tribes under the yoke and then taught them the processes of orderly government. Can you point out one war or series of wars during the intervening period up to the present time, the object of which was not territorial expansion, allocation of nationals, religious pretexts with temporal objects, seizure of material wealth or natural resources, monopoly of trade by land or sea, or personal ambition for world domination? And in what respect does the present war differ? Those days had Alexander, Caesar, Attila the Hun, Peter the Great, and Bismarck; now we have Hitler and the ominous shadow of Stalin presaging coming events. And by the same token, can you point out any of the mentioned wars wherein one or more of the warring nations did not summon outside aid by some lofty, sloganic appeal? Even we have heard of "War to end war," "Preserve democracy"; and today, if our ears deceive us not, we hear "Democracy is in peril," "Religion and civilization are at stake." Verily hath it been written that history repeats itself, and Europe presents another similar picture in the never-ending panorama.

Another fundamental we must recognize is that war is being waged even now in Europe. Peculiar as wars go, but nevertheless a declared war, with today a weird and ominous marking of time. If continued there will be the same horror, the same tragedy, the same devastation, the same ruin, the same murder of women and children, the same nothingness where once was life, the same cruel and terrible aftermath. The skies again shower destruction, land guns deal distant death, and beneath the surface of the sea men let loose their silent messengers of destruction. All of this is too well known to us and needs no lengthy description, so why dwell longer—too much has been said of this already. We agree that war is hell.

The next fundamental is that the United States abhors war and has no desire for war. It does not belong to our concept, it is not within our intent or purpose, it is a heritage no one of us has brought here from our European ancestry. But in spite of all this the shadow of war is over our land. Your desks and mine are piled deep with letters and telegrams carrying heart-rending appeals to keep us out of war. In the name of humanity they ask it; in the name Christ the King they ask it; in the name of God they ask it. Someone or several have brought this frenzy upon us and some day he or they will pay the price. What greater service could this Congress now do than to assure and reassure this country that there shall be no war because war mongers will be stifled, demagogues silenced, and propagandists denied? It shall not be said of us that judgment is fled to brutish beasts and men have lost their reason.

War! The thought palsies the lips of every man, it stabs the heart of every mother. Let us stop this talk of war. Who wants it? Certainly not this Congress; certainly not labor nor capital; certainly not our fellow citizens of foreign extraction who are rightly sorrowing over the partition or the destruction of the land of their fathers; certainly not the man on the street, who must fight the battle and bear the brunt of defeat or of a victory which, taken at its best, will be only a defeat; certainly not the sister states of our hemisphere who, with us, desire to live in friendliness and harmony with their neighbors, to pursue the paths of peace which lead to individual and national well-being, to work out their destiny under liberty and freedom.

Why should we participate in this war? Has Divine command been placed upon us to act as the preceptor of Europe? Since when have we been empowered to sit in judgment on the prevailing or changing forms of government in Europe? Since when have we imagined that by Presidential decree or legislative act or popular desire we can forever erase the centuries old inborn national hatreds over there? Shall we again take our seats at the council table and attempt to instill reason and justice into minds that will have them not or to assist in the partition of Europe along just and equitable lines? Are we ready to share in a so-called religious war? No, none of these purposes shall take us in. We will fight again as we have in the past to maintain our national honor, our national security, our national being.

The foregoing are fundamentals and must be accepted. As such they need not be extended.

After rather close attention, I am led to believe that the joint resolution now before us, labeled as the "Neutrality Act of 1939," is for the double purpose of keeping the United States out of war and maintaining a strict neutrality toward all belligerent nations. In the first of these purposes it is on precarious ground. In the second it dismally fails. An analysis of this joint resolution divides it into two references, the first dealing with our relationship with belligerent nations and the second having to do with restrictions upon our own citizens as to their conduct and travel. With this latter portion but little fault can be found. In this particular consideration I frankly confess that I cannot get unduly excited over centralization of control, possible dictatorship, too much power in one man, loss of democracy or democratic principles. I have too much faith in the United States of America and the ever-living principles of freedom and liberty, the priceless heritage of its people. I realize the restrictions placed upon our merchant marine, but I also realize that there are other nations in the world which are not at war, that there are other paths of commerce that do not lie in combat areas, and particularly do I realize that the rich trade of South America offers alluring markets which by the application of business acumen and honorable dealing can be made permanently ours. The naming of combat areas, constantly shifting and extending, is a delicate and perhaps dangerous problem, but at least some faith must be placed in him who directs. On the whole, this reference in the bill will do, particularly when we understand that for the most part it is already the established and prevailing law of neutrality.

But the second reference, which really defines our foreign policy under the title of the "Neutrality Bill of 1939" and is the crux of this problem, is an entirely different matter. Why take the time of this House in recounting the astounding details? Let me say with all the strength and vigor I possess that with deadly hatred I abhor Hitler and all his works. His departure would remove a scourge of civilization, an unchained rabid dog, an anathema to a Christian world or any other world that puts its faith and its trust in a power above. But fair is fair and right is right, and the failure of other nations to keep their pledged word, to stand by solemn treaties, is no excuse for our country to do likewise. In 1935 our Congress published to all the world its determined position toward all nations that might engage in war. Amended in 1936 and reenacted in 1937, it almost unanimously passed both branches of the legislative body, was approved and signed by our President, was hailed and acclaimed by the press and the people as a noble expression of

position. Becoming the law of the land it proclaimed to the world that the greatest nation on earth on whose escutcheon was no stain of infamy had established a principle from which there would be no recession under the usual course of honorable conduct. France understood—and so did Germany—and so did Great Britain and so did every other nation with which we hold diplomatic relations. But the scene changes and 2 years after three of those nations are at war. Immediately after this Congress is convened in special session and we are asked by the administration to pass a bill under the guise of neutrality which will aid two of the belligerent nations to the damage of the third, and our President and our Senate which passed the bill and our Rules Committee call this neutrality. Again fair is fair and right is right. Shall we throw over them the mantle of charity and charge their act to lack of thought, or shall we call a spade a spade and charge them with complicity in an attempt to blind the American people? Has the author of this bill and have its proponents the courage to label this bill as it should be labeled, the "unneutrality bill of 1939, changing the rules contrary to the precepts and interpretation of International Law as expounded by authorities, aiding favored nations," and would he or they have the courage to vote for such a bill under a correctly defined title without a definite mandate to that end from the people which mandate does not now exist? Before me are the pleas of friends whom I respect, the homogeneous postals of the pressure groups, the threats of political oblivion—for none of these will I forget my oath of office in my country's service, for none of these will I prostitute my self-respect.

What makes this bill unneutral is the provision euphemistically called a repeal of the arms embargo. I need not further explain. It opens our markets and our ports to belligerent nations to purchase and carry away for cash the deadly instruments of war. And these include the poison gas that causes human beings to writhe and struggle and choke and gasp for precious air; these include the flame throwers that turn man into a pillar of fire. Mercy, culture, humanitarianism, brotherly love, Christianity—you claim these as the attributes of our Nation and then vote to send such weapons abroad to be used against your fellow men. Is it for the price the purchaser will pay? Is it to furnish employment to the unemployed? Is it to enrich the treasury of industry that further taxes may be laid thereon? Such motives are unworthy of the thought so inconsistent are they with Americanism. This repeal of the arms embargo is a departure from our published law and establishes intervention in place of neutrality. No one of us is endowed with certain ability to see tomorrow as we see today. Those who say that repeal of the arms embargo will lead to our participation and those who say it will not are both wrong if they think they speak with surety. This much, however, can be said that our present neutrality insofar as the arms embargo is concerned makes our participation possible, but the repeal of our present arms-embargo plan makes our participation not only possible but probable. Perhaps a belligerent nation unfavorably affected may consider a change an unfriendly act and be less careful in avoiding untoward incidents, or it may even reach the point of an actual declaration of war. Equally absurd courses of action are not so unusual today. Are you who are favoring this repeal of the arms embargo prepared to follow through? Are you ready to suffer the probable consequences? Can you tell the citizens of this country that you obeyed their dictate to preserve neutrality? Can you satisfy anxious minds that by your vote you have done your best to keep us out of war? If your answer is no, it is a fair question to ask yourself, "Am I really a representative of my people?"

We cannot by legislation keep this country neutral if the country is not neutral-minded. We cannot by legislation keep this country out of war if the country is war-minded. But our people are neutral-minded; our people are not war-minded. And our task is to keep them so. We miserably fail them if under the guise of neutrality we willfully translate their desire into intervention and we miserably fail them if by a repeal of the arms embargo we lead them into war. In the final solution of this problem may the God of our Fathers keep us from temptation of every kind and from every source. [Applause.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] such time as he may desire.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, like every other Member of Congress, I received many communications during the last few weeks on the subject of neutrality legislation. These communications have been on both sides of the question. All of them have been written by sincere, honest people. A majority of them have opposed the repeal of the arms embargo. A strong minority have taken the other position.

One point that has been emphasized most strongly on the part of those who favor repeal is that this should not be made a partisan question; that it is too big, too vital, and too important to our welfare to be considered for one moment from the standpoint of partisanship. I agree with that viewpoint. Furthermore, I do not believe that anyone who is familiar with my legislative record can accuse me of being offensively partisan at any time. As to this particular issue, I can honestly say that I have approached it without the slightest trace of partisanship.

I do not believe that anyone can fairly accuse Republican Members of Congress of viewing this matter from a partisan standpoint. To make it a partisan issue would in the very beginning kill any chance of success on the part of Republicans opposing repeal of the embargo. There are approximately 100 more Democratic Members of the House than there are Republican. On any partisan issue, the Republicans are defeated from the start. The only chance to defeat repeal in this case is to treat the issue in a nonpartisan manner, and any statement to the contrary is not only a reflection upon the patriotism of the opponents of repeal but upon their good judgment, as well.

As far as my personal position is concerned, I supported the original neutrality bill, a prominent feature of which was the arms embargo, when it became a law in 1935. That bill was supported by the administration, passed both Houses of Congress almost unanimously, and was signed by the President. I supported the revision of the act in 1936, which was also an administration measure, and it received the practically unanimous support of all Members of Congress. I supported the 1937 bill, also an administration measure, which received almost unanimous support in both the House and Senate and was signed by the President. I supported those measures at the time of their enactment because I believed that a European war was almost inevitable.

I felt that if war did break out in Europe, it would be based upon the age-old rivalries and disputes over boundaries and racial questions. I felt that we could and should have no interest as a nation in a war of that kind. I felt that the only policy for this Nation to follow was to stay out and that we could stay out only by following a policy of strict neutrality. I believed then, as I believe now, that no one can question the neutrality of a policy which says that we will not sell implements of war or destruction to anyone.

For the past 4 years the arms embargo and the 1935 Neutrality Act as revised have stood as a part of the foreign policy of this Nation. Every European country knew that it was our policy, knew that these measures had passed Congress almost unanimously and knew that they represented the feeling and aspirations of the American people as far as involvement in European wars was concerned. Certainly, every nation which had reason to believe that it might be a party to a conflict had full notice of our policy in this regard.

Today the thing which was feared and anticipated, when the first Neutrality Act was passed in 1935, has come to pass. European nations are at war. Our laws prohibit the export of arms and munitions. As far as my position is concerned, I stand exactly where I stood in 1935, in 1936, and in 1937, when the country and Congress could and did consider this question from a calm, logical, impartial, and neutral standpoint. Those of us who are opposing repeal of the arms embargo stand today where we have always stood and where the President and the State Department

and the vast majority of the Members of Congress stood in 1935 and 1937.

The administration now takes a different position, not because of any change in the world situation between 1935 and the present time, but solely for the reason that there has been a change in the administration's foreign policy. That policy in 1935 was nonintervention and neutrality. That was still the position of the administration when the President made his famous Chautauqua speech on August 14, 1936, where he said "I hate war"; when he said also—

> Nevertheless, if war should break out again in another continent, let us not blink the fact that we should find in this country thousands of Americans who, seeking immediate riches—fool's gold—would attempt to break down and evade our neutrality.

It was still the policy of the administration when the 1937 neutrality law was signed by the President. The first indication that there was any change in the administration viewpoint came when the famous quarantine speech was made in Chicago on October 5, 1937, when the President proposed in effect that peace-loving nations get together to quarantine and stop the aggressor nations.

This change in the administration's policy was further emphasized in the President's message to Congress on January 4, 1939, in which he spoke of using methods "short of war" as a means of curbing aggressor nations.

The proposal to repeal the arms embargo is a logical next step in the President's policy of intervention and participation in the power politics of Europe. It is a question that is far greater than the repeal of the arms embargo, as significant and important as that may be in itself. Its great significance lies in the fact that if we repeal the arms embargo, Congress and the country will have given their approval of this change in administration policy. It will be construed as a green light authorizing the President to further extend his now-declared policy of interference and intervention in European affairs.

All of this would have been significant, important, and dangerous had we taken up the matter of repeal of the arms embargo before the outbreak of war. To repeal the embargo after war has begun makes it doubly significant, important, and dangerous. If there has been any one thing which has been settled beyond a doubt in the debate which has taken place on this issue, it is that lifting the embargo at this time is an unneutral act. It is one of the acts "short of war" to which the President no doubt referred in his message last January. In other words, it means that we have taken sides, and, having chosen our side, the question is whether we can logically and consistently withhold further aid, even to the point of sending troops abroad, should our side in the conflict need and demand it.

If we do not intend to do this, then we are guilty of misleading and misinforming England and France as to our position. Press comment in these two countries, after the passage of the present bill by the Senate, was all to the effect that the result marked a great Allied victory.

In my mail this morning I received a letter from a young lady residing in my district, reading, in part, as follows:

> I was in England when she declared war. Time and again I heard the remark: "Of course, the United States will come to our aid at once and not wait, as it did before, until the war is practically over." When I protested against such statements the reply was: "Oh, yes; you will. Our Governments have an understanding." When reminded of our Neutrality Act and our law against extending credit to nations in default on their debts to us, their reply was: "Your President will attend to that."

I do not know how general this impression may be in the allied countries. I do know that others returning from England and France have told me the same thing that this young lady mentions in her letter. If that is the viewpoint in England and France, how can they help but feel that this step, if we should take it, marks the beginning of our actual participation?

I think we should weigh well what we do today. Notwithstanding the fact that the administration's foreign policy has changed, it does not become this country's policy until approved by Congress. If we strike down the arms embargo today, we are definitely, in the eyes of our own people and the eyes of the world, approving a foreign policy which means not neutrality but intervention and, I fear, eventual participation. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include therein a letter from a constituent.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CORBETT].

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, during the past few weeks our mail has been very heavy. We have received numerous phone calls and telegrams. We have been reading numerous polls to determine just how the public is really reacting and what their true thoughts are on this neutrality issue.

All manner of doubts and suspicions have been raised regarding the authenticity and the validity of these communications. Now, regardless of what your attitude may be regarding them, I have here, and I want to leave it for investigation, a petition containing well over 12,000 names and every signature is authentic. They were gathered by a group of women who had and have no motive but a sincere desire to preserve the neutrality of these United States. They were gathered in less than 15 days, without any subsidization, in the leading industrial district of the world—the Pittsburgh district—and if there is any region of the world that stands to profit from a lifting of this embargo it is that district.

I submit this petition and I might submit some 15,000 other communications that have reached my office as evidence of what the people think and what they know.

This petition asks—to be brief—that we restore the law as it was in 1937, when we were thinking only in terms of the welfare of the United States. At that time when we were neutral and wholly impartial we wrote a decision which some are now seeking to change, and whatever they may say on this floor, whatever reasons they may trump up to convince themselves that the issues are something else, they will not deceive the people. The people know that we are here deciding whether or not to tear out one of the major insulations against war in order that we may extend further assistance to one side in this conflict.

They know that the arms embargo is a barrier across the road that leads to war. They know that we do not have to lift this embargo in order to be more safe. This country is just as safe from invasion from Europe as it is safe from invasion from Africa or Mars. Most of the people know and the rest will learn that we are not here limited to a choice between one insulation, the embargo, and another insulation, the cash and carry. We can deceive ourselves but not them, because it is very evident that we can have both insulations as we had them prior to May 1. The administration forces allowed the cash-and-carry provisions to expire last spring, and my good friend the capable gentleman from Texas [Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON], who spoke earlier, rose on this floor when the Bloom bill was under discussion and advocated that the carry-it-yourself principle as regards only arms and ammunition and implements of war be defeated, and it was defeated by a vote of over 2 to 1, and now it is offered to us as a new insulation in exchange for our insulation—the arms embargo.

I believe that we who are here writing this law ought to be just as candid as we can. There are two basic issues that underlie this debate. One is whether or not we shall maintain our strict neutrality or relax it in such a way as to benefit one side in the European conflict. The second issue is whether or not we shall increase the discretionary powers of the Executive.

Let us not lose sight of the fact that as we change this law to benefit those nations which control the Atlantic seaways, to that identical extent we open the possibility of Japan using our arms and ammunition for aggression in Asia. We cannot write a law that applies to only one ocean.

Throughout this confusion of debate and procedure I have and will preserve one rule to govern my vote and I offer

it to you for what it is worth. I shall vote consistently for that proposal which keeps us farthest away from the firing line, and I shall use only one lamp to guide my way, and that is the lamp of our experiences between 1914 and 1917. [Applause.]

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BUCKLER].

Mr. BUCKLER of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I am against war, and as long as I am a Member of Congress I shall never vote to send our boys over to Europe to fight. But I am for this pending bill for the reason that I believe it is a better law than the law we now have on the statute books. A few more incidents like that of the *City of Flint,* and perhaps we would be in the war. You let those sailors be torpedoed over there and destroyed, and you are on your road to war. If we had the present proposed law, the *City of Flint* would not have been over in the war zone. So I am for this bill, and when I cast my vote today I am not going to cast it to please the Communists of Russia or the Communists of the United States. I am going to cast it for America, and I am going to cast it for this bill. [Applause.]

I am against the United States entering wars on foreign soil, and I shall vote against sending any of our boys to foreign wars, whether they be in Europe or any other place on the globe, as long as I am a Member of the Congress of the United States. I want America to stay at peace with the world and will vote to strengthen our neutral position. We can better stay out of war by passing the neutrality bill of 1939 than by defeating it. The pending bill is not perfect, but it is far better than the present law, and I fear that defeat of the present bill will invite dangerous incidents like the seizure of the ship *City of Flint,* which is now a threat to our security.

The neutrality bill of 1939 is better than the present law for keeping us at peace, and I set the reasons down in order:

First. Cash and carry: This keeps United States ships like the *City of Flint* out of the war zones and keeps American people at home and away from war-torn countries. Under the present law we let our ships and citizens run all over the world and get into foreign danger spots. By voting for the neutrality bill of 1939 I vote to keep United States ships and citizens at home.

Second. No credits to warring countries: Under the new bill we will sell for cash on the barrel head. They say that our loans to warring countries during the World War got us into that war. We eliminate the credit danger because we do not allow loans to warring countries under the new neutrality bill now pending. Foreign credits will not get us into war, because we are going to keep United States dollars also out of the war zones and home where they belong.

Third. Opponents say "Repeal of embargo is first step to war." If that is so why did not the embargo provision protect us against the *City of Flint* capture by the Germans? The *City of Flint* carried no munitions nor was it armed, but it was seized as a prize of war just the same. This can happen again and again under the present law, but it cannot happen under the new neutrality bill of 1939. We must pass the new law to protect ourselves from incidents like this which dragged us into the World War.

Fourth. Prevents causes of American entry into the World War. Under the new bill we prevent credits and foreign war loans. We keep our ships and people at home and mind our own business. We sell to those who have the money. We will not sell to those who have not the money. We will not let other United States ships, like the *City of Flint,* carry the American colors into the war zones. We will not be doing the things we did in the World War that got us into that war. In other words, we are being practical now, and I am for the practical ideas that are safe as against theories that are unsafe and are not working in practice like the present law.

When I cast my vote I want to vote for the best possible bill to keep our American boys out of this war. I am not going to let any foreign dictator sway my vote as a good American. I think we should be boss over ourselves over here, and I think we will be under the neutrality bill of 1939. [Applause.]

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. PIERCE].

Mr. PIERCE of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I desire to repeat with all possible emphasis my statement that we must never again send our boys across the seas to fight in a European war. My reasoning back of those conclusions was set forth in the House debate on June 29. I am just as positive in my belief that we are going to be very seriously affected if Europe is compelled to accept a Hitler-dictated peace.

If Germany wins, you who have so often denounced the Versailles Treaty will then behold such an unfair treaty imposed by the victor that you may well save your denunciations for that time. Should you desire to get a glimpse of a real conqueror's treaty, then reread the terms imposed on Russia by Germany in 1917.

I do not agree with the oft-repeated statement that the present war in Europe is just another scrap over boundary lines. The conflict in Europe is a contest between contending theories of government—the democracies, however crude, on the one hand, and the totalitarian states, however cruel, on the other.

About seven centuries ago the Mongols invaded Europe under the able leadership of Tamerlane and Genghis Khan. These conquering hordes were turned back only by most desperate fighting, even under the walls of Vienna. This union of forces under Stalin and Hitler parallels the coming of the Mongols. It means the rise of barbarian practices and the death of institutions which we in America hold dear and sacred. If you really love American institutions, which are the outgrowth of English ideals, you simply cannot be indifferent to the struggle in Europe. I want those fighting on our side to share our stores. How are you opponents going to justify your course and your vote if you read in the morning papers a few weeks hence that English and French cities are in ruins from London to Edinburgh, from Paris to Marseilles? Will you be proud to realize that your vote prevented England and France from receiving the thousands of planes necessary for their defense and now awaiting delivery? Your only answer will be that in your attempt to be neutral you made a Hitler victory possible.

I do not presume to wisdom which would give me the right to seek to mold other men's minds nor to change carefully formed opinions. Nor do I claim knowledge of affairs not possessed by my colleagues. I do not want to preach, but, as one of the few men of this House who have lived a generous span of life of nearly fourscore years, I speak to my younger colleagues who are so kind to me. The old Governor appeals in affection and in the respect born of daily association.

I shall not live to see the final effect of this day's work. My thoughts are, therefore, projected into the future with an earnestness and anxiety which a younger man may not fully understand. I look back through recorded history; I strive to grasp the sorry shapes of events as they revolve and turn on the world's stage today. I am greatly moved by these events and by the tragic plight of humanity. I am, of course, most deeply concerned for our own country. I think of my nine grandsons and their world and their country, and I am consumed with the desire to make things better for them, to pass on to them a stable government functioning in a war-free world.

I lived through the agonies of the last World War, suffering them, day by day, while I went about my work in the same familiar places made strangely different by the absence of friends and neighbors as well as my only son and 20 volunteer companions from my own farm. The terrifying daily news of affairs in Europe penetrated our lives.

When I came to Congress I accepted the assignment to our common task of bettering life without any realization that it might bring us to this day of decision which may—yes; must—vitally affect the lives and destinies of men remote from us in time and space.

Weighing the swiftly changing events of the past months since we last debated this Neutrality Act, and praying that

you and I will be given judgment now to act in legislative capacity for the ultimate good of our own people and of humanity, I shall support the bill which has come to us after weeks of Senate debate.

Our Senators have not faced the issue alone. The whole country has participated in the discussion as it has never done before. Led by thoughtfully considered public debate, reading a portion of the thousands of printed arguments, and listening day and night to the radio, our people have resolved themselves into a great forum. They have made known to us their opinions and decisions in this crisis. We have had ample guidance in the matter.

We are now assembled for final action, and every man among us wants to do right. Every decent high-minded man will surrender all thought of taking any action except that dictated by his own best judgment. Seldom is any man given the opportunity and the responsibility of such an epoch-making, far-reaching, deciding voice in world affairs.

Summoning all my mental and moral resources, and as the result of the deepest consideration and most solemn pledge to the future of my children and grandchildren, moved by anxiety for the welfare of the helpless millions in our land and other lands, I know, for myself, that I cannot do other than to support this legislation. I am convinced it is designed to promote the universal good and to protect our country and people so they may live and work without facing the horrors of war. We are legislating for the purpose of making our country one among a family of nations, all enjoying the same primary blessing of peace.

We are surrendering many of our privileges—freedom of the seas, world trade, and certain rights which we have regarded as part of our heritage—all for the sole purpose of keeping our boys out of the bitter struggles of war.

I cannot urge other men to accept my judgment. I can only beg for fullest realization of the supreme importance of the hour and offer my own conclusions. I fervently hold that support of the pending bill is essential to the highest welfare of our country, as well as that of the whole world. As the world is now so closely knit, we must think in world terms. I believe support of this bill, inside or outside party lines, is the part a man must play today, the side on which he must fight, because he is motivated by a sacred desire to serve the highest good.

To those of you who may reasonably expect to live to see the far end of this day's work I want to repeat what a contemporary told me after the last World War—a man who had participated in it as a leader of men and a commanding general. I speak of Gen. Hunter Liggett, who said to me that he would like to have traded his life for a life 50 years ahead. Recalling his brilliant military career, I asked the reason. He said, "Within the next 50 years, perhaps within 25 years, it will be decided whether European civilization will commit suicide on the field of battle." He added, "If there is another great World War, and if it is fought to exhaustion, it means the end of European civilization." That is what I fear. If what is finest in that civilization perishes, what hope is there for our own economic and political system?

Because of the dignity of human life, and out of the richness of human experience coming from length of life, I feel that I may speak to some of my younger colleagues in this personal vein. Because they, too, will, in ripeness of years, look to a future they cannot share, I beg them to cast aside political expediency as totally unworthy of this great hour. Let us all express ourselves, by this vote, with the full realization that it is our supreme effort to banish hate among nations. Certainly it is our greatest contribution to the cause of peace and happiness for America and for the world.

I support this legislation in that spirit. I find I can follow no other course. I can only ask others to search their minds and hearts and to act, guided by their finest natures and by highest purposes.

Though we vote on different sides, our American citizens must know that we shall vote guided by our convictions and moved by our sense of citizenship and public duty. Any other imputation would be shameful. [Applause.]

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS].

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, no true American will approach this momentous question other than in a spirit of humility, sincerity, and doubt. No true American will stand here today, who loves this country, and who wants to keep his country out of war, and vote for a bill or for an amendment that he really believes would involve his country in war, and at the same time stultify his name throughout history. Months ago, in attempting to make up my mind definitely on this important subject, in my imagination and in my heart I communed with the shades of Washington, Jefferson, Wilson, Lincoln, and the other great men who were born here and loved this country so well, and who by their effort and by their every word placed America first and other nations second. I have communed in my thoughts with the Unknown Soldier, who lies in Arlington in "honored glory, known only to God," and I have honestly come to the conviction that it would be in the interest of peace for the United States, and in the interest of peace and happiness for the whole world to repeal the arms embargo now on the statute books of our country. [Applause.]

I do not claim, Mr. Speaker, to be a great international lawyer; I do not even claim to have wandered exhaustively among the dusty documents of 1,000 years ago or more, as my friend from Connecticut [Mr. SHANLEY] has done, in pursuit of the hidden riches of international law and the kingdom of Utopia.

I have the greatest admiration and respect for the learning and integrity of the gentleman from Connecticut, but I must say here that I am puzzled and astounded by the position the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHANLEY] has taken in offering this motion to this House. My friends, the main argument, the only argument that this great student of international law offers to you here today, as to why this arms embargo should remain is that it would be changing the rules during the game. Oh, he voted for it before, when every rule of the game of international law had been trampled underfoot by the dictators of the world; when every rule of humanity expounded to us by the fathers of our country, when every rule of international law taught by Professor Borchard, at whose feet for so many years the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut sat, had already been repudiated and trampled underfoot by the nations of Europe for lo these many years—the only beacon shining for the people on this earth. The United States has not been a party to this trampling upon respected and revered international law, whereunder and whereby the peoples of this earth could live in peace and tranquillity.

Mr. SHANLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. Now, my friend, I have only 10 minutes. You had 30 or 40 minutes. I beg your pardon.

When all of the rules of the game have been violated, the gentleman from Connecticut comes in here and, as the only Democratic member of the Commitee on Foreign Affairs, takes the position that the United States of America, this great Nation, must stand with its arms bound, with its conscience tied, unable and afraid to do anything because the musty pages and documents of international law, which have been repudiated by every nation on the face of this earth except the United States, say that you should not change the rule during the game.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I do not yield.

Mr. FISH. For a correction?

Mr. RICHARDS. Give me more time and I will yield.

Mr. FISH. Twenty seconds.

Mr. RICHARDS. No; not 20 seconds. I do not yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FISH. I will yield you time.

Mr. RICHARDS. How much time?

Mr. FISH. For the purpose of a correction. The gentleman said there was only one Democratic member on the committee. There are two Democratic members, because

the gentleman from New York, Dr. PFEIFER, is with us in this fight.

Mr. RICHARDS. Well, I have not talked to the gentleman from New York, Dr. PFEIFER, but this is the first time since I have been here that I have heard that the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] has a right to speak for any Democratic Member in this House. [Applause and laughter.]

My friends, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHANLEY] is a baseball player, as I am. He was a football player, as I was once in my younger days. He loves to go to the boxing matches, as I do, but when two boxers get into the ring and get to fighting each other according to certain recognized laws and rules, and he sits on the sideline with his children, and before the fight is over the fighters begin to gouge and dig, and sooner or later it appears that they may trample his children underfoot, the gentleman from Connecticut contends that he cannot protect his own children because the rules of the game will be infringed. [Applause and laughter.]

My friend talks about international law. International law. I subscribe to the same view held by the great Woodrow Wilson and President Taft and other great statesmen, that no peace and happiness could come to this world until we have true, respected international law. But, my friends, international law. O international law, float not forever on the fair horizon, dwell not forever in the dream of the enthusiast, remain not forever in the song of the poet, but come and make thy home among the children of men. That is what I want. That is what the people of the United States want.

There are a great many gentlemen on the left side of this aisle who come here before the American people and try to befuddle their minds and make them believe that this is a vote for or against war. I will unburden my soul to both sides of this House in response to that and say to you that I do not assume, I do not believe, that the repeal of this law or the retention of this law will preserve peace for the United States.

Peace in the United States will only be preserved by the radio, by the picture shows, by the newspapers of this country, and wherever men assemble and gather together on the streets and wherever the ministers of religion rise in the pulpit. As long as those people, as long as these agencies, control themselves, as long as they keep their heads, they will realize as you do and I do that there can be no benefit to the United States in becoming involved in this war and will not aid in molding war opinion.

Now, my friends, just another word. It has been said here that this is a bill in favor of England and France; that the repeal of this embargo would be in favor of England and France and against the other side. That may or may not be true, but regardless, a motion to retain the embargo or a law to repeal the embargo should stand on its own hind legs and should be measured with the American yardstick. If you want to measure this act with the American yardstick and show the sincerity of this administration, the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House and the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, Mr. Speaker, turn to another section of this bill which I feel is the crux of the bill, for every man and woman here knows that we became involved in World War No. 1 because of our insistence on the rights of international law as it applies to neutral trade and travel upon the high seas, and you will find that this section will operate to the disadvantage of England and France.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RICHARDS. Some people say we are trying primarily to hurt Germany; yet here is England mistress of the seas and, during wartime, I have often said that international law is what England says it is. This is another reason why I have no confidence in international law as it exists at the present time. Let me say, however, that if we prohibit our ships from going into belligerent ports, it is directly against the interests of England and France, because England and France control the seas and we could get to their ports but not to ports of belligerents on the other side, and everybody knows it.

In closing let me say that this is an American bill. I hope with all my heart it will have a tendency to make the American people think more seriously than they have been thinking, and I hope it will do a lot to keep us out of this war. I hope it is a neutral bill. I hope it will not be considered an unfriendly act by any nation in this war; but, Mr. Speaker, if it helps any belligerent, let us pray that it does not help those nations who have robbed the people in Europe, in many instances, of every vestige of human rights, including the right to worship God according to the dictates of conscience; that it will not help the nations which are today, by subversive activity, seeking right here in America to undermine our own system of government. [Applause.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SEGER].

Mr. SEGER. Mr. Speaker, most decisions that we have to make in Congress are not much more difficult than the average decision in business or professional life. An issue is presented which either coincides with or militates against a man's party principles, or his own economic philosophy and practical experience; he casts his vote "aye" or "nay" and if he is right 51 percent of the time he can go to sleep with a reasonably clear conscience.

But the vote we shall cast today is of a different character. Its implications reach forward into the mists of national and international destiny. It deals with the lives of young men in other nations, and may, before this war is over, involve the lives of our own young men. I doubt if there is a single Member of the House who, during the past 4 weeks, has not experienced the harrowing ordeal of sleepless nights. We are thinking neither of personal nor party profit. Every man, alone with his own conscience, is asking the question: "What will this vote mean when we look back on it in the years to come? Will there come a day when the historians of the future will write, 'The vote to lift the embargo, which seemed so harmless at that time, proved to be the first step toward America's participation in the second European war'?"

No man can answer that question. Only the future will tell. But so long as there is any doubt at all I, for one, want my vote to be against any action that has even the remote possibility of being a first step.

I was the war-time mayor of my city. I remember when the war broke out, and the industries of my district began transforming their production from peacetime to wartime goods. This was in 1914, long before our entry, and no one of us imagined that the manufacture of munitions for the Allies could possibly be a first step. We thought we were putting our workers to work in the good cause of democracy; we thought we were helping the Allies with our factories, and that this would be all the help we would ever be called on to give. But we know today, in the light of history, that though we did not enter the war until 1917, we had already in 1914 taken the first step.

I have been impressed by letters from manufacturers from my district who fear this vote may lead to involvement, who say that this munitions business may mean temporary profits to them, but they are opposed for America's sake.

A Member of this House said on Tuesday that he was not in sympathy with all the screaming of the mothers of this country that we keep the embargo for the protection of their sons. Mr. Speaker, the cries of the mothers of this country in the year 1917 still ring in my ears. Some of them came to my office and literally threw themselves on the floor and clasped my knees and begged me to keep their boys from being taken away. When I said to them that my own two sons had already gone they answered, "Oh, yes; but you are a public man; you have to do those things." Yes; a public man's sons had to be the first to go; and the wife of the public man went about her duties with her chin held high and a smile on her lips, but with anguish in her heart.

I hate Hitler now just as I hated the Kaiser then. I believed that my boys and the boys of those anguished mothers were

offering their lives in a noble cause. Today, as I read the history of the first World War, and consider the iniquities of the Treaty of Versailles, and all the long chain of evil consequences that it involved, I wonder whether Europe could not have made better peace in 1915 or 1916 than it made in 1919. I wonder whether we would not have served the Allies better if, instead of becoming a party to their slaughter and their hatreds, we had tried to help them to an earlier and a juster peace.

We lost our chance to work for peace in those days. Are we throwing away our chance to work for peace today? Is not our duty at least to try for peace before we commit ourselves to begin the manufacture and shipment of arms and poison gas? Our boys may or may not be involved as a result of our vote, but millions of mothers in other lands are waiting with bated breath and a clutching at their hearts for our decision. I have stood before my people again and again and promised, "You can rest assured my vote will never be cast for sending our boys to fight in any war on foreign soil." No pledge that I have ever made has evoked such a heartfelt response. I intend to vote today against what might be a first step in the violation of that pledge. In casting my vote to sustain the embargo on arms I believe sincerely that I am casting a vote for peace. [Applause.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER].

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Speaker, in the consideration of the resolution now before us I believe it is of primary importance for us to decide at the beginning the purpose of its adoption. In fact, that decision will to a very large degree determine the entire issue. If we have in mind a policy of neutrality as the safest course to pursue to avoid involvement in the present war in Europe, the resolution will take one form. On the other hand, if our object is something other than an impartial treatment of the belligerents abroad, then the resolution can very properly be of an entirely different character.

The issue resolves itself, therefore, Mr. Speaker, into one of policy rather than procedure. Is it our intention to conform to the declared purposes of this resolution by the enactment of neutrality legislation, or do we intend, under the guise of neutrality, to find an avenue for the expression of our prejudice? Neutrality will take one course; prejudice will go in a different direction. It was my understanding, and I believe it is still so understood by our people, that our purpose was the consideration of legislation designed to protect our neutrality, with the conviction that such neutrality would assure the greatest measure of security against our possible involvement in the war in Europe. Will the hope of the American people for peace be realized by following the advice of Washington to "observe good faith and justice toward all nations," or will these aspirations be attained by disregarding the warning which he sounded that "passionate attachments for others should be excluded"? It is for us to choose between these two courses—"good faith and justice toward all nations" or "passionate attachments for others." That choice will determine our course.

If we decide that the welfare and security of our people depend upon the long-established and traditional policy of "unentangling alliances," we will go one way; but, if the passion to intervene in the affairs of others has persuaded us to abandon this time-honored policy, then, of necessity, we must head in the opposite direction. Which is the probable pathway to peace? Which is the likely road to war?

The truce under which the nations of Europe have lived for a few short years has ended. It has been just another in the series of truces that have marked the centuries of struggle for power in the Old World. Europe is once again at war. Age-old quarrels, implemented by new ambitions and intensified by new passions and new intrigues, have been revived. Men march, women wonder, hearts hesitate as the war lords resume command in Europe. It marks the complete collapse of the idealism which prompted our abandonment of a fixed foreign policy some 20 years ago.

At the present time America is at peace with the world. And what is more important, we can, I believe, if we have the will to do so, stay at peace with the world. Why should it be otherwise? America took no part in the discussions which led up to this conflict. We had no place there. The representatives of Europe conferred on the redrawing of maps and the realigning of power. It was they who decided that war was to be the solution of their problem. It was they who cast the die which plunged their nations into another death struggle. It was they who concluded that their future depended upon the results of this disaster. The American people had made no agreement guaranteeing the sovereign rights or the territorial boundaries of any nation in Europe. The American people had given no assurance on which any of the governments of Europe could base any hope for military assistance in the event of war. As a people we were not involved in the diplomatic maneuvers or the calculated commitments which preceded this catastrophe. As a Nation, we were supposed to have withdrawn from the game of power politics in Europe after the close of the World War.

The proximate events leading up to the present tragedy in the Old World are a matter of record. The remote causes are also well known. Neither need be recited in detail at this time. Suffice it to say, that the course which I advocate places no stamp of approval on the cruel persecutions, the religious oppressions, or the terrorizing aggressions of any dictator. As an individual, I claim the right to denounce and condemn such practices, and I deny categorically the implication which is attempted to be made that a refusal to intervene in the conflict is tantamount to condoning these acts. They cannot be excused or condoned. As I see it, Mr. Speaker, they are the disastrous consequences and the pathetic results of the disintegration brought on by the World War and of the mistaken motives of the peace that followed, both of which invited the tyranny of a man to assert itself as a saving force for a nation. Like the present war, this tyranny was the sad aftermath of the idealistic crusade which prompted our previous abandonment of a fixed foreign policy.

The present war, causing, as it must, interruptions and dislocations in our normal relations with the belligerents, very naturally concerns us as a nation. Of necessity we must adopt some plan as the basis for our conduct toward and our treatment of those engaged in hostilities. A decision of some kind must be made. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that we must decide on one of two alternatives—involvement or noninvolvement, neutrality or unneutrality. I can see no middle course. We will intervene and thus invite involvement, or we will pursue a policy of neutrality and thereby guard against such involvement.

The main problem before the House today is the question of lifting the embargo on arms and ammunition. There is little fundamental disagreement on other matters. On this question, however, there is a division of opinion. Both sides to the controversy contend that the course which they advocate will carry out the mandate of the American people to keep out of war. The proponents and the opponents of the lifting of the embargo represent two conflicting schools of thought. Those who urge lifting the embargo believe that America must join with other nations to punish aggressors, that we must assume a responsibility in a program of collective security, that we must lend our aid to the establishment of quarantines, that we must join in righteous crusades to enforce peace, that we may resort to "measures short of war" for the purpose of restraining others from going to war; in a word, that we must take a part in the quarrels of others in the hope of stopping the quarrel. Have I overstated these obligations? If I have, the fault lies with those who have advocated their assumption—and our own President suggested both the establishment of quarantines and the possible use of "measures short of war." I say the fault lies with those who have advocated, not with those who have opposed, them. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that common

sense tells us that conduct of this kind will inevitably make friends of some nations and enemies of others. Will a nation accept a quarantine as a friendly gesture? Can it be denied that if we suggest hostility we naturally will invite hostility? Can we cooperate with one belligerent without antagonizing the other belligerent? Does this tend to possible involvement or noninvolvement?

The repealists claim that this cooperative effort, including assistance during hostilities, comes within the range of neutrality. To make such cooperation effective a verdict of guilt or innocence as between belligerents must be reached. Thereupon the sentence is to be carried out by the one called upon to decide whether such guilt or innocence exists. The judge, the jury, and the executioner are one and the same person.

Since this policy of cooperation requires the determination of guilt or innocence, it becomes necessary to vest wide discretionary power to decide this question. The repealists demand the delegation of such powers to the President so as to enable him to decide with whom this Nation should join in a campaign of a type, which in 1937 he characterized as a "quarantine." I contend, Mr. Speaker, the delegation of such discretion is fraught with danger no matter who the President may be. It is a surrender by the Congress to the President of one of its most important and far-reaching constitutional powers—the power to declare war. To discriminate between two enemies may easily be construed as an unfriendly act by the one against whom the indictment is laid. I fear, Mr. Speaker, that such discrimination will set in motion forces which cannot be stopped short of actual involvement, and that the price which we would undoubtedly pay for the decisions reached would be our active participation in hostilities. Does this course tend to war or lead toward peace?

Those who favor this policy base its justification on high moral purposes. With this claim before us it is difficult to understand the attitude of the repealists in objecting to an embargo being placed on poison gas. Many of us had hoped that at least some limitation might be placed upon this fearful phase of the conflict abroad. Can it be said that lofty purposes and noble motives and a fine sense of moral values will fail to blush in shame as the responsibility for this type of warfare fastens itself upon the proponents of repeal? Will the record of poison gas when it is written calm the conscience and quiet the soul of those who seem bent on furthering its fiendish use?

These are questions that must be answered. We must face facts—cold, barren, unadorned facts—which no amount of empty phrases can conceal and no amount of fervid enthusiasm can cover. Lifting the embargo on arms and ammunition is the plan of those whose basic philosophy approves going to war as the means of securing peace. Lifting the embargo is the avenue by which our intervention in the World War is endorsed and by which it is sought to catapult us into some form of a League of Nations. Lifting the embargo propels us as a partner into the game of power politics in Europe and gives us a stake in the gamble of dictatorships. These are fundamental propositions; they are matters of fact, and if they be such facts as draw certain conclusions, then surely I cannot be responsible for the results of the statement. The conclusions spring from the facts themselves. The American people need neither fiction nor imagination to give them the grim outlines of what our last romantic adventure entailed. Memory is all-sufficient for this purpose. And I am persuaded, Mr. Speaker, that neither their sympathies nor resentments will induce them to embark on another crusade.

Those who oppose lifting the embargo believe that a program of neutrality is the pathway to peace, and that it conforms to the long-established policy urged upon us in the early life of the Republic to avoid "entangling alliances." Such a program we believe is one of realism rather than idealism. It profits by our past experiences instead of gambling on future experiments. It restrains us from attempting another enthusiastic enterprise "to make the world safe for democracy" or to engage in "a war to end war." We believe that the way of peace does not lie in an attempted return to unrealized idealism, the failure of which is so shockingly before us today, but in applying to the problems of the present those principles which time and experience have so abundantly vindicated. We are convinced that our intervention in the quarrels of Europe will neither cure the ills nor remove the causes. We believe that our duty at home is greater by far than our responsibility abroad. We believe that the peace of America is something more than to be hoped for. We believe it must be planned for—and that plan, we believe, must rest upon an impartial treatment of all belligerents. The plan may not be ingenious, but it is safe.

The fact is, Mr. Speaker, we will never stumble into this war. If we get in—and God grant that we will not—we will be led into it, led into it by pursuing policies which will invite the antagonism of one and encourage the favor of the other. We will get in if we have an inordinate ambition to determine the balances of power in Europe and crave a desire to help in remaking the map of the continent. I believe that our relations with other nations involve too much to be trifled with. We cannot blow hot and cold. Vacillation has no place in international relations. We are either interventionists or noninterventionists. We owe a duty, and a solemn duty, to the American people to disclose to them the basis upon which we deal with other nations, so that they in turn may endorse and approve the fundamental philosophies upon which our relations depend, or reject and disavow them. If we are to be interventionists, let us tell them so. If the effort to put us into a League of Nations is to be revived, let us declare it unequivocally as a part of the plan. If our destiny depends upon a "collective security" policy and a participation in the politics of the Old World, let us so advise our people. If we are to join in a concerted action of "quarantine" in all quarters of the globe, let us acquaint our people with their new responsibilities. Those of us who oppose the lifting of the embargo on arms, Mr. Speaker, are not reconciled to these commitments nor do we believe that they represent the will of the American people.

We believe, Mr. Speaker, that in spite of the stress which the present strain brings, in spite of the winds of passion that beat upon us, in spite of the great waves of emotion and sympathy that toss us about, and the fury of the unrelenting gale of propaganda that twists the truth into distorted fabrications, we believe that our people have not been torn loose from their moorings, that they still have one fixed and resolute purpose, to remain, as the Father of our Country prayed that it might remain "unentangled and free." In opposing the lifting of the embargo we reaffirm our faith in a fundamental American philosophy of noninvolvement and reject the seductive overtures of those whose imagination, rather than experience would determine our national destiny. Our duty, as we see it, is to hold high a torch of living light rather than brandish a flame of intolerant hate. We hope to be peacemakers, not participants.

Mr. Speaker, I have consistently supported every national-defense program that has come to the House since I became a Member. I believe in an adequate national defense, and that such a defense of necessity must be measured in the light of world conditions. I intend to continue this course. I believe it is our first duty in these days of conflict abroad to provide for a defense which will command the respect of any and every nation, and which will be adequate to protect the honor and the integrity of the country. I believe that every safeguard should be provided which will insure the peace and tranquility of our people and which will impress our strength upon any who threaten the invasion of our rights. Such a defense, Mr. Speaker, would be a defiant note of independence to any ambitious dictator. I make this declaration, Mr. Speaker, as an answer to those who claim that nonintervention is the wail of a weakling or the cry of a coward.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the war abroad should increase our interest in our own national defense, and that, instead of concerning ourselves with supplying arms and ammunition to others, we should direct our energies to the expeditious completion of our own defense plans. Examine

for yourselves the records of our military mechanization. Examine for yourselves the record of our naval construction. Determine in your minds whether we would not do well to use our ingenuity and energy to consummate the plans which have been advocated or authorized by the Congress and which have been supplemented by the President's suggestion as necessary for our defense needs.

Shall it be said that we must experiment in the making of munitions for others in order to learn how to do this for ourselves? Shall it be said that our defense depends on the establishment of an arsenal for others? I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the lifting of the embargo on arms will be a handicap, not a help to the national defense. It will negative the pronouncements of the President and the purposes of the Congress that present world conditions require a national defense second to none. With such a defense we will be prepared to defend our position in this hemisphere and command respect everywhere.

For myself, Mr. Speaker, I can take no other course than oppose the lifting of the embargo. I have reached no hasty conclusion. I have counted the costs as I see them. I believe I have but one duty—to be true to my own conviction as an American. I believe my people seek peace and intend to pursue it. I believe that the Nation's integrity and its honor may be maintained without becoming involved abroad. I believe that our task is one of realism, not romance.

I have an abiding faith in the stability of our people, in the steadfastness of their devotion—a faith in their moral courage and in their spiritual strength. That faith stands firm today. It is the substance of my hope that by the energetic pursuit of peace America may render a real world service. In this fateful hour may that faith likewise be to us the evidence of a cherished destiny as yet unseen.

What doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God?

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN].

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JONES of Texas). The gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I feel that I may be trespassing in asking the attention of the membership, because what I intend to say has been said by others probably better than I could say it, and I make this apology; but I do believe that some of the things that have been said will bear repeating. In asking the attention of the membership for these few minutes I request that I be not interrupted, because I shall not yield.

The other day when this debate began I expressed the high hope that when it was over we could be proud of ourselves because of its character. I believe my hope has been justified by the quality of debate we have had.

I have heard many speeches—proper ones, of course—that would indicate that the United States was upon the verge of war. I regret this, for I do not believe we are either on the verge of war or anywhere near it. [Applause.] In my opinion, every Member in this House is utterly opposed to this country's getting into the war that is now more or less raging in Europe. [Applause.] I believe every patriotic citizen in America is determined also to help keep this country out of war. How best to do this is a subject of legitimate argument.

We are at peace with all the world. There is war in Europe. It is not of our making. The President of these United States did everything and reached the very bounds of his prerogatives in trying to keep down the war in Europe. One hundred and thirty million people in America, along with countless millions throughout the earth, prayed unceasingly that this cup might pass from any part of the world. It did not, and certain nations are at war. We are trying to stay out.

The question has been raised here—and it does not appeal to me at all, let me say—of changing some rules during the progress of the game.

Whose game? It is certainly not one in which we are engaged. We have no part in the game that is being played in Europe. If that question must be argued, may I say that every country upon the face of this earth was put upon notice early this year that a proposal to change the neutrality law of this country was in the making. This was offered and recommended by the President of the United States and the Congress began acting. The House of Representatives during the last session and before war was declared in Europe enacted an amendment to the neutrality law. The bill went to the Senate. The Senate Committee on Foreign Relations voted to put off consideration of that measure until the January session. As with any other proposal of any administration of the Congress when it is in process of enactment, be it a tariff law, be it a tax law, be it a social law, everybody has been put on notice. In the case of a tax law everyone in America that would pay taxes under the law if it went into effect is put upon notice that at the taxpaying time of the following year he will in all probability come under its terms, cut his cloth, fix his business, and make up his budget with that in view. So this matter of changing the rules in the middle of the game or in the game at all could not apply to anyone in Europe engaged in the present war because they were put on notice we were going to try to enact another bill. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, this game has been going on in Europe for 6 years with some nations. I think everyone admits that one nation in Europe has been arming for something during the past 6 years. For what? We did not know a few months ago. But with a law upon the statute books like we have today, if every other country in the world had peace and were trying to be neutral had a law like we have, a rich nation that owned its own munitions factories or had the money to buy munitions of war could without war being declared pile up as much ammunition as they could use in a 3-year or even a 5-year war, with unsuspecting small nations lying at their door, without factories for the manufacture of munitions, without the money to buy them unless they were placed in dire need by invasion of their territory. Is that a game that is quite fair? I do not think it is.

Is it immoral to sell munitions of war to somebody who was not the aggressor, who did not want war, who did not prepare for war? Is it unfair to sell them even a musket to defend that sacred place known as their fireside and their home and their inalienable right to liberty? It seems to me that would be a little bit cruel. Is it immoral to sell a Chinaman a gun with which to protect his land, his community, or his home? Is it immoral, and against the nations that are armed to the teeth, when an unarmed nation is attacked, to sell that unarmed nation, any place on the earth, something with which to defend itself, not for the purpose of being an aggressor, but only to defend that which is sacred and near and dear to them? I cannot see any immorality in that.

Nothing has been said in this debate, and no proposal has been made here or elsewhere that we refuse to sell arms and ammunition to Russia, a neutral; to Italy, a neutral; or to any other neutral in all of Europe. There is no condition that we can put on at the time of sale that will prevent resale to one of the belligerents. So, in effect, when you are selling to the neutrals you may be selling to one of the belligerents. I think we all might understand now where the great neutral country of Russia stands in the conflict and where the great neutral country of Italy stands in this conflict.

Mr. Speaker, we have a practical proposition here. The House passed a bill; the Senate passed a substitute or amendment to the House bill. What are you going to do about it? Are you going to send that bill back to the Senate and ask for a conference, giving the House conferees freedom of action? The Senate conferees are certainly not going to be instructed. It is going to be a free conference as far as the Senate of the United States is concerned. The Senate, by more than a 2 to 1 vote, passed a bill. It put in the bill repeal of the arms embargo. It also put in that bill a provision which would prevent American citizens from traveling

on belligerent ships. It also put in that bill a provison that American ships be prohibited from going into belligerent zones.

Keep us out of war? The doing of those two things prohibited in the Senate bill got us into the World War 22 years ago. Do you want to fail to write those provisions into the law of this land? If you want to write those provisions into the law, the thing to do today is to send the bill to conference and have the conferees free. Suppose the House conferees were instructed to stand by the Shanley amendment or by the Vorys amendment and they took their instructions to be that they could never yield? The Senate conferees by a command of more than 2 to 1 would say, "We cannot yield, and we will not yield on other points unless you yield on the arms embargo." In that case you would have no law. That is a terrible responsibility to take, and I, for one, will refuse to take it. [Applause.]

Let us think a little about the situation we are in and what might be the result of our act. What a picture we would have with no legislation at all. We would have reckless American citizens traveling on belligerent ships. We would have reckless American shipowners sending their ships into danger zones with American cargoes and with American sailors. What would be the reaction in a great conservative country like yours and mine, in which, as I stated, 99 percent of the people are praying that they may stay out of this war, if an American ship were sunk and 100, 200, or 500 innocent boys were sent to the bottom of the ocean? I tremble to contemplate what might be the reaction of this country to the sinking of ships and the destruction of American lives while we were asserting our right to ship any place in the world.

I saw this country—and I was a Representative in the Congress of the United States at that time, when there occurred the loss of lives and the violation of rights we then claimed—I saw this country converted from a peace to a war mind in 60 days. Five million men were called to arms, and two million of them went across the sea. We in America stand today in the backwash of that great conflict. Hopes were blasted, and the faiths of lifetimes were blotted out, and they have never returned. I pray God that as a Member of this body I may never be called on again to move an army under this flag. [Applause.] But I fear, Mr. Speaker, that if we do not enact these provisions, if we do not make it certain that the conferees are free to bring back a bill with these provisions in it, something may happen that will inflame the minds of this people again.

I am not disturbed about America. I believe the heart and the soul of America is still fine. It has been less than a century and three-quarters since the farmers drew up along the lanes of Lexington, and there asserted their inalienable right to freedom of action when they violated the rights of nobody else. I am an optimist not only about my own land but about the whole world. I know that, however we may divide in this House on this or any other question, if those rights are ever invaded or challenged by a foreign foe there will be a lane of Lexington drawn up in every nook and cranny of this land. [Applause.] I have faith, I have hope, and I have the confidence in our people, and the people to the ends of the earth to believe that imbedded in them is more good than there is bad when that emotion is appealed to. I cannot help but feel, and believe that the individual, the nation, or the civilization that forgets and denies God is doomed and damned, which I believe it should be. [Applause.]

I am one of those who want to see this thing done in the best way, and the way that we will be best understood, so nobody can say we have taken them by surprise or that we have changed the rules in the middle of the game; a game, in my opinion, in which we are not engaged, a game—let me repeat—in which we have no part; a game in which I pray God we may never have any part. [Applause.]

I express the hope and belief that in the years to come the people not only of our land but throughout the length and breadth of this earth will be inspired and guided, under God, by the teachings and precepts of the Man who more than nineteen centuries ago walked the Galilean land, and that again throughout the world, with dictators forgotten, with freedom fought for, attained, and maintained, goodness, good will, and peace will come. [Applause, Members rising.]

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, I have listened to different Members call upon God to give them a clear conscience to sell instruments of death and destruction to one belligerent to destroy the sons of mothers of another belligerent. But this is not a religious crusade. Religion is not all in one nation or in any set of nations. Like patriotism, it is common to all people. No man or nation has a monopoly of it.

Just why any Member should so far forget his religious teaching as to call upon God Almighty to help him destroy other people when the Fifth Commandment expressly says that "Thou shall not kill," is beyond me. These Members had better call upon the other fellow—Satan—as the one who does the killing and who will enter into a league with them in that unholy business. There is no need of getting excited. We know that in this resolution we are dealing with the lives of millions of young men of all nations, and perhaps ultimately with the lives of our own sons.

Oh, I am familiar with the argument we have just heard. I heard that same argument in 1914 here in Washington, and I heard it again in the campaign of 1916. "He kept us out of war." I was here in Washington in 1917 when the same argument and the same God was called upon to get us into war and to help us kill other nations' people. At that time they first protested that we were going to stay out of war, and then they gradually eased us into it—eased into the struggle—and we had no business there. [Applause.]

In the name of the Senate's fake neutrality resolution we are here in reality debating intervention. We are debating the un-American venture of selling arms, munitions, and implements of war to one set of belligerents with which to assassinate their own and other belligerents' youngsters. There is no neutrality or morality in mass murder, and I do not care which side we assist. Until 1917 we had sense enough to mind our own business and keep out of European quarrels.

I am opposed to raising the embargo on arms, munitions, and implements of war. Therefore I shall vote for the Shanley amendment. "The way to disarm is to disarm." These were the words of President Roosevelt in his message to Congress a few years ago. May Congress now send him a message that "The way to be neutral is to be neutral in reality and not in make-believe." [Applause.] It is not to sell arms, munitions, and implements of war—of death and destruction—to any belligerent nation. That is not neutrality. It may again involve us in a foreign war.

This is not our war. We have not yet designated Great Britain or any other nation to select wars for us. We have no quarrel of our own with any of the belligerent nations. No European nation has insulted or is threatening us. If we have any just cause to fight any nation, then let us have the manhood and the courage of doing it. Let us not ship arms to some other nation to kill the sons of men and women in this world. That is not a manly act; it is a cowardly act. Whom do you want to kill? Will you tell me? And if you do not want to kill anyone, why do you want to sell to any nation the instruments that do the killing? Let us not play the part of a coward and in the name of neutrality assist one set of belligerents against another.

We have turned our press, our theater, and our radio over to some nations to spread their false propaganda. It is a repetition of 1914. We may again burn a Bob La Follette in effigy and afterward apologize for our mistake. Let us not repeat the mistake. We have plenty to do to take care of our own people.

While our hearts ache for the youth of all Europe, yet there is nothing that we can do to help them. They themselves must get rid of their oppressors and establish the United States of Europe. Until that is done there will be no permanent peace or democracy in Europe.

This is Europe's war. As the editor of the Louisville Courier-Journal so ably says:

From now on America must be careful, careful, because from now on America will be bombarded from without by pleas, sophistical reasoning, false atrocity stories, selfish, ax-grinding propaganda of all descriptions; and from within by bugle blowers, flag wavers, munitions-making lobbyists, overly sentimental jackasses, unassimilable foreign groups, and all the rest of the lunatic bacteria that international strife always uncovers.

America has no business in Europe at a time like this; no business. Make no mistake about that. Their quarrels are not our quarrels and need never be unless we make them so. If we get drenched in their showers of blood it'll be only because we didn't have the common sense to mind our own affairs and keep them on the right side of the Atlantic. * * *

As for the moral aspect, the who-right-who-wrong question, no debate on any other subject whatsoever could be more stupid and futile—and dangerous. No nation is entirely good, no nation entirely bad. Thinking so brands the "thinker" a fool. This war is merely the continuation of the 1914–18 edition, the result, to a great extent, of subjecting a proud and worthy people to one of the most vicious, vindictive, and short-sighted "peace" pacts ever conceived by so-called civilized men, the terrible Versailles Treaty.

The United States is the melting pot of all nationalities. Some nationalities have not melted quite fast enough. There are still some hyphenated Americans. Of course, it is natural for us to sympathize with different nations, depending upon our ancestry. But, after all, there is room for just one thing, and that is for all of us to be pro-American. It is just as un-American to be pro-British as to be pro-Russian, pro-Italian, pro-German, or pro anything else. Where is Mr. DIES' committee? Why does it not investigate all of these un-American activities so that we can get rid of all of them? Let us be tolerant of one another's sympathies but let none of us ever forget that the United States comes first, last, and all the time.

Let us be intellectually honest with ourselves. We know there are no angels among the warring rulers in Europe. They are all aggressors. If you would take Stalin, Churchill, Hitler, Duff Cooper, Mussolini, Chamberlain, and Daladier and put them into a barrel and roll it down a mountainside you would always find an aggressor on top. Our witnesses are Poland, Ethiopia, the Boer Republic, Palestine, Morocco, and India. The belligerent nations are all equally guilty, just as the youth who in the past have done and in the future will do the fighting and the dying are all equally innocent.

We were tricked, propagandized, and lied into the last war. The *Lusitania*, a British passenger boat, was loaded with munitions by Great Britain and our citizens were invited to their destruction. You can answer who was guilty of this outrage. The fact that the *Lusitania* was loaded with munitions was known to some of our officials but kept from the Secretary of State, William Jennings Bryan. Let us hope that the *Athenia* did not suffer the same fate for the same unholy purpose—to arouse our emotions and involve us in a foreign war.

Undoubtedly, Lord Beaverbrook again told the President that this was our war—that they were fighting for democracy—to protect us. Did you ever see a yellow dog get into a fight and then yelp loud enough so that every respectable dog in the community finally got into the scramble? Undoubtedly, that yellow cur too yelped that he was fighting the battle of the other dogs. He, too, yelped for cash and carry and a $2,000,000,000 stabilization fund.

Suppose someone got control of all the bridges between the District of Columbia and Virginia, and that later he got into a fight with that State. Then suppose we sold him cash-and-carry arms and poisonous gas with which he destroyed sons of that State. Would Virginia think we were neutral, or would she consider us an accomplice before and after the fact?

Then substitute Great Britain, who has control of the ocean. Great Britain, who still unlawfully searches our ships on the high seas. Now you will have a true meaning of this so-called Pittman neutrality resolution.

This resolution is the first step into the European conflict. Step by step we will be eased into it, the same as in 1914. Then we went from "neutrality in spirit" to "too proud to fight" to "benevolent neutrality" to "armed neutrality" to "military intervention." Let us not get into another war via cash and carry and the stabilization fund. The price comes too high.

Let us be American citizens. Let us not become a party to manslaughter any place, and I can guarantee you that there is no danger to America. No nation or combination of nations can ever attack us successfully, and if they do we will send them to the place where it never gets cold. [Applause.]

Why shed crocodile tears? Great Britain and France are responsible for this war. The revelations made by the Russian Government after its revolution show that she, Great Britain, and France were equally responsible, if not the aggressors, in 1914. Then, after we won that war for the Allies they grabbed everything in sight. They laid the egg in 1920—the Versailles Treaty—out of which Mussolini and Hitler were hatched.

Let us bring 1914 up to date. Let us assume that Mexico, Russia, and France entered into an alliance—that Mexico's purpose for the alliance is to get back Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, and California. Then suppose the President returned from a fishing trip and found that Russia had been mobilizing her Army, that then he wired to Stalin and asked him to stop mobilization because it meant war. Suppose that Stalin replied that it was too late, he could not stop it.

Then, let us say, war starts and after 4 years Great Britain takes the role the United States took in 1914 and showers us from the air with "14 points." Suppose these "14 points" are agreeable to us and we lay down our arms, but to find that we are denied the right to sit at the council table.

Then after the loot had been divided among the so-called democracies we are called in to sign the treaty and admit that we started the war. Then suppose that Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, and California are given to Mexico; Alaska to Russia; Florida to Spain; New England to Canada; and Michigan, North Dakota, Minnesota, and Montana are made buffer States.

Suppose that, in addition, Canada wants an outlet to the Gulf of Mexico; that she is given a corridor through what is left of the United States and New Orleans is made a free city. Then would we not also have a Hitler? Would we not have taken back at the first opportunity that which was taken away from us? No matter which European nation you may sympathize with let me ask you these questions: Do you again wish to have your sons leave part of their limbs and their health in Europe? Some of their bodies on "Flanders Field"? Do you wish them again to wallow in the filth, the mud, and the blood of foreign battlefields? These are the questions for you fathers and mothers to decide.

If we are again lied into this war will there be another Coolidge, another Hoover, and another Roosevelt to veto the soldiers' bonus bills? Will the profiteers again form an economy league to uphold such vetoes? And will it again be necessary for Congress to pass another bonus bill over the President's veto?

Let us mind our own business. We have the best Government on the face of the earth. Let us protect it. If we get into this war we ourselves will have a Hitler. The itch already exists at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue.

If Congress would now promptly refuse to repeal the embargo there would undoubtedly be peace in Europe within 6 weeks. The truth is that Great Britain again wants other nations to fight her war for "power politics." As expressed here the other day, Great Britain will fight until the last Frenchman is killed and the last American dollar spent.

If we pass this Senate so-called neutrality resolution—intervention resolution—it will be drenched in rivers of tears, soaked in the blood of Europe's civilization, and perhaps our own. It will be saturated with treacherous, poisonous gas—a murderous weapon that has not been used to date in the present war, but the use of which the Senate legalizes in this resolution.

I wonder how the Members who voted us into the World War in 1917 feel when they see our colleague from Connecticut [Mr. MILLER] wheeled into this Chamber. He left

both of his legs in France "to make the world safe for democracy."

I wonder if those who were responsible for our entry into that conflict can give a satisfactory answer to themselves and to our colleague. Can they tell themselves, and can they tell him why and what for? I wonder if they realize that the same forces; the same mad emotions aroused by false propaganda are again controlling their action.

Let us not list our sons as eligible for service, but if war comes as a result of our action, let us go ourselves. Let us not say "go" to our sons, but rather "come." Let us not use our political position to obtain swivel-chair jobs for ourselves and our sons and let the sons of others do the fighting and the dying because of something that we started. Let us see to it that we get front seats in the first-line trenches in France, where the British ought to be, so that we can at least extinguish ourselves with honor in the European insanity, which insanity is so magnificently and splendidly propagandized in our own country. I say where the British ought to be, because you and I know that Great Britain will fight until the last Frenchman is killed and the last dollar of the stabilization fund spent.

In the name of all that is good, in the name of morality and humanity, and in the name of the fathers and mothers of all the sons of the belligerent nations and of our own sons, I ask you to vote for the Shanley amendment. Have a heart. [Applause.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McLEOD] as much time as he may desire.

PEACE OR WAR

Mr. McLEOD. Mr. Speaker, the question before us today is fundamentally the question of peace or war. When we vote on this all-important question now pending before the National House of Representatives, it is our prerogative to follow one course or the other: Peace or war. [Applause.]

Peace, the Christian; war, the barbarian. Peace, the happy, natural state of manhood; war, his corruption, his disgrace.

This so-called neutrality measure as it comes to us in the House from the Senate of the United States can have only the effect of increasing the inhumanities of the war already being waged in Europe and of bringing the horrors of that war closer to our people.

It is a repudiation of America's age-old and persistent plea that war should be exiled. It brands as hypocritical all the efforts of the statesmen of our past and our present to lessen the horrors and inhumanities of war by preachment and by covenant with other nations.

I abominate, no less than my colleagues, the practices of some of the nations now involved in the struggle in Europe.

But I abominate even more the very thought that our people should in any way facilitate the ruthless, the wanton, the heartless, and cold-blooded murder of the women and children who will be slain by the bombs and bullets that this measure as it stands would send from this country to Europe.

Mr. Speaker, you know the feelings and the heart of man. You know as I do that no man of any nation will ever remain calm and unbiased toward a people who have contributed in any way to the slaying of his loved ones. Loved ones who have committed no crime, who are as innocent in this war as your children and mine.

Yet this bill, probably by accident, and certainly not by design, makes a double attack on the women and children of all of the nations at war.

Every war involves a greater or less relapse into barbarism. War, indeed, in its details is the essence of inhumanity. It dehumanizes. It may save the state, but it destroys the citizen. War destroys in 1 year the work of many years of peace.

In the first place, we all know what this bill, with its elimination of the embargo on arms and munitions of war, will do. As soon as that embargo is lifted hundreds and eventually thousands of bombing airplanes will be started for Europe, either under their own power or on ships.

And while they will leave their new European ports undoubtedly with instructions to confine their operations to military objectives, we all know what happened in Poland. We read of hundreds of children and hundreds of women, as well as noncombatant males, who were ruthlessly slaughtered. Of course, we were told that this was only incidental and inadvertent to the destruction of military bases. But the point I make is, that regardless of whether they are killed by accident or ruthlessly slain, they will find their bodies broken and maimed by American bombs and American machine-gun bullets dropped from American planes. True, our men will not be flying the planes or pulling the triggers, but it will be the repeal of the existing embargo that will have sent these war machines and these bombs and bullets overseas. Is that humanity? Is that what this House, representative of the American people and of their ideals, is going to vote for?

Now there can be only one answer to the landing of those American-made bombs on the homes of the belligerent not being serviced or supplied by America. And that answer to that scorned or deprived belligerent is a similar, or even worse, frightfulness over the homes of the favored warring countries.

For God and humanity's sake, I beseach you, my colleagues, not to be parties to this unendurable horror by voting to repeal our neutrality, to repeal the embargo on arms and munitions.

It is clear to me that America sacrifices her much vaunted humanitarian principles when she contributes thus to war's horrors.

For the past month my office has been flooded with letters from constituents discussing the neutrality question from every conceivable angle. All are united in the one thought of keeping American boys and men on this side of the now treacherous sea.

To this view I subscribe wholeheartedly. We should direct our energies toward peace and national defense of the United States.

In a concerted effort to avoid war's dangers in the future, Congress enacted three neutrality laws between 1935 and 1937.

Back in 1935 when the first Neutrality Act was passed, it was enacted on the basis that one of the most effective ways of staying out of war was to refuse to sell arms and ammunitions to countries at war.

It was thought then, and should be the thought now, that to take the profits out of war would be to stay out of war. Congress by an overwhelming majority adopted that resolution and President Roosevelt approved it.

Only a few months later Congress again reiterated its policy and approved an embargo on the exportation of arms, ammunition, and the implements of war. The vote in the House on that measure was 353 to 27. Again in 1937, Congress approved the arms embargo in legislation which contained still sharper teeth—teeth which the administration is now endeavoring to yank out by the roots.

The Senate passed this legislation by a vote of 63 to 6, while the House gave its approval by a vote of 376 to 12.

These measures met with the approval of the President and they became America's neutrality statutes.

As yet we have had no proof that America could stay out of war if the arms embargo were repealed. History points the other way.

The present neutrality law is not perfect. No one has contended it was perfect. You cannot have perfect legislation in regard to neutrality due to the very inconsistency of the matter with which it deals. No law yet conceived would be flexible enough to cover the interests of the United States in Europe, Asia, and South America simultaneously.

But, let us not take a chance at a time like this. Let us show the European world our version of twentieth century civilization. Let us retain our present neutrality law. Let us continue to take the profits out of war. Let us carry forth the trust our people have placed in us, and hope with all our hearts, that no man living within this country today will live to see scenes reminiscent of 1917.

This world of ours has been tottering since those fearsome days. Another world-wide conflict might wreck it.

There is, as I have said, a second part of this pending bill which, if adopted as it stands, is an assault upon the very lives of the innocent women and children of Europe's warring nations. For, while this bill by lifting the embargo would make death easier, it would by its other provisions make it more difficult even than it is at present to get food, clothing, and those other necessities which are essential to life.

This bill makes it easier to ship bombs and bullets and harder to ship bread and butter.

Is that the position we are to take? Is that how we are to carry on America's traditions?

I submit that there is a distinction between those things which destroy life and those things which preserve life.

I submit, further, that our national position should not be that we want to participate in the destruction of lives but that we do want to aid in preserving life.

The distinction between these things is recognized in our existing law. It prohibits the shipment of destructive forces while permitting, with certain limitations, the shipping of those which, on the other hand, are essential to the preservation of life.

It seems to me unnecessary, after outlining the inevitable consequences of the passage of this bill upon all the warring nations, to point out the subsequent consequences on our own people.

Those consequences will be war. War is bred in hatred and distrust. This bill sows hatred and will breed war.

Our Nation may make millions of dollars by selling our bombers and our bullets. But we are going to give away the lives of our youths, we are going to wreck our families and possibly destroy our civilization.

I have labored over this problem as undoubtedly has every Member of Congress. I reach the conclusion that this bill as it stands would aid in the destruction of Europe and would eventually lead to America's participation in a last and most horrible war.

There is, therefore, only one course for me to take. I shall vote against the repeal of our neutrality; against lifting the embargo on arms, munitions, and implements of war; against American inclusion in the conflict; and against the spread of frightfulness to the women and children in all Europe.

What defense, I repeat, will excuse us for ignoring the solemn injunction of the founder of Christianity, whose words of appeal ring down to us through the ages, "Peace on earth, good will toward men." [Applause.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT] 5 minutes.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, of all that has been said on the subject of neutrality, of all that has been printed, of all that has come to us over the radio, of all that I have heard or read, I am firmly convinced that to repeal the arms embargo at this time the United States of America, in the eyes of the peoples of the world, will be guilty of committing an unneutral act.

Let us take a glimpse at the pages of history, to the eventful days of 1914–15, when the United States was involved in the arms traffic and the American people demanded an arms embargo. At this critical period in our history, Great Britain pointed a restraining finger at these United States of America and told us in no uncertain terms to the effect that, should we enact an arms embargo now that war is in operation, you, the United States, are guilty of an unneutral act.

The statement of Great Britain was agreed with by President Wilson and Secretary of State William Jennings Bryan, with the result that the proposed arms embargo was not adopted.

Mr. Speaker, are we going to forget the findings of the Senate Munitions Committee when they exposed the activities of the munition manufacturers, the international bankers, and others of their ilk, which resulted in the American people demanding and the Congress enacting the existing neutrality law.

Are we going to forget what took place in Spain a few years ago, when the American people demanded that we further strengthen the present neutrality law by the enactment of the arms embargo?

Are we going to turn our backs to the fact that Secretary of State Cordell Hull, Senator KEY PITTMAN, and even our present Chief Executive, as well as Members of this Congress, shouted with glee again and again their approval of the neutrality law containing the arms embargo, and hailing the legislation as a measure to keep America out of war?

Are we going to ignore their frank statements not so many months ago when they advised this Congress and the American people that repeal of the arms embargo, once war is declared, is an unneutral act?

Are we going to ignore the opinions of celebrated authorities on international law who are frank to advise that if we commit this unneutral act of repealing the arms embargo we deliberately invite acts of reprisal and retaliation on the part of Germany?

The mandate of the American people to us Members of Congress is to keep America out of war, and I contend with all my sincerity a vote to repeal the arms embargo is a violation of our sacred duty as representatives of the people, since it is a challenging invitation to German reprisal and retaliation and the first step on the part of this body to plunge America into war.

God forbid that any Member of this body should by his vote be guilty of bringing another World War upon the American people.

Keep in mind the first act of retaliation on the part of Germany means that the American people will demand redress, and then it becomes the duty of Congress, in the preservation of our national honor, to declare war.

War, war, that hideous word that brings heartaches and tears of blood and leaves in its wake a trail of destruction. Can not you gentlemen visualize the march of the youth of our Nation to the training camps and the change that is wrought on these fresh young hearts that transforms them into vicious and blood-thirsty individuals? Let us follow their course to the port of embarkation where they engage on another futile trip to the Old World in an attempt to settle century old disputes.

Are you going to close your eyes to the cemeteries in Europe and here in America where countless American flags mark the last resting place of thousands of the youth of yesterday?

Are you going to erase from your minds the pitiful sights in the 85 Veterans' Administration hospitals in our country today where you find the young men of '17 and '18 with mangled bodies, suffocated lungs, and shadowed minds—still fighting today the World War that they were told was a "war to end all wars"?

Are you content to forget the sorrowful plight of the widow and the orphan, of the gold-star mother, all waiting for the footsteps that will never return?

How can we forget this aftermath of war that has imposed a depression that has hounded every man, woman, and child, for 10 years of untold suffering?

Mr. Speaker, I wish to emphasize again that to repeal the arms embargo at this time is an unneutral act—a violation of international law—a challenge to Germany to retaliate—a step in the direction of our again becoming involved in another European brawl.

My vote shall and must be "no." Do not repeal the arms embargo; and, Mr. Speaker, when I return to mingle among my people—should our country be plunged into war—I am proud to know that I can look into the eyes of every mother and father, wife and child, of the soldier-to-be, knowing that my vote is no cause for their pointing their finger of shame and condemnation for failure to carry out their instructions, their clearly expressed mandate, keep America out of war. [Applause.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman who has just spoken was three times national commander of the Veterans

of Foreign Wars, an organization composed of veterans who fought in foreign lands, and he speaks for the veterans, as he has for many years past.

I now yield 7 minutes to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, first of all I remind the House that there is on the statute books today a so-called Neutrality Act. The distinguished floor leader from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] in his address said that if we did not agree in effect to the bill which repeals the embargo on arms, ammunition, and implements of war passed by the Senate, now before us, we should have no Neutrality Act. Today we have a neutrality law, and I call the attention of the Members of the House to the print of the Foreign Affairs Committee of three bills that have been under consideration—the law in effect now, the bill passed by the Senate, and the bill passed by the House last spring.

Mr. Speaker, I am against the repeal of the Neutrality Act. I am against the repeal of the embargo on arms and munitions of war. I could not make such a cruel arraignment of any one of my colleagues as to say that his vote will be cast insincerely. If a vote were so cast, it would haunt the man or woman who cast it for the rest of his or her days. It is true that there can be no greater love than this, that a man lay down his life for his friend. It is equally true that there should be no greater shame than this, that a man set out to kill his friend for his own benefit, and insincere voting may well bring about the death of his friend.

I know there are honest differences of opinion. I know there has been much soul-searching about the vote we are about to cast for we must all want to do what is best for America.

I am placed in a curious position myself, because, as the members of the Foreign Affairs Committee will remember, I voted against the so-called Neutrality Acts in past years because I thought there were some very unwise provisions in them, some that were likely to bring America into difficulty. But today we have a Neutrality Act on our statute books and it has been the law for a number of years. And, according to personnel of the State Department, authorities such as John Bassett Moore, Charles Cheney Hyde, Professor Borchard of Yale, Dean Roscoe Pound of Harvard, and also, I was told by the members of my own committee, on the minority side, of whom I am so fond, the changing of that law to aid one set of combatants after the countries had gone to war would be in effect unneutral. Germany has already given notice that the lifting of the embargo would be considered unneutral, and that there would be retaliation. When we lift the embargo we cross the bridge from neutrality to unneutrality, we cross the gap from peace to war, I fear. How can I face my conscience if I vote to repeal that act while the war is in progress, if I feel it be unneutral, if I believe later it will be the cause of sending our men to their death? It will not only send our youths to their death, in my opinion, but it will send our country economically to its death.

It is far better to speed up our national defense to such a state of efficiency that no nation would dare to attack us. The cost to this country would be far less if we were to have a navy equaled by none, a navy that could protect our own America and all of the American Hemisphere, and an army that could protect our own land and even protect all of the Western Hemisphere, than it would be to send our commodities, our money, and our men to Europe to fight in this war.

I have watched our international situation steadily since 1914. Overseas I saw those who were running the governments in France and England. I saw men who were directing the army and the navy, and the soldiers in the trenches. I saw the almost pitiful pleasure of those men because the United States had entered the war. I worked with them for a while. You do not forget those things. All my ties are with the British and French, but I do not feel we should enter this fight. America must come first. During the World War, in working overseas for a time, I realized that no human being who saw the horrors of that war at close range can ever forget them. In hospital work for veterans after that and later as a member of the World War Veterans' Committee, I had a chance to see what havoc war played with men and women. As a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee of this House for a number of years, I have listened and taken part in discussions upon international affairs.

Mr. Speaker, I have read speech after speech made in the Senate, I have listened to speech after speech in the House, I have read statement after statement of the administration, and not one of them reassures me. The distinguished majority floor leader spoke of the spirit of the men of Lexington, and of those early colonial days. In my own congressional district I represent the beautiful little town of Lexington. Mr. Majority Floor Leader, how do you suppose those men who fought at Lexington would feel if they realized that we were going to throw their sacrifices to the winds? They fought that day to unshackle the people of this country from the chains of Europe. Every single one of our forebears came to this country for freedom, for liberty. Are we so soon to forget that we left Europe to get away from tyranny, to get away from persecution? If we enter this war, Mr. Speaker, from now on we shall be in every entangling alliance, we shall be in every European intrigue, we shall be in every international conflict. I say it is time to call a halt.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard very little about women and the part they played during the World War. Sometimes perhaps we forget the frail women left behind, women grown old too soon, the women doing men's work, and doing it freely, with all their hearts, even giving their sons and husbands whom they loved more dearly than their own lives, because they felt by so doing they were going to end war. What can we say to those women today and to the fathers, and to the men who fought for us, what can we say to the men today who are in Congress who were disabled by that war, and who are gallantly carrying on; what can we say to them if today, willingly, with our eyes open, we vote to send other men and their sons back to that inferno, to that hell, which is war, that settles nothing?

Mr. Speaker, I presume that what I say today will change no vote, but what I do say I say from the depths of my heart, and out of a sincere conviction. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. ALLEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH].

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of hesitation that I seek to address the House upon this subject. I am painfully aware of the fact that I have done so on many occasions in the past. I doubt if I can add much.

Probably most of you know that from the very beginning I have had no faith in the efficacy of legislation which seeks to establish rigid rules governing the conduct of the Government of the United States in the face of unpredictable events. It was for that reason largely that I voted originally against the arms-embargo provision of our present law—against its reenactment in 1937 and in favor of its repeal last July. At best I think it will not be denied we have embarked upon an experiment in legislation never tried by any other government. We have sought to perfect a precautionary system, as it were, which would protect our peace and safety, and in doing so we have encountered difficulties—some of them unexpected. We have on the statute books today this arms embargo. One would be tempted to believe, after listening to this debate, that its enforcement in the present conflict is our first experience under it, but it is not our first experience. We have already had experience with this same law—not a very happy experience, as I look upon it. It was invoked first, as I recollect it, when Italy attacked Ethiopia. Automatically the embargo against the sale of arms to both of those belligerents, if you could call poor little Ethiopia a real belligerent, went into effect. Italy did not need any arms from outside her borders. She was armed to the teeth. True, of course, Ethiopia had no money and probably less credit, but be that

as it may, we found ourselves in the position of denying to the little man any opportunity, as far as we could prevent it, of gaining weapons for his own defense. I can imagine that Mussolini smiled rather grimly when he read our law.

We had experience with this law in the case of the Spanish civil war. It is not important what I or any of us believe as to the merits of that fearful conflict in Spain. Our law was invoked and neither side could purchase any arms from us. Franco must have smiled as he read our law. He purchased everything that he needed, or it was given to him, from Italy and Germany. His opponents were proportionately handicapped. I have heard it suggested by military people that the weight of weapons—munitions, if you please, arms—was what gained Franco his victory.

So in those two instances I think we see conclusively that our law operates to the advantage of the heavily armed aggressor and to the distinct disadvantage of the little man, who, suddenly attacked, in desperation tries to find a weapon with which to defend himself. [Applause.]

We have had another experience under this law. Mr. Speaker, you and I know that for more than 2 years, almost 3 years, war has been raging in Asia—Japan against China. Our law has not been invoked in that case. Why not? I am not competent to judge the mind or to read the thoughts of the President, but the fact is that the President has not declared that a state of war exists between Japan and China, and without that declaration our famous arms embargo cannot go into effect. How is it that such declaration has not been made? I can only assume that the President has taken advantage of a technicality in that neither Japan nor China has declared war upon the other officially, and thus he has felt justified in refraining from invoking the law which normally is expected to take effect whenever a real war takes place between two or more foreign nations. Why is it, I ask, that advantage has been taken of that technicality? Again I am not competent to judge the mind or read the thoughts, but I suspect that we have refrained from invoking our own law in the case of Japan and China because we know that China is the victim of aggression; that she has no industry competent to supply her with arms, and that to defend her territorial integrity and her independence she must purchase arms elsewhere, and that to invoke our law would, with respect to the securing of arms, be a bitter blow to China and place her at a distinct disadvantage in the face of her powerfully armed and aggressive enemy.

So we see in those three instances that this thing has not worked very well. It is a demonstration, in my view, of the utter impossibility of laying down a rigid rule which shall govern the Government and the people of the United States in the face of unpredictable events. My complaint about it from the beginning is not that we are doing something which we are not required to do under international law, but that we have inserted an element into the foreign policy of the United States, legislating into that policy in permanent form, this thing which I think is unwise. It is unworthy of us and, potentially, it is dangerous, for we cannot tell where it will lead us, none of us can. I would not pretend to predict its possibilities.

I am in favor of the Senate bill as an alternative, a preferable alternative, to the present law. I confess I am not wildly enthusiastic. Already we have found the difficulty of writing a neutrality act, already we are guilty of inconsistencies; and yet I do not object to those inconsistencies, because most of them I believe arose from "commonsensical" considerations. But to demonstrate how difficult it is to write a so-called neutrality act, let us consider the cash-and-carry provision of this bill, which says, in effect, that no American vessel shall carry any articles to a belligerent, and that any belligerent seeking to purchase any article or to acquire them must come here, pay cash on the barrel head, and take them home in his own ships. This sounds awfully nice until you begin to follow its application. Someone suddenly remembers that the Dominion of Canada (a belligerent) is just across Lake Erie and across Lake Ontario and that to apply the cash-and-carry provision to our commerce with Canada would utterly disrupt and destroy our whole economic connection with the Dominion. Visualize a law which forbids an American vessel on Lake Erie leaving Buffalo and going across the Niagara River with some petroleum aboard her. Visualize, if you please, the utter stagnation of the entire commerce of the Great Lakes, and also remember that Canada is our second largest customer, if my recollection of the figures is correct. So we found it necessary to effect in the law an exemption, not mentioning Canada but describing the situation as the "inland lakes bordering upon the United States." Then someone remembers that the West India islands, some of them, are British Crown colonies. They are belligerents. A cash-and-carry provision enforced against them would utterly disrupt our whole economic connection with them, so they are exempted. Then someone remembers that it would be a silly thing to forbid an American ship leaving San Francisco and sailing to Hong Kong, a British Crown colony, but a belligerent, or to Sydney, Australia, or to Auckland, New Zealand. We remember that, and so we exempt the entire Pacific Ocean, the entire Indian Ocean, the Arabian Sea, and I do not know what else.

I mention these little sidelights not that they are in themselves of vital importance, but they tend to illustrate how difficult it is to write a law of this kind and apply it consistently in the face of unpredictables. My regret is that we ever tried it.

There can be no doubt, however, that an overwhelming majority of our people expect the Congress to enact legislation which, if legislation can do it at all, will keep us from being involved in the present conflict. I believe the Senate bill approaches this difficult problem in a realistic way. It refrains from trying to make any distinction between arms on the one hand and raw materials and manufactured products, and food on the other hand. I believe this is the only attitude we can take with respect to the management, if I may use such expression, of our foreign commerce during war. We learned during the World War, and we are learning it again in the present conflict, that none of the belligerents makes the slightest distinction between arms on the one hand and raw materials on the other; all are contraband, and ships carrying them are subject to seizure under international law. If we are to regulate our commerce in time of war we might just as well realize that there is no distinction between arms on the one hand and materials other than arms on the other. In fact, a ship loaded with wheat is in just as much danger of being seized or sunk as a ship loaded with rifles. So I believe the Senate in its cash-and-carry provision at least approaches this difficult problem realistically and that if legislation can keep us out of war, this particular provision will do more in this direction than any other provision that can be drafted. [Applause.]

I believe scarcely a corporal's guard of us here in the House would urge an embargo against all exportations to belligerents, raw materials, food, fuel—I believe scarcely a corporal's guard of us would literally insist upon that, for that would not only be abject surrender but would also inflict misery and unhappiness upon our own people by our own act, and needlessly so. If this provision is enacted, however, it is a fact that no American vessel can become involved in the blockade established by the belligerents in Europe. This being the case we shall be as free as it is humanly possible for us to be free, we shall be free from the occurrence of those incidents of violence which we dread.

It may not be important, it may not even be interesting, Mr. Speaker, but on second thought I feel that the Members of the House will agree with me, that this legislation is being proposed largely because we are afraid of our own emotions. We are afraid that incidents will occur somewhere which will get us angry and drive us into war. It is precautionary legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I am optimistic about the future. I do not believe we are going to be drawn into this war; and, again, I try to look at it realistically. My reading of the history of this country convinces me that the American people will never go to war unless they have become the victims of a

studied, persistent series of overt acts of violence [applause], acts committed not merely by individuals, by cranks, by radicals, but committed at the behest of a foreign government. Without such acts, a series of them, without such acts carried on to such extent that their purpose and motive has become completely recognized I think America does not go to war. Who, Mr. Speaker, is going to commit such acts?

What belligerent is going to commit a seriously violent, overt act against the Government and people of the United States? In a former war a great belligerent tried that. That belligerent took the great gamble. It committed a series of violent, overt acts against the people of the United States, and capped them finally by an announcement that any American vessel that dared enter a vast area of the ocean would be sunk on sight without search, seizure, or mercy. They took the great gamble. They gambled we would not be angry enough to go to war, or that if we did we would be futile in a military sense. They thought they could win the war as it was then going on in Europe before we could get there. Their own Ambassador here in Washington, Von Bernstorff, warned his Government not to do that. He knew that we were getting angry, and again angry, and still angrier, and that we would not take another challenge. But his advice was ignored. They took the great gamble, and they lost the war. [Applause.]

Under this legislation as now proposed in the cash-and-carry provision, overt acts cannot be committed against our ships, because our ships will not be permitted to carry anything to the belligerents in Europe. What overt acts, then, can be committed? I have heard it suggested that sabotage would be instigated here in the United States in the form of explosions and outrages of one sort and another, and that in the face of that possibility we would better pass a law which might keep us free from sabotage. Mr. Speaker, if we are ever to frame the foreign policy of the United States upon the theory that we cannot keep order in our own Government, in our own country, then, by heaven, we would better crawl into a hole and pull the hole in after us. [Applause.]

It may be that madmen are loose in Europe; but as America stands today, in all her might and with all her potential power, I cannot conceive of any man so mad as to invite the United States to be his enemy. [Applause.] So I have never been panicky about our being drawn into this conflict, because I cannot conceive that any of the belligerents wants us to get in there and be its enemy. It would spell their ruin, and they all know it. [Applause.]

Let us be calm about this thing. I do not mean to be impertinent, but I think we have been a little jittery in the last 2 or 3 weeks. What we must do, of course, is keep our heads steady and keep our feet on the ground. Put our house in order. It needs it. Those high in authority in the United States Government should refrain from scolding other nations. [Applause.] Nothing is gained for us or in the interest of peace and liberty by exciting enmity. Perfect our defense. Command respect. I think Theodore Roosevelt expressed it very well when he said, "Speak softly and carry a big stick." [Applause, the Members rising.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED].

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have listened with a great deal of interest to my distinguished colleague from the State of New York. He has made a powerful address directed along the line of commerce and profit. I intend to approach this subject from a different angle.

Pride in ideal achievement, of course, is the source of all progress—at least so we are informed. The United States has made great progress in many fields and in one in particular. There is manufactured in the United States today the swiftest, the most powerful, the most deadly bombing plane known to the world. It is an instrumentality of war for offensive purposes, not defensive. No person can stand beneath the wings of one of these monarchs of the air without feeling a sense not only of admiration but of awe, and when one contemplates the purposes for which it is designed and the potentialities of death which it will carry when it starts on its mission, one stands aghast. It is the last word in military art. But we shall never know just how effective it is until it has been tried out, not in the zones of combat but in the little hamlets and villages nestled in the back country—on the countryside of some nation. I sometimes wonder just how effective this great instrument of war will be and just how destructive it will be. We know there is a move now being made to put it into the channels of foreign commerce—to sell it to other countries for use as an offensive instrument of war.

The distinguished gentleman from New York referred to Ethiopia. I am glad he did. In drawing an illustration, one of many which I have from official records, I will give you a brief picture of just what happened in one little, quiet, peaceful village in that primitive country, Ethiopia, on the 13th of January 1936, if my recollection is correct, 4 long years ago.

The last word in bombing planes at that time under the flag of Italy made three trips over that village within a very few moments. The bombs were released and immediately after the explosions of these bombs men came into the village to record the effectiveness of this instrument of war.

They reported that chunks of human flesh were quivering on the branches of trees. One crate of bombs had been dropped upon the market square and 60 people were mangled and torn to ribbons. Mules and horses were stamping in their own entrails. The little white church in that town was simply plastered with brains and blood. Men were running in all directions wildly insane, with eyes bulging from their sockets. Men were lying on the ground biting the ground and digging their nails into the ground. One woman sitting against a wall was desperately trying to haul her bloody intestines back into her abdomen. One little child sat on a doorstep holding up whimperingly the stumps of her arms in appeal to her mother, who was dead, with her face gone. The man who performed that heroic deed with these bombing planes designed for going back into the country districts, into the quiet villages and hamlets, recorded in his diary, "When my bomb dropped on the people below they blossomed like a rose." When the news went back to that country they had a celebration and they went wild with joy. They were war mad. Medals were struck off and pinned upon the aviator who performed that deed.

That is a new method of warfare, going back into the quiet country districts, and the purpose of it is psychological. By blasting the mothers and the babies and the old people back in the towns, far back from the war zone, the effect is simply to terrify the soldiers at the front. It is a new method of warfare. Perhaps our bombing planes can make the wretched, terrified victims of some of these back villages and hamlets blossom like a rose. Perhaps they can blossom like the poppies on Flanders fields that mark the graves of some of our dead. Perhaps they can do that. So far none of these bombs have been dropped on the helpless people back of the lines. I ask you, do you propose that this great Republic shall, by its acts, release the several hundred planes now ready for shipment to go over there, and put our stamp of approval on this diabolical, un-Christian, brutal type of murder? [Applause.] That is precisely what you propose to do. Every dictator in Europe, and every government, every one of the rulers in all the nations abroad involved in the conflict, is just waiting for that stamp of approval, and then hell will break loose, and we will be the instigators of it—make no mistake about that.

I am against unleashing these offensive weapons to go over there to go back into the country sections to kill women and children. The idea that we should furnish a butcher's cleaver, knowing that the man who wants it and pays for it is going to use it to butcher innocent victims not in the combat zone is abhorrent.

You have referred to this as a game. It is not a game. It is an insult to any game to call this type of procedure a game. I say to my colleagues that once a plane made in America drops its load of bombs on some peaceful village or town, destroying women and children, it will engender hate. My good brothers from the beautiful Southland, you men of chivalry, is there such a thing as hate as the result of military excesses at any time? Has our country suffered from hate generated in that way? What has it cost our country if you would reduce it to dollars and cents? What has it cost in affection and state of mind in this country?

I say to you that if you lift this embargo you have taken the first step to war. I know something about the record. Let me tell you that the big munitions interests who make the instrumentalities of war have served notice on both political parties that if they fail to lift this embargo neither will receive contributions from them for the next campaign. That applies to both sides, and you know it. You dare not take the floor and deny it.

Mr. Speaker, how little, oh, how little decency and morality count when the lure of profits leaps upon the scales to outweigh the nobler impulses of mankind. How quickly the war-profit group descended on Congress when an effort was made to put a ban on the sale of poison gas. Millions of gas masks have been issued by the belligerent nations to their children, even the little nursing babies are equipped with these contrivances. Can these masks, I wonder, withstand the penetrating, smothering, agonizing effects of this new article of neutral international trade? But why be troubled? There is profit to be had, so we are told by those who seek fool's gold—and that seems to be the test of true neutrality in this year of our Lord 1939.

A man is a faker, so we are now told, who does not believe that such a course leads to "peace on earth, good will to men." The modern conduct of a good neighbor is to kill the wife and children of his neighbor's family. The way to be neutral, so we are told, is to take sides; that the way to stay out of war is to get in. Some years ago we were told that to sell arms and ammunition would prolong wars. Now we are told it will shorten war.

We have today, as we did in 1917, the same Molochs of greed, demanding their toll in human life for profits.

I ask you men to read the news items in the press in 1917. The Times, February 4:

> In many brokerage offices, the assembled customers stayed long after the half day's work was done, discussing market and banking prospects in a more optimistic frame of mind than in many weeks.

The Times, February 4:

> Stocks rebounded sharply yesterday on receipt of definite news from Washington that the break with Germany had occurred. * * *
>
> Bethlehem Steel rose 30 points, and the new Bethlehem B. shares gained 10¾. * * *

Tribune, March 6:

> On Saturday it was generally believed that the bill providing for the arming of merchant ships would be passed, and stocks gained considerably as a result.

American, March 12:

> Wall Street has accepted the arming of ships and the special session of Congress as the second step along the road that leads to war with Germany, and on that theory bought stocks. * * * Stocks have been purchased on the theory that war means a boom for a time. * * * Wall Street is proceeding on the assumption that war is inevitable.

The Sun, April 9:

> Sentiment among bankers is patriotic and it is bullish. To many persons, long on stocks, war apparently merely spells another long period of abnormal profits for our corporations. * * * The big men hold stocks.

The Times, May 17, 1917:

> The Liberty Loan is not only a means of making democracy safe. It is a means of benefiting the money market.

The Saturday Evening Post, October 13, 1917:

> The first Liberty Loan paid only 3½ percent interest, but it was made free from all taxes, including the enormous super-toll on large incomes. Thus it would come about that a very rich man * * * would be receiving the equivalent of perhaps 10 percent on an investment that pays the poor hardly one-third as much.

On the day that war was declared in 1917 an item appeared in a prominent financial circular commenting upon the requested appropriation for the Army and Navy alone of $3,400,000,000 and the members of the National Council of Defense, the Federal Reserve banks, and the Treasury officials gave assurance that $2,000,000,000 at an interest rate not to exceed 3½ percent would be almost immediately available.

This financial circular made this statement:

> Anyone viewing this formidable array of strength would be a pitiable pessimist, indeed, if he looked to the future with any feeling of trepidation or foreboding.

And continuing, this financial circular said:

> If the record of the country's coming achievements carries a tinge of scarlet, the golden luster will be undimmed.

I shall not clutter the record with a long list of present-day newspaper clippings, but the following is typical and only a reflection of what occurred in 1917:

"WAR BABIES" CLIMB ON EMBARGO VOTE—CURTISS-WRIGHT HITS NEW HIGH—MARKET IS IRREGULAR

> NEW YORK, October 28, 1939.—Stocks opened irregular in a narrow range today with trading moderately active. Bonds were steady. Cotton futures advanced 5 to 12 points.
>
> Passage by the Senate of the neutrality bill without the arms embargo stimulated some buying in war stocks, but in many instances traders seized the opportunity to take profits and gains were small.
>
> Curtiss-Wright featured with a block of 12,000 shares at a new high of 9 up ¼. North American aviation opened 2,000 shares at 28 up ¼. Douglas and United Aircraft eased fractionally.

Mr. Speaker, at the risk of being called a faker, I say to you that the lifting of the arms embargo is the first step that will take the United States into the European war, and by that I mean a war that will send our men there.

Mr. Speaker, I shudder to think what history will say about this day's work of the American Congress if this House votes to lift the embargo to engage in such bloody, inhuman slaughter. It will establish a record in the field of brutality under the name of neutrality that will have no parallel in ancient or modern history. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 12 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SWEENEY].

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, it was Kipling who said:

> The tumult and the shouting dies;
> The captains and the kings depart;
> Still stands Thine ancient sacrifice,
> An humble and a contrite heart.

If this vote that is taken today is an adverse vote against the people of the United States, it is the first step toward war, it is the first step in the blood business, because the deliveries of arms, ammunition, and implements of war will follow and incidents will arise, as they did in the last World War, which will hasten our entry into the conflict and possibly destroy the Christian civilization of America.

I want to read to the House the statement of a Democrat, a good Democrat, three times Governor of Ohio, and now the senior Senator from the State of Ohio, on this issue of neutrality—of lifting the embargo on arms, ammunition, and implements of war—instruments of human destruction, if you will.

> I shall vote "no" on the proposal of cash and carry of implements of war intended for European belligerents.
>
> The demand for lifting the embargo on munitions and implements of war does not in Ohio come from the smallest unit of government—the family—where father, mother, and the children gather at the hearthstone and plan for the peace and safety of all.
>
> America opened its arteries in the World War to make the world safe for democracy. It was a royal feast for vengeful peace dictators, international gamblers, and profiteers. If we open our arteries again, we might bleed to death.
>
> The people should not forget that when our implements of war get into action international and neutrality laws are as dead as the Unknown Soldier.

Our pot of gold should be used over here to take care of those who went over there.

If cash and carry is adopted in 1939, and the war game runs true to form in Europe, we may have cash and credit in 1940 and cash and boys in 1941.

This is the statement of the Honorable VIC DONAHEY, who knows Ohio politics, who is the barometer for Ohio politics in this country, as far as his State is concerned. The sentiments of the Buckeye State will be registered in the vote here today of 19 or 20 out of 23, who are with the people of this country and who are not with the munitions makers and the international bankers.

Who started this fight to lift the embargo on implements of war? A few months ago the British King and Queen were here. I paid my respects to their visit on that occasion. I said then they were the advance agents for the next World War. They had a nice social visit. Just after they went back Mr. J. Pierpont Morgan went to London and he was there before war broke out. He returned to the United States with a contract as fiscal agent for Great Britain in the purchases of war supplies. I do not doubt what our friend the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] has just said—that there is a movement on foot to control the two major political parties with campaign contributions from the profits on the munitions the makers will sell to Europe. It was done in the last World War. It will happen again. War is insanity—it is "man's ingratitude to man." How any Christian can vote to sell poison gas, the most deadly instrument of modern warfare, is beyond comprehension.

Some time ago, back in the year 157 A. D. or thereabouts, I think it was, a philosopher, Tertullian, in his Apologeticus, said, in giving his appraisal of the Christians of his day:

See how these Christians love one another and how they are ready to die for one another.

Oh, I say today with derision, perhaps, "See how these Christians love one another and are ready to sell poison gas, implements of destruction, and bombing planes to kill their fellow Christians." Not with my vote. There will be no qualms of conscience in the dead hour of the night in the not-far-distant future, when a vision might arise of human beings enmeshed in entanglements of barbed wire, with their intestines hanging out and their lungs shattered by the poison gas and the implements of destruction we sent over there to engage in this blood business. When that day comes I thank my Creator that no fellow human being will be murdered through my vote today.

If we are going to become international sadists—I repeat, if we are going to become international sadists—then I ask the Congress to be fair and to be honest and write into this bill today a provision that on every implement of war, every bomb, every phial of poison gas there be stamped the words "Made in the United States of America." Do not be hypocritical about it when you put this country in the wholesale murder business. [Applause.]

Mr. Molotov, Premier Foreign Commissar of the Soviet Union, was under discussion here on the floor yesterday because he criticized the United States Congress in its deliberation of the present neutrality issue. I agree with the gentleman who criticized Mr. Molotov, because it is none of Mr. Molotov's damn business what we do in this country [laughter], and I second that motion to censure the Soviet statesman; but I want those who criticize Mr. Molotov and who are always saying if we do not lift the embargo we are going to aid Hitler and Stalin, let them remember the conduct of England and France. There is not a man in this Congress that has any use for the ideologies of Hitler or Stalin because they are so repugnant to our free institutions. I give credit to each Member for his opinions and expressions in this debate. Not a word is said about the propaganda of our friends for whom this law was created, the synthetic democracies of Britain and France, the nations that hold in subjection in their colonies today millions and millions of black men, yellow men, and white men in a state of serfdom akin to human slavery.

We are asked to be neutral. Thank God they have taken off the mask. It has been off for several months now. We know now why this law is to be passed—to help the synthetic democracies of England and France. There has been a campaign of aspersion against some of us who dared to be pro-American. Our colleague the ranking minority member of the Foreign Affairs Committee went to Europe with his colleagues to attend the Interparliamentary Conference at Oslo, and because of transportation difficulties he rode in a German plane from Berlin to Oslo, as a guest of a neutral government, and yet men on this floor and elsewhere and in certain newspapers throughout this country and Great Britain and France who are pro-British and not pro-American, have sought to pin on him a Nazi label.

They just cannot do it in the face of his war record [applause]; nor can they pin on Charles Lindbergh, Jr., a Nazi label. [Applause.] Charles Lindbergh, Jr., although I do not know him except by reputation, is a son of a man who sat here as a Member of Congress and was bitterly opposed to our entry into the World War. He had the courage to speak and write against the war declaration. He was one of the immortals of his day. Charles Lindbergh, Jr., would not be his father's son unless he gave the pronouncement which he did on this important question; and, no matter what the London Daily Times and other pro-British newspapers here and abroad may say, they cannot accuse Charles Lindbergh, Jr., of being anything other than pro-American; I salute Charles Lindbergh, Jr., and I salute Senator BORAH and scores of men in public life upon whom aspersions have been cast in the Canadian papers and in the London papers and in some American newspapers. They tell about Molotov getting mad because we do not try to do what he tells us to do. Let us embrace them all when we make any criticism, and not pick out just one side. They are all guilty of trying to mind our business.

Not long ago I referred to the fact that I was permitted to point out the danger of British propaganda leading up to this embargo controversy, and I suggested to the House at the time the King and Queen of Britain were here that no one in the House is so dumb or inarticulate as not to understand or express the cheap publicity surrounding the presentation of a Bible from King George to the President of the United States.

It was the same good book presented to the simple natives of Africa, India, and the Orient by other missionaries of lesser mien than the King and Queen. It was the same good book that preceded the flag and historically it was the Bible and the flag which preceded the British trader.

I read of the presentation of the King James version of Holy Scriptures in Hyde Park, N. Y. I recall the James boys, James I and James II. [Laughter.] I remember that it was James I that upheld the doctrine of the divine rights of kings. If I recall correctly he said, "There is a divinity that doth hedge a king." I do not forget his attitude toward the nonconformists and his statement, "They will conform or I will harry them out of the land." Yet I am frank to say that I was astounded when English propaganda did not stop with the visit of the King and Queen, with the presentation of the King James Bible by the King and Queen to the President of the United States. In answer thereto we are told that there went forth a prayer for the King of England, there went forth a prayer for the success of the British King over all his enemies, domestic and foreign—and that was in the United States of America, in the State of New York, in Hyde Park! Possibly it was under the theory of "Love your enemy," or possibly it was under the injunction, "Do good to them that hate you," that this prayer went forth. I commend it on these grounds in its entirety, and without profanity and without sacrilege, Mr. Speaker, I remind you that there is a prayer for the President of the United States written when our Nation was in its cradle of infancy by the first bishop of the United States, Bishop Carroll, of Baltimore. It is recited in thousands of churches and homes in the United States. It is a prayer for peace. This is the prayer of the saintly John Carroll, first bishop of the Catholic Church in the American Republic:

We pray Thee, O Almighty and Eternal God! Who through Jesus Christ hast revealed Thy glory to all nations, to preserve the works

of Thy mercy, that Thy church, being spread through the whole world, may continue with unchanging faith in the confession of Thy name.

We pray Thee, who alone art good and holy, to endow with heavenly knowledge, sincere zeal, and sanctity of life, our chief bishop (N. N.), the vicar of our Lord Jesus Christ, in the government of His church; our own bishop (N. N.) (or archbishop); all other bishops, prelates, and pastors of the church; and especially those who are appointed to exercise amongst us the functions of the holy ministry, and conduct Thy people into the ways of salvation.

We pray Thee, O God of might, wisdom, and justice, through whom authority is rightly administered, laws are enacted, and judgment decreed, assist with Thy holy spirit of counsel and fortitude the President of the United States, that his administration may be conducted in righteousness, and be eminently useful to Thy people over whom he presides; by encouraging due respect for virtue and religion; by a faithful execution of the laws in justice and mercy; and by restraining vice and immorality. Let the light of Thy divine wisdom direct the deliberations of Congress, and shine forth in all the proceedings and laws framed for our rule and government, so that they may tend to the preservation of peace, the promotion of national happiness, the increase of industry, sobriety, and useful knowledge; and may perpetuate to us the blessing of equal liberty.

We pray for His Excellency, the Governor of this State, for the members of the assembly, for all judges, magistrates, and other officers who are appointed to guard our political welfare, that they may be enabled, by Thy powerful protection, to discharge the duties of their respective stations with honesty and ability.

We recommend likewise, to Thy unbounded mercy, all our brethren and fellow citizens throughout the United States, that they may be blessed in the knowledge and sanctified in the observance of Thy most holy law; that they may be preserved in union, and in that peace which the world cannot give, and after enjoying the blessings of this life, be admitted to whose which are eternal.

Finally, we pray to Thee, O Lord of mercy, to remember the souls of Thy servants departed who are gone before us with the sign of faith, and repose in the sleep of peace; the souls of our parents, relatives, and friends; of those who, when living, were members of this congregation, and particularly of such as are lately deceased; of all benefactors who, by their donations or legacies to this church, witnessed their zeal for the decency of divine worship and proved their claim to our grateful and charitable remembrance. To these, O Lord, and to all that rest in Christ, grant, we beseech Thee, a place of refreshment, light, and everlasting peace, through the same Jesus Christ, our Lord and Saviour. Amen.

As I look upon the world today with its two-billion-three-hundred-million-odd souls confusedly arranged by race and by nations, as I look upon the population of the world, I, too, humbly pray in the form of a litany. I pray, Mr. Speaker, that America may be delivered from the spirit of imperalism, from the fate of Ireland, and from the fate of Gibraltar, O Lord, deliver us. From the fate of Malta, O Lord, deliver us; from the fate of Poland, crossed and double-crossed by the British Government, only 550 miles away from Germany, which failed to send any help to bleeding Poland, although she proclaimed to the world she had a mandate to protect Poland's honor—not even a bomb—but showered only pamphlets down from her war planes. From such a fate, O Lord, deliver us. What kind of a game is this, the power politics of Europe today? England condemns the rape of Poland in the western part of Poland by Hitler, but they bless the rape of Poland when that rape is committed by the Stalinist union in the eastern part of Poland. The British Chancelor, Mr. Chamberlain, commends the Government of the Soviet Union in taking control of Poland, as evidenced by this headline [exhibiting newspaper], but I continue my prayer:

From the fate of Kenya, O Lord, deliver us.
From the fate of Tanganyika, O Lord, deliver us.
From the fate of Uganda, O Lord, deliver us.
From the fate of Zanzibar and Pemba, O Lord, deliver us.
From the fate of Mauritius, O Lord, deliver us.
From the fate of Nyasaland, O Lord, deliver us.
From the fate of St. Helena, O Lord, deliver us.
From the fate of Seychelles, O Lord, deliver us.
From the fate of Somaliland, O Lord, deliver us.
From the fate of Basutoland, O Lord, deliver us.
From the fate of Bechuanaland, O Lord, deliver us.
From the fate of Rhodesia, O Lord, deliver us.
From the fate of Swasiland, O Lord, deliver us.
From the fate of southwest Africa, O Lord, deliver us.
From the fate of Gambria, O Lord, deliver us.
From the fate of Ashanti, O Lord, deliver us.
From the fate of Nigeria, O Lord, deliver us.
From the fate of Cameroon, O Lord, deliver us.
From the fate of Sierra Leone, O Lord, deliver us.
From the fate of Togoland, O Lord, deliver us.
From the fate of the Sudan, O Lord, deliver us.
From the fate of India, O Lord, deliver us.
From the fate of Ceylon, O Lord, deliver us.
From the fate of Cyprus, O Lord, deliver us.
From the fate of Hong Kong, O Lord, deliver us.
From the fate of the Malay States, O Lord, deliver us.
From the fate of Mesopotamia, O Lord, deliver us.
From the fate of North Borneo, O Lord, deliver us.
From the fate of Bruei and Sarawak, O Lord, deliver us.
From the fate of Palestine, O Lord, deliver us.
From the fate of the Straits Settlements, O Lord, deliver us.
From the fate of Weihaiwei, O Lord, deliver us.
From the fate of Papua, O Lord, deliver us.
From the fate of New Guinea, O Lord, deliver us.
From the fate of western Samos, O Lord, deliver us.
From the fate of Fiji, O Lord, deliver us.
From the fate of Nauru, O Lord, deliver us.
From the fate of Tanga, O Lord, deliver us.
From the fate of Barbados, O Lord, deliver us.
From the fate of Jamaica, O Lord, deliver us.
From the fate of Trinidad, O Lord, deliver us.

Mr. Speaker, I conclude my prayer by saying, without sacrilege, deliver us, O Lord, from the influence of Lord Lothian, the British Ambassador at Washington. Deliver us, O Lord, from Prime Minister Chamberlain; deliver us, O Lord, from Lord Beaverbrook, worthy successor to Lord Northcliffe and the intense British propaganda of the Anglophile, and from the spirit of imperialism, O Lord, deliver us. May the shade of our immortal George Washington be with us today. May he admonish his countrymen once again to guard against foreign entanglements. May the God in heaven who guides the destinies of this young Republic, be with us in this critical hour.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT].

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, if the war imps in the court of the god of Mars ever leave off from their blood drinking long enough to evidence manifestations of joy at the spread of their idol's philosophy, surely there must have been some real rejoicing on that distant planet the last 2 days. Not, my friends, because this House is now contemplating a declaration of war, but because we have ignored so completely any discussion of the possibility of promoting peace in Europe, we have said much about the advisability or inadvisability of promoting the war interests of one side or the other but we have heard far too little about our opportunity for promoting a civilization-saving peace in Europe. The RECORD will show that we are being allowed only 2 days and a few hours to debate this world-shaping decision, but in even such limited discussion, I wish more time had been taken to expressing thoughts regarding this country's great opportunity, in this sorry hour, to help restore peace in Europe.

We have heard much about the arms embargo as a weapon for war but we have heard far too little about the fact that the arms embargo is also a great weapon for peace. It is to this significant opportunity that America now has to make a peace contribution to the world, here and now, that I address myself.

Mr. Speaker, some have said we should repeal the arms embargo and use this weapon of arms shipments as a war measure to help the so-called democracies abroad; some have said we should use this weapon because it is ours and it is our right to discharge it where we will; some have said with more loquacity than logic, in what sounded like an oratorical prologue to a declaration of a holy war, that we should use this weapon to kill for the sake of Christianity; a few have even said audibly what many have whispered, that we should use this weapon for profit. In fact, so close to the position of profit from war have all arguments come which favor repeal that even the most pious cause savers have insisted that we offer our salvation for sale at so much a prayer and at so much a pistol with the interesting admonition

that "Once you have run out of cash, you have run out of cause." I shall have more to say about this later in my speech, but I pause here to ask, what will those who propose that America's foreign policy be rewritten to read, "Causes saved for cash," suggest to this Congress when there is no more cash? I shudder to predict their action then.

Those who, in their too zealous enthusiasm to win support for the repeal of the arms embargo at this time, let their imaginations run and resort to extravagant statements in an attempt to describe the present European war as a "holy war" should find food for thought and cause for reflection in a radio address delivered by the Most Reverend F. J. Beckman, archbishop of Dubuque, last Sunday, when he said in part, and I quote his own words:

> The present war is not, in my well-advised opinion, a just war, much less a holy war. It is propagandized as such by the sinister forces of international communism. The Communist antichrists want America and all Christian nations to engage in this war. Their agents here will stop at nothing to involve us, for well do they realize that a war-exhausted America is the only hope for communism for America.

My colleagues, if there is a holy cause America can serve in this war, and I believe there is, it is the holy cause of peace and not the holocaust of war.

My friends, over 95 percent of all Americans want peace. Peace with profit is intriguing to be sure, but peace for preservation of American ideals at home is imperative. [Applause.] Thus, more important to civilization in Europe than repeal as a weapon for war is the arms embargo as a weapon for peace.

Both sets of belligerents are today marking time in the war; no civilians are being bombed, no poison gas is being used, the armies on the western front are talking to each other with loud speakers. Should America, today, risk the consequences of breaking this stalemate? Should we give false hope to one side and false fear to another by taking sides on the economic front of this war at this time? Suppose one side—inspired by the hope, no matter how poorly founded, that our armies will again follow our arms—takes up the killing in earnest? Or suppose that other side, in the desperation that history is repeating itself, discards all caution and conscience? No matter who starts wholesale butchery of human lives it is inevitable that reckless ruthlessness will be met by reckless resistance, and our weapon for peace will have turned into the most useful sword for the god of Mars. Is any man so wise or so bold that he can guarantee this eventuality cannot result from repeal at this crucial time? If so, let him record his omnipotent wisdom in the next speech.

On the other hand, holding repeal in abeyance at this time with no assurance to either side that new offenses, inhuman atrocities, future actions may not make us change our course transforms this arms embargo into the greatest weapon for peace—peace not only in America but throughout the world—that any neutral nation ever had. Holding repeal in abeyance now while all is so happily quiet on the western front makes the arms embargo an invitation to all nations to use the conference table, a suggestion to all belligerents that they outline their aims in the war, a symbol that here stands a country reluctant to encourage—even for cash—either side to proceed with the killing. [Applause.]

On the arms embargo question we are not faced with the alternative today of "repeal it now or repeal it never," but those who would take the fateful gamble this day and hour despite the petitions and prayers of American mothers must remember that it is a question of "repeal it today and you repeal it forever" so far as this war is concerned. There is no argument advanced by repealists today which would not be just as effective 2 months, or 6 months, or 2 years from today, if future events indicate the necessity or wisdom of changing this weapon of peace into a weapon of war. But once repeal is voted, there is no opportunity left to use this power for peace. Our weapon for peace will have crumbled in our hands; our symbol of peace will have become but another bloody blade in the war. And no man voting for repeal today can shift the responsibility for so hastily scrapping this weapon of peace as he faces his conscience, his constituents, and his God.

The gentleman from New York, the Honorable BRUCE BARTON, has so clearly put this plea to use the arms embargo as a device for promoting European peace rather than European war, that I am sending a copy of his address home to many of my friends. It is a feature of this whole discussion which I join him in feeling has been sadly neglected by those who would rush through repeal at this time, unmindful of the fact that even today, as we vote, the arms embargo and the concern about what we shall do with it is helping to hold hostilities in Europe down to such a point official communiques published in this morning's papers from all governments report "little action" or the even more encouraging words of "all quiet." Heaven forbid that any action we take today will change these reports to long casualty lists and vivid descriptions of vicious fighting 60 days from now.

A study of the entire debate on this arms-embargo issue reveals there are four points of view on the question, each supported by a different group; and while there are borderline shadings of opinion from one group to another, I believe the separation into four divisions will enable each of you to peg your own position and classify yourself with accuracy.

The first group says, "Let us sell arms for cash because it is our war." This is the self-defense group, and they reason that if England and France should lose the war, we would be the next victim; they argue that America depends upon the Brtish Navy for our first line of defense and that our frontier is on the Rhine. There is no shame or hypocrisy about this group, and I admire their candor, although I disagree with their conclusions. To my mind there are several glaring weaknesses in this position. In the first place, if it is our war, then they should say, "Let us get into it as Americans should. Let us send our armies with our arms, if this is our war; let us assume our full share of the sacrifices of war. Let us, above all, not give cause to the slur of being Uncle Shylock by entering into any partnership with England and France whereby the people of these two countries do the fighting and the dying, do the bleeding in the mud and the rotting in the sun of no man's land while we do our part by supplying arms and munitions for cash in advance with the admonition that when you run out of cash it ceases to be our war and you must both bleed and die without benefit of American arms. Let us be consistent. If this is our war, we should join up in the fight; if it is not our war, we should stay all the way out regardless of the attractive possibilities of profit camouflaged in deceptive language."

Thus far this debate has produced not a single competent military authority who says we must fight this war for self-defense. Contrawise, Gen. Smedley Butler says, "Don't let anybody feed you that misinformation," and Gen. Hugh Johnson says such a position is "the most ill-formed, half-baked, blatant, dangerous, and unsupportable demagoguery. It is exactly the same soapy sophistry that pulled us into the World War." Certainly there does not seem to be much basis for repealing the arms embargo as a measure of self-defense.

The second group in this controversy say, "Let us sell arms for cash, because it's our cause." This group I refer to as the world savers. They said in 1917, "It's a war to end war; it's a war to make the world safe for democracy." This time these clarion calls have a hollow ring; so they say, "Let us save Christianity or civilization." In all events, many sincere people belong to this group, and I respect their idealism and sincerity. World savers must be credited with good intentions, but their reasoning is bad when they offer selling arms and munitions for cash as a device for washing away the sins and Satans of the world. Just to examine their stand carefully is to recognize the inconsistency of their position. Again, I say if there is somewhere some cause we should save or some nation of devils we should exterminate by sending 10,000,000 American boys to possible death, or worse, and

by losing every American liberty we now enjoy, then these repealists should say in simple candor, "Let's join up in the war here and now and get on with our saving. But surely we do not want to appear before the world as 'world savers for a profit.' We don't want our American foreign policy to read, 'Causes saved for cash—you furnish the men, the cause, and the cash; you take the risk and do the dying. We'll join up with the saving if you pay cash on the barrel head; but, mark you, no more cash, no more salvation.'" I doubt whether democracy, or peace, or civilization, or Christianity can be successfully saved on such a basis, and can see no reason for selling arms for a profit under the masquerade of such holy names. When and if this war becomes our war or our cause, let us get in as Americans should. Until and unless the time comes, let us stay out as neutral Americans must.

To present ourselves as cause savers on the partnership basis of "death for you, dividends for us" is too much like using gangster methods of holding hostages in front of them while they escape from robbed banks with their swag. It smacks too much of sending the collection plate into a heathen land 3 months ahead of the missionary.

The third group has a different viewpoint—they are more consistent albeit less convincing than the first two groups. They proclaim, "let us sell arms for cash because it is our right." This represents the biggest group favoring repeal. They protest loudly their desire for peace and they do not want America to go to war but they proudly assert it is America's right to sell what she will, when she will, to whom she will, regardless of what her existing law says she will or will not do. I believe this might be designated the "dollars and sense neutrality group," although there seems to me to be more dollars than sense involved in such a stand, because when business risks loom so large that they jeopardize American lives and liberties I submit that at such time good business becomes bad business. I will concede that America has that right, but the whole panel of reliable expert testimony warns us that we cannot exercise that right and remain strictly neutral. We can no longer deny this fact. We can evade the issue, close our ears to the evidence, pit the guesswork of laymen against the testimony of experts, but we cannot deny the fact that repeal of the arms embargo is a step away from neutrality.

Consequently, I question whether it is worth the risk to our peace and progress in this country to jeopardize the happiness of 130,000,000 people so that perhaps a million of them can make profits from such a gamble with the business of peddling the machinery of death. Were the evidence less convincing that such a course is a step toward war, and were the testimony of authority less one-sided in stating that repeal during war is an unneutral act, I might go along with this group because they cast their votes with the hope, no matter how poorly founded, that it is not a step toward war, and economic conditions in this country are so desperate that we are all looking for an easy way upward.

But I submit that all the possibility of profit from all the blood machinery we can sell to all the nations on both sides of the war are not worth the life of a single American boy. If I am wrong, what mother in America will offer that living sacrifice? If I am right, what Congressman would seek to force the sacrifice upon her? Surely I cannot force myself to vote for repeal of the embargo from a "purely materialistic point of view."

The one group which remains cries out, "We should not sell arms for cash, because it is our fundamental policy to keep out of war." This group I call the strictly neutral group. While their sympathies for good causes are just as sincere as any other group—and I know that I personally would fight to the last to keep communism, or nazi-ism, or fascism from invading our sacred shores—these men recognize the rules of the game of international relations, abide by the decisions of experts and authorities, pray that the arms embargo may be used as a weapon of peace, and refuse to permit personal sympathies or private prejudices to swerve them from the path of real neutality. English, German, Italian, Canadian, Russian newspapers all have indicated that these people, too, have read the international lawbooks and they are watching our action on the arms embargo as a symbol to determine our neutrality or unneutrality in this war. Once we take the warlike step of selecting sides by official action while the war is in progress, we become an active belligerent on the economic front and all our protestations of desiring peace are in vain if any nation or coalition of nations begins fighting back on a military front against our economic alliance with their enemies. Thus while we shout praises for peace we may in actuality be writing what is tantamount to a modern declaration of war. At least, it may easily become an invitation for the indignities and the incidents which, when amplified and aggravated by jingoistic press agents and hysterical radio commentators, can so easily and quickly lead us to war.

No man can guarantee us against this eventuality; when we try to mix manifestos of mercy with murder for money we gamble with the lives of all our constituents. It is easy enough to argue that no nation will attack us, that we can play cats and dogs with the rules of international law and rely upon our size to keep us at peace. But the record of 1917 is against such argument. When nations desperately fight for life or death or when their leaders goad their people on with falsehood and propaganda they know no rule of caution, consider no ultimate consequences, but strike out where they will and where they can against the forces surrounding them. True, we can win the war if we get in—but at what a cost. And having won the war, we merely bury ourselves more deeply in European intrigue and power politics and begin paving the way for our next entrance into the next war, because neutrality for us will then have become simply the relic of a bygone age of greater statesmen and better Americans than we.

The one mandate you and I have from the people of America today is to keep America out of war; the only Macedonian cry we hear from home is the fervent cry for peace. We now and then hear a whisper for peace with profit, or peace with vengeance, or peace with the big stick, but the great predominating cry is simply, "We want peace."

You, who today would assume the responsibility of implanting upon a formula for peace the unneutral act of lifting the arms embargo, have some important questions to consider which thus far remain unanswered. How can taking an unneutral step in wartime help preserve peace? What guaranty can you place against the mountain of evidence that such a step is a gamble with war? What do you hope to accomplish by such a step unless it is to help win a war which is ours, or save a cause which belongs to us, and if such a motive underlies your vote, should not America be told that if arms will not do the job our armies must follow through? If not, who will answer the question: Specifically, how will repeal of the arms embargo, of and in itself, help maintain American peace? For the answer to that question, the ears of 130,000,000 Americans are now attuned, but thus far the static of evasion has interfered with any clear-cut answer to that straighforward question.

Fellow Americans, my sympathies, too, are with England and France because, while I do not consider them altogether blameless in the development of the situation now plaguing the world, they do more nearly represent the cause I favor. I have no faith in either the methods, the objectives, or the leadership of communism, nazi-ism, or fascism. However, as a public servant I take it as my public duty to cast a conscientious vote for peace, and not to hazard my puny judgment and limited experience against the ageless wisdom of cumulative authority and experience which demonstrates that to repeal our arms embargo while the war rages in Europe is a definite step toward war. If and when this war becomes our war, or the cause is clearly enough outlined by friend or foe so that it definitely appears to be our cause, then America may change its mantle of peace for the armor of war. When the mandate from the people comes to us with the words, "It is now our time to fight for honor or for home

or self-defense," our decision may be different and the problem changed, but our mandate at this time is to vote for peace and to keep America out of the European war. And I predict and pray that this mandate from the people will continue to denounce the folly of war. I expect to guide my future actions and make my future decisions on the basis of what the future reveals. Changed circumstances may alter our current conclusions, but on the basis of today's facts and today's circumstances, I submit, America can best serve the cause of peace, both at home and in Europe, by refusing to lift our arms embargo here and now.

The world today needs a strong neutral nation which by its impartiality during wartime stands ready and available to help hurry the day of peace. Let us hold aloof from the war and remain ready to answer the summons when warring factions join in asking us to help disentangle their armies and reassemble true statesmen to work out a just and permanent peace. Let us not at this time stultify our influence for peace by signifying our unneutrality in the war. If America maintains a neutral peace, we can by our example, rather than by our arms or our armies, hurry the day when other people will throw off oppression and discard unworkable theories to voluntarily accept and adopt the blessings of self-government as a means of bringing greater happiness to greater numbers. Thus by being isolationists from war we can become the world's greatest inspirationists for peace.

On the 18th and 19th of last month the Scandinavian countries, which, contrary to careless statements on this floor, are each and all enforcing embargoes against shipments of arms and munitions in this war—and official letters to this effect are in Tuesday's RECORD on page 1153—met in Copenhagen and adopted a code of neutrality which included this statement:

> The Ministers taking part in the discussions appeal to their people to face the anxieties and privations of the wartime with calmness and composure. They give expression to their conviction that it is in the interest not only of the northern peoples but of all nations that throughout the war there remains a group of states which may facilitate that reconciliation of the belligerent nations which the future must bring.

Ladies and gentlemen of Congress, let us by our retention of our arms embargo and our continuance of real neutrality make it possible for the United States to join that gallant group of neutral nations. Let us render real constructive service in promoting a just peace rather than by taking action which may stimulate a war which is now lagging and which may well evolve into an early peace if we do nothing at this time to indicate to anybody that this country even remotely contemplates entering the present European war. [Applause.]

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. FORD].

Mr. FORD of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, a few moments ago when the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT] concluded his address, the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH], among other things, said that he, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT], spoke for the veterans of the World War. I challenge that statement for the purpose of the RECORD, and call attention to the fact that when the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT] appeared before the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House on April 12 of this year he said:

> First, let me say at the outset that I speak only for myself. I am making this clear to avoid any misunderstanding. Because of my activities in veterans' affairs in the recent past, it was suggested that I appear as a representative of all veterans. I assure you that I assume no such position.

In addition to that, if I am correctly informed, the recent American Legion convention in its session at Chicago declined to either favor or oppose the repeal of the arms embargo. Further, Mr. Speaker, I was surprised at the position now taken by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT]. When he appeared before the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House when that committee had neutrality legislation under consideration, in response to some questions by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], a member of the committee, the following occurred:

> Mr. HENNINGS. Do you believe in any act whatsoever? Do you think we would be better off if we repealed all legislation and went back to where we were before?
> Mr. VAN ZANDT. I would say yes.

In response to a question by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS], also a member of the committee, the following occurred:

> Mr. RICHARDS. You say owing to propaganda we got into the last war, and we had no business in it, or, in effect, you say that, yet you advocate repeal of the present neutrality legislation to throw us right back to where we were at that time.
> Mr. VAN ZANDT. Yes, sir.
> Mr. RICHARDS. You think it is better to take our chances on that than to have any legislation at all?
> Mr. VAN ZANDT. Exactly.

Mr. Speaker, it is quite evident that the gentleman from Pennsylvania has changed his position. [Applause.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT].

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, in response to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. FORD], when I spoke on the question of repealing the arms embargo, I was not speaking for the veterans of this country. At no place in my remarks can the gentleman point out where I assumed such authority. I spoke as a Representative of the Twenty-third District of Pennsylvania. Furthermore, my position is very consistent. I still take the position that all legislation on neutrality should be taken off the statute books, but I am not in favor of changing our neutral position once war has been declared. [Applause.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS].

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I speak once more to make my position clear on the Vorys amendment and to clear up any possible confusion.

I am for the Shanley amendment. I am for the Vorys amendment. I am for the best embargo we can get. The Vorys amendment will represent the most limited embargo and possibly the most drastic embargo that we can get. I urge every friend of the embargo to vote both for my amendment and for the Shanley motion.

It just comes down to this in this embargo business: Bombs, poison gas, or liquid fire from America to kill men, women, and little children in Europe. Are you for it or are you against it? It is just that simple question that is going to be presented.

I have dropped bombs. You do not aim at a uniform or wait until you see the whites of their eyes. You aim at a ship or a town. You cannot tell whether the people are dressed in uniforms or dresses or babies' rompers.

Now, granting the sincerity of all of us who are voting here, it does not help much when a little baby is screaming in agony from a wound to say, "I sincerely thought it would be all right."

We ask about the war aims and the peace aims in Europe. I think the belligerents have a right to say to us, "America, what are your war aims? What are your peace aims?"

What are our war aims? Let me quote from a distinguished gentlemen here, one of the repealists, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX]. He suggested this:

> Let us once again become savior of Europe. * * * Let us wage war again to preserve Europe and to make the world safe for democracy. Let us wage war again to end war, then let us resolve that within a quarter of a century we shall do it all over again, and again, and again * * * the burden of America, our destiny.

That is not my war aim.

Can Europe say to us, "What are your peace aims? Are you going to be as 'phony' a neutral on one side as Russia is on the other; staying out, but gaining profit and power from our blood and tears?"

My answer would be "No." Our peace aim is to hold peace for ourselves and to bring peace and not more killing abroad. Our peace aim is to live at peace with our neighbors nearby and far away. You have our good will and our respect, but our peace aims do not involve furnishing you either arms for war or unsought advice on your balance of power. Our peace

aim is based on union, that those who live near each other must learn to live together in peace. With this aim we spread from 13 little nations across a continent. We had one continental war, but we have made peace forever. This peace aim now spreads across our hemisphere in the good-neighbor doctrine. We say, "Europe, you must learn this lesson, that peace is preserved not by alliances of ideologies or bunds of races, or balances of power, but by having neighbors learn not to fight with each other. Until you learn that lesson we won't help you fight."

Once more I say on the Shanley motion, as amended or not amended, the embargo issue is clear. Bombs, poison gas, or liquid fire. Are you for it, or are you against it? [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. SCHIFFLER], such time as he may desire.

Mr. SCHIFFLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks, and include therein excerpts from international law codified, on the subject of neutrality.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WARREN). Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHIFFLER. Mr. Speaker, the subject under discussion is that of neutrality. The right of the United States Government to legislate upon this subject at this time I have previously stated, and my views may be found in the RECORD as of October 19, 1939.

I am more firmly convinced than ever that the views thus stated were sound and in accordance with the principles of international law. I am also firmly convinced that the repeal of the arms-embargo provision of our law is a direct violation of international law.

Our right, as a sovereign nation, would permit us to strengthen our neutrality laws for the security and protection of our own Nation. This is upheld by the law of nations. On the contrary, we are not permitted to relax in our laws in such manner as to lend aid of any kind to one or more of the belligerents and also against other belligerents.

Much has been said regarding international law and I desire to, at this time, quote from Fiore's International Law Codified, which, on the subject of neutrality, is as follows—and which, if violated, immediately subjects us to attack and the repeal of the arms embargo by this Congress at this time can and may provoke that very thing:

NEUTRALITY AND THE RIGHTS AND DUTIES ARISING THEREFROM—CONCEPT AND NATURE OF NEUTRALITY

1791. Neutrality, objectively considered, is in itself a state of fact, and consists in the complete abstention from any hostile act against either one of the belligerents and from any act calculated to favor either one of the belligerents in their military operations.

Subjectively considered, it indicates the legal status of a state which, in the event of war, takes no part in the hostilities, either directly or indirectly.

1792. Neutrality may be voluntary, absolute, or conventional. The first is a consequence of the autonomy of every state and of the right which it possesses to regulate with complete independence all matters concerning its relations with other states and to determine freely the position which it intends to assume on the outbreak of war.

The second is the neutrality which in a general and absolute manner is imposed in the common interest of all the states upon one of them, either by means of a general treaty or of a rule established in common accord by the states assembled in a congress, or through conditions agreed upon as to the recognition of the international personality of such state.

The third may be the consequence of a special treaty, by the terms of which two or more states undertake by reciprocity to observe neutrality in the event of war between one of them and a third power.

1793. General or absolute neutrality should be deemed under the legal protection of all the states interested in having it respected.

STATES ENTITLED TO BE CONSIDERED NEUTRAL

1794. Every state has the right, when war breaks out, to declare and notify, through diplomatic channels, its intention to remain neutral. Having made such a declaration and notification, it has the right to expect to be considered as a neutral and shall be entitled to the rights which arise from such legal status from the time of its declaration.

States whose neutrality must be deemed obligatory shall be considered ipso facto neutral as soon as war breaks out.

1795. A state which did not declare its intention of remaining neutral but actually fulfills the conditions necessary to be so considered, in the fact that it does not, directly or indirectly, take any part in the war, shall have the right to be considered neutral and entitled to enjoy and exercise the rights arising therefrom on condition of complying with the duties of neutrals.

1796. A state forfeits its right to neutrality whenever it takes part in the war for any reason, or furnishes assistance to a belligerent, either by undertaking some hostile act against one of the belligerents or by promising to do something which may be regarded as an act of military assistance.

The act of assistance does not lose its character as such by reason of the fact that the state would be obliged to undertake it on account of a previous treaty concluded with a belligerent or otherwise.

1797. No state may limit its neutrality to a part of its territory only.

The legal status of every state, from the viewpoint of absolute abstention or nonabstention from the war, shall be considered just as indivisible as its personality.

1798. No state which is the ally of a belligerent in a war waged by the latter against a certain state can lay claim to being a neutral in another war sustained at the same time by its ally against another state.

RIGHTS OF NEUTRAL STATES

1799. Any state which has declared its neutrality may make use of its military forces to defend it. In like manner, states which have declared themselves unneutral can form an alliance among themselves in order to defend their rights as such.

At any rate, the states which have remained neutral could increase their armaments with a view to defending their neutrality.

1800. Every neutral state may claim the legal and legitimate enjoyment of all the rights appertaining to an independent country in time of peace. It cannot, however, exercise them except subject to the restrictions made necessary by and the requirements of the state of war.

1801. No limitation upon the exercise of the rights of neutrals may be arbitrarily imposed by either belligerent. Such a restriction is only justified when provided for in the conventional rules established by the states with regard to their reciprocal duties in cases where they shall have declared their intention of remaining neutral, or when the restriction arises from the very nature of neutrality.

INVIOLABILITY OF NEUTRAL TERRITORY

1802. It must be considered an absolute right of any neutral state to preserve, during the war, the inviolability of all its territory, with its dependencies, and of its territorial waters, and to insist that no act of warfare shall be consummated therein by any of the belligerents.

1803. The belligerents are bound scrupulously to respect the inviolability of neutral territory and its dependencies and to abstain from committing therein any act of hostility, even of completing therein a military operation commenced outside such territory.

Every act of warfare undertaken or accomplished in the territory of a neutral state must be considered as contrary to the laws of war. Accordingly, it is unlawful to seize an enemy ship within the territorial waters of a neutral country, even when the ship has taken refuge there in order to escape the enemy.

If, however, a belligerent should commence an attack on the high seas and near the end of the battle the attacked ship should enter neutral waters, the inviolability of such waters could not be considered as infringed by the fact that the attack ended there, provided there was unity of action on the part of the enemy warship.

INDEPENDENCE IN THE EXERCISE OF THE RIGHTS OF SOVEREIGNTY

1804. Every neutral state is entitled to exercise with absolute independence its rights of sovereignty in time of war as in time of peace The free exercise of these rights may not be restricted on the ground of the possible consequent prejudice to either belligerent. It may be limited only in accordance with the preceding rules, or under special circumstances calculated to attribute to the acts of sovereignty the character of interference and of assistance to one of the combatants.

FREEDOM OF PEACEFUL COMMERCE

1805. A neutral state has the right to protect the freedom of peaceful commerce of its citizens in time of war, and to insure in every way the security of navigation and the inviolability of its merchant vessels and their cargoes. It is likewise its duty to protect the undeniable rights of its nationals to be considered as exempt from the laws of war so long as they have not infringed the duties of neutrality, and to safeguard their right to do business as freely as in time of peace. Moreover, such right may be exercised through the maintenance of commercial relations not only between neutral ports and those of the enemy but between any two ports of the belligerents, in execution of treaties concluded during peace and which must be considered as having remained in full force notwithstanding the outbreak of war.

1806. The belligerents are bound to consider in full force treaties concluded during peace with states which, at the outbreak of war, have made a declaration of neutrality, and to continue to assure to them and to their citizens the full enjoyment of all the rights and advantages arising out of these treaties, just as if the war, to which these states remain neutral, had not supervened.

DUTIES OF NEUTRAL STATES

1807. A neutral state must:

(a) Abstain faithfully and completely from taking part in the war and do nothing which, directly or indirectly, may contribute

to render either belligerent stronger; in general, abstain from any act whatever having the character of assistance to one of the belligerents for war purposes; and abstain impartially from lending assistance to either belligerent.

(b) Neither permit nor tolerate either belligerent, on the territory of the state or its dependencies, to undertake any operation or war or accomplish any act with respect to the war.

(c) Undertake by its laws to compel all persons subject to its jurisdiction to respect the rules of neutrality and the duties arising therefrom.

(d) Undertake to enforce its criminal laws to the end that persons subject to its jurisdiction may not violate with impunity the rules of neutrality and the resulting duties.

(e) Prevent, by all means at its disposal and with due diligence, any eventual injury which may be done to either belligerent from a violation of its neutrality by private individuals.

ACTS WHICH MAY BE CHARACTERIZED AS ACTS OF HOSTILITY

1808. The following shall be deemed acts of hostility:

(a) Assistance given to one of the belligerents by means of armed troops or placing at his disposal ships of war or vessels calculated to aid in the operations of the war.

(b) The permission or toleration of the use of its territory by one of the belligerents for the passage of its armies.

(c) Permission for or toleration of any operation within its ports or territorial waters by a belligerent warship calculated to strengthen its power or augment its armament, or to take in provisions and coal, except in case of urgent necessity, and then not beyond the quantity necessary for the needs of the crew during the time required to reach the nearest home port of the belligerent.

(d) Openly favoring or encouraging the enlistment of recruits within its territory on behalf of one of the belligerents.

(e) Permission for or toleration of a ship of war or privateer of one of the belligerents entering its ports or territorial waters to sell or to place in safety its prizes, except in cases of forcible entry under distress, in which circumstances shelter may be granted, on condition, however, of not taking advantage thereof for purposes of war.

(f) Permission granted to citizens to enlist in belligerent armies, or to accept letters of marque to engage in privateering, or to accept proposals of the belligerent states for fitting out ships of war or for participating in any manner whatever in the fitting out or armament of a privateer.

ACTS CONSISTENT WITH NEUTRALITY

1809. The following shall not be deemed hostile acts or acts inconsistent with neutrality:

(a) The passage of armies through neutral territory when the belligerent has crossed it without authorization and the territorial sovereign is powerless to prevent it except by becoming involved in the war.

(b) The enlistment in the belligerent armies of private individuals without authorization of the government, provided the government has applied to its citizens the laws in force concerning the legal consequences of enlisting abroad.

(c) Open and impartial commerce in munitions of war carried on by individuals at their own account and risk, without direct or indirect encouragement of the government.

(d) Any act whatever on the part of private individuals, not prohibited by municipal law, which may have been of advantage to one of the belligerents, but which was accomplished on the initiative of a private individual alone without the state having done anything that may have contributed to lessen the individual's risk and to protect him against the laws of war.

1810. It is no longer to be regarded as contrary to the duties of neutrality to grant permission to the belligerents to transport the sick and the wounded through neutral territory.

BELLIGERENTS TAKING REFUGE IN NEUTRAL PORTS OR TERRITORY

1811. It shall not be regarded as contrary to the duties of neutrality to give refuge in neutral ports to belligerent ships compelled to enter on account of stress of weather or of maritime disasters, or to receive on neutral territory soldiers requesting asylum after battle or troops pursued by the enemy who may seek refuge. These duties of humanity must, however, be accomplished without any indirect prejudice to the interests of the other belligerent and in compliance with the following rules:

1812. The neutral government may protect troops which, pursued by the enemy, have taken refuge in its territory. It may likewise do everything required by humanity for the maintenance and lodging of the soldiers, subject to the right to be repaid for the expenses incurred therefor by the state to which the troops belong, but it may not allow them to resume fighting unless they have been disarmed before leaving the neutral territory.

1813. The neutral government is bound to subject belligerent ships of war which have sought refuge in its ports on account of stress of weather to the condition of resuming their navigation only after a certain period of time, not less than 24 hours, following their arrival. It may permit ships which have been forced to put in for the purpose of repairing damages to make only such repairs as are necessary to render them seaworthy and to resume their voyage without augmenting their armament.

If a belligerent vessel has taken refuge in a neutral port to escape the attack of an enemy, which was pursuing it with superior forces and was certain to capture it, the neutral government could not, without violating the laws of neutrality, allow it to put to sea again in order to continue fighting, but must detain it and permit it to depart only after the commander has given his word to take no further part in the war.

PRISONERS LANDED AND PRIZES ABANDONED IN NEUTRAL PORTS

1814. A neutral state should not permit a ship of war which by unavoidable circumstances is compelled to enter one of its ports to land prisoners of war therein unless they are set free and permitted freely to depart.

1815. Should a belligerent vessel, owing to unavoidable causes, be compelled to abandon in a neutral port or in neutral territory prizes which it has captured, the neutral government ought to provide for the custody of the goods so abandoned and place them at the disposal of their owners unless the goods are contraband of war. In that case the goods would have to be kept in custody until the end of the war and should only be placed at the disposal of their owners or of the captors in conformity with the decision of the international prize court.

DILIGENCE REQUIRED IN THE OBSERVANCE OF THE DUTIES OF NEUTRALITY

1816. Any government of a neutral state which has not displayed perfect fairness and good faith in the strict observance of the duties of neutrality, and that due diligence which is required by the nature of things and the necessities of war shall be held responsible for any consequences of its failure to exercise due diligence.

1817. The diligence required of any government shall be determined with due regard to the circumstances which might render more or less imminent the danger of violating the duties of neutrality and the possibility of preventing injury to one or other of the belligerents.

Its responsibility would be in direct proportion to the means at its disposal to prevent the violation or to avoid or diminish the resulting injury to a belligerent and the degree of diligence displayed in adopting them. (Compare rules 604 et seq.)

FAULTS RESULTING FROM THE LACK OF DILIGENCE

1818. Ignorance on the part of a government of an act accomplished or planned by private individuals with the intention of violating the duties of neutrality cannot bar its liability for lack of diligence on its part whenever such ignorance may, under the circumstances, be considered as malevolent or grossly negligent.

1819. No neutral government shall be deemed guilty of a want of due diligence for not having adopted extraordinary precautions for the protection of the interests of the belligerents by limiting the liberty of its citizens beyond the bounds permitted by the institutions of the country. Nevertheless, the present powerlessness of a neutral government in preventing a violation of its duties of neutrality shall not be sufficient to bar its liability whenever it is shown to have failed in due time properly to provide the legal means calculated to prevent private individuals from violating the duties of neutrality.

ARBITRAL AWARD ON THE QUESTION OF DILIGENCE

1820. The determination of the degree of diligence which a government is bound to observe in the faithful discharge of its duties of neutrality is an unusually complex question which must be referred to a tribunal of arbitration.

DUTIES OF BELLIGERENTS TOWARD NEUTRALS

1821. The belligerents are bound to consider all states which at the outbreak of war have made a declaration of neutrality or have fulfilled the conditions required to be legally deemed neutrals, as enjoying all the rights of neutrals in time of peace, subject to the restrictions imposed in accordance with the common law in case of war.

They must also abstain from applying the laws of war to the citizens of neutral states not engaging in hostile acts, and consider them under the protection of the law in force in time of peace whenever they honestly and in good faith perform the duties of neutrality and do not infringe the laws and usages of war.

1822. The belligerents shall have no right by virtue of the exceptional law of war to capture neutral goods on board an enemy ship, except in case of contraband of war. (See rules 1870, et seq.)

1823. It shall not be permissible to treat a neutral vessel as an enemy or commit against it any act of hostility, when, by its papers, the vessel is able to establish its legal status as a neutral, and when there shall be no well-founded or reasonable ground to suspect the genuineness of the documents produced, or to raise the presumption that the vessel has forfeited its rights as a neutral.

1824. In principle, it should be deemed unlawful to capture enemy goods on board a neutral ship, unless they be contraband of war, even with respect to states which did not sign the treaty of 1856.

1825. Capturing an enemy ship in neutral territorial waters shall likewise be deemed unlawful, and the belligerent shall be bound to recognize the right of the neutral state to request that the prize be set free. (Cf. rule 1803.)

1826. The belligerents have no right in time of war to modify the rules governing peaceful commerce, but it is their duty to allow the citizens of neutral states to navigate their vessels and conduct commercial relations with perfect freedom and security under the protection of the common law in force in time of peace and of treaties, subject only to the restrictions arising out of effective blockade and the prohibition of carrying contraband of war.

RIGHTS AND DUTIES OF NEUTRALITY ACCORDING TO THE HAGUE CONVENTION OF 1907

1827. The states represented at the Hague Conference of 1907 and those which shall subsequently adhere to the general act shall be

bound to recognize the compulsory legal force of the conventional rules, adopted in common agreement, concerning the rights and duties of neutrality during war on land and on sea, provided the states which have signed the general act are parties to the war and subject to the reservations made by individual signatory states.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK].

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, this Congress usually represents in their action the will of the majority of the American people. This must be so, since the membership of this body is changed so often and because of the ease with which objectionable Members may be removed by the people.

In this debate it has repeatedly been stated that this Congress will never vote war against any nation involved in the European conflict. I do not believe this statement is true. I believe this Congress or any other Congress will vote war against any nation just as soon as the majority of the people in this country demand it.

Just now we are all agreed that we would not vote war against any foreign power. We do not because there is no demand from the people of this country for any such declaration. Therefore, the argument that we do not want to go to war is no argument at all, either for or against the present bill. To recount all the miseries of war does not answer the question before us. We have operated 2 years under a law having in it an embargo against the exportation of arms to warring nations. We passed that law when there was no recognized war in Europe or elsewhere. Our purpose was to do all in our power in peacetimes to avoid our being drawn into a conflict abroad should any such conflict develop. I think this was a futile piece of legislation, because we could not possibly legislate concerning a situation that was not then in existence and about which we knew nothing but mere surmise as to future possibilities. Since this act was passed and after 2 years of its operation a general conflict has broken out in Europe. Nations are now at war. At a time when war has actually broken out in Europe we are asked to repeal the embargo and change our policy. If we mean now what we meant when we passed the embargo law, we should avoid any act which would tend to encourage or discourage any nation at war. The only way I know of to keep out of a fight is to keep out.

Should we repeal this embargo, as I predict the House will this afternoon, we will have placed ourselves just one step nearer to involvement. If the repeal helps some nations and handicaps others, those handicapped will point to our act as the very means of their failure. From those nations and those who sympathize with them we cannot expect the same international treatment to which this or any other neutral nation is entitled. Those nations may commit acts which will arouse the ire of the people of the United States; and just as soon as that ire is sufficiently aroused, this Congress will vote war. Whether that ire is justly aroused we will not know, because the facts upon which that ire is fed may not be facts at all, or at least not all the facts. Information will be fed to the people of this country that those who want war will feed them. When public opinion is well formed in the United States, whether based on facts or not, that public opinion will demand action of this Congress, and this Congress will respond. For this Congress who now say "we will not vote war" to actually vote war is the easiest thing in the world to accomplish. All that is necessary is first to arouse the American people.

I for one am not willing to predict that we shall not enter this European war. I hope we do not. I will do all I can to prevent it.

In the present bill, just as I pointed out 30 days ago in this House, is a difficult matter to vote up or down. The provisions insisted upon by the President that our ships and citizens stay out of foreign war zones seems to me to be the best possible safeguard we could throw around this country. That part of the bill should be passed. But in the same bill and interwoven with it, is the repeal of the arms embargo. We cannot separate those propositions—we must vote "yes" or "no" as the bill stands.

Under these conditions I am convinced to a moral certainty that to change our stand on the exportation of arms at this time—a time when there is actual warfare raging in Europe—would open the door to possibilities which would actually involve us in war or furnish the basis of propaganda upon which a demand for war in this country could be built by those who would profit most out of our entry into war. For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I shall have to vote "no" on the entire bill.

Every nation in the world knew what our law was when they entered into war, and we most assuredly cannot be called unneutral if we mind our own business and stick to our own law. The turn of events in Europe may present a different situation before us in a very short time. We shall have to meet this situation. But today, right now, I refuse to offer any nation any excuse whatever to commit unfriendly acts against the people of the United States. [Applause.]

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. DISNEY].

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Speaker, we must stay out of the European conflict. We can stay out. We shall stay out. I shall bend every energy within me to that end. It is not our war. It is not of our making. We cannot and must not become a part of Europe by engaging in their conflicts every time a new generation of young men has arisen.

Every reasonable step must be taken to insure that end. Will retaining the arms embargo keep us out? Five years of an embargo, at the instance of two of our best thinkers, Jefferson and Madison, did not keep us out in 1812. International law and President Wilson's best efforts did not keep us out in 1917. This bill, putting strictures upon American shipping and the movement of American citizens to keep them out of war zones, may keep us out. I believe it will assist.

Sweden and Norway sold materials to all belligerents in 1917 and are doing so now. They did not get into the European conflict then and are not getting in now, although they lost 2,000 ships in the World War.

What keeps them out and kept them out? The same thing that can and will keep us out—a clear-headed national consciousness.

Is American thinking kept clear by scarehead statements and speeches made in the Congress and out by leading Members—statements not factually founded, but so constructed as to frighten the people? Declarations that this will or will not keep us out of the European conflict are mere statements of opinion. Since they are mere statements of opinion, why emblazon these statements with suggestions, not based upon fact, the effect of which is to frighten and confuse the millions of Americans who want above all things to see this cup of bitterness pass.

Basically, the catastrophe in Europe is the result of hatred. Why feed the flames of hatred in America with wild statements that result in evil, in the guise of good?

Can the American conscience stay clear if the molders of public opinion in America persist in rash acts and rash statements? Has a group of self-styled Solomons descended upon the earth, who believe that dogmatic statements amount to sound reason? No, Mr. Speaker; pride of opinion is a snare and a delusion, and it is more calculated to deceive than to instruct.

For my part, the reasoning of Senator George Norris; of Henry L. Stimson, Secretary of State under Hoover; William Allen White, leader of American thought for half a century; President Roosevelt, and other great Americans, seems logical.

Mr. Speaker, I have concluded to cast my vote in favor of the pending measure. I shall vote to repeal the existing arms-embargo law and to substitute a bona fide cash-and-carry system. I desire to state briefly the reasons which have led me to this conclusion, which have led me to adopt this course of action. First, let us consider the end which we seek to accomplish and then consider the means which are best calculated to accomplish that end.

Fortunately, we all agree as to the end. We differ only as to the best means for accomplishing that end. There is one point, at least, upon which we all agree—the desire to keep this country out of this war. In that desire the membership of this House is as united as one man. In that desire the people of this country are united. Few there are, if any, who would be willing to see this country reenter the bloody shambles of Europe. That sentiment is universal at this time.

But you ask if everybody desires to keep the peace, if everybody desires to keep out of this war, why should we worry? Why all this anxiety? Why all this solicitude? There are two sufficient answers to that question. In the first place, it takes two countries to keep the peace, whereas one country can break the peace, can precipitate war. No one country alone can decide whether it will have peace or war with another country. The worse of two countries can provoke war, can embroil itself and others in war. I repeat, there is no certain, no sovereign way, by which the most peace-loving country, acting alone, can preserve peace and prevent war. I mean, of course, no country that is not willing or is not bound to purchase peace at the price of surrender.

In the second place, the voice of experience bids us beware. In considering the future we must remember the past. When the World War broke out in 1914 the desire in this country to keep out of that struggle was as universal then as the desire to keep out of the present war is all-pervading now. The very suggestion that we enter that war provoked unanimous protest and abhorrence. At the outbreak of that war President Wilson himself proclaimed:

> We must be impartial in thought as well as in action, must put a curb upon our sentiments as well as upon every transaction that might be construed as a preference of one party to the struggle before another.

But time passed, and war came. Incident followed upon incident, casualty upon casualty, and disaster upon disaster. One tragedy trod upon the heels of another. Our ships were sunk. Our citizens were killed. Blood of our blood went to watery graves. Our sympathies were touched. Our emotions were stirred. Our passions were inflamed. Interested and insidious propaganda fed the flames. We entered the war. We sent 2,000,000 soldiers into the slaughter pens of Europe. It cost us uncounted billions of treasury. But that was not the worst—it cost us rivers of blood. It cost tens of thousands of lives. It wrecked many, many other lives which it did not destroy. Many a young life was ruined in the very morning of existence—left mere mutilated images. As we respect and honor the veterans of the last war, no one wishes to reinforce them with the veterans of another war. As we cherish and revere the Gold Star Mothers, we do not wish to increase their number by reenacting their tragedies. We want no more mothers in this country to be weeping like Rachael of old for her children.

But I need not repeat what everybody knows. I need not reiterate what everybody believes. I need not recall what no one can forget.

I come now to the simple question that is in every heart, that is on every lip: How can we keep out of this war? I wish that I knew the answer. The most that we can do, the best that we can do, is to take counsel of experience. Let us nct pursue the path that led us into the last war. Let us, as far as we can, avoid the causes that dragged or drove us into that conflict. There were some then who strove to avert war, but they strove in vain. Let us now do everything that human foresight can do to prevent the sinking of our ships, to prevent the killing of our citizens, and to prevent a recurrence of those causes and those casualties which involved us in that catastrophe. The pending resolution is at least designed to do that. It proposes, among other things, to repeal the existing arms-embargo law. The present law places an embargo upon the shipment of arms, munitions, and the implements of war to a belligerent or to a participant in a declared war, but it does not prohibit the shipment of the raw materials out of which arms and munitions are made. It does not prohibit our ships from transporting such raw materials to the belligerent countries. It does not prohibit our ships from traveling in troubled waters—in belligerent waters. It did not prevent the *City of Flint* from falling into the hands of a belligerent power. It would not prevent our citizens from traveling on our ships into those danger zones where death lurks in the deep—nay, where death "stalks like a pestilence at noontime."

The pending measure proposes to do those very things, to prevent, as far as we can, those causes which plunged us into the last war. The pending measure not only forbids our ships to transport arms and munitions to a warring power but forbids them to transport the raw materials out of which the implements of war are made. Not only that, it forbids our ships to transport both raw materials and finished products of every kind to a warring nation. More than that, it forbids our vessels to enter the ports or to enter the waters of those countries where the war is waging. There are some, indeed, who complain that the proposed measure goes too far, that the proposed sacrifices are too great. But if this bill errs at all, it errs on the side of peace. For my own part, I am willing to do everything—I am willing to make any sacrifice that can be made with honor—to preserve peace and to avert war. I am unwilling to do less. I shall, therefore, vote for this measure in the belief that it is a bona fide cash-and-carry measure.

This act, if passed, will, among other things, prohibit the sale of arms and munitions in this country to any belligerent government except for cash. It will prohibit the export of materials of any kind to a belligerent state until the shipper has filed a sworn statement with port collectors that title has been transferred to some foreign government, corporation, agency, or national. It will require all belligerents to transport all such materials and munitions in their own vessels or in the vessels of some other country than the United States. It also prohibits the shipment of arms and munitions in American vessels to any belligerent port on the globe and it bars American vessels from transporting supplies or passengers to belligerent ports situated in a danger zone or combat area. Last, but not least, it forbids American citizens to travel on the ships of a belligerent power, whether armed or unarmed.

I repeat that I support this resolution in the belief that it is a bona fide cash-and-carry measure and upon the assurance that it will be administered as such in good faith. When I say cash and carry I mean cash and carry. With me cash does not mean credit and credit does not mean cash. Cash, as we say out West, means "cash on the barrel head." Ninety days is not cash. I would not vote for a makeshift or a subterfuge.

I want Congress to pull these evils up by the roots. I want Congress to do its duty. I want the legislative department to meet and to discharge its responsibility. The administration, the enforcement of the measure, must, under our system, be left to the executive department.

Mr. Speaker, if you ask me whether this measure, if enacted, will positively keep us out of war, I answer that I do not know. No man can tell. I know of no royal recipe to prevent war. If I did know, I would be wiser than other men, because they do not know. They may declaim they do, but they cannot be that wise. During the last 3,500 years there have been more than 8,000 treaties of peace entered into among the warring nations of the past. The average life of these treaties was less than 6 months. The mortality rate on the average was more than two treaties for each and every year during the last three and one-half thousand years. So how can we now be dogmatic in our beliefs?

If you ask me why I am not content to retain and to rely upon the existing arms embargo law, I can make but one answer, and I answer in the light of experience. We tried the embargo once. We tried it from 1807 until 1811. The first Embargo Act was passed in 1807. It was followed by nonintercourse acts and nonimportation acts. Mr. Jefferson believed that the embargo would keep us out of war. He tried it in good faith. Jefferson said that he could hardly withhold himself from the wish that an ocean of fire rolled between this country and Europe. President Madison, suc-

ceeding Jefferson, tried the embargo in good faith. It did not keep us out of war. It failed then. It might fail now. At all events the embargo is condemned by experience. It was tried in the balance. The pending plan has not been tried. It has not been weighed in the balance. It has not been condemned by experience.

Mr. Speaker, if you ask why I am not willing to repeal the existing arms embargo and let it go at that, why I am not willing to return to international law, why I am not willing to rely upon international law to keep us out of war, I make this answer: we relied upon the law of nations to keep us out of the last war. We pleaded, we insisted, upon our rights as a neutral. We insisted that the belligerent powers observe the duties enjoined upon them by the law of nations. In spite of international law, in spite of all its sanctity and all its sanctions, we became involved in the bloodiest holocaust that ever scourged the sons of men. Mr. Speaker, I must be excused if I judge the future by the past, if I insist upon taking counsel of experience, if I decline to accept the advice and authority of those in high places who would counsel us to revive the age-old and time-honored doctrine of international law and who would ask us to rely in the future as we relied in the past upon that "time-honored doctrine" to keep us out of war.

We relied upon the law of nations to keep us out of the last war. It failed, as the embargo failed, to keep us out of war. Like the embargo, it has been condemned by experience. It was weighed and found wanting. We put our faith in the law of nations but those hopes, like Dead Sea fruit, turned to bitterness and ashes on the lips.

To revive the law of nations and rely upon the law of nations to keep us out of this war could, in my judgment, lead us again into hostilities. We know what would happen, we know from recent and from bitter experience, we know that our ships would be sunk, that our people would be killed, that passion and propaganda would again run riot, that history would probably again repeat itself and repeat its tragedies. That would be the way into war, not the way out.

I realize as much as anyone that the pending proposal is, in a certain sense, an experiment, but, sir, it is counseled by experience. The proposed plan has not been tried in the past. It has not been condemned by experience. It has not been adjudged in default at the bar of history. The embargo has been tried and it failed. The law of nations has been tried and it failed. It may be that the proposed plan will meet with no better fortune in the future, but we cannot know, we do not know that in advance. It has not been condemned in the past. I cannot lift the veil of the future, but in the light of experience, the proposed plan holds out the best promise to preserve the blessings of peace and to avert the evils of war.

Just a word about the oft-quoted idea that we are changing the rules in the middle of the game. To be literally correct, we started changing the rules before the game started, which we had reason to believe would start soon. The world had notice of our intentions. We have a perfect moral right to proceed in an orderly manner to complete those intentions.

In my judgment, it will not do to allow those international bullies, who have started what even they with their propaganda call a senseless war, for which they have been preparing for a decade, to say to us either directly or indirectly: "You started to change the rules. We started the dreadful game of war. Now it will be immoral for you to change the rules involved in this holocaust." In other words, those belligerents who have constantly attempted to preserve the peace and who made their calculations in the light of peace, rather than in the shadow of war, will not be permitted, by this theory, even to defend themselves against the aggressor—even to buy food and clothing for their women and children who every day clutch their gas masks and tremble at the sound of a whirring motor. I would treat them alike and let them all have equal opportunities according to their own situations, to purchase our materials.

I must reiterate what has been called to the attention of the Congress, that the neutral nations in Europe—neutral both in this and in the last war—as Sweden, for instance, have plied their trade with belligerents, taking their chances under the rules of international law. I am informed that Sweden and Norway lost a thousand ships each in the last war, but they did not become embroiled in the conflict merely because they traded with belligerents.

In my opinion the real likelihood of our getting into this conflict lies in the danger to democracy. Under the doctrine of democracy America has grown powerful and great, and the individual has maintained his rights under our Constitution. If that principle becomes the more endangered in Europe, then it is possible to foresee a change from the now prevailing sentiment against entry into the European conflict, and a grim determination on the part of our people to protect the doctrine of democracy, even to resorting to war, the instrument by which this Nation was brought into being. I repeat, that in my judgment, there lies the possibility of our involvement, when and if democracy in Europe, in the judgment of our people, becomes in serious danger of complete extinction and the civilized world likely to be forcibly turned over to international brigandry—then, and not until then, is there a possibility of sentiment in this country being revolutionized to a desire to enter the war.

My judgment is that the aggressors under force of circumstances are and should be compelled to take their chances with the nonaggressive, peace-seeking nations in this conflict. This bill nearest approaches that objective.

I shall vote for it after months of thoughtful premeditation, having in mind the boys—including my own sons—and the mothers of this Nation, and keeping also in mind that under our democracy we have personal and individual rights that are so sacred and so important to us and our posterity, that they are worth every effort, both physical and mental, that we can put forth to solve this problem.

We know that the ancient nations of the earth flourished, decayed, and disintegrated. We have the consolation that history teaches most unmistakably that nations, like individuals, prosper according to their right thinking, and that the idolatrous exaltation of a material sense of power and intelligence inevitably leads to decline, deterioration, ruin, and downfall. [Applause.]

Mr. BURGIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter written by ex-Governor Pinchot, of Pennsylvania.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER].

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. Speaker, last spring I was one of the charter members of the Committee to Keep America Out of Foreign Wars. I was profoundly concerned that America was being war-conditioned. My attendance at the convention of the American Legion in Chicago in September convinced me that America was war-wary.

All polls now indicate that 95 percent of the American people are profoundly opposed to our entering any foreign war.

No administration and no Congress can put the American people into war in their present temper. There is instant suspicion of any moves that tend in this direction. Propaganda must be much more subtle than it was in 1917.

How to keep America out of war is the fundamental issue. There is general agreement that we were drawn into the last war by three primary causes. War passions were inflamed by the sinking of American ships carrying supplies to belligerents and by the drowning of American passengers on belligerent ships. Our self-interest was aroused by the large credits to the Allies and the possibility of their loss. Each of these causes is measurably removed in the pending legislation. American ships may not carry anything to belligerent ports in Europe and may not enter combat zones. Americans are prohibited from traveling on belligerent vessels.

American-owned goods may not even leave America consigned to any belligerent. All credits to belligerents are prohibited even for 90 days.

Any Americans who are against Roosevelt, right or wrong, may be reassured by the knowledge that these provisions are most unacceptable to the administration and have been consistently opposed.

I have voted for the embargo hitherto under the conviction that it would discourage resort to arms. That hope has been proved vain.

Our problem now is how to keep from being involved. The longer the war lasts the more danger there is that America will be drawn in.

I believe removing the embargo will tend to shorten the war and encourage a diplomatic peace.

My conclusion is strengthened by the Russian-German alliance which has profoundly altered the world picture since we last considered this matter 3 months ago.

I cannot bring myself at this juncture to take action that is calculated to strengthen the hands of Hitler and Stalin.

Whatever may be the limits of their ambitions or their purposes, they obviously bode no good for the things in which we believe. Their coalition has a sinister significance and one that no thoughtful student of world affairs can properly ignore.

The Communist Commissar of Foreign Affairs, Mr. Molotov, sees signs of a holy war and attacks the Vatican concern over the godlessness that is sweeping over Europe. Apparently Stalin considers this is, and is determined this shall continue, an unholy war.

Russia is opening its markets 100 percent to Germany. America has opened its markets 85 percent to all who come.

In the interest of keeping America out of war, I believe we may wisely impose the restrictions of this bill on credits and on American passengers and vessels entering the war zones and may open our markets 100 percent to all who may have the cash to buy and take away.

All signs indicate this is not likely to mean a war boom. The singed American cat dreads the fires of another war inflation.

Any who support this legislation under the hope of a business boom are likely soon to be disillusioned.

The world has moved some distance since it was last involved in strife. Peoples are generally both war-weary and war-wary.

America can keep out of this war, and the restrictions on our shipping and our credits will be most helpful to this end that we all alike desire.

Let us all recognize the high determination of Americans everywhere to keep us out of war. Let us be charitable to the patriotic purpose of all those with whom we may temporarily disagree.

America is going to emerge from this holocaust strengthened and spiritually rededicated to fulfilling our manifest mission as an example of ordered democratic progress for the salvation of the world—not by our armed might, although we shall be adequately prepared—but by the awakening of individual Americans everywhere to our responsibility as Americans to make of our democracy a more pronounced success. Then the weary struggling peoples of the earth may be moved to follow our example, and democracy will experience a renaissance. "I, if I be lifted up, will draw all men unto Me." [Applause.]

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUNN] such time as he may require.

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, if I were convinced beyond a doubt that the bill now before the House would lead us toward war, I would not support it. It is my opinion that this bill, if enacted into law, will keep us out of war.

In the World War thousands of men were blinded. Although, in my opinion, blindness is not the worst affliction that can befall man, nevertheless, it is a terrible handicap. I know what I am talking about because for 30 years I have been without vision. Do you suppose that I would favor legislation which I knew would result in the murdering of hundreds of thousands of human beings and in the maiming of thousands for life? No; I would not! War is inhuman.

If we would take the profits out of war, and there would be no such thing as annexations or indemnities, it is doubtful whether nations would go to war. I do not think that the people of our Nation or of any other nation in the world want war. I do not believe that our great President Roosevelt would intentionally have us participate in a war unless it was absolutely necessary to defend the people of our country. The President has demonstrated many times that his main interest is in humanity.

If we would use about one-tenth of the money which is expended for munitions and other damnable devices of war for education and for the eradication of slums, we would be doing something that is not only constructive but also very humane.

Almost every square foot of ground in Europe has been saturated with human blood because of religious, national, and racial hatred; and human blood will continue to be spilled until that time comes when man will look upon his fellow man as his brother. Any country that persecutes people because of their religion, nationality, race, or color should be condemned—in fact, our country is guilty of inhuman treatment of many of its own people. The great God of the universe has put on this earth an abundance of everything necessary for man, and yet in every nation in the world thousands of human beings are poverty stricken. It is disgraceful and abominable for mankind to be compelled to suffer in a world of plenty. I hope the time is not far distant when the people of every nation in the world will come under one flag—the flag of humanity. [Applause.]

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. STEARNS] such time as he may desire.

Mr. STEARNS of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, I was not a Member of this House in 1935 and 1937, when the present law was placed on the statute books, but as a World War veteran and a former member of the Foreign Service of the United States I was naturally interested. My impression about legislation in this body is that few matters that have been thoroughly considered and vigorously debated are passed by such overwhelming majorities as this was; and while I did not even then approve of the principle of an arms embargo, I fear that I looked on the so-called Neutrality Act as a probably harmless gesture expressing, whether wisely or not, the universal desire of the American people for peace.

Since then I have seen some of the complications that the arms embargo can give rise to under varying and unforeseen conditions. As a Member of this House, and of its Committee on Foreign Affairs, I had occasion at the last session to go into the matter more thoroughly, and my conviction has grown and hardened that so long as such a provision remains law it will raise more problems than it solves and will tend to incidents and involvement. I therefore voted against restoring the embargo to the Bloom bill. I have seen no reason to regret my vote in that instance, and I see nothing in the changed conditions of today to change my stand. On the contrary, I believe that the recent trend of events has justified and borne out the wisdom of that vote.

Mr. Speaker, I am very proud of the district that I have the honor to represent in this House. The people of the Second New Hampshire District are a sober, earnest, industrious, thoughtful people, of whom it has been said that they have all of the Puritan's virtues and none of his defects. They are tolerant, friendly, and peace loving; but woe betide the man who thinks that he can dictate to them or trample on their rights. Their fathers fought and subdued the wilderness; they fought at Bunker Hill and Bennington and on many another field for American independence, and they sent a larger percentage of their manhood into the war to preserve the Union than any other Northern State. I belong to them and I understand them; and it was more of a satisfaction than a surprise to me to find that the position I have taken met with the approval of an overwhelming majority of them. [Applause.]

The people of my district want peace; they see no reason for our involvement in the present war. They are cool and level-headed about this and will not be stampeded by emo-

tional appeals based on incidents such as are bound to occur as the conflict takes its course, and which no legislation can prevent from occurring.

At the same time their sympathies are wholly and deeply engaged on the side of those—call them democracies or not—who, with whatever faults and shortcomings, are fighting today, as they see it, for the principles of human freedom which their fathers embodied in our Bill of Rights. They feel strongly that the present law seems to assist those who are attacking those principles, and that the retention of the arms embargo would be welcomed with rejoicing in Berlin and Moscow; and they tell me that they are unwilling that any dictator shall tell them what laws they are to keep and what reject. I should not know how to face them if I voted for what they would consider a surrender of their independence in the face of threats and intimidation.

I am not going to take the time of the House for any extended argument, as I believe the case for the present bill has been fully and ably presented. I should like to add just this:

Some of the opponents of this bill are proposing—illogically, it seems to me—to compromise. From the point of view of one who, like myself, regrets the surrender of hard-won principles of international law, the present bill as a whole can only be regarded as a painful but probably necessary compromise, which surrenders rights for which our ancestors have fought and died, in the hope thereby of maintaining peace. My sentiments have been brilliantly expressed by that indomitable son of our sister State of Virginia, Senator CARTER GLASS, in a memorable statement which I am sure no Member of this House has failed to read. Like him, I am forced to recognize the practical necessity for compromise; and I shall vote for this resolution with the conviction that it is a wise and practical measure which reasserts our freedom of action, while tending to guard us against incidents which might arouse the national passions and break down in the minds and hearts of the American people their present will to peace. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time is left?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM] has used 1 hour and 34 minutes. The gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] has used 1 hour and 25 minutes.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, so there may be no misunderstanding with reference to the time, I understood that debate was to run until 3:20.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. I yield.

Mr. RAYBURN. And I hope this will not be taken out of the time for either side.

Mr. Speaker, on yesterday I submitted a unanimous consent request that would have carried the debate until 3 o'clock today. That request was objected to. After consultation I decided to move the previous question at 3 o'clock, but the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM], and the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] feel they are committed to 20 minutes more time—10 minutes a side. I have agreed to that, but I shall move the previous question at exactly 3:20.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, we might just as well admit that propaganda is coming into this country in such magnitude that the 1914–17 stream looks like a mere trickle. We will have to admit that it has only begun. It is a regrettable fact that on the eve of the consideration of this bill in one of the great metropolitan papers of this city, those who would oppose the repeal of the arms embargo would be caricatured as marching down the street arm in arm with Stalin. The bloody beast of intolerance breathes its hot breath upon the Members of the greatest deliberative body in the world by name-calling, character-assassinating editorials that would question the high purposes and the patriotic devotion to their country of the Members that are trying to find the answer to the momentous questions, which will undoubtedly be settled this week. The editorials eulogize those who would take one course as against another because some differ as to the meaning of the word "neutrality," because some differ as to the concept of what our national policy should be as distinguished from what our personal prejudices seem to be at the moment. This is a sad commentary upon the freedom of the press and freedom of the speech guaranteed by our Constitution, that one group be castigated. I am willing to resolve the doubt in favor of the sincerity of the editors and columnists who resort to hitting below the belt when men of high purpose speak their heart upon these questions, that will chart the course of our Government in peaceful waters of true neutrality or in the storm-tossed seas of hatreds, fears, butchery of the innocent, and dethroning of the powerful.

I am sure you will be charitable with me when I say that while propaganda is showing its force, little can be done about it. The right to propagandize the American people is so clearly linked up with freedom of press and assembly that it is difficult and probably not desirable to halt the flood. Our defense against propaganda is to use the experience of the World War technique as a basis. We should accept nothing from foreign shores without weighing the alleged facts in the balance. We should ask ourselves "What is the source?" "What ax have they to grind?" "Exactly how does this affect the United States?" Let us ever and always apply this test to every morsel of information that comes to our eyes or ears.

We are called here in special session because a war has broken out in Europe. The natural history of Europe has been a history of war and conquest. The rotten growth of hate is so imbedded in the hearts of the several peoples of Europe that bloodshed by our American boys in another war, millions of dollars' worth of ammunition, and tons of food and oil and petroleum shipped from America would never remove it. We tried that once in a tragic effort to change Europe's history and we must confess that the present situation is worse than the one before the World War. Before we pit our Nation on the side of our personal feelings in this terrible conflict let us recognize that we are asking our Government to make new sacrifices for old results. We did not make the world better because we fought the last time, and we should remember our lesson. We should give serious consideration to the thought that if our Government persists in the policy of intervention, whether or not the United States will become permanently involved in the conflicts of empire in Europe.

Yesterday an appeal was made to us to make true the shibboleth of Woodrow Wilson that we fight to make the world safe for domocracy. Yes; to the tune of this shibboleth we marched our boys behind the bugles and the blares of trumpets to New York harbor to be transported across 3,000 miles of ocean while conscientious people preached and exhorted in America that we were fighting a war to make the world safe for democracy. What a travesty of justice to our people and to the soldiers in Flanders Field and to the lifeless unknown wreck who gave his all now lying in Arlington National Cemetery. The expression "Make the world safe for democracy" is a superficial, impossible, and an unwise slogan. Think of it! "Make the world safe for democracy." It is to say "make food safe for gluttony," "make religion safe for fanaticism," "make the social world safe for free love," "make justice safe for lawlessness." It is a weak, unsound, beggarly slogan. Our Government and our Republic was created to make safety, not to have safety made for it.

The cost of human life, the price of maiming, cutting, tearing the flesh of the flower of our youth, the gnawing destruction of the tissue of the lungs and nose and eyes of our soldiers, the shell-shocked, nervous veterans in mental wards throughout the length and breadth of our land, the terror in the hearts of the mothers who died a thousand deaths every moment that their sons were over there—the cost of these things can never be computed. The cost of a few tangible items we can figure. The cost of the World

War up until June 30, 1921, was $25,729,000,000. Continuing costs will run this figure up to $100,000,000,000. Let me recapitulate some of these continuing costs:

Veterans' Administration	$6,391,000,000
Interest on war debt	9,557,000,000
Settlement of War Claims Act of 1928	88,000,000
Total to June 1934, original and continuing costs	41,765,000,000

June 30, 1934, is the latest date for which official figures have been published relative to World War costs. Add to this figure bonus payments in the amount of $1,899,000,000. Bear in mind that it was contended by Winston Churchill before Parliament in London that the United States should pay its proportionate share of the Allies' cost of the war from the date that we declared war until our first troops landed in France.

On January 4, in the President's message to the regular session of the Seventy-sixth Congress, it was apparent that the appeal this time is to "make the world safe for religion." It was and is a dangerous appeal, because it is an attempt to arouse religious passion. Slogans for wars are made to throw men off their feet in their calm, cool, deliberate thinking. Shibboleths disturb their dispassionate judgment and remove the whole matter out of the realm of rational discussion into a realm of emotional ferment where man can be swayed to impulsive action by being frightened with the cry, "Your religion is at stake."

The hue and cry of the President on January 4 is not unlike the columnists and editors who cry "to arms for religious liberty." They have some relation to a Mohammedan mullah attempting to raise his tribesmen to frenzy frantically crying out, "The Christians are coming, the Christians plan another jehad."

It is true, of course, that the imposing success of Hitler and Mussolini, with their countries on the maps of Europe, by appeal to brute force, constitutes a challenge to the Christian faith. But there is a difference between seeing the challenge to the Christian gospel by the obliteration of all the churches in the Soviet Union and the limitation upon the creeds and the religions of Germany and Italy on the one hand and starting out to preach another crusade and girding ourselves for battle on the other hand.

The cries of the war makers, "Your holy religion is threatened; your sacred altars are imperiled; to arms, prepare to fight for your faith; God wills it," do not recognize the first line of defense for humanity and for religion and for the right to worship God as you see fit.

Ask yourselves the question whether or not dealing with the totalitarian challenge to your sacred altars in religion on the level of a war is not a throw-back to the Dark Ages.

At 10:30 one Sunday morning three parishioners of a church served by a friend of mine were lamenting the fact that the churches in Russia had been obliterated and their creeds wiped out. This discussion took place on a golf course. These three men earnestly hoped that communism would not close our churches here. This happened during the hour of worship; they did not attend, but they earnestly hoped that their church would stay open and that their parish would be served by a clergyman. Unwilling to even attend a church service, they hoped that the day would never come in America when communism would wipe the churches from the face of our Nation.

I appeal to you to look at our problem in neutrality with all the coolness and calmness of judgment that you had 2 years ago and 4 years ago when the latest Neutrality Acts were put upon our statute books. If we as American people were sincere that this conflict in Europe was a fight to save our churches and our altars in America and to safeguard our right in America to worship God as we see fit, on last Sunday morning the churches of this Nation would have been filled to overflowing and the depleted coffers of our churches would have overflowed with our hard-earned money. The most sacred possession of our people, the right to worship God according to the dictates of their own consciences, is not the real issue in this war hysteria. If we lose the right of freedom of worship guaranteed to us by the fundamental law of our land, it will be because the price for that freedom has grown so cheap that we do not support any church program in time of peace.

In a world filled with Hitlers, Mussolinis, Stalins, and the swaggering Japanese generals, so closely following the bloody conflict to make the world safe for democracy, that slogan could not be an effective appeal for a new war.

Last summer the French and English diplomats pursued the elusive man that walks like a bear, that rules with an iron hand over 168,000,000 people, to crush Hitler from the east. As long as diplomats of England and France were pursuing this bloodthirsty, ruthless, murdering, purging ruler of Russia, "Making the World Safe for Democracy" was not a safe slogan for this war while the battle lines and the sides were being drawn. It is still not a safe slogan because the geographical position of Turkey is needed to bottle up one side in this conflict.

The history of Europe from the time of the invasions of Germanic tribes has been a continuous story of government without the consent of the governed. For the purpose of this discussion let us examine some of the facts that were taking place immediately before and during the life of our Republic. In 1760 northeast of Austria-Hungary and east of Prussia lay the largest country in Europe with exception of Russia—Poland. Her people were Slavic, ruled over by feudal nobles, so jealous of each other that they were an easy prey for the other countries of Europe. Without privileges from the nobles, Polish working classes were miserably poor serfs, practically slaves, who gave up to their masters a greater portion of the crops they raised. Frederick the Great looked at this land of West Prussia which separated East Prussia from the rest of his kingdom with a covetous eye. He persuaded Maria Theresa of Austria and Empress Catherine II of Russia to join in the division of Poland in 1772. Other European nations condoned the division because they were greedy and annexed land wherever they could get it. By 1795 all the remainder of Poland was divided up between Germany, Austria, and Russia. The Prussian and Austrian armies and the common people of these countries had no desire to fight and conquer the Poles, but their kings gained the exclusive advantage of annexing more subjects upon whom to levy taxes.

Lithuania, northeast of Poland, was Russia's share in the division. The Lithuanians had been united with the Poles by the marriage of their duke to the daughter of the King of Poland, after the duke had followed his father-in-law upon the throne of Poland.

DOWNFALL OF THE FRENCH MONARCH

For hundreds of years the French King had been growing stronger until there was not another noble in the country who could oppose him. Any subject who offended him was thrown into prison without trial. Peasants and working classes had been ground down under heavier and heavier taxes. Millions of dollars sucked from the coffers of the poor went into the King's armies, the frivolity of his court, and the gayety of Paris. The French people, ripe for revolt, were without a leader until the royal treasury was empty.

Under the leadership of Mirabeau, the temper of the people was such that the King dared not force his will upon them, and, in 1789, the people stormed the Bastille and took it. Revolt of the common people spread like wildfire. Soldiers disobeyed officers, the King was captured in an attempt to flee France, and the people took charge of the Government. Kings of England, Prussia, Spain, Russia, and Austria, all made war on the French Republic, because they, too, had oppressed their subjects and they did not want their own empires to be put down; so the peasants—the poor—were herded like sheep to fight to uphold the kingdoms that kept them in serfdom. The French Army, with enthusiasm for this new freedom, beat back their invaders.

In such a setting Napoleon Bonaparte came to the front in charge of a French army in Italy engaged in combat with the Austrians. At one time the Austrian House of Hapsburg controlled a greater part of the peninsula. When Charles V was elected Emperor of the Holy Roman Empire, as a Hapsburg he was ruler of Austria; as a descendant of Charles,

Duke of Burgundy, he was lord of what is now Holland and Belgium; he was King of Spain, as the oldest living grandson of Ferdinand and Isabella. In the fifteenth century he defeated the French King for control of northern Italy, and only Russia, Turkey, Poland, and England were not under his sway.

Napoleon's armies were defending the French people against the Austrian armies, which were fighting to force the French people to return to the rule of the hated kings. Napoleon forced the Austrian Emperor to make peace with France. In the second war he cut to pieces the Austrian army and a second time compelled his enemies to make peace. Success intoxicated him and he sought and was elected Emperor for life.

The Kings of England and the Emperors of Austria and Prussia and the Czar of Russia had long since forgotten they owed their power to the swords of their fighting men and they claimed that God in His wisdom had seen fit to make them rulers over these lands and they were responsible to God alone.

The victorious French were full of warlike pride in their victories over the tyranny of kings and they swept over Europe to spread the idea that the people had rights that kings were bound to respect. For 16 years Napoleon beat the Austrians and Prussians singly and combined. He crushed the Prussian army trained in the school of Frederick the Great. He drove out the King of Spain, the King of the Sicilies, and the Kings of several small German Kingdoms. He placed his brother, friends, and son upon the several thrones of Europe, took away from Prussia all her territory, except Brandenburg, Silesia, Pomerania, and East and West Prussia. He organized the whole Polish Kingdom as the Grand Duchy of Warsaw. He annexed Belgium and Holland, and parts of western Germany and Italy. These new rulers named by Napoleon had come from the ranks of the humble. Bernadotte, one of Napoleon's generals, was chosen by the Swedes as their King.

Intoxicated with success, one-half million Frenchmen invaded Russia; the Russian people set fire to their beautiful city of Moscow, and bands of Russian cossacks, through snow and ice, came down upon Napoleon's army from the rear and took 100,000 prisoners. Encouraged by this terrible defeat of the French, the allied kings of Europe united to drive the little Corsican from the throne of France. In 1814 the troops of the kingdoms of Austria, Prussia, Russia, and England, and the Swedish troops, led by Bernadotte, Napoleon's former general, defeated the Corsican. The allied kings set the brother of Louis XIV upon the throne of France, and Napoleon was banished to Elba. He escaped, and the magic of his presence brought such joy to the soldiers of the King that they threw themselves at his feet. The King of France fled a second time, and the man chosen by the people was once more head of the Government.

All the kingdoms of Europe declared war against France and headed for her borders. Napoleon marched rapidly north into the low countries and defeated the Prussians. On the field of Waterloo the French were defeated in one of the great battles of the world's history. The defeated Prussians had made a wide circle and returned to the field of battle to aid their English allies, who had come from Brussels. A second time Louis XVIII was put upon the throne by the bayonets of foreign troops. The feudal lords were once again in control.

After Napoleon had been crushed, the kings and princes of Europe met at Vienna to divide Europe. Only the fear of uprisings similar to the French Revolution among the masses of people had driven the kings to act together. The Congress of Vienna in 1815 is a fair example of the way wars have always been settled without consideration of the wishes of the people. The map was divided by the hates and fears and intrigue of the several kings and princes. The Austrians were afraid of the Russo-Prussian combination. England did not love Austria but feared the other two powers. Prussia was given back some of its Polish territory and a great deal of land in western Germany along the Rhine, together with a part of the Kingdom of Saxony. Saxony's people were bitterly unhappy over this arrangement. Some of Austria's part of her Polish territory was given to Russia. What is now Belgium was joined to Holland. Its people are of the Catholic faith and disliked to be joined with the Protestant Dutch of Holland. Finland was transferred to Russia. Norway, taken away from Denmark, was given to Sweden, although the Norwegians wanted their independence. This union was another source of trouble. A greater part of Poland and Lithuania were joined to Russia. To pay back Austria for her loss of Poland, she was given all of northern Italy except the counties of Piedmont and Savoy near France. France ended up with territory she had before the revolution.

The Bourbons ruled France, the two Sicilies, and Spain. The Albanians, Serbians, and Rumanians were made subject to the hated Turks. The three kingdoms once vacant were supplied with kings their subjects hated. Poland was divided into four different governments. The Swiss were the only ones left untroubled.

This congress of 1815 by the kings, emperors, and princes laid the foundation for future revolutions and wars without number in Europe. The Poles unsuccessfully attempted to revolt, were forced to give up the use of their language, their schools, their courts, and their churches. The Italian people formed secret societies which had for their objective the uniting of Italy for freedom against foreign rulers. Mutterings of discontent were among the people of Germany. Greece revolted against the Turks and won its right of independence 15 years after the congress. Soon afterward Belgium broke away from the Netherlands. People of France revolted against the Bourbons and dethroned them permanently. In Spain one revolution after another followed. France changed again from citizen-king to a republic with the nephew of Napoleon Bonaparte as president, as ambitious as his uncle to be emperor.

Russia attacked Turkey in 1853. France and England were afraid that if Russia conquered the Turks she would become too powerful, so France and England rushed troops to aid Turkey. Russia was defeated. Thousands of soldiers were killed on both sides in this Crimean war. The little kingdom of Sardinia in western Italy joined the English and French in return for Napoleon III's promise to make war with Sardinia against the Austrians. If Austria lost, the Sardinians were to receive all of northern Italy, and France was to receive the county of Savoy and the seaport of Nice. As soon as the Austrians were beaten, Napoleon III gave the Sardinians only Lombardy in return for Savoy and Nice to France and the Austrians kept the county of Venetia. Other small Italian states seeing the success of Sardinia revolted against the Austrian princes in 1859. The people of Sicily, with the help of the secret promises of the King of Sardinia, revolted against the King, put upon their throne by the congress of Vienna. Next the armies of the common people of Sicily marched upon Naples, joined along the way by the people who rose against their former masters to welcome the liberator. The people of Italy and Sicily voted to join their brothers on the north to make a new kingdom of Italy. Victor Immanuel, King of Sardinia, thus first became the King of united Italy, and the dream of Italians for 600 years had come to pass.

All this time the kings of Europe had been engaged in contests with their own people, the French Revolution had taught the common people how to obtain liberties and the same year that the Austrians drove Prince Metternich from Austria, the last king was driven out of France. German princes were in trouble with their subjects, who demanded a share in the government, the right of free speech, free newspapers, and a trial by jury.

Austria, Russia, and Prussia joined together in the Holy Alliance to stop the spread of republican ideas and to curb the growing power of the common people.

Bismarck, a Prussian nobleman, became a prominent statesman in Prussia. His object was a united Germany which would be the strongest nation in Europe. The German states

united in a loose alliance called the German Confederation. Austria was the largest and Prussia second largest. Bismarck built a strong army. Every man in the nation, rich and poor, was obliged to serve in it. Taking advantage of trouble between Schleswig and Holstein, which belonged to Denmark and yet contained a great many German people, Bismarck declared war on Denmark. He induced Italy to declare war on Austria by promising Italy Venetia and other provinces in return for her aid. Prussia and Italy defeated the Austrians and Prussia took the leadership of the German Confederation.

Bismarck anticipated that France would be his next opponent. He kept the Austrians from joining to the rear of Prussia by requiring Austria to give very little territory to Italy and very little indemnity to Prussia.

The ambition of Napoleon and Bismarck could not continue in Europe without their coming to blows. A war with France would unite the German people. The French Emperor was extremely jealous of the easy victory that Prussia and Italy had won over Austria. Napoleon was proud of the French Army and wanted it to remain the greatest fighting force in Europe. He was as anxious for an excuse to attack Prussia as Bismarck was for an excuse to attack him. There certainly was no ill-feeling between the French and German people. The Germans along the Rhine under Napoleon had been given more freedom than they had under the Prussian feudal lords. Hostility and jealousy only existed between military chiefs. Bismarck thought that Europe was too small to contain more than one master military power.

Napoleon III proposed that the several kingdoms of southern Germany be given to France because they were hostile toward Prussia. Bismarck showed the original manuscript to the rulers of the little southern German kingdoms to turn them against Napoleon, and they bound themselves to fight on the side of Prussia in case war broke out with France. In similar fashion the Belgians became angered at the French. Bismarck had built a highly organized army that was ready at a moment's notice. The French, on the other hand, were lax. French citizens who could afford it were excused from the rolls of the army. The Emperor's revenue, through lack of system, went to the private pockets of government officials.

The incident used as an excuse was not hard to find. Old Queen Isabella, of Spain, had been driven from her throne, and the Spanish Army, under General Prim, offered the crown to Prince Leopold, of Hohenzollern, a cousin of the King of Prussia. This alarmed Napoleon, who imagined that if Prussia attacked him on the east this Prussian prince, as King of Spain, would lead the Spanish Army over the Pyrenees against him on the south. France made so vigorous a protest that the Prince asked the Spaniards not to think of him any longer. This was not enough for Napoleon, who now proceeded to make a fatal mistake. The incident was closed, but he persisted in reopening it. He sent his Ambassador to see King William, of Prussia, to ask the latter to assure France that never again should Prince Leopold be considered for the position of King of Spain. The King answered that he could not guarantee this, for he was merely the head of the Hohenzollern family. Prince Leopold, whose lands lay outside of Prussia, was not even one of his subjects. The interview between the King and the French Ambassador had been a friendly one. The Ambassador had been very courteous to the King, and the King had been very polite to the Ambassador. They had parted on good terms.

In the meanwhile Bismarck had been hoping that an excuse for war would come from this incident. He was at dinner with General von Moltke and Count von Roon when a long telegram came from the King, telling of his interview with the French Ambassador. In the story of his life, written by himself, Bismarck tells how, as he read the telegram, both Roon and Moltke groaned in disappointment. He says that Moltke seemed to have grown older in a minute. Both had earnestly hoped that war would come. Bismarck took the dispatch, sat down at a table, and began striking out the polite words and the phrases that showed that the meeting had been a friendly one. He cut down the original telegram of 200 words to one of 20. When he had finished the message sounded as if the French Ambassador had bullied and threatened the King of Prussia, while the latter had snubbed and insulted the Frenchman. Bismarck read the altered telegram to Roon and Moltke. Instantly they brightened up and felt better. "How is that?" he asked. "That will do it," they answered. "War is assured."

After the telegram was published in newspapers the people of Paris and Berlin were shouting for war. This was the start of the Franco-Prussian War, and simply proves how helpless the people of European countries are when they fall prey to diplomatic intrigue.

The war was short. France was condemned to pay indemnity of 5,000,000,000 francs. Alsace and Lorraine were annexed to Germany. Alsace was inhabited largely by German people intermingling with the French, and the whole province had belonged to France so long that its people felt themselves to be wholly French.

Bismarck took Lorraine, which was predominantly French, against his better judgment because the important city of Metz was strongly fortified. He was overruled by his military chiefs, but the desire among the French for revenge on Germany for taking this French-speaking province has proved that Bismarck was right. From a second-rate power, Bismarck's policy of blood and iron had made Germany the strongest military force in Europe.

The Reichstag, born as the result of the revolutions of 1848, has been called a big debating society, whose members had the right to talk but had not the right to pass any laws that were contrary to the wishes of the military leaders.

In 2 years France paid her indemnity and the German troops left her borders. France now adopted the German military system. She spread her colonies to Africa and other parts of the world. She enlarged her navy. England and Russia would not stand for France being crushed a second time when Bismarck proposed to reduce France to a second-rate power. England and Russia had spoiled his plans, and he waited for a chance to get revenge. The English and Russians were determined that Prussia would not grow so strong that she could divide the rest of Europe, and they joined together to maintain the balance of power.

Revolts in the Balkan nations now broke out among the Serbians and the people of Bosnia and Bulgaria. Russia, ever since the reign of Peter the Great, wanted a port free of ice and a chance to trade with the Mediterranean world. The Turks of Constantinople could bottle the Russians' agricultural trade at any time. So the Russian diplomats were happy to start up trouble among the Turks and Slavish people of the Balkan states. The Russian people rushed into an easy victory over Turkey with the help of the revolting Balkan states. Rumania, Serbia, and Bulgaria became independent. To maintain the balance of power, England and Austria joined with Germany to divide the territory of Europe so that Russia could not dominate little groups of nations to make her the strongest nation in Europe. As a result of this conference, Bulgaria was left under the control of Turkey and had to pay large sums each year to Turkey to be left alone. Her territory was made so small that less than one-third of the Bulgarians were living within her boundaries. Largely, the Serbians were still under Turkish rule, as were the Greeks of Thessaly and Epirus. A part of these Balkan states were to pay taxes to Austria in return for a promise never to take them from Turkey, and so the Congress of Berlin, like that of Vienna in 1815, laid higher the foundation for wars and revolutions.

The grievances of the people from the treaties that have been made as a result of power politics in Europe have kept the people of Europe in constant war. The murder of the archduke of Austria was merely the incident that exploded these old hatreds and fears and persecutions. We can never stop the avalanche of hate that has resulted from any of these boundary settlements until the people themselves decide upon their own boundaries, upon their own form of government, upon their own right to worship God as they see fit; and we cannot settle it for them. The will to govern themselves must first be born in their own hearts.

For 150 years during our national history Europe has been an armed camp. The rank and file of the people have

spilled their blood on the battlefields of Europe over issues that could gain them nothing, and after every war there has never been any combination of powers wise enough, charitable enough, and with the foresight inspired by justice to draw boundary lines which would forever keep the people of the several nations of Europe from becoming accomplices of their ruthless, restless, and greedy rulers. The general idea of the Versailles Treaty was to cut up Germany so as to make it a weak, subservient, second-rate power. Reparations payments to the Allies, we will have to now admit, bled the German democracy dry. It gave Poland a corridor to the sea and separated East Prussia from Germany. Hungary is not satisfied with the Rumanian frontier forced upon it by treaty. Bulgaria wants territory returned to her from Rumania, Jugoslavia, and Greece.

Devout Christians after the next war may be given to a country that allows no creeds. People who love one country and its form of government will be given to another country in whose philosophy they do not believe. Whoever wins this war, the people will lose, because the treaties that follow the war will still be as unjust as the treaties that have followed any other war in Europe. There will still be the heartless division that will divide men from their sacred altars, and again the people who feel these deep social, religious, economic, expatriated grievances will be made accomplices of other restless, ruthless rulers who will build upon the deeply embedded personal grievances of the victims of this war to make new, first-rate powers as a vehicle to avenge their grievances. So that we may understand how the several peoples of Europe feel after power politics dictates the cutting and slashing of national boundaries to reduce the vanquished to second-rate powers, let us visualize how our people could be stirred to never-ending national hate if a strip out of the center of our country all along the Mississippi River 100 miles wide were given to Mexico or Canada. Can you not see how our people would rally around a leader who would restore the fertile valley of the Mississippi to the United States of America?

We can never hope to stop war in Europe and our blood should never be spilled there again. In such an unending struggle that gnaws at the very bowels of civilization itself this country and those in high official position should remain discreetly aloof from that conquest when we know that our right to worship God, our right to freedom of speech, freedom of assembly, and freedom of the press are not jeopardized.

When our Neutrality Act was first put upon the statute books we resolved that war was a losing game and that we would enact legislation that would keep us out of wars that did not involve our primary interest. We dedicated ourselves to the purpose that we would settle our difficulties around the conference table, and the very purpose of the act was to keep us aloof from other people's quarrels. We said then that when the President shall find that a state of war exists he shall name the belligerents involved, and from the date of his declaration we would not ship arms, ammunition, and implements of war to either belligerent. We were not concerned then with who should win. The President of the United States so interpreted the act early in October, when the Italo-Ethiopian war at last became an uncontrovertible fact.

We should not ship arms, ammunition, and poison gas to be used upon the poor, weak, defenseless victims of power politics in Europe. We should not contribute to the tearing, maiming, and wounding of the helpless. Our Government resources, through Government-controlled corporations, should not be loaned to private corporations of any belligerent to prolong the war. The arms embargo is the best law to keep us from being involved and the Shanley and Wolcott motions should be supported.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALL] such time as he may desire.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I cannot help but give expression to a feeling of keen regret and disappointment at the turn some of the speeches in favor of the Pittman bill have taken.

And it strikes me as high time that in the interest of bringing cool and sober judgment to the decision we are going to make, we again assess our objectives.

I take it that they are simply these: To conserve the neutrality of our country as between the present and any future belligerents to the end that America shall remain at peace.

The final vote on this resolution will decide the differences that exist as to the best means of keeping us neutral and out of war insofar as any neutrality legislation can help bring the latter result.

Much of the debate here on Tuesday and Wednesday, and again on today, fills me with great misgivings. It would seem that the United States has a role other than that of an honest neutral.

In passionate and fervent language we have been urged to asume various roles—the role of the flaming knight to overcome the godless; the preceptor of international morality; the policeman of international behavior; and whatnot.

We have been told that certain belligerents are fighting "our battles"; that America cannot now shirk her responsibilities; that we must, in every way short of war, take our rightful place in the pacification of the world; that we are too great a power to simply sit by and do nothing while civilization is on the brink of destruction. And so on.

I cannot believe that any of these roles or missions are part of our destiny. Certainly they have nothing to do with the role of an honest neutral.

And I do not believe that if we should attempt to play them that we could be successful. Great as we are, we have our limitations, and the sooner we honestly admit this fact the better off we shall be. We do not know, and cannot know, and, above all, it is not in our power to determine, what is best for Europe. The grim history of Europe ought to teach that. And the grim history of our participation in the World War ought to prove it. Rightful as was our entry into that conflict, we determined nothing. At least not decisively.

Yet in the face of these facts we are again listening today to much of the same old story. But again it has nothing to do with our role as an honest neutral.

The destiny of the United States lies not on the other side of the Atlantic Ocean but on this side. And our task on this side is great enough without trying to take in the world. Our mission—and it is a big mission—lies in the Western Hemisphere and not in Europe.

Mr. Speaker, I shall vote to retain the arms embargo.

Mine is the deepest conviction, untroubled by any reservation, that the retention of the arms embargo represents the course of action that is best calculated to meet the primary interests that engage our thoughts in the present European conflict—the nurturing and protection of America's well-being and security, and her destiny.

The arms embargo is the core of the joint resolution pending before the Congress. The cash-and-carry policy, so-called, and the restrictions under it of certain rights of our people, are subordinate in the degree of importance.

This is crystal clear in the light of honest argument as well as clever pretense; despite the deluge of discussions and harangues and the attempt by some to sink the real issue, that of the arms embargo, in a veritable verbosity of words.

The repeal of the arms embargo, I am convinced, would constitute a threat to our peace.

I am not willing to be a party to the experiment of keeping us out of war by doing something that may bring us in.

I am for honest neutrality. I am for nonintervention.

I am opposed to any theory of collective action under any guise which may ease us in as a participant in the age-old feuds of Europe, whether it contemplate measures to fix and punish the aggressor, the employment of "sanctions," or the adoption of policies of aid short of war.

Relaxation of the arms embargo is an unneutral step. If we take it, we should not seek to blind ourselves to the potential consequences.

We enacted the arms embargo in 1935 as a measure of stringency, to furnish practical implementation of our desire to keep out of possible embroilment in any war through the

furnishing of the primary weapons of war to any of the belligerents. Ours was the undisputed right to enact that legislation. It was not framed to meet the needs or the desires of any European or Asiatic country or group. It was simple municipal legislation, American legislation, to safeguard our own best interests and not those of any other country. In short, it was a declaration to the rest of the world that in the event of any conflict to which we were not a party we would implement our neutrality by refusing to participate in the traffic of primary munitions to any of the belligerents. And when the present conflict began that law was on the books and became operative.

Now we are asked to relax this prohibition, this self-imposed stringency. We are asked to upset an established policy and a custom followed time and time again by other countries of the world on the theory that it is to better preserve our neutrality.

I cannot escape the inexorable conclusion that to repeal the arms embargo, to modify in the midst of a conflict our adopted rule of impartiality, would make our Government a party to the destruction of that impartiality and a party to the taking of sides.

We should not twist and torture our declared neutrality so that the policy of impartiality under the arms embargo will become one of taking sides.

Repeal of the arms embargo is not the sign post pointing the way for enduring peace for America. Rather, it is a gamble, an adventure into the unknown, but with gravely troubled feelings of what such a course may hold.

I am going to resist the repeal of the arms embargo to the full limit of my powers.

Let us stay clear of the grim business abroad. Let us adhere to our resolution of not taking sides.

We cannot know nor determine decisively what is best for Europe. On this the history of the World War speaks too eloquently and our undimmed recollections do not let us forget.

With reference to the so-called cash-and-carry provisions of the joint resolution, there are some modifications that I would like to see adopted. However, we can keep the present arms embargo and still have the cash-and-carry policy on all articles other than arms, ammunition, and implements of war. It is a distortion of the fact to say that retention of the arms embargo with cash and carry on secondary supplies is not possible. This is the objective we should strive for, and it is for this policy that I shall cast my vote. But if the arms embargo is not retained I shall vote against the joint resolution.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL].

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include therein a table of ships stopped on the high seas during the present war, issued by the Secretary of State, and to include excerpts from other authors.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, on August 20, 1935, the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], during the debate on the present neutrality bill used the following language:

> If the United States hopes to avoid being drawn into another World War, it must decide promptly upon a policy to safeguard its neutrality. Such a policy must be determined in advance. Our experience in the last war shows plainly that it cannot be improvised after the war breaks out. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 74th Cong., p. 13788.)

Mr. Speaker, if there were any doubt about the correctness of that statement heretofore, the 2 days' debate in the House of Representatives certainly should eliminate this doubt. The language used in the debates in both Houses and particularly in the House of Representatives during the present session of Congress demonstrates the wisdom of determining a neutrality policy in advance, and the danger of trying to improvise it after a war breaks out.

Mr. Speaker, I have heard the majority leader of this House today curse, damn, and doom a nation with whom we are at peace. I have heard him and others on the floor of this House, directly and impliedly, name aggressor nations with whom we are at peace and call them un-Godlike. I have heard opponents of this legislation on the floor of the House, in the press, and elsewhere called Communists, fellow travelers of Communists, and pro-German. Among such opponents are World War veterans, some of whom are disabled.

A cartoon published recently in a Washington newspaper pictured Stalin, marked "Communist" in the center; a caricature of a woman on one side labeled "Pacifist"; and a caricature of a man on the other side marked "Isolationist," all marching arm in arm. The heading was "Fellow travelers." All in the name of neutrality.

Mr. Speaker, the majority leader, Mr. RAYBURN, at the beginning of this debate appealed to the Members of this House not to become personal and to keep the debate upon a high plane. Mr. Speaker, as he spoke, I could not but remember the following quotation taken from the address of the President of the United States in the New York Herald Tribune Forum on October 27, in which he said:

> In and out of Congress we have heard orators and commentators and others beating their breasts and proclaiming against sending the boys of American mothers to fight on the battlefields of Europe. That I do not hesitate to label as one of the worst fakes in current history. It is a deliberate setting up of an imaginary bogeyman. The simple truth is that no person in any responsible place in the national administration in Washington, or in any State government, or in any city government, or in any county government, has ever suggested in any shape, manner, or form the remotest possibility of sending the boys of American mothers to fight on the battlefields of Europe. That is why I label that argument a shameless and dishonest fake.

Again he says:

> Repetition does not transform a lie into a truth.

Mr. Speaker, I concede to every proponent of repeal from the President on down, the same sincerity and the same honesty of purpose which I claim for myself, and which the President and some of the proponents of repeal deny to some of us who are sincerely and honestly trying to prevent the doing of that which we believe would be the first step toward war. War means that all the resources of a country are used, including its manpower, and for the President to label an argument sincerely advanced by opponents of repeal "a shameless and dishonest fake," for the President to charge that those proponents of the embargo are deliberately setting up "an imaginary bogeyman," for the President to call opponents of repeal fakers, liars, or falsifiers does not contribute anything to the solution of the problem and is unfair and not arguing the issues upon that high plane to which the majority leader referred in his opening speech of this debate.

Mr. Speaker, every one of the Members of this House and Members of the Senate have pledged themselves to peace. The President has time and again assured us that there is going to be no war. I do not question your sincerity nor do I question his, and I want to say again that, despite charges of being a faker, a fellow traveler of communism, pro-German, and whatnot, I concede to each one of you, including the President, the same honesty of purpose and the same sincerity which I claim for myself. My war record and record in this House stands, and I challenge any man to question my Americanism.

However, Mr. Speaker, I cannot forget that on March 4, 1917, 435 Members took their seats in this very House of Representatives; 435 Members took their oath of office. At the other end of the Capitol 96 Members of the Senate took their seats and took their oath of office. Before, during, and after the Presidential campaign of 1916 each one of these men had pledged himself to peace, pledged himself against war, just as you men and you women of both Houses are doing and have done during the past weeks. Mr. Speaker, I cannot forget that within 32 days after that Congress was sworn in and the Members took their seats that same Congress, pledged to peace, declared war against the Imperial Government of Germany. Despite all of the assurances on the part of the

President of the United States and on the part of individual Members of Congress that under no consideration will we go to war and that under no consideration will we send troops again to France, I cannot forget, Mr. Speaker, that in February 1917 Congress cut President Wilson's War Department appropriation bill $70,000,000 on the ground that we were not going to war, and in August 1917 I was marching down Michigan Avenue in Chicago with a rifle on my shoulder.

I cannot forget that while as late as January, February—yes; as late as March—1917 we were told that war was impossible; that the people would not stand for war; that the overwhelming sentiment was against war; and that even when war was declared we were told that no troops would be sent to France. Despite all this, in September 1917 I was marching from the Capitol to the White House behind John Philip Sousa's band playing The Stars and Stripes Forever, and a month later I was on a transport on my way to France. As late as January 1917 we could hear men and women singing, I Did Not Raise My Boy To Be a Soldier, and a year later the bands were playing, Over There, Over There.

I cannot forget, Mr. Speaker, that as late as March 1917 we were told that the American people would not stand for war, did not want war, there would be no war, public sentiment was strongly against war; and yet, 6 months later, I could hear ringing in my ears the shouts, the frenzied cries as I marched on my way to France. I could see women fainting as they lined, 10 deep, the streets in every city in the country. No, Mr. Speaker, all the assurances that individual Members can or will give now, all the assurances of the President. will not stop war if we now and here unloose the forces that bring war. It is not what we say here but what we do here that will bring war.

Ray Stannard Baker, Wilson's biographer, who has devoted perhaps more study to the subject than anyone in this country, in 1931 wrote:

> The more one studies the course of President Wilson during the period of neutrality the clearer become the fateful consequences that hung upon his decisions. As a matter of fact, the war was decided not so much by American batallions on the French front in 1918 as by the President's decisions during the period of neutrality in 1914 and 1915, which involved the disposition of indispensable supplies of American goods and money. (Vol. 5, p. 197, Ray Stannard Baker's Woodrow Wilson Life and Letters.)

Mr. Speaker, I have devoted weeks of my time to studying the history of the period preceding the World War from 1914 to 1917. I have devoted that time and study with the hope, Mr. Speaker, that I might bring to this House some views, some facts, which might help us to avoid the mistakes of that period and thus avoid the doing of those things which in 1917 brought war in spite of the assurances on the part of the President and Congress, sincerely given, that there would be no war.

President Wilson, Secretaries of State Lansing, Bryan, and others did not write the history of 1917. They made that history. That history was written and is being written today—20 or 25 years later. We are not writing history today. We are making it. The history we are making today will be written 20 or 25 years hence. If we make the same mistakes that they made, then the historians of the future will condemn us for not having avoided the pitfalls which we should have avoided. Let us first study the course of the World War.

In the spring of 1914 President Wilson sent Col. E. M. House to England on a mission. The immediate object was to promote a better understanding between Great Britain and Germany through American influence. House was, as we all know, President Wilson's closest adviser. He made a report to President Wilson on May 29, 1914, more than 2 months before the war was declared. In that report he points out the danger of war. We hear nothing about "making the world safe for democracy." We hear nothing of "saving civilization," and so forth. We were still friendly with Germany and truly neutral with all countries. We are amazed when we read the language of his report, which reads in part as follows:

> Whenever England consents, France and Russia will close in on Germany and Austria. England does not want Germany wholly crushed, for she would then have to reckon with her ancient enemy, Russia; but if Germany insists upon an ever-increasing navy, then England will have no choice. (Vol. 5, p. 38, Ray Stannard Baker's Woodrow Wilson Life and Letters; also from the original letter from Col. E. M. House in Mr. Wilson's file; also in the Intimate Papers of Colonel House, vol. 1, p. 249.)

This is not the Kaiser nor Hitler talking about being "encircled," but a report of Colonel House to Wilson that France and Russia, with the help of England, would close in on Germany.

In the same letter Colonel House wrote:

> The best chance for peace is an understanding between England and Germany in regard to naval armaments, and yet there is some disadvantage to us by these two getting too close.

Ray Stannard Baker, in his Life of Woodrow Wilson, volume 5, page 364, further says:

> Everything turned on the control of the seas. Great Britain had it, and by virtue of it was gradually involving America.

In other words, when we wipe the cobwebs of prejudice, hatred, and sympathy from our eyes, we are forced to the conclusion, Mr. Speaker, that Great Britain went to war to maintain her control of the seas, and Germany went to war to prevent Russia, France, and Great Britain from, as House said, "closing in on her."

Mr. Speaker, I have examined the papers, letters, notes, and messages of William Jennings Bryan, Colonel House, Ambassador Walter Hines Page, Secretary of State Lansing, and others, and I found much interesting material there from which we can now profit. While I have never altogether agreed with Bryan's philosophy of government, I have always been one of his admirers and as the years have passed, I have become convinced that in many instances I was wrong, and he, while idealistic, was right. As I examine the period from 1914 to 1917, his name looms in history. I feel that had we followed the advice of Bryan in many things, we would have avoided entanglement in the European war.

Immediately following hostilities in Europe in 1914, both England and Germany repeatedly violated our international rights, England being perhaps the greater offender, the difference being however, that while England's violations pertained to property rights, the German violations involved American lives.

The first question involved was the question of sending munitions of war to Europe, and the question of giving credit. The question of neutrality as it pertained to the shipment of munitions was discussed by me in my remarks before this House on October 23, and I shall not comment on it today.

When hostilities began in 1914, Henry P. Davison, of the J. P. Morgan Co., asked the Wilson administration what its attitude would be with regard to loans to belligerents. Robert Lansing, then counselor of the State Department, advised that all precedents were in favor of loans. Bryan, however, argued in a letter dated August 10, 1914, that—

> Money is the worst of all contrabands because it commands everything else. * * * We are responsible for the use of our influence through example.

Again he said:

> The powerful financial interests which would be connected with these loans would be tempted to use their influence through the newspapers to support the interests of the government to which they had loaned because the value of the security would be directly affected by the result of the war. We would thus find our newspapers violently arrayed on one side or the other, each paper supporting a financial group and pecuniary interest. All of this influence would make it all the more difficult for us to maintain neutrality—

Bryan warned.

Bryan's view that loans would violate the spirit of neutrality was supported by Lansing:

> He at once endorsed the position as sound in principle, even though not supported by precedent, and later came back to suggest an illustration which appealed to me as a very forcible one, namely, that as the Government discourages its citizens from enlisting in foreign armies and withdraws the protection of citizenship from them as long as they serve under another flag, it should discourage the money of this country from taking a part in foreign wars.

On August 15, 1914, the following was telegraphed to J. P. Morgan Co.:

There is no reason why loans should not be made to the governments of neutral nations, but in the judgment of this Government loans by American bankers to any foreign nation which is at war are inconsistent with the true spirit of neutrality. (Vol. 5, pp. 175–176, Ray Stannard Baker's Woodrow Wilson Life and Letters.)

Bryan took the position that these loans, while legal, were inconsistent with the true spirit of neutrality.

Lansing quotes Bryan as saying:

This, I believe, is the first time any great nation ever took this position. * * * It may be regarded as setting * * * a new precedent.

On October 23, 1914, Lansing, at the request of Wilson, prepared a memorandum in which he stated:

For the purpose of enabling European governments to make cash payments for American goods, it is suggested to grant to them short-time banking credits, to both belligerent and neutral governments, and, where necessary or desirable, replenish their cash balances on this side by the purchase of short-time Treasury warrants. Such purchases would necessarily be limited to the legal capacity of the particular bank, and, as these warrants are bearer warrants without interest, they could not and would not be made the subject of a public issue. These securities could be sold abroad or be readily available as collateral in foreign loans and would be paid at maturity in dollars or equivalent in foreign exchange. (Vol. 5, p. 186, Ray Stannard Baker's Woodrow Wilson Life and Letters.)

Space will not permit the giving of the full information on this subject, but it can be found on the pages in the volume quoted.

After the first loans were made, Andre Tardieu, French Minister, wrote:

The increasing volume of allied needs afforded the Americans almost unlimited trade possibilities. Prices had risen enormously. Profits had swollen tenfold. The Allies had become the sole customer of the United States. Loans the Allies had obtained from New York banks swept the gold of Europe into American coffers. From that time on, whether desired or not, the victory of the Allies became essential to the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I am forced to the conclusion despite every argument to the contrary, that while these loans and munition shipments may not have been the sole factor, they were one of the great contributing factors that involved us in the European war.

NEUTRALITY

No man ever tried harder to be really and truly neutral than Woodrow Wilson tried from the period of August 3, 1914, to March 1917. Yet no Executive ever surrounded himself with more advisers and friends and officials who were seeking to get us into the war and who were responsible for the doing of those things which, in spite of Wilson's desire to keep out of the war, finally got us into the war.

On the morning of August 3, 1914, when Germany declared war on France, President Wilson in an interview said:

I want to have the pride of feeling that America, if nobody else, has her self-possession and stands ready with calmness of thought and steadiness of purpose to help the rest of the world. (Vol. 5, p. 6, Ray Stannard Baker's Woodrow Wilson Life and Letters.)

Again, on August 17, 1914, he said:

The United States must be neutral in fact as well as in name during these days that are to try men's souls. We must be impartial in thought as well as in action. (Vol. 5, p. 38, Ray Stannard Baker's Woodrow Wilson Life and Letters.)

When in 1914 a distinguished group of Belgians arrived at the White House, accompanied by Secretary Bryan and Secretary McAdoo, their spokesman made a moving appeal:

Peaceful inhabitants—

He said—

were massacred, defenseless women and children were outraged, open and undefended towns were destroyed, historical and religious monuments were reduced to dust, and the famous library of the University of Louvain was given to the flames.

President Wilson expressed his pleasure and pride that "your King should have turned to me in time of distress," and promised that the documents left in his hands should have his "most thoughtful consideration."

You will, I am sure—

He said—

not expect me to say more. Presently, I pray God very soon, this war will be over. The day of accounting will then come. * * * Where wrongs have been committed their consequences and the relative responsibility involved will be assessed.

Even then Woodrow Wilson was careful not to condemn even Germany. He continued that—

It would even be inconsistent with the neutral position of any nation which like this, has no part in the contest, to form or express a final judgment.

On the same day he replied in nearly the same words to the protest of the Kaiser, and a little later to the President of France. (Vol. 5, pp. 160–162, Ray Stannard Baker's Woodrow Wilson Life and Letters.)

I want the American public to compare this attitude of neutrality with the attitude of President Roosevelt, who continually talks of "aggressors," quarantining nations, condemning nations, and individuals, and telling them he could not prevent Americans from being unneutral.

On August 21, 1915, President Wilson wrote to Colonel House as follows:

Two things are plain to me: 1. The people of this country count on me to keep them out of the war. 2. It would be a calamity to the world at large if we should be drawn actively into the conflict and so deprived of all disinterested influence over the settlement. (Vol. 5, p. 373, Ray Stannard Baker's Woodrow Wilson Life and Letters.)

Robert Lansing, in his War Memoirs, wrote that President Wilson was sincerely trying to maintain neutrality as late as March 1917. A study of the history shows that it was the things that we did while trying to sincerely keep out of war that swept aside our good intentions and built up the war psychology that finally got us into war.

BRYAN'S ATTITUDE

William Jennings Bryan was known as the Apostle of Peace. Had he thought that war would be declared, he would undoubtely have refused to accept the appointment of Secretary of State. Had he remained in the Cabinet, he could have done much to avoid war. The pro-Ally influence of Page, Lansing, and House, in my humble judgment, resulted in getting us into the war.

Both the Allies and the Central Powers violated our international rights with impunity. The climax came when, on May 7, 1915, a German submarine sank the *Lusitania*, with some 1,200 persons of board, nearly 800, including some 159 Americans, being lost at sea. On the night the *Lusitania* was sunk Mr. and Mrs. Bryan were at a dinner party. Mrs. Bryan is a brilliant woman and a practicing attorney. She kept a complete diary, and wrote the following in it:

Mr. Bryan was very much disturbed at the news. He said on the way home, speaking of the *Lusitania:* "I wonder if she had munitions on board? If she did," he said, "that puts a different phase on the whole matter. I will have Lansing investigate that." The next day Mr. Lansing examined the clearance papers and reported that the *Lusitania* did have munitions on board. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 74th Cong., p. 2257, speech by LEE, of Oklahoma.)

Bryan took the position that, if the *Lusitania* carried contraband, then "England has been using our citizens to protect her ammunition." He wrote Wilson:

Germany has a right to prevent contraband going to the Allies, and a ship carrying contraband should not rely upon passengers to protect her from attack. (Vol. 5, p. 338, Ray Stannard Baker's Woodrow Wilson Life and Letters.)

Mr. Lansing, on page 30 of his War Memoirs, wrote:

Mr. Bryan declared that no American citizen should do anything which might involve this country in war, even though he were compelled to surrender a strict legal right in order to avoid becoming the cause for such a disaster.

One of the reasons Mr. Bryan gave for resigning on June 9, 1915, was that Mr. Wilson refused to take steps to prevent American citizens from traveling on ships carrying munitions of war. On June 4 Wilson wrote Bryan:

I am inclined to think that we ought to take steps, as you suggest, to prevent our citizens from traveling on ships carrying munitions of war, and I shall seek to find a legal way to do it. (Vol. 5, p. 355, Ray Stannard Baker's Woodrow Wilson Life and Letters.)

Although Wilson contended for the right of citizens traveling on munition-loaded passenger ships, he then for a time seemed willing to make this concession to prevent Bryan from resigning.

No one can condone the sinking of the *Lusitania* without warning and with passengers on board. However, the failure of the Government to publish the full facts pertaining to the disaster and the sending out of half truths regarding the *Lusitania* disaster did more than any one thing to build up war psychology in this country. There is a phrase in the Bible that says, "There is no God." When the entire phrase is taken it reads, "The fool hath said in his heart, 'There is no God.'"

Mr. Speaker, had those in authority published the fact that the *Lusitania* was loaded with military supplies and ammunition very few passengers would have sailed on that ship, and certainly few, if any, Americans, after the German Ambassador published the well-known warning in the press. Mr. Speaker, those in authority who permitted more than 1,200 passengers to sail out of an American port on a passenger ship, concealing the fact that she carried munitions of war and military supplies, were responsible, in my humble judgment, for the death of the men, women, and children who died in that disaster.

After the ship was sunk the real facts were hidden from the public. The public was not told that the ship had ammunition and military supplies on board, and upon that half truth or suppression of truth was built a war psychology. Mr. Speaker, a terrible responsibility rests upon those in authority who thus failed in their duty.

Again, Mr. Speaker, we are being told half truths. Again we are being made the victims of a system of propaganda and a suppression of truth, whose only purpose can be to build up another war psychology. During the past weeks hundreds and thousands of newspaper columns have been written upon the German seizure of the *City of Flint*, but scarcely anything upon the 22 vessels that have been seized and the cargoes that have been confiscated by England and France during the same period. Mr. Speaker, I am placing into the RECORD under permission to extend my remarks a table furnished me by the Secretary of State, which gives a list of all the American vessels reported to the Department as having been detained by belligerents for examination of papers or cargo from September 1 to October 31.

American vessels reported to Department to have been detained by belligerents since Sept. 1, 1939, for examination of papers or cargo

[Completed to Oct. 31, 1939]

Vessel	Owner or operator	Cargo	Detained	Released
I. C. White	Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey		Tanker challenged by an unidentified cruiser Sept. 7, when 15 miles offshore near Barranquilla, Colombia.	
Eglantine	Lykes Bros. Steamship Co		German, Sept. 18. Ordered to stop by German submarine; told not to use radio and to send papers for inspection. Advised not to use radio for 3 hours on being permitted to proceed.	After 1 hour and 20 minutes.
Meanticut	do		British, Oct. 23. Ordered to proceed to Oran to discharge certain Italian cargo.	Oct. 27.
West Gambo	do		French, Oct. 22. 750 bales carbon black ordered ashore	
Endicott	do		French, Oct. 22. 2,276 bars of copper and 1,796 bags carbon black ordered ashore.	
President Harding	United States Lines		French, Sept. 9. Cargo still under seizure on Oct. 28: 135 tons copper, 34 tons petroleum, hides, oil, coffee, tin plate, and miscellaneous.	Promptly.
Saccarappa	South Atlantic Steamship Co	Phosphate, cotton	Arrived Sept. 3. Cargo seized Sept. 8 by British authorities	Ship released promptly; cargo unloaded.
Shickshinny	do	do	Detained Sept. 16, Glasgow, by British authorities	Sept. 18.
Sundance	do	Rosin and general cargo	Detained Oct. 11, London, to date, British authorities	
Black Osprey	Black Diamond Line	General	Vessel picked up Sept. 5 by British naval vessel	Sept. 13.
Santa Paula	Grace Line		When 30 miles from Curacao ordered to stop, delayed 20 minutes, unidentified British cruiser, believed to be *Essex*.	
Executive	American Export Line		Detained Casablanca, Morocco, Sept. 27 on orders from Paris because of nature of cargo.	Sept. 29 on condition vessel proceed to Bizerte, Tunisia.
Ethan Allen	Lykes Bros. Steamship Co	Tobacco	British authorities, Sept. 20	Sept. 30.
Patrick Henry	do	Cotton, flour, copper	British authorities, Oct. 10	Oct. 22.
Oakman	do		British authorities, Oct. 13	Oct. 27.
Cranford	do		British authorities, Oct. 17	Oct. 21.
Nashaba	do	Copper, cotton, etc	French authorities, Oct. 14	Oct. 25.
West Hobomac	do	Gilsonite, cotton, rice	French authorities, Oct. 18	Oct. 25.
City of Joliet	do	Cotton, lead, copper, etc.	French authorities, Sept. 14	Oct. 5.
Syros	do	Cotton, lead, etc	French authorities, Sept. 22	Oct. 10.
Hybert	do		Detained Sept. 10 about 2 hours by German submarine. Examined papers and warned not to use radio for 24 hours.	
Lehigh	U. S. Maritime Commission	Cargo for Hamburg	British authorities, Sept. 5	Sept. 7.
Warrior	Waterman Steamship Corporation.		British, Sept. 7, cargo phosphate requisitioned	
Wacosta	do		Detained Sept. 9 for 3 hours by German submarine. Papers examined, holds searched.	
Black Eagle	Black Diamond Line		British authorities. Details not known	
Exochorda	American Export Line		French authorities at Marseille. Removed 2 seamen (German nationality) Sept. 6.	
City of Flint	U. S. Maritime Commission, owner, chartered to United States Lines.	Contraband	Seized on high seas and taken by prize crew to Soviet port	

This record shows that four American ships had been detained by the Germans. Three of these ships were detained by German submarines. In each case the cargo and papers were examined and the ship was permitted to proceed with the warning not to use the radio for a certain period of time. The first ship stopped by the Germans was the *Hybert*, owned by the Lykes Bros. Steamship Co. It was stopped on September 10. The submarine commander examined the papers and detained the ship for 2 hours and released it after warning them not to use the radio for 24 hours.

The second ship stopped was the *Wacosta*, owned by the Waterman Steamship Corporation, on September 9. The papers were examined, the holds searched, and, after 3 hours, the ship was permitted to proceed.

The third ship was the *Eglantine*, owned by Lykes Bros. Steamship Co. It was stopped on September 18 by a submarine and after 1 hour and 20 minutes permitted to proceed, after being told not to use the radio for 3 hours.

The *City of Flint*, about which so much has been written, was the fourth ship.

On the other hand, 13 American ships were stopped by the British and 9 by the French during the same period. Space does not permit the discussion of each one individually. Suffice it is to say that the British on October 23 stopped the *Meanticut*, owned by the Lykes Bros. Steamship Co., ordered the ship to proceed to Oran to discharge certain Italian cargo. Here the British stopped the ship, ordered the discharge of the cargo, which was consigned to an Italian or neutral port, without one word of protest by the State Department.

On October 22 the French stopped the *West Gambo* and ordered 750 bales of carbon black ashore. On the same day

the French stopped the *Endicott* and ordered ashore 2,276 bars of copper and 1,796 bags of carbon black. On September 9 the French seized the cargo of the *President Harding* and are still detaining this cargo of 135 tons of copper, 34 tons of petroleum, hides, oil, coffee, tin plate, and so forth. On September 3 the British seized a cargo of phosphate-cotton, while on September 6 the French authorities at Marseilles removed two seamen of German nationality from the *Exochorda*. This last case reminds us that the United States went to war with England in 1812 because England took sailors from American ships.

Twenty-two American ships stopped by the British and French, cargoes and men removed, and not one word of protest from the State Department, practically no word of publicity in the papers, and volumes written about the *City of Flint*, which, it is conceded, had a cargo of contraband and was subject to seizure. Mr. Speaker, it is this type of publicity or lack of publicity—this type of propaganda—that got us into the World War, and it is this type of propaganda and half truths that will get us into this war if continued.

During the World War time and again England, as well as Germany, violated our rights. We condemned German violations in strong language, while at the same time we tolerated violations on the part of the British and French. The same thing is happening again, Mr. Speaker.

Again let me repeat that I have no sympathy for Hitlerism, Stalinism, or any other "isms," but my desire to keep this country out of war compels me to give the facts that the American public is entitled to have in the hope that I may make some little contribution toward keeping this country out of this war.

On March 1, 1916, Mr. Lansing, on page 110 of his War Memoirs, summarized the attitude which we took in 1916, as follows:

> For a year and a half we had made protest after protest to London because of illegal practices of the British authorities in their treatment of American commerce and in their disregard for American rights on the high seas, and these controversies were in progress at the very time when the proposals of the United States in regard to submarine warfare were rejected.
>
> Sifted down to the bare facts the position was this: Great Britain insisted that Germany should conform her conduct of naval warfare to the strict letter of the rules of international law; on the other hand, Great Britain was herself departing from the rules of international law on the plea that new conditions compelled her to do so, and even showed resentment because the United States refused to recognize her right to ignore or modify the rules whenever she thought it necessary to do so. Briefly, the British Government wished international law enforced when they believed it worked to the advantage of Great Britain and wished the law modified when the change would benefit Great Britain.

Again we are facing the same problem. England and France want us to be unneutral and to help them as against Germany and her allies, and if we follow the same course, the same result will follow—war.

But coming back to the *Lusitania*, Mr. Speaker, notes were sent back and forth between the United States and Germany. Bryan, in discussing the *Lusitania* note to Germany, said that it had a one-sided bearing as being so much sharper than remonstrances directed at Great Britain and as inflaming anti-German sentiment. He pointed out the illegal actions we were condemning were taken in retaliation for illegal British action which we tolerated. He referred to the misuse of the American flag. Wilson at first agreed to Bryan's view and later Lansing got him to change his mind. Our position was insisting that Germany comply with international law while tolerating England's violation of international law. Wilson was surrounded and was influenced by pro-British and anti-German groups, headed by Ambassador Page. Bryan was the only one who was truly trying to remain neutral. (Vol. 5, p. 338, Ray Stannard Baker's Woodrow Wilson Life and Letters.)

On Tuesday, June 1, 1915, a meeting of the Cabinet was held on the reply to the German note on the *Lusitania*. Bryan accused other members of the Cabinet as being pro-Ally and was rebuked by President Wilson and Wilson came out now against sending a new note to Great Britain on interference with neutral trade which he had earlier approved, showing that he himself had finally been influenced by Lansing and others to an unneutral view. At the close of the meeting, Bryan told Wilson he thought it unfair to all concerned for him to remain in the Cabinet. Wilson did not want an open break and asked Bryan to submit new suggestions as to a course of action. Wilson drafted a drastic note, Bryan pleading for delay or cooling off time. (Vol. 5, p. 351, Ray Stannard Baker's Woodrow Wilson Life and Letters.)

When the President received the reply from Germany on his note of May 31, Bryan's anxiety greatly increased. It seemed to him that, unless drastic changes were made in American policy, war, and possibly immediate war, could not be avoided. (Vol. 5, p. 351, Ray Stannard Baker's Woodrow Wilson Life and Letters.)

On Monday, June 7, Bryan spent an hour with Wilson passionately pleading against a course he felt certain meant war. On June 9, 1915, Bryan resigned.

Robert Lansing, in discussing the matter, said:

> With his firm conviction that the reply of the United States which the President had approved (to the two German notes on the *Lusitania*) would in the end bring about war between the United States and Germany, Mr. Bryan's withdrawal from the Cabinet was consistent with his avowed principles and with his conception of right and duty. (P. 29, War Memoirs of Robert Lansing.)

The primary reason for Mr. Bryan's resignation from the Cabinet was that he felt the course Mr. Wilson followed would bring war; that Americans should not exercise rights if the exercise of such rights meant disaster to the Nation and that neutrals should not be permitted, or, at least, should be warned against, traveling on belligerent ships or on ships carrying ammunition. History today records that William Jennings Bryan was right.

Mr. Bryan resigned on June 9, 1915, and Robert Lansing was authorized to act as Secretary ad interim on the same day. Several individuals were considered and among them Walter Hines Page, Ambassador to Great Britain. Mr. Lansing, on page 13 of his War Memoirs, gives the reason why Ambassador Page was not appointed in the following language:

> However, Mr. Page's prejudice in favor of Great Britain had embarrassed the administration and caused Mr. Wilson many anxious hours.

Colonel House, in discussing Page, said:

> My entire evening was spent in listening to his [Page] denunciation of the President and Lansing and of the administration in general. (The Intimate Papers of Colonel House, vol. 2, p. 177, February 9, 1915; vol. 6, p. 162, Ray Stannard Baker's Woodrow Wilson Life and Letters.)

Mr. Lansing took office at once, but subsequent events show that Lansing's prejudice in favor of Great Britain and France was second only to that of Mr. Page.

On July 11, 1915, Mr. Lansing wrote a memorandum on foreign policy that he expected to follow. Using his own language as found on page 19 of his memoirs, he said:

> Having, however, a settled conviction that eventually this country would enter the war on the side of the Allies, I prepared for my own guidance a memorandum as to our own foreign policies, based on the hypothesis that the United States would join in the conflict with foreign powers.

I was not only surprised and amazed but I was shocked that within a little over a month after Bryan's resignation the Secretary of State upon whom devolved the duty to remain neutral should write a memorandum of policy upon the hypothesis that the United States was to join forces on the Allied side. All through Mr. Lansing's book one finds not only statements showing his sympathies and his desire to enter the war immediately upon the Allied side, but dissatisfaction and regret that American public opinion was not in favor of war and that the propagandists were not able to build up a war psychology necessary to force Congress to declare a war which Congress did not want to declare. In the same memorandum of July 11, above referred to, he said:

> Germany must not be permitted to win this war or to break even, though to prevent it this country is forced to take ultimate part. American public opinion must be prepared for the time which may come when we will have to cast aside our neutrality and become one of the champions of democracy. (P. 21, War Memoirs of Robert Lansing.)

Again he said:

Thus the open announcement that the foreign policies of the administration would be based on the presumption that the United States would finally declare war against Germany would have been a serious mistake, even if the President had been won over to that course of action, which I am sure he could not have been in the summer of 1915 or any time prior to March 1917. (P. 19, War Memoirs of Robert Lansing.)

Again he said:

While my personal views as to the ultimate position of the United States (on July 11, 1915) were thus clear, the time was not ripe to take definite action. The opposition to entering the war on the side of the Allies was strong in 1915 in spite of the *Lusitania* affair.

Not one word about ammunition, and so forth.

The largest body who opposed our entry into the war were undoubtedly Americans who thought that the war was not our affair but a European quarrel with which we had nothing to do.

Again:

They clung tenaciously to the traditional policy of aloofness from European questions as they interpreted the words of Washington's Farewell Address. (P. 22, War Memoirs of Robert Lansing.)

And again, on pages 25 and 26 of this book, we find the following:

A very large majority of the people favored a continuance of neutrality and the avoidance of a rupture of diplomatic relations with Germany.

He said he could take no "other course" but to keep conductive correspondence with Germany.

How much more satisfying—

He said—

it would have been to have denounced the whole wicked business, to have sent Bernstorff home, and to have declared war against the Government which was the instigator and defender of the barbarous outrages. (Pp. 25–26, War Memoirs of Robert Lansing.)

And then, on pages 27 and 28 of his Memoirs, we find the following amazing statement:

While many of us in the administration desired to declare war, it seemed unwise until the indignation of the great bulk of the American people against Germany could be sufficiently aroused to force their representatives in Congress to vote for war with substantial unanimity. It meant a slow, irritating period of education and enlightenment as to German aims and the meaning of the great European conflict.

Mr. Speaker, think of the Secretary of State of the United States, 2 years before war was declared between Germany and the United States, speaking of arousing the indignation of the American people to force their representatives in Congress, Members of this body, to vote for a war which Congress and the people did not want. Think of the Secretary of State speaking of a "slow, irritating period of education" necessary to bring about war. And who was to do this educating, and how was it done? By suppressing information, by giving half truths, as they were given in the *Lusitania* case when the Government withheld from the people information that the *Lusitania* carried military supplies and ammunition. Half truths such as are being passed out to the people again, as is illustrated by the thousands of columns of newspaper space that is being given to the incident of the *City of Flint*, and nothing to the confiscation of cargoes and taking of men from ships and the 22 other ships detained by France and England.

Again, on July 8, 1915, Secretary Lansing, in writing to Wilson and discussing another note that was being sent to Austria on the sale of munitions, said:

Home consumption would be the real purpose and answer to Austria, the nominal purpose. (P. 55, War Memoirs of Robert Lansing.)

All through Lansing's book, his letters, and papers we find an impatience because of America's reluctance to go to war. On January 9, 1916, Lansing wrote another memorandum, which he entitled "A memorandum on the feelings of the American people toward the Germans in order to crystallize my thoughts and to have definite reasons upon which to work out a basis for the conduct of our intercourse with the Central Powers." The memorandum reads in part as follows:

We are not yet ready to meet the submarine issue squarely. Our people are not aroused to a sufficient pitch of indignation at the barbarism of the Germans. It is hard to comprehend this apparent indifference, but the fact that it exists cannot be doubted.

I cannot understand how a man whose duty it was to keep this country out of war could be so far blinded by his prejudice as to deplore the fact that our people were not aroused to a sufficient pitch of indignation to go to war.

Again, in his memorandum, Lansing said:

The first effort, in my opinion, should be to prevent, if possible, a situation arising which will force this Government into open hostility to the German Government. The time for that has not come. * * * I do not believe that Congress would favor drastic action and would be resentful if the President should act without their authorization. It is a humiliating position, but some way will have to be found to postpone definite action until there is a change among a portion of our people. There is no stronger bond among a people than race, and lacking it the United States labors under a serious disadvantage. (P. 102, War Memoirs of Robert Lansing.)

Again in his memorandum he said:

The sympathy founded on kinship, even though it has been unexpressed for generations, is biased and unjust and unreasoning. It causes a division of the American people into groups who are openly hostile to those who have different sympathies.

He then argues:

Since we cannot find a national tie in blood, we must seek to find one based on other grounds, otherwise we cannot claim to be a nation. That tie is to be found, I believe, in the political principle underlying our system of government. That principle is democracy in our public relation and individual liberty in our private relation. Any attack upon this principle in either form of expression will unite our people and arouse in them a strong spirit of patriotism. (P. 103, War Memoirs of Robert Lansing.)

Having discovered to his own satisfaction the one thing that aroused the people whom he had been unable to arouse heretofore, the one thing to create a war spirit and a war psychology which he so much desired, he then stated that our democracy was being attacked, and that our liberty was in danger, and used the following language:

It is my opinion that the military oligarchy which rules Germany is a bitter enemy to democracy in every form; that, if that oligarchy triumphs over the liberal governments of Great Britain and France, it will then turn upon us as its next obstacle to imperial rule over the world; and that it is safer and surer and wiser for us to be one of many enemies than to be in the future alone against a victorious Germany. (P. 103, War Memoirs of Robert Lansing.)

Again, on page 103, he continues:

Public opinion is not yet ready to accept this point of view. The American people will have to be educated to a true vision of the menace that Germany is to liberty and democracy in America as well as in Europe.

In other words, he was going to help educate the American people to the menace that Germany was to our liberty and our democracy, and right there is where we began to talk about making the world safe for democracy. That saying was nurtured, conceived, bred, and born in our very State Department.

During the period from 1914 to 1917, Mr. Lansing and the State Department were insisting upon the observation of international law and the exercising of our international rights against Germany and Austria, and tolerated the violation of our rights by Great Britain and France. This is being done today as evidenced by the table of ships detained, which table I am placing in the record.

Again, when resentment against England for violation of our rights grew so great as to endanger our relations with England, Mr. Lansing, in discussing his viewpoint used the following language:

Sympathetic as I felt toward the Allies and convinced that we would in the end join with them against the autocratic governments of Central Empires, I saw with apprehension the tide of resentment against Great Britain rising higher and higher in this country. * * * I did all I could to prolong the disputes by preparing or having prepared long and detailed replies and introducing technical and controversial matters in the hope that before the extended interchange of arguments came to an end something would happen to change the current of American public opinion. (P. 112, War Memoirs of Robert Lansing.)

Compare this policy with Mr. Bryan's attempt to delay and go slow contained in the *Lusitania* note. Should we be surprised that with the attitude of the Secretary of State, whose judgment was warped, whose whole desire was to help one side against the other, who deplored the fact that there was no war psychology in America, who spoke of educating the

public—should we be surprised that in the face of these facts America entered the World War?

The attitude of Walter Hines Page, our Ambassador at the Court of St. James, is difficult to understand. He, too, deplored the lack of war psychology in this country.

Colonel House recognized Page's prejudice and on August 4, 1915, he wrote to Mr. Wilson:

Page is in a blue funk. * * * To read Page's letters one would think the Germans were just outside London and moving rapidly westward upon New York.

Again, on August 4, 1915, he wrote:

Our hopes, our aspirations, and our sympathies are closely woven with the democracies of France and England, and it is this that causes our hearts and potential economic help to go out to them and not the fear of what may follow for us in their defeat. (Vol. 5, pp. 371–372, Ray Stannard Baker's Woodrow Wilson Life and Letters.)

But the most difficult thing to understand is the letter that Ambassador Walter Hines Page wrote to Colonel House on July 21, 1915, in which he used the following language:

It's a curious thing to say, but the only solution that I see is another *Lusitania* outrage, which would force war. (Vol. 5, p. 370, Ray Stannard Baker's Woodrow Wilson Life and Letters; also in vol. 2, p. 26, of the Life and Letters of Walter H. Page.)

Think of an American Ambassador to England representing this country being so desirous of our getting into the war, so blinded by prejudice as to make the statement that the only way to force war was to place another 1,200 innocent men, women, and children upon a liner, load that liner with munitions of war and military supplies, send her out to sea, fire torpedoes through her, hear the anguished cries of men, women, and children, and see some 800 of them drown. A man must, indeed, be greatly prejudiced to express a desire for such an incident to plunge America into war. Again, with views such as these, is it surprising that America entered the war?

Discussing Colonel House's viewpoint, Ray Stannard Baker in his Life of Wilson, volume 5, pages 365 and 367, said that tension eased after the second *Lusitania* note and that the British were disappointed. And when, Mr. Speaker, in the early part of 1916, Colonel House was sent to England and France on a mission of peace, instead of trying to make peace, he told Briand and Cambon, of France and England, that if there were any danger of the Allies being defeated the United States would enter the war. Returning from England via Paris, Colonel House paused to reassure Briand and Cambon, and with regard thereto he wrote in his diary:

I again told them that the lower the fortunes of the Allies ebbed the closer the United States would stand by them. (House's diary, February 17, 1916; Intimate Papers of Colonel House, vol. 2, p. 163; vol. 6, p. 148; Ray Stannard Baker's Woodrow Wilson Life and Letters.)

On February 9, 1916, Colonel House wrote to Wilson:

It was finally understood that in the event that the tide of war went against them (the Allies) or remained stationary, you (the President) would intervene. (Vol. 6, p. 148, Ray Stannard Baker's Woodrow Wilson Life and Letters.)

He seemed actually to have promised the Allies that the President would intervene, and in his diary of February 7, 1916, found in the Intimate Papers of Colonel House, volume 2, page 163, he said:

We had a complete understanding as to the immediate future.

Again, are we surprised that we should enter into a war when the peacemaker sent to Europe handed a club to one side with which to defeat the other, and is not that exactly what we are doing today in our neutrality bill? Mr. Speaker, the actions of the administration and those within it, their partiality, the naming of aggressors, talk of quarantining nations, and a thousand and one other things have pointed to the fact that we are today following the same course that Woodrow Wilson's administration followed from 1914 to 1917. And there is no question but what that same course will ultimately, if continued, reach the same result—war.

That even those within the administration are alarmed is illustrated by Raymond Moley in his Newsweek article of September 25, 1939. Mr. Moley has many friends within the administration to whom he can go and who will give him confidential information. I was amazed to read Mr. Moley's article in the periscope section of that weekly the other day:

WHAT'S BEHIND TODAY'S NEWS AND WHAT'S TO BE EXPECTED TOMORROW—WASHINGTON SPLIT

Beneath the surface, the New Deal is severely split over foreign policy. Speaking in strictest confidence, an amazing number of officials (including some key administrators and advisers) are expressing genuine misgiving at the trend of administration policy. They talk of Mr. Roosevelt's impulsiveness, of his "overplaying" the emergency here, of his extreme righteous indignation toward Hitler, of his known belief that this country's self-interest makes it essential that we help preserve Britain's sea power, and of his reported thoughts that "anything may happen" if and when Italy as well as Russia joins Germany in the war. The blunt truth is that a sizeable minority of new dealers feels there is a real likelihood of the United States being taken into war within a few months.

Before closing, Mr. Speaker, I want to discuss the question of the shipment of munitions. Ray Stannard Baker, who is perhaps the best student of the life of Wilson, in volume 5, page 181, made the following interesting statement regarding the traffic in war materials with the Allies:

Thus by the end of the year 1914 the traffic in war materials with the Allies had become deeply entrenched in America's economic organization and the possibility of keeping out of the war by the diplomacy of neutrality, no matter how skillfully conducted, had reached the vanishing point. * * * While British diplomacy maneuvered with skill to involve American industry and finance in the munitions traffic, it is certain that American business needed no compulsion to take war orders.

This statement was made in 1931, 8 years before the present war was declared, and I believe it is as true today as it was true in 1914.

Senator BONE, in the congressional debates on neutrality in 1935, quotes Admiral Sims as saying:

Thus the enormous pressure of the golden stream of war profits made us insist upon our right to make money out of the vital needs of nations fighting for their lives, and to insist upon being protected in this trade.

He added:

If a war arises, we must therefore choose between two courses: Between great profits with grave risks of war on the one hand or smaller profits and less risk on the other.

Again he quotes Admiral Sims:

A sudden inflation in a few industries, with the constant threat of a sudden collapse of these inflated industries upon the close of a European war, is not a healthy industrial development, even regardless of the risk to the nation which is involved.

According to Senator BONE, export of explosives jumped from $10,000,000 for the year ending June 30, 1914, to $189,000,000 for the year ending June 30, 1915, to $715,000,000 for the year ending June 30, 1916. He stated:

It is not strange that Germany found it difficult to look upon our policy in this regard as particularly neutral.

And, again, in the same debate Senator PITTMAN, chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, made the following statement:

Great as our trade was during the World War, and high as were our profits, they did not begin to compensate for our financial losses arising out of the war, and cannot, of course, be considered as any compensation for the suffering and death imposed upon our soldiers.

Mr. Speaker, the most heartless, cold-blooded act was when Congress twice—once in the Senate and once in the House—refused to eliminate the sale of poison gas and flame throwers. The President of the United States has asked European countries not to use poison gas and flame throwers, and they have a right to question his sincerity in making that request when both Houses of Congress have refused to put an embargo on poison gas and flame throwers. Mr. Speaker, the shipment of arms and ammunition to England during the World War did more than anything else to stir up hatred in Germany against the American people. German mothers who lost sons in the World War thought that those sons were killed with American shells or with American ammunition. The history of that period shows that the feeling was tense against America. Already the radio reports from Germany and other countries show a feeling of hatred toward America.

Every shell and every bomb will have painted upon it, in the eyes of the German people, the American flag. Every

shell will scream "America!" as it is hurled against the German lines, and you might as well have the band playing The Star-Spangled Banner as those American shells and bombs go crashing across the lines. The German people know where they come from.

And when, Mr. Speaker, you have created in Germany the same hatred, the same prejudice, the same desire to injure America that the propagandists have created in America to defeat Germany, then you will have steel striking flint and the result will be fire and war. Then, Mr. Speaker, you will have loosed the dogs of war and all the pledges of peace and professions of love for peace on the part of the President and Members of Congress and on the part of those who have loosed the dogs of war will be unable to stop the holocaust.

The Constitution has placed upon you and upon me and upon every Member of Congress a terrible responsibility—the responsibility of deciding just when America declares war; just when we are going to send our boys to the trenches; just when we are going to make widows and orphans and cripples; and when America is justified in taking that step.

I am no pacifist. My record stands, but, Mr. Speaker, I want to conclude by saying that it is not what we say now or in the months to come, but what we do which will bring about war. I am convinced, Mr. Speaker, that if we repeal the arms embargo, we will have taken the first step toward war. I pray God I am wrong.

IMPREGNABLE NATIONAL DEFENSE, REAL NEUTRALITY, AND THE PRESERVATION OF PEACE IN THE WESTERN HEMISPHERE

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, may I say that congressional action prohibiting the sale of arms and munitions to aliens engaged in war—declared or undeclared—and authorizing an increase in present appropriations for our land, sea, and air defenses materially would accomplish the following:

First. Keep us out of the present European war. Our participation in the last one cost us so many billions that this increase in current appropriations is small by comparison.

Second. Build up our defense—in time of peace and at peacetime prices for labor and material—to the point where no nation, or combination of nations, would dare attack us.

Third. Facilitate enforcement of the Monroe Doctrine and the Panama declaration.

Fourth. Accelerate the recovery of industry—not only in arms and munitions but industry in general—speed up employment, and bring about far greater prosperity than would be achieved by repeal of the arms embargo—all without risk of our becoming involved in war.

Fifth. Tend to shorten the wars in Europe and the Orient.

Sixth. Keep the American republics free from the ideologies, racial animosities, and political rivalries of other nations.

Seventh. Definitely assure the preservation of liberty and civilization.

Eighth. Enable us to preserve our sanity in a mad world and be in a better position to aid in world rehabilitation when hostilities have ended.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I realize full well that no souls are going to be saved at this late hour, but I do not want to have this debate closed and the record stand that my colleague, the author of the motion which we will vote upon in the next hour, ever stated on this floor that the Congress could not change the Neutrality Act. I listened attentively to the gentleman yesterday and checked his words this morning. I find that his statement was that we could not change our Neutrality Act in any way that did not strengthen our neutrality and that when embargoes were removed with an intent to aid one side, that should not be tolerated.

Reference was made this morning to the poll of the New York Herald Tribune, and it was stated that 11 out of 14 of the men replying to that questionnaire said that we could repeal the embargo, but not one of those names was submitted to this House. I have learned this afternoon on good authority that the list submitted is not complete; that several of the authors to which the Herald Tribune sent letters and who replied are not included in the list of 14 names and one of the 11 is understood to be a consul for the British Embassy.

Mr. Speaker, in the remaining moments I think it might be well to clear up one more point. Emphasis has been made by several speakers in this Well that we served notice on the world that we were going to change our neutrality law. I submit the only official action taken by the Government of the United States or any legislative branch of the Government of the United States by the time war started in Europe was the action of this House. We have not reached the point—and I do not mean this to be partisan—where the Secretary of State or the President of the United States can declare the legislative policy of this Government. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHANLEY].

Mr. SHANLEY. Mr. Speaker, in the interest of economy and because I believe that practically everything has been said in this debate that can be said, and said gallantly by all with the fullest respect for the traditions of this House, I will speak briefly. Previous speakers used my name in their speeches and made erroneous comments about my attitude on changing the rules. I always thought that when a speaker mentions another man's name he would yield, but those gentlemen refused to do so. Any man who knows my attitude knows that I have never made those statements. We changed our neutrality laws, of course, during war. Those gentlemen who stated that the proponents of this motion, including myself, do not want changes made during war have made a ridiculous statement which has not been borne out by the facts.

We have to change them at that time, because when any belligerent, regardless of what side he is on, attempts to interfere with our neutrality rights, it is the prerogative of the President to come to the Congress and ask us to use our embargo powers. If anything happens on the seven seas which hurts the prestige of this country, of course, we are going to change the laws, but we change them for one purpose and one purpose only—to strengthen our neutrality—and we ought to strengthen that neutrality by an intent to be really neutral.

The greatest test this country ever had was back in Washington's day. If a poll had been taken of the people at the time—the Franco-English war broke out in 1793—the people would have voted for helping France. Nobody wanted an embargo. What did George Washington do? He saw through the chaos and confusion of the moment. He saw that whatever temporary gain or benefit he might give France would redound to the everlasting detriment of America, so he put the embargo on, even though every poll that could be taken in America in those days would have been against it.

That aid and the alliance with France was the most decisive assistance we ever received. As Meis says, "No American should forget that. No Frenchman will. But it launched us into the midst of intricate European diplomatic problems.

Remember that when that news of the French declaration of war on Great Britain came to us in February 1793 we were still the ally of France, pledged to defend the French West Indies in case of war. But this was a distinctly European war, and had not Thomas Paine said so effectively that "separation from England meant separation from European wars"? Did not the same separation from all Europe mean the same thing?

Washington thought so, and enjoined, "friendly and impartial conduct."

Mr. Speaker, I have said repeatedly that the historic traditions and precepts of the founding fathers of this country have been fulfilled in almost 150 years of unbroken devotion and loyalty to neutrality. I think those traditions have never been better expressed than in the definition which Prof. E. M. Borchard and William Potter Lage have

enjoined in the preface to their challenging book Neutrality for the United States.

> Neutrality is an old institution which finds its source in candor, in the obligation to hold the scales even, to remain a friend of both belligerents, to lend suport to neither, to avoid passing judgment on the merits of their war. It assures both belligerents that they are dealing with a friend, not a disguised enemy. The belligerents must know who is in the war and who is not. In return for obligations assumed by a neutral the belligerents undertake to respect his rights as a neutral, including the right to remain out of other people's wars.

I think that I was one of those who did everything possible short of the outbreak of the present chaos in Europe to assist and help our peace-minded administration in stopping the war. But when that war broke out and our President saw fit under his finding power in the present Neutrality Act that there was such a war and that we should preserve neutrality, I accepted the solemn pronouncement of his embargo proclamation, and I have tried to conduct myself under the fulfillments of the definition that I have given in his proclamation.

In that proclamation on September 5 of the President on neutrality, he says:

> And whereas the United States is on terms of friendship and amity with the contending powers and with the persons inhabiting their several dominions.

And he enjoins upon us an "impartial neutrality during the existence of the contest."

Mr. Speaker, the present attempt to change the law is a complete departure from all of the historic aspects and all of the implications of this tradition. Everybody knows what the notorious purpose of this law is and my only answer can be in the words of Prof. Charles Cheney Hyde and Prof. Phillip C. Jessup that—

> The manipulation of American governmental control already established through a statutory embargo, with the deliberate design or aiding a particular group of warring powers by an effort that takes cognizance of their relative supremacy at sea, is a deliberate taking of sides which marks intervention in the conflict. Such intervention is not impartial in spirit, and it is not abstention from participation in the war. It is, on the contrary, a specious form of interposition sought to be disguised under a cloak of professed equality of treatment of the opposing contenders. Yet the real character of such conduct shines out like a lighthouse in the fog.

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHANLEY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Would the gentleman divide his amendment as proposed in order to afford the House an opportunity to have a separate vote on the part that refers to flame throwers and poison gas? If the gentleman will do that, I am quite sure that sort of an amendment would carry.

Mr. SHANLEY. I do not believe the House is in any position to stand for that. Knowing what happened to the Tobey amendment in the Senate, I cannot believe there could be a successful attempt at splitting the amendment at this late hour.

[Here the gavel fell.]

NEUTRALITY

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, the American people do not want war, and they are determined to keep this country out of the present war in Europe; and no matter what argument may be made and what reason may be advanced by those that are in sympathy with England and France for the sale of arms and munitions of war in the present struggle, it is clearly apparent that the best, the safest, and the surest way to keep out of this war is to maintain strict neutrality and prohibit the sale of arms and munitions of war to any of the warring nations.

Those who advocate the repeal of the present embargo on arms to the warring nations would disregard and set at naught the advice of the founder of our Government, George Washington, given us in the Farewell Address, and solemnly repeated in annual ceremonies in this Chamber on Washington's Birthday, the 22d day of February.

If our Nation continues on the course that has placed it in the preeminent position among world powers, we must follow the advice of Washington when he said:

> The great rule of conduct for us in regard to foreign nations in extending our commercial relations is to have with them as little political connections as possible. * * * It is our true policy to steer clear of any permanent alliance with any portion of the foreign world. * * * It is folly in one nation to look for disinterested favors from another; that it must pay with a portion of its independence for whatever it may accept under that character. * * * There can be no greater error than to expect, or calculate upon real favors from nation to nation. * * * Observe good faith and justice towards all nations, cultivate peace and harmony with all. * * * In relation to the still subsisting war in Europe, my proclamation of the 22d of April 1793, is the index to my plan. * * * After deliberate examination, with the aid of the best lights I could obtain, I was well satisfied that our country, under all the circumstances of the case, had a right to take, and was bound, in duty and interest, to take a neutral position.

Our Government maintained a policy of strict neutrality then, and for the protection of our country and our people neutrality must be maintained now.

President Washington in his neutrality proclamation decreed that—

> Whosoever of the citizens of the United States shall render himself liable to punishment or forfeiture under the law of nations by committing, aiding, or abetting hostilities against any of the said powers, or by carrying to any of them those articles which are deemed contraband by the modern usage of nations, will not receive the protection of the United States. * * * I have given instructions to those officers to whom it belongs to cause prosecution to be instituted against all persons who shall, within the cognizance of the courts of the United States, violate the law of nations with respect to the powers at war, or any of them.

Mr. Speaker, in this hour of strife let us turn to the ideals of the great humanitarian, our beloved President, Woodrow Wilson, who sought to lift humanity from the misery of war and strife and place all mankind on the enduring foundation of a league of nations to maintain permanent peace.

Mr. Speaker, we have reached the turning point in the affairs of world governments. If the family of nations is to go forward on the path of progress, we must turn away from armaments and war and devote our efforts to the establishment of a tribunal with the power to settle international disputes and maintain order and peace among the nations of the world, with power supreme over all countries where peace and war are at stake.

In this crisis let us stand ready to assist our fellow men in the warring nations to compose their differences and unite in building an international organization composed of the several nations to establish and maintain permanent peace throughout the world.

Mr. Speaker, while the nations of Europe are going through this travail of blood we must not and cannot take part in that carnage by placing in the hands of the belligerents the forces and instruments of destruction. Let us be a good neighbor and maintain strict neutrality by retaining an embargo on the exportation of arms and munitions of war.

Mr. Speaker, I shall vote for the amendment to retain the arms embargo.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of the time.

Mr. Speaker, certainly before we vote on this neutrality bill we should consider its genesis, its origin, the motive behind it, and what its objectives were originally. In the Committee on Foreign Affairs some 15 years ago when we considered this question of an arms embargo, not long after the war, the gentleman from Ohio, former Senator Burton, and myself, considering the reasons that involved us in the World War, came to a conclusion that every Member of the House and the country must come to—that one of the main factors in our involvement in the World War was the sale of arms, ammunition, and implements of war. We tried to work out a plan that would prevent the sale of arms and ammunition and write it into a neutrality bill for one single purpose and with one single motive—that of keeping the United States of America out of foreign wars. [Applause.] That is all there was behind the arms embargo. It took

some 10 years to educate the people and the Congress, so that finally there was an almost unanimous desire on the part of the people and of the Congress itself to write an arms embargo into the law. This was the sole motive, the origin, and the genesis of the arms embargo with which we are confronted.

It was written into law in time of peace to be effective in time of war, and now we find in time of war that there are those in high authority who insist that the arms embargo must be taken out of the neutrality bill. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the burden of proof rests on those who would take the arms embargo out of the bill—the burden rests on them to prove how taking the arms embargo out of the bill will keep us out of the war. No one has done that because no one can do it. So much for the history of the arms embargo.

I am opposed to the traffic in arms, in the first place, because I believe it to be an utterly unmoral, un-Christian, and vicious system turning our country into a great slaughterhouse for the sake of blood money and war profits that will involve us in every war all over the world. There can be no compromise on that issue—the issue of blood money and war profits. The gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] said that Germany gambled and lost the war. That is true; but why should we in Congress gamble with the lives of the youth of America by repealing the arms embargo that was enacted into law to keep us out of war? [Applause.]

I would not gamble with the life of one single American for all the blood-stained dollars of Europe. I would not gamble with the life of one single American soldier to sell arms, poisonous gas, and flame throwers.

Gentlemen have risen on this floor repeatedly and said that the sale of arms and ammunition is an immaterial proposition, that it is a mere gesture, that it does not amount to anything, that it cannot drag us into war. Let me recall what happened in 1917. I can prove to you that that was the main factor in getting us into the war. We did not declare war against Germany, Germany declared war against us by attacking our ships without warning. Why did they do it? Not because we were shipping food and raw materials, but only because we were shipping arms and ammunition.

I have right here in my possession letter after letter written by Ambassador Gerard, the American Ambassador to the Imperial German Court at Berlin, who repeatedly said that within 3 months after the war broke out in 1914 the Kaiser would not see the American Ambassador because of the hatred, the hostility, and the enmity of the German people toward America for only one reason, because we were selling arms and ammunition which was killing German soldiers.

Is it not self-evident to every Member, whether he be Republican or Democrat, that if we continue this vicious system for blood-money and war profits and send arms and ammunition to the other side to be used against German soldiers, whether it be poison gas or shells, anything made in America that kills German soldiers will be resented by the whole German people? If you do not think this is a move to war, then you belie and deny the whole history of the World War and the causes and origin of the World War.

We in America are not afraid of the Germans. We are not afraid of the English or the French or the entire world. We have the greatest Navy in the world. Mr. Speaker, I challenge anyone from the President down to specify what nation or nations have the faintest thought of attacking the United States of America, or what nation or nations have the faintest capacity to attack the United States of America; yet we are told that we must be in fear of invasions from foreign lands, if this nation or that nation wins.

This whole question, Mr. Speaker, comes down very largely to a symbol, and this symbol is the arms and ammunition issue before us. If we retain the arms and ammunition embargo in the neutrality bill the word will flash throughout the United States and all over the world that the Congress of the United States has decided to keep out of the wars of the world. [Applause.]

Repeal the arms embargo and the word will be flashed today all over the world that America has taken sides, that we have intervened, that we have lined up on the side of the Allies, that we are already participating in this war and that their fight is our fight. Very soon the propagandists will come over here and make us believe that, because we are the greatest pushovers in the world for foreign propaganda. They will make us believe that we are not only a part of this war, but that we started it.

So, Mr. Speaker, my appeal to you is to remember the words of Washington and Jefferson; Washington who proclaimed the original American policy of neutrality—noninterference, no entangling alliances, and peace. Let us not scrap these policies. The foreign policies of Jefferson and Washington are identical.

The President of the United States, in a message to the Congress, said that the arms embargo under Jefferson was the cause of the War of 1812. I submit to you that that was a complete embargo. We are not asking for a complete embargo, but only an embargo on arms and ammunition and poisonous gas.

Where do you Democrats think Thomas Jefferson would stand today? He would stand exactly where he stood 150 years ago, for an embargo—an embargo on arms, ammunition and poisonous gas and all deadly and lethal weapons.

I respect the gentleman from Mississippi who got up here as a true Jeffersonian Democrat, and I appeal to the Democrats of the South not to make this a party measure. This is an American measure that far transcends all party lines as it involves the security of America and the lives of our people.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BLOOM. I yield to the gentleman from New York one-half minute.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, let me point this out. There is not a northern State, not one, that is not divided, that I know about, but in the South you will find Virginia and North Carolina and Georgia and Alabama all lined up to defeat the arms embargo. If this vote rested with the North and with the East and the West we would carry it by an overwhelming majority. If it were not for the propaganda and the power of the administration, the arms embargo would stay in the bill by over 100 majority. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Vermont 1 minute.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am embarrassed by the fact that the last speaker failed to recognize that the entire delegation from Vermont is in opposition to his proposition. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time. [Laughter.]

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield one-half minute to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KERR].

Mr. KERR. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my own well-conceived ideas in respect to this legislation now under discussion, and to express, I think, the sentiment of a large majority of those whom I represent in this National Assembly. I shall not be alarmed by those who, in apparent sincerity, insist that the proposed neutrality bill, if passed, will inevitably cause this Nation to enter into a World War. I deny such an implication; in my opinion, it is baseless. This Nation has gone to war on three occasions because of a foreign power's depredation upon our maritime rights and the wanton destruction of our property and our citizens upon the high seas. When this depredation was wrought we were doubtless within our rights under the well-conceived rules of international law. International law is a safe course to follow in peacetime, but it rarely is efficient in time of war, and my interpretation of this act, as passed by the Senate, and which is now before us, is in no sense an attempt to abrogate or annul international law, but has for its purpose

the safeguarding of international law and the removal of those acts on the part of this Nation which heretofore have been the proximate cause of our declaration of foreign wars and our entrance into destructive combats with those who observed no well-established rule between nations and were only prompted by viciousness to take what they could and destroy that which they could not take. Under the rules of international law this Nation, when it is not engaged in war, can send its ships to any port and everywhere upon the high seas and its citizens into the four corners of the earth, and both its ships and its citizens have a right to carry on commerce and trade with belligerent nations as well as those at peace, subject, of course, to the rule governing contraband shipments. If all belligerent nations were careful to observe the rules of international law in respect to the destruction of property and citizens not engaged in war, we would have no use for this proposed Neutrality Act. My conception of the act is that it is an enabling act on the part of a great nation which is determined to keep out of war by observing rules and regulations which would make impossible the infraction of international law and the commission of depredations by belligerents which could not be overlooked.

What is the purpose of this act? I think it can be stated concretely and in an understandable manner and the purpose cannot be successfuly gainsaid. This Nation has evidently learned something by experience, and a very sad experience, and we now propose to profit by this experience. First, this act makes it unlawful for the entrance of our ships, for any purpose, into those belligerent countries engaged in war. Second, it forbids our citizens from traveling on any vessel in the control area of belligerents as defined by the President. Third, it provides that no merchant vessel of the United States shall go armed if engaged in foreign commerce. Disarming these vessels would remove the excuse of belligerent submarines for sinking and destroying property and life because of these submarines' inability to determine whether or not our vessels carried contraband war materials for its enemies. As far as this Nation is concerned, this is the most serious aspect of modern war. I am satisfied that those who have studied this problem realize that when a belligerent Nation seizes our commerce thinking it contained war contraband for its enemies, then that fact should be verified by search and seizure before the vessel is captured or destroyed within the purview of international law. Fourth, this act further provides that this Nation shall not buy the bonds of or make loans to any foreign nation engaged in war. In my opinion, this is the most exasperating act that this rich Nation could ever do and it cannot do this and be neutral.

So determined is this Nation to keep out of war that it has resolved every doubt against our right under international law and we have safeguarded business and commerce so that no belligerent nation could justifiably complain, and I assert without fear of successful contradiction that no other nation on this earth has ever undertaken to do what we propose to do by the passage of this pending act. This is not a gesture at neutrality—it is a purpose to do nothing which would involve us in foreign wars. And then again in this act we say to the belligerents, as well as all other nations, our ports are open; we are engaged in our normal business; if you want any commodity we produce, send here and get it or send somebody after it if you prefer; pay us for it and take it away wherever you will with the distinct understanding that we are not responsible in any manner whatsoever for its ultimate delivery. If this is not neutrality not heretofore exemplified on this earth, then I do not understand what it means for a nation to be neutral. I do not care what international law writers may say about the rights of belligerents or the duties of noncombat nations, I believe in my heart that this act under discussion is greater in its concept of human rights than anything ever evolved into international law. It is the highest tribute that this or any other Nation ever paid to an unselfish people who are determined to stay out of foreign wars and to preserve a civilization which fears God and respects mankind. [Applause.]

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of the time to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD].

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I feel that it is a physical, if not an intellectual, imposition upon the membership of this House at this time to undertake to make any remarks with reference to the issues involved in the pending controversy. I feel that if ever there has been an issue that was submitted to the Congress of the United States, in both branches of the Congress, that was fully and fairly and intensively and by every avenue approached, it has been this controversy. So I have felt there could be no justification for the suggestion made by some that there was any disposition upon the part of the leadership of this House to cut off legitimate debate upon this issue; and in view of the very full and exhaustive arguments that have already been made, as indicated, I know that my intellectual ingenuity, if I have any, would not be able to suggest in my remarks any new arguments or, possibly, any new or helpful implications from any of the arguments that have already been made. I simply desire to reiterate and, possibly, if I may, to emphasize some of the arguments that have been made in favor of the pending proposition. I think that it would be futile for me at this stage of the proceedings to hope to change the fixed conviction of any Member on either side of the aisle.

I am very happy that there has been universal testimony presented by every Member who has spoken in either branch of the Congress of the universal desire of the American people to maintain peace—to maintain peace and friendly relations with every nation in this world, even including the belligerents in the present contest, or any potential combatant that may enter into the contest later. I think that that universal sentiment is significant of the morality and the religion of the American people, and I rejoice that these debates have not had any issues upon the question of the solidarity of our people upon those questions. There is one assertion in this debate that has been denied, but I hope possibly to deny it with a little more emphasis than has heretofore been expressed, and that is the charge frequently made in debate, that one of the prime causes that led the Congress of the United States into this declaration of war against Germany in 1917, was that the Congress of the United States at that time was influenced by the selfish, sordid, and personal appeals and interests of the munitions makers of this country. I was here on that fateful April 2, 1917, when Woodrow Wilson, then the President of the United States, convened the Congress in extraordinary session. I regret that in the providence of God and that in the weakness of human nature so many of those 435 colleagues of mine who sat in this Chamber on that historic occasion, on both sides of the aisle, have passed to the last review before the High Chancelry of Heaven and that only 21 of us now remain here by the sufferance and tolerance of our constituencies.

I heard the President of the United States speak from his place on that stand on the memorable and historic occasion when the Representatives of the American people of both parties were waiting to hear the recommendations of the Chief Executive—not a democratic executive, but the President of the United States of America, and I shall repeat his words in part, because some student of history in years to come may be deceived by the statement that we went into the last World War in the interest of the munition makers of this country. I shall not read it all, but I quote in part what he said:

> On the 3d of February last I officially laid before you the extraordinary announcement of the Imperial German Government that on and after the 1st day of February it was its purpose to put aside all restraints of law or of humanity and use its submarines to sink every vessel that sought to approach either the ports of Great Britain and Ireland or the western coast of Europe or any of the ports controlled by the enemies of Germany within the Mediterranean. That had seemed to be the object of the German submarine warfare earlier in the war, but since April of last year the Imperial Government had somewhat restrained the commanders of its undersea craft in conformity with its promise then given to us that passenger boats should not be sunk and that due

warning would be given to all other vessels which its submarines might seek to destroy, when no resistance was offered or escape attempted, and care taken that their crews were given at least a fair chance to save their lives in their open boats. The precautions taken were meager and haphazard enough, as was proved in distressing instance after instance in the progress of the cruel and unmanly business, but a certain degree of restraint was observed. The new policy has swept every restriction aside. Vessels of every kind, whatever their flag, their character, their cargo, their destination, their errand, have been ruthlessly sent to the bottom without warning and without thought of help or mercy for those on board, the vessels of friendly neutrals along with those of belligerents. Even hospital ships and ships carrying relief to the sorely bereaved and stricken people of Belgium, though the latter were provided with safe conduct through the proscribed areas by the German Government itself and were distinguished by unmistakable marks of identity, have been sunk with the same reckless lack of compassion and of principle.

It was because of that appeal, and those undisputed facts, the Congress of the United States, late in the morning of April 5, 1917, voted on the President's recommendations, because of those grievances and those alone, to embark in that war with Germany. And I rejoice, as characteristic in great crises, certainly in that crisis, that no partisanship should divide the Congress of the United States upon issues affecting the integrity, the dignity, and the security of our country. I rejoice to remember that on that vote in the House of Representatives there were 193 Democrats who voted in favor of the declaration of war and 174 Republicans in favor of that declaration and that in the Senate of the United States 44 Democrats voted in favor of that declaration and 38 Republicans, showing that practically bipartisan-nonpartisan division on that great patriotic issue.

Therefore, I have undertaken, to answer that calumny that some gentlemen have undertaken in this argument to embalm against the integrity and patriotism of those of our Representatives who sat in the places that you now occupy on your side of the aisle and mine, that they were actuated by any motive or purpose except to preserve the dignity and rights of the people of the United States. [Applause.]

There is one phase of this bill that I desire to discuss very briefly. That is with reference to the embargo question. That is the very heart and essence of this whole controversy. There is no question about that. The whole issue in the House of Representatives this afternoon is going to revolve around the so-called Vorys amendment. We may just as well be prepared to meet that issue, because it is the essence of this entire controversy. These other things are somewhat incidental to it.

Now, what is neutrality, in its abstract sense? Efforts have been made here to persuade the House of Representatives that the passage of this bill, in view of certain geographical and strategical situations abroad, would be in favor of one side in this contest across the seas, but what does neutrality in essence, in spirit, in purpose—I am almost tempted to say in sacrament—mean? What does it mean in terms of international law, as well as equitable and just relations between the nations of the world? It means equality of opportunity for all of them, as far as our interests are concerned, in the abstract sense.

There have been pointed out innumerable instances of immemorial practice, even before this Government was formed; but since the foundation of this Government as a separate political entity it has been the immemorial practice, with one unfortunate exception, to recognize the right of belligerents, regardless of the justice or merit of their contention, to come to our shores and buy and pay for whatever they desired.

Furthermore, international law has heretofore gone much further than that and given to American ships, sailing under American flags, the right to transport our products to belligerent countries, taking the risk, of course, of carrying contraband of war. What do we propose to do here? We propose to pass a law saying that our arms embargo, as constituted under the present law; that is, arms and munitions, shall be lifted.

It is important for us to remember that several propositions are concentrated and involved in the general program that we are seeking in the Senate bill. We are proposing that any nation, France, England—yea, Germany, Russia, or any other government on the face of the earth can come to our shores in their ships, taking their own responsibility, and paying for those arms, munitions, and equipment before delivery, and if they can get away with it, take them back to their own country. Is there anything unneutral in the naked, abstract essence of that proposition of equality? If so, wherein does it lie? Oh, well, it may be argued by some, of course, because of England's present strength on the seas, that she is able to prevent German ships from coming, but, my friends, how does any man here know how long it will be before the British-French blockade may be broken by the submarine and air attacks by that almost irresistible air force of Germany? The situation would be entirely changed, but the principle of equality that we are seeking to write into this law for America now and hereafter, not only for this war but for any war that may come, will not be changed by the mere temporary changes in the fortunes of battle between the present belligerents.

I want to confess frankly, my friends, that I am not sensitive, personally speaking, about the temporary advantage that might be given to the western Allies if this embargo were lifted. There are now two alliances in Europe. Do not forget that. France and England; Russia and Germany. I may say that from the conception, from my admiration for the form of government represented by those two alliances as reflecting what we here in America believe as the constitutional system of government for a free people, I cannot complain that France and England may have some temporary advantage in this controversy. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WARREN). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, it was understood between the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] and me that the gentleman from Alabama be allowed to continue beyond the time.

Mr. FISH. I should be happy to do so if I have any power. I would suggest 3 more minutes.

Mr. BLOOM. Five more minutes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I am loath to trespass on the House.

Mr. BLOOM. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama be allowed to continue, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, it is almost impossible, if not indeed impossible, to put an embargo against the natural processes of a man's mind. Despite statutes, and despite proclamations, thank God we are still entitled to think at least as we please, although in some governments of the world men cannot act as they please under their systems of regimentation. And I say that I cannot find in myself any sympathy with the totalitarian governments' system of government.

I cannot conceive—it may be that I am narrow, bigoted, possibly, and prejudiced in my conceptions of what ought to be the fundamental rights of a free people.

I cannot conceive the denial of certain fundamental rights of men anywhere in the world. I conceive that a man ought to have the right to acquire property and dispose of it as he pleases, and to have it protected. I believe, and I feel that most of you Members believe, that a man ought to have the right to read the newspapers and magazines, to think for himself and argue with his friends and come to some conclusion or formulation of opinion, and express it as he sees fit without fear of the concentration camp, the firing squad, or "liquidation."

I believe that if out of the impulses of these hearts of ours, that sense of worship, that sense of appreciation in recognition of some great power infinitely stronger than ourselves, we see fit to go to some humble cabin church in the recesses of a rural district and kneel there at that altar and worship God as we see fit in that place, or if we go to some great cathedral in one of the great cities of the country with

all of its dignity, and majesty, and kneel down there to worship under the ritualism of that church, that it is a very valuable right for a free Government and a free people to maintain, and that we should be permitted to exercise such right. I believe that if you are working in your legitimate occupation here in the United States of America anywhere and you were suddenly to receive an order that you should drop your job and leave your family and go to some far distant place at the order of a regimented government to work as they saw fit and at what wages they saw fit to pay you, that you would resent it. I believe that if those powers came into this country, any power that might have temporary possession here in America, and destroyed all of our places of worship and destroyed those places which we have prepared for the more cultural development of life that it would be resented. Why? Because we believe and I feel that the democracies of Europe, including the Scandinavian countries, believe that all power ought not to vest in the state with its tyranny and power of arms, but that there should be reserved to its citizens, even the humblest and most obscure, some fundamental rights of freedom of speech and of religion, and some ordering of their own lives. [Applause.] These are the reasons why I cannot find much sympathy with the ideology—and to my mind that is a very much overused term these days—or the convictions and principles of these totalitarian governments.

They talk about flame throwers and poison gas and seek to eliminate them by amendment. Mr. Speaker, in the last World War who was it that first used poison gas and flame throwers and all other diabolical instruments of destruction in the war against their enemies? If you are familiar with the history of that operation, the question answers itself. War is a desperate thing; it is an inhuman thing; it is an un-Christian thing; it is a diabolical enterprise. God hasten the day, if ever it may come, when war as an instrumentality of action between the so-called civilizations of the world may perish from the face of this earth! [Applause.] I do not know that such day can come—at least, the world has been pretty slow in its progress to that end—but every combatant wants to use every instrumentality and device that his adversary uses; and why would it be equitable and just to refuse to a belligerent—any belligerent—the same weapons of offense or defense that those on the other side already have in vast quantities? Where is the equity in that proposition? Where is the justice of it? Where is the humanity of it?

Just one word in conclusion. This is a solemn moment for this House and for every Member in it. This has been a memorable debate in the Congress of the United States. This has been a most important issue affecting the destinies of the American people, their peace, their security, and their prosperity, not only immediately but possibly for many years to come, and I am glad the American people have shown such interest in it. I am glad that, as was pointed out by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] this morning, the participants in this debate have shown such a fine sense of restraint and courtesy in argument. I feel sure that we all have the same objectives.

I recall many years ago reading a quotation from Bulwer-Lytton's Richelieu; and I quote it not because it was of French origin or to indicate my sympathy for the French in this contest, but as a great apostrophe to liberty and patriotism as a principle, and I want to apply it to the spirit of this debate.

Richelieu said:

> "All things for France"—lo, my eternal maxim!
> The vital axle of the restless wheels
> That bear me on!
> Beyond the map of France—my heart can travel not,
> But fills that limit to its farthest verge.

Let us appropriate that sentiment to this country of ours. All things for the United States of America; all things for the peace and security of its people; all things that may be devised by legitimate and logical legislative programs to preserve that peace and fraternity with other nations.

It is because in my heart of hearts I believe the Senate bill more greatly conduces to those objectives that I give it my support, and I trust all efforts in this House to emasculate or destroy it may be defeated. [Applause, the Members rising.]

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to instruct the conferees and all amendments thereto.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WARREN). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS].

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, may the Wolcott amendment be read and made known to the Members of the House?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Wolcott amendment will be again reported by the Clerk.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WOLCOTT: At the end of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] add the following:

"That the managers on the part of the House in the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on House Joint Resolution 306 be further instructed to insist upon the following as to section 7:

"'SEC. 7. (a) Whenever the President shall have issued a proclamation under the authority of section 1 (a), it shall thereafter be unlawful for the Federal Reserve banks, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, the Commodity Credit Corporation, the Export-Import Bank of Washington, or any other agency of the Federal Government, or for any person, association, partnership, or corporation within the United States to purchase, sell, or exchange bonds, securities, or other obligations of the government of any state named in such proclamation, or of any political subdivision of any such state, or of any person, partnership, association, or corporation acting for or on behalf of the government of any such state, issued after the date of such proclamation, or to make any loan or extend any credit to any such government, political subdivision, person, partnership, association, or corporation. The provisions of this subsection shall also apply to the sale by any person within the United States to any person in a state named in any such proclamation of any articles or materials listed in a proclamation issued under the authority of section 12 (i).

"'(b) Whoever shall violate any of the provisions of this section or of any regulations issued thereunder shall, upon conviction thereof, be fined not more than $50,000 or imprisoned for not more than 5 years, or both. Should the violation be by a corporation, organization, or association, each officer or director thereof participating in the violation shall be liable to the penalty herein prescribed.

"'(c) Whenever any proclamation issued under the authority of section 1 (a) shall have been revoked with respect to any state, the provisions of this section shall thereupon cease to apply with respect to such state, except as to offenses committed prior to such revocation.

"'(d) This section shall not apply to loans, discounts, advances of credit, and other evidences of indebtedness incident to shipments between the United States and states bordering on the United States as described and provided in subsection (f) of section 2 of this act.'"

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 196, nays 228, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 3]

YEAS—196

Alexander	Carter	Elston	Harrington
Allen, Ill.	Case, S. Dak.	Engel	Hart
Andersen, H. Carl	Chapman	Englebright	Harter, N. Y.
Anderson, Calif.	Chiperfield	Evans	Hartley
Anderson, Mo.	Church	Fenton	Hawks
Andresen, A. H.	Clason	Fish	Healey
Andrews	Clevenger	Ford, Leland M.	Heinke
Angell	Cluett	Fries	Hess
Arends	Cole, N. Y.	Gamble	Hinshaw
Ashbrook	Colmer	Gartner	Hoffman
Austin	Connery	Gearhart	Holmes
Ball	Corbett	Gehrmann	Hope
Barry	Costello	Gerlach	Horton
Barton	Cravens	Gifford	Hull
Bates, Mass.	Crawford	Gilchrist	Hunter
Bell	Crosser	Gillie	Jacobsen
Bender	Crowther	Graham	Jarrett
Blackney	Culkin	Grant, Ind.	Jeffries
Bolles	Curtis	Gross	Jenkins, Ohio
Bradley, Mich.	Dirksen	Guyer, Kans.	Jenks, N. H.
Bradley, Pa.	Ditter	Gwynne	Jensen
Brewster	Dondero	Hall	Johns
Brown, Ohio	Douglas	Halleck	Johnson, Ill.
Burdick	Dowell	Hancock	Johnson, Ind.
Carlson	Dworshak	Harness	Jones, Ohio

Kean	Moser	Rogers, Mass.	Taylor, Tenn.
Keefe	Mott	Routzohn	Thill
Kinzer	Mundt	Rutherford	Thomas, N. J.
Kitchens	Murray	Ryan	Thorkelson
Knutson	O'Brien	Sandager	Tibbott
Kunkel	O'Connor	Schafer, Wis.	Tinkham
Lambertson	O'Leary	Schiffler	Tolan
Landis	Oliver	Seccombe	Treadway
LeCompte	Osmers	Secrest	Van Zandt
Lemke	Pfeifer	Seger	Voorhis, Calif.
Lewis, Ohio	Pierce, N. Y.	Shafer, Mich.	Vorys, Ohio
Luce	Pittenger	Shanley	Vreeland
Ludlow	Powers	Shannon	Wadsworth
McDowell	Rabaut	Short	Welch
McLean	Rankin	Simpson	Wheat
McLeod	Reece, Tenn.	Smith, Conn.	White, Ohio
Maas	Reed, Ill.	Smith, Maine	Wigglesworth
Mapes	Reed, N. Y.	Smith, Ohio	Williams, Del.
Marshall	Rees, Kans.	Springer	Winter
Martin, Iowa	Rich	Stefan	Wolcott
Martin, Mass.	Risk	Sumner, Ill.	Wolfenden, Pa.
Mason	Robsion, Ky.	Sweeney	Wolverton, N. J.
Michener	Rockefeller	Taber	Woodruff, Mich.
Miller	Rodgers, Pa.	Talle	Youngdahl

NAYS—228

Allen, La.	Disney	Kennedy, Michael	Pierce, Oreg.
Allen, Pa.	Doughton	Keogh	Plumley
Arnold	Doxey	Kerr	Poage
Barden	Drewry	Kilday	Polk
Barnes	Duncan	Kirwan	Ramspeck
Bates, Ky.	Dunn	Kleberg	Randolph
Beam	Durham	Kocialkowski	Rayburn
Beckworth	Eaton	Kramer	Richards
Bland	Eberharter	Lanham	Robertson
Bloom	Edmiston	Larrabee	Robinson, Utah
Boehne	Elliott	Lea	Rogers, Okla.
Boland	Ellis	Leavy	Romjue
Boren	Faddis	Lesinski	Sabath
Boykin	Fay	Lewis, Colo.	Sacks
Brooks	Ferguson	McAndrews	Sasscer
Brown, Ga.	Fernandez	McArdle	Satterfield
Bryson	Fitzpatrick	McCormack	Schaefer, Ill.
Buck	Flaherty	McGehee	Schuetz
Buckler, Minn.	Flannagan	McGranery	Schulte
Buckley, N. Y.	Flannery	McKeough	Schwert
Bulwinkle	Folger	McLaughlin	Scrugham
Burch	Ford, Miss.	McMillan	Sheppard
Burgin	Ford, Thomas F.	Maciejewski	Sirovich
Byrne, N. Y.	Fulmer	Magnuson	Smith, Ill.
Byrns, Tenn.	Garrett	Mahon	Smith, Wash.
Byron	Gathings	Maloney	Smith, W. Va.
Caldwell	Gavagan	Mansfield	Snyder
Camp	Geyer, Calif.	Marcantonio	Somers, N. Y.
Cannon, Fla.	Gibbs	Martin, Colo.	South
Cannon, Mo.	Gore	Martin, Ill.	Sparkman
Cartwright	Gossett	Massingale	Spence
Casey, Mass.	Grant, Ala.	May	Starnes, Ala.
Celler	Green	Merritt	Steagall
Chandler	Gregory	Mills, Ark.	Stearns, N. H.
Clark	Griffith	Mills, La.	Sullivan
Claypool	Hare	Mitchell	Sumners, Tex.
Cochran	Harter, Ohio	Monkiewicz	Sutphin
Coffee, Nebr.	Havenner	Monroney	Tarver
Coffee, Wash.	Hendricks	Mouton	Tenerowicz
Cole, Md.	Hennings	Murdock, Ariz.	Terry
Collins	Hill	Murdock, Utah	Thomas, Tex.
Cooley	Hobbs	Myers	Thomason
Cooper	Hook	Nelson	Vincent, Ky.
Courtney	Houston	Nichols	Vinson, Ga.
Cox	Izac	Norrell	Wallgren
Creal	Jarman	Norton	Walter
Crowe	Johnson, Luther A.	O'Day	Ward
Cullen	Johnson, Lyndon	O'Neal	Warren
Cummings	Johnson, Okla.	O'Toole	Weaver
D'Alesandro	Johnson, W. Va.	Pace	West
Darden	Jones, Tex.	Parsons	Whelchel
Delaney	Kee	Patman	White, Idaho
Dempsey	Kefauver	Patrick	Whittington
DeRouen	Keller	Patton	Williams, Mo.
Dickstein	Kelly	Pearson	Wood
Dies	Kennedy, Martin	Peterson, Fla.	Woodrum, Va.
Dingell	Kennedy, Md.	Peterson, Ga.	Zimmerman

NOT VOTING—4

Curley	Darrow	Smith, Va.	Taylor, Colo.

So the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pair:

Mr. Darrow (for) with Mr. Smith of Virginia (against).

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I desire to announce that my colleague the gentleman from Virginia, Mr. SMITH, is absent on account of illness. He has a pair with the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. DARROW. If he were present, he would vote "nay."

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the so-called Vorys amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. VORYS of Ohio moves to amend the motion of Mr. SHANLEY to instruct the managers on the part of the House in the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on House Joint Resolution 306 as follows:

Strike out all after "section 2" and insert:

"Whenever the President shall have issued a proclamation under the authority of section 1 (a) it shall thereafter be unlawful to export, or attempt to export, or cause to be exported, arms or ammunition from any place in the United States to any belligerent state named in such proclamation, or to any neutral state for transshipment to, or for the use of, any such belligerent state.

"For the purposes of this section, arms or ammunition shall include bombs, torpedoes, submarines, poison gas, flame throwers, liquid fire, and the other articles enumerated in categories I to IV, inclusive, and VI and VII in the President's proclamation, No. 2337, of May 1, 1937."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 179, nays 245, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 4]

YEAS—179

Alexander	Eaton	Johnson, Ill.	Rockefeller
Allen, Ill.	Elston	Johnson, Ind.	Rodgers, Pa.
Allen, La.	Engel	Jones, Ohio	Rogers, Mass.
Andersen, H. Carl	Englebright	Keefe	Routzohn
Anderson, Calif.	Evans	Kinzer	Rutherford
Anderson, Mo.	Fenton	Knutson	Ryan
Andresen, A. H.	Fernandez	Kunkel	Sandager
Andrews	Fish	Lambertson	Schiffler
Angell	Fries	Landis	Seccombe
Arends	Gartner	LeCompte	Secrest
Ashbrook	Gearhart	Lemke	Seger
Austin	Gehrmann	Lewis, Ohio	Shafer, Mich.
Barry	Gerlach	Luce	Shannon
Barton	Gilchrist	Ludlow	Short
Bender	Gillie	McDowell	Simpson
Blackney	Graham	McLaughlin	Smith, Maine
Bolles	Grant, Ind.	McLeod	Smith, Ohio
Bradley, Mich.	Griffith	Maas	Springer
Brewster	Gross	Mapes	Stefan
Brooks	Guyer, Kans.	Marshall	Sumner, Ill.
Brown, Ohio	Hall	Martin, Mass.	Sweeney
Burdick	Halleck	Michener	Taber
Carlson	Hancock	Miller	Talle
Carter	Harness	Mills, La.	Thill
Case, S. Dak.	Harrington	Mott	Thomas, N. J.
Chapman	Harter, N. Y.	Mundt	Thorkelson
Chiperfield	Hartley	Murray	Tibbott
Church	Hawks	O'Brien	Tinkham
Clason	Healey	O'Connor	Tolan
Clevenger	Heinke	O'Day	Treadway
Coffee, Nebr.	Hess	O'Leary	Van Zandt
Cole, Md.	Hinshaw	Oliver	Vorys, Ohio
Connery	Hoffman	Osmers	Welch
Corbett	Holmes	Pfeifer	Wheat
Costello	Hope	Pittenger	White, Idaho
Crosser	Horton	Powers	White, Ohio
Crowther	Hull	Rabaut	Wigglesworth
Culkin	Hunter	Rankin	Williams, Del.
Curtis	Jacobsen	Reece, Tenn.	Winter
Dirksen	Jarrett	Reed, Ill.	Wolcott
Ditter	Jeffries	Reed, N. Y.	Wolfenden, Pa.
Dondero	Jenkins, Ohio	Rees, Kans.	Wolverton, N. J.
Douglas	Jenks, N. H.	Rich	Woodruff, Mich.
Dowell	Jensen	Risk	Youngdahl
Dworshak	Johns	Robsion, Ky.	

NAYS—245

Allen, Pa.	Byrne, N. Y.	Creal	Ferguson
Arnold	Byrns, Tenn.	Crowe	Fitzpatrick
Ball	Byron	Cullen	Flaherty
Barden	Caldwell	Cummings	Flannagan
Barnes	Camp	D'Alesandro	Flannery
Bates, Ky.	Cannon, Fla.	Darden	Folger
Bates, Mass.	Cannon, Mo.	Delaney	Ford, Leland M.
Beam	Cartwright	Dempsey	Ford, Miss.
Beckworth	Casey, Mass.	DeRouen	Ford, Thomas F.
Bell	Celler	Dickstein	Fulmer
Bland	Chandler	Dies	Gamble
Bloom	Clark	Dingell	Garrett
Boehne	Claypool	Disney	Gathings
Boland	Cluett	Doughton	Gavagan
Boren	Cochran	Doxey	Geyer, Calif.
Boykin	Coffee, Wash.	Drewry	Gibbs
Bradley, Pa.	Cole, N. Y.	Duncan	Gifford
Brown, Ga.	Collins	Dunn	Gore
Bryson	Colmer	Durham	Gossett
Buck	Cooley	Eberharter	Grant, Ala.
Buckler, Minn.	Cooper	Edmiston	Green
Buckley, N. Y.	Courtney	Elliott	Gregory
Bulwinkle	Cox	Ellis	Gwynne
Burch	Cravens	Faddis	Hare
Burgin	Crawford	Fay	Hart

Harter, Ohio	McAndrews	Parsons	Snyder
Havenner	McArdle	Patman	Somers, N. Y.
Hendricks	McCormack	Patrick	South
Hennings	McGehee	Patton	Sparkman
Hill	McGranery	Pearson	Spence
Hobbs	McKeough	Peterson, Fla.	Starnes, Ala.
Hook	McLean	Peterson, Ga.	Steagall
Houston	McMillan	Pierce, N. Y.	Stearns, N. H.
Izac	Maciejewski	Pierce, Oreg.	Sullivan
Jarman	Magnuson	Plumley	Sumners, Tex.
Johnson, Luther A.	Mahon	Poage	Sutphin
Johnson, Lyndon	Maloney	Polk	Tarver
Johnson, Okla.	Mansfield	Ramspeck	Taylor, Tenn.
Johnson, W. Va.	Marcantonio	Randolph	Tenerowicz
Jones, Tex.	Martin, Colo.	Rayburn	Terry
Kean	Martin, Ill.	Richards	Thomas, Tex.
Kee	Martin, Iowa	Robertson	Thomason
Kefauver	Mason	Robinson, Utah	Vincent, Ky.
Keller	Massingale	Rogers, Okla.	Vinson, Ga.
Kelly	May	Romjue	Voorhis, Calif.
Kennedy, Martin	Merritt	Sabath	Vreeland
Kennedy, Md.	Mills, Ark.	Sacks	Wadsworth
Kennedy, Michael	Mitchell	Sasscer	Wallgren
Keogh	Monkiewicz	Satterfield	Walter
Kerr	Monroney	Schaefer, Ill.	Ward
Kilday	Moser	Schafer, Wis.	Warren
Kirwan	Mouton	Schuetz	Weaver
Kitchens	Murdock, Ariz.	Schulte	West
Kleberg	Murdock, Utah	Schwert	Whelchel
Kocialkowski	Myers	Scrugham	Whittington
Kramer	Nelson	Shanley	Williams, Mo.
Lanham	Nichols	Sheppard	Wood
Larrabee	Norrell	Sirovich	Woodrum, Va.
Lea	Norton	Smith, Conn.	Zimmerman
Leavy	O'Neal	Smith, Ill.	
Lesinski	O'Toole	Smith, Wash.	
Lewis, Colo.	Pace	Smith, W. Va.	

NOT VOTING—4

Curley	Darrow	Smith, Va.	Taylor, Colo.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pair:

Mr. Darrow (for) with Mr. Smith of Virginia (against).

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I desire to announce that my colleague the gentleman from Virginia, Mr. SMITH, is detained by illness; if he were here, he would vote "no."

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I desire to announce that my colleague the gentleman from Colorado, Mr. TAYLOR, is confined in the hospital; if he were here, he would vote "no."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHANLEY], which the Clerk will report for the information of the House.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. SHANLEY moves that the managers on the part of the House in the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on House Joint Resolution 306 be instructed to insist upon the following as section 2:

"SEC. 2. (a) Whenever the President shall have issued a proclamation under the authority by section 1 (a) it shall thereafter be unlawful to export, or attempt to export, or cause to be exported, arms, ammunition, or implements of war from any place in the United States to any belligerent state named in such proclamation, or to any neutral state for transshipment to, or for the use of, any such belligerent state.

"(b) The President shall, from time to time, by proclamation, extend such embargo upon the export of arms, ammunition, or implements of war to other states as and when they may become involved in such war.

"(c) The President shall, from time to time, by proclamation, definitely enumerate the arms, ammunition, and implements of war, the export of which is prohibited by this section. The arms, ammunition, and implements of war so enumerated shall include bombs, torpedoes, poison gas, flame throwers, and the other articles enumerated in the President's proclamation No. 2337 of May 1, 1937, but shall not include raw materials or any other articles or materials not of the same general character as those enumerated in the said proclamation and in the Convention for the Supervision of the International Trade in Arms and Ammunition and in Implements of War, signed at Geneva June 17, 1925.

"(d) Whoever, in violation of any of the provisions of this act, shall export, or attempt to export, or cause to be exported, arms, ammunition, or implements of war from the United States shall be fined not more than $10,000, or imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both, and the property, vessel, or vehicle containing the same shall be subject to the provisions of sections 1 to 8, inclusive, title 6, chapter 30, of the act approved June 15, 1917 (40 Stat. 223–225; U. S. C., 1934 ed., title 22, secs. 238–245).

"(e) In the case of the forfeiture of any arms, ammunition, or implements of war by reason of a violation of this act, no public or private sale shall be required; but such arms, ammunition, or implements of war shall be delivered to the Secretary of War for such use or disposal thereof as shall be approved by the President of the United States.

"(f) Whenever, in the judgment of the President, the conditions which have caused him to issue any proclamation under the authority of this section have ceased to exist, he shall revoke the same, and the provisions of this section shall thereupon cease to apply with respect to the state or states named in such proclamation, except with respect to offenses committed or forfeitures incurred prior to such revocation."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Connecticut to instruct the conferees.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 181, nays 243, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 5]

YEAS—181

Alexander	Evans	Kunkel	Ryan
Allen, Ill.	Fenton	Lambertson	Sandager
Andersen, H. Carl	Fernandez	Landis	Schafer, Wis.
Anderson, Mo.	Fish	LeCompte	Schiffler
Andresen, A. H.	Fries	Lemke	Seccombe
Andrews	Gartner	Lewis, Ohio	Secrest
Angell	Gearhart	Luce	Seger
Arends	Gehrmann	Ludlow	Shafer, Mich.
Ashbrook	Gerlach	McDowell	Shanley
Austin	Gilchrist	McLaughlin	Shannon
Barry	Gillie	McLeod	Short
Barton	Graham	Maas	Simpson
Bates, Mass.	Grant, Ind.	Mapes	Smith, Conn.
Bender	Griffith	Marshall	Smith, Maine
Blackney	Gross	Martin, Iowa	Smith, Ohio
Bolles	Guyer, Kans.	Martin, Mass.	Springer
Bradley, Mich.	Hall	Massingale	Stefan
Brown, Ohio	Halleck	Michener	Sumner, Ill.
Burdick	Hancock	Miller	Sweeney
Carlson	Harness	Mills, La.	Taber
Carter	Harrington	Mott	Talle
Case, S. Dak.	Harter, N. Y.	Mundt	Thill
Chapman	Hartley	Murray	Thomas, N. J.
Chiperfield	Hawks	O'Brien	Thorkelson
Church	Healey	O'Connor	Tibbott
Clason	Heinke	O'Day	Tinkham
Clevenger	Hess	O'Leary	Tolan
Coffee, Nebr.	Hoffman	Oliver	Treadway
Cole, Md.	Holmes	Osmers	Van Zandt
Connery	Hope	Pfeifer	Voorhis, Calif.
Corbett	Horton	Pittenger	Vorys, Ohio
Costello	Hull	Powers	Welch
Crawford	Hunter	Rabaut	Wheat
Crosser	Jacobsen	Rankin	White, Idaho
Crowther	Jarrett	Reece, Tenn.	White, Ohio
Culkin	Jeffries	Reed, Ill.	Wigglesworth
Curtis	Jenkins, Ohio	Reed, N. Y.	Williams, Del.
Dirksen	Jenks, N. H.	Rees, Kans.	Winter
Ditter	Jensen	Rich	Wolcott
Dondero	Johns	Risk	Wolfenden, Pa.
Douglas	Johnson, Ill.	Robsion, Ky.	Wolverton, N. J.
Dowell	Johnson, Ind.	Rockefeller	Woodruff, Mich.
Dworshak	Jones, Ohio	Rodgers, Pa.	Youngdahl
Elston	Keefe	Rogers, Mass.	
Engel	Kinzer	Routzohn	
Englebright	Knutson	Rutherford	

NAYS—243

Allen, La.	Camp	Disney	Gossett
Allen, Pa.	Cannon, Fla.	Doughton	Grant, Ala.
Anderson, Calif.	Cannon, Mo.	Doxey	Green
Arnold	Cartwright	Drewry	Gregory
Ball	Casey, Mass.	Duncan	Gwynne
Barden	Celler	Dunn	Hare
Barnes	Chandler	Durham	Hart
Bates, Ky.	Clark	Eaton	Harter, Ohio
Beam	Claypool	Eberharter	Havenner
Beckworth	Cluett	Edmiston	Hendricks
Bell	Cochran	Elliott	Hennings
Bland	Coffee, Wash.	Ellis	Hill
Bloom	Cole, N. Y.	Faddis	Hinshaw
Boehne	Collins	Fay	Hobbs
Boland	Colmer	Ferguson	Hook
Boren	Cooley	Fitzpatrick	Houston
Boykin	Cooper	Flaherty	Izac
Bradley, Pa.	Courtney	Flannagan	Jarman
Brewster	Cox	Flannery	Johnson, Luther A.
Brooks	Cravens	Folger	Johnson, Lyndon
Brown, Ga.	Creal	Ford, Leland M.	Johnson, Okla.
Bryson	Crowe	Ford, Miss.	Johnson, W. Va.
Buck	Cullen	Ford, Thomas F.	Jones, Tex.
Buckler, Minn.	Cummings	Fulmer	Kean
Buckley, N. Y.	D'Alesandro	Gamble	Kee
Bulwinkle	Darden	Garrett	Kefauver
Burch	Delaney	Gathings	Keller
Burgin	Dempsey	Gavagan	Kelly
Byrne, N. Y.	DeRouen	Geyer, Calif.	Kennedy, Martin
Byrns, Tenn.	Dickstein	Gibbs	Kennedy, Md.
Byron	Dies	Gifford	Kennedy, Michael
Caldwell	Dingell	Gore	Keogh

Kerr	Mason	Poage	Starnes, Ala.
Kilday	May	Polk	Steagall
Kirwan	Merritt	Ramspeck	Stearns, N. H.
Kitchens	Mills, Ark.	Randolph	Sullivan
Kleberg	Mitchell	Rayburn	Sumners, Tex.
Kocialkowski	Monkiewicz	Richards	Sutphin
Kramer	Monroney	Robertson	Tarver
Lanham	Moser	Robinson, Utah	Taylor, Tenn.
Larrabee	Mouton	Rogers, Okla.	Tenerowicz
Lea	Murdock, Ariz.	Romjue	Terry
Leavy	Murdock, Utah	Sabath	Thomas, Tex.
Lesinski	Myers	Sacks	Thomason
Lewis, Colo.	Nelson	Sasscer	Vincent, Ky.
McAndrews	Nichols	Satterfield	Vinson, Ga.
McArdle	Norrell	Schaefer, Ill.	Vreeland
McCormack	Norton	Schuetz	Wadsworth
McGehee	O'Neal	Schulte	Wallgren
McGranery	O'Toole	Schwert	Walter
McKeough	Pace	Scrugham	Ward
McLean	Parsons	Sheppard	Warren
McMillan	Patman	Sirovich	Weaver
Maciejewski	Patrick	Smith, Ill.	West
Magnuson	Patton	Smith, Wash.	Whelchel
Mahon	Pearson	Smith, W. Va.	Whittington
Maloney	Peterson, Fla.	Snyder	Williams, Mo.
Mansfield	Peterson, Ga.	Somers, N. Y.	Wood
Marcantonio	Pierce, N. Y.	South	Woodrum, Va.
Martin, Colo.	Pierce, Oreg.	Sparkman	Zimmerman
Martin, Ill.	Plumley	Spence	

NOT VOTING—4

Curley	Darrow	Smith, Va.	Taylor, Colo.

So the motion was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pair:

Mr. Darrow (for) with Mr. Smith of Virginia (against).

Mr. CLUETT changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, my colleague from Virginia, Mr. SMITH, is unavoidably detained by illness. If present, he would have voted "no."

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, my colleague from Colorado, Mr. TAYLOR, is sick in the hospital. He sent word that if he were here he would vote "no."

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the last roll call may be corrected to show my vote of "no."

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the request will be granted.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I move to reconsider the vote whereby the various motions were rejected and to lay that motion on the table.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The Chair appointed the following conferees: Mr. BLOOM, Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON, Mr. KEE, Mr. FISH, Mr. EATON.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the House today, the Clerk of the House may be authorized to receive a message from the Senate on the joint resolution, House Joint Resolution 306.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO PRINT

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who desire may have 5 legislative days within which to extend their own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, our beloved colleague, Mr. DARROW, of Pennsylvania, is ill in the hospital. He has sent me the following message, which I shall read:

PHILADELPHIA, *October 28, 1939.*

To Whom It May Concern:

I favor strong neutrality legislation and reiterate the stand I have heretofore taken in behalf of the embargo on arms and ammunition and the appliance of the cash-and-carry principle to any other exportations to belligerents, believing this to be the best guaranty of keeping free of foreign entanglements and for the preservation of peace.

GEORGE P. DARROW.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. REED of New York. Unanimous consent was granted to Members to extend their remarks in the RECORD. Does that include excerpts or brief quotations?

The SPEAKER. It does not.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the speech that I made today certain brief quotations.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks, and to include an editorial from a New Jersey newspaper.

Mr. SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, and to include two letters and two telegrams, and my reply to the same.

Mr. SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and to include therein two brief editorials.

Mr. SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by including a letter upon the embargo repeal written by a former World War veteran.

Mr. SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIROVICH. Mr. Speaker, I received unanimous consent yesterday to place in the RECORD the last encyclical of the Pope. I am informed by the Printer that it costs more than is usually allowed. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD at the point where the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHANLEY] concluded his remarks this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include a short statement on neutrality by citizens of the District of Columbia.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOSER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by supplementing the remarks I made in the Committee of the Whole on March 28 and June 16.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOSER. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks by submitting one paragraph from an article by Frederic William Wile.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the question of unemployment.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PFEIFER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include certain excerpts on neutrality.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

By unanimous consent, Mr. O'CONNOR was granted permission to revise and extend his own remarks.

Mr. MASSINGALE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to quote two or three short passages from Washington's Farewell Address.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a speech by Rev. Edmund A. Walsh, S. J., vice president of Georgetown University, Regent School of Foreign Service, on neutrality and American foreign trade, delivered at the opening session of the annual National Foreign Trade Convention, Hotel Commodore, New York City, on Monday, October 9, 1939.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks on two subjects and include in one a letter to the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, and in the other a letter from Mr. Aubrey Williams.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point and include a letter I shall address to the committee of conference.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, under the permission just granted me I include the following letter which I have addressed to the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on House Joint Resolution 306, in care of Hon. SOL BLOOM.

The first suggestion I have made is believed to be important, in view of the history of our entry into the World War. Certainly American passengers should not be permitted to travel on vessels laden with arms, ammunition, and implements of war, except at their own risk. In my humble opinion, no American vessel should carry such cargo consigned to a belligerent, or any agent of a belligerent, even though the destination may be a neutral port outside of a proclaimed combat zone.

My second suggestion to the conference is further set forth on pages 1253–1256 of the current CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The letter follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington D. C., November 2, 1939.

To the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on House Joint Resolution 306, in care of Hon. Sol Bloom.

I

GENTLEMEN: I respectfully call the attention of the conferees to the fact that in House Joint Resolution 306 there is, apparently, no provision that will make it unlawful for American vessels to carry arms, ammunition, and implements of war, title to which has been conveyed to a belligerent under section 2 (c), when such cargo is destined to a neutral port which is not in a proclaimed combat zone; nor is there any provision making it unlawful for any American vessel so laden and consigned to carry passengers.

I believe that it has been the intention of the Congress and the American people to prevent the carrying of passengers on any vessels so laden and consigned, but particularly American vessels. I therefore respectfully suggest and recommend the insertion of a new subsection, to follow section 2 (a), containing proper language with that intent, and submit the following:

(b) Whenever the President shall have issued a proclamation under the authority of section 1 (a), it shall thereafter be unlawful for any American vessel carrying articles or materials listed in a proclamation issued under the authority of section 12 (i), to carry any passenger, except such passengers as may declare, under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed, that such travel is solely at their own risk.

II

A further suggestion is respectfully submitted:

While for the purpose of conserving the material resources of the United States, authority exists in the Executive to recommend to the Congress that specific embargoes be placed upon the export of any material from the United States at any time, yet under conditions of conflict between foreign states, such action may appear to have diplomatic significance. It is, therefore, respectfully suggested that the duties of the Munitions Control Board created under section 12 be broadened, and that the title of the Board be changed to the Munitions and Resources Control Board, and that in addition to its other duties, the Board shall keep a record of the exports of material resources, and obtain reports from other administrative agencies concerning the production, domestic consumption, and surpluses, if any, of such resources, and to render reports to the President and the Congress when it appears that the domestic supply should be conserved by either restricting or embargoing the export of such materials. Upon receiving such a recommendation, the Congress could take such action as might appear fitting.

One application in point is the present condition of the domestic stock of scrap iron, and the condition of our petroleum reserves. A recommendation made by the Munitions and Resources Control Board for the purpose of conserving domestic resources could have little, if any, diplomatic significance.

I have drafted, no doubt imperfectly, language intended to accomplish the purpose outlined, which will be found on page 1254 of the current RECORD, one copy of which is attached hereto.

Respectfully submitted.

CARL HINSHAW, M. C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a resolution from the National Association of Real Estate Brokers on the preservation of property rights.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent in extending my own remarks made this afternoon that I may include therein a telegram from pastors of the New England Conference of the Lutheran Augustana Synod, representing 35,000 members, against lifting the embargo.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein tables with reference to exports and national defense.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLLES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a short letter from a farm organization.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I am heartily in accord with the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT]. I wish to join him also that the safeguarding of our Nation against the extending of credits to the belligerents has not received the consideration by the Congress which is deserves. Indeed, in my opinion, the question has hardly been touched upon, though it is vital to the proper consideration of our own economic interests.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] is correct in pointing out that neither the Johnson Act nor section 7 of the present bill safeguards our Nation against making loans to the belligerents.

I do not see how it is possible for any Member of this House to object to the provisions of this amendment. It merely provides for a more complete guaranty against the extension of credits to belligerents than is contained in the Senate bill. If the provision in the Senate bill really intends to insure us against the making of loans to belligerents, as its advocates claim it does, then the Wolcott amendment should receive the hearty support of every Member of this House.

I have the information from a source that I consider reliable that the legal staff of the State Department has already surveyed the possibility of making loans to the belligerents

through the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and that it has concluded that this is possible.

In this connection I now wish to recall to the Congress the amendment which I offered last February to abolish the Second Export-Import Bank of Washington in connection with a proposal that was up before us then to limit the loans of the Export-Import Bank of Washington to $100,000,000. It should be recalled that both of these banks were created by Presidential decree and later confirmed by statute. I wish to recall to you that I pointed out then that the law as it stood limited the loans of the Export-Import Bank of Washington only and not any loans that might be made by the Second Export-Import Bank of Washington. At that time it was contended by the opposition to my amendment that the Second Export-Import Bank of Washington had been abolished, and therefore my amendment had no application. No proof was given that the Second Export-Import Bank of Washington really had been legally dissolved. I communicated with the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to find out if the minutes of their proceedings shows that this bank was liquidated. They did not give me absolute assurance that it had been. I asked them to send me a copy of the minutes, but they failed to supply this.

At that time I also pointed out the following:

> Let me call attention to another feature of this bill. As it stands at the present time, I contend that there is no limitation to the amount of funds that may be outstanding at any one time, because the power still exists under this law to recreate by Executive order this Second Export-Import Bank of Washington.

Thus it is seen that, whether the Second Export-Import Bank of Washington was actually liquidated or not, the fact that it could be created by Presidential decree in the first place still makes it possible to make loans in unlimited amounts through the Second Export-Import Bank of Washington, if it still exists legally, or through another export-import bank that the President might set up by decree.

The Wolcott amendment specifically provides for a prohibition against such a possibility. The importance of this point cannot be overstressed.

Of course, there are still other ways through which it may be possible to extend financial assistance to the belligerents. The powers of the Executive over the money and credit of our Nation are so complete as to make it possible for him to give almost unlimited financial assistance to them. The power which he has under section 8 of the Gold Reserve Act of 1934 to "purchase gold in any amounts, at home or abroad, with any direct obligations, coin, or currency of the United States authorized by law, or with any funds in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated," and the power he has under section 9 to "sell gold in any amounts, at home or abroad, in such manner and at such rates and upon such terms and conditions as he may deem most advantageous to the public interest" makes it possible for him to give financial assistance to the belligerents, limited almost only by the physical assets of our Nation.

In the stabilization fund the Executive has another source from which extensive loans may be made to foreign countries.

I feel that the Congress has been woefully neglectful of the financial and economic interests of our country in failing to give proper consideration to the great dangers inherent in our financial and monetary set-up as these may be involved in the bill before us.

Nevertheless a few of us, including the gentleman from New York [Mr. WOLCOTT], have striven hard to call the attention of the Congress and the country to the importance and need of considering this whole problem. A great many of us in Congress, as our records will show, have sought to take the powers over the money away from the Executive and return them to the people. That which the gentleman from New York [Mr. WOLCOTT] now offers here in this amendment is merely in conformity with these efforts. I hope the amendment will be adopted.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include therein certain short quotations from editorials and letters.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein a column by George Rothwell Brown in the Chicago American of October 23.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

By unanimous consent, Mr. KEFAUVER was granted permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include a statement from the Committee for the Protection of the Foreign-Born, as well as a speech delivered at the commemoration of the fifty-third anniversary of the gift of the Statue of Liberty to the United States by France.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD with reference to Elliott Roosevelt's dealing in military planes to the Communists in Moscow and a few excerpts from documents and testimony.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. THILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include a newspaper article from the Times-Herald.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, November 3, 1939, at 12 o'clock noon.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. PETERSON of Florida:

H. R. 7615. A bill authorizing the Bradenton Co., its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across Sarasota Pass where Manatee Avenue, Bradenton, if extended, would cross Sarasota Pass, County of Manatee, State of Florida; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CRAWFORD:

H. Res. 323. Resolution requesting the Secretary of the Treasury to report to the House all the facts within the knowledge of his Department relative to Japanese demands that the United States customs officer salute a Japanese sentry at Honolulu; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 3, 1939

The Chaplain, Rev. ZeBarney T. Phillips, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, whose spirit of holiness and grace is the very breath of our souls: Make us to be deeply conscious of Thy presence as we face the duties of this day. Do Thou suggest, direct, control all that we design or say or do, that our powers, with all their might, may be dedicated to Thee for the advancement of Thy glory and the benefit of our country. Bless, we beseech Thee, with the spirit of wisdom our President; may he be sustained by strength from on high, as, in Thy sight, he devotes his life to the fulfillment of the exacting duties of his high and holy office. Guide us all in Thy way, O Christ, and mercifully show the fountain of knowledge to our thirsting minds, that, being free from sorrow and heaviness, we may drink in the sweetness of the life

eternal. We ask it in Thy name and for Thine own dear sake. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, November 2, 1939, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

REPORT OF THE NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the report of the National Adademy of Sciences, transmitted pursuant to law, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1939, which was referred to the Committee on the Library.

PETITIONS

Mr. HOLT presented resolutions of the West Side Woman's Club, of Charleston, and of a convention of the southwestern district of the West Virginia Federation of Women's Clubs, held at Barboursville, both in the State of West Virginia, favoring the maintenance of peace and protesting against the enactment of legislation which might directly or indirectly involve the United States in war, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a resolution of Post No. 1, Department of West Virginia, of the American Legion, Wheeling, W. Va., favoring continuation of the so-called Dies committee of the House of Representatives to investigate un-American activities, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. GUFFEY:

S. 3003. A bill for the relief of Ralph C. Hardy; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WALSH:

S. 3004. A bill to amend paragraph (a) of section 602½ of the Revenue Act of 1934, as amended, relating to the processing tax on certain oils imported from the Philippine Islands or other possessions of the United States, so as to provide uniform treatment for Guam, American Samoa, and the Philippine Islands; to the Committee on Finance;

S. 3005. A bill to increase the number of midshipmen allowed at the United States Naval Academy appointed at large;

S. 3006. A bill to repeal sections 3744, as amended, 3745, 3746, and 3747 of the Revised Statutes;

S. 3007. A bill to provide for civilian naval training, and for other purposes;

S. 3008. A bill to authorize the President of the United States to dispose of certain public vessels, and for other purposes;

S. 3009. A bill authorizing the President to present the Navy Cross to Capt. Frank N. Roberts, United States Army;

S. 3010. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to issue the Navy Expeditionary Medal to certain Army and civilian personnel;

S. 3011. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act limiting expenditures for repairs or changes to naval vessels," approved July 18, 1935 (49 Stat. 482; 5 U. S. C. 468a), so as to increase the limit on expenditures for repairs and changes to any naval vessel during the second half of its life;

S. 3012. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes," approved July 1, 1902 (32 Stat. 662), relative to the payment of the commuted rations of enlisted men;

S. 3013. A bill to amend section 5 of the act entitled "An act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1925 (43 Stat. 1190; 34 U. S. C. 893), so as to authorize the payment of a per diem in connection with naval aerial surveys and flight checking of aviation charts";

S. 3014. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes," approved July 1, 1902 (32 Stat. 662), so as to provide uniformity in the pay of all civilian employees of the Navy Department appointed for duty beyond the continental limits of the United States and in Alaska;

S. 3015. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant to the city of San Diego for street purposes, three parcels of land situate in the city of San Diego and State of California;

S. 3016. A bill to amend the act approved February 15, 1929, entitled "An act to permit certain warrant officers to count all active service rendered under temporary appointments as warrant or commissioned officers in the Regular Navy, or as warrant or commissioned officers in the United States Naval Reserve Force, for purpose of promotion to chief warrant rank," so as to permit service in the National Naval Volunteers to be counted for purposes of promotion;

S. 3017. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize an exchange of lands between the Richmond, Fredericksburg & Potomac Railroad Co. and the United States at Quantico, Va.," approved June 24, 1935 (49 Stat. 395), so as to permit the removal of certain encumbrances on the lands concerned; and

S. 3018. A bill to amend section 210 of the Communications Act of 1934, approved June 19, 1934 (48 Stat. 1073; 47 U. S. C. 210), so as to permit communication utilities to contribute free services to the national defense; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

DECLARATION OF NONPARTICIPATION IN THE FOREIGN WARS OF THE OLD WORLD

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. President, I introduce a joint resolution for proper reference, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD.

In connection with the introduction of the joint resolution I may say that on the front page of the Chicago Tribune of Thursday, November 2, 1939, there appear, graphically illustrated by McCutcheon, the following words:

The American Hemisphere.

A George Washington doctrine against American entanglements in Europe.

The Monroe Doctrine against European entanglements in America.

Uncle Sam pointing to these two great doctrines says to all the Americas, "Not until then will we be free from this eternal propaganda to get us hooked in Europe's endless wars." May we all adopt this American slogan, "America First—Absolute Neutrality."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the joint resolution of the Senator from Minnesota will be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 189) providing for adherence by the United States to the policy of no foreign entanglements or participation in foreign wars, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Whereas certain major powers of Europe and Asia are now engaged in war with which wars the United States has no concern; and

Whereas many of our citizens fear that at some time of the duration of these wars these United States might become involved; and

Whereas time has proved the wisdom of the principles of George Washington enunciated in his Farewell Address that these United States should not become embroiled or entangled in the wars and turmoils of foreign nations; and

Whereas these United States have found by past experience that there is nothing to gain by involvement in foreign wars for the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, etc., That we adhere to the policy of no foreign entanglements or participation in foreign wars as enunciated by President George Washington in his Farewell Address and that we will not authorize the sending of our American Army, Navy, or air forces to foreign soil; further that our national armed forces will be used only to protect America against invasion; and, further, that this resolution shall not be construed to abrogate, limit, or change the Monroe Doctrine.

PROTECTION OF LIVES ABOARD PASSENGER SHIPS

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. President, in presenting a Senate resolution calling for an investigation of the failure of the United States Maritime Commission and the Bureau of Ma-

rine Inspection and Navigation to enforce properly legislation enacted by the Congress for the protection of the lives of those who travel aboard passenger ships I desire to refer briefly to the fact that following the burning of the S. S. *Morro Castle*, in which more than 100 lives were sacrificed, due to the greed of steamship owners and the failure of Government officials to force compliance with laws enacted by the Congress, the Senate appointed a committee to investigate the burning of the *Morro Castle*.

In the report of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries on proposed legislation unanimously adopted by the House and Senate committees, which legislation was subsequently unanimously enacted by the Congress of the United States, the committee, in part, says:

It developed in the hearings that although the Bureau of Navigation and Steamship Inspection has for more than 25 years had authority to require sprinkler systems, such authority has been exercised very rarely.

Quoting from Senate Report No. 776 on the *Morro Castle* investigation, in which more than 100 people lost their lives, on page 15 they state:

In this particular case a properly functioning automatic sprinkler system might have saved the vessel.

SPRINKLER SYSTEMS ON ALL SHIPS

The House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, following a full 2-day hearing on this legislation, at which hearing Government officials were present and testified, reported that—

the amendment recommended by the committee constitutes a direction to the Inspection Service to require automatic sprinkler systems on all vessels having sleeping accommodations carrying 50 or more passengers, unless in a particular case, after proper investigation, such equipment is found not to be necessary for the protection of life and property. * * * The committee feels that the objection raised by others, including the Steamboat Inspection Service, are met by the amendment adopted.

It should be apparent to any independent-thinking Government official that the language I have quoted constitutes a mandate from the Congress of the United States to require the installation of automatic sprinkler systems aboard passenger-carrying ships, unless, after investigation, the responsible officials are justified in finding that a particular steamship is fireproof.

Incidentally, I understand that there is no governmental authority who will at this time state that any particular passenger-carrying ship is fireproof.

PROTECTION OF AMERICAN MERCHANT MARINE

In view of the fact that the Congress has appropriated many million dollars to be spent in the building up of an American merchant marine, surely those entrusted with the expenditure of that money should see to it that legislation enacted by Congress is complied with and that every possible means are employed to assure the safety of the passengers and crews aboard such passenger-carrying ships.

However, instead of complying with the mandate of the Congress, it is my understanding that these bureaucrats, mainly present or former naval officials, constitute themselves an authority greater than the Congress and, for reasons best known to themselves, prefer to build up the business and profits of economic royalists who have certain commodities for sale.

It is my hope that the resolution which I now submit will be adopted and that the committee will make a thorough investigation of the apparent failure of the responsible Government officials properly to enforce legislation entrusted to their administration before we have a repetition of the *Morro Castle* disaster.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution submitted by the Senator from Minnesota will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 196) was referred to the Committee on Commerce, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Commerce is authorized and directed to make an investigation of the failure of the United States Maritime Commission and the Bureau of Marine Inspection and Navigation to comply with legislation enacted by the Congress for the proper protection of lives of passengers and crews aboard passenger ships. The committee shall report to the Senate as soon as practicable the results of its investigation, together with its recommendation for the enactment of any remedial legislation it may deem necessary.

For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions and recesses of the Senate in the Seventy-sixth and succeeding Congresses, to employ and to call upon the executive departments for clerical and other assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed $15,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman.

RESOLUTION BY MINNESOTA FEDERATION OF LABOR

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. President, I now ask that there be printed in the RECORD the resolution of the Minnesota Federation of Labor on this very important subject. This resolution was adopted at the September 1939 convention, held at Duluth, Minn.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the Congress, believing that the construction and maintenance of an American merchant marine would be helpful in many ways, especially in providing work for skilled building and metal trades workers, authorized the creation of a Maritime Authority Commission and did appropriate for the use of such Commission many hundreds of millions of dollars; and

Whereas the Congress also unanimously directed the installation in all passenger-carrying ships of fire-preventive appliances to provide safety from fire at sea: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this convention call upon the United States Senators and Congressmen from Minnesota to insist upon the proper enforcement and administration of all laws pertaining to the operation of passenger-carrying ships at sea and instructing those in authority to carry out the provisions of this law by the installation of safety devices specifically mentioned therein; and be it further

Resolved, That if the provisions of this law are not being carried out, and if in the opinion of the Minnesota delegation to the United States Congress that it is warranted, that a congressional investigation be started in order to place the responsibility for the indifference to the safety of our citizens at sea; and be it further

Resolved, That our delegate to the next annual convention of the American Federation of Labor is hereby directed to present this resolution to that body and request that the American Federation of Labor seek the same objects as are above specifically referred to.

APPOINTMENTS EXCEPTED FROM CIVIL SERVICE IN PUBLIC EXIGENCIES

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, a few days ago I received a letter from the chairman of the Civil Service Commission concerning statements that appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with regard to Executive Order No. 8257, of September 21, in which the Commission explains that order and its effect, and gives certain valuable information. I ask that the letter be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the information of Senators and others who may be interested in the subject.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., October 21, 1939.

Hon. ALBEN W. BARKLEY,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR BARKLEY: In view of the statements which have appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with respect to Executive Order No. 8257 of September 21, the Commission believes that you will wish to have included in the RECORD the facts as to the issuance of the order and as to its administration. The order referred to reads:

"By virtue of and pursuant to the authority vested in me by the provisions of paragraph 8 of subdivision 2 of section 2 of the Civil Service Act (22 Stat. 403, 404), it is hereby ordered that, subject to appropriate noncompetitive tests of fitness, the Civil Service Commission is authorized to permit an immediate appointment without regard to the competitive requirements of the civil service rules in any case in which it appears that a public exigency exists which is directly connected with the neutrality of the United States or the preparedness program of the Federal Government. This authority may be used only under most unusual and compelling circumstances, and the person or persons so appointed will not thereby acquire a classified civil-service status."

On the 27th of September the Commission issued the following press release:

"The United States Civil Service Commission announced today that Executive Order 8257 of September 21, 1939, the issuance of

which was urged by the Commission, 'authorizing excepted appointments to meet public exigency,' will be utilized only for the appointment of extremely highly specialized experts whose services may be required under the neutrality or preparedness program. It will not provide for the appointment of any groups of persons and the Commission believes that only a handful of individuals will be affected at any time by the terms of the order.

"The Executive order states that, 'subject to appropriate noncompetitive tests of fitness, the Civil Service Commission is authorized to permit an immediate appointment without regard to the competitive requirements of the civil-service rules in any case in which it appears that a public exigency exists which is directly connected with the neutrality of the United States or the preparedness program of the Federal Government.' The order states, however, that this authority may be used only under the most unusual and compelling circumstances. It also provides that the person or persons so appointed will not acquire a civil-service status.

"Some inquiries have been received at the Commission whether this order will make possible any considerable number of appointments outside competitive provisions, and the Commission has assured all inquirers that it will not."

It will be noted that the Commission recommended approval of this order, and it may be stated that not a single appointment has yet been proposed for approval under the order. This indicates clearly that the agencies of the Government recognize the highly restrictive conditions under which any appointment may be approved.

It occasionally develops in any emergency situation that an appointment of a highly qualified person in a special field is required immediately without awaiting the result of a competitive examination under the usual provisions of the civil service system, which provisions would, of course, prevail in the absence of the emergency situation. The Executive order restricts the declaration of an emergency situation to the neutrality or preparedness program of the Federal Government, a limitation which permits such an appointment only to a few agencies of the Federal Government. As before stated, however, not a single appointment has been proposed for approval under this order.

By direction of the Commission.

Very respectfully,

HARRY B. MITCHELL, *President.*

EXCISE TAXES ON COPPER

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a very brief statement in respect to the colloquy which occurred the other day on the floor of the Senate with respect to reciprocal-trade agreements and excise taxes on certain commodities.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SO-CALLED EXCISE TAXES ON COPPER, ETC.

Under section 601 of the Revenue Act of 1932, so-called excise taxes were imposed, for a period of 2 years, on imports of copper, petroleum, coal, and lumber. These taxes have since been extended several times, and are now found in sections 3420–3430 of the Internal Revenue Code under the heading "Import taxes." By the terms of the statute these taxes "apply only with respect to the importation of such articles."

Under the express provisions of the law (sec. 3430 of the Internal Revenue Code) these taxes "shall be levied, assessed, collected, and paid in the same manner as a duty imposed by the Tariff Act of 1930 and shall be treated for the purposes of all provisions of law relating to the customs revenue as a duty imposed by such act," with certain exceptions not here pertinent.

Article 834½ of the customs regulations of 1937, issued by the Treasury Department, provides that these import taxes "shall be construed to be customs duties."

A report on petroleum, coal, lumber, copper, and certain oils and fats, published by the United States Tariff Commission in June 1939, states:

"Import excise taxes are administered by the Treasury Department and are levied, assessed, collected, and paid in the same manner as duties imposed by the Tariff Act of 1930. They are not only identical with tariff duties in their economic effects but, with certain exceptions, are regarded as identical for all provisions of law, such as in the negotiation of agreements under the Trade Agreements Act."

There can be no question of the legal authority of the President to modify these import taxes under the authority of the Trade Agreements Act.

Actually, in the first trade agreement which was signed, that with Cuba on August 24, 1934, the import tax on certain mahogany lumber was reduced. In both trade agreements with Canada, provision was made for the reduction of the import tax on certain types of lumber.

It is important to note that during the debates in the Senate on June 4, 1934, an amendment was proposed to the trade-agreements bill which would have excepted from the authority to proclaim modifications in duties and other import restrictions the taxes imposed on copper, coal, petroleum, and lumber by the Revenue Act of 1932, as amended. This proposed amendment to the trade-agreements bill was defeated in the Senate by a vote of 57 to 29.

TRADE AGREEMENTS AND THE ARMS EMBARGO

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I should like to have it appear in the RECORD at this time, for possible future reference, that when the trade agreement between the United States and the United Kingdom on November 17, 1938, was executed it included in article 16 the following subparagraphs, which I shall read:

ARTICLE XVI

1. The provisions of this agreement shall not extend to prohibitions or restrictions—

* * * * * * *

(c) Imposed by either high contracting party in pursuance of obligations under international agreements in force on the day of the signature of this agreement by which that high contracting party is bound.

* * * * * * *

(e) Relating to the control of the traffic in arms, ammunition, or implements of war, and, in exceptional circumstances, all other military supplies.

(f) Relating to neutrality or to public security.

(g) Imposed by either high contracting party should that party be engaged in hostilities or war.

On the same day, Mr. President, there was announced the text of the trade agreement between the United States and Canada. Identical provisions, in effect, will be found in article XII of that agreement.

In view of the fact that from time to time during the debate that proceeded over the past several weeks there was so much mention of the status of Great Britain with reference to the embargo on arms, it seems to me fitting, for the purposes of research, that there should be included in the RECORD at this point this reference, indicating clearly that Great Britain and the United States at all times had in mind in the trade agreements themselves that the embargo on arms definitely would be removed from consideration in the event of hostilities or in the event of the actual enforcement of the embargo. Obviously, Great Britain knew all along that our embargo would become effective in the event she went to war, and so stated when this agreement was entered into. Surely no one can now claim that enforcement of our embargo would have operated unfairly because of lack of knowledge of its existence upon the part of Great Britain. Conversely, it may even appear that the sure knowledge of its being invoked in the event of war was a spur to its repeal. In any case, I want the RECORD to recite the foregoing sections for purposes of ready reference.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR TAFT TO INDIANAPOLIS BAR ASSOCIATION

[Mr. TOWNSEND asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject Emergency Powers of the President, delivered by Senator TAFT before the Indianapolis Bar Association on October 30, 1939, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR DANAHER ON PROPOSED REPEAL OF ARMS EMBARGO

[Mr. NYE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address on the proposed repeal of the arms embargo, delivered by Senator DANAHER on the evening of October 14, 1939, which appears in the Appendix.]

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HOLT ON THE COST OF GOVERNMENT

[Mr. HOLT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement by him to the citizens of West Virginia on the subject of the cost of government, which appears in the Appendix.]

LETTER FROM HERBERT HOOVER TO WOODROW WILSON ON ROLE OF THE UNITED STATES IN EUROPE

[Mr. DAVIS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter written by Hon. Herbert Hoover to President Woodrow Wilson on April 11, 1919, relative to the role of the United States in Europe, and a brief editorial statement thereon, which appear in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY FORMER GOVERNOR LANDON ON AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on America's foreign policy, delivered by former Gov. Alfred M. Landon, of Kansas, before the

Men's Brotherhood, First Methodist Church, Shenandoah, Iowa, on November 1, 1939, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY HON. LEWIS W. DOUGLAS ON THE COST OF GOVERNMENT

[Mr. BYRD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address by Hon. Lewis W. Douglas, former Budget Director and Member of the House of Representatives, before the New York Herald Tribune Forum on Wednesday, October 25, 1939, which appears in the Appendix.]

GEORGE BERNARD SHAW'S INQUIRY AS TO BRITISH WAR AIMS

[Mr. SHIPSTEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Minneapolis Morning Tribune of November 1, 1939, entitled "Mr. Shaw Asks a Question," which appears in the Appendix.]

MILK IN CHICAGO—ARTICLE FROM FORTUNE MAGAZINE

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD portions of an article entitled "Milk in Chicago," published in the November issue of Fortune magazine, which appear in the Appendix.]

STEEL PRODUCTION

[Mr. GUFFEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article from the Washington Post of November 1, 1939, under the heading Steel's Highest Output Opens 79,000 Jobs, which appears in the Appendix.]

PROSPECTIVE INCREASE IN LATIN AMERICAN TRADE

[Mr. PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by Felix Cotten, published in the Washington Post of Sunday, October 22, 1939, on the subject of the prospective increase in trade between the United States and Latin America, which appears in the Appendix.]

PROGRESS OF AMERICAN INDUSTRY

[Mr. MINTON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an Associated Press dispatch under the heading American Industry Is Setting Fastest Pace Since 1929, which appears in the Appendix.]

NEGOTIATED PEACE IN EUROPEAN CONFLICT—EDITORIAL BY DAVID LAWRENCE

[Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial by David Lawrence published in the United States News of October 23, 1939, setting forth a plan as the basis for an honorably negotiated peace in the present Eupropean conflict, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE MONEY QUESTION

[Mr. FRAZIER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article on the money question, which appears in the Appendix.]

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I have just received word that the conferees on the neutrality joint resolution have not as yet finished their work and are not ready to make a report at this time. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess until 2 o'clock p. m. today.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate (at 12 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) took a recess until 2 o'clock p. m.

On the expiration of the recess the Senate reassembled, and the Vice President resumed the chair.

NEUTRALITY AND PEACE OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I am able to announce to the Senate that the conferees on the neutrality joint resolution have completed their work and have agreed on a conference report, but it will take probably a couple of hours for the drafting service to get the report ready for the consideration of the Senate. Therefore I shall, in a few moments, ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess until 4 o'clock. In the meantime I yield to the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH].

INTERPRETATION OF HATCH POLITICAL ACTIVITIES ACT

[Mr. HATCH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD interpretations by the Department of Justice of the so-called Hatch Act relating to political activities of Government employees, which appear in the Appendix.]

PERNICIOUS POLITICAL ACTIVITIES (S. DOC. NO. 135)

On motion of Mr. BARKLEY and by unanimous consent, it was—

Ordered, That the interpretations and summary by the Attorney General of the Hatch Act, relative to pernicious political activities, presented to the Senate today by Mr. HATCH, together with a copy of the said act, be printed as a Senate document.

AGRICULTURE

[Mr. MCKELLAR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a memorandum on agriculture, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY DR. WILMER SOUDER ON CRIME

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in RECORD an address on the subject Crime—The Church Must and Can Meet It, delivered by Dr. Wilmer Souder, of the Bureau of Standards, at the Laymen's Session of the International Convention of the Disciples of Christ at Richmond, Va., on Saturday, October 21, 1939, which appears in the Appendix.]

PROTEST AGAINST FINAL ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. President——

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. President, for more than a score of years, America has faced a severe economic crisis. Our entanglement in the quarrels of Europe has involved us more and more in the foreign affairs of the Old World. Throughout this period, I have constantly opposed adjournment of Congress because we are leaving unfinished tremendous domestic problems such as unemployment, hunger, poverty, and destitution. The farm problem remains unsolved and labor faces an uncertain future. How can we go home now in the midst of all this? With a slight reduction in unemployment that figure still stands at more than 10,000,000.

WE MUST NOT ADJOURN NOW

We are embarking upon the uncertain and dangerous course of a monstrous munition trade—a trade in guns, ammunition, war planes, bombs, and poison gas. We are to be the arsenal for one group of belligerents and we may become the target of other belligerents.

These domestic problems and foreign affairs demand a continuous session and our presence in Washington at all times. For us to leave the seat of Government now in the midst of all this confusion and uncertainty of a great foreign and domestic crisis is nothing short of legislative desertion.

I favor keeping Congress in session until we meet the regular session of January 3. We must remain as sentinels on guard on the ramparts which our duty calls us to watch.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate stand in recess until 4 o'clock p. m. this afternoon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 3 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until 4 o'clock p. m.

On the expiration of the recess the Senate reassembled, and the Vice President resumed the chair.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. MINTON. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Frazier	Lucas	Schwellenbach
Andrews	George	Lundeen	Sheppard
Austin	Gerry	McKellar	Shipstead
Bailey	Gibson	McNary	Slattery
Barbour	Gillette	Maloney	Smathers
Barkley	Green	Mead	Smith
Borah	Guffey	Miller	Stewart
Brown	Gurney	Minton	Taft
Burke	Hale	Murray	Thomas, Okla.
Byrd	Harrison	Neely	Thomas, Utah
Byrnes	Hatch	Norris	Tobey
Capper	Hayden	Nye	Townsend
Caraway	Holt	O'Mahoney	Vandenberg
Chandler	Hughes	Overton	Van Nuys
Clark, Idaho	Johnson, Calif.	Pepper	Wagner
Clark, Mo.	Johnson, Colo.	Pittman	Walsh
Connally	King	Radcliffe	Wheeler
Danaher	La Follette	Reynolds	White
Davis	Lee	Russell	Wiley
Ellender	Lodge	Schwartz	

Mr. MINTON. I announce that the Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST] is detained from the Senate because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HERRING] are absent because of illness.

The Senators from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD and Mr. HILL], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. DONAHEY], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are unavoidably detained.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-nine Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

NEUTRALITY AND PEACE OF THE UNITED STATES—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, I present the conference report on House Joint Resolution 306 and move its adoption. May I make a brief statement?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the conference report will be taken up for consideration and will be printed in the RECORD. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

The report is as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 306), Neutrality Act of 1939, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be stricken out by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"Whereas the United States, desiring to preserve its neutrality in wars between foreign states and desiring also to avoid involvement therein, voluntarily imposes upon its nationals by domestic legislation the restrictions set out in this joint resolution; and

"Whereas by so doing the United States waives none of its own rights or privileges, or those of any of its nationals, under international law, and expressly reserves all the rights and privileges to which it and its nationals are entitled under the law of nations; and

"Whereas the United States hereby expressly reserves the right to repeal, change or modify this joint resolution or any other domestic legislation in the interests of the peace, security or welfare of the United States and its people: Therefore be it."

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"PROCLAMATION OF A STATE OF WAR BETWEEN FOREIGN STATES

"SECTION 1. (a) That whenever the President, or the Congress by concurrent resolution, shall find that there exists a state of war between foreign states, and that it is necessary to promote the security or preserve the peace of the United States or to protect the lives of citizens of the United States, the President shall issue a proclamation naming the states involved; and he shall, from time to time, by proclamation, name other states as and when they may become involved in the war.

"(b) Whenever the state of war which shall have caused the President to issue any proclamation under the authority of this section shall have ceased to exist with respect to any state named in such proclamation, he shall revoke such proclamation with respect to such state.

"COMMERCE WITH STATES ENGAGED IN ARMED CONFLICT

"SEC. 2. (a) Whenever the President shall have issued a proclamation under the authority of section 1 (a) it shall thereafter be unlawful for any American vessel to carry any passengers or any articles or materials to any state named in such proclamation.

"(b) Whoever shall violate any of the provisions of subsection (a) of this section or of any regulations issued thereunder shall, upon conviction thereof, be fined not more than $50,000 or imprisoned for not more than five years, or both. Should the violation be by a corporation, organization, or association, each officer or director thereof participating in the violation shall be liable to the penalty herein prescribed.

"(c) Whenever the President shall have issued a proclamation under the authority of section 1 (a) it shall thereafter be unlawful to export or transport, or attempt to export or transport, or cause to be exported or transported from the United States to any state named in such proclamation, any articles or materials (except copyrighted articles or materials) until all right, title, and interest therein shall have been transferred to some foreign government, agency, institution, association, partnership, corporation, or national. Issuance of a bill of lading under which title to the articles or materials to be exported or transported passes to a foreign purchaser unconditionally upon the delivery of such articles or materials to a carrier, shall constitute a transfer of all right, title, and interest therein within the meaning of this subsection. The shipper of such articles or materials shall be required to file with the collector of the port from or through which they are to be exported a declaration under oath that he has complied with the requirements of this subsection with respect to transfer of right, title, and interest in such articles or materials, and that he will comply with such rules and regulations as shall be promulgated from time to time. Any such declaration so filed shall be a conclusive estoppel against any claim of any citizen of the United States of right, title, or interest in such articles or materials, if such citizen had knowledge of the filing of such declaration; and the exportation or transportation of any articles or materials without filing the declaration required by this subsection shall be a conclusive estoppel against any claim of any citizen of the United States of right, title, or interest in such articles or materials, if such citizen had knowledge of such violation. No loss incurred by any such citizen (1) in connection with the sale or transfer of right, title, and interest in any such articles or materials or (2) in connection with the exportation or transportation of any such copyrighted articles or materials, shall be made the basis of any claim put forward by the Government of the United States.

"(d) Insurance written by underwriters on articles or materials included in shipments which are subject to restrictions under the provisions of this joint resolution, and on vessels carrying such shipments, shall not be deemed an American interest therein, and no insurance policy issued on such articles or materials, or vessels, and no loss incurred thereunder or by the owners of such vessels, shall be made the basis of any claim put forward by the Government of the United States.

"(e) Whenever any proclamation issued under the authority of section 1 (a) shall have been revoked with respect to any state the provisions of this section shall thereupon cease to apply with respect to such state, except as to offenses committed prior to such revocation.

"(f) The provisions of subsection (a) of this section shall not apply to transportation by American vessels on or over lakes, rivers, and inland waters bordering on the United States, or to transportation by aircraft on or over lands bordering on the United States; and the provisions of subsection (c) of this section shall not apply (1) to such transportation of any articles or materials other than articles listed in a proclamation referred to in or issued under the authority of section 12 (i), or (2) to any other transportation on or over lands bordering on the United States of any articles or materials other than articles listed in a proclamation referred to in or issued under the authority of section 12 (i); and the provisions of subsections (a) and (c) of this section shall not apply to the transportation referred to in this subsection and subsections (g) and (h) of any articles or materials listed in a proclamation referred to in or issued under the authority of section 12 (i) if the articles or materials so listed are to be used exclusively by American vessels, aircraft, or other vehicles in connection with their operation and maintenance.

(g) The provisions of subsections (a) and (c) of this section shall not apply to transportation by American vessels (other than aircraft) of mail, passengers, or any articles or materials (except articles or materials listed in a proclamation referred to in or issued under the authority of section 12 (i)) (1) to any port in the Western Hemisphere south of thirty-five degrees north latitude, (2) to any port in the Western Hemisphere north of thirty-five degrees north latitude and west of sixty-six degrees west longitude, (3) to any port on the Pacific or Indian Oceans, including the China Sea, the Tasman Sea, the Bay of Bengal, and the Arabian Sea, and any other dependent waters of either of such oceans, seas, or bays, or (4) to any port on the Atlantic Ocean or its dependent waters south of thirty degrees north latitude. The exceptions contained in this subsection shall not apply to any such port which is included within a combat area as defined in section 3 which applies to such vessels.

(h) The provisions of subsections (a) and (c) of this section shall not apply to transportation by aircraft of mail, passengers, or any articles or materials (except articles or materials listed in a proclamation referred to in or issued under the authority of section 12 (i)) (1) to any port in the Western Hemisphere, or (2) to any port on the Pacific or Indian Oceans, including the China Sea, the Tasman Sea, the Bay of Bengal, and the Arabian Sea, and any other dependent waters of either of such oceans, seas, or bays. The exceptions contained in this subsection shall not apply to any such port which is included within a combat area as defined in section 3 which applies to such aircraft.

(i) Every American vessel to which the provisions of subsections (g) and (h) apply, and every neutral vessel to which the provisions of subsection (1) apply, shall, before departing from a port or from the jurisdiction of the United States, file with the collector of customs of the port of departure, or if there is no such collector at such port then with the nearest collector of customs, a sworn statement (1) containing a complete list of all the articles and materials carried as cargo by such vessel, and the names and addresses of the consignees of all such articles and materials, and (2) stating the ports at which such articles and materials are to be unloaded and the ports of call of such vessel. All transportation referred to in subsections (f), (g), (h), and (l) of this section shall be subject to such restrictions, rules, and regulations as the President shall prescribe; but no loss incurred in connection with any transportation excepted under the provisions of subsections (g), (h), and (l) of this section shall be made the basis of any claim put forward by the Government of the United States.

(j) Whenever all proclamations issued under the authority of section 1 (a) shall have been revoked, the provisions of subsections (f), (g), (h), (i), and (l) of this section shall expire.

"(k) The provisions of this section shall not apply to the current voyage of any American vessel which has cleared for a foreign port and has departed from a port or from the jurisdiction of the United States in advance of (1) the date of enactment of this joint resolution, or (2) any proclamation issued after such date under the authority of section 1 (a) of this joint resolution; but any such vessel shall proceed at its own risk after either of such dates, and no loss incurred in connection with any such vessel or its cargo after either of such dates shall be made the basis of any claim put forward by the Government of the United States.

"(l) The provisions of subsection (c) of this section shall not apply to the transportation by a neutral vessel to any port referred to in subsection (g) of this section of any articles or materials (except articles or materials listed in a proclamation referred to in or issued under the authority of section 12 (i)) so long as such port is not included within a combat area as defined in section 3 which applies to American vessels.

"COMBAT AREAS

"SEC. 3. (a) Whenever the President shall have issued a proclamation under the authority of section 1 (a), and he shall thereafter find that the protection of citizens of the United States so requires, he shall, by proclamation, define combat areas, and thereafter it shall be unlawful, except under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed, for any citizen of the United States or any American vessel to proceed into or through any such combat area. The combat areas so defined may be made to apply to surface vessels or aircraft, or both.

"(b) In case of the violation of any of the provisions of this section by any American vessel, or any owner or officer thereof, such vessel, owner, or officer shall be fined not more than $50,000 or imprisoned for not more than five years, or both. Should the owner of such vessel be a corporation, organization, or association, each officer or director participating in the violation shall be liable to the penalty hereinabove prescribed. In case of the violation of this section by any citizen traveling as a passenger, such passenger may be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned for not more than two years, or both.

"(c) The President may from time to time modify or extend any proclamation issued under the authority of this section, and when the conditions which shall have caused him to issue any such proclamation shall have ceased to exist he shall revoke such proclamation and the provisions of this section shall thereupon cease to apply, except as to offenses committed prior to such revocation.

"AMERICAN RED CROSS

"SEC. 4. The provisions of section 2 (a) shall not prohibit the transportation by vessels under charter or other direction and control of the American Red Cross, proceeding under safe conduct granted by states named in any proclamation issued under the authority of section 1 (a), of officers and American Red Cross personnel, medical personnel, and medical supplies, food, and clothing, for the relief of human suffering.

"TRAVEL ON VESSELS OF BELLIGERENT STATES

"SEC. 5. (a) Whenever the President shall have issued a proclamation under the authority of section 1 (a) it shall thereafter be unlawful for any citizen of the United States to travel on any vessel of any state named in such proclamation, except in accordance with such rules and regulations as may be prescribed.

"(b) Whenever any proclamation issued under the authority of section 1 (a) shall have been revoked with respect to any state the provisions of this section shall thereupon cease to apply with respect to such state, except as to offenses committed prior to such revocation.

"ARMING OF AMERICAN MERCHANT VESSELS PROHIBITED

"SEC. 6. Whenever the President shall have issued a proclamation under the authority of section 1 (a), it shall thereafter be unlawful, until such proclamation is revoked, for any American vessel, engaged in commerce with any foreign state to be armed, except with small arms and ammunition therefor, which the President may deem necessary and shall publicly designate for the preservation of discipline aboard any such vessel.

"FINANCIAL TRANSACTIONS

"SEC. 7. (a) Whenever the President shall have issued a proclamation under the authority of section 1 (a), it shall thereafter be unlawful for any person within the United States to purchase, sell, or exchange bonds, securities, or other obligations of the government of any state named in such proclamation, or of any political subdivision of any such state, or of any person acting for or on behalf of the government of any such state or political subdivision thereof, issued after the date of such proclamation, or to make any loan or extend any credit (other than necessary credits accruing in connection with the transmission of telegraph, cable, wireless and telephone services) to any such government, political subdivision, or person. The provisions of this subsection shall also apply to the sale by any person within the United States to any person in a state named in any such proclamation of any articles or materials listed in a proclamation referred to in or issued under the authority of section 12 (i).

"(b) The provisions of this section shall not apply to a renewal or adjustment of such indebtedness as may exist on the date of such proclamation.

"(c) Whoever shall knowingly violate any of the provisions of this section or of any regulations issued thereunder shall, upon conviction thereof, be fined not more than $50,000 or imprisoned for not more than five years, or both. Should the violation be by a corporation, organization, or association, each officer or director thereof participating in the violation shall be liable to the penalty herein prescribed.

"(d) Whenever any proclamation issued under the authority of section 1 (a) shall have been revoked with respect to any state the provisions of this section shall thereupon cease to apply with respect to such state, except as to offenses committed prior to such revocation.

"SOLICITATION AND COLLECTION OF FUNDS AND CONTRIBUTIONS

"SEC. 8. (a) Whenever the President shall have issued a proclamation under the authority of section 1 (a), it shall thereafter be unlawful for any person within the United States to solicit or receive any contribution for or on behalf of the government of any state named in such proclamation or for or on behalf of any agent or instrumentality of any such state.

"(b) Nothing in this section shall be construed to prohibit the solicitation or collection of funds and contributions to be used for medical aid and assistance, or for food and clothing to relieve human suffering, when such solicitation or collection of funds and contributions is made on behalf of and for use by any person or organization which is not acting for or on behalf of any such government, but all such solicitations and collections of funds and contributions shall be in accordance with and subject to such rules and regulations as may be prescribed.

"(c) Whenever any proclamation issued under the authority of section 1 (a) shall have been revoked with respect to any state the provisions of this section shall thereupon cease to apply with respect to such state, except as to offenses committed prior to such revocation.

"AMERICAN REPUBLICS

"SEC. 9. This joint resolution (except section 12) shall not apply to any American republic engaged in war against a non-American state or states, provided the American republic is not cooperating with a non-American state or states in such war.

"RESTRICTIONS ON USE OF AMERICAN PORTS

"SEC. 10. (a) Whenever, during any war in which the United States is neutral, the President, or any person thereunto authorized by him, shall have cause to believe that any vessel, domestic or foreign, whether requiring clearance or not, is about to carry out of a port or from the jurisdiction of the United States, fuel, men, arms, ammunition, implements of war, supplies, dispatches, or information to any warship, tender, or supply ship of a state named in a proclamation issued under the authority of section 1 (a), but the evidence is not deemed sufficient to justify forbidding the departure of the vessel as provided for by section 1, title V, chapter 30, of the Act approved June 15, 1917 (40 Stat. 217, 221; U. S. C., 1934 edition, title 18, sec. 31), and if, in the President's judgment, such action will serve to maintain peace between the United States and foreign states, or to protect the commercial interests of the United States and its citizens, or to promote the security or neutrality of the United States, he shall have the power, and it shall be his duty, to require the owner, master, or person in command thereof, before departing from a port or from the jurisdiction of the United States, to give a bond to the United States, with sufficient sureties, in such amount as he shall deem proper, conditioned that the vessel will not deliver the men, or any fuel, supplies, dispatches, information, or any part of the cargo, to any warship, tender, or supply ship of a state named in a proclamation issued under the authority of section 1 (a).

"(b) If the President, or any person thereunto authorized by him, shall find that a vessel, domestic or foreign, in a port of the United States, has previously departed from a port or from the jurisdiction of the United States during such war and delivered men, fuel, supplies, dispatches, information, or any part of its cargo to a warship, tender, or supply ship of a state named in a proclamation issued under the authority of section 1 (a), he may prohibit the departure of such vessel during the duration of the war.

"(c) Whenever the President shall have issued a proclamation under section 1 (a) he may, while such proclamation is in effect, require the owner, master, or person in command of any vessel, foreign or domestic, before departing from the United States, to give a bond to the United States, with sufficient sureties, in such amount as he shall deem proper, conditioned that no alien seaman who arrived on such vessel shall remain in the United States for a longer period than that permitted under the regulations, as amended from time to time, issued pursuant to section 33 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917 (U. S. C., title 8, sec. 168). Notwithstanding the provisions of said section 33, the President may issue such regulations with respect to the landing of such seamen as he deems necessary to insure their departure either on such vessel or another vessel at the expense of such owner, master, or person in command.

"SUBMARINES AND ARMED MERCHANT VESSELS

"SEC. 11. Whenever, during any war in which the United States is neutral, the President shall find that special restrictions placed on the use of the ports and territorial waters of the United States by the submarines or armed merchant vessels of a foreign state will serve to maintain peace between the United States and foreign states, or to protect the commercial interests of the United States and its citizens, or to promote the security of the United States, and shall make proclamation thereof, it shall thereafter be unlawful for any such submarine or armed merchant vessel to enter a port or the territorial waters of the United States or to depart

therefrom, except under such conditions and subject to such limitations as the President may prescribe. Whenever, in his judgment, the conditions which have caused him to issue his proclamation have ceased to exist, he shall revoke his proclamation and the provisions of this section shall thereupon cease to apply, except as to offenses committed prior to such revocation.

"NATIONAL MUNITIONS CONTROL BOARD

"SEC. 12. (a) There is hereby established a National Munitions Control Board (hereinafter referred to as the 'Board'). The Board shall consist of the Secretary of State, who shall be chairman and executive officer of the Board, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of Commerce. Except as otherwise provided in this section, or by other law, the administration of this section is vested in the Secretary of State. The Secretary of State shall promulgate such rules and regulations with regard to the enforcement of this section as he may deem necessary to carry out its provisions. The Board shall be convened by the chairman and shall hold at least one meeting a year.

"(b) Every person who engages in the business of manufacturing, exporting, or importing any arms, ammunition, or implements of war listed in a proclamation referred to in or issued under the authority of subsection (i) of this section, whether as an exporter, importer, manufacturer, or dealer, shall register with the Secretary of State his name, or business name, principal place of business, and places of business in the United States, and a list of the arms, ammunition, and implements of war which he manufactures, imports, or exports.

"(c) Every person required to register under this section shall notify the Secretary of State of any change in the arms, ammunition, or implements of war which he exports, imports, or manufactures; and upon such notification the Secretary of State shall issue to such person an amended certificate of registration, free of charge, which shall remain valid until the date of expiration of the original certificate. Every person required to register under the provisions of this section shall pay a registration fee of $100. Upon receipt of the required registration fee, the Secretary of State shall issue a registration certificate valid for five years, which shall be renewable for further periods of five years upon the payment for each renewal of a fee of $100; but valid certificates of registration (including amended certificates) issued under the authority of section 2 of the joint resolution of August 31, 1935, or section 5 of the joint resolution of August 31, 1935, as amended, shall, without payment of any additional registration fee, be considered to be valid certificates of registration issued under this subsection, and shall remain valid for the same period as if this joint resolution had not been enacted.

"(d) It shall be unlawful for any person to export, or attempt to export, from the United States to any other state, any arms, ammunition, or implements of war listed in a proclamation referred to in or issued under the authority of subsection (i) of this section, or to import, or attempt to import, to the United States from any other state, any of the arms, ammunition, or implements of war listed in any such proclamation, without first having submitted to the Secretary of State the name of the purchaser and the terms of sale and having obtained a license therefor.

"(e) All persons required to register under this section shall maintain, subject to the inspection of the Secretary of State, or any person or persons designated by him, such permanent records of manufacture for export, importation, and exportation of arms, ammunition, and implements of war as the Secretary of State shall prescribe.

"(f) Licenses shall be issued by the Secretary of State to persons who have registered as herein provided for, except in cases of export or import licenses where the export of arms, ammunition, or implements of war would be in violation of this joint resolution or any other law of the United States, or of a treaty to which the United States is a party, in which cases such licenses shall not be issued; but a valid license issued under the authority of section 2 of the joint resolution of August 31, 1935, or section 5 of the joint resolution of August 31, 1935, as amended, shall be considered to be a valid license issued under this subsection, and shall remain valid for the same period as if this joint resolution had not been enacted.

"(g) No purchase of arms, ammunition, or implements of war shall be made on behalf of the United States by any officer, executive department, or independent establishment of the Government from any person who shall have failed to register under the provisions of this joint resolution.

"(h) The Board shall make a report to Congress on January 3 and July 3 of each year, copies of which shall be distributed as are other reports transmitted to Congress. Such reports shall contain such information and data collected by the Board as may be considered of value in the determination of questions connected with the control of trade in arms, ammunition, and implements of war, including the name of the purchaser and the terms of sale made under any such license. The Board shall include in such reports a list of all persons required to register under the provisions of this joint resolution, and full information concerning the licenses issued hereunder, including the name of the purchaser and the terms of sale made under any such license.

"(i) The President is hereby authorized to proclaim upon recommendation of the Board from time to time a list of articles which shall be considered arms, ammunition, and implements of war for the purposes of this section; but the proclamation No. 2237, of May 1, 1937 (50 Stat. 1834), defining the term 'arms, ammunition, and implements of war' shall, until it is revoked, have full force and effect as if issued under the authority of this subsection.

"REGULATIONS

"SEC. 13. The President may, from time to time, promulgate such rules and regulations, not inconsistent with law, as may be necessary and proper to carry out any of the provisions of this joint resolution; and he may exercise any power or authority conferred on him by this joint resolution through such officer or officers, or agency or agencies, as he shall direct.

"UNLAWFUL USE OF THE AMERICAN FLAG

"SEC. 14. (a) It shall be unlawful for any vessel belonging to or operating under the jurisdiction of any foreign state to use the flag of the United States thereon, or to make use of any distinctive signs or markings, indicating that the same is an American vessel.

"(b) Any vessel violating the provisions of subsection (a) of this section shall be denied for a period of three months the right to enter the ports or territorial waters of the United States except in cases of force majeure.

"GENERAL PENALTY PROVISION

"SEC. 15. In every case of the violation of any of the provisions of this joint resolution or of any rule or regulation issued pursuant thereto where a specific penalty is not herein provided, such violator or violators, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than $10,000, or imprisoned not more than two years, or both.

"DEFINITIONS

"SEC. 16. For the purposes of this joint resolution—

"(a) The term 'United States', when used in a geographical sense, includes the several states and Territories, the insular possessions of the United States (including the Philippine Islands), the Canal Zone, and the District of Columbia.

"(b) The term 'person' includes a partnership, company, association, or corporation, as well as a natural person.

"(c) The term 'vessel' means every description of watercraft and aircraft capable of being used as a means of transportation on, under, or over water.

"(d) The term 'American vessel' means any vessel documented, and any aircraft registered or licensed, under the laws of the United States.

"(e) The term 'state' shall include nation, government, and country.

"(f) The term 'citizen' shall include any individual owing allegiance to the United States, a partnership, company, or association composed in whole or in part of citizens of the United States, and any corporation organized and existing under the laws of the United States as defined in subsection (a) of this section.

"SEPARABILITY OF PROVISIONS

"SEC. 17. If any of the provisions of this joint resolution, or the application thereof to any person or circumstance, is held invalid, the remainder of the joint resolution, and the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances, shall not be affected thereby.

"APPROPRIATIONS

"SEC. 18. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated from time to time, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the provisions and accomplish the purposes of this joint resolution.

"REPEALS

"SEC. 19. The joint resolution of August 31, 1935, as amended, and the joint resolution of January 8, 1937, are hereby repealed; but offenses committed and penalties, forfeitures, or liabilities incurred under either of such joint resolutions prior to the date of enactment of this joint resolution may be prosecuted and punished, and suits and proceedings for violations of either of such joint resolutions or of any rule or regulation issued pursuant thereto may be commenced and prosecuted, in the same manner and with the same effect as if such joint resolutions had not been repealed.

"SHORT TITLE

"SEC. 20. This joint resolution may be cited as the 'Neutrality Act of 1939.'"

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the title of the joint resolution, and agree to the same.

KEY PITTMAN,
WALTER F. GEORGE,
ROBERT F. WAGNER,
TOM CONNALLY,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

SOL BLOOM,
LUTHER A. JOHNSON,
JOHN KEE,
Managers on the part of the House.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the conference report will be agreed to.

Mr. McNARY and Mr. VANDENBERG. No, Mr. President.

Mr. VANDENBERG. We want the yeas and nays on the adoption of the conference report.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Just a moment. The Chair wanted to test the sense of the Senate, and see whether or not there was objection.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, in support of the motion to adopt the conference report, I wish to make a very brief statement as to the changes that have been made in conference.

The text of the conference report which I have just presented to the Senate is substantially the same as the amendment which the Senate adopted on October 27. The majority of the changes that were made in conference are of a clarifying or technical nature, and there were few changes of substance. A summary of the principle changes follows:

First. The provision in section 2 (c) (relating to transfer of title) under which the issuance of an unconditional bill of lading is to constitute compliance with the transfer requirements has been clarified. I will say that the provision in the conference report is exactly the same as that adopted by the Senate except for the selection of more definite language.

Second. The estoppel provision of section 2 (c) has been clarified so that the claim of any citizen of the United States to any articles or materials with respect to which a declaration of transfer of title is required will be barred if such citizen has knowledge of the filing of such declaration or that the articles or materials were exported or transported without filing the required declaration.

In other words, there are two conditions. One involves knowledge of the filing of the declaration, and in the second instance, if no declaration was filed and there was an effort made to export the articles without a declaration and the citizen had knowledge of such export, then he would thereafter be estopped to set up any interest in the articles or materials.

Third. The provisions of subsections (g) and (h) of section 2, which sections make an exception in the case of American vessels transporting materials to belligerents in certain waters, and which relate in part to transportation by American vessels and aircraft to ports on the Pacific and Indian Oceans, have been clarified so that the enumeration of certain bodies of water as being included therein will not be interpreted as excluding other dependent waters of either of such oceans.

In other words, the State Department, in a communication to the committee, called attention to the fact that the expression "dependent waters" has been interpreted in several treaties, particularly our treaties with Canada with regard to whaling, and that it has a very definite meaning. However, so as absolutely to make it certain with regard to the particular seas, gulfs, and bays which were mentioned in the joint resolution as passed by the Senate, the conference report provides not only that it shall apply to the Pacific and Indian Oceans and "dependent waters," including the bays, gulfs, and seas mentioned in the joint resolution as passed by this body, but shall also include any other dependent waters of such oceans.

Fourth. A provision was added with respect to neutral vessels which has the effect of granting them the same exemptions as are granted to American vessels so far as the transfer of title requirements of section 2 (c) are concerned. It was brought to the attention of the conference committee that in the absence of such a provision certain treaty obligations would be violated. As a result of this addition, changes of cross references were made necessary in sections 2 (i) and 2 (j).

In other words, neutral vessels may transport the same articles and materials that American vessels may transport to certain belligerent countries in the Pacific, South Atlantic, and the Caribbean without conveyance of title, subject to the restrictions that the exemption as to transfer of title with regard to neutral vessels is suspended during the period of time when the exemption as to American vessels is suspended by the proclaiming of combat areas by the President. In other words, it is proposed to give neutral vessels the same right as American vessels in such areas, but no greater right; and when American vessels will be barred from such commerce by the proclamation of a combat area or areas, then, while neutrals may carry on that trade, they must have the title conveyed to the belligerents before they can convey the goods to the belligerents in such area or areas.

Fifth. The provision of section 2 (k), relating to American vessels whose voyages were begun 7 days or more in advance of the date of enactment of the joint resolution or any subsequent Presidential proclamation naming belligerent states, has been modified. It now provides that any American vessel that has left a port or the jurisdiction of the United States before such date or before any such proclamation may proceed without regard to the provisions of section 2, but will do so at its own risk. In addition, no loss incurred in connection with any such vessel or its cargo is to be made the basis of any claim put forward by the Government of the United States.

I may say that one of the reasons for the clarification of that language was that it was indefinite as to whether a vessel leaving New Orleans, for instance, before the enactment of the joint resolution and proceeding to Baltimore and then to New York, and probably 2 weeks after the enactment of this measure sailing from New York to Great Britain and France, would come within the provisions of this act. The language is now made quite clear that when the vessel leaves the first port and the jurisdiction of the United States on its current voyage the time commences to run against the vessel. That now is in very definite language.

Sixth. A minor change was made in the provisions of section 7 (a), prohibiting extensions of credit to belligerent states, and so forth. An exception in the nature of a clarifying amendment was made in the case of credits which relate to the transmission of telegraph, cable, wireless, and telephone messages, and which were obviously not intended to be covered by the prohibition.

It has been represented to us—and, I think, on good authority—that the character of transactions in such cases between companies in the United States and foreign companies, particularly when the foreign companies are owned or controlled by the governments of the countries in which they do business, is that there is a division of the proceeds, and that at frequent periods of time settlements are made between the companies concerned. Fear was expressed that it might be construed that a foreign government owed a balance upon such a settlement, so that provision was included.

Seventh. Section 19 of the Senate amendment, relating to repeals, also contained a proviso continuing in effect the certificates of registration and licenses issued under the 1935 and 1937 acts and the proclamation of the President of May 1, 1937, defining "arms, ammunition, and implements of war." The various parts of the proviso relating to certificates of registration, licenses, and the President's proclamation have been clarified and transposed from the repeal section to subsections (c), (f), and (i) of section 12, respectively, where similar matters are dealt with. Certain cross-references required by the changes above referred to have also been made in the text of the conference report, as well as certain minor technical corrections.

In other words, we took the proviso out of the repeal section and made it a part of the relevant sections of the joint resolution itself.

A question arose as to whether or not, in the proviso to the repeal section, we had actually carried forward and reaffirmed the embargo list in section (i) of section 12, which the President had already established. In order to cover that matter entirely we made an addition to subsection (i) of section 12, which grants to the President authority to proclaim a list of arms, ammunition, and implements of war; and in the new sentence we expressly stated that the list he had heretofore proclaimed as constituting arms, ammunition, and implements of war should be and remain a part of the list of arms, ammunition, and implements of war until changed by subsequent action.

I think that describes, as far as I can do so, all the changes that have been made in the joint resolution itself.

When we came to the preamble, the preamble in substance as heretofore presented by the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] was agreed to by the conference committee.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Nevada if he will do me the kindness to say that two of the conferees on the part of the Senate did not sign the conference report.

Mr. PITTMAN. That is true, I will say to the Senator from California. I regret that I did not mention the fact; but the press already had the information, so it was received by the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. MCNARY and other Senators called for the yeas and nays, and they were ordered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD (when his name was called). I have a pair with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS]. I am informed that if present he would vote "yea." I transfer my pair to the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], and vote "nay."

Mr. SMITH (when his name was called). I have a pair on this question with the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. DONAHEY], who I am advised would vote "nay" if present. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], and vote "yea."

Mr. STEWART (when his name was called). I have a pair with the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN], which I transfer to the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], and vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. MINTON. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HERRING] are absent because of illness.

The Senators from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD and Mr. HILL], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. DONAHEY], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BULOW], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are unavoidably detained.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO] is paired with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN]. The Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] is paired with the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY]. The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HERRING] is paired with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ]. I am advised that if present and voting the Senator from Mississippi, the Senator from Iowa, and the Senator from Maryland would vote "yea." The Senator from Nevada, the Senator from New Mexico, and the Senator from California would vote "nay."

I am advised that if present and voting the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], the Senators from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD and Mr. HILL], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HERRING] would vote "yea."

Mr. HAYDEN. My colleague the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST] is detained from the Senate on account of the death of his wife. If present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. MCNARY. The junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] is necessarily absent. He is paired on this vote with the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BULOW]. If the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] were present, he would vote "yea," and I am informed that if the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BULOW] were present he would vote "nay."

My colleague, the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN] is necessarily absent. If present, he would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 55, nays 24, as follows:

YEAS—55

Adams	Barbour	Byrd	Connally
Andrews	Barkley	Byrnes	Ellender
Austin	Brown	Caraway	George
Bailey	Burke	Chandler	Gerry
Gibson	Johnson, Colo.	Neely	Slattery
Gillette	King	Norris	Smathers
Green	Lee	O'Mahoney	Smith
Guffey	Lucas	Pepper	Stewart
Gurney	McKellar	Pittman	Taft
Hale	Maloney	Radcliffe	Thomas, Okla.
Harrison	Mead	Russell	Thomas, Utah
Hatch	Miller	Schwartz	Van Nuys
Hayden	Minton	Schwellenbach	Wagner
Hughes	Murray	Sheppard	

NAYS—24

Borah	Frazier	McNary	Townsend
Capper	Holt	Nye	Vandenberg
Clark, Idaho	Johnson, Calif.	Overton	Walsh
Clark, Mo.	La Follette	Reynolds	Wheeler
Danaher	Lodge	Shipstead	White
Davis	Lundeen	Tobey	Wiley

NOT VOTING—17

Ashurst	Bulow	Herring	Truman
Bankhead	Chavez	Hill	Tydings
Bilbo	Donahey	Holman	
Bone	Downey	McCarran	
Bridges	Glass	Reed	

So the conference report on House Joint Resolution 306 was agreed to.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish to make a statement for the information of the Senate.

The adoption of the conference report completes legislative action upon House Joint Resolution 306 so far as the Senate is concerned. Under the rules of the House of Representatives the conference report would have to lie over until tomorrow, but I am informed that it will probably be taken up at once by unanimous consent, and, under the rules of the House, the Members of the House will have an hour in which to discuss it, after which time it will be voted on.

If unanimous consent is not obtained, it may be that a concurrent resolution adjourning the Congress sine die today will be agreed to in both Houses, in which case, under the rules of the House, the Speaker can recognize the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs to take up the conference report, and in that event there will be an hour for discussion. It is a privileged matter after the two Houses have decided to adjourn.

In view of these facts, I cannot at this time offer the concurrent resolution for sine die adjournment, and cannot do so until I receive word from the House, but so soon as I receive word from the House it is my purpose to offer the concurrent resolution. There will be a yea-and-nay vote on it, I am sure, and therefore I advise Senators to be available.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. BORAH. When does the Senator anticipate offering the concurrent resolution?

Mr. BARKLEY. As soon as I hear from the other House.

Mr. BORAH. Today?

Mr. BARKLEY. Today; I should say within an hour or so. I cannot fix the time exactly. It is my purpose to ask the Senate to recess subject to the call of the Chair. As soon as we hear from the House we will reassemble.

I ask unanimous consent that the Senate take a recess subject to the call of the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate (at 4 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.) took a recess subject to the call of the Chair.

At 5 o'clock and 23 minutes p. m., the Senate reassembled on being called to order by the Vice President.

Mr. BARKLEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Clark, Mo.	Hatch	Miller
Andrews	Connally	Holt	Minton
Austin	Danaher	Hughes	Murray
Barbour	Davis	Johnson, Calif.	Neely
Barkley	Ellender	Johnson, Colo.	Norris
Borah	Frazier	King	Nye
Brown	George	La Follette	O'Mahoney
Burke	Gerry	Lee	Overton
Byrd	Gibson	Lodge	Pepper
Byrnes	Gillette	Lucas	Pittman
Capper	Green	Lundeen	Radcliffe
Caraway	Guffey	McKellar	Reynolds
Chandler	Gurney	McNary	Russell
Clark, Idaho	Hale	Maloney	Schwartz

Schwellenbach	Taft	Townsend	Walsh
Sheppard	Thomas, Okla.	Vandenberg	White
Shipstead	Thomas, Utah	Van Nuys	Wiley
Stewart	Tobey	Wagner	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-one Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

FINAL ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk a privileged concurrent resolution, and ask for its present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The legislative clerk read the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 31), as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the two Houses of Congress shall adjourn on Friday, the third day of November 1939, and that when they adjourn on said day they stand adjourned sine die.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the concurrent resolution.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McNARY (when his name was called). On this question I have a pair with the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON]. I am advised that if he were present he would vote as I am about to vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. SHIPSTEAD (when his name was called). I have a pair with the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS]. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] and vote "nay."

Mr. STEWART (when his name was called). I have a pair with the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN]. I am informed that if he were present he would vote as I intend to vote. Therefore I am at liberty to vote. I vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. MINTON. I announce that the Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HERRING] are detained because of illness.

The Senators from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD and Mr. HILL], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. DONAHEY], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BULOW], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are unavoidably detained.

Mr. LUCAS. My colleague [Mr. SLATTERY] is unavoidably detained. If present he would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 46, nays 25, as follows:

YEAS—46

Adams	George	McNary	Russell
Andrews	Gillette	Miller	Schwartz
Austin	Green	Minton	Schwellenbach
Barkley	Guffey	Murray	Sheppard
Brown	Hale	Neely	Stewart
Byrd	Hatch	Norris	Thomas, Utah
Byrnes	Hughes	O'Mahoney	Tobey
Caraway	Johnson, Colo.	Overton	Van Nuys
Chandler	King	Pepper	Wagner
Clark, Idaho	Lee	Pittman	White
Connally	Lucas	Radcliffe	
Ellender	McKellar	Reynolds	

NAYS—25

Barbour	Frazier	Lodge	Townsend
Borah	Gerry	Lundeen	Vandenberg
Burke	Gibson	Maloney	Walsh
Capper	Gurney	Nye	Wiley
Clark, Mo.	Holt	Shipstead	
Danaher	Johnson, Calif.	Taft	
Davis	La Follette	Thomas, Okla.	

NOT VOTING—25

Ashurst	Bilbo	Bulow	Downey
Bailey	Bone	Chavez	Glass
Bankhead	Bridges	Donahey	Harrison
Hayden	McCarran	Slattery	Truman
Herring	Mead	Smathers	Tydings
Hill	Reed	Smith	Wheeler
Holman			

So the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

FELICITATIONS FROM THE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the President of the United States, which was read, as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, November 3, 1939.

MY DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: As it seems probable that this extraordinary session of the Congress will be brought to adjournment within a few hours, may I extend through you to the Members of the Senate my congratulations and good wishes?

I hope that world events will not make it necessary to have any other extraordinary session—and, therefore, in anticipation of seeing you all on the 3d of January next, I extend to you in the meantime my best wishes for a happy Thanksgiving and a merry Christmas. May I add that I hope those Members from States whose Governors have set November 30 as Thanksgiving Day will celebrate both Thanksgivings—the 23d and the 30th.

Very sincerely yours,

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

The Honorable the VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the Senate must await the formality of receiving notice from the other House that it has adopted the conference report. The House is now in the process of a roll call, which I anticipate will not take long. Also, we must await a message from the House that the House has adopted the concurrent resolution of adjournment. That action ought not to require much time. However, in the meantime there is nothing further for the Senate to do but to wait.

I wish to take this opportunity of expressing to all the Members of the Senate my best wishes for a 2 months' vacation. So far this year the Senate has not been long in recess. It has not had a real vacation. Therefore I wish for all Senators, all officers and employees of the Senate, and for our friends in the press gallery, 2 months' vacation of enjoyment and recreation; that the Christmas season and the New Year may bring to them much happiness; and that the one or more Thanksgivings which we are to celebrate during this month may also be greatly enjoyed.

I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate (at 5 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.) took a recess subject to the call of the Chair.

At 6 o'clock and 17 minutes p. m. the Senate reassembled, on being called to order by the Vice President.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Calloway, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 306), Neutrality Act of 1939.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 31, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the two Houses of Congress shall adjourn on Friday, the 3d day of November 1939, and that when they adjourn on said day they stand adjourned sine die.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled joint resolution (H. J. Res. 306) to preserve the neutrality and peace of the United States and to secure the safety of its citizens and their interests, and it was signed by the Vice President.

PRINTING OF DATA ON WORK OF THE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD certain data with respect to the work of the session.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I do not want to object if I may have a better understanding with the able leader of the majority as to the nature of the request. Sometimes there have been inserted in the RECORD immaterial and incompetent matters which I do not think add anything to the standing of the RECORD. Will the Senator be specific as to the nature of the material?

Mr. BARKLEY. I have asked the Secretary of the Senate to prepare for me certain statistics and material with respect to the work of the session. Also, in all likelihood there may be a memorandum from the State Department with respect to certain aspects of legislation. That is all I have in mind.

Mr. McNARY. With the understanding, Mr. President, that the matter inserted in the RECORD shall be limited to the statement made just now by our leader as to the material he is having prepared, and, in addition, the statement from the Secretary of State, I have no objection.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not know of anything else, and if the Senator objects to anything else I would not include it.

Mr. McNARY. I should object to anything other than stated by the Senator.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is all I ask.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky? The Chair hears none.

ADJOURNMENT SINE DIE

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I think everything has been accomplished that has to be accomplished at this session, and all formalities have been attended to.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. Has the Vice President signed the joint resolution?

Mr. BARKLEY. He has. Therefore, pursuant to the concurrent resolution heretofore adopted, I move that the Senate do now adjourn sine die.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned sine die.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 3, 1939

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Lord God of hosts, Thou who art the inspiration of our longings, help us to surrender to Thy outstretched arms of pitying mercy and whitening grace. Thou who dost impart to blind mortal eyes that loveliness which is immortal, O fill us with the spirit of truth that Thy thoughts may be our thoughts; that Thy ways may be our ways; and Thy works may be our works. We thank Thee that no smile of hope, no tear of sympathy, and no sacrificial task can be lost. We pray Thee that our labors may be a potent factor in this turbulent earth in setting in motion those deepening currents which shall melt storms into peace and mend the aching heart of the world. We rejoice, dear Lord, to know that home is the rainbow isle in the river of time whose compulsions are fed from the eternal spring of the human heart. Oh, may no plague come nigh our dwellings. Let a rich, divine blessing abide with our Speaker, the Members, the officers, and the employees of the Congress, and bring us together again without the loss of one. In our Redeemer's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

ELECTION TO STANDING COMMITTEES

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 324

Resolved, That BUTLER B. HARE, of South Carolina, be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the standing committee of the House of Representatives on Appropriations.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

House Resolution 325

Resolved, That FRANK B. KEEFE, of Wisconsin, be, and he is hereby, elected to the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

The resolution was agreed to.

RECESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that during the remainder of the second session of the Seventy-sixth Congress it may be in order for the Speaker to recess the House at any time with the understanding that the bells will be rung 10 minutes before reassembly of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN]?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I say to the gentleman from Texas that I hope this session will be prolonged until January 1. I would like to ask the gentleman a question. What is the program for today?

Mr. RAYBURN. It is to wait on the action of the conferees and when the Senate acts, and it is probable that the Senate may act on the conference report today, we would like to have the House in session to receive the conference report.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I wonder if the gentleman from Texas is taking into consideration the fact that the House may not adjourn? Would he want that authority for too long a period of time under those circumstances?

Mr. RAYBURN. Oh, I would not want that authority longer than Monday or Tuesday of next week.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Why not amend it by providing for 1 week?

Mr. RAYBURN. That is agreeable to me.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the modified request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I want to ask the leadership of the House if they will not give me and other Members of the House a hearing before the Rules Committee in order to discuss our remaining in continuous session? I introduced a resolution last spring for that purpose, and I have asked for hearings which have never been granted. I feel the country wants us here. It wanted us to remain in session last spring. There is much to consider besides neutrality or the lack of it which is important to our country.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, there is a complete reply to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts. If the House is to remain in session, no one has to have a hearing before the Rules Committee and it is not necessary for the Rules Committee to report out a rule. When a sine die resolution is offered, all the Members of the House have to do is turn it down.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The Members would like to have a chance to discuss it.

Mr. RAYBURN. They will have all day today if they desire to do that.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The motion is not debatable after it has been made.

Mr. RAYBURN. No; and it is not debatable before the Rules Committee unless the gentlewoman can get a hearing.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. All we want is a hearing.

Mr. RAYBURN. I cannot understand what the effect will be. The Rules Committee has never reported a rule in the history of the Congress directing when it shall adjourn or whether or not it shall adjourn.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. All I am asking for is a hearing. Why can we not make history by directing the Congress to stay in session?

Mr. RAYBURN. I may say to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts that I am not going to ask the Rules Committee to have a hearing on a resolution of that kind.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Then I make an appeal to the chairman of the Rules Committee.

Mr. SIROVICH. Mr. Speaker, the regular order.

Mr. RAYBURN. If a resolution of that kind is reported by the Rules Committee, I would resist it.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the majority leader a question about giving the Speaker the power to recess the House at a time when the Federal Treasury shows that we have gone in the red to the extent of one and one-half billion dollars since July 1. Should we not stay here and find some means of getting money enough from the taxpayers of this country to pay the Government's bills?

The regular order was demanded.

Mr. RICH. Then I object, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania object?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to ask the majority leader a question.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, the rules of the House must be observed. I have submitted a unanimous-consent request, and the regular order has been demanded, so there is nothing for either the gentleman from Pennsylvania or me to say.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RICH. Will it be possible for us to have an opportunity today to have the floor for 5 or 10 minutes?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will be delighted to recognize the gentleman.

Mr. RICH. Then I shall not object, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair hears no objection.

NEUTRALITY

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

NOVEMBER 3, 1939.

The SPEAKER,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

SIR: Pursuant to the special order agreed to on yesterday, the Clerk of the House received the following message from the Senate:

"That the Senate insists upon its amendments disagreed to by the House of Representatives to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 306) entitled 'Neutrality Act of 1939'; agrees to the conference asked by the House of Representatives on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon; and appoints Mr. PITTMAN, Mr. GEORGE, Mr. WAGNER, Mr. CONNALLY, Mr. BORAH, and Mr. JOHNSON of California conferees on the part of the Senate."

Respectfully yours,

SOUTH TRIMBLE,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I only wanted to congratulate the majority on the very efficient manner in which they repealed the arms embargo and to call their attention to the fact that now that Britain and France can buy arms if they have the money, you should make some arrangements to sell some to the Navy so they can get through the picket lines at Detroit and retake their own property. [Applause.] I also want to call your attention to the cheering news that as long as John L. Lewis is levying an assessment of $3,000,000 you had better get busy and get your share of it for a campaign contribution.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DINGELL. Now that you have a Republican Governor—I think he is a Republican Governor.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. DINGELL. Why does he not take care of the situation in Detroit? [Applause.] I have heard the gentleman talk about former Governor Murphy.

Mr. HOFFMAN. If Mme. Perkins would call off Brother Dewey, the Federal conciliator, that trouble could be ended.

The strike racketeers who are bleeding the workingmen of Michigan have not yet recovered from the foolish notion which they got when Frank Murphy, as Governor of Michigan, backed them up in their lawlessness and prevented the enforcement of the court's orders.

He is the man who aided in creating disrespect for law; who permitted the lawlessness—the "goon" squads and the wrecking crews of the C. I. O. to have their way in Michigan.

You may remember that not very long ago in just about 3 days Governor Dickinson, using less than a score of the same State police force that Governor Murphy had at Flint—yes; had there in addition to 370,000 members of the National Guard and yet permitted lawlessness—Governor Dickinson ended a strike at Pontiac, maintained respect for the law, and there was not even a broken nose or a bloody eye; while at Flint, under Murphy, many a man was sent to the hospital by the violence of the strikers.

If the Labor Department would keep its meddlesome fingers out of local affairs, would quit giving encouragement to those who would deprive American laboring men of their jobs, the hundred thousand men that are out of employment in your city of Detroit and elsewhere in the State because of the Chrysler strike would go back to work. [Applause.]

DO NOT LET THE NAVY BE MADE RIDICULOUS

On October 11, on the floor of the House, I charged that Local Union, No. 208, of the U. A. W., C. I. O., of Detroit, had with a picket line and by show of force prevented a representative of the United States Navy from taking possession of completed castings which were to be used in the construction of motors for aircraft. That it had refused to permit this representative of the Navy to pick up and ship out on a Government bill of lading patterns belonging to the Navy of the United States of America.

I further charged that this strike, which continued in one plant for 41 calendar days, in another for 24, had seriously interfered with the Navy's plans for national defense at the Government's aircraft factory located at the Navy Yard, Philadelphia, Pa.

In a letter dated October 20, Acting Secretary of the Navy Edison fully substantiated my charge and admitted that this union, through its picket line, had successfully defied the Navy.

That this union is still defying the Federal Government, and that its officials have no conception of the absurdity of their position and of their disloyalty, is indicated by a statement in a news dispatch from Detroit, which states that—

> The C. I. O.'s automobile workers' union took issue today with the Navy Department charge that the recent C. I. O. strike against the Bohn Aluminum & Brass Co. in Detroit interfered with the Navy's national-defense program, declaring two union offers to cooperate were ignored.
>
> International President R. J. Thomas, of the union, declared that the Navy twice turned down offers made by the union to cooperate.

Since when and from what source has the C. I. O. obtained the right to withhold property that belongs to the United States Navy and to demand that the question of its right to hold that property be a subject matter of negotiation?

We all know that the C. I. O. contended that the sit-down strike was legal—that is, that it had a legal right to take possession of the property of individuals or of corporations and drive fellow employees from their jobs. Even the United States Supreme Court's decision to the contrary has not convinced all those who support the sit-down, and has but changed the sit-down strike of the C. I. O. into the slow-down.

Now, the C. I. O. advances the preposterous proposition that not only may it interfere with the property rights of the individual employer, force the man who would work to pay tribute to it before he can go on his job, but it insists, and, so far, has made good on the proposition, that when the Navy demands patterns belonging to the Navy and which are needed for use in a Government-owned factory it may tell the Navy to "peddle its papers."

The President and official Washington may for political reasons submit to this affront because they do not care to further antagonize John L. Lewis, who only recently questioned the wisdom of the Government officials in now suggesting that the President have a third term. But the marines and the enlisted personnel of the Navy must be boiling mad and think it rather ridiculous to be building battleships costing millions of dollars and airplanes by the hundreds, and then surrendering to a picket line in Detroit. Must we put wheels on a battleship and send it to Detroit?

If the President does not want to order a Navy truck through the picket line to pick up material needed for national defense, he might suggest that the commandant at Annapolis permit the fourth, fifth, or sixth substitute Navy football team to take a crack at the Detroit picket line. Here is prophesying that those boys will go through that picket line like water over Niagara. They may not make a touchdown, but they will bring back the castings and patterns.

The folks are beginning to wonder just how far the Government by its inaction will go in supporting the C. I. O. and its organizing drive, and just what amount of cash the C. I. O., its affiliates, and Lewis will contribute to the President's third-term campaign fund.

We know that the activities of the National Labor Relations Board, the Senate Civil Liberties Committee, the coddling of the C. I. O. strikers by Governor Murphy, Mme. Perkins' views toward the legality of the sit-down strikes, the failure of the Labor Board to act upon the case of Harry Bridges, and the unrebuked use of the President's name have all helped immeasurably in the membership drive of the C. I. O. We know, too, that John L. Lewis' United Mine Workers gave the President's political organization $470,000 in his last campaign and that other labor organizations contributed enough more to make a total of more than $1,700,000.

We now learn from the press of November 1, 1939, that Lewis has levied two special assessments of $1 each against the soft-coal workers, one payable in December and the other in January; and two assessments of $1 each, payable in January and February, against the anthracite-coal workers. It was stated that he expected to realize from the two assessments approximately $800,000. Might it be pertinent to inquire how much of the $800,000 so collected from the wage earners will be devoted to political purposes, to further Lewis' personal political ambition?

The same news dispatches also carried the information that Lewis had begun the building of his war chest for 1940 by levying assessments, which leaders hoped would bring the union's total resources to nearly $3,000,000 by next March.

By what authority does John L. Lewis compel the workers of America to contribute $3,000,000 to be used by him and his executive committee? And by what authority does he divert a portion of that fund to political activities? And by what authority does he refuse to permit men and women to work until they have contributed to that fund? Is there any other organization in the United States of America which can charge a man a fee for the right to work to earn a livelihood? How much longer will this Government submit to this sort of tribute levying?

But to get back to the first point. Just how far are we to let any organization, labor, capitalistic, or communistic, defy our Navy? Here are two editorials, characteristic of many, which show that the people throughout the country are awakening to the situation; the first from the Enterprise News of October 31, published at Cambridge Springs, Pa.; the second from the Philadelphia Inquirer of November 2. I quote:

WHAT PULASKI DIED FOR

I had occasion to address the faculty and student body of Alliance College the other evening. We were honoring the memory of Pulaski, whose name has been familiar to millions of school children in America for the past 100 years. Pulaski was a Polish count—a nobleman—who lived only about a hundred years after Poland, as a nation, had her greatest flowering under a republican form of government in the seventeenth century. He hated autocracy wherever it was found. As a refugee from a newer government in Poland, he came to America, helped the Colonies mightily in the Revolution, and was mortally wounded at Savannah.

With all the diplomacy I could muster, I chose to wonder what we have in America today that would make the spirit of Pulaski sad. For, remember, he fought and died for freedom and against autocracy.

One of the saddest pictures, I think, is in Detroit at present, where there is plenty of employment in the Chrysler plants at good wages for workmen who do not dare to accept it. The C. I. O. union out there insists that its leaders should have the say about how fast production should move along the assembly lines, whereas almost everybody, I should think, will agree that this is something that logically and justly belongs in the hands of management. But, no matter, the leaders of the C. I. O. have called a strike.

I don't think Pulaski fought and died for that sort of thing.

The pertinency of this incident is the fact that the Chrysler strike started in a Dodge plant, located in a suburb of Detroit, which is peopled mostly by Polish-Americans. They cannot help themselves, of course. If you are a member of a union and the leaders call a strike and you don't strike, you had better hire a bodyguard. You'll need it.

WILL THE GOVERNMENT STAND FOR THIS?

The incident of the stoppage of work on important Navy aircraft parts, due to a C. I. O. strike in a Detroit factory, is not closed by Acting Secretary Edison's report to the House Naval Affairs Committee.

It is now its duty to investigate his most serious charge: That the regional C. I. O. director refused to allow a representative of the Navy Department to pass through the picket line "to pick up Government-owned patterns and ship them on a Government bill of lading."

That is to say, the strikers were determined to prevent completion of the urgently needed naval equipment not only at the Detroit factory but anywhere else.

Mr. Edison adds: "No further action was taken by the Navy Department to remove the patterns and castings." The congressional committee should ask why.

Is there no power in Washington to which the Department could appeal? How about the Attorney General or the Secretary of Labor?

Why such a supine surrender to pickets who refused to let the Government recover its own property so that it could continue its aircraft building program?

According to the head of the United Automobile Workers, Mr. Edison omitted an essential fact. It was a subsequent offer by the union to meet with Navy Department officials in Washington and "attempt to adjust the matter."

But the larger fact remains, according to the Acting Secretary's report, that the concern which produces about 90 percent of the bearings used by American aircraft was tied up by strikers who blocked the Government's effort to have its imperatively needed work performed elsewhere.

In addition there is the humiliating fact, admitted by Mr. Edison, that the Government knuckled under to the strikers and their picket line.

For 6 weeks the Navy Department stood by while the plant that had contracted to do its work was forced to lie idle. For 6 weeks the officials who wished only to get back the Government's patterns, without taking any sides in the industrial dispute, submitted meekly to the strikers' edict.

If John L. Lewis and the C. I. O. possess a power in this country to which the Government must bow, it is time the American people awoke to the menace. It is up to the House Naval Affairs Committee to turn the searchlight on this ominous incident and suggest means for preventing a repetition.

Such high-handed dictation to the Government would not be permitted for a moment in wartime. Why should it be tolerated while the Nation is hastening to strengthen all its defenses to insure its peace?

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] has time and again made remarks on this floor which might be termed squawking, and all about Governor Murphy. The Republicans now have their chance with a strike, which is something of a problem, and the great Governor of Michigan, whom the Republicans are not so keen about, has an opportunity to change the situation. He has an opportunity now to settle the matter. The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that the labor department of the State of Michigan has been fussing around with this problem in Detroit and has not been getting anywhere. Then Mr. Dewey came in from Washington and he tried it. There was a great deal of noise about what Republicans called interference, so he withdrew. Now the Governor is hoping and praying and talking through some

sort of a pipe line or having a pipe dream and uttering a lot of shibboleths, but still the question of the strike is not settled. It comes with poor grace from the gentleman from Michigan to come here and mention the strike at this time. I think it would be better if nothing was said about it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I do not blame you for wanting to keep your dirty linen covered up down there.

Mr. DINGELL. It is not our dirty linen.

Mr. HOFFMAN. But how can you expect the Governor of a State to accomplish anything when the whole Navy Department and the Federal Government cannot, or will not, do it?

Mr. DINGELL. I will tell you just how he can do it, by the same recommendation that the gentleman has made, or at least by the attitude he has previously assumed, just go in there with the militia and shoot them down, as would be the gentleman's policy.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Shoot them down, you say? Never at any time have I advocated shooting anyone, nor have I suggested shooting strikers or anyone else. I have suggested time and again the enforcement of the law. You would let them drive all the workers from their jobs.

Mr. DINGELL. That is what I would not have them do.

[Here the gavel fell.]

MY REPLY TO THE CRITICS OF OUR ARMY AND OUR NATIONAL GUARD

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana.

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, sometime ago I received a letter from the American Defense Society, Inc., with headquarters in the city of New York. This letter contains a scathing criticism of the United States Army, its present strength and efficiency; and for the purpose of answering it and giving facts, I present to you the entire letter of September 26, 1939, signed by Robert Appleton, chairman of the American Defense Society, Inc.:

THE AMERICAN DEFENSE SOCIETY, INC.,
New York, N. Y., September 26, 1939.

To the Members of the Senate and House, Washington, D. C.:

(1) It is important that Americans awake to the fact that there are grave deficiencies in the small military forces provided by the Defense Act of 1920, especially in view of world conditions.

(2) The purpose behind that act was to provide a well-trained and well-equipped skeleton army which would be adequate in time of peace and which could form the nucleus of a large force in time of emergency.

(3) The recent maneuvers at Plattsburg, where the First Army had its first complete field exercises, showed a shocking condition of affairs.

(4) This First Army is assigned to cover the States along the northeastern seaboard, including, besides the New England States, the States of New York, New Jersey, Delaware, Maryland, Pennsylvania, Virginia, and the District of Columbia.

(5) It is supposed to be provided with small arms, artillery, and proper facilities for transportation. The First Army, when called into the field exercises, had a deficiency of 77 percent in its personnel. It had a shortage of 60 percent in small arms. Its light field artillery was short 38 percent. Transportation showed a shortage of 83 percent, and antiaircraft was 57 percent short.

(6) More serious even than the shortage in men and equipment, however, was the disclosure that a large percentage of the men who participated in the maneuvers showed that they had not been properly trained in caring for themselves, or in the use of their equipment.

(7) From the public statements of official observers of the maneuvers it is evident that Army officials and those concerned with maintaining adequate national defense are greatly exercised over the present state of our national military defenses.

(8) Discussing the disclosed deficiencies, Lt. Gen. Hugh A. Drum said at Plattsburg Barracks on August 25:

"There is only one way to overcome these deficiencies—the existence in peace of a field army. It need not be large, but efficiency demands that the units thereof exist in peace and that they be brought together more frequently for training in the field. In the World War we delayed the creation of such a force until war was upon us. If we had acted higher authorities agree that we might have kept out of the war. I know we would have saved many lives and have shortened the war. Certainly this lesson is most pertinent to world conditions of today."

(9) The theoretical total of the First Field Army is approximately 325,000 men. This figure should be measured against a recent expansion from 180,000 to 227,000. Even this latter figure falls far short of the 280,000 authorized by the National Defense Act for the whole United States Army.

(10) Another important fact disclosed by the maneuvers is that it is not enough merely to bring the enlisted personnel up to the figure which military tacticians declare to be proper to meet possible emergencies.

(11) Three things are vital for the effective functioning of the forces responsible for the safety of the eastern seaboard:

1. It must have a headquarters staff in time of peace to plan and supervise the training and readiness of the First Army. Such headquarters staff does not now exist.

2. There must be at hand, at all times, adequate supplies of small arms, field artillery, and facilities for transportation of men and equipment.

3. Provision must be made for regular field maneuvers, where all arms of the service will be coordinated, where men will have personal experience of field conditions, and where the care and use of equipment can be learned.

(12) The only alternative to a large standing army, which is repugnant in a democracy, is the possession of a perfectly trained and equipped nucleus, which will give the Nation as a whole a chance to organize.

(13) At the present time the United States has neither the large army nor the effective nucleus, yet it is a truism of military tactics, that the Navy, the air force, and the land fortifications are incomplete without a trained army to protect and defend their bases and their sources of supply.

(14) Our Government at present is properly intent upon its naval and air defenses. With these activities the American Defense Society is in full accord.

(15) Equal attention, however, should be given to our land forces, and it is to this phase that this report is addressed.

(16) By revision of the National Defense Act and by Executive proclamation this small army should be created now. This would serve as a basis for the reorganization of the other field armies of the United States.

(17) We urge upon each member of the American Defense Society and upon every American the need for using every channel to express the national desire for tranquility and security in our land defenses.

(18) Our own experiences in the last war, and the present unsettled conditions throughout the world, alike indicate as a minimum of insurance that our small standing Army should be made as strong and as efficient as the brains and the resources of the Nation can produce and as our responsibilities demand.

Very truly yours,

ROBERT APPLETON, *Chairman.*

You will note that for convenience in answering some of the statements contained in this letter that I have numbered each paragraph from 1 to 18, inclusive, separately.

At the present time, with another world war prevailing in Europe, we are all vitally concerned with our own Army in the event of an emergency requiring its use for defense. At the present time, with the country in a condition of neutrality and peace, it behooves us all to give this matter our most earnest attention.

DEFICIENCIES IN PERSONNEL

Paragraph 5 of the letter of the American Defense Society, Inc., deals with deficiencies in Army personnel. It is true that there are deficiencies in the personnel of the Army; but I call your attention to the fact that on September 8, 1939, the President of the United States authorized an increase in the enlisted strength of both the Regular Army and the National Guard which will bring their respective strengths to 227,000 and 235,000. As the peacetime objective of these two components is 280,000 and 320,000, respectively, and the National Defense Act permits an authorized strength of 420,000 in the National Guard, there will yet remain a deficiency even when the recent authorized strength has been attained.

DEFICIENCIES IN EQUIPMENT

The same paragraph of the National Defense Society's letter makes reference to the deficiency in equipment. I wish to say that the War Department has on several occasions called to the attention of this Congress deficiencies in items of equipment. I have been informed that approximately one billion dollars will be required to provide for shortages in the critical items of munitions and for 45 percent of the shortages in the essential items, if we are to provide adequately for the total force of 600,000 as I have just indicated. "Critical items" are used in this sense as items unobtainable from any source within the time and quantity required, and requiring from 1 to 2 years for manufacture, and when items must be on hand in the event of

war. These items are normally thought of as heavy artillery and antiaircraft artillery, semiautomatic rifles, antitank guns, modernized artillery, ammunition, gas masks, and special combat vehicles. "Essential items," such as I now use the term, refers to items which are essential for field service and can be obtained from commercial sources. These items comprise many parts of equipment necessary for the training and maintenance of units in the field such as motor transportation, tentage, medical supplies, water purification, and field ranges.

Congress has made substantial appropriations to be used during the present fiscal year. It has supplemented these appropriations with the additional sum of $110,000,000 which was placed in the Second Deficiency Act of 1939. These appropriations will enable the Army, so I am informed, to meet approximately 94 percent of the deficiencies in the critical items necessary for the use of the existing active forces. The appropriations, however, will not provide "essential items" for the present strength for the required "critical items" for a force of 600,000 men. Besides this fact we must remember, even with the funds now available for which procurement is under way, the deficiencies will continue to exist until actual deliveries of the new equipment are made and some of these deliveries cannot be completed until December 1941.

DEFICIENCIES IN TRANSPORTATION

Until the year 1934 our Army was still using the antiquated motor transportation left over from the World War. During that year, by Executive order, the sum of approximately $10,000,000 was made available from P. W. A. funds to replace the worst of this wartime transportation and to permit the Army to inaugurate a modern motorized program. This provides for only a small part of the transportation required for field service and the additional sums of $1,000,000 each year, which have been appropriated for motor transportation, have been barely sufficient to cover maintenance and replacements. The limited amount of transportation equipment on hand requires a pooling of vehicles of several units to permit one unit at a time to take the field for maneuvers. I am informed that it will require the sum of approximately $60,000,000 merely for the purpose of equipping existing units with the motor vehicles on the basis of peacetime allowances. From these facts it is easily seen that Congress must give the Army tremendous increases in appropriations if we are to have completely mechanized units.

DEFICIENCIES IN TRAINING

The urgent need for the full training of the large units has always been recognized by those high in the councils of the War Department. In the past such training has been almost impossible due to (1) lack of funds for concentrating widely scattered units of the Regular Army and for leasing large areas and providing the necessary motor transportation; (2) the lack of special corps troops essential to such maneuvers; and (3) the lack of complete infantry divisions. The recent organization of the smaller triangular division should make it easier to bring about troop concentrations, thereby permitting the training of large units. I am advised that the Army is striving to complete the organization of five such divisions with necessary supporting or special corps troops and to give these divisions extensive field training. Such training costs money. It is estimated that approximately $35,000,000 will be required to provide for 4 months' field training for the Regular Army and 2 weeks of such training for the National Guard and Organized Reserve. The costs for such troop concentrations are largely expended in rail and motor transportation, in the use of training ammunition, in the consumption of food and other supplies, and payment for land for the use in maneuvers.

The letter of the American Defense Society, which I have quoted, refers to the Army maneuvers recently held at Plattsburg, N. Y. The letter makes the charge that even more serious than the shortage of men and equipment was the discovery that a large percentage of the men who participated in the maneuvers at Plattsburg showed that they had not been properly trained in caring for themselves or in the use of their equipment. Men can be properly trained only if time and means are available for their training. It is true that more training of our troops is desirable and even necessary to have an efficient force. At the same time it is my judgment that a great deal has been accomplished by the Army within the limited means available for this purpose. While I did not personally see the maneuvers at Plattsburg, I have been reliably informed that the bulk of the units were from the National Guard. When this is considered I believe the criticisms of the American Defense Society will be found to be unfair and rather harsh. In the past the National Guard has been limited because of funds to 2 weeks' field training and 48 armory training periods of 1½ hours each during the course of each year. The War Department advises me that the number of Army training periods has been increased from 48 to 60 per year, and in addition we know the funds are being sought to permit occasional week-end overnight training periods. When this is considered I am prepared to say that the National Guard has made excellent progress within the limit of the appropriations made by Congress for this purpose; and as additional funds are made available by Congress, I believe we will see excellent progress obtained.

Nor can I pause here without paying a tribute to those men in the National Guard who, to my own personal knowledge, have devoted much of their time, their energies, and their abilities in this patriotic service without pay. They have busied themselves in extra training periods without pay, studying range finding and other subjects for which time has not been available during their regular pay periods.

In conclusion, I wish to say that the Army as presently constituted needs no defense. It is true that we are all greatly concerned over the present state of our national-defense establishment. We are concerned as a Congress in making up the deficiencies of which we have knowledge. For successive years the General Staff of the Army has made recommendations to this House of Representatives and its committees for additional funds to properly enlarge, equip, and train our Army in all its component parts. Vast sums of money are required for such purposes. Congress, it is true, has yearly increased its appropriations but if we are to have that well-rounded, efficient, protective force which seems to be necessary in these trying hours, large additional appropriations are indispensible. The American people want the Army well and efficiently maintained, and it is my opinion that our people regard such additional appropriations as money well spent.

This extraordinary session of Congress will adjourn within the next few days. We will return to our respective homes and visit among our people. I feel that I know the heart of the American people; and when we reassemble in January, I believe we will bring back to our councils the audible demand of our constituency that we make available all funds necessary for an efficient, well-rounded defense army.

Mr. BROOKS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and to include therein a letter of the American Defense Society.

THE TREASURY STATEMENT

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Majority Leader, and Members of the House, from the unusual request of the majority leader to permit the Speaker to declare the House in recess at any time, I presume that it is to be taken for granted that the majority leader intends that we adjourn this session of Congress today, or not later than Tuesday.

It seems to me in view of the very difficult time this country may have in keeping out of war it would be very well for the Congress to remain in session, in order that we may see that America is kept out of this war. If we adjourn, and return to our homes after passing the bill as now contemplated by the House and Senate, giving the President of the United States the power to designate the

war danger zones, I say we will be granting too much power to the President of the United States. That power should remain in the hands of the Congress.

Let me call your attention to the fact that when the President of the United States called this session of Congress and when, on September 21, he made his address to the Congress, he made this statement:

At this time I ask for no other authority from the Congress.

It seems to me utterly foolish and ridiculous and unjustifiable that this Congress would now grant the President of the United States the power to carry out the Neutrality Act which this Congress is going to put into effect and designate war zones. It is foolhardy, it is ridiculous, it is unsound, and it is un-American. The President himself made the statement that he did not want any authority, and yet you are going to put that great power in his hands. You persist in giving him power. You are not responsible to your constituents if you do such a thing.

I have been asked by some of the Members on the front row, "Where are you going to get the money?" That is a question I want to turn to now, Mr. Majority Leader. [Laughter.]

WHERE ARE YOU GOING TO GET THE MONEY?

I want to call your attention to the statement of October 30, issued by Mr. Morgenthau, a statement of the United States Treasury which is in black, but should be in red. It is not good bookkeeping; it is unethical and it is unsound. He shows that we are in the "red" as of that day $1,416,540,868.52. This means that by the end of this fiscal year, or by July 1 of next year, 1940, you are going to be in the "red" $4,000,000,000. This administration has had a "red" balance ever since it has been in office. Let me show you what it is like:

Roosevelt's deficits

Mar. 4, 1933, to June 30, 1933	$892,600,000
June 30, 1934	3,409,000,000
June 30, 1935	2,938,000,000
June 30, 1936	4,361,000,000
June 30, 1937	2,707,000,000
June 30, 1938	1,459,000,000
June 30, 1939	3,685,000,000
June 30, 1940 (estimated)	4,000,000,000
	23,451,600,000

A staggering sum. It will stagger generations for 100 years in America.

If cash and carry is good for neutrality legislation, it should be our motto in handling the affairs of our own Government. The only thing that will save you from going in the "red" $4,000,000,000 this year is a war boom from Europe, or the fact that you might get into the war, and would then be able to cover up the Treasury statement so badly that you would not know where you are. That would be then a travesty on justice.

Let me call your attention to some of the statements made by the President of the United States when he was out campaigning for the office of the Presidency. On September 29, 1932, at Sioux City, Iowa, he made this statement:

We are not getting adequate return for the money we are spending in Washington, or, to put it another way, we are spending altogether too much money for government services that are not needed, practical, nor necessary. And then, in addition to that, we are attempting too many functions. We need to simplify what the Federal Government is giving to the people.

I accuse the present administration of being the greatest spending administration in peacetime in all our history. It is an administration that has piled bureau on bureau, commission on commission, and has failed to anticipate the dire needs and the reduced earning power of the people. Bureaus and bureaucrats, commissions and commissioners have been retained at the expense of the taxpayer.

Then in addition to that he said:

We are attempting too many functions.

Get that.

We need to simplify what the Federal Government is giving to the people.

No truer statement was ever made by a man that was running for office, but think how he has gone far afield from what he said then, with what he has been doing in the way of new departments of government, and greater expenditures of government. This administration has established more bureaus than any five previous administrations. It is a terrible thing to conceive, but I say to you Members of Congress that the war in Europe is not the great danger to America today. The great danger to America today is the break-down of our financial structure and our fundamental principles of the operation of government under our Constitution. I am sincere in that. It is the ruination of this country, and you Congressmen, if you live 5 years more at the way we are going now, you will live to see that, and you will live to rue it. It is Roosevelt and ruin. He wants to be a dictator. If not, let him return the power to Congress that you gave him and let him economize as he said he would do.

I call your attention now to the address made by the President of the United States on March 2, 1930, over the radio:

If we do not halt this steady process of building commissions and regulatory bodies and special legislation like huge inverted pyramids over every one of the simple constitutional provisions, we shall soon be spending many billions of dollars more.

That was a true statement then and it is more true today, but why does he not carry out those statements that he made at that time? It is horrible to conceive, and I say here that next January one of the first things you are going to be called upon to do is to increase the limit of the national debt from $45,000,000,000 to probably $75,000,000,000 or maybe $100,000,000,000, because it would not be too much money for this administration to spend if you are going to be in power for 8 years more. [Applause.] That, I hope, will not be the case. Then what is going to happen? Now, if you Members on the Democratic side think that is funny, by your laughing, if you think it is funny if we increase the national debt from $45,000,000,000 to possibly $100,000,000,000, then I want to tell you that there is something wrong in Congress, and we need new, conservative Congressmen. You may say that we are not fools, but we do the things that fools would do if we permit anything like that. This seems to be a funny thing for a good many Members of Congress today the way you seem to rejoice in the spending spree of this administration, but with me it is a serious thing, and it will be a serious situation with the rest of you some of these days when you look back at your record and see that you have been responsible for it—you Members who have been for everything that anybody wanted in your districts because it would mean votes for you, and you know that you broke this Government financially, and you know that you have broken down our form of government. Then it will be a serious thing for the American people.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. Yes. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Does not the gentleman think this would be a pretty good time to remain in session, stay on the job, and try to watch the foreign situation and at the same time take care of the tax problem and national-defense problem and the farm problem and a number of other problems confronting this Congress and the country?

Mr. RICH. I think the gentleman is correct and that is the reason why I think the request of the majority leader should not have been granted but that the Speaker should permit Members of Congress to come in here and try to find a solution for these many problems. If you gentlemen think you can keep on spending and spending and going into the "red" at the rate of four or five billion dollars a year, you will find out that there is a wreck ahead. Here is what the President said in his speech at Pittsburgh, October 19, 1932:

The credit of the family depends chiefly upon whether that family is living within its income. And that is equally true of the Nation. If the Nation is living within its income its credit is good.

If in some crises it lives beyond its income for a year or two it can usually borrow temporarily at reasonable rates. But if, like a spendthrift, it throws discretion to the winds and is willing to make no sacrifice at all in spending; if it extends its taxing to the limit of the people's power to pay and continues to pile up deficits, then it is on the road to bankruptcy.

Why not put cash and carry in effect while operating our Government, Mr. President? Cash and carry is good in neutrality. Cash and carry should be good in Government operation. We should raise as much cash from our people as we spend.

If you spend more than you receive then cut down your expenses. That is the sensible thing to do. That is a true statement I just quoted from the President. You know that we are on the road to bankruptcy today under this administration and you laugh at it. We have been on that road ever since this administration has been in power. The President said he was going to balance the Budget after 3 years. He has not been even close to a balance and he never will. But next year you will be off balance more than you have ever been since Mr. Roosevelt has been in office, notwithstanding the year you paid the soldiers' bonus. And it is a horrible, unjustifiable, unbusinesslike manner of running our Government. Never was such poor management shown as by this administration.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes in answer to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] has just passed to me a Treasury statement of recent date. I am afraid that the limited time I have will not permit me to get down that far.

I want to begin with the Mellon administration. You Republicans keep saying that a President ought not to serve three terms; yet it has been pointed out that Andrew Mellon served three terms. It is the Mellon administration I want to discuss.

There are a great many people who think we are headed for a European war. As far as I am concerned, I shall do everything I can to keep us out of it, but if we do go into war, the World War veterans in this House are going to see to it that the "dollar-a-year men" do not come out of the war multimillionaires. [Applause.]

We are going to see to it that these international bloodsuckers, known as international bankers and munitions makers, do not coin their millions out of the blood and tears of the suffering people of the world and then get away with it when the war is over. [Applause.]

We are going to see to it that curbstone patriots, wordy warriors, and long-distance heroes do not pace up and down the streets clamoring for war and then dodge the draft. [Applause.]

We are going to see to it that what happened after the last war does not occur again. If the tax laws that were in force at the time the war closed had never been repealed by the Republican administration, we would have paid the national debt off by 1930. [Applause.]

I love the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] as much as it is lawful for a Democrat to love a Republican, but he talks about taxing the profits of this war. I am not only in favor of taxing the profits on this next war, but I want to go back and tax the profits on the last war. Then you will not have so much propaganda for us to get into the next war. [Applause.]

When the Sixty-seventh Congress convened, I was here; the Republican Party was then in power. Very few of these service men were here then; but the Republican machine was here, and in power, and, by the way, the head of it was from Pennsylvania. They began to take the taxes off the big interests, and they continued to do so until they took off hundred of millions, if not billions of dollars annually that we needed to balance the Budget. Not satisfied with that, they gave back four or five billion dollars, all told, of taxes that had already been collected, and continued that policy until 1929.

In addition to that they refunded the foreign debt, spread it over 62 years, and reduced the interest so far below the rate we have to pay on the bonds this Government issued to get the money for them, that we lost $6,200,000,000. This was done to strengthen the securities the large financial interests in this country held in Europe, the international bankers, if you please, who made hundreds of millions out of the war.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. Let me finish my statement, please.

If you will go back and search the RECORD you will find that when Mr. Green, of Iowa, was chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, about 1924, they brought in a bill to return hundreds of millions of dollars to the big-income and inheritance taxpayers who got rich, or increased their wealth, out of the war, when the administration then in power was fighting and protesting and bemeaning us for attempting to pay the soldiers their adjusted-service certificates. I rose and pointed out to Mr. Green that he was denying what he called the bonus to the soldiers, but was giving a bonus to the big rich of this country who were able to pay and who made a large part of their money out of the World War.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. No; let me finish this statement. I will yield in time. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin for a question.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. How about the Democratic Party playing Santa Claus in a big way when they forced our American citizens to turn in all of their gold to the Government for $20.67 an ounce or go to jail for 5 years and then imported almost $11,000,000,000 worth of gold from foreigners and paid them $35 an ounce for it?

Mr. RANKIN. Now, that is the first wail of the gold bug I have heard in a long time. [Laughter]. I will come to the gold standard in a minute.

In 1929—the reason I yielded to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SCHAFER] was because he was here at the time—one of the first things they did after Mr. Hoover was inaugurated President, when everybody knew the country was broke and that we were headed into the greatest depression of all time, one of the first things they did was to bring in a bill here to turn back, I believe it was, $215,000,000 of taxes that had already been paid by people of this country who were most able to pay.

I led the fight against it. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SCHAFER] was here at that time, and my recollection is that he opposed me on it.

Now, if we would impose the taxes we ought to put on those interests that want to get rich out of the war, if we would restore wartime taxes, go back and tax those who got rich out of the last war, we would at least be moving a long ways toward balancing the Budget.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; I yield for a question, not a speech.

Mr. RICH. I would like to make the statement that on yesterday I voted on repeal of the embargo with the gentleman from Mississippi, showing that I did not want manufacturers in this country to make a profit out of war. I will go with the gentleman to vote that we cut the profit down to nothing on manufactures of war materials, but that is not the question.

Mr. RANKIN. I did not vote to repeal the embargo, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania knows it, if he was here.

Mr. RICH. And I said the gentleman did not. Neither did I.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I will yield to the gentleman for a question, for I want to be courteous, but I ask that he not take up all my time.

Mr. RICH. When Mr. Mellon was Secretary of the Treasury and we had a debt of $28,000,000,000, did he not reduce the debt from $28,000,000,000 down to $16,000,000,000 during his time?

Mr. RANKIN. No. Now, will the gentleman let me answer that in all politeness?

Mr. RICH. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN. I will tell you how he reduced it. He reduced it by canceling war contracts and taking credit for the proposed appropriations that were not spent. He reduced it by selling goods that had been produced to carry on the war. He did not do it by taxation and would never have done it by taxation.

And listen. At the time the Republicans were giving back by the hundreds of millions the taxes that had already been collected the Budget was not being balanced by taxation.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. BOLAND. I presume that by his reference to recipients of taxes that were paid back the gentleman refers among others, to the Bethlehem Steel Co., which received $100,000,000 back taxes.

Mr. RANKIN. I do not know how much money the Bethlehem Steel Co. received, but I do not question but that they got certainly not less than $100,000,000.

Another thing, Eugene Meyer was head of the Federal Reserve System. I believe he succeeded W. P. G. Harding. He had gone into a huddle with the Republicans and agreed to contract the currency and started this policy of deflation that has been followed ever since, and finally led to that of burying our gold in the ground.

If we are ever going to get out of this condition, if we ever intend to balance the Budget and restore prosperity, we are going to have to stop borrowing money from the rich and giving it to the poor for the rest of us to pay back with compound interest; we are going to have to take that gold out of the ground in Kentucky and use it to expand the currency to bring back commodity prices and restore prosperity.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I am in hearty accord with the gentleman's views. Does the gentleman think, though, that it is really necessary to use the gold? In other words, we could have a national currency quite as well without using the gold as we could with it, could we not? The question of value is psychological, is it not?

Mr. RANKIN. I may say to the gentleman from California that I have watched the managed currencies of the world for the last 10 years, and I realize the great danger of attempting a purely managed currency. I am of the opinion that if we would go back to a bimetallic standard of gold and silver with the reasonable ratio of 16 to 1, and issue currency against the gold we now have under the present law, which requires us to put up only 40 percent of gold behind every dollar, we could issue a sufficient amount of money to restore agricultural prices, to restore prosperity, to balance the Budget, and bring permanent prosperity to the American people; take people off the relief rolls and keep them off. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, I asked unanimous consent to insert my own remarks immediately after the two speeches by Hon. ROBERT F. RICH and Hon. JOHN E. RANKIN today, involving the action of the Republican Party in relation to the changes made in the tax rates, the tax collections, the payments on our public debt, and the effects of these changes. I did this because of the very limited time allotted to these gentlemen made a clear understanding of the matter quite difficult. In an address delivered on the floor of this House on February 24, 1936, I discussed this whole question, citing the facts and official figures on the entire subject. So many Members and thinkers on the subject have commented on that speech, and I have been asked for so many copies of that speech, that it occurred to me that it ought to be repeated for the general information it contains. Therefore I offer that speech under the unanimous consent granted to me for that purpose.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, we now have up for consideration the agricultural appropriation bill.

Mr. KELLER. Where are we going to get the money?

Mr. RICH. If the gentleman wants me to answer the question, which is somewhat irregular at this time, may I say that I do not think there is a Member of the House of Representatives who can answer the question, because I have asked it over and over for the past year. If there is any Member here who has the ingenuity, the initiative, and brains enough to get up here and answer the question, I will yield him my time right now; and the gentleman from Illinois is the man I should like to have try to answer the question.

Mr. KELLER. I can do it.

Mr. RICH. All right. I yield to the gentleman for that purpose.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Chairman, we have heard much about this question, Where are you going to get the money?—that I interjected the question for the purpose of answering it. It is a simple matter to get the money we need, and it always has been a simple matter. There has been much talk about balancing of the Budget, but there has not been a definition given as to what we mean by the "Budget." Somebody ought to get up here and tell us something about it. I am going to do just that, modest as I am in making the statement.

Mr. Chairman, 4 years ago, when the question of balancing the Budget came up, I went to the trouble to look up the subject with the greatest of care from the beginning of our Government to the present moment.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Is the gentleman going to make the official answer now as to where his party is going to get the money? In other words, is he speaking officially? I mean, does the gentleman represent the Democratic Party?

Mr. KELLER. I am representing KENT E. KELLER only, and that is sufficient for this time.

Since we started in we have been out of debt once in our lifetime as a nation, and then only for a short time. That was under "Old Hickory" Jackson. That was the only time we have ever been out of debt.

On the average, every 2 years and 11 months from the beginning of our history to the present time, a full year has been a deficit year; a year in which we did not get money enough to pay our bills for that year—that is, to balance the Budget. I want you to get this, because when we go to discussing balancing the Budget and where we are going to get the money and how we are going to get the money, we ought to see what we have done in the past, because that is going to show us whether we can or whether we cannot get the money.

If we have in the past, we can in the future. Our Treasury report shows that in the 144 years of our constitutional government, from 1789 to 1933, both inclusive, there have been 49 annual deficits—a little more than one-third of the years of our national existence have been years of unbalanced Budgets. Thirteen of those years, at most, were war years. Thirty-six years of unbalanced Budgets were peacetime years. All the war years were years with unbalanced Budgets. Of the 131 years of peace, 1 year out of each 3 years and 8 months showed a deficit—that is, we did not take in as much as we spent. The whole 144-year period taken together shows that on the average 1 year out of every 2 years and 11 months has been a deficit year with its unbalanced Budget. Did all these years of unbalanced Budgets ruin our credit? Did we ever fail to pay? Certainly not.

Mr. KNUTSON. Tell us how to get the money first.

Mr. KELLER. Wait just a minute. I am going to tell you how to get the money.

Following the Civil War, this country owed a Federal indebtedness of 17½ percent of our total national wealth. Now get that. At the close of the Civil War the United States Government owed 17½ percent of our total national wealth, and no less than that. Did it cause us to go broke in paying it? Certainly not. We nearly paid it off before we came to the last war. We could have paid it out long ago if we had tried to, or if we had been more interested in paying off our indebtedness than in reducing the taxes of the rich people and prosperous corporations.

What next? From that time until this, or, from the close of the Civil War to the present war, we have learned how to produce about three and a half times as much wealth, man for man, as we could have done or as we did at that period. This simply shows that if we could pay 17½ percent of our national wealth at the end of the Civil War that we could, if necessary, pay three and a half times that proportion of our national wealth reckoned on our most prosperous years, if we needed to.

This is the first thing I want to get clear to you. I want you to see that this question of balancing the Budget is not only not vital but it is a piece of nonsense, in my judgment, to bring it out every time we get up here and talk about it, unless we know what we are talking about.

Now, if we have done these things in the past, we can do them in the future. I say to you, frankly, that our necessities at the present time are as great or greater than at any period in our history, even including our periods of war. We are under as great obligation to pay whatever taxes are necessary to take us out of these conditions, and keep us out, as we have been at any time in our entire history.

Now, you ask how are we going to pay? I want to call your attention to one more thing which I have heretofore called to the attention of this House when I was a great deal newer here than I am now, and that is this: Following the World War, if we had continued the taxes on the tax books at that time, inside of the first 10-year period we would have paid every penny we owed. If you want to verify this, get the tables prepared on this subject by the Joint

Committee on Internal Revenue Taxes that serves the House and Senate together. All you have got to do is to go back to the speech delivered by my colleague from an adjoining district, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PARSONS], who submitted these facts to this body.

What did we do? I will tell you what we did. Instead of paying it when we had it to pay, we turned around in 1921 and reduced the income tax shamefully, and only a few men had the vision and the understanding to see where it was leading us. We could have paid the whole thing inside the first 10 years. We could have paid the soldiers' adjusted compensation at that time and never missed the money if Congress had desired to do that. But did they desire to? Oh, no. The Congress considered it much more desirable to serve the very rich people and the very prosperous corporations than to pay the soldiers their compensation. So they completely wiped out the excess-profits tax in 1921, because the income and excess-profits taxes alone had brought in $4,000,000,000 for the fiscal year of 1920, making a total national revenue income of $6,694,000,000 for 1 year's taxes, actually collected in cash. But the tender-hearted Congress could not stand such cruelty to the war profiteers. So, to protect these friends of theirs, they put the soldiers off without a penny. Again, in 1924, the Congress reduced the income tax and gave the soldiers a rain check, good after 20 years. I am proud of the fact that this Congress has provided for cashing these rain checks 9 years before that income-tax-reducing Congress intended it should be done. Not only this, but if we had known enough to do this, we might also have known enough to prevent the panic that succeeded in 1929.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLER. Certainly. We could have had money enough in our Treasury so that as men fell out of employment for technological reasons, we could have reemployed them in the service of this Government and there need not have been a single, solitary unemployed man in America.

Mr. KNUTSON. Where are you going to get the money?

Mr. KELLER. In just a moment I am coming to that.

There need not have been a single idle man in America, because there are at the present time, and there have been for the last 100 years, a sufficient number of national projects of permanent value to have taken up every solitary man who fell into idleness through no fault of his own.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. KELLER. Surely.

Mr. SNELL. I understood the gentleman to say that he objected to the fact that they reduced the income-tax rates.

Mr. KELLER. I certainly said that.

Mr. SNELL. If I recall correctly, the reduced income-tax rates brought in more income to the Government than the former rates.

Mr. KELLER. The gentleman ought to go back and look up the record on that.

Mr. SNELL. I think that statement is correct.

Mr. KELLER. The gentleman is wrong about that.

Mr. SNELL. I think that is right.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLER. I yield.

Mr. SNELL. Is not that statement so?

Mr. KELLER. No; it is not so. The fiscal year of 1920 brought in from income and excess-profits taxes $4,000,000,000 in cash. After the Congress reduced the income taxes in 1921, the income from that source fell to just half that amount in 1922 and never again reached even that figure. The gentleman will find this statement literally true from the Treasury receipts, and no statement even by Mr. Mellon can change the fact I here state.

Mr. MCCORMACK. I do not undertake to say that I know everything or know anything, but I simply express my own opinion——

Mr. RICH. Let Mr. Keller talk—he knows everything.

Mr. KELLER. Sure, I do—for your benefit. I am giving you what you need if you will only heed it.

Mr. MCCORMACK. I am very sorry for my friends from Pennsylvania, who has to ask the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KELLER] to yield to him in the time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania. It is very unfortunate, but the gentleman from Illinois has yielded to me.

We had a depression in 1920 and 1921, and, of course, the amount of income taxes was reduced during that depression. Naturally, when business came back the returns in revenue from existing law increased, and I think my distinguished friend from New York realizes that the depression of 1920–21 sharply reduced the national income, but the national income came back very rapidly because we whipped out of that depression very quickly.

Mr. SNELL. Every time the income tax has been reduced it has returned more income to the National Government.

Mr. KELLER. The gentleman from New York is mistaken, completely and entirely mistaken. I am rather suspecting my friend from New York believes the statements he hears made in the stump speeches of his party.

Mr. GIFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLER. I yield with pleasure to my friend from Massachusetts.

Mr. GIFFORD. From what the gentleman has said, he is going to get the money from taxation.

Mr. KELLER. Certainly. That is where all money for carrying on government comes from, always has, always will, always ought to.

Mr. GIFFORD. Is the gentleman ready to vote for those taxes?

Mr. KELLER. Certainly. When a proper tax bill is presented I will vote for it and work for it all the way down the line. Now, I want to follow this up. In 1924 we again reduced the income taxes, and again we gave back by a joint resolution taxes that were due, that already belonged to the people of this country. In 1926 we reduced the income tax and again gave back by joint resolution a year's taxes that belonged to the people.

Mr. SNELL. The conditions throughout the country in 1924 and 1928 were about the same.

Mr. KELLER. No.

Mr. SNELL. When we reduced the taxes in 1924 it produced more income for the National Government.

Mr. KELLER. Of course, the gentleman from New York has a perfect right to be wrong if he insists on it. But the Treasury receipts show the personal income taxes for 1924 to have been $704,265,390 and the corporation income tax to have been $881,549,546—a total income-tax receipts of $1,585,814,936—the lowest receipts for any year over a 10-year period prior to 1931.

Mr. KNUTSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLER. Yes; I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. The gentleman is an expert on taxation. Has he given any consideration to the cutting down of governmental expenses?

Mr. KELLER. Yes; that has been my work for many years. [Laughter.]

Mr. MILLARD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MILLARD. Does not the gentleman think that he has gotten this time under false pretenses? [Laughter.] The gentleman said he was going to tell us how to get the money, and he has not started yet, and his time is almost up.

Mr. KELLER. I have answered the gentleman's question already.

Mr. RICH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLER. Certainly.

Mr. RICH. Will the gentleman name one bill where he has voted to cut down governmental expenses?

Mr. KELLER. Yes; I voted for one of your bills. [Laughter.]

Mr. RICH. Will the gentleman name it?

Mr. KELLER. Well, I will look it up and get the name and the number. [Laughter.]

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman says he has been engaged in cutting down governmental expenses for years—does not the gentleman think that that was love's labor lost? [Laughter.]

Mr. KELLER. I do not think so. Now, to get back to this reduction of income tax. In 1928 you reduced the income tax and gave back certain taxes. In 1929, in December, when Congress met, when every man who knew anything about economic history knew that we were facing a national panic—knew that every time we have had a major stock crash on the stock market we have had a national panic, followed by a national depression. Of that there can be no doubt and is none. Yet in 1929, under those conditions, facing a panic, with men falling out of jobs every day, this Congress voted to again reduce the income taxes and give back supposedly $160,000,000 to the successful corporations and to the successful income-tax gatherers—those who had incomes.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLER. Yes; certainly.

Mr. SNELL. How can you give back something you never have had?

Mr. KELLER. I will tell the gentleman how to give back something you never have had. Just vote as you did in 1929, when the money was due, and you voted to give it back, before it was paid. You did that in 1929, in 1928, in 1926, in 1924, and 1921.

Mr. SNELL. But I still maintain that you cannot give back something that you never have had, and I also maintain that those tax measures produced more than the others did, and I would ask the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON] to confirm that.

Mr. KELLER. And I will bring that back to the gentleman and quote what your Secretary of the Treasury said, that whenever you put too high an income tax, the rich man will not pay. I quote from a letter from Mr. Mellon to the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee dated November 10, 1923:

"Ways will always be found to avoid taxes so destructive in their nature, and the only way to save the situation is to put the taxes on a reasonable basis that will permit business to go on and industry develop."

Mr. SNELL. The gentleman obtained his time to tell us where they are going to get the money.

Mr. KELLER. But I have answered that question a few moments back. Through taxes, of course.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Chairman, I ask the gentleman to grant me 5 minutes more.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I believe the gentleman obtained his time from the other side.

Mr. RICH. Give him some time so that he can answer the question because he has not said anything yet.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes more to the gentleman.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLER. Yes; to my friend from Idaho.

Mr. WHITE. Is it not a fact that during that very period huge income-tax refunds, and one item of $45,000,000 refunded to the Steel Trust in 1927, which was collected in 1917?

Mr. KELLER. And is it not a fact that during that period this body voted a law that originally provided that unless when you paid the income tax you protested you had no right to go back and ask for a

rebate? This body revoked that law in 1924, and they went back, and my recollection is they paid out of the Treasury of this country about $4,000,000,000 in rebates.

Mr. GIFFORD. And having reimposed all of the income taxes last year, all that we could get revenue from, if the gentleman is now going to get his money from taxes, will he tell us what kind of taxes?

Mr. KELLER. I shall be glad to do that, though I by no means agree we have reimposed all the income taxes that we could get revenue from. We are going to get some more from income taxes, in my judgment.

Mr. GIFFORD. But we are getting all we can.

Mr. KELLER. Oh, no; we are not. We are going to go, in my judgment, to as low exemptions as will pay for the collection. In England they are down to as low as $600 a year, and we will come to that right here. We are going to come to it, and we are going to take it all the way up through, and if the sixteenth amendment has not been nullified by the Court, since we are talking about the Constitution, we will enforce the law and we can get all the money that we need without hurting anybody.

We are going to take it, and do not think we are not. We are not only going to take whatever tax money we need, but we are going to accept the responsibility of coming here as a government and saying to every American man and woman, "There is a job ready for every man and woman who wants to work," and we are going to see to it that they have that job, and when we do that we will produce so much wealth that there will be no longer any excuse for poverty in this country of ours. And when we guarantee a job to every man and woman who wants to work, no man now out of a job, nor who has been out of a job, nor whose job has ever been endangered, as they all have been, not a one of them will object to paying a small income tax to insure himself a job and his children after him. It will be the cheapest possible job insurance; the very greatest security to men, to business, to governmental institutions. That is the only solution for unemployment—the guaranty of an opportunity to earn a living—a competency, in fact.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLER. To my colleague from Massachusetts, surely, with pleasure.

Mr. TREADWAY. To ask the gentleman whether he thinks the program of taxation to which he has referred, going to the very lowest salaried people, to the point where it will simply be paying for the collections, will be a very popular tax with those in control of the Democratic Party, just before election?

Mr. KELLER. Let me suggest to the gentleman that he take that home to his own party and see what it says about it.

Mr. TREADWAY. I am asking the gentleman. He has stated in an authoritative way——

Mr. KELLER. Oh, no.

Mr. TREADWAY. What the majority party here are going to do.

Mr. KELLER. No; I am not stating any such thing.

Mr. TREADWAY. I would like to know whether he thinks that will make votes for his party at the coming election and if that theory will not make votes, then I prophesy just as strongly that the theory that the gentleman is proposing will not be carried out by the Democratic majority.

Mr. KELLER. The gentleman may be entirely right as to that. But I beg the gentleman's pardon. I did not say that I was speaking officially. I said that I was speaking for KENT E. KELLER and nobody else.

Mr. TREADWAY. But we respect Mr. KENT E. KELLER's position as one of the leaders of the Democratic Party.

Mr. KELLER. I have never been so accused before. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLER. I yield.

Mr. DOUGHTON. The suggestion of the gentleman from Massachusetts, a member of the Ways and Means Committee, indicates that he judges the Democratic Party by the standards of the Republican Party. He knows that they approach a question of that kind, especially matters of taxation, with a view to the welfare of the Republican Party and to political benefits, rather than the welfare of the country. That is the viewpoint of his party, and he just naturally assumes that the Democratic Party proceeds on the same basis as the Republican Party. That is a false assumption.

Mr. TREADWAY. I would like to ask the gentleman whether he disputes the accuracy of the statement I made?

Mr. KELLER. I do not yield, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. TREADWAY. I said that the Democratic Party would not make this kind of taxes to which the gentleman from Illinois has referred. I stand by it, and I ask the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON] whether he disputes that or not?

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BURDICK. The gentleman from Illinois has been given the floor to explain where we are going to get the money. If about 40 of these curious ones would leave him alone long enough, perhaps he can tell us.

Mr. WEARIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLER. I yield.

Mr. WEARIN. If I remember correctly, we have had about $7,000,000,000 in emergency appropriations since the Democratic Party came into power. I believe it is true that there has been an increase of approximately $67,000,000,000, or thereabouts, in bank deposits, national income, and things of that character since President Roosevelt came into power. That might be one way in which we could pay that debt of $7,000,000,000.

Mr. KELLER. Certainly.

Mr. LAMBETH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLER. I yield.

Mr. LAMBETH. Does not the gentleman think that the best progress we could make toward balancing the Budget is to get the national income returned to normal, and has that not been gradually, steadily, and appreciably increasing ever since the present administration went into power on March 4, 1933?

Mr. KELLER. The gentleman has anticipated exactly what I am coming to, and I thank him for doing so. In 1928 and 1929 our national income was about $90,000,000,000 a year.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLER. I will in just a moment. Our income fell to under $40,000,000,000; about thirty-seven and a half billion, as I recall. We have returned it, through some method or other to about fifty-five billion. But what I want to put to every one of you, not as a partisan matter but as a matter of common sense, is this, that the minute we return our national income we will have no trouble in paying whatever amount of taxes we may require.

Mr. CRAWFORD. And relief goes out?

Mr. KELLER. And relief goes out. The gentleman from Michigan makes a suggestion, and it is a splendid suggestion, that just as soon as we return the national income, relief goes out, naturally and properly.

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLER. I yield.

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. Has the gentleman any figures to show whether or not the drop in national income from 1929 to 1932, and the increase from 1932 to 1936, bear any relationship to the drop and increase, respectively, of the national income in other countries, and of world income?

Mr. KELLER. Oh, yes; I have a great deal.

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. Will the gentleman put those figures in the RECORD, please?

Mr. KELLER. Yes; I will. I make this suggestion to the gentleman, that the proof of the fall of national income, the proof of panic, the proof of depression, lies in one thing—that is, the percentage of unemployment in the country. I want to call this to your attention. I am going to give you facts. The fact is that at the present time all of Europe, with its 550,000,000 people, has about six and one-quarter million unemployed. The United States, with its 127,000,000 people, has more than 10,000,000 unemployed. Can the gentleman tell us why this is true?

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. Despite the resourceful and beneficent administration we have had during the last 3 years?

Mr. KELLER. Oh, I beg the gentleman's pardon. You cannot parallel them to save your soul.

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. But we still have actually 11,400,000 unemployed.

Mr. KELLER. The parallel is not there.

Mr. RICH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Green last week said there were 11,400,000 out of employment. Harry Hopkins says we are going to have more on relief now than we had a year ago. If we are getting better, why the unemployment and why the greater amount of relief?

Mr. KELLER. I do not say we are getting better on unemployment. I did not say I accepted Mr. Green's figures. I gave the figure I consider conservative, although I think Mr. Green is practically right.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLER. I yield.

Mr. MCCORMACK. I think the gentleman has made a very powerful argument and a complete answer. The answer was so complete that they now have to ask the gentleman about unemployment. I think the gentleman has made a powerful and compelling answer. [Applause and laughter.] I might make the observation that when we get back to 1929 levels with the present tax laws on the statute books it is conservatively estimated that the Government will receive a revenue of $8,000,000,000 a year.

Mr. KELLER. And that, of course, will enable us to do what we have to do.

Mr. LAMBETH. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I think the gentleman is the best pinch hitter in the House of Representatives. [Applause.]

Mr. KELLER. I thank the gentleman.

[Here the gavel fell.]

ALICE EVERETT COX

Mr. WARREN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution from the Committee on Accounts and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 304

Resolved, That there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House to Alice Everett Cox, widow of O. E. Cox, late an employee of the House, an amount equal to 6 months' salary compensation, and an additional amount, not to exceed $250, to defray funeral expenses of the said O. E. Cox.

The resolution was agreed to.

LATIN AMERICAN TRADE

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 2 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the membership to House Joint Resolution 394, which I introduced in the House and which has been introduced in the Senate.

This resolution provides for the establishment of a joint congressional committee, consisting of five Members of the Senate and five Members of this House, to make a thorough study and investigation of the ways and means by which the United States may assist and contribute to the improvement of the economic, commercial, and cultural relations between the various American republics.

This investigation is important, not only from the viewpoint of improving Latin American trade relations, but also because it will bring out the problem of the cultural penetration of Latin America by Germany and Italy, with its consequent threat to the peace of this continent, and should disclose how this penetration and threat can be met by the United States.

I will present the Congress with further facts in support of this resolution early next session, and I will appreciate your support in getting it adopted.

The Department of Commerce figures indicate that Latin America is an important customer in the world markets. In 1937 the 20 Latin American republics purchased $1,636,000,000 worth of goods in the world market, or 5.9 percent of all the world's imports for that year. In the same year these republics sold $2,390,000,000 worth of goods in the world market, or 9.5 percent of all the world's exports for that year.

In 1937 the United States bought $672,000,000 worth of goods from Latin America, which was 21.7 percent of our total imports; and in the same year the United States sold $578,000,000 worth of goods to Latin America, or 17.2 percent of our total exports.

It is interesting to look at the Department of Commerce figures, expressed in terms of percentage, covering Latin American purchases from the chief industrial countries during 4 key years, and sales to these countries during the same years. The years are 1913, which is the pre-World War year; 1929, which is the peak boom year; 1937, the year of postdepression recovery; and 1938, which is supposed to be a slump year.

Sales to Latin America

	1913	1929	1937	1938[1]
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*
United States	25.03	38.7	34.3	36.1
United Kingdom	24.42	14.9	12.6	12.2
Germany	16.55	10.8	15.3	17.0
France	8.32	5.1	2.9	3.5
Italy	4.98	5.0	2.6	3.1
Japan	.14	1.0	2.7	2.6

[1] Estimated.

Purchases from Latin America

	1913	1929	1937	1938[1]
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*
United States	30.78	34.0	31.1	31.7
United Kingdom	21.24	18.5	17.6	16.3
Germany	12.38	8.1	8.7	10.6
France	7.99	6.2	4.0	4.0
Italy	1.99	3.0	3.1	1.5
Japan	.09	1.0	1.6	1.3

[1] Estimated.

During 1937 and 1938 England lost ground in Latin America, both in sales and purchases, while Germany gained as a result of its barter program. The principal export items of the United Kingdom to Latin America in 1937, and the principal export items of Germany to Latin America in 1938, are as follows:

Principal export items of United Kingdom to Latin America in 1937

[In thousands of dollars]

Article	Argentina	Brazil	Chile	Colombia	Mexico	Peru	Uruguay	Venezuela
Total	99,094	34,838	9,411	14,963	8,596	5,931	11,418	8,788
Coal	10,838	2,922	------	------	------	------	1,436	------
Cotton:								
Piece goods	15,895	275	1,386	7,304	623	790	1,157	3,109
Thread	1,860	558	505	515	------	------	992	------
Yarns	3,602	1,076	555	638	378	------	------	------
Disinfectants, etc	1,298	------	------	------	------	------	------	------
Electric goods and apparatus	2,694	712	364	26	56	146	54	145
Iron and steel manufactures	17,270	3,312	1,137	519	1,489	541	835	1,060
Locomotives, trams, and parts	1,923	6,162	65	153	------	457	98	------
Machinery and parts	6,292	5,112	609	800	1,164	511	449	591
Motor vehicles and aircraft	1,747	1,057	166	------	221	102	670	------
Paper, cardboard	1,110	169	118	83	------	42	78	38
Pottery, ceramics	1,093	365	80	31	------	84	114	61
Rayon and silk manufactures	1,165	176	201	123	303	60	111	64
Sodium compounds	1,024	1,573	154	------	88	68	122	------
Spirits	1,196	299	47	484	214	145	234	228
Woolen and worsted tissues	10,852	405	1,260	1,787	300	560	1,054	584

Principal export items of Germany to Latin America in 1938

[In thousands of dollars]

Articles	Argentina	Brazil	Chile	Colombia	Mexico	Peru	Uruguay	Venezuela
Total exports	59,174	64,863	24,310	16,587	18,407	12,432	14,405	15,391
Coal	1,597	4,516	------	------	------	9	106	29
Paper and wares	2,227	680	593	611	1,307	434	506	------
Clay and earthenware	1,886	478	315	371	428	294	330	272
Pharmaceuticals	2,567	3,743	975	2,057	2,486	639	371	849
Steel and iron pipes	1,821	1,240	488	499	390	229	193	2,197
Iron bars, shapes and other iron wares	9,173	7,627	3,098	2,235	462	333	2,620	1,839
Leather and textile machinery	1,301	3,152	496	447	526	172	408	149
Locomotives	1,902	1,700	59	------	------	11	41	------
Power machinery	1,371	1,477	636	263	466	314	189	317
Printing machinery	1,213	733	391	125	155	364	137	121
Motor vehicles and aircraft	2,729	3,417	3,208	283	324	880	1,155	397
Electro-technical equipment	4,545	3,718	2,150	712	855	622	1,281	560
Chemical products and dyes	4,261	4,025	597	526	663	207	276	172
Precision instruments and optical	1,109	1,635	403	298	488	270	106	332
Textiles (cotton and wool)	1,593	782	2,361	1,665	510	1,558	465	804

As a result of the present war in Europe there is virtually no export trade from England to Latin America, and absolutely none from Germany; and it is this vast trade that United States industry can secure and keep if it is handled on a firm foundation and with a proper understanding of the problems involved.

The future of the United States lies to the south, and if we bend our efforts to effecting closer relationship with Latin America we will never worry about getting entangled with the petty quarrels of old Europe.

Too few of us realize the tremendous potentialities of South America. For example, 1 of the 20 Latin American republics alone has an area larger than that of continental United States. That republic is Brazil, which has a population of 45,000,000.

I have recently had the good fortune of receiving firsthand from a young and talented Brazilian, M. Pio Correa, Jr., a vast amount of information concerning this interesting country of Brazil. It appears that this country is rich in radioactive minerals, nickel ore, rubber, precious stones, bauxite ore, mineral oil, vegetable oil, fibers, and a host of other products which should be of importance to our industrial and economic life.

Among the other 19 Latin American republics we find Argentina, Bolivia, Chile, Peru, Colombia, and Venezuela, with a combined population equal to that of Brazil and with products that possibly will likewise fit into our economic and industrial life.

Here at our very doorstep are 100,000,000 potential customers, who, if given the opportunity, will buy our products instead of those of Europe, and who will thus give employment to our millions of unemployed.

A joint congressional committee is the proper body to delve into all the matters pertaining to Latin America, and when the question of passage of this resolution comes before this House, as I trust it will in the opening days of the next session, I will again address this House with more and complete facts and figures pertaining to our Latin American friends and neighbors. [Applause.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD following the speech of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] on the subject he and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] have discussed here this morning, and to include a speech I previously made in the House of Representatives which gives certain facts and figures.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KELLER]?

There was no objection.

PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUNN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, a great deal of unjust criticism comes quite often from some Members of the House against President Roosevelt because he has not as yet balanced the Budget. When Mr. Roosevelt took office hundreds of thousands of men and women in the United States were on the verge of starvation; thousands of banks had failed and thousands of unfortunate human beings who had placed their money in those banks could not get it back. Since Mr. Roosevelt has been in office we do not hear of people starving to death. When they put their money in the bank today they know it is safe. President Roosevelt may not have been able to balance the Budget, but he did one thing—he balanced the people's stomachs with good, substantial food. He also would have accomplished a great deal more if the majority of the Members of Congress would have supported his legislation. As long as the President is doing his utmost to provide the necessities of life for the people who are out of employment and others who cannot work because of physical disabilities the Budget, is in my opinion, being well balanced. [Applause.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial from the Washington Post.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOUSTON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. GEYER of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. GEYER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an address I delivered on Labor Day at Milwaukee before the National Association of Letter Carriers.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

OUR DUTY AS MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 4 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, in a short time, either today or tomorrow, the Congress as a whole will have definitely decided the particular road which, in the opinion of the majority of the Members, is the road America will take in attempting to steer our ship of state through the difficult waters of present international affairs. I shall vote in favor of the conference report, including as, of course, it will the repeal of the embargo as well as the other provisions designed to prevent our involvement. As one Member who voted yesterday to instruct the House conferees to retain an arms embargo along with the other important provisions of the Senate bill, may I say that from now on it is, in my opinion, my duty and the duty of every single person to work along the lines that have been determined by the majority and to try to carry out the task which everyone has said was his task, namely, the task of keeping this Nation out of war. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, may I say, first, that I do not believe Members of this House who voted yesterday against instructing the conferees, cast their votes yesterday because they wanted to help the munition makers. I do not believe any Member of this House would do that. But we must guard against the consequences of our action. I have here, however, figures on the profits of various corporations for the last quarter of this year, which show conclusively to me that unless we pass effective excess-profits legislation we are going to have a serious dislocation of our domestic economy in favor of the munitions industry and against our normal peacetime industries. United States Steel, for example, made a net profit of $10,420,000 for the third quarter of this year and still there is talk of further price rises. Other steel, aircraft, and similar corporations showed very great advances in profits. Du Pont profits for the first 9 months of 1938 were $31,000,000; for the first 9 months of 1939 they were $62,000,000. This all took place before repeal. Hence, after repeal excess-profits taxation becomes more than ever necessary.

I believe it is almost certain that the purchases of the Allied nations and anyone else engaged in war who buy from us are going to be more and more weighted on the side of munitions and less on the side of the things which they would normally buy. We must put into effect at once measures to maintain a decent opportunity for our peacetime industries and to combat unemployment in them.

It is most important that we concern ourselves about the solution of our domestic problems. I am not going to elaborate upon that matter. I think there are certain adjustments in our W. P. A. that need making, and I think it is most important that every one of us should be careful to protect the rights of labor, as well as the rights of civil liberties. One matter brought especially to my attention is the refusal up to this time of the Consolidated Steel Co. to bargain with the Metal Trades Council of organized labor in Los Angeles. For the company to take this attitude after the American Federation of Labor put forth such great effort to secure a fair share of shipbuilding business for southern California seems to me hard to understand. This is one example of what may happen. I think, further, it is necessary that we solve our unemployment problem and our agricultural problem. It is necessary that we spend most of our energy in those directions. And I believe it is important in the days that lie ahead for us to have the best understanding we can possibly obtain of the attitude and problems not only of all groups of the people of our own Nation but of the problems and attitudes of all the nations in the world. Each of us inevitably has deep convictions about all these things. Peace may depend on cur understanding other people's convictions.

I appeal to you today primarily for unity of our own efforts and secondly for an earnest approach to our domestic problems, out of which, in my opinion, will come the best protection against the possible involvement of this Nation in war.

Finally, I believe, as I have already said, that this Nation should attempt to spread understanding throughout the world, that at all times and in all places our influence

should be thrown wherever we can most effectively throw it for the speediest possible conclusion of these hostilities on the basis of just and lasting peace.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I think the gentleman has made a very constructive suggestion. I wonder if he noticed this morning that evidence of this maladjustment has already been given by the announcement in the United Press report that England's purchases from the United States would from now on be shifted from agricultural products to war machines?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I thank the gentleman very much. I think that is a very important problem to consider and to act promptly upon. But I want to make it plain I do not believe any Member of the House who voted against instructing the conferees for the embargo, as I mighty nearly did myself, cast that vote because he wanted that situation to obtain. The situation does obtain, however, as the gentleman and myself have tried to point out, and we must act upon it.

I shall vote for the bill even though it contains no embargo because I believe it contains provisions which will safeguard America against involvement in this war—either because of outstanding debts, the destruction of shipping, or loss of American lives.

I voted to instruct the conferees to insist upon keeping the embargo on arms and ammunition. I did this because I know the munitions traffic is wrong. I did this because I found it one way—the only way open to me at the time to attempt to guard against an unhealthy and certainly disastrous munitions trade boom in the United States. We will sell more munitions and less fruit, less machinery, less of all peacetime goods. I voted for this embargo because I know the munitions traffic is wrong and because I dread to see our country make profits by the sale of weapons to other nations when we ourselves are determined to keep out of war. The very profits of such a trade, I am afraid, may prove a most powerful force drawing us toward war. I hope the profits can be controlled. I hope I will be mistaken in my fears. I hope that the forceful arguments of those who have said that lifting the embargo was the road to peace will prove to be true.

Had the embargo been retained in our legislation, I should have been ready to repeal it at any time with regard to any nation whose civilian population was attacked by enemy airplane bombing.

The greatest services we can now perform for freedom and democracy are three: First, to solve our problem of unemployment and to solve it with fundamental measures that will be lasting and not by means of allowing a war trade boom to develop; second, to work unceasingly for peace as soon as possible and on the most fair and just possible terms to all, including Germany; third, to work among the neutral nations to develop now a formula for decent settlement of the problems of the nations and for a lasting peace.

The greatest services we can perform for England and France are to promote the earliest possible peace and to demonstrate that a democracy can conquer the problem of unemployment.

Our immediate tasks are those I have mentioned plus the one most necessary task without which we can accomplish none of the others. That one most necessary task is to keep our heads, to refuse to be swept off our feet by propaganda, to keep our Nation herself at peace. This we can do if we have the will to do it and if we keep very busy at the jobs I have outlined. But it will not be easy.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, on October 27 the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN], under special order of the House, had the floor. I asked the gentleman from Michigan this question:

> Does not the gentleman think it is about time that even Members of Congress restrain themselves as purveyors of hate?

The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD has been changed to read, "purveyors of false information," and the answer has been changed to read "purveyors of false information." Is this correct procedure? Does a Member have a right to change the form and the substance of a question and the form and substance of an answer in the RECORD?

The SPEAKER. The rule is that no Member has the right to change a statement made by his adversary in debate without the consent of the gentleman who made the statement. As far as was stated by the gentleman from Michigan, the Chair does not know who made the alleged change. Therefore the Chair can only state the general rule.

Mr. HOOK. The change was made without my consent and without my knowledge.

The SPEAKER. Of course, the Chair has seen no transcript of the reporter's notes and has not seen the copy of the speech with the alleged changes, so, as the Chair stated, he can reply to the inquiry only by stating the general rule.

Mr. HOOK. Then the procedure is to obtain the transcript of the reporter's notes and determine who made the change?

The SPEAKER. That would be a preliminary inquiry. The gentleman could submit a unanimous-consent request to have the language in the permanent RECORD corrected now.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the permanent RECORD be so corrected.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, not seeing on the floor the gentleman from Michigan who is involved in this matter, I would ask the gentleman to withdraw his request at this time; otherwise I shall be obliged to object.

The SPEAKER. The Chair suggests that the gentleman from Michigan should be present.

Mr. HOOK. I withdraw my request, Mr. Speaker, and shall wait until the gentleman from Michigan is on the floor.

ARMS AND MUNITIONS TRADE WITH ENGLAND AND FRANCE

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to ask how much the United States is willing to pay for the arms and munitions trade with England and France.

Last evening I was amazed to learn from a United Press dispatch, London date line, November 2, written by their staff correspondent, Henry T. Gorrell, that the revision of the United States arms embargo law, while opening the way for large British arms and munitions purchases, was expected to lead to a drastic curtailment of imports from the United States. Mr. Gorrell writes as follows:

> One authoritative source estimated that British imports of certain American industrial products and foodstuffs would fall off as much as $150,000,000 a year.

I ask, Mr. Speaker, if our country is willing to pay this price in order that we may sell arms and ammunition to belligerent nations. This writer contends that the purchase of war supplies from the United States would be greatly offset by a curtailment of imports of nonessential industrial and agricultural products. It is his contention that this curtailment is necessary in order to protect the exchange and permit the unlimited purchase of arms and ammunition.

It is very interesting to note in Mr. Gorrell's article that he specifically writes as follows:

> The effect of the reduction of imports from the United States undoubtedly will be felt keenly over widespread areas of New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Michigan, the grain belts of the Middle West, the tobacco districts of the South, and the fruit zones of Florida and California.

The motion-picture industry stands to lose at least $30,000,000 a year. The automobile industry, which usually amounts to about $12,000,000 a year, is already at a standstill. British agents are reported to have ceased attending tobacco

auctions, and we do, annually, a tobacco business with the British Isles of $85,000,000. Fresh fruit, farm machinery, wheat, livestock products, and most all products which might be listed as nonessential will give way to the exportation of arms and ammunition.

Again I ask, Mr. Speaker, is it worth the cost? [Applause.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein an article appearing in the Washington Times-Herald.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

CONGRESS SHOULD STAY IN SESSION

Mr. THILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 20 seconds.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. THILL. Mr. Speaker, now that the arms embargo has been lifted we must make doubly certain that America will remain at peace. Congress should stay in session as long as the crisis in Europe and a war emergency exists.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. KELLER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, what is the reason for making the request?

Mr. THILL. The American people do not trust the President in the White House. I have received hundreds of letters—and I have them in my office—which will show the gentleman definitely that the American people do not trust this administration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

TULSA UNIVERSITY VERSUS CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY FOOTBALL GAME

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to announce that tomorrow at Catholic University will be played one of the best football games you will have an opportunity to see. It might be a relaxation from the events of the week to see this game. [Applause.] Tulsa University plays Catholic University. Confidentially, if you want to place a little bet on Tulsa, you will be perfectly safe in doing so. If you will take a look at the team in the gallery, you will realize that my advice is good.

Mr. KELLER. Does the gentleman take any responsibility on that?

Mr. DISNEY. I will accept the responsibility on that. I am going to place a little money myself. [Laughter and applause.]

In all seriousness, you will see one of the best forward passers it has ever been my privilege to see.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Oklahoma that it is contrary to the rules of the House for Members to introduce occupants of the gallery. I am sure that the rule was not in the mind of the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Speaker, I did not introduce them. I just noted their presence.

The SPEAKER. The Chair calls attention to the fact because it is contrary to the rules of the House. Of course, we are all glad to have these fine young gentlemen present.

THE TREASURY STATEMENT

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 4 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I want to depart from the seriousness of the last few days and try to support, if I may, in a few words, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, [Mr. RICH].

We had a debt after the war of some $26,000,000,000. About $3,000,000,000 was paid off from the sale of goods on hand, and not such a large amount as the gentleman from Mississippi indicated.

The abuse that Mr. Mellon drew from the minority during those days was great. Real enjoyment on the part of the minority was had at his expense. He went quietly on and reduced taxes and also greatly reduced the debt; and by reducing the taxes he encouraged business, released capital, and made it possible to reduce the debt. But still there lingers on the old enjoyment had at the expense of Mr. Mellon, while the present huge debt brings woe and worry even to those who are now still carping at him.

So, as a matter of illustration, I happened to think that I might quote—

There was a daschund once so long
He hadn't any notion
How long it took to notify
His tail of his emotion.
And so it happened that while his eyes
Were filled with woe and sadness,
His little tail went wagging on,
Because of previous gladness.

[Laughter and applause.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, I have two unanimous-consent requests to submit.

Mr. Speaker, the first is to extend in the Appendix of the RECORD a complete report of the proceedings held on October 18, in the afternoon, at the chapel at Bowdoin College, in Brunswick, Maine, in commemoration of the one hundredth anniversary of the birth of Thomas Brackett Reed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, the other request is that I have unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and to include therein certain excerpts from the speeches of the President with reference to the subject of unemployment, and also certain excerpts with reference to an interview which was given by Thomas Edison and Henry Ford in 1921.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

There was no objection.

THE TREASURY STATEMENT

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of the RECORD I wish to make a correction in the statement made by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] with reference to the amount of money available from the sale of surplus war supplies, and so forth, which was applied to the war debt.

If you will turn to page 612 of the 1930 Annual Treasury Report you will note the receipts from the sale of surplus war supplies, and so forth, is given as $4,483,046,569.99. This, however, includes $2,391,518,141.97 principal and interest on foreign obligations. The difference between these two amounts represents the amount available from the sale of surplus war supplies that was applied to the war debt. That was $2,091,528,428.02.

Mr. Speaker, I am one of those who consider the national debt to be of the gravest importance, and I hope that when we come back in January we will all take that view.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein

a short editorial from the Oregon Sunday Journal of October 29.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. THORKELSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter received from Canada.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD at this point and to include therein two news articles on the matter of our foreign trade in arms and agricultural products, appearing in this morning's paper.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, the parade of war orders is already under way and no one knows yet the volume they may attain nor the effect of the rapid expansion that will be needed to fill these orders and at the same time bring our own defenses up to date, nor has much thought been given to the final day of reckoning when these orders come abruptly to a halt following hostilities. Some of us have not yet forgotten the expansion of the World War days and the recession and collapse following soon thereafter.

The daily papers of Friday morning, November 3, announce that a flood of European war orders which administration headquarters expect will total a billion dollars in the next few weeks, will be released by the repeal of the arms embargo. I quote from an Associated Press article by Edward E. Bomar in this morning's Washington Post:

EMBARGO'S END TO FREE BILLIONS FOR ARMS HERE—BRITISH WANT 4,000 PLANES; FRENCH, 3,800; OTHER EXPORTS TO SUFFER

(By Edward E. Bomar)

A flood of European war orders, which administration quarters expect will total a billion dollars in the next few weeks, will be released by repeal of the arms embargo.

Even before the House action yesterday, a French purchasing mission contracted for 4,600 aircraft motors from two eastern manufacturers at a price of approximately $50,000,000, officials were informed. A British mission, meanwhile, has been negotiating for some 1,600 training planes.

The arms embargo halted delivery on some 600 aircraft early in September. In addition to these, the French contemplate purchases of some 3,800 planes and the British 4,000, it was reported authoritatively. A Swedish mission has been negotiating for upward of 250 aircraft and a Belgian mission for 200.

The British-French Allies have stressed their need for war planes of all types, but their purchases are expected to cover a wide range of other products, including:

Motortrucks and motorcycles, clothing, machine tools, field ranges, explosives, foodstuffs, surgical instruments, hospital supplies, searchlights, gas masks, pontoon equipment, water-purifying units, ambulances, tents, saddles, telephones, and radio compasses.

An immediate effect of repeal of the embargo will be to permit delivery of some 300 war planes for Britain and France which have been completed since the embargo was imposed.

Presumably, it will mean immediate reinstatement of export licenses for planes and other munitions, which were canceled. The impounded orders were valued at $14,680,807 for Great Britain and $58,205,739 for France.

Thus far the British and French purchases apparently have not been coordinated as were the Allied purchases toward the end of the 1914–18 war, but measures to avoid competition between the two buyers are anticipated shortly.

A British purchasing mission headed by Lt. Col. J. H. M. Greenly, an official of the British industrial firm of Babcock & Wilcox, Ltd., has been at Montreal, but is expected to transfer its principal activities to New York.

While Congress debated the neutrality issue, the British appeared to be withholding purchases, but France's representatives are known to have placed quietly many orders whose fulfilment was subject to repeal of the embargo.

Most of the foreign orders are welcomed officially as an aid to American national defense. It is pointed out that they will mean expansion of industry's capacity to produce munitions of all kinds. Aircraft industry officials have insisted that American plants could handle the additional contracts even though they are turning out more than 4,000 planes for the Army and Navy.

American military orders have priority over foreign contracts, and the Army and Navy are in a position to exercise direct control through the licensing system of the State Department.

The United Press makes an announcement from London dated November 2 that should be of great interest to the farmers of America at this particular time in view of the record corn crop now being harvested, and I quote herewith an article appearing in the Washington Post for Friday, November 3:

OTHER EXPORTS TO SUFFER

LONDON, November 2.—Revision of the United States arms embargo, while opening the way for large British arms and munitions purchases, was expected tonight to lead to a drastic curtailment of British imports from the United States, such as industrial and agricultural products.

One authoritative source estimated that British imports of certain American industrial products and foodstuffs may fall off as much as $150,000,000 a year.

Importers of American products said Britain's anticipated heavy purchases of war supplies from the United States would be offset "to a substantial degree" by curtailing imports of nonessential industrial and agricultural products, to protect exchange and permit purchase of arms and munitions.

The transportation of many American commodities, including tobacco, automobiles, women's apparel, shoes, hosiery, dried fruits, and barley already has been reduced drastically since the outbreak of the war.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HAWKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include an address by Senator BRIDGES, of New Hampshire, entitled "Challenge to America."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

OPPORTUNITY FOR YOUTH IN AMERICA

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 4 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, since the gentleman preceding me has just announced something about a football game this afternoon, I call attention to the fact that this afternoon a national corn-husking contest is being carried on in the State of Kansas; and if you gentlemen will listen to the radio, you will hear the boys from Pennsylvania going down the long rows of corn, and, bump, bump, bump, at the rate of 45 ears to the minute.

Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand a copy of a letter from Aubrey Williams to myself inserted in the RECORD yesterday by the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS], in which he asks me to make a public statement relative to some statement I made in Pennsylvania recently, in which I quoted him as saying that youth had no opportunity in Pennsylvania or in this country any more. Youth must have had an opportunity, because there must have been an opportunity for Aubrey when he stepped into a $10,000 job, and there are other like jobs in America. He resents the fact that I said his talk over there when he threw a wet blanket on youth sounded like a "red," and he wants me to refute that statement. My answer is that whether he is a "red" or not, to me he is as "red" as a York County barn.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMITH of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include an address that I delivered on the inauguration of the second president of Brooklyn College.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Illinois. Also a second request, Mr. Speaker, to extend my remarks at a subsequent time on the subject of the fatality of folk lore.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include two letters written by Col. Theodore Roosevelt.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EFFECT OF REPEAL OF ARMS EMBARGO ON THE ORIENT

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, under the rule under which we have been operating during the consideration of this resolution, it has been very difficult for any Member of the House to obtain the floor long enough to openly discuss this situation. I call the attention of the House at this time to the probability that the repeal of the arms embargo may have a very adverse effect on the oriental situation. When we repeal the arms embargo for the purpose of correcting a certain situation in Europe, are we not also at the same time complicating, from our standpoint, a situation in the Orient? When we lift the arms embargo I do not see how we are going to help furnishing Japan with all of the materials that she will need for her evil purposes. Japan will be entirely free then to declare war on China and to declare a blockade of the China coast.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. Just one moment, please. I have offered certain suggestions to the conferees, which they probably will not take, that might save that situation.

I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include a certain article entitled "America in the Key Position," by Kurt Bloch, from the magazine Asia and to now read the last paragraph from that article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. The paragraph to which I particularly refer is, as follows:

Thus the United States emerges as the decisive factor on the Far Eastern stage, with divided counsel. With public interest centered upon the war in Europe, the Far East may well for a while be pushed into the background of public discussion, but it is unlikely that it could easily be merged with other subconscious matter. By its own diplomacy and by the course of events, the United States has been forced into the ambiguous position of being "China's best friend" and the sole supplier of goods vital for Japan's conquest of China. Twenty years ago a similar ambiguity was overcome by the Lansing-Ishii agreement. Today Japan has gone so far beyond the limits of her treaty obligations toward the United States and China that it would seem impossible to find a similar way out of the Japanese-American difficulties and contradictions. The United States has no alternative but either actively to assist in the establishment of a Japanese new order in east Asia or to fight it by such measures as American legislation and American economic strength may supply.

The article in full is as follows:

[From Asia for November 1939]

AMERICA IN THE KEY POSITION

(By Kurt Bloch)

Victim No. 1 of the Soviet-German nonaggression pact of August 1939 was the Republic of Poland. Victim No. 2 may well be Japan, although it is too early as yet to foresee how serious the wounds caused by the splinters of the Soviet-German bombshell really will turn out to be.

Despite the local truce put into effect on the border of outer Mongolia, a comprehensive settlement of Soviet-Japanese friction would seem to have grown even more difficult than hitherto, because the Sino-Soviet relationship has been greatly modified through the outbreak of war in central and western Europe. Up till now the assistance granted by the Soviet Union to China was additional to and complementary with aid given by other powers, though the Soviet Union has granted China far more liberal aid than anybody else, with the sole exception of the United States Treasury under its silver-purchase program. Now, shortly after the conclusion of a new Sino-Soviet trade and credit agreement providing for no less than 700,000,000 rubles of Russian loans—possibly equivalent to about $100,000,000—this assistance by the Soviet has gained new importance, since Europe's powers are straining their resources for their own war nearer home.

China, indeed, has lost much valuable support through the outbreak of war in Europe. Both Britain and France had agreed in principle to lend their aid to vast development schemes in China's southwest. Sino-French railway projects for Kwangsi and Yunnan had reached an advanced stage, with French loans seemingly securing their early completion. Another important railway was to be built with British assistance to supplement the Yunnan-Burma Road. Both these projects may be considered as shelved indefinitely unless Soviet or American funds and materials can somehow be mobilized to replace Anglo-French aid, which will scarcely be forthcoming now.

Thus the Chungking Government is forced to rely well-nigh exclusively on Soviet assistance—if the Soviet Union will continue its help for China. To make sure of the Soviet's stand, China's leading Communist statesman, Chou En-lai has flown to Moscow. At the same time a new government crisis is shaking the Chungking Government. Even after the self-elimination of Wang Ching-wei quite a few important and influential members of the Chungking Government have continued to look askance at the Communist-Kuomintang alliance and to consider it rather as a truce than as a lasting "popular front." Though Soviet assistance was welcome to them, they were wondering whether the ultimate price for such aid—even at deferred payments—might not be too high and of a kind which they would thoroughly dislike. Recent evidence on ruthless anti-Communist activities of Chungking-appointed Chinese officials, even on the front behind the Japanese lines, and the general character of the leading Kuomintang personnel disclose that the popular front in China may be neither permanent nor unshakeable. If the leaders of the U. S. S. R. should decide to make peace with Japan at China's expense, their apology might well be based upon this frailty at the foundation of China's resistance.

The replacement of Dr. H. H. Kung, Wang Ching-wei's successor as leader of China's peace group, by Dr. T. V. Soong is an attempt to remove ambiguity from China's domestic scene. Whether this can be done successfuly is, however, rather doubtful. Dr. Kung is the one member of China's new "Soong dynasty" closest to China's big financial and business interests. His exit would seem to indicate that, in these circles, hopes of wartime commerce and its profits are running high, even though they may have to be shared with the Japanese invaders. The memory of World War profiteering is scarcely less strong in China than in Japan. In both countries, however, the present war between them has weakened, if not destroyed, the ability to produce for foreign markets profitably. Peace now would promise much more than its normal blessings. Once an end were put to Sino-Japanese hostilities, a new career of international wartime profiteering would be open to both of them.

China's military leaders, who in more than 2 years of war have developed a patriotism formerly unknown to many of them, are facing this domestic opposition of big business; and it seems as if they had decided to maintain their politico-military alliance with the Communist forces and the Popular Front. Their ability to cling to their resolve, however, depends on the decisions of Moscow. If the Soviet Union should decide to abandon China's cause, that cause may be lost.

There have been indications that the basis of Soviet policy now is a strong anti-British drive. From its earliest days, Marxism has considered Great Britain as the archenemy of democracy are freedom. The secret of Stalin's policy might turn out to be his determination to fight the British Empire to the last German and Japanese soldiers. If this were the Soviet game, China's chances for survival as a unified, independent country would, indeed, be slim.

Japanese military moves might be taken to foreshadow such a trend of events in the Far East. Next in importance to the truce on the Khalka River ranks the unification of the military command of the Japanese forces in China. This will doubtless soon be followed by the unification of civil administration in the various territories now subject to the combined Japanese authority. Wang Ching-wei's aspirations to form a new central government for all of China, claiming authority even in "free China," may now be fulfilled quickly. Such a step might very well result in the elimination from the various Japanese provisional governments of the bulk of the present personnel taken from the ranks of old imperial officials, in order to provide Wang with vast patronage opportunities to gain new adherence for his cause.

If Soviet support should be withdrawn from China, and Japan should prove ready to assume the function of a Soviet sword bearer against the British Empire, a subtle change in Japanese policy under the first impact of the German-Soviet pact might well prove to be transient only. But it is noteworthy that in September anti-British demonstrations in China and Japan were dropped, and Japan's threatening attitude against the Shanghai Municipal Council and foreign garrisons was replaced by a more accommodating attitude. Semiofficially, it has been hinted in Tokyo that this change was due to pressure by the United States Government. This would seem to disclose an understanding in Tokyo of the new accretion of strength to the American position as a result of events in Europe and of Japan's diplomatic isolation.

When the United States, in July, denounced the Japanese-American trade agreement of 1911, the official explanation of this step described this agreement as incompatible with the new American trade policy initiated, in 1934, with the Trade Agreements Act, and gradually developed in the Hull trade agreements with various nations. The legislative conditions under which the United States Government made this decision, however, were rather unequivocal; little doubt was left that the real intention of the United States, in denouncing the trade agreement, was to pave the way toward punitive economic action against Japan. In Japan itself the American move was understood to imply just such a threat.

The Japanese answer was the announcement of a new German-Japanese commercial agreement which, it was said, would secure to Japan vital supplies sufficient in peace and war. While the text of this German-Japanese agreement has never been disclosed, it may now safely be said that, for the duration of the European war, it will

be practically impossible to implement its terms. Moreover, some critical students of the embargo problem—insofar as it was hoped by an embargo to prevent Japanese war supplies from reaching her islands—rightly pointed out that action taken against export of such supplies to Japan could probably be nullified by German entrepôt business in commodities to which Japan was refused direct access. Now this possibility has vanished, and the British blockade would seem to leave little room for entrepôt business anywhere. This possibility of alternative supplies having vanished, Japanese dependence on American manufacturers and suppliers has greatly increased. Now, for the first time, an embargo on American exports to Japan, advocated by so many, might be developed successfully into a suitable instrument of peaceful compulsion.

Already Japanese equipment orders originally intended for Germany are being switched to the United States. However, American terms for Japan are still cash terms, while Germany since 1937 has been offering credit. Therefore it is likely that in the near future Japanese propaganda will try to influence American public opinion in favor of Japan's case. The more American supplies and American loans are needed by Japan, the more will such Japanese propaganda be intensified. Moreover, American interests, finding easier access to a widening market, will probably advocate friendlier relations with Japan.

It remains to be seen what conclusions the United States Government will arrive at in January 1940, when the trade agreement of 1911 expires and legal obstacles to punitive economic action against Japan are removed. Although public interest in the Far East has been visibly flagging, with war news from Europe making the headlines, this can scarcely be taken to indicate that public sentiment in the United States has grown more friendly toward Japan's case, especially since no change has taken place in the Japanese methods of warfare.

Unless the Soviet Union were to abandon assistance for China, the sheer force of economic circumstances resulting from the European war might succeed in pitting Soviet supplies for China against American supplies for Japan. Such a curious situation could scarcely last for any length of time with American popular sympathies on the side of China. It would certainly drive the embargo issue to the forefront of American politics during the January session of Congress.

It must be considered, accordingly, as more than a vague possibility that Soviet and American policy may be meeting in common cause on the battlefields of China. Preoccupation with the events in Europe and comprehensible resentment against the part played by the Soviet Union need not necessarily prevent more or less direct Soviet-American cooperation in far eastern diplomacy.

While these perspectives would seem to be the foremost results of the situation created in the Far East by the European war, it is a moot question how European hostilities may affect the British and French relations with the belligerents in eastern Asia. Britain's Ambassador in Chungking has already asserted that British friendship with China was not shaken by the events in Europe, and the personnel changes in the London Cabinet would scarcely suggest that the United Kingdom could now follow a course leading to a far eastern Munich.

Indirectly, the newly arisen need for Japan to seek an understanding with the United States, to secure supplies vital to Japan's economic life, may well redound to the advantage of the British Empire and its nationals in the Far East. As recent diplomatic history has proved, Japan could scarcely hurt Britain and British interests in the Far East without simultaneously violating American rights and interests. The parallelism of Anglo-American notes of protest has been due not only to diplomatic arrangements but also to actual identity of Anglo-American interests. Moreover, paradoxically, war in Europe will, to some extent, actually strengthen the British Empire in the Far East. Once more, the empire has been subjected to the concentric and galvanizing influence of united cooperation in war, and the British Dominions and possessions in the Pacific area have been put on a war footing. India's resources and India's military strength, especially in manpower, are once more at the disposal of the paramount power. From a purely military point of view, anti-British policies in the Far East have now become more risky than they were before the outbreak of war in Europe.

In addition, Japan may now hope to start a successful commercial drive on British Empire markets, though the spectacular developments of 1914–18—when Japan was Britain's ally—will scarcely be repeated, with the tendency toward industrialization within the empire and toward imperial autarchy so much more highly developed than 25 years ago. With export markets sorely needed by Japan, the hope for increased trade with the British Empire may well result in sharply decreased anti-British activities wherever Japanese influence extends.

On the whole, the same holds true of the French Pacific Empire, the Franco-British alliance having been extended to the Far East months ago. French military resources in the neighborhood of the Sino-Japanese theater of war constitute the vanguard of the joint Franco-British forces in the Far East.

To any anti-British and anti-French policies, there is today offered a strong military defense. With Japan undoubtedly able to exercise a large measure of naval control, her vulnerability on land today would constitute her greatest weakness, in the event that she were ready to play her part in the anti-British game which may possibly be the driving motive of the Kremlin.

If, however, Japan tries to realize the avowed primary aim of her policy, the subjection of China, it would seem she would have to make sure of lessened Soviet assistance to the Chungking government and of continued war supplies for herself from the United States. That Japan is conscious of the new importance of the United States in the far eastern line-up is clearly indicated by a minor detail in the personnel reshuffle which has taken place in Japan's diplomatic staff. One of the first results of the Soviet-German Pact and possibly of Italian neutrality in Europe's war, has been the recall of Japan's Ambassador in Rome, Toshio Shiratori, who has been among the protagonists of Japan's European diplomacy in the anti-Comintern bloc. Shiratori is going home via the United States, deeming it worth his while to study American far eastern diplomacy on the spot, and to find out for himself what action Japan may have to expect from the strongest naval power in the Pacific area. Moreover, diplomatic American-Japanese exchanges are proceeding in Washington, the precise objects of which have not been disclosed thus far.

Since Britain today is less likely to sponsor a far eastern Munich than is the Soviet Union, the attitude of the United States has now become of crucial importance for the future of the Far East. Suddenly, unexpectedly, and unwillingly, the United States is forced into the position of a monopolistic supplier of many of the most pressing needs of Japan's war economy. At the same time, Japan finds herself isolated diplomatically, and some of the most aggressive cliques and individuals have been discredited and eliminated from their key positions in Japan's Government. Japan is cutting her losses in a new deal with Outer Mongolia and still testing the uncertain ground of far eastern diplomacy.

In the new situation, the United States is faced with two—contradictory—elements in her own position. On the one hand, popular sentiment is still running high against the arch-aggressor nation of the Far East. Due to this trend of public opinion, the attitude of the United States could be clear-cut and unequivocal in principle, with the advocates of more concrete action against aggression looking scornfully down upon British weakness and hedging.

On the other hand, the large American interests in Japan and the growing attractiveness of the Japanese market are likely now to make themselves felt much more. American investment in, and American trade with, Japan has always been of far greater economic importance than the American stake in China. With Japanese orders and Japanese propaganda likely to increase in the vast American market, the fact should be kept in sight that present Japanese policies, in China and at home, threaten the present American stake in China and Japan with virtual destruction. In the long run, even the American interests in Japan will be served best by American action which would awaken Japan from her dreams of conquest to the realization of her own vital interests in peaceful cooperation with China and the West.

Thus, the United States emerges as the decisive actor on the Far Eastern stage, with divided counsel. With public interest centered upon the war in Europe, the Far East may well, for a while, be pushed into the background of public discussion; but it is unlikely that it could easily be merged with other subconscious matter. By its own diplomacy and by the course of events, the United States has been forced into the ambiguous position of being China's best friend and the sole supplier of goods vital for Japan's conquest of China. Twenty years ago a similar ambiguity was overcome by the Lansing-Ishii agreement. Today Japan has gone so far beyond the limits of her treaty obligations toward the United States and China that it would seem impossible to find a similar way out of the Japanese-American difficulties and contradictions. The United States has no alternative but either actively to assist in the establishment of a Japanese new order in East Asia or to fight it by such measures as American legislation and American economic strength may supply.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I offered an amendment to the motion to instruct the conferees of the House with respect to the extension of credits to belligerents by Government agencies. I know there was a great deal of discussion on the majority side of the House concerning the advisability of that. Many Members have advised me that they voted against the amendment because they were told it was redundant; that it was not necessary. I had called attention to the fact that the Federal Reserve banks which were organized by act of Congress, did not come within the inhibitions of the Johnson Act. As an interesting sequel to that, I am advised by long distance this morning from New York that the Federal Reserve banks have already been given the "Go" sign, in view of the action taken by the House yesterday, to furnish the credits by which belligerents may purchase war materials in this country.

Now, there is a great deal of discussion in the House at the present moment as to whether we should or should not remain in constant session. I have not been particularly enthusiastic about that. I did not see any particular neces-

sity for it, but if, as I am informed this morning, the Federal Reserve banks are going to furnish credits for the purpose of selling munitions to belligerents, I think it is our duty to ourselves and to our constituents to stay on the job as a check against any unneutral act by any of these Government agencies which do not come within the provisions of the Johnson Act and the Senate amendment. [Applause.]

I called attention to the fact that the word "person" did not include those agencies and that this amendment of mine was not redundant. Now we find that the agencies involved have themselves interpreted the bill to mean that they are not within its terms and limitations, and they are going ahead, in spite of the colloquy which took place in the Senate and in spite of the action taken by this House about furnishing these credits which may involve America in the European war. I believe in view of that, Mr. Speaker, that, unless we can correct that condition before we adjourn, this Congress should stay in session as a guard against dissipation of the taxpayers' money. [Applause.]

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. I think the country should congratulate the gentleman upon his statement. If within 24 hours after Congress lifted the arms embargo, we are advised from Great Britain that Great Britain is going to transfer its purchases from agricultural products in this country to war munitions and we are also advised that the Federal Reserve Bank of this country is going to furnish credit, then Congress should stay in session and not be carried away by this propaganda which was so evident yesterday. [Applause.]

Mr. WOLCOTT. I believe the gentleman is correct, and I want to reiterate that I do not want to be a party—and I do not think any Member of this House wants to be a party—to the use of the taxpayers' money in financing any European conflict.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. The action that has been taken by the Congress virtually commits us to one side in the war over in Europe. The gentleman cannot deny that?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I believe the gentleman is correct.

Mr. KNUTSON. We are selling to one side and not to the other, and the leadership on the majority side yesterday declared their sympathies with one side as against the other. The President has declared his sympathies for one side as against the other. We were neutral by law, but now we are not. We are definitely in it, and there is no doubt in my mind, if history repeats itself, that we will be in this war within 6 months, especially if the so-called Allies in the European war—I refuse to call it a world war unless we get into it——

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. KNUTSON. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that the gentleman have 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan has made no request for additional time.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the revelations of the Dies committee have awakened the American people to the perilous menace of un-American activities in our country. This investigation has not only exposed serious subversive activities in the various arms of our national defense, but it has uncovered hundreds of Government civil employees who have membership in Communist-front organizations, or who have shown a tolerance or sympathy for such.

Think of it, Mr. Speaker! People on the public pay roll, paid out of the Federal Treasury, working under the shadow of the National Capitol, bearing allegiance to or sympathy for some foreign ideology.

Mr. Speaker, the work of the Dies committee, however, will be a useless expense and a futile gesture unless the Congress pass legislation to put an end to this disgraceful spectacle. [Applause.] When Congress meets in January legislation to end this stark travesty should be introduced and vigorously pressed to passage. Of course, it is the normal duty of this committee to propose such legislation, but, in view of the temper of the Seventy-sixth Congress resulting from the sensational exposures of the committee, I predict that such legislation will receive ready and enthusiastic support.

Mr. Speaker, I think the Dies committee has amply justified its creation. I think it has performed a most excellent public service, and I am willing to vote such additional appropriation as may be necessary to carry forward this work so vital and important to our national welfare. [Applause.]

Mr. PITTENGER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. PITTENGER. From what source does this opposition to the Dies committee come?

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. Of course, it emanates mainly from these un-American organizations, and I regret to say that some of it comes from certain people occupying high positions in our Government. If the gentleman will follow me, I think he will find an answer to his inquiry.

Mr. Speaker, for more than 16 years Congress has sought a solution for the economic and social problems of our country which are the direct outgrowth of inadequate legislation dealing with immigration. In the past 3 years there have been several attempts to correct some of the evils which are daily growing more apparent.

On June 10, 1937, this body, by voice vote, passed H. R. 6391, the Dies bill, for the deportation of criminal aliens. This bill never came to a vote in the Senate, but it helped to focus the attention of the people on our alien problem. This bill also drew the fire of some of the alien groups in our country, and by the fall of 1937 there had been set up in New York City an organization known as the American Committee for Protection of Foreign-Born, with headquarters at 100 Fifth Avenue. This committee, claiming to represent 155 organizations, with a membership estimated at 1,055,000 persons, has been particularly active since that time. Among their affiliated organizations were the Communist Party, New York State Committee, International Workers Order, American League for Peace and Democracy, Friends of the Soviet Union, International Labor Defense, National Maritime Union, Workers Alliance of Greater New York, and many other groups identified with the foreign "ism" movements in the United States. The only thing American about this committee was its name, but by January 1938 it was boasting of its victories in 1937. In his report for the year, Dwight C. Morgan, secretary, said:

> We have won some victories with the forces we have been able to mobilize. We have been able to gain at least temporary refuge in the United States for Max Meister, a stowaway from Germany, who was held for exclusion at Ellis Island. We have been able, through Congressman CELLER, to stay the deportation of Hans Goepel, another anti-Nazi refugee. We were able the other day to remove from Ellis Island, Paul List, who was wounded in Spain, and now faces deportation to Germany.

Now, I have mentioned this Committee for the Protection of the Foreign-Born to call attention to the fact that the foreign-born and aliens in our midst, over 4,000,000 in number, are being organized for a united fight against any change in our immigration laws that will, so far as they are concerned, work any hardships upon them. And by these hardships I include fingerprinting and other means of registering, which I believe we will ultimately have to adopt in dealing with this alien problem.

HOW MANY ALIENS IN THE UNITED STATES?

In the 120 years from 1820 to 1939, inclusive, 38,219,687 persons have emigrated to the United States. Of this number, as late as 1930, according to the census, there were 6,234,613 persons who owed their allegiance to another flag, living under the protection of the Stars and Stripes.

Today, according to the most conservative compilations, we still have 4,091,159 unnaturalized aliens in this country competing with our own citizens and those who have become citizens through the process of naturalization for jobs, for business, and, in many instances, for both public and private charity.

After 10 years of the world's greatest depression, this is a situation which cannot be lightly laughed aside. And the immigrants continue to pour in on almost every ship that arrives at an American port, but we know them now not as immigrants but as refugees. "Refugee" is an easy word that softens our hearts and lowers our guard. In fact, in the recent shaping of events it seems that these European refugees are of more concern to the New Deal than are the 10,000,000 of American refugees who have been walking the streets of our cities in vain for years seeking the economic security that was promised to them back in 1933 by President Roosevelt. But the American people are not to be deceived by this refugee bunk. This is just another scheme to bring additional thousands here who are not wanted in Europe. On October 24 last the Swedish-American liner *Drottingholm* arrived at New York with 579 passengers, of whom 279 were Americans. Among the aliens aboard were 93 Germans, mostly Jewish refugees. One was Daniel Sternberg, who conducted the symphony orchestra at Tiflis, Russia. Perhaps Mr. Sternberg will find Americans most receptive to his symphonies, but if I had my choice he would play them elsewhere.

WHO ARE OUR IMMIGRANTS?

Of the 82,998 quota immigrants admitted to the United States during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939, the racial composition is as follows:

Hebrews	43,450
Italians	6,708
Germans	5,524
English	5,076
Irish	2,968
Scotch	1,968
Scandinavians	1,563
French	2,214
All others	13,525

Are these figures self-explanatory? Do they reveal a situation to our satisfaction?

Mr. Speaker, in 1929 a sincere effort was made to regulate our future immigration when President Hoover, by proclamation, put into effect the quota system. The total annual quota set for all nations was 153,774. These quotas were set according to a formula based upon previous immigration, and the national origin of the immigrants prior to 1920. Under the formula the quotas established for the countries of principal origin were as follows:

Great Britain and North Ireland	65,721
Germany	27,370
Irish Free State	17,853
Poland	6,524
Italy	5,802
Norway (2,377) and Sweden (3,314)	5,691
Netherlands	3,153
France	3,086
Czechoslovakia	2,874
Soviet Union (Russia)	2,712
Switzerland	1,707
Belgium	1,304
Denmark	1,181

The quotas for all other nations are below 1,000.

In studying the immigration records for the fiscal year 1939, one cannot help noticing the apparent disregard of all quota provisions on the part of the enforcement agencies of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, when we find that 30,096 Hebrews have been admitted from Germany during the past year, a number which alone exceeds the national quota by 2,726.

DEPORTATIONS FOR 1939

While 82,998 immigrant aliens entered the United States during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939, our deportations for the year were the lowest of any in the last 10-year period.

Our deportation record, by years, is as follows:

1930	16,631
1931	18,142
1932	19,426
1933	19,865
1934	8,879
1935	8,319
1936	9,195
1937	8,829
1938	9,275
1939	8,202

Of the aliens deported in 1939 over 20 percent, or 1,638, were criminals; 1,056 had been previously deported; and 3,080 had entered this country without valid passports. Can we afford to allow the condition here revealed to remain unchallenged?

WHO WE DEPORTED

Of the aliens deported in the 5-year period from 1934 to 1938, inclusive, 3,216 were English, 2,598 Italian, 2,463 French, 1,770 Irish, 1,383 Scotch, 1,483 German, 998 Chinese, 850 Scandanavian, 740 Greek, 510 Hebrew, and 28,486 people of other nationalities.

CONTRACT LABOR IMMIGRANTS

Under the provisions of the Immigration Act of 1917, employers may file petitions to be allowed to import alien workmen into this country.

In 1938 petitions to the number of 1,581, involving 2,515 aliens, were filed by prospective employers. Favorable action was taken on 736 petitions involving 880 laborers.

During the fiscal year 1939 favorable action was taken on 772 petitions affecting approximately 800 additional workers.

Can anyone logically assume that these alien workmen were a necessity in our country at a time when more than 10,000,000 of our own people were unemployed?

WHO ARE OUR IMMIGRANTS?

To further illuminate this interesting subject, I now refer to Press Release No. 19, Department of State, dated January 19, 1939, entitled "Immigration Quotas, Vital Statistics" for the year ending June 30, 1938. From this official press release I glean the information that of the 45,712 quota immigration visas issued by American consular officers abroad for that year, but 52 visas were issued to persons listed as "farmers" coming to the United States. There were 29 from France, 19 from the Netherlands, and 2 each from Germany and Hungary. So the people who are coming here are not coming to farm but to crowd up in our cities and to compete with our own business, professional, and laboring men.

This situation, Mr. Speaker, would not be serious but for the fact that these aliens frequently are unable to keep up with the swift tempo of American life and easily fall into the habits of their native lands. They crowd into tenements and become dissatisfied with their new-found promised land. Then it is but a step until, in many instances, they fall victims to one or another subversive movement which holds out to them social and economic objectives attainable only through bloodshed and violence. Many of these disillusioned victims have already told their stories before the Dies Committee Investigating Un-American and Subversive Activities in the United States. I wish that every citizen could secure and read a complete set of the committee hearings. It would be well worth the price if the Office of Education could supply a complete set to every school in the Nation, so that the children and their parents might learn exactly what the foreign "ism" elements in this country are doing to wreck our Government and destroy our liberties.

THIRTY THOUSAND ALIENS ON RELIEF—THOUSANDS MORE IN INSTITUTIONS AND PRISONS

Mr. Speaker, through the courageous action of Congress last year, more than 30,000 aliens were removed from the rolls of the Works Progress Administration early this year, effecting a saving of over $1,800,000 a month which was promptly made available for the relief of our own citizens, many of whom had long been denied the opportunity of public-works employment theretofore extended to the dis-

charged aliens. This was the logical and American way to deal with a most distasteful situation. The taxpayers of the Nation have too long been assuming burdens which normally should have been borne by others.

But there is another burden thrust upon us by the foreign-born and the aliens which we cannot escape. That is the burden of caring for the mentally defective, the insane, and the criminal alien element. Quite recently the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York has made a study of this phase of the immigration problem. In their publication Conquest by Immigration are found many interesting statistics. From them I have compiled the following tables showing the foreign-born inmates of mental and corrective institutions in the several States, and another list showing the alien-born prison population of certain States:

Foreign-born and aliens reported in institutions for mental defectives for 1938

Alabama	18
Arkansas	22
California	6,847
Colorado	756
Delaware	163
Idaho	94
Illinois	6,056
Indiana	525
Iowa	251
Kansas	271
Kentucky	25
Louisiana	33
Maryland	404
Massachusetts	1,596
Michigan	5,121
Minnesota	2,577
Mississippi	7
Nebraska	77
Nevada	20
New Jersey	2,043
New Mexico	8
New York	4,562
North Carolina	24
North Dakota	236
Ohio	1,328
Oklahoma	62
Oregon	353
Pennsylvania	824
Rhode Island	946
South Dakota	348
Tennessee	30
Texas	183
Virginia	14
Washington	784
West Virginia	92
Wisconsin	143
Wyoming	148

Foreign-born and aliens reported in penal institutions for 1938

California	851
Colorado	63
Connecticut	39
Delaware	124
Idaho	21
Illinois	196
Indiana	9
Iowa	40
Kansas	26
Maryland	99
Massachusetts	599
Michigan	686
Minnesota	12
Missouri	4
Nebraska	59
New York	946
Ohio	404
Washington	259
Wisconsin	69

THE FRIENDLY BORDERS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Mr. Speaker, our country has long been known for its hospitality to the stranger who comes here for business or pleasure. We have, in fact, been the good neighbor to all countries, particularly to Canada and Mexico.

The records, for 1938, of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, show 52,993,989 individual entries into the ports of entry along our borders, including each individual crossing of the border by any United States citizen or traveling alien. Of this total, 14,230,131 were alien entries from Canada and 14,421,370 alien entries from Mexico.

Besides the alien entries there were 15,740,505 citizen entries from Canada and 8,601,983 from Mexico.

To check against this horde of visitors is one of the duties of the Immigration Border Patrol. In 1938 the border patrol apprehended 13,655 law violators, 112 of whom were smugglers of aliens, 12,851 illegal entrants were seized, as were 692 persons wanted for other law violations. How many got by the border patrol will never be known, but it is safe to assume that the number runs well into the thousands, for once an alien is across the border and in the hands of friends the possibility of being apprehended and deported is remote.

The border patrol, as an organization, is small but efficient. Its complement of 850 officers and men cannot be expected to perform the impossible feat of adequately patrolling thousands of miles of our border, day and night. To keep the aliens out we must have additional laws with teeth in them to help.

MISUSE OF PASSPORTS

The simplicity with which persons can enter or leave our country is aptly illustrated in the case of Grover Bergdoll, the draft dodger. From his own story told on the witness stand in his recent trial before a military court at Governors Island, N. Y., we learn that Bergdoll, tiring of life in Germany, made two successful trips back to the home of his mother in Philadelphia, entering the United States each time by way of Canada under an assumed name. All of which took place when Bergdoll was a fugitive from the United States authorities, and his photographs and fingerprints had been broadcast and posted throughout the Nation. There were undoubtedly many "Bergdolls" who crossed our borders in the last few years. But what I cannot help wondering is how many men more dangerous to America than Bergdoll have sneaked into the United States or gone to some foreign countries and back as Communist Earl Browder and Communist Fred E. Beal did on phony American passports prepared for them by friends who knew the ropes and strings to pull in New York to get them.

We need some additional safeguards also to prevent the fraudulent issuance of passports. While I have cited these two instances of the misuse of passports on the part of American citizens, from facts developed in the testimony before the Dies Committee Investigating Un-American Activities, it is generally conceded that there are in several of the European capitals well-organized passport rings who specialize in the business of providing fake passports for secret agents of the Communist Internationale to all countries, including ours.

MANY ALIEN SEAMEN JUMP SHIPS AT UNITED STATES PORTS

Mr. Speaker, another source of frequent trouble to our Immigration and Naturalization Service arises from the horde of foreign seamen entering our ports. Many of them, it is known, ship on boats sailing for America, with the intent and purpose of jumping ship when they get here. In the fiscal year 1938 alien seamen paid off and discharged in the United States ports numbered 21,875. In addition to this number there were 1,577 seamen who were removed to hospitals in this country, and 2,841 seamen deserted their ships. Thus, 26,293 alien seamen were dumped in the lap of America. They either had to find jobs on American or foreign ships or haunt our waterfronts in search of relief or work.

During the year, 24,539 of these seamen reshipped to foreign ports, but 1,754 alien seamen remained in this country at the end of the fiscal year, unaccounted for. From testimony before the Dies committee it is easy to understand just how many of these alien seamen may possibly have engaged in activities of a subversive nature. Many also possibly have been utilized in carrying on the intensive espionage maintained in this country by Communist and Nazi and Fascist groups in Europe.

Mr. Speaker, if we hope to preserve our free democracy as was handed down to us by an illustrious ancestry; if we mean to perpetuate our liberty, we must immediately take

steps to rid our land of these enemy aliens who are busily engaged in spreading the doctrines of hate and discontent, and who are boring from within, with a view to the final overthrow of our Government. It may require some painful surgery to remove this suppurating cancer, but as one Member of this body, I am willing and anxious to support any necessary legislation to accomplish the operation.

These disciples of foreign ideologies continually complain about our form of government. They want to change it to conform to the Nazi form, the Fascist form, or the Communist form. Well, Mr. Speaker, if they do not like our form of government, in the name of God, why do they not get out and go back whence they came. [Applause.]

I regret to say that in my judgment the one thing that has increased the audacity and improved the opportunities of these foreign emissaries to ply their nefarious programs has been the attitude of our national administration during the past 6 years. There has been a well-defined tendency on the part of our public officials to coddle these "reds" and parlor pinks. Along with hundreds of thousands of Americans, I was utterly amazed a few days ago when the President in one of his press conferences characterized as "sordid business" the action of the Dies committee in exposing Government employees who are either Communists or "fellow travelers." This rebuke by our Chief Executive of a congressional committee endeavoring to perform a patriotic service was indeed a melancholy commentary.

All praise to this committee for its courage, its independence, and its determination to stamp out this malignant curse to Americanism regardless of any influence that may be exerted from whatever source.

Mr. Speaker, the greatest menace to this country today does not come from abroad. Our greatest danger lies in the activities of these subversive influences, and the sooner we suppress them the better for our country—the last pure democracy on the face of the earth. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include certain tables.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein a speech made by our colleague, Hon. MARTIN J. KENNEDY.

The SPEAKER. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

NEUTRALITY

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that now that it is determined the way we are going on this neutrality action, the majority of this House, in fact, all Members of the House, are sincere and faithful in the pronouncements they have made during this entire debate in maintaining our national neutrality.

Statements made on the floor this morning, innocent as meant to be, may have a tendency to reflect the taking of sides in legislation, and I am sure that all those who voted as the majority voted yesterday did so feeling that this is truly neutral legislation and that we have not taken sides but the vote was merely to take care of our own American needs and security. After all, it is kind of like a lawyer making up his case. He goes before the judge and jury, tries it through the long process of court procedure, great briefs are filed by each side, and it is prolonged, perhaps, through days and days of trial and testimony, charging of the jury by the court after extended arguments to the jury by counsel; yet at the end when he sees that case, if it goes through and is reported in Cyc or Corpus Juris, he will find it covered by one simple sentence, just one little item that makes up the great body of corpus juris. This, in my opinion, is the way this will turn out. I do not believe we should get exercised any more than to say that we feel it will uphold our neutrality as voted by both branches of the Congress, an action which expresses the feeling of this Nation.

I wish to ask the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] a question. He asked one a while ago and seems to be concerned about the position this country will be left in by this action as to shipments of war materials to Japan and China. As I understand it, we have already been shipping just what would be permitted under the law, as it presently is, to both China and Japan. I ask the gentleman from California what this bill as it now stands, with or without suggested changes that may be brought back by the conferees, will do to affect the situation? How does it affect America as far as selling to Japan and China is concerned? What danger is there?

Mr. HINSHAW. Answering the gentleman's question, Mr. Speaker, let me say that since the letter of the Secretary of State to various aircraft corporations no airplanes have been shipped to Japan. In the month of April, however, and I have the figures to support this statement, 124,000 tons of scrap iron went west-bound through the Panama Canal. If this bill is finally passed as it was when it went to conference there is no reason why Japan should not declare war on China and at the same time declare a blockade of China's coast. So far neither nation has been willing to declare war, perhaps in order to discourage the United States from proclaiming the embargo on war supplies. At the present time both nations are able to get some war supplies. After the embargo is repealed, however, only one will be able to get them. What are we going to do about that?

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATRICK. It seems to me we are in no greatly changed position there. That, apparently, is only an incident. That is all those orientals admit it to be. There has never been any war declared between China and Japan; it is merely an incident.

Mr. HINSHAW. At least nobody in high places has found there is a war between Japan and China.

Mr. PATRICK. No; they tell us only that it is just an incident. Certainly no chief executive of a nation would want to insult other nations who are at peace by telling them they are at war. I do not see how it will make any difference at all in our dealings with these nations because it becomes merely an academic proposition with the embargo removed.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATRICK. I yield.

Mr. HINSHAW. With all due respect, may I not say that everyone here knows that the effect of this bill will be to help those countries having strong navies, and at the same time it harms the land powers, and it harms all of the small nations that do not have navies or vessels of commerce.

Mr. PATRICK. That, of course, is not a matter for us to decide. We cannot even decide who is a nation now, we do not even know who is a nation. All we can wisely undertake is to try to look after America.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATRICK. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman states that no war has been declared between Japan and China, that it is referred to over there as an incident. I wonder if the gentleman knows that a member of the British Cabinet on the floor of Parliament the other day referred to the European war as merely a crisis?

Mr. PATRICK. I do not know. I believe the gentleman from Mississippi will concede there are those better able to discuss that than either he or I. If we are smart, we shall leave that to someone else. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

RESIGNATIONS FROM COMMITTEES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following letter, which was read by the Clerk:

NOVEMBER 3, 1939.

Hon. WILLIAM B. BANKHEAD,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby tender my resignation as a member of the following committees of the House of Representatives: Insular Affairs, World War Veterans' Legislation, Public Buildings and Grounds, Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress, and Elections No. 2.

Very sincerely,

BUTLER B. HARE.

The resignation was accepted.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following letter, which was read by the Clerk:

Hon. WILLIAM BANKHEAD, *Speaker.*

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby tender my resignation as a member of Committees on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, and Claims, to be effective immediately.

Respectfully yours,

FRANK B. KEEFE.

The resignation was accepted.

The SPEAKER. The Chair would like to have unanimous consent to speak out of order for a few minutes.

There was no objection.

BIRTHDAY OF HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN

The SPEAKER. I have just discovered that this is the anniversary of an occasion that occurred in the State of Massachusetts some years ago which, in its sequence, has developed into the presence on this floor today of a very able, distinguished, and beloved Representative who occupies the position of minority leader of his party in the House of Representatives, the Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN. [Applause, the Members rising.]

I do not propose to indulge in any fulsome flattery or undue praise with reference to the personal charms, ability, and popularity of our friend on the minority side, nor is it necessary for me to make any allusions as a Democrat to his skill as a political organizer [laughter], but it is a genuine pleasure to me, as I am sure to all of you, that this happy incident should be recalled in the presence of our friend, and I am sure that you all join with me in extending our felicitations and congratulations to him upon the return of this day.

I am not going to undertake to say how old he is, because he is still a very eligible bachelor, but, nevertheless, we are happy to pause for just a moment in the very serious deliberations of this body today to pay our tribute of admiration and affection for JOE MARTIN. Although he is a very modest man on all occasions, and somewhat shrinks from self-seized opportunities to make a speech, I am sure that we might have just a word from him. [Applause.]

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker and colleagues on both sides of the House, one might easily conclude we have started adjournment proceedings. [Applause.] I might, if I were at all suspicious, question the good faith of the Speaker and conclude he was placing me in what is commonly called a "hot spot." But seriously, my colleagues, I do heartily appreciate the kind words of my old friend of years here in Congress and one for whom I have the highest admiration and most profound respect. I also appreciate the good will of the membership of the House on both sides of the aisle.

We come here as Members of a great legislative body. We have many different views. We have our differences, but I honestly believe everyone who sits in this House honestly strives to do his duty in a manner which he believes to be for the best interests of his constituency and for the country.

Personally, I know of no greater pleasure than to be a Member of this body. I am proud of my membership here. I could on several occasions have probably gone to what might be considered by others a higher place, but I preferred to stay here where I have enjoyed my service and so many warm friendships. I think membership in this body is the greatest opportunity for service that could be presented to any American; and I am delighted to serve under one whom I believe is one of the fairest and most able Speakers who ever occupied that exalted chair. [Applause.]

I thank the membership of the House for its felicitations on this day, which, incidentally, Mr. Speaker, I try to forget, because as time goes on we do not care to recall birthdays quite so frequently. I appreciate this manifestation of good will, and from the bottom of my heart I express my warm thanks to the Speaker and to the Members of this House for their generous statements and expressions of friendship. [Applause.]

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. If it is not out of order at this juncture, the Chair was about to announce a recess in honor of Mr. MARTIN's birthday. [Applause.]

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky rose.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has agreed to recognize the gentleman from Kentucky. For what purpose does he rise?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROBSION]?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I want you to know that I personally appreciate the very fine courtesy that you have shown to our Republican leader, Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts, in your timely remarks on this his birthday. Mr. MARTIN is a capable organizer, a wise leader, and a broad-minded statesman, and one of the finest and most gracious men in the House. Our Speaker is always eloquent, gracious, and fair. He has the respect and esteem of the Members on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. Speaker, press reports indicate that the Federal Reserve Board and Federal Reserve banks, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and other Federal agencies take the position that the cash-and-carry provision of the neutrality bill does not apply to them. The people of the United States have labored under the belief that no credits could or would be extended to warring nations. They believed it was strictly a cash-and-carry bill. On yesterday I voted for the Wolcott amendment to make certain that the taxpayers' money of this country would not, through the Federal Reserve Board banks, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and other Federal agencies, be permitted to help finance another European war as we did between 1914 and 1918. [Applause.]

On today, or tomorrow, a motion will be made by the administration leaders to adjourn this Congress sine die. The Veterans of Foreign Wars and the American Legion in their recent national conventions urged that Congress remain in session during the present emergency. Hundreds of other great organizations, and millions of American people joined in the plea of the veterans. Hundreds of letters which I have received from my district and State and throughout the country concerning the neutrality question have insisted that Congress remain in session. The Congress was called into extraordinary session on September 21, and it has now been engaged for more than 6 weeks in considering foreign affairs, matters in Europe, to repeal the embargo on arms and thereby aid France and England. Nothing has been done to solve our pressing domestic problems. We still have 10,000,000 unemployed, millions needing relief. Agriculture is in distress, thousands of business industries are closed down. Why not remain in session and devote our time to a solution of these great problems. Why should we not during the next 7 weeks before Christmas do something for the people on this side of the Atlantic?

Under the new neutrality bill many perplexing questions and many incidents might arise that may involve us in war. I think we can render great service to the country and to the administration to remain in session, and therefore, Mr. Speaker, if a motion is made to adjourn today or tomorrow I shall vote against that motion. [Applause.]

Many of those who voted yesterday to repeal the embargo in the hope that it would help the farmers of the Nation today see their hopes dashed to the ground. United Press carries a London dispatch to the effect that Great Britain will

withdraw $150,000,000 that she planned to spend for agricultural products and will now use that money to buy munitions of war. England will get most of her agricultural products from her colonial possessions, South America, and other countries. England has already placed an order for 200,000 tons of beef with Argentina.

The press reports today indicate that our great bombing planes, shells, poison gas, flaming torches, and other death-dealing instruments are on the move. Millions and millions of dollars' worth of arms and munitions of war have been piled up in the hope that the embargo would be repealed. The munition makers of America have been busy in repealing the embargo. We, a great Christian Nation, are about to show to the world that we are the arsenal, munition makers, and brokers for France and England. We will furnish poison gas, flaming torches, and other instruments of death to destroy human lives and property. As the President said in 1936, we are in a mad race seeking "fool's gold and blood money." As Christians, we propose again to gather profits from the blood and tears of people across the seas in Europe and China. Believing that this in the end means war for our own people and cause us again to finance another European war and furnish our own blood and tears, I, for one shall fight and vote to keep this Congress in session until the regular session in January. Let us stay here and help to preserve peace and save democracy on this side of the Atlantic. [Applause.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. GEHRMANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GEHRMANN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. GEHRMANN. Mr. Speaker, in the mail this morning I received an essay written by a 16-year-old girl from my home county seat, the city of Ashland. The story is woven around her home and the characters are her father and her brother, who is still in high school. This boy is like thousands of other boys who are filled with patriotism. All they think about is enlisting in some branch of the Army, preferably the Air Corps, and they think it is heroic to do this. I shall ask permission to include this essay in my remarks because it is a true story of what is being enacted in thousands of homes today. I believe if this father, who served during the World War, and was wounded in action, had talked to his son several years ago the boy would not have been so anxious to join the Army and go overseas; in fact, he wanted to enlist in the Canadian Air Corps. However, after his father talked to him when the boy made his wishes known, and told him what hell he and his comrades had to go through in the trenches, how they were trained to curse when they were in bayonet practice, using dummies that were representing the opposing forces, the Huns at that time, the boy changed his mind. If the father had talked to that boy about this several years ago it would never have entered his mind to enlist in the Army.

Mr. Speaker, this essay pictures this situation so vividly that I ask unanimous consent to include it in my remarks at this point in the RECORD, because I believe the story deals with a drama that is being enacted in thousands of American homes every day now.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

WHY ONE AMERICAN BOY DIDN'T GO TO WAR

(By Alice Chapple)

When the subject turned to war at the supper table, Bill, a high-school senior, was almost feverishly excited. His eyes glistened, and he repeated descriptions he had read of the brutal bombing of civilians in Poland, and the last-minute war news that he had heard from London and Berlin over his father's short-wave radio. In fact, while the subject of discussion remained on war, Bill was vibrant, strangely agitated. During the rest of the meal he was silent, so silent it was noticeable by contrast, like a person daydreaming. But let another word be dropped about the fighting in Europe, and Bill snapped into life again, almost as though he were electrically controlled, and he would babble on, monopolizing the conversation in a strange sort of fervor.

His father, scowling at him across the table, frankly didn't like it.

"You know it isn't our war," he said abruptly, almost sharply.

"Why, John, he doesn't mean anything," spoke up mother, "Don't be so harsh with him."

But Bill, who sometimes winced under his father's tongue lashings, was oblivious to it this time. He rambled on about the western front, about Russia and Germany dividing up Poland, about the danger of Germany seizing Rumania unless somebody stopped Hitler.

Supper broke up, and mother retired to the kitchen to do the dishes. Bill followed his father into the living room, still babbling about the war.

Father, who had stooped over the smoking table to fill his pipe, swung around suddenly.

"For God's sake, Bill, cut it out! Drop it!" he ordered. "What's the war to you?"

There was a long silence.

"That's what I've been trying to tell you all day," Bill answered. "Yes; since yesterday—since 2 or 3 days ago."

The father, so stern a moment before, stiffened, and his face went white. He fought to control himself, but his throat went dry, and with an unnatural calm he forced out the words, "What's that?"

"Dad," Bill said, and his face suddenly became earnest and alive and beaming. "You know Canada's declared war. And Dad, they're opening an airplane school at Duluth for pilots and mechanics. And Tom and Joe and I have been talking. What would you think if we"—he hesitated, as if the words were painful—"if we—well, supposing Tom and Joe and I were to quit high school and go up to this Duluth school?"

The father was dead silent.

"That's not quite all," Bill continued. "You see, Tom and Joe and I figured if we put in a couple of months at this Duluth school we could——"; the boy broke off. Another long silence.

"Yes?" said the father finally.

"Well, hang it all, Dad," the boy answered, his voice a mixture of defiance and elation, "you might as well know the rest of it. We're figuring on going up to Port Arthur and enlist in the Royal Flying Corps."

Another long silence, broken by the boy.

"Now, don't you start telling me we can't do this, Dad; we've decided."

The father slowly put his pipe down on the table, with almost painful care, his fingers trembling just a little. Then he walked over to the writing desk, still without a word, and fumbled around in the back of one or two of the little pigeonhole drawers. He found what he was looking for after a moment.

"I'm not telling you anything," he said, his voice strained. "But sit down here a minute before your mother finishes the dishes.

"Do you see this little silver button? It's what I got out of the last war. I wore it for awhile, but over 15 years ago I took it off for the last time so I could forget the whole thing. I'm supposed to be proud that I can wear this button showing I was wounded in action, but I would give almost anything if I could forget that button and everything it means and never have another of those ugly nightmares that still torture me several times each year when the whole thing comes back to me.

"I was 18 then, and I enlisted to save the world for democracy. Get that—'to save the world.' You have had a feeling in church sometimes that we call religion. Well, this was the greatest religion that ever hit me. We were going out to actually save the world—this was the war to end all wars for all time to come. Can you think of a greater thing than that? A holier cause to dedicate yourself to?

"Well, we did our bit—a lot of other fellows like myself. All with this great ideal. And now I have got to be brutally frank with you. In all the years since you've been born I have never talked to you like this, because I had hoped against hope that the world wouldn't get into this mess again—at least not in your time. You know nothing of bloodshed now, and neither do most of the thousands and thousands of young fellows like you, who are being led off to this thing right now. But I have seen you turn your head away out at the farm when I have been preparing chickens for our Sunday dinner—turn your head away at the sight of the hot blood oozing onto the ground, at the muscles twitching crazily, at the muscles of the windpipe still contracting and expanding after the head is severed, as the heart pumps the last of its life-blood away. You didn't like this when you saw it in a chicken, and you turned your head away, and it was right that you should.

"But when you see it in human beings, when you see men you have just been talking to, slashed and torn down in front of you, see them writhing and jerking in spasms on the ground, you go on in a daze that you really never recover from. At least I haven't. That's why I've shut up like a clam about it. And I've tried to drive it out of my mind. And the only time it gets me now is those nights—every once in a while—when it seems to flash back, and I have to get up and go downstairs and walk around for a couple of hours to get it out of my system.

"Yes, and even then I think we could have stood it all and been glad of what we'd done if we hadn't found out what a ghastly fake the whole thing was.

"You know we were taught from morning till night that the Germans were vicious Huns. We were ordered to curse as we rammed our bayonets through dummies, before we began the real thing.

"Well, you know I was a prisoner for a while in a German prison. The 3 months I spent there was the most human part of the war. German mothers would come to us and give us little good things to eat.

" 'Perhaps my boy is in prison too,' they would say. 'I hope some other mother will be kind to him.'

"Now Bill," the father said, looking straight and searchingly into his son's eyes. "I'm not proud of what I went through. I hate myself for it. I hate myself for not talking to you long and earnestly about this before. I'm almost bitter that I belong to a human race that seems to be unable to think of anything better to do with its sons than to send them down into a pool of blood. I—Bill——."

The father's voice broke off. He stared at the rug. There was a long, long silence. Finally it was broken by Bill.

"Dad," he said, and his voice was high-pitched and shaking with emotion. "Let's—let's forget about that Duluth stuff. But damn it—" and his voice rose almost angrily—"why didn't you ever talk to me like that before?"

As the father slumped back into his chair there were steps from the kitchen.

"Well," mother said, "you boys seem to be having quite an earnest discussion, judging from the tone of your voices out in the kitchen."

"Oh, just talking a little about the war," said the boy, and as he caught his father's eye he added in slow, measured words, "but we're not going to talk about that any more."

The father heaved a sigh of relief, almost as if in pain. There was perspiration on his forehead. Mother looked at him furtively.

"Why, dad, are you all right?"

"Oh, sure," dad answered. "It's that darn good cooking of yours. It's always making me eat too much. Hang it all, Bill, we should have helped your mother with the dishes."

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BOREN asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. Under the authority given to the Chair heretofore by unanimous consent, the Chair declares the House in recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.) the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

AFTER THE RECESS

The recess having expired at 4 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m., the House was called to order by the Speaker.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 306) entitled "Joint Resolution Neutrality Act of 1939."

NEUTRALITY

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I present a conference report on the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 306), the Neutrality Act of 1939, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the conference report.

The Clerk began the reading of the conference report.

Mr. BLOOM (interrupting the reading of the report). Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact the statement is more explanatory than the report itself, I ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk began the reading of the statement.

Mr. RAYBURN (interrupting the reading of the statement). Mr. Speaker, there is going to be some discussion of the report and I therefore ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the statement may be dispensed with.

Mr. KNUTSON. I object, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota objects. The Clerk will continue the reading of the statement.

The Clerk resumed the reading of the statement.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the conference report be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 306), Neutrality Act of 1939, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be stricken out by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"Whereas the United States, desiring to preserve its neutrality in wars between foreign states and desiring also to avoid involvement therein, voluntarily imposes upon its nationals by domestic legislation the restrictions set out in this joint resolution; and

"Whereas by so doing the United States waives none of its own rights or privileges, or those of any of its nationals, under international law, and expressly reserves all the rights and privileges to which it and its nationals are entitled under the law of nations; and

"Whereas the United States hereby expressly reserves the right to repeal, change or modify this joint resolution or any other domestic legislation in the interests of the peace, security or welfare of the United States and its people: Therefore be it"

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"PROCLAMATION OF A STATE OF WAR BETWEEN FOREIGN STATES

"SECTION 1. (a) That whenever the President, or the Congress by concurrent resolution, shall find that there exists a state of war between foreign states, and that it is necessary to promote the security or preserve the peace of the United States or to protect the lives of citizens of the United States, the President shall issue a proclamation naming the states involved; and he shall, from time to time, by proclamation, name other states as and when they may become involved in the war.

"(b) Whenever the state of war which shall have caused the President to issue any proclamation under the authority of this section shall have ceased to exist with respect to any state named in such proclamation, he shall revoke such proclamation with respect to such state.

"COMMERCE WITH STATES ENGAGED IN ARMED CONFLICT

"SEC. 2. (a) Whenever the President shall have issued a proclamation under the authority of section 1 (a) it shall thereafter be unlawful for any American vessel to carry any passengers or any articles or materials to any state named in such proclamation.

"(b) Whoever shall violate any of the provisions of subsection (a) of this section or of any regulations issued thereunder shall, upon conviction thereof, be fined not more than $50,000 or imprisoned for not more than five years, or both. Should the violation be by a corporation, organization, or association, each officer or director thereof participating in the violation shall be liable to the penalty herein prescribed.

"(c) Whenever the President shall have issued a proclamation under the authority of section 1 (a) it shall thereafter be unlawful to export or transport, or attempt to export or transport, or cause to be exported or transported, from the United States to any state named in such proclamation, any articles or materials (except copyrighted articles or materials) until all right, title, and interest therein shall have been transferred to some foreign government, agency, institution, association, partnership, corporation, or national. Issuance of a bill of lading under which title to the articles or materials to be exported or transported passes to a foreign purchaser unconditionally upon the delivery of such articles or materials to a carrier, shall constitute a transfer of all right, title, and interest therein within the meaning of this subsection. The shipper of such articles or materials shall be required to file with the collector of the port from or through which they are to be exported a declaration under oath that he has complied with the requirements of this subsection with respect to transfer of right, title, and interest in such articles or materials, and that he will comply with such rules and regulations as shall be promulgated from time to time. Any such declaration so filed shall be a conclusive estoppel against any claim of any citizen of the United States of right, title, or interest in such articles or materials, if such citizen had knowledge of the filing of such declaration; and the exportation or transportation of any articles or materials without filing the declaration required by this subsection shall be a conclusive estoppel against any claim of any citizen of the United States of right, title, or interest in such articles or materials, if such citizen had knowledge of such violation. No loss incurred by any such citizen (1) in connection with the sale or transfer of right, title, and interest in any such

articles or materials or (2) in connection with the exportation or transportation of any such copyrighted articles or materials, shall be made the basis of any claim put forward by the Government of the United States.

"(d) Insurance written by underwriters on articles or materials included in shipments which are subject to restrictions under the provisions of this joint resolution, and on vessels carrying such shipments, shall not be deemed an American interest therein, and no insurance policy issued on such articles or materials, or vessels, and no loss incurred thereunder or by the owners of such vessels, shall be made the basis of any claim put forward by the Government of the United States.

"(e) Whenever any proclamation issued under the authority of section 1 (a) shall have been revoked with respect to any state the provisions of this section shall thereupon cease to apply with respect to such state, except as to offenses committed prior to such revocation.

"(f) The provisions of subsection (a) of this section shall not apply to transportation by American vessels on or over lakes, rivers, and inland waters bordering on the United States, or to transportation by aircraft on or over lands bordering on the United States; and the provisions of subsection (c) of this section shall not apply (1) to such transportation of any articles or materials other than articles listed in a proclamation referred to in or issued under the authority of section 12 (i), or (2) to any other transportation on or over lands bordering on the United States of any articles or materials other than articles listed in a proclamation referred to in or issued under the authority of section 12 (i); and the provisions of subsections (a) and (c) of this section shall not apply to the transportation referred to in this subsection and subsections (g) and (h) of any articles or materials listed in a proclamation referred to in or issued under the authority of section 12 (i) if the articles or materials so listed are to be used exclusively by American vessels, aircraft, or other vehicles in connection with their operation and maintenance.

"(g) The provisions of subsections (a) and (c) of this section shall not apply to transportation by American vessels (other than aircraft) of mail, passengers, or any articles or materials (except articles or materials listed in a proclamation referred to in or issued under the authority of section 12 (i)) (1) to any port in the Western Hemisphere south of thirty-five degrees north latitude, (2) to any port in the Western Hemisphere north of thirty-five degrees north latitude and west of sixty-six degrees west longitude, (3) to any port on the Pacific or Indian Oceans, including the China Sea, the Tasman Sea, the Bay of Bengal, and the Arabian Sea, and any other dependent waters of either of such oceans, seas, or bays, or (4) to any port on the Atlantic Ocean or its dependent waters south of thirty degrees north latitude. The exceptions contained in this subsection shall not apply to any such port which is included within a combat area as defined in section 3 which applies to such vessels.

"(h) The provisions of subsections (a) and (c) of this section shall not apply to transportation by aircraft of mail, passengers, or any articles or materials (except articles or materials listed in a proclamation referred to in or issued under the authority of section 12 (i)) (1) to any port in the Western Hemisphere, or (2) to any port on the Pacific or Indian Oceans, including the China Sea, the Tasman Sea, the Bay of Bengal, and the Arabian Sea, and any other dependent waters of either of such oceans, seas, or bays. The exceptions contained in this subsection shall not apply to any such port which is included within a combat area as defined in section 3 which applies to such aircraft.

"(i) Every American vessel to which the provisions of subsections (g) and (h) apply, and every neutral vessel to which the provisions of subsection (l) apply, shall, before departing from a port or from the jurisdiction of the United States, file with the collector of customs of the port of departure, or if there is no such collector at such port then with the nearest collector of customs, a sworn statement (1) containing a complete list of all the articles and materials carried as cargo by such vessel, and the names and addresses of the consignees of all such articles and materials, and (2) stating the ports at which such articles and materials are to be unloaded and the ports of call of such vessel. All transportation referred to in subsection (f), (g), (h), and (l) of this section shall be subject to such restrictions, rules, and regulations as the President shall prescribe; but no loss incurred in connection with any transportation excepted under the provisions of subsections (g), (h), and (l) of this section shall be made the basis of any claim put forward by the Government of the United States.

"(j) Whenever all proclamations issued under the authority of section 1 (a) shall have been revoked, the provisions of subsections (f), (g), (h), (i), and (l) of this section shall expire.

"(k) The provisions of this section shall not apply to the current voyage of any American vessel which has cleared for a foreign port and has departed from a port or from the jurisdiction of the United States in advance of (1) the date of enactment of this joint resolution, or (2) any proclamation issued after such date under the authority of section 1 (a) of this joint resolution; but any such vessel shall proceed at its own risk after either of such dates, and no loss incurred in connection with any such vessel or its cargo after either of such dates shall be made the basis of any claim put forward by the Government of the United States.

"(l) The provisions of subsection (c) of this section shall not apply to the transportation by a neutral vessel to any port referred to in subsection (g) of this section of any articles or materials (except articles or materials listed in a proclamation referred to in or issued under the authority of section 12 (i)) so long as such port is not included within a combat area as defined in section 3 which applies to American vessels.

"COMBAT AREAS

"SEC. 3. (a) Whenever the President shall have issued a proclamation under the authority of section 1 (a), and he shall thereafter find that the protection of citizens of the United States so requires, he shall, by proclamation, define combat areas, and thereafter it shall be unlawful, except under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed, for any citizen of the United States or any American vessel to proceed into or through any such combat area. The combat areas so defined may be made to apply to surface vessels or aircraft, or both.

"(b) In case of the violation of any of the provisions of this section by any American vessel, or any owner or officer thereof, such vessel, owner, or officer shall be fined not more than $50,000 or imprisoned for not more, than five years, or both. Should the owner of such vessel be a corporation, organization, or association, each officer or director participating in the violation shall be liable to the penalty hereinabove prescribed. In case of the violation of this section by any citizen traveling as a passenger, such passenger may be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned for not more than two years, or both.

"(c) The President may from time to time modify or extend any proclamation issued under the authority of this section, and when the conditions which shall have caused him to issue any such proclamation shall have ceased to exist he shall revoke such proclamation and the provisions of this section shall thereupon cease to apply, except as to offenses committed prior to such revocation.

"AMERICAN RED CROSS

"SEC. 4. The provisions of section 2 (a) shall not prohibit the transportation by vessels under charter or other direction and control of the American Red Cross, proceeding under safe conduct granted by states named in any proclamation issued under the authority of section 1 (a), of officers and American Red Cross personnel, medical personnel, and medical supplies, food, and clothing, for the relief of human suffering.

"TRAVEL ON VESSELS OF BELLIGERENT STATES

"SEC. 5. (a) Whenever the President shall have issued a proclamation under the authority of section 1 (a) it shall thereafter be unlawful for any citizen of the United States to travel on any vessel of any state named in such proclamation, except in accordance with such rules and regulations as may be prescribed.

"(b) Whenever any proclamation issued under the authority of section 1 (a) shall have been revoked with respect to any state the provisions of this section shall thereupon cease to apply with respect to such state, except as to offenses committed prior to such revocation.

"ARMING OF AMERICAN MERCHANT VESSELS PROHIBITED

"SEC. 6. Whenever the President shall have issued a proclamation under the authority of section 1 (a), it shall thereafter be unlawful, until such proclamation is revoked, for any American vessel, engaged in commerce with any foreign state to be armed, except with small arms and ammunition therefor, which the President may deem necessary and shall publicly designate for the preservation of discipline aboard any such vessel.

"FINANCIAL TRANSACTIONS

"SEC. 7. (a) Whenever the President shall have issued a proclamation under the authority of section 1 (a), it shall thereafter be unlawful for any person within the United States to purchase, sell, or exchange bonds, securities, or other obligations of the government of any state named in such proclamation, or of any political subdivision of any such state, or of any person acting for or on behalf of the government of any such state or political subdivision thereof, issued after the date of such proclamation, or to make any loan or extend any credit (other than necessary credits accruing in connection with the transmission of telegraph, cable, wireless and telephone services) to any such government, political subdivision, or person. The provisions of this subsection shall also apply to the sale by any person within the United States to any person in a state named in any such proclamation of any articles or materials listed in a proclamation referred to in or issued under the authority of section 12 (i).

"(b) The provisions of this section shall not apply to a renewal or adjustment of such indebtedness as may exist on the date of such proclamation.

"(c) Whoever shall knowingly violate any of the provisions of this section or of any regulations issued thereunder shall, upon conviction thereof, be fined not more than $50,000 or imprisoned for not more than five years, or both. Should the violation be by a corporation, organization, or association, each officer or director thereof participating in the violation shall be liable to the penalty herein prescribed.

"(d) Whenever any proclamation issued under the authority of section 1 (a) shall have been revoked with respect to any state the provisions of this section shall thereupon cease to apply with respect to such state, except as to offenses committed prior to such revocation.

"SOLICITATION AND COLLECTION OF FUNDS AND CONTRIBUTIONS

"SEC. 8. (a) Whenever the President shall have issued a proclamation under the authority of section 1 (a), it shall thereafter be unlawful for any person within the United States to solicit or receive

any contribution for or on behalf of the government of any state named in such proclamation or for or on behalf of any agent or instrumentality of any such state.

"(b) Nothing in this section shall be construed to prohibit the solicitation or collection of funds and contributions to be used for medical aid and assistance, or for food and clothing to relieve human suffering, when such solicitation or collection of funds and contributions is made on behalf of and for use by any person or organization which is not acting for or on behalf of any such government, but all such solicitations and collections of funds and contributions shall be in accordance with and subject to such rules and regulations as may be prescribed.

"(c) Whenever any proclamation issued under the authority of section 1 (a) shall have been revoked with respect to any state the provisions of this section shall thereupon cease to apply with respect to such state, except as to offenses committed prior to such revocation.

"AMERICAN REPUBLICS

"SEC. 9. This joint resolution (except section 12) shall not apply to any American republic engaged in war against a non-American state or states, provided the American republic is not cooperating with a non-American state or states in such war.

"RESTRICTIONS ON USE OF AMERICAN PORTS

"SEC. 10. (a) Whenever, during any war in which the United States is neutral, the President, or any person thereunto authorized by him, shall have cause to believe that any vessel, domestic or foreign, whether requiring clearance or not, is about to carry out of a port or from the jurisdiction of the United States, fuel, men, arms, ammunition, implements of war, supplies, dispatches, or information to any warship, tender, or supply ship of a state named in a proclamation issued under the authority of section 1 (a), but the evidence is not deemed sufficient to justify forbidding the departure of the vessel as provided for by section 1, title V, chapter 30, of the Act approved June 15, 1917 (40 Stat. 217, 221; U. S. C., 1934 edition, title 18, sec. 31), and if, in the President's judgment, such action will serve to maintain peace between the United States and foreign states, or to protect the commercial interests of the United States and its citizens, or to promote the security or neutrality of the United States, he shall have the power, and it shall be his duty, to require the owner, master, or person in command thereof, before departing from a port or from the jurisdiction of the United States, to give a bond to the United States, with sufficient sureties, in such amount as he shall deem proper, conditioned that the vessel will not deliver the men, or any fuel, supplies, dispatches, information, or any part of the cargo, to any warship, tender, or supply ship of a state named in a proclamation issued under the authority of section 1 (a).

"(b) If the President, or any person thereunto authorized by him, shall find that a vessel, domestic or foreign, in a port of the United States, has previously departed from a port or from the jurisdiction of the United States during such war and delivered men, fuel, supplies, dispatches, information, or any part of its cargo to a warship, tender, or supply ship of a state named in a proclamation issued under the authority of section 1 (a), he may prohibit the departure of such vessel during the duration of the war.

"(c) Whenever the President shall have issued a proclamation under section 1 (a) he may, while such proclamation is in effect, require the owner, master, or person in command of any vessel, foreign or domestic, before departing from the United States, to give a bond to the United States, with sufficient sureties, in such amount as he shall deem proper, conditioned that no alien seaman who arrived on such vessel shall remain in the United States for a longer period than that permitted under the regulations, as amended from time to time, issued pursuant to section 33 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917 (U. S. C., title 8, sec. 168). Notwithstanding the provisions of said section 33, the President may issue such regulations with respect to the landing of such seamen as he deems necessary to insure their departure either on such vessel or another vessel at the expense of such owner, master, or person in command.

"SUBMARINES AND ARMED MERCHANT VESSELS

"SEC. 11. Whenever, during any war in which the United States is neutral, the President shall find that special restrictions placed on the use of the ports and territorial waters of the United States by the submarines or armed merchant vessels of a foreign state will serve to maintain peace between the United States and foreign states, or to protect the commercial interests of the United States and its citizens, or to promote the security of the United States, and shall make proclamation thereof, it shall thereafter be unlawful for any such submarine or armed merchant vessel to enter a port or the territorial waters of the United States or to depart therefrom, except under such conditions and subject to such limitations as the President may prescribe. Whenever, in his judgment, the conditions which have caused him to issue his proclamation have ceased to exist, he shall revoke his proclamation and the provisions of this section shall thereupon cease to apply, except as to offenses committed prior to such revocation.

"NATIONAL MUNITIONS CONTROL BOARD

"SEC. 12. (a) There is hereby established a National Munitions Control Board (hereinafter referred to as the 'Board'). The Board shall consist of the Secretary of State, who shall be chairman and executive officer of the Board, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of Commerce. Except as otherwise provided in this section, or by other law, the administration of this section is vested in the Secretary of State. The Secretary of State shall promulgate such rules and regulations with regard to the enforcement of this section as he may deem necessary to carry out its provisions. The Board shall be convened by the chairman and shall hold at least one meeting a year.

"(b) Every person who engages in the business of manufacturing, exporting, or importing any arms, ammunition, or implements of war listed in a proclamation referred to in or issued under the authority of subsection (i) of this section, whether as an exporter, importer, manufacturer, or dealer, shall register with the Secretary of State his name, or business name, principal place of business, and places of business in the United States, and a list of the arms, ammunition, and implements of war which he manufactures, imports, or exports.

"(c) Every person required to register under this section shall notify the Secretary of State of any change in the arms, ammunition, or implements of war which he exports, imports, or manufactures; and upon such notification the Secretary of State shall issue to such person an amended certificate of registration, free of charge, which shall remain valid until the date of expiration of the original certificate. Every person required to register under the provisions of this section shall pay a registration fee of $100. Upon receipt of the required registration fee, the Secretary of State shall issue a registration certificate valid for five years, which shall be renewable for further periods of five years upon the payment for each renewal of a fee of $100; but valid certificates of registration (including amended certificates) issued under the authority of section 2 of the joint resolution of August 31, 1935, or section 5 of the joint resolution of August 31, 1935, as amended, shall, without payment of any additional registration fee, be considered to be valid certificates of registration issued under this subsection, and shall remain valid for the same period as if this joint resolution had not been enacted.

"(d) It shall be unlawful for any person to export, or attempt to export, from the United States to any other state, any arms, ammunition, or implements of war listed in a proclamation referred to in or issued under the authority of subsection (i) of this section, or to import, or attempt to import, to the United States from any other state, and of the arms, ammunition, or implements of war listed in any such proclamation, without first having submitted to the Secretary of State the name of the purchaser and the terms of sale and having obtained a license therefor.

"(e) All persons required to register under this section shall maintain, subject to the inspection of the Secretary of State, or any person or persons designated by him, such permanent records of manufacture for export, importation, and exportation of arms, ammunition, and implements of war as the Secretary of State shall prescribe.

"(f) Lincenses shall be issued by the Secretary of State to persons who have registered as herein provided for, except in cases of export or import licenses where the export of arms, ammunition, or implements of war would be in violation of this joint resolution or any other law of the United States, or of a treaty to which the United States is a party, in which cases such licenses shall not be issued; but a valid license issued under the authority of section 2 of the joint resolution of August 31, 1935, or section 5 of the joint resolution of August 31, 1935, as amended, shall be considered to be a valid license issued under this subsection, and shall remain valid for the same period as if this joint resolution had not been enacted.

"(g) No purchase of arms, ammunition, or implements of war shall be made on behalf of the United States by any officer, executive department, or independent establishment of the Government from any person who shall have failed to register under the provisions of this joint resolution.

"(h) The Board shall make a report to Congress on January 3 and July 3 of each year, copies of which shall be distributed as are other reports transmitted to Congress. Such reports shall contain such information and data collected by the Board as may be considered of value in the determination of questions connected with the control of trade in arms, ammunition, and implements of war, including the name of the purchaser and the terms of sale made under any such license. The Board shall include in such reports a list of all persons required to register under the provisions of this joint resolution, and full information concerning the licenses issued hereunder, including the name of the purchaser and the terms of sale made under any such license.

"(i) The President is hereby authorized to proclaim upon recommendation of the Board from time to time a list of articles which shall be considered arms, ammunition, and implements of war for the purposes of this section; but the proclamation No. 2237, of May 1, 1937 (50 Stat. 1834), defining the term 'arms, ammunition, and implements of war' shall, until it is revoked, have full force and effect as if issued under the authority of this subsection.

"REGULATIONS

"SEC. 13. The President may, from time to time, promulgate such rules and regulations, not inconsistent with law, as may be necessary and proper to carry out any of the provisions of this joint resolution; and he may exercise any power or authority conferred on him by this joint resolution through such officer or officers, or agency or agencies, as he shall direct.

"UNLAWFUL USE OF THE AMERICAN FLAG

"SEC. 14. (a) It shall be unlawful for any vessel belonging to or operating under the jurisdiction of any foreign state to use the

flag of the United States thereon, or to make use of any distinctive signs or markings, indicating that the same is an American vessel.

"(b) Any vessel violating the provisions of subsection (a) of this section shall be denied for a period of three months the right to enter the ports or territorial waters of the United States except in cases of force majeure.

"GENERAL PENALTY PROVISION

"SEC. 15. In every case of the violation of any of the provisions of this joint resolution or of any rule or regulation issued pursuant thereto where a specific penalty is not herein provided, such violator or violators, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than $10,000, or imprisoned not more than two years, or both.

"DEFINITIONS

"SEC. 16. For the purposes of this joint resolution—

"(a) The term 'United States', when used in a geographical sense, includes the several states and Territories, the insular possessions of the United States (including the Philippine Islands), the Canal Zone, and the District of Columbia.

"(b) The term 'person' includes a partnership, company, association, or corporation, as well as a natural person.

"(c) The term 'vessel' means every description of watercraft and aircraft capable of being used as a means of transportation on, under, or over water.

"(d) The term 'American vessel' means any vessel documented, and any aircraft registered or licensed, under the laws of the United States.

"(e) The term 'state' shall include nation, government, and country.

"(f) The term 'citizen' shall include any individual owing allegiance to the United States, a partnership, company, or association composed in whole or in part of citizens of the United States, and any corporation organized and existing under the laws of the United States as defined in subsection (a) of this section.

"SEPARABILITY OF PROVISIONS

"SEC. 17. If any of the provisions of this joint resolution, or the application thereof to any person or circumstance, is held invalid, the remainder of the joint resolution, and the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances, shall not be affected thereby.

"APPROPRIATIONS

"SEC. 18. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated from time to time, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the provisions and accomplish the purposes of this joint resolution.

"REPEALS

"SEC. 19. The joint resolution of August 31, 1935, as amended, and the joint resolution of January 8, 1937, are hereby repealed; but offenses committed and penalties, forfeitures, or liabilities incurred under either of such joint resolutions prior to the date of enactment of this joint resolution may be prosecuted and punished, and suits and proceedings for violations of either of such joint resolutions or of any rule or regulation issued pursuant thereto may be commenced and prosecuted, in the same manner and with the same effect as if such joint resolutions had not been repealed.

"SHORT TITLE

"SEC. 20. This joint resolution may be cited as the 'Neutrality Act of 1939.'"

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the title of the joint resolution, and agree to the same.

SOL BLOOM,
LUTHER A. JOHNSON,
JOHN KEE,
Managers on the part of the House.

KEY PITTMAN,
WALTER F. GEORGE,
ROBERT F. WAGNER,
TOM CONNALLY,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 306), Neutrality Act of 1939, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The House resolution contained a preamble stating the neutrality policy of the United States. The Senate amendment struck out the preamble. The conference agreement adopts the following preamble:

"Whereas the United States, desiring to preserve its neutrality, in wars between foreign states and desiring also to avoid involvement therein, voluntarily imposes upon its nationals by domestic legislation the restrictions set out in this joint resolution; and

"Whereas by so doing the United States waives none of its own rights or privileges, or those of any of its nationals, under international law, and expressly reserves all the rights and privileges to which it and its nationals are entitled under the law of nations; and

"Whereas the United States hereby expressly reserves the right to repeal, change, or modify this joint resolution or any other domestic legislation in the interests of the peace, security, or welfare of the United States and its people."

Section 1 (a) of both the House resolution and the Senate amendment provided that whenever the President or Congress, by concurrent resolution, shall find that there exists a state of war between foreign states and that it is necessary to promote the security or preserve the peace of the United States or to protect the lives of citizens of the United States, the President shall issue a proclamation naming the states involved and by subsequent proclamation name other states as and when they may become involved in the war. Section 1 (b) of the House resolution provided that when the conditions which have caused the President to issue any proclamation under subsection (a) have ceased to exist he shall revoke the same. Section 1 (b) of the Senate amendment provided that when the state of war which caused the President to issue a proclamation under subsection (a) shall have ceased to exist with respect to any state named in such proclamation, he shall revoke such proclamation with respect to such state. The conference agreement adopts the Senate provision.

Section 2 of the House resolution placed an embargo on arms and ammunition from the United States to any belligerent states named in any such proclamation. There was no corresponding provision in the Senate amendment. The conference agreement adopts the Senate provision and omits such embargo.

Section 3 of the House resolution prohibited a citizen of the United States to travel, except at his own risk, on any vessel of a state or states named in a proclamation issued by the President, unless in accordance with such rules and regulations as the President prescribed. Section 5 of the Senate amendment provided that it would be unlawful for any citizen of the United States, irrespective of whether he did so at his own risk, to travel on any vessel of any state named in a proclamation issued by the President, except in accordance with such rules and regulations as may be prescribed. The conference agreement adopts the Senate provision.

Section 6 of the Senate amendment prohibited the arming of any American vessel engaged in commerce with any foreign state except with small arms and ammunition for the preservation of discipline. There was no comparable provision in the House resolution. The conference agreement adopts the Senate provision.

Section 4 (a) of the House resolution provided that when the President issues a proclamation it shall thereafter be unlawful for any person within the United States to purchase, sell, or exchange obligations of the government of any state named in such proclamation, or of any political subdivision of any such state, or of any agent of the government of any such state, if such obligations were issued after the date of such proclamation. It also made it unlawful to make any loan or extend any credit to any such government, political subdivision, or agent. The President, however, could except from the operations of this section for a period of not more than 90 days without renewals ordinary commercial credits and short-time obligations in aid of legal transactions and of a character customarily used in normal peacetime commercial transactions. Section 7 of the Senate amendment contained similar provisions with respect to financial transactions between persons within the United States and states named in the President's proclamation, but omitted the provisions allowing the President to extend 90-day credits. The Senate amendment also contained a provision making it unlawful for any person within the United States to sell on credit any arms, ammunition, or implements of war to any person in a state named in any such proclamation. The conference agreement adopts the Senate provision with a clarifying change under which the same provisions apply with respect to financial transactions with or in the obligations of an agent of a political subdivision of a state named in a proclamation. The agreement also exempts necessary credits accruing in connection with the transmission of cable, wireless, telegraph, and telephone services. It also requires that violations of the provisions of the section shall be punishable only if they are knowingly committed.

Section 4 (d) of the House resolution provided that after a proclamation had been issued by the President it would be unlawful, except in accordance with such rules and regulations as the President prescribed, to export or transport from the United States directly or indirectly to any state named in the proclamation any articles or materials until all right, title, and interest therein had been transferred to some foreign government, agency, institution, association, partnership, corporation, or national. It provided that the shipper of such articles or materials must file a declaration under oath that no citizen of the United States had any right, title, or interest in such articles or materials, and that such declaration would be a conclusive estoppel against any claim of any citizen of the United States of any right, title, or interest in such articles or materials. Insurance written by underwriters on such articles or materials was placed in the same category. A further provision excepted from the operation of this subsection trade on or over lands, lakes, rivers, and inland waters bordering on the United States. Section 2 of the Senate amendment, which included the substance of section 4 (d) of the House resolution, also restricted American vessels in subsection (a) from carrying any passengers, or any articles or materials, to any state named in a proclamation issued by the President. Such restriction on transportation applied to all articles or materials, including munitions. Subsection (c) of the Senate amendment pro-

hibited the exportation or transportation from the United States to any state named in such proclamation of any articles or materials (except copyrighted articles or materials) until all right, title, and interest therein shall have been transferred as was similarly provided in section 4 (d) of the House resolution. Subsection (c) also provided that issuance of a bill of lading under which title to the goods shipped passes to the purchaser unconditionally upon delivery of the goods to the carrier shall constitute such a transfer of all right, title, and interest therein within the meaning of the subsection. It also contained a provision similar to the one contained in the House resolution that the shipper of such articles or materials must file a declaration under oath that no citizen of the United States had any right, title, or interest in such articles or materials, but differed from the House provision in that such declaration would be a conclusive estoppel against any claim of any citizen of the United States of right, title, or interest in such articles or materials only if such citizen had knowledge of the exportation or transportation of such articles or materials or of the filing of such declaration. Copyrighted articles or materials which are excepted by the Senate amendment are placed in the same category as other articles or materials in that no loss incurred by any citizens of the United States in connection with their exportation or transportation shall be made the basis of any claim to be put forward by the Government of the United States. Subsection (f) of the Senate amendment exempted from the provisions of subsection (a) transportation by American vessels on or over lakes, rivers, and inland waters bordering on the United States and transportation by aircraft on or over lands bordering on the United States. It also exempted from the provisions of subsection (c) such transportation of any articles and materials other than munitions, and any other form of transportation (train, bus, truck, etc.) on or over lands bordering on the United States of any articles or materials other than munitions. This subsection also exempted from the provisions of subsections (a) and (c) transportation to places referred to in this subsection and subsections (g) and (h) of articles and materials listed in a proclamation issued under the authority of section 12 (i) (munitions) if such articles or materials are to be used exclusively by American vessels, aircraft, or other vehicles in connection with their operation or maintenance. Subsection (g) excepted from the provisions of subsections (a) and (c) transportation by American surface vessels of mail, passengers, or any articles or materials (except munitions) (1) to any port in the Western Hemisphere south of 35 degrees north latitude, (2) to any port in the Western Hemisphere north of 35 degrees north latitude and west of 66 degrees west longitude, (3) to any port on the Pacific or Indian Oceans, including the China Sea, the Tasman Sea, the Bay of Bengal, and the Arabian Sea, or (4) to any port on the Atlantic Ocean south of 30 degrees north latitude. A further provision in this subsection prevented an American surface vessel proceeding to any such port so listed above if such port is included within a combat area applying to surface vessels. Subsection (h) exempted from the provisions of subsections (a) and (c) transportation by aircraft of mail, passengers, or any articles or materials (except munitions) (1) to any port in the Western Hemisphere, or (2) to any port on the Pacific or Indian Oceans, including the China Sea, the Tasman Sea, the Bay of Bengal, and the Arabian Sea. A further provision in this subsection prevented aircraft proceeding to any such port so listed above if such port is included within a combat area applying to such aircraft. Subsection (i) provided that every American vessel which is permitted to travel to belligerents as provided in subsections (g) and (h) shall file an export declaration containing a list of the cargo, the names and addresses of the consignees of the cargo, the ports at which such cargo is to be unloaded, and the ports of call of such vessel. It also provided that the excepted transportation referred to in subsections (f), (g), and (h) shall be subject to such restrictions, rules, and regulations as the President shall prescribe. Subsection (j) provided that subsections (f), (g), (h), and (i) shall expire when no proclamation issued under the authority of section 1 (a) is in effect. Subsection (k) permitted an American vessel whose voyage was begun 7 days or more in advance of (1) the date of enactment of the joint resolution, or (2) any proclamation issued after such date under the authority of section 1 (a), to continue such voyage without regard to the provisions of the joint resolution.

The conference agreement adopts the provisions of the Senate amendment and inserts a provision under which the exemption with respect to the Pacific and Indian Oceans and the named bays and seas is extended to all dependent waters of such oceans, bays, or seas. The conference agreement substitutes for the requirement of filing an export declaration of the cargo, consignees, and ports, the requirement of a sworn statement containing the same information. The conference agreement also provides that neutral vessels shall have the same exemptions relating to southern Atlantic, Pacific, and Indian Ocean transportation as apply to American vessels with respect to the requirement of transfer of title, but this exemption only applies as long as the port of destination is not within a combat area. A sworn statement by the neutral vessel as to cargo, etc., is also required. The conference agreement also exempts from the section American vessels which on the voyage then in progress have cleared for a foreign port or from the United States jurisdiction before the date of the enactment of the joint resolution or the proclamation. In such cases after the applicable date the vessel travels at its own risk, and loss to it or its cargo is not to be the basis of a claim by the United States. The conference agreement also makes some minor technical and clerical changes.

Section 3 of the Senate amendment required the President, if he finds that the protection of citizens of the United States so requires, to define combat areas into or through which it shall be unlawful for any citizen of the United States or any American vessel to proceed unless the President grants an exception to such citizen or vessel. It also allowed the President to make such combat areas applicable to surface vessels only, or to aircraft only, or to both. Penalty for violation of the section was a fine of $50,000, or imprisonment for 5 years, or both. There was no comparable provision in the House resolution. The conference agreement adopts the Senate provision.

Section 4 of the Senate amendment provided that the prohibition contained in section 2 (a) shall not prohibit the transportation by vessels under the control of the American Red Cross, which are proceeding under safe conduct granted by belligerent states, of officers and American Red Cross personnel, medical personnel, medical supplies, food, and clothing, for the relief of human suffering. There was no comparable provision in the House resolution. The conference agreement adopts the Senate provision.

Section 5 of the House resolution made it unlawful for any person in the United States to solicit or receive any contribution for or on behalf of the government of any belligerent state or of any association, organization, or agent of any such state, but allowed solicitation or collection of contributions to be used for medical aid and assistance, or for food and clothing to relieve human suffering, when such solicitation or collection is made on behalf of or for use by any person or organization which is not acting as an agent or in aid of any such belligerent state. Such solicitations and collections, however, were to be subject to the approval of the President and were to be made under such rules and regulations as he prescribed. Section 8 of the Senate amendment contained a similar provision with certain clarifying changes in language. The conference agreement adopts the Senate provision.

Section 6 of the House resolution provided that the provisions of the joint resolution preceding such section shall not apply to any American republic. Section 9 of the Senate amendment provided that it shall not apply to any American republic engaged in a war against a non-American state or states, if the American republic is not cooperating with a non-American state or states in such war. The conference agreement adopts the Senate provision with a clarifying amendment to insure that section 12 (relating to the Munitions Control Board) applies in the case of such republics.

Section 7 of the House resolution authorized the President, during any war in which the United States is neutral, under certain conditions to require the owner, master, or person in command of any vessel, whether domestic or foreign, before departing from a port of the United States, to give a bond to the United States conditioned that the vessel will not deliver any men or any part of its cargo to any warship, tender, or supply ship of a belligerent state. It further provided that if the President finds that any such vessel has previously cleared from a port of the United States during such war and delivered its cargo or any part thereof to a warship, tender, or supply ship of a belligerent state, he may prohibit the departure of such vessel for the duration of the war. Section 10 of the Senate amendment in subsections (a) and (b) contained similar provisions to those in section 7 of the House resolution, but made certain clarifying changes in language, and added "supplies, dispatches, or information" to the articles to which the prohibition in such section related. The conference agreement adopts the Senate provision.

Section 10 (c) of the Senate amendment permitted the President to require of the owner, master, or person in command of any vessel, foreign or domestic, before departing from the United States to give a bond to the United States conditioned that no alien seaman who arrived on such vessel shall remain in the United States for a longer period than that permitted under the regulations issued pursuant to section 33 of the Immigration Act. The President was also authorized to issue regulations with respect to the landing of such seamen as he deemed necessary to insure their departure either on such vessel or another vessel at the expense of such owner, master, or person in command. There were no corresponding provisions in the House resolution. The conference agreement adopts the Senate provision with clarifying changes.

Section 8 of the House resolution provided that if the President shall find, during any war in which the United States is neutral, that special restrictions placed on the use of the ports and territorial waters of the United States by the submarines or armed merchant vessels of a belligerent state will serve to maintain peace between the United States and the belligerent state, or to protect the commercial interests of the United States or its citizens, or to promote the security of the United States, and shall make proclamation thereof, it shall thereafter be unlawful for any such submarine or armed merchant vessel to enter a port or the territorial waters of the United States or to depart therefrom, except under such conditions and subject to such limitations as the President may prescribe. Section 11 of the Senate amendment contained similar provisions with certain clarifying changes in language but made the prohibition apply to the submarines and armed merchant vessels of all foreign states rather than limiting it only to belligerent states. The conference agreement adopts the Senate provision with one minor technical amendment.

Section 9 of the House resolution established a National Munitions Control Board and provided for the registration and licensing of every person who engages in the business of manufacturing, exporting, or importing any of the arms, ammunition, or implements of war referred to in the joint resolution. Administration of such registration and licensing was vested in the Department of State. Subsection (h) of section 9 repealed as of December 31, 1937, the provisions of the act of August 29, 1916, relating to the sale of ordnance and stores to the Government of Cuba. Subsection (i) of such section provided for annual reports to Congress by the Board, except when a proclamation issued under the authority of section 1 (a) was in effect, in which case reports were to be made every 90 days so long as such proclamation remained in effect. Section 12 of the Senate amendment contained similar provisions with certain clarifying changes in language, and provided that the Board shall make a report to Congress on January 1 and July 1 of each year without requiring the 90-day report provided for in the House resolution. The Senate amendment also omitted the provision contained in the House resolution repealing the act of August 29, 1916, since such repeal took effect on December 31, 1937. The conference agreement adopts the Senate provision with one minor change, requiring the reports of the Board to be submitted on January 3 and July 3 of each year instead of January 1 and July 1.

Section 14 of the Senate amendment made it unlawful for any vessel belonging to or operating under the jurisdiction of any foreign state to use the flag of the United States thereon, or to make use of any distinctive signs or markings, indicating that the same is an American vessel. Any vessel violating this provision would be denied for a period of 3 months the right to enter the ports or territorial waters of the United States except in cases of force majeure. There was no comparable provision in the House resolution. The conference agreement adopts the Senate provision.

Section 11 of the House resolution contained a general penalty provision carrying a fine of not more than $1,000, or imprisonment for not more than 5 years, or both. Section 15 of the Senate amendment contained a general penalty provision carrying a fine of not more than $10,000, or imprisonment for not more than 2 years, or both. The conference agreement adopts the Senate provision.

Section 12 of the House resolution contained general definitions. Section 16 of the Senate amendment contained the same definitions but added two new paragraphs defining "American vessel" and "citizen." The conference agreement adopts the Senate provision.

Section 15 of the House resolution repealed the acts of 1935, 1936, and 1937 (relating to American neutrality) and contained a saving provision that such repeal would not affect the validity of the proclamation numbered 2237 of May 1, 1937, defining the term "arms, ammunition, and implements of war," or of certificates of registration or licenses issued pursuant to the provisions of section 5 of the act of May 1, 1937. Section 19 of the Senate amendment contained similar provisions with certain clarifying changes in language and an additional provision that offenses committed and penalties, forfeitures, or liabilities incurred under such repealed joint resolutions prior to the date of enactment of this joint resolution may be prosecuted and punished, and suits and proceedings for violations of either of such joint resolutions or of any rule or regulation issued pursuant thereto may be commenced and prosecuted, in the same manner and with the same effect as if such joint resolutions had not been repealed. The conference agreement adopts the Senate provision except that the provisions relating to existing licenses and certificates of registration, and to Proclamation No. 2237, have been transferred with minor technical changes to the provisions of the conference agreement dealing with the respective subject matters.

Section 20 of the Senate amendment contained a short title. There was no comparable provision in the House bill. The conference agreement adopts the Senate provision.

The House resolution contained the title "Joint Resolution, Neutrality Act of 1939". The Senate amendment changed the title so as to read: "Joint resolution to preserve the neutrality and the peace of the United States and to secure the safety of its citizens and their interests." The conference agreement adopts the Senate provision.

SOL BLOOM,
LUTHER A. JOHNSON,
JOHN KEE,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry. Is the Clerk through with the reading of the report?

Mr. BLOOM. This is the statement and not the report.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. POWERS] asked unanimous consent that the further reading of the statement be dispensed with; the Chair asked if there was objection, and no objection was offered.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, your conferees on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the neutrality resolution have met with the Senate conferees and have reached an agreement. Inasmuch as the House by vote refused to instruct your managers, they entered the conference free to negotiate the best compromise under the circumstances.

Does the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] desire any time?

Mr. FISH. Yes; I would like to be recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH].

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, this is the Senate bill, which the House has hardly considered or discussed. We did have the right to offer three amendments to the bill as the Senate wrote it.

The conferees met this afternoon, and they adopted by, I think, a unanimous vote, a number of minor amendments. I believe that my colleague the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EATON] and myself were in accord with all the amendments. They were of very little consequence except to certain shipping interests on the western coast. They liberalized the provisions with respect to such shipping interests and their rights, and we favored all amendments that were made in the conference.

My colleague the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EATON] and myself did not sign the report; neither did the two minority members of the Senate, Senator BORAH and Senator JOHNSON of California.

The bill, as I have pointed out to you, is practically the Senate bill, which we have hardly discussed in the House at all. It contains the combat-area power, giving the President power to determine combat areas. I believe—and I think I am right in saying so—under the bill as now written in the Senate, American ships may go into the war zones, into the British Channel and into the North Sea, carrying American goods to Holland and Belgium and the Norwegian countries. Now, I submit, Mr. Speaker, if there is any such thing as a war zone, it is the British Channel and the North Sea, and our ships are now permitted, except for carrying arms, ammunition, and implements of war, and will still be permitted, to continue into the war zone unless the President declares that to be a combat area.

I also believe, and it is natural to assume, that the German Government, if it carries out the announcement it made today of unrestricted submarine warfare, will attack ships in the British Channel and in the North Sea, probably in the nighttime as well as in the daytime, and they will not know whether those ships are American, are neutral ships, or French or German ships, and I anticipate, if our merchant marine are permitted to carry scrap iron and steel and copper and so on into the North Sea and into the English Channel, that we will lose some of our own ships, and then again immediately we will be confronted by an issue with the German Government. Of course, we on the minority side and many of those on the majority side, made our fight. We have no complaint to make. The war is over except for the final vote on this bill. But the great issue has just begun, and that is keeping America out of foreign wars. [Applause.] I do not see how it keeps America out of foreign wars if we permit our merchant ships to go into that very definite combat zone that everyone must admit, no matter to what party he belongs, even those from the very solid South, to be a very dangerous zone, and I refer to the British Channel and the North Sea. It is certainly a dangerous place to be, infested as it is with submarines and airplanes and enemy warships. That is one of the objections. We could not offer that amendment in the House. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CORBETT] had the amendment prepared, but under the rule he was precluded from offering it because, if carried, it would have done away with the amendments that had already been offered prior to his.

Another part of the Senate bill which I think is objectionable and very vicious is the part that permits a British subject or a French subject to come over here and, let us say, negotiate a loan with J. P. Morgan & Co. in New York to buy all the scrap iron and all the copper and all the lead and all the steel that they may want. They may negotiate a loan for a billion dollars under the provisions of the Senate bill which we are now called upon to vote on, and which, I repeat, was never discussed in this House. That bill is the conference report. They can negotiate this loan from Morgan

& Co. or any other international banker, buy all they want of that kind of material here, and take it back to England or France and sell it to some private concern, and it may go into munitions, and then, after that, I think it will be very difficult to prove that that went to the British Government or to the French Government. I believe that is the loophole for the United States to finance these wars in Europe, and I am opposed to having our Government, or our people, rather, finance any more wars in Europe and hold the bag for Europe and European wars. [Applause.]

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. Yes.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Was there any change in section 7 to definitely define the word "person" so that it would include the Federal Reserve banks, the Stabilization Corporation, the Export-Import Bank, or any other Federal agency, and preclude them from giving credit to foreigners?

Mr. FISH. That, I consider, would be a major amendment, and no major amendments were made to this conference report. They voted that down in the House, and therefore we could not present it. We did not have the power even to offer it.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. But we were told here by the leaders on the majority side that the word "person" precluded the Government from extending any credit to any of the countries, but it is not here in the bill.

Mr. FISH. It is made very clear that individuals from those countries could come here and get all the money they want for this purpose, take back their goods, and then the difficulty would be to prove whether the goods went to a private industry or to the government.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. Yes.

Mr. BLOOM. Did not the gentleman vote for those amendments that were offered?

Mr. FISH. I have already said that I voted for all of the amendments offered to the conference report.

Mr. BLOOM. Was not this brought up in the conference, and was not the word "person" explained to the satisfaction of everybody, as to just what that means?

Mr. FISH. There was no such amendment offered in the conference. I do not know whether I am permitted to quote anyone else, but I clearly asked the chairman to explain that, and some other Member asked the same thing. It was agreed that an individual could come here and borrow almost unlimited sums and buy our goods, all except war materials, and take them back.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. Was any provision put in the bill by the conferees placing restrictions on the sale of poison gas or flame throwers?

Mr. FISH. I may say to the gentleman from Mississippi that I offered that amendment myself in conference and made the best fight I could for it, saying that I knew it would be turned down in the Senate, but I thought that the conferees ought to yield because the people back home would be unanimous for such an amendment, and if they wanted to amend the bill, they ought to accept the amendment. They took the position that having been defeated in the Senate they could not accept that amendment in all fairness. That is the reason given. I tried to get them to take it up by unanimous consent, take it back to the Senate, and say that the public had not been heard from at that time, and then bring the bill back in the House; but we were precluded under the rules from doing that, and so we could not get a vote in the House.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. BLOOM. Does the gentleman state that he offered that as an amendment, or that he just made that as a suggestion?

Mr. FISH. That is more or less quibbling, and I do not believe we ought to quibble. I offered it directly, asked them to consider and accept it. They told me they could not do it.

Mr. BLOOM. Did not the gentleman ask the parliamentary situation with reference to the poison-gas and flame-thrower amendment, and was it not explained to him at the time?

Mr. FISH. I wanted to offer this amendment, and they told me that the Senate rules precluded it because it had been defeated in the Senate. Then I made my fight.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. As a matter of fact, since that provision was in the bill as it passed the House, it seems to me the conferees would have had a perfect right to include it in the conference report and give the House a right to vote on it.

Mr. FISH. I made that argument to the best of my ability, but it was very evident they did not want to agree to it, and they had the votes. That is the answer to that.

Mr. BLOOM. Oh, no.

Mr. FISH. I made the best argument I could, but my views did not prevail.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. BLOOM. It was shown that that was specifically mentioned in the Shanley motion, was it not?

Mr. FISH. Yes.

Mr. BLOOM. Being, therefore, specifically mentioned in the Shanley motion it could not be taken up in the conference, the Shanley motion having been defeated in the House.

Mr. FISH. But it was also mentioned, of course, in the House bill. The words were in there.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. The mere fact that it was mentioned in the Shanley motion did not preclude its consideration by the conferees, for it was also contained in the House bill.

Mr. FISH. I cannot yield further, we are just wasting time, because I assure the gentleman that I made the best possible fight I could. I did not know that the gentleman knew anything about it, but that is water over the dam, and it is useless to discuss it further.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. WOLCOTT. This morning on the floor with respect to the interpretation which the Federal Reserve Board had put upon the word "person," in section 7, I had this to say:

> I am advised by long distance this morning from New York that the Federal Reserve banks have already been given the "go" sign, in view of the action taken by the House yesterday, to furnish the credits by which belligerents may purchase war materials in this country.

Was this statement before the conferees when they gave consideration to this section?

Mr. FISH. No; that was not brought into the conference at all.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Did they give any consideration to the interpretation which the Federal Reserve had already placed on this word "person"?

Mr. FISH. No.

Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand a press report for the attention of Members from the farm districts, whether they be from the South or West. I took the trouble to check up the vote a little while ago and I found that in 11 Southern States, omitting Louisiana, the vote was 90 to 1 [applause]—and I made my statement that way so you would clap at that time because you might not want to cheer when I read what I have here in my hand. The statement is the same in all the papers and all the press of the country, evidently:

> Due to the arms embargo vote and the ability of the British now to buy arms, munitions, and implements of war in America, they would cut down by $150,000,000 their purchases of American farm products of the South and of the West.

[Laughter.]

Now you can applaud.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. Certainly I yield.

Mr. RAYBURN. Whoever made that statement might as well have said $500,000,000 or $1,000,000,000 as to have said $150,000,000. It is simply a statement that somebody picks out of the air. There is no British authority for it.

Mr. FISH. I may state to the gentleman that it comes from London and is a United Press article.

It was not any American propaganda against the bill. This comes from London. They ought to know what they are going to do to the farmers, and they evidently do.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Does anything come from London by the United Press that is not passed by the official British censors?

Mr. FISH. I do not think so, and I think the British censorship is the strictest of any nation in the world. This came from London and for that reason I should say it is accurate. It has been passed by the British censors.

Mr. PACE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PACE. Will the gentleman indicate that the article stated there would be no reduction in the purchase of cotton?

Mr. FISH. I have not that part. I only have a short article here.

Mr. PACE. It stated there would be no reduction in the purchase of cotton.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, may I answer the gentleman about cotton and the price of cotton? We have already made a trade agreement giving 600,000 bales of cotton to England in return for rubber. How in the world is England going to buy any more cotton when we have already made this trade agreement? I do not believe they are going to buy any more cotton for the time being because they already have the 600,000 bales.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Over the short wave from London I heard the British say that they were going to buy cotton and bully beef in Central and South America.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to make a statement that I would have made yesterday if I had had the time which I anticipated I had at that time. I want this to go into the RECORD without any fear on my part of contradiction, that no nation in the world sells arms, ammunition, or implements of war to any belligerent nation; yet we were asked to repeal our law so that we could sell arms, ammunition, and implements of war to belligerents. I submit there is not a single European nation or an American nation that is selling a dollar's worth of arms and ammunition to any of the belligerent nations. Furthermore, I want to state for the RECORD that Switzerland has a permanent law against selling arms and ammunition to belligerents. Norway, Sweden, and Denmark have licensing laws which accomplish virtually the same thing. All of the European nations have refused to sell arms and ammunition to belligerent nations. One reason given by their ambassadors and ministers, and the sole reason, is that they wanted to stay neutral in this war in Europe. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, I now ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD at a later time a half a dozen letters addressed to me by these various ministers and ambassadors making the specific statement to which I refer—that is, that they are not selling any arms, ammunition, or implements of war—and these will cover all of the European countries.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH]?

There was no objection.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. KEE].

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, what the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] said really has nothing to do with the adoption of this conference report. We have brought back to you the bill which has the endorsement of this House. We have brought it back practically unchanged either in form or substance. The slight amendments we have made to the bill or to any section of it are merely clarifying amendments in order to remove from the measure any sentences or paragraphs of doubtful meaning.

Among these clarifying amendments is a slight revision of section 2 (c) with reference to transfer of title, to the end that an unconditional bill of lading is in compliance with the transfer requirements contained in the bill. I am speaking now of the more important changes that were made. We clarified the provision containing the exceptions of the waters into which American ships may go. You will notice in the bill as originally drawn that it excepted the China Sea, the Bay of Bengal, and the Arabian Sea, as well as the Atlantic Ocean south of the thirtieth degree of north latitude. We clarified that by merely adding "and their dependent waters," in order that all of the ports upon the seas excepted might be included and, as a matter of fact, that no mistake be made that those ports are not within the exceptions.

Those are the two most substantial amendments that have been made. The argument presented by the gentleman from New York is the same argument made on yesterday, the day before, and the week before, and it applies to the main features of the bill, all controversy on which has already been determined by a vote of the House. His argument is not pertinent to the changes made by the conferees.

The bill as it stands today is, in my opinion, the best possible act that could be passed by the Congress of the United States to keep our country free from the conflict that is now raging throughout the world.

Mr. BLAND. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEE. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. BLAND. I desire to inquire about the change that was made in connection with the elimination of the 7-day provision as to sailing. I understand there was some change made.

Mr. KEE. There was a change made.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEE. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I may say to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND] that the Senate bill contained a provision that a boat would have to sail from the United States 7 days before the law became effective, otherwise it would not be exempt.

That, we thought, was unfair because a ship might be about 6 days out and would have to turn around and come back.

A criminal penalty was provided and we thought it should not be retroactive. We provided it should not apply to any ship that had left the United States prior to the date of the enactment of the law.

Mr. BLAND. How about the cargo, is that brought in, too?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Yes; both are exempt.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I do not have anything further to say about this conference report. Enough has already been said about it. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BLOOM. I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 243, nays 172, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 6]

YEAS—243

Allen, La.	Dickstein	Keller	Poage
Allen, Pa.	Dies	Kelly	Polk
Anderson, Calif.	Dingell	Kennedy, Michael	Ramspeck
Arnold	Disney	Kerr	Randolph
Ball	Doughton	Kilday	Rayburn
Barden	Doxey	Kirwan	Richards
Barnes	Drewry	Kitchens	Robertson
Bates, Ky.	Duncan	Kleberg	Robinson, Utah
Beam	Dunn	Kocialkowski	Rogers, Okla.
Beckworth	Durham	Kramer	Romjue
Bell	Eberharter	Lanham	Sabath
Bland	Edmiston	Larrabee	Sacks
Bloom	Elliott	Lea	Sasscer
Boehne	Ellis	Leavy	Satterfield
Boland	Faddis	Lesinski	Schaefer, Ill.
Boren	Fay	Lewis, Colo.	Schuetz
Boykin	Ferguson	McAndrews	Schulte
Bradley, Pa.	Fernandez	McArdle	Schwert
Brewster	Fitzpatrick	McCormack	Scrugham
Brooks	Flaherty	McGehee	Sheppard
Brown, Ga.	Flannagan	McGranery	Sirovich
Bryson	Flannery	McKeough	Smith, Ill.
Buck	Folger	McLean	Smith, Wash.
Buckler, Minn.	Ford, Leland M.	McMillan	Smith, W. Va.
Buckley, N. Y.	Ford, Miss.	Maciejewski	Snyder
Bulwinkle	Ford, Thomas F.	Magnuson	Somers, N. Y.
Burch	Fulmer	Mahon	South
Burgin	Gamble	Maloney	Sparkman
Byrne, N. Y.	Garrett	Marcantonio	Spence
Byrns, Tenn.	Gathings	Martin, Colo.	Starnes, Ala.
Byron	Gavagan	Martin, Ill.	Steagall
Caldwell	Geyer, Calif.	Massingale	Stearns, N. H.
Camp	Gibbs	May	Sullivan
Cannon, Fla.	Gifford	Merritt	Sumners, Tex.
Cannon, Mo.	Gore	Mills, Ark.	Sutphin
Cartwright	Gossett	Mills, La.	Tarver
Casey, Mass.	Grant, Ala.	Mitchell	Taylor, Tenn.
Celler	Green	Monroney	Tenerowicz
Chandler	Gregory	Moser	Terry
Clark	Griffith	Mouton	Thomas, N. J.
Claypool	Gwynne	Murdock, Ariz.	Thomas, Tex.
Cluett	Hare	Murdock, Utah	Thomason
Cochran	Hart	Myers	Vincent, Ky.
Coffee, Wash.	Harter, Ohio	Nelson	Vinson, Ga.
Cole, N. Y.	Havenner	Nichols	Voorhis, Calif.
Collins	Hendricks	Norrell	Vreeland
Colmer	Hennings	Norton	Wadsworth
Cooley	Hill	O'Neal	Wallgren
Cooper	Hobbs	Osmers	Walter
Courtney	Hook	O'Toole	Ward
Cox	Houston	Pace	Warren
Cravens	Izac	Parsons	Weaver
Creal	Jarman	Patman	West
Crowe	Johnson,LutherA.	Patrick	Whelchel
Cullen	Johnson, Lyndon	Patton	Whittington
Cummings	Johnson, Okla.	Pearson	Williams, Mo.
D'Alesandro	Johnson, W. Va.	Peterson, Fla.	Wood
Darden	Jones, Tex.	Peterson, Ga.	Woodrum, Va.
Delaney	Kean	Pierce, N. Y.	Zimmerman
Dempsey	Kee	Pierce, Oreg.	The Speaker
DeRouen	Kefauver	Plumley	

NAYS—172

Alexander	Dondero	Hope	Mundt
Allen, Ill.	Douglas	Horton	Murray
Andersen, H. Carl	Dowell	Hull	O'Brien
Anderson, Mo.	Dworshak	Hunter	O'Connor
Andresen, A. H.	Eaton	Jacobsen	O'Day
Angell	Elston	Jarrett	O'Leary
Arends	Engel	Jenkins, Ohio	Oliver
Ashbrook	Englebright	Jenks, N. H.	Pittenger
Austin	Evans	Jensen	Powers
Barton	Fenton	Johns	Rabaut
Bates, Mass.	Fish	Johnson, Ill.	Rankin
Bender	Fries	Johnson, Ind.	Reece, Tenn.
Blackney	Gartner	Jones, Ohio	Reed, Ill.
Bolles	Gearhart	Keefe	Reed, N. Y.
Bradley, Mich.	Gehrmann	Kinzer	Rees, Kans.
Brown, Ohio	Gerlach	Knutson	Rich
Burdick	Gilchrist	Kunkel	Risk
Carlson	Gillie	Lambertson	Robsion, Ky.
Carter	Graham	Landis	Rockefeller
Case, S. Dak.	Grant, Ind.	LeCompte	Rodgers, Pa.
Chapman	Gross	Lemke	Rogers, Mass.
Church	Guyer, Kans.	Lewis, Ohio	Routzohn
Clason	Hall	Luce	Rutherford
Clevenger	Halleck	Ludlow	Ryan
Coffee, Nebr.	Hancock	McDowell	Sandager
Cole, Md.	Harness	McLaughlin	Schafer, Wis.
Connery	Harrington	McLeod	Schiffler
Corbett	Harter, N. Y.	Maas	Seccombe
Costello	Hartley	Mapes	Secrest
Crawford	Hawks	Marshall	Seger
Crosser	Healey	Martin, Iowa	Shafer, Mich.
Crowther	Heinke	Martin, Mass.	Shanley
Culkin	Hess	Mason	Shannon
Curtis	Hinshaw	Michener	Short
Dirksen	Hoffman	Miller	Simpson
Ditter	Holmes	Mott	Smith, Conn.
Smith, Maine	Talle	Van Zandt	Williams, Del.
Smith, Ohio	Thill	Vorys, Ohio	Winter
Springer	Thorkelson	Welch	Wolcott
Stefan	Tibbott	Wheat	Wolfenden, Pa.
Sumner, Ill.	Tinkham	White, Idaho	Wolverton, N. J.
Sweeney	Tolan	White, Ohio	Woodruff, Mich.
Taber	Treadway	Wigglesworth	Youngdahl

NOT VOTING—14

Andrews	Darrow	Keogh	Smith, Va.
Barry	Jeffries	Mansfield	Taylor, Colo.
Chiperfield	Kennedy, Martin	Monkiewicz	
Curley	Kennedy, Md.	Pfeifer	

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call my name.

The Clerk called the name of Mr. BANKHEAD, and he answered "yea."

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Taylor of Colorado (for) with Mr. Andrews (against).
Mr. Smith of Virginia (for) with Mr. Darrow (against).
Mr. Monkiewicz (for) with Mr. Chiperfield (against).
Mr. Keogh (for) with Mr. Barry (against).
Mr. Martin J. Kennedy (for) with Mr. Pfeifer (against).
Mr. Kennedy of Maryland (for) with Mr. Jeffries (against).

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I desire to announce that my colleague the gentleman from Virginia, Mr. SMITH, is detained by illness. If present, he would have voted "yea."

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed a concurrent resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested.

S. Con. Res. 31. Concurrent resolution providing for the sine die adjournment of the second session of the Seventy-sixth Congress.

SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT RESOLUTION

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I call up Senate Concurrent Resolution 31.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 31

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the two Houses of Congress shall adjourn on Friday, the 3d day of November 1939, and that when they adjourn on said day they stand adjourned sine die.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the Senate concurrent resolution.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken, and there were—yeas 223, nays 189, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 7]

YEAS—223

Allen, La.	Celler	Durham	Hunter
Allen, Pa.	Chandler	Edmiston	Izac
Anderson, Mo.	Clark	Elliott	Jarman
Arnold	Claypool	Ellis	Johnson,LutherA.
Ashbrook	Cochran	Faddis	Johnson, Lyndon
Barden	Coffee, Nebr.	Fay	Johnson, Okla.
Barnes	Cole, Md.	Ferguson	Johnson, W. Va.
Bates, Ky.	Collins	Fitzpatrick	Jones, Tex.
Beam	Colmer	Flaherty	Kee
Bell	Cooley	Flannagan	Kefauver
Bland	Cooper	Flannery	Keller
Bloom	Costello	Folger	Kelly
Boehne	Courtney	Ford, Miss.	Kennedy, Michael
Boland	Cox	Ford, Thomas F.	Kerr
Boren	Creal	Fries	Kirwan
Boykin	Crosser	Fulmer	Kitchens
Bradley, Pa.	Crowe	Gathings	Kleberg
Brooks	Cullen	Gavagan	Kocialkowski
Brown, Ga.	Cummings	Geyer, Calif.	Kramer
Bryson	D'Alesandro	Gibbs	Lanham
Buck	Darden	Gore	Larrabee
Buckler, Minn.	Delaney	Gossett	Lea
Buckley, N. Y.	Dempsey	Grant, Ala.	Leavy
Bulwinkle	DeRouen	Gregory	Lesinski
Burch	Dickstein	Griffith	Lewis, Colo.
Burgin	Dies	Hare	McAndrews
Byrne, N. Y.	Dingell	Harter, Ohio	McArdle
Byron	Disney	Havenner	McCormack
Caldwell	Doughton	Healey	McGehee
Camp	Doxey	Hendricks	McGranery
Cannon, Fla.	Drewry	Hennings	McKeough
Cannon, Mo.	Duncan	Hobbs	McLaughlin
Cartwright	Dunn	Houston	McMillan

Maciejewski	O'Leary	Sacks	Sumners, Tex.
Magnuson	O'Neal	Sasscer	Sutphin
Mahon	O'Toole	Satterfield	Tarver
Maloney	Pace	Schaefer, Ill.	Tenerowicz
Marcantonio	Parsons	Schuetz	Terry
Martin, Colo.	Patman	Schulte	Thomas, Tex.
Martin, Ill.	Patrick	Schwert	Thomason
Massingale	Pearson	Secrest	Vincent, Ky.
Merritt	Peterson, Fla.	Shanley	Vinson, Ga.
Mills, Ark.	Peterson, Ga.	Shannon	Wallgren
Mills, La.	Pierce, Oreg.	Sheppard	Walter
Mitchell	Poage	Sirovich	Ward
Monroney	Polk	Smith, Conn.	Warren
Mouton	Rabaut	Smith, Ill.	Weaver
Murdock, Ariz.	Ramspeck	Smith, W. Va.	West
Murdock, Utah	Rayburn	Snyder	Whelchel
Myers	Richards	Somers, N. Y.	Whittington
Nelson	Robertson	South	Williams, Mo.
Nichols	Robinson, Utah	Sparkman	Wood
Norrell	Rogers, Okla.	Spence	Woodrum, Va.
Norton	Romjue	Starnes, Ala.	Zimmerman
O'Connor	Ryan	Steagall	The Speaker
O'Day	Sabath	Sullivan	

NAYS—189

Alexander	Englebright	Keefe	Routzohn
Allen, Ill.	Evans	Kilday	Rutherford
Andersen, H. Carl	Fenton	Kinzer	Sandager
Anderson, Calif.	Fish	Knutson	Schafer, Wis.
Andresen, A. H.	Ford, Leland M.	Kunkel	Schiffler
Angell	Gamble	Lambertson	Scrugham
Arends	Garrett	Landis	Seccombe
Austin	Gartner	LeCompte	Seger
Ball	Gearhart	Lemke	Shafer, Mich.
Barton	Gehrmann	Lewis, Ohio	Short
Bates, Mass.	Gerlach	Luce	Simpson
Beckworth	Gifford	Ludlow	Smith, Maine
Bender	Gilchrist	McDowell	Smith, Ohio
Blackney	Gillie	McLean	Smith, Wash.
Bolles	Graham	McLeod	Springer
Bradley, Mich.	Grant, Ind.	Maas	Stearns, N. H.
Brewster	Green	Mapes	Stefan
Brown, Ohio	Gross	Marshall	Sumner, Ill.
Burdick	Guyer, Kans.	Martin, Iowa	Sweeney
Byrns, Tenn.	Gwynne	Martin, Mass.	Taber
Carlson	Hall	Mason	Talle
Carter	Halleck	Michener	Taylor, Tenn.
Case, S. Dak.	Hancock	Miller	Thill
Casey, Mass.	Harness	Monkiewicz	Thomas, N. J.
Chapman	Harrington	Moser	Thorkelson
Church	Hart	Mott	Tibbott
Clason	Harter, N. Y.	Mundt	Tinkham
Clevenger	Hartley	Murray	Tolan
Cluett	Hawks	O'Brien	Treadway
Coffee, Wash.	Heinke	Oliver	Van Zandt
Cole, N. Y.	Hess	Osmers	Voorhis, Calif.
Connery	Hill	Patton	Vorys, Ohio
Corbett	Hinshaw	Pierce, N. Y.	Vreeland
Cravens	Hoffman	Pittenger	Wadsworth
Crawford	Hook	Plumley	Welch
Crowther	Hope	Powers	Wheat
Culkin	Horton	Randolph	White, Idaho
Curtis	Hull	Rankin	Wigglesworth
Dirksen	Jacobsen	Reece, Tenn.	Williams, Del.
Ditter	Jarrett	Reed, Ill.	Winter
Dondero	Jenkins, Ohio	Reed, N. Y.	Wolcott
Douglas	Jenks, N. H.	Rees, Kans.	Wolfenden, Pa.
Dowell	Jensen	Rich	Wolverton, N. J.
Dworshak	Johns	Risk	Woodruff, Mich.
Eaton	Johnson, Ill.	Robsion, Ky.	Youngdahl
Eberharter	Johnson, Ind.	Rockefeller	
Elston	Jones, Ohio	Rodgers, Pa.	
Engel	Kean	Rogers, Mass.	

NOT VOTING—17

Andrews	Fernandez	Keogh	Taylor, Colo.
Barry	Holmes	Mansfield	White, Ohio
Chiperfield	Jeffries	May	
Curley	Kennedy, Martin	Pfeifer	
Darrow	Kennedy, Md.	Smith, Va.	

So the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

General pairs:

Mr. Taylor of Colorado with Mr. Andrews.
Mr. Smith of Virginia with Mr. Darrow.
Mr. Kennedy of Maryland with Mr. Jeffries.
Mr. Martin J. Kennedy with Mr. Pfeifer.
Mr. Keogh with Mr. Barry.
Mr. Mansfield with Mr. Holmes.
Mr. May with Mr. White of Ohio.
Mr. Fernandez with Mr. Chiperfield.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, my colleague the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. WHITE] has been suddenly called home by reason of serious illness in his family. If present, he would vote "no."

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I desire to announce that my colleague the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] is detained by illness. If he were present, he would vote "aye."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by printing in the RECORD a speech made by the Speaker of the House before the Legislature of Alabama on the 24th day of August, and the introductory speech made on that occasion by the Lieutenant Governor of Alabama.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter from Mr. Edward A. O'Neal, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, and an interview by Mr. Hartman A. Morgan.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENTS ON COMMISSIONS AND COMMITTEES

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I submit a unanimous-consent request which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. RAYBURN asks unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the second session of the Seventy-sixth Congress, the Speaker be authorized to fill vacancies on commissions and committees authorized by law or by the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

GENERAL PERMISSION TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I submit a further unanimous-consent request.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. RAYBURN asks unanimous consent that all Members of the House shall have the privilege until the last edition authorized by the Joint Committee on Printing is published, to extend and revise their own remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on more than one subject, if they so desire, and may also include therein such short quotations as may be necessary to explain or complete such extension of remarks; but this order shall not apply to any subject matter which may have occurred or any speech delivered subsequent to the adjournment of Congress: *Provided*, That quotations from reports of committees of Congress shall be from such reports only as have been submitted officially and printed as documents by order of the House, by law, or pursuant to the rules of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 326

Resolved, That FRED BRADLEY, of Michigan, be, and he is hereby, elected to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

The resolution was agreed to.

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEES

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House the following resignation from committees.

The Clerk read as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *November 3, 1939.*

Hon. WILLIAM B. BANKHEAD,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby respectfully tender my resignation from membership on the Committee on Indian Affairs and Public Buildings and Grounds.

Very sincerely yours,

FRED BRADLEY.

The SPEAKER. Without objection the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on two subjects and include therein a quotation of one page from a bill previously introduced.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include a radio address delivered by myself on November 2 on the neutrality bill, and also excerpts from the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and other associations.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, and to include an address by Miss Josephine Wilkins, delivered at Atlanta, Ga., on Facts versus Folklore, an adventure in democracy. I am informed by the Public Printer that this will run about three pages.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

MAJOR DISASTERS

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I have asked the indulgence of the House for this brief time to call attention of Members to a very unfortunate and ill-timed decision announced today by attorneys for the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. It is a decision that will adversely affect areas that will include some 30 States of this Union.

May I state at the outset that I have a profound respect for Hon. Jesse Jones who has done an outstanding job as Chairman of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. I have complimented that organization in the past and have pointed with pride to its splendid record. Moreover, as a member of the Subcommittee on Appropriations having jurisdiction over the R. F. C., I have steadfastly supported that organization.

But, Mr. Speaker and Members, I have a complaint—a serious complaint—to register with reference to a decision given out since noon today by attorneys for the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. After much deliberation and procrastination, R. F. C. attorneys have today advised some Members of this Congress, so I am advised, that droughts are not disasters. But the same attorneys have ruled that floods do constitute a disaster.

Let me say here that I am not personally acquainted with all of the attorneys in the R. F. C. and I am not aware of the particular one who gave such a profound legal opinion. I do not know if any such attorneys ever saw a dust storm or have the slightest idea what suffering our drought-stricken farmers have endured. But I do know that such an opinion is not only unsound but utterly absurd. Frankly, I am amazed and very much chagrined that anyone calling himself a lawyer should render such a silly decision and expect those of us living in the Middle West to accept such a decision as final.

A few moments ago I entered a protest personally to my good friend, Hon. Jesse Jones, who is now in the House cloak room, against such an absurd ruling on the part of the attorneys for the R. F. C., and he expressed the desire to assist the drought-stricken area in any way possible. But under such a narrow ruling of his legal staff that would seem impossible.

Of course, if the R. F. C. attorneys had taken the time to read the discussions on this floor before they gave out such a foolish ruling they certainly could not have possibly done so. When the disaster relief appropriation was being considered in this body, and before the committees, it was made plain that it was for droughts as well as floods. Of course, we want the flood areas assisted but——

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional miunute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. It would appear that the attorneys for the R. F. C. have never heard of the unusual drought in the Middle West. Possibly they do not know of that vast Dust Bowl area, a large portion of which has had little or no rain for months. Perhaps they do not know that in thousands of acres of wheat fields of Oklahoma wheat has not yet sprouted because of the serious drought. Maybe they do not know many other fields in Oklahoma and other States have not been planted for the reason that farmers have been unable to even plow the ground, and yet attorneys for the R. F. C. have the temerity to advise Members of this House that such a situation does not constitute a disaster.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Yes.

Mr. STEFAN. In order to tell the gentleman that I agree with everything that he said. I have just come back from the drought-stricken area of Nebraska, and the farmers out there will say "Amen" to what the gentleman has said.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has again expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, desiring to be strictly within the rules of the House, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a short table of imports and exports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include a letter written to me in 1934 on the subject of neutrality legislation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial recently appearing in the Boston Herald on the National Youth Administration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in two subsequent issues of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on two different subjects, and include therein certain excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include an address on the radio delivered by Dorothy Thompson, Ernest Lindley, Jay Franklin, and Boake Carter. The estimate is that this will run five pages.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an address I delivered before the Maryland National Guard of Baltimore.

The SPEAKER. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a resolution passed by the United Rubber Workers of America.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SCHAFER] may be permitted to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include therein certain Government statistics.

The SPEAKER. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD a bill which I had intended to introduce as late as possible in this body with comments of my own on the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KELLER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter from a constituent.

The SPEAKER. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, due to the fact that I have been greatly disappointed by the action of the House in the last few days on the neutrality bill, I have prepared an address entitled "After the War, Peace," as a sequel to the action of the House. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by placing this speech in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Maine. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter I received from Arthur C. Jackson, of the State of Maine, also his brief statement.

The SPEAKER. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLLES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a statement concerning the birthday of Elizabeth Cady Stanton.

The SPEAKER. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article on the Fort Wayne housing program.

The SPEAKER. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD with regard to certain farm prices and to include therein certain statistical tables.

The SPEAKER. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 1 minute.

PRIVILEGE OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as this deals with a question of the privilege of the House, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 5 minutes. I will conclude in shorter time if possible.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, today, during my absence from the Chamber, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOOK] stated in substance that when I was speaking on the floor of the House on the 27th day of October—and the proceedings will be found at page 1043 of the RECORD of that date—he asked me this question: "Does not the gentleman think it is about time that even Members of Congress restrain themselves as purveyors of hate?"

The gentleman from northern Michigan [Mr. HOOK], as I am advised, followed that statement today by saying in substance that the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD had been changed to read "purveyors of false information." The gentleman then continued:

> Is this correct procedure?
> Does a Member have a right to change the form and substance of a question and the form and substance of an answer in the RECORD?

The gentleman then obtained a statement from the Speaker to the effect that such procedure would not be proper as, of course, it would not.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOOK] then asked that the RECORD be corrected.

I state here and now that I did not change one word in the question asked by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOOK] and that no statement made by me on that day in any way changes the form or the substance of the colloquy; that the RECORD as it now stands on page 1043 is correct, as is shown by the official record of the stenographer who took down in shorthand and who transcribed the words that were uttered on that day and by the official copy sent to the printer, which a few moments ago was in the possession of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOOK].

Under permission granted to me to extend my remarks—and I ask the attention of the House so that if any Member objects I will ask unanimous consent to withdraw the extension—I added this:

> I do not know of any Member of the present Congress who ever knowingly was a purveyor of false information. I have found my colleagues to be honest, to be conscientious, and I regret that the gentleman should charge that any Member of Congress has been guilty of giving out false information. In my judgment, the charge is hastily made.

I also added this further statement:

> The gentleman cannot cite a single instance where I ever knowingly gave out false information and I do not believe that he can cite a single instance where any Member of this Congress ever knowingly gave out false information.

I repeat if there is a man on the floor who wants either one of these statements withdrawn I will withdraw it.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. In a few moments.

Those statements were made in defense of the integrity of the Members of the House, and to those statements I again subscribe. I do not now believe that any Member objects to either statement. If he does, let him speak.

Since the gentleman made the statement on the floor I have been advised by the Official Reporter that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOOK] did use the words "false information"; that he did use the words "purveyors of false information"; that he did not use the words "purveyors of hate." An examination of the original record proves the accuracy of my statement just made.

I further examined a copy of the official transcript which went to the printer, and which the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOOK] has examined, and from that transcript it appears that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOOK] is in error in assuming that he used the words "purveyors of hate"; that in truth and in fact he used the words set forth in the RECORD at page 1043, "purveyors of false information."

I therefore object to the suggested change in the RECORD, which would not be a correction of the RECORD, but which, if made, would render it an inaccurate transcript of the proceedings as they occurred.

While the statement made by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOOK] on the floor of the House today in my absence is of little, if any, concern to me personally, it does involve the integrity of the proceedings of the House; and if anyone challenges the accuracy of the statement which I have just made, I request that the Speaker of the House correct the statement of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOOK], so that the RECORD of the House will state the fact.

I have no doubt but that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOOK] spoke inadvertently, and I am quite sure that on reflection he will agree with me that no Member of the House ever knowingly misrepresents the facts.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I was surprised, as was the gentleman from Oklahoma, at the ruling given by the attorneys for the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. In making a ruling that disasters do not include droughts, I think they are overlooking the legislative history of the bill, because, if my memory serves me right, either

in the original appropriation for the Disaster Loan Corporation or in a subsequent appropriation for it, the question was asked whether or not a drought would be considered a disaster, and assurances were given by members of the committee in charge of the bill that a disaster would include a drought. I am sure that the interpretation of the gentleman from Oklahoma is fully warranted, as anyone knows that too little rain is just as much a disaster as too much of it.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I do not know anything about the so-called legal opinion that has been delivered by some attorney for the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, but may I say I can hardly understand how any man living in a drought district can complain on account of what the Government has done or what it has failed to do, when as much has been done for these districts as has been done through the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and other agencies of the Government. Only recently $20,000,000 has been applied to taking care of drought cases, and I understand other funds will be made available.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAYBURN. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. The gentleman does not take the same position that the attorneys for the R. F. C. take; that is, that a flood is a disaster but a drought is not?

Mr. RAYBURN. I do not take any position with reference to the question at all. However, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and other agencies of the Government have been very liberal with people in the drought areas and in the flood districts, and I do not think those people have any right to complain.

[Here the gavel fell.]

FARM RELIEF—WAR AND COMMUNISM

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]?

There was no objection.

FARM RELIEF

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I have just learned of this ruling to which the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON] referred. I fear it will work a great hardship on the farmers in some of the stricken areas. Some Members do not regard this disaster seriously, but I happen to know that so far as the district I represent is concerned it is the worst we have had in a hundred years. I voted against the adjournment resolution for that reason, and I believe if we had known this ruling was coming I could have induced the House to postpone adjournment until this proposition could have been acted upon, and the law so amended as to enable us to use these disaster funds to take care of the distressed farmers in the drought-stricken areas, as well as the flooded areas. They can be used in the flooded areas under the present law, regardless of this ruling.

If it had not been for the fight I have made here, I doubt if we would have got any assistance for them at all. I contended all along that these people were entitled to more consideration at our hands than are the people of Europe. This is our problem, and we must look after it. But the European conflict is not our war, and we should stay out of it.

We cannot afford to neglect our own people just because Europe has decided to stage another one of her age-old conflicts.

KEEP OUT OF EUROPEAN WAR

Owing to the limit of time, I was unable to complete my address to the House on Wednesday on the subject of keeping this country out of the European war. I, therefore, desire to finish my statement at this time.

This House is an open forum, and the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is about the only free press left open to us through which to take these messages uncensored to the American people, as well as to the American Congress. If a certain international element succeeds in plunging us into war, then all voices of protest may be silenced.

Therefore, since this may be my last opportunity to present my reasons why we should keep out of this war, I am taking advantage of it to present my side of the argument in terms you can all understand.

If this message helps to keep my country out of this war, then my efforts will not have been in vain. I agree with President Roosevelt's statement that we should keep out of the present European conflict.

I agree with Paul McNutt that we should resolve at all costs—short of a direct attack upon our shores—to keep America out of this war.

As I said, I am not a pacifist; and everybody who is familiar with Paul McNutt's record knows that he is not a pacifist. We are for building up our national defense, until we have an air force, a Navy, and an Army that can forever protect American shores, and defend American rights wherever and whenever we are attacked. But we are not willing to see this country dragged into the periodically recurring wars of Europe until we exhaust our manhood and our resources, and probably lose our American institutions, including our form of government—if not our Christian civilization.

We can keep out of this war; and we must keep out.

America's entrance into this conflict is being advocated by certain international financiers and munitions makers, and especially by the Communists, who have succeeded in stirring up trouble throughout the civilized world. They are determined to make trouble for us by dragging us in, if possible.

If they have not contributed largely to stirring up the present European war, they have, by their propaganda and their influence, contributed to keeping that war alive. They are determined to drag the United States into it and further pulverize the ground for communism to sweep the world when England, the United States, and Germany, the three great white nations of the earth, are exhausted, and peace again—if it may be called peace—"lies panting on the ravaged plains" of Europe.

Communism, which we all know has for its objective the destruction of our form of government, as well as our Christian civilization, has honeycombed this country, and has been financed by the highbrow Wall Street internationalists who largely control the finances of the world. If the Dies committee will continue to do its duty, it will unfold to the people of America a chapter of treachery to our Government, our industries, and our institutions that will so harrow up the souls of the Christian people of America that they will rise as one man and forever purge our Nation of these baneful influences.

This element seems to have got control of a large part of the metropolitan press. They own or control many of the large daily newspapers and magazines that are now being used as propaganda agencies to plunge this country into another devastating war.

If they do not own the large newspapers in a city, they invariably control them, through their advertising or otherwise, to such an extent that they dare not publish the whole truth as to what is going on—either as news items or in their editorial columns.

They have got control of the radio to a large extent at least, and have been drumming their alien propaganda into the ears of the helpless American people for years. They have even attempted to appropriate George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, Abraham Lincoln, U. S. Grant, Jefferson Davis, and Robert E. Lee and misrepresent them to the world as outstanding apostles of the things they are now attempting to perpetrate.

What would these great men think if they could arise from their graves and hear the way their names are being taken in vain, by these propagandists who are broadcasting their alien propaganda under the guise of democracy, or preaching a

false Americanism in broken English, and with distorted logic?

They are becoming a little more adroit now, and are using stooges who can speak perfect English to broadcast their propaganda.

It used to be that an American home could protect itself against outside vices, and a dispenser of evil dared not enter to corrupt the lives of its children; but today they come through the radio under the guise of advertising the sale of some article, gasoline, coffee, boots, or even bibles, and drum into the ears of the innocent children of America their alien ideologies, as well as their war propaganda.

If we are to protect our country, our homes, and our children, we are going to have to have an American radio, as well as an American press, and American movies, along with our American flag.

They have got control of the picture shows through which they rake down enormous salaries, many of which are 2, 3, 5, or even 10 times the salary of the President of the United States.

They are using the movies as a powerful weapon to push their alien doctrines and war propaganda, to undermine American morals, and to destroy everything for which our forefathers fought and bled.

In their vicious attempt to destroy representative government they even went so far recently as to give to the world a picture called, Mr. Smith Goes to Washington. It was the most pernicious and exaggerated attack ever made on the United States Senate. They pictured "Jefferson Smith," the newly appointed Senator, as standing alone against vice and corruption, while every other Senator was pictured as tucking his tail and running out, like a whipped cur. They did that in order to bring the Senate into disrepute, and to show that body the power of this alien influence to mold or control public sentiment in America, and to stir up strife among the American people. They selected a rare example of a senatorial tool of predatory interests, of former days, and held him up to the world as representing every single Member of the United States Senate, except the synthetic Senator, of their own manufacture, Mr. Jefferson Smith, who had just arrived.

They were all out of step but Jeff.

I wonder if this picture was intentionally designed to try to affect the Senate's vote on pending measures or on a probable declaration of war, or if it was just a part of the Communists' program directed from Moscow to overthrow representative government in the United States.

Through their nefarious system of block booking, by which they squeeze out the independent picture houses and compel their regular customers to accept every picture they offer, no matter how nauseating it may be, they have created a system of propaganda the like of which this country has never seen.

They are using it to spread their alien doctrines, undermine American institutions, corrupt the youth of the land, and build up a war psychology to try to drag America into this European conflict, which would likely cost the lives of millions of our young men, wipe out our form of government, and probably destroy the last vestige of our Christian civilization.

These communistic elements, aided, abetted, and financed by certain rich Shylocks in Wall Street, are stirring up all the trouble they can between the whites and the Negroes, especially in the South, knowing that the poor Negroes will be the sufferers in the end. But what do they care how much trouble they cause the people of the South, so long as it aids their cause.

They are behind this so-called antilynching bill and have been pushing it for years for nothing in God's world but to stir up trouble between the white people and the Negroes in the Southern States. I am speaking by the cards now, for I have heard every speech they have made in the House and every false and vicious attack they have waged against the white people of the South in those speeches since the opening day of the Sixty-seventh Congress.

There is a petition before the House now to take this bill away from the committee in order to force it through at the coming session.

In that bill they exempt all the gangsters and racketeers; it does not apply to them. It is a base subterfuge, designed to stir up race trouble in the South. It is carrying out the Communist program to stir strife and keep it going. It is not even designed to prevent lynching.

They are now carrying this propaganda through the picture shows, and mixing whites and Negroes in their pictures, which they know does not represent the normal life of the American people in any State in this Union, much less in the South. They have set in to destroy the separate schools in the Southern States, to change our election laws, and to break down the laws preventing intermarriage between the races. They want to force Negro equality on the South and to mongrelize America, so they can get complete control of it, as they thought they had done in certain South American countries. They are stirring the deepest resentment among the old-line Americans this country has ever seen.

These international Communists created Hitler; they created Mussolini, and Franco, and Stalin, and all the other ideological dictators of Europe.

They created Stalin through communism in Russia, which is the nihilism of another century brought down to date and made more vicious by modern methods. Russian communism has murdered 20,000,000 people in Russia since the close of the World War. In one year they took the grain and livestock, and everything else necessary to sustain life, away from the white farmers in the Ukraine and starved more than a million of them to death. Some writers contend they starved 3,000,000. These were white Christian citizens of Soviet Russia, where their people had lived for centuries. They were industrious farmers who had made abundant crops; but Godless communism robbed them of the products of their soil and their toil and forced upon them the most ignominious death to which suffering humanity could be subjected. Dante, by the wildest stretch of his imagination, could not have created a more terrible inferno than that of a million honest, industrious men, women, and children, starving to death in their own homes after an abundant harvest for which, in America, they could have enjoyed at least one glorious Thanksgiving.

I think I can see now the homes of those Russian farmers. I see in those humble cottages the Nordic faces of men, women, and children. I see them look with gladdened eyes as they all toil to pack their barns with an abundant harvest. I see the bearded Communist, the father of the sit-down strike in America, come with his wagons or his trucks and haul it away. I see the ashen faces of the Ukrainian farmers as they stare helplessly in the presence of their weeping wives and children. I see them shivering in the chilling blasts of winter as the inescapable menace of hunger gradually closes in until these children die with outstretched hands, while fainting fathers utter their expiring prayers of protests, and starving mothers give their withered breasts to dying babes.

That is what communism brought to Russia and what it has tried to bring, and is still trying to bring, to the people of America. How would you like to see them duplicate that picture in Mississippi, Ohio, Kansas, Nebraska, and every other agricultural State?

A friend of mine, a Member of Congress, was in Italy a few years ago, and he asked an Italian businessman why those people stood for the dictatorship of Mussolini. His answer was, "For self-protection." He said, "We do not like Mussolini or his policies any better than you do. We love democracy, we wanted representative government to continue, but we found it impossible under existing conditions." He said, "Communism invaded Italy, and organized the riff-raff to where it was an unsafe place for decent, law-abiding people to live. They were bringing about chaos. They would go into a man's place of business, help themselves to his goods, and walk out without paying a cent, and probably knock him in the head even if he protested. They would go into a restaurant, or a hotel, sit down and eat, and walk out without

paying a cent, and beat up the waiters or proprietors if they tried to collect. They would invade private homes and rob, rape, or murder the inmates, and if a policeman interfered they would gang and murder him." He said, "It was either Mussolini or chaos, and as much as we detest dictatorships, we chose Mussolini as the least of the two evils. We hope some day to get back to representative government."

After the World War, the Versailles conference discarded Wilson's 14 points and imposed peace conditions which everyone predicted would bring another European war. After a revolution or two, the German people set up a democratic government and tried to work their way out of a bad situation. Hitler was an obscure artist, whose name had never been heard outside of his immediate locality. The Communists flocked in to take charge of Germany. They put on the wildest monetary inflation Europe has ever seen. An American dollar, a French dollar, or an English dollar would buy so much German money that you could hardly haul it home in a one-horse wagon.

These internationalists—and I am quoting from a Member of this Congress who was there at the time—flocked into Germany by the hundreds of thousands, more than 50,000 of them coming from Russia alone. They brought foreign moneys with them and bought up the properties of the bankrupt Germans for a song, and then filled the places of honor, trust, responsibility, or remuneration with their own people, attempted to sovietize the country and grind the German people into the dust of subjugation. That is what created Hitler and the present Nazi regime in Germany. Will we now permit them to duplicate that disaster and create a Hitler for us in America?

God forbid!

I want it understood that I have no brief for Hitler, or for any other dictator or dictatorship. They are opposed to everything for which I stand. Nor have I ever belonged to any organization that had for its motive racial or religious prejudice or persecution. I am not a member of the Brown Shirts, the Black Shirts, or the Silver Shirts. I wear a common white cotton shirt, made in Mississippi. I am an American.

I regard nazi-ism, or fascism, and communism as merely different symptoms of the same disease—a form of international malaria. One of them is the chill and the other is the fever of the dying liberties of mankind.

But I am telling you what these international agitators and communists have brought upon the people of other countries and what their course of conduct would ultimately bring to America, and that is class bitterness and racial hatred from which their people would be the chief sufferers, and which would probably result in the destruction of our constitutional government, to be followed by the most consummate dictatorship the western world has ever known—after they had dragged us through another European war.

From the beginning, these elements have been in collusion with Moscow to overthrow the American Republic. If the members of the Dies committee will go through with their investigation to the end they will find that this movement has been financed by the smug international agitators in Wall Street who got rich out of the World War and who are now financing the propaganda to get us into the present European conflict—thinking that if they can keep it going long enough England, Germany, and the United States will become exhausted and they can then take charge and dominate the world.

They are undermining every phase of American life. They have invariably disrupted industry and paralyzed commerce, and have all but wrecked American labor, and at the same time they have penalized the American farmers and prevented recovery from a depression from which we should have emerged 6, 8, or 10 years ago.

They inaugurated the sit-down strike, the old weapon of nihilism, and have attempted in every possible way to prevent a settlement of these strikes and to destroy American industries. The scheme was to bring on a crash that would throw the country into communism.

Thank God, Paul McNutt, as Governor of Indiana, had the courage to kick these sit-down strikes out of his State and save both labor and industry from their disastrous consequences. I wish we could have had 47 more such Governors in the other States.

They have betrayed President Roosevelt; they have betrayed his administration; they have betrayed the Democratic Party; they have betrayed America.

They have attempted to honeycomb this Government and plant Communists in key positions. According to the report of the Dies committee, many of the names of this Communist-front organization published by the committee as being on the Federal pay roll are international Communist agitators.

Are we going to leave these international Communists, members of an organization sworn to overthrow this Government, striving to destroy Christianity, working to wipe out this Anglo-Saxon civilization that you and I enjoy—are we going to leave them in these key positions and permit them to sabotage this Government and wreck the industries of this country in case they succeed in dragging us into a war? They may create an incident in the bombing of a ship, or the blowing up of a factory, or the commission of some other horrible crime that they can lay at the door of a foreign power, in order to drag us into the war, and then complete the wreck of this great Republic, created by Washington, Jefferson, Madison, and Franklin, and which has afforded us the most glorious example of liberty, freedom, and self-government the world has ever known.

Some of them would dynamite the Capitol or blow up the White House to get us into this war.

When they first started trying to get us into this war, their beloved Russia was going to be on our side. The Russian Ambassador, Troyanovsky, alias Finkelstein, was here conspiring with these Communists and openly advocating a military alliance between Soviet Russia and the United States.

Thank God, that scheme failed.

There are more than 100 of us ex-service men in this House now, and if these people succeed in plunging this country into a war, we are going to see to it that they do not escape military service; that they do not remain at home to wreck our Government and get rich out of it. Not only that, but we are going to see that no "dollar a year" men come out of this war as multimillionaires. And while we are at it, we are going to tax not only the profits of this war but of the last war as well.

They are not going to plunge America into a holocaust of destruction and then escape all the consequences to reap enormous fortunes and then take charge of American institutions when the war is over and the country exhausted.

We are going to save America for Americans.

In addition to honeycombing our Government, they are trying to make a farce out of the civil service and a mockery out of our immigration laws. They have distributed copies of former civil-service questions and coached each other to where they crowd the civil-service register, and promote each other in the Government service until practically every bureau is rankling with resentment and seething with discontent.

They are flocking into this country by the thousands in flagrant violation of our immigration laws, crowding Americans out of their jobs, and adding to and intensifying the race troubles we already have.

Mr. Speaker, I am not criticizing any man for his vote on lifting the arms embargo. Members of the House have been subjected to such pressure as I have never seen brought to bear in all the years of my services in this House. I take it that everyone voted for what he thought was the best way to keep America out of this war. That is what I did, and I have no apologies for it.

But the battle has just begun; the next vote is the one to worry about. If we are to keep America out of this war, I fear we are confronted by a fight that will test the souls of men. We Members who voted on the different sides of this embargo question, and who were imbued with the sole idea and actuated by the sole purpose of keeping our country out

of this war, will be fighting shoulder to shoulder within the next few months against this organized, world-wide influence that will be turning heaven and earth to get us in.

I heard an old Confederate soldier say that General Forrest once said he "would not give a damn for any soldier who went into battle expecting to come out alive." No man who is not willing to take his political or his physical life in his hands to protect his country in a crisis like that which we are likely approaching is worthy to occupy a seat in this House, because if we yield to the pressure of these international influences we will probably pay for it with the blood of our people, with the lives of millions of our young men, and with the fate of our country itself.

As Shakespeare says,

> Better be with the dead,
> Whom we, to gain our place, have sent to peace,
> Than on the torture of the mind to lie
> In restless ecstasy.

My life or your life, physically or politically, means little or nothing compared to the lives and destinies of the 130,000,000 people whom you and I are sent here to represent.

If we were to consult those 130,000,000 people and give them all a chance to speak, they would thunder back almost with the voice of unanimity, "Keep America out of this war."

If Washington, if Jefferson, if Lincoln, if Davis, if Grant, if Lee—if all our great statesmen and patriots of former generations could press back the veil that hides us from that mysterious realm where they have taken their places "in the silent halls of death" and speak a word of warning to the American people that would echo throughout the "illimitable void of space" until it drowned all other sounds to silence, their unanimous admonition would be—as it has always been—"Keep America out of European wars."

If Woodrow Wilson, after being disillusioned as he was by his bitter experiences with the hatreds, the animosities, the intrigues, the duplicities, and the ingratitudes of Europe, could peer through the eternal mists and utter one word of fatherly advice to the people of this country, that word would be to, "Keep America out of this war."

If the gray-haired fathers and mothers who gave their sons in the last war, including the ones who have sunk in heart-broken silence to untimely graves, could make their voices heard, they would appeal to every Member of Congress to, "Keep America out of this war."

If the voiceless thousands of our patriotic dead who went down in the last war, including the Unknown Soldier who sleeps in Arlington's sacred tomb, could "wipe the grave dust from their palled brows" and come forth "in tattered robes of bony whiteness" to utter one word in the cause of their country, for which they died, it would be an appeal to, "Keep America out of this war."

God give us the wisdom to see the right and the courage to do our duty when we see it, that we may hold aloft the American flag and perpetuate American institutions to bless the coming generations as they have blessed our own. May the spirits of the immortal founders of this Republic guide and sustain us during the trying months that lie ahead. And may we, the recipients of American liberty—that proud heritage of patriotism, conceived in the minds of the greatest statesmen the world has ever produced, guarded and protected by the undying loyalty of a noble ancestry—may we forever preserve and defend that liberty in our time and transmit it unimpaired to our posterity, that this grand old Republic may go down to the future with strength in her loins, hope in her soul, and the Miriam song of triumph on her lips. [Applause.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SIROVICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. SIROVICH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIROVICH. Mr. Speaker, it takes a lifetime for a man to build up an honorable character. It takes but a moment to destroy it.

A few minutes ago I heard the reputation of the general counsel of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation bitterly assailed. I happened to have studied the workings of the distinguished, brilliant, and eminent general counsel of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, Claude Hamilton, Jr. He is one of the most indefatigable and persevering workers, one of the most assiduous and persistent caretakers of the rights of the people of our Nation, and one of the most indomitable public servants in the service of the Government of the United States.

He is a disciple of the present Justice of Supreme Court Hugo Black. He has endeared himself to all who have come into intimate contact with him for his gentlemanliness, for his kindness, and for his humanitarian services. While I do not desire to subtract anything that the previous speakers might have said about the drought, I am sure if they would contact this genial and able general counsel of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation he will do everything that is compatible with law and dignity to serve the cause that they represent. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

THE ADJOURNMENT OF CONGRESS

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the record roll call vote of the Members who voted to adjourn a few moments ago, like Banquo's ghost, will never die. It will rise to haunt many Members who voted to adjourn, not only those from the drought-suffering districts but those from many other districts. In view of the many important distressing and perplexing problems, domestic and foreign, which confront our country and our countrymen, the Congress should remain in session and help in their solution.

With reference to the complaint that was made after the sine die adjournment resolution was agreed to, I believe that if the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON] had voted against the resolution to adjourn so that this Congress could remedy the situation about which he complained, he would have been rendering far better service to the drought-afflicted areas of America. Action by Congress and not mere vocal protests after adjournment on drought relief and many other important problems is what the people want and are entitled to receive. Voting to adjourn and then protesting about administrative ills which Congress should and can cure reminds me of locking the barn door after the horse has been stolen. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. PARSONS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a joint resolution of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. J. Res. 306. Joint resolution to preserve the neutrality and the peace of the United States and to secure the safety of its citizens and their interests.

JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. PARSONS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President for his approval a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 306. Joint resolution to preserve the neutrality and the peace of the United States and to secure the safety of its citizens and their interests.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States announced that on the following date he approved and signed a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

On October 11, 1939:

H. J. Res. 384. Joint resolution to make provision for certain expenses incident to the second session of the Seventy-sixth Congress.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House a communication from the President of the United States.

The Clerk read as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, November 3, 1939.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: As it seems probable that this extraordinary session of the Congress will be brought to adjournment within a few hours, may I extend through you to the Members of the House of Representatives my congratulations and good wishes.

I hope that world events will not make it necessary to have any other extraordinary session—and, therefore, in anticipation of seeing you all on the 3d of January next, I extend to you in the meantime my best wishes for a happy Thanksgiving and a merry Christmas. May I add that I hope those Members from States whose Governors have set November 30 as Thanksgiving Day will celebrate both Thanksgivings—the 23d and the 30th.

Very sincerely yours,

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

The Honorable, THE SPEAKER,
The House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

ADJOURNMENT SINE DIE

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Texas.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of Senate Concurrent Resolution 31, the Chair declares the extraordinary session of the Seventy-sixth Congress adjourned sine die.

Thereupon (at 6 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned sine die.

APPROVAL OF A HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION SUBSEQUENT TO SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

The President of the United States, subsequent to the final adjournment of the second session of the Seventy-sixth Congress, notified the Clerk of the House of Representatives that he had approved a joint resolution of the House, as follows:

On November 4, 1939:

H. J. Res. 306. Joint resolution to preserve the neutrality and the peace of the United States and to secure the safety of its citizens and their interests.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

1111. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV a letter from the quartermaster general, United Spanish War Veterans, transmitting the proceedings of the stated convention of the Forty-first Encampment of the United Spanish War Veterans, held in Atlantic City, N. J., September 10–14, 1939 (H. Doc. No. 498), was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. BLOOM: Committee of conference. H. J. Res. 306. Joint Resolution, Neutrality Act of 1939 (Rept. No. 1475). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. WARREN: Committee on Accounts. House Resolution 304. Resolution for the relief of Alice Everett Cox; without amendment (Rept. No. 1474). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska:

H. R. 7616. A bill to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to furnish additional statistical information and marketing service for the benefit of the poultry industry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan:

H. R. 7617. A bill to authorize the acquisition of forest lands adjacent to and over which highways, roads, or trails are constructed or to be constructed wholly or partially with Federal funds in order to preserve or restore their natural beauty, and for other puposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SCHIFFLER:

H. R. 7618. A bill to authorize the acquisition of lands for cemetery purposes in the vicinity of Grafton, W. Va.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

H. R. 7619. A bill to set aside certain lands for Bear Butte National Monument and to authorize their administration as such; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 7620. A bill providing for the promotion of employees in the Customs field service; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PATRICK:

H. R. 7621. A bill providing for disposal of public lands in certain cases; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. POAGE:

H. R. 7622. A bill to provide for loans to farmers for soil conservation purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 7623. A bill to establish a cotton research award fund; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. STEFAN:

H. R. 7624. A bill to forbid the importation of certain agricultural products into the United States from foreign countries until the comparable domestic article attains the parity price; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CLAYPOOL:

H. R. 7625. A bill for the relief of Bert and Marie Freeman; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SOMERS of New York:

H. R. 7626. A bill for the relief of Ernest Unger; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. VOORHIS of California:

H. R. 7627. A bill extending the provisions of the act entitled "An act to amend the act entitled 'An act for the retirement of employees in the classified civil service, and for other purposes,' approved May 22, 1920, and acts in amendment thereof" to A. V. Taggart; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. WHITE of Idaho:

H. R. 7628. A bill for the relief of William H. Linhart; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

5857. By Mr. ANGELL: Petition of Hugh Sheehan, of Portland, Oreg., and others, asking for the retention of the embargo; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5858. By Mr. ASHBROOK: Petition of 1,800 members of the Council of Women Opposed to Participation in Foreign Wars, of Newark and Licking County, Ohio, protesting against the taking of any step whatsoever on the part of our Government which would tend to send American sons to another war on foreign soil; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5859. By Mr. DONDERO: Petition of citizens of Pontiac, Mich., urging that the good offices of our Government be employed at the earliest opportune time to secure, through collaboration with other neutral states, a truce between the nations now at war, wherein they may find by peaceful negotiation and discussion a way to compose their differences and solve their problems; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5860. By Mr. GIFFORD: Petition of James B. Conant, president of Harvard College, and others; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5861. By Mr. HART: Petition of Newark Post, No. 10, American Legion, urging that immediate action be taken to enact Senate bill 2711, prohibiting employment within the United States of aliens by manufacturers of aircraft, aircraft engines, and accessories for the Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5862. By Mr. SHEPPARD: Petition of the Long Beach Democratic Club, Long Beach, Calif., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the neutrality law; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5863. By Mr. WEAVER: Petition of R. C. McBride, of Waynesville, Haywood County, N. C., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the neutrality law; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5864. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Mrs. H. Boy Frankel, of Chicago, Ill., petitioning consideration of the resolution with reference to the neutrality law; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

APPENDIX

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 76th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Appendix

Keep America Safe for Americans in America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFTON A. WOODRUM

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1939

RADIO ADDRESS OF HON. CLIFTON A. WOODRUM, OF VIRGINIA, AT ROANOKE, VA., SEPTEMBER 18, 1939

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an address made by me over the radio on September 18, 1939, as follows:

An American patriot once said of a pending crisis, "These are times that try men's souls." Certainly the sentiment applies with full force and effect to the present hour. Once again greed and ruthless thirst for power have unleased the hounds of war and civilization plunges headlong into another conflict, the extent or ultimate effect of which no one can predict. It is impossible to conceive that such a situation could come about. Past experiences have shown us that no one can win; that everyone will lose; and no human language can picture the sorrow, suffering, and distress—to say nothing of the economic and spiritual losses that will ensue—and yet * * * on we go. The rapid spread and enlargement of this conflagration in the past 2 weeks has shown us in a very vivid way that no one can predict just what it will amount to, or when or where it will end. History will show, however, that it was unavoidable, that the "madman of Germany" would listen to no reason or logic, and would be satisfied with nothing short of the imposition of his iron will upon the people of the world by force. Certain it is that Great Britain and France, as well as our own Nation, wanted peace. This war to these countries, as well as to all of the nations, can mean but one ultimate thing, and that is irreparable loss.

The question uppermost in the minds of every American citizen today is, Can America keep out of this war? As the matter stands at the moment, I think the question can be very definitely answered in the affirmative. If you mean by keeping out of the war, can we avoid any aggressive action against other nations which will necessitate the sending of troops to foreign soil—then certainly the answer is "yes." We will keep out of that kind of war. Those of you who heard Elmer Davis in his broadcast Sunday morning will remember that he made a very pertinent observation: "That while America certainly would keep out of the war, the real question would be perhaps whether we could keep the war out of America." This is very definitely an element in the situation which we must not overlook in charting our course of conduct as a nation in this crisis.

I have just returned from the Nation's Capital, where, in connection with my duties, I came in contact with leaders in the legislative branch of the Government, in the State Department, and of the press. I can say this to you very positively, and I hope it will be reassuring: That no person connected with this Government in any official capacity has any other thought at the moment than that America should and will keep out of this war. Certainly that is the passionate desire of the President of the United States. Every official act of the administration, in my judgment, has been to the end that American neutrality shall be a very real proposition and that we must be careful to guard our position in that respect. For my own part, I have adopted a slogan for this crisis. There is nothing particularly new or novel about it, but I believe it represents the sentiments of my constituents and feel confident that it expresses the thought of an overwhelming majority of the American citizens. It is this: "Keep America safe for Americans in America." I commend this sentiment to your careful consideration. In whatever may come before Congress and in whatever official action I may be called upon to take as your representative, this shall be my guiding star. I feel very keenly the responsibility that is mine as your representative in Congress during this critical period. The peace, the security, the welfare of America, in my judgment, transcends all other considerations. So far as I am concerned, political considerations are "out of the window" until the war clouds have passed away. My official action is going to be governed solely by what, in my humble judgment, will be for the peace and security of America.

In connection with America's position in this crisis, there are several matters that I would like to comment upon briefly.

First. Our neutrality.

We all agree that America must stay out of this conflict. There is no difference of opinion on that score. There is some difference of opinion as to whether the present so-called neutrality, or the revision which the President has requested, will best serve our purpose to remain neutral and stay out of this war. What is neutrality? I think we mean by the word "neutral" that we will not take aggressive action, that we will not actively discriminate between belligerents, and that we will not permit our territory or our property to be used by one belligerent against another. I believe that sort of neutrality can and will be enforced in America. We should not, however, put a strained or unnatural construction on the word "neutrality" so as to have it mean that we must be indifferent to the happenings in this conflict, and that we must be unconcerned as to its ultimate outcome. That is not and cannot be the sentiment of the American people. A newspaper reporter remarked to me the other day, very pertinently, that in his judgment 90 percent of the American people were emphatically favorable to the cause represented by Great Britain, France, and Poland and that they wished to see them succeed. Yet, that same 90 percent of our citizenship are in favor of "America keeping out of this war. Remember now * * * we are making America safe for Americans, in America. Therefore, I do not believe our country should, or would get into this conflict to protect business interests abroad, nor should we as a nation be involved with some other power for safety of adventuresome American citizens traveling in foreign lands, or upon belligerent ships, after repeated

warnings not to do so. They should do that at their own risk and not put our country in a position of having to pick a quarrel because of their indiscretion.

The President has called Congress to meet in a special session. The big issue will be a revision of the Neutrality Act. It is most unfortunate that this action was not taken at the regular session of Congress, as suggested by the President. It could have been done then without embarrassment. Personally, I voted for the bill that passed the House, as did every other Virginia Representative. I shall vote for revision in the coming session, as I am emphatically of the opinion that by so doing we will come nearer having a real neutrality law that will protect the safety and security of our own country. While heartily agreeing to the sentiment that we have no business getting mixed up in this brawl, I confess I am unable to find much of a convincing nature in the arguments against neutrality revision. Some of our friends seem to suddenly have a bad case of jitters, for fear we will offend someone. Just what might we do to "get us into war"—and with whom? Now, let's be a bit realistic about the matter. Every thoughtful citizen knows full well that the continued peace and security of our own country, and our ability to stay out of war, may to a very large extent depend upon the outcome of the present conflict in Europe and Asia. What are we supposed to do? Pull down the shades, turn out the lights, and crawl under the bed? Is it possible that there are those amongst us who are so credulous as believe that the German dictator entertains any regard for the American Government, or that he would hesitate a split instant to take any action of any sort against America or her interests if he thought it would serve his purpose? Must we not know that if the time ever comes that Germany or her allies wish to mix it with America—and such time will most likely never come—that it will make no earthly difference whether we have sold supplies to belligerents? Or what our attitude has been? Does not the record show that to Herr Hitler international law means nothing? Treaties mere scraps of paper? And that his will is superior to the laws of man or God? As Great Britain and France have vividly realized, the only thing that will stop him is superior force; let us not emulate the stupidity of the ostrich and seek to avoid facing the coming storm by burying our heads in the sand.

Now, just what is involved in the neutrality fight?

In the first place, let us remember that if there were no neutrality law upon the statute books of America, and we were governed entirely by international law and custom, it would be lawful for America as a neutral nation to have unrestricted trade and commerce of every description with all belligerent nations. We could load munitions of war on our own ships and send them to Great Britain and France, or any other belligerent, taking the chance, of course, of having them destroyed at sea, with resulting international complications. Under the neutrality law, which is now in existence, we can sell to belligerent nations food, clothing, iron, steel, and many of the other commodities and materials which are necessary to nations in war; but cannot sell, under any circumstances or conditions, guns, airplanes, or any munitions.

Right at this point let us dispose of the chief argument of the opposition to revision. They say our Army and Navy will follow the war goods sold to belligerents; that such sales will lead us into war. That would be a most potent argument if we intended to sell the supplies, load them on ships flying the American flag, and manned by American seamen, and deliver such supplies to the purchaser in foreign ports. Of course, in such a case an American ship loaded with goods at that time belonging to Americans and manned by American seamen would be attacked and destroyed—then international complications would arise. But we propose to do no such thing. The purchaser must pay cash and come to the American port and get his goods in his own ship and under his own flag. If he gets into trouble after he leaves our shores that's his business. Such a transaction is perfectly in accord with American custom—with international law * * * and it's silly to talk of it getting us into war. Not only that, but our country, and its trade and commerce are entitled to benefit by the favorable economic position we occupy as a neutral. Farm and factory and labor are entitled to the benefit of the trade that by all rules of law or morality may come to our shores.

Now let us remember right at this point that it oftentimes happens that a belligerent nation, because of economic conditions or geographic location, may reap very great benefit from the neutrality of another nation. This can be very readily shown by the situation that Italy occupies today. Perhaps the greatest service that she can render to Germany at the moment is to remain a neutral nation, because by so doing her frontiers are closed to Great Britain and France, which means that perhaps the only practicable opportunity that these nations would have to reach Poland would be across Italian territory. Under our so-called Neutrality Act as it stands today, Germany is very decidedly and definitely favored. For economic and geographic reasons, Germany would not likely—under any circumstances—want American planes, but Great Britain, France, and Canada have now unfilled orders in America for airplanes and other defense implements. Our so-called present neutrality denies to these nations the right to purchase these necessary implements of war. Now, where does this lead us? Germany has rushed headlong into this war, after years of feverish preparations. Nothing could stop her. It was forced upon Great Britain and France. They have tried in every conceivable way to promote peace and to avoid war. They have not spent their time and energy in building up a huge war machine, as has Germany. Our present so-called neutrality, which denies these democracies the right to buy our supplies, is a most flagrant and unjust discrimination against these democracies and in favor of the aggressor in this sorry business. It just doesn't make sense.

What do we propose to do if the law is amended?

We propose, as I have said, to say to all of the belligerent nations that they may purchase our commodities in America for cash, but that they must load them upon their own ships and be responsible for their transportation to their own countries. There is no way that such a policy can involve us with any other belligerent nation. Now let us be perfectly frank about the matter. If, as a matter of practical effect because of our neutral position, Great Britain, France, and Poland are in an advantageous position in this conflict * * * then I for one am very happy indeed. It suits me fine, as I believe it will please an overwhelming number of our people.

We have been assured at Washington that vigorous action is going to be taken to prevent profiteering, and that the Government is going to require American interest to deal with all belligerents impartially on a cash-and-carry basis.

The second proposition which I shall comment upon in passing is that we must see to it that our neutrality is respected and that present conflict does not come to the shores of America. I am sure this is what the President meant when he said "the frontiers of America would be extended to protect this Nation." We must keep the battlefield in Europe and Asia.

In the third place, we must proceed in an orderly and logical way to build up our defense forces and strengthen them at every point. Certainly we have learned that much.

In the fourth place we must have a careful check of all aliens in America—those aliens who remain here illegally should be deported or put into detention camps. Please do not misinterpret this statement. There are literally thousands of foreign-born Americans who number among our very best and very finest people. Their sons have fought in our wars; they have contributed to our country; and, in fact, they are real Americans. The people to whom I refer in the first group are aliens who have slipped into this country contrary to our immigration laws and are here illegally. This group of people are a very definite menace to our security in this crisis. Leave them here, and we may expect sabotage.

Fifth. The war crisis in no way lessens the necessity to set our own economic house in order, to hold down and curtail Government expenditures, to simplify Government functions, and to try as best we can in such an emergency to have a better balance between income and expenditures.

Sixth. Someone has suggested a truce on partisan politics. This, of course, would be ideal. A friend of mine in Washington the other day said: "It is very fine for you fellows who are in power to want to call off politics, but what about those of us who would like to get in power?" On the neutrality issue there seems to be some effort to make it a partisan question * * * yet—almost without exception—the Republican press of the country has supported the President's foreign policy. I am sure in the coming session of Congress that there will be found many of the leaders of the Republican Party staunchly supporting the proposal to amend the neutrality law. But maybe it would not be fair to deny the American people their favorite sport—politics. When all is said and done, I am quite sure that in the year 1940 we will have a real little war of our own in America. The blessing of it is, however—for which we must be continually thankful—that it will be settled by ballots instead of bullets * * * and, however it is settled, the country will be safe.

In closing, let me express the hope that in these days of frequent dramatic news broadcasts of happenings abroad that we try to keep our heads and not get excited about emotional and melodramatic appeals. Let us go about our daily tasks and daily duties in a normal and orderly manner, and try to keep out of our hearts hatred and bitterness for anyone. Let us, individually and as a nation, remember that there will come a day when these warring nations, torn and bleeding, and tired of conflict, will be ready to listen to reason and to respond to logic. In such a day our country will have a mission to perform.

Armageddon Again?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD KNUTSON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1939

ARTICLE BY RAYMOND CLAPPER

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Daily News of last evening contained an article by Raymond Clapper that should be given the widest possible circulation. Mr. Clapper's article is timely and thought-arresting. It is with the hope that its circulation may be extended to all parts of the coun-

try that I avail myself of the privilege kindly granted by the House to insert it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The article follows:

[From the Washington Daily News of September 20, 1939]

ARMAGEDDON AGAIN?

(By Raymond Clapper)

Those who think, as I do, that no issue has as yet arisen to warrant us sending several million American youths to Europe again are being taunted with the question: "Are we going to think only of our skins and our own pockets?" Says another: "This is not a back-room brawl. This is Armageddon."

I think it is very much to the point to be thinking of our skins—at least to be thinking of those American families whose sons would have to risk their skins. Certainly it is not for us armchair kibitzers, safe behind our trusty typewriters, to be lecturing our friends into sending sons to fight in Europe.

Neither does it come with good grace from highly placed new dealers, who have been so solicitous about the skins of the unemployed and the economic underprivileged, to be so horrified now by the thought of anyone wishing to save his own skin.

I hope sincerely that this time the American people will think about their own skins—about the great skin that is America, providentially blessed by a degree of natural isolation from this crazy carnage in Europe; the America which shelters us within a potential paradise rich enough in natural resources to enable those so fortunate as to be Americans to live in the peace and comfort to which human beings are entitled. And to be ready to protect these treasures. Why not be thoroughly selfish about America? Is there anything to be cherished more?

But they tell us this war in Europe is not a back-room brawl. This is Armageddon. Yes. That's what they said before.

You can find it now in Walter Millis' The Road to War. How Walter Hines Page, our Ambassador to Great Britain in the World War, wrote to Woodrow Wilson about the first World War.

"It's a death grapple," he said. "All preceding mere 'wars' are not in the same class of events. It means extermination, not of the people of either nation, but the utter extermination of the system of either one or the other—English free institutions or German military autocracy."

And Elihu Root in a rousing speech: "There is no nation on earth, not England, nor France, nor Belgium, nor Italy, nor Russia, with a stake greater in the success of the Allies in this (1917) war against German militarism than the United States. * * * If we enter this war, we shall be fighting over again the battle of American democracy, along with the democracy of England, the democracy of France, the democracy of Italy, and now, God be praised, the great democracy of Russia; fighting for the principle of free self-government against the principle of old-time autocracy and military power."

Still they insist now that this present war is different. It isn't an ordinary war. It's a war of ideologies.

Well, 6 weeks ago Hitler was fighting to crush bolshevism. Now Hitler and bolshevism are allies. For years the ideological war raged. But the minute it was to Hitler's advantage to make a deal with bolshevism he made it. And what of bolshevism's war against fascism? Stalin has made a deal with Hitler because he gets something out of it. They both carve up Poland, and ideologies be damned.

All wars are fought under crusading banners which are supposed to take the curse off the loot that the powers are after.

If there is one thing that is completely cynical, it is war; and if we think of anything except our own national interests in trying to determine our policies during this period, we are plain suckers. It is part of the game to disguise those interests under high-sounding slogans, but that is the propaganda to lash up the morale. We are inclined to mistake the propaganda for the real thing, the selfish interest which hides beneath it.

Before we old folks begin talking about sending other Americans out to do the fighting let's be sure that something very vital to the future safety and security of this country is involved.

Chairman John Hamilton, of the Republican National Committee, just back from France, says: "It is my opinion that the Republican Party should dedicate itself to the task, not of hoping this country will stay out of war but of seeing that it does stay out of war."

The Republicans should not be allowed to occupy that platform all alone.

Fashions in Neutrality—Styles 1935 and 1939

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. THORKELSON

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 25, 1939

Mr. THORKELSON. Mr. Speaker, on January 20 I addressed the House on the responsibility of Congress. In the concluding paragraph I made this statement:

The people should now take the law into their own hands by insisting that all departments in the Federal Government adhere to the Constitution; that all laws enacted in conflict with the Constitution be repealed, one by one, so that the people's rights may be restored. That will start the wheels of industry going, furnish employment, increase consumption, build prosperity, and return the American smile to our people.

Mr. Speaker, we are now confronted with the responsibility of keeping this country out of war, and it is our duty to observe the wishes of the people instead of allowing ourselves to be influenced by the "invisible government's" propaganda in the kept press.

Why not give this a little thought: Our people do not want war. Congress does not want war, and I am reasonably certain that the Army and Navy are opposed to war. Now, who or what is threatening our neutrality?

What we need at this time are a few loyal newspapers which will dedicate their pages to the general welfare of this Republic and to the fundamental principles upon which it came into being. It is unfortunate when our so-called free press becomes subservient to the "invisible government," and a mouthpiece for foreign propaganda, which is for no other purpose than to obscure and pervert truth.

The President's message to Congress on September 21, 1939, the opening day of this special session, is a compilation of semitruths and excursionary flights of imagination to delude Congress. It is a "Sandman's story" to close the public's eyes to actual facts, so it will slumber quietly and not exert pressure on Congress for its own protection while the Federal factory molds sufficient rubber stamps to insure repeal of the arms-embargo clause in the Neutrality Act.

In his message to Congress, he requests the repeal of the arms-embargo clause and not the Neutrality Act. In other words, he wants to retain the power granted to him by the act which is, by proclamation, to assume personal control in the handling of all war material and credit to such nations as he believes are entitled to help.

I wonder how many of us actually believe that the President has called this special session of Congress to enact legislation that will compel him and the Federal Government to be more neutral? Has the President or the administration ever asked to be restricted or shorn of power? I do not believe so, for while I have been a Member of Congress he has asked for more and more power. For the President to request restrictions would be like a person asking for a double set of handcuffs. In making such request, he admits that he is dangerous, and in this knowledge asks to be restrained. He knows himself best, but if he is sincere in this request, I say Congress must not repeal the arms-embargo clause.

I can only say that if anyone believes that this session of Congress is called to provide a purer brand of neutrality, he is gullible indeed, for we are not here for that purpose. Congress has been assembled for no other reason except to repeal the arms-embargo clause, and remove such restrictions as are objectionable to the President. He wants a free hand, and no doubt lives in the hope that he, like his Democratic predecessor, may be recorded in the pages of history with the war lords now strutting in Europe, or shall I say to join the powers now waiting for us, to render our aid in the common destruction of our civilization for the benefit of the invisible government.

The people have expressed themselves by wire and by mail as being opposed to war. Members of Congress have been besieged by small and large groups of citizens who have expressed themselves as unalterably opposed to war. I do not differ from them, because I also am opposed to participation in war anywhere except in defense of our own country. Has the administration declared itself? No! The Executive and his statesmen have not declared themselves as opposed to war. On the contrary, they rattle their sabers and shout to Congress, "Help us to remain neutral! Don't let anyone ravish our neutrality!"

The question may now be asked: What is all the excitement about? And as I have already asked, Who is threatening our neutrality? Why does not the President, in one of his fireside chats, inform the public? It would be interesting indeed to have these mythical neutrality thieves identified.

Why does not the administration, with the power it now has, place these disturbers of neutrality incommunicado?

Let us get away from this silly acting and clowning and place the responsibility where it rightfully belongs. Who can involve our Nation or move us from a neutral position except those who direct the Government? Who are they? They are, first, the President himself; second, the State Department and those who are instrumental in clearing ships and cargoes to foreign ports; third, all department chiefs and other Federal employees, including members of the President's family, who are constantly expressing themselves publicly about foreign affairs which are of no interest to us and should for that reason be left for settlement to the nations concerned.

We do not elect a President as director of the world, but instead as President of the United States, whose duties are clearly defined in article II of the Constitution. There is nothing in article II which empowers the Executive to interfere in foreign wars or to direct foreign states. We certainly would object to foreign advice and interference in our affairs, so let us extend to foreign nations the same courtesy that we expect from them.

It may also be opportune to advise the Supreme Court to acquaint itself with article III of the same document, for its duty is clearly defined therein. There is no occasion for any of the Justices to express their opinions publicly, as was done by Mr. Justice Frankfurter on September 21, 1939:

FRANKFURTER SAYS WE CAN'T BE NEUTRAL

"No man who thinks really is neutral," said the Vienna-born Justice, as he termed neutrality "one of those slogans and catchwords that cover up thought."

Mr. Frankfurter is one of President Roosevelt's appointees to the Supreme Court. On the same day that the President appears before Congress in joint session and requests its help to maintain neutrality this brilliant appointee on the Supreme Court comes out publicly with the statement "We can't be neutral."

Mr. Frankfurter's statement that we cannot be neutral is sheer nonsense, for many nations located in war zones remained neutral during the World War. And switching his statement to "neutral in thought" is, if nothing else, deceptive. Who cares what Mr. Frankfurter or anyone else thinks? Wars are fought with bullets and not with vacuolated ideas. It is expressions in public such as the Justice used that are unneutral. No one, of course, can deny to others the right to think, but sensible statesmen in public service should not lend themselves to expressions which may lead our country into war.

Unfortunately there are too many of such class of statesmen employed in the present Federal administration, and to remain neutral it is evident that Congress must get rid of them sooner or later. These national and international experts are now a plague in the land. No wonder Mr. Elliott Roosevelt said "Congress is obsolete." It is not only obsolete but helpless if it does not impeach some of these windjammers.

I quote another short paragraph:

Justice Frankfurter spoke at a banquet at Ford Hall Forum liberal discussion group which awarded him its annual gold medal for "preeminent public service."

I can well understand that Mr. Frankfurter is a liberal, for he is recorded, on page 33 in Senate Document No. 14 entitled "Attempt by Communists to Seize the American Labor Movement," as one of the members on the national committee of the American Civil Liberties Union. It is well to bear in mind that Mr. Baldwin, of the same organization, testified before a hearing of the Judiciary Committee in the House that they believed in murder and overthrow of the Government of the United States. Now Mr. Frankfurter says "We can't be neutral."

Let me now quote from Senate Document No. 14:

Other members on the national committee (American Civil Liberties Union) include Norman M. Thomas, who is connected with six other organizations and who is a clergyman combining intellectual radicalism with religion; Peter Poscal Cosgrove, of Boston, a Nova Scotian, who has recently been a recruiting agent for William D. Haywood's industrial unit, the Kuzbas, in Russia; Felix Frankfurter, member of the law faculty at Harvard University; Elizabeth Gurley Flynn, a solicitor of funds for the I. W. W.; William Z. Foster, born in Massachusetts and heading the Trade Union Educational League; John Haynes Holmes, member of the League for Amnesty of Political Prisoners—an enterprise to obtain the release of the potential Communist leadership from the Federal and State prisons; Norman Hapgood, a newspaper writer; Arthur Garfield Hays, a New York attorney; Robert Morss Lovett, former professor at the University of Chicago and first president of the Federated Press; Judah L. Magnes, head of the Jewish Kehillah in New York City; and Oswald Garrison Villard, a New York publisher.

Is it possible that he is one of those the President has in mind who is threatening our neutrality? If so, the President should request Congress to remove him from office.

I now suggest that Congress resume its full power and act in the common defense and for the general welfare of the United States. It is our duty and responsibility to maintain neutrality and avoid all entangling alliances which may directly or indirectly involve us in war. Congress should not hesitate to remove from office anyone or all who overreach their official positions and in such manner involve us in war.

Congress has been entirely too hesitant in asserting its power. This is particularly true in regard to the Communist and his brother subversionist. Both of them are enemies of the United States, for they are engaged in subversion and destruction of our Government. I shall quote article III, section 3:

Treason against the United States shall consist only in levying war against it, or in adhering to their enemies, giving them aid or comfort.

It should be quite evident from this that those in official positions who tolerate such constitutional sabotage not only adhere to our enemies but actually give them aid and comfort. This is treason, and officials who fail in their duty "to preserve, protect, and defend our Nation" against such enemies should be removed from office.

Let us not forget that Congress alone is responsible, not to the President, not to the Supreme Court, but to the people of these United States, and to each State, for the welfare of our people and for the security of the Nation. We are elected representatives of the people and their Government. Let us not fail those who have placed their trust in us.

As a Member of Congress, my greatest desire is to aid the President not only in maintaining neutrality but also in keeping us out of war. I shall, however, do my own thinking, and I hope others will do the same; for, after all, we are here as Members of Congress and not as handmaids to the President and other Federal departments.

The people are, by an overwhelming majority, determined to maintain peace; and with us this should be easy, for we have nothing at stake in Europe or in the Orient. We are even casting the Philippine Islands adrift in 1946. This will, with the exception of Hawaii, leave us with a few unimportant islands in the Pacific.

It is not the so-called common or middle class of people that is instrumental in fomenting war. That is true today as it was in 1914, when from the Brandenburger Tor a thousand voices shouted, "Frieden! Frieden! Wir wollen keinen Krieg!" And from the Burgring in Vienna, "Frieden! Frieden! Nieder mit dem Krieg!" From the two great bridges on the Seine to the Quai d'Orsay, "A bas la guerre! Vive la paix!" And from the well-known Trafalgar Square in London, "Peace! Peace! No war!" And today I am sure that those who are fighting across the water, if allowed to express themselves, would say, as we, "We want peace—no war!"

The war 20 years ago was fought to place the international financiers or the invisible government in power so it could dominate the world. The character of the invisible government is engraved in the Peace Treaty of Versailles, and is responsible for the war in Europe today. Shall we rally to the support of the powers we helped 22 years ago to bring about a greater injustice than that which was written into the peace treaty of the World War? It is that question that Congress must decide, and I am sure the answer will be "No!"

If the present war in Europe continues, this and other sessions of Congress will be expected to keep the United States out of war. As a Member of Congress, I shall try to look into the future and base my decisions, not upon expediency or upon the now worn and frayed appeal, "We speak the same language, and blood is thicker than water," but instead upon what in my opinion is best for a greater and better United States of America.

I shall now quote from the President's message to Congress, September 21, 1939:

I have asked the Congress to reassemble in extraordinary session in order that it may consider and act on the amendment of certain legislation which, in my best judgment, so alters the historic foreign policy of the United States that it impairs the peaceful relations of the United States with foreign nations. * * *

Beginning with the foundation of our constitutional government in the year 1789, the American policy in respect to belligerent nations, with one notable exception, has been based on international law. * * * The single exception was the policy adopted by this Nation during the Napoleonic wars, when, seeking to avoid involvement, we acted for some years under the so-called Embargo and Nonintercourse Acts. That policy turned out to be a disastrous failure. * * * Our next deviation by statute from the sound principles of neutrality and peace through international law did not come for 130 years. It was the so-called Neutrality Act of 1935. * * * I now ask again that such action be taken in respect to that part of the act which is wholly inconsistent with ancient precepts of the law of nations—the embargo provisions. * * *

I give to you my deep and unalterable conviction, based on years of experience as a worker in the field of international peace, that by the repeal of the embargo the United States will more probably remain at peace than if the law remains as it stands today.

The question may now be asked, Who is the parent of the Neutrality Act of 1935? When it was enacted, the administration had an overwhelming majority of New Deal liberals in both Houses of Congress, and the administration had sufficient power to stop any legislation of which it did not approve. The President was also aware that it not only changed our international policy but was, as he said, liable "to be a disastrous failure." In spite of all this, it was enacted into law and signed by the President, August 31, 1935.

In looking for a reason for its enactment, it is well to bear in mind the conditions which existed in Spain at that time, for the communistic "red" army was operating there and was engaged in the destruction of life and property. My reason for alluding to the "red" revolution in Spain is that the Neutrality Act refers particularly to that country. I quote:

Resolved, etc., That, during the existence of the state of civil strife now obtaining in Spain, it shall, from and after the approval of this resolution, be unlawful to export arms, ammunition, or implements of war from any place in the United States, or possessions of the United States, to Spain, or to any other foreign country for transshipment to Spain, or for use of either of the opposing forces in Spain. Arms, ammunition, or implements of war the exportation of which is prohibited by this resolution are those enumerated in the President's proclamation No. 2163 of April 10, 1936.

Licenses heretofore issued under existing law for the exportation of arms, ammunition, or implements of war to Spain shall, as to all future exportations thereunder, ipso facto be deemed to be canceled.

This joint resolution, which was enacted into law January 8, 1937, is evidence in itself that the Neutrality Act is intimately related with the revolution in Spain.

Senate Joint Resolution 173, which was enacted into law August 31, 1935, gives the President power—

That, upon the outbreak or during the progress of war between or among, two or more foreign states, the President shall proclaim such fact, and it shall thereafter be unlawful to export arms, ammunition, or implements of war from any place in the United States, or possessions of the United States, to any port of such belligerent states, or to any neutral port for transshipment to, or for the use of, a belligerent country.

The President, by proclamation, shall definitely enumerate the arms, ammunition, or implements of war the export of which is prohibited by this act.

The President may, from time to time, by proclamation, extend such embargo upon the export of arms, ammunition, or implements of war to other states as and when they may become involved in such war.

The President is hereby authorized to proclaim, upon recommendation of the Board from time to time, a list of articles which shall be considered arms, ammunition, and implements of war for the purposes of this section.

It can readily be seen from this that Congress has delegated power to the President that it had no right to give to him. He now suggests that this wide power be allowed to remain in his hands, as set forth in the Neutrality Act, but that Congress should remove all restrictions, which, of course, is for no other purpose except to line up with such powers as he favors.

I quote another short paragraph for your consideration:

Whenever, during any war in which the United States is neutral, the President shall find that special restrictions placed on the use of the ports and territorial waters of the United States, or of its possessions, by the submarines of a foreign nation will serve to maintain peace between the United States and foreign nations. * * *

I wonder what the compilers of this legislation had in mind when the act was drafted. Just what influence "foreign submarines" may have on the United States that should bring about a change in our policy is something new to me. And the statement, "in which the United States is neutral," would lead one to believe that neutrality is the exception.

The act of 1936, together with its amendments, does not constitute a Neutrality Act, for it is selective. I quote:

This act shall not apply to an American republic or republics engaged in war against a non-American state or states, provided the American republic is not cooperating with a non-American state or states in such war.

How is it possible to draft neutrality legislation and call it "neutral" when it deliberately excludes all South American republics? Are we to assume from this that our neutrality is only extended to such nations as the proclaimer so designates?

In order to explode the neutrality myth I shall quote from the final act of May 1, 1937:

Whenever the President shall find that a state of civil strife exists in a foreign state * * * he shall so proclaim, and it shall thereafter be unlawful, except under such limitations and exceptions as the President may prescribe as to lakes, rivers, and inland waters bordering on the United States * * * for any American vessel to carry such articles or materials. * * *

The question which now arises is that there are only two countries which border on the United States—the one on the south, separated by a river that is sometimes dry, and the country on the north, separated by adjoining lakes. "To which one does this act refer?" is a question that might involve the United States in war.

After having read the act carefully I find that the only part of it which may enforce neutrality is the "embargo clause," and it is that which the President asks Congress to repeal. It is therefore evident that the President does not desire to be neutral, but wants instead to be released from such restrictions that may enforce neutrality.

In order to bring this out more clearly, I shall now quote another paragraph from the President's message to Congress:

The enactment of the embargo provisions did more than merely reverse our traditional policy. It had the effect of putting land powers on the same footing as naval powers so far as sea-borne commerce was concerned. A land power which threatened war could thus feel assured in advance that any prospective sea-power antagonist would be weakened through denial of its ancient right to buy anything anywhere. This, 4 years ago, gave a definite advantage to one belligerent as against another, not through his own strength of geographic position but through an affirmative act of ours. Removal of the embargo is merely reverting to the sounder international practice and pursuing in time of war as in time of peace our ordinary trade policies.

It is quite evident from this that the President, as he clearly stated in this paragraph, now fears that the embargo clause in the Neutrality Act will not allow such nations as now dominate the sea transportation to avail themselves of such war materials as they may buy in the United States. With him it is not a question of neutrality or fairness. It is, instead, to help those powers with whom he is in thorough accord and sympathy.

The President further states in his message:

Repeal of the embargo and a return to international law are the crux of this issue. * * * It has been erroneously said that return to that policy might bring us nearer to war. I give to you my deep and unalterable conviction, based on years of experience as a worker in the field of international peace, that by the repeal of the embargo the United States will more probably remain at peace than if the law remains as it stands today.

How the President can make this statement is indeed difficult to understand. The United States has been operating under international law since 1789, with the exception of a short period during the Napoleonic wars. For 130 years we, as well as other nations, have observed international law, and it is during this same period, and under international law, that the most disastrous wars have been fought. Let us not forget that we had international law in 1917, but did it keep us out of war? Certainly not. We simply fell into the World War—or were shoved into it by an administration that was practically 100-percent probelligerent.

The Neutrality Act may not keep us out of war, but it will serve one useful purpose. It will restrain shipment of arms and the clearance of our ships to belligerent nations and ports located in war zones. It is a law, and as such, if violated, will leave those responsible for such violation subject to punishment.

There is no law, rule, or regulation suitable to keep any nation neutral, for neutrality is purely elective with the governments of such nations as select to be neutral. This was clearly evidenced, as I have already said, in the World War, because Holland, Finland, the Scandinavian countries, and others remained neutral, although they were situated in the war zones. All of these nations operated under international law, but that was not the reason for their neutrality. They were neutral because they had governments that wanted to be neutral, and that is the only thing we need to keep the United States neutral.

I am, therefore, opposed to repeal of the embargo clause, and I want to help to impeach those that directly or indirectly, by infraction of the embargo clause, become instrumental in bringing us into the present war.

Peaceful Settlement of International Disputes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAMILTON FISH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 25, 1939

SPEECH OF HON. HAMILTON FISH, OF NEW YORK, BEFORE THE INTERPARLIAMENTARY UNION CONFERENCE AT OSLO, NORWAY, AUGUST 17, 1939

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech made by me on the peaceful settlement of international disputes before the Interparliamentary Union Conference at Oslo, Norway, on August 17, 1939:

Mr. HAMILTON FISH (United States). I propose to speak on the peaceful settlement of international disputes, which is the order of business before this Conference. I speak as an individual, and in the course of my remarks I propose to offer a resolution which I have not submitted to the administration at Washington nor to my fellow delegates from America. I want it clearly understood that I am speaking in an individual capacity as a delegate to this Conference and not as president of the American group.

We have at this conference 28 delegates from America, and I doubt if we have ever sent more than 10 delegates to any previous conference. The United States is allotted 28 votes, and we have here in Oslo 28 Members of Congress as delegates equally divided between the two great parties in America—14 Republicans and 14 Democrats. I do not see how any American could oppose on principle the proposition that I am submitting because that proposition is based upon arbitration, mediation, and the settlement of international disputes by peaceful means. That has always been the traditional policy of our country.

It is right and proper that the Interparliamentary Union should meet in this critical juncture of world affairs when Europe is confronted with another disastrous and ruinous war in peaceful, neutral, and democratic Norway. We in America are proud to count among our most industrious, loyal, and best citizens those millions of Norwegians, Swedes, Danes, and Finns who have emigrated to America and continue to uphold there the same principles of peace, neutrality, and democracy.

We are members of representative and parliamentary governments from all over the world which believe in the fundamental right of the people to govern themselves under free institutions and in the preservation of peace as a paramount and continuous policy. I never had more faith in the final triumph and extension of democracy and the right of the people to rule than I have today, in spite of its temporary challenge by dictatorships of the left or of the right. The answer to all dictatorships is to make democracy work in our own countries and to put our own houses in order. Parliamentary and representative forms of government are still the hope and aspiration of the struggling masses of mankind throughout the world. But it is none of our business what forms of government exist in other nations, whether it is communism in Russia, nazi-ism in Germany, or fascism in Italy; and by the same token it is none of their business what forms of government exist in any of our democratic countries. Free institutions, including free speech, free press and radio, and free assembly, together with personal liberty and economic justice, are the natural aspirations of free men and women in all sections of the civilized world.

I regret deeply to state that I believe that a European war is more imminent today than at any time since last September. If the Danzig and Polish agitation continues, the slightest spark may start a world conflagration. This Conference has listened to numerous interesting and able speeches from the point of view generally of the nation involved. As one who served in the World War, and for most of the time in the French Fourth Army under General Gouraud, I hate and loath war and do not offer any apologies for raising my voice in behalf of peace. I refuse to admit that the door to peace is closed or to yield to the defeatist talk that apparently covers Europe. I refuse to believe that if there is a will and sufficient determination that a way cannot be found to open the door of peace and the road to a peaceful settlement of international problems.

I am unwilling to agree that an issue such as the political control of Danzig, a small boil on the body politic, cannot be settled without the arbitrament of war. Where is the necessary leadership for peace? The military commands are prepared in the great nations of Europe to let loose the dogs of war and bring destruction, death, famine, and ruin throughout Europe. Is there no alternative or effective leadership for peace? Must pride, prejudice, and hatred dominate the councils of Europe and impose another war on its peace-loving people? It is not too late to strive for peaceful settlements of political disputes until war has broken out. The time to wage war on war is in time of peace. It is only too late after warring nations are actually at each other's throats. For my part, I submit and urge that nothing must be neglected in an honest effort to avert the horrors of war, the slaughter of millions of combatants and noncombatants, of innocent and helpless women and children, the economic and political ruin of Europe, and the advent of the forces of barbarism, paganism, mass murder, and communism. Not even the victor wins, but all nations will be bankrupt, despoiled, and ruined.

We have no power as delegates to enforce peace, but we have a solemn and sacred duty to exert our moral and political influence in our native lands to preserve peace through arbitration, mediation, and conciliation. We cannot dodge or evade the peace issue. We would be shirking our obligations to humanity and our duty as representatives of millions of free people throughout the world if we join in any defeatist attitude toward peace and wash our hands, like Pontius Pilate, over the crucifixion of Europe and maybe of civilization and Christianity. I urge this Conference to make a strong, united plea to the governments of the world, including the Vatican, in support of a 30-day moratorium on political and international disputes, and in the meantime to explore anew every avenue and possibility for a fair and peaceful settlement of the problems that are leading European nations to war, and to provide for a program of world recovery.

I submit the following resolution, which I understand will go automatically to the council for consideration and action:

"*Resolved*, That the Interparliamentary Union, in its session at Oslo, urges upon the Governments of Great Britain, France, Germany, and Italy an immediate consideration of a moratorium on war for 30 days or more, with a view to the settlement of international disputes by arbitration, mediation, and peaceful methods consistent with the principles for which the Interparliamentary Union was founded."

Peace hath her victories no less renowned than war. An armistice for 1 month pending a further effort for the preservation of peace might not only postpone war but prevent its outbreak for an indefinite period.

I speak for a great neutral country whose policy is to keep out of all foreign entanglements and wars. I offer no guaranty of success, but, as one who envisions the disastrous consequences to all nations involved, I appeal in the name of peace and humanity to this conference composed of delegates from democratic nations to go on record unanimously for the resolution I am herewith offering in favor of an armistice for 30 days between England and France on one side and Germany and Italy on the other to provide an additional opportunity to solve their immediate and serious problems. I take it for granted that the democratic nations believing in the principles of arbitration and mediation will be only too willing to resort to such peaceful methods of arbitrement.

I cannot vouch for the attitude of either the German or the Italian Government, but a repudiation of such an offer will be their responsibility and not ours. At least we will have the satisfaction of having endeavored without coercion to promote peace through arbitration and mediation, which is properly one of the main reasons for the existence of the Interparliamentary Union. We used the same method when we urged President Theodore Roosevelt to mediate the Russian-Japanese conflict.

The final solution of any peace program must take into consideration such fundamental problems as overpopulation, raw materials, adequate food supplies, and foreign exchange (gold). For the time being, however, a 30-day armistice or moratorium on war is of vital importance if the people of Europe are to be spared the most disastrous scourge in the last 100 years.

I pray that there will be no war in Europe this year, or for years to come. Modern warfare is a crime against humanity and civilization. The human loss is monstrous. No nation wins; even the victor loses and comes out a bankrupt and disorganized country, the prey to communism and anarchy.

Europe is foul with rumors of war. I ask this conference to rise above the deadlock in which Europe is engulfed into the daylight of peace and humanity. Hatred and revenge must be subordinated to the nobler principles of arbitration and peace.

If the great nations of Europe cannot settle their differences except by war, why not submit this problem of peace to a commission composed of distinguished neutrals, such as the King of Norway, the King of Sweden, the King of Belgium, and the President of Switzerland, or their foreign ministers?

There must be a peaceful way out of the existing deadlock except a bloody and disastrous war.

If we refuse to act and no armistice on war is arranged, the whole peace issue may go by default. Peacemaking machinery has broken down. The tension has been so continuous and so acute that it is not surprising if the statesmen of Europe are worn out and find themselves in an impasse or a deadlock that leads directly to war. If this conference can contribute its part in a democratic manner to the preservation of world peace, it will deserve the grateful thanks and prayers of millions of peace-loving and Christian people throughout all of Europe.

En conclusion, je dis aux membres de cette Conférence Interparlementaire: "A bas la guerre! Vivent la democratie et la paix!" [Loud and prolonged applause.]

The Arms Embargo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL T. CURTIS
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 25, 1939

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the repeal of the arms embargo. I believe there is great danger that it might become the first step toward war. To change the law at this point would be an unneutral act. Already the so-called cash and carry for arms and munitions is proving to be carry without the cash. Once credit is extended there is little difference between 90-day credit and credit for eternity when you are dealing with the nations of Europe. If the munition and financial interests of this country are allowed to have investments and profits in Europe's wars, the next step is apt to be the sending of American boys to protect those investments.

I am for keeping our neutrality law as it is. If any changes are made, they should strengthen it and not weaken it.

If America should be dragged into war, the first casualty would be our liberty and representative government. I am opposed to delegating any discretionary powers to the President.

What may or may not happen in Europe is not the issue. I am opposed to the United States policing the world. I do not want the life of one American boy sacrificed on Europe's battlefields.

Congress should proceed very slowly and make sure that no steps are taken that would endanger the peace of our country. There should be ample opportunity for thorough debate and ample time for the citizens of our country to express themselves to their representatives.

Safeguarding the Peace of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELMER J. RYAN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 25, 1939

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, today the House of Representatives met and adopted a resolution whereby we will adjourn until the 9th day of October, pending action in the Senate of the United States on the question of American neutrality.

Only one momentous question confronts the Congress in this special session which met last week. This session has only one objective, and that is the objective and goal of the American people today—the maintenance of peace for the United States.

Our Nation has nothing to gain and everything to lose by participation in European warfare. No profits which will entangle us in war can justify the horror and suffering which will be ours if we enter that conflict. Gold which comes to our people through the sacrifice of lives in war is fool's gold. Between profits and peace our choice must be, and the choice of the American people is—peace. To aid in the maintenance of peace for America is my goal in this special session.

MAINTAINING ARMS EMBARGO

I cannot believe that the supplying of munitions, arms, and implements of war to one side or the other will help us to remain neutral. To my mind the lifting of the embargo on arms is a step toward entrance into war. The furnishing of arms will create an economic alliance with those nations to whom we supply war implements. History proves that such an economic alliance inevitably leads to a military alliance.

I believe that there is a difference in supplying warring nations with raw materials, steel, wheat, cotton, and other commodities and supplying them with finished implements of war. The sale of manufactured war supplies to one side cannot help but increase the enmity of the opposing nations toward our country. We cannot permit our Nation to become an arsenal to furnish the implements of mass murder.

My vote was cast in the last regular session of Congress in favor of the arms embargo. I intend to again vote in its support in this special session.

RESTRICT AMERICAN SHIPS—NO SHIPPING TO NATIONS AT WAR

To allow American ships to carry commodities to the belligerents is to court the sinking of those ships, which would stir up war feeling in America. Therefore, I will support legislation forbidding American ships to carry commodities to the nations at war.

TRANSFER OF TITLE IN PURCHASES BY BELLIGERENTS

In my opinion the danger of loss of American property will be greatly lessened if we require the transfer of title to belligerents of all goods purchased in our Nation. If title is transferred to the purchaser before leaving our shores and if the requirement is made that the goods be transported by the purchaser we will greatly decrease the chance of American financial losses which would create war sentiment.

PROHIBITION OF LOANS AND CREDITS

By continuing our restrictions on loans and credits to nations at war we will prevent investments which would lead to sympathy and military help to those nations. Therefore I favor the continuance of the present policy of forbidding such loans and credits.

FORBID COLLECTION OF FUNDS IN AMERICA

Likewise, I believe it will tend toward our involvement if we permit the collection of money from our citizens to aid one side or the other. For this reason I favor legislation to retain the ban on such collections in the United States.

My efforts and my vote will be directed along the lines set out in these remarks. I reiterate that it will be my sole purpose and my sole concern during this special session to do my humble part in preventing the entrance of the United States into foreign war.

Miracles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL STEFAN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 25, 1939

ARTICLES FROM THE PEN OF THE LATE UNITED STATES SENATOR LAWRENCE Y. SHERMAN

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, by leave given me I include in my remarks two articles written by my friend, the late Lawrence Yates Sherman, who was once a distinguished Member of the United States Senate. One of these articles is entitled "Miracles," in which Mr. Sherman expressed his faith in a living God. This article was read during the impressive funeral services which were held on September 22 in Illinois:

MIRACLES

Pause tonight in the workshop of the elements housed in the infinite. Here the Omnipotent forges the mighty instruments which rule the world and reach the remotest outposts that belt the unknown.

Nature's chemistry is on a colossal scale. Its laws are unerring and unchangeable.

They rule the kingdoms of the quick and the dead. Weakness and strength, health and growth and decay, deformity, and beauty wait on its imperial decrees.

Electric energy and the responsive vibrations of a universe of ether that outrun human imagination set no limit on the mind with courage like Columbus to sail for a new world.

The most learned scientist must at least be a worshipper at the throne of the Most High.

The deft and marvelous inventions that supplement and multiply the fruits of toil all echo in the inventor's heart Morse's first message, "What hath God wrought?"

The greatest minds of every generation have walked the way that led them to the God that rules in wisdom and power.

The unbeliever and the scoffer have voiced their doubts and demanded the reign of reason rather than the guidance of faith. Yet when their voice is hushed in eternity, they have left nothing to light the world on its way. If they extinguished hope in a single human heart, they have taught no truth to inspire or planted on belief to raise mortal man above the clod of the valley or the dying beast of the field.

From an antique age the intellects graven on the tablets of human greatness have bowed in humility before the Divine.

The doubter demands miracles in our generation and discredits them because they claim they are not.

As large a demand is made on our belief by Nature every day as on our faith by miracles.

Repulsive ooze and slime, touched by the magic of Nature's breath, smile in the blossoms' colors to please the eye and bestow in fruit and grain food upon the multitude of earth.

Not all the wit and mind of men have produced a blade of grass or gain of wheat.

That is done only in the workshop of the elements. Man can cultivate and improve. He cannot impart the life or control the alchemy of the transformation from the useless and unpromising to the beauty that pleases and the use that supports human life.

Nature's works in their final analysis are daily miracles. They defy our understanding and mock all human knowledge.

The wisest and most eloquent atheist who ever lived could not tell why a potato grows when placed in the ground.

Still he denied all religions because he could not explain the human resurrection taught by Christ and Moses.

Walk in the forest, on the plain, by the complaining sea, in the mountain ranges, where the eternal snows mantle in spotless purity the loftiest summits of the world, like Nature's vestments on the mighty altars of the ever-living God.

Here in the vast cathedral domes and on the altars, not reared by mortal hands, we must interpret and understand.

Those enduring tokens have seen the Chaldean shepherds watch their flocks. They saw the Assyrian build Ninevah and Babylon in its last night of tumultuous revelry and drunken riot.

The conquering legions of Cyrus, the Persian, passed in review before them.

They witnessed Alexander's slaughtering march and drunken death in distant Asia.

They stood on the picket line of the ages when Caesar fell beneath the hand of Brutus in the Roman senate chamber, and when Attila, the Hun, retreated after failing to crush the Christian world at Chalons.

Vision is the art of seeing the invisible.

To all such those mute but mighty witnesses thunder as the cloud-wrapped summit of Sinai spoke to Moses.

When we pass through Nature's aisles, beneath the heaven's fretted vault, where the sweet influence of the Pleiades beams from afar, and Arcturus still guides his sons as in the days of Job, and the solemn anthem of the ceaseless tides sounds the knell of passing centuries, we feel the truth that things moving under universal laws are greater than men, and that all this is not a system of mere chance, tempered by accident, but that the Lord God ordered it from the beginning and reigneth now and forever.

THE SCULPTOR

I saw a sculptor chisel from flawless marble the form of one who lived for self. On the statue's granite base was carved his name, his birth, his death.

How soon the centuries blot out the inscriptions and destroy the work of man! Such memories perish utterly from the earth.

I saw another who wrote the unselfish story of his life on the inextinguishable page of the human heart, so that the touch of Nature made him akin to all the world. For him the sculptors of every age shall give their talents; the inscription shall not fade away, for every generation shall renew them; memory levies tribute on the ages, for as he lived for others, so does the future live his deeds and thoughts anew.

—Sherman.

Disabled American Veterans' Legislative Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. RANKIN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 25, 1939

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM OF THE DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS OF THE WORLD WAR

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I insert the legislative program of the Disabled American Veterans of the World War, which I commend to the consideration of the membership of the House.

It is my understanding that the legislation at this special session will be confined to the question of neutrality, and that consideration of veterans' legislation will be postponed until the regular session.

In the meantime I trust every Member of the House will study this program, as well as the programs to be submitted by the other veterans' organizations.

The matter referred to follows:

NATIONAL LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM, DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS

(Adopted by the nineteenth annual convention at Boston, August 1939)

1. That the D. A. V., independently and in cooperation with other patriotic organizations, aggressively combat all forms of subversive movements calculated to destroy the American form of government.

2. That the D. A. V., while supporting all worthy movements for better international understandings, continue to advocate proper military and naval preparedness.

3. That all hospitalized service-connected World War veterans receive total ratings while hospitalized.

4. That all service-connected disabled veterans shall be paid the same standard of compensation: *Provided*, That any statutory award to which a veteran is entitled shall not be disturbed.

5. That there be reenacted the "presumption of soundness" clause of the World War Veterans Act of June 7, 1924.

6. That there be a modification of the present stringent regulation governing the Disabled Emergency Officers' Retirement Act.

7. That the D. A. V. continue its policy of urging sites for hospitals according to the density of the military population rather than locating the institutions according to congressional district, State, county, or city lines.

8. That the policy be continued of improving and extending existing hospitals rather than establishing new institutions, except

in extraordinary cases where the density of the military population justifies new projects.

9. That, through Executive orders or legislation, the D. A. V. urge stricter enforcement of present preferences under the United States civil service.

10. That in all cases in which a disabled veteran is to be skipped on the civil-service register and a nonveteran or a nondisabled veteran selected, the service-connected disabled veteran shall be furnished with written reasons why he was not selected and be afforded an opportunity to rebut.

11. That persons who did not serve in time of war should not be classified as veterans in the matter of preference in civil service.

12. That if appropriate preferences looking toward actual appointment in Federal jobs are obtainable, the present points added to earned ratings may be traded for such preferences.

13. That, except in cases of fraud, a compensation rating that has continued for 5 consecutive years shall not be reduced during the lifetime of the veteran.

14. That all privileges that now go to veterans under the W. P. A. shall be extended to wives of disabled veterans in cases in which the veteran himself cannot perform W. P. A. duties, and the same privileges shall be extended to the widows of deceased veterans.

15. That the present compensation rates shall be increased at the rate of 10 percent when the veteran reaches 45 years, another 10 percent at the age of 55 years, and another 10 percent at the age of 60 years.

16. That, in addition to the present quota of appointments to West Point and Annapolis, there shall be one appointment and one alternate for each academy from each of the nine corps areas for the sons of wartime disabled veterans.

17. That the rate of interest on loans on Government insurance be reduced to 3⅜ percent.

Neutrality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 25, 1939

EDITORIAL FROM THE PORTLAND (OREG.) SHOPPING NEWS

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Portland Shopping News, of Portland, Oreg.:

[From the Portland (Oreg.) Shopping News]

NEUTRALITY

The most important question confronting this Nation and its citizens today is that for which Congress has been called into special session: "Shall we or shall we not sell arms to warring nations so that they make make more war or finish their fight with quicker dispatch?"

It is a grievous question, this, that we of America have been called upon to answer, and there is much difference of opinion on it. Yet we should be proud that the men we have elected to head the Nation's legislative and executive branches are able to view and debate it without any cheap truckling to national or individual greed. The views of Mr. Roosevelt, Mr. Borah, Mr. Nye, or Mr. Taft may differ, but they are honest and sincere in their individual beliefs.

On one point the mind of America is very much in accord. We do not want to grow rich on others' troubles, nor profiteer upon a war-torn world. Neither do we wish to be unfair in our dealing with those powers which depend upon this land as a source of supply.

Having thus raised a banner of fairness to others, let us be fair also to America. All war is a blow at the world. Death and depression are its team mates. The creation in this country of a huge, artificially created armaments industry to feed the guns of Europe while they belch would be a monstrous economic bubble waiting to burst. It would flourish for a time "like the green bay tree," but its eventual collapse might plunge this Nation into a pit of economic upheaval.

It is argued on the other side that since Britain and France have undertaken to crush "Hitlerism," we should not unfairly deprive them of American supplies, while the Nazis have a vast storehouse of Russian supplies. This sentiment is very strong, but it should be tempered with calm discretion.

Europe's endless quarrels must have proved by this time that the preservation of American democracy is the primary purpose of our sense of civilization. The course before us must not be one of "power politics." Neither should we plunge into the mad whirl of war production without serious thinking. This is a land that has built its civilization and its greatness on the fruits of peace—not on the fruits of war.

Let us remember the old fable of the man who sowed dragon's teeth and reaped a crop of soldiers. America must not sow dragon's teeth by selling guns to rival powers.

One Hundred and Fiftieth Anniversary of the Bill of Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SOL BLOOM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 25, 1939

ADDRESS BY HON. SOL BLOOM, OF NEW YORK, SEPTEMBER 25, 1939

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein the following address on the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the passage of the Bill of Rights:

On this day, 150 years ago, was erected one of the milestones of American liberty. The Congress, after long and careful consideration, on September 25, 1789, agreed upon the amendments to the Constitution which became the Bill of Rights.

From the hour of ratification until this hour, every person in the United States has been secure in the enjoyment of his right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

As we all know, the Constitution was ratified with misgivings, because that great charter did not contain specific barriers against governmental violation of individual rights and immunities. The framers of the Constitution pointed out that, since the powers of the new Government were enumerated and limited, individual rights could not be invaded. But the people demanded more. They demanded that the Government they were creating should be held down by positive written law, barring it forever from encroaching upon individual rights and liberties. Upon the assurance that Congress would heed this demand and bring forth the desired amendments for the people's approval, the Constitution was ratified.

In the first session of the First Congress, organized April 6, 1789, James Madison, in the House of Representatives, fulfilled his pledge to press for a Bill of Rights. He met with opposition and excuses for delay—and they were good excuses. Congress was swamped with business. It was organizing the new Government. Its first duty was to raise revenue. It had to regulate commerce and shipping. Great executive departments had to be set up, and the judicial department had to be organized. In the midst of this creative work Congress was forced to deal with Indian nations that threatened war on the borders. The relations between Congress and the Executive had to be defined. The President's power of removal raised a paramount constitutional question that consumed much time in debate.

Members protested that amendments to the Constitution should wait until the Government was put on its feet. "Why," they cried, "you have not even chosen the seat of government!"

With great skill and persistence, Mr. Madison pressed for consideration of a Bill of Rights. Others in the Senate worked to the same end. The promises to State conventions were held up as a sacred obligation upon Congress. Pressure from the States had its effect. Many State conventions had recommended amendments which they regarded as essential for the preservation of individual security.

All these proposals were debated at length in Congress. The discussions covered the history of the struggles for liberty throughout the ages, and all the methods whereby men had sought to evolve governments which, while protecting them, could be prevented from tyrannizing over them.

It is a pity that the papers of Congress were lost when the British burned the Capitol in 1814, for these papers contained the details of all proceedings which developed the Bill of Rights.

The outcome of the debate was the adoption by House and Senate of a resolution submitting specific constitutional amendments to the State legislatures. On the same day Congress adopted the following resolution:

"*Resolved*, That a joint committee of both Houses be appointed to wait on the President of the United States, to request that he would recommend to the people of the United States a day of public thanksgiving and prayer, to be observed by acknowledging, with grateful hearts, the many and signal favors of Almighty God, especially by affording them an opportunity peaceably to establish a constitution of government for their safety and happiness."

At this time, when the liberty of mankind is trampled upon by many dictators, and when free governments are destroyed by brutal aggressors, the American people may well renew their gratitude and thanks to the Almighty for preserving this free country.

Thanks to divine Providence and their own valor, the people won their liberty, and up to this hour they have retained mastery over their own Government, as well as maintaining their independence against all foreign assault.

In times of stress many attempts have been made by officers of government to violate the rights of individuals. These attempts have been made by Congress, Presidents, courts, and States. Congress has sought to penalize men for free speech. It has tried to impose a censorship over the press. It has tried to authorize unlawful search and seizure of private papers. It has tried to place men twice in jeopardy for the same offense. It has tried to take private property without compensation. It has tried to subject men to imprisonment at hard labor without an indictment. It has tried to deny to an accused man the right to confront his accusers. It has tried to give the Government the right to appeal a case in which the accused was acquitted by a jury. It has tried to make a crime out of an act which was not a crime when it was committed. It has tried to compel a man to testify against himself. It has tried to force the transfer to Federal court of a case which had already been constitutionally decided by a State court. It has tried to enforce bills of attainder.

In all these cases the Constitution and the Bill of Rights were invoked to protect the individual, and the courts, obeying the people's supreme law, held all these so-called laws of Congress to be null and void.

Presidents have attempted to suppress free speech. They have tried to take private property without compensation. They have tried to subject civilians to trial by court martial when the civil courts were open. They have tried to bring men from distant States for trial in the District of Columbia. They have sanctioned the stealing of private papers by Army officers and have tried to convict men on the strength of these stolen papers.

In all these cases the courts have intervened to protect the individual against the arbitrary and unlawful acts of Presidents. Addressing itself directly to the unlawful act of a President the Supreme Court said: "No man in this country is so high that he is above the law."

Corrupt judges have tried to defraud and oppress individuals in violation of the Bill of Rights. Congress has impeached and removed such judges from office.

The States have repeatedly tried to deprive individuals of life, liberty, and property in violation of the Bill of Rights and the courts have protected such individuals.

Treaties have been made which violated the constitutional rights of individuals and the courts have set these treaties aside.

No act of Congress, no order of a President, no judgment of a court, no law of a State, and no treaty is valid if it violates the supreme law embodied in the Bill of Rights.

During war the people willingly impose restrictions upon themselves, and the Government may impose restrictions under the Constitution. But even during war individual rights secured by the Bill of Rights cannot be violated. Neither Congress nor the President nor the courts can suspend the Bill of Rights on account of war. Come what may—peace or war—the right of life, liberty, and property is secure in the United States.

A great American statesman has said of the Bill of Rights: "Such provisions as these are not mere commands. They withhold power. The instant any officer, of whatever kind or grade, transgresses them he ceases to act as an officer. He becomes a trespasser, a despoiler, a lawbreaker, and all the machinery of the law may be set in motion for his restraint or punishment."

No American, looking out upon the world today, can fail to be shocked and grieved by the sufferings of peoples who have lost their liberty. In some cases they had very little liberty to lose. In other cases they were not vigilant in preserving their liberty. In still other instances brave, vigilant, and honorable nations have been destroyed by stronger neighbors.

Current events reinforce the lesson of history by showing how difficult it is for mankind to gain and hold liberty. The Americans 150 years ago thanked Almighty God for affording them an opportunity "peaceably to establish a constitution of government for their safety and happiness." We of today have 150 stronger reasons for gratitude to the Almighty, for we enjoy tested and tried security and liberty. American liberty is no experiment. It is our sacred inheritance. What was won by our fathers we must hold. Upon each generation falls the duty of safeguarding the great treasure, the precious jewel of liberty. The generations before us have done their duty. We must do ours if our children are to be free.

Our immediate duty now, as I see it, is to safeguard our liberty by keeping out of other nations' wars. It is easy to get into war, but sometimes nations have lost their liberty by plunging into unnecessary war. No triumph in any war we might wage could bring us greater liberty than we already enjoy. We risk nothing by remaining at peace. We risk everything when we engage in war to right the wrongs of the world.

"Our liberties we prize, our rights we will maintain" is the motto of one of our States. This breathes the spirit of individual domestic liberty and national defensive strength. Liberty and valor go hand in hand. With individual rights secure, with vigilance on our watchtowers, with the sword of might in our hands, and with the smile of God lighting the flag above us we can hold fast our liberty and independence.

Once Burned

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. SCHAFER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 25, 1939

EDITORIAL FROM THE SATURDAY EVENING POST

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Saturday Evening Post of November 18, 1933, entitled "Once Burned":

[From the Saturday Evening Post of November 18, 1933]

ONCE BURNED

The German people have been singularly unfortunate in their leaders, for their Government has twice been headed by a megalomaniac within the past 20 years. Apparently Germany, as exemplified in Hitler, has forgotten nothing and has learned nothing.

On the other hand, the Allies were singularly stupid in imposing on Germany a treaty that contained in it the germs of a new European war. Apparently, the only thing that Germany got from the most disastrous war in the history of the world was a new kind of militarism, and France a new and not wholly unwarranted case of the jitters.

Disarmament is not the immediate answer. The passing of the new Hitler militarism and the revision of the Versailles Treaty on a good-will basis is the only answer. Then, and only then, will disarmament be on the agenda. In 1914 the Kaiser came to the forks of the road and chose the path that led down to the hell of war. Hitler treads the same way today. In his day President Wilson advanced a weak theory that the Kaiser and the German people were two and divisible. There seems to be small doubt that today Hitler and the German people are one and indivisible.

Even so, we cannot believe that a new European war is possible. For if there is one lesson that stands out clearly for even the dumbest to read, it is that under modern conditions victors in war are losers in peace no less than the conquered. As a matter of fact, Germany's defeat and disarmament gave her certain very real advantages over the victors—advantages that were working to bring her back to a desirable place in the commercial sun.

America's course in the present situation and in every future situation that threatens a European war is clear. We must use our good offices in every way possible to prevent war, but if war comes in spite of every effort that we can make, we must retire within our defenses and refuse to be drawn into it on any pretext. We shall, of course, be propagandized, threatened, and insulted. We shall have to listen to all the old arguments and abuse, and stand out against the same insidious and undercover influences, social and business, that were so influential in bringing us into the last war. The hot-heads, the profiteers, the social and business internationalists—all the old propagandists will once more be out in front shouting for war. It will again be played up as something fine and holy. But most of us have not forgotten how sordid and destructive it was and how sordid and destructive the aftermath is.

Lest we forget, let us cast up our war account briefly:

Glory. More than a hundred thousand dead, other hundreds of thousands maimed or gasping out a miserable existence from gas and shell shock.

War profits. A short period of white lights and champagne for the few, long years of poverty and misery for the many.

War debts. Billions shot away for which we are paying and our children will continue to pay.

War loans. Most of the debtors defaulting. The others trying to save face by token or inconsiderable payments.

The big laugh and the last laugh. "A war to make the world safe for democracy." "A war to end war."

All the war profits were counterfeit money. All the war loans are being paid in conversation. All the cheers for Uncle Sam, sending his youth to the trenches and lending his dollars to the Allies, have changed into sneers and snarls at Uncle Shylock, the international sucker. All the high ideals are moldering in the graves of those who fought for them.

If, as, and when we are confronted with a similar situation, we must be strong to resist propaganda, strong to resist so-called war profits, and strong to defend ourselves. We must not be too proud to fight a defensive war for our country if it is attacked, but we must be too sensible to take sides in Europe's quarrels. By all means let us use our good offices to prevent war, but let no one in or out of the administration, by word or act, directly or indirectly, commit us to becoming a party to, or an ally or associate in, any new European war.

The declaration of Mr. Davis at Geneva that "we are in no way politically alined with any European power" is reassuring, but we must be on the alert to make sure that neither pressure nor circumstance modifies that statement. President Wilson was reelected because he kept us out of war.

For the moment disarmament is a losing cause. We must strengthen rather than weaken our defenses, but with one purpose—to keep out of war and to be so well prepared that warlike nations will hesitate to attack us. Just as our economic nationalism has no other than a defensive motive behind it, so must our preparedness have no other motive behind it than isolation from another world war.

Washington was eternally right when he told us to mind our own business and to keep out of European quarrels. Though it is the fashion to regard the Constitution as outmoded and Washington's admonitions as old stuff, both were never more up to the minute than they are today.

Do We Want Neutrality or War Trade?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERNARD J. GEHRMANN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 25, 1939

LETTER FROM HON. BERNARD J. GEHRMANN, OF WISCONSIN

Mr. GEHRMANN. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter sent by me in reply to the very large number of letters I have received from citizens of Wisconsin with regard to American neutrality:

Friends of Wisconsin:

I hope that you will pardon me for sending you a form letter in answer to your communication stating your stand on this war crisis. I appreciate your interest in this most important issue now facing the American people. I realize that as your Representative I am faced with the greatest responsibility of my entire life. My action does not only affect myself or my family but it could very well be responsible for plunging us into another world war that I am certain would be vastly more destructive than was the last one and would perhaps end our democratic form of government.

Therefore I feel that all my constituents are entitled to know my attitude. I am determined never to vote to send a single one of our young men across the ocean to try and settle the quarrels of Europe unless we are attacked. I am against the repeal of the present arms embargo and shall vote to retain it.

Well do we remember the fateful days of over 20 years ago. Under a wave of emotionalism and hysterics fanned to a white heat by the most adroit propaganda we embarked upon a crusade to make the world safe for democracy and to fight a war to end all war. After the armed conflict was over and the facts gradually leaked out we found that the major propelling force which drew us into that war was to protect our foreign investments and to protect and expand our commerce. This is putting it bluntly. But the facts are that our commercial and foreign policy gradually but inevitably drew us into the world conflict. Twenty-two years have passed, and the world is again at war. Never in all human history has the armament race carried on on such a gigantic scale as today. All the loss of the millions of young men and all the destruction of billions of dollars of property have seemingly been for naught. Wars have not ceased, nor are democracies secure. All this supreme sacrifice has been in vain. Instead, in its wake we have the most unprecedented world depression with its suffering and despair. Friendly trade relations have almost been destroyed. Fear has driven nations to intense nationalism. Huge national debts are breaking the backs of the people, and the heels of the dictators are crushing out the last vestige of human rights and liberty. The sum total of that supreme effort has been hate, fear, loss, despair, chaos.

Everyone is for peace. At least everyone says so. And most Americans will tell you with great emphasis that they don't want this country to get mixed up in another European war. But what we want and what we get are sometimes two different things. And generally the thing that determines is how much we are willing to give and to do to get the thing we want.

America will not stay out of this war, nor make her contribution to world peace, unless she makes up her mind now to pay the price that will be necessary. We have got to decide whether we will choose peace or profits. If we adopt a policy of allowing war trade to go on by selling arms and war materials, we would start straight down the road that led to the World War. Our munition factories would be enlarged to meet the war demand. When cash gave out, we would have to extend loans or close our factories, and we would have to help those who have been buying arms from us to win the war. In this connection, the following figures are interesting: Our trade with the Allies up to the time we entered the war amounted to $7,000,000,000. The World War has cost to date over $50,000,000,000. Here is another way of looking at the question of war profits: In the last war the United States sent 2,000,000 men to France. The pay for that period they were there was about $1,100,000,000. This is the sum which one corporation—United States Steel—made in clear profits, over and above all taxes in 1915–18. While soldiers fought in trenches for $1 a day, Eugene G. Grace, president of Bethlehem Steel, for the single year 1918, collected a bonus of $1,386,193. While 10,000,000 men lost their lives, the Du Pont Co. paid dividends on its common stock of 100 percent in 1916, 51 percent in 1917, 26 percent in 1918, and still had $50,000,000 to put into a new dye industry, $47,000,000 to buy 25 percent stock ownership of General Motors, acquired partial control of 26 other corporations. While 5,000,000 women were being left widows, profits in munitions companies ranged from 22 percent to 943 percent. While $208,000,000,000 were being spent on the war, profits in 1917 in a few of the munitions and supplies companies ranged as follows: Nagel Steel Co., 319 percent; Utah Copper Co., 200 percent; Calumet & Hecla, 800 percent; Bethlehem Loading Co., 362 percent.

Did it pay to choose profits from munitions sale instead of staying out of the bloody conflict?

Note what President Wilson himself told Frank Cobb the night before he asked Congress to put us into the World War:

"It means that we will lose our heads along with the rest and stop weighing right and wrong. * * * It means an attempt to reconstruct a peacetime civilization with war standards, and at the end of the war there will be no bystanders with sufficient power to influence the terms. There won't be any peace standards left to work with. There will be only war standards."

The whole question of peace or war for America is being threshed out now in Congress. The American people must make their choice about profits or peace. They should make their choice known to their Representative in Congress. This is a choice which will vitally affect all of our people. Let there be no delay in the people's decision. If there is prompt action by the people, there will be prompt action by the Congress. Let that action be for peace instead of profits.

There is one other important phase of the war-and-peace question which I would like to call to your attention in closing. That is the question of who shall have the power to decide on peace or war when we are not attacked. Many of you know that there have been introduced in this Congress various proposals to give the people the right to make the war or peace decision by means of a Nation-wide referendum when the Western Hemisphere is not attacked. These resolutions have been introduced in both the Senate and the House. They ask that we shall not engage in a foreign war unless the people give their consent. This legislation, I believe, is a protection which should be given to the people who, in the final analysis, pay the bills in blood and taxes.

I believe that Congress will act as soon as you and your fellow Americans make your desires known to your Representatives. Let us stay out of foreign conflicts. Let us choose neutrality in place of profits. Let us all work to give to the people the right to vote on foreign wars. These, I believe, are the things we have to do to stay out of this war. We must be ready and willing to help the world and our own people achieve the economic security which is the bedrock of a peaceful world. Our contribution as a nation should be first to put our house in order and give to the world an example of democracy that is working for all.

Must Stay Neutral

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VINCENT F. HARRINGTON

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 25, 1939

EDITORIAL FROM THE IOWA LEGIONNAIRE

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include therein the following editorial from the Iowa Legionnaire, September 15, 1939, entitled "Must Stay Neutral":

[From the Iowa Legionnaire of September 15, 1939]

MUST STAY NEUTRAL

Will the United States eventually get into the European war?

Not unless the war menaces the Western Hemisphere—if enough Americans keep sane.

The chances of Germany and her possible allies offending any nation in this part of the world are extremely remote, so why the widespread belief here that sooner or later we shall engage in the conflict?

True, Russia and Germany are in a pact through which the Nazis are receiving munitions and supplies and may get military aid from the Communists; true, that while Italy is now neutral, she may be expected to join the forces fighting Great Britain, France, and Poland; and true, the personal sympathies of most Americans are with the latter trio, but still sober thinking and study should fire every one of us to vigorously oppose any move whatsoever

which might cost the life of a single Yankee boy under the existing situation over there.

Should we sell arms and munitions to any of the belligerents, transported on our ships?

Ninety percent of Americans say no, because of what that policy caused in the last war.

Should we sell to those who would send after them and pay cash on delivery?

Many Americans say yes, contending this would be fair and neutral, but knowing it would help only one side—the side most of us favor, without risking a submarine attack from the other side which would certainly shoot us into the war. They either do not or do not want to realize that if an American plant producing for British and French purchases were to be blown up the reaction here would be like it would be if a vessel of ours were torpedoed.

We loathe nazi-ism and communism alike. We guessed months ago that Russia and Germany would unite, because their Governments were so similar. We have said and written repeatedly that the isms of both should be banished from our land because both would destroy Americanism.

We like some things about Great Britain and France, and our heart aches for Poland, Czechoslovakia, Austria, and Ethiopia and the victims of vicious persecution in Germany, Russia, and Italy. We earnestly hope the isms of Hitler, Stalin, and Mussolini are exterminated from the earth.

But we saved Great Britain and France at heavy loss of blood and treasure in 1917–18, and what did they do in gratitude? First, they tried to draw us into a League of Nations which was nothing more nor less than an alliance of the victorious powers to be dominated completely by Britain with 5 votes to our 1 in the lower house. They clamped penalties on the defeated through the Versailles Treaty which made it a volcano of hate. They agreed at the Harding Limitation of Armaments Conference to scrap ships—we did that and they scrapped blueprints. They refused to pay their war debts—now with those of other allies amounting to $13,000,000,000—insisting it was our war as much as theirs, and that we should willingly take that burden because we lost so many fewer men than they did in battle. They let Japan bite into Manchuria and rape China, Italy confiscate Ethiopia, and Germany gobble Austria and Czechoslovakia with hardly a word of protest. They tried desperately to induce Russia to be with them against the Rome-Berlin axis; they failed to do with "red" Russia what Germany has accomplished, and their enemies in recent years have been doing only what Britain and France tried to do for centuries.

In the light of these facts, the American people should retain the utmost balance on what our country's course should be. We must above everything else have unity of spirit among all classes and creeds; turn blazing resistance to destructive isms and their organizations and agents among us and make the country simply too hot for foreign spies. We must support our Government in a national-defense program through which we might stand alone if need be against any probable coalition. We must let the world know that if our Congress declares war we shall go anywhere under the flag. We should intensify our efforts to put over the Legion's universal service bill. We should try to expose schemes of those who would thrust us into fighting that they might profit, and try to winnow dangerous propaganda from the facts in everything we read and hear. We should make it too uncomfortable for profiteers on food and other articles to continue their nefarious practices. We should keep ever in mind the guaranties of freedom provided by the Constitution, for to violate them is to act like the Communists and Nazis.

National Commander Stephen F. Chadwick is sounding ringing appeals for America to stay neutral. Seventeen wars were fought on this planet between Armistice Day and the outbreak of the present conflict, in not one of which was there any thought of America becoming involved. Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Holland, Switzerland, and other democracies kept neutral in the last war and will do so in this one; why, then, must anyone be certain that the United States cannot be because we were not 22 years ago?

America must stay neutral if it can be done with honor and security. To that end every Legionnaire and every other loyal American should commit himself to the limit.

War veterans, with true Americanism which fires them to commendably despise both nazi-ism and communism, and who realize the Russo-German Pact may force some of them and many of their sons and other people's sons to die in armed conflict, are right in earnestly protesting against red-hued Earl Browder and brown-baked Fritz Kuhn and their Commu-Nazis trying to justify it in American institutions which the ideologies of their European masters would destroy.

Of course, their are two ways to protest, and the right way is to, in every move, uphold the Constitution and maintain law and order.

President Roosevelt will call a special session of Congress to convene October 2, to consider American policy in the European situation, the daily press was reporting when this paper went to press.

It is entirely within reason that this probable date was set with thought that by then the more than 1,000,000 World War veterans in the American Legion would have spoken on the subject through their national convention.

Can We Keep Out of War?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JESSIE SUMNER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 25, 1939

ADDRESS BY HON. JESSIE SUMNER OF ILLINOIS, SEPTEMBER 10, 1939

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me at the C. C. C. Camp Gilman, Crescent City, Ill., on Sunday, September 10, 1939:

The question now uppermost in the minds of all Americans is, Can we keep out of the whirlpool of war in Europe?

Several small nations of Europe manage to remain neutral throughout war after war there. But the great strength of the United States is also our greatest weakness. Foreign nations have learned to think of America as a rich relative, easily persuaded to kill a fatted calf for every prodigal.

Months before any aggressor trespassed the boundaries of Poland an army of diplomats and propagandists invaded the United States. Apparently they had forgotten how we insulted them by urging them to repay money borrowed in the World War.

They proclaimed their love for us. They flattered and made friends with men occupying responsible Government positions. They had refused to join us in our effort to prevent a Japanese aggressor from gobbling up Manchukuo at our back door in the Orient. But they urged us to lead them in an effort to suppress a German aggressor on their front porch. They reminded us that the League of Nations was an American suggestion.

The League of Nations is a splendid ideal. It is, in my opinion, unconstitutional. For under the Constitution the power to declare war resides in the Congress. The League of Nations renders this power merely formal. The real power is surrendered to diplomats and members of the State Department, who are appointed by the President, who, moreover, are career men, who survive the defeat of President after President. So far we have never found men for these positions who seemed to know how to cope with European diplomats. Living in the rarefied atmosphere of diplomatic circles, they forget to remember that we are no longer a colony of Great Britain. In that atmosphere the troubles of the little farmers out here, who have to pay their share of the bills for large sums loaned to and not paid back by foreign neighbors, seem very far away. The Representatives in Congress, on the other hand, are reminded once every 2 years that they are not elected in Great Britain. Congressmen have to represent people who have come from all nationalities, who look on all the countries as mother countries, who remember these countries tenderly but independently.

It is not only propagandists from the democracies who invaded us. The Germans had a case to present. The Treaty of Versailles settling the World War was unjust, and the United States did not ratify it. It took away an unfair amount of territory. Germany was a noxious weed. So Germany was slashed and cut until nothing was left except the root—the root of trouble in Germany—her overwhelming ambition to be as great as any other European country.

Unfortunately for the German cause, however, German propagandists used Nazi methods of diplomacy in America. They organized a bund. They paraded in New York in Nazi uniforms. It was as if a widow who had shot three husbands went to propose to her beloved with a revolver bulging out of her pocket. To such wooing your Uncle Sam has been polite but unenthusiastic.

The neutrality bill was catapulted upon the floor of the House so quickly after the departure of the English King and Queen that it seemed like a parting salute to them.

The British wanted this bill because it revived the cash-and-carry provisions of the present law, which expired this spring.

The cash-and-carry clause, as you know, permits warring nations to buy arms in the United States, providing they pay cash and carry away the arms in ships that are not American. Japan in the Pacific and England in the Atlantic have big navies. They can take advantage of this law and prevent their enemies taking advantage of the same privilege.

The House of Representatives voted down this provision and substituted an embargo preventing shipment of arms. The Senate refused to consider the bill, so the old law still remains in force. Under it we can't ship arms to foreign nations in the present war.

Those who voted for the embargo felt that the traditional American policy is one of fairness to all nations. We knew that England has a way of hooking up with, first, Germany against France, then France against Germany. We refused to hook up with England ahead of time. The State Department had already issued a regulation short of war restricting trade with Germany—at some expense to American agriculture, since it deprived us of the German market for oil, lard, pork, and other commodities. So far, however, your Congress has sincerely tried not to play favorites with any nation.

The declaration of war in Europe has put so many new angles upon all our current problems that Congressmen need to be studying night and day. The cost of living is rising. The undertaker across the street from me complains that, due to speculation in steel, the price of caskets has risen 20 percent. It's growing too expensive to live and almost too expensive to die. The umbrella of our Monroe Doctrine extends over Canada to our north, now waging war against Germany and Mexico to the south, now become a base for German ships and furnishing them oil recently taken away from Americans. The Congress is about to be recalled, asked to repeal the arms embargo, urged to pass a cash-and-carry provision.

Congressmen will appreciate that this is a very grave decision because there is no way of determining in advance how grave it may turn out to have been. The cash-and-carry provision is as easy to evade as was the old liquor prohibition law. Cash becomes short term credit—short term credits, not paid, become gifts to foreign nations. It puts us officially and permanently upon the European sucker list. It will bring the European war to the borders of the United States, if the enemy becomes strong enough, or acquires strong enough allies.

The chief advocates of the cash-and-carry provision are those who have been as optimistic about the Government bond market as Wall Street speculators were about the stock market in 1928.

In July when the notorious lending bill was being studied by the House committee of which I am a member, I asked the Secretary of the Treasury, who was a witness, whether, in view of the danger of war, we had better not stop so much borrowing and spending. He disagreed with me. Today the bond market is contradicting his judgment.

The point is that no expert can tell you how far the balloon of Government credit can be stretched before it will burst. Your Government is not in the same condition it was in 1917. We have been borrowing money from the citizens of tomorrow, eating their bread. Through the Government agencies working like moles are people who sincerely think that if they could make our country into something resembling Russia they would be doing you a favor. Many well-respected statesmen believe that if we go into a war dictatorship, as we must if we go into a war, we shall not emerge once more a free republic.

We have forgiven ourselves the mistake we made in 1917. If, knowing we have nothing to gain and everything to lose, we go into this one, what excuse shall we give the next generation?

Some of us think that, for once, England has muffed her cards. In the effort to suppress Germany are they not playing into the hands of a more powerful menace? This war would not be going on if it had not been encouraged by the Communist dictator. He is growing rich upon it, waiting, apparently, until England, France, and Germany are too weak to resist anybody. He has organizers in all the countries, including the United States, stirring up strikes and discontent, working toward a world revolution. If the German dictator is a wart upon the nose, the Communist dictator is a cancer upon the liver.

In the debate upon neutrality it was obvious that most thoughtful Congressmen felt that the best interest of Americans is to keep out of this war. Yet the thought seemed to haunt them that again, as in 1917, the people at home would become so worked up, the pressure of public opinion to help one side would become so great, that Congressmen would feel forced to vote for war.

For that reason I think that the American frontier is not on the Rhine but upon your own doorstep.

It is dangerous to leave public opinion to be created by the beaters of tom-toms. Be careful not to say to your neighbor "We can't stay out. We're sure to get into it." As if American citizens have no more control over our destinies than turkeys at Thanksgiving time—not that I care when we celebrate Thanksgiving so long as we can still count liberty and peace among our blessings.

Try saying instead, "We must remain at peace. We have malice toward none. We have sympathy for all, even for those who are misled."

At great cost of blood and money we have already proved in 1917 that we cannot force democracy upon any foreign country nor force them to remain at peace. If we refuse to become slaves to European hates, refuse to become war horses rushing into harness every time a European bugle toots, refuse to become skeletons in the dance of death, which has occurred periodically in Europe ever since the beginning of European history, we shall still have a chance, by reviving and repairing our form of government, to prove that it is best not only for English, French, German, and people of all creeds and races who live together peacefully here in America but for all who live together anywhere.

The road of peace for America will not be an easy road. It is not the path of least resistance. We may look cowardly, stingy, and cruel as we struggle along it. But it is the road you and I must take if we wish to promote the cause of peace and democracy for the children of men and women here and all over the world.

Lindbergh's Appeal for Isolation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES SECCOMBE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 25, 1939

ADDRESS BY COL. CHARLES A. LINDBERGH

Mr. SECCOMBE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address recently delivered over the radio by Col. Charles A. Lindbergh:

[From the New York Times of September 16, 1939]

LINDBERGH'S APPEAL FOR ISOLATION

WASHINGTON, September 15.—Following is the text of the radio speech by Colonel Lindbergh:

"In times of great emergency men of the same belief must gather together for mutual counsel and action. If they fail to do this, all that they stand for will be lost. I speak tonight to those people in the United States of America who feel that the destiny of this country does not call for our involvement in European wars.

"We must band together to prevent the loss of more American lives in these internal struggles of Europe. We must keep foreign propaganda from pushing our country blindly into another war. Modern war, with all its consequences, is too tragic and too devastating to be approached from anything but a purely American standpoint. We should never enter a war unless it is absolutely essential to the future welfare of our Nation.

"This country was colonized by men and women from Europe. The hatreds, the persecutions, the intrigues they left behind gave them courage to cross the Atlantic Ocean to a new land. They preferred the wilderness and the Indians to the problems of Europe. They weighed the cost of freedom from those problems, and they paid the price. In this country they eventually found a means of living peacefully together—the same nationalities that are fighting abroad today.

POINTS TO MONROE DOCTRINE

"The quarrels of Europe faded out from American life as generations passed. Instead of wars between the English, French, and Germans, it became a struggle of the New World for freedom from the old—a struggle for the right of America to find her own destiny. The colonization of this country grew from European troubles and our freedom sprang from European war, for we won independence from England while she was fighting France.

"No one foresaw the danger ahead of us more clearly than George Washington. He solemnly warned the people of America against becoming entangled in European alliances. For over 100 years his advice was followed. We established the Monroe Doctrine for America. We let other nations fight among themselves. Then in 1917 we entered a European war. This time we were on England's side, and so were France and Russia. Friends and enemies reverse as decades pass—as political doctrines rise and fall.

RECALLS WORLD WAR LOSSES

"The Great War ended before our full force had reached the field. We escaped with the loss of relatively few soldiers. We measured our dead in thousands. Europe measured hers in millions. Europe has not yet recovered from the effects of that war, and she has already enacted another. A generation has passed since the armistice of 1918, but even in America we are still paying for our part in that victory, and we will continue to pay for another generation. European countries were both unable and unwilling to pay their debts to us.

"Now that war has broken out again, we in America have a decision to make on which the destiny of our Nation depends. We must decide whether or not we intend to become forever involved in this age-old struggle between the nations of Europe.

"Let us not delude ourselves. If we enter the quarrels of Europe during war, we must stay in them in time of peace as well. It is madness to send our soldiers to be killed as we did in the last war if we turn the course of peace over to the greed, the fear, and the intrigue of European nations. We must either keep out of European wars entirely or stay in European affairs permanently.

WOULD PUT ASIDE PITY

"In making our decision, this point should be clear: These wars in Europe are not wars in which our civilization is defending itself against some Asiatic intruder. There is no Genghis Khan nor Xerxes marching against our western nations. This is not a question of banding together to defend the white race against foreign invasion. This is simply one more of those age-old quarrels within our own family of nations—a quarrel arising from the errors of the last war—from the failure of the victors of that war to follow a consistent policy either of fairness or of force.

"Arbitrary boundaries can be maintained only by strength of arms. The Treaty of Versailles either had to be revised as time passed or England and France, to be successful, had to keep Germany weak by force. Neither policy was followed—Europe wavered

back and forth between the two. As a result, another war has begun—a war which is likely to be far more prostrating than the last; a war which will again kill off the best youth of Europe; a war which may even lead to the end of our western civilization.

"We must not permit our sentiment, our pity, or our personal feelings of sympathy to obscure the issue, to affect our children's lives. We must be as impersonal as a surgeon with his knife. Let us make no mistake about the cost of entering this war. If we take part successfully, we must throw the resources of our entire Nation into the conflict. Munitions alone will not be enough.

LITTLE TO GAIN HE SAYS

"We cannot count on victory merely by shipping abroad several thousand airplanes and cannon. We are likely to lose a million men, possibly several million—the best of American youth. We will be staggering under the burden of recovery during the rest of our lives. And our children will be fortunate if they see the end in their lives, even if, by some unlikely chance, we do not pass on another Polish Corridor to them. Democracy itself may not survive. If we enter fighting for democracy abroad, we may end by losing it at home.

"America has little to gain by taking part in another European war. We must not be misguided by this foreign propaganda to the effect that our frontiers lie in Europe. One need only glance at a map to see where our true frontiers lie. What more could we ask than the Atlantic Ocean on the east and the Pacific on the west? No; our interests in Europe need not be from the standpoint of defense. Our own natural frontiers are enough for that. If we extend them to the center of Europe, we might as well extend them around the earth. An ocean is a formidable barrier, even for modern aircraft.

"Our safety does not lie in fighting European wars. It lies in our own internal strength, in the character of the American people and of American institutions. As long as we maintain an Army, a Navy, and an air force worthy of the name, as long as America does not decay within, we need fear no invasion of this country.

ASSERTS MUCH NEWS IS COLORED

"Again, I address those among you who agree with this stand. Our future and our children's future depend upon the action we take. It is essential to think clearly and to act quickly in the days which are to come. We will be deluged with propaganda, both foreign and domestic—some obvious, some insidious. Much of our news is already colored. Every incident and every accident will be seized upon to influence us. And in a modern war there are bound to be plenty of both. We must learn to look behind every article we read and every speech we hear. We must not only inquire about the writer and the speaker—about his personal interests and his nationality—but we must ask who owns and who influences the newspaper, the news picture, and the radio station. If our people know the truth, if they are fully and accurately informed, if they are not misled by propaganda, this country is not likely to enter the war now going on in Europe.

"And if Europe is again prostrated by war, as she has been so often in the past, then the greatest hope for our western civilization lies in America. By staying out of war ourselves we may even bring peace to Europe more quickly.

"Let us look to our own defense and to our own character. If we attend to them, we have no need to fear what happens elsewhere. If we do not attend to them, nothing can save us.

"If war brings more dark ages to Europe, we can better preserve those things which we love and which we mourn the passing of in Europe today by preserving them here, by strengthening them here, rather than by hurling ourselves thoughtlessly to their defense over there and thus destroying all in the conflagration. The German genius for science and organization, the English genius for government and commerce, the French genius for living and understanding of life—they must not go down here as well as on the other side. Here in America they can be blended to form the greatest genius of all.

"The gift of civilized life must still be carried on. It is more important than the sympathies, the friendships, the desires of any single generation. This is the test before America now. This is the challenge—to carry on western civilization."

One Reason Why the Neutrality Law Should Not Be Repealed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 25, 1939

EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I insert herein an editorial published in the New York Herald Tribune of September 24, 1939:

[From the New York Herald Tribune of September 24, 1939]

THE DEMOCRATIC WAY

This hour, when the whole world is adrift and the unpredictable is the probable, calls above all else for candor. The old accepted bases of civilization have been engulfed in the totalitarian tide. What should America do to cope with this terrifying unknown?

As our readers know, we have been and are strongly supporting President Roosevelt in his plea for restoring the so-called Neutrality Act to the historic bases of true neutrality. That way, in our judgment, lies not only the sound American system of government but also the best chance of peace for America. The present unneutral law not only holds an incidental threat to the potential allies of this Nation in the Americas and in the Pacific but, more important, establishes a fundamentally unsound basis for the long pull.

We think it highly important, however, that this amendment of the Neutrality Act should be made with complete understanding of all the realities of this situation. We urge it as part of the normal democratic way of handling an emergency under the American system. As part of that system, confronted by the present crisis, we deem it equally important to insist that Congress remain in session during this period of stress. With his usual clearheadedness Mr. Landon has done a great public service in insisting upon this point. He has also focused attention upon the personal factor which strengthens the urgency of this demand by his plea to the President to renounce a third term. The stanch Americanism of Mr. Landon shows in this plea as well as his intimate understanding of American politics.

It must be conceded, in all candor, that one of the strongest motives behind the hesitation of Congress to yield to the President's demand for modification of the Neutrality Act is distrust of Mr. Roosevelt's qualifications to direct the Nation in its present crisis. We do not question his motives, as does a considerable part of Congress. We do question his poise, his restraint, his judgment of events, his steadiness of purpose. His whole career as President has shown a flightiness, an impulsiveness, which render him, however patriotic may be his motives, singularly unfitted to guide the Nation through troubled waters.

We think this fact must be openly considered and frankly accepted by Congress in reaching a decision as to the Neutrality Act. The more candidly it is faced, the better. Mr. Roosevelt's sensational announcement of submarines at our gates was a particularly dramatic climax to a long series of emotional episodes in which Mr. Roosevelt has shown an inability either to hold his tongue or to keep his head. Submarines on the high seas off our coast are nothing new. They have no immediate significance, and the President displayed a dangerous war-mongering tendency in dramatizing them as he did.

There will be more such episodes. The country will not be easy in its mind, in our judgment, until either Mr. Roosevelt announces his rejection of a third term, as Mr. Landon urges, or he is succeeded in office by a President temperamentally fitted to guide the Nation in taut, racking hours.

The answer is not, however, to continue the present absurd unneutrality act. It is that Congress shall remain in session so long as the present emergency lasts. It has the power of debate. It has the power of investigation. It is the one effective democratic answer to an excitable President unable to restrain his tongue or his actions. After amending the Embargo Act to accord with the American system and provide adequate freedom of action for an unpredictable future, Congress should in all calmness remain in session. The lift to American hearts which this common-sense procedure would achieve would in itself count for much in maintaining the Nation's steadiness and will to peace.

United States Neutrality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. USHER L. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 25, 1939

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, since this special session of Congress was called for the sole purpose of revising our neutrality laws, it becomes very important to consider this subject thoroughly. When the fires of war are burning furiously in Europe and Asia and the Western Hemisphere seems the only place where peace seems secure, the matter of our own conduct in the eyes of other nations becomes material to the maintenance of peace in this hemisphere.

With respect to our neutrality, there are certain facts which this Congress is aware of, and these are material to any just action we may finally take. These facts are:

First. Ninety-five percent of the people in the United States do not want this country to engage in any war across the seas; most of these will fight to the finish if any nation

should bring war to our shores; but it is also certain that should this Congress declare war against any foreign power and attempt to send our forces overseas there would be widespread disorders in this country and probably open rebellion against such an act of Congress.

IS THIS COUNTRY READY FOR WAR OF ANY KIND?

Second. Is this country ready for war of any kind? It is well understood in military circles that for every man on the front line under arms three civilians are necessary behind the lines to keep the materials of war coming up to the front. With an army of 5,000,000, it would require 15,000,000 more to bring up the fuel of war. This whole organization must be united in purpose and nothing could bring this about except public opinion. When we have fully one-half of our population in some form of distress, with millions thrown out of their homes to become wanderers along the highways and streets, no such public opinion would or could be formed in this country. Our duty now is, if we desire to prepare for a war of defense, to adopt a policy which will enable honest men to retain their homes and care for their families. If the process of foreclosure and ejectment continues unabated as it has since 1929, the time will soon come, if it is not here now, when the great majority in this country will be homeless and a few will own the soil—the source of all life. Within the last 10 days we have seen examples of how those who are homeless react to this situation when they have a chance. In Poland, when the red Army of Russia occupied the eastern two-thirds of the territory, those who owned homes were rounded up and shot. Thousands hid away when the "red" Army came in, but they were soon found out. The Russians organized the poor of Poland into squads to bring in the landowners and when they did the landowners' property was confiscated and divided up among those who had no land. It was the Poles themselves who took the leading part in this murder and confiscation. This would never have happened if in Poland more consideration had been given to the homeless and the destitute.

What happened in Poland can happen here—it can happen anywhere. If the opportunity should come in the United States where the homeless could take united action, there is absolutely no doubt but what those in this country who have too much wealth would be hunted down by our own citizens and shot and their property distributed among those who were homeless. All property would be confiscated by the state, and most of the owners executed. This Congress should concern itself with the welfare of those in distress in this country and determine the cause of that distress and forcefully correct the situation. When we have the great majority of the people in this country enjoying the privileges of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, I will predict that there is no nation or combination of nations on earth that could send any force against us which we could not stop.

Third. Since we all say there shall be no war as far as the United States is concerned, the next thing is to know what to do about our present neutrality law. As a preliminary statement, I think the whole matter of concocting a neutrality law was a mistake and that this country would have been more secure now under international law. We must either work under that law or change the law.

In examining the proposed changes the President wants a repeal of the embargo in the present law and a further provision that our ships and citizens keep out of foreign war zones. The provision to keep our ships and citizens out of foreign war zones, it seems to me, is the very best possible improvement we could make to the present law. If ships and citizens violated that law and were sent to the bottom of the sea, this country's duty to protect them or demand satisfaction could not be called up, for the reason that nowhere do we attempt to protect our citizens who are engaged in the violation of our own laws. The Germans could sink as many of our ships found carrying contraband of war as they could locate, and this country would make no protest except if the act were done in manifest disregard to all principles of humanity.

Fourth. I do not know anything about the sentiment in other States, but in North Dakota it would appear that fully 75 percent of the people do not want the embargo removed. They believe that will keep us out of war. I do not know what the foundation for this belief is unless it be that since we are not now in any war or close to any war in this country that that fact is attributed to the present ban on shipping munitions to warring nations. Whatever the foundation, the fact remains that the people of North Dakota now believe that if we repealed the arms embargo that we would be headed for war.

No one is smart enough to predict just what will happen. If we do not repeal the arms embargo, does anyone in this country think munitions will not be sent to England and France? If the sentiment of the American people favors England and France, the munitions will go forward just as they did in the World War. We became directly involved in the war with Germany because she sank the *Lusitania*. Germany said the *Lusitania* was carrying a cargo of munitions for England. This Government said no—it was not carrying munitions. Senator La Follette said the *Lusitania* was carrying munitions, and for that statement came near to being impeached by the Senate of the United States. After the war the facts came out that La Follette was right. Germany was right, and she had the right to destroy munitions carried in neutral ships.

Should some shipowner, sympathizing with England and France or Germany, decide to smuggle munitions across the sea—and smugglers do not usually tell the Government what they have on board, except to show their manifests—and such a ship is stopped by an enemy submarine, examined, searched, and sunk, what will be the difference between that situation and the sinking of the *Lusitania?* Will public sentiment demand action against a nation that sinks one of our ships en route on a peaceful mission—no one but the searchers will know the ship is carrying munitions—and carrying innocent citizens of this country?

THE MOST IMPORTANT QUESTION WE CAN TAKE IS TO PROHIBIT OUR SHIPS AND CITIZENS FROM ENTERING ANY WAR ZONE

It seems to me the most important action we can take is not to concern ourselves with the question of whether we repeal or keep the ban on munitions, but to prohibit our ships and citizens from entering any war zone. If both will stay at home, there can be no possibility of going to war on their account.

If we keep the ban on munitions, those who make munitions will go somewhere else to make them. Not only will they go there, but they have already started making munitions outside of the United States for the use of belligerents.

No one can read about the complete destruction of Poland without wishing, hoping, and praying that he could prevent such an occurrence. But there are many such catastrophes taking place and have taken place within the past few months which are equally as abhorrent to an American citizen. We cannot police the world. Our duty, rather than to work out too far, is to work here at home and preserve civilization on the Westeren Hemisphere. If we do that, we will have to make more sacrifices than we are now aware of.

IT IS OF FAR GREATER IMPORTANCE TO CIVILIZATION FOR US TO FIGHT FOR AMERICA

I think it is of far greater importance to civilization for us to fight for America and save at least one spot on the surface of the globe where men may live at peace in their own homes and worship God in their own way.

Lest we forget what it cost to make the world safe for democracy in 1917–18, let me say that the total cost in money up to 1934 was $41,765,000,000, and to this should be added the amounts we have paid for the Veterans' Administration for war claims and interest on war debts for the years 1935, 1936, 1937, and 1938.

We find for 1935 that the total cost was	$659,348,870
For 1936	3,663,057,044
For 1937	709,746,494
For 1938	450,133,936

When we add these total costs together, to date we find the staggering sum of $47,247,286,344. And we are still not through, because we must add to this the money and credit

we advanced to the Allies during and after the war, which today, with interest, if no cancelations had been made, would have amounted to $22,000,000,000; therefore, the grand total would be $69,247,286,244, and still we do not have the beginning of the cost to us in the last World War. The real cost can be found in the following figures: The total forces mobilized were 4,355,000; killed and died, 126,000; wounded casualties, 234,000; prisoners and missing, 4,500; total casualties, 350,000. And it is to be remembered that we made this staggering sacrifice to make the world safe for democracy, and when we observe what is going on in Europe now we can realize how well we did the job in 1917–18. If there is a democracy left in Europe when the present war ends, it will be a surprise to everyone.

If we will now spend one-third of what it cost us in 1917–18 to make the world safe for democracy, and spend it for the rehabilitation of America, we will have built upon this continent a Government which will preserve for the world an impenetrable bulwark of civilization. If civilization is to disappear from the earth, let us hope that its last banner will be torn down on the soil of the United States.

National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. TOLAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 25, 1939

ARTICLE BY HON. CHARLES EDISON, ACTING SECRETARY OF THE NAVY

Mr. TOLAN. Mr. Speaker, it seems appropriate during these critical times to call to the attention of the Congress facts concerning our own national defense.

This is the reason I am inserting in the record the following remarkable, clearly written, and valuable article by the Honorable Charles Edison, Acting Secretary of the Navy.

The name Edison is a household word in America. Charles Edison is carrying on the best tradition of that name and giving to his country, as the head of our Navy, that fine, unselfish, and splendid service that has caught the grateful attention of the Nation, and one that would make his famous father so justly proud if he were alive today.

Likeable, lovable, brainy Charlie Edison goes about his tremendous task quietly, simply, and efficiently to make our defenses impregnable against the world, and thereby has won his way into the hearts and minds of the American people.

The article referred to is as follows:

[From Liberty for September 30, 1939]

THE AMERICAN MAGINOT LINE—HERE IS AMERICA'S PROBLEM: OUR NAVY IS THE FIRST LINE OF DEFENSE—IS IT STRONG ENOUGH?

(By Hon. Charles Edison, Acting Secretary of the Navy)

Along the thousands of miles of boundary between the United States and its neighbors no men crouch in cement-lined burrows grimly and ceaselessly watching the borders above the alert muzzles of guns. Our public parks are not scarred with trenches for emergency refuge against air raids, and in no city do basement doors proclaim shelter from poison gas. So live—at this writing—the peoples of Europe. In England and France, Italy and Germany, men and women and children have had to adjust their routine of normal living to include a constant awareness of danger from invasion.

Americans are free from such constant reminders of danger, yet the danger from war in Europe extends to the Americas, and the broad oceans which still are a natural bulwark against foreign aggression are also avenues for an enemy, avenues made into a speedway by the development of aviation.

The same combination of wings, motors, brains, and daring which makes it possible to carry tons of freight and passengers across the oceans makes possible the transportation of tons of explosives. The menace of perverted human ingenuity which can leap over the sea on wings is matched by submarines darting under the sea. Airplane carriers, for that matter, can, if not completely opposed, bring hundreds of bombers to cripple industries and communications far inland. Altogether, we now have to string a few strands of barbed wire along the tops of our natural barriers. The United States must have a Maginot line of impenetrable defense. It is being built!

Our essential task is to make it impossible for an invader to obtain a foothold on this side of the earth. Those who might attack us must, unless they come determined to die after doing as much damage as they can inflict, maintain an uninterrupted flow of supplies from their homeland. To defend ourselves successfully, we Americans must make this end of the sea lanes a dead-end street, so that no enemy can get over, under, around, or through to bomb the mainlands or—biggest defense problem of all—destroy the Panama Canal and thereby leave either coast without naval defense.

Given a rim of coastal defenses capable, in conjunction with the fleet, of stopping a direct assault upon the continent, the safety and peace of Americans are secured. Denied this safety belt, a navy twice the size of our eventual strength would be as handicapped as a heavyweight champion with both eyes blackened and closed.

This year the Navy Department has begun to fill the gaps in the existing rim of defenses, to provide the three coasts of the United States with overlapping areas of protection. It is a program integrated with the War Department's expansion of the Panama Canal's armed security to make that life line unbreakable. By direction of President Roosevelt, after his July conferences with Admiral William D. Leahy, retiring Chief of Naval Operations, and other high ranking officers, about $20,000,000 is being immediately invested to begin building and correlating new air bases and strengthening existing ones.

When the full program is eventually completed, at a cost several times that of the money available this year, the continental United States will be surrounded by a belt of invisible chain mail. Every approach to the United States or its neighbors by sea or air will be under surveillance. Scouting airplanes will exist in force to detect an enemy's approach. Combat airplanes and bombers will be ready to harry and delay the invaders while the main force of the Navy and the Army mobilize for action. Submarines and mine layers will go to work from all the bases within the zone of probable combat when the alarm is given.

Every portal to the northern half of this hemisphere is going to be equipped, so to speak, with "electric eyes" to slam the door and give warning of intrusion.

To most persons, and especially to those who live in the interior, the Navy Department is imagined to concern itself wholly with warships; and that, of course, is the Department's main business. But battleships, cruisers, destroyers, submarines, and airplanes are no stronger than their bases. With the growth in importance of airplanes as offensive and defensive weapons, the importance of dry land to naval operations has multiplied. So, too, has the importance of the submarine increased as a defense against attacks by air, for one of the jobs we rely upon the underwater craft to perform is to evade the defenses of airplane carriers and, by sinking them, to render the invading airplanes homeless and consequently total losses.

Of course, the Department's first task was to provide the United States with an adequate fleet of fighting ships. We have building or under contract 8 battleships, which will include some of the largest ever launched, 2 aircraft carriers, and 5 cruisers. About one-fourth of our 20 new submarines are completed, and more than a third of our 42 new destroyers. Besides these, the Navy is in process of acquiring 24 vessels of other categories, such as tenders and tugs, and half a dozen of the exceedingly swift little motor torpedo boats. Most of the job of giving the United States a fleet second to none is well begun. Now we are entering upon the task of backing up the fleet with the bases it will need, and that we expect to have finished before the new fighting ships are all afloat.

Spaced around the United States, from New London, Conn., to Sitka, Alaska, the Navy already has more than a score of such bases. Some are all-purpose establishments, some for submarines only, others for airplanes or destroyers, or for the several combinations of these three. Not included in this figure are the Hawaiian bases, which are in a class by themselves.

We are adding immediately a new air base at Jacksonville, Fla., and aviation-submarine bases at San Juan, P. R., and Kodiak, Alaska. Eventually we expect to build air and submarine bases at Quonsett, R. I., Corpus Christi, Tex., and Unalaska. That will give us, with the fleet at sea, our Maginot line of overlapping chain-mail defense—the greatest guarantor of peaceful security we have ever had or can have without going to jittery extremes.

If I have emphasized the potential duties of aircraft, submarines, and destroyers operating from this augmented girdle of defenses, it has been to explain what we are preventing. We are not getting ready for a war. We are making an attack upon the United States and its neighborhood so unlikely to succeed that nobody is going to try it. I interrupt this theme, which I hope the readers of Liberty will accept as an informal and untechnical report to the American people, emphatically to declare that we are not getting ready to fight anybody.

We are getting ready so nobody will try to fight us, or to dispossess our neighbors by force as a prelude to knocking us down.

If the key to American safety is the Panama Canal, then the keyhole is the Caribbean Sea. Most of us think of the United States as having two seacoasts, the Atlantic and the Pacific. We tend to forget the third, and southern, coast. The pretzel-shaped body of water formed by the Caribbean Sea and Gulf of Mexico is

now considered to be the most likely focus of attack upon us. Consequently, this area is getting the concentrated attention of the builders of our defenses. The hitherto almost defenseless West Indies, taking as a whole the arc of islands stretching from Florida to Venezuela, might provide a maze of shelters for raiding submarines or easy stepping stones for invading aircraft.

Remember, it is only 1,620 miles across the Atlantic to South America, and 2,530 overseas-miles to the heart of the West Indies, with tail winds all the way. By that route the core of continental United States and the Mississippi Valley is bared. The Navy is plugging this gap, not with ships particularly but with air and submarine bases, of which Puerto Rico is the most important.

As at the Panama Canal, the Puerto Rico defenses are a synchronization of the Army and Navy, with emphasis on aviation. The importance of the work there is made graphic by President Roosevelt's appointment of Admiral Leahy to be Governor of the Territory immediately upon his retirement as Chief of Naval Operations. Principally the Army's interest will be in a sizable force of long-range bombing planes to destroy any hostile concentrations in the islands or the mainland south.

The Navy will maintain a diversified aviation force and submarine fleet, for both of which Isla Grande, in San Juan Harbor, is being taken over by the Department. When completed, there will be facilities for one airplane carrier and auxiliary vessels and for two patrol-plane squadrons, each capable of being doubled immediately. Berthing for the carriers and a strategic number of submarines is being provided by extensive filling in and construction of a breakwater at the harbor entrance. Of course, large provision must be made on shore for fuel and ammunition stores, machine shops, hospitals, living quarters, and the like.

At St. Thomas, V. I., a step to the eastward, the existing limited aviation facilities are being expanded and modernized to accommodate a full marine squadron of 18 airplanes, a tender vessel, and personnel.

Consider that up to now the territory was bare of defenses. In fact, the West Indies and the southeast coast of the United States had only the naval base at Guantanamo Bay, leased from Cuba, as its protection.

Now the American West Indies will become to the United States all that Gibraltar has been to Great Britain.

Guantanamo Bay's most important use is for fleet operations. It is here that our larger fighting ships may concentrate in the event of a threat against the Atlantic side. Whether in war or at maneuvers, the concentration of ships makes large-scale operation of seaplanes difficult and usually dangerous. We are constructing a landing field for small airplanes to serve as an intermediate station between the outer bases at Puerto Rico and St. Thomas and the mainland, to which we now turn our attention.

At Key West, on Florida's tip, is a naval station, now closed, but which is to be rehabilitated for instant use when needed, as a base for submarines particularly. Florida is witnessing a great deal of onshore naval activity. The aviation training station at Pensacola will eventually be expanded to increase its capacity by half, and we propose sometime to duplicate that establishment on the opposite side of the Gulf at Corpus Christi, Tex.

Meanwhile we are going ahead to build at Jacksonville, Fla., a naval aviation base even stronger than the one in Puerto Rico. It will be the home of two carrier groups and three patrol squadrons, yet roomy enough to accommodate twice as many ships and airplanes in an emergency. Two utility squadrons of naval aircraft will also be based at Jacksonville, besides the necessary shops for overhaul and repair and other buildings.

Jumping now to the Pacific side of our defense problem, we find that while Nature was not so kind as to provide a screen of islands for our vulnerable spots, she did give us the protection of the widest stretch of waters on the globe. Coco Solo, in the Canal Zone, is the base for approximately 100 naval airplanes, which are computed as an integral part of the fleet defending this vital artery. At Balboa, on the Pacific side of the Isthmus, is a potential submarine base; but the recently established naval station there is principally an administrative set-up, a branch office of the Navy Department, let us say.

From the Canal Zone to San Diego, in southern California, is the longest break in our chain-mail belt of defenses. Between these points lie Mexico and the five northern republics of Central America.

But from the Mexican border to the tip of Alaska our overlapping zones of defenses are, or shortly will be, without a chink, while the outposts of the Hawaiian Islands make that territory the equivalent of an unsinkable fleet a third of the distance across the Pacific.

Very often the demand is voiced in Congress or from the public, that the United States acquire, by purchase or as debt retirement, strategic territory such as the British or French West Indies or the islands in the Pacific owned by Mexico, Costa Rica, and Ecuador. That, of course, is none of the Navy's business. I mention it because I anticipate the reader's question. The Navy's job is to do the best it can with what is available. Territorial expansion is something for Congress, the State Department, and the President to consider, and to attempt to negotiate if deemed wise.

Without expressing an opinion on the subject, I can say that when the present program of defensive bases is completed, and the ships, the airplanes, the men and matériel are available, the United States and its neighborhood will breathe easier and will have done a good job of canceling any threat from any quarter.

For that security we are indebted to the foresight of President Roosevelt and the devotion of the late Secretary of the Navy, Claude A. Swanson, who stuck to his job through its most critical period despite a desperate and eventually fatal illness, like a sorely wounded captain refusing to leave the deck of his ship.

Our new ships and bases, as the Navy's estimate goes, are the best guaranties of our peace and security in a troubled world. It is the Navy's hope that they will never be engaged in hostile action—the Navy's conviction that, if war is forced upon us, we are now equipped for victory at the least cost of wealth, life, and time.

Keep America Out of Foreign Wars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAMILTON FISH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 25, 1939

RADIO ADDRESS OF HON. HAMILTON FISH, OF NEW YORK, SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 23, 1939

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio speech delivered by me over the National Broadcasting Co.'s network, on Saturday evening, September 23, 1939:

I have to ask the radio audience for their indulgence this evening, owing to a bad cold.

I have just returned from a 6-week trip to Europe, where I visited 12 countries, and 3 more if you count Wales, Austria, and Danzig. This is the first of a series of speeches on keeping out of war. I will speak again next Tuesday, and discuss more in detail the neutrality bill and proposed amendments.

The President has called the Congress into special session in an attempt to scrap the arms embargo and to substitute either a cash-and-carry system or to return to the principles of international law, under which we went to war in 1917 and would again if we adhered to such a policy.

The President made an appeal for national unity and a nonpartisan attitude toward foreign policies. I am quite sure that the Republican Party will be glad to join with the President for national unity on any program to keep the United States out of war. That is the single greatest issue before the American people. It transcends all party lines and affiliations and must not be confused or sidetracked over academic disputes and debates involving the advantages and disadvantages of various types of cash-and-carry, arms embargoes, or return to international law.

The paramount issue before the country is to prevent America from being eased into war by the internationalists in our midst and the propagandists from abroad. I warn the American people that no stone will be left unturned by these internationalists, interventionists, and war mongers to build up public sentiment in order to drag us into European wars.

The campaign is already on in full fury. Every leader for strict neutrality and keeping out of war will be denounced by such smear artists and purveyors of hate as Dorothy Thompson, Jay Franklin, and a host of others of the same ilk. Every spokesman for peace, such as Col. Charles A. Lindbergh, will have his motives defiled and his name dragged into the mud if he dares to publicly proclaim his views in favor of strict neutrality and peace.

This campaign of hysteria, emotionalism, hatred, untruth, and poisonous propaganda has only just started, and it has for its sole purpose sending American youth to the battlefields of Europe. The campaign is financed by almost unlimited funds from abroad, as it was in the last war, and men and women of every walk of life will be on its pay roll. Every avenue of news and propaganda will be put to work to influence American public opinion to enter the European war.

I do not believe that this inspired and vicious propaganda will succeed in fooling the American people again, as they have been burned once. As Lincoln said, you can fool some of the people some of the time but you cannot fool all the people all of the time.

But it must be remembered that those in back of this campaign for war will stop at nothing to attain their ends, and they believe that they will succeed within 6 months. I warn the American people that they must discount the ridicule, abuse, and vilification of the motives and acts of every spokesman for peace in America. Half truths and plain ordinary lies will be the order of the day for these propagandists, paid and otherwise.

Only a few days ago I was ridiculed and denounced by those well-known smearers, Drew Pearson and Robert S. Allen, in their syndicated column, The Washington Merry-Go-Round, under date of September 21, for having proposed a 30-day armistice on war at the Oslo Conference. Messrs. Pearson and Allen stated that I had been taken to task by my colleague, DANIEL A. REED, of New York, which is an utterly false statement and typical of the propaganda that one may expect from now on. DAN REED supported and spoke for my resolution for a 30-day armistice on war and left a proxy with me to vote for it.

I consider it the soundest and most important proposal I have ever made during my 20 years in public life; and if the British had not objected, it would have been adopted overwhelmingly as written, instead of in diluted form. It might have postponed the war and opened the way for peaceful settlement of the disputes between England, France, Germany, and Italy, and saved Poland from being crucified by invasion and war.

The president of the French delegation made a speech before the council and said his delegation would support it in its original form if it came up for a vote, but I replied that I would not press it if the British were against it, as it would be a futile gesture.

The following is a quotation from my speech before the Interparliamentary Union Conference at Oslo, Norway, on August 17, which I admit I am more proud of than any speech I ever made:

"I regret deeply to state that I believe that a European war is more imminent today than at any time since last September. If the Danzig and Polish agitation continues, the slightest spark may start a world conflagration.

"As one who served in the World War, and for the most of the time in the Fourth French Army, under General Gouraud, I hate and loathe war and do not offer any apologies for raising my voice in behalf of peace. I refuse to admit that the door of peace is closed or to yield to the defeatist talk that apparently covers Europe.

"A 30-day armistice or moratorium on war is of vital importance, if the people of Europe are to be spared the most disastrous scourge in the last 100 years. If this conference can contribute its part in a democratic manner to the preservation of world peace, it will deserve the grateful thanks and prayers of millions of peace-loving and Christian people throughout all of Europe.

"Modern warfare is a crime against humanity and civilization. The human loss is monstrous. No nation wins; even the victor loses and comes out a bankrupt and disorganized country, the prey to communism and anarchy.

"I ask this Conference to rise above the deadlock in which Europe is engulfed into the daylight of peace and humanity. Hatred and revenge must be subordinated to the nobler principles of arbitration and peace."

I am inserting the entire speech in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and will be glad to send copies, free of charge, to any of the radio audience, as well as a copy of my radio remarks this evening, on receipt of a request addressed to me, HAMILTON FISH, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

I am an isolationist from war, but not an isolationist from arbitration, mediation, and peaceful methods of settling international disputes.

While I was in Europe I was bitterly attacked editorially by the New York World-Telegram, of the Scripps-Howard syndicate, as an alarmist and scaremonger for predicting that war would break out soon after August 20 and for urging a 30-day armistice on war. The proof of the pudding is in the eating thereof, but I have not noticed any editorial apology by these international-minded newspapers now urging the repeal of the arms embargo.

I have referred to these personal attacks on me not because I care one bit about condemnation from such biased sources—which in this fight is the highest possible commendation—but I feel that I should make the record clear to those peace-loving Americans who cooperated with me through the National Committee to Keep America Out of Foreign Wars.

If I were alone concerned, I would not dignify these contemptible distortions of fact with any reply. However, as the issue is far greater than any individual, group, or party, I feel it is only fair to expose publicly such misrepresentations in the cause of peace and keeping America out of foreign wars.

The mail and telegrams from my district average more than 10 to 1 in favor of retaining the arms embargo, but for the first time in almost 20 years I have been receiving threatening letters from internationalist fanatics who want America to fight Europe's battles and to police the world with American blood and treasure.

I am convinced, however, that if we should be forced into war we would become a dictatorship immediately and might never regain the freedom and liberty that the American people have always enjoyed.

I have led the fight during the last 10 years against subversive and un-American activities, such as fascism, nazi-ism, and communism, in America and yield to no one in my devotion to our free institutions, republican form of government, and to American traditions and ideals.

I shall ask for no quarter nor give any in trying to keep America out of war, and I am confident that there will be millions and tens of millions of American citizens who will stand shoulder to shoulder with those of us in Congress who are working in the interest of peace and against war.

I am not concerned with my own political future in this crisis or with threats that I may be digging my political grave. I am, however, very much concerned in not doing anything to weaken the neutrality laws by permitting the sale of arms and ammunition for blood money and war profits and making the United States the potential slaughterhouse of the world. I am not interested in blood-smeared dollars that may drag us into war.

I am only concerned in not having American soldiers follow the traffic in arms to European battlefields, as they did in 1917. I shall never by my vote put America into war, unless we are attacked, and help dig the graves of our American youth in foreign lands.

I am at a loss to know what groups in America asked for a special session of Congress to repeal the arms embargo. The American Federation of Labor, the National Grange, the veterans' organizations, the church and peace-loving elements, and millions of American fathers and mothers who love peace and loath war believe that the repeal of the arms embargo is the first step toward war, to be followed by the sacrifice of their sons' lives in foreign lands.

If the American people are sufficiently aroused to their own responsibilities and make known their views to their elected representatives in Congress there will be no repeal and we will stay out of war.

I am convinced that any substantial change in our neutrality law in time of war is an unneutral act and so regarded in international law. It is like changing the rules after the kick-off in a football game.

I cannot get much excited over the argument that we are helping England and France by repealing the arms embargo, as neither nation needs our arms and ammunition, each having an abundant supply. It would not make any sense if they bought arms from us when they can supply themselves much cheaper.

It is my contention that the arms embargo does not affect the war economy of either England or France, because they have erected huge modern munitions factories in recent years.

There is a great deal of misunderstanding of the neutrality law. The fact is that under the existing law England and France can buy everything they want in America except arms, ammunition, and implements of war. Under the Vorys amendment to the Bloom bill, adopted by the House of Representatives 3 months ago, implements of war were omitted, thus enabling any belligerent nation to buy airplanes.

I would like to see the Bloom bill with the Vorys arms-embargo proposal amended to provide that American merchant ships enter the war zones at their own risk. If that were done there would be no need for the cash-and-carry plan.

I have not referred to President Roosevelt and have refrained from any partisan references. I appeal to all Americans to consider the proposed changes in the neutrality bill in a calm and dispassionate manner. I believe the existing neutrality law, which is by no means perfect, can be modified to the satisfaction of most of our people.

I believe in freedom of speech, and have no quarrel with those who may differ with my views on modification of the neutrality law. However, I appeal to all factions and elements of the people to be united in opposition to the insidious propaganda that war is inevitable and urge them to stand steadfast in helping to keep America out of war. There can be no compromise on this issue affecting the lives and liberties of our people.

Hitler Could Not Stop

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL HINSHAW

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 25, 1939

ARTICLE BY HERMANN RAUSCHNING

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, the following article entitled "Hitler Could Not Stop," by Hermann Rauschning, appears in the October 1939 issue of the publication Foreign Affairs, an American quarterly review. It is vitally important that the Members of Congress and the people we represent learn everything possible that bears upon the affairs of the world today in order to exercise proper judgment in our future course of action and for this reason I have asked and obtained unanimous consent to insert this important article in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Hermann Rauschning, as is learned from Time magazine of September 18, 1939, the son of a Prussian officer, was trained in a military school and is an East Prussian Junker who joined the Nazis in 1931 because he could see no other way out for Germany's desperation. He became President of the Danzig Senate, Hitler's go-between in his off-stage talks with Poland's late President Pilsudski. But when the Führer ordered Rauschning to persecute Danzig Jews and Catholics, he quit the Nazis and took refuge in Poland.

The article follows:

[From Foreign Affairs for October 1939]

HITLER COULD NOT STOP

(By Hermann Rauschning)

Some people believed that Hitler could be induced by certain limited concessions, made dependent on his fulfillment of certain specified conditions, to change his methods of procedure and limit

his aims. Germany would then cease to figure as a troublemaker in the world and would fit into a new international equilibrium. The view was based on a number of sound assumptions and was justified by the example of the movement for German unification between 1864 and 1870. Bismarck often expressed the idea. He said that once the unified Reich had been constituted one of his main concerns would be to create general confidence in its pacific intentions. After rectifying the injuria temporum (the Bismarckian phrase), German policy would set itself the task of becoming a force for peace in Europe. Bismarck's national policy was based exclusively on force and was eminently practical. But its objectives were always limited. At the given moment it saw the necessity of fixing its own limits, and never overstepped them.

Sharply in contrast with Bismarck's art of the possible stands the hazy, impulsive policy of William II. At a critical moment during the latter's reign, the Morocco crisis of 1905, Sir Arthur Nicolson remarked that the German foreign office did not itself know what it wanted; and he went on to say that the real danger in German policy was not so much its expansionist outlook as its vagueness. That was entirely true. It was impossible to work out a policy of harmonious collaboration with a person who did not know what he wanted. William II based his foreign policy on surprises and sudden impulses; and that fact, much more than Germany's striving for world power, led directly to the World War.

Hitler's policy at first differed strikingly from the policy of William II. It differed also from the policy of the Weimar Republic, which was also—though for different reasons, chiefly the Republic's inherent weakness—wavering and uncertain. Hitler's policy was outspoken and showed that it was clearly conscious of its goals. Frankly nationalistic, setting out to revise the Versailles Treaty and rectify an obvious injuria temporum, it moved along lines noticeably similar to Bismarck's. It began, then, as the continuation of a policy which, in the previous century, after achieving its aims, resulted in over 40 years of peace for Europe.

In the beginning, Hitler's policy was strictly and exclusively national. Its one aim seemed to be to transform the little Germany that Bismarck had founded into the greater Germany that still lived in the thoughts of all German patriots. This was to be achieved by revision of the territorial provisions in the peace treaty, which in the long run would have proved unendurable anyway. Germany possessed many friends among her sometime war opponents. These would probably have approved of such a reasonable policy if certain revolutionary features attending its application, along with its terroristic methods, had not chilled good will abroad and intensified foreign hesitations. Even so, however, one still could argue that the extravagant features of the new German policy were superficial and would automatically correct themselves in due course.

Objectively, however, the policy of the Third Reich could be considered constructive only so long as it had a definite and limited scope. In other words, only if National Socialist foreign policy aimed specifically at uniting actually German territories in an enlarged German state could it expect that other states would tolerate the gradual reorganization of Europe under German leadership.

During the early years of the National Socialist regime, therefore, foreign criticism took the form mainly of moralistic disapproval of certain of its domestic methods. There was little disapproval of its aims as such. Indeed, some authoritative interpreters abroad exerted themselves to put even the domestic procedures of national socialism in a better light, thereby strengthening a natural inclination on the part of many persons to ignore certain repulsive revolutionary aspects of the movement as being strictly the private concern of the German people, explicable probably on the basis of the delight which they habitually take in discipline and "order." The austere forms which the German national regimentation adopted were calculated in many ways to beguile foreign criticism. The advantages of authoritarian methods became apparent in the ease with which Germany overcame many surface symptoms of her social and economic crisis. The country seemed to be on the road to order and recovery; hence (it was assumed), once a transitional period of unrest had passed, on the road to peace.

The domestic opponents of national socialism among the former ruling classes of Germany reached a similar view. During a first short period they grossly underestimated the strength of the new regime. There followed a second short period when the dominant feeling was one of shock and resentment at its brutal methods. Then finally the educated and patriotic middle classes settled down in the persuasion that the various outrages of national socialism were ephemeral, revolutionary manifestations that must needs be borne with for the time being.

In non-Nazi circles in those days, among the army leaders, the bureaucracy, and in business, the word was passed to allow the revolutionary outburst to wear itself out. The movement, it was said, would clean itself up. The wise course was felt to be to enter the party so as gradually to reshape it from within. Many important holders of public office felt, of course, that it was impossible to reconcile the party's unscrupulous conduct with their individual consciences, and that it was their duty to resign. They were reminded that to do so would only strengthen the new movement and intensify its extremist character. They were told that rather it was their duty to hold their positions as long as possible, in order gradually to weed out the catastrophe makers, or, at the worst, to serve as brakes on the plunge into catastrophe. Reasoning of this sort had a certain semblance of soundness, and it appealed, among others, to men such as Baron von Neurath, in foreign affairs; to Count Schwerin-Krosigk, in finance; and to Eltz Rübenach, in commerce. They decided not to break with national socialism but to work with it, to retard and moderate it, and to prevent another lapse into bloody revolution.

These motives were intelligible enough, but they were none the less mistaken. The National Socialist movement could not be reformed. It was obeying an inner iron-bound law of its own being. It was following the relentless urge toward extremism to which every revolutionary movement is destined. The collaboration of conservative and competent officials and men of affairs strengthened the regime; but they could not change it. They wore themselves out, and the movement went on regardless. An adjustment of the nature of a civil war was avoided; but in the end the price was the total capitulation of the restorative elements in the ruling and educated classes and of the liberal and democratic elements in business and labor.

The question now arises whether, in following the sometimes temporizing and sometimes frankly pro-Nazi policy, the western democracies did not make the same mistake in the foreign field which inside the Reich led to the capitulation and enslavement of the German citizenry as a whole. The policy of domestic collaboration avoided civil war within Germany; the conduct of the democracies in compromising with Germany aimed to avoid a European war. To be sure, there would be solid grounds for reasoning the other way round—that the disposition of the democracies to yield, without setting any clearly discernible limits on what they would yield, was what first made war a real danger. However that may be, there can be no doubt that pressure upon Germany from abroad might very well have led to the fall of the National Socialist regime. But would that have led to any lasting adjustment for Europe as a whole? Perhaps the overthrow of national socialism would have set a genuinely revolutionary development in motion. A period of anarchy might then have ensued. Or a strictly Prussian and militaristic solution might have been found, compared with which even the National Socialist regime might have seemed the lesser evil.

How such a gross misreading of national socialism could have held sway for so long in the world is hard indeed to comprehend. The lack of critical sense and foresight shown by German business leaders doubtless contributed. They merely noticed with satisfaction the temporary relief brought them through currency control and the new methods of dealing with labor problems, and they paid no attention to the disturbing revolutionary disintegration of all the elements composing what is called public order. They were simply obsessed by the idea that national socialism's energetic methods offered the chance of at least temporarily escaping from the general world depression.

There was another reason in addition to the apparent cessation of the depression in Germany which contributed substantially to the foreign inclination to view the course of events there with a certain amount of optimism. German unemployment was closely interrelated with a number of problems which, generally speaking, could be solved only by the cooperation of all countries; but above all it was related to the problem of raw materials. Now Germany's difficulty in securing raw materials would probably not have arisen under conditions of peaceful international commerce. But international commerce had been upset by the depression. It seemed only natural, therefore, to seek economic remedies for the critical situation in Germany which was driving her to adopt a policy of political expansion. If certain territories were handed over to Germany to be exploited, and if her need for raw materials were met, would not her menacing revolutionary trend be eliminated or diverted? An economically satisfied Germany, it was argued, would dissipate its explosive energies in peaceful labor.

Plausible as these considerations are, they fail to explain why, in spite of progressive surrenders to national socialist demands from year to year and in one area after another, the desired peaceful results were not achieved, but, on the contrary, German demands constantly grew.

The fact is, of course, that the whole form of reasoning outlined above rested on false assumptions. It grossly exaggerated the importance of economic considerations in the German situation and overlooked its irrational or nonrational motivations. Many observers were led astray by the patriotic impulses which the national socialist movement satisfied and failed to notice its disintegrating revolutionary tendencies. What especially was overlooked was the movement's antimoral background, which was what gave it its peculiar destructive power.

It is important to realize that Germany adopted the goal of economic autarchy not for economic or social reasons but for reasons having to do with national power, or, more exactly, national defense. We find the germ of this policy as far back as the time of Bismarck, whose economic protectionism was closely related to military policy. Then came Germany's decisive experience during the World War. Germany's geographical situation always puts her in danger of being cut off from world markets, and this fact, given her inadequate raw-material resources, forces her to plan either to enlarge those resources by technical devices or to obtain a supply of them through territorial expansion.

The dilemma is plain. But the full effect of it in National Socialist thought has by no means been realized abroad. The Nazi thesis runs as follows:

Numerically the German Nation is, next to Russia, the largest in Europe. But her inadequate territory bars her from full sovereignty as a world people. In peaceful times Germany, of course, could easily cover her raw-material requirements. But in time of war her dependence on the world market makes her fatally weak. With

the enormous development that has taken place in technical instruments of warfare, she no longer can prosecute a war on several fronts with any prospect of success. Her ability to employ her great technical and military capacities breaks down on the single circumstance that she is dependent economically on foreign nations. Attainment of her full status as a world people seems thus to be denied to Germany for all time, and she is condemned to play second fiddle to a numerically smaller nation like Great Britain and even to France, who has a colonial empire and free access to the open sea.

The distinctive trait of a world people, continues the Nazi argument, is its complete freedom of political action. The United States has this freedom. So have the British Empire, Russia, and (though to a somewhat lesser extent) France. If Germany wants to keep company with those powers and not rest satisfied in a secondary position, she has to adjust herself in terms of power to the present-day significance of economic space. To describe her resulting effort as part of a contest between "haves" and "have nots," between wealthy nations and proletarian nations, is to misrepresent it. That formulation of the situation is merely a psychological weapon in the war of opinion. The fact is that the largest and technically most advanced nation in Europe has been kept from playing more than a secondary role in the world. For Germany to accept the situation would have required either stern resignation or a resolve to seek a solution otherwise than through the assertion of power. Germany has felt herself too young and virile a nation to accept the former course; as for the latter, the World War left her without the requisite atmosphere of friendly collaboration.

Economic autarchy is an artificial instrument which must be used temporarily in the diplomatic and economic fields in order to achieve natural independence. It is not a permanent solution, the Nazis grant, and has never been thought of as such. It runs against the nature of things and is therefore foredoomed to failure. But for the time being it has afforded Germany the brief period of independence required for her to obtain, by diplomatic or military means as the case may be, her real goal—full sovereignty as a world people.

"Lebensraum," the space required by a nation for living, is not, in Nazi terminology, the mere space sufficient for subsistence under a system of free exchange of goods. It means a domain sufficiently comprehensive to provide Germany with absolute freedom of action. The limits of that domain expands automatically as the requirements of modern warfare expand. What would have been adequate in the year 1880 to make Germany self-sufficient and sovereign had become wholly inadequate by the end of the World War. To become truly sovereign under postwar conditions Germany must now expand the domain under her control eastward as far as the Caucasus and including the Ukraine, and westward as far as the open sea. She must have the oil of the Caucasus, the minerals of the Ukraine, and the grain of Hungary and Rumania; also she must have the steel of northern France, control of the shore line of Belgium, Holland, and northern France, and the colonial domains at present belonging to those countries. In this policy the law of the minimum controls; for the soundness of the policy varies with that factor, not with the maximum.

Such are the ideas of national socialism. The fundamental thing which emerges is the impossibility that olive branches and concessions in this or that particular could ever serve any purpose. Either it is full sovereignty for Germany or it is nothing.

Hitler's foreign policy, therefore, allowed him no freedom of choice. His particular aims all stood in a fixed and necessary relation to his comprehensive aim, full sovereignty for Germany as a world people. Germany will be satisfied only when she controls a completely self-sufficient territory. In the perspective of that policy, all projects for a return to a purely economic organization of the world necessarily remained uninteresting. The dependence of parts of the world on the whole, and the interdependence of all the parts, are the very things which must be rectified, abolished, and this not on doctrinaire grounds but because of the plain requirements of practical politics. Thus there were but two alternatives: Germany's complete surrender, her renunciation of all hope of becoming a world people; or an uncompromising struggle to attain the complete goal. The goal can be attained only by German control over all Europe. Only when European hegemony has been won can national socialism accept a system of international exchange of commodities as not any longer disturbing to German sovereignty. In view of this, the effort to make National Socialist imperialism believe that it would do well to go back to a system of free international exchange, and to explain to National Socialist chieftains that other countries are only too anxious to help them satisfy Germany's economic needs, were perfectly fatuous.

Other facts fortified the National Socialist determination never to abandon their full aims in the foreign field. Of great importance, for instance, was the National Socialist conviction that Germany's eagerness for world dominion corresponded to a real change in the power relationships of the nations. In this view, German foreign policy merely recognized an actual state of fact hitherto obscured by the antiquated manner in which the world's territory was distributed. In Nazi eyes England is a paper power, whose strategic position is in full disintegration. France is a dying nation, biologically unable any longer to play the part of a world power, much less a world people. The United States is no longer a young nation. It is, moreover, a hodgepodge of peoples and so can never attain a stable political form. It is not ambitious—hence, by a definition, not a world people. The proper sort of touch from the outside at the right moment would send it reeling into revolution.

The complacency of National Socialists who thus interpreted the realities of the world scene was not very much upset by the changes of the last half year. Reorganization in France and rearmament in Great Britain were regarded as mere show, specious bustle. The National Socialists considered that the democracies lacked one thing which is basic and essential—namely, the unshakable resolve to assert themselves in terms of power.

Hitler himself has commented on the sort of aggressive foreign policy described above. His opinion of the results of making concessions in diplomacy is particularly important. In a characteristic passage in "Mein Kampf" he writes:

"The shrewd victor will, when possible, present his demands to the conquered piecemeal. He can be sure that a people without character—and such will be any people that voluntarily submits—will see no sufficient reason for again going to war over any one of his separate encroachments. The more extortions of this kind are docilely accepted the more unjustified will it seem to people finally to go to war over a new act of oppression, ostensibly isolated, but really recurring; especially since they all in all have already put up with so much more and greater abuses in patient silence."

We come now to the central question as to the real nature of national socialism. Is it actually a national movement? Here we shall do well to consider not so much its political theories as its tactics. In his tactics, Hitler carries over into the general field of politics, and especially into the fields of foreign policy and military strategy, certain modern doctrines of the coup d'état and of civil war. His policy is one of permanent conspiracy. It is warfare by psychological pressure in accordance with methods of conspiracy and revolutionary disintegration. His policy is one of world revolution. But world revolution is not conceived of as the ultimate goal (as Lenin conceived it), but as a permanent activity aiming at the progressive decomposition of all elements of order. Hitler has absorbed and set logically in his mind the theories of the coup d'état developed by Trotzky and Malaparte. From them he derived the characteristic resort of his policy, the crippling of the will of his antagonist by bewildering it and splitting it. Combining threats and promises, his strategy aims to procure the voluntary submission of his opponent. He hopes to make the surrender easier by parceling out his demands and encroachments in small doses, so that no one of them will seem important enough by itself to fight over rather than to compromise. Hitler maneuvers his antagonist into the position held by the old regime in the typical revolution. He thinks the western democracies in the great world revolution now in full course are in the position of the old regimes and former elites which have capitulated and abdicated in the lesser revolutions of the past.

Actual experience convinced Hitler of the soundness of his judgment and of the practicability of his revolutionary system. And from that experience he drew the conclusion that his personal significance in history lies in his having perceived how hollow was the strength of the old states and that his personal mission was to liquidate them from their antiquated positions in the hierarchy of power. His confidence naturally was in no wise shaken by the fact that the risks which he supposedly had been running in his many foolhardy adventures proved in the result to have been no real risks at all. The seemingly impossible turned out unfailingly to be quite feasible. The old regimes, with all their enormously superior resources, time and again capitulated before the revolutionary squads of National Socialist Germany.

From this standpoint could concessions and offers of peace from an antagonist seem anything but symptoms of his readiness to capitulate? No; they merely sharpened the eagerness for attack. A mistaken psychology on the part of the powers of western Europe proved to be what brought on the very war which they had tried to prevent by being reasonable and conciliatory. In essence the war was being fought all along. It was stupid, then, to try to prevent its breaking out. The proper program would have been to try to put an end to it without a ruinous shedding of blood. This could have been done only by compelling Hitler to abandon his methods of conspiracy, and the only effective means to that end would have been prompt, continuous, and unequivocal assertions of principle backed by evidence of an unflinching determination and ability to maintain the position taken.

But the diplomatic situation was far from requiring Hitler to do anything of that sort. Rather, it supplied him with more and more opportunities for his psychological victories. To grasp the real significance of this fact it must be realized that, according to Hitler's doctrine of strategy, war in the old-fashioned military sense is secondary. In his conception of war, the bloody military action in the field has merely the function that pursuit after a victory has in ordinary military strategy. The really decisive action is supposed to take place before the outbreak of war. It consists in a demoralization of the enemy. In his plan the resort to weapons merely completes, by a last extreme act of force, the defeat which has already been determined by the methods of diplomatic conspiracy.

In recent months Hitler found himself fighting the early and what he imagined would be the decisive phases of a war. Strategic retreats now and then seemed necessary. But the first stages, to his way of thinking, offered very bright prospects. Why should he, then, bring the war to a halt? He was convinced that the total mobilization of the German people could be indefinitely endured, for National Socialist discipline had deliberately trained them to withstand hardships; whereas the democracies would find a state of continuous mobilization for war utterly foreign and inevitably provocative of fatal social unrest. So, too, the liberal economic system, in spite of its incomparably stronger position in actual

wealth, would collapse sooner than the planned war economy of national socialism, despite its far smaller economic reserves. True, the western powers were making rapid progress in rearmament; but time, in Hitler's view, was nonetheless working in the long run for national socialism.

How then, with Hitler viewing things in this way, could he have been induced to abandon his political objectives and voluntarily fall in with a new and far-reaching world adjustment on a basis of international collaboration and peace? One thing was certain. He would never be brought to do so by concessions. Hitler began with motives of patriotism. But whether forced by the inner logic of his policies, or perhaps guided from the start by his doctrine of the psychological war, he went on and on, until he had become the leader of a world revolution at the end of which loomed a new partitioning of the earth.

This idea of a new division, an offspring of Marxian ideas, but with the class war within nations worked over into a class war among nations, was most attractive to the dynamic Powers since it allowed them to extend their fronts in their psychological war more and more widely, until finally the moment arrived to assert their leadership and control over the whole earth.

One last consideration, national socialism was also compelled to go forward by conditions at home. Its one chance of keeping in power in Germany was to continue the revolutionary movement and to intensify it. It could not give up any of its instruments of control. It could not dismantle the economic structure which was one of its main sources of power. It could not go back to freer social and legal forms of organization without surrendering all along the line. It might for a time agree to limit its armaments, for what it needed, it had decided, was psychological superiority no less than military preponderance. In any case, though, there were specific things which clearly it could not do: It could not establish a state of law. It could not grant a constitution universally applicable to all individuals and classes. It could not relax its terroristic rule.

Under these conditions, any real political or economic cooperation with other countries was unthinkable, i. e., there was no possibility of a return to normal commercial intercourse, a normal credit policy, or a free exchange. While all the elements of a system of law and even the barest outlines of a system of public audit were completely lacking, could anyone seriously imagine that new billions of credit would ever be made available for Germany?

Any regime that has limited aims can compromise, can dispense with the complete attainment of every one of its objectives. Not so national socialism. Compromise, for national socialism, is death. The alternatives facing it were and are total success or total capitulation. One or the other. Any retreat abroad would at once create difficulties at home that would lead to the regime's collapse. From it, then, one could and can expect nothing but an unwavering advance along the road on which it set out—the road to hegemony over Europe and to world revolution.

He Is an American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 25, 1939

EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK SUN

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Sun of September 4, 1939:

[From the New York Sun of September 4, 1939]

HE IS AN AMERICAN

He is an American.

He hears an airplane overhead, and if he looks up at all does so in curiosity, neither in fear nor in the hope of seeing a projector.

His wife goes marketing, and her purchases are limited by her needs, her tastes, her budget, but not by decree.

He comes home of an evening through streets which are well lighted, not dimly in blue.

He reads his newspaper and knows that what it says is not concocted by a bureau, but an honest, untrammeled effort to present the truth.

He has never had a gas mask on.

He has never been in a bombproof shelter.

His military training, an R. O. T. C. course in college, he took because it excused him from the gym course, and it was not compulsory.

He belongs to such fraternal organizations and clubs as he wishes.

He adheres to a political party to the extent that he desires—the dominant one, if that be his choice, but with the distinct reservation that he may criticize any of its policies with all the vigor which to him seems proper—any other, as his convictions dictate, even, if it be his decision, one which holds that the theory of government of the country is wrong and should be scrapped.

He does not believe, if his party is out of power, that the only way in which it can come into power is through a bloody revolution.

He converses with friends, even with chance acquaintances, expressing freely his opinion on any subject, without fear.

He does not expect his mail to be opened between posting and receipt, nor his telephone to be tapped.

He changes his place of dwelling, and does not report so doing to the police.

He has not registered with the police.

He carries an identification card only in case he should be the victim of a traffic accident.

He thinks of his neighbors across international borders; of those to the north as though they were across a State line, rather than as foreigners; of those to the south more as strangers, since they speak a language different from his, and with the knowledge that there are now matters of difference between his Government and theirs, but of neither with an expectancy of war.

He worships God in the fashion of his choice, without let.

His children are with him in his home, neither removed to a place of greater safety, if young, nor, if older, ordered ready to serve the state with sacrifice of limb or life.

He has his problems, his troubles, his uncertainties, but all others are not overshadowed by the imminence of battle and sudden death.

He should struggle to preserve his Americanism with its priceless privileges.

He is a fortunate man.

He is an American.

Americanism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED BRADLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 25, 1939

ADDRESS BY HON. FRED BRADLEY, OF MICHIGAN, SEPTEMBER 8, 1939

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me before the Harold L. Young Post of the American Legion at Rogers City, Mich., on September 8, 1939:

Mr. Chairman and my friends and neighbors of Rogers City, I am very pleased indeed to have this opportunity to meet with you here this evening to discuss with you the most important subject nearest to our minds and dearest to our hearts in this Nation today—Americanism.

It is most important that in these hours of conflict abroad, the ultimate magnitude of which none can at present determine—I repeat, it is of the utmost importance that we in America soberly, impassionately, with freedom from prejudice, and in a spirit of tolerance toward all peoples, all races, all creeds, take stock of ourselves. It is time that we soberly consider the international bedlam, that we carefully weigh in our minds some of the probable problems of the future, and that we realize the possible consequences of events that lie ahead of us in the future, and we carefully review and counsel with ourselves over many of the unfortunate events of the past.

I am one of those who sincerely believed that the heads of the various European nations would be able to settle their difficulties without international conflict. But that conflict has come. From all indications it will be a long, bloody, horrible catastrophe. The question of whether or not the United States will become involved in this unfortunate conflict in the near future, or any time in the future, is as vital to you as it is to any group of our people. If we should go to war, many of you will be required to fight and perhaps die for America.

I say that I want you all to live for America, and we all must keep that thought uppermost in our minds. It is your right to demand of your officials in Washington that you shall not be required to spill your blood unnecessarily in a false cause or in a foreign conflict. It is your right to demand that America preserve that peace which is dearer to her than all else, save liberty itself.

So far as I am concerned America shall remain at peace, and remain absolutely neutral and friendly to all powers on the face of the earth.

Why is it that through the years America has been a symbol of hope to which the peoples of all the world have come with renewed courage and faith in the future? What was it they sought in the New World that they had never found in the Old? Freedom and

opportunity? Yes. But they sought more—a refuge, a haven of peace. They fled from war-torn Europe to a land where men might live in peace with one another, that together they might build a better world. They fought wars whenever necessary to defend their ideals; but they built a great Nation, not because of the wars they had fought, but in spite of them. They were able to advance because of the years of peace which they enjoyed. Without peace there can be no liberty. Without peace there can be no progress.

For over a century and a half every war in Europe and Asia—and they have been almost constant—has brought a flood of refugees to American shores. We have always welcomed those refugees. We always shall welcome them, providing that when they come to these shores they have a very definite determination, and maintain that determination, to live according to American ideals and under the American form of government. When any of these refugees have in their hearts or in their minds a preference for European ideals and traditions, let them go back to Europe and never return to these shores; and I say to you that those in America today who are resorting to what we call un-American activities or subversive influences—I say to all those—let the American people give them warning here and now that it is time for them to return to their Europe, to return to their foreign ideals and idealisms, the opportunity is here for them now to shed their blood in an outward manner if they so choose, but they must and shall refrain from further subversive activities in this country.

Now let me stress just a bit of tolerance on the part of all of us. Let us be most tolerant of the thoughts and words and actions of all of us in these trying days ahead. Remember we were all aliens in this land at some time in our past family history. That makes us none the less loyal Americans, but it does cause many of us to have a natural sympathy, a leaning toward one side or another in all international conflicts. Millions more recently arrived in this land than others have left relatives or dear friends back in the homeland over the seas.

That makes them nonetheless loyal Americans, but on the other hand it is bound to cause them to have a natural sympathy for the fortunes of their homeland—for the fortunes and fates which might befall those loved ones left behind. It is but natural that at times this leads to outward partisan expressions of words, actions, and deeds. Let us be tolerant; let us all respect those sympathies; let not that tolerance cause any of us to do or say anything which might cause this Nation to be brought into a conflict with which we should have absolutely no national concern. That tolerance, that self-control, my friends, will be one of the hardest problems for us as individuals, for us as a nation.

I have mentioned Europe's constant distress so now let us consider some of Europe's history. The Napoleonic wars which followed the French Revolution kept Europe in a turmoil for half a generation. There were revolutions which shook most of the continent in 1830 and again in 1848. In 1853, England and France supported Turkey in the Crimean War against Russia. In 1870 began the Franco-Prussian War. In 1877, Russia and Turkey again were engaged in combat. In 1894 came the Chinese-Japanese war, and in 1897, a war between Turkey and Greece. In 1904 came the Russian-Japanese conflict and in 1912 occurred the Balkan War. This was soon followed by the outbreak of the World War in 1914. And, in addition, when not engaged in fighting one another, the great European powers waged wars of colonial conquest, subjugating the peoples of small, backward nations. There are two moving causes of all wars: Greed, the desire for power, the desire to secure that which someone else has; secondly, defense, the desire to hold what one has. The American people have no international desire predicated on greed. We desire only to maintain peaceful relations with the entire world. It has been quoted to me recently that Adolph Hitler made the statement some months ago that having built up his army to wartime strength, he now thought it might be time to bleed the army. The American Nation has no desire to bleed itself—nor anyone else.

Until a fateful day in 1917 America remained aloof from all these European wars. By refusing to become involved in the numerous struggles of Europe, she was able to hold up to the world the example of the blessings of peace and self-government. She was able to provide a refuge for those who fled from the fury of foreign conflicts.

Then, in 1917, what happened? We were persuaded that this war was to be different. Propaganda succeeded in deluding us into the idea that this was the war to end all wars. We were told that through it the world was to be made safe for democracy.

There were many issues, economic and military, but we got into the World War primarily because we worked ourselves into an emotional jag. We got drunk on what we thought was idealism. We went Holy Roller. We mistook shouting and singing for religion, and the result—disillusionment. We gave our own manhood, our wealth, our resources; yes, we went into the war inspired by idealism, but we soon discovered that our Allies had no such ideals. General Pershing himself writes of an interview with a leading statesman of a foreign nation. In effect, he said this to General Pershing: "We have the highest regard for the ideals of your President Wilson. The slogans, 'The war to end all wars' and 'The war to make the world safe for democracy' were fine slogans with which to entice your people into this war. But we of the Allies have no such ideals. We have very definite reasons for being in this conflict. We in England are concerned principally with one thing—the freedom of the seas (of course, under English domination), so that we may maintain our trade with our colonies. Those in France have another aim, and one solely, namely, to make it impossible for Germany to ever again attack France and overrun France as it had in 1870." They were, of course, glad to have American manpower and American resources in the struggle; but what happened at the end of that struggle? At the end we saw the causes of the next war written into the Treaty of Versailles. Since that day the break-down of representative government and the rise of dictatorships have followed in nation after nation.

It may be that some day men will learn that war can settle nothing; that war can only destroy. It may be that some day we will learn that the horrors of war are followed by desolation and despair which drive peoples to desperate remedies. What happened to the 14 points when they fell into the hands of the power politicians in Europe? What happened to the League of Nations? What happened to the story of the war debts and of Big-Hearted Otis turned into Uncle Shylock in the propaganda of those for whom we had gone to bat.

No; we did not save the world for democracy; we did not save democracy for the world. We just burned our fingers to the bone, poking into a fire of European intrigue which had been smoldering for centuries.

Now let's benefit from our experience. If we can't do that, then it's nobody's fault but our own.

As to where our sympathies run, that's clear. Insofar as we can help without becoming involved, that may be O. K. But let's judge every action by whether what we do is in the interests of the United States of America. Let us remember that the greatest service we as a nation can do is to keep our health and our poise against the time when we may be called upon to help bind up the wounds of a world now once more torn by war.

We in America are still paying the price of that last war. Not only is the money which we lent to foreign nations irrevocably lost, but we are still deep in the depression which followed, as, indeed, depressions have followed every war since the dawn of time. Discouraged and disillusioned, we seemed to have lost the undaunted faith in ourselves, in our ability to solve our own problems which beset us, and we seemed to have lost faith in the future—a faith which has always been the greatest strength of the American people.

Now, let us consider how are we going to keep ourselves out of this war. In the last session of Congress we did not change the Neutrality Act. Consequently, the President, following the Neutrality Act still in effect, has declared that a state of war exists abroad and under the terms of the act has issued an embargo on the shipment of arms, ammunitions, and implements of war to the belligerent nations. According to the terms of the neutrality law now in effect, that shipment of arms, ammunitions, and implements of war to neutral nations for reshipment to the belligerent is likewise prohibited. Naturally, we expect that Congress will be called in session in the near future. Congress must be called in session soon.

The immediate problem before Congress will, of course, be to deal with Neutrality Act changes; equally to be high-lighted will be defense measures for the United States.

Furthermore, in my opinion, not the least of the responsibility of Congress shall be to insure the majority of the American people from suffering caused by profiteering by a selfish minority. Already we have heard of rapidly mounting prices of food supplies and other essentials and we have heard over the radio and read in the press stories of an acute shortage in certain essential commodities. Bunk! Pure bunk!

Throughout these last 8 months we wrestled with the then all-important problems of surplus commodities; we appropriated two hundred and thirty millions for subsidies to the southern cotton grower, to the western wheat grower, to the tobacco planter, to the corn grower—yes; and we had letter on letter, demand upon demand, from the domestic sugar interests for curbs upon the importation of Cuban and other island sugars in order that they might be permitted to supply a greater proportion of the domestic demand. Now, don't tell me that all these surpluses disappeared overnight. Let no one tell me there is any just reason—save selfish greed on the part of a few—for any of these drastic increases in prices. Yes, my friends, indeed, the first and most important business of Congress must be to save the interests of all people in this Nation—of the vast majority of those who pay the bills. It must be our duty to insure them against the unjust profiteering of a self-seeking, selfish, penny-grabbing minority.

It is virtually certain that if war continues the Congress will sit "from now on"—that is, from the time it is called into special session until the end of this war is in sight. The President has pretty well decided to call the Congress, and he awaits only a clarification of issues to be laid before it. Moreover, you can expect a dozen of the top leaders from both parties to be called in right away for a pre-session conference. The President should have unified support in Congress and from the country, and hence will seek to lay the groundwork for that in an astute political and patriotic move.

Look for the Nation's economy to be more and more rapidly geared to war needs and to such domestic shifts as may become necessary with Europe in conflict. Many steps have been taken in this direction and others are in progress, but the whole program will be speeded by developments of the last few days. All pressure is being used to hasten the acquisition of strategic materials. Industrial-mobilization plans have been completed. Panama Canal defenses are being strengthened.

Spending of the $10,000,000 appropriated by Congress for war material purchases this year will be actually under way shortly. Specifications from the Treasury Procurement Division for the purchases are due in a few days and bids are to be requested shortly thereafter. Among the first materials to be purchased are: Manganese ore, chromium ore, tungsten ore, tin, quinine, quartz

crystals, and manila fiber. Expansion of the list will be quickened by war developments.

Industry and agriculture here probably will be benefited greatly by war abroad—for the short pull. This is so despite the existing Neutrality Act which bars shipments of many commodities to belligerents in spite of the Johnson Act which bars credits and loans to governments in debt default to the United States.

Despite a strong bloc in Congress which will oppose Neutrality Act repeal on the grounds that it would lead us into war, the odds are overwhelmingly for some change in the law to permit commodity sales abroad. Your Congressman will oppose repeal. Pressure by the administration plus that exerted by farmers visioning higher prices and big demand for their products, manufacturers who will be bombarded with orders, and even from labor which would welcome the reduction in unemployment, will be so strong that Congress can hardly resist.

Significant, too, that top administration figures have already conferred on advisability of repeal of the Johnson Act. They agree that popular sentiment would be stronger against this than against neutrality repeal but latest thinking is that by proper interpretations of the Johnson Act all necessary steps can be taken to facilitate credit for foreign purchases.

Conferences the past week between the President and Jesse Jones, of the Federal Lending Agency, were on this subject; note that Jones said that R. F. C. and export-import banks are not covered by the Johnson Act. This simply means that these agencies can extend credits for foreign purchases here.

As pointed out in Washington last week, by the very nature of things trade with South American countries will grow during a European conflict. President Pierson, of the Export-Import Bank, has already cultivated trade relations there and in China, and has recently been in Europe. Not only will South America turn to the United States for commodities (especially manufactured articles) now obtained from Britain, France, Germany, and Italy but American manufacturers will now direct their trade efforts southward. Don't overlook the possibility of funds from European belligerents which will flow into South America for essential food and war commodities coming to the United States for purchases in turn by South America. This may be particularly true of aircraft.

Nothing in view this week indicates any necessity or possibility that the S. E. C. will close American stock markets. Despite wild gyrations of stock prices and the eventual unloading of vast amounts of foreign-owned American securities in behalf of European governments to provide cash and credit for purchases here, the machinery to do this has been so perfected that no undue strain is anticipated.

Among preparations for a full-fledged defense basis is the creation of a general advisory committee on banking as announced by George L. Harrison, of the New York Federal Reserve Bank. Representatives of banks, the stock exchange, and insurance companies are to comprise the committee. Among problems likely to come before it is that of liquidating securities of foreign nationals in this country.

Shipping will be broadly affected by war developments. Both merchant marine and naval shipbuilding will be accelerated, a survey of facilities already having been made so that full use of all yards can be made. Shifts in production schedules would include construction of vessels especially needed to provide well-rounded fleets. In case of actual war, older shipyards would be used for navy vessels while new and small yards would be devoted to tankers and cargo ships. The Maritime Commission's current shipbuilding program involves more than 80 vessels and a total cost in excess of $190,000,000.

Holding up of the *Bremen's* departure, along with that of the *Normandie* and two British ships, is indicative of care to be taken from now on. As a matter of fact, the Customs Service has been instructed to examine carefully all ships in foreign trade before they issue clearance papers. They are watching for unmanifested cargoes, ships stores, and possible armaments.

But now to return to the subject of our keeping out of this war—let me say this:

If the head of the Government and the Congress are determined to keep us out of war, they can do so and there is not the slightest doubt about it. If we get into this war, it will be because either the President or the Congress has weakened in the will to keep us out.

Consider this, the most hideous, most enticing of all games in this world is international relations. Playing the game upon that vast and troublesome chess board overcomes the imaginations of strong men. Let a man sit in at that table once and it will be a difficult thing to get him away from the game. Now, there are some in Washington, as everyone knows, who are obsessed with an itch to meddle into that power-politics game of Europe and to meddle very definitely on the side of one of the combatants. The great problem ahead of us in keeping out of war is in checking the activities of those individuals in our Government in keeping these activities within bounds and in Congress exercising some sort of supervision over them.

No power in this country can do that save Congress and public opinion. The suggestion has been made that if and when Congress is summoned, all elements in both Houses which are determined to keep this country out of war ought to form an organization—a steering committee aside from regular party committees. It should be bipartisan and have but a single objective—to keep a ceaselessly vigilant eye upon the State Department, the Navy, and the executive department of the Government. It should keep the country fully and fearlessly informed of what is going on in Washington and to marshal the strength of the antiwar groups in all parties in Congress.

The aim of this committee should be to keep Congress in continuous session as long as the war lasts. Such a committee should agree upon a policy at the very outset and follow its program logically. With its access to the ear of the Nation it should make the fullest use of its resources to place before the people the facts about the struggle and our relation to it. If we are going to offset the vicious effects of foreign propaganda which is bound to descend upon us and indeed is with us today; if we are bound to offset the effects of that propaganda we must see to it that plain, unvarnished truth is given to the people of this Nation. Such a course as has been suggested is, perhaps, the only one which can protect us from an administration which apparently has now gotten around to this singular idea, as expressed by one of its most intimate of the inner-circle personages, that America should be a knight-errant righting the wrongs of the world.

Yes; we must look forward to all sorts of subversive propaganda and we must recognize such, in order that we may maintain a strict neutrality. We must remember that there are those in this Nation who for selfish reasons will insist upon the shipment of munitions to the warring nations. The provisions for an arms embargo, giving aid to neither side, is neutrality. The elimination of an arms embargo and the substitution of any cash-and-carry plan, or similar subterfuge, is the power to be unneutral—it is not neutrality. We are told by some that an embargo on arms and munitions would be unneutral because it would act unfavorably upon England and France. Neutrality, according to such a conception, apparently consists of assuring that both sides in a war are equally armed for the struggle. With England and France controlling the seas, a theoretical provision permitting the sales of arms, implements of war, and ammunitions to all belligerents is simply in effect an alinement—an economic alinement, if you please—with England and France. It is in effect an alliance in the power balances of Europe. It will be the first step in American participation in the war before it is ended.

Europe has always had alliances in an attempt to maintain a balance of power. They are the history of her politics and her diplomacy. There was the triple alliance of Great Britain, Russia, and Austria in 1795. In 1813 Austria, Russia, and Prussia were allied in a drive to "stop Napoleon." In 1815 these same countries formed the so-called Holy Alliance, which was joined by England and France in 1818. In 1883 Germany, Italy, and Austria formed the Triple Alliance, which was renewed in 1887, 1891, and again in 1896. But just as America has steadfastly refused to become involved in the wars of Europe, so she has always declined to have any part in the intrigue of the power politics of Europe. She knew that to be drawn into European alliances would be to be dragged into European conflicts.

The American people believe that they can have their own peace, as they have in the past, though the peoples of other nations are engaged in a suicidal struggle. They are determined to maintain that peace as the only way of prosperity and progress, as the only hope of the future.

In the name of self-preservation they must not allow themselves to be led by vicious propaganda or false idealism into a struggle which all military experts agree will be the most devastating in the history of the world and from which many fear civilization itself will not emerge.

It is not self-interest alone which dictates such a course. America can best serve the world—as she has in years past—by not being dragged down into the conflicts of others, but, instead, by preserving her peace and by becoming once more a challenge and an inspiration to the world.

America can best serve humanity by refusing to give way to a campaign which, by arousing the vicious passions of intolerance and hatred, would persuade them to deal death and destruction to those whom propagandists would convince them are their enemies. To be humane is to be humane to all men.

America can best serve the ideals of democracy by assuring that the ideal is kept alive at home. We must beware that it is not extinguished by the military dictatorship which would immediately assume control of our national life upon a declaration of war. Let those who think this is too strong a statement read carefully the industrial mobilization plan which is now on the statute books and provides for the complete control of all wealth, the confiscation of all property, and the conscription of labor the day America goes to war.

America can best serve the cause of progress by assuring that when other nations have exhausted themselves in combat she will be able to lead the way along the path of peace and prosperity as she has in years gone by.

Will the history of the future record that we of today nobly advanced or meanly lost all that America has meant to countless millions for over a century and a half? Or will history relate that America continued as a beacon of light and a hope to the war weary and the oppressed peoples of all the world, or will the chapter of our day be entitled "The Twilight of the American Way of Life"?

The answer rests with us. It will take all the tolerance, all the courage, and all the vision of which we are capable. But, inspired by the spirit of those who have gone before us, of those who lost their lives in the last World War, we will not fail to pass on to future generations an America prosperous and at peace—an America that is the hope of the world.

Neutrology and Neutrality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. T. V. SMITH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 25, 1939

RADIO ADDRESS OF HON. T. V. SMITH, OF ILLINOIS, AT WASHINGTON, D. C., SEPTEMBER 23, 1939

Mr. SMITH of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an address made by me over the Columbia Broadcasting System on September 23, 1939, as follows:

My fellow countrymen:

"He who knows not and knows not that he knows not is a fool—shun him.

"He who knows and knows not that he knows is asleep—wake him.

"He who knows not and knows that he knows not is a learner—teach him.

"He who knows and knows that he knows is wise—follow him."

—*Oriental Wisdom.*

I. THE CIVIC DANGER OF MORAL CONFUSION

No greater danger can beset a moral nation than deep confusion about its duty. Such confusion divides us without our seeing why we are divided. We are divided from one another because we are, each of us, divided against himself. We want to do right, but we Americans hesitate to damage others and call it duty. That's what war does; it deflates duty from the best to below second best. When warring nations go out deliberately to do each other dirt, peaceful nations can do nothing that does not damage somebody. We must learn quickly, therefore, that as between evils it is as much our duty to choose the lesser evil as it is our duty between goods to choose the greater good. Unfortunately for pacifism, whether economic or military pacifism, not to choose is still to do somebody damage. If we do not choose or choose too late, we miss the boat of even the second best and find ourselves forced to take a third or fourth best.

What we require for peace is a line of duty that will get itself done as well as get said. This we have lacked since the World War; and, lacking such a lead, we have wobbled all over the international lot, confusing others because we ourselves are confused. Keep this up and we'll not unlikely wobble right into war. We said we fought before—and I for one believe it—to make the world safe for democracy. But we did not make the world safe for anything, even though we "won" the war. One reason we lost our cause while winning our case was that we changed the conception of our duty, midstream, before we'd finished our job. The Treaty of Versailles has proved the mother of war, partly because we conscientiously, as usual, withdrew cooperation from the method we ourselves had proposed to make that peace flexible against the desperate days. Moral ambition must be made of stuff sterner than palpitating fear, tired liberalism, or vacillating sentimentalism.

Our continuing confusion is written large in the daily mail of every Congressman. Our anguished citizens cry with one voice, "Keep us out of war." And from congressional offices goes up one mighty chorus of "Amen." But this same mail makes clear that our people do not themselves know how to get what they want. If for us to know how were as easy as for them to know what, the troubles of us Representatives would be settled by merely opening our mail. The letters, however, but propose peace; they expect us to dispose of war through something called "neutrality." But how are we to get neutrality when we don't agree upon what it is? And how are we to maintain it when its going to hurt some nations more than others? The letters rightly say that "we" can stay out of war if we will; but how is that little word "we" to be made to mean us—all of us American people? "We," when deeply divided, becomes but a wee little word of two puny letters; only a united "we" can work the wonders expected. But we are now so divided in counsel that each tends to think that any neutrality save his own brand will get us into war. Our confusion is indeed so deep as to lead many to argue that the best way to stay out is simply to stay put. So argued the ostrich before them. They want us to stay where we are without really knowing where we are. Heroic hiding will help but little in the storm of worlds now thundering; nor will any amount of picturesque arguing from "hell to breakfast," as in the nursery rhyme of certain Senators, increase by one tittle our actual safety on the winding stairway of confusion. Behold, as in another nursery rhyme.—(A. A. Milne, "When We Were Very Young.")

"Halfway down the stairs
Is a stair
Where I sit.
There isn't any
Other stair
Quite like
It.
I'm not at the bottom,
I'm not at the top;
So this is the stair
Where
I always
Stop.

"Halfway up the stairs
Isn't up
And it isn't down.
It isn't in the nursery
It isn't in the town.
And all sorts of funny thoughts
Run round my head:
'It isn't really
Anywhere!
It's somewhere else
Instead!' "

Leaving nursery rhymes to our moral Minniver Cheevys, we must begin by confessing our confusion, and then set ourselves to cure it if we can. It's surely safer for us politicians to know what we don't know than to think that we know what we don't. And what about you, my fellow countrymen?

The help I think I can bring is modest enough: It is to clear up this notion of duty and thus help make the little word "we" mean all of us. A moral nation must get its conscience clear. That is certainly the first step to endurance in peace, if peace prove possible, and to effectiveness in war, if war prove inexorable. It is, then, to this simple end of clarity that I now address myself.

II. DEPENDABLE DUTY IS BASED ON RIGHTS

To define our national duty apart from our rights is to subject us to every form of fanaticism. And to define our rights without consulting others is to imitate bullies, whom we despise. If we can discover a body of rights already allowed us by others, then we can claim them for ourselves with a good conscience. A sense of duty founded upon that solid substance of social fact might prove durable enough to support consistent action in the trying days ahead. Nothing else will do so. Now, this is the meaning of those who keep talking to us of international law. Fortunately for moral nations, which do not ask or wish to determine their rights without consultation, there has grown up through the centuries of civilized time a fairly well-defined and generally agreed-upon body of privileges that obtain even in wartime for those not engaged at war. This clearly is such a touchstone as is required by conscience, and fortunately it is at hand. Secretary Hull has already served notice that we reserve all our rights under international law. He could ask no less. He need ask no more. That's language that all the world understands, understands largely alike; and in that joint understanding lies our greatest safety. I do not say complete safety; for international law is no more a panacea than is anything else in wartime. But to accept these rights as the bounds of our duty is to call the sober opinion of mankind to witness that we ask no more for ourselves than others ask for themselves and that we demand no more than we are willing to grant. It was never too early for us to do this sane thing; it is not now too late. This, then, is what the appeal to international law really means: A simple return to rights that are ours and that others cannot justly complain of. This is the way for us to submit our consciences for the candid confirmation of civilized men. Such action furnishes us a home base of principle to save us from splurges into sentimentalism, from forays into fanaticism, and from a constant and fearful snatching at the straws of mere expediency. This principle firmly established, we may more safely resort to expediency itself when and as we must.

III. ECCENTRIC CONCEPTIONS OF DUTY

Without this home base we are continuously in danger of reaction from an overdose of eccentric idealism self-administered. Let me make this very clear, for I regard it as the greatest weakness in our national character, the largest danger for us to face down if we are to keep safe through a long war. Have we not all learned, indeed, from our New Year resolutions in childhood, if not from camp-meeting conversions in adolescence, that the more cautious our commitments, the more likely we are to deliver to ourselves? It is the same with our Nation. The backsliding of idealists is as dangerous as it is easy in wartime. We start, you see, with the generous impulse not to hurt anybody. We'll forego trade with warring nations. We'll make no money out of misery. We'll tighten our belts around the girth of our purity and keep ourselves unspotted from the wicked world. This is the familiar and beautiful principle of self-sacrifice applied to our Nation, and it leaves us feeling good from our decision to share some part of the sufferings of the war-torn world.

This high principle is expressed concretely in the present neutrality provisions that require us to forego completely the wickedest

part of international trade—that is, the trade in arms. The cash-and-carry provision, now lapsed in law but much alive in discussion, represents a Yankee admixture of self-interest with self-sacrifice. It enables us to sacrifice with safety, saving our souls, as it were, with 5 percent returns on our investment.

This attitude of self-sacrifice is very beautiful, indeed, and not without its undertow on all our hearts. The main thing lacking is that it does not wear well. It requires us to be moral heroes, and most of us are not moral heroes save while all dressed up for the part. We'd rather praise heroes than to practice heroism. As in regard to the famous "purple cow":

"We often long for heroes high,
And some day yet may see 'em;
But this we'll tell you here and now:
'We'd rather see than be 'em.'"

Such imputation of saintliness may hold of Gandhi and of his spiritual descendants. We may indeed be sincerely regretful that it does not hold of us. Beautiful as such heroism is, we know, as grown men and women, that it is the part of both wisdom and prudence to make certain that we can stand in the wear and tear of life and not to tax our moral resources beyond what the credit of our characters will continue to bear. All checks are equally good, of course, until it comes time to cash them. But this is just the kind of check which has always bounced back when America has tried to cash it. If Jefferson could rise from the dead, he'd tell us a few things about the capacity of our idealism to stand the gaff of an embargo that sacrifices our commerce. If Wilson could come from the grave, he would warn us of the awful cost of moral fatigue; and even Warren Harding could tell us of the infinite relief with which we Americans can accept easy normalcy after a season amid the snows of self-sacrifice. Having overdone our capacity for heroism, we easily overindulge our capacity for relaxation. The resulting moral lumbago boots neither us nor mankind. So let us beware, as we'd beware the "Ides of Destiny," the day when idealists get all fed up on their own idealism. The self-knowledge of what our rights are, and where they are, is better protection against war than is any panicky fear of war. It is the rabbit who runs, you know, that gets chased by the hounds. This, then, is our main conclusion: Duties independent of rights—who knows where they lead? Duties founded on rights objectively agreed to—these furnish the safest and most substantial clues for national sanity.

IV. EXPEDIENCY FOLLOWING AND FULFILLING DUTY

If through this self-knowledge of duty we can thus clear a path for our consciences, we may then use our minds to deal with problems of expediency as they arise. Arise they will—and galore! Against that day we must know our rights, but on that day we do not have to insist upon all our rights. Which ones we shall forego as a matter of prudent safety and which ones we shall allow violated as a matter of forbearance—these are problems to be compromised as we go along. We will not lose our way in the wilderness of crass expediency if we remember this home base of principle.

Moreover, such previous knowledge will keep us from the self-righteousness that easily arises out of our thinking that we're sacrificing more than we are. And yet to make the sacrifices required by expediency will help fulfill the feeling in all of us that unless we suffer we are somehow not doing our duty. We have, for example, the right not only to trade but to trade in our own ships. I would myself, as a matter of concession, gladly forego that right as a costly but justifiable insurance against the risk arising from a too rigid insistence upon what is ours. I can understand those who in the name of expediency would also go further and sell arms or even food for cash alone. All such expedient considerations are in order, but safely in order only after we have yoked our duty to our rights. Echoing Lincoln, let us have faith, faith that rights are also right, and in that faith let us dare to do our duty.

V. NEUTROLOGY AND NEUTRALITY DISTINGUISHED

We have now only to summarize these two main notions of national duty, giving to each its proper name. There is, first, I remind you, the beautiful doctrine of almost pure self-sacrifice for the sake of peace. Then, short of this economic pacifism, there is a qualified doctrine of self-sacrifice which appeals to the more worldly of the high-minded. This would embargo arms, but would continue to sell things like cotton, where a little more imagination is required to smell the blood on our hands from gun cotton exploding. The policy which combines this whole-hearted and this half-hearted sacrifice is not rightly called neutrality. Let us call it neutrology, for, like astrology, if not numerology, its appeal is to the stars for guidance.

Nobody has shown, I mean, that the sacrifice of any or all of our trade will keep us out of war. Yet it is surely the business of eminent neutrologists to show this, not merely to assert it; for they are asking us to begin by damaging ourselves. Sincerity here is not enough, not though it be as high-minded as Lindbergh's, even as lofty as VANDENBERG'S. Political preachers may, but statesmen must not, merely carry coals to Newcastle by proclaiming to the galleries of the Nation a conviction that all of us already fervently believe and applaud, that we must stay out of war. If that's all such men have to offer, their will to preserve our peace is likely to prove as shoddy as Senator BORAH'S poor wit to conjure the war away with cocksure prediction; for they are, one and all, veritably playing a hunch which, since it begins by sacrificing our rights, may well end by sacrificing our sons. It's not in the stars of such neutrology but in our own stamina that genuine neutrality seeks and may find strength to save us from war.

Neutrality, then—as universally rather than eccentrically defined—has three advantages in our present predicament:

1. By giving us a solid and consistent sense of duty, neutrality becomes our most likely path to peace.

2. Neutrality impairs neither our will to peace nor yet our capacity to provide arms, to provide them quickly, to provide them immensely—to provide them against the recurring fate of nations not ready for war when peace simply plays out on them.

3. I myself cannot but count it also an advantage of neutrality—neutrality as distinguished from our Chinese and Spanish adventures into neutrology—that it will help the friends of our cause. It is by a grace not to be spurned that we can thus accidentally prosper a course for which, geography alone failing us, we ourselves would now be fighting. I say this fearfully, even though advisedly.

I say it because America is united on the merits of the conflict now raging. It is not our war; but it is a war which involves a cause so completely ours that only distance separates us from the defense of our own. Mere physical distance at that; for all psychic distance is gone since the radio makes us near neighbor to every ideological nuisance in Europe and Asia. We do not have to name the aggressors. They take pride in naming themselves, and in boasting of their outrages against a cause that vibrates as our own through every fiber of our honest being. Shall we, then, grieve that our neutrality works against those who boastfully name themselves by short wave and ugly deed as destroyers of all that we have labored to save at home and have prayed to see built in the world? Shall we fail to stand up for our rights merely because friends of our way of life are helped thereby? Not if we are sons of the fathers who fought to bequeath to us this American way of life.

Beyond all doubt, we Americans are too civilized to want to fight. We may even be too proud to fight for many things others would fight for. We are fortunately too lucky now to have to fight. But we are not afraid to fight; for we do not fear to do our duty in defense of our inalienable rights. It is important for our safety that others do not misunderstand our prudence and particularly that they do not despise what I hope will be our forthcoming forbearance. This constitutes the high utility of proceeding mainly by principle and of making clear now what that principle is. Fear of war does not pass as principle, we must sadly remark, to those who, on principle, war upon their neighbors.

No; we Americans do not want to fight, nor will we fight if it can be avoided through a wise neutrality; but, I repeat, we are not afraid to fight, not we Americans. We have indeed from the days of our first fathers already engaged ourselves to defend in our homeland, and later in our neighborland of the Americas, the cause for which civilized men fight elsewhere today; the cause of law and order, of gentility and progress, of forbearance and freedom.

VI. CALM REASONABLENESS REASSERTED

Nothing in this speech, I assure you, arises from a mood born since fighting began in Europe. That this is so I certify by closing now with some paragraphs from my radio debate on this subject months ago with Senator ROBERT A. TAFT, of Ohio, himself though Republican wisely in favor of embargo repeal. (A debate now published in "Foundations of Democracy.")

"We might stay out of a raging war; we're certain to stay out of a nonexistent war. Prevention is so infinitely the better bet for us to avoid war that nobody who cares will spare any effort at prevention.

"If our most heroic effort fails to prevent the war, God grant it fail not through irresponsible criticism of the President here at home during these days of waiting and hoping. * * * If this effort at prevention fail, then we shall unite ourselves in a drive for the wisest possible neutrality. I join Mr. TAFT at this point in a hope as firm as it is desperate. There is no fate that foredooms us to war, even if war comes to Europe. Our best chance seized and lost—the chance to prevent, then we'll hug our last chance—the chance to avoid.

"But that chance will prove the less if we make neutrality mean isolation. * * * The trouble with us Americans is that we aren't used to having to choose between two evils. * * * We get all fussed up at the thought of death rained from the air on women and children, of cities razed, and cruelty enthroned. There is no isolation of ideas. Our sympathies undo us.

"Moreover, economic isolation would so dislocate our whole national life that nobody, I fear, but a philosopher who lives on humor and high thinking would stand the gaff. * * * We must say, in general, with an ancient sage, that isolation is for gods and brutes alone. Alas, we Americans are not gods, and God grant that we be not brutes.

"Our neutrality cannot mean isolation. It must mean self-defense. * * * What kind of neutrality can a country have that has already undertaken to defend two whole continents, in an age of radios and airplanes? It must mean a very spacious self-defense.

"It must be a bold neutrality. Only that kind is open to us. * * * It will not be bullied into restricting its trade, but will

do so only out of prudence and from a sense of caution. It will arm itself adequately and will keep its powder dry. A bold neutrality will harm friends as little as possible and will help its friends' enemies as little as possible. But most of all and best of all * * * neutrality will be and remain a strenuous struggle for peace through every peaceful means that's humanly possible."

We Can Stay Out of This War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 25, 1939

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. FRANCIS CASE, OF SOUTH DAKOTA

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to place in the RECORD the remarks I made over radio station KOBH in Rapid City, Tuesday, September 19, 1939, just prior to coming here for this special session of the Seventy-sixth Congress:

To the people of the Second Congressional District of South Dakota: The Congress of the United States will assemble in Washington, Thursday, the day after tomorrow, to consider questions arising out of the war now unhappily consuming Europe. I shall leave this afternoon to be present for the opening session. I have been in the State a month since the regular session adjourned, and, during that time, have talked with as many people as possible at various gatherings throughout the district. Unfortunately I have been unable to see all of you; this is especially true in those sections which I had expected to visit later during the fall.

The questions that will come before the Congress in the special session are so far reaching and of such intimate concern to every one of you, however, that I take this means of talking things over with you and of urging you to write me freely as the days go by.

EMBARGO WAS TWICE PASSED AND SIGNED

The primary question that will come before us will be a proposal to repeal the arms-embargo section of the Neutrality Act.

This act was first adopted by the Congress and signed by the President in 1935.

Two years later, in 1937, the act was supplemented by a temporary Neutrality Act designed to meet the situation in Spain, and then the act of 1935 was overhauled by the Foreign Affairs Committees of the House and Senate, extensively debated, passed by the Congress, and signed by the President.

COMMODITY RESTRICTIONS HAVE EXPIRED

The principal amendment of 1937 was the addition of a commodity embargo which would have prevented the shipment of general supplies and commodities to warring nations. This section, however, was placed on a 2-year trial basis and expired May 1 of this year, 1939.

Consequently, the principal features of existing legislation on the subject are these:

1. A requirement that whenever the President finds a state of war to exist among two or more nations, or a state of civil war within a nation, he shall proclaim the fact and name the nations involved.

2. That thereupon it shall be unlawful to ship arms and munitions of war to nations named in the proclamations.

3. That citizens of the United States shall not travel in ships of the nations at war.

4. That American ships shall not carry arms or implements of war to warring nations. They may, however, carry commodities and supplies.

All this is backed up by the Johnson Act, which prevents loans and credits to nations that have defaulted in payments on their loans made in the last World War.

ARMS EMBARGO NOT A HASTY LAW

Today discussion centers on the arms embargo. In 1935 and again in 1937 the congressional leaders definitely and repeatedly declared that this was the heart of neutrality legislation; that the embargo on arms was not a hasty or ill-considered proposition; that it not only would go far in keeping the United States out of war but would deter other nations from going to war.

It was recognized that the essence of neutrality was to announce our position in advance and to treat all nations alike. "Neutrality," we were told, "means that you must announce the rules in advance and not change them after the game starts."

The time to act, it was further argued, is in time of peace, when the nation is free from war hysteria.

F. O. B., U. S. A., AND C. O. D.

There were advocates then of a cash-and-carry policy. Personally, I recall that in 1934 I made speeches suggesting that if we sold munitions we should adopt the alphabetical description and "sell them only f. o. b., U. S. A., and c. o. d." That was cash and carry—come and get it, pay for it, take it away in your own ships, and take your own risks on the high seas.

This is no time, however, for pride of opinion, or for approaching this question from the standpoint of personal or political profit. There is only one basis for decision; that is, What is to the best interest of the people of the United States? This is no time to be pro-German or pro-British or pro-French, but only pro-American.

QUESTIONS PEOPLE ARE ASKING

Assuming that the people of the United States would prefer to see their Allies in the last World War win, but also assuming that the United States does not desire to get into war again, here are the questions that thoughtful people are asking:

1. Can we change the Neutrality Act now, amending it so as to favor one side rather than the other, and avoid retaliation that will plunge us into the war? Retaliation, also, that may endanger the Monroe Doctrine?

2. If the maintenance of the present Neutrality Act should cripple England and France and they should be on the point of defeat, would public opinion in the United States permit their destruction without sending them not only arms and munitions, but also money and men?

3. And that leads to the question, Would we be more likely to escape the need for sending men if we supplied arms and munitions now?

4. And that leads back to the first question in a practical form: If we undertake now to sell arms and munitions when 2 years ago and 4 years ago we said we would not, will the nations who are damaged attempt to blow up our factories and attack boats in our harbors on the ground that we have violated international law?

Or, to put it in the words of Senator VANDENBERG, "Can we be the arsenal for one side and not be the target for the other?"

OPPOSED TO FIGHTING EUROPE'S WARS AGAIN

I have no hesitancy in saying that if we were starting from scratch, if we could change our policy without being unneutral, I could vote for a cash-and-carry plan, but if a change means a declaration of war, I cannot go along, for I am opposed to sending our sons to fight Europe's wars again.

If we could recover the independence of a cash-and-carry plan and be given guaranties of its impartial administration, supported by a policy of international reconciliation and nonmeddling in European affairs, with assurances that we could take that position without becoming involved in Europe's war, I would certainly work and vote to that end.

The difficulty, however, is that our decision in these matters is likely not to be an open-and-shut question. Votes will be cast on propositions that are not all black and not all white. Many of them will be gray, and it will be difficult to tell what is the wisest course. That is why I have taken this means of talking with you and of venturing to suggest that a more important question is involved than that of the arms embargo.

That question is the future of the United States.

LET US PLACE AMERICA FIRST

Last spring, during the debate on revision of the Neutrality Act, I said that our ability to contribute soundly to solving world problems depended upon our ability to keep from becoming a partisan in quarrels that were not our primary concern. Pointing out that the Monroe Doctrine was the cornerstone of sound American foreign policy—no extension of foreign footholds in this hemisphere—I asked the question: How can we tell European nations to stay out of here if we insist on mixing in over there?

Our sympathies will be aroused—they are aroused by the unhappy plight of the people in Poland today. They will be aroused again and again if this scourge goes on. But at this time, in deepest conscience, may I plead with you that we reserve our deepest sympathies for the future of the United States. And by that I mean the true destiny of the American people.

MEN WERE TO BE FREE HERE

When our fathers came to America to establish homes they came with the hope that here they might establish a race of free men, free to worship as they pleased; yes, free to plan their own lives, too. They wanted to be free from the philosophy that has gripped Europe that men's minds are the property of the state and that their bodies are but pawns for governments to toss on the scales in a balancing of power against power, and then to hurl into war when war comes.

And war comes in Europe. Take Poland, for example.

War came to Poland in 1618, carved out East Prussia, and created the Polish corridor 300 years ago.

War came to Poland in the rise of Frederick the Great of Prussia in 1740, 200 years ago.

A generation later war came to Poland in 1772 and brought the first partition. The corridor became West Prussia.

Twenty years later war came to Poland in 1793 and gave west Poland to Prussia and east Poland to Russia. That was the second partition.

In 1795, the third partition gave Warsaw to German Prussia and south Poland to Austria.

Ten years later war came again with Napoleon. Then England fought France on the sea and supplied gold for Prussia to fight France on land. Poland was the soil of the tramping armies.

By 1812, Napoleon had made a buffer state of Warsaw, but 3 years later German princes took eastern Poland and the Czar of Russia proclaimed himself King of Poland.

By 1830, another crop of boys had grown up and civil war came when Warsaw revolted and threw out the Russians. A year later, the Czar returned, crushed the revolt and made Poland part of the Russian Empire.

Thirty-three years later—in 1863—war came again. Another revolt that was crushed and the Polish language was banished from the schools.

War came again in 1914—the World War that made Poland first the battleground on the eastern front, and finally the buffer state when peace was written at Versailles. Poland fought until 1923, taking considerable territory from Russia. Two days ago Russia invaded and recaptured that territory in the twelfth major conflict that has swept over Poland in 200 years.

A WAR FOR EVERY CROP OF SOLDIERS IN EUROPE

That is the story of life in Europe—a new war—a war of revenge with every new crop of soldiers. A war every generation. A war every 20 years.

The people of the United States again are asked to accept the false philosophy that we can end Europe's round of wars. History gives us no grounds to believe that we can do any such thing.

In 1917, Woodrow Wilson asked the question: "Is the present war a struggle for a just and secure peace, or only a new balance of power?"

Persuaded that the struggle was for a lasting peace, a war to end war, the United States went into that war. Today, the cycle of revenge has spun around again. A new crop of cannon fodder has matured and Europe is again at war. Indeed, Europe has not had peace for a dozen years.

Shall we now, with our unselfish effort of 1917 so clearly proved in vain, be fooled again?

Shall we, in this hemisphere, abandon the belief that man is entitled to plan his own life? Shall we condemn our children and their children's children to the Old World philosophy that balances power against power and makes people only pawns in the game of international politics?

Or shall our sons and our daughters have the right to dream dreams and build their homes free from the threat of war planned by governments in which they have no voice, wars brought on by the forces of greed, ambition, and jealousy—those forces and whims of European politics which we can never control?

Those are the questions involved in the decisions that we will be making these days. Parents are coming to me, as my parents went to their Representative 20 years ago, and are asking, "What does this mean as far as my boy is concerned? Can we stay out of this?"

WE CAN STAY OUT OF THIS WAR

Let me say here what I have said to many in the last few weeks: The United States can stay out of this war if we are determined to stay out of it; and, as far as I am concerned, every effort will be made to stay out of it.

We can stay out of it if people will read their history books again. If we are to decide rightly in this crisis, we need the sound judgment that comes from lessons of the past. We are being bombarded by propaganda from all sides, presented with a skill and by methods unknown to any previous generation.

YOUR PRIVILEGE TO HAVE A VOICE

I am told that a recent visitor from Washington to a South Dakota audience ridiculed the idea that any Congressman who had been "only a country newspaper editor" should venture to question the wisdom of the President on any policy of foreign affairs.

May I say to you that remark utterly missed the true meaning of America. For here we have had the idea that men were not chattels to be shoved about by those at the head of the Government. And it is not only the duty and the privilege of your Representative, but it is your duty and privilege as private citizens to have a voice in those affairs that affect your destiny.

READ HISTORY AGAIN

Let me urge, therefore, that you reread your history books.

Read again the story of modern Europe; the story of Poland, which I sketched today.

And reread your American history, too. Reread the great state papers of America—the Declaration of Independence, George Washington's Farewell Address, the Monroe Doctrine, Lincoln's second inaugural.

And if you want to read something current, get the September number of Harpers Magazine, given over to foreign affairs, with a special article by the historian Charles A. Beard, entitled "Giddy Minds and Foreign Quarrels."

If every citizen were to read this group of documents, we would have a revival of true Americanism. We would cease to worry about Europe and would set ourselves to solving our own problems.

We need in these days a rekindled vision of the true mission of the United States. America has been the hope of humanity, a hope that a government might be created by the people and for the people, and that in it people might control their own destinies and not be condemned, before they are born, to taking part in wars which they had no voice in making.

Maude Royden, brilliant English woman, visiting the United States 3 years ago, in Washington, said, "When the next war comes in Europe you will be told that it is your duty to get in again. Don't do it. When the war is over the world will need you."

INTERVENTION CAN MAKE IT WORSE—NEVER BETTER

Professor Borchard, of Yale, is regarded as one of the leading authorities on neutrality and international law in this country. In his book, Neutrality for the United States, Borchard says, "A strong neutral is the trustee for civilization in a shell-shocked world. * * * By intervention in European quarrels we can make the situation worse, but never better. * * * Europe must work out its own problems; it understands them better than we ever can."

THERE IS A BETTER FUTURE THAN THAT

There is a better future for the United States than trying again the role of savior for Europe.

That better future means building the United States into a power that can protect itself against aggression—and I will do my part to that end.

That better future means devoting to the solution of our domestic problems the energy and the expense that ambitious leaders in other nations give to the expansion of their frontiers—and to that we can all dedicate ourselves. We must show that constitutional democracy works.

That better future means cultivating good will with the other nations of this hemisphere so that the balance-of-power theory can never find foothold here. This may cost something, but it will cost far less than a foreign war, and in the end it means an America far greater than can be created on the battlefields of Europe, for it means an America fulfilling her own mission in the world.

May I close with a personal word? You, the people of western South Dakota have sustained me with your counsel in the days that have gone. Please continue to do so, for I shall need your counsel and your prayers as the American people move through these critical days and as I try to do my part as your representative in the Congress of the United States.

Neutrality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY N. ROUTZOHN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 25, 1939

Mr. ROUTZOHN. Mr. Speaker, under the privilege granted the Members to extend their remarks in the RECORD, I have concluded to add my mite to the contributions that will undoubtedly be forthcoming from many of those who feel impelled to give expression to their feelings anent the issue which is the subject of this special session of the Congress.

My purpose in offering what follows herein is to accord my colleagues the benefit of what I received responsive to a request addressed to the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress.

When I noted the disposition of our President to ridicule the present neutrality law and thereby endeavor to avoid responsibility for its enactment, I decided to verify the belief that the now so-called neutrality law was conceived and laboriously delivered as the boasted progeny of the New Deal.

In his recent message to the Congress the President alludes to the present neutrality law as the "so-called Neutrality Act of 1935," and then solemnly confesses:

> I regret that the Congress passed the act. I regret equally that I signed that act.

When I heard the utterance just quoted, I recalled that in the Presidential campaign of 1936 the President and the administration spokesmen pointed with pride to what is now termed a "so-called Neutrality Act" as one of the grand and glorious accomplishments of the New Deal.

For instance, I remembered the now famous Chautauqua speech of the President, delivered as an opening campaign broadside, on August 14, 1936, at Chautauqua, N. Y.

Could anything be more convincing that the child now so ruthlessly spurned belongs to him than the assertion—an exultant confession, then—which I quote:

> The Congress of the United States has given me certain authority to provide safeguards of American neutrality in case of war.
>
> The President of the United States, who, under our Constitution, is vested with primary authority to conduct our international relations, thus has been given new weapons with which to maintain our neutrality.
>
> Nevertheless—and I speak from long experience—the effective maintenance of American neutrality depends today, as in the past, on the wisdom and determination of whoever at the moment occupy the offices of President and Secretary of State.

* * * If war should break out again in another continent, let us not blink the fact that we would find in this country thousands of Americans who, seeking immediate riches—fool's gold—would attempt to break down or evade our neutrality.

They would tell you—and, unfortunately, their views would get wide publicity—that if they could produce and ship this and that and the other article to belligerent nations the unemployed of America would all find work. They would tell you that if they could extend credit to warring nations that credit would be used in the United States to build homes and factories and pay our debts. They would tell you that America once more would capture the trade of the world.

In the light of what the President said above, is it not a startling revelation to all of you that he now resorts to the mercenary and sordid by suggesting that we take advantage of the present opportunity to now manufacture, sell, and export arms, ammunitions, and implements of death and destruction?

Supplementing the famous Chautauqua speech of the President was an adddress of the Honorable Cordell Hull, Secretary of State, before the Good Neighbor League of New York City on September 15, 1936, on the subject entitled "Our Foreign Relations and Our Foreign Policy." This speech was radio broadcast over a Nation-wide network, ostensibly for informative purposes, but incidentally for political purposes.

I quote in part:

In trade interchange baleful elements enter particularly the trade of arms, ammunition, and implements of war. This trade is at present mainly incidental to the preparation for war. However, in some times and circumstances it may itself be an element in stimulating or provoking war.

* * * We must squarely face the fact that to stay clear of a widespread major war will require great vigilance, poise, and careful judgment in dealing with such interferences with our peaceful rights and activities as may take place.

Legislation recently passed provides some of the main essentials in a wise anticapatory policy. I have in mind the resolutions of Congress in 1935 and 1936, which, in addition to providing for the licensing of all imports and exports of arms, ammunition, and implements of war, prohibit their shipment to belligerent nations.

Another member of the State Department evidently thought well of the neutrality legislation, and I quote from a press release issued by the Honorable Sumner Welles, Assistant Secretary of State, on behalf of the State Department, on October 15, 1936, the same being part of an address by him before the Foreign Policy Association, New York City, on October 19, 1936:

Neutrality legislation has been devised by the Congress intended to minimize the danger of the United States being drawn into wars in whose origins it had had no part.

All of you will doubtless recall the results of the election of 1936 and that all but two States of the Union cast their electoral votes for Franklin Delano Roosevelt to succeed himself as President of the United States of America. Exulting over the glorious victory, the aforesaid Secretary of State released to the press for publication on November 7, 1936, the following unrestrained exuberance:

Democracy never in all history functioned on a more impressive scale than when over 45,000,000 American citizens went to the ballot boxes yesterday and recorded their views upon men and measures. No administration has ever received an endorsement so nearly universal and so nearly unanimous as that which the American people, in the free exercise of their suffrage, have given this administration.

Not the least of our record upon which favorable judgment was pronounced were our foreign policies and foreign relations during the past 4 years. The central policy has been that of the good neighbor, the most outstanding objective of which has been the promotion of conditions of permanent peace. These high aims and purposes in time of peace and strict neutrality in time of war have been the cornerstone of American foreign policy.

The unequivocal endorsement by the American people of these and other foreign policies is a matter of both gratification and genuine encouragement. We shall go forward with this program in the same earnest, persistent, careful, and cautious manner in which we have heretofore sought to advance this great undertaking.

We can well overlook the inaccuracies of the above statement of Mr. Hull to ask the question: Is the President willing to risk defeat of the New Deal administration for a third term by a complete reversal of foreign policy which Mr. Hull says elected him in 1936?

Not only was the Neutrality Act passed during the regime of the New Deal, but the original enactment was by a Congress that was noted for its subserviency to the President. It is, therefore, all the more difficult to understand how the President can now blandly satirize the legislation and thereby leave the inference that he had nothing to do with it other than to sign it.

He did sign it on August 31, 1935, and the statement he issued in connection reads as follows:

I have given my approval to Senate Joint Resolution 173—the neutrality legislation which passed the Congress last week.

I have approved this joint resolution because it was intended as an expression of the fixed desire of the Government and the people of the United States to avoid any action which might involve us in war. The purpose is wholly excellent, and this joint resolution will to a considerable degree serve that end.

Within a few days after the President approved the Neutrality Act of 1935 war broke out between Italy and Ethiopia, and the President applied the provisions of the law to the strife between these two nations. In doing so the President went further than the act required of him and made the following statement:

In these specific circumstances I desire it to be understood that any of our people who voluntarily engage in transactions of any character with either of the belligerents do so at their own risk.

Supplementing the statement of the President, Secretary Hull made the following remarks at a press conference when asked for elaboration of the President's statement of October 5 regarding transactions with belligerents:

As I said to you gentlemen heretofore, the language of the President's statement has thoroughly well-defined meaning, and every person should be able to grasp its meaning and its implications. Technically, of course, there is no legal prohibition—apart from the proclamation governing the export of arms—against our people entering into transactions with the belligerents or either of them. The warning given by the President in his proclamation concerning travel on belligerent ships and his general warning that during the war any of our people who voluntarily engage in transactions of any character with either of the belligerents do so at their own risk were based upon the policy and purpose of keeping this country out of war—keeping it from being drawn into war. It certainly was not intended to encourage transactions with the belligerents.

Our people might well realize that the universal state of business uncertainty and suspense on account of the war is seriously handicapping business between all countries, and that the sooner the war is terminated the sooner the restoration and stabilization of business in all parts of the world, which, infinitely more important than trade with the belligerants, will be brought about.

This speedy restoration of more full and stable trade conditions and relationships among the nations is by far the most profitable objective for our people to visualize, in contrast with such risky and temporary trade as they might maintain with belligerent nations.

I repeat that our objective is to keep this country out of war.

Again, on October 30, 1935, the following statement came from the President:

In dealing with the conflict between Ethiopia and Italy, I have carried into effect the will and intent of the neutrality resolution recently enacted by Congress. We have prohibited all shipments of arms, ammunition, and implements of war to the belligerent governments. By my public statement of October 5, which was emphasized by the Secretary of State on October 10, we have warned American citizens against transactions of any character with either of the belligerent nations except at their own risk.

This Government is determined not to become involved in the controversy and is anxious for the restoration and maintenance of peace.

However, in the course of war, tempting trade opportunities may be offered to our people to supply materials which would prolong the war. I do not believe that the American people will wish for abnormally increased profits that temporarily might be secured by greatly extending our trade in such materials; nor would they wish the struggles on the battlefield to be prolonged because of profits accruing to a camparatively small number of American citizens.

And to this statement the Secretary of State appended the following:

It is my opinion that our citizens will not be disposed to insist upon transactions to derive war profits at the expense of human lives and human misery. In this connection I again repeat that an early peace, with the restoration of normal business and normal business profits, is far sounder and far preferable to temporary and risky war profits.

By the time Congress met on January 4, 1936, the President was so pleased with his neutrality legislation that he stated in his annual message the following:

As a consistent part of a clear policy the United States is following a twofold neutrality toward any and all nations which engage in wars not of immediate concern to the Americas: First, we de-

cline to encourage the prosecution of war by permitting belligerents to obtain arms, ammunition, or implements of war from the United States; second, we seek to discourage the use by belligerent nations of any and all American products calculated to facilitate the prosecution of a war in quantities over and above our normal exports to them in time of peace.

Perhaps I should state at this point that when the original Embargo Act was passed in August 1935 it was the understanding that it would expire by March 1, 1936. That is the reason why the President, in his message to the Congress in January 1936, stressed the importance of passing neutrality legislation. Thereupon the act of August 1935 was amended and strengthened, and on February 29, 1936, the President, in approving this new legislation, stated the following:

By the resolution approved August 31, 1935, a definite step was taken toward enabling this country to maintain its neutrality and avoid being drawn into wars involving other nations. It provided that in the event of the Executive proclaiming the existence of such a war thereupon an embargo would attach to the exportation of arms, ammunition, and implements of war destined to any belligerent country. It also authorized the Executive to warn citizens of this country against traveling as passengers on the vessels of any belligerent except at their own risk.

By the resolution I have just signed the operation of the August resolution is extended and strengthened until May 1, 1937. A new and definite step is taken by providing in substance that when an embargo becomes effective obligations of any belligerent government issued after the date of the proclamation shall not be purchased or sold in this country, and no loan or credit extended to such government; but with authority the Executive, if our interests require, to except from the prohibition commercial credits and short-time loans in aid of legal transactions. * * *

The policies announced by the Secretary of State and myself at the time of and subsequent to the issuance of the original proclamation—Italy and Ethiopia—will be maintained in effect. It is true that the high moral duty I have urged on our people of restricting their exports of essential war materials to either belligerent to approximately the normal peacetime basis has not been the subject of legislation. Nevertheless, it is clear to me that greatly to exceed that basis, with the result of earning profits not possible during peace, and especially with the result of giving actual assistance to the carrying on of war, would serve to magnify the very evil of war which we seek to prevent. This being my view, I renew the appeal made last October to the American people that they so conduct their trade with belligerent nations that it cannot be said that they are seizing new opportunities for profit or that by changing their peacetime trade they give aid to the continuation of war.

Many more illuminating utterances of the President, of Secretary of State Hull, and of others in the State Department could be quoted as positive proof of a fixed policy of the Government relating to foreign affairs that now is ruthlessly reversed and repudiated. However, they would merely be repetitions and reiterations of what I have quoted.

I have but one question to ask and one comment to make:

Are we to have a foreign policy that is universal in its scope and applies to all governments alike or will our action toward belligerents be determined by whose ox is being gored?

My comment is: It may be safe for the administration to subject its domestic policies to constant change, but it is not safe for our Nation to change international policies that directly affect nations engaged in major warfare.

As the President would say, this is the crux of the whole thing.

Another Speechless, Rubber-Stamp Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 25, 1939

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, when Congress adjourned on August 5 it left, unfinished, amendments to the Wage-Hour Act, which were imperatively demanded by a large number, if not the majority, of our citizens. It had failed to amend the National Labor Relations Act, commonly known as the Wagner law, although correction of that monstrosity, reliable public polls showed, was demanded by more than 70 percent of our people. It had refused after lengthy debate and deliberate consideration to repeal the neutrality law.

Calling Congress back because of the European war, the President now demands that it repeal the Neutrality Act and, in addition, that it overlook the widespread demand for remedial legislation through amendments to the Wage-Hour and the National Labor Relations Acts. In addition, he has issued his command that Congress shall not consider legislation other than the repeal of the Neutrality Act.

On top of this demand that Congress shall not do anything to solve our domestic problems he has laid down the decree that Congressmen, for the present at least, shall not even discuss in the House neutrality legislation.

Why talk about and get excited over the actions of foreign dictators when the President himself denies to the elected representatives of the people the right of free speech in the Halls of Congress?

Long the President demanded and had a rubber-stamp Congress, but even the rubber-stamp Congress was permitted on occasion to talk. Now the order has gone out that Congress shall meet for a few minutes, adjourn for 3 days—the longest period permitted by law—then meet and again adjourn until the President has corralled sufficient votes to repeal the Neutrality Act.

The rubber-stamp Congress was an independent, militant body compared with the docile, speechless, sheeplike gathering that assembled here in Washington last Thursday.

Just how do you like it when the men sent to Congress are told they will not be permitted on the floor of Congress to present your views to their fellow Members? Under such a policy, how long will it be before the President will demand, and a few men will agree, that Congress shall be adjourned indefinitely? Under such circumstances, how long do you think it will be before a Hitlerlike decree will be issued, telling us that we have no domestic problems and that the question of foreign policy and of foreign war will be decided by the President and his decision acquiesced in by a few so-called leaders?

Why talk about American rights on the high seas or abroad when here at home John L. Lewis tells you when you can work and the President muzzles the people's representatives?

For the sake of harmony, I will consent to 3-day adjournments, but I will not consent that on the days we are permitted to meet Congress be denied its constitutional right of free speech.

If we are to have war—and I can find no justifiable reason for entering this war—or if we are to make additional preparations for national defense on land and sea—and overpreparedness is a virtue rather than a fault—it is imperative that we now and without delay enact legislation which will prevent the paralyzing of industries which are essential in time of war or of preparation for war.

No one has forgotten how the sit-down strikes and the strikes which have followed; how industrial disputes between labor organizations, the activities of communistic organizers and agitators in the ranks of labor, utterly destroyed production in the mining, motor, and steel industries.

It is futile to appropriate billions for national defense, to take measures to meet foreign aggression, and leave here at home in the very center of our country those Communists, those radicals who have long advocated the overthrow of our Government by force. The issue cannot be obscured; it cannot be hidden by arguing that labor organizers shall be free to exercise control over the production of those things which are essential to create and maintain an adequate national defense.

The greater the danger from foreign war, the greater the necessity for peace between labor and industry.

Time and time again in the last session of Congress, on the floor of this House, I called to your attention the fact, which could not be successfully disputed, that the National Labor Relations Act, as administered by the National Labor Relations Board, utterly destroyed the right given employees by section 7 to bargain collectively through representatives of their own choosing.

Last Friday, September 22, two members of that Board handed down a decision which, according to a third member of the Board, William M. Leiserson—

> Not only disregards the collective-bargaining history * * * but it also sets aside the current contract * * * which excludes the Crystal City plant.

He further said:

> What the federation (C. I. O. union) could not itself secure by collective bargaining when the contract was negotiated is given to it by the Board in a finding as to the appropriate bargaining unit.

When I argued here on the floor of this House that labor, that employees, were being denied by the Board the very rights given them by the act, that the Board was depriving employers of free speech, the Democratic majority laughed in derision and refused to act.

You stayed your hand while John L. Lewis and his communistic allies carried on their warfare against industry. Now, when our Nation is threatened with war, will you sit idly here, refuse to end the official life of this Board, repeal or amend the law which will enable Lewis and those Communists who have long preached the destruction of our Government by force, to, by strikes, sabotage, and their undermining methods, betray us from within to the foreign foe threatening from without?

Just a few days ago, in the public press, I noticed that plans had already been made for the next draft. Under those plans, first to be drafted will be the young men in what are termed the non-essential industries. Naturally, in this group will be included the professional men, the clerks; in many instances, the white-collar workers. Next will come the farm boys who are not absolutely needed for the production of food and the number needed for that purpose will be greatly reduced by the use of improved farm machinery. Then, and last among the ablebodied to be called, will be the workers from the factories.

Under the system as proposed, the workers in the steel mills, in the motor industry, in all of those factories which produce munitions of war, the packing-house workers, will be the last to be taken. Where John L. Lewis and his C. I. O. and its communistic allies are strongest men will be left here at home.

If you drain the country of the young, able-bodied, independent men who have refused to submit to Lewis' demands, and leave at home all those that the Communists, the C. I. O. and Lewis have forced into their organizations, after the war is over who will control this country?

Could any better plan be devised to deliver us into the hands of the Communists, into the power of Stalin and Hitler who have joined hands to destroy free government?

By draft, strip this country and send abroad millions of those who are best fitted physically and mentally to defend us; those who are loyal and patriotic, to a land where they will be killed, maimed, or crippled, and leave here at home those who deny the right of free speech, refuse to let women or men work until they have submitted to the rule of a labor dictator, and, the war over, victory won, it will be an empty one.

Of what avail to win a war, to make the world safe for democracy, and, our soldiers returning home, find their country and its Government under the control and in the hands of a man who can declare strikes, invade cities and States with his armed goon squads, and, like a slave master of old, say who shall work and where and at what task and at what wage and for how long the American citizen shall earn his daily bread?

Some think it is our duty to save the whole wide world. I believe in the teachings of old: "First cast out the beam out of thine own eye; and then shalt thou see clearly to cast out the mote out of thy brother's eye," and, following that admonition, I beseech you to first make this country safe for democracy. Protect and preserve these United States for ourselves and for our children.

The Preservation of Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 25, 1939

EDITORIAL FROM THE TITAN NEWS

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I submit herewith the following editorial from the April 1939 issue of the Titan News monthly publication of the Titan Metal Co., of Bellefonte, Pa.

The Titan Metal Co. is one of the largest manufacturers in my district and manufactures bronze and brass products.

The views of the company as expressed in the editorial portray the deep consciousness of the management in the preservation of the peace and security of America.

[From the Titan News, Bellefonte, Pa., for April 1939]

YOU—WAR—TITAN

The propaganda machine is well oiled and running wild. War talk is on the lips of millions of Americans, from the President on down the line. Almost daily we are confronted with street and plant talk such as, "Well, it won't be long now until you have lots of orders." "Why?" we ask, and the inevitable answer is "War."

It is true that brass is an indispensable product in time of war, and it is true that America's entry would provide a great amount of work. True, also, is the fact that war is inflation in its most hideous form, and inflation to a businessman means compounded troubles when the effects of the hysteria-producing "shot in the arm" wears off.

It has truthfully been said that taxes are paid with the sweat of every man that toils, and it is likewise true that wars are won or lost by the same people. Perhaps our problem of 12,000,000 unemployed can be temporarily solved by leading them to the altar of war. Such a solution must be an admission of our inability to solve a domestic problem.

Our brass products should be going into plumbing fixtures and building hardware for new homes for the working people to live in at low rentals.

Our brass products should be used to create better transportation facilities at low cost—automobile, subway, railway, airplane.

Our brass products should help mold the greatest navy in the world—twice the size of any existing navy if necessary—to protect our shores from attack under leadership of such mad dogs as Hitler and Mussolini and the smooth-talking diplomats of all the rest of Europe.

Our brass products should be utilized in the creation of low-cost electric products—washing machines, ironers, clocks, radios, television, telephones, oil burners, air condition units, refrigeration, pumps, gas appliances, bottling equipment, etc.

For nearly 10 years we have been trying to get out of depression by increasing costs of every item a workingman buys. Contrary to our past experience as an industrial nation, we have failed to recognize that millions of Americans are crying out for the opportunity to purchase low-cost products of industry.

War would again inflate all American industry. Expansion, expansion, expansion, financed by Uncle Sam. What happens when the war ends? Market diminishes for war products; only outlet is for peacetime products; result is a glutted market, overproduction, and unemployment. Is that a solution? Are we to start out again on a road that 22 years ago took us nowhere; a great country crying out for jobs and products at low cost, burdened with experimental legislative measures which have failed, increased taxation, twenty billions more debt, same number of unemployed that we had before the billions were spent; this same great Nation can find no lasting peace, prosperity, and happiness in war.

Our greatest need is to recognize and correct our mistakes and adopt a leadership which can heal the wounds inflicted on our productive enterprises by recognizing the necessity of close cooperation between labor, management, and capital.

If a company in a basic industry such as Titan can increase employment from an average of 136 in 1929 to over four times that number, surely there is a chance to provide jobs for all who want a job if industry as a whole gains confidence. It is possible for you to have a job because, as a part of a small, closely knit organization, capital was invested to build up and modernize the company. Large corporations are not so flexible. Confidence is lacking and the stock-market actions reflected by war scare is not helping the situation.

If war was hell when Sherman made his famous statement, what is it now? Murder from the sky will take its toll of women, children, the unborn, and the aged. Tom Chikouras, in the March 8 issue of the Chicago Daily Tribune, expresses the thoughts of the Titan News as follows:

SHALL IT HAPPEN AGAIN?

"The months before and twisting pain of birth
Were hers, but Mary thought the coin was small
To pay for Jim, the finest son on earth.
And John, his dad, forgot the miles of hall
Next day, and grinned, and passed out good cigars;
And bought a policy to school his heir—
With college most as far away as Mars.
Jim grew, with ills and much expense and wear
On Mary and his dad, became a Scout,
Played basketball, took high school in his stride,
And higher learning, too. The shabby stout
Old pair who called him son near choked with pride.
Then overseas they got into a brawl;
Jim's country sent him there—and that was all."

Can the American People Be Fooled Again?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. THORKELSON

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 25, 1939

Mr. THORKELSON. Mr. Speaker, in discussing peace, war, and neutrality, we must remember that of the three war alone is adaptable to regulation by law. War is premeditated; neutrality is elective, and peace is desirable.

A nation is neutral when its government observes international law, and this was clearly demonstrated during the World War, for many nations in combat zones remained neutral during that whole period.

The United States, which is 2,500 miles removed from Europe, became involved in that conflict for one reason alone: Our Government was not and did not remain neutral. I recall our absolute indifference to that war in 1914, and I further remember that there was no desire by our people to participate in that war in 1916. Yet 1 year after the election we became partners with England in that conflict.

The daily papers then, as now, were engaged in misrepresentation of actual conditions in Europe so as to mold public opinion favorable to the Triple Entente. In this, the papers were successful because public hatreds were gradually directed toward the Triple Alliance. The daily papers were not interested in publishing facts. They were instead directed by their owners, the invisible government. It was the international financiers that wanted war, and it is the same group, including a few new ones, that want us to take sides in this war, and if we do, we are fools.

I shall now quote from Senate Document 346, which I believe may be illuminating to those who are interested in not becoming involved in the present conflict.

WHO ARE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE WORLD WAR?

The fixing of the responsibility for causing the World War is not an easy task. One of the remarkable features of that war is that, thus far, nobody and no nation has admitted the responsibility for causing it. The emperors, kings, and ministers of the warring nations, as if conspired to mislead the world, pointed their accusing fingers upon one another and, parrot-like, repeated, "You did it; you did it." The Germans accused the English and the French Governments. The English and French politicians accused the German Kaiser. Everybody vied with everybody else in disowning and repudiating the paternity of the monstrous child, the World War.

During and after the World War Europe has failed to produce one single courageous statesman who would dare to fix upon the proper parties the responsibility for causing the World War. The statesmen and diplomats of the principal warring countries know, or ought to know, who caused the World War. There must be plenty of available and seriously incriminating documents in the archives of the English, French, and German Governments. It is childish and condemnable on the part of the statesmen and diplomats of those countries to hide the truth from the world. The truth is coming to light and the inexorable rays of the history of Europe point out the culprits.

Of all the statesmen of the warring countries, Lloyd George, the now ex-Premier of England, has done some service in aiding mankind in finding the parties responsible for the World War. It may fairly be assumed that Lloyd George knows the facts, but thus far he has failed, with the rest of his colleagues, to show a moral courage to state the whole truth. On one occasion he apologized for all the statesmen of all the warring countries by saying that nobody "quite meant war." That apology was made when he was the Prime Minister of England. When out of the ministry, however, he gives more or less concrete information. Thus, on December 23, 1920, speaking to the Empire Parliamentary Association, Lloyd George said:

"The more one reads memoirs and books written in the various countries of what happened before August 1914 the more one realizes that no one at the head of affairs quite meant war. It was something into which they glided or rather staggered and stumbled." (Issues of Today, January 14, 1922.)

In a syndicated article on January 6, 1923, Lloyd George became more communicative, and, instead of an apology, he offered a positive statement. He now calls the rulers of the "attacking empires" as the "nominal rulers" and "terror-stricken dummies." Furthermore, he definitely fixes the responsibility for the war upon the military organizations of Germany, France, and Russia. Lloyd George said:

"The more one examines the events of July 1914, the more one is impressed with the shrinking of the nominal rulers of the attacking empires and with the relentless driving onward of the military organizations behind these terror-stricken dummies."

Then, in carefully veiled language, leaving a good deal to be read between the lines, Lloyd George said:

"No one ever believed it (the cause of the war) was the assassination of the royal archduke [of Austria]. Were it not that the German Army was more perfect and more potent than either the French or Russian Army, were it not that every German officer was convinced that the German military machine was superior to all its rivals, there would have been no war, whatever emperors, diplomatists, or statesmen said, thought, or intended." (See Cleveland Press, January 6, 1923.)

This is only a part of the whole truth, but, nevertheless, it is truth. "No one at the head of affairs quite meant war." The "nominal rulers," those "terror-stricken dummies," could not of their own will make war. Emperors, diplomatists, and statesmen were unable to prevent war. "The relentless driving onward of the military organizations behind these terror-stricken dummies" forced the war ahead. Lloyd George is correct; the history of Europe upholds his contention. The military organizations of Europe were the instrumentalities by which the World War was started.

While the statements of Lloyd George cover only a part of the whole truth, yet they contain the most staggering admission of the appallingly emasculated condition of each and every civil government of each and every country in Europe. This staggering admission should challenge the attention of every thinking man and woman. Humanity believed that the crowned or elected rulers in Europe were the real rulers and that the duly constituted governments of the European countries were the real governing instrumentalities in the respective countries. On paper they made war, and on paper they attempted to make peace. But now Lloyd George admits that the rulers—and why not the governments?—were merely "nominal" and "terror-stricken dummies." "Whatever emperors, diplomatists, or statesmen said, thought, or intended," the World War had to come. The World War was made outside of the duly constituted governmental circles of Europe.

In addition to the statements of Lloyd George, we now have the statements and admissions of certain heads of the military organizations of England, France, and even of the United States of America. In these statements and admissions we see that while the Emperors, Kings, Presidents, diplomatists, and statesmen may have been thoroughly ignorant of the gigantic preparation for the World War, certain leaders of the military organizations were alert and ready for the conflict.

Marshal Foch, of France, in a letter at a banquet given after Easter, 1919, by the members of the English House of Parliament in honor of Sir Henry Wilson, chief of imperial staff (England), said:

"Long before the war, General Wilson (England) and I (France) worked together to prepare for the struggle." (See New York Tribune, April 9, 1919.)

Lord Haldane, former Minister of War of England, testifying before the coal commission, said: "Everything had been prepared long before" the war. (Quoted in issues of Today, January 14, 1922.)

Lord French, the British field marshal, says in his book (1919):

"It was not within the knowledge of all that the general staff of Great Britain and France had for a long time held conferences and that a complete mutual understanding as to combined action in certain eventualities existed." (Quoted ibid.)

Admiral Sims, of the United States Navy, has also come forward with his confessional statement. He says:

"In December 1910 [4 years before the war broke out] I submitted a secret report to the admiral of my fleet. I explained that it had been typewritten by me and that no other human eye had seen it. I stated that the concensus of opinion among the British officers and officials of European nations with whom I had conferred

was that war could not be delayed more than 4 years. I said this in that report and added that Britain and France would be in that war and that we would be in that war and that we would enter shortly thereafter." (Quoted ibid.)

The situation, then, was that the duly constituted governments in European countries did know that Europe was getting dangerously near a terrible war, while the military organizations were preparing feverishly for that very war. In this country we were blissfully lingering in the chimerical hope that we would not get into the war. We sent Woodrow Wilson back to the White House with an unprecedented majority in the belief that "he kept us out of war." Yet Admiral Sims, of the United States Navy, knew in 1910—4 years before the war broke out—that the war was coming and "we would enter shortly thereafter." Admiral Sims knew that England and France "would be in that war." And, as if to confirm Admiral Sims, Vice President Marshall, in a letter to E. G. Hoffman, secretary of the Democratic National Committee, at Fort Wayne, Ind., said:

"We were in the war from the very moment of its European beginning." (Quoted in Issues of Today, January 14, 1922.)

It is interesting to note that while the foregoing information was in the possession of some of the military leaders of this country, and same being during the Presidency of Woodrow Wilson, on October 26, 1916—6 years after Admiral Sims made his secret report—Woodrow Wilson made the following confession of ignorance concerning the war:

"Have you ever heard what started the present war? If you have, I wish you would publish it, because nobody else has. So far as I can gather, nothing in particular started it, but everything in general." (Speech in Cincinnati, October 26, 1916.)

It is evident to any open and unprejudiced mind that no people of no particular country wanted, caused, or started the World War. It is clear that the "nominal rulers," the "terror-stricken dummies," the emasculated diplomatists, and statesmen were unable to prevent the outbreak of the World War. It has been seen that the military organizations of all the warring countries were active in preparing for the World War, "whatever emperors, kings, diplomatists, or statesmen said, thought, or intended." But the military organizations were merely instrumentalities, effective tools in the hands of some heretofore unmentioned and unseen power. If, therefore, we can throw back the curtains, we shall find the culprit hiding behind the scene, and the hideous monster will come into full light.

We now summon to our aid the history of Europe. What the statesmen refused to disclose the history of Europe will reveal.

The Congress of Vienna in 1815 had divided Europe and bartered millions of human beings to the crowned and absolute monarchs of Europe. A storm of bitter protest was heard in every corner of Europe. It took about 50 years for the peoples of Europe, and after much privation, starvation, and bloodshed, to correct the evils committed by the Congress of Vienna. Germany was consolidated and Italy was unified. The industries of Germany were booming, and the territory of Germany became too small to absorb her own industrial products. An outside market was sought. In her quest for an outside market Germany found England disputing every inch of ground traveled by Germany. Thus a bloodless "trade war" was started.

Germany's only entrance into the Atlantic Ocean was through the English Channel. Passage of German ships through the channel was possible only by the consent of England. This being clear enough, England and Germany began to build battleships in theretofore unheard-of proportions. But it was soon discovered that battleships will not secure to Germany the freedom of the seas and the free and unmolested movement of German international trade. Therefore, Germany conceived the plan of building the Berlin-Baghdad Railroad, leading from Berlin to Austria-Hungary, across the Balkans, into Turkey, through Turkey, and ending at Baghdad, Asia. Through this railroad Germany could reach the largest portion of the world's population and transact most of the international commerce of the world without the interference of England. That is to say, whoever would have controlled the Berlin-Baghdad Railroad would have controlled the greatest bulk of the international commerce of the world.

But the control and successful operation of the Berlin-Baghdad Railroad necessitated the control of the territories through which it passed. Therefore the plan of "Mittel Europa" was conceived. Germany, Austria-Hungary, the Balkans, and Turkey were to be controlled by the owners of the Berlin-Baghdad Railroad. The "Pan German movement" and the shibboleth of "Deutschland Ueber Alles" and all other idiotic utterances were the offshoot of this plan. The "integrity" of the Austro-Hungarian monarchy was indispensable, and therefore Hungary was forced into the absolute control of the Austrian Empire.

While the plan of the Berlin-Baghdad Railroad was being made, a strong Russian movement got on foot. On paper it was called the "Pan Slavic movement." What it was will appear presently.

Russia, a great, big, and very rich country, had no ice-free outlet to high seas. The Baltic Sea is frozen during the greater part of the year. The Black Sea is an inland water and its only outlet to the Mediterranean Sea is at Constantinople. To secure this outlet, Russia would have to control Constantinople, the Dardanelles, and a part of the Balkans. In 1877 Russia made an effort to obtain control of this outlet and declared war upon Turkey under the still popular pretext that the Turks had "mistreated the Christians" in the Balkans. Turkey was defeated, the "Christians" were forgotten; but Constantinople was seized by Russia. England, however, interfered (the British Government always like the "Christians") and, in unison with Germany and Austria, blocked the Russian plan of obtaining an ice-free outlet into the high seas. This act caused Russia to become the sworn enemy of Germany, Austria, and England. By way of parentheses it might be stated that at the time of this writing (January 19, 1923) the "Near East Conference" is still grappling with the question of the control of Constantinople and of the Dardanelles, and this not because of any special love for the "Christians" either. At this time that sublime love is for oil. England was facing the plan of the Berlin-Baghdad Railroad and also the Russian plan to reach the high seas. That is to say, England was in grave danger of losing her control of the international commerce of the world. If, however, Germany could be "isolated," the danger would pass away, at least for the time being. England was the master of building "coalitions" and had the money to act as "pay mistress of her allies." But at that time she had no particular friend in Europe. France was not in love with her and Russia hated her. But her differences with France were patched up and the two countries, in 1904, entered into the Entente Cordiale. But Germany also formed the Triple Alliance, consisting of Germany, Austria-Hungary, and Italy. To this combination the Entente Cordiale was no match. Therefore, England induced Russia to join the Entente Cordiale and thus the Triple Entente was formed, composed of England, France, and Russia.

Russia's entry into the Triple Entente was obtained by reason of the fact that the plan of the Berlin-Baghdad Railroad crossed the Russian plan of reaching an outlet to the Mediterranean Sea. The Berlin-Baghdad Railroad was to cross the Turkish channels at Constantinople, where Russia planned to reach the Mediterranean Sea. Thus, with the help of Russia, England could effectively block the development and completion of the Berlin-Baghdad Railroad.

Here we have a complete picture of the European situation. If you take a map of Europe and draw a line from the Black Sea, in the middle of the Turkish channels at Constantinople, into the Mediterranean Sea, and indicate across that line the Berlin-Baghdad Railroad, you will find, at the intersection of the two lines, the very spot for the control of which millions of human beings have been slaughtered and, finally, Europe was wrecked. It is around that little point that the supreme love of the English Government for the "Christians" is even now centered. It is that little spot for which our own Wall Street has an unbounded love and affection.

From 1907 and 1914 Europe was divided into two powerful camps, the Triple Entente, guarding the interests of England, and the Triple Alliance, guarding the Berlin-Baghdad Railroad project. Both camps armed themselves to the teeth. The poisoned pen was put to work and a virulent propaganda, creating a bitter international hatred, was put into operation. England, France, Germany, and Russia were alike in this respect The minds of their people were poisoned and saturated in the virulent poison of international hatred.

While the subsidized press of each of these countries were feeding their poison of international hatred to their readers, while the uniformed imbeciles and paid propagandists of these countries were shouting for war, two rulers, the Emperor of Germany and the Czar of Russia, quietly sat down at a lunch table at Potsdam in November 1910 and earnestly discussed the ways and means to avert war. There, at the lunch table, undisturbed by the howlings of the war maniacs, those two rulers worked out among themselves a just basis for a peaceful existence of both countries. Germany was to acknowledge a controlling position of Russia in Persia and therewith an outlet for Russia to the high seas through Persia; and Russia was to withdraw her opposition to the German plan of building the Berlin-Baghdad Railway. (See E. R. Turner's Europe Since 1870, p. 409.)

This is history, and this incident is of great historical import. Civilized mankind might ponder over it with great moral benefit. If two rulers, who, by the consent of their people, are the accepted and acknowledged rulers of two great countries, can settle a vexatious international question in a peaceful hour at a simple lunch table—if this can be done, why fight a terrible war which accomplishes nothing; why kill millions of human beings without any visible benefit to any people on this earth; why hurl the world into chaos and millions of people into untold sufferings?

But a friendly relation between Germany and Russia, the completion of the Berlin-Baghdad Railroad, and Russia's control of Persia would have sounded the doom of England as the undisputed master of international commerce. Therefore the agreement of the Emperor of Germany and of the Czar of Russia not to fight and not to commit suicide was frustrated. In France a well-planned propaganda of "a revival of courage and assurance and great rebirth of national feeling" was started. In Great Britain "there was each year more vivid apprehension of possible danger from the greatness of the German Empire, resolution to be under perpetual guard, and determination under no circumstances ever again to let France alone confront German aggression or suffer her to be crushed." (See Turner's Europe Since 1870, p. 410.) How the English people at once became enamored with the French people!

Not so much in order to give full evidence of England's love for France but to precipitate a general European war, the "Morroco crisis" was trumped up. This was in 1911; we are getting close to the fateful hour.

The "Morocco crisis" was this: In 1906 England, France, and Germany signed an agreement wherein France and Spain were authorized jointly to preserve order in Morocco. France was permitted to occupy certain towns to maintain order. That was an international agreement, and it was supposed to be respected by France and Spain. But, international agreement or no agreement, "under the pretext of policing the distracted country," France

pushed an armed force farther and farther into Morocco, so that it became evident that Morocco would be reduced to a French possession. That act was committed in order to afford Germany a bait to start a rumpus. Germany took the bait. On July 1, 1911, "without preliminary warning, it was announced that the German commercial interests in Morocco were being threatened, and that hence a German warship had been sent to the harbor of Agadir, on the Atlantic coast of Morocco, to protect them" (Turner's Europe Since 1870, p. 411).

The challenge was accepted by Germany. It looked as if the war had come. But the people of France and England did not want war yet. The "opportune time for war" had not arrived. But the invisible power (we shall discover it presently) tried its luck. "All the French Fleet was concentrated in the Mediterranean Sea, and Britain's great fleet was ready in the channel and in the North Sea" (ibid., p. 413).

The military organizations of all these three countries were ready to fight. The invisible power was ready to sacrifice the lives of millions of human beings. But the people refused to fight. Therefore, it was decreed that the "present opportunity for war" was "unfavorable." And, accordingly, there was no war.

This master stroke was not done by the crowned rulers, diplomatists, or statesmen of those countries, nor was it done by the military organizations of those countries. They were ready to fight. This is what happened, and it was as simply done as it is written here:

Germany by that time had worked up an immense home industry and also international commerce. She had carried on a vast amount of import and export trade. All these were built upon borrowed capital supplied mostly by French and English international financiers. That is to say, about 90 percent of Germany's business was done on credit given by French and English international financiers. (See G. R. Usher's Pan Germanism, p. 162; also Turner's Europe Since 1870, p. 415.)

In order to fight a war there had to be people who wanted war, an army and navy which were to do the fighting, and, finally, money which was to keep up the war. France and England had the army, navy, and the money, but no people who wanted war. Germany had all the requirements. But the English and French international financiers began their "financial mobilization," in that they quietly began recalling their loans from Germany. And the German financiers just as quietly began to ship their gold to France and to England. When the German Kaiser called together the German financiers and announced to them that there was to be a war and asked them to prepare Germany's finances for war, the German financiers gently informed the Kaiser that there could be no war, because the German gold was shipped to France and England. That settled the question of war.

It is here, then, where the curtain is rolled back and for the first time the international financiers are discovered in their true role. They did not recognize the "opportunity" for war to be "favorable," and there was no war. The German Emperor, the navy of England, the navy of France, and the statesmen and diplomats of those countries were ready for war. The reasonable conclusion, therefore, is that the question of war or no war depended upon and was decided by the international financiers.

The inevitable outbreak of war was, however, merely deferred to a more "favorable opportunity." The agitation for war in every country continued with increased vehemence. Serbia was made a hotbed of virulent propaganda. The Triple Entente, through Russia, was pouring money lavishly into Serbia for propaganda purposes. The Serbian propagandists invaded Austria and Hungary and created disturbances there. The lives and property of Hungarian officials were endangered. International hatred was worked up to the highest pitch. War was in the air. War had to come. Only a good pretext for war had to be found.

In 1912–13 another attempt was made to "feel out" the people and to test the time as to whether it was "favorable" for war. The Balkan War broke out. Russia and Austria mobilized. But the opportunity was "not favorable" for a general European war, and there was no general European war.

But the agitation for war was still continued. Each nation armed itself to the teeth. The people of every country were groaning under the weight of the heavy armament. The invisible power continued with renewed energy the preparation of the mind of the people for war. This propaganda assumed such an enormous proportion that Lord Welby, formerly the head of the English Treasury, alarmingly exclaimed: "We are in the hands of an organization of crooks. These are politicians, generals, manufacturers of armaments, and journalists." (Quoted in F. Neilson's How Diplomats Make War, p. 328.)

The drive to create the pretext for war was now concentrated in Serbia. The foci of trouble were recognized again at the intersection of the German and Russian plans. The war had to be fought, if not in the Balkans, around the Balkans and near the foci of England's infectious point, the crossing of the Turkish channels by the Germans. To force the issue, Hungary was terrorized by the Serbian propagandists who were in the employ of Russia and indirectly in the employ of the Triple Entente. Finally, the directors of the propaganda resorted to plain murder. Two demented Serbian young students were carefully trained by Serbian officials and supplied with weapons of murder from the arsenals of Serbia and then sent out on their murderous journey. On June 28, 1914, these two young imbeciles assassinated the Archduke Franz Ferdinand of Austria, together with his wife at his side. Thus, by a carefully planned murder, the fuze was lit and the great conflagration was started. A pretext for war was created.

The plan of murder was so hatched in Serbia. The authors of the murder, it is so claimed by John Bull, were paid from London in the sum of £2,000 and £200 for expenses. The payment was made directly by the secret service attached to the Serbian Legation stationed at London. In proof of this statement, John Bull, an English publication, printed a letter written on the official sheet of the Serbian Legation at London, which, decoded, dated April 5, 1914, is as follows:

"For the elimination of F. F. (Francis Ferdinand) the sum of £2,000 sterling, paid as follows: £1,000 on your arrival in Belgrade (capital of Serbia) by the hands of Mr. G. and the rest of £1,000 on finishing the work paid as above. The sum of £200 for expenses and to pay agents, etc. (See John Bull, July 11, 1914. Reproduced in the American Monthly, June 1922.)

The fuze was lit. The international financiers did not start their "financial mobilization" to avert the war. The "favorable opportunity" for war had arrived. The German Emperor frantically sent his telegrams after telegrams to the Russian Czar asking that he should avert war.

The Russian Czar just as frantically replied and asked that the Germany Kaiser should block the war. The English and French statesmen kept the wires hot, appealing to all concerned to avert the war. But the war had to come. As Lloyd George has said, the "terror stricken dummies" could not stop the war. "Whatever emperors, kings, diplomatists, or statesmen said, thought, or intended," there had to be a war. The uncrowned and invisible rulers of Europe decreed that there should be war and there was war.

We repeat, and respectfully submit, that in view of the foregoing facts, it is clearly established that Hungary did not cause and did not bring about the last World War. The responsibility for the last World War rests solely upon the shoulders of international financiers. It is they upon whose head the blood of millions of dead and millions of dying rests.

THE PURPOSES IN THE WORLD WAR

We have seen that the underlying cause of the last World War was the Berlin-Baghdad Railroad. Closely connected to that railroad was the danger of the international financiers, under the protection of the Triple Entente, losing control of Europe's international commerce and finance. It follows, therefore, that the main purpose in the war was to prevent the completion of the Berlin-Baghdad Railroad. The other purposes were to make money. There appears not one single purpose throughout that whole war to make the world "safe for democracy."

The Treaty of London, entered into by the Entente Powers on April 26, 1915, shows definitely the main purpose of the World War. In that treaty Europe and a part of Asia were divided and distributed among England, France, Italy, Rumania, Russia, Serbia, and Montenegro, as follows:

England was to receive: (1) The neutral zones of Persia; (2) southern Mesopotamia and Baghdad; (3) Haifa and Akka in Suria; (4) a portion of the German colonies.

France was to receive: (1) Syria; (2) the vilayet of Adna and other extended territories in Asia Minor, including a part of the Armenian border, where are the oil fields of Mosul; (3) Alsace-Lorraine and the Saar Valley, with all the mining district and the whole of the old dutchy of Lorraine; (4) temporary occupation of the left bank of the Rhine, with permission to make a buffer state and fix such boundaries as she pleased; (5) a part of the German colonies.

Italy was to receive: (1) The Trentino; (2) the county of Corizia and Gradisca; (3) Triest and Istria; (4) a generous share of the Dalmatian coasts; (5) the island of the Istrians and Dalmation coasts; (6) Valona and its neighborhood; (7) the islands of the Dodecanese; (8) Smyrna and its hinterland (later this was changed to Adalian and a part of Asia Minor); (9) new colonial territories in compensation for the German colonies which Great Britain and France should receive.

Rumania was to receive from the territory of Hungary: (1) Transylvania up to the River Tisza; (2) the Banat of Temesvar; (3) the Bukovina.

Russia was to receive: (1) Constantinople and nearly the whole of Turkey in Europe; (2) the Bosporus, the Dardanelles, and the Sea of Marmora; (3) the islands of Imbors and Tenedos in the Aegean, at the mouth of the Dardanelles; (4) full liberty of action in Persia, including Ispahan and Yezd; (5) Trebizond, Erzerum, Van Bitlis, and other territories in Asia Minor; (6) a free hand in making the Russian western boundaries.

Serbia and Montenegro were to receive: (1) The south coasts of Dalmatia; (2) Spalato, Ragusa, Cattaro, and St. John of Medusa in Albania; (3) the eventual annexation of North Albania. (See J. J. Bass' The Peace Tangle, pp. 13–14.)

This wholesale distribution of countries and peoples was kept secretly away from the knowledge of the peoples of the Entente. Even Woodrow Wilson claimed that when he proclaimed that the American people were fighting to make the world "safe for democracy" he did not know the existence of the secret treaty of London and the distribution of Europe and a part of Asia. But, while the peoples of the Triple Entente were kept ignorant of this secret distribution and war aim, the language of that treaty was smuggled to the peoples of the Triple Alliance and there published broadcast to stir up the fighting spirit of the Germans and their allies.

"Carefully hidden from the peoples of the Entente, the secret treaties were published and discussed far and wide in the Central Empire. They were used by Pan Germans and militarists to revive the energy of the people in the hours of depression. Whenever the peace party in Germany seemed to be gaining ground, or whenever the people showed lassitude, the militarists brandished

these treaties and with them rallied the public opinion to their support. They could use the secret treaties to show with apparent finality that they were fighting a war of self-defense against the imperialists who desired the dismemberment and destruction of Germany and her allies." (Bass' The Peace Tangle, pp. 21–22.)

Were there only one single purpose in the World War, namely, the defeat of Germany, the division of Europe and a part of Asia, and to secure for the Entente financiers the absolute control of international commerce and finance, the war could not and would not have lasted longer than 6 months. But the invisible power wanted more. It wanted to make money—even at the sacrifice of millions of lives and even at the risk of throwing civilization into economic and moral bankruptcy.

The question of the duration of the World War hinged upon the ability of Germany to obtain sufficient iron ore from which ammunition was manufactured. In May 1915, in a confidential report, the six great industrial and agricultural associations of Germany, Chancelor Bethman-Hollweg was advised that "if the production of the Lorraine ore was disturbed, the war would be practically lost." Engerand, a member of the French House of Deputies, says that the German metallurgists had frequently declared that if the German ore mines were attacked by the French Army "the war would have been finished in 6 months with the defeat of Germany." (See C. K. Streit's Where Iron Is, There Is the Fatherland, pp. 4 and 33.)

In a heated debate in the French House of Deputies, after an investigation conducted by that lawmaking body, it came out that the duration of the war was in the control of a few international families. These families controlled most of the raw materials used in the manufacture of ammunition. They controlled most of the factories manufacturing ammunition. It appears further that they controlled both the civil governments and the military organizations of at least Germany and France. Some of the most notable of these families are the Vendel family, the Thyssen family, the Krupp family, and, above them all, the famous international family of the Rothschilds, who are Jews by religion and barons of England, Germany, France, and Austria by business. These ubiquitous families are so interspersed in the various countries that in some of the countries they have native-born citizens; in other countries they have naturalized citizens. Some of these citizens were found to be members of the governments of some of the warring countries.

The principal iron mines, smelters, and coal mines of Germany and France were immediately on both sides of the pre-war political boundary line separating the two countries in the Lorraine section. On the French side there is a very extensive iron-ore land, known as the basin of Briey. In the same region there is an extensive coal field, known as the basin of Bruay. These iron fields, iron mines, smelters, and coal mines were before and during the World War the property of a few international families and a few international corporations. The De Vendel family owned in one property about 25,000 acres of iron land, one half of which was in German territory and the other half in French territory. In another property, in the French basin, the De Vendel family, with the Creusot interest—the Krupps of France—owned 8 blast furnaces and also iron mines producing 1,000,000 tons of iron yearly. On the German side the De Vendel family owned mining concessions at Meyeurre and Hayange, producing 3,000,000 tons of iron yearly, also blast furnaces and smelters near these mines. In all, the De Vendel family controlled about 200,000 acres of iron land in that section. The Germans owned 18 mineral concessions in the Briey and Lonway Basin and a few more in Normandy. The Thyssens controlled the mines of Bailly, Jouville, and Souligny. The mines of Moutiers were controlled by an international group, the stocks being divided as follows: French, 100; German, 70; and Belgian, 10. The German "Phonix" group—Hasper and Koesch—controlled the French mines at Jarny and Saucy. The Gelsenkirchner owned in France the mines of St. Pierrmont, Sevey, Hout-Lay, St. Jean, Sainte-Barbe, Crusone, and Vallerupt. Other German ironmasters owned the mines of Murville and Valleroy. All of these concessions were in the basin of Briey, with the exception of Saucy, Crusno, and Vallerupt. (See C. K. Streit's Where Iron Is, There Is the Fatherland, pp. 4, 9, 10.)

One day before the war was declared the German Army proceeded to and did seize the French basin of Briey. The French Government immediately ordered the French troops to withdraw 8 miles from that section. Thus the Germans occupied that important iron territory without any resistance (ibid., p. 35).

The front at the basin of Briey was quiet during the war. It is said that not one single man was killed there until the American Army began its drive against the Germans (ibid., p. 1).

The reason for this is obvious. In the basin of Briey, about 25 miles behind the front, was the most important iron field from which the Germans mined a very large proportion of the iron used by them during the war. The German smelters were there, working at full blast day and night, preparing iron for ammunition destined to kill the French soldiers and other enemies. In the basin of Bruay, about 15 miles behind the front, were the most important French coal mines, which were worked day and night, so that the French may have enough coal to treat their iron, from which ammunition was manufactured to kill the Germans and other foes. In the French section of the basin of Briey alone, according to the statement made on the floor of the French Chamber of Deputies by Mr. Laucheur, a French munition maker, minister of munitions, and minister of industrial reorganization, the Germans mined 14,000,000 tons of iron during the war (ibid., p. 4). At the same time the French mined 28,000 tons of coal daily in the basin of Bruay in the Department of Pas-de-Calais, only 10 to 12 miles behind the Briey front (ibid., p. 42). How could the Germans mine their 14,000,000 tons of iron 25 miles behind the front, and how could the Krupps manufacture ammunition from that iron with which the French soldiers were killed by the millions if the French had bombarded those mines and disturbed the peaceful operation of same as well as the peaceful operation of the smelters? Likewise, how could the French mine their 28,000 tons of coal per day if the Germans had recklessly and discourteously bombarded those mines 10 to 12 miles behind the French line?

The principal business of the international owners of these mines was to make money during the war. If the Germans had been dislodged from the iron fields in the basin of Briey, according to the German metallurgists, "the war would have been finished in 6 months with the defeat of Germany" (ibid., p. 33). But if the war had come to a conclusion so suddenly, those international interests could not make their millions, the Krupps could not manufacture so much ammunition, and there would have been left a few millions of men alive. During the war, however, business was business. Both the German, French, English, and Belgian international families and international corporations were bent upon making money. What did they care about life, liberty, and happiness? They wanted money, and the war had to go on. And it did—without the bombardment of the precious holdings of iron and coal.

The enormity of this situation was pointed out by Gustav Tery, the editor of L'Ouevre, of Paris, on May 22, 1917. He declared that in the minutes of the general meeting held on March 14, 1916, by the blast furnace and steel mill corporation of Caen, which minutes were originally published in the financial L'Information, March 18, 1916, "it is specified that the Thyssen (German branch of the family) interests are carefully preserved in the new organization. It is understood that a part of the profits realized by this company in the making of war munitions (for France) will be put aside for the Thyssen (German) group, and that after the war automatically and legally the Messrs. Thyssen will receive this large sum. And it is certain that those same Thyssens work also for war in Germany. These interesting metallurgists receive their profits, then, with both hands; that is, from both sides of the frontier, from furnishing material to Germany and France. If money has no odor, steel has no fatherland" (ibid., p. 19).

In the Briey investigation conducted by the French Chamber of Deputies it was revealed that at the time the war broke out the iron mines, coal mines, and steel mills of both France and Germany in the Briey Basin were controlled by powerful trusts and interlocking directorates, the Germans owning mines in France and the French owning mineral properties in Germany, "the industrial magnates working in more or less close harmony" (ibid., pp. 13 and 26).

The industrial magnates were well represented in the French war Government. Francois de Vendel was a Deputy in the Chamber of Deputies. His brother, Humbert de Vendel, a member of the committee of forges (Steel Trust of France), was the single purchasing agent at London. General de la Panouze, the brother-in-law of Mr. Vendel, was the military attaché at London, and he surpervised the purchases of Mr. Vendel. Captain Esbrayat, director of the Damachy Bank, was the secretary of the commission of woods and metals—in the Ministry of Munitions. A Mr. Goldsberger (a Frenchmen), son of an industrial magnate of Berlin, was the director of the (French) bureau of importation. Mr. Laucheur, a munitions maker, was the Minister of Munitions (ibid. p. 24). Another Frenchman, Max Hoschiller, was employed as a propagandist to show that Germany was not in need of the 14,000,000 tons of iron mined during the war in the Basin of Briey. Thus the interests of the international families and of the international corporations and of the international industrial magnates were well and fully protected on both sides of the front.

It need not be argued that it would have been the human as well as the national interest of the French people to have the Germans driven out of the Basin of Briey and thus reestablish peace within 6 months from the beginning of the World War. Indeed, General Sarrail, of France, reasoned somewhat in this direction, he being not initiated into the mysteries of the war. In 1914 he projected an offensive that would have given the French possession of the Briey Basin if successful. He was told by the French general staff that it was too difficult to maneuver in that district, although the Germans found no difficulty in advancing there 14 kilometers in 2 days. To assure the tranquillity of the iron mines held by the Germans, the patriotic and uninitiated General Sarrail was removed from the command of that front and was replaced by the more complaisant General Gerard. What discourtesy it would have been to disturb or, worse, to dislodge the Germans from the peaceful mining of the French iron! "It is only for the poor devils that war is not a gentleman's agreement." (Pierre Renaudel, member, French Chamber of Deputies, quoted in "Where Iron Is, There Is the Fatherland," pp. 37 and 45.)

Finally, in 1917, it was decided to bomb the iron industries of Germany and thus end the war quickly. Even the French grand general staff approved of the plan. The plan was drawn up under the direction of Lieutenant Lejune, who was to command the bombing operation against the Briey Basin. But the bombing expedition was never started. When the reason for the delay was investigated it was found that Lieutenant Lejune, although a soldier, was in the employ of the French Steel Trust (ibid., p. 41).

The foregoing facts are cited to support the statement of Lloyd George and to bring the truth to light that, regardless of what "emperors, kings, diplomatists, and statesmen said, thought, or intended," the war had to come, and that the military organizations of the principal warring countries were in the control not of

the civil government but in the control of the industrial magnates, international families, and international companies. These facts show further that the Hungarian Nation was nowhere involved in the question as to how long the war should last or with what intensity it should be fought. In truth, these facts show that no people of any country had any say as to the starting or continuation of the war. The military organizations were in the hands of the international financiers, who had the final say as to how long and with what intensity and on what fronts the war had to be fought.

This almost unbelievable situation was recognized by members of the French Chamber of Deputies. From the tribune of that chamber Deputy Barthe, on January 24, 1919, solemnly declared:

"I affirm that either by the fact of the international solidarity of the great metallurgy companies or in order to safeguard private business interests our military chiefs were ordered not to bombard the establishments of the Briey Basin, which were being exploited by the enemy during the war. I affirm that our aviation service received instructions to respect the blast furnaces in which the enemy steel was being made, and that the general who wished to bombard them was reprimanded." (Quoted ibid. p. 46.)

Senator Gaudin de Villaine, a conservative member of the French Senate, quoting from the French Yellow Book, that "fabricants of cannon and armor plate; great merchants, who demand the greatest markets; banks, who speculate on the age of gold and on the next indemnity, think that the war should be good business," continues:

"I formally accuse the big cosmopolitan banks—at least, the owners of mining rights—of having conceived, prepared, and let loose this horrible tragedy (the World War) with the monstrous thought of world stock jobbing. I accuse these same money powers of having, before and since the war, betrayed the interest of France." (Quoted ibid. pp. 46 and 48.)

These are hard, definite, and pungent words. They were spoken by duly elected representatives of the French people. Their intention was to bring the truth to light and to fix the responsibilities for the war upon those who are actually responsible. All the reliable evidence and all the testimony of responsible men point to the fact that the international, industrial, and financial magnates stand convicted before the bar of civilization as the responsible parties for causing and continuing the last World War.

It should be clear from this that the World War was financed and prolonged by the financial interests of the major powers on both sides. There is further evidence to show that our Government was aware of that impending conflict, yet no information was given out to the public to acquaint them with the real cause of the World War.

Our so-called free press, which is supposed to speak in the interest of the people, was in reality employed by its owners—the invisible government—to disseminate poison of hatreds toward the Central Powers or the Triple Alliance. Do not forget, however, that the owners of the press were the same powers that instigated and prolonged the World War; and Lord Welby was correct when he said: "We are in the hands of an organization of crooks. These are politicians, generals, manufacturers of armaments, and journalists."

Mr. Speaker, we are in the hands of the same international exploiters today. They own and control the world's gold and credit. They own and control nearly all sources of publicity, our movies, our larger broadcasting stations, our daily press, and news distribution agencies. There is today no opportunity to place real facts before the people except in the so-called patriotic periodicals which the Dies committee and the Department of Justice are trying to suppress.

The power of the invisible government is so great today that even the Government itself is involved in un-American propaganda favorable to the invisible government instead of for the benefit and enlightenment of our people.

The war which is now raging in Europe is a natural aftermath of the Treaty of Versailles, and I may say at this point that nothing else could be expected after taking into consideration those who were responsible for the drafting of that treaty.

I shall now quote from the Senate document so as to further enlighten the public:

The members of the peace conference were composed of the so-called big four and experts. The so-called big four were Woodrow Wilson, President of the United States of America; Lloyd George, Prime Minister of England; Signor Orlando, Prime Minister of Italy; and M. Clemenceau, Prime Minister of France. These men "were all surrounded by Jewish advisers," and these advisers "played a decisive part." (Prof. C. Sarole, of the University of Edinburg, Scotland, Current History Magazine, January 1923, p. 593.) "The big four were mere novices in international affairs; geography, ethnology, psychology, and political history was a sealed book to them. 'They were specialists in nothing.' Whether one contemplates them in the light of their public acts or through the prisms of gossip, the figures cut by the delegates of the great powers were pathetic. Giants in the parliamentary sphere, they shrank to the dimension of the dwarfs in the international. In matters of international politics they were helpless at sea." (Dillon's Inside Story of the Peace Conference, pp. 102–203. Dr. Dillon was a member of the English delegation to the peace conference.) Mr. Lansing, Secretary of State, and a plenipotentiary from the United States of America, admits that President Woodrow Wilson was stubborn, unprepared, yet "seldom consulted his experts." (Lansing's the Peace Negotiation, p. 107.) With reference to the territory of Hungary, Lloyd George was so ignorant that at one sitting he exclaimed, "Where is Transylvania"—comprising one-third of the territory of Hungary—"which is coveted by the Rumanians?"

The official interpreter of the peace conference was "M. Paul Mantoux, one of the most brilliant representatives of Jewry at the conference." (Dillon's Inside Story of the Peace Conference, p. 127.) How brilliant his translations were and what chaotic situation must have existed at the conference may be shown by the following example:

One of the delegates said, "My country, unfortunately, is situated in the midst of States which are anything but peace loving—in fact, the chief danger to the peace of Europe emanates from them." The "brilliant" translation was, "The country represented by Mr. X unhappily presents the greatest danger to the peace of Europe." (Ibid, p. 128.)

The peace conference finally reduced itself down to a scramble of international financiers. The financial part of the treaty was written by international financiers and a large part of this work was done by our own Mr. Bernard Baruch, a New York financier, who told the investigating committee of the United States Senate: "I probably had more power than perhaps any other man did in the war; doubtless that is true." This powerful man wrote the financial part of the Paris peace treaty.

If Mr. Baruch had the power he claimed when he appeared before the investigating committee of the United States Senate, he used it unwisely and unjustly. In looking over "Conférence—des Préliminaires de Paix—Composition et Fonctionnement" I find that Mr. Baruch is on four important committees, but as members on "Questions Financières" I find the following gentlemen: Mr. Albert Strauss, Mr. Thomas W. Lamont, Mr. Norman H. Davis, Capt. Jeremiah Smith, Jr., and Mr. George Whitney.

There are 130 pages in the peace conference report, each page filled with an impressive list of people from whom much was expected on the 1st of April 1919. But, like the day like the deed, the world was fooled, for the gentlemen in question lacked foresight.

The Treaty of Versailles was written to destroy the nations that were defeated in the World War. It is not an expression of statesmanship but is instead a vicious instrument, unjust and cruel to a people who were not in any sense responsible for the World War. It is only natural that an intelligent people resent coercion and restriction, and this they were forced to endure by partition of their own countries. The more aggressive countries are now engaged in retrieving their former possessions and for this no one can be blamed except those who drafted the Treaty of Versailles. It is time that the larger world powers and the invisible government learned that in living, they must also let others live.

The purpose of the quotations is to expose those who were guilty of bringing about the World War, and I hope this information will counteract any desire to enter into the present war. You will notice that it was not the civil governments or the citizens of the warring countries that were responsible, but it was instead, as history proves, the international financiers or the invisible government.

The international financiers and their associates were not satisfied with the stringent terms of the peace treaty, but true to their stripe, demanded the last pound of flesh. They willfully and deliberately brought about inflation in Germany by the withdrawal of gold and gold-secured currency. After the collapse of the German money, these financial tricksters returned to Germany with sound money from adjoining countries. With this gold currency, they bought German marks, and real estate, for less than 5 percent of its actual value. It is interesting to note the wide scope of this exploitation. I find in the New York Times, September 14, 1922, the following advertisement:

New issue, 600,000,000 German marks, divided into 60,000 common shares, par value 10,000 marks each. Application will be made to increase the common-share capital of this company.

United European Investors, Ltd. (incorporated under charter of the Dominion of Canada). President, Hon. Franklin D. Roosevelt,

vice president, Fidelity & Deposit Co. of Maryland; vice president and chairman, executive committee, William Schall, William Schall & Co., bankers, New York; treasurer, August Scherer, 45 William Street, New York; secretary, A. R. Roberts, 7 Pine Street, New York.

Directors: Hon. Franklin D. Roosevelt; Almet F. Jenks, New York; William Schall; Andrew Haydon, Ottawa, Canada.

Advisory board in Germany: Senator August Lattmann, former partner, G. Amsinck & Co., New York; Senator John von Berenberg Gossler, partner, John von Berenberg Gossler & Co., Hamburg; Alfred Arnthal, Hamburg.

Bankers and depositors: William Schall & Co., New York; Deutsche Bank, Hamburg; Norddeutsche Bank, Hamburg.

Transfer agents: The Bank of America, New York.

The purpose of this company is to exchange its shares for German marks held by American investors and to invest these marks in actual values in Germany. Carefully selected investments will be made in real estate, mortgages, securities, and participation in industrial and commercial enterprises.

The company's facilities and connections enable it to secure attractive and sound investments; the directors will take advantage of the present money stringency in Germany and of the purchasing power of the mark, which is far greater than is reflected by exchange quotations.

Mr. William Schall, chairman of the executive committee, was sent to Germany by the company on a special mission to make a careful survey of German economic conditions. Mr. Schall conferred with the leading German financial authorities, and with their assistance selected the German advisory committee.

According to a letter from the department of the Secretary of State of Canada, the United European Investors, Ltd., was incorporated by Dominion letters patent dated the 9th of May 1922, with head office situate at Ottawa, Ontario. It was dissolved by a certificate of surrender of charter issued under date of July 12, 1927.

This gives a comprehensive view of the extent to which Germany and its people were exploited by international brokers and bankers, in collusion with German and international banks. Let us not forget that inflation is usually a deliberate manipulation brought about by those who control international gold money and credit. It is a sort of a milking process which leaves the poor destitute and the rich wealthier.

To bring this point home, let us remember that we have had inflated currency since 1934, when the gold was withdrawn and gold securities repudiated by our own Government. It is also well to bear in mind that we are now using a commodity or unsecured dollar that may, like the German mark, collapse at any time. The gold which is now held by the United States Treasury may be withdrawn, as it was in Germany; and when such withdrawal takes place, disaster will face us as it has other nations. The question is, Would we, the American people, resent such exploitation by foreign financiers? I believe we would; and it was such a discovery that terminated in deportation of those who had brought disaster to Germany.

It is only natural that these same international bankers are resentful at having been discovered. They no doubt acquired, by fraud, possession of much valuable property and securities which were later repudiated by the German Government when discovery was made of the manner in which such property and possessions had been obtained. No doubt many of those who invested through the medium of the United European Investors, Ltd., are also disappointed. Yet it is only just retribution and certainly no reason why we should declare war in their behalf.

There is no rhyme or reason why the United States should declare war on any country in order to restore to the international financiers the power of world domination.

The World War, as you can well understand after having read these remarks, was fought to place the invisible government in complete control of international gold and credit. In this the invisible government was successful, only to be foiled by the subsequent attitude of the Central Powers. The question which we must soon decide is whether or not we should become involved in the present conflict, which is for no other purpose except to restore to the invisible government its waning power in Europe.

In order to accomplish this, and to shape our opinions favorable to taking sides in this conflict, we are now submerged in a mass of propaganda no different from that which was employed prior to our entrance in the World War. This propaganda would have us believe that world civilization is to be destroyed if we fail to participate in the conflict. This is stupid propaganda, because world civilization will be destroyed much more quickly if we join the conflict. I make this statement deliberately, for civilization cannot be saved by having civilized powers engage in mutual destruction. It should be evident to all that the present world strife has been brought about for no other purpose except to deplete and weaken the ranks of the higher civilized nations.

It occurs to me that we should take time out to consider the underlying causes of this world unrest. Is it not possible that the present conflict is a deliberate attempt engineered by the forces within the invisible government to bring about destruction so that it may survive at the expense of civilization? It is for this reason that I advocate that we return to the fundamental principles of our Government in order to protect ourselves and our civilization.

In pursuing such course, we do not lend ourselves to unintelligent destruction of life and property, but can, instead, engage ourselves in intelligent reconstruction of our own country. There is not one good reason why we should sacrifice the lives of our people by joining any power which is now or may become involved in war. I am inclined to believe that our Executive will find better uses for his energy and advice at home than he will in wasting them in directing other rulers who seem to be quite capable of taking care of their own affairs.

Our present neutrality legislation was enacted by the Seventy-fourth and Seventy-fifth Congresses. It was sponsored by the present administration, passed by the same majority in Congress, and signed by the President. If it was good then, it is good now. At any rate, we must adhere to those principles we advocated 4 years ago, for any change made at this time will, without question, involve the United States in the present European conflict. I am even willing to go a little further than that, by making this statement: Congress should impeach and remove from office anyone found guilty of bringing about causes that may involve the United States in the present war.

Foreign Wars and Neutrality Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES F. BYRNES

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 28, 1939

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. KEY PITTMAN, OF NEVADA

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a speech delivered by the distinguished senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN] last evening on the subject of proposed neutrality legislation.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Fellow citizens of the radio audience of America, it is vitally important that you understand the attitude of your Congress toward foreign wars and the legislation that will be enacted by Congress at this special session. Numerous petitions and communications that have deluged Members of the Senate clearly demonstrate that these petitions are based either upon ignorance of the intent of Congress or are the result of vicious organized foreign propaganda. For instance, most of these communications contain similar demands such as "No cash and carry," "Don't repeal the embargo on arms, ammunition, and implements of war." Many of our citizens might even have been led to believe that it was the intention of the President to urge, and Congress to enact, a repeal of all neutrality legislation before the submission to the Foreign Relations Committee of the United States Senate the joint resolution proposed as a substitute for the House joint resolution, passed by the House at the last session of Congress. There exists now since the substitute proposal has been introduced, published in full in all of the great newspapers of the country and synopses of it in practically every paper of the United States, no reasonable excuse for any misunderstanding by any intelligent citizen of the United States or for the continuance of false propaganda.

It must now be evident from the message delivered by the President of the United States to the joint session of Congress on the 21st day of this month that the President is determined to use every power to keep this country out of a foreign war. It is evident from the plain language of that message that he willingly leaves to Congress the establishment of our policy and the form of legislation and that he will approve such legislation.

The proposed substitute joint resolution which I had the honor on behalf of the majority of the Foreign Relations Committee of the United States Senate to propose as a substitute for the House legislation does not repeal our neutrality legislation. On the contrary, by mandatory provisions, it vitally strengthens our neutrality legislation. The strongest provision in the proposed substitute is the carry provision. It is new and it is mandatory. It has never existed in any other law. It is known as section 2 (a). It says: "Whenever the President shall have issued a proclamation under the authority of section 1 (a)"—meaning when he shall have issued a proclamation that a state of war exists—"it shall thereafter be unlawful for any American vessel to carry any passengers or any articles or materials to any state named in such proclamation"—meaning by state any state that the President shall have proclaimed under section 1 (a) as being in a state of war. Now, what did the old cash-and-carry provision provide with regard to carry? It was found in section 2 (a)—and let us remember that this law expired by its own terms on May 1, 1939, and that there is now no law with regard to that subject. Section 2 (a) of the old law provided: "Whenever the President shall have issued a proclamation under the authority of section 1 of this act"—meaning the proclamation that a state of war exists—"and he shall thereafter find that the placing of restrictions on the shipment of certain articles or materials in addition to arms, ammunition, and implements of war from the United States to belligerent states * * * is necessary to promote the security or preserve the peace of the United States or to protect the lives of citizens of the United States, he shall so proclaim, and it shall thereafter be unlawful * * * for any American vessel to carry such articles or materials to any belligerent state * * *." It will be observed from a consideration of that language that absolute discretion was vested in the President as to whether he should permit our American ships to carry all kinds of articles and materials to a belligerent country, except arms, ammunition, and implements of war. He could permit our vessels to carry to belligerents scrap iron, steel, every kind of metal, oil, gasoline, cotton, and every other kind of raw material, because such materials are not described in existing law under the definition of arms, ammunition, and implements of war. These last-named articles were all described as contraband of war by the belligerents during the World War; that is, they were described as articles that would aid their enemy in the conduct of war and that, therefore, under international law, they could be confiscated or destroyed. The question as to whether they were going to the enemy or to a neutral the belligerent determined for itself, and there was no remedy during the existence of the war. Great Britain and Germany have already issued their contraband list for the present war. These lists are not limited to those few manufactured articles that we have defined as arms, ammunition, and implements of war; but they include the raw materials that the President now has the power to permit our vessels to carry to belligerents. From the actions of the German Government so far in the present war, it is conclusively evident that the German Government intends to pursue the same policy with regard to the submarining of neutral merchant vessels engaged in commerce with their enemy. I am satisfied that President Roosevelt would not permit American vessels to be destroyed with the consequent loss of the lives of our American seamen if carrying of any goods to belligerents would develop such results. However, section 2 (a) of the proposed substitute is intended to be a permanent law and to control every President that may ever be elected to office. What may be the sentiments, the prejudices, the soundness of judgment of future Presidents no one can know. Without regard, however, to these considerations, such vast and dangerous discretion is unnecessary and unwise.

It is urged that there were many contributory causes that led to our entry into the World War. Some contend that it was the result of extensive credits granted belligerents by citizens of the United States, while others allege that the munitions manufacturers inspired the sentiment that forced us into the war. I know that these alleged influences had no effect upon President Woodrow Wilson in asking for a declaration of war, or upon Congress in voting a declaration of war. I know from my knowledge of the sentiment of Congress at the time that we would not have entered the World War except for the establishment by Germany in February 1917 of its wide-flung war zone and the institution of unlimited submarine warfare, followed by the brutal taking of the lives of our American seamen on our merchant vessels. This zone extended way out to sea and covered practically all of the ports of Europe. It was impossible for any vessel to know when it had entered this zone. And yet in such proclamation Germany notified the world, including the United States, that it intended to sink without notice every vessel that entered that zone, whether neutral or not, whether engaged in trade with belligerents or with neutrals. This was contrary to all the precepts of international law that had been recognized for hundreds of years. Remember that at that time we had no neutrality legislation whatever, but were insisting upon our rights under international law. Between March 12 and April 2, 1917, when the President asked for the declaration of a state of war, 6 of our American merchant vessels were sunk with the loss of the lives of 63 of our American seamen. The patience of the American people was worn out. The patience of the President and of Congress ended. The Congress by an overwhelming vote declared that a state of war existed with Germany. If there lingers a doubt in the mind of any citizen as to the cause that forced us into the World War, let him read the able speeches that were made in Congress upon the war resolution. No more eloquent speech was made in favor of that resolution than was made by the distinguished Senator from Idaho, Senator WILLIAM E. BORAH. He based his vote for war, as is clearly shown in his great address, upon the destruction of the lives of our citizens upon the high seas in violation of our rights under international law. I cite this history because we hear and read remarks of Members of Congress and others outside of Congress asserting that President Roosevelt is leading us into the present war as they allege Woodrow Wilson led us into the World War. History challenges the statement that Woodrow Wilson led us into the World War. The circumstances, however, then existing and existing now are entirely different. Then we stood upon our rights on the high seas under the accepted precepts of international law. Today through the substitute joint resolution which I have offered in committee and which I know will be reported out by the Foreign Relations Committee, we intend to enact a law that will absolutely prohibit American vessels from engaging in any character of trade or commerce with belligerents. With regard to that provision, the President has no discretion or control. However, it may eventuate that some of the warring powers may proceed to submarine our vessels going to neutrals adjacent to their enemies on the grounds that the articles and materials going to such neutrals are moving into the enemy country. We cannot afford to lose the lives of our seamen for the consideration of this trade, even though under international law we would have a legal right to engage in such trade. We have granted to the President in such case the discretion from time to time to establish combat areas. In the event of such submarining, he would undoubtedly establish a combat area as to such adjacent neutral country. Remember that this authority is in addition to the absolute prohibition against American vessels so engaging in commerce with belligerents. If this law is enacted restricting the commerce of our American vessels that the lives of our seamen will be preserved, then no sufficient cause will exist to urge our Congress to permit this country to become involved in the European war.

And let us recall again that, under the Constitution, Congress, and Congress alone, has the power to declare war. Many of the polls that have been submitted in the country have asked the question, "Are you in favor of the repeal of neutrality laws?" Of course, very few are in favor of the repeal of the neutrality laws. The question itself conveys a wrong intimation of the issue. Congress has no intention of repealing the neutrality laws. The proposed substitute, which I believe will become law, greatly strengthens our neutrality law all along the line. It provides for the conveyance of title out of the American citizen to property that would be subject to destruction on the high seas. It thus eliminates this cause for controversy. I have already stated that it prevents our American vessels from carrying on any kind of trade or commerce with a belligerent. The proposed joint resolution further makes it unlawful for any citizen of the United States to travel on any vessel of any belligerent named in the President's proclamation as being in a state of war. It absolutely prohibits our American vessels engaged in foreign commerce to be armed. It reenacts and makes more mandatory the financial provisions of existing law. It prohibits the solicitation and the collection of funds by or on behalf of warring powers. It restricts the use of our ports by submarines and as a base of supply for belligerent war vessels. It grants to the President the power to restrict the use of our ports not only as to submarines and other war vessels of belligerents but even to armed merchantmen of belligerents. It strengthens the control of the National Munitions Control Board over arms, ammunition, and implements of war. It provides that the American Red Cross, under safe conduct granted by the belligerent powers, may charter American vessels and carry officers and American Red Cross personnel, medical personnel, and medical supplies, food and clothing, for the relief of human suffering. This is the proper way to carry such articles and such aid to the noncombatants of belligerent countries.

May I call attention to the fact also that we have greatly increased the penalties for the violation of section 2 (a) with regard to American ships, with regard to transportation in and through combat areas, and with regard to financial transactions. We not only make the owner of the ship liable to the penalty but in the case of a corporation or association or partnership we make the officers and directors of such corporation, association, or partnership liable to such penalty.

In other words, we have put teeth in our proposed neutrality law.

The only legitimate issue left is as to whether we should repeal the section of existing law providing for the embargo upon arms, ammunition, and implements of war as defined in the act. Now, under the universally accepted principles of international law from time immemorial belligerents have been permitted to purchase any kinds of articles or materials in any neutral country and all neutral countries have recognized this principle and do now recognize it except the United States. The prohibition against the export of arms, ammunition, and implements of war is the only departure from international law. The other provisions of existing law and of my proposed substitute are domestic legislation and not contrary to international law. We enacted the embargo law in the first place chiefly for the purpose of preventing the submarining of our American vessels. We should have known then, and we certainly know now, that belligerent governments

will consider it just as important to prevent those other materials not defined in the embargo act from reaching their enemy as the defined arms, ammunition, and implements of war. It is the destruction of the vessel with American citizens on board rather than the destruction of the property that arouses a war spirit in the United States. So we do not protect the lives of our citizens by the embargo on a few manufactured materials so long as we permit other contraband material to be transported on American vessels to belligerents. It is urged by the proponents of the embargo act that to sell arms, ammunition, and implements of war to belligerents is engaging in mass murder. Aren't we equally engaging in mass murder in Japan today by permitting to be shipped to Japan gasoline that runs their airplanes and scrap iron out of which they make their bombs with which to destroy the innocent population of China? Can anyone logically contend that oil and gasoline are not equally instruments of war with powder and other high explosives? And yet there is no prohibition against the export to any country, belligerent or not, of gasoline and scrap iron—in fact, of all the raw materials that I have named. It has been strenuously contended that to repeal the embargo would aid Great Britain and France because they are supposed to have control of the sea and because Germany has no way of getting such material into its country. But is this statement true now with regard to Germany? Russia may have been at war with Poland, although none of the belligerent powers have so declared. That war is practically over. Russia is not now at war with any country. None of the belligerents have declared that Russia is at war with any country. Under the embargo act Russia, not being at war, can legally import from the United States arms, ammunition, and implements of war as defined in the act. There is no law, either international or domestic, that prohibits Russia from retransporting these goods or substitutes therefor into Germany.

Russia has gold with which to buy such materials. Italy is not in a state of war with any country. Under our Embargo Act Italy may legally import arms, ammunition, and implements of war from the United States. There is no law, international or otherwise, which interferes with Italy's transporting such materials or substitutes for such materials into Germany. Ah, but it will be said that it is contrary to the embargo law to permit exports to a neutral country for reexport to a belligerent country. How can we determine these facts during war? It's impossible. But if we could determine these facts, what would there be to prevent Russia and Italy from retaining the arms, ammunition, and implements of war that we sent and sending into Germany arms, ammunition, and implements of war of their own manufacture? Is the President to declare that Russia is in a state of war so as to bring in force and effect the Embargo Act before Great Britain and France make such a declaration? It would probably be considered as a very unneutral and unfriendly act. Certainly no such declaration could be made with regard to Italy. Germany has an opportunity to obstruct on the high seas arms, ammunition, and implements of war imported by Great Britain and France. Great Britain and France have no opportunity to intercept arms, ammunition, and implements of war moving either from Russia or to Italy into Germany. But how about the small peaceful countries of the world? They have few factories for the manufacture of arms, ammunition, and implements of war. They have depended upon international law to be able to purchase such material from neutral countries when war is brought to them. Is not the helplessness of the small, peaceful countries of Europe now apparent? This country cannot remain neutral so long as the Embargo Act remains on our statute books.

The Congress of the United States has no intention of permitting our country to become involved in that European war. The Congress of the United States intends to remove every cause that might impel it to declare war. If a belligerent country imposes upon us by conducting warfare in our coastal waters, we will repel such impositions. It's not necessary that we go any further. If by reason of these acts of safety upon the part of our Government any government were so foolish—and I do not believe any government would be foolish—as to declare war against us, it would not injure us but it would eventually destroy the government that made such declaration. Our strategy would not be to send our soldiers to fight abroad. We would conquer through our economic and financial power and through our indomitable Navy.

America's Attitude Toward the War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 28, 1939

RADIO ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the notable address delivered by the President of the United States on the evening of September 3, 1939, following the outbreak of hostilities in Europe. The address was broadcast throughout the Nation.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

Tonight my single duty is to speak to the whole of America.

Until 4:30 this morning I had hoped against hope that some miracle would prevent a devastating war in Europe and bring to an end the invasion of Poland by Germany.

For 4 long years a succession of actual wars and constant crises have shaken the entire world and have threatened in each case to bring on the gigantic conflict which is today unhappily a fact.

It is right that I should recall to your minds the consistent and at times successful efforts of your Government in these crises to throw the full weight of the United States into the cause of peace. In spite of spreading wars I think that we have every right and every reason to maintain as a national policy the fundamental moralities, the teachings of religion, and the continuation of efforts to restore peace—for some day, though the time may be distant, we can be of even greater help to a crippled humanity.

It is right, too, to point out that the unfortunate events of these recent years have been based on the use of force or the threat of force. And it seems to me clear, even at the outbreak of this great war, that the influence of America should be consistent in seeking for humanity a final peace which will eliminate, as far as it is possible to do so, the continued use of force between nations.

It is, of course, impossible to predict the future. I have my constant stream of information from American representatives and other sources throughout the world. You, the people of this country, are receiving news through your radios and your newspapers at every hour of the day.

You are, I believe, the most enlightened and the best informed people in all the world at this moment. You are subjected to no censorship of news, and I want to add that your Government has no information which it has any thought of withholding from you.

At the same time, as I told my press conference on Friday, it is of the highest importance that the press and the radio use the utmost caution to discriminate between actual verified fact on the one hand, and mere rumor on the other.

I can add to that by saying that I hope the people of this country will also discriminate most carefully between news and rumor. Do not believe of necessity everything you hear or read. Check up on it first.

You must master at the outset a simple but unalterable fact in modern foreign relations. When peace has been broken anywhere, peace of all countries everywhere is in danger.

It is easy for you and me to shrug our shoulders and say that conflicts taking place thousands of miles from the continental United States; and, indeed, the whole American Hemisphere—do not seriously affect the Americas, and that all the United States has to do is to ignore them and go about our own business. Passionately though we may desire detachment, we are forced to realize that every word that comes through the air, every ship that sails the sea, every battle that is fought does affect the American future.

Let no man or woman thoughtlessly or falsely talk of America sending its armies to European fields. At this moment there is being prepared a proclamation of American neutrality. This would have been done even if there had been no neutrality statute on the books, for this proclamation is in accordance with international law and with American policy.

This will be followed by a proclamation required by the existing Neutrality Act. I trust that in the days to come our neutrality can be made a true neutrality.

It is of the utmost importance that the people of this country, with the best information in the world, think things through. The most dangerous enemies of American peace are those who, without well-rounded information on the whole broad subject of the past, the present, and the future, undertake to speak with authority, to talk in terms of glittering generalities, to give to the Nation assurances or prophecies which are of little present or future value.

I myself cannot and do not prophesy the course of events abroad, and the reason is that because I have of necessity such a complete picture of what is going on in every part of the world. I do not dare to do so. And the other reason is that I think it is honest for me to be honest with the people of the United States.

I cannot prophesy the immediate economic effect of this new war on our Nation, but I do say that no American has the moral right to profiteer at the expense either of his fellow citizens or of the men, women, and children who are living and dying in the midst of war in Europe.

Some things we do know. Most of us in the United States believe in spiritual values. Most of us, regardless of what church we belong to, believe in the spirit of the New Testament—a great teaching, which opposes itself to the use of force, of armed force, of marching armies and falling bombs. The overwhelming masses of our people seek peace—peace at home, and the kind of peace in other lands which will not jeopardize peace at home.

We have certain ideas and ideals of national safety and we must act to preserve that safety today and to preserve the safety of our children in future years.

That safety is and will be bound up with the safety of the Western Hemisphere and of the seas adjacent thereto. We seek to keep war from our firesides by keeping war from coming to the Americas. For that we have historic precedent that goes back to the days of the administration of President George Washington. It

is serious enough and tragic enough to every American family in every State in the Union to live in a world that is torn by wars on other continents. Today they affect every American home. It is our national duty to use every effort to keep them out of the Americas.

And at this time let me make the simple plea that partisanship and selfishness be adjourned, and that national unity be the thought that underlies all others.

This Nation will remain a neutral nation, but I cannot ask that every American remain neutral in thought as well. Even a neutral has a right to take account of facts. Even a neutral cannot be asked to close his mind or his conscience.

I have said—not once, but many times—that I have seen war and that I hate war. I say that again and again.

I hope the United States will keep out of this war. I believe that it will. And I give you assurances that every effort of your Government will be directed toward that end.

As long as it remains within my power to prevent, there will be no black-out of peace in the United States.

Neutrality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUSH D. HOLT

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 28, 1939

LETTER BY HON. RUSH D. HOLT

Mr. HOLT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD a letter I have written in regard to the proposed Neutrality Act.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR.

DEAR FRIEND: West Virginians may be sure that I will not cast my vote in the Senate to take us into war either through the front or back door. No issue since I have been in public life affects me more deeply than this one we are now confronting. I have always been in favor of strict neutrality.

I have condemned and do condemn nazi-ism, fascism, communism and all other isms which run counter to Americanism. We must not let our prejudices, our dislikes, dictate a course that will take us into this conflict. As Colonel Lindbergh said: "We are likely to lose a million men, possibly several million—the best of American youth." He meant your sons, your friends, your neighbors.

To those who want us to take sides, I say, let them be sincere. They can offer their services to the country of their choice. Do not have them sit back in comfort and ask others to die in ghastly "No Man's Land." Let them go if they want to but do not let them try to force others. Be careful of those who want to help other nations but who will stay at home as $1-a-year men or who are ineligible to serve in the Army.

The President in his speech to Congress wants us to get profits from sales to the belligerents. He said:

"From a purely material point of view, what is the advantage to us in sending all manner of articles across the ocean for final processing there when we could give employment to thousands by doing it here? Incidentally, and again from the material point of view, by such employment we automatically aid our own national defense."

Yet, in a speech at Chautauqua, N. Y., in August 1936, the President said:

"It is clear that our present policy and the measures passed by the Congress would, in the event of a war on some other continent, reduce war profits which would otherwise accrue to American citizens."

He now desires to repeal the very measure that reduced such war profits. The President continued:

"Industrial and agricultural production for a war market may give immense fortunes to a few men; for the Nation as a whole it produces disaster. It was the prospect of war profits that made our farmers in the West plow up prairie land that should never have been plowed, but should have been left for grazing cattle. Today we are reaping the harvest of those war profits in the dust storms which have devastated those war-plowed areas.

"It was the prospect of war profits that caused the extension of monopoly and unjustified expansion of industry and a price level so high that the normal relationship between debtor and creditor was destroyed.

"Nevertheless, if war should break out again in another continent, let us not blink the fact that we would find in this country thousands of Americans who, seeking immediate riches—fool's gold—would attempt to break down or evade our neutrality.

"They would tell you—and, unfortunately, their views would get wide publicity—that if they could produce and ship this and that and the other article to belligerent nations, the unemployed of America would all find work. They would tell you that if they could extend credit to warring nations that credit would be used in the United States to build homes and factories and pay our debts. They would tell you that America once more would capture the trade of the world.

"It would be hard to resist that clamor; it would be hard for many Americans, I fear to look beyond—to realize that inevitable penalties, the inevitable day of reckoning, that comes from a false prosperity. To resist the clamor of that greed, if war should come, would require the unswerving support of all Americans who love peace.

"If we face the choice of profits or peace, the Nation will answer—must answer—'We choose peace.'"

What better argument against cash and carry? Build our prosperity on war! Build our prosperity on the dead, wounded, and shell-shocked youth of the world! They say we can make a profit. Profit for whom? Not for the boys who go into the trenches as cannon fodder for a dollar a day. You hear it said, "We can't stay out." Why? We can stay out. We can't if we are going to chase profits. The choice is clear—profits or peace. I cast my lot with those who want peace.

What does this profit mean? Profits for days, depressions for years. Fool's gold, the President said in 1936. Why is it different in 1939?

Let's have a strong national defense, powerful enough to protect us from all foes, but let's make our line of defense on the American hemisphere—not in Europe and Asia.

Cash and carry. Cash for whom? Not the average American but cash for a chosen few. The American boys will follow the American munitions into the trenches. We cannot afford to become international gun peddlers.

I, for one, will not cast my vote for a plan that means intervention in the quarrels and wars of Europe. I will not cast my vote for our entrance into this war, either through the front or back door.

Sincerely,

RUSH D. HOLT.

Neutrality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE M. REED

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 28, 1939

EDITORIAL FROM THE PARSONS (KANS.) SUN

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD some editorial expressions from my own newspaper relating to the subject of Neutrality.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Parsons (Kans.) Sun of August 11, 1939]

KEEPING OUT OF WAR

If a Senator can judge from his mail, there are more people interested in "keeping the United States out of war" than any other question. At least I have received more letters and petitions upon that subject than any other.

Taken all together the opinions expressed make a queer collection, full of inconsistencies. Some of those who write earnestly urge that the Congress vote to keep the peace, but they want somebody to lick Hitler and/or Japan. So do I. I don't care who licks either or both of them, but I do not see how we can help do it and, at the same time, stay out of war. Or how we can take sides, even before a European conflict may break out and not finally be drawn into war.

We are part of the big world, of course. And the world is not so big as it used to be, from the viewpoint of communication, which has become instantaneous, and of transportation, which has been so quickened as to bring us close together. Maybe we just can't stay out of these wars and threats of wars, but at least I want to try to do so. If we could settle all the questions once and for all time by engaging in a war it might be worth while. At least we could consider the idea. We went into a great—the greatest of all wars, once to make the "world safe for democracy" and did nothing of the kind. So I'm reluctant to even edge into situations on the other sides of oceans and of the world. And that is just the effect that would come from following the suggestions of a majority of the letters a Senator receives—even if the writer did not desire it so. The trouble is that the writers do not follow through on the implications of their written words.

President Roosevelt had a quarrel with Congress about laws concerning neutrality, and at Hyde Park this week petulantly

charged the Congress with toying with the fate of some billion and a half of people. Quite a lot. At least half the people of the world.

The trouble with our President is that he looks upon his own notions as final and indisputable. The Congress does not concede that. There were a dozen bills or resolutions introduced into the two Houses of Congress this last session. Finally, a joint resolution was prepared in the Department of State which reflected the Roosevelt administration policy. It was termed a "neutrality" measure. It was nothing of the kind. It was a "Presidential discretion" bill. As the Christian Science Monitor (incidentally about the fairest, ablest, and most impartial commentator on domestic and world politics) accurately stated, "that anyone who waded through the Bloom resolution (and the writer did) came out with the feeling that it was a measure intended to give whomever was President virtually unlimited discretion in the conduct of foreign affairs during a period of war in foreign countries." The so-called Bloom bill, written in the State Department and backed by the President, was just that. The House of Representatives would not take it as introduced and the Senate would not have received and passed it had the House done so. When it came to the Senate in amended form, with which the Senate did not completely agree, it was laid over until the next session.

The trouble with President Roosevelt is that he wants complete authority to do as he chooses if a war breaks out in Europe. He will not be given that degree of authority or discretion. Both Houses of Congress are determined upon that. Rightly or wrongly, the Congress has other ideas upon that subject. The Constitution gives the last word to Congress, not the President, and the latter is to exercise the power and carry out the policy laid down by the legislative body.

And the Congress intends to do just that—whether President Roosevelt likes it or not. Under existing law he could, in his discretion, have found a state of war existing, even though undeclared, between China and Japan any time this last year or so—which automatically would have cut off export of munitions of war, and, perhaps, some war materials. He did not choose to exert that discretionary power. I am not quarreling with him for not doing so. Maybe it was better to do as we have done.

But, in the face of such facts, the Congress does not like the President to scold it and lay all responsibility on its shoulders just because it would not enact a new law which would give him almost complete authority to do as he should choose. And in that conclusion I agree. I helped to reach it.

CLYDE M. REED.

[From the Parsons (Kans.) Sun of August 12, 1939]

WHAT IS NEUTRALITY?

Sometimes I have trouble in making up my mind whether I dislike Hitler or the Japs the more. Japan is savage and barbarous in its attack upon China, but one can account for Japan. Maybe somebody can fairly appraise Hitler—but I can't. I thought at first that he was a "snake doctor" sort and would soon blow up. He obviously isn't the first, and he hasn't as yet blown up. So I was mistaken in my early estimate. So let us discuss Hitler as a phenomenon which very much disturbs the world.

In appraising Hitler one must first consider that France and French continental European policy gave him his chance and made it possible for him to do what he has done. The Versailles Treaty was an impossible thing. Realists Lloyd George and Clemenceau helped themselves while idealist Woodrow Wilson had his head in the clouds. That is where the present condition in Europe stems from.

France made a series of military and financial alliances with a ring of small countries around Germany that gave it almost complete control of continental Europe (France furnishing the money). The German Government in the years following the Versailles blunder or crime was choked to death, and the Germans were shamed by repression and humiliated through being treated as an inferior people, all for the glory and what the French thought was necessary to their security of France. Great Britain had its doubts of that policy, but it had grabbed off, with the consent and aid of France, all that it wanted, and so it kept still.

What Hitler has since done to France, Great Britain, and to Europe is plenty and then some. Not since Napoleon has Europe seen so dominant a figure, and it must be said for Hitler that he has accomplished his ends without war, while the great Napoleon made the whole of Europe a field of battle.

Now—

Has the United States of America a duty to take up the burden and go to war, for that would be the outcome, to mend the damage done by stupid and short-sighted policies of Great Britain and France? Selfish policies, also. At no time was either nation ever thinking about anything except its immediate interests. Certainly they gave us no thought while all this was being done. France used enough money to finance its continental allies to have made a part payment, at least, upon its debt to the United States of America. Great Britain refused to get excited about the rape of Manchuria by Japan, back in 1931, while the United States of America, through Hoover and Stimson, almost got us into war. Great Britain is now greatly concerned about the Asiatic situation—some 8 years too late.

Is it up to the United States of America to mend blunders of timidity or short-sightedness, or both?

My answer, in both and all such situations, is, "No." Europe has been fighting over boundary lines and power policies and trade spheres and racial jealousies for a thousand years. It will be doing so for the next thousand years, so far as anyone now can say. There is no essential difference between the present sequence of events and the results than can be found a score or maybe 50 times in the last 10 centuries of European history. Only the names of the actors are different.

I'm not a pacifist. I'm not even an isolationist. I know quite a number of good people who are honestly one or the other. I'm willing for the United States of America to defend itself and do whatever is wise for us to do and help the peace of the world—as much as we can.

But I'm not willing to send American boys across the sea—either the Atlantic or the Pacific—if we can avoid it. And I think we can if we will attend to our own business. Of course, if we give way to a desire to engage in power politics of either Europe or Asia or allow our emotions to control our foreign policy, we will get into war. Make no mistake about that. But, as I said before, not with my vote in the Senate.

CLYDE M. REED.

[From the Parsons (Kans.) Sun of August 23, 1939]

"POWER POLITICS" IN EUROPE

The old game of "power politics" goes on in Europe. Events of the last 48 hours have developed some possible new combinations and, maybe, put some of the older ones into the discard. But there is no change in either principle or practice. The players are the same. The game is like it has been played for a thousand years. Only the names of the actors and the particular way of grouping and moving the pawns are different.

Russia startled the world. But this little country newspaper in this column Monday, 12 hours ahead of the public announcement of the Soviet-Nazi agreement, suggested that maybe the British and French military staffs had got to Moscow too late. We had no inside information. Certainly there was uncertainty about what Russia might do.

Readers of history know that there was a time when France, England, and Russia were enemies. The British and French fought the Russians in the Crimean War. Then France made a pact with Russia, although it was still the enemy of Britain. But in the World War the three nations fought on the same side.

Italy was one of the triple alliance, Germany and Austria being the other members, before the Great War. But Italy went over to the other side during the war. France and Great Britain double-crossed Italy in the Versailles Treaty arrangements. Italy has been, naturally, sore ever since. Mussolini joined up with Hitler.

Hitler and Mussolini have rung all the changes on their "anti-Communist" pact. They have blazoned their dislike of Russia and the present Russian economic system to the world day in and day out for years. They have pretended to be the "protector" of western Europe against communism. Now they join up with it—as present information goes. (This is written Tuesday evening, after the day's news is in. What another day will bring is quite another and uncertain thing.)

For quite a long period Great Britain and Japan were allies. In recent years they have become enemies. Today the Japs hate the British more than they do any other people—and show it.

One could write along this line, mentioning the changing lines of the quarrels of Europe, of the shifting alliances, of the various combinations almost without end. But what's the use? Anyone who reads history knows about these things. The only occasion for any wonder is when anybody in this country thinks we should undertake to play any part in European "power politics." The trouble is that some people do think so, and some of these people are in high places of authority. Such men and women are using their emotions and not their reasoning power or a knowledge of history.

The best and only real friend that the United States of America has so far as European boundary line and racial disputes are concerned is the Atlantic Ocean. It is 3,000 miles wide and will keep us out of European quarrels if we will only let it do so. The writer favors using our best protector for all it is worth. In the light of the last week, the last year, the last 20 years, where is there room for any hope that we have any duty to participate in the "power politics" of Europe; have any possible gain from doing so; could possibly keep out of war if we did interfere on either side?

Great Britain and France, world empires, are differently situated. They have different interests from the United States of America, play their hand differently because they have different cards. France in recent years has been a lot more realistic and sensible where its own interests are concerned than has Great Britain. The foreign policy of the British for 10 years has been feeble, unwise, not to say stupid. Between those two countries since the Versailles Treaty was signed Europe has been brought into its present condition.

It is not our quarrel—any part of it. There is no gain for us to take any hand in any degree or choose up sides as between combinations of nations which change as do the "power" combinations of Europe. We must have none of it. In that way, and in that way only, can we keep out of war.

CLYDE M. REED.

[From the Parsons (Kans.) Sun of August 26, 1939]

THE DRUMS OF WAR

The drums of war are sounding again in Europe. Another of those periodical outbreaks because of boundary lines is occurring. Again it is the desire of a ruler to aggrandize himself first, and secondly, his country. Adolf Hitler, only so recently an Austrian house painter,

now the unpredictable dictator of Germany and the German race, is loosing forces that may possibly engulf all Europe before peace can again come. As this is written what are called "flashes" in newspaper offices are coming from various places across the Atlantic. They are the first sparks of what may be a great conflagration. Only the hours to follow this writing will tell the tale.

This is one of the age-old boundary-line quarrels. They have been happening in Europe for a thousand years. They may be happening for the next thousand years—so far as the writer can tell. There is nothing in the attitude of any of the powers of Europe to give hope that all of them are not as selfish, sordid, and short-sighted as they always have been. That includes Great Britain and France, the so-called democracies. If forced to take sides, the writer would prefer them to their enemies, but the United States of America will not take sides in the war, directly or indirectly, with the writer's vote in the Senate. But he is only 1 of 96.

Twenty-five years ago this month a war that became the World War began. The United States entered in 1917. In the intervening period we had sold one side great quantities of supplies; our munition factories were humming; Great Britain, France, and their allied countries owed us great sums; our citizens had traveled on armed foreign ships, some of which were attacked and sunk; our own commercial vessels traveled through the war zones carrying supplies, sometimes to neutrals, sometimes to belligerents; some of them were sunk; our country was flooded with propaganda from every conceivable source; our President was constantly writing notes instead of keeping our citizens off of foreign ships and our own ships out of sea war zones.

Our emotions were being constantly whipped up until finally an overwhelming demand of the country took us into war. The men in Congress—Senate and House—who voted against going into the war were almost ostracized. Ordinary criticism was not enough in those days of frenzy. We were told that a war was being fought "to make the world safe for democracy."

That was a first experience for this country. There is always a "first time," and any man, woman, or nation may fairly be allowed one mistake. That was our mistake as a nation.

This time we should know better. There is no war for or against "democracy" now imminent. It is a war over boundary lines and being fought by rival "powers" for their own selfish ends. No one of them is concerned about us—or our interests.

If war comes, there will be floods of propaganda loosed again. Once more our factories will have a chance to run day and night (if the war lasts long enough). But this time we have the lesson of a quarter of a century to light our way. This is not the "first time." This time, if we get into war, we cannot make any excuse.

The writer's creed is quite simple. It is in the words of Benjamin Franklin "to attend to our own business." That, in the writer's opinion, includes:

Avoid taking sides; avoid trying to pick out "aggressor" and discriminate against any nation as such; keep our citizens off foreign vessels, except as they travel at their own risk; keep our commercial vessels out of sea war zones, except they enter at their own peril; for anything that we sell to any combatant, potential war supplies or articles of peaceful commerce, collect in cash at our own ports and require that the title pass in those ports and that such things be transported by the purchaser at his risk.

Doing those things will, the writer believes, keep us out of war. Doing them would have done so in 1916 and 1917. We didn't do them. We were drawn into the war.

I am for whatever is necessary for the defense of America, but not one dollar to lend, or give, any European nation engaged in war. Either in a special or the coming regular session, my vote will be cast to carry out the policy outlined above. At the end of the last session a majority of both Houses of Congress held those beliefs. Possibly propaganda and waves of emotion may change some Members. I do not know. But I repeat here my pledge to my fellow citizens of Kansas that I will not vote to send an American soldier across the sea to fight over a European boundary line. No matter what other men may do, that I will not do.

CLYDE M. REED.

[From the Parsons (Kans.) Sun of September 19, 1939]

THE SPECIAL SESSION

Day after tomorrow the Congress of the United States will meet in extraordinary session. President Roosevelt exercised the prerogative of the Executive and called Congress to meet at noon Thursday to deal with foreign policy in the light of the war in Europe.

Most of the discussion among citizens in general, including letters written to their Senators and Members of Congress, revolves around whether we shall retain the embargo feature of the present so-called neutrality law or go to a cash-and-carry system of making supplies available for belligerent nations. The interest people take is indicated by the fact that 168 letters were received in one morning's mail in the last few days, about 80 of which were written to give the opinion of the person writing on a neutrality policy.

Despite what has been printed in the newspapers about neutrality laws, existing and proposed, there is much confusion in the minds of people who write and people who come to talk with the writer of this column. Let some of that uncertainty be cleared away.

At the present time there is no national law which places any restriction upon the sale and export of anything to any foreign nation except "arms, munitions, and implements of war." That is to say, rifles, machine guns, cannon, etc., in the arms classification; shells, shrapnel, powder, poison gases, bombs, torpedoes, grenades, etc., in the munitions class; vessels of war, airplanes designed for war purposes, tanks, armored vehicles, submarines, etc., in the implements of war category. When a state of war is declared, these things are automatically forbidden to be exported to belligerents.

Up to May 1, 1939, there was a provision in the law which gave the President power to place restrictions upon the export of war materials after a state of war had been found to exist. These materials included petroleum, steel, iron, copper, etc. There was no absolute or automatic embargo, but the President, in his discretion, could issue a proclamation finding a state of war existed, in which case their export would be unlawful. President Roosevelt has never used that discretionary power to limit sale and shipment of such materials to Japan.

The authority over "materials" given the President expired by limitation May 1 of this year and was not extended. Those materials are open to export without restriction at the present time.

There is no time limitation as to the embargo on arms, munitions, and implements of war. President Roosevelt wants that embargo removed or made discretionary with him. That matter of "discretion" is one of the bitter disputes between Franklin D. Roosevelt and those who do not care to vest unlimited discretion in any President of any party.

The people who write to or talk with this writer mostly assume that whether the United States of America stays out of or enters the war now raging depends greatly upon whether we continue the present embargo feature of the law or whether a "cash and carry" system is substituted therefor. Congressional and other proponents of the present law give room for this belief with their public statements and speeches. This writer does not subscribe to that view.

It is the firm belief of this writer that whether the United States of America enters into or stays out of the present war depends not upon whether we keep the present embargo or substitute a cash-and-carry provision for it, but upon the will of the people of this country and their elected spokesmen to stay out. The method of exporting what we do export is, to this writer, a detail. Important detail but not controlling. There is much wild talk on both sides of this question.

If the United States of America, through its people and its legislators, determines to stay out, and has the will to stay out, in spite of propaganda and emotion, we will stay out no matter whether we operate under the embargo or the cash-and-carry method. We can get in or can stay out no matter which plan is in the law.

This writer leans quite definitely to the cash-and-carry method as being more consistent and logical national policy to permanently follow. But not because he thinks that either policy will put us in or keep us out of war. That depends upon what we will to do.

So far as this writer's will goes, it is to stay out.

CLYDE M. REED.

Constitution Sunday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. DAVIS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 28, 1939

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. JAMES J. DAVIS, OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by me in behalf of Constitution Sunday over the Blue Network of the National Broadcasting Co., September 16, 1939.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The observance of Constitution Sunday has come out of an increasing realization of the part that religion bears as the fundamental and abiding basis of government in our country. The men who formulated the principles of the Constitution of the United States represented a biblical tradition. They believed in the rule of God in the lives of men as transcendent over any earthly power. They had witnessed the tyranny of princes and kings in the Old World and wanted none of it here.

Last year, together with others, I was active in asking for the observance of Constitution Sunday, September 18. This year I received numerous petitions from eminent clergymen, distinguished scholars, representatives of fraternal and patriotic orders, and others, asking that I introduce legislation to designate Sunday immediately preceeding September 17 of each year as Constitution Sunday. Early in the session of the Seventy-sixth Congress I introduced Senate Joint Resolution 100 for this purpose and it was referred to the Senate Library Committee. No hearings have been held on it as yet, but I am hoping that constructive action will be taken when Congress is again convened. Affirmative action on Senate Joint Resolution 100 will place this national observance of the

Constitution near the date each year when, at Philadelphia in 1787, George Washington and his compatriots in free government placed their signatures on the historic document.

This year September 17 has come on Sunday. A committee of eminent religious leaders has been formed to sponsor the exercises of today at the New York World's Fair. The President of the United States has graciously written his belief in the fundamental purpose of this occasion. The Governors of many States from Maine to California have issued proclamations asking citizens to observe it. Special services are being conducted at West Point and Annapolis. The interest developed has been most gratifying. Hereafter, it is our hope that Constitution Sunday will be observed regularly in September of every year.

One of the most important features of this day, as I think of it, is the gathering together of young Americans, coming to the age of 21, for an appropriate recognition of the new responsibilities of citizenship which have recently come to them. Every community in the United States should have some observance of these civic obligations in behalf of their youth. Constitution Sunday presents such an opportunity.

The heart of America is pleading for peace in a world that has been set on fire with the spirit of hatred and war. The Constitution is our surest bulwark of peace. In a day when as Americans we are seeking in every possible way to keep our country free from war, it is well that we remind ourselves of the glorious principles of toleration and balanced government which are set forth in this charter of our liberties. For these are the principles which have constituted the abiding protection for the rights of minority groups in our land, permitting them to live peaceably here without surrendering their right as free citizens in our Republic to differ with their neighbors according to their individual conscience.

The liberty we so greatly prize finds its roots in the free conscience of each individual citizen. This liberty is safeguarded in the Bill of Rights of our Constitution. Against it in the past have come in vain all the forces of mass greed and oppression which seek to subject the individual to the domination of the all-powerful state. Our united prayer today is that we may ever be kept in liberty and peace.

We seek for ourselves under the Constitution a continuation of the free expression of opinion which is now possible in this country as in no other in the world. We desire the right to say frankly and fully that we do not want war. We do not want to become embroiled in foreign strife. We do not want to be under the domination of foreign ideals of government. We wish to live peaceably together in this free land under the guidance of the Almighty.

I do not fear the flood tides of propaganda that sweep over this country as long as all sides are given equal opportunity to be heard. The Constitution guarantees free speech to all our citizens, not just a privileged few. We seek to uphold the right of every citizen to petition the Government and to be heard. Only so can the cause of peace be served for any settlement of our national judgment on the issues of peace or war which is based on half truths or one-sided statements cannot endure. If the time shall ever come when public opinion is muzzled in America, we shall be on the way to war.

Irresistably our country is being drawn to the determination of one central issue—the free right to work. The supreme challenge of the present age to our people is to put the Nation to work without putting ourselves into war. War comes when men are restless, discontented, and unemployed. It has been so in Europe. Unless we create a new spirit of work in America, we are in danger of riding into the spirit of war from which there shall be no turning back. War is destructive; work is constructive. War is based on hatred; work is based on cooperation. War destroys life and property; work builds life and property. War breeds through propaganda; work builds through truth. America wants none of war and more of work. Loyal adherence to the spirit of faith in God and man which is embodied in the Constitution of the United States will open up new fields of work and save us from the menace of war. If I understand the heart of the American people, I say America wants work—not war.

The Constitution of the United States is your Constitution. It belongs to you as a sovereign citizen. It is the American proof that every voting citizen is a ruler in this land. The Constitution is not the property of the Congress, the Supreme Court, or the President. Its fundamental law can be extended and enlarged through legislative enactment, defined and interpreted by the Court and administered by the President, but only through constitutional amendment, as provided in the document itself, can the basic law be abrogated or denied. I believe in the citizen's full power over himself, the Congress, the Court, the President, and the Constitution itself. It is your Constitution.

I do not believe in the Constitution simply because of its age or the veneration of tradition which surrounds it. I believe in the Constitution because it represents the highest ideal of government of, for, and by the people in an evenly balanced way. The maintenance of balance and the distribution of power in our modern life, whether it be the relation of labor to industry, industry to agriculture, or of the States to the Nation is of fundamental importance.

Defend and protect the Constitution as you would the purity and privacy of your own home. Uphold the Constitution because you require freedom of speech, press, organization, work, and religion. Stand by the Constitution because it maintains your sovereign right as a citizen. Encourage constitutional government because it serves as a safeguard against tyranny and oppression.

I wish to invite all who are listening in and other friends of the radio audience living in New York City to join us at the World's Fair in the Court of Peace tomorrow afternoon at 3 o'clock. At that time a program of unusual interest and distinction will be provided, and I am sure you will enjoy it if it is possible for you to be there. I urge you to come in the name of peace and the Constitution. I especially invite the young men and women of this metropolitan area who have come to the age of responsible citizenship to join with me in the Court of Peace for the observance of Constitution Sunday. By coming you will say, "I believe in peace. I am determined that we shall keep the peace under the Constitution of the United States."

I wish to invite my friends of the radio audience living beyond the metropolitan boundaries of New York City who may not find it possible to come to the Court of Peace tomorrow to send me word if you believe in the principles of Constitution Sunday as I have briefly presented them to you. If you believe as I do that the true basis of government in this land is the rule of God in the lives of our citizens, I should like to hear from you. For there is strength in numbers. Today we share a common cause—the cause of all America—the cause of peace and brotherhood under the Stars and Stripes. We are proud of this land; we are proud of its vast resources, its mines, forests, fields, its mountains, and broad, flowing rivers. We are proud of our youth—our young men and women—proud of their courage, their spirit of optimism, and their love for peace. This is the time to keep alive our pride in America—this America of ours, thank God, still in liberty and at peace.

Frances Willard Centennial Total Abstinence Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNN J. FRAZIER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 28, 1939

STATEMENT BY DR. A. C. JACKSON

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. President, this is the one hundredth anniversary of the birth of Frances E. Willard. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a portion of a statement by Dr. Arthur Charles Jackson, of Portland, Maine, president of the Frances Willard Centennial Total Abstinence Society; and I wish to state that the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. SHEPPARD] is to broadcast an address tonight on the life of Frances E. Willard.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FRANCES WILLARD CENTENNIAL TOTAL ABSTINENCE SOCIETY

(Arthur Charles Jackson, president, Portland, Maine)

September 28, 1939, is the centennial anniversary of the birth of Frances E. Willard, one of the noblest women of all time, as well as one of the greatest of any age or nation.

The story of her faith in the conquest of evil by good should be a mighty inspiration, alike to old and young of this and succeeding generations.

The Master's message was at once her guaranty and her command. The Bible was to her, in very truth, divine.

What immeasurable and increasing influence that book has wielded over the minds of men and women and the destiny of the world.

If it be the word of God, as we profoundly believe, surely it comes to human ears and understanding with all the dignity and peace and power that His word should command. If it be the work of man, then even the doubter must admit that the ancient Hebrews had miraculous skill to cast a spell across millenniums which, strengthening with the years, spreads wider today than ever and embraces the future as far as even the eye of imagination can behold. Not all invention, or all statesmanship, or all of literature have so touched and bettered human life as this one book. And it was the Bible that gave Frances Willard her mission, her strength, her hope, her argument, and her inspiration.

Thus prepared and thus equipped she went out into the world and to her work. No method can measure what she did. The half million of women whom she brought into organized cooperation in the Woman's Christian Temperance Union is but a suggestion of the real results of her activities. Indeed, the highest benefits her life bestowed were as intangible as air and as full of life. She made purer the moral atmosphere of a continent—almost of a world. She rendered the life of a nation cleaner, the mind of a people saner. Millions of homes today are happier for her; millions of wives and mothers bless her; and countless children have grown into strong, upright, and beautiful maturity who, but for the work of Frances Willard, might have been forever soiled and weakened.

* * * * * * *

Let us cherish the memory, the sweetness, and light of Frances Willard—St. Frances of Evanston—by imitating, insofar as we are able, her beautiful life and service.

We believe that every child of God, of whatever age, race, or religion, should have a right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, unmenaced and unpolluted by the frightful evils of the liquor traffic—a traffic regarded by millions of Christian men and women all around the world as one of, if not the deadliest enemy of the human race.

Partisanship in War Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, September 28, 1939

STATEMENT BY HON. FRANK KNOX

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement entitled "Knox Foreswears Partisanship in War Crisis." The reference, of course, is to Hon. Frank Knox, who is the editor and publisher of the Chicago Daily News.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KNOX FORSWEARS PARTISANSHIP IN WAR CRISIS—FEELS EDITORS WILL DO LIKEWISE—INSPIRED BY CONFERENCE WITH F. D. R.

WASHINGTON, September 21.—The current world crisis calls upon editors for "an inspiring, nonpolitical discharge of the very great responsibility they bear," counseled Col. Frank Knox, president and publisher of the Chicago Daily News, here at the invitation of President Roosevelt to advise on questions of national peace and security.

RESPONSIBILITY CAN'T BE EXAGGERATED

Predicting an alertness on the part of the press to perform its patriotic duty, he expressed confidence that editors will prove themselves to be "Americans first, and Democrats or Republicans or what not afterward."

At the Washington office of his newspaper, just as Congress was being convened in special session at noon today, Colonel Knox said:

"It is impossible to aggravate the gravity of the present world situation. It is an accomplished and recognized fact that the Soviet and Nazi Governments have pooled their interests under a secret agreement. There is no other possible interpretation of developments in eastern Europe. The world is dominated by a concentration of the manpower of Russia and Germany, the natural resources of Russia, and the German military skill in leadership.

"It is not a prospect at which we can look without a feeling of grave concern for the future.

"It ought to sober our thinking in America and relegate selfish partisanship to the background. Facing such a situation here, where we still have a free press, the magnitude of responsibility borne by newspapers cannot be exaggerated.

"Personally, so long as this situation persists, I have utterly forsworn partisanship. I know that the editors of newspapers of America, like myself, hold ourselves to be Americans first, and Democrats or Republicans or what not afterward. I feel sure that this spirit will dominate the worth-while newspapers of the country.

SEES WHOLESOME OMEN

"It was an inspiring experience to participate yesterday in a nonpartisan conference at the White House designed to discuss measures of common defense in the United States in a world given over utterly to force. The complete lack of any political sharpshooting in that conference was a wholesome omen for the future. It should be recalled that participating in that conference were the most prominent leaders of the New Deal and the most active leaders of the anti new dealers in the Democratic Party, as well as Republican leaders.

"When Congress adjourned more than a month ago these three divisions in public opinion were in sharp conflict. In the White House conference every vestige of feeling engendered by those divisions was washed out. The discussion revolved exclusively about matters relating to protection and maintenance of peace and security in this country.

"The most emphatic declarations were made by leaders of all groups that in the impending session of Congress the questions involving the interests of America in this grave crisis should be discussed and settled without the slightest reference to party alinements.

"I am sure the press of America will be quick to emulate the spirit of nonpartisanship displayed by the conferees. We are faced with momentous and far-reaching problems, among the most important since the organization of the Republic. These are above partisan concerns and deal with the future welfare and security of the American people. It must be that this portentous situation will call forth from the responsible editors of America an inspiring, nonpolitical discharge of the very great responsibility they bear."

Neutrality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAUDE PEPPER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, September 28, 1939

ARTICLE FROM THE NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article appearing in the New York Herald Tribune of September 21, 1939, on the subject of Neutrality.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Herald Tribune of September 21, 1939]

FORTUNE SAYS ONLY THIRD OF UNITED STATES IS FOR ISOLATION—REPORTS ITS SURVEY SHOWS CRUSHING DEFEAT BY PEOPLE OF THE POLICIES OF BORAH

A "crushing defeat" by the American people against the strict isolationist policy being championed in Congress by Senator WILLIAM E. BORAH, of Idaho, was reported yesterday in the current survey of Fortune magazine. Nearly two-thirds of the people, Fortune found, are against isolation.

The announcement came on the eve of the special session of Congress called to repeal the present Neutrality Act. The results show:

Eighty-three and one-tenth percent of the people want England and France to win and only 1 percent are for Germany.

Sixty-four and eight-tenths percent believe that the Allies can win as the situation stands at present.

Only 24.7 percent favor a complete embargo against all of the warring nations.

THREE QUESTIONS ASKED

Only three questions were asked, the first two to discover to what extent the public is already disposed to take sides in the European war, and the third to define the policy toward which those attitudes lead.

The replies were as follows to the first question: "In the trouble now going on in Europe, which side would you like to see win":

	Total	Men	Women
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*
Poland, France, and England and their friends	83.1	85.4	80.7
Germany and her friends	1.0	.8	1.2
Neither side	6.7	7.0	6.5
Do not know	9.2	6.8	11.6

The second question was: "As it stands now, if no further allies join either side, which side do you think will come out ahead?" The replies were:

	Total	Men	Women
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*
Poland, France, England, and their friends	64.8	71.6	57.6
Germany and her friends	8.3	8.4	8.1
Do not know	26.9	20.0	34.3

"This, then, is the background of hope and expectation, during the early stages of the war, against which the American public is to decide the all-important question of what the position of our country should be," Fortune comments.

The survey then asked the question: "Which of these courses of action comes closest to describing what you think the United States should do?"

The replies:

Total percent

Enter the war at once on the side of England, France, and Poland and send an army to Europe	2.3
Enter the war at once, but send only our Navy and air force to help England and Poland	1.0
Enter the war on the side of England, France, and Poland only if it looks as though they were losing, and in the meantime help that side with food and materials	13.5
Do not enter the war, but supply England, France, and Poland with materials and food, and refuse to ship anything to Germany	19.9
Take no sides, and offer to sell to anyone, but on a cash-and-carry basis	29.3

Total percent—Continued

Refuse any aid of any kind to either side, and refuse to sell anything at all to either side	24.7
Find some way of supporting Germany	.1
Other	3.4
Don't know	5.8

DECISION AGAINST ISOLATION

"This is a crushing decision," the survey continues, "against the strict isolationist policy being championed by BORAH in Congress, for, adding the cash-and-carry vote to that of the people who believe in taking sides, a total of nearly two-thirds of the population stands against economic isolation, while only a quarter are opposed to any trade with the belligerents.

"Here is the United States' answer to its momentous problem. Few people have no opinion on the subject. Adding the first three answers, 16.8 percent are willing that we should go into the second World War when or before our help is needed to tip the scales in the favored direction. Some 20 percent favor taking sides in the conflict by economic means short of war.

"The total vote for using our men or materials to make secure the outcome we want is 36.7 percent. Against this stands 24.7 percent voting for complete isolation, and between these extremes is a 29.3-percent vote favoring equal trade with all nations. If these two votes for what amounts to at least technical neutrality could properly be totaled, the resulting figure would be 54 percent.

"However, many of the voters for a cash-and-carry policy may believe that this form of neutrality will really favor the Allies, perhaps decisively, because they have more cash and ships for the carrying. On the other hand, some of them may also take into consideration the factor of neutral shipping whereby we could be supplying Germany with materials."

Neutrality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. MILLER

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 25, 1939

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, this special session of Congress has been called by the President for but one purpose, to repeal or revise our neutrality legislation. Several Members of this House with long years of service have told me that there was apparently more interest in this subject of neutrality, judging by the quantity of mail they had received, than has been indicated on any other subject during the past 25 years. With so much interest manifested from my district, it seems only right that I should make this statement, outlining my position on the question of repealing the arms embargo and revising our present neutrality law.

The special session of Congress has convened; the President has delivered his message in person to a joint session of the Senate and House; members of the President's Cabinet were seated in the Well of the House, and the galleries were packed with interested citizens, but this opening session was quite in contrast with the joyful joint session of the Seventy-sixth Congress which convened last January, when for many Members it was a happy reunion with old friends. Last Thursday the Members were solemn, and personally I felt very subdued and humble, realizing that the decisions of this Congress might well settle the dread question of peace or war for the United States in the near future.

That my constituents are aware of the importance of this special session is well proven by the fact that during the past 4 days I have received 1,808 letters, cards, and telegrams on this subject of neutrality, with 1,697 asking that the embargo be continued and 111 favoring lifting the embargo. These communications come from every section of my district and from all classes of society. With but one exception, every person from whom I have heard is opposed to any move which would involve us in a foreign war. I am sure that those who disagree with the position I take are just as sincere in their desire for peace as I am in mine. I have pledged myself not to be influenced by partisanship nor by the effect my vote may have on my political career, nor will the question of possible dollar profit be given consideration, as this cannot be considered when men's lives are at stake.

The other day I received a letter from one of my constituents which impressed me greatly, and I am going to quote it herewith, as it contains much food for thought:

The President made a dignified plea over the radio for neutrality, nonpartisanship, and unity. For neutrality the Nation is unanimous, though divided as to method. All are against partisanship, whether it be in Congress or by the President in his press conferences or in other respects. But it is not partisanship for him to differ with Congress or Congress with him. Where there is a duty to think and decide, difference is not partisanship. As to national unity, that is strengthened and not weakened when the Congress and the President each does his duty, even though they differ, provided they do it respectfully and calmly. But it is not unity—only the outward semblance of unity—when Congress surrenders its brain or its will to the President. There is a possible emergency and a possible concealed danger. The danger is that he may again ask "emergency legislation," as he did before, then hold it beyond the needs of the emergency, as he did before. Whatever the temptation, whatever the popular voice of the moment may be, I hope that men of all parties and views in Congress will resist it quietly but firmly, knowing that that is not democracy. In fact, it is precisely that unconscious surrender by the German people of their rights and duties a few years ago, under the plea of national need, that led to their loss of power to act and so to prevent war, to their sorrow and the sorrow of the world. For there are intermediate steps that inevitably lead in the end to loss of freedom, just as there are steps that must end in war. No matter who he is or what the excuse, enlarged power in one man is never safe. There must be a balance of power. We must remain free in order to be free. And happily it is the wish of the people, as the polls show, that Congress sit at this time, which means, of course, not as a sounding board, not as a "yes" body, nor as a nobody, but as Congress.

I agree with the sentiment expressed in that letter. We are not faced with an emergency at the present time, and it seems to me that now is the time for full, free, and thoughtful discussion of the problems we face. There is no need for hasty action. It might be well at this point to consider the situation as it exists at the present moment and see just what protection our existing neutrality law can give us.

On August 31, 1935, the President approved a neutrality law that the House and Senate had enacted. The law was enacted for but one purpose—to keep the United States out of any future foreign wars. Our people were determined that never again should our young men be called upon to fight or die on a foreign battlefield. President Roosevelt supported the law wholeheartedly and spoke of it as legislation that would in the future keep us out of war. In fact, in referring to the neutrality legislation the President said that this law would put new tools in his hands to aid him in keeping the United States out of any future war. He even added this interesting statement—that the only thing we had to fear was that in case of war breaking out on another continent there would be those Americans who, with a desire for profit—fool's gold—would urge repeal or evasion of the existing neutrality law.

On February 29, 1936, this act was amended in minor detail. In one place the word "may" was changed to "shall," so that the issuing of certain proclamations by the President would be mandatory. Again, on June 8, 1937, the act was amended to provide for an arms embargo to Spain, the question of civil war not being covered by the previous acts.

On May 1, 1937, the President again approved a revision of our neutrality law, and that is the law now on our statute books. The greatest change in this revision was the inclusion of the so-called cash-and-carry provision. The act was so written that the cash-and-carry provision would automatically expire on May 1, 1939; and it has, of course, since expired and has not as yet been reenacted into law. Briefly the existing law provides as follows: Section 1 provides that whenever the President shall find that there exists a state of war between or among two or more states, he shall proclaim such fact, and it shall thereafter be unlawful to export arms, ammunition, or implements of war from the United States to any belligerent nation or to a neutral nation for transportation to a belligerent nation; second, provides for the cash-and-carry provision relating to commodities and material not mentioned in section 1; third, prohibits loans and credits to belligerent nations; fourth, excepts other American republics; fifth, sets up a National Munitions Control Board to practically control the industry, providing for manufacturing permits, and so forth; sixth, prohibits Ameri-

can vessels from carrying arms and munitions to warring nations; seventh, deals with the use of our ports as a base of supply; eighth, deals with armed merchant ships of belligerents entering our ports and the use of our ports by foreign submarines; ninth, makes it unlawful for Americans to travel on ships owned by belligerent nations; tenth, makes it unlawful for American vessels to arm or to carry armament, arms, ammunition, or implements of war. The balance of the act relates to regulations, penalties, definitions, and so forth.

It is well to recall that this act was approved by the House with only a few dissenting votes at a time when there was a minimum of emotion and propaganda; at a time when war was not in sight. It was the considered judgment of the Congress, supported overwhelmingly by our people. During the 5 years that Congress considered neutrality legislation there was but one thought in the minds of its sponsors, and that was to prevent the tragedy of 1917 and 1918, when the mothers of America gave 50,000 sons on the altar of war.

Now, with war again raging in Europe, there are sincere men and women who advise repealing or modifying our neutrality law and, as they express it, go back to international law, which to me means going back to the condition that existed in 1914. It has been said that international law is whatever the nation that controls the seas determines it to be. International law depends on treaties and agreements; and in this day, when treaties are treated so lightly, it seems to me to be a dangerous experiment. If we make a mistake, the forfeit may be the lives of thousands of our finest young men. Do you wonder that at this moment I feel meek and very humble as I consider the responsibilities ahead? You will recall that the existing law provides only for an embargo on arms, ammunition, or implements of war. There are a great many sincere citizens who feel that we should repeal the embargo on arms and substitute the cash-and-carry provision, which would mean that any nation needing such arms, ammunition, or implements of war who could come here in its own ships and pay us cash on the spot could have all they needed. Just 2 short weeks ago, during a radio broadcast, I said I had no fear that a strict cash-and-carry provision would in itself involve us in a war if only we could and would stick to it. I expressed the fear, however, that at the end of a few months of the adoption of a cash-and-carry provision certain countries would come to us and say: "We have given you all the cash we have. We cannot finance this war on a cash basis any longer. We have been good customers of yours, so you will have to arrange for either loans or credits." Would not we then have a moral obligation to grant this request? And if we did, we would have taken another step toward active participation.

I am reminded of the old saying, "If a man doesn't take the first drink of liquor he will never become intoxicated." In this instance, if we do not take the first step toward war, we will not become involved in that war. There are three steps we might take: (1) Repeal our neutrality law; (2) extend loans and credits; and (3)—the fatal step—the sending of our men to Europe. Now, even before Congress has considered the question of cash and carry, proponents of repeal of the arms embargo have stated they would change the term "Cash and carry" to "Come and get it." According to reports the bill to be reported out of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee will carry this "Come and get it" provision which will allow the extension of credit—to be sure, a short-term credit—but we all know from past experience that short-term credit often becomes long-term credit.

I am not unmindful of the fact that we could well have a war boom here in the near future, just as we did in 1914, 1915, and 1916, but what good will it do us if, as a result, we should become involved needlessly in a war? Profit would then melt away and finally, I fear, we would see the end of our democracy. I can think of circumstances and events that might sometime make it necessary for us to enter a war to not only save democracy but for humanity's sake. However, when that time comes let us face the issue honestly and act directly, but not in the name of neutrality. If now, while we are trying to write a neutrality act to maintain our neutrality, we have in our minds the aiding of this, that, or the other nation, we cannot say we are truly neutral. Is it not possible that the ruler of a nation, whose enemies we aid, might well say that if the United States is going to furnish his enemies with everything but manpower, he might as well have the United States openly at war with him and then proceed to an overt act which we could not or would not ignore?

As the President said 2 weeks ago, we are the best-informed people in the world. I hope we can calmly consider the information we received; that we can keep both feet on the ground, and, regardless of how strong our sympathies may be or how bitter we may feel toward those who brought about the present war, we can maintain an honest neutrality, recalling the Proverb of the Old Testament, "As he thinketh in his heart, so is he."

I have given a good deal of time and study to this question of neutrality. It is a subject which has interested most veterans of the World War. Many of us came back with a feeling in our hearts that we had fought in the war to end all wars, and we were determined to do whatever we could as individual citizens to prevent this country from ever again becoming involved in a European war. While we may have thought a good deal about this subject, there are many in this country whose life work has been studying and teaching international law and diplomacy. Certainly we cannot ignore the expressed opinions of such men as Prof. Philip C. Jessup and Prof. Charles Cheney Hyde, of Columbia University, or Prof. Samuel F. Bemis and Dr. A. Whitney Griswold, of Yale. Professor Jessup is particularly outspoken on this subject, and the September 21 edition of the New York Times carries an article written jointly by Professors Jessup and Hyde, part of which I quote:

> To be more precise, if the Congress, in order to strengthen the sinews of France and England, removes the present embargo so as to enable those powers to gain a distinct advantage over their enemy, the United States makes itself in fact the ally of those who secure its sustenance. But, more than that, such conduct is illegal as well as unneutral and may, if resorted to, place the Nation in a most embarrassing and even hypocritical position when it undertakes to assert its neutral rights, which Secretary Hull recently announced we had not abandoned. * * * The answer is that the manipulation of American governmental control already established through a statutory embargo, with the deliberate design of aiding a particular group of warring powers by an effort that takes cognizance of their relative supremacy at sea, is a deliberate taking of sides, which makes intervention in the conflict.

It seems to me it would be presumptious on the part of a freshman Congressman to ignore such definite statements from such outstanding authorities; men whose knowledge of the subject and whose Americanism cannot be questioned, and I feel I could not be honest with myself or the people whom I represent if I did other than vote for continuation of the arms embargo. I agree with the President on the other points raised in his message, namely, that some effort must be made to define war zones and to keep United States ships and nationals out of war zones. Whether this can be done by a declaration or whether it will take special enactment of law I cannot say.

In this whole question of neutrality there certainly is room for honest differences of opinion, but I trust that those of you who differ with the position I have taken will at least credit me with a desire to do whatever can be done to prevent this Nation from becoming involved in the war which is now being waged.

Neutrality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 28, 1939

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, my objective, your objective, and the desire of every Member of Congress is to keep our country from becoming involved in this terrible war.

There is an honest difference of opinion as to how that can be accomplished, not only among Members of the House and Senate, but among our citizens.

It is to be regretted we find ourselves today when a war is raging in foreign lands in a position where it is absolutely necessary to change our present Neutrality Act.

This is my opinion.

Many of our citizens are not in accord with my views.

Naturally on a matter of such importance we are hearing from our constituents. Some of mine agree with me while others do not.

At the outset, I want to address myself to those who have written me expressing the hope there will be no change in the law under which we are now compelled to operate, the act of May 1, 1937. This law is intact today with the exception of section 2 which, under the law itself, expired May 1, 1939.

Let us see what position that leaves us in. Today it is unlawful to export or attempt to export arms, ammunition, or implements of war from any place in the United States to any belligerent state named in the proclamation of the President, or to any neutral state for transshipment to, or for the use of, any such belligerent state. That is the provision of paragraph (a) of the first section of the law.

The President has faithfully performed his duty in issuing his proclamations. He has gone just as far as he is permitted under the law that controls. He is not responsible for the conditions I am about to enumerate because he must obey the law.

Do you know that under this existing Neutrality Act:

First. American vessels may go into any sea area even in the face of danger from mines, submarines, and aircraft of belligerents.

Second. American citizens may travel on American or other neutral vessels through areas made dangerous by mines, submarines, and aircraft of belligerents.

Third. American vessels may carry scrap iron, scrap steel, copper, cotton, oil, and other essential war materials to belligerents.

Fourth. Motor trucks and tractors may be exported to belligerents but not armored motor trucks.

Fifth. Cotton may be exported to belligerents but not gun cotton.

Sixth. Brass tubing in pipe form may be exported to belligerents but not brass tubing in shell form.

Seventh. Lead in the form of bars may be exported to belligerents but not lead in the form of bullets.

Eighth. Steel for guns may be exported to belligerents but not guns.

Ninth. American exporters may sell goods to belligerents without transfer of title to the purchaser, which means that American goods on the high seas are subject to destruction by opposing belligerents.

Tenth. Trucks and tractors containing an engine that could be installed in an airplane or tank may be exported to belligerents.

Eleventh. Food in any form, which is as necessary as arms and ammunition, may be taken in American vessels to belligerents.

In other words, arms, ammunition, or implements of war cannot be exported to any belligerent state, but the material that is necessary to manufacture them can.

Analyze carefully what can be sent to belligerents in American bottoms and then determine if the present law should remain unchanged.

The President and the Secretary of State wanted a law that permitted the sale of anything to anyone provided that the purchaser took title and possession in the United States. The original recommendation likewise would have prohibited American ships from entering combat zones and would have restricted the travel of American citizens in combat zones.

At the time these suggestions were submitted to the Congress, Secretary of State Hull said:

These proposals are intended to aid in keeping the United States from becoming involved in war. They contemplate, primarily, a state of affairs in which relations in the world have ceased to be peaceful.

Our purpose must be at all times to endeavor to foster that state of relations among nations which will maintain the fabric of world peace. In pursuance of that aim we have done, and must do, everything possible within the limits of our traditional policy of noninvolvement in overseas affairs.

In considering the present proposals for legislation we must keep in mind that, no matter how much we may wish or may try to disassociate ourselves from world events, we cannot achieve disassociation. The simple fact of our existence as a great nation in a world of nations cannot be denied; and the substance of the legislation adopted in this country inevitably influences not only this country but also other countries. The problem for us is not whether we shall help any foreign country or any group of foreign countries. Nor is it that of passing judgment upon or interfering in other peoples' controversies. Rather, it is that of so conducting our affairs and our relations with other peoples, both before and after the outbreak of war elsewhere, that we shall be more, and not less, secure; so that we shall not become parties to controversies; and so that our attitude and actions will encourage other people to avoid rather than to become engaged in controversy.

On July 14, 1939, the President sent a message to Congress which said, in part:

The cornerstone of the foreign policy of the United States is the preservation of the peace and security of our Nation, the strengthening of international law, and the revitalization of international good faith. The foreign policy of this Government may be misinterpreted or it may be misunderstood, but it cannot be destroyed. Peace is so precious and war so devastating that the people of the United States and their Government must not fail to make their just and legitimate contribution to the preservation of peace.

The Congress has pending before it at the present time certain proposals providing for the amendment of the existing so-called neutrality legislation. Some of these proposed changes I regard as necessary to promote the peace and security of the United States.

There is an astonishing amount of confusion and misunderstanding as regards the legislation under consideration, and particularly with regard to the operation of the existing arms embargo.

I shall try to bring out as clearly as I can the important points of agreement and disagreement between those who support the principles contained in the six-point peace and neutrality program recommended by the executive branch of the Government and those who oppose these recommendations.

In substance and in principle both sides of the discussion agree on the following points:

1. Both sides agree that the first concern of the United States must be its own peace and security.

2. Both sides agree that it should be the policy of this Government to avoid being drawn into wars between other nations.

3. Both sides agree that this Nation should at all times avoid entangling alliances or involvements with other nations.

4. Both sides agree that in the event of foreign wars this Nation should maintain a status of strict neutrality, and that around the structure of neutrality we should so shape our policies as to keep this country from being drawn into war.

On the other hand, the following is the chief essential point of disagreement between those who favor the adoption of the recommendations formulated by the executive branch of the Government and those who are opposing these recommendations.

The proponents, including the executive branch of the Government, at the time when the arms embargo was originally adopted called attention to the fact that its enactment constituted a hazardous departure from the principle of international law which recognizes the right of neutrals to trade with belligerents and of belligerents to trade with neutrals. They believe that neutrality means impartiality, and in their view an arms embargo is directly opposed to the idea of neutrality. It is not humanly possible, by enacting an arms embargo, or by refraining from such enactment, to hold the scales exactly even between two belligerents. In either case and due to shifting circumstances one belligerent may find itself in a position of relative advantage or disadvantage. The important difference between the two cases is that when such a condition arises in the absence of an arms embargo on our part, no responsibility attaches to this country, whereas in the presence of an embargo, the responsibility of this country for the creation of the condition is inevitably direct and clear.

There is no theory or practice to be found in international law pertaining to neutrality to the effect that the advantages that any particular belligerent might procure through its geographic location, its superiority on land or at sea, or through other circumstances, should be offset by the establishment by neutral nations of embargoes.

The opposition to the present substitute proposal joins issue on this point, and stands for existing rigid embargo as a permanent part of our neutrality policy. And yet by insisting on an arms embargo in time of war they are, to that extent, for the reasons I have stated, urging not neutrality, but what might well result in actual unneutrality, the serious consequences of which no one can predict.

Those who urge the retention of the present embargo continue to advance the view that it will keep this country out of war, thereby misleading the American people to rely upon a false and illogical delusion as a means of keeping out of war.

No matter what action the Congress takes on this question, it cannot satisfy all belligerents. Our one desire should be

to enact a law that will eliminate, as much as it is humanly possible to do so, the danger of our country becoming involved.

We should by all means take the profits out of war by proper taxation and we should make profiteering a felony.

Our merchant marine will suffer financially by preventing our ships from carrying arms, munitions, and so forth, but what is that loss in comparison with the life of one American?

Remember under existing law nothing can prevent our ships entering a combat zone. I can see in advance the temper of our people if some of our ships are destroyed. It is our duty by law to keep our ships out.

Under no consideration do I want ships flying the American flag traveling in the combat zone, and we should also prevent our citizens from traveling on the ships of belligerents and other neutrals that enter combat zones.

Fortunately, partisanship has practically been laid aside. We find the leaders of both great political parties seeking the same objective, a law that will eliminate as much as possible the danger of becoming drawn into this conflict.

There is another matter that I think should be cleared up. The statement has been made over the radio on several occasions that our Government can advance credit to belligerents through the R. F. C. under the Export and Import Bank Act. This is true, because the R. F. C. is set up as a corporation, but under the Export and Import Bank Act Congress limited the amount of credit which could be extended to $100,000,000, and I am personally informed by the officials of the R. F. C. that the $100,000,000 has practically been allocated and no part of it was advanced to a belligerent nation. I feel confident that should the Congress be requested to extend the amount of credit that can be advanced under this act we will certainly place a proviso in the law that not one cent of credit can be advanced to a belligerent nation.

Congress passed a law in 1937 in the hope it would keep us out of war. It now develops it is an instrument so worded that there is extreme danger it will draw us into war. Anyone who will carefully analyze the law cannot dispute this.

The mothers and fathers of those who will be required to fight our battles are praying their sons will never be called to the colors. So am I. Never do I want to see the day one American is sacrificed on the altar of war.

Regardless of whether our views are in accord, we should all feel that every American has but one desire, and that is that we remain at peace with the world.

I feel the great responsibility that is mine in this hour of peril and I pray for divine guidance.

Being constantly in touch with the officials of the Government and legislative branches, I can assure the people of the country I have yet to find one, regardless of views, but that wants our country to remain at peace.

When the President addressed Congress September 21, he said in part:

> Because I am wholly willing to ascribe an honorable desire for peace to those who hold different views from my own as to what those measures should be, I trust that these gentlemen will be sufficiently generous to ascribe equally lofty purposes to those with whom they disagree. Let no man or group in any walk of life assume exclusive protectorate over the future well-being of America—because I conceive that regardless of party or section, the mantle of peace and of patriotism is wide enough to cover us all. Let no group assume the exclusive label of the "peace bloc." We all belong to it.
>
> These perilous days demand cooperation between us without trace of partisanship. Our acts must be guided by one single hard-headed thought—keeping America out of this war.
>
> I should like to be able to offer the hope that the shadow over the world might swiftly pass. I cannot. The facts compel my stating, with candor, that darker periods may lie ahead. The disaster is not of our making; no act of ours engendered the forces which assault the foundations of civilization. Yet we find ourselves affected to the core; our currents of commerce are changing; our minds are filled with new problems; our position in world affairs has already been altered.
>
> In such circumstances our policy must be to appreciate in the deepest sense the true American interest. Rightly considered, this interest is not selfish. Destiny first made us, with our sister nations on this hemisphere, joint heirs of European culture. Fate seems now to compel us to assume the task of helping to maintain in the western world a citadel wherein that civilization may be kept alive. The peace, the integrity, and the safety of the Americas—these must be kept firm and serene. In a period when it is sometimes said that free discussion is no longer compatible with national safety, may you by your deeds show the world that we of the United States are one people, of one mind, one spirit, one clear resolution, walking before God in the light of the living.

In conclusion, let me assure you the one thought I will always have in mind is "Keep this country out of war."

God, the Father

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS LUDLOW
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 25, 1939

ADDRESS OF HON. LOUIS LUDLOW, OF INDIANA, TO THE CHRISTIAN MEN BUILDERS, INC., OF INDIANAPOLIS, SUNDAY, SEPTEMBER 24, 1939

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, in these troubled times when the world is torn with passion and hate, when in so many countries bitterness and darkness have put in total eclipse the sweetness and light of religious faith, it is inspiring to find such organizations as Christian Men Builders, Inc., of Indianapolis, upholding with unsurpassed fervor the Christian standard of thought and living.

This association of devoted workers, known as Christian Men Builders, is in many respects wholly unique. It was organized 26 years ago last March, and during practically its entire existence Merle Sidener has been its leader. Mr. Sidener occupies an outstanding position in the esteem of our people.

The membership of Christian Men Builders is an interesting cross section of our community. It is composed of laborers, bankers, lawyers, clerks, newspapermen, professional men of all kinds—a composite of all of the respectable and respected elements that enter into city life. It is no uncommon sight for a man with working clothes on his body to sit side by side with a banker or a carefully groomed businessman. It is no place for snobs, but every true-blue man who wants an opportunity to do his bit to make this world a better place in which to live will find himself welcomed cordially and sincerely, whether he be clad in overalls or in the habilaments of the rich. Christian Men Builders, Inc., heartily subscribes to the philosophy of Robert Burns—

> A man's a man, for a' that.

It looks at his soul and not at the cut of his garments. If he is in earnest and willing to work, he finds the door that leads to humanitarian service is wide open. In the organization today are members of practically every denomination, all forgetful of the narrow limitations of creed while they band themselves together in the service of the Master. Christian Men Builders, Inc., is a nonprofit organization, nondenominational, and nonsectarian, a haven for all who wish to do worthwhile work for the relief of their fellow beings.

There are 3,000 members of the organization, and its Sunday meetings, which are broadcast over the radio, have an average attendance of over 900.

I was honored with an invitation to be the guest speaker of Christian Men Builders, Inc., on Sunday, September 24, on which occasion, after being introduced by Mr. Sidener, I spoke as follows:

> If I, a layman, am permitted a choice of subjects for this feeble effort to interpret the Divine will and purpose, which I call my first sermon, my subject shall be "God, the Father," and my text shall be the Lord's Prayer:
>
> "Our Father who art in Heaven, hallowed be Thy name, Thy kingdom come, Thy will be done on earth as it is in Heaven. Give us this day our daily bread and forgive us our trespasses as we forgive those who trespass against us, and lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil, for Thine is the kingdom and the power and the glory forever. Amen."
>
> You will note that in instructing mortals how to pray Christ, the Saviour, taught them first of all to say "Our Father." Thus we have the highest authority likening the relationship of God to the

human race as that of a father over his children. When the Savior selected this simile He knew He was choosing language that anyone could understand. Among all peoples, even primitive savages, the father is the recognized head of the household, whose feeling toward his children is that of tender solicitude. No plummet line can sound the depths of a father's affection for his children, and Christ, the Lord, epitomized in the most understanding way the loving and forgiving attitude of God toward mankind when He taught us to say "Our Father who art in Heaven."

What do we know about our Father who art in Heaven? No one has ever seen God, and the limitations of finite vision are such that we look through a glass darkly when we seek to discern the characteristics of the great Spirit who rules the universe. Yet as one who has lived a good while on this earth and whose fortune it has been to see Divinity in action on many different occasions I make the unqualified declaration that God is revealed to human beings in at least four ways, each one of which I shall discuss briefly.

GOD IN NATURE

First, God is revealed to mortals in Nature. Can anyone behold the beauty of a carnation, a chrysanthemum, or a gardenia, or survey the star-lit heavens above him on a cloudless night and say in his heart that there is no God? God's imprimatur is on all nature. Every rose petal, every leaf, every twinkling star is a testimonial to Divinity. Can anyone doubt the fatherhood of God when he takes into account the provision that has been made for the sustenance of the human race—the blessed rains that make the seeds to germinate and the sprouts to penetrate the earth, the sunshine and the shadows that chase each other over the billowy fields and make the crops to grow and ripen and finally the golden harvest, and then another year comes around and Nature's program is repeated and all the wonderful productivity of Nature burgeons forth anew, and so on forever? Is anyone so blind that he cannot see in these recurrent miracles of Nature a loving God, or Father, as Christ calls Him, keeping watch above His own?

No one has ever seen the face of God, it is true; but all nature is eloquent with testimonials that there is a Supreme Ruler whose love for you and me and all of His other creatures is boundless. Witness the untold millions of tons of coal He has planted in the hills and mountains to warm us in the wintertime; the vast deposits of oil He has stored in the bosom of the earth to drive our wheels and looms; the lavish prodigality of the life-sustaining products of our farms and orchards; the sea food that abounds in every ocean, only waiting to be brought to our tables. These and countless other great sources of human supply did not just happen. They indicate a divine plan and purpose. They are a revelation of God.

Take a watermelon, for instance. A combination of a little seed and the earth, moistened by the rains and warmed by the sun, produces a 50-pound melon weighing 300,000 times as much as the seed from which it sprang. Its exterior is green, and within that exterior is a layer of white, and within the white is a luscious core of red, and through the red core seed are scattered, each one capable of continuing the work of reproduction. I wonder if any person who stops to think can partake of a tangerine without associating it with a loving Providence. Here we have a succulent bit of fruit with a protective covering so amenable to the finger touch that no effort is required to remove it, and tucked away on the inside we find the delicious fruit in segments, each segment an ordinary mouthful. Did a tangerine just happen so? No; it is one of the innumerable evidences of divine planning. A thousand other examples might be given of God's kindness as a provider for human needs, such as the egg, the orange, the apple, the wealth of summer and autumn's rich cornucopia of ripened fruits and grain.

The discoveries of the astronomers, marvelous as those discoveries are, do not reveal among the starry corridors the Supreme Ruler whose will established order in the universe; and yet I cannot imagine a more amazing or more convincing revelation of divinity than the orderly processes of the planets. A story is told of a German astronomer, an expert in reading the heavens, who predicted that 75 years hence certain heavenly bodies would be in a certain relative position observable only from a point 10,000 miles away. The astronomer died. His son, to whom he had made the prediction, lived the allotted span of life, and he, too, died. When the time approached the astronomer's grandson journeyed 10,000 miles to the point of indicated observation, and he saw through the telescope exactly what his grandfather 75 years before had predicted would come true. Asked if the phenomenon had taken place as forecast by his grandparent, he said:

"Yes; on the exact second."

Can anyone imagine what would happen to the universe if there were not a living God to keep the planets in their orbits? The first line of the first book of the Bible says: "In the beginning, God created the heaven and the earth." Does anyone have to direct his attention further than to the daily rotation of the earth and the annual revolution of the planet around the sun to be convinced that God still rules the heaven and the earth? When we go to sleep at night we do not worry lest there should be no daybreak on the morrow. We know, or if we consult an almanac we can know, the exact time when the sun will rise next morning. Our confidence that the earth will continue to revolve as usual is an unconscious tribute to our conviction that God is in His heaven and that all's well with the world.

GOD REVEALED IN HUMAN ACTIONS

The second way God is revealed is in the acts of Godlike men and women. With all the dross in poor human nature, there is a residium of nobility in every soul that is Godlike in character. That residium is likely to manifest itself in the most unexpected times and circumstances, and when it does it seems to justify, often with dramatic vividness, the Biblical assertion that man is made in the image of his Maker. Behold a really good man and you see our nearest earthly approach to God.

Every one of us can recall from his own book of recollections acts of human beings that reflect the goodness of God. When I was a boy 18 years old I was stricken with typhoid fever. We lived in a section of rural Indiana where the wilderness was still more a fact than a memory. I was at first violently delirious, and then for months my life hung by a slender thread. The old country doctor said that everything depended upon the care with which I was watched over and nursed. I do not suppose anyone in our neighborhood had ever heard of a trained nurse whose services could be had for hire. What did the neighbors do? Knowing that my father and mother were worn almost to death and could not cope with the problem, they volunteered their services, freely and without stint, to save my life. In relays they came from many miles around and watched by my bedside, two of our neighbors sitting up with me all night after a hard day's work in the fields, to be followed the next night by two more, and so on, week after week, until I got a new grip on life. They would have been deeply hurt if anyone had suggested monetary compensation for their loving services. The only reward they ever received was my eternal gratitude. They were simple country folk, but they made me feel the goodness of God.

Every now and then something resembling divinity flashes up like a bright and shining meteor in human conduct. I was sitting in the Press Gallery at Washington many years ago when a Representative from the State of Colorado arose to make a solemn announcement. He had been duly sworn in and seated as a Member of the great lawmaking body, but what he arose to say was that he had been making a study of the election returns and that he had come to the conclusion that he had not been elected and that his opponent had been elected. Suiting his actions to his words, he sent his resignation to the Speaker's desk and asked that his seat be vacated and that his opponent be sworn in to succeed him. I had never seen anything quite like that happen, and I said to myself, "God must be pleased by this honest man." Evidently the people of Colorado were pleased, too, for after that they sent John F. Shafroth to the Governor's office and then to the Senate of the United States. Death a few years ago closed his illustrious career and he was widely mourned.

Actions do not need to be monumental in size to reflect the spirit of divinity. Some of the smallest attentions awaken in the hearts of the recipients a great response. Some weeks ago, following adjournment of Congress, worn almost to death, I went on a long ocean trip to try to find rest. I did not know that anyone was aware of my departure, but when our ship had cleared New York Harbor and all of the familiar landmarks had faded in the distance the purser handed me a bunch of telegrams and special-delivery letters from Indiana friends wishing me bon voyage. I cannot tell you how much I appreciated those messages of love. It was a thoughtful thing for my friends to do and it did so touch the heartstrings.

When Ralph Waldo Emerson was a tottering old man, broken physically and mentally by the infirmities of age, he attended the funeral of his lifelong friend, Henry Wadsworth Longfellow. He gazed pensively for a long time at the face of his friend in the coffin and then in feeble voice he remarked:

"I don't know his name, but he was a good man."

And so it is that if we look with eyes of discernment we can see in every really good man a reflection of the glorious image of God.

CONSCIENCE THE VOICE OF GOD

A third way in which God is revealed to us is in the conscience that exists in every human being. The voice of conscience is the voice of God. Every person that lives is equipped with one of these silent monitors called conscience. It may be in bad working order. It may be seared and warped until it is almost out of commission, but there it is. On questions of right and morality it is an unerring guide, and if we follow it we will not go wrong. The weakness of human nature is such that we do not give the attention we should pay to the dictates of conscience. We are continually persuading ourselves that the promptings of conscience need not be taken too literally; that when the voice of conscience says "Thou shalt not" it means "Maybe we can."

GOD REVEALED THROUGH CHRIST

And now I come to the fourth and last way God is revealed to the world, and that is through the life and mission of Jesus Christ, the Savior. This is the most important of the many phases of revelation, because it carries with it the idea of atonement and redemption. Through it the loving fatherhood of God shines most luminously. This is the chapter that links us with the eternal and makes us a part of the everlasting kingdom of God through the forgiveness of sins. It says to me, a sinner:

"You have said that you are sorry and you have asked to be forgiven. You are forgiven. Your past is a closed chapter. Forget it and come with me."

It is this marvelous transformation from bondage to freedom, from darkness to light, that is envisioned in the Lord's Prayer: "Thy kingdom come, Thy will be done, in earth as it is in heaven." I have always believed that this part of the prayer dictated by the Saviour himself is loaded with meaning. I have always believed it foreshadows a possibility of the overthrow of wickedness and the establishment of God's kingdom on this marvelous earth of ours,

and that it offers to each and every one of us a part in ushering in the kingdom. The earth with all its seemingly limitless domain, its mountains, and its seas, is but a tiny segment of the universe; but it is comforting to know that we are not too insignificant and remote to come within the scope of God's encircling love. I have always believed that Christ spoke with supreme authority and divine vision when he taught us to pray:

"Thy will be done, in earth as it is in heaven."

If I have caught the significance and implications of Christ's life and mission, this means that we may join God's eternal kingdom right here on earth, and by availing ourselves of the innumerable opportunities that are offered to help others, we may earn our place in the eternal kingdom and walk in strength and rectitude until we meet the Father face to face.

One of the most beautiful attributes of the kingdom of God is its open door to the poor and lowly of the earth. It is no closed corporation. At its table is always spread a feast of love and whosoever will may come, the only condition being that he who seeks to enter shall be contrite and pure of heart. Thank God, salvation is without price. In my long career as an observer of human values I can truthfully say that I have found virtue more often in hovels than in palaces. It has been my lot to meet countless thousands of human beings—God's run of the mine—and as far as my finite vision can discern, some of the lowliest and meekest of those I have known will be among the greatest in the kingdom of God. There is no educational test for admission to God's kingdom. Some of the best persons I have ever known, the personification of all that is good and kind and true, whose departure years ago from the kingdom of God on earth to the kingdom of God above left a pain in my heart that still aches and throbs, could hardly read or write. The most impressive and dramatic lesson in the Bible is the parable of the Good Samaritan. If anyone were to ask me how a title to a place in the kingdom of God can be secured, without fail, I would advise him to do as the Good Samaritan did. It is a part of God's eternal plan that those who show mercy to others will have mercy shown to them. The true Christian is one whose conscience never sleeps. He is always thinking and planning ways to be of service to others. He is forever sounding the depths of compassion and searching the limitless possibilities of love. "Love," said the great seer, Emerson, "is our highest word, and it is the synonym for God." We can do nothing better, we can do nothing finer, we can do nothing grander than to help our fellow mortals over the rough places of life. That is what Jesus of Nazareth did, that is what all the saints of all the ages have done, that is the very essence of Christianity. To sincere human beings, earnestly wishing to justify our existence in a world where there is so much to be done to relieve suffering and distress, where there is so much need of love and mercy, it is an appealing thought that by helping others we can earn our way to salvation. The formula for Christian service is very simple and to do our part it is not necessary to worry over the unexplainable mysteries of life. If we go about genuinely and sincerely trying to help our fellow mortals, if we will do all the good we can, to all the people we can, in as many ways as we can, just as long as we can, we will have the blessed consciousness of work well done and as the evening of life approaches we will walk serenely toward the sunset with God's everlasting arms around us.

Let Us Make Democracy Safe in America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 28, 1939

ARTICLE BY R. ARMISTEAD GRADY

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, while so much time is being spent and so much thought being given as to how far, if at all, we should endanger the peace and democracy of America in order to throw American influence and perhaps American youth into the bloody balance scales of Europe, it is well that we recall that there is still much work to be done at home in order to safeguard the democracy we now enjoy here.

Let us not let the seductive lure of internationalism lull us into becoming oblivious to the fact that there is much we can do to preserve democracy in America without, as Senator BORAH so aptly put it, "Fumbling with the hinges of hell," by becoming involved in Europe's holocaust through a doubtful desire to make profits from the pitfalls of international greed.

Let us give more time to the business of making America great and good than we give to the business of getting America gory from the bloodstains of a war in which we have no business unless our avarice for business profits causes us to send the flower of American youth once again to the slaughter beds of Europe as an inevitable sequel to our greed for the fool's gold of blood-stained murder money.

For the thoughtful reading of all who are unwilling to "gamble your life for their country," ladies and gentlemen of Congress, I give you a statement entitled "Let Us Make Democracy Safe in America," which was written by my good friend R. Armistead Grady, of Duluth, Minn., secretary of the Minnesota-Dakotas District of Kiwanis International, and expressing as only Armistead Grady can a sentiment which I hope and believe is shared by the vast majority of the Members of this Congress.

LET US MAKE DEMOCRACY SAFE IN AMERICA

Let us make democracy safe in America!
Let us make minds, souls, and bodies safe in America!
Let us make labor, art, and science safe in America!
Let us make God safe in America!

Perhaps we can save a mad world, but let us first strive to save children's minds from sewage sloughs, their bodies from starvation and disease, and their spirits from utter blindness. There—is a battle for the most courageous.

Perhaps we may penetrate a jungle and maim or kill a wild beast, but let us first encircle our home with the protecting flame of peace, plenty, knowledge, and strength of body and soul.

Let the vermin, the snakes and the wild beasts of the jungle battle within the jungle, peer from its borders, and cringe at the wall of protecting fire between jungle and clearing. Let us fight back the jungle if it encroach upon our homes. Let us fight back from the sun-lit clearing, not from the black, treacherous, mired and slimey center.

Let us have the smoke of creation, of building, of production, soaring high above our cities. Spare us from the pall of low-hung smoke of destruction.

Let us spend money, aye—all of our buried gold and all of our minted pieces of silver that a wall of security surround American homes. That wide and smooth highways stream from end to end of America. That the air be filled with carrier birds and watchful eagles. That from coast to coast steel rails glisten and carry men, machines, and the plenty of land and sea to all our cities and all our peoples. That field, prairie, and even desert yield bountifully.

Aye, let us spend much money in the building of schools, colleges, and universities that every child may reach the end and zenith of its natural bent and desire in mental accomplishment. Let us spend money lavishly that science may progress in magnificent laboratories; and more money that hospitals, many hospitals, may heal the sick and make strong the weak. Dig up the buried treasure and build many factories, homes and schools. Encircle America with a protecting flame of life, not death. Life—strong, proud, sane, courageous, spiritual.

Let us make life, thought, yea God, safe in America and democracy will be reborn in a mad and tortured world; for a weary people will see, comprehend and say "it is good."

Let us fight for America and Americans. Let us fight that every American man have work. That every American mother have peace. That every American child have health and opportunity for development of mind and spirit. Let us make America so safe, so happy, so soaring, all peoples will say "This is good. This is possible. We will build likewise. We will demand that our own beloved lands become safe for men, for women, for chidren, for God."

Let us make democracy and Americans safe in America!

R. ARMISTEAD GRADY.

The European Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 28, 1939

RADIO ADDRESSES BY HON. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN, OF NEW YORK; PROF. CHARLES HODGES, OF NEW YORK UNIVERSITY; AND MR. SOLOMON PORTNOW

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio addresses recently delivered by Prof. Charles Hodges, Mr. Solomon Portnow, and myself:

Mr. PORTNOW. Ladies and gentlemen, with Europe on a powder keg, it seems somewhat ironic to call a round table to discuss the

European crises. In the "white war of nerves" discussion seems to have run out its course tonight.

London, Paris, Berlin are blacked out. Mobilization seems complete according to latest dispatches, and optimism for a peaceful solution is very low.

While the world waits the inside behind the news is what we are concerned with in the studios tonight.

The New York University Forum Hour has therefore called this special session to give you an analysis at this critical zero hour.

America's policies have yet to be formulated if war breaks out. What role we shall play is indeed the profoundest problem facing us.

At the moment we have no bulletin to read to you. But while we are waiting, let us hear from two prominent persons who are experts in their respective fields of public and international politics.

We are honored this evening to have with us Congressman SAMUEL DICKSTEIN, chairman of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization and author of the resolutions investigating un-American activities in the United States. Our second speaker is Prof. Charles Hodges, observer and analyst of international affairs and professor of international politics at New York University.

First, we hear from Congressman DICKSTEIN:

ADDRESS BY HON. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN

After many years of propaganda and the imposition of alien ideas of many peoples and nations, Hitler was ready to aim his master stroke in the destruction of the Republic of Poland. Years of success are behind him. He was able by threats and blackmail to destroy the liberties of Austria, Czechoslovakia, and of his own German people.

Today Germany is no longer a civilized country. It is a tyrrany, brutally ruled by a master madman.

The other day a German boat came to port filled with people escaping from a possible European war. The boat was filled to capacity, but a strange thing was noticed about its German passengers. Every one of them would be looking around in all directions before he or she would have a word to say to American reporters. This is something that has been observed very often about Germans coming to this country. They all have what is known as the "German look," looking around before they answer any questions to make sure that they are not overheard by spies.

Hitler has made Germany a country infested with spies. No one is allowed to say anything displeasing to the Nazi regime or anything which the Nazi regime considers detrimental to its cause. At present the movies and the radio are censored; the schools teach you that there is only one nation which amounts to something, and that is Germany; and the rest of the world consists of mediocre slaves who should consider themselves happy to submit to the German yoke. As to Poland, of course, not one pleasant word is said; it is a country which in the opinion of the German Government does not deserve to live, because Hitler needs "lebensraun" for his own people. The Germans are entitled to living space, the Germans are entitled to expansion in all directions, the Germans are entitled to impose their ideas and ideologies on the whole world, but no other nations are allowed to breathe.

The United States has for a period of 6 years been bombarded with constant Nazi propaganda. The ships of the North German Lloyd have in recent years brought in tons of antidemocratic and treasonable literature extolling the virtues of Hitlerism and Fascism, and telling Americans how to convert this country into a Nazi paradise, by arraying one American against the other. All these efforts have, however, been in vain. The American people, quick to sense Germany's propaganda machine, have been alert, and were not diverted from their love of liberty, and would not fall for the idea of fighting Germany's wars when the German consuls began to send out army registration blanks, not only to their own citizens but to Americans, a condition of affairs which I exposed on the floor of the House of Representatives several months ago.

A plea was made to the conscience of the world to permit Germany to keep all she was able to acquire by force on the theory that the world is better off that way. Early last week Hitler thought he was playing his trump card by signing a nonaggression pact with Russia, although he claimed for many years that he was fighting communism, and that nazi-ism was opposed to communism.

You may recall that several years ago when I was instrumental in the creation of a committee to investigate un-American activities in the United States, I called un-American and lumped together facism, communism, and nazi-ism as inimical to our institutions and our form of government. It was my contention right along that these seemingly opposite forces are in reality all aimed to destroy our form of government, irrespective of whether they assault us from the right or from the left. Democracy, as we understand it to be is a form of life equally obnoxious to dictators of the type of Hitler and of the type of Stalin. Human dignity, the liberty of the individual count for nothing in a totalitarian state. Whether or not human liberty is to be destroyed in the name of racialism or in the name of a dictatorship of the proletariat is immaterial, the important thing is that human liberty is being destroyed by totalitarian states, no matter what they call themselves.

I feel that we in America are having a particularly trying time of it. Of course, we are lovers of liberty; of course, we believe in the dignity of man; of course, we believe that wrong should be righted—but we do not believe that wars settle anything, and as much as we may desire to see the democracies win in the forthcoming struggle, we cannot allow ourselves to be dragged into war but can best preserve the interests of mankind by remaining neutral.

Neutrality does not mean lack of interest. It does not mean that we can close our eyes and permit totalitarian states to overrun democracies. Surely we cannot allow Hitler any bloodless victories or any victory gained at the expense of trampling on human rights. We remember so well what happened 1½ years ago in Austria. We remember what happened so very recently when the protectorate of Bohemia and Moravia was established.

Wherever Hitler set his foot it meant death and oppression. There is an old Polish saying that where a German once establishes himself liberty and justice are gone forever. While this statement might be extreme, and while I do not wish to condemn the whole German race because of the brutality of a Hitler, it is true that where the German seeks expansion it can only be at the expense of other nations, and where one nation is trying to destroy the liberties of another there can be no two opinions as to where our sympathies should lie.

In its political career as a free nation Poland has repeatedly made mistakes. It did not, for instance, take proper care of its minorities, but under the present circumstances I am sure that Poland will see that oppression of other nations or races does not pay and that real peace can only be had when there is cooperation among all races and nationalities composing a commonwealth.

America has been the shining example to the rest of the world how nationalities can live together and races can form a united nation. America has as many nationalities as Europe; in fact, it has more of some nationalities than Europe. It has been liberal in admitting people of all races and climes to settle within its borders and to form a new nation which, in the words of Lincoln, "was conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men were created equal." Nevertheless, the example of America was not followed by Europe. We have an intense nationalism that seeks to destroy one nation by another if it happens to be in its way. Hitler is the typical example of a ruthless leader who will swallow little nations in the name of a fantastic racial theory. After destroying the little nations he may turn to the larger nations with the same object.

Fortunately the world at large cannot sit by and permit him to do so. It is true that military preparedness has cost Europe a tremendous sum of money. It is true that billions were spent in armaments, battleships, and the military machinery designed to curb Hitler's further ambitions. All this expenditure will have been in vain if mankind will keep on "appeasing the beast" and some definite plan is not immediately formulated to see to it that there shall be no reocurrence of a war by blackmail. At this time it is hard to tell whether or not mankind will be able to avoid a war in order to curb Hitler and what he stands for. There is no question, however, that his method of achieving bloodless victories has been definitely stopped. There is no longer a question of how soon a threatened nation will submit to blackmail. There will be no further blackmail paid.

America has always been a great prize to go after. When my committee on un-American activities was functioning a few years ago I called to the attention of the public this vicious propaganda which I was afraid would finally destroy our free press, free speech, and free assembly. Fortunately, the American people, ever vigilant in protecting their liberties, did not permit this to be done. It is to the everlasting credit of our people that in spite of persistent, vicious, and poisonous propaganda which tried to poison all the sources of public opinion in the United States, and in spite of the vicious campaign of hatred which Hitler launched, our people remained true to their democratic ideals, and we hope the time will never come when our democratic ideals should fall by the wayside.

And so now, when war clouds are menacing, when it seems that the whole civilized world is rocking on the edge of the abyss, we, in America must proudly keep the torch of liberty aflame. It is up to us to give mankind that one refuge against nationalistic excesses and government by blackmail.

The last war still leaves us with bitter memories of sabotage at Kingsland and Black Tom. Here the work of German spies caused untold damage and destruction. This sort of sabotage must not be repeated. In this country at present Nazi Germany has ready and waiting over 300 agents, seeking to cause serious trouble in the United States. We must at once reenforce the Intelligence Service of our Army and Navy to cope with this situation.

ADDRESS OF PROF. CHARLES HODGES

This week opened with Poland's problem the problem of peace. By midweek this Polish problem had been transformed by the axis powers, under the drive of Hitler's diplomacy, into a European problem as a much larger basis for peace or war. Tonight this European problem in turn has become a world problem. It makes the preservation of peace as definitely the task of the United States as of any other power on the face of the globe. This crucial concern in the maintenance of what is left of the semblance of public order round the world does not permit Washington to engage in a Hamlet-like soliloquy of detachment, "To act or not to act."

The only question which confronts the Roosevelt administration today is the method of participation in the last desperate efforts to preserve peace. More sinister a thought—What part will the United States play if the desperate gamble of Hitler leads to the war of blood?

The Nazi, their Fascist partner to the south, and their newfound Communist friends to the east are being driven forward by

the operation of the feared "military timetable" of embattled Europe. The march of events under this heretofore inexorable schedule of military necessity has never permitted Europe in the past to escape the disastrous consequences of general mobilization. These are war.

The reason for my pessimistic position regarding the prospects of peace and our detachment from every world crisis or its aftermath, world war, is simple. It lies in the essentially imperialistic nature of Nazi Germany's philosophy of life. Even Premier Chamberlain understands this; and we should see by now that Germany's policy has opened up into ever-widening circles of demands. Each builds outward to overshadow more and more of Europe. Eventually the lengthening shadow of the swastika, according to every bit of Nazi documentation from Hitler's "Mein Kampf" to Dr. Goebbel's not exactly disarming propaganda, must, according to these apostles of expansion, extend to every quarter of the globe. The very core of nazi-ism today in Europe is the strident assertion of Germanic supremacy.

The foundations for expansion lie in the understandable doctrine of inclusion of all "lost" Germans bordering the Third Reich of 1933 within a Greater Germany. This made for a divided world opinion on the anschluss with Austria—even at the pre-Munich stages of the drive to include the Sudeten Germans and the handful on the Baltic at Memel. This gave to what now was hailed as "Gross Deutschland"—"Greater Germany"—just under 80,000,000 of Germanic peoples. With the extinction of the surviving part of Czechoslovakia and its transformation this spring into the so-called Bohemian and Moravian protectorates the mask dropped from national socialism. Open imperialism without any racial basis save the demand for this thing that the Germans call "lebensraum," or "living space," appeared. This is the assertion, substantially speaking, that Nazi Germany has a primary right to a superior existence in Europe, together with such extra European resources as are necessary to maintain the leadership level which is the first tenet of the Nazi doctrine of power politics.

Already the Nazi Germany that yesterday only wanted to recover all its "lost" Germans in order to live as a homogeneous national state in delightful peace with the rest of the world has by its racial imperialism incorporated within its boasted 87,000,000 of people minorities who now constitute one-tenth of the whole population of the Greater Reich. Remember that Germany first appealed to world opinion to let her go ahead and get rid of the injustices which arose from these "lost" Germans being outside the fatherland, though more than half of the Austrians did not wish anschluss, and propaganda could make no headway with the Sudeten Germans in cracking open Czechoslovakia until they had disposed of Austria. Breaking down the forcibly included minorities into their rough totals gives us 7,000,000 of Czechs; over a million and a half Poles; 150,000 Slovenians or Carinthians within Austria, or people called Chorvats; 130,000 Lusitians or Wend folk; 78,000 Lithuanians; 12,000 Danes; 8,000 Hungarians; 5,000 Slovaks; and 4,000 Friesians. When we add to this total of 8,887,000 non-Germans held deliberately within the Reich some 500,000 Jews plus 800,000 half Jews, counting all Semites by the Nazi racial theory, we find a total number of 10,200,000 "protected" people.

The operation of Nazi philosophy at this point is pretty significant for the future of international relations. These racial groups face a grim choice: Either "compulsory extinction" or emigration from this nazified greater Germany to lands called the "sub-Germanic zone of waste" by one of the official political geographers of Nazi thought. In the Nazi scheme of things it bears the popular term of "Germanische Befehlsraum" or an "area of Germanic disposition." Since Germany is a proudly proclaimed totalitarian state, obviously the Reich does not recognize the very idea itself of minorities. Equally, obviously, its internal and external policies must be applied to the elimination of minorities inside the bounds of Germany and to the subordination of what the Germans regard as the ring of inferior peoples eastward and southward to Nazi overlordship.

The real destiny of these "inferior" peoples would be to maintain themselves in an inferior status as servile nations upon which the superior Germans can erect a new imperium only Roman in its geographic concepts.

The whole force of Nazi Germany is behind Hitler's drive for what national socialism calls living space—lebensraum.

The Nazi dominion, nothing more than a Hitlerized version of the old pre-war middle Europe and its eastward march, represents the idea of economic penetration paving the way for political overlordship. The economic occupation of Austria, followed by that of Czechoslovakia, simply provided the Nazi with new outlets for the economic expansion underlying political domination. Poland, with its Anglo-French backers, therefore constitutes a rebel in the Nazi scheme of things.

Such a fanlike expansion of the Third Reich from its fortress-like position in Central Europe over the countries lying to the northeast, east, and southeast of the existing empire means control over 113,000,000 inhabitants. Ninety-nine percent of them have not a drop of German blood in their veins. That these are nations who have their own ambitions for national existence in their own way of living only constitutes an offense in the eyes of Hitler and his camp followers of oppression. The Nazis proclaim their determination to dictate life and death to a block of 200,000,000 people. This means dictation of European destinies for a lifetime—a power that must upset the rest of the world, with decisive effects upon the existence of all of us. There is here the real threat of world-wide regimentation.

Listen to the words of Reich's economic minister, Dr. Walter Funk, declared on March 28, 1939:

"Our boundaries enclose today the most industrialized country in the world. Its outposts have firmly gripped the territory between the North and the Black Seas. Under present conditions, the world has but one alternative—either to cooperate with Germany or to face an inevitable destruction of its national economy. The countries of eastern and southern Europe must submit to cooperation with the self-adjusted economic system under the leadership of the Reich."

Something of the real purpose of trade domination came to me from Nazi authorities. They have sought the major place in the trade of these countries because when they have 50 percent of this commerce they overthrow any government eastward by use of this economic blackjack. The Nazi can wreck, they say, any regime under these circumstances by precipitating revolution.

I have detailed the record of Nazi expansion in Europe. I have applied the Nazi language, brutal though it may sound in American ears, to this system of aggrandizement. This is because it is there—a fundamental historic truth behind every surge of empire. No such imperialistic impulse stops the extension of its overlordship until one of two things happens—either it is blocked by superior force or the dream of a new universal Roman empire is realized as a Pax Germanicus with world-wide dimensions in this day of superspeed transportation on land, sea, and in the air.

There is no such thing as a reasonable imperialism in world politics, because the essence of empire building down through the ages is force. The physics of power politics now ascendant in Europe, now supremely expressed by Hitlerism, is a force that automatically reaches to every part of the globe. It only stops ultimately when it meets adequate countervailing force. This means that the United States cannot choose between "holding aloof" or "doing something" about the present European crisis. The only choice appears to me to be the moment at which we propose to meet this challenge to our way of living and the means which we propose to employ to check the course of a new barbarism round the globe.

At this point we come down to statesmanship in detail—even to the words and the punctuation of the laws of this democracy which affect our foreign policy. These obviously center about the long controversy over neutrality. My position is that real neutrality in the lofty moral atmosphere of the nineteenth century has no meaning for us today. The issue is not whether we are going to fold our hands and do nothing about the destruction now imminent of our kind of world or whether we are to throw another A. E. F. into a new western front. The only question is how we may dispose of our great power to tilt the scales in favor of conditions which most nearly express in the outside world what we are striving for within the framework of American life.

Roughly speaking, Americans at this juncture are interested in a world where changes by chronic crises and the threat of military action or its actual employment cease. This does not mean that we are concerned with the maintenance of what is left of the Versailles peace, with the clamping down simply in favor of the so-called "have" nations of all prospects of change in the status quo. We are both idealistically and realistically committed to pacific adjustment and repudiation of all the methods of diplomatic terrorism and blackmail which have typefied the Fascist philosophy of "dangerous living" in action.

The next few days therefore mean to me that over and above the technicalities of neutrality legislation the United States will find itself faced with a fundamental decision. This will determine the whole character of changes in our legal definition of international purposes at this supreme moment. This means that if Europe's plunge toward war is halted by what is now more than the eleventh-hour conference, this zero-hour meeting must lead to a redefinition of world interests. This comes as straight to Washington as it does to Berlin, Paris, London, Rome, Moscow, and Tokyo—not even to forget Warsaw itself. If the poised military machines of Europe tomorrow lunge forward in their wrecking of western civilization, even more does Washington face the necessity of straightforward, unequivocal determination of where our interests lie in this challenge of force. Of one thing I am certain myself: They do not lie on the sidelines. There can be no sidelines in a second world war. Even those who would stand and wait become passive participants in a struggle for the direction of world life.

Mr. PORTNOW. Thank you, Professor Hodges.

Ladies and gentlemen, you have just heard a special session of the New York University Forum Hour, arranged in cooperation with station WEVD, on the European crisis. The last speaker you heard was Professor Hodges, observer and analyst of international affairs and professor of international politics at New York University. He was preceded by the Honorable SAMUEL DICKSTEIN, New York Member of Congress.

We interrupted our regular schedule at this time to bring you an analysis of the very latest developments abroad.

Now, our time is up, and before signing off may I remind you that we resume our series of high-lighting public affairs on September 14.

Until then this is your chairman, Solomon Portnow, saying good night, and cordially inviting all of you to be with us again when we go on the air 2 weeks from tonight.

Good night.

Veterans and Neutrality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEPHEN BOLLES
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 25, 1939

Mr. BOLLES. Mr. Speaker, I am asking unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a letter from Henry A. Friede, Wisconsin department commander of Disabled American Veterans of the World War. Mr. Friede says:

You have been summoned for a special session of Congress by our President, and apparently for one reason only, and that is to change the neutrality law which was lauded by him 3 years ago as being an outstanding piece of legislation, but today, according to his way of thinking, is obsolete.

It is hard to believe that a President of this great Nation of ours would make a statement about protecting English possessions in the Western Hemisphere with American troops even after they have declared war on Germany, and this statement was made without sanction from your honorable body. So many things have happened during the last year which lead one to believe that he is strictly pro-English or pro-French. When a situation like this exists we, the people, have only one hope and that is that our Representatives in Washington will realize and vote with only one thought in mind, and that is to not only be neutral to the letter but also in spirit. The writer feels that to change the neutrality law at this time will be our first step in entering the war on the side of a group of defaulting nations who now owe us over $16,000,000,000 in post-war debts, and who have got their heads together, and when we try to collect so much as tell us to try and get it. Furthermore, all war debts incurred during the war, which amounted to many more billions, have been wiped off the books. Should we enter another war we will be forced to loan many more billions, which no doubt our children and grandchildren will be struggling to pay in American taxes. Furthermore, it is common knowledge that these European nations spent many, many billions for armament; still they insist they are too poor to pay us. The World War cost the American Government—and we are still paying in the form of compensation to the disabled veterans—many millions a year, and these payments will continue for a long time to come, and a new war will undoubtedly add billions more to our compensation payments, which again will go on for years and years until the last veteran or his dependents die.

It is the writer's sincere hope that you will do your utmost to see that the present neutrality law will remain as it is and the officials in Washington who insist on trying to pull us into the war are put on the spot publicly and that their activities are called to the attention of the public.

Trusting that you will do your utmost to prevent this Nation from being drawn into this war, and also to prevent the slaughter of the American youth for the sake of a group of defaulting nations, I am,

Sincerely yours, HENRY A. FRIEDE.

The Voice of the People versus Warmongers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. THORKELSON
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 28, 1939

Mr. THORKELSON. Mr. Speaker, in the Washington Post, September 26, in an article entitled "Letter Bloc in Action," the writer makes this statement:

The largest influence against President Roosevelt's program about neutrality is letters coming in to Members of Congress from the country. There are other influences, yet it is safe to say that but for the letters, the President's proposal would be enacted readily.

The writer then asks, "What are these letters and what do they say?" From that point on the writer's assumption as regards the letters and the Congressmen's attitude is wrong, for I believe most letters are read and answered.

I find the majority of my letters very interesting. It is true, as the columnist intimates, that practically all the writers are opposed to war—and why not? It is the so-called common or middle-class people who always fight in the defense of the Republic. It is the same people who pay for the war and who are left holding the bag when the war is over. It is these people who are impoverished when the war makers, the international financiers, and the "invisible government" accumulate the gold, wealth, and power. It is the middle class or common people, of which I am one, that objects to war. The reason for this is no doubt due to the fact that they are looking face to face at their enemy—the "invisible government."

The first immigrants who came here to work and build were poor in estate but rich in the hope of human rights and liberties. They were not afraid to labor and build homes for themselves and for posterity. It is those early settlers who must be accredited as builders of this Nation, and it is the now increasing middle class that carries on.

They were happy until they fell afoul of the money changers, but they have been miserable since the advent of the financiers. They are positively in despair since the international financiers became articulate by wielding power through the "invisible government." It is now surprising that these people want to remain at peace? And that they object to sending their children to war to suffer and die for the "invisible government," and to further enslave themselves in the toils of this international monster? Let those who question their patriotism take heed, for each and all would rally to repel invasion of this continent, as they will to protect the United States against the destructive activities of the Socialist and Communist that are now operating under the beneficence of the "invisible government."

Is it now any wonder that these people—our people—do not want war? Is it strange that they might refuse to fight the second World War for the international exploiters in the "invisible government"? Is it not much more likely that our next war will be against the Socialist, the Communist, the international exploiters and financiers for destruction of their "sugar daddy," the "invisible government"?

Is it not much more important to get rid of the subversionist, the socialist, and the Communist, and is it not to our interest to get rid of political rot, intrigue, and double dealing in our own Government and its many departments? It is within the people's power to rescue our Nation from this rapidly swelling river of filth, rot, and intrigue before it is carried over the precipice into a whirlpool of internal strife.

In our own interest, let us fight the next war to restore our own Government to a democratic republic, based on the ever-sound and fundamental principles so clearly set forth in the Constitution of the United States. Let us restore the link which was removed in 1913—the seventeenth amendment.

Article I, section 3, of the Constitution states:

The Senate of the United States shall be composed of two Senators from each State, chosen by the legislature thereof, for 6 years; and each Senator shall have one vote.

Article IV, section 4, says:

The United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union a republican form of government, and shall protect each of them against invasion; and on application of the legislature or of the executive (when the legislature cannot be convened) against domestic violence.

Article V, in part, states:

No State, without its consent, shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate.

Article VI says, in part:

This Constitution and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof; and all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land; and the judges in every State shall be bound thereby, anything in the Constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding.

The adoption of the seventeenth amendment was not in pursuance of the Constitution, for the United States no longer can guarantee every State in the Union a republican form of government, because in the adoption of the seventeenth amendment the States were deprived of equal suffrage in the Senate (art. I, sec. 3).

The causes which were instrumental in shaping public approval for the adoption of the seventeenth amendment were no doubt engineered by the invisible government to bring

about what we have today—a "democracy," or communistic state. The irony of all this is that the slogan in the World War was too true. We were successful in saving the world for "democracy," for we now have communism, its identical twin. These Siamese twins, "democracy" and "communism," are the war babies now undermining and destroying our democratic Republic. We, the people, must unite to get rid of this monstrous offspring and its parents in the invisible government. We are loyal Americans when we face the Constitution and the flag and traitors when we turn our backs upon them.

Mr. Speaker, what is the power of the people in this Nation? It is within their power to take charge of the Government through the Congress of the United States. If Congress fails to obey the orders as given in the Constitution, the people must, in common defense and for the general welfare of themselves, take charge. It is therefore imperative that we, Members of Congress, assume our constitutional responsibility to the people and to our Nation.

The people demand that the Government remain neutral. It is the duty of Congress to comply with this command of the people, so that there will be no cause for war. For the columnists to insinuate that the letters we receive are inspired by foreign nations is in itself an affront to the people. Such statements are in reality a subtle type of propaganda, no different from that which now fills the pages of the "kept" press. It is inspired by the "invisible government" and paid for by those who now control world gold and credit. Statements like this are deceptive:

> In this situation, various suggestions are made. One is that the mass of letters be examined to see how many are in identical words. If many are identical, it would suggest that the letter writing is to a large extent organized and promoted. Then it is suggested that inquiry be made to find out who, or what organizations, are conducting the campaign. It is suggested further that there be counterorganizations to promote the writing of letters in favor of the President's proposal.

It can readily be seen that such investigation as the writer suggests would bring about persecution of those who differ from the administration and the "invisible government." It would differ from the present investigations only in that it would end in investigation and persecution of private patriotic citizens who object to again sending their children to the front to die for the "invisible government." Why not investigate sources of propaganda in films, radio, and in the "kept" press, and the propaganda spewed by hired writers? Why are the special investigating committees engaged in searching for an excuse to silence patriotic papers and in investigating subscribers to such papers? Why is the investigating organization employed to trump up charges against those who are engaged in publishing facts instead of propaganda pleasing to the "invisible government"? Why all this tomfoolery, when the Communists are so thick that the investigators may break their necks stumbling over them? What are we—mice or men—to tolerate such un-American activities?

Our citizens who are criticizing the administration or "invisible government" are in the right, and in such criticism they are not criminals, but they are instead sincere, straightforward citizens. God knows, there is much cause for criticism and condemnation.

Another writer makes this statement, in the Washington Daily News:

> Neutrality does not mean and never can mean "impartiality" in the sense that American policy and acts must confer the same or equal benefits upon both sides in the war.
>
> Any benefits that either side gains depends upon:
>
> 1. Its geographical position.
> 2. Its strength or weakness of arms at sea or on land.
> 3. Its ability to get American goods.
> 4. Its ability to pay for those goods in money, credit, or goods.

Points 1, 2, and 3 in this quotation do not concern us. Point 4 concerns us to the extent that the purchaser must pay cash in gold for merchandise delivered f. o. b. on his own responsibility, to be transported in his own ships.

As to the first paragraph, I may say that we should be "impartially neutral," which does not mean, as the writer assumes, that we must confer the same equal benefits upon both sides. Neutrality may therefore be compared to impartiality, fairness, or good sportsmanship, in a game, fight, or war.

There was no reason or justification in detaining the *Bremen* at the potential opening of the present hostilities in Europe. In this premeditated and unjust detention, we were partial to one nation and unneutral to the other. I shall now quote a letter from a previous Secretary of State, the Honorable William Jennings Bryan, as an example of neutrality:

> The Secretary of State to the German Ambassador (Bernstorff)
>
> WASHINGTON, *April 21, 1915.*
>
> Excellency: * * * In the third place, I note with sincere regret that, in discussing the sale and exportation of arms by citizens of the United States to the enemies of Germany, your excellency seems to be under the impression that it was within the choice of the Government of the United States, notwithstanding its professed neutrality and its diligent efforts to maintain it in other particulars, to inhibit this trade, and that its failure to do so manifested an unfair attitude toward Germany. This Government holds, as I believe your excellency is aware, and as it is constrained to hold in view of the present indisputable doctrines of accepted international law, that any change in its own laws of neutrality during the progress of a war which would affect unequally the relations of the United States with the nations at war would be an unjustifiable departure from the principle of strict neutrality by which it has consistently sought to direct its actions, and I respectfully submit that none of the circumstances urged in your excellency's memorandum alters the principle involved. The placing of an embargo on the trade in arms at the present time would constitute such a change and be a direct violation of the neutrality of the United States. It will, I feel assured, be clear to your excellency that, holding this view and considering itself in honor bound by it, it is out of the question for this Government to consider such a course.
>
> * * * * * * *
>
> Accept (etc.)
>
> W. J. BRYAN.

The Honorable W. J. Bryan as a sincere neutral did not fit into the Wilson administration. He was too fair, I presume, to suit the Presidential advisers, the late Colonel House, Mr. Baruch, and others. Many citizens and Members of Congress, knowing that advice is still furnished by the same group, fear the attitude of this administration. In this knowledge they realize that there must be some restriction so that this Nation will not be consigned to war, as it was in 1917. This restriction is found in the arms-embargo clause. It is well to bear in mind, however, that it will provide no greater assurance of peace than international law did in 1917, yet it will point an accusing finger at those who permit violation of the act. Evidence of such violation will be found in the sinking and destruction of our shipping in forbidden zones.

In speaking of war zones it must be understood that such areas are not designated by neutral nations, as we attempt to do in the Neutrality Act. In reality there are no war zones, because any ship that carries contraband cargo to belligerent nations or for consignment to belligerent nations through neutral states is subject to seizure or destruction when overhauled by belligerent warships. The embargo clause in our Neutrality Act serves one purpose alone, which is in restricting shipping of war material to nations at war, and it identifies those who are instrumental in violation of the act.

In a life-or-death struggle mistakes may be made in enemy attack and a neutral nation may become a victim because powers at war disregard international law. For example, a power at war may camouflage its ship as that of a neutral power. When challenged such ship may shed its neutrality disguise to attack and destroy the challenger. It is such infraction that often invites a weaker power to attack shipping in war zones without apparent provocation. Because of such danger our ships should not be permitted to enter such danger zones. This may be taken care of by regulation of clearance papers.

In my remarks on September 25 I referred to a special type of consultant that became popular with the advent of the late Colonel House. It is strange how some executives fall under the spell of a person or special group of advisers. It is quite evident, if one is to judge by results, that these White House ghosts not only give bad advice but also are grossly incompetent. This is clearly evident as we observe the condition our Nation is in today.

It might be a good idea for Congress to give a little advice to the President, for after all we are responsible and must in the end accept the blame. I am sure there are many Members in both Houses capable of giving better advice to the administration than that it may expect from agents of the "invisible government."

The "invisible government's" propaganda machine already claims victory for England and France, so the question may be asked, "Why all this unnecessary effort to get the American people interested in a war that we care nothing about?" I have never seen so little enthusiasm for a war as for the one we are now trying to support by the repeal of the arms-embargo clause.

Imports and Exports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 28, 1939

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to keep the record current with reference to our exports and imports.

Our foreign trade in agricultural products, according to figures just released by the Department of Commerce, continue to show a decrease in exports and an increase in imports.

For the 8 months ended August 1939 our agricultural exports amounted to $343,867,000, a decrease of $183,613,000, or 34.8 percent from the same period of 1938. Imports of agricultural products for the 8 months of 1939 amounted to $693,311,000, an increase of $65,464,000, or 10.4 percent over the same period of 1938. This decrease in exports and increase in imports resulted in an import balance of $349,444,000 for the 8 months of 1939 as compared with $100,367,000 for the same period of 1938, an increase of $249,077,000, or 249 percent in our import balance of trade in agricultural products for the first 8 months of 1939. Also our total trade—exports and imports—in agricultural products showed a decrease of $118,149,000, or about 10 percent for the first 8 months of 1939 as compared with the same period of 1938.

While the Roosevelt administration and proponents of the reciprocal-trade program are alarmed and perplexed, the American farmer is likewise alarmed and dissatisfied over the agricultural export market, which the Hull trade program promised to expand.

Instead of expanding foreign markets for our agricultural products the Hull reciprocal-trade program seems to be working in reverse. The loss in our principal agricultural exports is shown in the following decreases for the first 8 months of 1939: Cotton, $53,736,000; tobacco, $18,214,000; corn, $70,970,000; wheat, $35,654,000; fresh fruits, $4,184,000; all foodstuffs, $112,072,000.

While on the other hand small increases in our exports of meat products, lard, and vegetables were registered.

The following tables give our trade up to August 31, 1939, or the period before the war in Europe began:

Agricultural exports, imports, and trade balances, 8 months ended August 1938 and 1939

Total trade	8 months ended August—		Increase (+) or decrease (−)
	1938	1939	
Agricultural:			
Exports	$527,480,000	$343,867,000	−$183,613,000
Imports	627,847,000	693,311,000	+65,464,000
Import balance	100,367,000	349,444,000	+249,077,000
Total trade	1,155,327,000	1,037,178,000	−118,149,000

EXPORTS OF AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS

Export items	8 months ended August—		Increase (+) or decrease (−)
	1938	1939	
Total agricultural exports	$527,480,000	$343,867,000	−$183,613,000
Cotton, unmanufactured	140,039,000	86,303,000	−53,736,000
Tobacco, unmanufactured	69,671,000	51,457,000	−18,214,000
Foodstuffs (total)	301,702,000	189,630,000	−112,072,000
Corn	82,102,000	11,132,000	−70,970,000
Wheat	68,018,000	32,364,000	−35,654,000
Wheat flour	16,144,000	16,100,000	−44,000
Oil cake and meal	6,154,000	5,894,000	−260,000
Vegetables and preparations	8,910,000	10,348,000	+1,438,000
Fruits:			
Fresh	28,292,000	24,108,000	−4,184,000
Dried and evaporated	11,830,000	11,053,000	−777,000
Canned	12,049,000	12,902,000	+853,000
Meat products	18,868,000	22,008,000	+3,140,000
Lard, including neutral	11,916,000	13,492,000	+1,576,000
Dairy products, except fresh milk	3,836,000	4,268,000	+432,000
Other foodstuffs	33,583,000	25,961,000	−7,622,000
Other agricultural products	16,068,000	16,477,000	+409,000

Source: U. S. Department of Commerce figures (Sept. 26, 1939).

Aid For the Allies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BENNETT CHAMP CLARK
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, September 28, 1939

LETTER FROM MAJ. GEN. SIR LEONARD ROGERS

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be inserted in the RECORD an open letter to the editor of the London Daily Telegraph from Maj. Gen. Sir Leonard Rogers, on the subject of the Contribution Which Should Be Made by the United States to the Cause of the Allies.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICA'S AID TO THE DEMOCRACIES—HOW HELP MIGHT BE PROFFERED

From Maj. Gen. Sir Leonard Rogers.

To the editor of the Daily Telegraph.

SIR: President Roosevelt doubtless expresses the true opinion of the American Nation in his sympathetic words in support of the British and French stand against the Hitler bid to enslave the remaining free portion of the world.

I trust that it may not be out of place to suggest—and it is merely a suggestion—that the great American Nation may also wish to show their sympathy with the ideals for which Britain and France are engaging in a life-and-death struggle in something more than words, and more, too, than a business contribution on a cash-and-carry principle of neutrality; but short of taking an active part in the war.

In the first place, might they not consider the costless gesture of canceling the war debts of Britain and France, which obviously have no cash value and form but a small part of infinitely greater sacrifices made in defeating the 1914 German bid for world power, to the benefit of the world at large?

Might it not also be in the true interests of the United States to go further and grant large credits to Britain and France to cover the production of war materials, with some relief to American unemployment?

In view of their immense unused gold accumulations, might not the United States make that contribution to the world-wide democratic cause free of interest; with the proviso that it should be repaid at the conclusion of the present war, provided that United States is then satisfied that they have made as great sacrifices, including the proposed credit, as have Britain and France?

No true democrat doubts ultimate victory, but only the united effort of the democracies is likely to bring it about in time to avert a lengthy set-back to the progress of civilization of the world at large.

Yours faithfully,

LEONARD ROGERS.

HAMPSTEAD, *September 2.*

Dedication of Physical Education Gymnasium Building at Seton Hall College, South Orange, N. J.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT L. VREELAND

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 28, 1939

Mr. VREELAND. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, October 1, 1939, at one of the outstanding and fast-growing colleges of the country located in my district, namely, Seton Hall College, South Orange, N. J., the laying of the cornerstone of a new physical education gymnasium building is scheduled. This marks the first building of an expansion program and is, in my opinion, to be one of the finest and best-equipped gymnasiums in the East, if not in the entire country. Seton Hall College, under the very able leadership of its president, Rev. Dr. James F. Kelley, my very dear friend, and the board of governors, has grown remarkably in the past few years and ranks among the leading educational institutions in this Nation.

I wish at this time to commend the Most Reverend Thomas J. Walsh, archbishop of the diocese of Newark, Rev. Dr. James F. Kelley, and the other members of the board of governors upon their noble achievement, with the feeling and thought that their expansion project will continue with rapid strides.

The following are a few of the letters received by the college from New Jersey leaders:

STATE OF NEW JERSEY,
October 1, 1939.

YOUR EXCELLENCY: I am proud to be included among those whose letters will be sealed in the cornerstone of the Physical Education Building of Seton Hall College.

Such great changes are taking place in the world today that it is difficult for us to project our imaginations into the world of 200 years hence, when I understand the seals of this cornerstone may be broken.

If it is difficult for us to imagine what the world will be like 200 years from now, perhaps our lives will seem equally strange to the people who will then inhabit our State.

Through the pages of history posterity will be informed of the state of the world at this time, of the wars which are devastating Europe and Asia and threatening to overthrow our present civilization. They will know the outcome of these wars and their aftermath and what, for good or evil, arose out of the ashes of war. We in this country pray that the blight of war will not fall upon us; that our system of government, which has withstood so many storms, will endure, as we all firmly believe it will. But prayer should be combined with the determination that we shall constantly strive to maintain our American institutions and ways of thought.

We in New Jersey enjoy many advantages. Though forty-fifth in size, we are ninth in population, and sixth in value of manufactured products. We have been abundantly blessed by reason of a favorable climate and location, which have lent encouragement to the development of agriculture and industry and the growth of great recreational centers.

We are especially happy in the thought that throughout our Nation each child is given the opportunity of an education. The American system of education is one of the finest features of our national life. Countless members of foreign races have sought homes and refuge in our country. Today, while their mother countries are at war, we witness the fusion of these races in our country under one banner. Much of the credit for this happy blending of the races can be given to our school system, which has trained the children of foreign-born parents to become good citizens of the United States.

An essential feature of present-day education is physical education, which is doing so much to help children attain vigorous maturity. In laying the cornerstone of a physical education building we are today laying the foundation for the physical well-being of countless children who will benefit from the training given in this school.

By contrast to the situation in Europe, where followers of the Christian religion are being persecuted, we are today enlarging the activities of a college devoted to the dissemination of religious teaching. This brings home to us most strongly another advantage of life in the United States of America—the blessing of religious freedom.

Out of the building whose cornerstone is laid today, and out of the college of which it is a part will radiate forces and influences for good. As we seal this cornerstone, we greet posterity across the bridge of time, and we pledge ourselves that we, who today carry the torch of education, shall not fail to train those who come after us to so carry on that our land shall ever remain what it is today—the hope of the world.

Sincerely yours,

A. HARRY MOORE, *Governor.*

Most Rev. THOMAS JOSEPH WALSH, S. T. D., J. C. D.,
Archbishop of Newark, Newark, N. J.

NEWARK EVENING NEWS,
September 19, 1939.

Very Rev. JAMES F. KELLEY,
President, Seton Hall College,
South Orange, N. J.

DEAR DR. KELLEY: Only in the Americas could such an event as this cornerstone laying at Seton Hall take place today. Elsewhere in the world the lights of civilization are out or going out. Elsewhere in the world intolerance and persecution have taken the place of tolerance and humaneness.

This ceremony can be held, this building can be dedicated to Christian education because the people of this Nation are dedicated to tolerance, to respect for the opinions of mankind, and to reverence for God and His truths. A people united in peaceful pursuits, with religious and racial hatreds eliminated, will pray God that this building will carry on the fine traditions of Seton Hall.

Yours,

ARTHUR J. SINNOTT, *Editor.*

NEWARK SUNDAY CALL,
September 12, 1939.

Very Rev. JAMES F. KELLEY,
President, Seton Hall College,
South Orange, N. J.

DEAR DR. KELLEY: It is a privilege to be included among those whose thoughts are to be preserved for posterity in the cornerstone of Seton Hall's physical-education building, but I am afraid that I am too overwhelmed with shame and disappointment in this hour in the world's history to be able to believe that posterity will give much weight to my words or to those who will be associated with me in this enterprise.

I have an uncomfortable feeling that on some distant day, when your building, now so new and fine, is razed to make way for one still nobler, the wreckers will come upon the contents of this cornerstone and read with laughter and pity the words of those who lived in an age when men sought to settle their differences by force of arms.

I am confident that mankind will ultimately discard war as an instrument for adjusting national grievances. When that day comes, men will look back upon our generation as contemptuously as we regard those who burned witches and made propitiatory offerings to evil spirits.

The abolition of war and the establishment of a universal brotherhood of nations and peoples can be accomplished only by education and by educational methods which place spiritual values above the material. Christian educational institutions are striving for this goal, but they have made only a beginning.

The recrientation of the thinking of thousands of years is a task for the centuries. Let none doubt, however, that with courage and persistence and humility the change can be accomplished.

The educational system of the United States, despite its imperfections, offers the world its greatest hope. We have taken natives of every land and taught them to dwell side by side in peace and understanding.

The American school has destroyed the accumulated prejudices of hundreds of years of European history. The spectacular success of American assimilation suggests that in the schools of the world will mankind find the catalyst which will end hatred among men by destroying the illusion that there are vital differences among them.

The glory of the Roman Catholic Church is its teaching that God recognized neither race nor color; that in His eyes all men are alike. Until this teaching spreads over the earth man must always be trembling on the brink of bloodshed and disaster.

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD F. BATAILLE.

COURT OF CHANCERY OF NEW JERSEY,
October 1, 1939.

Very Rev. JAMES F. KELLEY, Ph. D.,
Seton Hall College, South Orange, N. J.

DEAR DR. KELLEY: Today's ceremonies of laying the cornerstone of the Physical Education Building of Seton Hall College by His Excellency the Most Rev. Thomas J. Walsh, Archbishop of Newark, marks another step in the continuing progress of a great Catholic college. The new building will be an enduring monument to the perseverance of our most reverend archbishop and the president and faculty of the college. In considering the successful efforts of its promoters, our thoughts go to the means which made their plan effective. This new institution, like most every other Catholic institution in the United States today, represents the modest contributions of the diocesan faithful. It is not the product of financial encouragement from rich philanthropic foundations; nor is it the result of generous benefactions of wealthy Catholics. The Catholic institutions, in this country, arise and take form largely through

the voluntary sacrifices of the rank and file of our Catholic citizens. We point with pride to their accomplishments. Today Catholic education in the United States ministers to the needs of more than two and one-half million students. It provides facilities on every level from kindergarten to university. A survey shows that throughout our country there are over 10,700 Catholic educational institutions, attended by some 85,000 teachers. There are approximately 8,000 elementary schools, 2,000 high schools, 225 colleges, universities, and normal schools, and 200 major and minor seminaries. The cost, maintenance, and operation of these schools run into an average daily outlay of $1,000,000. There is an investment in lands and buildings and equipment that runs into hundreds of millions of dollars. If the investment of the church in educational facilities were to be turned over to the State, the State would have a heavy burden to carry. The State's aid to the church's educational program is limited to the minimum help of tax exemption. Nothing more. While the financial burden of education weighs heavily in some dioceses, yet that burden will continue to be cheerfully borne, if its transfer to the State means that the church's teachings of the Catholic youth are to be circumscribed or limited in the slightest degree. We Catholics hold, and our children are taught, that this life is of minor importance. Eternal life is the complete life. We contend that any system of education which stresses earthly life and neglects eternal life is fundamentally defective, because religion is not merely an element in education but a fundamental element.

"Reason and experience both forbid us to expect that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principle." Those words are not the utterance of any Catholic prelate, sage, or educator. They are the imperishable words of the immortal George Washington. His words are heeded in the Catholic schools. They find no place in the curricula of secular education.

Morality is based on religion. It is the law of right living and our children are taught that it is God's law, therefore just, and must be followed. Our school is a school of the faith and the preservation of the true faith demands that a Catholic child shall be trained in a Catholic school. I can better emphasize this point by borrowing the language of a great Catholic prelate of this diocese who said: "The child who is educated only in a secular school is spiritually illiterate; and of him it may be said that he is unlettered of God, unenlightened of Christ, ignorant of Heaven and the eternal destiny of his own immortal soul. He is not alive to the warning whisperings of conscience; his will has not been strengthened and his heart not trained in the school of discipline. Manhood comes, he is a scholar in this world's science; but the world that has no ending is a complete blank to him. He can measure the earth, weigh the air, name the planets, compute the shining sun, and knows nothing about the Creator of them all and himself—spiritual illiteracy."

The the Protestant church is giving serious thought to the absence of religious training in secular schools is evident from the remarks of Dr. F. Ernest Johnson, secretary of the department of research and education of The Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, who, also, is professor of education at Teachers College, Columbia University, on August 29, 1939, before the Williamstown Institute of Human Relations, at Williamstown, Mass. He suggested that public education include among its aims the equipment of boys and girls, youth and adults for participation in the religious life of the community. He asserted that "the result of our present educational policy will be an increasing isolation of religion from life."

In this present day we have but to cast our eyes over the field of secular education and in many instances we find that the scholastic atmosphere is charged with the devastating social poisons of communism and atheism. Those twin enemies of religion are largely imported European products and should find no place in our system of education. They are not American-born. Indeed not. Our country is essentially religious. The first act of the great navigator, Columbus, upon discovering this continent, was to kneel, raise the cross of Christ upon our shores, and offer thanks to God. Our first President, Washington, was intensely religious. He cannot be charged with ever holding back his views of faith in the existence of the Supreme Being. Our American forefathers were of a religious bent. They dedicated this country to God and publicly expressed their sentiments of religious belief in God in the Declaration of Independence. Upon the currency of the United States they inscribed their motto of faith in these words: "In God we trust." The money which the atheist, the Communist, and the godless use as a medium of exchange in this country is marked with a definite expression of the religious convictions of the founders of this Republic. The ideals of our colonial forefathers still prevail; they have in no way lost their influence in the hearts and the minds of true Americans. Christ is still King, and Catholic teaching will continue to proclaim that truism until the last man Christ died to save is gathered to the bliss of Heaven or consigned to the shades of eternal death.

The Catholic layman supports in full measure his municipal, State, and National Governments. That support includes taxes levied for the maintenance of the public or secular schools which his child does not attend. He likewise, from a conviction of right, contributes most cheerfully to the support of the Catholic school. He thus bears a double tax. We indulge the hope that in the no distant future the traditional American sense of justice and fair play will find a way to help conscientious parents to care for the religious and moral education of their children without the necessity of being subjected to the burden of double taxation.

Today may not seem the opportune time to ask the Government to give consideration to the financial burden of the religious educational institutions because of the emergent problems confronting it. The State and Nation for 10 years have been groaning under the burden of an economic depression that has sent and is still sending millions of our citizens to the relief rolls. The devastating war which began in Europe a few weeks ago, as well as the horrible conflict which has been raging between Japan and China, are of immediate outstanding concern to our people and, just now, are properly holding the national attention. Those wars, really world-wide in extent, are casting their ugly dark shadows over this hemisphere. However, regardless of any National or State aid, our Catholic institutions will continue to carry on, and their devotion to Christian ideals may, perhaps, convey to a war-torn world that the practice of Christian principles is necessary to end unrest and to bring permanent peace to suffering humanity.

In conclusion, permit me to congratulate you and your fellow coworkers upon the successful realization of a project that means so much to Catholic life.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES M. EGAN.

What Is Your Attitude Toward Your Government?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. KERR
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 28, 1939

ADDRESS BY HON. JOHN H. KERR, OF NORTH CAROLINA

Mr. KERR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me on September 15, 1939, to the student body consisting of more than 1,100 students, assembled at Wake Forest College, in the State of North Carolina, at the beginning of the one hundred and sixth anniversary session of this great institution:

Members of the student body, ladies, and gentlemen, this is the third time in many years that I have had an opportunity to appear before a Wake Forest audience. I hope that this is not my last appearance. I fully realize that you young gentlemen who are here in the process of preparing yourselves for citizenship should, and doubtless will, play a most important part in the preservation of those ideals and virtues which have made our Nation, the United States of America, great, and given it a position that no other nation has ever occupied. If you should fail in this critical period of the world's history, the consequences may be disastrous, and those critics of Thomas Jefferson who insisted that a government of the people was impossible will have proven to be correct.

I think that the great problem which has always faced this country and all democracies is the nation's youth. I think that Mr. Jefferson understood this when in the answer to those who criticized his ideals he said that "A government of the people would be safe and permanent if the people were made intelligent through universal education, so that one class could not exploit another."

You may accept as a fact that the Constitution of the United States cannot be destroyed except by a revolution of the people. Note the preamble: "We, the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution of the United States of America." The Constitution and this democracy will stand or fall together. Only a revolution of the people can effect the destruction of both. This was the position Mr. Webster took in his answer to Mr. Haynes in the momentous States' rights debate between these two gentlemen. Thus far the American Constitution has stood the test of time and the test of secession. The freedom which we enjoy in this Nation is wrapped in the folds of the Constitution, and I believe that it is sufficiently elastic to preserve those things which our ancestors held to constitute human rights. We will doubtless add to and take from this document many times, but we will and should always preserve its fundamental principles and its spirit.

No student of history can have any doubt that a democracy is by far the most difficult form of government that ever existed. In a totalitarian state or a communistic state a citizen has only to do what he is told; it is not necessary for him to think or make any choice, no responsibility rests upon the citizen, and the governmental machine is effective as long as the citizen obeys.

If I were called upon to give my opinion in respect to those influences which entered most in the making of this Nation great, I would unhesitatingly say that it was the religious spirit which

was most pronounced in our ancestors and that unconquerable individuality of their descendants which was constructed upon self-sacrifice and the will to make good and accomplish something in life. Our ancestors were a religious people. Those who first came to this country came primarily to seek religious freedom and escape persecution. It is not strange that they sought the form of government which guaranteed to them freedom and the right to do as they wished within the bounds of moral restraint and within the common-law maxim "that the welfare of all the people should be the highest law." And I am convinced that all true Americans still cling to the tenet that the future must be a goal of greater common welfare, of greater opportunity, and greater general happiness. And in the last analysis the problem which our forefathers attempted to solve through our Constitution was the old problem which throughout all ages has engaged the faculties of man, namely, the question of right and wrong.

The affairs of the world are in a deplorable condition, but that does not necessarily mean that our democracy is seriously imperiled. Doubtless it would be but for two things which are at the present time insurmountable, namely, the fact that freedom and liberty have been and are yet the cornerstone of our national life, and the further fact that there is no nation or combination of nations physically or financially able to invade our territory and molest our form of government.

What we should most fear and what I shall call your attention to in this address are matters involving our internal affairs, namely, the utter indifference manifested on the part of the present generation in respect to the affairs of our Government, the want of responsibility on the part of the average citizen of this age, and the shocking criminal record of the youth of this period of our national life. To correct these defects is the task every good citizen should undertake.

Since the day of Solon, the law giver, the founder of democracy, to this day the ability of the people to rule themselves has been disputed and on many occasions has been successfully challenged. Mr. Jefferson thought he had placed his finger on the trouble. His remedy was universal education and intelligence. And I am sure that he had in mind a qualitative system rather than a quantitative system of education, and he never intended the Government to do more than provide physical security, freedom, and untrammelled opportunity.

A self-sacrificing people are trying to perfect Mr. Jefferson's remedy, and we are now spending annually $2,500,000,000 for the education of the youth of this Nation, and this sum about equals the amount spent for this purpose by all the other nations on earth. And at this point I wish to call your attention to what I hold to be the most serious fault in our democracy at this period of our national life, that fault is the callous indifference on the part of this generation to those fundamental attributes which made us great and can only preserve our history. And so I am asking you this question, and asking every other citizen of the United States, "What is your attitude to your Government?"

My question may be in the nature of an indictment, at any rate I hope to be classed as a constructive critic. There is not now and never has been a legitimate place in this world for a destructive critic; such a critic gets nowhere and no great institution was ever established by such criticism. The power to get together and agree is the foundation upon which all great achievement has been wrought. We should court constructive criticism, it is a beacon light to remind us of the faults of ourselves and the virtues and mistakes of others. And here let me remind you that Nature does not deal in perfections, and the noblest characters of this life were not cast in flawless molds. And who would have it otherwise?

Does the average high-school or college graduate know anything about his Government? No. His definition of a democracy, if he could give one, is that it is a government of the people, for the people, and by the people. Beyond this few would venture to give a definition. The average citizen's estimate of a public official, the representative of the people in the councils of the Nation, is usually formed from what he or she sees in the press, and this you can in most cases discount. I do not challenge the freedom of the press. It is an important place in our democracy, but I do hold that it is the duty of every good citizen to inform himself as to the history and the purposes of his Government. This is the only means by which you can determine your attitude to your Government. To be indifferent in respect to this duty is nothing less than a moral crime. We can love neither an animate nor an inanimate object unless we know something about it. Every human institution, if it is to be permanent, needs its watchdog, and no institution more than a democracy. But what good is a watchdog if he does not know what he is watching; if he does not know how to safeguard his heritage, or if he does not know what his heritage is? How can an elector wisely choose a representative to express his views about government when the elector has no views or concrete knowledge of what can and should be done, or how it should be done and the effect of his act?

There can be no higher honor than to be the representative of the people in a democracy. It should be a legitimate object of ambition to the best men in the country, and the people should always realize their responsibility in the choice of their representative. A careless estimate of a voter, who knows or cares but little about his government, would likely elect just such a representative, and this is the representative who is most likely to fall a prey to subversive influences. And let me say here advisedly that I do not think that opportunity has ceased to knock at the door of the youth of this land, and I believe that a great majority of the people of this Nation are eager for right thinking, clear-minded leadership in politics and every other walk of life. Just such a leadership will go far toward the correction of the indifference and irresponsibility and the crime of which we complain.

Can the average college student tell you who is his Representative in Congress? I fear he cannot. Can the average citizen of this age define "local self-government" or "State sovereignty"? I am satisfied that he cannot.

What I want to do is to impress upon you that a democracy cannot succeed as a form of government unless the people take an intelligent interest in public affairs. You remember that the makers of our Constitution insisted upon preserving the right of local self-government and there were comparatively few rights delegated to the Federal Government. Most of the government was left to the States. It is apparent that as the Nation's affairs become more complex that there will be an expansion of Federal power, but in admitting this we should be inspired with the determination to preserve local self-government and State sovereignty.

I may doubtless appear harsh in my criticism of this age for its indifference and utter ignorance of government technique. I hope and pray that we may be aroused to correct this mistake. What we should do and begin to do at once is to train the youth of this Nation in the technique of democracy and not in the technique of revolution and destruction. You will never see another political platform which does not advocate an adequate provision for the less fortunate through relief, old-age pensions, subsidized housing plans, and the like, and every political party will write into its platform a plan to restore financial solidarity and business expansion which will cure the unemployment problem. These problems must be met. You cannot ignore them. Let's meet them in the democratic way and so inspire our people through love for our Constitution and knowledge of the function of our Government that we will convince the world that a democracy is a permanent institution.

Let us be able to answer the destructive critics. You have heard that the Government has spent vast sums of money in the last 5 years, and I think most of us will admit that we have spent too much money in recent years. Emergencies had arisen in our national life which made it necessary and unavoidable. And we should thank God that we were able to spend this money and still be solvent. What this Government has spent for national protection, relief, permanent improvements, and education, as reflected in our increased indebtedness for the last 5 years, does not equal the annual expenditures of the Nation for automobiles and upkeep—eight and one-half billion dollars; for cigarettes and tobacco, two and one-half billion dollars; for amusements, $4,000,000,000; and for cosmetics and liquor, two and one-half billion dollars; a total of seventeen and one-half billion dollars. I recall these figures to show you what an income this Government has. Our standard of living is the highest in the world and our labor is paid the highest price in the world. The debt of the Nation, all the States, and all the political subdivisions of the States is approximately $60,000,000,000, and this has accumulated over a long period of years. The annual income of this Nation now is more than $70,000,000,000. One year's income will pay all our public indebtedness and there will still remain an amount almost sufficient to feed and clothe every person in the United States.

I am not sure that indifference and irresponsibility is not the proximate cause of the criminal record of this Nation. We could save $15,000,000,000 annually to be expended on worth-while endeavors if we wipe out this stricture upon our civilization. There is a problem for every good citizen, and your attitude to your Government will determine the solution of this menace.

Coming back to my old college home after years of hard work and political adventure, fully sharing the experience of joy and sorrow of the average man, and with a heart full of gratitude to God for His blessings and a keen sense of obligation to those who have helped me achieve my success in life, my thoughts often linger about the associations and experiences I had here. I have never ceased to thank those who induced me to come to Wake Forest College, and I shall always hold in affectionate regard those wonderful men who taught me and with whom I associated in my college career.

May I refer to the faculty when I was here: there was Dr. Charles E. Taylor, then president of this institution, the wise philosopher and businessman unsurpassed, he was the very best judge of human nature I ever saw, always as candid and guileless as a child, and his sense of humor has rarely been equaled. There were here then those superb Christian gentlemen, old Dr. William Royal, and his son young Dr. William Royal, the lives of these men were a benediction to every student. I once asked the old doctor, when he was explaining to me some literary feast that he had just enjoyed, why it was that he continued to study so much when he already knew so much, and his reply was, "John, I am satisfied that the more I learn here the higher I will enter the university above." Young Dr. Royal was as gentle as a woman and faithful to every duty ever committed to him by God or man; he taught Greek and knew it so well that I always thought that he had little respect for a student who did not master that language. I could never make more than 75 on Greek, and I fear that I fell in that class whom he thought was hopeless. Professor

Mills, my old math teacher, knew more about mathematics than any person I ever saw, and always assumed that everybody else knew all about this science, which assumption was most violent. Professor Mills was a walking encyclopedia, he was accurately informed on almost every subject, talked well, and was a most interesting companion. And then there was here Prof. John F. Lanneau, the French Huguenot; he had a genteel background that dated a thousand years, and his stately personal appearance and demeanor was the admiration of all who knew him. He was worth $5,000 annually to any institution just to walk through its campus twice a day. There was my kinsman, Dr. William Louis Poteat. He was born good, and throughout his long life walked with God. He was a great thinker, and I hazard nothing when I assert that he was the most intellectual man this State has produced in a hundred years. Professor Carlyle was our latin teacher; he considered every responsibility committed to him sacred, was one of the best public speakers I ever listened to, and was a great Democrat both in spirit and partisanship. Had Professor Carlyle sought political honor and public office, he would have been a most formidable candidate and would have adorned any office in the gift of the people. Prof. J. C. Maske was here, he soon endeared himself to the student body by reason of his modesty and thorough mastery of the subjects he taught, every student who entered his classroom had the profoundest respect and admiration for him.

These men of whom I have spoken have all gone "across the Unknown River to the Unseen Shore," and there yet remain but three here who were members of the faculty when I was a student. Dr. Sledd, who came to teach modern languages but soon took the chair of English, loved English and its literature and was never happier than when explaining the sublime attributes of the great thinkers and writers of ancient and modern times. Dr. Sledd was always sentimental and his poetic soul frequently burst forth in verse as sweet and as fragrant as the dawn of a summer's day. Dr. Gorrell is here, a man whom Nature endowed with the faculty to teach; his long service at this institution has been invaluable, and I can be corroborated by thousands when I state that no finer teacher ever served any institution in this country. And there yet remains my law teacher, Dr. Gulley. I have no words adequate to express my affectionate regard for him or to properly evaluate his fine service to this institution. He could take a piece of chalk and get to a blackboard and make a synopsis and diagram of a principle of law that a fool could understand and never forget. He never had his equal as a teacher in this State, and I have no idea that John Minor in any way excelled him as a law teacher.

Time is inadequate for me to make but a short appraisement of the men who taught me here and greatly influenced my life. When I came here this institution had the largest enrollment of any institution in this State, and I thought then, and think now, that it is one of the very best educational institutions in this land. Then there was an influence here—and I hope it exists now—which impelled you to realize that no education of mind and body was complete unless safeguarded by a spiritual conception of man's duty to his fellow man and to his God. There was no influence here in this college then which discredited the religious teaching of Jesus Christ or which in any way attempted to subordinate human freedom or the doctrine of popular government established by our fathers. I hope that there will never be a place in this institution for nazi-ism, fascism, or communism, or any other kind of ism which has for its purpose the destruction of our democracy. There should be an inspiration here and at every other school in this Republic to make our democracy so perfect that all other nations will consider it a model.

Certainly under the influence and direction of your great president, Dr. Kitchin, no subversive influence could originate or exist here now. Your president is a member of one of the most distinguished families ever reared in our Southland. Most of his immediate family has a passion for politics, and every member of it has been true to the ideals of democracy and they loved this country with a devotion most pronounced. Their names will always adorn the history of this State and Nation.

And right here I want to impress upon you that one college professor can create more subversive influence and discord among the people by his contact with the student youth of this Nation than all the red-flag demonstrations of cranks and crackpots which ever attempt to parade in it.

Young gentlemen, when shadows of doubt begin to fall about you and you begin to feel that other forms of government are superior to ours, I would have you pause and look back down the road where you came from. If you can do this and remember the way and the history of those generations who preceded you and the blessings you have received because of their fidelity and love for this Government, then you will never be lost. Your heritage is the greatest any nation ever possessed; feel a sense of your great responsibility; do not allow the spirit of indifference to find a place in your life. Take a profound interest in your governmental affairs, and I have no fear as to what your attitude toward this Government will be. That attitude will determine its stability of our democracy and the ideals of popular government.

The Significance of the Pan American Movement in the Present Singularly Unhappy Juncture of World Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SOL BLOOM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 28, 1939

ADDRESS OF THE HONORABLE CORDELL HULL, SECRETARY OF STATE OF THE UNITED STATES AND CHAIRMAN OF THE GOVERNING BOARD OF THE PAN AMERICAN UNION, ON THE OCCASION OF THE CELEBRATION OF PAN AMERICAN DAY AT THE NEW YORK WORLD'S FAIR, FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 22, 1939

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein the following address of the Honorable Cordell Hull on The Significance of the Pan American Movement in the Present Singularly Unhappy Juncture of World Affairs:

In the name of the governing board of the Pan American Union, I should like, first of all, to express our gratitude to the management of the New York World's Fair for their courtesy in designating this day as Pan American Day. For myself I welcome this opportunity to make a few brief remarks regarding the significance of the Pan American movement in the present, singularly unhappy juncture of world affairs.

Around us here are striking achievements of scientists and engineers, of architects and artists, revealing what could be done for the advancement of the human race if only their genius could be given free scope for constructive effort everywhere. There is a poignant contrast between what we behold here and the soul-searing pictures of suffering and destruction brought to us hourly from those portions of the earth in which armed hostilities are now taking place. That contrast should strengthen in all of us a determination to assure an organization of world affairs which would make possible the use of such magnificent technical skill as is here assembled solely and uninterruptedly for the creative work of peaceful progress.

The attainment of such an organization of world affairs has always been one of the underlying purposes of the American republics. It has always been one of the principal objectives of the great movement of cooperation and solidarity—the ties of which, happily, have grown ever stronger among our nations.

Today the American republics are supremely fortunate in that they are at peace within and without our hemisphere. Each of our republics is ready to defend itself against any threat to its security that may come from any part of the world. At the same time, it is the unalterable desire of each and every one of our nations to remain at peace ourselves and to exercise all influence in our power toward the end that just and enduring peace may become firmly established everywhere.

Less than a quarter of a century ago 12 of our American republics were involved in a world war. When that ordeal ended all of us were determined to devote our best efforts toward the establishment of a world order in which recourse to war as an instrument of accomplishing national aims would be unthinkable. Within the limitations of its own traditional policy each of our nations has since sought to make its fullest practicable contribution toward the attainment of that objective.

This attitude on our part is a direct result of our own American experience. From the very beginning of their independent existence the American republics have sought to shape their international policies in accordance with certain cardinal principles. Crucial among these are, first, recognition that each nation is a juridically equal member of the family of nations; and, second, recognition that civilization and progress are possible only when there is universal acceptance of order, implemented by international law and based upon justice, fair dealing, mutual respect, cooperation, and the sanctity of agreements, freely made, faithfully observed, and honorably altered by peaceful methods when need arises.

By applying these principles among ourselves we have gradually built up in the Western Hemisphere an international system which is our American way of peace.

Among the 21 American republics are found various degrees of numerical strength and of military power, as well as different degrees of wealth and of industrial and financial organization. Yet we have

arranged and have managed to live side by side. Among us small countries do not feel menaced by their powerful neighbors. Among us no group of nations is allied against any other group. Our peace does not rest on fear.

There are, to be sure, causes for controversy here as there are in other parts of the world. But mechanisms for resolving them have been set up by mutual agreement. These mechanisms are in operation, and there is a growing realization that just claims advanced by any member or members of the group will be fairly dealt with.

All this is the fruit of our persistent endeavors to give form and substance to the ideals which we profess. We have striven for years to remove causes of distrust and friction between and among our several countries. Many of us, including the United States, have had to recognize that mistakes were made and that rectification was in order. We have had to overcome false pride and to correct errors. Much of this has been done; and the doing of it has established faith and trust among the American nations.

Our periodic inter-American conferences have played a great role in this development. I should like to recall to your attention the work done by the three most recent ones.

At the Seventh International Conference of American States, held at Montevideo in 1933, substantial progress was made toward removing the individual causes for controversy through agreement on a treaty to govern the rights and duties of States.

In 1936 the Inter-American Conference for the Maintenance of Peace, at Buenos Aires, considered the need of strengthening the methods by which the peace of the American nations could be safeguarded and maintained. One result of that conference was a Convention for the Maintenance, Preservation, and Reestablishment of Peace, which provided for consultation between the 21 republics in case the peace of the western world was menaced from within or from without.

Finally, at Lima, last year the Eighth International Conference of American States, in its basic declaration, affirmed the solidarity of the nations of America, based on "the similarity of their republican institutions, their unshakable will for peace, their absolute adherence to the principles of international law, of the equal sovereignty of states, and of individual liberty without religious or racial prejudices." With this in mind, the 21 republics affirmed their determination to maintain these principles, to defend them against any threat from outside our hemisphere, and, in the event of danger, to consult among themselves as to measures which might be taken in cooperation for the common safety.

At this very moment representatives of all of the American governments are assembling in Panama for the purpose of taking the measures necessary to safeguard the peace of the Americas. Here we see the functioning of an international system of cooperative peace, designed to assure internal concord and external security for the nations of our hemisphere.

At all three of the conferences, important steps were taken in the direction of a mitigation of unreasonable trade barriers among our various countries and between each of them and the rest of the world. At all three, means were devised for strengthening cultural and other relationships—those indispensable foundations of international understanding and cooperation—again, among our various countries and between each of them and the rest of the world. The resolutions and recommendations of the conferences along these lines have been or are being put into effect by the American republics. Here, too, we see the functioning of a system of cooperative peace.

We, of the Americas, are justly proud of these achievements. And yet we know that however precious, however gratifying, is this onward march of inter-American solidarity and cooperation, it is not enough by itself to give our nations the fullest attainable measure of security, progress, and prosperity.

In every line of national endeavor, each of our countries is thoroughly conscious of the interrelated and interconnected character of the present-day world. Under modern conditions peace and stability are indivisible in the sense that a major break-down of one or the other in any important portion of the globe inevitably affects the life of the entire world. For several years the impairment of normal international economic relations and the disastrous deterioration of international morality in many parts of the earth have retarded our material progress and have filled us with anxiety and apprehension. For the past 2 years the conflict that has been going on in far-off Asia has cast its shadow upon us too. The tragic hostilities in Europe—the greatest calamity of all—have been in operation but 3 short weeks, and already their fateful effects have laid a heavy hand upon many phases of the lives of our nations.

We know that our nations will be materially poorer and spiritually poorer in proportion as the flames of protracted war impair or destroy, in the areas directly involved, the foundations of modern civilization.

Knowing all this, our nations have sought steadfastly to exert their influence in the direction of an avoidance of a widespread war anywhere. We have endeavored, by appeal and by example, to convince other nations that a system of international relations based upon action in conformity with the dictates of international law and morality, upon fair and fruitful cooperation among nations for the greatest good of all, and upon sound, healthy, and mutually beneficial trade relations, is practicable and attainable; that a system based on these principles is far more conducive to the welfare of each and every nation than a state of affairs in which callous disregard of law and morality, with resort to brute force and unbridled violence, are the methods deliberately chosen for the attainment of national aims.

Now that a major war in Europe is a grim reality there is greater necessity than ever before for all nations still in a position to do so to increase their exertions for the preservation of those fundamental principles of civilized international relations, through the application of which alone, we, of the Americas, are firmly convinced, the progress of the human race can be maintained. There is no other basis of enduring peace, of cultural and material advacement for nations and for individuals, of social and political institutions founded upon human freedom and the dignity of the human soul.

It is our devout hope that the conflict now raging in Europe will not extinguish upon that continent the light of that resplendent civilization with which it has, in modern times, illumined the world. It is our fervent prayer that all nations may find in themselves sufficient strength of conscience, of reason, of the very instinct of self-preservation to return—before it is too late—to the tried and proved highway of those basic principles of international relations which, for the moment, continue to function fully only in our hemisphere and in a constantly diminishing area elsewhere.

In the New World we have found that acceptance of these fundamental principles has made for progress and peace. To these same principles all nations can adhere, whenever they choose, and so, together with us, attain once more the blessing of an ordered and law-governed world. Meanwhile, in these hours of tragic trial, it is our duty to ourselves to keep these principles alive in our own midst and to make intensive and unceasing effort toward bringing about adherence to them throughout the world.

Neutrality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVA B. ADAMS

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 28, 1939

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON, OF COLORADO

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an able speech delivered by my distinguished colleague the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] on the subject of Neutrality. This speech was delivered at Minneapolis, Minn., and broadcast by the Mutual Broadcasting System.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Thank you, Mr. Corneaby, for your nice introduction. You have been very kind to me since I arrived in Minneapolis and I am deeply grateful. When I see Senator LUNDEEN in Washington Saturday I shall express to him my personal appreciation of your generous hospitality.

Press dispatches recently released in London and Paris bluntly state, "Unless the United States repeals the arms embargo, democracy will surely perish from the earth," and from Berlin we have a press warning that a repeal of the arms embargo will constitute the first "slip" by the United States toward war.

While these foreign reactions are intensely interesting to us and make us feel important, they are by no means vital or controlling. The Congress will not take a popularity poll in Europe to find out how the proposed changes in our foreign policy fits this selfish European interest or that.

We must make it evident to everyone that our foreign policy is being formulated to enable us to maintain our own neutrality in a realistic and orderly manner, and that policy must above all reflect what appears to us to be an honest and satisfactory method of promoting the welfare, the security, and the happiness of our own 130,000,000 men, women, and children.

This is no time for hysteria or loose thinking. It is a time for serious contemplation. Congress, called into special session today by the President, should go about the business of adopting a neutrality act with the cold-blooded calculations of a banker entering into a business transaction, and we should count the costs, in blood and treasure, of war, with cool heads and accurate adding machines.

There will be a full discussion in Congress of the proposed new neutrality policy, and no successful effort will be made to invoke

the gag rule in the United States Senate. All the ramifications of the problem will be gone over exhaustively and at great length.

I look for the President's plan to be adopted with whatever limitations at the moment seem expedient after weeks of bitter discussion, equaling in vigor and intensity the debate over the League of Nations.

The 24 Senators opposing the President's proposal are able and fearless men, with deep-seated convictions acquired from long and diligent study of foreign affairs. I do not agree with their conclusions at all, but I do respect their patriotism, admire their courage, and know full well that the country will listen to their appeal with the rapt attention which their knowledge and sincerity warrant.

No political party and no particular political philosophy has anything to do with their bold determination to prohibit the sale of arms and munitions to belligerents. Their stand comes from the heart and is much deeper than party or personal politics. Every political party and every political school of thought in this country is represented in their ranks.

In this fight they are not Republicans, Democrats, Farm Laborites, or Progressives—they are crusaders in what they believe to be a moral issue of gigantic proportions.

Advocates of the retention of the arms embargo and advocates of its repeal are each erroneously declaring that the opposing policy is the road to war. Neither allegation is truthful nor logical. We can retain the embargo and remain at peace or lift it and still remain at peace. It is by no means the controlling factor in determining this all-important question of war. There may be moral reasons for retaining the embargo and economic reasons for lifting it, but the decision to change it or not to change it is strictly a domestic decision and by itself will have little to do with getting us into war. If we go to war, it will be because of our insane, reckless desire to fight other people's wars and our short memory of the utter futility of the last World War. However, every practical safeguard to insure our continuous peace should be enacted into law by Congress, to the end that the private conduct of every citizen and the official conduct of the United States Government may promote peace and good will with all nations.

Congress will approach this vital problem of American peace determined that under no pretext shall we be "sucked" into the current European butchery; and that under no pretension shall we send the flower of our youth to this bloody slaughter on foreign soil 3,000 miles away.

It is argued that there can be no neutrality between right and wrong and that America, therefore, should not be neutral. We must remember that in international disputes no nation is likely to be wholly right or wholly wrong. The facts affecting these things cannot be fully known to us; and we, therefore, are in no position to judge the equities involved. It is well to remember in this connection that God has not called upon us to be the judge of nations, and neither has He made us His policeman of the world.

We should know that our participation in a world war must mean the immediate suspension of all civil liberties and constitutional government during its duration. We should know that the Federal Treasury, already badly weakened, will reach the status of certain collapse under the strain of conducting a world war, for if we go in, every ounce of our resources and every cent of our capital must be made available to our allies. We should know that a most terrible period of depression and economic chaos must follow the war boom caused by such a gigantic conflict.

The economic, political, and social readjustments following such a war would likely be so violent, so unpredictable, and so difficult in their consequences that no democracy could possibly cope with them. We should realize that it is not our duty to rescue European pride from well-deserved humiliation. We should know that we cannot extinguish the flames of prejudice and hatred which have smoldered and burst forth at irregular intervals through the centuries on the unhappy European continent.

We must understand that if we rectify the blunders and mistakes of the stupid, selfish European diplomats in this instance, that they will be at it again even before the treaty of peace is consummated.

European diplomacy has ever been as cold as the frigid northland; as selfish as the wild beast of the jungle, and as mercenary as the Merchant of Venice. The law of self-preservation warns us to beware of its intrigues.

We are thinking too much in terms of the immediate international situation as we contemplate the President's proposed neutrality measure. The policy which we are asked to adopt is positively not short term or expedient legislation; it is legislation that is expected to remain on the books for a long time and formulating a permanent long-term foreign policy for our country. It is true that the opportune setting for the passage of such legislation is during periods when the world is at peace so that the question may be approached with more light and less heat.

I would remind you, however, that for years now war has been raging in the world. First, it was Italy in Africa. Then the civil war in Spain with most of the nations of Europe helping one side or the other, a typical display of Europe's own idea upon how a neutral nation should conduct itself, and for some time now Japan has been shelling China. So if the United States waits for world-wide peace before she shall determine her own foreign policy and her own neutral position toward belligerents she may never do so. To lift the arms embargo now is positively not an unfriendly act toward any nation.

After this last European war was declared nations all over the world frankly stated their positions toward it. How silly it is to say then that the United States of America does not have a perfect right to openly define her position even though some nations are now at war.

It is true that it isn't good sportsmanship to change the rules after the game starts, but this war is not our game, and we are not a party to it. Thank God that we only occupy a seat in the bleachers as deeply concerned spectators. If we take wise precautions to remain in that fortunate position, who is there with a right to complain. Certainly neither Berlin nor London has any right to quibble about that. As a matter of fact, the only side we should choose to take in any war is our own side.

The so-called cash-and-carry policy is neutral in principle and equitable in practice insofar as we ourselves are able to make it so. It is no fault of a merchant with goods to sell if muddy roads keep customers away. "Cash and carry" provides an honest, open, equitable, and neutral method of transacting international business to belligerents in a time of war.

The United States is happily a Nation with no ambition to expand her territorial dominion and she has absolutely no desire to extend political penetration into any land.

We are honorable in all of our international dealings, and we have no designs upon any nation. There is no sound reason for us to voluntarily quarantine ourselves from the world. We are not a country of cowards. Neither are we a land of knaves. It is in our interest and in the interest of the civilized world that we buy goods and sell goods on the open market, and that is what we propose to do under the cash-and-carry policy.

Neither complete isolation nor complete insulation is either necessary or desirable.

Unless an open trade channel guarded with proper limitations be provided, American goods will likely be bootlegged, smuggled, and sold indirectly, with consequent losses and embarrassments to us. American ships will be tempted to engage in contraband traffic, and if they do not so engage, they will be wrongfully accused of that crime anyway and apt to be indiscriminately subjected to indignities which we in our pride will not tolerate.

With international suspicions rampant, frank, open honesty on the part of the United States will prove to be the imperial virtue and the need of the hour We refuse to favor one nation above the other. We will treat them all fairly and impartially. Under the President's proposal no American ship will be permitted to haul anything for a belligerent to be delivered directly or indirectly, and no one will be given the slightest excuse for suspecting a single ship bearing in permanent design upon its sides the American flag.

Cash and carry does not imply, however, credit and carry. There should be no credit, public or private, extended to any belligerent under the guise of private loans or otherwise. The extension of credit to a belligerent constitutes the rankest kind of unneutrality. It would virtually mean that America was financing the war, and sooner or later in that case our soldiers would follow our dollars into the conflict.

Money loaned to a belligerent can never be repaid and would therefore for all practical purposes constitute a gift. The Johnson Act is effective insofar as it goes, but it will need to be extended and strengthened to cover the whole subject of private and public loans to belligerents.

Unless airplane warfare solves the problem, I doubt whether the Germans can smash the Maginot line, and I seriously doubt that the English and French can successfully break through the Siegfried line. With Russia's unlimited natural resources at her back door, how can the Allies starve Germany? Without Atlantic bases Germany's submarine campaign will shortly be ineffective against English shipping. From this distance it looks very much like a draw, with neither side holding any appreciable advantage.

The United States, by spilling the blood of 2,000,000 American youth, coupled with the expenditure of not less than forty billions of borrowed dollars, could very likely go over the top of the Siegfried line and bring Germany to her knees.

Are we so reckless that we would condemn 2,000,000 American boys to a horrible death in no man's land and spend $40,000,000,000 which we would be obliged to borrow from our citizens with no assurance of repayment simply to conquer Germany and Russia?

We would be fools to go to the expense of crushing Germany and Russia unless we planned to keep an armed guard over them permanently to see that they maintained forever the form of local government which we in our assumed wisdom might prescribe for them.

When we insist upon the right to adopt the form of government of our choosing for ourselves, then, to be consistent, we must grant that same right to every other nation. America hates communism and its blood brother, nazi-ism, with justifiable intensity, but that is not a good excuse for us to engage in a political crusade against them, spilling the blood of our innocent youth to correct merely what we deem to be their political fallacies.

America has neither love nor respect for Stalin or Hitler; but since we firmly believe in our right to choose our own political leaders, we must, to be consistent, advocate Russia's and Germany's right to choose their leaders, however distasteful to us they may be. We should bear in mind that British diplomacy is entirely responsible for Hitlerism.

If the philosophies of nazi-ism and communism be false—and I am certain they are violently in error, because they are founded upon force and not upon justice—then time and circumstances will reveal that error to their own people, and a correction will follow as a natural course. History knows of no other permanent cure for political diseases. We must have patience in such matters. The German people, as a people, are no better and no worse than the English or the French.

For more than a hundred years, under the Monroe Doctrine, we have made the Western Hemisphere the sphere of our influence, and we have denied to Europe any right of territorial expansion or

political penetration therein. By inference, at least, we imply in the Monroe Doctrine that we shall not seek political penetration into Europe, for without such an implication the doctrine falls of its own weight.

Under what pretext can we deny the Americas to Europe? Can we consistently say to Europe, "You keep out of the Western Hemisphere" and still maintain that we have the right of political interference in the Eastern Hemisphere?

Only a complete misconception of the Monroe Doctrine and its obvious implications could possibly lead to such an erroneous and unreasonable conclusion. If we will put our temptation to police the world behind us, we will contribute thereby to the cause of world peace; but if we attempt to extend the Monroe Doctrine and make its application world-wide, we will add to world chaos and succeed in making ourselves ridiculous.

No one can predict how long the present war will last. It could end very abruptly, or it might continue for years. But so long as it does continue, Congress should remain in session and meet every emergency as it arises and not delegate one single constitutional power to leaders of the Congress, to the Department of State, or to anyone else. The whole situation is far too precarious to delegate discretionary powers to a small group of men. Under the Constitution, only Congress has the power to declare war, and Congress should exercise all of its other constitutional powers to prevent war. It is too late for it to prevent war after the incidents leading to the declaration have been consummated.

Whosoever advocates that America's participation in this European war is inevitable is hasty and reckless and is permitting his fears or his desires to run away with his better judgment. It is not our duty to destroy our youth and our treasure and to sacrifice our form of government upon the altars of the broken-down diplomacy of Europe.

Hapless Poland is entitled to our deepest sympathies, but God has not delegated America to be His right arm. He has not delegated us to enforce justice and equity in Europe with the sword.

A wise exercise of courage, common sense, and justice by European statesmen in all of the countries at war during the past 20-year period would have spared their people from this unspeakable war. Congress must and will refuse to spill American blood because of the blunders of these selfish, proud European statesmen who rule Europe.

Thirty miles of sea has spared England from invasion for many centuries. Three thousand miles of ocean insulates the Western Hemisphere from the war dogs of Europe. A reasonable policy of preparedness will insure our security and a wise diplomacy, founded upon law and not upon Presidential proclamation, will preserve our peace. Times and circumstances have been kind to us. If we will keep our powder dry, guard against traitorous foreign "isms," proceed cautiously with belligerents, act justly toward all men, and pray sincerely for Divine guidance, peace will be our lot.

If America has the will for peace, she will have peace.

Efficiency in Government Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. HOUSTON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 28, 1939

EXCERPT FROM FEDERAL ADMINISTRATORS BY ARTHUR W. MACMAHON AND JOHN D. MILLETT, COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY PRESS, 1939

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I insert an excerpt from Macmahon and Millett's Federal Administrators.

It seems apparent that in the past too little has been done toward applying approved business methods in an effort to increase the efficiency of the administrative agencies of our Federal Government—the largest corporation in the world.

Turning the pages of this new book on Federal Administrators, my attention was arrested by the section dealing with business managers. The authors use the case-history method of tracing governmental improvements. First they list the inauguration of an experienced general business manager in one of the departments as making an important forward step toward a more efficiently operating state. They describe the significant but little-known success attained by Richardson Saunders, assistant to the Secretary and business manager of the Department of Labor.

This Department administers these divisions: United States Conciliation Service, Labor Standards, Public Contracts, Wage and Hour, Labor Statistics, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Children's Bureau, and Women's Bureau.

Since his appointment by President Roosevelt in 1933, Mr. Saunders has proved himself a valuable public servant. A study of the several innovations for which he is responsible may well point the way for similar integration in other departments and agencies.

BUSINESS MANAGERS

The story of existing business managers is in part a forecast of the matured stage when general managers will be freed for larger responsibilities by having in association with them persons trained to direct the facilitative activities sometimes called departmental housekeeping. The story, however, is in part an account of incomplete stages in the evolution of the general managership itself.

The institutional activities in question notably concern finance (including physical equipment and supplies) and personnel. The Budget and Accounting Act of 1921 required each of the departments to name a "Budget officer" who would be responsible for the preparation of the departmental estimates and their transmission to the Bureau of the Budget. In practice this was likely to entail the further responsibility of managing the appearances on behalf of the department at the hearing before a representative of the Bureau of the Budget and later before the subcommittees on appropriations in Congress. In addition to the Budget officer (though often fused by designation in the same individual), most departments have had a personnel officer. The mere existence of these posts, of course, is no clue to their actual importance. In some cases action on such matters at the department level is largely perfunctory—the estimate forms are sent out and collected; approvals of appointments, leaves, travel authorizations, and the like, are acted upon almost without pretense of discriminating supervision. In any case, where bureaus are vast, intelligent direction at the departmental center must lie in coordination of Bureau organs rather than in sweeping centralization.

Note may properly be taken first of situations in which the business managership may be regarded as a general managership in embryo. The Labor Department has afforded an interesting case of integration proceeding on the business side. Before 1933 the Department seemed amorphous. In point of bulk of operations it was concerned largely with immigration and naturalization, and this preoccupation had become more pronounced in the decade after the close of the World War. Nor was the consideration of immigration channeled; it spilled at the top; responsibility was muddy, shifting. The Department had no focal point; no one existed who even as much as knew by name the key personnel in all of the bureaus. At the time the new administration took charge in 1933 a reorientation in the emphasis of the Department was inevitable. An opportunity was afforded to take account of conditions at the center. An axis was injected in the person of a business manager.

Richardson Saunders, appointed by the President in 1933 to one of the two assistantships to the Secretary provided by law for the Department of Labor, was designated as budget and personnel officer. Saunders had enjoyed considerable experience in financial matters, much of it with public bodies. In 1913 he was appointed assistant engineer in the department of finance of New York City, where his job was to make inspection reports on all the construction work undertaken by the city. When this function was transferred to the board of estimate and apportionment, Saunders continued in his capacity as a supervising engineer. In 1918 he joined the American Cyanamid Corporation as assistant treasurer and comptroller of the Air Nitrates Corporation. From 1919 to 1923 he was consulting engineer for the Emergency Fleet Corporation of the United States Shipping Board and assistant to the director of finance. Thereafter he was associated with various private enterprises, notably as a manager of some of the J. C. Penney properties and banks in Florida. He was president of the Miami Chamber of Commerce from 1928 to 1929 and secretary of the board of regents of the University of Miami.

In his capacity as business manager of the Labor Department, Saunders has been responsible for several innovations of considerable importance. He has introduced a detailed accounting sheet kept on a monthly basis to reveal, in addition to the actual monthly outgo, the total expenditures of the fiscal year to date, the unencumbered balances, and the appropriation item against which each expenditure is charged. The accounting system of the Department has been completely revised and central control of finances has been made a reality. This financial reorganization was effected in cooperation with the General Accounting Office and has been used by other departments in their attempts to improve accounting procedures. Through the hearings on bureau-budget estimates held in his office Saunders has gained an intimate acquaintance with most of the operating details of the Department. In his supervision and control of expenditures he has been assisted by a staff headed by a chief accountant.

All appointments, promotions, and dismissals within the Labor Department are also made through Saunder's office. In the field of personal administration, as in finance, Saunders has brought about two important reforms. He began a system designed to facilitate intradepartmental transfers across bureau lines. He found that there was in the Department practically no knowledge of the work which various individuals performed and no real record of available talent which might be shifted from one bureau to another. Accordingly, at Saunders' behest, the United States

Employment Service, one of the bureaus of the Department, undertook to provide a card index of all the employees of the Department.

Not only was a job history of every individual employee thus made readily available in this way, but there was also a record of comparable jobs throughout the Department It was intended to introduce in the Labor Department a system that will be conducive to a career service. In the second place, Saunders was responsible for the establishment of a conciliation committee within the Department to hear complaints of employees and to investigate matters of employee maladjustment. The committee is composed of four employees and four supervisors, with Saunders as one of the latter and also chairman. All complaints are given careful consideration and usually investigated by a subcommittee; the committee has done important work in improving the morale of the Department. In these developmental activities which affect employment in the Department Saunders has been assisted since 1936 by Robert Chester Smith, director of personnel.

Although inaugurated under auspices which were personal, if not political, in the ordinary sense, the step that has been taken in the Department of Labor is not likely to be retraced. Its spirit has been thoroughly administrative. An important beginning has been made in laying the basis of management, although perhaps in the early years after 1933 the Secretary was too guarded and the avenues of immediate approach at headquarters were too personal to furnish an ideal setting for the development of stable management in its comprehensive sense.

German-American Antirepealists Not Necessarily Pro-Nazi

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAURENCE F. ARNOLD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 28, 1939

ARTICLE BY DAVID LAWRENCE

Mr. ARNOLD. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by David Lawrence from the Evening Star, of Washington, D. C., of September 27, 1939:

[From the Washington Star of September 27, 1939]

GERMAN-AMERICAN ANTIREPEALISTS NOT NECESSARILY PRO-NAZI

(By David Lawrence)

An unfortunate tendency has developed hereabouts with reference to the flood of mail being received on the arms embargo. It is the inclination of the receivers of mail to jump at conclusions about the signers and to regard those who have names of German origin as necessarily sympathetic with the Nazi position.

No greater mistake could be made by Members of Congress than to assume that, because a letter is signed by an American of German ancestry, he wants the embargo maintained so as to help Germany win the war. The truth is there is ample evidence to explain just why Americans of German birth or descent are much more concerned about a possible war abroad than is any other single group. Those of us who recall what happened in the neutrality period between 1914 and 1917 and immediately thereafter, when America entered the war, know the grave injustices which were visited upon German-Americans. The vast majority—indeed, the preponderant number—sympathized with Germany, but the moment America entered the war their allegiance and loyalty to the United States was unquestionable.

It is true, nevertheless, that other people looked with suspicion on German-Americans, and their plight during the war was an uneasy and uncomfortable one. It would not be surprising if the German-Americans of today were as eager to prevent American entrance into the war because of the unhappy relationships that might develop inside America as from any feeling about having to enter battle against blood brethren.

BELIEVE REPEAL MEANS WAR

This raises the point of whether the repeal of the embargo will actually bring nearer or make more remote the possible entrance into the war. It would seem that many German-Americans have been persuaded to believe that the lifting of the embargo is synonymous with eventual entrance of America into the war. Actually this view is not given credence by international-law experts, many of whom feel that the question of American entrance into the war will be decided on other issues altogether, and might, indeed, be the result only of provocation by some belligerent, no matter what laws are passed here.

The view has been advanced among the proponents of the arms embargo that to repeal the law would incur Germany's ill will. But the converse of this proposition is that failure to supply Canada and the British and French may mean incurring the ill will of the nations which buy the most products and have been closest to the United States in the past. Whatever is done about the present neutrality statute is bound to result in some ill will abroad, so the problem may easily resolve itself into whether to offend the democracies or the dictatorships.

EMOTIONAL STAND REVEALED

The letters and telegrams which are pouring in on Senators and Representatives show clearly that many of the senders are emotionally affected by war sympathies, and that many citizens have been accepting the notion that, somehow or other, to change the law is to drag America into war.

The sponsors of such a view have not proved it, and neither can the advocates of repeal prove that their course will keep America out. But there is one thing sure—the American groups of foreign origin are in a difficult spot nowadays through circumstances beyond their control.

Thus a large number of Irish-Americans who have always been anti-British are found urging Members to keep the embargo though they do not indicate they want this done just to hurt Britain. Some Members of Congress representing large Irish districts are urging the retention of the embargo just as are some Members from States where large numbers of German-Americans reside. Reports indicate also that many Scandinavian-Americans are against any change in the existing law.

MANY FAIL TO WRITE

These lines in Congress are being assumed without taking into account the vast number of Irish-Americans or Scandinavians or Poles or Czechs who have not taken the trouble to write to Washington at all. Undoubtedly some foreign money has been spent in America to influence German-Americans and others, but the importance of this can easily be exaggerated, as experience before 1917 readily proves. If German-Americans write vehemently to Members of Congress urging retention of the law about the embargo, it is because they have been told, as have other Americans of *Mayflower* descent, that to change the law is to involve the United States in a possible war.

The biggest task before the advocates of the cash-and-carry plan is to convince their constituents the new bill will do more to keep America out of war than the old law, and that is what most Members of Congress, irrespective of party, who favor "cash and carry" sincerely believe, for it cannot be emphasized too strongly that there is no disposition in any quarter here to favor American entrance into the war on any conceivable issue except a direct attack on our defenses.

Neutrality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH J. MANSFIELD

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 28, 1939

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. RICHARD M. KLEBERG, OF TEXAS, GIVING HIS VIEWS IN REGARD TO NEUTRALITY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, Representative KLEBERG, of the Fourteenth District of Texas, delivered a very able and timely address over the radio last Tuesday evening, September 19, and I feel it should be inserted in the RECORD. It follows:

The subject assigned to me, neutrality, in its general sense may best be described as the condition of a nation which takes no part in a war. Much has already been said and more is to come under this heading, so I think it proper at the outset to make the statement that insofar as neutrality has to do with the purposes of this discussion its objective will be, primarily, that of peace for our country—the United States of America. In talking to you tonight I speak from a veritable Gethsemane of heart and mind—this being the eve before the opening of the special session of Congress called by our President for the purpose of deliberating over what should be done to safeguard the future of our country and, if possible, prevent our involvement in war.

MANY PHASES

There are two kinds of wars—wars of aggression and defensive wars—considering, of course, war from a standpoint involving two or more nations. We have, of course, another kind of war with which we are not concerned for the purposes of this discourse. Wars of rebellion and wars of revolution within the same nation. These latter have no part in view of the subject which is that of neutrality.

Neutrality itself has many phases and can be limited or extended to cover any one of its various types. It may be temporary, conditioned by the existence of war, or established as a permanent policy. The first of these types is the voluntary exercise of sovereign power by a country terminable at its will and independent of external authority. Another type may be constituted from a necessity imposed upon a nation from without by internation agreement and is to place a limit upon the exercise of true sovereign power. Neutrality, in some of its phases, entails reciprocal rights and duties of neutral states and nations as well as belligerents.

NATURAL LAWS

It is my opinion that in a consideration of neutrality such as the one before the special session of the Congress that we should not be blind to other facts and problems of vital importance. Facts which have a definite and inexorable bearing in their possible and probable effects upon the future of our country. It is my purpose in the too brief time for an exhaustive consideration allotted to me to try to make known to you my present thought with reference to this subject which today occupies the minds of all loyal citizens who have reached maturity. Yes, too, the minds of those who have not yet reached that age.

Sound consideration must not ignore natural laws, nor the important lessons of history. Any consideration of neutrality ignoring these is careless. The first law of nature is conceded to be that of self-preservation. The first law of humans is self-defense and it follows, as the day the night, that the first law of nations is national defense and should be thus accepted. If this premise is sound, and I take it to be so, national defense as we understand it may be divided for our purpose into two divisions. I present them in the order which seems to be that of their relative importance.

FRIENDLY RELATIONS

In the first class those intangible but none the less important factors, facts, and things which have to do with the preventing, if humanly possible, of wars of any kind, which, of course, includes a war of invasion. In the second class we find those tangible things known as actual preparedness at home, involving a well-equipped air, land, and sea force, together with the essential equipment, financial and material, for the support of the general military and naval establishments, together with the requirements of the civilian population. Dealing with the first of these divisions of national defense, those matters looking toward the prevention of war and, too, if and when war should come, despite our best efforts, and God forbid, we find that these deterrents or matters looking toward prevention might well constitute an important, if not the most important, part of a sound national-defense program.

In nature those individual forms which bind themselves together under Nature's laws are more effective in both offense and defense, so it is that the individual who has both friends and family is stronger than he who stands alone. I hold, therefore, that in the case of nations it is of paramount importance that our Nation should do everything in its power not to alienate or sever but rather to strengthen the bonds of its friendships and ties with other countries. We should likewise by our conduct do all those things which might tend to add to the list of friendly countries which today is tragically small. Our friendship is important to these and their friendship and attitude toward us is invaluable in this tragic hour.

CONDITIONS NOT THE SAME

In this connection let us review the facts which make up the situation which confronts us under the present Neutrality Act. This act, with its embargo provision, was voted by a Congress with the same determined objective as the present Congress. Back in 1935 world conditions were far different from those which confront us today, and by this action of a devoted group of your fellow citizens and before the development of present conditions to their present state had come upon us, we found the embargo provision of this act instead of functioning in accordance with the ideal of neutrality was an unneutral instead of a neutral act. Conditions had so shaped themselves in Spain, Ethiopia, and China as to make the Neutrality Act one which forced us into the position of strongly aiding the aggressor in each case while at the same time denying succor to the aggrieved. Of course, we know that we cannot correct one wrong by perpetrating another and to be left in a position which is a result of a wrongful act, or to say the least an act which places us in the wrong light, and permit that condition to remain unchanged is a wrongful act of omission.

EMBARGO NOT NEUTRAL

The embargo provision of the present law of our land places an embargo on materials, munitions, and supplies of war prohibiting their leaving our country indirectly or directly with a destination in another land or lands to be used by belligerents at war with one another. A state of war under this provision must be found to exist by the President of the United States and upon this finding the President is ordered to proclaim the embargo to be in effect and is to list all of those materials which he deems may be defined as munitions and supplies of war as well as those nations at war. In my opinion, for many reasons which time does not permit me to give, the very existence of this embargo provision to the act as well as the manner provided in the act for its being made effective constitutes a violation of any sane conception of national defense and neutrality itself.

EXAMPLE OF OTHER NEUTRALS

After much study it is my present thought and my mind is still open to conviction otherwise that neutrality, by direct legislative act is a gesture. That neutrality is a matter which cannot be legislated into existence but rather must be the expression of public opinion and determination of a people evidenced by their action and proper resolutions by duly constituted representative authority as well as action by the people themselves. I have in mind for the basis of this statement the historic significance of the maintained neutrality of Norway, Sweden, Switzerland, Finland, etc., in the last World War. A neutrality which was maintained without legislation or restriction in any form. I hold that because of the manifest impossibility of predicting the future, in days when events transpire with unbelievable speed and kaleidoscopic succession, that there can be no wisdom in restrictions being placed on the future necessary activities of our country in the face of unpredictable events to follow. The vital nature and importance of this line of reasoning and thought is not weakened by a survey of existing facts. Facts which are notable indeed if we cast a discerning look into the future which, of course, must be based on intelligent reconnaissance of the past.

IF ALLIES ARE VANQUISHED

At this juncture I submit an interrogatory for the purpose of developing this phase with greater clarity. What do patriotic and thinking people see in the future of the United States and North America if, perchance, England and France were to be vanquished and their naval forces taken from the seas? Documentary history, insofar as it affects us in the United States, calls our attention to the existence of the Monroe Doctrine. Factual history would indicate the investment of German capital in Latin, North, and South America. World War history brings before our eyes again the tragic plight of Europe. More recent history indicates the vastly more destructive results of ultramodern warfare and the development of machinery for human destruction. We can readily visualize the condition of the Old World of tomorrow at the conclusion of a titanic struggle which might end in the erasure of England and France as nations and as factors in the preservation of the freedom of the seas. In this capacity the development of the naval strength of the United States has been limited by reason of our reliance and dependence upon the continued strength of the naval power of England and France. The English Navy was treated, for example, as an adjunct part and parcel of our own in the maintenance of free access to the seas. Our Navy, because of this accepted theory, has been deemed sufficient to meet our requirements, but upon a review of the picture which presents itself with England and France removed we see its hopeless weakness and inadequacy.

ALLIES' PREDICAMENT

I have refrained with purpose from enumerating more explicitly by name or otherwise the probable, possible, and potential future developments. I do this in belief that the time is not yet arrived for more explicit expression. And now to another picture, from which you may discern some of the vital reasons why I feel that the embargo provision should be lifted from a standpoint of neutrality when considered as a part of national defense.

England and France depend for their arms, munitions, guns, and shells and explosives, on munition factories located in France and England—two rather small countries territorially. These factories and sources of supply in France and England would, of course, be an immediate target were a concerted air raid to be conducted by the many times numerically superior air forces of Russia, Germany, and Italy. Their destruction would mean for France and England land, sea, and air guns with no available supply of ammunition; and with the present embargo in existence, what is there to deter the totalitarian states of Russia, Germany, and Italy from attempting, to say the least, the attainment of this objective?

CASH AND CARRY

Let us turn to the other view of the matter, with the embargo out of the way, and with all material, equipment, and munition sources in the United States available to all of the world and every nation therein, provided they come, procure, pay for, and sail away with their purchases. This to be made possible by a repeal of the embargo provision and the substitution therefor of a simple resolution by both Houses of the Congress. This resolution should set out the expressed determination of the American people not to engage in a foreign war, containing, of course, the salient and unassailable truth that we have no desire to accept or create any responsibility for the inability or ability of paying for and taking away these supplies which exist in definite degree with reference to other countries. We will not be responsible for either the war in which they find themselves involved or their failure in foresight looking toward maintaining the essentials which would permit them to use our markets and ports.

INTERNATIONAL LAW

International law, age old as well as recent, neither inhibits nor prescribes this attitude on the part of a nation which is by common consent an accepted neutral posture. Another angle and this derived from examining the picture which thus presents itself as a deterrent, for instance, to an effort to prosecute to fulfillment a war to the end between Russia, Germany, and Italy as against France and England. What will Italy's outlook be with reference to her situation in the Mediterranean? Would she not quickly see

the impregnability of the British blockade of the Suez Canal and the Straits of Gibraltar? Would not Italy, Russia, and Germany combined see that the mere destruction of munition sources in England and France would not be the end? They would immediately visualize the situation without the embargo and England and France free to obtain supplies elsewhere. A long-drawn-out war would be inevitable, the outcome doubtful. Pressing economic forces would combine to the extent that Russia, Germany, and Italy would think of plans to end the struggle by peace negotiations rather than a continuation of responding to hallucinations bent upon human destruction and conquest.

FREEDOM TO TRADE

For the stated reasons may I in conclusion simplify my position? I believe the arms embargo should be repealed because it is both unneutral and in violation of sound national-defense policies. I believe it should be repealed because to fail to do so now would constitute an actual act of unneutrality by the failure to act in remedy of our unneutral position favoring as we do the totalitarian states as against states who believe in Almighty God, freedom of speech, and religious worship. I believe the embargo should be repealed because it constitutes a continuing menace to our peace and that it provides a way at least whereby—and God forbid the event—we might be forced to the choice of abandoning the Monroe Doctrine, and at the same time finally be called upon to defend ourselves from organized attack from abroad. And, lastly, because simple logic and such reasoning power as I possess indicate no sane reason why we should bind the United States of America by a law of our own creation and acceptance from freedom of decision and action in meeting future unpredictable events.

My every thought is for the purpose of serving the Fourteenth Congressional District and our country, which we all love in the most effective way, in staying out of war by every possible and honorable means. We have no reason to go to war as I see it, no excuse to become involved in war, and certainly I am convinced that, saving a war of actual defense, all we can ever possibly gain from a war of that character would be the continuing chance to live and remedy our grievous error which we will have committed if we permit this Nation to go to war.

ETERNAL FAITH, VIGILANCE NECESSARY

I ask all of you, my fellow Americans, for your unselfish and patriotic assistance to lead us to the right answer and to help the Congress of the United States in serving a great people which can always be depended upon to strive for the continuation of our form of government and the priceless guaranty of a freeman's right to a continuation of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness free from fears and oppression. I will welcome your advice by letter, any and all of you, and will appreciate your support in this trying period. God willing, we will have peace if we deserve.

Along with life and liberty the God of our fathers gave us reason as a distinguishing factor between men and other forms of life.

As a result of the exercise of reason came our form of government as a reward for our faith in God born of reason. Let us tonight by prayer and purpose reassert our faith in God, in representative democracy and our form of government, and the orderly processes of enlightened reason.

Eternal faith and vigilance today are the price of both liberty and peace.

We are the most peace-loving people on earth, but God forbid the stress which might provoke our other side.

Let us preserve the faith, O God, for you and our land.

I Am War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN F. SMITH

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 28, 1939

EDITORIAL FROM THE ABERDEEN (WASH.) DAILY WORLD

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert herewith an editorial entitled "I Am War," from the issue of September 6, 1939, of the Aberdeen Daily World, published at Aberdeen, Wash., and written by Mr. Ed Van Syckle, a brilliant young newspaperman residing in my district. I have read many denunciations in poetry and prose of the horrors and diabolical effects of war, but in my opinion this editorial by Mr. Van Syckle is unsurpassed in all the literature which is extant on the subject and is worthy of preservation in our permanent records:

[From the Aberdeen (Wash.) Daily World of September 6, 1939]

I AM WAR

I am War. Yes; you know me; but there are grass and flowers covering the scarred fields where we met before. You daintily balance your teacups, and relish your wine, and you talk small talk with your neighbors over back-yard fences. You have replanted your groves and the grain waves in the gentle winds. You work and play and dance, and trifling things amuse you. So you are prone to forget me. But you should not.

For I am War. Remember? I have called on you before. I have taken from your huts and your castles, your great buildings that gleam so magnificently in the sun. You came to me from your hills and your plains and the secluded valleys where you felt so safe and secure. I demanded it. I took you from your firesides, the peace of your quiet lanes, the mills and factories, from the oceans and all the lands that you call home. And some I did not let return. Thousands, millions did not return.

For I am War. I kill. I ravage and despoil. I am the waster of flesh and brains * * * and youth. For if I do not take you I will take your son. And I will leave only a stench on the battlefield. I do not care if he is brave or cowardly. I will sprawl his body by some tiny pool made by the rains. And the curly head you fondled and the smile that lifted your heart will be smeared with blood. Yes; it will be ghastly.

I will torture you with anguish and fear. I will rend your body until you wish death to ease the pain. I will tear the white throats of your children. On the pavements they will lie and gaze into the heavens with staring but not understanding eyes. I will leave your cities in shambles and your peoples will strew the streets in death.

Your homes will be ruins, or gaping craters where they once stood. You will search in vain for those that lived there, for one small trace; and you will hope to God it cannot be found.

A whole generation of you will die. Or it will come back in torment, and scarred, and broken, with faces hardened by agony and bitterness. And the memories torturous, the hatreds, the broken faiths, the spending of your substance, the losses that even God cannot replace * * * they will scourge you for generations and generations to come.

Yes; you will remember me. For I am War.

The European Situation and Neutrality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAMILTON FISH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 28, 1939

RADIO ADDRESS OF HON. HAMILTON FISH, OF NEW YORK, SEPTEMBER 26, 1939

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech delivered by me over the Columbia Broadcasting System on Tuesday evening, September 26, 1939:

I am grateful to the Columbia Broadcasting System for an opportunity to speak over their network from Chicago during the American Legion national convention.

The American Legion is one of the greatest patriotic organizations in America and its members know what war is. I am positive that the rank and file of the Legion are overwhelmingly in favor of strict neutrality and keeping America out of war unless we are attacked.

I happen to have been the chairman of the subcommittee that drew up the preamble to the American Legion constitution, which has never been changed, and I am, I believe, the oldest war veteran in point of service in the Congress.

I do not claim, however, to speak for the Legion, except as a paid-up member, but I have spoken in Legion posts in almost every State of the Union and know that there is no greater force in our country for strong national defense and for keeping America out of war.

There is even now being waged in Legion ranks, and throughout the country, a bitter controversy between the adherents of an arms embargo and the cash-and-carry plan, which now turns out to be a credit scheme. But there is no real controversy between Legionnaires or the American people about keeping out of war, in spite of the propaganda of the internationalists at home and foreign propaganda from abroad.

It is refreshing to speak from Chicago, where the Chicago Tribune has led the fight against all un-American activities at home and consistently exposed the propaganda of the internationalists to involve us in foreign entanglements and war.

The eastern seaboard press is international-minded, and seems to be under the impression that the traditional American policies established by Washington, of neutrality and nonintervention in

European quarrels, is outmoded and that our manifest destiny now is to police and quarantine the world.

Newspapers like the New York Times, the Washington Post, and a host of others in Baltimore, Philadelphia, and Boston, are so biased in their internationalism and advocacy of sanctions, concerted action, and collective security that it is almost impossible to obtain a hearing in the large eastern papers in behalf of our traditional American foreign policies of neutrality and no entangling alliances.

For that reason it has become necessary to get time on the radio to reach the people in their homes.

It is my definite opinion that 90 percent of the American people want to stay out of war—that the percentage is higher in the West than in the East is due to the eastern international press. However, about 25 percent of the people are, through propaganda, being led to believe that war is inevitable. I am primarily concerned with combating this false and vicious propaganda, which is far more dangerous than any of the proposed modifications of the Neutrality Act. The real issue is keeping out of war, and exposing those elements in our midst who, although giving lip service to peace, are endeavoring to ease us into war. I do not believe that 10 percent of the Members of Congress would vote for war unless we are attacked.

Main Street is swamping Congress with letters and telegrams for strict neutrality, an embargo on arms, and for keeping out of war. The propaganda machine of the administration has become so worried about the avalanche of mail from the wage earners, farmers, and small-business men, and often big-business men like Henry Ford and Ernest Weir, chairman of the Steel Institute, from all parts of the country, that an alibi had to be concocted. Someone had to be blamed; a "goat" had to be found. Why not the Communists? I have no love for the Communists, but if my memory is correct, the Communists and radical new dealers have been bedfellows for the last 6 years, and Stalin and Roosevelt have been their political gods. But a "red herring" had to be found, so why not the "reds"?

I imagine that such powerful American groups as the church elements, the National Grange, the American Federation of Labor, veterans' organizations, and millions of American mothers will resent the implication that they are pawns for the Communists in wanting strict neutrality and to keep out of war. However, that is the type of propaganda one can expect from administration sources.

A few days ago the submarine bugaboo was loosed on the people, and turned out to be a complete dud. Now it is claimed that the Nazis and Communists are influencing public opinion and running the country. I admit, if my old aversion—the Communists—are, it is the fault of the administration that has kissed and pampered them consistently, particularly around election day for their votes.

The real line-up on the arms-embargo issue is Main Street against half of Wall Street, which is far from united, as some of the biggest bankers and industrialists are for the retention of the arms embargo. Main Street does the fighting and pays the bills. Wall Street makes the munitions and collects the profits.

Even the administration propaganda machine cannot get very far against Main Street as long as we have freedom of the press and the radio. If the American people insist on retaining the arms embargo and notify Congress there will be no loans, no American soldiers sent to Europe, and we will keep out of foreign wars.

Mr. Michaelson, chief Democratic propagandist, 24 hours after President Roosevelt's plea for national unity and nonpartisan action on neutrality legislation, issued a blast blaming the Republicans for opposing the President's cash-and-carry plan because of partisan advantage with a view to the 1940 elections. Let me say to Mr. Michaelson that the Vorys arms-embargo amendment was adopted in the House of Representatives by a majority of 41 votes, where incidentally I led the fight for it with the help of 61 Democratic Members who, in spite of the terrific pressure exerted from the White House, voted for it.

It was openly said that these courageous Democrats were threatened with being purged if they did not support the President. Now it is claimed that the Republicans are playing politics, when, as a matter of record, President Roosevelt cracked the whip on his party in the House and Senate from the very beginning. At the so-called nonpartisan conference held last week not a single Republican Member of the Senate or House Committee on Foreign Relations was invited.

The Democratic majority of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee even excluded the Republican minority from its meetings in formulating its bill. In view of this procedure I propose to issue a call for a meeting of the minority members of the House Foreign Affairs Committee on October 9 to consider the parliamentary situation, with a view to protecting the legislative rights of the House of Representatives in case the Senate virtually substitutes a new bill. No matter what happens in the Senate the House of Representatives, in my opinion, will stand firm for the arms embargo.

I shall insist that the House be permitted ample time to consider any new proposals and to offer amendments to them.

I cannot understand how any Member of Congress from a seaboard State could favor the credit-and-carry plan, which is an intolerable discrimination against our ships and would practically destroy our merchant marine. For years the Congress has been appropriating huge sums of money to build up our merchant marine, and now it is proposed to scrap it in a cowardly manner.

I see no reason why our merchant ships cannot go into the war zones at their own risk, like those of all other neutrals. Norway lost over 1,000 ships in the World War, and Sweden and Holland several hundred. England, the mistress of the seas, lost a hundred ships in the recent war in Spain.

I'm convinced that any traffic in arms for blood money and war profits is the same as digging the graves of American soldiers in foreign lands. I have always upheld the profits system in America, based on reasonable profit and private initiative, and have debated this issue with Norman Thomas a half dozen times. I agree with Mr. Thomas, however, and the Socialist Party in favor of an embargo on arms.

If we permit the sale of arms for war profit and blood-smeared dollars to kill people with whom we are at peace, we endanger the security of America and the lives of our youth. If we do, then there is something rotten in the profit system. I do not propose to sacrifice American lives for foreign dollars. Instead, if necessary, I would be willing to urge that the Government take over and operate the munitions plants in the United States.

At the present time England and France can buy every conceivable commodity from us except arms and ammunition and airplanes. The Vorys amendment would permit the sale of airplanes, as it struck out the words "implements of war." If the Senate adopts it and adds a proviso that American ships go into the war zones at their own risk, that would end the controversy.

In addition every dollar spent by foreign nations for arms or ammunition in America means just one less dollar to be spent to buy American cotton, wheat, corn, pork, and other foodstuffs.

I have always opposed all halfway measures, such as sanctions, compulsion, and collective security, as they all mean war—bloody, destructive, and ruinous war—in which even the victor loses. By the same token the sale and shipment of arms is a halfway measure that leads to war and tens of thousands of American crosses in foreign lands.

I am willing to appropriate millions or billions for national defense, but not one single dollar to send American soldiers to foreign lands to fight other peoples' battles. We did that once and got no thanks, except to be called Uncle Shylock over the repudiation of the war debts.

The big issue in America is to keep out of war, and the only way I know how to do it is to prohibit the sale of arms and ammunition and to enact a real neutrality law. Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Belgium, Switzerland, Spain, and Italy, all in the war zones, are able to remain neutral; and why haven't we the same common sense to stay out of the eternal wars of Europe? No matter where our sympathies may be we must preserve our own free institutions and American liberties instead of becoming involved in foreign entanglements and wars.

I do not know what kind of neutrality bill will be finally passed in the Senate, but whether it is good or bad it will have to come back for action in the House of Representatives.

I do not believe in selling arms and ammunition in time of peace or in time of war. It is an unholy, immoral, un-Christian, and also dangerous traffic.

I have stated my views consistently in the Congress for over 10 years against any traffic in arms. I doubt if a single neutral state in Europe would sell arms and lethal weapons to any of the belligerents, so why should we?

There is very little difference between selling cannon, antiaircraft, and machine guns than selling torpedo boats and submarines or of arming belligerent ships. What is to prevent any belligerent merchant ships from buying cannon and, after they are beyond the 12-mile limit, to arm themselves? If this is done we would have an "Alabama claims" on our hands when the war in Europe is ended.

If Congress refuses to repeal the arms embargo, it will amount to serving notice that we propose to keep out of Europe's wars. If we repeal it, it means that we are halfway in, and the next step will be to substitute credit for cash, and that is in the making in the proposed fake Senate neutrality bill. The third and final step is shipping our soldiers over to the battlefields of Europe after our arms and credit or loans. The good ship "Cash and Carry" has already been torpedoed by the administration and even before it was actually launched. The real purpose is now apparent; credit is substituted for cash, and we are back to 1914.

I pray to God that there will be peace in Europe in 6 months, and I think there is a good chance of it if none of the combatants can break through each other's heavily fortified lines. I am inclined to believe if we do not repeal the arms embargo it may hasten a return to peace, and by the same token if we repeal it and sell arms and deadly weapons we may be prolonging the destructive war, with no assurances of victory for England and France. I do not propose by my vote to gamble or speculate with the lives of American citizens by repealing the arms embargo and making America the potential slaughterhouse of the world for war profits and blood money that might involve us in war.

If we are to go to war in the future, it must be in defense of America and not in defense of our munitions makers, war profiteers, stock-market speculators, or for any foreign country.

The National Committee to Keep America Out of Foreign Wars, composed of 50 Members and former Members of Congress, which successfully conducted a campaign to arouse public sentiment in behalf of the arms embargo as adopted by the House of Representatives last June, is again on the job to maintain the arms embargo both in the House and Senate, in an effort to keep America

out of all foreign wars. I hope that all Americans who hold the same views will cooperate with this committee in support of its program. I will be glad to furnish, on request, any information desired regarding the organization and its program.

A Sound Proposal for a Permanent Domestic Recovery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 28, 1939

PROPOSAL BY MR. JAY C. HORMEL, OF AUSTIN, MINN., OF AN ECONOMIC PROGRAM TO BRING LASTING PROSPERITY TO THE PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES THROUGH THE DEVELOPMENT OF HOME MARKETS AND BY INCREASING OUR PERMANENT TRADE WITH NEUTRAL NATIONS

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me today, I take the opportunity of presenting to the Congress and the country a worthy proposal for a lasting domestic recovery as presented by Mr. Jay C. Hormel, of Austin, Minn. Mr. Hormel's suggestion should have the considerate attention of Congress, the administration, and the country in connection with the enactment of neutrality legislation. In my opinion, we should strive to build for permanent prosperity for the United States instead of a wartime boom with its detrimental consequences. Protecting our home markets and permanent development of foreign trade with neutral nations gives the key to lasting prosperity.

PROPOSAL FOR DOMESTIC RECOVERY

(By Jay C. Hormel, Austin, Minn.)

I think that almost to a man, those who saw action in the World War want to keep America out of this war. Those men are thinking of their comrades-in-arms who were on the casualty lists of 20 years ago.

To a man, also, those who have observed the economic consequences of the last war should want to spare America from again suffering those economic consequences it brought about.

We are so interdependent in this world that it is impossible for one nation to attain an isolation which will protect it against suffering the ills which affect the rest of the world. It is impossible for this country to escape the consequences of impoverishment which are bound to come to Europe as a result of the war.

Of course, if we get into the war, we must throw our every resource to wartime activity. Then we will suffer the full economic consequences of the war.

If we stay neutral, we can still gear our economy to the war in such a way as to make it inevitable that we suffer the full economic consequences.

If, however, we do not gear ourselves to wartime economy, the economic consequences for America need not exceed the effect which Europe's reduced buying power will have on us.

Being in the meat business, I will use examples from the meat and livestock industry.

Twenty years ago we had an export meat and lard business. We lost it.

Why?

Because Europe became so poverty stricken in the World War that she was forced to become self-sustaining. She had to almost stop buying our livestock products.

Until last week England imposed a quota system against our meats. Today the quota restrictions are removed. We are invited to increase our meat and livestock production. We are invited to rebuild our meat- and livestock-producing machinery. We are invited to divert a large number of people from their normal activity to that of producing meat and livestock products for the Allies.

We know this is only temporary business. We know that when the war is over Europe again will be so poor it will be forced to exist on what it can produce within its own economy. American workers who have left some sort of employment to engage in meat and livestock production again will be thrown out of their jobs. Their present employment will have become disorganized and disrupted and will not be available to them when the "producing for war" spree is over.

Where 10,000,000 men make up our army of unemployed today, we may have 25,000,000 unemployed as "recovery" from this war starts; that is, if we gear ourselves to this war economy.

On the other hand, if we do not gear ourselves to this war economy, we may find here an opportunity for some recovery of our own situation. For example, some thirty-odd million pounds of ham were imported from Poland last year. This many hams produced at home would require the employment of 40,000 or 50,000 farmers and farm hands, 2,000 packing-house workers, in addition to all the necessary employees in collateral businesses—the production and transportation of coal and salt and packages—everything needed, in fact, from hog houses and granaries straight through to delivery and distribution facilities for the finished product.

There are similar opportunities in the thousands of other American industries.

In addition, by making for ourselves the things which we have been getting from the nations now at war, we can further move toward the reemployment of those who lost their businesses and their employment because of the last war. There is added opportunity if we gain for ourselves markets among the neutral countries which the warring nations are now neglecting.

If we can somehow take advantage of this opportunity to expand and stabilize our normal economy, if we can somehow eliminate all artificial interference with the normal flow of business and avoid any impediments to the free working of the natural stimulants to business, this country might well find itself in good economic health by the time the war in Europe ends.

On the other hand, if we take all the war business we can get and can handle, and struggle for wartime production and profit, we will be putting our unemployed at temporary rather than permanent work. We will divert a great number of currently employed from their permanent jobs to temporary jobs. We will boom our land prices and incur debts on the basis of an inflated price structure. We will produce impoverished farm lands and increase taxes. We will bring upon ourselves unemployment and losses when the period of readjustment comes.

Apparently we are now faced with the most important choice in our history. We can move into a fool's paradise, based on temporary wartime business, or we can take this opportunity to improve our domestic working for each other.

America Loves Peace and Hates War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN J. KENNEDY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 28, 1939

ADDRESS BY HON. MARTIN J. KENNEDY, OF NEW YORK, AT OSLO, NORWAY, AUGUST 17, 1939

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me at Oslo, Norway, August 17, 1939, as a delegate in the American group to the Interparliamentary Union:

Mr. Chairman and fellow delegates, I have the honor, as a Member of the Congress of the United States of America, to represent a district which is located in the heart of the great city of New York, a city with a population of over 7,000,000 people. This city is composed largely of foreign-born citizens and of their children to the first and second generation. Our population is drawn from every country in the world. Among our Senators and Representatives we find men who were born in European countries. Many of the children of our foreign-born citizens can point with pride to grandparents who fought in the War between the States to preserve our Union.

The citizens of my beloved country are best described in the following words of the poet Irving entitled "Americans All," a school poem studied by my son, John Kennedy, aged 10, who is now sitting in this historic legislative chamber.

"So when on the horizon rises
A war cloud to threaten the land,
With liberty's native-born children
Shoulder to shoulder they stand,
For America ready to battle,
For America ready to fall,
Not Russians nor Swedes nor Italians—
Americans all."

Regardless of their origin, race, creed, or color, they are undivided in their loyalty to the land of their adoption, the United States of America. This is as true today as it was in 1917. The people of my city are pacifists in the sense that they love peace and hate war. The people of my State and my Nation also hate war and love peace.

Many of the delegates from the United States have intimate personal knowledge about war from actual military service and want peace more than anything else in the world. Whatever success my country or fellow citizens of the United States enjoy they enjoy because of their intense love of peace and fair dealing with other people and nations.

World peace is the most urgent problem of the human race to which we can address ourselves at this conference. Today peace is the subject uppermost in the minds of all right-thinking citizens throughout the civilized world. The sun never sets on the mothers of the world praying for peace. The mothers in the far-flung reaches of the Sahara Desert are just as much concerned about their boys and world peace as the mothers in the crowded city streets of Berlin, London, Paris, New York, and Oslo. At this very minute, the strongest human impulse in the heart of every mother is a desire for enduring peace.

Let us hope that this conference of 1939 will make a definite contribution to the cause of lasting peace. In my opinion, we can make such a contribution by urging the citizens of the world to return to the lessons that we were all taught at the knee of our mothers. These lessons consisted of obeying the Golden Rule and the Ten Commandments. Briefly, they are the brotherhood of man and the fatherhood of God. Let us all urge my proposal, because its formula is so well known and has proven so successful in the past that it should be our guide for the present and the future.

I have purposely refrained from quoting the speeches and remarks of any contemporary statesman on the question of war and peace because, however appropriate those remarks may be, there is the possibility of misinterpreting or of maliciously twisting the true content of the speech. Suffice it to say that many volumes have been written on the subject by the best minds of the world, but unfortunately their words have fallen upon barren soil.

I am sure that we all fervently hope that the efforts of His Holiness, Pope Pius XII for a peaceful settlement of the pending controversies between some of the nations will meet with success.

Let us, here in Oslo, determine to do everything possible to avoid war. We should stop at nothing short of victory in our fight for peace. I cannot stress too strongly the importance of constructive leadership in these troublesome times, and in my opinion the Interparliamentary Union should provide this leadership to the citizens of the world. By our calm and friendly approach to the problems that vex the universe, we will give new courage and confidence to all those whose faith seems shaken in the parliamentary system of government, and we will add strength to the keystone of society—the home.

Last evening, as I left this building which is the home of the Parliament of Norway, I felt homesick, being so far away from America, but this feeling soon left me because as I walked to my hotel, mingling with the crowds, I soon felt as if I were back home in dear old New York. I met friendly faces swimming out of the crowd and I walked shoulder to shoulder with many a tired father going home to a family waiting to welcome him. I saw the light falling slantwise past the glowing cornices of your great buildings and I felt the hum of wholesome activity which means contentment, and while these things were happening I again realized that regardless of geographical location or nationality, the home is the one place in all this world that is immune to hate and fear. In the charmed circle of the home is heard the laughter of happy children and here is found the love of a faithful wife and devoted mother. The tradition of the home must always be preserved regardless of the cost—without it this world of ours would be an empty and dreary place in which to live.

Actual Neutrality for the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. CLASON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 28, 1939

LETTER FROM THE COMMANDER IN CHIEF AND RESOLUTION OF THE FORTIETH NATIONAL ENCAMPMENT OF THE VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter to the President of the United States from the commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars and also a resolution adopted by the Fortieth National Encampment of the Veterans of Foreign Wars:

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D. C., September 19, 1939.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Formulated on the basis of numerous resolutions adopted at the Fortieth Annual National Encampment of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, held in Boston, Mass., August 28 to September 1, 1939, our policies for the ensuing year, briefly summarized, are as follows:

1. Security for America, by more modernized, mechanized, motorized matériel and mobilized men for effective national-defense purposes; by equalizing the profits and burdens of war; and by an actual neutrality as to wars outside of the Americas.

2. Security for American citizens, by extending governmental employment and assistance only for citizens; by reducing all immigration quotas; by deporting all criminal and undesirable aliens; by promoting constructive youth activities, adult education, and public forums; by exposing all anti-American activities; by upholding our constitutional liberties; and by revitalizing our representative democracy.

3. Security for America's veterans and their dependents, by employment for those who are employable; by adequate compensation and care for those veterans who were disabled in service; by pensions for those war veterans who are vocationally handicapped by disabilities; and by adequate pensions for the dependent widows and orphans of all deceased veterans.

Because of the great importance of our Nation's international policies, we attach hereto a copy of the adopted resolution designed to keep America out of war.

Your consideration of our V. F. W. policies, aimed, we earnestly feel, to serve the best interests of our country, our comrades, and their respective communities, will be highly appreciated.

Very respectfully yours,

OTIS N. BROWN,
Commander in Chief.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

ACTUAL NEUTRALITY FOR THE UNITED STATES

Resolution 243

Whereas power politics have long been the most potent factors in the policies of the more powerful nations of Europe and Asia; and

Whereas recent developments in Europe have definitely established that economic, prestige, and power considerations are of much greater importance to and a much greater motivating force in the various countries in Europe and Asia than are any differences in their respective ideologies of government; and

Whereas the World War did not end all wars, did not advance the ideals of democracy, and did not restrain the spread of autocratic, dictatorial, and totalitarian forms of government, as per the hopes held out in the slogans used by American citizens during the period of the World War as justification for our participation therein; and

Whereas our participation in the World War has so far cost the Nation more than $50,000,000,000; the lives of more than 130,000 of the youth of our Nation; more than 193,000 of them being wounded, and in service-connected disabilities for perhaps more than 500,000, of whom 340,000 are now receiving compensation, in addition to unmeasured misery for the surviving widows and orphans and parents of deceased World War veterans; and

Whereas our Nation's participation in any possible future world war would prove to be infinitely more devastating and costly economically, financially, and in the lives and health of the youth and citizens of our Nation than was so as to the last World War, with no resulting advantages for our country or for civilization generally which would justify such sacrifices on our part; and

Whereas it is believed that it would be infinitely better for the cause of civilization generally, and for the cause of our country and its people in particular, that the United States keep out of war: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Fortieth National Encampment of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, That we do hereby advocate the adoption and application of the following policies, designed to keep America out of war:

1. Adequate mechanized, motorized matériel and trained men for national defense.

2. Renounce war as an instrument of international policy.

3. Recognize the existence of war regardless of its formal declaration by any belligerent.

4. Advocate compliance with the provisions of the Kellogg Treaty.

5. Proclamation by the United States that it will not engage in any war of aggression.

6. Proclamation by the United States that it will support and defend the Monroe Doctrine.

7. Withdraw armed protection to American citizens, after a period of warning, during their continued travel or residence in any country at war or in any war danger zone.

8. Disclaim responsibility for the safety of American citizens in any country which is at war or in any war danger zone.

9. Continue compliance with the provisions of the so-called Johnson Act.

10. Prohibit the extension of credit or loans by the United States or any of its citizens to any country or its citizens which is engaged in war.

11. Permit sale of supplies to any nation at war only if paid for, and only if ownership thereof is transferred at our shore lines, without any protection or responsibility whatsoever by the United States Government as to same.

12. Prohibit any American merchant vessels from becoming armed.

13. Provide for the clear identification of all American merchant vessels during time of war between other nations.

14. Disclaim any responsibility for the protection of any American merchant vessels which carry any merchandise to any country at war or into any danger zone, but permit clearance of American vessels only if adequate private insurance is carried on such vessels and members of their crews which travel into any danger zones.

15. Take the profits out of any possible future war by steeply graduated personal and corporation income taxes.

16. Enact legislation to provide adequately for all disabled veterans and the dependents of all deceased veterans of all wars, past and future.

17. Conduct an educational program to show the costs of war.

18. Encourage peaceful international negotiations to adjust most irritating deficiencies, differences, and inequities among nations.

The Arms Embargo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 28, 1939

LETTER FROM JACOB PANKEN

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter, which was published in the New York Times of September 24, 1939:

[From the New York Times of September 24, 1939]

MISTAKEN ACTION—ARMS EMBARGO REGARDED AS AN ERROR OF CONGRESS

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

For 20 years, within the limits of my sphere and my ability, I warned my fellow Americans against the menace reared in Russia. In common with all Americans, I held and still hold dear the right of each individual with his fellows to decide the kind of world he wants to live in, the kind of government he wants to live under. The Russian adventure was not an expression of its people. The regime was born in the murder of its opponents, suckled on blood, and perpetuated in the denial of freedom of conscience and human rights.

Bolshevik ideology was not intended to be confined within its own borders. Like worms boring into healthy trees and fruit, Russia's ideology was made to bore into and within the democracies. Bolshevism is an ideology which denies the truth, mocks decency, abandons morals, and epitomizes the lie. It developed a philosophy which spurns the culture (and culture is accumulated decencies and morals of the ages) of all who refuse to accept bolshevism. The moral code, accepted by man and by which he lives, is regarded as capitalistic and in consequence it must be destroyed. That's bolshevism. That also is nazi-ism.

DESTRUCTIVE PHILOSOPHY

The human race has, over the centuries, stored up the results of its experience, and out of experience came our concepts of right, truth, and justice. The philosophy of bolshevism is like that of nazi-ism. That of the Nazis is also the philosophy of the Bolsheviks. Destroy all that has been created, acquired, and built.

In September 1938, the heart of Hitler bled for the poor Sudeten Germans, the "blood brothers" of the German people. In September 1939, the heart of Stalin bleeds for his "blood brothers," poor Ukrainians and White Russians. How much alike these two regimes are, these two ideologies when put in practice; how similar even they are in propaganda.

For 20 years blood brothers of Stalin in Poland were not deemed oppressed, for there was not even a squeak out of Stalin on their behalf. For almost 20 years the Sudeten Germans were an integral part (just as Ukrainians and White Russians are part of Poland), of Czechoslovakia. But all of a sudden a terrible hue and cry went up that blood brothers were being oppressed, murdered, bled, and otherwise maltreated, so the big brothers came to their assistance.

SUBVERSIVE PENETRATION

Russia and Germany—Germany makes the kill and Russia feeds on it, and in the rear, there is Japan; there is Italy, watching, waiting for its opportunity to join in.

Russia penetrated into our own country through "fellow-travelers," through the "party line gentleman," through the "borer from within." Nazi-ism has worked and bored through the American bund and its "fellow-travelers." In 1931 the Nazi and the Bolsheviks in Germany joined hands to strangle the German Republic. They joined together in a plebiscite to oust the democratic government in Prussia. They failed at that time. But the betrayal by the Communists in Germany of the Republic in 1931 and again in 1933 bore its fruit—Hitlerism!

We in our country through shortsightedness or worse—political adventure—have put ourselves on the side of Germany, and now that of Russia. The Congress in failing to amend the Neutrality Act strangled international law, which permits the sale of munitions to belligerents. The failure to amend the Neutrality Act has given aid to Germany.

I make bold to say that the action of Congress has not only strengthened the hand of Hitler, but it went to his head. In a measure, at least, it encouraged Germany to rape Poland and set the stage for another world war.

Now Russia is on the side of Germany. Its borders are open to the Nazis for supplies to its military forces, even if Russia does not enter the war against England and France.

CONGRESSIONAL ERROR

Congress has given us strange bedfellows—Bolshevik Russia and Nazi Germany. It has allied us with dictatorships against the democracies. We are helping Germany against France and England.

That help, even if it is not material, is buoying up the spirit of the German rulers. It is too frightful to contemplate.

Europe is being gassed, bombed, decimated. We have the gas masks, we have the means of defense. We are not asked to carry the gas masks or the means of defense to those left in Europe who are still worth while. All that we are asked is to afford them the opportunity to buy from us what we have, and yet there are those who would see Europe destroyed, the democracies liquidated, and civilization thrown back hundreds of years in the name of some peculiar ideology which its followers are pleased to call isolation.

The Congress should atone for its mistake. It ought to undo the wrong it did. It must bring back the United States within the compass of recognized international law.

It would be frightful if Congress would, in this extreme moment in the life of the democracies of the world, shut its ears and close its collective mind against our, might I say, brothers in progress.

"He who lives by the sword shall perish by the sword." (Matthew 26:52.) But he will not perish unless the efficacy of his sword will be destroyed. We need not deny the soldiers for the common good the weapons which they so sorely need, and which we can supply and still not violate any of the principles of international law.

JACOB PANKEN.

NEW YORK, *September 19, 1939.*

Neutrality Minus Partisanship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN J. KENNEDY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 28, 1939

LETTER TO SENATOR ROBERT F. WAGNER, DATED SEPTEMBER 27, 1939

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter, which I yesterday addressed to Senator WAGNER:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., September 27, 1939.

Hon. ROBERT F. WAGNER,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: As you know, the State of New York has 45 votes in the House of Representatives out of a total of 435, and on June 30 the New York delegation voted as follows on Roll Call No. 117, which was the embargo amendment to the so-called Bloom neutrality bill:

For the embargo	21
Against the embargo	20
Absent	4

Shortly the House will again be called upon to vote on this same bill with certain Sente amendments.

May I suggest to you, as a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations and as the senior Senator from our State, that you invite all the Representatives in the Congress from our State, both Republicans and Democrats, to a "family conference," so that we may privately discuss this most pressing national question. President Roosevelt has taken this issue out of partisan politics, and, following his plendid example of statesmanship, I believe you might properly arrange such a conference. At the conference table it would be possible for us, the Representatives of the Empire State, with its population of more than 10,000,000 souls, to discuss dispassionately and with all friendliness the neutrality bill. As the result of such a conference, I am sure all of our colleagues would have a better understanding of the provisions of the bill and its purposes. It even may be possible to reconcile the wide differences of opinion now existing among the Representatives from New York, and thereby bring about an agreement in our delegation on the merits of this bill.

Mindful of the unusual procedure suggested, I hope you will assume this leadership, because the neutrality bill will affect the lives and future of every American.

Sincerely yours,

MARTIN J. KENNEDY.

I was prompted to write this letter because the subject of neutrality has become the most important and involved issue confronting the people of the United States. The State of New York is deeply concerned, and, as the Representatives from New York, it is our duty to seek all available information on the proposed neutrality bill so that we may cast an intelligent vote.

My plan for a "family conference" between the Senators and Representatives from our State, regardless of party affiliation, has never been tried. However, at this critical period in world affairs, custom and formality should be replaced with action and common sense.

I feel confident that all the Representatives from New York State, Republicans and Democrats, are most anxious to decide the question of neutrality on a purely patriotic basis, and for this reason I believe my suggestion to Senator WAGNER is practical and timely.

American Neutrality and Alien Ideologies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 28, 1939

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN, OF NEW YORK, ON SEPTEMBER 12, 1939

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address delivered by me on September 12, 1939:

In these times of doubt and hesitation there is a great difference of opinion among our people as to how to keep this country neutral and yet do everything in our power to prevent alien ideologies from affecting the well-being of our people.

Our President, in his neutrality proclamation, stated that he wanted our people to remain neutral, but that neutrality in action does not mean neutrality in thought. We still must take sides, and we cannot give the same sympathy to aggressors which we give to victims of aggression.

There are many foreign groups in the United States which would like us to become the proving ground for their own pet theories and ideas. There is a man who calls himself the leader of the German-Americans and who glories in the fact that Hitler can lick the whole world. Of course, if Adolf Hitler can lick the whole world, he can lick this country, and in course of time all of us will become subjects of the great German Fuehrer. It is groups like the one which I have just described which have always been responsible for a great deal of trouble and unrest in this country of ours. We cannot close our eyes to the fact that such groups have always been found on the side of our enemy and will never contribute anything to the well-being of our people. This so-called bund maintains camps throughout the United States in which members are drilled by foreign drill masters, made to take the oath of allegiance to a foreign potentate, and behave in every way unlike Americans but like aliens.

Our neutrality should prevent such camps from spreading their poisonous propaganda throughout America. There are also peculiar circumstances surrounding some of these camps—Camp Nordland, for instance, which is situated close to the chemical depot of the Hercules and Atlas Powder Mills. Are the members of that camp engaged in activities which may result in the same type of sabotage out of which grew in 1915 the Black Tom and the Kingsland explosions? I am sure that our vigorous police officers will see to it that no harm comes to this Commonwealth because of the proximity of alien camps to important works of our national defense.

Hand in hand with alien activities which seek to sabotage our industrial establishments comes an activity which on the face of it may appear very patriotic, but which I, as chairman of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization of the House of Representatives, will call upon to check in its very beginning. There are many aliens who go to our naturalization courts applying for citizenship papers, not with the idea of becoming a part and parcel of our democracy, but in order to use American citizenship as a cloak to cover anti-American activities. It surely is not the act of an American citizen to glory in a foreign ruler "licking the whole world," which, of course, means destroying the United States. No American wishes his country to become the province of another government; and, of course, by becoming subjects of Adolf Hitler, Americans will not be happier than by continuing as Americans.

But it seems that some alien elements here would like us to become a foreign province, and it is aliens of this type who ostensibly become American citizens for the purpose of promoting alien interests. I do not propose to sit calmly by and allow such false citizens to run this country with impunity. Any naturalized citizen who takes an oath of allegiance to this country just as a matter of routine, but who is not at heart honestly and sincerely devoted to the principles of our Constitution and our American democracy, will have his naturalization papers canceled under legislation which I seek to introduce at the next session of Congress. Citizenship cannot be acquired by nature of routine answers in the naturalization courts, but must be earned by individuals who will sincerely grow to love America and what it stands for. Only men and women of proved loyalty will be able to become naturalized under our laws, and naturalized citizens who are members of foreign groups advocating alien ideologies should thereby forfeit any claim to the protection of America and have their citizenship revoked. Only in this manner can we protect the purity of our citizenship and see to it that no one but loyal Americans carry the title of American citizenship.

Deportations should be resorted to in the case of disloyal individuals who do not deserve the protection of our laws and institutions.

Let me warn all these alien sympathizers and men who wave the alien flags and wear foreign uniforms and goose-step around the United States that we will not tolerate these conditions too long but will very promptly deport and otherwise punish every alien who uses the sanctuary of the United States to spread un-American ideals and teach our people foreign ideologies.

A number of bills are pending in Congress which seek to compel naturalization of aliens who have lived in this country for many years or who were admitted to this country for permanent residence. I do not believe in this type of legislation, and I do not believe American citizenship should be forced on anyone. Quite the contrary; I do not want any but the most loyal of our aliens to wear the badge of American citizenship. Only after an alien has been thoroughly imbued with American ideals and become fully acquainted with our institutions and Government, and only after an alien has proved that he has no ties with any foreign government, but that he believes that this is a Government for all the people, without discrimination against any race or creed, should the alien be given the boon of American citizenship. To simply force a man by law to become a citizen even though his heart does not respond to the principles of our own Government will do much more harm than good. Let us clean house at once and remove disloyal naturalized citizens from our rolls. They do not deserve a place in America; and if they like foreign ideologies so much, nothing should prevent them from leaving this country and going where their own ideologies are the political creed of that foreign government. There will be many among us who will wish them good riddance, and the sooner the better.

President Wilson in 1914 said that no one can be an American and have a hyphen attached to the term "American." There can be no German-Americans, Irish-Americans, or other hyphenated Americans. One is either an American or he is not. Let us separate the wheat from the chaff and the sheep from the goats. There cannot be any halfway measures, and I am serving warning here and now that when Congress opens, either for a special session or the regular session next January, appropriate legislation will be enacted to make it impossible for aliens not imbued with our philosophy of government to masquerade as Americans—and God knows we have plenty of them now.

The noose is tightening about Hitler's cohorts in America. In the week just passed the press reported the stoning of Nazi camps in Pennsylvania and in St. Louis. The temper of the American people has reached a boiling point. Fritz Kuhn and his bund have reached the realization that their operations as a storm-troop unit in this country is at an end. So we now find a new Nazi-inspired Fascist group known as the Christian Mobilizers and the Nazi-inspired Christian Front. The German bund has overrun these hate groups, and has taken over all the key positions. As a

result of all these activities we encounter riots and street-fighting scenes in and about the city of New York. Street speakers coached by Nazi-trained propagandists are trying night after night to cause serious trouble to law-abiding citizens.

These Nazi camps must be closed. Foreign uniforms must be banned. These alien-inspired camps have been the training ground for many former members of the so-called Irish republican army. It was one of these wild revolutionaries who made the statement at a closed Fascist meeting that "if we declare war on Germany, they would bomb New York City the same way they bombed London."

In times like the present there is only one ideal to be pursued by all of our people, the ideal of national unity, and only by the elimination of alien propaganda and a rededication of our people to the ideals of the founders of our Republic can we become again a Government "of, for, and by the people, dedicated to the principles of our democracy and the rights of all men, irrespective of race or creed."

Economic Aspects of Gold Payment in the Cash-and-Carry Proposal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FREDERICK C. SMITH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 25, 1939

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the cash-and-carry provision of the proposed legislation no doubt will involve widely divergent opinion and interpretation. There is, however, a particular phase of the matter—an economic consideration—to which I wish to direct the attention of this Congress. This is entirely aside from any effect the cash-and-carry provision might have in either keeping us out of the war or getting us into the war. So that we are here not concerned with any effect its adoption might have on neutrality, but only with the effect it would have upon our economy.

Many people are inclined to visualize the transaction as very similar to a person entering a grocery store, selecting a number of groceries, paying cash for them, and carrying them home. But the cash and carry we are here considering is something altogether different. It is not as simple as the cash and carry of groceries. Indeed, it is a very complex and involved proposal.

There are only three possible means that can be considered as available to France and the United Kingdom as cash: 1, gold; 2, holdings of American investments and securities; 3, barter. Since the last can be of little use in time of war, only the first two need be considered. Here, however, we shall consider only the first—gold.

Figures as to the amount of gold those two countries have available for the purchase of war materials vary somewhat. Five billion dollars is given by several authorities. Higher figures, up to $6,000,000,000, are given by a competent authority—Edward J. Howard, editor, Standard Statistics Co. The United Kingdom produces now annually about $700,000,000 of gold. We are perhaps safe, therefore, in assuming she and France would have about $6,000,000,000 available for purchases of war supplies the first year.

On its face it would appear that if we received gold in payment for our goods, we would be receiving cash. But if the word "cash" means value received, which no doubt we all believe it does mean, for our goods, we will see by an examination of the transaction involved that it would not be an actual cash transaction.

Let us take a concrete example. Suppose a French purchasing agent arrives in New York with a million dollars in gold with which he wishes to buy airplanes. But he cannot pay the gold to the manufacturers of planes. He deposits it in, let us say, the Chase National Bank. Here the Federal Treasury steps in and takes full title to the million dollars of gold. Then the Treasury issues gold certificates in the amount of a million dollars which it sends to its agent, the Federal Reserve bank, for the account of the Chase National Bank. Or possibly it merely credits the Federal Reserve bank with the gold certificates for the account of the Chase National Bank. In turn, the Chase National Bank enters upon its books a deposit for the account of the French agent. The steps in the transaction are not quite as simple as this, of course. Nevertheless this represents the basic steps in the gold-buying operation.

In actual practice, the Treasury may buy the gold by paying for it out of the general fund. But by a bookkeeping device this transaction is transformed into the one described heretofore. Otherwise the purchase price of gold would be added to the national debt, which is not the case. Against the deposit in the Chase National Bank the French agent pays out checks to the manufacturer for planes.

To the average person, to one who has not studied the question, this is likely to appear as a perfectly legitimate and innocent transaction. The manufacturer would receive his pay in credits, or paper money, with which he would pay for his materials and labor. It is only when we consider our present abnormal financial and monetary condition that we realize the disastrous consequences which must certainly ensue from this so innocent appearing a transaction.

The important thing to be observed at this point is that in this transaction the gold is used, not as currency, but wholly to create credit, after which it leaves the economy entirely, to be buried in a vault where it is as dormant and useless as it was before it was mined from the earth. Not only is the procedure unorthodox, but anomalous as well. There is no way of ever canceling this credit out except by a reverse process in the transaction. That would involve great difficulties, as I shall later show.

How much of this credit has been created by the influx of gold into this country since the gold-buying program began? How much of this credit is now in our banking system? Today the United States Treasury has about $16,900,000,000 in gold, or in the neighborhood of 65 percent of the world's monetary supply. Of this immense hoard about $9,000,000,000 has been purchased since the Government bid the price up from $20.67 an ounce to $35. Therefore, the amount of credit base in the banking system created by the Treasury's purchase of gold at $35 an ounce is $9,000,000,000, or the same amount as that of the gold purchased. For every dollar of gold purchased a dollar of credit base is created and added to the volume of credit already in the banking system.

Now this nine billions of credit base has, under our present banking laws and practices, a potential expansibility up to nearly sixty billions. That is, this nine billions of credit permits an expansion of loans up to nearly $60,000,000,000.

The effect of dumping this vast amount of gold into our country has caused a swelling of available bank credit to dangerous proportions. The present total potential credit-expansion possibilities are more than $100,000,000,000.

There is general agreement that the importation of this vast amount of gold has created a precarious situation in our credit structure. That the continual addition to our gold hoard adds seriously to the danger is admitted even by the Secretary of the Treasury. In a letter to Senator WAGNER March 23, 1939, he said:

> It is doubtless true that we have more gold than we need to provide a specie base for our monetary system.[1] * * * At present, however, gold and gold-certificate holdings are so far in excess of those legal requirements that they can hardly be said to constitute a protection against undue expansion of our currency and credit. We now have enough gold to permit an enormous expansion of credit and currency even after generous allowance for the outflow of gold that might accompany such an expansion."

Howard J. Trueblood in an article entitled "Gold: An American Dilemma," in Foreign Policy Reports of September 1939, in discussing the excess of gold in the United States, says:

> This huge increase is unwanted, since it can serve no useful purpose to the United States; and it has contributed to the maldistribu-

[1] Only about $5,000,000,000 of gold (gold certificates) are used as a currency base. Only about $2,000,000,000 of gold (gold certificates) are required by law as reserves for this currency.

tion of world monetary reserves. Hence there is general agreement that our excess stocks are at least a nuisance and at worst a tangible danger to our monetary and credit structure, owing to their inflationary potentialities.

As early as the latter part of 1935 the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System recognized the potential danger in the large volume of excess reserves that was being created by the inflow of gold. They recognized that this was adding an amount of credit for which there was no possible use or need in commerce, industry, or agriculture. They then sought to obviate the danger by raising the reserve requirements of member banks, and so reduce the excess. This they did by raising the reserve requirements 50 percent, which became effective the 15th of August 1936. Reserve requirements of member banks were again increased, this time by 33⅓ percent, to take effect one-half March 1, 1937, and the remaining one-half May 1, 1937.

On page 4 of the 1937 Annual Report of the Federal Reserve Bank we read:

> The excess reserves of about $1,500,000,000 which would be eliminated as a base of further credit expansion by an increase of 33⅓ percent in reserve requirements could, therefore, support an increase in bank deposits, which, if it occurred, would unquestionably constitute a credit expansion on a scale injurious to the Nation's economy.

On page 22 of the 1938 report appears the following:

> Member banks at present have excess reserves of $3,600,000,000. * * * The use of the available means of absorbing reserves, to the extent that it may be in the public interest to do so, would still leave the banks with a volume of excess reserves upon which it would be possible for an injurious credit expansion to develop.

Now, consider these two statements in connection with the fact that the excess member bank reserves being now $5,280,000,000, permit an expansion of deposit liabilities, or credit, of about $35,000,000,000.

No doubt steps will be taken in the near future to again reduce these enormously excessive excess reserves, likely by again raising reserve requirements. The great influx of gold keeps adding to our dangerously large credit base. The gold, after serving the purpose of creating the credit, is buried away in the earth, where it lies dormant. Then, to keep the credit which the gold set up from producing a runaway inflation, it is impounded, made inactive, by the device of raising reserve requirements.

As is well known, the Treasury not only has recognized the latent danger the large addition of gold is producing in our credit structure, but it took definite steps in the temporary policy it instituted in December 1936 of "sterilizing" newly bought gold to prevent a further increase of the credit base. The plan was to pay for the gold with funds secured by the sale of Government securities. This method added to the Federal debt but was intended to keep the gold from adding more credit to the banking system. The policy was short lived, and the "sterilized" gold was "desterilized."

Suppose the $6,000,000,000 which the French and British have to buy war materials were added to our present store. That would increase the credit base in the banks by the same amount and add accordingly to our present credit troubles.

Obviously, the American people as a whole cannot get cash, that is real value, by exchanging American goods for something that is altogether useless to us, is in fact unlawful for us to use, must be buried in the earth to remain as dormant as before it was mined, cannot be used as security for any paper currency, but yet at the same time, because of the anomalous mechanics of granting or creating credits, must enter our credit structure and thus aggravate an already dangerous condition and threaten still further the safety of our financial institution.

To those who might say, "We would have the gold, someday it could be sold and we would eventually receive the value for it," we can only reply that many obstacles will have to be overcome and they very probably will prevent our ever receiving full value for it.

Let us consider some of these obstacles. By arbitrarily bidding up the price of gold from $20.67 an ounce to $35, the United States Treasury has created an artificial market for gold, increased normal production, and caused a maldistribution of the monetary gold supply among the nations of the world. The result has been to effect profound changes in their currencies and credit structures, which now require less gold than formerly.

Many nations have become dictatorships. These are in a position to force their peoples to use flat money, so far, at least, as their internal economy is concerned. This fact is of the utmost importance to a full comprehension of the probable difficulties that will confront our Nation in finally disposing of our excess store of gold.

The many altered situations in the different nations, of their currencies and credit arrangements, caused by paucity of gold, which in some measure resulted from our draining it away, tend to become more or less permanently fixed.

That these conditions will seriously contract, for many years, the market for gold can hardly be questioned. Indeed, whether the other nations might dump all the yellow metal into our lap and then go off gold entirely, is no longer a question for mere academic discussion.

Jules I. Bogen, in the September 25, 1939, issue of the Journal of Commerce and Commercial, New York, says on this point:

> In view of the experience over a number of years of the countries in the sterling area, which based their monetary systems upon a currency unit divorced from gold, further demonetization of the yellow metal as part of the postwar monetary arrangements must be reckoned with as a probability.

Suppose the five or six billions of gold now held by the French and British Governments were added to our store, we would then have at least $15,000,000,000 more of gold than we have any monetary use for. If, then, at some future time we should find a buyer for our gold, just what and how much would we receive for it?

Obviously, we shall have to accept commodities in exchange for our gold. What commodities? Competitive commodities would destroy our home markets. We would have to limit our exchange to noncompetitive articles. Last year we imported about $700,000,000 worth of noncompetitive merchandise. At that rate it would require about 30 years to realize the value from our gold. Would you call that cash? How would the purchase of this merchandise with gold affect our export trade? Would it not seriously curtail our exports, since we now exchange them for noncompetitive goods?

Certain it is that if the so-called cash-and-carry provision in the pending measure passes, and England and France are permitted to dump an additional five or six billion dollars of gold into this country in payment of war supplies, until we can resell the gold abroad, the producers of the United States, our own laborers, farmers, and the rest, as a whole, must bear every cent of the cost of those war supplies.

We, as a nation, would not receive any cash, real value, for our goods until the gold we took from foreigners could be sold back to foreigners. This is a self-evident truth. The fable of the miser who accumulated gold at the expense of his own bodily needs to the place where he starved to death illustrates the point. Gold itself is not wealth, but only a means thereto.

We would receive real cash on the barrel head, not when we took foreigners' gold for our goods but when we exchanged that gold for needed foreign produce. We would be a sanguine people, indeed, if we believed we could ever import from foreign nations as much needed labor, service, and goods for these billions of gold as we would give for them.

The gravest responsibility rests upon Congress in disposing of this problem. Self-preservation being the first law of nations, as it is of individuals, we must be guided primarily by self-interest. The profound adverse effects further additions to our gold store must have upon our economy demands that we act immediately to prevent any further injury to it.

Above all, in our deliberations, let us remember that it is the interests of the common man that are most vitally affected. It is he who must bear most of the burden of any wrong action we may take.

Neutrality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 2, 1939

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. CLYDE L. HERRING, OF IOWA

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered over the Columbia Broadcasting System last Friday evening by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HERRING].

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In the minds and hearts of all Americans, from the President and the Members of Congress to the millions of people scattered throughout the land, there is but one thought, one purpose, one determination. It is to keep the United States of America out of war.

There exists in Washington the same determination to keep us out of this war that exists throughout the Nation.

The problem before this session of the Congress is to enact such laws and prescribe such conduct on the part of America as will most likely prevent our becoming involved in any way.

The difficulty is in agreeing upon that program which is most certain to effect the result which everyone so earnestly seeks.

In my opinion, the proposal of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, in which the President and the Secretary of State concur, enunciates a policy which we should follow as most certain to protect the United States of America, its institutions, and its people. I am therefore, without reservation, supporting the President and that policy.

The legislation reported by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and approved by the President is not intended to repeal the present neutrality law but to place in its stead a law better adapted to our needs, based upon years of experience with the existing statute, during which its salient weaknesses have been made obvious. Its purpose is to reinforce our position as a neutral nation and make more certain the results which all desire to accomplish.

There is considerable confusion as to the present Neutrality Act. It should be clearly understood that the present law imposes only a limited embargo on arms, ammunition, and implements of war. In modern warfare other materials and supplies are as essential as cannon. Under existing law American ships laden with foodstuffs, grains, cotton, minerals of all kinds, and other war supplies may travel to the very war zones themselves and there make delivery to either belligerent.

It should be remembered that the presence of American ships and citizens in the past World War danger zones led to our entrance into that conflict, both ships and citizens having fallen victim to submarine warfare.

Under the proposed legislation, designed to strengthen our neutral position, this invitation to war will be eliminated, because under its terms no American ship will be permitted to carry war materials, nor will American citizens be permitted to enter war zones or travel upon the ships of other nations and belligerents, except that they do so at their own risk.

The only previous occasion when the United States attempted to enforce an embargo was in 1807 during the Napoleonic war, in reply to the English orders in council and to the Napoleonic decrees, which made lawful prizes of American vessels sailing the high seas. American commerce was threatened and the Congress adopted the embargo as a preventive measure, which only served to bring distress and discontentment at home and, like our recent experience with prohibition, resulted in repeal because it came to be regarded as onerous and against sound public policy.

It is urged that to repeal the present embargo upon the limited list of war materials would be an act of unneutrality because it would definitely favor one group of belligerents. If this be admitted, then it must be equally true that the embargo is now aiding another group of belligerents. It is not enough to answer that this favoritism is the result of a law which was in effect when present hostilities started, because the President attempted, and in my opinion a vast majority of the American people desired, repeal of the embargo provision several months ago, when experience had taught its ineffectiveness and unfairness.

I believe it is time that we consider first neutrality toward the United States, and speaking for myself, I am perfectly willing to change any law at any time, which in the judgment of a majority of the Members of Congress will promote the interests and protect the peace of the people of our country and I have no intention of seeking the approval of any foreign power before declaring my support of such policy.

Our purpose is to strengthen our position as a neutral, not to weaken it. We do not propose to abandon neutrality, but to make it more easily enforceable. And may it be well understood by all the world, we, the American people, support the ideals of peace out of an earnest belief in peace, and not because we have been or will in the future be in any way intimated by a display of arms, or reversion to the persecutions and barbarities of the Dark Ages.

It is to be observed that the American people live peace as well as profess a love for peace. We do not covet the territory or property of other nations. We are opposed to imperialism in all its forms, subtle or aggressive. But we shall continue to assert our right of self-determination as to how the ends of peace may best be served.

Many months ago the President called attention to the wisdom of strengthening our neutral position, particularly by the removal of the embargo provision, which he deemed harmful. Congress had under consideration at time of adjournment the recommendations which he and Secretary Hull made in his further message to Congress on July 14. Because hostilities have since broken out in Europe, and before the Congress had acted to effect the change deemed necessary for the maintenance of neutrality and peace, are we to understand that the Congress should not be permitted to complete the important service requested by the Chief Executive, and which the exigencies of the situation demand?

For my part I am wholeheartedly behind the President's program to keep us out of war, and I shall give him every possible assistance.

As I have previously stated the sole concern of the President, the Members of Congress, and the people of this Nation is the maintenance of peace. We desire no war with a foreign power. We are prepared to studiously avoid any possibility of being drawn into the present war or future wars by remaining absolutely neutral in our international relations.

We are willing to go far beyond any of our predecessors in the pursuit of our determination to maintain peace by imposing upon ourselves restrictions as to our conduct, which is without precedent in the annals of this or any other nation.

Let me repeat, our purpose is to strengthen our position as a neutral, not to weaken it. We do not propose abandonment of the present neutrality law. We propose to put a better law in its place.

The proposed bill provides that the Congress as well as the President may put the provisions of the law into effect by declaring that a foreign war exists.

It would lift the present embargo, but it provides that no American vessel may transport goods or passengers to nations at war.

It requires that title to goods shall pass to the purchaser before such goods leave our shores.

It proposes to vest in the President authority to define combat areas, which would be forbidden to American citizens and ships of American registry.

A munitions control board would be established charged with the responsibility of keeping a complete record of arms exports and to render a report thereon to the Congress semiannually. This legislation does not affect the Central and South American republics.

Both the present act and the proposed measure forbid the arming of merchant vessels and prohibit the solicitation of funds for any belligerent government, but do permit solicitation of funds for the support of the Red Cross and other agencies of mercy engaged in relieving human distress.

Both prevent loans to belligerents, and goods must be paid for on a cash-and-carry basis.

Both the old law and the proposed bill forbid Americans to travel on the ships of belligerent nations, except under such conditions as the President may prescribe.

Contrast the self-imposed restrictions upon our personal liberty, and custom, with the age-old practices of neutrals under international law.

Before the United States sought a better way of remaining neutral, a neutral state was defined merely as a nation which declined to take sides. Trade with belligerents was accepted without restriction and with only such interference as the belligerent country on the opposing side was powerful enough to inflict.

Shipping, seldom a prosperous industry in peacetimes, became an important factor in the national economy, and international trade was most earnestly sought.

Citizens traveled at will throughout the world, and at least one great empire built much of its prestige on the fact that the flag followed the citizen wherever he might go and stood prepared to defend him and his rights against such aggressors as he might encounter.

Commencing with our original experiment in 1935 the policy of the United States since has been to find a constantly improved method for handling international relations under definite law.

The present neutrality law which the Congress seeks to improve by substitution was not an inspired instrument but a compromise piece of legislation, even as the pending measure will be subject to change by amendment. As I have had occasion to say repeatedly during recent years, it is highly improbable that the Congress can adopt a neutrality law sufficiently narrow to be effective and sufficiently broad to be safe, covering a period of years in advance, the conditions and circumstances of which are unknown to us at the present time and which may be wholly unlike we now envision.

No one among us is so all-wise and all-powerful as to be able to say with certainty, "This is the way." We can only be guided by our best judgment and earnest conviction and hope that we have determined wisely as well as honestly the policy by which we shall continue to govern our neutrality in this grave world crisis.

There is and there will continue to be, in countries where freedom of expression is permitted, a difference of opinion as to method in achieving any desired result.

And there is a growing concern that present tendencies throughout the world may lead to a point where America will be the only country remaining where such freedom of expression is enjoyed.

In my office in the past 10 days we have received thousands of letters and telegrams, the plea in each being "Keep us out of war."

Individual citizens differ in the recommendations which they make, but they join as one voice in insisting that everything possible be done to prevent our being drawn into the conflict on the side of any belligerent.

These communications are welcomed and they are very helpful in enabling us to ascertain the sentiments of our people.

I have before me a large number of messages from citizens of Iowa expressing their views and urging me to act accordingly. I believe in free and full debate of the various proposals, which I know will be given every possible consideration by the Congress.

If we believe in democracy, we must respect the right of the individual to be heard, but after mature deliberation and a judgment is reached by a majority of those charged with the responsibility of determining a policy, we should without reservation support that policy, until such time as experience will have taught us that further changes are both desirable and necessary.

Such was the reasoning employed in supporting amendments to the present neutrality law. Not until it had been thoroughly tested and sufficient time had elapsed to reveal its inadequacies was an effort made to substitute a better neutrality measure.

Realizing the impossibility of regulating well the world without first regulating well our own lives, the United States of America accepted the doctrine that we should have friendly relations with all nations and entangling alliances with none; that we should assume responsibility, moral and physical, to protect the Western Hemisphere from the imperialistic designs of any European power. We have assiduously cultivated the habit of minding our own business, letting the rest of the world know that we recognized our sphere of influence as that of the Western Hemisphere, an influence exercised on behalf of peace, not conquest, and leaving to Europe and Asia the settling of disputes as to the Eastern Hemisphere.

In addition to providing the safeguards contained in this well-established policy, and the promise of peace contained in the proposed legislation which the Congress is now giving consideration, I, for one, favor a continuance of the policy to build up our Navy, air force, and Army as measures to protect and defend the two best allies we have—the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans.

Proposed Neutrality Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES L. McNARY

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 2, 1939

ADDRESS BY HON. ROBERT A. TAFT, OF OHIO, AT VIENNA, ILL.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an impressive address delivered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] at Vienna, Ill., on last Saturday evening.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Fellow Republicans, everywhere throughout the United States Republican enthusiasm is rising. In the East, in the Central West, on the Pacific coast, the Republican meetings are crowded; the Republicans are confident and determined that the people in 1940 will demand a change in national policy, and many Democrats, even in Washington, agree with them.

The reasons for this change in public sentiment are obvious. After six and one-half years of New Deal experimentation, after demanding and securing more arbitrary power than any government has ever enjoyed, the New Deal has failed in its declared purposes. It promised prosperity and employment. More than 10,000,000 men are still unemployed. The national income, which approximated $80,000,000,000 in 1928, is still only sixty-five billion, although there are 10,000,000 more people among whom to divide this reduced income. No wonder times are hard. It promised higher prices for the farmer, and, until the war boom, prices of farm products were generally lower than they were 6 years ago, in September 1933, before any of the farm-control measures were inaugurated.

Instead of curing our problems, the New Deal has produced grave threats against the freedom and the stability of our people. In its craving for power to carry out its planned economy, it has tried to subject the courts and the Congress to the arbitrary powers of the President. It has threatened to swamp local self-government and personal liberty by all-inclusive grants of power to Washington. It has increased the national debt by more than $20,000,000,000, and is incurring deficits at the rate of $4,000,000,000 a year, an insane policy which can only lead to national bankruptcy, inflation, and the utter destruction of the American system of thrift, industry, and free enterprise.

Instead of prosperity it has produced depression by imposing an intolerable weight of regulation and taxation on private industry and on those who might enter and extend private industry and increase employment. Even the humanitarian and reform measures, like relief, social security, housing, security control, and collective bargaining for labor, have been so recklessly and unwisely administered as to defeat their own purposes. It is not strange that the American people have turned from the "brain trust" quacks and are searching for a better doctor. It is not strange that every Republican leader is confident of Republican success on the basis of the domestic situation.

But to some extent today attention has been diverted from domestic policy. All America is shocked at the catastrophe in Europe. In spite of all our hopes, Europe has been plunged into a war which threatens civilization itself. Undoubtedly the people of this country are tremendously interested in the war problems, but I do not think they are going to let any war issues change their fixed opinion that the New Deal domestic policies are a failure. If economic conditions improve by the artificial stimulus of war, it is still perfectly clear that they did not improve through any New Deal wisdom. War cannot conceal the dangers and collapse of New Deal policies.

Furthermore, it is just as important for the Republicans to point out the danger of New Deal fallacies, and to offer their own constructive alternative policies as it ever was before. In fact, it is just a little more important. While the people's attention is diverted, and using the war itself as an excuse, we will doubtless see the inner circle of the New Deal proposing more Government dictation of business and individuals and more and better deficits. A fight in Congress must be carried on, as it was carried on in the session this year, to prevent the extension of reckless spending and regulation of everybody, until they can be reversed in 1940. The newspapers and the radio can serve a real public purpose by giving at least equal prominence to domestic questions as to those of the European war. Unless we are ourselves involved in the war, domestic policies are going to have more to do with the future welfare of our people than the result of European battles.

I find a few Republican leaders discouraged by the rise of these new issues of foreign policy. There is no reason for such discouragement, provided the Republican foreign policy is based on the same sound Americanism as its domestic policy. The welfare of this country and its people depends on keeping out of the European war, and the people are determined that we shall do so. On that issue the Republicans occupy the strong position. They are the peace party.

It is true that the President today has expressed his determination to keep America out of war and that his actions and recommendations up to this time look in that direction. But the Democratic Party has a bad record. President Wilson was reelected in 1916 on the boast that he had kept us out of war, and we were in war almost as soon as he took office for a second term. President Roosevelt, in his Chicago speech, expressed the opinion that we should, by economic embargoes, quarantine those countries which we judged to be aggressors. In his opening address to Congress in January of this year, he proposed "many methods short of war, but stronger and more effective than mere words" to protect religion, democracy, and good faith among nations. He approved, last spring, a Washington Post editorial advocating interference in European quarrels. He is a recent and a half-converted convert to the cause of peace. If the people of this country wish to remain in peace after 1940, they had better trust the administration of their foreign policy to the Republicans.

Today the American people are overwhelmingly in favor of keeping out of war. But even today there are many people who, at heart, do not sympathize with that position. Furthermore, the American people are an emotional people. A tremendous war spirit was aroused in 1917 by the sinking of American ships and the drowning of American citizens. We went to war in 1898 because a friendly people were oppressed by cruel dictators. No one can be sure what waves of feeling may sweep over the country

if American ships are sunk or innocent civilians and noncombatants slaughtered without mercy. Many of those who shout for peace today may shout for war tomorrow. And so now is the time to make certain that our present feeling is based on reason and not solely on prejudice. What possible arguments can be made for our entrance into the war at any time?

War is so horrible today that the reasons against it are obvious to all. The glamour and romance of an earlier day, always largely imaginary, have been completely destroyed by the methods used in the World War. Instruments of destruction threaten the entire civilization built up in Europe through thousands of years, with all its historical landmarks, and all its institutions and accomplishments for improving the welfare of mankind. No man wants to spend months or years in the trenches himself. Every parent dreads the day his sons may sail away to war.

But it is said that we cannot stay out. We can stay out if we are determined, and remain determined, to do so. We have stayed out of many European wars. If we admit that we cannot stay out, we will be perpetually involved in war, because in Europe races are so mingled that no one can even draw boundaries without leaving minorities which are a perpetual source of friction. There have been wars for thousands of years, and there will be wars for years to come. Of course we can stay out. Holland and Switzerland and Scandinavia stayed out of the World War, although they were in the very midst of it. We have an isolated location, and it is still isolated in spite of all the improvements on sea and in the air. I find that many people who say that we cannot stay out, at the bottom of their hearts do not wish to stay out. Theirs is a defeatist attitude and certainly no argument for not trying to stay out.

Secondly, it has been widely argued that we should enter the war to defend democracies against dictatorships. The President's own expressions have indicated this belief in the past. No one can sympathize more than I do with the success of democratic governments against dictatorships. No one desires more strongly than I the destruction of Hitlerism and Stalinism, but I question whether dictatorships are necessarily destroyed by war. The purpose of the World War was to save democracy, but it actually resulted in the destruction of more democracies and the creation of more dictatorships than the world has seen for many years. Nothing is so destructive of forms of government, particularly forms of democratic government, as war. We may go in to save England and France, and find that when the war ends their governments are either Communist or Fascist.

Our going to war would be more likely to destroy American democracy than to destroy German dictatorship. Congress would be flooded by a large number of measures designed to have the Government take over business and regulate every detail of private and commercial life. The President already has statutory power to take over the railroads and manufacturing plants in case of war, and the radios and public utilities in case of threatened war. I have little doubt that he would exercise most of these powers. We have been warned by Mr. Johnson, the Assistant Secretary of War, that private business would be regulated in every detail by the Government. Conscription of wealth seems a reasonable accompaniment of conscription of men, but if carried out in a New Deal spirit it will result in the complete socialization of all property. We went far down that road in the World War. By an earnest effort, normal conditions were restored after the war, but I doubt whether today we would ever see again real local self-government in the United States, or real operation of private enterprise. We might retain the forms of democracy, but we will be likely to find ourselves with an absolutely arbitrary government in Washington, and a plebiscite every 4 years to determine who shall control it. A government by plebiscite either is not, or will not long remain, a democratic form of government.

I believe we will do the cause of democracy much more good if we maintain our neutrality, and show that a great nation can get through a crisis of this kind without abandoning democratic principles. We cannot interfere with other forms of government. We can only assist democracy by showing the people of the world that it is more likely to bring peace and happiness to its citizens than any other form of government. In that manner it spread all over the world in the nineteenth century and will triumph again.

The third argument that we should enter the war is based on the theory that if France and England are defeated, we will be overwhelmed by Germany. This view is widely held, and it will be more strongly pushed if England and France are losing. I do not claim that a world dominated by Hitler and Stalin would be a pleasant world to live in. But terrible as conditions might be, I do not see why they would threaten the safety of the United States. If, by some remote possibility, Hitler could overwhelm England and France, it would not relieve him from the complications of European policy. England and France defeated Germany, but Germany has been a thorn in their side for 20 years. No race and no dictator has ever dominated Europe for long. Why Hitler should choose to add to his European troubles by attacking the strongest nation in the world is hard to see. He would gain nothing by such an attack on this country, because he would already have available, in Africa and Asia, the raw materials and colonies Germany has sought. I cannot even see any reason why trade between the United States and the rest of the world would not continue in about the same volume as before.

But, above all, the best military authorities tell us that we can defend North America and the Caribbean Sea south of us, if we maintain an adequate navy and an attendant air force. Today we have the best navy in the world, and it is essential that we keep it of a size and condition sufficient to assure our safety without war. The Republicans certainly have approved all the increases in naval appropriations.

In short, the horrors of a modern European war are so great, its futility is so evident, its effect on prosperity and happiness and democratic government itself so destructive that any alternative seems to be preferable except the subjection of this country to physical attack or the loss of its freedom.

The Republican Party is for peace and will be the peace party in 1940. What is the best policy to keep us out of war? In the first place, we must learn to distinguish propaganda in whatever guise it comes and try to sift the truth from the vast ocean of reports. A false idea of conditions may result from the best-intentioned reporters with strong individual prejudices as much as from deliberate false statements.

I believe that the adoption of the cash-and-carry system is more likely to keep us out of war than any other proposal which has been made. We became involved in the World War because the American people were outraged at the sinking of American ships and the drowning of American citizens. Some people seem to think that the arms embargo will prevent the repetition of such incidents, but they do not seem to realize that under the present law everything except the very limited classification "arms, ammunition, and implements of war" may be shipped to Europe and is being shipped to Europe in American ships, including castings, steel, and machine tools with which to make guns; and alcohol, cotton, and cellulose, with which to make ammunition. In fact, even if the arms embargo is repealed, arms, ammunition, and implements of war would never be more than a small proportion of total shipments. In the World War, prior to our entry in 1917, they only amounted to 13 percent, while other goods and materials amounted to 87 percent. The Germans recognize no distinction between arms and other contraband, and almost the whole 87 percent is contraband. Finnish ships carrying only lumber were sunk last week. American ships today are likely to be sunk at any moment. You may have noticed last week that when the *Courageous* was torpedoed an American freighter was right there, picking up the survivors. Under the cash-and-carry system American ships would be excluded from the war zone, and the chance of incidents leading to war tremendously reduced.

The President has said that he could obtain this result by proclaiming that American ships would travel at their own risk. To my mind, this does not satisfy the requirements. The American people may be as much aroused by the unjust torpedoing of American ships traveling at their own risk as any other kind of American ship. There should be a legislative prohibition of such travel.

Under the present law, credit for all goods can be and is being advanced to British and French firms. If we permit the steady growth of such credits, we build up a large number of people in this country financially interested in the success of England and France and likely to aid any propaganda for us to enter the war. If cash must be paid for all goods shipped, then even a manufacturer of arms has no financial interest in the success of either side. Again the President suggests that by proclamation he can relieve the United States of responsibility for collecting such credits. But this is not enough; we want to avoid the interest which may lead to war. Furthermore, experience has shown that credits advanced to warring countries may be very difficult to collect. They also increase indefinitely the artificial and inflated prosperity brought about to some extent even by cash purchases. We will have a hard enough time adjusting ourselves to the economic reaction at the end of the war without making that reaction much worse through the loaning of money abroad. Such loaning during and after the World War tremendously increased the severity of the 1929 depression.

Provided that a strict cash-and-carry plan is adopted, I believe the arms embargo should be repealed. Many people seem to think that this means a departure from neutrality. I do not agree, and I may say that I stated my position on this question on April 25 of this year over a Nation-wide radio hook-up long before the President made any recommendations to Congress. The most neutral position we can take, in my opinion, is to say to all nations, "We will sell you whatever we have if you pay cash and carry away your purchases in ships which you supply." No one has ever claimed before that an arms embargo is necessary to neutrality. We have been neutral in countless wars without any arms embargo.

I get a good many letters which indicate that the writers think someone is trying to repeal the Neutrality Act. No such proposal has been presented to Congress, and the cash-and-carry amendments, with repeal of the arms embargo, increase our neutrality. An arms embargo has always seemed to me unwise, and unfair as between other nations. It directly discriminates in favor of those nations which build up their military establishment in peacetime so that they are not dependent on imports. It discriminates against weak and peaceful nations which have not increased their own munition plants. It discriminates in favor of land powers against sea powers. It deprives England and France of one of the natural strengths of their position. They have

many natural weaknesses. For instance, Germany can go to Russia for ammunition and supplies, while England and France cannot. I can see little difference between shipping arms and shipping the machinery and material with which arms are made; and the German Government takes the same position today. I see little sense in a law which prohibits our supplying arms to our friendly neighbor, Canada, on the north, while it permits the shipment of arms to our neighbor, Mexico, on the south, from which assistance indirectly can easily reach Russia and Germany. I see little sense in a policy which permits American companies to set up airplane factories in Canada and deprive American workmen of the work resulting from airplane manufacture in the United States.

The removal of the arms embargo is not in any way calculated to increase the chances of our getting into war. The Germans are not going to declare war on us simply because we ship finished arms instead of materials. Even if American ships were permitted to sail, they are as likely to torpedo them without munitions as with. I do not see that Hitler has any cause to complain merely because the law is repealed now instead of before the war began. The proposal to change the law was pending in Congress and openly recommended by the President before war began. I have heard some people say that if we sell arms to Europe those arms will therefore be followed by American troops. There is no reason or logic in such a conclusion.

As to the bill actually presented to Congress, I have some criticism of details. I believe the war zone should be declared by Congress in the first instance; that a war zone surrounding all Europe might well be substituted for the prohibition against shipment to belligerent countries. I believe private credits should be covered as well as credits to governments. I believe that the provision permitting 90-day credits should be eliminated. Cash and carry means cash, and not 90-day credits. I am opposed to giving the President any discretion which will enable him to favor one warring nation over another, and thereby abandon neutrality. The arms embargo should be repealed only if the cash-and-carry plan is written into the law.

The President may at some time recommend a course unfair to one combatant nation as against others, but his present recommendations are entirely consistent with neutrality and increase the chance of our keeping out of war. It is important that the Republican Party, if it is to maintain its position of authority with the people, shall not cry "wolf!" until there is a wolf.

There are some who say that politics should stop at the water's edge and that the Nation must present a united front. I do not at all agree. I do not believe that any position of the Republican Party should be dictated by partisanship, whether in foreign or domestic policy for that matter, but if the President should advocate a policy, for instance, which leads this country toward war, I would feel it not only my right but my duty to oppose it as energetically, and as publicly, as possible. There is no principle of subjection to the Executive in foreign policy. Only Hitler or Stalin would assert it.

The Republican Party today has a heavy responsibility. We should all analyze every proposal that is made, and oppose those which tend toward war. We should concern ourselves perpetually with domestic policy. We should oppose every effort to use the war as a cover for extending wasteful expenditure and bureaucratic regulation. We should be prepared to present a constructive program to restore our people to work, to maintain our domestic liberties, and to encourage individual initiative and build up private business activity. We should devise policies to guard against artificial expansion and speculation, which may bring on another depression with its hardship and suffering. On the course which the Republican Party pursues depends the peace and happiness of the people of the United States.

Exportation of War Goods

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 2, 1939

ARTICLE BY LOWELL LIMPUS

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very interesting and instructive article written by the distinguished writer, Mr. Lowell Limpus, entitled "Arms a Fraction of War Goods Exports." The article appeared in the New York Daily News of today.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Daily News]

ARMS A FRACTION OF WAR GOODS EXPORTS

(By Lowell Limpus)

WASHINGTON, D. C., October 1.—Nearly nine-tenths of the things we sold the Allies before we got into the last World War aren't on the present embargo list.

When it comes to stopping the exports used by warring nations, experience seems to indicate that the Neutrality Act is little better than a giant sieve. It simply doesn't touch 87 percent of the sales we made in 1914–17.

The figures are explicit. In the 30 months that elapsed between the outbreak of the war and the time we broke with Germany, we sold the Allies $7,562,573,000 worth of supplies. They constituted the bulk of our export trade.

And only $960,390,000 of that total represented the wartime sale of munitions, firearms, armor plate, and other items on the 1939 embargo list.

The other things which made up almost nine-tenths of that total—items which are perfectly legal to export today, unhampered by any cash-and-carry or bring-your-own-ships regulations—included vast quantities of wheat, meat, cotton, coal, sugar, wood, gasoline, tires, railroad cars, electrical apparatus, and cigarettes.

Of course, Uncle Sam might have sold some of these seemingly harmless things to the same customers if there hadn't been a war. But it is clear that he wouldn't have sold nearly so much—not by almost $4,500,000,000 worth.

The figures are clear about that, too. We reach them by comparing our normal, peacetime trade for the 30 months preceding the war with the business we did during the next 30 months.

WAR DOUBLED TRADE

During the 30 months ending June 30, 1914, we sold the seven biggest allied customers (who were, in order, England, Canada, France, Italy, Japan, Australia, and Russia) $3,226,934,000 worth of goods. And during the next 30 months, when the war was raging, we sold the same seven customers a total of $7,562,573,000, as stated.

That certainly looks like the war boom netted us $4,335,639,000.

Now, since only the $960,390,000 was spent for goods listed on the present embargo, it is evident that munitions constituted only 22 percent of the total increase in wartime business.

Only one slight adjustment has been made. We figured the increased munitions sales at $960,390,000, after deducting an item of $76,103,000, which looks like the normal, peacetime sales of steel plates, etc., that we sold in the 30 months before the war broke out. And the $960,390,000 was the remainder.

GERMANY'S TRADE LOST

That munitions business, in fact, almost balanced the amount of ordinary trade with Germany, Austria-Hungary, Turkey, and Bulgaria which we lost when they went to war. For the 30 peaceful months that trade amounted to $897,754,000.

The 30 months of peace for which we selected statistics extended from January 1, 1912, to June 30, 1914, including all trade up to the month before the war broke out. The 30 months of war extended from July 1, 1914, to January 1, 1917, the month before we broke with Germany. They give us this picture:

Peacetime exports

January–June 1912	$1,006,775,000
To June 30, 1913	2,170,319,000
To June 30, 1914	2,329,684,000

Wartime exports

To June 30, 1915	$2,716,178,000
To June 30, 1916	4,272,177,000
To Jan. 1, 1917	2,970,855,000

It is evident that our entire business with the world totaled $5,506,778,000 (of which $3,226,934,000 was with the Allies) for the 30 months of peace and that for the 30 months of war it rose to $9,959,210,000 (of which $7,562,573,000 was with the Allies).

If we figure total munitions sales to the world—the amount being $1,036,657,000—it becomes evident that the embargoed articles represented only 10 percent of the entire world business. That gives anybody his choice of three percentages. The munitions plus other war equipment represented, respectively, 22 percent of the increase in sales to the Allies, 13 percent of the total sales to the Allies, 10 percent of the total sales to the world.

That isn't a lot any way you figure it.

Munitions exports

Commodity	Peacetime exports of munitions			Wartime exports of munitions		
	January–June 1912	To June 30, 1913	To June 30, 1914	To June 30, 1915	To June 30, 1916	To Jan. 1, 1917
Firearms	$1,679,000	$3,971,000	$3,442,000	$9,475,000	$18,065,000	$30,458,000
Steel plates, etc.	11,828,000	23,907,000	17,055,000	12,500,000	25,020,000	20,373,000
Explosives	2,524,000	5,266,000	6,271,000	41,476,000	467,081,000	402,635,000
Planes and parts	57,000	81,000	188,000	1,540,000	7,000,000	946,000

Our export trade with the World War nations in peace and war before 1914 and after

THE ALLIED POWERS

Nation	Peace			War		
	January–June 1912	To June 30, 1913	To June 30, 1914	To June 30, 1915	To June 30, 1916	To Jan. 1, 1917
England	$279,482,000	$592,462,000	$590,387,000	$911,794,000	$1,526,685,000	$913,566,000
France	65,556,000	142,498,000	155,591,000	369,397,000	628,851,000	471,272,000
Canada	157,497,000	397,426,000	329,791,000	300,688,000	468,784,000	336,644,000
Russia	11,302,000	26,323,000	31,252,000	60,827,000	309,805,000	280,173,000
Italy	32,456,000	75,554,000	73,737,000	184,819,000	269,246,000	183,225,000
Japan	26,566,000	57,597,000	51,087,000	41,517,000	74,470,000	59,240,000
Australia	23,502,000	52,340,000	54,578,000	52,211,000	74,217,000	45,142,000
THE CENTRAL POWERS						
Germany	$151,797,000	$328,629,000	$341,875,000	Negligible		
Austria	11,067,000	23,065,000	22,304,000	Negligible		
Turkey	1,893,000	3,300,000	3,308,000	Negligible		
Bulgaria	87,000	103,000	326,000	Negligible		

Repeal of the Embargo Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 2, 1939

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. ALFRED E. SMITH

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered last evening by the Honorable Alfred E. Smith over the Columbia Broadcasting System on pending neutrality legislation.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

At the outset of my remarks, let me first say that I do not know of anybody in the United States of America who wants this country to go to war. Certainly I do not—for I have three sons of the fighting age; the oldest of them is already in the Army and would be among the first to leave this country in the event that the United States was brought into the European struggle.

So, therefore, the argument, as far as I am concerned, resolves itself into this: What should we do that is best calculated to keep us out of war? In the discussion of this there is no room for personalities, parties, classes, or creeds—all differences must be wiped out in this hour of challenge. Personal interests must be subordinated to the common good. We must be selfish, not for ourselves but for the whole Nation.

PRACTICALITIES CITED

I was brought up in a tough political school where facts counted for more than theories. My training has been to distinguish between high-sounding principles and actual results. My experience has taught me not to ask, "Has it a lofty purpose?" but to demand an answer to the question, "Does it work?"

The present Neutrality Act does not work. The theory back of it seemed excellent. The principle upon which it rested appeared sound when the act was passed. In the absence of any severe test, the purpose which it contemplated could not have been successfully criticized. But all this has changed. The act has now been tested. It has not met the test and in the coming state of world affairs it can't possibly meet the even more drastic strains of the future. It has been weighed in the balance and found wanting.

I am not the least bit interested in the language of any of the acts so far suggested, nor for that matter in any act that may hereafter be suggested, as to its details. What I am interested in, however, is that course which is best calculated to keep us from being drawn into the European war.

FORGET TECHNICALITIES

This is no time for technicalities. We should have a prompt decision by Congress on the merits. I don't mean to discourage debate. There is a real question to be argued. What I do advocate—and I am sure the overwhelming majority are with me—is that the debate shall be on the real issue and not on obscure or minor considerations. Personally, I am not interested in the argument as to whether or not we should return to so-called established principles or international law. I am not a student of law, but I am ready to defend the propositions that there is no respect for international law at this time.

Similarly, I take no stock in quibbling over constitutional questions in connection with the proposed substitute for the present Neutrality Act. Apparently there are some learned people who think we should give a lot of time to a discussion of whether the Constitution of the United States permits Congress or the Senate, as well as the President, to decide that a foreign war exists. What is the difference? The President's decision would be based on conferences with congressional leaders anyway and would be subject to review by Congress. In a crisis there is no time for legalistic hair-splitting. Let Congress go straight to the real issue and let Congress decide it, because, after all, Congress speaks for all the people of the country; that is my understanding of democratic representative government.

QUOTES ROOSEVELT

"The Neutrality Act as it stands today prevents the sale to a belligerent nation of any completed implements of war, but it allows the sale of many types of uncompleted implements of war, as well as all kinds of general materials and supplies."

These words are taken from the speech of the President of the United States when Congress convened last week. He further says that the present law allows such products of industry and agriculture to be taken in American ships to belligerent nations, and he concludes that herein lies the definite danger not only to our neutrality but to our peace. I am unable in the light of history to understand how that statement can be successfully disputed.

Let us go back into history. Many reasons were advanced as the cause of our entering the World War nearly 22 years ago.

Nobody can truthfully say, in the light of history, that Woodrow Wilson was anxious to plunge this country into the World War. In fact, he leaned in the directly opposite way. Long before he called upon Congress to declare war against the imperial Government of Germany because of the sinking of American ships, there was a distinct feeling throughout the country that we should go to war to vindicate the dignity and the majesty and the sovereignty of this great Republic. In a conversation with his secretary in 1916, after a submarine had sent an American ship to the bottom, he said, "I will not be rushed into war, no matter if every last Congressman and Senators stands up on his hind legs and proclaims me a coward."

FACE SAME SITUATION

In the latter part of January 1917 Germany announced to the United States that she was going to begin on February 1 unrestricted submarine warfare in the zone around the British Isles and undertook to specify the route which a restricted number of American ships might take through this zone. When the secretary to the President brought that Associated Press bulletin to the White House and showed it to the President he said, "This means war. The break that we have tried so hard to prevent now seems inevitable."

Here we are under the present Neutrality Act, facing that exact situation. The law as it now stands allows supplies to a belligerent country to be carried in American ships; supplies which will be needed for the prosecution of the war, although not named in the Neutrality Act.

But all of that seems to be beside the question in view of the attitude of the German Government as shown by the destruction of two Swedish steamships. The attitude of Berlin to the sinking of these two ships clearly indicates that the German Government does not recognize any difference between the goods covered by the American embargo and the goods that are not covered by the embargo.

That means that anything delivered to belligerent nations in American ships puts the ship in danger of destruction and means

the loss of the lives of American seamen. I believe that we should prevent the transportation in American ships of any goods of any kind, war goods or other goods, contraband or noncontraband or any passengers to the warring nations. It is undoubtedly the absence of such a law in 1917 that brought us into the World War. There is only one way of avoiding a repetition of this experience and that is by keeping American ships and American passengers out of trade with belligerents.

DEFINITION "THE BUNK"

The distinction between contraband and noncontraband, war material and nonwar material is essentially the bunk. As a matter of fact, the Swedish boats were carrying lumber, and that was declared to be contraband of war because it is used for shoring in coal mines which produce fuel necessary for the production of war materials. As I have said, in this war the Germans have already declared there is no such distinction as far as they are concerned. They take the position—if I read the papers aright—that everything routed to the British Isles is contraband of war and they put it upon the ground that no belligerent can afford to buy anything at the present time that is not absolutely necessary to the prosecution of the war.

In view of this and in the light of the German attitude to the sinking of the Swedish ships, those who oppose amendment to the present Neutrality Act are compelled to take the position—let them sink the ships. Those who desire the Neutrality Act amended take the position that we will not let the ships go where they can be sunk.

The Bible speaks of beating swords into plowshares. By the same token plowshares can be beaten back into swords. Armies travel on their feet and on their stomachs, and therefore shoes and food can be regarded as war material and contraband.

Under these circumstances we should keep American ships and American passengers out of the export business and let the purchasers come and get what they need by paying cash and carrying it away in their own ships.

I read by the papers that the Members of Congress are being deluged with letters, the purpose of which is to convince them that we should keep out of the war. Right. The news article said that most of the letters come from people who do not desire any amendment to the Neutrality Act. That is probably because they do not understand it. I would suggest that those who believe, after a study, that amendment is best calculated to keep us out of the war should also write to their representatives in Congress.

Therefore, I repeat, the question before Congress is which of the two measures is best calculated to keep us out of war—the present Neutrality Act or the amendments suggested by the President.

It is because I firmly believe in my heart and soul that the amendments suggested by the President are best calculated to save us from the scenes that we witnessed in 1917 when our American boys were starting for France that I am at this microphone tonight appealing to the American people to stand solidly behind the President because he is so clearly right, so obviously on the side of common sense and sound judgment of patriotism that only those who lack an understanding of the issue will oppose him. I urge this with all the sincerity I possess, with the profound conviction that I speak for the good of the Nation which we all love so much.

Proposed Neutrality Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD P. NYE

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 2, 1939

ADDRESS BY HON. WILLIAM E. BORAH, OF IDAHO

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the RECORD an address recently delivered by the senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] on the general subject of neutrality.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Ladies and gentlemen, Europe is again in the midst of war. The President of the United States has issued proclamations to the effect that in this war this Nation shall stand neutral. But we all realize that laws and statutes and proclamations are not and will not be sufficient to maintain successfully a policy of neutrality. Only the united will of the people can accomplish this difficult task. It is highly proper therefore that we openly and frankly discuss all phases of this question which bears, and will bear, so heavily upon the great body of the people. I want to associate myself tonight with all those who believe we can and ought to remain neutral. I want to resolve with you that we will in good faith put forth our best thoughts and our best efforts to accomplish that great aim.

If we can succeed as a people, especially in the midst of conditions such as they now are, in establishing here upon this western continent a great neutral power—a power standing not for force, not for cruelty and injustice, but for peace, for fair dealing among nations, for reason and justice—we will not only have added honor to our own Nation, happiness to our own people, but we will have rendered to all nations and all peoples a service far greater than it will ever be possible for us to render by joining any nation or nations in carrying on war. Force is gradually undermining and destroying freedom everywhere. If we are not going to wholly surrender to a world governed by force, then we must establish somewhere a great power which speaks for and represents in act and deed the things which make for reason and justice. Whatever may be the discouragements, and however great may be the obstacles thrown in our way, let us make the effort, let us unite behind a policy which, if carried through in good faith upon the part of the Government and with effectiveness upon the part of the people, will not only shelter our homes from mass murder, our people from poverty and premature graves, but will also go far toward guaranteeing anew the blessing of free institutions. It is an effort worthy of a great and free people.

We are met on the threshold of all debate, of all consideration, of this subject of neutrality with the statement often delivered and with an air of finality that we cannot be neutral, that Europe is now so near to the United States, owing to modern inventions and the mingling of business affairs, that neutrality is impracticable, if not impossible. This seems to me a spineless doctrine. It is not the doctrine inherited from our forbears. If true, we would be the most ill-fated nation on the earth instead of being, as we had long supposed, the most favorably circumstanced of any, or all, nations.

How near was Europe, how smotheringly close, was the European system when Washington announced his policy of neutrality and published it to an astonished and enraged Europe? He thought neutrality both wise and practicable; in fact, he believed that such a policy was indispensable to a free America. Yes; how close was Europe to the United States at that time? The United States was really looked upon by European powers as a part of the European system. Brazil at that time belonged to Portugal. Practically, if not all, the balance of South America was owned or controlled by the Spanish crown. The West Indies belonged to England, France, and Spain combined. European countries owned or controlled Central America, Mexico, also what was later known as Texas, Arizona, California, Florida, Louisiana, New Mexico, and Alaska. In fact, this continent might be said to have been at this time geographically a European controlled continent. Our entire northern frontier was heavily garrisoned by European regulars. The Indians were being used by European powers to harass our people and all Europe mocked at the idea that this young Republic would long remain an independent government. We were in actual contact, physical, political, and spiritual—if I may use such a term in this connection—every day of our lives with Europe and affected likewise daily by the domination of the European system. But Washington said we will be neutral as to these European conflicts. And had he not so declared and made good, does anyone doubt the devastating effect upon freedom, upon liberty, upon this Republic?

But we have no alternative, it is in effect declared, after these 150 years of self-government, we must go in in some way or other into all these controversies, broils, and wars of Europe. It is useless, we are told, to try to avoid this fate. Though these wars are not our wars, though they are wars brought on through the manipulation and unconscionable schemes of remorseless rulers, though their national policies are not our policies, though their crimes are not our crimes, still, we have no alternative, so it is urged, but to sacrifice the wealth, the homes, the savings, and the lives of our own people whenever the conflicts arise. Although our people have sought peace and now seek peace, still we must make war because European governments maintain an eternal saturnalia of human sacrifices. Though the law of our land banishes racial and religious persecution from our common country, still, because Europe is "near," we must join in the racial and religious conflicts and sacrifice our people over conditions which our forbears long since rejected. Though we seek no people's territory, nevertheless, because Europe is "near," we must sacrifice the savings of our people and the sons of our mothers in this endless imperialistic strife. Though we would take no part of the loot which was divided up at the close of the World War, we are now called upon to make sure the title to a vast amount of this loot. What a fateful doctrine to propose! Let us renounce it and make the effort at least to establish freedom from the European system.

But friends, the problem of maintaining neutrality under present conditions lies closer home. Let's go direct to its discussion. It is presented by this proposal to repeal the Arms Embargo Act. To those who are advocating repeal, I submit this question: Is it not your main purpose in securing repeal to enable us to furnish arms, munitions, and implements of war to one group of nations and to deny them to another group of nations, which groups are now in mortal combat? Is not this laying the foundation for intervention—in fact, is it not intervention—in the present European war? Is it not your purpose to take sides through the authority which will be available when the embargo law is repealed?

And if the purpose of repeal is to do these things, and we do them, is not neutrality broken down, destroyed, and are we not thenceforth by every rule of international law, by every dictate of common sense and common honesty, parties to a European conflict? I further submit to those who hear me: Do you think the time has come when for reasons of humanity, or of national defense, we should take our place in another European war? I feel we are really considering in this debate the broad question of whether we are justified as a people in intervening in this conflict and meet the issues as they are being presented upon the battlefields of Europe, for we cannot escape that destination if we move along the lines now proposed.

Let me review a brief and recent piece of history. Four years ago there began an earnest discussion in this country of the subject of neutrality. It was taken up in Congress and fully debated. Every phase of it was presented. It was discussed in the open arenas of the Nation. Learned men in all walks of life brought their contribution to the consideration of the subject. Our people wanted, above all things, to cut out the sale of arms to warring nations. It was felt it would help to keep us out of foreign wars.

Finally, in 1937, we passed a law which prohibited the sale of arms, munitions, and the implements of war to any nation or nations engaged in war. This law met the approval of both Houses of Congress almost unanimously. It met the approval of the executive department. It met the approval overwhelmingly of the great majority of the American people. At the time this law was passed and this policy of neutrality established there was no war of any moment anywhere. Germany and Britain were upon comparatively friendly terms. Both as a matter of morals and as a matter of international law, as a sovereign right, we had the undoubted right to establish this policy of declining the sale of arms, munitions, and implements of war to any nation engaged in war. It is now proposed to repeal entirely this provision of the law. It is proposed to repeal it to enable this Government to furnish arms to one side and to withhold them from the other. The proposal for repeal is based upon the program of taking sides in the furnishing of arms. Undoubtedly, as I say, we had a right to pass the law, and undoubtedly we have a right to repeal the law. But when we couple the repeal with the announced and declared program of furnishing arms and munitions to one side and withholding them from the other, such program will unquestionably constitute intervention in the present conflict in Europe.

It may be said to repeal the law is not unneutral. I think under the circumstances it is. However, let's not discuss technicalities. But when it is said to me as a Senator: I want you to carry through a program, the first step of which is repeal, the second step of which is the furnishing of arms and munitions to one side, openly, persistently, and continually declared, then I know I am voting for intervention, I am helping to take this Nation into a European war. I cannot hide behind the fact that they are two different acts, because both are a part of one plan and that plan includes the furnishing of arms which is beyond question intervention. All anyone need to do to know that this is the real, the controlling purpose of repeal is to read the literature on repeal down to the last 48 hours.

The talk here in Washington is no longer that of merely furnishing arms. It is said we must prepare to fight. One of my colleagues, a most able and sincere Senator, declared a few nights ago publicly: "Let us give up this 'dream of impartiality,' therefore, of neutrality. It is better," said he, "to take sides and fight." He was speaking out boldly what is now heard from the same sources from which came the agitation of furnishing arms. And if in a few months we can tear up the law which a nation almost universally approved, how long do you think it will take to put across the proposition of sending our young men into the trenches once we have intervened? They may say to me: You cannot be sure that intervention will send our young men to Europe. Of course, I cannot be sure, but I cannot be sure that it will not. I say that would be the logic of the movement. But suppose I cannot be sure, I ask: Why risk it? Why trifle with foreign wars? Why bring the American boys to the precipice where any incident of war may kick them over?

The plan now presented by the advocates of repeal is that the democracies of Europe are imperiled, that we must go to their rescue, that civilization is threatened, that we cannot ignore the problem presented. But, if the war continues and the imperiling of democracies and the threatening of civilization increase, what can we say, having once put our hand to the plow? Will we turn our backs upon the whole situation? I repeat, as I stated a moment ago, what we are really considering these days is the broad question: Has the time come when the United States must take a part in this European conflict? Why deceive ourselves as to what will happen once we enter the conflict? Why shut our eyes to the inevitable consequences which must flow?

The time will not permit a detailed discussion of what is known as the cash-and-carry plan. It is based upon the principle that those who want our arms and munitions or raw material shall come and get them, pay cash, and carry them away. But, while I cannot discuss it in detail, I want to take time to say that this plan does not change the situation, as I understand it, with reference to neutrality. The cash-and-carry plan repeals the embargo law and enables our Government to direct the arms and munitions to one side and withhold them from the other. Whatever merits or demerits this plan may have, it does not seem to me to bear, only most indirectly, upon the question which I have sought to have you consider this evening.

I am concerned at this time with one proposition, that of avoiding any act or acts which will embroil us in a European war. I do not believe the cash-and-carry plan has any considerable bearing upon that point, and I shall therefore content myself with this brief reference.

Friends, I know how deep-seated is the feeling in this country against certain creeds and ideologies prevailing in Europe. I have had ample proof of this feeling in recent weeks. I would not want any of our people to think less of these creeds and ideologies than they do.

Here let me digress a moment. A newspaper friend called me shortly before I came to this room and suggested this sentence I have just read might be susceptible to misconstruction, that perhaps I should have used the word "more" rather than the word "less." Perhaps so. What I meant to say was that I would not want anyone in this country to abhor these creeds and ideologies less than they now do. They are in conflict with every tenet and teaching of our American civilization. But it is not hatred of another country but love of our own which makes for wisdom and justice in the formation of national policies.

We should not forget at this time that the world is still in turmoil and millions of men and women are in misery and want because of a treaty which was written in hate and bitterness 20 years ago. I do not want myself to be confused as to a right course to pursue in the interests of our own people because of my feeling toward creeds and governments of which, as a practical matter, we must take notice.

What we are all interested in is, what course will most likely bring peace to the United States and contentment and happiness to the American people. Where the welfare of an entire Nation and the health and the lives of the people are involved, we can afford to be patient, to be tolerant, and, at the same time, determined in our effort to find the right way. The democratic processes should at all times be kept intact.

Free speech, free press, uncontrolled consideration in debate are essential to right conclusions and sound judgments in a democracy. We can all afford to trust our cause to the democratic processes, and, when the final judgment is made up according to those processes, we can rest in the belief that the judgment will be a wise judgment.

Twenty years ago we went into Europe to take part in a European war. We went with high hopes and, in my opinion, for ample cause. But even so, how futile the sacrifices we made. Scarcely had the heroic story of our soldiers been written before the so-called peace treaties had set at naught the principles for which our soldiers fought. Every move in that direction, therefore, should be subjected to the test of the best thought and the high motives of the entire American people. If the worst should come, and for any reason we should be involved in another European struggle, nothing should be taken for granted as to why the sacrifice must be made.

In conclusion, the President has called a special session of Congress for the purpose of removing the embargo on arms, munitions, and implements of war. There are some of us who want to keep the old law—who insist that the sale of arms to all nations engaged in war shall continue to be prohibited. The only question in controversy, the only matter of difference that I know of, is the sole question of whether we shall sell arms or not sell arms. We see that the supporters of repeal are anxious to put an embargo on ships going to war zones, on loans to all nations engaged in war, anxious to prohibit our citizens from traveling in war areas; all this and more is to be done in the name of neutrality in the effort to keep us out of war. We most heartily support this entire program. We say, in the name of peace: Do these things. Maintain neutrality as to all these matters. But we observe here that there is a sudden break in the embargo—the most threatening and disturbing of all factors, the most calculated to get us into trouble—arms, munitions, and implements of war are to be let through. Embargo is not to apply. What is the significance? We feel sincerely that this is an error. We stand where we stood 2 years ago; where Congress stood; where the Executive stood; and where the people stood. What is the significance? Why prohibit loans in the name of peace and for the protection of our people but not prohibit arms? Why place an embargo on all these other things mentioned but repeal it as to arms? That is the sole matter of controversy. What we did 2 years ago we did in the name of humanity, in the name of peace, to protect our homes, our sons and daughters, and to help keep us out of war. Blame us not therefore if we are slow to surrender our convictions.

What we who oppose repeal are contending for is now the law of the land. It has been and is being enforced under the proclamation of the President. No arms, munitions, and implements of war are being sold. In what possible way can the United States be benefited by permitting the sale? Who is it that is to be benefited? In what respect is this country threatened by reason of the fact no sale of arms is being made. In what respect are the safety and security of the people imperiled? This is the sole matter of controversy. We urge that the same rule, the same principle, be applied to the most deadly of disturbers—arms—along with the other things prohibited.

This, as you see and have well realized, is a problem which concerns every home, every family, and every citizen under the flag. Those of us who must represent you in this in determining the proper course to pursue want to know how you think and feel about it. The people have altogether too little to say about the affairs of government in times of war or with reference to matters which lead to war. You not only have the right, but it is your solemn duty to record your convictions in every practical way that may be presented.

The Pittman Peace Proposal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 2, 1939

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. LEWIS B. SCHWELLENBACH, OF WASHINGTON, SEPTEMBER 29, 1939

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by the Senator from Washington [Mr. SCHWELLENBACH] over the National Broadcasting System on September 29, 1939.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The United States will stay out of this war! That must be the high resolve of every American! I do not need to tell you this now. But during the months to come let it not be necessary for anyone to tell you. The will for peace must not relax. There will come times of confusion. Efforts will be made to confuse, by subtle propaganda, by stories of wartime atrocities, by arousing a feeling of fear. None of these must succeed. Neither sympathy, horror, nor fear may be permitted to swerve you from your determination for peace. That determination must be firm and grim. Your minds must never drift on this subject. Nobody ever drifted any place except into trouble. I am confident that you at your firesides, reading your papers and listening to your radios, are the ones who can and will keep us out of war.

There are so many reasons for this. In the first place, war would cost so much. I don't mean merely the billions of dollars cost—I mean the cost in human lives and in broken bodies and stricken minds. I mean the maladjustment of our economic system. I mean the probable destruction of our democratic government.

Then we must ask ourselves, "What would it avail us to be in this war?" The answer is nothing. We want none of the things for which wars are fought. The last time we hoped we could make the world safe for democracy and end wars forever. We now know how vain was our hope. I think we made an honest mistake then. We would not be honest with anyone if we made the same mistake now.

At this time, we of the Congress are here to try to work out possible legislative assistance to keep us at peace. Among Members of Congress, I find that same grim determination I have urged upon you. Although we may differ as to the exact path we should take, we have no differences on the goal we seek to reach. That goal is peace for America.

It seems to me that, in trying to decide upon our course, common sense requires that we first inquire concerning our past experience. That is usually the safest procedure.

Since the founding of our Republic two Europe-wide wars have occurred. We got into both of them. In the first, England fought France under Napoleon. It was 132 years ago. In the second, England and France were fighting Germany. It was 25 years ago. Surprising as it may seem, the passing of time and the changing of conditions have not materially changed the nature of our national dangers of involvement. Then as now England controlled the seas. Then as now England was determined to starve out its continental adversary. Then as now each was determined that we should not help its enemy. Then as now neither was willing to obey the established rules of international law. We got into both of those wars because of the attacks upon and destruction of our citizens, our property, and our ships upon the high seas. Is it not wise that we should not repeat the mistakes of those two occasions?

During the period before 1812, we tried an embargo. Not merely on munitions, but like the proposal of many who today support the present embargo against all goods. At first it applied to all foreign shipping. Then after 14 months it was modified so that, like our present embargo, it applied only to belligerents. Thomas Jefferson was its sponsor and advocate. Yet even he, 3 months after its adoption in a letter to Madison said, "I take it to be the universal opinion that war will become preferable to the continuance of the embargo after a certain time."

I make not the slightest claim that this embargo took us into the War of 1812. However, no one can deny the fact that it did not keep us out.

We are all familiar with what happened in the last war. We remember the illegal searching and seizing of our ships by England. They almost brought us to war against England. Then came the submarine campaign of Germany. We were exasperated with England's disregard of our property rights. We were outraged with Germany's destruction of the lives of our citizens. During this war we stood on our rights under international law. President Wilson consistently and vigorously protested as to the right of our ships and our property and our citizens to sail the seven seas. We never swerved from this course. Finally, public opinion so strongly condemned Germany's conduct that we plunged into war. I concede that the sale of British war bonds to our people played its part in getting us into that war. Nevertheless, no one can fairly read the history of those days without concluding that the proximate cause of our entrance was the destruction of American lives by German submarines.

Now, what does our present so-called neutrality law provide? Does it correct the mistakes of the last two experiences? So many people in this country are relying upon it. Impartially analyzed, it not only does not correct the mistakes of the last wars—it is a combination of both of them. In regard to arms, it gives us the embargo which failed Thomas Jefferson. In regard to everything else, it gives us the international law which failed Woodrow Wilson. Do you who are relying upon the present law realize that under it American ships, American property, and American citizens can travel in precisely the same way as they did in 1915 and 1916? Any day we may see a repetition of the *Lusitania*, the *Essex*, or the other World War tragedies. American citizens and American goods may travel on our ships, neutral ships, or even belligerent ships, through submarine- and mine-infested danger areas. They not only can, but they are doing it every day. Since there is no law against it, it is the duty of our Government to protect them. The fact is that aside from arms we are in the same position today as we were in 1915 and 1916. I wonder how many of you people who now demand that we make no change in our law were aware of that fact. The self-same conditions which took us into the last war exist today. If we want peace, these conditions must not continue.

Now let me discuss Senator PITTMAN'S proposal for peace, which is the bill now before the Senate. It is a careful, painstaking effort to correct our past mistakes. It is a code of restrictions upon our citizens so as to prevent any one of us from so conducting ourselves as to endanger all of us. It prohibits our ships from traveling to belligerents or from making deliveries to belligerent ships. It prohibits goods owned by Americans being shipped to belligerents. It prohibits our ships and our citizens, even though destined for neutral countries, to travel through the dangerous submarine and mine-infested areas. It prohibits our citizens from traveling on ships owned by belligerents. It prevents the arming of our merchant vessels. It prevents our Government and our people from loaning money or extending credit to belligerent governments. It so strengthens the duties of the Munitions Control Board as to give Congress such a check on munitions as to prevent our being dragged into war by munitions sales. It takes away from the President all of the important discretionary power granted in the 1937 act. There is not a word in it giving the President power to name aggressors. Since it treats both sides precisely alike, it is as truly neutral as any law that could be devised. Since it simply restrains our own citizens, neither side has a right to object to it. It tries to substitute a true peace plan for our present dangerous, unneutral hodgepodge. If any law can keep us out of war, this one will.

After several years of study on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, I am convinced that this is the best device for peace. I recognize in those who disagree with me the same sincere desire for peace which I think I have. It is important in this debate that both sides recognize this fact. We can and must debate this subject. We must not create dissension among ourselves over it. We all seek the same goal—peace.

What we must do is to protect and preserve democratic methods in America. No doubt we will be urged again to spend our resources in a futile effort to correct conditions in Europe. We must not succumb to that urging. When this war ends the hope of the world will rest upon the existence some place of a strong democracy. That place should be here. Let us turn our hands to that task. Let no influence turn us from it.

Letter to President of American Federation of Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNN J. FRAZIER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 2, 1939

LETTER FROM HON. VIC DONAHEY, OF OHIO

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a copy of a letter written by the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. DONAHEY] to the president of the American Federation of Labor.

The letter was addressed to Mr. Green at Cincinnati, Ohio, while the Federation was holding its annual convention in that city.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEPTEMBER 26, 1939.

Hon. WILLIAM GREEN,
President, American Federation of Labor,
Netherland Plaza Hotel, Cincinnati, Ohio.

MY DEAR PRESIDENT GREEN: I have before me your letter of September 14, extending to me a special invitation to attend a session of the A. F. of L. on Monday, October 2, 1939.

I regret that I cannot attend what I believe to be a history-making session of the American Federation of Labor in our home State—Ohio. My heart is tied up in the consideration of a neutrality that will keep us out of war.

On October 10, 1900, I received my first commission from the A. F. of L. as general organizer for Tuscarawas County, Ohio, and it was signed by the "noblest Roman of them all"—Samuel Gompers.

I congratulate the delegates attending the fifty-ninth session of the A. F. of L. This great organization has made history and has lived true to form. It is an all-American institution.

I want to submit to you what I believe to be the seven wonders of American government:

1. No people ever acquired so vast and resourceful a continent in so quiet a manner.
2. No nation ever rose to such greatness by means so peaceable.
3. No nation has an older written Constitution than America.
4. No nation ever rose to such power and strength in so short a time.
5. No nation has ever placed in the hands of its subjects such perfect civil liberty and high standards of living.
6. No nation has ever existed in which men have been left so free to work out their own destiny and enjoy religious and political freedom.
7. No nation gives greater protection and freedom to its women and children than America—the most worth-while country in the world.

I urge this great convention, with the eyes of the world on it, to adopt a ringing stand on neutrality based on common sense and common honesty, dedicated, if you please, to mother, home, and country—the sweetest trinity locked in the hearts of men who toil.

Fraternally yours,

VIC DONAHEY.

Neutrality Legislation and the National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, October 2, 1939

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. EDWARD R. BURKE, OF NEBRASKA

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered on September 30, 1939, by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BURKE] over a Nation-wide hook-up of the Columbia Broadcasting System on the subject Neutrality Legislation and the National Defense.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Within the next few hours debate will open on the floor of the Senate upon the question of amendment of the existing Neutrality Act. Bear this in mind at the outset. The proposal is not to repeal a neutrality law and leave a void, as some would have you believe. It is to strengthen legislation, the chief purpose of which is to render less likely our involvement in any foreign war.

America is consecrated to the cause of peace. We covet not a foot of soil that belongs to another. There is in the hearts of our people not a trace of envy, or jealousy, or hatred of any other nation. Beneath contempt is the individual who would charge, or by innuendo imply, that the motive of any of the participants in shaping our national policy is influenced by considerations of financial gain to industry, labor, or agriculture. America would sacrifice much to restore peace—a righteous peace; a lasting peace—among all the nations of the world.

May I repeat with strongest approval the words of President Roosevelt at the opening of this special session of Congress:

"I proceed on the assumption that every Member of the Senate and of the House of Representatives and every member of the executive branch of the Government, including the President and his associates, personally and officially, are equally and without reservation in favor of such measures as will protect the neutrality, the safety, and the integrity of our country and at the same time keep us out of war."

The question then is whether that objective can with greater likelihood be attained by retaining the Neutrality Act in its present form, or by adopting some or all of the suggested changes. It is with firm conviction in the efficacy of the amended bill that I speak to you tonight. Let its several suggestions be read and understood by all citizens throughout the land. Let them be weighed impartially as to their value in protecting the safety and integrity of our country and in keeping us from involvement in foreign wars. When that has been done, I have not the slightest doubt that an overwhelming voice of approval of the suggested changes will swell the chorus from "every living heart and hearthstone all over this broad land."

The main feature of the existing law, as you well know, is a prohibition on the export of arms, ammunition, or implements of war to a belligerent state. Authority was delegated to the President to place restrictions on the export of certain additional articles or materials. Thereafter no American vessel should transport to a belligerent state such articles. Title should be transferred to some foreign government, agency, or national, before shipment. By limitation written into the act this section expired on May 1, 1939.

When the President signed the original act on August 31, 1935, he stated that the question of the advisability of imposing an embargo on the export of arms required further and more complete consideration. He expressed the opinion that this prohibition might have exactly the opposite effect from that which was intended. It might, in other words, retard rather than favor the protection of "the neutrality, the safety, and the integrity of our country" and the effort to keep us out of war.

Secretary of State Hull has consistently held to the view that an embargo on the export of arms is undesirable. He stated to the committees of Congress last May what everyone must recognize to be the true condition:

"Modern warfare is no longer warfare between armed forces only; it is warfare between nations in every phase of their national life. Lists of contraband are no longer limited to arms and ammunition and closely related commodities. They include not only those items which contribute toward making warfare possible, but almost every item useful in the life of the enemy nation. A nation at war is no less anxious to keep cotton or petroleum, or, indeed, any useful product, from reaching an enemy nation than it is to keep guns and airplanes from reaching the enemy's armed forces. I doubt whether we can help ourselves to keep out of war by an attempt on our part to distinguish between categories of exports."

The correctness of the conclusion reached by Secretary Hull is indisputably borne out by experience. Two alternatives present themselves. Congress could enact an all-inclusive embargo. We could completely close our doors. We could make it impossible for anything and everything produced in America to reach a belligerent state either by passage directly from us or through an intermediate country. Such an embargo rigorously enforced during a general and protracted war would tumble our whole economic system into ruins. With half the world in need of all we would have for sale, our goods would pile up on the docks and in warehouses. Our commerce would be disrupted. Prices would break. An army of unemployed would walk the streets. Discontent would seize our people. Irresistible would be the demand for repeal of such an embargo.

We have demonstrated that an arms embargo is undesirable and productive of no good results. A complete embargo is unwise and its consequences devastating. There is an alternative. Simple. Sensible. Sound. It is set forth in the pending substitute. It attempts no meaningless distinction between classes of goods. It recognizes the futility of discriminating between the raw material, the partly fabricated article, and the completed product. It says to all the world that what we have for sale is ready for any purchaser without the slightest discrimination on our part. As far as we are concerned, all will be treated exactly alike.

More than that this proposal goes to the very root of the evil we are trying to correct—the evil of involvement in war. Since certain countries unfortunately are engaged in a titanic struggle which is not of our making and in which we do not propose to permit ourselves to become involved, we will not let our ships make deliveries to any of the belligerents. We will say to them, one and all alike, if you want that which we have for sale come and get it in your own ships. Title must pass to you here and it will not pass until payment has been made. When you leave our territorial waters with the goods you have bought and paid for—wheat, oil, cotton, airplanes, or whatever they may be—we have no further responsibility. You take all the chance of a safe passage.

It must be clear to every person capable of reasoning that the way for America to keep from involvement in this war is to make it unlikely that American goods, American ships, American seamen, American citizens, will be sent to a watery grave while pursuing a course permitted by law. We propose to strengthen our neutrality legislation by making such happenings unlikely to occur.

But, it is said, if we follow this course of dealing not at all with any of the belligerents except on the terms stated, some belligerent, unable, for reasons with which we have nothing to do, to come and get goods from us, or lacking ability to pay for them, will become incensed. So what! Will such a nation retaliate by preying upon our commerce with neutrals? I do not think so. I credit all of the belligerents with more sense than that. But are we to be deterred

from acting within our recognized rights and in accordance with our best judgment by threats of force? Much as we abhor war, zealously as we will strive to treat all with such complete fairness as to give no justifiable offense, we still have the ability and the will to meet such a situation. To meet it promptly and with such overpowering force that there will be no repetition.

The surest way for America to keep from ever having a war forced upon her is to make adequate protection for the national defense. Not to engage in any conduct remotely resembling aggression. Not to act the part of the bully. Not to fight on foreign soil. Not to participate in wars between other nations no matter how deep our sympathies may be. We must be strong, we must be prepared both in man power and in equipment, in order that we may thus command the respect of the world.

Promotion of our national defense affords the final and conclusive reason for the prompt repeal of the arms embargo. You ask how that is so? The answer is that it is not the country which buys from us arms, munitions, and implements of war which receives the only or the greater benefit. By completing the process of manufacture here, whether of planes, tanks, arms, or war equipment of any kind, we are thus enabled to develop the facilities and the organization to place our own national defense in a position of superiority that will render America immune to attack from any nation or combination of nations in all the world. Had an arms embargo been in force from 1914 on it would have served not at all to have kept us out of the war. But it would have left us woefully weak and unprepared when we were forced to enter.

It is our common hope and prayer that the day will soon come when righteous men and women in every land will take control. When war will be no more. When every dispute will be settled at the council table.

We will not hasten the coming of that day by fondly lapsing into a false security. An America weak and unprepared will not be able to lead the world along the pathway of peace. We have the latent resources, the partially developed possibilities, the manpower to make this Nation impregnable. Let us perfect our national defense and we can then take the leadership in the movement to end war. Toward that end the repeal of the arms embargo is an essential step.

"Realization that the neutrality law now on the statute books is neither really neutral nor in any way a reliable guaranty against war, explains the rising tide of sentiment for its amendment," says the Washington Post. The Pittman bill is strictly neutral. It affords the most reliable guaranty against our involvement in war. It should be, and I have no doubt will be, promptly adopted.

Proposed Neutrality Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ERNEST LUNDEEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 2, 1939

RADIO ADDRESSES BY HON. GERALD P. NYE, OF NORTH DAKOTA

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD two addresses on the subject of neutrality legislation, delivered on September 30 and October 1, by the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE].

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. GERALD P. NYE, SEPTEMBER 30, 1939

Retention of the arms embargo is the first requisite for the preservation of American peace. To repeal it now would be to take the first, most important step toward our eventual participation in the war in Europe.

England and France wish the United States to repeal the arms embargo. This wish is to be expected. Do they want it repealed to insure the United States against being drawn into their war?

The fact is that these two nations have known for 2 years that they were up against a challenge in Europe and have been making ready to meet it in a military way. The Chamberlain government, however, until last March, was more concerned with buying Hitler off than with its own war preparations. The sacrifice of the one real democracy in central Europe, Czecho-Slovakia, was the climax of that policy. Now, with the bankruptcy of Chamberlain's appeasement and the alleged change in policy, we are being asked to throw overboard a provision to ensure our own peace—which Congress by overwhelming majorities wrote into law in 1935, 1936, and 1937—the ban on the shipment of arms to belligerent nations.

Why are France and England so eager to see the repeal of the arms embargo? True they want our munitions-plant capacity devoted to their needs. But more than that—and the real crux of the matter—their World War experience with us has taught them to know that if the United States caves on one really important issue, the road to war for us will then easily be laid out. If we give up the arms embargo now, they know they can accomplish easy change of the other provisions of law intended to help keep us out of other people's wars. They know that once this first step is taken it will be comparatively easy to get rid of any cash-and-carry requirements, and of the Johnson Act forbidding American loans to nations that have forgotten to pay us what they owe us from the last war.

Once these barriers against involvement have been destroyed, the final step of sending our young men on to correct Europe's ills will not be far off. The last chase in behalf of imperialism has already cost us to date $47,247,286,344.

England and France do not want us to repeal the arms embargo because they want us to keep out of war. But here in our own country there are many eminent authorities who insist not only that England and France will be crushed by Hitler but that the United States will be drawn easily into Europe's war if we don't repeal the Embargo Act. I wish someone would clearly explain just how maintenance of the arms embargo, which only 2 years ago was hailed by the leaders as a great protection against war, is going to drag us into war. Oh, we hear that it is because the arms embargo leaves uncovered so many commodities the shipment of which to belligerent nations would be sure to invite incidents that would take us to war. The administration's proposal is to repeal the arms embargo and enact a cash-and-carry law that will cover all commodities, including armaments.

May I ask those who so reason why, if they are so fearful of our commerce with nations at war dragging us into their war, why wouldn't there be larger security against war in our retaining the arms embargo, and adding all commodities to the embargo list? If it be answered that this would be too costly in foreign trade, then let it be acknowledged that it is trade and profits, not security about which we are most solicitous. Very well; then why not keep the embargo and put back into the law the thing that was there until last May, namely, the cash-and-carry provision for all other commodities.

Incidentally, let there be a reminder at this time that the neutrality law had a cash-and-carry provision of that very nature until last May when the administration permitted it to expire. Now the same administration bemoans the fact that there is no cash-and-carry provision to ensure our security against war. Why were they so careless as to let what they now so much want expire last spring? Perhaps the answer to that is the same as the answer might be to another related question, namely, Why did the administration, from the President down, once praise the neutrality law, with its arms embargo and cash-and-carry plan, as a safeguard of American neutrality, and why does it now so roundly condemn it?

It is generally acknowledged that the administration would prefer outright repeal of the entire Neutrality Act and then fall back on international law as the instrument to keep us out of war (the same international law that served so well in getting us into the last war). But as recently as the fall of 1936 President Roosevelt was praising the existence of the neutrality law. In his famous Chautauqua speech the President, the same one who only in August complained because the refusal of Congress to repeal the arms embargo had halted a nice economic boom, this same President at Chautauqua said:

"The Congress has given me certain authority to provide safeguards of American neutrality in case of war * * * new weapons with which to maintain our neutrality.

"* * * Effective maintenance of * * * neutrality depends * * * on the wisdom and determination of whoever at the moment occupy the offices of President and Secretary of State.

"It is clear that our present policy and the measures passed by Congress would in the event of war * * * reduce war profits which would otherwise accrue to American citizens. * * * Let us not blink the fact that we would find * * * thousands of Americans, who, seeking immediate riches—fool's gold—would attempt to break down or evade our neutrality. * * * If we face the choice of profits or peace, the Nation will answer—must answer—'We choose peace!'"

Today, while the President is urging destruction of what he then called "weapons with which to maintain our neutrality," the people of America, however, are saying, "We choose peace." We stand a far greater chance of having peace if we hang tight to the arms embargo. If there are going to be changes in that program let them be changes to tighten the existing law and to make the most effective peace insurance we can have.

This battle to retain the arms embargo is going to be won if the people of the land will continue their insistence against its repeal. That statement is hardly consistent, is it, with the newspaper dispatches from Washington to the effect that there are already more than a majority of the Senate pledged to vote for embargo repeal. What is that information intended to do if not to convince the people that their fight here is already lost, that there is no longer any utility in writing letters to your Senators and the President urging retention of the arms embargo. Will it work? Not for very long, I am sure. When this great debate gets under way in the Senate next week there will be, day after day, most positive demonstration of the fact that the fight is not lost, that it is only just begun, and that there is ample reason to believe that the majority in the Senate will vote to keep the embargo.

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. GERALD P. NYE, OCTOBER 1, 1939

I insist that repeal of the arms embargo is not in keeping with American determination to stay out of Europe's war. This attitude is not prompted by any partisan spirit. Those of us who are for the arms embargo now were supporters of it since 1935, when we introduced bills for both the cash and carry and the arms embargo. We thought then that America needed both of them to keep us out of war, and we still think so. We have been able to observe how greed can grow into a great power in the affairs of the Nation, how quickly a little privilege can become a vested interest, how readily, to be specific, the traffic in death can become not only respectable but arrogant.

We are a nation of people almost unanimous in expressing a determination to stay out of the European War. But of this great number there are some who are eager to help one side engaged in the European conflict to the extent of arming them with the instruments which war calls for. When will it dawn upon such people that, since modern war is conducted on two specific fronts, the military and the economic, one quite as important as the other, that we cannot be into a war on one front without expecting shortly to be into it on both fronts. If we are determined to fight this war with materials, we will inevitably end up by fighting it with men.

How many more wars do we have to have before we learn that lesson? It was written long ago, "Where your money is, there will your heart be also."

This pending decision by Congress on the arms embargo involves the question whether the United States will take the first step toward participation in Europe's war. I insist that we cannot conscientiously declare ourselves out of Europe's war when we go into Europe's war actively on the economic front in support of one side.

The people should be reminded that they have no vote on this question—no vote on the possibility that they will die in the mud in the Rhine for some cause to them unknown. They vote on everything else, but not on the most important matter in their lives. The administration refused the people that right last year when it pressured Congress to defeat legislation giving that right. Now, that same administration is engaged in taking away another safeguard against our involvement in war—the arms embargo.

In this situation Congress is the only protection from involvement. The debate will start tomorrow noon.

What is the fight about? It is about getting into a war situation by accident, or because of greed, or because one single man thinks we ought to get in. That is not democracy. The bill that is pending has some good and some very bad features. The good features are now or have been a part of our neutrality law. The bad features are those granting more power to the President.

The arms embargo is the real heart of the controversy, and I hope the window dressing in the bill is not going to be permitted to blind anyone to that fact.

We who fight repeal of the arms embargo will insist that to make our country the arsenal for one side in the European war is to make our country the target for the other side; that the embargo is pure neutrality; that repeal is the first step into the foreign war; that we can get along without the blood profits that are available through embargo repeal.

Those who favor repeal of the arms embargo will insist that the embargo is unneutral, that there is money in the murder business, that we need the returns from foreign war to bolster our economy, that we must choose sides, that the cause of democracy is involved in Europe's never-ending imperialistic struggles.

The arms embargo has become a kind of traffic light. If it is repealed, the light will turn green—"Go ahead"—along the road to war. Now the light stands at red, "Stop!" and we propose to keep the arms embargo there to hold that light at red, to let all and everyone know that the American people propose to stay out of this war.

The fight in Congress to keep the arms embargo on the books is going to be desperate. It is going to be desperately fought, because once that embargo were repealed, there will be no turning back and putting it back on the books—not until after another war.

The gloating dispatches from Washington expressing the administration's belief that they had the votes to repeal are probably doing some harm. They are discouraging some people from writing their Senators and Congressmen. I want to tell you that you will see within a very few days that a majority has not pledged itself to repeal the embargo, and I am confident that it will not be repealed. The very fact that the administration has taken time on the air every night for 2 weeks indicates that its forces are not sure of their ground.

There are some other contradictions, too. What of this representation that unless we sell war supplies to England and France those countries are going to be crushed, and then to know that the purchases by those two countries of munitions during the 5 months preceding the invoking of the arms embargo were insignificant? The truth is that England and France know that if repeal of the arms embargo can be accomplished they can anticipate with far greater ease, a little later on, repeal of the cash-and-carry requirements, repeal of the Johnson Act, and finally repeal of that resolve to keep American sons off the European military front.

Here in America eminent statesmen insist that the repeal of the embargo is essential if we are to stay out of Europe's war. Does anyone believe that England and France want us to repeal the embargo for that same reason? There isn't an American who doesn't know better.

And speaking of inconsistencies, what of the attitude of those who are now demanding repeal of the arms embargo as a thing necessary to keep us out of Europe's war, by comparison with their insistence only 2 years ago that unless we wrote an arms embargo to prevent exportation of arms into Spain the United States would be drawn into that civil war in Spain? Now, war in Europe has broken out, and the administration has turned a somersault and is asking that we repeal the arms embargo which in 1937 they considered so necessary for our own peace.

Here are many insisting upon repeal of the arms embargo as a step to keep us out of war, yet insisting in the same breath that we get into Europe's war to the extent of supplying one side with arms and making our Nation an arsenal for that side.

Eloquently men plead for an adjournment of politics on this issue, only to let us observe the leaders of the repeal cause summoning into conferences only that part of a committee bearing a certain partisan label and known to be friendly to the cause of repeal, and excluding all others.

We have had proclaimed a state of emergency here in our own country. In that connection let me point out that Congress was summoned into special session in the name of a limited emergency. Of course, if an emergency exists, the Congress ought to be here. But why must those who insist that there is an emergency be equally insistent that as soon as Congress has repealed the arms embargo it should hurry back home?

Contradictions? Who does not remember how, after Congress this summer refused to repeal the arms embargo, the President echoed a complaint to the effect that because we had not repealed the embargo we had lost our chance at a nice little trade boom? But now the President and his following are talking, talking, talking about how to prevent anyone making a profit out of this situation that has developed abroad.

I said before that many people think that the issue is one of choosing sides. It is awkward choosing sides in these days. You never know who is in bed with you when you wake up. Who expected to see the marriage of those supposedly bitter enemies, Soviet Russia and Nazi Germany? What assurance do we have that we would not wake up one moment to find England tied up with one or both of them?

And speaking of changing around, the changes of the President himself have naturally made many of us wonder where he will land next. They have made us wonder whether he has not embarked on a policy which may lead him on courses different from those he had in mind. The President today says that the existence of the arms embargo may be responsible for taking us into Europe's war; that it is unneutral to refuse to sell to all nations at war alike; that we ought to repeal it. This is the same President who in the fall of 1936 was heaping praise upon the neutrality law, including the arms embargo, as a "weapon to safeguard American neutrality" against the appeal of "fool's gold."

Let us be honest with ourselves and clear about our facts in this controversy. The neutrality law, with the arms embargo in it, was written for the purpose of keeping the United States out of other people's wars. Until last May that law carried within it, together with the embargo forbidding the exportation of munitions to any nation engaged in war, a cash-and-carry plan now being advocated as a substitute for the arms embargo. But let it not be forgotten that the administration that now wants the cash-and-carry plan permitted that cash-and-carry plan to expire last May. Here they come in the name of emergency to ask repeal of the arms embargo and establishment again of the cash-and-carry plan. They were for the arms embargo and are now against it. They were against the cash-and-carry when they let it die last April, and are now for it. All this switching around makes many of us sure that they may have less interest in protecting our peace than in accommodating our laws to a certain interventionist foreign policy and winning profits.

The appeal is made that though we have the arms embargo preventing the exportation of munitions to nations at war, there is no safeguard against traffic in other commodities being so challenged and jeopardized as ultimately to take us to war. Overnight some people have become most zealous in their determination to prevent American trade with nations at war which would risk searches, seizures, and sinkings that might take us to war. All right, let us agree that this danger does exist. What are we to do about it? Is the only answer to repeal the embargo and write the cash-and-carry plan to cover all commodities, including munitions? Certainly not. If we want the most thoroughgoing safeguard against that kind of chance, then what we want is an enlargement of the existing embargo that will forbid exportation of anything and everything to nations at war, or resort to a program which the administration once recommended—the maintenance of only a normal peacetime trade with nations at war. If that is not to be done, then let's have the embargo plus cash and carry to cover everything else.

The time to start staying out of Europe's war was before Europe went to war. Congress and the President made that start by writing the neutrality law. Now is the time for Americans, their President, and their Congress to hold fast to that kind of a start. We so desperately need today to be prevented from taking those steps which could so easily be steps straight to war. We ought to guard most jealously against the possibility of the United States gearing its economy to a wartime basis if we would avoid a repetition of that disastrous experience which is still with us.

We should decline to be fooled into believing that there is the faintest ideal of democracy involved in that European conflict today. The No. 1 issue is the maintenance of existing imperialism and

empires, and the prevention of other imperialisms and empires being built to outshine them.

There is already some sentiment in this country to the effect that much as we may regret it, the time does seem to be at hand when we are going to have to clean up over there in Europe once again; that we stopped too soon the last time; that we have got to hop in there again and this time sweep clean; and that the way to start doing that is to move in at once on the economic front by becoming the arsenal for one side, which can be done only by repealing the arms embargo. This attitude, I might say, in light of what does prevail and will prevail in Europe for a long time to come, reminds one of the housewife who, during a 3-day duststorm out in the Dust Bowl, went out with her broom and swept her porch every half hour.

Say what you will, there were no causes more largely responsible for our entry into Europe's war in 1917 than foreign propaganda and our wartime trade. The record clearly discloses how true this was. Let us not repeat that experience. Let us not take the first step, which so easily paves the way to the next step, even to further steps involving declarations of war. Let us not do that, at least until we can have a clearer definition than now exists of what part we can play successfully, of what chance there is of going to war and remaining a democracy. Until we shall perchance have decided that Europe and her aches are really aches, let us not fool ourselves into believing that we can get half in and yet stay out of that war, for we ought to know that we are either going to be in or out—in or out.

An emergency exists or is declared to exist. "Repeal the embargo" becomes the hue and cry. Adjourn politics. Politics ought to be adjourned in this controversy. But there must be no adjournment of allegiance to the cause of keeping America strong, keeping democracy secure where we have a real chance to keep it secure, one place in all the world. There must be no adjournment of allegiance to that principle and policy dictating that America mind her own business, that America avoid entanglement in European power politics, about which we know so little and which we certainly cannot disentangle.

Speak up, Americans, make your voices heard. Don't for one minute permit yourself to believe that this cause of retaining the arms embargo is lost, for it is not lost. This fight is only just begun, and I say to you that it will be a matter of only a few days before there will be ample demonstration of the fact that a majority of the Members of the Senate have not pledged themselves to vote for repeal of the arms embargo.

Interparliamentary Union Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 2, 1939

ADDRESS BY HON. ALEXANDER WILEY, OF WISCONSIN, AUGUST 17, 1939

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a speech delivered by me before the Interparliamentary Union Conference at Oslo, Norway, August 17, 1939.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Fifty years ago the Interparliamentary Union came into being. The Parliamentary Union was the result of a great hunger of mankind to see if there were not ways and means of perpetuating parliamentary forms of government, to the end that men might tap the "untapped sources of power" that William James speaks of.

An English thinker once said that "life has meaning and to find its meaning is my meat and drink." A great German once said: "Life means to transform into light and flame all that we are or meet with." When the Interparliamentary Union came into being, parliamentary form of government was on the "upgrade" and there are those among us now who still believe, in spite of recent events, that parliamentary form of government is still on the "upgrade." We believe with that distinguished statesman, who was mentioned by one of the British members yesterday, that this is a "dawn period."

Unless reason and common sense prevail, we may have to go through another Gethsemane, but no matter what the immediate future holds, we will not be "downed" either by fear or discouragement. I have faith that there are silent, unseen, beneficent forces that are working. "There is no place where His voice is not heard."

While under the agenda we are speaking upon the general political situation of the world, yet many great thinkers have reached the conclusion that the crisis is a moral one. Great movements recognize that to be the truth. This country, the land of my fathers, has felt the stimulating influence of "moral rearmament." Mr. President, we have tried many panaceas, but are we ready to face our problem and say that we will fail until we apply to international affairs those moral standards of honesty and unselfishness which we were taught from our pulpits? We know that nations have been inoculated with the disease germ which in the name of expediency, policy, destiny, teaches them that they can repudiate their word, break treaties, defraud creditors, etc. Which among the great nations has not forsaken its obligations? Which one now can be trusted to keep its word? In human society, if an individual carried on as nations have been carrying on, he would be considered immoral, a criminal. Just as with individuals, however, it is possible for nations to set a loftier standard. Switzerland and the United States show the way. In these countries all nationalities live in harmony.

I had not intended to speak, but when it was suggested by the chairman of our delegation that I say a few words, I was especially happy to comply with that suggestion for two reasons:

First, there was a sentimental one. I wanted to speak from the rostrum of the Storting. My parents came from this land. They have both gone on ahead in the journey. If they were alive, they would be happy to see me, a representative of America, in their own homeland.

My first reaction was not to speak, because I remembered that on one occasion one of the great statesmen of this country over a century ago, in the great international crisis when Napoleon was stirring up affairs in Europe, said in response to an inquiry, "Nu er det tid til a holde kjeft," meaning that now it was time to keep your mouth shut. But again I realized that in a meeting of this kind—a meeting of the Interparliamentary Union, the only institution of its kind on earth, dedicated to the perpetuation of parliaments—it was my duty to speak..

The second reason, then, for my speaking I have already referred to. It is this: To bring to this body of serious-minded men—many of whom have dedicated their lives to this work, men who have come year after year to the meetings of this organization to exchange their points of view to the end that the great parliamentary systems of the world may be preserved—to preserve the great freedoms of mankind—to bring to this great body a reiteration of the old, old need—a quest for God. It is the supreme need of the hour. Goethe called it "more light." Others call it a "spiritual rebirth." The history of nations is replete with instances when men and nations returned from their waywardness to find inspiration, courage, vision, guidance, and rebirth in the "things of the Spirit."

You men know that integrity of the individual man is the great need of mankind today. You men know that it is the "great business" of parliaments and of the members thereof not only to pass laws but to provide moral leadership in this changing world.

I have been very much interested in all of the talks given, and I want to compliment the personnel of this convention for the spirit of equanimity, of friendliness, courtesy, and understanding, that has been manifested. I was very much interested in the remarks of the distinguished statesman from Great Britain, Lord Davies, when he spoke on the subject, "Peaceful Change." He has suggested one of the many subjects that must be considered by the nations of the world if we are not going to keep on finding ourselves in a volcanic crater that continually threatens to erupt.

A number of years ago, another distinguished Norwegian statesman used this expression: "Med lov skal landet bygges." That is, "By and through law the land shall be built." Lord Davies reached that conclusion when he said that "Everything depends on willingness of the nations to submit themselves to the rule of law," and this distinguished statesman supplemented his statement with a further conclusion that "Durable peace can only be founded on justice." Now, may I suggest that both the rule of law and justice are the attributes of the Infinite One, without whose aid and guidance it is apparent that mankind has by its own willfulness wandered in the wilderness of international friction and hatred.

There is a germ at work among the peoples of the earth known as international fear, hatred, jealousy. We must counteract this with the brotherhood of man built upon the rule of law, justice, and understanding. I know to many people such an expression sounds almost superficial, but some of us are beginning to see that the saving power in civilization is to be found in an awakening of mankind. That means an appreciation of the things of the Spirit.

My friends, an ancient philosopher, looking up at the stars at night, appreciating something of the glory of heaven and the insignificance of his mortal self, asked the question, "What are we here for?" Perhaps we can paraphrase that situation and question and look out upon the troubled world and ask, "What are we here in Oslo for?" The thinking of mankind today determines its course tomorrow. The chairman of our delegation quoted the scripture that, "For lack of vision the people perish." With vision, then, the nations of the world will succeed. What we need is perspective, fearlessness, and even a saving sense of humor.

We are here "but for a day," and after we have moved off the stage the show will go on; but as long as we are here, let us play our parts like men. I personally believe that when the "comets" on the political sky today are dim, the parliaments of the nations will shine forth brightly and new parliaments will come into being. I have faith in the upward march of humanity. We may be in a temporary dip now, but up ahead there will be a turn and the race will succeed in climbing higher. We cannot maintain the status quo in things material, and it cannot be done, either, in our perception of things spiritual.

I have spoken for myself. I have not had an opportunity to submit my thoughts to either the chairman or the members of our delegation. However, on behalf of the delegation and myself I want to express our appreciation to this country for the magnificent reception that we have received.

Mr. President, it was a great pleasure to hear the distinguished statesman, Stortingspresident Hambro. I agree with him that America owes much to Europe. From every land in Europe America has received its bloodstream. Your great culture has enriched our lives. Your music, your literature, your drama, some of your great ideas in economics, philosophy, and religion we have made our own. But, Mr. President, you have something we do not want. I refer to those barriers analyzed by the psychologists as fear, hatred, and distrust. Yes, we owe you much. We know the world is small. We are neighbors. We want to help. Your problems are intricate. There are many equations that we do not understand. I say we want to help, but we want to help you to help yourselves to the end that your problems may find solution through you.

I agree that the refugee problem is a political one. If war comes, it is very apparent we shall see after its close another large refugee problem. If we permit the idea to grow that it is the business of other nations to take over the defeated groups in a conflicting nation, then we may find ourselves having to look after the groups that are now in control of their governments.

We want to be helpful, but America does not want to meddle in Europe. The role of a meddler I do not crave for my country.

Advantages of Being an American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEWIS B. SCHWELLENBACH

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 2, 1939

EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK SUN OF SEPTEMBER 4, 1939

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH. Mr. President, the advantages of living in a country at peace with the world, where citizens enjoy liberties to the fullest extent, is probably more greatly welcomed now than ever before in all the days of civilization. A recital of these blessings is very opportune, as it gives all of us a chance to feel the full scope of our exceptional opportunities.

The New York Sun of September 4, in an editorial which I believe is deserving of national recognition, well expresses the general view of the accepted advantages of our great country. I hope the editorial may be given wide distribution, as it is worthy of our best attention and is a pleasant reminder of our unhampered, profitable activities.

It is with distinct pride that I have been party to an administration that has helped to attain the great privileges of our country and has established policies to maintain these privileges. The people may be assured, as I am, that President Roosevelt will always endeavor to preserve our blessings and keep us out of war.

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Sun of September 4, 1939]

HE IS AN AMERICAN

He is an American.

He hears an airplane overhead, and if he looks up at all, does so in curiosity, neither in fear nor in the hope of seeing a protector.

His wife goes marketing, and her purchases are limited by her needs, her tastes, her budget, but not by decree.

He comes home of an evening through streets which are well lighted, not dimly in blue.

He reads his newspaper and knows that what it says is not concocted by a bureau, but an honest, untrammeled effort to present the truth.

He has never had a gas mask on.

He has never been in a bombproof shelter.

His military training, an R. O. T. C. course in college, he took because it excused him from the gym course, and it was not compulsory.

He belongs to such fraternal organizations and clubs as he wishes.

He adheres to a political party to the extent that he desires—the dominant one, if that be his choice, but with the distinct reservation that he may criticize any of its policies with all the vigor which to him seems proper—any other as his convictions dictate, even, if it be his decision, one which holds that the theory of government of the country is wrong and should be scrapped.

He does not believe, if his party is out of power, that the only way in which it can come into power is through a bloody revolution.

He converses with friends, even with chance acquaintances, expressing freely his opinion on any subject without fear.

He does not expect his mail to be opened between posting and receipt nor his telephone to be tapped.

He changes his place of dwelling and does not report so doing to the police.

He has not registered with the police.

He carries an identification card only in case he should be the victim of a traffic accident.

He thinks of his neighbors across international borders—of those to the north as though they were across a State line rather than as foreigners—of those to the south more as strangers, since they speak a language different from his, and with the knowledge that there are now matters of difference between his Government and theirs, but of neither with an expectancy of war.

He worships God in the fashion of his choice, without let.

His children are with him in his home, neither removed to a place of greater safety, if young, nor, if older, ordered ready to serve the state with sacrifice of limb or life.

He has his problems, his troubles, his uncertainties, but all others are not overshadowed by the imminence of battle and sudden death.

He should struggle to preserve his Americanism with its priceless privileges.

He is a fortunate man.

He is an American.

Editorials From Chicago Daily Tribune

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRIK SHIPSTEAD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 2, 1939

EDITORIALS FROM THE CHICAGO DAILY TRIBUNE OF SEPTEMBER 22, 1939

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Chicago Daily Tribune of September 22, 1939, entitled "The War Parties," and another editorial from the same issue of the Tribune entitled "Dying for Danzig."

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Chicago Daily Tribune of September 22, 1939]

THE WAR PARTIES

If Congress were starting from scratch to determine what, in the event of a foreign war not yet begun, would be the best neutral policy for the United States to adopt, there could be an honest difference of opinion. Some people might, and some honestly do, argue that the cash-and-carry plan of selling goods and materials, including implements of war, would be the best method of dealing impartially with all the belligerents. The one which could control the sea or protect its shipping could reach our markets and we would have no other part in the business except to sell to cash customers who took away the goods in their own ships.

Other people, with an equal show of reason and with an even greater stress on the ethics, might argue for the present embargo on specified implements of war, although these include only a few and probably not the most important articles needed by a country at war. Still other people might think it best that there should be no special legislation whatever and that the Government should act under old international usage and law regarding neutral trade and rights.

The circumstances in which such a discussion might be had in Congress do not, however, at this time exist. They did when the Neutrality Act was passed in '37. The purpose in passing the act at that time, before there was a war, was to establish in times of peace the rules which would govern America if other countries went to war. The fairness of this, it was argued, was to be found in the fact that all nations knew what to expect of the United States and none could justly say that America had adopted certain rules after the outbreak of war and that these rules purposely made discriminations contrary to true neutrality to do injury in one direction and give aid in another.

Discrimination, it was said then, would not be neutrality. It was generally conceded that the virtue of the rules lay in their predetermination. Whatever the opinion was as to the precise merits of the laws passed, there was general agreement as to its fairness, and people thought at the time that it would remove some

of the danger that in a general conflict Americans could not maintain their neutrality.

Certain elements of the people now want to repeal or modify the embargo and permit the sale of munitions.

Some of these people sincerely believe that modification will give added security to our country—protecting it against war. Other proponents of cash and carry are moved primarily by a desire to help the French and British win the conflict. That element wants to abandon neutrality, while saying they wish to preserve it. This is a hypocritical or a foolish inconsistency. It follows the theory that a nation can pick sides in a conflict, select the nations it will aid, take all steps short of war, and still be regarded as a neutral noncombatant. That, it must seem to many sensible people, is muddled reasoning and a dangerous line of thought.

Some of the people who favor this choosing of sides are guided by sentiment and some of them by more specific intents. There are three war parties in this country and they combine to seek action increasing the probability, if not inviting the inevitability, that a war of a year or more in Europe will find an American Army overseas again.

One of these war parties contains persons who think their continuance in public office and authority will be guaranteed by military intervention in Europe. They figure that not only the party in power but the persons in authority when a war begins will be carried over into another term to prosecute it. They think that a successful appeal to the country can be made to continue a war government. People would hear a great deal about adjourning politics and about the dropping of party labels. It may be noted that in the British war dictatorship all byelections for Parliament have been canceled and that it is planned to cancel the full election of November 1940 if Great Britain is at war at that time. One American war party thinks that the tradition against the third term would disappear if the United States were fighting overseas.

There is another war party which believes that war would bring about a permanent change in American social, political, and economic conditions. The milder minded of this party refer back to the temporary changes in national activity made by the World War and to what they call the unselfish, unified national efforts which for the time changed the national psychology and made possible an approach to the collectivized state. This, they think, would be repeated with permanent results if the Nation were thrown again into a tremendous war. The tougher-minded gentry go beyond this hopeful idea and believe that if the United States were involved in a general world catastrophe the American form of government would be completely overthrown, capitalism destroyed, and the Communist state placed upon the ruins of representative government and private enterprise. That is the hope of all "reds."

The "reds" believe that if the capitalistic world can be thrown into another conflict more exhausting than the one it barely survived in Europe the last time, it will be forever finished—not, however, if the United States remains out of the wreckage. Our own American "reds" are even redder in the face than they are in their doctrine these days. They are giddy with whirling about trying to follow the Moscow line, not knowing from day to day where it is. Wherever Stalin is going they are following, difficult as it is to imagine what he is doing and why. It is hard to be orthodox to another man's shifting heresies but our Communists are doing the best they can.

The third war party is composed of our colonials. They believe that it is even more the duty of the United States than of Canada to assist Great Britain, forever the mother country to them, in its wars. When Mr. Chamberlain decided that Poland should not be asked to consider the return of Danzig, he decided the issue for his American followers. When he decided that this time he would go to war, he decided for them also. There are reservations to their subscription; not all of them intend to offer themselves. Very few of them would be found in the front line. They think of war as something fought by young men they do not know, who appear out of the vast population and agree to sacrifice themselves for causes which the colonials adopt. Somewhere in the hinterland there is a great peasantry which can be conscripted for battle service.

The fact that these three American war parties have backed the repeal of the embargo is a weighty argument against it.

DYING FOR DANZIG

Some Poles are still fighting courageously, desperately, and forlornly—but not with the support of their Government or under the direction of their army commander and his staff. Marshal Smigly-Rydz and the high command skipped to Rumania. President Ignace Moscicki, Foreign Minister Josef Beck, and the other high officers of the Government are in the same sanctuary.

The gentlemen who made the war were not "bitter-enders." Survivors of the shattered troops—peasant boys and young officers—may fight on, but the gentlemen of government, whose chests were out toward the enemy in the preliminary test of nerves and the diplomatic exchanges, departed while the roads and frontiers were open, and they took plenty of this world's goods with them. They can survive the wreckage of Poland and may hope to make another war.

When Franco suddenly smashed all resistance in Catalonia and then turned on Madrid, he did not catch any high government officials of the regime he had overthrown. They had made good their departure to France with plenty of gold. Soldiers were in the surrender, but not statesmen who would fight as long as they were safe. King Zog was the first fugitive out of Albania. He did not even wait for his wife and new-born child.

The Emperor of Ethiopia need not be regarded as a timid person, but he did not fall with his capital or make a last stand as the Lion of Judah with his troops. He was too important, as the symbol of the state to grace a Roman triumph. It comported more with his dignity to grace an English country house and draw on a substantial bank account.

But why mention minor characters when greater figures provide history with notable escapes from the downfall of their own great war adventures? The old gentleman at Doorn did not die in a suicidal charge of the Death Head Hussars. They looked very formidable in their mortuary uniforms, but the Kaiser rode hard to Holland. It is better for an all highest to saw wood than to face a victor, whatever happens to the people. And Napoleon's coattails were straightened out in the wind every time he thought some other place than the place he happened to be was the place he ought to be.

He deserted his army in Egypt and beat it for France—for reasons of state. No good advice could keep him out of Russia, and no consideration for his troops could keep him in it. The fastest horses and the best sleigh split the freezing Russian winds—for reasons of state—on the way to safety, while his army died in the snow. The Old Guard perished at Waterloo, but not Napoleon. He was on his way again on a charger riding fast for Fontainebleau.

The gentlemen who make wars do not fight them. They take the glory of victory and skip from the miseries of defeat. Many a Polish boy who probably did not care a damn about traverses in the corridor and who might not have been able to find Danzig on the map has died since his great marshal and his high officials decided to accept the hospitality of Rumania.

Arms Embargo Repeal Proposal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 2, 1939

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. ARTHUR CAPPER, OF KANSAS, SEPTEMBER 29, 1939

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD remarks of mine over the Columbia Broadcasting System on September 29, 1939, relating to the pending neutrality legislation.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am opposed to the United States taking any part in this European war.

It is not our war.

I do not want the United States dragged into this war, or bribed into this war, or led into this war by the mistaken enthusiasm of some of our own leaders. There is just one safe place for us, and that is the United States. The surest way for us to keep out of trouble is to stay on our own ground and mind our own business.

I believe the people of the United States are overwhelmingly opposed to the United States becoming involved, and I think they will hold their elected representatives in the Senate and the House of Representatives responsible if they take action that leads us into war.

The crux of this whole question is the President's demand for the repeal of the arms-embargo provision of the existing Neutrality Act.

I am most emphatically opposed to repeal of the arms embargo, and will fight against repeal to the last.

I take this stand because I believe repeal of the arms embargo is a definite and certain step toward war.

I am not taking a step toward war—I want to keep the United States out of war, not push it into war.

I am convinced our chances of staying out of the present war will be much better if we let the existing arms-embargo provision of the Neutrality Act alone.

I might call attention to the fact that this Neutrality Act in 1937 was approved in the Senate by a vote of 63 to 6. It passed the House 376 to 13. The President signed the act just as he had signed practically the same act in 1935—and pointed to it as a great step toward peace in his campaign for reelection in 1936.

This Neutrality Act as it now stands is not a Democratic act. It is not a Republican act. It is an American act, and should not be wiped out as a neutrality act by repeal of the arms-embargo provision.

I said a moment ago that this is not our war.

I think all of us ought to bear that in mind—this is not our war. The war issue in Europe is boundary lines, spoils, power politics—not humanitarianism, not democracy.

Let us not be misled, nor mislead ourselves into believing, that the Allies in Europe are fighting in some unexplained way for democracy, for civilization, or fighting for the United States.

You know and I know this war is rooted in European power politics. It is not a war for democracy. So I say again we should keep out of the bloody fracas.

I can remember a quarter of a century ago when the propaganda was started that these Allies were fighting to make the world safe for democracy; later we were even told that we would take part in the war that was to end war.

We believed that in 1917. Our leaders believed it. Our people believed it. Our young men believed it. No nation ever went forth to war with higher ideals than did the people of the United States in 1917.

The disillusionment that started in 1919 was a bitter one. The millions of boys, the billions and tens of billions of dollars that went to Europe to fight for democracy in 1917 and 1918 won the war for those who talked of democracy—but they didn't save democracy. In fact, the World War just about ended democracy except in the Western Hemisphere.

I am opposed to the United States sending our boys overseas again to complete the job of replacing democratic government with dictatorships all over the world, for that will be the result, win or lose, as I see it.

Let us save our boys and young men for something better than fodder for Europe's battlefields during one of the long succession of wars that Europe has fought over boundaries and power.

Now, I say to you that repeal of the arms embargo will be taken in Europe and will be regarded by our own people as a definite abandonment of a program of neutrality and as a definite step toward participation in Europe's latest war for spoils and conquests.

And right there is reason enough to oppose the repeal of the arms embargo.

I hold that our chances of standing clear in the European conflict are better if we remain neutral than if we take sides.

It will be a terrible mistake if we blunder ourselves into an unneutral position. And, frankly, I say this as one whose sympathies are with England and France.

Repeal of the arms embargo at this time cannot and will not be interpreted anywhere except as an unneutral act.

During time of peace we enacted the arms embargo for the purpose of making it easier for the United States to keep out of Europe's wars. The arms embargo put Europe on notice—notice that the United States expected to remain neutral.

The United States could have established a cash-and-carry law for the sale of munitions at that time without any question of unneutrality being raised.

But now the situation has changed. Europe is at war. If we repeal the arms embargo, it admittedly is done for the purpose of helping Britain and France against Germany.

That certainly would be an unneutral act.

It would be serving notice on Europe that the United States, instead of remaining neutral, is taking sides with the Allies.

Now, admitting our sympathy with the Allies, we may as well be realistic.

If we start selling munitions on a cash-and-carry basis and build up a huge industry with only two customers, this is what is going to happen:

When the cash runs out, rather than lose our customers and dislocate our domestic business structure by allowing the munitions industry to collapse, we will substitute credit for cash.

The next step will be to make loans to the Allies to protect the credit that has been advanced.

And then, finally, we will send American boys overseas again, just as we did in 1917. That would be a terrible mistake.

Once we set our feet on that path the result is inevitable, my friends. First, make war profits from cash sales, then give credit, then make loans, then send our men.

I am against any program of loans or extensions of credit by the United States Government or its citizens to any nation engaged in war. I am very much opposed to the 90-day-credit-allowance clause in the pending legislation.

Realizing that repeal of the arms embargo means just one thing, that we will enter the European war now raging; knowing that the people of the United States feel as I do, that we ought not, must not, get into this war that is not our war if we possibly can avoid it, I am going to continue to oppose repeal of the arms embargo with all my might. When we lift the arms embargo and start selling war supplies it is almost equivalent to a declaration of war.

I am for a strong Navy, a large air force, and adequate national defense, but not for fighting Europe's battles for any European nations or set of nations.

Holland, Sweden, Switzerland, Denmark, Norway, and a half-dozen other countries next door to the trouble in Europe are showing their good sense by keeping out of this war and remaining neutral. Why should we travel 3,000 miles across the seas looking for a fight? I say let them alone.

Our Neutrality Act was enacted in the belief that Europe's wars are not our wars. The belief is just as well grounded today as it was 2 years ago when the Congress enacted it and the President signed it. So I am for keeping the Embargo Act as it is. Good sense, morals, material well-being, and devotion to the principles of democracy all sound the warning—"America, stay out!"

We have between us and the trouble abroad a natural barrier potentially more powerful than a dozen navies. Our immediate duty to ourselves and our sister republics is to keep on this side of the world and set an example for the other side to follow. We can't keep the peace by involving ourselves in somebody else's war.

My sympathies are with the Allies; but when it comes to taking part in a foreign war, I am neither German nor British. I am American.

I am sorry I cannot go along with President Roosevelt in his high enthusiasm for the welfare of the entire world, but I believe the Members of the Senate are free men, with the right to their own beliefs and the duty of living up to those beliefs. Furthermore, I am opposed to giving the President more discretionary war powers. I think Congress should remain in session as long as the emergency exists, and should perform its duties as the Constitution requires. I am glad to stay here and do my best to keep America out of war.

I intend to continue to stand for what I believe is best for my country—and that includes keeping the arms embargo in effect indefinitely.

I have my personal sympathies for England and France, but I think vastly more of the United States than I do of any European country. Whatever we do, let's be sure that we are thinking of the future welfare of this country first.

If these Europeans are determined to have wars, let them fight their own wars. Our problems are right here at home, not in Europe.

I hope we have learned something from history. Our experience in the World War should teach us that it is a good thing to keep out of European wars. We lost the lives of 126,000 of our finest American boys; it cost us $41,000,000,000. We got nothing for it—not even thanks. We loaned them $14,000,000,000. They still owe us and will never pay.

We also made 23,000 new millionaires in the United States through World War profiteering. The big fellows who make huge profits in wars are anxious to get in the game again. I am opposed, and the masses of the people in this country are opposed, to giving these merchants of death a chance to pile up their millions as they did before. For this country to supply munitions and armaments to either side makes us the worst profiteer of all—the one who profits by the death and suffering of millions of human beings. We must not do it. Blood money will bring neither happiness nor prosperity to the people of America.

Just what good the United States, and in the long run the world, would get out of United States intervention in this war is more or less doubtful.

But here are some things I know the United States would get:

First. A dictatorship.

Second. A further increase in the national debt of tens of billions of dollars.

Third. Losses of life running perhaps into millions; destruction of property running into the billions.

Fourth. After the war, a depression worse than the last one—and very likely a continuation of the dictatorship, and then some more European wars.

I say we ought to keep these things in mind and stay out.

I say again the way to stay out of the European war is not to take the first step that would lead us into it—repeal of the Embargo Act. When we start selling munitions we start entering this war, which is not our war but just one of Europe's many wars. And if we enter one more of Europe's wars, we probably will participate in every major European war from now on.

Now I have given you the main reasons, my friends, why I have joined forces with Senators BORAH; HIRAM JOHNSON; CLARK of Missouri; VANDENBERG, of Michigan; NYE, of North Dakota; Senator FRAZIER; Senator LA FOLLETTE, and at least two dozen other Senators, in unfaltering opposition to the repeal of the arms embargo and against any further grant of power to the President to handle foreign relations.

That is the way I feel about it.

And judging from the letters and telegrams that are coming to Senators and Representatives that is the way the great majority of Americans feel about it.

I have received more than 11,000 letters and telegrams since Britain and France declared war. And there are at least ten urging that the United States remain neutral for ever one that would repeal the arms embargo. The Members of Congress from New Hampshire and Massachusetts—from States clear across the country to California—tell me that their mail is preponderantly the same way.

It's very plain to me the people of this country don't want to go to war for Europe's boundaries. I think that feeling is almost unanimous.

The great majority of our people believe, and I believe, that the sale of munitions will lead us directly into the European war.

The great majority of the people of this country—the ones who will have to do the fighting if war comes—want the arms embargo kept in effect. They don't want the Neutrality Act amended to make it any less neutral.

And I say to you that these people are right. I believe the American people will keep their heads and resist all the propaganda designed to lead us into war.

It is not our war. We must not allow ourselves to be stampeded into it. We learned our lesson 20 years ago. We cannot bring peace to Europe by taking more war to Europe.

And if we start selling munitions to the warring nations of Europe, then most assuredly we are on the way to sending our boys to Europe again.

My friends, it is up to you, it is up to the people of the United States to insist that Congress reject the pleas to allow the sale of munitions to warring Europe, no matter how eloquent these pleas are; no matter how well intentioned the people who would follow the course that led us to war in 1917—and will lead us there again unless Congress stands firm in this grave emergency.

My friends, Europe is the land of the double-cross, as well as of the little white crosses. Why should America go abroad looking for either?

When the whole country is aflame we should not be hasty in taking action. We do not need to, and certainly ought not to repeat the mistake we made in entering the previous World War.

In conclusion let me assure you I shall protest in the Senate with all the energy and earnestness I possess against weakening the Neutrality Act by amendments making it less neutral. I shall insist on retaining the Embargo Act which will stop the profiteering in war supplies.

And before I close, let me say also that I am strong for a war referendum in the Constitution of the United States. I say the men who will do the fighting and the people who will pay the bills should have something to say on the question of going into foreign wars.

I promise you right now that as a United States Senator I never will vote to ever again send American boys across the seas to fight someone else's war. I say the life of one American boy is worth more than Poland or any other land they may be fighting over.

Proposed Neutrality Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNN J. FRAZIER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 2, 1939

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. GERALD P. NYE, OF NORTH DAKOTA, AUGUST 24, 1939

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a radio address delivered by my colleague, Senator NYE, on August 24, 1939, on the subject Save American Neutrality.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

If the Republican Party looks for success in 1940, it must first look to the affording of platform and candidates winning the confidence of that great majority of Americans who wish to see their Government meet present-day challenges with intelligence and without quackery.

We shall get nowhere as a party if our outlook is merely that looking to victory. We shall be woefully defeated if we choose to assume that victory will come alone on the strength of the growing unpopularity of the opposing party's administration. We shall die as a party if we choose to pursue a policy of government that ignores the tremendous challenges presented these days. We shall be overwhelmingly defeated if our program is to be merely that of destroying the so-called New Deal without a thought to the worthy accomplishments that ought to be retained.

For 6 years we have had government by leadership that clearly was without a goal, without much more than an ability to cash in on immediately popular processes that have won no permanent remedy or good. It has been too much a government of witch hunters and medicine men pursuing illusive evil connections and influences presumed to be the root of all evil, a government that seemed to be strong in leadership but leading nowhere. For more than 6 years we have heard representations of purpose which all too infrequently have been accomplished. Republicans should be ever mindful of the fact that the people want leadership with purposes that will be accomplished, with vision that acknowledges a genuine place for government in rebuilding the economic structure in a way that affords largest measure of opportunity for the greatest number.

For 6 years we have had a government by leadership that obviously has been hoping for a normal economic recovery to be credited to that leadership striking in the dark, guessing, and wild spending policies. The result of those 6 years is the economic status of 1931, plus a drifting and waiting and trusting to luck, plus a futile resignation to the order prevalent that gets nowhere. It leaves us with an air of defeatism and a policy of despair, a condition brought most definitely to a head and into plain view by the President's attitude toward the international situation. The Republican party ought to know that the people are not going to be content with a substitution for this policy in the form of a let-things-right-themselves policy.

The Republican Party must, and will, pursue a policy that corrects our domestic ills by carrying to the American farmer assurance of cost of production, plus a profit for that part of agricultural production that is consumed by Americans; and to the American people in need, of an honest measure of security. But, all of this avails us little or nothing if the country is to be plunged into another foreign war that will thoroughly disorganize any program of economic recovery even before we have won it. The Republican Party must accept the challenge which the present administration lays down; that challenge which would have us involve our country in the power politics of the world and forget or ignore those serious problems which threaten us right here at home.

One does not discuss the Roosevelt foreign policy without first asking what it is. For my own part, I cannot define it except to say that it seems to be one of thrusting and lunging and parrying and playing the game of poker at the international table where more experienced gamblers have been playing for years, without anyone winning from them a pot deserving the name. It is a policy which finds an administration preaching a determination to keep this country of ours out of war, but pursuing a course of activity that can only be inviting ourselves to another war even before we know that about which the next war will be fought, whom we will be fighting with, whom we will be fighting against.

America wants to be free of another foreign war. Americans have made that particularly plain again and again. America wants peace. Americans have made it plain that they want nothing of involvement in those hates and prejudices which are so exclusively Europe's. We have assumed that we learned a lesson 20 years back that was going to last.

While we are most emphatic in declaring a determination to stay out of foreign wars, we are equally confused about the methods whereby we will help ourselves to stay out of other people's wars. Today the American people, millions of them, are believing that the present national administration wants a neutrality law to help us keep out of war, when, in fact, that same administration really wants to do away with the all-important part of the neutrality law.

Let us, first of all, get the facts straightened out. To hear and see the Roosevelt administration at work today, as it has been for a year, the people are left to believe that Congress put something over that the President did not like when the Neutrality Act of 1937 was passed. That was the law that forbade American exportation of arms, ammunition, and instruments of war to nations engaged in war, forbade loans and credits to nations at war and forbade Americans upon the vessels of nations at war. The President not only signed this act and made it the law of the land, but his administration did more than that and asked for the law in its present form.

Let the whole background of the neutrality picture be made clear. True, a neutrality law was first given life by the Senate Munitions Committee. It drafted and introduced three resolutions covering the ground now encompassed by the law. The administration combined these three resolutions and introduced new legislation which differed from the Munitions Committee program, only as relates to the discretionary powers given the President under the law. The Munitions Committee program was much more mandatory than is the present law. But what should be made clear is this: The present neutrality law was asked for by the Roosevelt administration. That is the same law that the same administration now condemns and asks repeal of in part.

The President has been demanding change in the law, particularly as respects that feature of it which forbids the sale and exportation of arms, ammunition, and instruments of war to nations at war. He demands this change in the name of a truer neutrality. He wants the change made in such a way as will let the law operate to favor of those nations which have command of the sea in time of war, those nations that can come and get what they want in the way of war supplies. That would be, as things stand right now, England and France. It also means Japan. The law the administration wants is one that would favor one group of nations as against another group. And they want the people to accept that kind of law under the title of neutrality.

The administration hasn't yet got what it has so insistently demanded, this repeal of the arms embargo in the neutrality law, the embargo that does deal alike with all nations in time of their wars. Both the House of Representatives and the Senate have denied the administration its request. These denials came in the face of terrific pressure. The action of Congress in this respect has been severely criticized, even to the extent of calling Congress pro-Fascist. What Congress was really doing was denying power to a President to involve us in war. Congress was striving to maintain the laws that would help us keep out of other people's wars. The administration was bitter about the refusal of Congress to grant the Presidential wish and repeal the arms embargo. I expect that any of us would have been equally bitter if we had been in the President's shoes and gone as far as he seems to have gone in assuming a leadership in the European squabble.

The pretentions and the actions of President Roosevelt with respect to war and peace have been so utterly contradictory that there must quite naturally be confusion in the public mind about this whole neutrality consideration. Why would the President be so angry about the refusal of Congress to repeal the arms embargo—the arms embargo his administration once asked for—the arms embargo he himself once praised? Let us see if the answer to that is to be found.

It will be remembered that up to a certain point the President consistently preached the doctrine of "keeping out of war." If the people want one picture of the President upon this and the question of neutrality, they will find it in that famous campaign speech of his delivered at Chautauqua, N. Y. Other most contrary pictures are available of him since.

This administration has drifted from a strict "keep out of war" policy, and the drifting started at precisely the time when that administration saw itself failing miserably in its domestic policy. The drift started and continued through those days when a war boom might save the face of the administration. The administration will deny this most emphatically. But the President himself let the cat out of the bag, and let his tongue slip during those hours when he was spitting cotton because Congress would not do his bidding and repeal the arms embargo. Surely we are not forgetting his words to the effect that failure to repeal the arms embargo had prevented a war boom.

The acrobatics of the President in the foreign situation during the past year would be funny, if it were not for the fact that these moves have carried such complete danger to the future of a nation that knows that American democracy can be so easily destroyed if America lets itself be played into another frightful world war. The administration has actually been playing "sickum dog" on England and France during the past year.

England and France no more want war than we Americans want our country in war. Both nations were doing a good job of avoiding war. They were permitting an adjustment in Europe of the injustices that they had helped to inflict at Versailles. And up to a certain point we encouraged this. It will be remembered that there were more administration voices than one taking for President Roosevelt credit for what was done at Munich, credit for the avoidance of war there by reason of his letter to the Italian dictator. The administration was proud of the Munich Pact up to the hour when there was discovery of the displeasure of the American people with what England and France were doing in surrendering the small democracies to Hitler. It was then that the administration began making faces at England and France, demanding that they stand by their guns and by democracies if they expected to retain American sympathy and respect. It doesn't require much imagination to see Ambassador Bullitt representing our displeasure. It requires even less imagination to see England and France wanting our respect and our help, wanting to know what America would do if they did stand by their guns and demand a halt of Hitler operations in eastern Europe; to see them being assured by American spokesmen that in the event such a demand led to war, surely they could count on American cooperation, because America wanted to save democracy. Naturally, England and France would want to know, "Well, what of your neutrality law that forbids access to American war supplies; what of the Johnson Act, that forbids more loans to those of us who have not paid up on our last war debt?" Is it difficult to believe that American spokesmen and Ambassadors would be caused to assure France and England that these laws would be surmounted at the proper time, that already the arms-embargo repeal was pending in Congress? Do we forget that during that very time the administration was publicly prophesying that the House of Representatives would vote the repeal with a majority of a hundred or more votes? Surely England and France were being given every reason to believe that the United States was making ready to give them every possible help. President Roosevelt was being made to stand out as the leader in settling Europe's mess. The "leader" was left in a most undignified position when the House of Representatives, instead of voting the arms-embargo repeal, as prophesied, voted against the repeal with a majority of more than a hundred votes.

Then followed the terrific pressure upon the Senate to undo the damage that had been done and save the face of the President, the Nation, and even democracy—a face that had been injured because one lone man had stuck his nose into affairs that the American people have insisted we shall keep out of. The Senate response to demands for arms-embargo repeal only made a bad matter worse, and England and France are given notice that if any American pretends to be able to commit America to a given course of action in Europe, he is speaking only for himself, and himself alone.

Now, let's be honest with ourselves. Law, embargoes, and all the resolve in the world to stay out of Europe's wars may not keep us out of those wars. It is possible that a state of affairs might arise in Europe that would very definitely challenge our own country, and that would make necessary our getting into that war. Frankly, I do not see possible a state of affairs there that would deserve the wasting of one more American life on European battlefields. But I'm ready to acknowledge that the condition might develop. Suppose it does. Who shall determine when that time comes and whether the cause is worthy? Shall it be the Congress of the United States, or shall it be the President?

In that question is embodied the real nub of the neutrality controversy. It is a question of Presidential power, Presidential discretion, Presidential chance to commit the country in a way that makes staying out of war exceedingly difficult.

The neutrality law was the result of a complete demonstration of the ease with which American appetite for profit from other people's wars could, and did, lead us to war in 1917. However much we may like to think we rallied to the cause of democracy in 1917, the truth is that democracy became the rallying cry only after decision to go to war had been reached. Up to that time the condition that was leading us to war was our war trade and the security of our war-boom trade. Read the communications of the President, his Cabinet, and his ambassadors during the many months leading up to 1917 and you will find little or no solicitation about the well-being of European "democracy." On the contrary, you will find much solicitation about our trade and profit from Europe's war, about American banker loans to the Allies, about changing our neutrality policy so as to permit larger help to the Allies, so that the Allies in turn can continue buying our goods and maintain our American prosperity.

Don't forget, fellow Americans, don't ever forget those lessons of 1914, 1915, and 1916, lessons of how our actual direction can be straight to war even while our leadership is talking peace and pretending neutrality. Don't ever forget those letters and conversations which found our Lansings and Pages driving away at and breaking down Presidential resolve to maintain a real neutrality. Don't permit anyone to ever cover up and blind us to the fact that American bankers, having bet extensively in the way of investment in the allied cause, prompted English leaders on the program to pursue if they wanted to overcome the determination of the American Government to stay out of war. For example, remember how one firm of American bankers advised England by cable to make it clear to America that England would immediately curtail its purchases in the United States unless the United States changed its foreign policy, a policy which, at the moment, was finding the Federal Reserve banks advising Americans to get security for what they were selling abroad.

There must be no forgetting that all that time, while the people were being given to believe that their Government was conducting a strictly neutral policy, the United States Government was actually committing itself to policies that could not lead to anything other than participation in that European war.

Don't ever forget the picture painted by Ambassador Page in his ultimate cablegram to President Wilson, when Page said, "Our going to war is the only way in which our trade position can be maintained and a panic averted," and further that "the pressure of this approaching crisis has gone beyond the ability of the Morgan financial agency for the British and French Governments." There is nothing about saving democracy involved in these communications, and yet it was only 30 days after this cablegram that the leaders of the American Government and all the rest of us were declaring war to save democracy.

If America really means to stay out of foreign war, she needs to remember how easy it is to get in. We need the neutrality law. We need the restraints upon a President. We need to leave the decision of going to war or doing that which will take us to war with the people; if not with them, then with the Congress.

We have our sympathies and our prejudices respecting Europe, of course. Certainly we cannot like some of the things that take place there. But we have not learned a thing as a result of the last war if we have not learned that European purpose, causes, and wars are not ours, or that it does not lie within our power to inflict our ideals and our purposes upon Europe even after we have helped a part of Europe in the winning of its wars.

The country has been flooded by foreign propagandists for many months. Those from one land are no more deserving of our hearing and our confidence than those of another. They are still propagandists, and should be registered as such. British propaganda is being woven nicely into what seems to be American foreign policy under Roosevelt. One British authority wrote that perhaps the only way that England could get the United States on her side actively in another war would be for England to make certain that Japan was against England in that war. Is the present situation in Asia at all significant in light of such an expression of purpose? Lord Baldwin comes to our shores and only a few days ago in New York declared: "A democrat should be prepared to die for his ideals," and his American audience applauded the thought of rallying their sons to European battlefields to save whatever might be labeled "Democracy" there, once again. Significant, is it not, in light of the written plans for British propaganda, to again appeal to American love for democracy in order to involve us in European wars?

Democracy! Oh what sins are committed in thy name, what crimes upon the American people, what injustice upon American sons.

In the present European controversy the cause of democracy is no more involved than is the cause of American women's suffrage or liquor prohibition. The cause there is that old, old one of power politics. It is a cause that we cannot meddle in unless we are ready and anxious to jeopardize the life of the one remaining great democracy, our own.

For the reading of those Americans who believe that democracy calls us to Europe again, I recommend that article published in July of this year in a French magazine—that article written by André Tardieu, former French Premier. The translation of this article before me has this French leader saying that in America "the 'great democracies' of Europe have been accused of not being democratic at all in reality—that opinion is not wholly without foundation." Quite a concession, this. When will we Americans learn to resist these appeals from abroad in the name of democracy? We had better be doing that quickly if we would avoid a course that will have us marching men and dollars once again onto bloody foreign fields to win a war for someone else, only to discover finally, and after it was too late to do anything about it, that every cause for which we had thought we were fighting had been lost.

A policy of minding our own business is good American policy today. That ought to be our policy at least until we can know what that thing in Europe is all about. It is especially good policy,

since we have so very much of important business to mind right here at home, too.

We should be ever ready to help the world to peace without jeopardizing our own peace. We have nothing to gain by throwing our resources into the European hopper even before we know what the next European war is going to be all about.

Mind our own business! America first! That seems to sound cheap to some patriots. We are told that it constitutes an extreme nationalism, an all-time high in selfishness.

Why not America first? Is it selfish? Not one small part as selfish, certainly not more selfish, than are those European causes which would seem to invite us to participation. It is no more selfish than the attitude of the father who thinks first of his home and his family. If that be selfish, then even things which touch the divine are selfish, too.

And, more than that, if America doesn't provide for America, who will? England and France perhaps? We ought to know that if America is going to be saved, America is going to have to do the saving. That being the case, then who are more important to America than Americans? Where in all the world is there 1 foot of soil so important to us as American soil? Where in all the world is there a cause sufficiently great to invite the shedding of the blood of American boys on foreign battlefields where hates of thousands of years look down and rejoice at the reenacting of a carnage which has been going on without determination for generations beyond count and will be going on in spite of us and what we do.

When leaders fail at home, they take their people into foreign wars, but let that not be true in America. Some dictators find it possible to continue their days of power by creating a war psychology and an armament economy, but that can never be true in America. Or can it? Not if we will hang fast to America-first causes. Not if we can maintain a neutrality in other people's wars. Not if we can keep American leadership from committing us to foreign causes.

We Are Right to Be Safe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JESSIE SUMNER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 2, 1939

ADDRESS BY HON. JESSIE SUMNER, OF ILLINOIS, OCTOBER 2, 1939

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me before the Republican League of Women:

Madam Chairman, fellow Republicans, our party has been making a notable contribution toward the progress of popular government. Republicans have waged an effective campaign to preserve certain principles of American Government which, until 1932, were considered so fundamental that they were never permitted to become an issue between two leading political parties.

Republicans have fought steadily for thrift in government, for adherence to the Constitution, and for independence of the courts, of the Congress, of the people.

A portion of the opposite party has fought with us.

Business began to be encouraged this summer, because a little band of Democrats and Republicans in Congress had knees which did not buckle under political pressure.

It takes a hero to brave party reproaches. But we need not forget that those heroes of the other party rose upon the shoulders of a solid Republican bloc.

Now, many of us fear that another fundamental, time-tested American principle is in jeopardy. A principle which is most important because it involves the lives of you and your children. That principle is the impartial policy in dealing with foreign nations even when they are at war with one another. Washington initiated that policy which, to be sure, is the policy of England and other nations, when neutral. Every American President adhered to that impartial policy during neutrality until after 1914.

In the World War he who was called the Great Commoner, William Jennings Bryan, heroically proved that he deserved his title. He resigned as Secretary of State because he refused as an officer in a neutral Nation to lend his support to partiality—to the violation of what he regarded as a vital American principle.

Bryan, apparently, believed, like President Adams, that a neutral America had no business trying to pass upon the merits of a war in which America was not a participant, to favor one side as against the other. He saw his superior waiving precious rights it had taken a century to build up. Even going so far in partiality to Great Britain as to refuse to warn Americans that, under international law, in traveling upon ships of Great Britain, then a belligerent, such Americans were subject to the same destructive war tactics as if they themselves were belligerents. Had the warning Bryan demanded been issued, there would probably have been no *Lusitania* "incident."

You are aware of the casual attitude so many politicians entertain toward women voters, saying, "Women are no real force in elections. They won't get out and pay your way."

In 1916, however, women worked strenuously for the Presidential candidate whose campaign slogan was, "He kept us out of war."

Nothing, perhaps, has so disillusioned women with politics as the deliberate and tragic deception which subsequent investigation shows to have been the basis of that campaign. Two months before the November election, it appears, the administration had done everything short of war except ask the Congress to declare war.

Women are not cowards. Women gladly risk their lives to give birth to the citizens of tomorrow. Women train the world of tomorrow. But they do not wish, without real justification, to sacrifice the lives of those for whom they so readily sacrifice themselves.

Last winter there was a "peace" meeting here with women delegates from all over the Nation. Startling sentiments were expressed. Speakers from foreign countries urged that the American President lead the (more or less) democratic allies (which in the World War included Japan) in a united front against dictators. An American urged those present to go home and rouse their neighbors. To ask the people in their home communities, "If it is always right to be safe?" concluded, "If we want peace, we must fight for it."

Today the fight for peace is going on all over America. War hysteria is being fought with hysteria for peace—but hysteria for peace won't maim and kill any American youths.

The League of Nations theory is again being preached. So far all it has done for America is get us into war. It may be fine for Europe, though it has caused furious rearmament against those nations said to dominate the League. For America, however, it is a device which would virtually throw away our three impregnable defenses: (1) 3,000 miles of ocean; (2) a vast self-sufficient area more difficult to invade and subjugate than impenetrable Russia; and (3) a nation of individuals so cosmopolitan in their sympathies and so energetic that nothing can conquer us, unless, like Samson, we let ourselves be inveigled into surrendering our source of strength.

After all, we've already done much for democracy and peace. The American Revolution inspired the English to seize further liberties from the King and encouraged the French democracy. It was American insistence upon neutral rights to "do business as usual" during European wars which built up the rights of all neutral nations and thus made a wonderful contribution toward world peace.

We know now that the cause of popular government lost prestige when we abandoned our traditional policy in 1914. We virtually abdicated the Declaration of Independence. We gave away enough money to pay for all relief since 1932. We made fools of ourselves and corpses of American young people. We offered a 14-point peace to Germany, which we ought to have known we could not get for them at the peace table. We became a party to a hideous revenge which made another war inevitable.

It was wrong that America did not remain safe in 1914. If America enters this war—and your money and your boys follow your sympathies—it will be only because we have acquired a bad habit of losing our heads, a habit which will be our undoing every time a European war occurs—and these wars over territory and resources flame up in Europe every time a new generation grows old enough to fight.

In 1917 we were unprepared for war, still less well prepared to maintain that stoic calm which is a nation's chief bulwark against war. New means of communication made that war seem nearer and more dangerous to us than previous wars. Today, however, we are fortified by congressional investigations showing the real cause of the last war.

In 1914 the American people were taken unawares. The dangers of having their safety in the hands of one human man did not occur to them. They did not realize that they needed to be vigilant against that man's lack of judicial temperament. They did not imagine that a President of the United States might talk impartiality in public and, perhaps, not realizing that he did so, connive with foreign belligerents in private. Inch by inch Americans succumbed to the idea that somehow that European war was no mere boundary dispute. They let their own sympathies betray them.

If you believe that it is a dangerous risk to repeal the embargo, read Borchard on Neutrality for the United States. Your instinct for self-preservation is based upon sound international law.

According to Washington, Adams, and Bryan, and today's leading international lawyers, the essence of neutrality is a spirit of impartiality. Peace depends upon our keeping an "impartial, friendly" attitude toward all belligerents. That's what it takes to save the lives of countless Americans. We love England, we love France. Surely, with so much at stake, we can find it in our hearts to pity our German cousins, who were led into the World War by the Kaiser and have been led since then by a philosophy of desperation.

The Congress is in session to vote for or against repeal of the embargo. It is proposed to substitute a cash-and-carry provision.

The proposed bill is easy to evade. Should it be administered with that divine recklessness with public money which has so failed as a national policy we will again be giving away large sums to nations who don't pay us back the money they borrow in wartime—try, instead, to draw our money and soldiers after our money. That in a country where money is so far from plentiful that right here in the Nation's Capital people tell me of seeing little children eating out of garbage pails.

The danger which is said to threaten us this time is the spread of dictatorship toward America.

It is just as well to remember that Germany was a democracy after the war. But debts piled up. Inflation became necessary. The people were in despair. Then came the voice. He had courage. The people had lost theirs. He was a star. They hitched their wagon to his coattails.

We, too, are headed toward insolvency, not knowing when it will come. Since 1932 we have gone a long way back down the road to one-man government. If we remain neutral, if we are not above thinking of national security in terms of the pocketbook and our own skins, there is a good chance to recover. Otherwise lack of neutrality may bring upon us the very dictatorship we are urged to help prevent in European battlefields.

Underneath the resounding slogans thought up by war propagandists European wars are usually motivated by economic conditions. They are struggles to keep what you have and prevent your opponent from getting some of it. Our only chance to keep what we have is to refrain completely from participating. In every European war in which America takes part—even to the extent of sending money—there are two losers—the official loser and America.

It's time, I think, that we gave the deposed William Jennings Bryan a vote of confidence. That we serve notice upon belligerents that we will not participate in this war. That we intend to preserve all the neutral rights relinquished since 1914. That in the future, as before 1914, we will—at the end of the war—present a bill for every damage to our neutral rights and insist upon payment. That if any nation wants to borrow from Uncle Shylock it can first make its credit good by tendering to us territory equivalent in value to its war debts.

That's business. That's neutrality. That's the traditional American policy without which Bryan refused to assume further responsibility for maintaining American peace.

A petition sent me from Danville, Ill., was signed, I am told, by the local commander of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. His hip was shattered in the World War. The bullet which did that job, they wrote me, bore the label "Made in America."

Some of us who, like Bryan, believe in an embargo of arms believe that our historical experience warns us that we cannot safely become an arsenal for belligerents. That it is unsafe to encourage much beyond our own great needs of defense this particular industry. In the safety of America, we believe, lies the real promise of future safety for the world.

The Embargo and International Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. SCHAFER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 2, 1939

ARTICLE BY ERNEST LINDLEY

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Ernest Lindley which appeared in the Washington Post on October 1, 1939:

[From the Washington Post of Sunday, October 1, 1939]

"MATTERS OF FACT"—THE EMBARGO AND INTERNATIONAL LAW

(By Ernest Lindley)

If the arms embargo is lifted it will be in spite of a great many of the arguments made by opponents of the embargo. Some of the arguments are palpably absurd. Some are based on downright misinformation.

This column is always reluctant to challenge the facts of a fellow-columnist. Every writer makes a certain number of mistakes about his facts, no matter how careful and conscientious he is. However, some of the statements now being put forward as "facts" are so obviously wrong that it seems worth while to devote this space to examining a few of them.

1. The assertion that international law requires the repeal of the embargo. This was implied by the President in his message to the current special session of Congress and has been asserted flatly by numerous writers. A few days ago Miss Dorothy Thompson wrote to the effect that "nearly everybody who knows anything about international law" favors lifting the embargo.

Maybe so. But nearly everybody who knows anything about international law concedes that an embargo on the export of arms, ammunition, and implements of war is entirely consistent with international law. On that point this column has several times quoted various authorities. Last Thursday the similar conclusions of still other authorities were printed by Arthur Krock, of the New York Times, who, like his paper, favors repeal of the embargo. Mr. Krock found it necessary to dismiss the President's assertion that return to international law is the "crux of the issue," because "the authorities do not support him (the President) in this position."

2. Certain statements in Mr. Walter Lippmann's column of last Thursday, "New Embargoes for Old." Mr. Lippmann said the defenders of the arms embargo have been telling us that it is "'unneutral' to change the rules of the game once war has been started. Well, the embargoes which they like and approve in the Pittman bill change the rules of the game. They lay embargoes which prevent the Allies from buying transportation and credit. These two embargoes are of great importance. They did not exist when war broke out, and if it is unneutral to repeal the embargo against selling arms, it is just as unneutral to lay two new embargoes against the sale of transportation and credit."

Of course, the argument that it is "unneutral" to change the rules in the middle of the game is fallacious. It is the neutral's privilege to change the rules whenever and as often as he pleases, provided he does so for the purpose of remaining a nonparticipant in the war and provided that he enforces his rules against all belligerents alike.

Mr. Lippmann, however, is wrong in writing of an "embargo" on credit as a new rule which is to be introduced in the middle of a game. The embargo on credit exists already. In fact, it is a double embargo, because it is required by two separate laws. The first of these is the Johnson Act, passed in 1934, forbidding credit to nations which defaulted on their war debts. The British and the French embargoed themselves under this law by failing to make payments due on their war debts. (Incidentally, they pleaded inability to obtain dollars with which to make their payments. It now appears, however, that they have plenty of dollars—billions of them—with which to buy war supplies in this country.)

In the second place, the existing neutrality law, passed in 1937, forbids loans to nations at war. The new Pittman bill merely carries forward this prohibition with certain minor changes.

Fifty percent of Mr. Lippmann's argument on this point is, therefore, based on an error in fact. The other half is concerned with the embargo on transportation; the requirement that belligerent nations take full responsibility for the transportation from our shores of goods which they buy here, plus the provision for keeping American ships completely out of war zones. Mr. Lippmann seems to think this is a kind of penalty to the Allies.

It is a penalty, but at the same time it is a benefaction. It means, in substance, that we will not protest against their all-inclusive contraband lists. It means that we will not attempt to ship goods in American-flag ships to such neutral nations as Holland, Belgium, and the Scandanavian states. It means, in effect, that we will not interfere in any way with the allied blockade of Germany, which presumably is the strongest weapon which the Allies have.

Contrary to Mr. Lippmann's assertions and insinuations, the cash-and-carry or come-and-get-it plan does not work to the disadvantage of the Allies; it is to their great benefit. In this column's opinion, it is much more to their benefit than they have any right to expect from this country, especially since their cash, their capacity to buy, exists largely because of their failure to make reasonable settlements of their debts to us on account of the first World War and because of our ostrich-like readiness to take gold and silver for burial in the ground in exchange for useful American goods.

3. The efforts to portray Great Britain and France as poor, weak countries, in contrast with the might of Nazi Germany. As an example, take Miss Dorothy Thompson's column of last Wednesday, in which she wrote of the Allies as dependent upon their ability to "purchase machine power in this country."

Miss Thompson wrote:

"Now, if nations small in area and low in resources, which are primarily commercial—which depend for their existence on trade—are going to be shut out of normal markets at the moment when those markets are absolutely vital to them, such nations will either disappear or the most ruthless imperialism will have to be revived and colonies subjugated and absolutely owned. Otherwise it will not be possible for sea-going countries small in area and poor in natural resources, like Great Britain, to exist, except on the terms of great land powers which have all resources inside their borders."

From this statement no one would suspect that Miss Thompson had ever heard of the British Empire. Without reliance upon us or any other neutral nation for a single dollar's worth of goods, the British Empire has two or three times the resources of Germany in raw materials. The manufacturing capacity of Great Britain and France combined, apart from their empires, exceeds that of Germany. Grant Germany free access to the iron ore of Sweden, to the coal and oil of Poland, to the oil of Rumania, and to the foodstuffs of Poland, Hungary, Rumania, Denmark, and Scandinavia, Germany is still a poor country in comparison with the British Empire. Add the French Empire and the contrast is even more striking.

If Germany should obtain unrestricted access to the resources of Russia, the balance would be changed, of course—although it might be 2 or 3 years before those resources could be developed sufficiently to meet Germany's requirements. Meanwhile, if the British and French can keep the sea lanes open, in the face of submarine and aerial attacks, their resources are immensely superior to those of Germany. It is because of that that they are resorting to blockade.

The French and the British may be behind Germany in certain phases of rearmament, but that is due to no lack of materials or of industrial capacity. Nor, it should be noted, are they deficient in manpower. Without counting their empires they have, between them, nearly as large a population as Germany has. Including their empires their numerical superiority is tremendous. The French have trained and armed as fighting troops large numbers of their colonial subjects. The British have done so on a much smaller scale.

However, in one British dominion alone—India—there are more than 350,000,000 people, between two and three times as many people as there are in the United States. There is the greatest reservoir of manpower in the world outside of China. If the Indians cannot be mustered to fight to save the Empire of which they are a part, we might at least pause to inquire why our resources, and perhaps eventually our manpower, should be called upon to save the British Empire, including India, for the British.

If the British and French Empires should be subjected to simultaneous attack by three or four other armed powers—Germany, Russia, Japan, and Italy—they might be overwhelmed. But that has not come to pass. In any event they are no weaklings. Their resources in materials, industrial capacity, and manpower are vast, without calling upon us for any assistance whatsoever except our normal peacetime exports to them.

City of Minneapolis—Centennial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OSCAR YOUNGDAHL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 2, 1939

HISTORY OF MINNEAPOLIS AS PREPARED BY THE CENTENNIAL COMMITTEE

Mr. YOUNGDAHL. Mr. Speaker, 100 years ago this year, under an action of the Congress of the United States, the first legal claim to private property in which is now the city of Minneapolis, Minn., was perfected.

Today Minneapolis, a great city of a half million souls, begins the celebration of its hundredth birthday. It is fitting that a great industrial center such as Minneapolis should pause to pay tribute to that spirit of courage and foresight which in a short hundred years has turned this pioneer's homestead into the great metropolitan center of the Northwest, which has developed from this pioneer's humble abode a great city of beautiful homes, parks, playgrounds, and industrial institutions.

And so, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to record here in the RECORD of the Congress that made that first claim possible, the thrilling history of Minneapolis as prepared by the centennial committee.

The matter referred to is as follows:

"The exact date of a city's birth is not always easily determined," says Horace B. Hudson in his History of Minneapolis. "There is often a choice between the date of the erection of the first temporary dwelling or camp and the first permanent settlement. Minneapolis enjoys a full measure of uncertainty surrounding its birthday."

As a matter of fact, any one of several dates might be selected as the birthday of Minneapolis, but the year 1839, when Franklin Steele, early pioneer, took over the claim that later developed into the first legally owned piece of property on the site of what was to become the city of Minneapolis, very probably has a right to the honor.

In 1836 Major Plymton, who was the commandant at Fort Snelling, staked out a claim and built a cabin on the east side of the river adjoining St. Anthony Falls. In 1837 Sergeant Carpenter, also from Fort Snelling, staked out a claim on the west side of the river. Neither man had legal claim to the land because at that time the land east of the Mississippi River had not been ceded by the Indians, and the land on the west side of the river was still a part of the Fort Snelling Military Reservation.

In 1838–39 Franklin Steele arrived from Pennsylvania and took a half interest in the Major Plymton claim and he also took over what rights Sergeant Carpenter had to his tract of land. Steele then went to Washington in order to lobby for a bill that proposed to restrict the area of the Fort Snelling Reservation and open the St. Anthony area to settlement. The passage of the bill enabled Steele later to successfully claim legal title to the land. Steele returned to Fort Snelling and St. Anthony from Washington on June 13, 1839, and formally asserted his claim to the land. The ceding of the lands east of the Mississippi to the St. Croix River by the Indians in 1837 gave the basis for legal title to the tract on the east side of the river that Steele had taken over from Major Plymton. Hence it is that the year 1839, marking as it did the date when a settler first got legal title to lands on the site where the city is now located, may be properly recorded as the first permanent settlement.

It was in 1839 also that the first trading post was established on the site of the present Minneapolis. On November 5, 1839, Roswell P. Russell arrived at Fort Snelling with Henry M. Rice. They began immediately to trade with the Indians, settlers, missionaries, and soldiers, and established a post at the falls. Thus they became the first storekeepers of the locality. Henry M. Rice later became prominent in the early affairs of the Minnesota Territory and State. He was chosen a Delegate to Congress and then United States Senator when Minnesota was admitted to the Union. He was also a member of the first board of regents of the University of Minnesota.

In 1834 Samuel and Gideon Pond, natives of Connecticut, arrived at Fort Snelling and prevailed upon the post authorities to permit them to build a house on the shore of Lake Calhoun and do missionary work among the Indians. The house was built on a wooded knoll on the east bank of the lake and in the midst of an Indian village of 20 tepees. The next year, or in 1835, Rev. J. D. Stevens arrived and, assisted by the Pond brothers, built a house on the west shore of Lake Harriet and opened a school for Indian children. Neither of these structures survived to become a part of the settlement, because later when the Indians were removed the missionaries accompanied them and the houses were destroyed and lost.

If one desires to go back to the time when a white man first saw the Falls of St. Anthony, he could select that day in the summer of 1680 when Father Louis Hennepin, Franciscan priest, carved the arms of France on an oak tree that grew on the brink of the falls. This was only 60 years after the Pilgrims landed at Plymouth Rock. The intrepid priest had traversed the unbroken wilderness to the future site of Minneapolis and named the tumbling waterfall "St. Anthony," only this comparatively short time after the early colonists reached the Atlantic shore.

Father Hennepin was a member of the La Salle exploring party that had been commissioned by the French King to explore the upper Mississippi River. La Salle remained in the Illinois country and sent Hennepin to complete the exploration. Hennepin ascended the river to a point below Fort Snelling and then abandoned the river to follow an Indian trail to Mille Lacs Lake, then the home of a large band of Indians. The Indians took him prisoner and subjected him to numerous dangers and hardships. On the plea that he wished to go down the river to learn if La Salle had left supplies that he had agreed to leave Hennepin gained permission to leave Mille Lacs. Reaching the Mississippi River from Mille Lacs Lake, he and a few companions traveled down the river until they came to the falls, which he named St. Anthony, and there pitched his camp. He was the first white man to visit the site of Minneapolis.

There is no record of any other white man visiting the falls until 1766, or 86 years later, when Jonathan Carver, of Connecticut, on an exploring expedition journeyed from Mackinaw to Prairie du Chien. He paddled up the river to St. Anthony Falls, arriving there on the 17th of November 1766. In his journal he made an extended reference to the falls describing their beauty and location.

"In the middle of the falls," he wrote, "stands a small island about 40 feet broad and somewhat longer, on which grew a few cragged hemlock and spruce trees, and about halfway between the island and the east shore is a rock lying at the very edge of the falls in an oblique position that appeared to be about 5 or 6 feet broad and 30 or 40 feet long. At a little distance below the falls there is a small island of about an acre and a half, on which grow quite a number of trees.

"The country around the falls is exceedingly beautiful. It is not an uninterrupted plain where the eye finds no relief, but is composed of many gentle rises, which in the summer are covered with the finest verdure, and interspersed with little groves that give a pleasing variety to the prospect. On the whole, when the falls are included, which may be seen at a distance of about 4 miles, a more pleasing and picturesque view, I believe, cannot be found throughout the universe."

Early pictures and drawings of the falls and the views adjacent confirm Jonathan Carver's description of the landscape and the territory which is today the site of Minneapolis, with its beautiful lakes, parks, and boulevards.

At the close of the Revolution that part of Minnesota east of the Mississippi passed from England to the United States. The part west of the Mississippi was Spanish territory but later became French, so in that early day what is now the east side of Minneapolis was a part of the State of Virginia, while across the river on the west side, and where the principal part of the city now is, the land belonged to the French. However, in 1803, as a result of the Louisiana Purchase, the territory west of the river became a part of the United States. The east side of the river remained a part of the State of Virginia until subsequently it became a part of Indiana and then of Wisconsin. The area did not become Minnesota until the Territory of Minnesota was organized in 1848.

Other early visitors to the future city of Minneapolis were Lt. Zebulon Pike, who journeyed up the river in 1805; and Maj. Stephen H. Long, Army engineer, who visited the site and camped on the east side of the river July 16, 1817. On August 24, 1819, Colonel Leavenworth, with two companies of the Fifth Regiment of the United States Infantry, arrived to establish a military post at the mouth of the Minnesota River. In the party were 98 officers and men. Three days later, Colonel Leavenworth and his small party rowed up the river to view the falls. The next spring the fort was located on its present site and was completed in 1821. Colonel Leavenworth named it Fort St. Anthony, the falls at that time being more famous than anything else in the Territory. In 1824, however, Gen. Winfield Scott visited the fort on a tour of inspection and suggested that the name of the fort be changed to "Snelling" in honor of its early commander.

In 1821 soldiers from the fort built a small sawmill on the west bank of the river just below the falls in order to saw out lumber for the fort. Water from the falls furnished the power. In 1823 the mill was fitted up to grind flour. Thus it was that the two industries, lumber and flour, which were to make the name Minneapolis known throughout the world, came to have their beginnings beside the Falls of St. Anthony.

Aside from trappers and half-breed squatters, there were no settlers, however, in the neighborhood of the falls until some dozen or more years later. Settlement was discouraged by reason of the fact the Indians still owned the east side of the river and the Fort Snelling Reservation included the lands on the west side so that title to lands could not be secured.

The Franklin Steele claim, the legality of which was established in 1839, became the first permanent settlement on the present site of the city of Minneapolis. There was not much activity in the neighborhood for about 8 years, or until 1847, when Franklin Steele began the sawmill development that marked the real beginning of the settlement, and when, in 1848, W. A. Cheever platted the town of St. Anthony, which he called St. Anthony City. At that time there were about 300 half-breeds, squatters, and trappers in the neighborhood. Practically all activity was on the east side of the river. Steele established a ferry above the falls in 1847 in order to enable easier access to the west side of the river. At that time there were less than 50 persons who lived on the west side, most of them half-breeds. The first bridge over the river was built by Steele 7 years later and was open for traffic in 1855. It was a toll bridge, 25 cents being charged for a wagon and 5 cents for a foot passenger.

It was the Falls of St. Anthony, with its possibility for water power, that of course drew the first settlers and started the first industry. A sawmill was the first structure erected by white men within the limits of present Minneapolis. This was the Government mill built by soldiers from Fort Snelling in 1821. Two years later, or in 1823, the first gristmill was built, also by the soldiers. Neither of these, however, were commercial mills and each operated spasmodically for short periods.

The immense forests to the north offered the raw material for the great sawmills, which began to spring up after Franklin Steele built his mill in 1847. During the next 40 years the larger part of the forest area was converted into lumber in Minneapolis mills. The rivers and streams to the north provided ideal means of transportation. There was hardly a section to the north from which logs could not be brought to the city by water. The Mississippi River also provided an easy and cheap transportation outlet for the finished lumber to the south, and great rafts of sawed timber were regularly floated down the river to St. Louis and other cities.

When Franklin Steele built his commercial sawmill at the falls in 1847, he laid the foundation for the industrial development that was to build a great city. Two years later, in 1849, other men began to arrive whose names are also associated with the early development of the sawmill industry in Minneapolis. Among these sawmill pioneers were Arnold W. Taylor, who arrived from Boston in 1849, Caleb Dorr, Charles Simpson, S. W. Farnham, Loring Lovejoy, Samuel Stanchfield, John Martin, T. B. Walker, H. C. Ackley, W. E. Jones, Jonathan Chase, the Chute brothers, John Rollins, Joseph Dean, Tuttle & Lane, Mayo & Clark, and others.

In 1870 the whole row of sawmills were destroyed by fire. A new dam, 300 feet below the old one, was then constructed and five of the mills rebuilt. Following the completion of these mills on the west side of the river came others erected by Leonard Day, W. E. Jones, Doilus Morrison, W. D. Washburn, and Robinson & Clement. In 1862 Joseph Dean startled the community by purchasing an entire block, bounded by First and Second Avenues, South and First and Second Streets, at a cost of $500 per lot, for use as a lumber yard. In 1866 the Pacific Mill was erected at the foot of First Avenue North. This was the largest and best equipped mill in the city. In 1876 it was sold to Camp & Walker. It was the first successful steam mill.

The story of the sawmill development in Minneapolis is not complete without a reference to Ard Godfrey, who came to the falls in 1847 from the State of Maine to build the first mill for Franklin Steele. He took a prominent part, not only in the building of sawmills but later in the building of flour mills. His home that he built in 1848 is said to be the oldest frame building in Minneapolis. It has now been moved to Richard Chute Square, north of the old Exposition Building, and is occupied by the Hennepin County Territorial Pioneers Association.

The sawmill industry continued for about 50 years, when the depleted forests deprived the mills of their raw material, and they gradually closed down. By the year 1900 the sawmill industry in the city had begun to disappear.

The second great industry that developed here because of the falls and which helped to lay the foundation for the city's greatness was the flour-milling industry. This industry differed from the sawmill industry because it grew as the Northwest developed. As the farms opened, a market for wheat became necessary and the flour mills of the city supplied the market. Some of the men famous in the early history of Minneapolis are the men who established the city's flour-mill industry.

The old Government flour mill was purchased in 1849 by Robert Smith, of Illinois, who remodeled it. In 1879 this mill was razed to provide the location for the Northwestern Flour Mill. Two years after Robert Smith bought the Government mill Richard Rogers built the first commercial grist mill. It was located between First and Second Avenues SE. This mill was powered from the Steele-Godfrey dam that had been built 3 years earlier. In 1852 Rogers formed a partnership with Steele and enlarged the mill. In 1858 Ard Godfrey built a flour mill at the junction of Minnehaha Creek and the Mississippi.

According to a study of the development of the flour-milling industry in Minneapolis made by the Minneapolis Civic and Commerce Association in 1930, the year 1854 marked the beginning of the real development of the industry. Before that time mills had been combination affairs—part sawmill and part grist mill. In 1854 John W. Eastman, Capt. John Rollins, and R. P. Upton built a $16,000 mill devoted exclusively to the manufacture of flour, and in 1858 this mill shipped the first consignment of flour from Minneapolis to eastern cities. In 1863 the mill was rebuilt, and its name was changed to the Island Mill. It was destroyed by fire in 1872.

From this date the industry developed rapidly, and men came to be identified with it who later made the industry famous throughout the world. These men included George H. Christian, Charles H. Pillsbury, John S. Pillsbury, Cadwallader C. Washburn, James S. Bell, and John Crosby, and others. In 1876 Minneapolis had 18 flour mills. The industry continued to increase until it made Minneapolis a world center for flour milling.

America's Destiny

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. WILLIAM DITTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 2, 1939

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article:

[From the New York Daily News Record of September 7, 1939]

AMERICA'S DESTINY

Again the tocsin of war resounds in Europe. Once more a resort to arms startles the world. America stands aghast at the fearful consequences which must follow a recourse to the most primitive method of disposing of international problems. Whether the impending carnage was precipitated by lust of conquest on the part of the dictatorships or was the outcome of the determination on the part of the so-called democratic powers to maintain the status quo in Europe—every American is entitled to his own individual opinion. As a nation we should proclaim none. It is not our quarrel. We have no part in European intrigues to maintain or to upset the balance of power. We have no place in imperialistic embroilments.

Armed intervention on our part could not end imperialistic aims abroad, nor stamp out the greed of gain and lust for power which perennially agitate Europe. America's role must be that of peacemaker—not participant.

Nevertheless, the old shibboleth * * * "A war to end war"—"To safeguard democracy"—"To save civilization" * * * will ring through our land again, as alien propagandists and reckless politicians strive to ensnare us in the web of international involvement.

As a peace-loving Nation we desire to see an end to war; but we know that it will not be eliminated by force of arms. Conquest breeds animosity, and the spawn of hate is violence. There can be no peace—no lasting order—until the older nations of embattled Europe learn that "They who live by the sword shall perish by the sword."

The American people do not want war, or the spoils of war, and they must not be dragged in either by accident or design. America can and should work for the restoration of peace, a peace based on equity as well as legality, but she can assume the role of peace maker only so long as she is nonpartisan. Hence, any course other than strict neutrality would be fatal.

America's destiny lies within America. She must be free to work out her own destiny. By solving her pressing social and economic problems and by affording to all her citizens an opportunity to

share in the blessings which peace and prosperity bestow, America can set an example of tranquillity and progress that may yet serve as a guide to a war-weary Old World.

Let America work out her destiny in peace.

Just What Is This Neutrality?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. HOUSTON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 2, 1939

EDITORIAL FROM THE BERGEN EVENING RECORD OF HACKENSACK, N. J.

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Bergen Evening Record, of Hackensack, N. J.:

[From the Bergen Evening Record, of Hackensack, N. J., September 27, 1939]

JUST WHAT IS THIS NEUTRALITY?

Probably 90 percent of the American people and possibly 99 percent of both Houses of Congress have a sincere desire to keep this Nation from involving itself in the current Armageddon between Europe's holy havers and unholy grabbers. Most of them realize, as do all history students, that the second world war will not permanently settle the economic pressures and the national hatreds of that blood-soaked continent any more than did the first.

Psychologically nearly all Americans hate dictatorships—Nazi, Fascist, Communist, or Japanese alike. Americans believe in the orderly processes of law and that right is might. Many of them have learned to complement their national altruism with international realism. As a result, they believe that even the victors of the current to-have-and-to-hold holocaust in Europe will be bled white in men, materials, and money when it has reached its history-making and devastating conclusion. Experience compels the conviction that Britain and France under such conditions are unsound international credit risks. That experience was gained 22 years ago when our idealistic emotionalism, set aflame by British-French propaganda, plunged us into a foreign partnership to make the world safe for democracy.

Although the partnership was victorious, it failed to entrench democracy because the two European partners subordinated sane American altruism to greedy European realism. They got rid of a fearsome Kaiser, they expanded their empires, and they hamstrung 60,000,000 hopeless and leaderless people. These hapless 60,000,000, seeking for 15 years a savior, got one 5 years ago in madman Hitler. Now he and they confront our former partners with a grave situation which means dismemberment if they lose the war and bankruptcy if they win it. In 2 short decades the losers have risen from national despair to glory while the winners have fallen from national glory to despair.

Thus European history is again being written on the sands in blood, and America 3,000 miles away is taking an inventory of itself. Experience dictates its course this time, and its name is neutrality to the bitter end. Whether an arms embargo or a cash-and-carry plan is the more neutral will be extensively debated in Congress. The best definition of neutrality is: To lend no active aid to either or any belligerent. Granting long-term credits to any of them might violate our neutrality by giving us a direct interest in the debtor's future success and solvency, but this is prohibited by existing law against defaulting debtors, among which are Britain and France. If loopholes exist, they should promptly be plugged tightly.

If the existing embargo law on munitions is retained it must logically be expanded to include practically everything grown or manufactured here. Munitions are a vital concomitant of war, but so are the foodstuffs which nourish the soldiers in the lines and keep up the morale of the peoples behind them. So also are all the necessities that keep bodies warm and fit for fighting and working. If our embargo law was designed to prevent a European war, it has proved to be a failure. It should therefore be repealed in its present form, or it should be amended to prohibit the sale of anything and everything by citizens of the United States to belligerents anywhere.

The alternative is a cash-and-carry law containing every possible safeguard to prevent our involvement on either side. The sale and delivery in the United States of our products to any belligerent who wants to buy, pay cash, and carry home his property cannot be considered unneutral, provided all belligerents have the same opportunity here to buy, pay, and carry at their own risk. Such a policy would doubtless benefit Britain and France, which control the Atlantic, against Germany and benefit Japan, which controls the Pacific, against China. The evidence of its impartiality lies, however, in the fact that while private American sympathies are preponderantly with Britain and France in Europe they are just as strong for China in Asia.

Our grave question is whether such a plan would ultimately involve us in a foreign war. Directly the sale of American merchandise and its delivery to foreign ships in American ports to be transported overseas at the purchaser's risk should not involve us. It would help us keep out if all Americans were forbidden to sail as either passengers or crew on vessels of belligerents, and it would also help if all American ships were forbidden to carry supplies directly or indirectly consigned to belligerents either in or out of war zones.

In the last analysis, it's not what Americans do here that will get us into or keep us out of the war. It's what Americans think here that will get us in or keep us out. If they permit themselves once more to be deluded by clever propaganda from without and, more dangerously still, from within, they'll get in. But if they'll stop to think that American involvement means immediate regimentation of all men and machines throughout the land they'll think harder; and, if they'll reason it out to a logical conclusion, they'll realize that national regimentation means national dictatorship, sugar-coated at the start as for the duration of the war. After that dictatorship and regimentation may be deemed desirable or be enforced during a post-war reconstruction period of unlimited duration. Then the deluded Americans who wanted to travel a military road to glory may well exclaim: "O war, where is thy victory; O victory, where are thy profits; O Constitution, where are our liberties?"

Neutrality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY C. DWORSHAK

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 2, 1939

ADDRESS BY GEN. HUGH S. JOHNSON, SEPTEMBER 27, 1939

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, although there is unanimity that this country should remain out of the European war, there is a difference of opinion regarding how this may best be accomplished. Many support the arms embargo, while others contend we should repeal the embargo and aid Great Britain and France, thus obviating the likelihood that we shall be called upon to furnish manpower later.

In such a crisis it is regrettable that so many Americans distort their vision. We cannot be neutral and yet take sides in this conflict. If we believe that Britain and France are fighting our war, and if we have a direct interest in the outcome of century-old fueds and boundary quarrels, then we should not deceive ourselves, but should permit our personal sympathies to influence the policies of our country. We cannot be partly in and partly out of this war. If it is our war, we should get in immediately; but if it is not our war, then we should do everything to preserve our neutrality and prevent involvement of this country in the conflict.

During the past quarter century the United States has had some experiences in world affairs and therefore should have a realistic background from which to approach the present war. Surely an impartial review of past events will serve to forewarn us regarding foreign policies now and help avoid a repetition of costly mistakes.

Therefore I direct your attention to the address delivered by Gen. Hugh S. Johnson before the Twenty-first Annual National Convention of the American Legion, at Chicago, Ill., on September 27, 1939, which follows:

I am proud to be invited here by my comrades, ex-makers of the world safe for democracy, ex-warriors to end all war. Proud, but timid, too. I'm the guy who ballyhooed just under 2,000,000 of you into uniform to fight the holy war. It was my job to play that tune. Please don't shoot the professor.

Well, we all have an alibi. Twenty-two years ago and we were very young. We have learned a lot—or have we?

It was a magnificent adventure. We flocked to the colors "to grind every selfish dominion into dust." No war of conquest. We sought no territory, not a dollar of tribute. We were not fighting the German people—only their dictatorial leaders. The only difference between Hitler and the Kaiser is the droop of the drawers and

the cut of the mustache. We were out to abolish all former diplomatic games of seven-toed Pete with deuces wild. Our boys died for "open covenants openly arrived at" to abolish the enslavement of peoples to either conquerors or domestic tyrants. We were for self-determination—no more international shotgun weddings.

With smiles and smirks our associates accepted our childish enthusiasms—while they took our money and our lives. We were the world's prize fat boy with the bag of candy among a horde of hungry urchins. We have been so ever since. As Will Rogers used to say, "We never lost a war or won a conference." And with Texas Guinan's greeting I salute us all—"Hello, suckers!"

Who won the war—beside the M. P.'s? We never said we did. But nobody can ever deny this—without us the Allies were licked. Or this—with no thought of our own present or future interest we denied no Allied request. We gave everything. We omitted nothing. No nation ever went so trustingly and generously to battle for the Lord.

When the Allies were busted we simply opened our Treasury. Though they at first scorned our arms when the pinch came, at their desperate prayer we sent them "men in their undershirts"—boys untrained and unready—until we had more men in France than the British ever had. When they were starving we rationed our people to give them food, without which, as they have admitted, they never could have held. When submarines wrecked their shipping we almost ruined ourselves to replace it. When their raw materials failed we supplied them fully. We withheld nothing. We did all this in time to turn certain defeat into accomplished victory.

What did it cost us? In dollars, forty billions. Skip it. Such boxcar figures reach so far toward the infinite that we can't understand. We paid a good half of the whole Allied cost of the war. Yet it was astronomical chicken feed to the real cost—10 years of terrible depression, $200,000,000,000 of lost income and production.

It has loaded our future with debt and taxes that chain our young generations like slaves to the oars of a Roman galley. You and I received this bright heritage of America from our fathers unmortgaged and free—a place where every man in the sweat of his labor could earn a reasonable living. That's the way we got it. We gambled it for Europe. We are passing along a wreck of it to our children. Rich or poor, they must pay 20 percent of all they make for our blunder, and the field of opportunity has been reduced one-third. That's what we paid for our last blunder, and we are not through paying yet.

What did we get for that deadly price? We were told we were going to get "international decency." Boy, look at the damn thing!

Of material things—territory and tribute—we got just what we asked—precisely nothing. We were fighting for treasures of the heart.

"Open covenants, openly arrived at"? At the very moment that we marched, secret treaties had promised to deliver conquered nations captive.

"No conquests"? Our associates partitioned the world.

"No tributes"? Under the guise of fantastical "reparations," tributes enslaving generations and paralyzing the trade of the world were laid upon the conquered.

"War to end war"? The seeds were then sown of the "red" horror that now threatens the world.

"A world safe for democracy"? Except here and in a very few places in this hemisphere democracy is dead.

Not a vestige of our aims remains to reward us for all our sacrifice. We were bamboozled in the beginning and defrauded in the end. Faith in the promises of nations seems vanished from the earth. No pot can call any kettle black. Poland and Czechoslovakia will as bitterly accuse Britain and France of double-crossing and running out as they will accuse Germany and Russia. They two-timed us on the debts and threw us a curve on the post-war peace pacts—especially in Manchuria. Nice people! Every principle for which we went to war is a mouthful of dust and burned out ashes.

Well, have we learned anything? I am not so sure. Nobody wants war but we hear that we can't keep out—can't avoid doing it all over again with the same associates. The Book of Proverbs says: "As a dog returneth to its vomit so doth a fool to his folly!" Venture the welfare of this peaceful, honest, square-shooting people again into that welching, double-crossing betrayal. It sounds absurd and impossible. But are we surely foolproof against our own folly? Who says we can't keep out if we want to—and why? This fatalistic dogmatic opinion is almost as dangerous as an outright demand to get in. It relieves our very Government of effort to the uttermost to keep us out to the end. For if it be true that we can't keep out anyway, how can anybody be blamed for getting us in tomorrow—or next month—or next year? Indeed, as professional soldiers, we know that if it were certain truth that we could not keep out in the end it would be better to get in now. It would be better to gear the tremendous engine of destruction of an armed and mobilized America to its highest efficiency beginning immediately.

But we don't need to make a second fool's sacrifice. We can keep out. As Morton Downey says—England and France have. The argument is that, with the British Navy and the French Army defeated or weakened, we will be the next victim. That doesn't add up to make sense. If the war should stop tomorrow or with any outcome foreseeable in the next 2 years, we should still have the British and French Empires between us and the brutalitarian states. On the other hand, if the belligerents are fools enough to fight it out to a finish, both will be so exhausted that neither would dare take us on for a generation.

Apart from the utter destruction of long-drawn modern war is the fact that even conquering nations cannot spread themselves too thin or digest too much. Every one of Hitler's recent conquests have weakened him by presenting problems of territorial organization and the digestion of rebellious and alien peoples. Even in his joint venture with Russia, he has simply gone to bed with another murderer. Neither of those political gorillas dares to go to sleep with his thumb in the other guy's mouth. Even a victorious Hitler can't straddle the Atlantic.

No, the war in Europe reduces the danger to the Americas. It is absurd to say: "We can't keep out." And yet, it would be equally absurd to say: "We can't get in."

In one set of circumstances we can be drawn in. Nations have affronted us only when they thought we were weak or wouldn't fight. There is one absolute necessity in keeping out. We must become so strong in the air, on the sea, and the land that no nation dare attack us in this hemisphere.

It is a fashion to say that air force has dwindled our bulwarks of thousands of miles of sea water. That is plain nonsense. We are exposed to greater dangers of raid but as long as those oceans remain and we command the seas and adequately prepare on land, no nations can threaten us with armies. It is armies alone that can destroy nations.

The bulwarks are there, and we can defend them. But they must be armed and manned. We have not done that yet. Our Navy is as strong as it was in 1918. But the country does not know the half of the pitiful state of the armament and equipment of our Army. It has almost no modern equipment and no reserves. It is in no sense ready to keep us out of war.

This is alarming. Here in the Americas are prizes richer for busted piratical nations than any galleon that ever sailed the Spanish Main. We can defend them. But we must prepare to defend them—and we are not prepared. Why haven't we done so?

That takes us right back to the argument that we can't keep out of this war because we must keep the British Navy and French Army between us and the dictators. In other words, we depend in part on them to defend the Americas—and so have remained weak ourselves.

But in this double-crossing, treaty-breaking world, how can we rely on any nation to defend our interests—even Britain and France? What happened to our reliance on them to support the highest ideals for which you fought twenty-odd years ago?

Every promise stands repudiated or broken. Czechoslovakia and Poland relied on them. Where are those nations now? In this treacherous modern world we can't stake our country in reliance on anybody but the strength of our own right arm and the unity and common purpose of our own people—armed and prepared not merely to keep America out of war but to keep war out of the Americas.

The argument that we can't keep out says that we must get in to destroy dictatorships. We are a democracy—almost the last one left. If we get in there would be more dictatorships than democracies on our side. One thing is certain sure—if we take arms in this war, good-bye democracy here—Kathleen Mavourneen—"it may be for years and it may be forever."

Look at our neighbor Canada today. Magna carta is in the ash-can and the Bill of Rights is out the window. You have to do that in war today. We did some of it in 1918. But Woodrow Wilson so hated centralized power that he gave up most of his war powers the day after the Armistice. This administration also has had emergency powers. So far as I can recall it never willingly gave up one. On the contrary, its policy has been constantly increased centralization of power not merely in a Federal Government but in a Federal governor. If we go to war, we must not lose our democracy, but it is a fair bet that George Washington wouldn't be able to recognize it at the end. First to hear that to keep out of war we must get into it. This argument is equally absurd—to keep our democracy we must give it up. Are we going haywire on any such cockeyed muddy thinking as that?

There is an even worse threat to democracy here. We entered the World War with trifling debt and taxes. We have multiplied debt 40 times and increased taxes to the breaking point. It is that which has hindered our prosperity and made living hard. If we go into a new war, we will double those already unbearable burdens—or worse. Neither our political nor our economic systems can stand the shock. Governments and property rights only exist so that people can work in safety. When any such systems become so hard to bear that people can't stand them, they go down, and they should go down. Signing a declaration in this war will be signing a death sentence to democracy and to everything that we have known and loved as American.

We shall find our way though. We shall, because we will stick to the fundamental principles of Americanism that made this country great. We will retain our forms of democratic government. We will keep out of European quarrels and entanglements. We will defend our own and remain strong enough to do so. Treating both sides at war with cold impartiality, we will rely on nobody but ourselves.

We want the world to know that while we bitterly deplore the destruction of everything we sacrificed and fought for in 1918, we recognize that both sides were in part guilty of that destruction. We hold it against neither. But that experience left us somewhat

like the mouse in the cheese-baited trap—we don't want any more cheese.

They must fight their own battles—with this single warning: If they bring that fight westward to threaten us on our own shores, we shall rise, as we rose in 1918, with all the power and the majesty of the strongest nation on earth, to send them howling home.

The Moral Basis of Neutrality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VINCENT F. HARRINGTON

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 2, 1939

SERMON BY REV. EDWARD W. STIMSON, PASTOR OF THE FIRST PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH OF SIOUX CITY, IOWA

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include therein a sermon preached at the First Presbyterian Church in Sioux City, Iowa, by its pastor, Rev. Edward W. Stimson. This is one of the finest contributions to the present neutrality discussion that I have yet seen or heard.

THE MORAL BASIS FOR NEUTRALITY

Mark 3: 23: "How can Satan cast out Satan?"

Ever since the appalling news came over the radio that Europe was again at war, the chief question in the minds of most Americans has been "How can we keep out of it?" How can we maintain our neutrality? President Roosevelt has said that he believes we can remain neutral, and has promised that he and the State Department will do everything they can to keep us so. Just now we are asking ourselves, What is the strongest and most adequate basis on which we can maintain our neutral position?

AMERICA'S OWN INTERESTS

Of course, one currently popular appeal is being made on the basis of national self-interest. The European war is not our business. Mere shrewdness should make us determined to keep out of it. Why should we send our boys to fight Europe's battles? Why should we waste our resources again in the futile attempt to settle the perennial quarrel of European power politics? We have plenty of experience to draw upon still fresh from 20 years ago. We lost 130,000 lives in action, many more from secondary causes, and got nothing for it, not even thanks in the end, but only criticism for not joining in sooner. The billions of dollars it cost us will never be repaid. We ruined our western plains, foolishly plowing them up to furnish war-boom wheat, and now have the Dust Bowl to remind us of our folly. The prosperity we temporarily enjoyed was mainly for a few profiteers, while in the end our national losses were permanent. We had loaned billions to feed the armies of Europe and make possible the profits from war trade, and since we could not collect the loans we really gave it all away. How can we be so foolish as to want to do it all over again? On the basis of American national interest, we should stay out, not only of the fighting, but also out of war-supplies business. If they couldn't pay last time, how can we expect they will be able to do it again?

But this sensible national self-interest argument will not sound so good to certain individuals and corporations who see an opportunity for immediate personal profit. There are plenty of people who will clamor for the chance to make quick money out of war trade again. Already now there is agitation to change the neutrality bill, which was written with the deliberate purpose of keeping our business from becoming involved in just the kind of war boom which many are now anticipating so eagerly. Plausible as the national self-interest basis for neutrality is, I doubt that it will be a sufficient argument. Self-interest becomes confused when ultimate national interest and immediate prospects of business prosperity are at odds.

MORAL CONSIDERATIONS INESCAPABLE

Meanwhile, economic interest is not all determining where the passions and enthusiasms of the American people are involved. We are fundamentally an idealistic people. We have a tradition of willingness to help whomever we consider to be the under dog. When our passions become aroused we do not ask about our national self-interest. We are willing to risk any price to make the world safe for democracy, to stop the lawless aggressors, etc.

In the present war, as the European propaganda machines get going, the appeal will inevitably be to our idealism. They know that we cannot let mere national self-interest control our actions where we can be persuaded that great moral issues are involved. Our very Christianity, with its emphasis upon unselfish brotherhood, will not let us draw our skirts about us and pass by on the other side. It was Cain who said to God, "Am I my brother's keeper?" and the implication was that he should have cared about his brother. Christianity does not encourage moral neutrality when a true moral issue challenges Christians to take sides.

We are fond of quoting such verses as:

"Once to every man and nation comes the moment to decide,
In the strife of truth with falsehood, for the good or evil side."

And rightly so when we can be sure that there is clearly a good side and an evil side. The propagandists of the nations at war know that we are prone to such idealism, and will certainly seek to use that knowledge to the uttermost to persuade us that there is a clear moral issue involved, and that it is our moral duty to join them. We shall again hear the argument, "Would you stand by and let a big bully beat up on your little brother?" We shall again be propagandized to feel that we are slackers for staying out of a great moral crusade.

Therefore, right now, before we have had time to be swamped with hysteria, and to take a strongly partisan stand, we should ask ourselves, What is the true moral situation in this war, and does it justify our staying out of it when our great might and abundant resources would mean so much in determining the war's outcome? What is the moral basis for neutrality?

We can ask the question now because practically all of the relevant facts are already in our possession. Of course, now that war is going on, there will be more and more accounts of horrors and atrocities to stir our emotions. There will be frightful acts committed by both sides. That is modern war for whoever engages in it. But the acts of the nations which have precipitated the war, while there was yet a chance to keep peace, when moral judgment might have been exercised, are now already history, and the question of moral blame, if it is to be used to stir our partisan feelings, can now be decided.

Frankly, I believe that we are morally justified in remaining neutral. From a Christian standpoint I must declare that it is morally imperative that we remain neutral. There is no true argument that should persuade our consciences that it is our duty to enter this war.

To support this contention I would call to your attention this morning two major considerations which I believe we should keep firmly in our minds:

1. There is no clear moral issue of right and wrong in this war in Europe.

2. Our entering into the war on one side cannot further a moral solution of the European problem.

WHO IS MOST TO BLAME?

Let us consider first the relative guilt of the parties involved.

Already the attempt is being made to convince the American public that Germany is solely guilty. We like to take sides in any contest, and our still living sympathies of 21 years ago condition us strongly to favor the allied cause. Have we any right to think of the Germans alone as villains, and of the Allies as righteous defenders of civilization and democracy?

Certainly Adolf Hitler and the others in command of the Third Reich have acted badly. There is no doubt this time that they precipitated the open warfare in Poland, delivered impossible ultimatums to the Polish Government, started troops into Poland when they knew France and Britain were committed to the defense of her territorial integrity, refused to heed the last request of those nations to withdraw the troops from Poland and submit the matter to a conference, and thereby made inevitable the declarations in London and Paris that a state of war existed. Certainly in comparison the acts of the British and French political leaders at the last, trying to forestall the outbreak of hostilities, have been morally far more praiseworthy and commendable.

The moral contrast is not confined to the acts surrounding the actual outbreak of war. The whole policy of the Third Reich under Hitler has been such as to merit moral condemnation. Hitler's government has deliberately turned its back upon Christian virtues, and adopted the cult of predatory militarism. The doctrine in Hitler's book, Mein Kampf, has only one moral meaning—absolute opposition to Christian morality. The persecution of the Jews, the perversion of German education, the onslaught on the Christian Church with the incarceration of men like Neimoller—all of these policies are convincing to us that the Third Reich has been morally impossible. Nothing too bad can be said of Nazi policies, and as you all know, I have not been backward in expressing my opinion of them. Between the general policies of the Nazis and the policies of the British and French democracies there is no moral comparison. I cannot say as much for Poland, since Paderewski was exiled and the present dictatorship established. They, too, have persecuted Jews, stifled liberty, and were not adverse to grabbing a bit of Czechoslovakia last winter. Yet considering the chief warring nations, the moral contrast in recent internal policy is obvious.

But are we justified in letting these obvious facts determine our moral judgment? Is there not a danger that we may oversimplify the issue by concentrating our attention upon the spectacular factors in recent history? I saw a cartoon from the Minneapolis Journal this week which demonstrated this fallacy perfectly. The caption of the cartoon was "Why 10,000,000 men are under arms." The whole cartoon space was blank white, except for one tiny figure—the figure of Adolf Hitler. According to that oversimplification of recent history, Hitler alone is to blame.

Granted that Hitler had the power and position to say the word that started the hostilities. But was Hitler wholly in control of the situation he had helped to create at that fateful moment? The

last statement he issued before war began revealed pathetically how much he was by then the victim of circumstances. And while Hitler helped to make those circumstances, it is just as true that other circumstances made Hitler and gave him his power over the German people. In any fair moral appraisal of this war we must go back further than Hitler and his acceptance by the German people to the causes of his rise to power. Who made Adolf Hitler the menace of world peace in 1938 and 1939? Any fair-minded historian knows that it was primarily the work of vindictive, short-sighted Allied leaders, in 1919 at Versailles, and in the following years up until the fall of the German Weimar Republic in 1933.

The question of moral blame may thus be compared to the homely situation which occurs in many a quarrel between children. Every father with small children knows how difficult it is to establish justice once a squabble has begun. You hear loud wails from two angry throats and enter the room to ask who started it this time. With a great show of injured righteousness, the older one sobs, "He hit me first!" Then, if you are a wise parent, you will probably ask, "Well, what did you do to him to make him want to hit you?" Gradually the obscured truth is revealed that the older one has schemed most of the blocks away from the younger, or done some other sly but exasperating deed which caused the younger to finally boil over in desperation. No doubt that the younger hit first; was the physical aggressor. But the older one was just as much to blame. In fact, by repeated persecutions and pesterings the older child has all but ruined the younger one's disposition. You wonder whether parental discipline can distinguish degrees of guilt. You feel like spanking both of them!

Now, it was my special privilege to observe first hand the sly, exasperating provocation of the present European squabble. As you know, I was in Germany as a postgraduate student during those fateful last days of the Weimar Republic. I saw first hand how the Allies were to blame in making Hitler. The Weimar Republic was the child of Versailles and the progressive democratic leadership of post-war Germany. It was the sort of regime which should have commanded the full sympathy and cooperation of the democracies of the world. Ebert Rathenau, Stresemann, Bruening, Curtius, these men were idealists, liberal-minded democrats, internationally minded, peace-loving statesmen. The liberal German reaction against the blundering militarism of the German war leaders put them into power. They led Germany into the League of Nations. Under them Germany observed the letter of the Versailles Treaty—even to having only 100,000 in her standing army, while the Allies themselves never did observe their own promise in that same treaty to disarm.

And how did the Allies help those splendid leaders of the Weimar Republic? Did they encourage the success of that struggling young democracy in Germany? Their encouragement was enforcing with a vengeance the provisions of the Treaty of Versailles. With vindictive malice they continued the cold war of economic attrition, the terms of which had been laid down by Lloyd George and Clemenceau. At Versailles Germany had been made to agree to pay pounds of flesh from year to year. A highly industrialized nation, dependent for her economic life upon getting raw materials abroad and selling manufactures in exchange, Germany was isolated. Most of her trade had been southeast down the Danube. In that path were erected little independent states tributary to France for support, states which ran up high tariff barriers, blockading the trade route. Germany's ships had been taken away from her, her Rhine made an international stream. With prostrate industry, she was forced to pay reparations. We were blamed for that because the Allies said they had to collect from Germany to pay us.

The German people suffered. We made fun when German marks became worthless, and papered walls with them. German mothers dropped fainting of hunger in the streets during the inflation; their children were tortured with rickets. Some relief had to be given, and the Young plan and the Dawes plan eased the tension for awhile. But with the world crash of 1929 things became worse again. The Germans pled for a customs union with Austria, to open the southeast avenue of trade, and were refused. Breuning went to Paris and got down on his knees to Minister Laval, pleading for some mercy that the democracy might be maintained, but Laval shrugged his shoulders and turned a deaf ear. That pitiful episode is well told in Pierre Van Paasen's Days of Our Years. There were 6,000,000 unemployed in Germany, and a food shortage. When we have unemployed in overproducing America we can feed them. Germans were going hungry again. Relief was inadequate. Poor students lived largely on potatoes. I know, for I ate with them in the Studentenheim Mensa—suppers of potatoes. There was a wave of student suicides sweeping over Germany. I attended an advanced seminar in economics with Professor Ropke on the subject of The Economic Crisis. He was a member of the circle of economic advisers of the government, and made frequent trips to Berlin for conference. Then he would come back and tell us how badly Germany's finances were tottering.

The following quotation from my own notebook, written in Germany in 1931, tells the story:

"One cannot live long in Germany without feeling the tensity, the pressure, and the strain of the economic-political situation. German reparations and Hitlerism may seem distant and merely mildly interesting from across the sea, but here they are ever present in thought. University courses are given on the reparations problem and the Versailles Treaty. The most eagerly attended history courses deal with the period just before and after the war. People take their membership in political parties very seriously.

"Germany is being goaded to desperation by the reparations problem. She is paying, but she is selling her industries to American capitalists and letting needed replacements in machinery and railway rolling stock go to do it. Taxation is grievous. The economic crisis in Germany is not due primarily to capitalistic overproduction as in America. Here it is the paralyzation of economy under a staggering load.

"And, worst of all, Germans feel that the load is unjust. They know that the harsh measures of the 'Versailles Dictat,' as the Germans insist on calling it, were meted out upon the supposition of Germany's sole guilt and culpability for the war. This assumption has been admitted by historians in all nations to be false, and a mere postwar hysterical rationalization of vindictive measures, resulting in what is not really reparations but exaction of tribute. Of course, war is not just, and one can hardly plead that justice should come from it. Yet now that passions have had time to cool one might expect a revision.

"The grievous burden is producing political consequences in Germany that may well be viewed with alarm from outside. Germany is split into a dozen or more political parties. Fortunately, since the war, the Social Democrats, with a policy of international cooperation, have been in control. Lately, especially in September 1930, their control has been threatened. They are faced on the one hand by Nazis, who demand noncooperation and refusal to pay reparations; on the other by Communists, who see in Russia's revolution and repudiation of all debts of the former Czarist government a way out of Germany's troubles.

"At a recent meeting of German and American students here we discussed the reparations problem. A German student speaking for the younger generation, claimed that German young people of a generation that had nothing to do with the war could not be expected to spend their lives paying between 4 and 6 marks apiece each month in tribute to foreign countries. They do not understand why they must. They did not contract the debt. They have seen on historical grounds that the assumptions behind its levy are false. If things are not changed by the Allied nations, one cannot but expect revolt within Germany. And if such a party as the Hitlerites gained power, the result would be upsetting not only for Germany but for the whole of Europe.

"All of these observations leave no room for a facile optimism about the condition of Germany or the future peace of Europe. Peace may be maintained, but it will take more wisdom than is at present being used. Germany seems to be drifting onto the rocks. There is danger of either fascism or bolshevism."

It took no great prophet to see these things in Germany in 1931. In desperation the German people were clutching at straws. They developed an attitude that nothing could be worse, so they trusted their fate to a loud-mouthed political adventurer who made big promises. The policy of the Allies in their continued war of economic attrition goaded them to it. Then who is to blame that Hitler gained power in Germany and has led Europe into war?

My point is not to absolve Germany or Hitler, but to prove that the Allies are also guilty. This present war is just another episode in the age-long struggle of power diplomacy between the imperial states of Europe. They have all been in the same game for centuries. To extoll morality on either side is ridiculous. There is no moral issue at the bottom of this war—only a sordid contest for wealth and power. Therefore, we cannot take moral sides. Morally, the only answer is neutrality.

WHAT COULD INTERVENTION ACCOMPLISH?

The final consideration is the futility of our ever expecting to achieve an idealistic moral good if we did go into the war. Even if we decided one side was sufficiently more right than the other to warrant our going in to set Europe at rights, we could do little good when once the war would be over.

Here I would cite the wisdom of Jesus in our text. "How can Satan cast out Satan?" How can the adoption by us of the same evil military methods European nations are now using do anything morally helpful to stop the use of those methods in Europe? It is war itself that is evil. If we enter it we shall ourselves become no better than they. They are bombing civilians; so should we. They are using poison gas; so should we. They are training their young men to the brutality of modern fighting; so should we have to train our young men. In seeking to cast Satan out of Europe, America would become satanic, too. If democracy is lost in Europe, so will it be lost here, too, the moment "M Day" comes. And at long last, if we did win some kind of a victory, what good could we make of it? Wilson had no success at Versailles. Could we expect to really set up a just settlement of affairs in Europe, and establish a new set of democracies there? To ask the question is enough. In the struggle of political ideologies, military force is not the weapon of democracy, but of dictatorship. Democracy must be the willing choice of free peoples. If we expect to be able ever to help Europe establish a just peace and return to democracy we had best stay out of her squabble. Then, when they finally decide over there that the way of militarism is futile, we can go with some moral authority to help them find the way.

The moral basis for neutrality is clear.

There is no moral issue in this war that demands our support and makes our going in a conscientious necessity.

If we did go in we could only confuse the issue still further in Europe, and rob ourselves of the right to say the helpful word we may say toward the making of a just peace in the Europe of the future. There is enough satanic rottenness in this mess already. Over there they are tarred with the same stick. We dare not hope to do any good by becoming like them. "How can Satan cast out Satan?"

America Must Not Become Involved in This War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NEWT V. MILLS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 2, 1939

Mr. MILLS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, on March 5, 1937, approximately 2 months after I took the oath of office as a new Member of this body, I appeared on this floor in interest of a peace joint resolution, after having been prompted by an honest desire to do something effective toward achieving universal peace. I took that responsibility hoping the Members of Congress would have the courage to face the issue and be induced to carry the fight to a successful conclusion; however, little was said in Congress, but throughout the continental United States peace-loving people caught the significance of the peace resolution I had offered and began to offer their approval and endorsements. However, international events have so occurred that today we are confronted with a very complex international crisis, that if not properly handled will plunge this great people into another European conflict to which every American citizen is opposed, as permanent peace burns in every human breast.

DO NOT ACCEPT ANY REASON FOR WAR

Nothing will ruin the country if the people themselves will undertake its safety and nothing can save it if they leave that safety in any hands but their own; however, I am most anxious to point out at this time reasons advocated by certain groups for war, but none will suffice save to keep this country free and preserve the traditions of our sacred institutions of home, school, and church and diregard misguided forces that are trying to take us along the same path that Europe is presently traveling and that path, history shows, led to the World War.

The theologian might call war the punishment for the sins and transgressions of men.

The radical might explain it as the inevitable outcome of the struggle for international markets by a capitalistic people.

The economist might explain it as the result of an impossible adjustment in the economic relationships of mankind.

The editorial writer might blame war due to international dealers in armaments.

The politician might explain it as the necessity to quell those who have a desire for power.

The psychologist might explain it as the triumph of the death instinct over the instinct of love.

The philosopher might tell us that war is an expression of man's passage through space and time, of no greater or no less significance than the life histories of other species that have now vanished from this earth. It is a thing, they might say, that we can no more control than we can control the passage of the earth through space.

Whatever might be the cause of war, it does indeed seem that it is the start of a dizzy ride toward inevitable destruction; and it cannot be denied the same selfish reasons of greed and hate are responsible for the present catastrophe.

PEACE OR WAR?

Mr. Speaker, the greatest number of inhabitants of the earth do not want war but peace. Given their choice and the chance to express that choice, they would vote solidly against war; therefore, the issue before the world today is peace or war. The heart of America is pleading for peace in a world that has been set on fire with the spirit of malice and hatred. The Constitution is our surest bulwark of peace. We seek for ourselves under the Constitution a continuation of the free expression of opinion which is now possible in this country as in no other in the world. We desire the right to say frankly and fully that we do not want war. As Americans we are seeking in every possible way to keep our country free from war, and it is well that we remind ourselves of the glorious principles of toleration and balanced government which are set forth in this document. For these are the principles which have constituted the abiding protection for liberty and the rights of minority groups in our land, permitting them to live peaceably here without surrendering their right as free citizens to differ with their neighbors according to their individual conscience.

The liberty we so greatly prize finds its roots in the free conscience of each individual citizen. Our liberty is safeguarded in the Bill of Rights of our Constitution. Against it in the past have come in vain all the forces of mass greed and oppression which have sought to subject the individual to the domination of the all-powerful state; however, united in prayer we stand for liberty and peace against war.

DREADFUL COST

Mr. Speaker, I hate war. Millions have marched behind the banner, never to return to see loved ones again, and we all recognize men will be destroyed by present warfare methods probably 10 times as fast as during the World War.

Well may we remember the forgotten statistics of the World War when 74,000,000 men were mobilized, 10,000,000 killed, 3,000,000 maimed, 19,000,000 wounded, 10,000,000 disabled or incapacitated for the balance of their lives, 9,000,000 orphans, 5,000,000 widows. Fathers returned to find homes and property destroyed, mothers and children passed on to the beyond while they were away, never to see them again, and in a dying hour children crying to see their dad once more. Sherman said, "War is hell"; however, war is a disastrous catastrophe that pushes men's souls out into eternity.

PRICE OF PARTICIPATION

Mr. Speaker, industrial and agricultural production for a war market gives immense fortune to a few, but for a nation as a whole it produces disaster, indebtedness, destroys common understanding of peace that we all so well cherish, and not only results in loss of property and lives but destroys the very foundation of democracy, which guarantees life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness to all men and in return supplants dictatorial government with vast amount of feudalism following, which results in many years of trial and error to rebuild the losses sustained in the pestilence that follow. It intensifies human hatreds. It settles no problems. It weakens all participants. It destroys the foundations of civilization. War, being the complete triumph of force over reason, cannot be expected to give us other than a world that is ruled by force.

War helps to create a gulf between the well-to-do and the poor, inasmuch as history has proven that the poor bear the burden of taxation and the ill-gained wealth of war accumulates in the hands of a few. As a result a drainage system is created whereby the poor are forced to work longer hours and for smaller wages, being undernourished, to help meet the financial burdens whereby the rich benefit from the laborer and taxpayer indirectly inasmuch as the rich reap interest from money loaned to the government and the taxpayer pays the bills.

Too, war breeds prejudice against the opposing nation which continues to exist after the war is ended; and when an indifference exists between nations, the honesty of that nation is distrusted and, with the same result breaks down the common understanding of business, which in turn is crippled, bringing about unemployment, resulting in a financial depression, which has very well been proven in history that after each war follows a depression.

Not only do economic conditions become impaired but social unrest usually breeds in the minds of the people, that cost the government invariably billions of dollars usually spent in ways that will not in return be collected but instead a loss to the government.

DOOM OF CIVILIZATION

Contrary to the law of Almighty God and fundamental principles of humanity and reason, which solemnly affirm that nations, as well as individuals, should live in peace one with the other, the world today presents a picture wherein each nation is striving its utmost to outdo its neighbor in preparing for war, and I would have you to know the cost of war is almost beyond figures; therefore, huge sums of money which could best be used in the relief of suffering, in the advancement of industrial progress and science, and which represents a staggering burden of taxation on all people, have been voted and are being spent to increase navies and air forces, equip armies with every conceivable weapon of destruction, and to construct fortifications, all of which constitute a menace to the peace of the world and to the lives of every man, woman, and child, threatening the very foundation of the social structure, and must inevitably result in the degeneration of the human race, unless every precaution is exercised, and I hold whether it is a long or short war in Europe, it will be followed by a profound economic disorder and perhaps an economic collapse and the result of this European war will prove as all other wars, the more we rely on war business to help us, the more serious will be the economic dislocation in this country when that war business stops, and if war is to continue every 20 to 25 years, as in the past, a far more reaching disaster will befall the world than an economic disorder as civilization will be doomed under the present warfare methods.

SUREST SAFEGUARD

Sacred traditions are embodied within every heart in hope of retaining peace, whereas dictatorship in other lands rears its head in thirst of slaughtering the old, poor, young, innocent, and helpless, holding "might is right."

Five thousand years of recorded history and the armed civilizations that have perished in the march of time across the centuries have taught us there is no security in the sword. Is there any sure cure for the disease of war? There is a remedy without a relapse, a cure without a crutch, a treaty without a trench as recorded in the Forty-sixth Psalm—

He maketh wars to cease unto the ends of the earth; He breaketh the bow, and cutteth the spear in sunder; He burneth the chariot in the fire.

THE VISION OF TOMORROW

I am sure we are devoted to the cause of peace, and interested in preserving peace for our country; however, today such interest is not enough unless we enact wise legislation designed to safeguard our Nation in any crisis. We must remember, and every American citizen must remember, that we cannot afford to temporize and postpone taking the proper measures until we stand in danger of being drawn into the present terrible conflict.

Our experience in the last dreadful World War has taught us what to expect. The sympathies of our people will be aroused by every means possible—especially propaganda for the financiers and war lords. There is but one way to fight this dangerous propaganda and that is for every man, woman, and child in this country to remember that we want no part in this European turmoil. It is very true that here in the United States we are vitally interested in our democratic traditions. We are so interested in our liberal traditions that we must not for one single moment risk losing them in the savage European inferno.

Perhaps many will say that worries of this sort are unnecessary and that the European trouble is very remote from us. As I remember, we regarded the war as remote in 1914, and yet in the end we sent American boys to Europe to die horribly.

In any great conflict individuals will have their private sympathies, because that way of life and government which is closest to our own must naturally command our respect and interest. If our own sovereign Nation is ever threatened, then let us fight, and I wager we will have no lack of soldiers for our cause, but until such a time let us retain peace and not send our boys to die on European battlefields, as our first responsibility is to our own people. We have today an awesome responsibility, and let us not for an instant lose sight of it. When the awful battle smoke of Europe has cleared away let us be able to say proudly that we have preserved our national honor by preserving our peace. We have an ideal here in America, and it is an ideal of peace inviolate, and of the progress and prosperity which come with peace.

Today we see great nations in Europe resorting to force as a means of progress, forgetting that few questions are ever really settled by brute force. The people of those countries did not want to fight, any more than our own people want to fight. They were led to conflict by a chain of events and influences which might have been prevented if the people themselves had had great foresight. It is foresight that I am urging today, vision to see the perils that we as a great neutral nation will face and wisdom to meet those dangers judiciously.

Let us proceed with caution in the shaping of any law designed to preserve our neutrality. Let us consider well each clause and phrase of our neutrality measure, remembering well that this one piece of legislation has a vital bearing on the peace and future of our country and the safety of our people.

On the floor of this House we have passed bills granting compensation to those noble veterans who fought so bravely in the last war. I favored those measures, as I believe that our veterans can never be paid; however, I hope and earnestly pray that we will never have veterans of another war disabled, blinded, and crippled.

There can be no mistake more terrible than one which results in loss of human life; yet a mistake on our neutrality legislation might mean the loss of millions of lives, the orphaning of thousands of helpless children, and the wounding and crippling of many soldiers. Yes; the cost of such a mistake would be too great to count, and surely it is within the powers of statesmanship to bring about this compromise and end this growing disunity.

It is disunity among our people that will do far more damage than the political advantages to be gained by either side or party on the subject of neutrality.

Our true obligation is not only the destiny of our own children, but all the children of America who will be set back a hundred years in their opportunities as well as the growth of American life, if we participate in this European war; therefore, democracy and the rose youth of this great land of abundance and liberty rests in keeping America out of this conflict.

I thank you.

Address by the Secretary of War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW J. MAY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 2, 1939

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. HARRY H. WOODRING, SEPTEMBER 29, 1939

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address by Hon. Harry H. Woodring, the Secretary of War, September 29, 1939, on the occasion of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the establishment of the Army of the United States:

In the summer of 1805 there set out from St. Louis, in what was then the Louisiana Territory, an expedition comprising in all 1 officer and 20 soldiers of the Regular Army. Traversing an unknown wilderness, enduring all manner of hardship, encountering and overcoming one perilous natural obstacle after another, this small party explored the headwaters of the Mississippi River, and 9 months later returned to its base. It has been stated of the

expedition's leader that "without an educated partner, he acted as astronomer, surveyor, commanding officer, clerk, spy, and guide." In the spring of 1806 this same young Army subaltern, with a military escort of approximately the same size, explored the valley of the Arkansas River, penetrated into what is now the State of Colorado, and then moved southwest into regions over which flew the flag of Spain.

The youthful commanding officer of these two expeditions—surveys which furnished invaluable information to the people of the United States on the vast resources of their recently acquired western domains—was Lt. Zebulon Montgomery Pike. For him towering Pike's Peak in Colorado now is named.

In April 1813 Zebulon Montgomery Pike advanced in rank during the intervening years from lieutenant to brigadier general, led an expedition against York in Canada, the site of the present city of Toronto. He was in command during one of the very few successful land campaigns waged by American forces during the second war for independence. Fatally wounded during the investment of York, General Pike died on the field of battle as that Canadian stronghold fell before the assault of his troops.

To my mind the career of Zebulon Montgomery Pike epitomizes the careers of those who have worn the uniform of this Republic of ours since the establishment of the Army of the United States 150 years ago today.

I speak not as a onetime soldier in the World War's emergency ranks, but as a civilian Secretary of War when I express my deep and my very profound admiration for those soldiers of ours who, at times neglected, at times ignored, at times even derided, dared the vast expanses of the unknown wilderness in peace, and, with equal courage, braved the known dread dangers of battle in war.

These were soldiers "fit to stand by Caesar, and give direction." These were the soldiers who surveyed, located, and constructed the primitive trails and roads which opened to civilization the wilderness that they themselves had first explored. Meriwether Lewis and William Clark—young Army officers—in the early 1800's were leaders of an expedition of less than half a hundred soldiers, guides, and interpreters, who set forth up the Missouri River, moved over the wide rolling prairies of the Midwest, crossed the rugged, forbidding Rockies, and, descending the Snake and Columbia Rivers, reached the western ocean. Traversing and retraversing the country between the Father of Waters and the waters of the Pacific, surveying and mapping as they forced their tortuous way through regions never before beheld by the eyes of white men, they made contributions of inestimable worth to the later development of what is now our great Northwest. Six years later, veterans of this 8,000-mile trek engaged in the campaigns of the War of 1812—as did Zebulon Pike—their souls steeled to meet the perils of war through the hardships undergone during peacetime battles with the forces of Nature.

In 1838 Lt. John Fremont undertook the first of his explorations west of the Mississippi, which were to earn for him the sobriquet of the "Pathfinder." Nine years later the "Pathfinder" was to play a prominent role in the conquest of California during the period of hostilities with Mexico.

Likewise, the muster rolls of the contending forces during the War between the States were replete with the names of officers and soldiers who, in the era following the termination of the War with Mexico, had pioneered in surveying the newly gained territories and in developing the communications of its sparsely settled areas.

The old Cumberland Pike, running from Maryland's panhandle westward to St. Louis on the Mississippi, was a monument to the Army's pioneering construction activities, as were the Chesapeake & Ohio and the Erie Canals. And, as the covered wagons of the first small groups of settlers, as the first stage coaches, as the first commercial caravans slowly moved into the newly opened regions over overland routes located by the blue-clad soldiers, the same blue-clad soldiers afforded the protection essential to the advancing forces of civilization.

The Great Lakes survey was a project allotted to the Army, which also surveyed and marked practically every mile of our international frontiers and many thousands of miles of our State boundaries. Our great transcontinental rail lines were projected by Army personnel. The Baltimore & Ohio, the Boston & Albany, the New York, New Haven & Hartford, the Erie—to name but a few—were among the railways of this country located, constructed, and, in many instances, initially operated under military auspices. Erection of a number of our first lighthouses was a task which devolved upon military personnel, as did completion of the Washington Monument and construction of the Library of Congress, the wings and dome of the Capitol Building, and the Lincoln Memorial, familiar sights to millions of American citizens who have visited the District of Columbia.

Completion of the Panama Canal and the simultaneous eradication of those dread tropical diseases which so ravaged the Isthmus as to thwart completely the French canal enterprise were Army accomplishments.

And let it not be forgotten that for over 100 years there has been entrusted to officers of the Army's Corps of Engineers the development and maintenance of our inland rivers and coastal harbors, and the prosecution of projects which have as their purpose the protection of life and property against the ravages of flood.

For this Army of the United States—throughout the century and a half of its history—"Peace hath had her victories, no less renowned than war."

It was these same agents of peacetime progress who, when the dark clouds of war poured their fury upon the Nation, fought and died under Zebulon Pike before York in 1813, stormed the Rock of Chapuletepec in 1847, defended the stone walls and boulders on the hillsides of Gettysburg in 1863, charged San Juan Hill in 1898, battered at the gates of Peking in 1900, underwent the incredible hardships of the jungle campaigns of the Philippine Insurrection in 1901, and who, in 1918, on the French western front, emerged victorious from combats in which they had been opposed by all the forces of hostile nature and hostile man.

Those soldiers of the past have bequeathed to the soldiers of the present a heritage of loyalty and devotion to duty, continuously manifested throughout the Army's history. Americans may be assured that their land defenders of the present day will assume the responsibilities of the national defense with all the stanchness of purpose—in peace, and, if it is ever fated to come, in war—that characterized the services of their gallant predecessors.

As our Army passes its one hundred fiftieth milestone, a great part of the globe is held in the viselike grasp of Mars. How all encompassing this second world war may eventually become, only the future historian can relate. However, the Government of the United States has determined that insofar as lies within its power, the mailed fist of Mars shall not extend across the oceans to pound upon the Americas. Hence the current precautionary program for strengthening the armaments of our protective forces; hence the recently directed movements of reinforcing units to the Isthmus of Panama and the island of Puerto Rico; hence the President's Executive order authorizing modest increases in the enlisted strengths of the Regular Army and the National Guard—all for the purpose of speaking with authority for peace.

Our national defense forces must be afforded the material means, must be so distributed, and must be given the strength to permit successful accomplishment of the protective missions assigned them.

Young "doughboys" of the infantry and young "red legs" of the field artillery—proud successors to their soldier sires who exercised so vital an influence on the development and preservation of the Republic—soon are to embark for our Caribbean garrisons, there to watch over America's outlying ramparts. As these physically sturdy, mentally alert, and morally upright American youths mount the gangplanks of the Army's transports, surely, from the soldiers' Valhalla, will be bestowed upon them the benedictions of their soldier forefathers. And as they journey southward through tropical seas will go with them the admiration and affection of all true American citizens, for never before have the missions of our Army as a force for peace and the high character and intent of its personnel been so fully appreciated by the people whose homes they defend.

A College President Discusses Our Place in the World Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. VORYS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 2, 1939

ARTICLE BY DR. GEORGE W. RIGHTMIRE

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following discussion by Dr. George W. Rightmire, president emeritus of Ohio State University. A scholar, educator, author of legal works, and distinguished Ohio citizen, he has just returned from a year in Europe, during which he spent months of study in England and also visited many of the nations now involved in conflict. The following discussion, which he has entitled "Keep Us Out of War," stands out as a keen analysis of the present situation as it affects our country:

War rages again, just 20 years after the close of the great World War, which, for more than 4 years, engulfed Europe and much of the civilized world outside in blood and slaughter. The European nations bled each other white.

On the part of Germany and her allies, that war was fought to extend and confirm her national influence; Great Britain and France fought to prevent this, and to maintain their dominance in European politics. Germany's political ambitions clashed with theirs and each side fought to a finish for European supremacy. The European balance of power was the issue, as it has been in innumerable wars in Europe for centuries. This issue involves both political and economic supremacy, and sometimes religion and race have been weighty factors.

WHY WE ENTERED

It was solely to escape these dire conditions in Europe that the ancestors of almost all the Americans today left Europe and came

to this land of hope and opportunity. Yet, we went into the great World War 22 years ago to help England and France. We raised and trained 4,000,000 boys for that war and sent 2,000,000 to face the shells and bayonets and to hold the trenches on the western front. More than a quarter of a million never came back, and Gold Star Mothers since then have made pilgrimages to France to weep at the graves of their boys who fell fighting Europe's battles.

A CRUSADE?

We were enthused, almost frenzied, and were propagandized into the belief that we were entering upon a crusade—

1. To make the "world safe for democracy";
2. To engage in a "war to end war";

and later—

3. To establish and enforce the principle in Europe of "self-determination of peoples."

We recall the end of that titanic struggle—the Treaty of Versailles stripped territory from Germany and her allies and gave it to neighboring states in Europe, and their possessions in other parts of the world were distributed to the British Empire and France and Japan. Germany was considered the arch offender, and the purpose of the treaty was to make it impossible forever for her to rise to power again.

The United States came out of the Great World War without an additional foot of territory, after having advanced billions of dollars' worth of equipment and supplies and having extended credits for other billions—practically all of which remains today an unpaid and ignored debt, owed to us by many European countries. We refused our signature to the Treaty of Versailles, and we declined membership in the League of Nations and in the Permanent Court of International Justice, both of which were created by the treaty. We came out of Europe at the end of the war with a reverberating shout of relief and a Nation-wide chorus of "Never again." An "over" balance of power was established in Europe by the treaty, which the League of Nations was expected to make permanent; but the League itself, as a political factor, accomplished nothing and has long since failed.

DID NOT END WAR

Most of the years since Versailles have witnessed wars in north Africa, east Africa, east Asia, west Asia, and southern Europe, and Germany has recently been steadily taking back in Europe the territory held by the Teutonic powers 25 years ago.

SELF-DETERMINATION

The principle of the "self-determination of peoples" has been found unworkable. Treaty makers could not make enough states in middle Europe to accomplish this, for peoples there of many races and tongues are inextricably intermingled and have been for hundreds of years, and so majority and minority groups were thrust together with an admonition to the majority to respect the rights of the minority. But the problem of the minority peoples in such states has been acute since Versailles. Ancient prejudices persist, each racial group desperately adheres to its language and culture, and these countries bristle with communal antagonisms awaiting the day when they may live again.

SAFE FOR DEMOCRACY

Nor has democracy found the world safe. The Chinese, with the most individualistic notions and practices of all peoples, have for 2 years been suffering all the horrors of war undeclared; Germany, Italy, Poland, Russia, and Spain are clear dictatorships, and there are others of less note; England still rules in India, the Sudan and far-flung territories elsewhere in Africa, and in the isles of the seven seas; France rules vast regions of central and northern Africa and in eastern and western Asia; the United States still is supreme in the Philippines.

SLOGANS

Mankind in all ages has had a fatal weakness for slogans; they have fascinated the people. In the great crusades of eight centuries ago the peoples of Europe marched and fought all the way to Jerusalem, fired with religious fervor by two slogans, "Rescue the holy sepulcher" and "God wills it." They were fatally effective at the time, but mankind has never repeated them since, although the same need has always existed as existed then.

We know that slogans have a way of voicing emotions or enthusiasms which may be artfully and artificially stirred for the occasion, and when they have answered a temporary purpose of arousing to action, they fade away and leave man gasping and perplexed and stultified.

"Make the world safe for democracy," "This is a war to end war," "There shall be self-determination of peoples"—all these mighty, resounding slogans of 1917, which swept us like crusaders into the great World War in Europe—the greatest and most devastating of all history—have not been fulfilled in Europe; they have been repudiated there and have long since been as "sounding brass and a tinkling cymbal" here. As Walpole said two centuries ago:

"Every age has some ostentatious system to excuse the havoc it commits—conquest, honor, chivalry, religion, balance of power, commerce—no matter what—mankind must bleed and take a term for a reason."

These three slogans are powerless to mobilize us again. Their failure and our disillusionment have renewed our determination to "avoid entangling European alliances" and never again to send our young men to die on European battlefields in struggle for European domination and supremacy.

For centuries the nations of Europe have fought among themselves, with allies in one war who were enemies in the next; they have not often warred for eternal principles of right and justice, but for more territory and more power or for curbing the power and ambitions of another—always national self-interest has been at the bottom of their troubles. They have warred upon each other, they have then made treaties of peace, they have altered the line-up and have started new wars in ceaseless round.

Their troubles have always resided within themselves, they have created their own contentions and if they are ever ended permanently it will be because they settle them themselves. Study the map of Europe. It is a bewildering entanglement of national boundary lines across which governments glare at each other, and passport authorities and customs assessors await the traveler who would pass on; through the accidents of past wars a small country may contain several peoples, and each jealously preserves its own language, dress, and customs, and is in reality a racial and political unit.

European peoples have long faced the sublime test of recognizing each other in peace and friendship. European statecraft rests upon a civilization reputed to be the world's highest, and it must accept the responsibility of achieving harmony and cooperation among its suffering and really war-hating peoples. The great common people of each nation declares its abhorrence of war, and it is the supreme task of Europe's statesmen to find the way to peace.

WAR RAGES AGAIN

And now, in 1939, war rages again in Europe. Why? Germany has demanded her old territory from Poland awarded to Poland by the Treaty of Versailles; Poland has defied Germany, England and France have allied themselves with Poland, determined to maintain their paramount influence in European affairs, and to resist further expansion of Germany; they regard further enlargement of Germany as a direct menace to their own safety and integrity. And so the war is on.

Can this be a "war to end war"? No one has made that claim for it, and in the light of experience in the Great World War it would have a ghostlike sound. Can it be a war "to make the world safe for democracy"? Poland is and has been for some years a virtual dictatorship; France and England sought the aid of Russia in their defense of Poland, thus proposing that two democracies and two dictatorships fight the war against a third dictator. Russia is a classic example of dictatorship.

Can it be called a war for the "self-determination of peoples"? It is well known that Poland includes large bodies of Germans, Russians, and Hungarians; England and France rule the destinies of millions of alien peoples, and their self-determination has not been mentioned at this time.

These are the three stirring slogans of the Great World War, powerful then but dismal failures in the crucible of world politics.

WAR PROPAGANDA

And yet the American people must nevertheless be alert to sense and defeat propaganda designed to sweep us into this war. The old slogans are dead, but determined propaganda can make new ones overnight. Slogans appeal to our feelings and emotions, never to our reason. They prompt action and stupefy thinking.

The press and the radio are carrying as news and comment from Europe and America most elusive propaganda tending to show that our coming into this war is only a matter of a short time; that it is, indeed, inevitable.

We are being told that trade and industry would be instantly and vastly stimulated, but we went through all that in the great World War, and after it closed there was a short period of economic decline, then a few years of feverish prosperity, and now 10 long years of unemployment, financial depression, relief, mounting taxes, and monumental debts—all oppressing us today and all of which are traced by our best thinkers back to the waste of men and materials and the social and moral degeneracy which war must always produce.

DO NOT SHARE

We are being reminded of our intimate inheritance from England in language, literature, law, and history as a reason for joining England in this war. But, indeed, we are ever remindful of our inheritance and yield to none in admiration for the British people and respect for their accomplishments all around the seven seas. Yet we must ever remember that we are not sharers in England's foreign policies, nor are we party to the vast range of diplomacy by which the British Empire has been created and is maintained.

The commitments by which Britain holds her international course in Europe, in South and East Africa, in the Sudan, in western Asia, in eastern Asia, and on all the shores washed by the Indian Ocean, are foreign to America and the entire Western Hemisphere. And so long as the war over there goes on we shall be facing new propaganda most plausible and agitating; we must exercise eternal vigilance.

Surely we have not forgotten how we were flooded with European propaganda in the last war. Some strong editorials and radio comment are already analyzing the war motives in Europe today, and are voicing our national purpose to stay out. They should be our natural leaders in correct thinking and action on this matter and should help us to steer a sane course in these times of domestic problems and foreign confusion.

NOT IN "SPHERE"

America is no part of European political policies; we have our own political purposes and ideals. We are not in the "sphere of influence" of any European nation or group of nations.

This war is not of our making; its center is 4,000 miles away in Poland, and the outcome cannot possibly affect our national life

or well-being. The British Empire and France in fighting Germany are serving interests of their own and furthering their own national policies. There is no reason why the United States should send a single soldier to the battlefields of Europe. Our present duty is to maintain a highly adequate defense at home and let Europe settle the troubles which Europe produces in Europe.

What is the thought of the American Legion and the other veterans of foreign wars? What is the thought of the school teachers of the country? Of the businessmen and financiers? Of the ministry? Of the press and the radio? Let us mobilize a body of opinion in the United States today which will demonstrate to the President and Congress our invincible national will to keep out of this war.

Lifting Arms Ban Now Is Held Unlawful

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAMILTON FISH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 2, 1939

LETTER TO NEW YORK TIMES FROM PROFESSORS CHARLES CHENEY HYDE AND PHILIP C. JESSUP, OF COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter written to the editor of the New York Times, under date of September 20, 1939, by Professors Charles Cheney Hyde and Philip C. Jessup, of Columbia University, two of the best known authorities on international law in America, who claim that the lifting of the arms embargo at this time would be an unneutral act.

This is the same viewpoint as held by Professors Bemis, Griswold, and Borchard of Yale University.

The letter is as follows:

LEGAL DOUBT—LIFTING ARMS BAN NOW IS HELD UNLAWFUL

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

The Congress about to convene will be called upon to make a momentous decision—whether it shall remove the existing embargo on munitions of war to belligerent countries. The issue is not merely one of policy; it is rather one of law. To put it differently, the Congress must first consider and decide whether any legal duty rests upon the United States as a neutral not to remove the embargo. The decision on this point needs to be taken before any other can be intelligently or wisely reached.

The situation confronting the United States today is sharply different from that of a month ago, before the war broke out. While peace reigned, no international obstacle hindered Congress from legislating as it might see fit. With the outbreak of war, however, the situation changed overnight. The United States found itself, and still finds itself, as a neutral burdened with a number of well-recognized duties toward all of the warring states. These duties it is not free to alter according to its convenience or preference. The fact that these duties are owed to a belligerent with whose policies it has no sympathy does not change the duties; it merely makes it extremely hard for the Nation to keep its balance and to be guided by its head rather than its heart.

OUR DUTIES AS A NEUTRAL

What are the outstanding duties which the United States as a neutral must respect? Here are a few. Its Government must remain strictly impartial, whatever be the feelings of the people; it must not itself furnish aid to any belligerent; it must not take sides in the war; it must not directly or indirectly assist a favored belligerent at the expense of its foe.

It is true that international law does not normally oblige a neutral state to prevent its citizens from exporting munitions of war from its territory. Yet the freedom from such an obligation vanishes when once the government of the neutral has itself undertaken, as by its statutory law enacted in time of peace, to forbid exportations to belligerents and has made the matter of exportation one of government control. Thereafter, when war ensues, it requires affirmative governmental action to permit exportations of previously forbidden articles from neutral territory.

Hence, relaxation of embargoes after the outbreak of war may in fact and in law amount to governmental participation in the conflict. This is obvious if or when the reason for removing a particular embargo is to aid the cause of one or more of the fighting states which will vastly profit from such action because of their command of the seas. In such a situation the neutral purveyor becomes the special support or prop of the favored belligerent, and the government as well as the people of the neutral becomes in reality a participant in the conflict. Such conduct is, under such circumstances, unneutral and is contemptuous of the legal duty which the law of nations imposes upon every neutral sovereign.

EMBARRASSMENT FOR US SEEN

To be more precise, if the Congress, in order to strengthen the sinews of France and England, removes the present embargo so as to enable those powers to gain a distinct advantage over their enemy, the United States makes itself in fact the ally of those who secure its sustenance. But more than that, such conduct is illegal as well as unneutral and may, if resorted to, place the Nation in a most embarrassing and even hypocritical position when it undertakes to assert its neutral rights which Secretary Hull recently announced we had not abandoned.

The precise ground of objection would be that our Government, having in time of peace asserted control over and forbidden the exportation of munitions in wars which might ensue, cannot relax its grip without affirmative Congressional action; and that such relaxation, being the direct expression of a notorious desire to help a particular cause, constitutes a governmental taking of sides which is unneutral and illegal.

AN ARGUMENT DISCOUNTED

Thus these two factors—the governmental control already achieved by an act of Congress and a governmental desire to relax that control so as to help France and England—would combine to produce a result that the opposing belligerent, Germany, would pounce upon to establish the unneutral aspect of embargo-removing legislation. These factors would render inept and unconvincing the contention that when or if Congress removed an embargo which the United States was not obliged to impose, no legal duty to any belligerent is involved, provided every state engaged in war enjoys equal freedom to help itself to American resources.

The answer is that the manipulation of American governmental control already established through a statutory embargo, with the deliberate design of aiding a particular group of warring powers by an effort that takes cognizance of their relative supremacy at sea, is a deliberate taking of sides which marks intervention in the conflict. Such intervention is not impartial in spirit, and it is not abstention from participation in the war. It is, on the contrary, a specious form of interposition sought to be disguised under a cloak of professed equality of treatment of the opposing contenders. Yet the real character of such conduct shines out like a lighthouse in the fog.

It is not here sought or necessary to press the contention that neutral contributions of munitions of war to belligerent states tend to bring the contributor into the conflict, and to make it the enemy of that belligerent which suffers a distinct detriment from its conduct. At the moment that is a matter of secondary importance. The question of the hour is whether the United States is today, with its present neutrality law on the books, free, under the law of nations, to remove embargoes in order to help the enemies of Germany. It is believed that the United States has not been free since September 3.

HISTORY IS CITED

If this conclusion is correct, what would be the consequences of American unneutral participation in the war as against Germany? It is perhaps unnecessary to consider how Germany as an offended belligerent would seek to vindicate its rights. It may merely be recalled that as a result of Washington's and Jefferson's frank recognition of neutral duties we paid England about $143,000 for our breaches of neutral duty in the 1790's and that in 1873 England paid the United States $15,500,000 for English breaches of neutral duty during the American Civil War.

It is not suggested, however, that our national action should be determined on the basis of fear that we should be liable to pay a bill for damages, no matter how large. It is rather suggested that the United States today, as in the time of President Washington, should be guided by a decent respect for its obligations under international law.

Within the past 2 years, American governmental utterances, embracing those of our faithful and high-minded Secretary of State, have deplored the lawlessness of some other countries and their contempt for the precepts of international law. Such denunciations lose their influence and confidence if the integrity of the Nation is impaired.

ALTERNATIVES SUGGESTED

A country such as our own needs today, when its Congress is summoned for a particular purpose, to consider honestly, resolutely, and fearlessly the question whether it can modify its law, in order to assist one set of belligerents whose cause it favors, without becoming a deliberate violator of the law of nations. Unless it can answer that question affirmatively in the best of faith and in the light of law and practice, it cannot at this time relax its embargoes without besmirching its character as an advocate of international justice.

The United States is free to enter the war as a belligerent if it decides so to do. We express no opinion on the wisdom of such a choice, but if the sympathies and conviction of all its people demand that course of action, it will be taken; let it then be taken boldly and frankly. But if the sober judgment of the American people is that our duty and our interest require that we be neutral, let us follow that course with equal honesty and with respect for that international law of which we pride ourselves on being the champion.

CHARLES CHENEY HYDE.
PHILIP C. JESSUP.

NEW YORK, *September 20, 1939.*

What Are the Rights of Neutrals?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. THORKELSON

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 2, 1939

Mr. THORKELSON. Mr. Speaker, in the Evening Star, September 28, 1939, the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, Senator KEY PITTMAN, is quoted as follows:

> It is vitally important that you understand the attitude of your Congress toward foreign wars and the legislation that will be enacted by Congress at this special session. Numerous petitions and communications that have deluged Members of the Senate clearly demonstrate that these petitions are based either upon ignorance of the intent of Congress or are the result of vicious organized foreign propaganda. For instance, most of these communications contain similar demands, such as "No cash-and-carry," "Don't repeal the embargo on arms, ammunition, and implements of war." * * *
>
> There exists now, since the substitute proposal has been introduced, and published in full in all of the great newspapers of the country and synopses of it in practically every paper of the United States, no reasonable excuse for any misunderstanding by any intelligent citizen of the United States or for the continuance of false propaganda.

I, for one, challenge the article in substance and in fact, for it is misleading, erroneous, and deceptive. The article is pure propaganda to disarm the public as to the danger of the now proposed neutrality legislation.

The distinguished Senator spoke for Congress. I shall speak for myself, and my attitude is that the Senator did not express my views correctly, nor that of those who have expressed their views to me in petitions and letters.

The letters that I have received do not indicate that the people are ignorant, but on the contrary, intelligent and cognizant of congressional weakness. We should not question the people's intelligence, but instead that of such Members of Congress as believe that we can enforce our own neutrality laws on other nations without involving ourselves in war.

The people are very well informed, for they realize that Congress has no constitutional authority to enact legislation international in scope, nor the right to delegate power to the President to enforce such legislation. I hope that Members of Congress will understand if any attempt is made by us to enforce such legislation, it can only end in war. It is for that reason that I object to repeal of the embargo clause, for the Neutrality Act itself, with that clause removed, will give the President power and opportunity to involve this country in war, as was done in 1917.

I maintain, however, that any attempt by us to digress from international law, outside the 3-mile limit, will meet with international disapproval, and any attempt by us to enforce such assumed authority will lead to war.

I am, of course, in accord with repeal of all neutrality legislation as a proper procedure and sounder international position, but I am also extremely fearful of repeal at this time. If repeal is contemplated, Congress must, in order to keep the administration neutral, make it an impeachable offense to issue clearance papers to our ships bound to nations at war and their colonies, to ports in war zones, or to neutral nations for transshipment to nations at war.

For Members of Congress to believe that after having granted the President power by legislation to declare war zones, that he has the magnetism to enforce international acceptance of such zones as he may proclaim, is an overestimation of congressional power and of the President's ability. If he attempts to enforce his proclamation, he would immediately be challenged by other dictators, and that, as you know, is cause for war.

However, if it is the intention of Congress to promote, as in the contemplated neutrality legislation, a competition of international dictators, let us first come to agreement with nations so ruled. I suggest as a remedy for this plague, that all dictatorial megalomaniacs be placed in an arena to fight for leadership among themselves. When the victor emerges he may, in order to give us a breathing spell, be removed to St. Helena as a warning to others with dictatorial aspirations.

Members of Congress should understand that in giving the President power to proclaim or designate war zones, it also gives him power to order clearance for our ships to zones not so designated or proclaimed. Granting such power to unneutral executives is like sending a cab driver up as pilot of an airplane, or giving a stick of dynamite to a child; for it can only end in crashing neutrality and exploding peace.

Is it possible that Members of Congress believe that England would not intercept neutral ships and commandeer contraband cargo bound for Germany? Can any one of us believe that England will permit contraband cargoes to reach such countries as Holland, Finland, Lithuania, Denmark, and other Scandinavian countries, particularly when such cargoes are not in accord with reasonable peacetime demands? Certainly not; for England is now engaged in a tight blockade of Germany, not only of war material but of all food supplies as well. It is the old starvation blockade; an old weapon of Albion. In such blockade, little consideration is given to those who lack food supplies—the ill-clothed, ill-housed, ill-fed—for with England as well as Germany it is a case of winning the war.

Is it now illogical or unreasonable to assume that Germany will not retaliate with a similar blockade upon England, suitable to such means as may be at her command? Of course she will. If Germany lacks a navy to intercept such shipping, and ports for unloading commandeered contraband cargoes, she will, of course, be forced to dispose of such ships and contraband cargoes according to the means at her command. What are Germany's weapons? They are the submarine and the airplane, which means that ships intercepted will be destroyed by gunfire, bomb, or torpedo.

All neutrals may, therefore, expect interception and destruction of ships that carry contraband cargoes to nations at war. We occupy the same position as other neutrals, and the fact that Congress gives the President power to declare war zones does not make it obligatory that other powers accept his designation; for we are no exception to the rule. If we attempt to protect our shipping with convoys, it is equal to declaration of war and will be considered a hostile act by one of the warring powers.

Although it may be recapitulation, allow me to explain this in the following manner:

No statesman will deny that we and other neutrals may expect in accordance with the rules of war to be treated alike; that a ship carrying contraband cargo from the United States, Mexico, or Central America to England is subject to the same rules as a ship carrying contraband cargo from Norway, Sweden, or Finland to Germany. Many of us, however, forget that shipping bound to Prince Edward Island, Bermuda, or the Bahamas, is subject to the same rules of war as shipping bound to England.

Suppose the President leaves these islands, Prince Edward Island, Bermuda, and the Bahamas, out of his proclaimed war zones, and let us further suppose that we clear shipping for such destination with passengers and freight. Now, assuming that one of these ships is lost, say "submarined," who is to blame? No one is to blame but Congress for granting such power to the President, and he for not knowing better than to enforce such stupid legislation.

Do not forget, however, that Congress alone is to be blamed for such legislation. The President will evade responsibility, for he will say: "It is the law." The same excuse we so often hear from department heads, when questions arise in committees in regard to the intent of the law. It is for this reason that I am bitterly opposed to all unconstitutional granting of power to the President or to his appointees, for it makes Congress the goat, and what is more serious, its Members potential traitors to the people that sent them to Congress.

Neutral ships carrying contraband cargo from the United States of America, Mexico, or Central America to England

may, therefore, expect to be intercepted by German submarines or aircraft, and sunk by gunfire, bombs, or torpedoes, for Germany has no available ports for war prizes because her own ports are under blockade by the enemy.

Neutrals ships carrying contraband from Norway, Sweden, or Finland, to Germany, may expect to be intercepted by the British Navy, seized and convoyed to British ports as war prizes, and the cargo commandeered and used by the captor.

Those who have followed my line of reasoning may now agree with me that the only part of the Neutrality Act we have the right to enforce is the arms-embargo clause and the regulation of credit. Foreign nations cannot expect nor compel us to sell anything to them that we refuse to part with. It is that clause the President is asking Congress to repeal. In addition, he asks that we extend credit to buyers. Let me say at this point that such credit is for no other purpose except to help such power as is in control of ocean traffic. If this credit extension is allowed, the taxpayers of the United States will finance the present war for the "invisible government," as we did the World War.

It is this kind of legislation that is passed by those who arrived in Congress in the chariot driven by Mr. Roosevelt. Lost in admiration of the driver, they forget the greater duty to their own people, and follow each other instead, like the elephants in a circus parade. Being well fed and properly trained, they perform when their master cracks his whip.

Let us now look at this from a propaganda angle, for eventually we must face this monster of misrepresentation and deception. Let us suppose that clearance is issued to ships bound for Prince Edward Island, Bermuda, or the Bahamas, and that one or more of these ships falls victim to a submarine blockade. How will the invisible government's propaganda machine react to such loss? Do you not believe it will be a repetition of World War propaganda?

The P. E. P. will swing into action and ask the New Deal, its planning partner, for help, and both will cry to high heaven for aid. Will the papers tell the truth and admit that such blockage is well within the rights of nations at war and not different from that laid down by the English Navy? No!

Let us now again assume that one or more of these ships is lost in fouling a floating mine, or let us even go a little further than that and say that they were sunk deliberately by an interested power, to create war hysteria in the United States. Would it make any difference to the press? No, indeed; for the invisible power that is promoting the war is the same that controls war propaganda. The invisible government's propaganda machine would swing into operation with a barrage of misrepresentation to aline public sympathy with Great Britain and France, as it did in the World War. As I see it now, such propaganda would meet with failure, for we know more about the subversive operation of the invisible government now than we did twenty-odd years ago. If the papers are correct in stating that France and England are determined to go on with the war, let them do so. It is their war, not ours.

It is now generally conceded that the Wilson administration had one foot on a banana peeling and the other in the British war machine. The molding of public opinion did the trick; hatred toward Germany removed the banana peeling and sympathy for England placed the other foot in the British war buggy, which took our people for a ride. We have not forgotten that trip, for it left us with six cemeteries on foreign soil. We paid the running expense for that ride, and we have loaned them money to build a new machine which is now ready to take us for another trip if we repeal the arms embargo clause.

The people, in listening to the World War propaganda, fell into a trap set by the international exploiters. It is the same measly crew that is behind the propaganda which now covers the pages of our daily papers. My reason for replying to this article is due to the fact that it is a subtle type of propaganda which may influence those who have not given due consideration to legislation now requested by an administration that differs only in degree from that of its predecessor of 1917.

When I compare the Wilson and Roosevelt administrations, I have in mind particularly the specter behind the two, and those who, in 1917, when a nation was threatened, left their insidious imprints in an agreement that led us into the World War. The same insidious specters that cast their evil shadows over the Versailles conference were also the dominating influence which guided the pen that drafted the treaty of peace.

When I say the difference between the two administrations is only one of degree, I have in mind that each, and the one before the last, like sprouting leaders are not far apart in obtuseness. As I turn the pages in history, I find that leaders now, as those before, like the elephants in the parade, follow each other into the tent of the invisible government only to perform as those who have gone before.

To continue under this leadership and direction will only end as planned, in enslavement of our people and in national disintegration. The success of this planned destruction is in direct relation to the public's lack of interest and our unwillingness to understand what is happening to this Nation. No one who has the interest of our country at heart should regard this transition without apprehension. Our safety lies in recognizing those who guide the invisible hand that writes democracy and communism, instead of the Republic of the United States.

The danger in legislation that has been enacted for a number of years may be found in the fact that it deprives Congress of its constitutional power and centralizes the same in Federal departments. This is in line with the planned conversion of our Government. This attempt in the destruction of our Republic is not accidental, but is instead a well coordinated movement directed by the invisible government through its agents and representatives in the Federal employ. No one in the invisible government is idle. As a matter of fact, they occupy the more important positions in Federal departments and bureaus. This, of course, is also planned by the invisible government for two reasons: Power and cheapness. Important positions are necessary to keep those who are directing the movement well informed and it is always good business to allow us, the people, to pay the expenses. This is particularly appropriate in this planned destruction of our own Government, for our denseness furnishes amusement for the planners.

All subversive legislation and activities are clothed in innocent titles, and are so flexible that they follow any popular movement, yet never swerve from their ultimate objective—planned destruction of our Government.

The Neutrality Act is a part of this plan. The word "neutrality" is employed because it is pleasing to the public. Let anyone challenge the purpose of the act and see what happens. He is denounced by the proponents of the act as antineutral, and the people blindly rally to the support of the invisible government against the antineutrals only to aid in their own enslavement and destruction.

Innocuous titles, appellations, and slogans are gold bricks handed out by the invisible government to gullible Americans for their aid in laying low patriotic citizens who are opposed to sabotage of the Republic.

Congress must retrieve its lost power by repealing all legislation not in accord or agreement with the fundamental principles set forth in the Constitution of the United States. Our Nation is near the precipice. Shall we wait until it falls, or will you in united effort join and set it back solidly upon the Constitution? It should be obvious to all that the principle of sound government has not changed. It cannot change. It is instead we who are at fault, for we have neglected to carry on with the sublime faith of those who suffered and died to set us free.

The leaders and men we need are those who will dedicate themselves to those principles which are inscribed in the Constitution and so ably interpreted by George Washington and Thomas Jefferson. It is no longer a question of expediency or parties. It is instead all for the United States of

America and for those who dedicate themselves to perpetuation of the fundamental principles of this Nation and perpetuation of the Republic forever and forever.

The Honorable Alfred E. Smith Supports the Plan of President Roosevelt on Neutrality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SOL BLOOM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 2, 1939

RADIO ADDRESS BY FORMER GOV. ALFRED E. SMITH, OF NEW YORK

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an address delivered by the Honorable Alfred E. Smith, on Neutrality, October 1, 1939, over the Columbia Broadcasting System, under the auspices of the American Union for Concerted Peace Efforts:

At the outset of my remarks let me first say that I do not know of anybody—I have never even heard of anybody—in the United States of America who wants this country to go to war. Certainly I do not, for I have three sons of the fighting age; the oldest of them is already in the Army and would be among the first to leave this country in the event that the United States was brought into the European struggle.

So, therefore, the argument, as far as I am concerned, resolves itself into this: What should we do that is best calculated to keep us out of war? In the discussion of this there is no room for personalities, parties, classes, or creeds—all differences must be wiped out in this hour of challenge. Personal interests must be subordinated to the common good. We must be selfish, not for ourselves, but for the whole Nation.

I was brought up in a tough political school, where facts counted for more than theories. My training has been to distinguish between high-sounding principles and actual results. My experience has taught me not to ask, "Has it a lofty purpose?" but to demand an answer to the question, "Does it work?"

The present Neutrality Act does not work. The theory back of it seemed excellent. The principle upon which it rested appeared sound when the act was passed. In the absence of any severe test, the purpose which it contemplated could not have been successfully criticized. But all this has changed. The act has now been tested. It has not met the test and in the coming state of world affairs it can't possibly meet the even more drastic strains of the future. It has been weighed in the balance and found wanting.

ASKS END OF QUIBBLING

I am not the least bit interested in the language of any of the acts so far suggested, nor for that matter in any act that may hereafter be suggested, as to its details. What I am interested in, however, is that course which is best calculated to keep us from being drawn into the European war.

This is no time for technicalities. We should have a prompt decision by Congress on the merits of the question. I don't mean to discourage debate. There is a real question to be argued. What I do advocate, and I am sure the overwhelming majority are with me, is that the debate shall be on the real issue and not on obscure or minor considerations.

Personally, I am not interested in the argument as to whether or not we should return to so-called established principles of international law. I am not a student of law, but I am ready to defend the proposition that there is no respect for international law at this time.

Similarly, I take no stock in quibbling over constitutional questions in connection with the proposed substitute for the present Neutrality Act. Apparently there are some learned people who think we should give a lot of time to a discussion of whether the Constitution of the United States permits Congress or the Senate, as well as the President, to decide that a foreign war exists. What is the difference? The President's decision would be based on conferences with congressional leaders anyway and would be subject to review by Congress. In a crisis there is no time for legalistic hairsplitting.

Let Congress go straight to the real issue and let Congress decide it, because, after all, Congress speaks for all the people of the country; that is my understanding of democratic, representative government.

AGREES WITH ROOSEVELT

"The Neutrality Act as it stands today prevents the sale to a belligerent nation of any completed implements of war, but it allows the sale of many types of uncompleted implements of war, as well as all kinds of general materials and supplies." These words are taken from the speech of the President of the United States when Congress convened last week.

He further says that the present law allows such products of industry and agriculture to be taken in American ships to belligerent nations, and he concludes that therein lies the definite danger not only to our neutrality but to our peace. I am unable, in the light of history, to understand how that statement can be successfully disputed.

Let us go back into history, or, as I have many times said, let's look at the record. Many reasons were advanced as the cause of our entering the World War 22 years ago.

Nobody can truthfully say, in the light of history, that Woodrow Wilson was anxious to plunge this country into the World War. In fact, he leaned in the directly opposite way. Long before he called upon Congress to declare war against the Imperial Government of Germany, because of the sinking of American ships, there was a distinct feeling throughout the country that we should go to war, to vindicate the dignity and the majesty and the sovereignty of this great Republic. In a conversation with his secretary in 1916, after a submarine had sent an American ship to the bottom, he said: "I will not be rushed into the war, no matter if every last Congressman and Senator stands up on his hind legs and proclaims me a coward."

However, in the latter part of January of 1917 Germany announced to the United States that she was going to begin on February 1 unrestricted submarine warfare in the zone around the British Isles and undertook to specify the route which a restricted number of American ships might take through this zone. When the secretary to the President brought that Associated Press bulletin to the White House and showed it to the President, he said: "This means war. The break that we have tried so hard to prevent now seems inevitable."

FACING SAME SITUATION

Here we are under the present Neutrality Act facing that exact situation. The law as it now stands allows supplies to a belligerent country to be carried in American ships; supplies which will be needed for the prosecution of the war, although not named in the Neutrality Act.

But all of that seems to me to be entirely beside the question in view of the attitude of the German Government as shown by the destruction of two Swedish steamships. The attitude of Berlin to the sinking of these two ships clearly indicates that the German Government does not recognize any difference between the goods covered by the American embargo and the goods that are not covered by the embargo. That means that anything delivered to belligerent nations in American ships puts the ship in danger of destruction and means the loss of the lives of American seamen.

I believe that we should prevent the transportation in American ships of any goods of any kind, war goods or other goods, contraband or noncontraband, or any passengers to the warring nations. It is undoubtedly the absence of such a law in 1917 that brought us into the World War. There is only one way of avoiding a repetition of this experience, and that is by keeping American ships and American passengers out of trade with belligerents.

The distinction between contraband and noncontraband, war material and nonwar material is essentially the bunk. As a matter of fact, the Swedish boats were carrying lumber, and that was declared to be contraband of war because it is used for shoring in coal mines, which produces fuel necessary for the production of war materials.

As I have said, in this war the Germans have already declared there is no such distinction as far as they are concerned. They take the position—if I read the papers aright—that everything routed to the British Isles is contraband of war, and they put it upon the ground that no belligerent can afford to buy anything at the present time that is not absolutely necessary to the prosecution of the war.

In view of this and in the light of the German attitude to the sinking of the Swedish ships, those who oppose amendment to the present Neutrality Act are compelled to take the position—let them sink the ships. Those who desire the Neutrality Act amended take the position that we will not let the ships go where they can be sunk.

PLOWSHARES INTO SWORDS

The Bible speaks of beating swords into plowshares. By the same token plowshares can be beaten back into swords. Armies travel on their feet and on their stomachs, and therefore shoes and food can be regarded as war material and contraband.

Under these circumstances we should keep American ships and American passengers out of the export business and let the purchasers come and get what they need by paying cash and carrying it away in their own ships.

I read by the papers that the Members of Congress are being deluged with letters, the purpose of which is to convince them that we should keep out of the war. Right! The news article said that most of the letters come from people who do not desire any amendment to the Neutrality Act. That is probably because they do not understand it. I would suggest that those who believe, after a study, that amendment is best calculated to keep us out of the war should also write to their Representatives in Congress.

Therefore, I repeat, the question before Congress is which of the two measures is best calculated to keep us out of war—the present Neutrality Act or the amendments suggested by the President.

It is because I firmly believe in my heart and soul that the amendments suggested by the President are best calculated to save us from the scenes that we witnessed in 1917 when our American boys were starting for France that I am at this microphone tonight, appealing to the American people to stand solidly behind the President because he is so clearly right, so obviously on the side of common sense and sound judgment and of patriotism, that only those who lack an understanding of the issue will oppose him. I urge this with all the sincerity I possess, with the profound conviction that I speak for the good of the Nation which we all love so much.

Neutrality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM W. BLACKNEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 2, 1939

Mr. BLACKNEY. Mr. Speaker, I desire at this time to present some facts pertaining to the all-important question of neutrality. I question whether there has been any subject before the American Congress in many years that has enlisted public attention as had the discussion on the question of neutrality, and this is wisely so, for the reason that our American citizens just naturally are vitally interested in this subject because they are the ones who will directly bear the results of unneutral legislation.

Here at Washington we hear a great deal said about propaganda with reference to this subject. Those who favor the President's legislative program pertaining to neutrality are very prone to assert that letters coming in opposed to this legislation are propaganda. This statement is not true. If the citizens of America, in the respective congressional districts thereof, write their Congressmen on legislation in which they are vitally interested, that certainly is not propaganda, but their lawful right in expressing their convictions to their Congressmen who, after all, are but the agents of their constituents.

I have received thousands of letters from my district on the subject of neutrality. I have read these letters, all of them, with interest, because they contain an earnest appeal from fathers and mothers and other citizens of my district, expressing their views upon this all-important subject. I, personally, am glad to receive these letters. It is a fine thing in America when our citizenry takes interest in government. It is a wholesome sign, because it shows that they are vitally interested in governmental problems and policies.

Many Americans believe that our isolation policy was first enunciated in Washington's Farewell Address in 1796. However, this statement is not true because the roots of this doctrine go far back into our colonial history. It was the viewpoint promoted by most leading Americans many years before Washington delivered his Farewell Address. Our colonial forefathers came here in the hopes that they could find refuge and a sanctuary from the perpetual quarrels and wars of Europe. These wars have been going on for centuries and may continue for centuries more, regardless of what the United States may do, or may not do.

Our colonists' hopes, however, were soon changed. The lands they occupied still remained colonies of Europe. They still found themselves entangled in the great struggle of European democracies for world balance of power. That is identically the same reason for which we are being urged to meddle in Europe today.

The fact that our American Colonies were automatically involved in European wars, in which wars they had no direct interest, was one main reason for the Declaration of Independence and the beginning of the American Revolution. During the early months of the revolution, John Adams said—

We ought to lay it down as a first principle and a maxim never to be forgotten, to maintain entire neutrality in all future European wars.

Our revolutionary history shows that Washington, Adams, Jefferson, Madison, Monroe, George Mason, Alexander Hamilton, Richard Henry Lee, and practically every other American statesman at that time were all advising America that its welfare lay in refraining from entering into entangling alliances and quarrels with Europe.

Their wisdom could be summed up in this way, "We will keep out of Europe—Europe keeps out of America." This statement was really the enunciation of the Monroe Doctrine, which has been so vital in the history of America. Our traditional policy toward Europe has been isolation from their politics, quarrels, and wars, but maintaining relations on the issues of commerce, peace, and friendship. Let me quote from Washington's Farewell Address, to which I have previously alluded. Note how pertinent the statements still are today:

Why forego the advantages of so peculiar a situation? Why quit our own to stand upon foreign ground? Why, by interweaving our destiny with that of any part of Europe, entangle our peace and prosperity in the toils of European ambition, rivalship, interest, humor, or caprice?

The policy of our Government, in general, has been to refrain from foreign involvements, and that policy has been successful for our country. It has increased the United States from an original population of 3,000,000 until we have a population today of 130,000,000. That policy should be continued in the future.

The people of America are bitterly opposed to our emergence in a world war. We are not forgetful of the last World War, with its 8,500,000 killed, 22,000,000 injured, 7,500,000 captured and missing. Neither are we unmindful of America's casualties in that World War. We mobilized some 5,000,000 of the finest of our youth, sent 2,000,000 of them to fight in Europe, with 350,000 casualties, including 125,000 dead. Neither are we unmindful of the billions of dollars that America spent in the World War.

The time has come in America when our first duty is to our country and to the 130,000,000 people comprising the United States, our citizens. We have all the problems here that we can safely handle in order to preserve the heritage of our great Nation.

The best way to keep out of future wars is to remove as many as possible of the causes that contributed to our involvement in past wars. This is the prime purpose of our neutrality legislation. It should be American legislation, designed to help preserve the peace of America. There is no proper place in such legislation for futile and dangerous attempts to insure peace throughout the world, to punish far-distant aggressors, or to equalize the existing inequities between nations. Picking the aggressor is a most difficult and dangerous task. The unequal application of our neutrality laws is not neutrality.

We are not going to have freedom from war unless we are willing to give up the trade profits that drag us into war. Is it not better to give up millions in war profits, if that be necessary, without the surrender of a single life, rather than go into a war that will cost billions in money, the deaths of untold numbers of American youth, and that may mean the ultimate destruction of our free Government?

The overwhelming majority of the people of this country wants us to keep America out of war. The overwhelming majority of the Congress wants to keep America out of any European war. Therefore, thoughtful care should be given to any neutrality bill before it becomes the law of the land.

Wars are not launched by the people. They are started by leaders—leaders looking for power and fame; but first they must fan the fires of prejudice and hate in order that the people will follow. Americans are determined this time not to be swayed either by the propaganda of the warring

nations or by the excitements of those at home who cannot keep their heads.

It will not be difficult to keep the United States out of this war. All it will need is a determined will to stay at peace, manifested by the American people and by the Nation's leaders. No legislation should be passed that will involve the United States in foreign entangling alliances or that will send American troops abroad.

We cannot afford to get mixed up with European diplomacy and European politics, and European alliances, all of which change from day to day. We should not fight for foreign causes on foreign battlefields. It is neither obligatory nor prudent for America to do so.

It is advisable that American citizens should be prohibited from traveling on vessels of all countries engaged in war; that shipments of American-owned goods on vessels of all countries engaged in war should be prohibited; that all sales to such countries should be paid in cash before loading and goods carried by buyer not on American ships; that no credits or loans should be extended to any country engaged in war; that our citizens should be notified to get out of all countries engaged in war or stay at their own risk; that we should maintain democracy under the American concept; that our Army and Navy and air forces should be increased and perfected for the successful defense of our country against aggression; that all subversive influences in the United States must be removed; that no propaganda on the part of the aggressor nations should be permitted to destroy our American democracy; that we should remember it is the voice of the American people and not the voice of foreign propagandists to which the Congress and the President must listen.

Events in Europe have placed upon the President and the Congress the grave responsibility of keeping the United States out of war. Our people want neutrality and peace. It is inevitable that differences of opinion have arisen over how best to make this universal desire effective. But it is unthinkable that those charged with such grave responsibility should be influenced by petty partisan considerations of domestic politics. The danger is that they may be influenced by partisan considerations in international politics.

In the weeks to come momentous decisions must be made. The test of those decisions must always be whether they will tend to keep the United States out of war. They must never reflect a desire to help one group of belligerents over another.

Moreover, our people demand that these decisions shall represent the combined wisdom and best judgment of all who must share responsibility for them. They will not condone blind following of one-man leadership, no matter how disinterested or inspiring that leadership may be.

We are an emotional people and deep and quick in our sympathies. All too frequently in recent years we have been beguiled in our domestic affairs by appeals to our hopes and to our fears. In our international outlook we have been in constant danger that frantic appeals to our prejudices and equally frantic appeals to our sympathies would breed a tension or intolerance or an unreasoning devotion to causes abroad that would bring into our country all of the hates and the cleavages of sympathies which underlie the appalling situation in Europe.

In a topsy-turvy world, in which many sins are being committed in the name of democracy, we must distinguish between real democracy and the sham and pretense which seeks to masquerade under democracy's cloak.

We must not forget that for centuries Europe has been torn by the wars engendered by power politics; that the touchstone of the foreign policy of every European nation always has been national self-interest.

We must not forget that the history of Europe is a sordid story of broken pacts, reversed policies, secret treaties, and hidden treacheries. We must not forget that the United States entered the World War without Congress or the people having any knowledge of the secret treaties which existed among the Allies.

We must not forget that fighting Europe's battles is not the best way to preserve our civilization, and we must no longer delude ourselves with the vain hope of making the world safe for democracy, but realize that we are facing the grim necessity of keeping democracy safe in the United States.

The Neutrality Acts of 1935 and 1937 were passed virtually unanimously by Congress when there was no public excitement or danger of war and when Congress could put its unprejudiced thought to the preparation of a proper neutrality bill, which bill was approved by the President. I see no reason now why, in time of European war, there should be a sudden departure from that neutral policy which had met with virtual unanimity by both Congress and the President, unless the proposed amendments to the existing law should greatly strengthen that legislation.

I personally favor a strict neutrality law with teeth in it, rigidly enforced, and my votes shall always be cast to best protect America in this respect and to prevent her from being embroiled in European entanglements.

Put Control of Rivers Under Maritime Board

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VINCENT F. HARRINGTON

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 2, 1939

EDITORIAL FROM THE SIOUX CITY (IOWA) TRIBUNE

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include therein an editorial from the Sioux City (Iowa) Tribune, written by Mr. O. L. Brownlee:

PUT CONTROL OF RIVERS UNDER MARITIME BOARD

Congress should lose no time in voting down the Wheeler-Lea railroad bill and in adopting a resolution calling for a special study of the inland-navigation question with the view of divorcing water and rail transportation and placing the inland lakes and streams under the jurisdiction of the United States Maritime Commission.

Probably two-thirds of the Members of the Senate and House who voted for the Wheeler-Lea bill, now in conference committee, did so on the theory that inland navigation should be regulated in some way by some governmental body. Lacking anything but an elementary knowledge of the subject, it did not occur to them that the Interstate Commerce Commission is not the proper body.

Congress—and the public, too—has been considering inland navigation from the standpoint of coordinating it with rail and truck transportation. Long study of this question and knowledge of the railroad bias which exists in the Interstate Commerce Commission has convinced this newspaper that we should approach the inland navigation problem from the standpoint of coordination with intercoastal, coastal, and international shipping, that all navigation problems should be integrated and placed under the direction of a central body.

This opinion is supported by the action of an important committee of Congress itself in the last session. The House Committee on Merchant Marine reported favorably the Bland bill which would place all inland navigation matters under the jurisdiction of the Maritime Commission. Congressman HARRINGTON, of Sioux City, is a member of that committee and voted to report the Bland bill favorably. The bill was held up in the House by action of the Rules Committee which gave precedence to the Wheeler-Lea bill because that measure previously had passed the Senate.

The Wheeler-Lea bill emerged in such condition, due to amendments, that it is not certain the railroads want it as the measure stands and no community now served or which may be served by water transportation wants it. In view of the hodge-podge the measure now represents and the widespread dissatisfaction with it, Congress should back up and start all over again. Bad legislation is worse than no legislation.

Even if Congress is not prepared to accept the Bland bill, although it bears a favorable committee report, Congress has a duty to itself and to the country not to pass legislation which would strangle inland navigation and to learn more about the subject before attempting to legislate on it. The Maritime Commission understands navigation problems which is more than can be said for the Interstate Commerce Commission some of whose members probably couldn't distinguish between a twin-screw motorship and a scow.

We Need Sound Thoughts on Neutrality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN G. ALEXANDER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 2, 1939

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, in this very difficult situation which the United States finds itself in as a result of the international turmoil now engaging much of Europe and Asia in war it is necessary that we do some sound and constructive thinking.

Among upward of 6,000 messages and petitions which I have received on the subject since September 21 there are many which are wise and thoughtful. From this group I have picked out one which to me sums up the combined opinion of nearly all the messages received to date, and I am consequently asking that it be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, together with my reply to same, with the hope that it may have some influence in the important decisions which must be made here in Washington during the next few weeks.

I hope many people will take time to read the following letter:

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., *September 26, 1939.*

Hon. JOHN G. ALEXANDER,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR JOHN: According to press reports you and the rest of the Minnesota boys are taking the same stand on the Neutrality Act that I believe in. Nevertheless, you will have to make some more converts in order to keep the President from overriding you.

Inasmuch as your constitutents' letters are the principal way in which you can tell what they are thinking, I would like to make a few brief remarks.

From the President's many speeches I think there is no question but what he is doing his best to emphasize his hatred for the dictators and their brutalities. He even emphasizes this in his speeches asserting the neutrality of this country. In his speech about a week ago, he put it very plainly. He said we should be absolutely neutral, but we ought to help the Allies.

If the President actually thinks the best way for us to keep from sending men overseas is to do all we can to aid England and France—and not be neutral—why doesn't he come right out and say so in so many words in order that the average man on the street can believe in his sincerity? As it is, his speeches are beginning to get that insincere tone so common to Herr Hitler's utterances. I take it from what the President has said that he wants this country to keep out of actual armed conflict, but does not want us to be neutral, and thinks we can under the guise of neutrality actually give material assistance to the Allies and still keep out of war. If he would only say this in specific words, it would help. Maybe he is right, and maybe that is what we ought to do, but if we are to take that course it should be stated plainly and without any "weasel" wording.

I do not agree with this viewpoint at all. It is quite evident that this war is the result of the Versailles Treaty and the actions of France and, to some extent, England doing all they could to harm Germany and hold her down ever since the last war. The Germans are too great a people to be permanently held down, and they naturally followed the first leader who promised to give them back their self-respect, etc. Inasmuch as it is not our fault, but the fault of the Allies, that Germany was driven into its present bad position, I do not think we should take sides to cure the situation, because of the terrible price we shall have to pay if we do get mixed up in it. Of course, we all hate Hitlerism, etc., but will our participation in this event the way the President suggests be the best thing for this country? I don't think so.

I believe the present embargo against the sale of arms and completed materials of war should stand; that we should sell food, clothing, metals, and other materials not strictly munitions of war to anyone who will provide the money to pay for them and the bottoms in which to carry them away.

I believe we should manufacture plenty of airplanes, cannons, tanks, etc., of the latest and best designs, and should experiment and try to improve the design and manufacture of these articles, but should keep them for our own use. It is quite possible that the time is coming when we will need a navy at least twice the size we now have, and probably three times the size, because it is not improbable that in 15 or 20 years, or perhaps 3 or 4 years, we will have to deal with a combination of Germany, Russia, and Japan. If we have an army of a million men or more with ample equipment for modern mechanized warfare, a navy in each ocean competent to deal with any aggregation which might be brought to bear against us in either ocean, and a fleet of airplanes which would down any combination of air fleets which might be brought to bear against us, then we will be safe from outside military aggression.

The above contemplates a staggering expense, but we could do that for a lot less than the forty or fifty billion dollars which we would have to spend if we should get into the present war.

I would suggest that you call attention of all the embargo-repealing Congressmen to the mail they are undoubtedly getting and the probability of their defeat the next time they go to the polls if they do not listen to the people and vote on this vital measure the way the man on the street wants them to vote. Well-to-do people who have money invested in "war baby" stocks or commodities, etc., cannot help but have their interests somewhat warped by the contemplation of increased profits if we can sell completed ammunitions, etc. The ordinary man is more likely to disregard this phase as not affecting him and think more of what is going to happen to his boys. If Congress should recess for a week or 10 days before taking a vote on this matter and all Congressmen go home and make a few hundred house-to-house calls, they would find out what the people really think and how they will have to vote if they want to remain in public life.

Respectfully yours,

G. V. T.

SEPTEMBER 30, 1939.

DEAR MR. T.: I cannot adequately express to you my deep appreciation of your letter of the 26th regarding the neutrality problem.

I wish to quote to you, however, an excerpt from a letter which I wrote recently to one of my lawyer friends in Minneapolis who had written me somewhat along similar lines, which is as follows:

"I cannot see how the President or anyone else can espouse the cash-and-carry program for munitions without going to the aid of the beneficiaries of such a program to the fullest extent. Viewed from this angle, I think their action is dishonest or cowardly, or both. It is dishonest inasmuch as they are not giving the people the full expression of their viewpoint, and it is cowardly in that they are not willing to go to the limit to back up their viewpoint."

You will note how close this thought coincides with the fourth paragraph of the first page of your letter.

I am also deeply convinced of the necessity to proceed at once to double the size of our Navy, and, as you say, tripling it would be better. I think what we need in the way of an Army is more men trained to serve as officers.

I am sure if every Congressman were to receive thousands of letters from back home such as I have received during the past 3 weeks, they would not have to make any house-to-house call to be conscious of what the people think about the neutrality problem. I have had approximately 6,000 messages regarding the situation which exists here in Washington, and of that number not more than 25 are in favor of the President's program.

I am sure you will not object to my insertion of your very fine letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I feel that it is a message which should be brought to the attention of more people than myself, consequently I beg your indulgence in the liberty which I am taking therewith.

Believe me to be,

Most sincerely yours,

JOHN G. ALEXANDER.

In Hitler's speech of September 19 he asserted that Germany was going to respect the sovereignty and rights of Russia. Of course he is, because he fears their huge military machine. He did not fear Poland's Army, and you see the consequences. Shall we not beware?

It is terrible to be forced into a situation where we have to admit this, but we might as well face the cold, unpleasant facts of militarism in today's world.

Anyone who has really gotten down to serious study and hard thinking in this matter has doubtless reached the conclusion that there are only two answers to the question of war—only two methods whereby we may safeguard our peace—either the huge military machine, the way Russia has trod, or an international police force operated under a world-wide federation proportionally contributed by each nation for the purpose of maintaining peace and preserving law and order.

Under present world conditions the latter method is out of the question. Therefore, I assume the United States must, for its own peace and safety, pursue the former, as both of the above letters suggest. It is too bad we have to do so—too bad for such wastefulness to be necessary, but how else can we protect ourselves and preserve our freedom?

Our Heritage of Justice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. HOOK

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 2, 1939

ADDRESS BY HON. FRANK MURPHY, ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Hon. Frank Murphy, Attorney General of the United States, upon the sesquicentennial of the Department of Justice of the United States of America, in the Great Hall, Department of Justice Building, Washington, D. C., September 25, 1939:

In Europe and Asia today, many of the mightiest nations on earth are engaged in arbitrating their differences by the mass destruction of human life. Here, we peacefully celebrate the one hundred and fiftieth birthday of an organization dedicated to the settlement of differences tolerantly, by the rule of reason, under laws that apply equally to all.

That record of impartial justice, impartially administered for a century and a half, is a proud inheritance of all of us who carry on the Department's work. And today, especially, it is a heritage to be guarded jealously. For on its preservation the safety of democracy itself very heavily depends.

Look at the history of the vanished democracies of Europe and of the autocracies that have risen in their stead. Of course, it is partly a picture of economic insecurity and social chaos, but it is also a picture of failure to keep the institutions and processes of democracy clean and efficient. It is a picture of democratic governments that failed not only to keep their people physically secure but also to keep the people's faith in the integrity and the efficiency of their government. And when that happened the governments at fault were inevitably swept away.

We cannot let that happen here. We have managed to keep for a century and a half a system of human living which, despite its imperfections, represents the goal of thoughtful men, great and humble alike, since the dawn of human history. The thinkers of today—those who love justice and liberty—are looking to America to keep that system safe in a world gripped by war.

Our great duty and obligation is to show that we are worthy of this trust.

With a steady purpose in our hearts, we must free our public life of everything dishonest and unclean. If there is one thing that a democratic people should not excuse in any democratic government, it is official corruption and crime. More than anything else, corruption destroys the integrity of government. More than anything else, it disheartens the people and kills their faith in government. And unless we stamp it out, unless we protect the integrity of government, we should not hope for democracy to succeed.

We have a duty, also, to protect and improve the efficiency of government—to provide the essential services effectively and economically. We know, in the main, how this can be done. We know that there must be freedom from the spoils system. We know there must be high standards and careful methods of choosing personnel, and a modern system of managing personnel once they are chosen.

There is no part of our job more important today than the protection of civil liberties. The world has been racked for many years by waves of intolerance that have destroyed the rights of minorities in other lands and reached even into our own midst. We are told by some that the way to recovery and peace is to crush one group or another that supposedly is to blame for all our troubles.

There is nothing for us in such a course but sorrow and tragedy. America was not built to its present greatness by intolerance, and we will not solve our present troubles by intolerance. We are one people—no matter how many the races and religions and nations that make up our population. Only as one people can we correct the conditions that are holding us back. But we will remain one people only as long as we religiously and meticulously protect the rights and liberties of every individual and group among us.

There is one final duty of this Department and of the entire Nation that I have in mind especially today. It is the duty of being alert and ready to cope with those whose aim or mission it may be to sabotage and undermine this greatest citadel of human freedom left on earth.

We are a nation whose creed is to live and let live. We practice the principles of equal justice and equal rights for all, regardless of race or creed or national origin. We have practiced those principles for a century and a half, even though we have known that by so doing we were giving the enemies of democracy a perfect field of operation. It is our intention to adhere to those principles. But at the same time we do not need to close our eyes to the fact that certain elements in our midst may be willing to take advantage of this situation—to use the protection of those very principles of equal justice and equal rights for all—to promote and foster a system under which the principles themselves would be utterly destroyed.

There are well-meaning individuals who fear that by taking action to protect democracy against that kind of activity we will in fact make inroads upon democracy.

I recognize the sincerity of that position, but I do not believe it is based on a realistic view of the nature of democracy. I do not believe that loyalty to democratic ideals precludes a democratic nation from bracing itself against realities in a world where, for the moment at least, might is the test of survival. I do not believe we would serve democracy by standing silent and apathetic while the agents of autocracy and subversive elements plan and scheme and work to establish a system that would mean the end of democracy and freedom and equal rights for all.

Freedom of speech, freedom of the press, and freedom of religion—these things that are the very heart and soul of our lives can and must be preserved. But while preserving them we can be on guard against the enemy in our ranks and keep ourselves fully informed about their movements. We can be mindful of lurking danger and prepared to act wisely and judiciously, but firmly and effectively, when such action may be necessary to preserve our free institutions from undoing.

That, after all, is the sum and substance of our task—to keep freedom alive in a world where more and more of mankind are seeing freedom slip from their grasp. The voices of humanity call to America to avoid that fate. My conviction is that we will.

PRESS COMMENTS

One hundred fifty years of progress in the administration of American justice was observed on September 24, 1939, when the Department of Justice marked its sesquicentennial. The Attorney General of the United States, the Honorable Frank Murphy, addressed the employees of the Department of Justice on Our Heritage of Justice, on Monday, September 25, 1939.

"Upon this happy occasion the Department rededicates itself to the task of safeguarding human rights, civil liberties, and equitable justice," Attorney General Murphy said in a statement issued to the press.

The post of Attorney General was created by the Judiciary Act of September 24, 1789, which provided for a Supreme Court with a Chief Justice and five Associate Justices, a district court and a district judge for each of the States, and three circuit courts.

Gov. Edmund Randolph, of Virginia, legal adviser to President George Washington, was nominated to fill the position at an annual salary of $1,500, and occupied the office of Attorney General in the Federal Capital in New York City.

With the removal of the seat of government to Washington, the various departments were housed in nondescript buildings grouped about President Washington's house. No accommodations whatever were provided for the Attorney General, who was expected to furnish his own quarters, fuel, stationery, and clerk.

In 1822 the Attorney General was furnished with his first official quarters—one room on the second floor of the old War Department building. There the office was maintained until 1839, when the Attorney General, whose staff now consisted of a clerk and a messenger, and who had acquired the nucleus of a library, moved into rooms located on the second floor of the Treasury Building.

Sixteen years later the office was removed to a brick building on the southeast corner of Fifteenth and F Streets. Here it remained until 1861 when, upon the completion of the south wing of the Treasury, a suite of rooms was provided on the first floor of the new addition.

Finally, after 81 years of existence, the office of the Attorney General had expanded to such an extent, both in functions and in personnel, that it became in reality one of the executive departments of the Government.

In recognition of this fact, the Congress enacted the law of June 22, 1870, which established the Department of Justice. Today the Department of Justice—the largest law office in the world—is housed in a spacious building, opened in October 1934, which occupies an entire city block between Ninth and Tenth Streets.

Today the affairs and activities of the Department of Justice are generally directed by the Attorney General who has, as his chief aides, the Solicitor General, the Assistant to the Attorney General, the Special Assistant Attorney General, six assistant attorneys general, the Assistant Solicitor General, the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Director of the Federal Bureau of Prisons, the Director of the Bureau of War Risk Litigation, the Director of the Bond and Spirits Division, and the Administrative Assistant to the Attorney General.

In addition, United States attorneys and their assistants, United States marshals and deputies, personnel in the field offices of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, field employees of the Federal Bureau of Prisons, and others, are among the 11,000 persons employed by the Department of Justice.

Neutrality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. WILL TAYLOR
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 2, 1939

LETTER FROM CHARLES D. HILLES

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

SEPTEMBER 14, 1939.

Mr. E. WORTH HIGGINS,
Managing Editor, the United States News,
Twenty-second and M Streets NW., Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HIGGINS: You ask: "Are you, or are you not, of the opinion that under present conditions 'politics should be adjourned' while the administration attempts to discharge its grave responsibility to the people?"

I think the administration should abate its activity in domestic politics and direct its energies exclusively toward support of the President in keeping the country on an even keel. Partisan politics in recent months has centered around the President's vindictive assault upon Democratic Senators who would not do his bidding. The people in many States passed directly upon the "purge" proposals and rebuked the President. There were repercussions and reprisals in the session of Congress that followed. Much of the bad blood flows from those incidents and encounters.

The urge of the President for unity has not been apparent during the years that a state of war has existed in Japan, China, Italy, and Ethiopia. For years also a state of violence has been consuming Spain, yet there was no abatement of the political activities of the President. It is true that the war in which Great Britain, France, Germany, and Poland are engaged is on a larger scale, but international principles and rules are the same.

A clamor for peace in time of war is easily raised, and is usually raised, by those who wish to thwart the Government. Today's clamor for a wartime political truce, suddenly pushed into undue prominence, was obtruded upon the public notice so as to become the universal subject of conversation on next Wednesday, when the Congress meets to reverse the recently revised position of the Government in the matter of neutrality.

The United States is not at war and does not intend to become involved in the war of others. More than 90 percent of our people are determined we shall not be drawn in. The suggestion that we follow the lead of Great Britain and create at this time a coalition Cabinet is a part of the proposal that politics should be adjourned. But Great Britain did not enlarge her Cabinet until after Parliament had announced that a state of war exists, and even then those who were invited into the Cabinet were men whose fundamental views were shared by Mr. Chamberlain and his associates. There was an intraparty division. Mr. Chamberlain and Mr. Eden held violently divergent views, it is true, as do Mr. Roosevelt and certain Democrats. If we are to follow the British pattern, we will wait until we are at war and will then invite Senators GLASS, BAILEY, and TYDINGS into the official family.

There are vitally important domestic problems to be solved. The evils which arise from innovations in an orderly government in the long run commonly overbalance the good. There are very great differences of opinion as to the wisdom of policies of government introduced by Mr. Roosevelt that concern the destiny of the country. Bona fide sine die adjournment of politics would mark the beginning of a dictatorship. If the country had not been convinced before the outbreak of war that the New Deal is determined to destroy the third-term precedent in order to continue Mr. Roosevelt in office indefinitely our people might feel differently about the proposed moratorium.

The surrender of restraint and of basic liberties of men is responsible for the war into which Europe has been plunged. In striving to avoid involvement in the second world war we must not make the mistake of joining the world movement toward concentrated executive power. If the situation is so grave that it justifies the suggestion of an adjournment of politics, the President should not bear the burden alone. Mr. Roosevelt is not neutral. He is not neutral in thought or in final purpose. He is partisan, emotional, and valorous. He could not long conceal his aspirations and designs.

The Congress should be either in session or on call. There is no unreasonable opposition in our Congress to legitimate government; there is no radical bloc; there is no trace of a Jacobinical principle, characteristic, or idea. It will be less practicable to have the semblance of a coalition of the two major parties in the executive branch than it would be to have a coalition of the executive and legislative branches. And in addition to being of greater practical value to have Congress a part of the working team, the presence of that body in Washington would give every congressional district direct representation.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES D. HILLES.

A Fair Farm Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAM C. MASSINGALE
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 2, 1939

Mr. MASSINGALE. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago the distinguished gentleman from Missouri, Hon. CLARENCE CANNON, made a most enlightening address on the floor of the House, dealing with farm prices and refuting the statements of those who advocate legislation of some sort to prohibit a further advance in farm products due to war conditions. As Mr. CANNON so clearly and ably pointed out, such suggestions come from those who are wholly unacquainted with farm conditions and farm prices and how the price of farmers' produce is fixed.

The farmer, of course, does not get anything near the cost of production or even parity for his produce, and is at the mercy of all kinds of cheap competition, market gambling, and other devices used to discriminate against him. It is for this reason, Mr. Speaker, that I believe it timely to supplement several addresses I have made on the question of cost of production as outlined in my cost-of-production bill, H. R. 2371, now for the consideration of Congress and on which a petition is on file to withdraw it from the consideration of the committee and to have the bill brought before the House of Representatives for consideration. It seems that in the past few months, fairness to the farmer is beginning to be more and more the topic in internal economic affairs. The farmer cannot make the grade on the present farm prices or under the present farm act. The farmer only wants a fair farm policy giving him a substitute for the tariff which industry has enjoyed for many years on its products. This tariff enables industry to enjoy domestic prices at least as much higher than world prices as the tariff imposed on competing products amounts to for all those manufactured articles that are consumed in the United States. That is all that cost of production means, and I ask to have included in the record as a part of my remarks the following article by Gen. Hugh S. Johnson:

This article by General Johnson is a clear and forceful statement of factual matters that should be convincing to any person who will read it.

FAIR FARM POLICY

(By Hugh S. Johnson)

The best argument ever made for some form of farm subsidy is that it is the "farmers' protective tariff." Agriculture produces more of some crops than the domestic market can consume. It has long had to sell a large part of these crops in competition with other countries with much lower living standards.

Many other industries enjoy domestic prices higher than world prices because of our high protective tariff. If they want to produce a surplus and export it they compete with the world at lower prices. But they get the higher domestic price for the part consumed at home. If the export prices are too low for profit they simply do not produce for export. They can do that because they can control production.

But the farmer can't. There are 6,000,000 separate producers. The amount planted does not control the amount produced. They turn out annually the vast surplus that nature and necessity dictate.

Now, when you have a surplus and continuing production of any product you can't get much more for your whole output than the market price of the surplus. With export crops that price is made abroad.

No tariff and nothing that a farmer can do can raise the prices of his product to the level of other tariff-protected products. This is true not only of his surplus but of his entire crop. He is the principal "unprotected" producer. He is outside our tariff walls when he comes to sell, but inside them when he comes to buy. He must take a low world free-trade price for what he sells and pay a highly protected price for what he buys. That subsidizes industry at the expense of agriculture. Agriculture could stand that during the period of free or cheap and virgin land. It can no longer do so. The farmer also must have his "protective tariff."

That is the argument. It makes a clear principle, but it doesn't tell half the story. Many varieties of governmental action besides tariffs have tended to raise the price of what the farmer buys, but not of what he sells—higher taxes, wages, freight rates, shorter work weeks, and social-security measures of all kinds.

For a long time nothing was done to equalize this politically imposed and impossible burden on agriculture. The New Deal has honestly tried everything suggested except outright subsidy. Yesterday this column described the nature and failure of these experiments.

Their underlying errors seem to be two. First, they try to get for the farmer a "tariff-protected price" on his whole production and do not restrict his "tariff benefit"—as industry is restricted—to the part consumed at home. Second, although they propose, by creating scarcity, to make the consumer pay that fair ("parity") price, they are unwilling frankly to face that necessity when scarcity doesn't appear. In that case they go to the Public Treasury. The first policy is unwarranted and unfair and the second is less than honest.

There is no consumer resistance to fair prices for farm products. All that is necessary to do is to let the farmer produce what he will at the best price he can get, but on that part of his crop used at home to levy a "farmers' tariff"—the difference between "market" price and determined "parity" price—and give him the money.

What does the consumer care whether he pays that price because of blundering, artificial scarcity or partly by reason of a tax? Nothing. But he cares whether our farm policy is fair and successful, whether it wastes millions, regiments agriculture, destroys food and foreign markets, busts the Treasury, and taxes him to buy cheaper food for foreign Nazis, Fascists, "reds," Japs, Germans, British, or French. The present cumbersome contraption does or threatens all these things. The simpler plan avoids them all.

We Should Agree Upon Thanksgiving Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS H. CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 2, 1939

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, tentatively, it seems, there is an agreement that nothing is to be taken up in this special session, except the so-called neutrality legislation.

There is another matter, however, which should be considered at this session or it will be too late to avoid national turmoil and confusion. That is settlement of the question of what day is to be observed as Thanksgiving Day. For we now have the prospect of one day being observed in about half the States and another day in the other half.

The observance of an annual day of thanksgiving and prayer is a custom in America, older than the United States itself. In fact, the custom is more than twice as old as constitutional government in the United States. From 1621 to 1789 was 168 years; from 1789 to 1939 is 150 years.

SELECTED BY WASHINGTON AND LINCOLN

Historically, Thanksgiving Day has not always been on the same day of a month, nor even in the same month. The first Thanksgiving Day proclamation of George Washington, however, selected the last Thursday in November, possibly in keeping with the day appointed in the prayer book of the Protestant Episcopal Church in America.

Observance of that day was not uniform even then, until 1863, when Abraham Lincoln formalized the tradition of the last Thursday in November with a definite proclamation. So the last Thursday of November it has been until the year of our Lord 1939, when the present President, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, without advance notice to church leaders, calendar makers, football coaches, college-term registrars, or Congress, announced that it should be on the third Thursday of November.

The resulting confusion rivals only the European war in public interest. While the Allies quarrel with the Axis-powers over who shall have Turkey, Americans wonder which day it is proper for them to eat turkey in their homes. Texas, the great State of Texas, Mr. Speaker, I understand is to solve the problem by observing both days and thus will attack turkey on both the third and fourth Thursdays of November.

Apart from the amusing aspects of the situation, however, the question raises some important questions. It calls for attention to the effect on things sacred as well as secular, on church programs as well as football dates and college calendars. The Congress, itself, should note the effect upon an act of the Seventy-fifth Congress—the naming of Armistice Day as a national holiday.

While the third Thursday is a shifting date, November 11 is not. The result is that where Armistice Day and Thanksgiving Day have been separated by from 13 to 18 days, they will be only 6, 7, 8, and 9 days apart through most of the next decade.

Consultation of the calendar yields these tables:

Comparison of old-style (Washington and Lincoln) Thanksgiving Days and new-style (Franklin D. Roosevelt)

	Last Thursday	Third Thursday
1939	Nov. 30	Nov. 23
1940	Nov. 28	Nov. 21
1941	Nov. 27	Nov. 20
1942	Nov. 26	Nov. 19
1943	Nov. 25	Nov. 18
1944	Nov. 30	Nov. 23
1945	Nov. 29	Nov. 22
1946	Nov. 28	Nov. 21

Number of days between Thanksgiving and Christmas

	Old style	New style
1939	24	31
1940	26	33
1941	27	34
1942	28	35
1943	29	36
1944	24	31
1945	25	32
1946	26	33

Number of days between Armistice and Thanksgiving

	Old style	New style
1939	18	11
1940	16	9
1941	15	8
1942	14	7
1943	13	6
1944	18	11
1945	17	10
1946	16	9

A study of those tables will suggest to every Member points to be considered, points related to the religious, social, and economic life of the country. The thing to keep in mind in studying those tables is that without agreement on the date, approximately half of the States will be following one date, and half the other. Clearly, whichever date is to be observed, there should be agreement.

For that purpose, Mr. Speaker, I have prepared and propose to introduce a bill to make the last Thursday in November of each year a public legal holiday in the District of Columbia and in all places within the jurisdiction of the United States. It would read as follows:

A PROPOSED SOLUTION

Whereas the Pilgrim fathers early instituted the custom of observing a day of thanksgiving and prayer; and

Whereas the people of the United States, continuing the custom in their homes and their churches, under selection of the first President of the United States, and under proclamation of the President at a time of great national crisis when national unity was greatly desired, have observed the last Thursday in the month of November as a national holiday of Thanksgiving: Therefore

Be it enacted, etc., That the last Thursday of November in each year, being the day known as Thanksgiving Day, which shall hereafter be proclaimed by the President of the United States as a day of prayer and thanksgiving, is hereby made a legal public holiday within the District of Columbia and in all places within the jurisdiction of the United States.

SEC. 2. All acts or parts of acts inconsistent with this act are hereby repealed.

Since preparing this bill, I have learned that a resolution for a similar purpose has been introduced by my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. REED]. It is entitled House Joint Resolution 383, and I may say that it is immaterial to me which proposal is considered. But I submit that legislation on this subject should be considered at this session, in order that the American people may conserve the fine traditions and values that have come from their observance of the last Thursday in November as our national Thanksgiving Day.

In this connection, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD, a very interesting and scholarly study on the subject of legal holidays made by the Honorable William Tyler Page some years ago, and recently brought down to date. It gives in detail the legal holidays of the several States, and cites the Federal statutes on this subject. It will be found a most valuable statement for reference by anyone who studies the subject of legal holidays.

There was no objection. The matter referred to is as follows:

OUR LEGAL HOLIDAYS

There are no so-called national holidays. In creating a holiday, such as Christmas Day, Independence Day, Labor Day, etc., Congress by law made such days legal holidays within territory over which the United States has jurisdiction, usually in the District of Columbia, the seat of government. Then, as in most instances, the States in turn following the example of Congress have severally made such days legal holidays within those States; and where this has been done uniformly, days so made legal holidays have come to be called "National holidays." But there are no national holidays in the strict sense of the term. Congress, in May 1938, however, declared Armistice Day (November 11) a national legal holiday. Any State may or may not declare it a holiday within such State.

The chief legal holidays are:

January 1: New Year's Day, all the States, Territories, and colonial possessions.

January 20: Inauguration Day, every fourth year (District of Columbia only).

February 12: Lincoln's Birthday (Alaska, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Jersey, New York, North Dakota, Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Puerto Rico, South Dakota, Tennessee, Utah, Washington, West Virginia, and Wyoming). In Massachusetts by Governor's proclamation.

February 22: Washington's Birthday (all the States, Territories, and possessions).

March–April: Good Friday, movable, dependent upon occurrance of Easter Day (Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Louisiana, Maryland, Minnesota, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Philippines, Puerto Rico, and Tennessee. In Connecticut Good Friday is usually proclaimed by the Governor as a day of fasting and prayer.

May 30: Decoration or Memorial Day (all States and possessions, except Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, and South Carolina).

July 4: Independence Day (all the States, Territories, and possessions).

First Monday in September: Labor Day (every State and Territory except the Philippines).

October 12: Columbus Day (Arkansas, Arizona, California, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Mississippi, Missouri, Nebraska, Nevada, North Carolina, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, North Dakota, Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, Wyoming, and Puerto Rico). In Kansas it is not a holiday as to courts or notes.

November: General election day (first Tuesday after first Monday in November). Every State and Territory except Alaska, Connecticut, District of Columbia, Hawaii, Illinois, Massachusetts, Mississippi, Ohio, Philippines, and Vermont. In Illinois it is a legal holiday in Chicago and several other cities. In Ohio it is a half holiday. In Maine it is a legal holiday only as to the courts, which also close on the State election day (biennially, in even years, second Monday in September).

November 11: Armistice Day. A national (?) legal holiday by act of Congress, May 1938.

November: Thanksgiving Day (last Thursday in November, every State, Territory, and possession).

December 25: Christmas Day (every State, Territory, and possession.)

Under the negotiable-instruments law, every negotiable instrument is payable at the time fixed thereon without grace. When the day of maturity falls upon Sunday or a holiday, the instrument is payable on the next succeeding business day. In the United States legal holidays are fixed by State and Territorial legislation.

"Holiday" shall include Christmas, the Fourth of July, the Twenty-second of February, and any day appointed by the President of the United States or the Congress of the United States as a holiday or as a day of public fasting or thanksgiving. (Bankruptcy Act, U. S. Code, title 11, sec. 1.)

Holidays: The employees of the Government Printing Office shall be allowed the following legal holidays with pay, to wit: The 1st day of January, the 22d day of February, the 4th day of July, the 25th day of December, Inauguration Day, Memorial Day, Labor's Holiday, and such as may be designated by the President of the United States as a day of public fast or thanksgiving. (Act of Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, par. 46, 28 Stat. 607.)

January 31, 1879 (20 Stat. L. 277). Holidays in the District of Columbia.

Chapter 38. An act to amend section 993 of the Revised Statutes of the United States for the District of Columbia so as to make the 22d day of February a holiday within said District.

Be it enacted, etc., That section 993 (1) of the Revised Statutes of the United States relating to the District of Columbia be, and the same hereby is, amended by adding to the days therein declared to be holidays within the District the 22d day of February; and such day shall be a holiday for all the purposes mentioned in said section: *Provided*, That this act shall not apply to the 22d day of February, 1879.

June 28, 1894, chapter 118. An act making Labor Day a legal holiday.

Be it enacted, etc., That the first Monday of September in each year, being the day celebrated and known as Labor's Holiday, is hereby made a legal public holiday, to all intents and purposes, in the same manner as Christmas, the 1st day of January, the 22d day of February, the 30th day of May, and the 4th day of July are now made by law public holidays.

Note: (1) The Revised Statutes of the District of Columbia, here referred to, provide as follows:

"SEC. 993. The following days, namely: The 1st day of January, commonly called New Year's Day; the 4th day of July; the 25th day of December, commonly called Christmas day; and any day appointed or recommended by the President of the United States as a day of public fast or thanksgiving, shall be holidays within the District, and shall, for all purposes of presenting for payment or acceptance, for the maturity and protest, and giving notice of the dishonor of bills of exchange, bank checks, and promissory notes, or other negotiable or commercial paper, be treated and considered as is the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday."

And all notes, drafts, checks, or other commercial or negotiable paper falling due or maturing on either of said holidays shall be deemed as having matured on the day previous.

(Other acts make holidays of Inauguration Day, 1888, June 18, ch. 391, post, p. 592; Decoration Day, 1888, August 1, ch. 723, post, p. 600; and Monday, when either falls on Sunday, 1881, December 21, ch. 2, post, p. 331; and give per diem pay to employees, 1885, January 6, Resolution No. 5, post, p. 486, and 1887, February 23, Resolution No. 6, post, p. 574.)

American Law Enforcement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. GRANT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 2, 1939

ADDRESS BY J. EDGAR HOOVER, DIRECTOR OF THE FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

Mr. GRANT of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, we are all interested in West Point, Annapolis, and the Coast Guard Academies. We have right here in Washington another academy, which, under the direction of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, has just completed its twelfth session. This is the F. B. I. National Police Academy. While the Navy, Army, and Marine Corps and Coast Guard stand guard without, this army stands guard within—an army dedicated to law and

order. The F. B. I. and the graduates of the National Police Academy are ready to meet the needs of this Nation in its task of internal defense. Under the guiding genius of J. Edgar Hoover, this army will keep America American.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an address delivered by J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, United States Department of Justice, at the graduation exercises of the F. B. I. National Police Academy and reunion in the great hall of the Department of Justice Building, Washington, D. C., September 30, 1939, as follows:

This occasion marks the culmination of 3 months of hard work for you members of the twelfth session of the F. B. I. National Police Academy. I know you must be happy with the thought that you are returning today to your respective communities. And if I may correctly judge from the enthusiastic manner in which you have carried on during the past 3 months, I know that you are anxious to return to your homes and begin to apply the knowledge you have gained here.

While this is a happy occasion for you, it is a sad one for those of us of the F. B. I. who have had the privilege of associating with you. There is a great deal of consolation however in the thought that this is the beginning of a new relationship which I trust will endure down through the years. You of the twelfth session have been particularly fortunate, since you have spent your last week in Washington with your predecessors of the other 11 sessions of the academy. You have had an opportunity to exchange experiences with them and they with you. This should be invaluable to you when you resume your duties. They have had to face obstacles and circumvent many pitfalls. Their achievements, yes, and their defeats, should be of material assistance to you, and it is a sustaining force to know that you have their moral and spiritual support. The men who have gone before have blazed new trails. It is for you to "go forth and do likewise." Still you must protect your ranks from the same influences that challenge the forces of law and order on every front.

Never before has American law enforcement faced such challenges as it does today. At no time in our national history has it had the opportunities which it has today to carry out its sworn duties—the protection of American life, liberty, and property. In a period of national emergency there are added dangers that lurk on every hand. Added stress, strain, and increased burdens are an open invitation to the underworld to further the interest of its own "invisible empire"—plunder and destruction.

American law enforcement must rise to meet the foe on every side. As never before, the national well-being calls for and demands self-sacrifice on the part of all of its public servants and the patriotic unwavering cooperation of all of its citizens.

Facing the underworld is one thing; facing organized efforts of saboteurs is another. It is unfortunate but true that there are those within our midst who enjoy the opportunities and liberties which American democracy guarantees them, and who openly preach its destruction. The first instinct of man is that of self-preservation. The first order of the day is the preservation of American ideals, traditions, and democracy. This demands that our internal defense be made secure. This is a new task that you and your fellow law-enforcement officers throughout the United States must face. In its discharge there can be no wavering. Failure means chaos. Once the termites gain access to a structure, its doom is inevitable. Once subversive forces which expound the cause of foreign isms undermine our ideal of government declared in the Declaration of Independence and defined by the Bill of Rights and the Constitution, then, indeed, we, too, can expect the horrors of a permanent blackout of everything which we have cherished. That is why I say law enforcement and America truly face an emergency.

It is a known fact that many foreign agents roam at will in a Nation that loves peace and hates war, a country which has proclaimed its neutrality in a strife-torn world engaged in mortal armed conflict. At this very moment, lecherous enemies of American society are seeking to pollute our atmosphere of freedom and liberty. They are our foes. Before them we will not capitulate. American law enforcement will rise to meet the challenges of the day. Already we of the F. B. I. have begun to feel the added stress and strain. At the present time complaints of espionage, sabotage, and neutrality violations are being received in great numbers. These require careful consideration and calm investigative attention. Never before has there been such urgent necessity for national unity and concerted action. We must put our house in order to meet every conceivable challenge. Certainly through a unified effort American law enforcement must stem the onrush of those who hide behind the very banner of democracy for protection. You know, and I know, that there are even native-born pseudo-American citizens as well as aliens who have sold their birthright for less than the proverbial "mess of pottage." They detest law and order. Their plan calls for its overthrow. Let us not give them the opportunities which they seek. Law and order in every section of the land is the best inoculation I know to protect ourselves from the scourge which they spread. There is an old adage, "When in Rome, do as the Romans do." Let us here and now coin a new one, "When in America, do as Americans should!" And it is high time that once and for all we erect walls of civic pride and individual responsibility which will forever protect us from the internal upheavals engendered by the fires of hate from across the seas.

This morning we can well give thanks for the wisdom and patriotism of an Attorney General—Hon. Frank Murphy—who recognizes the pitfalls that lie ahead and who has sought to gird law enforcement in its task of internal defense.

As you F. B. I. National Police Academy associates leave here today, I hope you will go out with the firm conviction that you have a job before you. Let constituted authority be responsible and do the job and remember that it is your task to intelligently apply your talents to insuring justice and doing your bit to maintain our national integrity. Every emergency that might arise can be reasonably foreseen, and now we are preparing ourselves to meet these emergencies in a sane, intelligent manner. Never again should we be caught unprepared in meeting situations as they arise. The Nation is safer from spies and saboteurs than it has been in time of war raging on any continent. It is far better prepared to deal with these matters than in the past. Let there be no hysteria, no unbridled trampling upon the rights of innocent persons; in short, let there be intelligent, sane, common-sense action instead of wild, fantastic witch hunts. Let us seek results and not headlines.

This of necessity requires training and the ability to meet situations as they arise. Upon you, then, devolves the responsibility of acquainting your fellow officers in your communities with the instruction you have received in the F. B. I. National Police Academy; and by the same token, as the opportunity arises, you should encourage the citizens of your communities to cooperate to the utmost with constituted authorities, but to refrain from the sporadic, haphazard, wild-eyed beating of tom-toms which is so often the case with vigilantes and others of similar ilk, who, all too frequently, are motivated purely by personal reasons.

The progress that has been made in lifting the standards of law enforcement has come solely as a result of police training, higher personnel standards, and the gradual freeing of law enforcement from the shackles of corrupt political domination. The surface, however, has hardly been scratched. The future lies before us. It alone holds the ultimate answer, which will be determined, I am confident, by your actions and the intelligent manner in which I know you will meet each task.

A job well done merits appreciation. If you are to lift the standards of law enforcement in your respective communities you must first of all discharge your duties in a manner which will merit public confidence. Every newly appointed officer should, of course, first be properly trained before he is assigned to duty. The mere issuance of a badge and a night stick is not enough. The test tubes of scientific crime detection have caught more crooks than the rubber hose ever has or will. To stoop to unethical and illegal tactics in reality brings one down to the level of the criminal himself. And it is not sufficient merely to train a new man; he must keep abreast of new developments throughout his career. Above all, police training must be kept on a practical level and imparted in a common-sense manner. It should always remain in the hands of law enforcement. In the past all too frequently police training has been handled by too many theatrical blatherskites whose only contact with crime has possibly been a trip to the county jail or the State prison, and in one case I know of the so-called police instructor's qualifications were limited to a penitentiary term. That, he held, qualified him to teach law-enforcement methods. You wouldn't want a tooth pulled by one who had been trained by a carpenter who was an expert at pulling nails with a claw hammer. Neither does our country want law-enforcement officers who have been trained by academic theorists who, in a quest for reality, have wandered from the protective cloisters of the classroom.

You will constantly be harassed by the vagaries of corrupt political domination. In this I can give you only one suggestion—have no part of any of the scheming chicaneries of those whose sense of greed and personal gain far surpasses their sense of civic duty for law and order. Let the facts alone determine the outcome of cases—let the chips fall where they may. You will be vilified by those who aline themselves with the underworld, but you can sleep at night and will have the respect and admiration of the law-abiding citizens of your community. That the right will triumph is a certainty. We in the F. B. I. have had to fight just such a battle. I know of instance after instance where you men of the National Police Academy have gone through the valley of despair but have emerged from the depths of corrupt political domination to the plains of decency because you have dared to stand by your convictions and have demonstrated that crime can be conquered.

Crime is a social disease. It must be treated as such. Like a cancerous growth, it must be cut out or burned out of the body politic. As you leave Washington today, do so with the determination that you will meet the challenges which will inevitably confront you with the full knowledge that the entire facilities of the Federal Bureau of Investigation are behind you. We face mutual problems. Your achievements are our achievements, and they inure to the credit of all law enforcement. As a part of the F. B. I. you leave Washington with the best wishes of all of your friends, and as you leave, in addition to giving you our best wishes we give you our motto—Fidelity, Bravery, Integrity—may you cherish it as do we of the F. B. I.

The National Commander's Inaugural Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 2, 1939

ADDRESS OF HON. RAYMOND J. KELLY, NATIONAL COMMANDER OF THE AMERICAN LEGION

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks, I insert the masterful address of the Honorable Raymond J. Kelly, national commander of the American Legion, delivered on the occasion of his election to that exalted post by the national convention of the American Legion in Chicago, Ill.

The matter referred to follows:

Men and women of the American Legion, you have made me both proud and most humble today. More proud than any day I have known since we put on the uniform. Most proud that you have selected me to lead and to serve you.

It finds me humble in anticipation of the problems which this year will surely bring to our country and to our American Legion; more humble with the thought that the influence of the American Legion will aid in determining the destinies of this land far beyond the span of our own generation; most humble in the privilege presented to again serve my country.

This convention has placed certain mandates upon me. The many great national commanders of the past have blazed a sharply outlined path for me to follow. The expressed will of the Legion was their command; I pledge you it shall be mine.

A national commander is not chosen because of his efforts or desires. The activities of many friends and supporters who have confidence in him alone brings his election.

To thank these comrades of mine adequately exceeds the ability of words to portray. The obligation is a debt beyond the power of one man ever to repay. My eternal gratitude is yours.

For 20 years the American Legion has devoted its best thought to the welfare of our country. That it will continue to do so goes unquestioned.

For 20 years we have preached the doctrine of Americanism. We will continue to do so as long as we continue an organization. So shall we continue to preach adequate legislation to safeguard the well-being of our disabled comrades and their dependents. So shall we continue our struggle to achieve equal opportunity to earn a living for those comrades who are now innocent victims of economic maladjustment. Adequate defense of our land from enemies, foreign or domestic, is a sound pledge that we must keep; and the heritage of our free institutions, liberty and equality of opportunity received from our forefathers, must be guaranteed to those who come after us.

This has been the Legion's program. There is no reason for revision now that a score of years have passed. Always in conformity with the best interests of the Nation as a whole, it is our duty never to forget that the Legion owes a definite obligation to its membership. The Legion was founded upon the principle of service to the American veterans of the World War. It will continue to serve them.

But the Legion is more than that. It has gone beyond the treatment of what to it were internal problems. It has consistently broadened the field of its operations to serve the Nation as a whole.

The Legion says that the security and salvation of America transcends all other considerations. The security of the whole is the safety of each. Now, as never before, we must save our youth from being dumped into the bubbling cauldron brewed of Old World poisons.

The Legion insists that tomorrow must not be dedicated for our sons and daughters to the service of the red planet, Mars. To prevent this it is our job to preserve sober thought in an uncertain, liberty-destroying world.

As your national commander, I pledge myself to go from this convention and make known to our fellow citizens your mandate to keep our Nation out of any armed conflict overseas. Here we have conscientiously advised our fellow countrymen of the vital necessity of their maintaining a realistic neutrality policy. Attempting to cloak our neutrality with a biased belligerency must inevitably lead us straight into war.

Let us determine that a widespread and national forbearance resulting from measured and deliberate consideration of the problems of preserving peace will in itself erect a reasonable barrier against the suicide of our civilization by the sword.

As you return home may I urge you to be cool and deliberate in your pronouncements and actions. If you must become partisan, let it be solely an aggressive partisanship for the American way of life.

May God bless you as you leave here. May God guide me in the decisions I must make for you. As you depart rededicate yourselves to the duty of protecting our country; remembering an even more serious crisis confronts your homeland than that of 1917–18.

I pledge you my entire efforts will be devoted to the program of the organization we love and to the country it serves. Whatever sacrifice it demands I am prepared to make.

With God's help and your support, we shall again aid our country in reaching its objectives of peace for our people.

To this end, my comrades, I pledge the strength of my lasting devotion.

The Poll Tax as a Restriction on Suffrage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE E. GEYER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 2, 1939

ARTICLE FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES

Mr. GEYER of California. Mr. Speaker, at the close of the regular session last August I introduced into this Congress a bill to prohibit the collection of a poll tax as a prerequisite for voting for any candidate for any national office. This practice still exists in 8 of the 48 States. It is a relic of reconstruction days and was used first by the Romans upon captured subjects. It was considered at that time as a symbol of servitude similar to that of "Passing under the yoke."

The following article from the New York Times Magazine of February 12, 1939, will be of interest to those who believe that our brand of democracy has no place for a property qualification as a prerequisite for voting. The article, written by Virginius Dabney, of Richmond, Va., follows:

SHALL THE SOUTH'S POLL TAX GO?—A RELIC OF RECONSTRUCTION DAYS REAPPRAISED IN THE EIGHT STATES WHICH STILL CLING TO IT

(By Virginius Dabney, Richmond, Va.)

From the crags above Harper's Ferry to the mesas fringing the Rio Grande a revolt is brewing against the poll tax. The strength of the movement varies in each of the eight southern States which retains the levy as a prerequisite to voting, but it is definitely a movement. It was well under way before President Roosevelt, in September, called for elimination of the tax, and it has since gained impetus.

Striking evidence of the revolt is seen in the unanimous action of the recent Atlanta conference of 29 southern capitalists, labor leaders, educators, editors, and others, who met under the sponsorship of the Southern Policy Committee, and called for the abolition of the tax as a prerequisite to voting. The question now is how soon the movement will grow strong enough to persuade the South to abolish the levy.

The poll tax has an ancient, if not always honorable, history. Aristotle refers to it as a "most ignominious imposition" which "none but slaves paid to their tyrants." It was levied by the conquering Romans upon the peoples they reduced to subjection and was considered at that period to be an earnest of servitude. A thousand years later Wat Tyler led the peasants of England in a bloody rebellion against the tax and, although the uprising was put down, many of its objectives were achieved. The franchise in England was less hedged about with restrictions thereafter.

Today in the South the people are not brandishing clubs or pikes, like those which Tyler's sturdy rustics brought into play against the English aristocracy of the fourteenth century, but the tide of revolt is rising. Louisiana and Florida have abolished the levy on the franchise during the past 2 years. An effort to repeal the tax in Arkansas received legislative approval in 1937, but was voted down by the people last fall. The only States which now retain the tax as a prerequisite to voting are Virginia, South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi, Tennessee, Arkansas, and Texas.

It is a striking fact that Virginia, the oldest American colony, had universal white manhood suffrage for half a century, beginning soon after the first representative assembly in the New World met at Jamestown in 1619. It is also noteworthy that this same Virginia, supposedly the seat of a preeminently aristocratic society, likewise had universal white manhood suffrage during the decade which ended with the outbreak of the Civil War.

The poll tax which Virginia and seven other Southern States retain today, either in their constitutions or on their statute books, is the fruit of the reconstruction era. Various restrictions upon the voting privilege were imposed in the form of property requirements and other similar limitations during most of the colonial and the antebellum periods, but the poll tax, as we know it, was framed

late in the nineteenth century as a device to sunder the liberated Negro slaves from the polling booth.

After the orgies of reconstruction some such device was deemed necessary, for widespread electoral fraud had been resorted to by desperate whites during the postbellum years and well-disposed southerners considered such a situation intolerable. So, as the turn of the century neared, the Southern States began enacting franchise requirements which were, in most instances, technically legal. By the early nineteen hundreds every State below the Potomac and the Ohio had fallen into line. In addition to poll taxes, a variety of residence, property, and educational qualifications were imposed. Almost all the Negroes were effectively disfranchised.

But a substantial percentage of the whites also were disfranchised. If such was the intention of the framers of these constitutional provisions and statutes, the writer has been unable to find convincing evidence to that effect. On the contrary, such evidence as the writer discovered indicates that the restrictions were designed to let the whites vote but to prevent most of the Negroes from doing so.

Today, from a third to a half a century after these barriers to the ballot were erected, the number of persons of both races who are prevented by them from voting is enormous. That is particularly true in the poll-taxed States, where the number of whites participating in the business of electing candidates to office is by far the lowest in the Union.

In the Presidential election of 1936, for example, the 9 States which then had the poll tax sent only 24 percent of their adult citizens to the polls, whereas in the 39 other States 72 percent voted. Since the whites outnumber the Negroes by large majorities in all but 1 Southern State today, and in that one—Mississippi—the totals are virtually the same for the two races, it can be seen from the foregoing percentages that the proportion of whites who vote where the poll tax obtains is only a fraction of those who vote where it does not.

This is partly accounted for, of course, by the fact that there is a comparative lack of competition from the Republicans in the South, with a corresponding lack of interest, and by the further fact that there are other franchise restrictions in addition to the poll tax. However, it cannot be doubted that this levy, which ranges from $1 to $2 per year, bears a large share of the responsibility.

Evidence is obtainable through a comparison of the number of voters in Virginia, which has a poll tax, with the number in North Carolina, which repealed its tax 18 years ago. In 1936 the number of Virginians who voted for the various Presidential candidates was 334,000, whereas no fewer than 839,000 North Carolinians participated in the same election. The population of the Old North State is not much larger than that of the Old Dominion, and conditions in the two Commonwealths are similar. But the number of voters is always vastly greater in the former State than in the latter. The same sort of comparison may be made between Virginia and Kentucky, West Virginia and Maryland, each of which borders on Virginia, each of which has no poll tax, and each of which casts from nearly two to nearly three times Virginia's vote.

Why has the poll tax persisted in the South? There are various reasons. In the first place, the conviction persists in many parts of the region that this device is still necessary to the maintenance of "white supremacy." In the second place, the political leaders often favor retention of the levy, since those who have been chosen to office by a limited electorate naturally prefer not to risk the uncertainty of a contest in which thousands of new voters take part. Again, those interests which prefer to see political power remain in the hands of the "upper crust" of propertied voters, rather than in those of the masses, likewise back the status quo. Lastly, the attitude of the disfranchised whites has been, in the main, either indifferent or inarticulate until recent years.

What have been the political and social consequences of the levy? Those who favor its abolition say it has tended to encourage corruption, for the wholesale payment of taxes by political organizations is a common practice. Another result, they say, has been the partial atrophy of the democratic process, owing to limited participation by the people in that process. Another is that it has placed obstacles in the way of securing needed social and labor legislation in States where so many beneficiaries of this legislation cannot vote.

Arkansas and Mississippi still have no workmen's compensation law. Alabama and Florida have no law for the protection of women in industry, while Mississippi, Georgia, and Kentucky allow women to be worked 60 hours a week. Child labor legislation in the South is likewise considerably less effective than elsewhere, and the only Southern States with minimum-wage laws are Kentucky, Louisiana, and Arkansas, the first two of which have no poll tax.

That tax, it is argued, also makes movements for reform in State or local government more difficult than in regions where the tax is not levied. Political machines see that their followers' capitation taxes are paid up, with the result that when the ordinary independent voter becomes aroused a short time before election it is apt to be past the deadline for making the payment, or he may have to pay several years' back taxes before he can vote. In Virginia, for example, he must put up 3 years' tax, if his tax for that period has not been paid, or a total of $4.50, while in Alabama the would-be voter under 40 years of age can be required to pay his back tax of $1.50 for every year since he reached the age of 21.

There remains the question of the influence of the poll-taxed States in the councils of the Democratic Party. With the abolition of the two-thirds rule at the Democratic National Convention of 1936, the solid South was deprived of its power to block such candidates for the Presidential nomination as it deemed objectionable. As a sop to the region the Democratic National Committee was directed to formulate a plan under which the Southern States would, in the future, receive a "bonus" in the form of additional delegates, based on the total Democratic vote cast in those States. Since the poll-taxed States regularly cast far fewer votes than the others, they can have no hope of getting this bonus.

Those who favor abolition of the capitation levy contend that the tax might be justified if it could be shown that the States which have it enjoy a better brand of State and local government than those which do not. But they ask whether it can be seriously argued that South Carolina, Mississippi, or Georgia is better governed than, say, Connecticut, Kansas, or Colorado.

As for the maintenance of "white supremacy," they are unable to see that this issue is important any longer. Is white supremacy endangered, they ask, in North Carolina, which has nearly a million Negroes, and which abolished its poll tax in 1920? In that State every registrant for voting must demonstrate to the registrar his ability to "read and write any section of the Constitution in the English language." Under this arrangement hundreds of thousands of formerly disfranchised whites are exercising their right to vote, whereas the number of Negro participants in the elections remains small.

Those who favor retention of the poll tax feel that its elimination would ultimately endanger white dominance in the South, even if it did not have that result immediately; and they frequenly say that "if a man isn't willing to pay a dollar or two a year to vote, he isn't much of a citizen." Since, in the eight poll-taxed States, the proceeds from this payment go wholly or partly to public education, it likewise is argued that if the capitation tax were abolished the schools would suffer. But the poll-taxed States do not enforce collection of the levy, which is really a voluntary payment, rather than a tax. The consequence is that receipts from it are far below what they would be if it were a regularly collected head tax on every adult, proceeds of which would be devoted to public education.

Official figures on State suffrage tax receipts for 1936 give the following totals: Alabama, $306,675; Georgia, $289,976; Texas, $1,685,244; Virginia, $810,481; Arkansas, $300,631; South Carolina, $255,419; Tennessee, $655,470. Figures from Mississippi are not available, but it is clear from the foregoing that if a head tax were levied annually on every adult without relationship to the franchise, receipts would be two or three times as large as at present, with corresponding benefits to education. Massachusetts raised $2,650,526 in this way for education, welfare, and other local purposes in 1936, and Connecticut raised $2,254,641.

Those who favor the status quo in the realm of the poll tax likewise argue that in these days, when millions are on relief and other millions are crying for largess of one sort or another from the Public Treasury, it is unwise to throw the polls open to urban laborers, rural sharecroppers, and other underprivileged elements with possibly grasping tendencies.

Whatever the validity of this argument may be in other spheres, it certainly does not hold good as far as old-age pension schemes are concerned. This is because six of the eight poll-taxed States exempt from payment persons who have arrived at a certain age. In one, the exemption begins at age 45, while in four it begins at age 60. Hence, in the words of the Richmond Times-Dispatch, "the limited electorate of younger voters who have paid the levy will be swamped by the older voters who don't have to pay it, and who are apt to vote for weekly 'ham and egg' outlays to the aged—mere scrip-tease devices which are sure to break down in the end."

It cannot be gainsaid that the movement against the poll tax is gathering momentum. Not only is pressure being brought in the various States, but there is the possibility of a congressional enactment implementing the section of the Federal Constitution which guarantees to the people of each State a republican form of government. Under such a plan Congress would forbid any State to demand payment of a tax as a prerequisite to voting on the theory that such a demand is in conflict with the maintenance of republican institutions. It is probable that such an act could not be put through Congress, and if it were put through it might encounter an insurmountable barrier in the Supreme Court. At all events, the poll tax is under fire in the South.

The Cost of War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. SCHAFER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 2, 1939

BROADCAST BY CAPT. EDDIE RICKENBACKER, AMERICA'S ACE OF ACES

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the

following broadcast by Capt. Eddie Rickenbacker, America's ace of aces during World War, September 26, 1939:

Men and women, fathers, mothers, sons, and daughters, young and old in every part of this great land, I come to you tonight without political ambitions or selfish motives.

I speak for myself alone as a private citizen of this country who loves his heritage, as well as the liberties and opportunities it offers, with a passion that knows no bounds.

Only 22 years ago we Americans entered the World War with a profound conviction that we were fighting for the preservation of democracy.

The close of the World War and subsequent events during these past 22 years have brought about the disillusionment and realization that the winner and the loser of such a conflict must suffer the consequences alike.

Our penalty, the same as that of other nations, was the complete disruption of our economic machinery, bringing about 10 years of depression—correctly named but grossly misunderstood.

There are millions still unemployed, billions of dollars are being paid in additional taxes, hospitals are still filled with thousands of veterans, wrecked mentally and physically—all of them once the flower of American manhood, someone's father, brother, or sweetheart, but all of them some mother's son.

The cost to the world approximated $250,000,000,000. With this staggering sum we could have built homes costing $2,500 each on 5-acre plots of ground costing $100 an acre.

We could have equipped each of those homes with a thousand dollars' worth of furniture and given such a home to every family in Russia, Italy, France, Belgium, Germany, Wales, Scotland, Ireland, England, Australia, Holland, and the United States of America.

We could have given to every community in those lands—of 40,000 people or more—a $2,000,000 library, a $3,000,000 hospital, and a $10,000,000 university.

And if we could have invested the balance that would have been left in a way that would have brought a rate of 5 percent annually, there would have been sufficient to pay an annual salary of $1,000 each to 125,000 school teachers and 125,000 nurses.

The cost to these United States, including direct and continued up to date, has totaled approximately $47,000,000,000.

If we placed this staggering sum into peacetime circulation, we would not now have millions of unemployed, plus the direct loss of 50,000 men, and approximately 250,000 casualties.

Well could we rid ourselves, with this vast sum, of the slums of our great cities, the misery and poverty that go with them.

Well could we multiply our opportunities of education and culture, through better and larger institutions of learning.

Well could we afford, not one, but several airports in every large city.

Well could we rid ourselves of the inadequate highways, narrow streets, and the constant congestion in every city, large or small.

Well could we multiply our airways, expediting the transportation of mail, people, and merchandise to and from every hamlet in this country.

Well may we remember the forgotten statistics of the World War.

Seventy-four million men mobilized, 10,000,000 killed, 3,000,000 maimed, 19,000,000 wounded, 10,000,000 disabled or incapacitated for the balance of their lives, 9,000,000 orphans, and 5,000,000 widows.

In view of these startling facts, who could wish for our participation in another world war?

Certainly, it could not be the mothers with babes in their arms, nor the fathers, wrinkled and weathered with age.

Certainly it could not be the middle-aged men and women with their vivid memories of 1914 to 1918.

No; but it can be the lack of knowledge and understanding on the part of our youth, coupled with the selfishness and greed of a few.

Let us not permit our boys and girls to be regimented into uniforms, carrying wooden guns, almost from the time they leave the cradle, but preserve for them the game of marbles on the street corner or in the alley.

Preserve for them the baseball game after school hours on the commons.

Preserve for them the opportunity for developing model airplanes and other happy pursuits.

Then, and then alone, need we never fear for men and women of character to carry on.

Let us realize a few more pertinent facts that have been smothered or forgotten by insidious propaganda from those people in the old world and their agents in our land.

There is no difference in the lack of reason for the war of today in the old world than that which caused wars that have been going on for centuries.

The same selfish reasons of greed and hate are responsible for the present catastrophe.

These same reasons—selfishness, hate, and greed—can well be responsible for our being involved again in a war of destruction of property and mankind.

Certainly I feel no ill will toward the people of any of the belligerent countries, and my heart bleeds with sympathy for all of them.

But this can be no justification to me for our involvement again, with its horrible consequences of the probable loss of millions of our young men, and billions of our wealth.

In view of my record during the World War, such a statement may well be questioned.

But it was the very nature of my experiences that has brought to me the realization that American soldiers and billions of American dollars have no place on foreign soil.

Should, however, this country ever be threatened with invasion by a foreign nation or nations—I shall gladly offer my services, my two sons, and any worldly goods I may possess to protect and guard our institutions.

It must further be remembered that, if this Nation becomes involved in the present European conflict, we should go into it, with the full understanding, that to be of any benefit, it will mean keeping a standing army in the Old World for the next 100 years as a military police force to prevent a repetition of the 1914–18 war and the present one.

I am convinced, with this further understanding, that the people of the United States would never consent to such an additional penalty for their participation.

I am not a pacifist in any sense of the word. I believe in preparedness to insure against foreign invasion, by having, primarily, a peacetime aviation industry, developed through peacetime service, that will give us an adequate military aviation reserve for defensive purposes only.

Regardless of who proves the victor in the present war overseas, remember always both victor and vanquished have completed their economic ruin for years to come.

Consequently, we need never fear an early attack on our shores. In the meantime it behooves the United States to establish her home defense.

With a strong navy, an air force of 25,000 pilots and 50,000 planes, no foreign government dare even think in terms of war against us, and if they should be so foolish, our people need have no fear of invasion.

With the moral fabric of the people of the Old World having collapsed, there can be only one result from this present conflict at its conclusion—no matter who wins.

With millions of the flower of their lands having been blown to bits or wrecked for life, with billions of dollars' worth of their property having been destroyed, revolution and revolution alone will follow.

Wars are the stamping grounds for revolutions, and revolutions are the stamping grounds of communism.

Let us guard against that happening here. With the vast improvement in destructive weapons, men, women, and children are being, and will be, destroyed 10 times as fast as during the World War.

We in America, in view of these prospects, may well recognize that our frontiers lie in the Western Hemisphere.

Let us develop our social, political, and commercial intercourse between our neighbors of the 21 republics to the south of us for the best interest of all concerned.

Let us guard against our economic structure being keyed up through promises of false prosperity.

Let us recognize that selfishness, greed, and hate might well develop an unsound economic structure—the collapse of which no democracy can survive.

Let those who profit through the development of such unsound economic structures and at the expense of other people's misery and mistakes—be they capitalists, politicians, or wage earners—bear in mind that they are in a great minority.

Let us maintain a sense of balance in thought and activity, even though it may mean for the moment, less in worldly belongings.

Or even let us keep in mind that we can well afford, through the maintenance of our absolute neutrality, to suffer even the consequences of lowering our standard of living for a short period of time to prevent happening here what is happening in the Old World.

Let us realize that the obligation of our leadership, be it capitalistic, political, or social, rests heavily on our shoulders in these trying times.

We who live in the land of abundance and liberty should be willing, through peacetime service and accomplishment, to maintain these liberties and independence—to prevent bankruptcy and starvation.

Today this country stands united, with few exceptions, on the major issue that is before us, namely,

KEEP US OUT OF THIS WAR

Congress is engaged in a discussion of a question where there is a division of opinion as to which course will positively keep us out.

There has come into the picture the use of conferences and the press for political purposes.

This discussion is growing in bitterness.

Already it has begun to divide our people by bitter charges and countercharges.

I can accredit a great number of people on both sides of this question as being perfectly honest in their views. And that is also true of members of our legislative bodies.

But if this disunity is to be stopped, and if we are to maintain a unified will to keep out of this war, this bitter discussion must be tempered with the view in mind that only through compromise can unity be maintained.

Surely it is within the powers of statesmanship to bring about this compromise and end this growing disunity.

It is disunity among our people that will do far more damage than the political advantages to be gained by either side or party.

Our true obligation is not only the destiny of our own children but all the children of America, who will be set back a hundred years in their opportunities, as well as the growth of American life, if we participate in this war in Europe.

And we of the general public have a right to call upon our statesmen—regardless of party or creed—to hold this country resolute to the one great issue of keeping us out of this war.

In closing, may I utter this fervent prayer—that this generation will, in its wisdom and mature consideration of this question of absolute neutrality, prevent posterity or future generations from condemning or indicting us as having legalized wholesale slaughter, murdered the flower of our youth, and massacred democracy.

It Will Keep Us Out of War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERNARD J. GEHRMANN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 2, 1939

Mr. GEHRMANN. Mr. Speaker, while men, women, and children are being blasted off the face of the earth the manufacturers of munitions and the implements of death glory over the possibility of profits which will accrue to them from the blood of the human race. And neither race, color, nor creed matters so long as these profits are forthcoming.

Although America seems resigned to the fact that we shall not cross so much as a duck pond, much less the Atlantic Ocean, to become embroiled in someone else's misery, the fact remains that a neutrality law of itself will not be sufficient to accomplish this purpose. Some factions claim that the present law should be amended or repealed, permitting the sale of arms, munitions, and the implements of destruction upon a cash-and-carry or some other basis. Others contend that the lifting of the present embargo would inevitably lead us into war.

It is not for the purpose of suggesting what kind of neutrality law we should have that prompts me to take the liberty of this writing. I have been obsessed with the thought, however, that, irrespective of what form our neutrality law ultimately takes, we need but play the searchlight of truth upon the issue to realize that we cannot remain at peace within our own country if the Congress neglects to place upon the statute books an enabling act thereto in the form of a permanent, merciful social security. It would prove the greatest single factor in maintaining peace in America, for happiness and contentment have never been on speaking terms with war and misery.

Though dwelling within one entity, this grave problem presents itself in two separate and distinct parts. A neutrality law of itself may exist for a time, but without social security throughout our land, it would soon disintegrate and die. If the peace of America is to be preserved and perpetuated, then it behooves this special session of Congress to take cognizance of this truth.

If the present neutrality law remains unchanged, we may lose a large part of the business which was being done with certain countries now engaged in conflict. If this be so, then we must find other outlets for these goods or suffer accordingly. It is most gratifying to know that these new markets lie within the borders of our own country. We need but supply the purchasing power.

If, on the other hand, the present neutrality law is revised or repealed, permitting the sale of the implements of war and bringing to America a large degree of temporary benefits, providing we do not become embroiled, then we must take immediate steps to cope with the economic catastrophe which would necessarily follow cessation of hostilities. A catastrophy which may descend upon us even sooner, as the exhaustion of foreign cash may quicken its reality. It therefore becomes doubly imperative that a form of permanent, merciful social security be enacted into law now. It would serve as a cushion against such an eventuality, minimizing its devastating effects upon our people.

If the munitions manufacturers can arrest the attention of the Congress with their pleas for bloody profits, then it seems perfectly justifiable to conduct a flank movement in the interest of all the people, by the enactment of a plan of social security which would prevent a black-out of peace in America. It may not be amiss to remind you that the membership of Congress cannot feign neutrality where the welfare of their own country is at stake, for no one knows better than the Congress that a remedy must immediately be prescribed which would alleviate the mire of misery into which we have already sunk and the bottomless pit of hell into which we might later sink. No better medicine could be given the patient than happiness and contentment.

Although it is not meant to dwell upon the inequities of our present system of merciless social security, other than to reiterate what you already know, which is, that the benefits derived therefrom are not sufficiently far reaching to be of substantial value, it may not be out of order to remind you that the lower standard of living legalized by it, will doubtless be lowered, because of the higher commodity prices which are already a reality.

Any person having one iota of concern for the welfare of his fellow man, desires a system of permanent, merciful social security inaugurated in our land. Why, then, has it not been done? Because everybody seems to be asking everybody else the same unanswered question, Where are we going to get the money?

If we could pick ten or twenty billion dollars per annum out of trees, our problem would be definitely solved. Business would boom overnight as a result of the spending of this money for the necessities and even some of the luxuries of life. But we cannot do this, because science has so far been unable to produce money trees. We must, therefore, look elsewhere for the wherewithal.

The fact remains, however, that the expenditure of ten or twenty billion dollars per annum, by people who do not now have 20 cents, figurately speaking, would result in many times this amount in additional business, because of its attendant turn-over. And now wealth would follow in its wake, through the purchase of goods and the hiring of labor.

Although we are wont to believe that business, both big and small, is hard-boiled and cold-blooded, the truth remains that business must work with a principle, either consciously or otherwise, if it is to remain in business. Business does not get money because it gives merchandise, but gives merchandise to get money. Business gives discounts to get money; business gives bargain sales to get money; business gives better services to get more business. Business must give to get, in accordance with a God-given principle, which had its beginning in the dawn of time. It invariably demonstrates success for those who work with it and ultimate failure for those who do not.

Since business would benefit directly by the expenditure of this money, then why can we not go to business to get it? Has it not been demonstrated that business must give to get? If business gives to get in all other respects and the principle remains unchanged under the plan I have in mind, then we may rest assured that it can and will demonstrate the same degree of success. We need but apply it to immediately appreciate its beneficial effects.

The principle of give to get, in legal form, has not been untried. Precedent, demonstrating some 20 years of successful existence, has already been established. Even more astounding is the knowledge that its application has demonstrated the same degree of success under a Federal law, now upon the statute books.

Although it was applied in the collection of funds, it does not constitute a tax, as we know it, but a contribution, earmarked and expended for a specific purpose. When this principle was first embodied in the enactment of a law in the State of Oregon, some 20 years ago, it required that all owners of automobiles contribute 1 penny upon each gallon of gasoline purchased. These contributions were earmarked for the specific purpose of building more miles of bigger and better highways.

The benefits accruing from the expenditure of these contributions in the building of these highways did not stop with the purchases of sand, gravel, lumber, steel reinforcements, machinery, and equipment, but directly or indirectly affected many interwoven industries and created new ones, including garages and service stations. It is a foregone conclusion that had it not been for the contributions upon the purchase of gasoline, the largest single industry in the world would still be in its infancy.

It is erroneously assumed that more miles of better highways have been the direct cause of the growth of the automobile and other related industries to its present gigantic proportions. But can we not go back to the cause or the medium by which these highways came into being? Were not the contributions upon the purchase of gasoline, the cause, and the highways the effect? Can we not go back one step further, that we may attain the saturation point of cause and effect in this respect? Is not the process of elimination reached when we can appreciate the truth that the application of the God-given principle of give to get is the ultimate cause for the successful existence of the largest single industry in the world? The application of this principle, as exemplified by the so-called gasoline tax, has created enormous wealth and brought economic security to millions of our people.

Prior to the enactment of the so-called gasoline-tax law, the average price of gasoline throughout the United States was 30 cents per gallon. Today, the average price of gasoline is 19 cents per gallon, including a contribution, or so-called tax, of 5 cents. This total price is 37 percent lower than it was 20 years ago, when gasoline sold at 30 cents per gallon, without a contribution.

It has been claimed that any plan which proposes that a contribution of 2 percent be levied upon all business transactions would bankrupt and paralyze the country. The knowledge, however, that the State of Florida tolerates with signal success a 40-percent contribution upon a specific business transaction leads me to predict that it is not the enactment of a 2-percent contribution upon all business transactions which would wreck the country, but the repeal of the present 40-percent contribution upon the purchase of gasoline.

In conclusion, may I again remind you that the enactment of a permanent, merciful social security as an enabling act to any neutrality law, would bring peace to America and dissipate the possibility of involvement in foreign entanglements. The continued healthful existence of the American eagle, emblematic of these United States, lies in the immediate enactment of the Townsend plan. It will keep us out of war!

The Duty of Congress in World War Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 2, 1939

ARTICLE BY WALTER LIPPMANN

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, sometime ago the remark was made that Congress should pass neutrality legislation and then go home. I do not agree with that viewpoint. Congress has a duty in the world-war crisis. Congress should stay in session, and as conditions change Congress should be ready to meet the new problems and contribute, so far as legislation can do it, to a policy that will keep America out of foreign entanglements and out of foreign wars. Congress has that responsibility, and by remaining in session can best discharge it.

Walter Lippmann has contributed an interesting article in the Washington Post for September 30. He discusses world-war problems, the effect of legislation that will be passed by Congress, and the duty of Congress at this time. His article follows:

No one need spend any further effort arguing whether Congress should remain in Washington for the duration of the war. The question is settled. The bill reported to the Senate disposes conclusively of the idea that the direction of American policy is to be left to the discretion of the President. The bill is so drawn that Congress could not, even if it wished to do so, adjourn and go home. For the bill will impose new and drastic embargoes on American shipping to virtually all parts of the world and upon American finance and commerce in the bulk of its foreign transactions. The administration of the embargoes in order to make them workable, in order to protect American interests from unnecessary injuries, and in order to mitigate the losses will require continual and detailed attention by Congress. The legislature will have to be at hand not for the purpose of making speeches every day but for the purpose of watching the practical effects and of understanding the real situation as it develops and of consulting about the actual operation of the law. A procedure will have to be worked out by which the administration and Congress can effectively discharge their responsibility.

But while it is now settled that the President is not to have a free hand in foreign policy and that he can exercise his powers only by remaining closely accountable to Congress, it is not yet clearly settled that Congress is fully prepared to play its great part. That will not be settled until it has been made perfectly evident in the coming debate that the Congress really means to accept the responsibility of debating and deciding great issues. The country has made plain that it does not wish to leave its destiny to the personal judgment of the President; but it would be jumping out of the frying pan into the fire to submit the decision of these great issues to the letter writer, the radio speakers, the lobbyists, and the organizers of mass meetings and parades and demonstrations.

The Congress has accepted its constitutional responsibility for the peace and security of the American people; it will not be equal to that responsibility unless it reaches its decisions by the conscientious and fearless examination of the evidence and the argument presented in the actual debates. Congressmen must listen to their constituents who express their opinion, but if they are to be worthy of the respect of their constituents, each Congressman will have to say what Edmund Burke said to his constituents—that "his unbiased opinion, his mature judgment, his enlightened conscience, he ought not to sacrifice to you, to any man, or to any set of men living. * * * They are a trust from Providence, for the abuse of which he is deeply answerable. Your Representative owes you not his industry alone but his judgment; and he betrays you, instead of serving you, if he sacrifices it to your opinion."

This conception of the duty of the elected legislator is the very heart and soul of representative government. Let the legislator abdicate to the executive, and there is personal government; let him abdicate to the pressure of crowds, and there is government by agitators and demagogues. The legislator cannot, without betraying free government, abdicate his right and his duty to follow his own best judgment in the light of his own conscience.

Happily, that is the view adopted by the American Legion in its convention in Chicago, that it is the task of the citizens to say that they want neutrality and noninvolvement, and a wholly adequate armament, but that it is the task of the Congress and the administration jointly to determine the means. The Legion has given the people a wise example. It has recognized that citizens can declare, for example, in favor of increased national defense, but that citizens cannot make blueprints for new battleships; it has recognized equally that citizens can declare for a policy of neutrality, but that they are in no position to determine whether, for example, an embargo on finished arms or an embargo on ships and finance is the better means.

The character of the armaments and the structure of the neutrality legislation cannot be determined by letter writers and by the radio audience. That is responsible and technical work which calls for first-hand information, for study and reflection, and for thorough discussion among men who are able to know all the facts.

It is a work that Congress cannot evade by counting letters, reading the result of polls, and trying to make its decisions conform to the winds of opinion. The people can speak to Congress about what they want accomplished. As to how it is to be accomplished, Congress seeks to incite pressure which prevents the Congressmen from using their judgment; that bloc is violating the spirit of representative government.

Much is at stake in this debate. Not least among these things is whether representative government is to prove itself equal to the great task which has to be done. If the debate is protracted into a filibuster, if it ceases to be honest deliberation and becomes a contest in the incitement of popular emotion and the encouragement of pressure groups, then whatever the final outcome, the country will suffer. It will suffer because it will have to face the grave perils that lie ahead without a government that can be relied upon, without leadership that it can confidently trust, without the unity that is the one final, sure guaranty of its security.

That must not happen. It will not happen if Congress will debate the measure before it, decide the issue when every responsible legislator has had his say, and then remain continually on guard to deal with the effects of its measure, and with developments that cannot now be foreseen.

America's Destiny

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. GWYNNE
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 2, 1939

SERMON BY THE REVEREND C. J. GUNNELL, B. D.

Mr. GWYNNE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following sermon delivered at Christ Episcopal Church, Waterloo, Iowa, on Sunday, September 10, 1939, by the rector of the church, the Reverend C. J. Gunnell, a veteran of the World War and chaplain of Becker-Chapman Post of the American Legion. The sermon, based on the text "The Twilight That I Desired Hath Been Turned Into Trembling," Isaiah 21:4, is a splendid statement of the duty of America in the present European conflict:

The twilight time in Babylon of old was a time of refreshment and ease. The hours after sunset were the valued hours of the day. All day long the sun would beat pitilessly upon the streets and buildings of the city. All day long the continual glare of the vivid sunshine would blind the eyes; in the evening the inhabitants of Babylon, wearied by the sun glare, would welcome the time of twilight, when in the coolness they could rest and refresh themselves.

The twilight hours in Babylon were the coveted hours of the day. However, in a time of siege the twilight hours became hours of dread. It was then that the hated enemies of Babylon, the warriors of Elam and Media, could make their death-dealing attacks under cover of the deep, dark shadows and the vague half light of twilight time. The prized twilight time could easily be turned into horror and trembling.

So many of us today in America, after observing the rush of the mad events in Europe of the past few days, can voice the sentiment of the inhabitants of old Babylon: "The twilight that I desired hath been turned into trembling." We doubt if there ever has been a time such as this—a time when men and women everywhere have been so eager for the solution of the problems which are causing uncertainty amidst world-wide distress. All of us these days seem bent upon the search for counsel which shall in wisdom guide us through these perilous days.

The twilight has descended upon us—a twilight of indecision—a state of blurred vision when we halt between two opinions. When we know not which path to take and we become the easy prey of every fearmonger; when the multitudinous voices of the propagandists cause us to tremble; decisions are hard to make simply because the issues are not clear.

The twilight has been turned into trembling. My friends, this is particularly true in regard to our national policies. We are undecided what to do. Decisions are hard to make. The issues are so confused. What shall our national course be? Where are the safe channels between the sharp rocks and the treacherous shoals through which may be guided the old ship of state? These are the questions which confront us, and we know not what to do. The twilight is so hazy and is full of trembling.

May I say that through the twilight gleams the true clear light which has guided us through the years and will guide us now? Allow me to say there is only one true course to take and the issues are quite clear. The time has come when we who call ourselves Americans should strive to ascertain America's true destiny in the world of nations. Shall we again be disobedient to the heavenly vision? Shall we once more "entangle ourselves in foreign alliances"? Shall we again retard our national progress by clouding our path with the fogs of Old World hatreds and animosities?

Has America a destiny in the world? What is her mission and her destiny?

May I ask you to bear with me a few minutes while by way of illustration I recount an experience which was recently mine. Two years ago, together with a few hundred Legionnaires, I journeyed through the battlefields of France. We viewed the fields of white crosses in the awful valley of the Meuse Argonne. We stood in awed silence in the shell-pocked fields and valleys adjacent to the city of Verdun. We saw the ravishing work that explosives and the fire of big guns could do to forest, bluff, and field. One evening, returning from Montfaucon to Verdun, we journeyed through the most terrible valley in the world, the Ravin de la Mort, the valley of death. In this valley, less than 10 miles long, over 1,000,000 men were killed during the Great War. Here in this valley Old World hatreds and Old World jealousies and animosities had slain more than a million of the flower of humanity. As we journeyed through this valley, our thoughts were not of this valley of death but of another valley close to the village of Bethlehem, in the Judean hills, when on another night God gave a message of peace to the world; when startled shepherds heard the angelic message for which a troubled world had long been waiting. A message which would guide men in the way of peace. To wondering shepherds in a quiet valley in the hills near Bethlehem came God's message for humanity, "Peace on earth to men of good will." The Heavenly Father's guaranty of peace if only men would practice good will.

Here near the fortress of Verdun in this valley of death was man's answer to God's message of peace to men of good will. What was the answer? Written here in the valley of death with the blood of a million men was the awful answer. War through ill will. Death through hatred, malice, and greed.

Returning to Verdun, we saw the preparations being made for another great conflict—a conflict which even now rages. Once again the choice flower of the manhood of Europe is being offered as a sacrifice to the fanged jaws of the molech of war, a tragedy beyond words to describe.

Several days later we found ourselves viewing through our tears the Statue of Liberty and the beloved shore line of America. After our journey through the battlefields of France, we faced America as pilgrims—pilgrims who viewed a new land: A land where men of various races and faiths could live together in freedom and friendship. Briton and German, Jew and gentile, Roman Catholic and Protestant were living together in this land in peace and friendship as brothers.

Is there another land in this wide world where men of all races and creeds are living together as brothers?

Surely Almighty God has reserved America for a divine purpose. Her destiny is a glorious and an enviable one. After this present conflict is over, this war which is now known as the second World War, one nation will have to guide the nations into the way of peace. Dare we proclaim that God has reserved for America the divine privilege of leading the nations into the way of peace and establishing among men the old landmarks of democracy?

Is there another nation capable of doing this? Not one. If this is America's destiny, dare we prostitute our forces by selling our birthright for an uncertain mess of pottage? Dare we in the face of our mission join with Europe's perennial hatreds and jealousies? The social and economic problems following in the wake of this second World War will undoubtedly be much more difficult to solve than those of the first World War. Twenty years or more is too short a breathing space between wars, and many problems which have arisen as the result of the last war still clamor for solution. Let us not allow the propaganda now being issued in America to stir us to hatred. Rather let us listen for the still small voice of God, the only voice capable of guiding us on the same paths of peace.

What, then, shall we do? Let us keep our heads clear, our hearts tender, and our knees bended in prayer. We will need clear heads and tender hearts in the days that are to come. We will need to pray more fervently that God may keep us cool and sane. There is a light to lighten the national path—the bright, unfailing light of God, the true light of the world.

After all is said and done, national greatness does not necessarily depend upon the extent of territory over which its authority spreads, but is found in the character of its policies. The two greatest nations of antiquity insofar as their subsequent influence upon human affairs is concerned were the Greeks and the Hebrews. Greece and the Holy Land were small countries. Both of these peoples had a national vision. Greece's vision was that of an ideal state, and the Jews' vision that of a righteous state. The world is richer because these two nations strove to be true to their visions.

God has had a hand in molding the vision and destiny of this Nation. This Nation was not brought into being by a haphazard set of fortuitous circumstances, nor was it by chance that our forefathers were guided to these shores to found here a nation "conceived in liberty." It was not merely by chance that the motto emblazoned on the national standard bears the sacred words "In God we trust." By faith in God and the brotherhood of man this Nation has survived when other nations have failed. America has a glorious and a privileged destiny. For does she not stand as a model today for all the world to note that it is possible for men of varying creeds and nationalities to live together under God as brothers? This is her divine destiny. Is the twilight so dim or our hearts so fettered with fear that we fail to see the clear light burning in the eastern sky?

Are the clamorous voices of the world so loud or are our ears so deaf that we hear not the voice of God declaring, "This is the way; walk ye in it"? Do the forces of hatred cause us to fear? Then the force of love must dispel the force of hatred.

Through the darkness gleams the light which can illuminate this dark world—a light which points the way. The forces which have bound together the various peoples and creeds into one great nation are the forces which will keep this Nation strong. They are the forces which will redeem the world—the two great essentials of democracy, love and brotherhood.

America's destiny is a divine destiny to point the world to these two great essentials and save the world from self-destruction.

Surely America's destiny is a glorious one: "To heal the broken-hearted, to preach deliverance to the captives, and recovering of sight to the blind; to set at liberty them that are bruised"; to create among nations the will and the way to universal peace.

Who Opposes Neutrality?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 2, 1939

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, here in Washington the thinking is so muddled, so confused, that it is like a ray of sunshine on a muggy day to pick up any one of many dailies or weeklies that are published in the Fourth Congressional District of Michigan, and read an editorial reflecting the views of the folks back home and disclosing that they are not fooled by the phrase makers, the flag wavers, the legalistic lingo of the folks here in Washington.

As an example of this sane, clear, straight thinking let me quote the editorial written by Mark P. Haines and published in the Sturgis Daily Journal of September 16, 1939. That editorial is as follows:

WHO OPPOSES NEUTRALITY?

Senator BORAH in his radio address Thursday night declared flatly that the President's plan to repeal the embargo on the sale of arms and munitions to European powers that are able to come and get them and pay for them in cash "will unquestionably constitute intervention in the present conflict in Europe; that laws and statutes and proclamations are not and will not be sufficient to maintain successfully a policy of neutrality. Only the united will of the people can accomplish this difficult task."

No one doubts that there are powerful influences at work in this country and other neutral nations to make this another world war. Greatest of these is the international armament industry, a business that depends for its profits upon bigger and better wars. Evidence is not lacking that the conflict now raging in Europe was instigated by armament firms that know no nationality and admit responsibility neither to man nor God.

Pierre Van Paassen, noted foreign correspondent, in his recent book, Days of Our Years, describes in graphic and convincing fashion how the infant Nazi party of Adolph Hitler was sponsored by French, German, Czechoslovakian, and British armament manufacturers. Answering his own question, "Why should Hitler have received French, Czechoslovakian, and British money?" Van Paassen says:

"The answer is simple. One needed but read the Fuehrer's book, Mein Kampf. In that document the upstart party leader, with scarcely 10,000 followers at the time he wrote the book, announced that his first task upon attaining power would be to rearm the Reich. Did not such a man deserve international sympathy and support? Armament factories all over the Continent were standing idle, dividends were sinking, stock quotations going lower and lower. And not a cloud on the horizon to give the deadly armament industry a little spurt, no danger anywhere to warrant the manufacture of a single gun. Would it not be a godsend if Hitler could come to power and make Germany dangerous once more? Wouldn't that be sufficient excuse to kill all this nonsense in Geneva about world peace and disarmament? Once Germany started to rearm, all could follow suit. For the primary condition of a general armament campaign is the rearmament of only one powerful state. With Germany on the way 'the tragic and ridiculous spectacle' (as François Delaisi called it once) of nations arming because they were afraid, and afraid because they were arming, could start all over again." The writer adds: "The French metal industry agreed to the rearmament of Germany as early as 1925, as being the only condition for the stimulation of the inner French market."

Appalling as the thought may be, does anyone doubt that American manufacturers of guns, explosives, airplanes, and other war supplies would be in a position to realize huge profits if the President has his way and the arms embargo is repealed?

In view of the international ramifications of the armament monopoly, it is not inconceivable that American boys, if they are again sent to fight Europe's wars, will be shot and killed with guns and bullets manufactured in the United States. It happened in the recent Spanish war, where it was disclosed that German and Italian manufacturers of war supplies had been selling guns, tanks, and munitions to both sides in the civil conflict, although Italian and German troops were fighting with Franco's forces against the Loyalists.

In court procedure in this country a man who procures and sells a gun to another man knowing that he intends to use it to commit a murder becomes an accessory before the fact, and, if convicted, is liable to drastic penalties. What is true of the individual is true of nations. If the United States undertakes to sell guns and war materials to European nations it becomes an accessory both during and after the fact of mass murder.

Of course, war will stimulate certain types of business in this country. It will improve business in the same way that an earthquake does, by making it necessary to rebuild a devastated city, with this important difference—an earthquake is an act of God, a war is an act of men gone mad.

Newspaper dispatches from Washington state that the prospects for repeal of the embargo on arms have been greatly enhanced by the upturn in business since war was declared. If this is true, and it probably is, we'll be fighting and dying shortly to make the world safe for the munitions makers. Then, indeed, we will have a world that will be an "Idiot's Delight."

So far as I can see, there is no reason whatever why this country should engage in the present war. If this is still a government of the people, for the people, there is no reason why people throughtout the country should accept the dictum of our American internationalists that war is inevitable.

Senators and Congressmen are still your representatives. They are yet where you can get at them. It is within the power of the people to call upon them to keep us out of this war and to tell them, in no unmistakable terms, that if they permit us to be drawn into it, you, the people, will see to it that they stay at home after the next election rolls around. Let those Representatives and Senators who oppose your views know what it is that you want, for, after all, they are your servants.

This Country Must Maintain Strict Neutrality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 2, 1939

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I submit that the Government of our country is facing a great crisis; that the Members of the Congress have been called to the Capital to consider our national policy and the course that the people of this country shall follow in dealing with the great nations now at war—a war in which the fate of civilization is at stake. The form of our future Government may depend upon the course that we decide upon at this session of Congress.

In making this momentous decision let us follow the precepts and examples of our first President, who guided our Government through the perilous times of the first years of its existence, when our small Nation was surrounded on every side by the territory of foreign countries—the British in Canada to the north, the Spanish in Florida to the south, and French in Louisiana to the west.

President Washington firmly established the principle of neutrality as laid down in his proclamation:

A PROCLAMATION

Whereas it appears that a state of war exists between Austria, Prussia, Sardinia, Great Britain, and the United Netherlands, of the one part, and France on the other, and the duty and interest of the United States require that they should with sincerity and good faith adopt and pursue a conduct friendly and impartial toward the belligerent powers:

I have therefore thought fit, by these presents, to declare the disposition of the United States to observe the conduct aforesaid toward those powers, respectively; and to exhort and warn the citizens of the United States carefully to avoid all acts and proceedings whatsoever which may in any manner tend to contravene such disposition.

And I do hereby also make known that whosoever of the citizens of the United States shall render himself liable to punishment or forfeiture under the law of nations by committing, aiding, or abetting hostilities against any of the said powers, or by carrying to any of them those articles which are deemed contraband by the modern usage of nations, will not receive the protection of the United States against such punishment or forfeiture; and, further, that I have given instructions to those officers, to whom it belongs, to cause prosecutions to be instituted against all persons who shall, within the cognizance of the courts of the United States, violate the law of nations, with respect to the powers at war, or any of them.

In testimony whereof I have caused the seal of the United States of America to be affixed to these presents and signed the same with my hand. Done at the city of Philadelphia, the 22d day of April 1793, and of the independence of the United States of America the seventeenth.

G. WASHINGTON.

Our country in following the principles wisely established by our first President, George Washington, and the great doctrine promulgated by President Monroe, has kept this Nation free from foreign entanglements, and can be credited in a large measure to the preeminent place our country has attained among the world powers.

Let us strictly adhere to the principles of neutrality, that we may preserve for ourselves and our children the blessings of liberty, security, and happiness, the safeguard of good government.

America Must Stay Out of War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 2, 1939

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, the people of America are demanding of their Representatives in Congress to keep them out of war. That is the primary job of this special session and of all subsequent sessions until this war is over.

But we cannot just fold our hands and say, "We are going to stay out of war." If we try that, the devil of propaganda is certain to find some work for our idle hands to do. What is necessary is, first full understanding of all factors in this situation both on the part of Congress and on the part of the people; and second, a dynamic program of active work for a just and lasting peace and for the strengthening and perfecting of our democracy and the economic situation of our people here at home.

America's job is to have something in the way of real salvation to offer to a war-torn world. America's job is to keep alive the faith that God's laws still operate even in this darkened world.

LEST WE FORGET

It is important to remember our mistakes. Twenty-two short years ago Americans were making huge profits out of a European war. Our soldiers were following our goods and products across the ocean, many of them never to come back. Twenty-one short years ago that war ended and America woke up, too late, to find that she had fought a war which did not end war, or save democracy, or even create a lasting peace, but which ended in a treaty that was to sow the seeds of another war and of new dictatorships. Shortly after the war—in May 1920, to be exact—the financial interests which during the war had strengthened their hold on our economic life deliberately created a monetary deflation which brought unemployment to millions and disaster to American farmers. The people had lost their jobs, their incomes, their sons. But war profits had made some of our biggest corporations larger and more powerful than ever, and the money lenders had profited by creating the money with which the Nation fought the war. So we had two kinds of war profiteering. The one, which most people knew about but which was never effectively checked, resulted from profiteering at the expense of American consumers as well as from the sale of war material at exorbitant prices. The other, which most people did not know about or understand, resulted from the Nation borrowing its own credit from the private banks. The deflation of 1920, deliberately created by the banker-controlled Federal Reserve Board, gave the holders of Government bonds—and, indeed, all creditors—a very substantial increase in the buying power of the interest and principal they collected; this at a time when the rest of the Nation was being plunged into a depression from which agriculture, at least, has never really recovered.

Lest we forget, the war also gave us the basis on which the financial excesses of the twenties could develop. It brought an unhealthy flood of gold to America and promoted the stupendous lending spree of our financial oligarchy, which caused the stock-market boom and ended up in the crash of 1929. It also brought about the collapse of the international gold-standard system, which pulled the whole world into the mire of depression after it.

These are things to remember. They are not things to repeat.

DEPRESSION, THE REAL CAUSE OF WAR

And now there is this new war, already called the second world war. One cause of it undoubtedly is the Treaty of Versailles, which was not really a treaty of peace but one of revenge, though it was probably no whit worse than what Germany would have imposed had she been victorious. But anyone who followed post-war developments in Europe was compelled to see that a revision of the Treaty of Versailles was inevitable; that it would have come even without Hitler; that the British and French were gradually realizing the stupidity of their policy of trying to keep a great and intelligent people in perennial subjection.

Many people are blaming Hitlerism for this war. But just to the extent that they are correct in this, to that same extent the depression which made Hitler possible in Germany must be regarded as a still more fundamental cause. For it is necessary to remember that Hitler's rise did not really begin until German trade had been destroyed by deflation; until her financial system was paralyzed by the sudden stoppage of foreign lending and the flight of capital from Germany; until her domestic economic life was wasting away, with 7,000,000 people—one-third of all Germany's workers—unemployed. Depression and unemployment, confusion and insecurity, plus the persistent deflationary policy of the Government, thus primarily produced Hitler's dictatorship, as they produced dictatorships in several other European nations.

It is important that the American people keep constantly before their eyes the grim picture of economic distress and depression as the basic causes of Hitlerism and of other forms of dictatorship. Every democracy, our own included, will run the risk of the loss of liberty just so long as they refuse to solve their economic problems. It is evidently ridiculous to assume that military defeat of Hitlerism will in itself accomplish this solution. It is equally certain that any nation which is at war must suspend all social and economic progress, and many elements of democracy itself, for the war's duration. It therefore becomes the primary duty of American ingenuity and insight to solve those problems and make democracy the dynamic force which it ought to be. If we succeed in this task, we may yet make the world safe for democracy. But we can do it only if we stay out of the war.

DICTATORSHIP, DEMOCRACY, AND THE ECONOMIC PROBLEM

Irrespective of who wins this war, the gold-standard finance capitalism which ruled economic life prior to 1929 will almost certainly be destroyed by it. Some substitute will have to be found for the economic practices whereby an international financial oligarchy substantially controlled the fate of civilized nations by means of a gold-standard monetary system down to the time of the great depression. Two alternatives are possible. Either this substitute will be worked out by democratic method and within democratic institutions or else it will be done by dictatorship and attended by the loss of liberty. Germany under Hitler has instituted a new economic order based upon complete regimentation, the rigid control of production, consumption, prices, and wages. Germany has thrown overboard all pretense of being orthodox in monetary matters and has attempted to provide an increase in the volume of the means of payment which would be commensurate with the increase in production. The fact, however, that she has not yet broken with the tradition of borrowing the nation's money into circulation necessarily means that she has thus been increasing her national

debt at a very rapid rate. Current changes in Germany's financial system should be given the closest study.

In all fairness it should be said that Germany, as did Russia before her, has apparently succeeded in putting all of her human and material resources to work in full production. The essential thing which Americans should not overlook, however, is that the success of Germany in bringing this about has not been due to the regimentation of her people's lives and economic activities, but to the simple fact that she has been regularly and boldly injecting new buying power into the purchasing-power stream to finance Government orders for rearmament and public works. It is also essential to realize that the volume of outstanding money was rigidly controlled by an ingenious system of forced loans, taxation, and the virtual prohibition of private investment. Insofar as Germany's "full production" has been based on a vast increase in armament, it is essential to point out that it could not result in an increased real income for the people, and that, barring some miraculous intervention, war would, on the contrary, become inevitable.

This is not the way the democracies should try to solve their problems, though it contains a great lesson. Of course, the British and French are now forced to institute quasi-dictatorial governments of their own and to put every ounce of their strength into the production of war goods. But evidently the substitution of wartime dictatorship is no step at all toward working out this economic problem in a democratic way. The big lesson of the German experience remains, however, that the more men, machines, and natural resources are put to work, the stronger a nation becomes. We have not yet practically recognized this simple, fundamental truth. For we are still deliberately weakening our system of democracy by permitting millions of our people and a large proportion of our material resources to remain idle. This is the challenge to America of these trying times: To put our unemployed to work producing goods and services which will raise the living standards of our people, and to do this without surrendering any of the fundamental liberties guaranteed by our Constitution.

If we can meet this challenge, we will be able to show the world the road to real prosperity and lasting peace. It is certain that we will fail to meet this challenge unless we remedy one of the basic obstacles which now stands in the way of the full use of our productive capacity. I refer to our faulty monetary and credit system, which makes it impossible for this Nation to have in circulation the volume of money necessary to balance the full production of goods, unless either the people or the Government borrows this money into circulation in the form of private bank credit and pays the banks interest for their costless creation of that credit. There are many other things that need to be done, but assumption by the Congress of its constitutional power to issue and control the Nation's money is first and most important. It has been truly said that "all other reform waits upon monetary reform."

I think it almost inevitable that this war will compel a general abandonment of the eighteenth century practice of having governments borrow their nation's money into existence at interest from private banks, thus building up a burden of national debt which can never be discharged. The belligerents are even now, at the beginning of this war, so overburdened with government debt that there seems little doubt but that ultimately either inflation or repudiation will have to be resorted to. There is a better and far sounder way, and some nations have by now begun to learn it by bitter experience. They have learned that they can prevent both inflation and deflation by controlling the volume of money in circulation. It is absolutely essential, however, that any government which assumes its basic economic responsibility and undertakes to control the volume and maintain the stable buying power of its money must also stop this foolish practice of tying the volume of money to the volume of debt.

The future of human liberty largely depends, therefore, upon whether or not some great democratic nation which is not at war accomplishes these fundamental economic reforms. Clearly it is America's duty, and I hope and pray it may be her destiny, to be that nation.

THE IMPORTANT MATTERS

The important things for America in these dark days are, in my opinion, not the things that are most talked about. They are instead, primarily, to perfect here at home the pattern of a democracy triumphant over its problems, a democracy that can distribute to its people regularly and continuously the abundant products of its factories and its farms, a democracy that has dealt with unemployment more successfully than any dictatorship has ever done, and, above all, a democracy free from the control of international financial power, able to prevent forever any repetition of the financial crime of 1920, and exercising once again its basic sovereign right to create and control its own medium of exchange.

This is no time to turn from the needs of our own people and the solution of our domestic problems. It is a time instead to work at them with renewed energy. For our American democracy must offer as vital a challenge to a demoralized world as possible. Under the stress of these times when some of us are just waking up to realize how much American freedom means to us perhaps some long-neglected things can be done. Why, for example, should we consider only industrial mobilization plans of the War Department instead of developing a program that will give us full production under all conditions? Can we not see that to plan for peace and plenty will give us the firmest possible basis for true national defense?

In addition to this one most fundamental matter there are other things that are really more important than the currently much-discussed question of the arms embargo. The first is a strengthening of the antiwar spirit of the American people. This, I think, can be accomplished best by developing the fullest possible understanding of the causes of this war, the most careful skepticism with regard to foreign propaganda of all sorts, and the adoption in both thought and action of the traditional American foreign policy set forth in the Monroe Doctrine and practiced so successfully down to the time of the Spanish-American War. The second thing of real importance is the development of a plan and program for a just and lasting peace and a continuous putting forward of this program until this war is ended. The third matter is the prevention of profiteering—particularly in the arms trade, which will flourish if the embargo is repealed. This is important not only because profit in the arms trade is wrong but also because Government revenue will be most important in making possible a program of full employment now and at the time when the war trade ceases. Finally, we should face now the problem of how foreign nations at war are to make payment for goods purchased from America. For we do not want to repeat the experience of the last war with regard to this matter.

AN UNDERSTANDING OF THIS WAR

There can be no doubt about Mr. Hitler. He has frightened every small nation in eastern Europe and he has destroyed three of them already. He has constantly threatened war unless he could have his way. He has tried to subordinate religion and the individual conscience of people to the Nazi state. But other people are guilty, too. Josef Stalin certainly is the man more responsible than any other for bringing on this war at the time it came. Every attempt by American Communists to apologize for his action has been ridiculous, and it becomes daily more clear that his sole aim is to increase his personal power and to challenge Hitler's supremacy as the world's best liquidator of helpless states and minorities. Britain and France, on their part, have clung to vast empires whose very existence has been in large part the cause of unrest on the part of have-not nations. And America must share to some degree their guilt because we decided the issue of the last war only to fail utterly in preventing the drafting of the Treaty of Versailles from which sprang Hitler and the chain of circumstances which we face today.

This war is no simple proposition. Fundamentally, as I have said, it is the result of conditions of depression and needless poverty imposed upon the peoples of many nations by the blindness and selfishness of their rulers. This war is partly the result of the utterly unscrupulous dealings of the dictators. It is partly the result of the struggle of nations without empires to gain a share of the gigantic empires that are held tenaciously in the hands of Britain and France. And, finally, it is partly—but only partly—a struggle between democracy and dictatorship. To many of us this last issue seems the most important one. But it is vital to remember that it is not the only one.

It is important in these black days to remind ourselves over and over that no nation is as bad as the propaganda of its enemies says it is nor as good as its own propaganda says. The President has urged us all to sift the news, the radio reports, the things we see on the screen, and to try to separate the true from the untrue. Upon our doing this with care may depend the peace of America.

WILL AMERICAN SYMPATHIES LEAD THE NATION TO WAR?

Not that there can be any doubt where America's natural sympathies lie in this struggle. We are beginning to realize that freedom and liberty are real things. We are beginning to see how easily they can be destroyed. We are beginning to understand that peace cannot be based on conquest or treaties of revenge like the Treaty of Versailles, but we are beginning to see also that peace can never be as safe in the hands of absolute rulers such as Hitler or Stalin as it is in the hands of elected representatives of the people.

There is no use for anyone to try to hide the fact that most of the American people breathe a sigh of relief when they read of French or British successes and are, on the other hand, more deeply concerned and, therefore, more subject to the effects of war propaganda whenever they hear that Hitler has scored a victory over some army half as big and a quarter as well equipped as his, or that Stalin has thrown some 4,000,000 men into a "bold and fearless" attack on the already defeated Polish Army. These feelings on the part of the majority of Americans are not "neutral" and there is little use trying to say they are. For this reason, among others, there are people who have said all along that America is certain sooner or later to get into this war. I do not believe that needs to be true at all. I think we can stay out of this war if we want to badly enough and if we will do a little thinking along with our feeling. In the end the Nation's peace will depend not so much on laws of Congress as on how stout the antiwar sentiment of the Nation really is.

There can be no question that the vast majority of our people want this country kept out of war. The question is, Can they learn to make a very sharp distinction between their desire to see dictatorship defeated and the very different question as to whether America should mix in Europe's conflicts? Upon our ability to make that distinction probably depends our chance of staying out of war and of being able to work unceasingly for peace—for a peace as quickly as possible and for a peace that will be on fair enough terms to be lasting.

For an American to say he is opposed to nazi-communism is to speak the obvious. But for him to say he is going to plunge his Nation into war is quite a different thing—especially since all the forces in this country which might actually want war are the ones most opposed to doing those things which would make our democracy an effective challenge to Nazi-Communist dictatorship throughout the world.

NEUTRALITY

So far as neutrality is concerned, the simple truth is that whatever is done about the arms embargo will not be really neutral. If we leave the law as it stands, we will be favoring Germany, and if we repeal the arms embargo, we will be favoring Britain and France. The only difference that I can see is one pointed out by the President, namely, that by keeping the law as it stands our favoring of Germany is due to conscious action on our part, whereas by changing it the advantage which will then go to the Allies will be due to the circumstance that Britain and France are sea powers and Germany is not.

The people are being seriously misled, in my opinion, with regard to the importance of the arms embargo. Millions of them apparently believe that the arms embargo and what is done about it is going to determine whether or not America stays out of war. Some leaders are claiming that if we keep the arms embargo it will keep us out; others are claiming that if we lift it, it will keep us out. I think both of these statements are deceptive exaggerations. It is most important to remember that so long as we are shipping everything else under the sun to both neutrals and belligerents there is just as much likelihood of our having our goods sunk or confiscated or of being involved in this way as there would be if cannon and shells were mixed with the wheat and the steel. And it is evidently very foolish to say that if we lift the embargo and start shipping arms to all who can get them we will have erected any barrier at all against our drifting into war. The question of keeping America out of war is going to depend upon other and more weighty things—mostly, I think, on the ability of our people to take a long-range view of this war, to remember all its causes and all its implications, and to realize that our first duty, and the only one we can certainly perform, is our duty to the people and democratic institutions of America. We can stay out of war if we are constructively engaged in working for real democracy at home and real peace in the world. We cannot stay out if we cease working for the solution of our own people's problems and give way to panicky fear over the possible consequences of a Hitler victory.

The real arguments on the embargo are these:

If we do not lift the embargo we will, by a conscious, deliberate action be assisting Hitler and Stalin in their business in Europe. We will be running the risk of finding ourselves supplying Hitler with arms by the way of the Pacific through a technically neutral Russia at the same time that we refuse to supply them to Britain and France.

Therefore, if the arms embargo is retained, it should be made to apply to every nation in the world, for otherwise the belligerents are certain to get our arms from friendly neutrals. If our action is to be based on thoroughgoing opposition to unquestioned evils of the arms trade, then we ought to be insisting on extending the embargo to the world instead of making the unconvincing argument that to merely keep an arms embargo against belligerents will keep America out of war.

On the other hand, if we lift the embargo, the munitions industry will enjoy a boom; and unless proper laws are passed now to prevent it, a few Americans will get jobs making munitions, and we will be fooled into thinking the unemployment problem has been solved. For this we must necessarily suffer in the future, and many groups of our people will suffer right now.

Therefore it is of paramount importance that if the arms embargo is lifted, the most severe laws should be passed to prevent profiteering in munitions, and to prepare for the certain depression which will follow this miserable boom period. I cannot understand why this proposal has not been advanced in every single speech advocating repeal.

It is for this reason that a number of Members of Congress are attempting by every possible legislative means to accomplish the drastic taxation of profits resulting from this war trade. My own bill (H. R. 7545) on this subject reads as follows:

A bill to prevent profiteering in war munitions

Be it enacted, etc., That there shall be levied, collected, and paid an excess-profits tax equal to 80 percent of all net profits in excess of the average net profit realized in the 24 months immediately preceding the passage of this act upon every person, partnership, association, company, or corporation engaged in the business of manufacturing, exporting, or dealing in arms, ammunition, or implements of war as defined in the proclamation of the President No. 2349, of September 5, 1939. In computing net profits, such persons, partnerships, companies, associations, and corporations shall include therein all increased payments, whether in cash or otherwise, to any person whose total compensation amounts to $10,000 per year or more.

This is only one formula that might be applied, of course. Others will be suggested; and it does not matter whose bill is passed or how so long as Congress stops now profiteering by dealers in weapons of death.

Last spring I voted with a majority of the House to retain the arms embargo in the neutrality law. I did so because I believed the munitions traffic to be wrong. I still believe that as much as I ever did. But I must confess that I was considerably worried to find that the vote of the House was regarded as another triumph for Herr Hitler, to be added to an already very long list of triumphs.

And since that time events of the greatest magnitude have taken place, and we face a world situation shot through with wrongs. If ever we were confronted with a choice of the lesser of two evils, that time is now.

For unless we have an assurance that adequate legislation will be passed to prevent profiteering in the munitions business and to end the power of international finance, we are confronted with the uphappy choice of voting either against the embargo and for Mr. du Pont, Mr. Baruch, and Mr. Morgan or voting for the embargo and for Mr. Hitler and Mr. Stalin. Either we must vote to sell implements of death or else we must vote in such a way as to encourage those forces in the world which are already best equipped with such implements. It is hard, indeed, to say that one way is absolutely right and the other absolutely wrong under these circumstances. For this reason I will keep an open mind until the time my vote is cast on this bill.

I feel it is only fair, however, to let the people know the way I am thinking on this subject.

For my part, therefore, I must base my decision on one fundamental purpose which I shall follow, and that purpose is to do those hard-headed and realistic things which seem best calculated to keep my country out of war and to make it possible for us to work for peace and to make our democracy really work here at home. I am convinced that propaganda based on fear of the spread of the power of the dictatorships is the one force most likely to defeat these efforts and drag America into war. Whether or not such propaganda is justified is beside the point. Already it exists. To add substance to it will, I believe, constitute the greatest single danger to America's peace.

A war is now in progress on the European Continent. I believe all will agree that there is not 1 chance in 1,000 of the United States entering that war on the side of Germany and Russia. The dictators' opposition to religion alone would be enough to make that true. Either we will keep our heads and remain at peace or else we will once more go off to war on the side of England and France. This war is not made by people and no decent man seeks to see any people of any nation crushed as a result of it. It is a war, on the other hand, that came when it did mainly because of the signing of an agreement between the two most absolute rulers in the world today. The full significance and extent of the Russo-German pact no one but Stalin and Hitler probably knows. But at the very least it did two things. It brought together into a strange and portentous partnership the two great dicatorships of the world and it assured to Germany so long as she remains at war a full access to the almost limitless resources not only of Russia but of all southeast Europe, the Near East and most of Asia. It even gives her access through a friendly power to the Pacific Ocean and to Japan, a power which has already demonstrated its ability to supply itself with modern munitions of war, and hence in a position to export these if she can replace them with imports from a third nation.

There seems small chance that an arms embargo covering all the nations, neutral as well as belligerent, will even be seriously considered. Several times in the past few years I have voted for such general embargoes, and I believe I would do so now if the issue were presented in that form. But there is little chance that it will be. For, so far as I am aware, none of the advocates of the embargo has suggested that it be extended to any except actual belligerent nations.

Hence, if our present law is not changed and if Japan remains neutral, then without any violation of law at all, Japan might purchase arms from the United States and then ship the output of her own munitions plants across Russia into Germany. The same thing might happen in the case of Italy. This, then, would mean that we would be supplying arms to Germany, whereas we would be refusing to sell even on a cash-and-carry basis to Britain and France.

I am certainly against any attempt to stir up bitterness against the German people, and I hope against hope we will not believe the lies about them which poisoned American minds during the last war. But Mr. Hitler is not the German people.

And it is a mighty serious matter to be responsible for continuing an embargo policy which amounts to giving Adolf Hitler the advantages of a blockade of Britain and France so far as arms are concerned, in addition to the tremendous advantage he has already gained from his working agreement with Josef Stalin.

Of course we ought to be immune to propaganda, and we ought to stick to our job here in America under every circumstance and not be swept off our feet by fear of forces that, after all, are pretty far away.

But I am not talking about how it ought to be. I am talking about how it is. And as a practical matter the fight to keep America out of war is going to have its toughest battle when it goes up against fear. We will be told that if Hitler wins we will find his bunds in South America and Mexico—perhaps even in new German possessions in the Western Hemisphere—and that we will be threatened by a Europe and Asia dominated by the German and Russian dictators. And suppose we are also told that by a conscious act of Congress—an embargo act that we ourselves could change—we are helping very largely to bring about the triumph of Nazi-Communist dictatorship in a large part of the world. When that time comes then, indeed, I will be fearful for this Nation's peace. For then is when we will forget to analyze things carefully, forget about the subtle influence of international finance, forget about the empires of Britain and France, forget about our experiences in the last World War, and think only, as we thought 22 years ago, that "we will be the next." If the arms embargo—at least in its present form—were removed, this propaganda appeal would, I believe, have considerably less effectiveness. I believe this is important.

SAFEGUARDS WHICH CAN BE PROVIDED BY LAW

In all the furor about the arms embargo it appears that millions of American citizens have completely overlooked, or else been misled, regarding the fact that there are a great many other commodities besides arms which are important to warring nations. All of these commodities can, under existing law, be shipped from the United States to either belligerents or neutrals, either in or out of the war zone, whether paid for or not, and in either American or foreign ships. As a matter of fact, this is being done right now and we do not even have any provision that such trade shall be carried on at the trader's risk. People who are writing to their Congressmen saying they want "no change in the present neutrality law" ought to understand this situation and consider some of these matters which the present law does not cover at all.

The shipment of any type of goods is, of course, dangerous. Almost anything is dangerous in a world like this. The only perfectly safe course would be to prohibit the shipping or sale of anything at all to any nation in the war zone. But as a practical matter, however willing some of us might be to do exactly that and to meet the unemployment problem that would result here at home, even the most ardent advocates of isolation know that such drastic legislation is just simply impossible to pass. It seems, therefore, inevitable that we will be selling large amounts of cotton and wheat and steel and copper and many other things to both neutrals and belligerents. And the people are probably right who say that to add finished arms to this list will not make it any more likely that we will be dragged into war on account of the sinking of ships or loss of goods than would be the case if we sold everything except finished arms.

It is because of all these factors that it has been proposed that as a precautionary measure we require belligerent pur-

chasers to take title to and pay for goods of any sort before they leave our shores and to carry them away in their own ships.

This is called cash and carry and it has nothing whatever to do with the question of the arms embargo. Indeed, it was first proposed to cover other goods besides arms. We can have both an arms embargo and cash and carry or we can have neither one. Or we can have cash and carry without an embargo, as the President suggested, or we can have an embargo on arms and no cash and carry as we have now. Many people have written to me saying they are against cash and carry and for the arms embargo. That is hard to understand. I believe what these people really mean is that they want an embargo on arms and a cash-and-carry provision for other products.

Surely, therefore, we should provide at the very least that trade or travel carried on by Americans with belligerents or in war zones must be done at the trader's or the traveler's risk. And, as further safeguarding measures, there could be written into law the following provisions: (1) That title to goods must pass to foreign purchasers before the goods are shipped to belligerents; (2) that American ships be kept out of the war zones; and (3) that Americans be forbidden to travel on belligerent vessels. All these provisions would be new provisions of law. They are not the law now. In addition, we should certainly keep and, if possible, strengthen the prohibitions which are a part of existing law against Americans making loans or extending credits to belligerents.

All these things will to some extent curtail trade and make it more difficult to carry on. But if they help to save the lives of American young men, then these and many other measures, too, ought certainly to be taken by the Congress.

THE LEGISLATIVE SITUATION

Few people in the country understand the process through which this so-called neutrality legislation will pass before it becomes law. The situation is this: The House passed at the last session a new neutrality bill, which contained an embargo against shipping arms and ammunition to belligerents, a requirement that belligerent purchasers of American goods must take title to them before they are shipped, and certain other provisions. The Senate did not act on that bill or any other bill.

The Senate started work at the special session on that House bill. But the Senate Foreign Relations Committee has completely rewritten the bill, has removed the arms embargo, and added very much stronger provisions with regard to the following things: (1) Requiring that goods shipped to belligerents go in non-American ships and that title be taken by foreign buyers before they leave America; (2) forbidding Americans to travel on belligerent ships; (3) prohibiting American ships to enter war zones; and (4) putting a ban on loans and credits to belligerents. Just what the bill will look like when the Senate is through with it no one knows, but the probabilities are it will not be amended very much.

Now, although the Senate has changed the House bill very drastically, nevertheless it is, from a legislative standpoint, still the same bill. So that when the Senate has finished with it there will be a conference between members of the Senate and House Foreign Affairs Committees without any action by the House intervening. This conference committee will adjust differences between the House and Senate bills, and the only vote that will be taken in the House will be on the final bill as drafted by the conference. The House will have to vote "aye" or "no" on the entire bill, and it will not be possible to amend it. In all probability that final bill will contain these provisions: (1) Repeal of the arms embargo; (2) requirement of belligerent purchasers that they pay for our goods before they leave America and carry them away in their own ships; (3) prohibition against loans and credits to belligerents; (4) provisions forbidding American ships to enter war zones and American citizens to ride on belligerent ships—that is, it will provide for keeping American-owned goods, American financial interests, American ships, and, above all, American citizens out of the war zone.

If I am right in my judgment as to what the bill will contain, then Members of the House who want to keep the embargo will have to vote "no," which will mean they will have to vote against the other provisions I have listed above. If a Member wants to have the safeguards provided in (2), (3), and (4) of that list, then he would have to vote "aye" on the entire bill, including the repeal of the embargo. Weighing all the evidence that I have before me now, I believe the best vote under these circumstances would be "aye."

HOW ABOUT PAYMENT

Now we come to a problem which may, in the course of time, prove exceedingly serious both for the United States and for nations buying from us. That is the problem of how payment for these goods is to be made. One way is in gold; another is in foreign exchange; another is by borrowing from the United States in order to buy in the United States. None of these methods is a good one from anybody's standpoint, in my opinion. Britain and France are the only nations that can pay in gold. But soon every bit of gold in the world will have been transferred to the United States. Already we have three-fifths of it. Britain and France have nearly all the rest. Soon the other nations will have been drained of gold and will have learned to get along without it. What will happen then? Is it not altogether possible we will really have a gigantic "gold brick." We will have sent valuable products abroad and we will have received useless gold in return. Of course, we could issue money against the gold or we could coin it. But if we ever get sensible enough to issue our money in a constitutional manner, we will also be sensible enough to understand that gold redemption or even gold "backing" are not only utterly unnecessary but likely to become actually vicious practices.

If we take payment in foreign exchange, the only way we can spend that exchange will be by buying vast quantities of goods from the nations which are now buying from us. With our present faulty distribution of buying power, we all know that one consequence of this will be to bring about serious competition on the American market between these imported goods and our own products fashioned by American labor.

As to our extending credits, certainly we do not want to repeat the World War experience of having American money lenders extend billions of dollars of credit to belligerent nations and then send an American army to Europe to make sure the debts—all except those owed our Government—will be collected.

Therefore, I believe this problem must be faced, and that the only ultimate answer to it is that payment should be made in tangible wealth located in the Western Hemisphere, such as American securities or commodities of which we have a shortage, or in island possessions of European powers which lie immediately off the American coast, and which add nothing important to the European empires but which would mean much to America from a standpoint of national defense.

Machinery for effecting transactions in this manner can be set up, and is indeed provided for in bill H. R. 7544, which I have introduced, and the text of which reads as follows:

A bill to provide sound payment for goods sold to belligerent nations

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) payment for all goods purchased in the United States for export to any belligerent nation shall be made to the Munitions Control Board in tangible wealth located in the Western Hemisphere, or certificates of ownership therefor: *Provided, however*, That no such payments shall be made in gold, silver, or foreign exchange.

(b) The Munitions Control Board shall deposit all tangible wealth or certificates of ownership therefor thus received with the Secretary of the Treasury, who is hereby authorized and directed to issue non-interest-bearing obligations of the United States in equivalent amounts. The Secretary of the Treasury shall deposit such non-interest-bearing obligations of the United States with a Federal Reserve bank, and such Federal Reserve bank shall establish a credit in favor of the Munitions Control Board in amounts equal to the non-interest-bearing obligations of the United States thus deposited, at the par value thereof.

(c) Upon the presentation of invoices and such other papers as may be necessary to substantiate their claims, the Munitions Control Board shall pay to any and all such persons, partnerships, companies, associations, and corporations, as have exported goods to belligerent nations, the amounts due such exporters.

To those who say this suggestion is impractical I would point out that it cannot possibly be as impractical as literally giving away the resources of America for foreign war purposes, which is what happened before and what will happen

again unless we think this problem through and act upon our thinking. Of course this whole idea that we can make the American people prosperous by means of a gigantic export trade is really a hopeless folly. True prosperity for all the people of our Nation can only be assured by enabling them to consume the full volume of their own production.

WHAT WILL KEEP AMERICA OUT OF WAR?

And now I want to repeat what I consider to be my most important single statement. It is this: No law, no embargo, no cash and carry, nothing indeed of that sort can guarantee that America will be kept out of war. Our ability to do that will depend on other more profound forces, some of which I have already mentioned. To that main subject—what will actually maintain the peace of our country—let us now return.

The one thing that can keep Americans out of this war will be their ability to recapture the traditional American point of view toward foreign conflicts. That point of view, briefly stated, was that we would resist any attempt to interfere with the independence of any nation in the Americas, but that we would not attempt to play a game of power politics with Old World nations. That point of view further required that we deal with all nations on a basis of equity, recognizing their governments as their people chose to set them up. And, finally, that traditional point of view of Americans has always held that our main job lay in the Western Hemisphere and especially within the borders of our own Nation.

Through most of our history we went ahead with our trade and stayed out of foreign wars, both. We were able to do this because our point of view on foreign wars was right—because it was an American point of view based on the needs and protection of our own people and not on our judgment of the actions of other nations.

Indeed, traditional American foreign policy—the policy that was so successful down to about 1890, and which has been periodically abandoned since that time—did not, as a matter of fact, include either neutrality laws or embargoes. It simply included a state of mind on the part of the American people and their representatives that we could not and should not try to run the affairs of the whole world, that we had enough to do here at home, or at any rate in the Western Hemisphere, and that Europe's and Asia's wars and conflicts would have to be handled by the people who were right next to them and who therefore knew far more about them than we did. If we could help constructively in some manner to promote peace, and if our help was asked for, that was different. We had a frame of mind of tending to our own business—and so we did. Our troubles started when we began to get great and to dream dreams about being the mightiest nation in the world. From that time on we began more and more to feel a duty to review the form of government of other nations and to try to at least umpire their games of power politics. So far as I know we never did much good at this game.

Unless we can cling to that essentially American viewpoint which I have sketched, the United States will be in increasing danger of going to war from the moment a victory for the dictators seems likely. Everyone ought to realize and think about these things. The acid test of antiwar sentiment will not come unless and until the cause of dictatorship seems to be close to triumph. What will we do then? What will the American people say then about men who are still working to keep their country out of war? These are hard questions. But the time may come when they will have to be answered. It is best to think about them now.

Furthermore, now, if ever, is the time when the bill to tax the profits out of war and a measure to provide for financing war with Government instead of private credit should be passed. The bill to tax the profits out of war, sponsored by the Veterans of Foreign Wars, was introduced in the last session by 50 Senators and some 7 or 8 Congressmen, of whom I happened to be one. All this bill means is that if the United States should ever be drawn into war—which God forbid—the financial burdens will be born somewhere near equally by all and the Government will derive sufficient revenue to pay for the war as it is being fought. Surely no one can say it is unjust to conscript capital on something like the same basis as we conscript man power. And I sincerely believe the very kind of opposition that has been shown against this bill is indicative that its passage would be a move for peace.

CONSTRUCTIVE PEACE EFFORTS

It is not enough for us to merely try to stay out of war; we must work positively and untiringly for peace. Let every American remember that the preservation of freedom, the development of the human spirit, the deepening of religious faith, and the saving of these values which mankind has sought and hoped for through the centuries may well depend upon the existence of one sane nation in this war-torn world.

Continuous effort on our part to draw together the neutral nations, to formulate plans for ending this war on the basis of enduring peace, to guard those values of life, of religion, of culture, which war destroys so quickly—these should be our immediate tasks. As time goes on even the belligerents must begin to realize that the only beneficiaries from a protracted war will be those forces who expect to take advantage of conditions of chaos, desperation, and degradation. There have been ugly charges that some of those forces are cynically watching this thing go on—even hoping it will not end too soon. Against such forces America must work day and night. And we may not have to work alone.

The Panama Conference of American Nations has taken some most important steps forward in building up in the world two vitally necessary things: First, a determined bloc of neutral nations bent on keeping the peace and protecting neutral rights; second, a powerful movement for an early, a just, and lasting peace. America's efforts in the field of foreign affairs should be directed in those two directions. Together with our sister republics, we might even be able to save Europe from herself if we are wise and sane and earnest in these efforts.

At present we know next to nothing about what the real war aims of the belligerent nations are. In the World War we thought we knew, but we did not. We cannot tell what consequences may flow from a victory by either side. We can only guess, and we probably will guess wrong. The American Government should ask the belligerents now for a clear statement of their war aims in order that intelligent and continuous moves for peace can be made.

But we do know what consequences flow certainly and unavoidably from war itself. We know that the best and finest young men will be the first to die; we know that liberty will substantially be suspended; we know that hates will be engendered which may take years to wipe out; we know that prejudice and fear will possess people's hearts and minds; we know that all real progress for humanity will be set back immeasurably; and we know democratic government will be put to a strain from which it is at least questionable whether it can fully recover.

With so much to lose from such a venture it seems plain indeed that Americans should solemnly resolve never to go to war except in defense of the peace and safety of the western world.

America's peace, then, depends upon her renewed devotion to the whole Monroe Doctrine, her understanding of how confused and mixed are the factors in the war now raging, her sincere and constant efforts to bring peace to the world, and on her providing now that in case war does ever come to this Nation again its burdens will be equally shared by all groups and classes in the Nation. Above all, it depends upon the degree of our devotion to the task of doing all things necessary to divorce our democracy from the power of international finance and to free its people from the burdens of unemployment and poverty in the midst of possible plenty.

America can stay out of war if the people and the Congress refuse to be stampeded by unreasonable fears or hatred, if we take up with determination the battle against unemployment and poverty here at home, and if we pass legislation making it impossible for any group or person to profit out of any war in any way.

America can stay out of war if enough of us are determined to do so, and if we remember that no power which denies liberty to its people can continue for any considerable length of time to rule the world.

American Neutrality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES F. BYRNES

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 4, 1939

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. GEORGE W. NORRIS, OF NEBRASKA

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address on American Neutrality delivered by the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] over the blue network of the National Broadcasting Co. on October 3, 1939, at Washington, D. C.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Everybody wants to stay out of the war. The American people are unanimous in favor of peace. This statement is true of Congress. It is true of President Roosevelt. I do not doubt the sincerity of Members of Congress, and I have no doubt of the sincerity of the President. We are striving to attain the same end. We are determined to take no step that will bring our country into the pending European war. The struggle going on in Europe is Europe's struggle. Regardless of our sympathies, our likes, or our dislikes, it is a catastrophe beyond our jurisdiction and beyond our domain. There is a unanimity of thought, and that thought is, How can we best keep the United States out of the European catastrophe? We are united; we are unanimous in the object to be accomplished. That object is peace for the American Government, the American people.

There is, however, a difference of opinion, both in the country and in Congress, as to the best and most practical method to attain this much-desired goal.

The Embargo Act now on the statute books forbids the sale of munitions and implements of war to belligerents. One side to the controversy is in favor of retaining this law as it is. The other side proposes to change the law and substitute for it what is ordinarily known as the cash-and-carry plan. Let us with perfect candor and without prejudice examine these two propositions.

In discussing the question I am assuming the honesty, sincerity, and patriotism of both sides, and I believe this assumption to be true. I question no man's motive. I concede to those who do not agree with my theory the same honesty and the same conscientious convictions that I claim for myself, and I enter upon the discussion of the question with full and unlimited respect for the opinions and judgments of my opponents.

Under the embargo provisions of the so-called neutrality law, what can be done? What is the practical effect of the enforcement of this law?

Under this law everything except completed implements of war can be carried in American vessels to the ports of belligerent nations. Under this law American citizens can travel on the ships of belligerent nations. Under this law we can sell metals and materials to make arms, but we cannot sell the arms themselves. We can sell to belligerent nations copper tubing to be used in explosive shells, but we cannot sell the finished product. We can sell belligerent nations cotton, but we cannot sell gun cotton. We can sell belligerent nations steel for military airplanes, but we cannot sell the airplane itself. We can sell almost any part of any war machine, but if the parts are put together in America and become a finished product, we are prohibited from selling them.

The only difference is, if these parts are put together to form the finished product by American workmen, on American soil, their sale is prohibited under existing law. Whereas, if the parts are shipped separately and put together by foreign labor on foreign soil, the shipment is allowed.

With the exception of completed munitions of war, this law permits us to sell anything to anybody, and to carry those materials, whatever they may be, across the ocean in American ships, manned by American seamen.

The danger of this situation should be apparent to everybody, and the likelihood of such a condition bringing us into the war should be obvious to every American citizen.

It must be remembered, also, that many materials and articles of commerce are practically as important as munitions and implements of war. Have we forgotten the slogan in the great World War, which was heralded into every nook and corner of our country, "Food will win the war!"

That slogan was true. Without food, armies cannot fight. Without food, the people behind the lines cannot work; they cannot produce. Without food, no nation can carry on war. It is not only important, but it is absolutely necessary.

Under existing law, products of American farms and American factories, with the exception of munitions of war, can be and, if the law is not changed, will be shipped in American vessels, owned by American citizens and manned by American seamen. What will happen when these ships are destroyed and sunk, either by submarine of Germany or by man-of-war of Great Britain? What will happen when American lives are lost at sea because of a torpedo fired by a submarine?

Have we forgotten the sinking of the Lusitania? Do we not remember the outraged feelings of the American people when the news of that disaster came to their knowledge? Can we measure the influence which that terrible disaster had upon the minds and hearts of the American people? Do we not remember many other similar episodes that provoked our people to a pitch of frenzied animosity? Do we want those things to happen again? But unless we change the present embargo law, they will happen again.

We know from experience that such things will inevitably happen, and that when they do happen, the feelings, the emotions, and the sentiments of the American people will be aroused to boiling point. We know that when American ships are sunk and American cargoes lost, the owners will call upon the American Government for support, and that such a call will have behind it a propaganda and a force that will be almost irresistible. The property involved will be of the value of millions, and if in these catastrophes American lives are lost, it will be beyond the imagination to conceive fully the influence that will be brought to bear upon the American Government to get into the war.

Under existing law, if goods are sold and shipped to one of the belligerent nations, the time will soon come when these American citizens will be calling upon the Government of the United States to collect their debts. This is not a fancy; it is not a dream; it is a mathematical certainty. We know from experience it is true. We remember in the last war American citizens sold war materials and all other kinds of materials, such as food and clothing, to belligerent nations.

When those debts were not paid, and when it became evident the belligerent nations owing the debts might possibly lose the war, thus making it impossible for the debts ever to be paid, these American citizens and corporations used every instrumentality within their power to push the American Government into the war, so that their debts might be secured and eventually paid. These creditors gave no heed to the terrible sacrifices that would have to be made in order to collect these debts. They did not think of and gave no heed to the certainty that American boys would have to die on foreign soil, that thousands of women would be made widows, that numberless children would be made fatherless in America—that these financial obligations might be made good.

These are some of the things that put us into the World War. To a great extent we made a collection agency of the United States Government. These debts had to be collected, even though thousands of American boys had to sacrifice their lives; even though unborn generations had to labor and toil to make those debts good.

When it became evident that the belligerent nations were not able to pay, then the next step taken was to induce the Government of the United States to lend the money of the people to these nations.

Many billions of dollars were thus loaned. It all came out of the pockets of the taxpayers of the United States. The money was raised by the Government of the United States through the sale of bonds. The promises of practically all of these nations that borrowed the money have been broken. Nearly all of the debts have been repudiated, and still the American people are burdened for the payment of the outstanding bonds that were issued. This great financial influence was brought to bear to bring the American Government into the war. These facts are a matter of history. All this brought about our entrance into the war, and as a result the blood of our brave boys was coined into gold to pay the expense of this inhuman sacrifice of human life. This will probably happen again, unless we change the present law.

We remember what happened when American citizens traveling upon the high seas lost their lives on account of the depredations of one or the other of the belligerent nations. Based upon such happenings as these, those who for financial or other reasons wanted our country to get into the war were enabled to work upon the emotions and the sentiments of the American people, so that eventually they brought about a condition that was one of the greatest factors in forcing our country into that catastrophe.

Let me repeat: All of these things could happen again, will happen again, in my opinion, unless our embargo law is changed.

I have briefly outlined what might occur and what probably would occur, and what I believe must occur, if we follow those who are opposed to any change. It seems clear that unless a change is made in our present law, the chances are we will

eventually be brought into the war. The things I have enumerated brought us into the other World War, and it seems logical they would bring us in again.

No man can tell with absolute certainty whether it is possible for us to keep out of the war. No one can foresee the changes that may occur in the immediate future. The course for us to pursue is the one least liable to get us in; the course to avoid is the one which in all probability would take us into the war.

I desire now to consider what changes are advocated by those who believe some changes of existing law are absolutely necessary in order to keep our Government at peace.

What is proposed by those who would change the Embargo Act and adopt the cash-and-carry plan? And does such a plan offer a greater probability of our escaping the engulfment of our country in war than existing law offers?

To my mind, it seems so clear the change suggested by the President will be an improvement, that it is difficult for me to understand the attitude of those who are opposed to any change in our embargo law.

It is proposed to make it unlawful for any American vessel to carry any passengers or any articles or materials to any port of a belligerent nation. It is proposed to make it unlawful to export or transport to a belligerent nation anything of any kind until title to the property has been transferred and the goods paid for. Such property, whatever it may be, cannot lawfully be carried to its destination in any American ship.

Therefore, no American citizen will have any interest whatever in the property sold, and, if the property is destroyed on the seas, no American citizen will have any financial interest in it.

It is proposed to make it unlawful for any citizen of the United States or any American vessel to proceed into any combat area upon the seas. It is proposed to make it unlawful for any citizen of the United States to travel on ships of any belligerent nation. It is proposed to make it unlawful for any American vessel engaged in commerce upon the high seas to be armed. It is proposed to make it unlawful for any person within the United States to purchase bonds or securities or other obligations of any belligerent government, or any political subdivision of such government. It is proposed to make it unlawful for any person within the United States to solicit or receive any contribution for any belligerent government.

If, in the present emergency, we are guided, as we should be, by our experience of 20 years ago when we went into the World War, then it seems to me there can be no choice between the two plans I have described. On the one hand, it is proposed that the present Embargo Act shall not be changed, and, on the other hand, it is proposed to change it and set up all these safeguards I have mentioned, in lieu of the present law. An examination of them will disclose to any unprejudiced mind that, taken together, these are safeguards against all of the causes that carried us into the Great World War. If they had been on the statute books at that time, it seems clear to me our chances of remaining out of that World War would have been greatly enhanced. If these safeguards are now enacted into law, our escape from entering into the present European war seems almost certain.

Twenty years ago, every few days the American people read of some American ship being sunk on the high seas or captured by a belligerent nation and taken into a port of that nation. They read of American lives being blotted out because of some act of a belligerent nation. These catastrophes, often horrible beyond description, excited the minds and emotions of the American people to such a degree that millions of our citizens became enraged, even frenzied, in their helplessness.

The result was the building up of a sentiment that could not be resisted, and Congress, by an almost unanimous vote, took the fatal step that brought misery and suffering to thousands of our innocent citizens, that heaped upon the backs of our taxpayers a debt we are struggling now to pay.

The action I have outlined is one which our Nation has a perfectly legal right to take. There is no dispute anywhere but that, under international law, we have a right to provide by law for all the things I have enumerated.

So far, I have been considering the question upon a strictly legal basis. I have ignored the question of sympathy, of moral right, of our belief in religious freedom and liberty. So far, I have suggested no action based upon emotion or a love of humanity. Basing our consideration entirely on cold legal deductions, we must reach the conclusion that it is far safer to enact the provisions I have enumerated than it would be to permit the Embargo Act to remain unchanged. From this cold-blooded legal consideration of our rights we must be brought to the conclusion that it is far better for our peace and security and for the happiness of our people to repeal the Embargo Act and enact in its stead the provisions of the proposed law.

Indeed, to me there is but one choice, and I am led inevitably to the conclusion that these changes in our Embargo Act are absolutely imperative if we are to avoid, as far as humanly possible, being drawn into the existing war.

In addition to our having a strictly legal right to do the things I have outlined, there is another compelling reason why we should take the step proposed. It is fair to say that our people do not believe in dictator governments, or in the barbarous and inhuman methods that are used by these dictators to increase their power and their dominions. The methods that Hitler, Mussolini, and Stalin have adopted to further their unholy ambitions are barbarous, inhuman, uncivilized, unjustified, unmerciful, and murderous. We have no sympathy with the principles of such conquests, or with the methods used to attain them. Therefore, our sympathies, our hopes, our prayers, are all with the British and French Governments in this conflict.

It is self-evident today that England and France, fighting with their backs to the wall, are fighting not only the battle of humanity and civilization but they are faced with foes ruthless and murderous in their dishonorable and unjustifiable procedure.

Hitler and other dictators are representatives of paganism, and are fighting to destroy religion and to establish upon the grave of human freedom a despotism greater, more cruel, and more inhuman than any that has ever existed in the history of the world. They go on the theory that they are not bound to respect the rights or liberties of anyone, and that they have a right to capture and take by force any nation they are able to conquer. Their theory, if carried to its logical conclusion, means the destruction, the end, of our present civilization.

It is said by those who are opposed to any change in our embargo law the course I have outlined will be favorable to England and France. But it is equally true, if we fail to take the course I have outlined, and the present embargo law is kept intact, such action will be favorable to Hitler and other dictators. It is plain, therefore, that, whether we enact the proposals I have described or whether we permit the embargo law to stand unchanged, our action will result in helping, in a degree, one side or the other in the war.

It is fortunate, therefore, that in following our legal rights as universally recognized we are able to enact a law which will more likely keep us out of the war and at the same time puts us on the side of humanity and civilization.

We have a legal right to take either course. We decide our course on a perfectly legal proposition. If we decide to pursue the path most likely to keep us out of the war, we should be gratified to know such a course will help the right, rather than the wrong. Should there be any doubt or hesitation on the part of anyone who believes in liberty, who loves humanity, who loves his family, who wants to preserve civilization, as to the course we should pursue? How, under the circumstances, can we possibly hesitate?

I fervently believe the course I have advocated will keep us out of war and that such a course offers the greatest probability that our Nation may ride through the troubled waters in peace and honor.

One of the impelling reasons that took us into the World War was to make good the losses of American ships that occurred in the combat area. Another reason was to insure the payment of money loaned by American citizens. Another reason was to protect the right of American citizens to travel upon ships of belligerent nations. Another reason was that we permitted materials, such as foodstuffs and clothing, to be transported to belligerent ports in American vessels manned by American seamen.

All of these activities are prohibited by the administration bill now pending in Congress. None of these activities will be prohibited if we permit the embargo law to stand as it is.

At the beginning of the World War, on the floor of the United States Senate, I said our entry into that war was placing the dollar sign on the American flag. For this speech I was denounced as a traitor; I was burned in effigy; a prominent Federal official in a public address said I ought to be put up against a wall and shot; I became an outcast in my own country. I believe that time has vindicated the position I then took.

When we entered the World War we made the greatest mistake in the history of our Nation. We put the dollar sign on the American flag and went into the war. Now, 20 years later, let us keep the dollar sign off of the American flag and stay out of the war.

My friends, I have concluded. I bid you good night.

Pending Neutrality Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE M. REED

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 4, 1939

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. CLYDE M. REED, OF KANSAS

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD a radio address delivered by me on last Sunday evening on the subject of the pending neutrality legislation.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Across the ocean to the east of us Europe is again engaged in its age-old pastime of war. For thousands of years that part of the earth's surface has fought over boundary lines, racial questions, religious differences, dynastic ambitions, and lust for power. The conflict waging now is not essentially different from those that have been waged for the past 10 or 20 centuries.

Ten days ago the Congress of the United States met in an extraordinary session on a call of the President. Tomorrow morning the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations will report an amendment to existing law concerning our relation to countries engaged in war. Tomorrow will begin a debate on the Senate floor that will go into history as one of the great discussions of our Congress. The issues are important and are such that they stir the emotions of our people.

These emotions have been deeply stirred already. That is evidenced from the pains that so many people are taking to inform Members of Congress of their feelings and opinions concerning the issues before us. I have received over 5,000 telegrams, letters, and petitions, mostly from people of Kansas, but including expressions from people over the United States. Other Senators are having the same experience—some in even greater proportion than my own.

These expressions indicate three things: A universal desire to keep the United States out of war; a decided preponderance of sympathy with Great Britain and France; a lamentable confusion in the minds of many—perhaps the majority—concerning the concrete issues before the Congress. It is to this latter element that I shall address this discussion.

Whenever human emotions are deeply stirred, reason abdicates and logic takes a vacation. It has always been so—it is so now.

People may write out of their emotions and disregard reason and logic, but Members of Congress responsible to the country for their acts have not that privilege. Members of Congress are human and have emotions the same as other people. But these emotions should be kept under control. I am trying to do that in dealing with my responsibility as a Senator. It is entirely natural, and not improper, for people to write me out of their emotions. It would be entirely improper for me to vote as a Senator out of my emotions and disregard what my reason tells me is the wise course to pursue.

Leaders whose voices carry throughout the Nation have expressed conflicting opinions. It is this conflict of statement that is, perhaps, responsible for much of the confusion which is reflected in the advice I receive from those who write me.

For example, the present law contains a prohibition called an embargo upon the shipment of arms, munitions, and implements of war to belligerent nations. This embargo has been a part of our statutory law for about 4 years. We have had no chance to actually test its value as a factor in keeping out of war. Yet earnest opponents of any important change in the present law frequently, usually, in fact, frankly declare that "the repeal of the embargo is the first step toward war." That is an emotional declaration based upon opinion and not upon any actual experience. But it has had the effect of making the present embargo the symbol of peace and implanting in the minds of earnest people the fear that any change of modification of existing statutes would bring us into war.

On the other hand, President Roosevelt, in his message to Congress delivered on its convening September 21, asked for a repeal of the embargo provisions because, in his opinion, they were "most vitally dangerous to American neutrality, American security, and American peace."

The President further declared:

"I seek a greater consistency through the repeal of the embargo provision and a return to international law."

And still further the President stated that "repeal of the embargo and a return to international law are the crux of this issue."

Here we have the issues joined by the opponents of repeal, the leaders of which are authors of the present law, and the Chief Executive of our Government. The Congress of the United States will determine the issue. The battle will begin tomorrow in the Senate.

In joining the issue the great leaders of the two sides take diametrically opposite positions and make flatly contradictory declarations. No wonder that the average citizen becomes confused.

With the most earnest respect for the opinions of my colleagues who take that position, I do not agree that the retention of the embargo is essential to preserving peace or keeping America out of war.

On the other hand, I do not agree with the President that the embargo is inconsistent with international law, and find no support in my reading of international law or of available authority on that subject for that statement.

The President proposes, after repeal of the embargo, the inclusion in the law of cash-and-carry provisions as regards the sale and export of articles, whether arms, materials of war, or articles of peaceful commerce when sold to belligerent nations.

I find no substantial authority for any belief that the present embargo is any more or less consistent or inconsistent with international law than would be the cash-and-carry system proposed to be substituted for it. It is my opinion, supported by virtually all of international law authority, that either may be consistent, and neither be inconsistent with international law. I do not think that either is essential to preserving the peace, and neither would take us into war or keep us out of war.

I further disagree with the statement of President Roosevelt in his message to Congress that the Embargo and Nonintercourse Act of the Jefferson administration "was the major cause of bringing us * * * into our own War of 1812." History does not support that view. The Embargo and Nonintercourse Act were repealed 3 years before the War of 1812 began. Furthermore, there is no similarity or parallel between those acts and the arms-embargo provision of our present law.

The fact is that the War of 1812 was declared by our Government for the purpose of enforcing our rights under international law on the high seas. England was stopping our vessels, searching them, and imprisoning our seamen, and seizing our cargoes. After protesting over a long period of years against these things, we declared war in an endeavor to stop them.

Furthermore, the insistence of the administration of President Wilson on the rights of our vessels and our citizens to enter into and travel through combat zones during the last World War was, in my opinion, a major factor in our entering into that war. We insisted upon our rights under international law; our vessels entered the war zone; some of them were sunk; some of our citizens were drowned; and the country became so inflamed that it supported a declaration of war.

So the facts are, that clinging to the so-called rights of neutral nations under international law got the United States into two wars. If we should decide to pursue the same policy now that our Government followed in the years preceding our entry into the last World War, our chances of becoming actively involved in a European war which is not of our making and none of our business would be greatly enhanced.

Some of my able and earnest colleagues in the Senate do not favor retaining the present embargo; do not favor the enactment of the cash-and-carry system, but do believe in depending entirely upon international law. I do not think this advisable. Getting into two wars through dependence upon international law is sufficient for me.

The present embargo is a limitation upon our rights as a neutral under international law which we may impose upon ourselves if we choose to do so.

Repealing the embargo and substituting a cash-and-carry system is a limitation upon our rights as a neutral under international law which we may make if we choose.

Neither, in my opinion, in any way conflict with international law.

Stating my points of disagreement with positions taken by able leaders on both sides who are just as sincere and just as earnest as I am is hardly sufficient. This Congress must take either negative action through refusing to repeal the present embargo, or affirmative action by repealing it and substituting other provisions. I must have a part in the final decision.

I shall use the balance of my time to express my own views.

I have not favored and do not now favor the principle of the embargo. This attitude was not recently taken. It has been my position over a considerable period of time. I cannot state the basis for that position any better than by quoting the language of an address I delivered at a public dinner in Washington on March 2 of this year. In discussing our foreign policy at the invitation of my congressional colleagues of both Houses, I said in part:

"In the event of a serious and prolonged war, means of carrying on will be sought in this country by one, and perhaps both, sides. We will be urged to do this and that and the other. My conception of true neutrality is to treat the rest of the world, aside from the Western Hemisphere, alike. They will want our foodstuffs, our fibers, our metals, and perhaps our manufactured articles. The courses that we may choose to follow and maintain true neutrality are these:

"1. To sell nothing to anybody, or

"2. To sell anything to everybody.

"I favor the latter course. We are a productive nation and have a surplus of food and other things above our own requirements. There is no reason, in my opinion, why we should deny to any part of the rest of the world, whether engaged in war or not, any part of the surplus we have above our needs. To do so would not only disturb our own economic situation but would unnecessarily deprive a world needing our surplus, and needing it more, perhaps, because of war, than would be the case otherwise.

"But to this policy I would attach a condition that a clear title to anything we sell to any nation or group of nations engaged in war must pass from American citizens to a foreign purchaser before the commodities purchased leave our shores. You can call this the cash-and-carry system if you will, or the come-and-get-it method, if you choose. I have no quarrel with phraseology on this point, but it represents my idea of a correct policy for us to follow."

I have not changed my views since the delivery of that address. These have always been my views. However, those views were expressed at a time when there was no declared war in the world. That situation has changed. It is now a question of changing our rules of neutrality after war has begun. I am giving deep consideration to this point, and my conclusions may influence the vote I shall cast.

I am opposed to either the President or the Congress seeking to define an "aggressor," and firmly opposed to this country undertaking any responsibility of that kind

Under the theory of international law our vessels and our citizens have a right to travel on the high seas, even through combat zones. We fought two wars to defend that right. The trouble with the theory of the right of neutrals under international law is that in times of war belligerents pay no attention to these rights unless it suits their purpose to do so. I fully recognize that in not insisting upon these rights we are placing a limitation upon ourselves, but, as between maintaining our theoretical right under international law and staying out of war, I am for staying out of war. Therefore I shall, with my vote, support enforcing that limitation upon ourselves.

I opposed the Bloom bill in the last regular session of Congress. It was reputed to be a cash-and-carry bill. It was nothing of the kind. It was a bill that, if enacted into law, would have vested the President with discretion to handle relations between the United States and belligerent nations very much as he chose. I was then, and I am now, opposed to increasing Presidential discretion.

President Roosevelt was greatly disappointed because Congress would not accept the Bloom bill, which presumably was prepared by the Department of State in accordance with his views. He was severe in his criticism of Congress for its failure to accept that bill. Fortunately, the President has receded from that position, and the bill to be laid before the Senate tomorrow is, according to the last draft I have seen, free from any attempt to increase Presidential discretion. The measure we will begin to consider tomorrow is much superior to the Bloom bill.

Our entry into war or our keeping out of war will be dependent not upon the retention or the repeal of the embargo, nor upon the enactment of a cash-and-carry system, but upon our will to stay out of war and the wisdom of executive and legislative leaders in interpreting and applying the overwhelming desire to maintain peace.

To the best of my judgment, my own vote will be so cast. I, too, will to stay out of war.

America's Catholic Youth and Europe's War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 4, 1939

RADIO ADDRESS BY BISHOP SHEIL

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered over the National Broadcasting Co.'s red network on the evening of October 2, 1939, by the Most Reverend Bernard J. Sheil, D. D., auxiliary bishop of Chicago. The address is entitled "America's Catholic Youth and Europe's War."

In passing, let me say that the address is a most interesting and timely one on the current problem of the day; and I trust that in these busy moments every Senator will find time to read the address in its entirety.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This morning came news that would almost strike dumb every lover of America, every faithful son and daughter of the Catholic Church, every man and woman of good will hoping in these dark days for the reign of intelligence and wisdom and justice in the world.

George Cardinal Mundelein, archbishop of Chicago, is dead.

Yesterday afternoon I was with him and the symbolism of a moment of harvest—of reward for a life grandly lived—is today so startling as to be incredible.

He asked me to come out to his home at St. Mary's of the Lake. There, in the little town of Mundelein, he had built the most modern of all our Catholic seminaries to train American youth to be servants of America and of the universal church.

There, 20 years ago, with the imagination and the courage of youth he had begun to build out of a swamp one of the great institutions for the education of youth in America. There he determined to blend all that was timelessly beautiful and inspiring in the art and the philosophy of democratic America, as an eagerly welcomed part of the timeless and universal art and the timeless and universal philosophy of a universal church.

His own villa was an architect's replica of George Washington's home at Mount Vernon. The chapel at which his young seminarians prayed and sang Palestrina was an adaptation of an American-Colonial church in Lyme, Conn., which he had admired for its beauty and its simplicity as a boy. There side by side in a joyous sense of the mighty place of the art and the thinking of democratic America in the unity of man's achievements, were the crucifix and the blessed mother, the prophets and the saints, the schoolmen and the great popes—and George Washington and Abraham Lincoln and the signers of the Declaration of Independence.

Unseen by his boys, we knelt at vespers in that colonial chapel. Before us, quite unconscious of the presence of their great patron, 200 American boys in the surplice and biretta of the seminarian chanted the age-old vesper service.

We stood in the library of the seminary with its Renaissance colonnade. The brilliant coffered ceiling bore his coat of arms of the busy bee. It was lettered with the names of great scholars of the church. But he talked most of his pride in one particular item of that library, the complete autographs of the signers of the Declaration of Independence, of all the Presidents of the United States, of all the Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States.

As he rode over his grounds he spoke with unconcealed gratitude that God had vouchsafed to him, as to few men, the good fortune to see really accomplished in his lifetime a little of the things he had dared begin.

He talked proudly of how enduringly he had built in concrete and steel and how even more enduringly he had built in young men.

He talked feelingly of how he had tried to make a full place in his young men's lives for flowers, and music, and art.

He talked of "the undone vast" that lay ahead of him to give the spirit of America its full place in the spirit of the church, and to give the spirit of the church its full place in the spirit of America.

Constantly he referred to something President Roosevelt had said in a speech at the Statue of Liberty; that it seemed as if God, in His wisdom, had for centuries purposely hidden this Western Hemisphere from the sight of Europeans, beyond the veil of the seas, that mankind might have a second chance in this New World after almost ruining the old one.

And he cleared carefully with me, for the second time, the speech which he wished and authorized me to make tonight at Cincinnati at the National Conference of the Catholic Youth Organizations which were so close to his heart.

What he authorized me to say was controversial. It was something he would not have wanted to have said for him, except that he felt that others had created a situation which might be mistaken to compromise the position of the Catholic clergy toward the Congress of the United States, and toward his great friend and admiration, the President of the United States, in this hour of great decision on national policies so closely affecting his beloved youth of the United States.

All today I have taken counsel with my conscience against the promptings that all voices should be stilled at this time of grief.

But kneeling in prayer beside him with the spirit of yesterday afternoon upon me, I have felt that I would be unfaithful to the trust he imposed in me, as probably the last act of his conduct of his archdiocese, if I failed to bear tonight the counsels of his practical wisdom and his spiritual tolerance which he had wished me to say to his countrymen for him—his last message of loyalty to the political processes of representative democracy—his last message of loyalty to the spirit of God's tolerance in this troubled world.

What I say from now on is what this patriot of America, this prince of the universal church, had specifically authorized and approved my saying, in his exultant happiness and vision of the greatness of America in the golden light of yesterday afternoon.

A few months ago I crossed the Atlantic on my way to Rome to have the privilege of a visit with the Holy Father.

A few weeks ago I came back.

The crossing to Europe I made by airplane, by the Clipper.

The crossing back was so different, on a little vessel diverted from her regular run to take care of American refugees like myself. There were submarine warnings and a ban on radio communication for fear of revealing position.

The genius of aeronautics, the symbol of youth, as well as youth itself, had already been abused by political leadership, stupid to the point of a crime against God, to burn the life out of Polish cities whose destruction the Holy Father had tried so desperately to avert.

As I bade farewell to friends in Paris they told me with tears in their eyes how happy I should be that I was returning to America, "the last best hope of earth," where men might still do justice, love mercy, and humbly walk with God.

To give mankind its second chance here in this New World, the course of America seems so clear.

It is to stay out of Europe until peace comes to Europe, and under no circumstances send our American youth into Europe's wars.

Last week I was in Washington. I was heartened beyond words at official feeling. Everyone in Washington, from the President down, is determined that the United States shall keep its youth out of war.

There are many of God's innocents in Europe for whom our hearts bleed, and every instinct of Catholic followers of the Prince of Peace is to resent those who break this peace. But it is not a callousness—it is an ultimate service to the greatest interests of humanity—that we do stay out of this war, to husband our strength for two great purposes.

The first purpose is to defend what may be left with us of civilization against the risks of a mad revolutionary Europe blindly rolling on toward new worlds to conquer for antichrist.

The second purpose is to be really able to help a Europe, purged by its war of the materialistic causes of war, to come to a state of mind conducive to a lasting peace that will not sow the seeds for another war.

I do not want to be misunderstood.

Our sympathies are not confined to the people of any one nation or of any one group of nations engaged in the conflict. Our sympathies are with the common men and women of all nations, for we know that they all want peace and liberty, not war and domination.

As I came home I tried to think why there should be such enormous differences between the hemispheres in the ability of peoples of the same European stock to live together in friendship.

I thought to myself as I saw America again:

"Thank God for our material resources of enough to go around."

"Thank God for our spiritual tradition of mutual tolerance."

"But thank God, most of all, that in these crucial revolutionary years in Europe we have had the matchless political leadership in foreign affairs of President Roosevelt."

To have lived through a few months of Europe is to have known as never before what a precious thing that gift of political leadership is.

This tragedy of miserable common peoples, helpless and hopeless to know where their leaders are taking them or what to do about it—is not a tragedy of the natural gifts which God has given to Europe. It is a tragedy of human leaders, who blinded by their materialism and their conscious or unconscious selfishness have over a whole generation, in every country, committed a crime of false stewardship against humanity and against God.

For the materialistic philosophy of political diehards, morally and intellectually bankrupt, an entire continent is to pay the price of moral and material anarchy.

In the face of all the teachings of Christianity those diehards in all European nations were determined to prolong or achieve the exploitation of others.

The end result has been the unconscious instigation of a merciless revolutionary movement which like all great revolutions in history will feed on itself and burn blindly on until it has burned itself out.

Only in the Vatican is there in Europe the gift of statesman's vision possessed by President Roosevelt.

It is not strange.

The foresight of a statesman is a sense of how great masses of people are going to react and move, and that foresight is the reward only of those who really understand, because they really love and sincerely serve God's common people.

A few days ago you perhaps saw reprinted in your papers an editorial from the Osservatore Romano, the official newspaper of the Vatican. Every American Catholic must glow with pride at the praise which that editorial of the Vatican gave to President Roosevelt's latest message to Congress, and the identity it established between the views of the holy father and the views of our own President.

Let me read you just one sentence:

"It is impossible," says that editorial, "not to perceive the almost literal identity of the essential points enumerated by the head of state of one of the most powerful and modern nations of the world, and the principles enunciated by the supreme religious leader with the highest spiritual authority of the world. For the august Pontiff, preaching springs from revealed truth; for the statesman, it comes from concrete experience."

And in particular the editorial praises the President's message for its "noble appeal to religion."

This recognition that the two greatest leaders of the world think alike on the greatest problem in the world and that both these leaders are our leaders should make American Catholics feel not only proud but safe. It is a matter of particular joy to us that at this time of crisis these two great sources of inspiration are flowing in one direction.

And it is in the spirit of the warmth and gladness of the Vatican's response to the President's message that we members of the Catholic faith in the United States must do everything in our power to strengthen the President in his mighty task of guiding America to safety.

That should give the key to the attitude of American Catholics on the recommendations of the President now before the Congress to keep the country out of war.

No one believes more thoroughly than do I, very conscious that I am a member of a religious minority in this country, in the democratic process of free and complete discussion and the sacred right of petition.

We all hope that this session of Congress will furnish a forum in which the American people as a whole can thoroughly educate themselves to their great problem and reach an honest and Nation-wide conviction of the wise course to follow during these dangerous days.

But it constitutes disrespect for wisdom and experience, and is a positive impediment to our democratic process, deliberately to bludgeon Senators and Congressmen with letters and telegrams which can only be counted and not read. Every intelligent man knows that, by and large, with whatever exceptions, when such communications are not the product of selfish political instigation, they reflect only uninformed emotions and only confuse those who are trying to find practical means to retain peace.

There is for Catholics a peculiar obligation not to seem to abuse the fortunate existence of our magnificently organized church—a church whose divine mission sets it apart from and above human partisanship. Non-Catholics of good will should be given no reason to feel that an organized minority of the church is resorting to pressure tactics against the rest of the community on an issue which affects every citizen of this our country.

It is sheer arrogance and impertinence for any citizen or group of citizens to pretend that they are the exclusive guardians of peace.

As the President said in his message, "We all belong to the peace bloc."

Of course, there may be honest difference of opinion as to the means best calculated to keep us out of war. But during these times of stress and high tension it is of supreme importance that we keep cool heads and exercise calm, deliberate judgment. It is not time for slogans and emotional outbursts.

The decision as to the wise course to follow in foreign affairs is an amazingly complicated business dependent on a sensitive balance of knowledge of a thousand factors, which few men have.

The devising of a course of action in such circumstances is the gift of a statesman.

It is derived, as the Vatican newspaper says, from "concrete experience."

It is not something to be divined by emotional charlatans who have become statesmen overnight and whose unctuous voices betray a first urge to hear themselves, no matter whose thought they convey.

You know what—and whom—I mean.

I lived through the last few crucial weeks in Europe itself. But I do not consider that qualifies me to set myself up as a prophet to urge on the world my judgment that the President's judgment is wrong.

This complicated problem of how to stay clear of war is a problem of judgment—of practical judgment—for experts in the business, not a matter of amateur logic or of good intentions. The "last best hope of earth" is now in the keeping not of our hearts but of our heads. Those of us who do not make such problems our business are really no more competent to be our own statesmen than to be our own doctor or our own lawyer.

Let us respect the processes of representative democracy by leaving the problem to Congress and the President whom we elected for that purpose, without trying to withdraw the election by high-pressuring their deliberations.

As between our great leader on the one hand, whose humanity, Christianity, and judgment have been proved time and time again in international affairs, and those, on the other hand, whose judgment has been proved to be wrong or has not been proved at all, there is only one common-sense course to follow for those of us who are not experts in the President's business.

It is to accept his leadership, to trust his solemnly expressed intentions to protect our youth from war, and to give him the benefit of unsolvable doubts.

But while we members of the Catholic faith place our trust in the ability and the integrity of the President to direct our united self-protection against external danger, we have an individual Catholic duty to keep our beloved democracy from breaking down within.

The greatest asset of that democracy is the intangible mutual respect that lets live here in productive peace the very same races and people that in Europe seek for each other's blood. In other countries ties of common race, common culture, common form of religion reconcile internal conflicts. We have no such bonds. These are the only ties by which we are bound together in a free nation, capable of a united will for self-defense, for self-preservation, our tradition of live and let live; our conscious appreciation of the necessity of friendship and trust in each other; our belief in a common future as a new people greater than ever the world has seen. We are—and never forget it—a composite people.

In the depths of the titanic struggle across the water many attempts will be made to turn our minorities against one another, to turn all of them against our leaders, and to destroy those slender bonds of the united will of a free people.

Those who preach race hatred and intolerance among us in such a world at war are traitors to our lonely democracy.

They menace our moral unity.

They divide our precious strength.

We Catholics are the greatest organized body within this country founded upon the teachings of the Christ who said, "Love thy neighbor as thyself."

We have a particular responsibility to continue the Catholic Church as a tremendous force for tolerance and mutual racial respect, so that Christianity, humanity, and American democracy can survive.

It is a clear lesson of history that whenever racial hatred gets a real start in a land, it is the beginning of the dissolution of civilization in that land.

No man can be both honest and intelligent if he professes to want to safeguard peace in America at the same time he preaches the kind of racial hatred which has destroyed peace everywhere else in the world.

What we need in this country today—with all its magnificent pent-up energy of youth straining to find an outlet—is a real vision of mankind's second chance. We need a vista of building here greater than we know—a civilization so generous, so magnificent that youth of all religions and races will care much more for what they give to that magnificence than for what each of them gets out of it—an America to which a spiritually exhausted world may turn as to the monastery in the mountains of the Lost Horizon.

Let there be no mistake about it. The supreme battle of the modern world is the battle for God and the moral law. There are powerful, well-organized forces in the world today which are aggressively and fanatically anti-God. The vast resources of many governments themselves are being employed to uproot from the minds and the hearts of peoples the sacred ideas of God, religion, and morality.

That is why we have powerful and compelling reasons to thank God on bended knees that we live in a country where religion is in honor; that we have a great Executive who shows by word and example that he has a profound belief in God and supreme reverence for divine Providence.

Eager, vigorous, courageous, enlightened youth is the one force which can and will scrap the deadly international policies of lying and deceit, chicanery, and hypocrisy which have brought the world to such a sorry pass.

In the titanic struggle before us, in which the destiny of civilization will be determined, we must have young men and women who are prepared to throw themselves into that struggle with dauntless courage and quenchless enthusiasm.

What will give them that enthusiasm? Not the material prizes for which too many men and women of my generation have wasted

their lives. This young generation—and I know them so well—are the most idealistic, just because they are the best educated and most sophisticated generation the world has ever seen.

They will not work from greed or to protect greed.

They will work, as no men or women have ever worked before, for the moral law, to make a world dedicated to God that by their own idealistic standards is worth living in.

That is why everyone who really wants to save our American democracy should support in every possible way those—and I care not of what denomination—who are to strengthen youth in their devotion to God and the moral law.

In creating a united will of a free people to keep America safe for democracy, those who are laboring in the churches building the Nation's moral front are building the real fighting front.

In the world which such a youth will build all men will live as enduring friends and mankind as a single united body bound by one faith in God and one truth from God.

In that world, war will be banished forever and peace forever honored.

While we are watching our own youth build that world, let us, in compassion, remember the youth of Europe who were not fortunate enough to have our second chance.

These are the beautiful words of charity of our beloved cardinal adapted from his last letter to his clergy, with which he was most anxious I should close:

"Let us pray for the victims of war, pray for the wounded and maimed, for the orphaned and homeless.

"Pray for the repose of the souls of the men and boys, hurried into eternity in the springtime of youth, in the strength of young manhood, not of their own volition, pawns on the chessboard, fodder for cannon.

"Pray for those others who loved their country and were willing to offer the supreme sacrifice that their children might have freedom and prosperity—and peace."

The Boyhood of Lincoln

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SHERMAN MINTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 4, 1939

ADDRESS BY ROSS F. LOCKRIDGE

Mr. MINTON. Mr. President, one of the things we cherish most in Indiana is the Lincoln tradition. In the hills of southern Indiana Lincoln spent the formative years of his life, and we are endeavoring to preserve the story of his boyhood.

On October 1, 1939, a distinguished Hoosier historian, Mr. Ross F. Lockridge, delivered, under the auspices of the Boonville Press Club, in Spencer County, Ind., a most interesting and informative address about the boyhood of Lincoln.

I ask unanimous consent that this address may be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Fellow Hoosiers of southern Indiana, I have been requested to speak upon a subject rather specifically worded as follows: "On this spot let us erect a suitable Lincoln monument." Although I shall adhere to this subject, yet I think I should say that I do not mean to waive entirely the possibility that it might be found feasible to erect such a monument at one of the other great Lincoln sites in Spencer County.

I wish to say that, in my opinion, there are at least three other very notable sites in this county, connected with the boyhood and youth of Lincoln, which might offer eligible locations for a monument to Lincoln—the Hoosier youth. These are: The site of his log-cabin home at Lincoln City, in what is now the Nancy Hanks Lincoln Park; the site of one of the log school houses where he attended school, on State Road No. 62, about a mile south of Gentryville; and the site of the Lincoln landing on the Ohio River in Rockport.

I think it will be agreed by all that any one of these places, and possibly others, would be eligible for such a monument. Indeed, we might broaden our consideration here today to cover the general subject: "Let us erect a suitable Lincoln monument in southern Indiana." I wish to call your attention to the fact that there are several Lincoln monuments of heroic proportions already erected in Indiana, but not in southern Indiana. I shall mention three of these: The magnificent monument of Lincoln in front of the Lincoln National Life Building at Fort Wayne, representing him in the pride of his young manhood just as he was leaving Indiana; the impressive monument of Lincoln as President, located in the courthouse yard at Wabash; and the heroic statue of President Lincoln in University Park, Indianapolis. There is a splendid monument to Lincoln nearer this spot than any of these, but it is not in Indiana. I refer to the very handsome Lincoln Memorial on the Illinois side of the Wabash at Vincennes, where he entered Illinois as a full-grown man in 1830.

Certainly it is most timely and opportune that a movement be launched here today to erect a monument in the form of a statue of heroic proportions, as a fitting recognition of the 14 formative years that Abe Lincoln spent as a growing youth here in southern Indiana. I speak only for myself when I say that I shall have no interest in any such movement that does not contemplate a Lincoln monument of quality, caliber, and cost fully equal to, if not superior to, any of these others that I have mentioned.

And now I shall address my remarks to the eligibility of this particular place for such a purpose. I am happy to say that there are abundant human and historical associations that nominate this handsome historic roadside park, the Abe Lincoln Ferry Park, which we are dedicating today as an eminently fitting site for a monument to Abe Lincoln, Hoosier, in his particular character as a ferryman or flat-boat man.

Right here the Hoosier youth, Abe Lincoln, spent the greater part of his time during about 9 months of his seventeenth year (1825–26) operating a ferry across Anderson Creek as a hired hand of James Taylor. The old pioneer river road at that time crossed Anderson Creek here between where the present road crosses it and where it joins the Ohio—probably a little nearer the Ohio than the modern road. There was no bridge. Anderson Creek was deep and was often swollen so that it was dangerous, if not impossible, to ford it. So Abe ran a ferry here with a small flat boat that would carry one team and wagon at a time. Anderson Creek was properly known then as Anderson River. It was recognized as a navigable stream. By act of the Indiana Legislature January 17, 1820, Anderson River was declared navigable as far as Hurricane Fork, near St. Meinrad.

I think it very important in this connection to note the actual conditions that prevailed here at that time. While Abe was working here, a small village showed signs of starting at this place. Later it became known as Maxville, which was laid out and platted in 1841. A few scattering houses were built and some business places were erected. It flourished for several decades during steamboat days, but with the decline of river traffic it passed away entirely. During the time that Abe worked here, in the years 1825 and 1826, steamboating was just beginning to enjoy its early heyday on the Ohio. La Belle Riviere was enjoying its temporary distinction as the Main Street of America. The first steamboat passed this place less than 15 years before. Even before Maxville became a village the mouth of Anderson Creek was a notable stopping, landing, and loading place. It became a favorite loafing place for men and boys of the community, both during daytime and evening. Here, around a campfire while waiting for passengers, Abe enjoyed many happy hours, telling stories and taking part in rough country frolics. He was just then reaching his full height of 6 feet and 4 inches. On every foot of this ground he ran and jumped and wrestled with the husky youths and strong men of this pioneer river settlement. So I think it must be noted that from the standpoint of the physical development of this remarkable boy, this spot suggests some very significant associations for our consideration now. What could be more appropriate than the erection right here of a statue, depicting that husky youth just as he looked here—just like he was when he lived, and worked, and played here on this spot?

There are associations here also that suggest some very important features in the development of his mental faculties and in the formation of some of the peculiar habits for which he became especially noted.

Just then entering upon his greatest awakening of mental curiosity and his intellectual enjoyment of all human contacts, the boy Lincoln cultivated his growing habit of storytelling here while listening with interest to the wonderful yarns of men who had been in many strange places. The rivermen and the steamboat travelers were of vast interest to him. Abe boarded all the boats and talked with all the folks, both passengers and crew, at every opportunity, thus rapidly broadening his views of the big outside world. It is easy to believe that his chief ambition at this time was to be captain of a steamboat.

This was his first experience as a riverman and it took him entirely out of the little backwoods settlement into a new and strange world. He must have observed many remarkable flotillas here and certainly came into very intimate contact with some of them. During that very time, probably early in January 1826, the famous Boatload of Knowledge conducted by Robert Owen and William Maclure, with their illustrious company of teachers, scientists, and artists, passed this way on their voyage to New Harmony. Young Robert Dale Owen was on that boat. He was destined to influence President Lincoln greatly in his preparation and issuance of the Proclamation of Emancipation by a famous letter that "stirred the President like a trumpet call." Whether or not Abe actually talked with members of the Boatload of Knowledge here as they passed on that eventful voyage, he had full knowledge of it later and of the great social experiment at New Harmony, of which Dennis Hanks said in later life that "it well nigh druv' Abe crazy." During that time he was reading the New Harmony Gazette and thus became familiar with the principles of the Owenite Community of Equality. Certainly many of the humanitarian

ideals of Robert Owen and of Robert Dale Owen were adopted by Abraham Lincoln.

It was just about this time, or probably a few months earlier, May 25, 1825, that the celebrated Marquis de Lafayette went up the Ohio past this place and was wrecked upon the huge rock at Lafayette Springs just about Cannelton, some 12 miles from here. Lafayette was compelled to camp there around a campfire at the spring in the rock for several hours, which attracted the attention of the whole countryside. Lincoln knew of all these things and was deeply affected by them. His experiences here broadened his opportunities for reading and enlarged his choice of books. He was afterward quoted as saying that he read every book "within a radius of 50 miles" from his home, which was only about 15 miles from here. A life-sized, or heroic statue, here, would surely reflect the significance of all these vital associations.

I hope I can give adequate emphasis to one significant event that occurred here, which I consider most outstanding in its effect upon the mind and heart of this developing youth.

It was right here that Abe earned the first dollar he could rightly call his own. His regular pay, as a hired hand, went to his father. But Abe became ambitious to do something for himself, so he built his own scow in order to do some business on his own account along the river here at odd hours. Abe told one day in Cabinet meeting how he earned his first dollar at this place. Secretary Seward wrote down the story in the President's own words, as follows:

"I was contemplating my new boat, and wondering whether I could make it stronger or improve it in any part, when two men with trunks came down to the shore in carriages, and asked, 'Will you,' said one of them, 'take us and our trunks out to the steamer?' 'Certainly,' said I. I was very glad to have the chance of earning something, and supposed that each of them would give me a couple of bits. The trunks were put in my boat, the passengers seated themselves on them, and I sculled them out to the steamer. They got on board, and I lifted the trunks and put them on the deck. The steamer was about to put on steam again, when I called out, 'You have forgotten to pay me.' Each of them took from his pocket a silver half dollar and threw it on the bottom of my boat."

Here the President paused and gave thoughtful emphasis to the remainder of his statement.

"I could scarcely believe my eyes as I picked up the money. You may think it was a very little thing, and in these days it seems to me like a trifle, but it was a most important incident in my life. I could scarcely credit that I, the poor boy, had earned a dollar in less than a day; that by honest work I had earned a dollar. The world seemed wider and fairer before me. I was a more hopeful and thoughtful boy from that time."

It was right out here in the middle of the Ohio River where that episode occurred.

Surely it goes without saying that a monument erected here depicting that lusty boy, as he was then, looking out over the beautiful Ohio where that important incident in his life occurred, would impress all that may be privileged to look upon such a monument, with the touching significance of that episode, which was to make of him "a more hopeful and thoughtful boy." Moreover this incident was to have some very practical and immediate results. It was this incident, or another like it, that gave Abraham his first experience in law. Kentucky jurisdiction ran to the low-water mark on the Indiana side and there were two Dill brothers operating a ferry across the Ohio at this place under a Kentucky license. They filed charges against Abe and brought him before Squire Samuel Pate, a Kentucky justice of peace, near here on the other side of the river, to be tried for running a ferry without a license. Abe pleaded his own case. He said he did not take passengers across the river, but only to midstream so they might board steamers that would not stop. There was no other way for them to take such steamers here. There was no law covering such a situation. It was a work of simple necessity. He had not "set them over the river" and therefore had not violated any law. Kentucky did not require a license for such service.

Judge Pate sustained Abraham's argument and dismissed the case. This was the beginning of his interest in law and in courts, and he frequently crossed the Ohio here in his flatboat to visit that Kentucky judge and to talk with him and hear him try cases. He also attended corn huskings and other frolics across the river as well as on this side.

It goes without saying that a monument erected here on the banks of the Ohio River would, of course, illumine the elemental influence that this great river had in determining the character and even the public career of Abraham Lincoln. Therefore I wish to call attention to some related experiences that Lincoln had on the Ohio River at other places than here at Anderson Creek.

Beginning with his flatboat experience here at Anderson Creek, Abe broadened his river activities rapidly. In 1827 he worked several weeks as a day laborer on the Portland Canal around the falls of the Ohio at Louisville, and the following year he made that famous trip from Rockport by flatboat all the way to New Orleans.

The rivermen of the Ohio and the Mississippi always regarded Lincoln as one of themselves. This was expressed in a dispatch from Rockport, Ind., May 21, 1860, when he was nominated for President:

"Old flatboat men claim him as one of their number, and as he was a safe pilot in guiding hundreds of boats through the torturous windings of the Father of Waters so they are quite willing to trust him with the helm of the ship of state."

Abe's flatboat experiences had some strangely practical results. While practicing law at Springfield, Ill., he invented and patented a device for improving the handling of flatboats. His intimate knowledge of flatboats was responsible for a unique development in the history of naval warfare during the Civil War. When the Swedish inventor, John Ericsson, was turned down by the Navy Department on a new model that consisted simply of two guns on a revolving turret mounted on a broad, flat surface, like the deck of a raft or flatboat, the persistent Swede appealed to the President. Abe was interested immediately. He said, "I'm not an authority on battleships but I am an expert on flatboats, and this looks to me like it is built on sound flatboat principles." He accompanied the Swede to the Navy Department and insisted on a trial. The result was the *Monitor,* a strange looking craft, like a cheese box on a raft, which won that signal victory over the *Merrimac,* March 9, 1862. This revolutionized naval warfare, introducing the iron-sheeted cruiser. I think this is worth a statue on the beautiful Ohio.

At this point I want to attempt a constructive interpretation of the more than passing influence that all of this river life and these associations had upon the boy, who was destined to be the emancipator of a race and the savior of a nation.

Abe's early life near the Ohio River, his flatboating experience here at Anderson Creek and on the Ohio, together with his two long trips down the Ohio and down the Mississippi to New Orleans, made a profound impression upon his very being. From all this he got an unalterable understanding of the physical integrity and unity of America. To him the Ohio River was always the beloved connecting link between Kentucky, the happy home of his childhood, and Indiana, the happy home of his boyhood. He could not contemplate this well-loved river as a hostile border. He had lived on both sides of this river, he'd played on both sides, he'd worked on both sides, and he had courted girls on both sides of it. He had stone bruises on his feet, made on both sides of the Ohio. He had earned his first dollar upon it. He had flatboated up and down its broad surface. He had looked lovingly upon it year after year from both sides.

If the Union should be divided, it would have to divide here at the Ohio. This was incomprehensible and impossible to Abraham Lincoln. He could not give up his dear Kentucky as he knew it here. All this was in his heart and mind when he made that immortal appeal in his first inaugural address to the North and South.

"Physically speaking, we canot separate. We cannot remove our respective sections from each other nor build an impassable wall between them. A husband and wife may be divorced and go out of the presence and beyond the reach of each other but the different parts of our country cannot do this. They cannot but remain face to face; and intercourse, either amicable or hostile, must continue between them. It is impossible then to make that intercourse more advantageous or more satisfactory after separation than before. Can aliens make treaties easier than friends can make laws? Can treaties be more faithfully enforced between aliens than laws can among friends? Suppose you go to war, you cannot fight always; and when, after much loss on both sides and no gain on either, you cease fighting the identical old questions as to terms of intercourse are again upon you."

I have no doubt at all that when he made this classic appeal he had immediately in his mind this beloved river as he knew it best right here; and that out of this came that almost incomprehensible love of union, which was to be the most dominating single influence in his career as the man of the ages.

Abraham Lincoln's love of union cannot be explained by any application of academic principles. It was fundamentally a part of him. It had simply grown into him so deeply that he was permeated with it through and through. It was taught him by the greatest of all teachers, great Nature, as he contacted Nature here in this organic relation of land and water.

Thus his love of union became elemental in his nature through soil and water—the soil of Indiana and the soil of Kentucky and the waters of the Ohio. The integrity of the Union became the stanchest factor of his convictions. Though he hated slavery with all the intensity of his nature, his love of union was greater than his hatred of slavery. He often said in the very heat of the antislavery contest:

"Much as I hate slavery, I would consent to the extension of it rather than that the Union should be dissolved, just as I would consent to any great evil to avoid a greater one."

And out of that deep and fundamental conviction he declared officially right when the fight against slavery was hottest:

"I would save the Union. I would save it the shortest way under the Constitution. The sooner the national authority can be restored the nearer the Union will be 'the Union as it was.' If there be those who would not save the Union unless they could at the same time save slavery, I do not agree with them. If there be those who would not save the Union unless they could at the same time destroy slavery I do not agree with them. My paramount object in this struggle is to save the Union, and is not either to save or to destroy slavery. If I could save the Union without freeing any slave, I would do it; and if I could save it by freeing all the slaves, I would do it; and if I could save it by freeing some and leaving others alone, I would also do that. What I do about slavery and the colored race I do because I believe it helps to save the Union; and what I forbear, I forbear because I do not believe it would help to save the Union."

To this he added:

"I intend no modification of my oft-declared personal wish that all men everywhere could be free."

In fact, he had already prepared a rough draft of the Emancipation Proclamation and was only awaiting a favorable opportunity to issue it when it might be most helpful to the Union. Now, I think it is clear that a monument here, where he had his most consistent contact with the Ohio River, would inspire profound reflection upon the historic background that made him the "savior of the Union."

And here I want to make reference to what is perhaps the most intimate suggestion that could be offered as to the significance of a monument at this place. This suggestion is that a monument here will be truly representative of his entire life in southern Indiana.

This junction of Anderson Creek with the Ohio River here may be taken as the very heart of the so-called Hoosier Lincoln country. It was at Tobinsport, Ky., some 20 miles up the river from here, where the Lincoln family is believed to have crossed the Ohio into Indiana in 1816. They came down past Lafayette Springs near Cannelton and are supposed to have camped there one night, right where Lafayette was shipwrecked some 9 years later. They came on through Troy down this old pioneer road, then north and west, to the place where they made their new home about 15 miles from here. The town of Rockport, which is about 17 miles down the river from here, is also about the same distance as Troy from the Lincoln home—about 15 miles. Rockport, on the Ohio, became Lincoln's home town and county seat. There he heard law cases tried and borrowed law books. From there he made his great flatboat trip to New Orleans in 1828.

The Lincoln farm home, about 15 miles northwest of here, is now a part of the Nancy Hanks Lincoln Park. There his mother and only sister are buried. It was there that Abraham Lincoln was "raised," as he said. There he got his schooling from Hoosier schoolmasters in Hoosier log schoolhouses. There he lived from the age of 7 to the age of 21, from the fall of 1816 to March 1, 1830.

So it follows naturally that a monument here would accentuate to all the world the fact that Abraham Lincoln was a Hoosier. He was a genuine Hoosier. The origin of that now well-known term has never been fully agreed upon, but its original meaning and application are well known. It came into being while Lincoln lived in Indiana, and it came to be applied to the people of Indiana. Whatever its derivation, it signified at that time a rough and husky fellow, such as those Indiana backwoodsmen were, such as Abe certainly was. The very year the Lincolns left Indiana this popular term became classic through the poem The Hoosier's Nest, by John Finley, which was given to the world on New Year's Day 1830:

"I'm told, in riding somewhere west,
A stranger found a Hoosier's nest—

* * * * * * *

Two rifles placed above the door;
Three dogs lay stretched upon the floor—
In short, the domicile was rife
With specimens of Hoosier life."

Lincoln was brought up in such a Hoosier's nest. He was "raised" a Hoosier.

Finally a monument at this place looking directly upon the Ohio will be a fitting symbol of what this beautiful river meant to the heart and soul of Lincoln. Although the great river boats that Lincoln loved to see and to board at this place have passed away, just as his humble ferryboat has passed away, yet the beauty of the river remains the same. It offers here a picturesque prospect for recreation, meditation, and inspiration linking the forever-changing present with the immutable past. While birdlike planes soar far above it, mingling with the fleecy clouds in the azure blue—symbols of a progress that the Hoosier youth, farseeing as he was, could not foresee—this splendid modern highway will continue to bring speeding throngs in ever greater numbers to this place to enjoy its scenic beauty and to contemplate here, just as Abe Lincoln did, the age-old history and the mystic charm of the beautiful Ohio. I have no doubt that he contemplated it in the spirit expressed in the lines of a Hoosier poetess, Bessie H. Wolford, who dwelt beside it:

"When the trees that God planted in Eden were young,
When the nations of earth were one kindred and tongue,
Ere a leader arose to make Israel free,
Or the Nazarene wandered by fair Galilee,
Then, as now, thou wert flowing forever and ever,
Through ages of silence, O beautiful river.

* * * * * * *

Flow on, bearing with thee the tide of the years,
Our joys and our sorrows, our smiles and our tears;
Flow on with unchanging, unchangeable motion,
Like thee, we move on to eternity's ocean;
Till life shall be lost in the life of the Giver,
Onward, flow onward, O beautiful river."

With all these influences going into our very beings—as they went into him—as we look upon a suitable monument of the boy Lincoln here, we may enter into the very feelings of that wonderful youth who got some of his "raising" here.

The Ohio River is the river of Lincoln, just as truly as it is the river of George Rogers Clark and the river of La Salle—La Belle Riviere. It flowed through the very spirit of his youth, even as it flowed through the very heart of America. To him it was the backbone of America—the great American way. Standing here upon the very ground that was so often pressed by his feet, gazing upon the river, where his eyes rested lovingly upon it and upon fair Kentucky, we may enter into something of the formative influences that determined the career of this "man of the ages" and feel kinship with the "better angels" that ever attended him.

"Born in Kentucky, raised in Indiana," as he said, and contacting the Ohio intimately throughout his youth, with loved ones forever at rest on both sides of it, we may believe that out of these associations and memories came the inspiration of his appeal to the North and South in the classic conclusion of his first inaugural address:

"We are not enemies, but friends. We must not be enemies. Though passion may have strained, it must not break, our bonds of affection. The mystic chords of memory, stretching from every battlefield and patriot grave to every living heart and hearthstone all over this broad land, will yet swell the chorus of the Union when again touched, as surely they will be, by the better angels of our nature."

Surely all this vast range of associations should be in the contemplation of those who are charged with the movement to erect a suitable monument to the Hoosier boy, Abe Lincoln, in southern Indiana. There is today no suitable statue of Lincoln as a boy. Certainly there ought to be one at least, and it ought to be here in southern Indiana, where he spent most of his boyhood years. The erection of such a statue would be a fine objective memorial to him. He was himself decidedly objective in his habits of thinking. He liked to see things in their natural and objective relations.

Such a statue ought to be erected on the Ohio River. There is, I believe, no Lincoln statue now on the banks of the beautiful Ohio. There are Lincoln monuments, of course, in some Ohio River cities, such as Cincinnati and Louisville, but these statues are not directly on the river. Such a statue should depict him in his youthful character, as a riverman—a ferryman or flatboatman—as he was here. Surely there is an abundance of human and historical associations to elect this place—the Abe Lincoln Ferry Park—as a proper location for such a statue.

And so I conclude by reiterating my subject: On This Spot Let Us Erect a Suitable Lincoln Monument.

Keeping America Out of the War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN G. TOWNSEND, JR.

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 4, 1939

EDITORIAL FROM WILMINGTON (DEL.) JOURNAL-EVERY EVENING

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Wilmington (Del.) Journal-Every Evening, of the issue of Wednesday, September 20, 1939. The editorial is entitled "America Can Keep Out."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wilmington (Del.) Journal-Every Evening, of September 20, 1939]

AMERICA CAN KEEP OUT

With Congress on the eve of a special session, now is as good a time as any for every American to abandon the mistaken notion that sooner or later this country must get into the war. There is no excuse for this kind of thinking. There is no reason for voicing this kind of judgment.

On the contrary, it will be vastly to the benefit of the nation if all its citizens resolve herewith to have no more to do with the philosophy of futility which has captured the minds of so many of their fellow-citizens. A defeatist attitude is unworthy of Americans. More than that, it is positively dangerous.

It is true, of course, that the United States was unable to stay out of the World War. But we are people of a poor state, indeed, if we have not learned, from the bitter experiences of that conflict, what course we must follow to avoid a repetition of all the horrors and all the loss of blood and treasure which marked our other adventure on foreign fields.

Let us, then, say to ourselves and keep repeating to ourselves that America must stay out of this war, whether it last 2 months or 10 years.

Let us, by no act of ours as a Nation, encourage any other country to believe that we are going to war. Let us focus our main attention, not on the continent of Europe and its never-ending quarrels and hatreds, but on the continent of North America where our primary interests lie and where our future destiny rests.

Americans today are called upon to save no democracy except their own. They are under no obligation to anybody except other Americans. Their great function, perhaps their one function, in these days of crisis is to demonstrate to all the world

that they can make their own democracy work and that those who live under its shining aegis can be happy, peaceful, and contented.

Americans have no mission and no purpose to reform other nations or to alter their pattern. If the Germans want nazi-ism let them have it. If the Russians like communism or the Italians prefer fascism that is their privilege. If the Japanese think they fare best under army rule who are we to tell them that they are misguided?

Americans, moreover, have no right to preach or to moralize. They have faults of their own which need to be corrected. They have economic and social troubles which need to be cured. In short, America has its own business to mind, a business which exacts every ounce of its energy and attention.

America can keep out of the war. It will keep out of the war provided its people so resolve and so determine. The great mass of our citizens are for peace. They can have it by refusing steadfastly to accept the alternative or to take any step which makes the alternative inevitable.

Democracy at Bay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, JR.

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 4, 1939

ADDRESS BY DR. ERNEST H. WILKINS, PRESIDENT OF OBERLIN COLLEGE

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the assembly address delivered by Dr. Ernest H. Wilkins, president of Oberlin College, on September 20, 1939. The subject of the address is Democracy at Bay.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We meet under the heaviest shadow that has darkened any college opening within your lifetime—a shadow darker, in some ways, than that which shrouded us in the Septembers of the World War.

What will the year bring forth for us? The shadow is not likely to diminish or to disappear. Will it remain a lowering menace, or will black storm descend upon us also?

In Europe, where the storm rages most furiously, the issue is clearly drawn. Clearly drawn, that is, as a present and immediate issue—less and less clearly drawn if one takes into account the actions and inactions that have led to the catastrophe. But now, in September 1939, there confront each other, on the lands, on the waters, and in the skies of Europe, forces which are fairly to be called forces, respectively, of dictatorship and of democracy, of tyranny and of freedom. On the one side, a ruthless lust for domination, which has crushed freedom even in the land of its own growth, and has by force and fraud reached out to enslave still other lands; on the other side, nations bred in the knowledge and the use of freedom, rising at last with infinite reluctance to meet what seems to them an ineluctable challenge.

It is not all utter black against pure white. Among the motives of the darker side there is an element of legitimate resentment and disillusion; and among those who stand on the darker side the vast majority, despite present compulsion, would engage far more gladly in works of light than in works of darkness. And on the brighter side the hands and hearts of the combatant democracies are by no means unstained.

Yet the present European conflict is in its essence, nonetheless, a mortal struggle between tyranny and democracy; and the outcome of that struggle is inestimably momentous, not for Europe only but for the whole world.

Meanwhile, in the Far East another aggressor still wages pitiless war upon the most peace loving of all the nations of the earth. And if that struggle is now for us surpassed in immediate concern, we may well remember that it is growing ever more bitter for the vast hordes of those who have already suffered, for the inoffensive millions from whom the crash of hurtling destruction is never very far away.

Where do we stand in such a world, as nation and as democracy? Where do we stand in point of danger; where do we stand in point of duty?

That we stand in some degree of danger no one can reasonably deny; but it is easy to overestimate or to underestimate the degree of danger in which we stand.

By danger I mean, of course, danger of drifting or being drawn or being driven into war. The experience of war, even if it should not terminate in defeat, would be catastrophic, not only in its unspeakable self and in the misery of its subsequent depression but in the impairment of democracy which would inevitably attend it and would be all too likely to linger and to increase after its close.

We stand in danger, in various ways, from Germany, from England and France, from Japan, and from ourselves.

We stand in double danger from Germany—first, because of German submarine activity; and, second, because, following a German success in the war, we should become a proximate objective for further conquest.

Under our Neutrality Act as it now stands we cannot export arms, ammunition, or implements of war to the belligerents, but we are free to export to them materials which are classed or will soon be classed as contraband. Germany is blockading Britain by submarine. Under international law Germany has the right to stop and search American merchant vessels and to remove contraband or tow a contraband-carrying vessel into port. She has the right to sink such vessels if they refuse to stop or resist search and seizure, but not otherwise. German submarines cannot transship contraband and cannot tow vessels into port; and Germany considers that these circumstances create an exception which justifies her in sinking any vessels carrying contraband—a doctrine which this country does not accept. We may then expect such sinkings. If they are not too numerous, if they take place in European waters, and if they are carried out without great loss of American life, we shall presumably content ourselves with protests. If Germany goes berserk, as she did before, our mounting resentment will impel us toward war and may push us in. Yet Germany certainly does not want us in the war; and our own resistance to entrance as a result of submarine activity is apparently much greater than it was 25 years ago. I rate this danger, therefore, as very real, but not immediate.

We stand in some measure of danger from Germany, also, because nazi-ism is avowedly bent not only on European but on world conquest; and because if the present war beats down England and France, the Atlantic becomes a Rhine. On our peace day last spring I quoted to you several statements of Nazi ambition for world conquest. Let this one song-refrain suffice as reminder of them all:

"Today Germany is ours, tomorrow the whole world.
Heute gehört uns Deutschland und morgen die ganze Welt."

But I think that the danger from such mania for conquest, though real, is less than it was last spring; for up to that date the mania had not been challenged—and now, at last, the challenge has come.

If Germany should prevail and should so weaken England and France that they could no longer serve as barriers, we should face across the open sea a rampant planetary madness inflamed with victory, jealous of our power, covetous of our resources, and hostile to our democracy. Moreover, if Germany should overwhelm France and England, democracy would disappear in those two countries and in the remaining smaller European democracies as well, and that disappearance would immeasurably impair the strength of the democratic principle in our own land. At the moment it does not look as though Germany could so prevail, though stalemate looks more probable than a Franco-British victory; but if the unholy alliance of Germany and Russia—an alliance which cynically proves the hypocrisy of the Nazi abhorrence of communism and the Communist abhorrence of nazi-ism, and confirms both regimes as twins in sheer dictatorship—if that unholy alliance should become an active military alliance, then the danger to England and France, and to ourselves would be very greatly increased.

We stand in danger, in a different way, from England and France. It would be greatly to their advantage to have us enter the war on their side; and it may be expected that they will try to get us in. They can make a strong case for our intervention. But I believe that our resistance to propaganda, even to propaganda based on fact, is definitely greater than it has ever been before. This danger, then, though it exists, is also secondary rather than immediate.

We stand in some slight danger from Japan. Japan, like Germany, is imbued, as I pointed out in my peace-day talk last spring, with the mania for world domination—a mania which rests, in her case, in a deeply rooted conviction of her own divinity. But the menace of that madness is probably less than it was last spring—partly because of the continuance of Chinese resistance, partly because of the momentary loosening of ties between Japan and Germany. On the other hand, that madness is unquestionably being fed by a growing conviction of British helplessness. Moreover, our own Government this summer, in its denunciation of our commercial treaty with Japan, took a step which was intended and was felt as punitive. There is therefore danger of retaliation—danger which will be increased if we take further action adverse to the interests of Japan. Even so, the danger from Japan alone could hardly be rated at this time as more than slight. But if Germany should succeed in bringing about an active triple military alliance between herself, Russia, and Japan, then our Pacific danger would be more than triply multiplied.

We stand in danger also from ourselves—from those who might expect to make large gains of any sort if we should enter the war, and from sensationalism and the emotional response thereto. But in both these fields we have new curbs, which will suffice at least to check our progress on the old road to war; and if our danger increases it may be expected that such curbs will be increased as well. We stand in danger also from those leaders, who, while honestly desiring to keep us out of war, may through unwisdom advocate measures which would tend to bring us in.

And we stand in danger from all the imperfections of our own democracy—the cleavages, the injustices, the ignorance, the selfishness, all that impairs a democracy, noble despite these imperfections, but potentially so much nobler still. The presence of such flaws and tensions in the body politic renders it weaker and more unsteady than it would otherwise be, more liable to yield to pressure, more liable to topple into war.

Yet with the many dangers faced and thus assessed, this seems to me a fair conclusion: In Europe democracy is truly at bay; our own democracy, though endangered, is not yet at bay, but it must stand on guard. In other words, while the danger of our being drawn into the war is extensive and varied, my present judgment is that that danger is not immediate. It is all too clear that we may be drawn into the war, but I do not think that our entrance is inevitable. On the contrary, my present opinion is that we can stay out, if we are sufficiently determined to do so, and if we exercise a perpetual vigilance.

What, then, is our duty with reference to our inner danger, with reference to Japan, and, most of all, with reference to the European war?

I have already alluded to the curbing of war profits and of sensationalism, and I shall turn presently to the problem of our neutrality. To the perpetual theme of our inner betterment, I shall not revert today.

As for Japan, it still seems to me, as it did last winter when I talked to you on the dilemma of neutrality, that the President's failure to apply the Neutrality Act to the war between Japan and China was inexcusable. He certainly frustrated the intention of the law and of its makers; the nonapplication of the act is certainly operating now, as I always thought it would, to the advantage of Japan, and we have kept greedily on with the utterly foolish business of arming a country which, though traditionally and most desirably a friend, is at the moment a potential enemy. Our proper present action with regard to Japan seems to me, therefore, to be the all-too-belated application of the Neutrality Act to the war between Japan and China.

As for the European war, the situation is much more complex. The two general possibilities are, of course, that we should go in, and that we should stay out. I believe, as the great majority of our citizens most obviously believe, that unless circumstances change markedly, we should stay out, but as intelligent and influential men and women we can hardly let our minds rest in that negative conclusion unless we have faced squarely the case for intervention.

The strength of that case has indeed been indicated by much that I have already said in the course of this address. Forces which are now, on the whole, forces of evil are engaged in mortal struggle with forces which are now, on the whole, forces of good. The forces of evil are specifically forces of dictatorship; the forces of good are specifically forces of democracy. Shall we stand by and watch passively while the evil ravages the good, while dictatorship moves to the destruction of democracy? England and France are fighting not only their war but ours; are barriers between ourselves and rampant madness. Shall we stand by and take the chance that they will win for us? The appeal is twofold; it summons our sense of chivalry, and it excites our own defensive self-interest.

Too late. If only, before disaster fell, if only we had evolved some effective form of world organization or quasi world organization. If only we had taken our part in the League of Nations, imperfect though that instrument was, of necessity, even at its best. If only we had achieved Streit's great plan for the federal union of the strong democracies. It is fundamentally because of the world's failure to establish some such organization that the cataclysm has come upon us, and in that failure the share of the United States is very large indeed. For such world organization I have labored and hope again to labor, and in that task many of your predecessors and many of you have been and will again, I hope, be with me. And if such organization may gleam beyond the darkness of this war, then perhaps even this war may find its compensation.

But for the moment we have no such organization, and we know only too well the shattering horror of war and the long misery that follows in its train. Shall we plunge into that horror and that misery? Shall we let this country take you and hundreds of thousands like you as fodder for cannon and bombs and gas, for abysmal depression, and perhaps for revolution? The time may come when overwhelming need of self-defense will force us to do even this. But unless that time should come, our entrance, as a separate nation, into this conflict of separate nations, would be a wild knight errantry and an inordinate sacrifice. Unless that tragic time should come, our greatest service to the stricken world lies rather in the safe maintenance and the constant perfecting of this haven and stronghold of democracy. And we need you for that maintenance and for that perfecting.

We should, then, stay out. But it remains true that England and France are fighting our war, are barriers between ourselves and rampant madness. Can we do nothing, shall we do nothing to help them, beyond the giving of our unsubstantial sympathy?

That general question, reduced to practical and immediate terms, means this: Our Neutrality Act now prohibits any export of arms, ammunition, and implements of war to belligerent states; shall we so amend it as to make such export possible? It is to consider precisely such an amendment that Congress has been called into session tomorrow.

If we adopt such an amendment, we shall do so primarily because it would help England and France, while not helping Germany. Obviously such an amendment, though mentioning no nations, would be in fact unneutral. Would the passage of such an amendment be wise or unwise? Specifically, would it diminish or increase the chances of our being drawn into war?

That is a critical question. It is not an easy one; it leaves plenty of room for differences of honest opinion. I shall state my own opinion, not to impose it on you, but because I think you are entitled to know where in this matter I stand.

When the adoption of such an amendment was proposed last spring I favored it. The nations concerned were not then at war, and the action would not then have had the unneutral character which it would have now. And if the action had been taken then, it would have constituted such evidence of our prospective support for England and France that it would have tended to prevent the war.

Too late. The time for preventive action is past, and the adoption of the same amendment now would not serve to stop the war.

In my present judgment, it would tend to draw us into the war, for it would enrage Germany; it would lead to German sabotage in munitions plants in this country; it would establish in us a mood of quasi belligerence; and it would cause a great development of the munitions industry, which would then crave continued and ever larger markets for its satisfaction.

I am opposed to the amendment also for a still deeper reason. I said a moment ago that if we should adopt it, we should do so primarily because it would help France and England. I am very much afraid that we should be adopting it, secondarily, because it would help the munitions industry and the various industries which are most directly subsidiary thereto. And that motive seems to me not less than hideous. I said to you last winter that I believed that the private export of arms, ammunition, and implements of war should be unlawful at all times—always excepting export to nations declared to be our own allies. I moved from that position last spring, in view of the possibly preventive character of the action then proposed. But I have now returned to that position, and hold it with increased conviction. If at tragic last we must strike for our own defense, then we may well help to arm those who are aiding us in that defense. Until then let there be no export of machines of death.

I would revise the Neutrality Act, not by lifting the arms embargo but by prohibiting the export of secondary war materials in American vessels, or in foreign vessels except on the cash-and-carry plan. In my judgment, the one thing most likely to get us into the war would be the sinking of a series of American vessels carrying secondary war materials to England and France. Congress ought, therefore, to make it impossible for American vessels to carry war materials to any belligerent.

I am aware that the imposition of this further restriction would in some measure check the immediate expansion of American industry. But if American industry would only look clearly into the future, it would realize that every war gain would be more than swallowed up in a postwar depression. The cost of peace, the cost of refraining from war trade, may be high, but the cost of peace is infinitely less, even in dollars, than the cost of war. And the cost of peace is a cost in dollars only—the cost of war is a cost in dollars and in human flesh and blood and spirit.

The power to declare war or to keep this country out of war lies in Congress, which will meet tomorrow. The Members of Congress are not inaccessible gods or dictators. This is a democracy; the Members of Congress are just our representatives—yours and mine. In the last analysis, and on the whole, they will do what they think we want them to do. Then, if you want them to keep us out of war, tell them so.

To those of you who are upperclass men, the idea of writing to your Congressman is not new. If any of you need advice as to the writing, the Oberlin Peace Society will help you, in accordance with directions which you will find in the Review, which will be placed in your hands as you leave the chapel.

If any one of you fails to do his part toward keeping us out of war, then if war comes, he shares the blame. If any one of you does his part toward keeping us out of war, then if we do keep out of war, he shares the praise.

May that praise be yours to share.

Keeping America Out of War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. REUBEN T. WOOD

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 2, 1939

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Speaker, the Congress has been convened in special session because of the situation in Europe to consider changes in our present neutrality laws, to safeguard the interests of the United States, and to determine what

course should be adopted to insure against our being drawn into the European conflict.

The important question facing us is what we shall do concerning our position on neutrality and legislation which affects it. I have never believed, nor do I now believe, that our present neutrality law should have been passed. I am convinced that our failure to repeal the arms embargo section of our neutrality law was a strong contributing factor to Hitler's decision to invade Poland, the incident which launched the present European conflict. We should have never departed from the long-established principles of conducting the foreign policies of this Nation under international law. We should return at once to normal foreign policies under international law, which would be our most effective safeguard against war.

Our present neutrality law has not worked. An embargo on supplies to belligerent nations will not prevent us from being drawn into armed conflict. Rather, it will tend to increase our danger of becoming embroiled in war. We have been selling arms to Germany for years, even though we had a treaty with Germany in which Germany promised it would not import arms, and thereby we inadvertently contributed to German preparedness for its aggression on Poland. That has not drawn us into war. For many months we have been selling arms to China and war supplies to Japan. We are not in the far eastern war. Holland, Spain, Sweden, and Switzerland all were neutral nations during the last World War, yet all of them sold war supplies to one side or the other, or to both sides. They did not become involved in that war. The arms embargo provisions of the present neutrality law forbid us, apparently, from selling arms to Germany, Poland, Britain, and France, because Britain and France have declared war, but not, apparently, from selling arms to China and Japan, which are waging an undeclared war. It allows us to sell arms to Italy and Russia, which in turn can sell to Germany, but does not allow us to sell to Canada. It lets us sell anything but arms to anybody, belligerent or not, and carry the goods to them in our own ships. We can sell Britain and France the metals and other materials to make arms, and we can deliver them in our own ships, but we cannot sell them arms made in this country from these same materials. We can sell tractors, but not tanks; cars, but not armored cars. There can be no moral or material difference between selling arms and selling the materials to make them.

We should continue our normal trade with the world and pass such legislation at this session of the Congress as will accomplish the following purposes:

First. Prohibit our citizens from going into war-danger zones.

Second. Forbid our ships to carry contraband of war.

Third. Prevent the convoying of our ships through danger zones.

Fourth. Require all purchases made in this country by belligerents to be upon a strict cash-and-carry basis.

Fifth. Take the profit out of munitions of war.

Sixth. Prevent all forms of war profiteering.

Seventh. Prohibit the making of any foreign loans.

Eighth. Adequately prepare this Nation against any attack which may be made upon it.

I am unalterably opposed to the sending of a single soldier or battleship to Europe. The people of the United States do not want war, and so long as we hate war and love peace we can keep out of the war in Europe.

The radio and the newspapers should be very careful not to engage in any jingo propaganda in the interests of the military junkers and war profiteers, as our greatest danger now and in the months to come is and will be war propaganda. We can and should have a sensible and accurate reporting of the European war news by the radio and the press.

The mothers, fathers, sons, and daughters of this Nation want peace, and every vote I cast upon legislation affecting this vital question will be a vote which I conscientiously believe to be a vote for peace and against war.

Results Under Reciprocal Trade Agreements Program During First Half of 1939

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH W. BYRNS, JR.

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 2, 1939

REPRINT FROM COMMERCE REPORTS OF AUGUST 19, 1939

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following reprint from Commerce Reports of August 19, 1939, issued by the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, United States Department of Commerce:

RESULTS UNDER RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS PROGRAM DURING FIRST HALF OF 1939

(Prepared by the Trade Agreements Unit, Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce)

Continuing the trend evident in previous years, United States exports to the countries with which reciprocal-trade agreements have been concluded made a more favorable showing during the first 6 months of 1939 than exports to nonagreement countries. Reflecting unsettled conditions throughout the world, total United States exports from January 1 to June 30 registered a decline from the high level at which they had been maintained in the same period of 1938, but the percentage of decrease was appreciably smaller in the case of the trade-agreement countries than in that of the countries with which no agreements were in effect. Taking the average for the 2 years 1938 and 1939 against the average for the preagreement years 1934 and 1935, in order to obtain a broader comparison, a substantial increase is shown in exports to both the agreement and nonagreement groups during the period January to June, but the increase is considerably greater for the agreement countries.

CONTRIBUTION OF TRADE AGREEMENTS TO FOREIGN COMMERCE

Obviously, the movement of international trade is determined by many factors, whose influence it is impossible to segregate or to appraise with any satisfactory degree of accuracy, and the reciprocal-trade agreements concluded by the United States have constituted only one element in the expansion of our exports sales. However, in view of the continuance over an extended period of a better export trade with the countries that have lowered or stabilized their tariffs or other trade barriers affecting American products, it seems reasonable to conclude that trade agreements have been contributing effectively to an expansion of our foreign commerce.

Also on the side of imports the statistics record a freer movement of trade with the agreement countries. Comparing the returns for the first half of 1939 with those for the corresponding period of 1938, it is found that imports from the countries with which trade agreements are in force expanded more rapidly than imports from other countries, and the same is true if the average for the first 6 months of 1938 and 1939 is compared with the average for the first 6 months of the preagreement years 1934 and 1935.

That imports in 1939 increased appreciably over those of the previous year, while exports declined, is explained by the abnormally small foreign purchases by the United States in 1938 following the business recession, imports of such raw materials as rubber, tin, wool, and hides and skins being particularly affected. With the return of better conditions in the first half of 1939 an expansion in the demand for imported products was an entirely natural development.

Since the trade agreement signed with the United Kingdom on November 17, 1938, became effective on January 1, 1939, that country is included in the trade-agreement group for the first time, but only so far as the comparison between 1938 and 1939 is concerned. To compare the average for these 2 years with the preagreement period would be meaningless from the standpoint of trade-agreement results, since the United Kingdom agreement was effective in only 1 year. The statistics of our trade with the United Kingdom have therefore been omitted entirely in making the longer comparison. That trade, particularly on the side of exports, is so important that its inclusion or noninclusion in either group largely determines the relation between the agreement and the nonagreement countries.

RELATIVE CHANGE IN EXPORTS

For the first 6 months of 1939 exports to the trade-agreement countries, including the United Kingdom and its Crown colonies and Ecuador, declined in value by $62,500,000, or 7 percent compared to the same period of 1938, whereas the value of exports to other countries with which no agreements have been concluded declined by $112,900,000, or 16 percent. An examination of the

statistics of our trade with the individual countries immediately reveals that the decreases which took place in exports to the United Kingdom and Canada alone were more than sufficient to account for the entire decline for the agreement group.

That there was a falling off in the value of American goods sold to the United Kingdom in the first half of 1939 was primarily due to the poor showing made by certain agricultural products, notably wheat, cotton, and tobacco, for which that country is our leading foreign market. In the case of wheat, materially lower prices in 1939 were to a large extent responsible for the decreased value of our sales. The reasons for the abnormally small exports of American cotton are too well known to require special mention. Purchases of American leaf tobacco by the United Kingdom were exceptionally heavy in 1938, and our smaller exports in the first half of 1939 were still appreciably higher than in the same period of 1937.

Only a comparatively small part of the apparent falling off in exports to Canada during the first 6 months of 1939 is attributable to purchases by that country for its own use. Although the United States statistics show nearly $30,000,000 worth of corn exported to Canada in the first half of 1938, but less than $1,000,000 worth in the same period of 1939, careful investigation has developed the fact that a large part of the 1938 total represented corn which, although recorded as destined to Canada, was actually merely in transit through that country and eventually reached other destinations. Total corn exports from the United States since the beginning of the current year have been far below the 1938 level both in quantity and value.

Considering our export trade as a whole, the statistics for January to June 1939 show clearly that the decline in value from the high level of the previous year relates almost exclusively to crude materials and crude foodstuffs, and that falling prices were in large measure responsible. Exports of manufactured goods, that is to say of the types of products for which it has been possible to obtain the most effective concessions through the negotiation of trade agreements, represented approximately the same value as in 1938. For most crude materials, particularly crude foodstuffs, a highly competitive world market exists and other factors than trade agreements exercise a dominant influence on the direction of international trade. The four trade-agreement countries which account for practically all of the decline in our exports to that group in 1939, namely, the United Kingdom, Canada, Belgium, and the Netherlands, are all heavy purchasers of our raw products. For all of the other agreement countries, except Cuba and Honduras, increases are recorded.

RELATIVE CHANGE IN IMPORTS

For the first 6 months of 1939 imports from the trade-agreement countries, including the United Kingdom and its Crown colonies, and Ecuador, increased by $92,400,000, or 16.6 percent, compared to the same period of 1938, while imports from the countries with which no agreements have been concluded increased by $41,200,000, or 10.2 percent. In the case of imports, finished manufactures represent a much smaller part of our total trade than is true of our exports during the first half of 1939—20.6 percent against 56.8 percent—and for a number of leading raw and semifinished materials required by American industry, such as rubber, tin, nickel, and hides and skins. Trade-agreement countries, notably the United Kingdom, the British colonies, and Canada, are the principal sources of supply. As has already been noted, imports of industrial materials were below the normal level in 1938, but revived in the first half of 1939. Much of the expansion in our purchases from the United Kingdom, the British colonies, and Canada was due to this fact, these countries alone accounting for nearly two-thirds of the entire increase in imports from the trade-agreement group, with the balance widely distributed.

To sum up, the changes shown by the statistics of our foreign trade during the first half of 1939 may be considered as representing a return to a more normal relationship between exports and imports, following a year in which exports were maintained at a high level, while imports showed an exceptional decline. Separating the countries with which trade agreements were in effect from the nonagreement countries, exports to the agreement group show a relatively small decline, for which adequate explanation is found in decreased shipments of basic commodities to certain leading countries, due to general market conditions, while the increase that took place in imports from trade-agreement countries is accounted for primarily by an increased demand for raw materials and may therefore be considered a healthy development. Even with the changes indicated, trade with the agreement countries left an export balance of $175,300,000, exports to that group having had a total value of $824,400,000 for the 6 months January to June 1939, against imports valued at $649,100,000.

TABLE 1.—*United States trade with trade-agreement countries and with all other countries, January–June 1939 compared with January–June 1938, and January–June 1938–39, compared with January–June 1934–35*

[Values in millions of dollars]

Item	Comparison of January–June 1939 with January–June 1938				Comparison of January–June 1938–39 with January–June 1934–35			
	January–June 1938 value	January–June 1939 value	Change		January–June 1934–35 average value	January–June 1938–39 average value	Change	
			Value	Percent			Value	Percent
EXPORTS, INCLUDING REEXPORTS								
Total, trade-agreement countries[1]	886.9	824.4	−62.5	−7.0	[2]370.1	[2]571.9	+201.8	+54.5
Total, nonagreement countries	703.9	591.1	−112.9	−16.0	[2]470.4	[2]647.5	+177.1	+37.7
Total, all countries	1,590.8	1,415.5	−175.4	−11.0	1,030.1	1,503.1	+473.0	+45.9
GENERAL IMPORTS								
Total, trade-agreement countries[1]	556.7	649.1	+92.4	+16.6	[2]373.1	[2]446.7	+73.6	+19.0
Total, non-agreement countries	404.2	445.4	+41.2	+10.2	[2]403.6	[2]424.8	+21.2	+5.2
Total, all countries	961.0	1,094.6	+133.6	+13.9	929.2	1,027.8	+98.6	+10.6

[1] Including the 18 countries (and colonies) with which agreements were in operation during the greater part of the last 6 months. Only 1 of the agreements was in operation throughout 1935, 6 throughout 1936, 12 by the middle of 1936, 15 by the middle of 1937, 17 by the middle of 1938, and 18 by the middle of 1939, including the agreement with the United Kingdom (covering also Newfoundland and the non-self-governing British colonies). The last agreement concluded (with Turkey) became provisionally effective only on May 5, 1939, and Turkey is, therefore, not included in the above calculations as an agreement country.

[2] These figures do not include Ecuador, the United Kingdom (including Newfoundland and non-self-governing British colonies), and Turkey with which agreements have been concluded but where the period during which the agreement has been in effect is too short to justify inclusion for purposes of comparison.

[3] The apparent discrepancy shown by these figures in comparison with the other totals is due to the noninclusion of trade with Ecuador and the United Kingdom and its Crown Colonies.

Source: Latest records of Division of Foreign Trade Statistics, Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce.

GENERAL NOTE.—Percentage changes have been calculated upon fuller figures in thousands.

TABLE 2.—*United States trade with individual trade-agreement countries—6-month period ended June 30—1934–39*

[Values in millions of dollars]

Trade-agreement countries (in order of effective dates)	Dates effective	Exports, including reexports						General imports					
		January–June 1934 and 1935 average value	January–June 1938 and 1939 average value	January–June 1938 value	January–June 1939 value	Percentage change		January–June 1934 and 1935 average value	January–June 1938 and 1939 average value	January–June 1938 value	January–June 1939 value	Percentage change	
						1938–39 over 1934–35	1939 over 1938					1938–39 over 1934–35	1939 over 1938
Total, trade-agreement countries		370.1	517.9	886.9	824.4	+54.5	−7.0	373.1	446.7	556.7	649.1	+19.7	+16.6
Cuba	Sept. 3, 1934	25.0	38.5	40.5	36.5	+54.1	−9.9	44.8	55.6	60.3	51.0	+24.1	−15.5
Belgium	May 1, 1935	27.1	37.9	42.7	33.1	+39.8	−22.5	15.2	25.0	18.5	31.5	+64.4	+70.0
Haiti	June 3, 1935	1.7	1.9	1.5	2.3	+9.0	+50.7	.5	1.6	1.6	1.6	+206.7	−4.9
Sweden	Aug. 5, 1935	16.2	34.7	30.4	39.0	+114.6	+28.1	15.5	19.0	20.0	17.9	+22.4	−10.5

TABLE 2.—*United States trade with individual trade-agreement countries—6-month period ended June 30—1934–39*—Continued

[Values in millions of dollars]

Trade-agreement countries (in order of effective dates)	Dates effective	Exports, including reexports						General imports					
		January–June 1934 and 1935 average value	January–June 1938 and 1939 average value	January–June 1938 value	January–June 1939 value	Percentage change		January–June 1934 and 1935 average value	January–June 1938 and 1939 average value	January–June 1938 value	January–June 1939 value	Percentage change	
						1938–39 over 1934–35	1939 over 1938					1938–39 over 1934–35	1939 over 1938
Trade-agreement countries—Continued.													
Brazil	Jan. 1, 1936	20.3	32.0	30.7	33.4	+57.9	+8.8	45.9	48.6	47.2	50.0	+5.8	+5.7
Canada	do	154.1	221.5	241.2	201.8	+43.7	−16.4	118.1	132.6	116.5	148.8	+12.3	+27.7
Netherlands (including overseas territories)[1]	Feb. 1, 1936	38.1	81.1	85.2	77.1	+112.7	−9.5	45.5	62.6	58.9	66.3	+37.6	+12.5
Netherlands proper	do	26.4	45.9	50.3	41.5	+74.1	−17.5	16.1	14.1	12.2	16.1	−11.9	+31.8
Netherland Indies	do	4.8	14.8	12.8	16.8	+208.8	+31.7	23.6	37.1	35.4	38.8	+57.4	+9.6
Netherland West Indies	do	6.7	20.0	21.7	18.4	+198.1	−15.2	5.4	9.6	9.6	9.6	+77.8	+0.7
Switzerland[2]	Feb. 15, 1936	4.3	5.5	5.1	5.9	+28.1	+14.4	7.6	11.3	8.9	13.7	+49.2	+54.2
Honduras	Mar. 2, 1936	2.7	2.9	3.1	2.7	+8.3	−11.49	3.9	3.1	2.6	3.6	−20.6	+38.4
Colombia	May 20, 1936	10.3	21.8	19.0	24.5	+110.4	+28.7	26.5	23.8	24.0	23.7	−10.1	−1.0
Guatemala	June 15, 1936	2.1	3.7	3.4	4.0	+79.7	+16.8	3.4	5.8	5.2	6.4	+71.9	+21.9
France (including colonies)[3]	do	61.6	77.9	75.8	79.9	+26.4	+5.4	35.4	38.7	33.3	44.2	+9.2	+32.6
France proper	do	56.0	69.1	67.9	70.3	+23.3	+3.5	30.5	28.5	24.0	33.1	−6.7	+38.1
Nicaragua	Oct. 1, 1936	1.2	1.6	1.2	2.0	+32.8	+66.7	1.3	1.9	1.6	2.2	+42.9	+35.4
Finland	Nov. 2, 1936	2.6	6.0	5.6	6.3	+130.8	+10.9	4.8	9.5	8.8	10.2	+96.7	+16.8
El Salvador	May 31, 1937	1.5	1.8	1.7	1.8	+20.7	+5.4	3.0	5.3	4.6	6.1	+75.3	+34.3
Costa Rica	Aug. 2, 1937	1.3	3.2	2.4	3.9	+140.1	+65.3	1.5	2.1	2.3	1.9	+39.8	−16.9
Ecuador	Oct. 23, 1938	(4)	(4)	1.9	2.2	----------	+14.2	(4)	(4)	1.0	1.7	----------	+65.1
United Kingdom proper	Jan. 1, 1939	(4)	(4)	254.4	229.7	----------	−9.7	(4)	(4)	51.4	72.7	----------	+41.4
Newfoundland	do	(4)	(4)	3.6	3.6	----------	+1.7	(4)	(4)	3.1	2.9	----------	−4.1
British colonies	do	(4)	(4)	37.2	34.7	----------	−6.7	(4)	(4)	86.9	92.8	----------	+6.9
Total, nonagreement countries		[5]470.4	[5]647.5	703.9	591.1	+37.7	−16.0	[5]403.6	[5]424.8	404.2	445.4	+5.2	+10.2
Total, all countries		1,030.1	1,503.1	1,590.8	1,415.4	+45.9	−11.0	929.2	1,027.8	961.0	1,094.6	+10.6	+13.9

[1] These figures include Surinam (Dutch Guiana), the trade with which is too small to warrant individual listing.

[2] United States statistics show only a small portion of the actual exports to Switzerland, most of which are transhipped through a third country and are shown as exports to that country. Therefore, too much significance should not be attached to the statistics of exports to Switzerland.

[3] These figures include all French colonies. Only France proper is listed separately.

[4] Countries with which agreements have been concluded but where the period during which the agreement has been in effect is too short to justify inclusion for purposes of comparison.

[5] The apparent discrepancy shown by these figures in comparison with the other totals is due to the noninclusion of trade with Ecuador and the United Kingdom and its Crown colonies.

Source: Latest records of Division of Foreign Trade Statistics, Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce.

GENERAL NOTE.—Percentage changes have been calculated upon fuller figures in thousands.

Neutrality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED C. GARTNER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 2, 1939

RESOLUTION OF CITIZENS OF NORTHEAST PHILADELPHIA

Mr. GARTNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a resolution adopted at a meeting of the citizens of Northeast Philadelphia, as follows:

We, the people of Northeast Philadelphia, assembled for the consideration of the neutrality problem confronting the people of the United States, petition our Representatives to present the following resolution on the floor of the Congress of the United States, now in session.

It is the sincere judgment of the citizens assembled that if the present neutrality law is made less strict by the lifting of the embargo on arms to warring nations, regardless of how they are paid for or how they are transported, it will be detrimental to the welfare of the American people, because:

(1) It is conceded by all that one group of warring nations will benefit more than the other, giving rise to a hatred for the United States by the nations less favored. This hatred will, no doubt, reflect itself in reprisals as the pressure of war becomes greater. These reprisals will undoubtedly lead us into war.

(2) America is a nation the population of which is made up of immigrants and descendants of immigrants of various nations. If our Government takes sides in this world crisis, which the lifting of the embargo is tantamount to, it will destroy the affections of large portions of our people for our Government and our Nation; and instead of being a united people in this crucial period we will experience internal dissension, which will be detrimental to our national welfare for generations to come.

(3) By lifting the embargo on arms and shipping them out of the country it definitely prevents our Nation from attaining that state of preparedness so vital to our own interests and defense at this time. Let us give employment, but let us keep the products of industry for our own welfare.

(4) By keeping nations at war armed tends to prolong the desire for struggle, with consequent greater loss to humanity, and retards the desire for settlement of the disputes of the warring nations at the conference table.

We further petition our Representatives in the Congress of the United States to strongly urge our Government to turn their minds and energies from thoughts of a war to the finish, which merely piles up hatred and vengeance for future wars, to thoughts of peaceful adjustment of world problems, even to the extent of asking for a conference of all nations, and foster the spirit of the brotherhood of man among nations, to the end that humanity might bind up its wounds and look into the future with a real, sincere hope for justice, peace, and contentment.

CITIZENS OF NORTHEAST PHILADELPHIA, ASSEMBLED,
DR. EDWARD M. WALSH, *Chairman*.

Roosevelt vs. Roosevelt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFF CLEVENGER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 2, 1939

EDITORIAL FROM THE CHICAGO DAILY TRIBUNE

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include therein an editorial from the Chicago Daily Tribune of September 29, 1939, entitled "Roosevelt vs. Roosevelt":

ROOSEVELT VS. ROOSEVELT

A few days ago we published an editorial entitled "PITTMAN vs. PITTMAN" in which was quoted Senator PITTMAN'S eloquent

argument of 2 years ago in favor of the arms embargo he now wishes repealed. Mr. PITTMAN said that it was the arms trade which got us into the last war and would get us into the next one if we tolerated it. He warned especially against amending this law after a war has begun. To do that, he said, would infuriate the nation which would be injured by the change and bring about reprisals which would force us into the conflict.

Next in the series was an editorial entitled "Hull vs. PITTMAN."

It quoted Secretary Hull's remarks in opposition to proposals to amend the Neutrality Act. He said that to amend the act in the midst of war would be most unwise and dangerous.

And now we offer "Roosevelt vs. Roosevelt." The quotation which follows is from the President's "I hate war" address, delivered at Chautauqua, N. Y., on August 14, 1936. The arms embargo was then, as it is now, the law of the land and Mr. Roosevelt, far from desiring to have it repealed, spoke approvingly of it. He said:

"It is clear that our present policy and the measures passed by the Congress would, in the event of a war on some other continent, reduce war profits which would otherwise accrue to American citizens. Industrial and agricultural production for a war market may give immense fortunes to a few men; for the Nation as a whole it produces disaster. * * *

"Nevertheless, if war should break out again in another continent, let us not blink the fact that we would find in this country thousands of Americans who, seeking immediate riches—fool's gold—would attempt to break down or evade our neutrality.

"They would tell you—and unfortunately their views would get wide publicity—that if they could produce and ship this, and that, and the other article to belligerent nations, the unemployed of America would all find work. * * *

[This forecast was incorrect at every point. There has been no clamor from business or industry for war profits. But in his message requesting the present special session of Congress to repeal the law in question, Mr. Roosevelt said, on September 21, 1939: "From a purely material point of view, what is the advantage to us in sending all manner of articles across the ocean for final processing there when we could give employment to thousands by doing it here?"]

"It would be hard to resist that clamor [continuing the quotation from Mr. Roosevelt's 1936 speech]; it would be hard for many Americans, I fear, to look beyond—to realize the inevitable penalties, the inevitable day of reckoning that comes from a false prosperity. To resist the clamor of that greed, if war should come, would require the unswerving support of all Americans who love peace.

"If we face the choice of profits or peace, the Nation will answer—must answer—'We choose peace.' It is the duty of all of us to encourage such a body of public opinion in this country that the answer will be clear and for all practical purposes unanimous."

That was in August 1936, just a little more than 3 years ago. Today it is not the munition makers who are clamoring for repeal of the embargo; one after another of the industrial associations has taken a stand against repeal. It is Mr. Roosevelt himself who wants to take the steps which 3 years ago he said would get us into war.

In this connection, perhaps one more quotation from the Chautauqua speech may be pertinent. Mr. Roosevelt said:

"The effective maintenance of American neutrality depends today, as in the past, on the wisdom and determination of whoever at the moment occupy the offices of President and Secretary of State."

This was not the only occasion on which Mr. Roosevelt spoke with enthusiasm of the law forbidding the export of lethal weapons to belligerents. In his message to Congress a few days ago he spoke of "the grave doubts expressed as to its wisdom by * * * officials charged with the conduct of our foreign relations, including myself." But when on February 29, 1936, he signed the joint resolution of Congress continuing the embargo, he said:

"By the resolution approved August 31, 1935, a definite step was taken toward enabling this country to maintain its neutrality and avoid being drawn into wars involving other nations. It provided that in the event of the Executive proclaiming the existence of such a war, thereupon an embargo would attach to the exportation of arms, ammunition, and implements of war destined to any belligerent country. * * * By the resolution I have just signed the operation of the August resolution is extended and strengthened until May 1, 1937."

He went on to record in a tone of great satisfaction that he had issued an embargo proclamation promptly after the outbreak of hostilities in Ethiopia and continued:

"It is true that the high moral duty I have urged on our people of restricting their exports of essential war materials to either belligerent to approximately the normal peacetime basis has not been the subject of legislation. Nevertheless, it is clear to me that greatly to exceed that basis, with the result of earning profits not possible during peace and especially with the result of giving actual assistance to the carrying on of war, would serve to magnify the very evil of war which we seek to prevent. This being my view, I renew the appeal made last October to the American people that they so conduct their trade with belligerent nations that it cannot be said they are seizing new opportunities for profit or that by changing their peacetime trade they give aid to the continuation of war."

These quotations from Mr. Roosevelt's papers are cited not so much to demonstrate his inconsistency and his amazing capacity for believing what at any moment he wants to believe, regardless of the facts, but to raise the question why he now takes precisely the opposite view from that which he held only 3 years ago. The answer is not at all obscure. Mr. Roosevelt as long ago as October 1937, when he made his speech dedicating the outer bridge in Chicago, had made up his mind that if England and France got into war against Germany, they would be fighting our war for us. To one who holds that belief there can be no such thing as neutrality in the sense of detachment from the struggle.

Mr. Roosevelt says today he doesn't want to become an active participant in the war, but if he has his way in the matter of the embargo, it will be infinitely more difficult than it now is to stay out of the war. By the repeal we shall have served notice that we accept the Roosevelt thesis that the allies are dying for us. That is not a comfortable position for a proud nation and it will be particularly uncomfortable if Mr. Roosevelt's expectation that we shall make a great deal of money out of the arms trade is realized.

With his capacity for self-deception, Mr. Roosevelt may actually have persuaded himself that he doesn't want this country to get into the war. But his mind and his principles are singularly fluid, as the record of his previous commendation of the embargo proves. Once the embargo is lifted, a serious obstacle to American entrance into the war will have been removed. If Mr. Roosevelt doesn't recognize that fact, the explanation lies in his amazing capacity for believing at any moment exactly what his emotions and ambitions command him to believe.

Neutrality Then and Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 2, 1939

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, for centuries European nations have engaged in warfare. We here in America love peace.

Almost every American desires to remain neutral in this war. We were drawn into the last World War through our emotions, our sympathies, because some of our leaders sold us the idea that we should "make the world safe for democracy." That war brought us untold suffering, an exorbitant bill which we are still paying; caused us to lend billions to France, Great Britain, and their allies, none of which has repaid except Finland, and the world is no more "safe for democracy" than before.

Because some bankers and munitions makers, among whom were the Du Ponts, President Roosevelt's in-laws, made millions upon millions of dollars selling munitions to Uncle Sam and to the Allies, Congress proposed in 1935 to put an end to war profiteering and to pass neutrality legislation which would keep us out of future wars. That proposal was given long, earnest, and prayerful consideration by Congress. It was finally adopted by an overwhelming vote.

When the civil war in Spain was raging and European nations were in danger of becoming involved Congress passed a special act which prohibited the selling of arms to either faction, and Secretary of State Hull, to aid us in keeping out of war, proposed that we continue the embargo and opposed its repeal.

If the repeal of the arms embargo in 1937 and 1938 would tend to involve us in the Spanish war, what reason is there to believe that the repeal of the present legislation would now keep us out of war?

Senator PITTMAN is now the most vociferous of all Senators in asking that the arms embargo be repealed, but unfortunately for the Senator's record of consistency, he played a leading part in obtaining the passage of the present Neutrality and Arms Embargo Acts. In May of 1937, pointing out that international law was no safeguard for this country, he said:

> We relied upon international law for every assertion of our neutral rights, but this reliance brought us no benefits or protection and was our undoing.

Then, according to the Senator, because we had failed to force Great Britain to respect our undeniable rights on the high seas and because under the international law we had furnished arms, munitions, and other contraband of war to the Allies, we became involved in the World War. The

embargo of exportation of arms to belligerents was adopted, according to Senator PITTMAN, as an effort to keep us out of any foreign war.

To prove that the present Embargo Act was designed to and will aid in keeping us out of war, we do not need to rely upon the statements of Senator PITTMAN, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and Secretary of State Hull to that effect, for we have the words of the "big chief" himself. President Roosevelt had something to say about this law before the third-term bug bit him, and here is what he said on August 14, 1936:

> It is clear that our present policy and the measures passed by the Congress would, in the event of a war on some other continent, reduce war profits which would otherwise accrue to American citizens. Industrial and agricultural production for a war market may give immense fortunes to a few men; for the Nation as a whole it produces disaster.
>
> Nevertheless, if war should break out again in another continent, let us not blink the fact that we would find in this country thousands of Americans who, seeking immediate riches—fool's gold—would attempt to break down or evade our neutrality.
>
> They would tell you—and unfortunately their views would get wide publicity—that if they could produce and ship this and that and the other article to belligerent nations, the unemployed of America would all find work.

It is not the businessmen who are asking for repeal, for their organizations have gone on record as opposed to repeal. It is the President who now asks for the repeal of the law which in 1936 he said closed the doors on war profiteering and was of aid in keeping us out of a foreign war.

Wholeheartedly and enthusiastically I agree with the statement made by the President at that time when he said:

> If we face the choice of profits or peace, the Nation will answer—must answer—"We choose peace." It is the duty of all of us to encourage such a body of public opinion in this country that the answer will be clear and for all practical purposes unanimous.

When on February 29, 1936, the President signed the joint resolution of Congress continuing the embargo he said:

> By the resolution approved August 31, 1935, a definite step was taken toward enabling this country to maintain its neutrality and avoid being drawn into wars involving other nations.

When Senator PITTMAN, Secretary of State Hull, and President Roosevelt made the foregoing statements the world was at peace except for the civil war in Spain. An overwhelming majority of Senators and Congressmen and of our people then believed that we had taken a long step forward toward world peace. The only difference between those days and the present is that now there is a world war, and the President's friends, his personal associates, and those who are dependent upon the continuance of his administration are booming him, without rebuke from him, for a third term as President, and in addition he is asking for the powers of a dictator.

Let us abide now by the statements then made by the President, the Secretary of State, and the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

These are the undisputed facts:

First. A few international bankers and munitions makers, at a cost to this country of billions of dollars, of hundreds of thousands of lives, made a wartime profit out of the sale of munitions. The President now asks that we permit the sale of munitions on a 90-day credit to nations which still owe us more than $5,000,000,000 on our loans to them during the last war. If he sells on a 90-day credit, you and I know that, if at the end of the 90 days the bill is not paid, he will be asking that credit be further extended. If the former Allies cannot get the money to make a payment on the last war debt, where will they find the cash to pay for munitions now?

Second. Congress, at the demand of the people, voted to put an end to war profiteering, to destroy one of the motives which might again involve us in a foreign war.

Third. To keep us out of war, by a vote of more than 4 to 1, and with the approval of Senator PITTMAN, of Secretary of State Hull, of President Roosevelt, after debate, and, it is to be hoped, patriotic and prayerful consideration, Congress passed the Neutrality Act.

Fourth. Now the President wants to repeal the Neutrality Act which he, his Secretary of State, and Congress, the people's representatives, put on the books to keep us out of foreign wars.

Fifth. According to Secretary of State Hull, relying upon international law, we became involved in the World War.

Why return to the procedure which involved us before? Why, for the sake of war profits, repeal this legislation, which we all considered our safeguard?

Let us continue in force the embargo which the President, the Secretary of State, the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and Congress devised and enacted to keep us out of war.

Diplomatic Correspondence Incident to European War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KEY PITTMAN

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 5 (legislative day of Wednesday, October 4), 1939

LETTERS BY THE PRESIDENT AND THE SECRETARY OF STATE

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD copies of diplomatic correspondence with certain foreign governments, containing pleas for peace by the President of the United States and suggestions that belligerent nations refrain from the bombardment from the air of civilian populations or of unfortified cities; also a statement by the Secretary of State regarding neutrality.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
August 24, 1939.

The following is the text of a communication dispatched this evening by the President to the President of the Polish Republic:

"His Excellency IGNACE MOSZICKI,

"President of the Polish Republic, Warsaw, Poland:

"The manifest gravity of the existing crisis imposes an urgent obligation upon all to examine every possible means which might prevent the outbreak of general war.

"With this in mind, I feel justified in suggesting that certain possible avenues of solution be considered.

"The controversy between the Government of Poland and the Government of the German Reich might be made the subject of direct discussion between the two governments.

"Should this prove impossible or not feasible, a second avenue might be that of submission of the issues to arbitration.

"A third method might be conciliation through a disinterested third party, in which case it would seem appropriate that the parties avail themselves of the services of one of the traditionally neutral states, or a disinterested republic of the Western Hemisphere wholly removed from the area and issues of the present crisis. Should you determine to attempt solution by any of these methods, you are assured of the earnest and complete sympathy of the United States and of its people. During the exploration of these avenues, I appeal to you, as I have likewise appealed to the Government of the German Reich, to agree to refrain from any positive act of hostility.

"Both Poland and Germany being sovereign governments, it is understood, of course, that upon resort to any one of the alternatives I suggest, each nation will agree to accord complete respect to the independence and territorial integrity of the other.

"It is, I think, well known to you that speaking on behalf of the United States I have exerted and will continue to exert every influence in behalf of peace. The rank and file of the population of every nation, large and small, want peace. They do not seek military conquest. They recognize that disputes, claims, and counter claims will always arise from time to time between nations, but that all such controversies without exception can be solved by peaceful procedure if the will on both sides exists so to do.

"I have addressed a communication in similar sense to the Chancelor of the German Reich.

"FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT."

AUGUST 24, 1939.

The following is the text of a communication dispatched yesterday by the President and delivered today to the King of Italy by Ambassador Phillips:

"Again a crisis in world affairs makes clear the responsibility of heads of nations for the fate of their own people and indeed of humanity itself. It is because of traditional accord between Italy

and the United States and the ties of consanguinity between millions of our citizens that I feel that I can address Your Majesty in behalf of the maintenance of world peace.

"It is my belief and that of the American people that Your Majesty and Your Majesty's Government can greatly influence the averting of an outbreak of war. Any general war would cause to suffer all nations whether belligerent or neutral, whether victors or vanquished, and would clearly bring devastation to the peoples and perhaps to the governments of some nations most directly concerned.

"The friends of the Italian people and among them the American people could only regard with grief the destruction of great achievements which European nations, and the Italian nation in particular, have attained during the past generation.

"We in America having welded a homogeneous nation out of many nationalities, often find it difficult to visualize the animosities which so often have created crises among nations of Europe which are smaller than ours in population and in territory, but we accept the fact that these nations have an absolute right to maintain their national independence if they so desire. If that be sound doctrine, then it must apply to the weaker nations as well as to the stronger.

"Acceptance of this means peace, because fear of aggression ends. The alternative, which means of necessity efforts by the strong to dominate the weak, will lead not only to war but to long future years of oppression on the part of victors and to rebellion on the part of the vanquished. So history teaches us.

"On April 14 last I suggested in essence an understanding that no armed forces should attack or invade the territory of any other independent nation, and that this being assured, discussions be undertaken to seek progressive relief from the burden of armaments and to open avenues of international trade including sources of raw materials necessary to the peaceful economic life of each nation.

"I said that in these discussions the United States would gladly take part. And such peaceful conversations would make it wholly possible for governments other than the United States to enter into peaceful discussions of political or territorial problems in which they were directly concerned.

"Were it possible for Your Majesty's Government to formulate proposals for a pacific solution of the present crisis along these lines you are assured of the earnest sympathy of the United States.

"The Government of Italy and the United States can today advance those ideals of Christianity which of late seem so often to have been obscured.

"The unheard voices of countless millions of human beings ask that they shall not be vainly sacrificed again."

Arrangements for Ambassador Phillips to deliver the message to the King in person at Turin, Italy, were made by Premier Mussolini and the Italian Foreign Minister Ciano. Ambassador Phillips was authorized to give Premier Mussolini a copy of the communication.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
August 25, 1939.

The following is the text of a communication dispatched this evening by the President to the Chancellor of the German Reich:

AUGUST 25, 1939.

His Excellency ADOLF HITLER,
Chancellor of the German Reich,
Berlin, Germany:

I have this hour received from the President of Poland a reply to the message which I addressed to Your Excellency and to him last night. The text of President Moszicki's reply is as follows:

"I highly appreciate the most important and noble message which Your Excellency was good enough to address to me.

"I would like to emphasize that the Polish Government always considered direct negotiations between governments as the most appropriate method of solving difficulties which may arise between states. We consider this method all the more fitting when adopted between neighboring countries. It was with this principle in view that Poland concluded pacts of nonaggression with Germany and the Union of Soviet Republics.

"We consider likewise the method of conciliation through a third party as disinterested and impartial as Your Excellency to be a just and equitable method in the solution of controversies arising between nations.

"While naturally wishing to avoid even the semblance of availing myself of this occasion to raise the points at issue, I nevertheless consider it my duty to point out that in this crisis it is not Poland who is proffering any claims or demanding concessions from any other nation.

"It is therefore only natural that Poland agrees to refrain from any positive act of hostility, provided the other party also agrees to refrain from any such act, direct or indirect.

"In conclusion may I express my ardent wish that Your Excellency's apepal for peace may contribute toward general appeasement, which the people of the world so sorely need to return once more to the blessed path of progress and civilization."

Your Excellency has repeatedly and publicly stated that the ends and the objectives sought by the German Reich were just and reasonable. In his reply to my message the President of Poland has made it plain that the Polish Government is willing, upon the basis set forth in my messages, to agree to solve the controversy which has arisen between the Republic of Poland and the German Reich by direct negotiation or through the process of conciliation.

Countless human lives can be yet saved and hope may still be restored that the nations of the modern world may even now construct a foundation for a peaceful and a happier relationship if you and the Government of the German Reich will agree to the pacific means of settlement accepted by the Government of Poland.

All the world prays that Germany, too, will accept.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
September 1, 1939.

The President at 4:30 o'clock this morning addressed the following message to the Governments of Great Britain, France, Italy, Germany, and Poland:

"The ruthless bombing from the air of civilians in unfortified centers of population during the course of the hostilities which have raged in various quarters of the earth during the past few years, which has resulted in the maiming and in the death of thousands of defenseless men, women, and children, has sickened the hearts of every civilized man and woman, and has profoundly shocked the conscience of humanity.

"If resort is had to this form of inhuman barbarism during the period of the tragic conflagration with which the world is now confronted, hundreds of thousands of innocent human beings who have no responsibility for, and who are not even remotely participating in, the hostilities which have now broken out, will lose their lives. I am therefore addressing this urgent appeal to every government which may be engaged in hostilities publicly to affirm its determination that its armed forces shall in no event, and under no circumstances, undertake the bombardment from the air of civilian populations or of unfortified cities, upon the understanding that these same rules of warfare will be scrupulously observed by all of their opponents. I request an immediate reply.

"FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT."

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
September 14, 1939.

STATEMENT BY THE SECRETARY OF STATE

The Secretary of State made the following statement at the press conference on September 14 regarding neutrality.

The Government of the United States has not abandoned any of its rights as a neutral under international law. It has, however, for the time being prescribed, by domestic legislation, certain restrictions for its nationals which have the effect of requiring them to refrain from the exercise of privileges which but for such legislation they would have the right to exercise under international law, such as the right to travel on belligerent vessels, to make loans and extend credits to belligerent governments, et cetera. These restrictive measures do not and cannot constitute a modification of the principles of international law but rather they require nationals of the United States to forego, until the Congress shall decide otherwise, the exercise of certain rights under those principles. Furthermore, this Government gives the widest possible notice to American shipping regarding danger areas as the information is acquired by it. This Government also warns American nationals and American shipping against actual danger in any other respect as situations involving such danger are brought to its attention, whether those situations result from lawful or unlawful activities of the belligerents. It endeavors to exercise all due diligence in the protection of American lives and property and of course must expect American nationals likewise to exercise due diligence in keeping clear of danger—actual or potential.

In the letters which I addressed to Senator PITTMAN and Representative BLOOM on May 27, 1939, I stated the situation as follows:

"The rights of our nationals under international law may properly be restricted by our own legislation along certain lines for the purpose of avoiding incidents which might involve us in a conflict. In indicating certain restrictions upon the exercise of our rights as a neutral I do not wish to be considered as advocating the abandonment of these, or indeed of any, neutral rights; but there is reasonable ground for restricting at this time the exercise of these rights."

The principles of international law as regards neutrals and belligerents have been evolved through the centuries. While belligerents have frequently departed from these principles on one pretext or another, and have endeavored to justify their action on various grounds, the principles still subsist.

This Government, adhering as it does to these principles, reserves all rights of the United States and its nationals under international law and will adopt such measures as may seem most practical and prudent when those rights are violated by any of the belligerents.

Pending Neutrality Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SHERIDAN DOWNEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 5 (legislative day of Wednesday, October 4), 1939

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, JR., OF WISCONSIN

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I offer for printing in the RECORD a radio address delivered by the Senator from

Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] last evening in the National Radio Forum, sponsored by the Washington Evening Star, over the National Broadcasting Co. network. The subject of the address is the Pending Neutrality Legislation.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

You know that Congress is now debating a change in our foreign policy. It is making a decision on keeping or repealing the prohibition against the shipment of deadly weapons. This is not an ordinary debate. It is one of those times in life when you make a decision from which you may never again be able to retreat. Even if the decision is wrong, we go on suffering the consequences of one grave mistake.

There are times like that. It was like that when the German people voted for Hitler in 1933. Once they had taken that decision, they were never given a second chance to go back and change their minds. A man tired of life leans out over the roof of a 10-story building. There is a moment, a brief moment, when he can pull himself back. He decides not to. After that it does him no good to change his mind, to decide he wants to live.

You and I are at the edge of that roof now. For the first time we really feel the pushing of people who want us to close our eyes and jump.

The real issue is not being discussed much. The real issue at stake is our own national interest. Is it to start going into the war? Is it to keep out? I am for keeping the country out. I have been for the arms embargo since it was proposed, and I am still for it. The people who applauded it in 1935 and 1937 and are against it now are the ones who have changed their policy. Some of them have changed it from staying out to risking a little plunge into war, partly for the "fool's gold" it will bring, partly because they are willing to take sides. But you cannot take sides and then pull back. That was the lesson of the last war for us.

Let us not delude ourselves. Once we have taken sides through action by our Government in order to make arms available to England and France, the pressure will be terrific to get us into the war.

Before we take such a step, which may ultimately put us in such a situation, let us examine our national interest and determine what course we should follow in order to safeguard it. Our great national interest is to preserve our own democracy and to make it work. I am as much opposed to dictatorship of every kind or description, foreign or domestic, as any living man, and my record will show that I have done my share to preserve civil liberties and maintain democracy. Therefore, I ask the question: Have we any evidence upon which to base the assumption that democracy will be preserved in Europe if England and France win with or without our aid? Our country joined them once before to make the world safe for democracy. You remember the tragic result! Are they prospective allies to whom we can entrust the safekeeping of our national interest and the future of America?

Let us review the record of these partners who will soon be asking us to join them in another waltz of death and destruction. Briefly, then, Great Britain and France used propaganda—much of it false—between 1914 and 1917 to get us into the war on their side; then they pretended to accept our high-sounding war aims, such as the 14 points, making the world safe for democracy, etc. At Versailles they pulled out the secret treaties and in wanton disregard of the 14 points and the armistice they proceeded to grab the spoils. In the years after the war they helped to strangle every effort toward democracy in Germany. They thus became the illegitimate parents of nazi-ism and all the terrible things it has brought with it.

Great Britain backed up Japan when she grabbed the first hunk of China in Manchuria and left us holding the bag when we tried to stop it. Great Britain and France, despite all our efforts to cooperate in checking Mussolini's gobbling up of Ethiopia, finally got together and agreed to let him have it. Then came Munich. Then democratic Czecho-Slovakia, pledged protection by France specifically, was betrayed by them into Hitler's clutches. And now Poland! Is this record from 1914 to 1939 one to inspire confidence and trust? The answer is, No!

Today we know as little of the actual war aims of Great Britain and France as we did before the secret treaties were published in the last war. Once more we hear the glittering, high-sounding generalities about "saving civilization," but we don't know what lies underneath the surface. We don't know what chunks of other nations' territories they may be offering neutral nations to join their side. If they win, will they write a more terrible treaty than they wrote in 1918? Will Europe be torn to shreds, the swag divided again, and this time, if we go into the war, will we have to maintain an army abroad to stand guard over the wreckage? This would mean universal military training and conscription at home and billions of taxes upon the people of this country for countless generations. It is clear that we cannot preserve democracy abroad simply by taking sides in this war.

It is equally clear that we will destroy it at home if we become involved in the war. Remember that we are the only powerful nation left where democracy is still alive and working. War is democracy's greatest enemy. It cannot live under war conditions. If we enter the war, our own democracy would be the first casualty. Then we would inevitably have a dictatorship such as we have never seen before. In the very nature of war psychology labor would be virtually conscripted, collective bargaining abrogated, the farmers would have their prices fixed, business would be regimented if not taken over by the Government, the press and radio would be censored, and men from 21 to 45 drafted to fight overseas.

I fear that after the war is over we would have a difficult if not an impossible task in trying even to restore democracy here at home. The world would then be in a state of chaos and collapse, revolution would inevitably be rampant. In such a situation plausible arguments would be made to continue the dictatorship. Those political parties and persons responsible for our getting into the war would then hesitate to restore full rights to the people, lest in wrath, disillusionment, and suffering the people would punish those they blamed for their dead and their misery.

You know that the slogan makers are busy again. This is to be a war to "save civilization" instead of democracy. The trouble with that cry is that modern war cannot achieve its objective. It cannot do so because it destroys such vast quantities of manpower and wealth. Economic collapse follows in the wake of modern war just as certainly as night follows day. This is one of the tragic lessons we should have learned from the last war. More than $300,000,000,000 of wealth was destroyed in that war. Great Britain, France, and their Allies tried to squeeze the last drop from the fruits of victory. They took millions of square miles of territory, billions of marks in reparations payments or in payments in kind, and yet despite all they exacted at Versailles, economic collapse seized the victor nations and shook them to their very foundations.

One thing we can be sure of in this war is that the advance of science and invention since 1918 will make the destruction much greater than in the last one. I am convinced that a few months after this war is over, no one will be able to tell the victors from the vanquished. Suffering, chaos, and collapse will be abroad in every nation which has taken part in the war. For those reasons I think it is just so much eye-wash to say that unless we get into this war and bring about a victory for Great Britain and France that the Nazis will begin to attack nations in this hemisphere. I do not believe any nation or group of nations can arise from the ashes of war's destruction to challenge the most powerful nation on the face of the globe.

But for the sake of the argument, and in order to try and think the whole thing through, let us suppose that the Nazis win, and that by some miracle they make the fruits of victory compensate for the destruction of manpower and wealth they themselves have suffered, and let us further assume that they then decide to begin military and naval operations across 3,600 miles of ocean in this hemisphere. I say that in such an eventuality then is the time for this Nation to gird its loins for war. A war fought with this hemisphere as a base, where all the advantage of thousands of miles of ocean would be on our side, where we would be operating from a comparatively sound economic and financial base and, equally important, where we would not be dependent upon allies whose past record does not inspire confidence and trust.

Make no mistake about it; we can have an invulnerable hemisphere. No nation or group of nations can successfully attack it if we but provide the necessary Army, Navy, and the bases needed for their efficient operation. This policy requires that we do not permit strategic islands to fall into hostile hands. It means that we interpret the Monroe Doctrine to include the prohibition of penetration by foreign nations through propaganda or otherwise in this hemisphere. The great body of expert opinion on national defense agrees that we can make this hemisphere safe against all comers. The destiny of our Nation should be worked out in this hemisphere and not in Europe or Asia. In the end, our ideals and way of life will be infinitely more secure and it will cost far less than participation in a foreign war.

Our great opportunity for service in the cause of civilization is to stay out of this war and thus preserve in this hemisphere a haven of sanity in a world where madness now prevails. We can then concentrate on our own problems and prove that democracy can work in a modern economic environment. Then when the war is over we will indeed be in a position to give the world succor and leadership. We will have kept the lamp of democracy and tolerance alight. We will have demonstrated the soundness of our way of life and war weary and disillusioned people will see in our example the way to rehabilitate civilization in their own lands.

But if we become involved in war, we will be in no position to help anyone, not even ourselves. For we will suffer the same economic collapse which will be abroad in every nation that engages in this war. We will have snuffed out democracy. Intolerance and hate will be rampant in the country, and a staggering debt will be piled on top of the forty billions now owed by our Government.

But if we want to stay out of war in Europe, and I know most of us do, we must not take steps that will take us into the war. It is one thing for you and me to take sides in our capacity as private citizens; it is a far different thing when our Government takes sides.

In other words, we cannot have our cake and eat it, too. We either make up our minds to stay out of this war in Europe or by a series of steps we will ultimately find ourselves in it.

It is perfectly clear that if we repeal the arms embargo after the war has started, it will be regarded abroad as an efficient act of our Government to take sides in this war. In Great Britain and France, they will hail it as they would a great military victory.

They will say in so many words that we are coming in. In Germany it will be equally clear that we have taken sides against them. Senator VAN NUYS, of Indiana, was frank about it Sunday night over the radio when he said, in effect, that what the advocates of repeal were trying to do was to find a way to wipe Hitler off the face of the earth without our country getting involved in war. But this cannot be done with any certainty. If arms, ammunitions, and implements of war on a limited-credit and carry basis are not enough, then long-term credit will next be provided. The Johnson Act, passed to prevent nations owing us ten billions since the last war from floating any more loans until they pay up, will be repealed and, if this is not enough, the same arguments which are now being made for repeal of the arms embargo will be made for our sending troops abroad.

There has been a lot of confusion created in the public mind over this issue. Speakers over the radio have been leading the people to believe that the Congress and the country must choose between repeal of the arms embargo and cash and carry. This is not the case. Cash and carry is not an alternative to repeal of the arms embargo. If we are determined to keep out of the war, we can have cash and carry for all other commodities and also maintain the arms embargo. But without the arms embargo cash and carry is a very feeble safeguard against our involvement in war. We can, and should, prohibit American citizens from traveling on ships of warring nations. In short, every safeguard against incidents which might be the cause of our being drawn into war in the bill pending before the Congress can and should be passed. And at the same time we can keep the embargo against the sale of arms, ammunition, and implements of war, which is now in full force and effect.

The repeal of the arms embargo will not only be an unneutral act but it will also result in a tremendous expansion of our munitions industry. The present plant capacity of this industry is backlogged with orders from our own national-defense program. If Great Britain and France can buy arms, ammunition, and implements of war here, as the administration advocates, it must be either at the cost of setting aside our own rearmament program or hundreds of millions of dollars must be immediately invested in new plant capacity. This will result in a bulging out of our economy to meet the wartime demand. This will, in turn, provide great inducements for the repeal of the Johnson Act once the purchasers are out of cash. Then loans will be floated, and we will find ourselves right where we were in 1916 and 1917. Let me quote from Ray Stannard Baker, President Wilson's official biographer, who certainly is not biased against him:

"* * * by the end of the year 1914 the traffic in war materials with the Allies had become deeply entrenched in America's economic organization"—

Now, mark these words—

and the possibility of keeping out of the war by the diplomacy of neutrality, no matter how skillfully conducted, had reached the vanishing point. By October, perhaps earlier, our case was lost."

We not only need to keep the arms embargo to prevent our economy from becoming top-heavy but we should amend the cash-and-carry proposals now pending in the Senate to limit the war trade in other commodities, and thus prevent it from sidetracking our own rearmament program. We must not let our natural and exhaustible resources be drained away. Only in this way can we make certain that our Nation will not become economically and financially dependent upon the success of one group of warring nations.

Our patriotic course is clear. We should keep the embargo on arms and enact all the other features of the pending bill designed to reduce incidents likely to lead to war. We should limit the trade in other commodities to a strict cash-and-carry basis, not credit and carry. We must restrict this trade so as to protect our resource base and not permit an uncontrolled wartime commerce to develop which will help to drag us into war in Europe or in the Far East. We should concentrate on making democracy work at home, and thus maintain our civil liberties and preserve our way of life. We have a great opportunity to build up an intercontinental economy in this hemisphere. We can provide an army and navy to defend it for a fraction of the cost of our involvement in war abroad. We do not have to accept as the solution of our problems the employment resulting from trade produced by slaughter and destruction.

We can utilize our idle manpower, productive capacity, and idle capital to restore our natural-resource base, to rehabilitate and conserve our human resources, to develop our Nation and this great and rich hemisphere. Here is a program that will give us a dynamic America, restore that equality of economy opportunity that characterized the development of our own physical frontier. Here is a program which gives this generation a rendezvous with destiny in this hemisphere instead of death in some other.

I put this program up against the program of taking sides, against the program of selling arms, against the program of intervention in a long, weary war which will probably end abroad in revolution and end here in dictatorship.

The decision of Congress depends on which program the people choose.

Pending Neutrality Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVA B. ADAMS

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 5 (legislative day of Wednesday, October 4), 1939

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON, OF COLORADO

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD an address delivered over the radio last evening by my distinguished colleague the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] on the subject of the pending legislation.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I AM A PACIFIST

I am a nationalist, an isolationist, an insulationist, and a pacifist; that is, I am a pacifist until the Monroe Doctrine shall have been violated or our territory actually invaded. You have heard that Senators with that kind of a complex are opposed to lifting the present embargo on arms. In my case that is not true. I want either a complete and absolute embargo or a realistic substitute adopted, like the cash-and-carry plan, which will approach in its effect an absolute embargo, so that all danger of getting into this war will be removed. No half-way measure will afford any protection whatever.

THE DISTORTIONIST

One professional distortionist has said that our present arms embargo has "brought on the current European war," and another has said its repeal is "the road to war." Both statements are perfectly ridiculous and contain not one scintilla of truth.

For many months I have been diligently studying the foreign policies of the United States. Two years ago I helped to enact the existing neutrality law, and I have read and reread the proposed Pittman bill from cover to cover.

In the intensely absorbing debate now occupying Congress the issue is surprisingly simple, even though in its implications and reactions it may be far reaching and involved. This is the meat of the proposition: Shall we sell to belligerents all vital materials, including munitions, for cash to be carried on their own bottoms, as recommended by the President, or place an embargo on finished munitions to the belligerents and handle other vital materials, which have been declared contraband by all warring states, just as though there were no war?

THREE COURSES

To me, at least three distinct courses appear open for America to pursue during this crisis.

We may return to international law and espouse the doctrine of the freedom of the seas and be in a war within 30 days; or

Secondly, place an absolute embargo on arms, munitions, implements of war, and all declared contraband such as wheat, oil, cotton, etc., to belligerents and so-called neutrals alike, and by the imposition of an embargo completely isolate ourselves and thereby remain at peace. That is drastic action, but if we are going to take the embargo cure we better do a complete job of it. No half-way measures such as the present embargo law will suffice. Placing an embargo on three or four finished articles to two or three nations will afford us little or no protection. If embargo be the answer, follow it to its logical conclusion, which is absolute. President Jefferson tried the embargo plan in 1807 and it ended in tragic failure. In the World War munitions only amounted to 13 percent

of our war exports, while raw materials and other goods totaled 87 percent. England and Germany do not distinguish between guns and raw materials, and therefore our munition embargo advocates are in error when they do so.

The third course which we may adopt is the so-called cash-and-carry or come-and-get-it policy—the Pittman bill. It will work.

SELF PRESERVATION

Nations at war have murderous designs upon each other and restraint on the part of any of them is only relative at best. War is positive evidence that selfishness is on a murderous rampage. Belligerents, by the very nature of war, are wholly selfish, and neutrals must be selfish at least to the point of self-preservation.

I have a right to walk down the street through a murderous riot, but common sense tells me to substitute discretion for valor and keep out of trouble. There is nothing particularly noble in keeping out of trouble by surrendering one's rights unless self-preservation be noble and fighting be ignoble.

While domestic considerations must control the passage of our neutrality policies, yet impartiality and fairness should govern their application to international affairs so that there shall be at least no discrimination. Neither the present Neutrality Act, the proposed revision, nor any other so-called neutrality act which we might enact can possibly be uniform in its effect upon every foreign state. We cannot help that. Any far-reaching act by us will throw the commercial world out of adjustment to some extent. The very best that we can do is to apply our laws uniformly to all without a hint of favoritism or variation, and if we do that no one should complain.

CONTRABAND LISTS ISSUED

England and Germany have each issued their contraband list for the European war. Today England would seize and confiscate and Germany would sink any United States ship loaded with oil, wheat, cotton, or munitions destined to their respective enemies. Neither England nor Germany draws a distinction between oil and munitions. Either may be used in the war machine, and yet our existing law places an embargo on munitions and places no restraints whatsoever upon the shipment of oil, wheat, and cotton. American merchants have the right now to sell such designated contraband to belligerents, and American ships have the right to haul it under what might correctly be termed the "credit and delivery" system now in vogue. I most sincerely hope that we are able to change the existing law before some American vessel is sunk, thereby developing an incident which will incite our citizens to war.

Congress does not represent Russia or Germany or France or England. Congress represents 130,000,000 American men, women, and children and has the duty of legislating in behalf of their security, welfare, and happiness. Her acts need not be ratified in Europe so long as Congress seeks to only place limitations upon the conduct of her own citizens.

Since England and Germany make no distinction between wheat and machine guns insofar as their respective blockades are concerned, why should Congress place an embargo on the one and permit the other on the high seas in American bottoms, where it will likely force our Nation into a grave situation?

IT'S OUR MOVE

It is neither illegal, under our laws, contrary to international law, nor is it unethical to change the laws of the United States which have not been ratified by other nations in treaties. After this war broke out, England and Germany each seeking to blockade the other, named a list of articles which they decreed should be contraband. Who is there to argue that after such a pronouncement by a belligerent, a neutral may not adjust itself to that warring nation's arbitrary declaration in designating contrabands? To contend otherwise is to hold that only belligerents have rights. If England and Germany notify us that they will seize or sink American vessels carrying shipments of wheat or cotton or oil, why should not our Congress prohibit such shipments by law before they are seized or sunk?

STOP-WATCH DEAD LINES

When Canada declared war on Germany a few days ago we immediately proclaimed that fact, and the sale of arms and munitions to that country was automatically prohibited. An hour was set as the deadline for this event. Millions of dollars worth of bombers were rushed from the United States to Canada to beat that deadline. The delivered bombers were to be used for destructive purposes, and we knew that when they were delivered. Looking at it strictly from a moral standpoint, did the hands of the clock make a righteous act wicked? If an embargo on arms is justified on moral grounds today, it was justified last month. Immoral acts are not subject to hairsplitting legalisms and stop-watch deadlines.

I do not believe that any studious American can read carefully the existing Neutrality Act and not fully realize that its revision is pressing and necessary. Today under it we can sell and deliver to our hearts' content arms and munitions to Russia, Italy, China, and Japan. Arms and munitions are made to kill people and destroy property, and they have no other use. If we are placing our embargo on such articles for moral reasons, why sell them to anyone at any time? Why not place an embargo on these death-dealing instruments under all and every circumstance? Our policy under existing law is like prohibiting the sale of opium to known addicts only and permitting its sale to everyone else.

THE PITTMAN BILL

This is the provision to be found in the Pittman bill which has won for it my enthusiastic approval: When a state of war exists, "it shall thereafter be unlawful for any American vessel to carry any passengers or any article or material to any state" at war. Existing law does not deny the right of any American vessel to load up with a cargo of declared contraband, other than finished arms and munitions, and to head straight to Liverpool or Hamburg. That law must be changed, and at once.

The Pittman bill prevents our vessels from carrying on any trade or commerce with a belligerent. It denies any citizen of the United States the right to travel on any vessel of a belligerent. It prohibits American vessels engaged in foreign commerce to be armed. It stops the solicitation and the collection of funds by or on behalf of warring powers. It restricts the use of our ports by submarines, warships, and armed merchantmen of belligerents. It greatly strengthens the control over arms, ammunition, and implements of war. It provides for granting safe passage in American vessels of the American Red Cross and medical personnel, medical supplies, food, and clothing for the relief of human suffering. In short, it is a complete program for the safe conduct of American citizens when war rages, and it attempts in a sensible, realistic way to avoid every violent incident before it occurs. Why such an extreme departure from international law in the interest of safety does not have the instant approval of every isolationist, insulationist, and pacifist in the land is beyond my comprehension. The pending resolution is the closest thing to a complete and effective embargo which it is possible for the Congress to enact. No state is going to declare war on us for carrying out honestly and earnestly such a pacifist policy.

WORLD WAR LESSONS

America should have learned many lessons in our last experience with a World War, the most important one being how to keep out. We got in trying to uphold the doctrine of the freedom of the seas. Under the Pittman bill, we will properly abandon that doctrine made obsolete by the joint blockading tactics of England and Germany, and we will prohibit American vessels from engaging in every character of trade with belligerents. By such self-imposed, drastic restraints upon our own citizens, and by that means only, may we hope to avoid conflict with the English man-of-war and the German submarine. Such complete surrender of rights by the world's foremost naval power is a signal victory for modern-day ruthless submarine despotism and English blockade tactics. What further compliance can either of these belligerent powers ask?

I desire to make it plain tonight, with God as my witness, that I would rather face an enemy firing squad than vote for a "measure short of war" or one which would be a single "step toward war." With that fixed conviction in my heart, I have examined every line of the existing law and every word in the pending Pittman bill and have applied to every provision in both this test, and this test only, "Is it a step toward war? Is it a measure short of war?" Applying that test without prejudice I have discovered that the present Neutrality Act is woefully weak and dangerously incomplete, and I have found the Pitman bill sensible, comprehensive, and complete except in two particulars, which I shall now point out.

BEWARE OF CREDIT

The Pittman neutrality bill as introduced should be amended so that it will be a genuine cash-and-carry bill and not a credit-and-carry. To extend credits of any kind in any amount for any length of time, even for 90 days, is inexcusably unneutral. For the United States to extend credit to a belligerent is tantamount to financing his war, and if we finance his war our boys will follow our dollars into his fight as surely as the sun rests. This dangerous provision in the bill will doubtless be corrected on the Senate floor. Neither do I believe that the President, Congress, nor anyone else should define combat areas. We have gone so far in abandoning all claims to the freedom of the seas in the pending bill that we should not lose the effect of that courageous surrender by setting up areas now to embarrass and endanger us. With these two exceptions the Pittman bill goes a long way toward insuring American peace in a war-mad world where great powers are fighting with their backs to the wall for their very lives.

THE CORRECT SOLUTION

The President recently stated with great truth that the people of the United States are the best informed people on earth. He could well have added that once they grasp the facts they are quick to reason out the correct solution. Every Senator has received thousands of letters, mostly from parents pleading that we "keep out of war." My letter writers differ widely on how this shall be accomplished, but they are united in the great objective of staying out of war. Even our businessmen, who are supposed to reap vast profits, and our farmers, who are expected to receive high prices in a war boom, know now that war business is bad business. Many of my correspondents say, "Keep us out of war; do not change the neutrality law." They do not mean to be so glaringly inconsistent. They do not realize that the existing law is less than half a law. They have been reading headlines and swallowing slogans without following through. The debate in Congress will bring everything out in the open, and when the American people have all the facts before them their verdict will be sound and sensible. Every phase and every point in this controversy will soon be known. That is well, for in a democracy everyone is charged with the responsibility of helping formulate governmental policies.

THE ROAD TO PEACE

The Pittman bill, if enacted into law, calls for a severe sacrifice on the part of American citizens, and especially the shipping interests; but if we escape this cataclysm of war that sacrifice will be worth a thousand times its cost and will pay rich dividends in values which cannot be measured in gold.

If the American people will accept the great sacrifice called for in the Pittman bill in the right spirit, control their natural hotheadedness, deflate their war enthusiasm, adequately improve their national and hemispheric defense, correct domestic social disorders, curb their prejudices, and act justly toward other states, even though they violently disagree with them, and earnestly seek and humbly follow divine guidance, a long and lasting peace will be their reward.

Pending Neutrality Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. TOBEY

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 5 (legislative day of Wednesday, October 4), 1939

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. CHARLES W. TOBEY, OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD an address which I delivered over the radio last evening, having to do with the pending joint resolution.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Fellow Americans, while I am talking to you at this moment, there are hundreds of American merchant vessels, with American crews, slipping through European waters, carrying goods to one belligerent or the other, goods aimed to help or hurt one side, in this bitter European war.

In my opinion this must be stopped and stopped at once, otherwise we face the same danger that we faced just before we were drawn into the World War. At that time, back in 1917, in the 3 weeks' period just before we entered the war, 6 of our merchant vessels were sunk, with the loss of 63 of our American seamen, and as a consequence we were drawn into the war.

Referring to this, Senator PITTMAN said to you on the radio the other night, and I quote: "The patience of the American people was worn out, the patience of the President and of Congress ended. The Congress, by an overwhelming vote, declared war with Germany." Hon. Alfred E. Smith on the radio Sunday said, and I quote him, "I believe that we should prevent the transportation in American ships, of any goods to warring nations. It is undoubtedly the absence of such a law in 1917 that brought us into the World War. There is only one way to avoid a repetition of this experience, and that is by keeping American ships, and American passengers, out of trade with belligerents."

The President, in his message to Congress on the opening day, said, "This Government must lose no time or effort to keep the Nation from being drawn into the war." Well said, Mr. President! But, fellow countrymen, nothing is being done to put an immediate end to American vessels slipping through the war waters of Europe.

The arms-embargo-repeal bill, now being debated in the Senate, contains in sections 1, 2, and 3, a definite and worthy prohibition of this practice, and should be enacted into law at once, in my opinion. Every hour that passes between now and enactment of sections 1, 2, and 3, is an hour of danger to everyone of the 130,000,000 men, women, and children of America. The sad feature is, that instead of enacting sections 1, 2, and 3 into law at once, and then taking up the arms-embargo-repeal section of the bill, the Senate has insisted upon holding up passage of these safeguarding sections until it completes debate on the arms-embargo-repeal section of the bill, which, everyone says, will run for several weeks and, perhaps, for months.

I say put first things first; the people of this country have a right to expect the Senate to put first things first, by taking up sections 1, 2, and 3 immediately, and voting them into law, and then going on with this debate on the embargo-repeal section.

I trust you understand what I mean when I say that time is of the essence, and we cannot afford to "fiddle while Rome burns." We cannot afford to debate embargo repeal for weeks or months and allow our ships to sail in the war zones where, based upon our prewar experience, they are likely to be sunk. This would get us into war quicker than anything else. Whether we enact sections 1, 2, and 3 into law immediately or hold them up until lengthy debate is ended on the arms-embargo-repeal clause may very well mean the difference between our being forced into the war or kept out of it. The choice is yours, for I am glad to say that there is now pending in the Senate a motion, which I offered on the floor this afternoon, that the pending bill be separated into two parts, so that sections 2 and 3, to get our ships out of the war zones, could be enacted into law at once and not be held up by leaving them in the bill containing the much-debated arms-embargo-repeal clause.

The procedure that I am urging will not in any way delay final vote on the embargo on arms provisions. It will merely set up an order of procedure, which will place first things first, which calls for consideration and vote on the emergency provisions before debate and vote on the repeal clause.

In view of our present unprotected situation, with our vessels on the high seas carrying cargoes to all belligerents, many now located in the danger zones off the European shores, American property and American lives are at stake.

Should the Senate refuse to adopt my motion, and during the next few weeks of debate on the arms-embargo-repeal clause should there be a repetition of our experiences in the war zones of 1917, I say that those who refused to put first things first will have a serious and tremendous responsibility. It will then be too late; lives and property will have been destroyed, public opinion will have become inflamed, and we may find ourselves on the brink of entrance into another European war, the last of which cost the United States approximately $47,000,000,000 and produced thousands of deaths and maimed bodies. We will be embarking upon a world war, the last of which found, as stated by Capt. Eddie Rickenbacker, 74,000,000 mobilized, 10,000,000 men killed, 3,000,000 men maimed, 19,000,000 men wounded, 10,000,000 disabled or incapacitated for the balance of their lives, 7,000,000 orphans, and 5,000,000 widows.

Two days ago Dr. Edwin Borchard, professor of international law at Yale University, declared that Great Britain admitted that in the World War her merchant ships sometimes flew the American flag or had the American flag painted on her sides to mislead German submarines, and attempted to justify the practice as a "war ruse." He asserted that the *Lusitania* flew the American flag on the trip preceding the one on which she was sunk.

We do not know whether England is making use of such practice during the present war, but we do know that it is a practice which imperils American vessels in the war zones, and jeopardizes our determination to stay out of the present war.

Fellow citizens, this is our opportunity to prevent a recurrence of our experience of 1917. Whether we shall hold up passage of these safeguard provisions throughout the controversial debate on the arms-embargo-repeal clause, or whether we shall adopt a motion to make these safeguards into law at once, and then proceed with debate on the arms-embargo-repeal clause, is up to the Senate and up to you, for you can write or wire to your Senator and to me, and help to get action now, to enact sections 1, 2, and 3 immediately. Ask your Senators to support the Tobey motion. The vote on the Tobey motion is expected to be taken this Saturday.

I made the motion in the Senate today in all sincerity, motivated by one desire and one desire only: To protect my country immediately against occurrences that might again draw us into the European conflict, as they did 22 years ago.

A Washington newspaper has recently quoted one of the Senate leaders as saying that he did not "fall" for the suggestion that these emergency provisions be disposed of immediately, leaving action on the embargo repeal to be taken up immediately thereafter. "It would have been a smart move if anybody had 'fallen' for it," the leader is quoted as having said.

Has the time come in this country when a Member of the Senate cannot honestly make an effort to do something in that body which he feels is constructive, and which he honestly feels is urgent, in order to preserve the lives and property of millions of citizens, without having his motives smirched by such innuendoes?

Nothing in my action is designed to be deceptive or to be a "smart move." There is not a bit of partisanship in it. I am not asking any Member to "fall" for anything.

On the contrary, I am frankly asking every Senator to stand with me for a principle, and support this move to protect our country from circumstances likely to draw us into the war.

Let me repeat: Sections 2 and 3 of the Senate neutrality bill set up safeguards which will take our American merchant ships out of the war zones and put an end to the dangers of our being drawn into the war as we were in 1917, due to their being torpedoed.

It has been acknowledged by both the proponents and opponents of repeal of the arms embargo that the preponderance of debate will be with reference to section 18 of the bill, namely repeal of the arms embargo. In other words, the time consumed by the Congress in debating the controversial issue of repeal of the arms embargo would hold up enactment of sections 2 and 3 of the joint resolution, so that, during the many weeks before final enactment of the joint resolution, American vessels will be allowed to continue to carry materials to all belligerents—this without transfer of title—and American vessels will continue to be allowed to travel through combat areas.

Based upon our experience preceding our entrance into the last European conflict, this makes extremely likely the sinking of American vessels in combat areas carrying goods bound for a belligerent state, with resultant loss of American goods, ships, and seamen.

During every hour that passes between now and the date of final enactment of the measure, we are placing American lives and property in jeopardy, and upon occurrence and reoccurrence of such tragedies public opinion, molded through the press, radio, and motion pictures, and through passionate debates from the platform and floors of Congress, will follow the course that it followed preceding our entrance into the last World War.

The Tobey motion, now the unfinished business in the Senate, makes a separate bill of sections 1, 2, and 3, and seeks immediate enactment of these safeguard provisions.

If our ships are sunk, propaganda will play its part to get us in the war.

Let me illustrate by one of our outstanding experiences preceding our entrance into the last war.

Upon the sinking of the *Lusitania* it was stated that this vessel was carrying a substantial cargo of munitions to a belligerent, and that it thus was subject to sinking by the enemy. The London Daily Express, in an issue published 4 days after the torpedoing, said, "It is untrue that the *Lusitania* was carrying ammunition on its final voyage."

One American refused to believe the Express, however. This is described in an article published in the Sunday Oregonian on September 17 of this year, which was as follows:

"Senator Robert M. La Follette, of Wisconsin, father of the present Senator LA FOLLETTE, said the *Lusitania* had been carrying munitions for the allied armies. Immediately terrific outcry went up against him. He was accused of being a traitor and an agent of the Kaiser. A threat was made to expel him from the Senate. He stood his ground and asked the Treasury Department for the *Lusitania's* bill of lading. He was told it had been turned over to the State Department.

"He demanded that the State Department show him the bill of lading. He wanted to show the country the *Lusitania* was not the peaceful merchant vessel the people thought it had been. The State Department refused his demand on the basis that the bill of lading was to be retained for diplomatic correspondence. Walter Hines Page, American Ambassador in London, urged the President to put the United States in the war at once.

In his book, Road to War, Walter Millis, of the New York Herald Tribune, has said the sinking of the *Lusitania* was the first big stride in this country's involvement in the conflict. Not until after the war was the nature of the ship's cargo disclosed. The collector of customs at New York, revealed that the *Lusitania* carried large quantities of ammunition consigned to the British Government, including 4,200 cases of Springfield cartridges; Winston Churchill himself, English Cabinet member, subsequently admitted this.

If my motion is denied and similar events take place, the people will look back to this day in the Senate and know that the opportunity was turned down by this body.

As we contemplate the action which I propose, let us remember the fruits of war.

While 20 years have elapsed, yet the evidence of the human, material, and financial wreckage of that war is all around us. If we would stir up our minds by way of remembrance, go to the neuropsychiatric hospitals, as I have, which are scattered all over this country, full of shell-shocked and mentally incapacitated cases, to the cripples of America, to the saddened homes, to the crosses in the cemeteries. Observe the national debt, the decline in public morals, the body blows at democracy. All these and many others are the fruits of the last war.

Then fellow citizens, recall the immortal words of Kipling and say in your hearts with me—

"Lord God of hosts, be with us yet,
Lest we forget—lest we forget!"

Repeal of Embargo Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM STEWART

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 5 (legislative day of Wednesday, October 4), 1939

LETTER BY HON. KENNETH McKELLAR, OF TENNESSEE

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter written by my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR], on the subject of the proposed repeal of the Embargo Act.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEPTEMBER 25, 1939.

MY DEAR FRIEND: Your recent letter about the Embargo Act has been received and carefully noted.

Every sane American wishes to keep out of this European war. The only question is the best way.

The present Embargo Act forbids the sale of manufactured arms, implements, and ammunition to nations at war. This would appear to be fair and neutral, but in reality it is not, because in the present situation the Embargo Act puts us on the side of Germany, as that country buys arms and ammunition not from us but, if at all, from Russia, Italy, the Baltic States, and other nearby countries. On the other hand, the act is very injurious to England and France, because they are geographically more isolated, but have better access to the seas, and naturally buy most of their purchased arms and ammunition from the United States. It is also unfair to Canada, our neighbor, whose welfare and territorial integrity are of concern to us under the Monroe Doctrine. We have been at peace with Canada 100 years, and now cannot sell her an airplane or truck if used for war purposes. Therefore, instead of the present Embargo Act being a neutrality act, it is an act which favors aggressor nations and operates against peaceful nations. If continued, it would likely involve us in conflict. To be truly neutral, our country should treat all nations at war alike.

I am sure you do not wish to favor one country over others. I do not, though the British are my kin and I greatly admire them. But I have not forgotten that neither France, England, nor Germany is paying her war debts to us. All three nations owe us large sums. Our experience in the late war and the failure of these nations to pay their just debts to us constitute our best insurance against war now. This is no time to become a partisan of any foreign nation at war.

I utterly oppose war. Therefore, as the present Embargo Act favors Germany, I approve the repeal of that act (which German propaganda is trying so hard to retain); and I favor the passage of an act providing for real neutrality and the best method of keeping us out of war. The so-called cash-and-carry plan of the President and Secretary Hull, which treats all nations at war alike and permits us to sell to any nation which will pay for our goods and carry them away in its own ships, is, in my judgment, the best plan, and certainly will greatly lessen the chances of our being involved in this war.

You say you want the present Embargo Act retained and nothing else done. Under that law, any nation at war may buy raw materials of war and manufacture them into guns and ammunition, and the materials may be carried to such belligerents in our ships. Should any of our ships bearing such materials be sunk by any one of the nations at war, the sinking of the ship might involve us immediately. Therefore, in dealing with arms, ammunition, or materials of war I do not want them transported in our own ships.

Under the present law our merchant vessels may enter war zones, our merchants and manufacturers may keep title to the war materials until they reach the belligerents, and limited credit may be extended the belligerents by United States merchants. Do you want this state of affairs to exist? I am sure you do not.

The President has recommended, in the interest of American safety and peace, that American ships shall not carry war materials, arms, ammunition, or supplies to nations at war; that American merchant vessels shall be prohibited from entering into war zones; that American citizens shall be prohibited from traveling on belligerent ships or in dangerous areas; that the title to goods bought in this country shall be transferred in this country, so that we may not be involved, and that no war credits shall be extended to belligerents. I am in favor of an act prohibiting or regulating all these things so that our country may not become involved. It is the best way to secure our peace. My one aim in this crisis is to prevent America from becoming involved in this war.

One Tennessean wrote me in part as follows: "I have just returned last week from a trip to Chattanooga, Nashville, and Paris, Tenn., and without exception everyone I talked to expressed himself as I have to you." (That is, in opposition to the repeal of the Embargo Act.) This statement naturally astonishes me because I do not think it remotely reflects public sentiment in the State.

Within the past 10 days I have been to the county seats of 29 counties in Tennessee and to at least 6 other towns, seeing hundreds of leading citizens in every county I visited, and in every instance discussing neutrality with them. With a single exception in Murfreesboro, no one expressed himself or herself to me in opposition to the repeal of the Embargo Act, but all favored the President's plan to safeguard and keep our country out of war.

I agree with you that this is no time for party politics, and no party politics is being played here now. Republicans and Democrats alike have joined for the purpose of taking the best steps for keeping us out of this war. I think the President's measure will be passed by a 2-to-1 majority in the Senate. We all want peace. There is no absolute guaranty of peace, of course, but we want to take the most effective steps possible to secure it.

I have received a few very bitter letters in favor of retaining the embargo, and showing much heat and bias, letters which would not have been written if the writers had been acquainted with the facts as I have just given them to you. I regret to receive such letters, but I forgive the writers because in this case I know they do not know what they do in thus writing.

All of us here are striving, under the leadership of President Roosevelt and of our own Secretary of State, Cordell Hull, to keep us out of this unrighteous, uncalled-for, devilish war, brought about not by the great body of the splendid German people but by a single despot who is temporarily in control of them. I ask you to have confidence in us in this matter. At such times threats and denunciations do no good. It is time for all of us to act together for America, for our boys, and for peace.

I favored the present embargo law when it was enacted. Like most other men in public life, it seemed to me then that it would really result in our country being neutral in case of a foreign war. Now that actual events have demonstrated the contrary, I advocate repeal of the law. The facts stated will show you that I have had an open mind on the subject, and that my votes and actions have been governed by a desire for peace and to have us neutral in fact, and not merely in name.

I want your views and cooperation at all times, but I hope you will not be led to write because of the untrue propaganda which is being sent out by radio and otherwise by all three of the nations at war.

With kind regards, I am,
Sincerely, your friend,

KENNETH MCKELLAR.

Position of Senator Murray on Phases of Neutrality Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. MURRAY
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, October 5 (legislative day of Wednesday, October 4), 1939

LETTER FROM HON. JAMES E. MURRAY, OF MONTANA

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a form letter which I have sent to several of my constituents, expressing my position on some phases of the pending neutrality legislation.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

DEAR SIR: I regret very much that you received a form letter from my office, but I am sure you will understand that it is utterly impossible for me to personally answer the thousands of letters, telegrams, and post cards coming to me at this time.

I appreciate your observations on my stereotyped opposition to "foreign controversies and wars." I must confess that the American people are pretty well fed up on generalities of that kind. It is kin to the expressions, "I hate war," "I will not vote to send American boys across, etc.," and "This is a step into war." In the language of Shakespeare, they have become "dull," "stale," and "unprofitable." Yet, if I failed to expressly state in some form my opposition to such foreign involvement, I would be suspected by some oversuspicious constituent of concealing my intentions. I assure you that I am absolutely opposed to involving this country in foreign controversies or war, and I hope you will accept my word for it.

You are anxious to have a less ambiguous expression of my position and you suggest that in my statement, which you have already received, I have retained "a great many loopholes of interpretation" through which I may be able to escape in a possible nefarious design to involve the United States in a bloody foreign war. I assure you I had no such intention in mind when I formulated that letter. I want to be frank about everything I have to say in connection with this serious and perplexing problem confronting our country. I regret that you appear to hold some suspicion, and yet I don't wish to criticize you because I believe you are sincere in your anxiety to learn my true position. I hope you will feel that I am just as honest, sincere, and patriotic as you are, and that I am anxious to safeguard my country from this war just as much as you. I have nothing to conceal and want to make myself as clear as the English language will permit.

I will try to answer fully the questions which you have propounded. First you ask, "Can the United States afford to have its hands bloody with the blood of European men, women, and children killed with munitions, scrap iron, and steel bought in this country?" I am surprised, and would be offended did I not believe in your sincerity, to be asked such a question, the answer to which is so perfectly obvious. Certainly the United States cannot afford to have its hands bloody with such traffic, but you are entirely mistaken when you say that the President's cash-and-carry policy makes this possible. As a matter of fact, it is the present "embargo act" which you appear to support that makes this possible and permits the hands of the United States to become so bloodied. Under the Embargo Act we are now engaged in sending steel, scrap iron, and munitions to Europe, and will continue to send them to Europe as long as the Embargo Act remains in operation. The Embargo Act does not prevent the shipment of steel and scrap iron direct to Germany or to France and England. It only prevents the shipment of manufactured munitions, made out of steel and scrap iron, direct to Germany or to France and England. But it permits the shipment of munitions made out of scrap iron and steel direct to Italy and to Russia—allegedly neutral nations but in fact allies of Hitler—and obviously such munitions can be transshipped from Italy and Russia or from any of the other neutral nations into Germany. You will see, therefore, that it is not the cash-and-carry act that produces this situation, but is in fact the Embargo Act, which, you may innocently be led to believe, is perfect.

The United States is engaged at this very moment in sending steel, copper, and scrap iron to all of the belligerent countries now engaged in war and murdering women and children with bombs and munitions. If I could stop this with my vote, you may be sure that I would do so. I would vote to embargo the steel, copper, scrap iron, cotton, zinc, and every other metal and material which goes into munitions immediately. But, my dear sir, there isn't a chance in the world to take such action. All the hypocrites and fakers in the United States who are now attacking the cash-and-carry plan will be against a general embargo of these materials I have mentioned. Senators from the wheat-growing States who are vigorously attacking the President's proposals and insisting on the embargo of munitions insist on the right to sell and make all the blood money possible out of the shipment of western wheat to the belligerents to feed and sustain their soldiers in the field while engaged in killing men, women, and children.

The Senators from the South will all insist on shipping all the cotton and other commodities the South produces and sells to Europe for use in prosecuting the war so that the South may profit from such traffic. All the Senators from the oil States will insist on furnishing all the oil and gasoline that the murderous armies of Europe need for the purpose of propelling the airplanes that drop the bombs on defenseless towns and villages, murdering innocent women and children. The same is true with reference to every other commodity produced in the United States going into munitions.

Senators from States which may be affected will oppose the embargo being extended to copper, cotton, wheat, meat, steel, scrap iron, and everything else that Hitler needs and which he will get through Italy and Russia; and which France and England need and may be able to get by direct shipment. Some critics of the President's proposals know, of course, that no general embargo will ever be voted, so they are contented to wrap the American flag around themselves and befuddle the minds of innocent people by pretending that if we embargo munitions alone and stick our heads in the sand, our hands will be clean and unsoiled by the blood of women and children in Europe.

No more false and hypocritical argument can be made than that. Under the Embargo Act we are absolutely allowed to ship direct to Germany or to her adversaries, as well as to all the neutral nations in Europe, all the steel, copper, scrap iron, cotton, and other materials they require for the fabrication of munitions to bomb the towns and villages of Europe. Germany, of course, does not need manufactured munitions because she has the most gigantic munitions factories in the world and has also come into possession of the great Skoda factories in Czechoslovakia and the munitions plants in Poland. She needs no manufactured munitions, and she can get all the materials she requires with which to fabricate munitions through Russia and Italy (her allies), and other neutral nations on the Continent. Germany's adversaries are the only ones in need of finished munitions. We cannot ship munitions to Canada; but we can, under the Embargo Act, ship munitions to Italy or to Russia which may be transshipped to Germany. Therefore, under the Embargo Act, Germany can get munitions from the United States if she needs them.

What we are seeking to do under the Embargo Act is to take away from France and England their traditional right and privilege under international law to buy munitions in the only neutral country capable of supplying them. In other words, we are depriving Great Britain and France of their natural geographical advantages as sea powers in possession of transportation facilities, and giving Hitler, who needs no munitions, a powerful advantage which he would not have under international law.

I would be in favor of undoing this favoritism and denying all belligerents everything that goes to make war, and then our hands would be perfectly clean. Of course, that would result in a serious industrial upheaval in this country, just as it did in 1807 during the Napoleonic wars when Jefferson put such a plan in operation.

I think I have made myself as clear as can be expected. I would like to ask you, as one of my constituents: Do you approve of the kind of neutrality that the present embargo gives us? I realize that it is possible I may be mistaken in my views. I welcome advice from my constituents, but I sincerely hope that they may not unconsciously become purveyors of false propaganda set in motion by foreign influences in this country.

Next you ask if I "think the present war is being fought over ideologies represented by the phrase 'Democracy versus Dictatorships' or is it being fought by large powers each jealous for its economic power and political domination of the European scene?" I am surprised that you would ask such a question of anyone having a semblance of knowledge of Europe. No one but a moron would conceive that the present war is a war over ideologies such as you describe. It is obviously the result of the economic national and racial injustices and conflicts growing out of the Versailles Treaty. It is the result of a failure of European statesmanship, and I don't intend to attempt to figure out just where the burden of the blame lies among the various European nations involved in European power politics; but that it is not a struggle between the democracies and dictatorships is so obvious that no amount of window dressing could deceive a high-school student. If you believe that Senators here are so naive as to imagine that this is a war of ideologies, you have indeed a poor conception of the situation.

In conclusion you ask, "Just what do you mean by a 'system of real neutrality?' Candidly, with all due respect, I hesitate to

discuss this matter with you because I am afraid that you may misunderstand me and suspect my motives and intentions. I do not want to quarrel or argue with you. Personally, I have a clear conscience and am not trying to hold a brief for either of the belligerents. It is very difficult to discuss the meaning of "neutrality" in a letter. Briefly, the principles of neutrality have grown up over the centuries under international law. These principles and rules are based on the wisdom and experience of mankind for centuries, and have become the accepted basis of neutral conduct in the world. In modern times, of course, powerful warlike nations have ignored and defied international law. They have sunk neutral ships and forced neutral nations into war, and, as a result, we have this struggle today in neutral countries to work out plans and policies designed to prevent involvement in war. Under international law, neutral nations have always been permitted to deal with the belligerent countries and sell them both materials of war and manufactured munitions. Major wars dislocate and upset the industrial and internal affairs of neutral nations. Normal trade is interrupted, and in some degree they are forced to go into war trade in order to prevent complete industrial collapse and unemployment. All nations, under international law, heretofore recognized this situation and permitted neutrals to carry on war trade. Many nations relied upon this policy; they had access to munitions and materials of war and neglected to build up huge military armaments, as I will explain later.

Neutrality does not mean that a neutral nation must balance the scales exactly in dealing with belligerents in order to see that one side has no advantage over the other. A neutral nation leaves the belligerent nations just as it finds them and offers to deal with both on an equal basis. If one belligerent is in a position, because of its control of the seas, to have access to some neutral nations where materials and munitions can be purchased; and the other nation, because of geographical difficulties, is unable to reach them, that is not the fault of the neutral nation. It is the result of the geographical position of that particular belligerent, and that is exactly the situation in this war. Germany has access to the materials and munitions of Italy, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Russia, and other neutral nations in the Baltic and in the Balkans that the Allies are shut off from. Germany can buy from those countries but France and Great Britain cannot. However, Great Britain has access to the United States and some other countries because of its sea power and transportation facilities. If we embargo munitions and materials, we are, therefore, shutting the Allies out and leaving Germany in a position of great advantage; we change international law to the advantage of Germany, and we are unneutral.

The question is, What should our position be? I didn't create the principles of neutrality, so please don't blame me if you find fault with them. If you feel that a neutral nation should refuse to sell war materials or munitions to a belligerent nation, you are perfectly within your right in advocating this view. Some nations, you know, neglect to build up extensive munitions plants for the manufacture of war materials and depend more or less on neutral nations in time of war as a source of supply. The United States has always recognized this situation. The United States bought most of its munitions in Europe during the World War. In case of war again this country would undoubtedly buy many materials and munitions of war from other neutral countries. If France and Britain have failed to take time by the forelock and provide for their military requirements, they, of course, will be offended and will claim that we are violating neutrality by refusing to give them access to war materials and munitions in this country.

The whole problem is a difficult and very delicate one, I realize. If all nations adopted the embargo system and refused to sell munitions or war materials, then all nations would have to become highly militarized and equipped with munitions plants of sufficient magnitude to supply all their wants in time of war. This, of course, would saddle such a back-breaking burden on the people that it would eventually destroy many nations. Only God can tell the true course we should follow in this darkened world. I think the United States might be right if it could embargo everything and set an example to the whole world by having nothing to do with mass murder. But certainly it can't take a position of being half in the war and half out, as it does under the present Embargo Act.

I can't continue this discussion longer, but I hope you will understand me. I do not believe that I am infallible and that I know the exact answer to this dangerous and threatening question of neutrality. As I have told you, I am willing to embargo everything that contributes to the murder of innocent men, women, and children in war, if the Congress of the United States would be willing to take that step. We would be assuming a tremendous responsibility. It might seriously strain our economic system. I feel, however, that I should vote for such a course if a substantial number of Senators consider it feasible and not destructive. I would like to so vote to express my abhorrence of the diabolical conditions in Europe which now threaten civilization. It must be evident, however, that if we can't embargo everything, the only honest, intelligent position we can take will be to sell all belligerents for cash and require them to take title and carry the commodities in their own boats.

I think I have made my position as clear as I can, and have left few, if any, loopholes. If you have any advice to offer me, I assure you that I am willing and anxious to have it; but I hope you will feel that I am sincere and honest in this matter—just as honest and sincere as you are. I will always appreciate advice from my constituency; but, as I have said, I hope and trust that they will not become unconscious purveyors of propaganda. In the midst of all the perplexities and perils that now menace our country, I have only one thought, and that is to protect my own country and to injure or handicap no other nation in the world.

Hoping that you will accept this full explanation in the spirit in which it is given, I beg to remain,

Very truly yours,

JAMES E. MURRAY.

The Young Men and the War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 2, 1939

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I will relate an incident that happened on September 20 last in the city of Indianapolis which, I think, well illustrates the attitude of our young men on the war now raging in Europe. I submit the information which I shall present without any coloring and without bias for the light it throws on what our young men are thinking about the war and the danger of America's involvement.

There is no finer group of young men in this land of ours than those who comprise the Junior Chamber of Commerce. In every city where this organization exists its members are taken from the cream of the young manhood of the community. They are chosen to represent the various businesses and professions, the many and varied activities that make the community life. They are responsible, alert, serious-minded young men who wish to perform their full duty to their fellow men and their Maker. In Indiana our State Junior Chamber of Commerce has a membership of over 2,000 young business and professional men. The Junior Chamber of Commerce of Indianapolis has over 200 members, and it is a very live and forceful factor in our city and State. At the head of the Indianapolis group as its president is Mr. J. Russell Townsend, Jr., a very capable and public-spirited young businessman who enjoys the universal respect and confidence of our people.

I was unexpectedly honored with an invitation to be a guest of the Indianapolis Junior Chamber of Commerce at a regular noon luncheon of the chamber at the Canary Inn on Monument Circle. There was a full attendance and as I surveyed the crowd of fine-looking, serious-minded young men I felt that it was an honor, indeed, to be their Representative in the Congress of the United States.

After the meal the conversation turned toward the war and I could see that was the subject uppermost in their minds. Members of the Junior Chamber of Commerce are all between the ages of 21 and 35 and war will take a terrible toll from them if we become involved. Nevertheless it was made apparent in a thousand ways that these men were thinking primarily not of themselves but of America. Their talks were in the highest patriotic vein. Willingly would they die for their country if it were attacked, or if it were in any real danger, but they did not see why their blood should redden the soil of Europe in the settlement of age-old European boundary disputes that have been going on a thousand years and that will still be going on a thousand years after we are all dead and gone. "We should keep out of Europe and its whole ugly mess," was the dominant thought of that group.

The tide of conversation turned to the legislation now pending in Congress to wipe out the existing neutrality law and to repeal the embargo against the shipment of munitions. What did the young men think of that? They had but one thought which was the view of all present and that was that repeal of the embargo would be a most dangerous step from the standpoint of the peace and security of America and that it probably would be the opening wedge that would get us into the war. There was no difference of

opinion in that group. Without a single dissenting voice resolutions were adopted opposing repeal of the munitions embargo and favoring the retention of the present Neutrality Act. The resolution that was adopted endorsed and reaffirmed a resolution previously adopted by the Indiana Junior Chamber of Commerce at its State meeting at Gary on September 16, which was textually, as follows:

Whereas the experience of this Nation prior to its entrance into the last World War indicates that one of the major forces causing the actual declaration of war on the Central Powers was the huge industrial and agricultural dislocation which threatened its internal economy should the allied powers be unable to continue their purchases of goods; and

Whereas this Nation is only now recovering from the tremendous industrial and agricultural overexpansion resulting from so supplying goods and munitions to the belligerents of the last World War; and

Whereas any great further addition to this Nation's stock of precious metals threatens to disrupt the monetary standards of the world and deprive the present monetary metals of much of the present value; and

Whereas the industrial and agricultural interests of the Nation would best be served by now concentrating their efforts on the supplying of useful goods to other neutral nations: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by a majority of the delegates of the Indiana Junior Chamber of Commerce present at its eighth annual convention, That the present Neutrality Act should be retained, and that this resolution be communicated to the President and the United States Senators and Representatives from Indiana.

Also it was resolved by the Indianapolis Junior Chamber of Commerce that American ships should be prohibited from entering all dangerous waters regardless of the cargo carried and regardless of the destination.

The young men of the Junior Chamber of Commerce of Indiana have no sympathy for Hitler or Hitlerism, dictators or dictatorships, but they believe that if we do what is best for our people, for the present generation, and for all posterity in the long train of ages to come, we will stand squarely and firmly on the ancient doctrine of keeping America out of Europe and Europe out of the Western Hemisphere. They do not see how we can stay out of the war in Europe and go into it, too, as they are fearful we would be doing if we plunge into power politics and become the arsenal and supply house for one set of fighting powers. They do not understand why we should seek to wipe out the sins of Europe with the blood of our American boys. And that, I believe, Mr. Speaker, is what the young men of America are thinking today.

The Challenge of Nihilism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GUY M. GILLETTE

OF IOWA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 5 (legislative day of Wednesday, October 4), 1939

ADDRESS BY DR. MAURICE S. SHEEHY

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address delivered by Dr. Maurice S. Sheehy, of the Catholic University of America. The address affords helpful sidelights on the pending question.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To be neutral on neutrality appears most difficult at the present moment. There are some things toward which a neutral attitude is for me impossible. I am not neutral toward sin; as a clergyman my life is dedicated chiefly to preventing the agony of soul involved when individuals prefer created gods to their Creator. I am not neutral toward disease and, insofar as in me lies, will strive to eradicate it. I am not neutral toward the United States of America, which has given me and all its citizens freedom and the right to pursue life in accord with the will of God. For it, if necessary, I would gladly offer what few remaining years of life may be given me. Nor could my attitude toward the Catholic Church be described as neutral, for from it I have received abundantly of the spiritual treasures within its keeping.

I am neutral toward neither nazi-ism nor communism, both of which have been condemned either explicitly or implicitly by Pope Pius XI, and I detest with all the powers of my soul the triumph of nihilism which has been accomplished by a union of those forces.

Nihilism began as an intellectual movement in Russia in the 1860's. It rejected the obligations of traditional morality and the "tyranny of authority." It appeared to die for a time, and then was dragged forth from its odoriferous grave by the Communists as the precursor of the order in which the individual becomes a slave to the state. Nihilism is a pseudo religion which rejects any sort of doctrine, indulges in complete moral skepticism, and politically is nothing more or less than absolute despotism. To the present triumph of nihilism in the union of nazi-ism and communism, I propose to devote most of the time assigned me on this broadcast.

However, before doing so, I can but deplore the hysteria, the confusion, and the acrimonious disputes which rage over the country today on the highly confused neutrality issue. One of the entertaining legacies of the late Gilbert Chesterton is a book called The Man Who Was Thursday. In this book, which deals with plots and counterplots, with secret messages and messengers bearing the names of the days of the week, a happy culmination is the discovery that all are bent upon the same goal and enrolled in the same army.

Today all Americans are concerned about the same goal—peace and security. May I recall a few messages from the President of the United States bearing upon this point? In his message to Congress last January, President Roosevelt stated:

"An ordering of society which relegates religion, democracy, and good faith among nations to the background can find no place within it for the ideals of the Prince of Peace. The United States rejects such an ordering and retains its ancient faith."

Again, on September 3, President Roosevelt declared:

"It is right that I should recall to your minds the consistent, and at times successful, efforts of your Government in these crises to throw the full weight of the United States in the cause of peace."

At the time the President made this statement, I happened to be in Europe at a vantage point where I could see that both the activities and messages of President Roosevelt contributed notably, if not successfully, to the preservation of the peace of the world.

On September 3 the President stated:

"I hope the United States will keep out of this war. I believe that it will. And I give you assurance that every effort of your Government will be directed toward that end. As long as it remains within my power to prevent, there will be no blackout of peace in the United States."

On September 21 President Roosevelt added:

"These perilous days demand cooperation between us without trace of partisanship. Our acts must be guided by one single, hardheaded thought—keep America out of war."

With these utterances the President of the United States placed himself at the head of our army of peace, and that army is no racket. Working along parallel lines and with indefatigable zeal, Pope Pius XII was spending himself to preserve or restore the peace of Christ for our war-torn world. So marked have been the similarities, both of expression and deed, of the President of the United States and the Holy Father that Observatore Romano, Vatican newspaper, made the following comment:

"It is impossible not to perceive the almost literal identity of the essential points enumerated by the head of state of one of the most powerful and modern nations of the world and the problems enunciated by the superreligious leader with the highest spiritual authority in the world. For the Pontiff, preaching springs from revealed truth; for the statesman, it comes from experience."

Perhaps I should also extend my declaration of unneutrality to two men? I yield to the Holy Father my heartfelt loyalty and devotion, and at the same time I respect as the legally elected head of our State, Franklin D. Roosevelt. The efforts to make the latter a "war monger," to question either his sincerity or integrity in this hour of grave crisis, is a crime that outrages every impulse of decency in the intelligent American. May I recall a last message of the cardinal archbishop of Chicago, "Only in the Vatican is there in Europe the gift of statesman's vision enjoyed by President Roosevelt."

It happens that I know more or less intimately the leaders of both parties who are debating the present neutrality bill. Without exception, each leader is a man of unquestioned integrity. And if a fluoroscope could reveal the inner workings of the hearts of BORAH, or JOHNSON, or PITTMAN, or BYRNES, and their colleagues, there would be revealed both the finest Americanism and the most earnest devotion to peace.

Only yesterday a Senator telephoned me this message, "Tremendous pressure is brought to bear upon me to vote contrary to what I believe are the best interests of the Nation." And I told him, "This country is safe as long as every man votes according to his conscience." Then he asked, "What is the Catholic position on this bill?" To which I answered, "There is no 'Catholic position' on this bill."

Now, may I speak above the coalition of world forces, which I have called Nihilism? My thought is largely due to a most remarkable book, perhaps the most significant in recent months, called the Revolution of Nihilism. The author is Hermann Rauschning, the former leader of the National Socialist Party and ex-president of the Danzig Senate, who, because he was ordered to

arrest Catholic priests and disenfranchise Jews, retired from his post. In his book, written 2 years ago, Dr. Rauschning states:

"A German-Russian alliance means simply the confluence of two streams which run toward the same sea—the sea of world revolution."

Now, one of the best-informed writers of our day is a man named Adolf Hitler, whose best-known work is Mein Kampf. Hitler has written:

"Therefore, the fact of forming an alliance with Russia would be the signal for a new war, and the result of that would be the end of Germany."

In regard to the first statement, Herr Hitler ranks both as prophet and as historian. The second statement implies that in such an alliance Germany would be absorbed by the Soviet. May God prevent such an eventuality for those many noble souls of German birth!

Then Hitler continues:

"Those who are in power in Russia today have no idea of forming an honorable alliance nor of remaining true to it if they did."

These are courageous words, but I suspect that at least 6 months must elapse before they can be fully verified by their author.

Then Hitler continues:

"It must never be forgotten that the present rulers of Russia are blood-stained criminals; that here we have the dregs of humanity, which, favored by the circumstances of a tragic moment, overran a great state, degraded and extirpated millions of educated people out of sheer blood lust, and that now for nearly 10 years they have ruled with such savage tyranny as was never known before."

Alas! how true. And into that power last week Herr Hitler delivered the fate of millions of Poles. Already their churches are being razed and the emblems of religion torn to the ground. Is it any wonder that a few days ago Pope Pius XII wept with the Polish delegation which came to see him as he prayed:

"May Christ, who wept at the death of Lazarus and over the ruins of His fatherland, gather and some day compensate you for the tears you spill over the death of Poland, which will not die."

At this point I should like to quote from the Omaha True Voice, official publication of Bishop James H. Ryan. Last week it stated editorially:

"The Catholic cannot but view the Nazi-Soviet military alliance as the work of Satan himself. The leaders of both these peoples are arch enemies of the Church of God. One of them the late Pope Pius XI publicly called 'an enemy of the Cross of Christ.' * * * We see nothing ahead but disaster and destruction for catholicism as long as the Nazi-Soviet union endures."

But let Herr Hitler continue to describe the new rulers of millions of Polish people:

"It must not be forgotten," he states, "that these rulers belong to a people in whom the most bestial cruelty is allied with a capacity for artful mendacity and believes itself today more than ever before called to impose its sanguinary despotism on the rest of the world."

These words were uttered before Herr Hitler and Stalin began dancing cheek to cheek.

Nor does the idea of world conquest seem to be foreign to the author of Mein Kampf:

"Today we number 80,000,000 Germans in Europe. The correctness of our foreign policy will not be established until, a bare century hence, 250,000,000 Germans are living on this continent, and living, not squeezed together as factory coolies for the rest of the world but as peasants and workers who reciprocally assure each other livelihood by what they produce."

If one wonders where these people will live, probably some information may be secured by inquires made in Austria, Poland, and Czechoslovakia. And the song which Mr. Hitler has taught his youth to sing as they march under his banner contains these lines:

"Heute gehört uns Deutschland,
Morgen die ganze Welt—"

"Today we own Germany, tomorrow all the world."

Is it any wonder that in a recent poll of the Institute of Public Opinion, in answer to the question, "If Germany should defeat England, France, and Poland in the present war, do you think Germany would start a war against the United States sooner or later?" Sixty-three percent answered affirmatively? Now, that, to my mind, is nonsense; it is nonsense due to propaganda, and the propagandist is Adolf Hitler.

Now let me return to another passage from Herr Hitler's pen:

"How can we teach the German worker," writes Hitler, "that bolshevism is an infamous crime against humanity if we ally ourselves with this infernal abortion and recognize its existence as legitimate?"

That, Mr. Hitler, I would like to insert parenthetically, seems to me to be your personal problem.

And then he adds:

"The struggle against Jewish bolshevization of the world demands that we should declare our position toward Soviet Russia. We cannot cast out the devil through Beelzebub."

May I add to this scriptural allusion an old saying, "He must have a long spoon that would eat with the devil."

Now let me return to Dr. Rauschning's Revolution of Nihilism. He writes:

"There will be no ordinary coalition between two powers for normal practical purposes. Germany and Russia, if they come together, will radically transform the world."

Now some of my listeners, no doubt, are asking, "Is it any of our business?" Let Germany and Russia divide Europe and Asia as they desire—if they do not annoy us. Again let me quote Herr Rauschning:

"In the National Socialist view the political situation in America is unstable and can be developed into outright revolution; to do this is both a tactical aim of the national socialism, in order to hold America aloof from Europe, and a political one in order to bring North and South America into the new order. By its ubiquity and its tactics of universal menace, national socialism is preparing to occupy the key position for colonial domination, for domination of the great sea routes, and for the domination of America and the Pacific."

These are strong words, too strong to command my assent. I do not think there is remotely in the mind of Mr. Hitler any thought of disturbing directly the people of the United States. Yet during the month of January, which I spent in South America, I heard broadcast after broadcast from Germany uttering the vilest lies and the most vicious propaganda about our country in order to poison South America against us.

The real peril to the United States is not the domination of nazi-ism in this hemisphere but the domination of the world by communism.

If there should be any doubt about where Communists stand at the present hour, then may I call attention to the words uttered by the leader of the Communist Party, William Z. Foster, before the Dies committee last week. When asked by Chairman Dies, "In the event of war between the United States and Russia, where would your allegiance lie?" Mr. Foster refused to answer. Foster also stated (according to a report in the New York Times) that if the United States entered the war on the English-French side, he would not support the United States. Then he made a very interesting statement which I hope Mr. Hitler will hear sooner or later: "The Soviet Union has stopped Hitler in the East and has smashed the Fascist axis."

Now I hate war, as does every civilized being. At a rather tender age I was privileged to render some meager assistance to soldiers returning to base hospital 28, and the memory of ruined bodies, broken hearts, and disordered minds has never left me. War, means for millions of youth, death. But in our concern for peace at home we are apt to overlook what is going on in Europe, and if the twin forces of disaster which now must salute as their field marshal Stalin converge upon this hemisphere, then there can be no peace.

Our solemn obligation is to devote ourselves not merely to procuring for America peace here and now, but to insure the youth of America against the surging tide of nihilism.

The Share of the Domestic Beef Market Supplied by the American Beef Producer

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WADE H. KITCHENS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 5, 1939

STATEMENT BY THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. KITCHENS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement issued by the Department of Agriculture on the domestic beef market:

The American beef market belongs to the American farmer, and is controlled and dominated by him. Since 1923 annual imports of cattle and beef have averaged only 3 percent of our total domestic production. These imports have varied from year to year in accordance with the level of cattle and beef prices. In 1929, for instance, when prices were high, imports equaled nearly 6 percent of domestic production. During the depression, as prices declined, imports also declined until in 1931 they equaled only 1 percent of domestic production. Later, when prices improved, imports again expanded somewhat. In 1937, when prices were around predepression levels, imports were equal to about 5 percent of the domestic production.

Live cattle from Canada and Mexico, together with canned beef, largely corned beef from South American countries, comprise the bulk of these imports. The imports of canned beef, in terms of carcass beef, exceed those of live cattle.

Imports of live dutiable cattle during the past 3 years have been coming in at about the predepression level. For the 1936–38 period they averaged 439,360 head annually, as compared to 454,670 for the 1927–29 period.

Imports of canned beef in recent years have on the average exceeded somewhat the predepression levels, as the United States has come to depend almost entirely upon South America for its canned beef.

Prior to 1934 this country had practically ceased producing canned beef, as facilities for this type of canning in the packing industry were very limited, and as American packers apparently found that other methods of sale were for the most part more economical. Before the war quantities were canned domestically,

but this beef came largely from low-grade cattle and was inferior in quality to that now imported. As a rule, much of the inferior quality beef previously put up domestically in cans is now sold as sausage ingredients and utilized in the manufacture of sausages. Domestic packers have usually found a better outlet in the fresh-meat trade for the domestically produced beef of the grade from which the imports of canned beef have been produced than has been possible through the domestic canned-meat industry. Consequently, we have come to depend upon South American canned beef.

The share of the domestic beef market supplied by the American farmer, calendar years 1924–28

Year	Imports [1]					Production of beef and veal, dressed-weight basis	Percent imports are of production
	Cattle (dutiable)	Dressed-weight basis					
		Cattle (dutiable)	Canned beef	Other beef	Total cattle and beef		
	Number	*Thousand pounds*	*Thousand pounds*	*Thousand pounds*	*Thousand pounds*	*Thousand pounds*	
1924	141,985	50,440	17,565	18,401	86,406	7,849,000	1.1
1925	172,910	46,678	19,922	16,660	83,260	7,867,000	1.1
1926	211,598	53,033	52,612	23,482	129,127	8,044,000	1.6
1927	436,204	130,033	89,997	50,998	271,028	7,182,000	3.8
1928	517,150	135,215	131,845	57,774	324,834	6,540,000	5.0
1929	410,656	129,213	199,747	50,727	379,687	6,632,000	5.7
1930	226,273	49,697	140,262	19,459	209,418	6,696,000	3.1
1931	85,570	17,797	48,965	3,494	70,256	6,807,000	1.0
1932	95,407	19,200	61,597	1,697	82,494	6,574,000	1.3
1933	63,329	9,829	103,360	970	114,159	7,283,000	1.6
1934	57,679	11,091	116,685	1,149	128,925	[2] 8,072,000	1.6
1935	364,623	105,009	190,657	10,248	305,914	[2] 7,599,000	4.0
1936	399,113	127,075	219,510	6,200	352,785	8,516,000	4.1
1937	494,945	153,600	220,243	6,592	380,435	7,840,000	4.9
1938 [3]	424,022	130,332	196,493	3,239	330,064	7,839,000	4.2

[1] Imports for consumption; includes veal.
[2] Excludes meat from Government slaughter.
[3] Preliminary.

Compiled by Division of Information, Agricultural Adjustment Administration, from published Bureau of Agricultural Economics figures.

Bonneville at Your Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER M. PIERCE

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 2, 1939

ADDRESS BY DR. PAUL J. RAVER, SEPTEMBER 29, 1939

Mr. PIERCE of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, the Bonneville Dam on the Columbia River, 150 miles from the ocean, at the head of the tidewater, is the most important Government project in Oregon. Built primarily for navigation, Bonneville has, as a byproduct, a present development of 86,400 kilowatts. There are now being constructed two units, with 104,000 kilowatts additional capacity. Ultimately there will be developed 518,000 kilowatts when the plant is fully completed.

The question in the minds of our people is, Will this great development result in the increased use of electricity in the Northwest, at low cost to the rural and domestic consumers, or will the overlords of the private utilities steal for their own selfish purposes this great heritage? The Niagara power resources were so stolen, with the aid of corrupt governmental agencies. The people have derived no benefit from the low-cost Niagara energy. However, Niagara has been immensely valuable to the monopolies, who are said to have made a quarter of a billion dollars from the monopolized use of a natural resource belonging to the people.

Many times I have said, "The only way for the people to enjoy low rates on electricity from Bonneville will be through their own distribution systems. Low-cost electricity can never be attained over the wires and through the meters owned and controlled by the Wall Street utilities."

The first Bonneville administrator was Mr. J. D. Ross, who died just as he was getting his plans into operation. For several months there was no administrator, and Engineer Carey was acting in that capacity. Then Mr. Frank Banks, the reclamation engineer in charge at Grand Coulee, was given a temporary appointment. On September 15 Dr. Paul J. Raver was designated Administrator, and is now in charge of this great project under permanent appointment from the Secretary of the Interior. On September 29, 1939, Dr. Raver delivered a speech before the City Club of Portland, Oreg., on the subject, Bonneville at Your Service. This address will be read and studied with much interest by thousands in the Northwest, who have been impatient over the endless delays and uncertainties in governmental action in relation to Bonneville project. It clearly indicates the course which will be followed by the administration in selling and distributing the surplus electric energy developed at Bonneville. Therefore I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD as part of my remarks this address of Dr. Paul J. Raver, administrator of Bonneville power project, as follows:

When Mr. Snow and Mr. Scott invited me to appear before the City Club they asked me to speak freely and fully about Bonneville. They asked me to discuss not merely the immediate question of power distribution, but rather the broad implications of the Federal program for developing the Columbia River. We are all interested in Bonneville power. But we are more interested in what this power can do, how it can help solve the daily problem of earning a livelihood.

It is gratifying to make my initial talk before a civic group which is devoted to the sober consideration of the basic problems of the region. I have looked back through some of the bulletins of the City Club and observed the broad, open-minded approach it has taken to the controversial issues of the past few years. I noticed your members were concerned with the power issue as far back as 1928, when you made a study of the proposed merger of the two Portland electric systems. I was glad to see that you approached the question from the standpoint of economics, from the proposal's dollars and cents significance to the community.

I noticed also that your organization has discussed the question of Bonneville from time to time. I was gratified to find that you viewed Bonneville as a means rather than an end. I was gratified to observe that you saw beyond the initial savings and immediate benefits that low-cost hydroelectric power can bring. Important as these immediate savings are—representing hundreds to thousands of dollars for the merchant and the property owner—of far greater importance are the long-term benefits of integrated development of the Columbia River for the welfare of the entire region.

Let me assure you at the outset that I have no preconceived views about Bonneville. I believe I come here with an open mind, with a willingness to listen rather than dictate, to learn rather than to teach.

I have spent a good part of my life on this problem of power. I have studied its significance in an industrial State like Illinois and in an agricultural State like Tennessee. I have studied it from the standpoint of State regulation, rural electrification, industrial utilization, and from probably every other angle, but always, I believe, from the standpoint of economic distribution in the public interest.

Nowhere, however, have I found a region where power is so all important a factor in the lives of its people. Too many persons, I am afraid, have regarded power—and particularly Bonneville power—as something apart from their daily livelihood, a matter remote from their immediate concern. To most of us it has meant merely the electric bill at the end of the month, and probably the complaint that it is too high. That is a usual complaint, perhaps as prevalent as the discussion of the weather. Maybe we'll be able to do something about it besides talking.

I am glad to find that there are those who see in Bonneville more than an opportunity for cutting a few cents off our light bills. I do not wish to convey the impression that I am disparaging cheap power in the home. (My wife would never let me do that.) Frankly, I see little reason why power that costs $2.60 in Tacoma costs $5 in Portland. I hope that with the aid of Bonneville you and I can help close that gap. But more of that at a later time.

Right now I want to pay tribute to those farsighted individuals and civic groups who regard Bonneville as the key project in the long-time development of a great river system for all its potential values: agencies like the Northwest Regional Council and the various planning commissions and other progressive civic groups. With them I believe that Columbia River power must be used on every economic front—the farm, the home, and the factory. And I hope this program for building power use will be more than a beating of drums. I sincerely trust that the Bonneville project can unite with our State and local institutions—both public and private—to explore the opportunities for the most valuable utilization of our hydropower.

Before going into the broader aspects of Bonneville, let us understand each other clearly about the present situation. I have brought myself and my family to the Northwest to work and to live. My job is to put Bonneville to work, to pay off the entire cost of the power development.

Like the manager of any enterprise, I have rather specific instructions from my board of directors. The Congress of the United

States has directed me to carry out certain policies. With these policies some of you may not agree. But they are the law of the land and their existence must be recognized.

First. The Bonneville act requires the Administrator to encourage the widest use of all energy generated at the dam. To meet that requirement, uniform wholesale rates have been adopted.

Second. Congress has directed that this electricity shall not be monopolized by limited groups. In compliance with this mandate, a region-wide transmission system is being constructed.

Third. The congressional act requires that Bonneville be operated for the benefit of the general public, and particularly rural and domestic customers.

Fourth. The Bonneville law requires that 50 percent of the power be reserved until January 1, 1941, for public and cooperative systems. That is being done.

Fifth. The act specifies that preference in the sale of power shall at all times be given to such nonprofit agencies as public districts, cities, and cooperative systems. That is the law.

Sixth. I am authorized to prepare resale rate schedules, if advisable, to insure low-cost power out at the end of the line. Such retail rates are being studied now.

Seventh. I am required to cancel contracts with private companies on 5 years' notice to meet the demands of public and cooperative systems. I hope we will be able to develop Bonneville so rapidly that no cancelations will be necessary.

Gentlemen, those seven points are the law of the land. Within their framework we must solve the problem of marketing Bonneville power for the widest general welfare.

Like any business investment, power must pay its way. Every cent allocated to power must be returned to the Federal Treasury, together with a reasonable rate of interest. The sale of this power makes possible one of the greatest navigation projects since the construction of the Panama Canal. Similarly, power sales from Grand Coulee will make feasible an unprecedented irrigation project.

These two projects are the beginning, not the end. There is enough power in the Columbia River to pay for more of these great humanitarian developments. Nearly 12,000,000 kilowatts can be harnessed—power worth $200,000,000 a year when sold at the lowest wholesale rate in the Nation. And, gentlemen, those huge blocks of power cannot be sold if we continue to use power on the basis of scarcity rather than plenty. True, our power use in the Northwest is above the national average. But so are our resources, our educational standards, our income.

Unless we are prepared to use power abundantly, we cannot hope for the fuller development of the Columbia River. We cannot hope to see the land and water and mineral resources of the Northwest opened to hundreds of thousands of more citizens who want to come out here. The problem is not to sell Bonneville's half-million kilowatts; it is to market the Columbia River's 12,000,000 kilowatts. Bonneville is only 5 percent of the total job.

I have seen a lot of stories in the paper that Bonneville power has not been sold; that it will not be sold. Much of this publicity emanates from a group of very able propagandists who are paid not to build Oregon or the Northwest but to disparage such projects as Federal development of the Columbia River. I am not afraid that Bonneville power will not be sold.

Like Boulder Dam, like Norris, like Wilson Dam, Bonneville power will be sold. If we have any faith in the future of the Northwest; if we believe it can support hundreds of thousands of additional families; if we believe it has resources that await intelligent development, we need not be alarmed about marketing our power. Surveys indicate that at normal growth we can use all of Bonneville and Grand Coulee in the next 15 years. And every indication points to a growth that is well above normal.

My able predecessor, Mr. Banks, has said that all the available power at Bonneville will be disposed of in 6 months, making due reservation as provided by law. Only 86,000 kilowatts will be available at Bonneville for the next year. Within a few months the first Bonneville transmission line will be completed—reaching here to Portland and southward to Salem and Eugene. Other lines will extend to Grand Coulee, to The Dalles, to Kelso, to Raymond, to Ellensburg, and to adjacent points. And to speed the use of this power, the Federal Power Commission has approved a uniform rate along the entire system. This rate has been hailed as the lowest wholesale schedule in America.

Even now—before a single Bonneville transmission line is completed—large blocks of power are going out over existing lines. On a temporary contract the Northwestern Electric Co. has taken as high as 30,000 kilowatts in a single day. The local utilities have been seeking this power eagerly, literally beating a path to the doorstep of the Bonneville Administration Building.

No; the problem is not selling Bonneville power. It is using it—using it for a profit, for comfort, for the benefit of the entire citizenry of the Northwest. As a Federal project, that is Bonneville's purpose. Under the Federal law, that is my duty.

Here in Portland, I am told, there is a lethargy and a division among many of you. I am told you are still fighting the battles of the Civil War, jousting over issues presumably settled. Over the issue of uniform versus zone rates, widespread transmission versus marketing all energy at the dam site, over public versus private distribution of power. I think most of those questions are moot points; something like the windmills at which Don Quixote tilted so vigorously.

Frankly, I can see no basis for the dispute over industrial versus home use of power. Perhaps before our power lines were designed there was occasion for some difference of opinion. But now the lines are under construction; the policy has been translated into transmission circuits that are rising throughout Oregon and Washington that will serve practically all of the major centers of population.

There is power enough in the Columbia River for both purposes, if we use it wisely. We can make this low-cost energy equally available to home and to industry.

The primary need, however, is new uses in the home, on the farm, in the store, and in the factory, in the school, and down on our streets and highways; uses that will be felt in the economic life of the community. In the T. V. A. area new industries have taken advantage not merely of cheap power but natural resources of the region. I need not point out that such utilization spreads its benefits widest in the community.

Any power program for the Columbia Basin must be based upon the realization of the problems of the region, problems we can't afford to ignore. Through efforts of State and Federal agencies most of us are becoming increasingly aware that we have problems in our own back yard. They are real and vital questions that reach down into the lives of every one of us.

First among them is the problem of our primary industry, lumber. Depletion of timber, increasing operating costs, loss of markets, and a variety of other causes have cut down employment in this basic industry. The effect has been felt throughout the community by the merchants, property owners, and those in the various service industries. If we can use our hydroelectric power to help meet the problems of declining lumber pay rolls, I believe we shall carry out a mandate of Congress to market the power in the interest of the general public. I hope that at Bonneville we can devote much of our attention to this problem. I hope we can work closely with the United States Forest Products Laboratory, to encourage new and economic uses of our timber resources. I hope we can assist in local studies in the various communities. In the near future I hope we shall have more specific proposals to advance. Certainly the matter demands our immediate attention.

The second problem is the great increase of population throughout the Northwest. Coming west with my family 2 weeks ago, we saw car after car of families heading this way. They want another chance—on the farm or in the shops. It is all very well to talk about the vast frontier in the Northwest, but most of us realize that there is comparatively little farm land available for new cultivation. Although we have 13 percent of the Nation's land area, less than one-eighth of our region can be used to grow crops.

At Grand Coulee power will help to pay for irrigation of a million and a quarter acres. With Bonneville power, I hope that we can encourage reclamation and supplemental irrigation by providing a low rate for water pumping. Even in the comparatively wet Willamette Valley summer irrigation can increase crop yields and raise living standards. I do not believe we want to see farmers continue on submarginal land. Some additional land can be made available by clearing and draining. But we must provide steady employment, at fair wage levels, to support these thousands of new families as well as the thousands of our own men who seek work in the Northwest and cannot get it.

Our third major problem is the unbalance of trade. For years the Northwest has been a colonial empire, shipping out its raw materials and buying its manufactured goods. The resulting situation has left us at the mercy of world markets. One of the most fruitful uses of power would be the development of local decentralized industries. Our extended transmission system and uniform rates are a step in that direction. By bringing low-cost power to our communities we can promote the fullest use of the raw materials at hand. Location of industries is an economic question. If the iron ores of Columbia County can be processed profitably with electric power, a line should be built there. If limestone from eastern Oregon can be made the basis for a new industry, the Bonneville administration should help in the development. The Tennessee Valley Authority, for example, has devised new methods for processing phosphate ores. The phosphate beds of the Northwest area are far greater than those of any other region, and there is a desperate need for a vastly expanded fertilizer industry to preserve the soil of the Nation.

Perhaps we can assist other agencies in the establishment of a pilot plant to work out the technique for processing phosphate fertilizer. The same is true of manganese, magnesium, chromium, and other ores which exist in abundance in this area. Recently the Federal Government has given increased attention to the problem of developing these metals, which are so essential to our national economy and national security.

There is a great deal that can be done to assist in an orderly industrial development which will tend to insure the permanent prosperity of the region. It may be that most of our work will be limited to the direct applications of hydroelectric power, but undoubtedly we can assist in studies and surveys of the nature I have outlined.

We have talked a great deal about new industries, but much remains to be done if an integrated program is to correct the unbalance of trade and to furnish steady employment for citizens and a reliable market for farmers and merchants.

Even considering all the forest-products industries in the Northwest, we find that there is a regional deficiency of nearly 25 percent in the value of our manufactures. Expressed in terms of jobs for men who want them, the Northwest has a deficiency of more than 22 percent. Leather and rubber products produced here are practically negligible in quantity. On a per capita basis we produce less than 8 percent of the chemicals that the average State does. With

hydroelectric power becoming an increasingly important factor in modern chemistry, there is no reason why we cannot develop this field intensively in the Northwest.

Similarly, the introduction of basic metal industries would induce various processing industries to locate nearby. I already have been in contact with certain industries which are deeply interested in the advantages of Columbia River hydroelectric power and deep-water navigation. A multitude of manufactured articles can profitably be procured from the natural resources of this region.

There is a growing local market for the products of such industries. There is no reason why we must continue to import practically all types of manufactured goods into this area when we have raw materials to make them, the power to process, and ready hands looking for the jobs.

In placing primary emphasis on power, I do not wish to minimize the importance of the transportation question to those who live and work in the Northwest. A uniform power rate throughout the Northwest will encourage exploitation of the basic resources of every community. But I recognize the fact that power alone is not enough. I wish it were. Of equal importance is the problem of bringing your goods to market, and there are no uniform rates when it comes to shipping.

This freight-rate problem is not a new one to me. I have faced it before; I am willing to face it again. As Bonneville administrator, my concern is not with power alone. We cannot use our power effectively until we solve the allied problem of freight rates. Gentlemen, I stand ready to help you on this problem. I want to work with you and for you. All I ask is that you share the responsibility with me. This invitation is not a general pleasantry, issued on the spur of the moment. It is directed to those sober-minded citizens who want to do something about one of the most serious problems that faces them.

I have said that I am aware of the division and disputes that have existed in a few localities. I regret that I come here to find part of the citizenry divided into two armed camps, neither trusting nor working with the other. Such a situation cannot continue if Bonneville is to mean anything to either group.

As to where I stand, I hope I shall make my position clear. My cards are on the table. You are entitled to a straightforward statement of policy. You are entitled to know what you may expect from me so that you can guide yourselves accordingly.

First of all, let me say, I am not here to prolong any feuds; nor am I here to dictate to any locality. Within the bounds of the Bonneville Act, I shall to the best of my ability assist every group—be it large or small, public or private—to distribute Bonneville power at retail prices that will reflect the lowest wholesale schedule in America.

I am not going to jump in and take business just because it is available. I want to know whether a given contract will promote the growth and stability of Bonneville and the Northwest. I consider it my primary responsibility to see that the terms of these contracts assure the benefits of Bonneville power to all classes of consumers—home, farm, and factory. And by "benefits" I do not mean merely generation savings. A basic readjustment of retail rates is essential if Bonneville power is to have any economic significance at all.

As to the newly formed public groups, they will be given every assistance in getting started. Our engineers, our rate experts, and our accountants will do everything possible to start them off right. Within a very short time I hope to be able to announce standard resale rates for public systems marketing Bonneville power. These rates should represent not merely an appreciable savings to the consumer but an opportunity to use very much more of the Northwest's best buy—hydroelectric power. I also predict that these resale rates, energentically promoted, will stimulate farm and commercial use and provide a real impetus to industrial development. I cannot let this opportunity pass without expressing my admiration and respect for the excellent record made by such public systems as Tacoma and Eugene. Their commercial and residential rates are one-half to one-third of most of the Oregon and Washington systems, and every utility man—be he public or private—will ungrudgingly concede they have done a splendid job.

As to the private utility companies, I have no ax sharpened for any of them. The patrons they serve and the investors they represent are their own judge and jury. By their treatment of their consumers, their stockholders, and their employees they shall determine their own future. If, measured by a fair yardstick of all legitimate costs, they can meet the rates of the public systems, they will survive and continue to serve. If not, they will be their own executioner.

As to resale rates of private companies, that matter is intimately linked with the State regulatory commission. I have been on the regulation end long enough to know all of the delays and difficulties inherent in the system. However, I think we are justified in expecting an early and substantial reduction in rates from companies purchasing Bonneville power.

Whoever distributes Bonneville power, all will agree that the public is entitled to get more for its money. Right now transmission lines, distribution systems, transformers—in fact, practically the entire investment of our utilities—are idle nearly half the time. At little increase in cost these facilities can provide the consumer with several times the current he now uses. It is not too much to ask that this anomaly be corrected.

As to the issue of public versus private distribution of power, that question is in your hands rather than mine. Each community has the right—and the obligation—to choose the method which will insure the lowest electric rates and the best possible service. With the increasing importance of power in community growth—and particularly in industry—no city can afford to be handicapped by electric power rates that are very much higher than its neighbor.

I appreciate the fact that nothing I can say will deter the people of the Northwest from settling this issue in their own way. I trust that the decision of the people will be based on intelligent, factual analysis of the problem rather than on partisanship or propaganda.

In the determination of an issue so vital to the future of our Northwest country, I am hopeful that the leaders of community thought—groups such as the City Club—will take the lead in seeing that the question is settled on its merits. If my staff or myself can assist in the solution of the problem by furnishing engineering, accounting, or legal information, we shall be glad to serve. I hope you will call upon us.

Whatever your decision may be upon this question, I trust that the interests of all concerned—consumer, employee, investor, will be respected. If there is to be a transition from private to public—or public to private—operation in distribution of power, I am confident that a fair price, a price based on legitimate investment, will be paid. I am confident that the ultimate management will retain the technical and skilled employees so essential to reliable and efficient service.

I hope I have conveyed to you my conviction that it is the end, not the means, that is important. An inefficient public system is no better than an inefficient private one. High rates are no more desirable because they come from a public plant instead of a private one.

As far as I am concerned, I shall do everything I can to work with you toward the goal I have outlined. I promise you a strong personnel at Bonneville, the best I possibly can get. And I assure you they will work vigorously, and vigilantly, in the public interest.

I have spoken today in general terms. To do otherwise would be premature and ill-considered. When I have been here longer, I shall be able to speak more specifically. When I have met you individually, and come in closer contact with your problems, I shall be better prepared to discuss them. I hope you will ask me to be with you again so that I may review our progress, consider any of the issues that may arise, and dispose of any fancied differences that may come between us. We do not want to isolate ourselves from the community or its leaders. We want them to feel that they are a part—and a vital part—of the Bonneville project, free to work with us toward a common goal.

I do not wish to let this opportunity pass without paying tribute to the men who have preceded me as administrators of the Bonneville project. The reputation of J. R. Ross extended far beyond the Northwest. His vision and imagination commanded the attention of engineers throughout the Nation. His generosity, his simplicity, and his sincerity, were apparent to all who knew him. It is a privilege to take up the work which he started. I hope the job we do will be worthy of his memory.

I also want to express my thanks and appreciation for the splendid cooperation of Mr. Frank A. Banks. As acting administrator of the Bonneville project he filled a breach that was difficult and trying. He had not only to supervise a major power program here, but go on with construction of the largest project in the world—Grand Coulee Dam. I am indebted to him for making my task here easier and I look forward to working more closely with him in coordinating our program for the greater development of the Columbia.

Franklin D. Roosevelt saw in the development of the Columbia River—I quote his own words—"water power of incalculable value for cheap manufacturing and economy and comfort on the farm and in the household." When I was offered the job of Bonneville administrator a short time ago, President Roosevelt's words came to my mind. I saw the opportunity to extend the advantages of the Columbia River's tremendous power resources to the region. But I saw more than that. I saw a chance to set a new standard for power utilizations—a goal for the entire Nation.

And, finally, I saw a chance to help in the big job of making America's greatest river serve all her people. It is a high privilege which I invite you to share.

Comment on Address by Bishop Sheil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 5 (legislative day of Wednesday, October 4), 1939

ARTICLE FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES OF OCTOBER 5, 1939

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the New York Times of Thursday, October 5, 1939, containing

comment on the radio address made by Bishop Bernard J. Sheil, of Chicago, which address I caused to be placed in the RECORD yesterday.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of October 5, 1939]

VATICAN PAPER STRESSES EMBARGO REPEAL STAND

ROME, October 4.—The Osservatore Romano published today extracts from the speech made by Bishop Bernard J. Sheil, of Chicago, commemorating Cardinal Mundelein's death, and quoted in full the passage in which Bishop Sheil cited the Osservatore's editorial praising President Roosevelt's message to Congress on the neutrality bill.

The mere fact that the Vatican newspaper printed this passage indicated, according to Vatican circles, the favor in which the Holy See views Mr. Roosevelt's neutrality policy. In today's issue the Osservatore also printed a long dispatch from Washington in which Mr. Roosevelt's neutrality thesis is fully explained and in such a manner as to leave no doubt of the keen interest and sympathy it has aroused at the Vatican.

Reduction in Surtax Rates Will Put People to Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 5, 1939

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK, OF MASSACHUSETTS, SEPTEMBER 13, 1939

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address delivered by me over station WBZ, Boston, Mass., and station WBZA, Springfield, Mass., September 13, 1939:

The unfortunate catastrophe that is being carried on in Europe and the undeclared war in China are naturally uppermost in our minds today. Can the United States stay out of war? is the question that is being asked on all sides. In my opinion, our country can and will stay out of the war. I can see the necessity for feelings of caution, but I cannot see the necessity for feelings of alarm. There are certain reasons for such an opinion. We must remember that the American people are more seasoned today than we were 25 years ago. By "seasoned" I particularly mean that we are more immune now from the influences of propaganda than we were then. We are not believing everything we hear today.

We must also remember that our elements of national defense, our Navy, our air forces, and our Army, are formidable today, a different situation than that which existed at the beginning of the World War. These elements are being further increased and strengthened, and additional appropriations will undoubtedly be made, not for conquest but for protection and for peace of our country. Under such circumstances belligerent nations will be more inclined today to respect our neutral position and our rights as a neutral under international law than was done between 1914 and 1917. It would be the constant violations of our rights under international law by some of the nations engaged in war that could not be tolerated any longer with respect for ourselves that would bring about a change of our present status of a neutral nation. I can conceive of no nation now engaged in war that would want to violate our rights, with our present condition of preparedness, and to take any chance of our power and might being thrown into the war against them. To me the fact that we are prepared, thanks to the leadership of President Roosevelt, in the building up of our Navy, Army, and our air forces, is the best assurance that we have of peace, of not being drawn into this unfortunate and destructive conflict.

We must also remember that while there is no question as to where the sympathies of Americans lie, we are as united as we can be in our determination to stay out of this conflict. I can see no justifiable reason at this time for any feelings of alarm on the part of our mothers and fathers, and of our people, that the United States will be drawn into this conflict.

While we are aghast at the terrible slaughter of human beings in other lands, slaughter that has only started, as a nation at peace we must give consideration to the domestic problems that confront us.

We all remember the trying days of 1929 to 1933, when the destructive deflationary influences of the depression brought about foreclosure of homes and farms, bankruptcy of business, closing of thousands of banks with the loss of life's savings to hundreds of thousands of our people, 16,000,000 unemployed, with very little effort being made from the angle of the Federal Government to meet this serious situation.

Since then, under the humane leadership of President Roosevelt, we have seen courageous and constructive efforts made to solve our problems. Naturally, there have been honest misunderstanding and differences of opinion. That is to be expected. That is as it should be in a democracy. The passage of progressive legislation always meet with the honest but misguided opposition. That has been the history of the past as well as the present. It will be the history of the future. I can well remember some years ago when an effort was made in Massachusetts to pass a Workmen's Compensation Act and a minimum-wage law for women and children, that such humane legislation was opposed on the ground government had no right to legislate on such matters. And yet who would dare urge their repeal today?

We have been engaged in a war; a war against the destructive influences of a depression, and we have had to spend money, not to destroy but to save human lives. We have met our problems in the democratic way through the ballot box, and not through bullets and revolution. If we keep these facts in mind, we will obtain a better understanding of our problems of today and of our solution of them.

It is my main purpose today to discuss briefly a domestic question that I consider of great importance to all of us, the question of taxation and reemployment.

While our unemployment conditions of 1933 have been sharply reduced, nevertheless, unemployment is the main question that still confronts us. Under private business, with its profit system, which we believe in, the system of individual enterprise, we must ultimately look to business for the solution of this problem. We must also look to government to cooperate through the regulation of abuses that are harmful to our people and to our Government. That is as it should be in a democracy. Each have their responsibility. Each must work in his proper field, and in mutual, constructive, and tolerant cooperation with each other in attaining this necessary end.

In the world crisis that has developed, national unity and confidence are essential. There is every indication of the existence of this state of mind by both political parties, and by government and business.

During the last session of Congress important tax-relief and tax-revision legislation was passed, helpful to business and to our people, and which has already resulted in a better understanding existing between Government and business. As a result of the restoration of business confidence, expansion of business has occurred, and further employment has taken place. In the last session, Congress reduced the social security pay-roll taxes on employer and employee during the next 3 years over $1,500,000,000. Congress also passed a tax-revision bill the beneficial results of which have restored confidence in the ranks of business.

A subcommittee of the Committee on Ways and Means, of which I am a member, is now giving further study to tax legislation, and particularly to legislation that will act as an inducement for business expansion and reemployment through this means. There is much that can be done in that direction.

Without confidence few persons will make capital investments, or take a chance with their money in a venturesome business enterprise. It is confidence and an inducement for legitimate capital investment in productive enterprise that will put idle money and unemployed to work. When we get our idle money to work, we will then get our idle men and women to work. I have yet to meet a man or woman capable of working who does not prefer work to relief.

One of the deterrents, probably the greatest, to business expansion, is the high surtax brackets of the Federal Government. At present, our normal rate is 4 percent, but our surtax rates run up as high as 75 percent, making 70 percent in all, in some cases, and this does not include the State income taxes imposed by a State.

You can see from this statement that a deterrent exists to business expansion by new or venturesome capital. Taxes should be imposed upon the theory of capacity to pay, not upon the theory of deterring legitimate business expansion. I might say that this is not a condition alone of recent years. Both political parties are to blame for surtaxes that deter; both parties should join together in their reduction to a proper level. In normal times their effect upon business and employment is not so harmful as it is in days of business adversity, when we are slowly and painfully trying to return to business normalcy and recovery.

The best interests of the man and woman who is looking for a job calls for a sharp reduction of the present surtax rates. This and any other deterrents to business activity should be remedied as soon as possible. These rates should be reduced in the next Congress to a level that will induce idle money to work in productive enterprise, and not in tax-exempt securities, where they are doing no good toward meeting our problem of unemployment.

Such action will not only help meet our unemployment problem but as business expands, relief costs will be reduced, and at the same time, as experience of the past has shown, governmental revenues will be increased. Idle money is now invested in large amounts of tax-exempt securities. The high, and in some cases confiscatory, surtax rates are a contributing factor to this condition. Why not view the situation from a practical and realistic angle, one that is decidedly for our best interests?

I favor a sharp reduction of the unreasonably high surtax rates:

(1) Such action will help the unemployed, through

(2) Further restoring confidence in business and inducing the investment of new and venturesome capital, so necessary to business expansion.

(3) Such action will increase revenue for Government—Federal, State, and local—and at the same time reduce relief expenditures.

In 1913, when the Federal income-tax law was passed, the highest surtax rate was 6 percent. In 1916 it was increased to 13 percent; in 1917, during the World War, it was increased at its highest point to 63 percent, wartime taxes, which are different than peacetime taxes; in 1918 it was increased to 65 percent; in 1921 reduced to 50 percent; in 1924 reduced to 40 percent; in 1926 reduced to 20 percent; in 1932 increased to 55 percent; in 1934 increased to 59 percent; and in 1935 increased to 75 percent, which, with the normal rate of 4 percent, made 79 percent.

The average businessman wants, like you and I, to do what is right. Unscrupulous businessmen exist, but we must not judge all by the actions of a few. It is to our interests to see business expand. It is to our best interests to assist such expansion. Business means employment; expansion means new opportunities of employment. The last Congress passed legislation that will go a long way toward business confidence and business expansion. The next Congress should continue this constructive work of the last session.

While England Slept—Winston Churchill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN F. SMITH

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 5, 1939

A REVIEW BY HON. MARTIN F. SMITH, OF WASHINGTON

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, under the unanimous consent granted by my colleagues, I desire to review as fully as circumstances will permit one of the most startling and enlightening books which it has been my privilege to read in many years. I refer to the book entitled, "While England Slept," by the Right Honorable Winston S. Churchill, who is again serving his country as First Lord of the Admiralty, the same post which he filled with such distinction and success during the last World War. After having read and reread this remarkable book, and pondered over its contents, I have become convinced that it sets forth experiences of England and lessons to be derived therefrom which we in the United States would do well to heed and consider in due season. We are told by philosophers and sages that "Experience is a dear teacher." This is a truism which England is learning today and which may continue to be brought home to her with increasing force with the passing of the coming months and years. Wise thinkers have also pointed out how desirable and less costly it is to profit from the experiences of others, when we are in a position to do so. Therefore, I make bold to declare, in view of the tremendous and swiftly moving events which are transpiring in Europe today and the amazing realinement of world powers which is taking place, and the possible future threat and menace to the safety and security of our own country, that every Member of this House and the Senate, and every official of our Government, and as many of our citizens as can do so, obtain copies of this work and give it their serious study and consideration. We should immediately increase and strengthen our national defenses.

Winston Churchill has been properly called the Cato of England. Cato, as we recall, was the Roman whose oft-repeated phrase "Delanda Est Carthago" still lives in history. These burning words "Carthage must be destroyed," he kept shouting into the ears of his countrymen, but they gave no heed, and later learned how strong and formidable Carthage had become. Churchill's book consists principally of speeches which he delivered in the House of Commons during the period from 1933 to 1938.

Commencing in 1933, when Hitler became Chancellor, he calls attention to the fact that Germany is rearming, and down through the following years, in each year, time after time, he reiterates that Germany is growing stronger, stronger than England, and gradually gaining supremacy in the air, and that his beloved England is sleeping. In speech after speech he urges England to also prepare and strengthen her national defenses, especially her air defenses. But scant heed is paid to his warnings until the dark day arrives when England discovers to her consternation, upon finally becoming aroused from her long slumber, that Germany has built the most powerful war machine in the history of mankind and intends to use it to enforce her will upon England and France and the rest of the world.

In 1933 he said:

We may within a measurable period of time, in the lifetime of those who are here, if we are not in a proper state of security, be confronted on some occasion with a visit from an ambassador and may have to give an answer in a very few hours; and if that answer is not satisfactory, within the next few hours the crash of bombs exploding in London and cataracts of masonry and fire and smoke will apprise us of any inadequacy which has been permitted in our aerial defenses. We are vulnerable as we have never been before. I have often heard criticisms of the liberal government before the war. All I can say is that a far graver complaint rests upon those who now hold power if by any chance, against our wishes and against our hopes, trouble should come.

Not one of the lessons of the past has been learned, not one of them has been applied, and the situation is incomparably more dangerous. Then we had the navy and no air menace worth considering. Then the navy was the "sure shield" of Britain. As long as it was ready in time and at its stations we could say to any foreign government, "Well, what are you going to do about it? We will not declare ourselves. We will take our own time, we will work out our own course. We have no desire to hurt anyone, but we shall not be pressed or forced into any hasty action unless we think fit and well." We cannot say that now. This cursed, hellish invention and development of war from the air has revolutionized our position. We are not the same kind of country we used to be when we were an island, only 25 years ago. That is borne in upon me more than anything else. It is not merely a question of what we like and what we do not like, of ambitions and desires or rights and interests, but it is a question of safety and independence. That is involved now as never before.

It seems to me that there are three definite decisions which we should now take at once, and without any delay. The first affects the Army. We ought to begin the reorganization of our civil factories so that they can be turned over rapidly to war purposes. All over Europe that is being done, and to an amazing extent. This process is incomparably more efficient than anything which existed in the days of Prussian imperialism before the war. Every factory in those countries is prepared to turn over to the production of some material for the deplorable and melancholy business of slaughter. What have we done? There is not an hour to lose. Those things cannot be done in a moment. The process should be started and the very maximum of money that can be usefully spent will be spent from today on if we act with wisdom.

Then there is the question of the Navy. For the Navy, at any rate, we should regain freedom of design. We should get rid of this London Treaty which has crippled us in building the kind of ships we want, and has stopped the United States from building a great battleship which she probably needed and to which we should have not had the slightest reason to object. It has forced us to spend some of our hard-earned money—the little there is for these purposes—unwisely. It has forced us to take great ships which would have been of enormous utility in convoying vessels bearing food to these islands and to sink them in the ocean, when they had 10 to 15 years of useful life in them. We must regain our freedom at the earliest possible moment, and we shall be helped in doing so by the fact that another of the parties to that treaty (Japan) is resolved to regain her freedom, too.

Then there is the air. I cannot conceive how, in the present state of Europe we can delay in establishing the principle of having an air force at least as strong as that of any power that can get at us. I think that is a perfectly reasonable thing to do. It would only begin to put us back to the position in which we were brought up. We have lived under the shield of the Navy. To have an air force as strong as the air force of France or Germany, whichever is the stronger, ought to be the decision which Parliament should take, and which the national government should proclaim.

The responsibility of His Majesty's Government is grave indeed, and there is this which makes it all the graver: It is a responsibility which they have no difficulty in discharging if they choose. We are told they have to wait for public opinion, that they must bring that along and must be able to assure the good people here that everything is being done with the most pacific intentions—they must make a case. But nothing like that can stand between them and their responsibility to the Crown and Parliament for the safety and security of the country. The Government commands overwhelming majorities in both branches of the legislature. Nothing that they ask will be denied to them. They have only to make their proposals, and they will be supported in them. Let them not suppose that if they make proposals, with confidence and conviction, for the safety of the country, their countrymen will not support them. Why take so poor a view of the patriotic support which this Nation gives to those who it feels are doing their duty by it? I cannot feel that at the present time the Government is doing its duty in these matters of defense, and particularly in respect of the air. It seems to me that while we are becoming ever more entangled in the European situation, and while we are constantly endeavoring to weaken, relatively, our friends upon the continent of Europe, we nevertheless are left

exposed to a mortal thrust, and are deprived of that old sense of security and independence upon which the civilization of our island has been built.

In the spring of 1934 Mr. Churchill warned his countrymen of the growing German air menace. He said:

To urge the preparation of defense is not to assert the imminence of war. On the contrary, if war were imminent, preparations for defense would be too late. I do not believe that war is imminent or that war is inevitable, but it seems very difficult to resist the conclusion that, if we do not begin forthwith to put ourselves in a position of security, it will soon be beyond our power to do so. What is the great new fact which has broken in upon us during the last 18 months? Germany is rearming. That is the great new fact which rivets the attention of every country in Europe—indeed, in the world—and which throws almost all other issues into the background. Germany is rearming—that mighty power which only a few years ago, within our own experience, fought almost the whole world and almost conquered. That mighty power is now equipping itself once again, 70,000,000 people, with the technical apparatus of modern war, and at the same time is instilling into the hearts of its youth and manhood the most extreme patriotic, nationalistic, and militaristic conceptions. According to what we hear, according to what we are told and what comes in from every quarter, though little is said about it in public, Germany has already a powerful, well-equipped army, with an excellent artillery, and an immense reserve of armed, trained men. The German munition factories are working practically under war conditions, and war material is flowing out from them and has been for the last 12 months in an ever-broadening flow. Much of this is undoubtedly in violation of the treaties which were signed. Germany is rearming on land; she is rearming also to some extent at sea; but what concerns us most of all is the rearmament of Germany in the air.

Let us, first of all, look at the dimensions of the danger as it affects this country at the present time. However calmly surveyed, the danger of an attack from the air must appear most formidable. I do not accept the sweeping claim of the extreme votaries of the air. I think that a great many statements which are made are calculated to frustrate the purpose of reasonable precautions by presenting the problem as if it were one which was insoluble. But, without accepting these claims, no one can doubt that a week or 10 days' intensive bombing attack upon London would be a very serious matter indeed.

The most dangerous form of air attack is the attack by incendiary bombs. Such an attack was planned by the Germans for the summer of 1918, I think for the time of the harvest moon. The argument in favor of such an attack was that if in any great city there are, we will say, 50 fire brigades, and you start simultaneously 100 fires and the wind is high, an almost incalculable conflagration may result. The reason why the Germans did not carry out that attack in 1918 must be stated. It was not at all that our air defense had become so excellent that we were protected against it. It was because the advance of the Allied armies, with the British Army in the van, already confronted the Imperial Government of Germany with the prospect of impending defeat, and they did not wish to incur the fury of retribution which would follow from such a dreadful act of power and terror as would have been involved in such a raid. Since those days the incendiary thermite bomb has become far more powerful than any that was used in the late war. It will, in fact, I am assured by persons who are acquainted with the science, go through a series of floors in any building, igniting each one practically simultaneously.

Not less formidable than these material effects are the reactions which will be produced upon the mind of the civil population. We must expect that under the pressure of continuous air attack upon London at least 3,000,000 or 4,000,000 people would be driven out into the open country around the metropolis. This vast mass of human beings, numerically far larger than any armies which have been fed and moved in war, without shelter and without food, without sanitation, and without special provision for the maintenance of order, would confront the government of the day with an administrative problem of the first magnitude, and would certainly absorb the energies of our small army and of our territorial force. Problems of this kind have never been faced before.

Then there are the docks of London and the estuary of the Thames. Everyone knows the dependence of this immense community, the most prosperous in the whole world, upon the eastern approaches by water. We studied it very carefully in the war, and I have not the slightest doubt that it has weighed very much on the minds of His Majesty's Government. It ought not to be supposed that the danger of an air attack, assuming that such a thing occurred, would necessarily be confined to London or the area around it. Birmingham and Sheffield and the great manufacturing towns might all be made the subject of special study, and every part of the country is equally interested in whatever measures of security can be taken to provide against such a peril. Not less dangerous than the attack upon the cities and the great working-class areas and upon the manufacturing centers would be that directed upon the dock-yards and the oil-fuel storage, which unless proper precautions are taken, as I trust they have been or are being taken, might actually paralyze the fleet, with consequences which no one can fail to perceive.

The danger which might confront us would expose us not only to hideous suffering, but even to mortal peril, by which I mean peril of actual conquest and subjugation. It is just as well to confront those facts while time remains to take proper measures to cope with them. I may say that all these possibilities are perfectly well known abroad, and no doubt every one of them has been made the subject of technical study.

I come to the more difficult and much more debatable question of what remedy can be applied. What measures can we take to provide against these very great perils, or at any rate to mitigate and minimize their effects? I do not think, to give a personal opinion, that it is much use planning to move our arsenals and factories over to the west side of the island. When one considers the enormous range of modern aeroplanes and the speeds at which they travel, 230 and 240 miles an hour, it is evident that every part of this small island is almost equally within range of attack. If vast sums of money were spent in displacing our arsenals from their present position, it might well be found that before this cumbrous process was completed improvements in airplanes would have more than discounted any advantage which might have been gained. The flying peril is not a peril from which one can fly. It is necessary to face it where we stand. We cannot possibly retreat. We cannot move London. We cannot move the vast population which is dependent on the estuary of the Thames. We cannot move the naval bases which are established along our southern coasts with the great hereditary naval populations living around them. No doubt where new factories were being created the factor of distance would be an important consideration, but in the main I am afraid we shall have to face this peril, whatever it may be, where we stand.

It would be a great mistake to neglect the scientific side of defense against aircraft attack—of purely defensive action against aircraft attack. Certainly nothing is more necessary, not only to this country but to all peace-loving and peace-interested powers in the world and to world civilization than that the good old earth should acquire some means or methods of destroying sky marauders. It is a matter which is of interest to us all that we should be able to meet this present menace which no generation before our own has faced, which shakes the very fabric and structure of all our civilized arrangements, and by spreading fear and danger far and wide makes it more and more difficult to preserve security and tranquillity in the minds of the different great states. If anything can be discovered that will put the earth on better terms against this novel form of attack—attack by spreading terror throughout civil populations—anything that can give us relief or aid in this matter will be a blessing to all.

The fact remains that when all is said and done as regards defensive methods, pending some new discovery, the only direct measure of defense upon a great scale is the certainty of being able to inflict simultaneously upon the enemy as great damage as he can inflict upon ourselves. Do not let us undervalue the efficacy of this procedure. It may well prove in practice—I admit you cannot prove it in theory—capable of giving complete immunity. If two powers show themselves equally capable of inflicting damage upon each other by some particular process of war, so that neither gains an advantage from its adoption and both suffer the most hideous reciprocal injuries, it is not only possible but it seems probable that neither will employ that means. What would they gain by it? Certainly a continental country like Germany, with large foreign armies on its frontiers, would be most unwise to run the risk of exposing itself to intensive bombing attacks from this island upon its military centers, its munition establishments, and its lines of communication, at a time when it was engaged or liable to be engaged by the armies of another first-class power.

We all speak under the uncertainty of the future which has so often baffled human foresight, but I believe that if we maintain at all times in the future an air power sufficient to enable us to inflict as much damage upon the most likely potential aggressor as he can inflict upon us, we may shield our people effectually in our own time from all those horrors which I have ventured to describe. If that be so, what are 50,000,000 pounds or 100,000,000 pounds raised by tax or by loan, compared with an immunity like that? Never has so fertile and so blessed an insurance been procurable so cheaply.

Observe the reverse of the picture. Assume that one country has a powerful air force and that the other has none, or that the other country has been so decisively beaten in the air that it has hardly any air force left. Then not only war machines but almost any flying machine that can be fitted to carry bombs will be employed to go over and to torture every part of the state and the community in that other country until it surrenders all that is asked from it. Absolute subjugation could in the end be enforced by such air attack, once a country had lost all power to fight in the air. Once complete ascendancy in the air had been secured, the victor power might almost at leisure pick out any aircraft factory and make an intensive attack upon it, and thus there could be no recovery. It is almost the only form of war that we have seen in the world in which complete predominance gives no opportunity of recovery. That is the odious new factor which has been forced upon our life in this twentieth century of Christian civilization.

For all these reasons we ought to decide now to maintain, at all costs, in the next 10 years, an air force substantially stronger than that of Germany, and that it should be considered a high crime against the State, whatever government is in power, if that force is allowed even for a month to fall substantially below the potential force which may be possessed by that country abroad.

I firmly believe that we may have it in our power to avert from this generation the supreme catastrophe of another war. The idea

that we can intervene usefully in sustaining the peace of Europe while we ourselves are the most vulnerable of all—are the beggars, in fact—is one which cannot be held firmly by any man who looks at this in the faithful discharge of his duty.

I therefore assert, first, that Germany already, at this moment, has a military air force—that is to say, military squadrons with the necessary ground services, with the necessary reserves of trained personnel and material—which only await an order to assemble in full open combination, and that this illegal air force is rapidly approaching equality with our own. Secondly, by this time next year, if Germany executes her existing program without acceleration, and if we execute our existing program on the same basis which now lies before us without slowing down, and carry out the increases announced to Parliament in August last, the German military air force will this time next year be in fact at least as strong as our own and it may be even stronger. Thirdly, on the same basis—that is to say, both sides continuing with their existing programs as at present arranged—by the end of 1936—that is, 1 year further on and 2 years from now—the German military air force will be nearly 50 percent stronger, and in 1937 nearly double. All this is on the assumption, as I say, that there is no acceleration on the part of Germany and no slowing down on our part.

I come to civil aircraft which are capable of being used for military operations, the dual-purpose machines, as they are called in Germany. Here the story is very much worse for us. Germany has already between 200 and 300 machines of long range with great speed, 220 to 230 miles an hour, which are now ostensibly or actually employed in carrying mail bags and to some extent in carrying passengers; these machines can be converted into long-distance bombers of the highest efficiency in a few hours. All that is necessary is to remove some parts of the passenger accommodation and fit bomb racks in their place. These bomb racks, I told the House 5 months ago, are already made and kept in close proximity to the machines. That is the position at the present time. Germany has already between 200 and 300 of these machines. This time next year the number will have risen to at least 400 of these machines, which in the case of war will be a direct addition to the German military force.

Against that we, as I understand, can set nothing that is in the slightest degree comparable for military purposes. Our civil aviation is valueless for war purposes. Indeed, it has been the custom of ministers and others to boast of this fact as proof of our pacific intentions—if, indeed, proof were needed. Everyone knows that we have built for comfort and for safety and without the slightest contemplation of convertibility. Therefore, I assert—and I invite the Government to contradict the statement if they can—that by this time next year, taking both the military and the convertible civil aircraft into consideration, Germany will have a substantially stronger air force than Great Britain. Frankly, I do not think that the country has prepared itself to realize this fact. The conditions in 1936 and 1937, if the German convertible machines are added to the military machines, will be that the figures of the German air force will be far more adverse to this country than the purely military figures, which are bad enough, that I gave a few moments ago.

I come to ordinary civil aviation. It is difficult to compute the value of this for war, but it represents reserve pilots, mechanics, landing grounds, factories, airdromes, and a general familiarity with the flying art, which is, indirectly, of great importance. I think you may say that civil aviation bears the same relation to the fighting force as the mercantile marine has for so many generations borne to the Royal Navy. It is quite certain that the German pool of civil aviation, from which a military air force can be expanded and developed, is already far larger and far more closely related to military purposes than ours. The principle underlying German civil aviation and all the regulations and subventions point to their commercial machines being made efficient for rapid transformation into military or training machines.

Nor is Germany neglecting defensive preparations. Air-alarm arrangements, gas drills, and so forth, are taking place all over Germany as well as in many other parts of the continent of Europe. The House must not miss the bearing of this upon retaliation, upon the protection one can get from the power of retaliation, because if of two populations, both exposed to attacks of this kind, one has all kinds of protection which enable it to avoid loss of life, it is perfectly obvious how great will be the injury to the one unprepared. I know that the Government has been considering this matter, and I understand the reason why nothing has been done is the fear of frightening the population. It is much better to be frightened beforehand than when the danger actually comes to pass. It is much better to be frightened now than to be killed hereafter.

I am assured that many of the German airdromes are proof against air attack. They build concrete embankments around the shelters where the airplanes are stored, so that the place is quite safe; whereas you have only to look at the airdromes of our air force to see that they are vulnerable to any attack, and might be put out of action altogether. Anyone, however pacific he may be, must surely admit that there is no proper protection of our airdromes, I think that this is a primary and urgent duty of the government. I heard the debate the other day upon the devastated areas of our country. Many suggestions were made for remedying the situation. Suppose there is a great deal of work to do in earthing up these airdromes which will have to be constructed; why not give it to those unemployed people? Recruit twenty or thirty thousand men from those areas on good wages, and let them go about the country and do this necessary work, instead of being employed on relief work and so forth. Let them act, not as unemployed, but as a labor reserve, and let them go forward and revivify their own homes by sending back the wages which they earn by doing the most necessary and urgent of public tasks.

So far I have dealt with what, I believe, is the known, but beyond the known there is also the unknown. We hear from all sides of an air development in Germany far in excess of anything which I have stated today. As to that, all I would say is: Beware, Germany is a country fertile in military enterprises. The great Napoleon, in the years after Jena, was completely taken by surprise by the strength of the German Army which fought the war of liberation. Although he had officers all over the place, the German Army which fought in the campaign of Leipzig was three or four times as strong as he expected. Similarly, when the great war broke out the French general staff had no idea of the reserve divisions which would be brought immediately into the field. They expected to be confronted by 25 army corps; actually more than 40 came against them.

It is never advisable to underrate the military qualities of this remarkable and gifted people, nor to underrate the dangers that may be brought against us. I only say it does not follow that, in the figures I have given today, I am not erring grievously on the side of understatement. It sounds absurd to talk about 10,000 air planes but, after all, the resources of mass production are very great, and I remember when the war came to an end the organization over which I presided at the Ministry of Munitions was actually making airplanes at the rate of 24,000 a year, and planning a very much larger program for 1919. Of course, such numbers of airplanes could never be placed in the air at any one moment, nor a tenth of them, but the figures give an idea of the scale to which manufacture might easily rise if long preparations have been made beforehand, and a great program of production is launched.

In the beginning of 1935, Mr. Churchill referred to the increasing tension of the European situation caused by the rearmament of Germany, and said:

We are entering a period of serious anxieties. It is a period also of increasing tension. I will give the house two causes which, it seems to me, cannot possibly be overlooked. The first is this: German unemployment has been very largely cured by German preparations for war. Several millions of people, who when Herr Hitler was elected looked to him to provide them with work, have had work found for them, and that work has consisted in the preparation of armaments or the construction of military roads, or the removal of military factories to remote parts of Germany, and generally in all these processes. The great wheels of German industry have been set working, and they are turning out in endless succession every kind of weapon of war. To reverse or stop that would undoubtedly produce a convulsion in the internal domestic life of Germany and one most likely to cause embarrassment and reproach to the regime.

But there is another reason, and this second reason I will describe as the suddenness of a possibly decisive attack. The motorization and mechanization of large armies enable plans to be made by which hundreds, even thousands, of motor vehicles may be started in the night from different parts a hundred miles behind a frontier, and in the dawn may be found in possession of important parts of a defensive line.

Lastly, above all, there is the air, which introduces the most hideous factor of all, because airplanes can be dispatched on a mission of destruction or of provocation at almost any moment, and no mobilization need be made beforehand and no warning need be given. Therefore I say that on all these grounds we are bound to realize that we are entering upon a dark and dangerous valley through which we have to march for quite a long time unless some blessed relief comes to us through some agreement—for which there is hardly an exertion that we should not make.

We are entering upon a period of danger and of difficulty. And how do we stand in this long period of danger? There is no doubt that the Germans are superior to us in the air at the present time, and it is my belief that by the end of this year, unless their rate of construction and development is arrested by some agreement, they will be possibly three, and even four, times our strength. There is nothing to prevent such a result being reached if the Germans simply continue to maintain this great machine which they have set in motion and keep it revolving. They have created whatever it may be—1,000, 1,500—brand new aeroplanes in a comparatively short space of time; and the plant that brought that about can produce double and treble that number with great ease during the present year. I can only hope that they will not think it necessary to use it to that extent.

The Royal Air Force is to be raised to 1,500 first-line strength. By first-line strength I mean, and I imagine the Government means, aeroplanes formed in squadron with 50 percent reserve for pilots, with all the organization and everything that is necessary. To produce a program of that kind is the most formidable advance in British defense which has ever been made, and the committee should not be at all inclined to underrate the magnitude of the effort which the Government has now proposed to us. But I cannot help saying what a pity it is that we did not make this proposal 2 years ago, or even 1 year ago, because then we should have been in a position during this critical period to make an output similar to that which is being made in other countries.

Later in the spring of 1935 Mr. Churchill warned against the sense of false security and what he termed "serious deficiencies in all the defense services."

Speeches are made in the country by leading ministers saying that we have decided that we must have air equality, that we cannot accept anything less. We have not got it. We are already decidedly inferior to Germany, and, it must be said, of course to France. All that lies before us for many months is that this inferiority becomes more and more pronounced. In the autumn of this year, in November, when we are supposed to be 50 percent stronger, I hazard the melancholy prediction that we shall not be a third, possibly not a quarter, of the German air strength.

The German Army, already developed to 21 or 22 divisions, is working up to 36 as fast as it can—a division a month or something like that coming into full mobilizable capacity, tanks and the whole business. There is the Navy, and submarines have been made. Some are actually, I believe, practicing, training their crews in that difficult art. Let me tell the House that submarines can be manufactured very quickly. I remember in November 1914 arranging for Mr. Schwab, of Bethlehem, to make 20 submarines in what was then considered the incredibly short period of 6 months. Although these vessels had to be shifted from the United States to a Canadian dockyard for reasons of neutrality, it was possible to put sections on the railway trucks and to deliver them in time. How do you know what progress has been made in constructing such sections? The arms production has the first claim on the entire industry of Germany. The materials required for the production of armaments are the first charge on the German exchange. The whole of their industry is woven into an immediate readiness for war. You have a state of preparedness in German industry which was not attained by our industry until after the late war had gone on probably for 2 years

Besides this, there is tremendous propaganda, beginning with the schools and going right through every grade of youth to manhood, enforced by the most vigorous and harsh sanctions at every stage. All this is taking place. It is a very nice, comfortable world that we look out on here in this country. It has found an apt reflection in this debate today, but it has no relation whatever to what is going forward, and going forward steadily. Mark you, in time of peace, in peace politics, in ordinary matters of domestic affairs and class struggles, things blow over; but in these great matters of defense, and still more in the field of actual hostilities, the clouds do not roll by. If the necessary measures are not taken, they turn into thunderbolts and fall on your heads. The whole of this great process of psychological, moral, material, and technical mobilization of German war power is proceeding ceaselessly and with ever-increasing momentum.

It is easy, then, for Herr Hitler and the German Government to pursue a policy which I have heard described as "power diplomacy." What a transformation has taken place in the last 2 or 3 years. Two or three years ago it was considered sentimental, intellectual, liberally minded, to speak words of encouragement and compassion, and even to speak patronizingly of the German people, and to seek opportunities of making gestures to raise them up to more and greater equality with other countries. Now we see them with their grievances unredressed, with all their ambitions unsatisfied, continuing from strength to strength, and the whole world waits from week to week to hear what are the words which will fall from the heads of the German Nation. It is a woeful transformation which has taken place.

It would be folly for us to act as if we were swimming in a halcyon sea, as if nothing but balmy breezes and calm weather were to be expected and everything were working in the most agreeable fashion. By all means, follow your lines of hope and your paths of peace; but do not close your eyes to the fact that we are entering a corridor of deepening and darkening danger, and that we shall have to move along it for many months and possibly for years to come. While we are in this position, not only have we our own safety to consider but we have to consider also whether the parliamentary governments of western Europe, of which there are not many that function in the real sense of the word, are going to be able to afford to their subjects the same measure of physical security, to say nothing of national satisfaction, as is being afforded to the people of Germany by the dictatorship which has been established there. It is not only the supreme question of self-preservation that is involved in the realization of these dangers but also the human and the world cause of the preservation of free governments and of Western civilization against the ever-advancing forces of authority and despotism.

In midsummer of 1935 Mr. Churchill issued the following solemn warning and prophecy, which has since been fulfilled:

It has for some time been evident that Germany intends to embark upon a gigantic process of rearming by land, sea, and air, which will make her the most formidable military power in the whole world.

In December 1935, Mr. Churchill called attention to Germany's huge and enormous expenditures for preparation for war:

The scale on which foreign rearmament is proceeding is prodigious. Sometime ago I made a statement that Germany had spent, directly or indirectly, on armaments in the year 1935 upward of 800,000,000 pounds sterling. These figures startled people—at least they startled those people who are capable of taking in anything. I made that statement on good authority, and I have had the assistance of a financial authority who has worked out for me a long argument, much too long to quote in debate, showing how money has been secretly found for these purposes in the German finances. Broadly speaking, since the arrival of Herr Hitler in power 3 years ago the Germans have spent about 1,500,000,000 pounds sterling upon warlike preparations, directly or indirectly. The money has been raised by internal borrowing, and the revenues of Germany are already mortgaged 2 or 3 or possibly 4 years ahead. These figures are stupendous. Nothing like them has ever been seen in time of peace. Supposing they are exaggerated and that the figure which they spent in 1935 is only 600,000,000 pounds, we should still be confronted with facts which are unprecedented, unparalleled, and immeasurable in their consequences. It must also be remembered that in all probability money goes further in Germany than here. In face of these figures it surely seems unreasonable to blame His Majesty's Government for the modest sum for which they are asking in the estimates of the year and for the additional expenditure that will be required under the White Paper.

The fact that Germany is spending at this enormous rate upon armaments warns us not only of the magnitude of the danger, but possibly of its imminence. Expenditure on armaments means wages. The weekly livelihood for a very large proportion of the German people has now become dependent upon military preparations. Several millions of people in Germany who were unemployed have found employment in munitions manufacture or in the armed forces. On the other hand, the whole is supported by borrowed money on a large scale, and the financial situation has become such that this cannot go on indefinitely.

It cannot go on, but how can it stop? A terrible dilemma lies ahead of the most peacefully minded government in Germany. If they go on, there is bankruptcy; if they stop, there is tremendous unemployment. There is no chance of Germany finding additional substitute employment by trading with tropical colonies or by the peaceful conquest of our markets or those of other nations, which would in the immediate future in the slightest degree compensate for the curtailment of the vast munitions program on which the whole of Germany is now engaged. The German Government will have to choose at no distant date between an internal and an external catastrophe. Can we doubt what course the man at the head of Germany would be likely to choose?

It is easy to say this cannot go on, but what will happen when it stops? It is that which invests the situation with the most alarming urgency, with a kind of doomlike inevitableness which causes the most melancholy and alarming reflections. Germany, we are told, is not yet ready for war. Some say she is only half ready. Yet we see already that she is the only nation in Europe unafraid of war. If what we have seen in the last few days is the mood of a partially armed Germany, imagine what the tone will be when these colossal preparations are approaching their zenith, and when at the same time the limits of internal borrowing are already in sight.

Wars do not always wait until all the combatants are ready. Sometimes they come before any are ready, sometimes when one nation thinks itself less unready than another, or when one nation thinks it is likely to become, not stronger, but weaker as time passes. I fear, indeed, that there may be a culminating point in the history of Europe—the armaments history of Europe. I cannot tell when it will be reached. It will certainly be reached in the lifetime of the present Parliament. Let us never accept the theory of inevitable war; neither let us blind our eyes to the remorseless march of events.

There are two ways of preparing for the supply side of national defense. First, there is the accumulation of reserves of munitions of all kinds, which under modern conditions must be enormous, and the storing of them at great expense in magazines. That method was the only one which was known and practiced up to the Great War. There is a second method, the modern method, which is quite different. The whole industry of a country is prepared in time of peace for an alternative form of manufacture. Even the smallest workshops play their part in making components. Assembly centers are provided where the components can be fitted together. Thus the whole industry of the country is ready to turn over from peace to war conditions on the pressing of a button.

If we had only begun to act 3 years ago when the danger first made itself apparent, we should possess a reserve power today which could spring at any moment into full preparatory activity. Very little disturbance 3 years ago would have produced enormous reserves at the present time. I am well aware that something has been done. What is immediately needed is to bring it out into the open, to support it with ample money and staff, and to press it forward with the utmost vigor. Let me make myself clear. This does not mean any immediate increase in the deliveries. It does not mean immediately more ships, more munitions, more aeroplanes, but it does mean that you have an industry which, if the need ever arises, will not fail you, and will not interpose between you and your safety 2 horrible years of hiatus such as some of us in positions of responsibility went through in the Great War.

Here is the great disadvantage at which we stand compared with the German air industry. I am not mentioning this for the first time. I told the House 18 months ago of the extraordinary development of this method which was proceeding in Germany. There is not the slightest reason why it should not be set on foot here. It might have corrected to some extent the boom in aircraft shares. It would, anyhow, have given a reserve, if trouble

comes, without which, although you may have a force at the beginning of the war, you will not have the power to keep that force in continuous activity, and it will come to an end after a few months. There is no doubt that this method of the widely distributed manufacture of components ought to be as much a part of the life of an industrial country in this present unhappy modern age as the practice of archery on the village green was in medieval England. It is the simplest and most primary method by which the freedom of a country can be assured, and it is the very heart of modern national defense.

The air power of any country cannot be measured by the number of airplanes nor by any of the particular definitions which are given. It must be measured by the number of airplanes which can be placed in the air simultaneously and maintained in action month after month. It is dependent not only on the number of organized squadrons but upon the expansive power of the industrial plant. A mere comparison of the number of machines possessed by the different countries, or the number of pilots trained, or even the number of squadrons formed, is no true guide. The organization of the airplane industry is not merely the production or the accumulation of so many thousands of airplanes by a given date. It must also insure the continuous flow of supplies from the date of the outbreak; and the supreme advantage which Germany has seized at the present time resides in this fact. They do not need to have any considerable reserve. They can feed the fighting squadrons direct from the factories and testing grounds, just as, in the last year of the war, when Mr. Lloyd George's great national shell factories and gun plants came into operation, we were able to feed the field armies direct from the factories without the need to accumulate supplies short of the actual fighting zone.

In these circumstances it is, I am sorry to say, not likely that we shall be able to overtake Germany and achieve air parity, as was promised, unless and until Germany herself decides to slow down or arrest her air expansion. Clearly a saturation point will be reached when those who are guiding Germany decide that they have given to air development all that portion of their resources which they can spare, having regard to all other needs. If, when that point is reached, we continue to develop our force, ultimately we shall achieve air parity, but that day will be fixed by decisions which will be taken in Germany and not by decisions which will be taken here, whatever we do.

Let us see what we are doing. It is a general impression that we are overhauling Germany now; that we started late, it is true, but are making up for lost time, and that every month our relative position will improve. That is a delusion. It is contrary to the truth this year, and probably for many months next year. I am not saying anything which is not known in every country in the world. These matters are thoroughly understood. Germany will be outstripping us more and more even if our new programs are accepted, and we shall be worse off at the end of this year than we are now in spite of all our exertions. The explanation of this unpleasant fact lies in the past.

Will there be time to put our defenses in order? We live in contact with the unknown, but we are not defenseless now. Will there be time to make these necessary efforts, or will the awful words "too late" be recorded? I will never despair that we can make ourselves secure. The Royal Navy, especially after the toning up which it has received, is unsurpassed in the world, and is still the main bulwark of our security; and even at this eleventh hour, if the right measures are taken and if the right spirit prevails in the British Nation and the British Empire, we may surround ourselves with other bulwarks equally sure which will protect us against whatever storms may blow.

I will continue and conclude this review in a separate and subsequent document.

While England Slept—Winston Churchill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN F. SMITH

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 5, 1939

A REVIEW BY HON. MARTIN F. SMITH, OF WASHINGTON

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I have already placed in the RECORD the first part of my review of the timely and thought-provoking volume entitled "While England Slept," by the Right Honorable Winston S. Churchill, and herewith include the continuation and remainder thereof. I commend it to the thoughtful study and consideration of my colleagues in both the House and Senate and the American people for the lessons we in the United States may learn from the experiences of England. In the world of today we need to substantially increase and strengthen our national defenses.

In 1936, after Hitler had reoccupied the Rhineland and denounced the treaties of Versailles and Locarno, Mr. Churchill said:

When we think of the great power and influence which this country exercises we cannot look back with much pleasure on our foreign policy in the last 5 years. They certainly have been disastrous years. God forbid that I should lay on the Government of my own country the charge of responsibility for the evils which have come upon the world in that period. I would not do such a thing, but certainly in that period we have seen the most depressing and alarming change in the outlook of mankind which has ever taken place in so short a period. Five years ago all felt safe; 5 years ago all were looking forward to peace, to a period in which mankind would rejoice in the treasures which science can spread to all classes if conditions of peace and justice prevail. Five years ago to talk of war would have been regarded not only as a folly and a crime but almost as a sign of lunacy. Look at the difference in our position now. We find ourselves compelled once again to face the hateful problems and ordeals which those of us who worked and toiled in the last struggle hoped were gone forever.

The violation of the Rhineland is serious from the point of view of the menace to which it exposes Holland, Belgium, and France. It is also serious because when the Rhineland is fortified—and I listened with apprehension to what the Secretary of State said about the Germans declining even to refrain from entrenching themselves during the period of negotiations; I listened with sorrow to that—when there is there a line of fortifications, as I suppose there will be in a very short time, it will produce reactions on the European situation. It will be a barrier across Germany's front door which will leave her free to sally out eastward and southward by the other doors.

What is the real problem, the real peril? It is not reoccupation of the Rhineland, but this enormous process of the rearmament of Germany. There is the peril. I confess that I have been occupied with this idea of the great wheels revolving and the great hammers descending day and night in Germany, making the whole industry of that country an arsenal, welding the whole of its population into one disciplined war machine. There is the problem that lies before you. There is what is bringing war nearer. This Rhineland episode is but a step, a stage, an incident in this process. There is fear in every country, all around. Even here, in this island, with some protection from distance, there is fear, deep fear. What is the fear, and what is the question which arises from that fear? It is, How are we going to stop this war which seems to be moving toward us in so many ways?

In 1936, after the general staffs of Britain, France, and Belgium had conferred on cooperation in the event of unprovoked aggression by Germany, Mr. Churchill again stressed the magnitude of Germany's expenditures for rearmament:

From the end of March 1933 to the end of June 1935 the official publications of the German Government show an increase in the public debt to a minimum figure of over 7 milliards of reichsmarks, to which must be added the yield from increased taxation in that period, which has been used for Government expenditures, and which amount to 5 milliards. Therefore the minimum expenditure for 2½ years above the preceding budget expenditure is 12 milliards, or £1,000,000,000 at the official rate of exchange. That is all that is acknowledged, but there are two other lines of approach which suggest that that figure is far below the actual fact. A veto prevails in Germany on all expansion of private plant for purely economic purposes. The capital expenditure of Germany, other than for residential buildings, may therefore be regarded as almost exclusively devoted to warlike preparations, in which, of course, I include the preparation of those great military roads where four columns of troops can march abreast, which may play a greater part in a future war than the fortifications that are being built.

Again, taking the figures from German official sources, the expenditure on capital account, deducting the expenditure on residential buildings, has been as follows: In 1933, nearly 5,000,000,000 marks; in 1934, nearly 8,000,000,000; and in 1935, nearly 11,000,000,000—a total of 24,000,000,000, or, roughly, £2,000,000,000. I am taking the rate of exchange at 12 marks to the pound, and I am making no allowance for the fact that armament production is much cheaper in Germany than it is here. (An honorable member: "Why?") Wages are much lower. Look at these figures—5, 8, and 11 for the 3 years. They give you exactly the kind of progression which a properly developing munitions industry would make.

There is a second line of approach to these figures. There is a marked increase in the German national income. Again I take this from official German figures. The increase in the national income has not gone into consumption. Wages have remained unchanged and the cost of living, if anything, has risen. Therefore, the increase in the national income has gone into constructional work, the bulk of which is represented, directly or indirectly, by armaments. Look at the increase in the figures of the German national income—in 1933, 1,200,000,000 reichsmarks; in 1934, 7,000,000,000; and in 1935, 11,400,000,000—practically the same progression as I showed in the previous calculation. That is exactly what you would expect from an industry getting on its feet, opening out, and finally

coming into full blast. These figures make a total, since Herr Hitler came into power, of nearly 20,000,000,000 reichsmarks. The year 1935 shows on this calculation, as well as on the previous one, the same figure of over 11,000,000,000 marks, which is considerably over the £800,000,000 which I have for some months past been bruiting about the country.

There are other means by which this progress can be checked. There is the number of persons employed in the armament and cognate industries and in military forces. There has also been an elaborate investigation into the number of stamps which have been affixed to the 3 months' bills which are used for effecting this extraordinary process of internal inflation, but that is too complicated to trouble the committee now. They will see from what I have said that there is very considerable justification for the startling statement that I have advanced, and to which I most strictly adhere, that £800,000,000 was spent on warlike preparations in 1935 alone. Does the Government contradict these figures? Unless they are to contradict them specifically and can show reasons why they are wrong, I think my statement might be allowed to stand, and might be taken into the general currency of thought on this topic.

The Chancelor of the Exchequer used an argument about how expenditure would rise to a peak, then fall a little, and then remain level, but at a much greater height than at the present time. That is not the future as I foresee it. I cannot believe that, after armaments in all countries have reached a towering height, they will settle down and continue at a hideous level far above the present level, which is already crushing, and that that will be for many years a normal feature of the world's routine. Whatever happens, I do not believe that will. Europe is approaching a climax. I believe that climax will be reached in the lifetime of the present Parliament. Either there will be a melting of hearts and a joining of hands between great nations which will set out upon realizing the glorious age of prosperity and freedom which is now within the grasp of millions of toiling people, or there will be an explosion and a catastrophe, the course of which no imagination can measure, and beyond which no human eye see. I believe also that a strongly armed Britain, resolutely and valiantly led, seeking peace but ready to run risks for peace, may conceivably turn the scale between the blessing and the cursing of mankind.

In another speech the same year Mr. Churchill renewed vigorously his proposal previously made for the formation of a ministry of munitions or supply. He said:

I now turn to the main issue: What is our own position in the matter of defense? We do not hesitate to give the law to nations and to arraign delinquent peoples at our bar. How stands our own defense? Before and during the general election the Prime Minister freely exposed its deficiencies. Oddly enough, he dwelt particularly on the deficiencies in the Navy, which appears to be the only service which this year and probably next year is not unequal to its immediate responsibilities. But, then, toward the end of the election, he was at pains to say: "I give you my word there will be no great armaments." Frankly, I do not understand that statement in the circumstances in which we are or in the context of our thought and discussions. Is not doubling or trebling the air force a great armament? Is not trying to have an air force—trying vainly, I admit—equal to that of Germany or France a great armament? What is the point of saying we are not to have great armaments? There is only one explanation, and that is that these great armaments will exist only on paper, and that it is not in our power for a very long time to obtain the deliveries which would turn them into realities. There followed the "white paper," setting forth in extremely vague terms the plan for a very large rearmament. As a paper plan, I have nothing to say against it. That was 3 months ago.

Let me draw attention to the rapid passage of time. Three months passed in a flash. All the time all over the world events are moving. Three months and—Hullo, another defense debate. Three months ago I ventured to say that it was no use asking the Government for a larger program, because, except, perhaps, in the building of destroyers for the Navy, where work could be placed out in smaller yards, they would not be able to execute the programs which they had already declared and on which they were engaged. The limited sums of money which the departments are able to spend are an unfailing telltale of the truth that they are not able to carry out this process of rearmament which they desire and which they have the utmost need to execute. I defy anyone to rise from the treasury bench and say that the programs to which they have set their hands are going to be carried out punctually to the dates which have been assigned to them.

Three months have passed since I urged upon the Government the formation of ministry of munitions or supply. We are now told that that may be necessary in the future, but it is a dividing line; so said my right honorable friend, between the Government and me—or it is one of the dividing lines—that I advocate the creation of a ministry of munitions, and that they do not think it is time to undertake it. It ought to have been created a year ago. No doubt it will be created 6 months or a year hence. What has been gained by the past delay? What will be gained by the further delay? Have things got any better since this time last year? Has the Government any assurance that they will get better by this time next year? Everything has become worse as every month has passed. Show me a single quarter in the world where there is the slightest improvement. Show me a single great new fact which should give us reassurance.

The rearmament of Germany is proceeding upon a colossal scale and at desperate breakneck speed. All Europe is arming and preparing the whole of industry for war. At the other end of the world Japan is fiercely arming and is in a state of the highest martial exaltation. All the old, evil factors which were apparent a year ago, all the old perils, are now presented in an aggravated form. The only new factor, the only great new prime factor, is the grave antagonism which has grown up between us and Italy. Can anyone deny that everything is worse, from the point of peace and safety, than it was this time last year? Three months ago there were many complaints in the defense debate about the vagueness of the "white paper." Why did the committee suppose that it was vague? I imagine it was vague because the Government had not the slightest idea of how and when it could be executed. But in this matter time is the supreme condition. You may draw up a program to be executed in 3 years. You may feel sure and tell Parliament that it will make us reasonably safe. So it might, if it could be executed in that time and if nothing else happened abroad before that time. But will anyone on the treasury bench say that punctuality can be achieved? Already we hear that the 3 years may be 4 or 5 years, etc. What does that mean? Of course it means that the program is already hopelessly in arrears; that deliveries are not coming to hand; that what the Government themselves think necessary for the safety of the country to be accomplished in no more than 3 years can only be accomplished in 5. Therefore, we shall not be provided with the safety which we need, because everything turns on time, and because, to use Burke's famous phrase, "Every single set of circumstances involves every other set." Where will others be, then, if you are late? What, for instance, will be the strength of the Germany Army or the German air force in 1938 or 1939?

Already, in the last Parliament, we had confessions of failure and of miscalculations about the air. My right honorable and learned friend has this afternoon revealed to us the terrible hiatus which must intervene before machine tools and gages can be supplied. Suppose, 3 years ago, when the Government were first warned, they had said, "We will, at any rate, begin to put our industries into a state of preparation. No one could say that is provocative." Ordering battleships, etc., might have disturbed your disarmament policy, but to make the simple provision of getting these indirect, but very vital, implements could not have been called provocative. "We will make the lay-outs of the factories. We will see about the precision tools. We will have everything ready, so that, if our well-meant example of disarming should not be followed by other countries, and if we pursue it to the last moment and then find ourselves in a difficult position, we shall, at any rate, have got ready underneath the means of repairing the risk that we have run. We can begin at once to rearm." If only 2 years ago the measures which have now been taken had been put into operation, we should be getting very considerable supplies. You would have your future in your own hands. You would be the masters of the events and not, perhaps, the victim. Even a year ago, when there was no dispute about the danger, when it was common ground among all parties, and when the Prime Minister admitted that mistakes had been made—even then there was just time to do a lot. Then "why stand we in jeopardy every hour"? Why, still, now at the eleventh hour, are we unable to decide on measures equal to the emergency? Is there no grip, no driving force, no mental energy, no power of decision or design? We are told that we must not interfere with the normal course of trade, that we must not alarm the easygoing voter and the public. How thin and paltry these arguments will sound if we are caught a year or two hence, fat, opulent, free spoken, and defenseless! I do not ask that war conditions should be established in order to execute these programs. All I ask is that these programs to which the Government have attached their confidence shall be punctually executed, whatever may be the disturbance of our daily life.

Later in the year he again referred to Germany's huge expenditures far exceeding England's, and said:

Last autumn I made a statement about Germany spending at the rate of the equivalent of £800,000,000 directly and indirectly upon warlike purposes, including strategic roads. I have often repeated the statement and it has often been challenged. I gave a very full account of the methods of calculation that I had employed. Now the Chancelor of the Exchequer at question time has given an answer, with the full knowledge of the Government, which in no way contradicts what I said, and anyone who reads the answer carefully will see that it is a complete acceptance of what I have said. I think, therefore, the committee may take it that £800,000,000 was the equivalent of German expenditure in 1935, and, as that rate is continuing, perhaps it may be £900,000,000 in the current year.

Now, there are the figures by which we can judge the scale of our own efforts. In January there was some talk of spending £300,000,000 apart from normal upkeep. Of course, it was absurd to suggest that any such sum could be spent this year. The Government were quite right not to tie themselves to spending any particular figure. I remember that I warned the House that I doubted if they could spend more than £50,000,000 additional to the regular estimates. Now, supplementary estimates

have been presented of £30,000,000, but that does not do justice to the Government's effort. There is a good deal of abnormal expenditure in the ordinary services this year, and it is fairer to compare with 1934, and therefore I take it that there is an increase of £75,000,000 toward making up deficiencies and toward expansion, above the 1934 expenditure.

We must compare these estimates with the German expenditure. I make full allowance for the fact that we do not need to keep a great continental army in this country. That makes the comparison between the two countries not at all exact. Nevertheless, it is of value to compare them for the purpose of seeing the scale on which the events are proceeding. If you want to compare them, you should first deduct from the £800,000,000 at least £300,000,000 for the upkeep in 1936 of the German forces. That leaves £500,000,000 for extraordinary expenditure and expansion for something very serious which may happen quite soon. This £500,000,000 compares with our £75,000,000. That gives us the scale.

My anxieties are not at all diminished by anything I have heard today. On the contrary, I feel that they are deepened and aggravated. Everyone is going away on holiday, and when we come back we shall all be looking forward to the coronation, but do not forget that all the time those remorseless hammers of which General Goering spoke are descending night and day in Germany, and that the most warlike and, in many ways, the most efficient people in Europe are becoming welded into a tremendous fighting machine equipped with the fearful agencies of modern science. That is a spectacle which I will not say is one that has never before existed, because it would be meaningless; it would fall utterly short of the facts. All I will say is that it is a machine upon which £800,000,000 or £900,000,000 are being spent for the second year in succession.

In December 1936 Mr. Churchill again called attention to lack of preparation in these words:

The Army lacks almost every weapon which is required for the latest form of modern war. Where are the antitank guns, where are the short-distance wireless sets, where are the field antiaircraft guns against low-flying armored airplanes? We want to know how it is that this country, with its enormous motoring and motorbicycling public, is not able to have strong mechanized divisions, both Regular and Territorial. Surely, when so much of the interest of our youth is moving in those mechanical channels, and when the horse is receding with the days of chivalry into the past, it ought to be possible to create an army of the size we want fully up to strength and mechanized to the highest degree.

Look at the Tank Corps. The tank was a British invention. This idea, which has revolutionized the conditions of modern war, was a British idea forced on the War Office by outsiders. Let me say they would have just as hard work today to force a new idea on it. I speak from what I know. During the war we had almost a monopoly, let alone the leadership, in tank warfare, and for several years afterward we held the foremost place. To England all eyes were turned. All that has gone now. Nothing has been done to equip the Tank Corps with new machines. The medium tank which they possess, which in its day was the best in the world, is now long obsolete. Not only in number—for there we have never tried to compete with other countries—but in quality these British weapons are now surpassed by those of Germany, Russia, Italy, and the United States. All the shell plants and gun plants in the Army, apart from the very small peacetime services, are in an elementary stage. A very long period must intervene before any effectual flow of munitions can be expected which should induce us to impinge on the normal course of trade. If we go on like this, and I do not see what power can prevent us from going on like this, some day there may be a terrible reckoning, and those who take the responsibility so entirely upon themselves are either of a hardy disposition or they are incapable of foreseeing the possibilities which may arise.

Now I come to the greatest matter of all, the air.

Parliament was promised a total of 71 new squadrons, making a total of 124 squadrons in the home-defense force, by March 31, 1937. This was thought to be the minimum compatible with our safety. At the end of the last financial year our strength was 53 squadrons, including auxiliary squadrons. Therefore, in the 32 weeks which have passed since the financial year began we have added 28 squadrons—that is to say, less than 1 new squadron each week. In order to make the progress which Parliament was promised, in order to maintain the program which was put forward as the minimum, we shall have to add 43 squadrons in the remaining 20 weeks, or over 2 squadrons a week. The rate at which new squadrons will have to be formed from now till the end of March will have to be nearly three times as fast as hitherto.

What is the comparable German strength? I am not going to give an estimate and say that the Germans have not got more than a certain number, but I will take it upon myself to say they most certainly at this moment have not got less than a certain number. Most certainly they have not got less than 1,500 first-line airplanes, comprised in lot less than 130 or 140 squadrons, including auxiliary squadrons. It must also be remembered that Germany has not got in its squadrons any machine the design and construction of which is more than 3 years old. It must also be remembered that Germany has specialized in long-distance bombing airplanes and that her preponderance in that respect is far greater than any of these figures would suggest.

We were promised most solemnly by the Government that air parity with Germany would be maintained by the home-defense forces. At the present time, putting everything at the very best, we are, upon the figures given by the Minister for the Coordination of Defense, only about two-thirds as strong as the German air force, assuming that I am not very much understating their present strength.

In the spring of 1938, following the annexation of Austria by Germany, Mr. Churchill said:

The gravity of the event of the 11th of March cannot be exaggerated. Europe is confronted with a program of aggression, nicely calculated and timed, unfolding stage by stage, and there is only one choice open not only to us but to other countries who are unfortunately concerned—either to submit, like Austria, or else to take effective measures while time remains to ward off the danger and, if it cannot be warded off, to cope with it. Resistance will be hard, yet I am persuaded that it is to this conclusion of resistance to overweening encroachment that His Majesty's Government will come, and the House of Commons will certainly sustain them in playing a great part in the effort to preserve the peace of Europe, and, if it cannot be preserved, to preserve the freedom of the nations of Europe. If we were to delay, if we were to go on waiting upon events for a considerable period, how much should we throw away of resources which are now available for our security and for the maintenance of peace? How many friends would be alienated, how many potential allies should we see go, one by one, down the grisly gulf, how many times would bluff succeed, until behind bluff, ever-gathering forces had accumulated reality? Where shall we be 2 years hence, for instance, when the German Army will certainly be much larger than the French Army, and when all the small nations will have fled from Geneva to pay homage to the ever-waxing power of the Nazi system, and to make the best terms they can for themselves?

We cannot leave the Austrian question where it is.

The public mind has been concentrated upon the moral and sentimental aspects of the Nazi conquest of Austria—a small country brutally struck down, its government scattered to the winds, the oppression of the Nazi party doctrine imposed upon a Catholic population and upon the working classes of Austria and of Vienna, the hard ill-usage of persecution which indeed will ensue—which is probably in progress at the moment—of those who this time last week were exercising their undoubted political rights, discharging their duties faithfully to their own country. All this we see very clearly, but there are some things which I have not seen brought out in the public press and which do not seem to be present in the public mind, and they are practical considerations of the utmost significance.

Vienna is the center of all the communications of all the countries which formed the old Austro-Hungarian Empire and of all the countries lying to the southeast of Europe. A long stretch of the Danube is now in German hands. This mastery of Vienna gives to Nazi Germany military and economic control of the whole of the communications of southeastern Europe by road, by river, and by rail. What is the effect of it upon what is called the balance of power, such as it is, and upon what is called the Little Entente? I must say a word about this group of powers called the Little Entente. Taken singly, the three countries of the Little Entente may be called powers of the second rank, but they are very vigorous states, and united they are a great power. They have hitherto been, and are still, united by the closest military agreement. Together they make the complement of a great power and of the military machinery of a great power. Rumania has the oil; Yugoslavia has the minerals and raw materials. Both have large armies; both are mainly supplied with munitions from Czechoslovakia. To English ears the name of Czechoslovakia sounds outlandish. No doubt they are only a small democratic state; no doubt they have an army only two or three times as large as ours; no doubt they have a munitions supply only three times as great as that of Italy—but still they are a virile people; they have their treaty rights, they have a line of fortresses, and they have a strongly manifested will to live freely.

Czechoslovakia is at this moment isolated, both in the economic and in the military sense. Her trade outlet through Hamburg, which is based upon the peace treaty, can, of course, be closed at any moment. Now her communications by rail and river to the south, and after the south to the southeast, are liable to be severed at any moment. Her trade may be subjected to tolls of an absolutely strangling character. Here is a country which was once the greatest manufacturing area in the old Austro-Hungarian Empire. It is cut off now, or may be cut off at once unless, out of these discussions which must follow, arrangements are made securing the communications of Czechoslovakia. She may be cut off at once from the sources of her raw material in Yugoslavia and from the natural markets which she has established there. The economic life of this small state may be practically destroyed as a result of the act of violence which was perpetrated last Friday night. A wedge has been driven into the heart of what is called the Little Entente, this group of countries which have as much right to live in Europe unmolested as any of us have the right to live unmolested in our native land.

It would be too complicated to pursue the economic, military, and material reactions, apart from moral sentiments altogether, into the other countries. It would take too long, but the effects of what has happened now upon Rumania, upon Hungary, upon Bulgaria, upon Turkey, must be the subject of the closest possible study, not only by His Majesty's Government, but by all who aspire to take part in the public discussion of these matters. By what has happened it is not too much to say that Nazi Germany, in its present mood, if matters are left as they are, is in a position to dominate the whole of southeast Europe. Over an area inhabited perhaps by 200,000,000 of people, Nazidom and all that it involves is moving on to absolute control. Therefore, I venture to

submit to the House that this Nazi conquest of Austria cannot remain where it is, and that a patient, determined, persevering discussion of it ought to take place and to be pushed forward, first of all, no doubt, through the chanceries and by the diplomatic channels, but also and ultimately it should be pushed forward in the natural place for such discussions at Geneva—under the League of Nations. We are not in a position to say tonight, "The past is the past." We cannot say, "The past is the past," without surrendering the future.

I affirm that the Government should express in the strongest terms our adherence to the Covenant of the League of Nations and our resolve to procure by international action the reign of law in Europe. I agree entirely with what has been said by the leaders of the two opposition parties upon that subject; and I was extremely glad to notice that at the beginning and in the very forefront of his speech the Prime Minister referred to the League of Nations and made that one of the bases of our right to intervene and to be consulted upon affairs in Central Europe. The matter has an importance in this country. There must be a moral basis for British rearmament and British foreign policy. We must have that basis if we are to unite and inspire our people and procure their wholehearted action, and if we are to stir the English-speaking people throughout the world.

Our affairs have come to such a pass that there is no escape without running risks. On every ground of prudence as well as of duty I urge His Majesty's Government to proclaim a renewed, revivified, unflinching adherence to the Covenant of the League of Nations. What is there ridiculous about collective security? The only thing that is ridiculous about it is that we have not got it. Let us see whether we cannot do something to procure a strong element of collective security for ourselves and for others. We have been urged to make common cause in self-defense with the French Republic. What is that but the beginning of collective security? I agree with that. Not so lightly will the two great liberal democracies of the west be challenged, and not so easily, if challenged, will they be subjugated. That is the beginning of collective security. But why stop there? Why be edged and pushed farther down the slope in a disorderly expostulating crowd of embarrassed states? Why not make a stand while there is still a good company of united, very powerful countries that share our dangers and aspirations? Why should we delay until we are confronted with a general landslide of those small countries passing over, because they have no other choice, to the overwhelming power of the Nazi regime?

If a number of states were assembled around Great Britain and France in a solemn treaty for mutual defense against aggression; if they had their forces marshalled in what you may call a grand alliance; if they had their staff arrangements concerted; if all this rested, as it can honorably rest, upon the Covenant of the League of Nations, in pursuance of all the purposes and ideals of the League of Nations; if that were sustained, as it would be, by the moral sense of the world; and if it were done in the year 1938—and, believe me, it may be the last chance there will be for doing it—then I say that you might even now arrest this approaching war. Then perhaps the curse which overhangs Europe would pass away. Then perhaps the ferocious passions which now grip a great people would turn inwards and not outwards in an internal rather than an external explosion, and mankind would be spared the deadly ordeal toward which we have been sagging and sliding month by month, I have ventured to indicate a positive conception, a practical and realistic conception, and one which I am convinced will unite all the forces of this country without whose help your armies cannot be filled or your munitions made. Before we cast away this hope, this cause, and this plan, which I do not at all disguise has an element of risk, let those who wish to reject it ponder well and earnestly upon what will happen to us if, when all else has been thrown to the wolves, we are left to face our fate alone.

In the last speech contained in the book, which he also delivered in the spring of 1938, Mr. Churchill uttered his last solemn warning:

A country like ours, possessed of immense territory and wealth, whose defenses have been neglected, cannot avoid war by dilating upon its horrors, or even by a continuous display of pacific qualities, or by ignoring the fate of the victims of aggression elsewhere. War will be avoided, in present circumstances, only by the accumulation of deterrents against the aggressor. If our defenses are weak, we must seek allies, and, of course, if we seek allies, alliances involve commitments. But the increase of commitments may be justified if it is followed by a still greater increase of deterrents against aggression.

I was very glad to hear the Prime Minister reaffirm in such direct terms our arrangements for mutual defense with the French Republic. Evidently they amount to a defensive alliance. Why not say so? Why not make it effective by a military convention of the most detailed character? Are we once again to have all the disadvantages of an alliance without its advantages, and to have commitments without full security? Great Britain and France have to stand together for mutual protection. Why should not the conditions be worked out precisely and the broad facts made public? Everyone knows, for instance, that our air force is tripled in deterrent effectiveness if it operates from the French bases, and, as I pointed out in the House 3 weeks ago, the fact that an attack upon this country would bring the attacker into conflict with the French Army is another great security to us here. We are obliged in return to go to the aid of France, and hitherto we have always been better than our word.

Here, then, is the great security for the two countries. Do not conceal it. Proclaim it, implement it, work it out in thorough detail. Treat the defensive problems of the two countries as if they were one. Then you will have a real deterrent against unprovoked aggression, and if the deterrent fails to deter, you will have a highly organized method of coping with the aggressor. The present rulers of Germany will hesitate long before they attack the British Empire and the French Republic if those are woven together for defense purposes into one very powerful unit. Having gone so far, there is no safe halting place short of an open defensive alliance with France, not with loose obligations, but with defined obligations on both sides and complete interstaff arrangements. Even an isolationist would, I think, go so far as to say, "If we have to mix ourselves up with the Continent, let us, at any rate, get the maximum of safety from our commitments."

I must say that I myself have not felt during this crisis that there is an immediate danger of a major land war breaking out over Czechoslovakia. I know it is very rash to make such a statement, but when there is so much natural, but misdirected alarm in the country, now on one point and now on another, one must run some risks in stating one's honest opinions. At any rate, that is the assumption on which I base my argument this afternoon, and I will give my reasons to the House. The first reason is that, in the opinion of many good judges, Germany is not ready this year for such an ordeal as a major land war. The second reason carries more conviction to me, because obviously the first is based upon facts which one cannot measure and secrets which one cannot probe. It is that I cannot see that it would be to the interest of the rulers of Germany to provoke such a war.

Are they not getting all they want without? Are they not achieving a long succession of most important objectives without firing a single shot? Is there any limit to the economic and political pressure which, without actually using military force, Germany will be able to bring to bear upon this unhappy state? She can be convulsed politically, she can be strangled economically, she is practically surrounded by superior forces, and unless something is done to mitigate the pressure of circumstances, she will be forced to make continuous surrenders, far beyond the bounds of what any impartial tribunal would consider just or right, until finally her sovereignty, her independence, her integrity, have been destroyed. Why, then, should the rulers of Germany strike a military blow? Why should they incur the risk of a major war?

Moreover, I think it is to be considered that there are other, even more tempting lines of advance open to Germany's ambitions. A serious disturbance among the Hungarian population in the Rumanian province of Transylvania might offer a pretext for the entry of German troops, at a Hungarian invitation or without it. Then all the possibilities of the oil and food of Rumania would be open. Here, again, force may be voiced and virtual annexation may be veiled in the guise of a compulsory alliance. In the meantime the control of Vienna enables the economic fortunes of all the states of the Danubian Basin to be manipulated, exploited, and controlled so as to favor German designs, and for the benefit of German finance, trade, and arms. Why, then, should Germany go to the one place where she would encounter the veto of France, and of Russia, which has also made definite assurances? I do not think the government would have run very much risk if they had added the full force of Great Britain to the French declaration about Czechoslovakia. They would not greatly have increased their commitments and they would have made assurance doubly sure.

But the story of this year is not ended at Czechoslovakia. It is not ended this month. The might behind the German dictator increases daily. His appetite may grow with eating. The forces of law and freedom have for a long time known nothing but rebuffs, failures, and humiliations. Their influence would be immensely increased by any signs of concerted action and initiative and combination. The fact that Britain and France combined together at such a moment in such a cause would give them the strength and authority that they need in order to convince wavering states that they might find a good company of determined people to whom they might join themselves upon the basis of the covenant and in accordance with its principles. On the morrow of such a proof of unity as could be given between Great Britain and France we might be able to make such an arrangement, or begin to make it, for the effective fulfillment of the covenant. We might have a group of powers, as it were mandatories of the league, who would be the guardians of civilization, and once this was set up strong and real it would liberate us, at least over a long period, from the torments of uncertainty and anxiety which we now have to endure. Joint action on this occasion would make easier and safer the problem of dealing with the next occasion. If successful, it would certainly pave the way to more effective joint action in the enforcement of the nonintervention policy in Spain. Nations that have joined together to meet one particular emergency may well find, when they look around, that they have assembled forces sufficient to deal with other emergencies not yet before us, and thus we may gather an ever-growing company, ranged under standards of law and justice, submitting themselves to principles that they are ready to enforce; and thus, by military and moral means combined, we may once more regain the ascendant and the initiative for the free peoples of the world and throughout the Empire.

Do not let anyone suppose that this is a mere question of hardening one's heart and keeping a stiff upper lip, and standing by to see Czechoslovakia poleaxed or tortured as Austria has been. Something more than that particular kind of fortitude will be needed from us. It is not only Czechoslovakia that will suffer. Look at the states of the Danube Basin. First and foremost there is Yugoslavia. That is a most powerful and virile state, three-quarters of whose martial people are undoubtedly in the fullest sympathy with the democracy of France and Great Britain, and are animated by an ardent hatred of Nazi or Fascist rule. They have a rooted desire to maintain themselves in their independence. Is nothing being done to ascertain what Yugoslavia would do, assuming that Great Britain and France were prepared to interest themselves in the problems of the Danube Basin? Yugoslavia might well be gained, and I am told that the effect of that on Bulgaria would probably be to draw her into the same orbit. Then there is Rumania, so directly menaced by the potential German movement to the east. These three countries, if left alone, and convinced that there is no will power operating against the dictators, will fall one by one into the Nazi grip and system. What then will be the position of Greece and Turkey?

I ask these questions, hoping that they may be carefully considered. Is it not possible that decided action by France and Great Britain would rally the whole of these five states as well as Czechoslovakia, all of whom have powerful armies, who together aggregate 75,000,000 people, who have several millions of fighting men already trained, who have immense resources, who all wish to dwell in peace within their habitations, who individually may be broken by defeat and despoiled, but who, united, constitute an immense resisting power? Can nothing be done to keep them secure and free and to unite them in their own interests, in French and British interests and, above all, in the interests of peace? Are we really going to let the whole of these tremendous possibilities fall away without a concerted effort of any kind? If we do, let us not suppose for a moment that we shall ourselves have escaped our perils. On the contrary, we shall have multiplied our perils, for a very obvious reason. At present Germany might contemplate a short war, but once she has laid hands on these countries and extended her power to the Black Sea the Nazi regime will be able to feed itself indefinitely, however long war may last, and thus we may weaken the deterrent force against war of that blockade to which the honorable Member who has just spoken referred. We should have removed another of the deterrents that stand between us and war. The nazification of the whole of the Danube states is a danger of the first capital magnitude to the British Empire. Is all to go for nothing? Is it all to be whistled down the wind? If so, we shall repent in blood and tears our improvidence and our lack of foresight and energy.

Two years ago it was safe, 3 years ago it was easy, and 4 years ago a mere dispatch might have rectified the position. But where shall we be a year hence? Where shall we be in 1940? In these next few months all these substantial countries will be deciding whether they will rally, as they would desire to do, to the standards of civilization which still fly over Geneva, or whether they will be forced to throw in their lot and adopt the system and the doctrines of the Nazi powers. The Prime Minister spoke about the negotiations with Italy. I forbear to comment upon them, because I prefer to await the results when they are presented to us. I know no more effective means of aiding those negotiations than the creation of a Danubian bloc, and nothing that would make it more likely that any engagement entered into would bear fruit and be effective in the hour of serious need. I trust that the Government will do their utmost. If it is too late, the evil is upon us, but do not let any chance be thrown away of endeavoring to save this great area from being overrun, exploited, and despoiled.

I now come to the second aspect of the deterrents which we are assembling against aggression—namely, national defense. I welcome very much the announcement that the Prime Minister has made in this respect, and particularly his decision to consult the trade unions. I know that he is averse from hasty decisions. No one can say that this is a hasty decision in the third year of rearmament. I was very glad also to hear the reassurance that drastic action will be taken to augment the speed of our air program, of our air raid precautions system, and our our antiaircraft artillery. It is only a fortnight ago that my right honorable friend told us he was satisfied that we were making the best and the most effective use of our resources. However, it appears that there were other resources not being used which now will be used in a greater effort. I regret very much that these additional resources have not been applied during the last 2 years, when the air program was seen to be trailing so far behind. Not only did we start 2 years too late, but the second 2 years have been traversed at only half speed.

Let me give a warning drawn from our recent experiences. Very likely this immediate crisis will pass, will dissipate itself and calm down. After a boaconstrictor has devoured its prey it often has a considerable digestive spell. It was so after the revelation of the secret German air force. There was a pause. It was so after German conscription was proclaimed in breach of the treaty. It was so after the Rhineland was forcibly occupied. The House may recall that we were told how glad we ought to be because there would be no question of fortifying it. Now, after Austria has been struck down, we are all disturbed and alarmed, but in a little while there may be another pause. There may not—we cannot tell. But if there is a pause, then people will be saying, "See how the alarmists have been confuted; Europe has calmed down, it has all blown over, and the war scare has passed away." The Prime Minister will perhaps repeat what he said a few weeks ago, that the tension in Europe is greatly relaxed. The Times will write a leading article to say how silly those people look who on the morrow of the Austrian incorporation raised a clamor for exceptional action in foreign policy and home defense, and how wise the government were not to let themselves be carried away by this passing incident.

All this time the vast degeneration of the forces of parliamentary democracy will be proceeding throughout Europe. Every 6 weeks another corps will be added to the German Army. All this time important countries and great rail and river communications will pass under the control of the German General Staff. All this time populations will be continually reduced to the rigors of Nazi domination and assimilated to that system. All this time the forces of conquest and intimidation will be consolidated, towering up soon in real and not make-believe strength and superiority. Then presently will come another stroke. Upon whom? Our questions with Germany are unsettled and unanswered. We cannot tell. What I dread is that the impulse now given to active effort may pass away when the dangers are not diminishing, but accumulating and gathering as country after country is involved in the Nazi system, and as their vast preparations reach their final perfection.

For 5 years I have talked to the House on these matters—not with very great success. I have watched this famous island descending incontinently, recklessly, the stairway which leads to a dark gulf. It is a fine, broad stairway at the beginning, but after a bit the carpet ends. A little farther on there are only flagstones, and a little farther on still these break beneath your feet. Look back over the last 5 years. It is true that great mistakes were made in the years immediately after the war. But at Locarno we laid the foundation from which a great forward movement could have been made. Germany began to rearm in earnest and openly to seek revenge. If we study the history of Rome and Carthage, we can understand what happened and why. It is not difficult to form an intelligent view about the three Punic Wars; but if mortal catastrophe should overtake the British Nation and the British Empire, historians a thousand years hence will still be baffled by the mystery of our affairs. They will never understand how it was that a victorious nation, with everything in hand, suffered themselves to be brought low, and to cast away all that they had gained by measureless sacrifice and absolute victory—gone with the wind.

Now the victors are the vanquished, and those who threw down their arms in the field and sued for an armistice are striding on to world mastery. That is the position—that is the terrible transformation that has taken place bit by bit. I rejoice to hear from the Prime Minister that a further supreme effort is to be made to place us in a position of security. Now is the time at last to rouse the nation. Perhaps it is the last time it can be roused with a chance of preventing war or with a chance of coming through to victory, should our efforts to prevent war fail. We should lay aside every hindrance and endeavor, by uniting the whole force and spirit of our people, to raise again a great British nation standing up before all the world; for such a nation, rising in its ancient vigor, can even at this hour save civilization.

Mr. Speaker, to me it seems that the outstanding lesson for us to learn from the experiences of England, as described by Winston Churchill, is the wisdom and absolute necessity of our increasing and strengthening our national defenses. In this connection I desire to quote, in conclusion, the words of two great Americans who are also authorities on this subject—Capt. Eddie Rickenbacker and Col. Charles A. Lindbergh.

Captain Rickenbacker, in a recent radio address, said:

With a strong Navy, and an air force of 25,000 pilots and 50,000 planes, no foreign government dare even think in terms of war against us; and if they be so foolish, our people need have no fear of invasion.

Colonel Lindbergh, in his recent radio address, said:

Let us look to our own defenses and to our own character. If we attend to them, we have no need to fear what happens elsewhere. If we do not attend to them, nothing can save us.

From Palm to Pine Through a Land of Enchantment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 5, 1939

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, so much has been done by Congress to aid the States in the commendable

work of highway building that every United States highway, whether running east and west or north and south, is of great interest to national lawmakers and administrative officials at Washington. However, some of these newer highways in the West are of greater interest because of their possibilities. The United States Highway 89, through Arizona, or a link of the same, is a case to illustrate.

In general, highways have been built east and west with greater enthusiasm and more outlay, especially west of the Mississippi River, than have roads north and south. Perhaps this is because the general trend of our population movement is toward the West. One great objective in highway building has been to connect the East and Middle West with the far West and Pacific coast by concrete roads or other types of modern highway construction. A fairly good job has been done in building these east-west modern roads. Arizona has logically received her liberal share. Four great transcontinental highways cross Arizona; namely, United States Highways 60, 66, 70, and 80. We would be delighted to have Arizona crossed north and south by four such remarkable highways. It is about one of these north-south highways that I rise to speak today.

First, let me explain why four transcontinental east and west highways pass through Arizona. It is because Arizona is geographically a gateway to the Pacific Coast. Arizona always has been such a gateway. The great barrier between the eastern part of our country and the Pacific coast has been the Rocky Mountain area. This great natural barrier is lowest in Arizona. That geographical fact explains why two transcontinental railroads were built across Arizona to the Pacific coast. It also explains why air travel, either by plane or dirigible to the Pacific coast, prefers to pass over Arizona, and these geographical conditions permitting all-year-round travel, unhampered by snow and bad weather, really explain the presence of four transcontinental roads running east and west through Arizona.

On next Sunday, October 8, the Governor of Arizona and a large concourse of people will meet at Sedona in Oak Creek Canyon, in northern Arizona, for the celebration of the completion of a highway through Oak Creek Canyon, from the Verde Valley to Flagstaff. This completes another north-south road and closes a link in a significant international highway, reaching from Mexico to Canada, and now makes it possible to travel on good, modern pavement all the way from Mexico to neighboring Canada on the north. I wish I might have all the Members of this Chamber as my guests for a few hours in this beautiful Oak Creek Canyon where the celebration is being held. I did invite the Members of the House Committee on Naval Affairs to be my guests in Arizona this September 13 and 14, and had made tentative arrangements with two chambers of commerce to take my colleagues through Oak Creek Canyon as a part of their sightseeing in northern Arizona. Some bad storms and the calling of the special session changed the committee's plans and prevented the carrying out of mine. This rare treat is yet in store, not only for the Members of the House Naval Affairs Committee, but, I hope, for many others of my colleagues as well.

United States Highway 89 leads through some of the most scenic portions of Arizona. Whether this new link from Prescott and Jerome to Flagstaff, by way of Oak Creek Canyon, will become a part of United States Highway 89, which now follows a different course, has yet to be decided, but that it will be a part of some United States highway running north and south cannot be doubted. And what a highway! Of all the highways of America over which I have ever traveled, I know of none over which I would rather take my friends for a thrill, such as scenic grandeur can give.

Oak Creek Canyon is a miniature Grand Canyon of the Colorado. The Grand Canyon in northern Arizona is known throughout the world and is recognized as the most sublime natural spectacle on earth, but I tell you truly that Oak Creek Canyon, in my judgment, will repay a second visit, even more than the Grand Canyon. It has all the gorgeous colorings in the canyon walls which may be found in the Grand Canyon. It is drawn on a much smaller scale so that its sublimity is concentrated, and it may now be traversed with ease on a splendid automobile road. Gentlemen of Congress, I could wish nothing better for myself than to join the Governor of Arizona next Sunday in this celebration at Oak Creek Canyon, and I could wish nothing better for you than that you might be my guests on a trip through Oak Creek Canyon on this new highway.

Price Movement and the Shoe Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM D. BYRON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 5, 1939

Mr. BYRON. Mr. Speaker, the remarks I am going to make today are addressed to the President of the United States and the Tariff Commission, as well as to this House, of which I have the honor of being a Member. My remarks are on a subject that is being discussed by the general public and is being closely watched by the administration and practically every branch of the Federal Government. I refer to the subject of the price movement and the possibility that we will all have to pay higher prices for commodities and the necessities of life. There is, I am sure, in this crisis a general feeling among sound businessmen that they should not allow, if they can possibly help, the prices of raw materials, commodities, and finished goods to advance to the point where they will suffer from some of the violent reactions we have had in the past.

This feeling, I believe, is somewhat of a change of heart for business brought about undoubtedly by sad experience, but it nevertheless will help the Congress materially in its work to protect the ultimate consumer from excessive extortion and unreasonable cost of living. However, the businessman who knows that an inflated price level will eventually work to his ultimate disadvantage will need help in some cases from the Federal Government.

I shall attempt to prove my point by expressing my views on a subject with which I am familiar and on a business with which I have been intimately associated for 25 years. I refer to the shoe and leather industry, one of the most important and certainly economically necessary in the United States.

In 1929, the Seventieth Congress passed what is known as the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act. You are all familiar with the consequence of this legislation, which a great many people think did more to start the depression and to bring on the collapse of business than anything else up to that time.

In my own mind and for our own industry, it was a very vicious and pernicious piece of legislation. Now, however, we are in the situation where prices are advancing at a very rapid rate either through scarcity or speculation, and the question arises as to how we can keep them under control. When the price of sugar started to get out of line several weeks ago the President, in his wisdom, canceled sugar quotas and immediately a sharp upturn was at least checked for the time being. I have heard nothing but favorable comment on his action.

The price of manufactured shoes to the retailer and through him to the ultimate consumer depends largely on the price of

the leather that goes into them. Of course, there are other factors which might raise or lower the manufacturing cost, such as labor and overhead, but I find in examining the figures that on a girl's shoe which is produced in volume and a manufacturer will sell for, say, $1.55, the value of the leather is 64 cents, or approximately 40 percent of the cost. The same is true in the selling price of the leather where the value of the hide is even more and in some cases runs as high as 65 percent of the cost.

So it is very reasonable to assume that any steps that can be taken to keep hide prices down to a reasonable level will, in the end, keep down the cost of shoes to the general public. My own figures show that on the present market a 10-percent rise in hide prices—and they have gone up now considerably more than that—reflects at least 8 cents a pair in the particular shoe about which I am speaking. Now the retailer may be able to absorb from 5 to 10 cents a pair without adding to the price to the consumer. However, the chances are that he will not, and that this shoe will be taken out of the $1.55 price level and, instead of retailing for $1.99, it will immediately go to $2.25.

Now, there is nothing exorbitant about these figures, which are based on a small profit for the shoe manufacturer and the shoe retailer. Suppose, however, we would take the 10-percent ad valorem duty off of the South American hides which was placed there by the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act, and which was designed to help the farmer, and nearly broke everyone in the United States—would we not place a large portion of this great industry in a position to keep down the cost of its product? Of course, there is also a duty on leather and a duty on shoes, but with practically every other country in the world at war, they will be too busy manufacturing for themselves to import finished products into this country.

Now, as I have said, this duty placed by the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act on hides and skins was designed to help the farmer. I think the average farmer will tell any Member of Congress that it did nothing for him at that time. The fact is that the large packing companies consider the hides as more or less a banana peel when they are purchasing cattle. It is true that a number of the big packers take the hides from their own kill and put them in their own tanneries at whatever price they please, and in this manner can control, to a large extent, the market on leather for their own convenience. But this is another subject, and might later be worth looking into if price conditions should get very bad. The point I make now, however, and in conclusion, is that by putting hides and skins back on the free list, where they had been for, I believe, 50 years, or until the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act, will tend to put the price of shoes down to the ultimate consumer and will have no effect on the farmer.

I am sending these remarks to the President of the United States, the Tariff Commission, and to the various departments of the Government which I think will be interested.

The Share of the Domestic Market Supplied by the American Farmer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK H. BUCK
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 5, 1939

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, there seem to be several of us who desire to keep the record clear as far as information regarding farm activities is concerned. For some time past we have heard a good deal of discussion about keeping the American market for the American farmer, the inference being that he was imposed upon by imports of commodities that are classed as agriculture.

Let us look into this. The American farmer still has the American market for the things he produces, the same as he has always had. For many years he has been supplying approximately 90 percent of the domestic market. In recent years that percentage has not declined; if anything, it has increased.

But why does not the American farmer, with his agricultural surpluses, supply 100 percent of the domestic market?

The American farmer might possibly be able to supply 100 percent of the domestic market. If he were to completely supply the domestic market, however, he would be doing two things.

First, he would be raising products which he is not equipped to produce, such as coffee, rubber, silk, and bananas. Consequently they would be produced only at a high unit cost, if at all.

Second, because he would be shutting out all imports of foreign farm products into this country, his products would likewise be barred from foreign markets. And since the American farmer needs more than the American market, he could not afford that course. For instance, during the past 15 years, our domestic agricultural exports have averaged $1,346,000,000, whereas competitive imports have averaged $718,000,000. To have gone on a strictly nationalistic basis during this period would have cost the American farmer $528,000,000 a year.

In other words, it is more economical for the farmer to produce an abundance of those commodities which he is best equipped to produce—with them supplying the home market and selling the remainder abroad—while he lets foreign producers supply a trickle of competitive imports and certain specialty articles not so readily produced in this country.

In order to visualize just what the share of the domestic market supplied by the American farmer amounts to, I append hereto a table covering the years 1924 to 1938, which is self-explanatory.

The share of the domestic market supplied by the American farmer, calendar years 1924–38 [1]

Year	Gross farm income (1)	Domestic farm exports −15 percent (2)	Competitive farm imports +25 percent (3)	Value of domestic farm market [column (1) − (2) + (3)] (4)	Imports of domestic farm market [column (3) ÷ (4)] (5)	Domestic market supplied by American farmer (6)
					Percent	*Percent*
1924	$11,483,000,000	$1,793,000,000	$1,230,000,000	$10,920,000,000	11	89
1925	12,800,000,000	1,816,000,000	1,251,000,000	12,235,000,000	10	90
1926	12,378,000,000	1,544,000,000	1,216,000,000	12,050,000,000	10	90
1927	12,437,000,000	1,602,000,000	1,245,000,000	12,080,000,000	10	90
1928	12,816,000,000	1,584,000,000	1,194,000,000	12,426,000,000	10	90
1929	12,791,000,000	1,439,000,000	1,271,000,000	12,623,000,000	10	90
1930	10,337,000,000	1,021,000,000	876,000,000	10,192,000,000	9	91
1931	7,397,000,000	698,000,000	559,000,000	7,258,000,000	8	92
1932	5,562,000,000	563,000,000	370,000,000	5,369,000,000	7	93
1933	[2] 6,273,000,000	590,000,000	456,000,000	6,139,000,000	7	93
1934	[2] 7,182,000,000	623,000,000	516,000,000	7,075,000,000	7	93
1935	[2] 8,115,000,000	635,000,000	736,000,000	8,216,000,000	9	91
1936	[2] 9,385,000,000	603,000,000	869,000,000	9,651,000,000	9	91
1937	[2] 9,983,000,000	677,000,000	1,085,000,000	10,391,000,000	10	90
1938 [3]	[2] 8,738,000,000	704,000,000	596,000,000	8,630,000,000	7	93

[1] Revised June 14 to agree with revised B. A. E. gross income figures as released June 5, 1939.
[2] Excludes Government payments.
[3] Preliminary.
Compiled by Division of Information, Agricultural Adjustment Administration, from published Bureau of Agricultural Economics data.

Neutrality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT L. VREELAND
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 5, 1939

LETTER FROM HON. JOHN A. MATTHEWS

Mr. VREELAND. Mr. Speaker, it is most interesting to note in the question of neutrality that persons not in legislative work really think out the issues and are interested enough in the welfare of their country to present their views to their Representatives.

The following is a very masterful treatise on the question of neutrality by the very able judge, John A. Matthews, of Newark, who is highly respected by every member of the bar of our State:

NEWARK, N. J., *September 19, 1939.*

Hon. ALBERT L. VREELAND,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN VREELAND: May I identify myself as Judge John A. Matthews, of Newark, N. J., who appeared before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee at the last session of Congress and who wrote you and sent you, at your request, a copy of an address I delivered over the radio against repealing the embargo provisions of our present neutrality law?

Well, our prophecy has come true. The international bankers and "the captains of business and finance" are once again doing what William Allen White says at page 371 of his book, "Woodrow Wilson," they did in 1917, "superimposing their will upon the will of kings," and, as is plain to see, upon our President, and they are trying hard to impose it upon the Congress.

You may recall that my fellow Democrat, KEY PITTMAN, resented that statement when I made it at your committee hearing. But it is just as true today as White says it was true in our pre-World War days. Moreover, White says, again at page 371, "Democracy had no champion in those days. It (the war) began as a war for commercial power. War motives were shot through with the greed of junkerdom in every European capital." And so it is today.

May I venture the following suggestions to you, who, in the providence of God, will keep alive the truth of what Champ Clark, the father of Senator CHAMP CLARK, once said on the floor of the House, namely, that "the history of our country seems like a last attempt on the part divine Providence in behalf of the human race."

1. I think Senator VANDENBERG'S reported statement that "you cannot be an arsenal for one belligerent without being a target for the other" can well be the keynote of our campaign against destroying the protection which American mothers now have for the sons they went down into "the valley of the shadow" to bring into this world.

2. The Nation should know the real purpose of Morgenthau's visit to Europe this summer and whether his visit had to do with this campaign to put us into the blood business. We should find out whether the European banking and munitions gang held parley with our dictator of the "stabilization fund."

3. The Nation should have its attention called to J. P. Morgan's "grouse hunting" trip to Europe this summer, at which time he "entertained" the King of England after the King had returned from his "visit" to America. When Morgan arrived home, just before war was declared, he is reported to have said to newspapermen that it would be natural for his firm to be asked to be agent for the purchase of war supplies here for England and France. Remember they were in the days of the World War, when, as Hendricks' book, The Life and Letters of Walter H. Page, shows, we paid England's overdraft of her account for war supplies with J. P. Morgan to the extent of $400,000,000 "out of the proceeds of the first Liberty loan" (vol. II, pp. 272, 273). And remember that's what England owed Morgan on April 6, 1917, when we entered the war. And that's what "cash and carry" will turn out to be if we become England's arsenal. Indeed, if the Nation has put before it the financial condition, the debt of England and France today (Paul Mallon had a brief résumé of it in his column recently), our people will realize that in a so-called long war, which the propagandists for England are now declaring this war must be, neither England nor France could begin to pay cash even on the basis of what they bought and never paid for in the World War. Cash and carry is only a catch phrase to delude the American people. If they have the cash, let England pay now what she owes us—$3,316,858,552. And let France pay us her debt—$3,654,944,930.

4. The country should also get this picture. Why are the propagandists for England and France flooding our press and radio with statements that there will and must be no short war, but that the war must last "2 or 3 years"? Even allowing that Hitler is the "aggressor" in Poland—and he is "aggressing" for what the burglars of Versailles took from the country he fought for as a citizen and as a soldier—why should overtures for peace after the conquest of Poland be refused in advance of their being actually made? And why should our country by her unneutral act in repealing the arms embargo and thus making possible a "long war" by becoming first the arsenal of England and France and ultimately their cobelligerent—why should our country, I say, join with self-seeking England in closing all the doors to peace and remove herself from the only role she should play in this conflict, that of arbiter and peacemaker?

Let us make no mistake about it. History will rightly lay at our door this threatened world carnage if we join in this dastardly business of closing the doors to an early peace. The fate of Poland, who selfishly abetted the fate of Czecho-Slovakia, may well be mollified by an early peace, the terms of which we, as a neutral, might well be consulted about. A World War can mean only, as Herbert Hoover says, "universal dictatorship."

Moreover, as Hoover says in the same article, "no competent observer believes that the dictatorships, singly or in combination, could successfully attack the Western Hemisphere, even if they were inclined to try it, which they are not. * * * We cannot become the world's policeman unless we are prepared to sacrifice millions of American lives—and probably some day see all the world against us. In time they would envisage us as the world's greatest bully, not as the world's greatest idealist. * * * War means that our country must be mobilized into practically a Fascist state. It would be so organized. It went some distance in the last Great War, although we did not use that term at the time. It would have gone much further if the war had extended longer. I speak as this not from hearsay but as one who participated in the economic organization of the Great War. I saw the rise of opposition to demobilization of the interests which benefited, and I have seen the attempts to restore these measures ever since. * * * Let us at least recognize that a war to save liberty would probably destroy liberty. In my view, another great war will make dictatorship universal." (Liberty Magazine, April 15, 1939.)

Incidentally, I notice Roosevelt didn't ask Hoover to the conference for Thursday next. Yet Hoover has had more international experience and knows more of European intrigues than Landon or newspaper owner Knox ever could know. If there is to be no politics in this conference, why leave Hoover out?

5. Again the Nation should reflect on this eventuality. Russia, whom England wooed in vain, has a big ideological foothold in France, as was evidenced by the all but successful efforts of the "Front Populaire." Who knows whether if by our unneutral act of repealing the embargo we become England's arsenal and thus really create the "long war" into which we, as a result of repeal, will surely be drawn, who knows whether we may not be left "holding the bag" with England, who, of course, will then fight "to the last American." With Japan and Russia in comparative entente, with Germany and Russia in declared entente, it is not my unreasonable fear that France may, in a "long war," find herself internally fomented by the present seemingly dormant "Popular Front" crowd until revolution compels her alinement with her ideological friends. And let it be noted that the Communist crowd in France, or call it if you will the leftist crowd, or the Socialist crowd, refused to accept preferred places in the Daladier war cabinet under the pretext that the representation offered wasn't commensurate with their strength and members in the nation.

6. Our people should be told of an opinion recently given by Henry L. Fraser, an authority on international law and a member of a committee which has recently completed a 3-year study of the subject of neutrality. Mr. Fraser may be quoted as follows: "A more difficult question arises when a neutral state relaxes its regulations existing at the outbreak of war. Would the lifting of the present prohibition on the export of arms, ammunitions, and implements of war * * * compromise our neutral status? It seems clear to me that the lifting today of such embargo would be an unneutral act." (Cf. New York American, September 16, 1939.)

And suppose that Germany upon our repeal of the embargo should call it what it is in international law, an unneutral act, how long do you think it would be before we were given, not incidents, but an invitation into war? The game of European power politics has no rules; its chips are human lives. Let America ponder being the cause of a "long war" by becoming its arsenal. Let us not merit the blame for destroying civilization by cooperating to block an early peace.

7. The Nation should have the "lay aside partisan politics" plea stripped of its camouflage. The "limited emergency proclamation" of the President looks like a political move. It will be only 21 days after war was declared in Europe that you of the Congress are called into special session. Why didn't he call you before he proclaimed this "emergency"? Was it because he wanted to put himself before the country in a position to dictate terms to you of the Congress when he should call you into special session? Let the Nation know that the real "emergency" in our country today is the solution of our domestic problems and not European power politics. Lifting the embargo would be plunging into European politics as the rankest kind of a partisan.

As the erstwhile New Dealer, Moley, says in his book, After Seven Years (Harper Bros.):

"The American people have been told that they must help the democracies because two or more forms of government cannot coexist in the world, because the world must become all democratic or all totalitarian. This, of course, is a fallacy.

"In point of fact, there has been no scintilla of evidence that Britain and France are at all concerned with the defense of democracy or with a desire to bring all nations to the democratic form of

government. War has threatened not because of the internal horrors produced by Hitler's intolerance but because of a struggle over the boundary lines of Europe. Only our bellicose patriots forget the distinction."

8. The country should be told on the floor of Congress and by you real Americans over the radio who the arch propagandists for repeal really are. As Colonel Lindbergh said over the radio, September 15 (cf. New York Times, September 16): "We must learn to look behind every article we read and every speech we hear. We must not only inquire about the writer and the speaker—about his personal interests and his nationality—but we must ask who owns and who influences the newspaper, the news picture, and the radio station."

Tell the country who is and what is behind Stimson. Reveal Nicholas Murray Butler, lately returned from England, in his true light as America's Anglophile No. 1. Expose that "educational congress" in New York under Butlerian auspices, which timed itself almost to the month of the declaration of war, and show how Englishmen hogged the stage to propagandize America to the side of England. Point out how Lord Lothian (formerly Philip Kerr, Lloyd George's alter ego at the Peace Conference) now England's Ambassador to the United States, is a close friend of Geoffrey Dawson, editor of the London Times, and "one of the 10 most important people in England." He is to this propaganda drive for war what Lord Northcliffe was in the pre-World War days.

9. Finally, may I suggest that you call the attention of the Senate to what to my mind is the real story behind this repeal-the-embargo campaign, namely, the greed of the captains of industry and finance, or to put it another way, the greed of the international banker-munition makers.

You will find ample proof that history is repeating what William Allen White said was done in pre-World War days, by reading pages 123 to 126 of Gunther's book, Inside Europe. May I give you a few high lights of quotation from these pages as follows:

"The arms companies are as incestuous as white mice. They play together and breed. * * * Extraordinarily interrelated and intertwined the arms firms lace the whole world in their net. * * * It has long been known that French and German steel producers had an unwritten understanding during the World War not to bomb each other's plants. * * * War scares are good; real wars will be better. Let there be no mistake about it. Arms dealers want war. They are hypocrites if they deny this. War is to them what milk is to a baby. They fatten on it. They fatten on it like pigs in corn."

Another illuminating source of proof that these merchants of murder want to see the embargo on implements of war removed may be found in Pierre Van Paasen's recent book Days of Our Years, at pages 75, 76, 131, 132, the highlights of which may be quoted as follows:

"Representatives of the German Chemical Trust, of the Swiss copper interests, and of Vickers (British arms company), Krupp (German arms company), Schneider-Creusot (French arms company), and the Comité des Forges (French steel makers' trade association, which dominates the policy of its 250 producers who are its members by allotting quotas and setting prices) met in Vienna at the moment (during the World War) when the armies were locked in a death struggle in the mud of Flanders. Their sole purpose was to devise ways and means of keeping the war going profitably. 'People believe they are dying for their fatherland; they are dying for the industrialists,' said Anatole France, when he learned the answer of Senator Berenger as to why the metallurgical district of Thionville was not taken back at the outbreak of the war, when it was undefended by the Germans and the French Army was within a stone's throw. The reason no attempt has been made to recapture Thionville was that it would have brought the war to a premature termination. 'For the occupation of Thionville,' declared the Senator, 'would have reduced Germany to 7,000,000 tons of poor steel per year; all production would have been stopped. Seizure of Thionville would have put an end to the war immediately.' The stoppage of the war was to be prevented at all costs."

Is history about to repeat itself? Must there be a "long war" to "stop Hitlerism," or to "seek fools' gold," as President Roosevelt said August 14, 1936, at Chautauqua, N. Y., or to enrich the international merchants of murder?

But perhaps the most illuminating quotation from Van Paasen, which reveals the real story behind this present war, is the following, which I will set out in full so that the entire context may be had:

"Paul Faure, deputy for the district of Le Creusot, revealed in the French Parliament that Schneider-Creusot, the mammoth French Cannon Trust, headed by the cousins De Wendel, one of whom was a member of the French Chamber and the other of the German Reichstag, was contributing funds to the Nazi Party of Adolf Hitler, and that Skoda, the Czechoslovakian Armament Trust, which is largely controlled by Schneider-Creusot, was supplying Germany with artillery, gunpowder, and cartridges on credit.

"Why should Hitler have received French, Czechoslovakian, and British money (for Sir Henry Deterding, chairman of Royal Dutch Shell, was also reported amongst the contributors to the Nazi Party's funds)? The answer is simple. One needed but read the Führer's book, Mein Kampf. In that document, the upstart party leader, with scarcely 10,000 followers at the time he wrote the book, announced that his first task upon attaining power would be to rearm the Reich. Did not such a man deserve international sympathy and support? Armament factories all over the continent were standing idle, dividends were sinking, stock quotations going lower and lower. And not a cloud on the horizon to give the deadly armament industry a little spurt; no danger anywhere to warrant the manufacture of a single gun. Would it not be a godsend if Hitler could come to power and make Germany dangerous once more? Wouldn't that be sufficient excuse to kill all this nonsense in Geneva about world peace and disarmament? Once Germany started to rearm, all could follow suit. For the primary condition of a general armament campaign is the rearmament of only one powerful state. With Germany on the way, "the tragic and ridiculous spectacle" (as Francois Delaisi called it once) of nations arming because they were afraid, and afraid because they were arming, could start all over again.

"It did start all over again, and you felt sick at heart with the chicanery and the hypocritical palaver in Geneva about peace and democracy by men who represented the so-called great democracies, but who were scheming and conniving behind the scenes to sacrifice the German people to a barbaric, militaristic authoritarianism because that was the condition sine qua non for setting the armament campaigns in their own countries in motion again. Before August 1914 the most influential Parisian newspapers had been heavily subsidized by Germany to whip up the spirit of revanche in the French people, and so help the French Government pass ever heavier war budgets, and, in turn, give the Kaiser's cabinet the opportunity of obtaining more war credits from the German people. Now the chief task of international diplomacy was to kill the urge for peace and general disarmament in the peoples by introducing a new menace to peace in the center of Europe.

"You saw the sordid mystification of Geneva, the murderous traffic to betray the hope of humanity, but who were you, a simple newspaperman, to denounce the contemptible trickery to set the peoples on the warpath again? Was it likely that anyone would believe that men like Austen Chamberlain, Baldwin, Briand, Stresemann, MacDonald, Simon, and Paul Boncour, who had the word "peace" forever on the tip of their tongues, were in reality playing with the life and death of Europe and the future of civilization? You managed to get some 'revelations' printed in the periodicals and reviews of the Quakers and the Christian antimilitarists in Holland, Switzerland, and France, but that was all that could be done about it."

In conclusion, may I urge that alongside of these revelations by Cunther and Van Paasen the country have placed before it these words by President Roosevelt, at Chautauqua, on August 14, 1936:

"Industrial and agricultural productions for a war may give immense fortunes to a few men; for the Nation as a whole it produces disaster.

"Nevertheless, if war should break out again in another continent, let us not blink the fact that we would find in this country thousands of Americans who, seeking immediate riches—fool's gold—would attempt to break down or evade our neutrality.

"They will tell you—and, unfortunately, their views get wide publicity—that if they could produce and ship this and that and the other to belligerent nations the unemployed of America would all find work.

"They would tell you that if they could extend credit to warring nations that credit would be used in the United States to build homes and factories and pay our debts.

"It would be hard to resist that clamor; it would be hard for many Americans, I fear, to look beyond—to realize the inevitable penalties, the inevitable day of reckoning. * * *

"If we face the choice of profits or peace, the Nation will answer—must answer—'We choose peace.'

"It is the duty of all of us to encourage such a body of public opinion in this country that the answer will be clear and for all practical purposes unanimous."

It will not do to try to explain Mr. Roosevelt's change of mind on the embargo and war profiteers as the New York Sun did in an editorial, September 13, 1939, wherein it said:

"It should not be necessary to recall that the Chautauqua speech was made in the heat of a Presidential campaign or that the peace of the world was then so badly disturbed that a speech of that sort went big. The Italian conquest of Ethiopia had just been accomplished. Germany was starting to reconstruct its war forces. The Spanish civil war was boiling. Japan was busy in China. As a candidate for reelection, Mr. Roosevelt found peace an attractive topic and in the speech quoted by Senator NYE he played it to the limit."

The "heat of a Presidential campaign" is again in the offing. If we lift the embargo, we will be at war when that campaign gets under way. The third-term objections, our domestic problems, the recovery of our country from its all-too-long depression, everything will be subordinated to the old slogan, "don't change horses in midstream."

Senator BORAH, the mothers of American sons, millions of them, look to you as the star of their hopes, and not to the tinsel title of "Gold Star Mothers," as a bauble for the blood of their boys. Once again I repeat what I said to you in a letter some time ago: I am unwilling to think that the Congress of my country will answer the warning of American mothers and fathers against shedding the innocent blood of their sons in any European carnage by a reiteration of that awful curse of 2,000 years ago, "Their blood be upon us and upon our children."

Sincerely yours,

JOHN A. MATTHEWS.

Fool's Gold

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES F. O'CONNOR
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 5, 1939

EDITORIAL FROM THE LIVINGSTON (MONT.) ENTERPRISE

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Livingston Enterprise, of Livingston, Mont.:

FOOL'S GOLD?

Old-time prospectors can tell many stories of the fellows searching for mineral wealth, who picked up a rock or piece of stone that looked as though it carried a heavy load of yellow gold. It sparkled in the sun and seemed to possess the value that had called this and that prospector to spend lonesome days and days of hard work out in "them thar hills."

Perhaps this chap dared show his find to a fellow prospector and learned then and there that in reality he had failed to find the yellow metal he had been searching for, but he had picked up what among prospectors is known as fool's gold, of no value. It may be that his discovery of the worthlessness of his find came after a long trip to town, but sooner or later he found it necessary to return to prospecting and digging, never to be fooled a second time by the lure of the shiny surface.

Twenty-five years ago, the United States was not greatly unlike the prospector. Gold, lots of it, was offered if our great industrial and business organizations would gear up to the capacity necessary to provide the equipment and merchandise needed by belligerent nations in Europe who were too busy prosecuting a war to provide for the wants of soldiers and civilians enlisted in the war program. Factories were set going at full blast in America and new jobs were created by the tens of thousands to get under way these vast manufacturing programs. New factories were constructed, new machines were made, and the money rolled in.

Finally the war ceased, and with that cessation a nation industrially geared to overproduction was suddenly confronted with the necessity of getting enterprises back on a normal basis. Europe had so impoverished itself that the normal pre-war market was gone and our own bank rolls were depleted because of loans made in the heyday of war excitement, which have not, and undoubtedly will not, be repaid. In the countries that had been at war it became necessary for them to produce their own foodstuff, clothing, and other needed material and supplies, because their credit had become exhausted during the war. Finally, with our own participation in that world struggle, the situation became more acute, and national obligations to those who risked life and limb to fight "over there" were but a small part of an expense bill that was to contribute to the financial crash that eventually followed. Within a few short days declining values of everything produced or possessed brought penury to replace affluence and the gilded dollars that had seemed to flow in disappeared as snow fades under the heat of a warm spring sun.

Fool's gold?

Today we have another opportunity to repeat the program above recited. Another war rages in Europe. Even promising greater havoc than its predecessor, we are inclined to look with much enthusiasm upon potential riches and quick money that will be offered. Larger and more costly machines are being used in combat, and food shortages have appeared less than a month after the actual beginning of hostilities. We witness the daily rise in the cost of our own food supplies, and some of us rush to store sugar and other staples, thinking to insure against the upward trend, only to find we are contributing to a state of mind that "ups" the cost of every article we are later compelled by our own necessity to purchase.

Of course every loyal American would and does want to see every American gainfully employed, but not at the expense of replacing the 12,000,000 unemployed today with 25,000,000 unemployed after this war has been decided.

It would be far better for this country to gear its industry to supply that which in peacetime has been imported, for our European importations have vanished overnight. This responsibility which is today forced upon us can well care for the reemployment of those not now at work.

The Congress, now in extraordinary session, can well limit its action to consideration of the cash-and-carry system, and even this permission may prove costly in the long run. It can hardly be denied that the Congress faces one of the most serious problems that has ever confronted it.

This country, like the prospector, has had the experience of taking what looked like gold to the assayer, only to discover our possession of fool's gold. What is true of the business that demands too much and expands too much is equally true of the workman who demands too much and thus contributes to fatal expansion.

Repeal of the Arms Embargo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM J. MILLER
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 5, 1939

LETTER FROM CHARLES CHENEY HYDE AND PHILIP C. JESSUP

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following communication which was printed in today's edition of the New York Times:

[From the New York Times of October 5, 1939]

LEGAL ASPECTS OF REPEAL—DRS. HYDE AND JESSUP SUPPLEMENT THEIR ARGUMENT AGAINST EMBARGO CHANGE

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Since the publication of our letter in the New York Times of September 21 concerning the legal aspect of a repeal of the embargo on munitions of war, numerous utterances in unofficial, as well as official, places cause us to supplement our statement.

First of all, we must challenge the suggestion that international law has ever imposed any duty on a neutral to permit the exportation of munitions of war from its territory, and that accordingly the retention of the embargo is contrary to the precepts of international law. That is not the case and never has been. As we have already pointed out, the applicable rule of international law is merely that the neutral state is not normally obliged to prevent the inhabitants of its territory from exporting munitions of war therefrom.

In the Neutrality Report for the Harvard Research in International Law (American Journal of International Law, vol. 33, sup., pp. 283 ff.), there is an extensive list of precedents for neutral arms embargoes. The list includes the following states, which, when neutral, have prohibited the export of arms and munitions; it is to be noted that these are chiefly states which may properly be called traditional neutrals:

Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Salvador, Honduras, Panama, Paraguay (of these, five have embodied the rule in their penal codes); Austria, Belgium, Denmark; Hamburg, Hanover, Lubeck, Mechlenburg-Schwerin (before the unification of Germany); Germany (in 1920 during the Russo-Polish war); Liberia, Netherlands, Norway.

OPPOSITION CITED

Mr. Hackworth, the able legal adviser of the Department of State, testifying before the Foreign Relations Committee in 1936, cited other and broader World War examples and said: "So far as I know, nobody complained about them" (hearings, p. 294). In regard to the arms embargo specifically, in a prepared memorandum he said: "There appears to be little or no serious objection to this section from any quarter, even by those who tell us that we should have no domestic legislation but should constantly rely upon international law. The sentiment of the people seems to be opposed to the furnishing of finished instruments of war to belligerent countries" (hearings, p. 298).

In December 1936 Secretary Hull, at the Buenos Aires Conference for the Maintenance of Peace, sought to secure the agreement of all the American republics to a treaty which declared in article VIII that "upon the determination of the existence of a state of war between two or more American republics, those of the high contracting parties remaining neutral shall not permit, during the continuance of hostilities, the exportation from their respective territories of arms, ammunition, or implements of war to any of the belligerents or to any neutral country for transshipment to, or for the use of, any of the belligerents" (State Department Press Releases, Dec. 12, 1936, p. 483).

It is fantastic to call the present arms embargo a violation of international law, and it is misleading to intimate that it represents a departure from that law.

SOME CHANGES LAWFUL

We must emphasize the point that we have been far from asserting that any change in a neutral's laws and regulations, effected in time of war, would be a breach of international law. The neutrality report for the Harvard research in international law correctly states that some changes under certain conditions may lawfully be made. The point, however, that we have sought to stress is that the United States, having before the war forbidden exportations of arms and munitions to belligerents, cannot now permit such exportations without an affirmative governmental act; such an affirmative act, if taken for the purpose of assisting one belligerent side, "constitutes a governmental taking of sides which is unneutral and illegal."

We stressed the "two factors—the governmental control already achieved by an act of Congress and a governmental desire to relax that control so as to help France and England."

In the neutrality report for the Harvard research in international law much the same position is taken (at pp. 316 ff.) where it is said:

"The task confronting the neutral state which takes action under this article [permitting changes during war to safeguard its neutral rights or to fulfill its neutral duties] is to make certain to itself and clear to other states that the motive inducing the adoption of a new rule or regulation during the course of a war is the product of its concern to act strictly in accordance with the laws of neutrality and not the result of a desire to aid one or the other belligerent. * * * The neutral state which takes action under this article may be required to bear the burden of showing that the change in its rules was induced by its own neutral necessities and not by the desire to aid one or the other belligerent."

CHANGE IN SITUATION

As we said in our letter of September 21, "the situation confronting the United States today is sharply different from that of a month ago before the war broke out. While peace reigned no international obligation hindered Congress from legislating as it might see fit. With the outbreak of war, however, the situation changed overnight."

Moreover, we stated that the repeal of the embargo at this time would reflect the desire and effort of our country to help a particular cause in the present conflict. It has since been suggested that the proof of such motive is beyond reach. We are not now asking what proof of motive would be necessary to satisfy the mind of an international tribunal. We are merely asserting that there is evidence which must convince the mind of an honest American people who are shrewd enough to perceive, and fair enough to acknowledge, the real reason behind the effort to repeal the embargo.

Hence we would suggest to those who support repeal of the embargo to ask themselves the question and to answer it in all honesty, "Would you still favor repeal if the situation were the reverse of what it is and if repeal would aid Germany instead of the allies?" If the answer to that question is "no," there is substantial recognition of what seems to be the obvious fact that the underlying purpose of repeal is to aid the allies.

Undoubtedly some persons sincerely believe that aiding the allies now by repealing the embargo will help to keep the United States out of war by contributing to an early allied victory. That is beside the point which we made, namely, that if the purpose of repeal is to aid one belligerent side, the conduct would not be impartial, and the United States would become to that extent a participant in the conflict and would subject itself to the charge of being guilty of unneutral conduct.

RESPECT FOR LAW URGED

We hear it said on every side that the bearing of international law on the conduct of the United States at the present time is unimportant, that the real issue is one of policy, and that in deciding what that policy should be at a time like the present the requirements of international law sink out of sight and are not to be regarded as a deterrent of the action which we wish to take.

This contention is of vast significance, since its rests upon the notion that a distasteful legal obstacle to a desired line of national conduct may be blandly thrust aside. Is the United States really ready to flout international law? Is it prepared to class itself with those nations whose conduct it has denounced as lawless? Somehow one cannot believe that the American people would consciously and deliberately become a lawbreaking nation.

As a Nation we have always insisted that there is a law determining neutral rights and duties. It is not the American philosophy to repudiate that traditional position when the law hampers our freedom of action and to assert it only for our advantage when protesting against violations of our rights under that law. There is little disagreement with the proposition that today the world sorely needs examples of national adherence to precepts of law and justice. Is it possible that the United States will now take the stand that national policy should be guided not by respect for law but solely by a desire to further what is deemed to be a national interest?

CHARLES CHENEY HYDE.
PHILIP C. JESSUP.

NEW YORK, *October 4, 1939.*

Congress Should Stay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT L. VREELAND
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 5, 1939

EDITORIAL FROM THE NEWARK (N. J.) SUNDAY CALL

Mr. VREELAND. Mr. Speaker, the Newark Sunday Call, one of the leading Sunday papers of New Jersey and edited by my good friend, Eddie Bataille, expresses an opinion which I think is the keynote of the whole question before the country in these times of stress.

The following editorial appeared Sunday, September 24, 1939:

[From the Newark (N. J.) Sunday Call of September 24, 1939]

CONGRESS SHOULD STAY

There is no good reason to doubt the sincerity of President Roosevelt's desire to keep America out of war. But his open sympathy for the allied cause makes many doubt his ability to maintain the official impartiality required of the head of a neutral state.

It is unfortunate that he climaxed an excellent and sensible message by a blunt suggestion to Congress to do the work he outlined and then get out of town. His desire to be rid of Congress will strengthen the suspicion that he wants a free hand in foreign affairs. Once Congress adjourned, only he could call it back. It is not enough to keep in touch with the leaders of Congress.

In normal times the conduct of foreign affairs is the constitutional responsibility of the President. These are not normal times. Mr. Roosevelt is impulsive and loves to be bold and dramatic. His is not the most dependable temperament in times which call for dispassionate judgment.

He is surrounded by advisers in whom the American people have little confidence. He needs the constant collaboration and restraining influence of Congress, which is much more closely in touch with public opinion than he.

Congress should stay in Washington until the beginning of the regular session in January.

Cash-and-Carry Neutrality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. WILL TAYLOR
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 5, 1939

EDITORIAL FROM THE KNOXVILLE JOURNAL

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit an editorial from last Monday's issue of the Knoxville Journal, of Knoxville, Tenn.

This editorial from the pen of one of the most virile and versatile editorial writers of the South, Mr. Guy L. Smith, illustrates by allegory a very strong argument for cash-and-carry neutrality.

The editorial is as follows:

[From the Knoxville (Tenn.) Journal of October 2, 1939]

A READER'S ARGUMENT IS FURTHER EXAMINED

On Saturday there was published on this page a letter from a reader in which he expressed his opposition to the repeal of the existing embargo legislation as follows:

A certain man had two neighbors who lived nearby, one an enemy and the other a friend, so he said to his friend:

"Lend me your gun; I want to shoot my neighbor, who is an enemy."

"No," said the friend, "I will not lend you my gun, for I should then be an accessory before the fact of the proposed killing."

"Oh," said the neighbor, "but I will buy your gun and pay you for it cash."

"A thousand times no," said the friend, "if I took money and lent you my gun as well, I would be a worse criminal than you propose to become; my answer is ten thousand times no."

On its face, that simple example may seem both sound and humane; the trouble is that it does not accurately illustrate the real relationships in the present European struggle between nations. Let's be a little more accurate; a little truer to the facts involved between Hitlerism and the British-French alliance.

This is the way the little story should read:

"A certain man had two neighbors who lived nearby, one an enemy (previously convicted of murder, arson, and stealing), and the other a friend, so he said to his friend:

"Lend me your gun; I want to be in position to defend myself against my gangster neighbor in case he goes on a rampage as he has in the past. Particularly do I need the loan of your weapon if this gangster neighbor teams up with another nearby gangster who affects the handle-bar mustachios of several years ago."

"But," protested the neighbor, "if I lend you my gun I will be accessory before the fact of a possible killing."

"Oh," said the neighbor, "then I will buy your gun and pay you cash for it. And by the way, you might keep in mind that my gangster enemies have already killed many other neighbors, have taken their property, and have subjected their own followers to cruel tyranny. Further, if your gun helps me give these gangsters

a good drubbing your chances of not having to cope with them later are just that much brighter."

With the parable nearer to life, as they are in the revised story, would the answer still be ten thousand times no?

Does Declaration of a Neutral Zone Mean War?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. THORKELSON

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 5, 1939

Mr. THORKELSON. Mr. Speaker, on September 21, 1939, the President delivered to the joint session of Congress a message, in which he suggested that we return to international law. The question which may be asked is, What was the President's purpose in making this request? I shall now quote a few paragraphs to refresh your memory:

It was the so-called Neutrality Act of 1935—only 4 years ago—an act continued in force by the joint resolution of May 1, 1937, despite grave doubt expressed as to its wisdom by many Senators and Representatives and by officials charged with the conduct of our foreign relations, including myself. I regret that the Congress passed that act. I regret equally that I signed that act. * * * I seek reenactment of the historic and traditional American policy which, except for the disastrous interlude of the Embargo and Nonintercourse Acts, has served us well for nearly a century and a half. The step I recommend is to put this country back on the solid footing of real and traditional neutrality.

This recommendation is clear and can be understood by all of us, but the President did not mean that, because he did not ask for the repeal of the Neutrality Act so we could return to international law. I shall now quote what he asks for:

I seek a greater consistency through the repeal of the embargo provisions and a return to international law.

This reveals his real intention, and it is not, as he said, for the United States to return to the traditional policy of international law, for to bring that about would require repeal of all neutrality legislation.

In order that those who read this may understand how plausible and deceptive language may be, I shall quote a few more paragraphs from the President's message:

Repeal of the embargo and a return to international law are the crux of this issue.

This should read: Repeal of the embargo and a return to international law are the jokers of this issue, because repeal of the arms-embargo clause will give the President unlimited power, which in itself may provoke an incident or causus belli. I do not believe anyone familiar with international law will concede that there is even the slightest possibility that all nations will accept our Neutrality Act as an amendment to international law. International objections may be raised when the President begins to enforce the power given to him by Congress. All nations except the United States subscribe to international law, but we have an act of our own which is to be enforced by the President. Is it now reasonable to believe that other nations will meekly submit to the President's proclamations? I think not, for they might say, "Mind your own business, Mr. President."

Let us put the shoe on the other foot. Suppose, while we are engaged in a life-and-death struggle, a foreign dictator arbitrarily would set aside zones for the ships of his country so that they could carry merchandise to our enemies or enemy possessions. Would we accept such proclamation meekly and submissively? Of course not. We would tell him to mind his own business. We have done that before and no doubt would do it again.

Assuming now that the President gives orders to the Navy to enforce the power given to him by Congress in the Neutrality Act. It is his duty to see that the laws are faithfully executed, and Congress has given the President a power in the Neutrality Act which, if enforced, is bound to meet with objections from nations now at war.

This is a phase which Congress must consider seriously before it repeals the arms-embargo clause. In reality the Neutrality Act is unenforceable unless it is backed by the full force of the United States Navy, and then we might provoke an international fight.

I wonder if Members of Congress realize what they are doing in granting such power to any Executive. In addition to its danger, it is also unconstitutional for there is no provision in the Constitution of the United States that gives Congress the right to grant such power to the President by special acts of Congress. As to Congress, it is an indication of weakness, for we, by granting such power to one man, admit that he and his appointees are more competent than 531 Members of Congress. Congress may recover the prestige and public confidence that has been lost for the past 8 years by taking charge of the Government as set forth in article I of the Constitution, and it would not be amiss to assist and advise the President as regards his duties as set forth in article II.

From the President's message:

I now ask again that such action be taken in respect to that part of the act which is wholly inconsistent with ancient precepts of the law of nations—the embargo provisions. I ask it because they are, in my opinion, most vitally dangerous to American neutrality, American security, and American peace.

It is not the embargo provision that is inconsistent with the law of nations, it is instead the Neutrality Act itself. So the paragraph should read in the following manner: "I now ask again that such action be taken in respect to that part of the act which is wholly inconsistent with ancient precepts of the law of nations"—the Neutrality Act. "I ask it because it is, in my opinion, most vitally dangerous to American neutrality, American security, and American peace."

We must not be misled by panaceas or soothing words. The objective of this special session is not to strengthen neutrality. It is instead to give the President unlimited power by repeal of the arms-embargo clause so that he may be released from all legal restrictions, which, of course, will leave Congress responsible for his acts.

It is necessary to understand the minds of those who guide the hand that writes pleasing words and slogans in order to confuse and deceive the public. It is unfortunate when anyone underrates public intelligence, or even that of Congress, employing deceptive phraseology in a document that may mean war or peace.

The Neutrality Act gives the President power to declare war zones, to regulate ocean-going traffic within zones not so declared, and to detain or to prohibit departure of ships under foreign flags. All of these powers may involve us in war. If enforced, they will prove objectionable—not only to nations at war, but also to neutral nations. See section 7b of the Neutrality Act.

The embargo clause is not in conflict with international law. In fact, it is not unusual to place an embargo on merchandise in time of peace as well as war. Nations now at war have placed embargoes on such merchandise as they need for their own use. We have the right to do exactly the same. Such procedure or embargo is not inconsistent with international law. As a matter of fact, there is no provision in such law that compels any nation to sell merchandise against its wishes.

We have been entirely too liberal in giving to other nations secrets of private as well as military value. It is this attitude on our part that is actually responsible for much of the progress in other nations in all fields of production, and it is also responsible for much unemployment we are suffering today. We need embargoes to protect our industry. Embargoes are employed in other nations, and should be equally useful to us. Let us be sensible and disregard the propaganda which is now carried in our daily papers, which is for no other purpose except to instill fear of war. Where is the attack to come from? Surely not another attack from Mars!

The present "spy scare" began in Hollywood and is carried on constantly in our daily papers. This prepared propaganda is for the purpose of making our people believe that

they are in the midst of an army of enemy spies. What are these mythical spies looking for? And what secrets are they after? Surely, if we are to believe our daily papers, magazines, and information obtained from congressional committees in regard to the leakage of military secrets, this bogey vanishes of itself. Can anyone in his right mind imagine an army of spies peeping around corners trying to steal secrets that can be obtained on a cash-and-carry basis?

The embargo clause sustains American neutrality because it restrains the unwarranted power granted in the Neutrality Act itself. It is a part of an act that is a declaration of our policy enacted into law. This policy has been recognized and accepted not only by nations at war but by neutral nations as well, and to change at this time will be looked upon with disfavor by such nations as may be affected. It is not a question of our rights, for they cannot be disputed. We have a perfect right to change our own legislation whenever we please, but when such changes affect our position internationally, it is better to wait for a more propitious time. We should follow the precedent established by the late Secretary of State, W. J. Bryan, when he, in 1915, refused to make a similar change in our international policy on the request of one of the powers at war. A precedent established during President Wilson's administration should be equally sound during President Roosevelt's administration. See Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 55.

I quote the President again:

> These embargo provisions as they exist today prevent the sale to a belligerent by an American factory of any completed implements of war, but they allow the sale of many types of uncompleted implements of war, as well as all kinds of general material and supplies. They furthermore allow such products of industry and agriculture to be taken in American-flag ships to belligerent nations. There in itself, under the present law, lies definite danger to our neutrality and peace.

I shall now quote from section 6 (a) of the Neutrality Act, May 1, 1937:

> Whenever the President shall have issued a proclamation under the authority of section 1 of this act, it shall thereafter be unlawful, until such proclamation is revoked, for any American vessel to carry any arms, ammunition, or implements of war to any belligerent state or to any state wherein civil strife exists, named in such proclamation, or to any neutral state for transshipment to or for the use of any such belligerent state or any state wherein civil strife exists.

Violation of this provision is subject to a fine of $10,000 and imprisonment for 5 years and confiscation of ship and cargo. The President complains because American-flag ships are allowed to clear to belligerent nations with a cargo of merchandise that is not prohibited in his proclamation. If the President is interested in preventing export of products in American-flag ships, why does he not include all products in his proclamation? It is within his power to do so.

If the President is interested in preventing export of contraband cargo in American-flag ships, he may give orders not to issue clearance papers to ships carrying such cargoes to nations at war, their possessions, and war zones. Contraband articles come within practically the same classification as other war necessities. No special legislation is required to stop American-flag ships from trading with nations at war, in war zones, or any other zones—for that can be accomplished under the present law, by refusing clearance of such ships. As a matter of fact, refusing clearance is the most effective method to enforce our neutrality.

There is no restriction in trading with neutral nations removed from active combat areas, but, I believe, as I have said before, that to prevent mistakes it is better to identify our ships distinctly and to follow trade routes in a straightforward manner. If the destination of such ships is to neutral ports in active war zones, all belligerents should be notified of departure and when entering such zones.

Declaring "emergencies" has become a chronic habit of this administration, to which it is now a confirmed addict. I realize misery loves company, but the habit of the administration is self-elected and certainly not argument for making it a public nuisance. Let us forget this acting and clowning with "emergencies," with spy scares, war scares, attacks from Mars, and other phobias. Are we a nation of hypochondriacs, or are we a nation of sound and sensible American people, able to mind our own business and courteous enough to extend the same right to others?

Let us forget all this planned regulation under which we have operated for 7 years. If there are supermen, let them come out in the open, so we may know who they are. Those who have acted as advisors in this and other administrations are no criterions of ability if we are to judge by results.

The Inter-American Conference of Foreign Ministers at Panama City is another planning body that is liable to give the United States a headache, for they have set aside a sea limit of 300 miles, extending south of Cape Horn, and northward on both sides of South America and North America to the southern boundaries of Canada. This is called a safety zone, a sort of new Monroe Doctrine. As I see it—it means a lot of trouble for the United States, for if we attempt to protect this zone we are bigger fools than I think we are. I shall now give the British version of this, quoting from the Washington Daily News:

> BRITISH SEE NEW PROBLEMS IN SAFETY ZONES
>
> LONDON, October 4.—The Western Hemisphere's "safety band" is a "novel idea but replete with imponderables," sources close to the British Navy said today.
>
> The sources recalled that the 3-mile limit principle in territorial waters dated back to the days of Queen Elizabeth when guns could shoot no further.
>
> Commenting on the "safety belt," the London Times said: "Any action taken by an American Navy to enforce prohibitions contained in the [Panama City3 declaration would have no sanction in international law, and such action would amount to an act of war and nothing else.

I am quoting this because it is in line with the points I have made against establishing zones for trade routes outside the 3-mile limit. This is the English version, and those who are now fighting for the Neutrality Act should read this and give serious consideration to the subject now up for debate in the Senate. This so-called safety band does not differ in status from other safety zones which would be established should the President proclaim and designate war zones.

It means war for the United States, as is clearly stated by the London Times, if we intend to enforce our opinion on any nation, neutral or belligerent. Our Neutrality Act, as is clearly stated, has no sanction in international law, and for that reason cannot be enforced by any means short of war.

It is for that reason that I am opposed to the repeal of the arms-embargo clause. Its restriction on shipping to nations engaged in war counteracts the danger in proclaiming safety zones for the routing of such ships. Such safety routes are established indirectly, and comprise such safety bands as are not included in the war zones. Such designation "would have no sanction in international law," and any action taken by our Navy for protection of such safety bands is an act of war. Do not miss the point. This opinion comes from London, England, and I will grant that no power in the world has juggled and used international law to its own advantage more than Great Britain.

Myopic statesmen wrote injustice in the Treaty of Versailles, and hatreds in the Treaty of Trianon. In this partition of innocent vanquished powers, particularly of Hungary, a grave injustice was done. It was such injustices that have made it impossible for tranquillity to be established in a region of Europe that has always been more or less disturbed.

The present war in Europe follows the immutable law of gravity.

The present war will no doubt in time realine and adjust the borders of the central European states along lines best suited to themselves. Self-determination being conceded, why deprive others of that which is recognized as the right of a people?

The World War was nourished by the invisible government in London, Berlin, Paris, and in our own New York. We raised an army and paid for that war. Let the invisible government now raise its own army and pay for the present war.

Mr. Roosevelt Argues for a Real Neutrality Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM D. BYRON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 5, 1939

EDITORIAL FROM THE BALTIMORE SUN, SEPTEMBER 22, 1939

Mr. BYRON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Baltimore Sun of September 22, 1939:

Mr. Roosevelt's address to the Congress yesterday possessed in full measure the responsibility and dignity for which the occasion called. In word, in voice, and in manner the President revealed understanding of the gravity of the decisions to be made and understanding of the obligation upon all to rise above political or personal bias. If Mr. Roosevelt can maintain this attitude during the stress of the debate and controversy of the next few weeks, he will serve his country well, and he will set an example which his opponents must respect to the further good of the Nation.

The speech may be divided into two phases: In one the President deals with method in determining the policies of the United States. In the other he deals with content of policies. The soundness of his treatment of method in determining policies is plain for all to see. His objective is to stay out of war. He grants that to be the objective of other responsible men in office and out of office. With agreement on objective, with agreement that "the mantle of peace" is wide enough to cover all, he proposes to move along a course of rational argument in formulating policies that will most probably insure peace; and he promises very soberly to consult with leaders of both parties in the Congress, during periods when the Congress will not be in session, in order that all may be fully informed as to facts in the war which concern the welfare of this people. This is the way of a free, self-governing, self-sustaining people. It is the safe way. It is the way which guards against impulse and passion.

As to the content of immediate policies which offer the best prospect for preserving our peace, the President ably argues for the legislation to which his administration has been committed for months. He finds anything like genuine economic isolation from the belligerents to be a delusion. American experience with embargoes prior to the War of 1812 and the facts of the present situation equally show that an attempt to shut ourselves within economic walls will fail. All the authority of the Jeffersonian hierarchy could not reconcile the American people to the embargo of a century and a quarter ago; and today no one of the isolationist leaders, no one of the advocates of embargo, is willing to go to the American people and say that they should cease all trade with the belligerent powers as a means of guarding against "economic involvement," which some superficial students have insisted was the cause of our entrance into the last war, or as a means of guarding against "incidents" on the high seas which might arouse our people.

A spirited, dynamic people will not consent to be shut in. With that established as the basic fact, the President rejects the argument that economic isolation in a narrow area is either necessary or wise. That is to say, he rejects the argument that we should continue the present so-called Neutrality Act, which lays an embargo upon shipments of arms, munitions, and implements of war to belligerents. He shows the inconsistency of embargoing munitions and of permitting the sale and shipment of processed articles which may be assembled quickly on the other side into munitions. He proposes, instead of the halting, inconsistent embargo upon the segment of our trade that is represented by arms, munitions, and implements of war, a policy which will (a) assert and rest upon our rights to trade under international law and will (b) limit the dangers inherent in trade during wartime by requiring belligerent purchasers to pay cash on our shores and to transport their purchases in ships for which they bear the responsibility.

This will permit sale of all commodities, subject to the rules, including arms. The Sun has repeatedly stated its support of this view. If any be concerned about the moral aspects of the trade in arms, munitions, and implements of war, they will find themselves at a loss for argument in reply to Mr. Roosevelt's portrayal of the inconsistency of embargoing the completed article used in war and freely permitting sale of the processed parts which may be assembled abroad into the completed article. If any be concerned about our rights to sell arms, munitions and implements of war, the historic record of our freedom to do so is there for all to see. If any be concerned about the question of neutrality, they will find themselves in difficulty to explain why we should lay an embargo on arms, for the first time in our history, when the practical effect will be to hamper Britain and France and to aid Germany. And if any be concerned with the anger of Germany, the reply is that we already have it, and will have more of it as we continue to sell nonmilitary supplies.

The sound policy for this country, the policy that is in accord with our history and with the temperament of our people, the policy that we can be expected to live under with reasonable comfort and with the maximum of security during the trying days that are ahead, is the policy in which we assert and maintain all our rights to trade and then take our own steps in our own way to limit the dangers that attend trade during war. That is the policy that is embodied in the Hull program. That is the policy that Mr. Roosevelt urged yesterday upon Congress. It should be adopted.

Marvel Mills Logan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 5, 1939

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, announcement of the death of Senator MARVEL MILLS LOGAN, of Kentucky, on Tuesday, October 3, was received with sorrow by his many friends throughout the United States and Canada. I have been acquainted with him since September 1920, when I met him at Boston, Mass., at the Annual Session of the Sovereign Grand Lodge of the Independent Order of Odd Fellows. At that time he was a Representative of the Grand Lodge of Kentucky. Thereafter I met him annually at those conventions until the time of his demise.

When I met him he was attorney general of the State of Kentucky. I afterward knew him as a member of the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky. Then I knew him as United States Senator from that State. All his life he has been active in public affairs. As a Member of the United States Senate he was chairman of the Committee on Claims. This committee considered a bill in which Minnesota people were interested. It affected thousands of families and involved a substantial sum of money. Senator LOGAN was chairman of the subcommittee, and due to his wide grasp of problems of this country, we were able to command his attention and his sympathetic consideration of this important measure. I mention this to show the great humanitarian viewpoint which always actuated him in public life.

His public career is ended but all of us classify him in the language which Lord Tennyson used in his ode on the death of the Duke of Wellington. This language of Lord Tennyson is said to be the finest tribute ever written. He said:

He stood four squared,
To all the winds that blow.

So may it be said of Senator LOGAN that he was a leader in the affairs of Government in this country and his integrity, loftiness of purpose, his outstanding ability, marked him as a man worthy of this tribute.

Of course, I knew him as a friend, and I express the sentiments of a multitude of people when I say that to know him was to love him and that every individual who came within the sphere of his influence was benefited thereby.

Senator LOGAN never lost his touch with mankind and the greater his honors in public life, as well as in his private life, the greater seemed to be his common appeal to the men and women of America. I express what I think is the unanimous sentiment of everyone that knew him:

Green be the turf above thee
Friend of my better days,
None knew thee but to love thee,
None loved thee but to praise.

With the passing of our friend, Senator LOGAN, the fraternal circle has lost one of its great workers and leaders. The world was truly his home, and to do good was his religion. With Senator LOGAN it was a sound approach to life to say that all men were brothers, and consequently he subscribed

to those lofty fraternal sentiments which preach the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man.

I first met him, as I have heretofore indicated, as a member of the Independent Order of Odd Fellows. He was a representative from the Grand Lodge of Kentucky. I was a representative from the Grand Lodge of Minnesota. As the years passed by, his qualities of leadership in the fraternity were demonstrated, and in September 1929 he was installed as grand sire of the Independent Order of Odd Fellows. He served in this capacity until September 1930. This mark of distinction is attained by only a few. It came to him in recognition of his outstanding devotion to all of the fine ideals which the great fraternity over which he presided has proclaimed to the world. He was a real leader. He inspired confidence. He practiced in his daily life the doctrines of friendship and love and truth.

He loved his fellow men, and they loved and trusted him. A poem that has touched the hearts of men describes the visit of an angel who interviewed Abou Ben Adhem.

Senator LOGAN, as this man of old, loved his fellow men. I liken him to this character. I close my brief tribute to his memory by commending as typical of the character of Senator LOGAN the sentiment expressed by the ancient friend in the following verse:

Abou Ben Adhem (may his tribe increase)
Awoke one night from a deep dream of peace,
And saw, within the moonlight in his room,
Making it rich and like a lily in bloom,
An angel writing in a book of gold.
Exceeding peace had made Ben Adhem bold,
And to the presence in the room he said:
"What writest thou?" The vision raised its head
And, with a look made of all sweet accord,
Answered, "The names of those who love the Lord."
"And is mine one?" said Abou. "Nay; not so,"
Replied the angel. Abou spoke more low,
But cheerily still, and said, "I pray thee, then,
Write me as one that loves his fellow men."
The angel wrote and vanished. The next night
It came again with a great wakening light,
And showed the names whom love of God had blessed,
And, lo! Ben Adhem's name led all the rest.

Neutrality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT L. VREELAND
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 5, 1939

LETTER FROM HOWARD E. GROSVENOR

Mr. VREELAND. Mr. Speaker, of all of the mail received in my office during this period, when the Congress is considering neutrality legislation, I believe the one received by me from the Colonel Winterton Chapter of the Military Order of the Purple Heart to be the greatest tribute ever received from any of my constituents.

This order is made up of veterans who have been wounded in action. They are the ones who fought in the last war, and to their opinion should be given the greatest credence.

The letter follows:

COLONEL WINTERTON CHAPTER, NO. 10,
THE MILITARY ORDER OF THE PURPLE HEART
OF THE UNITED STATES,
East Orange, N. J., September 22, 1939.

Hon. ALBERT L. VREELAND,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR AL: At the regular monthly meeting of the Colonel Winterton Chapter, No. 10, Military Order of the Purple Heart, held September 14, 1939, the adjutant was instructed to reply to your recent letter addressed to the commander, Roland C. Smith.

It was the consensus of opinion of the members present at this meeting that you, as our Representative in Congress insofar as this district is concerned, should be charged with the duty of deciding what action the Government of the United States should take on the question of neutrality to be acted on at the special session after careful consideration of the facts available to you in Washington and the opinions as expressed by the members of this chapter, as follows:

Each and every member of this chapter is battle-scarred and is well aware of the cost entailed in life and property, as well as years of suffering by some after, in waging a war. Nevertheless, they are also mindful of the fact that at this time there is loose in the society of nations a system which may, if successful, endanger that freedom we now enjoy, which was purchased at such a sacrifice by our forefathers, unless stopped by some organized effort on the part of those lovers of liberty.

We also believe that all moves of an international nature should be approved by the Congress, as direct representatives of the people, and under no circumstances should the President be authorized to decide major issues affecting the welfare of the Nation; furthermore, there should be no legislation which would tend to eliminate American commerce from the seas.

While the members are wholeheartedly for peace, they are still ready and willing to fight, if acceptable as combatants by the Government, to preserve that peace. To you we have passed the torch. It is up to you to decide. But no matter how you decide, your friends in this chapter will know your decision was made in the interest of all concerned.

With kindest personal regards, I am,
Sincerely yours,

HOWARD E. GROSVENOR,
Adjutant.

Congress Means Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY
OF VERMONT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 5, 1939

ADDRESS OF HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY BEFORE THE NEW HAMPSHIRE MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me at Manchester, N. H., on October 5, 1939, before the New Hampshire Manufacturers Association:

Since accepting your courteous invitation to address you upon this occasion, many things have happened which have had a tendency to distract one's attention from our domestic economic problems. The whole atmosphere of Washington at this time is saturated with war talk; it is charged with a tendency toward further delegation of power and a greater centralization of authority, forgetful of the lesson we have learned in the last 6 years. Not minimizing the responsibility which is ours by reason of the international situation, it nevertheless is my judgment that our main attention should be focused not solely on the continent of Europe and its never ending quarrels and hatreds, but rather on this continent of North America, on which, thank God for the independence and courage of our forebears, we now live; it is here where our primary interests lie and our future destiny rests.

America must stay out of this war! We are called upon to save no democracy except our own. We are under obligation to no one except Americans. Our great burden of responsibility in these days of world crises is to demonstrate to all the world that we can make our own democracy work, and that those who live under its fine aegis can be happy, peaceful, and content.

We have our own business to mind; our own economic and social troubles to cure. The great mass of our citizens are for peace. America can keep out of the war provided its people so resolve and so determine.

In this connection industry has a challenge to answer, affirmative action to take to belie the statement of those who say: "We won't become embroiled in this war unless industrialists on the scent of war profits force us into it." You know, or should know, as hard-boiled, long-headed New England businessmen, that from a purely mercenary viewpoint, you can't afford a war. Why?

Any temporary excess profits your enterprise might conceivably earn during wartime would be wiped out by stupendous long-term taxes which inevitably would follow in the wake of such a war's termination.

Moreover, the inescapable depression which follows every war would have to be faced and met with the terrific price it exacts.

Finally, do not idly dismiss the probability that our involvement would lead to conscription of all industry with iron-clad Government control, no profits, followed by Nation-wide peacetime regimentation.

No; war would be too costly even from that standpoint. Such considerations are those not taking into account the most costly price of all—the price paid in human life.

There is no question about it, our participation in the war will mean the temporary obliteration of much that the American people have come to regard as the essentials of their civilization, and that the dictatorship necessarily set up for its conduct will be continued.

During the war free speech, free press, and free assembly will be restricted. The profit system will be scrapped, labor organizations will be enchained, party government discontinued.

We will have a central government of arbitrary powers rationing out food, clothes, and necessities; dictating what job each individual may have; fixing prices; seizing all profits.

The price in money of conducting a war on such a major scale will be paid in an inflation which is almost an inevitable consequence. With the concomitant wiping out and destruction of the people's savings there will be higher taxes and lower living standards, and all living costs will rise concurrently.

When the war ends and peace comes, so also will come the inevitable business crash as dislocated industries throw out unwanted workers and new labor-saving devices make renewed unemployment more lasting than even today.

In these days of turmoil abroad the narrower considerations of partisanship give way to the deeper concerns of patriotism. We must, however, never lose sight of the fact that real Americanism always asumes, and genuine patriotism demands, the arrival at sound national policy by the orderly processes of honest debate, the essence of democracy. This Nation is of one mind—that is, to keep out of this war and to avoid the terrible slaughter and destruction incident to our military involvement overseas and participation in the age-old wars of European power politics. But to say that we are of one mind does not mean that the successful steps of our national program are not a proper subject for careful deliberation and honest discussion among all the people.

I have no purpose in this presence to be pugnaciously partisan, but I am speaking to you as a Republican, and as such I am constrained to comply with your request and to discuss the situation as I have seen it, and as I understand it.

(1) What, then, did Congress do for business in the Seventy-sixth Congress?

(2) What will it do in the next regular session?

(3) What should it do?

Here, then, are some things that Congress could do to help business:

Congress could back-track to the clear and overwhelming "mandate" given it and the Democratic administration in 1932.

The President of the United States has referred to "a mandate" many times since March 1933. But the mandate he received was unmistakable. It was drawn up at Chicago and the President flew to Chicago in a melodramatic manner to add his pledge to the promises of the Democratic Party. Those promises—it may come as a shock to us today—included:

"A 25-percent drastic reduction of governmental expenditures;

"A call upon the Democratic Party in the States to make a zealous effort to achieve a proportionate result;

"A Federal Budget balanced immediately;

"A sound currency to be preserved at all hazards;

"A removal of Government from all fields of private enterprise."

This was the real "mandate" of the American people. They stated clearly that they wanted Government to stay out of the mess, that they'd attend to it as they had done before. They were ready to pay the fiddler for their bad judgment by declaring emphatically that they would not tolerate any easing of their debt obligations through tinkering with the standard of money.

The people had an opportunity to take another course, to issue a different mandate. There was, as you will recall, the Socialist platform:

"A Federal appropriation of five billions for immediate relief;

"Five billions for public works and roads, reforestation, slum clearance, decent homes for workers;

"A shorter day and week without reduction of wages;

"Free public employment agencies;

"Minimum-wage laws;"

and so on.

But the people wanted none of political magic, or doles, or dictation from the District of Columbia. The leader they chose was the one who decried the growing number of boards and commissions and bureaus, the leader who expressed their belief—and in their homely words—that "taxes come from the sweat of every man who labors;" that "liberal governments are wrecked on the shoals of loose fiscal policies."

The leader they chose was one who expressed, in a stirring speech, a belief in States' rights and that individual liberties would go when the Federal Government attempted to run everything.

Yet not a single plank in the Democratic "mandate" has been carried out; while, despite the opposition of a militant minority, practically every plank of the Socialist platform has been put into operation.

Now, socialism is the direct antithesis of the American free enterprise system. Socialism is the political operation of the machinery by which a people exchange the products of their labor, trade their services, undertake new enterprises. The half-way house on the road from free enterprise to socialism is—

Political control of the machinery;

Control of the people's earnings and savings;

Political control of the set-up of industrial and agricultural and commercial operation;

Control of the relations between manager and employee;

Control of the myriad activities of the market place;

Control of every act of every enterpriser who brings money, labor, machines, and materials together and takes products and services to the market place;

Control that begins with the financing of the project and follows through to the label of the package;

Control of banks, labor relations, oil, coal, lumber, telephones, retailer, stock and grain exchanges, insurance;

Control of the social problems of States and cities;

Control by supervision, and also by competition, as in the case of the Federal yardstick for power;

Control by means of 153,000,000 compulsory reports from business management last year.

This control exercised by some 137 Federal boards, bureaus, commissions, incorporations, and authorities—a majority of which agencies pass laws daily in the form of rules, regulations, and judgments often based on arbitrary opinion and personal whim.

Government by men instead of law.

The money cost of this control, great as it is, is not the real hindrance to recovery today. The real hindrance comes from the thing we are fighting, the tremendous increase of taxes and enormous peacetime borrowings. That sum is equal to the gross income of all the States west of the Mississippi. It is a sum equal to one-third the earnings of the American people. But even at that, the genius and drive of business management could take this tax burden in its stride and forge ahead if it were not for the greater obstacle which has been erected by the tax money Congress appropriated ostensibly to speed recovery. This obstacle is composed of new controls of business operations by executive bureaus.

Now, control in itself is not bad, but when this control is of the uncertain kind, in that bureaucrats have the power to change the rules overnight and change them back again the following day, then you have an obstacle indeed. Congress used to write the rules in the true American way, on the statute book, so that anyone could read if not understand. Today Congress has been obliged, because of the magnitude of the socialistic program to "make America over," as Professor Tugwell put it, to delegate lawmaking to executive departments. Today, hour by hour, thousands of rules, "interpretations," Executive orders, with all the effect of law, carrying penalties of fine and imprisonment, are made by more than fifty-odd new bureaus, boards, commissions, authorities, set up without definitive powers and more or less under the domination of the Chief Executive. Here are a half dozen examples:

Mr. Andrews, wage-hour administrative agent of our lawmaking body, Congress, announces he has reversed himself in exempting from the Federal law those white-collar employees who receive a monthly salary of $200 and more. Here is placed in the hands of one man the power to prescribe the working conditions of more than a million citizens, the power to throw thousands of operating budgets into the red. Whim or caprice, or political favor, may rule his decision. In this case Mr. Andrews admits he is rewarding a special group which, he says, "has done such a swell job in helping me fight my battles." The special group in this case was a labor union, but it would have been just as reprehensible and disturbing to business planning and venturing if it had been the United States Chamber of Commerce.

This is a two-headed monster. It looks both ways. It is not unreasonable to assume that some man occupying such a place of authority might by a parallel act do labor everlasting, destructive damage. The people—labor and management, are confronted with a problem which outweighs the question temporarily in the scales. Labor might do well to ponder, in the light of recent events, its own position in the picture should the Government continue to take and exercise such control.

A ship carrying whisky was rammed and sunk in harbor. The distiller applied for refund of the $2-a-gallon revenue tax, following the procedure prescribed in official regulations. The Alcoholic Tax Bureau informed him that the regulations had been changed; the consignee was the one to apply. The new regulation was followed only to have the consignee informed that another regulation provided the application must be made within 30 days and the time had expired. But finally, after months of bickering, the bureaucrat approved the refund on the ground that the amended regulation had not been published.

A Senate committee found 70,000 regulations in the Internal Revenue Bureau were not open to the public.

Some one of the score of young men and ladies in the Federal Trade Commission, whose job is to read the newspapers, found the manufacturers of granite tombstones were misleading their customers by calling granite "everlasting." Some day they may even rule that an affidavit must accompany a can of milk from contented cows to the effect that no single cow is discontented. The Commission has ordered a manufacturer to mark his fabrics "rayon" because they look so much like silk.

The Labor Relations Board adds injury to insult in its tyranny of prolonged hearings, some running into months, with stenographic records at times extending into the tens of thousands of pages. Its decisions enter the dangerous realm of the intent of the accused. It decides that the philosophic sayings of Henry Ford circulated for 25 years now are circulated with intent to embarrass the administration of Labor Department.

The Michigan Rural Rehabilitation Corporation, set up by the Department of Agriculture, requires each farmer who receives livestock on credit to sign an agreement that he will not "at any time prior to the final liquidation of my loan * * * do anything that is in opposition to the A. A. A. program."

The Social Security Board will soon decide whether agents of life-insurance companies are subject to the act, and the decision is

to be on the strange ground that if the company exercises a high degree of control over its agents they and the company are taxed, whereas a loose control and directions makes the company exempt.

Let's bring it right home to Manchester. According to the Associated Press the National Labor Relations Board, in a decision described as "unique," has ordered the Wambec Mills, of Manchester, N. H., to pay 2 years' wages to two skilled workers it never actually hired, and to hire them immediately.

There was no public announcement of the action of the Labor Board that usually accompanies such decisions, but it was learned that the decision, the first of its kind, was handed down several days. J. Warren Madden, Chairman of the Board, and Edwin S. Smith, member, signed the order.

In July 1937 Alphonse Chartier and Edward G. Geoffrion, described as experienced silk-mill workers, applied for jobs at the mills. The men went through all the steps preliminary to getting employment and the employment manager was said to have promised them both jobs. After investigation at the nearby mill where the two workers had been previously employed, it was found, according to information here, that the two men were described as "trouble makers" and when they reported for work at Wambec Mills they were told the jobs were not available.

The N. L. R. B. version of the matter was that the men were not trouble makers, and the Board ordered the company to pay them wages from the time they reported for work and were turned down up to the present, and further ordered the mill to hire both men now.

And in so many instances the citizen has no redress at court. The decisions of boards and bureaus are in many cases without court appeal. Courts will not entertain motions on the part of the citizen who feels he has been aggrieved on the ground that the courts have no jurisdiction. This is not a partisan statement. Two ardent new dealers, Senator Logan, of Kentucky, and Congressman WALTER, of Pennsylvania, both of whom have voted for every piece of New Deal legislation setting up these boards and bureaus, admit that great injustice has been done. They admit it in the form of an appeal which they presented to Congress 3 weeks before the regular session ended—an appeal that was brought out unanimously from the Senate Judiciary Committee and passed by the Senate. Upon the personal plea of Senator MINTON it was to be reconsidered. The House Judiciary Committee brought it out unanimously. The appeal provides—of all things in this land of the free and home of the brave—that a citizen still has the right to be tried by a jury of his peers.

It is a shameful admission that the Bill of Rights and the Constitution have been violated by New Deal legislation. The passage of this bill will be a palliative one. Congress should review its legislation and definitely place limits beyond which this great new bureaucracy cannot go, because it has been shown that an appeal from a Labor Board decision has cost those citizens who have made such appeals an average of $20,000. This makes it impossible for the small-business man to get relief.

Up here in New England 150 years ago the executive powers of Great Britain were extended to such an extent that our people rebelled. That executive, King George, had sent his bureaucratic appointees to the Colonies along with his tax collectors. The sturdy colonists went to war because of it, and announced to the world that they went to war because their ruler had "sent hither a multitude of officeholders to eat out our substance and harass our citizens."

We have multiplied this fully 10,000 times today in the United States, and only by a realization of the whittling away of our individual freedom and the building up of a ruling class which has taken place can we give a mandate to our representatives in Congress to restore the free enterprise system to America.

Enough of that background material. The Seventy-sixth Congress brought forth a change. The corporal's guard of vocal dissenters from such a program was enlarged and strengthened. At its insistence a change materialized. It accomplished many things, as many of you are aware.

What did it do for business? Here is the answer, in part:

(1) Although the appropriations for expenditures by the Federal Government were originally close to $10,000,000,000, an effort was begun in July to push through Congress a bill for novel and questionable forms of projects, and for an attempt to evade the statutory limit on the national debt by borrowing and spending outside the Budget approximately $2,700,000,000 more. Reduced in form, this bill passed the Senate. It was defeated in the House. The House refused to consider it, and against the spendthrift leadership of the administration forced at least a beginning of economy.

(2) The Senate passed a bill authorizing the United States Housing Authority to raise a second $800,000,000 and give another $45,000,000 to its borrowers. The House refused to consider this bill.

(3) In the face of official insistence of an appropriation of $850,000,000 for so-called relief, the sum was originally cut to $725,000,000 and later raised to $825,000,000. Congress did away with the prevailing-wage theory for skilled persons; required them to work for a reasonable time for their security weekly wage; required that careers on relief be ended through an 18-month rule; did away with theater projects and the like; and gave less in appropriations than had been officially requested.

(4) Against militant opposition it put its stamp of disapproval upon the creation of a bureaucracy fraught with political consequences inimical to the best interests of the Nation, by passing the Hatch bill which provides penalties for attempts to use relief workers for political purposes, and provides that any employee in the executive branch except the policy makers, is to lose his position if he engages in any political activity.

(5) It passed the revenue act, which abolished the tax on undistributed profits; placed the rate on corporate net income at 18 percent; allowed corporations to carry forward net operating losses for 2 years; permitted corporations to declare a higher value on capital stock this year and next for purposes of capital stock and excess-profits taxes; and ameliorated several provisions of law causing hardship to individuals and corporations. Hundreds of millions of dollars in future taxes saved to both labor and industry.

(6) It made extensive amendments and revisions in the Social Security Act, particularly as to old age insurance, the benefits of which were increased while being made payable 2 years earlier, beginning on January 1, 1940, while the tax rates at 1 percent were prevented from advancing on January 1. By virtue of its provisions, in the future small nonprofit organizations will be relieved from a ruling that their unpaid officials are to be counted as employees to make the organization employers of eight or more subject to the Federal tax of 3 percent on actual pay rolls. Freezing the pay-roll taxes at 1 percent saved many millions to industry and labor for the days to come.

(7) Under Republican leadership, it insisted that the limitation upon the total public debt at $45,000,000,000 should not be raised.

(8) Despite the persistent evasion of responsibility by the administration, it provided for investigation by a special committee of the House of the National Labor Relations Act.

(9) Efforts of the administration to obtain from the Rules Committee a rule necessary for consideration of amendments to the wage-hour act were defeated, and the act was neither altered, amended, nor repealed.

(10) Appropriations for the Army and Navy were about equal, each receiving between seven hundred and eight hundred million dollars, for naval aviation fields, shore stations, the accumulating of strategic materials; for civilian-pilot training; the creation of a Coast Guard Reserve; the building of a highway across the Isthmus of Panama; the manufacture and purchase of aircraft instruments and aeronautical accessories; in short for adequate national defense.

(11) In the face of determined administration resistance, Congress forced a measure of tax revision to relieve business of crippling punitive levies and established a special recess investigation to recommend general tax codification to the next session.

So much for a partial list of the legislation enacted.

We fought for economy at every step of the way in the last session, and that fight most assuredly will be pressed in the next term. However momentous may be the problems and issues ahead for American business, however challenging the foreign situation may appear, orderly finances in government remain a cardinal requisite of real national strength and security. Our program does not contemplate the merciless and heartless disregard of the unemployed or the unemployable. But here, as in every other aspect of government, we are dedicated to honest and efficient administration, to the elimination of political racketeering, and to the direction of all relief funds to those actually in need.

We tried in both the House and Senate to restore the power over money to the Congress, where, under the Constitution, it rightfully belongs. That fight surely will go on, for the American people appear to be in no temper to have their monetary system permanently on a 24-hour basis. A stable currency and a fixed money are the foundation stones of productive enterprise, under whatever conditions of emergency or tranquillity.

Next, our side attempted to curb the increasing tide of foreign imports from the bankrupt nations of Europe and the Orient. Recent events have given us great assistance in an economic way, where as a minority in Congress our objectives could not be wholly accomplished by legislation last term. Our dedication to the principles of solid protection for the American standard of living and wages, and preservation of the home market for our American farmers, still stand as beacon lights of Republican policy. These, likewise, are cornerstones of true and lasting American prosperity.

A special committee of the House is at work seeking codification of the Federal tax laws, with a view to removing unnecessary shackles upon enterprise, thrift, and prudence.

Assuredly there will be new tax legislation at the January session. It must be legislation calculated to strengthen our economic position on the home front. It must be based upon the traditional American concept that taxes are designed for revenue, not to serve as vehicles for vast and untried social experiments often at war with the principles of private enterprise and constitutional self-government by consent.

Reverting to Europe's catastrophe—America can best serve the entire world by remaining out of war.

When exhaustion lays the nations of Europe, who shall feed them, if not America? Whence will come the materials of reconstruction and rehabilitation? Indeed, our economic vitality may be the sole thread to save European civilization from the abyss of chaos. But what of this assistance? Should we bleed our own economy white by direct military participation abroad? What if we should involve our own financial system to the point of wild monetary inflation? Who then would succor the victor and the vanquished alike in their terrible agony of economic prostration and social disorganization after an exhausting general war?

America's first line defense is along the economic front at home. Strong, vibrant, robust, unafraid, we could be the true benefactors of stricken Europe. But weak, uncertain, anemic, and fearful of our own security, we would be unable to carry to the Continent that morsel of aid which might avert another Dark Ages.

What will we undertake to do at the regular session, do you ask? We shall continue to undertake:

(1) To curb unnecessary, wasteful, and reckless spending.

(2) To make such necessary amendments in the Federal tax structure as will eliminate or modify the provisions which are retarding business recovery.

(3) To so amend the National Labor Relations Act as to clarify the mutual obligations of workers and employer, and the duties of both toward the public, in order to end the present paralyzing discord.

(4) To repeal the dangerous discretionary authority which the President now has over the nation's monetary system; define specifically the area of government competition with private enterprise, so that business may be able to create jobs with some certainty as to the future; clarify and codify and publish the existing rules and regulations so that industry and business may know what to expect.

(5) To restore American markets to the American farmer and wage earner, and develop new markets for agricultural products, to such an extent and insofar as the existing situation aboard may make it possible so to do.

(6) We shall oppose and reject all experimental legislation not clearly helpful in promoting recovery, or which would subject agriculture, labor or industry to the compulsory decrees of a Federal bureaucracy.

(7) Keep the United States out of war.

It has been well said, and it may be said again, that this Republic is founded on inalienable liberties. It is dedicated to the dignity and personality of individual men and women. It is consecrated to truth, justice, tolerance, and mercy. These liberties and obligations are inseparable. If political freedom, intellectual freedom, or economic freedom are any one of them undermined all the others will fall.

These high purposes of this Nation are being undermined by the policies now pursued at home and by alien theories from abroad. Our first great mission is the preservation of these principles.

Today economic progress is being paralyzed. That destruction is the destruction of social progress. The imperious necessity of America is to restore economic productivity and thereby jobs for men. That alone can support our humanitarian aspirations. For social progress in care of the aged, the young, the ill-fed, the ill-clad, the ill-housed there must be parallel economic strength. Economic restoration is our second great mission.

We are the living custodians of the torch which fell from the hand of Abraham Lincoln. Cooperating we may again rekindle the heart and mind of America with the glow of hope and promise for the future. Congress faces an opportunity for a service to a great people. Congress means business. What are you going to do about it?

Preservation of American Liberties

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. E. COX

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 5, 1939

ADDRESS BY HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK, OF MASSACHUSETTS, AT THE NATIONAL CONVENTION OF THE VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Hon. JOHN W. McCORMACK, of Massachusetts, at the national convention of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Boston, Mass., August 29, 1939:

As we view the happenings of recent years—yes, even weeks, in certain countries of the world, we realize more profoundly what it means to be an American citizen. In looking over world conditions we have directly called to our conscious mind the meaning of our institutions of government, and of the benefits that flow from our priceless heritage.

"We hold these truths to be self-evident; that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness," is as true today as when uttered and fought for by those courageous heroes of the Revolutionary days.

Here we enjoy and possess a government that recognizes that state is not supreme—omnipotent—the beginning and end of man's existence.

Here we recognize that God himself is omnipotent; that while government is necessary in order for a people to live and exist together, it is the servant and not the master of its people, with all sovereign and political powers ultimately resting in the people.

Here, as individuals, we possess personal liberty, freedom of religious conscience, freedom of speech and of the press, the right of peaceful assembly, of petition to our public officials, of the sanctity of the family life being protected, of the protection of property lawfully obtained, of the right of a trial by a jury, and the other human rights set forth in the Constitution, rights that government itself cannot abridge or abrogate.

Here, my friends, the dignity and the personality of the individual is guaranteed and protected. History has shown that the destruction of the dignity and personality of the individual is the first attempt made upon personal liberty, the first effort being made in an attack on religion, all religions, either directly, as in the case of Soviet Russia, or indirectly, but just as destructive, as in the case of Nazi Germany.

Under our constitutional democratic processes of government, no governmental policy of persecution can exist, such as exists under certain totalitarian nations. Individuals might, but, thank God, our Government, as such, cannot engage in such a vicious policy. While, unfortunately, we have had in the past vicious movements of intolerance and bigotry due to weaknesses, prejudices, and emotional reactions of unthinking persons responding to the indecent and un-American appeals of those who exploit them, our constitutional Government has never engaged and can never engage in such contemptible practices. Every American should realize that bigotry is not only indecent but un-American. It violates the spirit and the intent of the Constitution. This is a proper time for the strong condemnation of efforts that are now being made to again array American against American because of a difference of race, color, or creed.

Here we have a Government that recognizes the omnipotence of God, and not of man, as the source of all rights and powers, and that man is responsible to God for the manner in which he exercises his powers. Our Government—a government of laws and not of men—has its origin in love, love of God, and love of neighbor, not, as in certain dictator-controlled nations, in hate.

If we keep this important fact in mind, we can then understand more clearly the reasons for the actions of those governments which are following the course of hate.

Hate carries with it the application of force and violence, hypocrisy, deceit, a disregard of the rights of others and of equity and justice among nations.

Hate appeals to the baser thoughts of man. It attempts to destroy the forces of good and to substitute therefor the forces of evil.

The history of man records, and present-day events clearly show, that where hate obtains control the rights of man disappear.

Let us not forget that what we possess was not created by Americans of today. Our Government was born by men who knew from experience the results of oppressive and personal government, of men who fought oppression to establish great principles of government and to put them into operation. Today that Government is ours—a great heritage. It is our duty to preserve it. It is our individual duty to vigorously and intelligently, rationally and not emotionally, perform our responsibilities to that end.

The first duty of government is self-preservation. Within its means, a government must provide for its national defense. If a government does not perform that primary duty, those in control are recreant to their tasks. The conditions that exist throughout the world, the dangers imminent from other nations, the policies of other nations, are prominent factors in determining our policies of national defense. We have been blessed with an excellent geographical location, but we are not justified in these days of rapid travel and communication in placing too much confidence upon this factor alone.

It is our duty to have navy and air forces and an army that are not only capable of adequate defense but which will be powerful enough to command respect—yes, fear, if necessary—in the minds of any nation or combination of nations that might cast their envious and covetous eyes in our direction.

Six years ago our Navy was in a helpless condition. Our air forces and our Army were negligible. We were unprepared. I remember well the fight that I and others made in the House in 1930, 1931, and 1932 to prevent, on the plea of false economy, our Army being sharply reduced from its then small level.

Today, thanks to the foresight and leadership of Franklin D. Roosevelt, our beloved President, and the Members of Congress who supported him, our Navy stands prepared, our air forces are being rapidly increased, and our Army is being prepared for any future emergency. During the period, for illustration, from 1922 to 1929, inclusive, we built only 17 naval vessels, 9 cruisers, 3 submarines, and 6 river gunboats, totaling 83,710 tons. During the same period Great Britain built naval vessels totaling 325,832 tons; Japan, 324,401 tons; France, 271,118 tons; and Italy, 204,320 tons. From 1929 to 1933 we built nothing to speak of.

According to a recent Navy Department statement, since March of 1933 there have been completed 106 new naval vessels, all now in commission. These include 4 aircraft carriers, 8 heavy and 9 light cruisers, 27 destroyers, and 21 submarines.

There are at present under construction 8 battleships, 2 aircraft carriers, 38 destroyers, 20 submarines, 6 light cruisers, and a score of smaller craft and auxiliary vessels.

Our defenseless position of 6 years ago has been changed under President Roosevelt.

In the carrying out of that program President Roosevelt and the Members of Congress who supported it—this program of preparedness—received the wholehearted support of your great American organization, the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States. Let us give credit where credit is due.

As we view recent world events, with European imperialism undimmed, with unholy alliances being made between forces of world revolution and destruction of our ideals, forces far more powerful today than only a few days ago, with combination of nations of this type seeking to impose their will on others, employing any methods necessary, and acting upon the vicious theory that "might is right," in my opinion it will be our duty, of necessity, to further increase our elements of national defense to a point that will assure the protection of our priceless heritage. A navy is not built after a war starts. Whatever the world conditions might be in the future we must be prepared to meet them.

So long as powerful nations pursue the policy of "might is right," much as we dislike it, we must be prepared to meet force with force. In a lawless dominated community the law abiding must use extraordinary measures for their protection. Where lawless nations exist a law-abiding nation must govern itself accordingly. Our security is in preparation. So long as some nations persist in their substitution of the reign of terror for the reign of reason, as I see it, we must establish a policy that represents the maximum and not the minimum requirements of protection. Unless world conditions change materially soon adequate protection calls for further increases, particularly in our Navy and our air forces.

We must remember that the rights and benefits that we possess carry with them the duty of protecting them and our Government. The obligation of protecting our priceless heritage is a duty that we cannot shirk—it is one that we will not shirk. An adequate national defense is an important instrument to that end.

In describing the United States, a historian of repute, of another land, termed it as "an invulnerable state of states; an indestructible country of countries; an impregnable nation of nations."

That is the United States of today, created by the fathers of the country and the framers of the Constitution, and passed onto us by generations of the past.

It is our responsibility and duty to keep it so—to be prepared to meet all attacks from without or from within—to preserve for ourselves and for posterity the "inherent and inalienable rights" of "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

Unjust Freight Rate Discriminations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WADE H. KITCHENS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 5, 1939

RESOLUTIONS UNANIMOUSLY ADOPTED AT A MEETING IN LITTLE ROCK, ARK., FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 15, 1939

Mr. KITCHENS. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

Be it resolved, That we, the members of a conference assembled in Little Rock, Ark., representing agriculture, industry, and commerce, in an area comprising 10 Southern States, most earnestly appeal to our Senators and Congressmen to fight for the removal of unjust freight-rate discriminations which have been imposed upon this great southwestern area.

Industry cannot develop and agriculture cannot thrive in this area until transportation costs have been reduced and such reduction made secure. We beg of our Representatives in Washington to oppose any conference report on the Wheeler-Lea transportation bills unless and until the amendments adopted by the House have been incorporated in the conference report, together with other amendments necessary to insure low-cost water services to the Middle West, South, and Southwest.

Regulation of port-to-port freight-rate structures by the Interstate Commerce Commission means increased freight costs to the producing and consuming public. We urge our Senators and Congressmen to oppose any conference report on transportation which does not contain an iron-clad mandate to the Interstate Commerce Commission which will insure to the public who pays the freight the economies of low-cost water services for which Congress has expended hundreds of millions of dollars to provide.

We urge upon our Representatives in Washington to give careful and sympathetic consideration to the reports of the Secretary of War, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Chairman of the Maritime Commission, which show clearly and conclusively that the legislation proposed in the Wheeler-Lea bills is not in the public interest.

Respectfully submitted.

John M. Fouts, Chairman, Fort Worth, Tex.; John J. Dee, Houston, Tex.; C. A. Newton, St. Louis, Mo.; Wm. R. Henderson, Jr., Memphis, Tenn.; Ted Schwachhofer, Muskogee, Okla.; J. Hendrix Alphin, El Dorado, Ark.; John P. Morrow, Batesville, Ark.; John F. Wells, Little Rock, Ark.; D. A. Linthicum, Long Beach, Calif.; John A. Fox, Greenville, Miss., Committee on Resolutions.

Northwest Citizens About To Be Bilked Again by Federal Agency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN G. ALEXANDER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 5, 1939

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, Minneapolis and St. Paul citizens and people in the entire Northwest area should rise up in united protest against another steal now being promoted here in Washington by big-business interests of the East.

The proposed price-fixing plan for bituminous coal, if we allow it to be adopted by the Board of Examiners of the Bituminous Coal Division of the Department of Interior, will place an added strain not only on business and industry but also on every individual pocketbook in our great midcontinent area. It is just another one of several similar Government edicts which have been put across in favor of selfish eastern interests at the expense of the people of the producing West.

Its effects will be similar to the baneful results which have come to us by reason of the workings of the "Pittsburgh-plus plan," now called the multiple basing point agreements. It may even be as bad as what has happened to us by reason of the unjust rates and discriminatory treatment which has been handed the Northwest for years since the rule of the Interstate Commerce Commission began in the United States.

It will not only add from $1 to $2 or perhaps $3 per ton to individual fuel bills but it will be reflected in higher gas and electric rates and in more severe competitive conditions for our factories and industrial establishments, perhaps causing us to lose still more of them, thus making more severe our unemployment situation and our tax burden.

An illustration of how the price-fixing proposal will raise the cost of coal to the consumer is as follows: From southern Illinois mines to Minneapolis and St. Paul the all-rail rate on steam-size coal is $3.32 per ton, as compared to the rail-and-river rate via Alton or east St. Louis of $2.50 per ton. The barge rate for domestic sizes is $2.70 per ton, as compared to an all-rail rate of $3.60.

From Kanawha River points to Minneapolis and St. Paul the combination rail-lake-river rate is $5.55 per ton, and the all-water rate is $3.50.

But the proposed plan not only fixes the price at the mine on the basis of the all-rail rate but it further penalizes the use of the waterways by fixing higher rates for coal which moves by rail and water than by all rail.

Similar discriminations are included in the prices for the upper Mississippi River area from the Omar No. 4 mine of West Virginia, except that the discriminations are greater. Further, the price on rail-water coal, f. o. b. at the mines in southern Illinois for delivery in the Twin Cities, is approximately $1 per ton higher under the Commission's new proposals than the all-rail price from the same mines.

In addition to that, the all-rail prices at the mines will be increased so that the consumer who now enjoys the saving resulting from the transportation of coal by water will not only be deprived of this substantial water saving, but must pay a higher price for coal received by rail.

And to intensify the transportation handicaps of our interior section, where freight rates are already excessive, the Bituminous Coal Division has exempted from the penalties imposed on the interior, water-borne coal for industry and commerce located along the Great Lakes and on the Atlantic coast, where industry already had a decided transportation advantage.

This is discrimination of the rankest type against the Midwest localities and should not be allowed to stand. We should take strenuous steps against it.

SUGGESTS STRIKE AGAINST FEDERAL TAXES AS REMONSTRANCE AGAINST UNJUST TREATMENT

My experience here in Washington has not only confirmed my convictions on this subject, but it has also forcibly impressed me with the realization, that the Midwest area has long suffered under an economic system in which we have enjoyed a position little better than that of provinces.

I have studied these various problems for several years as I have noted with pain how the lifeblood of our State has been drained by the destructive regulations fostered and aided by the Federal Government. One is forced to wonder if it would perhaps not be better for rich producing sections such as ours is, blessed with such great natural wealth and resources, to set up an organization separate from the Federal Government in all except matters of national defense, postal and monetary affairs, and perhaps a few other functions.

There seems good justification for some sort of serious action not only because we are suffering severely under the trade rules and under an economic system forced on us by the Federal agencies, but also because such a huge system of government as we are building up in Washington is more expensive than when administered locally; and also because statistics show that we 12 States of the Northwest paid more into the Federal Treasury during 5 years of the depression, from 1933 through fiscal year 1938, than we received back.

The States of Minnesota, Wisconsin, Michigan, Iowa, North and South Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas, Missouri, Illinois, Indiana, and Ohio paid into the Federal coffers in total taxes during that period $5,704,947,055 and received back in Federal benefits only $5,686,081,000. In other words, each of the over 18,000,000 inhabitants of these 12 Midwest States paid in an average of $144 per person, and we received back only $143 per person from the Federal Government. And the chance is pretty strong that we would not have needed even that much, had we not been bled white by such schemes as the Pittsburgh-plus plan, the unfair rates promulgated by the Interstate Commerce Commission, and others, and now presently by the plans of the Bituminous Coal Commission.

Another good indication that our section is not progressing but is fast going down hill, instead of growing as we did prior to about 1916, is in the fact that in 1934 we lost one of our 10 Representatives in Congress, so that now we have only 9. Why? Because other States are growing larger, while we stopped growing or got smaller.

We have had a lot of strikes, and I hate them as much as anyone possibly could, but if we cannot get a little more consideration and justice from these Federal departments here in Washington, I suggest that we all go on a strike against paying in any more taxes. Our slogan should be, "No more income taxes, no more cigarette, liquor, amusement, gasoline, or social-security taxes unless and until we get our just deserts."

Who will take the leadership for such a movement and save the Midwest from complete enslavement by the blase eastern interests? Something should be done, and at once.

OUR WEALTH DRAINS TO EASTERN FINANCIAL CENTERS

As matters stand at present, the wealth produced by our farms, forests, mines, and natural resources flows to the eastern financial centers aided by these nefarious governmental rules and rates. Our own State is one of the greatest producers of natural resources in the Nation, but still we are in the depth of a terrific economic depression with over 100,000 people out of work and poverty-stricken, if not starving to death, while our wealth in the iron mines, in the forests, and fields flows and continues to flow to the metropolitan centers of the East. What can the end or the answer be unless we all awaken from our indifference and act in unison as I have suggested?

Abe Lincoln, the Ferryman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 5, 1939

ADDRESS OF HON. JAMES M. TUCKER, SECRETARY OF STATE OF INDIANA, ON THE OCCASION OF THE DEDICATION OF THE NEW INDIANA ABE LINCOLN FERRY PARK, ON ANDERSON CREEK, NEAR TROY, ON SUNDAY, OCTOBER 1, 1939, UNDER THE AUSPICES OF THE BOONVILLE PRESS CLUB

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include therein an address made by the Honorable James M. Tucker, secretary of the State of Indiana, on the occasion of the dedication of the new Indiana Abe Lincoln Ferry Park, on Anderson Creek, near Troy, Ind., on the 1st day of October 1939, which ceremonies were held under the auspices of the Boonville Press Club of the State of Indiana. The splendid address given by Mr. Tucker follows:

This is the site of the Lincoln Ferry, where the boy, Abraham Lincoln, spent the greater part of his seventeenth year operating a ferry across what we now call Anderson Creek, but which was then known as Anderson River. We are met here at this dedication to once again pay tribute to the greatest man, not of divine origin, who has ever lived on this earth. No man in the annals of history has left an impression that has ripened and grown greater with the passing of years than that made by Abraham Lincoln from the date of his birth until his death in 1865 at the hands of an assassin. Honest, diligent, shrewd, strong, manly, and above all humane are only a few of the many adjectives that may be used to describe the life of this great man.

History, we are told, is the story of man and his achievements. As time has passed the names of many men have been engraved upon the pages of history. There are many who have risen to fortune, fame, and glory but of that great number there are only a few who have pressed their personalities upon the forefront of history with such vigor as to withstand the ravages of the ages. As we view those of long ago so will future generations view those of whom we think in terms of yesterday.

Let us turn back the pages of history and note the great whose names have been so indelibly carved thereon that their fames have lasted until this day. Twenty-three hundred years ago, namely, in the fourth century B. C., Alexander the Great held sway over all of the then-known civilized world. In a span of a few short years this young man had conquered kingdom after kingdom and empire after empire until, as we are told, he went up on top of a mountain and wept because there were no more worlds to conquer. Alexander's name is still written with those of the great men of the world, not only because he succeeded in conquering the world, but because his conquests brought a fusion of eastern and western civilizations, the marks of which have lasted until this day.

After Alexander there came other great men, but none so outstanding as Julius Caesar. In the first century B. C., Julius Caesar rocked the entire foundation of the world and gained an immortal place in history as a result of his placing himself at the head of the Roman State. Under the tutelage of Caesar, Rome rose to the mastery of the world—not alone by force of arms but by intellectual accomplishments. The works of Caesar and those who have followed after him have lasted even unto today. Without him the entire face of history would have been changed—our language, for example, would not be the same without its Latin base. As in that, so in many other things the Latin influence is felt, and the reason in most cases goes back to the dominant characterists of that great man.

In the latter part of the eighth century there arose in what is now France a King of the Franks, who was able to make order out of the chaos that resulted from the fall of the Roman Empire. That man, Charlemagne, succeeded in shaping an empire that rivaled that of Caesar in its extent. Truly the impression that he has made on history is a lasting one. Without the strength and foresight of Charlemagne, the entire face of Christian civilization might have been changed into a Mohammedan one. It was Charlemagne who preserved Europe for Christianity and thus permitted the civilization that we know now to come into being.

In more modern times there, too, arose in France another whose greatness is the more remarkable because he sprang from nothing to become the ruler of continental Europe, a feat equally daring as it was valiant, for Napoleon Bonaparte found France a weakened

republic and built it until it held sway over all the nations of Europe except England. Napolean is not alone remembered for his victories, but for the many economic and legal improvements that he inaugurated during his reigns.

However, in a brief glance at those five men—five great men of the past—one thing flashes forth; one word alone is common to them all—conquerors. Each of them sought to foist upon the people and the world of their time, their ideas, their ideals, their desires, and their will in order that they might make names for themselves and to glorify their achievements in years to come. Contrast their outstanding characteristics and the fame that has lived after them with that of Lincoln, and therein you can see why Lincoln is the greatest of all men that has ever lived. Lincoln's sole idea in his work was to make this world a better place in which to live; not for white or black, rich or poor, or aristocrat or commoner, but for everyone. Lincoln's fame has lasted and grown brighter with the years, because he did not climb the ladder of success to fame and fortune over the broken bodies and gutted fortunes of conquered peoples; nor was his climb one of a person intent on personal glory. It was one that was made without any intention of creating a name for himself, but fame grew from the glories of his achievements made for the betterment of the human race. The unsought-for fame attained by Lincoln far surpasses in brilliance that of any other great man of history, who devoted their lives to the making of themselves famous.

In reading modern history too little attention is paid to the formative years of Lincoln's life which were spent here in Indiana. It was that period from his seventh to his twenty-first year wherein the boy Lincoln grew to become a man, and it was in those years spent here in Indiana that the foundation for the great life that he led was laid. Here he was taught the great unity of America. He was a riverman. He worked on the river. He made many trips up and down the Ohio and twice made trips to New Orleans by flatboat from Rockport. These experiences had a strong effect in molding his character. To him the Ohio River was not a boundary between Indiana and Kentucky but it was a connecting link between the place of his birth and the place where he spent his boyhood life. It was not in Lincoln to contemplate his beloved Ohio as a hostile border. To him the Ohio and the Mississippi and their connecting links were the arterial system of a great nation which they bounded together and which gave to it its very life. It was incomprehensible to Lincoln to believe that the Union should be divided. He could not contemplate it being divided at the Ohio, which was the natural place of division, and he so stated in his first inaugural address. It is for us as Hoosiers to forever impress upon people and upon history the fact that that great ideal of Lincoln's life was taught to him while he was here in our beloved Hoosier State. While he was here, Lincoln had many jobs. He was hired out to James Taylor, an enterprising farmer, whose home was about one-half mile up the creek. While he worked for Mr. Taylor, he also did some general farm work and worked as a butcher. His regular pay was $6 per month, but he was given special wages for his butchering. It is interesting to note that the regular rate for butchering was 25 cents per day, but Abe, because of his size and strength, proved to be so efficient as a country butcher that he received 6 cents extra per day for his services; in all, 31 cents per day. He often used an expression in later life that he acquired from his experience as a country butcher. Once when a dignified group of visitors called on him at the White House and in expressing their sympathy for the President because of the terrible burden the war put upon him, Abe surprised them by remarking, in an absent-minded way, "Yes; it's sure a hard hog to hold."

Picture, if you will, the young Abe moving from his hill home in Kentucky to a new land here in Indiana. See him as a boy of 7 crossing the Ohio and coming here to spend the most formative years of his ife in our State. It seems to me that that can be likened to the grinding of a piece of glass. The glass is taken to the grinder rough with no definite form, and by a process of polishing and rubbing the edges are worn away and a smoothed, polished, mirrorlike surface is the result. The experiences Abraham Lincoln had here in those 14 years were the polish that made him the man he was later to show to the world. Here Abraham Lincoln learned what it was to work for a living. True it was that he worked for Mr. Taylor, but the $6 he received as a salary per month from that went to his father, and he remarked often in later life of the time he earned his first dollar. Secretary Seward, during Lincoln's Presidency, wrote down the story in the President's own words of that experience, and this is what he said:

"I was contemplating my new boat, and wondering whether I could make it stronger or improve it in any part when two men with trunks came down to the shore in carriages and asked, 'Will you,' said one of them, 'take us and our trunks out to the steamer?' 'Certainly,' said I. I was very glad to have the chance of earning something and supposed that each of them would give me a couple of bits. The trunks were put in my boat, the passengers seated themselves on them, and I sculled them out to the steamer. They got on board, and I lifted the trunks and put them on the deck. The steamer was about to put on steam again, when I called out, 'You have forgotten to pay me.' Each of them took from his pocket a silver half dollar and threw it on the bottom of my boat."

Here the President paused and gave thoughtful emphasis to the remainder of his statement.

"I could scarcely believe my eyes as I picked up the money. You may think it was a very little thing, and in these days it seems to me like a trifle, but it was a most important incident in my life. I could scarcely credit that I, the poor boy, had earned a dollar in less than a day; that by honest work I had earned a dollar. The world seemed wider and fairer before me. I was a more hopeful and thoughtful boy from that time."

It was here, as a result of his activities as a ferryman, that he gained his first experience and knowledge of the law. Kentucky jurisdiction, as you know, runs to the low water mark on the Indiana side. It does now and it did then. There were two Dill brothers operating a ferry across the Ohio at this place under a Kentucky license. They filed charges against Abe and brought him before Squire Samuel Pate, justice of the peace of the Commonwealth of Kentucky on the other side of the river, charging Abe with running a ferryboat without a license. Abe pleaded his own case. He was too poor to hire a lawyer to plead for him and it was well that he was because from that brush with the law Abe gained his ambition and desire to become a lawyer. His defense was that he did not take passengers across the river but only to midstream so that they might board the steamers that passed by here but would not stop. There was no other way for them to take such steamers at this place, likewise there was no law governing such a situation. It was a work of simple necessity. He had not "set them over the river" and he therefore had not violated the law, for the Commonwealth of Kentucky did not require a license for such services. Abe's logic at this early date served him as well as it did in later life, for Judge Pate ruled with him and dismissed the charges.

We find in reading history that Abe was a flatboatman of excellence. He could not only build flatboats but could handle one with the best of them. It is amusing also to note that it was Abe's experience from having been a flatboatman and having learned the art of building them that the Union profited during the Civil War. When the Swedish inventor John Ericsson came to the Navy Department with his proposed draft of the *Monitor* early in the Civil War, he received no attention whatever. His plans were ridiculed. The Secretary of the Navy refused to have anything to do with it. At that time the Union had already established its blockade of all Confederate ports, when, suddenly, the *Merrimac*, an ironclad ship belonging to the Confederates, proceeded to wreak havoc upon the Union Navy by ramming and sinking its wooden ships with impunity. There was consternation in the Federal Navy Department, but during all this time Ericsson had quietly kept on with his plans because he knew his "cheese box on a raft," as it was called, would work. He had, in desperation, appealed to Lincoln, explaining to him his plan of placing a revolving turret with a cannon on the flat surface of a boat or ship. Lincoln listened to Ericsson and approved of his plan and told him that he did not know much about ship building but he did know a great deal about flatboat building and that Ericsson's plans certainly met all the requirements of good flatboat building. You are well acquainted with the result. It was Ericsson's *Monitor* that fought with the *Merrimac*, the first navy engagement between ironclad ships, which not only saved the Union cause in the Civil War but revolutionized the building of naval ships throughout the world.

The advent of Lincoln upon the political stage in 1860 was so opportune that to us it seems as though he was ordained by God to be chosen for the task he so ably mastered. No other man, in that darkest of hours for this Nation, had the foresight, diplomacy, and patience with which to battle a rebellious South and a recalcitrant North. Lincoln had the ability to foresee the futility of attempting to rear two nations in the confines of what is now the United States. Geographically and racially we know now that we were meant to be but one people, but there were many, in the North as well as in the South, who were unable to foresee that then.

Lincoln's sole ambition, his sole desire, his every living breath was for the preservation of the Union. To that end he was willing and did sacrifice his home, his family, his fortune, his political future, and above all, his life. No more sad thing and no more dastardly deed was ever done than his assassination after the work was done. One cannot but think that the hectic and trying days after the war would not have been had Lincoln lived on.

Throughout the entire conflict Lincoln's patience, though sorely tried at times, never faltered. Time after time, when generals would fail to do what they should have done, causing a reverse to the Federal troops, Lincoln would forgive them and give them another trial. During the war a great many of the northern soldiers were youngsters and away from their homes, would desert. When captured, the commanders, who wished some semblance of discipline to be preserved, would have them court-martialed and ordered shot. The appeal to Lincoln from a soldier so condemned never went unheeded. He would order the papers of the case sent to him and would promptly forget the whole incident, much to the chagrin of his generals. Truly Lincoln's humanity was so great that words are unable to convey the extent to which Lincoln would go to aid others in avoiding suffering. A man absolutely devoid of anger and passion in his relations with others is most ably described by his own words in his second inaugural address when he said "with malice toward none and charity for all." As late as March 1865 he further expressed this sentiment

when he met the Confederate commissioners attempting to negotiate peace, telling them that if the rebellious States would agree to come back into the Union as they were before the war and to free the slaves they could name their own terms.

Noble, thoroughly cognizant of what he desired to do and willing to sacrifice all that that ideal might be reached, patient and steadfast, diligent and untiring in his efforts for the culmination of that ideal that the Union might be preserved, Lincoln lived to see the completion of his work and the successful accomplishment of that for which he so nobly strived. However, the saving of the Union is not his only claim which rears him to an immortal place in the seat of fame. This man of many characters on the 19th day of November 1863 gave to the world and to posterity the greatest utterance ever spoken by the tongue of men in the English language. Rhetorically, literally, in beauteousness of phrase his Gettysburg Address transcends any other literary masterpiece ever made by the hand of man from the beginning of time, in its breadth of feeling, deepness of thought, and clarity of reason. As we read it now we are at a loss to understand the ability of a man to put together such euphonious phrases containing such an explicit statement of the American ideals of citizenship in a masterpiece that required less than 15 minutes for its delivery. But Lincoln did that as he did everything else—no flare or no pomposity. As was his life so was his Gettysburg Address, a direct and simple statement of his beliefs.

Lincoln with his nobility of soul and purpose has done what no other great man has ever done. As time has passed on, his name has not become dim with the passing of the ages but has year by year, when the magnificience and effect of his works has been realized, grown brighter in the minds of men. His life was such that we cannot but help note the similarity between it and that of the Master. Like Christ he lived for others, and like Christ, he sacrificed all that he held dear that humanity might live in a better world.

Because of the man he was, the things he did, both great and small, Lincoln transcends all territorial and racial boundaries—he belongs not to America but to the world as its most brilliant apostle of human freedom. In history the name of Abraham Lincoln has stood forth above all others in the past, it so stands forth now, and will so stand forth in the future and forever.

"As some tall cliff that lifts its rugged form
Swells from the vale and midway leaves the storm
Though round its breast the rolling clouds are spread
Eternal sunshine settles on its head."

It Seems to Me

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN C. SCHAFER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 5, 1939

ARTICLE BY HEYWOOD BROUN

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Heywood Broun which appeared in the Washington Daily News of Tuesday, October 3:

[From the Washington Daily News of October 3, 1939]

IT SEEMS TO ME

(By Heywood Broun)

I wish to arise to a question of personal privilege, but in part the subject does lie in the domain of public interest. Once upon a time it was a general newspaper practice to give a man a chance to reply when some damaging charge was made against him. Now it seems increasingly customary to shoot the yarn out and let the injured party try to catch up under his own steam. And once a story has a start of 12 or 20 hours a denial has to be extremely agile ever to catch up with it.

On Saturday a man named Joseph Zack told the Dies committee that I had been a member of the Communist Party for 2 years. He said I joined in 1928. Out goes the story over press-association wires and into the columns of the newspapers by which I am directly employed. The New York Times was the only paper with sufficient courtesy and devotion to good journalistic practices to call up and ask what I wanted to reply. I have never seen or heard of Zack to the best of my knowledge and belief, and I doubt whether he is familiar by name or reputation to any city editor or managing editor.

On several occasions I have stated that I have never been a Communist. And something over a year ago I testified to this fact before the Dies committee. Now I am neither a liar nor a perjurer. I have been in the newspaper business continuously for more than 31 years. And so it makes me good and sore when some unidentified stranger can get up and take a crack at me without any newspaper offering me a chance to reply before publication. I realize that Stamford is a 30-cent phone call. It makes me particularly sore when the paper for which I work does a thing like that to me. And I also say it's bad newspaper work, because it is a matter of not particularly obscure record that during the time Zack assigns me to membership in the Communist Party I ran for Congress on the Socialist ticket and took a pretty thorough shellacking in the columns of the Daily Worker, which always referred to me as Hey Gin Broun. And the Worker also carried some excellent cartoons in which I appeared in a perambulator being wheeled around by Norman Thomas.

I am not arguing right now about political or economic interpretation of this or that. Or "radical" or "liberal." I simply state again for the tenth, and, I hope, the final, time that I have never been a member of the Communist Party for 2 years or 2 minutes. And that, I think, is enough or maybe too much of personal note. However, there is a public stake in such matters. A single item can do enormous damage to persons far more important and infinitely more virtuous than myself. I know enough of the time element in the making of a newspaper to realize that there are situations in which it is not possible to get both sides of a story immediately. But even if the story can't wait there ought to be an obligation to set forth the fact that the party of the second part has not yet had a chance to say his say. It isn't a question of redress. It's a question of fair play at the beginning. Libel suits are no good in circumstances where they may seem to be warranted. That's a sucker's game in the first place, and the practice might be abused into constituting an actual threat to free press. There used to be a day when indignant citizens stormed into newspaper offices with horsewhips, but even up here in rural Connecticut it's years since I've seen a horsewhip. Additionally I might, on occasion, find myself on the wrong end of the whip. And punching people in the nose never gets you very much after you have turned 50. I guess I'll just have to take it out by saying in this single column that I'm good and sore, and that I'm going to continue that way. When I swear that a thing isn't true then no newspaper and no prattling Zack can pin it on me. I won't go for it. After all, I've saved up $34, there are bullheads in the pond behind the house, and the woods abound with edible roots and wild berries.

The Dies Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 5, 1939

EDITORIAL FROM THE RICHMOND (IND.) PALLADIUM-ITEM

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an editorial appearing in the Palladium-Item, of Richmond, Ind., of date October 2, 1939, which eulogizes the splendid work now being done by the Dies committee of the House of Representatives. May I say, in passing, that I sincerely hope each Member of the House will take the time to read the illuminating editorial which is embraced herein and give calm reflection to the far-reaching results of any continuance of the policy which the Dies committee has discovered to exist in our own Government.

The editorial follows:

[From the Richmond (Ind.) Palladium-Item of October 2, 1939]

HOW DID THEY GET THERE?

Representative DIES, chairman of the congressional committee investigating un-American activities, was authority for the statement that the Justice Department has been ordered by the Roosevelt administration to get rid of about 2,850 persons in Government service who are known to be Communists. President Roosevelt later denied any such action was contemplated.

How did those 2,850 Communists get into Government service? Someone had to appoint them to the positions they hold. Were those who did the appointing such dumbheads that they did not know they were appointing enemies of our country to positions in the Government? Or were they secretly sympathetic with communism and Communists and were they helping the game along? Has the Justice Department known right along that these persons involved were Communists? If so, who has kept that Department from taking action long ago?

Were thousands of Communists employed in Government positions when either Hoover, Coolidge, Harding, Wilson, Theodore Roosevelt, McKinley, or Cleveland was President? No? Well,

then, why suddenly do so many Communists appear in Government service under the administration of Franklin Roosevelt?

Are 2,850 Communists the only ones in Government service? Or are there hundreds or thousands more of these persons there?

We are fortunate, aren't we, that Congress set up this committee to investigate such subversive activities? Fortunate that Representative DIES is chairman of the committee, a man who has investigated regardless of the political results. How many remember the time when President Roosevelt expressed displeasure with the work of the committee? How many recall the many unpleasant remarks made by various persons connected with the New Deal about the committee being a "red" baiting organization?

Do you approve of the work and findings of the Dies committee? If you do, does it occur to you it is queer that President Roosevelt does not come out publicly now in expression of his appreciation for the patriotic work that committee is doing? He has stated he is sorry he signed the present unneutral neutrality law. So he can express regret for a personal mistake. Why does he not, therefore, express regret for his disparaging remarks made some time ago concerning the Dies committee and now congratulate it on the splendid results accomplished?

An Answer to Senator Borah

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 5, 1939

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. EMANUEL CELLER, OF NEW YORK

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an address I delivered Tuesday, September 19, 1939, at 7:45 p. m., over the National Broadcasting Co. network, radio station WJZ, as follows:

At the outset I am unalterably in favor of keeping out of the present and all wars. I am in favor of doing everything humanly possible to avoid our entrance into war. I shall vote for a war resolution only when our national sovereignty is imperiled, if the very life of our Nation is at stake. I shall vote for every reasonable, sensible measure with this objective in view and reject all bills that directly or indirectly impinge upon this principle. I do not want a recurrence of that fantastic period between 1914–17 when America made its last frenzied journey along the road to war and ruin.

The issue is not as the distinguished senior Senator from Idaho [WILLIAM BORAH] stated over this station the other evening—intervention or nonintervention. It is simply methods of neutrality. Unlike the distinguished Senator, I cannot lose sight of the fact that radio, television, radiophotography, the magnitude of international trade, high-speed airplanes, the well-nigh annihilation of time has brought nations closer together. In 1914 the Atlantic Ocean, 3,000 miles wide, had never been spanned by an airplane. Now planes traverse it in little more than a day. Mechanical ingenuity has given it the aspect of a narrow channel. Virginio Gayda, fascism's leading newspaper spokesman, a short while ago threatened that Italy and Germany would soon meddle in American affairs and that the United States is "not protected by distance." The wife of our President has stated that her recent transcontinental tour convinced her that people are beginning to doubt that the United States can isolate itself from the rest of the world. In truth and in fact, we cannot. We are a dependent nation, commercially and economically. For example, we must import many articles to insure our economic progress and our commercial supremacy; to mention but a few—sisal, hemp, tin, rubber, manganese. We are not indeed a self-sufficient people.

Senator BORAH sets up a straw man. He says the opposition maintains that "because Europe is so 'near' to the United States, owing to modern inventions and the mingling of business affairs, that neutrality is impracticable if not impossible." Nobody in his right senses could argue that so-called "nearness" to Europe makes neutrality impossible and none of us seeking the arms-embargo repeal has set up such an argument. Such is but a figment of the Senator's imagination. Whether we are near or far, we must remain neutral but, nevertheless, that "nearness" must give us pause. We cannot live in a vacuum. Our latitude and longitude cannot make us insensible to what is going on in Europe. If our present rigid policy of so-called neutrality and isolation has frankly aided a culprit and aggressor nation, namely the Reich, and has practically denied help to victim nations, it is time to call a halt. Our closeness to Europe cannot blind us to Nazi brutalities nor to the Soviet's perfidy.

The Senator says that in Washington's time, South America was practically divided between Portugal and the Spanish Crown and the West Indies and Central America belonged to England, France, and Spain. Therefore, America was "smotheringly close" to Europe yet Washington, continues the Senator, issued his neutrality proclamation. Again the Senator sets up a straw man. We, seeking the arms-embargo repeal, are also for neutrality to the *n*th degree, yet wholeheartedly support Roosevelt's proclamation of neutrality. But Washington acted through fear. He was beset by all the nations mentioned. His was an unavoidable policy of embargo and nonintercourse while British warships impressed our seamen and captured our ships and Barbary corsairs and French privateers exacted tribute from merchantmen.

It is well to remember that in 1794 Gouverneur Morris wrote: "I am tolerably certain that, while the United States of America pursue a just and liberal conduct with 20 sail of the line at sea (armaments) no nation on earth will dare insult them. One thing I am thoroughly convinced of, that if we do not render ourselves respectable, we shall continue to be insulted." Our Nation was blockaded. American frontiers were attacked. There was a compelling reason why Washington, abetted by Hamilton, was neutral. He had no choice in the matter because there was "no 20 sail of the line at sea"; he had no Navy and no Army with which to fight. He knew that force then, as today, is the final arbiter between nations. Citing Washington's neutrality is meaningless in connection with the type of present-day neutrality.

The Senator seems to imply that repeal of the arms embargo would constitute an unneutral act because it would mean actually taking sides in the war. That statement involves a non sequitor. Repeal is not taking sides. He says that because France and Britain can buy arms in this country and Germany cannot, "is that not intervention in the present European war?" I fail to see how that is "intervention." Frankly, under his strained and illogical point of view, we are now intervening. I must remind the Senator that under the present law it is eminently proper and fitting for traders to sell to France and Britain all possible supplies and materials which go to make armaments and munitions. We sell, without let or hindrance, steel, scrap iron, oil, airship parts which are subsequently reassembled. Germany, lacking control of the seas, cannot make purchases of such vitally necessary war materials. By Senator BORAH's own test, we are thus "intervening." Yet he wants the present act continued. The present act bars arms and munitions but does not bar many vital war materials. What is the distinction between the two? Secretary Hull very succinctly points out that under the conditions of modern war lists of contraband are no longer limited to arms and munitions. I agree with the Secretary that life-giving wheat is just as important as death-dealing gases.

The Senator argues that repeal of the arms embargo and the setting up of the so-called cash-and-carry idea would enable us to furnish arms and implements of war to one group of nations and deny them to others, and, therefore, is not that taking sides or intervention in the war? I again say emphatically "no!" Indeed, such a change would be a healthful return to the principle of neutrality as it was understood during the 145 years of our history. Never before have we tried to map our laws on neutrality according to the geographical advantages and disadvantages of belligerents. We never distinguished between arms and the steel and copper that makes them.

Italy has just renewed her sailings to America. She can buy anything and everything. She is not a belligerent. She can transship her purchased American arms and munitions to her axis partner, Germany. It is true the law forbids transshipment, but such is well-nigh impossible of proof. Mussolini could ship Hitler his own Italian-made arms and munitions, etc., and replace same with American products. That would be sticking to the law. Thus our present BORAH unneutral neutrality becomes the means of aiding the much-hated Hitler through Italy. And now the ghoul Stalin, who shares the corpse of Poland with his brother ghoul Hitler, can feed him more American arms.

Furthermore, the present statute gives the Reich an equivalent of an Atlantic Fleet, as it keeps American munitions from Britain and France with just as much certainty as if the German Navy kept British and French ships from carrying our guns and implements of war.

Canada is a declared belligerent. She, therefore, cannot buy now as much as a single airplane, no matter how much needed for her home defense, although Italy, and now Russia, open allies of Hitler, can buy all he, Hitler, wants. I say this also despite the fact that our President has interpreted the Monroe Doctrine as requiring us to go to war in the event of an attack of aggression by an enemy upon Canada.

Our Nation does not want war, but does want a change in the Neutrality Act. I believe that the vast majority of our people are behind this Roosevelt-Hull idea of cash and carry. A recent Gallup poll showed that 89 percent of our people favored it. The majority of our people would not advocate the change if they believed the Senator was right.

The Senator, who has always been a stickler for international law, fails to realize that the present act flies in the face of international law. It has always been the studied purpose of the United States from our very beginning to advocate and practice unrestricted trade in arms and munitions. It had never been the practice of any nation (except now Germany and other aggressor nations) to maintain in time of peace large military establishments or stores of arms and ammunition to repel invasion by a well-equipped and powerful enemy. If such arms embargo were adopted in the early days by other nations, the consequences would have been very serious to the United States. We were always compelled to buy from abroad most of our munitions. In the

event of an attack by a foreign power, it would be a very serious disadvantage for small nations, particularly at the outbreak of war, not to have the right of such purchases. Secretary of State Lansing, in 1915, echoing the views of his predecessors, especially Thomas Jefferson, pointed out that the United States had always depended upon the right and power to purchase arms and ammunition from neutral nations in case of foreign attack. This right, which it always claimed for itself, it cannot now deny to others. Former Secretary of State Stimson strongly endorses this policy. If the Borah proposal were adopted and every nation would be compelled, in consequence, to have in readiness at all times vast stores of munitions of war to meet every emergency, every nation would thus become an armed camp.

Senator BORAH is an advocate of peace and so am I. His present theory would force militarism on the whole world and would work against universal peace. The very Washington whom Senator BORAH quoted on neutrality was a stern advocate of this practice of international law. To adopt Senator BORAH's theory would be playing into the hands of the present-day military despots. It would make most nations, unable to buy arms from us or other neutral nations, the prey of the current crop of deluded Caesars.

Furthermore, as I see it, there is no such thing as "neutrality" in thought or deed. In a recent fireside chat our President said, in part: "I cannot ask that every American remain neutral in thought. Even a neutral has the right to take account of facts." How can anyone in his right senses, how can anyone with any degree of humanity, within him, remain neutral in the face of that dreadful sea tragedy, the bombing of the *Athenia*, caused by the deliberately criminal action of the Nazis? Many innocent lives have been lost. This ship was torpedoed by a German submarine without warning. More than 300 American citizens were aboard. That bombing was in violation of a treaty which the United States has with Germany. It was an act as wantonly cruel as that which sank the *Lusitania*.

"I will not fight against women and children," said Hitler, in his war message to the Reichstag. "I have given my air force orders to restrict its actions to military objectives." As he spoke, German planes were dropping bombs on women and children in Polish cities. Maybe he can make us believe that terroristic bombing of a city is an attack upon a military objective. Heart-rending atrocity stories appear daily. Women and children were blown to fragments by bombs aimed, of course, at "military objectives." He has released a military terror in Poland that inevitably leaves men, women, and children crushed under the ruins of their homes. The Germans themselves release handsome photographs of the gutted and lifeless villages that mark their path in Poland. And now Stalin has entered the "blitzkrieg." How can one be neutral in thought in the face of such stark cruelty and betrayal?

The present Neutrality Act leaves belligerents free to buy in our markets war essentials such as oil, iron, steel, and copper, and permits shipments of same by American merchant vessels. There is thus nothing to prevent our becoming involved in seizures and other difficulties, in English and French blockades. The amended Neutrality Act voids the possibility of any such dangers by introducing the principle of "cash and carry," or "come and get it." This means that all belligerents would be free to buy all goods, provided they pay for same in cash and carry same away on their own ships. Also, no cargo destined to a belligerent could leave here until the American shipper had divested himself of all financial interest. Thus the new act would minimize our becoming involved in the war. The Senator failed to emphasize these advantages in the new bill. Of course, such a cash-and-carry proposal favors Britain and France. They have the cash and the means of carriage. They control the Atlantic. That may be unfortunate for the Reich. Hitler may regard such a change in our statute as an unneutral act. Let him. Frankly, in my opinion, the more we can aid England and France, by "measures short of war," as Roosevelt has it, the better. For lack of a better term, I would call the proposal of "cash and carry" a sort of "benevolent neutrality" toward the Allies.

Defeat of England and France would surely undermine our security and bring Hitlerism and Stalinism close to our doors. Aid to these democracies now is our greatest insurance against another war.

We in America have the perspective that permits us a realistic insight into the problem our neutrality creates in the present conflict abroad. We will be "bombarded" by propaganda from the belligerents. This is inevitable. But the issue to be faced is a cold and hard one. If unfortunate circumstances insure Hitler's success eventually, especially in the light of his unholy alliance with Stalin, his gleaming eye may be cast in our direction as "next" in his grandiose program for world domination. Fantastic as such a future may seem, we find his agents here desperately active in their attempts to effect a "peaceful penetration" of what it pleases the Nazis to call their ideals. Should Hitler be defeated, we shall not have to consider this very ugly possibility.

A revision of the Neutrality Act, I am confident, will prevent the recurrence of the so-called incidents that led us to participate in the last holocaust. This in itself is a paramount objective. A revision of our Neutrality Act will serve to establish England and France on a more equitable footing in their "last stand" fights against the totalitarian menace. A revision of our Neutrality Act now may save us many hours of bitter despair in the future.

Pending Neutrality Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES F. BYRNES

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, October 6 (legislative day of Wednesday, October 4), 1939

LETTER FROM HON. JOSIAH W. BAILEY, OF NORTH CAROLINA

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter addressed to the people of North Carolina by the senior Senator from that State [Mr. BAILEY] on the subject of neutrality legislation.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the People of North Carolina:

In view of a multitude of letters, it seems advisable to make a candid statement to the people of North Carolina on the subject of legislation intended to preserve the neutrality of our country for the purpose of keeping us out of the war.

There are three subjects before us: (1) The existing law; (2) the House bill; (3) the Senate committee bill, reported out September 28, and before us only since then. In due course there is likely to be a fourth, the conference bill, in the final phase, in the nature of a compromise between the pending bill and the bill passed by the House in the recent session. The first three have been approved, in their time, by the President and great numbers of people, and they have also been opposed by many. It is likely that the fourth—the conference agreement, yet to be wrought out, will likewise be both approved and opposed. We must read our letters in light of these facts, and interpret many received prior to September 28 as either supporting or condemning a measure that was not made known until that date. Let it be borne in mind that under the rules a bill in new form may be wrought out and submitted by the conferees of House and Senate, and such a measure will not be subject to amendments from the floor of either branch of the Congress.

Nevertheless, one may be sufficiently definite with respect to the matter before us, and this is my purpose in this public communication.

First of all, I am for keeping this country out of the present war, and I shall go far in the future to keep it out of any war. The welfare of the human race demands of us that this country shall escape the disaster and ruin entailed by modern warfare. The preservation of our constitutional democracy and the welfare of our people is more important to mankind now than ever before. Moreover, I have the utmost abhorrence of any policy that could possibly ensue in the sending of our boys to battle. If we ever fight, it must be on our own shores and in the defense of our homes against invaders and oppressors. Commerce is not worth the cost of war, and peaceful means of promoting it are more effectual than the means of force. I am not inclined to think that so-called international rights are worth the cost of war; and here, too, the methods of peace are more effectual. I believe that the involvement of this country in a war at this time, even if we should be successful, would tend to bring this country to ruin and our people into poverty, and hundreds of thousands of homes into incurable sorrow. We should prepare our defenses in the highest degree. We must have a great navy, a great merchant marine, and a well-trained, efficient, and modern military equipment. Some of us may not like this, but we are dealing with the world as it is, and we must remember that there are in the world nations that seem disposed to take whatever they can, whenever they can, wherever they can. Power to resist there must be. Our peace may not otherwise be preserved.

With the foregoing convictions governing me, I have decided that the new legislation, as reported by the Committee of the Senate on Foreign Relations, will tend more to make for the peace and security of our country than the existing law. The new legislation, when adopted, will remove our ships not only from the ports of belligerents but from zones of danger designated in the bill as combat zones. The existing law leaves our ships free to sail the seas regardless, carrying other than arms, ammunition, and implements of war. We may be sure that the distinction will not be observed. A merchant ship carrying food, cotton, tobacco, or people would be just about as likely to be attacked in the present situation as a ship fully armed and carrying airplanes, explosives, or guns. I subscribe to the policy that we should not only play the part of a neutral but we should also avoid provocation and seek to avoid

incidents that might inflame our people and change their minds, now so profoundly attached to peace.

The policy proposed in the new legislation has also the virtue of being consistent with the international law of neutrality and with the historic policy of our country. That is to say, the new bill is in accord with experience and is approved by time and the customs of nations. It will be understood everywhere as actually and historically neutral. The only deviation from the standards of international law lies in the fact that we of our own motion withdraw our ships from belligerent ports and zones of combat. This is done in our own interest and to avoid incidents that might change the temper of some of our people from peace to war.

There are those who say that to change the law, now that war has started, is not sound policy and will be regarded as unneutral. I do not think this position can be sustained. When the Congress adjourned in August notice was given not that we would maintain the present law but that we would postpone action on the subject until the next session of the Congress. This was fair notice to all concerned that we might change the law. In addition to this we do not owe any obligation on this point to any nation. No treaty rights are involved. No moral obligation is implied. We have right to frame our policy in the interest of our peace, and this right is fortified by the fact that we propose to change it in the direction of historic international law and our historic policy as to neutrality.

On the subject of our relations to other nations, I do not intend to make utterances tending to arouse emotions or to create irritation. Let us pursue the true course of neutrals. We may have our attachments and we may have our antipathies, but let us be careful not to make utterances tending to inflame feelings. I have said this because I propose to present here what seems to me to be the essence of our situation.

We have a choice to make. We may choose to maintain the existing law, knowing that it is not consistent with our historic policy, knowing that it is not the only course consistent with the accepted international-law neutrality, knowing that its consequences may be to aid Germany and her allies and to deprive England and France and their allies of the normal means of defense and of sustenance, or we may support the proposed law, knowing that it is in accord with our historic policy and with the historic standards of the international law of neutrality, and knowing that it will, without risk to our ships and without risk of money or men, tend not to deprive England and France and their allies of the means of defense and of sustenance which normally are available to them not by reason of anything we have done, but wholly because they may control the Atlantic and Mediterranean Seas against their enemy—if indeed it shall be proved by events that they can.

Confronted with this choice, there are many considerations, but the consideration that appeals to me with the greatest force is a moral consideration, which I will not undertake to elaborate now, as I am sure our people know what is going on in Europe and what is involved. Whatever may be said on behalf of the German leader, it must be said that he has shown to the world that no obligation is binding upon him and that there is no way to deal with him by way of covenant or agreement. We and those who come after us in this country will have to deal with world powers and we may justly desire to deal with powers which respect their agreements and which do not hold that might makes right. We may now set a precedent that will serve us well in the future, for we can never hope to treat successfully with powers not subject to accepted moral restraints.

The motive in the pending bill is that of providing the security of the United States by avoiding involvement in the existing war. To this motive we must steadfastly hold in all events. The policy outlined in the bill is not so much one of aiding England and France as it is one of not contributing to the plans of Germany and her associates. And it is because it is considered that the existing law does unintentionally so contribute to those plans that we have for months been setting about to revise it. Since we are unwilling to aid England and France, surely we must see to it that we do not assist Germany and her associates by following a policy recognized the world over as unnecessary to neutrality as defined by international law.

I could well stop here, but I am impelled to add that I deeply desire that this country shall not pursue an abnormal policy, unnecessary to neutrality, the consequence of which would be to further the plans of the German leader. If he should succeed I do not wish it to be said that we aided him. We have an account to give to posterity and to the God of nations, to the Righteous Ruler of the nations who exacts at last of every nation and every ruler, and indeed of every human being, even to the third and fourth generations, the penalty of iniquity. He is a covenant-keeping God and requires that rulers shall keep their covenants. He does justice and loves mercy and in due time visits His judgments upon all cruelty and upon all who persecute and oppress His offspring of every condition, race, and creed. The Creator of men created also the moral law. It is self-executing. This moral law is the warp and woof of civilization. Others may forget but we must always remember that it underlies and sustains all abiding law. Soon or late it blesses all who observe it and overthrows all who disregard it. These considerations do not justify us in taking steps that might involve us in this war, but they would rebuke us if we should maintain a policy, unnecessary to our neutrality, the consequence of which would be to contribute to the plans of the German leader.

We must make it plain beyond all question that under no circumstances or temptations will we lend money to England or France or engage our country or its sons in this war.

Finally, let me say a word of comfort to those who are fearful that we will by some means become involved in this war. I do not think we will be involved. None of us can forecast the long future. I see no likelihood that within 2 years we will be involved, and 2 years from now, I hope we will be able to look forward to another 2 years of national peace and security. Our people are determined upon peace. Let them maintain this determination.

With all good wishes,

Very truly yours,

JOSIAH W. BAILEY.

Pending Neutrality Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. DAVIS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, October 6 (legislative day of Wednesday, October 4), 1939

ARTICLE BY HON. JAMES J. DAVIS, OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by me, published in the Philadelphia Inquirer on September 20, 1939, on the question now pending before the Senate.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GUEST COMMENTATOR DAVIS CALLS NEUTRALITY WEAK FORM OF INSURANCE—WE CAN STAY OUT, BUT POSITIVE ACTION IS A NECESSITY, PENNSYLVANIA'S SENATOR SAYS—COOPERATION URGED

The Inquirier publishes herewith another in a series of guest comments, reflecting the opinions of prominent citizens on important public issues.

The invitation to contribute to this symposium of citizen opinion was issued without any restrictions, and the choice of the subject was left wholly to the individual. Obviously, therefore, opinions expressed in this and following articles of the series do not necessarily coincide with the editorial policy of the Inquirer and may even be in direct conflict with it.

Another guest comment, by another prominent American, will appear in this position at an early date.

(By JAMES J. DAVIS, United States Senator from Pennsylvania since 1930, "Puddler Jim," immigrant boy and steel worker, was twice nominated without the support of the State Republican organization. Served as Secretary of Labor under the Harding, Coolidge, and Hoover administrations, where he aided in formulating an application of the quota immigration law and was cosponsor of the Davis-Bacon bill, forerunner of the act which fixed minimum wages for employees of contractors doing Government work. Prominent in fraternal organizations, has been director general of the Loyal Order of Moose since 1907)

"There can be no question as to the desire of the great majority of our people to keep free from war. The question is how we may escape involvement in the titanic conflict that is now raging in both Europe and Asia. Certainly no strong reliance may be placed on negative measures.

"Something more than the enactment or modification of neutrality legislation is necessary. At its best neutrality legislation is a weak form of national fire insurance. It is the attempt through legislation to prohibit the activities of our citizens that might jeopardize the peace. It does not in itself make for peace.

"QUIT TALKING ABOUT WAR

"Back of the law there must be the spirit of peace in the hearts and minds of the American people. Without this spirit among us there can be no lasting peace. As long as such a spirit steadfastly prevails we shall not go to war.

"Specifically I would suggest a number of constructive measures in behalf of peace.

"Quit talking about becoming involved in war and start making practical plans for the expansion of business enterprise that can be carried on successfully within our own borders without resort to war. America wants work—not war.

"Maintain our position as already established in various parts of the world as a strong and powerful nation with a voice that speaks consistently of peace and that will be heard because we can defend our peace.

"PUT ASIDE PARTY DIFFERENCES

"Refuse to take any national position that will ally us with certain foreign powers in opposition to others. If we take sides with one group against others we shall have lost our neutrality and disobeyed the injunction of George Washington to beware of entangling alliances.

"Inhibit the emotions of fear and distress that we have suffered in the past unless they are harnessed to constructive tasks of peace. Constant and unrestrained fear thoughts may lead to national weakness and make us the prey of the dangerous forces now raging in the world. Constant concentration on trouble will inevitably bring it either to the individual or the Nation.

"Bring the best intelligence of the country together at Washington, the seat of our foreign office, for continuous conference with the President, irrespective of party, for the duration of the war emergency.

"COMBAT ONE-SIDED PROPAGANDA

"Make available to the President a nonpartisan intelligence representative of the Nation as a whole to meet the most serious problem of our time.

"Organize an active spirit of class and racial toleration in our schools, churches, civic, labor, agricultural, and business associations that will combat the menace of one-sided propaganda and insist on the maintenance of our civil liberties under the Constitution so that we shall not become the victims of war hysteria.

"Resist the temptation to put all of our foreign-born population under suspicion because of racial origin.

"WE CAN REMAIN AT PEACE

"Encourage free discussion, public forums, the citizens' right to petition their Government, the voice of the people in the newspapers and on the radio, and every form of free exchange of thought and feeling that will help maintain our intellectual and emotional balance.

"These are but a few of the ways that we may follow in our endeavor to help the United States escape involvement in war.

"I wish solemnly to affirm that we can remain at peace if we make the maintenance of peace our first national obligation."

What Shall We Do Now?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEWIS B. SCHWELLENBACH

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, October 6 (legislative day of Wednesday, October 4), 1939

ADDRESS BY HON. LEWIS B. SCHWELLENBACH, OF WASHINGTON, BEFORE SEATTLE BAR ASSOCIATION

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address which I delivered at a meeting of the Seattle Bar Association on September 13, 1939.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In assigning to me a subject upon which to speak tonight, my good friend George Boldt named it "The State of the Nation." I have two complaints to register against this selection: First, it is too restricted. George should know that Members of the United States Senate believe in free, unlimited debate. We don't like to be hampered by having subjects which might in some way limit the scope of our remarks. Second, the subject is not sufficiently dignified. George should also know that United States Senators are very dignified. Therefore, I am going to discard the assigned subject and choose one of my own, which will be both unlimited and dignified. The subject upon which I choose to speak is, What Shall We Do Now?

I use the word "now" advisedly. I use it because of my belief that every problem, regardless of its nature, scope, or importance, must at some time during its consideration touch upon its relationship with the all-important question, "How can we stay out of the European war?"

No one need prove to the American people the necessity of our remaining out of the European war. Everyone should constantly restate and reiterate, however, the reasons why we should stay out of the European war. The American people must never for a moment be permitted to forget them. There are four main reasons:

1. The cost of our participation. By this I mean the lives of thousands of our men. I mean the maimed bodies and stricken minds of hundreds of thousands of our men. I mean billions of dollars which would be spent, the maladjustment of our economic system, and the possible destruction of our governmental system. It must not be forgotten that, should we go into this war, we would enter it at a time when economic problems here were much more serious than they were in 1917. We must not forget that success upon our part in such a war would require the surrender of our democratic rights and would entail the danger that, at the conclusion of such a war, those rights could not be reclaimed.

2. The futility of our participation. No sane person today will argue that the sacrifices of 1917–18 either made the world safe for democracy or delayed the present European war. More people today live under dictators than did in 1917. The last 8 years have seen war more widespread than at any previous time in the world's history.

3. We must not forget that our participation probably would materially lessen our chances of wielding a powerful economic influence on behalf of permanent world peace. We thought before that our voice at the peace council would be strengthened by our participation. We now know that that council brought out the Treaty of Versailles with all of its inequalities and inequities. I do not criticize Versailles as vigorously as do some. Treaties at best at the conclusion of war always have been unjust and unfair. Versailles ranks very well in comparison with many others. Nevertheless, it did contain inequities and unjust provisions which made impossible the successful functioning of the machinery which it set up for the maintenance of peace. Assuming the present war is of long duration, our chances of strongly influencing the provisions of the peace treaty on the side of justice and equity will be much greater if we occupy a position of dominance in world economics than if we are ourselves weakened by the part which we might actively take in war.

4. Believing as I do that a long European war will in itself destroy democracy in the Old World, I contend that we do have both the opportunity and the responsibility to maintain democracy at home. We will lose that opportunity and fail in that responsibility unless we can preserve a condition of peace for ourselves.

That brings us to the question, What can we do to stay out of this war? There is no sure road that we can take. There are no legislative insurance policies that we can buy. In fact, I sense a positive danger in the attitude of many people who believe that by legislative fiat we can stay out of war. We must not assume an attitude of drifting. Nobody ever drifted away from danger. If we simply drift, we will drift into trouble. The present situation requires a positive will for peace.

Whether we like it or not, we do have an interest in world affairs. You notice I use the word "interest" instead of "investment." The word "investment" implies the obligation of use of force to protect it. We must not lull ourselves into a sense of security by ignoring what is going on in the world. We are a part of the world. We can't overlook that fact. We must, however, have an awareness of the ever-present danger of our involvement. If we should get into the war, it would be because the American people demanded it. No President and no Congress ever dragged the American people into war. Public opinion is, by overwhelming odds, the strongest factor which might result in our participation.

In this regard, we must not forget that the agencies for developing public opinion are much more efficient than they were 25 years ago. The radio and the press bring us much closer to the details of any conflict anywhere than they did at that time. Therefore I say there rests upon each individual, either in the Government or out of the Government, a constant responsibility of maintaining a determined attitude upon this question. It will not be decided in Washington, D. C. It will be decided by the people in their own homes listening to their own radios and reading their own newspapers.

Believing this, I think it of the utmost importance that we have constantly called to our attention the events which occurred in 1914 to 1918. We must not be permitted to forget the lessons we should have then learned. With all seriousness, I suggest that it would be valuable if our newspapers would each devote one-quarter of its front page to a reprinting of the war news 25 years ago today.

During the last 6 years the Congress has attempted to study the causes that led us into the last war, and to write legislation which would prevent their repetition. This brings us to a consideration of the so-called neutrality legislation. I use the term "so-called" because I think it unfortunate that it was called neutrality legislation. Its name has caused much confusion in our thinking. In the dictionary we find a synonym for neutrality. One is "disinterestedness." The American people cannot be disinterested in what is going on in the world about us. We should not be disinterested even if we could.

International law, during a long period of years, has built up its definition of neutrality. It conceived of nations, not belligerent, which still had recognized rights in the conduct of their own business in every part of the world. It was based upon the theory that belligerent nations, even during the conduct of a war, owed the responsibility to act as gentlemen toward nations not participating. Very well-defined and well-recognized rules of conduct toward neutrals became accepted in the civilized world. Treaties and conventions were signed setting up and outlining these rules. The Nation became a neutral through the simple procedure of the issuance of a proclamation such as President Roosevelt's first proclamation, issued immediately after the outbreak of the present war. This proclamation was similarly issued by many other nations, and did not involve the so-called Neutrality Act. Were those rules respected, we need have no fear of being involved so long as we conducted ourselves in conformity with them. The last

25 years has seen the almost complete abandonment of those rules. There has been nothing one-sided about their abandonment. The far-flung blockade which England and France declared against Germany had as its only precedent a similar far-flung blockade declared by them in 1915. President Wilson then vigorously protested against the extent of the blockade. The search and seizure of vessels destined for neutral shores by England in 1914 and 1915 not only was contrary to international law, but almost resulted in our getting into the war against those nations which were later our allies. We all remember the vigorous notes of protest penned by President Wilson at that time. So completely has recognition of neutral rights disintegrated that the sinking of many vessels last year off the coast of Spain by German and Italian submarines brought almost no protest from England and France.

Therefore, when we in Congress attempted to write a law to enable us to avoid controversy with belligerents, we should not have called it a neutrality act. It doesn't fit either the dictionary definition or the international law definition. It is a law by which our Nation regulates the conduct of its own citizens, taking away from them certain of their well-recognized rights in order that they may not involve all of our people by insisting upon our protection of their rights. Any fair-minded person attempting to evaluate such legislation must recognize that, since this is certainly a surrender of well-established rights, our Government has the right, in laying down the rules, to surrender that percentage of our rights which, in the opinion of the Government, will be most conducive to the avoidance of controversy upon our part. Since no foreign nation has a right to demand that we surrender any of our rights, then no foreign nation can complain if, in working out the standards, we don't happen on a result which is both impartial and disinterested.

The heart of the so-called neutrality legislation was the cash-and-carry provision contained in section 2. Briefly stated, it provided that no goods, the title to which remained in an American citizen, could be shipped by either American or foreign ships to a belligerent or to a neutral for transshipment to a belligerent. It prevented American ships from carrying any goods to a belligerent and decreed that insurance contracts on goods shipped to belligerents should not be deemed American interest therein, and prohibited the underwriters thereof from asking our Government to make claim for losses thereon. This section expired on May 1. Section 1 of the act is the so-called arms embargo. It prohibits the sale and shipment of arms, ammunition, or the implements of war to any belligerent or to any neutral for transshipment to a belligerent. This section is still in effect.

The President takes the position that in modern-day warfare all goods of value are of military value. He contends that no distinction should be made between goods which have been actually manufactured into arms, ammunition, and implements of war and other goods capable of manufacture into arms, ammunition, and implements of war. He contends that our involvement in the last war came from the shipment of goods owned by Americans and the sailing of vessels owned by Americans and the sailing on vessels, no matter by whom owned, of American citizens. He has asked the Congress to place all shipments upon a cash-and-carry basis.

The opposition to the President's position comes from those who believe that the arms embargo be continued even at the expense of the failure to reinstate the cash-and-carry provisions. We are in the anomalous position of having those who most ardently advocated cash and carry being willing to permit our own goods to be shipped on our own vessels through war zones to belligerents. It seems to me reasonably apparent that no one can defend our present situation. Congress should be permitted to act upon this question. The threatening of a filibuster in this situation is, to my mind, indefensible.

The opponents of the President's position make two arguments against the arms embargo repeal. First, they say that it would favor England and France to the disadvantage of Germany and, therefore, would be unneutral. In making this argument, they forget that fundamentally this law is not an effort to be disinterested or impartial but an effort to keep us out of war. Furthermore, it can be said with equal force that as the law now stands it favors Germany as against England and France which is equally unneutral.

Their second argument is that the furnishing of munitions will get us into war. Judged by the standards of the last war, this again is not sound. Every word of testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee went to prove that it was not munitions but other goods which led us into the last war. The leaders of the opposition had full opportunity to present testimony upon this point and they presented none. Furthermore, on July 28 of this year, in a speech before the Senate, Senator NYE of North Dakota make the following statement, which I quote:

"No member of the Munitions Committee to my knowledge has ever contended that it was munitions makers who took us to war. But that committee and its members have said again and again, that it was war trade and the war boom, shared in by many more than munitions makers, that played the primary part in moving the United States into a war that became an affair of ours only as we were interfered with and molested in our pursuit of the profit we found available from other people's wars."

Since Senator NYE is the leader of the opposition, this admission against interest coupled with failure to submit affirmative proof stands, in my opinion, as an almost complete answer to this argument.

I suppose that we will be confronted with a third argument when we get into session; that is, that we shouldn't change the rules now that the war was started. That was the precise reason why 11 of us on the Foreign Relations Committee insisted that action should have been taken in July. Were it not for the fact that our so-called neutrality legislation since May 1 has been a mere skeleton, I might be inclined to agree with them. I do not believe, however, that we can permit the present dangers to continue just because the most ardent advocates of the cash-and-carry system prevented us from reinstating it before war was declared.

I am also convinced that of equal importance in involving us before was the lack of preparation for our own defense. We waited almost 2 years after the last war broke out before we started to even think about preparedness. The German high command was constantly told that they need not fear us, we were so totally unprepared. No one can deny that this information, in part, at least, resulted in their nonchalantly ignoring our neutrality rights. I think we all are glad to know that we haven't made that mistake this time and that we are not going to make it this time.

I have listened by the hour to arguments on the Senate floor how we were endangering ourselves with the threat of militarism when we authorized the increase of our Army from 135,000 to 165,000 men and when we built toward a Navy which could defend our shores. I never could agree with them. I am glad now I was never even tempted to agree with them. When the military becomes so strong in a nation as to dominate it, it then presents a danger. It has always seemed to me utterly silly for anyone to present this bogey as a threat of American preparedness.

The will for peace is the thing which is going to keep us out of war. We can't shut our eyes. We can't shut our ears. We must not stick our heads in the sand. We must not drift. We must constantly maintain, through clear thinking, an intelligent determination to stay out of the European war. It can be done that way and through no other means.

I now want to discuss the other side of this subject; that is, the relationship between domestic problems and the possibility of involvement. Believing as I do that if we do get into the war it will be through the force of public opinion, I think it worth while at this time that we should give serious consideration to the many disputes and controversies that exist here at home. No factor is more important than that we should place our own house in order. The nation which is beset with unsolved economic problems, with class and racial differences and prejudices, with disputes industrial and political, is much more likely to be drawn into a world war than it would be were its various problems solved. A nation discontented has a much greater chance of being unnecessarily drawn into war than a nation whose people are content. The events of the last few days have placed upon each one of us new and greater responsibilities to cooperate with everyone else in securing a betterment of the conditions under which all our people live.

In saying this I do not urge the abandonment of any principles. I do not urge a compromising of anything which is right. I do, however, strongly urge the cutting out of the rough edges. I urge the lessening of the friction between our different people and our different groups. I urge the abandonment of selfish personal ambitions for power or position and the abandonment of senseless, preconceived notions that have stood in the way of domestic peace.

My hope is that what has happened in Europe may cause our people calmly and dispassionately to appreciate and understand our American democracy.

There are so many people who view our form of democracy as a pattern. To them the pattern itself is the sacred thing. They see our Constitution as a set of rules established and preserved to maintain a status quo. For myself, I don't think they honor either our Government or our Constitution by this view. Those who wrote our Constitution were not only wise; they were also far-seeing; they visioned a nation ever expanding, ever progressing. No patriotic American would accuse them of conceiving a strait jacket upon American advancement or progress. Of course, in making changes we must be slow. Our legislative bodies must be slow. Our courts must be slow. Our people must be slow. However, need for care must not be the excuse for stagnation. There are times when stagnation will much more surely destroy an institution than even a little too rapid change. True progress in government comes from avoiding either of these extremes. I credit our founding fathers with sufficient astuteness to recognize this. They braked down our speed with a written constitution. They insured against stagnation by making it a living, growing document, which could be used to fit the needs and the problems of the world's most rapidly expanding nation.

In order for a democratic community to endure, certain prerequisites are evident:

1. We must protect with our lives those weapons which will enable us to protect the democratic community. Most powerful of these are freedom of speech and freedom of press. Never for a minute may we permit these instrumentalities of democratic process to be impaired or diminished.

2. Equality of opportunity to participate in Government enjoyed by every citizen qualified to participate. That opportunity must be free from coercion or fear on the one side and free from impossible promises of reward upon the other.

3. The minority in a democratic community must recognize the right of the majority to govern, provided that the majority gives

equal recognition of its responsibility for fairness and honesty in its treatment of the minority.

In a democracy the majority must insure to the minority the same degree of justice which it demands for itself. Failing in these obligations the majority becomes merely a mob. When the majority becomes a mob, democracy fades out.

It ill behooves us to be critical of nondemocracies elsewhere if we make a shadow of our democratic institutions here. There may be widely different opinions about America's present-day responsibility to the world; there can be no difference of opinion in our responsibility for furnishing to the world an example of peace and democracy in the Western Hemisphere.

One of the most controversial of all of our problems has arisen out of disputes between those who employ and those who are employed. It is of supreme importance now that constructive efforts be made by everyone to minimize those controversies. In order to determine how we shall deal with our labor problems it is much more important that we should understand the causes of the labor struggles than that we should, with moral indignation, pass censor upon the participants in those struggles. Industrial warfare is always an ugly thing, costly to labor, to capital, and to the general public.

The duty of men who will to understand, who will to solve our present problems, is the duty to refrain from inflaming the suspicions and ill feelings that inevitably attend differences between industry and labor.

The plain fact is that we have already lost costly and critical years in the long and difficult process of developing orderly responsible industrial relationships. The establishment of such relationships is the first and primary task of industrial as well as political statesmanship.

Enlightened public opinion has long recognized that before we can achieve and maintain industrial peace we must create conditions under which labor will be able to act and bargain collectively and with dignity. We cannot expect industrial peace until we can expect and ask for collective responsibility on the part of labor; and we cannot expect collective responsibility on the part of labor without a frank recognition of a democratically chosen collective leadership of labor in industry. The very preservation of private enterprise in industry depends upon industry's willingness to permit the irresistible demand of the average man for a larger share of control over, and consequent responsibility for, the conditions of his work.

A civilized community demands that both labor and capital respect its law. Under the present administration Government has at last moved, and is continuing to move, toward providing machinery which will safeguard the principle of collective bargaining. These efforts of the Government may be seriously impaired by excessive labor disturbances now visible in different sections of the country. Labor, which was extremely patient when Government was insensitive to its needs, should not lose its self-restraint when Government has demonstrated its awareness of labor's just demands. It is important that labor as well as capital recognize that if any group or class presses its demands beyond what the community as a whole regards as the bounds of reason there is danger that the community may reject the just as well as the unjust demands of that group or class. In a democracy men must accommodate their demands to the demands of others; there must always be a large measure of give and take in the adjustment of human relations. A civilized democracy demands patience and self-restraint from all of its citizens.

We must judge these problems with an open mind. We must be aware of what is going on in the world. Yet we must never for a moment forget that our responsibility is to decide then upon the basis of the best interests of our people not only today but in the days to come. I know many people are asking the question, "What will happen if the dictators gain control of Europe?" In the light of that fear, they say we should rush in now to put them down. I don't think the dictators are going to get control of Eurtope. If they do, I am confident it will be only after such a war as to prostrate all of them. If they do, I am confident that ultimately they will defeat their own ends. I want to conclude by reading to you a statement I made last year over an international broadcast on the night that Hitler marched into Austria. It includes a quotation from Emerson's essay on Compensation. Emerson said this. I quote:

"This law writes the laws of cities and nations. It will not be balked of its end in the smallest iota. It is in vain to build or plot or combine against it. Things refuse to be mismanaged long. * * * Though no checks to a new evil appear, the checks exist and will appear. * * * Nothing arbitrary, nothing artificial can endure."

Of all forms of government yet conceived, democracy furnishes the most useful agencies for fighting arbitrary and artificial mismanagement. What we must do is to protect and preserve democratic methods in America. No doubt we will be importuned again to spend our resources in a futile effort to correct conditions in Europe. The inevitable law of which Emerson speaks will take care of Europe. What we must do is to preserve American democratic processes—to care for our own.

History shows that democracies have disappeared when they failed to care for their own. Never in the world's history has it been more necessary for democracy to work than it is that democracy work here now.

That we have an abundance of local problems, no one can deny. Quarrels exist between industry and labor and Government. This is the time when these quarrels should be submerged for the general good. America's position must be consolidated. The permanent advance of civilization depends upon the successful maintenance of democratic institutions somewhere. That place should be here. Let us turn our hand to that task. Let no outside influence turn us from it.

Pending Neutrality Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE L. HERRING

OF IOWA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, October 6 (legislative day of Wednesday, October 4), 1939

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. PRENTISS M. BROWN, OF MICHIGAN

Mr. HERRING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address delivered by the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. BROWN] on October 5, 1939, on the pending neutrality legislation.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I know of no citizen in the United States who wants this country to go to war. In tens of thousands of letters and telegrams which I have received from all parts of the country, mainly from my own State of Michigan, everyone, both pro and con on the neutrality issue, urges that we be kept out of war. On the question of how to do it, there is the most violent disagreement. A few of these letters are vicious. Some indicate that the writers are greatly overwrought upon the issue and say things that would not be said if based upon cool judgment. Many of the letters are inspired, but, nevertheless, they reveal the attitude of the writers. The most appealing are those that come from children and from mothers and fathers who refer to the possibility of their dear ones being called into the service.

Many of these writers seem to forget that Senators are human; that we, like them, have families, sons who may be called into the service. I have three sons, one who is now eligible for military service. He is a strong, vibrant youth, symbolic to me of all the sons of American mothers and fathers. This should lead those who write in terms of violence to at least give us credit for being activated by the same motives as are they.

So I approach this problem—how to keep out of war—with the viewpoint of an American having in mind what will best serve to keep my country out of war and as a father having the purpose of keeping my sons from facing death on the battlefields of Europe. My vote in Congress upon the neutrality issue will have but one purpose; that is, to keep this Nation out of war. I want this country to remain a noncombatant. I feel reasonably sure that we are safe from attack. I feel reasonably sure that assaults upon our citizens, ships, and property abroad will not be sufficient to cause war, because I do not think our citizens, ships, and property should be abroad, and they will not be if the pending act becomes law. Therefore, the only way that we will go into a war is by our own deliberate and considered choice.

Fortune has favored us in geographical location. We are not, like Belgium, Holland, and Switzerland, in the paths of the contending armies. We are, thank God, isolated, and war cannot, in my judgment, be forced upon us. What, then, is the danger? Why fear that we would deliberately choose to go in? I will try to give you the facts as I see them.

In my judgment, despite the fact that our general feeling now is that our entrance into the last war was a mistake; notwithstanding that the British and French have deliberately failed to pay us the just debts they owe us out of the last World War, American sentiment is strongly pro-French, pro-British, and pro-Polish; or to put it the other way, it is mainly anti-Hitler. Why is this so? I am not among those who assert that we should say nothing about it. We have free speech. We can express the views our minds entertain. We don't like Mr. Hitler because he has seized and throttled democratic government in Germany and has reorganized a powerful nation for the purpose of dominating Europe. Like the war-drunk military masters of the past, from Alexander to Napoleon, the power lust dominates him and he must have, not Germany as it was under the Kaiser, but a more powerful, dominant, and militant Germany than ever before. Our sentiment has risen against him because he has cruelly persecuted a Jewish minority; because he has endeavored to break down religion, attempted to break down the great Christian Church in Germany, Catholic and Protestant alike; because he has mercilessly bombed Polish cities and slaughtered Polish citizens without just cause; because he has devoured the democratic countries to the

south of Germany such as Austria and Czechoslovakia against their will. I think no military master or ruler in history has gone as far as he has. He aspires not only to one-man rule, but he dictates his successor. Even the absolute monarch claimed no such power; he was bound by the laws of legitimate inheritance and succession. But Hitler names his successor, his successor's successor even unto the fourth. But we condemn him most because he has plunged an unwilling world into war, unleashed the most contagious passion known to man, and menaced my sons and yours. This and much more is the reason for the dominant anti-Nazi sentiment of America today.

I fear this sentiment. I saw its parallel in 1916, and I can see its workings today. I fear the propaganda of the British and French. It is able, it is subtle. Its chief said the other day, "Hitler is England's best propagandist." I want to do that which will completely counteract both this conscious and unconscious propaganda.

We are now facing a realistic situation. How can we best meet it? How can we best prevent America from becoming a participant in this war?

Heretofore there has always been trade between a nation at war and a nation at peace—when military power did not prevent it. In both of our wars with England we traded with France and other neutrals, as far as we could in view of the British sea power. The Mexican War did not stop us from trading with Europe. The American Civil War did not prevent the North from trading with England and France and Germany; nor did our Spanish War. In all of our wars our trade in all articles continued.

Germany has built a mighty army and a mighty air force, and her geographical position enables her navy to control the Baltic Sea. Germany maintains a trade with all neutrals she can reach. Through her army the trade routes between Germany and Russia, Rumania, Hungary, Italy, and even Belgium and Holland, are kept open. Through her naval control of the Baltic her trade with Sweden, Norway, Finland, Denmark, and Russia is maintained. From these nations she gets vital military supplies. But Britain and France, who have spent tremendous sums to control the seas are, for the first time in history, denied by our law, passed largely because of American public sentiment in the Ethiopian, Spanish, and Chinese difficulties, to trade in war implements with us. Is it a neutral position we now take? No; it is a position which in fact gives Germany an unfair advantage over England and France. Germany's army and navy keep its trade lanes open. America's neutrality law keeps the French and English trade lanes with America closed. This the American public does not approve.

I say, let us be realistic about this. Our one great object is to prevent America from going to war.

It is not the mere question of whether Congress, in whom the constitutional power to declare war rests, will declare war. A vote in the Senate today would probably be unanimous against war. The question is, Will American public sentiment, in the event of allied losses and possible defeat, change American sentiment? I affirm that from my 7 years of contact with Members of the House and Senate, I am convinced that Congress will not declare war unless forced to by an overwhelming public demand.

How can we prevent conditions that will give rise to such a demand? By returning to the age-old practice of real neutrality, which in this situation it must frankly be admitted will aid the English and French just as the policy of Sweden, Finland, Russia, and others aids Germany. The American public will then know that we are doing nothing to aid Hitler. Many believe we are doing so today. If our age-old policy of neutrality aids Britain and France, I assert that the great majority of the American people will say that if it is right for Germany to trade with her neutrals to the north and east and possible to so trade because of her Army and Baltic Sea navy, then it is also right for England and France to trade with their neighbors to the west, and possible not by reason of any action of ours but because of their control of the seas. Our present law aids the German Army and her Baltic navy, and in effect blots out the power of the French and English Navies.

Let us think not of Germany, not of France or England, but only of America. If fate decrees we should go into this war, on whose side should we go? Everyone knows the answer. If our strict adherence to neutrality, as known in the past when these German Armies and British Navy were built up, aids in the result which will tend to keep America out of this war, why not assume such neutrality? Hitler, Chamberlain, and Deladier think only of their own nations. Let us do the same. I am convinced that this bill will best serve that purpose.

The issue here has been magnified beyond all reason. My distinguished colleague yesterday called repeal a symbol. He means a symbol of war. It is not. We will not go to war if we repeal the embargo. We will not go to war if we retain the embargo. Repeal or no repeal, we stay out. The issue is not war or peace, no matter how loudly the opposition shouts it to be so. We are not threatened with attack. Even if Germany now foolishly desired to provoke the world's most powerful nation by assaulting us, she could not do it. If we go into this war, we will do it of our own free will. None but the people of the United States will decide that question. Let us calm down in the Senate, in the press, in the news reels, and in the country and approach this and all like questions with cool reason, knowing that one piece of legislation will never do all the good that its authors claim for it, nor all the damage its opponents charge to it. What we now do, be it right or wrong, will never tear down the firm determination of this Congress and this Nation to keep America at peace.

Pending Neutrality Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HIRAM W. JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, October 6 (legislative day of Wednesday, October 4), 1939

RADIO ADDRESS BY FORMER GOVERNOR LA FOLLETTE, OF WISCONSIN

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of a radio address delivered by Hon. Philip F. La Follette, former Governor of Wisconsin, on last Tuesday, on the subject of the pending neutrality measure.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Twenty-two years ago a pitiless campaign of abuse raged around my father. His name was made a word of hatred, his picture was torn from public places and ground under foot. He was burned in effigy.

His offense—his only offense was his profound conviction that the underlying causes of that World War were to be found in the commercial and imperialistic conflicts of European states. He voted against war in the face of personal abuse such as few men have known. Until his death he was sure that he had voted right—voted for the best interests of America. Millions now agree that he did.

The bitter experience of those days are burned into many American hearts. We know that there are steps which lead one by one to war. A peace-loving nation like ours cannot be led into war overnight. A democratic nation goes to war because it takes the steps that lead to war. Once those steps are taken, war becomes inevitable unless a miracle occurs.

THE ROAD TO WAR

Twenty-five years ago we expected to stay out when we elected President Wilson on the plea, "He kept us out of war," only to find later that we had secretly embarked on a course which led to war. That is why we are all struggling to see through the maze of arguments we hear now, as America stands poised to take that first step down the long road to war.

Three years ago, recognizing this country's overwhelming determination to stay out of other people's wars, Congress by a large majority adopted, and President Roosevelt signed, the Neutrality Act. That law was based on months of investigation conducted by Congress into the events that took us into the last war.

It was designed to guard against the mistaken steps we took in 1915 and 1916. Its most important provision prohibits the manufacture for sale of arms and ammunition to nations involved in war.

The President has just made to Congress a number of recommendations to strengthen the original purposes of the Neutrality Act, such as, for instance, a regulation that will keep Americans and American ships out of the danger zones. All such recommendations have the wholehearted support of the people of this country. We all favor amendments to strengthen the law.

The entire difference of opinion arises over the proposal of the President that Congress shall repeal the embargo on guns and ammunition and permit their sale to nations at war. Let me repeat there is no dispute over strengthening the Neutrality Act. The sole question is: Shall the Neutrality Act be scuttled by repealing the embargo on arms?

Let us pull the truth right out into the open. This question involves peace or war. If Congress repeals the arms embargo now it will do so to aid one side in the present European war. That is what we did in 1915, and that is what took us into the war in 1917. Some may try to fool our own people; but, make no mistake, we shall not fool anybody else.

Every country in the world will at once recognize such a step for what it is—our taking sides with one of the warring groups. From that moment there could be no such thing as our being out of the war.

It will be only a question of how far and how fast we get into it. It is beyond my comprehension how anyone can argue that we are helping to keep America out of the war by becoming an ammunition factory for the European war.

The eventual issue raised by the embargo question is: Shall we or shall we not become involved in the war in Europe?

HUMANITY'S SUFFERING

No sane American would dare propose that it is our job to save anybody's empire. Certainly no thoughtful American would urge that we should enter the European war to save humanity. Humanity has suffered in recent years when it might have been easier to save it. Humanity has been bombed and gassed in the uplands of Abyssinia, on the farms, and in the cities of China, and in the

arid plains and mountains of Spain—not bombing in a relatively equal fight but in the rush of well-equipped battalions and squadrons against primitive people with a spear, against nations struggling to modernize their institutions, and against a society torn by civil strife.

Then was a time when, if ever, the appeal to humanity should have had the greatest force. But those appeals were then unanswered by those who now make them in their own extremity. I do not criticize. No man or woman speaking in this safe and blessed land has the moral right to criticize those who are charged with the terrifying responsibility of leading a people dwelling in the teeming lands of Europe or Asia.

An appeal to enlist in a crusade to fight brutal dictatorships strikes a responsive chord in the warm hearts of the American people. The desire to see the tyranny of dictatorship ended, whether those dictators be red, black, or brown, springs from America's deep-rooted love of liberty; and I yield to no man in my loathing of dictatorship as a denial of the free principles upon which America was founded.

But we must not fool ourselves into thinking that we can help fight dictators in Europe and still stay out of war. A nation cannot be half in and half out of war. We either go in or stay out. Past experience and today's facts should have taught us that cash and carry before very long would become "charge it" and carry it, too.

More important, let us not forget the tragic error of thinking that war supplies are all we shall be called upon to provide in this European war. Six months ago, while in France, I asked one of the highest officials what they expected from the United States in the event of war. He instantly shot back the reply "supplies—and men."

More than 1900 years ago the Master said, "What shall it profit a man if he gain the whole world but lose his own soul?" That fundamental precept applies not alone to individuals but to nations as well. What shall we gain to crush dictatorship in Europe, if we lose our priceless freedom at home?

Make no mistake; the moment we embark on the road to war we inevitably take on the trappings of dictatorship. Modern warfare calls for the mobilization of a great deal more than an army. It demands the complete regimentation of all resources and all the people. It demands regimentation of thought and action of the entire population.

As war lengthens in duration and grows in intensity, the shackling of freedom becomes more and more absolute. When peace comes at last, the terrifying economic collapse which must follow may well become the emergency to continue dictatorial powers and thus destroy Americanism itself.

Let me turn again for a moment to my father's experience. At the very height of American enthusiasm for the World War, he never wavered in his repeated predictions that that war would be followed, not just by more wars, but by the worst economic collapse the world had known.

He was not a prophet. He was a student. He knew history. He knew that nations could not destroy millions of productive human beings and billions and billions of dollars of wealth without paying the inevitable price in hard times, poverty, and depression.

Look at the world today. Europe enters this war with billions of dollars of debt left over from the last one. With the enormous debt the world now carries and with the awful increase in the destructiveness of war today, you can write it down as a foregone conclusion that if this is a prolonged war, it will end in the complete collapse of the economic and political systems of every nation which participates in it.

But worse than the loss in bankruptcy and poverty—worse even than the slaughter of millions of human beings—is that prolonged war will be followed by the worst era of demagogues the world has seen. Those who sow the seeds of hatred, who spread racial, religious, and class strife, bigotry, and intolerance would feed and fatten on the distress and collapse that must follow. Every scoundrel anxious to exploit degraded aspects of human nature would find a thousandfold increase in the fields he can till if we make hatred respectable by joining in war.

"The stability and future of the American Nation do not depend on the victory or defeat of any other nation anywhere in the world."

They depend on what we do here at home. That is why in all that has been said I have kept waiting for word about America and American problems.

It is shocking to discover the eagerness with which some of us have dropped our own unfinished tasks here at home and turned our backs on the problems that gave us 10,000,000 unemployed, millions of distressed farmers, and millions of young and old who face still another winter with a scanty and uncertain living in this land of plenty.

In our excitement over wars in Europe and in Asia are we forgetting America? Are we forgetting that our task is not for ourselves alone but for every people of hope everywhere? If we are to be helpful to the world in the years to come, we must not forget that our first task is to safeguard our own people here at home and the principles and ideals in which they believe.

You have heard of the forgotten man. Does that forgotten man now live in a forgotten country?

When they vote for or against wrecking the Neutrality Act, your Congressmen and your Senators will be taking the first big step on the road to war or peace. You have elected them to decide for you. But you owe it to your conscience and your country to take your own stand on one side or the other of this life-and-death front.

There can be no alibis. This is not an issue where just a few chosen experts alone know the answers. This great issue is not a test of brains. It is a test of character. Once the floodgates are opened, the fences and those who sit on them will be swept ruthlessly along over the precipice.

Mothers and fathers—you who have through pain and sacrifice brought life into the world—what do you think? Your voice is more important than all the statesmen and leaders in all countries. Speak up for yourselves and your children.

Young men and women—you who dream of finding a useful place in the life of your country where your creative gifts can help America again become the beacon light of the world—you who would pay the bloody price for the mistakes of politicians—speak up for young America.

You who are older—doctors, teachers, nurses, ministers of all faiths, workers, and tillers of the soil; you who have the wisdom of experience—speak up and give your country guidance in this critical hour.

Americans all! You still hold in your hands the power to guide the destiny of this great land. Use it! America, speak up!

Our Duty as Americans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, October 6 (legislative day of Wednesday, October 4), 1939

ADDRESS BY JOHN HAMILTON BEFORE NEW YORK COUNTY REPUBLICAN COMMITTEE

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an able address delivered by Hon. John Hamilton, chairman of the Republican National Committee, before a meeting of the New York County Republican Committee and workers at the Manhattan Center in New York City, Thursday evening, September 28, 1939.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

There are few places left in the world where such a meeting could be held as we are holding here tonight. Since September 3 the United States has been the only great nation where the processes of democratic government continue to function unimpaired. The implications of that fact are almost staggering. It places upon us a responsibility unique among the peoples of the world.

We must meet that responsibility as Americans. And all of us here and all those of like political faith throughout the country must meet it as Republicans. But we are Americans first and Republicans second. As Republicans our first duty is to be good Americans. Happily there is no conflict here. We can become better Americans by becoming better Republicans.

By that I mean we can best serve our country by closing our party ranks and achieving a unity in which there is strength. We must forget whatever differences we may have had amongst ourselves in the past. We must let bygones be bygones. We must look forward and not back. The course of world events has placed upon us as a party a new and grave responsibility. Ours is the obligation to keep alive the American system of representative government. As the party of Lincoln it is our sacred trust to see that government of the people, by the people, for the people shall not perish from the earth.

All of us have heard a great deal of talk lately to the effect that politics ought to be adjourned in the present emergency. But what do those who make this appeal really mean by politics?

If they mean the kind of politics that was played right here in New York County by "Jimmy" Hines, if they mean the kind of politics that is played across the East River in Brooklyn by Frank Kelly and across the Hudson River in Jersey City by Frank Hague, of course that kind of politics ought to be adjourned. That is putting it mildly. It ought to be ended for all time. And we're getting around to that.

But there is another kind of politics—a quite different kind. It is what I shall call the politics of principles. It is politics in the true and uncorrupted meaning of the word as defined by Webster: "The theory or practice of managing or directing the affairs of public policy." And let me say most emphatically that that kind of politics should not be adjourned by the Republican Party at this time.

For that is the kind of politics which subordinates partisanship to national welfare, the kind of politics that has as its objective the preservation of representative government in the United States, the kind of politics that translates ideals into action, the kind of politics that makes democracy work.

It is the kind of politics that is constructive in theory and in action, which does not seek to obstruct for the sake of obstruction, nor to embarrass the opposition merely because the opposition wears a different party label. It is the kind of politics that guarantees the freedom of speech, of worship, and of assembly. It is the kind of politics that vitalizes the Constitution and assures the smooth functioning of our Government of checks and balances, represented by the executive, the legislative, and the judicial branches. And, finally, it is the kind of politics that hears and understands and obeys the voice of the people every day. Heaven help us if that kind of politics is ever adjourned in these United States.

We are told that we are facing an emergency. In fact, a state of limited emergency already has been proclaimed. But what is the nature of this emergency? No guns are leveled at this Nation. No threatening demands have been made upon us. No ultimatum has been delivered. And none will be delivered. We are a Nation at peace and not at war. And if the will of the people is allowed to prevail, we will remain a Nation at peace.

It is true that the outbreak of warfare in Europe has brought us to a crisis in the ordering of our own affairs. Momentous decisions must be made which may well affect for better or for worse the whole future destiny of our Nation. But there is no immediate threat to impel us to rush headlong to hasty and ill-considered conclusions. There is ample time for mature consideration and deliberate debate.

There is no obligation or compulsion to blindly follow the leadership of any one individual or group, no matter how disinterested or inspiring that leadership may be. There is no reason to surrender our American birthright of frank, free, and open discussion to any leadership, no matter how intelligent and well informed that leadership may be. And let no leadership attribute unworthy motives to those who differ honestly with it and have the courage to express those differences. Let the voice of the people be heard. And let the voice of the people prevail.

Along with this talk of adjourning politics is heard the suggestion of coalition government—the suggestion that Republicans be included in the Cabinet of the present administration. The plea is made that we must make a show of national unity; present to the world a united front.

Those who advance this argument overlook two fundamental facts. In the first place, the kind of united front of which they speak becomes a necessity only after final decisions have been made and the national welfare demands that the entire Nation stand back of them. In the second place, ours is not the type of government which lends itself to coalition.

We have as yet made no final decisions in this crisis. We are in the process of making them. We are in the discussion stage where regimentation of thought and opinion has no place. We are at the point where it not only is the privilege but the duty of every responsible citizen to exercise his best judgment for the welfare and the protection of his country. Now, if ever, is the time for every American to speak out, boldly and unafraid. Ideas which cannot stand the test of scrutiny and debate are unworthy either of support or adoption.

Unlike England we are not at war, and unlike England we have a written Constitution and a two-party system of government. The members of our Cabinet are responsible to the President alone. They hold office at the President's will; may be dismissed without reason at his pleasure. They can be held to no accountability either by the Congress or the people. That is not true of the English system. Yet, even in England, after the declaration of war, when national unity reached a life-and-death imperativeness, leaders of both the Liberal and Labor Parties declined posts in a coalition war cabinet. As explained by Sir Archibald Sinclair, the liberal leader, they felt that they could render better service to the nation by supporting all necessary war measures from an "independent position."

Our Federal system of checks and balances was set up by the Constitution. From this logically flowed our two-party system of government, now so time-honored that it is as deeply rooted as if it had been implanted in the Constitution itself. Republican and Federalist, Whig and Democrat, Republican and Democrat—so runs our political history. The story of third party movements is a story of successive failures.

The proper function of the minority party under our two-party system is both positive and negative. On the positive side, its function is to propose and fight for policies which to its leaders seem better designed to promote the public welfare than the policies and program of the party in power. From the negative standpoint, its function is one of constructive criticism to expose the errors and fallacies of the majority party's philosophy and to serve as a brake upon excesses which inevitably result from the unrestrained exercise of great power.

Minority party criticism should always be motivated only by a desire to advance the public good. A classic example of its abuse is to be found in the reminiscences of Senator Thomas H. Benton, of Missouri, concerning the Adams administration. Senator Benton wrote:

"I belonged then to an opposition which was keen and powerful and which permitted nothing to escape that could be used against the President rightfully or wrongfully."

I covet for the Republican Party today an opposition record which nobody will ever be able to narrate in those words. I covet for us an ability to distinguish between good and bad in the performance of the administration. I covet for us a willingness to cooperate with the good. And I equally covet for us a determination to attack the bad and to expose it and, if possible, to prevent it from coming into being.

But I resent any attempt in the name of emergency to stampede the party into becoming a mere rubber stamp for administration proposals, to divert it from its proper function in our system of representative government. In 1933, in the name of emergency and in its zeal to promote the public welfare, the party acquiesced in the surrender of important legislative powers to the Executive. Not until the last session did the party make any substantial success in reclaiming for the Congress its rightful powers and in its efforts to restore representative government. That success, I might say in passing, was achieved by the only kind of coalition that is possible under our form of government—a coalition of like-thinking representatives of the people in Congress—in this case Republicans and Jeffersonian Democrats.

The result of the adjournment of politics in 1933 is that millions of unemployed still walk our streets and our national debt has reached an all-time high. The mistake of 1933 must not be repeated.

Nothing would be more disastrous to this Nation than adjournment of politics which would permit a black-out of urgent domestic problems. As a party, we would be faithless to our trust if we permitted what is happening in Europe to divert us from the task that is ours of correcting the errors of the past six and a half years and of redirecting our energies toward a useful and permanent recovery.

We need to reorder our finances and we need to consider some of the ill-advised legislation which still remains on the statute books. There are many other vital domestic issues about which we need to think and to think deeply.

We must not forget that our domestic problems are just as vital, just as urgent as they were in the weeks preceding the European war. We must not forget that those problems still remain unsolved. We must not forget that only a few weeks before the outbreak of hostilities overseas the Temporary National Economic Committee told us that the survival of the system of private property itself depends upon the restimulation of economic activity, that government acted, but the economic machine remained stalled on dead center; that people are still without jobs; that farmers are still without satisfactory markets; and that industry is still without sufficient purchasers.

The challenge thus presented to our party can be met only by political action. It is our solemn obligation to meet that challenge and not to dodge it by seeking refuge in an adjournment of politics at a time when our domestic problems are as critical as our foreign relations.

And we must meet that challenge soon. The party national conventions are less than a year off. In November of next year the people must choose a President of the United States. If there ever was a time when the politics of principles should not be adjourned it is now and in the months preceding that vitally important undertaking.

The real need today is for more, and not less, political alertness. It would be fatal for the Nation if we permitted our preoccupation with the affairs of Europe to blind us to the state of affairs at home. The danger is all the greater since the war itself already is serving to obscure and to distort the domestic picture.

The war in Europe may enable the New Deal to escape in large measure the dire consequences of its mistaken farm policy, its wasteful spending folly, its hamstringing of business, its drying up of the sources of investment capital, its fomenting of labor strife, and its bleeding white of the American people through the pyramiding of taxation.

As security values advance on the stock exchanges under the stimulus of war demand, as industrial operations speed up, and our crop surpluses are reduced, our people must not be permitted to lose sight of the fact that all of these things are merely the result of temporary circumstances and that the fundamental conditions which retard the return of a sound prosperity remain unchanged and must be changed if we are to regain our normal standards of American wages and American living. We must not delude either ourselves, or permit the people to be deluded, by mistaking a temporary war boom for a return of sound prosperity. By so doing we would only postpone the ultimate day of reckoning and aggravate conditions which already are unsound.

So let us dedicate ourselves here and now to party unity and to unselfish service to the Nation through political action based on sound principles and uninfluenced by unworthy partisan considerations.

Repeal of Arms Embargo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, October 6 (legislative day of Wednesday, October 4), 1939

LETTER BY COL. HENRY BRECKINRIDGE

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a most able and illuminating letter on the subject of the repeal of the arms embargo, written by Col. Henry Breckinridge and published in the New York Times of October 1, 1939.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of October 1, 1939]

LIFTING EMBARGO HELD NOT UNLAWFUL—VIEWS OF DRS. JESSUP AND HYDE DECLARED CONTROVERTED BY THE FORMER'S PREVIOUS EXPRESSIONS

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

In your issue of September 21 was published the joint letter of Charles Cheney Hyde and Philip C. Jessup on the question of removing the existing embargo on munitions to belligerent countries.

On January 30, 8 months ago, Dr. Philip C. Jessup wrote another letter which was published in the New York Times and to which reference will be made later in this communication. Charles C. Burlingham was a cosigner of that letter.

It is unpleasant to read Dr. Jessup's drastic comment in his recent letter on the action proposed to the Congress by the President. It would be "unneutral and is contemptuous of the legal duty which the law of nations imposes upon every neutral sovereign." Again, he characterizes it as "illegal as well as unneutral." He suggests, in speaking of his country, "it cannot at this time relax its embargoes without besmirching its character as an advocate of international justice."

With great respect, I differ with Dr. Jessup, and my difference of opinion is based largely on what I glean from his own writings or the precedents which from time to time he has so voluminously collected. In his letter published in the Times of September 21 he speaks with a dogmatism and finality supported, so far as I can learn, neither by the precedents of his own collection nor by the official admission at any time of any officer of the United States throughout its history acting on a specific case requiring a formal stand by our Government.

PREVIOUS STUDY CITED

Fortunately for us less-informed citizens, as recently as July 1939 Dr. Jessup, as reporter for the research in international law under the auspices of the faculty of the Harvard Law School, gave us a fat tome on the Rights and Duties of Neutral States in Naval and Aerial War. Whether or not Dr. Jessup agrees entirely with the comments in this book I cannot say, because the book has an introductory comment. This tells us that there is fundamental difference of opinion among the compilers of the book, and that its contents are not presented to its readers as reflecting even a consensus of the advisory committee.

Many interesting things appear in Dr. Jessup's report of July, 1939. For example, the Thirteenth Hague Convention of 1907, Article 7, is quoted as follows: "A neutral power is not bound to prevent the export or transit for the use of either belligerent of arms, ammunition or, in general, of anything that could be of use to an army or fleet."

Again, "the neutral laws of the United States never forbade the export of contraband until 1935."

It may help our minds to recall that portion of Dr. Jessup's "Draft Convention," cited by Dr. Clyde Eagleton in his letter published in the Times on September 25. I quote: "A neutral state, for the purpose of better safeguarding its rights and interests as a neutral may, during the course of a war, adopt new measures or alter the measures which it has previously adopted, provided, however, that the new measures adopted do not violate any provision of this convention." Why, it may reasonably be asked, does Professor Jessup so blandly conclude that the proposed changes are not "for the purpose of better safeguarding its rights and interests as a neutral"?

Dr. Jessup cites the comparable text of the Thirteenth Hague Convention of 1907: "Preamble. Seeing that, in this category of ideas, these rules should not, in principle, be altered in the course of a war by a neutral power except in a case where experience has shown a necessity for such change for the protection of the rights of that power."

RIGHTS DEFINED

And Article 26 of that same Hague convention: "The exercise by a neutral power of the rights laid down in the present convention can under no circumstances be considered as an unfriendly act by one or other belligerent who has accepted the articles relating thereto."

Thus, never before 1935 did the neutrality laws of the United States forbid the export of contraband. New legislation restricted the normal rights of American citizens under international law, and the common-sense interpretation of The Hague Convention of 1907 is that this legislation can be changed while a war is in progress, and under no circumstances can it be considered an unfriendly act by belligerents. This is true, unless Professor Jessup can sustain his contention from clear authority that a neutral power can only change the status after the outbreak of hostilities by still further restriction and may not relax any pre-existing restriction.

What is the American history on the subject? During the Napoleonic wars with England, while hostilities were in progress, we imposed and raised embargoes. Reference to the action of our Government in 1794, 1797, 1807, 1809, and 1812 is sufficient proof of this. Most of this action was unwise, but would Dr. Jessup say it was illegal, dishonorable, and unjust?

The joint resolution of 1935 amended our neutrality laws at the outset of the Italo-Ethiopian War and the joint resolution of 1936 did likewise while the Italo-Ethiopian War was in progress. But Dr. Jessup would retort that these were restrictive and not relaxing actions.

During the World War Secretary Lansing in one of his notes to the Austro-Hungarian Government on the arms-export question wrote: "The right and duty to determine when this necessity exists rests with the neutral, not with a belligerent. It is discretionary, not mandatory. If a neutral power does not avail itself of the right, a belligerent is not privileged to complain."

Admiral Sperry, an American representative at the Hague Conference of 1907, in speaking of the point now under discussion, stated that, "All the acts performed by a neutral state in fulfillment of its duties of neutrality are performed by its own authority and not for the purpose of fulfilling a duty or granting a favor to one or the other of the belligerents."

COMMENT ON REPORT

Referring again to Dr. Jessup's report at the botton of page 318 and the top of 319. Speaking of article 13 of his proposed "Draft Convention on Rights and Duties of Neutral States in Naval and Aerial War," his comment is, "From the point of view of the principle embodied in this article, it is immaterial whether the new rule is thus intended to perfect the performance of a neutral duty or whether it is intended to exercise a neutral privilege for the sake of further protecting neutral rights and interests."

"Nevertheless, the text does not go so far as to say that no relaxation of a rule would ever be permissible." This is the comment of Dr. Jessup's report upon his own proposed article 13, which gives a neutral the right to change the status after the outbreak of hostilities.

Again I quote from Dr. Jessup's report: "Fear that changes during war might be considered unneutral apparently carried no weight in the United States during the eighteenth century." Why should it in the twentieth century?

It is admitted that we are dealing with a question obscured by the varying positions taken by nations as dictated from time to time by their self-interest. This is true of much in international law.

But surely the burden of proof must be upon those who deny the right of the United States to pass any neutrality law, either of restriction or of relaxation, that does not violate the well-established rules of international law.

Respectfully do I invite Dr. Jessup to cite one authentic instance in which the Government of the United States has admitted the right of any foreign power to restrict its rights of action as a neutral as long as its action does not assert some unprecedented privilege for itself or its citizens. This is the stand taken by Lansing to Austria-Hungary. It is the stand taken by Sperry as one of our representatives at the Hague Conference of 1907.

Now, let us come to the other letter of Dr. Jessup printed in the Times of January 30. It will be recalled that this was just before the total collapse of the Loyalist government under the onslaughts of Franco and after 2½ years of civil war. Candor compels the admission that Dr. Jessup fell back on the technical fact that the United States had never recognized the belligerency of either party to this civil war, and that, therefore, the United States was not technically bound by the laws of neutrality.

CONTRARY ACTION SEEN

But as a practical matter he was advocating that the President lift the embargo on arms to Loyalist Spain, that there might flow from our shores, 2½ years after the outbreak of hostilities, a stream of arms and munitions to succor the Loyalist armies in their desperate plight. That was an eloquent and closely reasoned appeal to change the status after hostilities had commenced. In January he was urging the exact action in behalf of the Loyalists that he now deplores because it would be unneutral and unjust. He justified his stand on arms to Spanish Loyalists by saying there was no formal war.

With great sincerity and facility Dr. Jessup found the lawyer's reasons to help those whose cause he then espoused. It is interest-

ing to see that same mind now weaving a less tenable thread of argument to the advantage of Nazi interest and to the disadvantage of the western democracies.

His reason for raising the embargo at the eleventh hour to Loyalist Spain was stated by him as follows: "It would further mark a return to our historic policy of avoiding intervention in European civil wars by following a strict hands-off policy instead of taking affirmative action, which, as events have demonstrated, inevitably affects the outcome of a struggle in which we profess not to be concerned." This "hands-off" policy then was to lift the embargo and to permit the shipment of arms to the losing faction of the Spanish civil war. His "hands-off" policy now would insure that England and France could get no arms from here.

"* * * For ye pay tithe of mint and anise and cummin: and have omitted the weightier matters of the law, judgment, mercy, and faith: these ought ye to have done, and not to leave the other undone.

"Ye blind guides, which strain at a gnat and swallow a camel."

HENRY BRECKINRIDGE.

NEW YORK, *September 28, 1939.*

Pending Neutrality Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY S. TRUMAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 9 (legislative day of Wednesday, October 4), 1939

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. LEWIS B. SCHWELLENBACH, OF WASHINGTON

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD an address delivered by the able Senator from Washington [Mr. SCHWELLENBACH] in the American Forum of the Air last night. I think it is the ablest discussion of the question now before the Senate which has yet been made.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I don't know whether Mr. Granik will like what I am about to do or not. I was invited and asked to use up my 12 minutes' portion of this program in making a speech. I am wondering if audiences, particularly radio audiences, are not getting a little tired of listening to speeches upon this question. There has been an average of two or three an evening during the last 2 weeks.

Like every other Senator, I have received a large volume of mail during this special session—so large that it is impossible to give specific answers to each letter. Many of the letters contain definite questions which are very pertinent. Therefore I have decided to use my time in reading some of these questions and my answers to them. In other words, I am taking advantage of Mr. Granik's invitation to answer my mail by radio. There will not be time to read the whole context of any letter, so I am limiting myself to those portions of the letters which contain the questions, and those portions of the replies which contain the answers to the specific questions.

I had one letter last week from a man in Bellingham, Wash., which contained this question: "My understanding in 1937 was that the Congress had passed a completed neutrality bill. I thought that bill was permanent, yet I saw by the papers in April of this year that hearings were being held in both the House and the Senate on new neutrality legislation. Then when the Congress decided not to adopt any legislation last session and the war came on, the President called you folks back in special session. What I would like to know is why there was any need for Congress considering neutrality at all this year."

My answer to that question was: "It is true that in 1935 and 1936 and 1937 we in Congress passed neutrality acts. The 1937 act had three main parts. First, was the arms embargo. Second, a provision requiring all goods shipped to a belligerent to be carried on ships not owned by Americans and with the title to the goods passing to the purchaser before the goods left our shores. The third provision was known as the financial section, and it rather indefinitely restricted financial transactions between our people and belligerent governments. Section 2 of this act, or the carry provisions, expired by the terms of the act on May 1 of this year. Under the law as it now stands, our goods and our people and our ships may travel between the United States and the belligerent countries. It was the fact that that expired which caused us last April to hold hearings on the whole question.

"In the opinion of most of us that was the most important part of the law. As a result of those hearings, everybody in the Senate concluded that it was necessary to restate and strengthen the carry provisions of section 2. Everybody concluded that it was necessary to strengthen the provisions of the financial section. Everybody concluded that it was necessary to prevent our ships, even though destined for neutral countries, to stay away from submarine zones and mine-infested zones, and that our citizens should be kept off belligerent ships.

"For those reasons, about which there is no particular difference of opinion, it became necessary to rewrite the neutrality legislation. In addition to that, a great number of us, and I think the majority, concluded that America's chances of staying out of the war would be much better if the so-called arms embargo were repealed. That is the question around which the present debate is raging, but I think you can see that, regardless of anyone's opinion upon that phase of the question, there must be agreement that some legislation is necessary. I don't think any Member of Congress will seriously disagree on that conclusion."

Another interesting question was posed to me by a writer living at Clarkston, Wash. Clarkston is right near the Idaho line. The letter came to me by air mail, having been written on Wednesday. It said: "Now, I am confused. We here next door to Idaho have always had great confidence in Senator BORAH and when he came out against the repeal of the arms embargo why I thought, of course, that I did agree with him. Then last night Senator NORRIS went on the air and took the opposite side. Personally, I look upon Senator NORRIS as my ideal statesman. Tell me how these two men, with all their experience and with their honesty, can violently disagree on this vital subject."

My answer to that letter was as follows: "I don't blame you for being confused. I agree with everything you have said about both Senator BORAH and Senator NORRIS. Does it not occur to you that what you have asked me is simply an illustration of what a fine thing it is to live under American democracy? There are very few places in the world today where a debate, such as we are now conducting could be carried on. In many countries if Senator BORAH and Senator NORRIS made the speeches which they did over the radio, one of them would end up in a concentration camp. Here we still have room for differences of opinion. We still have the right to express those differences of opinion. That room and that right must not be destroyed. That's why it is so important that, regardless of the outcome of this legislation, we stick to our determination to stay out of this war. We must not endanger American democracy by getting into it."

The next letter is interesting because it comes from a high-school student, and I will read all of it:

"MY DEAR SENATOR: I am a junior in high school and I want to get on my high-school debate team. The subject for the try-out is, 'Resolved, that the Congress should amend the Neutrality Act as requested by the President.' I have been studying this for the last 2 weeks, and I would like to have you help me by explaining what the new bill will do. I have studied all about the arms embargo, and I have made up my mind about that, but what I want you to do is to tell me exactly what the bill will do. Yours very truly."

My answer was this:

"MY DEAR RICHARD: I received your letter telling me about your debate try-out. I am sending you, under separate cover, copies of the present law and the proposed bill; also the Senate committee hearings and six speeches, three on each side of the subject. I am glad to know that you have made up your mind about the arms embargo, and I hope that the speeches by the six Senators will not confuse you.

"You do ask me the specific question about what the proposed law will do, and I will answer that specifically as follows:

"It is a careful, painstaking effort to correct our past mistakes. It is a code of restrictions upon our citizens so as to prevent any one of us from so conducting ourselves as to endanger all of us. It prohibits our ships from traveling to belligerents or from making deliveries to belligerent ships. It prohibits goods owned by Americans being shipped to belligerents. It prohibits our ships and our citizens, even though destined for neutral countries, to travel through the dangerous submarine and mine-infested areas. It prohibits our citizens from traveling on ships owned by belligerents. It prevents the arming of our merchant vessels. It prevents our Government and our people from loaning money or extending credit to belligerent governments. It so strengthens the duties of the Munitions Control Board as to give Congress such a check on munitions as to prevent our being dragged into war by munitions sales. It takes away from the President all of the important discretionary power granted in the 1937 act. There is not a word in it giving the President power to name aggressors. Since it treats both sides precisely alike, it is as truly neutral as any law that could be devised. Since it simply restrains our own citizens, neither side has a right to object to it. It tries to substitute a true peace plan for our present dangerous unneutral hodge-podge. If any law can keep us out of war, this one will.

"With best of luck to you in your try-out for the debate. Yours truly."

The next letter from which I wish to read came from Wenatchee, Wash. In part, it reads as follows:

"What are you fellows trying to do? For the last 5 years I have heard about cash and carry. I thought that meant real honest cash, and now I see your bill provides for 90 days' credit. Why are you making that change and giving credit to these governments?"

I answered in this way:

"You certainly are entitled to ask the question you submitted in your letter. If, as you say, this present bill would propose to loosen

up credit, I would certainly vigorously oppose it. I think it extremely unfortunate that those who oppose the bill have attempted to represent to the people that the new bill does loosen up credits. The fact is it definitely restricts them. I first ask you to remember that the present law, insofar as it relates to financial transactions, was very largely written by those who now oppose the new law. In 1935, 1936, and 1937 they wrote into the law the financial provisions which prohibit credits, the extension of credits, or the public sale or exchange of bonds or other obligations by any belligerent government. At the end of that section they used this language:

" 'Provided, That if the President shall find that such action will serve to protect the commercial or other interests of the United States or its citizens, he may, in his discretion, and to such extent and under such regulations as he may prescribe, except from the operation of this section ordinary commercial credits and short-time obligations in aid of legal transactions and of a character customarily used in normal peacetime commercial transactions.'

"If you will read that carefully, you will see that it places almost no restrictions upon the President. He can grant 60-day, 90-day, 120-day, or even 6-month credits under it. Those of us who wrote this new law felt that that was too much discretion to give to the President, and that it should be limited. Consequently, we inserted into the law three definite restrictions.

"We said that the President could not permit the extensions of credit by our citizens to belligerent governments for a period longer than 90 days. It isn't 90 days' credit. The 90 days is the outside limit. Then we provided that the obligation or contract by which the belligerent government bought goods from our citizens would have to show upon its face that it was not renewable. Our third restriction was that if any government failed to pay within 90 days they then could get no more credit.

"In other words, we took the present law, which was written by the opponents to the proposed law and which was loose and indefinite, and tied it up in three important particulars. Now the opponents of this law, who in 1935, 1936, and 1937 were perfectly satisfied with the indefinite and loose provisions which I have quoted, are trying to make you and other people in the country believe that the Pittman bill opens up the field for extended credits. It not only does not open up the field, it tries to tie up the loopholes in the present act."

The next letter was very short. It just had two sentences. Let me read them:

"You said over the radio last night that the United States will stay out of this war. Do you really believe it?"

My answer was: "I most assuredly do believe the United States will stay out of this war. The chief reason I believe it is that the American people are so determined to stay out. We know the utter futility of getting into another European war. We tried it once, thinking we could help solve Europe's problems. It took them only a short 20 years to get back at each other's throat again. We don't intend to sacrifice the lives, the bodies, and the minds of our young men, nor the resources of our country making that same mistake again.

"Another reason is that the Members of Congress are so determined that we stay out. Since I have been in Washington the last 2 weeks, I have not heard a single Member of Congress express the fatalistic idea that we had to get in. We are all determined that we are not going to get in.

"The third reason is that the President is determined to stay cut. I talked to him and I talked to many Members of the Senate who also had conversations with him on the subject. You probably have read criticisms of the President in the last few years that when he makes up his mind about something he, to quote the articles, 'gets his Dutch up' and nothing can change him. The President has 'his Dutch up' on this question of staying out of war, and nobody is going to change him on it. He is not going to permit our Nation to get into this war."

Proposed Neutrality Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SHERMAN MINTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 9 (legislative day of Wednesday, October 4), 1939

EXCERPTS FROM ADDRESS BY HON. CLAUDE PEPPER, OF FLORIDA

Mr. MINTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD excerpts from a speech delivered by the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] at a mass meeting called to support the proposed neutrality law held in the National Press Auditorum in Washington, D. C., on September 26, 1939.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The eyes of the world are upon America again. For what we do in the next few weeks shall, in the judgment of most men, determine not only the course of our country but the kind of world in which those who come after us shall live.

A war has been thrust upon the world by a great international brigand. A man who himself has ordered men shot down without a trial; with a pistol in his own presence because they differed with him politically. A man who has repudiated religion and man's God and turned the clock of time back before religion and Christ and the cross.

By a man who has probably adopted war—the killing of men, the widowing of wives, the orphaning of children, the maiming of men's bodies, the cruel, cold destruction of the finest artistry of man's mind and hands as the chief instrument of his international policy.

By a man who disdains human freedom, who scorns human rights, whose cynical mind ignores human aspirations, who derides the reach of human conscience into the ethereal realms of the spirit.

In the face of the prayers of the world, against the entreaty of men and women of good will everywhere, to satisfy his lust for power and greed for conquest, this man has engulfed the world in the carnage of war.

We love peace. We so much want peace that we are willing to make any sacrifice for it. In the neutrality legislation now pending we have been willing to give up the freedom of the seas—to abandon the high roads of the world—to bring home every American ship which flies the American flag, because we so much are determined upon peace.

While no other nation in the world restrains its commerce or closes its borders to any purchaser who comes for its goods, we say we will not venture a single ship—a single sailor or a single citizen—even where war may be upon the high seas, let alone in a country where a war is.

To the warring nations we say "If you want our goods, come and get them in our own harbors, upon our own shores; take them home, your own goods, in your own conveyances, and at your own risk."

While Germany buys from any one of a dozen neighbors upon ordinary commercial principles without any remonstrance from Germany's enemies, there are those who say that we will offend Germany if we alike open our shores and in our own harbors sell Germany's enemies who may come, get, and take home the goods they buy from us here.

In spite of the fact that under the neutrality law we do not even send our ships to Canada upon the Atlantic or the Pacific, though those sea routes are within the shadows of our shores.

They say we have not made enough sacrifices for peace.

They say they favor "come and get it" as a principle for general commerce, yet they profess to distinguish between commerce generally and commerce that might go to make war.

They say they will not keep soldiers at the front, yet they would furnish food, and uniforms, and communication wires, and trucks, and paper and pencils, and all the myriad other articles which go to make war.

They say it's all right for a land power to buy from its neighbors, but all wrong for a sea power to buy from its neighbors.

They say it's all right to sell wheat, but they overlook that it was the fact that Germany did not have wheat which ended the war.

They say if America sells her goods, her arms, to any purchaser who "comes and gets them," it will contribute to the carnage of war.

I say if America does not sell her goods, the carnage of war will spread.

I say if America's goods or guns are bought and taken home by any country who uses them in the defense of human freedom, for the preservation of the Christian religion, for the sanctity of human rights, the sacredness of human hopes and aspirations, I thank God for it.

They say America's destiny is isolation. I say if they mean by isolation staying out of Europe's quarrels, not haggling over other people's territory, not seeking other nations' conquest, we are all isolationists; but if they mean by isolation that we are disinterested in whether civilization perishes from the earth, whether bloody Hitlerism baptizes the earth, whether dastardly dictatorship encompasses the world, whether the iron feet of tyrants trample down the free peoples of the earth, whether religion endures and God is worshipped, whether we have no sense of right, no feeling of wrong, no sympathy for victims, no sentiment for the oppressed, no care for those who are maimed and mangled; if they mean that America is alike without a conscience or a cause; if they mean that America repudiates all her glorious past, that she forfeits all her noble destiny, that she has grown callous to every fine thing that moves the hearts of men and women, I say, "Thank God, I am not that kind of an isolationist."

Now, therefore, in this crucial hour let America be prayerful, patriotic, calm, cool, solemn, for what we are about is the serious business of preserving all that we have saved out of the wreckage of the past. A united people, one from many, we stand forth before the world to find and to follow a course which is fair, which is right, and which our ancestors before us and the Providence which has guided us will alike approve.

Neutrality Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KEY PITTMAN

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 9 (legislative day of Wednesday, October 4), 1939

ARTICLE BY HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS, OF UTAH

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have published in the Appendix of the RECORD an article written by the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], at the request of the Detroit News and the North American Newspaper Alliance, dealing with the subject of neutrality.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Detroit News and the North American Newspaper Alliance]

(By Senator ELBERT D. THOMAS)

For those who wish to understand clearly the problems facing Congress during the special session in bringing about a modification of the so-called Neutrality Act of 1937 it is well to keep certain definite facts in mind at all times.

International law is a series of customs governing the habits of nations in carrying out their relations with one another and the relations of their nationals with nationals of foreign states. Customarily international law is divided into two major groupings, the law during peacetimes and the law during wartimes. Neutrality is a division of international law.

The law which Congress is considering is domestic law. Anything which Congress does will not modify international law as such, but it will curb the activities of American citizens in their dealings with belligerent states and with nationals of belligerent states.

Thus, when it is said we shall go back to international law, such a statement means merely that the Government of the United States will remove those restrictions from the activities of American citizens if the restrictions are in excess of what is deemed a proper act under international law. There will be no going back to international law as such as a result of the special session of Congress, because neither the President nor Congress is in a mood to remove all restrictions.

LIMIT FOR AMERICANS

Therefore, that which Congress will do will be merely to limit the activities of Americans. Congress will enact only domestic law, and that which it may do will not affect the international law of neutrality so far as other countries are concerned, because no other country has a law similar to our Neutrality Act of 1937.

Now, then, it is said that it would be unneutral to change the rules of the game while a war is in progress. It would be unneutral if we were to take a stand to allow American citizens rights outside the realm of international law, but as long as any restriction we put on our American citizens will be within this realm such change could not be deemed unneutral.

A restriction on American citizens might work to the advantage or disadvantage of certain belligerents, but this would not be contrary to the law of neutrality, because there is no way under the sun to do or not to do anything which will affect all the belligerents in the same way.

Another thing for us to keep in mind is the fact that America today is a declared neutral, not because of the Neutrality Act of 1937, but because of the international law of war. The President proclaimed America's neutrality first in accordance with international law and domestic law, and then proclaimed certain embargoes and prohibitions in accordance with the Neutrality Act of 1937.

NO WAR PARTY

Therefore there can be legally no pro-war group of American citizens, and actually there are very few citizens who want to see America in war. No one is advocating it.

I cannot emphasize this point too greatly. There is no war party in America, there is not even a saber bloc, such as attracted substantial support before the war of 1917. For an orator to insist otherwise is tantamount to going into the street shouting "Fire" when there is no fire, to cry "Stop thief" when there is no theft, to alarm and to panic a sensitive and worried public without reason or excuse. There are no war groups in the United States today. This may be stated as an axiom.

I personally stand exactly where I have always stood, claiming that America's mission is to remain neutral and that no possible advantage could come to us or to the world by our getting into this war. Therefore everything that I would work for would be something which in my opinion would tend to keep us out of war and tend toward building American neutrality traditions and practices stronger than ever.

If we can keep most of the nations of the world from becoming belligerents, not only shall we save lives but also there will be some chance to have a constructive peace tempered by neutral influences rather than a harsh peace imposed by victors upon the vanquished.

AGREE ON NEUTRALITY

Therefore I emphasize the fact that those on both sides of the controversy concerning the embargo actually stand shoulder to shoulder on the peace program and both are in hearty agreement that American neutrality shall be preserved. How best this can be done is therefore the question. Those who want to modify the act press for modification because of a firm conviction that the act as it exists may be more likely to bring us into war than it will as modified.

Why do we say this? In the first place the act merely embargoes shipments of arms, ammunitions, and implements of war. All other things can be shipped to belligerents. The nation, therefore, which is lacking in arms, ammunitions, and implements of war, and which could get those things from us, is a nation that is hurt by our present embargo.

Now it just happens in this war that those nations which have not turned their entire economy into a war economy find themselves behind in the matter of certain implements of war, primarily airplanes. So strongly did the nations of the world feel that future war activities would depend upon airplanes that the nations which lost the World War were prohibited from building military airplanes. Germany did not start her present program until 1934 in respect to arming of the air. The Allies did not protest this in spite of the treaty. The results of the breach now are apparent to all.

LIMITATION HITS ALLIES

Therefore, the lifting of the embargo on airplanes undoubtedly will aid England and France. But if America restricts all exports to belligerents and makes those materials and commodities which now are outside the realm of arms, ammunitions, and implements exportable only after title has passed and ownership has been transferred to the buyer and consideration for the purchase received, we will thereby put a tremendously great limitation upon England and France, for they are in need of many things.

In the sum of all exports, then, the modifications to the act as suggested will primarily affect (and this will be adversely) England and France. Germany must buy indirectly because of, first of all, the barter system and, secondly, the hazards of the British-French blockade. Therefore the practical effect of the projected modifications cannot be looked upon as pro-Ally and will not, actually, because of the restrictions placed upon other things than arms, ammunitions, and implements of war.

Then, too, we must remember that the same restrictions in respect to purchases, transfer of title and ownership will hold for arms, ammunitions, and implements of war because those articles and materials can continue to be exported only under license and under complete governmental supervision, and the National Munitions Board has to report to Congress all transactions in those three classifications of articles.

RESTRICTIONS SET UP

Thus America is not going back to international law, but will remain even if all the President's points are incorporated into law, a nation restricting her citizens very much beyond the demands placed upon them through the provisions of international law, and America, too, will remain in that position of restricting her citizens more greatly than are the citizens of any other neutral restricted.

For example, in addition to the transfer of title in all commerce which will go to states at war, all American merchant vessels will be prohibited outright from carrying passengers or goods to belligerent states. The only modification of this rule probably will be certain activities under restriction covering American ships on the Great Lakes and in other territorial waters of the United States. Americans will be prohibited from traveling on belligerent ships.

The arming of American merchant ships will be prohibited. This will be done because of a firm conviction as a result of our experiences in the World War that it was a mistake to arm our merchantmen. It is assumed now that, even in a period of unrestricted submarine warfare, if a belligerent ship knows that our merchant ships cannot carry arms or any other goods to belligerent countries, and if it is known that our merchant ships have no facilities at all to do harm to a submarine there can be no excuse other than dastardly and wanton wickedness for a submarine to attack one of our ships.

COMPLETE CONTROL

Under the restrictions of the projected law an American ship could not be other than a messenger of peace. The financing of wars, the sale of belligerent bonds, and the sale of belligerent credit certificates will be completely prohibited. The solicitation of funds and the collection of money for belligerents will be stopped.

The prohibition against the use of American ports as a base of supplies for war vessels and submarines will be a part of the law. There will be a complete control of any armed merchant ships and any submarines of belligerents that may come into our ports.

The Munitions Control Board will control to the utmost the exportation of all arms, ammunitions, and implements of war and will

report its findings and decisions regularly to Congress. The Congress of the United States will always know all necessary particulars in regard to the trade in arms. Then if abuses should arise they may be stopped very quickly.

Then I am sure that the projected law will continue the provision that "this act shall not apply to an American republic or republics engaged in war against a non-American state or states, provided the American republic is not cooperating with a non-American state or states in such war." Thus the solidarity of American neutrality will be developed and one more step toward making the Monroe Doctrine universal in its acceptance for the Americas will be made.

Pastorius Day Celebration, Philadelphia, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. DAVIS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 9 (legislative day of Wednesday, October 4), 1939

ADDRESS BY HON. JAMES J. DAVIS, OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, on October 6 I attended a great mass meeting in the Metropolitan Opera House in Philadelphia as a part of the Pastorius Day celebration. The music was splendid beyond my words to describe. The first number was Hail, Columbia, Happy Land, and the meeting was concluded with the singing of The Star-Spangled Banner. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the address which I delivered on this occasion.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This is the United States of America. It is our land. Here we live under the Constitution. Here we have the protection of the Bill of Rights. I speak from experience when I say that if there are any unnaturalized citizens present this evening you should at once begin to prepare yourselves for American citizenship and to enjoy the blessings which come from complete loyalty to this land in which we live.

In these times that stir and try the souls of men our hearts are filled with conflicting emotions. The need of the hour is sober thought and disciplined emotion. More than everything else, ours is the desire for peace. We find ourselves facing the upheavals of the Old World culture and the crest of the wave of hatred and war is moving rapidly toward our own shores. Believing as we do in peace, we are determined to withstand the barrage of propaganda and the false idealism which threaten to engulf us and destroy our peace.

We have lived through a World War and we have seen the terror of revolution. The influences of these events have cast their lengthening shadows far into the future. They have taken their toll on the battlefields of Africa, China, and Spain. We have witnessed the political and economic disaster of Central Europe. We have seen since the World War whole nations on the verge of bankruptcy and financial chaos. We have observed the destructive consequences of a peace that was framed in the spirit of war. From it we have learned that no issue is really settled until it is settled in the spirit of peace.

In our own country we have undergone an unprecedented depression. These 10 long years since 1929 have shattered our proud dreams of Utopia to which the Technocrats pointed in other days. The millions of hungry unemployed have gone everywhere in search of jobs. The right to work has been challenged. The hope of continuous employment from youth to old age has been shattered. Almost overnight we seem to be confronted with strange conditions and unusual problems which have taxed our social intelligence to the breaking point. While we continue to speak of "balancing the Budget" and putting men "back to work" we are coming to realize that we are in a death grapple with fundamental problems more serious than mankind has ever faced before. We are fighting in the cause of humanity—the battle of industrial freedom. Until we penetrate beneath the surface of these problems and get to the bottom of public issues, there is little hope for economic revival for the American people. In the past we have thought of our problems as very largely economic or political. Today we are coming to see that they are intensely human problems wrapped up in the inner nature of man himself. They depend upon the framework of mind, spirit, and character within the individual citizen. Until the greed and the selfishness which have marked the blind partisanship of the past have been restrained there is not much prospect of the human progress we so greatly desire. Recourse has been had to legislation. We now have the statute books heavy with new laws but the coming of the new legislation has not given a guaranty of the better day we seek. Facing these problems, the verdict of the future will be either that we are the gravediggers of a great and glorious past, or the pioneers of a better and more constructive tomorrow. Which shall it be?

As we face the future, it must be as good Americans. We are challenged to find within the framework of American culture and upon the background of American history a higher design for living and our individual destiny. For surely the position of Americans of German descent is one of great prominence. You and your fathers have become American citizens because of your free resolve to live your lives in this New World. Not only have you come here and remained here voluntarily, but you have chosen irrevocably to cast in your lot with the free people of this great continent. You have adopted for yourselves freely and fully the fundamental principles embodied in the Constitution of the United States. Particularly is this true in Germantown and Philadelphia, the shrine of American liberty, the cradle of the charter of our liberties. If there is any place in all the land where the Bill of Rights should mean the most, it is here in the very heart of Pennsylvania. Not only have you adopted these principles in the past, but from year to year as you gather in the celebration of Pastorius you have reaffirmed this confession of faith, taking once again the oath of allegiance. No one may rightly say that this oath has been taken lightly. You cannot and do not seek any other political allegiance. You cannot and do not hold a separate political faith. You cannot and do not approve of un-American methods and activities. You cannot and do not hold before your eyes any greater loyalty than that which you yield to these United States.

I have enjoyed over a long period of years the association with my many friends of German birth and descent. I know how strongly you feel attached to the glorious history of German achievement in this New World. I have sung with you your folk songs. I have talked and mingled in many of your festive occasions. I have met with many of your congregations gathered in sanctuary. I have found you steadfast and faithful in the performance of your individual responsibilities in your patriotic duties. I am confident that you will continue to be faithful to your fundamental pride and loyalty in America.

No one born in a foreign land as I have been can better estimate the true affection which one holds for the place of one's birth. This is the land of my adoption. This is the land where I have found great life and liberty. This is the land where I have married and where my children have been raised. This is the land where I expect to be buried. Even so, my thought goes back to the land of my birth. I cherish the companionship of those who speak of it as their homeland, and I am not forbidden to speak to them in the familiar folk tongue of a language of our common birth. I sing with them the old Welsh hymns. I feel with them a pride in the skill and the ingenuity of the workman of Welsh descent. I glory in the contribution which the Welsh have made to this New World. Surely I should be counted unnatural and a strange creature, should I forget the land of my birth and the blood heritage of the past. Similarly I can understand how men and women of German blood in America feel for their kindred. I can understand this feeling when found in any one of a dozen nationalities represented numerously in the State of Pennsylvania. As Americans we take pride in our ability to think differently, to acknowledge a different ancestry, and yet to remain together in peace and brotherhood.

Even before the landing of Germans under Franz Daniel Pastorius on October 6, 1683, and the subsequent founding of Germantown, Pa., there were Germans in this New World. In reality, there were Hessians present in Fort Royal, S. C., as early as 1562. That was more than 120 years before the landing of the good ship *Concord*, I am told, and the records show that in 1607 a goodly number of German artisans lived in Jamestown, Va. As with the German immigrant of today, so with the Germans who settled in Pennsylvania. They have shed luster upon the early history of our Commonwealth. Conrad Weiser, sometimes called the Father of the Pennsylvania Germans—pioneer, patriot, volunteer, and trusted interpreter—has special significance at this time. A monument has been erected to his memory. Standing at Weiser's grave at the time of Washington's visit to Womelsdorff, the Father of his Country said: "The departed man rendered many services to this country in a difficult period and posterity will not forget him." Daniel Boone, of German-American stock, was the first to penetrate the wilderness of the Far West. A German Marylander, Johann Lederer, was the first to explore in 1669 the country west of the Alleghenies. John Zinger, a German printer in New York, was the father of the liberty of the press in this country. The two Conrad Weisers, father and son, were the first interpreters of the Indians. General Muhlenberg, of revolutionary fame, was afterward the first Speaker of the House of Representatives and first United States Senator of Pennsylvania. I. L. Hassler created our coastal survey. Two Germans, the Roeblings, father and son, planned and perfected the great Brooklyn Bridge. William Rittenhaus in 1690 erected the first paper mill in America. Thomas Ruetter in 1716 founded the first iron works in Pennsylvania. Christopher Witt in Germantown built our first church organ, and Johann Behrent in 1775 built the first American piano. Casper Wuster in 1738 founded the first glass factory in America. The

Cramps, great American shipbuilders, were also of German descent. Johann G. Cramp, the founder, came to the United States in 1756. Karl S. Herreschoff, the famous builder of racing yachts, was born in Minden, Germany, and came to the United States an accomplished engineer in 1800.

Eberhard Faber, founder of the American lead-pencil industry, was born in Nuremburg, Germany; Klaus Spreckels, founder of the American beet-sugar industry, was born in Hanover; John I. Astor, founder of the American Fur Co., in Walldorff; and G. Martin Brill, largest car manufacturer, in Cassel. A man who may be regarded as the founder of the American department store, John Wanamaker, was originally known as "Wannamacher." I am told that he was a life member of the German Society of Pennsylvania, founded in 1764. And who will forget the fame of Inspector General Baron von Steuben, Major General de Kalb, Major General Muhlenberg, Gen. Christopher Ludwig, Senior Surgeon Dr. Otto—all of Revolutionary fame. During the War of 1812 Major General Armistead was the defender of Fort McHenry, Baltimore. The heroic deeds of Armistead and his men inspired Francis Scott Key to write The Star-Spangled Banner—our national anthem. During the Civil War 1,176,817 Americans born in Germany joined the Army of the North and no less than 52 Germans rose to the rank of general in the Union armies. These few names do not begin to tell the story of German achievement in behalf of America.

I very well remember speaking in Berlin in praise of Karl Schurz, who did so much to bring a new spirit of liberty into our own American political institutions. Today his name is honored both in America and in Europe for his love of liberty and his vision of true representative government. The Karl Schurz Memorial Foundation has been established to keep alive the principles to which he dedicated his own life.

I have received a number of honorary degrees. Among them I prize none more than that which I received from Muhlenberg College. I have regarded with more than usual affection the relationship thus established between this college and myself, particularly because I have rejoiced to have my name associated with that of the beloved Muhlenberg.

The deeds of the past challenge us to greater deeds in the future. Those who have gone before us have paved the way for a glorious tomorrow. The difficulties of the present hour must not fill us with terror, but should call us to a more active endeavor in behalf of this country which we so greatly love. There are always those who seek to misunderstand and misinterpret any activity of a cultural nature of foreign origin. False implications have even been drawn from our meeting today. However, we are here fully intent upon the preservation of our American form of government and to acknowledge the great debt which this Nation owes to men and women of German descent who for long generations have made this land their home and the last abode of their affections.

The problems of peace and neutrality are now before us. There are many sinister influences at work in our land which in the name of peace desire secretly to embroil this Nation in war. They are the ones who say "I believe in peace, but," people who are endeavoring to lead us away from the principles of George Washington. Efforts are being made to identify this country with foreign quarrels not of our own making. I wish to say emphatically—the present strife of Europe is not our war. As I have said many times in the past, I shall do everything in my power to keep this country free from war.

Our first responsibility is the maintenance of our own domestic economy. We have unsolved problems in our own land from which we are being diverted at the present time. We still have 10,000,000 unemployed. We still have a national debt of staggering proportions. We still have millions on relief and work relief for whom only a temporary provision has been made. We still have railroads that are next door to bankruptcy. We still have farm prices that are ridicuously low. We have these and other domestic problems for which no permanent provision has been made. I am thoroughly convinced that the best judgment of both business, labor, investment, and the taxpayers of America counsels us that war can never bring the solution to these problems that they require. War will take our best and use it for the worst. War will take our young men and use them as cannon fodder. War will disrupt the normal processes of business and trade. War will build hate where once there was good will. For every problem war solves, it throws up a dozen greater problems to be solved. America wants peace, not war. America wants work and peace.

A propaganda has gone abroad in the land that we should now come to the rescue of the democracies of Europe. In effect, we are urged to replace our own present form of government with a centralized military government in behalf of the age-long quarrels of the rival imperialisms of the Old World. Fortunately in this hour of propaganda and counter propaganda the American people are not asleep. I rejoice that so many are alert and watchful. I rejoice that the American people as a whole are now asking for peace and not for war. Our people are able to think for themselves and they can see beneath the subtle suggestions that have been thrown out for the purpose of embroiling us in Europe's conflict. As Americans we still believe with George Washington that this country should avoid entangling alliances. We still believe that this country has a set of conditions which are not at present found elsewhere in the world and which permit us to remain at peace while other lands are plunged in war. In fact, we are now drawing to the close of a decade of war. The world has witnessed war ever since 1931. The imperialistic designs of warring powers have turned both China, North Africa, and Spain into a human slaughter house. We successfully adhered to our fundamental American principle—to keep out of foreign wars. We kept out then and we should keep out now.

Our first and last thought must now be for America. We have here a form of government which has carried on for over 150 years—the oldest government of any major power in the world. These blessings have come to us because of the Constitution of the United States. We are grateful for the blessings we here enjoy. We are determined to allow no alien philosophy of government to destroy these blessings. There is no place in America for those who would put first the cause of communism or fascism. There is no place in America for a totalitarian concept of government contrary to our Constitution. There is no place in America for the iron hand of a dictatorship.

We have within our borders a great prize. We have here the wealth of the world. We have a body of over 130,000,000 American citizens. They have had the opportunities of education such as no other people have so largely enjoyed. Here we have freedom of speech, freedom of press, freedom of organization. We are determined to maintain these liberties and to perpetuate our American form of government.

We would do well to remember that these blessings will remain with us only so long as we are strong enough to protect them. We need a national defense that will permit no foreign power to entertain destructive visions of our American civilization. We want a Navy on both the Atlantic and the Pacific coasts equal to any in the world. We want an air force of intelligent, highly trained men equal to any emergency. We want industrial adaptation that can be directed to any military need. In a word, we are determined to protect ourselves on land, sea, and in the air.

I very well recall when I came with my mother to this land, she carried with her pictures of Queen Victoria and Abraham Lincoln. She had lived under an unwritten constitution. She had held allegiance to the British Crown. When they landed in New York City, however, she said, "This is now my land; it is our new home; it shall be the land for my children"; and she was completely faithful to the land of her adoption. She passed on to her children this same loyalty to America. From first to last, since I came to this land, I sought in every possible way to be faithful to the Stars and Stripes and to the Constitution of the United States and to the Government of the people, by the people, and for the people which, please God, shall not perish from the earth.

In conclusion I wish to say that I was invited to speak at this meeting by Capt. Louis Schmidt, whom I have known for over 30 years. I have implicit confidence in his loyalty to this country. He had assured me that the purpose of this meeting is fundamentally patriotic and American. I am not for Hitler; I am not for Stalin; and I do not stand under the banners of nazi-ism or communism. I am opposed to the infiltration of alien doctrines of the totalitarian states into this country. I believe I am well within my rights as an American citizen when I say that I resent the activities of those who seek to intimidate me or to prevent me from exercising fully and freely the civil rights of an American citizen. I would have kept my appointment at this meeting even though it should have been necessary for me to come from Washington to Philadelphia on a handcar and pump my own way. If for no other reason, I would be here to address loyal German-American citizens gathered to uphold the principles of free speech to which all of us stand committed under the Constitution of the United States.

I do not expect to be caught up in any controversy between Nazis and Communists in this country. It is well known that the battle between these alien philosophies is being carried on throughout the land. At the present time, I understand that the American League for Peace and Democracy is under investigation by the Dies committee. The Washington branch of this organization has issued a statement, October 4, saying: "We advocate a foreign policy for the United States that closely corresponds with the express views of the President. On domestic issues we have backed the program of the New Deal and defended the constitutional guaranties of civil liberties against the attacks of un-American and undemocratic forces." And yet Miss Neulight, speaking for the American League for Peace and Democracy, declared that I should cancel my engagement to speak to our German-American citizens. I am confident that my appearance tonight in the Metropolitan Opera House gives no comfort to Herr Hitler or to those who favor his methods and form of government.

During the World War I spoke in many German-American meetings. I found them steadfastly loyal to our flag. My observation is the same as that of Gen. Hugh Johnson, who last night on the radio declared that "during the war he did not find a more loyal or patriotic group of American citizens anywhere than those of German descent in the United States." I am for peace. I am working for peace, but should our country become engaged in war, I would not expect on that account to be separated from loyal German-Americans or any other loyal group of Americans with whom I have lived and worked these many years. The worst foes of America at the present time are not the armed forces of any foreign power; they are the forces within our own midst which seek to divide and separate the American people on the basis of class or race. We are all one people; we have a common destiny; we have a common allegiance; we put first our loyalty to the Government of the United States and the principles of constitutional government under which we live.

Pending Neutrality Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KEY PITTMAN

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 9 (legislative day of Wednesday, October 4), 1939

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. HENRY L. STIMSON, FORMER SECRETARY OF STATE

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have published in the Appendix of the RECORD an address recently delivered by former Secretary of State, Henry L. Stimson, over the Columbia Broadcasting System. I wish to say that, while I do not agree with every position taken by the former distinguished Secretary of State, it is a very able address, and I think it is worthy of being published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In discussing the so-called neutrality legislation I shall try to start from a basis on which we can all stand together. Then we can more easily see what the problem is and what our real differences in regard to its solution may be. I believe that our people are very much united in the common objective which they are trying to attain and that such differences as exist are differences only as to the best method of reaching that common purpose. In such a situation we ought to be able to discuss the matter as American citizens in a common spirit of tolerance and patriotism.

I think that the problem before us is really a problem of national defense and what we are all trying to decide is how best to preserve and protect the security of the people of the United States. That is the purpose which I think President Roosevelt and Secretary Hull have in mind when they ask for a repeal of the present embargo. I think it is also the objective which their opponents have in mind when they oppose the repeal of the embargo. The only difference between them is as to which method will best promote that ultimate aim. If I had the naming of the bill now before the Senate, I should call it a bill to promote and preserve the security of the United States. I should not call it a neutrality bill. Neutrality is not the end of our efforts. It is merely one of the means which is being discussed in an effort to reach the real objective, security.

Again a great many people think the end which we are considering is how to keep the United States out of war. But after all that again is only a means toward the achievement of a further ultimate end. It is true that at the present moment we are all united on trying to keep out of war.

But a time may well come when the only way to promote the security of the people of the United States would be to fight for that security. That has been the case several times in our history, and very often the case in the history of other nations. The people of Great Britain and France think that it is the case with their countries today. If a time should come when it was clear beyond peradventure that the only way to preserve the security of the United States and its institutions was to fight for them, I believe that the great majority of our people would choose war rather than the greater evil of submission to an enemy on our shores. So I think I am right in my analysis of the ultimate aim of all of us, and I hope that those who are listening to me tonight will agree with me. I will therefore discuss the issue pending in the Senate from that standpoint.

I am one of those who believe that the President and Mr. Hull are right. I believe that the embargo provisions of the present law have not been an aid to the security of the United States, but that, on the contrary, they have greatly jeopardized that security. For 4 years these provisions have tended to make the leaders of Germany and other nations believe that the people of the United States took no concern in what was going on in the world outside their boundaries; that they did not feel any responsibility or apprehension for anything that might happen abroad even if those events might result in the destruction or subjugation of all of the democratic and peace-loving nations in Europe and the domination of that entire continent by the aggressive power of the dictatorships. I think that those leaders have been encouraged to believe that we did not have foresight enough to see what would happen to us in case of such a catastrophe and that we would take no step whatever, even peaceful steps, to forestall such a danger. I thus think that these provisions for an embargo have to a material extent encouraged the present breach of the peace by Germany when she invaded Poland. I believe that such opinion as to the United States constitutes a gross slander on the foresight, wisdom, and patriotism of our people and a gross misapprehension of our history; of what we have done in the past and what we would do in the future in case necessity required. And I believe that these provisions of the present law have thus produced a situation which, unless altered, is almost certain to result in an ultimate clash between ourselves and the leaders who have thus so completely misunderstood us and our character.

Under these circumstances I am confident that a repeal of this embargo would be of both material and moral help in preventing such a disaster. It would not only materially assist and encourage the nations who are fighting for freedom but it would aid in keeping those nations who are now wavering from joining the side of the dictators. Thus I consider that such a repeal would greatly contribute to our own safety. It would not only help to keep us from becoming involved in this war but it would help prevent a subsequent attack upon us and our hemisphere in case the dictators should win this war.

Let us examine the lessons of history and experience bearing on this question. This provision in the present law for a compulsory automatic embargo against the shipment of arms by this Nation was adopted 4 years ago, and its adoption was a departure from our general policy as a nation which had lasted almost unbroken for 150 years. An examination of that policy may help us today. It was based upon the wisdom of early American statesmen who knew the character of their countrymen, who also knew Europe during a great war, and who were uncommonly foresighted in devising the means of guiding a growing American Nation through the difficulties of a stormy world.

These ancestors of ours were peace-loving but not pacifists. They had had the hardest kind of fighting to preserve their liberties. They were idealistic but cool-headed. Above all they were not oblivious to the outside world. The seafaring men of early America were among the boldest sailors of the sea. The merchants and the traders of New England and the eastern seaboard were in touch with all foreign markets and were familiar with the vital influence of commerce upon us and other countries. The statesmen who represented these men believed that the United States would always be a peace-loving Nation and that its future would be devoted to the orderly development of its inheritance on this continent. They themselves were devoted to personal liberty and for that reason were deeply opposed to the maintenance in times of peace of a large military establishment or of stores of arms and ammunition. But they recognized very clearly that such a policy might at times endanger our country in case we should be attacked by a more military or aggressive nation. They therefore believed that we should keep ourselves free to purchase arms for our self-defense in case any such attack were made.

They also recognized that there were other peace-loving nations in the world like ours who might be similarly attacked by more aggressive or better armed enemies, and they were wise enough to see that what they sought for themselves they could not deny to others. Consequently our Government has urged that there should be full freedom under international law for other nations as well as ourselves to purchase arms and ammunition in the markets of the world even after the outbreak of war. It saw clearly that otherwise there would be no alternative except for every nation to have in readiness at all times sufficient munitions of war to meet any emergency and they believed that this would eventually result in the whole world becoming an armed camp. It was that such a situation would be the death of any hope for general disarmament or for the establishment of a system of reason and justice in the settlement of international disputes.

It therefore deliberately took its stand for a policy which would encourage nations to avoid militarism in time of peace but would permit them to obtain through purchases outside their borders the means of self-defense in case war was forced upon them by a better armed aggressor nation. This policy of the United States has been long recognized by our Secretaries of State and our historians.

In the light of what has happened in the world today I think we can now see that this former American policy was wise and that it was dangerous and unwise to depart from it 4 years ago. Today the world is being confronted with one of the most powerful, deliberate, and dangerous efforts in organized national aggression that has ever been attempted. For at least 400 years most of the nations had been slowly laboring for a better international organization for peace. They have had many setbacks but their progress, though slow, had been unmistakable and hopeful. They have been trying to establish a system which should depend upon accepted rules of conduct rather than assertions of force and which should be founded upon the general principle of mutual respect for each other's sovereignty and safety. They have been struggling to introduce reason and justice rather than the sword as the arbiters for international disputes. They have thus sought gradually to establish a true system of international law.

But within the past decade a group of aggressive nations has suddenly arisen which has rejected this effort and cast all its beliefs

and traditions into the discard. These nations have frankly reverted to aggression and force as the only rule of international practice. They have laughed to scorn the principle of fidelity to rules and treaties and agreements among nations. Instead they have developed a skillful technique of terrorism and force, the methods of which have of late become familiar to us all. Every reader of the world's news can now recognize when a new aggression is being planned and set on foot. The successive steps which will lead up to a final ultimatum or blow, whether it be against Austria, Czechoslovakia, Poland, China, Ethiopia, Albania, Estonia, or the Ukraine, can be recognized from the first moment when a servile and controlled press begins its clamor. In such a situation all of the peace-loving nations of the world, including ourselves, are thrown back upon the only remaining recourse—self-defense—and woe to them if the privilege which our ancestors sought to preserve as a policy of this country is not left open to them, namely, the privilege of buying arms in the markets of the world for their self-defense.

Consider what an adverse effect our experiment 4 years ago in embargo legislation is having upon France and Great Britain as they face this organized system of aggression in Europe. A few years ago in the Washington and London naval conferences of 1921 and 1930 they joined with us in an earnest effort to promote world peace by naval disarmament. They reduced and limited the number of their ships. Both of their navies are weaker today than they would have been if they had not made this effort. But now, when that effort has failed and other nations have been secretly arming against them, we have passed an embargo law which forbids them to resort to our markets in order to repair their consequent weakness in national defense. The safety of those navies today would certainly be greatly strengthened if their owners could buy airplanes from our manufacturers.

I am not calling your attention to these matters for the sake of these other nations. I am speaking to you solely in the interest of our own country. I ask you, in all seriousness, cannot you yourselves see how the security of the people of the United States will be affected by a naval disaster to those two nations? If the fleets of France and Great Britain should be beaten down by the dangers that threaten them today, have you any doubts as to the seriousness of the situation which would then confront us? Have you any doubts as to the jeopardy in which our own American interests in this hemisphere would then be placed? This very week there has been going on at Panama a conference between representatives of all the republics of this hemisphere "for the purpose of taking the measures necessary to safeguard the peace of the Americas." That is the language in which our Secretary of State described the meeting. Now, by whom is that peace threatened? Against whom are these safeguards being constructed for the preservation of our Monroe Doctrine? I do not think that either Great Britain or France would in these days be considered by even the smallest or weakest of the 21 republics of this hemisphere to be a threat to its peace or to the safety of its institutions. The representatives at the Panama conference evidently have other nations in mind. They evidently recognize that if Germany and her supporters should win this war, and should then with their fleets control the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans, a very novel and a very grave situation would then confront the nations of this hemisphere.

But some one may assert that the repeal of the embargo would be an unneutral act because we would be trying to help Britain and France win the war in which they are engaged. My answer is that in opening our markets for the sale of arms to all who can come and get them we should be doing only what has been recognized as lawful for a neutral nation to do for a hundred and fifty years. Furthermore, if any should seek to ask our reason for so doing, we are doing it for the purpose of preserving our own security in a world where international law has been so broken down by the acts of the dictator nations that the necessities of national defense have become more clearly paramount than ever.

Again some of the opponents of repeal have said that it would be illegal for us during the pendency of the war which has now broken out to change our law as to the embargo and go back to our practice of former years. These gentlemen do not hesitate to favor other changes in the law, such as the new proposed restrictions on American shipping which may well have results adverse to France and Britain. But they would have us stand by our error of 4 years ago as to the embargo even if it endangered our own safety to do so, lest otherwise we might have misled and done a wrong to Chancelor Hitler. Such language seems like a voice from Mars. In the face of the present situation it is fantastic. These objectors base their objection upon precedents which have never applied to such a situation as faces the world today—a situation where the old rules of international law have been reduced to chaos by the action of Germany itself. To illustrate what I mean, just consider the absurdity of the situation which would be presented if Chancelor Hitler appeared before an international tribunal with a claim against the United States based upon our repeal of the embargo provision. He would have to say in substance: "The United States has wronged me by changing this law. I invaded Poland and destroyed her cities in the confident belief that America would not make this change and that I could carry out my aggression with immunity. Now she has changed and I have been visited with punishment by Poland's guarantors. I demand damages." How far would he get? The objection sounds like a product of hysteria. I put forward such details only to emphasize the absurdity that a grave measure of legislation for the purpose of promoting our national safety should be delayed by arguments like these.

In short my view is that the security, present and future, of the United States and of its people will be promoted by the repeal of the embargo and that such a step will not tend to drag us into war. So long as Great Britain and France are fighting and their forces command the seas, the people of the United States cannot be dragged into war except by their own deliberate volition. They need not fight unless they want to fight. And they can be counted on to make that momentous decision with great prudence and caution. The real time of danger will only come in case France and Britain are beaten down, subjugated, and their fleets taken or destroyed or made useless by air attacks. Then and then only may the people of the United States lose their choice to determine whether they will go to war or not. Then, and then only, is a foreign aggressor likely to enter this hemisphere and approach our shores and seize positions on the continent which will actually threaten us. Then, and then only, will we face the worst of all possibilities—the possibility of an invasion of our land and homes by a foreign force. The British and the French are now fighting a battle which, in case they are beaten, will, whether we wish it or not, become our own battle; and in the interest of our own safety we should repeal this foolish and dangerous embargo and return to the wise policy of our forefathers. Our national security is an aim upon which we can all stand together animated by a common patriotic purpose.

Projection of America Into War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD P. NYE

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 9 (legislative day of Wednesday, October 4), 1939

ADDRESS BY DR. JOHN HAYNES HOLMES

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Getting America Into War Has Started Again" delivered on September 27, 1939, by Dr. John Haynes Holmes.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Nothing is so vitally important to the American people at this present moment as to keep our own country out of the war now raging on the continent of Europe. This is especially important in view of the efforts being made on every side to get this country into the conflict. One would think that the proposition was so ridiculous that it could find no salesmen foolish enough to try to put it over. We went into the last war under the impression that we were fighting to make the world safe for democracy and to end war forever on this planet. We sacrificed 137,000 of our fairest young men dead or maimed; we expended $40,000,000,000 of our hard-earned wealth; we corrupted our public morals, disordered our political and economic life, prepared the way for the great depression, only to discover that Europe was not interested in ideals, that France and England were concerned not with peace but with extending and consolidating their empires, that in the Versailles Treaty were the inevitable causes and conditions of another war. And now this war has come. Is it conceivable that the American people are such idiots as to be drawn into war again? Are we actually going to burn our fingers a second time pulling the hot chestnuts of other nations out of the imperialistic fire? It would seem to be impossible. The worst cynics could not charge a democracy with conduct which a moronic child would know enough to avoid. Yet siren voices are again enticing us into the whirlpools of deceit and disaster. In a few months, even a few weeks, we shall be in dire danger of being swept off our feet by a campaign to get us into this new war even as we went into the old one. This campaign is being organized on at least three fronts.

First, there is the English propaganda, which is already well under way. Indeed, this propaganda got started long before hostilities began, for the visit to this country last June of King George and Queen Elizabeth, a delightful social event in which guests and hosts alike were at their best, was in essence nothing in the world but a magnificently camouflaged attempt to persuade every American to do his duty when Great Britain was again fighting for her empire. Now this English propaganda is descending upon us like an avalanche. We know just how it was prepared and loosed a quarter of a century ago. Every detail of the long-sustained, highly organized, enormously expensive, and completely successful undertaking upon the part of the English to drag us into the last war has long since been published, and is familiar. Even the plans for getting us into this next war have been carelessly or callously laid bare in Mr. Sidney Rogerson's

amazing book, entitled "Propaganda in the Next War," published in England a year ago but not yet published in this country. Every move for our seduction, in other words, has been prepared, and now, with the opportune arrival of a new British Ambassador, Lord Lothian, well trained by his experience in the last war, may be expected to be started without delay. Newspapers, radios, movies, and lecture platforms will combine to release these propaganda germs upon us. We shall encounter them at our public dinners, in our churches, in our drawingrooms, in our homes. It will be like breathing the foul atmosphere of pestilence. Have we become immune to this contagion? Have we built up resistance to such attack? Or are we the same old "easy marks" we were in 1914–17? This coming year will give us the answer.

Secondly, there are the business interests which are eager to get us into the war for the sake of the profits that may be made. "Thar's gold in them thar hills" was the cry of the pioneer prospectors who wandered the ranges of the far West in the covered-wagon days. "There's gold in that there fighting" is the cry of American industrialists, exporters, and jobbers generally who supply the myriad materials with which a modern war is kept going. Chief among them, of course, are the armament and munition manufacturers whose methods are no longer mysterious. These "merchants of death," as they have been called, have for years been fomenting wars, continuing wars, extending wars, for the sake of keeping business at top speed in the munitions plants. Again and again they have started war scares, organized preparedness campaigns, defeated disarmament and peace conferences, and always in wartime have sold their goods indiscriminately to both sides, the enemy as well as their own country. Just now they are dedicating their talents to breaking down the neutrality law, by removing the present embargo against selling and shipping arms, ammunition, and implements of war to belligerent nations. For this is the real explanation of what is going on in Washington today. It is not the will of the President nor the wish of the people that is important, but the nefarious purposes of those munitions manufacturers to whom the neutrality law is an obstacle in the way of big profits. The Capitol is swarming with the lobbyists of the big-business interests. The President is surrounded no longer by the liberal and progressive counsellors who have fashioned the New Deal, but, strangely enough, by the very crowd of bankers and corporation magnates whom he has for so long been fighting. The neutrality law was passed 2 years ago, and signed by the President, for the express purpose of keeping this country out of another European war. Now it is being attacked for the express purpose of getting us into the war by those who know exactly what they want.

This is not to deny that there are good citizens who seek the repeal of this embargo law for reasons purely unselfish and idealistic. They believe that we should not deny arms and munitions to France and England in their struggle against Hitler's Germany, which they regard as involving everything that is precious to our civilization. But do these people know what they are doing? Do they realize that the repeal of the embargo is the first step of an entrance into the European war, which will not end until our boys are being shipped across the seas by the millions to die in strange and lonely lands? If they do realize this, why do they not tell us and urge now, instead of later, that America become one of the active belligerents against Germany? There is no mystery about this process of entering a war. We went through the whole thing a quarter of a century ago. First, we sell goods to the embattled nations. Then we provide loans and credits, which may easily be accomplished by the repeal of the Johnson Act. Then we discover that the nations not accessible to our aid become angry, then hostile, and at last openly our enemy. Then we are attacked and ourselves get angry and talk loudly about honor and national interests and the vindication of democracy, and before we know it are in the war. "Easy is the descent into Avernus." If we change the neutrality law by repealing the embargo we shall have entered the war, to all intents and purposes, at the moment of repeal. All the support of this proposal, consciously or unconsciously, is a move to get us lined up on the battle front with Britain and France. We shall decide within the next few weeks, in this single congressional fight, whether a year or 2 years hence American blood will soak the soil of Europe.

Lastly, there is the political influence which is today headed straight for the goal of war. By this I mean specifically our President, who, despite his many excellent and even great qualities, has yet shown tendencies of thought and action in relation to foreign affairs which constitute elements of danger in the present crisis. In saying this I do not mean to charge or even suggest that Mr. Roosevelt is not a sincere and ardent lover of peace. On more than one occasion and in more than one way he has shown that he desires peace as wholeheartedly as any of us. But he interprets peace in terms of arms and of intervention in war. Already he has chosen sides in this European struggle.

At this moment, in Washington, he is using every means at his disposal to bring about a situation in which he may give aid to France and England in their battle against Germany. As the struggle becomes severe and long continued, he will want to do more than help the Allies with arms and munitions. He will want to intervene actively on their side by loaning them money, sending them ships, giving them our Navy, and at last giving them our boys. Already, before the war is a single month old, Mr. Roosevelt is walking in the footsteps of his great political hero, Woodrow Wilson. Let it be remembered that Wilson was a peace lover also; that he took us into war less than 6 months after he had won an election on the slogan, "He kept us out of war"; that he entered this war sincerely to establish a durable peace and thus to get rid of war forever. It is when I look most intently at Mr. Wilson's example that I fear most dreadfully Mr. Roosevelt's policies. In both cases I see a sincere love of peace, coupled with an indubitable love of power, and an overleaping ambition to use power to dictate peace to a warring world. Mr. Wilson tried it, with results all too terribly familiar. If anybody can tell me how Mr. Roosevelt can succeed where Mr. Wilson failed, I should like to hear.

Such are some of the influences now directed to getting America into this war. If these influences succeed, they will achieve the supreme tragedy of history, for America, the last hope of the world, the last refuge of civilization, will then go down in a common ruin with mankind. For ourselves and for mankind alike, we must stay out of this war that we may be able to do certain indispensable things which we alone can do. First, preserve inviolate within our borders those democratic institutions and principles without which civilization cannot hope to survive; secondly, bring succor to the millions of distressed and dying who will soon be cumbering the earth; thirdly, work, as only a neutral and thus mutually friendly nation can work, to stop the fighting at the earliest possible moment; lastly, seek peace, and see to it, when peace is made, that it is a peace which is merciful and just, and thus calculated to endure. Our fatal mistake in the last war was to sit at the peace table as a belligerent and thus as a friend of the victors. In this war we must plan to sit at the peace table as a neutral, and thus as a friend of humankind.

This is our mission. It will be lost if it is not defended, and it must be defended now if it is to be achieved. Therefore, the slogan of this hour, "Keep America out of war."

Small Business and Its Credit Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 9 (legislative day of Wednesday, October 4), 1939

ARTICLE BY ERNEST G. DRAPER

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Ernest G. Draper, member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, on Small Business and Its Credit Problem. The article was published in the Washington Post of Sunday, October 1, 1939.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SMALL BUSINESS AND ITS CREDIT PROBLEM

(By Ernest G. Draper, member, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System)

May I say at the outset that the opinions expressed below are my personal views and in no sense represent an official viewpoint of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

How small is small business? Nobody knows and nobody will ever know, because, in this instance, size is purely relative. A large concern in Noroton, Conn., looks small in New York City.

We can make the picture somewhat clearer by having our definition of small business cover both small and medium-sized concerns. Even then the argument will be endless. So let us make an arbitrary ruling. It will not satisfy everybody but it will come closer to the facts. Let us say that, speaking broadly, a small or medium-sized concern is one which hires 500 or less employees or has total assets of less than $1,000,000. If we use these guides—and they seem to me to be fair—we discover some interesting facts.

Before attempting to give any statistics, may I say that there are a number of ways by which to gage the relative importance of small business in the national economy. If, for instance, you are a private individual and are thinking of purchasing a small concern, you naturally center your efforts upon finding out the asset value of the company, its earning power, the scope of its market, either present or potential, and other facts of that nature. But if you are looking at this problem of small business from the standpoint of the public interest, then the information that you seek will be of an essentially different character. From the standpoint of the public interest—that is, of the people as a whole—there are three essential facts to know about small business. First, what proportion of those employed in industry are employed in small business? Second, what proportion of the national income is earned by small business? And third, what percentage of the total number of corporations and

unincorporated enterprises in this country have total assets of less than $1,000,000?

According to a recent survey made by the Twentieth Century Fund, an impartial agency devoted to the dissemination of factual information upon a variety of economic subjects, we find, first, that of those employed in 1929—the latest date available—in all manufacturing industries more than 62 percent were employed in plants hiring 500 workers or less.

We find, second, that of the total national income approximately 60 percent is produced by small unincorporated enterprises and corporations with total assets of less than $1,000,000.

We find, third, that of all the corporations in this country about 95 percent have total assets of less than $1,000,000.

In giving these figures I do not wish to mislead you by exaggerating the importance of small business. For instance, it is true that 95 percent of all corporations are small. But it is also true that these 95 percent own only 14 percent of the total corporate assets in the country, whereas the remaining 5 percent of large corporations own 86 percent of these assets. But when we are judging a problem of this character from the public interest standpoint, we must remember that assets, while most important, do not tell the whole story. The whole story must also include the number of employees dependent upon the successful functioning of small business and also the relative importance of small business in providing the Nation with its yearly income.

From these two vital standpoints our country has a stake in small business and a responsibility toward it which our Government should not shirk. While it may be true that a general recovery cannot be stimulated merely by stimulating small business, nevertheless it is likewise true that we shall never get a broad recovery of large and lasting proportions if we do not see to it that the credit flow to small business is continuous and of sufficiently generous proportions as to satisfy the legitimate needs of all classes of sound small business.

Also, it may be true that, as a result of the European war, all business will expand and that will have its temporary stimulating effect upon small business as well as large industry. Undoubtedly something of this sort may take place. But we must also remember that war conditions will bring about innumerable dislocations, some of more or less violent nature. A small business that was recently regaining a good earning basis may, through no fault of its own, be thrown off balance or permanently crippled by the indirect but devastating effects of a European conflict.

Based upon a wide variety of information which includes Government and private surveys and reports, testimony of various individuals in Government hearings and many unsolicited letters from small-business men, it is my opinion that there are two groups of business enterprises whose needs are not adequately met by existing financial machinery:

1. Those who need short and intermediate credit but whose credit standing at the present level of business activity does not make them acceptable risks for banks. These are not misconceived or mismanaged or insolvent businesses but businesses whose prospects of success are dimmed by the current economic situation.

2. Small- and medium-sized businesses which need loan or equity capital for an intermediate or long period. The growth of Nation-wide business units, the discontinuance of bank affiliates and of underwriting by banks, the increased cost of security issues, and the disappearance of local underwriters have made it difficult for this type of business concern to find long-time credit except at prohibitive cost.

It has been said by many persons that government should not enter further into the field of rendering financial assistance to business, because by so doing it will subsidize many mismanaged, unprofitably operated concerns. I would never advocate that the Government assist in making funds available to such enterprises. However, I do believe that there are many small concerns whose liquid resources have been severely strained by a series of depression losses. There are others who require funds to finance the purchase of new machinery and equipment or to extend or improve plant operations in order to enable them to carry on a more profitable operation.

In years past a substantial portion of outstanding commercial loans held by banks consisted of what would be termed today capital advances, but they were evidenced by short-term paper that was renewed from time to time as it matured. Today the demand is increasing for longer-term credit. These long-term loans are opening an avenue to banks for the expansion of their earning assets. While these loans lack liquidity and marketability, nevertheless many banks have made a number of such advances safely.

In making long- or intermediate-term loans, a bank not only has to consider the nonliquid and nonmarketable character of such assets but must consider the added risks involved, such as an adverse turn in the business cycle during their life or management and technical changes that may occur. The volume of such loans any one bank can make will depend upon the nature of its deposit liabilities; the volume of its holdings of other nonliquid and nonmarketable assets, such as real-estate loans; the quality of such loans available to it; and the ratio of its capital structure to its deposits. The risks involved are such that the Federal Reserve banks as banks of discount for their member banks would be performing the proper functions of a central banking system in assisting commercial banks to make this type of credit available.

Section 10b of the Federal Reserve Act now authorizes a Federal Reserve bank, under rules and regulations prescribed by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, to make an advance to a member bank on its promissory note, with a maturity up to 4 months, when secured "to the satisfaction of such Federal Reserve bank." This makes eligible as security at Federal Reserve banks long- and intermediate-term loans made to business. This provision in the Federal Reserve Act, although providing aid from the Federal Reserve System to member banks in making such loans, does not offer as effective cooperation as is provided for under the limited provisions of section 13b of the Federal Reserve Act. This section authorizes the Federal Reserve banks under certain circumstances and conditions to make loans to business enterprises. However, the statutory limitations of section 13b, which provide that loans can be made only to established commercial and industrial enterprises for working-capital purposes, and that maximum maturities cannot exceed 5 years, do not permit the Federal Reserve banks to operate satisfactorily in meeting the present situation.

In spite of the restricted nature of the present section 13b of the Federal Reserve Act, it may be interesting to note what the Federal Reserve banks have accomplished in making direct advances, advances in cooperation with banks, and commitments to banks covering advances made by such banks, to business enterprises since June 1934.

The Federal Reserve banks have received over 9,300 applications, amounting to $400,000,000. Of these, 2,750 were approved, amounting to $184,000,000. Approximately 1,200, amounting to $60,000,000, were declined because the funds were not to be used for working capital purposes as required by law, or because the applicants were not established industrial or commercial enterprises. Of this grand total of $184,000,000, advances and commitments direct to borrowers amounted to only $38,000,000, whereas the total commitments to and advances through financing institutions amounted to $73,000,000.

To the end of 1938 net earnings on industrial advances, before making provision for losses, amounted to $2,800,000. Determined losses charged off aggregated $160,000, and reserves set aside to take care of estimated losses amounted to $1,865,000. This left net earnings of about $770,000 for the period June 19, 1934, to December 31, 1938. At the present time the Federal Reserve banks have outstanding $15,000,000 in advances and $11,000,000 in commitments. Of the advances outstanding about $2,500,000 are past due 3 months or more. The Reserve banks have acquired about $1,300,000 of miscellaneous assets in connection with the liquidation of defaulted obligations. What the final losses will be is impossible to state at this time, but present indications are that they will not be unduly large.

From the record cited above, you can see that the Federal Reserve System has materially aided banks in meeting the long-term working capital needs of business. However, it is undoubtedly true that the restrictions placed upon the Reserve banks, to which I have referred, have prevented the granting of many loans that could have otherwise been made. For this reason, it is my belief that a plan for the creation of an Industrial Loan Corporation as an integral part of the Federal Reserve System, using the Federal Reserve banks and branches as its field force, would be of great assistance to both banks and business enterprises, both in the field of long-term financing and in those other situations mentioned previously. This is the plan originally suggested by Chairman Eccles before a congressional committee last spring.

The Federal Reserve banks have offices already established in 36 cities (12 Federal Reserve banks and 24 branches). These offices are widely distributed in the various trade areas throughout the country, and are well qualified for such service, because of their knowledge of business and economic conditions in their respective districts and their close contacts with local banking institutions. With this organization already in existence, it would be possible to commence operations with a minimum of delay and expense. Also operations could be expanded or contracted from time to time in accordance with changing conditions. The experience gained by the Board of Governors and the Federal Reserve banks in connection with industrial loan operations during the past 5 years would be of great aid to them in performing this service.

Briefly the plan is this: Funds in the Treasury now set aside or used for industrial loans under the provisions of section 13b—about $139,000,000—would be turned over to an industrial-loan corporation. This would involve no additional borrowing or increase in the public debt. The Board of Governors would be the board of directors of this corporation, and the 12 Federal Reserve banks with their 24 branches would be the field agents to pass on applications. In this way prompt and economical action would be assured by utilizing existing machinery and experienced personnel.

The corporation would make loans or commitments or acquire preferred stock, but not more than $1,000,000 to any one borrower. Intermediate or long-term loans could be made by private lenders and insured banks protected by commitments of the corporation.

The corporation would have $100,000,000 of capital and $39,000,000 of surplus. It would have power to issue $500,000,000 of Government-guaranteed debentures. Upon liquidation, all remaining assets would go to the United States Government. One important feature of the plan would be to set aside, out of its surplus, $25,000,000 for an insurance fund for small loans not exceeding $25,000. The industrial-loan corporation would guarantee 10 percent of any lender's aggregate insured loans, so that the loss on any loan even up to 100 percent would be absorbed by the corporation, so long as aggregate losses did not exceed one-tenth of the lender's insured loans. The principle behind this plan is the same as that in title I

of F. H. A. The corporation's possible losses on insured loans would be limited to the $25,000,000 set aside as an insurance fund. It has been estimated that the aggregate cost to the borrower, including insurance and service charges, would not exceed 6 percent.

In making this proposal my only object is to offer what seems to me to be a practical plan for meeting the problem as it exists today. This plan does not provide for the creation of a new Government credit-granting agency, but broadens the powers of the Federal Reserve System in order to enable it to be of more effective assistance to banks and business.

Why not get to the bottom of this problem once and for all by devising legislation which is simple in character, inexpensive in operation, and cooperative in its approach? In this way we could meet the present situation squarely and without reliance on an entirely new set-up of elaborate and perhaps unwieldly machinery, but with the assistance of a flexible, permanent Federal agency such as the Federal Reserve System. Then if it should develop, after the passage of such simplified legislation, that the need is not as serious as anticipated, no great harm would be done and no great expense incurred. If, however, the need should prove to be greater than anticipated, the flexible machinery of this new plan would take care of this increase in demand regardless of volume.

This plan seems to me to offer the most effective solution to the difficulties in which a large and important sector of our industrial economy finds itself bogged down. The discouraging condition of small business is not primarily a result of its own inefficiency. It exists because of powerful economic disturbances over which it has no control and against which it cannot individually wage a successful fight without some reasonable amount of cooperation from a permanent public-interest agency.

Neutrality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEWIS B. SCHWELLENBACH

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 9 (legislative day of Wednesday, October 4), 1939

ADDRESS BY HON. HARRY S. TRUMAN, OF MISSOURI, AT CARUTHERSVILLE, MO., OCTOBER 8, 1939

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH. Mr. President, on October 8 the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] delivered at Caruthersville, Mo., a very interesting address on the historical background of our problem of remaining out of war. I ask unanimous consent that it may be inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is a very great pleasure and a privilege to be here today with my many friends. I shall always be grateful to this great section of the State, because you believed in me when I needed you, and I shall never forget it.

I know that you are interested in the special session of Congress, and this being the Sabbath Day I am going to talk to you a little while on peace. My text will be from the Sermon on the Mount, "Love Thy Neighbor."

I shall begin by praying to the great Creator of Heaven and Earth, the Divine Father of us all, to give to our world rulers and to those in authority wisdom and the ability to forget their supposed wrongs and to earnestly try to bring everlasting peace and happiness to this troubled world.

The present situation in Europe has been brought about by greed and selfishness and by a refusal of the several nationalities which make up the population of that continent to learn to love their neighbors.

There are the Italians, who have been taught to hate Frenchmen and Englishmen; Russians, who are taught that Greeks, Turks, and Japs are devils and inferior races. Then there are the Germans, who by propaganda have been brought to a state where they hate all who are not of Tuetonic descent. The words "love" and "tolerance" have been eliminated from the German vocabulary. They've become persecutors and robbers of other races and nationalities. They have even gone so far as to teach that the Prince of Peace was an imposter because he was a Jew.

The three dictators, Russian, German, and Italian, have gone back to a code little short of cave-man savagery. They've used this magnificent machine age of ours to destroy our vaunted civilization, and I am here to tell you that if there isn't a moral reawakening in high places in this old world, we'll go into another and darker age than the tenth century ever was. The role of this great Republic is to save civilization. We must keep out of war. We must keep out of brawls, hates, and prejudices of that Old World mess, and to do it we must use the best brains and judgment of which we are capable.

Four great men have walked across the world stage and have tried to solve the problems now troubling mankind in Euorpe. Those four men were Caesar, King Henry the Fourth of France, Napoleon, and Woodrow Wilson. They all failed magnificently.

Caesar and Napoleon wanted to place the whole continent of Europe, Asia, and Africa (and they are really one continent) under the same hegemony, break down the trade barriers, and use their unlimited resources for the benefit of the whole population. Caesar was assassinated before he finished his plan and no successor of his had his ability or insight.

Napoleon almost succeeded, and then he went to Russia. Hitler is trying to do what Napoleon did. He's gone to Russia, too. I wonder if he'll wind up as the great Frenchman did.

King Henry's plea was a United States of Europe with a congress and a senate to work out the difficulties of the various states, take down the trade barriers, live and let live. He also was assassinated before he could accomplish his purpose.

None of you have forgotten Woodrow Wilson and his 16 points for peace. He was destroyed by European power politics as played by Lloyd George and Clemenceau, and by the United States Senate. His grand plan was almost the same one that Henry the Fourth proposed. It failed, and Europe is right back where Julius Caesar left off. His 16 points for peace are just as good today as ever.

We went into the World War of 1914–18 with high hopes and the ideals of a crusade, and we came out disillusioned and went on a mad debauch of our own. Professional pacifists and professional neutrality preachers have endeavored to make the Nation believe that we went into that war for profits and for gain; that we were drawn in by munition makers and J. P. Morgan. Nothing is farther from the truth. We went in because more than 500 American lives had been ruthlessly taken by the same savage policy now being pursued by the German Government.

For 4 years the Senate of the United States has been groping for a method to keep us out of war. The present so-called Neutrality Act is the result of that keep-us-out-of-war sentiment. It isn't a neutrality act. It is a domestic attempt to stay out of trouble. The President in his message to the special session emphasized the fact that all sides and all factions honestly want to keep us out of war.

I honestly believe that the proposed amendment to the present law will come more nearly doing that than if the present law is not amended. Our entry into the last war was directly caused by the sinking of American ships and the killing of American citizens in the war zone. We propose to stop American citizens and American ships from taking that risk. We propose to strengthen our position as a neutral. We are not abandoning our so-called neutrality legislation at all. We propose a better law in its place. The proposed law provides that Congress, as well as the President, may put the provisions of the law into effect by declaring a war is in existence.

The proposed law would lift the arms embargo, but it provides that American vessels may not transport goods or passengers to nations at war or into combat zones. It would provide that title to purchases made by a nation at war, or by one of its nationals, shall pass before the merchandise leaves our shores. It makes "cash and carry" mandatory. It creates a munitions-control board which would be responsible for keeping records on munitions and arms sales. This board would be required to make reports to Congress every 6 months.

The present law and the one proposed forbid the arming of American merchant vessels and forbid the solicitation of funds in this country for belligerents except for Red Cross and relief activities.

No loans may be made to nations at war. They must pay cash and transport their purchases in their own ships. These self-imposed restrictions are something new under the sun. We are honestly endeavoring to prevent incidents that may involve us in the war. We are trying to profit by past experience. No person is wise enough to foresee the future. No Member of Congress is wise enough to foretell what may happen. But we all know that we must stay out of war. We all know that it was only after the indiscriminate sinking of American ships and the murder of American citizens on those ships that the United States entered the war.

Those ships carried wheat, oil, pig iron, spelter, flax, and other merchandise. Some of them carried munitions. They were American ships, manned by American sailors and, in some instances, carried American passengers. They were operating in the war zone. They were carrying goods to belligerents. Under the proposed law that will not happen. Under the present law it can and may happen.

Now, as to the sale of munitions, I am of the opinion that we should not help the thugs among nations by refusing to sell arms to our friends. We virtually say to aggressor nations, "We'll sell you arms and ammunition in peacetime and help you get ready to attack those nations who have not put on an armament race, who have tried to live peaceably with their neighbors, those nations who maintain no bunds or Silver Shirts or Communist parties to help undermine our institutions; but when war comes we'll help you by not letting our friends buy arms and munitions in our markets."

I think it is to our interest, our very selfish interests, to lift the embargo. Our best insurance for peace, as George Washington

said, is to be prepared for war. Our factories, if geared up to manufacture implements of war for foreign sales, will be in position to supply us if we need to be supplied, which God forbid. I hope—we all hope—we'll never have to face that contingency.

We shouldn't, however, sit idly by and let a catastrophe come upon us as England and France have done.

I have read everything I can get on this subject; have listened carefully to the Senate debate; and I have come to the conclusion that the measure reported to the Senate by the Foreign Relations Committee should become the law in substantially its present form.

Pending Neutrality Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 9 (legislative day of Wednesday, October 4), 1939

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER, OF NEW YORK, OCTOBER 7, 1939

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a most eloquent and illuminating address on the subject of neutrality delivered by my colleague the senior Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] over the Columbia Broadcasting System on Saturday, October 7, 1939.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Night after night over the air, you have heard debates about how to change or whether to change the present Neutrality Act. Day after day in the public press you have read the editorials pro and con on the Neutrality Act.

In order to avoid repetition, in order to direct your attention to an issue far closer to your welfare and your interest than the form of any particular law, I want to change the whole emphasis of this discussion.

The sole vital concern of the American people in the present international situation, the one desire that burns passionately and continuously within them, is to keep America at peace with all the world. This overpowering emotion subordinates all other issues and reduces them to their proper magnitude. If I may paraphrase a great statement made by Abraham Lincoln, I would say this:

If America can best be kept at peace by retaining the Neutrality Act in its present form, that is what the American people are for. If America can best be kept at peace by repealing the Neutrality Act in its entirety, that is what the American people are for. And if America can best be kept at peace by retaining the act in part and revising it in part, that and that alone is what the American people want.

It is in this spirit, animated by this sole objective, that all the Members of Congress are approaching the legislative questions now before them. The differences are honest differences about methods. My own careful study has convinced me profoundly that neither the repeal of the old law nor its retention in its present form can best safeguard our neutrality and our peace. I feel as certain as anyone can be that in view of changing world circumstances, changes in the old law must be made.

The pending bill makes these changes. It profits by the unfortunate experience which took us into the last World War. It draws upon the experience that has kept us through all our history a peace-loving Nation, and through almost all our history a peaceful Nation.

Now what are these changes and what would they accomplish?

Under the present law, except for munitions, American ships and American seamen can carry any American-made goods owned by American citizens, to be sold in any port in the world. Under the present law, an American ship, if not stopped by the British Navy, can sail into the North Sea and sell steel to Germany, to be made into shells or cannon. Under the present law, if not sunk by a German submarine, an American ship manned by American seamen can carry American-owned cotton to Liverpool, to be sold to the Allies and made into explosives.

In short, under the present law, about 90 percent of all the articles we sold to Europe during the last war before we entered it—90 percent of the goods that the belligerents in Europe today would normally want to buy from us to feed their war machines and the people backing up their war machines—can be carried across the seas on American boats by American seamen, if not stopped or sunk by one of the belligerent nations.

But in these crucial words, "if not stopped or sunk," we have what experience and common sense tell every thinking person is the most serious threat of war to the United States.

For when nations are at war, such high-sounding terms as international rights and freedom of the seas are conveniently forgotten. When nations are at war, their vital self-interest will not permit them indefinitely to allow the free passage of supplies to their enemies.

On the other hand, no self-respecting nation, American least of all, can allow its ships and its nationals to be attacked upon the high seas, even by nations which are fighting for their lives.

And because of the conflict between these two hard facts, there is only one realistic course for America to follow if it wants to avoid the causes of war and at the same time maintain its dignity and self-respect. This course is for the American Congress absolutely to prohibit American ships from carrying American passengers or American goods of any kind to any belligerent nation, or to proceed through any combat areas. The bill provides that any belligerent nation which wants to purchase American goods must come and get them, must take title to them before they leave our shores, must carry them across the waters in their own boats and at their own risk. There is no possible way that this kind of commerce can involve America in a war.

Now what is the second main step that the pending bill takes to keep America at peace? Under the present law, there is a limited restriction against arming American ships engaged in trading with the belligerents. The pending bill not only prohibits such trading altogether, but also prohibits the arming of any American merchant ships sailing anywhere on the seven seas. If a merchant vessel is armed, what is to prevent the suspicion that instead of being the ship of a neutral nation, it is the ship of a nation at war, flying the wrong flag? What is to prevent the suspicion, if a vessel is armed, that no matter what its seeming destination, it is headed directly or indirectly toward the war zone and to the aid of some belligerent? Our own history shows clearly that the arming of neutral merchant vessels leads to incidents which threaten to involve them in the conflict.

If we are determined to remain at peace with the world, we do not need and do not want to arm our merchant vessels. America has its Navy on both coasts to protect it from any possible aggression. In our Navy, expanded to meet the needs of these uncertain times, America can well rely for its peace and its security.

The third important step in the direction of peace is to prevent American investments in warring nations, which may draw America nearer to war. The pending bill places additional and drastic restrictions on the financing of any business transactions with the belligerents. In place of the law now in effect permitting commercial credits without clear limitations, the new bill insists that warring nations must buy our goods on a cash basis, or at most a 90-day credit basis, without renewal. A single default even on these restricted conditions will require return to a mandatory cash basis. For myself, I would make assurance doubly sure by requiring belligerents to pay cash in every case. There must be no American soldiers following American loans to fight on foreign ground.

It is evident that none of these three vitally important provisions has anything to do with the arms embargo. Why, then, has the pending bill anything to do with the arms embargo?

The bill seeks merely to make the munitions provision of the present law consistent with the three all-important steps in the direction of peace which I have already discussed. If these changes will strengthen our neutrality under international law, if these changes will help to keep us out of war, the remainder of our neutrality law can and should be made consistent with them.

It is not consistent to prohibit the sale of 10 percent of the supplies a warring nation may need while permitting the sale and transportation in our own boats of the other 90 percent they need just as badly. It is not consistent to forbid the sale of finished airplanes while permitting the sale and carriage in our own boats of raw and semifinished materials to make those airplanes, or of high-test motor fuel to fly them. It is not consistent to forbid foreign ships to come here to buy some war materials but to allow our ships to carry into the perilous war zones other war materials.

A neutrality policy which in time of war among other nations is so unbalanced and inconsistent cannot be a guardian of American peace nor promote good will on the part of all nations toward America. As a final step toward peace, therefore, the pending bill removes the inconsistencies of the present law. It places an embargo, not upon a few arbitrarily selected commodities but upon all American ships, seamen, and passengers from getting into danger. It places an embargo on the flotation of extensive credits that would tie us up too closely with those at war. It lifts the embargo on all materials that anyone wants to buy here, pay for here, and carry away without risk to us.

A year ago, in charting our relations with the outside world, I declared to the people of my State: "I will never vote to send troops to Europe to fight in any war. I am unalterably opposed to our country's becoming involved in the rivalries and the hatreds of the European Continent. Our policy should be to go about our peaceful missions, without fear of anyone and without anyone's favor, taking sides with none, and free from entanglements with all."

I stand squarely upon that statement today, confident that it expresses America's convictions, confident that we may rest securely upon our strength, our national unity, and the good will we hold toward all mankind and deserve of all mankind.

Lloyd George Looks to America To Invite Peace-Solution Parley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 9, 1939

STATEMENT BY HON. DAVID LLOYD GEORGE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting a statement made by Hon. David Lloyd George, Prime Minister of the British Empire during the World War, which I hope every Member will take time to read.

The matter referred to follows:

LLOYD GEORGE LOOKS TO AMERICA TO INVITE PEACE-SOLUTION PARLEY—PRECIPITATE AND FURIOUS REPLY TO HITLER'S OFFER MAY DRIVE SOVIET ACTIVELY INTO ENEMY CAMP, HE WRITES

(By David Lloyd George)

LONDON, October 8.—The war between the western powers and Germany has not yet begun in earnest—on land, on sea, or in the air. There have been minor conflicts in the air, but the thousands of bombers and fighters which each of the parties has at its command have not yet clashed or displayed to any appreciable degree their terrible destructive power. The fight on land is mainly a long-distance artillery duel designed to clear the ground in front of the real scene of the struggle. The opposing forces have not yet come to grips.

There has been some submarine activity, with diminishing results for the assailants and increasing successes for the defenders, but no one believes the German attack on allied shipping has yet been fully developed. The airplane has not so far been called to the aid of the submarine. Activities and counteractivities at sea have only so far revealed the probability that the struggle is to be conducted as a war of strangulation. We are effectively blockading Germany on the most important sea frontiers. Germany is retaliating by attacking all neutral vessels that carry food or materials to Britain.

The rival powers make the most of every incident in this preliminary fencing. The grim reality has not started. What are combatants waiting for?

SLUGGISHNESS IN ATTACKS

The Germans have concentrated their energies on the subjugation of Poland by an overwhelming display of force. Having completed their conquest, their forces are being swung without loss of time to the French frontier. But the reason for this unwonted sluggishness in the attack by Germany and in the allied reply is not entirely due to exigencies of the Polish campaign. These ought to have accelerated British and French activity in order to relieve the pressure which was crushing their Polish allies.

Hitler is in no hurry to launch an all-around offensive. In his Reichstag speech he has made a bid for peace. What is it worth? Should it forthwith be spurned without counterproposals which will appeal to the conscience of the civilized world?

It is always difficult to discuss peace terms during the progress of a war. Those who suggest methods of achieving a peaceable solution are always liable to the accusation of faltering and faint-heartedness. Those who hold that all wars must sooner or later end in peace and that no reasonable opportunity for reaching that end should be neglected are apt to be treated as shivering pacifists.

Naturally everyone shrinks from incurring such a suspicion at a time when courage is the supreme virtue, but courage which rushes on to its doom with its tail up and its head down is not of the highest quality. It is pure bullheadedness and may end in a crash against concrete walls.

WARNS AGAINST HASTY ANSWER

After the Fuehrer's speech, I still repeat my appeal to the British Government that it should not rush into a defiant answer which will alienate opinion at home and abroad that is sincerely anxious to avoid the immeasurable calamity of a World War, which may last for years and irrevocably destroy the fabric of our present civilization. A furious, precipitate answer will alienate opinion which it is essential we should conciliate and win to our end in any struggle that may ensue, whether it be diplomatic or military.

When Hitler talks peace, it is described as a "peace offensive"; when a British speaker talks peace, it is "surrender." What nonsense. Peace talk is one of Hitler's weapons on the war front and on the important neutral front. Hitler is not afraid of cheap taunts of cowardice being hurled at his head by ranting patriots because he pleads for peace. Nor is Goering. They know that their own people have to be satisfied, so they seek to create the impression that a solid peace is the real aim of their policy, and that the real peace breakers are English politicians whose sole desire is to encircle and destroy Germany.

Nations will not long endure the horror and sacrifice of war at the bidding of warmongers in any country. Hitler knows that well, and he uses the whole of his oratorical art to rally peace sentiment on the side of war. The strength of Mr. Chamberlain's position when he led us into war lay in the universal conviction that he honestly shudders at the thought of war. The people in all countries are praying for peace. Every time a peace offer is thrust aside by a belligerent, it strengthens the resolve of the peoples whose leader makes the offer of peace to wage war to the bitter end. But rejection of peace tends gradually to undermine the morale of the nation whose leaders are responsible for refusing to enter into an international conference with a view to bringing hostilities to an end.

FERVOR LATER COOLS

As casualties pile up into ghastly pyramids of carnage, and as not only the horrors, but the strain and irksomeness of war conditions fray the nerves of a people, the refusal of their government to enter into discussion on peace cools the nation's zeal and weaken's the nation's will. A peace offensive by the enemy is therefore a dangerous weapon, which must be countered not alone by dogged and angry refusals but by a subtler, more sapient and sincere counter offensive.

It would be a mistake to compare the conditions of the present war with those of the last. You could then demand the restoration of the whole of Belgium as a preliminary condition of peace. You cannot put forward the same demand with regard to Poland. It would be a challenge to Russia, who has annexed the White Russian and Ukrainian provinces of Poland which are not Polish by race, language, or religion.

If we had to deal with Germany alone, we might with reason plead the experience which has taught us to distrust the good faith of Nazi leaders. But in this case we have to take into account the fact that two powerful neutrals are involved in the peace discussions and that a mishandling of the situation may drive them into active unfriendliness, if not into actual hostility.

Russia is certainly implicated in any Polish settlement, and no general or permanent peace is possible without a consideration of Italian claims in Africa and the Mediterranean. If we antagonize Russia by our reply to Hitler, we must face the stern prospect that an offensive and defensive alliance between Russia and Germany could not be overthrown by 3 years of war. I dare not contemplate all the possibilities of such a tremendous combination of strength against us.

RUSSIA COULD BREAK BLOCKADE

Even without Russia entering the war, an understanding by which Russia undertook, with German expert aid, to mobilize her inexhaustible material resources to supply German deficiencies would effectually break the blockade, which is our only reliable weapon. It is obvious to every one who considers the leisurely measures we are taking to increase our armies in the field that we are no longer depending on hurling our young manhood, and that of France, against masses of reinforced concrete bristling with weapons of slaughter.

If Russia is anxious for a peace talk now, it would be a sad mistake to refuse. We surely ought to know by now that snubbing Russia is a costly piece of insolence. Do not let us repeat that diplomatic gaucherie.

It may be said that Russia cannot produce certain raw materials essential to war. But she and Italy can buy them elsewhere, and if they can buy them they can also sell them elsewhere. We could not prevent these purchases without sinking their ships and making war upon them. Do let us look around all the hazards of our policy, and not always assume that all chances and eventualities of fortune must necessarily come our way.

No man who cares for the good name of Britain would urge us to append her signature to any pact which would stain her honor. But any man who believes in the beneficence of the British Empire as an agent in the advancement of a free, humane civilization, would deplore a policy which would impair its might—and, therefore, its influence—by the reckless addition to its task of enterprisings which are beyond its great strength to accomplish.

A quarrel with Russia was not an obligation of honor for Britain. The Ukrainians are not Poles—neither are the White Russians. We are not, therefore, in honor bound to sacrifice hundreds of thousands of British lives to restore these provinces to Poland. Liberation of the true Poland is another matter. To that we are pledged.

HITLER AGREEABLE TO CONFERENCE

Why not propose a conference of the leading powers of the world to review the whole situation? Hitler seems agreeable to that idea. Russia could hardly refuse to agree, inasmuch as she was the first to propose it some months ago. Our objection to it then was simply on the grounds that it was premature. All parties could enter into such a conference without prejudice to the attitude they have adopted on the questions in dispute.

It is essential that America should be induced, if possible, to take part in such a congress. She is the only completely disinterested power. The fact that the United States of America has consistently refused to get mixed up in the controversies that have led to this

war will give her a position of incalculable value in helping the warring powers to come to a fair decision on the issues which have been raised. If the President of the American Republic were to summon such a conference, it would be impossible for any of the belligerents to reject such an invitation without laying themselves open to the condemnation of all the neutral powers of the world.

No topic which is likely to provoke an international disturbance should be excluded from the discussions. Herr Hitler has indicated some of these matters—disarmament, colonies, a Polish state. We are free to propose others which are equally vital to an enduring peace settlement. The presence of neutrals will insure a distinterested consideration of these problems. The fact that each of these contending parties will appeal for neutral support would tend to discourage extreme demands. Nothing would be lost and everything might be gained by such a conference.

The Refugee Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAMILTON FISH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 9, 1939

SPEECH OF HON. HAMILTON FISH, PRESIDENT OF THE AMERICAN GROUP, THE INTERPARLIAMENTARY UNION, AT THE ANNUAL CONFERENCE OF THE UNION, HELD AT OSLO, NORWAY, ON AUGUST 16, 1939

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech delivered by me at the Interparliamentary Union's Conference, held at Oslo on August 16, 1939:

I propose to speak briefly this morning on the refugee problem, but before doing so I want to give notice that tomorrow, if I am able to obtain the time in the discussion on the peaceful settlement of international disputes, I propose to offer a resolution, which I would like the delegates to consider beforehand, asking for a 30-day armistice between the great European nations in order that they may settle their difficulties by arbitration, conciliation, and peaceful methods rather than by war. I cannot conceive how any democratic nation could refuse to submit these great problems of peace and war to arbitration and conciliation because that at least is consistent with the very existence of the Interparliamentary Union.

The matter that I am about to speak on has already been referred to by the honorable gentleman, Mr. Bellenger, representing the British Parliament, as well as by others. I propose to present to the delegates briefly a plan, or possibly a vision, on a large scale, backed by prominent and wealthy Americans, providing for the settlement of refugees in the undeveloped and sparsely populated but healthy uplands of central Africa. The African continent is the only place left in the world where there are vast territories, rich in natural resources, and where overpopulation is not yet a problem.

This proposal may sound visionary, but it is not half as daring as the founding of a new nation in North America 300 years ago. There is an old saying, "Where there is no vision the people perish." Certainly it must be true that if there is no vision in solving the refugee problem the refugees themselves must perish.

This problem of the refugees is inseparably connected with the preservation of peace. The largest and richest nations with undeveloped territories and natural resources cannot shut their eyes to these deplorable conditions without feeling themselves partially responsible for the prolongation of economic unrest and uncertainty that exists throughout the world. The problem is by no means a Jewish or a racial problem; it involves Catholics and Protestants as well, and people from many nations.

It is essential to discover a new homeland for these unfortunate refugees, driven out by dictatorial governments, where they can find peace, security, employment, and civil liberty. The question that I propose to the delegates from the representative and parliamentary governments of the world is whether there is not still within the boundaries of Africa a vast undeveloped territory capable of supplying the need and of furnishing the livelihood of large numbers of European refugees. I believe in plain speaking. I doubt whether Great Britain, France, or the United States will accept any more refugees in their already over-populated countries where the unemployment of their own people has become a serious and continuous problem. I am not giving away any diplomatic secrets when I tell you, my colleagues, that I discussed the refugee problem with both Lord Halifax, the British Foreign Secretary, and M. Bonnet, the French Foreign Minister, both of whom expressed a definite desire to cooperate in ascertaining if there were any sparsely inhabited but livable lands within their colonial possessions that could be developed by modern science, engineering, irrigation, and medical research and supervision. I also had the honor of discussing the refugee problem with M. Mendel, the French Colonial Minister, who volunteered to have an immediate survey made in the French colonial possessions in Africa and particularly that section to the south and east of Lake Tschad, and invited me to meet him early in September in Paris after his survey had been completed. Both the two foreign ministers of Great Britain and France showed genuine interest in the project, and without making any commitment plainly stated that they were vitally interested in opening up any undeveloped but healthy sections of their colonial possessions for use of Europe's refugees.

I speak for a group of wealthy Americans who are prepared to subscribe a very large sum, up to $100,000,000, to establish a homeland for refugees, regardless of race or religion, in the high lands of Africa. If vast sections of Africa can be made useful to mankind the nations that possess them cannot sit idly by and refuse to open them up for the overpopulated parts of Europe and for the refugees. It is no answer to say that they may be temporarily uninhabitable. The country that I represent today is one of the greatest and richest nations in the world, but it was totally undeveloped 300 years ago. Other nations to the south of us, Cuba, Mexico, Panama, Venezuela, Colombia, and Brazil, nearer the Equator, have been made not only livable, but great, rich, and populous, even without the aid of modern science, medicine, and engineering.

I plead with my fellow delegates to consider this problem. There is no resolution as yet before you, but I ask you to consider the matter and take it back to your Parliaments for further discussion and for inquiry to see whether there is not land available somewhere in this world of ours so that we can, with the help of American money contributed by philanthropists, place these refugees in a homeland of their own where they will have security and peace. I plead with my fellow delegates to cooperate in solving the refugee problem by providing a new homeland for these people where they may have plenty of elbow room and an opportunity to provide for themselves in peace and security free institutions of their own making. It must be a democratic state under representative or parliamentary forms of government, with freedom and liberty for all. [Loud applause.]

Let Congress Join Forces on Neutrality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN J. KENNEDY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 9, 1939

LETTER TO VICE PRESIDENT JOHN N. GARNER DATED OCTOBER 5, 1939, AND REPLY DATED OCTOBER 6, 1939

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter of invitation to the Vice President, and his reply, as appended:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., October 5, 1939.

Hon. JOHN NANCE GARNER,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The eyes of the Nation are on the Senate of the United States, because every citizen is actively and vitally interested in the speeches and the proceedings of the Senate on the neutrality bill. The Members of the House of Representatives are also closely following the proceedings by reading the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, because it is physically impossible for the 435 Representatives to find space in the Senate Chamber so that they may personally listen to the debate.

The proposed neutrality legislation is deeply controversial, and it is therefore important that both branches of Congress have all available information on the subject to assist us to cast an intelligent vote. I believe that it would greatly aid the House Members to be able to be present during the present sessions of the Senate.

The capacity of the Senate Chamber cannot accommodate the House Members, but the capacity of the House Chamber can accommodate both the Senators and the Representatives. May I suggest that arrangements be made for the Senate to hold its sessions in the House Chamber during the special session so that the Members of the House would have the privilege of being in attendance and listening to both sides on the question. I am sure that the House will be delighted to cooperate by making the necessary change in the rules which cover the use of the House Chamber.

In addition to the enlarged facilities offered by the House Chamber, there is also the loud speaker system which would be a convenience for the speakers and the listeners.

With my kind regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

MARTIN J. KENNEDY.

THE VICE PRESIDENT'S CHAMBER,
Washington, October 6, 1939.

Hon. MARTIN J. KENNEDY,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. KENNEDY: Your favor of the 5th received this morning and I am taking the privilege of referring it to the Rules Committee of the Senate which would have jurisdiction of the matter referred to.

Senator MATTHEW NEELY is chairman of the committee. May I suggest that you and others interested get in touch with him and members of the committee for further consideration of the matter.

With great respect, I am,
Very cordially yours,

JNO. N. GARNER.

Mr. Speaker, should the Senate act upon my invitation, I am quite sure that you and the Committee on Rules will make the necessary arrangements.

War Is Over—Says Shaw

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 9, 1939

STATEMENT BY GEORGE BERNARD SHAW

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting a statement by George Bernard Shaw, world-famous publisher and playwright.

The matter referred to follows:

WAR IS OVER—STALIN WON IT, SAYS SHAW—WRITER ASSERTS FRANCE, BRITAIN, AND REICH "BACKED OUT"

(By George Bernard Shaw)

LONDON, October 6.—The war is over.

Every person in the country capable of seeing three moves ahead in the game of military chess has known this from the moment when the first Russian soldier stepped across the Polish frontier.

But it was obvious before this to the subtler observers when we, to our eternal credit, threw our thoughtless pledge to Poland to the winds.

That pledge was categorical and undeniable.

THREE-YEAR WAR NEEDED

The Poles knew and we knew that we could not put a single soldier into Poland or a single ship into the Baltic until we had conquered Germany.

That conquest we admitted would take at least 3 years. The conquest of Poland by Germany would take 3 weeks.

Poland's only hope was our air force.

The Poles must have pressed for a pledge on this point specifically, for Prime Minister Chamberlain and Foreign Secretary Halifax had declared that if Hitler laid a finger on Poland we should attack Germany "with all our resources."

SMASHING ATTACK INDICATED

This was understood by the Poles to mean exactly what it did mean: That at 11 o'clock on the 3d of September we should dispatch all our bombers to smash up the Rhine cities and Berlin, as Madrid and Warsaw had been smashed up, but with the all-important difference, that though Madrid and Warsaw could no more retaliate than the Abyssinians or the Northwest hill tribes, Germany could immediately play a hailstone chorus on London and all of our provincial centers, the game going on as long as there was a gallon of petrol left in either country to keep it up.

It is, I repeat, to our eternal credit that when it came to this point and we were faced with the responsibility of initiating such a suicidal climax of human villany, we funked it. (Ed. note—Scotch slang for "backed out.")

HUMAN LIVES DON'T MATTER

The French funked it. The Germans funked it.

It was not human lives that mattered: For we bombed German battleships in the Kiel Canal and the Germans torpedoed the Athenia with its hundreds of passengers without remorse.

Our announced methods of blockade had mothers and children as their first victim for, in a siege, fighters must have their bully beef as long as there is a bone in the cupboard and noncombatants must starve first.

It was the cities that mattered. We are not sufficiently good Europeans to feel, as I feel, that the slaughtering of a hundred German boys was just as great a loss to all parties as the slaughter of a hundred thousand English lads, but the reduction of London, Paris, Berlin, to say nothing of dozens of provincial cities and seaports, to heaps of rubbish would bury the belligerent governments under rubbish, and this they were all ready to bar though they blacked out all the same—just in case.

In vain Poland called on us to treat German cities as Warsaw was being treated; our only reply was to drop a packet of tracts on them.

Thus betrayed, Poland has surrendered and laid herself at Hitler's feet. He was able to say that, as Poland's cause is lost, we have no further excuse for continuing the war.

Whereupon, we threw off the mask of knight errantry and avowed flatly that we didn't care two hoots about Poland and were out on our old balance of power lines to disable Germany, which we now called abolishing Hitlerism.

This left Der Fuehrer in a very dangerous position. The axis had broken in his hands from the beginning, Italy and Spain having promptly deserted him. The anticomintern pact had become a danger to him; Turkey was definitely against him; Rumania and the Balkans generally were mortally afraid of him.

UNITED STATES STAND PRO-BRITISH

America's neutrality was pro-British, just as our nonintervention policy in the Spanish Civil War was pro-Franco.

The year 1918 has proved that Germany though unconquerable and even victorious here and there, in the field, could be starved into complete demoralization and defeat by the Allies.

The situation was not pleasant even for a leader drunk with success. Encirclement was fairly complete. Except on one side, where Russia stood with an army of 6,000,000 men eating their heads off.

Those of us who were intelligent and knowledgeable enough to see that the balance of power was in the hands of Stalin had forced our government to make overtures to Russia, and Alfred Duff Cooper (former first lord of the admiralty who resigned in protest after the Munich surrender), a very favorable specimen of our reigning oligarchy, loosened his old-school tie so far as to plead in the London Evening Standard that Stalin, though, of course, a bloodthirsty scoundrel, was perhaps not quite so villainous as Hitler.

Hitler, having the tremendous advantage over Duff Cooper of being a proletarian, and knowing something about the world he was living in, courted Russia more sensibly.

Stalin, 500 percent or so abler and quicker at the uptake than all the dictators, including the Westminster Cabinet, rolled into one, had nothing to consider except which of them he should take by the scruff of the neck.

Before deciding, he sent a handfull of his 6,000,000 men to take possession of the White Russian Ukraine and a substantial bit of Poland.

Hitler at once capitulated unconditionally and was duly taken by the scruff of the neck; for Stalin could use Hitler to keep Duff-Cooperism out of the rest of Poland.

He informed us, in effect, that since we couldn't even be civil to Russia we should not make Poland a gun emplacement for the obvious ultimate aim of our rulers (as far as they are capable of aims) of restoring the Romanoff czardom and once more dining happily with the Benkendorys in Chester Square.

COMMUNIST DRIVE INOPPORTUNE

And so the diplomatic situation stands.

Nothing has happened since except that the French, whether after consulting with us or not I do not know, have most inopportunely started prosecuting their Communists.

Meanwhile, we are all enduring all the vagaries of ineptest military communism from mere discomfort to financial ruin and breaking up of our homes.

Powers, which no Plantagenet king or Fascist dictator would dream of claiming, have been granted to any unqualified person who offered to assume them, including an enterprising burglar.

Whatever our work in life may be, we have been ordered to stop doing it and stand by. Wherever our wives and children are, they have been transported to somewhere else, with or without the mothers.

Our theaters and cinemas have been closed, and our schools, colleges, and public libraries occupied by the military bureaucracy. We have been bundled out of our hotels into the street, neck and crop, and our own houses simultaneously made into nests of billeted little evacuees, often unofficially described at little Hooligans.

HITS WAR BUDGET

Our bungalow, bought by us after careful calculation of our ability to pay the mortgage interest and get to our place of business in a baby auto, have been put "beyond our means" by an appalling budget and by rationing of petrol which aims at our complete immobilization, just as blacking out aims at our being completely blindfolded from sunset to sunrise.

When the bungalows and suburbs raised a bitter cry that they cannot pay the new taxes, Sir John Simon replied frankly that if they don't the government will be forced to resort to inflation, thus reminding us that in Germany, when we forced the Reich to resort to it, two penny postage stamps cost 12,000 marks and the postman's wage rose to a king's ransom, on which you could barely live, whilst the annuities and insurances on which our unmarried daughters and retired folk used to live in decency and some comfort would become worthless.

PRICES UP, INCOME OFF

Our incomes depreciate from week to week through the rise in prices, which the Government is pledged to prevent and cannot.

Such (and much more) is military communism in inexperienced hands, often the hands of fools who come to the top in wartime by their self-satisfied folly, though nobody would trust them to walk a puppy in peacetime.

When we complain we are told we must all make sacrifices and we had better buy white overcoats, carry our gas masks everywhere, and take impracticable precautions against high explosives, blasts, and poison gas.

Naturally we cry, "Sacrifice! Yes. But what for?"

WHAT IS IT ALL ABOUT?

You tell us to be resolute and determined, but we cannot be resolute and determined in the air about nothing. What are we suffering for? Upon what are we resolved? What have we determined? What in the devil's name is it all about, now that we have let Poland go?

Chamberlain in reply states our aim in peroration.

Winston Churchill echoes it in a broadcast with a certain sense of absurdity which the microphone betrays. Our aim is first to deliver Europe from the threat and fear of war. And our remedy is to promise them 3 years more war (!) next, to abolish Hitlerism root and branch.

Well, what about beginning by abolishing Churchillism, a proposition not less nonsensical and more easily within our reach?

But we are told that if we don't send Hitler to St. Helena he will proceed to annex Switzerland, Holland, Belgium, England, Scotland, Ireland, Australia, New Zealand, Canada, Africa, and finally the entire universe, and Stalin will help him.

WHY NOT WAIT FOR GRAB?

I must reply that men like this are frightened out of their wits. Stalin will see to it that nobody, not even our noble selves, will do anything of the sort. Had we not better wait until Hitler tries to do it and then stop him with Stalin and Roosevelt at our back?

The Archbishop of York in the next broadcast finally rose to the occasion as became a great Christian prelate. Unfortunately, he began not as a Christian prelate but as a righteously angry, hotheaded Englishman, by giving his blessing to our troops as "dedicated" to the supreme and immediate duty of lynching Hitler and his associates.

RAKING UP HISTORY

Now, I cannot go into the question of whether Hitler deserves to be lynched without raising awkward analogies between his case and those of Mussolini, Franco, Stalin and his associates, and raking up events in India and Ireland which unfriendly pens have represented as somewhat dictatorial on our part.

I simply remind the archbishop that although we can easily kill a hundred thousand quite innocent German men, women, and children in our determination to get at Hitler, we should not finally succeed in lynching him, and the killing of Germans and our own losses in the process would produce a state of mind on both sides which would operate as a complete blackout of Christianity and make the archbishop's sane, final solution impossible.

VERSAILLES ALL OVER AGAIN

If we won, it would be Versailles all over again, only worse—with another war even less than 20 years off. And if, as is desperately possible, we drove Russia and Germany into a combination against us to avert that catastrophe, which is just what our Stalinphobe old school ties and trade unionists are recklessly trying to do, then we shall indeed need God's help and not deserve it.

BALDERDASH ABOUT DEMOCRACY

No; it will not do, however thickly we butter it with bunk and balderdash about liberty, democracy, and everything that we have just abolished at home.

As the archbishop nobly confesses, we made all the mischief—we and the French—when we were drunk with our victory at Versailles. And if that mischief had not been there for him to undo, Adolf Hitler would have now been a struggling artist and of no political account.

He actually owes his eminence to us; so let's cease railing at our own creation and recognize the ability with which he has undone our wicked work and the debt the German nation owes him for it.

BUSINESS NOW TO MAKE PEACE

Our business now is to make peace with him and with all the world instead of making more mischief and ruining our people in the process.

I wrote without responsibility because I represent nobody but myself and a handful of despised and political powerless intellectuals capable of taking a catholic view of the situation.

One of these unhappy outcasts is my friend H. G. Wells. He has written a vitally important letter to the Times, of which nobody has taken the smallest notice. I disagree with him on one point and would feign to comfort him on it.

He warns us that we are risking not only a military defeat but the existence of civilization and even of the human race. Dear H. G.: Let us not flatter ourselves. The utmost we can do is to kill, say, 25 millions of one another and make ruins of all our great cities and show places for Maori tourists.

Well, let us. In a few months we shall matter no more than last summer's flies.

As two of the flies, we naturally deprecate such an event; but the world will get on without us, and the world will have had an immense gratification of the primitive instinct that is at the bottom of all this mischief and that we never mention, to wit: Pugnacity, sheer pugnacity for its own sake, that much-admired quality of which an example has just been so strikingly set us by the Irish Republican army.

The Neutrality Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. O. BURGIN

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 9, 1939

EDITORIAL FROM BEASLEY'S FARM AND HOME WEEKLY, OF CHARLOTTE, N. C.

Mr. BURGIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from Beasley's Farm and Home Weekly, published at Charlotte, N. C.:

[From Beasley's Farm and Home Weekly, Charlotte, N. C.]

SHOULD NOT LOSE OUR SOULS STRIVING TO SAVE OUR SKINS

In their fear lest we get into this war the people of this country have been imposed upon rather brazenly by those who have been busily whipping up an antiwar hysteria. This imposition runs all the way down from the speeches of Senator BORAH and Colonel Lindbergh to the propaganda of Father Coughlin and the crass efforts of the Russian and German mouthpieces in the country. By twisting the issue now before Congress by declaring unequivocally that to change the Embargo Act certainly means war and to make no change means no war, these people have been able so to frighten the less thoughtful people that they are blindly besieging Congress not to make any move.

"Do you want to get into this war? Are you willing for your son to go?" And the terrified people shout, "No!" "Then demand that there be no change in the neutrality law." This process has so whipped up the hysteria that the people are unable to weigh the argument and listen with sense and calmness to the President when he tells them that he is striving with might and main to keep out of the war and is showing them the best way to do so. In this melee we are about to lose our self-respect and the respect of the world, including Hitler's crowd, who already take delight in telling us that we are only a set of boobs, anyway. That is what they really mean when they tell us that we were pulled into the last war by British lies.

Certainly the people of this country do not wish to get into the European war, and there is no reason for us to do so. But while holding to that purpose we should not sink so low as to forget all human values nor become so drunk with fear that nothing but staying out will count. We can stay out with dignity without sacrificing all our rights, without losing all perspective or sacrificing our sense of right and wrong, and, above all, failing to comprehend what the struggle is about. So far as rights go, we are willing to surrender many rather than to get into war.

Thus the new neutrality bill in Congress surrenders nearly all the rights of an independent and neutral nation. It surrenders our right to come and go upon the high seas, our right to trade with belligerents and to a considerable extent our rights to continue our peaceful trade with other peaceful nations. As a neutral we are surrendering important rights which Italy as a neutral will hold to and profit by. But that is all right. Our people wish it so. We can afford to surrender much.

But we cannot surrender our right to help the side which is staggering under the burden of defending all that we hold dear from the assaults and the possible triumph of what we hate and condemn. To claim to be neutral in thought in this struggle would by hypocritical. We are not neutral. No good man is neutral when he sees vice and virtue struggling. Not being neutral, we should refuse to pose as neutral. Legally we can be neutral, and under that legal neutrality we can help our friends. Let us boldly say that we shall sell them arms and munitions and anything else they need because we have both the legal and moral right to do so and because we wish to do so. Any other course would be taken by Hitler's cutthroats simply as cowardice. We shall have their contempt as well as the ill will which we already have.

Let us not be driven into the cynical attitude of passing up the agony and suffering of Europe as something that does not concern us, merely a rivalry of governments in which all are equally to blame. To fall into that callousness would simply show that we are unworthy of our position in the world, unfit to assume those duties of help after the war which are rather vaguely spoken of among those who fear that we may do something now.

If we lose our understanding now we shall be slow to regain it when the war is over. We should never forget for a moment that the English and the French, neither their people nor their Governments, wanted to go to war. For 7 years they were so opposed to going to war that they gave up, step by step, whatever a drunken and wreckless leader demanded. They could not believe that any nation could allow itself to be rushed headlong into a war whatever the cause. We should not forget that this very forebearance, this dread of war, kept the English and French from being prepared for war till the very last. Their desire to keep out of war gave Hitler the great start he had in building up the machine that ran over and crushed without pity a helpless neighbor and would so crush whatever stands in its way.

We cannot accuse the French and British people of bringing on this war. Their desire to have no war has cost them dearly in unpreparedness. "Herr Hitler," says David Lawrence, "came in recent months to have a contempt for the British and French. He felt that they had been cowed into submission by fear of the horrors of war. He misjudged the spirit of liberty-loving people, even as some of his coleaders or successors may some day misjudge American indifference and aloofness as cowardice.

"The stoicism of the Briton and the stolidity of the Frenchman are easy to misjudge. These characteristics are not ostentatious or passionate nor do they connote bluster or bluff or threat. They are merely the qualities of a people who know liberty and know how to fight to retain it.

"War means regimentation and, for the time being, a loss of liberty, but it means a swing back to freedom afterward. A democracy understands when to impose and when to relax restrictions.

"But the greatest of all forces in a war-engaged democracy is its spirit. This is a collective emotion hardly to be dismissed with the single word patriotism. It is a spirit rather of united brotherhood, crusading for a principle that is bigger than life itself.

"To the extent that materialism and selfishness, indulgence and fondness for worldly pleasures have crept into the postwar life of the two decades since 1918, we see on almost every side in America an indifference to the higher compensations. We see a love of self, of individual power, of profits and possessions. Death, the inevitable end of mortal man, decreed for everybody at sometime, becomes an illogical, distant contingency. Anything, anything to live; yes, even peace at any price!"

Banshees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN L. SWEENEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 9, 1939

LETTER OF THE HONORABLE JOHN J. O'CONNOR

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an amusing and enlightening letter by our former colleague the Honorable John J. O'Connor, of New York, on the subject of banshees.

NEW YORK, *September 16, 1939.*

Mr. FRANK M. O'BRIEN,
Editor, The New York Sun,
280 Broadway, New York.

DEAR MR. O'BRIEN: Because I was out of town surveying the 1940 situation in New England, your editorial, A Double-Headed Banshee? in your paper of September 14, has just come to my attention.

In the editorial you refer to the President's complaint that the newspaper correspondents had created a double-headed banshee of Corcoran and Cohen, and the editorial mentions my name as one who could have a banshee. You go on to say, "More education about banshees is needed." It surely is—from the President down.

Being totally and proudly of Irish extraction, with the strain never crossed since the days of the last king of Ireland, Roderick (the Red) O'Connor, permit me to keep the record straight.

Banshees were of the female sex, so Corcoran and Cohen could not, apparently, qualify in that historic category. No banshee ever played the accordion or the stock market in utilities, etc. Truly, they were women of the fairies, according to Irish and general Celtic folklore. They were accustomed to screaming or keening at night to foretell the death of some member of the household. There were similar ghostly informers in both British and Welsh folklore.

The confusion into which the newspapermen fell must have been due, not alone to the confusion of sex or the screaming of the accordion in the White House at night but to the keening of this pair, bearing ominous bodings to business, the utilities and investors generally. The banshee always brought sad news—never encouraging words.

Back in the nineties—gay or otherwise—I lived in a small city in Massachusetts. On the same street with the O'Connors was a family named Fields, who were professional keeners. They hired themselves out for wakes and chanted dolefully and long over the departed one. To keep in trim, they practiced day and night. Time and again we stood outside their house and listened to the odd chants and moanings, so far removed from the new world.

A few miles away, in Pawtucket, Corcoran lived on the other side of the railroad tracks. But the outstanding distinction of the Irish banshee was that she only attended on families of pure Milesian descent. There may have been keeners in Pawtucket but there were few Milesians. However, outside of sex, Cohen could not have been a banshee or be bothered by any.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN O'CONNOR,
Former Congressman.

Pastorius Day Dinner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED C. GARTNER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 9, 1939

RADIO ADDRESS OF THEODORE H. HOFFMANN, NATIONAL CHAIRMAN OF THE STEUBEN SOCIETY OF AMERICA

Mr. GARTNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD the address of Theodore H. Hoffmann, national chairman of Steuben Society of America, over station WGBI, Scranton Pa., and delivered on the occasion of the Pastorius dinner of the German-American Federation of Lackawanna County on October 5, 1939, at the Hotel Jermyn:

He is a traitor to his race,
Who, lured by power, or awed by place,
Makes compromise with wrong;
Upon the gibbet of his lie
His soul shall shrivel, rot, and die,
And minstrelry shall pass him by
Without the mockery of song.

He is immortal—only he—
Who stands for right unflinchingly,
On watch from dark till dawn;
By God's eternal stars he steers,
Nor stays for storms, nor fails for fears,
For truth is truth a thousand years;
God's heroes march forever on.

Mr. Chairman, guests of honor, fellow Americans, tonight, on the eve of Pastorius Day, it is my privilege to be with you in the important city of Scranton, situated in a State that is so replete with German culture, folklore, and history. Therefore, I appreciate having been given this opportunity, and to be able to convey at the outset the thanks of the Steuben Society of America for the honor of having its national chairman address you today.

You men and women of Germanic extraction assembled here will be called upon to assist in working out a program whereby we can support our country and its institutions, and whereby we may be allowed to contribute our bit to preserve the principles as laid down by the founders of this Republic, and to cherish its traditions.

The history of the achievements of men and women of our race and their contributions to this our country need repetition upon such occasions as these.

On October 6, 1683, the ship *Concord* sailed up the Delaware River and landed near the newly founded village of Philadelphia to discharge her passengers, who forthwith established themselves at Germantown under the leadership of Franz Daniel Pastorius. They were Germans; the first considerable group of immigrants from the country from which a continuous stream of newcomers has since that time arrived in America to become a part of the American people and to contribute to the building of the great Nation of which we are proud today.

Like the landing of the *Mayflower* at Plymouth, the landing of the *Concord* is symbolic of the future history of America. It should be one of the sacred memories of every true American. The coming of the Pilgrim Fathers of Plymouth foreshadowed one aspect of the character of the American Nation, and the arrival of the Pennsylvania pilgrims foretold another aspect. Neither of these events can be understood if it is to be taken as something of value only to those who are of the same European stock as the men and women who stepped ashore on these memorable occasions. They are not true Americans who cannot grasp the common national significance of both these events as well as of similar occurrences during the infancy of the American Nation.

We of German extraction are glad to share with our friends who claim descent from other nations of Europe the veneration, love, and affection we owe and give to this, our country. For after all, we are all extensions of European stock, some of our parents stepping off the immigrant ship a year or two ahead or behind the parents of other men and women who have blended, fused, and merged so that the native-born American is or will be a composite in a very large measure of Irish, English, Scotch, Italian, German, and other blood. To that composition Germany has contributed courage, loyalty, industry, and a love for freedom. German blood has been spilled on every battlefield ever since the existence of the United States. Its crimson trail may be traced from Valley Forge and on through the history of our country.

Firm as a wall of iron the Germans have ever stood in defense of true Americanism. Like Steuben at Valley Forge and Yorktown, like De Kalb at Camden, like Armistead at Fort McHenry, like Kichlein at Long Island, like Herkimer at Oriskany, like Quitman at Chapultepec, like Osterhaus on Lookout Mountain, like Schurz and Steinwehr on Cemetery Ridge, like Custer on the Little Big Horn, like Schley at Santiago, like Barbara Fritchie at Frederick, like Muhlenberg in his pulpit, and thousands of others, the Germans will be on the firing line in any crisis—not watchfully waiting but striking hard blows for the priceless heritage of liberty, the radiant hope of humanity—that government of the people, by the people, and for the people shall not perish from the face of the earth.

Today the dark clouds of war are over Europe and have already opened up, pouring death and destruction over many countries, threatening to engulf the entire world.

Today in our country we are faced with the same sinister and insidious war propaganda which drove our country into the World War, a war which it is now conceded we ought never to have entered.

As Americans, interested in American institutions and principles, we do not consider it to be within our province to presume to prescribe to any other country what form of government its people shall adopt. We do not deny to peoples in this country their right to express themselves, if they feel justified in doing so; but we emphatically deny the right of organized groups and men in public life and office to carry on a high-pressure propaganda in this country for the purpose of stampeding it into actions which are contrary to the public welfare, and a menace to its peaceful relations between friendly nations.

This is a question which affects all Americans.

Ours is a Nation composed of citizens of all countries, and no one has a place in our ranks whose allegiance is not wholly to the United States of America.

We deprecate and disapprove of any exhibition of foreign politics on our shores which can have no other result than to create a feeling of hostility against those who exhibit it and the country which they claim to represent.

We resent it as in conflict with the principles on which our country is founded. Our problems are different from those of any other country. Whereas there is homogeneity of population in England, France, and Germany, we here have representations of all the races and nationalities of the world within our borders and we have a right to demand of them that when they leave their respective countries they also leave behind the differences which separated them at home. They must learn to consider and study all questions and problems from the American perspective and none other. As Americans we cannot tolerate any attempts made to be influenced by any of the many factions in European countries, and for the sake of the continued peace of our people we must frown down any attempt to spread among them the seeds of dissention which if allowed to germinate will cause them to forget and disregard their oath of allegiance to the country of their choice and adoption and thus be guided in their conduct by foreign-born prejudices and not by what should be their first and only consideration—the welfare of America.

The terrible and almost irremediable conditions existing in Europe and in our country are nothing but the fruits of that document of superhate, greed, and avarice, the Treaty of Versailles. To call it a peace document is the superlative of hypocrisy.

At Versailles the Allies imposed upon Germany those terms of humiliation and degredation which that people now insist they will remove at all hazards. To anyone who should question our right as American citizens to enter into this subject at all, I make the reply that this is an American question on all points. An American President laid down certain 14 points, the same American President, when Germany sued for peace, put to it the question, "Will you consent to make peace on the strength of my 14 points?" and received the reply: "On the basis of those 14 points we will lay down our arms." And be it said to our eternal shame that our representatives broke faith with the vanquished foe. Outwitted by the most clever and the shrewdest of European diplomats, we assisted in forging the fetters which the world must break if peace and happiness shall once more gladden the face of the earth. The Versailles Treaty crucified the 14 points. It made the world safe, not for democracy, but for English and French imperialism, militarism, and the dictatorships.

The great justification for the last war was that it was to end war; but what a consummation of that devout wish! The world has not only gained nothing, but has lost almost everything, even its soul. It has violated its pledges to the quick and the dead, has dishonored its signatures under solemn treaties, has defiled its past and jeopardized its future. The sacred tenets of old have been cast to the winds, the manly fight between foemen was distorted into a deviltry of madmen with pen in hand and sacrilege on tongue.

Whoever felt proud of this so-called treaty has no cause to feel proud today in looking backward 20 years. I need not dwell upon these past events and do not need to pass judgment on them. Others have done that in whose favor it may be said that they hail from the victorious countries, although their condemnation of the insanity of Versailles has been carefully hidden from the American people. Such news is still not fit to print.

There is no parallel in history, the destruction of Carthage excluded, where victors defied every law of God and man and reason and decency, as during and after that war that was to be a holy war, a veritable crusade.

So I say, let's mind our own business and attend to our own serious problems and we will have plenty to do.

"The true patriot benefits his own country without diminishing the welfare of other nations."

In order that our country may never again be drawn into another conflict on foreign soil and our boys again needlessly slaughtered, it is our solemn duty to insist that our Congress does not change the provisions of the present Neutrality Act. There is one thing certain, and that is that Congress is the last chance for our country and our people to keep out of war.

We hear a great deal about possible invasions by foreign powers. We need have no fear of invasion, because it would mean economic, financial, military, and naval suicide for any nation that would try it.

Various groups and some important individuals in this country are assiduously working through propaganda and organized influence to get the United States once more to join openly in the dangerous game that leads to war. They are beginning to spread the crusade idea that this great, powerful, Christian Nation must join the intrigue and military debauchery of the Old World to save democracy.

These are beautiful and inspiring phrases. The fact of the matter is these idealists are putting themselves in the unenviable position of becoming selling agents for the warmongers and the international munitions profiteers. The United States may well prepare again to be the dupe of Europe to supply money, credit, and munitions and spill the life-blood of thousands of American boys on foreign soil unless the "save the world for democracy" farce is unmasked and the play stopped.

Not so long ago our Ambassador to France, William C. Bullitt, at Bordeaux, delivered a speech partly devoted to a eulogy of Bordeaux wines to which no objection can be made as far as good salesmanship is concerned, but when beyond that he endeavored to again sell the United States to France, as Herrick did, we certainly protest that the people of this country disavow every promise he may have made in that direction.

It is praiseworthy for our ambassadors to foreign countries to cultivate pleasant relationships with them; but it is to be regretted that the adulation which they in return receive as being representative of a great and powerful country makes them forget their own homeland.

Ambassador Page, who "misrepresented" the United States in London during the World War, was a glaring instance of that failing. It was said of him that he was the best "Englishman" in the United Kingdom.

The most important admonition to the citizens of the United States who are appointed to diplomatic posts in foreign countries should be, Don't forget that you are an American!

The people of the United States themselves—they who will be called upon to sacrifice the lives of their sons on the battlefield, they who must bear the financial burden of conducting such a war, they who will be called upon to tax themselves for the support of thousands of invalids who may have escaped total annihilation, they who must assume the burden of paying pensions to those who have returned unscathed from scenes of carnage on foreign soil—shall be the sole judges to decree that such sacrifices and burdens shall hereafter be assumed.

The people have a right to learn through the proper committees of the Senate and House what the foreign policy of the administration is, and this information must be given before we become involved. After the administration has secretly engineered us into a position out of which we cannot extricate ourselves, when the cry goes up, "Stand by the President," it will be too late to save us from war; the hands of Congress will have been fettered.

Events of the last few months have plainly shown the determination of the international warmongers to bring about a vast world conflict. Thousands of propagandists in papers throughout the country forced war scares into headlines that were never justified by facts and wrote lurid hate fictions disguised as news.

You can be sure that every effort will be made by internationalists, by interventionists, and by warmongers to drag us into foreign wars.

Let us live up to the slogan not of any President, who as history has shown, may forget, but of our own Uncle Sam, who has nailed his flag to the masthead with the command which those in and out of power dare not disregard, "No more foreign wars for me!"

We are passing through an era of stress, restlessness, and great uncertainty, both economic and political; the basis and fundamentals of our democracy are being assailed by undeserved privation on the one hand, and on the other they are fiercely attacked by

political demagogues who make so-called practical politics their slimy trade.

If we are to maintain the ideals of our democracy, it is necessary that we think of these things seriously. Each generation and each period has its problems. For present-day Americans perhaps nothing is more important than the constant and vigilant resistance to the domination of selfish and private interests in the affairs of government in order that liberty and justice may still be secure and the public welfare may still be supreme.

And so my message to you in this hour of great need, in this crisis, is to fight together shoulder to shoulder for our objectives.

According to statistics there are over 32,000,000 souls in this country of ours who are of German origin. History is replete with accounts of the devotion, sacrifices, and achievements of the German element in the founding and upbuilding of the United States. History also records, in a black chapter, the unwarranted persecution of this same element during the period of the World War.

So let us make it clear that we will not tolerate any attempt made by any group in any way to attack our race and blood, and that we intend to fight with all honorable means at our disposal any and all propaganda and race discrimination aimed at our good name and splendid record of contribution which materially helped to make this country great and powerful.

That we will fight with all honorable means at our disposal any and all attempts on the part of any and all persons in public office or any and all groups who will attempt to drag this country into foreign entanglements or bring us into foreign wars.

That we will fight hand in hand with other patriotic Americans to prevent the flower of our manhood from being slaughtered on foreign soil, because we believe that the future of American youth is on top of American soil, not underneath European dirt.

Americans of Germanic extraction do not want communism, fascism, nazi-ism, or any other foreign "isms" in this country.

But we ask the Government and the Dies committee to also investigate French and British propaganda prevalent in our land.

Let's get the truth about the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, the Rockefeller Foundation, and the Foreign Policy Association.

Let's get the truth about the Alliance Francaise. Have we forgotten that France some years ago set aside a huge fund for propaganda to be used in the United States of America?

I ask every American citizen of Germanic extraction to continue to live up to the traditions of this country.

I ask every American citizen of Germanic extraction to be neutral in word and deed.

I ask all American citizens of Germanic extraction to stand together to protest and fight against all attempts to entangle our country with foreign alliances or to break down our neutrality, all of which would jeopardize the independence of our country and our democratic form of government.

And, in conclusion, let us remember the words of Abraham Lincoln:

"The people of the United States are the rightful masters of both Congress and courts; not to overthrow the Constitution, but to overthrow the men who pervert the Constitution.

"The struggle of today is not altogether for today—it is for a vast future. If destruction be our lot, we must ourselves be its author and finisher. * * * As a nation of freemen, we must live for all time—or die by suicide."

There must be no repetition of 1914 to 1918, resulting in more than a hundred thousand American boys dead, hundreds of thousands maimed or gasping out a miserable existence from shell shock and gas poisoning. The record of the war debts of our dear Allies to the tune of $13,000,000,000 which we will never get—a war that cost us $50,000,000,000 for which we are paying today and for which our children will continue to pay.

And we are now asked to approve a credit-and-carry plan, a plan which would circumvent the Johnson Act, which prohibits the granting of credits to any nation that defaulted on its war loans. Our answer is, unalterably and definitely, "No!"

We must not become involved in war.

Opposing Repeal of the Arms Embargo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAMILTON FISH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 9, 1939

LETTER OF HON. HAMILTON FISH, OF NEW YORK, IN REPLY TO COMMUNICATIONS RECEIVED IN BEHALF OF THE ARMS-EMBARGO REPEAL

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter I forwarded to those of my constituents who favor repeal of the arms embargo and setting forth my views on the cash-and-carry plan:

For more than 12 years I have opposed in the Congress the sale of arms and ammunitions, both in time of peace as well as in war, for blood money and war profits to kill people with whom we are at peace. I regard the traffic in arms as being immoral and un-Christian, and tending to drag us into wars throughout the world.

I do not believe the real controversy is between the arms embargo and the credit-and-carry plan, but rather between war and peace. I am willing at all times to accept any amendments to the neutrality law that will help perfect it and keep America out of war; I don't care what the name of the plan is. I would favor an amendment that American ships enter the war zones at their own risk, or even a cash-and-carry plan, if the arms embargo is maintained.

I agree with President Roosevelt's statement at Chautauqua in 1936 that "if war should break out again in another continent, let us not blink the fact that we would find in this country thousands of Americans who, seeking immediate riches—fool's gold—would attempt to break down or evade our neutrality. * * * To resist the clamor of that greed, if war should come, would require the unswerving support of all Americans who love peace. * * * If we face the choice of profits or peace, the Nation will answer—must answer—'We choose peace.'"

Although I have always opposed the arms traffic, I shall keep an open mind as to any amendments or proposals, from whatever source, that will promote peace and keep us out of war.

Thanking you for your letter, I am,

Sincerely yours,

HAMILTON FISH.

Proposed Argentine Trade Agreement Hits at Northwest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN G. ALEXANDER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 9, 1939

LETTER FROM THE ST. PAUL (MINN.) ASSOCIATION OF COMMERCE, AND AFFIDAVIT OF ATTILIO CASTIGLIANO

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, among the many resolutions and letters received by me in relation to the Government's proposed reciprocal trade agreement with Argentina, none better express the situation regarding the damage its adoption will cause Northwest agriculture than the following messages which I have just received from St. Paul:

ST. PAUL ASSOCIATION OF COMMERCE,
St. Paul, Minn., October 3, 1939.

Hon. JOHN G. ALEXANDER,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ALEXANDER: Farmers and businessmen of the Northwest are deeply concerned with the untoward results which might accrue to Northwest agricultural and business interests as a result of negotiations now pending between the United States Department of State and representatives of Argentina in the matter of reciprocal-trade agreements.

There is, we fear, a tendency to overlook the importance of Argentina as an agricultural competitor and to minimize the agricultural importance of some 20 other South and Central American countries which may come to us for concessions on competitive agricultural products.

Argentina in area is about equal to our 11 Mountain and Pacific States with about 700,000,000 acres of land, of which 223,000,000 acres are adapted to stock raising, 210,000,000 acres of land for crop production, and 180,000,000 acres to orchards and forests.

Wheat, corn, flax, and oats are leading crops with production in sugar, wine, cotton, fruit, casein, cheese, other dairy products, and poultry making rapid progress.

The livestock census of 1930 enumerates 32,211,855 head of cattle, 44,413,200 head of sheep, 3,768,738 head of hogs.

Packing houses have been established at Buenos Aires and the export of the beef and mutton has become a great industry. The largest refrigerating plant in the world is located there. Argentina now supplies more than half of the hides imported by the United States. Flour milling is a second largest industry.

Argentina has about 25,000 miles of railroad and 57,600 registered trucks plying over 178,000 miles of highway.

In 1936 Argentina sold to us about $77,000,000 while our sales to her were about $56,000,000. Her exports to the United Kingdom in 1937 were about $99,000,000; to Germany (1938), $50,000,000; to

Belgium, about $23,000,000 in 1938; to France and Italy, about $21,000,000 each. The figures for 1935 and 1936 show that we bought much more from her than we sold to her.

A study of her industrial development shows that she now has more than 40,000 industrial plants employing more than 500,000 persons. This industrial development would tend to discourage high hopes for increases in our sales to her of manufactured commodities.

With these facts in mind, with more which might be set out here, the board of directors of the St. Paul Association of Commerce and the agricultural committee of the association feel impelled to submit the following resolution:

"Resolution

"The board of directors of the St. Paul Association of Commerce concurs in the following resolutions adopted by the agricultural committee:

" 'The agricultural committee of the St. Paul Association of Commerce, in session duly called, views with concern reported negotiations now pending between the United States Department of State and representatives of Argentina in matters of trade agreements between these two countries.

" 'Argentina is a strong, rapidly growing agricultural state comparative to agricultural United States in climate, crops, soil, machinery equipment, and farming technique, as well as in livestock, poultry, and dairy production.

" 'Argentina is a direct competitor in beef, mutton, pork, poultry, wheat, corn, oats, barley, rye, and flax production with our Northwest farmers.

" 'We oppose tariff concessions to Argentina at the expense of our Northwest agricultural welfare.

" 'We suggest that our agricultural interests be definitely safeguarded against unfavorable and arbitrary exchange rates.

" 'We submit exchange on New York should be on a most-favored-nation basis.

" 'We authorize the selection of a representative to file a brief and appear at hearings at Washington, D. C., that Minnesota and Northwest agricultural interests may be fully protected and safeguarded, not only in relation to Argentina but in relation to any other competitive markets for which trade agreements are proposed.' "

Hearings are to be held October 16 in Washington. We urge you to attend this hearing. The St. Paul Association of Commerce will have a representative at this hearing.

Very truly yours,

ROLAND J. FARICY, *President.*

STATE OF MINNESOTA,
County of Ramsey, ss:

Attilio Castigliano, being first duly sworn, under oath deposes and states:

1. That he is the vice president and treasurer of the Stella Cheese Co., a $300,000 Wisconsin corporation, organized and incorporated in 1917 and that his address is Metropolitan Bank Building, St. Paul, Minn.

2. That the Stella Cheese Co. has been engaged in the production of cheese of Italian types since its organization, and that at the present time said company produces annually about 10,000,000 pounds of cheese of the following varieties: Reggiano, Parmesan, Romano, Modena, Asiago, Provolone, and Gorgonzola.

3. That in the production of said volume of cheese the Stella Cheese Co. is utilizing approximately 120,000,000 pounds of milk, equivalent to 6,000,000 pounds of butter, and that it operates cheese factories and curing warehouses at the following points: Baltic, Mass, Ewen and Baraga, in the Upper Peninsula of Michigan; Campbellsport, Le Roy, Clayton, Cumberland, and Baronett, Wis.

4. That, with the operation of said plants, it furnishes steady employment during the entire year to about 300 persons, earning salaries running from $60 to $350 per month, and is utilizing the year around the entire milk production of 2,500 farmers.

5. That in the distribution of the cheese of its production the Stella Cheese Co. maintains distributing warehouses in Boston, New York, Newark, Philadelphia, Buffalo, and Chicago.

6. That the affiant has been advised that the Department of State intends to negotiate a reciprocal-trade agreement with Argentina involving certain concessions to be granted to Argentina, among them a reduction on the present tariff rate on cheese imported from said country.

7. That the Stella Cheese Co., is interested in this matter particularly, because all the types of cheese imported into the United States from Argentina, whether known under the names above mentioned or not, are made with a process identical to the process used in producing the Italian types of cheese above mentioned and produced in the United States.

8. And that, being desirous of collecting data and information valuable to the Committee for Reciprocity Information, the affiant respectfully prays said Committee for Reciprocity Information and the Department of State to advise him of the nature and the extent of said intended concession, and particularly of the types and varieties of cheese affected by said intended concession.

Now, therefore, the affiant respectfully serves notice to the Department of State and to the Committee for Reciprocity Information of the intention of the Stella Cheese Co. to appear officially at the hearing to be held October 16 at 10 a. m., before the Committee for Reciprocity Information in Washington, D. C., and kindly requests said committee to furnish him with copy of the rules and regulations governing said hearings.

ATTILIO CASTIGLIANO,
Vice President.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 27th day of September, A. D. 1939.

T. F. QUINN,
Notary Public, Ramsey County, Minn.

My commission expires April 23, 1943.

Address of Hon. Aubrey Williams Before National Conference of Catholic Youth Organizations

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK W. FRIES
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 9, 1939

ADDRESS BY HON. AUBREY WILLIAMS

Mr. FRIES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by Administrator Aubrey Williams before the National Conference of Catholic Youth Organizations, Cincinnati, Ohio, Tuesday, October 3, 1939:

I am very happy to participate in this meeting. I am happy to be here with my friend and fellow worker, Mr. Burns Weston, and I am happy to be here because of my friend, Monsignor Wagner.

All people of good will today are shocked and saddened by the catastrophe which has finally come to pass in Europe. The thing that we had hoped and prayed for 20 years would not happen, has happened and all our values seem to be knocked awry. The most tragic part of this conflict lies in that very fact—that all the people of the world are shocked and confused by the seeming disappearance overnight of the values of peace and progress toward which their efforts had been directed. They stand still in their tracks, sensing a loss of the familiar landmarks by which they had been accustomed to mark their way and they say, "Where now?"

I am not here today to talk about Europe but about America. My job is concerned with America and American youth. Others wiser in world affairs than myself will have to interpret the tragedy of Europe's battlfields. But I am concerned that the overwhelming impact of that tragedy should not blind us to our task here at home, the task at which this Nation has been working for 164 years, the perfecting of our democracy.

We have seen democracy disappear in country after country and it has strengthened our determination to make democracy in our own land so strong and so effective that it could withstand all attack. Democracy is not an ideal that can be destroyed with gunboats and armies; it is destroyed only when the people themselves lose faith in its effectiveness. It is that faith which we in this country must defend and strengthen; that is our first task in a confused and tragic world.

Everywhere the people of the world are taking stock. We ought to do likewise. We will do well these days to look frankly at the conditions under which our people live in order to estimate the strength of their faith in democracy. Let us look behind the words "democracy," "freedom," and "opportunity," to see the extent to which they have reality and meaning for our people. Let us look at our Government to see what is being done to bring about for all people a life worth living and defending instead of a life futilely thrown away on a battlefield. These are the battles which we in this country are fighting, battles against conditions which undermine faith in our own democratic institutions.

There is much talk today at home and abroad about democracy. At the moment to prate of democracy is all the rage. Whatever anyone wants to do, it is the fashion to clothe it in the mantle of democracy. The discerning know that this is all too often the merest pretense and that it is the veriest lip service to a dominant word or vogue.

But those who live and practice the ways of democratic living know better. They know that democracy is a product of action—that it is a way of life. Not something talked into being, not something repressed into existence, not a thing born of fear, but a free, vigorous, unafraid existence born from inner strength developed through the give and take of a society of free men, women, and children.

We speak of winning freedom, and this is right. It has to be won; won each day. It has to be lived into existence with each new day. What was possessed last year—10 years ago—may not exist today—will not exist, we may be sure, unless it is rewon

again or held against those forces that seek everlastingly to thwart and deprive man of his own personality and of his freedom.

Our gains even have not been too impressive, and when the world is taking stock of itself it might be well for us to do a bit of checking and stock taking of what we have in the way of democracy here at home.

One of the predicates of democracy is a reasonable degree of equality of opportunity—social, economic, and political. Looking at the facts, no honest man can claim that this country offers anything like equal opportunity for all. We know that it never has. It has striven to do so, and this is one major point of difference between us and the totalitarian states. We may judge ourselves not by what we have accomplished but by what we would like to do—by our objectives—granted that we have not been able to attain the objectives. We live in the faith and with the hope that we shall come nearer and nearer to their realization.

What is important here is to keep in mind what our objectives are and to what degree we are achieving them.

I have little hope that I can add anything to the discussions that have already taken place at your conference and which will take place tomorrow. You have discussed how adversely the difficulty of finding a job affects youth. You undoubtedly have been told many times that this is our biggest and most serious problem—this problem of unemployment. I can only emphasize and underscore that statement.

There are some 21,000,000 young people between the ages of 16 and 24. Seven million of these are privately employed in industry, agriculture, and other occupations; 5,000,000 are in secondary schools and colleges; 9,000,000 are at home or looking for work. Based upon the Biggers' report and other studies, it is safe to say that almost 6,000,000 of these are in the labor market looking for work, and most of these are desperately in need. Add to these the millions of adults unemployed, and you have the gist of the Nation's most difficult and vital problem.

It is becoming almost trite to say the Nation must soon find a way to include all of these millions in its going economy. For 6 years this has been the burden of the work before the New Deal. Practically all its efforts have been directed toward the solving of this problem. First, was the effort to do something about the banking system. It was recognized that before you could do anything about unemployment you had to do something about the banking system of the Nation. In 1933, when the Roosevelt administration came into power it found the banking houses of the Nation closed Twenty-two hundred of them had closed their doors during the year. There was in progress a mixing of investment banking with deposit and savings banking. One of the first and most important steps which this administration took was to put a floor under the banking structure of the Nation and guarantee the safety and security of deposits. The next step it took was to arrange for the separation of investment and deposit banking. This was a recognition of the great importance of money and what happens to money in the national economy. Now banking has been stabilized and arrangements made whereby people can do business with money, regularized and divested of previous hazards. This has had and will have far-reaching effects on stabilizing employment and reducing unempoyment. The problem of money, its propensity to flow into the hands of those who already have more than they can profitably use, its tendency to jam and jell and freeze are part of this problem of unemployment; and anybody to understand the problem of unemployment, the problems of youth seeking to get employment, will do mighty well to study money and what happens to it.

The next thing this administration undertook was a wide series of Government interventions to implement and increase business activity. First, it was the establishment of the C. C. C., then the F. E. R. A., then the W. P. A., then the Public Works Administration, then the A. A. A., then the Surplus Commodity Corporation, then the Farm Security Administration, then the National Youth Administration, then the Federal Housing Administration, the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, the Farm Credit Administration, the United States Housing Authority, and the Rural Electrification Administration. These all had a multiple purpose. They were born of the necessity caused by the depression, to give employment to unemployed workers, and next they were designed to increase the total purchasing power. They all had also a corollary purpose; in that each served the people by adding to the public wealth; the Rural Electrification Administration to provide rural people with electric power, etc. In the same category are those things such as old-age assistance, old-age annuities, unemployment compensation.

These are all of a piece and represent the democratic form of intervention and implementation of industry. They are the modern way of aiding business and industry. Specifically, the F. E. R. A., W. P. A., N. Y. A., and P. W. A. may be said to be required because of the dislocations in industry due to our power to overproduce; or, conversely, our lack of purchasing power, which in turn creates unemployment. The F. H. A. and U. S. H. A. may be said to be caused by trends in the field of housing. It is increasingly evident that low-cost housing is no longer a profitable investment for private capital. Old-age annuities, old-age security, and old-age pensions may be said to be caused by employment trends in private industry where it is increasingly the employment policy of industry to have younger and younger people.

The National Youth Administration and the Civilian Conservation Corps may be said to be caused by the increase in population and the reduction of industrial population as caused by the trend of industrial technology whereby industry can produce more with fewer people. These moves and similar moves have been the result of a great demand throughout the Nation and have been subjected to wide public discussion. This is right and proper and is very desirable, because there can be no question but that some such measures are here for a long time, how long no man can say; possibly some of them are here permanently, such as old-age annuities, unemployment compensation, public expenditures for youth. In inaugurating these measures the administration has necessarily employed new techniques and new methods. It has, however, a strong precedence for such intervention by the Government in assisting business. I refer to the Government's having given private corporations every other section of land across the continent as a means of aiding them in the development of railroads. I refer to the tariffs which have been assessed against the consumers all these years. I refer to the subsidies that have been granted to the shipbuilders, to the airplane industry, to the communications industry, and so forth. I have not the slightest quarrel with this. I think it was proper. I only regret that some who are strongest in their advocacy of Government intervention in private industry through direct subsidies to business are most severe in condemning the Government's intervention in seeking to aid industry through increasing the purchasing power of the whole people.

These things are destined to play an important part in the future of America. They have, on the whole, been organized and administered in such a way as to make them fit easily within the framework of the American way of life. They provide for the continued individualization of living. They are designed to protect and stabilize home ownership, as for example the H. O. L. C., F. H. A., U. S. H. A., and thereby stabilize the family as the continued basic unit of our society. They provide for the continued individualization of the worker, offering him opportunities to continue to work in his chosen profession; the artist to paint, the musician to play, the writer to write, the brick mason to lay brick, a carpenter to build, a painter to paint, and further, they provide for the continuation of competitive industry through using the traditional form of payment to workers which enables them to go to stores of their choice and buy the goods they individually desire. These are the very antithesis of measures taken in antidemocratic states where mass feeding, mass housing, mass control of all aspects of production reverse the process and make the state the supreme unit.

The third approach this administration has made toward the development of a more stable and prosperous economy has been in the form of regulatory and supervisory legislation:

(1) I refer to the wages and hours legislation in which a law was placed on the Federal statutes saying that a man shall not work for less than a wage stipulated through joint government and industrial action, and that he shall not work more than a fixed maximum number of hours.

(2) I refer to the National Labor Relations Board set-up to strengthen and support collective bargaining in which the Government places alongside of that legislation, long in existence, for the protection of corporations and property and banking, legislation for the protection of the workers.

(3) I refer to the securities exchange law established to insist upon honesty and integrity in the marketing of bonds and stocks.

(4) I refer to the monopoly investigation—the T. N. E. C.

(5) I refer to the T. V. A. for this is also essentially a regulatory structure in that it establishes, by its influence, practices, and conditions, for kindred and similar industries under private control.

These measures and similar measures have been the center of heated controversy and they have produced a Nation-wide clash of ideas. What they are really designed to do is strengthen the arms of those people in those industries who are trying to work along the traditional and promised American way of life. They represent the necessity of the average man for protection against the overpowering industrial and financial oligarchy which has come into existence on the back of the technological leviathan, born in recent years. They represent means to save the competitive elements in industry, to aid the worker in his efforts to secure a reasonable share of the products of his labor. They represent protection for the investor to secure a reasonable return at not too great a risk of losing all his capital. No reasonable person can deny the necessity for these and similar measures.

Every informed person knows that increasingly a few giant corporations in the hands of fewer and fewer individuals control more and more of the means of production in America. Every informed person in America knows that in a large segment of American industry, competition has all but disappeared, and that what you have is industries acting as if there were competition. Every informed person knows that the individual acting as an individual worker, pitting his strength against these giant corporations as a worker is helpless and that only through organization and collective bargaining has he got any chance at all to secure a reasonable return for his labor. These too, along with the money question, along with the intervention of government for the aid of business, and the increase of the national income, will constitute a future and continuing part of those measures designed to increase employment and produce enduring prosperity.

But this cannot be all. These are things which the Government must do. But they are only part of the total picture. Granting the desirability and necessity of everything that has been said, which of course as you and I know, large portions of the population do not do, I want to say that I recognize that these do not

constitute the complete answer. As a matter of fact, they do not properly constitute a most important part of the answer, for after all is said and done, the problem of unemployment is the problem of industry, and first in line with this principle it should be put down as a primary postulate that the American people and youth included, look to private industry for its future. It accepts Government intervention, it agrees to and finds desirable the moves that have been made with respect to the controlled supervision, the protection and supervision of certain aspects of industry by the Government, but it looks to private industry as the regular way of making a living. It is the economic industrial pattern. It is accepted with the same faith and loyalty and devotion that goes to the Government, the church, baseball, or what have you.

It is a part of American life. It is the way we want to make our living. This being true, what this means is that by some means we must make it possible for private industry to include the whole people in its economy. At the moment it is not being done. Millions of workers find the doors of industry closed to them. Millions of trained and competent workers find the places where they formerly made their living closed to them—closed for no good reason that they can understand. Millions of young people coming of age are denied the opportunity of work. Many of them going for years without ever having had a single job. We are told that we are in a contracting economy. We are told that production quickly outruns consumption. Undoubtedly this is all true, but I for one hold that we must everlastingly put the problem of unemployment back in the laps of industry. We must put the problems of unemployed youth on the desk of industry. We must say to industry, here are millions of unemployed people, many of them trained adults, many are competent youths, young and eager. What are you going to do about it? The conservatives have been right in saying that Government could not keep on going into debt forever in giving work to the unemployed—partly right, at least—but they have been wrong in not saying that industry had to find ways to give work to all of the people who wanted to work; they are right in holding that no government can forever spend more money than it takes in, but they are not logical or sound when they fail to accept the full meaning of their attitude and do nothing to force industry to meet its responsibility. A nation lives by large major patterns. In America we have the democratic form of government as our pattern in government, and this form of government should live out and up to the meaning of that form of government. We have in this country freedom of religious worship that are patterns for worship, and we should see to it that that pattern works, and allow nothing to interfere with it.

We have industrial democracy—that is the pattern that we have decided on as the way of making our living. Now that pattern is obligated to provide all men with the necessary opportunities to make a living. It must do so if it is to continue to be the pattern. We cannot, we will not, go on adhering to an industrial pattern which fails one out of every four people in the country. There are too many people left out. If it is to continue to be the way of making a living, then it must provide all men, or nearly all men, who are willing to work, a chance to earn a living and no amount of excusing, no amount of alibi is going to be a satisfactory answer to the millions denied opportunity in the going economy.

There is a curious philosophy going around in America these days, one that is difficult to understand, having been what we have for the last 200 years—having held steadfastly to the faith that there was a good life for everybody here, that there was plenty to go around so that all might share abundantly. Having believed all these years that if one would work hard, that the day would come when the fruits of that labor would be a home to live in, clothes to wear, food to eat, and a bit of pleasure, some travel, education for one's children, but long after these 200 years we hear this sort of philosophy preached—that we have got to tighten our belt, that we have got to get over the idea of such things as wages of $2 an hour for brick masons, that we have got to cut out all of this extravagance of the Government paying men $50 a month as a stop-gap during the time industry fails them. This is a curious philosophy and for me it simply doesn't make sense. It doesn't fit with facts, for everywhere on all fronts we have learned how to produce with almost miraculous abundance. The farmer can grow so much that he makes himself poor by the very abundance of his success. We have so much corn we don't know what to do with it. We have so much wheat that our wealth becomes our poverty.

We have so much cotton that it makes us poor to pay the storage on it. Whatever may be wrong with the farmer, it is not his lack of power to produce abundantly, and yet we are told that we must tighten our belts. We are told that we are living extravagantly on a national average income of $125 a month, and the same is true of production of material and commodities. We can produce so many chairs that there are no people to sit in them, so many cups, so many saucers, tablecloths, so many sheets, so much glass. We know how now to produce everything in such abundant quantity that no man, no family, need ever again want for anything. The hard central truth is that we have found out how to produce the abundant life, but we don't know how to distribute it. We need never again be poor. No child need ever again be hungry. No person, boy, girl, man, or woman need ever again be cold for lack of clothing. There was a time when our ignorance of the means of production did make it impossible for everyone to have enough clothing, to have food—it did not exist. That time has gone forever.

Now, that all being true, the last valid reason for destitution, for want, for poverty has been done away with and it becomes merely a question of the organization—organization of our forces that we have created—organization of the means of distribution of income so that all people shall have a purchasing power sufficient to have the things they need to have—the things made possible by our greater knowledge of farming, of soil, of steel, of land, of textiles, of communications, of travel, of pleasures. Now, we want this distribution of income and we want this participation of the good things now made possible by our industrial geniuses, but we want them within the framework of our democratic way of living.

We want them under the traditional way of life which we call the American way of life. We want them under our present form of government, with its elected Congress, an elected President. We want them under a free and open system of industry where merit and worth are the means of advancement. We want them under arrangements in which the American home is the unit of our society, where the individual and his personality are the inviolate sovereigns of our political and economic social order.

These things, I believe, are possible. It will take time—it will take patience. What is most essential is that we shall preserve our basic rights and our traditional liberties and allow no infringement of these. And we must develop a courage to match our power and we must study to inform ourselves of the effects of this power on our political and economic and social situations. We must study to enlighten, to inform, to educate ourselves of those basic parts of our economy—money, ownership, organization of industry, collective bargaining, Government protection and supervision, Government intervention for the aid of business, the national income, its tendency to contract and expand, and, above all, the individual in his collective and corporate relationships—these constitute the keys to the future.

I could have spoken here tonight on some of the special problems of youth and of the National Youth Administration, but this whole social and economic problem which I have discussed is really the basic problem of young people. The National Youth Administration—indeed, the Federal Government itself—could not solve this youth problem. It is up to the people of the whole country. Young people are more vitally concerned in having the problem solved, and in the democratic way, than the rest of us. They have longer to live. But it is a job for everybody, and I hope that young people will consider the whole question in its broadest implication as affecting directly the solution of the social and economic problems confronting each of them as individuals.

A Reply to an Article by Westbrook Pegler in the Washington Post and Other Newspapers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAMILTON FISH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 9, 1939

LETTER FROM HON. HAMILTON FISH, OF NEW YORK, TO WESTBROOK PEGLER IN REPLY TO AN ARTICLE PUBLISHED BY HIM IN THE WASHINGTON POST AND OTHER NEWSPAPERS

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter in reply to an article by Westbrook Pegler in the Washington Post and other newspapers:

SEPTEMBER 28, 1939.

Mr. WESTBROOK PEGLER,
The Washington Post, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PEGLER: I was amazed and astonished to read your article published under date of September 27 in the Washington Post and other newspapers, taking me to task for "carelessness regarding the source and truth of information." I am afraid, after 2 years, your memory is not as infallible as you would indicate.

I remember a pleasant visit from you, with no outbursts by you as you indicated, and I also remember that you were gathering information to be used against the Roosevelts in your columns.

It is true that I showed you several letters that had just come to me from constituents and others alleging that Mrs. James Roosevelt, for whom I have a high regard, received $35,000 from the Federal Government for the repair and maintenance of her home at Hyde Park while President Roosevelt used it as a summer White House. If your memory had been a little better, you would have recalled that I said at that time that I did not believe these charges, but would investigate and ascertain the facts.

The same applies to your statement that the President's father in his will provided that his son should have no hand in the management of his estate. I have repeatedly replied to inquiries that I knew nothing about it and did not believe it.

The only basis of truth in your column is that I showed you some letters that were on my desk, that had reached me that day,

requesting me to look into these charges. I asked the Ways and Means Committee for this information.

If my memory serves me correctly, after 2 years' time, the only compensation the Roosevelt family received for the House at Hyde Park during the President's occupancy was for actual cost of construction and changes made to accommodate his secretaries and staff. I do not remember the amount.

I pride myself on the fact that I do not make statements carelessly, and check every detail carefully before accepting them as facts, as I know that anything that I might say that cannot be substantiated would weaken the balance of my argument.

It seems to me that some of the columnists are much more careless with facts than men in public life, who know that the slightest deviation from the facts defeats the cause which they are upholding.

With kind regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

HAMILTON FISH.

Address Before American Jewish Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 9, 1939

ADDRESS BY HON. JOHN D. DINGELL, OF MICHIGAN

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a speech delivered by me on Monday, October 2, at the American Jewish Congress in the city of New York, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, members of the American Jewish Congress, and friends, I come before you today as a friend who understands your trials and your great sorrows and as one who is sympathetic and anxious to find a solution for them. In extending the invitation your illustrious and scholarly president, Dr. Wise, conferred upon me a singular honor and I want to express my thanks and appreciation to the Congress for this opportunity to discuss the tragic events which concern all humanity and which have burdened the hearts of all liberty lovers throughout the world.

In presenting my credentials to this distinguished audience I want to say that I am proud of the fact that I am free from bigotry, intolerance, and the hydra-headed hatreds which divide and destroy mankind. Whatever I may ever accomplish or build as a monument in my service in Congress I hope the greatest, in fact the only one, might be the reputation for waging a consistent and relentless war against bigotry, intolerance, and hatred whenever their presence is detected or even suspected.

I refer you to the membership of the New York delegation in Congress; particularly, to my distinguished and beloved colleague, SOL BLOOM, and to my confrere and very distinguished ranking member of the Judiciary Committee, EMANUEL CELLER, and to the energetic, aggressive, and indomitable SAMUEL DICKSTEIN, or to my scholarly humanitarian friend, Dr. SIROVICH. They will vouch for me—of that I am certain.

Because of its complexity and the cross-current of vicious and unsupported propaganda it is most difficult to discuss the many phases of the tragic events in Europe at the present time which burst without warning. Through the haze, however, there are visible certain and unmistakable evidences of planned destruction, pillage, and flagrant error which threatens civilization and the free government of nations.

In recent months the map of Europe was transformed to suit the ideas of a combination of madmen led by Hitler, who first destroyed the post-war democratic form of government in Germany and then proceeded to persecute all churches including the Catholic and Protestant communions; destroyed the trade-union movement; ruthlessly suppressed Free Masonry and in a fiendish merciless campaign of extermination vented his spleen upon the unfortunate and hapless citizens of the Jewish faith. Every vestige of democracy and freedom which the people of Germany enjoyed under the republic was obliterated. Compromise with opposition changed to blood purges, secret murder, and the establishment of concentration camps. The spying tentacles of the merciless and hated Gestapo were fastened upon the peoples of Germany, Austria, Czechoslovakia, and now, to accomplish complete destruction, upon prostrate Poland.

The Treaty of Versailles, so it is claimed by nazi-ism, was unjust and oppressive. Therefore, it became necessary for Germany to subjugate and destroy her neighbors. This hypocritic wail about the Versailles Treaty is the most brazen insult sponsored by nazi-ism ever to gain hearing by a civilized world. Can anyone express any sympathy for Hitlerized Germany over the terms of the Versailles Treaty when an examination is made of the treaty of Brest-Litovsk and Bucharest which imposed conditions upon vanquished Russia and unfortunate Rumania so severe and burdensome as to perpetuate the enslavement of their peoples? The German militarist aggressor ran amuck five times in the past 75 years, attacking and sacking Denmark, Austria, Belgium, France, and reborn Poland, in addition to the recent cold-blooded and premeditated rape of Czechoslovakia. Germany having lost the World War, the Nazis claim she should have had the privilege of writing her own terms of surrender and to exercise the rights of the conqueror. The Versailles Treaty was not the beginning of any wrong; it was the culminating climax of a crime perpetrated upon her own, as well as other people, by the war lords of Germany. Having conspired with Russia and ungrateful Austria, the militarists of Germany once before partitioned the ancient kingdom of Poland which, according to history, was the bulwark of Christendom and on several occasions the savior of western civilization.

Poland, once the refuge of the oppressed peoples, in its growth and progress became the envy of her neighbors then, as now, and therefore had to be destroyed. The western boundaries of Poland created by the Treaty of Versailles were far inside the ethnic and ancient domain of what was always Polish, not German terrain. The recreated Republic of Poland was but 40 percent as large in area as it once had been. Yet, in spite of the fact that her boundaries at one time extended to the west as far as the Oder River, the brazen and unscrupulous Nazi propagandists are trying to mislead the world, and America in particular, by stating that the western provinces of Poland and the so-called corridor are ancient German crown lands. Similar and baseless propaganda was spread in justification of the conquest of Czechoslovakia. The rankest insult to American intelligence and hospitality is to be found in the official expressions of the Chargé d'Affairs of the Nazi Embassy at Washington which were branded as brazen lies and effrontery by Colonel Hurban, the Minister of the Republic of Czechoslovakia.

An example of recent Nazi generosity is the complete destruction and enslavement of Poland. There is not even a treaty such as the Brest-Litovsk, to say nothing of a comparatively mild Versailles Treaty for Poland to sign. She has been sunk without trace in a sea of despondency and hopelessness, and a flood of blood spilled by the hundreds of thousands of young Polish patriots who fought to maintain their independence and culture against Nazi enslavement as prescribed in a typical Nazi German action. The Versailles Treaty has been shortsighted and unfair, grossly unfair to Poland whose boundaries were contracted to the point of strangulation and so arranged as to make her an easy prey for her treacherous and rapacious neighbor. Over a million eight hundred thousand Poles were damned up within the Reich on soil that was always Polish and never should have been German. Even Danzig, the feigned object of nazi-ism's agression was under Polish jurisdiction and control for 850 of the 1,000 years of its existence. Danzig always lived and could not exist without Polish commerce and trade. Another yipping blatherskite and faker who is responsible for the present war which threatens England's very existence today, rushes into print as a highly paid columnist, critic, and commentator, condemning Poland's leadership and lack of preparedness, demanding to know what was wrong, when as a matter of fact he who did not know, "where is Teschen and what is Teschen," should at least recognize his own handiwork and the strangle hold which he had given Germany over Poland through the establishment of the East Prussian littoral, a boundary within a boundary, and the bastardy of Danzig which were responsible for the plight of Britain's eastern ally.

Were it not for the far-sightedness and persistence of other statesmen who insisted that Poland must repossess in part her ancient coal, iron, and mineral territories, she would not have maintained herself as long as she did. In the second treaty of Versailles statesmen and not ignoramuses must write terms and establish boundaries. The bunglers of the Polish and Palestinian problems should not be permitted to inject themselves where intelligence and fairness should be the guide.

Much propaganda intended to mislead the people and the Congress of the United States and to influence the action of our lawmakers as regards the embargo is being disseminated throughout the United States. Let me here and now declare my position, free from any sentiment, though like the great majority of my fellow Americans, I, too, am naturally inclined toward the democracies, yet, I solemnly state that I am uncompromisingly and unequivocally opposed to America's entry into the war on either side. We must remain neutral, we must treat both sides without favoritism, reserving the right to sell our products of the mine, mill, and factory, as well as of the farm, to any and all nations, neutral or belligerent, for cash in cold-rolled American money to be carried away in their own bottoms and at their own risk. I refuse to be allied with communism and nazi-ism and to be a party to the murder of Dolfuss, the torture of Schusnigg, and the brigandage and destruction visited upon Austria, Czechoslovakia, and Poland, to say naught of offering assistance to commu-nazi-ism which seeks to enslave France and Britain, and which subsequently will reach out to destroy the United States.

Recent events in Poland with the ultimate distintegration and collapse of the armed forces of the Republic brought about expressions of wonderment and speculation as to the real and underlying causes for the ineffective resistance to the admittedly superior and mechanized Nazi forces. According to my best information, the sudden and complete collapse was brought about by Nazi German spies who infested Poland in numbers estimated at from seven hundred thousand to a million. These Nazi spies, supposedly loyal citizens of Poland, were as a matter of fact, with rare exception, each and every one of them, spies and saboteurs. When the unde-

clared war broke out these spies were obliged to follow out their orders by appropriately marking all objectives, cutting lines of communication, and destroying Polish railroads and bridges.

We in America who have been so extremely tolerant toward these un-American and subversive organizations had better recognize the menace and, without temporizing or in any sense compromising, undertake to destroy them before this grave menace shall turn upon America and bring about results which are only too tragically evident in Poland. However deficient Poland may have been in her war equipment or her system of transportation, this had nothing to do with her sudden and complete collapse. The work of the Nazi spy and the saboteur, the traitor within the boundaries of Poland was responsible for her destruction and resultant temporary enslavement.

This problem of Nazi and Communist propaganda is vital, pressing, and one which the Congress of the United States must solve permanently. In the meantime, however, the Department of Justice must very carefully analyze the situation and apply such remedial force as will safeguard the well-being of the Nation.

Knowing something of the knightly chivalry of nazi-ism, I can easily understand why the venerable scientist, President Ignace Moscicki, Marshal Smigly-Rydz, and Chancelor Beck, of Poland, were forced to flee to Rumania. Anyone ought to understand the fate that awaited these patriots. Had they followed the Schusnigg example, they would have been tortured and murdered as were the hapless rulers of Austria. I will not subscribe to any criticism of their actions, as I know only too well what happened to others.

The Catholic Church, of which I am a proud and regular communicant, and my basic American training, have taught me to despise communism and nazi-ism and all for which these stand—godlessness, free love, persecution, and regimentation; the combination of which brings about depravity of the mind, and shriveling of the heart, and the ultimate loss of the soul. Yet, in America today we find men and women of supposedly sound mind following the advice of fakers and Nazi and Communist propagandists—in nearly every instance the paid mouthpieces of their respective masters. The unholy wedlock which created communazi-ism should dispel any and all semblance of doubt regarding the duplicity and downright bestiality of this unholy alliance, for what is lacking in meanness in one is to be found in the other. This same communism which was created, financed, and implanted in Russia by a war-mad and desperate imperialistic German regime will for a certainty destroy the madness of naziism if in the meantime it does not submerge civilization.

The American people are being led to believe by the propagandists that the repeal of the embargo on arms, munitions, and airplanes means American involvement in the European war. The attitude and pronouncements of the President of the United States are a clear indication that the reverse is true. Recent pronouncements by the Pope and such stalwarts of the Catholic Church in America as Father Sheehy and Al Smith confirm my confidence in the President of the United States, whom I propose in this instance to follow.

A large element of misguided Christians, both Catholic and Protestant, has followed, blindly and faithfully, biased pro-Hitler radio champions. A reversal of sentiment, or, as we say, a turn-about-face, will surely follow when the entrenched Nazis and Communists, each in their respective fields of influence in subjugated Poland, begin the organized campaign of suppressing the activities and teachings of the churches of Poland, chiefly of the Roman Catholic Church. In its stead will come the pagan doctrine of the states' mastery over the church, the family, and people. The Society of the Propagation of the Faith will be superseded by the League of the Godless, teaching atheism, free love, and communism; religious communities and various Catholic orders will be dissolved and their properties seized. The fundamental and central ritual of the Holy Mass so essential to Catholic spiritual well-being will be gradually suppressed, and a scandalized and demoralized youth will be taught to laugh at the ancient ceremonial. The militant priesthood, with the primate of Poland at their head, will protest, yea, they will wage war, with the result that churchmen will be sent to concentration camps and even to the block.

The stoning of Cardinal Innitzer's palace followed the occupation of Austria by a fortnight, as I recall. Cardinal Hlond, of Poland, is returning from a pilgrimage to Rome. On his arrival at Warsaw the Nazis may give him a stoning reception such as Innitzer and Faulhaber are already familiar with.

Strange that the American Catholics who shouted long and loud about an internal war between Communists and Nazis in Spain, even to the point where they gave tacit support to the Nazis and Fascists, now assume an attitude of total indifference toward invaded Catholic Poland, that stalwart of the Church of Rome, the buffer against communism and oriental savagery which stood for centuries like a rock unshaken and unafraid. Today not a voice is raised in her behalf among the churchmen even as she lies prostrate and bleeding, crushed by the spiked heels of nazi-ism and communism, which in Spain were at least treading in opposite directions. Where are the voices which cried out in horror over Spain and Mexico; they are silent, inaudible. An exaggerated and sudden consciousness of involvement based on pure sophistry militates against Poland when but a short time ago the same radio voices were raised to a screaming crescendo in behalf of an embargo and subsequently its maintenance in order to aid the same church in another country. That was in Spain; however, this is Poland. I cannot see the difference; and if there be any, it is in favor of the church in Poland, which is in far more danger than it was in Spain.

I shall not be found in the ranks of the false prophets, Roosevelt haters, and windbags yet to be deflated, who knew better than the President and the State Department that there would be no war. I will not subscribe to any plan which will permit the sale and export of metals, crude oil, and minerals used in war or foodstuffs and grain produced in Idaho while shutting off the sale and export of the factory-made products which can be turned out in the city of Detroit, the State of Michigan, and other parts of the country, which will give employment and prosperity to American workmen and businessmen. I favor the sale of our products in this instance, provided the customers will pay cash, come and get their orders, and carry them away in their own vessels at their own risk.

As far as I can foresee, we in America are certain to antagonize one side or the other, depending on what the action of Congress might be. If the embargo is lifted and we choose to exercise our traditional American right of carrying on our commerce and trade with any and all nations, we will offend whom? Soviet Russia and Nazi Germany—a combination which does no business to speak of with America, and which has destroyed our business with Austria, Czechoslovakia, and now for a certainty wiped out our trade with another cash customer—Poland. If we fail to repeal our self-imposed embargo, as recommended by President Roosevelt, we alienate the good will of France, England, and their powerful, high-living-standard dominions, populous territories and colonies, among which we must list Canada as the first, most consistent, and best customer of the United States.

Insofar as I am concerned, if my vote in Congress is to cause Hitler and Stalin to go stark mad, I should prefer that to bringing about the final gasp of Britain, France, and democracy.

The inhuman, barbaric war of the Nazis has projected and accentuated the problem of added hundreds of thousands of refugees in war-torn Poland. Acute as was this same problem affecting the unfortunates of Germany, I can only say now that it has grown in tragic extremity as much as it has increased in numbers.

We in America must unite, must join hands, figuratively and actually, to give such relief as might be possible. We must do this without the loss of a single precious moment. There are countless thousands in blood-drenched, bomb-scarred and charred Poland who thus far survived "nazi-ism's protection" who are doomed to perish of starvation, disease, or exposure to the cold winter blasts unless we in America extend our hands and give substantial aid.

I know you will agree with me when I say that this is no time to make distinctions of any kind as regards relief. It is my philosophy, and I know it to be yours, that the sole and only consideration is humanity, crushed, bleeding, starving, in tragic need of immediate assistance.

And while we dwell upon the question of refugees, a subject that has always been near and dear to my heart, let me call your attention to the fact that the Twenty-fifth Interparliamentary Conference at Oslo, which I attended as a delegate, has taken cognizance of the refugee problem which existed in Germany before the outbreak of the present war. I was privileged to discuss this problem with various members of the social and ethnic committees who sat jointly on Saturday, August 19, discussing the problem of refugees. A motion proposed by a delegate from Great Britain named Bellenger, to the effect that the interparliamentary conference urge upon all governments to take immediate and concerted action to settle the refugee problem by governmental action on a basis of equality between all classes of refugees, was acted upon favorably. It is my belief that the United States Government should take the initiative in this problem and accordingly should bring about the calling together in conference the representatives of the interested and affected governments in order to bring about the earliest possible and complete solution of this problem. I should be very happy to discuss further this idea with members of the American Jewish Congress, for I want to make known that it is my intention to introduce a resolution in Congress calling upon the President of the United States to call such a conference; and I believe it would be desirable to have some expressions of your seasoned and well-considered opinions before I undertake to draft the instrument.

I regret, my friends, that I was obliged to hurriedly sketch for delivery a rambling discourse upon a subject that has such a varied and many-sided perspective. I feel that I have scarcely rendered justice to this important subject. However, I am grateful for the opportunity to present my views and I want to thank Dr. Stephen S. Wise and the American Jewish Congress.

Repeal the Embargo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN KEE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 9, 1939

LETTER FROM HON. JOHN KEE, OF WEST VIRGINIA

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter recently

addressed by myself to Mr. K. B. Thomas, of Bluefield, W. Va., in reference to the Neutrality Act now pending before the Congress.

After receiving my letter, Mr. Thomas called me by telephone and requested permission, which was granted, to read it before a meeting of the Rotary Club in our home city. As the letter briefly expresses my views touching the matter of the proposed repeal of the embargo clause in the present so-called neutrality law, it will serve to make that position clear to other inquirers. The communication is as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *September 30, 1939.*

Mr. K. B. THOMAS,
Secretary-Treasurer, Community Savings & Loan Co.,
Bluefield, W. Va.

MY DEAR MR. THOMAS: I was very happy to receive your recent letter and to note your views upon the all-important legislation that is now being considered by the Congress.

That America should stay out of the war is a settled proposition. No one disputes this fact. All of us want to remain free from entanglement or involvement in the conflict. The only vital issue is the problem of what we ought to do or not to do in order to keep out.

It is my most earnest conviction that our present so-called neutrality law is entirely unneutral. By this law we are violating every national precedent, abrogating a principle of international law, penalizing innocent nations, handcuffing our own people and industries, and lending our aid to the dictators and aggressors. We are denying to the defenseless nations of the world the means of defense against complete destruction.

I am firmly convinced that the embargo clause should be repealed and the cash-and-carry principle established. The carriage, however, of ammunition, munitions of war, and other commodities to belligerent nations upon American ships should be barred. We can then say to these nations that we will loan them no money; we will give them no credit; we will furnish them no soldiers; but, if they will come with the cash, we will sell them our commodities, to be carried away by them on their own ships and at their own risk.

Can anybody point out just how this policy could get us into war? It cannot possibly work that way. During the last war Norway, Sweden, Denmark, and the Netherlands remained neutral—none became involved. And yet none of these states had any embargo on sales and shipments. All of them had a cash-and-carry system similar to that we propose. They even went so far as to let their own ships carry the commodities. They stayed out, and we can stay out.

That our present policy—that is, our embargo upon the shipment of arms and ammunition—is aiding the aggressor nations cannot be disputed. That its repeal will aid the nations which are on the defensive may be true. But which is the more unneutral, to knowingly leave upon our statutes a provision that aids the aggressors, or to do a lawful thing that may help the weak nations in their fight against annihilation?

This will likely be a long war. During its progress the world must be fed and clothed and otherwise supplied. There is no reason on earth why we should bar the peoples of the earth from coming to our doors, buying what they need, and taking it away. It is far better that we thus let our farms, our mills, our mines, and our factories give our people employment than it would be to stop all of our activities and let our unemployed possibly seek to go to war rather than to remain idle.

With my very kindest wishes, I am,
Sincerely yours,

JOHN KEE, M. C.,
Fifth West Virginia District.

Biennial Convention of the National Federation of Post Office Clerks at Houston, Tex., September 6

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT THOMAS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 9, 1939

ADDRESS BY HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH, OF WEST VIRGINIA

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by Hon. JENNINGS RANDOLPH, of West Virginia, at the biennial convention of the National Federation of Post Office Clerks, held at Houston, Tex., on September 6, 1939:

Mr. White, Mr. House, Third Assistant Postmaster General Black, Mr. Martin L. Sweeney, of Ohio, Deputy First Assistant Postmaster General Donaldson, Mr. Lambert, Clerk of the House Committee on Post Office and Post Roads, the officers and members of the National Federation of Post Office Clerks, and ladies and gentlemen, that is a long introduction, but I am sure I didn't miss anyone that I thought might be called in the list of speakers later. I am so sorry that of necessity I will have to leave this convention banquet early this evening. I appreciate the very gracious spirit of cooperation of those who are in charge of tonight's proceedings. They have given me the opportunity to speak first so that I may get away as soon as possible, to board a plane northward.

May I say at the outset that I feel that this organization can feel justly proud of your "big four" at the National Capital. [Applause.] I mean Mr. Otte, Mr. Torka, Mr. Horner, and Mr. George [applause]—and as a Member of the House Civil Service Committee, I should like to speak what is in my heart of hearts, when I say that it is so refreshing for a Member of Congress to deal with representatives of an organization like yours in Washington, men who don't want to drive you into something, but who desire to counsel with you on legislation, and that is what I appreciate, Mr. George, of you and your colleagues. [Applause.]

MERIT SYSTEM GAINS

Of course, there are real gains that are being made from the standpoint of extension of the merit system in the governmental agencies of the United States, gains which should have been made perhaps years ago, but gains nevertheless that are now being carried forward.

Perhaps many of you will not agree with me, but I feel that there should be a court of appeals and a place where your grievances [applause] might be listened to carefully by those with independent judgment, and I have introduced such legislation—just one of many measures dealing with this subject in a way that will bring it to solution.

I am happy to tell you that at this last session of the Seventy-sixth Congress it was found possible to extend the benefits to substitute postal workers in that 15 days' annual vacation was given and 10 days' sick leave, and that is right and proper, and I do feel that the substitutes have this need and I know that they appreciate such help.

I could go into the many phases of merit-system legislation, but, of course, those who are here from the Post Office Department and your own officers have during the earlier session today discussed these matters in detail; other speakers will do likewise. So, if I may have the opportunity for the next few minutes, I would like to talk frankly about some problems that I believe face not only those individuals who are members of the Postal Service of the United States but face all individuals, be they workers in public or in private life. Before I speak just a few moments on one or two subjects of that type, I should like to say this: I believe that in the Government of the United States, in the various agencies, that there is no more loyal or efficient group of workers than are the postal clerks of this Republic. [Applause.] I am not trying, when I make that statement, to say something that is pleasant to your ears, but I do believe—I say this as a member of the House Labor Committee—that I know that the postal clerks of the United States Government will never engage in a sit-down strike against the Government of the United States. [Applause.] I know that of this one branch. As Federal employees, you will recognize not only your opportunity for service in the community where you labor but you understand full well the responsibilities that are upon each and every one of you, and you have and will, I know, continue to discharge those duties in the highest possible American way. [Applause.]

DEMOCRACY VERSUS DICTATORSHIP

Now, let us see for just a moment if we may think just about a problem or two that are perhaps closest to your hearts. It was Sam Houston who was talking to Andy Jackson—Old Hickory, they called the President. Sam Houston was a rather—should I say pioneering, virile type of man, so history tells us, and Sam was saying to Andy that there were a lot of folks who think that in this country we should have more power vested in the President. Then he pointed out that across the waters there were strong men—we call them dictators today—who were in charge of affairs over there and, he said, perhaps we needed a little more of the iron hand. Andy Jackson is supposed to have replied: "Now Sam, after all, there are a lot of browbeaten people in Europe who would be happy to exchange places with those who think that in this country we are not governed properly." Then he went on to say that perhaps it is best that the laws are made by a bunch of ornery Congressmen and administered and carried forward by just the sort of middle-of-the-road President like him. He said, "America is the only land in which you can cuss the President and all the President can do is to cuss back or go fishing." [Laughter.]

That is what Sam Houston and Andy Jackson were talking about 100 years ago, and the people of the world are talking about that same subject today. Contrasting the Old World dictatorship with the New World democracy, men and women throughout the

Republic are attempting these days to keep their feet on the ground and at the same time look into the realities of the situation which faces us.

Now, as for myself—and I know that Congressman SWEENEY will agree with me on this one item—I feel that the United States of America must remain neutral in the conflict which is now raging 3,000 miles across the sea. [Great applause.]

This land of yours and mine is a peace-promoting country, and I believe that, by and large, the men and women of this Nation have certain definite feelings about democracy in its fight against dictatorship, and individually and collectively they express that. I want to reiterate that the Government of the United States, a great democratic Government, with republican institutions which have been fostered here, which have made this Nation great—that this Government of yours and mine has a responsibility to work out its problems here at home and not attempt to be an international police force for the rest of the world. [Great applause.]

PLANES BRING DEATH

War is so much different today than it was even in the last world conflict. The devastation, the destruction, and the damage which will be wrought in this war is not comprehensible to all of us who think of the dire trouble which will beset those people directly engaged. It is but about 2 hours and 45 minutes in a bomber from London to Berlin or vice versa, and only about 2 hours from Paris to Berlin or a return trip. And so in these days wars are not being fought in the front-line trenches between soldiers in uniform, but wars are being fought behind the lines as well, where the noncombatants are faced with a real destructive force of a foe, and women and children and older individuals in the country, whose churches, homes, and schools are in the industrial centers, these are the prey of a war of the present day. And so, when we sit here tonight as men and women who have come together in the land where tolerance prevails, let us not feel so unkindly about any group of individuals in any country participating in this war. I hold no brief, of course, for a single individual who is attempting an aggressive war, but I do say to you tonight that, somehow or other, I believe that if the German people had the right to speak individually at the ballot box, as we have the right, that they wouldn't have voted to enter into a war at this time. [Applause.]

In Washington, not so many days ago, I talked with a Japanese, and I asked him very honestly if he felt that if the people of Japan had the right to say, individually, whether they would be at war with China. He replied: "We would never be in China today if the people of Japan actually held the destiny of our country within their own hands." Tonight, as we meet here and go about our ways, unobstructed by the Government of the United States, with the freedom of press and the freedom of religious worship and expression, and the freedom of speech and a well-rounded working and developing democracy, we should be considerate of what certain people of the world are subjected to at the present time. But let's remember sometimes men and women are forced into conditions where they cannot turn about. And I do feel that in certain sections of Europe tonight, those who lead the people into war are selling their own country short. And somehow or other, perhaps within weeks, perhaps not for months, the people of those countries will revolt and perhaps that will bring about the conclusion of the war, even though the aggressor nation seems to be winning at the present hour.

And now, ladies and gentleman, as I conclude these brief remarks, I believe that in Russia there is dictatorship; in Germany there is dictatorship; in Spain there is dictatorship; in Italy there is dictatorship. And contrasted with these dictatorships we have the democracy of the United States. I really believe that if Hitler were to pass away tonight, there would be a break-up in Germany tomorrow, and in the other countries that I have just named. But, if in the United States of America a tragedy should befall us tonight, in that the President of the United States would pass away, the Vice President of this country would take his place. If he were not there to take the position, the Secretary of State would fill the position, and so on to the rest of the Cabinet members. Although there would be a heavy sadness and sense of loss among the American people, yet this plan of yours and mine, because it does work under a democracy and under republican institutions of government, would continue, and there would be no lag whatsoever in the forward looking progress of our Nation.

PEOPLE SHOULD SPEAK

Now, I have this to say; many of you may not agree with me, but tonight, as we view this world scene of action, see the curtain rise and fall on the various episodes and acts, I believe that the United States of America should not leave to the President of this Republic the right to declare a foreign war; shouldn't even leave it to the Congress of the United States to declare a foreign war. MARTIN SWEENEY, I hope you will agree with me about this—maybe you won't—I believe that the American people, by referendum, should speak their minds about participation in a foreign war to be fought on foreign soil. [Applause and cheers.] Yes, there are enemies from without; enemies that sometimes seem to press close to America. But, my friends, there are enemies within our land who are perhaps even more real tonight than the foes who might attack us from without. I don't want to be misunderstood. Naturalized Americans are just as important to this country as the native-born citizens. We are all descendants of those that came to these shores either at an early or late date. But, we find in the United States today, between 4,000,000 and 6,000,000 individuals who are aliens through and through, and I mean just that. They accept the privileges, they accept the profits, they accept the protection of America and at the same time they do not accept the responsibilities of citizenship in the land in which they live. [Applause.] They hold, by the hundreds of thousands, jobs in industry, commerce, and business, and every one of those jobs should go to American citizens. [Applause.] They bore from within the labor organizations of this country and spread discord and cause unnecessary strikes and with lying tongue and false prophecy they try to tear down institutions of home and church and school, which, if some may call them old-fashioned, are nevertheless the foundation stones upon which America has been built. I don't want to talk drastically just for the minute or two that I have remaining but, ladies and gentlemen, I am firmly convinced that we in the United States of America today must increasingly square our shoulders against the evils within. We must say to these men and women, "If you don't desire to become American citizens, then America should rid itself of you." [Applause.]

BUND IS UN-AMERICAN

Not so many months ago, in New York City on George Washington's birthday, there were some 18,000 men and women who gathered in Madison Square Garden under the auspices of the German-American Bund. They came ostensibly to pay tribute to the Father of His Country, yet what they came for was to denounce this country and all its institutions. I looked up the name of the organization—the meaning of the word "bund," and I found in Webster's dictionary that it meant "bound," and I said to myself—I hope I express your thoughts in this statement—"I would like to see each and everyone of those individuals bound for the country from whence they came." [Applause.]

Now, my friends, it was 150 years ago that George Washington said, "Citizens of a common country by birth or choice, that country has a right to consecrate your fullest affections." He told the truth, a truth which grows with every year. I have introduced in the Congress of the United States legislation which is being considered now by the House Committee on Immigration and Naturalization—not a drastic piece of legislation, but as I conceive it very proper piece of legislation, and it is simply this: We will pass a law which will be enforced, and it will say in effect to each and every individual who is not a citizen of the United States, but who lives in this country, "We give you 365 days in which to declare your intention of becoming a citizen of this country, and if at the end of that period you have not so signified, this land will take you into custody and deport you to the country from which you came." [Applause.] [Cheers.]

Mr. House and Mr. George, and all those who are officers of this organization, to everyone here, I am deeply appreciative of this opportunity which you have given me tonight to participate thus briefly in what I know is to be a very fine, pleasant, and profitable convention. It is my first visit in Houston, where my good colleague, ALBERT THOMAS lives, and I only wish that I might have the time to remain here and meet with you in your gatherings, listen to the splendid addresses that I know will follow tonight, tomorrow, and on the days of the week until you have closed your convention. I won't be taking my seat because I will have to leave.

Good luck; God bless you all. [Convention rose with great applause.]

Thomas S. McMillan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER CHANDLER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 9, 1939

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. Speaker, THOMAS S. MCMILLAN was one of the most useful and valuable Members of Congress, and, by his passing away, his colleagues in the House of Representatives have lost an able and conscientious associate, and the people of South Carolina and the United States a faithful and distinguished public servant.

Representative MCMILLAN brought to the House of Representatives in 1925 extensive experience as a teacher, lawyer, agriculturist, and legislator, and applied his training, his talents, his keen mind, and active body very effectively to his duties. A skillful parliamentarian and debater, it was exceedingly difficult, if not well-nigh impossible, to defeat him on the floor whenever he opposed an amendment to an appropriation bill. He was direct, frank, and unafraid in

the discussion of legislation, his manner was persuasive, and his reasons cogent.

Personally, TOM MCMILLAN was genial, courteous, and affable. His death in the meridian of life deprives us of a friend, but it is always consoling to know that life does not consist primarily in the number of years that we live. Representative MCMILLAN crowded into half a century a record of abundant accomplishment and generous service to his fellow man.

There Should Be No Politics or Partisanship in Connection With Pending Neutrality Legislation—Cash-and-Carry Plan Is Practical

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 9, 1939

CORRESPONDENCE CONCERNING PENDING NEUTRALITY LEGISLATION

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following correspondence between the managing editor of the United States News and myself, and also a letter I have written to a constituent on the subject of the pending neutrality legislation:

THE UNITED STATES NEWS,
Washington, D. C., September 11, 1939.

Hon. JENNINGS RANDOLPH,
United States Representative,
Elkins, W. Va.

DEAR MR. RANDOLPH: As you know, President Roosevelt has canceled a proposed radio address on Democratic Women's Day on the ground that national unity must come before political or partisan considerations.

At the same time the White House has indicated the imminence of a call for a special session of Congress at which it is apparently hoped to limit debate in order to drive through revision of the Neutrality Act which would remove the embargo on arms to belligerents.

Because the issue is of immediate importance and because it is one whose ramifications embrace all shades of political philosophy, the United States News has addressed to national political leaders and statesmen the following question:

"Are you, or are you not, of the opinion that under present conditions 'politics should be adjourned' while the administration attempts to discharge its grave responsibility to the people?"

Because we believe your views are authoritative, we ask you this question. We would appreciate, therefore, a letter of 300 to 500 words, by air mail or otherwise, by or before Friday, September 15, for publication in our issue of September 18. We will take pleasure in sending you a copy of the issue in which your answer appears.

Sincerely yours,

E. WORTH HIGGINS,
Managing Editor.

ELKINS, W. VA., *September 14, 1939.*

Mr. E. WORTH HIGGINS,
Managing Editor, The United States News,
Twenty-second and M Streets NW., Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. HIGGINS: Replying to your letter of September 11, and answering specifically your question, I am pleased to state as follows:

Under the present conditions I am strongly convinced that there should be an adjournment of so-called politics, and that the full strength of the national administration be directed toward its realistic responsibilities to the American people. It will be recalled, and I believe there is rather general agreement on this subject, that President Roosevelt met in 1933 a most grave national crisis. Through his leadership and courageous action he carried through those dark days splendidly, and there was a united citizenship behind him. The country responded, and there was a minimum of partisanship. We were a united people.

On the eve of a special session it is my considered opinion that the President once again has indicated that there must be unity prior to any political considerations. I sincerely believe that the President means to do everything possible to keep the United States out of this foreign war. In my individual capacity as a Member of the House of Representatives, it shall be my purpose to cooperate toward that desired end. I feel that belief is shared by the great majority of my colleagues, regardless of their party affiliations.

It has been gratifying to me to know that the President on September 20 will meet the congressional key men from both major political parties of the present administration. I feel that such conferences can be most valuable, and there must be in these coming crucial days the fullest cooperation between the major sections of our Congress. Individually, I am of the feeling that the cash-and-carry proposal is needed. I voted for such a provision during the first session of the Seventy-sixth Congress.

The American people desire fervently to stay out of the present European conflict. There can be no doubt of that. We must have a united front. Let us avoid war. Let us promote peace.

Very sincerely yours,

JENNINGS RANDOLPH.

SEPTEMBER 28, 1939.

I have your good letter of September 26 and deeply appreciate your writing me as you have on this vital question of neutrality.

I believe we all have a single objective at this time, and that is to keep the United States out of war. In my individual capacity as a Member of the House of Representatives it shall be my purpose to cooperate in every way humanly possible toward that desired end. I feel this is also the purpose of the great majority of my colleagues, regardless of their party affiliations.

It is only natural that public opinion should differ as to the best means to accomplish this, and we are all able to hear and read free and unbiased discussion on the question of peace and neutrality. It is my purpose as your Representative to see that we have true neutrality, and I am of the honest and sincere belief that the cash-and-carry proposal is the logical way to accomplish this. I voted for such a provision during the first session of the Seventy-sixth Congress, prior to the present crisis. I sincerely believe that the present arms-embargo provision is neither a guarantee of peace nor a means of enforcing true neutrality, since it may easily operate in such a way as to be entirely nonneutral in its effect.

The American people desire fervently to stay out of the present conflict and I consider it my solemn duty to see that the best possible legislative action is taken in an effort to prevent this country from becoming involved. I know that the people, the Congress, and the President are united in this earnest endeavor.

Most sincerely,

JENNINGS RANDOLPH.

Neutrality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. MILLER

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 9, 1939

RADIO ADDRESS BY WILLIAM J. MILLER, OF CONNECTICUT

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me yesterday over the radio:

A week before the convening of the present special session of Congress I had the pleasure of talking to you over these facilities on the subject of neutrality and the proposed repeal of the existing arms embargo.

Since that evening the special session has been convened. A joint session of the Senate and House of Representatives heard President Roosevelt deliver an important message. This joint session was noticeably different from the joint session that listened to the President last January. It was a subdued gathering. The President's voice sounded serious, and one could have heard a pin drop in that huge House Chamber as the President read his message. The Members of the Senate and House listened attentively, realizing that the decision they would soon be called upon to make might well decide the question of peace or war.

The President made two important recommendations: (1) That Congress repeal the existing embargo on arms, ammunition, and implements of war, and, as he expressed it, go back to international law; (2) that our neutrality law be amended so as to prevent American ships and nationals from entering a war zone. As I listened to the reading of these two recommendations I was startled by the inconsistency of suggesting repeal of the arms embargo and a return to international law, while in the next breath it was suggested that we waive our unquestioned rights under international law and keep our ships and citizens out of war zones. While it may be inconsistent, I agree, however, that in an effort to prevent our becoming involved in a foreign war we should waive our rights and keep out of combat areas.

The President assured the country that it was his intention to do all in his power to prevent our entering into the war now raging in Europe. He asked for suspension of partisanship. It is apparent

now that partisanship will not enter into this neutrality debate. Party lines are split wide open as they should be. Suspending partisanship does not mean, however, that debate will or should be limited. Now is the time for full, free, and frank discussion of all phases of this difficult problem. I have already given you my word, and I repeat it today, I will not be influenced by partisanship nor will I be influenced by the effect of my position or vote may have on my chances of reelection next year, and most certainly I will not be influenced by any possible dollar profits that may come to anyone as a result of any action taken by Congress.

At the outset you may be interested in a brief explanation of the parliamentary situation that exists in Congress on this important subject. You will recall that last June the House of Representatives finally passed the so-called Bloom neutrality bill. As passed by the House this bill continued the arms-embargo provision but did not include any restriction on American ships nor American citizens going into a war zone or combat area. I will explain why that provision was left out in a few minutes. The approved Bloom bill was then sent over to the Senate where the Senate Foreign Relations Committee voted not to report the bill out to the Senate at that time. Following the opening of the present special session, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee decided to use this bill as the vehicle to enact into law the President's recommendations. They did, however, strike out all of the provisions of the Bloom bill except its title and started all over to write a new bill. Because of that situation the new neutrality measure is now before the Senate. Following action by the Senate, the bill will probably be returned to the House where, in all probability, it will then be referred to a conference committee to iron out the differences between the bills as they passed the House and Senate. If that procedure is followed, the matter may come before the House on the question of accepting or rejecting the conference report and under the rules of the House debate would be limited to but 1 hour—30 minutes for each side. In that way the House would be gagged. Leaders in the House are now studying the rules to see if some way cannot be found whereby the whole question of neutrality and repeal of the arms embargo cannot be debated at least for a reasonable time by a motion to instruct the House conferees to insist on certain provisions. I am hopeful that adequate debate will not be prevented and that we can get a record vote in the House as they will soon have in the Senate. I will oppose any effort to gag the House.

In my last broadcast I summarized the provisions of the existing neutrality law section by section. It might be interesting for my listeners to have the resolution now being debated in the Senate summarized at this point. The proposed law written by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee is known as House Joint Resolution 306. Section 1, paragraph A, provides that whenever the President, or the Congress, by concurrent resolution, shall find that there exists a state of war between foreign states and that it is necessary to promote the security or preserve the peace of the United States, or to protect the lives of citizens of the United States, the President shall issue a proclamation naming the states involved and he shall later add other states if they become involved. Paragraph B provides simply that when the war that caused the issuing of the proclamation ends, the President shall so proclaim the fact. Section 2 provides that after the President shall have proclaimed a state of war to exist as provided in section 1, it shall be unlawful for any American vessel to carry any passengers or any articles or materials to any state named in the proclamation. Paragraph B provides a penalty of $50,000 fine or 5 years in prison, or both. Paragraph C makes it illegal to export anything to a belligerent until title has been transferred to the belligerent.

Another paragraph provides that it shall be legal for American vessels to transport anything at all on or over lakes, rivers, and inland waters bordering on the United States, or to transport by aircraft on or over lands bordering on the United States. This section simply means that anything at all—arms, munitions, wheat, and whatnot—could be shipped into Canada via the Great Lakes or even on or over the Rio Grande into Mexico.

Section 3 relates to combat areas and provides that after the issuing of a proclamation under section 1 the President shall by proclamation define combat areas, and thereafter it shall be unlawful for any American vessel or any American citizen to proceed into or through such combat areas. A penalty of $50,000 fine or 5 years in prison, or both, shall be imposed on any shipowner, and $10,000 fine, or 2 years, or both, shall be imposed on any citizen who violates this provision. Section 4 excepts vessels chartered by the American Red Cross. Section 5 makes it unlawful for an American citizen to travel on a belligerent ship. Section 6 prohibits the arming of American vessels. Section 7 makes it unlawful to purchase or sell the bonds of a belligerent, except that the President can make an exception in the case of ordinary commercial credits and short-time obligations in aid of legal transactions. Any exceptions made by the President shall be reported to Congress every 6 months. Section 8 prohibits the raising of funds within the United States except under regulations issued by the President, where the funds are to be used for medical aid or for food and clothing to relieve human suffering. Section 9 provides that the act shall not apply in the case of American republics in war against non-American states. Section 10 prohibits any vessel leaving an American port to carry men, fuel, supplies, or dispatches to a belligerent warship. Section 11 makes it unlawful for a belligerent submarine or armed merchant vessel to enter a United States port. Section 12 continues the existing National Munitions Control Board with very broad powers to control the munitions industry. The balance of the resolution relates to regulations, definitions, and so forth. You will recall that many sections of the proposed new law are similar to the existing neutrality law.

The important changes are the repeal of the embargo on arms, ammunition, and implements of war; the setting up of a cash-and-carry, or, to be truthful, a limited credit-and-carry provision on all shipments to nations at war; and the preventing of American vessels or American citizens from entering a combat area to be defined by the President. There is nothing in the new proposal preventing neutrals from transshipping to belligerents. There is bound to be much debate on this latter restriction, for while it undoubtedly will go a long way toward preventing us from becoming involved in a war, it will be a difficult section to write in such a way that it will not work undue hardship on American shipowners. Under this section, for example, New England fishing vessels will be unable to even go to Newfoundland to dry their codfish while Great Lakes vessels will be permitted to take anything and everything into Canada. So much for the provisions of the new bill.

During the past 10 days several Member of the Senate, in addition to speaking in the Senate, have broadcast on the subject of neutrality. I have listened to many of these broadcasts and it seems to me that an effort is being made by those who favor repealing the arms embargo to accuse those who would continue that embargo with being opposed to any change of the neutrality law. Such is not the case as I will show later. Anyone familiar with the situation that prevailed in Congress during the last regular session will agree that the cash-and-carry provision relating to commodities not covered in the arms-embargo section could have been reenacted with little or no opposition. The cash-and-carry provision expired, under the terms of the act in May 1939, and the administration made no effort to reenact that section. It is interesting to refer to the debate on the floor of the House, when the so-called Bloom bill was being considered. I would like to quote to you from page 7990 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 27, 1939, which covers the remarks made by Hon. LUTHER A. JOHNSON, ranking Democratic member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee. I quote: "Mr. Speaker, for the information of the House, I am authorized to announce, in order to eliminate certain features of the bill which are objectionable to some Members of the House, the acting chairman of the committee [Mr. BLOOM], after consulting with a majority of the Democratic members of the committee, and with their concurrence and support will offer amendments to change the bill as reported, in the following particulars: (1) In section 2 of the bill strike out the provision making it unlawful for citizens of the United States to travel on vessels of belligerent nations and substitute in lieu thereof 'that no citizen of the United States shall travel upon vessels of belligerent nations except at his own risk'; (2) strike out all of section 3 relating to areas of combat operations." Section 3, which was referred to by Mr. JOHNSON, would have made it unlawful for citizens of the United States or vessels flying the flag of the United States to proceed through any areas defined from time to time by the President to be areas of combat operations and so specified in his proclamation.

This quotation certainly makes it clear that the responsibility for taking that provision out of the Bloom bill rests definitely with the administration. When it came to the final vote on the Bloom bill I voted, first, to recommit the bill to the Foreign Affairs Committee, but when that motion failed I voted against adoption of the bill. I voted against the Bloom bill in spite of the fact that it contained an arms-embargo provision, partly because it did not prohibit American vessels and American citizens from entering the war zone. This certainly refutes the accusation of my friend Reader, that those who voted against the Bloom bill favored allowing American citizens and American vessels to enter war zones. Previous addresses have made my stand clear on this point.

The country, and I think the Congress, approves of most of the recommendations made by the President. If it were not for the controversy over the repeal of the arms embargo, I am sure the balance of the President's recommendations could be enacted into law almost over night. We are willing to keep our ships and our citizens out of the war zones but it is going to be difficult to adequately define war zones or combat areas in a way that will not work unnecessary hardship on our normal commerce. There will be very little opposition to adopting a cash-and-carry provision as to commodities not covered by the arms, ammunition, and implements of war embargo section. There will be opposition, however, to the extending of even 90 days' credit on these commodities. During my last broadcast I expressed a fear that the terms of cash and carry could not and would not be lived up to very long. I said at that time that it would not be very long after the adoption of cash and carry until we would have a request for limited credit and soon after that for unlimited credit. We have already reached the limited credit request, even before adoption of cash and carry. We are asked to approve "limited credit and carry."

Last Tuesday evening Senator NORRIS, who favors repeal of the arms embargo, said during an address over the radio that it is so clear to him that the President's proposed Neutrality Act revisions improve the present law "that it is difficult for him to understand the attitude of those who are opposed to any change." Personally I do not know of a single Member of Congress who is opposed to any change, but I ask, in the name of all that is reasonable, why it is necessary to repeal the arms embargo in order to strengthen our Neutrality Act by further restricting our citizens by keeping them, along with American ships, out of war zones. I repeat, Why is it necessary to repeal the arms embargo and make of this country an arsenal for one combatant in order to enact new provisions that have been proposed to strengthen our neutrality? The

question is not shall we repeal the embargo or keep the law as it is. We can keep the embargo and otherwise improve the present law.

During the opening debate in the Senate Senator BORAH asked just who was asking for the repeal of our arms embargo and where the demand was coming from. Was it from our farmers? Was it from labor? Was it from World War veterans? Was it from our clergy or those seated in our church pews? Was it from young men of war age, or was it from fathers and mothers of America? This question has not as yet been answered on the floor of the Senate.

It might be well for us to pause and reflect as to what the demands may be that require the repeal of the arms embargo at this time. The most frequently stated argument is the rather empty one that the embargo should be repealed because it has not "worked." This argument can, of course, be easily refuted in reference to the application of the embargo in the Spanish civil war or the Ethopian war, and the fact that its functioning did not threaten our neutrality in any way. There seems to be no other argument left, other than the one which holds that retaining the embargo will react to the benefit of Germany. This is undoubtedly a valid argument and, as such, must be weighed against the stronger argument for continuance, in that repeal would be an unneutral act. Almost without exception, those persons with whom I have discussed the subject and who favor repeal, have, at some point in the argument, made the statement that we must stop Hitler. Such motives, insofar as they color the argument and reasoning of these advocates of repeal, are not neutral and I repeat, neutrality is what we have told the world we would maintain.

It has been said that it would be impossible to prevent neutral countries such as Italy and Russia, from securing munitions here and shipping them into Germany. In an aside I might add that it now appears that the partnership of Italy and Germany has been dissolved. We had an opportunity to see how that worked out during the war in Spain. We found that certain munitions which had been shipped to a neutral found their way into Spain. I am told that it was not too difficult for our representatives abroad to trace such shipments. In fact, some such shipments were traced to Spain. Even under the existing law, it is my understanding that the section of the law relating to the munitions control board is broad enough to allow them to refuse a license to ship further munitions to a given neutral if the board had reason to believe that they were to be shipped to a belligerent or used in place of munitions that the neutral had shipped to a belligerent.

Before I go on with the discussion of the question of repealing our arms embargo, I would like to briefly refer to some of the mail I have received since the opening of the special session. Certain columnists have said that the letters being received by Members of the House and Senate are inspired by Moscow and Berlin. I deplore that statement. It seems to me that such a statement is an insult to those sincere men and women who are honestly disturbed at the possibility of our being drawn into another war. The first 10 days of this special session brought me 2,380 letters, telegrams, and postal cards, of which only 204 favored repealing the arms embargo. Undoubtedly many of these letters were inspired by radio appeals but, on the whole, I am convinced that the vast majority of them were written by citizens who were only making use of their right of petition and who desired only to make known their views as to whether the arms embargo should or should not be repealed. In the mail I have received are letters from some of our leading manufacturers in Connecticut; from executives in some of our largest insurance companies; from two of our largest brokers; from numerous business and professional men, and from priests and ministers. Many of these letters were far from being expressions of other people's ideas; they were carefully thought out, and presented very convincing arguments in support of the position they were taking. I think I am being truthful when I say that I have read every letter which has come into the office and I am convinced that, with few exceptions, they are from constituents whose sincerity or Americanism cannot be questioned. Certainly there is room for honest difference of opinion when we discuss such a far-reaching subject as revision of our neutrality legislation. I have tried to answer every communication but in some cases the address was insufficient so may I again urge those who write to me to make sure the full name and address is given.

In the remaining time available I will try to confine myself to a discussion of some of the pros and cons of the arms-embargo-repeal dispute, but before I go on, it might be well to repeat what I said a month ago—the existing neutrality law containing the embargo provision was enacted in 1935 and reenacted in 1937 by an almost unanimous vote of both the Senate and House, it was approved by the President and to a large extent by the press, and the people of the United States. It was enacted for but one purpose—not to prevent wars in Europe but to lessen the likelihood of our becoming involved in some future foreign war. Thus far, wherever applied, it has worked as intended. The adoption of the existing law served as notice to the world that henceforth it was to be our policy during a war period. It was notice that we would not supply arms, ammunition, or implements of war to any nations that in the future found themselves involved in a war. Its adoption was accepted as a step toward peace.

During a recent debate on the radio I have heard it said that we cannot alter our neutrality law now that war has broken out because it would be unneutral to change the law. That is not exactly a correct statement. I do not contend that there may not be changes made upon the part of neutrals during the progress of war but there cannot be changes which would effect, unequally, the belligerent nations or which do not respect the interest of the belligerent nations as they prevailed at the time the original law was established. To change a neutrality law or rule with the motive of affecting or aiding certain belligerents is a distinct violation of international law. Changes may be made in neutrality during war but only in the direction of tightening or safeguarding a country's neutrality and not in the direction of relaxing it. This fact is supported by some of the most outstanding authorities in the United States on international law.

A few weeks ago I inquired of our State Department as to what persons they considered outstanding authorities on this subject of international law and neutrality in the United States. I have communicated with some of these persons whose names were given to me and, without exception, they all agree that to repeal the arms embargo, under existing circumstances, would be unneutral and illegal. The opinions come from such authorities as Professors Philip C. Jessup and Charles Cheney Hyde, of Columbia University; Professors Samuel F. Bemis and Dr. A. Whitney Griswold, of Yale. I quote, in part, from a statement made by Professors Jessup and Hyde: "To be more precise, if the Congress, in order to strengthen the sinews of France and England, removes the present embargo so as to enable those powers to gain a distinct advantage over their enemy, the United States makes itself in fact the ally of those who secure its sustenance. But, more than that, such conduct is illegal as well as unneutral and may, if resorted to, place the Nation in a most embarrassing and even hypocritical position when it undertakes to assert its neutral rights, which Secretary Hull recently announced we had not abandoned." It certainly seems to me that it would be presumptuous on the part of a freshman Congressman to ignore the opinions of such men—men who, in the past have acted as counselors to our State Department and men whose Americanism, ability, and honesty cannot be questioned.

In talking this matter over with my colleagues I have come to the conclusion that there are three schools of thought on this subject of repealing the arms embargo: (1) There are those who honestly feel that the embargo should be repealed as a step toward peace; (2) there are those who feel that the embargo should be continued as an aid to continued peace; and (3) there are those who feel we should repeal the arms embargo and openly aid our former Allies, regardless of neutrality. The third group is frankly honest. With respect to the group interested in aid to Britain and France and abandonment of neutrality, it might be interesting to note here that in the past few days printed cards have been coming into the office with the message "Help the Allies now to win so our men will never be necessary. Cash and carry." This, I think all will agree, is not neutrality or any semblance of neutrality. I am sure that the overwhelming majority of our citizens are in favor of keeping out of war and, while our sympathies may lie with one side or the other and we may have strong feelings against those who brought about the existing war, certainly the Congress should ignore its personal feelings and legislate in such a way that we will not become involved in the present war.

During the present session I received a letter from one of my constituents who claimed that France and Britain were helpless victims of a cruel aggressor. Let's consider that situation for a moment. It is hard to visualize Britain and France as helpless victims. After all, Great Britain is a huge empire. In India alone they have a population of more than 350,000,000. Britain has huge natural resources in Canada and other parts of the Empire. France is also a far-flung empire, and I cannot believe that they are in dire need of any material help from the United States, even if we were in a position to aid them; certainly not for some time to come. Assuming for the moment that those who contend it is our duty to aid the Allies are correct, is it right to say this is also our fight but we will aid you only if you pay us in cash? I have said before to those who favor our intervention, that if that is the desire of the American people we should forget neutrality and openly and frankly say we are taking sides in the dispute; that we are going to aid our former Allies with munitions and airplanes; and that if they need loans, we will grant them loans. And, if manpower is needed, we stand ready to provide manpower. There may be some who would take that position at this time, but I am confident that they are in the minority. Several who advocate repeal of our neutrality legislation and a return to international law argue that the present law does not make sense inasmuch as wheat and oil may be as essential to a warring nation as munitions and airplanes. However, it is well to recall that international law has always made a difference between arms, ammunition, and implements of war and other nonmilitary commodities. The term "materials of war" is sufficiently broad so that the embargo could be extended to include any and all materials used by military or naval forces of countries at war. Those who advocate a return to international law are overlooking the fact that the question of international law and of what use could be made of it was thoroughly discussed at the time Congress framed the existing embargo statute. It was all considered and debated and the opinion was almost unanimous that while international law had its place in the whole scheme for peace, there were other things which individual nations ought to do and had to do in order to advance the cause of peace and especially there were things that should be done but could not be done under international law alone. During the Senate hearings on the embargo section of our law in 1937, our

State Department, speaking through its counsel, said to the committee: "I do not see how you can expect to keep out of war if you are going to place your reliance on international law."

The enactment of the law against the sale of arms and ammunition has ample precedent in the laws of other countries. The most distinguished authorities on international law have stated that the right to do so is clear. Such a celebrated authority as John Bassett Moore says: "There are already various countries which, in accordance with their laws, impose such a ban"—that is, a ban on the sale of arms and munitions. Professor Jessup, one of the most distinguished authorities on international law, to whom I referred a moment ago, said that there is nothing novel in a neutral's assuming the duty not imposed by international law of prohibiting its nationals from engaging in the contraband trade.

I have been able to find no citation under international law or no practice which denies the right of a nation to prohibit the sale of arms and munitions. Belgium and Switzerland placed an embargo on munitions during the Franco-Prussian War; during the Spanish war, the Netherlands placed an embargo on arms; during the Russo-Japanese War, Sweden did likewise. Then we followed the same practice during the Ethiopian war and in the recent Spanish war, this Government especially endorsed the enactment of this principle. I have been informed by our State Department that there are 10 other neutral nations who have an arms-embargo law or who restrict the sales of arms and ammunition by refusal to grant licenses for their export. I have been informed by the Swedish Legation that, contrary to many statements published in our newspapers, Sweden refused to export arms, ammunition, and war matériel to either side during the World War. The Norwegian Legation has also advised me that arms and ammunition are included in a general embargo provision in that country. Other countries which are operating under an embargo provision are the Netherlands, Switzerland, Denmark, Finland, Brazil, Haiti, Honduras, and El Salvador.

It is claimed by some that by placing an Arms Embargo Act we departed from the principle of international law and denied to those who desired to purchase arms a right which they had under international law. It would certainly be difficult to support the contention that the embargo on arms denies any nation any right they possessed under international law.

If time permitted, I could go on presenting reasons that cause me to oppose the repeal of the embargo on arms, ammunition, and implements of war. During the campaign I promised you I would work for a strengthening of our national defense, that I would suport legislation that would maintain this country as a neutral nation in any future foreign war.

Because I am honestly convinced that it would be an unneutral act to repeal our embargo law and that such repeal might well prove to be but a step toward war, I shall, when given the opportunity, vote against repeal of the embargo on arms, ammunition, and implements of war.

If we refrain from committing what many authorities contend would be an unneutral act, if we maintain an honest neutrality, what nation on the face of the earth will commit an overt act or bring about an incident that will cause us to go to war? What nations, if any, have indicated any hostility toward us? I pray that we may continue at peace and remain friendly with all nations for all time.

I Am Proud of My Membership in Committee To Keep America Out of War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 9, 1939

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I am a member of the National Committee To Keep America Out of War and I am proud of it.

I became a member of this committee because I believe its objective to be a worthy and important one. Its founders, officers, and members are individuals of unquestionable patriotism, integrity, and responsibility.

I am certain that no one can justly criticize the methods pursued by the National Committee to Keep America Out of War to achieve its objective.

I do not assume, of course, that anyone expects or anticipates an apology from any Member for holding membership in this committee because I cannot for a moment conceive that any member of such a committee would feel called upon to apologize for or defend his connection and activities with an organization such as this, and composed of such individuals who make up this committee working for the objective to which this committee is devoted.

It would be difficult for any fair-minded person to find a valid reason why any good American citizen should attack the National Committee To Keep America Out of War or any of its officers or members.

Instead of its officers or members having to defend themselves for their connection with the National Committee To Keep America Out of War it would rather appear that anyone who attacks the committee or its activities should explain their real reasons therefore.

Who Starts the War Machine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. THORKELSON

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 9, 1939

Mr. THORKELSON. Mr. Speaker, as I read statements on neutrality by private and public correspondents and writers on that subject, I become more impressed with the confusion that exists in the minds of those who write. The Neutrality Act is highly controversial because it is impractical. Neutrality, on the other hand, is not.

Those who, in 1935, constructed the neutrality legislation did not design an arbor for neutrality, but paved a highway to war. They drafted legislation to destroy foreign trade and to persecute business. They set up another board for the invisible government at the expense of the taxpayers. The only neutral part of the act is the word "neutrality." The rest of it is similar to other New Deal legislation, for it is cockeyed.

I shall now digress from this subject to discuss, paragraph by paragraph, a statement by the Secretary of State, which was released on September 14, but received by me on October 4, 1939:

CHANGE OF NEUTRALITY POLICY IN TIME OF WAR

(Statement by the Secretary of State)

The Secretary of State made the following statement at the press conference on September 14 regarding neutrality:

"The Government of the United States has not abandoned any of its rights as a neutral under international law. It has, however, for the time being prescribed, by domestic legislation, certain restrictions for its nationals which have the effect of requiring them to refrain from the exercise of privileges which but for such legislation they would have the right to exercise under international law, such as the right to travel on belligerent vessels, to make loans and extend credits to belligerent governments, et cetera. These restrictive measures do not and cannot constitute a modification of the principles of international law but rather they require nationals of the United States to forego, until the Congress shall decide otherwise, the exercise of certain rights under those principles. Furthermore, this Government gives the widest possible notice to American shipping regarding danger areas as the information is acquired by it. This Government also warns American nationals and American shipping against actual danger in any other respect as situations involving such danger are brought to its attention, whether those situations result from lawful or unlawful activities of the belligerents. It endeavors to exercise all due diligence in the protection of American lives and property and, of course, must expect American nationals likewise to exercise due diligence in keeping clear of danger—actual or potential."

It occurs to me that other nations do not care if we abandon international law, for it is our loss. What they object to is an attempt by us to enforce our neutrality legislation outside the 3-mile limit.

Domestic legislation is purely a local matter, and should not be confused with international law. However, when we attempt to enforce our own rules outside of the 3-mile limit, we challenge the right of every power in the world. We do exactly that in the Neutrality Act, and if an attempt is made to enforce the act, it means war, with such powers as object to our enforcement.

In the letters which I addressed to Senator PITTMAN and Representative BLOOM on May 27, 1939, I stated the situation as follows:

"The rights of our nationals under international law may properly be restricted by our own legislation along certain lines for the purpose of avoiding incidents which might involve us in a conflict.

In indicating certain restrictions upon the exercise of our rights as a neutral I do not wish to be considered as advocating the abandonment of these, or, indeed, of any, neutral rights; but there is reasonable ground for restricting at this time the exercise of these rights."

It is not our nationals that provoke incidents or cause for war. It is, instead, the administration itself. It is even ridiculous for the Secretary to intimate that anyone except the administration and agents of interested powers are responsible for provoking incidents that will lead us into war.

The principles of international law as regards neutrals and belligerents have been evolved through the centuries. While belligerents have frequently departed from these principles on one pretext or another, and have endeavored to justify their action on various grounds, the principles still subsist.

The Secretary is correct that "the principles of international law as regards neutrals and belligerents have been evolved through the centuries." The question may now be asked, Why did this administration depart from such principles in 1935, and why is the administration interested in enacting legislation at this time that is contrary to such principles? It is statements such as the Secretary of State released that bring about confusion and suspicion of Federal departments and bureaus.

This Government, adhering as it does to these principles, reserves all rights of the United States and its nationals under international law and will adopt such measures as may seem most practical and prudent when those rights are violated by any of the belligerents.

In this paragraph, the Secretary of State appears to be threatening a mythical enemy. What nation has he in mind? If he knows, why not say so? If the State Department is so concerned over our nationals, why did the Department submit to the treatment they received in Mexico and some South American republics? Why did the State Department fail to object to Japan's attitude in China, particularly after the sinking of one of our ships? After these rebuffs, why did the State Department sell the *DC–4?*

JAPANESE LINE BUYS AMERICA'S LARGEST LAND PLANE

SANTA MONICA, CALIF., August 15.—America's largest land plane, the Douglas *DC–4*, has been sold to the Japan Air Transport Line.

A Douglas Aircraft Co. announcement said both United States military and State Department officials favored the sale as a move to build up America's production capacity. They added it would not hamper national defense.

The *DC–4* weighs 65,000 pounds and carries 42 passengers. Sale price for the ship and drawings for its assembly abroad was given as $725,000.

Over a hundred million dollars has been spent directly or indirectly through Government contracts in developing the power plant of this ship, and in addition to that, scores of fine instruments and accessories were also included in the sale of the ship. It is not that a private concern has no right to sell its merchandise, but why allow a ship of this type to be sold to any nation when it may furnish engineering plans, and why include blueprints for construction? It is not difficult to knock the ship down and build machinery to reproduce the same ship on commercial scale. This ship was developed by the air lines of this country at a reputed prototype cost of $2,000,000 over a period of 3 years. It was finally tested on June 7, 1938.

By taking out the commercial equipment and substituting the necessary bomb racks and armament, it would be possible to place aboard 10 of the 1,100-pound bombs—more bomb tonnage than was dropped on the metropolitan area of London during the whole World War—and start out on a trip, and imagine what might happen if the ship is found somewhere along the California coast.

The *DC–4* left Burbank May 22 last and flew to Oakland, to Salt Lake City, to Cheyenne, with block-to-block cruising speed of 207 miles per hour. On June 1 it left Chicago and flew to New York at a speed of 207 miles per hour.

I mention this because it is along the line with the remarks I inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 173. I said:

Why peep around corners for spies when secrets of this sort can be obtained under cash-and-carry basis?

I believe it is high time that we forget to help other nations in military preparedness, for it is quite possible that we might need all of it for our own use and protection of the American Continent and adjacent islands.

Europe owes the United States thirteen or fourteen billion dollars, an obligation which should be paid. Why would it not be good business to settle this debt by buying islands along our coast and in the Caribbean Sea with this credit? Such islands would be valuable for protection of the Panama Canal and for our coast line. It is a proposition that we may consider now as we prepare the United States defenses for the future.

The strategic value of colonies is now evident not only on the Atlantic seaboard but on the Pacific coast as well. It was with this in view that I early in the year proposed that we prepare the islands in the Pacific for future use.

To better understand the value of colonies, let us use Germany for an illustration. Germany, not having colonies, has no place where her raiders can take on supplies or obtain repairs. Her naval and merchant ships are constantly in jeopardy of an attack by the enemy. Suppose, on the other hand, that Germany had colonies in the Pacific and Atlantic. The picture would be entirely different, for such places could be used for military bases and harbors for warcraft and merchant vessels. Naval patrol vessels could use the harbors for repairs, refueling, and for protection. What is the picture today? German merchant and naval ships are like the *Flying Dutchman*, ocean ghosts, mentioned at times in the press for propaganda purposes to swing public sympathy. These ships without ports furnish an ever-valuable subject for those who spin yarns on the dogwatch.

When our colonies are gone we will have ghost ships about which future generations may spin yarns as they wait for attack from bases we had but lost, while our statesmen were playing politics and our Army fighting for our destroyers, the "invisible government," instead of the Stars and Stripes.

Let us look at this from a business angle. During any war we can always trade with our own colonies. Commercial and war supplies may even be stored in such places—say, Manila. If foreign war breaks out, such commercial and military bases may always be used, not only as harbors and repair stations for our Navy and merchant marine but also as potential reserve depots for dwindling military and commercial stock. It was with this thought in mind that I supported a bill that was to provide sufficient money to establish a harbor at Guam.

The Philippines are the most valuable colonial possessions we have, and if the islands are properly fortified they will be equal to 10 navies and may be maintained, if properly administered, without any cost to us.

It is important that we visualize the future, and, as war is now conducted, no fleet would dare to leave these islands astern for the purpose of attacking any part of the United States. The nation with the greatest number of well-spotted colonies is in an enviable position in the event that war breaks out, for a nation with such colonies is a constant hazard to the enemy's fleets and commerce. I hope for 1946 that our statesmen in looking into the future will visualize the United States of America as a world power, with colonies upon which the sun will always rise.

In this digression I drifted off on a subject that is close to my heart, but I shall now return to topics more pertinent at this time.

In general discussion and debate the question arises as to the rights of our citizens, but such discussion is often confusing, because it speaks of the rights of citizens under international law, which in reality is not concerned with individuals. The rights of our citizens are guaranteed under the Constitution of the United States; and while the Federal Government's constant reference to the protection of our nationals may appear all right, the Federal Government should bear in mind that the people in the United States have reserved the rights of the States and their own rights to themselves. It is a nice gesture on the part of the Federal Government to express apprehension for the people, and a few people may

appreciate such attempted Federal guardianship, but a great majority believe the procedure should be reversed.

The Federal Government's continuous alarm that some of our nationals may bring about an incident provocative of war is, if nothing else, extremely ridiculous. Wars are not brought about by the people any more than the murder of Francis Ferdinand caused the World War. Such incident is the excuse which is used by those who do not have the courage or the decency to assume responsibility for their own acts. As I look back, before the World War I do not recall anyone harboring antipathy or even interest in European nations and their affairs. I am certain there was none in the locality in which I lived. In spite of our indifference, we were constantly bombarded with pro-Entente propaganda. We had the "invisible government's" propagandized news of war horrors for breakfast, lunch, and dinner.

After the war was over we discovered there was no foundation of fact in these news. What was the purpose of this? It was to keep that subject constantly before us, so we would be receptive to the final commitment. This continued in ever-increasing intensity until peace and war became an issue in the 1916 campaign.

After the people had been worked up to the point where they began to look for Germans under their beds and good Americans with German names fell victim to suspicion, the climax arrived in the sinking of American ships, and finally in the loss of the steamship *Lusitania*.

In the midst of this propaganda, and as we approached the 1916 campaign, Colonel House and Mr. Baruch, the advisers to Wilson's administration, swung the slogan "He kept us out of war" to the campaign masthead. On the strength of the predominating public desire for peace, Wilson was elected for the second term—to declare war. We know more about it now than we did at that time.

The point I wish to emphasize is that the administration knew we were just about to embark in the World War, and it was not an incident brought about by our nationals, but was, instead, a deliberate agreement of Wilson's administration to render service to the Entente in the World War.

My reason for having called your attention to the past is to compare it with the present. None of the rank and file of real Americans today has the slightest desire for war, and no incident will be brought about by those citizens as cause for war. Incidents will come from higher up in the administration.

The problem which confronts those whose greatest desire is to see us involved in the present war is to provide an incident for war which may be employed without leaving the culprits responsible. It would be unfortunate for the warmongers to be held responsible for causing war, and to pay war's penalty, for they are too smart for that. But this time, however, it is our business to put them on the spot, so that, if they try something, they may be held answerable for their crime. The invisible government is not going to lead the American people by the nose this time, as it did in 1917. The procedure will, I hope, be reversed.

Let us now glance over our "rights" to which various Government representatives constantly refer.

Under international law we may sell and ship merchandise to nations at war without involving our neutrality, but in doing so we must take chances with other neutrals and not bellyache when our ships are captured or sunk by the power at war. We know the danger and we must take the consequences, but whatever happens such losses are no cause for war and should not be used by the administration for the purpose of agitating public sympathy. It is instead a part of the game and we ought to be good sportsmen and take the losses we sustain in such traffic. It is poor satisfaction to bury 30,000 of our young men in foreign cemeteries because a few of our citizens are overcurious or so acquisitive that they cannot refrain from jeopardizing their lives by traveling on ships of belligerents in war zones. It should be understood that neutral ships trading with nations at war are looked upon by such nations as if they were enemy ships and are treated accordingly.

Many people, however, do not understand why ships trading with neutral nations may also meet with disaster at the hands of warring powers. For example, Holland and Denmark are both neutral nations bordering on a nation at war, Germany. Suppose we clear a ship with cargo to either one of those nations. May we expect unhindered entry and departure? I think not, unless the manifest of the ship shows that the cargo is the property of the nation to which it is consigned and of ordinary peacetime requirements. If it should happen to be war material or contraband, and a reasonable doubt as to its final destination exists, such ship will be returned to the ports of the nation that conducts the blockade, where the cargo will be confiscated. Has the blockading power this right? Of course it has. It is a matter of life and death to such nation to prevent all war material and contraband from reaching its enemy. It is because of such blockade that nations adjoining enemy boundaries endeavor to remain strictly neutral. You can readily understand that while we have a legal right to ship to such neutrals, the nation that conducts the blockade also has the right to examine such ship so as to prevent war material from reaching ports where it may be transshipped for enemy use.

For a better understanding, suppose a nation adjoining enemy territory normally imports 1,000 tons of iron ore per year. The record of the amount of such imports is generally known. Let us now assume that this same country, after war is declared, increases iron imports to 10,000 or more tons per year. The nation operating the blockade may in such instance, and does, assume that such excess importation of iron ore is for transshipment, and it is therefore within the right of the blockading nation to commandeer ships and cargoes that might reach their enemies.

Let us bear in mind that nations which are not at war may trade with each other without the slightest fear of attack by nations that are engaged in war. It is, of course, possible that a ship might be sunk even when engaged in trade with nations at peace, but in such event the owners are usually compensated.

In pursuing trade with peaceful nations we eliminate incidents that may furnish excuse for war, such as the sinking of the *Athenia* and *Lusitania*. There is no one that disputes the rights of our citizens to travel on belligerent ships, but when they do, it must be at their own risk.

This special session, while launched as an emergency and set to martial music, did not start a war dance. I believe the more sensible citizens are tiring of the administration's jitterbugs and megalomaniacs. Schizophrenics should be replaced by sound-minded businessmen and the balmy should be sent to a nut house.

While Britain and France are stewing over our indifference to the second celebration for the international financiers, Lorelei is singing to the Poilus. No backers, no show; so it looks like the war is stranded somewhere in France until Uncle Sammy makes up his mind to sign the check. The war fever did not rise in America in spite of the money spent to grease the old war buggy of the invisible government. As a matter of fact, there is as little enthusiasm for war in Europe as there is here, since the boys across the pond have identified the owners of the blooming war chariot.

Neutrality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. MILLER

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 9, 1939

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, in this unsettled period, when we are being deluged with propaganda of all kinds, it is refreshing and helpful to read calm, unemotional articles by recognized authorities on international law and neutrality.

Such are the letters written by Prof. Charles Cheney Hyde and Prof. Philip C. Jessup appearing first in the New York Times. Professor Hyde is the author of the volume entitled "International Law—Chiefly as Interpreted and Applied by the United States." He has also prepared monographs on international law printed by our Department of State for confidential use of our delegation at the Peace Conference in 1918–19. During President Harding's administration Professor Hyde was appointed Solicitor for the Department of State.

Professor Jessup has been professor of international law at Columbia University since 1935. He has served as Assistant Solicitor of the Department of State and served with the American Expeditionary Forces in the World War. He is the author of the volumes American Neutrality and International Police and Neutrality, Its History, Economics, and Law.

Letters by these authorities have been inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, one by the gentleman from New York, the Honorable HAMILTON FISH, of New York, on page 191, and the other, on page 335, by me.

It is my sincere hope that many of my constituents will take time to study the opinions of such outstanding authorities.

George Cardinal Mundelein

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES KRAMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 9, 1939

FUNERAL SERMON BY MOST REV. JOHN J. CANTWELL, D. D.

Mr. KRAMER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following funeral sermon for George Cardinal Mundelein by His Excellency Most Rev. John J. Cantwell, D. D.:

May it please your excellency, most reverend brethren of the hierarchy, right reverend, very reverend, and reverend Fathers, and dearly beloved of the laity, when a man is suddenly taken away from a work which his genius has inspired and his hands have fashioned, when the maturity of his years would assure him of a wider extension of his labors and a larger usefulness, we, who mourn his passing, feel the transitory nature of human sovereignty and the vanity of human wishes. Such feelings, however, natural as they are, disappear before the consideration that the priesthood is rooted, not in the natural, but in the supernatural order. That day a young man kneels before the bishop to receive the yoke of Christ he is warned that henceforth his chief ministry is to show forth the death of the Lord at the holy altar. So daily must he die to the world and live only unto God.

As the mothers of Sparta sent forth their sons to war and bade them return with their shields or upon them, so holy church from the beginning sends forth her priests as men destined unto death, whose only hope is that when the end comes they may be able to say with the Apostle, "I have fought the good fight. I have finished my course. I have kept the faith. Now there is laid up for me the crown which the just Judge will render me in that day."

Mighty is the sorrow that these days weigh upon the widowed church in Chicago, because he who was its good shepherd has been called away. The mourning of Chicago has found a responsive chord all over this wide land, from the rock-bound coast of Maine to where the waters break on California's silver sands. He who stood as a watchman on the walls of Zion, who represented the person of the sovereign pontiff as papal legate, who sat in conclave with the princes of the church to perpetuate the succession of Peter, has passed into the house of silence.

He has answered his Master's last summons to return home. And who would regret the mire of the market place and the dust of the dreary and lonely road when summoned to the table of the King and the company of the saints. It ill becomes us to be sorrowful in his behalf, who remain to fulfill our own unfinished tasks, or to mourn as those who have no hope. He has gone into no strange country but into his Father's house.

Such an attitude as this toward death is the very flower of that "faith which is the substance of things to be hoped for, the evidence of things unseen." And George Cardinal Mundelein was, above all things, a man of liveliest faith. His ancestors through six generations on American soil perpetuated the truths handed down from the saints, and that in many lands were budding into a second spring. His was the generation in which men and women, though weak, were made strong; though timid, became valiant unto battle. They were men and women who marched under the shadow of the cross, and would permit no man to violate the sanctity of conscience; theirs was the age that not for the first time in history forced men of iron to the gates of Canosa.

Such was the inheritance bequeathed to George Mundelein in his youthful years. Educated in the traditional manner of Catholic children, he imbibed respect for authority and that love of home characteristic of the race from which he sprang. His early education was entrusted to the Sons of St. John de la Salle, a congregation of men who have deserved well of Catholic education in the United States. A call came to him as it came of old to Samuel sleeping beside the tabernacle. His ears were early attuned to the music of choirs invisible, and his eyes were holden by a cloud of witnesses that hovered over his head. He answered a call to the priesthood, and pursued his studies under the direction of the venerable Benedictine Fathers in Beatty, Pa. He achieved the ambition of many an American boy in being permitted to continue his preparation for the priesthood in eternal Rome. It was here he said his first mass, as it was here he developed that tender love and sterling loyalty for the person of him who sits in Peter's chair, and for George Mundelein, as priest, bishop, and prince of the church, the voice of the vicar of Christ was ever the voice of the Commander in Chief.

It is the law of the church that at stated periods every bishop in the world must visit Vatican City and report to the pope on the condition of his diocese. There is, therefore, year by year, a constant procession of the governors of the church over the threshold of the Apostles. They come, like messengers hastening from the field of battle, bearing tidings to their chief of the fortunes of war. What changing pictures of hope and fear, of joy and sorrow, of victory and defeat must pass before the successor of St. Peter as he sits by the tomb of the fisherman to hear the varied messages. They tell the story of knout and of chains and of hopeless exile. They come with the tales of great churches, once free, that are now on bondage, and where no man dares to sing the songs of Zion.

From other lands come bishops in the same Roman purple with the wine of youth in their veins. They hasten as bearers of great joy—from the United States, from Canada and the Cape, from Australia, and from the lands of the rising sun. And at the head of the rank, with measured step, comes a man of keen and vigorous mind, unfolding the story of the mighty works of religion and charity wrought through God's grace in the great church in Chicago. Its cardinal archbishop is proud of his city and jealous of its honor. He tells of new parishes established, of new churches built, of schools founded. He tells the story of the founding and the development of a noble seminary where the children of the pioneers may prepare themselves under the shadow of Mary's mantle to take up the torches that day by day fall from the aged and wearied hands. The shepherd speaks of a noble clergy that perpetuates the zeal of the Apostles. Holy masses are multiplied, the sacraments are frequented, the young are instructed, the sick visited, and the poor have the gospel preached to them. What a glorious vision passes before the eyes of the Supreme Pontiff when Chicago's cardinal tells of a mighty congress that he, first among his peers, dared to invite to the United States that the church in America might have its share in the spiritual glory of the elder lands.

In that day to the hospitable gates of Chicago flocked the children of the Christian fold from every land. We view the march of priests and the long procession of mitered heads. After them, clothed in royal purple, come princes of the church sustaining the hands of him who, as the Pope's representative, was the pledge to this new land of Rome's unwearied love and a token of apostolic confidence in the faith of American Catholics.

Cardinal Mundelein ruled over a diocese to which the tribes of the earth contributed their quota. Men and women of many races and many tongues had found shelter within the hospitable gates of our country. Escaping the blood-drenched fields of Europe and abandoning the lands where their ancestors lie in death awaiting the angel's trumpet, they found here under the Constitution liberty, a kindly understanding, sympathetic interest, concord, amity, and peace. Cardinal Mundelein could assure the vicar of Christ that in his metropolitan church, as all over this land, men and women, children of races inured to strife and battle, join hand and heart under the Stars and Stripes. They and their children have become champions of peace and justice and patriotic citizens of the land of their birth or adoption.

As they advance down the years they march shoulder to shoulder and knee to knee. They bow with truly Catholic fervor before the altar of God, and all the while are they deeply conscious that the strength derived from that common table is that which binds them, though of different race and tongue, in that supernatural reality which is the mystical body of Christ. Mindful of the fratricidal conflicts of the lands they have abandoned, they are ever ready under the aegis of the church and the guaranties of the Constitution to labor with their fellow citizens in maintaining within our shores the reign of charity, justice, and peace.

It is to the glory of George Cardinal Mundelein and his flock that under his inspiration and guidance and through their cooperation

Chicago can show the world an example of that harmonious living which is so much needed in the world today and which must ever be the foundation of progress and peace.

But His Eminence of Chicago was not only a brilliant churchman and a leader of the hosts of Zion, he was a great American citizen. After the love of God comes the love of country. A man must indeed be insensible to human emotion whose heart does not beat faster at the thought of his native land. His forbears had been exiles from the fatherland, but neither they nor their children have ever been exiles from the faith. A great Catholic must be a great American. He knows that all authority comes from Almighty God; that the President of the United States and the Governor of the State rule in civil and temporal matters with the same authority that the Pope in Rome governs the church in things spiritual, for all power comes from God.

Cardinal Mundelein was not a man to confine himself to the sacristy, but exercising his franchise as a free American citizen, he played a man's part in public life. In these days that are passing he was very sad, because man of peace that he was, he would walk under the standard of the Prince of Peace. Yet he was not a weak man. Well he believed with the Apostles that the strong man armed keepeth his court. And well did he understand the words that week after week rose up before him in the vesper service: "Blessed be the Lord God of Israel, who taught my arms to fight and my fingers to battle." So he would, if needs be, lift his voice to denounce wrong and injustice, whether at home or in the chancelries of Europe.

It was a patriotic impulse too, that gave inspiration to the marvelous movement among the youth of Chicago, which has extended from the shores of the Atlantic to the Pacific.

So important did this work seem to him, that from his own household he selected one whose soul was knit to his own, that he might salvage the forgotten children in the purlieus of a great city, and the lanes and highways of the countryside. The meanest child in the most pitiable rags was for Cardinal Mundelein as one made a little less than the angels. He would use the natural talents of these youth, intellectual and physical, to bring them under the influence of Christ's Church and Christ's Commandments. But this distinguished work among the youth did not blind him to the fact that in their endeavor to perpetuate Christian teaching the Catholic people were not getting fair play from their fellow citizens.

Cardinal Mundelein recognized that the American state had committed itself to the so-called nonsectarian system of instruction. The common school has won the day in these States and has won the affection of the populace. Public money generously supports it. But such a system can never satisfy Catholics. Baptized in the name of the Trinity and incorporated in the Body of Christ, the soul of the child even before the dawn of reason, is the Temple of the Holy Ghost. Therefore, when such a child comes to learn of the world and the things about him, it is Catholic instinct that he must have access to Christ and Christ to him. A school whose windows are closed to Him, who is the light of the world, cannot be the best school. The Catholic heart revolts at the thought that Christ must stand at the door of the school while the voice of his children, bought with his blood, rings in his ears. He knocks. but the answer comes: "You cannot enter here." It was the knowledge that it was impossible to give a Catholic education to all of the children, that gave impetus to the movements that have succeeded so well among the large multitude of the less fortunate youth.

My brethren of the hierarchy would not pardon me if I failed to mention the solicitude which the Cardinal of Chicago bore for the men who are laboring under the mighty difficulties and straitened circumstances in the lands of the South and the West. He followed with keen interest the heroic struggles of many bishops, whose deeds are being written not in the sands of the desert, but in the book of life. And the same interest that he had in the missions he manifested as Chancelor of the Catholic Church Extension Society, which found in him a wise guide and a stirring influence.

America needs the Catholic Church because a great nation demands a great religion. "Not in bread alone doth man live, but in every word that proceedeth from the mouth of God."

And there is no organization that can come before the American people and speak the word of God with the authority that compels respect except that church whose sons have written their names large in the annals of the pioneers; of that church of which George Cardinal Mundelein was in these days a leader and a prince. Among the citizens of this State are many whose names will live in history, and not the least of them will be that of him whose obsequies in bitter grief we conduct this morning.

Now, dear and eminent friend, good-bye. Your brethren of the hierarchy and your priests rank after rank stand beside you and pray for your soul. May the earth rest lightly upon you and may your spirit rejoice in a peace that passeth understanding.

O solemn communion of the saints that binds us by golden chains to the feet of God, O consoling teaching of the church, that we may follow those who have gone before us with our deeds of mercy. The generous heart is stilled forever. The lips that spoke of the things of God are locked in silence. The busy hands are folded in peace and the feet that were swift in errands of mercy rest forever. Cardinal priest that he was, his request is now the common one of all mankind, the charity of our prayers, our alms, deeds, and our sacrifices. The strife of life is over. Hushed are the winds; the waves are still. May his rest be beneath the Eternal Arms in the light that shall never fail.

Relief

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE E. GEYER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 9, 1939

Mr. GEYER of California. Mr. Speaker, last session when we passed the W. P. A. appropriation bill there were many in this House that predicted dire results if all the people thrown off the rolls by the action of this body were forced to depend on the States for their livelihood. The State of California is probably as generous as any State in the Union with those that are upon its relief rolls. California has many thousands who have migrated there following the advice, "Go West." These people find a flooded labor market and search for work is in vain. Perhaps they think it is a little more comfortable to starve to death where the climate is mild rather than suffer, in addition to the pangs of hunger, the bitter cold of an eastern or midwestern winter. At any rate, the State of California has in addition to its own normal relief load, a part of the burden of many of the other States. This problem of relief is a national problem and may not be shifted, if we are to be fair, to the different States for solution.

If the victim happens to be along in years and has by that reason served society well, it seems that he must be penalized for that service of helping to build this richest country in the world. Industry has no place for him and the best he can do is to eke out a miserable existence until he is old enough to qualify for an old-age pension. Then he may expect a little more, but in this the Congress has been all too niggardly.

In the midst of this miserable condition it is indeed strange that the loyalty of the victims to our democracy and the things for which it stands remains unshaken. Can we expect a suffering one-third of our people to always remain so? Especially when they know that we have too much of everything according to this miserable economy of scarcity that guarantees profits and plenty of them before it cares for human needs. If there ever was a time that loyalty to our institutions was necessary, it is during this national crisis. The best defense to our Nation is a happy and contented people. This can be brought about only by guaranteeing to every man who wants to work a job at a decent living wage and to those who may be so unfortunate as to be unable to work, either an old-age pension as a right and not as charity, or if too young for that, a monthly allowance. We can do no less if we are to live up to the principles expressed in the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States. I hope at the coming session that we may pass legislation to care for our citizens who find themselves, through no fault of their own, unable to care for themselves.

I have printed below a letter from one who exemplifies the true spirit of those this Congress has wronged.

The letter follows:

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
September 30, 1939.

HON. LEE E. GEYER,
Of California.

DEAR FRIEND: As I am a newcomer to your grand State, a State of one of the number of States that make up our grand United States, of which I am proud to be a voter, a resident for over 60 years. Born in Cleveland, Ohio, I came out here July 3, 1937, and have voted here ever since. Your name was handed to me with a paper that is headed with these words: "Not printed at Government expense. United States of America, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Proceedings and Debates of the Seventy-sixth Congress, first session.

"Politics and Relief. Eating and Starving by Shifts. Does Patriotism Feed on Hunger?"

[Speech by yourself] "in the House of Representatives, March 20, 1939."

Now, my dear friend, I just received this great speech of yours. I'm just back from receiving my grocery supply that we receive here

twice per month (14th and 30th of each month). Let me state in my own words: I have to spend 14 cents carfare to get to this place at 2210 Temple Street. It is about 3 miles from where I live. On September 16 I went over there for the first time—14 cents carfare. I received 2 pounds of green beans, 2 pounds of lima beans, and two pounds of onions. That is all, to last until September 30. Today I went again (September 30). I received 2 pounds of flour, 2 pounds of corn meal, some carrots. That is all for 14 cents carfare. On my card they mark "next time October 14, full issue to October 14, 1939."

I pay $3 per week for a room where I can cook. But what have I to cook? Let's figure this out. From August 21 to October 4 (date rent is due) I have paid out to landlady $18 for rent. I received $27.96 from the State Relief Administration in cash. This leaves me $9.96 balance in cash to eat, pay carfare. I have to pay 14 cents to get my check each time, carfare; 14 cents to get groceries, 28 cents in all to receive cash, 28 cents to receive what little they give us, from the 21st of August to September 30—40 days in all to make $9.96 to stretch over these 40 days, about 25 cents per day. It cannot be done. "Yes," they say, "find a cheaper room, $2 per week." Yes there are rooms for $1.50, $2, and $2.50 per week. But, I don't wish to live where half of the house is drunk most of the time and bugs that you can't sleep. I never drank in my life and I cannot stand anything like that. Yes, this a. m. when I read I was going to write to some one about the things they give up at Temple Street I was informed that I would get cut off all together. Well, dear friend, if this letter will cause things to be better and I do get cut off, I know that it has helped some one.

Talk of democracy away from our own land. I think it is about time we clean our own front-door steps. Eight million men, women, and children on relief yet hungry, jails full, courts overworked, $12,000,000,000 in money in this State's banks. No wonder they are going out for "ham and eggs." I don't blame them, and I, for one, will state here, this condition will make me vote for "ham and eggs" November 7. I trust that this letter will help not only me but thousands of others.

Thanks. I remain,

At your service,

CHARLES H. STALKER.

Pending Neutrality Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 10 (legislative day of Wednesday, October 4), 1939

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. TOM CONNALLY, OF TEXAS

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a very able address delivered on last Friday evening, over the network of the National Broadcasting Co., by the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] on the subject of pending neutrality legislation.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

My countrymen, America is at peace. God grant that she may remain at peace. Twenty-two years ago Europe was drenched in blood by a terrible war. We were dragged into that war.

Today, again, great nations with millions of men with arms in their hands are reeling and struggling in modern warfare. We do not propose to be dragged into this war. The American people love peace and hate war. They want their sons to live at home. They do not want them to die on foreign battlefields.

President Roosevelt called Congress to draft and pass an act for real neutrality and a program to keep us out of war. The joint resolution now before the Senate was drawn by the Committee on Foreign Relations, of which I am a member, after conferences with the President, with the Secretary of State, with eminent authorities, and after mature and exhaustive consideration.

It is offered as giving greater assurance to keep us out of war and to preserve a legal and real neutrality than any measure which can be devised.

It repeals the Arms Embargo Act of 1937 and prohibits the shipment of arms or ammunition or supplies of any kind in American ships to any nation at war.

Our citizens, not our Government, may sell the products of our fields and factories to citizens of all nations who may come to our shores, acquire title, and transport them in foreign ships. They must come and get it.

The Embargo Act now provides that it is unlawful to export arms, munitions, or implements of war from the United States to any nation at war. There is now no limit on other supplies to nations at war.

It was passed in the mistaken hope that we might persuade militaristic powers not to bring on war. We know now how empty was that hope. There is widespread misunderstanding of the embargo. Opponents of repeal constantly and sedulously have claimed that the embargo means peace. Some have accepted that claim without analysis or examination. That false assumption has been hammered into the public mind, when the claim is wholly baseless and unsupported.

Why do we repeal it? Because, to keep it is to make the United States unneutral. We have the same right to repeal it now that we had to pass it then.

It permits our citizens to sell to warring nations, excepting arms and ammunition, all other supplies and to carry them to nations at war in American ships. Repeal of the embargo is necessary if the United States is to be neutral in fact, and neutral under international law. Why do I say that? Because, under international law, from the time of Grotius, warring nations may buy and neutral nations may sell munitions, arms, and every commodity, without distinction, to nations at war. Every other neutral that can is now selling arms, ammunition, and supplies to the warring factions. I read from article 5 of Convention No. 13, The Hague Conference of 1907. It says:

"A neutral power is not called upon to prevent the export or transport, on behalf of one or other of the belligerents, of arms, munitions of war, or, in general, of anything which can be of use to an army or a fleet."

The theory of the Arms Embargo Act is that in time of peace it is legitimate to sell arms to any nation but not to sell them in time of war. Is it right, in time of peace, to sell arms to an aggressor to prepare for war and wrong to sell them in wartime for defense against the aggressor? It encourages aggressors. It penalizes peaceful and unprepared nations.

The embargo says, "We will sell you arms in time of peace, but you cannot get any in time of war. We will sell them to you in time of peace for offense. We will sell them to you in time of peace so that you can get ready for war. We will sell them to you in time of peace when your neighbors are asleep. We will sell them to you in time of peace when your adversary is unsuspecting and unwary. We will let you arm to the teeth, aggressors. Come on, conquerors, come to our shores and buy arms and ammunition. Arm yourselves to the teeth. Get our airplanes, get our cannons, get our bayonets, get our rifles, and all the devilish machinery of war, and then start your war, and we pledge you that, when you strike, your victim shall not get such things from this great neutral power. We cannot do anything for your victim. He must suffer. He cannot secure any arms here." The aggressor fixes his own time to strike his victim. That time determines when his victim can no longer get arms. Unsuspecting an attack, the victim does not prepare. The aggressor, by his attack, shuts off our markets. That is the doctrine of the existing Embargo Act—the so-called Neutrality Act.

The embargo applied to our citizens would mean that the highwayman who plans to hold up an innocent citizen on his way home tonight can get all the arms, all the blackjacks he may desire. "Come and get them." But if the citizen, when assailed upon the highway, asks his chauffeur to borrow a weapon to defend himself, the law says, "No, you cannot do it. This aggressor has a vested right to say to the United States, 'You cannot sell anybody else, in time of war, arms to protect himself from my aggression'."

That is the doctrine of the so-called Neutrality Act. The embargo, if applied in private life, would say to the safecracker who wants to rob a bank, "Come over. We shall be glad to sell you nitroglycerin. We have good jimmies; we have good pistols; we have good instruments for burglars. Here they are." But when he goes down to the bank vault to rob and to kill, if the watchman or the owner is there, under the Embargo Act, they could not borrow a weapon from the elevator boy; they could not borrow a pistol from a bystander to defend their property and their lives. That is the doctrine. If it were wrong to sell arms in time of war for defense, it is a greater wrong to sell arms in time of peace for offense.

Hitler is buying arms and supplies from Holland, from Denmark, from Belgium, from what was Poland, from Russia, from Rumania, from what was Czechoslovakia, from Italy, from Hungary, from what was Austria, and from adjacent lands. He controls the Baltic and can buy from Sweden and Holland. If it is not unneutral for these nations to sell commodities, including arms and ammunition, to Germany, how can it be unneutral for the United States to sell supplies to any nation which may come and get them.

They say "to repeal the embargo will help Great Britain and France." Then, by the same logic, to keep the embargo helps Hitler and Stalin.

It is said that it would result to the advantage of the democracies because they dominate the sea. That is not our responsibility. In every war some nations have one advantage and others another. We are not responsible for the geography of the earth. We made not the mountains; we made not the oceans; we made not the boundaries of Europe. The nation that has one advantage has the right to enjoy it without interference, just as another nation that enjoys another advantage has a right to enjoy it.

Germany has great advantages on land. She can buy from all the nations I have named. The Allies do not have access. They cannot have access to those markets. We do not deny to either the Allies or to Germany those natural advantages—the one on the land, the other on the sea. Unless the embargo is repealed, that

is exactly what we are doing. We are denying England and France their advantage, while Hitler enjoys his land advantage.

The embargo does not touch a multitude of things which go out upon the seas. If the embargo is kept on the books, American ships—not foreign ships but American ships—can carry any of these supplies to any nation at war. They may carry them right into England or right into Germany or right into France.

In the World War it was not the kind of cargo our vessels carried that brought us into war. It was the unrestricted submarine warfare of Germany when she killed our citizens and sank every kind of vessel.

Before America was dragged into the World War, while at peace and while neutral, 25 American ships were attacked or sunk on the seas. American lives were lost. Those ships did not carry arms or ammunition.

They were carrying general American commerce. The Kaiser sank them then. Hitler will sink them now. We shall then be face to face with the same issue that plunged us into the World War. The embargo will bring us to the brink of war.

German submarines are now sinking Finnish ships and Swedish and Danish ships. They are not at war. Those ships carried no arms or munitions. One had a cargo of butter.

The arms embargo offers no assurance of peace. It does not offer even a hope of peace.

How may we, then, keep out of war? The proposed act provides that no American vessel may carry any American passenger or cargo to any nation at war; no arms, no ammunition, no food, no raw materials, no clothing; no anything can leave an American port in an American ship for a nation at war. They must come and get it. No American ship or cargo can be sunk on their way to nations at war, because there will be no such ship or cargo on the sea. No American lives will be lost, because no citizen will be on such a ship. No supplies can leave American shores until the title has been transferred.

The joint resolution is an American act enacted by Americans and for Americans. We are making tremendous sacrifices of our shipping and our commerce in behalf of peace. We limit the rights and the liberties of our citizens in the interest of peace, to keep out of war.

My countrymen, we hope that this joint resolution will keep us out of war. In a world in which military power has overthrown law and peace—where the sword rules like a king upon a throne, where armed might rules like a sceptered monarch, where ambitious dictators with great armies are bent on conquest—America must build the greatest navy upon the seas, powerful and strong enough to dominate the Atlantic on the east and the Pacific on the west. We must provide aircraft until it is adequate, both for the Navy and for the Army. We must provide aircraft defenses. We must be prepared to meet any threat to our safety or security. The voice of George Washington lays upon us that solemn duty.

While we hope and pray that, under God, this joint resolution will keep us out of war, we must be prepared to defend the territory, the governmental institutions of the United States, and the lives and liberties of our people.

Wheeler Homecoming Celebration, Hudson, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, JR.

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 10 (legislative day of Wednesday, October 4), 1939

ADDRESS BY HON. BURTON K. WHEELER, OF MONTANA

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] at the Burton K. Wheeler Homecoming Celebration held at Hudson, Mass., on Sunday afternoon, October 1, 1939.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is a pleasure to be back in Hudson and to greet old friends and acquaintances.

Though the town has changed with the march of progress—though many sites familiar 30 years ago are no more—and though there is increased business activity and many more persons are here, yet the old spirit is the same. I am proud to be numbered among the sons of Hudson, just as I am pleased, beyond my limited description, with the great reception that has been accorded me.

My obligations to you now are even greater, and I have long known that I owe you much. It was in your public schools that I received my primary education. It was the principal of the Hudson High School who suggested and encouraged my study of the law. Fate has treated me kindly, and I wish to acknowledge my debt to Mr. Charles A. Williams and to Miss Ethyl Rawson of the Hudson public school system for the encouragement which they gave me.

It was the town of Hudson, the county of Middlesex, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, and the glorious traditions of all New England that furnished the background of which I am so proud. No State, no part of these United States ever produced greater liberals, greater leaders, or better men than John Hancock, Benjamin Franklin, Samuel Adams, Paul Revere, John Adams, and the host of patriots whose names and whose deeds are so indelibly inscribed on the pages of history of this Nation. They were the liberals of their day. Some called them radicals. Today we honor them as patriots. The liberalism of these farseeing patriots has been a constant source of inspiration to all Americans.

New England has contributed more than leadership to our great Nation. Democracy on this continent had its birth in the town meeting. I can well remember as a boy clutching the hand of Abe Tyler, my grandfather, as we went to town hall. I thrilled to the discussions. There it was after full and open debate by all citizens who desired to participate, that town problems and policies were settled. Such free and open discussion and the rule of the majority is real democracy.

Your forefathers and mine laid down their lives to establish a democratic republic in this land. They were farmers, cobblers, blacksmiths, tailors, merchants and tradesmen, but with the march of progress the shoeshop became a factory and the cobbler an employee. The small factory or shop with its owner-worker disappeared and in its stead came modern industrialization, combinations, and trusts. Mass production replaced the individual and brought with it severe tests of democracy—unemployment, low farm prices and poverty.

Amid economic inequalities, social injustice, and poverty democracy always labors if, indeed, it does not fail. Poverty is as needless as it is vicious. It fills the earth with subversive dogmas, endangers our democracy, and hence our freedom. Poverty is the menace of peace, the seed of race hatreds, and the cause of religious prejudice. If man must hate, let us not hate each other—let us hate poverty. If man must make war, let us not fight each other—let us make war on poverty.

The success or failure of American democracy is dependent upon economic and social conditions—upon the welfare and happiness of the people who compose it, and not upon who wins the war in Europe. Men will fight and even die for democracy; but once gained, their children and grandchildren come to accept the privilege of constitutional democracy as commonplace. Lacking employment, food, clothing, shelter, or markets for their produce, they become a fertile field for demagogues. Once Germany attempted a democracy, but its people had been reduced to economic serfdom, and in poverty succumbed to the false promises of economic security. They sold their freedom for the promise of bread. The old saying that "you cannot have bread for nothing" is as true today as ever. You must work for it or you'll be required to give up your liberties for it.

Through the ages the number one economic problem had been that of producing enough. American industrial genius solved this problem in our country by mass production.

Now, we are told we have too much farm land, too much factory capacity, too many mines, too much food and clothing; so much of everything that starvation lurks at our doors. So much wheat, milk, and meat that farmers are losing their farms, laborers losing their jobs, and people losing faith in their fellow man, if not in their Government.

What a paradox!

Let us not forget that it is the very lack of all these things of which we have an abundance that lies at the bottom of the wars in Europe and in the Orient.

It must be apparent then that mass production to be successful must be accompanied by mass consumption—money earned and in the pockets of the people to buy the goods produced.

We in America must use our genius and our resources in solving this paradox of want in the midst of plenty, if we desire to save the country from financial and moral bankruptcy. We must not use that genius or our great resources in a futile European war. It should never be forgotten that it is the moral and financial bankruptcy of a nation that brings about dictatorship.

Less than 23 years ago we went into a bloody conflict "to make the world safe for democracy." Today, after that so-called victorious holy war, the world knows less democracy than ever before. To say the World War was futile is to be charitable; it was horrible; it was disastrous. I shudder to think of the potential results, direct and indirect, of the present war.

A quarter of a century ago Kaiserism was to be stamped out; now it is nazi-ism. Both are indefensible—both are repugnant to free peoples. The problem that faces Europe today not only parallels the 1914 situation but is one which is recorded in the pages of European history a hundred times. The characters may be more bold, the names changed, and certainly the villain is equally or more repulsive, but the plot and the climax are as old as European history itself.

My sympathies are with the Allies—and I know that the American people and all lovers of democracy want Hitlerism crushed. It is the symbol of dictatorship, of bankruptcy, followed by intolerance, bigotry, and prejudice. All this is the product of the last war, and should the present war assume the dimensions of the

first World War I am fearful that there will not only be a bankrupt Germany but a bankrupt world—not one Hitler, one Mussolini, or one Stalin, but many.

Sympathetic as we are with those who find themselves at war with dictators, we must never lose sight of the fact that our entry into war cannot be measured alone in terms of lives lost and dollars spent. The price would surely be loss of democracy and Christianity. They could not withstand the impact of war.

Our problem is to solve our economic difficulties at home and not the politics of Europe. Our problem is to preserve American democracy—and not the balance of power or the boundaries of Europe.

We are passing through a grave crisis—a trying period. We must be vigilant in guarding our peace. Neither sentiment, propaganda, nor profits must be allowed to influence our determination to avoid our participation in the present conflict.

Already there has been loosed upon us a flood of propaganda from both sides. Its intensity will be multiplied with the passage of time. Already in Washington the war hysteria rises in full flood. Detectives watch the Capitol, watch the office buildings, and watch each other. It won't be long now before we will be spying on each other and seeing German U-boats in the Great Lakes and enemy airplanes over the Rocky Mountains.

I sometimes wonder whether we shouldn't be more afraid of the war propaganda originating in New York and Washington than that which emanates from foreign capitals.

The American people today seem resolved to withstand it. Let us pray that they keep steadfast in the hectic days to come. They realize that our vision may be clouded, and our thinking dulled, but they know that the cost of war will be greater today than ever before.

War profits will destroy true neutrality. They lure and corrupt. War profits may bring a temporary and artificial prosperity—a prosperity which would be only a shot in the arm of our economic system productive of a cheap and murderous jag—but which would end in a disastrous depression. At this moment there is some increase in the price of wheat, sugar, beef, and other basic goods. Certain industries are hastily reemploying men, but for any war-engendered prosperity we will eventually pay and pay and pay.

We are neither Germans, Poles, Britains, Frenchmen, Italians, nor Russians. We are Americans, and in this hour of world strife our country is a haven for peace. We must so maintain it. Cries of nazi-ism, fascism, or communism that we presently hear neither frighten nor interest me. Working democracy can withstand their attacks. The only "ism" in which I am interested is Americanism. We should build up our national defense so that no nation will dare attack us; we must build up our trade in the Americas where our natural markets lie.

And now my friends, as a Member of the United States Senate I promise you that I will never vote to send a single American boy across the water to fight on foreign soil. Neither will I, by my vote, approve of a single step that in my judgment may lead this country down the road to war.

These are some of the reasons why I am not in favor of selling arms and munitions to any of the belligerents. This is why I would insist that all other products be paid for in cash and delivery made in this country. And this is why I would say to all Americans—you travel in troubled waters at your own risk—you cannot and must not involve this country in war.

America must be kept safe for Americans in America!

Attitude of Senator Caraway Toward Repeal of Arms Embargo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES F. BYRNES

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 10 (legislative day of Wednesday, October 4), 1939

ARTICLE FROM THE WASHINGTON POST

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a brief article from the Washington Post under the heading "Mrs. CARAWAY, two sons in the Army, holds repeal best peace bet." The article sets forth the attitude of the Senator from Arkansas [Mrs. CARAWAY].

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post of October 8, 1939]

MRS. CARAWAY, TWO SONS IN ARMY, HOLDS REPEAL BEST PEACE BET

The lone woman Senator, Mrs. HATTIE CARAWAY, of Arkansas, whose two sons are Army officers, yesterday told the International News Service she was going to vote for "President Roosevelt's arms-embargo repeal because I don't want my two boys to have to go to war."

Mrs. CARAWAY'S sons are Capt. Paul W. Caraway, instructor in law at West Point, and Lt. Forest Caraway, stationed at Chilkoot, Alaska. Both are West Point graduates and would be in line for immediate duty in event of war. Mrs. CARAWAY said:

"I feel very deeply on the subject of neutrality. I don't want to see the son of any American mother go to war.

"Many women, because I am the only woman Senator, write to me and tell me that if I had any sons I would not vote for repeal of the embargo.

"Well, I have two sons, both Army officers, and I am sure that if we were forced into war that they would go to the front line. I do not want that, and I'm certain that mothers of other sons who would have to go do not want it.

"If I thought that repeal of the embargo would lead us into war, I certainly would not vote for it. But I believe, with the restriction the President's bill carries on American shipping to war zones and the cash-and-carry provisions on all shipments to belligerents, that it, if anything will, will keep us out of war."

List of Supporters of Pending Neutrality Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THEODORE G. BILBO

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 10 (legislative day of Wednesday, October 4), 1939

LIST COMPILED BY HON. KEENER C. FRAZER, PROFESSOR OF INTERNATIONAL LAW, UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to publish in the Appendix of the RECORD an important list of outstanding men and women in the Southeastern States. The proposals for the revision of the neutrality laws of the United States, as formulated by President Roosevelt and Secretary of State Cordell Hull, submitted to the Congress of the United States in special session, are approved and supported by this group of more than 100 men and women, representing the churches, journalism, business, the professions, civic interests, labor, and education.

I think I am safe in saying that these leading men and women of this great section of the United States voice the sentiment of more than 98 percent of the people of this section.

For this list I am indebted to Hon. Kenner C. Frazer, executive secretary of the Southern Council on International Relations, and professor of international law of the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, N. C.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHURCH LEADERS

Bishop H. P. Almon Abbott, diocese of Lexington, Lexington, Ky.
Bishop Theodore D. Bratton, Jackson, Miss.
Bishop Thomas C. Darst, diocese of eastern Carolina, Wilmington, N. C.
Bishop J. Lloyd Decell, Methodist bishop of Alabama and Georgia, Birmingham, Ala.
Bishop Hoyt M. Dobbs, Methodist bishop of Louisiana and Mississippi, Jackson, Miss.
Bishop William M. Green, diocese of Mississippi, Jackson, Miss.
Bishop Robert C. Jett, retired bishop, diocese of southwestern Virginia, Roanoke, Va.
Bishop Paul B. Kern, Methodist bishop of Tennessee and Florida, Nashville, Tenn.
Bishop H. J. Mikell, diocese of Atlanta, Atlanta, Ga.
Bishop A. S. Thomas, diocese of South Carolina, Charleston, S. C.
Bishop John D. Wing, diocese of south Florida, Orlando, Fla.
Bishop Frank A. Juhan, diocese of Florida, Jacksonville, Fal.
Rev. John W. Frazer, D. D., Mobile, Ala.
Rev. M. Ashby Jones, D. D., Atlanta, Ga.
Rev. George Stoves, D. D., Macon, Ga
Rev. R. P. Marshall, D. D., editor, Florida Christian Advocate, Lakeland, Fla.
Rev. John W. Inzer, D. D., First Baptist Church, Asheville, N. C.
Rev. James W. Jackson, D. D., Columbia, S. C.
Rev. Albert S. Johnson, D. D., First Presbyterian Church, Charlotte, N. C.

Rev. John Glenn, D. D., Edenton Street Methodist Church, Raleigh, N. C.
Rev. B. R. Lacy, Jr., D. D., president, Union Theological Seminary, Richmond, Va.
Rev. W. E. Rollins, D. D., dean, Virginia Theological Seminary, Alexandria, Va.
Rabbi Edward N. Calisch, D. D., Congregation Beth Ahabah, Richmond, Va.
Rabbi Joseph Rauch, D. D., Temple Adath Israel, Louisville, Ky.

JOURNALISTS

Mr. Julian Hall, editor, the Eagle, Dothan, Ala.
Dr. John Temple Graves, editor, the News, Birmingham, Ala.
Mr. David E. Smiley, editor and president, the Times, Tampa, Fla.
Mr. Tom Wallace, editor, the Times, Louisville, Ky.
Mr. Barry Bingham, publisher, the Courier-Journal and Times, Louisville, Ky.
Dr. Herbert Agar, the Courier-Journal, Louisville, Ky.
Mr. John D. Ewing, publisher, the Times, Shreveport, La.
Mr. Frederick Sullins, the News, Jackson, Miss.
Dr. Clarence Poe, editor, the Progressive Farmer, Raleigh, N. C.
Col. Santford Martin, editor, the Journal and Sentinel, Winston-Salem, N. C.
Mr. Charles A. Webb, president, the Asheville Citizen and Times, Asheville, N. C.
Hon. George F. Milton, president and editor, the News, Chattanooga, Tenn.
Mr. J. H. Nye, editor, the Tennessean, Nashville, Tenn.
Mr. Virginius Dabney, editor, the Times-Dispatch, Richmond, Va.
Dr. Douglas S. Freeman, editor, the News Leader, Richmond, Va.
Mr. Louis I. Jaffe, editor, the Virginian-Pilot, Norfolk, Va.

BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONS

Mr. A. W. McAllister, chairman of the board, Pilot Life Insurance Co., Greensboro, N. C.
Mr. P. H. Callahan, president, Louisville Varnish Co., Louisville, Ky.
Mr. J. Skottowe Wannamaker, president, American Cotton Association, St. Matthews, S. C.
Mr. John Sprunt Hill, Durham, N. C.
Mr. Algernon Blair, contractor, Montgomery, Ala.
Mr. Bennette E. Geer, manufacturer, Greenville, S. C.
Mr. John A. Law, president and treasurer, the Saxon Mills, Spartanburg, S. C.
Mr. F. M. Jackson, Sr., Birmingham, Ala.
Hon. Blanton Fortson, jurist, Athens, Ga.
Hon. Kemp D. Battle, lawyer, Rocky Mount, N. C.
Hon. Walter Stokes, Jr., lawyer, Nashville, Tenn.
Hon. James H. Hammond, lawyer, Columbia, S. C.
Hon. Devereux Lippitt, lawyer, Atlanta, Ga.
Hon. Helen Douglas Mankin, lawyer, member Georgia House of Representatives, Atlanta, Ga.
Hon. Charles Hall, lawyer, Macon, Ga.
Hon. Douglas Arant, lawyer, Birmingham, Ala.
Hon. E. Smythe Gambrell, lawyer, Atlanta, Ga.
Mr. L. O. Crosby, lumberman, Picayune, Miss.
Mr. Vance J. Alexander, president, Union Planters National Bank & Trust Co., Memphis, Tenn.
Mr. E. R. Malone, president, American National Bank, Pensacola, Fla.
Mr. Oliver J. Sands, banker, chairman finance committee, Church Schools in Diocese of Virginia, Richmond, Va.

CIVIC LEADERS

Mrs. Karl Bishopric, North Carolina Federation of Women's Clubs, Spray, N. C.
Mrs. R. H. Latham, General Federation of Women's Clubs, Asheville, N. C.
Mrs. C. T. Wanzer, Charlotte, N. C.
Mrs. J. U. Reaves, Alabama Federation of Women's Clubs, Mobile, Ala.
Mrs. Laura Smith Ebaugh, American Association of University Women, Greenville, S. C.
Mrs. J. Ralston Wells, Florida Federation of Women's Clubs, Daytona Beach, Fla.

LABOR LEADERS

Mr. John A. Peel, regional director upper south region, Textile Workers' Union of America, Roanoke, Va.
Mr. T. A. Wilson, chairman, North Carolina Industrial Commission, ex-president, North Carolina Federation of Labor, Raleigh, N. C.
Mr. E. L. Sandefur, C. I. O. director for Carolinas, Winston-Salem, N. C.

EDUCATORS

President John Stewart Bryan, College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, Va.
President Julian A. Burruss, Virginia Polytechnic Institute, Blacksburg, Va.
President Francis P. Gaines, Washington and Lee University, Lexington, Va.
President J. N. Hillman, Emory and Henry College, Emory, Va.
President R. B. Montgomery, Lynchburg College, Lynchburg, Va.
President W. T. Sanger, Medical College of Virginia, Richmond, Va.
Dean J. Nelson Frierson, University of South Carolina, Columbia, S. C.
Dean James H. Hewlett, Centre College, Danville, Ky.
Dean W. C. Jackson, Woman's College of the University of North Carolina, Greensboro, N. C.
Dean Charles W. Pipkin, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, La.
Dr. Helen G. McDonald, Winthrop College, Rock Hill, S. C.
Dr. James W. Patton, Converse College, Spartanburg, S. C.
Dr. Calvin B. Hoover, economist, Durham, N. C.
Dr. Gilbert T. Rowe, professor of religion, Duke University, Durham, N. C.
Dr. Amry Vandenbosch, professor of international law, University of Kentucky, Lexington, Ky.
Dr. Mary Watters, Mary Baldwin College, Staunton, Va.
Prof. Keener C. Frazer, professor of international law, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, N. C.
Dr. E. A. Ziegler, professor of foreign economics and finance, University of Florida, Gainesville, Fla.
Dr. A. F. Harmon, Montevallo, Ala.
Dr. W. W. Pierson, dean, the Graduate School, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, N. C.
President Hamilton Holt, Rollins College, Winter Park, Fla.
President John H. Sherman, University of Tampa, Tampa, Fla.
President Dice R. Anderson, Wesleyan College, Macon, Ga.
President George C. Bellingrath, Rabun Gap-Nacoochee School, Rabun Gap, Ga.
President M. L. Brittain, Georgia School of Technology, Atlanta, Ga.
President Rufus E. Clement, Atlanta University, Atlanta, Ga.
President Harvey W. Cox, Emory University, Emory University, Ga.
President Guy H. Wells, Georgia State College for Women, Milledgeville, Ga.
President Pierce Cline, Centenary College of Louisiana, Shreveport, La.
President D. M. Nelson, Mississippi College, Clinton, Miss.
President B. L. Parkinson, Mississippi State College for Women, Columbus, Miss.
President H. G. Bedinger, Flora MacDonald College, Red Springs, N. C.
President Frank P. Graham, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, N. C.
President Gideon I. Humphreys, High Point College, High Point, N. C.
President Walter L. Lingle, Davidson College, Davidson, N. C.
President Howard E. Rondthaler, Salem College, Winston Salem, N. C.
President E. W. Sikes, Clemson College, Clemson, S. C.
President Henry N. Snyder, Wofford College, Spartanburg, S. C.
Chancelor O. C. Carmichael, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tenn.
President Charles E. Diehl, Southwestern University, Memphis, Tenn.
Dr. Alex Guerry, vice chancelor, the University of the South, Sewanee, Tenn.
President Stewart W. McClelland, Lincoln Memorial University, Harrogate, Tenn.
President Ernest L. Stockton, Cumberland University, Lebanon, Tenn.
President E. A. Sutherland, Madison College, Madison College, Tenn.
Dr. M. D. Collins, State superintendent of schools, Atlanta, Ga.
Dr. A. H. Collins, State superintendent of education, Montgomery, Ala.
Dr. Willis Sutton, superintendent of schools, Atlanta, Ga.
Dr. T. H. Harris, State superintendent of education, Baton Rouge, La.
Dr. Clyde A. Erwin, State superintendent of education, Raleigh, N. C.
Dr. James H. Hope, State superintendent of public instruction, Columbia, S. C.
Dr. Sidney B. Hall, State superintendent of public instruction, Richmond, Va.

NOTE: Name of Mr. C. A. Fink, president, North Carolina Federation of Labor, arrived too late to be listed with other labor leaders.

Air-Mail Pick-up

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELMER THOMAS

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 10 (legislative day of Wednesday, October 4), 1939

ARTICLE BY FREDERIC J. HASKIN

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, in connection with the convention of postmasters now being held in this city, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article appearing in the Boston Traveler

by Frederic J. Haskin entitled "Air-Mail Pick-Up to Cover All United States."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Boston Traveler]

AIR MAIL PICK-UP TO COVER ALL UNITED STATES

(By Frederic J. Haskin)

WASHINGTON, D. C., August 24.—Last June, 12 years almost to the day after Lindbergh's great flight, regular air passenger service was started over the Atlantic to Europe, and the world acclaimed another triumph in the amazing progress of aviation.

Overshadowed by this spectacular achievement, but surpassing it in significance from the standpoint of public service, another great event in aviation was taking place at about the same time.

This was the inauguration of the air mail pick-up service.

The first event brought Europe within 24 hours reach; the second brought the advantages of direct air service, now enjoyed by less than 15 percent of our population, within reach of the smallest community, with the prospect that it eventually will revolutionize the air transportation system.

The comparison offers a simple index to the relative utility value of commercial aviation's two latest innovations.

WORLD INNOVATION

The air mail pick-up service was established by the Post Office Department, under an act of Congress, to test the merit of the system whereby collections and deliveries are made in flight in providing service to communities which are unable to obtain it because of their size, geography, or lack of airport facilities. Nothing like it had ever been tried as a scheduled air operation anywhere in the world.

Two routes were laid out, one extending between Philadelphia and Pittsburgh, and the other between Pittsburgh and Charleston and Huntington, W. Va. There are 58 communities on the 2 lines, none of which, with the exception of the 4 termini, has ever had a direct air service of any kind.

Operator of the routes is All American Aviation, Inc., of Wilmington, Del., the president of which is Richard C. du Pont, internationally known flier and aviation authority, who is also president of the American Soaring Society and once held the American gliding championship.

FEEDER SYSTEM

In addition to providing air-mail facilities for communities which cannot be practically or economically incorporated into the trunk line air system, the pick-up service was started in an effort by the Government to encourage the development of a fast and efficient feeder system for the main lines.

In aviation circles the conviction is widely shared that the development of feeder lines and the extension of the benefits of air transportation to communities that are anxious for the service is essential to the ultimate success of commercial aviation in this country. Neglect of this vital arm of any adequate transportation system is considered by many experts to be the big weakness of aviation's expansion program.

While the system has been in operation only a short time, it has demonstrated the entire feasibility of the pick-up principle.

The high degree of performance achieved by the service in maintaining daily schedules and in the efficient handling of the air mail, although it has been pioneering a new field, has demonstrated its efficacy as a practical and economical adjunct of air transportation.

FERTILE FIELD

What is also important is that the growing volume of mail that is being moved daily over the two lines is proof of what has been long suspected but never verified, that there is a fertile field for the expansion of commercial aviation beyond the country's populous centers.

The success of the operation has been so encouraging that the company has extended the service to include express, and the feasibility of placing the pick-up equipment on passenger planes to be used for collecting mail and express when landings are unnecessary is now being studied in connection with plans to expand the system to every section of the country.

While novel and spectacular, the air pick-up system is a simple and dependable operation. The ground equipment consists of two steel poles 28 feet high, which are set 60 feet apart. A transfer rope, to which the pick-up container is attached, is suspended horizontally between the poles. The pick-up equipment in the plane comprises a winch and shock absorber and a 60-foot steel cable, to which is attached a four-fingered grapple. Deliveries are made with the same kind of containers and ropes that are picked up. The mail itself is transported in small pouches which are placed in the containers. These pouches are labeled as to their destination, and they are sorted en route for delivery.

DELIVERY AND PICK-UP

As the plane approaches the air station for a pick-up and delivery the cable and hook is unreeled through a hatch in the bottom of the ship. The rope bearing the delivery container is attached to a release just over the hatch and is lowered by hand, so that in approaching the station the plane is trailing two lines, the delivery rope and the cable.

The plane comes into the station on a gentle glide much the same as it would in landing. An instant before he reaches the air station, the pilot releases the delivery bag and rope, which fall to the ground. The containers have been especially designed and constructed to protect their contents from this impact. In making the pick-up the plane passes over the masts of the air station at an altitude of 50 to 70 feet. As contact is made, the rope slips down the cable into the grapple. Simultaneously the bag slides to the opposite end on the fitting by which it is attached to the rope. This simple slide-fitting attachment, which absorbs most of the shock of contact, is what really makes it possible to make the pick-up without imposing an excessive strain on the plane. The remainder of the shock is taken up by the olio-strut in the plane, so that the whole contact is barely noticeable. A safety link in the cable protects the plane from accident should the hook become fouled by an obstacle on the ground.

In present operations the pick-up load has been limited to 50 pounds, but in tests loads weighing over 70 pounds have been picked up with the same equipment without placing any undue stress on the plane or giving any indication that the limit has been reached. The normal speed at which pick-ups are made is usually 90 and 110 miles an hour, but they have been successfully made at higher speeds up to 125 miles an hour. Similarly there has been no indication that a limit has been reached on the speed at which pick-up can be made with the present equipment.

Communities fortunate enough to be situated on airways are within 24 hours' reach of one another. Europe is less than 2 days away. The advantage of this service to the business and industry of these communities is incalculable. Communities on the two pick-up routes of All American Aviation now share these advantages as those located on airways, and an adequate feeder system of lines of this type would bring them within reach to every locality in the country.

The air pick-up also has an important relationship to the national defense. As a preparedness measure, the Government is now engaged in training 20,000 reserve pilots a year. The national expansion in aviation that will result from this tremendous program will absorb many of these flyers who desire to make aviation a career, but there are many more who will finish their courses and find no opportunity to utilize their training. A means must be found for keeping these men in the air or much of the value and effectiveness of the program will be destroyed. The best pilots are the active pilots. Spreading the feeder system throughout the country will offer a field of employment to some of these pilots, which will be a definite contribution to the success of the preparedness program.

Letter to California Delegation on Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 10, 1939

LETTER FROM JOHN ANSON FORD

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, because I believe it sounds a note which is greatly needed to be heard in Washington right at this time, and because I am deeply impressed with the fairness of its balanced appraisal of the present international situation, I am asking to have printed in the RECORD the following letter addressed to Members of the California congressional delegation by Los Angeles County Supervisor John Anson Ford:

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *October 9, 1939.*

To the Members of the California Congressional Delegation, Washington, D. C.

DEAR FRIENDS: I trust it will not be considered presuming if I attempt to interpret to you something of California's spirit and attitude with respect to the present war in Europe and America's relation to it.

A few nights ago I presided at a mass meeting in the Los Angeles Philharmonic Auditorium, participated in jointly by organizations and citizens representing a very wide range of viewpoint politically, and in the fields of economics and international relations. Admitting the possibility of some individual divergence of opinions, I think I can speak for the very large constituency represented at the Philharmonic. And having been daily in close touch with the thought and feeling of the people of Los Angeles County for the past 5 years because of duties as an elective county official, I believe what I say reflects the overwhelming opinions of this county, which comprises about 43 percent of California's population. To a lesser extent I am speaking for the majority opinion of the balance of the State, having recently conferred with several of the northern leaders and having friends or acquaintances in most of the counties.

That the people of California, along with the rest of the country, want the United States to keep out of the war goes without saying.

Their question is, rather, How shall we keep out of the war honorably and to the benefit, not the detriment, of ourselves and the world at large?

The attitude which you, the California congressional delegation, take can exert a profound influence on the pending decision of Congress and of the American people.

First, I believe the American people are determined not to send another expeditionary force to Europe. If the Allies are hoping to repeat the record of 1917 and thereby tilt the scales of war in their favor, it becomes immediately imperative that Congress disabuse the European diplomatic mind of that hope. Rather, our thoughts and our resources must be dedicated to a constructive, not a destructive, program of lasting peace. Speedy decisions are needed. World changes are taking place almost overnight.

Second, there is strong sentiment in California that Mr. Roosevelt should undertake to mediate peace. Hitler has opened the door. England and France have not closed it. No great moral principle will be violated by such an effort. Let America see to it that neither pride nor war propaganda cause her to let this opportunity pass to help reconstruct the European scene before it is reduced to blood and ashes, for I find many Californians are coming to see that a peaceful world must be a changed world. Above all, the change must be a matter of the mind and heart, not merely governments, and systems and boundaries.

Among the outward changes which carry with them a new material and spiritual outlook on life are the following:

(a) Britain must speedily abandon her imperialistic policies and accelerate the democratic movement toward democratic and autonomous confederation of her constituent dominions.

With the passing of the Empire must pass the imperialism of its financial overlords. While Britain has a homeland in some respects gloriously democratic at heart, her world-wide aims and methods remain imperialistic and antidemocratic.

(b) Present-day Germany must be interpreted in the light of the Treaty of Versailles. The criminal folly of that crushing peace is widely recognized. To say this is neither to approve or condone Hitler. History alone can fully appraise that enigmatic personality and his glaring contradictions.

Whatever may be Germany's grievances against the Treaty of Versailles—and admittedly they are great—Californians are particularly aroused against the racial intolerance and atrocities practiced by Hitler. To Californians as to all the great American majority, the broad principles of democracy and not banishment or extermination of one racial group by another, offer the basis for lasting peace among the peoples of the civilized world.

(c) These very principles of democracy should indicate our own course. Our task is not the extermination by war of the German regime, however much it may be repugnant to us. Instead, having faith in the slow but sure capacity of an intelligent people eventually to purge and cleanse its own house, Californians feel that our task is to stand guard, with our moral economic and military weapons of defense, confidently awaiting that day when the fires of intolerance and the hot glow of egomania shall have burned themselves out.

Third. Californians have learned to think of this European struggle in personal terms, with worthy and unworthy motives mingled in typically human fashion—all magnified to a national scale and clothed in obscuring terms of intrigue, multilateral diplomacy, and propaganda.

Fourth. California is now demanding that in this time of war we prepare for peace. Economics are too much an integral part of international ethics to admit of delay in preparing for the future. Trade, employment, social security, the moral and cultured well-being of the people—all these are in the balance. The United States must positively shape events through Executive and congressional action or events will shape themselves, to the detriment of all.

Some nation or some individual must initiate the effort for peace. And time is of the essence. Judging by the results of the World War, a peace effort earnestly seeking justice with mercy would serve mankind far better than a so-called peace of victory.

America, California believes, is peculiarly fitted by her detachment from the scene of conflict and by reason of her eminent leaders to initiate negotiations for a peace of justice tempered with mercy. Our President and our Secretary of State have given abundant evidence of their practical capacity to perform this difficult world service.

Guided by the disillusioning experience of 1919 and strengthened by 20 years of sober study of international trends, let America attempt again some constructive part in the affairs of our world.

No other people in all history have been so endowed geographically and racially to speak for all mankind. The principles of our Government suggest that we cannot live unto ourselves. To the degree that we truly serve mankind in this hour of need we shall be abundantly rewarded.

The people of our country have always been forward looking. While realities at home and abroad demand that past wrongdoings and shortcomings of ourselves and others must be humbly acknowledged, we in America believe that a better world and a better United States will be vouchsafed if we seek it with humble and contrite hearts. To believe otherwise is to envisage chaos and another Dark Age.

It is not rhetorical verbiage to say that the United States has a great destiny. To fulfill that destiny we must use our deep spiritual power and our vast material strength to bring the brotherhood of man nearer to reality.

This great crisis is America's great opportunity.

JOHN ANSON FORD.

Who in Europe Lives in a Glass House?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 10, 1939

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, those in this country who because of misguided patriotism or the desire for ill-gotten war profits would involve the United States in the present European conflict, either directly or indirectly, would do well to study the following date book of European treachery which under leave extended to me I am inserting herewith as it appeared in an editorial in my home-town newspaper. An impartial study of these recorded historical facts should convince all pro-Americans that none of the belligerents in Europe come into the court of war with clean hands and that any move on the part of this country to tinker with the blood business abroad must be based on a jungle greed for profits and not a Christian impulse to protect any "innocents abroad."

GERMANY DECEIVES POLAND—ENGLAND DECEIVES PALESTINE

If trickery, and imperialism, and broken promises are the stock in trade of one set of belligerents in Europe, they are also the formulas steadfastly applied by the other set. America rightfully abhors force, intimidation, and subjugation in foreign affairs and believes in the concept of individual liberty and equality of opportunity. America believes in these concepts equally whether it be in the environment of Poland, Czechoslovakia, Palestine, or in India where the British Empire keeps the Hindu race as economic puppets paying tribute to the Crown. In a war to determine which nation should subjugate the peoples of another, surely this country should remain neutral, impartial, dispassionate. "Means short of war" should be studiously avoided in a profit-making zeal to capitalize upon Europe's carnival of death, lest they become "a short cut into war" making us participants in a war in which we have no interest and in which there is no "right side." Such neutrality may not please certain groups of brokers and bankers, may actively displease munitions makers and shipbuilders, but it will gladden the heart of every American mother of every American boy. As the gentleman from Iowa, Congressman HARRINGTON, has so vividly said, "All the American investments abroad are not worth the slaughter of a single American boy—if so, what mother will furnish that boy?"

Those who are today insisting upon placing the imprint of the dollar sign above the flag of American neutrality by asking Congress to repeal the arms embargo and making us the supply agent of wholesale murderers of all countries, including Japan, owe the citizens of America two straightforward answers to two direct questions which they have thus far studiously avoided. I am, personally, still uncommitted for or against any American peace program or neutrality plan, but I insist that the proponents of putting this country into business for blood money quit evading the issue and answer these questions, so that the millions of Americans who, above all else, do not want to send American boys to die and rot on foreign battlefields will have a clear-eyed understanding of the risks involved in the repealist campaign.

TWO QUESTIONS REPEAL ADVOCATES AVOID

The two questions which still remain most eloquently unanswered are:

First. Just how, precisely and definitely, will repeal of the arms embargo help keep America at peace? Permit no smooth-tongued issue dodger to answer this by talk of keeping American ships out of foreign waters, cash and carry, or setting up combat areas in which American citizens are forbidden—both sides of the neutrality controversy agree with the neutrality program except for the arms-embargo repeal. Make somebody answer you directly how repeal of the

embargo, how the business of selling war-making machinery will contribute to American peace? That is a fair question and deserves a fair answer.

Second. Can America have its cake and eat it, too? If repeal of the arms embargo is for the purpose—as some Senators and administrative officers now freely say it is—of enabling the United States to help defeat Germany and Russia and not for the purpose of strengthening our insurance against getting into war, then these repealists owe this country an answer to this question, too. Can we help defeat Germany and Russia and still keep out of war? Can we "have our cake and eat it, too"? If we can, the munitions makers and other repeal advocates owe this country a clear-cut statement of how it can be done. They must show what our course will be if Germany and Russia fight back. Senator BORAH raised this question clearly in his masterful address on October 2—thus far no Senator or White House spokesman has replied to it. Americans deserve an answer to this question; it is neither good politics nor good public policy to continue to evade it or to camouflage it by torrents of words about points in the bill on which all men stand agreed.

It is the two questions above which inquire about the peace-preserving or peace-destroying features of repealing the arms embargo. This is no time to evade the issue or deceive the people. Let those who would risk the lives of millions of American boys on the gamble that we can profiteer by selling arms to belligerents, help England and France win the war, contribute to the new map-making of Europe, reorganize the governments of nearly half a billion people, and still have a reliable safeguard against getting into the war, speak up and meet the issues. This is no time for breast beating about good intentions; it is high time, now, to talk frankly about the consequences of making a bad guess about how far we can go in playing with the fire of war and not get burned by its coals.

THE BLACK KETTLES AND THE BLACK POTS OF EUROPE

While waiting for the overdue answers to these questions I urge that all of you read the following "calendar of cupidity" which I have taken from the editorial page of my hometown newspaper, the Madison Daily Leader:

THE BLACK KETTLES AND BLACK POTS OF EUROPE

Whatever attitude the United States takes toward the European war, all patriotic people are agreed that that attitude must be dictated only by what seems best for the United States.

Those who seek a more or less active participation in the war on the side of the British and French base their view on the feeling that if the Germans beat them the world will be uncomfortable and unsafe for American democracy.

Those who seek to insure that the United States take no part in the war base their view on the feeling that American democracy is best served by preserving its strength, and its essence by keeping as clear as possible of the whole thing.

Either view sounds selfish. But what else is justified by the record of both sides since the World War? The Miami Daily News recently assembled the damning record of all the warring powers since 1919. By permission we reproduce that record:

GERMANY

Spent from 1919 to 1933 complaining against the Treaty of Versailles, and trying to evade many of its provisions.

Spent from 1933 to 1939 tearing up the Treaty of Versailles.

Decreed military conscription, 1935.

Occupied the Rhineland in violation of the Locarno Treaty, 1936.

Invaded and annexed Austria, 1938.

Sliced off a portion of Czechoslovakia, 1938.

Invaded and annexed the remainder of Czechoslovakia, 1939.

Took Memel from Lithuania by extortion, 1939.

Started, according to the best information available at present, a new world war, 1939.

POLAND

Seized a large part of Upper Silesia from the League of Nations, in defiance of the result of a plebiscite, 1921.

Seized Wilno, capital of Lithuania, 1924.

Mistreated German and Ukrainian minorities, 1919–39.

Seized Teschen area from prostrate Czechoslovakia, 1938.

FRANCE

Blocked every effort to induce the victorious powers to disarm, as promised in the Treaty of Versailles, 1919 to 1933.

Carried on economic war upon prostrate Germany, 1919–29.

Dominated the League of Nations, which put seal of approval upon Polish seizures of Silesia in 1921 and Wilno in 1924.

Occupied the Ruhr Valley of Germany on thin reparations pretext, 1923, with Prime Minister Poincaire privately expressing hope the Germans would not pay so France could annex the valley.

Unofficially supported Japanese invasion of Manchuria until realizing her stand was undermining her own insistance upon sanctity of the Versailles Treaty, 1931.

Blocked effective sanctions against Italy when latter invaded Ethiopia, 1935.

Sacrificed Czechoslovakia to appeasement policy, 1938.

Violated Syrian mandate by letting Turks take district of Hatay in deal for Anglo-Franco-Turkish alliance, 1939.

Defaulted on war debts to United States up to and including the present time.

ENGLAND

Carried on intermittent bombing of tribes on northwest frontier of India, 1920–39.

Supported Japan against United States at time of Manchurian invasion, 1931.

Failed to deal effectively with Italian aggression in Ethiopia, 1935.

Sacrificed Czechoslovakia to appeasement policy, 1938.

Broke Balfour promise of a Jewish homeland in Palestine, 1938–39.

Defaulted on war debts to United States up to and including the present time.

The Businessman Looks at Crime

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 10, 1939

AN EDITORIAL BY HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with permission given me by the House under unanimous consent, I submit the following editorial prepared by me and appearing currently in one of the nationally known monthly magazines of the Macfadden group:

THE BUSINESSMAN LOOKS AT CRIME

Were it physically and mentally possible for an American businessman operating his store on Main Street in Anytown, U. S. A., to peer into the cipher-looking end of a blue-steel revolver every 9 minutes by command of a hold-up man, hear burglars smash in the back door of his store every 2 minutes, and at the same time be able to answer the phone 37 times a day to receive the sorrowful news that 37 of his friends had been murdered, he would at the end of the day drop to his knees and pray Almighty God to show him his duty in suppressing lawlessness.

Yet that in part is the true story of what is happening to the businessmen of America, collectively, day in and day out throughout the year. But that isn't half the story. A serious crime cannot be committed every 22 seconds in this great Nation without striking across the threshold of the businessman or casting a shadow over his home hearth. Businessmen of America cannot escape being included in the victims of the 3,879 serious crimes that are committed daily in the United States.

As businessmen we sweat over our balance sheets and operating statements, but we rarely pause to figure in the cost of crime, which has been conservatively estimated at an annual levy of $120 upon every man, woman, and child. It does not appear in the reports of the United States Treasury, yet the annual bill inflicted upon the American people by the vultures of vice and violence is $15,000,000,000.

The businessman must come to look upon his local law-enforcing agencies with the same feeling of partnership as he does his board of commerce or commercial club in the business field, his lodge or club in the social field, and his church in the spiritual field. The businessman must look at crime, unpleasant though the task may be. In its cycle of an attack every 22 seconds, crime will eventually pull his name from the box. Crime looks at the businessman. It is time the businessman looked at crime.

The average citizen is all too resigned to leaving the job of looking after crime to the local police department or the sheriff's department. He complains about them and too frequently feels that any new equipment they may need in coping with modern Mephistopheles is only a luxury that will add to the tax burden of the property owners. In other words, "it can't happen here," and "if it does, then we'll do something about it."

The businessman spends an hour or more a week in conference with his board of commerce devising ways and means of inducing new industry to move into town to provide new pay rolls and relieve unemployment; or to widen the advertising campaign to enlarge the customer area from which the home town draws. The same businessman joins heartily in the campaign to beautify the town with parks and boulevards. Yet the ugly smear of crime in one section or another of his city is to him merely another item in the daily paper. It is forgotten by nightfall unless the offense

has been sufficiently fiendish to cause a bad dream or two, but even then, it is dismissed with the dawn of another day.

What can the businessman do?

It would be simple to say that the way to stop crime is to stop producing criminals, yet in saying that we strike at the very heart of the problem. One only need to refer to the tabulation of uniform crime reports for the year 1938 to learn that 53 percent of the arrests made during 1938 were of persons less than 30 years old, and that 18.8 percent were less than 21 years of age. Another sad slant on the youthfulness of the annual criminal round-up are the figures showing that during the last year in crimes against property—robbery, burglary, larcency, auto theft, etc.—the toll was 31.5 percent of youngsters under the age of 21. Likewise, appalling are the figures showing that 12 percent of our murderers, 24 percent of our rapists, and 28 percent of our robbers are under 21.

It is in every sense a community problem and its phases of youthful delinquency can lead to any or every home in that community. The fact is, 30,000,000 American homes hold the solution of the crime problem of the generation. Our insurance against crime tomorrow is the premium paid today in the form of proper examples set before our youth. In shrinking responsibility we may innocently become an accessory before a crime.

If it is good business to encourage home beautification, fire prevention, and other types of campaigns, it is good business to promote a year-around campaign for the juveniles that will afford ample opportunities for exhaustion of the pent-up energy of youth in gainful, helpful, and healthful ways.

That forceful figure for law and order and arch enemy of the underworld with its fledglings of sooty down—a man for whom I have the highest regard, J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, recently hit the crux of this phase when he said:

"The functioning of youth movements has an inestimably beneficial effect upon the welfare of the juvenile members of our communities, and any work which improves the moral outlook and character of younger members of society justifies itself in the dividends which posterity will receive."

While looking at crime, the businessman must also focus his glasses on politics. He must become interested in politics. There has been no greater stumbling block in the path of citizens bent on cleaning up ugly criminal situations than corrupt criminal machines, with one hand in the pocket of the taxpayers and the other pawing tribute out of the loot of the criminal. Every businessman's worthy endeavor should be to courageously cast into the abyss every vestige of corrupt political influence associated with the administration of criminal justice. Corruption in politics has been a millstone about the neck of too many sincere law-enforcement officers. Their hands have been tied while the underworld bloated itself with plunder pilfered under the protecting wing of venal officeholders, too often likewise waxing fat on the blood money spewing from their pipe line into the subterranean regions of lawlessness.

No businessman would tolerate such a system among his own employees. Why does he tolerate it and its consequent gloomy record of lawlessness among the employees on the public pay rolls? The only sound answer for the businessman who is looking at crime with a view of reducing its magnitude is to exercise his right as a citizen every election day by electing and encouraging the election of men to public office who are fearless, whose past records cannot be questioned, and who owe no allegiance and have no alliance with the denizens of the underworld. Having elected such public servants, the businessman must continue vigilant that honest government shall prevail.

The businessman should encourage the divorcement of law-enforcing agencies from our system of politics. I am informed in one city they have had 31 chiefs of police in 63 years. That is an average of a new chief every 24 months. The reason—politics. Police administration must not be changed at each shift of the political wind if an effective attack is to be made upon crime.

I can point with pride to two outstanding successes wherein an isolation policy for law-enforcement agencies has reaped rich reward to the taxpayers. I refer first, because of its national scope, to the Federal Bureau of Investigation. For the past 14 years this strong arm of the United States Department of Justice has functioned under several administrations but totally free from all political influence. Consequently, this agency, so ably directed by Mr. Hoover, is internationally famous and has the respect of every law-abiding citizen of the United States. Its long record, starting with the wiping out of gangsterism, which had the Nation on edge a few years ago, down through the crushing of the kidnap racket and into its present-day greatly enlarged realm of enforcement of Federal laws, stands as a glowing tribute to those American citizens who have tirelessly contended that crime would be whipped if hungry politicians kept their fingers out of the operations.

Likewise, high in this respect, stands another police organization upon which the people of the Commonwealth have hung the "no trespassing" sign. I refer to the Michigan State police, who have gained national recognition for efficiently combating crime without the aid of political machines. Its chief, Oscar G. Olander, has likewise served through alternating administrations of political parties of conflicting views.

With a police department fortified against the shifting political sands and built around a framework impregnable to political handicraft, the businessman may now concentrate his attention upon the building of well-trained unit of officers mentally and physically equipped to match wisdom and sinew against the cunning and brawn of the crook.

In the past, organized training and instruction for police officers has been confined to large metropolitan areas. On smaller forces officers were compelled to rely upon their own resourcefulness and their knowledge gained only through years of experience.

The twentieth century underworld offspring was quick to grasp the facilities of the fast automobile, machine gun, radio, and other modern developments as tools of his trade. Legislative bodies—local, State, and National—were slower to make these available to their agents. But with the acquisition of these facilities came the realization that organized, trained, law-enforcement officers are absolutely essential to any present-day police unit.

Here again Mr. Businessman can make his contribution by encouraging locally a police-training unit. The police-training movement is still in its infancy, but the Federal Bureau of Investigation has already demonstrated its effectiveness through the work done by the Federal Bureau of Investigation National Police Academy.

Although this training work is yet in its formative stages, the F. B. I., some State and local departments, the Office of Education of the Department of Interior, the American Municipal Association, certain colleges, and a number of professional agencies have cooperated in the development of training for police service.

Probably the most ideal training system is that of the Federal Bureau of Investigation National Police Academy, headed by Director Hoover. Law-enforcement officers from all over the United States, recommended by local officials, have filed applications with the F. B. I. and from these applications a limited number are selected every 3 months for an intensive course of 12 weeks' training at the F. B. I. school in Washington. The student receives practically all of the training given a G-man. In return for this training at the expense of the Federal Government (except for room, meals, and traveling expenses) the local government agrees to establish some form of a training school with their F. B. I. graduated officer as the instructor. Training gained at the National Police Academy is in this manner passed along to other members of the local department. The Federal Bureau of Investigation is to be highly commended for affording this training to key police officers throughout the Nation.

Many State-police units have a similar intensive course for their own rookie officers, but usually this training is not available to the local police and sheriffs' units.

An example of what colleges can do was demonstrated in Michigan recently when the Michigan State College established a police-administration class. Fifteen men graduated this summer, having completed a 5-year course consisting of 3½ years' academic work, with the remaining period in actual practice at the State police barracks. Already more than half of the "college cops" have entered positions with various police departments.

Adequate training of officers is due to receive more and more attention, and the businessman will do well to be an exponent of a local police-training course, irrespective of how small a beginning.

Combating the menace of lawlessness is by no means a hopeless task if our citizens will arise to the responsibility before them. Forces of decency have sufficient facilities if courageous men can be found to use them. As one of the heaviest losers to crime in the past, the American businessman must look crime squarely in the face and determine that there shall be no compromise with the forces of evil.

The American businessman, as a leader in his community, must enlist the mind and the heart of the citizenry in this battle against crime. He must lead the attack on juvenile delinquency; destroy crime's alliance with politics; and help establish a corps of well-trained, efficient officers thoroughly prepared to outwit the enemies of society and expose crooked officeholders. Irrespective of national economic conditions, business can never realize the full benefits of prosperity until this widespread lawlessness is curbed.

The American businessman has this important job to do—and he is going to do it.

Keep America Out of War—Amend the Present Neutrality Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 9, 1939

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, according to the latest press dispatches from London, Paris, and Berlin, the war in Europe is now at a standstill. Hostilities have been temporarily suspended, we are told, while the great nations of Europe are making what appears to be a final search for peace.

In view of the many admitted obstacles to a peaceful settlement of the present European dispute our grim hope for peace at this time might seem a futile one. Nevertheless, let us hope that peace will come presently by way of compromise instead of later by way of surrender, which in the final

analysis may spell disaster for all nations concerned. We pray that this war may be ended now; that peace may come before it is too late to bring order out of the chaos of a strife-torn Europe.

OUR GREATEST RESPONSIBILITY

Whether it be peace or war that lies over the horizon for Europe, we in America must not forget that our first and greatest responsibility is to our own country and to our children who shall inherit it after us. We must not at any time relax our efforts nor soften our determination to keep America out of war. By keeping America out of war we shall be doing something infinitely great, not only for ourselves and our posterity, but also for Europe and the world at large.

In an address which I delivered at Spartanburg, S. C., shortly before my return to Washington, I remarked:

> In America let us keep the issue clear. We should continue to be concerned with only one thing—and that is to keep America out of war. * * * But let us lose no time in deciding upon a course of action which will keep us out of war today, tomorrow, a year from now, 2 years from now, or however long the struggle in Europe continues.

And I wish here today to again express the thought that we must lose no time in deciding upon a course of action which will keep us out of war. As I glance back upon the history of events that carried us into the last war, I can see where we left our peace objectives unguarded, where we left our wish to stay out of war unprotected, because we failed to establish a firm and practical policy at the outset of the war.

PRACTICAL PLAN

At the outbreak of that war we were intent upon peace, as we are intent upon peace today. Yes; it was our wish then, as it is our wish now, to keep America out of war, but we failed to look ahead; we failed to plot the inevitable course of events; we failed to take cognizance of the facts and face them as facts. Mainly, we wished for peace, and wished for it from the bottom of our hearts, but we lost as we failed to provide measures of protection for our peaceful intentions. America was then without any definite, clear-cut international policy, and, although we did not realize it at the time, we were drifting—drifting toward our eventual entry into the war.

My support of the cash-and carry plan, which the President has recommended to Congress, is based on the sincere belief that it is a sane, practical plan which will do much to keep us from drifting into war.

Repeal of the arms embargo section of the present Neutrality Act, selling to all belligerent nations for cash and carry, is a highly practical and realistic treatment of our desire to keep America out of war. I term the proposed cash-and-carry plan a practical and realistic treatment of our desire to keep America out of war for these two fundamental reasons:

First. It will serve to hasten the end of the present struggle.

Second. It will place America in the position of aiding England and France instead of Germany, as is now the case.

HELP END WAR

We know, first and foremost, that as long as there is war in Europe we shall be subjected to the danger and possibility of involvement. The danger and possibility of our being drawn into war will not disappear until Europe is at peace again.

Therefore, the American people are extremely anxious to see the war in Europe brought to a close at the earliest possible moment so that the danger of our being drawn into the conflict might disappear at the earliest possible moment. That the cash-and-carry plan will serve to hasten the end of the present struggle is the most logical conclusion to be reached upon analysis of the present European situation.

First, England announced some time ago that she would not cease fighting until Hitler is defeated and his aggression halted, and, unless the basis for an honorable peace can be found in Europe at this time, England will certainly continue her fight against Hitler. England has also declared that she is prepared to fight for 7 or 8 years if necessary. Hitler has declared for Germany practically the same thing, but his contentions are less susceptible of proof. However, the important thing for us to realize here is that the cash-and-carry plan would make available to England and France airships, and so forth, with which to bring the war to a speedier conclusion.

Of course, Germany, under the cash-and-carry plan, would be permitted to send whatever ships she could to our shores and purchase these same materials, the question of who obtained the goods being left up to the warring nations, not America. But it is believed that England, mistress of the sea that she is, will be able to transport sufficient materials to bolster up the weak spots in her war machine.

One of the weakest spots in the English and French fighting forces is in the air. The airships of Germany greatly outnumber those of England and France, but we have in America the productive capacity to turn out several thousand planes a month, which would in a reasonable length of time enable England and France to match the air strength of Germany.

PRESENT ACT AIDS GERMANY

Since under the present Neutrality Act Germany is being aided, and since by repealing the arms-embargo section of the present Neutrality Act England and France, instead of Germany, would be aided, we simply have to decide whether it will be best for us in the long run to, on the one hand, aid Germany, or, on the other hand, aid England and France. This time let us be objective and practical in our conduct of foreign affairs by making our choice as realists, not as wishful thinkers and impractical idealists. The plain, inescapable fact is that we have much less to fear from an English-French victory than a German victory. Aggression feeds on aggression, and let us do nothing to help the aggressor nation triumph in the present struggle.

AVOID DRIFTING INTO WAR

One of the strongest and most salient features of the cash-and-carry plan recommended by the President is that it forbids the use of American ships in trade with the belligerents. This is a much-needed safeguard against our involvement in war. We know that what did most to draw us into the last war was the sinking of American ships and the loss of American lives on the high seas. We must remove the danger of a recurrence of "incidents" which might again inflame public sentiment and lead us down the road to war. Keeping public sentiment strongly against our going into war is, after all, the thing which will do most to actually keep us out of war. The American people today are unanimously opposed to our entering war, and as long as this opposition to our participation in war is maintained we shall remain at peace. This is a certainty.

Therefore, what is most important is that we at this session of Congress lay the foundation for a firm, clear-cut international policy which will keep us from again drifting into war as we did in 1917. By amending the present Neutrality Act and establishing the cash-and-carry plan we shall lay that foundation for a sane and practical policy which will best serve to keep America out of war.

The Share of the Domestic Pork Market Supplied by the American Pork Producer

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WADE H. KITCHENS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 10, 1939

STATEMENT BY THE AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ADMINISTRATION

Mr. KITCHENS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following statement issued by the Agricultural Adjustment Administration:

> In the case of pork, as with practically all United States farm products, it is the volume of exports rather than the volume of

imports that really concerns the American farmer. The American farmer has the American pork market; what he needs is an export outlet for his surplus hog products, rather than additional protection from foreign imports.

Up until 1936, pork imports into this country were so small as to be only a fraction of 1 percent of our total domestic production. During the last 3 years, high pork prices, resulting chiefly from drought liquidation of herds, have attracted slightly increased importations. During these 3 years pork imports have amounted to 1 percent of our total domestic production. In other words, the American farmer has at least 99 percent of the American pork market. He also has some share in the pork and lard market of foreign countries.

The largest proportion of pork imports into this country at all times is the result of continued demand for such luxury products as Polish canned hams.

The share of the domestic pork market supplied by the American producer, excluding lard, calendar years 1924–38

Year	Pork production	Imports[1]					Percent imports are of production[4]
		Hams, shoulders, and bacon[2]	Pork, fresh or frozen[2]	Pork, salted, pickled, and other[2]	Live hogs in terms of pork equivalent[3]	Total, pork	
	Pounds	*Pounds*	*Pounds*	*Pounds*	*Pounds*	*Pounds*	
1924	9,149,000,000	757,000	5,684,000	342,000	3,730,000	10,513,000	----
1925	8,128,000,000	1,157,000	7,235,000	466,000	9,637,000	18,495,000	----
1926	7,966,000,000	1,769,000	9,156,000	1,347,000	9,863,000	22,135,000	----
1927	8,430,000,000	3,972,000	14,511,000	3,072,000	19,739,000	41,294,000	----
1928	9,041,000,000	2,537,000	7,767,000	2,526,000	1,993,000	14,823,000	----
1929	8,833,000,000	2,084,000	4,124,000	2,314,000	344,000	8,866,000	----
1930	8,479,000,000	1,980,000	1,093,000	1,583,000	14,000	4,670,000	----
1931	8,734,000,000	1,979,000	754,000	1,234,000	96,000	4,063,000	----
1932	8,915,000,000	3,015,000	1,658,000	1,075,000	19,000	5,767,000	----
1933	9,124,000,000	1,672,000	539,000	703,000	4,000	2,918,000	----
1934	8,342,000,000	969,000	182,000	495,000	4,000	1,650,000	----
1935	5,953,000,000	5,297,000	3,923,000	1,274,000	1,878,000	12,372,000	----
1936	7,535,000,000	26,088,000	12,945,000	2,810,000	9,595,000	51,438,000	1
1937	6,886,000,000	47,422,000	20,877,000	6,532,000	9,105,000	83,936,000	1
1938[5]	7,563,000,000	44,347,000	4,287,000	3,748,000	31,000	52,413,000	1

[1] Imports for consumption.
[2] Actual weight basis.
[3] Converted at 55 percent of live weight.
[4] Blanks indicate less than 1 percent.
[5] Preliminary.

The National Debt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES SECCOMBE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 10, 1939

ADDRESS BY HON. STEPHEN BOLLES, OF WISCONSIN, SEPTEMBER 7, 1939

Mr. SECCOMBE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following address to the Wisconsin Bankers' Association by the Honorable STEPHEN BOLLES, Member of Congress from the First District of Wisconsin, September 7, 1939:

Mr. Chairman, members of Wisconsin Bankers' Association, I hope no one here has remained to hear me as an expert on banking. Over a long period of years as a newspaperman I knew banks only as institutions which had the best, highest, most profoundly ornate buildings in the city. I remember many years ago that "Golden Rule" Jones, who had been elected mayor of Toledo, said the only use he had for banks was an overdraft. I learned later when I expanded a little in what we modernistically term "our economic life" that the first attribute of a banker and a most necessary part of his personal equipment was the ability to keep a poker face and say "no." This lesson in human architecture has been of great value in Congress, since I have voted "no" on so many of the wildly extravagant appropriations of billions of dollars.

I am not so sure that what I would have said a week ago I can say now. We are plunged into a cloud of darkness and we are looking for light in the east. A war-torn Europe demands new resolvements in attitudes. We cannot say that the financial structure of yesterday is that of today. Congress has voted a continuation of the President's power to alter the weight of the dollar and to continue the $2,000,000,000 stabilization fund. I voted "no" on this and am glad now in the international situation that I did so.

We have been going along in the United States for almost 7 years doing revolutionary things. We have piled up a debt into astronomical figures. We have appropriated, in the first session of the Seventy-sixth Congress, $13,000,000,000 which will have to be paid either out of tax revenues or by borrowing, and which made a deficit exceeding $3,000,000,000 for 1940. In these 7 years we have violated and voided every law of economics. We have slapped facts in the face. We have spent fifty billions in recovery without recovery. We have tried schemes dead from the days of Diocletion; withered, as would be the bullrushes around Moses when Pharaoh's daughter found him. We have placed on the Federal statute books more regulatory laws than all the dictators in Europe ever did and put the foot of the Government in the door of business to get an entrance so that there may be sold the phony financial plans of an experimental sales crew from the guinea-pig laboratory of an irresponsible collection of misguided zealots.

This is the hour when we should promulgate a new declaration of independence. It is time for freedom from legislative shackles and Executive dictatorship. We should not be carried away by fictitious profits from war. We will have to pay double for them later. Nor should we forget in the hysteria of war that we have still a job to do in order that freedom in this Republic may again be established. We have now the world's greatest bureaucratic government, the greatest debt, the greatest army of unemployed, a persistent downward trend of farm income. As most of you here are from cities, villages, and towns dependent in greater part on farm prosperity and income, I may say that this question involves us all.

I need not go into a discussion of national farm policy as reflected by laws and their administration. We have to admit that all these experiments, so far as stable recovery is concerned, have been failures. This condition has its reflection in every bank. In a search for causes of these abnormal conditions we must ultimately arrive at two destinations—continuous deficits and growing public debt. Debt follows deficit, and the penalty is the unprecedented volume of taxation now imposed by Federal, State, and local governments. Many of these taxes have reached or passed their maximum of productivity under the inexorable law of diminishing returns.

We may thus see that public debt and its twin brother, taxation, are the most important items the American Nation confronts. All other questions are submerged in these two—debt and taxation. It is perfectly clear to everybody that increase of expenditures, not the lack of revenues, has been the cause of constantly recurring deficits. It was a shocking exhibition of Government inefficiency when Congress was asked to vote for an increase of the debt limit. That was defeated, thanks to the support of many on both sides of the House. Our debt now exceeds $40,000,000,000. This does not include the contingent liability of some $5,000,000,000 due to obligations issued by various Government agencies and guaranteed by the Government. There is also the contingent liability—a potential liability—coming from some millions of dollars in housing programs. There are some offsets to this in the Treasury balance and resources of a few Government corporations and credit agencies. The book value of these items amounts to some $5,000,000,000.

When we come to consider this national debt we must realize that the total value of all farm lands, including farm equipment, buildings, and improvements, is estimated to be about $30,000,000,000, and that the gross assets of all manufacturing corporations in the metal and metal-products industry, which also includes steel, with the added corporations making food products or chemicals, are less than $40,000,000,000, with a net worth of such corporations much less. Then we can realize the immensity of this debt and what it means as a retardant to any recovery. There must follow an unprecedented volume of taxation already imposed on all industry, with the hark back into every home in the land. A group of industrial leaders some few months ago stated that "the more burdens heaped upon private enterprise, the fewer persons it can employ. The fewer it employs, the heavier it will be taxed to support the rest. Heavier taxes can produce a chronic state of depression.

There was no lack of knowledge on the part of the Members of the present Congress, both in the majority and minority groups, of the consequences of appropriating billions of dollars and still adding to both deficit and debt. There are those in Congress who definitely advocate inflation and believe that the solution of the debt and deficit both lies in the issuing of currency without let or hindrance, so as to supply the Treasury with cash. This, of course, is inflation, and strange to say, there are a number of earnest advocates of this policy. They are, with one or two exceptions, confined to the majority side of the House. I may say to you that in the desperation of finances, Government activities, and carrying out the programs for the bureaucratic organization, we are in great danger of such an inflationatory movement well supported in the next session of Congress. This is not called money inflation but credit inflation. This is the hovering specter of disturbance which we must look at and realize fully.

That such inflation under whatever name it may come will impair the credit of the United States Government is agreed upon by all of us. The debt heretofore has not been financed first of all from the savings of the people, but because the Government has placed its I O U's in the banks and then receiving credit on which it draws. The result is an abnormally expanded credit base which, unless handled with greatest care, can become unmanageable.

The safety of every bank deposit, activity in industrial enterprises, value of agricultural products, opportunity for employment, security of insurance policies all depend upon the unimpaired credit of the United States Government. That credit affects the fundamental human values. The banks own a little over 50 percent of the total direct and interest-bearing obligations. These are the keystone of the credit structure. Their holdings represent about

25 percent of their total assets and around 60 percent of total investments. Therefore I say to you, with all emphasis, that we must put every ounce of energy of all those who will be affected directly and indirectly into this preservation of our credit and to fight to the very end against any step toward inflation. Any drop in the prices of these obligations would not only disturb the financial structure of the country, but have serious repercussions on the greater mass of our people.

We may thus clearly see the interrelation between stability of Government credit, maintaining the public debt at its present level or less, the absolute necessity of reducing deficits by smaller appropriations, and arriving at a tax base which will not diminish the revenues by increasing the rates. I believe the public is becoming conscious of this great burden of debt. We have not overcome the deficits. Congress, in spite of the militant minority, continually increased the Federal debt and the appropriations in the last session. The fact is clear as daylight that the control of this situation rests in the hands of Congress and it behooves everyone, regardless of partisanship, to impress upon every person who is in Congress the necessity to guard against the present policy of expanding deficits. There is no royal road to this end. There seems to be a lack of any congressional plan to end these recurring deficits and the absence of any procedure to effectuate a plan even to gradually return to a balanced Budget.

We were fortunate in the last session not to have any bank legislation of a disturbing nature. I may say that the banking and currency committee had before it some twoscore bills with all sorts of haywire schemes, and they have so far died within the committee walls. There is a growing feeling in this Seventy-sixth Congress that it should rebel against administrative and bureaucratic pressure. There is enough pressure from outside without having it come from within. One must be actually in Congress to understand the power of this group pressure. Once upon a time a Member of Congress was supposed to have a liberty of thought and to act and speak and vote his own convictions after careful study of important questions. Now he is torn by conflicting emotions as one antagonistic group after another dangles before him a dark picture of his future if he does not vote the way the group suggests. These groups take no consideration of debt or deficit. They enter into no realm of economics. All they want is what they want, regardless of what happens afterwards. I do not suppose that we can rid ourselves of these pressure groups. We have over 200 of such organizations working in Washington. It costs thousands of dollars to feed, clothe, and pay salaries to this group of lobbyists. They are sentinels more for their groups than they are for active lobbying. It is certainly time to declare some freedom of action and to return to the understanding of fundamentals in the operation of government. Way back in 1776 Adam Smith, who was the first writer on economics, a man of erudition and a great teacher, at a time when understanding of the value of capital and free movement of peoples was beginning to impress itself upon our civilization, wrote this:

"To prohibit a great people, however, from making all that they can of every part of their own produce, or from employing their stock and industry in the way that they judge most advantageous to themselves, is a manifest violation of the most sacred rights of mankind."

Let me quote from the Majesty of Calmness, by Dr. William George Jordan, which seems to be apropos at this particular time in our history:

"The nation that is strongest is the one that is most self-reliant, the one that contains within its boundaries all that its people need. If, with its ports all blockaded it has not within itself the necessities of life and the elements of its continual progress, then it is weak, held by the enemy, and it is but a question of time till it must surrender. Its independence is in proportion to its self-reliance, to its power to sustain itself from within."

It is time that we return to freedom. The road back is beset with difficulty. No egg has ever been unscrambled. What needs to be done cannot be done in a few moments, a few weeks, many months, many years, and perhaps several decades. When we contemplate the fact that our deficits reached $23,000,000,000 in 6 years and that we have spent all of the revenues amounting to even a greater sum, we may realize that we have spent in these years on a planned economy and in experiments for recovery $50,000,000,000 it is time for us to pause and examine the shipwreck. After a great storm at sea over many days, with mountainous waves that pound the ship, tear away its smokestacks and its deck boats, batter it almost into helplessness, the good captain heaves to when he reaches a place of calm to take toll of the damage. We have been passing through such a storm for 6 years or more.

Senator KING, of Utah, a leading member of the majority party, speaking at the close of the Senate session, declared, "The Government may not continue this spending policy without inviting disaster. The spendthrift, whether it be individual, corporation, or government, must ultimately face the day of reckoning. Loose fiscal policies have undermined and destroyed governments of the past. We should not pursue policies which must inevitably result in impairing the financial integrity of the Government."

Senator MCCARRAN, of Nevada, in that same debate spoke of a personal interview with Trotsky, who had not then been exiled from Russia, in which the Soviet leader said that he predicted the day would come when bureaucracy would become so powerful in the United States that it would control the Government, influence its policies, and shape its legislation. The Senator pursued the subject by saying that there were more than a million Federal employees and that "bureaucracy has an insatiable appetite; it reaches out for more power and encroaches upon personal rights and liberties."

Let me quote to you also from the words of Edmund Burke, who was a great friend of the Colonies:

"The path to happiness for nations and men does not lie in sweeping innovations; always it lies in doing justice to the past, in welcoming what it has achieved as 'an entailed inheritance' and even in the hour of reform, in carrying it through in a spirit of gratitude and reverence toward existing institutions, which are not to be remade by the energies of a single generation of radical reformers, however ardent their passion for human happiness may be."

It is only by taking the road to freedom, going back to the principles which are fundamental in the American Government, destroying the bureaucratic domination, and calling a halt upon flights into the stratosphere of expenditure that we may return to a confidence in the future.

Income and outgo statement of the Federal Government, July 1 to July 31, 1939

The Government collected		$307,845,807.53
The Government spent		807,324,993.63
Leaving a gross deficit of		499,479,186.10
To arrive at the net deficit to be met by borrowing or by draft on general fund:		
Subtract:		
Statutory debt retirements	$134,250.00	
Add:		
Deficit in trust funds, gold increment, silver seigniorage, and Government checking accounts	113,306,162.29	
Net addition to the gross deficit		113,171,912.29
Net deficit		612,651,098.39
Decrease in general-fund balance		390,918,687.03
Increase in public debt		221,732,411.36
Debt, July 31, 1939		40,661,264,822.47
Pre-war debt, March 31, 1917		1,282,044,346.28
First post-war peak, August 31, 1919		26,596,701,648.01
Lowest post-war debt, December 31, 1930		16,026,087,087.07
Increase since December 31, 1930		24,635,177,735.40

This summary is compiled from United States daily Treasury statements to show the gross deficit, the net deficit, and the drafts on the general fund to finance the deficit.

America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES HAWKS, JR.

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 10, 1939

EDITORIAL FROM THE SATURDAY EVENING POST OF OCTOBER 7, 1939

Mr. HAWKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to include therein an editorial appearing in the October 7 issue of The Saturday Evening Post entitled "America."

This editorial is, in my opinion, not only the most powerful but also the most sensible pro-American argument I have read or listened to, and I am putting it in the RECORD hoping that every Member of the Congress and many other American citizens will have the opportunity to read and digest its clear statement of fact regarding Europe's war.

The editorial follows:

[From the Saturday Evening Post of October 7, 1939]

AMERICA

Destiny has an errand here and we are about to keep an appointment with her. We do not know for sure what the business is. We do know it is important and that it behooves us now to steady our minds and think for ourselves.

There is an omen.

The event of incomparable human significance, one to which war itself is subordinate, is that the star of world supremacy has passed from the Old to the New World. To say that this happened during the World War, or that the World War caused it to happen, is not so. That star is the sign of ultimate power, and the power was here. In the World War for the first time, like a giant in swaddling clothes, we put it forth, and it was astounding, not to others only but to ourselves. We were not entirely unaware of it, but never before had we exerted it, and never had we considered either the historical meaning or the consequences of possessing it. Suddenly, therefore—and no one prepared for it—the world's center of political

gravity shifted from one continent to another—that is to say, from Europe to America.

The star that now stands in our sky has no constancy. That is why we call it an omen. We are able to chart its travels during at least 4,000 years. For nearly a thousand years—and that was its longest vigil—it stood in the sky of Egypt. Then it passed to the Assyrians, from the Assyrians to the Babylonians, and back again to the Assyrians. For 500 years it was divided between the Greeks and the Persians. After that it took its place in the Roman sky and tarried there a while. During five centuries the world was a Roman world and peace was the Roman peace. Then for nearly 1,500 years it was a vagabond star, appearing and disappearing in a most unpredictable manner. Twice it rose over the Byzantine Empire and twice over the Tartars, Mongolians, and Huns. It passed to the Holy Roman Empire, which was wrecked by the Reformation. It went from there to the Ottoman Turks, and then for two centuries it was lost. That was a time of human chaos. This period of 1,500 years during which the star had a vagabond existence includes the Dark and Middle Ages.

In 1700 it was seen rising again, or might have been seen dimly, on the horizon of England. Napoleon tried to conquer it and failed. England became the British Empire, assumed supremacy in the world, and kept a British peace. During the British peace there were many wars, of course, just as there were during the long Roman peace, but the preferred condition was one of peace and economic order, and Great Britain was its defender.

To the rise of American power Europe was politically purblind. As a physical phenomenon it was astonishing and measurable; its further meanings were never considered. The thought of the star of world supremacy passing from Europe to America was one the European mind could not entertain. It happened and was not believed. American power determined the outcome of the World War, which England and her Allies had otherwise lost; an American army of more than two millions of men appeared in Europe and vanished. Still it was not believed. The only way Europe could think of America was as a stem of western civilization; the trunk and roots of it were in Europe. And to the stem would have been assigned the task, nay, the moral obligation, to restore the power and authority of Europe.

In all that we think we know of the historical process there was never a thing so strange as that the star of world supremacy should pass to a people who did not wish it, who had no idea what to do with it and who dreaded the responsibilities of possessing it. One of these is the responsibility to keep peace and order in the world—not absolute peace, of course, since that is yet impossible, but a regime of peace where there would be otherwise a regime of war.

Our first idea was to organize that responsibility and share it with Europe. Thus the Covenant of the League of Nations that President Wilson wrote into the Versailles Treaty and which the American people, by instinct, rejected.

Our second idea was disarmament. Europe was distrustful and suspicious. Disarmament was all right in principle. But suppose the world did actually disarm? Military supremacy in that case would pass to the nation that had the most powerful industrial machine and sure access to raw materials, because, in the event of war, it could beat all others in creating new weapons. What was the name of that one nation? America. Therefore, was the American disarmament evangel entirely sincere and disinterested?

Our answer to that was to say that, in default of disarmament, we were going to build the incomparable navy. Then for the first time the other maritime powers were willing to discuss naval disarmament in dead earnest. They all came to Washington, and there we said to them: "See. We have the longest sword. We can make it much longer still. But we believe in disarmament. And to prove it, we now propose to break our sword to the length of the next longest one, and to keep it at that length if you will agree not to lengthen yours. Do you agree?"

They agreed, in a state of amazement. Such a thing had never happened before in the history of the quarrelsome human race as that a people actually possessing the paramount power should offer in a voluntary manner to limit its weapons. But while we were towing our warships to sea and sinking them with our own gunfire, the foreign naval experts were already finding holes in the disarmament treaty through which they could push unforbidden types of warcraft, and one day we woke up to the fact that the American Navy was the only one that had actually declined in strength.

Meanwhile we had been pursuing a third idea, which was that, since we were the most productive people, and still the richest, notwithstanding our own exertions in the World War, it was our business and a kind of duty to assist in the restoration of Europe. So we poured our resources into Europe for that purpose, on a scale so prodigal and immense that we upset the economic balance. This is a long and complicated story. We are interested here in the sequels only. We lost our money, and we advanced the next war by maybe 10 years.

Now, therefore, the World War has been resumed. It is wrongly so named. It is, in fact, again what it was before—a European war, on the one side to defend and on the other to seize the star of world supremacy that is not there. It is here.

And again we shall have to decide what to do with our power. The decision we make may alter the history of the world for a thousand years. Twenty-two years ago we were putting it forth on the Continent of Europe, saying to ourselves, and believing, that we had engaged in a war to end war. It sounds ironic now. Nevertheless, it is one of the romantic facts to be written down in history that we had no other purpose. We were defeated. We were defeated because it was not our war. It was Europe's war, and the peace that was written was a European peace, laying down the lines for the next war.

Neither is the present war our war. We had no spoon in the caldron. Yet what are we saying about it? We hope we shall not be drawn into it. The President tells the people their Government will do everything it can think of to keep them out of it. For all that, we communicate to one another the fear that we shall somehow be got into it in spite of ourselves, moved by our emotions.

These are feeble attitudes and false. Nevertheless, they are dangerous. What we are saying to ourselves is that we leave it all to feeling. If our feelings crystallize, then we shall act. That is what we did before. We reelected a President on the slogan, "He kept us out of war," and 5 months later we were in it. From that experience, from the defeat we suffered, from the consequences, we should have learned what is wanting in the American ethos. Not to have known it then was pardonable; not to have learned it since, if we haven't, would convict us of weakness in mind and character.

Why these feeble attitudes that are in fact false? Why is our thinking so maudlin and muddy? Why are we so liable to be moved headlong by feeling? The answer is that we have within us no sense of American destiny. For want of it, this American power—the paramount power of the world—has no true center of its own, and that is a perilous fact. We need something more. We need the historical imagination to see that American destiny is unique in itself, entirely separate from the destiny of Europe.

Given that we were thus founded upon ourselves, with inner certitude, we should not now be saying of the European War either that we hope to stay out of it or that we are fearful of being drawn into it. We should not be exhorting one another to beware of foreign propaganda. We should not be dividing our minds between the isolationists, who say it is none of our business, and those, on the other hand, already abandoned to emotion, who say we shall betray civilization unless we go forth to save the democracies.

Instead of all that, we should know beforehand, and with certainty, under what conditions we would go to war at all. It would have to be our own war, not Europe's. It would have to be one wherein we were sure who at the end should write the peace, that it might be the American peace, unlike any peace that had been made before. If this be not in our destiny, then the star of supremacy that hangs in our sky is but a material sign, and that we disbelieve.

But no American war is remotely in view. We have no thought of starting one; no aggressor is threatening to bring war to us. That being so, of what now should we be taking forethought?

We should be thinking of what the state of the world will be when this European war ends. Our actual power will be still what it was; relatively it will be much greater than it was, because the power of Europe will have been damaged. We shall have by far the most efficient industrial machine in the world. We shall have two-thirds of all the gold, the only sound money and the only credit to lend. Our economic and financial supremacy will be such that we could, if we would, take possession of the world. But that is not what we want to do. If that star in our sky were an omen of world empire, we would wish it to go away; and if there is a new thing possible in the earth, it is that for once a people possessing the power to seize empire are not so tempted.

What else might we do with it? That is what we ought to be thinking about. It is ours. We did not gain it by conquest. We created it entire with our own hands. Therefore we are morally free to do with it what we will. Certainly, then, by taking thought, by discipline of the economic motive to make it serve the idea we fought for and lost 22 years ago in Europe, we could put it forth in ways to nourish the things we prefer to live with in the world and let the others wither.

War cannot end war; nor does it greatly abate the aggressor. The unmoral economic motive begins immediately to arm him again, and it has all to be done over. America, England, and France armed Germany. That was business. After Munich, England continued to sell essential war materials to Germany. That was business. America and England armed Japan against China. That was business. The economic weapon employed in peace to strangle war would be mightier than all the navies. Could there be a higher use of the American power than to impose that thought as a new law of the world and mind that it was kept?

First Army Maneuvers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. SHANLEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 5, 1939

OPENING CONFERENCE ADDRESS BY MAJ. GEN. HUGH A. DRUM, COMMANDING, PLATTSBURG, N. Y., AUGUST 15, 1939

Mr. SHANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend and revise my remarks and include therein the speech

of Maj. Gen. Hugh A. Drum at the opening conference of the First Army maneuvers.

I think that we should all be ever mindful of the admonition of President George Washington in his Farewell Address when he exhorted us to take "care always to keep ourselves, by suitable establishments, on a respectable defensive posture." I am confident that the distinguished speaker in our First Army maneuvers bespoke that thought.

I. GREETING

May I extend a welcome to all ranks and wish you every success in our maneuvers. Many here are attending a large army maneuver for the first time, and many more will experience for the first time the comradeship and esprit de corps engendered by the fraternity associated with military companionship and the patriotic objectives of our services. These associations are bound to be pleasant and productive of lasting friendships and increased military knowledge. A real opportunity for advancement in our chosen tasks of national defense is offered us in this gathering. Aside from actual training, much is to be learned by the exchange of views and cooperative consideration of our problems. We are here to learn—not to test the efficiency and capacity of individuals and units. Book and historical knowledge has its place in our preparatory studies; however, in the final analysis we must look to frequent training in the field with troops as the real approach to practical efficiency. Without placing undue hardship on the troops we have endeavored to illustrate the practical difficulties you may expect to encounter in actual campaigns in some exercises. You will profit by such experiences. The directing staffs have spent many days in advance preparation to insure your comfort and successful training. Do not expect perfection, as nothing is perfect in war, and, moreover, many of this group are as new at this game as you are. I know you appreciate the value of these views and will assist me and the directing staffs by mutual cooperation. By entering upon this work in such a spirit our tour of service will be pleasant and the return will be greatly improved efficiency.

II. NEED OF AN ACTIVE FIELD FORCE

In our national defense considerations in recent years great stress has been given to the United States Fleet, the organization of our productive industries for war, the development and acquisition of more modern armament (air and ground), and the expansion of our overseas garrisons. These provisions are important and essential steps and have met with national approval. However, those experienced in actual combat in war are convinced that these efforts, important as they are, are incomplete unless they include the creation in peacetime of a well-trained, adequately equipped, and well-organized fighting army force. This element is essential to the security of a nation, and at the same time is most difficult to create. A solution of the former considerations is of value only if well-organized fighting army forces are available to supplement and utilize these important assets. Of what value are modern munitions without manpower organized and trained to operate them? Of what value in war is a fleet or an air force without protected bases, or whose offensive action cannot be supplemented by a well-organized and trained army? The answer to these questions is found in the special and urgent efforts now being made by Great Britain to create a ground field army essential to supplement its large armament program and the expansion of its fleet and air forces.

Our experiences, as well as those of every other nation, are convincing that success in war is ultimately dependent upon a field army—one comprising both air and ground forces, adequately equipped and organized and efficiently trained and led. In our United States Fleet, with its air components, we have an efficient modern sea power. It is organized and trained as a homogeneous combat unit and so operates at all times. The high command is organized, and, by constantly functioning as a unit, has acquired the efficiency and facility to meet any exigency of war and combat. Whereas the picture of our Army is quite the opposite. Aside from the overseas garrisons our Army forces of all components are widely scattered in small Army posts and in the many communities of the 48 States. All units would have to be greatly expanded and all higher headquarters would have to be organized from the bottom up before our entry into a war. The General Headquarters air force is now undergoing expansion in many respects. The larger Army units are seldom brought together for organization and training, and even then the high commands must be improvised for the occasion. The superior qualities of the individual officers and enlisted men cannot entirely compensate for these serious defects, which will exist in any emergency unless we change radically our present system. Under such conditions our Army, except for munitions, faces problems quite similar to those that occurred when we entered the World War. It was a year and a half before our forces were prepared to enter battle as a field army in that war. Even our Regular Army First Division was not available for a year. Armaments, supplies, and equipment did not cause this delay, as the French and British supplied them as soon as our soldiers were organized and made available for training in France. It is important that we realize and make known this vital lesson and never forget that the most difficult preparedness problem is the organization and training of manpower—the creation of an efficient field force directed by skilled leaders, capable of utilizing the power of modern weapons.

In the military profession you are faced with a condition which does not confront any other professional group. The doctor, lawyer, banker, etc., can test and apply the principles and lessons he has studied and evolved each day of the year. He can continuously adjust his methods and policies and by practical experience determine whether he is adequately trained in his trade and sound in his conclusions. The soldier, on the other hand, must wait until he is called upon to preserve the integrity of his country before he can apply his theories and training. His stake is greater than that of any other profession. Furthermore, individual expertness is only supplemental to the more difficult problem of mass organization and efficiency. History is replete with examples of the defeat of nations and unnecessary loss of life when poorly organized and improperly led untrained troops have met trained organized ones in battle. In our country, with its large industrial plants, the problem of creating a well organized and trained field army, adequate for the first phases of a war, is more difficult than the transformation of our industrial system to a reasonable war basis.

The general purposes of the First Army maneuvers are in furtherance of the views that I have just expressed. These exercises are a step in that direction, but I am sure you will agree that 2 weeks once in 4 years devoted to this work are hardly adequate, especially under conditions where many important elements of a well-rounded-out organization are absent and which require an improvisation of the high commands on each of these infrequent occasions. However, with your cooperation we can and will accomplish much in these few days toward cementing ourselves into that military organization, so essential to success in national defense—an efficient field army.

III. SOME PRACTICAL CONSIDERATIONS RELATIVE TO OUR MANEUVERS

In planning a program for these maneuvers I have been faced with many practical problems—an important one of which is related to the composition and strength of the units to be included in the Army. One group of advisors advocated an assumption that the units comprising the First Army be as stated in our paper plans and at war strength, armed and equipped with the modern armament we hope some day to secure. I have resisted this approach as unreal—as presenting a false picture and thereby deceiving you and our fellow citizens who are really concerned in the protection of their homes. Our training would be superficial and visionary and would mislead you as well as the public. Consequently, I have deemed it better to be realistic and to have a more practical approach by directing that the Army enter these exercises exactly as it stands in peace—under a situation where an emergency has come upon us suddenly as it may—where we have been called into the field for active operations without delay. This is the basis of the War Department initial protective force plan. This is real—such a conception must bring home to us some of the actualities of our state of preparedness. The First Army as it has taken the field this month is not in fact an army. It is a collection of individual units, lacking adequate army, corps, and divisional troops, partially equipped and woefully short in the manpower, weapons, motors, etc., which experience has proven to be essential to an efficient field army. Let us consider these conditions in some detail:

a. *Comparison of First Army and type Army*

	Type Army	First Army	Shortages	
			Number	Percentage
75 mm	480	300	180	38
155 mm	432	84	348	83
3" AA	72	31	41	57
Machine guns	4,926	1,863	3,063	67
Auto rifle	6,663	2,836	3,827	57
Tanks	210	251	+41	Over 16
Trucks	25,752	4,416	21,336	83
Personnel	321,475	75,116	246,359	77

b. Prior to this concentration, no corps or Army headquarters were in existence and no division headquarters were fully manned. To secure the personnel with which to improvise these units for this maneuver, I had to deplete our important Regular Army antiaircraft and coast defense units and gather in Regular officers from R. O. T. C., National Guard, and Reserve duties, thereby weakening seriously important units of defense, which should be available for immediate action.

c. The only aviation that could be made available is corps observation. The current expansion of the Army Air Corps prohibits our having any combat air units, so important for cooperative work with ground forces. Were combat aviation present, it would be my idea to demonstrate its uses on the battlefield by utilizing its potential powers to concentrate attacks initially on the hostile reserves, assembly areas, and communications, and as the battle is joined, to bring its fire and bombing power into the ground fight for interdiction and counter-battery efforts and to facilitate the operations of the infantry.

d. No artillery of a caliber larger than that operating organically with infantry divisions (75's and 155 howitzers) will be available and no Army or corps artillery. Only two antiaircraft artillery regiments will be present.

e. No corps or Army Regular chemical, engineer, signal, motor, medical, or supply units except two signal battalions will be available.

f. We will have the mechanized cavalry brigade and one battalion of tanks in addition to the divisional tank companies. These are our most modern weapons, yet few in comparison with our needs.

g. No antitank guns will be available. Only a few of the MI semiautomatic rifles will be in the hands of the troops. While infantry regiments will use the latest organization, the heavy weapon companies thereof will lack modern equipment in many respects.

h. The normal motor transportation of a field army should be about 28,500 vehicles. We will have only 4,657. This is about 15 percent and such shortage will, of course, greatly influence our mobility, capabilities of supply, and speedy transport of troops.

In the foregoing I have enumerated only the more important weaknesses in the Army preparedness picture. We may add thereto the inexperience of our officers and enlisted men in field exercises of large forces—the absence of the physical hardness required for active service, especially on the part of the National Guard and Reserves, and much ignorance concerning the conditions a soldier will encounter in the field and in battle—the field life of a soldier. These are real human handicaps which lack of preparedness has forced us to face before in most emergencies. Naturally they have influenced me in prescribing your training in these exercises. I know you will utilize the superior qualities of our personnel to overcome them better than any other soldiers in the world. You will take the tools available and do your best.

IV. THE TRAINING PROGRAM FOR THE EXERCISES

With the considerations just mentioned in mind, I drew up a program for our exercises which in general terms comprises the following main objectives, stated in order of actual sequence:

1. Instruction in a hurried mobilization of the Army, wherein we expand some existing organizations and create others, and by utilizing personnel from all components we improvise the higher commands, divisions—corps and Army—as well as an umpire group.

2. Instruction in the acquisition and organization of a suitable training area about Plattsburg, N. Y., and Manassas, Va.

3. Training in a hurried concentration of the Army in these areas—one-third at Manassas and two-thirds here at Plattsburg. In this work we are using all means of transportation—marching, airplanes, motor convoys, railroads, and even barges on the Hudson and Lake Champlain.

4. Actual training of the troops in the field, from the viewpoint of the individual soldier to the highest command unit—the Army staff.

5. Instruction in demobilizing forces and shipment home.

We have now accomplished all these objectives, except the fourth and fifth. Due to the nonexistence of higher commands in peace, the work and planning for the first, second, and third steps has taken all winter, requiring frequent conferences with transportation, supply, and other agencies, as well as between the higher commanders and staffs. My directing staff, the Corps Area staffs, and those of the States and divisions have been busy along these lines for months. Of course, there would be no such time available were we called out with little or no warning. All of these preliminary arrangements would have to be made after the emergency arose, and time would not be available to meet many of our shortcomings. We have organized the Army, such as it is, the maneuver area of nearly 300,000 acres, set up a supply system and concentrated the Army therein. There has been lots of profitable training in these important phases. Now we are ready to take up the actual field training of the Army.

V. GENERAL SCOPE OF THE FIELD TRAINING OF THE FIRST ARMY AT PLATTSBURG

We are limited to 15 days for the whole period of training. Five and one-half of these days have to be devoted to mobilization, concentration, and demobilization—to the shipment of the forces to and from their home stations, establishing camps, etc. Including Sundays, 2½ days are needed for rest and recreation. This left me 7 days for actual field training—for example, maneuvers. This is rather a short period in which to knit together an army and make it efficient in coordinated combat. Adding to this limitation, the unhardened physical condition of most of the troops, you will realize that the scope of our actual field training has to be greatly restricted. Before entering into the rigors of an extended Army maneuver a gradual hardening process for the personnel is essential. Then again, the minor tactics of battle, including the teaming of the cooperative arms, such as Infantry and Artillery, are best taught by small exercises which also give junior leaders opportunities for greatly needed training in independent leadership. These considerations, as well as others, have prompted our schedule which includes in order of sequence: First, two-sided reinforced regimental exercises; second, two-sided reinforced brigade exercises; third, a two-sided corps exercise; and last, a two-sided Army exercise. The divisional exercises are included in the two-sided corps and Army maneuvers.

In all of these exercises, air observation units, tanks, antiaircraft artillery, horse cavalry, and mechanized cavalry, such as we have, will be included and be a part of each separate command. The supply of food, water, and ammunition, and the care of the sick will be actually performed. There will be four overnight bivouacs, affording an opportunity to learn something of the conditions on a battlefield and the life of a soldier in the field in campaign.

VI. SPECIAL TRAINING CONSIDERATIONS

1. Definite objectives: To secure the best results from these 7 days of actual field training, it is essential that definite objectives, reasonable in scope, be predetermined. We cannot learn all of war in this short period; unless we concentrate our attention on a few definite objectives, the final results will be superficial and of little value. In each exercise, I hope all commanders will predetermine and announce the specific lessons to be imparted.

2. Training all ranks: A universal fault in past large maneuvers has been a tendency to approach the training scheme from the viewpoint of higher commands and staffs utilizing the rank and file merely as pawns for them to play with. I desire and have arranged the exercises to avoid such defects. I hope you will bear in mind the importance of keeping all ranks interested—playing their part—and will teach them their jobs as you learn yours. I want every man from the lowest rear-rank private to know the situation in each problem and what you are trying to do. Keep them in the game at all times and they will learn and do a better job. Remember that in a great expansion for war many of our enlisted men will become officers, and junior officers will reach high command, so let them know the broader picture of the exercises. These thoughts have prompted me to include in this conference the higher noncommissioned officers of the Army.

3. Speed in troop movement versus efficiency in combat fighting: Since the development of motors, facilitating speedy movement of troops, and the invention of mechanized forces, as well as the growing importance of the airplane, some Army men and many civilians believe that the solution of most campaigns rests primarily on rapid and wide troop movements. Encircling movements—surrounding an enemy—raids against supply places and lines—distant objectives—have gained first consideration in their thoughts. Such operations are important and at times may have decisive influences, but somewhere and sometime before a final decision is secured a battle will have to be fought. Irrespective of the speed of its preliminary movements, an army will have to engage in a ground battle before gaining a final decision. By rapid movement an army may gain an advantage of position, but it can seldom secure a decision without first winning a ground battle. Consequently, unless we know how to fight—to win a battle—speed of movement will be of little avail in modern war. Strategy in war—disposition of larger forces—is the function of the high command—one man—and is generally limited to one or two decisions in a campaign. Tactics—the fighting of a battle—is the function and job of all men of an army. Tactics and technique in battle, especially with our modern armament, are more difficult to learn than the rapid movement of troops and the wide swing around of mechanized forces, and therefore far more important.

In their normal daily life our people are using autos and trucks for every purpose. Some 30,000,000 are in the country, and our people are motor-minded. They know far more about motors and convoys than of fighting with modern weapons or any weapons. In connection with this statement relative to the daily movement of Americans by motor I wish to call your attention to the fact that during and after the Battle of St. Mihiel, in preparation for the Meuse-Argonne fight, I directed the motor movement of 458,000 American soldiers in a period of about 10 days. I give you this illustration to show you that even 20 years ago the Army was conscious of the potentiality of motors in the movement of troops.

I do not intend to belittle the advantages of speed off the battlefield; it has its place in the art of war and is important. Yet there is nothing which has come to us from the recent fighting in Europe and Asia to give any indication that mobility off the battlefield can compensate for inefficiency in the conduct of a fight. With our limit of 7 days for field training we cannot learn everything. Then, again, our motor transportation is limited. While there will be some rapid movements by trucks and wide swings by the mechanized brigade, the main objective of our training will be associated with the execution of battle—i. e., what the combat units have to do after the motor vehicles bring them in contact with an enemy. What I term the "mechanism of battle."

4. Decisive battle: In our writings and teachings we speak of the "decisive battle"—i. e., a battle to win a final decision over the enemy. Our doctrine is that all forces should be brought to bear in the "decisive battle." The commander must concentrate his full effort—avoid piecemeal employment of units, dispersion of efforts by scattering his forces and by independent disjointed operations. At the same time, the commander should utilize the full combat power of all instruments available and seek combat favorable to them, a battle wherein his air and mechanized weapons may join the other forces in decisive blows. Bear in mind also that decision in battle is secured not so much by killing men as by skillfully employing all available means to disorganize the enemy forces. While men unfortunately have to be killed in this operation, it is best accomplished by powerful blows which destroy the enemy's system of command and supply. These are the vitals of battle organization, and, if permanently severed, the means of direction, unity of action, and sustenance will fail and the power of cohesive resistance will then disintegrate. These are the results to be sought, and all means—air, mechanized, and other ground forces—should be coordinated for this purpose. This principle applies to all units, from the fight of a platoon to that of the army as a whole. Indoctrination of a command in this principle is essential to battle success. It should guide the initiative of all leaders and insure cooperative action by all units. Teach it to your commands—concentrate forces and fires, fight, advance, outflank, and pierce the

enemy lines, all with the objective of reaching and disorganizing his command and supply systems.

5. Planning and organizing battle: In the narrow limits of our routine peacetime training we seldom have occasion to visualize a field army in battle and all the problems associated therewith. We picture our regiments of a few hundred men or our divisions of a few thousand men with a few guns. We see a few airplanes and tanks associated with a division. Compare this picture to an army of more than 300,000 men, several hundred guns, a mechanized brigade, several hundred airplanes, hospitals, depots of supplies of all kinds, and great transportation systems. Think of the problems of food, water, gas and oil, sick and wounded, repairs, shelters, as well as those relating to the direction and coordination of all units in combat. I am sure you will realize that such an immense machine needs great leadership, direction, control, and management; that it is incapable of running all over the country by leaps of a hundred miles at a time and fighting successfully a battle today and another tomorrow a hundred miles away, as some of our theorists of today would have us believe. Such a conception fails to comprehend the human and technical problems of such a mass. Few persons who have not been through a war experience realize that it normally requires several months to establish a supply and evacuation system which will permit the efficient operation of a field army. All of the efforts of the A. E. F., with French assistance, permitted us to set up a sufficient supply and evacuation system in about 30 days for the maintenance of the First Army at St. Mihiel and Meuse-Argonne. Many of the installations which we used in the First Army had been established many months before. I give you these figures to impress upon you the magnitude of the supply and evacuation problem.

Let us visualize in general terms the essential steps associated with the operations of an army in campaign:

First. After selection of a theater of operations comes the concentration of the army therein and the establishment of bases of supply—food, gas and oil, munition—and a system of supply, distribution, and evacuation.

Second. Coordinated reconnaissance of air and ground forces to locate the enemy and gain knowledge of his movements and the terrain features associated therewith.

Third. A rapid advance of detachments to develop further the enemy's main forces and to secure terrain features as a basis for the coming battle.

Fourth. Decision for battle and the form it will take.

Fifth. The arrangement of the army for the battle—composition and disposition of the forces and means to insure their coordination in the fight, and behind them establishment of the supply and evacuation and communication arrangements.

Sixth. The launching of a concerted and united blow.

These are not simple steps to be accomplished overnight. When they are well planned and conceived and time is taken to insure adequate knowledge thereof by all the units of the army, the foundation for success will have been laid. Otherwise, it is a hit-and-miss play, with the useless sacrifice of thousands of lives and the danger of failure. These same general steps are applicable to the smaller units of an army and should guide you in your approach to and conduct of battle. Seek out and develop the enemy—then plan and organize for your fight and launch your troops in a coordinated blow. This applies to platoons and air flights as well as to an army.

VII. MECHANISM OF BATTLE

The increased fire power and range of modern aviation and field artillery, coupled with the rapid movements of mechanized forces, will demand battle operations in greater depth and width than ever before. The combined ground and air battle of the future will embrace an area of conflict equivalent, at least, to the range of light artillery. Decision will seldom be gained until the rear area of light guns is penetrated. On an army front, many small combats will develop, with a tendency to lack of coordination. The supporting artillery will have to make several echelonments forward and frequently will lose contact with its infantry. Attack air units must join in the fight and supplement the artillery. Infantry, tanks, artillery, mechanized units, attack aviation will be encountered on one hand, and on the other they will have to be teamed and directed in coordinated attacks and advances. Food, ammunition, gas, oil, and water supply will be difficult. It will be a fight of several days. In the conduct of such a fight, or the mechanism of battle, our great difficulty will be to preserve the integrity of the fighting groups and to sustain a continuous blow until successful. Speed in combat is as important as in the movements preliminary thereto, but coordinated blows, when all arms use their fire power in concert for definite objectives, are the real basis for success.

In the time available, I can point out only a few salient considerations which should guide you in your conduct of the "mechanism of battle":

a. Maintain constant patrolling and reconnaissance, day and night, and connecting groups with adjacent units.

b. Provide adequate antiair and antitank reconnaissance and defense.

c. Cooperate with adjacent units by outflanking operations and enfilading fires.

d. Maintain a close link between infantry and artillery supporting units.

e. Tie in to decisive blows the assistance of tanks and attack aviation.

f. Maintain communication to insure artillery and air support at critical times.

g. Keep your higher commanders informed of your own actions as well as those of the enemy.

h. Plan your combat—have a scheme of maneuver for each local fight—bring all your fire power to bear to insure rapid advances in accordance with this plan.

i. Fight at night as well as in daylight.

j. Maintain reserve units for local maneuver and to further your plan.

k. Insure resupply of ammunition, gas, oil, and adequate food and water as you advance.

VIII. OTHER BATTLE CONSIDERATIONS

1. Coordination and initiative of subordinates: This brief, but inadequate, description of the "mechanism of battle" should bring home the necessity for close coordination on the one hand, but more important the reliance that must be placed on subordinate commanders. Superior qualities of initiative on the part of subordinates will be needed. With an understanding of the high commander's plan of battle and his doctrines on the conduct of battle, the subordinate commanders can and will meet local combat situations by their own initiative and resourcefulness. Our training must encourage this attitude in all ranks so that the junior leaders will be aggressive and force an early decision in the battle.

2. Speed of action and decision: Speed of action as a corollary to our modern weapons and transportation demands rapid mental processes as well as physical movements. The full value of our modern implements will be lost unless our mental processes are stepped up in harmony therewith. We must develop the faculties of sizing up situations quickly, grasping opportunities, making quick decisions, and utilizing our modern communications for transmitting these to the troops in brief intelligent instructions.

3. Combat orders: These conditions demand a radical change in our system of combat orders and the time lapse between their issuance and receipt by subordinate units. With the advent of increased mobility in rear of the battle area and the introduction of mechanized and motorized and aerial forces into the conduct of battle, not only must the commander and his staff speed up their mental processes, but they must devise means whereby the decisions of the commander can more quickly be transmitted to the troops who will execute them. If your commands are properly trained and indoctrinated, it is not essential that subordinates be given details of how to carry out their jobs. A commander must have in mind a definite and clear-cut plan that he desires carried out. Knowing his own mind, and confident of his judgment, the commander can state in a very few words what he wants accomplished and in most general terms how it is to be done. By such approaches we may reduce the lapse of time between the issuance of the higher commander's decision and its receipt by commanders of front-line units. Our previous conception of 6, 12, and 24 hours from the division, corps, and army headquarters to front-line units must be reduced if we are to take advantage of the modern means placed at our disposal for conducting battle. The staff must not be permitted to delay the transmission of the commander's decision any more than should the intermediate headquarters through which it of necessity passes. Having announced a scheme of maneuver and arranged for proper coordination of the efforts of those to be engaged in the fight, most staff details may be reserved for supplemental orders. This will leave available the maximum time to subordinates for reconnaissance and proper planning of their own part in the operation. I cannot too strongly urge you to accelerate the transmission of tactical decisions in order to avoid the loss of the advantages of the speed and power of our modern weapons.

4. Mechanized forces: In our army here at Plattsburg we have the mechanized cavalry brigade and a battalion of infantry tanks. Although their basic weapon—the armored tank—is the same, the main purposes of these forces are quite different. The mechanized cavalry brigade is a complete unit, prepared for independent operations; has its own air observation, artillery, and communication and supply units. Its mobility and power make it suitable and valuable in operations in advance of the army—in raids, outflanking blows, and as a reserve for use at the crisis of battle, whereas infantry tanks are intended primarily to reinforce and assist advancing infantry units and are especially valuable in these respects. Defense against these forces has been greatly improved with modern weapons and facilities, such as the new antitank guns and tank mines. Unfortunately, our First Army lacks much of this equipment, so we will have to improvise. The 75 millimeter and 37 millimeter are good antitank weapons. Road obstacles are readily constructed. One of the first steps in defense against these forces is distant air and ground reconnaissance with a speedy communication system. With a small mobile force of guns, infantry, and engineers held centrally, timely information should permit adequate blocking operations to meet advances of mechanized forces—so also in opposing the infantry tank. Confidence in your antitank weapons and obstructing means will remove most of the fear of these weapons, in the same manner as confidence in the efficiency of antiaircraft fire will lessen the fear of the airplane.

5. Night operations and attack: There is a phase of combat which has probably been too greatly slighted and of which we have too little knowledge. I refer to night movements and night attacks. I hope during these exercises that every opportunity will be developed and prosecuted for the testing and experimenting with thoughts concerning night operations. On several occasions troops will be in contact throughout the night. I hope that during these

periods you will endeavor to develop lessons which will benefit all of us. It is not hard to visualize a battlefield at night, with the enemy positions lighted by searchlights and flares dropped from aircraft, with the attacking or advancing troops in the shadow. It is not difficult to visualize, in a situation such as will confront the troops during these maneuvers, that an entire line might be moved forward under cover of darkness and overrun a hostile outpost position with little or no difficulty. There are many opportunities for the imagination to conceive means of identification and methods of maintaining control during night operations. The fastening of white patches on men's backs or some other distinguishing mark may permit patrols or larger elements to identify one another when operating at night in hostile territory. I hope efforts will be made to develop schemes and tactics for night engagements.

6. Battlefield supply: In your preparation for the Army maneuvers I hope you will give consideration to supply on the battlefield. This will include food and water, as well as ammunition. The supply will have to be made at night. It is an easy task, if properly planned and executed, but frequently a miserable failure, with natural discontent following. In the Army maneuver you will bivouac 2 nights, where the supply will be an actual problem. So don't force me to say after the exercise, "I told you so."

IX. HEADQUARTERS UNITS

Organization and functioning of the headquarters staffs in combat is a problem requiring your attention. Bear in mind that these headquarters are not limited to officers, but include many enlisted specialists and much mechanical office machinery. They are the focal point from which directions for operations issue. If they fail to perform their function of accurate thinking, swiftly translated into clear directives, the sacrifices of gallant troops will have been made in vain. Staffs have an invariable tendency to become too large. To guide and direct large military organizations, we require small compact headquarters, capable of functioning rapidly, with complete coordination. A staff routine and system of operation is an essential factor to insure businesslike and timely action—organization and procedure is necessary and should be developed in each staff group. They must operate, at times, 24 hours a day for several weeks, be prepared for rapid night movements, and it is imperative that members retain their vigor, health, and mental alertness. Weariness and discouragement in the commander and his staff infect their troops instantly and disastrously.

X. MANEUVER MAP

Discuss terrain features and their relationship to our field training and certain assumptions forced by the problem and private property.

XI. COMPETITION BETWEEN UNITS

Our American soldiers enjoy a healthy competitive spirit. We can secure many advantages by utilizing this characteristic. Consequently, I hope you will inject competition into all phases of our camp and field life during the maneuvers. Please make effective in this connection my instructions for recognition of outstanding services in the maneuvers.

XII. PRIVATE PROPERTY—CLAIMS

Instructions have been issued in detail reference private property and claims. I am sure you and your soldiers realize the importance of care in this particular, especially care against fires.

XIII. CONCLUSIONS

a. The soul of an army: The acme of efficiency in combat springs from the soul of an army—its esprit de corps—that fraternal comradeship which inspires individual and group confidence, determination, and the mutual respect and affection which engender the spirit of willing sacrifice for the success of the whole. The development of these qualities in the leaders insures similar traits in the lower ranks.

As our Army and its corps assemble as units in peace only once in several years, the value and inculcation of these human qualities should receive close attention in our field exercises. Let us endeavor to think, plan, and act in the spirit of the First Army, I, II, and Provisional Corps, and knit ourselves into the combat teams these great fighting units represent.

While we live in a machine age—militarily as well as commercially—let us not forget that success in battle in the final analysis is secured by man. His desires to become efficient, his willingness to meet hardships and to make the supreme sacrifice, are inspired by his respect and affection for and confidence in his leaders. The personality of the leader is a vital factor. Who ever heard of the numerical designation of Civil War units? It was Hancock's, Longstreet's, or Jackson's corps. Success in battle will seldom be secured except through personal leadership—so in this machine age we must guard against the danger of the mechanical element dominating the human side.

b. Conclusion: It is a pleasure to welcome you here. I hope that the exercises upon which we are about to enter will prove both interesting and instructive. It is my earnest desire that every effort be made to take advantage of each opportunity for the training of the individual as well as the unit. The umpires have been directed to give exercises of various kinds to battalions and regiments in reserve when it is evident that they are going to remain in such condition for some time. During the actual army maneuver I have given instructions that the umpires shall prepare and give problems to the battalion commanders which will maintain interest and further the instruction of the smaller units. Particularly will they observe the close contact essential between the infantry and the artillery.

I am very happy that in this exercise we have the three components of the Army of the United States represented, and distributed throughout the command. These contacts will develop a mutual respect among these components and will tend to develop a more efficient Army of the United States.

I again welcome you to the First Army maneuvers. I know that both individually and as a group you will work hard for the success of our maneuvers, and I am sure that we all will have a profitable 2 weeks.

Police Powers for the League of Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES SECCOMBE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 10, 1939

ARTICLE BY HARRY FREASE

Mr. SECCOMBE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include the following article by Harry Frease, of Canton, Ohio:

The problem of preserving international peace without war, has never been solved, after more than 4,000 years since the Babylonian Nation was ruled by a code of laws compiled by Hammurabi.

For more than 40 centuries down to the present day, the only preparedness for peace has been a preparedness for war; without any effective means for determining and enforcing international rights and obligations, except by war.

International law is merely a collection of maxims, without any effective means for interpreting or applying them to conflicting claims of international rights and duties.

Treaties of amity are no longer considered as binding upon the nations concerned, beyond their own purposes from day to day; and diplomatic negotiations bind no nations who do not wish to be bound.

The Permanent Court of Arbitration, established at The Hague in 1899 and amplified in 1907, cannot compel unwilling nations to arbitrate their differences, and has no means for enforcing its awards.

The League of Nations, formulated at Versailles in 1919 and subsequently established at Geneva by some 54 nations, has no means for enforcing its covenants, or the decisions of its assembly, or of its council, or of its arbiters, and has failed to accomplish its purposes.

The Permanent Court of International Justice of 1920, adhered to by some 52 nations, cannot command the presence of unwilling nations and cannot enforce its judgments.

The Pact of Paris, formulated in 1928 and adhered to by some 64 nations, contains no provisions for enforcing its agreements or for determining and preventing violations thereof.

And finally the Declaration of Lima, made on December 23, 1938, between some 20 American governments, goes no further than the American Declaration of Indepndence in 1776, and provides no means for establishing and enforcing the principles formulated therein.

The absence of mutual guaranties and effective executive powers has been obvious ever since the Covenant of the League of Nations was formulated, and that omission is a sufficient reason in itself for the failure of the League, as it is now constituted, to perform the function of preserving peace without war during the 20 years of its existence.

The success of the American constitutional form of a national government for a considerable number of separate sovereign States, was largely because it included legislative, executive, and judicial departments for well-defined but limited national purposes only, and left the organization and general powers of government for all other purposes to be determined and enforced by the several States, subject only to the particular powers delegated to the National Government.

It would seem to follow that if the Covenant of the League of Nations were revised by amendment, so as to establish legislative, executive, and judicial departments, with well-defined and limited supernational powers only, leaving all the strictly national powers to be dealt with by the several member governments there is no reason why the League of Nations should not function for preserving peace, without any other changes in its present organizations.

More particularly, if a permanent international police force were included in the executive department of the League of Nations to carry into effect the legislation of the League and the judgments of the court of justice, the existence of such a force would render unnecessary the maintenance, for immediate mobilization, of large armies and navies for preserving peace or preventing war and

would permit the disarmament which is contemplated by the Covenant of the League.

SUGGESTIONS FOR REVISION

The legislative department of the League might be modified so that the Assembly shall consist of representatives of the people of the members of the League, elected by the citizens of the respective nations in proportion to the population thereof, and so that the Council shall consist of a smaller number of representatives selected by the national governments of the respective members, likewise in proportion to the population thereof; and so that each representative in the Assembly shall have one vote and each representative in the Council shall have one vote.

The Assembly would correspond directly to the American House of Representatives, the British House of Commons, and the French Chamber of Deputies; and the Council would correspond somewhat to the American Senate, the British House of Lords, and the French Senate. The Assembly might have 1 representative for each 2,000,000 citizens of the respective nations, with a minimum of 1 representative; and the Council might have 1 representative for each 10,000,000 citizens of the respective nations with a minimum of 1 representative.

The legislative powers of the Assembly and the Council should be limited to international questions, including the codification of international law without interfering with legal international treaties, and its enactments should be by a majority vote in each of the Assembly and the Council. In addition to its legislative powers the Council might well be given advisory powers, and, preferably, controlling powers over the international acts of the executive department, the same to be exercised by a two-thirds or three-fourths vote of the councilors.

An executive department for the League might readily be provided by substituting a president-general for the existing permanent secretary-general, appointed by the Council with the approval of the Assembly for a single term of not exceeding 10 years; who would be not only a president for administering the affairs of the League, but also a commander in chief of an international police force, the different elements of which should be supplied by the member nations or governments, in proportion to the population thereof.

In suggesting the size of an international police force, one might begin with the plan which prevailed in the United States of America when its population was about 25,000,000, which was that a regular army of 1 soldier for each 1,000 citizens was sufficient for purely national purposes. Such a ratio in the 15 so-called democracies proposed by Clarence K. Streit as a nucleus for his Union Now, containing a population, without dependencies, of 279,869,000, would create an international police force of 279,869 soldiers; and if Japan, Germany, Italy, Russia, and Latin America, with their populations of 491,564,000 were added, it would increase the international police force by 491,564 soldiers, making a total force of 771,433, without considering China or India, and other continental and insular nations or dependencies.

Such an international police force might be sufficient, and it would surely not be excessive, when made up of the necessary land, naval, and air forces, and especially if it were divided into several continental posts or depots, as in America, Europe, and Asia, and perhaps in Africa; and no nation, not even the United States of America, should hesitate to supply its quota, when an international disarmament has been effected.

The judicial department of the League has been well established in the Permanent Court of International Justice, and to render it fully effective requires only the adherence of all the members of the League, and especially of the United States, without reservations; the compulsory acceptance by all its adherents of the jurisdiction and the judgments of the Court with respect to all international questions whatsoever, ipso facto and without special convention; and the availability of an international police force to compel obedience to its judgments.

There is no need for any revision of the power or jurisdiction of the League Court, because the same is already well defined and limited by article 36 of the statute for the Court, to strictly international questions, as follows:

"(a) The interpretation of a treaty;

"(b) Any question of international law;

"(c) The existence of any fact which, if established, would constitute a breach of an international obligation;

"(d) The nature or extent of the reparation to be made for a breach of an international obligation."

Such a revision of the Covenant of the League of Nations and the statute for the Court of International Justice, would seem to be necessary, and is believed to be all that would be necessary to secure international peace without war; and it is difficult to see how any one of the 64 adherents to the Kellogg-Briand Pact of Paris could refuse to agree to the League Covenant and the court statute, as amended, because it was therein agreed, as follows:

"ARTICLE 1. The high contracting parties solemnly declare in the names of their respective peoples that they condemn recourse to war for the solution of international controversies, and renounce it as an instrument of national policy in their relations with one another.

"ART. 2. The high contracting parties agree that the settlement or solution of all disputes or conflicts of whatever nature, or of whatever origin they may be, which may arise among them, shall never be sought except by pacific means."

All the nations of the world, excepting a few in South America, have subscribed to the foregoing declaration and agreement, which is nothing more than a restatement of the preamble to the Covenant of the League of Nations, as follows:

"The high contracting parties—

"In order to promote international cooperation and to achieve international peace and security;

"By the acceptance of obligations not to resort to war;

"By the prescription of open, just, and honorable relations between nations;

"By the firm establishment of the understandings of international law as the actual rule of conduct among governments;

"And by the maintenance of justice and a scrupulous respect for all treaty obligations in the dealings of organized peoples with one another—

"Agree to this Covenant of the League of Nations."

It is very difficult to understand what the United States expected to accomplish by taking the lead in formulating the Pact of Paris, which merely restates the purposes of the League of Nations, some 6 years after refusing to ratify the Covenant, which had been inspired by former President Taft and promulgated by President Wilson; without supplementing the declaration and agreement with the necessary provisions for interpreting and enforcing the obligations clearly defined therein.

It is just as difficult to understand why the people of the United States have acquiesced for some 20 years in the refusal, which is nothing less than a criminal neglect of their official statesmen, to either adhere to the Covenant of the League, and to the statute of its Court, without reservations, or to take the necessary steps, somewhat as suggested herein, to revise the Covenant and the statute by the necessary amendments to render them effective and therefore acceptable to all the nations of the world.

It is even more difficult to understand why the people of the United States have permitted their official statesmen to withhold an adherence, without equivocal reservations, to the statute for Permanent Court of International Justice, which was advocated by Andrew D. White and Joseph H. Choate and their respective associates at The Hague in 1899 and 1907; was proposed by former President Taft and his associates in the League to Enforce Peace in 1915; was drafted by a committee of 12 international lawyers, including the late Elihu Root, in 1920; was recommended to President Harding, with certain conditions and understandings, by Charles E. Hughes, as Secretary of State, in 1923; for which President Coolidge obtained the advice and consent, with certain reservations, of the United States Senate by the affirmative vote of 76 Senators in 1926; which was revised by a committee of jurists, including Elihu Root, in 1929; and although the revised statute was submitted to the Senate by President Hoover in 1930, the advice and consent for the adherence of the United States was refused by an affirmative vote of 52, which was less than the necessary two-thirds of the Senators present, as a result of which the United States remains in a very equivocal position with respect to the Permanent Court of International Justice.

AMERICA SHOULD ACT

The events of the past 20 years, during which the United States Government has sought isolation and a pretended neutrality by refusing to enter the League of Nations and to submit to its Permanent Court, and especially the events of the past 20 months, during which Hitler has defied the world, clearly show that world peace without war cannot be preserved unless the American people shall require its Government to enter the League and submit to its Court, when revised, without any reservations whatever.

In 1915 to 1917 America did not evade the inevitable results of a diplomacy which falsely proclaimed that we were "too proud to fight" and which encouraged Germany to prolong the war until the United States was compelled to fight.

And in 1939 America cannot evade the inevitable results of a diplomacy of neutrality which is not and never can be neutral, or of an isolation which is not and never can be isolation, because either one will encourage Hitler to proceed with his piracies until the United States is compelled to fight.

Nor can America evade the inevitable results of a delusive diplomacy, expressed at a time when "we can expect war at any moment" by announcing that "America will stay neutral," that "America will go to war only if she is attacked," "or if the British Fleet is defeated," and that "the foreign ministers of Germany, Italy, France, and Britain should meet and see if there is a way out."

With the reverberations of the Munich agreement (?) ringing in one's ears, it is somewhat naive to believe that a meeting of foreign ministers could find a way out; and it is quite as naive to believe that in event of war America can stay out, until she is attacked; and it is not merely naive but it would be crass cowardice and also a slow suicide for America to await the destruction of the British Fleet before going to war.

Why should France and Britain assume to speak for Poland, and perchance for Hungary, at another Munich meeting? Or, why should France and Britain be expected to police the world until America is attacked or until the British Fleet is destroyed? The only answer to these questions is that for 20 years the United States has refused to participate in the League of Nations, which has been said by Dr. Butler to be the only possible "solution of the world problem in terms of prosperity and peace."

The same thought was expressed in another way by Cordell Hull, our Secretary of State, in an address to the Tennessee Bar Association in June 1938, as follows:

"The most important problem now confronting the human race is that of establishing throughout the world, as the foundation of further progress, an unshakable regime of order under law."

This world problem has not been solved, and can never be solved, without the full participation of the United States in a league of nations, revised to create a representative union of national governments, having the necessary supernational legislative, executive, and judicial powers, and limited to strictly international relations of the respective national governments.

POSTSCRIPT

Whatever diplomacy the United States shall adopt with reference to the European war which was initiated by Adolph Hitler on the day after the foregoing paper was completed, its influence in solving the world problem of peace will be enhanced to a dominating degree, if it promises an ultimate adherence to the League of Nations and the Permanent Court of International Justice without reservation, which it can safely do if the League and the Court are supplemented by an international police to enforce international law.

Pending a termination of the existing war, the United States might well propose to follow the declaration of Lima by organizing a league of American nations and reviving and enlarging the Central American Court of Justice of 1908 to 1918 as an American court of international justice, with an international police to enforce international law in the American Hemisphere.

Such a leadership might suggest a similar procedure on the part of the neutral European nations which have already had one conference at Brussels upon call of the King of Belgium for the purpose of coordinating their defensive activities.

In answer to the well-grounded aversion to the idea of sending American soldiers for duty abroad, it is sufficient to say that in a properly distributed international police force it should not be necessary to send American troops across the waters; and in any event the United States Navy and the United States Marine Corps are constantly sailing the high seas, and our sailors and marines are frequently used for protecting American interests in foreign lands.

The Neutrality Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KEY PITTMAN

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 11 (legislative day of Wednesday, October 4), 1939

DISCUSSION OF NEUTRALITY BY SENATORS NYE AND PITTMAN AND A PANEL OF OTHER SENATORS

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix a discussion of the pending neutrality legislation which took place October 1, 1939, on the American Forum of the Air, and was participated in by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE] and myself, and a panel consisting of the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. LUNDEEN], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. VAN NUYS].

There being no objection, the discussion was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Announcer MCCORMACK. WOL, in cooperation with WOR, presents the American Forum of the Air.

Tonight listeners to the coast-to-coast Mutual network will hear the first of this season's Sunday night broadcasts—emanating from the modern broadcasting studios of the new Department of the Interior Building in Washington, D. C.

The facilities of these radio studios have been extended by the Secretary of the Interior, Harold L. Ickes, in the interest of free speech, on assurances these educational broadcasts will present both sides of a national problem, temperately discussed by the leaders of opposing schools of thought, and conducted by a nonpartisan, nonpolitical organization.

Tonight's American Forum of the Air will be presented identical to those which became such widely listened to programs last year. Under the direction of Theodore Granik, pioneer in educational radio discussion, you first will hear the presentation of both sides of tonight's topic of discussion by outstanding leaders on the subject. Following the formal presentation of opposing views, the issue will be heard in informal discussion by a panel board ready to treat the argument extemporaneously.

And now Mr. Theodore Granik.

Chairman GRANIK. Thank you, Mr. McCormack.

Tomorrow the Senate of the United States will begin its historic debate on revision of the Nation's neutrality law.

As reported by the Foreign Relations Committee, the bill provides for repeal of the arms embargo, requires that shipments of American goods to belligerent countries be made in non-American vessels, and authorizes the President to designate combat zones in which American ships and citizens would not be permitted to travel.

The committee report on the measure declared that the Nation cannot maintain its neutrality "so long as the arms embargo remains on the statute books."

"An embargo on arms, ammunition, and implements of war," it added, "is contrary to the accepted precepts of international law, which prescribe that any belligerent may purchase any articles or materials in any neutral country. Belligerents as well as neutrals have relied from time immemorial upon this law.

"The embargo," the report continued, "was a voluntary departure from international law by the United States Government, and cannot, in the opinion of this committee, be administered in an equitable or neutral manner, nor serve to maintain the peace of the United States."

Proponents of the measure contend that it will protect the neutrality, the safety, and the integrity of our country, and at the same time keep us out of war. Its opponents, however, argue that repeal of the embargo on arms shipments would create a definite road to the involvement of the United States in the European war, contending that, once this first step is taken, it will be easy to get rid of any cash-and-carry requirements and of the Johnson Act forbidding loans to debtor nations in default.

And while the controversy is centralized around the single question of whether there shall be or shall not be an embargo, it is expected that one of the other major points of the discussion, will deal with the issue of whether 90-day credits for belligerent purchasers of American goods shall be permitted.

On the eve of congressional action the American Forum of the Air is pleased to present a debate on the question tonight.

We will hear, first, from Senator KEY PITTMAN, of Nevada, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. He will be followed by Senator GERALD P. NYE, of North Dakota, long a Senate leader in international problems.

Immediately following we will present an informal panel discussion. Our panel members are: Senators ERNEST LUNDEEN, of Minnesota, TOM CONNALLY, of Texas, JOHN A. DANAHER, of Connecticut, and FREDERICK VAN NUYS, of Indiana.

And now, as our opening speaker, Senator KEY PITTMAN.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR KEY PITTMAN

Fellow citizens of the radio audience of America, in the 12 minutes allotted to me I can touch but briefly on the most important phases of the proposed neutrality legislation. The members of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the United States Senate who participated in the drafting of the proposed substitute for the House joint resolution were actuated solely by determination to preserve the neutrality and the peace of the United States, and to secure the safety of its citizens and their interests. The names of the distinguished Senators who voted in the Foreign Relations Committee to report out this substitute are known to the people of the United States. These men are just as intelligent and patriotic and love peace just as intensely as the distinguished Senators who oppose the proposed substitute. The world situation today and its possible future effect upon the United States is too serious for us to permit that there be any misunderstanding as to the proposed legislation or that legitimate consideration of the subject be obscured by catch phrases and appeal to the groundless fears of mothers and fathers.

In the proposed substitute for existing law and for the House joint resolution, restrictions upon the travel of our citizens, upon their trade, and upon our American vessels have been made much more severe than exist in the law today or that have ever been proposed in the Congress of the United States. I will admit on the very start that obedience to this proposed legislation will entail a great sacrifice upon the part of our citizens, but I am confident that every patriotic citizen will be willing to make this sacrifice in the knowledge that it has for its purpose, and will probably have as a result, the keeping us out of the European war.

Let us see in brief what it proposes. It absolutely prohibits American vessels from carrying passengers or any kinds of articles or materials to the warring powers. The old neutrality law, which expired on May 1, 1939, granted the discretion to the President to determine what articles might be transported in American vessels to belligerents with the exception of those few manufactured articles defined in existing law as arms, ammunition, and implements of war. That was the provision in the law of 1937 that Senators opposing the proposed substitute bragged was voted for by 63 Senators and voted against by only 6. Aren't those 63 Senators pleased that we now propose to amend the law by now taking this discretion away from the President and absolutely mandatorily prohibiting our American vessels from engaging in any commerce with belligerents? If they do not favor such change, let them say so now. The old cash-and-carry law which expired on May 1, 1939, as far as the divesting of title out of the American citizen, is reenacted in the proposed substitute, but has been strengthened by providing that any loss by any American citizen in the sale and transfer of title and possession of his goods shall not be made the basis of any claim by the United States Government. Do not the opponents of the present legislation approve of that additional clause? The provision for a foreigner to take title and carry all goods from the United States applies only to the warring powers, but some of the warring powers might start to submarine our American vessels who are dealing with neutrals adjacent to warring powers as they did in 1917. We can't afford to allow our American seamen to suffer death through submarining without notice for the sake of trading

even with a neutral. We do not know whether such conditions will arise, nor with regard to what neutral it will eventuate. Nor can we know how long such action might continue, and therefore we have granted to the President of the United States the discretion to place combat areas around those neutrals, commerce with which results in the destruction of our ships, our American vessels, and the lives of our citizens on board, and to prohibit entry by our American vessels into such combat area. It is impossible to conceive that any President vested with such responsibility would use such power necessarily, and it is equally inconceivable that he would refuse to use such power in carrying out the intent of Congress in protecting the lives of our seamen.

Do you know that today there is no law restricting American vessels from carrying scrap iron, steel, lead, zinc, copper, and every kind of metal, oil, gasoline, and every other character of raw material to any of the warring powers? Certainly the opponents of the proposed legislation must favor the absolute restrictions that we propose to enact into law prohibiting the transportation of such materials to the warring powers. Great Britain has issued its list of contraband—that is, articles and materials that may be seized or destroyed if they believe they are going to their enemy—which includes all of the articles that I have named which under existing law may be carried by our American vessels to the warring powers. Germany has gone even further in its list of contraband. It includes every article of commerce. Only recently Germany has sunk Swedish vessels because such vessels were carrying wood pulp to Great Britain. Everyone knows that the chief use of wood pulp is in the manufacture of paper. Oh, yes; wood pulp may be used for the manufacture of other things. In fact, today nearly everything can be manufactured into instruments of war. And yet the opponents of the proposed legislation are willing to defeat the proposed neutrality law simply because those few manufactured articles which are defined as arms, ammunition, and implements of war may be purchased in this country the same as all other kinds of war instruments and taken away by warring powers in their own vessels.

All the old provisions, even those that have died by their own terms, are reenacted into the proposed legislation and materially strengthened. There is some question being raised by the opponents of the proposed legislation with regard to section 7 (a) of the proposed substitute, entitled "Financial transactions," prohibiting the purchase, sale, or exchange of bonds, securities, or other obligations of the warring powers, or the making of loans, or the extension of credit to such powers, because it is provided that if the President shall find that such action will serve to protect the commercial interests of the United States or its citizens he may, in his discretion, and to such extent and under such regulations as he may prescribe, except from the operation of said section ordinary commercial credits and short-time obligations in aid of legal transactions and of a character customarily used in normal peacetime commercial transactions. They forget that that language is exactly the same as was contained in the bill for which 63 Senators voted when the existing law was before the Senate in 1937. They forget that such law is now on the statute books; and no Senator or Congressman to my knowledge has ever made any objection to it in the past. The Attorney General, in construing the Johnson Act, which is in almost the same language as section 7 of the existing law and of the proposed substitute, except that such act does not by any proviso grant any discretion to the President to permit the extension of short-time credits, said in part: "This, I think, is indicative of a purpose to deal with such 'bonds' and 'securities' and with 'other obligations' of like nature, observing the rule of ejusdem generis—that is, obligations such as those which have been sold to the American public to raise money for the use of the foreign governments issuing them—not contemplating foreign currency, postal money orders, drafts, checks, and other ordinary aids to banking and commercial transactions, which are 'obligations' in a broad sense but not in the sense intended. It was obviously not the purpose of the Congress to discontinue all commercial relations with the defaulting countries." Ninety-day drafts, checks, and other instruments used in the payment for export goods are generally considered as cash transactions, and the Treasury Department so decided at a conference at which, I am informed, Senator JOHNSON was present But let us remember that the proviso in existing law rests the permission of the extension of such normal peacetime commercial transactions in the President. I am unwilling to believe or admit that any President of the United States would use this discretion contrary to the best interests of the United States. However, the Foreign Relations Committee have added a mandatory clause to such existing law in the following language: "but only if such credits and obligations have maturities of not more than 90 days and are not renewable. If any government, political subdivision, or person to which credit has been extended pursuant to the authority vested in the President under this subsection is in default in whole or in part upon any obligation to which such extension of credit relates, no further extension of credit to such government, political subdivision, or person shall be made or authorized under this subsection during the period of such default."

If any 90-day checks or drafts of a belligerent government are not paid in full at maturity, then the President is prohibited from granting such government said 90 days' extension of credit on any other transactions during such default. Is there any stronger mandatory provision that could be enacted? Do we not know that 95 percent of commercial transactions are conducted through drafts and checks and that a period must elapse between the time of the giving of such drafts and checks and the time when such drafts and checks are presented and credit is given to the seller? Are exports of our wheat and cotton and other usual exports to be obstructed, if not stopped, through the abandonment of the customary methods of payment for such goods? We are voluntarily placing great restrictions upon our citizens and their industries without absolutely taking the chance of stopping all exports. Our country is not in a condition today to bear any such additional burdens.

I am impatient at the hocus-pocus that whatever we do today will be a step toward war because tomorrow Congress will yield to persuasions to do things that they believe wrong today. A distinguished Senator of the United States enunciated this baseless contention when he said recently in a national broadcast: "The next step will be to make loans to the Allies to protect the credit that has been advanced." Well, would the Senator vote to give authority for our Government to loan money to a belligerent government for such purpose? Of course not. Would any Senator who opposes the proposed legislation vote to grant such authority? Of course not. Would any patriotic Member of Congress cast such a vote? I do not believe it. I have just as much confidence in the wisdom and patriotism of every Senator in the United States as I have in the distinguished Senators who fear such action and who would fight against it. The Government of the United States cannot lend money to a warring power without authority of Congress. Congress alone can appropriate money to carry on a war. Congress alone can authorize war. The Members of the Congress of the United States are patriotic, intelligent, and sincere men and women. They have a fixed determination to keep out of the European war. It is, therefore, deceptive to say that such a Congress, if it takes a step that it believes right today, is going to take another step tomorrow that is not right.

Chairman GRANIK. Thank you, Senator PITTMAN. You are listening to the American Forum of the Air presenting a discussion on the neutrality bill. You have just heard Senator KEY PITTMAN, of Nevada.

And now we are pleased to present Senator GERALD P. NYE, of North Dakota.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR GERALD P. NYE

I insist that repeal of the arms embargo is not in keeping with American determination to stay out of Europe's war. This attitude is not prompted by any partisan spirit. Those of us who are for the arms embargo now were supporters of it since 1935, when we introduced bills for both the cash and carry and the arms embargo. We thought then that America needed both of them to keep us out of war, and we still think so. We have been able to observe how greed can grow into a great power in the affairs of the Nation, how quickly a little privilege can become a vested interest, how readily, to be specific, the traffic in death can become not only respectable but arrogant.

We are a nation of people almost unanimous in expressing a determination to stay out of the European war. But of this great number there are some who are eager to help one side engaged in the European conflict to the extent of arming them with the instruments which war calls for. When will it dawn upon such people that, since modern war is conducted on two specific fronts, the military and the economic, one quite as important as the other, that we cannot be into a war on one front without expecting shortly to be into it on both fronts? If we are determined to fight this war with materials we will inevitably end up by fighting it with men.

How many more wars do we have to have before we learn that lesson? It was written long ago, "Where your money is, there will your heart be also."

This pending decision by Congress on the arms embargo involves the question whether the United States will take the first step toward participation in Europe's war. I insist that we cannot conscientiously declare ourselves out of Europe's war when we go into Europe's war actively on the economic front in support of one side.

The people should be reminded that they have no vote on this question, no vote on the possibility that they will die in the mud in the Rhine for some cause to them unknown. They vote on everything else, but not on the most important matter in their lives. The administration refused the people that right last year when it pressured Congress to defeat legislation giving that right. Now that same administration is engaged in taking away another safeguard against our involvement in war, the arms embargo.

In this situation Congress is the only protection from involvement. The debate will start tomorrow noon.

What is the fight about? It is about getting into a war situation by accident, or because of greed, or because one single man thinks we ought to get in. That is not democracy. The bill that is pending has some good and some very bad features. The good features are now or have been a part of our neutrality law. The bad features are those granting more power to the President.

The arms embargo is the real heart of the controversy, and I hope the window dressing in the bill is not going to be permitted to blind anyone to that fact.

We who fight repeal of the arms embargo will insist that to make our country the arsenal for one side in the European war is to make our country the target for the other side; that the embargo is pure neutrality; that repeal is the first step into the foreign war; that we can get along without the blood profits that are available through embargo repeal.

Those who favor repeal of the arms embargo will insist that the embargo is unneutral, that there is money in the murder business, that we need the returns from foreign war to bolster our economy, that we must choose sides, that the cause of democracy is involved in Europe's never ending imperialistic struggles.

The arms embargo has become a kind of traffic light. If it is repealed, the light will turn green—"go ahead"—along the road

to war. Now the light stands at red, "Stop!" and we propose to keep the arms embargo there to hold that light at red, to let all and everyone know that the American people propose to stay out of this war.

The fight in Congress to keep the arms embargo on the books is going to be desperate. It is going to be desperately fought, because once that embargo were repealed, there will be no turning back and putting it back on the books—not until after another war.

The gloating dispatches from Washington expressing the administration's belief that they had the votes to repeal are probably doing some harm. They are discouraging some people from writing their Senators and Congressmen. I want to tell you that you will see within a very few days that a majority has not pledged itself to repeal the embargo, and I am confident that it will not be repealed. The very fact that the administration has taken time on the air every night for 2 weeks indicates that its forces are not sure of their ground.

There are some other contradictions, too. What of this representation that unless we sell war supplies to England and France, those countries are going to be crushed, and then to know that the purchases by those two countries of munitions during the 5 months preceding the invoking of the arms embargo were insignificant. The truth is that England and France know that if repeal of the arms embargo can be accomplished, they can anticipate with far greater ease, a little later on, repeal of the cash-and-carry requirements, repeal of the Johnson Act, and finally repeal of that resolve to keep American sons off the European military front.

Here in America eminent statesmen insist that the repeal of the embargo is essential if we are to stay out of Europe's war. Does anyone believe that England and France want us to repeal the embargo for that same reason? There isn't an American who doesn't know better.

And, speaking of inconsistencies, what of the attitude of those who are now demanding repeal of the arms embargo as a thing necessary to keep us out of Europe's war, by comparison with their insistence only 2 years ago that unless we wrote an arms embargo to prevent exportation of arms into Spain, the United States would be drawn into that civil war in Spain. Now, war in Europe has broken out—and the administration has turned a somersault—and is asking that we repeal the arms embargo which in 1937 they considered so necessary for our own peace.

Here are many insisting upon repeal of the arms embargo as a step to keep us out of war, yet insisting in the same breath that we get into Europe's war to the extent of supplying one side with arms and making our Nation an arsenal for that side.

Eloquently men plead for an adjournment of politics on this issue, only to let us observe the leaders of the repeal cause summoning into conferences only that part of a committee bearing a certain partisan label and known to be friendly to the cause of repeal, and excluding all others.

We have had proclaimed a state of emergency here in our own country. In that connection let me point out that Congress was summoned into special session in the name of a limited emergency. Of course, if an emergency exists, the Congress ought to be here. But why must those who insist that there is an emergency be equally insistent that as soon as Congress has repealed the arms embargo it should hurry back home?

Contradictions? Who does not remember how, after Congress this summer refused to repeal the arms embargo, the President echoed a complaint to the effect that because we had not repealed the embargo we had lost our chance at a nice little trade boom? But now the President and his following are talking, talking, talking about how to prevent anyone making a profit out of this situation that has developed abroad.

I said before that many people think that the issue is one of choosing sides. It is awkward choosing sides in these days. You never know who is in bed with you when you wake up. Who expected to see the marriage of those supposedly bitter enemies Soviet Russia and Nazi Germany? What assurance do we have that we would not wake up one moment to find England tied up with one or both of them?

And speaking of changing around, the changes of the President himself have naturally made many of us wonder where he will land next. They have made us wonder whether he has not embarked on a policy which may lead him on courses different from those he had in mind. The President today says that the existence of the arms embargo may be responsible for taking us into Europe's war; that it is unneutral to refuse to sell to all nations at war alike; that we ought to repeal it. This is the same President who in the fall of 1936 was heaping praise upon the neutrality law, including the arms embargo, as a "weapon to safeguard American neutrality," against the appeal of fools' gold.

Let us be honest with ourselves and clear about our facts in this controversy. The neutrality law, with the arms embargo in it, was written for the purpose of keeping the United States out of other people's wars. Until last May that law carried within it, together with the embargo forbidding the exportation of munitions to any nation engaged in war, a cash-and-carry plan, now being advocated as a substitute for the arms embargo. But let it not be forgotten that the administration that now wants the cash-and-carry plan permitted that cash-and-carry plan to expire last May. Here they come in the name of emergency, to ask repeal of the arms embargo and establishment again of the cash-and-carry plan. They were for the arms embargo and are now against it. They were against the cash and carry when they let it die last April, and are now for it. All this switching around makes many of us sure that they may have less interest in protecting our peace than in accommodating our laws to a certain interventionist foreign policy and winning profits.

The appeal is made that though we have the arms embargo preventing the exportation of munitions to nations at war, there is no safeguard against traffic in other commodities being so challenged and jeopardized as ultimately to take us to war. Overnight some people have become most zealous in their determination to prevent American trade with nations at war which would risk searches, seizures, and sinkings that might take us to war. All right, let us agree that this danger does exist. What are we to do about it? Is the only answer to repeal the embargo and write the cash-and-carry plan to cover all commodities, including munitions? Certainly not. If we want the most thoroughgoing safeguard against that kind of chance, then what we want is an enlargement of the existing embargo that will forbid exportation of anything and everything to nations at war, or resort to a program which the administration once recommended—the maintenance of only a normal peacetime trade with nations at war. If that is not to be done, then let's have the embargo plus cash and carry to cover everything else.

The time to start staying out of Europe's war was before Europe went to war. Congress and the President made that start by writing the neutrality law. Now is the time for Americans, their President, and their Congress to hold fast to that kind of a start. We so desperately need today to be prevented from taking those steps which could so easily be steps straight to war. We ought to guard most jealously against the possibility of the United States gearing its economy to a wartime basis if we would avoid a repetition of that disastrous experience which is still with us.

We should decline to be fooled into believing that there is the faintest ideal of democracy involved in that European conflict today. The No. 1 issue is the maintenance of existing imperialism and empires and the prevention of other imperialisms and empires being built to outshine them.

There is already some sentiment in this country to the effect that much as we may regret it, the time does seem to be at hand when we are going to have to clean up over there in Europe once again; that we stopped too soon the last time; that we have got to hop in there again and this time sweep clean; and that the way to start doing that is to move in at once on the economic front by becoming the arsenal for one side, which can be done only by repealing the arms embargo. This attitude, I might say, in light of what does prevail and will prevail in Europe for a long time to come, reminds one of the housewife who, during a 3-day dust storm out in the Dust Bowl, went out with her broom and swept her porch every half hour.

Say what you will, there were no causes more largely responsible for our entry into Europe's war in 1917 than foreign propaganda and our wartime trade. The record clearly discloses how true this was. Let us not repeat that experience. Let us not take the first step which so easily paves the way to the next step, even to further steps involving declarations of war. Let us not do that at least until we can have a clearer definition than now exists of what part we can play successfully, of what chance there is of going to war and remaining a democracy. Until we shall perchance have decided that Europe and her aches are really our aches, let us not fool ourselves into believing that we can get half in and yet stay out of that war, for we ought to know that we are either going to be in or out—in or out.

An emergency exists or is declared to exist! Repeal the embargo becomes the hue and cry! Adjourn politics! Politics ought to be adjourned in this controversy. But there must be no adjournment of allegiance to the cause of keeping America strong, keeping democracy secure where we have a real chance to keep it secure, one place in all the world. There must be no adjournment of allegiance to that principle and policy dictating that America mind her own business, that America avoid entanglement in European power politics, about which we know so little and which we certainly cannot disentangle.

Speak up, Americans; make your voices heard. Don't for 1 minute permit yourself to believe that this cause of retaining the arms embargo is lost, for it is not lost. This fight is only just begun, and I say to you that it will be a matter of only a few days before there will be ample demonstration of the fact that a majority of the Members of the Senate have not pledged themselves to vote for repeal of the arms embargo.

Announcer McCORMACK. Immediately following station identification, we will continue with the panel discussion.

This is the Mutual Broadcasting System.

Announcer McCORMACK. This is the American Forum of the Air, originating in the broadcasting studios of the new Department of the Interior Building in Washington, D. C., and presented over the Mutual network by WOL in cooperation with WOR.

We return you the chairman of the program, Mr. Granik.

Chairman GRANIK. Thank you, Senator NYE. This concludes part I of tonight's American Forum of the Air.

And now, as part II of tonight's American Forum of the Air, we present an informal panel discussion. The panel members are: Senators JOHN A. DANAHER, of Connecticut; TOM CONNALLY, of Texas; ERNEST LUNDEEN, of Minnesota; and FREDERICK VAN NUYS, of Indiana.

Senator DANAHER will open the discussion.

Senator JOHN A. DANAHER (Connecticut). Thank you, Mr. Granik.

There cannot be the slightest question of the good faith and the earnestness and sincerity of the Members of the United States Senate in their desire to keep the United States out of war. We honestly do differ, however, as to the method to be pursued in that

particular. Senator PITTMAN, the distinguished Senator from Nevada and chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, has described the pending bill as a proposed neutrality law. I claim that it is not a neutrality law, that that is a misnomer. I say it is a trade-in-munitions bill, and I believe that we can properly turn to the report of the Committee on Foreign Relations, where we read: "The embargo is contrary to the accepted precepts of international law, which prescribe that any belligerent may purchase any article or materials in any neutral country."

I want to legislate for the United States, and not for any belligerent.

Senator CONNALLY, out of your long experience on the Committee on Foreign Relations, and out of respect for your part in the draftsmanship of this particular act, I would like to direct your attention, if I may, to section 7B, and let me point our first that section 7A is the one which purports to place the limitation upon credits, and section 7B reads that "The provisions of this section shall not apply to a renewal or adjustment of such indebtedness as may exist on the date of such proclamation."

I claim, Senator, that the very language there adopted, if enacted into law, will make possible, between now and the date of the proclamation, the extension of unlimited credits creating any amount of indebtedness for any possible purpose in furnishing munitions to a belligerent. What is your view, Senator CONNALLY, if I may ask?

Senator TOM CONNALLY (Texas). Senator DANAHER, I think you are getting the cart ahead of the horse in jumping over about five or six pages of the bill and ignoring its chief purpose, and singling out a section that really has no serious application. Section 7B, to which you refer, refers to existing debts owed by people in European countries to American citizens. Of course that has nothing on earth to do with the war. Those are debts that have been incurred in former times, and of course they may be renewed if they cannot be paid. I came here tonight to discuss this bill on its merits, and not to engage in partisan politics. One of the Senators on the main panel seemed to spend most of his time denouncing the administration and President Roosevelt. I want to discuss this bill and see whether it is right or whether it is wrong, no matter who is for it and who is against it. I respect the views of those who are opposing the repeal, but I want to tell you one reason why I favor repeal of an embargo.

The embargo on arms provides that in time of peace—that is the existing law—any nation preparing for conquest, arming itself to overrun peaceful neighbors, may buy all the arms in the United States which it may desire, but when it once strikes and creates a state of war the innocent victim of its aggression can't get a single gun or a single bayonet to meet the guns and bayonets which have been sold to the other nation, in time of war. It offers a disadvantage to the weak and defenseless and the innocent and peaceful. It offers a premium to the aggressor, to the conqueror, and to the militaristic nations that look with covetous eyes upon the property or the territory of their neighbors. It permits the burglar in the daytime to buy his jimmy and his tools and his nitroglycerine in order to rob a bank or steal your treasure, but when he is discovered in his acts it prevents the owner from borrowing a weapon from his neighbor to repel the burglar and to punish him for his crime.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it has been said that to repeal the arms embargo constitutes unneutrality. I deny it. It is not true. The United States of America is the only nation on earth that has such a law. All of the great countries of the earth recognize that international law permits any nation to buy from neutral nations in time of war any commodity, arms, ammunition, implements of war, food, clothing, raw materials and anything, and it is not a violation of international law. Today the countries neighboring Germany, Italy, Hungary, Rumania, what was once Poland, what was once Czechoslovakia, Belgium, Holland, Denmark, are selling Germany, and Germany is buying from them arms and ammunition, supplies of every character. That is not unneutral. If it is not unneutral for those countries to sell to Germany, why is it unneutral for the United States to sell to England and France or to Germany, for that matter? Under the arms embargo which these gentlemen want to retain, Italy can come to America today and buy all the arms and ammunition that she wants, and what assurance have we got that when they are once bought and transported even in American ships, they may not be transported to Germany for her use? I submit, Senator LUNDEEN, who will follow me, that that is in part my answer as to why the embargo should be repealed.

Senator ERNEST LUNDEEN (Minnesota): We should remember that this is war between two utterly selfish groups. They are not engaged in any humanitarian objects. They are engaged in protecting themselves and all of their interests, looking after their empires, because they are empires, and great empires.

Many people think of France as a little country. It has more than a million square miles more than the United States in its colonies. Great Britain is more than four times the size of the United States. They are looking after themselves. They are not so careful about us. It seems to me they owe us some money. It seems to me they owe us some war debts. In 1917 I stood on the floor of the House of Representatives and predicted that they would be loaned billions and they would never pay them back, and they did not pay them back. They have been rather insolent about it. These groups are all selfish. I would like to see these West Indies Islands turned over as part payment for some of these debts, and perhaps that would make some of these European nations pause about war the next time. Democracy in Europe? Is there one left? Where is there any democracy—they are all dictators over there. They switch around according to their best interests. I hope it is not undignified to say, "Who took the whiskers off Russia a while ago, and who put them on now, again?" Why, they were very, very crude, terrible people a while ago, and then, shortly after that, they became very respectable when the British Empire went over and for 6 months courted them. Now, of course, they are bewhiskered again, and terrible people.

Now, we are being charged, according to the newspapers, rent for the trenches that we fought in and rent for the graves in which we placed our hero dead. And if we don't pay the rent, they cremate them. I don't know what they intend to do with the ashes of these hero boys we sent over there.

Now, I am greatly interested in what these distinguished and learned Senators say, but I am more interested in what Washington and Jefferson and Jackson and Lincoln and the Founders and Fathers of the American Republic said about situations like that, and I want to read one paragraph from Washington, the Father of our Country, when he said, "Why forego the advantages of so peculiar a situation? Why quit our own to stand upon foreign ground? Why, by interweaving our destiny with that of any part of Europe, entangle our peace and prosperity in the toils of European ambition, rivalship, interest, humor, or caprice? It is our true policy to steer clear of permanent alliances with any position or portion of the foreign world." Then he said, "The jealousy of a free people ought to be constantly awake, since history and experience prove that foreign influence is one of the most baneful foes of republican government."

Senator VAN NUYS, I am sure the American public are going to be much interested in your point of view. I know we all respect one another's position; we are all Americans, we are trying to do the best we know how for this country, where we were born, and the Nation we love.

Senator VAN NUYS (Indiana). Mr. Chairman, I only have a word or two of observation at this time. The thing that impressed me in this debate up to date, and which to me is radically wrong and should be stopped if we are going to solve this question impassionately and on a sincere basis, was the observation made by the second speaker tonight who says that the Nation stands today before a traffic signal with the green light on if this so-called neutrality amendment is passed, but as the law is today, it flashes a red stop light. I want the American people listening in to know that there isn't a one of the majority of the Senate which will pass this bill, these amendments, very shortly, but what stands adamantly against the entrance of the United States of America into this or any other foreign war. I am only speaking for myself, Senator CONNALLY and Senator LUNDEEN, only for myself, but I hope as one of the results of this war that Hitlerism will be wiped off the face of the earth forever. Now, how best to accomplish that without involving this country in the war, in a foreign war, is the problem which confronts us. Why should we be drawn into another war? The Chief Executive in the message which he recently sent to Congress, incorporating a detailed statement from Secretary Hull and in which statement the President concurred, said that the chief concern—Secretary Hull said—of this country is its peace and neutrality. And later, just recently, the Chief Executive broadcast to the American people and assured them and reassured them that there would be no black-out of peace as long as he could control the executive situation.

A preponderating majority of the Congress, Senate and House, join in those sentiments. But what is more vital and more determining than the Chief Executive or the Senate or the House is the fact that the great overwhelming majority of the American people are against ever entering into another foreign war. I hope that as a result of this nonpartisan, patriotic debate on the floor of the Senate and here tonight, that that statement that the passage of these amendments is tantamount to the United States of America not entering into another foreign war.

And now, noticing the anxious look upon the face of Senator DANAHER, and the great documentary arms, ammunition, and implements of war which he has piled up before him, I defer to him at this time.

Senator DANAHER. For a question, if you please, Senator VAN NUYS. I have observed in the course of your remarks that your attitude is born of a desire to crush Hitlerism. Do you not conceive it to be the purpose of the United States Senate to legislate in favor of the people of the United States, and the position of our country before the world, rather than to pass such legislation as would either aid or crush any nation?

Senator VAN NUYS. I do not admit, Senator, that the objective of this law is along that line, and I prefaced my observation by the statement that that was my individual opinion and desire.

Senator DANAHER. Senator, of course you are aware that there are a great many people whose sentiments, whose sympathies, in fact I properly might say the sentiments and sympathies of all of us, rebel at what has happened, for instance, to bleeding Poland, and on that account a great many people wish to lend assistance to England, and because of that I sent to the Secretary of State for a break-down under the munitions export license arrangement, for the actual figures of the extent to which we have assisted England during 1939, when the imminence of war must have become at least as apparent to England as it did to us. And it is a singular thing, Senator VAN NUYS, that from the end of April of 1939 to the end of August of 1939, arms export licenses were issued to English carriers, or to American exporters to be sent to England, all kinds of munitions, including airplanes, the total of $701,000 worth. Now, it is perfectly apparent from the figures, Senator, I

should say, that either of two things is true. One of them necessarily must be that England does not need our help under the arms, ammunitions, or munitions and implements of war theory. Wouldn't you say so?

Senator VAN NUYS. Well, it really isn't my turn. Senator CONNALLY is next, and I defer to him as the next on the panel.

Senator LUNDEEN. May I say there that I have a clipping in my hand which states that both Britain and Germany are supplying warplanes to Rumania right now. Take that mix-up.

Senator CONNALLY. My answer to Senator DANAHER is that we are not predicating this legislation on how we can help England, or how we can hurt Hitler, or how we can assassinate Stalin, as he has been assassinating his friends and allies all these years. This bill is designed to keep the United States of America out of war. Under the present bill, American citizens cannot sell arms and ammunition, but they can sell anything else on earth, and they can carry it in American ships, not alone to neutrals but to belligerents and warring nations. What got us into the World War? It was not what the ships had in them, because Germany sank food ships and clothing ships and all other kinds of ships, irrespective of whether they carried munitions. Under this bill no American citizen can ship anything to a warring nation in an American ship, neither arms, munitions, nor implements of war, nor general supplies of oil or cotton or food or any other article of commerce, raw materials—not one thing going abroad in an American ship, and when we keep American ships off the seas, when we keep them from going to belligerent nations, we have done more than any government on the face of this earth in all the history of time ever did before to keep out of war.

Now, why should we refuse to sell one belligerent arms and ammunition? Under international law they have a right to buy them, and if in time of their need, in time of danger, we refuse to award them the same right that all other nations possess to our markets, we are committing an unneutral act. We are doing that to their hurt and their damage which is not authorized under international law.

For that reason this bill, when it treats both belligerents alike as to arms and ammunition, when it treats them all alike in refusing the transport of American goods of any kind in American ships to belligerent nations, gives to the American people the greatest guaranty, much greater than the present so-called embargo law.

I deny it; I reject it. All of us want to keep the United States out of war, and that is what this bill is designed to do. It is the best guaranty that has ever been offered to the American people, to say nothing of having been adopted, in all the history of time. Is not that true, Senator LUNDEEN?

Senator LUNDEEN. You say about keeping out of war. It seems to me I heard that 22 years ago. They were going to keep us out of war. Oh, yes; they were all for keeping out of war. But they were getting us in just as fast as they knew how, behind the camouflage of keeping us out of war.

When I was a young Congressman at that time, I was observing as much as I could the movements behind the scenery.

I just had a clipping taken out of the Sunday papers. We hear a great deal about conscription and militarism, and here is an article here about one of these nations introducing conscription that might be of some interest, a nation that says it is a republic but now is a dictatorship.

Here I have the Chicago Daily Tribune of September 29, and I would like to ask the distinguished and able chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee about that, whether it is correct or not. "Our chameleon foreign policy"—and here is a drawing of Senator PITTMAN speaking to Congress on April 7, 1937. "Congress seeks to keep out of the next war. Our bill places an embargo upon the exportation of arms, munitions, and implements of war to belligerents. This is the only embargo imposed. No one has seriously opposed it."

Then recently Senator PITTMAN is represented as stating, "Not to sell arms and munitions to belligerents is dangerous. The embargo must be repealed."

Well, I think that ought to be cleared. I am sure that our able chairman might want to say something there.

Senator KEY PITTMAN (Nevada). Senator LUNDEEN, some people, you know, profit by experience. Others don't. I have made a great many mistakes since I have been in the Senate, and frankly I admit it. I really thought at one time that the embargo was going to be more effective than it was. I can't think it can be effective when there are just a few manufactured things like guns and ammunitions in it and you have oil and gasoline and iron and steel and everything that makes ammunitions out of it, and I don't think it can be solved by reason of the last thing that happened—that is, the alliance of Russia with Germany—because she can get all the ammunitions into Germany from the United States.

Announced MCCORMACK. So we have concluded the initial broadcast in this season's series of the American Forum of the Air broadcasts emanating from the broadcasting studios of the new Department of the Interior Building in Washington, D. C.

The facilities of these radio studios have been extended by the Secretary of the Interior Harold L. Ickes in the interest of free speech, on assurances these educational broadcasts will present both sides of a national problem, temperately discussed by the leaders of opposing schools of thought and conducted by a nonpartisan, nonpolitical organization.

The Mutual network will bring you this forum broadcast every Sunday evening from 8 to 9 o'clock, eastern standard time, through out the session of Congress. Tickets to this broadcast may be had by sending your request to station WOR, New York, or WOL, Washington. In the interest of education, there are printed and distributed, free of charge, a limited number of copies of the entire proceedings of these broadcasts. Address your requests and comments to WOL.

The American Forum of the Air is directed by Theodore Granik, who presided as chairman tonight, and comes to you as a presentation of WOR in cooperation with WOL.

This is Stephen McCormack speaking.

This is the coast-to-coast network of the Mutual Broadcasting System.

Pending Neutrality Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD P. NYE

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 11 (legislative day of Wednesday, October 4), 1939

RADIO ADDRESS BY. HON. JOHN H. OVERTON, OF LOUISIANA

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address on neutrality delivered by the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] in the American Forum of the Air, Mutual Broadcasting Co., on October 8, 1939.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Congress of the United States is now considering a measure of the most vital importance to every man, woman, and child in America. Our decision on this question may lead us to war, or it may keep us in the paths of peace. I submit that we should do everything within our power to keep the United States not only out of the present European conflict but also out of all foreign wars in the future. We should do not simply a few things to keep us out, but everything within reason. We should think first of America and not European or other foreign nations.

Our neutrality resolution should contain both the arms embargo and the cash-and-carry plan, and also, with perhaps some slight modifications, all the other safeguards proposed in the resolution now before Congress. There is no reason whatsoever why we cannot retain the present embargo on arms, ammunition, and implements of war and reenact the cash-and-carry provision on all other commodities. Up until May 1 of this year we had both the arms embargo and a cash-and-carry policy on all other articles of export. The arms embargo is still the law of the land, but the cash-and-carry requirement expired last May. Let us retain the one and reenact the other. The objection that I have to the neutrality resolution pending before Congress is not by reason of its carrying a cash-and-carry provision, but because it undertakes also to repeal the arms embargo, which is the cornerstone of our neutrality and our strongest legislative safeguard against involvement in foreign wars. Let us, therefore, understand this fact clearly: We do not have to repeal the arms embargo in order to have the cash and carry. We can and should have both.

We adopted the arms-embargo policy in 1935, 1936, and 1937, when our judgment was not warped by either the friendships or animosities engendered by the present European conflict. That policy was adopted to meet just such a situation as now confronts us, and for the threefold purpose of keeping us out of war, of refusing to aid other nations with deadly weapons in carrying on war, and of maintaining a fair and just neutrality. The administration officials and spokesmen who approved this policy, declared that it was a clear policy, a wise policy, a powerful protection for us. Now that the contingency against which we have been protecting ourselves has, in fact occurred, should we now scrap one of the fundamental safeguards, agreed upon all sides as a measure calculated to preserve our own peace? The neutrality legislation, with its continuing arms embargo, was American legislation deliberately enacted by the American Congress, not out of consideration for foreign nations but solely in the interest of these United States.

To repeal the arms embargo would be to take sides officially by act of our Government. If the American people are being asked to take sides they shall be so asked frankly and openly, and not through the side door of the arms embargo repeal. If we begin now to supply one side with arms in this mammoth conflict now just getting under way in Europe, we shall find, as we did in the World War, that gradually we shall be called upon to do more and more, and to take step after step on the road that leads us to war. Soon the American dollar will be following our American arms, and then the American flag and the American soldier will be following both to the battlefields of Europe.

We have erected a few barriers against involvement in foreign wars. We should keep every one of them. I favor strengthening them, adding to them, but I am opposed to striking down a single one of them.

Personally I am against the United States taking sides. Bitter experience teaches us that it is not to our national interest to do so. We took sides once before in the power politics of Europe. We came out of that war without having saved the world for democracy, without putting an end to all wars, without attaining any of the high ideals for which our soldiers fought and died in foreign lands. What we got out of this misadventure was a dishonored debt of over $13,000,000,000 owed us by European nations and a post-war depression from which we have not recovered. We spent for that war, including the default on the war debts, approximately $60,000,000,000. We sacrificed the lives of over 100,000 of our young men and have filled our veterans' hospitals with thousands upon thousands of others, maimed, diseased, bereft of reason. What a tragic reminder of the utter futility of our participating in the wars of European nations or of trying to adjust their racial, religious, territorial, and political differences.

Another World War will take infinitely more of our life, our wealth and resources, our democracy. So strongly do I feel about that this I am unwilling to take a single step toward participating again in the endless and ever-recurring quarrels of European nations, which neither we nor they can apparently ever hope to settle.

Our participation in another World War would bring us a virtual dictatorship in the United States during the course of the war. The nature of modern, totalitarian war makes that unavoidable. The only way to avoid it is to keep the country out of war. Another great war will jeopardize our democracy. You recall the extensive and unprecedented powers which had to be given to our Executive during the last war. They will seem mild compared to the complete controls that another war will put into the hands of any President, regardless of who he may be.

If we ever get into another major war, we may never regain the democracy we will be forced to give up while the war is on. I do not believe we can impose democracy upon all of Europe. But I do believe that we can and must preserve democracy in these United States, encourage its growth throughout this hemisphere, and be prepared to defend it here from all outside attack. I cannot understand how anybody who cherishes our free institutions, our democratic traditions and spirit, our very civilization, can contemplate taking sides now, even just a little, with anything but complete horror. We must perform our task in our own country and on this hemisphere, where we have great opportunities which coincide with our real national interest. We may and do have sympathy for certain nations in Europe, but we must not allow such sympathies to blind us to what is good, what is possible, and what is practicable for the United States. Our own country, its strict neutrality and avoidance of war, should be our first and last thought.

The neutrality legislation adopted in 1935, 1936, and 1937, after careful study of our previous war experience, has become an important part of our national policy. The barriers against easy involvement in foreign war put up in legislation must not be broken down. The present law includes the arms embargo, the ban on loans and restriction on credits, the prohibition against our citizens traveling on belligerent ships. To these provisions should be added the cash-and-carry proposal and other safeguarding measures. Such action will best serve the interests of the United States. The notice that we gave to the rest of the world over 4 years ago that we would not again become an arms arsenal for any set of belligerents, that we would not again supply in wartime the deadly weapons of mass murder and wholesale destruction, was a sound decision, and is still a sound and humane policy.

I take my stand for retention of the arms embargo, together with the rest of the present law, and the addition of cash-and-carry provisions, as the best insurance to our peace.

Problems of Law Enforcement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 11 (legislative day of Wednesday, October 4), 1939

ADDRESS BY HON. J. EDGAR HOOVER

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address on the problems of law enforcement delivered by Hon. J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, before the International Association of Chiefs of Police at San Francisco, Calif., on October 10, 1939.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

There have been few times, if any, in our history when law enforcement faced a more serious ordeal than today. Not even in the turbulent World War days were there greater problems. We then battled only subversive forces and sporadic crime, not a widely flung underworld often highly organized in racketeering and destruction. There has never been a greater need for progress, development, and improvement within the ranks of law enforcement. Widespread cooperation must be marshaled if we are to meet the difficult problems that lie before us.

We have a habit in the International Association of Chiefs of Police of speaking frankly, of rolling up our sleeves at these annual meetings and talking over our problems man to man, striving always to face the truth, no matter how unpleasant that may be. In this spirit of frankness, I ask that we face the fact together that the demand for improvement must start within the ranks of law enforcement, for it will come only through our own efforts. Glaring irregularities which public apathy may have glossed over in the past will be brought into the foreground in the future. Our house must now be put in order through vigorous and concerted action, both for national defense and self-defense.

The President of the United States has instructed the Federal Bureau of Investigation to take charge of all investigative work in matters involving espionage, sabotage, subversive activities, and violations of our neutrality regulations. He has asked all law enforcing agencies to refer promptly to the F. B. I. any information obtained by them relating to such matters. I am confident that each and every law-enforcement agency in our Nation will realize its responsibility in this national emergency and will wholeheartedly respond to our President's request.

You are assured that the F. B. I. will carry on this special work in the same way in which it has functioned in other phases of its activities in recent years—in a calm, impartial, vigorous, but unhysterical manner. Constitutional guaranties of American citizens must be protected. We must proceed in an orderly, lawful manner.

Just as the old-fashioned dragnet never served as a cure for crime, neither will similar "drives" be an effective inoculation against espionage. The paramount task is to secure the facts, and establish the guilt of those who owe their allegiance to a foreign power, before invoking the authority of the law. This is the function of duly constituted, capable, and efficient law enforcing and investigative bodies, but, of course, we need the aid of loyal and thoroughly honest, patriotic citizens at all times.

If the internal defense of the Nation is to be preserved, there must be a coordination and centralization of responsibility such as the President of the United States signified by his recent request directed to American law enforcement. Every effort must be directed in an orderly manner by thoroughly responsible, well-trained, professional law-enforcement officers, totally devoid of hysteria. The evil spirits which would destroy America must be met and conquered. In this there can be no middle ground.

In the wave of patriotism that is rising in the country there lies the danger of overzealous groups or individuals engaging in acts which are distinctly un-American in method, no matter how patriotic in aim. We need no vigilantes in this situation. The vigilante method is distinctly contrary to American ideals of justice. The Federal Bureau of Investigation has been called upon to investigate all matters relating to espionage, sabotage, and violations of the neutrality regulations. In turn the Federal Bureau of Investigation has requested cooperation of all law-enforcement officers in the United States.

This combined attack by Federal and State forces should be sufficient so far as investigation and prosecution are concerned. Beyond the efforts of these law-enforcement agencies there is a need, of course, for the individual cooperation of all sincere and earnest Americans. This cooperation should be limited, however, to passing on to the proper officials all questionable facts or rumors which may come one's way. An alert public is the best defense against traitorous or inimical conduct. Let us be realistic and practical, ever alert to the dangers which we know lurk in practically every community in the land, but always calm in our judgment between the real and unreal.

Therefore I place before you as the prime requisite of progress in law enforcement the urgent current need of reconstruction, or improvement, of the weeding out of inefficiency, and a spirit of grim determination to face the problem of all crime with a resolution never before known in our history. This cannot be done for us; we of law enforcement must do it for ourselves.

In proof of this, I have only to point to the development of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Today, through the selection of proper personnel, through a Gibraltarlike stand against outside interference, through constant battling for the better things in enforcement, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, I am proud to say, has demonstrated that obstacles can be overcome. No favored friend of the underworld makes appointments to the Federal Bureau of Investigation. No power is great enough to swerve this body from its sworn duty nor from its tenets of fidelity, bravery, integrity. And I insist that the experiences of the Federal Bureau of Investigation are within the grasp of every law-enforcement organization in America. Many of you have been resolute in your determination to mold your organization upon the same principles of efficiency and decency. This of necessity requires unrelenting persistence, a spirit of self-sacrifice, and unwavering faith and courage to dig in and fight for that which is right. It requires the fearlessness emulated by the Attorney General of the United States, Hon. Frank Murphy, in his stand against corruption and his burning zeal to do something about the situation.

It is the unfortunate plight of America, in this period of chaos in world affairs, to become the jousting ground for the subversive forces which work against our best interests, even our national existence. That these may go beyond the ordinary espionage

activities and into the realms of sabotage and the fomenting of outbreaks and riots is, of course, not beyond possibility. Such things have been tried before. They are a part of the plans of those who, like termites, bore from within. I need not tell you men of law and order that the underworld will take every advantage of the added burdens upon law-enforcing bodies. This is an inevitable certainty. Beyond that the minions of lawlessness will be used at every opportunity by those who seek to undermine our national defense.

Therefore, as a battleship's decks are cleared for action in the face of an enemy challenge, so must law enforcement be ready for any emergency, armed with the best of ideals, courage, personnel, and equipment.

The maintenance of law and order has always been one of our most important governmental functions, warranting the highest type of personnel and facilities that a community can provide. If your community has failed in its duty, it is now your solemn obligation to insist that the opportunities be provided whereby lecherous barnacles—the lazy officer, the corrupt officer, the cheating officer, or the ignorant officer—may be eliminated. Facilities long lacking must be made available if our people are to be protected. The handcuffs of corrupt politics must be struck from your wrists in order that you may be allowed to place the profession of law enforcement upon a high plane of efficiency, honesty, and integrity. Decency demands that this be done in every community in America.

To do this our profession in its entirety must be able to go before the public with clean hands. We must be able to prove, in asking that corrupt politics in law enforcement be cast aside, that we are not tainted by partisan political machinations. When we ask for cooperation and demand efficiency let us be sure that there are no cheap jealousies or lack of cooperation to weaken our case. Unfortunately, there is not enough cooperation among the law-enforcement bodies of America. Lip service does not suffice. There is too much petty jealousy among officers. There is too much eagerness to capture the headline instead of the criminal.

You men of experience can recount instance after instance of how a lack of cooperation has brought about added expense, difficulties of apprehension, and often the escape of a desperado. The chase of practically every major criminal has presented outstanding examples of unselfish effort of law-enforcement officers, eager to lift the banners of law and order above all other aims. At this time I would be remiss if I did not publicly express the appreciation of the F. B. I. for the efforts of those officers who have aided us in the discharge of our duties. And we have been proud of the opportunities which we have had in helping you.

Since we are frankly considering the problems and difficulties of law enforcement, let us examine another evil wrecker of popular public respect. I refer to the matter of corruption. There have been instances wherein vicious criminals, even professional murderers, have been allowed to go free by persons who blemished the name of law enforcement by calling themselves peace officers. It is true that law enforcement has been stifled by crooked politics.

Truthfully, no single criminal can correctly be given the title "Public Enemy No. 1." That appellation can be claimed only by "Old Man Corrupt Politics." And he lives in practically every community in the land. No officer can truly promote law enforcement when he follows the precepts of crooked politics and himself indulges in corruption, whether it be petty graft, the acceptance of bribes for the freeing of arrested men, or for the weakening of testimony in court or engaging in acts of criminality, which has been the case all too often, and is evidenced unfortunately by men in uniform having been convicted of every type of crime from petty thievery to bank robbery and rape.

It should be an inviolable rule that every law-enforcement officer in America should be fingerprinted before he is given a shield of authority, and those prints sent to the F. B. I. in Washington for search against the criminal records. Not until the International Association of Chiefs of Police goes on record as demanding this protection can it be truly said that the police departments of this country are making a determined effort to free the inner ranks of law enforcement from those destructive agents who do so much to stain its name.

It certainly should be no matter of pride to any of us when a chief of police is found to be a fugitive from justice or when ex-convicts are discovered in the ranks of law enforcement. The time long has passed when a thief should be set to catch a thief. Thieves and all other criminals can best be brought to justice by honest men. Only men of integrity and decency can shake the complacency of the underworld.

It must be taken for granted that the average law-enforcing body is most eager for improvement. Nevertheless, the status of the majority is lowered by those retrogressive bodies which still adhere to the outmoded and disproved theory that enforcement of law truly rests in the end of a night stick. Police training is now available to practically every law-enforcement officer in America who desires it. The F. B. I. National Police Academy already has graduated over 400 officers, the majority of whom are qualified police instructors. And the doors of the academy are open to every community in the Nation. The entire facilities of the F. B. I. are at the command of American law enforcement.

Yet it is a grievous fact that there are a number of communities which absolutely refuse to take advantage of police training. In others it has been found that certain officers have been sent to the National Police Academy as a mere sham and a sop to public opinion. They have gone there, many of them, under personal sacrifice; they have given of their time and their efforts and returned to their communities only to find themselves blocked at every turn by jealousies or by an absolute aversion to advancement in police methods. Sometimes the stumbling block has been an older officer, too set in his ways to admit that there is such a thing as scientific crime detection; but all too often the obstacle has been the intrusion of corrupt politics. In case after case the graduate has been shunted from one job to another, or pigeonholed with the promise of later activity, or the excuse of insufficient funds with which to conduct the necessary schools.

Why law enforcement, in certain instances, should deliberately and sometimes maliciously refuse to take the channels which inevitably will lead toward a weakening in the ranks of crime is more than any intelligent advocate of law and order possibly can understand. In spite of all this, however, progress has been constant and gradual, until today law enforcement is regarded as having surpassed all other public services in the advancements which it has made.

Consider for a moment the possibilities of the F. B. I. National Police Academy. The primary purpose of the F. B. I. National Police Academy is to train selected officers in order that they may return to their respective police organizations and impart the training received at Washington, D. C., to the members of their local departments. With the completion of the twelfth session of the F. B. I. National Police Academy, over 400 graduates have returned to their communities and have made instruction available to almost 100,000 police officers. In addition officials have graduated from the academy representing the Royal Canadian Mounted Police; the Quebec Provincial Police; New Scotland Yard, London, England; and the Shanghai municipal police, Shanghai, China.

I am happy to report that those officers attending the next session of the academy will be housed in a modern, air-conditioned barracks building at Quantico, Va., during their 3 months of training free of charge except for actual subsistence. In addition we are building the most modern pistol and rifle ranges at Quantico to be found anywhere in the world, where daily the Police Academy students may receive the finest training in all practical uses of firearms and protective devices known to law enforcement. The F. B. I. training center at Quantico fulfills a dream of many years—it establishes a veritable "West Point of law enforcement."

Certainly, here is the forerunner of a new day in law enforcement. Here is a tribute to the foresightedness of you outstanding officers who have cooperated so efficiently with the Bureau in this work. I am grateful to your Committee on Police Education and Training for its support of our training project and I desire to pay my respects to those officers who have attended the F. B. I. National Police Academy at great personal sacrifice. I cannot praise too highly the determination and absolute heroism of such men in continuing their studies against every possible effort to turn them from their chosen path.

Progress can come only in a lawful manner. No law-enforcement body which stoops to entrapment or illegal or unethical tactics can possibly deserve anything but contempt. The catching of a criminal is one thing, his conviction is another. No law enforcement body can call itself properly efficient unless it is so equipped that it can follow through in court what it has begun in the field of apprehension.

It has always been my belief that peace officers should fight for the right, not only in the actual apprehension or detection or conviction of offenders, but in all matters as well. It was for this reason that I subjected myself to the sneers and jeers of sentimental piffle-purveyors by decrying the scandals of parole. It has been for this reason that I have constantly abjured the average citizen to be ever alert in his own community for his own protection. An officer's sworn duty to himself should be to fight day and night, no matter what his hours of duty may be, for improvement of conditions about him. This means that passive inaction no longer can be tolerated.

The world today is in a death grapple for the preservation of democracy. It has been the record of history that dictatorships, whether in villages, states, or nations, have been founded upon gangster tactics. Our fight against dictatorships must begin at home—in every crossroads in the land. If a chief of police is hampered in his work by a venal politician then it is his duty to stand up like a man and let his community know that fact. If criminals go free because a prosecuting attorney is subject to bribe-taking, then it is a solemn obligation to get the evidence and prove this man to be what he is, for after all, a crook in public office is 10 times as devastating as any crook who ever roamed the underworld. There is no stain that can soil civilization more, no viciousness more deadly, no stench more vile, than that of a criminal who masquerades as a protector of his community.

There is a great need for wide extension of crime-prevention activities. One of the most important of all law-enforcement activities is the building of a closer bond of cordiality and of understanding between the law-enforcement officer and the child. There is no greater saving in life, property, or human qualities than that which comes in the prevention of crime. The subject must be approached scientifically and realistically. There is no place in it for the sob-sister or the charlatan, the fakir, or the quack. Neither is there any place for the weak-kneed "Caspar Milquetoast," who is unwilling to face the facts.

The youth problem in crime is a national disgrace. The figures compiled by the Federal Bureau of Investigation must make one stop and think. They point to a definite increase in youthful criminals. So far this year more persons 19 years of age have been arrested than of any other age. They are closely followed by the 18-year-olds. It is not pleasant to walk through any penal institution or jail in America and look into endless rows of

youthful faces. Over 19 percent of all persons arrested this year have been under voting age. These individuals constitute 12 percent of all murderers arrested, 29 percent of all robbers, 46 percent of all burglars, 33 percent of all thieves, and 54 percent of all automobile thieves. We cannot dodge the issue or argue that these facts result from youthful folly. America no longer can refuse to face the causes behind this rising tide of juvenile crime. It is a definite challenge.

I have been condemned for insisting upon bringing to light many phases of youthful crime, and because I have dared to speak the truth—that crime rests at the doorstep of the American home. Some individuals believe we should keep all of this behind a curtain, but I insist that no concealed evil can be remedied. The way to cure a plague is by quarantine, by ferreting out the carriers of disease and either eradicating them, or placing them where they cannot infect the populace. The same realistic approach to crime prevention must be made.

I believe the time is approaching, unless we block it, when the subject of probation will be open to as many charges of scandal as that of parole. This applies particularly to the power which certain judges have taken upon themselves, either through egotism, sentimentalism, corrupt politics, or other causes, to decide whether or not a man should serve his sentence or ever be tried. I have the case before me of a motor thief, who was not even taken into court because a judge decided that the case was merely one of youthful folly. In another instance a teacher—an instructor of youth—was found quite by accident to have a criminal record, which included embezzlement and the forgery of United States Treasury checks. Yet she had never served a day of her sentence. In another case a bank embezzler who stole Christmas and vacation savings was allowed to go free on probation after serving a 1-day sentence. Again, a bank official, who, it is estimated, stole more than $100,000, walked out of court without serving a day, having been put on probation. Such perversions of ordinary justice poison the springs of public confidence in law enforcement.

Not for a moment must we lose sight of the fact that sure detection, swift apprehension, and certain punishment are the three time-proven ingredients which provide a remedy for crime. Any weakening in this attitude places us at the mercy of the underworld. We are constantly surrounded by nitwits and porous-brained sentimentalists who, either through powder-puff perspective or actual affiliation with the criminal element, seek to undermine the foundations upon which we must stand if we are to protect the American home.

Just why certain individuals who intrude themselves upon law enforcement seem to give the major part of their attention to getting criminals out of prison instead of putting them there, where they deserve to be, is a mystery we never will be able to solve. We must fight them with every atom of strength we possess and bestow upon them the contumely they deserve as first aids to crime. There must be a rededication to not only fight crime but to prevent crime.

I have said before and I say again—America has room for only one ism—Americanism. All other isms are inimical to the best interests of our Nation. Let no smoke screen descend upon you, blinding your vision from the pitfalls that lie ahead. Let there be no misunderstanding as to the meaning of true Americanism. It is an abiding adherence to our democracy that sprang from the Declaration of Independence and is defined by the Bill of Rights and the Constitution. Loyalty to those principles is Americanism. Its ideals are translated in a wholesome respect and obedience to the laws of the land. It is holding high the banners of law and order. Americanism represents liberty. It is respect for all nations without entangling alliances. It is free worship without bigotry. It is truth without distortion of fact. Americanism is love for our time-honored institutions. Americanism is that desire, that willingness, that determination that motivates our citizens to stand ready to defend our liberty against every subversive force, whether it come from within or without. Again, I say, our spacious land is big enough only for the one true ism—Americanism—first, last, and always.

The maintenance of law and constituted authority is our surest and safest protection against the scheming aggression of the unlawful and godless enemies of the stability of our social order. Let us keep a united front for its preservation.

Repeal of Present Neutrality Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEWIS B. SCHWELLENBACH

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 11 (legislative day of Wednesday, October 4), 1939

ADDRESS BY JAMES W. RYAN, ESQ.

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH. Mr. President, yesterday at Columbia University Law School, James W. Ryan, Esq., a noted New York lawyer and member of the International Law Division of the American Bar Association, delivered an interesting address on the legal phases of the pending neutrality legislation. I ask unanimous consent that the address may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The question we are to discuss today more vitally affects our national life than any question that has arisen since we entered the World War. It involves a charge that by exercising our right as a neutral nation to carry on our national economic life by offering to trade on a commercial basis on equal cash terms with all belligerents we are aiding or making a gift to one belligerent which is an unneutral act and is, therefore, proper cause for war being declared against us. That is a charge that is so important, because involving the great issue of life and death, that it is worthy of the most profound intellectual efforts of which we are capable. It is a charge that is so serious that it can properly be discussed only with the utmost sincerity. After much consideration of the law and the facts in this matter, I am firmly convinced that that charge is unwarranted, and I feel honored to have the opportunity of presenting the results of my consideration to the incoming generation of lawyers, judges, and national leaders represented in this meeting of Columbia University Law School.

The charge that the intent of Congress in the new neutrality statute or Pittman-Connally bill is to aid or make a gift to one of the belligerents is in effect a charge that the American people, speaking through Congress, intend to take sides and mix in the war. The obvious answer to this is that the American people have no intention of taking sides or mixing in the war. Every poll of public opinion that has been taken shows this almost unanimously. And not one of the supporters in Congress of the new statute has stated that it is his or his constituents' intent by the new statute to aid or make a gift to one of the belligerents or to refuse to trade on the same commercial terms with all belligerents. A careful examination also of the President's message to Congress and of the newspapers and of the Government's press releases shows that neither the President nor any other official in the executive departments or administration has ever stated that that is the intent of the new statute. On the contrary, the supporters of the new statute in Congress and those in the administration who have made public statements have expressly disclaimed any such intent and have given precise and adequate grounds in furtherance of our national defense and security, and in furtherance of our concern to act strictly in accordance with the laws of neutrality, as their reasons for support. And as Congress and not the Executive is the legislative body, any possible expression by executive officials of intent or reasons for their supporting the new statute would be immaterial on the question of intent of the American people when expressing themselves through Congress.[1] I am astonished at the lack of knowledge of fundamental legal rules and of the provisions of the Constitution of the United States displayed by many of those opposing repeal with respect to this indisputable fact.

The continued assertion that the individual sympathies or opinions of the President or other administration officials determine the intent of Congress, no matter what Congress' real or expressed intent is, tends further to becloud the real issues and confuse the public mind and improperly embarrasses our country in its relations with foreign countries. Perhaps I should not bear too heavily on the general run of opponents of repeal in this connection, because the real responsibility in history will rest on Senators BORAH, NYE, and VANDENBERG for not correctly stating the material facts and issues involved. It is immaterial that such mistake was made in good faith and from lack of proper consideration and analysis of the matter. The important thing now, however, is for the people and Congress to avoid being distracted by irrelevancies and to get down to serious and careful consideration and discussion of the real issue, whether or not the new statute will most effectively further our national defense, security, and interests. As I shall endeavor to show, international law has nothing whatever to do with this real matter under consideration, and the less said about international law the better if we are to think clearly, avoid unnecessary controversy with foreign governments on irrelevant issues, and reach a sound result in accord with our urgent national interests of self-preservation and not in violation of any law or rule or fairness, international or otherwise. The rights of self-preservation and of security and self-defense are unchallengeable fundamentals in international law and in every branch of jurisprudence and field of human conduct.

Furthermore, there are well-settled rules of law for determining the intent of Congress or other legislative body in a statute, and these rules are known by every competent lawyer and are applied invariably by the courts. Any international tribunal or other court

[1] Cf. the Supreme Court's decisions that in construing an act of Congress the intent of the executive departments is immaterial excepting that where an ambiguously worded statute is involved an administrative interpretation made by those departments during enforcement and continued for 10 or 15 years will be followed by the courts (*Texas & P. R. Co.* v. *United States*, 289 U. S. 627; *Alexander* v. *Cosden Pipe Line Co.*, 290 U. S. 484; *United States* v. *Missouri P. R. Co.*, 278 U. S. 269; *United States* v. *Jackson*, 280 U. S. 183; *United States* v. *Farrar*, 281 U. S. 624; *Norwegian Nitrogen Products Co.* v. *United States*, 288 U. S. 294; *Constanzo* v. *Tillinghast*, 287 U. S. 341).

would as matter of ordinary course follow these rules both because they are well-settled law and because they are necessary rules based on clarity and integrity in thinking and reasoning. If the language of the statute is clear and unambiguous, the intent of the legislative body as expressed in the statute is unassailable.[2] Bad faith or insincerity cannot be charged against the whole American people or against the people of any other great democratic nation when represented and acting through vote of the majority of their elected representatives in a legislative body or congress and clearly expressing their intent in a statute.[3] Good faith of the entire nation when so acting is presumed. The language of the new statute is clear and unambiguous and falls within this rule. The law is equally well settled that if the language of a statute is ambiguous or not clear, the interpretation which accords with law is to be accepted.[4] The Supreme Court has held that international law is part of our law and of the law of every civilized country.[5] An unneutral act is a violation of international law. Therefore the new statute, even if ambiguous, would fall within this rule of interpretation that Congress intends no unlawful or unneutral act.

The law is also well settled that when the language of a statute is not clear the court will examine and accept the intent as expressed in the congressional committee reports recommending passage of the bill and the other statements of intent made by the Senators and Congressmen who supported the bill in Congress.[6] The new statute also falls within this rule because the report of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations and the statements of the Senators supporting the bill show that the intent is not to commit an unneutral act or to aid or favor one belligerent as against another, or to otherwise mix in the war, but is "to preserve the neutrality and the peace of the United States and to secure the safety of its citizens and their interests" (p. 1 of Senate Committee on Foreign Relations Report, Sept. 29, 1939). The intent has also been stated by supporters of the new statute in Congress as being to further our national defense and security by accelerating and increasing our industrial capacity in the production of armaments to meet our own armament needs for national defense and to prevent large industries of that kind now in the United States and essential to our national defense from moving to Canada or other foreign country because of the unfortunate embargo provisions of our old Neutrality Act which interfere with plant operation on a mass-production basis and reduce the capacity or unit rate of plant production per month. And aside from this benefit of increased production for our own needs conjointly with the increased export trade there is the decisive fact, which those opposing the new neutrality statute entirely overlook, that our Government, as the territorial sovereign, can and will take over the newly enlarged armament plants and their products exclusively for our own national-defense needs at any time that such action becomes desirable or necessary. Laws already on the books (National Defense Act of June 3, 1916, U. S. C., title 50, sec. 80, 39 Stat. 213–214; National Defense Act of 1920; Acquisition of Stocks of Strategic Materials Act of June 7, 1939, ch. 190; and Naval Appropriation Act of March 4, 1917; and see Industrial Mobilization Plan, Revision of 1939, as released by the War Department)[7] become effective immediately in any national emergency and authorize the President to require all armament plants and other businesses located in this country to produce all the war materials we need for our own country's use before producing them for anyone else. The new neutrality statute therefore enormously increases our military strength without requiring any appropriation from Congress or additional burden on our taxpayers. The intent of the new statute has been further stated as being, by repealing the present Neutrality Act, to eliminate a wholly unintended and unneutral result flowing from that act by stopping our giving aid and special privilege to and unfairly discriminating in favor of one of the belligerents who happens to be the aggressor who started the war. Right now, for no good reason of national interest, we are refusing to trade on a strictly commercial basis with countries who are in desperate need of our products and with whom, until the present embargo statute became practically effective a month ago, we had maintained friendly trading relations for more than a hundred years. Indeed, they have been our largest and best customers for so long that friendly trade with them has become an essential part of our national life.

These purposes that I have mentioned, which the American people and the supporters in Congress of the new statute desire furthered, are all legitimate purposes under international law and in no way conflict with our duty as a neutral. The mere fact that a foreign aggressor starts a war with another foreign country does not deprive us of those rights or freeze them so that they cannot be later asserted in a form not in conflict with the settled rules of international law. No foreign country or belligerent has the right or power to determine our national policy, or what is the same thing—to prevent us from changing our national policy as our national interests require at any time, provided we do not actively aid one of the belligerents and unfairly discriminate against the other.

As the clearly expressed intent of the new statute is to further our national defense and security, and maintain our neutrality by offering equal trading opportunity to both belligerents, it is immaterial that one of its minor or incidental effects is an economic benefit to one belligerent, resulting solely from the temporary inability of the other belligerent to send ships to us to buy and carry away the goods which we are offering to sell on the same terms to both belligerents. A neutral is under no duty to try to equalize the trading abilities of the belligerents. On August 12, 1915, Secretary of State Lansing, in a letter to the Austro-Hungarian Ambassador (State Department Document 113 of 1915), repudiated the "novel principle" that neutral nations are obligated to place an embargo on arms and ammunition because one of the belligerents cannot obtain them through commercial intercourse.[8] And trading with a belligerent has never been regarded as aiding or granting a favor or special privilege to that belligerent, provided the offer to trade is made to both belligerents on equal terms.

The statements in Congress by opponents of a bill, such as by Senators BORAH, NYE, and VANDENBURG in this instance, are of no weight or value in determining the intent of the supporters of the bill or of the majority in Congress voting for it.[9] This is a reasonable and necessary rule because it is common human experience that opponents of a measure have a tendency to state inaccurately the purpose or intent of their opponents, or to, if possible, further their own opposition or cause by charging bad faith or improper motives to their opponents, and thus draw a red herring across the trail of the real issue being discussed. A necessary curb on this tendency, especially in a legislative body, is to be impartial by accepting, in the absence of the clearest evidence of insincerity or bad faith, only the statements of supporters of a cause with respect to what the intentions of those supporters are, and with respect to the evil or problem of public interest which they see and which they are dealing with, and the remedy which they propose for the purpose of furthering that public interest or overcoming that evil. To charge a man or a people with an intention which they disclaim is to charge them with bad faith and imposes on the accuser a heavy burden of producing clear and convincing evidence to support the accusation. I have been unable to find in the present instance any such evidence which a court applying ordinary and reasonable legal rules and criterions would regard as admissible. Certainly the speculations of newspaper columnists regarding unexpressed administration intention, and the spontaneous expressions from time to time by individuals of natural human sympathy with an unjustly attacked people, do not constitute such evidence.

To anyone trained in weighing and assessing the proper value of evidence, or in historical or legal research on a scholarly basis, such scattered expressions of individual sympathy on humanitarian grounds are wholly extraneous to the evidence and facts necessary to be considered in determining the intent of a plainly worded statute designed to further our national defense and security and to maintain strictly our neutrality under the settled rules of international law. This being the state of the evidence, it borders on treason[10] and is detrimental to the welfare of the country to make an accusation of bad faith against a majority of Congress or the people in a national emergency when danger of war exists, and it further interferes with proper operation of the democratic process

---

[2] *Re Kearney* (7 Wheat. (U. S.) 38); *George Van Camp & Sons Co.* v. *American Can Co.* (278 U. S. 245); *Matson Nav. Co.* v. *United States* (284 U. S. 352); *Magoun* v. *Illinois Trust & Sav. Bank* (170 U. S. 283); *United States* v. *Shreveport Grain Co.* (287 U. S. 77); *United States* v. *Raynor* (302 U. S. 540); *Helvering* v. *City Bank Farmers Trust Co.* (296 U. S. 85); *Humphrey* v. *United States* (295 U. S. 602); *Helvering* v. *New York Trust Co.* (292 U. S. 455).

[3] *Florida C. & P. R. Co.* v. *Reynolds* (183 U. S. 471; *Middleton* v. *Texas Power & Light Co.* (249 U. S. 152); *License Tax Cases* (5 Wall. (U. S.) 462); *Talbot* v. *Seeman* (1 Cranch (U. S.) 1); *East Saginaw Salt Mfg. Co.* v. *East Saginaw* (13 Wall. (U. S.) 373); *Planters' Bank* v. *Sharp* (6 How. (U. S.) 301); *Atchison, T. & S. F. R. Co.* v. *Matthews* (174 U. S. 96); *Whitney* v. *United States* (274 U. S. 357); *Bird* v. *United States* (187 U. S. 118).

[4] *Chippewa Indians* v. *United States* (301 U. S. 358); *Anniston Mfg. Co.* v. *Davis* (301 U. S. 337); *National Labor Relations Board* v. *Jones & Laughlin Steel Co.* (301 U. S. 1); *Porter* v. *Investors' Syndicate* (286 U. S. 461); *United States* v. *Coombs* (12 Peters (U. S.) 72); *Russian Volunteer Fleet* v. *United States* (282 U. S. 481); *Federal Trade Comm.* v. *American Tobacco Co.* (264 U. S. 298); *Carey* v. *South Dakota* (250 U. S. 118); *Standard Oil* v. *Missouri* (224 U. S. 270); *Hylton* v. *United States* (3 Dall. (U. S.) 171); *United States* v. *Gue Lim* (176 U. S. 459); *Crowell* v. *Benson* (285 U. S. 22); *Richmond Screw Anchor Co.* v. *United States* (275 U. S. 331); *Reinecke* v. *Northern Trust Co.* (278 U. S. 339); *Northwestern Bell Telephone Co.* v. *Nebraska Co.* (297 U. S. 373); *Ann Arbor R. Co.* v. *United States* (281 U. S. 658); *United States* v. *La France* (282 U. S. 568); *Sproles* v. *Bedford* (286 U. S. 374); *Posades* v. *National City Bank* (296 U. S. 497).

[5] *The Paquete Habana* (175 U. S. 677); *Kansas* v. *Colorado* (206 U. S. 46); *Hilton* v. *Guyot* (159 U. S. 113); *Ware* v. *Hylton*, 3 Dallas (U. S. 199); *Shanks* v. *Dupont*, 3 Peters (U. S. 242); *Seton, Maitland & Co.* v. *Low*, 1 Johns (N. Y.) 1, 5 (Kent, J.).

[6] *Richbourg Motor Co.* v. *United States* (281 U. S. 528); *United States* v. *Great Northern R. Co.* (287 U. S. 144); *Wright* v. *Mountain Trust Bank* (300 U. S. 440); *Humphrey* v. *United States* (295 U. S. 602); *Atlantic Cleaners & Dyers* v. *United States* (286 U. S. 427); *Helvering* v. *Twin Ball Oil Syndicate* (293 U. S. 312); *Matson Nav. Co.* v. *United States* (284 U. S. 352); *McFeely* v. *Commr. of Internal Revenue* (296 U. S. 102).

[7] Industrial Mobilization Plan, 1939 Revision, War Department Commerce Clearing House War Law Service, p. 50051.

[8] State Department Document 113 of 1915, Policy of United States Toward Maritime Commerce in War, 1914–18, vol. 2, p. 42.

[9] *McCaughn* v. *Hersey Chocolate Co.* (283 U. S. 488); Federal Trade *Commr.* v. *Raladam Co.* (283 U. S. 643); *Wright* v. *Mountain Trust Bank* (300 U. S. 440); *United States* v. *Great Northern R. Co.* (287 U. S. 144); *Helvering* v. *Twin Ball Oil Syndicate* (293 U. S. 312).

[10] It would certainly be a violation of the Sedition Act of 1798, passed during President Adams' administration.

by putting public discussion on an unsound basis. The constitutional right of free speech does not give the right of irresponsible attack on the good faith of our country not based on any substantial evidence which a court or reasonable man would accept.

So far as I have been able to ascertain, no one has questioned our right as a neutral to permit our citizens to trade with belligerents in any and all kinds of goods. There is no rule of international law prohibiting our doing so.[11] Indeed, that right cannot seriously be questioned, because our country and all other countries have always asserted it and have in almost every instance exercised it.[12] Article 7 of Hague Convention V of 1907 expressly recognizes the right. The charge is that we had that right and would have it still excepting for the fact that certain belligerents started a war, and at that time we were not asserting or exercising the right. As the right could be exercised only during a war, it is difficult to understand on what intelligent or logical basis a charge can be made that failure to exercise a right at a time when it could not be exercised constitutes a waiver of that right. There is surely no support in American jurisprudence or in any foreign jurisprudence with which I am familiar for a contention that a legal right is waived or abandoned by failure to exercise it in a situation in which there is no reasonable opportunity to exercise it. Furthermore, waiver of legal rights, like laches, election, and the statute of limitations, to which it bears a close resemblance, is not favored by the law. The rule of waiver originated in the English common law and, so far as careful research discloses, although applied in rare and so-called "hard" cases in our municipal law, has never been recognized as a part of international law. The rule of abandonment is also inapplicable. Under that rule the abandonment or failure to assert rights must have continued for such a long period of time, measured in years or decades, that every reasonable possibility of intent to assert the rights has been excluded by necessary inference by the great and wholly inexcusable delay in asserting them. The 1 month's delay since the war started in asserting our right is of no significance, because that was a necessary and incidental delay required to get Congress together, and is a wholly insufficient period of time on which to base a claim of implied intent to abandon legal rights. Any other interpretation would deprive democracies of most of their rights under international law. Only a dictatorship can act instantaneously.

Moreover, intent to commit an act is never equivalent to commission of the act itself.[13] Therefore, even if there were an intent to aid or make a gift to one of the belligerents, that would not be an unneutral act unless what was done constituted an aid or gift. A careful reading of the new statute discloses that there is no language in it which on any possible legal construction could be regarded as constituting an aid or gift to a belligerent or to anybody. It is limited to authorizing trading on a commercial basis with all belligerents. If a shopkeeper sells you a hat, he doesn't aid you or make you a gift of it; he sells it to you for value received, in exchange for its purchase price. When a country trades on a commercial basis with another country it isn't giving away anything. It is taking an equivalent for what it sells or delivers. The contention that by merely trading on a commercial basis with another nation we are aiding it or making a gift to it is novel and ingenious but without support so far as I have been able to find in either municipal law or international law. Indeed, Hague Convention V, concerning the rights and duties of neutral powers and persons in case of war on land, signed at The Hague on October 18, 1907 (36 U. S. Stat. L. 2310), to which both Germany and the United States were parties, expressly provides to the contrary in chapter III, as follows:

"ARTICLE 17: A neutral cannot avail himself of his neutrality—

"(a) If he commits hostile acts against a belligerent.

"(b) If he commits acts in favor of a belligerent, particularly if he voluntarily enlists in the ranks of the armed force of one of the parties * * *.

"Article 18: The following acts shall not be considered as committed in favor of one belligerent in the sense of article 17, letter (b):

"(a) Supplies furnished or loans made to one of the belligerents, provided that the person who furnishes the supplies or who makes the loans lives neither in the territory of the other party nor in the territory occupied by it, and that the supplies do not come from these territories; * * *."

Simply because two nations declare war against each other is no reason why the economic life of neutral countries should be destroyed or impaired by shutting off their commerce with the warring countries on which the neutral's national life in large part depends. Certainly this is so when the neutral is a large trading nation like our own and not committed to a nationally self-sufficient policy excluding commerce with other countries. If a nation trades in time of peace with one country rather than another, it is no ground for that other nation declaring war. There is no reason for any different rule in time of war. But the new statute is not subject to that kind of attack, because authority is expressly given by it to trade with all belligerents on the same terms. The new statute is not shutting off any trade between Germany and the United States. Indeed, the fact is that Germany in substance shut off that trade long before this war started by engaging in the barter system with other countries than ours and by imposing tremendous and almost insuperable obstacles to normal commercial trading with us. The 90-day credit provision in the new statute is the normal credit extended in commercial transactions of this kind both during peace and war and does not constitute a gift or loan without financial value received. And, anyway, that credit provision is not of the essence of the new statute.

The charge that the new statute aids or makes a gift to one of the belligerents is made in still another form. It is charged that international law prohibits our trading with belligerents in armaments because a month ago when the war started we were not trading with them or permitted by act of Congress to trade. The charge in substance is that an act of Congress or national legislation has enlarged or restricted international law or our rights under that law. This conflicts with the settled rule that no single nation's statute can amend or repeal international law. The charge further implies that Congress' power in furtherance of our national defense or interests over questions closely connected with war or peace is reduced or impaired and made impossible of exercise merely because a foreign aggressor has started a war against another foreign country. It is further urged in support of this charge that in a few isolated instances Secretary of State William Jennings Bryan and others have disclaimed the right to change the national policy of a neutral during the progress of a war for the purpose of aiding one of the belligerents. Of course, the tacking on of the words "for the purpose of aiding one of the belligerents" begs the question and makes those precedents irrelevant to the present discussion, in which that fact is not established. Moreover, those instances are outnumbered by the instances in which our country, while neutral, has changed its national policy during the progress of war, more particularly during the Napoleonic wars extending from 1792 to 1814 (with one short intermission), and during the World War in the period from 1914 to 1917, and by the instances in which other neutral countries have changed their policies during war. While neutral we changed our national policy and lifted or imposed embargoes during the progress of a war in 1793,[14] 1794,[15] 1795,[16] 1806,[17] 1807,[18] 1808,[19] 1809,[20] 1810,[21] 1811,[22] 1812 (2 months before June 18, 1812, when war was declared against

---

[11] Department of State announcements on October 25, 1914 (State Department Doc. 20), and on January 20, 1915 (State Department Doc. 44; Policy of United States Toward Maritime Commerce in War, 1914–18, vol. 2, pp. 40–41).

[12] Hague Convention V, August 18, 1907 (36 U. S. Stats. at L. 2310), to which Germany and the United States were parties, Article 7: "A neutral power is not called upon to prevent the export or transport on behalf of one or other of the belligerents, of arms, munitions of war, or in general, of anything which can be of use to an army or fleet." (Senate Document, vol. 48, p. 2298, 61st Cong., 2d sess). Wheaton's elements of International Law (1904 ed., p. 671); Kent's Commentaries (vol. 1, p. 142); *Seton, Maitland & Co.* v. *Low* (1 Johns (N. Y.) 1, 5 (Kent, J.); *Northern Pacific Ry. Co.* v. *American Trading Co.* (195 U. S. 439); Kerr, Principles and Rules of Neutrality (2 Jurid. Soc. Papers, 629, 634); Hague Convention V, 1907, articles 7, 8, and 9 (36 U. S. Stats. at L. 2310, 2323); Hague Convention XIII, 1907, articles 6 and 7 (38 U. S. Stats. at L. 2415, 2428).

[13] *Marine Ins. Co.* v. *Tucker* (3 Cranch (U. S.) 357).

[14] Statement of legal adviser, State Department, to Senate Committee on Foreign Relations in 1936 at hearings in connection with the present Neutrality Act.

[15] The instructions of Secretary of State Randolph of May 6, 1794, to John Jay in regard to our position with respect to the rules of neutral commerce (State Department Doc. 29 of 1794, p. 183) were changed "greatly" in the treaty we entered into with Great Britain on November 19, 1794 (State Department Doc, 31 of 1794, p. 131). Policy of United States Toward Maritime Commerce in War, 1914–18 (vol. 1, pp. 14, 15). "France soon protested that this treaty violated the treaty of 1778" (ibid., vol. 1, p. 15). "The result was a stipulation (by Great Britain) that wherever provisions and other articles not generally contraband should become so, and for that reason should be seized, they should not be confiscated, but paid for. * * * He (Secretary of State Randolph) stated that the effect of this clause would be to encourage trade in provisions with France, as in the event of either arrival or capture the American merchant was assured a profitable voyage" (ibid., vol. 1, p. 16).

[16] The change of policy evidenced in our entering into the treaty of October 27, 1795, with Spain (State Department Doc. 68, p. 298). "The treaty was even more favorable to neutral commerce than the plan (of 1776), because it included no statement that enemy ships should take enemy goods." (Policy of United States Toward Maritime Commerce in War, 1914–18, vol. 1, p. 17.)

[17] Nicholson Act or First Nonimportation Act of 1806, prohibiting importation of various kinds of British goods.

[18] Embargo Act of December 22, 1807 (cf. The William King, 2 Wheat. (U. S.) 148), prohibiting American ships from leaving port on any foreign voyage and prohibiting foreign vessels from carrying any goods from American ports.

[19] Supplementary Embargo Act of January 9, 1808 (2 U. S. Stats. at L. 453).

[20] Nonintercourse Act of 1809, permitting trade with any country excepting the two belligerents, England and France.

[21] Macon Act of May 1, 1810, providing that as soon as Great Britain or France withdraws its decrees against our shipping the Nonintercourse Act would be revived against the other country.

[22] President Madison's two proclamations, one putting the Nonintercourse Act into effect again only with respect to England, and the other withdrawing that proclamation.

England),[23] 1914,[24] 1915,[25] 1916,[26] March 12, 1917,[27] and 1934,[28] Germany while neutral changed her policy during the progress of the Crimean War between England and Russia, and in 1870 asked England to change her policy during the Franco-Prussian War, and in 1914 and again in 1915 asked us[29] to change our policy during the progress of the World War. Austria-Hungary made the same request of us on June 29, 1915.[30] Spain while neutral changed her policy during the war of 1798.[31] The few instances cited to show invalidity are therefore insufficient to show a settled rule of international law and are rather exceptions to the rule than the rule itself. In none of the instances that I have mentioned in which neutrals changed their national policies during war did the change of policy result in bringing the neutral into war. The two instances which alone have been found and cited by Professor Jessup were instances in which the change of policy consisted in giving direct aid to one of the belligerents, and the result was merely the presenting of claims for damages after the wars had ended. One claim, that of the United States against England for breach of neutrality during the Civil War, was settled in 1873, and the other, England's claim against us for breach of neutral duties during the Napoleonic wars, was also settled after the war had ended. A careful examination of the facts in both of those instances shows that the breach of neutral duty involved was far different from anything that could reasonably be conceived of in connection with the new neutrality statute which Congress is now considering. Furthermore, those instances indicate that if the new statute authorized a direct aid or gift to one of the belligerents, and such gift were actually made, all that we would probably be confronted with would be a claim for such damages as the other belligerent could show after the war had directly resulted to it from our alleged breach of neutrality. All remote, inconsequential, and indirect damages would be nonrecoverable.

Looking at the whole matter therefore in the light of all the rules of international law, and of all the various conflicting precedents and statements of position not yet incorporated into international law, it is clear that the new statute does not constitute a violation of a neutral's duty as defined by international law or as defined by the rules of fair commercial trading between nations. It is important to note that in no case in which our Secretary of State has admitted that a neutral could not change its policy during war was there any set of facts presented such as exists in the present case, nor was there any situation presented which required him or our Government to make a determination or take a formal position in the matter. Bryan, in 1914 and in 1915, for instance, could and should have answered Germany's requests[32] that we change our policy during war by making the same reply that was made on August 12, 1915,[33] to a similar request by Austria-Hungary—namely, by merely declining to do so on the grounds that our existing policy did not violate international law and was the one which our Government regarded as best protecting our interests and maintaining our neutrality.[34] Such refusal would of course not be an admission or contention that we had no right to change our policy if in our Government's judgment our national interests of defense, security, or neutrality required it. In other words, what was said by the Secretary of State on those occasions was what in a court's opinion we would call dicta, and not necessary or essential to a decision of the matter presented. None of them therefore constitutes what in law would be regarded as a legal precedent, and even if they did those few precedents never became settled rules of international law and were overruled by later and more numerous precedents to the contrary. Not only is there no legal precedent but also there is, so far as careful search has disclosed, no statement in any standard publication on international law which supports the attack being made on the new statute. The nearest such statement is the one quoted by Professor Jessup, from the neutrality report, prepared largely by himself, of the Harvard Research in International Law, at page 316, where, without any citation of authority to support it, it is said:

"The task confronting the neutral state which takes action under this article (permitting changes during war to safeguard its neutral rights or to fulfill its neutral duties) is to make certain to itself and clear to other states that the motive inducing the adoption of a new rule or regulation, during the course of a war, is the product of its concern to act strictly in accordance with the laws of neutrality and not the result of a desire to aid one or the other belligerent."

That quotation is far from supporting the opposition to the new statute because it assumes that the purpose of the new law, or change of policy, is a "desire to aid one or the other belligerent." Indeed, Professor Jessup now admits that the new statute is valid and proper provided its intent or purpose is not to assist one belligerent side. He admits specifically that changes in a neutral's laws and regulations in time of war are not a breach of international law unless made with intent or purpose to assist one of the belligerents.[35] In view of that admission it is certainly incumbent on him to sustain the burden of establishing that the intent or purpose of the new statute is to assist one belligerent side, and nothing he has yet said or published seems to me to constitute a production of evidence or facts showing that that is Congress' intent or purpose in the new statute. Yet every statement he makes assumes that he has established that fact. He repeatedly stresses two factors—governmental control already achieved by act of Congress, and governmental desire to relax that control during progress of a war so as to help France and England.[35] The words "so as to help France and England" are pure assumption and require evidence which under recognized legal principles would be sufficient to establish them. Such statements and evidence as he has produced are clearly insufficient under either municipal law or international law to establish that fact of intent to aid France and England.

Professor Jessup asks whether those favoring repeal of the present neutrality statute would favor repeal if the situation were what he calls the reverse of what it is and if repeal would aid Germany instead of the Allies.[35] That way of putting the matter is merely another begging of the question and is not the reverse of the present situation. Of course, the American people do not wish to enter the war by aiding or making a gift to Germany any more than they wish to do so by making a gift to England. The real answer to his question is that irrespective of what any foreign country wants or needs we intend at all times, while keeping within the rules of international law, to exercise our right to trade on a commercial basis with all belligerents and to supply our own Nation's needs for security and adequate defense, and that is what the new neutrality statute will do.

Professor Jessup fails therefore on all three essential questions in dispute: First, whether evidence exists which is sufficient under recognized legal principles to establish that the intent of Congress in the new statute is to aid one of the belligerents and unfairly discriminate against the other; second, whether there has been a waiver of, or intent to abandon, the trading rights which he admits

---

[23] Embargo Act of 1812.

[24] Change of policy regarding armed merchant vessels visiting our ports. Letter of September 19, 1914, and November 7, 1914, from Acting Secretary of State Lansing to German Ambassador. (J. B. Scott's Diplomatic Correspondence Between United States and Germany, 1914–17, pp. 116–120), compared with letter of January 18, 1916, from Secretary of State Lansing to British and French Ambassadors, and with our actual reversal of that policy beginning shortly afterward as stated in Secretary of State Lansing's War Memoirs (cf. the *Nercida*, 9 Cranch (U. S.) 388).

[25] Secretary of State's letter of October 22, 1914, to the British Ambassador (State Department Doc. 26), repudiating our previous statement that the Declaration of London of February 26, 1909, which had already been accepted at our request by Germany and Austria, defined the duties of neutrals which the United States would follow. Policy of United States Toward Maritime Commerce in War, 1914–18 (Department of State publication, vol. 2, pp. 8 and 9).

New Working Arrangement Between United States and Great Britain of December 6, 1914 (State Department Doc. 37), changing our duties as a neutral as previously accepted and observed.

[26] State Department Documents 178, 201, 203, 204, and 211 of 1916. Also, on November 11, 1916, "after a lapse of 7 months, Secretary Lansing stated the position of the United States in regard to the contraband policy of the Allies" (Policy of United States Toward Maritime Commerce in War, 1914–18, vol. 2, p. 38).

[27] Department of State announcement of armed neutrality on March 12, 1917 (State Department Document 240 of 1917), that the United States was placing an armed guard on all American merchant vessels. Policy of United States Toward Maritime Commerce in War, 1914–18, vol. 2, p. 84. (At the time Congress convened in extra session on April 2, 1917, 66 American citizens had been killed as a result of submarine attacks on American vessels. Policy of United States Toward Maritime Commerce in War, 1914–18, vol. 2, p. 85).

[28] Arms Embargo Act of May 28, 1934, during war between Bolivia and Paraguay.

[29] Letter of German Ambassador of April 4, 1915, to Secretary of State (J. B. Scott's Diplomatic Correspondence Between United States and Germany, 1914–17, Oxford University Press, 1918, pp. 152–153): "This industry (the American maritime industry) is actually delivering goods only to the enemies of Germany. * * * If it is the will of the American people that there shall be a true neutrality, the United States will find means of preventing this one-sided supply of arms or at least of utilizing it to protect legitimate trade with Germany, especially that in foodstuffs. This view of neutrality should all the more appeal to the United States Government because the latter enacted a similar policy toward Mexico. * * * If this view were applied to the present case, it would lead to an embargo on the exportation of arms."

[30] State Department Document 99, Policy of United States Toward Maritime Commerce in War, 1914–18, vol. 2, p. 41.

[31] N. W. Stephenson's History of the American People (1934), p. 364.

[32] Letter of German Ambassador of April 5, 1915, to Secretary of State (J. B. Scott's Diplomatic Correspondence Between United States and Germany, 1914–17, p. 177).

[33] State Department Document 113 of 1915, Policy of United States Toward Maritime Commerce in War, 1914–18, vol. 2, p. 42.

[34] Letter of April 21, 1915, from Secretary of State William Jennings Bryan to German Ambassador (Foreign Relations, 1915, supp., p. 160; Policy of U. S. Toward Maritime Commerce in War, 1914–18, vol. 2, pp. 297–299).

[35] Letter, Philip C. Jessup and Charles Cheney Hyde, New York Times, October 5, 1939, p. 22.

we had at the outbreak of the war; and, third, whether the commercial trading with belligerents which is authorized by Congress in the new statute constitutes an actual aiding or making of a gift to one of the belligerents.

One of the longest established rules of the international law of war is the rule recognizing the right of a neutral's citizens to trade or not trade with belligerents as the neutral desires, or as its national interest requires, provided there is willingness to trade or not trade with both belligerents on the same terms.[36] If it keeps within that rule, a neutral is not chargeable either with a casus belli or a hostile or discriminatory act on which diplomatic protest would be warranted.

In other words, the matter of a neutral nation's deciding to permit its citizens to sell or not sell arms or other goods to belligerents is one which is entirely outside the recognized rules of international law, and therefore a decision one way or the other on that matter does not violate them.

Of course, this does not mean that a neutral can give money, or give direct economic aid, without financial value received to one belligerent to the exclusion of the other. That would be a casus belli. But so long as the transactions are of a strictly commercial nature, involving two-way benefits, there is no basis whatever for criticizing them on the ground that they violate international law, provided the neutral authorizes trade on the same terms with both belligerents.

If one of the belligerents is unable, because of weaker military force or temporary lack of vessels or naval command of the seas, to continue commercial trading with neutrals, that is simply one of the incidental vicissitudes of the war insofar as it is concerned, or, as they say in the vernacular, it's hard luck. It is surely no ground for complaint that the rules of international law are not being observed by neutrals. Indeed, any attempt by a neutral to shift its policies deliberately from time to time in an effort to equalize the abilities of the belligerents to carry on commercial trade with neutrals would logically and inevitably result in the neutral's being finally at war with the victorious belligerent.[37] On October 15, 1914, the State Department announced (in State Department Document 20 of 1914) regarding the sale of munitions to belligerents, that although these articles were considered contraband and were subject to seizure by an enemy of the purchasing government, it was the enemy's duty to prevent the articles from reaching their destination, and that if the enemy "should be unable to do this, that is for him one of the misfortunes of war; the inability, however, imposes on the neutral government no obligation to prevent the sale" (Policy of United States Toward Maritime Commerce in War, 1914–18, vol. 2, p. 40).[38]

The term "neutrality" in connection with trading with belligerents has an exact and well-known definition under international law. The term "neutrality" as used in our present Neutrality Act varies from that definition and is clearly a misnomer, and the only question involved in connection with the proposed repeal of that act is whether or not our national interest and security would best be served by repeal. That is, of course, a proper matter for Congress to determine, but that is the limit of congressional power, unless it wishes to impose as a condition to repeal that belligerents buy on a cash-and-carry basis, or that American vessels be excluded from war zones to prevent seizures or sinkings. Congress, of course, has power under the Constitution to declare war, but all other matters of carrying on our relations with foreign governments are entrusted to the Executive, excepting that any treaties must be ratified by the Senate.

A repeal of the Neutrality Act will not involve questions of international law and will not lead inevitably or to any extent to war. The matter, from either an international law or constitutional standpoint, has nothing to do with the question of declaring or aiding in a war.

For the reasons that I have given, therefore, the present Neutrality or Embargo Act should be repealed, and the new neutrality statute or Pittman-Connally bill should be passed by Congress.

---

[36] See footnote 12.

[37] State Department Document 113 of 1915, Policy of United States Toward Maritime Commerce in War, 1914–18, vol. 2, p. 42.

[38] Cf. Benjamin Franklin's two letters on June 3, 1780, and June 5, 1780 (in State Department Documents 11, p. 146, and 12, p. 147), that "for the sake of humanity" the rule of international law should be that neutral "traders in unarmed vessels" trading with belligerents should have their vessels and goods exempt from seizure by either belligerent unless the belligerent making the seizure should pay a fair price or compensation. "The statements of Franklin in these two letters contained the idea which made the treaty of 1785 between the United States and Prussia an unusual one in regard to commerce in time of war and marked the beginning of the development of the American principle of immunity of private property at sea." Policy of United States Toward Maritime Commerce in War, 1914–18, vol. 1, p. 5. On May 7, 1784, Congress adopted (State Document 21 of 1874, p. 157) a "new plan for treaties," under which in the event of war "contraband goods could not be confiscated but could be purchased." Policy of United States Toward Maritime Commerce in War, 1914–18, vol. 1, pp. 8 and 9. "The first American treaty made after the adoption of this plan was the treaty with Prussia, signed September 10, 1785. * * * Article 13 provided that 'the merchandise heretofore called contraband, such as arms, ammunition, and military stores of every kind,' could not be confiscated, but that the captor could purchase such merchandise by paying the owner its full value." (Ibid., vol. 1, pp. 8 and 9; and Miller, Treaties of the United States, vol. 2, p. 162). "Identical provisions are contained in the treaty between the United States and Prussia, July 11, 1799, art. 15, reaffirmed by the treaty between the same parties May 1, 1828, art. 12." Treaty Provisions Defining Neutral Rights and Duties, 1778–1936 (S. Doc. No. 24, 75th Cong., 1st sess.), pp. 9 and 10. Those treaties are still in effect between Germany and the United States (29).

Pulaski Memorial Day—Gen. Casimir Pulaski, Polish Hero—Polish-American Contribution to Our Republic

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN F. SMITH

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 11, 1939

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, President Roosevelt has very appropriately proclaimed today—October 11, 1939—as General Casimir Pulaski Day in honor of the memory of that great Polish hero and patriot who fought with Gen. George Washington's army in the American Revolution. President Roosevelt acted pursuant to a resolution which we adopted in the last session of Congress, and to which I was glad to give my hearty support.

President Roosevelt's proclamation stated:

> We do honor to ourselves and our Nation in honoring those sons of foreign nations who assisted in the establishment of the United States * * * and one of these, whose name we hold in high esteem, is Count Casimir Pulaski, who met death on October 11, 1779, in consequence of his exploits in the assault upon Savannah.

Mr. Speaker, the Polish people who reside in my district are noted for their industry, thrift, and loyal Americanism. I esteem it a privilege to join with them in the faith and hope that Poland will arise again as a free and independent republic to take her rightful place among the cultural and progressive nations of the earth.

Well representing Polish nobility, Pulaski is often referred to as "Count Pulaski" in historical works. He was born in Podolia, Poland, at a time when that nation was undergoing a severe internal political battle. With rapacious neighbors beginning to conspire against the freedom of his people, the boy Pulaski was consumed with an early desire to ward off danger, and evinced a keen interest in military affairs at a very young age. Long before he reached his majority Pulaski joined in the guard of Duke Charles, and thus gained a rigorous and practical experience in the art of warfare.

In 1769 he joined his father, Joseph Pulaski, in what was termed "the Confederation of Bar," this confederation being a conjointure of Polish noblemen, each one of whom pledged his time, his fortune, and his life to the salvation of Poland. Casimir Pulaski and his brother, Francis, became the active leaders in the movement. The older leaders were soon dispersed, some going abroad; others were confined in dungeons. Pulaski's father was one of those confined in a dungeon prison, where he later died.

But, despite this, Casimir carried on, and at the head of a small force of cavalry he performed heroic feats. With his brother he became a constant terror to the Russians, who were trying to capture him. Against overwhelming odds for 4 years this great patriotic organization under their great leader fought to oust the enemies of Poland from his country. But all their efforts proved fruitless. During this time one of General Pulaski's brothers was killed before his eyes, the youngest brother taken into captivity, and many of his countrymen were doomed to misery.

Gen. Casimir Pulaski was the leading spirit of his countrymen in this unequal struggle to preserve the country intact. Although but 25 years of age, he was the acknowledged leader and the hero of his countrymen. Heedless of his foe, which was much more powerful, he fought with a

zeal and tenacity that made him renowned as a cavalry leader throughout the Continent of Europe.

General Pulaski not only lost his father and brothers in this glorious attempt to save Poland from the first of her ignoble partitions, but his estates were confiscated and he was proscribed by King Stanislaus and had to travel to Turkey. Soon thereafter, in 1772, Count Casimir Pulaski issued his memorable manifesto, in which he said in part:

I am not astonished that the enemies of my country resolved on her ruin, should direct their shares against those who most firmly resist their impetuosity, and that they should regard as such the brave Poles whom they have sacrificed and who are still repelling their most cruel attacks. * * * My destiny was clear, when at the age of 21, far from yielding to the amusements of youth, I regarded every moment as lost which was not employed in repelling the enemies of my country. * * * I have endeavored to mark my course by an invincible fortitude. Neither the blood of one of my brothers, which was shed by the enemy before my eyes, nor the cruel servitude of another, nor the sad fate of so many of my relations and compatriots has shaken my patriotism. * * *

Perhaps no better insight into the sturdy character of Pulaski, who is revered both in Europe and America, could be given than the above excerpt from his manifesto. He traveled to Turkey, but, repelled with the feeble notions of liberty entertained by the Sultan, he journeyed on to Marseilles, France, and from there to Paris. It was in the French capital that he made the acquaintance of Benjamin Franklin, and young America's struggle for independence. Benjamin Franklin, writing from Paris to General Washington on May 29, 1777, said:

Count Pulaski, of Poland, an officer famous throughout Europe for his bravery and conduct in defense of the liberties of his country against the three great invading powers of Russia, Austria, and Prussia will have the honor of delivering this into your excellency's hands.

General Pulaski landed in America the middle of July 1777, and after presenting his letters to Washington and Congress, waited for Congress to take action. In the meantime Washington's army passed through the streets of Philadelphia. Spurred by the sight of marching soldiers, Pulaski, restless and eager to aid our cause, decided not to wait for his commission, but to follow the army as a volunteer. In Europe a member of the nobility, an officer of distinguished prestige, in America a private in the ranks. Such was Pulaski. Not self, but service, was his life's motto.

The night of September 8, 1777, Washington assembled a council of war to decide which position the army should take in defense of Philadelphia. The upland, across the brook of Brandywine, was chosen. The army moved to this position at dawn. The enemy's attack was expected on the 11th, and about 9 of that day the red uniforms appeared. The battle started. The vanguard, under General Maxwell, retreated under heavy pressure. The rest of the army was stretched out lengthwise, for a considerable distance along the brook. The right wing was under the command of General Sullivan, and the left wing, to the south, was under the command of General Armstrong.

General Wayne and General Proctor commanded the cannon and artillery. Washington remained with the reserve, which was commanded by General Greene, and Pulaski was stationed by the side of Washington.

Upon the withdrawal of General Maxwell the British kept up fire, but did not attempt crossing the creek. Washington was about ready to strike a blow at the enemy, but first wanted to be convinced that the opponent's main forces were not circumventing him for an attack at the rear. To that end a detachment was sent out to explore the region. About 2 o'clock an orderly dispatched the news that the enemy could not be seen on any of the roads on the opposite side of the creek. An order of attack was about to be issued when a man in a cart was noticed waving his hat and striving to reach headquarters. The man turned out to be Squire Cheney, with the startling news that the main forces of the enemy had crossed the Brandywine to the north and were fast approaching the army's rear.

Washington immediately directed the division of Sullivan, together with the brigades of Conway, Stirling, and Stephans, to meet the enemy. They hurriedly arrayed themselves for battle just as the British were spied on the road. Thereupon the British vanguard showed itself on the plain. The American artillery opened fire. Hessian riflemen were playing havoc with the American front ranks. At the same time a column of infantry rushed to the upland occupied by the Americans. The center was holding up under the bombardment, but both wings were fleeing. The enemy then concentrated on the center, which soon wavered. Chaos reigned.

At this juncture Pulaski secured Washington's permission to use his bodyguard, some 30 horse, and launched a furious attack at the pursuers. With great skill he wedged into the side of the pursuing column. Swinging their sabers from left to right, this small detachment brought confusion to the ranks of the enemy. The pursuit was momentarily checked. Pulaski's forces took shelter with General Greene's army and together they held the enemy while the rear of the American Army retreated to Dillworth. There the road narrowed, and the Americans gained a vantage point where they could withstand the onslaught of the enemy. Thus Washington's army was saved.

Within 2 months after his arrival on September 15, 1777, Congress elected Pulaski "commander of the horse, with the rank of brigadier."

General Washington's letter to Congress recommending the appointment of Pulaski read as follows:

This gentleman has been, like us, engaged in defending the liberty and independence of his country and has sacrificed his fortune and his zeal for these objects. He derives from hence a title to our respect that ought to operate in his favor as far as the good of the service will permit.

Shortly afterward Washington's army was saved from an almost inevitable destruction at Warren Tavern, near Philadelphia, only by the war craft of Pulaski. He also engaged in the Battle of Germantown. On the day of the Battle of Germantown he was sorely disappointed and mortified. There were but four regiments of cavalry raised and not one of them completed. Three of them only, such as they were, had joined General Washington's army, and on the day of the battle guards were furnished out of those regiments to attend on the commander in chief and on other generals. This was a matter of deep regret and bitter chagrin.

When General Washington had taken his winter quarters at Valley Forge the Cavalry were sent over into New Jersey on account of forage and for other service on that side of the Delaware. Pulaski made his headquarters in Trenton.

Weary of the lapse in activity subsequent to these previous battles, and dampened by the pettiness of the command under which he was stationed, as well as the tardy tactics of Congress in carrying out his suggestions for the improvement of the Infantry, Pulaski expressed a wish to return to Europe. Washington persuaded him to remain, however.

In March 1778 he asked permission from General Washington and Congress to organize an independent corps, later to be known throughout the Colonies as the Polish Legion. In equipping it he is said to have spent $50,000 of his own funds. These horsemen, among other arms, bore the famous Polish lances, a new weapon on this continent. Rated as the most expert horseman in the American Cavalry, his service in leading and inspiring the cavalry was of inestimable value. From the time Pulaski took command it became a notable weapon of offense and defense. It is entirely possible that without it the cause of independence would not have been won.

Then followed the Battle of Charleston, S. C., when the city was sieged by 900 British troops from General Prevost's army. Although not altogether successful in his assault, Pulaski held the city 2 days until the arrival of reinforcements.

Probably Pulaski's most distinguished service was rendered in the siege of Savannah, Ga., although this move was made contrary to the sound advice of Pulaski, who pleaded a delay of a number of days due to their unpreparedness. Pulaski

was here made commander of the entire cavalry, both French and American. During the battle their scheme failed. The French became entangled and their Admiral D'Esaing was wounded. Chaos resulted in the ranks. Hoping to rally the men and regain order, Pulaski rushed into the thick of the battle. Leading his men in a desperate charge, he received a wound in his right thigh and was carried from the field of battle fatally wounded. Pulaski died 2 days later while on board the brig *Wasp*, leaving Savannah Harbor on the way to Charleston. According to his friend and companion in arms, Capt. Paul Bentalou, he was buried at sea, and funeral services were held afterward in the city of Charleston.

In this manner, at the age of 31 years, ended the life of one of the most active and greatest patriots of his time. A man well born, of handsome physique, and liberal education, who abandoned a life of ease and complacency for a career of unnumbered hardships and much bitterness. His was a proud and magnanimous personality, but he had to contend with petty men and the crudeness of a nation in its genesis. His corps of lancers and light infantry, which were recruited mostly in Baltimore, has since become famous under the name of Pulaski's Legion. He is known as the founder of the American Cavalry. Pulaski, like Washington, could have chosen the easy course. They were both men of large means. But they recognized the responsibility of wealth and rank.

An equestrian statue, which stands between Thirteenth and Fourteenth Streets on Pennsylvania Avenue, Washington, commemorates this hero of two hemispheres.

The splendid funeral honors paid by the citizens of Charleston to the memory of the brave Pulaski, the united regrets of the people and of the Army at the loss of an officer no less beloved than he was useful, and the last tribute of respect offered to his memory by Congress, have already evinced the sensibilities and gratitude of our Nation. The gallant son of Poland had enthusiastically espoused the cause of America. He served that cause with zeal, ardor, and fidelity.

Pulaski died as he had lived, a hero, but an enemy of kings. Since the time of Pulaski others have come from his native land to mix their blood with the blood of other peoples to make one common country and to build a single destiny. Many Americans of Polish extraction have offered their lives in defense of this country on many battlefields, in the Civil War, the Spanish-American War, and in the great World War. The blood of Pulaski still flows in the veins of his countrymen.

N. Y. A. Building, Lonaconing, Md.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM D. BYRON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 11, 1939

ADDRESS BY HON. WILLIAM D. BYRON, OF MARYLAND

Mr. BYRON. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me at the laying of the cornerstone of the N. Y. A. Building, Lonaconing, Md., on September 30, 1939:

Mr. Administrator, Mr. Mayor, Judge Walsh, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, I am particularly complimented at being asked to come to Lonaconing this afternoon to participate in the laying of the cornerstone of this community building. The fact that the Administrator of the National Youth Administration has considered this project of such importance that he has taken the time to come from Washington to address you is also, to my mind, particularly significant. It shows an interest in his work, no matter how large or how small, that augurs well for the success of his administration.

When I was campaigning for Congress in this district—Sixth Maryland—I spoke both in the primary and the general election of my special interest in public works in the building up of the physical side of the district and of my interest in youth and the unemployment situation. I do not recall, and I am sure that you do not, that I made a great many promises on what I could do to relieve this unhappy situation. However, I want to say on this occasion that I have conscientiously tried, and voted, to be of some help in relieving the situation, and have met with a fair success.

The National Youth Administration appropriation has increased from $449,276 in 1939 to $1,089,149 for the current year. I think the Congress acted wisely and humanely in appropriating this money.

Buildings and projects of the kind for which we are laying the cornerstone today do not just happen, they are the result of a lot of thought, energy, and hard work on the part of the people of the community and on the part of the organization which carries through. I noticed in a news report that this entire project resulted from the activities of the Allegany County Welfare Board, which established the National Youth Administration training center at Lonaconing, and the Citizens' Unemployed League.

At this time I want to publicly commend three ladies who were originally interested and worked for the project and through their efforts it is now coming into being—namely, Mrs. Emma Wagus, Mrs. Mary Cook, and Mrs. Clinton Spiker. While I am sure that every man and woman is interested in this project these three ladies seem to have been outstanding in their support. I want to also commend the mayor, Mr. D. Clarkson Laird, and the council for their foresight and activity in raising the funds to match the Federal Government appropriation. It seems to me the completion of this structure will be a monument to the cooperative spirit of the people of Lonaconing. Of course, the whole idea of a building of this kind is simply not in the finished structure of wood, stone, brick, and mortar. While this building is under construction the young people of this community will be learning valuable trades that will fit them for useful occupations in after life.

I sometimes feel that one of the things this country, or any other, has to fear is the fact that young people may not learn to work with their hands as well as their minds. I have often heard it said—and I believe it is true—we learn that mind accumulates knowledge through use of ones hands, and generally speaking, if you will show me a skilled artisan I will show you a sound mind.

This building will have a twofold purpose of filling a great need in your community—a library, medical center, nursery school, community hall, and a place where young people and the community as a whole can meet in good fellowship, and will also serve to train the youth of your community in more practical ways of making a living.

I congratulate you all upon your foresight, enthusiasm, and cooperation in what will undoubtedly be a highly successful community undertaking.

Of course, you know that practically every Government agency at one time or another comes under fire. This would be so, and I am frank to say will be so under any administration in Washington. One of the things I have heard is that at times young men are being put to work and wages being paid at the expense of men with families. This is not actually so and I want to defend, if need be, this type of work in Lonaconing or any other community in the United States.

I believe that my next remarks will appeal to young people as well as mothers and fathers. I do not have to remind you of the terrible events that are taking place overseas. It is really too horrible to contemplate, but I just want to ask you to consider what the youth of the warring nations are doing in their various countries today.

Instead of the C. C. C.—a very fine and worth-while organization and one which is doing splendid work in forest and wildlife preservation, especially in western Maryland—you have over there compulsory military training camps. I do not know what the average youth of warring nations, whose ages correspond with those helped by N. Y. A. are doing, but I feel sure it is not the constructive, peaceful work you will accomplish on this particular building.

So sum it all up the entire program of this or any other administration is built around the hope for peace in this country. This hope for peace, I feel sure, can be realized, as you know that Congress is now in special session and debating the highly controversial subject of neutrality. It is unfortunate, but it is never true that all men think alike on a subject of this kind.

We all—and I except no Representative or Senator and give them due credit—we all want to keep this country from the European conflict and stay out of war.

I myself as a veteran of the last war and as one who was brought up in the Army and know the terrible side of it, would go to any ends to keep us from becoming involved. After studying the whole matter very carefully, I am convinced that the best way to do this is to keep our ships and our citizens on this side of the Atlantic and to deal with all nations on equal terms. I do not want to send my own boys to fight on foreign soil, and you can rest assured that I will not knowingly vote for any program that would send yours. I cannot conceive of my voting to send young men of America to collect a debt for any manufacturer; I cannot conceive of my voting to avenge the injury of an American citizen who has been warned to stay away, or for the sinking of any American ship that has trespassed on foreign seas in an express violation of law.

I honestly and truly believe that the legislation now before this extraordinary session of Congress will do more to keep us out of war than anything yet proposed.

In closing, let me again express my interest in you and your problems and to congratulate all who have had a hand in the conception of what I know will be a fine and unusual building in this community.

Neutrality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. O. BURGIN

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 11, 1939

LETTER FROM THE SECRETARY OF THE SOUTHERN COUNCIL ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS, AND ENCLOSURE

Mr. BURGIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter received by me from the secretary of the Southern Council on International Relations, together with the list referred to therein:

THE SOUTHERN COUNCIL ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS,
Chapel Hill, N. C., October 2, 1939.

Congressman WILLIAM O. BURGIN,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. BURGIN: I beg to submit for your consideration a representative list of citizens of the Southeastern States—leaders in religion, education, journalism, the law, and business—who favor the repeal of the embargo on arms and other proposals made by the President to Congress in special session.

I am, with respect,

Sincerely yours,

KEENER C. FRAZER,
Executive Secretary,
Professor of International Law, University of North Carolina.

The proposals for the revision of the neutrality laws of the United States, as formulated by President Roosevelt and Secretary of State Cordell Hull, submitted to the Congress of the United States in special session, are approved and supported by a group of more than 100 men and women of the Southeastern States, representing the churches, journalism, business, the professions, civic interests, labor, and education.

CHURCH LEADERS

Bishop H. P. Almon Abbott, diocese of Lexington, Lexington, Ky.
Bishop Theodore D. Bratton, Jackson, Miss.
Bishop Thomas C. Darst, diocese of eastern Carolina, Wilmington, N. C.
Bishop J. Lloyd Decell, Methodist bishop of Alabama and Georgia, Birmingham, Ala.
Bishop Hoyt M. Dobbs, Methodist bishop of Louisiana and Mississippi, Jackson, Miss.
Bishop William M. Green, diocese of Mississippi, Jackson, Miss.
Bishop Robert C. Jett, retired bishop, diocese of southwestern Virginia, Roanoke, Va.
Bishop Paul B. Kern, Methodist bishop of Tennessee and Florida, Nashville, Tenn.
Bishop H. J. Mikell, diocese of Atlanta, Atlanta, Ga.
Bishop A. S. Thomas, diocese of South Carolina, Charleston, S. C.
Bishop John D. Wing, diocese of south Florida, Orlando, Fla.
Bishop Frank A. Juhan, diocese of Florida, Jacksonville, Fla.
Rev. John W. Frazer, D. D., Mobile, Ala.
Rev. M. Ashby Jones, D. D., Atlanta, Ga.
Rev. George Stoves, D. D., Mason, Ga.
Rev. R. P. Marshall, D. D., editor, Florida Christian Advocate, Lakeland, Fla.
Rev. John W. Inzer, D. D., First Baptist Church, Asheville, N. C.
Rev. James W. Jackson, D. D., Columbia, S. C.
Rev. Albert S. Johnson, D. D., First Presbyterian Church, Charlotte, N. C.
Rev. John Glenn, D. D., Edenton Street Methodist Church, Raleigh, N. C.
Rev. B. R. Lacy, Jr., D. D., president, Union Theological Seminary, Richmond, Va.
Rev. W. E. Rollins, D. D., dean, Virginia Theological Seminary, Alexandria, Va.
Rabbi Edward N. Calisch, D. D., Congregation Beth Ahabah, Richmond, Va.
Rabbi Joseph Rauch, D. D., Temple Adath Israel, Louisville, Ky.

JOURNALISTS

Mr. Julian Hall, editor, the Eagle, Dothan, Ala.
Dr. John Temple Graves, editor, the News, Birmingham, Ala.
Mr. David E. Smiley, editor and president, the Times, Tampa, Fla.
Mr. Tom Wallace, editor, the Times, Louisville, Ky.
Mr. Barry Bingham, publisher, the Courier-Journal and Times, Louisville, Ky.
Dr. Herbert Agar, the Courier-Journal, Louisville, Ky.
Mr. John D. Ewing, publisher, the Times, Shreveport, La.
Mr. Frederick Sullins, the News, Jackson, Miss.
Dr. Clarence Poe, editor, the Progressive Farmer, Raleigh, N. C.
Mr. L. S. Laprade, editor, the Herald, Durham, N. C.
Col. Santford Martin, editor, the Journal and Sentinel, Winston-Salem, N. C.
Mr. Charles A. Webb, president, the Asheville Citizen and Times, Asheville, N. C.
Hon. George F. Milton, president and editor, the News, Chattanooga, Tenn.
Mr. J. H. Nye, editor, the Tennessean, Nashville, Tenn.
Mr. Virginius Dabney, editor, the Times-Dispatch, Richmond, Va.
Dr. Douglas S. Freeman, editor, the News Leader, Richmond, Va.
Mr. Louis I. Jaffe, editor, the Virginian-Pilot, Norfolk, Va.

BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONS

Mr. A. W. McAllister, chairman of the board, Pilot Life Insurance Co., Greensboro, N. C.
Mr. P. H. Callahan, president, Louisville Varnish Co., Louisville, Ky.
Mr. J. Skottowe Wannamaker, president, American Cotton Association, St. Matthews, S. C.
Mr. John Sprunt Hill, Durham, N. C.
Mr. Algernon Blair, contractor, Montgomery, Ala.
Mr. Bennette E. Geer, manufacturer, Greenville, S. C.
Mr. John A. Law, president and treasurer, the Saxon Mills, Spartanburg, S. C.
Mr. F. M. Jackson, Sr., Birmingham, Ala.
Hon. Blanton Fortson, jurist, Athens, Ga.
Hon. Kemp D. Battle, lawyer, Rocky Mount, N. C.
Hon. Walter Stokes, Jr., lawyer, Nashville, Tenn.
Hon. James H. Hammond, lawyer, Columbia, S. C.
Hon. Devereux Lippitt, lawyer, Atlanta, Ga.
Hon. Helen Douglas Mankin, lawyer, member Georgia House of Representatives, Atlanta, Ga.
Hon. Charles Hall, lawyer, Macon, Ga.
Hon. Douglas Arant, lawyer, Birmingham, Ala.
Hon. E. Smythe Gambrell, lawyer, Atlanta, Ga.
Mr. L. O. Crosby, lumberman, Picayune, Miss.
Mr. Vance J. Alexander, president, Union Planters National Bank & Trust Co., Memphis, Tenn.
Mr. E. R. Malone, president, American National Bank, Pensacola, Fla.
Mr. Oliver J. Sands, banker, chairman, finance committee, church schools in diocese of Virginia, Richmond, Va.

CIVIC LEADERS

Mrs. Karl Bishopric, North Carolina Federation of Women's Clubs, Spray, N. C.
Mrs. R. H. Latham, General Federation of Women's Clubs, Asheville, N. C.
Mrs. C. T. Wanzer, Charlotte, N. C.
Mrs. J. U. Reaves, Alabama Federation of Women's Clubs, Mobile, Ala.
Mrs. Laura Smith Ebaugh, American Association of University Women, Greenville, S. C.
Mrs. J. Ralston Wells, Florida Federation of Women's Clubs, Daytona Beach, Fla.

LABOR LEADERS

Mr. John A. Peel, regional director, upper south region, Textile Workers' Union of America, Roanoke, Va.
Mr. T. A. Wilson, chairman, North Carolina Industrial Commission; ex-president, North Carolina Federation of Labor, Raleigh, N. C.
Mr. E. L. Sandefur, C. I. O. director for Carolinas, Winston-Salem, N. C.

EDUCATORS

President John Stewart Bryan, College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, Va.
President Julian A. Burruss, Virginia Polytechnic Institute, Blacksburg, Va.
President Francis P. Gaines, Washington and Lee University, Lexington, Va.
President J. N. Hillman, Emory and Henry College, Emory, Va.
President R. B. Montgomery, Lynchburg College, Lynchburg, Va.
President W. T. Sanger, Medical College of Virginia, Richmond, Va.
Dean J. Nelson Frierson, University of South Carolina, Columbia, S. C.
Dean James H. Hewlett, Centre College, Danville, Ky.
Dean W. C. Jackson, Woman's College of the University of North Carolina, Greensboro, N. C.
Dean Charles W. Pipkin, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, La.
Dr. Helen G. McDonald, Winthrop College, Rock Hill, S. C.
Dr. James W. Patton, Converse College, Spartanburg, S. C.
Dr. Calvin B. Hoover, economist, Durham, N. C.
Dr. Gilbert T. Rowe, professor of religion, Duke University, Durham, N. C.
Dr. Amry Vandenbosch, professor of international law, University of Kentucky, Lexington, Ky.
Dr. Mary Watters, Mary Baldwin College, Staunton, Va.
Prof. Keener C. Frazer, professor of international law, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, N. C.
Dr. E. A. Ziegler, professor of foreign economics and finance, University of Florida, Gainesville, Fla.
Dr. A. F. Harmon, Montevallo, Ala.
Dr. W. W. Pierson, dean, the Graduate School, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, N. C.
President Hamilton Holt, Rollins College, Winter Park, Fla.

President John H. Sherman, University of Tampa, Tampa, Fla.
President Dice R. Anderson, Wesleyan College, Macon, Ga.
President George C. Bellingrath, Rabun Gap-Nacoochee School, Rabun Gap, Ga.
President M. L. Brittain, Georgia School of Technology, Atlanta, Ga.
President Rufus E. Clement, Atlanta University, Atlanta, Ga.
President Harvey W. Cox, Emory University, Emory University, Ga.
President Guy H. Wells, Georgia State College for Women, Milledgeville, Ga.
President Pierce Cline, Centenary College of Louisiana, Shreveport, La.
President D. M. Nelson, Mississippi College, Clinton, Miss.
President B. L. Parkinson, Mississippi State College for Women, Columbus, Miss.
President H. G. Bedinger, Flora MacDonald College, Red Springs, N. C.
President Frank P. Graham, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, N. C.
President Gideon I. Humphreys, High Point College, High Point, N. C.
President Walter L. Lingle, Davidson College, Davidson, N. C.
President Howard E. Rondthaler, Salem College, Winston-Salem, N. C.
President E. W. Sikes, Clemson College, Clemson, S. C.
President Henry N. Snyder, Wofford College, Spartanburg, S. C.
Chancelor O. C. Carmichael, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tenn.
President Charles E. Diehl, Southwestern University, Memphis, Tenn.
Dr. Alex Guerry, vice chancelor, the University of the South, Sewanee, Tenn.
President Stewart W. McClelland, Lincoln Memorial University, Harrogate, Tenn.
President Ernest L. Stockton, Cumberland University, Lebanon, Tenn.
President E. A. Sutherland, Madison College, Madison College, Tenn.
Dr. M. D. Collins, State superintendent of schools, Atlanta, Ga.
Dr. A. H. Collins, State superintendent of education, Montgomery, Ala.
Dr. Willis Sutton, superintendent of schools, Atlanta, Ga.
Dr. T. H. Harris, State superintendent of education, Baton Rouge, La.
Dr. Clyde A. Erwin, State superintendent of education, Raleigh, N. C.
Dr. James H. Hope, State superintendent of public instruction, Columbia, S. C.
Dr. Sidney B. Hall, State superintendent of public instruction, Richmond, Va.

NOTE.—Name of Mr. C. A. Fink, president, North Carolina Federation of Labor, arrived too late to be listed with other labor leaders.

The Arms Embargo Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. OLIVER

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 11, 1939

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. JAMES C. OLIVER, OF MAINE

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks, I am pleased to incorporate herewith a radio broadcast made by myself on Saturday evening, October 7, over station WCSH, of Portland, Maine:

Citizens of the First District, once again it is my privilege and pleasure to address you in connection with national and international problems as they affect the welfare and interests of you and your families. Through the courtesy of station WCSH, for the past 3 years that I have held the office of United States Representative from the First Congressional District of Maine, it has been possible through the medium of these broadcasts to contact you each 2 weeks during the congressional terms and explain in some detail the various issues as they have arisen, but never in that time, despite the many unsolved domestic problems which still confront us, has this Nation of ours been faced with a more critical or vital situation or period than that in which we now find ourselves. I say that advisedly, because any undue meddling in this maelstrom of foreign war means intervention and eventual involvement for us. Such embroilment on our part will surely and certainly lead to military dictatorship with all of the dire and terrible consequences which the word "dictatorship" implies. Even today, with the limited emergency already proclaimed by the President, he has the power to take over full control of the radio broadcasting of this Nation, such power being available under the Federal Communications Act of 1934. Control of the radio in Germany and Italy and Russia made and makes it possible for the Hitlers, Mussolinis, and Stalins to rise and remain in power. Furthermore, other laws remain unrepealed from the World War which threaten our liberties equally. If we take one step toward intervention at this time, then it will only be a short time before we shall be sold the idea of taking the next step and gradually we approach the brink until as in 1917 we step over the precipice into the insanity of another World War to save the civilization of the world, as we are now told. Then rapidly will follow a draft law for our youth, the desolation of our firesides, the drafting of our wealth, the confiscation of our savings, the doubling and the trebling of our burden of taxation, the manifold increasing of our debt, and the eventual post-war pestilence, panic, economic and moral paralysis.

Every thinking man and woman of America knows this and every thinking man and woman of America fears this. Therefore, we hear from every home and every fireside the universal cry, "Keep America out of this war." Beyond any shadow of doubt every Member of the Seventy-sixth Congress is determined to do his share toward this end, and every Member of Congress knows that in this arms-embargo issue we are playing with international dynamite. In my opinion, the rank and file of our people know it also, and now a terrible responsibility falls upon the shoulders and the heads of all public officials. Fully appreciating the entire significance of this responsibility, I come before you this evening in complete humility, realizing the inadequacy of one human mind to grasp the entire ramifications of the international intrigues and diplomatic double-crossings of the Old World with all its historic treachery, its deceit, and its chicanery.

That is why I approach the whole problem of the suggested changes in our neutrality law with suspicion and misgivings. Remembering the basis of the selling propaganda of 1914–17, I listen, read, and observe with a continual question mark in my mind. Then it was, "Save the world for democracy"; now it is, "Save civilization for the world." Then it was the Kaiser; now it is Hitler. Then, at the start of that conflict, it was, "Sell us your supplies"; now it is the same cry. Then it was, "Loan us the credits—we do not need the men"; now in a few months it will be the same story. Then manpower will unquestionably follow our arms, our credits, and our financial interests. You, the thinking men and women of this district, in spite of the prevailing obvious sympathy for France and England, you sense this; you know it. The repeal of the arms embargo itself is not the real issue in this discussion. England and France can get along without these actual implements of warfare. The real issue is the point that this repeal will signify our intention to intervene and will signal to the whole world that once again the United States is taking a hand in the age-old struggle of Europe; that once again America is on the road to military intervention; that once again we are feeding the flames of war with the financial and physical resources of this great peace-loving Nation of ours. Why—for what conceivable reason—should I, as a Member of Congress, become a party to such insanity? Rather should I reason to myself thus:

America's frontiers are not on the Rhine, but they are the Atlantic and the Pacific. They are in Alaska and in South America. Within these broad limits lie more than 95 percent of our markets and practically all of the raw materials needed for the best material existence man could ever hope to enjoy. This country has never been invaded or threatened with invasion since 1812; and as long as we keep our American nose out of un-American affairs and our powder dry and plentiful, in my opinion, America never will be invaded. At the present time in all of Asia and Europe combined, there is not a single plane that could bring war to our land and return whole. We are geographically gifted for a position of isolation, and as long as we maintain in the form of our "Maginot" or "Siegfried" lines adequate naval forces, with a backlog of trained and fully equipped modern military forces, we are unassailable.

And so should I continue to remind myself as follows: That every time we have stepped beyond the limits of our immediate national interests we have been doomed to failure; and though we have never lost a war, we have time and time again lost our shirts. We fought Spain to free Cuba, and we won all in that military struggle; but all that we got out of that venture in foreign altruism in addition to the loss of millions of dollars and thousands of lives was a fertile field for the Chase National Bank to exploit native labor through sugar plantations.

In 1917 we ventured forth once again to beat up the Kaiser, preserve democracy, and stop war for all time. Once again we won all the battles but we lost 126,000 Americans, we maimed some 234,000 other Americans and we lost at least $41,000,000,000 directly with an indirect and cumulative loss of more than one hundred billions. Such a staggering sum devoted to domestic development would have paid off all mortgages on all farms, homes, and would have bought new farms for 3,000,000 of our homeless and wandering farmers and would have purchased every corporation, utility, and business house in the Nation. But we did win the war, and we did beat the Kaiser. But, today, he is living in Holland, presumably with his financial resources intact and his physical person untouched and unblemished through the terrible contact of war. But today our hospitals are filled with mentally deranged, blinded, and maimed men who were the pawns in that foreign embroilment of ours. What of the democracy we were to perpetuate? What of the madness of war which we were to end? You know the answers. You know that we were suckers, and you must know that we are being played once again for the same kind of suckers. Why should we stop Hitler? We stopped the Kaiser * * * for what? Let them stop Hitler, let the wily and suave diplomats of the Old World stop Hitler * * * they

made him. Their greed is responsible for his rise. The national and international selfishness of the Versailles treaty kindled the fire which has forged this modern madman. Hitler nor any other dictator in Germany could ever have developed if 60,000,000 people had not been made paupers by the greedy and avaricious territory grabbers of the Old World who, after military victory, once again carried out their historic ambitions and practices of dividing and partitioning the territory of the vanquished. Those who divided the swag must now accept the responsibility for the consequences. We asked for nothing, although we gave plenty, and we, as a nation, accepted no part of the responsibility for the division of the spoils. We accepted no part of the responsibility for the future policing of the world for which we owe thanks and eternal gratitude to such patriots as Borah, Lodge, Johnson, and the others who defeated the League of Nations and the World Court in our Senate.

As I continue to remind myself of those events of 20 to 25 years ago, I can still hear the statements of President Wilson that he kept us out of war and after his reelection on that platform I remember that it was only 1 month from the time he assumed the presidential chair in 1917 that he read from the rostrum of the House of Representatives his proclamation asking the Congress of the United States for a declaration of a foreign war. Now, President Roosevelt talks the same strain, and I thoroughly believe that he is sincere, but I also believe that he is just as wrong as I think Wilson was, in his foreign policy in 1916 and 1917. It is not what men say that really counts, but it is the thing which they do that really matters. Once we start on the road toward the supplying of this foreign conflagration with the fuel of warfare, just so surely are we started on the road toward financial and physical embroilment.

Believing most thoroughly and sincerely in the foregoing I am opposed to the repeal of the arms embargo. This does not mean that I am pro-German, nor that I am anti-British, nor am I pro-any nation or anything except pro-keeping our American nose out of the age-old European struggle for the balance of power and domination of world trade. In 1937 I voted for the arms embargo and for cash-and-carry restrictions on all other commodities being shipped to belligerents. At that time the bill received practically unanimous consideration both in the House and in the Senate. From press releases it was also evident that British sentiment was not opposed to the enactment of this type of American neutrality. The same administration or its mouthpieces which are now advocating the repeal of the arms embargo, in 1937 sponsored the enactment of this same prohibition against the sale and shipment of arms, ammunition, and implements of warfare to belligerent nations. At that time only 13 Members of the House and 6 members of the Senate voted against the passage of the bill.

On May 1, 1939, there expired the provisions of the law with respect to the cash-and-carry provisions for all commodities other than arms, ammunition, and implements of warfare, which as I have stated were forbidden supposely for all time to belligerents. So this has left us with no restrictions as to commodities outside of the arms classification. Then during this last session of Congress there was introduced the Bloom bill, which undertook to repeal completely the embargo against arms, etc., but at the same time it provided for the reenactment of the cash-and-carry restrictions on other commodities which had been in effect from May 1, 1937, to May 1, 1939. Obviously, there was no real objection to the passing again of these cash-and-carry sections of the 1937 law, but there was a tremendous amount of opposition to the repeal of the arms embargo. Finally, in the House an amendment was inserted to the Bloom bill which provided for the continuance of the embargo against arms and ammunition but eliminated the prohibition against implements of warfare. This amendment was passed after a terrific fight and Democrats joined with Republicans to put it over. Then the bill was passed and sent over to the Senate. You will remember that in the closing days of the session the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations refused to report out the bill with a bare majority of only one vote. There the matter has rested until this special session of Congress was called to deal with it again. In the meantime, of course, a declaration of war against Germany has been made by England and France. This has complicated the issue even more, for now there enters into the picture the passion engendered by propaganda from both sides of the European conflict.

It seems to me that in order for a person to convince himself that the arms embargo should be repealed he must first convince himself that this Nation has a moral right to traffic in the industrial production of weapons for mass murder. Just because a fight is progressing between two persons it does not seem moral or right to me to step up and for the sake of profit equip them with brass knuckles and other implements of destruction. As a general proposition I do not believe that we should manufacture the means of mass murder except for the purposes of our own self-defense. Not only do I feel this way for the general moral principle involved, but I further believe that it is suicidal for us to furnish foreign nations with weapons which they may conceivably turn against us if the fortunes of war or the schemings of diplomats should change present friends to future enemies.

Secondly, for a person to convince himself that the arms embargo should be repealed he must satisfy himself that changing the rules after the war has started is not a serious breach of neutrality which even partakes of the nature of active intervention in support of one side to the conflict. In the days leading up to our participation in the World War our State Department quite definitely stated to Germany that a similar act would be contrary to all concepts of neutrality. Why is the situation any different today in this regard?

In the third place, for a person to convince himself that the arms embargo should be repealed he should convince himself that there is a definite and certain danger that Hitler will invade our shores when, as, and if France and England are defeated. When one considers that the conquering and physical possession of the Allies must come only as a result of a completely successful military invasion by troops, then it does not seem conceivable to me that Hitler could ever get across the English Channel to invade England or through the Maginot fortifications to invade France. In any event, even if his forces did eventually realize such a military mission, the German Army would certainly have taken a terrible beating and would scarcely be in readiness for a foreign invasion 3,000 miles from their homeland. Some folks are worried because of their fear that the British Navy would be available for the transport of the German forces after they had mopped up the British, but they do not visualize what the condition of the British Navy would be after such a terrific struggle as would be necessary before Hitler's cohorts could get into the British Isles. Then, again, could there be any doubt but that the commanders of the British Navy would order any remaining ships scuttled before they would permit their surrender to the German forces. In such an event where would Hitler get the ships to transport manpower enough to attack the Western Hemisphere? It can't be done.

In the fourth place, for a person to advocate the repeal of the arms embargo he should follow his hand through and advocate the next steps which logically follow such a declaration of intention to intervene. Supply the arms for cash until the cash runs out, then supply them the necessary credit; then follow the credit with men. That these progressive steps will lead to our actual participation in this holocaust is just as obvious and just as certain as the ebb and flow of the tide. Any person who is willing to advocate and follow this course is quite consistent in advocating the repeal of the arms embargo. Personally I do not want any part of it and shall actively oppose such a course.

In the fifth place, the person who advocates repeal must convince himself that we are now on the road to adequate preparedness in this country, for if we are not on such a road, then we certainly should be devoting all of our facilities to that end. Until this country is absolutely prepared to meet any possibility or probability of attack from any single nation or combination of nations, then we certainly should not ship any finished weapons, any essential raw materials of defense, or any component parts of weapons of warfare to any nation of the world. It is altogether obvious that this country is not in that condition, and until it shall be, then it appears to me to be criminally negligent to ship such articles to any foreign powers. The only possible excuse for the establishment of a wartime economy in this Nation is for the purpose of our own national defense. To that objective I have always applied myself and shall so continue as long as I am in public office.

I have attempted in these few minutes to explain as comprehensively as possible the present situation as I view it. I am opposed to the repeal of the arms embargo, but I am perfectly willing to vote for the restrictions on the shipments of other types of goods as they have been suggested. In fact, I did so vote in 1937. I am not only opposed to the entrance of this Nation into a foreign war, but I am opposed to any steps which may be the preliminary approach to such a calamity.

If this session of Congress continues for 2 or more weeks I shall follow my usual practice of addressing you each fortnight. If the opportunity presents itself to do so, I shall review the legislative situation as it develops and I shall take the opportunity to outline the various moves which I have and shall make to help the United States maintain a policy of isolation and insulation from the impacts of a European struggle in which, in my opinion, we have no business.

In the meantime, do not forget that the sordid scroll of war propaganda will continue to unroll. It is our duty to ourselves and to our families to deliberate dispassionately over each and every story that comes to our attention. Instead of the pinch of salt which you may use in viewing the unrolling of the anticipated propaganda, apply a whole barrel full.

Until 2 weeks from tonight at this time, good wishes and good night.

Mr. Aubrey Williams

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 11, 1939

EDITORIAL FROM THE BALTIMORE SUN

Mr. LYNDON B. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, a great many people have long heard a great deal about Mr. Aubrey Williams, because Mr. Aubrey Williams has been the director of

one of the greatest American programs ever put into effect—the National Youth Administration.

But a great many people during these last few years have been looking at Mr. Williams and, alas, seeing the little man upon the stair, celebrated in the current popular song, who was not there. Among those who have habitually looked at Mr. Williams from time to time and figured Beelzebub must be back from his vacation there is now occurring a tremendous change of heart. I suppose it is because at last the National Youth Administration has touched some heart and life close to theirs and, touching it, has touched them.

The Baltimore Sun took a look at Mr. Williams last Sunday when he visited and spoke in Baltimore—and it saw the real Mr. Williams.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I append the editorial which appeared in the Baltimore Sun Tuesday, October 10:

[From the Baltimore Sun of October 10, 1939]

MR. WILLIAMS GOES TO THE RIGHT IN A NEW AGE OF PORTENTS

Sea-serpent weather in October is strange enough, but that is a merely minor prodigy in these cockeyed days. The Communists and the Nazis are now arm in arm, the world's No. 1 militarist wages peace, not war, and a National League team has held the New York Yankees off for eight innings, though the natural order of the universe then intervened in a Yankee win. We have not, it is true, had meteors in the sky, and the birth rate of three-headed calves continues comfortingly low. But Mr. Aubrey Williams, of the National Youth Administration, has come out flat-footed for private initiative and the demobilization, so far as possible, of Government relief.

Time was when Mr. Aubrey Williams was among the flamingest evangels of a new and quite radically altered order. He looked upon the businessman with the disdain then fashionable in certain exalted quarters; the Government, he seemed to feel, could extend its philanthropic embrace without stint or limit to all those who suffered, for whatever reason. For instance, "* * * the support of art, writing, and other artistic pursuits is going to be the business of government," he was certain; "the American people have tasted blood here," and retreat would be impossible. Not that the powers of darkness had been wholly dispersed in the Republic. "We have got to stick together. We have got to keep our friends in power," Mr. Williams assured the Workers Alliance, denying, however, that he meant anything political.

But Mr. Williams was in Baltimore on Sunday and the change in him was almost Jekyllian. Government, now, should merely see to it that "private industry works." The American people now fear a growing bureaucracy; and the permanent unemployment of millions, so long a favorite nightmare of Mr. Williams' more advanced colleagues, now seems to him wholly avoidable. Whirl, indeed, is king in a new era of portents. We wouldn't even be surprised now if Mr. Williams indorsed the profit motive.

Addresses at Dedication of New Gymnasium Building at Seton Hall College

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT L. VREELAND

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 11, 1939

ADDRESSES BY THE MOST REVEREND THOMAS J. WALSH AND REV. DR. JAMES F. KELLEY

Mr. VREELAND. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, September 28, I brought to the attention of the House of Representatives the laying of the cornerstone of a new gymnasium building of Seton Hall College in my district. It is now my privilege to include herein copies of the speeches given at the ceremonies on October 1, 1939, by the Most Reverend Thomas J. Walsh, archbishop of the diocese of Newark, and the Reverend Dr. James F. Kelley, president of the college.

They are both to be highly commended for their untiring efforts and achievement toward the fulfillment of their dreams.

ADDRESS BY THE MOST REVEREND THOMAS J. WALSH

Your excellencies, most reverend bishops, right reverend and very reverend monsignori, very reverend and reverend fathers, venerable religious brothers and sisters and beloved brethren of the laity, and kind listeners of the radio audience, in the year 1853 the diocese of Newark, comprising the 21 counties of the State of New Jersey, was established by the Holy See. On November 1, 1853, the first bishop of Newark, His Excellency the Most Reverend James Roosevelt Bayley, took canonical possession and was solemnly installed in St. Patrick's Cathedral, Newark.

Bishop Bayley found in the diocese of Newark no religious community of priests or brothers or sisters; no Catholic school; no Catholic charitable institution of mercy; no funds; 41 unpretentious churches or chapels, many of which were burdened and loaded with crushing debts; 35 missionary priests and 40,000 Catholics, rich in faith and virtue, and poor—immensely poor—in financial means.

The first institution organized and put into operation in the diocese of Newark was Seton Hall College. Seton Hall College, instituted and founded as a diocesan college under the direction, supervision, and conduct of the bishop and diocesan clergy for the Catholic college education of male students, was formally opened in a purchased academy building located near Madison, N. J., on September 1, 1856. Seton Hall College was transferred to its present site in South Orange September 10, 1860.

Seton Hall College is civilly incorporated. Clergy and laity, under the presidency of the bishop, constitute its board of trustees.

Seton Hall College was chartered by the State of New Jersey as a college in the year 1861, and registered by the Middle States Accrediting Association on November 26, 1932. Seton Hall College receives day and boarding students.

Seton Hall College was founded in the year 1856, particularly and specifically for the perpetual use of all Catholics then residing or ever to reside for all time within the then diocese of Newark and now the province of Newark, the entire State of New Jersey.

Under the administration of the bishop and diocesan clergy, Seton Hall College has operated uninterruptedly and fruitfully during its venerable life of 83 years.

Many great and immortal scholars graced the professional and administrative chairs of Seton Hall College during the years. Seton Hall College is proud of her students and alumni.

When Seton Hall College was opened on September 1, 1856, 83 years ago, there were then, in the then diocese of Newark, comprising the entire State of New Jersey, 35 priests and 40,000 Catholics. On October 1, 1939, there are in this province of Newark, in this State of New Jersey, 1,250 priests and 1,200,000 Catholics.

May I recommend to the kind attention, consideration, and patronage of all the Catholics in this province of Newark, in the original diocese of Newark, in this State of New Jersey, their very own Seton Hall College.

Seton Hall Diocesan High and College Preparatory School for Boys was established as a distinct educational institution here on the Seton Hall College property in September, 1899. Seton Hall High School for Boys was registered in the Middle States Association in 1930. Seton Hall High and College Preparatory School is a boarding and day school for boys. Seton Hall Diocesan High and College Preparatory School, attended this current year by 535 boys, is recommended.

Seton Hall College now has 581 registered students. Seton Hall College extension schools for men and women in Newark and Jersey City now have a registration of more than 1,000 students, and are recommended.

I thank the most reverend bishops, the right reverend, very reverend, and reverend clergy, the venerable religious brothers and sisters, and all members of the laity—men, women, and children—for the esteemed honor of your appreciated presence at Seton Hall College for the memorable function of this day.

I bless Seton Hall College and you all.

ADDRESS BY REV. DR. JAMES F. KELLEY

Your excellency, Most Rev. Thomas Joseph Walsh, archbishop of Newark; your excellencies, most reverend bishops, right reverend, very reverend monsignori, very reverend and reverend fathers, distinguished guests, and all friends of Seton Hall; those of you who have braved these elements today and those of you on the radio, through the kindness of station WAAT:

On an occasion like this it is permissible and proper to take just a moment to express a word of sincere thanks to all friends of Seton Hall. On behalf of the faculty and student body, then, may I extend our grateful thanks, first to our presiding leader, his excellency, Archbishop Walsh; to the illustrious prelates who have honored us by their presence; to our distinguished guests and alumni, and to all of you, our friends. Seton Hall is indeed proud of the honor you pay her by your gracious presence and gratefully thanks you for the encouragement you inspire.

It is not saying anything new to remark that our civilization stands today at the crossroads. Newspapers, magazines, and radio all are shouting about the chaos in Europe and Asia; of wars declared and undeclared; of new empires striving against old ones; of governments overthrown by modern Neros; of Christianity and democracy being attacked by peculiar diabolical "isms." We seem to be living at the closing of one era and the beginning of some new strange economic and social and political epoch. What is going to happen, or, for that matter, what is actually happening, no one really knows. But one fact that will appeal to all of us is that if the foundations of society and culture are being destroyed, then whatever safeguards we can find to reinforce civilization should be welcomed and supported by every American.

Now, one of the most powerful bulwarks against anti-American, antireligious "isms" is a true system of education. There would

be nothing to worry about in this country if every American student were being taught his real duties to God, to his country, to his neighbor, and to himself. Instead of that, however, while we nightly condemn dictators who use education simply to develop useful, unenquiring blind slaves of the state, still our own American education has been making the mistake for years of treating man merely as a material and intellectual animal. In denying or neglecting man's spiritual nature, we are endangering American democracy far more than any outside communistic or nazi-istic enemies by jeopardizing the origin and source of man's individuality, of his freedom and liberty, and of all those God-given rights so dear to America and to America alone.

If education is even half as important as all this, then today's event is an outstanding occasion not only in the life of Seton Hall, but for the community and the State which it serves. For these ceremonies in which you are taking part mark not merely the building of a new material gymnasium, but reveal the growth of an educational system built upon the philosophy of respect for God and country and fellow man, and built upon the old-fashioned idea that education should perfect the entire individual in his physical, intellectual, and spiritual faculties. Those have been the ideas and ideals guiding Seton Hall in her 83 years of service to science and religion and democracy. And because today is an important milestone for her, a bridge between her past traditions and her future glories, I would like your permission to take you back over the past history of Seton Hall and then to tell you of her present and future greatness.

The story of Seton Hall College is intimately connected with the early history of the Diocese of Newark. It was only 87 years ago—in 1853—that the State of New Jersey was divided from the Diocese of New York, and for the first time set up as a separate diocese. The Most Reverend James Roosevelt Bayley, descendent of two pre-Revolutionary American families—the Bayleys and the Roosevelts—was appointed as the first bishop of Newark. In this present great New Jersey of today it is hard to visualize the condition that existed here less than 100 years ago. While today we have approximately 1,250 priests for about 1,200,000 Catholic people in the great province of New Jersey, comprising the Archdiocese of Newark and the Dioceses of Trenton, Paterson, and Camden, only 83 years ago Bishop Bayley found but 35 priests and 40,000 Catholic people. The people were largely first generation immigrants from every land across the sea, poor in wealth and learning, but weighted down with the riches of faith. As far as can be learned there were but 41 poor churches or chapels; no Catholic charitable institutions of mercy; no religious brothers or sisters, and but three or four elementary schools in the entire State or diocese.

Midst these poor conditions the first institutions founded in the Diocese of Newark by Bishop Bayley were Seton Hall College and the Diocesan Major Seminary—two distinct and separate institutions, but both, then and still under the direction of the Ordinary of the Archdiocese of Newark. Seton Hall College, the first Catholic college in New Jersey, was from the beginning, and still is, staffed by the secular clergy of the Diocese of Newark and is one of the nine colleges in America conducted by diocesan clergy. Bishop Bayley's first assignment after his ordination in 1844 had been as the vice president of St. John's College in the Bronx, N. Y. He knew well then that the most urgent need in this new territory was to set up an institution which would ensure outstanding educated leaders. As he surveyed the destitute condition of his new diocese, one man stood out as the coworker who could carry out his educational dreams. He, too, had had experience as an educator; like his superior, had previously been an instructor in St. John's College in New York, and having founded the first permanent Catholic school in New Jersey during his pastorate in Madison.

In Morristown, too, he had been an ardent advocate of parochial schools, and Bishop Bayley chose him as his educator. Seton Hall was fortunate beyond words in having as its first president a man whose fiery zeal and indomitable courage and tireless energy gave it the initial impetus which carried it on through the Civil War and the World War and the crises of the late nineties and of our own times, and which rebuilt itself upon the ashes of three destructive fires. It was Bishop Bayley and the then Father McQuaid who together selected as the first site of Seton Hall the mansion building of Madame Chegarry's Academy in Convent Station, N. J. Courses were begun there in September 1856 with an enrollment of five students. Like most early American schools, it was born in poverty and reared in the determined efforts of its founders to spread the gospels of goodness and truth and knowledge. As institutions, like men, are oftentimes great because of the obstacles they have had to overcome, within 3 years, in 1859, it was found that the property in Madison was too small for the number of students applying for registration. So, together, once again Bishop Bayley and Father McQuaid set out, and after weary months of searching for adequate buildings and grounds, on April 2, 1860, they purchased the present property in the village of South Orange. Because the extensive white-marble mansion on the 60-acre campus would still be insufficient for the number of students who were now enrolled, the cornerstone of a new building was laid on May 15, 1860, and in September of the same year courses began for the first time on the present campus. Within a year, in March 1861, Seton Hall obtained a charter and was incorporated by a special act of the legislature, which was immediately approved by Gov. Charles F. Oldin, a charter as liberal as any ever granted by the State of New Jersey, giving to Seton Hall all the rights and privileges of a university. That charter expressly stated that Seton Hall was to have a personal existence as a college, and granted the right to confer every degree granted, then or in the future, by any college in the State of New Jersey. In the words of the charter itself, Seton Hall was to have the power of conferring the usual academic and other degrees compatible with the laws of the State of New Jersey; therefore, was to have the right to grant all academic degrees from the bachelor's to the master's and doctor's, and all other degrees, such as all other honorary degrees.

Such were the beginnings of Seton Hall 83 years ago. That is quite an old age as far as American colleges go. For in its 163 years of existence America has necessarily been more concerned with material growth and expansion than with the arts. Comparatively few of her colleges or universities go back more than a century. Of the 800 colleges in America today, Seton Hall is older than 600 of them. Only 2 institutions of higher learning preceded Seton Hall in New Jersey—New Jersey College (later Princeton), founded in 1746, and Queens College (later Rutgers), founded in 1776. Seton Hall was thus the first college founded in New Jersey as a State of the Union. With a longer record of service than 75 percent of the colleges in America today, she has seen hundreds of colleges come and go; she has seen many of those now existing close their doors for varying periods of years. Her 83 years of uninterrupted service have developed a system so outstanding that it deserves an explanation here.

For today this illustrious old institution has become one of America's finer colleges—old enough to have earned a heritage, yet young enough to learn and to keep progressing. One of the country's most progressive colleges, with spirit and vitality, she is breaking some old traditions by establishing new ones. Fifteen thousand two hundred and ninety-five students have gone through her classrooms from 1856 to 1939, and 1,666 of these have received their degrees. Originally the only Catholic college in New Jersey, she is still the only Catholic boarding college for men in the State, and in addition to boarding students, two-thirds of her enrollment are day students.

It is not the least bit of an exaggeration to say that Seton Hall today is the fastest growing college in the United States. In place of the 5 students in 1856, the enrollment for this year, 1939–40, is 2,295 in its campus and urban divisions. Her five classroom buildings and her six dormitory buildings are crowded to the walls, necessitating this year for the first time in her history the acquisition of dormitory facilities off the campus.

For this largest enrollment of students in her history, she offers courses and degrees in 11 distinct departments. To take care of these courses, in place of the faculty of 3 in 1856, she has an outstanding faculty of 170 professors, 25 of whom have their doctor's degrees, and 57 their master's degrees. Every department is under the direct supervision of a doctor in his specialty.

If it be true that no college is better than its faculty, Seton Hall is indeed one of America's best, for her faculty has been carefully selected from all over this country and from foreign universities including degreed representatives of 36 outstanding colleges and universities. Since the spirit of any organization is the composite of its members Seton Hall has a capable group of educators who still cling to the idea that man was made by God and for God and that the Deity had done a better work than the American educators who during the past century remade man and left out the soul. Believing with St. Augustine "Thou didst create us O Lord for Thyself and our heart is restless till it rests in Thee" the faculty of Seton Hall believes that the true purpose of education is the proportionate development of the entire man—mind and body and soul.

It is this understanding of education that Seton Hall attempts to impart to the candidates that it selects from its applicants. For several years now Seton Hall has been in the very desirable and enviable position of having more applicants than it has been able to accept. Not wishing to grow too rapidly and anxious to obtain the best possible college material those who would profit most from her years of schooling, an admissions' committee for several years has been laying down conditions for admission far more exacting than the average college could dare to demand. As a result of most rigid standards of entrance requirements, 33 percent of the college applicants were rejected in 1938, and 25 percent of the current year.

Most of this startling growth has occurred within the past decade. Much of it may be attributed perhaps to the greater demand for real college education. Some of the growth, too, may be explained by the increased facilities for reaching the college—scarcely any college could have a more enviable position, situated only 14 miles outside of New York City, and on the city line of Newark, in a suburban population that is well able to patronize college courses and able to gaze from its summit over the homes of more than 10,000,000 people; with suburban electrified railroad running into its municipality and bus service connecting it with all outlying areas.

But the factor most responsible for this phenomenal increase is to be found in the person of the president of the board of trustees, His Excellency Archbishop Walsh. This is neither the time nor the place for praise or flattery, but the record demands this statement of fact; that it was primarily his excellency's development and improvement of the quality of the curriculum and of the selection of her faculty which has been the major cause of this outstanding growth. It is without any semblance of platitude or flattery that one would say that what Bishop Bayley and Father McQuaid were to Seton Hall in its origin, Archbishop Walsh has been in its resurrection and renaissance of the past 10 years. No living memory can recall anyone who has shown more interest and who has done more for Seton Hall than our present archbishop. As president of the board of trustees of Seton Hall,

his administrative and executive ability, his foresight and planning, vitalizing zeal and energy have raised Seton Hall to the distinction which it now enjoys. In spite of the multitude of works and worries that few men but himself could visualize, much less endure, His Excellency Archbishop Walsh has always found time for the administration of Seton Hall. My two distinguished predecessors now present, His Excellency Bishop Thomas H. McLaughlin, of Paterson, N. J., president of Seton Hall from 1922 until 1932, and His Excellency Francis J. Monaghan, Bishop of Ogdensburg, N. Y., president from 1933 to 1936, will agree with me that their outstanding development of Seton Hall was always inspired and aided by His Excellency Archbishop Walsh. He has been the driving force behind every progressive move made at Seton Hall since he first came to live on her campus 11 years ago. It was because Archbishop Walsh was unwilling to recommend anything but the very best in education that Bishop McLaughlin expended every effort to set up a complete college, including not only the bachelor of arts, as it has always done, but the bachelor of science curriculum as well, placing all departments under the supervision of a doctor in that specific subject, and finally, in November 1930, winning for the college the national recognition of accrediting agencies like the Middle Atlantic States Association. It was only after such recognition had been obtained that Archbishop Walsh on every public occasion at which he spoke, invited the Catholic young men of his diocese to support and attend Seton Hall College. Because he himself was never satisfied with minima requirements, he has ever encouraged and insisted upon constant improvement in the curriculum and facilities at Seton Hall.

No better proof of his interest in the advancement of all things pertaining to Seton Hall is to be found than in the definite example of the new auditorium-gymnasium. It was because of his own belief that education must aim at intellectual, spiritual, and physical development; because of his realization that man is a composite of body and soul with their mutual interdependence; because of his realization that in our modern age it is frequently necessary to approach the spiritual through the physical, that the long-dreamed-of building has taken form in this outstanding $700,000 edifice. For many long years alumni and friends of Seton Hall have talked of the absolute necessity for a gymnasium and for recreational facilities, but no decisive steps were ever taken until, under the inspiration of His Excellency Archbishop Walsh, a campaign was conducted in 1935. This fund was then deposited in the Newark chancery office and a printed list of the names and amounts contributed was distributed. In May 1939 his excellency the archbishop appointed a committee of five, under the chairmanship of the Very Reverend Monsignor John G. Delaney, to study the problem of a new gymnasium. In the course of the next 2 years this committee visited the outstanding gymnasia along the eastern seaboard and in the Midwestern States in its quest of features which they wished to incorporate in their own building. On May 2, 1939, the final meeting of this committee took place and contracts were awarded on June 23, 1939. Six days later, on June 29, formal breaking of the ground took place in the presence of many of you who are here today.

Those of you who are here, though you see only the skeleton of the building, can appreciate that when completed it will be one of the outstanding gymnasia here in the East. In the mezzanine basement, which is directly before you, can be seen the outline of a magnificent theater, equipped for stage or motion pictures, to accommodate an audience of several hundred, and alongside of it the cafeteria-dining room and modern kitchen, the many bowling alleys and squash courts and rifle ranges; the main swimming pool, 75 feet long by 35 feet wide, and alongside of it the beginners' practice pool, with its row of 350 spectators' benches, and over to the left the large exercising rooms, fencing, boxing, and wrestling rooms. Alongside of these the billiard room. Here on the level on which I am standing, 10 feet above the ground, to which a series of 8 limestone steps lead to a large platform, and another series of 8 steps up to a magnificent lobby, will be one of the largest basketball courts in the East, containing 2 practice courts of regular size, 48 feet by 84 feet, with a main exhibition court in the center running lengthwise, also of standard size. At the far end of the auditorium on the same floor will be the vast stage, 68 feet long by 25 feet wide, with huge scenery storage spaces to the right of it, and to its left the 4 dressing rooms, 2 on the main floor and 2 in the mezzanine balcony. On either side are classrooms for physical-education courses and adjoining them offices for the professors in these courses, and for the athletic directors, reception rooms for newspapermen and visitors, and offices for the coaches of various sports. These are only a few of the features that are incorporated in this tremendously large building, 225 feet long and 154 feet wide.

The site of the building was chosen because of its ideal location, lying as it does immediately on the city line of Newark and on the village line of South Orange, with an entrance on one side from South Orange and on the other from the city of Newark, permitting access to the building for all activities for a 5-cent bus fare. Two other roadways leading off from the huge parking space running clear ahead of us here some several hundred feet, taking care of 1,500 cars; one road leading directly to the main entrance of South Orange Avenue, while another leads out to the Ward Place entrance, bordering on South Orange and Malpewood. It would be impossible to conceive of a better location for a building; one more accessible to people in the community and people in the metropolitan area.

Since my assigned half hour is drawing to a close, very briefly and very quickly may I end as I began with a word of thanks to you all. Your presence here today has been a tribute to a glorious past that this old institution has compiled and will be an inspiration to it to serve in ever-increasing measures the present and the future. Seton Hall will try to keep pace with your tribute by serving both the community of Essex County and the entire State to the fullest capacity possible by offering to those who seek the best education an opportunity to find it right here at home. As the years go on the community should be still more proud of Seton Hall as it realizes that no college in the country offers more in the way of an outstanding faculty and diversity of courses, and degrees which are recognized universally, and, above all, in the thoroughness of the training which it affords to their youth. As she has done for more than one-half the lifetime of this country, Seton Hall will continue as one of the Nation's greatest custodians of true education, as the champion of truth and knowledge and goodness, as the defender of religion and liberty and democracy. May God grant her long, long years as His educator, leading the youth of today and the youngsters of tomorrow as she did her gray-haired sons of yesteryear against the frontiers of error and ignorance.

United States Does Not Pay Rent for Ground Where American Dead Are Buried in France

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 11, 1939

LETTER FROM GEN. JOHN J. PERSHING

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, in these critical days when appeals are being made to arouse our citizens on the question of neutrality, many statements are made not based upon facts.

In a recent address a very well-known clergyman who uses the radio weekly made the statement that France charged our Government rent for the ground where American soldiers are buried in that country. I knew the distinguished clergyman was in error, but to make sure I was correct I wrote a letter to Gen. John J. Pershing, chairman of the American Battle Monuments Commission, and as part of my remarks I include his reply. General Pershing's letter follows:

[The American Battle Monuments Commission. Established by Congress, March 1923. John J. Pershing, chairman; Robert G. Woodside, vice chairman; J. B. P. Clayton Hill; D. John Markey; David A. Reed; Finis J. Garrett; Mrs. Henry Fenimore Baker]

WASHINGTON, *October 6, 1939.*

Hon. JOHN J. COCHRAN,
United States House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. COCHRAN: In reply to your inquiry of October 4, I wish to say that the United States Government does not pay rent on the graves of our American dead who are buried in France. In fact, the French Government has exempted us from the payment of taxes or duties of any kind whatsoever on the land on which our cemeteries and memorials are located and on the materials which we have sent to France for these establishments.

With best wishes and kindest regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

JOHN J. PERSHING, *Chairman.*

Effect of Pending Neutrality Legislation on the Merchant Marine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KEY PITTMAN

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 12 (legislative day of Wednesday October 4), 1939

STATEMENT OF HON. JOSIAH W. BAILEY, OF NORTH CAROLINA

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have published in the Appendix of the RECORD a state-

ment prepared by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], chairman of the Committee on Commerce of the Senate, supplying data with regard to our American merchant marine, and suggesting the effect on the merchant marine of the enactment of the proposed legislation. It is a very able statement and very clear. I may say that I do not agree as to the loss to our merchant marine, but that is simply a difference of opinion. There is no proposed amendment suggested, and, therefore, I do not feel in any way committed by the statement.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 306), as reported in the Senate, would repeal the Neutrality Acts of August 31, 1935, as amended, and of January 8, 1937, and prescribe in lieu thereof regulations restricting the activities of American vessels and American citizens in trade and intercourse with belligerent states in wars in which the United States is neutral.

It clearly appears from the hearings on neutrality bills of the Seventy-sixth Congress, first session, and the reports on House Joint Resolution 306, that the central objective of the pending legislation is to restrict the neutral rights of our citizens and ships in foreign commerce in order to maintain our Nation at peace. The worthiness of this objective is unquestioned. It is desirable, however, to examine the methods proposed in the bill to attain this objective, because the proposed restrictions would profoundly affect the merchant marine of the United States and would disturb and dislocate the flow of our commerce, with resultant losses and hardships not only to the shipping industry (both management and labor), but to producers, shippers, and consumers as well.

Under the law of nations the ships and the citizens of a neutral country have the right to engage in trade and commerce with any nation, belligerent or neutral, subject to rules as to blockade and contraband of war. The powers of the neutral state usually are exercised to maintain these rights of its citizens and its commerce. However, our national policy, as expressed in our existing statutes, restricts these neutral rights of our ships and citizens in certain respects affecting ocean shipping and travel. Under these existing statutes, when the President, as he has done in the case of the present European war, finds that there exists a state of war between two or more foreign states, he is directed to proclaim such fact, and it is then unlawful to export or transport (directly or by transshipment via a neutral country) arms, ammunition, or implements of war from the United States to any belligerent state named in the proclamation; it is unlawful for American citizens to travel on ships of belligerent countries except in accordance with rules prescribed by the President; and it is unlawful for any American vessel engaged in commerce with a warring nation to be armed. These provisions of law do not seriously disrupt our foreign trade, nor do they discriminate against American shipping to any material extent.

Under the pending bill (H. J. Res. 306), as reported in the Senate, if the Congress (by concurrent resolution) or the President finds that there exists a state of war between foreign states, and finds that it is necessary to promote the security or preserve the peace of the United States or protect the lives of its citizens, the President is directed to issue a proclamation naming the states involved (sec. 1 (a)). When such a proclamation is issued—

(1) It will be unlawful for any American vessel to carry any passengers or articles or materials to any belligerent state, with exceptions as to inland and overland trade with Canada (sec. 2 (f)), and certain limited exceptions relating principally to passenger and mail transportation in the Western Hemisphere (sec. 2 (g));

(2) (If the President also finds protection of our citizens requires it) it will be unlawful, except as prescribed in rules and regulations, for any citizen of the United States or any American vessel to proceed into or through any combat area defined by the President (sec. 3);

(3) It will be unlawful for any citizen of the United States to travel on any vessel of a belligerent state except in accordance with such rules and regulations as may be prescribed (sec. 5);

(4) It will be unlawful for any American vessel engaged in commerce with any foreign state to be armed (sec. 6); and

(5) It will be unlawful to export or transport from the United States to a belligerent state any articles or materials unless all title therein is transferred to a foreign government or national (sec. 7).

Both the present law and the pending joint resolution exempt any American republic engaged in war against a non-American state from the provisions thereof.

Other provisions of the bill, not directly affecting the maintenance of the American merchant marine, are omitted from this discussion.

Considering first the general effect of the bill on the American merchant marine, the United States has a definite long-established statutory national policy (now expressed in the Merchant Marine Act, 1936) providing for the development and maintenance of a merchant marine sufficient to provide shipping service on routes essential for maintaining the flow of its water-borne export and import foreign commerce, capable of serving as a naval and military auxiliary in time of war or national emergency, and owned and operated under the United States flag by citizens of the United States. For many years the United States persistently has encouraged private capital to invest in shipping in order to secure such a merchant marine. Under the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, the United States subsidizes the construction and operation of American vessels for use in essential trade routes in competition with foreign operators. Under the subsidy contracts, operators of subsidized vessels must maintain necessary shipping services on these essential routes. Provision is made for the employment and training of American citizens as officers and seamen. Under this act the United States has the fullest right to requisition American vessels for national-defense purposes. Section 9 of the Shipping Act, 1916, prohibits the sale or lease of American-flag vessels to foreigners or their transfer to foreign registry except with the consent of the Maritime Commission. Under this policy the shipping industry with the aid of the United States has embarked upon a program of merchant-marine development which since 1936 has made tremendous strides in attaining the objectives of the national policy.

The restrictions of the pending bill not only would seriously disrupt, curtail, and injure the American shipping industry, but would bring to a virtual stop this program to develop and maintain the American merchant marine as a great national benefit and asset.

The American merchant marine would be placed at great disadvantage in competition with foreign shipping. The bill would remove the embargo upon the shipment of arms and munitions to belligerent countries, an embargo which affects shipping in both American and foreign vessels. The restrictions proposed in lieu thereof prohibit the shipment of all articles and materials to belligerents by American vessels and would leave the foreign vessels, whether neutral or belligerent, free from such restrictions. American shipping would be prohibited from carrying any commerce, however innocent in nature, from the United States, or from any other country, to any belligerent country named in the proclamation, no matter how far such belligerent is removed from actual combat zones. American shipping is to be prohibited from proceeding into or through any combat area, as defined by the President, even though trade lanes to other neutral countries are thereby blocked. There is no restriction against carrying passengers, articles, or materials in American vessels from any state named in the Presidential proclamation to the United States, or to any other neutral state, but this privilege is subject to the prohibition against passage through a combat area.

It is impossible to foresee or appraise the precise effects of the proposed legislation upon the American merchant marine. For example, the legislation will undoubtedly affect American tanker operations; but the ramifications of the tanker problem are so great that no definite predictions can be made at present. Predicated upon combat areas, which might be prescribed in view of present conditions, upon the assumption that the list of belligerents is not enlarged, and enactment of the bill in substantially its present form, some fairly definite results can be stated.

Approximately 130 American dry cargo, combination or passenger ships of about 860,000 gross tons would be withdrawn from service. The lines upon which the great majority of these ships operate would be abandoned.

In addition to the 130 ships in foreign trade, 16 American ships of approximately 80,000 gross tons—dry cargo and tank vessels usually considered a part of our coastwise fleet but principally engaged in trade between Atlantic, Gulf, and Pacific ports of the United States and Canadian ports—could no longer operate as at present.

Estimates indicate that between 165 and 170 American dry cargo, combination or passenger ships of about 1,100,000 gross tons could continue to operate in foreign trade, much as at present, although more than half of these—in number and tonnage—would be adversely affected, some seriously. The uncertainty as to the future of some of these operations, however, is illustrated by the fact that if it became necessary to enter a combat area to serve Mediterranean ports, 20 vessels of 108,000 gross tons immediately would be withdrawn, and 7 other vessels of 74,000 gross tons would have to be rerouted so drastically, it is possible their continued operation might no longer be practicable.

The abandonment, curtailment, or injury to the American services above referred to will have far-reaching repercussions. Some of the more obvious consequences may be summarized as follows:

1. Those lines which would necessarily abandon their services would be forced to reduce their organizations and release personnel. They would bear heavy out-of-pocket expense for lay-up of the vessels as well as depreciation expense, unless such vessels could be employed in some other trade. The prospectus for such other employment is not encouraging, in view of the large number of American ships which would be thrown out of service and made surplus.

2. Many of the ships are subject to mortgage indebtedness, some in large amounts. If operations cease there would be no revenue with which to make mortgage interest and amortization payments. The mortgages then would be in default and the vessels subject to foreclosure. Insofar as these mortgages are held by the United States, it would be morally questionable to foreclose them, since the default would be due to governmental action.

3. Some of the lines involved have entered into long-range construction agreements with the United States. If their revenues are wiped out by governmental action, obviously they will have no money for new ship construction.

4. If the vessels under discussion are laid up for a long period, their usefulness in case of emergency would be seriously impaired. Some plan should be developed to the end that vessels removed

from service will be kept in condition for immediate operation to meet possible national-defense requirements.

5. Thousands of American seamen would be thrown out of employment.

6. The merchant-marine training program would be adversely affected. It would seem idle to expect young men to continue to train for a career at sea on American vessels if such vessels are to be removed from the sea en masse each time a limited area might be dangerous.

7. Whenever the restrictions on operation become no longer applicable, the American shipping companies, if able and willing, would have to begin their services all over again and gradually build up in the face of many handicaps. The shipping business, being highly competitive, cannot be dropped and reentered at will. Shipping goodwill is an asset which is built up gradually. A period of pioneering must be gone through to secure business; good agency relations must be reestablished, and solicitation must proceed along definite channels. Should our vessels be laid up for even a year, it would be many years before they could regain their present position in the trades.

8. Many American steamship companies would no doubt be in such poor financial condition that they would not be able to re-establish operations.

9. Money spent for American ship wages, stores and supplies, feeding, repairs, insurance, etc., amounting to many millions of dollars a year, is largely expended in the United States. Similar expenditures by foreign ships are made abroad so far as is practicable. If a great number of American ships are laid up, the loss on these items to American business would be very considerable.

10. An examination of the prospects for rerouting American vessels affected by the proposed prohibitions shows very little prospect of profitable employment for such vessels in services from the United States to nonbelligerent countries and possessions. Very few foreign vessels have been withdrawn from the South American trade. The South American trade volume may increase, but steady employment for more than 100 additional American ships, or even a considerable portion of them, cannot be visualized. Similarly, trans-Pacific trade with the Orient has declined within the last year and there appears no room for any number of additional vessels in that trade.

This summary of effects of the proposed legislation should be qualified with respect to subsidized vessels, in view of section 611 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended. That section provides that in the event the United States defaults on an operating subsidy contract or cancels the same without just cause the contract, upon compliance with the provisions of the section, may transfer its vessels to foreign registry. By reason of the sweeping restrictions of the proposed legislation many American vessels will be prevented from operating in accordance with the law and contracts entered into under the law. These conditions might be held a default on the part of the United States in carrying out its contracts. Transfer of these vessels to foreign registry probably would be beneficial to the American owners under the circumstances envisioned but questionable desirability from the standpoint of the merchant marine and the national defense of the United States.

The foregoing discussion has been concerned principally with the effect of the proposed legislation upon American ships and shipping companies. Its effect on American commerce in general should also be considered. Section 2 applies only to commerce carried to belligerent countries. (N. B.—It is not entirely clear whether commerce destined for a neutral port and carried to a belligerent port (and out again) en route to the neutral port is permitted.) Commerce from such countries may be carried in American ships.

A number of commodities which are vital to the industry and the national welfare of the United States such as rubber, tin, manganese, ore, chrome ore, etc., must be transported from belligerent dominions, colonies, dependencies, and protectorates which may be far removed from combat areas. If American vessels are prohibited from carrying any commerce (however unrelated to warfare) to these so-called belligerent sources of vital materials, the American vessels must proceed there in ballast, and charge a greatly increased rate on the vital import commodities to cover the entire expense of the voyage. This increased transportation cost must be passed on to American industry and the American consumer.

Whether foreign neutral or belligerent merchant ships will be available to engage in the trades under consideration cannot be determined at present. It is probable that merchant ships of the belligerent countries will be needed for their national wartime purposes. If the war conditions continue over a long period, it is likewise probable that merchant ships of neutrals can find more lucrative employment in or near the war zones than in such services as the United States-Straits Settlements, or India, or Africa trades, even though they could charge American exporters high rates for carrying out-bound cargoes to such countries, since American ships would be barred from such out-bound trade.

Materials and articles now purchased in the United States by foreign combatant and outlying belligerent countries will of necessity be purchased from our trade competitors if foreign-flag vessels cannot be found to carry them from the United States.

It appears probable that the net result of the proposed "shipping to belligerents ban" will be a return to the conditions of 1914–18, when American products of farm and factory were piled on wharves and in warehouses for want of adequate shipping facilities or for markets which could afford to absorb the shipping rates; also a return to scarcity and high cost of essential import materials. These results may be so damaging to our domestic economy that the proposed neutrality law, if enacted, will have to be changed. By that time, however, American industry, exporters, and shipowners will have suffered enormous losses.

The United States has invested large sums in the development of trade routes, from which it is now proposed to withdraw our ships. No record is found of any such withdrawal by any neutral country, whether strong or weak, in advance of actual danger. It is now proposed to write off this cost in the interest of neutrality on the assumption that American ships trading with belligerents will bring us nearer to war.

Even if it be assumed that the presence of American ships in war zones contributed in some degree to our involvement in the World War, it cannot be claimed with justice that those trading to outlying belligerent countries contributed to such involvement.

At the present time the insurance companies, convinced that Germany's submarine campaign against British and French commercial shipping has begun to lose effectiveness, have slashed (as of September 28, 1939) war-risk rates 16.6 percent on cargoes carried in English or French ships traveling to and from the United States and Europe. When experience is showing an increase in the safety factor of belligerent ships in the combat areas, why should the United States voluntarily withdraw its safer neutral ships from many of the principal trade routes of the world, some of these removed by thousands of miles from the combat areas, and that before the established right of our ships to operate on such routes has been questioned?

Undoubtedly the most far-reaching provision of the pending bill is the prohibition against shipping any article or material in American vessels to a belligerent country. It appears from the considerations above discussed that this provision will disrupt American commerce and will destroy much of the American merchant marine. This prohibition is highly artificial and arbitrary. It prohibits the transportation of cargo in American vessels to belligerent countries regardless of whether the cargo is loaded in the United States or in some other country; regardless of the nature of the cargo, whether absolute contraband, conditional contraband, or noncontraband; regardless of whether the port of destination and the waters traversed are in a combat zone or not; and regardless of whether or not the destination or the waters traversed are blockaded, patrolled, or mined. Inland and overland trade with Canada is excepted along with some minor exceptions as to the Western Hemisphere, but shipping to Australia, New Zealand, Hong Kong, South Africa, Straits Settlements, French Indochina, India, and other outlying countries far separated from the mother country at war is prohibited. No reason appears why our ships should keep off practically all the highways of the seas because a few sea lanes are blocked or purported to be blocked by belligerent countries, nor why normal intercourse between nations at peace should be disrupted.

Section 2 apparently goes considerably beyond the peace-safeguarding methods proposed by the President in his message on neutrality. The President proposed a restriction on American ships and American citizens from moving in danger areas to be designated by Executive action. To proclaim by statute that movement in American ships to any belligerent technically at war, regardless of the actualities of the war conditions, imposes a needless sacrifice on American shipping likely to be highly expensive and certain to be disruptive of American commerce.

Although the Senate committee having jurisdiction over the legislation has not seen fit to solve the problem by a withdrawal of the protection of the United States from ships and citizens traveling in danger zones, it is suggested that it does not necessarily follow that the restriction adopted should be so broad as to include countries only nominally at war, such as far-distant dominions, colonies, dependencies, or protectorates of an empire at war. If a discretion similar to that vested in the President under section 3 (c) were added to section 2, areas of a country only technically at war could be properly excepted.

Effect on Merchant Marine of Pending Neutrality Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 12 (legislative day of Wednesday October 4), 1939

ARTICLE BY MARK SULLIVAN AND EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD an article by Mark Sullivan, published in this morning's New York Herald Tribune, and an editorial from the Herald Tribune along the same line. Both deal with the effect of the proposed neutrality legislation on American shipping.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Herald Tribune of October 12, 1939]

DEATH BLOW TO MERCHANT MARINE SEEN IN PROPOSED NEUTRALITY BILL—MARK SULLIVAN SAYS CURB ON SHIPPING WOULD DRIVE HUNDREDS FROM SEA AND IMPAIR UNITED STATES DEFENSE—QUOTES WARNING GIVEN BY ADMIRAL LAND

(By Mark Sullivan)

WASHINGTON, October 11.—What Admiral Emory S. Land said to Congress over the radio Tuesday night—he said it in perfectly polite words, as becomes an officer and a gentleman and an Annapolis graduate, but, in the vernacular, what he said—amounted to, "Wait a minute, there! Do you realize what you are doing to those ships?"

It was merchant ships the admiral meant, not naval vessels. The admiral, after a fine career in the Navy, is now serving the Government in the field of merchant shipping. He is Chairman of the United States Maritime Commission, set up in 1936. Its business was and is to restore American merchant shipping to the sea. To that end, the Commission has spent hundreds of millions of dollars building ships, chartering ships, and subsidizing operation of ships.

Having this responsibility of building up an American merchant marine, Admiral Land was obliged to take notice of what would be the effect of the neutrality bill now in Congress. Because of what Admiral Land said and what others begin to say; because of the facts underlying what they say, it is necessary for the public to understand what the neutrality bill does about merchant ships.

RIGHTS WOULD BE WAIVED

In war our merchant ships, like merchant ships of all neutrals, have certain rights under international law. These rights we now propose to waive. The word "waive" is used rather than "give up," for in Senate discussion it is pointed out that we should retain the privilege of sometime reasserting our rights under international law, if we choose to. But for the present, in order to go great lengths in avoiding involvement in the war, we propose to waive the rights of our merchant ships.

What we undertake to do about our merchant ships, as provided in the proposed neutrality measure, is to set up great limitations, to put our ships under servere restrictions and penalties.

First, the proposed measure says, "it shall be unlawful for any American vessel to carry any passengers or any articles or materials to any state" that is at war.

Now, when the states at war include Britain and France, they take in much territory. This provision of the neutrality measure would make it unlawful for any American ship to go to any colony or dependency of France or England. It would be unlawful to go to Australia, or to India, or Hong Kong, or any French possession in the South Seas; or to Newfoundland, or to Bermuda, or any British or French possession in the West Indies or South or Central America.

It would even be unlawful for an American ship to go by sea to Canada. The bill contains an exception making it all right for an American ship to cross an inland water, to go from Buffalo or Chicago across the Lakes to Canada. But it would be unlawful for an American ship to go from Boston to Halifax or from Seattle to Vancouver.

(I have said in all cases "unlawful to go." Actually the words of the measure are "unlawful to carry passengers or articles to." This phrasing is probably inadvertent. Few ships would care to go empty.)

The measure does a second thing, an overlapping thing. It provides that the President, in his discretion, shall define "combat areas," and thereafter it shall be unlawful * * * for any American vessel to proceed into or through any such combat area.

Combat areas presumably would be most of the waters of western Europe—the North Sea, Baltic Sea, the English Channel, the waters west of France, and perhaps Mediterranean waters south of France. The setting up of such combat areas would keep American ships not only away from the nations at war but presumably from Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Holland, perhaps from some Mediterranean ports.

RESTRICTIONS ARE BROAD

These restrictions are imposed upon American ships without regard to the nature of their cargoes—they might be carrying toy balloons or baby rattles. And the penalties for violation are severe—5 years in jail, $50,000 fine, or both.

The effects of all this would be to drive hundreds of American merchant ships from the sea; turn the business and routes of these ships over to others, the Japanese or European neutrals—other neutrals who will stand on their rights under international law.

It will become difficult for America to get needed raw materials, such as jute, from India. The further, indirect consequences would be many. One consequence would be serious impairment of our national defense, for, as Admiral Land pointed out, merchant ships are necessary to a strong navy.

Fifteen years ago it was said that the 1922 Conference for the Limitation of Naval Armament at Washington sank more warships than all the battles in history. A current wisecrack says the proposed neutrality bill if not changed would sink more merchant vessels than ever were sunk by torpedo or cannon shot. This would not be material if it prevented our involvement in war. But are we sure it will?

Here, plainly, is a thing that few realize, which must be thought about, about which something must be done.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of October 12, 1939]

SACRIFICING AMERICAN SHIPPING

Senator BAILEY, of North Carolina, whose interest in the American merchant marine is well known, has rendered a service in calling attention to the probable effects on the merchant marine if no modifications are made in the initial draft of the neutrality-law changes. The Senator estimated that 130 ships, with a total tonnage of 860,000 tons, would be forced out of foreign trade and another 16 vessels, aggregating 80,000 tons, could not operate as at present if the law is passed as it now stands. In addition, there would be tankers amounting to an as yet undetermined tonnage.

What this would mean, stripped of technicalities, is that one of the most important sections of the American merchant marine would be badly crippled. If, incidentally, the provision against calling at non-European ports of belligerents were to be strictly interpreted, American shipping in other parts of the world besides Europe would be seriously crippled. Taken altogether, the new restrictions would go far toward driving American shipping off the seas. Only the lines to and from Latin America would remain virtually unimpaired.

Persons who brush aside the argument in behalf of the merchant marine make two serious mistakes: They assume that ships now engaged in the European trade could, by a mere order of their owners, be transferred to other routes, and they completely overlook the fact that the United States is dependent on the outside world for much of its indispensable imports. Ships can only be rerouted when the prospects of business warrant it. In the meanwhile, if the ships of the belligerents and the leading European neutrals are interfered with as a result of blockades and submarine campaigns, there will be a shortage of tonnage in which to carry from war zones the imports that the United States needs.

Everyone sympathizes with the point of view which Secretary of State Hull expressed that it would be worth the sacrifice of a part of our shipping if this would surely keep us out of war. But it does not follow that such a sacrifice would in any sense serve as a guaranty against the United States being drawn into the war. At best, it would only diminish the likelihood of misunderstandings arising out of injury to American ships in belligerent waters. But there is nothing in history to show that even complete nonintercourse with belligerents can necessarily keep a nation out of war.

The least that can be hoped is that, if Congress is determined to sacrifice American shipping, it should, at least, so draw the restrictions that they only affect ships bound to or from actual war zones in Europe in which there is direct danger of mines and of torpedoes. It would be shortsighted in the extreme to include the territories of belligerents on this side of the ocean, or in the Far East, among those at which American ships might not call. Not only is the danger of anything happening to American vessels in or near any of these ports small, but the admission of the principle of abstention would, in this case, amount to placing in the hands of other nations the power to virtually close all the seas of the world against American shipping. It is one thing to keep out of belligerent waters in the war zones. It is something quite different to withdraw from long-established trade routes simply because a German submarine might be lurking nearby and might torpedo an American vessel, even though it was not engaged in commerce with belligerents. If this is to be the criterion of American policy, it would be more logical to place the entire merchant marine in drydock.

Pending Neutrality Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KEY PITTMAN

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 12 (legislative day of Wednesday October 4), 1939

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. WILLIAM H. KING, OF UTAH

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have published in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able address on the subject of the pending neutrality legislation, delivered last evening over the Mutual Broadcasting System by the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING].

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE EMBARGO PROVISIONS OF THE ACT OF 1937 SHOULD BE REPEALED

In the limited time at my disposal I will be unable to but briefly refer to a few points arising in connection with the so-called neutrality bill now before the Senate. This measure seeks the repeal of the so-called Neutrality Act of 1937. The embargo provision of

the act was regarded as the most important, and most of the discussion now occurring in the Senate is devoted to the question of the embargo. May I be permitted to state that I opposed the act of 1937, contending that it deprived the United States and its people of rights recognized by international law as well as rights which an independent nation was entitled to enjoy and to assert. There has been great opposition to this act; and demands have been made by many of our citizens, as well as those in important positions in the Government, that it be repealed.

The President of the United States, on September 21 of this year, in an address to the Congress, asked it to assemble in extraordinary session to consider the repeal of the embargo provisions of the Neutrality Act of 1937, and he stated that in his best judgment that act "alters the historic foreign policy of the United States and impairs the peaceful relations of the United States with foreign nations." The address of the President emphasizes the importance of such policies and measures as will protect the neutrality, safety, and integrity of the United States, and at the same time "keep us out of war." The President referred to the constant efforts of the United States, in the face of the building up of vast armies, navies, and storehouses of war in other countries, to encourage peaceful settlements and bring about the reduction of armaments, and avert threatened wars. Reference is made to the efforts of the executive branch of the Government to protect our Nation from being involved in war, and to aid in averting the present "appalling conflict." The President referred to the historic record of the United States, and to its efforts to promote peace. In a number of eloquent paragraphs the President referred to efforts of conquest—military and economic—by nations, and of the challenge to religion, democracy, and to international good faith. He further added: "An ordering of society which relegates religion, democracy, and good faith among nations to the background can find no place within it for the ideals of the Prince of Peace. The United States rejects such an ordering and retains its ancient faith."

The President further stated that he "foresaw some time ago the trends of foreign affairs and their probable effect upon the United States, and recommended to Congress in July of this year that changes be enacted in our neutrality law." He added that international law has had as its primary objective the avoidance of the causes of war and the prevention of the extension of war, and that deviation from the sound principles of neutrality and peace through international law brought about disastrous results. With respect to the act of 1937, which the present measure seeks to repeal, the President expressed regret that Congress passed such an act and also that he had signed it. The President stated that the "embargo provisions of the act of 1937 are inconsistent with ancient precepts of the law of nations and are vitally dangerous to American neutrality, American security, and American peace."

The President further states that he seeks a greater consistency through the repeal of the embargo provisions "and a return to international law"; that he seeks a "reenactment of the historic and traditional American policy which served our country for nearly a century and a half." We cannot ignore the solemn words of the President when he said that he gives it as his "unalterable conviction that by the repeal of the embargo the United States would more probably remain at peace than if the law remained as it stands today; and therefore that the repeal of the embargo and a return to international law are the crux of this issue." The President, in addition, in urging the repeal of the existing law, submitted recommendations for legislation needed to meet the situation.

The measure before us meets the recommendations of the President with respect to the repeal of the embargo provisions of the existing law, and it also contains other provisions relating to the broad subject of neutrality.

On the 14th of July last the President submitted to Congress "with his full approval" a statement from the Secretary of State, and asked that it be given "earnest consideration." The Secretary's statement referred to the confusion and misunderstanding regarding the operation of the arms-embargo provisions of the law of 1937, and in order to make clear the situation, pointed out that the first concern of the United States must be its own peace and security, and that the policy of the Government should be to avoid being drawn into wars between other nations. Furthermore, the statement continued, there should be no entangling alliances "and involvement with other nations, and in the event of war the United States should maintain a status of strict neutrality." The statement further declared that the executive branch of the Government, when the arms embargo was originally adopted, "called attention to the fact that its enactment constituted a hazardous departure from the principle of international law, which recognizes the rights of neutrals to trade with belligerents and of belligerents to trade with neutrals." It further declared that neutrality means impartiality, and "that an arms embargo is opposed to the idea of neutrality" because in enacting such a measure, or by refraining from such enactment, it would be humanly impossible "to hold the scales exactly between two belligerents." It further stated that those who support the recommendations for the elimination of the embargo play into the hands of nations which have taken the lead in building up their fighting power and work against the interests of peace-loving nations, particularly those not possessing their own munitions plants."

The Secretary's statement contains strong arguments in favor of the position taken by the President in the address referred to, and justifies the averment that the embargo encourages a general state of war both in Europe and in Asia, and therefore its results are prejudicial to the best interests of the peace and security of the United States.

The Secretary's later statement, which was approved by the President, supports the policy recommended by the President, and which is consistent with the rules of international law and with the course of our country over a period of 150 years.

As I have stated, the most important provision of the pending bill is the repeal of the embargo provision of the act of 1937. I repeat when I state that the message of the President and the statement submitted by the Secretary of State are powerful arguments in favor of such action.

Undoubtedly the American people are concerned over the disturbed conditions in various parts of the world and are desirous that every effort be made by our Government to prevent the United States from being involved in international conflicts. The situation in Europe, as well as in Asia, reveals the tragic effects of war, and the democratic peoples throughout the world are determined, so far as possible, to prevent the fires of international conflict from continuing their devastating course. The destruction of Czechoslovakia, the devastation of Poland, with the slaughter of thousands of innocent men, women, and children, have so aroused the democratic forces throughout the world that they demand the cessation of the horrors and brutalities which attend modern warfare. Only a short time ago Czechoslovakia was a progressive republic, supported by millions of patriotic citizens; Poland was rising out of the mists and ruins of centuries of oppression. Now both Poland and Czechoslovakia are destroyed and nazi-ism has marshalled its armies to secure further conquests. Soviet Russia has collaborated in these recent tragic events and is now bringing independent states—Latvia, Estonia, and Lithuania—under its control—economically and, indeed, politically. It now demands that the brave and courageous Finns obey Stalin's commands. Other democratic nations in Europe are frightened at the specter of nazi-ism and communism, and their present preoccupation is to preserve their independence. These frightful conditions in Europe and in Asia cannot but arouse in this peace-loving land a feeling of horror and indignation. But withal there is a determination that every honorable means shall be taken to preserve our country against the subversive and destructive forces beating against the pillars of society and the foundations of democracy, liberty, and justice. Any legislation enacted by Congress must have as its purpose the protection of the liberties of the American people and the preservation of this God-given Republic.

The American people desire peace. The spirit of democracy is the spirit of peace and justice and equality for all. While our country has been a party to international conflicts, it can truthfully be said that the American people have desired to follow the principles of peace and fellowship and good will. The founders of the Republic and the American people have been influenced by the teachings of the Christian religion, which has fashioned our political and social life along spiritual and religious lines.

As indicated, they have sought to promote the most friendly relations with the peoples of the world. They seek no conquest; they desire to live in peace and be an example, if possible, to influence other peoples to accept democratic principles and follow in the paths of justice and righteousness. Undoubtedly they look with growing concern at conflagrations raging in various parts of the world, and they are determined that the fires of international conflicts shall not be brought to the shores of America.

As I have indicated, however, even though democratic peoples love peace and abhore war, they cannot help but express concern when they see liberty-loving people attacked by dictators and powerful aggressors.

The records of the past are replete with the destruction of small and liberty-loving nations by strong and powerful military combinations. But, as I have indicated, the American people are sympathetic with the oppressed and persecuted, but they sincerely desire that no situation shall arise which will result in this Nation becoming a participant in the conflagration now raging in various parts of the world, and for that reason the repeal of the 1937 act is sought.

It is believed by the proponents of the embargo provisions of the pending measure that it will tend to immunize this Nation against war. So solicitous are many who are supporting this bill to prevent war that they are willing to abandon at least for the present neutrality rights which are recognized by civilized nations.

The repeal will be in harmony with and will strengthen international law. That code protects the rights of neutrals, both upon land and sea. It recognizes the importance of trade and commerce, and throws the mantle of its protection around ships carrying the fruits of man's toils and labors. International law does not speak for isolation, nor does it require nations to erect barriers around their borders, or prevent international intercourse among people of the world.

The bill before us is an abridgment of some rights of our Government and of American citizens. But as I have indicated, many Americans are willing to yield some rights, if in so doing our country may not be drawn into war. I share that view and therefore give my support to the repeal of the embargo provisions of this bill. There are some persons who favor a renunciation of all rights provided by international law, and the adoption of a "scuttling" policy which seeks isolation by complete surrender of the rights which belong to civilized peoples and independent governments. I have contended that the rights of neutrals as well as belligerents, should rest upon the foundations of international law

in times of peace as well as in war, and it should be made in the spirit of international law in relation to neutrals as well as belligerents.

The abandonment of conceded rights by a neutral may not prove advantageous to the nations willing to surrender such rights, and a unitary declaration of policy by such neutral may give a belligerent an opportunity to formulate policies aimed directly at the surrendering nation. Experience and history reveal the fact that nations which surrender rights under the law of nations, and also rights under treaties, have not been free from attack.

In my opinion, the United States, with its prestige and power, whenever and wherever opportunity affords, should take the lead in urging the maintenance of the sanctity of international law. Indeed, each nation should be concerned in the protection of neutral rights. Our Nation from the beginning stood for neutral rights; freedom of the seas; the right to carry on trade and commerce in wartime as well as in peacetimes.

Conditions may arise in which we will be willing to forego the assertion of conceded neutral and national rights, hoping thereby to prevent the spread of the fires of conflicts among nations; but if the United States announces in advance that it will claim no neutral rights, and will bar its citizens from traveling, its ships from sailing the seas, its agriculturists and manufacturers from disposing of their commodities, there is no certainly that all dangers would be averted or that domestic peace would be assured. There would still be the danger of involvement resulting from the conduct of belligerents or possibly by reason of opposition upon the part of nationals. There is no assurance that a renunciation of all rights accorded to neutrals would prevent our Government or any nation from being drawn into an international conflict.

Neutral nations have been assailed when they scrupulously adhered to the principles of international law, and they have been invaded when they did not assert the rights of neutrals or of their nationals. As indicated, waiving of the neutral rights of nationals, does not insure freedom from foreign assaults. When we are asked to renounce the rights of neutrals and the rights of our nationals, we must consider what the results would be—the benefits to be obtained and the evils which would follow.

As stated, the abdication of one right usually leads to the demand for further concessions, culminating in the ultimate destruction of the whole fabric of international law—the policies and principles of right and justice which exists among civilized nations.

It has been the policy of our Government to strengthen international law and not to whittle it away or to undermine it. The act of 1937, for which the pending measure is a substitute, cannot, in my opinion, be called a neutrality act. Certainly it was not a measure that tended to avert war or to promote or strengthen international relations. It did not make for neutrality because it sought to deprive Americans of freedom of action in the event of foreign wars and, as I have indicated, it notified in advance that our government would not differentiate between autocratic nations who violated international law and the victim of such violation. It certainly tended to undermine the Kellogg-Briand Pact and interfered with trade agreements which our Government had promoted. Undoubtedly it stimulated the world race in armament and greatly increased expenditures by nations great and small for armaments and preparations for war.

The embargo is not a neutral measure. It repeals in part the international law of neutrality. It is not the duty of neutrals to keep in even balance between both belligerents. If equal opportunity is afforded to belligerents the exactions of neutrals are met.

The important question before us is to determine what we are willing to sacrifice in the hope of escaping being drawn into the conflict. The United States, in considering its present interests, may conclude that the surrendering of rights, though precious and important, may avoid its involvement in international conflicts.

Obviously, a neutral nation is at liberty to waive a right, even though it may eventuate in some undesirable results. Under international law there is no question but that the United States has the right to carry on trade and commerce with belligerents as well as neutral nations, and an important question is whether the benefits to be derived by the American people from such waiver of conceded and recognized rights justify such renunciation.

If time permitted I could cite scores of authorities supporting the proposition that it is not unneutral for the United States to repeal the present Neutrality Act or to sell munitions of war and supplies to France and Great Britain or to other nations.

Unanimity of opinion does not always attend legislation, particularly where important issues are involved. The act of 1937 met with opposition, and it is now admitted that such opposition was warranted. And the measure now before us, though strongly supported by the President, and, I believe, by a majority of the American people, encounters opposition by sincere and patriotic Americans.

I am not in agreement with all of its provisions, particularly the one which may seriously affect our legitimate trade and commerce in the Pacific area. But, as indicated by the President, the repeal of the embargo is so necessary and vital that the pending measure will receive support from some who do not approve of all its provisions.

All Americans pray that peace may soon come to this disordered world, and I am sure it is the desire of all Senators to aid in that objective.

It may be said that there are other things more important than money or property or even life itself. I refer to honor and liberty, the triumph of justice, and the perpetuity of democracy. The American people joined in the World War because they believed that the cause in which they enlisted sought to preserve civilization and establish justice and liberty and righteousness and to advance moral and spiritual principles which must persist if a reversion to barbarism is to be averted.

It is to be hoped that they may not again be called upon to make such sacrifices.

Pending Neutrality Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSIAH W. BAILEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 12 (legislative day of Wednesday October 4), 1939

REPORTS OF CIVIL AERONAUTICS AUTHORITY AND MARITIME COMMISSION

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I have a report of the Civil Aeronautics Authority on the effect of the proposed neutrality legislation, as well as a report of the Maritime Commission on the same subject. I desire to file these reports and ask that they be printed in the Appendix.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The reports are as follows:

MEMORANDUM FROM CIVIL AERONAUTICS AUTHORITY—EFFECT OF PROPOSED NEUTRALITY LEGISLATION ON INTERNATIONAL TRANSPORT OPERATIONS OF AMERICAN AIR CARRIERS

In enacting the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, Congress declared in section 2 that in the exercise and performance of its powers and duties under this act, the Authority should consider as being in the public interest and in accordance with the public convenience and necessity, the encouragement and development of an air transportation system properly adapted to the present and future needs of the foreign and domestic commerce of the United States, of the Postal Service, and of the national defense, and the encouragement and development of civil aeronautics. On September 29, 1939, House Joint Resolution 306 was reported from the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. It is difficult to foresee the effect of such legislation on the international operations of American air carriers during a period when a state of war has been proclaimed by the President to exist between two countries.

The proposed legislation, by reason of the inclusion of the word "aircraft" in the definition of "vessel," found in section 15, is applicable to air transportation as well as to surface transportation. At the outset it should be pointed out that aircraft are limited in their operation by reason of their cruising range and available landing areas. Furthermore, except as provision is made by convention, treaty, or other international arrangement, aircraft of one country are not permitted to utilize the air space over or to land on the territory of a second country. Where such rights are accorded, they are generally given on a reciprocal basis. It is equally important to point out that if the landing rights are granted, the country so granting them expects to derive certain benefits by way of the carriage of its nationals and its mail.

From a technical standpoint, it is possible for present-day aircraft successfully to make the flight nonstop from the United States to Europe. However, to do so requires the transportation of such large fuel loads as practically to eliminate any pay load, thereby making the operation economically unsound. In the conduct of both the trans-Atlantic service and the South American services the American international air carrier makes regular stops at possessions of one or more of the present belligerents. Without such stops, the carrier would find it almost impossible to continue its operations.

The committee's draft of section 2 (g) provides certain exceptions with regard to transportation in the Western Hemisphere south of 30° north latitude. In other words, the American international air carrier is exempted from the provisions of 2 (a) and 2 (c) to the extent that it may be permitted, subject to such restrictions, rules, and regulations as the President may prescribe, to transport to any place in the Western Hemisphere south of 30° north latitude mail, passengers, personal effects of passengers and crew, and any articles or materials which are to be used exclusively by such aircraft. The carrier, however, is not permitted to transport air express or freight.

The legislation as presently drafted has a much more pronounced effect upon the existing trans-Atlantic service. The carrier operates over one of two routes, the northern or the southern. The

northern route makes stops at Shediac, New Brunswick, and Botwood, Newfoundland, thence to Foynes, Ireland, and Southampton, England. The southern route follows a course by way of the Island of Bermuda to Horta, the Azores; Lisbon, Portugal, and thence to Marseilles, France. By reason of the European conflagration, the service on the northern and the southern routes has been terminated at Foynes, Ireland, and Lisbon, Portugal, respectively. Shediac, New Brunswick; Botwood, Newfoundland; and the Island of Bermuda are all British possessions. The language of section 2 (g) (1) and (2) as presently drawn is not broad enough to permit stops at these British ports under such restrictions, rules, and regulations as may be prescribed by the President, for only points in the Western Hemisphere south of 30° north latitude come within the exemption. Since all of these points are north of this geographical line, service conducted over the northern route must proceed nonstop from a point in the United States to Foynes, Ireland, and over the southern route from a point in the United States to Horta, the Azores. The effect of the legislation, therefore, would be practically to prohibit flight over the northern route and greatly to restrict operations over the southern route.

The distance between New York and the Azores is approximately 2,365 miles. For a time the carrier conducted nonstop operations over this sector of the trans-Atlantic route. From the outset it was admitted that by stopping at Bermuda a larger pay load might be carried. With the outbreak of hostilities and the resultant reduction of schedules operated by European merchantmen, there was a greatly augmented demand for passenger space on the trans-Atlantic air service. It was determined advisable, therefore, to authorize the carrier to make regular stops at Bermuda, for by doing so the carrier is able to increase its trans-Atlantic pay load and revenues by almost 50 percent. The shorter flight from the Azores to Bermuda does not require the fuel load that is necessitated for the longer flight from the Azores to New York. The gross load of the aircraft is limited; if the aircraft is heavily loaded with fuel, there is a corresponding decrease in the amount of weight which may be devoted to the transportation of revenue-producing traffic.

One other important consideration enters into the operations over the southern route. Not infrequently weather conditions between Horta, the Azores, and the United States are such that a stop must be made at Bermuda for refueling purposes. If the stop at that point is prohibited, the schedule must be held over at the Azores until weather conditions change, or the carrier, in order to complete the flight, must engage in a hazardous enterprise.

The air transportation service between the United States and Europe is particularly valuable during periods of emergency, for it offers a safe, expeditious, and reliable medium for the transportation of confidential communications between this country and Europe.

It is suggested that if the trans-Atlantic air transportation service is to continue, that an exception should be made in the proposed legislation exempting aircraft from the provisions of section 2 (a) and (c), permitting them to stop at the three points heretofore named, and to transport mail, passengers, personal effects of individuals on the aircraft, air express, and necessary supplies for the operation of the aircraft between New York or Baltimore and Bermuda or Newfoundland.

A third effect of the proposed neutrality legislation is to be found in the language of section 2 (g) (3). While the language permits American aircraft to transport mail, passengers, personal effects of passengers and crew, and necessary supplies for such aircraft from the United States to any port on the Pacific Ocean or the China Sea, it does not permit the transportation of air express or freight from the United States to these ports. It is not believed that there is any substantial reason for placing such restrictions upon air transportation services on the Pacific.

A further effect of the language of section 2 (g) is to be found in the words "from any port in the United States," in line 12 of said section. This language has a result which it is believed was not in the minds of the committee. As the bill now stands, an American air carrier could carry a passenger from Miami to Jamaica and could also carry a passenger from Jamaica to Colombia, but since the exemption is only for transportation from ports in the United States, the aircraft could not carry a passenger from Colombia to Jamaica. Since much of the traffic carried on American international routes in the Western Hemisphere is between and from points in the Caribbean from and to points in South America, it is submitted that there would be a real effect upon the revenues of the carrier.

To cure the effects which have heretofore been pointed out, it is suggested that the language of 2 (g), insofar as it applies to the operation of aircraft, should be amended to permit the transportation of air express and freight. Furthermore, it is suggested that the language of the present clause 3 of section 2 (g) might be amended to read as follows: "or (3) to transportation by aircraft to any point on the Pacific Ocean or the China Sea or in the Western Hemisphere of mail, passengers, personal effects of individuals on such aircraft, air express, and necessary supplies for such aircraft."

American international air carriers therefore would be able to continue operations on their present scale, except as they might be controlled by restrictions, rules, and regulations prescribed by the President.

The discussions thus far have assumed that service to England and France would not be conducted so long as a state of war exists. Obviously, when a country is at war, there is an effect upon air transportation. Furthermore, the combat areas which may be designated might be of such a nature as to prohibit the use by the air carrier of the terminal points Foynes, Ireland, or Lisbon, Portugal. If such be the case, the trans-Atlantic service, of necessity, would cease. Such, however, are contingencies which cannot be foreseen, nor can their effect be appraised.

The Neutrality Bill (H. J. Res. 306) and Its Effect on the Merchant Marine and Associated Industries, and on the Domestic Economy

[As revised]

The policy of the United States with respect to its merchant marine has been a positive one since 1916. It is designed to furnish shipping services adequate for maintaining the flow of American water-borne foreign commerce and capable of serving as a naval and military auxiliary in time of a national emergency. It provides, further, that the American merchant marine should be owned and operated under our flag, by our citizens. The Government has encouraged private investment in shipping. It has subsidized it so that American labor, industry, and commercial interests would benefit from its uninterrupted services in world markets. American citizens are trained to be its officers and seamen.

House Joint Resolution 306, as reported in the Senate, if enacted into law, would prescribe, in lieu of the existing Neutrality Act of 1935, as amended in 1936 and 1937, regulations which would sharply restrict American foreign trade and shipping during any war in which the United States is neutral. The prohibitions and restrictions imposed, however, upon our merchant marine by the pending legislation, if enacted, would seriously endanger the progress the Nation has already made in this direction.

It is the purpose of the Government to maintain our Nation at peace. This is a worthy objective, but the means employed should be carefully considered.

It is not believed necessary to arrest the progress we have made in creating a strong merchant marine by legislation as far-reaching as that proposed by House Joint Resolution 306 in order to preserve our neutrality. Neither is it necessary to disrupt our national economy and disturb labor conditions to the extent proposed.

The effect of the proposed law will be briefly examined in this survey as it relates to:

A. The American merchant ships;
B. The shipping and associated industries; and
C. The movement of commodities and the national economy.

Part A.—Effect of the Proposed Law on the American Merchant Ships

United States documented vessels of ocean-going size engaged in the transportation of passengers and dry cargo in our foreign trade (excluding the Great Lakes) number 326 of 2,150,000 gross tons. Forty-four of these vessels of 308,000 tons are owned by the Government, the remaining 182 of 1,842,000 gross tons by private American operators.

Of this foreign-trade fleet of 326 vessels of 2,150,000 tons, less than half, or 150 vessels of a million tons, are operating under subsidy contracts.

As of October 2, 1939, 29 of the 326 vessels under discussion were temporarily inactive (performing repairs, awaiting schedule in particular trades, or for similar reasons). Two hundred and ninety-seven vessels of 1,923,500 tons were actively engaged in serving the foreign ocean-borne commerce of the United States.

The figures stated do not include the American tanker fleet engaged in carrying liquid cargoes. A total of 365 such ships of 2,678,000 tons are documented under the laws of the United States. Such vessels often are shifted between foreign and domestic runs, and the operation of particular tankers is not generally associated with a particular trade route, as is the case with passenger and dry-cargo vessels.

It is impossible to foresee or appraise the precise effects of the proposed legislation upon the American merchant marine. For example, the legislation will undoubtedly affect the American tanker operations, but the ramifications of the tanker problem are so great that no definite prediction can be made at present as to how many of the 365 tankers will be affected, nor to what extent.

With respect to the passenger and dry cargo vessels, the effects of the proposed legislation can be predicted. Predicated upon "combat areas" which might be prescribed in view of present conditions, upon the assumption that the list of "belligerents" is not enlarged, and enactment of the bill in substantially its present form, some fairly definite results can be stated.

Approximately 130 American dry cargo, combination, or passenger ships of about 860,000 gross tons would be withdrawn from service. The lines upon which the great majority of these ships operate would be abandoned.

In addition to the 130 ships in foreign trade, 16 American ships of approximately 80,000 gross tons (dry cargo and tank vessels usually considered a part of our coastwise fleet but principally engaged in trade between Atlantic, Gulf, and Pacific ports of the United States and Canadian ports) could no longer operate as at present.

Estimates indicate that between 165 and 170 American dry cargo, combination, or passenger ships of about 1,100,000 gross tons could continue to operate in foreign trade, much as at present, although

more than half of these (in number and tonnage) would be adversely affected, some seriously. The uncertainty as to the future of some of these operations, however, is illustrated by the fact that if it became necessary to enter a "combat area" to serve Mediterranean ports, 20 vessels of 108,000 gross tons immediately would be withdrawn, and 7 other vessels of 74,000 gross tons would have to be rerouted so drastically it is possible their continued operation might no longer be practicable.

On the basis of 130 dry cargo, combination, or passenger ships which would doubtless be withdrawn under the proposed legislation, it is apparent that more than 47 percent by number and 44 percent by tonnage of the American-flag active foreign trade fleet could no longer operate on present trade routes.

The trade routes affected and the approximate number of ships which would be withdrawn from them are as follows:

Route	Number of ships	Gross tonnage
United States North Atlantic-continental Europe	31	233,316
United States North Atlantic-United Kingdom and Ireland	4	21,148
United States North Atlantic-Mediterranean and Black Sea	4	37,438
United States North Atlantic-Australasia	4	24,171
United States North Atlantic-India	4	22,918
United States North Atlantic-Atlantic Canada	4	22,456
United States North Atlantic-Red Sea-Persian Gulf-India	7	42,146
United States North Atlantic-Baltic-Scandinavian area	6	32,824
United States North Atlantic and Gulf-South and East Africa	10	66,922
United States North Atlantic and Gulf-West Africa	6	32,449
South Atlantic United States-continental Europe	6	30,212
Atlantic United States-certain Caribbean ports	1	6,336
United States Gulf-United Kingdom and Ireland	13	80,409
United States Gulf-continental Europe	23	141,572
United States Pacific coast-Australasia	2	36,034
United States Pacific coast-United Kingdom and Continent	5	30,039
	130	860,390

An examination of the prospects for rerouting American vessels affected by the proposed prohibitions shows very little prospect of profitable employment for such vessels in services from the United States to nonbelligerent countries and possessions. Very few foreign vessels have been withdrawn from the South American trade. The South American trade volume may increase, but steady employment for more than 100 additional American ships, or even a considerable portion of them, cannot be visualized. Similarly, trans-Pacific trade with the Orient has declined within the last year, and there appears no room for any number of additional vessels in that trade.

During the past 2 years the Maritime Commission has ordered for itself or in conjunction with private operators 137 new vessels of more than a million tons. Twenty-two of these already have been launched, and those upon which trials have been held have proved to be the most efficient of their types in the world. The Government and the shipowners are investing about $300,000,000 in these 137 new vessels.

The benefits of this program extended to American labor and American producers of materials in every State of the Union.

The ships already ordered constitute only part performance of an orderly long-range replacement program involving a total of 500 new ships to be constructed over a period of 10 years at a total cost of $1,250,000,000.

Should the principle of House Joint Resolution 306 become the established policy of the United States, many if not all of the new ships ordered or planned would face a very doubtful future and represent extremely poor risk from the investment standpoint.

PART B.—EFFECT OF THE PROPOSED LAW ON THE SHIPPING AND ASSOCIATED INDUSTRIES

The withdrawal of the 130 American flag vessels which would be affected by enactment of the proposed neutrality legislation from the services in which they are now engaged without placing them profitably in other trades would result in losses to maritime labor, shipyards, suppliers of materials, insurance companies, and ship operators, and also in losses to the Government. Suitable reallocation of the ships is unlikely. The following analysis points out these losses.

Loss of business and unemployment (other than administrative personnel)

A conception of the loss of business and the resultant effect if the services under consideration were discontinued and the ships laid up, may be gained by considering the figures for the calendar year 1938. Gross revenues received by the steamship lines which would be affected, from freight, passengers and mail, amounted to approximately $73,000,000. This revenue was disbursed in part for wages, materials, supplies or services performed in the United States, as follows:

Wages	$10,500,000
Food, stores, supplies, and maintenance, purchased in the United States	6,200,000
Repairs performed in the United States	5,800,000
Insurance premiums	3,500,000
Fuel	8,500,000
Other vessel expense	1,000,000
Total vessel expense, including wages	35,500,000

In addition to the amounts shown above, amounts well in excess of $1,000,000 each were spent for use of terminals, the services of domestic agents, brokerage, employment of tugboats with their crews, pilots and many other services necessary for the operation of steamships. One of the largest items of expense was for the employment of stevedores. Because our records do not contain a break-down of the respective amounts spent in the United States and foreign countries, we can only give a rough estimate of the cost of such services, in the United States, viz, between $9,000,000 and $10,000,000.

Because of the large number of persons which would be affected by a disruption or curtailment of steamship services and because of the intermittent employment of some of them it is difficult to give actual data. It is estimated that between 8,500 and 9,000 seamen are now employed on vessels engaged in services which would have to be abandoned or curtailed. While a few of these men would be retained to preserve the vessels in lay-up, the vast majority would have to be released to seek other employment. Correspondingly, stevedores, repair yard workers, ship chandlers, and many others would be forced out of employment.

This loss or curtailment of employment as regards stevedoring and fuel cost presupposes that neutral or other foreign-flag lines would not be in a position to handle all of the commerce which would be relinquished by the withdrawal of American-flag vessels. The other items mentioned would not be expended in the United States to anything approaching the figures stated, even if foreign-flag vessels are available. The crews of foreign vessels are hired abroad; and repair, insurance, and other expenditures are made abroad whenever practicable.

Trained seagoing personnel for commerce and national defense

The merchant marine training program which has been inaugurated would be adversely affected. It is not likely that young men would wish to continue to train for a career at sea on American vessels in the face of the uncertainties which would attend the operation of such vessels if the proposed law becomes our national policy.

Governmental investment in trade routes

The United States has invested large sums in the development of trade routes from which it would be necessary to withdraw our ships if House Joint Resolution 306 were enacted. Regardless of whether the ships could be allocated to other routes, the Government's investment in the abandoned routes would be lost.

The enormous losses and expenditures occasioned by our lack of ships during the World War period convinced the people of the United States that an American merchant marine is a necessity. At the end of the World War period a great number of ships were constructed or under construction for the Government; and it was decided to operate these ships for Government account in the development of trade routes found essential to the flow of our foreign commerce until such time as the lines serving such routes could be sold to private operators, the Government absorbing the losses during that period. After the sale of many of the lines governmental aid in their operation was found necessary. This aid was first rendered in the form of ocean-mail contracts and more recently as differential subsidies.

Except insofar as the governmental expenditures for trade-route development may be considered written off as a premium to insure the availability of ships for the national defense, the sums expended may properly be considered an investment by the United States in the development of good will and in the absorption of pioneering and development expenses.

The amount of such governmental expenditure in the development of the routes it is not now proposed to abandon by reason of legislation which, if enacted, would necessitate the withdrawal of our ships is stated in the following table for the period from 1923 to September 30, 1939. This table includes operating losses sustained by the Government, ocean-mail payments, and operating-differential subsidy. Governmental ship operating losses prior to 1923 cannot readily be segregated by routes and services.

Governmental expenditure

Route:	
U. S. North Atlantic–continental Europe	$65,426,000
U. S. North Atlantic–United Kingdom and Ireland	13,697,000
U. S. North Atlantic–Mediterranean and Black Seas	[1] 18,166,000
U. S. North Atlantic–Australasia	5,304,000
U. S. North Atlantic–India	6,302,000
U. S. North Atlantic–Atlantic Canada	4,616,000
U. S. North Atlantic–Red Sea-Persian Gulf-India	
U. S. North Atlantic–Baltic-Scandinavian area	8,810,000
U. S. North Atlantic and Gulf–South and East Africa	4,778,000
U. S. North Atlantic and Gulf–West Africa	5,709,000
U. S. South Atlantic–continental Europe	6,866,000
U. S. Atlantic–certain Caribbean ports	
U. S. Gulf–United Kingdom and Ireland	82,096,000
U. S. Gulf–continental Europe	
U. S. Pacific coast–Australasia	8,801,000
U. S. Pacific coast–United Kingdom and Continent	
Total	230,571,000

[1] It is estimated that about two-thirds of the American-flag tonnage on this route could continue to operate for the present, but one-third would be immediately withdrawn.

Goodwill

As previously stated, the gross revenues derived from the operations of steamships which would be forced to lay up if House Joint Resolution 306 were enacted amounted to $73,000,000 in 1938.

The shipping business, being highly competitive, cannot be dropped and reentered at will. Shipping goodwill is an asset which is built up gradually. A period of pioneering must be gone through to secure business; good agency relations must be reestablished and solicitation must proceed along definite channels. Should the vessels be laid up for even a year it would be many years before they could regain their present position in the trades.

The business which has been obtained by these American-flag lines is the result of years of effort on the part of the American owners striving to obtain a portion of the water-borne export and import foreign commerce of the United States. Business which is presently being obtained has for the most part been wrested away from foreign competitors in spite of the handicaps of older vessels and higher costs than those of competitors. The odds against American-flag shipping have within the past few years been progressively decreased through the introduction of faster and more modern vessels; and Government aid, in the case of the subsidized lines, has tended to reduce the cost differential against us. Current shipbuilding activities within the United States promise still greater reduction of these odds.

The goodwill of shippers has been obtained not so much through patriotism, but through dependency, frequency, and regularity of service. The curtailment or abandonment of a steamship line will of necessity force the shipper to seek service elsewhere, and he will continue to patronize, even in normal times, a line which has best served him and protected his interests in emergencies. We are witnessing more and more a trend of American shippers to support American-flag vessels.

Although it is impossible to determine what would be the financial condition of American steamship companies affected by the proposed neutrality legislation at the end of the effective period of the law, it is likely that they would not be in position to reestablish operations on any trade route.

Organization

The steamship companies which would be affected if the operations of their lines were suspended by reason of House Joint Resolution 306, if enacted, have been built up over a number of years and comprise trained and expert employees. These companies also have well-established foreign agencies employing many American cititzens who have necessarily established permanent residences abroad. During the year 1938 the salaries of officers and employees allocated to the particular services which would be affected amounted to approximately $4,800,000. This figure does not, of course, include general office and other administrative expense, such as rent, light, heat and power, stationery, office supplies, etc. The figure does not include salaries of officers and employees of the various domestic-agency companies whose livelihood is dependent upon the steamship lines which would suspend operations.

The abandonment or serious curtailment of these steamship lines would result in almost complete disorganization of these operating companies and agencies; employees would have to be reduced to the barest minimum if the vessels were placed in lay-up; offices would be closed, and personnel be scattered to find or attempt to find other employment. This disorganization would be one of the most serious features involved in a restriction of these steamship services; and if normal service was resumed at some future time, these companies would have serious difficulty in again collecting efficient staffs.

Lay-up expense

The cost involved in the withdrawal of ships from operation, their preparation for a long period of lay-up, and their maintenance and preservation while in lay-up is almost impossible to forecast without a thorough and detailed study, which would take into consideration such factors as the policy of the owners, availability and location of points of lay-up, and methods employed in preservation. The preparation of a vessel for a long period of lay-up necessitates the opening up of machinery—coating machinery, deck and cargo gear, and other movable parts with proper lubrication; the removal to shore and storage of navigating gear, instruments, bedding, and other equipment which would be subjected to damage from moisture, etc. In the case of passenger vessels, depending on the location and the period of lay-up, it might be necessary or advisable to remove cabin, saloon, public hall, and other furnishings for protection against loss by theft or damage from moths, moisture, etc. When the vessels were again to be placed in operation it would be necessary to go through the reverse of this process. We are unable to give an estimate of the cost which would be involved in the process of preparing for lay-up and coming out of lay-up, but they would be very substantial.

The cost of maintaining the 130 vessels under consideration while in lay-up would be variable, depending upon the company's policy and methods employed. A reasonably low estimate of the cost would be in the neighborhood of $6,000,000 per annum.

Depreciation

The annual depreciation charges on the vessels involved amounts to substantially in excess of $5,000,000. If House Joint Resolution 306 were enacted, there would be no revenue accruing to the affected companies against which this amount could be charged, and the enforced idleness of the ships for a year or several years would not prolong their lives for a corresponding period because of the elements of obsolescence, and the more rapid deterioration of vessels while in lay-up than while in operation. The amount quoted does not include any estimate of depreciation on the vessels owned by the United States, since no depreciation is charged against them under Governmental accounting practice.

Amortization Payments and Interest on Mortgages

Additional charges which must be met by the owners in cash each year are the interest payments on mortgage indebtedness on the vessels as well as amortization of such mortgages. No earnings would be available from the operation of the ships out of which to meet these payments if the proposed legislation were enacted. It is estimated that amortization and interest on vessel mortgages would approximate $3,400,000 annually, of which approximately $2,600,000 represents payments on obligations held by the United States Government. It seems needless to point out that unless a moratorium is granted for the payment of this indebtedness that the steamship companies, without any income, would deplete all of their reserves, and undoubtedly many would be thrown into bankruptcy.

Reallocation

As previously stated with regard to the 130 vessels, which would be withdrawn from their trades as a result of enactment of the proposed legislation, prospects for their reallocation are not encouraging.

The problem is here considered, not from the standpoint of the effect on the owners of the vessels themselves, but with respect to the effect on the other elements of the merchant marine if the 130 vessels were allocated to other trades. The trades in which the vessels would be permitted to engage have, in normal times, had adequate tonnage, and thus far there has been no serious shortage of ships because of the withdrawal of foreign flag vessels. In the protected trades of the United States there is normally more than sufficient tonnage, and the same may be said with regard to the South American trade. The withdrawal of American flag vessels from trades serving belligerent ports would prompt the owners to seek employment for their vessels either in the protected trades of the United States or the South American trade, and inasmuch as the Commission would have little control over the operation of nonsubsidized lines, the introduction of these vessels in other trades would be detrimental to the line now engaged in that trade, and would probably yield very little profit to the line which was added.

Shipyards and Shipbuilding

As previously stated, 129 ships are now ordered or under construction in the United States as a part of the Government's 10-year ship construction program which calls for 500 new vessels.

The necessity for this program is illustrated by the fact that of the 326 dry cargo, combination, and passenger ships comprising the foreign trade fleet, 287 vessels, of 1,740,000 gross tons (or 81 percent), will be 20 years old by 1942.

While the Commission does not contemplate cancelation of any orders already placed for new ships, the uncertain future of our shipping under the proposed legislation might interfere with the long-range program for the building up of a strong merchant marine, inasmuch as we are presented with a possibility of legislation which will doubtless seriously affect the carriage of foreign commerce in American-flag ships throughout the world.

The probable effect upon shipyard labor of any dislocations in our shipbuilding program is realized when it is recalled that the industry requires a large staff of technical employees skilled in the art and science of shipbuilding, as well as many semiskilled and unskilled workmen. Labor in industries such as the iron and steel, and other industries which supply materials which go into a ship, will likewise be affected. The cost of a ship is about equally divided into two parts—one half being the cost of construction and assembly within the shipyard and the other half representing the cost of materials and equipment purchased from allied industries. Considering shipyard labor and labor in allied industries, it has been estimated that about 85 percent of the cost of building a ship is labor.

The importance of shipbuilding in the national economy is indicated by the fact that materials and equipment used in shipbuilding involve directly or indirectly practically every known industry and are supplied in varying quantities from every State in the country.

Ship repairing is quite as essential to the maintenance of a merchant marine as the building of the ships. During the lifetime of a ship an average expenditure equal to at least three-fourths of its original cost is required for upkeep, surveys, modernization, and repair. Hence, not only would the taking out of service of 130 of our merchant vessels result in throwing out of employment many shipyard workers which normally would be given employment in connection with repair work, but if the long-range construction program were seriously influenced by the proposed legislation, the loss to our shipyards and repair yards will be felt for many years after the actual period of construction now contemplated.

PART C—EFFECT OF AMERICAN FOREIGN TRADE AND NATIONAL ECONOMY

The disruption of certain of our shipping services as a result of the enactment of the pending neutrality bill would unquestionably have a marked effect upon our national economy. The industries of the United States are dependent to a marked degree upon a number of strategic and critical commodities, many of which are not produced in this country and must be imported from abroad. Any factor which would tend to curtail the importation of these com-

modities or bring about substantial increases in ocean-freight rates would affect the price American industry would have to pay for its raw materials, and in turn, the price paid for the finished product by the ultimate consumer.

The following analysis of the more essential strategic commodities indicates the extent to which the United States is dependent upon foreign sources of supply as well as their importance in our national economy.

The most important strategic commodities in relation to key industries in the United States and from the standpoint of the shipping problems involved in the event a neutrality law similar to the bill now under consideration is enacted are the following: Tin, rubber, manganese, chromium.

Tin

In 1938 this country imported 52,166 long tons of tin ore which came principally from British Malaya. Approximately one-third of our consumption is used in the manufacture of tin plate. The remainder is used for the various alloys such as solder, babbitt, tin foil, etc. Tin is also used in the production of brasses and bronze, as well as in the production of tin salts, of which the latter product is important in the ceramic and textile industries. At the present time the United States is able to produce approximately one-third of its requirements from scrap tin plate and alloys.

In 1938 the steel industry produced 1,430,000 gross tons of tin plate, of which 79.5 percent went to the container industry. Considering the tin-can and other tinware industries, 1937 figures show that the wages paid the 33,145 wage earners amounted to $37,000,000, and that the value of the products was $359,000,000. In 1937 the canning and perserving industries handling fruits, vegetables, fish, and other sea foods, employed 155,000 wage earners to produce products valued at $867,000,000 paying them $101,000,000 in wages.

In 1938 American vessels transported 33 percent of our tin imports; the vessels of present belligerent countries, 34 percent; other foreign-flag vessels, 33 percent. In 1938, 89 percent of the tin imported into this country came from present belligerent countries.

Freedom of ocean transport is a vital factor in our supply and under present conditions it is believed that the requirements of American industry for tin plate will increase to a considerable extent.

It was estimated that at the end of August 1939 there was on hand in the United States 8,967 long tons of tin, which was sufficient under normal consumption for only 1½ months. (See appendix No. 1.)

Rubber

In 1938, 427,200 long tons of rubber were imported into the United States, of which the principal sources were British Malaya and Netherlands Indies. In this same year 70 percent of our rubber came from countries that are now belligerents; 52 percent was transported in vessels of present belligerent countries; 19 percent in American-flag vessels; and 29 percent in neutral foreign-flag vessels.

The manufacturers of rubber goods must depend entirely upon imports. Approximately 80 percent of the rubber consumed in our rubber manufacturing industry, which is the largest in the world, is used in the manufacture of tires and inner tubes. The remainder is utilized in the manufacture of boots and shoes, rubber hose, druggists supplies, and other miscellaneous products. On a value basis, crude rubber is the most important single commodity imported into the United States. About one-half of the total imports of this commodity have been carried in recent years by British vessels, and about one-fifth by American vessels. The total domestic stocks of crude rubber on hand, including those in transit is estimated at 160,000 tons, a supply sufficient to last from 2 to 3 months.

In 1937 the rubber products industries consumed 531,000 gross tons of crude rubber in the manufacture of products valued at $883,000,000; the wages paid the 130,000 wage earners amounted to $171,000,000. In 1937, the motor vehicle industry, which is dependent on the rubber industry, produced products valued at $3,096,000,000, and paid 195,000 wage earners $316,000,000. In that same year the motor vehicle parts and bodies industries produced products valued at $2,080,000,000, and paid its 285,000 wage earners $440,000,000. (See appendix No. 2.)

Manganese

During 1938 the United States imported 170,000 long tons of manganese ore, which came largely from Russia and the British Gold Coast. Thirty-four percent of this commodity was shipped from present belligerent countries. Thirteen percent was carried in vessels of European nations now at war, 14 percent in American-flag vessels, and 73 percent in neutral foreign-flag vessels.

This commodity is essential in the production of steel, and is one of the most important strategic materials in which this country is deficient. It is estimated that from 14 to 18 pounds of manganese is used in the production of each ton of steel. The United States produces normally about 3 percent of its requirements for the steel industry, and about 65 percent for the manufacture of dry cell batteries. Of the total amount of manganese used, however, imports supply over 75 percent of our industrial requirements. At the end of 1938 there were 840,000 tons of imported manganese ore in Government warehouses. It is estimated that this supply would be sufficient to last only about a year at the normal rate of steel production.

In 1937 the steel works and rolling-mill products industries in which manganese is used as an essential material employed 479,000 wage earners, who were paid $780,000,000 in wages. The value of the products of these industries amounted to $3,330,000,000. (See appendix No. 3.)

Chromium

During 1938 the United States imported 301,745 long tons of chromium, principally from East and South Africa, the Philippines, Turkey, New Caledonia, and Cuba. Fifty-nine percent of this commodity was shipped from ports located in present belligerent countries. Sixty-two and one-half percent was transported in American-flag vessels; 17½ percent in vessels of nations now considered belligerents; and 20 percent in neutral foreign-flag vessels. Chrome ore is used largely in the manufacture of ferrochrome for the alloy-steel industry. It is important for both military and peacetime industries. The United States is dependent upon imports for 99 percent of its requirements. This point, together with the fact that American-flag vessels are now transporting over 60 percent of our supply, indicates clearly the importance of American vessels in the transportation of this commodity for supplying vital industries in this country. (See appendix No. 4.)

Among the other strategic commodities necessary to American industry, tungsten is highly important. It comprises from 17 to 18 percent of the weight of high-speed tool steel. This commodity could be produced in the United States to take care of our industrial needs, although the cost would be great. One of the largest importers of tungsten in the United States specifies the use of American bottoms in all contracts which he is making at present for the importation of tungsten into this country from foreign sources, the reason for this being that he wants to insure the greatest safety in the transportation of this essential commodity.

More than 50 percent of the items we import may be classified as strategic or critical commodities either because we cannot produce them in this country or, if we can, the cost would be exceedingly high. For example, consider four industries that play an important part in our national economy—the automotive, drug, food, and communications. The automotive industry uses considerable quantities of tin, rubber, chrome, manganese, nickel, shellac, cork, and a number of other commodities which we may be able to produce only in small quantities, or not at all, and for which we must depend entirely upon foreign sources for our supply. In fact, it has recently been said that every State in the Union and 57 foreign countries contribute material for American-made automobiles.

The drug industry needs iodine, castor oil, opium, camphor, menthol, and quinine. A large part of our food industry is dependent almost entirely upon the importation of coffee, tea, cocoa, spices, tropical fruits, nuts, etc. The telephone industry needs flax, tin, rubber, mica, nickel, and platinum. It may be said that there are few industries that do not require commodities from abroad in order to carry on their business. Those employed in the tire, steel, automotive, oil, garage, trucking, taxi, and automobile-repair trades would be directly affected if the importation of one commodity—rubber—was substantially curtailed.

The total or partial withdrawal of American-flag vessels from certain of the essential trade routes would have the effect of placing American commerce moving on those routes in the hands of foreign-flag services. Experience in the last war taught that when we are forced to depend upon foreign-flag vessels to carry our commodities freight rates increase to high levels. It is to be expected that during the conflict in Europe vessels of foreign nations will be placed in the most lucrative trades, which may reasonably be trades other than those vital in supplying American industries with such products as rubber, jute, tin, manganese, chrome ore, and chemicals. Any curtailment of the normal operation of those industries engaged in the production of iron and steel, automobiles, machinery, tin products, rubber goods, chemical products, and drugs, to mention only a few, would probably affect to a considerable degree labor, industry, railway and highway transportation, agriculture, and commercial activities in general. Although it might be possible to obtain these essential imports by the utilization of foreign-flag services, rates might be expected to advance as a result of the functioning of the law of supply and demand. This was experienced in the last European war, and our national economy was severely affected as a result of the high shipping rates which were imposed. (See appendixes Nos. 5 and 5–A.)

Export trade

Normally our exports represent about 10 percent of the value of the movable goods produced in the United States, and the state of our national economy is in a large measure determined by our ability to sell this surplus in foreign markets. In 1938 it is estimated that 9 percent of our total production was exported to foreign countries. The indicated 1938 ratio was thus only 1 point lower than the 10 percent of production annually exported in the period from 1925 to 1929. The fact that foreign markets were able to absorb about 10 percent of our total production in 1938 was an important sustaining influence on the volume of production in the United States, particularly in the first half of the year, when domestic trade underwent a substantial shrinkage. The ability to export this 10 percent of our total production oftentimes may mean the difference between prosperity and depression in the United States. In 1938 exports amounted to $3,094,00,000, while imports amounted to $1,961,000,000.

If we do not import, or are prevented from importing essential requirements, foreign nations will not be able to buy as much of our cotton, tobacco, grain, oil, iron, and steel, and a great many other commodities that make up a large segment of our national

economy. The following table shows the percentage export trade is of total domestic production for 11 important commodities:

Percentage export trade is of total production

Commodity:	
Aircraft and parts, except engines	33.0
Cotton	30.5
Lubricating oil	30.2
Tobacco leaf	29.6
Tractors	19.4
Agricultural implements and machinery	14.5
Industrial machinery	14.4
Automobiles, including passenger cars, trucks and busses	14.0
Gas, oil, and fuel oil	9.8
Motor fuel	8.0
Crude petroleum	6.4

It was estimated, for example, that the amount of time devoted to producing for export in 1936 represented the equivalent of the full-time services of 2,000,000 workers, not including the thousands engaged in transportation, banking, brokerage, insurance, advertising, merchandising, and other services. Indirectly more than 1,000,000 additional full-time workers were estimated as being employed as a result of our export trade in supplying the necessary commodities to take care of the needs for the number engaged primarily in industries which do a large export trade.

If, as a result of the pending Neutrality Act, American ships will be prohibited from carrying articles or materials to ports of belligerent nations, a substantial number of persons now working in those industries and services directly connected with export industries may be thrown out of work or have their income drastically curtailed.

The following table shows the importance, on a value basis, of our 10 leading export groups:

Ten leading exports on a valuation basis for the calendar year 1938

1. Unmanufactured cotton	$228,700,000
2. Unmanufactured tobacco	155,700,000
3. Crude petroleum	111,700,000
4. Gasoline and other motor fuels	103,500,000
5. Wheat	101,300,000
6. Passenger automobiles	100,100,000
7. Corn	94,500,000
8. Copper	86,800,000
9. Motortrucks	72,100,000
10. Aircraft	68,200,000

Appendix No. 6 is a statement showing values of the 10 principal commodities exported to nations now considered belligerents in 1938. Appendix No. 7 shows the same type of information to nonbelligerent nations.

Distribution of total exports of trade regions

Europe, normally our leading export market, took 43 percent of our total exports in 1938. Latin America ranked second, with 18 percent; Asia was third, with 17 percent; northern North America fourth, with 15 percent; Africa fifth, with 4 percent; and Oceania sixth, with 3 percent.

Of the above exports, the countries which are now belligerents purchased quantities which aggregated in value $559,900,000. This represented 50 percent of the total exports of the 10 commodities listed above.

During 1938 we also exported lumber sawmill products valued at $36,000,000, 49 percent of which was destined to countries which are now belligerents. Our exports of naval stores the same year amounted to $12,000,000, 49.4 percent of which went to present belligerent countries.

In 1938 this country exported to countries now considered belligerents such agricultural and forest products as tobacco, cotton, corn, wheat, lumber, and naval stores in the amount of $380,000,000. It is thus seen that any disruption of the exportation of these commodities would seriously affect industries upon which thousands of our citizens are dependent for a livelihood.

Considering our total foreign commerce in 1937, it is found that imports in the amount of $1,314,735,000 were received from present belligerent countries designated in the President's proclamations; our total imports for that year amounted to $3,010,000,000. Exports to countries that are now considered belligerent nations amounted in 1937 to $1,673,204,000 out of a total trade of $3,299,000,000. The large percentage of our foreign trade with present belligerent countries accentuates the possible effect upon our national economy of the enactmnt into law of the neutrality bill.

The lack of merchant ships at the outbreak of the World War caused enormous losses to American business. American consumers were affected because retail prices of certain products, the manufacture of which was dependent upon the importation of such raw products as rubber, tin, chromium, tungsten, aluminum, and wool, advanced to high levels.

Great Britain commandeered 1,500 of her merchantmen for war purposes, and German ships were withdrawn from service, leaving the United States with inadequate means for shipping our products to foreign markets and getting essential imports from those markets. Left almost entirely upon our own resources, our products were piled up in warehouses and elevators, in freight cars and upon docks, with few ships to transport them.

During this emergency the price of transporting a bale of cotton from the Gulf ports of the United States to Liverpool rose from $2.50 to $50 a bale. It is estimated that it cost this country $750,000,000 more to produce the cotton crop in 1914 than was received for it. The major portion of this huge loss was due to our lack of shipping facilities.

At the same time the cost of transporting wheat from the United States to Liverpool jumped from 8 cents a bushel in 1914 to 27 cents in 1915, and during the war reached the peak of $1.36 a bushel. One dollar per pound was being asked and obtained for packaged freight from New York to Marseilles. In this expensive fashion we had brought home sharply to us the folly of depending on ships of other countries to carry our foreign commerce. The lack of merchant ships during the World War period cost this country billions of dollars lost in trade and paid out in excessive emergency prices for ship tonnage.

Although the conditions set forth above with regard to prices and rates were in part the result of the United States being deficient in merchant vessels sufficient to handle our import and export trade, the same effects might readily be felt as a consequence of withdrawing certain American-flag vessels from the trade with present belligerent countries far removed from war zones.

Rates

The rate structure of ocean shipping would in all probability be drastically affected if the pending neutrality bill becomes law. At the present time freight rates are higher than normal because world conditions have so upset established routes as to increase the multiplicity of costs inherent in shipping charges. It is axiomatic that balanced-cargo shipments tend to reduce freight rates. Should it be necessary for vessels to proceed in ballast to a port of a belligerent nation and return with cargo to the United States from that port, rates would necessarily increase out of all proportion than if cargoes were available for movement in both directions. The exigencies of war conditions and an unbalanced cargo movement can only result in an abnormal rate structure, the extent of which cannot at present be foreseen.

APPENDIX NO. 1

STRATEGIC COMMODITIES

Tin

The following table shows total United States imports for 1936, 1937, and preliminary 1938 data, as well as the important sources from which this commodity is obtained:

Country	1936		1937		1938 (preliminary)	
	Pounds	Value	Pounds	Value	Pounds	Value
Total, all countries	170,305,359	$75,450,941	197,376,708	$104,284,762	111,326,139	$44,860,324
British Malaya	121,791,574	53,658,930	149,426,914	79,490,432	82,146,688	32,952,813
United Kingdom	18,903,632	8,708,923	16,137,467	8,432,401	7,362,734	3,200,669
Netherland Indies	6,133,848	2,669,369	9,194,566	4,793,256	6,936,024	2,716,274
Netherlands	10,044,284	4,613,776	5,481,231	2,958,631	4,963,335	2,062,990
China	2,305,726	997,879	10,006,714	5,126,838	4,668,589	1,807,756
Hong Kong	7,961,336	3,386,580	4,631,648	2,222,866	2,697,139	1,034,384
Australia	56,000	25,592	212,800	60,214	291,200	126,914
Germany	358,471	140,756			[1] 44,807	[1] 17,109

[1] Includes Austria.

APPENDIX No. 2

RUBBER

(Crude rubber) other than latex, guayule, jelutong, and pontianak

The table below shows total United States imports from 1936 to 1938 from all countries, as well as the principal sources of supply:

Country	1936		1937		1938 (preliminary)	
	Pounds	Value	Pounds	Value	Pounds	Value
Total, all countries	1,046,223,100	$152,072,496	1,287,104,961	$237,307,041	890,714,201	$125,373,864
British Malaya	740,025,596	107,485,693	802,841,635	146,612,872	536,786,703	73,771,167
Netherlands Indies	194,291,760	28,712,970	314,486,666	59,046,980	233,699,208	33,821,016
Ceylon	60,462,077	8,811,675	66,993,586	12,850,512	55,492,395	8,493,595
French Indo-China	29,527,904	4,068,092	36,503,326	6,235,210	45,253,662	6,746,806
Brazil	8,971,853	1,297,847	12,830,963	2,305,699	7,281,977	892,753
British India	1,931,624	259,403	47,267,046	9,214,215	4,735,730	684,957
Liberia	1,955,093	234,602	2,494,625	487,582	3,553,542	482,061
Philippine Islands	901,376	100,759	624,467	102,952	1,455,205	179,602
United Kingdom	4,997,471	779,574	692,597	159,435	695,322	127,532

APPENDIX No. 3

MANGANESE ORE

United States imports from foreign countries of manganese ore containing 35 percent or more manganese[1]

[Manganese content]

Country	1936		1937		1938 (preliminary)	
	Pounds	Value	Pounds	Value	Pounds	Value
Total, all countries	869,905,938	$8,190,429	873,710,740	$8,265,802	383,114,315	$4,632,897
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	315,997,167	2,716,401	418,288,167	3,959,955	180,707,689	2,661,557
Gold Coast (British)	281,999,003	3,166,498	291,529,709	2,942,430	143,112,858	1,500,813
British India	147,165,719	1,307,436	81,812,028	679,232	29,390,247	236,945
Brazil	117,072,717	872,371	79,531,802	597,413	29,808,332	220,328
Cuba	39,112,241	521,370	126,301,155	2,185,800	137,836,658	2,242,425

[1] The rate of duty as of the act of 1930 is 1 cent per pound on metallic manganese content. Effective as of Jan. 1, 1936, our trade agreement with Brazil specifies that the rate of duty will be ½ cent per pound on metallic manganese content, while this commodity enters the United States duty free from Cuba under the act of 1930.

APPENDIX No. 4

CHROME ORE OR CHROMITE

United States imports of chrome ore or chromite

[Chromic oxide content]

Country	1936		1937		1938 (preliminary)	
	Tons	Value	Tons	Value	Tons	Value
Total, all countries	141,198	$4,431,898	247,056	$7,324,488	163,570	$4,854,892
Other British South Africa [1]	33,391	1,372,644	96,354	3,290,767	49,542	1,778,651
Philippine Islands	2,504	81,668	20,688	490,639	38,221	915,221
Union of South Africa	18,987	577,586	31,839	820,146	30,318	831,938
Turkey	9,186	364,668	18,480	750,509	9,650	469,145
French Oceania	33,347	1,163,192	28,384	927,063	15,270	388,534
Cuba	22,813	358,241	30,179	463,243	12,773	198,173
Greece	10,879	254,627	9,449	274,951	4,165	155,736
All other countries	10,091	259,272	11,683	326,870	3,631	117,493

[1] Other than Union of South Africa.

APPENDIX No. 5

Statement of strategic commodities by flags of carriers for calendar year 1938

[In cargo tons of 2,240 pounds]

Commodities (strategic materials)	Total imports		American		Belligerent nations										Other foreign nations			
					British		French		German		Polish		Total		Belgian		Danish	
	Tons	Percent	Tons	Percent	Tons	Percent	Tons	Percent	Tons	Percent	Tons	Percent	Tons	Percent	Tons	Percent	Tons	Percent
Tin	52,166	3.8	17,304	33.2	17,860	34.2	------	------	------	------	------	------	17,860	34.2	------	------	729	1.5
Rubber	427,200	31.4	82,915	19.4	220,551	51.6	10	------	5	------	------	------	220,566	51.7	------	------	374	.1
Manganese (ferro)	25,736	1.9	3,436	13.4	2,986	11.6	651	2.5	------	------	------	------	3,637	14.1	------	------	980	3.8
Chromium	301,745	22.2	188,974	62.6	37,704	12.5	------	------	15,500	5.1	------	------	53,204	17.7	------	------	1,597	.5
Aluminum	460,867	33.9	25,095	5.6	13,111	2.8	285	.1	797	2	------	------	14,193	3.0	------	------	7,624	1.6
Miscellaneous: Antimony, coconut shells, charcoal, manila fiber, mica, nickel, optical glass, quartz crystal, quicksilver, quinine, and tungsten [1]	92,641	6.8	32,098	34.6	21,906	23.6	1,493	1.6	3,506	3.8	28	------	26,933	29.1	84	0.1	4,673	5.0
Total	1,360,355	100	349,822	------	314,118	------	2,439	------	19,808	------	28	------	336,393	------	84	------	15,977	------
Percentage by nationals	----------	------	25.7	------	23.1	------	.2	------	1.4	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	1.2	------
Percentage by national groups	----------	------	25.7	------	----------	------	------	------	----------	------	------	------	24.7	------	------	------	----------	------

APPENDIX No. 5—Continued

Statement of strategic commodities by flags of carriers for calendar year 1938—Continued

[In cargo tons of 2,240 pounds]

Commodities (strategic materials)	Other foreign nations—Continued																	
	Finnish		Honduras		Italian		Japanese		Netherland		Norwegian		Panamanian		Swedish		Total	
	Tons	Percent	Tons	Percent	Tons	Percent	Tons	Percent	Tons	Percent	Tons	Percent	Tons	Percent	Tons	Percent	Tons	Percent
Tin					72	0.1	5,066	9.7	10,001	19.2	1,004	1.9	50	0.1	80	0.1	17,002	32.6
Rubber			202	0.1			29,061	6.8	81,407	19.1	10,009	2.3	2,626	.6	40		123,719	28.9
Manganese (ferro)							43	.1	6,111	23.7	11,429	44.4			100	.4	18,663	72.5
Chromium							7,500	2.5			49,970	16.6			500	.2	59,567	19.7
Aluminum	5,182	0.7			366	.1			500	.1	401,522	87.1	2,413	.5	3,972	.9	421,579	91.4
Miscellaneous: Antimony, coconut shells, charcoal, manila fiber, mica, nickel, optical glass, quartz crystal, quicksilver, quinine, and tungsten [1]					1,856	2.2	19,403	20.9	388	.4	6,742	7.3	9		455	.5	33,610	36.3
Total	5,182		202		2,294		61,073		98,407		480,676		5,098		5,147		674,140	
Percentage by nationals	.4				.2		4.5		7.2		35.3		.4		.4			
Percentage by national groups																	49.6	

[1] Some of these commodities moved in such small quantities that they are not separately identified and most probably were reported as "general cargo."

Source: Tabulation of cargo reports submitted to the Maritime Commission by the ocean carriers.

APPENDIX No. 5A

Statement of critical commodities by flags of carriers for calendar year 1938

[In cargo tons of 2,240 pounds]

Commodities (critical materials)	Total imports		American		Belligerent nations								Other foreign nations							
					British		French		German		Total		Belgian		Brazilian		Danish		Greek	
	Tons	Percent	Tons	Percent	Tons	Percent	Tons	Percent	Tons	Percent	Tons	Percent	Tons	Percent	Tons	Percent	Tons	Percent	Tons	Percent
Coffee	904,341	57.7	493,713	54.6	93,138	10.3	17,707	2.0	21,542	2.4	132,387	14.6	981	0.1	71,612	7.9	20,757	2.3		
Cork	75,215	4.8	17,955	23.9	365	.5			74	.1	439	.6					5,992	8.0		
Graphite	2,103	.1	68	3.2	890	42.3	36	1.7	119	5.7	1,045	49.7					70	3.3		
Kapok	7,563	.5	797	10.5	3,995	52.8			65	.9	4,060	53.7								
Tanning materials	111,453	7.1	52,705	47.3	14,898	13.4	65	.1	4,528	4.1	19,491	17.5					10,164	9.1	6,080	5.4
Miscellaneous: Flaxseed, fluorspar, hides, iodine, nux vomica, opium, platinum, titanium, vanadium, asbestos, and cryolite [1]	465,569		82,686	17.8	68,277	14.7	358		13,315	2.9	81,950	17.6			25		41,191	8.8		
Total	1,566,244		647,924		181,563		18,166		39,643		239,372		981		71,637		78,174		6,080	
Percentage by nationals	100		41.4		11.6		1.2		2.5						4.6		5.0		.4	
Percentage by national groups	100		41.4								15.3									

Commodities (critical materials)	Other foreign nations—Continued																	
	Honduran		Italian		Japanese		Netherland		Norwegian		Panamanian		Swedish		Union of Soviet Socialist Republics		Total	
	Tons	Percent	Tons	Percent	Tons	Percent	Tons	Percent	Tons	Percent	Tons	Percent	Tons	Percent	Tons	Percent	Tons	Percent
Coffee	21,071	2.3	7,119	0.8	4,776	0.5	25,451	2.8	99,559	11.0	3,581	0.4	23,334	2.6			278,241	30.8
Cork			40,185	53.4			91	.1	10,045	13.3					508	0.7	56,821	75.5
Graphite			15	.7	317	15.1	398	18.9	190	9.1							990	47.1
Kapok					33	.4	1,783	23.6	827	11.0	63	.8					2,706	35.8
Tanning materials			772	.7	280	.2	559	.5	21,402	19.2							39,257	35.2
Miscellaneous: Flaxseed, fluorspar, hides, iodine, nux vomica, opium, platinum, titanium, vanadium, asbestos, and cryolite [1]			1,388	.3	1,758	.4	709	.2	250,882	53.9	112		2,484	.5	2,384	.5	300,933	64.6
Total	21,071		49,479		7,164		28,991		382,905		3,756		25,818		2,892		678,948	
Percentage by nationals	1.3		3.2		.5		1.9		24.4		.2		1.6		.2			
Percentage by national groups																	43.3	

[1] Some of these commodities moved in such small quantities that they are not separately identified and most probably were reported as "General cargo."

Source: Tabulation of cargo reports submitted to the Maritime Commission by the ocean carriers.

APPENDIX No. 6

STATEMENT OF VALUES OF PRINCIPAL COMMODITIES EXPORTED

Tabulation of exports by countries, $1,000,000 and upward, for calendar year 1938

Country	Unmanufactured cotton	Unmanufactured tobacco	Crude petroleum	Gasoline and other petroleum products	Wheat	Passenger automobiles, new	Corn	Copper	Motor-trucks	Aircraft
Total exports	$228,700,000	$155,700,000	$111,700,000	$103,500,000	$101,300,000	$100,100,000	$94,500,000	$86,800,000	$72,100,000	$68,200,000
Belligerent:										
Australia		7,600,000		4,900,000		6,700,000			2,500,000	1,200,000
British India		1,800,000				1,800,000			2,400,000	
Canada	12,300,000	1,200,000	35,700,000	6,000,000	5,200,000	8,700,000	38,000,000		3,700,000	3,500,000
France	23,900,000	3,000,000	25,400,000	6,500,000				7,000,000	3,500,000	
Germany	16,900,000	1,400,000	1,800,000	7,000,000	2,600,000		9,600,000	16,800,000		
Hong Kong									3,300,000	1,200,000
New Zealand		1,100,000		2,000,000		1,500,000				
Poland	10,500,000					1,200,000		2,500,000	1,300,000	
Union of South Africa				1,500,000		14,200,000			3,000,000	
United Kingdom	41,200,000	111,300,000		18,800,000	23,900,000	3,300,000	20,000,000	6,500,000		3,900,000
Total	104,800,000	127,400,000	62,900,000	46,700,000	31,700,000	37,400,000	67,600,000	32,800,000	21,000,000	9,800,000

Source: Shippers' export declarations.

APPENDIX No. 7

STATEMENT OF VALUES OF PRINCIPAL COMMODITIES EXPORTED

Tabulation of exports by countries, $1,000,000 and upward, for calendar year 1938

Country	Unmanufactured cotton	Unmanufactured tobacco	Crude petroleum	Gasoline and other petroleum products	Wheat	Passenger automobiles, new	Corn	Copper	Motor-trucks	Aircraft
Nonbelligerent:										
Argentina			$2,400,000			$10,100,000			$3,900,000	$6,200,000
Belgium	$6,700,000	$1,500,000		$2,800,000	$10,600,000	6,800,000	$3,400,000	$2,200,000	2,700,000	
Brazil				3,900,000	3,900,000				2,500,000	1,900,000
China		6,500,000							2,600,000	6,400,000
Colombia					1,700,000				1,900,000	
Cuba			1,400,000	1,800,000		2,100,000			1,200,000	
Czechoslovakia	12,000,000							6,700,000		
Denmark				1,400,000	1,900,000	1,000,000				
Egypt						2,100,000			1,300,000	
Greece					2,300,000					
Hungary									1,100,000	
Italy	19,300,000		9,200,000	1,700,000				4,400,000		
Ireland		4,200,000			10,300,000		7,700,000			
Japan	53,000,000		29,900,000	7,700,000				22,200,000	2,100,000	11,100,000
Kwantung			1,400,000	1,700,000						1,400,000
Mexico					2,900,000	2,100,000			1,200,000	1,200,000
Netherlands	4,400,000			4,600,000	12,500,000	1,300,000	10,700,000	2,000,000		3,300,000
Netherland East Indies										8,500,000
Netherland West Indies				6,700,000						
Norway		1,100,000				1,600,000			1,700,000	
Persia									1,500,000	
Peru					1,200,000				1,400,000	
Philippines				2,500,000		2,100,000				1,800,000
Portugal					1,900,000				1,200,000	
Russia				2,200,000						5,200,000
Spain				4,800,000					1,900,000	
Sweden		1,400,000	1,100,000	5,300,000		8,300,000		3,800,000		1,000,000
Switzerland		1,300,000								
Turkey										3,200,000
Venezuela					2,200,000				3,700,000	
Total	95,400,000	16,000,000	45,800,000	47,100,000	51,400,000	37,500,000	23,600,000	41,300,000	31,900,000	51,200,000

Source: Shippers' export declarations.

We need the products of other lands.

IMPORTS

	Percent
Rubber	100
Sugar	72
Coffee, tea, cocoa	100
Tin	100
Wool	31

We gain by selling beyond our borders.

EXPORTS

	Percent
Cotton	51
Lubricants	40
Lard	37
Tobacco	38
Kerosene	25
Agricultural machinery	20
Automobiles	12

The Crusade for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HIRAM W. JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 12 (legislative day of Wednesday October 4), 1939

RADIO ADDRESS BY REV. EDWARD L. CURRAN

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD an address

delivered on October 7, 1939, over the Columbia network by Rev. Edward Lodge Curran, Ph. D., president of the International Catholic Truth Society. The subject of the address is The Crusade for Peace.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The crusade for peace is the most important issue before the attention of the American Nation today. It is a crusade to preserve our present constitutional form of American democracy. It is a crusade to intensify and expand the defenses of our country so that no "red" or "brown" aggressor may ever duplicate in the United States the cunning and cowardly rape of Poland. It is a crusade to keep the United States out of war. And it is a crusade to keep the United States out of the vestibule of war.

The crusade has expressed itself in letters, in phone calls, and in telegrams to Congress demanding that the present embargo on arms and ammunition to foreign belligerents be maintained, no matter what other changes may be made in our present neutrality legislation.

Professional columnists in some of our metropolitan newspapers have referred sneeringly to this expression of an awakened public opinion. The professional columnists should rejoice that we still live in a country where citizens still possess the freedom and the energy to convey their attitude on proposed legislation to the supreme lawmaking body of the United States. The professional columnists themselves are professional letter writers, receiving handsome salaries for their daily epistles in the metropolitan newspapers. In spite of the professional columnists, we of the antiwar crusade intend to increase and deepen and intensify the voice with which the American people is beseeching the Congress to keep us out of war.

There is no mistaking the message of our voice. It is the composite voice of American manhood and American motherhood—Protestant, Jewish, and Catholic alike. It is the composite voice of all American citizens who remember the blunder and the stupidity and the failure and the deceit of our participation in the last World War. We insist that the Congress of the United States heed our voice.

We shall fight, if need be, to the last drop of blood and to the last breath of our failing bodies, against any invasion by any aggressor against the continental, insular, or Territorial possessions of the United States. We shall fight against any dictatorship, either from the right or the left, that raises its hand within the gates and attempts to strangle our present constitutional form of American democracy. But we shall not fight for the European nations that took our money and our blood 20 years ago and then sneered at our peacetime idealism. We shall fight for the defense of our country along every American front, but we shall not fight, any time or anywhere, for foreign causes upon foreign battlefields.

We beg the Congress of the United States to keep us out of foreign entangling alliances, whether they be the alliances of international politics or the alliances of the international munitions trade. We recognize a difference between arms and ammunition, which are fundamentally and primarily commodities of death, and all other commodities, which are fundamentally and primarily commodities of life, even if the munitions makers and their allies, the foreign propagandists, refuse to do so. Therefore, we beg the Congress to keep us out of war by keeping us out of the vestibule to war. The contemplated repeal of the embargo on arms and ammunition to foreign belligerents means the entrance of the United States into the vestibule to war.

There is not a single argument advanced that can justify the removal of the embargo on arms and ammunition. Those who would sell arms and ammunition to all for "cash and carry" have already given the lie to the title of their amendment by providing for 90 days of credit to the very nations who have been our insulting debtors to the tune of billions of dollars for the past 19 years. If they have not paid in 19 years, how will they be able or willing to pay in 90 days?

Senator KEY PITTMAN, of Nevada, who is eloquent now on the Senate floor for repeal of the embargo on arms and ammunition, was eloquent 2 years ago for the maintenance of the embargo. We wonder who has whispered in his ear. What economic royalist has put pressure on the Senator through the White House? We should love to read the history of the psychological and political transformation by which PITTMAN the embargoist has become PITTMAN the repealist.

Stung by the concentrated expression on the part of hundreds of thousands of American citizens against removing the embargo on arms and ammunition, certain groups in the United States placed Mr. Alfred E. Smith, former Governor of New York State, before the microphone a week ago. There is no one who admires Al Smith more than I. As a fellow American, I love him for his Americanism. As a fellow Catholic, I love him for his catholicism. He is one of whom all Americans may be proud.

We listened to the speech of Governor Smith with feelings of sadness and surprise. There was not a single argument presented to justify the President's demand that the embargo on arms and ammunition be removed from our new neutrality legislation. Mr. Smith said that the "present Neutrality Act does not work." When, Mr. Smith, did it break down? How and where did it break down? How can an embargo on arms and ammunition cease to work? Even if all other clauses of the present Neutrality Act should be changed, why cannot the embargo on arms and ammunition remain? For the past several years, Mr. Smith, the embargo clause of our present Neutrality Act has helped to keep us out of declared and undeclared wars in both Europe and Asia. It kept us out of the Spanish civil war, when every "red" in this country was howling for its repeal in order that Stalin might have accomplished in Spain what he has already accomplished in Poland.

You are not true to the record, Mr. Smith. The present embargo on arms and ammunition has worked. "It has not," as you tried to suggest, Mr. Smith, "been weighed in the balance and found wanting." The only balance that has weighed it and found it wanting has been the Fairbanks scales of the Du Ponts and the other munition-making economic royalists in this country.

For the sake of the record, Mr. Smith, we agree with you that the transportation of any goods or any passengers in American ships to warring nations should be prohibited. For the sake of the record, Mr. Smith, we agree with you that American ships and American passengers should be kept out of the export business. For the sake of the record, Mr. Smith, we believe that American markets of international trade should be kept open to belligerent nations for all commodities save arms and ammunition. We should sell all commodities save arms and ammunition to any belligerent power that comes with cash and that takes away the purchased commodities in its own ships or the ships of other nationalities. But we are now and always dedicated to the retention of the embargo on arms and ammunition, no matter what the President desires and no matter how itchy the palm of the munition makers and the international bankers may become.

Again, Mr. Smith, for the sake of the record, we resent your statement that only those who lack an understanding of the issue will oppose the demand of the President that the embargo on arms and ammunition be repealed. The record of the President is open to the American people for the past 6 years. American citizens have the right to criticize, in public or in private, the record of any citizen or public official of the United States, including the President of the United States. Should any citizen be denied the right to express public criticism of public acts on the part of public officials, either over the radio or in the press or on the public platform, the moment of that denial is the moment of a collapsing democracy and an incipient dictatorship.

We of the Antiwar Crusade understand the issue. It is the issue of keeping us out of war by keeping us out of the vestibule to war. It is the issue of isolating and identifying those commodities which are clearly and directly and purposely and immediately weapons of death. It is the issue of refusing to become a party to the contract of wholesale murder by furnishing such arms and ammunition to any belligerent nation abroad.

It is the issue of refusing to allow the munition makers and the international bankers to wax rich and fat on the broken bodies and the bayoneted breasts of those who are done to death by arms and ammunition manufactured in the United States. It is the issue of remembering that the cash-and-carry policy applied to arms and ammunition 20 years ago became the policy of credit and carry and next, through the flotation of foreign loans in the United States the policy of float and carry, and finally the policy of being carried into the death and destruction and massacre and mutilation of actual warfare. It is the issue of amending and strengthening the present Neutrality Act without canceling a single word of the embargo on arms and ammunition to foreign belligerents.

This is not a Catholic question or a Protestant question or a Jewish question. This is an American question. We of the Antiwar Crusade, who are fighting for the retention of the embargo on arms and ammunition in all neutrality legislation, resent certain recent attempts to identify certain remarks in the Italian newspaper Osservatore Romano as semiofficial approval of the President's desire to remove the embargo. They are nothing of the kind. Let it be said to all the world that the Osservatore Romano is not the official representative of the Papacy. Let it be said to all the world that in matters purely civic and purely political no American Catholic takes orders from or is bound by the statements in any foreign newspaper no matter in what foreign country the statements may be printed.

This is not the time for participation in foreign affairs, either directly or indirectly. This is the time for preparedness. This is the time to perfect our coast defenses and our antiwar craft. This is the time to build an army capable of successfully defending every mile of our boundary line and capable of successfully stopping the advance of any "brown" or "red" aggressor across our Mexican or Alaskan borders. This is the time to build an air force that can plunge every enemy bombing plane reckless enough to attack us into oblivion. This is the time to build a navy that can successfully protect both our Atlantic and Pacific coasts at one and the same time. This is the time to protect our country from subversive activities within the gates by removing every Communist and every Nazi from public office in America. This is the time to legislate for peace and prosperity and preparedness here in the United States of America.

Peace legislation means keeping out of the vestibule of war by retaining the embargo on arms and ammunition to foreign belligerents. Preparedness legislation means keeping the products of American makers defenses for the air and land and sea defenses of the United States of America. Prosperity legislation means vitalizing the economic life of this Nation so that 10,000,000 Americans can be put back to work and so that every American family may be the recipient of a living annual wage.

This is the cause of our antiwar crusade. Billions for defense but not one cent of American money and not one ounce of American blood and not one item of American arms and ammunition for the foreign causes of foreign nations on foreign battlefields abroad.

Neutrality Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. NORRIS

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 12 (legislative day of Wednesday October 4), 1939

RADIO ADDRESS BY RT. REV. MSGR. JOHN O'GRADY

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Rt. Rev. Msgr. John O'Grady, secretary of the National Conference of Catholic Charities, in Omaha on the evening of October 10, 1939.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

After months of tension we awoke on September 4 to find the nations of Europe once more at war. We almost felt as if the end of the world were close at hand. People at first were loath to discuss it. Then they began to ask. What will hapen to modern civilization? What will be the fate of Christianity? What will war do to all that we have cherished throughout the years? Are we returning once more to an age of cruelty and barbarism? Every now and again some brave citizen would say, "This is no concern of ours." Then he would begin to brood. It was clear that he was not satisfied with his own statement. "We cannot," he would go on to say, "have any peace in the world until we get rid of those dictators."

This citizen was not speaking for himself, he was speaking for America.

In these past weeks we have given more and more thought to the implications of the war. We have asked ourselves, over and over, "What effect will the war have upon our lives in America?" "What influence will it have upon our whole social welfare program? Are we right in fearing that as public attention is concentrated upon the war that program will be overlooked? Are we liable to assume that a slight war boom will make an end of our whole problem of employment in this country, although the real chances are that a war boom would provide no more than 2,000,000 jobs during the next year?" That would leave us still with a large reservoir of unemployment, we would still need a Federal work program. Yet we must not forget that rising prosperity will create a further demand for reduced rates on unemployment compensation. The method suggested will be more and more merit rating. The system will thus be less capable of standing the shock of depression. The extension and increasing of benefit rates will be much more difficult than before.

In these 5 weeks of war we have asked ourselves also, "What part must America play in this tremendous struggle?" We understand the nature of this struggle. We know that it represents the revolutionary aims of two great powers to force their social systems upon the whole world. We are not wholly indifferent to those aims. No believer in our democratic institutions, no believer in the teachings of Christ can be wholly indifferent to them. We know that either democracy and the teachings of religion will survive or they will be supplanted by the rule of force and the ethics of paganism. Yet just as we are as one in regard to the principles involved, so we are as one in our desire to keep out of the war. We search in Europe for political leadership comparable to our own. We cannot find it. Until such time as that leadership emerges and the true voice of the people of Europe is heard we know that we have no part in the European war.

So in the last 5 weeks one question has dominated our thoughts: How is America to keep out of the war? We have listened to the wonderfully clear speech of the President in which he told us that the safest way to keep out of war was to revise the arms embargo in the light of existing conditions. We have listened to the opponents of the President, who wish to keep the Neutrality Act in its present form. The President has asked us not to distinguish between belligerents and to place no distinction upon the kinds of goods they buy from us. His opponents have argued that those belligerents may be permitted to buy anything they please except armaments.

In all the bitter struggle now going on in Congress the leaders of both sides are agreed upon one thing—that all actions which we take must be judged by whether their effects may strengthen or weaken our chances of keeping out. You and I, I think, would agree on a further point. We would agree that the longer the war lasts, the greater is the chance of our becoming involved. If we agree on this, then we must ask ourselves, Will the Neutrality Act lengthen or shorten the war?

There is one way in which the act might shorten the war, and that is by giving Hitler a quick victory. Would such a victory keep America out of war? According to the Gallup poll, 70 percent of the people of this country believe that after the Nazis and the Communists had conquered Great Britain and France, we would be their next objective. So we see that there is no peace for us that way.

Would the repeal of the arms embargo shorten the war? We cannot tell; but there seems good reason to suppose that it might. In any case, we know that on the all-important matter of our own safety it will give us the preparation that we need for our self-defense. It will gear our factories to producing the things we need for defense, and it will do so at no cost to ourselves. We will have no need to pile up huge stores of arms that may soon be obsolete. We will not need to transfer billions of our funds from our productive services of welfare and public works.

And think for a moment what would happen if we maintained the arms embargo. We must not underestimate the initiative of American capital and American enterprise. It will go always to places where it is most needed, and if it cannot operate upon American soil, it will migrate to soil upon which it can fulfill its functions. New plants, equipped with American machinery and built by American engineers, will be constructed in nearby countries to manufacture the armaments which we ban from American soil. And let us not imagine that Mr. Hitler will be any less angered because American armaments for Great Britain and France are not built on American soil.

Above all, in these 5 weeks of war we have come to realize with deeper gladness and devotion than ever before how unutterably precious to us are the blessings of American freedom. We understand how great is our fortune in living in a country in which there is freedom of religion, freedom of education, and freedom of speech and thought. With increasing determination we realize that we must dedicate ourselves anew to the struggle to make our democracy work more effectively than ever. With increasing determination we must see to it that so far as possible inner qualities within us must be remedied, and each person must be given a fair chance of securing the things necessary for human personality and family life. With increasing determination we realize that we must struggle for still greater security against the industrial hazards that bring such needless waste and suffering in human life. War makes it all the more necessary to rededicate ourselves anew to the Christian teaching and practice of brotherly love. It should make us reexamine our consciences in regard to what we are doing as individuals in the practice of personal services. We must not relax our efforts to build our private and public-welfare programs on a firmer foundation. Relaxation of efforts means a step backward.

In the midst of the greatest and most far-reaching conflicts of all time, the heart of man yearns for peace. Our holy father, Pius XII, prays and works incessantly for peace. Some day nations must again lay down their arms and sit around the council tables of peace, but it must be a different peace from that of Versailles. It must not be a victor's peace. It must be a peace based on justice and charity. It must be implemented by forces that make for its endurance.

Let us hope that America will play a great part in the moral and material rebuilding that must follow peace. Let us pray that by our understanding and our devotion we may find a real peace—one which is Christian and good and which will last forever.

Secretary of War Woodring and Assistant Secretary Johnson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 12 (legislative day of Wednesday October 4), 1939

EDITORIAL FROM THE ARMY AND NAVY JOURNAL

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD an editorial from the Army and Navy Journal of the issue of September 30, 1939. This editorial deals with the relationship between the Assistant Secretary of War, Mr. Louis Johnson, and the Secretary of War, Mr. Harry Woodring, which I think is of pertinent interest at this time. I think if there ever was a time when our Nation needed cooperation and harmony in the War Department, it is today. From my own experience with Mr. Woodring, as a

member of the Military Affairs Committee of the Senate and a member of the War Department subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, I have found him to be an able, capable, conscientious executive and member of the Cabinet supervising a very important department. He should have the support of all who are associated with him at all times, and particularly at a time like this. The editorial from the Army and Navy Journal is a thoroughgoing rebuke to Mr. Louis Johnson, The Assistant Secretary of War, and his undermining of his Chief at this critical time, and the stories coming from the Tom Corcoran and Ben Cohen group that he is soon to succeed his superior. I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Army and Navy Journal of September 30, 1939]

In the subtle and effective way the President has of dealing with squabbles in his administration he has ended the feud conducted by Assistant Secretary Johnson against Secretary Woodring. By his statement to the press, in disapproval of the book suggesting methods by which business should prepare for war, the foreword of which was written by Mr. Johnson, and by his dissolution of the War Resources Board, created by that subordinate during the Secretary's absence at Panama, the President has manifested publicly a lack of trust in his judgment and conduct, and has opened the door for him to resign, or to remain in office, as he may see fit. Evidently, the President's expressions of lack of confidence mean that the ambitions of the Assistant Secretary to obtain the war portfolio never will be realized. Thus ends ingloriously the campaign to bring about the resignation of Secretary Woodring. The single result of it is to strengthen the latter's standing with the President. The Secretary has shown extraordinary patience in connection with his Assistant's efforts to assume authority which belongs solely to his Chief, toward inspired published reports that he was to be transferred to a diplomatic post, and toward statements attributed to his subordinate that the latter had been promised the Secretaryship of War and was about to get it. Knowing in the end it would be his work and accomplishments that would count with the President and the people, the Secretary proceeded quietly in the performance of his duty. He maintained the closest personal as well as official relations with the General Staff. He saw that all matters of supply for which the Assistant Secretary is by law, responsible, were kept in line with the policies the President approved. He gave such sound advice to the President on military matters that it was invariably accepted. He made it a rule to make speeches only when he believed they would be timely and effective, and while forceful, they never irritated Congress. In fact, the Secretary's relations with the Vice President and Congress as a whole are closer, perhaps, than are those enjoyed by any other Cabinet member, a valuable asset which the President realizes. It is a pity that Mr. Johnson, who has real ability and energy, has failed to display toward his chief that loyalty, which the President regards as essential for efficient administration. Perhaps, the deserved rebuke Mr. Johnson has received, will cause him, if he continue in office, to revolutionize his conduct, and to appreciate that a successful administration of the Department in these perilous times will mean glory for all in which he will share with pride.

Abraham Lincoln

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ERNEST W. GIBSON

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 12 (legislative day of Wednesday October 4), 1939

ADDRESS BY GOVERNOR AIKEN, OF VERMONT, AT FAIRFIELD, ILL.

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by the Honorable George D. Aiken, Governor of the State of Vermont, before the Lincoln Club of Wayne County, at Fairfield, Ill., on October 6, 1939.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

For me to come here today to tell the people of Illinois any of the story of Lincoln would be more presumptious than carrying coals to Newcastle. But to attend this occasion as a representative of the State which gave a larger percentage of its vote to Abraham Lincoln than did any other State seems perfectly proper.

When the affairs of a nation, either through the exercise of tyranny or the adherence to outworn details of government, or because of fumbling and confused administrative efforts, reach the point where a change in the management or methods of government is necessary, then someone must be first to step forward.

It is to the credit and honor of Wayne County, Ill., that among the farm folks here was found the courage and foresight which prompted them to be the first to endorse that greatest of all our Presidents. All that can be said in praise of Abraham Lincoln has been said. All honor that can be paid to his name has already been paid. The greatest tribute that remains for us to pay the man today is that at each meeting convened for the purpose of honoring him we should derive inspiration from the principles expounded by this great American and consider their present-day application.

To represent the people well one must know them. Lincoln, born and raised in poverty and without the opportunity of education, did know them. More than any other man of our country he characterizes the American ideal that even the humblest have the opportunity to be great. Wealth and ambition are not the mark of greatness. It was the humility of Lincoln in the White House, his realization that he was only human and dependent on the will of God and the will of the people that made him the greatest of Presidents.

Humble of birth, he knew the meaning of poverty in such a manner that enabled him, during the deepest crisis of American history, to understand the suffering and needs of the people. He knew the meaning of work; the right and wrong of human conduct concerned him deeply. Human liberty and human rights were enunciated by him for all time. And when he passed on to the ages, the whole world knew him as a man of humanity and the epitome of Democracy. A true American—self-reliant, self-made, kindly, and simple—he personified the traits of character which must prove the foundation of any successful government.

As we meet here to honor Lincoln and commend the county which first officially endorsed him, we are likewise endorsing the form of government for which he labored. In thus honoring Democracy, let us in the crisis of today also consider the meaning of Democracy.

On July 4, 1776, when the representatives of the Thirteen Original States met in Philadelphia to sign the Declaration of Independence, they did not simply separate us from an Old World government, but they established on this continent a new form of government, the most truly democratic form of government to be found on earth, and one which has endured to the present day.

The essence of democracy, that indispensable element which distinguishes it from other forms of government, is the element of opposition—the right and duty of citizens to question their government and to express themselves freely one way or another on its policies.

In 1797 Congress enacted the alien and sedition laws, which, in effect, made criticism of government a crime. The uprising of the people against such presumptuous legislation resulted in the election of Thomas Jefferson and the repeal of the law. May I say here that the State of Vermont cast its vote wholeheartedly and enthusiastically for Thomas Jefferson—that the Vermont State Legislature memorialized him to accept a third term as President. One of our treasured historical keepsakes is the letter in which he replied, setting forth clearly and distinctly reasons why no man should aspire to a third term for President.

Two years ago a bill, having the support of the highest officials of our land, was introduced into Congress. Like the old sedition law, this bill, too, in effect, made criticism of, or opposition to, government on certain matters punishable by a $10,000 fine or 5 years' imprisonment. This bill was, fortunately, killed, but always and forever we must be on guard lest in one way or another we lose the right to question the intentions and actions of our Government.

Today the blight of war has spread over a large part of Europe and Asia. We know not where this pestilence will end. A limited emergency, whatever that means, has been declared here in America. We have been asked to drop partisanship in the present crisis—not to question the acts and proposals of officials in the highest offices. Partisanship implies a strong and biased devotion and adherence to a cause. It is often blind, passionate, narrow, unreasoning, or fanatical, and quite often conceals selfish political ambitions. As for the request to drop selfish political ambitions, regardless of party, whether this suggestion is intended for those who would perpetuate themselves in office or for those out of office who desire to regain control simply to redistribute patronage, I am all for it.

But if dropping partisanship means that we should not question the motives of our Government, that we should aline ourselves solidly behind those who during recent years have been anything but nonpartisan in word and deed, then I say that now, of all times, must men and women of America freely express themselves and guard the right to do so as they have never done before.

The people of Germany dropped partisanship; they surrendered their right to free speech and self-government in return for promised security. Shall we drop partisanship for promised neutrality? The people of Russia dropped partisanship. Willingly or not, they became subservient to a single group, and finally to a single man.

Would Lincoln drop partisanship today, when the voices of American people should be heard as never before? I think not.

The people of Russia and Germany dropped partisanship. As a result, there was established that very form of government which the world is now being immersed in bloodshed to wipe out. You and I cannot help but be partisan—but partisan, regardless of party or creed, to those principles of freedom enunciated by the great President from Illinois.

It is not unpatriotic to question the motives and policies of any government at this time. Patriotism is love of country and devotion to its welfare. It cannot be considered unpatriotic to do our utmost to keep our country out of war, especially when the danger of war constitutes a menace to our form of government and our American institutions.

We are all concerned about the part America will play in the war now spreading over Europe. Our people demand peace. Our people demand continued neutrality in the strictest sense of the word. The hospitals constructed during recent years are not yet sufficient to care for those who lost their health or reason in the last World War. We have not recovered from the economic disaster which that war visited upon us. We remember too well the boys who left the farm and home and went away and did not come back.

We are not neutral in our thought. Nearly every one of us sympathizes with the democratic powers in this struggle. Our own Government has definitely on more than one occasion evidenced its desire to aid these nations in their conflict against totalitarian government.

But I want to repeat now what I have said on many occasions during the last 4 or 5 weeks that America's peril lies not in the danger of losing a war but in the fact that while defeating dictatorship abroad we would inevitably be losing democracy at home.

Politics and policies are two different things. I am only too glad to abandon politics. In fact, so far as possible, I have conducted my state duties on a nonpolitical basis. But the policy of this country is the fundamental support of democracy first at home. It is laudable to want to support it abroad. It is natural to want to lick the dictators of the world. But if we try to support it abroad, to defeat all those nations where the people have lost control of their government, we will soon find ourselves hopelessly entangled in the intrigues and bloodshed of the world, and our own Government lost in the process.

Modern war is essentially economic and obviously completely alters a nation's economic structure. We are told frankly that our Government has for months been preparing plans for streamlining the economic functions of our Nation in order to more efficiently fight the forces of totalitarian states. They admit that if we are to meet these nations successfully in war that we must become their counterpart in our operations. If all the people knew the plans already developed for this country in the event of war, there would be no war. If to them were revealed the already published and admitted economic war plans of our Government, they would plainly see the evil end to which we would bring ourselves.

It would take stronger men than Abraham Lincoln to protect the individual liberty against the ravages of a modern war. I would like to call your attention to a book called Adjusting Your Business to War, written by Leo Cherne and published by the Tax Research Institute. The book contains a foreword by Louis Johnson, Assistant Secretary of War, who would have the responsibility of regimenting the material resources of our Nation in event of war. Therefore, the book acquires a semiofficial nature. Two features of the book cannot fail to impress the readers. The first is information compiled by the International Business Machines Corporation showing what could have been done with the amount which participation in the World War from 1917–19 cost the United States.

This money would have wired for electricity the 9,400,000 homes in the United States now without current. It would have paid off every farm mortgage in the United States. It would have installed modern plumbing and bathrooms in the 5,750,000 farm homes in the United States now without these conveniences. It would have established an educational and endowment fund equal to all present endowment funds of our schools and colleges combined. It would have built four consolidated schools at $250,000 each in every county in the United States. It would have built airports to the amount of $1,000,000 in every county of the United States.

It would have provided $5,000,000,000 for flood and soil erosion control. It would have established a trust fund which, yielding 3-percent interest, would give every blind and deaf person in the United States $100 a month for life. It would have provided for 10 bridges equal in size to the $60,000,000 Triborough Bridge. It would have built another canal across the Isthmus of Panama to cost as much as the one already there. It would have paid the entire cost of the recovery and relief program of our Nation from 1932 to 1938. It would have created an endowment fund which at 2 percent would give an income to support a world peace organization larger than the League of Nations, the World Court, and the International Labor Office combined.

All these things could have been done and at the same time wealth would be created for ourselves and posterity with our share of the cost of the last World War. And now what is planned in the event of another war which would be even bigger and more costly?

In the event of hostilities the President will ask for, and undoubtedly receive, emergency power, because it would be partisan and unpatriotic to oppose that request. He would be given complete control of all facilities of industry, all labor, all power, all agriculture, all commodities, all material resources, all financial institutions, and all methods of transportation.

Farmers would be told what to plant, where to plant, and what price to sell for.

Labor would have its wages and hours set for every type of work, and men would be told where they must work.

Industry would be told what each factory could make and a price fixed by Government on both raw material and finished product.

War profits would be absorbed by Government by methods already devised; and I am wholeheartedly for this part of the program.

There would be no $1-a-year men as in the last World War. Their places would be taken by men receiving $10,000 a year. And this, if past operations of our Government is any indication, would mean political conduct of the material side of war.

Surveys have already been made, production schedules drawn up and methods already devised to impose price fixing, priorities control, the issuance of compulsory industrial orders, the commandeering of materials, the licensing of all business and proportioning of commodities and raw material. The plans call for such a regimenting of all our resources, industrial, human, and natural, as would make the war lords of Germany and Russia blush for their inefficiency and thoughtlessness.

And no one in this country seriously believes that the power thus delegated to the administration in Washington would ever be wholly returned to the people at the end of the war. No administration and no central government that has used every means at its command short of war to appropriate for itself the resources of our States, to subserve the courts of the land, and to take undue control of our local affairs would fail to use the excuse of war to attain ends which the American people would not grant in times of peace. American businessmen of today oppose war because they know that at its conclusion there would be but one business—government.

War under the present Federal administration would be the shortest route to the loss of our liberties and the destruction of democracy at home. We can't hope to chastise every nation ruled by a dictator no matter how much we sympathize with the people of that nation or of neighboring countries. The best way to preserve democracy is to show the world that democracy is the best form of government under which to live. And our military efforts should be directed solely toward an adequate defense of America. We must not let this threat of war, which for years hung constantly over Europe and is now held over our own heads, take our attention from those repairs that need doing in our own yard.

Are the boundary lines of Latvia more important to us than fair prices and a decent living for 30,000,000 farm dwellers? Is the liberty of Estonia more precious to us than the fate of 10,000,000 unemployed in our own country? Is the destruction of Hitlerism more dear to us than our own democracy and the traditions of freedom?

The Forces Against Hitler

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. NORRIS

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 12 (legislative day of Wednesday October 4), 1939

EDITORIAL FROM MANCHESTER GUARDIAN WEEKLY

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Manchester Guardian Weekly of September 15, 1939, entitled "The Forces Against Hitler."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Manchester Guardian Weekly]

THE FORCES AGAINST HITLER

The full strength of Hitler's power is immediate and visible. Nobody can doubt it. Germany is, after Russia, the most populous state in Europe. Her exceptional capacity for organization has been directed to a single aim. Her ruler has persuaded or compelled her to adapt her whole life to preparation for war. That ruler has certain advantages over Wilhelm II. The Kaiser ruled by divine right, whereas Hitler rules by personal spell. To the ordinary German he is the author and symbol of national recovery and of the restoration of German prestige in German eyes. There are, of course, unknown quantities in German politics. The ruthless persecutions, the suppression of some of the most vigorous elements in the nation, the banishment of so much skill and science from the service of the state, these have to be set against Hitler's success in organizing and mobilizing German power. The stability of a system based on such violent foundations must be uncertain. But for the moment he stands before Europe in all his might, master of an immense army and of all the instruments of destruction that science has given to man's evil passions, known to all his neighbors for his ruthless treatment of all who oppose him. Gibbon observed that barbarism could never upset civilization, for civilized man would have gunpowder, whereas the barbarians would depend on their primitive weapons. He had not foreseen a day when those conditions would be reversed, when the most savage manners would be combined with the most efficient machinery. It is not surprising that every small state in Europe has to hide its sympathies in this struggle.

The forces against Hitler are less easy to measure because they are not all above the surface. Nor can they be so easily collected and organized in a concrete form. Nazi-ism is an armed and militant doctrine, and it has the strength of a religion. But it is necessarily in conflict with other faiths and other ways of life. The dictators despise western Europe because they think that liberalism—and liberalism, in its widest sense, is the spirit and basis of the life of western Europe—is decadent and effete. They see only the weaknesses of the democracies. Those weaknesses are manifest, and nobody will deny their importance. But the attack of nazi-ism is not an attack on their weaknesses but on their strength. The feeling for liberty, the belief in the dignity of man, the respect for civilized law—these are great moral and political principles that are directly challenged by nazi-ism. What is wrong with the democracies is not that they hold these truths, but that in the difficult art of politics their application is sadly imperfect. Nazi-ism denies the truths themselves. These truths belong to the inheritance of Europe, and they are the bonds that unite peoples diverse in race in a common culture. For they belong to the Christian tradition of Europe which by teaching the underlying equality of all human individuals gave a new meaning and a new sanction to the Greek ideal of liberty and the Roman sense for law. Hitler has thus against him all that is vital in democracy both as a religion and as a way of life; as a faith and as a habit.

To measure this force we must remember the place that the struggle to vindicate and establish those principles takes in the great moments and the great documents of history. The Declaration of Independence by the American Colonies, so aptly quoted by the Liberal leader the other day, is rightly regarded as a landmark in history because it told feudal Europe that liberty and self-government are rights that attach to all men as children of a common Father. When Washington said that the concentration of power in one hand was the essence of tyranny he was opposing a king who was a very mild and amateur tyrant in comparison with Hitler. The dictators, looking at parliamentary government, with all its weaknesses and failures, see nothing grand or firm in the politics of western Europe. They cast derision on the French Revolution and the history of the British Parliament. But the latent strength of the principles that have inspired so much heroic history, religious and political, may easily escape the men who, having built their own power on confusion, think that arbitrary force is a universal remedy. If you remove from the history of Britain and of the United States, of France and Italy, of the Netherlands and the Swiss all that has been done to establish the rights of man by Christian prophets, liberal thinkers, and by rebel movements, what would be left? And this belief in liberty is the basis of the life of western Europe. What kind of life does nazi-ism offer in its place? Let anybody consider what life is like in Scandinavia and Switzerland, as described by Sir Ernest Simon in his recent book, The Smaller Democracies, and compare it with the life of Nazi Germany with its mass drill of mind and manners, its concentration camps, and its silenced thinkers, its homes and streets haunted by spies and eavesdroppers. Then let him consider what it would mean to the peoples of those states to be submerged in the Nazi system. Let him measure their loss in dignity, in freedom, in happiness, in their respect for themselves and for their nation. All of these states are formally neutral, but their history and their system of life forbid indifference. A world with so much of the passion for freedom in its blood and so much of the habit of freedom in its life will not easily submit to a tyrant, however ruthless his power.

Nothing to Mediate, Yet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 12, 1939

EDITORIAL FROM THE CHATTANOOGA TIMES

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Chattanooga Times of October 10:

[From the Chattanooga Times of October 10, 1939]

NOTHING TO MEDIATE, YET

Few political developments in this country in the past 20 years have been more amazingly contradictory to the policies of the Government and the sentiment of the people than the one which finds an element of the Senate suffering peace jitters. Isolationists who have contended for 20 years that the United States cannot hope to affect the course of European politics are urging that President Roosevelt intervene as a mediator between Nazi Germany, on the one hand, and Great Britain and France, on the other. Members of Congress who have supported as a cardinal point of this Nation's foreign policy a refusal to condone aggression as an instrument of national policy are now urging Mr. Roosevelt to accept Hitler's conquest of Poland as a fait accompli and to take the position as the elected representative of the people of this country that Hitler can be depended on to agree to an honorable peace.

The attitude of some Members of the Senate is incredibly fantastic. When Senator JOHNSON of Colorado tells the Senate, as he did on Monday, that the whole world would "be gratified" if the Senate recessed for 3 days, that such an act would be considered a sign that the United States desires peace, and that the people are counting on the Chief Executive to do what he can to effect it, he suggested a course which in the adoption would wipe out with one stroke every principle upon which this country has based its position as a world power.

Adolf Hitler has given Europe and the world two choices—peace on his terms or a destructive war. Hitler has asserted that the world must accept his conquest of Czechoslovakia, his annexation of Austria, his seizure of Memel, the disintegration—fourth partition—of Poland. The peace he would accept, or impose, would have to be based on the acknowledgement that Germany and Russia dominate all of Europe east of France's Maginot line and that, in addition, Germany's lost colonies would be restored to the Reich. It is small wonder that Russia supports Hitler's peace terms.

Neither Hitler nor any of his spokesmen has asked, directly or indirectly, that President Roosevelt become a mediator. No controversy can be mediated unless good faith on both sides is conceded and unless it is understood that in the interest of peace each side is prepared to yield ground which in the process of mediation is found untenable. Hitler has not offered to yield anything; indeed, what he seeks is not a mediator but someone—almost anyone with any standing—to take the position that he ought to be upheld.

Not even Mussolini, who has a military alliance with Germany, will undertake to mediate in those circumstances. Yet there are Members of the Senate apparently prepared to turn their back on every declaration of the American Government against aggression, and place President Roosevelt in the intolerable position of suggesting that Hitler's every aggressive act be condoned. Senators who support an appeal that Mr. Roosevelt intervene at this juncture cannot understand the implications of their position.

In effect, they say that the American people are more interested in the cessation of warfare than they are in any principle for which they may previously have declared. The American Government has refused formally to accept the German conquest and dismemberment of either Czechoslovakia or Poland; because the tragic fate of those unhappy states resulted from aggression, and because the United States has steadfastly refused to condone aggression, this country continues to recognize the Czechoslovakian Government and has more recently recognized the Polish Government now established in France. Yet those who want Mr. Roosevelt to grasp Hitler's "outstretched hand" ask him to say for the American people that Poland's destruction and the conquest of Czechoslovakia must be accepted as a basis for an enduring peace.

Except as an apologist for Hitler, President Roosevelt could not act as mediator, for there is nothing to mediate. The alternative to a war in which the aim of Germany's enemies is to stamp out Hitlerian aggression is a peace which puts the stamp of approval on every aggressive act of Hitler's brutal regime. Unless it is decided that a cessation of hostilities coupled with a pious hope that Hitler will keep the peace is worth purchasing at the cost of abandoning every principle for which this Nation has stood in world affairs, the American Government can concern itself with the European situation only to the degree of speeding the work of strengthening its own defenses. For Congress to take any step which had the effect of weakening the stand Britain and France are making would be to perform a monstrous disservice to every American who has regarded his Government as a force for just and honorable relations among all countries.

Citadel of Civilization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. FRIES

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 12, 1939

EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON TIMES-HERALD

Mr. FRIES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Times-Herald of October 8, 1939:

[From the Washington Times-Herald of October 8, 1939]

CITADEL OF CIVILIZATION

"Destiny first made us, with our sister nations on this hemisphere, joint heirs of European culture. Fate seems now to compel us to assume the task of helping to maintain in the western world a citadel wherein that civilization may be kept alive." (From President Roosevelt's message to special session of Congress, September 21, 1939.)

The above-quoted lines occurred in the last paragraph of the President's masterly speech opening the special session of Congress, called to consider Neutrality Act revision. In our opinion, those lines were as important as anything else the President said in that speech.

Certainly in North America we have just about all the building materials needed for the citadel of civilization of which the President spoke. We print again the most encouraging set of statistics we have ever seen about the United States:

"The United States contains 6 percent of the world's area and 7 percent of its population. It normally consumes 48 percent of the world's coffee, 53 percent of its sugar, 72 percent of its silk, 36 percent of its coal, 42 percent of its pig iron, 47 percent of its copper, and 69 percent of its crude petroleum.

"The United States operates 60 percent of the world's telephone and telegraph facilities, owns 80 percent of the motorcars in use, operates 53 percent of the railroads. It produces 70 percent of the oil, 60 percent of the wheat and cotton, 50 percent of the copper and pig iron, and 40 percent of the lead and coal output of the globe.

"The United States possesses more than $12,000,000,000 in gold, or about half the world's monetary metal. It has two-thirds of civilization's banking resources. The purchasing power of its 130,000,000 population is greater than that of the 500,000,000 people in Europe, and much larger than that of the more than 1,000,000,000 Asiatics.

"The United States also has 95 percent of the world's bathtubs."

What we lack South America has—coffee, rubber, tropical fruits and drugs, tin.

South America is just a trifle smaller than North—7,570,000 square miles as against our 8,000,000—while it is much more underpopulated than North America; about 80,000,000 people to North America's 160,000,000 or so.

ALL COULD LIVE WELL

If the two continents could somehow pool their resources and develop an adequate system of distribution, every man, woman, and child in the Western Hemisphere could be well fed, well clothed, well housed. Or make it 98 percent of all the people in the Western Hemisphere—there are eternally a few morons, subnormals, and criminals who have to be kept away from some of civilization's benefits for civilization's and their own safety.

In the United States we have achieved this ideal for about two-thirds of the population. There remains the one-third that is ill-fed, ill-clad, ill-housed, in the President's famous phrase. But a beginning has been made toward passing around more of the good things of machine civilization to these people. The W. P. A., home relief, T. V. A., the food stamps, farm-mortgage moratoriums, Federal housing subsidies—all these New Deal measures and many others have been steps in that direction.

The New Deal may have gone too far and too erratically in some of these reforms, but the basic idea has been right. Unrestricted competition, 100 percent rugged individualism, proved themselves failures in 1929, when they brought on widespread misery and 100 percent panic.

SEVERAL BIG "IFS"

If the United States can keep pushing ahead along the general lines mapped out by the New Deal, and if its influence can help the rest of the Western Hemisphere to make essentially the same kind of progress, the Western Hemisphere should be able to become the citadel of what civilization may be left in the world. And it should become the most prosperous and the happiest large slice of territory ever to flourish in the history of the world.

The above paragraph is a pretty "iffy" paragraph. But the biggest "if" in this beautiful vision is this: That it has a chance of coming true only if the Western Hemisphere can keep out of war. If we get dragged into the latest European war, Mr. Stalin will most likely capitalize the bankruptcy of the entire world after the shooting stops.

We need endlessly to renew our resolution to keep out of the European war, and we need enough naval and air defenses to protect our hemisphere against any conceivable combination of nations bent on bringing war over here.

Hitler's Boasting to Bolster Nazi Courage Offers No Basis for Peace Except Surrender

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 12, 1939

EDITORIAL FROM THE CHATTANOOGA NEWS

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Chattanooga News of October 7:

[From the Chattanooga News of October 7, 1939]

HITLER'S BOASTING TO BOLSTER NAZI COURAGE OFFERS NO BASIS FOR PEACE EXCEPT SURRENDER

What is the real intent and meaning of the speech Adolf Hitler made Friday to the Nazi Reichstag? This is a question which people all over the world cannot help but ask themselves.

Hitler's speech took an hour and 20 minutes for its delivery to his hearers. The Nazis made the most elaborate preparations, that every German would have the chance to hear it. All work was suspended, stores closed, loud speakers put up everywhere through the Reich. Unquestionably the German Government felt it of the utmost importance that their people hear what Der Fuehrer had to say.

We printed the speech in full in our paper yesterday. It occupied 13 columns of closely printed type. But a reading of it leaves one in great doubt as to what was the real, fundamental purpose Herr Hitler had in making it.

The first half of the speech was devoted to a discussion of the Polish war and Poland. It is a strange picture that Hitler sought to present. He termed the "blitzkrieg" against Poland "a great victory * * * unique in history." He sought to extol the strength of the Polish Republic and therefore to parade what the German Army had done as extraordinarily remarkable.

In so doing Hitler did not compliment the Poles. The closest he came to doing so was to admit that "the Polish soldiers as individuals fought bravely on many occasions." But from this he turned to a scornful description of the Polish officers as a class. "Their officers," he said, "beginning with the command, can only be described as irresponsible, unconscientious, and inefficient." He ridiculed the defense of Warsaw, insisting that any comparison of Warsaw and the Alcazar in Spain's civil war "is entirely out of place."

Der Fuehrer cited instance after instance in which he claimed numerically inferior German forces had defeated and routed greatly superior Polish forces. He gave no hint that Germany had used four times as many men as Poland had. Why was Hitler so ungenerous, so lacking in charity, actually so despicable, in his verbal assaults upon the Poles?

A friend suggests that actually his reason was that the true German spirit is not one of confidence and strength but one of fright, that can easily turn into despair. Therefore Hitler deliberately selects the mechanism of deriding an army and a people almost destroyed in order to overcome the German fear and to inspirit a worried folk. There may be a good deal to this explanation of an attitude that otherwise is strange indeed.

In regard to Russia, Hitler put the best face he could upon the pact with Stalin. Reversing completely the things he has said for 20 years about the stupidity, brutality, treachery, and villainy of the Communist state and its leadership, he referred to "the similarity of the problems affecting the two states," Russia and Germany, wherefore "every reason for any mutually hostile attitude has disappeared." He went on to say that Germany no longer hungered for the Ukraine or the Urals, surely a generous proclamation to Stalin, who has a "red" army twice as large as Hitler's Reichswehr.

Then he indulged in veiled threats about further remaking of the map of Eastern Europe, insisting that Germany and Russia together intend to procure "tolerable conditions" in that region; that they would "establish a new order of ethnographic conditions" resettling nationals so that minorities problems in the south and east of Europe would be avoided. He recognized that this whole region was "filled with splinters of the German nationality," whose independent existence could not be maintained. Therefore "resettlement" of these minorities must be undertaken.

Turning to the western world, he indulged in considerable fawning toward the French and appeal to the British. He insisted that he had the utmost respect for France and desired to bury forever the ancient enmity between the two nations. He denied that he had ever acted against British interests, and said one of his life aims had been "to reconcile these two peoples not only through mutual understanding but through inner sympathy."

So far as Britain is concerned, all the Nazis now want is the restoration of all their colonies and adequate living room. Germany has an "elementary right to a share of the world's resources of raw materials."

He has six points, he says, that now need to be settled. They are:

(1) A new Reich frontier which corresponds to the economic and racial needs of the Nazis.

(2) "The disposition of the entire living space according to the various nationalities.

(3) "A solution and settlement of the Jewish problem."

(4) Reconstruction of the economy of Poland and all southeastern Europe.

(5) Some sort of guaranty for the Polish area.

(6) The mitigation of the effects of war.

In essence, this means that what Hitler proposes is that France and England stop fighting and turn over the control of all Europe to him—that is, so far as Stalin will permit him to control it. As a program for peace, it is about as unsuitable a statement as could have been made. Undoubtedly peace could be made on these terms. But these terms are those of complete surrender of the democracies to the dictators.

The Arms Embargo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN L. SWEENEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 12, 1939

EDITORIALS FROM THE GAELIC AMERICAN

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include timely excerpts from the Gaelic American, New York newspaper, on the subject of the pending neutrality issue, as follows:

[From the Gaelic American, New York, October 7, 1939]

AN OLD SORE IS REOPENED BY CHURCHILL

Mr. Winston Churchill, First Lord of the British Admiralty, in a world-wide radio broadcast on October 1, in which he pictured England as the defender of human liberty, reopened an old American sore—the Civil War.

"All the heroism of the South," said Mr. Churchill, drawing a parallel with Nazi Germany, "could not redeem their cause from the stain of slavery."

In all fairness to the Confederates, who had the backing of England in their fight to smash the Union, Mr. Churchill should have pointed out that they inherited the slavery issue from England. Its doom was sealed when the Declaration of Independence was written, proclaiming the principle that "all men are born free and equal." With this slogan of emancipation, the Colonies went to war and broke forever the link that bound America in thrall to the British Empire.

Does Mr. Churchill hope to stir up another civil war on the arms-embargo issue?

[From the Gaelic American, New York, October 7, 1939]

LINCOLN GAVE THE ANSWER TO INVASION BUNK

In a drive to stampede Congress into repealing the arms embargo, many of the editorial writers, columnists, and correspondents associated with newspapers and interests that worked to embroil the United States in the last war are again "ringing the changes" on the danger of an American invasion by Germany. President Lincoln long since gave the right answer to this silly propaganda. Here's what the Emancipator said of it:

"Shall we expect some trans-Atlantic military giant to step the ocean and crush us at a blow? Never! All the armies of Europe, Asia, and Africa, with all the treasure of the earth (our own excepted) in their military chest, with a Bonaparte for a commander, could not by force take a drink from the Ohio or make a track on the Blue Ridge in a trial of a thousand years."

President Lincoln at Springfield, Ill., on January 27, 1837, gave that measured opinion, be it remembered, at a time when our population was less than 20,000,000.

[From the Gaelic American, New York, October 7, 1939]

A BOGEY REVAMPED

The many letters appearing in the press, and particularly in the New York papers, are to a large extent unneutral and the writers take sides covertly or openly with England and France in the present war. What a contrast with the letters with which the Congressmen are being bombarded from all parts of the United States, advocating nonparticipation in all foreign wars. It is estimated that 95 percent of the letters to Washington oppose the repeal of the arms-embargo provision of the Neutrality Act. The letters to Congress are written by average Americans, while those to the press emanate from bureaus established here by foreign governments.

As there are three well-equipped English bureaus in this city, their output is considerable, and their letters to the press are couched as if the writers were of old-time American stock. Perhaps the main headquarters of English propaganda is the British Library of Information, 270 Madison Avenue, New York, ostensibly a research bureau to which newspaper writers sometimes look for facts and figures relating to the British Empire. This office is not, however, for the convenience of those preparing copy for publication. It has other duties, and letter writing to the American papers is one of them.

In many of the letters appearing in the New York papers the writers try to alarm the credulous by emphasizing that in the event of the defeat of the two empires, the next object of attack by Germany would be the United States. This very item of the foreign propaganda was stressed during the World War. Such slogans as "If you do not fight Germany in Europe you will have to fight her in America" were kept up for 3 years. This absurdity, strange to say, was believed by the credulous and unthinking, who were convinced that it would be safer and more desirable to fight Germany in Europe. The English propagandists are again stressing this bogey that misled the gullible 22 years ago. Day after day we read in letter after letter that Hitler contemplates to invade America after he has disposed of the two democracies. Is it not plain to any person of common sense that the European powers will have their hands full to fight each other, and that no military leader or dictator would, in his wildest dreams, contemplate an invasion of America or any one of the Central or South American republics? No group of imperialists in the Old World would harbor such a wild project as the invasion of America. All the nations of the world combined, in the improbable event of such a combination, could not with any hope of success invade the United States. What did Abraham Lincoln say of a potential invasion of America? Speaking at Springfield, Ill., on January 27, 1837, he said:

"Shall we expect some trans-Atlantic military giant to step the ocean and crush us at a blow? Never! All the armies of Europe, Asia, and Africa combined, with all the treasure of the earth (our own excepted) in their military chest, with a Bonaparte for a commander, could not by force take a drink from the Ohio or make a track on the Blue Ridge in a trial of a thousand years."

When Lincoln spoke these thrilling words the population of America was less than 20,000,000. Today it is 130,000,000. The propagandists will, however, advance the argument that Lincoln lived before the age of fast ships, ocean cables, radio, airplanes, and all the modern inventions which have almost annihilated time and space. In all modern progress, however, America has kept well in the lead and the latest engine of warfare, the airplane, is an American invention. Today, as well as in Lincoln's time the Atlantic and the Pacific Oceans secure the United States from the danger of invasion.

The American who believes that one European country can invade America, and who fears that the contest would be doubtful, is unworthy of his heritage. Let him memorize Lincoln's words and imbibe the spirit of the great American who believed that all the nations combined could not conquer the United States.

Preservation of Peace and Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE E. GEYER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 12, 1939

ARTICLE FROM THE YORK (PA.) GAZETTE AND DAILY

Mr. GEYER of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert in the RECORD an article from the Gazette and Daily of York, Pa. It is very pleasing to me to note that others are also stressing the importance of other things than the embargo alone, when it comes to the all-important problem of keeping this country out of war. Surely under the cry of national crisis, we are not going to allow this great Nation to scrap all the gains made in social legislation and create such a hysteria that we will be willing to scuttle the civil liberties guaranteed to us under the Constitution. I must confess that there are times when I am a bit alarmed when I follow the recent trends.

The article follows:

[From the York (Pa.) Gazette and Daily]

JOINT LABOR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS GEYER PLAN

The joint labor committee, of York County, comprised of unions affiliated with the American Federation of Labor and the Congress of Industrial Organizations, last night recommended a program to keep the United States out of war and to extend democracy at home. The joint labor committee decided to recommend the program proposed by Congressman LEE E. GEYER, of California, to members of American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations unions and to the people of the community at large, to maintain peace and to extend democracy. The recommended program follows:

1. Take all the profits out of war.

(a) Nationalize, if possible, the munitions industry. That failing, limit the profit thereon.

(b) Curb all profiteering, particularly on food and other necessities of life.

(c) Continue the protection of labor's right to organize and bargain collectively in order that they may defend their wages and living standards against war profiteers.

2. Guard against incidents such as the sinking of the *Lusitania* likely to incite war fever in this country.

(a) Keep American citizens out of war danger zones.

(b) Keep American ships out of war danger zones.

(c) Prohibit the travel of American citizens on belligerent ships.

(d) Require belligerents to take title to all commodities, including food and clothing, as well as raw materials of war, such as scrap iron, oil, and cotton, before they leave American ports.

(e) Require belligerents to transport all commodities in their own ships.

(f) No credits, either public or private, to warring nations.

(g) Continue the Munitions Control Board requiring all purchases of war supplies to be licensed by the Government.

(h) Treat the finished product the same as the raw materials of which "arms, ammunition, and implements of war" are made by replacing the embargo with "title and carry" on all, thereby treating all nations alike. This is real neutrality.

3. Preserve and extend democracy at home.

(a) Protect the civil liberties (freedom of speech, press, and assembly) of all Americans in order that the desire of the American people to remain at peace may continually be voiced.

(b) Allow every group, regardless of whether they are in the minority or the majority, to continue to exercise the rights of freedom of speech, press, assembly, and worship as guaranteed under the Constitution, lest this denial become contagious and spread until the privileges be lost, as was the case in Germany.

(c) Insist on the right of a job at a decent living wage for every man able to work, and an adequate pension to those past employment age, not as charity but as a right. This will provide the economic basis of real national unity and patriotism, giving no chance for un-American doctrines to gain headway.

Problems of Law Enforcement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH J. O'BRIEN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 12, 1939

ADDRESS OF J. EDGAR HOOVER, DIRECTOR, FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION, BEFORE THE ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF CHIEFS OF POLICE, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., OCTOBER 10, 1939

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by J. Edgar Hoover at San Francisco October 10, 1939:

There have been few times, if any, in our history when law enforcement faced a more serious ordeal than today. Not even in the turbulent World War days were there greater problems. We then battled only subversive forces and sporadic crime, not a widely flung underworld often highly organized in racketeering and destruction. There has never been a greater need for progress, development, and improvement within the ranks of law enforcement. Widespread cooperation must be marshaled if we are to meet the difficult problems that lie before us.

We have a habit in the International Association of Chiefs of Police of speaking frankly, of rolling up our sleeves at these annual meetings and talking over our problems man to man, striving always to face the truth, no matter how unpleasant that may be. In this spirit of frankness, I ask that we face the fact together that the demand for improvement must start within the ranks of law enforcement, for it will come only through our own efforts. Glaring irregularities which public apathy may have glossed over in the past will be brought into the foreground in the future. Our house must now be put in order through vigorous and concerted action, both for national defense and self-defense.

The President of the United States has instructed the Federal Bureau of Investigation to take charge of all investigative work in matters involving espionage, sabotage, subversive activities, and violations of our neutrality regulations. He has asked all law enforcing agencies to refer promptly to the F. B. I. any information obtained by them relating to such matters. I am confident that each and every law-enforcement agency in our Nation will realize its responsibility in this national emergency and will whole-heartedly respond to our President's request.

You are assured that the F. B. I. will carry on this special work in the same way in which it has functioned in other phases of its activities in recent years—in a calm, impartial, vigorous but unhysterical manner. Constitutional guaranties of American citizens must be protected. We must proceed in an orderly, lawful manner.

Just as the old-fashioned dragnet never served as a cure for crime, neither will similar "drives" be an effective inoculation against espionage. The paramount task is to secure the facts and establish the guilt of those who owe their allegiance to a foreign power before invoking the authority of the law. This is the function of duly constituted, capable, and efficient law-enforcing and investigative bodies, but, of course, we need the aid of loyal and thoroughly honest, patriotic citizens at all times.

If the internal defense of the Nation is to be preserved, there must be a coordination and centralization of responsibility such as the President of the United States signified by his recent request directed to American law enforcement. Every effort must be directed in an orderly manner by thoroughly responsible, well-trained, professional law-enforcement officers, totally devoid of hysteria. The evil spirits which would destroy America must be met and conquered. In this there can be no middle ground.

In the wave of patriotism that is rising in the country there lies the danger of overzealous groups or individuals engaging in acts which are distinctly un-American in method, no matter how patriotic in aim. We need no vigilantes in this situation. The vigilante method is distinctly contrary to American ideals of justice. The Federal Bureau of Investigation has been called upon to investigate all matters relating to espionage, sabotage, and violations of the neutrality regulations. In turn, the Federal Bureau of Investigation has requested cooperation of all law-enforcement officers in the United States.

This combined attack by Federal and State forces should be sufficient so far as investigation and prosecution are concerned. Beyond the efforts of these law-enforcement agencies there is a need, of course, for the individual cooperation of all sincere and earnest Americans. This cooperation should be limited, however, to passing on to the proper officials all questionable facts or rumors which may come one's way. An alert public is the best defense against traitorous or inimical conduct. Let us be realistic and practical, ever alert to the dangers which we know lurk in practically every community in the land, but always calm in our judgment between the real and unreal.

Therefore, I place before you as the prime requisite of progress in law enforcement the urgent current need for reconstruction, of improvement, of the weeding out of inefficiency and a spirit of grim determination to face the problem of all crime with a resolution never before known in our history. This cannot be done for us; we of law enforcement must do it for ourselves.

In proof of this I have only to point to the development of the F. B. I. Today, through the selection of proper personnel, through a Gibraltar-like stand against outside interference, through constant battling for the better things in enforcement, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, I am proud to say, has demonstrated that obstacles can be overcome. No favored friend of the underworld makes appointments to the F. B. I. No power is great enough to swerve this body from its sworn duty, nor from its tenets of fidelity, bravery, integrity. And I insist that the experiences of the F. B. I. are within the grasp of every law-enforcement organization in America. Many of you have been resolute in your determination to mold your organization upon the same principles of efficiency and decency. This of necessity requires unrelenting persistence, a spirit of self-sacrifice, and unwavering faith and courage to dig in and fight for that which is right. It requires the fearlessness emulated by the Attorney General of the United States, Hon. Frank Murphy, in his stand against corruption and his burning zeal to do something about the situation.

It is the unfortunate plight of America in this period of chaos in world affairs to become the jousting ground for the subversive forces which work against our best interests, even our national existence. That these may go beyond the ordinary espionage activities and into the realms of sabotage and the fomenting of outbreaks and riots is, of course, not beyond possibility. Such things have been tried before. They are a part of the plans of those who, like termites, bore from within. I need not tell you men of law and order that the underworld will take every advantage of the added burdens upon law-enforcing bodies. This is an inevitable certainty. Beyond that the minions of lawlessness will be used at every opportunity by those who seek to undermine our national defense.

Therefore, as a battleship's decks are cleared for action in the face of an enemy challenge, so must law enforcement be ready for any emergency, armed with the best of ideals, courage, personnel, and equipment.

The maintenance of law and order has always been one of our most important governmental functions, warranting the highest type of personnel and facilities that a community can provide. If your community has failed in its duty, it is now your solemn obligation to insist that the opportunities be provided whereby lecherous barnacles—the lazy officer, the corrupt officer, the cheating officer, or the ignorant officer—may be eliminated. Facilities long lacking must be made available if our people are to be protected. The handcuffs of corrupt politics must be struck from your wrists in order that you may be allowed to place the profession of law enforcement upon a high plane of efficiency, honesty, and integrity. Decency demands that this be done in every community in America.

To do this our profession in its entirety must be able to go before the public with clean hands. We must be able to prove, in asking that corrupt politics in law enforcement be cast aside, that we are not tainted by partisan political machinations. When we ask for cooperation and demand efficiency, let us be sure that there are no cheap jealousies or lack of cooperation to weaken our case. Unfortunately, there is not enough cooperation among the law-enforcement bodies of America. Lip service does not suffice. There is too much petty jealousy among officers. There is too much eagerness to capture the headline instead of the criminal.

You men of experience can recount instance after instance of how a lack of cooperation has brought about added expense, difficulties of apprehension, and often the escape of a desperado. The chase of practically every major criminal has presented outstanding examples of unselfish effort of law-enforcement officers, eager to lift the

banners of law and order above all other aims. At this time I would be remiss if I did not publicly express the appreciation of the F. B. I. for the efforts of those officers who have aided us in the discharge of our duties. And we have been proud of the opportunities which we have had in helping you.

Since we are frankly considering the problems and difficulties of law enforcement, let us examine another evil wrecker of popular public respect. I refer to the matter of corruption. There have been instances wherein vicious criminals, even professional murderers, have been allowed to go free by persons who blemished the name of law enforcement by calling themselves peace officers. It is true that law enforcement has been stifled by crooked politics.

Truthfully, no single criminal can correctly be given the title "Public Enemy No. 1." That appellation can be claimed only by "Old Man Corrupt Politics." And he lives in practically every community in the land. No officer can truly promote law enforcement when he follows the precepts of crooked politics and himself indulges in corruption, whether it be petty graft, the acceptance of bribes for the freeing of arrested men, or for the weakening of testimony in court or engaging in acts of criminality, which has been the case all too often and is evidenced unfortunately by men in uniform having been convicted of every type of crime from petty thievery to bank robbery and rape.

It should be an inviolable rule that every law-enforcement officer in America should be fingerprinted before he is given a shield of authority, and those prints sent to the F. B. I. in Washington for search against the criminal records. Not until the International Association of Chiefs of Police goes on record as demanding this protection can it be truly said that the police departments of this country are making a determined effort to free the inner ranks of law enforcement from those destructive agents who do so much to stain its name.

It certainly should be no matter of pride to any of us when a chief of police is found to be a fugitive from justice, or when ex-convicts are discovered in the ranks of law enforcement. The time long has passed when a thief should be set to catch a thief. Thieves and all other criminals can best be brought to justice by honest men. Only men of integrity and decency can shake the complacency of the underworld.

It must be taken for granted that the average law-enforcing body is most eager for improvement. Nevertheless, the status of the majority is lowered by those retrogressive bodies which still adhere to the outmoded and disproved theory that enforcement of law truly rests in the end of a night stick. Police training is now available to practically every law-enforcement officer in America who desires it. The F. B. I. National Police Academy already has graduated over 400 officers, the majority of whom are qualified police instructors. And the doors of the academy are open to every community in the Nation. The entire facilities of the F. B. I. are at the command of American law enforcement.

Yet it is a grievous fact that there are a number of communities which absolutely refuse to take advantage of police training. In others it has been found that certain officers have been sent to the National Police Academy as a mere sham and a sop to public opinion. They have gone there, many of them, under personal sacrifice; they have given of their time and their efforts and returned to their communities only to find themselves blocked at every turn by jealousies or by an absolute aversion to advancement in police methods. Sometimes the stumbling block has been an older officer, too set in his ways to admit that there is such a thing as scientific crime detection, but all too often the obstacle has been the intrusion of corrupt politics. In case after case the graduate has been shunted from one job to another, or pigeonholed with the promise of later activity, or the excuse of insufficient funds with which to conduct the necessary schools.

Why law enforcement, in certain instances, should deliberately, and sometimes maliciously, refuse to take the channels which inevitably will lead toward a weakening in the ranks of crime is more than any intelligent advocate of law and order possibly can understand. In spite of all this, however, progress has been constant and gradual until today law enforcement is regarded as having surpassed all other public services in the advancements which it has made.

Consider for a moment the possibilities of the F. B. I. National Police Academy. The primary purpose of the F. B. I. National Police Academy is to train selected officers in order that they may return to their respective police organizations and impart the training received at Washington, D. C., to the members of their local departments. With the completion of the twelfth session of the F. B. I. National Police Academy, over 400 graduates have returned to their communities and have made instruction available to almost 100,000 police officers. In addition, officials have graduated from the academy representing the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, the Quebec Provincial Police, New Scotland Yard, London, England, and the Shanghai Municipal Police, Shanghai, China.

I am happy to report that those officers attending the next session of the academy will be housed in a modern, air-conditioned barracks building at Quantico, Va., during their 3 months of training, free of charge except for actual subsistence. In addition, we are building the most modern pistol and rifle ranges at Quantico to be found anywhere in the world, where daily the Police Academy students may receive the finest training in all practical uses of firearms and protective devices known to law enforcement. The F. B. I. training center at Quantico fulfills a dream of many years—it establishes a veritable "West Point of law enforcement."

Certainly here is the forerunner of a new day in law enforcement. Here is a tribute to the foresightedness of you outstanding officers who have cooperated so efficiently with the Bureau in this work. I am grateful to your committee on police education and training for its support of our training project and I desire to pay my respects to those officers who have attended the F. B. I. National Police Academy at great personal sacrifice. I cannot praise too highly the determination and absolute heroism of such men in continuing their studies against every possible effort to turn them from their chosen path.

Progress can come only in a lawful manner. No law-enforcement body which stoops to entrapment or illegal or unethical tactics can possibly deserve anything but contempt. The catching of a criminal is one thing, his conviction is another. No law-enforcement body can call itself properly efficient unless it is so equipped that it can follow through in court what it has begun in the field of apprehension.

It has always been my belief that peace officers should fight for the right, not only in the actual apprehension or detection or conviction of offenders, but in all matters as well. It was for this reason that I subjected myself to the sneers and jeers of sentimental piffle purveyors by decrying the scandals of parole. It has been for this reason that I have constantly abjured the average citizen to be ever alert in his own community for his own protection. An officer's sworn duty to himself should be to fight day and night, no matter what his hours of duty may be, for improvement of conditions about him. This means that passive inaction no longer can be tolerated.

The world today is in a death grapple for the preservation of democracy. It has been the record of history that dictatorships, whether in villages, states, or nations, have been founded upon gangster tactics. Our fight against dictatorships must begin at home—in every crossroads in the land. If a chief of police is hampered in his work by a venal politician then it is his duty to stand up like a man and let his community know that fact. If criminals go free because a prosecuting attorney is subject to bribe taking, then it is a solemn obligation to get the evidence and prove this man to be what he is, for after all, a crook in public office is 10 times as devastating as any crook who ever roamed the underworld. There is no stain that can soil civilization more, no viciousness more deadly, no stench more vile, than that of a criminal who masquerades as a protector of his community.

There is a great need for wide extension of crime-prevention activities. One of the most important of all law-enforcement activities is the building of a closer bond of cordiality and of understanding between the law-enforcement officer and the child. There is no greater saving in life, property, or human qualities than that which comes in the prevention of crime. The subject must be approached scientifically and realistically. There is no place in it for the sob sister or the charlatan, the faker, or the quack. Neither is there any place for the weak-kneed Casper Milquetoast who is unwilling to face the facts.

The youth problem in crime is a national disgrace. The figures compiled by the Federal Bureau of Investigation must make one stop and think. They point to a definite increase in youthful criminals. So far this year more persons 19 years of age have been arrested than of any other age. They are closely followed by the 18-year-olds. It is not pleasant to walk through any penal institution or jail in America and look into endless rows of youthful faces. Over 19 percent of all persons arrested this year have been under voting age. These individuals constitute 12 percent of all murderers arrested, 29 percent of all robbers, 46 percent of all burglars, 33 percent of all thieves, and 54 percent of all automobile thieves. We cannot dodge the issue or argue that these facts result from youthful folly. America no longer can refuse to face the causes behind this rising tide of juvenile crime. It is a definite challenge.

I have been condemned for insisting upon bringing to light many phases of youthful crime, and because I have dared to speak the truth—that crime rests at the doorstep of the American home. Some individuals believe we should keep all of this behind a curtain, but I insist that no concealed evil can be remedied. The way to cure a plague is by quarantine, by ferreting out the carriers of disease and either eradicating them or placing them where they cannot infect the populace. The same realistic approach to crime prevention must be made.

I believe the time is approaching, unless we block it, when the subject of probation will be open to as many charges of scandal as that of parole. This applies particularly to the power which certain judges have taken upon themselves, either through egotism, sentimentalism, corrupt politics, or other causes, to decide whether or not a man should serve his sentence or ever be tried. I have the case before me of a motor thief who was not even taken into court because a judge decided that the case was merely one of youthful folly. In another instance, a teacher—an instructor of youth—was found quite by accident to have a criminal record, which included embezzlement and the forgery of United States Treasury checks. Yet she had never served a day of her sentence. In another case a bank embezzler who stole Christmas and vacation savings was allowed to go free on probation after serving a 1-day sentence. Again, a bank official, who, it is estimated, stole more than $100,000, walked out of court without serving a day, having been put on probation. Such perversions of ordinary justice poison the springs of public confidence in law enforcement.

Not for a moment must we lose sight of the fact that sure detection, swift apprehension, and certain punishment are the three

time-proven ingredients which provide a remedy for crime. Any weakening in this attitude places us at the mercy of the underworld. We are constantly surrounded by nitwits and porous-brained sentimentalists who, either through powder-puff perspective or actual affiliation with the criminal element, seek to undermine the foundations upon which we must stand if we are to protect the American home.

Just why certain individuals who intrude themselves upon law enforcement seem to give the major part of their attention to getting criminals out of prison instead of putting them there, where they deserve to be, is a mystery we never will be able to solve. We must fight them with every atom of strength we possess and bestow upon them the contumely they deserve as first aids to crime. There must be a rededication to not only fight crime but to prevent crime.

I have said before and I say again—America has room for only one ism—Americanism. All other isms are inimical to the best interests of our Nation. Let no smoke screen descend upon you, blinding your vision from the pitfalls that lie ahead. Let there be no misunderstanding as to the meaning of true Americanism. It is an abiding adherence to our democracy that sprang from the Declaration of Independence and is defined by the Bill of Rights and the Constitution. Loyalty to those principles is Americanism.

Its ideals are translated in a wholesome respect and obedience to the laws of the land. It is holding high the banners of law and order. Americanism represents liberty. It is respect for all nations without entangling alliances. It is free worship without bigotry. It is truth without distortion of fact. Americanism is love for our time-honored institutions. Americanism is that desire, that willingness, that determination that motivates our citizens to stand ready to defend our liberty against every subversive force, whether it come from within or without. Again, I say, our spacious land is big enough only for the one true ism—Americanism—first, last, and always.

The maintenance of law and constituted authority is our surest and safest protection against the scheming aggression of the unlawful and godless enemies of the stability of our social order. Let us keep a united front for its preservation.

An Open Letter to the Gallup Poll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 11, 1939

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, under leave extended to me I am inserting in the RECORD at this point a copy of a letter, which I yesterday sent to Dr. George Gallup, of Princeton, N. J., the manager of the American Institute of Public Opinion and the so-called Gallup Poll, which appears in a number of American newspapers.

My reason for inserting this letter in the RECORD will be obvious to all who read its contents. I have written Dr. Gallup because I am frankly disturbed by the unscientific and inaccurate conclusions reported in the publication of this poll in the Washington Post and other newspapers under date of October 11. Heretofore I have never had any reason to doubt the motives or impartiality of the Gallup poll; I do not know that I doubt them now, but it must be apparent to all who study the analysis made in the body of my letter that the findings of this particular poll reflect some gross errors of reasoning, and I am sure you all join with me in the hope that Dr. Gallup will replace the loosely worded question carried in this poll by one which will enable his interviewers to make a careful and accurate analysis of American public sentiment on what is probably the most important question ever analyzed by Dr. Gallup's organization.

A poll of the size and significance of the Gallup poll can be a great power for good or a tremendous influence for evil. If the questions are meticulously phrased, the answers honestly recorded, and the samplings generously enough taken such a poll can help legislators understand the true sentiments of their constituents. However, should such a poll ever be used for purposes of propaganda or political preferment, it could render a genuine disservice to America until such time as its corruption and bias were exposed. It is with the sincere hope that Dr. Gallup will desire to maintain his regular polls on a high plane of impartiality and fairness with which they were originally started that I have written him with these constructive criticisms and that I have offered to insert his reply in the RECORD, because I am sure that you will all join me in being gratified at his anticipated willingness to reexamine American public opinion on the arms-embargo question with an interrogatory so phrased as to accurately probe the sentiments of our constituents.

My letter to Dr. Gallup follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., October 12, 1939.

Dr. GEORGE GALLUP,
Manager, the Gallup Poll, American Institute of Public Opinion, Princeton, N. J.

MY DEAR DR. GALLUP: It is because I have always defended the Gallup poll as an unbiased and scientific effort to sample public opinion without design or prejudice and because I have every confidence in your sincere desire to conduct such a sounding of public sentiment that I am writing you this letter of what I hope you will consider constructive criticism.

I have reference to the poll published in the Washington Post, and I presume other daily newspapers, of October 11. The text accompanying the statistics of this poll indicates that the same question has been asked in similar polls on at least three occasions. My purpose in writing this letter is to call to your attention and to the attention of my colleagues in the House and Senate the strange conflict existing between the statistics of these polls and the conclusions you draw therefrom in the text accompanying them. I am sure this conspicuous error in logical findings is an oversight on the part of one of your associates and not a willful effort to paint into the picture something which your question entirely and clearly fails to reveal. It is because I have this confidence in your integrity and sincerity of purpose that I am calling these fallacious findings to your attention in the belief that you will want to take steps to bring your figures and your conclusions into harmony with each other.

The question asked by your interviewers was, "Do you think Congress should change the neutrality law so that England and France or any other nations can buy war supplies here?" Your findings show a range of from 57 to 60 percent favoring such a change. I have no fault to find with these findings or this question, but when the text which you print with these statistics draws such startling, irrelevant, and disassociated deductions as the following quotations from your statement, I cannot help but call attention to such fallacies. For example, the statement, "During the past few days, after Senators BORAH and VANDENBERG had presented their case against repeal of the arms embargo and Senators CONNALLY and PITTMAN had presented the opposite case, institute interviewers were busy gathering the opinions of voters throughout the country." The implication is clear-cut to the effect that "interviewers were busy gathering the opinions of voters throughout the country" on proposed repeal of the arms embargo. But the institute's question avoids mention of the arms embargo; asks simply about selling war supplies (which could be wheat, cotton, beef, razor blades, or any other nonmilitary commodities) to England and France or "any other nations" (and the field is left all the way open and not even limited to belligerent nations). So conclusions that America wants repeal of the arms embargo cannot validly be made on the basis of such a leading question.

May I submit another example or two of how your findings do violence to the conclusions your reporter deducts from them? I quote: "Even though a majority of voters may favor selling war supplies to belligerent countries * * *." There is no basis for such a conclusion in the interrogatory quoted in your article since it says "so that England or any other nation can buy war supplies here." Opening the field to "any other nations" does not limit it, certainly, to "belligerents," and those answering your interviewers were not given a clear-cut choice.

Even a more obvious example of how the statistics and the statements of this report fight against each other is the following quoted from this article of October 11: "Among those voters who want to see the arms embargo lifted the chief reason is an economic reason" and "Those voters who think the neutrality law should remain unchanged and the arms embargo kept in force argue principally that to lift the embargo would lead the United States into war." Your interrogatory states: "Do you think Congress should change the neutrality law so that England and France or any other nations can buy war supplies here?" Nothing there about lifting the arms embargo. Nothing asked and nothing answered by which it can scientifically be concluded that any percentage of those questioned did or did not favor selling "arms, munitions, and implements of war" to "belligerent nations." The person interviewed is asked one question and his answer is interpreted to mean something entirely different.

Now, Mr. Gallup, were it not for the fact that your poll of public opinion has come to have a reputation for impartiality and accuracy, such erroneous conclusions as above cited would not be serious. However, I am sure you are most zealous to maintain the reputation of your fact-finding organization and I feel confident you will want to rectify the false conclusions above referred to and for that reason I am calling them to your attention. I personally have every confidence in your sincerity of purpose and believe you are as eager as I that no false assumptions be based upon the findings of your interviewers. While studying statistics in my postgraduate work at

Columbia University, I was impressed with the ease with which unintentional errors can creep into questionnaires and how important it is that conclusions harmonize perfectly with the findings secured from specific inquiries.

I have heard your poll quoted in Congress to show "the American public favors repeal of the arms embargo" and have wondered at the sharp disparity between your findings and the mail received in practically every congressional office indicating the American public wants the arms embargo retained. An analysis of your findings and conclusions, as above briefed, clearly explains one possible reason for such a difference. Careless readers conclude, "The Gallup poll shows Americans want the embargo lifted." Actually the Gallup poll shows no such thing by the widest stretch of the imagination although the text, erroneously, does make such conclusions. The poll itself simply shows that Americans favor selling England and France or other nations (not necessarily at war) "war supplies" (which no authority limits to the arms, munitions, and implements of war which are the crux of the fight on embargo repeal). It is most unfortunate that such a glaring discrepancy occurs in such a highly respected poll on one of the most important issues ever explored by your interviewers. I hope your zest for accuracy and your desire to maintain the reliability and reputation of the Gallup poll will lead you to correct this unhappy situation.

Many Congressmen join with the writer in coveting for ourselves an accurate analysis of just what the American public does desire regarding repeal of the arms embargo. We would welcome an accurate testing of public sentiment by your interviewers to confirm or dispute the trends definitely indicated by the correspondence we are receiving. We are not proponents or opponents of any pet neutrality scheme, but we are trying to find a peace-preserving formula back of which a majority of American public opinion can and will rally. Your organization could render real assistance on this epochal measure if you will prepare a straightforward, impartial question on lifting of the arms embargo and report your findings with conclusions based on such a nonprejudicial question.

May I suggest you interview American sentiment on some such question as, "Do you think Congress should repeal the existing arms embargo in your neutrality legislation, so that nations at war could buy arms, munitions, and implements of war from the United States?" That is the question in dispute in Congress. Findings on that question would be most helpful in the present controversy. They would also make interesting comparisons with the findings you report on the altogether different question listed in your present analysis of American neutrality sentiment. Or you might ask, "Do you think cash-and-carry provisions in our American neutrality program should include shipments of arms, munitions, and implements of war to nations at war, or do you believe this country should continue to prohibit the shipment of such munitions to belligerents?" Either of the above questions asks a fair question and will provide an analysis upon which helpful conclusions can be based. And just as a sporting proposition, I'll bet you a ticket to the Army-Navy football game that the percentages reported will be surprisingly different from those received to the less clear-cut question upon which you are now drawing conclusions.

If you find it too expensive or too arduous to make a Nation-wide survey on either of the straight-to-the-shoulder questions I have suggested, may I suggest that in the interests of accuracy and fairness you at least take sample findings in several States and publish the comparisons between those findings and the ones you are currently reporting?

Finally, let me state that I presume your interviewers use several follow-up questions to the one you print in your article of October 11. However, you and I both know, as does every student of statistics, that the first question directs the line of answers which the individual gives to subsequent clarifying questions. If the first question is a "leading question" or an ambiguous one—and I believe your interrogatory is subject to both indictments—the answers to the follow-up questions are at least partially predetermined in advance. Let us, therefore, have an analysis of American opinion on the clear-cut question of where American citizens stand on the matter of selling arms, munitions, and implements of war to nations at war.

Mr. Gallup, I believe the errors in statistical fact finding to which I feel compelled to call the attention of my colleagues and you are unintentional and accidental. I absolve you of any desires to engage in propagandizing on either side of the arms-embargo issue; I have had great faith in the integrity of your Institute of Public Opinion, and I expect your reply and reaction to this letter will reestablish this confidence in your desire to keep free from permitting your Gallup poll to become an instrument for the distribution of inaccurate information. Since I am inserting this letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in a desire to point out how some speakers are incorrectly concluding from your statistics that America has expressed itself through them on the arms-embargo question, I shall do you the courtesy of also inserting your reply in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, unless that procedure is objected to by you.

With every assurance of my continued belief in your integrity and my confidence that you will help to correct the erroneous impressions unintentionally created and circulated by your current statistics on the neutrality question, I am,

Cordially yours,

KARL MUNDT, M. C.,
First District, South Dakota.

The "Iroquois" Incident

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. FRANCIS HARTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 12, 1939

Mr. HARTER of New York. Mr. Speaker, this morning's paper carried the news that the liner *Iroquois* had docked safely in New York Harbor yesterday. This is a particularly interesting news item in view of the news releases disseminated last week which astounded citizens throughout the country who had been urged to keep their feet on the ground.

At that time the Nation was told that the executive department, after long discussion with members of the Cabinet, released the story that a representative of our Government was told that the *Iroquois* would be sunk on its present trip to New York, on which it had embarked a day or so before.

I feel that we are entitled to know what prompted this release. Did our executive department feel that in making the release public after the *Iroquois* sailed it was helping to keep the country from becoming inflamed against some other country or countries in this crisis? Did those persons responsible for the release feel that it would help to make the relatives of those American citizens on the boat—passengers and ship personnel alike—feel more at ease while the ship was crossing, wondering what radio program would be interrupted to announce the sinking of the *Iroquois?* The people of this country are keeping their feet on the ground; and I think the least their officials can do is to go about performing their duties quietly, aiding our citizens rather than causing consternation and fear. We yet wonder what country was indicated in the release as being the butt of our ill-feeling if the ship were sunk. By all means, our Nation's duty is to protect that liner in its crossing, but was the accompanying ominous innuendo broadcast to the American people and the world also necessary? Does not the release make our officials somewhat ludicrous? If the vessel should have happened to come to grief, certainly our inefficiency would have ample international advertising. Perhaps I am wrong; but if I am, many citizens who wish to see our mighty country stand out during these trying times for its intelligent, unemotional handling of its international affairs are likewise wrong. Veterans of the last war, former members of our Intelligence Service, and other citizens have personally expressed to me their indignation concerning the release. I hope those responsible will quiet our fears that this may be only the beginning of releases which may tend against quiet, reasoned, thoughtful consideration of international episodes.

Common Sense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 12, 1939

ARTICLE BY JOHN T. FLYNN, FROM THE WASHINGTON DAILY NEWS

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by

John T. Flynn, appearing in the Washington Daily News under date of October 11, 1939:

[From the Washington Daily News of October 11, 1939]

PLAIN ECONOMICS

(By John T. Flynn)

NEW YORK, October 11.—I listened to Maj. Gen. Smedley Butler on the radio the other night as he talked about the neutrality fight. And as I listened I could not help thinking that, of all the cheap forms of propaganda used on the American people in the last 2 years, nothing tops the attempt to make them believe that when Hitler has disposed of Britain and France he will turn his attention to our vast and alluring resources.

That particular argument has always struck me as a peculiarly contemptuous affront to the intelligence of the American people.

Butler, who spent his life in active operations as the commanding general of the marines, who has taken part in 125 military operations all over the globe, disposed of that argument pretty quickly.

He said what, it seems, every person must admit—that any country which sent a military expedition to the United States would not think of sending less than a million men. After all, a million men would not be too few to send against our rich and powerful 130,000,000 people 3,000 miles from Europe, when Italy sent half a million against the almost unarmed and barefoot people of Ethiopia.

To bring such an army would require a thousand ocean-going vessels—large ones. And they would have to be landed all at once.

But for every soldier the conqueror would have to carry immense stores, arms, ammunition. He would have to bring for an army of a million men 400,000 vehicles—tanks, trucks, cannon carriers, wagons, etc. He would have to bring gasoline to service those trucks and tanks—50,000,000 gallons for a limited period of 9 months. He would have to bring machine guns and countless shiploads of ammunition for these guns.

How many additional ships this would take one may only estimate, but not less than an additional thousand.

All these men and all this material would have to come all at once—not in installments—because it would be ridiculous for a foreign enemy to land a few thousand men on this coast thousands of miles from their base.

When the ships which landed arrived they would then have to return to bring more materials. And to do this they would have to have fuel—coal or oil. Where would they get it? Certainly we would not be at the beach to supply them with it.

And what would the American people be doing all this time? Remember, all our great harbors put together could not accommodate all at once 2,000 ships to unload their men and munitions, assuming that the enemy had possession of them, which, obviously, they would not have.

And where is the navy which would be equal to convoying such an armada across the seas? The whole thing is a preposterous tale, fit only to frighten children. Yet serious men are saying we had better go over and fight against Hitler in Europe rather than have to fight him later on our shores.

Columbus Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 12, 1939

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, in celebrating the four hundred and forty-seventh anniversary of the discovery of America there is no added honor we can pay Columbus, for he needs no eulogies, since history accords him all the praise that this great man deserves.

Columbus not only discovered America but he also planted the cross of Christianity upon it. It was the greatest contribution to civilization and progress the world has ever known.

Throughout the world the anniversary of the discovery of America should be observed and celebrated. To us, however, it means more than an historical celebration; it is a holy event. Humbly, my friends, I ask you to continue making payments to Columbus' memory for what he has done for us. We can best honor him by continuing our efforts toward good and loyal citizenship in our glorious country—America; and with the same spirit of Christian humility and decency in our hearts we have tried to live up to the standard set by him, an Italian, and the first white man who stepped on the shores of the American Continent.

Columbus was a man of pure life, a scholar, one who was persistent in his views, and, to my mind, the greatest man of all time. On this day, the anniversary of that great occasion, I call on all true and loyal Americans to stand by America and to thank God that we are in a country that guarantees us freedom of speech and press and the right to worship God according to our own dictates. Our Government wants peace—a true peace and not verbal peace.

In other countries these are troubled times, as we all know. And here in Washington the representatives of the American people are striving to protect our civilization, our freedom of speech, press, and worship. As a Member of Congress, I assure you that I will make every effort to protect our rights as Americans. We must never forget that we are first and foremost—Americans. However, let us also remember that the privileges we enjoy as Americans must be carefully guarded and not left to the mercy of those who would have us stampede each other in haste to line up behind some "ism" or another. I think I am right in saying that not only those who are gathered here but all of us, want "Americanism" first, last, and always.

Let us all honor the name and memory of Columbus, for in honoring him we also honor ourselves.

Christopher Columbus discovered America, and I hope this Congress will make this day a day of honor and respect to him by adopting my resolution making October 12 a national holiday.

P. W. A. and the Special Session

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES KRAMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 12, 1939

ARTICLE FROM THE CENTRAL CONSTRUCTOR

Mr. KRAMER. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks, I include the following article, appearing in the October 3 issue of the Central Constructor, a magazine published weekly and monthly by the central branch of the Associated General Contractors of America at Des Moines, Iowa, concerning the public-works program:

[From the Central Constructor of October 5, 1939]

P. W. A. AND THE SPECIAL SESSION

When Congress assembled at the call of the President for a special session to consider neutrality legislation, the House and Senate both convened; the Senate went to work through its committees to advance the neutrality revision bill for full-Chamber debate; and the House stayed in session long enough to vote Members their mileage allowance and promptly adjourned. Its plan, according to report, is to meet every third day and then recess again until such time as the Senate has finished with the measure at hand and sent it over for action by the lower House.

This is in keeping with the one-purpose reason for the special session. But it suggests an excellent opportunity for the Nation to get something for the money that session will cost it by utilizing the time of the House now, and that of the Senate later, while the House debates neutrality, for the enactment of legislation not entirely dissociated with the chief business of the session.

Congress should provide now, while time necessarily hangs on the hands of at least a half of it, for a continuation of the Public Works Administration.

It will be immediately argued, when this proposal is made, that this is an emergency session called for the single purpose of preparing this country for the role it must play in a war-torn world—preparing it to stay out of the war itself. But the authors of all such plans have also in mind the preparation of the United States for efficient handling of the situation which would prevail if we should, despite all our efforts, be drawn unwillingly into the war. And for that aspect of the future it is by no means unreasonable that Congress should tackle the P. W. A. issue again at this time.

The P. W. A. organization has already been reduced materially, looking toward complete abandonment of the agency, but it still has enough of a staff and a hold-over organization throughout the country to carry on a modest program.

Late last month Federal Works Administrator John M. Carmody returned to their sponsors 5,043 applications for P. W. A. projects. All were marked "No funds." These projects were estimated to represent a total of nearly $2,000,000,000 worth of construction, and approximately 60 percent were reported to have been passed upon favorably. That is, in the ordinary course of events, had P. W. A. been continued by the preceding Congress and funds appropriated for it, these projects would have been approved and built under the P. W. A. plan. Now they are out.

Many other communities in addition to those represented in the list to which projects have just been returned have taken steps toward making application for grants with which to finance needed useful public improvements. These and the communities which were too late to be included in the last previous program have been urging their Congressmen to take favorable action toward a continuation of P. W. A.

The preparations for peace—which are also preparations for war if war comes—should not ignore the potential usefulness of P. W. A. for either eventuality. If peace prevails, P. W. A. can have the same value it has had heretofore, and that value has never been denied. If war comes, P. W. A. could readily adapt itself to jurisdiction over many of the construction operations which would be launched almost instantly.

P. W. A.'s personnel, from the top down to the field organization, knows the contractors, knows sources of supply, knows local conditions, and is closely familiar with the rules and regulations which could be invoked to speed up a construction program. The absence of such a force would mean long delays and incalculable lost motion in getting a wartime program under way and completed in this country.

Iowa has 165 projects that have been awaiting funds. Many Iowa communities have splendid projects which have been financed with the aid of Public Works Administration grants. Others, with equally vital need of improvements, have failed to secure the Federal assistance which would permit them to go ahead.

Meantime, while P. W. A. languishes for lack of congressional approval of its continuation, W. P. A. goes merrily on. If the argument is made that the crisis has passed in our unemployment emergency, and that, therefore, P. W. A. is no longer a national need, that argument must apply equally to W. P. A. Yet, after a small and temporary reduction in the numbers on the "WPAyroll," we already hear that returns to the previous strength are approaching again as winter draws near.

The restriction of the work of the present special session of Congress is wise. Construction as an industry has many matters it would be glad to have dealt with by Congress at its earliest convenience, but it does not ask that this special session take them up. The industry realizes that to open the path to anything like a general session now might seriously handicap the expediting of the main work of this special session.

But P. W. A. does have an importance to the country, quite as acute for peacetime as for wartime, or vice versa. Congress should breathe new life into it now.

Neutrality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK O. HORTON

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 12, 1939

EDITORIAL FROM THE SATURDAY EVENING POST

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the current issue of the Saturday Evening Post:

[From the Saturday Evening Post of October 14, 1939]

PHANTASY OF A BLOODLESS SWORD

People were never so stupid as to imagine they could make themselves neutral by passing a law. All the confusion in our minds about neutrality legislation has been owing, in the first place, to the fact that neutrality was not the subject, and, secondly, to bewildering equivocations on the tongue of government. In the dimness of this confusion there has taken place, almost unawares to the people, a perilous change in this Nation's foreign policy. That is the key to any understanding of what has happened. For the record, and while we may, let us tell ourselves truthfully how we arrived at a grave crisis of thought and feeling on this one question: Shall the export of arms and munitions to nations at war be forbidden?

The first act of Congress to be called a neutrality law, imperfectly enacted in 1935, directly proceeded from an idea of the innocents—namely, the idea that munitions makers, international bankers, and profiteers were the war bringers; it was believed that if this three-headed monster could be chained down, the peace of the world would be promoted, and we should be less likely ourselves to be drawn into another European war. It was a law, therefore, to limit the rights of American citizens as neutrals. Their right to sell arms and munitions to nations at war—a right of all neutrals under international law—was absolutely annulled. The right to export raw materials and foodstuffs to nations at war was restricted in three ways: First, even such goods as these could not be carried to a belligerent in American ships; second, title to the cargo had to be transferred to the foreign buyer before it could leave an American port; third, American bankers were forbidden to buy or sell the bonds and I O U's of nations at war, which would be to provide them with credit and perhaps cause in this country another war boom, such as occurred during the first World War. This was called the cash-and-carry or the come-and-get-it-and-pay-for-it policy, to govern the export of materials and foodstuffs. The sale of arms and munitions was forbidden on any terms.

The law was strengthened by amendment in 1936 and again in 1937, with no change of idea. Everybody knew what its demerits were. It was inflexible and might sometime work as we had not wished it to work; it would work always to the advantage of the great maritime nations controlling the seas, which is to say Great Britain and France on the Atlantic side and Japan on the Pacific side; furthermore, it surrendered what we had always before been willing to fight for, namely, freedom of the seas for neutrals; and it was a drastic limitation upon all the rights of neutrals in time of war for which the American Government had contended throughout our history. Nevertheless, in the form in which it was finally enacted in 1937, the vote for it in Congress was almost unanimous, public sentiment heartily supported it, and the President signed it.

Now, the first point is that the administration did not begin to attack the law until after its foreign policy had changed.

The change was sudden. In his 1936 Chautauqua speech the President had been saying "I hate war" and "If war should break out again on another continent, let us not blink the fact that we should find in this country thousands of Americans who, seeking immediate riches—fool's gold—would attempt to break down or to evade our neutrality. * * * To resist the clamor of that greed * * * would require the unswerving support of all Americans who love peace."

How far from that to the quarantine speech in Chicago in October 1937, when he said there was no escape for us through mere "isolation and neutrality," and proposed that the peace-loving nations of the world combine and make a concerted effort to quarantine and stop the aggressors.

Never since that speech has the administration been neutral in thought, word, or deed. Continuously thereafter high members of the administration, certainly not without Mr. Roosevelt's approval, seized every occasion to incite hatred and fear of the aggressors, who were called by name, and to implant the thought that if Great Britain and France were attacked we should have to exert our power to save them in order to preserve the democratic principle in the world. Then the President himself, in his message to Congress last January, made the famous utterance that whereas words were futile, still there were many methods "short of war, but more effective than mere words" whereby aggressor nations could be brought to account.

Shortly after this it became known that the administration was demanding a revision of what it referred to as the so-called neutrality law. There was a White House conference with Members of Congress, at which the President was understood to have made their blood run cold by telling them America's first line of defense was in France. When this had leaked out and had produced a profound and premature political sensation in the world, he denied having said it. Whether he said it explicitly in that way, at that time, does not matter at all. The idea was implicit in the quarantine speech, in his message to Congress, and in many other sayings.

Then there was his farewell to the people of Warm Springs, Ga., "I'll be back in the fall, if we don't have a war," and his endorsement of an editorial that followed in the Washington Post saying that in using the collective word "we" the President meant to aline this country with the democracies of Europe, and was telling Hitler and Mussolini "that the tremendous force of the United States must be a factor in their current thinking." This endorsement of the Washington Post's interpretation of what he meant was made at a press conference, April 11, which the New York Times reported in the following words: "President Roosevelt strongly implied today that he believed the involvement of the United States in any general European war was inevitable, and that this Nation should stand shoulder to shoulder with Great Britain and France against Nazi-Fascist machinations."

And how far that was from the positive statement that he had made on February 3. "We are against entangling alliances, obviously," he said. "The foreign policy has not changed and is not going to change."

If he meant there had been no change in foreign policy since his quarantine speech, that was probably true. But this was a policy

the American people did not yet comprehend and knew very little about.

Nothing was aimless. All this was leading to a certain thing. The President was resolved to get rid of the law that made it unlawful to sell arms and munitions to nations at war. In June he sent to the Capitol his own so-called neutrality law, asking that it be substituted for the one on the books. The law he proposed was amazing. It would have invested the President with almost unlimited discretion to employ the economic power and resources of this country in a foreign war, such resources not only as materials and foodstuffs but arms, munitions, and all implements of war; also credit and shipping, and then very large control of the private activities of American citizens.

The administration very well knew that the opposition, calling itself "the peace bloc" and derisively called "the isolationist bloc," would make its hardest fight against the repeal of the 4-year-old embargo on the export of arms and munitions to nations at war. Therefore, it put forward Secretary Hull, and after him others, to argue that there was really no logical difference between, on one hand, guns, bombing planes, and explosives and, on the other hand, the materials out of which the belligerents could manufacture their own war implements, or the food they ate while doing it. The humanitarian might shudder at the thought of selling the lethal instruments for profit, and that could be understood, but the difference was in logic unreal.

This argument was evasive. Consider it. To manufacture guns, planes, and explosives requires time and equipment. In war, time is vital, and every nation at war may be supposed to be running its full equipment in high gear. If we embargo arms and munitions, the nations that control the sea still have access to our raw materials, our fuel, and our surplus foodstuffs, and that is tremendous advantage, but if we lift the embargo they have access, besides, to our industrial power. Obviously the purpose of repealing the embargo on arms and munitions would be to sharpen and lengthen our weapon against Hitler. Logic had nothing to do with it. Policy was acting.

Wanting to know why the President's neutrality law did not continue the embargo on arms and munitions, the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House consulted the State Department. The words that follow are from the minority report of that committee: "When representatives of the State Department were asked whether there was any change in the international situation which should cause Congress to repeal the provision for an arms embargo at this time, our committee was told that Hitler's taking over of 27 munition plants in Austria and the Skoda works and 11 other plants in Czechoslovakia justified the change."

That was to say, because Germany had acquired additional munition plants, therefore, it was necessary to give England and France access to American munition plants. The idea is clear. The motive is comprehensible. But when did it come to be the foreign policy of the United States to mind the balance of military power in Europe? Certainly on February 3, when the President said that there was no change in our foreign policy and that there was not going to be any change, the people did not know that that was our foreign policy. The minority report of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House added, "We are opposed to the President's policy of using the threat of our power to preserve a balance of power in Europe."

Much to the President's chagrin, his so-called neutrality law was defeated. Meanwhile the come-and-get-it feature of the old law expired in May, leaving the rest of it as it was; the export of arms and munitions to nations at war absolutely forbidden.

That was in July. The struggle between the President and Congress was dramatic. At the very end he called a conference at the White House of both those who supported him and those who opposed him; that was the conference which the Vice President is supposed to have terminated by saying, "It's no use, Cap'n. You haven't got the votes."

And what was the crucial point of that struggle? Not the embargo, really. Not whether or not the sale of arms and munitions to nations at war should be forbidden by law. That was only the fighting point. It is now a curiously twisted pattern. The idea of the so-called neutrality law completed in 1937 was to limit the rights of neutral citizens, for fear they should create circumstances and conditions tending to involve the country in war. But the passionate idea of those who last July defended that same law against the law the President was trying to put in place of it was to limit the power of an unneutral government to involve the country in another European conflict.

After his defeat, the President retired to Hyde Park, where he held a press conference, which was reported in the New York Times, July 22, as follows: "Mr. Roosevelt confirmed one of the many utterances attributed to him by those who participated in the White House conference Tuesday night. He said he told the group that he had already fired two shots for peace and wanted a chance to fire a third, should the occasion arise. Reporters were left to infer that he could not fire the third shot unless this Nation were free to ship arms and munitions to belligerents."

He wanted a bigger gun. An economic gun; a shot to be fired for peace. And yet a gun to intimidate Hitler.

Continuing the report of that Hyde Park press conference, the New York Times correspondent wrote: "Because the United States had been eliminated, for the present at least, as a factor to be reckoned with by aggressor nations, who might have hesitated in the face of potential American aid to nonaggressors, the chances of an outbreak of war had been increased, the President explained."

So said Winston Churchill, now First Lord of the British Admiralty, in the New York Herald Tribune, July 14. "It is of capital importance," he wrote, "that Hitler should not be misled into believing that the recent vote on President Roosevelt's neutrality bill represents the last word which the United States has to speak upon the fundamental issues now at stake. * * * This controversy may be a potential factor in bringing about what all American citizens most desire to prevent," namely, a European war.

So you see how it may be—and we say it sardonically—that the war which did come was our fault, on the testimony of both the President of the United States and the First Lord of the British Admiralty, because Congress at a certain moment did not give Mr. Roosevelt the economic weapon with which he would have undertaken to redress the balance of power that Hitler had upset in Europe.

When the war came the President did these things, seriatim: He proclaimed an absolute embargo on the sale of arms and munitions, as he was obliged to do under the law he had been unable to get rid of; he proclaimed a limited emergency, in order to have a freer hand all around; through the Federal Lending Administrator he announced that the Johnson Act, forbidding American credit to be loaned to America's defaulting war debtors, does not bind the lending agencies of the Federal Government, and that the Government's own Export-Import Bank and its Reconstruction Finance Corporation have plenty of unused credit to finance both the production and the sale of American commodities, in benefit of those European belligerents who happily control the sea and can, therefore, come and get them. And then, saying he believed public feeling had changed to his view, he called Congress in special session to reconsider repealing the embargo on the sale of arms and munitions.

Historically, the policy of the American Government had been to assert and defend the right of neutrals to sell arms and munitions to other nations freely, in peace and war; and there was much to be said for that policy. There is much to be said for it still. Nevertheless, deliberately, in time of peace, we departed from it. Now, with Europe in a state of war, to change our peacetime law forbidding traffic in arms and munitions, and to change it in a way to benefit one side only, is an unneutral act. Let no one be deceived to the contrary. Such an act on the part of a nation that holds the decisive economic power is one the consequences of which cannot be foreseen.

During 2 years of unneutral propaganda, the Roosevelt administration, evolving a foreign policy of its own so dangerous that the revelation of it had to be graduated to the Gallup polls, at the same time imposed the hypnotic thought that we can exert the power without ourselves becoming involved in actual war. This we believe to be a phantasy in contempt of both experience and common sense. There is no such magic weapon, all-powerful and yet bloodless.

People cannot be neutral in feeling. That is impossible. We suppose that American sympathies now lie more one way than toward any other foreign war since our history began. All the more on that account should the Government be the image of our reason. No government should know what its own sympathies are. Would that we had at this time a government steadfast in the American tradition of jealous neutrality, and willing, if necessary, to fight for that, instead of one hotly demanding the sword of this Nation's economic power to wield in Europe's war.

Enforcement of Proclaimed Guardianship Will Mean War for United States

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 12, 1939

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, during Wednesday's session of the House of Representatives the gentleman from Montana [Mr. THORKELSON] requested me to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the list of 16 British possessions located within our newly proclaimed guardianship of the Western Hemisphere and adjacent waters 300 miles or more off shore. They are Canada, Newfoundland, British Guiana, British Honduras, Grenada, Jamaica, Bermuda, Labrador, Barbados, Leeward Islands, Bahamas, St. Vincent, St. Lucia, Trinidad, Falkland Islands, Georgia Island.

During the speech by the gentleman from Montana he agreed with my statement that this proclaimed guardianship presents grave potentialities. If we attempt to enforce this guardianship, it will mean war for the United States.

Pending Neutrality Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, October 13 (legislative day of Wednesday, October 4), 1939

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS, OF ILLINOIS

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered last evening by the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] on the pending Pittman neutrality measure. The address was delivered over the Columbia Broadcasting System.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Tonight America looks at a world in which the progress of civilization in Europe and Asia has been brought to a standstill. Bombs dropping on homes and churches, torpedoes bringing swift and silent destruction to majestic vessels, machine guns riddling the bodies of men, women, and children, are lashing the passions of entire nations into a maelstrom of fear and hate. It is a hideous picture of horror and calamity for peaceful America to contemplate. However, when the Old World throws itself into tragic darkness it is the duty of Americans to remain cool and collected. The hour demands clear and honest thinking, sound argument based upon actual facts, as well as accurate and temperate speech. It is no time to ring the tocsin and use slogans and catch phrases which will unduly alarm the American people. And in these few moments I propose to discuss the question now before the Senate of the United States calmly, dispassionately, and honestly, with only one object in view—the preservation of the peace of the United States. That is paramount with the American people.

I do not underestimate the immediate and vital importance of the controversy centered around the present embargo when I say that both the advocates and opponents of a ban on the sale of arms, ammunition, and implements of war have far overemphasized the importance of this one issue. While I recognize the sincerity and the patriotism of those distinguished citizens belonging to both schools of thought, I cannot agree that action by the Congress of the United States lifting the embargo will place us on the road to war, as we have been told by men in high public office, including Members of the United States Senate.

Those words, "on the road to war," have an ominous ring. They can be repeated over and over, echoing and reechoing in our minds, until we find ourselves in a state of war hysteria. We have seen the dictators of other nations play upon the people's emotions, their patriotism, their ambitions, and their fears, until they march out on the battlefields to destroy their fellow men. If we keep our feet on the ground and our heads out of the clouds, no such thing can happen here. Yes, if the American people are left to themselves, they will go their way in enduring peace.

The hundred thousand letters, telegrams, and cards which I have received from citizens of Illinois, although expressing conflicting views on the pending neutrality legislation, are unanimous in the declaration that we must stay out of the European struggle of power politics. So long as that feeling exists, American troops will never be sent across the water to fight the battles of other countries. This Nation will only go to war if and when the American people themselves say so. They have plainly indicated that they want no part in this European holocaust.

Now, what is the important thing to do, to keep this Nation thinking in terms of peace? What was it that caused us to go to war in 1917? It was not the invasion of our shores, the threat of destruction of our Government, or sabotage of our munitions factories. It was the killing of American citizens and the destruction of American property on the high seas in unrestricted submarine warfare which caused this Nation to declare war on Germany. Today the only probable opportunity for belligerent nations to change the sentiment of the American people from peace to war is through the sinking of our ships in the Atlantic Ocean.

And with the experience of the last war before us, the Senate of the United States proposes in the legislative measure it is now considering to root out, insofar as possible, those perils of war. Under the Pittman bill American citizens cannot sail on belligerent ships. Under the Pittman bill we shall sell everything to belligerent nations, such as wheat, cotton, steel, shells, arms, etc., provided they send their ships to our ports, pay for this property in cash, and leave our shores seaward bound upon their own responsibility. In addition to that, there will be restricted zones in which our ships cannot travel. In short, what we seek to do under this mandatory cash-and-carry plan is to keep our ships out of the combat zones of the Atlantic and thereby save them and American lives from destruction. My friends, this is a splendid piece of legislation, designed wholly and solely to keep America out of foreign wars.

The importance of the cash-and-carry plan so far overshadows that of the repeal of the embargo, from the standpoint of keeping us out of war, that the question of lifting or continuing the embargo becomes relatively inconsequential by comparison. The Pittman bill negates every consideration that brought us into the last war.

In this legislation we further abandon our traditional policy of freedom of the seas; we sacrifice national pride; we take a heavy toll from American shipowners. But this loss is nothing compared with economic dislocation, the contracting of a huge war debt, and the possibility of leaving the bones of a half million American boys on foreign soil.

Certainly no one can disagree that the possibility of war with one of the belligerent powers is further removed when we take our ships carrying secondary war supplies, such as cotton, wheat, oil, steel, copper, etc., out of the danger zones of the Atlantic Ocean. Already we have witnessed Germany sending to the bottom of the North Sea two ships of Sweden and one of Finland, both bound for England carrying wood pulp. Wood pulp is a secondary war material, but in the eyes of the belligerents it is contraband, as is practically every other commodity that is exported. If neutral nations like Norway and Sweden lose their vessels, ultimately the belligerents are bound to get some of ours. If they sink enough of them, then you will hear strong and patriotic people demanding that destruction of American property and the loss of American lives be avenged. War propaganda will start in all its insidious forms, with the possibility that it might precipitate a change in the sentiment of the American people.

With that picture in front of me, my sense of duty to the American people tells me I have but one choice—that is, to cast my vote for cash and carry.

Now let me discuss for a moment the proposition to repeal the embargo on arms, ammunition, and implements of war. Long have been the hours that I have spent in study and research upon this vexatious problem. In order to reach any decision it is necessary to analyze the law and its effects. Bear with me a moment. Let us see how it works. It is not as complicated as you think.

When nations are at peace, America, under the present so-called Neutrality Act, can sell to any nation in the world arms, ammunition, and implements of war. In the last few years we have sold millions upon millions of dollars of war supplies to England, France, and Germany. This law places America in the ridiculous position of supplying planes and guns and bullets to the soldiers of warring nations, and then telling them the moment war is declared that they have fallen from grace and can have no more.

We sell the rifle to the German soldier and say, "We shall sell you all you want, but don't shoot." We lay the machine gun in the lap of the English soldier and say, "You can have all you want in peacetime, but the moment the machine gunner starts his rapid-fire motion you can have no more." We send the bombing plane to France and say, "You can have all you want in peacetimes, but the moment war is declared you can have no more." And so it is with all war materials classified under the present act. I submit that a bullet sold a moment before war is declared will kill a man just as quickly as one sold a moment after hostilities have begun.

In other words, those who object to the repeal of this law on moral grounds are starting rather late. For 5 years I have been a Member of Congress, and yet I have heard no one advocate an embargo on war supplies in peacetimes as well as war. Since this Nation in peacetimes, without the slightest protest from anyone, helped build belligerent nations up to war strength, I can see no moral justification for this Government now saying, "We can sell no more."

Another potent point in the argument for repeal can be found in the fact that we aid aggressor nations preparing for war, while the moment war starts we deny unprepared peaceful nations which are attacked the right to buy war supplies from us. Listen to this: Is there anyone in the world who does not believe that Russia is in this war? Does anyone believe China and Japan have not been fighting for the past 2 years? And yet, because there has been no declaration of war by Russia or China or Japan, we can and do, under the present Neutrality Act, sell these warring nations arms, ammunition, and implements of war. Under these circumstances how can anyone consistently justify the continuation of the embargo when such absurdities exist?

Yes; today under this strange law we can sell communistic Russia, which technically is not at war, a thousand bombing planes tomorrow, but we cannot sell Canada, our peaceful neighbor for over a hundred years, a single pound of powder because she is at war; and yet Russia, in taking a huge slice of Poland and subjugating the little Baltic republics with her army, has done almost as much to disturb the peace of Europe as any nation now formally at war.

Look to our own future. Assuming we were attacked—assuming we ran out of war supplies in our defense of home and country—is there a patriot in this land who would declare it an act of immorality for us to buy implements of war from some other nation? How would we feel toward nations refusing to sell?

My friends, when this law was passed in 1937 no one could prophesy what the future would bring forth. It was in keeping with the then existing conditions. It was passed with the knowledge that changing world conditions might nullify its effectiveness when applied to our domestic policy. So this law, honestly designed in times of peace to keep us neutral, has proved, when applied to present world conditions, to be the very essence of unneutrality.

When our domestic policy is seriously affected it is the duty of the Congress of the United States to pass or repeal any legislation which it believes will protect and sustain the general welfare. I am one of those who believe that the proper way to protect the social and economic welfare of this Nation is to change the rules, if necessary, when the war starts. No other nation does less.

In conclusion, I join with you in expressing a mighty hope that regardless of the length of the war America will stay out. What is more, I repeat that I shall vote millions for defense but not one dime to send our Army across the sea to extract chestnuts from the international fire. Let us stay out. When this holocaust of hell is finished this shattered old world will need a great nation like America to bind up the wounds and keep European civilization from collapsing into a coma. Let the world understand that in this crisis we uphold and defend our traditional policy of peace. Eternal justice and happiness for all nations can come, not by the sword, but only through counsel, conciliation, and compromise. God grant that our greatest glory in the future will not be through triumph upon the field of battle but through success in keeping America out of war.

The Postal Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH McKELLAR

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, October 13 (legislative day of Wednesday, October 4), 1939

ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT TO POSTMASTERS ON OCTOBER 11, 1939

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD the address delivered by the President of the United States to postmasters on October 11, 1939. It is a splendid address, and I think will be of great interest to the country.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Postmaster General, postmasters, ladies, friends of the Postal Service, it is a privilege and a pleasure to greet you here at the White House this afternoon. You know when Jim Farley holds a convention it really is a success.

To you, and through you to all the postmasters of the country, I want to express my heartfelt appreciation of all that you and they are doing to maintain our great postal system as the efficient institution it has become under the able direction of our Postmaster General, your friend and mine. Today we may all share in the pride which by every right and token should thrill Jim Farley's kindly heart. He is doing a grand job and each one of you is contributing to it.

I am glad you are here in such goodly numbers, for you represent the Nation's biggest business. The vast extent of the enterprise of which you are a part can best be measured if we pause to sum up the work.

The collection and dispatch of letters is only one aspect of your work. Our Postal Service, be it remembered, also comprises our largest savings bank, our largest express business, our largest system for the transmission of money, as well as the largest agency available to the people for the investment of their savings in Government bonds.

The temptation would be strong, if time permitted, to examine the fascinating and romantic story of the Postal Service, not only the background of its marvelous development in our own country but its first beginnings back in the dawn of man's history.

We do not know when the postal service came into being but we do know that some 25 centuries ago Herodotus stated an ideal which is still exemplified by Jim Farley's cohorts: "Not snow, nor rain, nor heat, nor gloom of night stays these couriers from the swift completion of their appointed rounds."

It matters not what the means of transportation of the mails may be—whether the mules and camels of the Old Testament which Job said made his days "swifter than a post"—or those modern annihilators of distance, the train, the automobile, and the airplane.

The mission of the postal service was admirably stated many years ago when two famous educators collaborated in interpreting the work which you are doing. Because I think each of you will carry home a clearer conception of your duties as postmasters if you accept their interpretation, I give you the words of Charles W. Eliot and Woodrow Wilson, which you will find inscribed on the facade of our own central post office here in Washington:

One said "Messenger of sympathy and love—servant of parted friends—consoler of the lonely—bond of the scattered family—enlarger of the common life."

The other said "Carrier of news and knowledge—instrument of trade and industry—promoter of mutual acquaintance, of peace and good will among men and nations."

It is wonderful to see you all here and to have an oportunity to say hello. I hope your stay in Washington is a pleasant one and that you will carry back home bright memories of the convention which has brought you here.

American Shipping in Wartime

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, October 13 (legislative day of Wednesday, October 4), 1939

ADDRESS BY W. K. JACKSON

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by W. K. Jackson, vice president of the United Fruit Co., before the National Foreign Trade Convention at New York City, October 11, 1939.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

There have been critical periods in the history of the American merchant marine, involving not only the maintenance of our overseas commerce but directly affecting our national defense. These crises have generally arisen as an incident to the existence of a foreign or domestic war and have not been legislative in character. No industry has ever been called upon to make greater sacrifices in the national interest. Again we stand at the crossroads. On one side the chart shows the existence in northern European waters of a war between the world's greatest armed powers, with all the dangers of air, surface, and submarine naval warfare, with torpedoes, mines, bombs, blockades, stops, searches, seizures, sinkings, prize courts, and confiscations. On the other side is the proposed neutrality bill, which, by legislative fiat, proclaims that all the ocean routes which in any way touch at the shores of the far-flung British Empire and French colonial possessions are hypothetically equally as dangerous and "verboten" to American vessels. Between Scylla and Charybdis, we face decisions of portentous importance. Shall our ships carry on as they did following the Revolutionary War and during the Napoleonic wars, as they did when they dared face the Barbary pirates, and even later during the only too recent great World War, or shall we tie up an important part of our fleet at the dock, throw the crews on the beach, put out the fires, forget our well-recognized rights as neutrals on the high seas, and await the termination of the European war?

Before answering this question it would be the part of wisdom calmly and dispassionately to analyze the nature and character of the dangers threatening our ships if they venture on the high seas. Undoubtedly the waters surrounding the combatants, such as the English Channel, the North Sea, and the Baltic Sea, are danger zones in which ships of both belligerents and neutrals may be sunk and lives lost. It is said that if the belligerents disregard our neutral rights and our ships are sunk, with the loss of American seamen, our minds will be inflamed; that we are an impulsive and emotional people, and that we could not control ourselves, and that we would throw ourselves headlong into this war which is Europe's and not ours. The neutrality bill proposes to save us from ourselves. Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Holland, Finland—in fact, all the nations of the world having a merchant marine—are sending their ships to sea, with the loss of some ships and some lives in the danger zone, but still their ships and sailors venture forth, and the peoples of these countries do not go to war. The American ship and sailor are no less intrepid. They, too, will keep open the lanes of foreign commerce with American-flag ships and keep our commerce moving and the workers of our farms and factories employed.

Are our legislators ready to go on record as saying that we Americans are less capable of self-government than any other nation in the world? It is a sad commentary on democratic institutions if we cannot trust ourselves to meet a crisis when it comes and refrain from being dragged into a war by our emotions, if the well-considered national interest counsels that we keep out. No other nation has found it necessary or desirable to propose legislation prohibiting their ships from going to belligerent ports.

Certainly there is no material gain in keeping our ships out of this trade. On the contrary, our merchant marine suffers a grievous loss, and turns over its business to foreign-flag ships. It will be

very difficult to ever recover this business when the war is over. It imposes a restriction on the ownership and operation of ships under the American flag which does not bear upon any foreign-flag ships. It tends to prevent the construction of new ships in the United States and hampers the building up of our merchant marine. It produces unemployment among our seamen and water-front wage earners. It tends to still our factories and stop our plows, so that throughout the length and breadth of the land there is stagnation and unproductive idleness, with all of the resulting social disservice to humanity, because we fear to keep our foreign trade. From a material and economic standpoint the proposed law is wholly indefensible.

Nor can we gain a moral victory. There can be no question of immorality involved if our ships are engaged in transporting normal commercial cargo. Let it be clearly understood that I am not advocating or even discussing the merits or demerits of carrying arms and ammunition. In the minds of many loyal, sound-thinking Americans who are thoroughgoing students of history, there must exist grave doubts as to the wisdom of wholly restricting our American ships from entering the combat zone of European waters, or from carrying passengers and ordinary cargo to the ports of belligerents. It is freely admitted that this self-restraining prohibition constitutes an abdication by the United States of its well-recognized rights under international law.

However, we must recognize that the American people in their earnest desire to keep out of the European war have been led to believe that our ships should not enter the more or less dangerous war combat zones, but I challenge the assertion that our people believe that American ships should be restricted in their operations in non-combat zones far removed from the theater of actual hostilities. To restrict our operations in non-combat zones, to throw away our trade with the dominions and colonial possessions scattered throughout the world, is an abject surrender to an exaggerated fear, and an unreasoning betrayal of the rights of our Nation. The American people have not understood the far-reaching effects of this proposal.

It has been said that it was the illegal and inhuman killing of our seamen on the high seas which impelled us to enter the World War. This killing of our seamen took place in the combat zone or European waters, and not even during the period of unrestricted submarine warfare did German submarines sink any American vessels engaged in neutral trade in non-combat areas. Is there even any slight reason to believe that in this war Germany will extend its scope of operation to sea areas far remote from Europe, and indulge in indiscriminate sinking of neutral shipping engaged in the peaceful carriage of noncontraband goods? By what stretch of the imagination can we fear that Germany will or can afford to divert submarines and torpedoes to attacking neutral shipping and American shipping in particular—in our intra-hemisphere or north and south trade—or for that matter in the trade between our Pacific coast and Australia and New Zealand. It is said that shipping must make great sacrifices in the proposed law for the purpose of protecting the lives of our citizens and the peace of our country. Who threatens the lives of our citizens in our nearby waters—what reasonable man can think that any real threat or danger exists? Why put on gas masks in America because they wear them in London? Why abandon your house in fear of fire because houses are being burned in Warsaw as an incident to war? Why abdicate our rights to carry on our own peaceful pursuits in zones far removed from the scene of conflict? There is no real threat to the lives of our seamen in these waters. Are we to abandon our ships because somebody believes in ghost stories, or through some species of hysteria an imaginary threat has been created? There is no sound or logical reason for prohibiting our American vessels from carrying on peaceful trading in noncombat zones, and not even an emotional reason for such prohibition. The very least we can do and maintain any degree of self-respect is to assert and maintain our rights as a neutral to carry on normal peacetime trade relations with every country or colonial possession on this side of the Atlantic.

The Monroe Doctrine was a policy enunciated by President Monroe at a time when a series of wars had devastated the countries of Europe and left them at the mercy of ambitious, dictatorial governments animated by a desire for world conquest and domination. Today Europe is embroiled in a war of destruction with continental leaders taking what they want by might and force, without regard to the nationality or feelings of the smaller countries which they are gobbling up. The Monroe Doctrine is a policy designed to protect the territorial integrity of the independent nations of the Western Hemisphere. It was conceived and promulgated after one of the most destructive periods in the history of ocean-borne commerce, with the young American republics as the principal sufferers, and innocent, too, because they were not participants in the European wars then being carried on. Its tone was firm and unequivocal, and its effectiveness was backed by the universal public opinion and armed power of the Republic. Although it was not at that time acquiesced in by the European monarchies, it has been respected for more than a century.

Today the European world is again aflame, and we are confronted with the problem of commerce-destroying instrumentalities on the high seas. The ambitions of certain European rulers would be best served by destroying the commercial integrity of the Western Hemisphere. Again our national rulers must meet a situation of vast importance to our prosperity and our institutions. Once again it becomes necessary to tell a war-mad world that the normal peacetime activities of the neutral nations of the Western World are sacred from the wanton attacks of European belligerents and that our commercial integrity must be respected.

You cannot disassociate the commercial and economic life of a people from the maintenance and preservation of its political institutions. If one is threatened, so is the other. Of what value is territorial integrity if it be not accompanied by commercial and economic freedom? We should no more permit the skulking submarine to threaten and destroy our peacetime commerce than we should permit the armed forces of a European belligerent to threaten or destroy the territorial integrity of the free nations of this Western Hemisphere. The freedom of the European nations to enter our waters must be accompanied with a respect for the uninterrupted continuance of normal peacetime intercourse between the free peoples of the Americas, and by this I do not mean the carriage of contraband destined by transshipment or otherwise to European belligerents.

The recent conference at Panama unmistakably discloses a unanimity of feeling among the Western Hemisphere democracies on this subject. We are ready for an epoch-making continental declaration of policy which will be backed by all of the resources at our command. The declaration of this policy will further cement the ties that bind our peoples into a common purpose to perfect and protect our institutions—a declaration so made that it will even command the respect of European rulers. It is possible that the declaration of Panama is too ambitious, that we cannot effectively police so large a safety zone, but this much we can do. We can tell the world that normal peacetime ocean transportation by neutrals in this hemisphere shall not be attacked or destroyed. This declaration will be enough, because it is wholly within our recognized rights and is capable of enforcement. This will not lead us into the European war, any more than has the act of Belgium, Denmark, and Holland in firing at belligerent airplanes flying over their territory, or the act of Sweden in attacking German war vessels interfering with Swedish vessels in her own waters, precipitated these countries into the war. We cannot countenance an attack upon our own marine life line that runs from coast to coast through the Atlantic, the Caribbean, the Panama Canal, and the Pacific.

For centuries our ablest thinkers and statesmen have laboriously developed the principles of neutrality whereby the acts of the belligerents, and the devastation and dislocation of war could be confined within the narrowest possible limits. Neutrality is designed to restrict and restrain the belligerents and to increase and enlarge the rights of neutrals. In the broad sweeping restrictions of the proposed law we reverse all conception of neutrality, and, instead of asserting rights of freedom and noninterference, we relinquish our right to sail a large part of the high seas and disrupt and destroy our position of equality among the nations.

Our forebears did not desert the seas when war clouds hung over the world. They did not stay in port because someone might try to attack them on the high seas, and they were ready and apt at defending themselves. They were not obsessed by fear nor disdainful of their rights.

Any legislation which is based upon fear and especially fear as to what we ourselves might do, and not fear as to what somebody else may do is necessarily unsound. The only sound basis for any legislation is the broad general welfare of the whole United States over a reasonably long period of time. The advocates of this sweeping legislation say in effect that we must tie our hands, diminish or impair the effectiveness of such of our defense weapons as the merchant marine, give up our trade, create depression and unemployment, abdicate our rights for fear that we may fight or defend ourselves if we are unreasonably attacked. We will be weak and despised among nations if we adopt so spineless a policy of defeat and surrender.

The United States Postal Service—The World's Greatest Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH McKELLAR

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, October 13 (legislative day of Wednesday, October 4), 1939

ADDRESS BY POSTMASTER GENERAL FARLEY TO NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF POSTMASTERS

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Hon. James A. Farley, Postmaster General, at a dinner tendered the postmasters at the Mayflower Hotel last night. The address is full of most interesting facts concerning our postal affairs, and I urge Senators and others to read it.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

For more than 6 years I have had the honor and great privilege of serving as Postmaster General of the United States. Every passing day has given me a new picture of the Postal Service and has filled me with admiration and respect for you, the postmasters, and the postal employees who make it work so smoothly and efficiently. What appeals to me most in this great Service is not its size nor the vast amount of money it handles—it is the human side. The post office is the primary element of communication, and without communication society could not exist. You men and women who operate the mail service are not only the messengers of business and industry but you are also the messengers of all human emotions. Every inhabitant of our country, the people in the cities and those in the rural sections, wait for the coming of the mail carrier for news of their fellow countrymen, their friends, and relatives; news of the things which, after all, are the most important in life; the intimate happenings, the births, the deaths—in fact, all of the joys and sorrows of our people are made known by the use of the mails. I therefore feel a great personal pride in belonging to an organization which renders such an essential human service.

This is a business organization; and, like any other business concern, best results are obtained when there is a complete understanding between the executives and those who do the actual work. For that reason, from the very beginning of my administration I have tried to make it clear that not only your officers but you individually are always welcome here at headquarters in Washington. During the past 3 days we have been pleased to have you, the postmasters of the United States who are members of the National Association of Postmasters, visit us in the Department, and we have gained much from this personal contact. I sincerely trust that you as individuals and as an organization have profited greatly from your meeting here.

I believe in organization, because only through organization can definite results be accomplished. The independence of this country was achieved by organization, and every gain that Americans have made has been the result of organized effort of one kind or another. So long as you are guided by sound public policy you may be assured that I will be in full sympathy with your efforts.

I think the postmasters of the United States are especially fortunate as the beneficiaries of recent legislation, sponsored and approved by this administration, which provides life tenure during good behavior. You now have the opportunity to establish yourselves permanently in the business life of your community to a far greater extent than you could have done under the old order of things when appointments were made for 4-year terms and postmasters were changed with each change of administration. I think you understand, however, that this new opportunity carries with it new and greater responsibilities. The proponents of this merit system, or rather the extension of the merit system to include postmasters, had a definite purpose, and that purpose was to improve the public service. I am sure that you people who are here tonight, as well as our postmasters throughout the country, fully appreciate that it is your plain duty to demonstrate the wisdom of this law by doing your part to improve the service to the public. In thousands of cities and towns the postmasters and the postal employees are the only known representatives of the Federal Government. Therefore, aside from your official duties, you have an obligation to so conduct yourselves as to merit the confidence and respect of your fellow citizens. You should be typical Americans, gracious and honest; serving, encouraging, and helping your fellow man without respect to class, race, or creed.

The United States Post Office and its people constitute the greatest public service in existence today. In times of peace and in times of war, its ministrations are vital and essential. When a new town develops or an old town goes out of existence, we learn about it quickly in our headquarters in Washington. Any change in the development of a community, or in a section of a large city, immediately affects the character of services we must render. We are quick to sense these changes and quick to take action to enlarge or diminish our facilties. Scandal has rarely touched this splendid communication system. We are proud of its honorable record and we are grateful to our predecessors who have done a fine job. It is our definite purpose to continue its operation under sound administrative policies and to improve and safeguard it as the most universal and most essential function of government.

I have said to you on previous occasions, and to other postal groups, that this service belongs to the public, and we who are permitted to engage in its affairs should be humble and most grateful for the opportunity it offers us to serve. We must keep before us always the thought that the public is to be considered first and that we as individuals are of secondary importance. The public has a right to expect and receive faithful performance of the many and difficult duties carried on in a modern postal system. Moreover, our patrons expect and should receive careful and courteous attention at all times. Many fine things have been said and written about the Postal Service, about its romance and the courage displayed by those who see to it that the mail goes through under conditions which many times have been most hazardous. That is all very fine, and I heartily approve and concur in these commendations. I feel, however, that those of us who are alive and do the job now should concern ourselves especially with the matter-of-fact, everyday business problems of our work. The objectives of the Postal Service can be summed up in three words—certainty, celerity, courtesy.

We have a dual responsibility to the public. We have not only the patrons and customers to consider but also the taxpayers, who provide the money for the operation of the entire Government. In this connection, may I talk to you quite frankly about the need for economy. I want no misunderstanding about what I say on this subject. There is to be no curtailment of service. But I especially urge all postmasters and the entire personnel of the Postal Service to cooperate in maintaining the best possible service without increasing our present rate of expenditures. A short time ago the President found it necessary to advise the heads of all executive departments and agencies of the Government that no deficiencies should be incurred and that all should operate within the appropriations granted by Congress. It is your job and my job to carry out the wishes of the President, and he knows that he can depend upon our good will and complete cooperation in this respect.

Since 1933 our services and facilities have been expanded and improved, necessitating the outlay of many millions of dollars. I fully appreciate that not only the mail volume but the financial transactions of the Department have been increasing steadily as the business of the Nation has improved. We have added additional personnel until now we have on our rolls the greatest number of employees in the history of the service. In this we have made our contribution to the relief of unemployment. We have added new buildings, hundreds of them; new equipment has been purchased, and every known device, the efficiency of which has been proven, has been adopted. Transportation facilities have been improved and we have taken advantage of those facilities.

All along the line our expenditures have been increased to meet the modern requirements of revitalized American business and commerce. We have spent the money wisely and have weighed each step carefully, assuring ourselves before making expenditures that our action was entirely in the public interest. I have no idea that the business development which has been going on will stop. On the contrary, I am definitely of the opinion that no man nor woman here tonight, nor any citizen who may hear what I am saying, can visualize the further developments and progress of this Nation, its Postal Service, and its transportation systems, that will occur within the next few years.

There is one thing I do know, that we are now operating the finest postal system in the world, and I am reasonably sure that we have an organization in both personnel and equipment that should be able under careful and painstaking direction to absorb a greater volume of business without materially increasing our expenses. I am therefore going to ask each postmaster here tonight, and each and every postal employee throughout the Nation, to cooperate with the Department in making full use of what we now have to work with before considering increases in the number now employed. Likewise, let us be sure of our ground before suggesting additional expenditures for equipment and supplies over and above the prevailing rates.

I urge all postmasters to continue their advertising campaigns, of the air mail for example, for I feel that we have many citizens who do not fully appreciate and understand the opportunities offered by this amazingly fast feature of the Postal Service. I am quite sure that we can handle an increased volume in circulars and advertising matter of all kinds and make revenue gains without commensurate increases on the expenditure side of our ledger.

You will probably regard this as a sales talk, and that is exactly what I intend it to be. Sales talks and sales campaigns are necessary to the life of any business organization, and they are, therefore, necessary to the life and success of this great public utility.

Postmasters and postal employees should consider it their duty to call to the attention of their neighbors, particularly business people, the advantages to be gained by a greater use of the Postal Service. This can be done without interference or competition with private business. In the handling of letters we enjoy a monopoly. We provide other facilities also that cannot be offered or maintained by private enterprise. The objective in our campaigns for the greater use of postal facilities is to convince businessmen, and private citizens as well, how they can improve and increase their own profits by a more generous patronage of this establishment.

We have been getting along all right. I am happy to say to you that in five of the six full years of operation under this administration we have conducted that part of the Postal Service which is rendered to the public for hire not only within the revenues but also with a profit.

During the fiscal year ended June 30, 1939, the revenues were approximately $744,000,000, or $17,000,000 more than the revenues for the fiscal year 1938. We have just finished the first quarter of the fiscal year 1940, and the income reports show that we are still on an upward trend, being several million dollars ahead of the same 3 months ending September 30 than last year. This indicates that there will be a net operating surplus for the fiscal year 1940.

I am glad that this result has been achieved during my service with the Post Office Department, and I am happy to have the opportunity to acknowledge publicly my deep appreciation to the people in the Postal Service, the departmental staff, the postmasters, in fact all postal employees. It is you who have accomplished this, for it is you who handle directly the affairs of the Post Office. We adopt policies here in Washington for your guidance, and in the broader sense we manage the affairs of the Service, but no matter how lofty our ideals may be, our efforts would be futile without your wholehearted cooperation.

The revenues which I have just stated for the fiscal year 1939 were the greatest in the history of the Service. There is no other

postal establishment in the world that in volume or income approaches the Postal Service of the United States. In fact, we have several States of the Union in which the postal income exceeds that of some foreign countries.

This Department, with the help of the Army Air Corps, initiated the air transport system, fostered and developed it until private capital was attracted. We then turned it over to private enterprise, which has now improved and extended this new transportation system so that the United States air transport lines travel more miles, carry more passengers, more mail, and more air express than all of the air transport systems in the rest of the world combined. We are deeply interested in aviation and shall, I hope, continue to be its best customer.

Railroad transportation has improved and is continuing to improve. The Post Office Department is likewise a good customer of the railroads. Our payments to the railroad companies of America during the last fiscal year exceeded $98,000,000.

We operate the greatest bank in America—the Postal Saving System—having 8,000 branches with more than 2,700,000 depositors, and with balances to their credit of more than $2,162,000,000.

In the registered mails we transport the bulk of the money of the Nation.

We handle more than 700,000,000 parcels annually.

The Department contracts for the operation of more than 11,000 star routes.

On June 30 there were 32,800 rural routes in operation.

The Department owns and operates more than 8,800 automobile trucks in 1,400 cities.

The Department maintains 2,844 postal units in Government buildings and works with the Treasury Department in the planning and construction of new buildings.

We have our own real-estate organization for the procurement of quarters for post offices not located in Government-owned buildings. There are 13,492 buildings under lease, contract, or allowance.

The Post Office Department has a splendid investigating agency—the Inspection Service—which investigates all postal violations and keeps the Department constantly advised of service conditions.

On June 30 there were 44,400 post offices, employing 206,242 people under the supervision of the postmasters.

It is you and the employees who serve directly under you upon whom the Department depends, and the public depends, for the continuous and orderly movement of the mails. It is a great pleasure to have had you with us for the Thirty-ninth Annual Convention of the National Association of Postmasters. I am told this is the largest convention in the history of your organization, there being more than 4,000 postmasters and guests registered and in attendance at this meeting. I know that you have enjoyed the fullest the unusual opportunities offered by your meeting here, particularly the personal greetings of the President of the United States.

And may I avail myself of the facilities of this broadcast to extend my greetings and your greetings to each of our postmasters who were unable to come to Washington for this convention. I am sorry that they could not be with us, but I do want them to know that we are all thinking of them and that they have our sincere good wishes. And I request you and all the postmasters who may be listening in throughout the country to convey to our employees in each office my personal greetings and grateful appreciation for their splendid cooperation.

I congratulate the officers of your National organization and of your State organizations, and commend each and every one of you for your activities in maintaining this fine association. We are glad you came. I hope that you thoroughly enjoyed your visit and wish you Godspeed on your journey home.

I want to thank you for the honor bestowed upon me in having me as your guest at this dinner, which is attended by more than 3,400 people, the largest dinner ever served in a Washington hotel. Here again the postal people have established a new record.

Congratulations to each and every one of you on this splendid event, and again, many, many thanks.

Roosevelt on Foreign Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, October 13 (legislative day of Wednesday, October 4), 1939

ARTICLES BY HARLAN MILLER

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD two articles by Harlan Miller entitled "Roosevelt on Foreign Affairs." The first was published in the Washington Post of October 12, 1939, and the second in the Washington Post of today.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post of October 12, 1939]

OVER THE COFFEE

(By Harlan Miller)

ROOSEVELT ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS, I—PRELUDE TO DIPLOMACY

(Editor's note: So far no one has appraised President Roosevelt's background and training for skill at foreign affairs. How extensive is his knowledge? How well equipped is he to protect American interests—whether as sponsor of our neutrality or as peacemaker? In two columns this background is briefly summarized.)

Franklin Roosevelt has made 13 trips to Europe, man and boy. His first voyage came in 1885, at the age of 3, when he began to learn French and German. The last was the year before he was elected President.

His visits overseas averaged 10 weeks, and he has spent in all about 32½ months in Europe.

His father and mother went abroad almost every year, and his mother made two long visits to China, when she was 8 and again at the age of 22.

At the Roosevelt dinner table, even when the President was a small boy in the eighties and early nineties, conversation about foreign affairs was as customary as conversation about the movies at the average American dinner table today.

His first visit in Washington occurred when he was 5 years old. At that age he became acquainted with William Whitney, who was Secretary of the Navy, and John Hay, who was later Secretary of State.

He also met President Cleveland, who wanted to appoint his father Minister to Holland. (It was on this visit that Cleveland said he hoped the little boy would be spared the burdens of the Presidency.)

From his ninth to his fourteenth year he spent every summer in Europe, with his parents. While his father stopped at the health resort at Nauheim, Germany, Franklin Roosevelt spent 2 summers at the German schools there and 2 summers cycling through Germany and adjoining countries.

On one of these cycling jaunts Franklin and his companion unwittingly violated a German regulation or two, and he still remembers affectionately the German colonel who rebuked him and then gave him some cookies and milk.

Roosevelt learned his Europe at first hand, from Norway to Italy and from Ireland to Austria.

On another occasion, when he was 19, he visited Kaiser Wilhelm's yacht in the harbor at Molde. Family legend has it that a souvenir of that visit, a lead pencil used by the Kaiser, is still preserved at Hyde Park, with the Kaiser's teeth marks still intact on it.

Roosevelt's father subscribed to several European periodicals, which came to the house at Hyde Park. Before he was 10 he was reading the London Spectator, the Revue des Deux Monds in French, and the Welt Rundschau in German, and he still reads foreign periodicals regularly. He has a complete file of Punch from 1841 to 1939.

All told, on his various journeys Franklin Roosevelt has visited 29 foreign countries, and ever since he was a boy he has met and talked with the men who run those countries. He began to collect stamps before he was 10. Today he can draw an accurate map from memory of every continent and nearly every country.

So his education in world affairs began early, and has continued until this day, when every hour of every day a sheaf of dispatches and reports is brought to his desk from the State Department across the street.

No other American President has had a preparation so broad and so deep for the handling of America's foreign relations. Only Herbert Hoover among them approaches him in familiarity with foreign countries, and Hoover's foreign experiences did not begin until he was a grown man and married and preoccupied with mining.

Mere travel does not make a man an expert on foreign affairs. Roosevelt studied international law under John Bassett Moore, and he has known and talked with almost every eminent statesman of his time. Even Roosevelt's severest critics concede that he knows a thing or two about what goes on across the oceans.

[From the Washington Post of October 13, 1939]

OVER THE COFFEE

(By Harlan Miller)

ROOSEVELT ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS, II—13 VOYAGES, 29 LANDS

How deep and authentic is President Roosevelt's knowledge of foreign affairs?

The President has spent more time in Washington than a three-term Senator. Probably more time than a four-term Senator. Half of this time he was Assistant Secretary of the Navy.

As every Senator knows, the front porch and front lawn of the Navy is foreign affairs.

From 1913 to 1920 the Franklin Roosevelts belonged to the "young married" crowd of the Capital's official circle. Roosevelt became intimately acquainted with the young secretaries of the embassies and legations as well as with the ambassadors and ministers; with the counselors, chargé d'affaires, naval and military attachés of the 50 governments accredited here.

Now these young men have grown older; they are ministers or ambassadors themselves, or high in their own governments at home;

Roosevelt still knows them. He can exchange phone calls and letters with them with an informality no other President has enjoyed. He has private sources of information which must be almost as good as BORAH'S. And Roosevelt knows these diplomats so well that they can't spoof him.

At Harvard he majored in history, and in his last year at Columbia he majored in international law. He read Admiral Mahan's Influence of Sea Power when he was 11, and has reread it occasionally; at 14 he was debating on Philippine independence and the increase of our Navy.

There were Delanos and Roosevelts all over the world when he was a boy. Their letters were read and discussed at the Hyde Park breakfast table, and when they came for visits the whole world was spread out in the living room like a map; the names and the scenes in his stamp collection came alive.

This background was there when his 13 trips to Europe began, his visits to 29 foreign countries. Before he left college he could speak and read French and German fluently, and he had a fair reading knowledge of Spanish and Italian.

He can understand Hitler's radio speeches in the original.

To augment the hourly dispatch bags from Cordell Hull at the State Department he subscribes to a special clipping service on foreign affairs. At the end of each year he goes through a synopsis of the world developments in international relations. He reads a review of every book published on foreign affairs and reads many of them in toto.

Since he entered the White House, there has been a steady parade of rulers and statesmen through its doors, from Hjalmar Schacht, of Germany, in 1933, to King George this year.

But even before that he had known and talked with Clemenceau, Lloyd George, Poincare, Orlando, Nitti, Balfour, King Albert, and a score of others of the world's great ones.

Thus he has always had a rare chance to know what the score was.

He was in Paris during the 1919 peace conference, and while he took no official part in that clinic on world affairs, he met and talked with everyone and saw what was happening behind the curtains. He brought Woodrow Wilson back from his first jaunt to Paris.

It was an interneship in world affairs that helps him as a diagnostician today.

No other American President has ever entered the White House with such an intimate knowledge of world politics and international stresses and strains. An examination of his record and background makes it seem that any President, whether Cordell Hull or Vandenberg or McNutt or Tom Dewey would be fortunate to have so seasoned a Secretary of State as Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

Preparedness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH McKELLAR

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, October 13 (legislative day of Wednesday, October 4), 1939

ARTICLE BY JAMES G. STAHLMAN

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a newspaper article on the subject of preparedness. The article is from the Nashville Banner of October 6, 1939. It is a column that is conducted daily by James G. Stahlman, president and publisher of the Nashville Banner, published at Nashville, Tenn.

Mr. Stahlman served as a private in the United States Army during the World War and is now an officer in the United States Naval Reserve. Mr. Stahlman stands high as a newspaperman, since he served two terms as president of the American Newspaper Publishers' Association, after having served for the same period as president of the Southern Newspaper Publishers' Association. He is an ardent advocate of the neutrality legislation now before the Senate and desired by the President. In this column he makes a strong plea for ample national defense and tells the reason why.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FROM THE SHOULDER

(By James G. Stahlman)

Nashville gets the South's first airplane factory.
That's good.
But that isn't all.
There'll be lots of collateral development.
That will be still better.
Vanderbilt gets a student air training course under the C. A. A.
That's also good.
What does all that mean, anyhow?
Plenty.

In the first place, the coming of that plane factory adjacent to Nashville's municipal airport means that Nashville definitely steps out as the air center of the South.

We have the best airport that I've landed on anywhere, with the exception of LeBourget at Paris.

We have everything here that it takes to foster air interests.
We have made the start.
The end, no one can foretell.
The possibilities in the situation are almost incomprehensible.

Now all of this fits into what is being planned and what this country should push.

That's the biggest air force in the world.
That's what we need.
That's what we should have without delay.
I heard Eddie Rickenbacker talk the other night.
He knows what airplanes mean in time of war.
He knows better than any man in this country.
He ought to.
He's as practical about the whole matter as any man I know.
He says America should have not less than 50,000 airplanes.
Not less than 25,000 pilots.
He's just as right as that a dollar is worth only 59 cents.
We should have now, 50,000 planes.
We should have now, 25,000 pilots.
This country needs thousands more antiaircraft guns.
It needs thousands more coast-defense guns.
It needs a navy twice the size of the present one.
A fleet in the Pacific.
A fleet in the Atlantic.
It needs an army of not less than 500,000 men.
It could stand one of 1,000,000 men.
It needs to make Hawaii impregnable.
That's basic from the Pacific angle.
Anybody will tell you that.
It needs to make the Panama Canal impregnable.
It must be completely protected.
That's basic, too.

With that sort of set-up, I'd be willing to invite Hitler and the rest of the boys over for tea.

I'll guarantee they wouldn't land with any guns on their hips.

And I'd guarantee they wouldn't land at all, unless we hung the latch-string on the outside.

No, sir.

When you've got the stuff to take care of yourself, the bad boys stay in their own backyard.

That's human nature.
That's common sense.
There's a lot in that "discretion the better part of valor" stuff.

Especially when you're looking down the business end of 16-inch guns.

With two fleets—say, I don't imagine American shipping would be swept from the seven, eight, or nine seas.

With the coastal line of the United States bristling with heavy guns, anti-aircraft guns, aircraft bases, and a couple of cap pistols for good measure—

I'm asking you, who'd be fool enough to try to push us over?
Not even Hitler.
And he's crazy in many particulars.
But he isn't that kind of crazy.

Neither are the rest of the lads who rattle the sabers now and then.

We'd better make up our minds that, so long as there are crazy people in this world, we had better be smart.

And if we're real smart, we'll get a healthy supply of those things that crazy people respect most.

I'd rather spend billions on defense than billions on the dole.
We'd solve half our unemployment problem in a plan like this.
We'd put millions of people to work in gainful occupations.

We'd make our money represent something besides idling shovels and shuffling rakes.

We'd make factories hum.
We'd make business better.
"Oh, but that's materialistic," yelp the idealists.
Yep, that's materialistic, all right.
But it's also horse sense.

"Yes; but that's arming ourselves to the teeth," cry the scared cats and the professional pacifists.

So it is.
But let's arm to the teeth.
To the hip.
To the toe.
To the fingertip.

Let's make it certain that nobody's going to come snooping around over here with bombers, tanks, and gas.

Let's make America the safest place on the face of the earth.
It can't be done with BB's and popguns.
It can and should be done the way I've outlined.
Even more so.
I'd rather fortify Hawaii than rebuild Fort Negley.
We spent several hundred thousand on the latter.
Let's spend several hundred million on the former.

And then let's spend what it will take to make and keep this country free from any and every threat—
It will cost far less than getting into any man's war.
And don't fool yourselves about that!

Bureau-Made Criminal Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. USHER L. BURDICK
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, October 13, 1939

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Daily News carries a story in its issue of Thursday, October 12, 1939, as follows:

WHAT THY LEFT HAND DOETH—IT IS NIGH IMPOSSIBLE FOR A CONGRESSMAN TO KEEP UP WITH ALL THE THINGS CONGRESS DOES

If any correspondence school is offering a compact law course that can be digested in 60 days, it probably could find a customer in Grocer William V. Miller, of Cheltenham, in adjoining Prince Georges County.

Tried in Baltimore Federal Court yesterday on 20 charges of failure to report customers' purchases of sugar in quantities of 100 pounds or more, Mr. Miller told Judge William C. Coleman that he had taken the advice of Representative USHER L. BURDICK (Republican, North Dakota) that there was no Federal law requiring such reports.

Representative BURDICK, a former Assistant United States Attorney, and a former speaker of the North Dakota Legislature, took the stand.

"I voted for this bill but I did not think it had become law," he said. "The regulations as laid down by the Federal Treasury change so often you can't keep up with them. Why, the statute book of the United States is bigger than a mail-order catalog.

"Furthermore, the reference library of Congress confirmed my opinion—erroneously, it would seem—that it was no violation of the law to sell 100 pounds of sugar for a legitimate purpose (not for manufacture of illicit liquor) without reporting the purchase to Government agents."

The jury was out 5 minutes. Grocer Miller got 2 months.

Generally I have no fault to find with a newspaper reporter, even though I am misquoted, in case the misquotation is not purposely made. In reading this whole article, its general purport is true, although some of the facts are not. In the Miller case tried before the Federal district court at Baltimore, Mr. Miller testified that he asked me as a lawyer if there was any act of Congress making it a criminal offense to sell for legitimate purposes a hundred pounds of sugar without making a report to the Treasury Department of such sale. I stated to him I did not believe there was any act of Congress relating to the sale of 100 pounds of sugar, and a report thereon, but that the statute on that subject passed in 1934 authorized the Secretary of the Treasury to make such rules and regulations as they thought proper within the limits of the statute.

I advised Mr. Miller accordingly and asked him several times if any regulation had been served upon him or brought to his attention. He stated then and on the witness stand that he had never received any copy of a regulation nor was any read to him by any official. At the trial Government agents swore they talked with Mr. Miller generally about the regulations and left a copy with his clerk. There was a square conflict in the evidence as to whether Miller ever had notice of the regulations.

I did not state on the witness stand that I have voted for the 1934 statute as reported, but clearly testified that I was not a Member of Congress until January 3, 1935, but while this statement of the newspaper reporter is not a true statement of what I said, I believe that it is immaterial to what I want to say now. The point I wish to make is this: In the Miller case he was convicted of the violation of a regulation of the Treasury Department, authorized by an act of Congress.

The judge charged the jury that it made no difference to whom he sold the sugar; that the crime of violating this regulation was complete when Miller failed to report the sale. The newspapers seem to delight in saying that Miller was convicted because he was advised by a Congressman. I did not advise him as a Congressman, but as a lawyer, and gave him the only advice any lawyer could give, namely, that there was no act of Congress making the sale of 100 pounds of sugar, when not reported to the Government, a crime, but that if there was a regulation on the subject, it would be served upon him. That is the advice I gave him. Mr. Miller said he never received notice of the regulation, but the judge instructed the jury that the notice was served as a matter of law. Under those instructions there was nothing for the jury to do but bring in a verdict of guilty. I appreciate a comical story when I see one and I think the way this Miller story was written up by the newspaper correspondent was a comic. It was not very comical to Miller, however, who will have to serve 60 days for having sold 100 pounds of sugar to his neighbors for perfectly legitimate purposes.

As stated, I did not vote for this act of 1934 because, for one thing, I was not a Member of Congress until 1935. I will state now that as long as I remain in Congress I will never vote for an act which will empower the Treasury Department or some other bureau to write up and promulgate any further criminal laws of the country. There is no doubt but that Congress is to blame for this un-American system of lawmaking. Congress passes an act and provides in it that the "department" can finish the job by making any regulation they see fit not inconsistent with this "shotgun" act.

The next point is, How is a businessman to know what the law is and how is any lawyer able to find the law? We used to look in the statute books to find the law, but not so now. Under this system of bureau-making law, we have a new set of books to consult. We have the Federal Register, which is published daily at the city of Washington and contains several pages of "rules, regulations, and orders" from some bureau, all purporting to be the law. These regulations are changed whenever the bureau thinks it advisable, and the revised regulation is again published. At the end of 6 months, we have a bundle of publications several feet high in any one of which may appear a regulation which it is a crime to fail to comply with.

If this bureau system of making laws—civil as well as criminal—is not a step toward dictatorship, then I know of nothing that could resemble dictatorship more. Businessmen simply cannot tell for 24 hours what they must do to comply with the regulations made by some bureau. Many have charged that the President wanted to be a dictator, but you can see now who is making a dictatorship possible; it is not the President, but Congress. When Congress will deliberately authorize a bureau to create law—criminal law—it is a direct authorization of dictatorship.

Effect of Section 2 (A) of the Proposed Neutrality Law on Pacific Coast States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, October 13, 1939

STATEMENT OF A CONFERENCE OF WESTERN INTERESTS

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement:

The following statement of fact concerning the effect of section 2 (A) of the proposed neutrality law on Pacific Coast States was developed at a conference of western interests held in San Francisco on Tuesday, October 3, 1939. The conference was represented by all large Pacific coast port cities from Seattle to San Diego:

1. The enactment of section 2 (A) of the proposed Neutrality Act would seriously affect between 75 and 100 American-flag ships based on the Pacific coast of the United States, which trade with belligerents, or potential belligerents, in the Pacific Ocean area.

2. Those ships which are now engaged in trade with belligerents, namely, to Canada, Australia, New Zealand, Hong Kong, Straits Settlements, Burma, Ceylon, and India, will have to suspend im-

mediately upon enactment of the law, while the remainder which serve China, Japan, and Vladivostok, will suspend if and when a state of war involving the countries named is found to exist.

3. The ships affected include the great liner service of the Matson Navigation Co., to Australia and New Zealand, which would become illegal upon enactment of the law, the old-established services of the American President Lines, to Oriental and Indian Ocean ports; the American tanker services of the various oil companies operating from California to all points in the Pacific Ocean; the American-flag tramp services out of Pacific coast ports, which are available to provide tonnage not otherwise obtainable during peak movements; the newly created steamship services operating from the Pacific Northwest to Orient ports; and the services touching upon Canadian ports from Alaska or other American mainland ports.

4. The enactment of section 2 (A) also would tend to destroy whatever possibility there may be for the much-needed expansion of American-flag services on the Pacific Ocean in accordance with the Maritime Commission's new construction program, a goal which the Pacific coast has long sought to achieve and which is now within reach. The benefits to national defense from such expansion are self-evident.

5. The effect of the total or partial withdrawal of American-flag tonnage from these vital trade routes would be to place American commerce in these routes completely at the mercy of foreign-flag services. Experience in the last war and developments that have already occurred in the present war indicate that a large amount of foreign tonnage also will be withdrawn from the Pacific Ocean area in favor of more lucrative routes in the Atlantic area. Such experience also indicates that when absolute reliance must be placed on foreign tonnage, freight rates increase to prohibitive levels.

6. The developments above described would have most serious, if not catastrophic, effect upon all elements of the west coast's economic structure, including not only steamship companies, but also agriculture, labor, industry, railroads, and business generally, all of which are dependent in one way or another upon the maintenance of trans-Pacific Ocean trade.

7. A suspension of even a small part of the American-flag services would throw out of work thousands of Americans now employed, both on the ships as seamen, stewards, officers, etc., and on shore as longshoremen and office administrative employees. The pay roll of the west-coast States bordering on the Pacific would be cut by millions of dollars per annum in such an event. In addition, the substantial purchases by these companies, which aggregate more millions of dollars per annum, for food, ships' stores, and supplies and fuel, would also be terminated; with a resulting large loss to west coast business and labor depending upon such transactions.

8. The large and widespread agricultural interests of the west coast would suffer enormously, first, because facilities for transporting their products to countries bordering on the Pacific would be woefully inadequate; and, second, because the freight rates imposed by such limited facilities as may be available would be so high as to reach nearly prohibitive levels, thereby depressing value of agricultural products.

This condition would affect all important agricultural products, including citrus and deciduous fruits, wheat and flour, canned and dried fruits, vegetables, etc. This would aggravate the presently unsatisfactory situation in respect to farm economics and would tend to further curtail the earnings of agriculture and labor.

9. Industry, not only on the west coast, but also in the great manufacturing centers of the Midwest, would lose its normal peacetime export markets which absorb millions of dollars of manufactured goods annually. These markets would be lost on account of inadequacy of transportation facilities and excessive freight rates previously referred to. The result upon the economic structure of the Nation is certain to be adverse.

Equally important would be the serious effects upon import movement following the curtailment of the necessary supplies of raw materials, including tin, rubber, jute, ores, chemicals, and other items, that are not available in the United States, and are absolutely indispensable to the American industrial system. These items are now being imported principally from belligerents, or potential belligerents, in the Pacific area.

It would appear that it is extremely hazardous to rely upon foreign-flag tonnage for these vital materials. This would affect not only the operation of industry from the business point of view, but also the adequacy of our industrial system with regard to the national defense.

10. The great lumber industry of the Pacific Northwest, which has sustained serious economic reverses in the past several years, would be further penalized and demoralized by the enactment of this section 2 (A).

11. The American railroads, trucking companies, inland waterway carriers, and other agencies which feed cargo to merchant ships at Pacific coast ports would suffer considerably, both from the curtailment of the movement and the diversion of cargo to Vancouver or other Canadian ports via Canadian railroads.

12. All Pacific coast ports would suffer a substantial curtailment of revenue necessary for the maintenance and operation of harbor facilities which have been constructed at considerable public expense in contemplation of the uninterrupted flow of peacetime commerce.

13. The operation of American-flag ships in the Pacific Ocean is relatively safe under present-day conditions and presents no apparent threat to America's neutrality. It appears, therefore, that there is no valid reason why normal trade routes should not be continued as in peacetime.

How Scio Licked Hard Times

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL R. LEWIS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 13, 1939

ARTICLE FROM READER'S DIGEST

Mr. LEWIS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, in these days when millions of individuals and thousands of communities are asking Government assistance to help them solve their individual and community problems growing out of the present depression, it is extremely heartening to learn that the people of one American community have solved their own problems without governmental assistance and have made their own community an outstanding example of what the sensible and rational approach to the realities of their own situation could do in restoring prosperity and making their community a brilliant example for the rest of America to follow. I refer to the little city of Scio in Harrison County in eastern Ohio and to the vision and the hard-headed willingness to face the unpleasant facts of their situation and sound common sense of one of its leading citizens, Mr. L. P. Reese. The remarkable story of this prosperous community in the midst of the wreck of depression, a prosperity achieved during the darkest days of the depression, is thrillingly told in an article appearing in this month's Reader's Digest, condensed from an article previously appearing in Forbes Magazine, which is as follows:

[From Reader's Digest—Condensed from Forbes]

HOW SCIO LICKED HARD TIMES

(By Webb Waldron)

In 1932 Scio, Ohio, and L. P. Reese, now its leading citizen, both had their backs to the wall; both were due to go down as depression casualties. Scio's crisis had begun in 1927, when its one industry, a large pottery plant, folded. In 5 years, population dropped from 1,200 to 400; more than half the houses became vacant; some homes sold for as little as $100. Scio was licked.

So was L. P. Reese, and for about the same reasons. In 1932 Reese was a worker in a pottery plant in a nearby town. The depression hit his company and he was laid off. His savings dwindled; some of his family went on relief.

One day he accepted the invitation of friends in Scio, likewise unemployed pottery hands, to go rabbit hunting. They passed the idle plant, and Reese called off the hunting while he inspected the buildings. Roofs were in disrepair, windows were broken, weeds choked the doors. But Reese remarked, as he finished:

"I've an idea I could do something with that place. I wonder if Scio would be interested."

The rabbit hunt never got beyond that point. Reese told his story to Scio's bank cashier, dentist, real-estate dealer, clothing-store merchant, and others.

He had long believed that cheap imported pottery, much of it from Japan, could be duplicated successfully in this country. He had even designed kilns and mass-production machinery, but his employers had not been interested. But now Scio determined to back him.

Reese put up his total capital of $2,000, including a loan on his war-risk insurance. He found that tax assessments of $3,600 against the plant could be paid off by installments. The property was knocked down at a sheriff's sale for $8,000, the terms allowing Reese plenty of elbow room.

Offering only the hope of jobs, Reese called for volunteers to repair the buildings. During Thanksgiving week in 1932 the entire town turned out—minister, doctor, bank cashier, dentist, merchant, school principal, and practically every able-bodied workman. They repaired roofs, put in new windows, cut away weeds, rebuilt the road.

Reese fixed up a corner of the unheated plant for living quarters, and with six volunteers moved in to work on the equipment. For 6 weeks they put in 14 to 18 hours a day. By January the machinery and the kilns had been rebuilt. The Scio-Ohio Pottery Co. was ready to go.

It lacked only funds for a pay roll, credit for raw materials, and orders. A clay salesman who had known about Reese's plan—and

believed in the man, the idea, and the town—persuaded his firm to gamble two carloads of clay.

Reese then went to Chicago and persuaded the buyer for a large chain of stores to take the first carload of cups and saucers—and to pay for them on delivery.

Production started in mid-February 1933. The first pay roll—$990.53—fell due on the 23d. Reese had a cash balance of 11 cents. There was a huddle in the back room of the bank. Twenty men put up $100 apiece and the pay roll was met. On February 23 of each succeeding year Scio has had a community dinner in commemoration of that occasion.

In 1934, the first full year of operation, the company did a gross business of $331,000; last year, $1,284,000. There are more than 500 employees, the monthly pay roll averaging $50,000. There has never been a lay-off.

Among his employees Reese has several former school teachers, two ministers, a one-time stationmaster, several engineers, a contingent of college graduates. Farm families from the entire countryside are represented. Among the 2,200 people in the township only 12 are on relief. Meanwhile, the population of Scio has doubled, there has been a small boom in new homes, savings accounts have multiplied.

Reese, who is "L. P." to Scio, is no desk-industrialist. For my visit he appeared in a white shirt and necktie—and was soundly razzed. His attitude is a product of his own experience as an employee. "I've already got all the money I deserve," he told me. "From now on profits are going into increased pay and bonuses." The wages he pays are already tops for the industry, sometimes twice the average. The minimum—to the boys who sweep out—is 50 cents an hour. From there the scale goes up to $2.50 an hour. Last year $22,000 was added to pay checks as a Christmas bonus.

Two years ago, when union delegates arrived in Scio, Reese, once a union officer himself, let the visitors tell their story to his employees. Then he suggested an employees' meeting to settle the issue. Both he and the organizers stayed away. The vote was unanimously against unionizing.

Recently Reese, with his advisers—the bank cashier, the dentist, and the real-estate operator—decided that increased business merited plant expansion. It would eventually mean more employment and better pay, but meanwhile would probably prevent any wage increases for 2 years. Reese put the question to the employees. The vote was unanimous to expand.

Reese and Scio have put the depression in reverse. Their methods are neither spectacular nor new. They are deeply rooted in tradition. The same imagination, courage, and industry by which Americans, from the first pioneers, always got the upper hand on hard times. Reese and Scio are proof that the old spirit has not run out, that its effectiveness has not diminished.

Neutrality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 13, 1939

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address which I delivered recently over the radio:

Good evening, everyone, tonight there are two thoughts uppermost in the minds of the American people—the war in Europe and keeping American out of that war.

Tonight men are dying in that war. Other men are being maimed for life. Women are losing their husbands, children their fathers, parents their sons. Homes are being destroyed. Great cities like Warsaw are in ruins and the war has been in progress for little more than a month. Death, destruction, waste of life and property, and human misery are the only rewards of war.

Tonight, thank God, the American people enjoy the blessings of peace. Millions of Americans are listening to their radios—listening to war news from Europe, peace news of America. Be your homes ever so humble, you Americans and your loved ones are secure from air-raid bombs and high-explosive projectiles.

Tonight there is a difference of opinion among the people and among their public servants at Washington as to the best way to preserve American peace and neutrality. But there is no division among us about America remaining aloof from the holocaust that fills us with horror. The American people are united in a demand to keep out of the European war, united in a determination to keep peace in the Western Hemisphere. They depend upon the President to keep his pledge of peace, which Congress unanimously applauded.

For a number of years, the American people have been "educated" on the theory that the arms embargo was the Nation's best "peace insurance." Led by President Roosevelt, officials of the administration, Members of Congress, Republicans and Democrats alike, joined in the campaign to "sell" the American people the theory that the arms embargo offers the best way to keep America out of war—other people's wars. I took a modest part in that campaign which ended with the enactment of the arms embargo neutrality law. For the American people were "sold" completely on the theory that the arms embargo is our best bulwark against war.

Millions of Americans still are "sold" on the arms embargo now that they are confronted with a condition, not a theory—a war, rather than the threat of war in Europe. It will require some compelling reason to "unsell" them on the protective value of the arms embargo. Too many people remember America's shifting policy during the World War, how we were drawn, step by step, into that conflict. They know the arms embargo would permit no such shifts in policy.

No one who has made even a casual study of world affairs from the standpoint of the foreign interests of the United States claims the arms embargo is a perfect or a foolproof neutrality policy. No law can be flexible enough to cover the interests of the United States in Europe, Asia, and South America at one and the same time. But the fact remains that we had the arms embargo when the European war began. The fact also remains that no real attempt was made to change the law because it aided the aggressor Japan in China, or the aggressor Italy in Ethiopia.

When we undertake to treat all warring nations alike by enacting laws before war begins and then refuse to sell arms to any belligerent after war starts we must be prepared to sacrifice some material interests to maintain our neutrality—to keep out of the conflict. And in any choice between the sacrifice of material interests and the sacrifice of American boys on foreign battlefields the American people never will hesitate to sacrifice material interests.

The President, in his message opening the special session of Congress, freely confessed his enthusiastic support of the arms embargo. He then expressed his deep regret that Congress had passed the law and his equally deep regret that he had signed it. The President based his regret upon the belief that the arms embargo was more apt to involve the United States in the European war than the so-called cash-and-carry bill now pending in the Senate, with his blessing.

With all due respect to the President, I must in all candor submit that it is one thing to confess an error in judgment and express regret for it, and it is quite another thing to convince the American people that a second guess will prove any more sound than the first, which he so passionately defended until recently. A record stands so all who run may read.

It is obvious from the flood of mail deluging all Members of Congress in opposition to the repeal of the arms embargo that the President failed to make it clear either to the country or to Congress why the arms embargo would endanger our peace and why the so-called cash-and-carry bill would preserve our peace. If he had done so, all opposition to the cash-and-carry measure in Congress and out would have melted away and this new bill would have the same overwhelming approval that was accorded the arms embargo.

Let us remember that the arms embargo and the cash-and-carry provisions, which now have lapsed, were embodied in the same act. Let us also remember the President himself allowed the cash-and-carry provisions to lapse, under the limitation in the law. The President might have asked Congress to reenact those provisions. Instead, he chose to ask Congress to pass an entirely new law.

No dissenting voice was raised when the President requested the adjournment of politics so far as the neutrality legislation is concerned. We all are glad to note the absence of partisan spirit in the debate on a matter of such vital importance to the American people. We all desire a united Nation in this crisis. And above all, we wish to avoid any step that might involve this country in the European war.

Now let me point out that four-fifths of the articles America exports are on the contraband lists of both Germany and England. In view of that fact, we would not run the risk of exporting contraband articles in American ships in any event. Since that is true, it seems that a compromise might be effected to minimize the danger of embroilment in the war. That would be the retention of the embargo on munitions of war and reenactment of the cash-and carry provisions of the old law on raw materials.

Under that procedure, no actual change in our neutrality policy would be involved. There is an established principle of international law that neutral nations may not, after the outbreak of war, change their legislation for the purpose of assisting one of the belligerents. One authority holds that if we repeal the arms embargo, Germany would have the right under international law to take steps of reprisal and retaliation against American ships. He even goes so far as to say German reprisal might be taken against American ships, even in coastwise trade, and even if they were not carrying contraband of war. That is what the American people wish to avoid—an incident that might lead us to war.

We all noted the President's realistic statement that the American people could not be expected to remain neutral in thought in this war. But after all, our personal sympathies and our neutrality laws are two quite different things. Most Americans will be standing on the side lines rooting for one side to win and wishing the worst of luck to the other side. But the big idea

behind neutrality is keeping out of war—other people's wars—and those same Americans are firmly opposed to any change in the arms embargo.

We must remember that the arms embargo was enacted in peacetime. The sole purpose of that law was to keep us out of other people's wars—to preserve the neutrality, the security, and peace of the United States—no matter what nations went to war in the future. That law was not designed to aid or hinder any nation engaged in war.

Now that war is raging in Europe, it is not a question of the American people loving one or the other of the warring sides less, when the neutrality law is concerned. Americans simply love a peaceful America more.

And no matter how much love any European nation may profess for the United States, it is to be hoped that whatever bill is enacted it will be a strict cash-and-carry law. If we extend the proposed 90-day credit, cash goes out the window. If the sponsors want a trick name for the bill, let them call it title and tote.

The Allied war debts of about $12,000,000,000, 20 years past due, and without so much as a sou or a shilling paid on account of principal or interest, are not so musty that the American people have forgotten them. In fact, Congress passed the Johnson Act, prohibiting debtor nations from borrowing any more money from the United States, to jog the memories of our associates in the last war. While the American taxpayers hold the bag, this 90-day credit is proposed to circumvent the Johnson Act.

It is unthinkable that any American worthy of the name or any set of Americans would deliberately seek to plunge this country into the European war. I am sure that no Member of Congress who happens to disagree with the President on the so-called neutrality bill or any other measure begrudges the President the same degree of sincere desire for peace that he ascribes to those who dissent from his viewpoint.

There is one point in the President's message with which any conscientious Congressman must take issue. That is his asserting that "in a period when it is sometimes said that free discussion is no longer compatible with national safety." This is not one of those times when free discussion of the proposed so-called neutrality bill is not longer compatible with national safety. It is one of those times when free discussion of a measure involving the peace of the United States not only is compatible with national safety, but national safety may depend upon free discussion.

There has not been the slightest indication in any quarter of a disposition to filibuster, to delay consideration by prolonged debate. On the contrary, no one who believes in the orderly processes of democratic government can complain about dilatory tactics in the debate thus far. The advocates of the President's program have consumed equal time with the advocates of keeping the arms embargo as the best means of keeping America out of war.

On the other hand, there are persistent reports of a flood of propaganda actually urging the "gagging" of Members of the House on this matter of vital importance to the American people. Before the debate in the Senate was a week old, inspired newspaper articles appeared in which it was stated without giving any authority for the statement, that the people were tired of the debate—tired of a free discussion of a question involving the peace and security of the United States, weary of a debate on a question of keeping America out of war, if you please.

I have asked what action the House will be allowed to take on the so-called neutrality bill when it comes to the House. No responsible leader has answered the inquiry. Let me point out the reason for that inquiry. Under legislative procedure, the bill now being considered by the Senate bears the number of the House bill. The House bill, passed June 30 last, included the arms embargo, adopted by a vote of 214 to 173.

That entire bill was scrapped, and the Senate Foreign Relations Committee substituted a complete new measure. Despite the fact this new legislation would commit this Government to a policy that might lead to war, it is reported that a movement is afoot to gag the House to hasten enactment of the measure. Instead of sending the bill to conference to iron out the differences between the Senate and House measures, it is reported that a gag rule will be presented to cut to a couple of hours the debate on a question which may involve the peace of this Nation. This gag rule, it was reported, would be so framed that a vote for the gag rule would be a vote for the new Senate bill—a bill that never has had a moment's consideration by any House committee, much less the House itself.

That vote would complete action on the bill. That vote would kill the arms embargo. That vote would change the neutrality policy of this Government in the midst of this European war. That vote could conceivably be the first step toward American involvement in this European war.

The United States of America is the only true democracy on the face of the earth, and if there ever was a time in the life of this Nation for a demonstration of democracy, it will arrive simultaneously with the neutrality bill in the House to be considered for the first time. Free discussion and consideration commensurate with the vital importance of the bill may be stifled by gag rule as ruthlessly as if by edict of a European dictator.

This measure can receive the consideration it deserves only if the American people demand it of their Representatives in Congress. The American people are entitled to know whether their Representatives are to be gagged or will be permitted to vote for the method they believe best to preserve the peace and security of the United States and the American people.

Civil Rights and Liberties

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SHERMAN MINTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 14 (legislative day of Wednesday, October 4), 1939

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS, OF UTAH

Mr. MINTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an interesting and able address delivered by the distinguished junior Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] as part of the program of the National Conference of Civil Liberties, held at the Hotel Biltmore, New York City, October 13 and 14, under the auspices of the American Civil Liberties Union, with William Allen White, chairman of the conference. The address was broadcast over the National Broadcasting System.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE LESSON OF LESSONS FOR AMERICA

After many years spent in study and in work I have founded an opinion which has evolved into a philosophy of life as it is applied to governments. It is my unshakable conviction that in the setting up of the Government of the United States the founders provided a pattern for the greatest social and political institution on the earth, and that in the years that followed a greater number of men and women have had the opportunity to live lives which might be described with the one word "full" than have enjoyed relatively full lives in any other part of the world or under any other governmental system on the earth.

In many places I have been an eyewitness to pestilence, famine, and to life laid bare by yesterday's wars, floods, earthquakes, and volcanoes. To these we may add the suffering from acts of selfishness and greed, and even of stupidity. Statesmanship and good planning might have eliminated much, reduced all. We all have seen life enriched as a result of legislation prompted by the common humanities, so much so that we today ask, Of what value is government if it does not help its people? A thoughtless person will say that welfare as an object of government, perhaps as its prime object, is a new and a dangerous theory, yet it will be found to be one of those many things under the sun which are not new when we read history and remember that the old Romans believed that government's undertakings should be "pro bono publico," for the good of the people, and that the ancient Chinese taught: "The people is the important thing; the people must be cherished."

No gains in civil rights and in civil liberties, terms which should not need definition, have been made as a matter of mere accident or as a result of keeping government out of the realm of labor and industrial disputes or other civil strife. From the Magna Carta to now no immunities from Robert Burns' lament over man's inhumanity to man have been gained, and no inhumanities have been corrected, simply by standing by or standing apart and letting nature take its course. These gains have not been made except by hard work, and usually have followed the path of real suffering so acute as to threaten the fact of a true democracy at work. The Bill of Rights must have been a bitter pill to the exploiters of that day. The rights of man asserted are hard medicine for abusive men and agencies in any generation. It is not more difficult to raise the standard of living than to keep it from being lowered simply by blinding ourselves to the new uses men put to their wits to violate the common hopes, aspirations, and ambitions which their fellow men have a right to possess in a free country. America has never been wholly free from exploitation from within.

It must be true that the first purpose in establishing government in the United States of America was to grant liberty and permit the individual citizen in America to develop the talents that he may possess, at least insofar as to make him in every sense a free man. A civil liberty is nothing more than the privilege of not having placed in one's way, in one's journey along life's path, a barrier to the fulfillment of common ambitions and hopes. Their realization, amounting to nothing more than constitutional liberty, sets us as a nation apart from all others in our peculiar and rather full enjoyment of basic freedom. Government has provided no frills and furbelows, but it has beaten off slavery, inescapable starvation, and other adversaries, and has taken on as a new foe an old enemy in new clothing, namely, the labor spy.

We have become almost unconscious of our oldest civil liberties, which we enjoy daily, else we would not be startled at the phrase, and else it would not attract suspicion and distortion. I have been told that I should not appear publicly in defense of the work that I have done as a member of the subcommittee of the Education and

Labor Committee of the Senate, of which I am chairman, and of which subcommittee, roughly called the Civil Liberties Committee, I am a member. I have been told that our work is not popular. I fancy that in the same kinds of quarters the work of those who had passed the constitutional amendments called the Bill of Rights, soon after the Constitution itself was adopted, were not popular either. I am speaking of personal popularity. The rights themselves are bound to be popular, because they are indispensables in popular government, or government of, by, and for the people. They are popular rights, for this is no more than a synonym for public civil liberties. When one may not come and go without fear, buy or sell without duress, worship without permission, one is not an American. When one cannot join or not join without penalty, be a citizen of his State, a citizen of his Nation, a party member, a lodge affiliate, a church pillar, or owner of a business, without having to pay a toll which he dare not admit, one is not a free person. When one may not enjoy and have satisfaction in the many loyalties which do not conflict because American citizenship is complex, one has lost something vital, he is not a full man, and his life, being not quite full, may actually be empty. Jefferson helps me make my point in great simplicity by referring to his four great freedoms—the freedom of property, the freedom of mind, the freedom of the soul, and the freedom of the body. If we take away these civil liberties or refuse to overcome new violations thereof, we destroy the finest blessings to man ever chronicled in history. No congressional committee, no committee in either House of Congress, has ever been empowered to do a greater thing than that of preserving the essence of American liberty.

The achievement of liberty is a matter of degree and always will be. Yesterday the right to buy and sell was more or was less valuable than today, because there were more or were fewer restrictions on monopolies and trusts; yesterday the right to come and go was more or less valuable because yesterday railroad tariffs were higher or lower and because yesterday you had more or you had less money. Yesterday you had a right to work if you could get a job, and the right to eat without work becomes important if that is the only way in which one may eat. If there are epidemics in the land, no rights are important or assertable until one has medicines and responsible advice from a good medical source. If the individual means to combat disease is still further lowered, then the public needs a greater service, for there is no liberty when a great percentage of our people have broken bodies. When one's hope for the future is destroyed through a curb on worship, one's soul is marred.

Government must, accordingly, provide at least in a measure for physical, cultural, educational, and economic opportunities. Liberty follows the times, and civil rights follow liberty like a faithful companion.

How do we dare risk the consequences of freedom? We are today watching a war from the side lines, as we so often have done. Someone reads that I am taking a leading part in seeking a repeal of the arms embargo as a proper step toward further insuring our peace, and I give my reasoning, which I believe to be sound and convincing, and I state that my conclusions are a result of study and thought. Someone on the other side makes as stout a claim. Then comes the flood of letters, some organized, some spontaneous. The right of petition is thus exercised with all the pressure that skilled propagandists, ardent lobbyists, and well-meaning individuals, thinking for themselves, can exert. Has any wrong been done? Not in America, where we enjoy civil liberties. Yet if we destroy one civil liberty, or allow it to become ineffective, we shall soon destroy all. I have been told that no matter what I do, if war should come I will have the blood of mothers' sons on my hands. My letters read both ways. I am a responsible member of the policy-making branch of our Government. If I were not in America, and wished to do so, perhaps I could send musketmen to the address of such a writer, and because he had insulted me, send him to a concentration camp for presuming to criticize a lawmaker. But my correspondent's right is sacred; but with all its sanctity it is not more valuable to him than the right to be free from having industrial spies at work to undermine him in the security of either his home or his job, or, what is more important than either, his character. But the essence of liberty is self-restraint. Abuse of liberty will bring liberty's destruction. When we fight for the right of becoming a party to a contract, we must also fight just as hard to see that the contract's obligations are fulfilled or else the original right becomes purposeless.

Let us go back a few years.

Something had begun, and making more than a start, had found its way into our very national bloodstream, which could not go unchallenged. It was born of a desire to have a law declared unconstitutional and advice by lawyers to act as though the law were unconstitutional even before it had been legally stricken down. That was going pretty far, standing alone, but it was the consequence of this advice, not the giving of it, that brought about a frustration of civil rights. Soon, in the assumption that the law would not stand up, and particularly that it should by all means be nullified even if good, certain industrial managers began to employ spies, and the evil spread through a large part of our American industry like a cancer. The industrial spy was, thereafter, placed in such wide use, and his influence was given such spread that countless men lost faith in one another. There even developed, naturally enough, the spy on the spy, and with this, universal fear on the part of everyone concerned, namely the employer, the group or groups spied upon, and the spy himself. In such a state of lost faith, society's very existence is threatened, and with the continuation of such a low level of confidence, society in time would be destroyed. Fear is not a possible substitute for faith. It was a case of introducing an evil to destroy what was suspected as an evil. Granting that the suspicion was honest, for the sake of the record granting even that it was justified, it was an imprudent risk, with the ever-present fear that the evil of spying be turned on its user, as it was turned in many cases, to the impairment, the moral destruction, and the material damage of its victims.

Again it was a mistake to permit public police officers to take a side and pit themselves against a part of the public. In doing so they ceased to be public officers and became partisans, and when arms and gas were used we had a civil war in the small, to be sure, but, in fact nevertheless, with danger of its spread. Without officers of the law acting as law officers, so far as those areas were concerned we were without law and order. Employers turned spies on, but could not turn them off. They started "hookers" undermining men's characters, and could not stop them. The lying "missionary" sent out to break faith in some men broke faith in all men. And trust, the very essence of social life, ceased to be.

It was in this state of affairs that Senator LA FOLLETTE and I began our inquiries. Senator WALSH is with us in our present investigations. We have had no thought but to bring about a restoration of civil rights and keep America American. Constructive legislation is now before Congress, and if we are to have it enacted, our work is only begun. Nothing useful to the great body of the public ever was achieved without opposition. While no one can openly work against the proposed law because it is written to correct admitted evils, still it may die from indifferent support. Since only by eternal vigilance liberty is kept alive, deadly indifference dulls liberty's worth and ultimately kills its spirit. Liberty in its fullest sense is tensely spiritual and like all spiritual things it is easily marred.

Just as our great civilization in its final analysis rests upon three cultural inventions—the wheel, the domestication of animals, and the development of cereal food—just so does our democracy rest upon the political concepts of the four great freedoms of the mind, the soul, the body, and private property. American democracy hangs by the thin thread of restraint and common consent. A loss of civil liberty, therefore, may mean the loss of all liberty. For our moral let us turn to good old Aesop: An eagle in flight was hit by an arrow. As he fell wounded to the ground he turned to see the cause of his destruction. On noting that the arrow had been guided by eagle feathers he uttered as he died, "There is in each of us the element of our own destruction."

Ladies and gentlemen, that is the lesson of lessons for America today.

Labor and Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEWIS B. SCHWELLENBACH

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 14 (legislative day of Wednesday, October 4), 1939

ADDRESS BY SENATOR SCHWELLENBACH BEFORE AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech delivered by me before the convention of the American Federation of Labor at Cincinnati, Ohio, on October 12, 1939.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I appreciate very much the invitation to appear before this convention.

At first blush it would seem that a detailed discussion of the problem of the apple industry might be far afield from the program of a labor convention. Knowing as I do, however, the degree of recognition by the American Federation of Labor of the close connection between those who might be classed as laborers and those who might be classed as farmers, I did not hesitate to accept the invitation. In our highly developed economic system the prosperity of each group depends upon the prosperity of each other group. Neither the labor union nor its members can hope to flourish during the period of depressed agricultural conditions.

There is another reason why labor is and should be interested in the present disastrous situation confronting the apple industry. The percentage of cost necessarily expended in order to place apples upon the market going to labor is much higher than any other agricultural product.

The average cost of production, according to a 3-year study made by the Washington State College of Agriculture on 81 farms in the Wenatchee Valley, was $1.17 per box. This includes all legitimate

costs of production and packing the fruit, and of this amount about 70 cents per box was considered a fair estimate of the actual cash expenditure, the balance of the item being made up of overhead charges of interest and depreciation and a cash value figured on the labor of the farmer and his family.

In addition to these costs there are charges for warehousing, shipping-point storage, and selling of the apples before they move east. The combined average charge for these three items in the Wenatchee Valley at the time of this study was 26.7 cents per box. At that time an additional charge of 75 cents per box was charged for transporting the crop to the eastern market. When the $1.17 for producing and packing a box of apples is added to the warehousing and transportation charges, we have an item of $2.18 invested in the average box of apples by the time it reaches the eastern seaboard.

One can see why the Washington boxed apple commands a relatively high price in the eastern market. One can also appreciate that the portion of this price returned to the Washington farmer is relatively modest.

It should be emphasized that the natural advantage the State of Washington has in a climate and soil especially well adapted to apple production is at least partially offset by the long haul to the eastern or export markets. For this reason it has been necessary to concentrate on the production of a quality product, and the result is the high-graded and standardized Washington boxed apple.

The extent of the dependence of the western commercial growers upon the export market places them in a very unfavorable situation this year. Last season some 12,000,000 bushels were exported. Exports during the 1939–40 season are expected to be considerably below that figure.

Not only does Europe have a large apple crop, but the war presents a great handicap. Shipping space and the foreign exchange available for fresh fruit are likely to become serious problems. Consumer demand in Europe is expected to shift toward foods that are less perishable and cheaper than fresh apples, although a certain amount of fresh fruit probably will be considered essential to health.

For the next few months it is expected that the United Kingdom will be supplied largely from its own crop plus imports from Canada. A heavy harvest of around 16,000,000 bushels is expected in Canada. Even Canada, however, with a preferred market in the United Kingdom for about 7,000,000 bushels of apples anticipates greatly reduced exports for 1939–40.

France expects very large apple and pear crops this fall of her own. The new Government import-control system undoubtedly will cut down the movement of apples into France much below last season.

The unsettled conditions resulting from the war have limited fresh apple exports this season to less than one-third of the amount exported up to this time last year. This curtailment of export outlets, in addition to a bumper apple crop of 103,000,000 bushels and the prospects of the second largest citrus crop on record, has resulted in ruinous prices to the apple grower. Apple prices so far this season are even lower than those existing in the 1937 season. It is estimated that from ninety-five to ninety-nine million bushels of apples are available for fresh domestic consumption as compared to an average of 81,000,000 bushels during the last 10 years.

United States apple crops and prices

Year	Commercial sales	Fresh exports	Fresh domestic consumption	Farm price
	Million bushels	*Million bushels*	*Million bushels*	*Dollars per bushel*
1929–38	94	12	81	0.86
1935	104	12	92	.72
1937	116	11	105	.67
1938	82	12	70	.84
1939[1]	103	4–8	99–95	[2].63

[1] Preliminary estimate. [2] September prices.

Consumer purchasing power during the apple-marketing season will be higher than in 1938, and is expected to be about equivalent to 1937. Competition from other fruits, however, has increased greatly. The prospects are that this year's fruit crop will be the second largest on record, and will be 13 percent above 1935, 7 percent below 1937, and 6 percent above 1938.

Under present conditions the parity price of apples as calculated by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics is $1.23 per bushel. The present farm price of apples is 63 cents per bushel, or only 51 percent of parity.

To meet this situation growers have undertaken a program to divert low-grade apples from fresh consumption. The Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation is supplementing this grower program by purchasing a bushel of apples for relief distribution for every bushel diverted. Under this program the farmers are attempting to secure fair prices for their fruit and at the same time supply consumers with an ample quantity of the best quality apples available at reasonable prices.

Apples have just been put on the surplus list and it is too early, therefore, to estimate the volume of distribution which can be secured through this outlet. This may mean a great deal to apple growers later on as the stamp plan is extended to additional cities.

To those who know nothing of the apply industry it is always surprising to discover that orchard land in the State of Washington ranges in value from eight to twelve hundred dollars per acre. It has not been uncommon for an orchard of the Delicious variety to sell as high as $2,000 per acre. These values come about through the great length of time necessary to bring an apple orchard into full bearing, and the rather considerable costs that must be incurred for irrigation water, land taxes, and investments in buildings, equipment, and irrigation system. While apple trees may begin to bear moderately in the seventh or eighth year, they are not considered to be in full production until about the tenth year. During this long period of waiting there is little or no income and considerable outlay for maintenance of the growing orchard.

I know there is no need for me to make a sales talk on the dietary value of apples. However, it is of interest to consider briefly the findings after a scientific survey made this year by the New York Horticultural Society:

"Apples add nonirritating bulk to the diet because they contain large amounts of pectic or jelly-forming material. The pectin promotes transit in the intestines without irritating the glands, and in that way improves digestion. Apples in the form of raw apple pulp or powder have been used very successfully in the treatment of diarrhea or dysentary in infants and of intestinal ulcers in adults. Apples supply readily available energy because of the solubility of the sugars which they contain. Apples contain numerous minerals, including fair amounts of calcium and iron, which are so important for bone, tooth, brain, and muscle building.

"Apples provide ample quantities of the essential vitamins A and C, as well as lesser amounts of vitamins B and G. Vitamin A aids in building up of disease resistance in the human body. It is commonly believed that oranges are a good source of vitamin A. Dr. Henry C. Sherman, of Columbia University, well-known nutritian authority, assigns them a value of only 20 units per ounce, while several varieties of apples, including McIntosh and Golden Delicious, have a value of from 30 to 36 units per ounce. Vitamin C is the antiscurvy vitamin. Apples contain a large amount of this vitamin, which cannot be stored in the body and which must be replenished daily. Most of this vitamin is stored close to the skin. One apple a day, eaten skin and all, will give one all of this vitamin needed regardless of his other foods.

"Apples furnish an alkaline reaction in our systems, thus counteracting acid-forming foods and checking colds and superacidity."

We, representing apple-producing areas, will most certainly appreciate any assistance which can be rendered to us by this powerful organization.

Speaking on behalf of the orchardists of my own State, I wish to repeat my appreciation for this opportunity to thus briefly appear before you.

Pending Neutrality Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENNETT CHAMP CLARK

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 14 (legislative day of Wednesday, October 4), 1939

RADIO ADDRESS BY COL. CHARLES A. LINDBERGH

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD the address delivered over the radio last night by Col. Charles A. Lindbergh.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I ask the Senator from Missouri if he knows who advises with and collaborates with Colonel Lindbergh as to his attitude and public views?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I can say to the Senator from Texas that I have no information on that score, but Colonel Lindbergh has always seemed entirely capable of forming his own decisions and expressing his own opinion.

Mr. CONNALLY. I have no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the address being printed in the RECORD?

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Tonight I speak again to the people of this country who are opposed to the United States entering the war which is now going on in Europe. We are faced with the need of deciding on a policy

of American neutrality. The future of our Nation and of our civilization rests upon the wisdom and foresight we use. Much as peace is to be desired, we should realize that behind a successful policy of neutrality must stand a policy of war. It is essential to define clearly those principles and circumstances for which a Nation will fight. Let us give no one the impression that America's love for peace means that she is afraid of war or that we are not fully capable and willing to defend all that is vital to us. National life and influence depend upon national strength, both in character and in arms. A neutrality built on pacifism alone will eventually fail.

Before we can intelligently enact regulations for the control of our armaments, our credit, and our ships, we must draw a sharp dividing line between neutrality and war, there must be no gradual encroachment on the defense of our Nation. Up to this line we may adjust our affairs to gain the advantages of peace, but beyond it must lie all the armed might of America, coiled in readiness to spring if once this bond is cut. Let us make clear to all countries where this line lies. It must be both within our intent and our capabilities. There must be no question of trading or bluff in this hemisphere. Let us give no promises we cannot keep—make no meaningless assurances to an Ethiopia, a Czechoslovakia, or a Poland. The policy we decide upon should be as clear cut as our shore lines, and as easily defended as our continent.

This Western Hemisphere is our domain. It is our right to trade freely within it. From Alaska to Labrador, from the Hawaiian Islands to Bermuda, from Canada to South America, we must allow no invading army to set foot. These are the outposts of the United States. They form the essential outline of our geographical defense. We must be ready to wage war with all the resources of our Nation if they are ever seriously threatened. Their defense is the mission of our Army, our Navy, and our Air Corps—the minimum requirement of our military strength. Around these places should lie our line between neutrality and war. Let there be no compromise about our right to defend or trade within this area. If it is challenged by any nation, the answer must be war. Our policy of neutrality should have this as its foundation.

We must protect our sister American nations from foreign invasion, both for their welfare and our own. But, in turn, they have a duty to us. They should not place us in the position of having to defend them in America while they engage in wars abroad. Can we rightfully permit any country in America to give bases to foreign warships or to send its army abroad to fight while it remains secure in our protection at home? We desire the utmost friendship with the people of Canada. If their country is ever attacked, our Navy will be defending their seas, our soldiers will fight on their battlefields, our fliers will die in their skies. But have they the right to draw this hemisphere into a European war simply because they prefer the Crown of England to American independence?

Sooner or later we must demand the freedom of this continent and its surrounding islands from the dictates of European power. American history clearly indicates this need. As long as European powers maintain their influence in our hemisphere we are likely to find ourselves involved in their troubles. And they will lose no opportunity to involve us.

Our Congress is now assembled to decide upon the best policy for this country to maintain during the war which is going on in Europe. The legislation under discussion involves three major issues—the embargo of arms, the restriction of shipping, and the allowance of credit. The action we take in regard to these issues will be an important indication to ourselves and to the nations of Europe whether or not we are likely to enter the conflict eventually, as we did in the last war. The entire world is watching us. The action we take in America may either stop or precipitate this war.

Let us take up these issues one at a time and examine them. First, the embargo of arms. It is argued that the repeal of this embargo would assist democracy in Europe, that it would let us make a profit for ourselves from the sale of munitions abroad and at the same time help to build up our own arms industry.

I do not believe that repealing the arms embargo would assist democracy in Europe because I do not believe this is a war for democracy. This is a war over the balance of power in Europe—a war brought about by the desire for strength on the part of Germany and the fear of strength on the part of England and France. The more munitions the armies obtain, the longer the war goes on, and the more devastated Europe becomes, the less hope there is for democracy. That is a lesson we should have learned from our participation in the last war. If democratic principles had been applied in Europe after that war, if the "democracies" of Europe had been willing to make some sacrifice to help democracy in Europe while it was fighting for its life, if England and France had offered a hand to the struggling republic of Germany, there would be no war today.

If we repeal the arms embargo with the idea of assisting one of the warring sides to overcome the other, then why mislead ourselves by talk of neutrality? Those who advance this argument should admit openly that repeal is a step toward war. The next step would be the extension of credit, and the next would be the sending of American troops.

To those who argue that we could make a profit and build up our own industry by selling munitions abroad, I reply that we in America have not yet reached a point where we wish to capitalize on the destruction and death of war. I do not believe that the material welfare of this country needs, or that our spiritual welfare could withstand, such a policy. If our industry depends upon a commerce of arms for its strength, then our industrial system should be changed. It is impossible for me to understand how America can contribute to civilization and humanity by sending offensive instruments of destruction to European battlefields. This would not only implicate us in war but it would also make us partly responsible for its devastation. The fallacy of helping to defend a political ideology, even though it be somewhat similar to our own, was clearly demonstrated to us in the last war. Through our help that war was won, but neither the democracy nor the justice for which we fought grew in the peace that followed our victory.

Our bond with Europe is a bond of race and not of political ideology. We had to fight a European army to establish democracy in this country. It is the European race we must preserve; political progress will follow. Social strength is vital—politics, a luxury. If the white race is ever seriously threatened, it may then be time for us to take our part in its protection, to fight side by side with the English, French, and Germans, but not with one against the other for our mutual destruction.

Let us not dissipate our strength, or help Europe to dissipate hers, in these wars of politics and possession. For the benefit of western civilization, we should continue our embargo on offensive armaments. As far as purely defensive arms are concerned, I, for one, am in favor of supplying European countries with as much as we can spare of the material that falls within this category. There are technicians who will argue that offensive and defensive arms cannot be separated completely. That is true, but it is no more difficult to make a list of defensive weapons than it is to separate munitions of war from semimanufactured articles, and we are faced with that problem today. No one says that we should sell opium because it is difficult to make a list of narcotics. I would as soon see our country traffic in opium as in bombs. There are certain border-line cases, but there are plenty of clear-cut examples: For instance, the bombing plane and the antiaircraft cannon. I do not want to see American bombers dropping bombs which will kill and mutilate European children, even if they are not flown by American pilots. But I am perfectly willing to see American antiaircraft guns shooting American shells at invading bombers over any European country. And I believe that most of you who are listening tonight will agree with me.

The second major issue for which we must create a policy concerns the restrictions to be placed on our shipping. Naval blockades have long been accepted as an element of warfare. They began on the surface of the sea, followed the submarine beneath it, and now reach up into the sky with aircraft. The laws and customs which were developed during the surface era were not satisfactory to the submarine. Now aircraft bring up new and unknown factors for consideration. It is simple enough for a battleship to identify the merchantman she captures. It is a more difficult problem for a submarine if that merchantman may carry cannon; it is safer to fire a torpedo than to come up and ask. For bombing planes flying at high altitudes and through conditions of poor visibility identification of a surface vessel will be more difficult still.

In modern naval blockades and warfare torpedoes will be fired and bombs dropped on probabilities rather than on certainties of identification. The only safe course for neutral shipping at this time is to stay away from the warring countries and dangerous waters of Europe.

The third issue to be decided relates to the extension of credit.

Here again we may draw from our experience in the last war. After that war was over we found ourselves in the position of having financed a large portion of the expenditures of European countries. And when the time came to pay us back these countries simply refused to do so They not only refused to pay the wartime loans we made but they refused to pay back what we loaned them after the war was over. As is so frequently the case, we found that loaning money eventually created animosity instead of gratitude. European countries felt insulted when we asked to be repaid.

They called us "Uncle Shylock." They were horror-struck at the idea of turning over to us any of their islands in America to compensate for their debts, or for our help in winning their war. They seized all the German colonies and carved up Europe to suit their fancy. These were the fruits of war. They took our money and they took our soldiers. But there was not the offer of one Caribbean island in return for the debts they could not afford to pay. Extension of credit to a belligerent country is a long step toward war, and it would leave us close to the edge. If American industry loans money to a belligerent country, many interests will feel that it is more important for that country to win than for our own to avoid the war. It is unfortunate but true that there are interests in America who would rather lose American lives than their own dollars. We should give them no opportunity.

I believe that we should adopt as our program of American neutrality, as our contribution to western civilization, the following policy:

1. An embargo on offensive weapons and munitions.
2. The unrestricted sale of purely defensive armaments.

3. The prohibition of American shipping from the belligerent countries of Europe and their danger zones.

4. The refusal of credit to belligerent nations or their agents.

Whether or not this program is adopted depends upon the support of those of us who believe in it. The United States of America is a democracy. The policy of our country is still controlled by our people. It is time for us to take action. There has never been a greater test for the democratic principle of government.

Neutrality in Warfare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEWIS B. SCHWELLENBACH

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 14 (legislative day of Wednesday, October 4), 1939

LETTER FROM CLOYD LAPORTE

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter written by Cloyd Laporte, which appeared in the New York Times this morning, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of October 14, 1939]

NEUTRALITY IN WARFARE—REMOVAL OF ARMS EMBARGO HELD NO BREACH OF INTERNATIONAL LAW

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Profs. Charles Cheney Hyde and Philip C. Jessup in their letters to the Times of September 21 and October 4 have taken the position that the removal of the arms embargo under present circumstances would be a breach of international law. They base their position upon two contentions: (1) That there is a rule of international law which prohibits neutral states from changing their neutrality legislation during wartime if the motive leading to the change is the desire to assist one or more of the belligerents; and (2) that such a desire would be the motivating cause of the adoption of the changes now proposed.

The sole authority which they cite for their alleged rule of international law is the Draft Convention on Rights and Duties of Neutral States in Naval and Aerial War, being a part of the Harvard Research in Internation Law (American Journal of International Law, vol. 33, supplement, July 1939). Professor Jessup was himself the reporter who prepared the draft.

NOT A CONSENSUS

The nature of this as authority should be examined. It is, as its title indicates, a draft of a proposed convention designed to regulate neutrality in warfare. Its publication date is as recent as July 1939. It has not been adopted by any government. It does not appear to represent even the consensus of opinion of existing writers on and students of international law. This appears from the following foreword which accompanies the draft:

"The consideration of the Draft Convention on Rights and Duties of Neutral States in Naval and Aerial War revealed fundamental differences of opinion regarding the general organization of the draft, its underlying theories, and a number of specific rules and principles set forth therein. The research nevertheless presents it, without any implication that the draft as published reflects even a consensus of the members of the advisory committee, hoping that its debates upon the problem may be continued among scholars throughout the world with a view to the further clarification of the subject."

The draft convention consists of a number of articles, and appended to each article are pages of comment. It is from a part of this discussion—the comment on article 13—which Professors Hyde and Jessup quote in support of their alleged rule of law to the effect that any change in neutrality laws made in wartime must not be "the result of a desire to aid one or the other belligerent."

PERTINENT FACTORS

The articles themselves, which purport to state the principles to which some of those engaged in making the draft subscribe, do not state any such principle. The pertinent provisions are in articles 4 and 13. Article 4 reads as follows:

"A neutral state, in the exercise of its neutral rights and in the performance of its neutral duties, shall be impartial and shall refrain from discrimination between belligerents."

Article 13 reads as follows:

"A neutral state, for the purpose of better safeguarding its rights and interests as a neutral or better fulfilling its duties as a neutral, may, during the course of a war, adopt new measures or alter the measures which it has previously adopted: *Provided, however,* That the new measures adopted do not violate any provision of this convention."

It will be noted that article 4 merely requires that a neutral state "shall be impartial and shall refrain from discrimination between belligerents" and that article 13 expressly recognizes the right to alter measures in wartime. Nothing in the proposed article lays down any test requiring a searching into the motives of the lawmakers in adopting a change of rules. The text of the articles would seem to be complied with when the new or altered measures are applied to all belligerents. In fact, the authors of the draft convention state, in their comment to article 13, immediately before the sentence which is quoted by Professors Hyde and Jessup in their letter of October 4:

"As already indicated in the comment under article 4, the impartiality required of a neutral state is a technical rather than a factual impartiality; the neutral state is under no duty to attempt to equalize conditions thrown out of balance by geographical factors or by the relative power of the contesting parties on the sea, in the air, on land, in supplies of raw materials, or in industrial equipment."

INDEFINITE DOCUMENT

Neither the draft convention nor the comment accompanying it indicates to what particular theories the "fundamental differences of opinion" revealed by the research related. In their letters to the Times Professors Hyde and Jessup indicate that the portion of the comment quoted by them is not merely a theory upon which there may be fundamental differences of opinion, but that it is law binding upon all neutral states. Yet, interspersed throughout the comment are references to previous action of neutral states, including the United States, which appear to be contrary to this so-called rule of law. Thus it is stated:

"Indeed, most of the progress in the development of the law of neutrality from the end of the eighteenth century to the present time has resulted from changes introduced while a war was in progress. Some of these changes have been made and justified on the theory that they were designed merely to make more effective the discharge of a preexisting legal duty, but, as in the case of the laws and regulations adopted by the United States in 1793, there was in reality a progression beyond the point then established in international law."

Also it is said that: "The United States passed and lifted several embargo acts during the French Revolutionary and Napoleonic wars," although it is said that these acts may be justified as retaliatory.

The comment further says:

"It is clear, therefore, that in the course of the American Civil War neutrals made changes in their policies although these changes were not required by the then existing international law and although they operated unequally upon the belligerents."

It would seem, therefore, that the test of impartial motive applied to legislation passed during wartime, is by no means a doctrine so generally accepted that it may be called a binding rule of law. Assuming, however, without conceding, that there is such a rule of law, it is submitted that the neutrality bill now before the Senate fulfills the requirements of any such rule.

In the first place, the act would be applicable to trade with all belligerents. If some of the belligerents would not be able to take advantage of its provisions because of geographical or other factors, these are factors which, as the comment above quoted indicates, a neutral state "is under no duty to attempt to equalize."

In the second place, the question of motive is not to be resolved by the opinions which Professors Hyde and Jessup say they hear "on every side." There are undoubtedly varying reasons which lead individuals to support or oppose the measure. In a democracy all shades of opinion are freely expressed. It is primarily those responsible for legislation whose reasons are entitled to the greatest weight. Among these is the report of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate accompanying the bill, which states its purpose to be "to preserve the neutrality and the peace of the United States and to secure the safety of its citizens and their interests."

The best evidence that the purpose of the legislation is to preserve our own neutrality is to be found in the fact that the repeal of the embargo on arms does not stand alone, but is coupled with the imposition of an embargo on shipping and provisions regarding the passage of title and cash payment and short-term credit, which can only operate unfavorably to Great Britain and France.

What is proposed is the repeal of an arms embargo which by itself will operate to the advantage of Great Britain and France, coupled with other drastic provisions which must operate to their disadvantage. Whether the measure will help or harm them in the long run is a question which only the future can answer. The proposed legislation must be considered as a whole.

If there is a rule of law, as contended by Professors Hyde and Jessup, making the motive of proposed legislation determinative of its legality—and the existence of such a rule appears at the least to be extremely doubtful—it is submitted that the neutrality bill meets the requirements of such a rule.

CLOYD LAPORTE.

NEW YORK, *October 11, 1939.*

Tribute to Senator McNary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 14 (legislative day of Wednesday, October 4), 1939

ADDRESS OF HON. CHARLES A. SPRAGUE, GOVERNOR OF OREGON, BEFORE OREGON REPUBLICAN CLUB, THE DALLES, OREG., OCTOBER 9, 1939

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the excellent address delivered by Governor Sprague be printed in full in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OREGON REPUBLICANS SHOULD PRESENT THE NAME OF SENATOR CHARLES L. M'NARY FOR PRESIDENT

(Address of Hon. Charles A. Sprague, Governor of Oregon, before Oregon Republican Club, The Dalles, Oreg., October 9, 1939)

I come before you tonight to substitute as speaker for Senator STYLES BRIDGES, of New Hampshire, who is detained by official duties in Washington and so is unable to address you tonight as was previously planned. All of us, I know, though we fully appreciate the untoward events which prevent the distinguished Senator from attending this gathering, greatly regret his absence. We were hopeful of hearing his exposition of Republican gospel and desirous of seeing and greeting him as one of the Presidential possibilities of 1940. He comes from a sturdy State, New Hampshire, where political virtues find deep root, a State which by the very narrow margin of 4,000 votes failed to achieve the political fame in 1936 of its neighbors, Maine and Vermont. New Hampshire, however, did cling to its Republican tradition in 1936 by electing its Governor, STYLES BRIDGES, to the United States Senate, and in 1938 reaffirmed its old allegiance by electing a Republican Governor.

Though separated by a continent, Oregon stands close beside New Hampshire and its stalwart neighbors. It was an Oregon Senator, the late Frederick Steiwer, who first denounced the surrender by the Congress of its constitutional lawmaking powers at the mandate of the Executive in the early days of the Roosevelt administration. It was the Oregon Republican Club which over 5 years ago organized to revitalize the party and to challenge the fundamental concepts of the so-called New Deal. It was Oregon which remained Republican in registration and swept Republican candidates to victory in 1938.

Tonight we stand at something of an interlude. We do not know the candidates of 1940 and we do not know just what the immediate issues will be. The violent change in international matters may sharply alter the current of domestic politics. It is therefore a most appropriate time to review the record of promise and achievement of the present political administration.

The Roosevelt battle cry in 1932 was to balance the Budget, enforce rigid economy by a 25-percent cut in expenditures. Begun heroically, the economy policy was followed by a season of extravagance not yet terminated, the like of which has never been seen in peacetime. This spending program has resulted in an increase of the national debt by some $25,000,000,000, a continuing unbalanced Budget, and the building of a vested interest in easy spending which will not easily be weaned from the public teat.

The initial attack on the depression took the form of the N. R. A., where big business and organized labor dictated the draft of a law which gave each powers leading to exploitation of the public. The N. R. A. broke down in practice, and it was a merciful court which uttered pax vobiscum over the emaciated form of Hugh Johnson's "blue eagle." Now the administration has swung from the N. R. A. legislation which fostered cartels and monopolies, to enforcement of the Sherman Antitrust Act, under a new apostle of reform.

Under the A. A. A. the Federal Government sought to curtail crop production, but Nature has proven a more powerful dictator than Secretary Wallace. Fickle rain and wind and sunshine have played havoc with the estimates of experts, and crop prices have fluctuated with the weather rather than the decrees from Washington. And growers have demonstrated that they can make reduced acres yield more by intensified cultivation.

But the great reform of the new administration was the money juggling act. By resorting to the common refuge of monarchs financially derelict this Government clipped its coinage, reduced the gold content of the dollar, repudiated the solemn covenant in its bonds in hopes that by this financial necromancy it could restore commodity prices.

You recall the seductive promise of Professor Pearson who sold the President this bill of goods, that by devaluing the dollar we would restore commodity prices to the level of 1926. That good Republican year was taken as the goal of perfection which this gold-dollar legerdemain would bring permanently to pass through the magic of managed currency. Alas for the dollar jugglers. Commodity prices never did reach the level of 1926, and just a few months ago the commodity price level sagged back nearly to its low levels at the depth of the depression; and the price of wheat (aside from the Government subsidy) was at the lowest level since the time of Queen Elizabeth.

The spurt of better times which followed in natural reaction from the depression was followed in 1937 by an abrupt recession. The President who in 1936 jubilantly proclaimed "We planned it that way, and don't let anybody tell you any differently" blamed the decline in business on his wicked enemies. The fact remains that it was not until the elections of 1938 had shown by Republican victories a definite turn toward conservative policies that business revival began and has gone forward quite independent of Washington.

Reference is sometimes made to social reforms promoted by the present national administration. But these reforms have been accompanied by the evoking of class hatreds, the imposition of burdensome taxes, and the crushing of the spirit of enterprise until the damage has exceeded the social benefits in many respects. It was the friendly smile of the President that encouraged forces in the labor movement so they felt they could unleash such threats at order as the sit-down strike in Michigan and the goon lawlessness in Oregon. No word of rebuke came from the President over such reversion to anarchy and jungle law.

Now, I do not recite these grievances merely to open old wounds. But it is timely when the smoke screen of foreign affairs is used to suppress political debate that the country be reminded that the domestic political issues are not in suspense and that there must be no relaxation of the effort of Republicans to present those issues intelligently and vigorously in the campaign of 1940.

As Chairman Hamilton, of the Republican National Committee, said in a recent address, "Nothing would be more disastrous to this Nation than an adjournment of politics which would permit a black-out of urgent domestic problems. As a party we would be faithless to our trust if we permitted what is happening in Europe to divert us from the task that is ours of correcting the errors of the past 6½ years and of redirecting our energies toward a useful and permanent recovery. * * * We must not forget that our domestic problems are just as vital, just as urgent, as they were in the weeks preceding the European war."

I recognize that in time of national crisis it is the duty of citizens regardless of party to rally behind its constituted leadership in unified support of this country's interests. I am certain that in the field of foreign affairs President Roosevelt will find the Republicans are Americans first and partisans second; that they will go as far as judgment and conscience permit in support of the President's foreign policy. But Republicans will not hesitate to present to the country ideas and policies either on the foreign or domestic front which they feel will best safeguard the rights of American citizens and promote their welfare. The "limited emergency" which is declared to exist does not extend to the suspension of free and honest discussion of political problems.

Suppose now we take a survey of the general political scene which confronts us at the present time. The most conspicuous feature of the political landscape is the condition and position of the Communist Party. Events of the last weeks have proven beyond the shadow of a doubt that the American Communist Party is nothing but an offshoot of the Comintern of Moscow. When Stalin says thumbs up, Browder puts his up; when Stalin says thumbs down, Browder reverses; and just now Browder and the New Masses and Daily Worker are doing a confusing wiggle waggle at the behest of Moscow. The embarrassment and discomfiture of the Browder-Stalin axis cannot be concealed. The strain on simple intelligence and intellectual honesty which loyalty to the "party line" entails has shattered the morale of party members and alienated the sympathies of the fellow travelers and pinko intelligentsia.

The bitter hatred of Communists for Hitler and Mussolini and the Fascist and Nazi idealogies led to the professed desertion of the ideal of revolution and the adoption of the "popular front" scheme by which the Communists sought to cooperate with so-called liberal and democratic groups to defeat the spread of fascism. Numerous subsidiaries with high-sounding labels were sponsored with Communists as guiding spirits which were used to lure leftists into the radical camp.

Imagine the shock that came with news of the political alliance of Russia and Germany, of Stalin and Hitler, the red star and the swastika. It was only a short time before that the Daily Worker said:

"The whispered lies to the effect that the Soviet Union will enter into a treaty with Nazi Germany is nothing but poison spread by the enemies of peace and democracy, the appeasement mongers, the Munich men of fascism."

It took the Daily Worker 24 hours to get its breath (or its instructions from Moscow), but then it made about face and lamely defended this marriage of convenience as one in the interest of peace and for the benefit of Poland. Now, as "reds" and "brownshirts" clasp hands over the prostrate form of Poland, the Communists in America are reduced to feeble whispers of approval of Russia's betrayal.

Why in a Republican address devote so much time to a discussion of the plight of the Communist Party? Simply because this Soviet-German alliance is one of the most significant events of the twentieth-century politics. Its effects will be far reaching. It cannot help but result in steady defection from Communist ranks, and may mark the shattering of the old Communist Party.

In America this Communist debacle will put a brake on the leftward movements which have been a manifest tendency during the past decade. With Soviet Russia revealed as a greedy nationalist and imperialist and with Communist leadership in this country exposed as an apish imitation of Moscow, American people who have been playing around with the pinks will desert their company like many-legged bugs which run from the sunlight when a plank is overturned.

The Republican Party has consistently stood for sound American principles with absolute divorce from the influences of alien doctrines. It stands now to gain as the people turn to the right and shun the bait of Moscow and the fury of Berlin.

But the Republican Party must brace itself and not allow itself to be swept off its feet in a tide of reaction. It must hold steadfast for rational progress. It must create a worth-while program for America, not just hold a wet finger to the wind to test the political breeze. It is both morally dishonest and politically inexpedient for Republicans to attempt to overreach the Democrats in gestures to the left. We do better if we occupy our historic role as a party which conserves the best in the past as it forges ahead to achieve the best for the future.

At this moment our party is casting about for the right leader who can weld together the various elements in the party, who has the confidence of all sections of the country, and who can be trusted to develop party policies which will solve as swiftly and correctly as may be the problems of our day. Various names have been suggested. The name of the brilliant district attorney of New York, Thomas E. Dewey, is mentioned. Another name viewed with favor in many quarters is that of ROBERT A. TAFT, of Ohio, Senator from that State, who with his wife paid a recent visit to Oregon where they proved pleasant guests and capable leaders. The veteran, Senator VANDENBERG, of Michigan, has a strong following and has a fine record of discriminating and fearless appraisal of the numerous legislative proposals under the New Deal regime. Senator STYLES BRIDGES, who was to have been our speaker here tonight, is also a young man of promise and capacity.

As I survey the scene, however, I believe that Oregon Republicans should present as candidate for the Presidency before the 1940 Republican National Convention the name of CHARLES L. MCNARY, senior Senator from Oregon. Senator MCNARY has a long and distinguished record as a Member of the United States Senate. As minority leader he has guided the Republican Party in the Senate with skill and wisdom. He represents the best type of thinking of the Republican Party, a worthy blend of conservatism with progressivism. He is in high personal favor with all of his colleagues. He is a man of independence of judgment, yet one who is sensitive to the needs of the country. A native son, he can also be presented as a favorite son of Oregon.

With characteristic modesty, Senator MCNARY will doubtless be unwilling to seek the nomination. His friends, however, should carry his banner and solicit the support of other Western States in his behalf. Let it be a case of the nomination seeking the man, not the man seeking the nomination.

So much for leadership. Now let us consider practical issues.

The initial problem in this country is to rebuild economic life with wide diffusion of prosperity and do it within the democratic framework. The present administration has produced no adequate solution. When the collapse came in 1937 its only answer was renewal of spending with deficit financing. Comparative statistics show that the degree of recovery in foreign countries has been much more rapid than in this country.

There are those who claim that we shall not again see general prosperity in this country, who say that the closing of the frontier marks the end of the period of great industrial expansion. Similar claims have been made in the past but the genius of the American people has reasserted itself and after a pause the country has moved forward to greater heights of prosperity. We reached the end of the supply of good lands for homesteads in 1890 but the level of economic well-being continued to rise for 40 years. There is no known limit to the frontiers of inventive genius and society has by no means fully satisfied its wants.

The error of the New Deal is to think that Government action will cure all our economic woes. Business activity depends on the work and the enterprise of millions of men and women. The proper function of government is to keep clear the channels of commerce depending on the natural stimulus of individual activity to use those channels in the movement of goods and furnishing of needed services. Native economic instincts will assert themselves unless they are oppressed or blighted.

We will get economic health when the people of the country feel safe to adventure and when the prospect for enterprise is one of reasonable gain for the risk involved. When war broke out, the memory of past profits immediately whetted the appetites of speculators and investors and prompted a spurt of activity. That is a most unfortunate spark to ignite the motor of business. But the circumstances show that people are ready to adventure when they think the conditions are propitious.

Conditions have not been propitious for a long term of years. The depression was a natural aftermath of extravagance and overspeculation plus a readjustment from wartime inflation. This depression was prolonged by the antibusiness attitude on the part of the national administration. Now the normal business needs of the country are forcing a degree of recovery in spite of fears of political activity from Washington. It is altogether reasonable to expect that the return of Republicans to power would help renew faith in the stability of our economic system and encourage again the flow of capital into investment and the employment of labor.

The Republicans further should take a stand which recognizes the supreme worth of the individual, which decries regimentation and bureaucratic interference. Keep life alive at its roots if you want flowers and fruit. Encourage individual citizens in self-reliance and in initiative and enterprise, and you reinforce the very foundations of society. The only atmosphere in which such individual activity will nourish is one of freedom. Not without cause is it true that the countries with the widest and richest economic development are those where liberty is maintained and the worth of the individual man recognized.

Republicans also must move toward a sound fiscal system. We cannot keep on indefinitely piling up the national debt. The speeding up of the tempo of business will enable the Government to reduce some of its expenditures, especially in the field of relief, and will provide the added income needed to carry and to retire in orderly manner the national debt. I believe the country can carry its debt load if employment gains and business revives. Unless we soon put our financial house in order there will be ultimate breakdown which will cause ruin to all classes of people.

So much for domestic issues. I turn now to a consideration of America's foreign policy and the wise course for the Republican Party to espouse. At present a great controversy is raging over repeal or alteration of the present neutrality law. There is a sharp division of opinion over the change, but this difference is not on party lines.

We hear a great deal about keeping America out of war. Considerable public hysteria prevails. It is easy to observe a sort of fatalism in public thinking, an assumption that we are drifting into war, which, of course, inspires a frantic attempt to avoid the drop over the precipice.

This assumpetion is not warranted either in history or in a reasonable view of the present situation. War in Europe is not new. In truth, nearly every valley in Europe has been harrowed by war. For centuries armies have marched and countermarched. Sometimes they have fought wars of religion. Sometimes they have fought in the rivalries of royal dynasties. Sometimes they have fought for conquest, and sometimes, as Carlyle said of the Seven Year's War, that Louis XV's harlot "might take revenge for an epigram." Just now the contest appears to be one of imperialism, the battle over territory and power. It is also a contest between rival philosophies of human relations—the authoritarian idea of fascism against the democratic idea represented by France and England.

This is not the first time in looking across the ocean at embattled Europe our people have been swayed in their sympathies toward one side or the other. During Washington's administration republican France with its new gospel of "liberty, equality, fraternity," had widespread approval in this country. So manifest was this sentiment that the French Minister, Citizen Genet, presuming on this fact, violated our regulations for neutrality and his recall was demanded of the French directory. The policy of neutrality adopted by Washington with the approval of Jefferson and Hamilton of his Cabinet proved sound. Harried as we were when England and Napoleon were locked in death grapple, that policy proved the salvation of the infant nation. When finally violation of our national rights did lead to the second war with England, we entered as principal and not as an ally.

Do you realize that the United States is now the oldest of all the governments in the world? From our vantage point behind the moat of the Atlantic Ocean we have seen empires rise and fall, have seen revolutions "devour their own children." We saw Napoleon overrun Europe and topple over kingdoms. Then we saw his sun wane in the twilight of Waterloo and go out in the obscurity of St. Helena. We saw Bismarck forge a German Empire with Prussia as its core, and then saw it collapse in the defeat of the Kaiser's armies in the World War. We saw modern Italy emerge under the leadership of Garibaldi and Cavour, and now have seen it reach a none too secure pinnacle under the dominance of Mussolini. We saw the ancient house of the Romanoffs pass to the slaughter in the Russian revolution from which a new and strange political system has sprung. We have seen Great Britain substantially readjust its powers of government and finally surrender its authority to a British commonwealth of nations. All this in the brief century and a half of America's constitutional history.

Here the house of our fathers is yet habitable. It has withstood the fires of civil strife and the storms of foreign war. But in the political vulcanism which attends modern warfare we do not know how long it might survive. Fighting a war to preserve democracy puts the country immediately under a dictatorship. What assurance would we have, if the war were costly and prolonged, that at its close the powers of the Government would be relaxed and the rights of citizens restored?

There is another reason why America should not throw itself as a sacrifice on the altar of the war god, and that is the need to preserve an area where western culture may still flourish. I do not think the present war means the downfall of western civilization, but certainly in the countries involved the springs of culture will be dried up for a period. America then can serve as the city of refuge for art and music and learning. Most of all it can serve as the haven of liberty. France gave us Bartholdi's Statue of Liberty whose flaming torch still beckons toward war-torn Europe, a beacon glowing, we hope as long as the race endures, in testimony that here human freedom flourishes.

I speak as I do, not from craven fear of the sacrifices which war might entail and not out of a narrow chauvinism. Certainly I

deplore the spirit of the pharisee who beats his breast in self-gratification over his good fortune in living in America and scorns the poor publicans whose lot is cast by fate in the warring nations of Europe. I recognize, too, that this country cannot fully insulate itself from the remainder of the world. We cannot tell with a world in flames just how far the brands will be carried. But let us establish our lines of defense within the traditional zone of American interests.

What foreign policy then should the Republican Party espouse? I respond that it should reaffirm, but with different emphasis, its traditional policy of protection. In the years since the Civil War the Republican Party was known as the party of protection. It stood for protection of the American manufacturer, the American farmer, and the American workingman. We do not hear so much about it now, perhaps because the Democrats have gone high tariff, too. But the old watchword still has force.

Let the Republican Party stand for protection of American homes and American youth against participation in foreign wars.

Let the Republican Party stand for the protection, by force if need be, of this country as the citadel of human liberty. Let us by friendly association with other nations be ready to help rebuild the stricken lands when the agony of war passes. In thus effectively protecting American interests on the foreign front the Republican Party can in the years ahead render as valuable service to the country as it did through its policy of domestic protection in the years of our expanding industry and commerce.

The Republican Party had a mission in the past—it has a duty at the present and an opportunity for the future. Under leadership with clean hands and strong hearts it can make a vital contribution in directing the destinies of this great people. It must not in its zeal for power sacrifice principle, but it must be alert to keep its policies abreast of the true needs of the people.

Let us as Oregon Republicans meet the challenge of 1940 as we did that of 1938, with definite determination to rebuild and revitalize the party as an instrument of government in the common good.

Stay Out, America—Article From Liberty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 14 (legislative day of Wednesday, October 4), 1939

ARTICLE FROM LIBERTY OF OCTOBER 21, 1939

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from Liberty entitled "Stay Out, America."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Liberty of October 21, 1939]

STAY OUT, AMERICA

SHALL WE FIGHT AGAIN?—A GRIM WORD FROM SOME WHO KNOW WHAT IT WOULD MEAN

Few Americans know so much about what war must mean as those American correspondents who reported the last war. For these men saw that conflict more humanly than generals behind the lines; more vividly than our industrialists and workers at home, our diplomats abroad; even more fully than the A. E. F. doughboy.

The following opinions come from some of our country's most prominent foreign correspondents, members of the recently organized Overseas Press Club of America:

Reginald Wright Kauffman, accredited correspondent with American, French, British, and Belgian Armies and United States Navy for North American Syndicate; covered peace conferences; established and for 4 years headed New York Herald Tribune's League of Nations news bureau at Geneva:

"Twenty-odd years ago Europe's 'democracies' charmed the United States into winning a World War for them to save democracy. Our share: Over 132,000 killed, about 200,000 wounded, God knows how many permanently diseased. Today those 'democracies' are asking us to fight persecutors, dictatorships, totalitarians.

"Well, Germany is certainly not a democracy. But who are their antipersecutors, antidictatorship, antitotalitarians who want us to join them, and what have they lined up? Great Britain, who has surrendered Palestinian Jews to Palestinian Mohammedans. France, who has sky-bombed the citizens of her Syrian mandate. And Poland, a triumvirate. And how are we to play our part? With money and boys. Also by cementing our alliance to the Latin American republics. Twenty-one 'republics'—14 of them frank dictatorships. Also by becoming totalitarian ourselves.

"Do you want to go on?"

Henry Wales; served abroad for New York World, Chicago Tribune, International News Service; attached to A. E. F.'s G. H. Q.; reported peace conferences, League of Nations, Mussolini's march on Rome, Hitler's putsch, etc.:

"Let America refuse to be 'drawn into' a European war by emotion or misconception. Let America realize she is an 'economic empire' committed by her vast interests to protect her foreign trade. If in so doing she joins a coalition to defend her commerce from a raiding aggressor, let America take a firm stand for justice in the resulting peace negotiations. Let the American plenipotentiaries then remember the bitter lessons of the Paris conferences of 1919. Delegates, technical advisers, 'experts' of all nations warned Lloyd George and Clemenceau that the unjust conditions would sow dragon's teeth. They are ready now for the reaping."

Wythe Williams; Paris correspondent of the New York Times during World War, later representing Philadelphia Ledger and Paris Temps. Reported on entire western front, all peace conferences, all subsequent reparations and debt negotiations, to 1936. Now editor of Greenwich (Conn.) Time:

" 'We do not repudiate, neither do we pay.' This might be taken as the wall motto of our former European associates in regard to cash and kind advanced by the United States for the promotion of the World War.

"It was in evidence almost immediately after the signing of the Versailles Treaty, but a few 'token' payments—about a dime's worth in relation to the whole—were sufficient to blind us. And so we permitted a post-war debt to more than double the amount already due.

"Today the European hand already is outstretched, hopeful that our vision is not yet restored."

Herbert Corey, World War correspondent for Cincinnati Times-Star and the Associated Newspapers on all western fronts, including Serbian. Now a Washington correspondent and magazine writer:

"Shortly after the armistice I interviewed Gen. Wilhelm Groener, who had succeeded Ludendorff as quartermaster general of the German Army. He said:

" 'When you Americans came in, the war had reached a stalemate. We could not have moved forward. Neither could the Allies have moved us back. The Americans broke every rule of tactics and strategy. But they were young, enthusiastic, fearless, and they broke our lines. They lost 10 men where 1 veteran would have been lost. But—they won the war.'

"Our American participation in that war was a growing pain of a great nation. We were fooled into it. We paid a good part of the bill. Every promise made to us was broken. But that growing pain may have matured us nationally. Perhaps this time we will not be coaxed into being the sucker in the game of power politics."

Leland Stowe, former chief of the Paris bureau of the New York Herald Tribune; covered the western front, all important conferences. Spanish revolution, rise to power of both Mussolini and Hitler. Author of Nazi Means War:

"I could write about the horrors of the bombings in Spain; about the red pulp of women's and children's bodies. But no human being will ever conceive these things until he's seen and smelled and felt them. Few people believe in hell until they get there.

"So what? So who blew to bits thousands of Spanish and Chinese civilians? Who put 10,000,000 Czechoslovakians under Hitler's heel? Who intends to draft millions of America's youth for another world war? Who?

"Not merely Hitler and Mussolini and Franco and the Japanese. What about their accessories in the crime of war? The list is long. It includes Neville Chamberlain, and Daladier and Bonnet, of France, at its very top. But it also includes plenty of Americans—all those in democratic lands who knife democracy in somebody else's country. If we don't want Hitlerism, we must stand united against everything that Hitlerism represents.

"Sentimentalism won't keep America out of war. Adherence to the principles of human freedom, integrity, courage to face facts—these might."

Eugene Lyons, United Press war correspondent and representative at peace and subsequent conferences. Sent to Russia, he wrote, after first-hand experience, Assignment in Utopia. Now editor of the American Mercury.

"Surely no one in his senses can miss the horrible irony of the slogans under which the World War of 1914–18 was fought. It looks, indeed, as if those slogans were badly mixed—so that it became a war to end all democracy and make the world safe for war. When the history of our times is summed up, that World War will mark the boundary of democractic development, after which it declined disastrously. Let us not flatter ourselves that we have escaped the general decline. Movements and philosophies of suppression—antidemocratic, whatever their pretensions—have been flourishing throughout the United States.

"When the first World War so definitely retarded democracy, it would be folly to suppose that a second World War could reverse the process."

Pending Neutrality Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN G. TOWNSEND, JR.

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 16 (legislative day of Wednesday, October 4), 1939

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. CHARLES L. McNARY, OF OREGON

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an address relating to the proposal for revision of our neutrality legislation delivered by the Senate minority leader, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] on Sunday evening, October 15, over the Mutual Broadcasting System be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In discussing proposals for revision of our neutrality legislation, I believe that we should concede at the outset that all of us have a common objective, namely, to do that which will keep the United States out of war. I do not believe there is a man in Congress who again wants to see the blood of America's fine youth spilled on foreign battlefields. It may be observed that our distinguished President shares the same view. Each of us, whatever our views on particular questions, wishes to do that which will best protect our own country and its people.

This was the objective we all had in mind back in 1935 when Congress enacted the first Neutrality Act. In that legislation we believed that one of the most effective ways of staying out of war was to refuse to sell arms and munitions to countries that resorted to war. Most of us then felt—and many of us still feel—that our unrestricted sale of arms and munitions during the World War was a major reason why we became involved in that conflict. We felt that one practical method of avoiding war was to say to our people: "You must forego the profits from the sale of arms and munitions to countries at war in order that the peace of your own country might be preserved." Congress overwhelmingly adopted that resolution and the President approved it. It became the national policy of our Government.

Some months later Congress again approved an embargo on the exportation of arms, ammunition, and implements of war. On that occasion the vote in the House was 353 to 27 and so unanimous was the support of the embargo in the Senate that a roll call was not demanded. In 1937 Congress again approved an embargo on arms, ammunition, and implements of war in legislation containing other safeguards for our neutrality, which are not now in serious dispute. The Senate passed the 1937 legislation by a vote of 63 to 6, while the vote in the House of Representatives was 376 to 13. The President likewise gave his warm approval to these measures. Indeed, the President in the summer of 1936 enthusiastically endorsed such provisions as the arms embargo as "new weapons with which to maintain our neutrality" in time of war abroad. And, on that occasion, the President warned us to be on our guard against those, seeking "fool's gold," who would, when war came, attempt to "break down or evade our neutrality."

My only purpose in citing this brief bit of history is to indicate to you that the present arms embargo was adopted only after the most thoughtful deliberation, with the approval of the President, repeatedly expressed, and with virtually the unanimous support of all parties and factions in Congress.

In this legislation we believed we had taken a practical step, with a minimum of damage to the American economic system, toward avoiding incidents that lead to war. None ever contended it was perfect legislation. You cannot have perfect legislation in regard to neutrality or any other very important subject. But we thought it was a practical and a sound way to safeguard our country from war.

Now we are asked to repeal the arms embargo which has been our national policy for more than 4 years. In view of the purpose for which this law was three times enacted so overwhelmingly, surely the burden of demonstrating why the embargo should be lifted rests on those who advocate such a course. Beyond all shadow of doubt they should prove to us that repeal of the embargo is in the best interests of this Nation. If they do not, then the arms embargo should be maintained.

Unless it can be shown that repeal of the arms embargo will better serve our domestic interests than its maintenance, then it should not be repealed. Reasons which spring out of the effect of the present embargo on other nations are beside the point. The American Congress has a duty to legislate for the best interests of the American people, not for the benefit of some foreign power.

In the few weeks since the Senate started debate on this issue I have not heard advanced a single argument which adequately demonstrates how repeal of the embargo would serve our domestic considerations. Surprisingly, I have heard it suggested that we should repeal the arms embargo in order to give assistance to one group of nations at war against the other belligerent. This seems to be the real reason why repeal of the arms embargo has been proposed.

Yet I do not wonder at the timidity with which this reason is advanced. It is a shocking suggestion that we should repeal a domestic law, designed to keep us at peace, for the purpose of helping one group of belligerents. Clearly such action, for that reason, would be participation in the war. It would be an unneutral action and it would be an action that might cost us dearly. Indeed, it might be the very means of involving us in the war, which is the very thing we are seeking to avoid. Why should we take that risk?

Those of us who remember the years from 1914 to 1917 know the part which the American export of arms and munitions to the Allies played in arousing the hatred of the German nation against us. So bitter did the Germans become as they learned that American guns and shells were killing their men that actually they attacked this country in the submarine warfare. They sought to stir up one of our neighboring nations against us. In their desperation the Germans determined to stop the exports of American munitions at all costs. There was nothing for President Wilson to do but acknowledge these attacks on us and ask Congress formally to declare the war which already existed.

I now hear Members of Congress saying that they will never vote for the involvements of this country in war. But what else can they do if the events of 1914 to 1917 are repeated? The important thing is not to undo what we have done to prevent such a chain of events from beginning. The wise thing is to prevent the incidents which force on us the duty of making such a terrifying decision.

Yet it is now contended that there is no real distinction between the arms, ammunition, and implements of war now under embargo and other commodities useful in war. Of course there are distinctions, very real and practical distinctions, and there are psychological differences. There were very important differences 25 years ago. There are important differences now. Export of American cotton and wheat and other raw materials would never enrage a people as American exports of arms and munitions to the Allies enraged the Germans in the years 1914 to 1917. It was the sale of these murderous articles in those years which contained the seeds of involvement in war for us.

And what do those who urge repeal of the arms embargo have to say to the proposition that munitions which we would now export may be used a year or two hence against our own boys, should we, and may God forbid it, become involved in this terrible conflict? Who knows the course this war may take? Who knows what alliances may be made if it continues for a year or two? Already we have seen such unexpected developments as the alliance of the Russian bear and the Nazi swastika. Is it not wiser to keep our arms and munitions out of the hands of the fighting countries? Is it not wiser to keep them at home to build up our national-defense needs? Let us take every precaution possible to keep out of war, but we should do nothing to impair, even in the slightest degree, our own Nation's defense forces.

Entirely aside from repeal of the arms embargo, I am opposed to the pending bill in the Senate, because it does impair our national defenses. Advocates of repeal of the arms embargo apparently are aware that if that safeguard is wiped out it will leave a gaping hole in the ramparts of our neutrality. I say they apparently are aware of this, because they have made desperate efforts to plug up this hole by drastic and stringent provisions in other directions.

For instance, they have undertaken to make it unlawful for an American ship to carry any passengers or any articles or materials to any nation at war. This means that American ships cannot carry passengers or cargoes from the port of Seattle to Vancouver or Victoria in Canada. It means an end, for the duration of the war, of any ocean-borne commerce in American ships from Baltimore, New York, or Boston to Canadian ports. It means that American ships must surrender their peacetime business in the Pacific with such places as Australia, New Zealand, and Indochina, and in the Atlantic with Bermuda, the Bahamas, Nassau, Jamaica, and French Martinique. To make it clear, let me repeat that this provision in the Pittman bill forbids American vessels to carry passengers and cargoes to any of these places—not just war material but any kind of cargo.

Now, it is obvious that this is an unnecessary and burdensome restriction on American shipping. Our purpose in placing restrictions on our citizens in connection with neutrality legislation is to avoid dangerous contacts which might involve the Nation in war. What danger can there be to American vessels engaged in their ordinary peacetime trade between Portland or Seattle and the Canadian ports of the British Northwest? Does anyone seriously suppose that these ships will be subjected to submarine hazards from nations involved in war in Europe? Of course not. In this restriction we are needlessly harassing our own citizens.

Yet, while that restriction has been made too drastic, the sponsors of the pending bill have left in it a loophole large enough to drive an armored car through, as one correspondent has described it. I refer to the omission from this bill of any provision making

it unlawful for American ships to carry arms, ammunition, and implements of war to neutral countries for transshipment to nations at war. Under the present law that is forbidden. But if the arms embargo is repealed, American ships lawfully could carry bombs and shells and poison gas to certain neutral countries in Europe, from whence they could be transshipped to the belligerents. They could do this under the proposed substitute unless the President exercised the discretion granted him to declare combat zones. It may be said that, of course, the President would prevent such shipments by exercising that discretion. Very well; but if the President prescribes combat areas sufficiently extensive to close up this loophole, then he will take American-flag ships completely out of European and Mediterranean waters. Indeed, American ships will have to confine their foreign activities to the Latin American and Asiatic trade.

My concern is over what would happen to our merchant marine under such drastic restrictions, particularly if this war should go on for a few years, as some observers think possible. Obviously, we shall not go on building merchant ships if there is no need for them. Obviously, under such restrictions, a part of the merchant marine we now possess will have to be laid up and will deteriorate. When that happens, we have impaired our national defense.

The first line of our national defense has been our Navy and our merchant marine. The theory underlying the hundreds of millions of dollars which the Government has spent in subsidies for shipping has been that we were in reality contributing to our national defense. We have long recognized the American merchant ships as an auxiliary in time of war to our Navy and an integral part of our national defense. Yet, in the neutrality bill now before the Senate, we undertake to undermine much of the progress made toward this necessary protection.

What is the more bewildering, there is no real need for such action. If the arms embargo is left in our law, many of the problems sought to be reached by such drastic restrictions against shipping will disappear. Let us by every means seek to protect our neutrality, but let us be practical and realistic, and let us not do irreparable damage to ourselves. We should keep the arms embargo and see to it that our national defense is unimpaired and adequate. In my opinion, by this course of action we will guarantee our neutrality, insure our safety, and maintain our peace with all the nations of the earth.

Pending Neutrality Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 16 (legislative day of Wednesday, October 4), 1939

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. ALEXANDER WILEY, OF WISCONSIN

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address delivered by myself on Sunday night, October 15, 1939, relative to the pending neutrality legislation.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Ladies and gentlemen, on this Sabbath evening I am happy to speak to you on the subject of peacetime patriotism and about the neutrality debate in Congress. It may be a surprise to my radio audience not to hear a partisan talk on the neutrality issue, but let me say at the outset that I am more interested in the things on which we can agree than in the points on which we might differ. Unity and harmony among our people are always desirable, but in times of stress they are essential. This is a talk concerned with our great common objective—peace for America. Possibly our discussion tonight will be unique because it will be neither for nor against the embargo. Is it though so strange that in a debate on neutrality some of us should remain neutral and reserve our judgment until all the evidence is in? I was not a Member of the Senate when the present law was passed and have listened attentively to nearly every speech made on both sides of this question. It is my hope that what I have to say, then, will serve in these days of political tension and international crisis as a guidepost to a sober and analytical approach to our problem. It is of transcendent importance that we, without prejudice, rancor, hate, or hysteria, approach this subject.

Speaking before the world-wide Interparliamentary Union in Oslo, Norway, just a few days before war broke out, I stated: "From every land in Europe, America has drawn her bloodstream. Your culture has enriched our lives. Your music, your literature, your drama, your great ideas in economics, philosophy, religion, we have made our own. But, Mr. President, you have something we do not want. I refer to those large barriers of fear, hatred, and distrust erected between your nations by centuries of fear, hatred, and distrust. Yes; we owe you much. We know the world is small. We are neighbors. We want to help you, but your problems are so intricate. There are so many equations that we do not understand. I say we want to help, but we want to help you to help yourselves to the end that your problems may find solution through you. We want to be helpful, but America does not want to meddle in Europe. The role of a meddler I do not crave for my country."

America is confronted today with the problem of how to remain at peace.

No straight-thinking citizen wants America to get into war, and, of course, it is the obligation of everyone to do all in his power to avert it. To each of us, then, comes the challenge to maintain peace here in America and to contribute toward its establishment in the world. We have heard from each side in the debate in Congress statements to the effect that if the Congress does not do what that side desires it will have a tendency to precipitate us into war.

My main thesis tonight, if I have one, is to deny the truth of such a statement. In that respect, I say both those who contend for the resolution and those who contend against it are mistaken. And I say further, when such arguments are used, a great injury may be done to the Nation.

I heard one Senator ask another not long ago, "Do you think it would have been better if the President had not convened the Congress in special session to debate this issue?" And the second Senator said "yes." I asked, "Why?" The answer given was substantially as follows: "You know why. Look at the mental state the country is in. Look at the contentions which are made by the partisans in this debate—each side claims that if it does not succeed this country might get into war. Look at the letters as they come in, showing that many of the people do not fully understand the issues which are involved. Millions of them apparently think Congress is voting on war or peace. Millions have had their blood pressure built up to almost a bursting point under the impression that this is one of the great momentous occasions in history. And when the affair is over, millions of people on the losing side will be of the opinion that Congress has sold out America. "Don't you think," this Senator continued, "it would have been better not to have had all these fireworks, all this blowing off of steam, all this fear, agitation, and hysteria?"

He presented this argument with such force that I was prone to answer in the affirmative, but I hesitated, and then said "No." When the debate is closed and the people settle down to a contemplation of these "feverish weeks" they will realize first that there was no need for them to get unduly agitated. Secondly, they will realize that many of them have been victims of propaganda, misinformation, and illogical thinking. Thirdly, they will be prepared if and when a real occasion arises to think more clearly, and act more rationally. Fourth, they will realize that they have had an experience similar to many of the experiences that some of the people in Europe went through time and time again before they finally surrendered their liberties to a ruling group.

I believe this experience will bring to the consciousness of the people the realization that this Nation is made up of individuals, and as these individuals think and act so will the Nation. Fifth, I believe also, that out of this experience the people will realize the need of unity. They will see that there are forces which would split them asunder. They will realize that by centering their thought and energy upon America and America's needs, and thinking less about other countries, they will find here that which will bring about national unification for the great purpose and object of peace.

The people are realizing more and more that this war in Europe is not our war, and they are beginning to feel, in spite of excited radio expounders, that no American war is even remotely in sight.

This debate has developed for the knowledge of our people the significant position and power of the United States of America. With our wealth and our manpower we could reach out and seize more land, more peoples, as is being done in Europe and in the east, but here there is no such desire. But with this wealth and this power we owe an obligation both to the present and the future. In 1917 we entered the World War with our manpower and our power of finance to advance the cause of democracy, the freedom of mankind everywhere, and the peace of the world. We did a good job—an unselfish one. We got nothing in return for it, but we learned a lesson then, and it is this—by war and through war democracy and peace are not advanced. We know further that if we got into another war it might destroy our democracy. It would bring no peace; it would bring degradation, suffering, and destruction.

Without preeminent position on this globe we cannot hide behind the door of the present and think we have looked after the obligation that is ours. Economics, as everyone knows, is a large factor in peace and war. When this war is over—yes, perhaps before this war is over—there will be found the way, because of our preeminent position in the world of economics—we have the money, we have the men, we have the power—the way which will lead to peace. Let us then study this economic weapon we possess. Perhaps therein will be found the solution for war.

In the debate in the Senate it is admitted by both sides that this European war is not our war and that we must stay out of it. It is contended, however, by each side that if Congress fails to do what that side desires, it might mean America's involvement. It has been customary for many of the speakers to depict the horrors of war. (Most of them haven't gotten within a hundred miles of the pictures drawn recently by Van Pasen—what he saw.)

One side in the argument lashes England and France. The other side does the same to Hitler. One side maximizes the amount of trade that will result from the sale of munitions and implements of war; the other side minimizes. Neither side argues for a total embargo on everything, knowing that it would not work.

With the lights of democracy flickering out all over Europe our job, yours and mine, like that of the keeper of the lighthouse, is to keep the light of democracy burning in America and not leave it in a futile attempt to salvage the wrecks on foreign shores.

What Congress does in shaping America's foreign policy will be shouted from the roof tops all over America as a 7-day wonder. It will meet both with thunderous acclaim and storms of disapproval. But, my friends, therein is not found the answer.

The answer will be found in whether or not America is successful in keeping out of war. Our job, then, is to see that America stays at peace with the world. Our job is to see that a foreign policy is created which will protect and defend America. Is it not possible, my friends, strawmen have been set up on both sides in this debate? Is it not possible that we are battling over an embargo policy that is not nearly as important as retaining our mental balance? Suppose we retain the embargo. It is claimed that it works to the advantage of Germany. If that is true she certainly will not declare war if we retain it. On the other hand, Great Britain and France are not going to declare war if we retain it. Suppose that Congress repeals the embargo law. If that works to the advantage of Great Britain and France as the maintenance of its works to the advantage of Germany, they won't declare war on us for its withdrawal. Germany may not like it, but certainly she would rather endure it than draw us into the conflict on the side of the Allies. This is a time for sane, deliberate thinking. The people are interested in how to keep America out of war. This is the primary issue. Fortunately the people are realizing that the repeal of the Embargo Act, or the failure to repeal it, will not get us into the war.

In view of this war talk in and out of Congress—who wants war?

You know and I know that labor does not want war.

You know and I know that big business does not want war.

You know and I know that the clergy and the professional men, and the mothers and fathers of America, do not want war.

You know and I know that no Congressman or Senator wants war.

You know and I know that Cabinet members do not want war.

You know and I know that the President does not want war.

We repeat, who, then, in America wants war? No one.

What, then, is the excitement all about? It relates to the repeal or the failure to repeal the present Embargo Act; and partisans on both sides of the fence, as I have said, have argued, and are ready to argue, to sustain their position, that war might come if you do not follow the course they suggest.

I say to you that war will not come as the result of either the repeal or failure to repeal the present act.

What then are the factors which will determine peace or war for America?

First, Chancelor Hitler (and perhaps Stalin)—and what he does in the future.

Second. The American people—and what they do in the future.

Third. The political leadership of America—and what it does in the future.

I need not go into detail as to the first one of these factors which will contribute toward war or peace for America—"Chancelor Hitler and what he does in the future." It suffices to say that if he should violate the neutrality of Belgium or Holland, should open up a gas war or an acid war, or a germ war that it would have a tendency to make a large percentage of our people see red. If Chancelor Hitler should send agents to this country who would duplicate what was done previous to our entry into the World War, agents who would sabotage our property, that too would have significant consequences. Whatever you may say about Chancelor Hitler you have to admit that he is a shrewd individual and he knows that in any war if he had American resources, American troops, and American ships against him he would go down. He will do everything to avoid a conflict with America.

I have come to the second factor which will be determinative of peace or war in which America may become involved. It is this: "The American people and what they do in the future." Therefore, we ask the question, What can the average American do to keep the covenant of peace—to practice "peacetime patriotism"?

I answer that question as follows:

First. He can keep calm and not allow an emotional bias to sway his judgment.

Second. He can keep in mind the fundamental truth that we have nothing to gain and everything to lose by participating in another war. He must aid in balancing our economy, so it will be shock proof against excess wartime demand and profits.

Third. He can keep in mind that it is not our job to settle European disputes—or meddle in Europe.

Fourth. He can refuse to accept any war propaganda from any side, remembering that his obligation is to remain pro-American.

Fifth. He can express his mandate to newspapers and radio stations all over America that America is not to be terrorized by scare headlines which inflame American emotions—that war news presentations must be strictly factual—must be torn from their boldface prominence to a more fitting obscurity. Our domestic problems are far more important to America than Europe's war. Let our newspapers and radio stations concentrate on putting the emphasis of American attention back where it belongs—back on America. That is not a callous indifference. It's one intelligent way to preserve American democracy as a beacon light for war-torn Europe. This is no panicky head-in-the-sand escape from realities. It is a realistic approach. Take Europe out of the headlines and put America back in the forefront of American consciousness.

Sixth. The average American can concentrate on American peace rather than European war. The average American can stop picking sides. Neutrality begins in the mind of the individual not in the legislative halls. When we think unneutral thoughts we're scuttling American peace.

Seventh. The average American can realize that his voice is the most potent in the world. He can accept the challenge to find the way to embargo war.

Eighth. In general, the average American can think less of Europe and more of America.

Thus far we have discussed two of the factors which make for war or peace: Hitler and his future acts, and the American people and their future acts.

The next determining factor is the political leadership of America and its future acts. How can that leadership practice peacetime patriotism?

First. The political leadership of America, both executive and legislative, can write a moratorium on politics where peace is at stake and follow the same peacetime credo that we have just outlined for the average American.

Second. The political leadership of America, both legislative and executive, can give more time to the consideration of Washington's advice—no entangling alliances—remembering that alliances, financial and economic, may be as dangerous to peace as alliances political.

Third. The political leadership of America can accomplish a constructive purpose by standing for an added check on the dogs of war—aiding in getting a war referendum amendment passed, making it necessary for Congress to have a mandate from the people before this Nation can engage in foreign war.

Fourth. The political leadership of America can formulate legislation and plans that not only will aid our national economy now but will especially prepare for the shocks and problems that will arise when this war in Europe ceases.

Fifth. The political leadership of America can define and restrict the powers of the Executive in relation to our foreign affairs. Rightly or wrongly, the haunting precedent of totalitarian states makes the average American fearful of the encroachment of any one man on the powers that must be shared in a republic.

Sixth. The political leadership of America can stimulate trade with South America and other noncombatant countries; think our farm problem through; think our labor-capital problem through, and solve these problems.

Seventh. The political leadership of America can reinstate in the American people a feeling of confidence; it can demonstrate the Government's ability to balance the Budget; it can get rid of government by experts and return the Government to the people.

Grave as the European situation appears, we in America need not be appalled—need not fear and distrust the future of our country. Men's minds here are alert, independent. They are not palsied—they are active. We are arising to meet the challenge head-on, and my faith is that it will be met and America will remain at peace. In spite of the fear mongers and the hysteria begetters, I am glad to ascertain that more and more people are coming to the conclusion that we will not be drawn into this European war. They are realizing that Congress alone has the power to declare war, and that this power is the greatest insulation against America's involvement.

Let us "trust in the Lord with all our hearts and lean not unto our own understanding." If "in all our ways we acknowledge Him, He will direct our path" and America will remain at peace.

Address Before American Legion, Department of Maryland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SHERMAN MINTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 16 (legislative day of Wednesday, October 4), 1939

ADDRESS BY HON. PAUL V. McNUTT, FEDERAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATOR

Mr. MINTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered at Baltimore, Md., on October 14, 1939, before Social Security Board Post 142 of the American Legion, Department of Maryland, by Hon. Paul V. McNutt, Federal Security Administrator.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I count it a double privilege to meet with you here tonight; first, because I share your allegiance to this great Legion, under which those of us who have served our Nation in war have carried on its ideals in times of peace; second, because we are all of us working at the same task—that of administering Federal activities through which the American people have set out to make social security a reality on their jobs and in their homes. Our paths, both as members of the American Legion and as public servants engaged in social-security activities, lead in converging lines toward the same goal—that of realizing the full promise of American life, of making this country a better, safer, and freer place to live.

Two of the most important steps the Federal Government has taken in this direction have occurred within the past few months—the establishment of the Federal Security Agency in July and the strengthening of the Social Security Act through the amendments passed in August.

In grouping the Social Security Board and its five fellow agencies under our new overhead organization, the President's reorganization plan looked toward economy and efficiency—and much more. In bringing together major Government services for the welfare of the family and its individual members, this action unified a policy; it set an objective. The President himself has stated the purpose toward which all of us are working: "To promote social and economic security, educational opportunity, and the health of the citizens of the Nation."

This is a pledge to every man, woman, and child in the country—a pledge that the rights of a free people shall not be denied them because of personal misfortune. There is nothing new about this; it simply reaffirms a time-honored principle. The Government of the United States was founded on this principle of equal opportunity for all; our history has repeatedly proved that it works. It is working today. But because today we are a vast and varied, yet closely knit Nation of 130,000,000, we must now apply this principle on an equally Nation-wide scale.

Security—a sound footing on which to build our individual lives is a necessity common to us all. Some of us are rich and some poor. But rich or poor, we need Nation-wide protection against sickness, ignorance, and the economic hazards of our industrial society. We all know how one typhoid carrier can wreck the health of a community. We are beginning to recognize that unleashed ignorance is an equally menacing contagion. And we have learned from experience that the worst of all epidemics is economic instability. It has not been so long since we emerged from such an epidemic, and we know its cost, not only in dollars and cents, but also in human hopes and happiness. We know that health and education alone will not forestall want—that threats to the people's pay envelopes can be equally devastating.

It takes various kinds of security to protect every group and every age. True, every living human soul needs shelter and food and clothing. But security limited to that alone is the security of a prison or a poorhouse. This is not the security that a free people will tolerate for its children, its youth, its working men and women, its aged. Each of these groups and each person in these groups has individual needs. And our privilege to call ourselves an enlightened democracy depends on how well we meet the needs both of the individual and of the group.

That is what we are working toward in all the programs which now come under the Federal Security Agency—security for the individual and for the group. And of all, that group which most needs security, and which contributes most to individual security, is the family. There—on family security—is exactly where the greatest emphasis belongs; on the security a man builds up for himself and his wife and children during his working years; the security that goes on when he is too old to work; the security that doesn't vanish when he dies. And that is the kind of security these Government services in which we are interested seek to promote.

It is a security based on self-respect and self-sufficiency, not on regimentation. No man, woman, or child is made a better individual through regimentation growing out of need. I have seen soup kitchens, I have seen poorhouses, I have seen orphan asylums; and I can say this—though such institutions are needed to meet some problems, for people with homes and families, however modest, these homes and families are the foundation of the kind of life we prize. And because this is so, it is right and proper that the American Government should be concerned for the welfare of American families.

This Government concern for family security naturally demands Nation-wide Government organization, and that in turn demands efficiency and economy all along the line in the Federal Government, the States, and their local communities.

But economy must be interpreted in its broadest sense—as a tool of effective and constructive administration, a method of assuring an equitable income for those who need the protection of social-security legislation. There's nothing new in saying that the money put into the family pocketbook increases not only their security but also that of the merchants and others with whom they deal and that of the communities in which they live.

We have come a long way toward assuring this kind of security in the past few years. But there is much still to be done. The 1930's presented a problem of Nation-wide need, and we attacked it and solved it in the best and quickest way we knew. Looking back with the perspective of experience we can see where mistakes were made, where organization and activities were duplicated. The 1940's should improve administration and consolidate the gains of the 1930's. The framework has been established. The task now is to simplify and perfect the human relationships involved—between all of us who help to administer Government services on the one side, and the millions of men and women who stand to benefit from them on the other.

When we look back on all that has been accomplished for social security in the short time since this national enterprise was initiated we can afford to smile at the doubting Thomases who thought it wouldn't work. Facts—facts which are known not only to those of us who have an inside view but also to the entire country—have answered these earlier doubts.

But the troubled times in which we now find ourselves may breed new ones. And I'd like to say a word to spike them in advance. Come what may—the state of limited national emergency which the President recently declared, or even some disaster which would hurl us into war, as we all pray it may not and feel that it will not—come what may, social security marches on. The 46,000,000 workers who have Federal insurance accounts need feel no fears that their social-security cards will become valueless scraps of paper. They can be confident that the added protection recently provided both for their own old age and for the future of their families will be forthcoming at the appointed time. Nor need anyone fear curtailment in the other parts of the Social Security Act—job insurance and public assistance and public health, and child welfare.

The same thing is true of all the other measures through which we are now promoting the security of the American people. Our united purpose is to make security a reality throughout the length and breadth of the country. This purpose has been given national expression and added impetus in the creation of the Federal Security Agency. This new national organization simply brings together Federal agencies dedicated to the common cause of human betterment. Through the Board's new Bureau of Employment Security we are helping the States to bring men and jobs together and to provide out-of-work benefits to bridge the gap between the old job and the new. Through the Public Health Service we are combating the menace of contagion, epidemics, and other widespread health hazards. Through the Office of Education we are stimulating the varied educational opportunities essential to a democratic people, and we are providing vocational rehabilitation so that handicapped workers can again become self-supporting. Through the Civilian Conservation Corps and the National Youth Administration we are giving youth a chance to build up their bodies and their morale, a chance to learn how to work and to get training for future work, a chance to provide for their own support and their families' support, and a chance to contribute to the wealth of the Nation by public work well done. On this front youth has fought a winning battle against its twin enemies of want and idleness. We have seen across the seas what happens when youth refuses longer to be frustrated and responds to any summons that promises them a future, no matter if that future does turn out to be one of destruction.

The Federal Security Agency and its five member organizations are not only the only ones dedicated to this purpose. For in its broader sense, social security embraces all the measures through which the American people are utilizing Government as a channel for mutual service and joint protection—including those that safeguard the health and welfare of children, that deal with wages and hours of labor, that protect the people's savings, that promote agricultural rehabilitation, and that provide decent, healthful housing. In all these fields, a beginning, and more than a beginning, has been made; and continued growth may be expected. In others, we are still only feeling our way—notably in the development of a comprehensive and effective national health program. But the line of progress is clear. In this country all our forces are geared to the conservation not only of our natural resources but also of our human resources.

The spiritual heritage of our great democracy has never been more virile and vital—or more needed—than it is today. The preservation and the enrichment of our American way of life is what we are striving for in the broad social-security program of which all these Government measures are all a part.

This principle—the principle of social security—has been repeatedly reaffirmed. The constitutionality of social security has been upheld by the Supreme Court. The administration of social security has been integrated and improved through the creation of the Federal Security Agency. The scope of social security has been expanded, and the protections it offers strengthened by the amendments to the Social Security Act. Social security in this country is so firmly rooted, so effectively moving toward its appointed goal, that its continuation and its further development are beyond all doubt or question.

I speak positively, and I do so for three reasons. First, because I know that it is the considered and constant determination of the American people to get this social-security protection. They need it, and they want it. They propose to utilize their Government machinery as one method of achieving it.

Second, as Federal Security Administrator, I can say that the Federal and State officials to whom the administration of these programs has been delegated are determined to fulfill the mandate which the people have placed upon them. And in saying this I speak not only for those of us within the administrative agencies, but also for the President of the United States. Our national objective remains, as it has always been, construction, not destruction.

The third reason for my conviction that nothing will curtail our progress toward social security is based on the history of European social legislation. Even in countries that have experienced war and the fear of war, these disasters have not stemmed the tide once it was turned in this direction. Germany, France, and Great Britain, for example, were aware of the needs of their people and had taken some steps to meet them before the dark days of 1914 to 1918. In France protective measures were still pretty scattered; in Germany social insurance was fairly comprehensive; and in England health insurance and unemployment insurance were established. In spite of the travail of war, these countries provided government allowances for those in need; and they supplemented and expanded their insurance measures, so that more people were benefited than before. These developments went on even during the war years, and everywhere they formed the basis for a notable expansion of social insurance as soon as the war ended.

These are some of the reasons why I have no fear that war or any other eventuality will rob the American people of the genuine security which they have been, and are, building by their own efforts. But there is another and still more potent reason. And here I speak as a member of the American Legion to my fellow members. Because we have no illusions about war, to us the making and the keeping of the peace are more than words. Because we know what war means, we hope and pray that our Nation will not be put to this bitter test, that we may continue the ways of peace not only in social security but also in all our other national and personal pursuits.

And so, in closing, I know I may restate, for you as for myself, our pledge of faith to the American idea—a pledge which President Roosevelt recently expressed in these words: "If we fight with all our strength for the preservation of the liberty in which this Nation was conceived and the principle of equality on which it was founded; if we recognize and protect ourselves from the dangers that threaten from without and within; if all groups and all classes work together in a spirit of tolerance—then we can be sure that we will not come to the end of our dream."

Repeal of the Arms Embargo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSH LEE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 16 (legislative day of Wednesday, October 4), 1939

ADDRESS BY HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS, OF UTAH

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a summary of the remarks made by the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] before the American Academy of Political and Social Science, at Philadelphia, Saturday evening, October 14, in support of the repeal of the arms embargo.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It would be wrong to say that the considerations before Congress today on our peace policy are unimportant simply because both sides want peace. Public interest in our special session was at the seething point until it was discovered that there is no war party in the United States and no war bloc. Since then it has flagged. Nevertheless, as earnest as we are, we are divided into two definite groups as to how best to remain a calm, energetic, peaceful nation, attending to our own affairs and expecting others not to molest us, and remain not only at peace but a peaceful influence upon a belligerent world.

Once we discover our issue we are safe in discussing it. The issue is not peace or war. It is not a question of this being a step toward war, and that being a step away from war. There are no steps to war in contemplation. There is the law of cause and effect, and from the premise that we repeal the arms embargo, enact the restrictions laid down in the new proposed neutrality resolution, and give some greater degree than now of recognition to the principles of international law—from that premise we are confronted with an almost inescapable conclusion, namely, that we are making more sound and more certain the American position as a neutral.

It follows that our embargo of today may seriously be mistaken for lack of national fortitude and lack of confidence that we are indeed a free Nation, and that our failure to enact the other features of the projected resolution is simply a failure to restrict our citizens wherein they should be restricted.

We have today freedom of the seas, with our ships laden with all sorts of deadly materials, such as metals, oils, gasoline—yes, and even rubber, which we should conserve, inasmuch as it is not grown in the United States—steaming unarmed and unescorted into ports of belligerents and offering, if they choose, long-term credit. In contrast it is proposed to let them have the finished product, since we let them have the raw materials anyway; make them take title here and carry it away in a cash transaction or its equivalent, so that there will not be any thought later to have the Government become a lender under any conditions. Will anyone seriously contend that to remove the embargo under these conditions is not tightening up our neutrality, removing haphazard national shipping policy, and securing to us a position of strength, dignity, and peace?

But it has been said we have no right to change the rules during progress. Or, shall we call war a game? Let us make a legal case in equity out of it and see what we have under contemplation. We have a situation in which our neutrality law is unsuited. In the heat of a summer and in the press for adjournment the Senate Foreign Relations Committee voted by a close poll not to pigeonhole the bill but to lay it aside for the period of the regular session for an emergency session such as this if it should come. Meanwhile, the House of Representatives, by enacting it, had served notice to the world that the present law is unsatisfactory. Meanwhile, the President of the United States and the Secretary of State and his State Department have served notice to the world that the law is unsatisfactory. Meanwhile, the Senate will not consider its amendment or repeal only because the Senate is fagged and because the European war has not started and because a filibuster is threatened. There is no nation on earth that was not on notice that we would be summoned into extra session and a resolution amending neutrality probably be forthcoming almost the minute that there was an emergency abroad which might threaten our safety. Some who say we have no right to change our rules today refused to consider them yesterday on the ground that there was not going to be any war. If that was a reason not to consider them yesterday, is it valid to say today that we shall not consider them because there is a war? Is it right to say that we won't call the doctor because we are not sick, and then, becoming thoroughly ill, say that we still won't call the doctor for the reason that we now are sick? This is not logic, and it is not law, and it is not international good morals. The world was on notice last spring that Congress would act to revise the neutrality law.

I have urged in many forums, and cannot repeat it too many times, that that which we are considering is domestic law. It is meant to set up a code of domestic conduct for this Nation without impressing too greatly the rest of the world. Argument that we have been helping Germany and are about to help England and France is utterly idle. We are not about to assume any larger right than we have always had. Our net claims to neutral rights have always been less than international law allows, so there is no question of being unneutral. Our law today allows us less license than would straight international law. Our law, when we pass the embargo repeal, with its other features, will allow us even less tomorrow than today. One may not menace his neighbors by failing to assert his rights. It is overassertion, not underassertion, that creates damage and violates the security of others and is unneutral. Restriction must never be confused with its opposite—enlargement. We may not foresee, much less plan, all the complications which may arise from America's leading a normal international life. Your grocer does not pick his customers. They just come to his store, if they will. He does not sell his top apples to Mrs. Jones and his bottom apples to Mrs. Smith. They come with their baskets, and they go in peace. So, it must follow, may nations; and if one comes in brutal, drunk, and swaggering, this Nation still is well enough policed and strong enough, I take it, to eject him. If our customers are like Hatfield and McCoy of the famous "feuding" families of another generation, we cannot help that, so long as they have the money to buy our goods and go on. We do not force our wares on anyone, and we do not count Hatfield's cash or McCoy's cash to see how much each has and to make sure it is equal and that we are being fair to both; neither do we examine their fortifications to see whether one may get home safely with his basket and the other not. We are minding our own business, and this America proposes to do in a rather affirmative but modest and not arrogant sort of way, thus basing our neutrality upon the right of a nation to stay at peace in the midst of a warring world.

Pending Neutrality Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENNETT CHAMP CLARK

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 16 (legislative day of Wednesday, October 4), 1939

EDITORIAL BY WILLIAM HIRTH

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD an editorial from

the Missouri Farmer, written by William Hirth, president of the Missouri Farmers' Association, which is the largest farm cooperative in the United States. The editorial is entitled "If This Be Treason."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Missouri Farmer]

IF THIS BE TREASON

No doubt some of our readers think I am "tearing a passion to tatters" because I write so much about the new hell that has broken loose in Europe, but I am doing this because, in my opinion, if we should become actively involved in it we will be the biggest pack of fools in Christendom, and that ere we emerge from it we will have wrecked the American Republic. Our National debt is already $45,000,000,000, and approximating what we would have to spend for new ships, guns, munitions of war, etc., and the new billions we would be forced to lend to England and France (who already owe us billions from the last war which they never expect to repay), and the added billions that would be required for relief when the senseless slaughter comes to an end, and when the millions employed in our war industries would once more be thrown out of work, these various expenditures which are too vast for the average mind to comprehend would more than double our present national debt, and our taxpayers simply could not carry such a load—not only would it bankrupt the Federal Treasury—but with our country already honeycombed with Communists and others who hate our institutions it would mean a dictatorship, and finally revolution. Not only would our participation mean billions of dollars in increased taxes, but having once more covenanted to "save" the rotten democracies of Europe, we would be asked to send millions of young Americans to the shambles across the sea, and the chances are that one or more millions of them would remain dead upon the foreign battlefields, where 37,568 erstwhile young Americans already lie under little white crosses—and who can place a fair value on the lives of a million young Americans who have no quarrel in Europe, and who passionately pray God for the right to live in peace with their fellowmen?

It is for the above reasons that I am so deeply concerned over the crisis that confronts our Nation, and why, if the fateful and senseless issues in Europe are not compromised, I am hoping that the President and Congress will serve notice upon England and France that they must survive or perish upon their own resources—that having had one sad experience in trying to "make the world safe for democracy" we will not engage in a similar fool's adventure. And the surest way to get the President and Congress to do this is for the overwhelming mass of our voters to impress upon them that they will scourge from public life any man or set of men who will permit the United States to once more become a cat's-paw in the affairs of war-cursed Europe, and thus menace the continued existence of our own institutions. Ours is still a "government of, for, and by the people" if the millions on the farms, and in our offices, shops, and factories will make vigorous use of their right of free speech and a free ballot.

In 1937 Congress enacted the present Neutrality Act by an almost unanimous vote, and under its terms we served notice upon the nations of the world that in case of war we would not sell munitions and other implements of war to the belligerents, and not only in our own land, but in other lands, this act was hailed as a tremendous step toward world peace. Through it we served notice that we did not intend, in times to come, to commercialize these instrumentalities of death, and we felt good about it, and had a right to. But since the "four horsemen" have begun to ride and hell has broken loose certain Members of Congress have changed their minds. Now these gentlemen say, in substance, that we will be willing to sell implements of war to all comers if the matter can be so handled that our own feet will not get caught in the bear trap, and they make no bones over the fact that they have changed their former position, first, because they want England and France to win, and, second, because they wish to put our unemployed to work making guns, shells, war planes, etc. In other words, after thinking it over, they see no reason why we shouldn't make some easy money out of the European situation if we can do so safely. Gone is the noble resolve to contribute to world peace that was behind the Neutrality Act when it was enacted back in 1937! And the astounding thing is that these Members of Congress insist that we can play into the hands of England and France in this manner and still remain neutral. And, of course, the most of them know better than this; they know that when we permit English ships to begin loading war munitions along the Atlantic seaboard German bombers will not hesitate to blow up these ships as they steam out to sea, and that it is not unlikely that they will go a step further and endeavor to blow up the plants that supply their cargoes of death, and thus is not the responsibility these gentlemen are asking our country to take a frightful one? Does not any sane man know that if we want to stay out of the war the only certain way to do it is to give aid and comfort to neither side?

And now what about the hue and cry of "saving the democracies" of Europe? Is there any "democracy" left in Europe that is worth saving? What of England's heartless crushing of the Boer Republic in South Africa some years ago? And what of England and France's consent to the murder of Czechoslovakia only a few months ago? And did not these countries dictate the Treaty of Versailles, which was a hell's broth that made the present conflict inevitable sooner or later? Agreeing that Hitler is a renegade and a menace, from time out of mind have not the statesmen of Europe been a pack of wolves who have been actuated by territorial spoils, and have they ever been deeply concerned over the liberties of their peoples? Has there ever been a time when "Peace on earth, good will to men" dominated their objectives? And having had one experience in "saving" the schemers of Downing Street that came perilously near wrecking our own beloved Republic, shall we again place ourselves in position where we will be asked to send millions of young Americans across the sea to pull their chestnuts out of the fire? If we would serve the cause not only of democracy but of civilization, we will lose no time in building an army and navy that can protect our American democracy and the Monroe Doctrine against all comers, and I hope the time is close at hand when our young men will band themselves together and solemnly declare, "We will gladly shoulder guns to defend America against an invader, it matters not who he is or from whence he comes, but, so help us, God of our fathers, we will not offer up our lives on the battlefields of Europe, and if this be treason, let those who will make the most of it." And then let us see what the powers that be will do about it.

Finally, let us remember that we have not as yet conquered the depression; that we still have idle millions who are a heavy burden upon the Government; and that the farm question is as far from being settled as it was when Secretary Wallace began his guinea-pig experiments.

America's Attitude Toward European Conflict

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNN J. FRAZIER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 16 (legislative day of Wednesday, October 4), 1939

ADDRESS BY JOHN B. TREVOR, JR.

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by John B. Trevor, Jr., first vice president of the Allied Patriotic Societies, Inc. The address discusses the position the United States should take in view of the present European conflict.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It appears to the chairman of your special campaign committee that the most important problem before the Allied Patriotic Societies is the position we should take about the present European conflict. In some ways our task is easier than in most of the issues in which we have been involved. We do not have to contend with an apathetic public opinion. The country is aroused to the need for action. Congress is being flooded with letters and telegrams on a scale seldom seen before.

There is need, however, to clarify the issues. Leaving aside the minor points, the basic issue at stake is, Shall we continue to remain a neutral in the conflict now raging in Europe, or shall we enter the war as a belligerent? There is no third course. We cannot be in the war in the economic field and out of it in the military. In making our decision let us be guided by reason and not by our emotions.

We are probably safe in assuming that the vast majority of the American people want the country to remain neutral. They remember all too clearly the horrors of the last war, which they know will be eclipsed by a present-day world conflict. The dislocation of our economic structure, due to the staggering total of loans to our late Allies, which were never repaid, is still with us. We cannot forget that the terms of the peace which they imposed on the vanquished generated a bitterness which is chiefly responsible for the present situation. We remember that we received no share of the vast territories taken over by the conquerors.

Looking at the Europe of today, our conviction to stay out should grow stronger. The only possible reason to enter the war is to save the institutions of the so-called democratic nations from subjugation by the totalitarian powers. But let me point out that England and France are no longer democracies. Messrs. Hitler and Stalin have won a crushing victory on the ideological front. In England elections have been suspended for the duration of the conflict. France is ruled by decrees issued arbitrarily by the Government without regard to the popular will. Even Canada has taken steps which make it a semidictatorship. Let us not think that if we enter the war we will escape this inevitable process. Legislation has already been drawn up which will confiscate in case of war up to 75 percent of the individual's property. On the plea that since we draft manpower we should also draft capital, such a proposal would have an excellent chance of passing. We would then become a corporate state very similar to Italy. Nominally, of

course, these special measures should lapse upon the declaration of peace, but how much do you suppose the individual would get back, bearing in mind governmental inefficiency and the reluctance of the bureaucrat to disgorge special powers?

The Honorable William R. Castle, former Under Secretary of State, says, as quoted in today's New York Times, "that if the United States were dragged into another European conflict we would be, when the war was over, only another dictatorship."

If we stay out of the war, we shall be following the traditional American policy. James Monroe, in the message to the Congress which is known as the Monroe Doctrine, said:

"In the wars of the European powers in matters relating to themselves we have never taken any part, nor does it comport with our policy so to do. It is only when our rights are invaded or seriously menaced that we resent injuries or make preparations for our defense. * * * Our policy in regard to Eurcpe, which was adopted at an early stage of the wars which have so long agitated that quarter of the globe, nevertheless remains the same, which is not to interfere in the internal concerns of any of its powers; to consider the government de facto as the legitimate government for us; to cultivate friendly relations with it, and to preserve those relations by a frank, firm, and manly policy, meeting in all instances the just claims of every power, submitting to injuries from none."

We never hear the above extracts from the Monroe Doctrine but they are just as vital to our national safety as the matter with which we are familiar. Disregard of President Monroe's dictum that we should consider the government de facto as the legitimate government has in one current case brought our international relations to an absurd impasse. For the purpose of assigning immigration quotas we lump together the quotas of Germany and that area which formerly composed the Czechoslovak state. We also apply the penalty duty put on German imports to imports from Czechoslovakia, presumably to punish the Czechs for allowing themselves to be defeated, yet we do not recognize that the German Government is the de facto government of this region.

As a result of this war, and perhaps as the result of wars to come, the boundaries of Europe are almost certain to undergo change and readjustment. Unless we go back to the Monroe Doctrine and recognize de facto governments, we may well get into the impossible position of not recognizing the actual governments in large areas of Europe. Such a situation would be most awkward for our commerce, and would, in a very real sense, constitute insult and provocation.

The Monroe Doctrine is the path of sanity and safety. In only one respect might we reasonably clarify it. It would be to our interest to refuse to recognize the de facto government of an area where such government or a subsidiary is advocating the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force and violence. Extending recognition to such a government would be merely extending the cloak of diplomatic immunity to its propagandists in this country.

If it is our wish to stay out of war, we must refrain from doing any unneutral acts. It is not sufficient for us to announce our desire to be neutral, the belligerents must also recognize our neutrality by acquiescing in it and by not treating us as a party to the war. This will not happen if we commit acts in defiance of international law for the purpose of helping one side and hindering the other.

Let me read what three authorities on international law say on the question of neutrality:

From A Digest of International Law, by the American authority, John Bassett Moore, under the heading, "Neutrality, Its Significance," he quotes from Mr. J. Q. Adams, Secretary of State, to Mr. Gallatin, May 19, 1818:

"By the usual principles of international law, the state of neutrality recognizes the cause of both parties to be just—that is, it avoids all consideration of the merits of the contest."

Mr. Moore also quotes from a decision of a Federal court:

"The idea of a neutral nation implies two nations at war, and a third in friendship with both."

From Le Droite International Theorique et Pratique, by Calvo, the well-known South American authority on international law:

"The first duty imposed on a neutral state is that of being impartial in its relations with the belligerents, to abstain from all acts having the nature of a favor, to aid one to overcome the other."

According to International Law, A Treatise, by Oppenheim, an adviser at the British Foreign Office:

"Neutrality as an attitude of impartiality involves the duty of abstaining from assisting either belligerent either actively or passively * * *."

The most immediate danger is that we will compromise our neutrality by a repeal of the embargo provision of our neutrality law. Such a measure would partake of the nature of an unneutral act. In the words of Mr. Henry S. Fraser, technical adviser to the late George W. Wickersham on the League of Nations committee for the codification of international law:

"There is an established principle of international law that a neutral may not, after the outbreak of war, change its legislation for the purpose of assisting one of the belligerents."

If the embargo is repealed, Mr. Fraser adds:

"Germany will instantly have the right under international law to take steps of reprisal and retaliation against American ships."

Our Government has in the past recognized the justice of this point of view. During the last war, while we were still neutral, the German Government requested us to place an embargo on shipments of arms to the belligerents. Previously we had had no such embargo. Consequently the application of an embargo would have changed our relations with the belligerents. The situation was identical in principle with the present proposal to lift the embargo. The Secretary of State replied to the German Ambassador in part as follows:

"This Government holds, as I believe Your Excellency is aware, and as it is constrained to hold in view of the present indisputable doctrines of accepted international law, that any change in its own laws of neutrality during the progress of a war which would affect unequally the relations of the United States with the nations at war would be an unjustifiable departure from the principle of strict neutrality * * *."

Let me point out that the two usual arguments in favor of repealing the embargo are fallacious in the extreme. It is often said that our industry will be benefited by the arms orders from the belligerents. This does not appear to be the case if a long view of the matter is taken. If we insist on cash payment, and actually get it, the Allies will have to pay us either in their holdings of American and other foreign securities or in gold. Of course, if we do not insist on cash payment, the last war probably gives us a notion as to when we shall be paid. Now, England has large holdings of foreign securities, but it is very doubtful if she would consider using them for this purpose. For many years she has had an excess of imports over exports and has used the income from her foreign holdings to pay the deficit. Without these holdings she would have great difficulty in supporting her large population. Therefore it seems probable that gold will be used to pay us. If several billion dollars of gold is added to our already inflated reserves, the foreign nations will be left with a deficiency of gold. Then the logical step for them to take would be to demonetize gold—leaving us with a hoard of yellow metal completely useless for financial transactions. The effect on our internal economy can be imagined.

Some advocates of repealing the embargo are so strong in their desire to help the democracies that they ignore all other arguments. But would repealing the embargo help them for any length of time? There is reason to doubt it. According to today's papers the Soviet Government has agreed to rush goods to the Reich. What could be easier than for the Soviet Government to order needed arms from us for shipment to Germany? If delivery was made by the Pacific route the military and legal obstacles in the path of the Allies, if they attempted to stop the trade, would be very great.

Now, in regard to other phases of the war situation. No doubt some additional legislation is needed or at least desirable. Measures which tend to protect American citizens from getting involved in the hostilities or in aiding them to leave the scene of war quickly are worth while. It might be well not to issue any visas to immigrants while Americans are stranded in Europe in appreciable numbers so that our citizens can get accommodations on the liners. We would be quite within our neutral rights in adopting the cash-and-carry plan for materials not covered by the embargo, and some such provision would no doubt be a protection to our interests, a provision excluding American shipping from an actual war zone, provided the definition of "war zone" was made sufficiently flexible to take care of possible changes that may be needed. Additional precautions against subversive activities are also in order.

But all these matters are questions of detail. The basic problem is to keep America out of war. If we get in and lose the better part of our manpower and economic resources, we will have set the stage for dictatorship in our own country. I therefore move the following resolutions:

"*Be it resolved*, That the Allied Patriotic Societies, Inc., is opposed to the entrance of the United States of America into the present European war; and be it

"*Resolved*, That the Allied Patriotic Societies, Inc., is opposed to the repeal of the arms-embargo provision of the present neutrality law or the adoption of any other measures likely to affect our neutral position; and, furthermore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the president be instructed to send a copy of this resolution to Senators WAGNER and MEAD, and to the leading metropolitan newspapers."

(NOTE.—This resolution was adopted by the Allied Patriotic Societies at their regular monthly meeting on October 9, 1939.)

Neutrality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD R. BURKE

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 16 (legislative day of Wednesday, October 4), 1939

RADIO ADDRESS BY RT. REV. MSGR. JOHN A. RYAN, D. D.

Mr. BURKE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio

address delivered on yesterday afternoon by the Rt. Rev. Msgr. John A. Ryan, D. D., of Washington, respecting the repeal of the arms embargo.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In this broadcast I do not profess to represent the Catholic Church, nor the National Catholic Welfare Conference, nor the Catholic Association for International Peace. I am speaking only for myself, as an American citizen who believes that he knows something about the principles of international morality.

Much time has been wasted and millions of words uttered within and without Congress in an empty and futile dispute concerning the meaning of neutrality. Those who denounce the existing embargo on the sale of munitions to the belligerents maintain that it is unneutral because it favors Germany and is unfavorable to England and France; the opposing group declares that lifting the embargo would be unneutral because it would help England and France and injure Germany. Both groups are right.

According to Webster's International Dictionary, neutrality in international law means: "The condition of a state or government which refrains from taking part directly or indirectly in a war between other powers." Note the word "indirectly" in this definition. To keep the embargo would indirectly aid Germany and injure Britain and France; to lift it would indirectly aid Britain and France and injure Germany. If the disputants would make a distinction between neutrality in itself and in its effects they would avoid much confused thinking and much waste of time and language.

When the United States maintains an embargo against the sale of arms to all belligerents, its action or attitude does not, as such, favor either side; when, as I hope will happen, it lifts the embargo it will continue to refrain from directly taking sides. But the effects of the new attitude upon the two belligerent parties will be vastly different from the effects of the older attitude; that is, the effects of the present law and embargo. The difference in effects will be due specifically to the difference in the conditions of the belligerents themselves.

As the distinguished Austrian jurist, Anton Menger, pointed out many years ago, "Nothing is more unequal than to treat unequals equally." Aristotle said the same thing more comprehensively almost 23 centuries ago. No position which any state may take can treat equally belligerents whose conditions are unequal, any more than a mother can treat her 18-year-old daughter and her 4-year-old daughter equally if she provides both with garments of the same dimensions. The primary concern of the United States today, is neither to maintain a strict technical neutrality nor to treat the two sides equally; both these thing are impossible.

The advocates of the embargo and the proponents of repeal agree in their desire, before everything else, to keep the United States out of the war. While I am heartily in favor of that objective, I dissent from those who contend that the more effective method of attaining it is to retain the embargo. Those who desire arguments for lifting the embargo I would refer to the speeches delivered in the Senate by the advocates of repeal. To me those speeches are sufficiently cogent and persuasive. The assertion of the isolationists that selling arms to the belligerents got us into the last war, and would have a similar effect now, is not impressive. It lacks logic and is too simple. Other factors than the sale of arms contributed mightily to our decision to enter the great war. Some of these factors no longer exist while other factors are now present which were absent in 1917.

Happily, the repeal of the embargo would not only promote our national welfare and safety, but would be in conformity with the precepts of morality and religion. Some of the utterances by isolationists, both inside and outside of Congress, suggest the inference that our country has no obligations of love and charity to any other country. These men advocate not only political but moral isolation. They contend that the injustice inflicted by the Hitler government upon the peoples of Poland, Germany, and Austria, and the manifold injustices which it will inflict over wider areas if it is successful in this war, are no moral concern of ours. They remind us unpleasantly of Cain, who demanded: "Am I my brother's keeper?" They imitate the Priest and the Levite, who passed by on the other side, remaining neutral to the suffering and helplessness of the man who had fallen among robbers. The person who asserts that we should be impartial and indifferent with regard to the conflict between the Hitler government and the Allies, repudiates not only Christ's gospel of brotherly love, but the principles of natural morality.

States, no less than individuals, are subject to the moral law. And they are bound not only by the precept of justice but, likewise, by the precept of charity. In the present crisis our country is morally obliged to do all that it reasonably can to defeat Hitler and destroy Hitlerism. Victory for this evil genius and his evil principles, in this war, would mean the destruction of Christian civilization throughout a large part of Europe. This tragic result would follow inexoraby from the Nazi philosophy and the Nazi policies which have been pursued during the last 5 years.

Upon what specific grounds do I base this assertion? First, the Hitler government has been continuously engaged for more than 5 years in a cruel and insidious campaign for the destruction of the Christian religion in Germany, and latterly in Austria. In a joint pastoral letter issued about 4 years ago by the hierarchy of Germany, the bishops protested against "the propagation of a new paganism," and declared that the Hitler government was attacking not merely "a particular article of faith but the very essence and fundamentals of the Christian religion * * *." Three years later, or about 1 year ago, another joint pastoral letter of the German bishops declared that, in the intervening 3 years, the persecution of religion had become "more hostile and more violent," and that the government was striving for "the uprooting of Christianity in general, and the introduction of a faith that no longer has the least relation to belief in God and the Christian belief in a future life."

Second, the Hitler government has consistently and continuously flouted the principles of charity, justice, and truth, which were brought to Germany by St. Boniface more than twelve hundred years ago and which have been diffused, developed, and made effective by Christian teaching alone.

Third, the Nazi philosophy and the Nazi government have substituted the absolute and totalitarian state for Christian democracy and have brazenly outraged the sacredness and rights of the individual.

Fourth, the alliance between Hitler and Stalin suggests that victory for the former will greatly strengthen the position of communism.

No genuine believer in Christianity or in the moral law can be neutral, or impartial, or indifferent in this awful situation. No intelligent man who holds that states as well as individuals have duties of charity to one another will deny that the United States is under moral obligation to do all that it reasonably can, to employ every means that can be employed without disproportionate inconvenience, in order to defeat Hitler and save Christian civilization in Europe. To permit the sale of munitions and other materials under a cash-and-carry system would not involve unreasonable inconvenience or grave risk and might be decisive in the conflict.

The issue between Hitler and the Allies is sometimes misstated by those who oppose the policy of assisting France and Britain. "Why," asks a certain columnist, "should we punish only Hitler? Why should we not also wreak vengeance upon the Allies, who are responsible for Hitler through their infamous creation, the Treaty of Versailles?" Other confused persons declare that we should not close our eyes to the crimes of injustice committed by England during many centuries in many countries. I can fully understand this emotional attitude. One of my father's brothers, a newborn babe, died on the roadside when his parents and brothers and sisters were evicted from their home, as an incident of the accursed system of landlordism which England maintained in Ireland for centuries. My grandparents on my mother's side were forced to leave the Emerald Isle by the cruelty of the notorious landlord Scully, in another part of County Tipperary. But the Englishmen who committed these crimes are all dead. "Let the dead bury their dead." Today we have to deal with not only the English people who are living but also the German people who are living and who are being robbed of their religion, their liberty, and all the moral values which lift men above brutes.

The moral question confronting America is not that of "punishing villains in Europe," whether living or dead. It is the question of contributing, so far as we reasonably can contribute, to the valiant effort now being made by British and France to prevent the triumph of paganism and barbarism in Europe. Hitler is a madman and a monster. As Rev. Robert Gannon, S. J., said recently, "Hitler is the most pestilential and altogether infuriating character of all times." One has to go back to Attila or to Genghis Khan to find men comparable with this "pestilential and infuriating character." And his capacity for evil is much greater than was that of either Attila or Genghis Khan.

Neutrality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. DANAHER

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 16 (legislative day of Wednesday, October 4), 1939

RADIO ADDRESS BY MAJ. AL WILLIAMS

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, one of the most distinguished of American fliers overseas during the World War was Maj. Al Williams. On October 12, over a coast-to-coast network, he broadcast an address entitled "Neutrality." I ask unanimous consent that it be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am an ordinary American, of a plain American family. Yesterday I talked to my mother. She seemed confused about the so-called neutrality wrangle going on in Washington. That sweet little lady saw her two sons put on the uniforms of fighting men

and march away in 1917. She stifled her tears and prayed. And if she is confused, perhaps others are confused as to just what the politically tinted neutrality row is all about, and what it will lead to.

I want to answer my mother's questions in your hearing, in the same simple words she used to teach me my prayers—the same plain words with which she taught me to say "Sir" and how to guide my tongue from the babble of babyhood to simple sentences, with one important distinction, namely, that I'm going to talk to you in the language we used as youngsters on the baseball diamond—sentences clipped and clear, so clear that no American can misunderstand them.

I have waited, in vain, for some American political leader who would dare to do this—dare in plain, simple sentences to tell us what strict, true neutrality means, and why it is essential for the continued peace and safety of America. No, they are splitting hairs, dodging plain talk, for fear the real problems and dangers will be understood.

People, common people like me, want peace. We know that these oceans on either side of us are God-given bulwarks of safety, as long as we keep our thoughts, emotions, and our greed for profits within our own boundaries. Certain leaders are trying to sell you and me enough so-called neutrality to soothe our consciences, and enough loopholes in that neutrality to grab the profits of supplying materials and weapons for killing other men.

Even as you listen to these words men are being killed in Europe—men who are, or were, the husbands, sons, and sweethearts of other women; men who are screaming in pain as their torn bodies stumble in the mud, fall from the sky, or sink beneath the waves, while the high-powered propagandists of Europe are in our midst trying to convert and confuse Americans or influence our leaders. None of these propagandists will stumble and die in the mud, burn in the air, or choke in the sea. You bet your life they won't.

The gall of these fellows—propagandists, native or foreign—to even try to sell us another bill of goods for joining in another European war, without even changing the slogans that tricked us into the last war.

How can we insure American peace? Is neutrality the only answer? Still talking from third base, I say "yes" to my mother, "yes" to the men and women of America, and a still louder "yes" to the political leaders who tricked us into the last World War, and who will trick us into this one unless we clamp down on them—now. So let's get down to brass tacks.

What is neutrality?—since our leaders refrain from telling us.

According to Webster's International Dictionary, "neutrality is the condition of a state or government which refrains from taking part, directly or indirectly, in a war between other powers."

There are no "ifs," no "ands," no "buts," no "whereases," in that definition; no faintest hint of hopes for curing unemployment, nor how to make profits justifiable before God out of the business of putting weapons or materials in the hands of other men to kill still other men.

There's no middle course. We are going to be neutral or we are going to be unneutral. We cannot sell anything to any warring nation and maintain our neutrality and our peace.

The fate of this country and everything it stands for hangs upon just how well you understand this, and how determined you are to insure American peace, and just how determined you are that Congress and the President shall execute your determination. If there were no profit in selling to Europe right now, there would be no foggy neutrality wrangle right now.

Long since a flat and complete embargo would have been clamped on our export trade to Europe, and our risks would have been eliminated. But no. The difference between the strict neutrality which we want to insure American peace for all of us and the split neutrality which they are trying to sell us is no promise of peace for any of us but the hope of profits for a few of us.

Complete neutrality, by which we sell nothing to any European warring nation, has a price tag on it—in dollars and cents—in the dollars and cents you won't make in sales by insuring American peace.

There's a price tag on split neutrality, too—and it's in American blood—written in the blood of your loved ones.

And if the bloody price tag is to be paid—there's another payoff in the depression after the drunken war profits cease. And remember, we'll have that depression with us, because we still haven't found the answers to that depression which has been with us for the past 9 years.

The people of this entire planet must—in a wide sense—be regarded as a community. Just keep that community idea in mind—and see where it leads us.

The present European war is a disease epidemic that is killing men, women, and children, but only a few isolated men have dared tell you to stay away from that disease epidemic. Switch the analogy to your own community. Suppose an epidemic of infantile paralysis was raging there. Would you be thinking of your lofty rights and privileges or profits, or your safety, and the safety of your loved one, big and little?

Suppose you are trying to avoid epidemic localities. You have a right to enter them, at your own risk. There's a wild-eyed fellow on a soapbox telling you: "It's your right to go into those places, and no one can stop you." Would you heed him, or keep on your way, without worrying about your rights and such rot? You'd keep moving, just as I would. Contact with the epidemic center means greater risk of becoming infected. You'd keep moving—or more sensibly—you'd stay home and keep your people at home.

Apply this analogy to the war in Europe and you've got the answer.

What will we do about our export trade if it is cut off from Europe temporarily? To the south of us is a great continental market, rich in raw material and low in factory-finished products. Cultivate and take that market with good old American business sales methods, and hold it with sound American products—especially now—while Europe, which has always had an eye on that market, can't get at it, being too busy cutting throats.

What about that "wolf-wolf" gag, about "maybe we will have to fight the winner of the present European war?" That's assinine. It's a gag to mislead you. When this war is over, Europe will be so distressed sharing the spoils, if any, and trying to hold their respective governments together, that America will be safer than ever. Especially will this be true if, instead of arming any of them, we get down to brass tacks and arm ourselves with the finest equipment for an impregnable national-defense system.

Europe is a bad business risk for Americans. We underwrote Europe, and its hazy democracy, in 1917. And, as a businessman, I'd say to Europe: "No more American support—money or otherwise. You're busted again. You fail to show a profit by preserving the democracy we financed in 1917. And if we back you again, you'll be back again in a few years asking for another handout. Nothing doing! We're going to preserve the democracy of the only nation in the world where democracy seems to mean something, and when you're all through with your power politics slaughtering, we will still be a going democratic concern. You! Europe, started this brawl without asking us—now finish it—and pay for it—without asking us."

I know some of the foreign propagandists who are in America now and perhaps listening to me—and I am talking to them as well as to Americans—I hope they understand that we are onto their game and want none of it. And so, to you smart propagandists, "Get back to your homes in Europe where there's death and war, and for once be found dead, if necessary, in the front lines, where no propagandist has ever been found, dead or alive.

We have had our one bloody lesson and your unpaid debts accuse themselves."

And, still speaking as an ordinary American citizen, I challenge anyone to show me that any of the proposed so-called neutrality laws proposed by the administration and now under consideration, are neutral in fact or are sponsored by anyone whose record has been stainlessly neutral to date.

The National Association of Manufacturers, and some sections of big business, came forth with a general statement: "We can and must stay out of war. Industry opposes the utilization of war emergency to boost prices for the purposes of making excessive profits." That statement was planned to prove American big business does not want war. I say the issue is not war; it is neutrality. But they say nothing about neutrality.

All America wants peace. Some of America had been led into thinking there is a way to insure peace, yet make money out of peace. Part of this confusion is the result of foreign propaganda—part from the efforts of so-called Americans, who are selling you on foreign entanglements while waving the American flag, and the rest of the confusion is attributable to an administration that is unmistakably unneutral and has been unmistakably unneutral in utterance and attitude.

And by the administration, I mean the President, his Cabinet, and certain portions of the Congress. What have I got to back up that statement? Well, here's the story as I see it:

The President's speech on "the quarantining of aggressor nations" scared the wits out of me. That speech meant he proposed to enforce peace—a world-wide policing job.

Prior to that, Americans had been worried about the moves of the President and Secretary of State Hull to back up England's plans for bluffing Mussolini out of his Abyssinian campaign.

The President, and Secretary Hull, and the entire Cabinet, tolerated the Chinese-Japanese War for years, and refused to declare a state of war existed—even though hundreds of thousands of soldiers were killed and armies were in the field.

The President has persistently used the scare phrase when leaving or returning from vacations: "Unless there is war in the fall; unless there is war."

Do you recall the crash of that Douglas bomber—which even American airmen were not allowed to see? When that ship crashed—killing my friend, Johnny Cable—a passenger was found on board. At first he was given a false name but later was identified as a representative of the French Air Minister.

Who cooked up that deal—and what other deals are in the making?

The most devastating recent shock to the nerves of Americans was the President's report to his press conference that two submarines had been sighted near the American coasts. That report should have come from the United States Navy. Coming from the President, it scared the country—and his jocular comment, after refusing to identify the subs: "They might have been Swiss submarines"—did not reduce the scare effect.

I have disagreed with other administrations and other Presidents in the past. That's my right. I expect to disagree with other administrations and other Presidents in the future. But this is the first time I have ever feared a President or an administration.

And now this same administration is seeking full and complete authority to handle our neutrality policy while a war is on in Europe. Looking over that record, I say, "Don't give them that authority."

Without further ado, what does the President mean by urging that "we return to international law?" England made her own international law in the last war. The German subs made theirs—and when we entered the war we made our international law.

My answer is that there is no such thing as an international law that will hold in wartime. Don't take my word for that—read history. And since there is no international law I ask, Who or what is going to decide what becomes of America in case we insist upon trading with warring Europe?

The President and the administration want such authority under the proposed repeal of the Embargo Act. I say again, "Don't give it to them." The men who wrote the Constitution, upon breaking with a tyrannical English King, wrote it with one basic idea, namely, that no one man or group of men outside Congress should ever again have such powers to run this country and the destinies of its people by proclamation. They knew the bitter taste of dictatorship. If you permit that authority to pass into the hands of any one man and slip that one remaining anchor chain of liberty, you are done as a democratic nation. Insist that the present Embargo Act be held as it is—unchanged.

Insist that Congress remain in session to handle our critical foreign affairs and until peace is declared in Europe. Under the Constitution this is the right and the function of Congress, not of the President. Insist that Congress muzzle the loose talkers in this administration, who, pretending to speak for themselves, are actually and deliberately shaping our international relations toward war. Democracy is not on trial; it's the leaders of democracy who are on trial. Democracy will live on forever. May God give you one ray of light to see the safety and sense of sticking for strict neutrality and for paying the price, which is a money price, and not a blank mandate on American liberties nor on American blood.

And if this is all too plain and too clear, just remember that, inspired by and paraphrasing the words of John Hancock, "Here it is—big enough and blunt enough for anyone to understand it."

Peace is a state of mind—of mind your own business. And America's business is here in the Americas.

Aspects of War in Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD R. BURKE

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 16 (legislative day of Wednesday, October 4), 1939

ARTICLE BY JACQUES MARITAIN

Mr. BURKE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article under the heading "Europe is already saved," written by Jacques Maritain, and published in the Commonweal.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EUROPE IS ALREADY SAVED

(By Jacques Maritain)

The thing which I want to say at once and that I want to cry from the housetops is that the spiritual situation of Europe has completely changed and that the salvation of Europe has begun. I am absolutely convinced that western civilization will be saved. To be more precise, it is already saved. At the price of whatever mass sacrifice, perhaps of what torrents of blood, of what destruction, after however many months of sorrow and agony, this salvation may be realized in events themselves, I beg you to believe that on that subject I am not suffering from any optimistic illusion.

I know what night we are entering; into what general ruin it is feared that the civilized universe may be thrown. But I also know that in this ruin the universe will not perish; I know that this night is not a night of despair but a night of resurrection. For anyone who seeks to understand the drama of human history from a point of view beyond that of the immediate moment, it seems that he must have an unshakable confidence in the final result of the war which has just begun.

I said that the spiritual situation of Europe has completely changed: The striking indication of this change is the Russo-German alliance. It has completed the unmasking of the enemy. For a long time, for a very long time, people everywhere—in the Old World as well as in the New—had been asking themselves this question, "Are we not forced to choose between communism and Hitlerism?" How many souls were tempted by their just horror of the Fascist and totalitarian slavery to sympathize with communism; how many were tempted by their just horror of the Communist slavery to sympathize with totalitarianism? In the name of the "principle of the lesser evil," falsely applied, were thus excused all crimes.

And when we took pains ceaselessly to explain that here was a question of two opposite aspects of the same evil, of two horns of the same devil, only those understood who attached some importance to the philosophy of history. Now the whole world understands, in the shattering clarity of events. One has only to see in one's mind Herr von Ribbentrop, the promoter of the anti-Comintern agreements, decorated with the Order of Lenin; it is sufficient to see Stalin and Ribbentrop shaking hands while they smile at one another the cynical smile of accomplices.

The moral sickness from which the Occident was wasting away, the horrible lie by virtue of which each believed himself obliged to choose between one bad thing and another bad thing and to set up one evil in opposition to another evil—such was the profound thing which threatened the civilized world with a self-destruction for which there was no remedy. That thing has disappeared. The false front of being a defender of order and civilization by which with diabolical hypocrisy the revolution of Hitler had disguised itself has fallen away. Iniquity and violence have met; the Marxist opposition to Christianity has embraced Hitler's opposition to Christianity.

Everybody clearly realizes that, whether bolstered by the myth of the dictatorship of one class or by the myth of the superiority of one race—by the Marxist-Stalinist myth of the state calling itself Socialist, embodying the proletariat and its destiny, or by the Hitler myth of the state calling itself "proletarian," embodying the superior race and its destiny—there is only one revolution; and this revolution is in essence directed against the first principles of all Christian civilization, against everything which indicates the mark of God on man, against everything which implies respect for the human person, for justice, and for truth, against everything which relates to greatness and liberty of the human soul. Hitler is the precursor (fourrier) of Stalin.

The illusion which held that the world was divided between the two antagonistic forces of Communist totalitarianism and of racist totalitarianism has been dispelled. Moreover, we know clearly that both one and the other totalitarianism are in reality but a single spirit, a single homicidal force. And face to face with that force is another which one can no longer call a third force (since the two which it opposed at the same time are now joined together)—that very force which created Europe and which has its purest sources in the Gospel, and which, while it requires our civilization to purify and renew itself in a radical way, nevertheless appears manifest as the vital principle of that same civilization. Here is the capital historical change which, in the spiritual order, we have just witnessed.

I have said that western civilization is already saved. The signal indication of that salvation is the way in which two people who have a horror of war have entered into war to stop the monstrous enterprise of Hitler's domination. When, on the level of temporal strife, anti-Christian totalitarian force took up with Hitler the arms of military aggression; when, treading underfoot all international good faith, German National Socialism undertook to impose by violence its will upon Poland and to devour that country while sheltering itself under the terror of a general European war, at that moment France and Great Britain took up the challenge; they deliberately opened the gates of war, knowing to what they exposed themselves. * * *

Civilization does not die unless it betrays itself. As long as it is capable of actions such as this one, it can suffer the most enormous losses; it is sure that it will not perish. However terrible may be the ordeal it will not be a tragedy but a sacrifice. And the end of a tragedy is death; but the end of a sacrifice is salvation and resurrection.

Jeanne d'Arc left us this prophecy: That one day France and England would unite to accomplish together a great enterprise. In one sense the present war seems to be the continuation of the war of 1914, but now its apocalyptic aspect has become manifest. Quite obviously it is for the common good of civilized humanity that France and England suffer and fight and that Poland has been martyred; it is for the fundamental human values to which every free spirit in the world, particularly the spirit of the American Nation, is attached. I know that the American public is clearly aware of this; that is why it is sufficient for me to mention the point briefly. If Hitler should triumph, the ideal of a society of free men, based on an effective respect for the rights of the person, offering to each an equal opportunity to develop the gifts which each has received from God, and allowing for fraternal cooperation, would receive a heart's blow. But Hitler will not triumph.

Permanent Crop Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. BANKHEAD, 2D

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 16 (legislative day of Wednesday, October 4), 1939

EDITORIAL FROM THE BIRMINGHAM NEWS OF OCTOBER 13, 1939

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a splendid

editorial from the Birmingham News of October 13, 1939, on the subject of permanent crop control.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Birmingham (Ala.) News of October 13, 1939]

CROP CONTROL IS HERE TO STAY

Out of the efforts made during the last decade to improve the position of the American farmer, at least one national policy of major importance seems to be definitely established as a part of our agricultural economy. That is crop control.

In the light of events in recent years, it is hard to see how we can do without some kind of control over production in the few major crops, particularly cotton, wheat, tobacco, and possibly one or two others. It seems to be the only device whereby ruinous overproduction of these staple commodities can be prevented.

We shall probably continue to have crop control for two reasons. One is that it seems necessary, and the other is that the farmers themselves apparently do not intend to let go of the device, which in general has worked reasonably well for them.

After crop control was first adopted—with the consent of the farmers themselves—prices of the major agricultural commodities rose from the extremely low levels of the worst depression years, and the huge surpluses began to diminish. By preventing too great overproduction and cutting down the surpluses crop control put agriculture on a sounder and more stable basis. On crops of more moderate size farmers were able to obtain better prices and realize a higher income.

American agriculture was doing better from 1933 to 1936 than it had in years, largely because of crop control. Then in 1936 came the Supreme Court decision which invalidated the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and as a consequence of that the crop control acts were repealed. Immediately, we had overproduction again in the major crops, and prices tumbled. The farmers were almost back where they were before 1933.

In 1937, the first full crop year after the A. A. A. decision and the repeal of the crop-control acts, we grew the largest cotton crop in history, about 19,000,000 bales. In other major agricultural commodities we grew crops that were among the largest on record, if not the very largest.

This was no accident. The crops of 1936 were held to reasonable limits because, even though the A. A. A. was invalidated and the control acts repealed early that year, the machinery for controlling crops then being planted had already been put into operation. Crop control continued in existence for the crop year of 1936.

When almost all effective regulation of crops had been removed, farmers overproduced enormously in 1937, and the resulting collapse of agricultural commodity prices was probably the most important factor in bringing on the business recession which began that year.

Then, in 1938 and again this year, a measure of production control was again established in some of the major crops, though not all, and yields were once more brought within fairly reasonable limits.

The history of the improvement in the agricultural position from 1933 through 1936, the severe setback in 1937 after the invalidation of the A. A. A. and the repeal of the original crop control acts, and the beginning of another upturn in agriculture following the reestablishment of crop control in the last 2 years, offers convincing evidence of both the need and the effectiveness of regulated production.

Further proof of a very significant nature is found in the experience of one major farm group in the last 2 years—the bright-tobacco growers. These producers rejected the control plan for bright tobacco in the crop year of 1939. In the referendum a majority of the tobacco growers—50-odd percent—voted for crop control, but the majority was less than the required two-thirds, so there was no limitation of production. If memory serves, this was the first time that producers of a major crop failed to authorize control.

The result was that this year's crop in the bright-tobacco region was the largest in history—1,014,670,000 pounds. This overproduction glutted the market, and prices fell by one-third from the 1938 levels. Naturally, the bright-tobacco growers found themselves in a distressful condition.

The bright-tobacco growers learned their lesson from this experience. In the referendum held a few days ago on the question of a control program for the 1940 crop they voted overwhelmingly for control. The majority was about 9 to 1 in the six States participating—Georgia, Florida, Alabama, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Virginia. The percentages of the vote in favor of control ranged from 82 percent in Florida to 97.5 percent in Alabama, and the average for the six States was 89.9 percent.

With the record production this year and a carry-over of nearly 2,000,000,000 pounds, obviously the sensible thing to do was to restrict production for next year. The aim of the 1940 control program is to limit acreage to an amount that will produce not more than 660,000,000 pounds.

After experiences such as farmers have had in cotton, wheat, and tobacco in recent years, it is to be expected that in the future they will generally vote for crop control. As long as the farmers themselves have the decision on production control in their own hands, and as long as a two-thirds majority is required to make it effective, the device will be democratic in nature, and therefore not subject to objection on the ground that it is regimentation by government.

Crop control may not solve all our agricultural problems. But it is now clear that, whatever else is done, control of production in the major crops is essential to the stability of our agricultural economy.

A Comparison, Germany Today—And in 1914

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 16, 1939

RADIO COLLOQUY BETWEEN HON. EMANUEL CELLER, OF NEW YORK, AND DR. MAX WINKLER

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following colloquy between Dr. Max Winkler and myself, over station WOR, of the Mutual Broadcasting Co., on Friday, October 13, 1939, at 11:15 p. m., entitled "A Comparison, Germany Today—And in 1914," as follows:

Congressman CELLER. My attention has been directed to a statement in the Voelkischer Beobachter, Hitler's own newspaper, prior to the outbreak of the present conflict. It read, in part:

"Germany today is stronger than she was in July 1914. * * * The potential production of German industry in case of war is * * * much greater today than in 1914 because of the installation of modern machinery."

In your opinion, Dr. Winkler, is this statement true?

Dr. WINKLER. It is not. It was in all probability designed to impress the German reader, or those who are ignorant of the profound changes which have taken place in Germany since 1914 along economic and financial lines. I would say the reverse is true.

Congressman CELLER. In other words, Germany today is much worse off economically than she was at the outbreak of or during the first World War?

Dr. WINKLER. That is correct. Germany's own official figures, which certainly do not understate the situation, will prove it.

To begin with, Germany's stock of gold, which is still the universally accepted standard of value, has all been dissipated, with the result that German money has ceased to have any value in the financial markets of the world.

Congressmn CELLER. How do you explain another observation made by the Voelkischer Beobachter, namely:

"The times when it was predominantly necessary to have gold to wage a war are past"?

Dr. WINKLER. This would be true if Germany had either credit or foreign investments which could be liquidated and the proceeds used to pay for much that is needed by Germany to prosecute a war.

Congressman CELLER. But Germany has neither. Her credit has been destroyed as a result of her repudiation of virtually all legitimately contracted debts. Her foreign investments are estimated at a maximum of 5,000,000,000 marks, and much of it is in countries with exchange restrictions or regulations, thus rendering liquidation thereof difficult, if not impossible.

	Now	Prior to war	Decline
			Percent
Gold stock	RM70, 773, 000	RM1, 238, 000, 000	94. 28
Notes in circulation	8, 092, 000, 000	2, 742, 000, 000	[1] 195. 11
Ratio of gold to notes	0. 87	45. 15	
Federal debt	32, 580, 000, 000	5, 157, 897, 000	548. 40
Exports	5, 911, 000, 000	10, 198, 600, 000	42. 88
Imports	5, 468, 000, 000	11, 206, 100, 000	52. 16
Total trade	11, 379, 000, 000	21, 404, 700, 000	46. 85
Foreign investments	5, 000, 000, 000	30, 000, 000, 000	83. 33

[1] Increase.

Dr. WINKLER. What was Germany's political position in the last World War and her economic advantages as a result thereof?

Congressman CELLER. When Germany plunged the world into war a quarter of a century ago, the Reich had an alliance with Austria-Hungary, Italy, and Rumania. She was successful in inducing also Bulgaria and Turkey to join what was known at the time as the Quadruple Alliance. This combination was, without any question, a much more powerful factor to be reckoned with than the Germany of today. Because of these alliances, Germany had complete access to, and control of, the rich wheat fields of Hungary and Rumania, the rich oil fields of Rumania and Austrian Poland. She had control of the Dardanelles and thus occupied a very important and most enviable position in the Near East at the gateway of three continents.

Dr. WINKLER. Is it not true also that even in the battlefield the Germans managed to achieve marked success?

Congressman CELLER. Certainly. Within a relatively short time Germany was successfully waging the so-called blitzkrieg. She invaded and occupied almost one-third of France, including its most important industrial section. She even came within a few miles of Paris. She invaded and occupied all of Belgium and controlled the important seaport of Antwerp. She invaded and occupied virtually all of Russian Poland and pre-war Serbia. But after the war had progressed, both Italy and Rumania decided to throw in their lot with the Allied Powers. As a result, the German armies invaded and occupied virtually all of Rumania. Technically, Italy today is still an axis partner of Germany. But, undoubtedly, when Mussolini refers to this partnership he does so with his tongue in his cheek. It is significant that Air Marshal Italo Balbo, who undoubtedly speaks with the knowledge and consent of Il Duce, has called the Soviet leaders "tragic buffoons" and "models of gross bestiality." Certainly this characterization of Germany's newest partner suggests very strongly that history may repeat itself and that Italy again will take its place at the side of the Allies.

In the spring of 1918 the Russians were forced to lay down arms, and by virtue of the treaty which was signed with the Russians at Brest-Litovsk, virtually all of the Czarist Empire came under the control of Germany. Is it not obvious from all this that the Germany of a quarter of a century ago was immeasurably stronger than today?

Dr. WINKLER. It would seem so. One more thing: Hitler storms against the Versailles Treaty.

Congressman CELLER. It hardly lies in his mouth to complain. He seems to have forgotten the outrageous terms which were imposed upon the Russians or Rumanians by the conquering Germans. The shoe was then on the other foot. The Treaty of Brest-Litovsk provided that Russia cede to Germany an area of more than 300,000 square miles with a population of about 50,000,000, or one-third of the population of all Russia.

The territory ceded contained 35 percent of the entire transportation system of the Czarist empire, three-quarters of all the iron production, and almost 90 percent of the entire coal output. In addition, Russia was obliged to pay at the earliest possible moment a war indemnity amounting to 6,000,000,000 marks, or one and one-half billion gold dollars, and surrender the entire gold reserve of the Russian State Bank.

It is characteristic of German promises and the manner in which they keep them that prior to the Brest-Litovsk Treaty the German Government solemnly declared that the basis for negotiations with Russia would be "no indemnity and no annexations."

How about Germany's treatment, or, rather, mistreatment, of the Rumanians after they laid down their arms?

Dr. WINKLE. Two days after Brest-Litovsk the Rumanians were forced to lay down arms and seek for peace. A treaty was signed at Bucharest on May 7. The most characteristic provision of the treaty was an agreement whereby Rumania was to sell to Germany, for a period of 2 years, the surplus of its entire agricultural and mineral production at about one-half of the prevailing market prices, with the German Government reserving the right to renew this agreement for an additional 7 years. It was further provided that all Rumanian demesnes were to be leased to a German company for a period of 90 years, Rumania agreeing to supply labor in connection with the exploitation of the land. When the Rumanian delegate was on the verge of collapse as a result of being called upon to sign this shameful treaty, the German spokesman encouraged him by saying:

"This is indeed a treaty of genuine friendship compared with what we have in mind for England and France."

Congressman CELLER. Apparently, as to harshness and cruelty, the Versailles Treaty fades into insignificance when compared with the treaties of Brest-Litovsk and Bucharest, which Germany foisted upon Russia and Rumania.

Dr. WINKLER. Incidentally, what is your opinion about the Fuehrer's latest peace overture, and do you think it is a sincere offer of peace?

Congressman CELLER. No. Emphatically no. Hitler is really in a state of panic. He certainly is most anxious for peace, despite his successful blitzkrieg in Poland. His offer is prompted, however, by a genuine desire to save Germany from inevitable collapse. He is also reminded, perhaps, of the deposition and flight of the Kaiser. The situation in Germany as revealed by statistics, both official and semiofficial, is most desperate, and, despite all the assurances to the contrary, Germany is in no position to last through a protracted war.

Dr. WINKLER. The unholy alliance with Moscow is likely to prove an empty victory if not a real embarrassment. Foxy Stalin is playing both ends toward the middle. Note his recent barter of English rubber and tin for Russian timber—and he guarantees delivery to Britain, this despite German submarine menace.

Congressman CELLER. Is it not also true that Russia is in no position to supply Germany with raw materials, even if she were willing to sell to the Reich in return for very dubious I. O. U.'s?

Dr. WINKLER. This is absolutely so. I have before me a compilation of Russian production which was published in the Deutsche Volkswirt under date of August 11. Some 16 different products are examined, and it is found that in 13 cases the amount produced is either substantially below or just about equal to the minimum requirements within Russia. In only three cases is there any excess over domestic needs.

Congressman CELLER. These figures, moreover, apply to a peacetime consumption. In wartime the excess of output over home requirements is substantially less. Remember, also, that the only products which can be exported to Germany are manganese, timber, less what she barters to England, and very little oil. And as to these, the rising demands of Stalin's army may exhaust all surplus. Then, again, the difficulties of transportation are almost insurmountable. Practically all rail lines in Poland between Russia and Germany have been wrecked. There remains the Baltic, but this is too roundabout a way, as these products come from southern Russia.

Dr. WINKLER. There is no doubt about this.

Congressman CELLER. Much has been said about the enormous reserves which Germany has in food. What is Germany's position in this respect?

Dr. WINKLER. Here again we have official statistics which disprove the German boasts. The Frankfurter Zeitung, in an article published August 29, points out that the food reserves amounted on July 31, 1939, to 4,489,000 tons, of which 289,000 tons were in the hands of farmers and the remainder in warehouses and elevators. On the preceding day, August 28, the German Minister of Food Supplies, Walter Darie, in a broadcast to the German people, presumably for the purpose of allaying their fears created by the distribution of food ration cards, said, and I quote:

"We possessed on August 1, 1939, exclusive of the new harvest, a reserve of agricultural products aggregating 8,600,000 tons. The importance of this huge reserve is apparent if one realizes that all the requirements of the German people for bread and flour do not amount to more than this figure for a full year."

Congressman CELLER. It would, therefore, seem that the actual amount, as given by the Frankfurter Zeitung, is just about enough to last Germany slightly more than half a year.

Dr. WINKLER. It is apparent, is it not, Congressman CELLER, that the Nazis are repeating their exploits of the World War?

Congressman CELLER. Indeed they are. As in 1916–17, they have already sent forth their armed raiders disguised as merchant ships and these masked surface bandit ships are wreaking tremendous havoc to Swedish, Danish, Norwegian, Dutch, Finnish, and other neutral shipping. At this very moment the Nazis are conducting powerful propaganda in this country to continue the arms embargo. I personally am receiving mail sacks full of letters which bear Nazi earmarks. Among those I have received in opposition to my stand favoring the repeal of the arms embargo, are some 45 communications, presumably from 45 different constituents in my district. Strangely enough, the letters, all exactly alike, emanated from one address. I took the trouble to search out the house and, to my amazement, found it to be an empty lot. I have answered many of the other letters. Scores have replied that they were surprised to receive the acknowledgment, inasmuch as they had not written me. They complain that in all likelihood their names have been used by pressure groups. Hundreds of my acknowledgments have been returned to me marked "unknown at address." Furthermore, over 200 mimeographed postal cards bitterly assailing me were presumably sent out by residents in my district. Upon close examination we discovered that all of them are mailed from a Long Island City post office substation at 10 a. m. on the same day. Long Island City is far removed from my district.

In 1916 the Germans had a well-organized campaign to establish the arms embargo. The Source Records of the Great War, particularly volume 3, make interesting reading indicative of the extremes to which the Germans went in 1916–17 to influence public opinion in this country, especially to develop sentiment for an arms embargo. Count von Bernstoff openly boasted in his cables to the German Foreign Office that he was quite sure of a successful campaign to secure a majority of both Houses concerning the embargo. The American embargo conference was one of the Kaiser's numerous propaganda organizations in the United States. It was established to prevent the exportation of munitions to the Allies. The outfit distributed to 5,000,000 voters letters advocating an arms embargo. Twenty thousand dollars was paid into the Chicago offices alone of the two telegraph companies. Millions of pamphlets and circulars were also distributed, particularly denouncing American makers of munitions. In the volumes aforesaid there may be found frequent requests successfully made by Von Bernstoff to Wilhelmstrasse for additional funds to force pro-German policies on Congress. President Wilson was in fact accused of unneutrality in permitting exports of munitions concerning which Count von Bernstoff lodged a protest with the State Department. Wilson denied the request of Von Bernstoff and refused to depart from the neutrality that the United States had always followed, as that doctrine had been understood in international law. Frankly, I say again that we must stand by that international law. It is our anchor to windward. We always relied upon our right to purchase munitions from neutrals in our hours of war and need. A right which we always asserted for ourselves we cannot now deny to others.

Dr. WINKLER. Is not Hitler's recent speech a bullying bid for peace very much like the Reich 1916 peace note?

Congressman CELLER. The resemblance is unmistakable. Germany made a peace move in 1916, after the fall of Bucharest, Rumania. She had been dreadfully weakened by her losses in the Battle of the Somme. Emperor Franz Josef and his Austrian-Hungarian Army were getting scared. Food and fuel were running short. The Kaiser then sought peace as Hitler now seeks peace—for the same reasons. The Kaiser's military staff cautioned him not to make any bid for peace and at the same time give any hint of weakness. He must wait until after an important German success. The dodge is being revived by Hitler. The victory of Bucharest provided the opportunity then, just as the fall of Warsaw provides it now. Examine Hitler's speeches and the Kaiser's plea for peace

and you find both containing the same admixture of cant, bombast, and sheer gall.

Apparently there is nothing new. Just as in the World War, the German Government gave repeated assurances which proved worthless, so, too, Hitler, in the last few years, has likewise made pledge after pledge which he has convincingly demonstrated to be so many scraps of paper.

Dr. WINKLER. Do you not agree that it is the economic war rather than the war on land or in the air which Germany dreads most?

Congressman CELLER. I certainly do.

Dr. WINKLER. In other words, we are more or less in agreement as to the importance which economic weapons play in modern warfare. The employment of these weapons which are possessed by the western powers and not by the autocracies justify the hopes and expectations that the tyranny of Hitler and all that Hitlerism stands for will collapse, as did the tyranny of the Hohenzollerns and all they stood for 20 years ago. Democracy then triumphed over autocracy and will undoubtedly triumph again.

Strengthen Defenses; Keep Peace Uppermost in Mind

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. IVOR D. FENTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 16, 1939

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I want to emphatically state that our country must be kept out of the European war. Our Army and Navy must be strong enough to defend the United States from invasion, and which will also help to guarantee the peace of our Nation.

I have received thousands of petitions from my constituents in the hard coal area of Schuylkill and Northumberland Counties in Pennsylvania. Hundreds have come from other parts of the country.

Many petitions favor retention of the arms-embargo provision of the present Neutrality Act; others propose repeal. Many citizens want no change in the act; others urge different forms of modifications.

With some of the greatest countries of the world now in conflict, God only knows what the morrow will bring. The momentous question of neutrality is one in which there is a great variance of opinion.

Personally, I pray to God that the United States will not become involved in another conflict which will sap the life and vitality of our Nation. As one who has served in the World War, I think I can speak authoritatively of the horrors of war.

In my every action I have endeavored to follow principles which I conscientiously believe will help keep our country from becoming involved in foreign entanglements.

I hope, in the future, the Almighty will grant me the foresight and wisdom to act in a manner that will safeguard the neutrality of our country at a time when judgment is so sorely pressed, and what we might regard as a trivial move might have far-reaching and disastrous consequences.

I am 100 percent for an Army and Navy strong enough to defend our country from invasion, and which will help guarantee the peace of our Nation.

Our country must be kept out of the European war. Never again should the life of our manhood be sacrificed on the blood-stained battlefields of Europe.

As we are in special session my thoughts in Congress and my actions will certainly reflect the spirit of my constituents at home, whom I have faithfully endeavored to serve during the last session.

It is my fervent prayer that during the present situation my actions will be in the best interests of my constituents and our beloved country.

The people of the United States are a peace-loving people. The best way to protect that peace is to strengthen our defenses, and keep peace uppermost in our minds.

Dedication of the Hispanic Room in the Library of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 16, 1939

RADIO ADDRESS BY ARCHIBALD MacLEISH, LIBRARIAN OF CONGRESS

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, as war rages in Europe our relations with the Hispanic American republics become increasingly important. The inescapable forces of foreign war constantly raise up problems of cultural, diplomatic, and commercial relations with our neighboring American nations which require the friendliest atmosphere for their solution. Although friendship between nations is an end in itself, there is now more justification than that for good relations. The American nations must draw together, in free and voluntary union, for defense against the forces threatening their peace, their freedom, and their ancient democracy.

Few Government agencies are so well situated to aid in advancing this necessary and desirable common front as the Library of Congress. On Columbus Day Archibald MacLeish, Librarian of Congress, dedicated the Hispanic room in the Library of Congress. His address was broadcast to Central and South America. It was a magnificent beginning of what will undoubtedly be a most important contribution by the Library of Congress to the cause of better American relations. I take great pleasure in extending my remarks with the following text of the address by Dr. MacLeish:

REMARKS OF ARCHIBALD MACLEISH, LIBRARIAN OF CONGRESS, ON THE OCCASION OF THE DEDICATION OF THE HISPANIC ROOM IN THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS, OCTOBER 12, 1939

This is an occasion without precedent in the history of the Library of Congress. But not perhaps for the reason of which you think. It is an occasion without precedent in the history of the Library of Congress because it is the first time in the Library's history when the Librarian has opened a new building or a new division with a speech.

The Library moved across from the Capitol to the building in which we stand to the accompaniment of an eloquent and admired silence. Forty years later it pushed its frontiers across the street to the Annex, which can be seen from these windows, without a single word. Today it opens its Hispanic room with a speech by the Librarian.

Unkind critics or unkinder friends will suggest that the difference is a difference in Librarians—that my predecessor being truly a librarian knew the golden value of that silence to which students in libraries are continually admonished; whereas I, being a versifier, suffer from the itch for words which has always characterized my calling. It is a plausible explanation for it contains much truth. There is indeed a difference in Librarians and a difference, I fear, for the worse.

But the real explanation is not this. The real explanation is that the times change as well as the men. There are times when a great institution can let stone and mortar speak for it. And there are other times when it must attempt to speak, however haltingly, for itself.

This is such a time. Once the value of the things of the spirit could be taken for granted. Once it could be taken for granted anywhere in the civilized world that the free inquiry of the free spirit was essential to the dignified and noble life of man. Once it could be assumed as a matter of course that the work of artists, the work of poets, the work of scholars, was good and should be respected and would be preserved. Now it is no longer possible to assume these things. Now—and it is still incredible to us that it should be true—now such an act of faith in the life of the human spirit as we perform here today, such an act of respect for the labor of poets and scholars and of love for that which they have made, cannot be taken for granted; cannot be left to speak for itself even in a room as beautiful, as eloquent as this. It is necessary for us to say what it is that we are doing and why it is that we are doing it.

I for one am not proud of this necessity. I am not glad that it is necessary to speak.

What we do is this: We dedicate here a room and a division of the Library of Congress which has been set apart for the preservation and the study and the honor of the literature and scholarship of those other republics which share with ours the word American,

and which share with ours also the memories of human hope and human courage which that word evokes—evokes now as never before in the history of our hemisphere.

Why we do it is also obvious. We do it because this literature and this scholarship are worthy in themselves of the closest study and the most meticulous care and the greatest veneration; and because they, more than any other literature and more than any other scholarship, help us in this Republic to understand the American past which is common to us all.

We are beginning to perceive, as the peaceful dream of the nineteenth century fades away and the economic theories and scientific theories, which were to explain everything, fade away with it—we are beginning to perceive that man never was, and never can be, such a philosophic abstraction as the thinkers of that century supposed—that man is a creature living on this earth and that the earth he lives on qualifies his life. America has shaped and qualified and redirected the lives of men living on her continents for 400 years. But we who are born in America and live our lives here, have not very well understood our relations to these continents, nor our debt to them, nor in what way they have altered us and changed our bodies and our minds.

We have not understood this because we have turned, for the most part, to the literature and the scholarship of Europe for instruction, and for the interpretation of our world. Those of us who were of Latin origin have turned to the literatures of latinized Europe, and those of us who were of English and Celtic and Scandinavian and Teutonic origin to the literatures of northern Europe. We have found there great treasures, great wisdom, high instruction—but only rarely an interpretation of our own lives in terms of the earth we know. Even the American child reading his European poems feels the strangeness: the seasons are wrong, the springs too early or too slow, the birds and animals different.

It is a curious condition but one which, by long habit, we have come to take as natural. We have looked at America with borrowed European eyes so long that we should hardly recognize the country if we saw it with our own. Doubtless we shall continue for many generations to look at America with these eyes. Our cultural inheritance is European by origin, and like other European legatees of other legacies we can enjoy it only in the original currency. Which means inevitably that we employ that original currency to value our American lives. But though it is inevitable that the great richness of our European past should impose its values upon our American present, it is not inevitable, and it is surely not desirable, that the great richness of our European past should exclude us from the richness of our own.

From the beginning of the sixteenth century there has been accumulating on these continents a body of recorded American experience of the very greatest importance to anyone concerned to understand the American earth and the relation of that earth to the men who live upon it. Because this experience has been recorded in several languages and because it has been deposited in scattered places—places as far apart as Santiago de Chile and Bogotá and Buenos Aires and Mexico City and New Orleans and St. Louis and Quebec—because, furthermore, it has been overlaid with the continuing importation of European literature and European thought—for all these reasons the recorded American experience has not influenced the common life of the Americas as it should have influenced it. It has not been useful to an understanding of the Americas as it should have been useful.

Other men who know these continents better than I know them—other men who know these records of the American experience better than I shall ever know them—will think of many instances in their own lives when the words of men who lived in the Americas before them have made suddenly clear, and suddenly explicable, matters they had long wished to understand. But even in my shallow knowledge of these things there is one such indebtedness. Some 12 years ago in a Paris library I came upon a copy of Bernal Diaz' True History of the Conquest of New Spain. There in that still living, still human, still sharply breathing and believable story of Mexico it seemed to me that I understood for the first time the Central American experience—the experience which is American because it can be nothing else—the experience of all those who, of whatever tongue, are truly American—the experience of the journey westward from the sea into the unknown and dangerous country beyond which lies the rich and lovely city for which men hope.

I tried at that time to make a poem of this understanding. The argument of my poem began—

Of that world's conquest and the fortunate wars;
Of the great report and expectation of honor.
How in their youth they stretched sail; how fared they
Westward under the wind, by wave wandered,
Shoaled ship at the last at the ends of ocean.
How they were marching in the lands beyond.
Of the difficult ways there were and the winter's snow;
Of the city they found in the good lands: how they lay in it;
How there was always the leaves and the days going.

Other men will say the same thing in other words and many of them better. Historians will tell us how their study of the documents and monuments of Mexico and Peru opened to their minds the true perspective of American civilization—a civilization of which the first European date is the year 1523 when a school for Indian boys was opened in Mexico City—of which the first American date lies deep under the limestone waters of Yucatan and the iron earth of Guatemala. Scholars will speak of the year 1539 when the first book to be printed in the Americas was printed in the city of Mexico. Lovers of human liberty will remember the name of Carlos de Sigüenza y Góngora who, in the year 1691, at a time when witches were being hung in Salem, successfully defended against the ecclesiastics of Mexico his opinion that the great eclipse of that year was a natural event. They will quote against all witch-burners in all centuries and countries his noble words: "I stood with my quadrant and telescope viewing the [blackened] sun, extremely happy and repeatedly thanking God for having granted that I might behold what so rarely happens in a given place and about which there are so few observations in the books."

No man living in the United States can truly say he knows the Americas unless he has a knowledge of these things—a knowledge of this other American past, this older American past which shares with ours the unforgettable experience of the journey toward the west and the westward hope.

What we are doing in this room, then, is to dedicate to the uses of the citizens of the United States, and to the uses of learners and readers everywhere, these records of the American experience. In this Hispanic room of the Library, students of the Americas may follow the great Iberian tradition which has populated with its ideas and its poetry by far the greater part of these two continents. Here they may read the rich and various works written in these continents in the Iberian tongues—the two great tongues which, with our own, have become the American language. Here, if our hopes are realized, Americans may some day find the greatest collection of Hispanic literature and scholarship ever gathered in one place.

There are men in the world today—and many rather than few—who say that the proper study of mankind is not man but a particular kind of man. There are those who teach that the only cultural study proper to a great people is its own culture. There are those also who say that the only real brotherhood is that blood brotherhood for which so many wars have been fought and by which so many deaths are still justified. The dedication of this room and of this collection of books is a demonstration of the fact that these opinions are not valid in the Americas; that in the Americas, peopled by so many hopes, so many sufferings, so many races, the highest brotherhood is still the brotherhood of the human spirit and the true study is the study of the best.

This is the belief of the people of this Republic expressed by the action of their National Library in the dedication of this room.

Why Be Foolish Again?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL C. MICHENER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 16, 1939

EDITORIAL FROM THE DETROIT FREE PRESS

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, the Detroit Free Press is one of the outstanding newspapers in the State of Michigan and the Middle West. A constituent has called my attention to a recent editorial in the Detroit Free Press, which I feel confident expresses the sentiment of an overwhelming majority of the people of Michigan.

Pursuant to the authority given to me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include this editorial, which is as follows:

[From the Detroit Free Press of September 24, 1939]

WHY BE FOOLISH AGAIN?

We in America separated from Europe and put an ocean between ourselves and that continent because we wanted to live more free, more wholesome, more comfortable and saner lives than could be lived there.

We came to America because we wanted to get away from the silly festering quarrels and enmities of the Old World, from its barbarous wars and from its miasmic morals.

We came to America because we didn't want to be ruled by an overlord or a military caste, or by autocratic fiat, but wanted to rule ourselves.

Then in 1917 we found ourselves inveigled and bullied into going back and wallowing in the old mess.

This was in part because we listened to seductive propaganda, and in part because we had neglected to maintain a power of self-defense which would have made even reckless belligerents respect our rights.

The rewards for our foolishness were the lives and limbs of thousands upon thousands of the best of our youth, a war debt of billions of dollars, a moral and economic upset from which we

have not yet recovered, and flagrant, and in some cases abusive, ingratitude from those we had aided.

And all we did was a total loss. We did not help Europe, and we hurt ourselves grievously and dangerously.

Now efforts are being made by all sorts of propagandists to induce us to do the same foolish thing a second time.

These propagandists try to appeal to our sympathies and to our sentimentality, to our prejudices and to our hates. They undertake to flatter and scare us. They try to tempt us with promises of gain and to intimidate us with threats of loss.

We are told by people who wag their heads mournfully that we "can't stay out."

But all this is just the old gold-brick game, whether it is run from Washington or London or Paris or by whisperers in parlors and clubs and on street corners.

Twenty-two years ago we allowed ourselves to be led across the ocean by the nose to grovel in the chronic slaughterhouse which is Europe. We know what the reward was. Why in the name of common human intelligence should we fall for that sort of thing again?

Civil Liberties in America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES H. LEAVY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 16, 1939

ADDRESS BY HON. FRANK MURPHY

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Speaker, the matter of what constitutes civil liberties and what constitutes an infringement thereon is always of great concern in our country. In unusual periods of national and international stress, when our emotions rather than our reason control our actions, civil liberties are often endangered and impaired. We are passing through just such a period at this time, and the sound, patriotic counsel of men who understand and know is entitled to unusual consideration.

On October 13, 1939, in New York City, at a conference on civil liberties, the Honorable Frank Murphy, Attorney General of the United States, delivered an address which was broadcast throughout the Nation on this important subject of civil liberties. Attorney General Murphy has demonstrated time without number, as head of the chief law-enforcing agency of the United States Government, that he is a man of sound judgment, high ideals, and a patriotism not excelled anywhere in this great land of ours. This address, entitled "The Test of Patriotism," will serve for many years as a guide for every liberty-loving American.

I am proud to have the privilege of making this speech of this great man a part of the permanent records of this Congress by having it inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and I cannot too highly commend it to my fellow citizens everywhere. The address follows:

Five months ago, when the western world was still clinging to an uncertain peace, I was privileged to meet with a group of municipal officials and to discuss with them the subject of civil liberties. I had occasion to say that in my settled conviction the finest contribution which America has made to civilization is our loyalty to the idea of civil liberty.

Tonight, when much of the western world is torn by a fierce and bloody war, I want very heartily to reaffirm that conviction.

It is true that in certain parts of the world might for the moment appears to be triumphant over right. It is true that in many countries the traditional civil and religious rights of the individual are no longer recognized.

These are realistic facts that we must realistically face. Common sense dictates that with virility and courage we must prepare ourselves to guard all the magnificent physical and spiritual resources that make up our national heritage. To let our defenses weaken, to be soft or infirm in our attitude toward national security, would be a faithless and unworthy thing.

But while we must be strong to protect our democratic heritage, we can and must still recognize that the heart and soul of our heritage is the civil liberty of the individual, and that in protecting our physical wealth we must not destroy our spiritual wealth of freedom. For civil liberty is still the finest possession of the American people. It is still that priceless thing without which life loses its dignity and becomes only a hopeless form of spritual slavery.

And by the same measure that civil liberty is precious to us we must be willing and determined to defend it against the forces that threaten to destroy it.

In a world filled with many uncertainties there are some things that are certain.

We know that in the hearts of the American people there is a great, steadfast desire to keep out of war. It is a desire for peace that no public servant or political leader in this land can afford to underestimate.

But we also know that in a world where force has been unleashed the mere desire for peace is not a guaranty that a peace-loving nation can remain at peace.

It is not enough for us merely to say that we want peace and that we abhor war—that we will have no part of war. When the world is aflame with war, or gravely threatened by war, it is the duty of a responsible government to do something more than talk peace. First, it must take active steps to prevent unnecessary involvement. Second, it should make itself ready to resist attack—not only attack from without but attack from within as well—attack by sabotage and subversive activities.

I am concerned tonight to discuss our defense from internal aggression. For we cannot be unmindful of the fact that the present attack on peace and liberty in Europe originated in the internal aggression of powerful groups against the democratic authority of their own lawfully established governments.

But in our zeal to protect ourselves from internal aggression, we must be on guard that we ourselves are not guilty of aggression against the civil liberties of our own citizens. We must not fall victim to the infection of despotism that in recent years has been sweeping the world. For if we suppress civil liberty, we suppress democracy itself.

In our own land this generation has seen a little of what happens when a crisis develops and the Government is not prepared to protect its people against internal attack. I have in mind the period of the World War and some of the wrongs against liberty that were done in the name of patriotism.

Let me make it plain that I have not come before you in the role of the "second guesser" who always knows afterward what should have been done in a particular situation. I am speaking only as a citizen and public servant who earnestly hopes and confidently believes that we, the American people, will profit by our own wartime mistakes and, even more, by the mistakes of other democracies that no longer live to tell the story.

I believe we all should recognize that however tragic the wrongs that were done, they sprang from misdirected zeal rather than evil intent.

We should remember that in the feverish, warlike atmosphere—an atmosphere which inevitably is dangerous to liberty—average citizens, normally calm and reasonable, became so imbued with the rightness of their cause that opposition or criticism was intolerable to them. Not only could they brook no open disagreement with national policy, but the failure of others to share their own attitude became in their eyes evidence of lack of patriotism.

From suspicion and distrust it was for some people an easy step to violence and vigilante activities. In some communities, irresponsible, extralegal organizations assumed functions that belonged properly to the civil authorities. And in some cases the civil authorities themselves were carried away by a hysteria of fear. Defenseless men and women were mistreated by such groups on mere suspicion. On many occasions the constitutional right of peaceful essembly was violated and homes were invaded and searched in the dark of night for evidence of disaffection and disloyalty. In their zeal to help defend their country well-meaning people resorted to methods which in the calm of peacetime would not be considered.

Even if we recognize, as we must, that this condition was not general, it is a picture that friends of democracy have every reason to regret. But I want to emphasize how much I believe that instead of viewing it with rancor toward anyone we should keep two things carefully in mind.

First, we should remember that much of this was done sincerely in the name of patriotism and national defense.

Second, we should keep in our minds and hearts a firm resolution that while making the security of the country our first and greatest concern in this troubled hour, we will injure not one of the qualities that have made this Nation the strongest haven of democracy and freedom on earth.

I know there are sincere individuals who earnestly believe that in a period like the present, when the country is seeking ways to avoid war but yet must prepare its defenses, it is not possible to maintain both civil liberty and a strong defense against internal attack at one and the same time. They are convinced that we must choose between the temporary suppression of civil rights and a weak and ineffective internal defense.

I do not believe that we face any such choice. I do not believe that a democracy must necessarily become something other than a democracy in order to protect its national interests. I am convinced that if the job is done right—if the defense against internal aggression is carefully prepared—our people need not suffer the tragic things that have happened elsewhere in the world and that we have seen, in less degree, even in this land of freedom. We can

prevent and punish the abuse of liberty by sabotage, disorder, and violence without destroying liberty itself.

At the time of the World War, the country's defense against internal attack was not fully prepared, and events took their natural course. The civil authorities were not trained for their new responsibilities. The door was wide open for irresponsible organizations to set themselves up as agencies of law enforcement. That is precisely what happened.

Today the picture is quite different. The delicate business of combating espionage has been coordinated under the Department of Justice. Under responsible direction, it will be carried on, as it is today, not by overzealous, inexperienced laymen, but by men who have been equipped for the work by careful training—training that includes instruction in the rights of the citizen as well as in methods of crime suppression. And we have every reason to expect them to be worthy of their training and instruction.

This work should be done and will be done by responsible employees of the Federal Government, acting in cooperation with the duly constituted law-enforcing agencies of State and local governments. There will be no alinement with agents of vigilante groups or private industrial organizations which are concerned primarily with industrial disputes and labor problems. Enforcement officials will themselves obey the law of the land.

I believe that in this way we can eliminate at least the occasion for many of the wrongs that were done under the stress and strain of the World War. But at the same time, I recognize that preparedness on the part of the Federal Government is not by itself a guaranty that these things will not happen again. To meet the double responsibility of self defense and preservation of civil liberty, we need from every State and local government and, preeminently, from every citizen, an equal determination that this responsibility shall be met.

We need, and we earnestly ask, from every citizen and every government an unswerving resolve that for as long as this crisis endures, we will keep our heads—that we will not abandon our bill of rights—that whatever measures we may adopt for our defense against subversive activities, we will use them just as calmly and judiciously as we do firmly and resolutely.

But given a thoroughly prepared internal defense, given the proper mental attitude of calmness and cool reasoning, we need something more. We need a sound sense of direction—a clear understanding of our own policy and our own position.

First, we need to remember that in an emergency it is right and just for our democracy to be on guard not only against internal attack by foreign agents but obstructive activities by people in our own ranks as well.

We have a right to expect that once a policy has been formulated and adopted by constitutional, democratic procedure, it will be accepted and observed by all as an expression of the sovereign will of the people, until such time as the policy is changed by constitutional methods. Even those who disagree with it should do their part to make it effective. This is the democratic way in peacetime; it is the democratic way in time of war.

Finally, we have a right to expect that attempts to prevent the fulfillment of a policy by sabotage, violence, or subversive activities can and will be dealt with vigorously and according to law.

And here we can take our lesson from those democracies abroad that failed to deal vigorously with illegal activities against the democratic process and that now are only memories in the minds of men.

The second thing we need to remember is that an emergency does not abrogate the Constitution or dissolve the Federal Bill of Rights. That is not only good sense; it is good constitutional law.

Seventy-three years ago, 1 year after the Civil War, the Supreme Court declared in the famous Milligan case that "the Constitution of the United States is a law for rulers and people, equally in war and in peace, and covers with the shield of its protection all classes of men, at all times, and under all circumstances."

To the many friends of civil liberty gathered at this conference I want to give the emphatic assurance that in this emergency, as well as in time of peace, the Department of Justice embraces that policy without reservation. And because we are convinced that it represents the wishes of the overwhelming majority of the American people, we are determined to apply it and to practice it as thoroughly and intelligently as men are capable of doing.

We are aware, and the pepole should also be aware, that this will be no simple task. It is a problem of steering an even course that will invade neither of the two boundaries that I have mentioned. In brief, it is a problem of finding a sound basis for maintaining public safety without encroaching on the Bill of Rights.

In enforcing some laws we must not violate other laws. In upholding the Constitution we must not infringe on the priceless heritage of civil liberty which the Constitution guarantees. To do that—to suppress or suspend the Bill of Rights—would be to destroy the very democratic principles that we are seeking to preserve. It would be to yield to the same autocratic psychology that we want to keep out of this country. We must not let that come to pass. We must have it understood that while we will oppose firmly and vigorously any illegal activities we will do so in a responsible manner and within the orbit of the Constitution. That is the American way.

The immortal Justice Holmes laid down a formula which I believe will help us to keep a true course. In a celebrated war-time case, involving the very things we have discussed here tonight, he wrote these lines:

"When men have realized that time has upset many fighting faiths, they may come to believe even more than they believe the very foundations of their own conduct that the ultimate good desired is better reached by free trade in ideas. * * * While that experiment is part of our system, I think that we should be eternally vigilant against attempts to check the expression of opinions that we loathe—unless they so imminently threaten immediate interference with the lawful and pressing purposes of the law that an immediate check is required to save the country."

The willingness, the determination, the ability to follow that democratic principle, so ably stated by a great friend and interpreter of democracy. will be, in my estimation, a real test of patriotism in this or any future crisis.

The true citizen of America will remember that loyalty to our tradition of civil liberty is as much a part of patriotism as defense of our shores and a hatred for treason. He will never forget that civil liberty under the American system is a legal right in time of war as well as time of peace—that, whatever the time, it is liberty for all, irrespective of the accident of birth.

The true American will remember that, whether it be peacetime or wartime, there could be nothing more unpatriotic in this land of many peoples and many creeds than the persecution of minorities and the fomenting of hatred and strife on the basis of race or religion.

He will realize that if, in the atmosphere of war, we allow civil liberty to slip away from us, it may not be long before our recent great gains in social and economic justice will also have vanished, for a nation that is calloused in its attitude toward civil rights is not likely to be sensitive toward the many grave problems that affect the dignity and security of its citizens. We must not let this crisis destroy what we have so dearly won.

Many years ago, in the midst of another great emergency, Abraham Lincoln put this question to the Congress of the United States:

"Must a government of necessity be too strong for the liberties of its own people or too weak to maintain its own existence?"

Let us in this troubled hour answer that question as befits a great and enlightened democracy. Let us prove for all time that ours is a twofold strength—the physical strength of self-defense and the moral strength of unflinching devotion to our own ideals.

The Russo-German Alliance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS F. FORD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 16, 1939

ARTICLE BY JACQUES MARITAIN

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Mr. Speaker, the hypocritical attempt on the part of the totalitarian dictators to maintain the fiction that Hitlerism and Stalinism were motivated by different objectives has at last been abandoned, and the world now sees both communism and nazi-ism as identical enemies of western civilization and Christianity. In fact, the Hitler-Stalin pact is the mating of the "Beast of Berlin" with the "Brute of Moscow."

Just what effect this throwing aside of the mask by these two cynical, bloodthirsty tyrants will have on the future of the world is the theme of the following splendid article from the pen of Jacques Maritain, which appeared first in the Commonweal and was reprinted in the Washington Post of Sunday, October 15, 1939:

[From the Commonweal]

EUROPE IS ALREADY SAVED

(By Jacques Maritain)

The thing which I want to say at once and that I want to cry from the housetops is that the spiritual situation of Europe has completely changed and that the salvation of Europe has begun. I am absolutely convinced that western civilization will be saved. To be more precise, it is already saved. At the price of whatever mass sacrifice, perhaps of what torrents of blood, of what destruction, after however many months of sorrow and agony, this salvation may be realized in events themselves, I beg you to believe that on that subject I am not suffering from any optimistic illusion.

I know what night we are entering; into what general ruin it is feared that the civilized universe may be thrown. But I also know that in this ruin the universe will not perish; I know that this night is not a night of despair but a night of resurrection. For anyone

who seeks to understand the drama of human history from a point of view beyond that of the immediate moment, it seems that he must have an unshakable confidence in the final result of the war which has just begun.

I said that the spiritual situation of Europe has completely changed. The striking indication of this change is the Russo-German alliance. It has completed the unmasking of the enemy. For a long time, for a very long time, people everywhere—in the Old World as well as in the New—had been asking themselves this question, Are we not forced to choose between communism and Hitlerism? How many souls were tempted by their just horror of the Fascist and totalitarian slavery to sympathize with communism? How many were tempted by their just horror of the Communist slavery to sympathize with totalitarianism? In the name of the "principle of the lesser evil," falsely applied, were thus excused all crimes.

And when we took pains ceaselessly to explain that here was a question of two opposite aspects of the same evil, of two horns of the same devil, only those understood who attached some importance to the philosophy of history. Now the whole world understands in the shattering clarity of events. One has only to see in one's mind Herr Von Ribbentrop, the promoter of the anti-Comintern agreements, decorated with the Order of Lenin; it is sufficient to see Stalin and Ribbentrop shaking hands while they smile at one another the cynical smile of accomplices.

The moral sickness from which the Occident was wasting away, the horrible lie by virtue of which each believed himself obliged to choose between one bad thing and another bad thing and to set up one evil in opposition to another evil—such was the profound thing which threatened the civilized world with a self-destruction for which there was no remedy. That thing has disappeared. The false front of being a defender of order and civilization by which with diabolical hypocrisy the revolution of Hitler had disguised itself has fallen away. Iniquity and violence have met; the Marxist opposition to Christianity has embraced Hitler's opposition to Christianity.

Everybody clearly realizes that, whether bolstered by the myth of the dictatorship of one class or by the myth of the superiority of one race—by the Marxist-Stalinist myth of the state calling itself Socialist, embodying the proletariat and its destiny, or by the Hitler myth of the state calling itself "proletarian," embodying the superior race and its destiny—there is only one revolution; and this revolution is in essence directed against the first principles of all Christian civilization, against everything which indicates the mark of God on man, against everything which implies respect for the human person, for justice and for truth, against everything which relates to greatness and liberty of the human soul. Hitler is the precursor (fourrier) of Stalin.

The illusion which held that the world was divided between the two antagonistic forces of Communist totalitarianism and of racial totalitarianism has been dispelled. Moreover, we know clearly that both one and the other totalitarianism are in reality but a single spirit, a single homicidal force. And face to face with that force is another which one can no longer call a third force (since the two which it opposed at the same time are now joined together), that very force which created Europe and which has its purest sources in the gospel, and which, while it requires our civilization to purify and renew itself in a radical way, nevertheless appears manifest as the vital principle of that same civilization. Here is the capital historical change which, in the spiritual order, we have just witnessed.

I have said that western civilization is already saved: The signal indication of that salvation is the way in which two people who have a horror of war have entered into war to stop the monstrous enterprise of Hitler's domination. When, on the level of temporal strife, anti-Christian totalitarian force took up with Hitler the arms of military aggression; when, treading underfoot all international good faith, German national socialism undertook to impose by violence its will upon Poland and to devour that country, while sheltering itself under the terror of a general European war, at that moment France and Great Britain took up the challenge; they deliberately opened the gates of war, knowing to what they exposed themselves. * * *

Civilization does not die unless it betrays itself. As long as it is capable of actions such as this one, it can suffer the most enormous losses; it is sure that it will not perish. However terrible may be the ordeal, it will not be a tragedy but a sacrifice. And the end of a tragedy is death, but the end of a sacrifice is salvation and resurrection.

Jeanne d'Arc left us this prophecy: That one day France and England would unite to accomplish together a great enterprise. In one sense the present war seems to be the continuation of the war of 1914, but now its apocalyptic aspect has become manifest. Quite obviously it is for the common good of civilized humanity that France and England suffer and fight and that Poland has been martyred; it is for the fundamental human values to which every free spirit in the world, particularly the spirit of the American Nation, is attached. I know that the American public is clearly aware of this; that is why it is sufficient for me to mention the point briefly. If Hitler should triumph, the ideal of a society of freemen, based on an effective respect for the rights of the person, offering to each an equal opportunity to develop the gifts which each has received from God, and allowing for fraternal cooperation, would receive a heart's blow. But Hitler will not triumph.

Proposed Argentine Trade Agreement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY B. COFFEE

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 16, 1939

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement made by me before the Committee for Reciprocity Information:

A reduction in the tariffs on the competitive agricultural commodities listed in this proposed trade agreement with Argentina presents a serious threat to agriculture and in turn to the general welfare of this country. While my protest will be particularly directed against the reduction in tariffs on the livestock products listed, I want it understood that I am definitely opposed to making any tariff concessions on any competitive agricultural commodity listed in this agreement.

This trade agreement would accentuate the trend which has been so apparent since the World War toward industrializing this country at the expense of agriculture. In the efforts that have been made to restore foreign commerce through these trade agreements, agriculture, and particularly the livestock industry, has borne the brunt of the concessions that have been made.

To reduce the tariff on canned, cured, or pickled beef, hides, tallow, casein, turkeys, corn, and the other competitive agricultural commodities listed would tend to add to our accumulation of price-depressing surpluses.

There can be no justification for reducing the tariff on any of these competitive agricultural commodities when millions of dollars from the Federal Treasury are now being spent in reducing production and in aiding the disposal of the surpluses. The American market must be preserved for the American farmer if agriculture is to receive its fair share of the national income. Restoration of the purchasing power for American agriculture will provide a greater market for industrial products and more employment than restoration of purchasing power in some foreign country. There is no doubt that we might increase our sales of automobiles and industrial products to Argentina if under this agreement we tear down our protection and permit a flood of competitive agricultural commodities to enter this market. But what about the sales that will be lost in the domestic market? Sixty-eight percent of all the automobiles in the world are owned right here in this country.

The United States is a surplus-meat-producing country. Between 1925 and 1929 we were exporting more than a billion pounds of pork products a year—as much as all of the other countries of the world combined. Pork is the chief competitor of beef. A surplus of either commodity adversely affects the price of the other. Argentina normally exports more than a billion pounds of beef, which constitutes approximately one-half of the total beef exports of the world. Isn't it unreasonable and illogical to assume that we should encourage the importation of meat when we have a normal exportable surplus?

Under the Canadian trade agreement of last year the tariff on cattle was again reduced, with Mexico the principal beneficiary. During the period from January to June this year 486,000 cattle were imported as compared to 242,000 in the same period last year, an increase of 100 percent. I appeared before you at the hearing protesting these concessions.

In the event the 6-cents-a-pound tariff on canned beef is reduced, the same concessions would automatically be extended to Uruguay, Paraguay, and Brazil. Less than half of our canned-beef imports have been coming from Argentina. These foreign countries now practically monopolize the canned-beef market in the United States. Even with the 6-cent tariff it has been impossible for domestic producers and processors with their higher costs to compete with the South American product produced and processed with cheap labor. To reduce this tariff would not only preserve this monopoly but encourage a large increase in the imports of canned beef, which competes directly with our domestically produced beef, pork, lamb, poultry, and other food products.

An analysis of our trade with Argentina shows that during the period 1911 to 1915 our exports to Argentina amounted to $47,251,000, and our imports from Argentina amounted to $47,800,000; almost in balance. The next 5-year average, embracing the war period, 1916 to 1920, our exports averaged $131,000,000, but our imports from Argentina jumped to an annual average of $185,000,000—an adverse trade balance during that 5-year period of about $250,000,000.

If during the present war Argentina's normal outlet for its beef exports to Europe should be curtailed, our domestic market will be flooded with surplus canned beef not alone from Argentina but from other South American countries.

This agreement also proposes to reduce the 25-cents-a-bushel tariff on corn. With an estimated two-and-a-half-billion-bushel corn crop, a carry-over of 470,000,000 bushels, and Government

loans outstanding on corn to the extent of $146,000,000, it is inconceivable to me that such a proposal could be seriously considered. Practically all of this corn must eventually be converted into beef, lamb, and pork. Unless the American market can be preserved for the American meat producers, the corn farmers' plight will be accentuated, and the tendency will be for increased demands for subsidies from the Federal Government and greater losses for the Commodity Credit Corporation and the taxpayers of this country to bear.

There can be no justification for any reduction in the very low tariff now provided on hides amounting to only 10 percent ad valorem. Hides are the most important byproduct in the slaughter of cattle. The tariff is now so low that it is insufficient to curb imports when a price-depressing surplus occurs in the United States. To further reduce this small protection would antagonize every dairy farmer and livestock producer in the United States. They are certainly entitled to this meager protection on this important byproduct.

The American dairy and livestock producer can supply the American market adequately with all the beef, tallow, hides, casein, and other livestock products that can be utilized in the domestic market if given the opportunity. They have learned from sad experience that only a small surplus is needed to depress prices below cost of production.

Because of the drought and the depletion of livestock aided by the purchase and slaughter of 8,000,000 cattle by the Federal Government, the livestock industry is now on a relatively stable basis. The cattle population was reduced from 74,000,000 in 1934 to 66,000,000 in 1938. Since that time the cattle population has been on the increase and it is estimated that there will be approximately 2,000,000 increase shown January 1, 1940, over the 66,821,000 head as of January 1, 1939. For the first 8 months of 1939 there has been a decline in the slaughter of cattle and calves compared with 1938 of approximately 470,000 head. This indicates restocking and that the cattle industry may soon be faced with a surplus again.

The domestic sheep industry is in a period of increased production and the slaughter of hogs for 1939–40 market year is expected to be about 7,000,000 head larger than a year ago. Instead of negotiating trade agreements to facilitate increased imports of meat the State Department should be exerting every effort to find new markets for our surplus livestock products.

Farmers throughout the United States are shifting their production in an effort to produce some product for which they can find a market at a fair price. Producers of exportable surplus commodities for which foreign markets have been lost are gradually shifting to the production of other commodities, which in turn create further agricultural problems. Many of the farmers in my State and throughout the Nation have gone into the production of turkeys, and now under this proposed agreement it is contemplated to reduce the tariff of 10 cents a pound on dead turkeys. The tariff on live turkeys was reduced under the Canadian trade agreement from 8 cents to 4 cents. This tariff reduction is proposed in the face of a 22-percent increase in turkey production this year in the United States, which is 15 percent greater than any previous year's production. (This might be in anticipation of two Thanksgiving Days; I don't know.) However, I do know there can be no justification for encouraging foreign importation of turkeys when our domestic growers can supply the market. Turkey production in Argentina is in large-scale units and on a commercial basis. If this tariff protection is reduced, our domestic market will be flooded with Argentine turkeys, depressing not only the price of turkeys but the price of all poultry. Poultry competes with other meats, and depressed poultry prices tend to depress the price of other meats. Consequently those of us who are interested in the welfare of agriculture view with alarm any attempt to reduce the tariff on any agricultural commodity which the American farmer can supply.

National prosperity cannot be restored to this country until agriculture receives its fair share of the national income. I want to call to your attention the following facts supplied me by the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, which is a clear indication of the tendency that has been prevalent since 1922 to industrialize this country at the expense of agriculture. In 1922 we exported $1,884,000,000 worth of agricultural products and $1,881,000,000 worth of nonagricultural products. Agriculture's proportion of our export sales was 50 percent. Since that date the proportion of agricultural products exported has been year by year gradually dwindling until last year, when agriculture accounted for only 27.1 percent and nonagricultural products accounted for 72.9 percent. During the first 8 months of this year agricultural products' share of our export trade has fallen to 18.4 percent, as against 81.6 percent for nonagricultural products. To rehabilitate agriculture and restore prosperity in this country this trend of sacrificing agriculture for industry must be stopped. No group nor section of the country can expect to prosper long at the expense of another. This maladjustment must be corrected. This proposed trade agreement with Argentina, instead of helping our domestic economy, will further throw it out of balance.

While I recognize the desirability of friendly commercial relations with Argentina as well as with all foreign countries, I also recognize the fact that Argentina's agriculture is similar to our own and that we are both confronted with the same problem of finding markets for these same products. Certainly a fair analysis of our own agricultural problems would convince even the most skeptical Argentinean that this Government, in fairness to its own citizens, would not be justified in encouraging the importation of these competitive agricultural commodities, which could only add to our domestic difficulties.

While we all deplore the war now devastating Europe, it has nevertheless offered American industry an opportunity to expand its sales in South America without the necessity of sacrificing the American farmer and livestock producer.

In closing I want to sound this word of warning: That if this proposed agreement is made, carrying tariff concessions on these competitive agricultural products, the next session of this Congress will probably refuse to extend the life of the Reciprocal Tariff Act unless provision is made for Senate ratification of the trade agreements. I am already convinced that such is necessary to properly protect agriculture, and particularly the livestock industry.

The Issue of National Pensions Is More Alive Today Than Ever

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 16, 1939

ARTICLE BY S. HOWARD LEECH

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, one of the most disturbing things about the present atmosphere in the National Capital is the almost complete absorption of most legislators and officials with the European situation. Important as that situation is, it certainly is more necessary now than ever for the Congress to consider those great domestic issues which must be settled in a sound manner if our democracy at home is to be a dynamic force. One of these issues is that of national pensions. Therefore, I have asked permission to have included with my remarks the following article by S. Howard Leech, of Baldwin Park, Calif.:

A COMMON SENSE NATIONAL PENSION

(By S. Howard Leech, national correspondent)

In our first press release we stated the next consideration in establishing the fundamental justice of an old-age pension would be to consider at what age such a pension should begin, how much this pension should be, and how the money should be raised with which to pay these pensions.

Let us first consider the age at which such pensions should begin. It is now thoroughly realized by all intelligent, thoughtful, well-informed citizens that the employment age at which industry will employ workers is being steadily lowered. In the greater part of the large industrial plants this age limit is about 40 years, and there are but few industries which will employ workers over 45 or 50, and in some cases this age limit has been reduced to around 35.

From an economic standpoint, therefore, some provision must be made for those beyond the employment age, otherwise they must inevitably become charges upon the county, State, or Nation. A common sense national old-age pension is both the most logical, the most just, and at the same time the cheapest method of reaching the millions beyond the age of 60. It is quite possible that ultimately the Nation will be compelled to lower this age limit to 50 or even 45. However, this is for future consideration and will depend, in a large measure, upon the economic-financial conditions of our Nation in the future.

It is generally conceded by practically all advocates of a national old-age pension that such pensions should begin at about the age of 60 years. All existing economic conditions point to this age as a present logical starting point in this necessary national old-age pension. In the first place, any man or woman who has lived and worked in this Nation for 40 years—from the age of 20 to 60—has earned by this work a dividend on the wealth that person has produced during this 40-year period, as shown in release No. 1.

In the second place (except in rare cases) as industry will not employ workers over 60, some provision must be made for those who have not inherited, or been able to save, enough to provide for their old-age requirements. The percentage who have been able to do this under our existing economic-financial conditions, is very small, therefore, the absolute necessity for a common-sense national pension. All such citizens who have reached this age and are willing to withdraw from competition in the labor field, should be paid a dividend from this wealth they have produced to give them reasonable social security, with a comfortable home, good healthful food, adequate comfortable clothing, with a few luxuries and pleasures of life.

The bill H. R. 5620, now before Congress and already sponsored by 128 Congressmen, calls for a minimum pension of $30 a month, with a maximum of $60. While it is fully realized this would not give an individual who had worked for his country for 40 years, a luxuriant living, or a man and wife with double this amount, any opportunity to enjoy world tours, buy high-priced automobiles or expensive clothing, it is held by the promoters of this bill that it would at least, be a beginning and a great relief to millions of elderly citizens now actualy suffering for the bare necessities and comforts of life.

The next logical step is to consider how the money with which to pay these pensions is to be raised. This, let us admit, in the minds of some, may be a controversial question, but the method which at this time seems the most practical, the most cheaply administered with the greatest tax spread is the gross income-tax method, with proper regulations. A transactions tax has been advocated by some, but the most of the well-known economists, statisticians, industrial leaders, Senators, and Congressmen are not in favor of a transactions tax for the reason, they point out, that it would have a strong tendency to pyramid, and would compel the small-business enterprises to pay the larger part of the tax. Other proposals have been advocated, such as income taxes, inheritance taxes, special taxes on luxuries, amusements, and what not, none of which seem to be of a definite positive nature.

As to the gross income tax we have two outstanding examples of its practical workings and positive results. A gross income tax—in lieu of some unsuccessful and unpopular taxes—was enacted in the State of Indiana in 1933, where it has proven to be most successful; having brought the finances of the State out of the red up to a point where for the year 1939 the budget shows a fund of nearly $14,000,000 for local schools, more than $38,000,000 reduction in property taxes, about nine and a half million for needy blind, aged, and dependent children, with a local bonded indebtedness reduced more than $38,000,000 and with the tax base broadened, and no new taxes.

The Territory of Hawaii also adopted a gross income tax, as a replacement tax, several years ago with the same general results achieved in Indiana. This is reported to be a system heartily endorsed by the majority of corporations, large- and small-business concerns, and is generaly acknowledged both in Indiana and Hawaii to be the most equitable and the most economical of administration of any tax measure ever adopted in these political subdivisions. The gross income tax is, therefore, very generally conceded to be a fair, reasonable, practical tax base, if and when, certain provisions are incorporated in such a measure. Some of these provisions will be discussed later in this series.

Neutrality or ——?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAN R. McGEHEE

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 16, 1939

ARTICLE FROM THE TIMES-PICAYUNE, NEW ORLEANS, LA.

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, the Times-Picayune, a daily newspaper, published in New Orleans, La., offers periodically prizes to the students in the territory in which it circulates, for the best essays on some current topic or subject. On last week the subject was neutrality. The adjudged essay on this subject was written by James Magee, of the Brookhaven, Miss., High School, it receiving first prize of the thousands offered.

It being the outstanding essay, in my opinion it is also worthy of being printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. I therefore ask unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks and include same therein.

[From the Times-Picayune, New Orleans, La.]

NEUTRALITY OR ——?

(By James Magee, Brookhaven (Miss.) High School)

As Europe's war continues to gain momentum and to tighten its deadly grip throughout the world, the United States Senate in special session engages in a miniature conflict closer at hand—the debate over present neutrality legislation. Upon the results of this debate may depend the commercial and economic future, not only of America, but, to a large extent, of the rest of the world.

Whether the United States will lift the embargo on munitions trade with belligerents or draw closer into her shell of "super-neutrality" in an effort to stay out of war at all costs is a factor which, with consideration of hitherto unparalleled international interdependence, can eventually determine, besides the duration of hostilities, the very outcome of this second World War.

With the cash-and-carry plan of conducting trade with belligerents, must repeal of the arms embargo necessarily mean America's entrance into the war? Moreover, can she maintain strict neutrality behind self-imposed barriers to unrestricted trade—depriving England and France of manufactures and munitions necessary to carry on war and thereby unintentionally fighting against the very democracy for which she struggled in the last great war?

Against this muddled background one fact stands out with startling clarity: America cannot hope to maintain absolute neutrality. Consequently, since the fate of the arms embargo must choose for her one side or the other, and this choice must have marked effects on existing international relations, the neutrality dispute arises as public interest No. 1 of the week.

Highway Improvement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE B. CROWE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 16, 1939

ADDRESS BY HON. EUGENE B. CROWE, OF INDIANA

Mr. CROWE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me at the convention and twenty-fifth anniversary, American Association of State Highway Officials, held at Washington, D. C., and Richmond, Va., October 9 to 13, 1939:

Mr. President, delegates, ladies, and gentlemen, I am glad to attend this convention and appreciate the honor of sharing the platform today with your president and other members of this association on this, your twenty-fifth anniversary and silver jubilee. I am glad to have taken part in some of the prearrangements for this jubilee.

I appreciate the honor of being a member of the Roads Committee of the House. I serve on that committee with the very able chairman, Mr. WILBURN CARTWRIGHT. On February 27, this year, Mr. CARTWRIGHT introduced House Concurrent Resolution No. 10, asking that the Congress of the United States recognize the fine services and splendid work done by the American Association of State Highway Officials since its inception 25 years ago. Following that, Mr. CARTWRIGHT was in the hospital for some time following an accident and prevented from attending to his official duties for some time. Accordingly, he asked me if I would please pilot the resolution through the House. I was glad to do this, and after some time was heard before the Rules Committee, which committee suggested that I take the resolution directly to the House and bring it up under unanimous consent. The bill, however, had been referred to the Committee on Rules, but it was their pleasure that I bring it to the House without a rule. Following this and after some further preliminary work, I was recognized by the Speaker of the House, the Honorable WILLIAM B. BANKHEAD, and there being no objection, it was given favorable consideration by the House. After this I took it to my friend, the junior Senator from Indiana, the Honorable SHERMAN MINTON, where he looked after the resolution in the Senate, and I am informed it was passed by the Senate without a dissenting vote. I am sure your association will appreciate the fact that the great deliberative body, the House of Representatives, passed this resolution unanimously, and you will further appreciate the fact that it passed the Senate in the same manner. You are to be congratulated on the respect and high opinion in which your organization is held by the Congress of the United States.

A tremendous change has come over the highways of the United States during the last 25 years. Great improvements are yet to be made and will be made in them. I realize the change as much as anyone. I recall vividly my early driving when I owned my first car in the year 1911, traveling a distance of 60 to 75 miles to visit a friend or relative and have noon lunch with them and getting back the same day could only be accomplished if both the automobile and the roads behaved themselves perfectly. A shower of rain or a blowout or two of a tire rendered it more than a day's trip.

My State, Indiana, is making great progress in road building, particularly during the last 7 years. Prior to that, it was more of a haphazard, hit-and-miss proposition. Prior to these late years, when the slab was layed, there was no bridge to cross the stream, or if they built a bridge across the stream, there was no slab. After both slab and bridge were constructed, then you would have to beg maybe for months before the berms would be put in condition and still further months before the side roads on curves and embankments would properly be protected by fencing or other safety devices. Today in our State, when the slab is layed, a bridge across the stream is constructed, the sides of the roads are completed, the

fencings and guardrails are constructed, and in a businesslike manner the road is completed. This, thanks to our last two Governors and to the very splendid highway commission which we have today consisting of Mr. Dicus, Mr. Siniff, and Mr. Atchison. They, together with the engineer and other officials, are doing a splendid job. I have had the pleasure of driving over the roads of a lot of States of the Union, and I feel no State which has better highways better marked and safer to drive over than are the highways of Indiana.

We construct highways for utility. The better they are constructed, the more substantial they are built, the more worth while they are for utilitarian purposes. Great improvements can yet be made for those purposes. Second, good highways are for the pleasure and use of mankind. With present automobiles, perfected as they are today, the better the roads, the more the pleasure of driving over them is enhanced, so that is a second purpose of a good highway system. There is a third great purpose which we are so apt to overlook, and that is the use of highways in our national defense set-up.

We realize the highways of some of the nations of Europe, and particularly Germany, have superhighways which were not built alone for utility or pleasure by any manner of means. The real purpose and view in the construction of those highways was for national use in a military way. My opinion is the conditions unsettled as they are in Europe, with no one knowing what will happen there either now or in the years to come, that it is high time that we look after our highways from a national standpoint and for national defense. Furthermore, with conditions as they are in the West and with Japan with her militaristic ideas in the Pacific Ocean, it is high time that we look to this for one of our great arms of national defense. We should not overlook transportation by rail, water, or highway.

For national defense, highways should not just be constructed with the thought of going from city to city. The program should be worked out so as to connect strategic points from a military standpoint as well as from the standpoint of utility and pleasure.

Furthermore, our highways should probably connect with Canada on the north and with Mexico, Central and South America on the south. By all means, we should cooperate with the nations south of us to the end that highways of great consequence could unite us with the Panama Canal Zone. We may find it necessary to transport great amounts of supplies and many troops by highway to the Panama Canal Zone. Furthermore, to better our trade relations and to bring us in closer contact with the states of Central and South America, superhighways should connect the United States with those countries. Through them more travel, both by highway and water, would bring more people of the United States and Central and South America together, and would get them better acquainted. We would learn to know each other which would greatly enhance commerce between these two continents.

Your organization should and will look for greater improvements in your highway building in the future. I am sure that the next 25 years will bring unheard of, unthought of, improvements to the highway systems of the Nation.

I again thank you for the opportunity and privilege of being present on this notable occasion.

Neutrality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 16, 1939

EDITORIAL FROM THE McCONNELSVILLE (OHIO) HERALD

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the McConnelsville Herald, of McConnelsville, Ohio:

[From the McConnelsville (Ohio) Herald]

WANT THE KIND OF NEUTRALITY WHICH LESSENS CHANCES FOR WAR OVERSEAS

By and large, there is a more sensible attitude toward our participation in the present war than existed 25 years ago. Today public opinion overwhelmingly favors France and England and we are neutral in that we don't care who licks Hitler. But opinion is just as overwhelmingly against any entanglement in what is generally considered as a European war. Our people are disillusioned and, in our opinion, it would be utterly impossible to again arouse them to a crusading height and the frenzy of a holy war. The last war was one of idealism. We fought "to make the world safe for democracy." Instead of the gospel of democracy being spread throughout the world, we have seen the rise of dictators, backed by mighty armies and all the devilish armament which the inventive genius of man can devise. We were fighting Kaiserism—and today we have a worse form of arbitrary power called Hitlerism. It was to be a "war to end war"—and the nations have been fighting ever since. Again, Americans were disgusted with the peace. They had furnished the men and money which decided the war for the Allies. At its close they sought no territory, asked no indemnity—and naturally they felt much of resentment at the crass repudiation of Allied war debts. Having failed so utterly to solve the problems of Europe by our entry into the last war, naturally little of sentiment exists today for again sending millions of men overseas and for expending billions of dollars upon a similar venture.

But, aside from the lessons gleaned from the last war, Americans are fearful to enter another struggle lest while fighting abroad for democracy this "pearl of great price" be lost at home. With our huge existing debt and our appalling daily deficits in the Budget, thoughtful men and women rightfully fear that the cost of another war heaped upon the last can end only in financial chaos, revolution, and some form of a dictatorship. In many quarters there is also a deep distrust of placing what Senator VANDENBERG has termed "formidable" war powers in the hands of an administration marked throughout by its consistent greedy grabbing for more so-called emergency powers. There is a settled belief that some of the President's advisers, who have little faith in the "profit system," are eager and anxious for the opportunity to employ wartime powers toward the Government operation of industry, and they recall in this connection, with trepidation, the "McAdoodling of the railways," which cost the taxpayers a cool billion during the last war; nor do they like the idea of a state of wartime emotionalism where any criticism of the President or the national administration is treasonable per se.

These are some of the reasons why letters and telegrams in an almost unprecedented volume have poured and are pouring into Congress during the debate on neutrality. Practically all of these letters voice the same sentiment—they know or care little about the technicalities of the neutrality debate. What they do want is the sort of neutrality which lessens our chances for becoming drawn into the vortex of war overseas. That is what the people want the Congress to do—help keep us out of the mess overseas.

We Were There Once Before

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 16, 1939

ARTICLE FROM THE SPECTATOR (PORTLAND, OREG.), OCTOBER 1939

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Spectator (Portland, Oreg.) for October 1939:

WE WERE THERE ONCE BEFORE—THE TRAGIC LESSON OF THE FIRST WORLD WAR MUST NOT BE FORGOTTEN; THE UNITED STATES MUST REMAIN ALOOF FROM THE EUROPEAN DOG FIGHT

(By Richard L. Neuberger)

America has a job to do. That job is to stay home and preserve democracy here. Europe has started cracking up again. This country had better keep one haven of freedom and sanity, so that the inevitable task of restoring civilization can be undertaken with some possibility of success.

The following quotations have today the same significance they had in 1917:

"This war will not make the world safe for democracy."—Harry Lane, United States Senator from Oregon, 1917.

"We went into a foreign war, a war having its roots in wholly foreign policies. We left our dead on foreign soil. The policies of those countries remain the same. Europe is no nearer peace than before. We have our dead and crippled, our maimed and insane, our wrenched and twisted institutions, while Europe retains her bitterness, her dissension, her old balance of power."—William E. Borah, United States Senator from Idaho, 1934.

The United States moved into a European war 22 years ago. It was supposed to be a war to end war and to make the world safe for democracy. There has never been so little democracy in the world as there is now, and so much war and threat of war. The World War accomplished nothing.

The gangster Hitler, one of the most ruthless men who ever lived, is the immediate cause of the present conflict in Europe. But for the conditions that gave Hitler power in Germany the allied countries are largely responsible. During the last war they told the German people that their quarrel was not with them but with the Kaiser and his regime.

In 1918 the German people began to revolt. The army crumbled and the Kaiser was exiled. Germany drafted its Weimar constitution and set up a republic. Unfortunately for the world the republic perished. England and France helped kill it. They wrote the Versailles Treaty in blood and hate. They exacted reparations the German people could not pay. The Kaiser was gone, yet still the Allies applied the thumbscrews to Germany. The republic

waned, and as it waned a gutteral-voiced agitator named Hitler began gaining seats in the Reichstag.

With mercy and justice and help England and France could have saved the republic. Instead they kept on the economic thumbscrews. Today a generation of Britons and Frenchmen may die for that folly. The German people should not trust the cruel Hitler. But should they trust England? "We are not fighting for territory," the British Government assured the world in December of 1916. From the war England got 1,415,929 square miles of land, an area half the size of continental United States.

All this adds up to the conclusion that America should stay behind its shores. There is plenty of work to do here. Civil liberties must be preserved. Natural resources have to be conserved. Widespread unemployment and poverty are yet to be ended. The national health can be improved. Housing facilities are still inadequate. Farmers must get cost of production for their crops. The social-security program requires improvement. These things concern our own people and are sufficiently important to keep the Nation busy at home.

International diplomacy at present is no place for a nation with honor. Russia and Germany, a few months ago supposedly grim enemies, are now locked in totalitarian embrace. England, France, the alleged friends of democracy, sold out Czechoslovakia, which was a democracy, and now defend Poland, which is not a democracy and whose ambassador to the United States approved the annihilation of Czechoslovakia. In the great crusade for freedom England and France are allied with Turkey. Remember the last war? Then the Turks were portrayed as barbarians. Now they have flopped over and suddenly become friends of liberty.

A great country must not repeat mistakes. Two decades ago America was carried away by hysteria. Harry Lane, of Oregon, was one of six United States Senators who said the war would not make the world safe for democracy. Here in his home State, of which his grandfather, Gen. Joseph Lane, was the first Governor, Senator Lane was called a traitor and a man of the stripe of Benedict Arnold. People denounced him in unmeasured terms. He died a few weeks after he had voted against the war. Now the State and Nation know that he was right.

When the *Lusitania* was sunk in 1915 by a U-boat, Lane and one or two other men in public life asked the populace to keep calm. They were bitterly condemned. Senator La Follette, of Wisconsin, was nearly expelled from the Senate for insisting that the *Lusitania* had been torpedoed because it was not a peaceful merchantman but was carrying munitions of war. The British press heatedly denied this charge. Our Government refused to reveal the *Lusitania's* bill of lading. Long after the war it was published. The *Lusitania* that tragic day had been loaded with 173 tons of ammunition, including 4,200 cases of Springfield cartridges.

What did America get out of its entry into the World War? Approximately 120,000 men died and 182,000 were wounded. To date the war has cost the United States $60,000,000,000, and some of those costs are continuing. Practically none of the countries has paid its war debt to us. Incidentally, Poland still owes America $259,000,000. Great Britain owes this country $5,419,000,000. Hitler has arbitrarily crossed out the debts of Germany and Austria. "Over $13,000,000,000," says Congressman HOMER ANGELL, "which came from the earnings of American citizens as a result of heroic sacrifice and privation, have been confiscated by these foreign powers."

Hitler is one of the worst despots of history. Long ago he alienated the sympathy of men of good will. But Hitler is a problem of Europe. He is a phoenix that rose from the ashes of fires kindled by the statesmen and diplomats of Europe. Other military tyrants—Frederick the Great, Napoleon, Bismarck, Wilhelm Hohenzollern—have not been American problems; and now neither is Hitler. And after this war, unless the rulers of Europe learn a lesson they have not mastered yet, another Hitler or another Napoleon will arise to menace that unhappy continent.

For centuries in Europe people have been persecuted and sent to war. Since the days of Attilla the Hun, men and women have died and suffered in futile conflicts. Catholics, Jews, Huguenots, and all sorts of minorities have undergone discrimination and persecution. Why should America intervene in this welter of hate? America did not formerly do this. Thomas Jefferson did not propose that we enter the Napoleonic wars. Jackson did not put us into Russia's war on Turkey. Grant made no suggestion that we meddle in the war between France and Prussia.

Already people here in far-away Oregon are wondering whether this country can stay out of the present war. Why should there be danger of getting in? Sweden will keep out, and so will Denmark, Holland, and Switzerland. Those countries are right in the amphitheater of battle. Their borders touch the frontiers of the combatants. They can hear the rumble of the artillery. If countries within sound of the war can remain aloof, surely the United States, barricaded behind a vast ocean 3,500 miles wide, should be sufficiently calm and steady to do likewise.

War settles nothing. It leaves a residue of anger and desolation which decades cannot wash away. Benjamin Franklin said that there is no good war and no bad peace. It is my opinion Mr. Roosevelt will go down in history as a great President who has helped the people, but he will sacrifice that status if he leads the Nation into war. This country is different from European nations. Fortunately, our people think differently. Now, we are planning to give the Philippines independence. Has England ever seriously considered lifting the shackles from India or Kenya or South Africa?

Obviously, in the present war American opinion is on the side of the Allies. There is no sentiment in this country in favor of the brutal and arrogant Hitler. But Americans must not forget that the Allies sat by complacently while the German Republic fell and Hitler strode to sovereignty. What is happening in Europe is dreadful and appalling. The United States can best serve Europe by preserving, in at least one nation, the freedom and democracy for which free men yearn. Perhaps, when the horrible conflict is over, an America which is still aloof can dictate a peace which will last longer than 21 years. Then, perhaps, kings and fuehrers and prime ministers and commissars and premiers will not try by fiat to suspend the sixth commandment.

"We should maintain peace, commerce, and honest friendship with all nations," said Jefferson, "entangling alliances with none."

Editorial From Los Angeles Daily News Calls for a Peace College

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 16, 1939

EDITORIALS BY MR. MANCHESTER BODDY

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, the following editorials written by Mr. Manchester Boddy, editor and publisher of the Los Angeles Daily and Evening News, sound such necessary warning and contain so challenging a suggestion that I have asked permission to have them printed in the RECORD:

[From the Los Angeles Daily News and Evening News of September 26–27, 1939]

VIEWS OF THE NEWS

(September 26, 1939)

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF MANUFACTURERS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
14 West Forty-ninth Street,
New York, N. Y., September 18, 1939.

MANCHESTER BODDY,
Publisher, Daily News-Evening News,
Los Angeles, Calif.

DEAR MR. BODDY: American industry's attitude on war and peace is not only a matter of first importance to the Nation but is also the subject of much public misunderstanding.

In view of this, I am taking the liberty of sending to you, personally, a copy of a statement by Howard Coonley, president of the National Association of Manufacturers. As you know, the N. A. M. is representative of a large cross section of American industry and I am sure you will agree that its statement on war is not only timely but, as well, is nationally important.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM V. LAWSON,
Director of Public Relations.

Following is the statement of the National Association of Manufacturers issued by its president, Howard Coonley, to which Mr. Lawson refers:

"American industry hates war.

"War destroys lives. War wrecks homes. Economic chaos and years of crushing depression are its inevitable aftermath. It imperils representative democracy. Free institutions are among its early victims. Ultimately no one can escape the ruin of war.

"American industry wants peace. Peace is the lifeblood of progress. Peace must be the national objective.

"Industry's position on this matter has been stated repeatedly, and there must be no misunderstanding about it.

"The United States can stay out of war.

"Emotionalism can betray us into war.

"A public will to peace, coupled with wise public policies and affirmative action to this end by our Government, will keep us out of war. A fatalistic attitude that war is inevitable for us is absurd. It presupposes that America cannot conduct itself intelligently to preserve peace and its own interests.

"Europe's problems do affect us, but our domestic problems still must come first.

"If yesterday industry was the only source of prosperity and reemployment, today it is as well the keystone of preparedness and peace. Under any conditions, America must depend on a smoothly functioning, efficient industrial system.

"Manufacturers will not relax their efforts to achieve and maintain sound improvement in our domestic economy.

"Industry opposes profiteering—the utilization of war psychology to boost prices for the purpose of making excessive profits.

"As manufacturers we recognize it to be our responsibility and moral obligation to conduct our businesses so that the prices of the products we produce and sell are related equitably to production costs.

"We pledge our energetic support to this policy.

"The N. A. M. calls upon all its members to exercise vigilance against any price or profit policies not justified by actual cost and anticipated cost of replacement.

"Months ago this association said: 'No sensible person believes that profit can come out of the wreckage of human life and economic dislocation.'

"The use of this crisis as an excuse either to extort unjustifiable profits or to pursue partisan political objectives is not only indefensible and dangerous but reprehensible morally. Nor should pleas of 'emergency' be utilized as an excuse for reaching objectives which the American people would not otherwise sanction.

"The present situation calls for agreement on common objectives, but the democratic process of consultation and criticism must never be abandoned. Otherwise we shall be following in the footsteps of those who believe in government by coercion.

"In a world distraught by force the best way to preserve representative democracy is to practice it."

DEAR MR. LAWSON: I quite agree that American industry's attitude on war and peace is not only a matter of first importance to the Nation but that it is also the subject of much public misunderstanding.

This misunderstanding exists, I think, because the words that proclaim your attitude are not loud enough to overcome the impact of events. Observe I do not say events of your ordering. What I mean to imply is that your attitude becomes unimportant in the midst of the very events that have made the issuance of your statement necessary.

There is no need to elaborate or catalog these events. I interrupt my writing to select these representative headlines from the exchange desk:

"Gains Run to Four Points on Strong New York Market."

"Business Makes Best Strides in Two Years—American Prices Stimulated by War Outbreak; Inquiries Indicate Pace Will Be Quickened."

"Fight Food Price Rise."

"Food Prices Climb."

"Metal Markets Join in Upswing."

"Grain Futures Mount Sharply."

It isn't enough that you add to a list of generally accepted platitudes your statement:

"The N. A. M. calls upon all its members to exercise vigilance against any price or profit policies not justified by actual cost and anticipated cost of replacement."

Even it cannot confidently be said (as you do say): "American industry's attitude * * * is a matter of first importance to the Nation" if all of the calamities that you say may befall our national economy as a result of war, befall it regardless of your attitude.

I am particularly intrigued with the statesmanship evidenced in these concluding paragraphs of Mr. Coonley's statement:

"The present situation calls for agreement on common objectives, but the democratic process of consultation and criticism must never be abandoned. Otherwise we shall be following in the footsteps of those who believe in government by coercion.

"In a world distraught by force the best way to preserve representative democracy is to practice it."

In this spirit may I presume to suggest how the N. A. M. can translate its attitude into action?

(September 27, 1939)

(This is the second installment of our letter to the National Association of Manufacturers of the United States of America.)

It is generally agreed that war economy means more production, higher wages, higher cost of living, a boom in "local business," with about 53 percent of the "new business" made on the "installment" plan.

When war ends—or when nations fall into bankruptcy or internal revolution—immediate economic "reaction" will occur in the United States. Workers who bought on the installment plan will have no money with which to meet payments.

This will start a "cancelation" movement that will gain momentum and volume until it overwhelms the national economy. With this will come an acute attack of economic "jitters." Once more we will hear on every hand the hysterical shoutings:

"My God, here we are starving in the midst of plenty!"

"Factories everywhere and not a wheel turning!"

"I want goods—you want goods—we can't buy any. Why?"

"Who closed down our industries? Why doesn't capital do something about it?"

"Share the wealth!"

"Turn the jobs over to the fellow who wants to use the products!"

Can't you see, my dear Mr. Lawson, how logically, how naturally these conclusions will be reached when war "boom" gives way to the "horrors" of peace? And can't you see how readily such rabble-rousing "truisms" will be accepted by the milling masses of bewildered citizens?

There is nothing farfetched about this. It is so obvious that even today United States industry cannot afford to hope for peace in Europe. If Europe should agree to peace right now the United States would immediately be thrown into a devastating depression, one far more disastrous to the safety of the United States than the war now being fought 3,000 or 5,000 miles away.

A peace scare is already fraught with more potential danger to the economy of the United States than a war scare ever was.

If this sort of feeling has developed in 1 month, what will be the situation if war lasts 6 months, or a year, or 3 years?

The answer is obvious. We will be forced to perpetuate war economy. To do this we will have to invoke the dictatorship provisions of the National Defense Act of 1916, section 120 of which provides, among other things:

"The President, in time of war, or when war is imminent, is empowered, through the head of any department of the Government * * * to place an order with any individual, firm, association, company, corporation, or organized manufacturing industry for such product or material as may be required. * * *

"Compliance with all such orders for products or material shall be obligatory. * * * The President, through the head of any department of the Government, in addition to the present authorized methods of purchase or procurement herein provided for, is hereby authorized to take immediate possession of any such plant or plants * * * and any individual, firm, company, association, or corporation, or organized manufacturing industry, or the responsible head or heads thereof, failing to comply with the provisions of this section shall be deemed guilty of a felony, and upon conviction shall be punished by imprisonment for not more than 3 years and by a fine not exceeding $50,000."

For many years the War and Navy Departments have been working on a plan for the mobilization of the country's economy.

A mobilization plan already adopted by the Army and Navy provides for sweeping economic control, including labor, prices, transportation, power, fuel, and trade generally. Its purpose is to divert materials and services from peacetime to war-making channels.

Surely no one can study these plans and provisions without realizing how thoroughly this country has observed the time-honored injunction:

"In time of peace prepare for war."

The purpose of this letter is to urge that your great organization, in the spirit of its expressed "attitude on war and peace," conceive a new national policy:

"In time of war prepare for peace."

If we would preserve fundamental American democracy, we must prepare to take definite action now probably along these lines:

Create a permanent "peace college" to develop ways and means of meeting peace problems just as we have a War College to develop ways and means of meeting war problems.

This peace college should be composed of representatives of industry, labor, transportation, finance, and agriculture on a nonpartisan basis. It should be dedicated to the preservation of American democracy and confine its operations to the utilization of such tried and approved measures as come within the general "field of agreement" of its various members.

An important function of the "permanent peace college" should be to plan:

(a) The peacetime utilization of surpluses that are produced during the time lag between the end of war and the return to "normal" peace economy, as a basis for stabilizing international finance and our domestic currency and credit.

(b) The coordination of various forms of government relief, insurance plans, public works programs, relief plans, etc., to meet anticipated problems that come with the transition from war boom to normal peace economy.

By keeping the "peace college" in continuous session it will be possible to have such plans and programs worked out in a sane and deliberate manner; it will be possible to submit these plans and programs for approval to Congress for democratic action free from the threat of panic and widespread riot.

There isn't much real danger of the United States actually fighting in Europe, but the very nature of the war now going on over there, considered in connection with our national economic situation, leads inevitably to the conclusion that Europe's war probably will come to the United States.

Let's be prepared to keep it out.

In time of war—prepare for peace.

Very truly yours,

MANCHESTER BODDY.

Committee for Reciprocity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHIL FERGUSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 16, 1939

STATEMENT BY HON. PHIL FERGUSON, OF OKLAHOMA

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement

submitted by me to the Committee for Reciprocity in opposition to the reduction of tariffs in the trade-agreement negotiations with the Argentine:

GENTLEMEN: I wish to enter this statement in opposition to the reduction of tariffs in the proposed trade agreement with the Argentine.

The reduction of the tariff on foreign byproducts of livestock, including tallow, hides, blood, bones, etc., would necessitate the lowering of the domestic price of these products. The lowering of the domestic price would mean that the price of the edible meat would of necessity have to be raised.

The domestic price of beef, pork, and mutton, bearing the high cost of distribution, cannot be raised much higher or the consumer will go on a buying strike. If the price is lowered, however, the inadequate percent the producer now receives will of necessity be cut to the place the producer will be forced to operate at a loss.

I also see a severe threat in the lowering of the duty on preserved beef and veal because of the low cost of production in South America.

A special threat to my district is the reduction of the duty on turkeys, which, if cut from 10 cents to 5 cents per pound, would undoubtedly cut the price of turkeys raised in Oklahoma to more than 5 cents per pound, since the eastern consuming centers could buy foreign turkeys much cheaper with this small duty than we could afford to ship them from Oklahoma. The same thing applies to the proposed reduction of tariff on eggs. Eggs and turkeys are a big source of income to farmers in Oklahoma, and we cannot afford to make this sacrifice in a trade treaty with the Argentine.

In conclusion, before the trade treaty was negotiated with Canada, which permitted the reduction of the tariff on cattle weighing over 700 pounds from 3 cents to 1½ cents, I predicted that the tariff reduction would act as an automatic weight on the beef-cattle market. My prediction has been true. Every time the market has started to advance an influx of heavy cattle from Canada and Mexico has pressed the market down. The argument made in favor of reducing the tariff—that the number imported were insignificant—has not proven true in the effect on the market. I plead the livestock producers' cause before the Canadian treaty was negotiated, and I sincerely hope the Committee on Reciprocity will not force the American farmers and livestock men to bear the additional cross of a treaty with the Argentine that will undoubtedly cut the price of beef and mutton further and might well paralyze the turkey-raising industry in this country.

I respectfully submit this statement for your serious consideration.

Second Surrender—European "Friends" Legion Reaction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. SCHAFER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 16, 1939

ARTICLE BY BOAKE CARTER

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Boake Carter, which was published in the Evening Public Ledger, of Philadelphia, on September 29, 1939:

[From the Philadelphia Evening Public Ledger, September 29, 1939]

SECOND SURRENDER? EUROPEAN "FRIENDS" LEGION REACTION

(By Boake Carter)

Twenty-two years ago war raged in Europe. The United States determined to make that war—with all its European issues—our own war. We asked our women folk to do war work, knit socks and sweaters. They worked with willing hands.

We asked them to give up their sons, husbands, and sweethearts so that their men could make Europe's cause our cause. They yielded willingly. But their hearts were as hearts of lead.

We surrendered our liberties temporarily. We turned over our factories to the Allies. We opened our Treasury and said: "Take what you need." We sent our battleships to Europe to help them.

We did not rest at "volunteers." We actually conscripted our men to send them "over there" to make their cause our cause. Shipload after shipload departed for France until 2,000,000 of our men stood upon French soil, ready to lay down their lives for European issues and a European war.

We turned over to them our men, the labors of our women, our factories, our money, our trust, and our liberty.

Again war rages in Europe. France and Britain hope that we will open our hearts and pocketbooks again and make their cause our cause once more. They hope that we will begin—by lifting the arms embargo.

Before we yield—if we yield—might it not be well, in justice to those mothers who are called Gold Star; in justice to those Americans—some of them fathers, uncles, brothers, husbands who gave up the dearest possession of all—life itself; in justice to those who, these last 22 years have continued to hobble their way through the rest of their lives, maimed, tubercular, or with shattered nerves; in mere justice to these Americans, might it not be well to review what gratitude we have received from those we helped save?

First, we were ridiculed by our European friends (?) for entering the war so late and after, they said, it was almost won.

The current joke in England was the story about the Rainbow Division being properly named—"the rainbow only comes after the storm."

Our friends (?) whose cause we made our cause to the dirge of death and to the tune of $200,000,000,000 in material losses, charged our Government, meaning us, a rental for the billets occupied by our men who had come to save them.

When we used their ships they charged us a fee for transporting our live soldiers to France.

They charged us a fee for similar transportation of the bodies of our men back from Europe to the peace and solitude of the farm lands of America and the arms of women whose eyes were bright with unshed tears.

They charged us for the cemeteries in France in which we buried our dead—those who did not "come back."

This was the gratitude of our friends (?), in whose defense we poured out our blood, our treasure. They charged us fees for these little things—bills the old folk may have forgotten and bills Young America of today does not know about.

And now—with war again in Europe—our friends (?) turn once more with outstretched hands for arms and eventually more of our men.

And in Chicago, the old folk meet—men who fought the last time. Legionnaires, we call them nowadays. And up rises their commander, Mr. Stephen Chadwick, to report upon an American Legion trust fund. A trust fund originally intended for decoration of the graves of those men of ours who "did not come back" from France.

In 1937 the Legion obtained a court ruling to permit the use of this $200,000 trust fund for other means.

"Under French law," the New York Times reports, "a concession fee becomes due on each grave every 15 years. When the first time limit expired following the World War, it developed the bodies of Americans were to be exhumed and burned in lime pits unless the fees were paid."

Mr. Chadwick reported to the Legion the $200,000 has been used to build underground vaults in Neuilly, overlooking Paris, for "reburials in cases of expired concession fees."

Our friends!

Our men died for them 22 years ago. America debauched her own economy for them.

And now, years later and when they supplicate the United States again for our munitions—well knowing that our men surely will follow behind those munitions once the blood sales are begun—they threaten to pull up our dead of 1917–18 from their miserable patch of strife-strewn earth and burn our men's bones in lime pits because we failed to pay them a fee for the privilege of letting our dead remain in their foreign graves.

Our men were heroes in 1917. Now they are good for lime pits like common carrion.

Our friends!

And we should lift the arms embargo for them?

Pending Neutrality Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. FRIES

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 16, 1939

LETTERS FROM HON. WILLIAM B. BARRY, OF NEW YORK

Mr. FRIES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following two letters written by the gentleman from New York [Mr. BARRY] to his constituency:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., October 6, 1939.

DEAR CONSTITUENT: My purpose above all other considerations, is to keep my country out of the European war. We have no stake in it worth one American soldier's life.

It is my firm conviction, after long and conscientious deliberation, that a policy of honest neutrality toward that conflict is the best way to keep this country at peace.

Neutrality is defined as "refraining from interference in a contest." The primary, if not sole purpose of the alleged neutrality bill now being debated in the Senate is to lift the arms embargo, so that the United States can supply Englishmen and Frenchmen with arms and ammunition with which to kill Germans. Every capital in Europe recognizes the obvious purpose of this legislation, and yet its chief sponsors fatuously call it a neutrality measure.

I am convinced that just as soon as we become an arsenal for one side the other side will in all probability retaliate. An act of retaliation, such as blowing up an American munitions plant with a loss of lives, will be all that the propagandists need in order to have us send the youth of America to a futile death on foreign soil.

I am therefore unqualifiedly opposed to lifting the arms embargo. The assumption by some and the contention by others that the present law is not neutral is unsound. It is absurd to contend that America has a duty to supervise every war and supply the weaker side, or the side it favors, with arms and ammunition. How can we be interfering when we don't send arms to either side?

I am also opposed to giving 90-day credit to countries that now owe us billions of dollars which they have never made an honest effort to pay. Once the merchants of death get a financial interest in the belligerents they will do their utmost to drag us into the war to protect their loans. There is no conflict between the arms embargo and the cash-and-carry plan for other commodities. I am in favor of Congress enacting both as an additional safeguard.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM B. BARRY, M. C.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., September 14, 1939.

DEAR SIR OR MADAM: Since hostilities started in Poland, many anxious Americans have asked me whether or not Congress will permit the United States to be dragged into another European war. My answer is that Congress will do whatever the American people demand of it.

I am therefore convinced that it is the urgent duty of every patriotic citizen, who believes that we have no stake in Europe worth shedding American blood over, to commence a determined crusade to keep Congress in a neutral state of mind. A country-wide movement should begin immediately before propagandists have had time to inflame the Nation.

Speaking for myself, I will never even consider voting for war unless this country is actually attacked; or the Monroe Doctrine violated; and any informed person with common sense will admit that there is absolutely no danger of such events happening. No nation or combination of nations could make a successful invasion and none would be foolish enough to try it. Our only enemies are foreign propagandists and American partisans whose alien interests are placed before that of their own country.

In spite of emotional hysteria and propaganda, the war in Europe is but a repetition of the countless conflicts that have taken place over territory and power for many centuries on that unfortunate continent.

When one examines the actual sequence of facts leading up to the struggle, and the present and potential line up of warring nations it is silly to believe that the powers are waging a fight over the ideal of democracy, for which we thought we fought the last war. Unquestionably geographic location and a common interest in the well-known law of self-preservation are the dominating, if not sole, reasons for the two so-called democratic nations being arrayed on the same side. Despite the contentions of the alarmists who claim that dictators and democracies are destined for a death struggle, these different forms of governments like different religions, have, since this Republic was founded, existed side by side in this world and will continue to do so.

Furthermore, it is not our responsibility to spread or preserve democracy all over the world by force of arms. Nor is it our duty to protect weak European or Asiatic nations from the strong. The Monroe Doctrine confines our activities in that respect to North and South America which continents cover enough territory for us to be concerned about.

We can best serve the world and democracy by illustrating that peace can be maintained on the Western Hemisphere between nations whose peoples' ancestors came principally from war-torn Europe. The United States must prove to peoples who have yielded to dictators that democracy is still the best way of life by winning its own bloodless war over unemployment. We must prove that a democratic nation guarantees economic security to its people as well as civil and religious liberty, else we may get a dictator ourselves.

In conclusion, I wish to emphasize that I am well aware of the fact that certain men are more responsible for Europe's present tragic plight than others. I know that it is impossible for human beings to watch the terrible struggle without sympathizing with one side as against another. However, I do know that a proper restraint on the part of the American public plus a resolute determination to avoid involvement will keep us out of war. We must never forget what the last war did to the youth of America—and that it apparently taught Europe nothing.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM B. BARRY, M. C.

Dedication of the Abe Lincoln Ferry Park

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS LUDLOW
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 12, 1939

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, October 1, 1939, a new Indiana Lincoln Park was dedicated, to be known as the Abe Lincoln Ferry Park. This park is in Spencer County, Ind., on the banks of both the Ohio River and Anderson Creek, and marks the place where, in the years 1825 and 1826, young Abe Lincoln for a period of 18 months operated a ferry across the creek, which was then known as Anderson River.

The dedicatory services were under the auspices of the Boonville (Ind.) Press Club, a very notable organization, distinguished by its many successful civic enterprises. This club has been especially active in initiating and carrying on movements to uncover historical facts about Abraham Lincoln and to perpetuate the memory of that great man. Over a year ago this club started a campaign, in which all the civic and patriotic organizations of southern Indiana joined, in requesting the Indiana Highway Commission to buy the land surrounding the old Abe Lincoln Ferry and to incorporate it into a Lincoln park. The site of the Lincoln Ferry consists of 3 acres. A year ago the Indiana Highway Commission bought the land and laid it out in an appropriate manner, one of the improvements being a very attractive shelter home.

The address dedicating the Abe Lincoln Ferry Park was delivered by Hon. T. A. Dicus, chairman of the Indiana Highway Commission, who spoke as follows:

We are standing this afternoon in the presence of a great American ideal. The progress of a nation depends upon a profound, fundamental, spiritually imbued reverence for and devotion to the guiding principles for which that nation stands. These principles are to be found in summarized form in outstanding documents and speeches resultant from the struggle to make us a free, unhampered people, a people immune from the mailed fist and iron heel of the dictator.

We are enjoying the "separate and equal station to which the laws of nature and nature's God entitles us." We are inspired not only by our immediate physical surroundings but by the purpose which impels us to gather here for this dedication service. I am confident that each and every true American citizen understands and is deeply grateful for the ideals of liberty and freedom that characterize our great democracy. I have such confidence because of our efficient educational system that exists primarily for the purpose of inculcating these ideals into the minds and lives of our future citizenship. I have this confidence because our homes are founded upon the belief in freedom and equality. I have this confidence because in our memories we have a constant parade of great Americans who were imbued with the same stellar principles and who crystallized our ideals into realities.

So, we find ourselves upon this occasion in the presence of our ideals. Man never enters into a situation that is more helpful to his better living and contributes more to his personal refinement and tolerant attitude than to stand in the presence of his ideals. Stripped of all petty racial, political, religious, and economic differences, of all selfish and sinister purposes, we are assembled here to envision once more, with common understanding, the divinely inspired American plan.

Equality, liberty, tolerance, human understanding sympathy—all are attributes of American democracy. Each and all are virtues of any great American. No truly great American ever lived but who incorporated these virtues into his philosophy of life. These virtues are fundamentally right because they are Christian. Our democracy will survive and progress directly proportional to our individual and collective appropriation of these virtues into our many activities.

Our history may be read understandingly in the biographies of our great men, and it is refreshing and inspiring to pause here this afternoon and take cognizance of one who possessed to a superlative degree all of the qualities which we have enumerated—the qualities of a truly great American. One who stands in our minds as a positive proof of all of the claims we make for America; one who exemplified in private and public life the practicability of applied American principles; one born of the lowly to rise to the pinnacle of attainment; one whose simple life, loving and human understanding, generous, unselfish, Christ like attitude toward his friends and enemies, won for him the unstinted love and affection

of all posterity and the characterization of "Honest Abe" or "the immortal Lincoln."

We strive to explain the tremendous magnitude and quality of Lincoln's character. We find that as soon as his smattering of formal education would permit he became thoroughly acquainted with the Bible—a necessary attainment for those who are to be truly educated. His spirit of adventure was kindled by the lovable character of Robinson Crusoe. His spiritual life was cultured and encouraged by Christian's example in Pilgrim's Progress. His native wisdom was whetted and tempered by the writings of Benjamin Franklin, and his ambition engendered by the life of George Washington. All of these influences—interwoven with the love and sympathetic understanding of his mother and enriched with his romance with Ann Rutledge—destined him to be man among men and a superb example of the true American.

It is most gratifying to Hoosierdom that the boy Lincoln lived and played and was happy even on the soil upon which we now stand; that his formative years were spent in the beauties of our southern Indiana; that one of his earliest adventures was launched from this very spot. It was here that he embarked upon a mission by flatboat, the experiences of which inspired him on to some of the greatest activities of his life.

With this understanding of the significance of this occasion, and "* * * with malice toward none," there is little wonder that we humbly and with reverence assemble here to dedicate this spot to the memory of one whose full, well-rounded life has so definitely and adequately exemplified the spirit of all virtues of the American people; one whose efforts helped to shape the destinies of the greatest nation of all times, a nation of people whose basic principles are identical and correlated with the "way of life" exemplified and lived by our Master—our own United States.

Since the day that Abraham Lincoln embarked at this point to take produce tc New Orleans on flatboat via the Mississippi we have witnessed progress in all fields of endeavor such as no other period of equal time in all the history of the world. The oxcart and flatboat serve only to enrich our memories and increase our appreciation concerning the long and sometimes weary steps in the progress of our country. Ribbons of steel bind our whole country into a closely woven economic and social unit. Miles of highways of more recent development lead into practically each and every community of our land. We believe it will be interesting to speak briefly upon this occasion concerning the Indiana highway system, which contributes much to the reality of our presence here today.

Throughout the ages the progress of a people has been a story of their roads. Today our entire economic and social life is built around good roads which provide rapid communication and convenient transportation of commodities.

Nearly every day we have visitors remark about our wonderful system of State highways, and just as often homecoming Hoosiers say that nowhere did they find a highway system equal to our own. Our highways are the pride of Hoosiers, and right so; but they did not just happen. They are the product of much work by a staff of highway engineers, second to none in the Nation.

Only a little over 100 years ago, when the capital was established at Indianapolis, Indiana was largely wilderness, and roads—such as there were—were mere trails through the forest. About this time the Federal Government began work on the national road across Indiana. The roads of that period may be pictured in our minds from the fact that contracts for this road called for removing trees from the central 30 feet, leaving no stumps higher than 15 inches, and rounding these so that they offered no obstruction to vehicles. This was the first large-scale road building in Indiana.

In subsequent years, under county and township control, we made rapid strides in road building, using native stone, sand, and gravel; until we attained first rank in our percentage of improved roads. Compared to other States they were improved, but contrasted to roads of today they look like cowpaths.

Only 20 years ago the State highway commission was formed, and the first roads taken into the State system. During the two decades since that time a remarkable change has been made in our transportation system.

From the pioneer, Lincoln with his ox team, plodding the crooked paths that were called highways 100 years ago, and from the mud and dust of our so-called improved roads of 20 years ago, I invite you to turn to another picture.

Think of a hard-surfaced highway extending from San Francisco to New York and then to Miami. Add enough intermediate surface, free from dust and mud, to make two roads from Los Angeles to Baltimore. Top it all with one city street extending from Indianapolis to Cedar Rapids, Iowa, and you have an idea of the size of Indiana's State highway system.

This immense system, paid for without one cent of bonded indebtedness, represents a cash outlay of hundreds of millions of dollars and is a monument to the skill of Hoosier highway engineers.

The operation of this great system is one of the biggest businesses in Indiana. Every mile, when once constructed, must be kept in good condition. Just the simple task of mowing weeds twice a year on this system is equal to driving one mower three times around the world.

To mark one center line on this system requires over 100,000 gallons of asphalt paint.

There are over 36 miles of bridges and bridge floors to maintain.

Tons and tons of snow must be removed each winter.

Thousands of yards of stone and gravel are necessary to provide firm shoulders along pavement edges.

Thousands of miles of side ditches must be kept open for drainage.

Surfaces must be kept smooth for comfortable travel, firm to bear the ever-increasing load of heavy commercial vehicles, and cracks must be filled to prevent pavement destruction by the elements.

All of this, and much more, is required to provide a way over which traffic may move. But that is not enough. We must also provide for safe, comfortable, economical, and convenient movement of that traffic.

We have on the rural State highways of Indiana over three and one-half billions of miles of travel each year. If you had traveled at the rate of 50 miles per hour, day and night, from the year 6,000 B. C. up to the present time, you would still have 361 years to go to equal the total of 1 year's motor traffic on Indiana State highways. It would take 140,000 cars around the world at the Equator, or it would take each of Indiana's million motor vehicles on two round trips to the New York World's Fair and on a side trip to Kansas City.

One of every five of the cars on State routes is from some other State. Thus, our neighbors travel 730,000,000 miles with us each year and, if all crossed from east to west on one highway, would make one car every 7 seconds, day and night, throughout the year.

One out of every five of the vehicles on State highways is a truck or other commercial vehicle. This tremendous load of traffic is equal to 1,000 vehicles per day on each mile of road, but is, unfortunately, not so evenly distributed, and we find many miles carrying 400 or less, and many other miles carrying from 3,000 to 25,000 per day.

This composite stream of local and foreign traffic, composed of heavy commercial and light passenger vehicles, operated by drivers of both sexes and of all ages, races, and degrees of intelligence, moves at varying speeds over this vast system day and night in all sorts of weather, from the extreme heat and thunderstorm of July and August, to the snow, sleet, and icy cold of Hoosier winters.

We have progressed far in our development of roads and our use of roads since the time, more than a century ago, when Lincoln ferried an occasional team and wagon across Anderson Creek. Today the highway industry stands in the forefront, if not at the forefront, of the fields in which we labor. And yet, we are still seeking, in the building of roads, to do as Lincoln did with his ferry, aid the traveler in reaching his destination, more conveniently, more quickly, and with greater safety.

With our hearts quickened and glad upon this occasion and inspired as we are by this gathering, let us renew our confidence in our destiny, which is imbued with the real American spirit. Let us "press on toward the goal" that we may do honor to our reverend dead and make sure that "this Nation under God shall not perish from the earth."

Neutrality and the Arms Embargo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SHERMAN MINTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, October 4), 1939

ADDRESS BY SERGEANT YORK

Mr. MINTON. Mr. President, if Colonel Lindbergh, who is not a colonel except in an honorary sense, is to be accepted as an authority on war and peace, I think we might well accept as additional authority one who learned war from living in the hell of it. We should therefore welcome the expression of views from a great hero of the World War, Sergeant York. I ask unanimous consent that there may be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered on October 4 by Sergeant York.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Ladies and gentlemen, I have just come down to WSM radio studios after a visit to the home of "Old Hickory"—Andrew Jackson—which is some 12 miles from Nashville.

One of the reasons I left my home at Pall Mall, in the eastern part of middle Tennessee, last night was to make this little radio talk. The other reason was to visit the shrine of Tennessee's greatest hero, Andrew Jackson.

Out at the Hermitage today I was one of the few men in the midst of more than 400 Gold Star Mothers, and it was my duty to speak at the tomb of Andrew in the presence of these Gold Star Mothers and some of my buddies who went across and came back in the last war.

In such company, and on such hallowed ground, I thought a good deal about the course this country should take in the present troubled times.

Surely, we all hope that never again will we have to shed tears with another group of Gold Star Mothers.

And, yet, we Tennesseans are just as firmly resolved that we shall never be untrue to the traditions of bravery and courage and honor that made Andrew Jackson the hero of New Orleans.

I think we must, and will, be true to both these great emotions that I feel, that my people here in Tennessee feel, and I think the people of the whole country feel.

When you come right down to it, this is a problem for the people of the country as a whole, and that's the way it will be solved. That is the true democratic manner.

It is in the democratic manner for me, then, to tell my fellow citizens just how I feel about what is going on in Washington.

The President of the United States, on September 5 last, issued a proclamation of neutrality for the United States in the current war in Europe.

I understand that a proclamation calling for support of the President's proclamation of neutrality was issued today by Governor Cooper, of Tennessee. In that I can say that our own Governor voiced my own sentiments.

In the President's proclamation, President Roosevelt said:

"Let no man or woman thoughtlessly or falsely talk of America sending its armies to European fields."

I heartily endorse such sentiment.

The President also said:

"In modern foreign relations, when peace has been broken anywhere, the peace of all countries everywhere is in danger."

We know that he is right in that serious statement affecting the present peace of neutral nations.

Our duty is to uphold him in his determination that the American desire for neutrality shall not be changed.

But let us not close our eyes to possibilities already on the war horizon. That is not only dangerous, it is downright foolish.

If war becomes necessary—and when and if, and only if, it becomes necessary—then let us stand behind the President as solidly, as heartily, as whole-heartedly, and as completely in time of war as in time of efforts to preserve our peace.

I have known war, and, like President Roosevelt, I hate war.

But let me make this clear. I do not hate war to the extent that I would sacrifice the standing and the national honor of my country to obtain an unsatisfactory, unstable peace—a failure of peace, such as was the conference of Munich last fall.

Today the Congress of the United States is in special session at the call of the President.

The issue of neutrality and the issue of the arms embargo are at stake.

I see no reason why this country should not engage in a "cash and carry" basis with countries of warring Europe.

But when I say "cash and carry" I mean it in the full sense of the words. I mean just that—nothing else.

No terms whatsoever, under whatever circumstances of promises, should be permitted. On this stand we should all be firm and uncompromising.

We should remember, among other things from the last great World War that we should never forget, that the "promises to pay" were broken by every nation to which we loaned money except little Finland. She alone has kept faith with her promise. Her word alone has been worth a dime.

In times of war, to get certain necessities, a nation would promise almost anything and sign almost anything. Almost any kind of promise is born of desperation. But peacetimes bring calmer days and these promises are forgotten.

Common business sense demands today that America remember the lesson she learned during the last war and make her transactions this time on the cash basis—the old-fashioned "cash on the barrel head" basis. That's just good common sense, and I think anybody ought to see it that way.

The main issue confronting the American people, however, is not how much cash money we can make out of the unfortunate people engaged in war but how we ourselves can keep out of war.

We must do it, of course, by honorable means. That's the American way.

But the same energy, effort, and wirepulling we are now putting into the fight for extra wartime business we might well put into the fight for peace, and I'm afraid that's going to be a big battle.

It is necessary that the peace-loving people of America do their individual part toward maintaining our peace, and there is a limit to that part.

It should never consist of any word or thought or move that might be in opposition to the policy of the national administration, and that is strict neutrality.

I have confidence in President Roosevelt.

I believe he will lead the people of America safely and peacefully through the present world emergency.

I believe he is telling the truth when he says repeatedly that he hates war.

He, too, has seen war.

He came to France when he was The Assistant Secretary of the Navy and went up to the front sectors.

He has first-hand knowledge of the horror of war.

I believe that with the vision and memory of the World War and its sacrifices ever before him he will use every honorable resource at the command of this Nation to keep us out of conflict. I pray for his success.

Yet always there must be the uppermost thought in the mind and heart of the good, loyal American that if the neutrality of the United States cannot be honorably preserved, then we must war with those who would war against us.

We must never let our passionate desire for peace be considered by the aggressive dictators of Europe as a sign that we are afraid.

America is not afraid.

Our will to live in peace is not a sign of weakness. It is strength and sanity far greater than some leaders of Europe could understand.

Let them never doubt this. Let Americans themselves never forget it.

We are the strongest, the mightiest, the greatest nation in the world, and we hope to stay that way. In peace we even pray to the God in whom we put our trust that we shall have peace.

But that does not mean we will go to any limits for peace. We shall not go beyond the limits of national honor.

America shall be true to the traditions of Washington and Jackson and Jefferson. We shall fight to keep the democracy they gave us—our greatest heritage.

I believe we can best preserve our democracy in peace. But we will be willing to war, if war be the only chance. Let no man doubt that.

I believe the temper of the American people is for an alert peace.

This was shown a few days ago, in the American Legion convention in Chicago that Governor Cooper and other Tennessee Legionnaires attended.

It was also shown here today when war mothers gathered at the tomb of Andrew Jackson.

Tennessee sent nearly 80,000 men to the last World War.

Nearly 2,000 of them were killed.

More than 500 Tennessee boys are still sleeping in Flanders Fields.

The gold stars are still visible in every city and town and rural hamlet in Tennessee.

We should, if possible, spare our people another great war.

Yet always we should hold fast to the ideal that Americanism can best be preserved by an alert, prepared, honorable peace objective, but a willingness and readiness and ability to fight if that peace is not accepted by those who guide the destinies of other nations.

At night, when I retire, I pray that never again will my country be plunged into the hell that I know war to be.

No future generals would accept my services. For the years have taken their toll.

But I have a son, almost 20 years old, back home at Pall Mall. He is not anxious to go to the battle front. But he is ready if the leaders of this Nation call him.

He trusts our leaders—from the President and the Congress on down—to keep us out of war, if possible.

And, as his father, I pray that my wife shall never become a Gold Star Mother.

Let all America be willing to pray for peace—and fight for peace.

America Needs an Increased Air Force

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 17, 1939

ADDRESS BY CHARLES F. HORNER

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Charles F. Horner, president, the National Aeronautics Association, at the air-progress rally, Elkins, W. Va., October 7, 1939:

Anyone who makes a prediction of how much progress aviation will make in the next decade would be foolhardy. So much has been done during the three decades of its existence that aviation today is almost a miracle child of American ingenuity, courage, and foresight.

Within the current year we have seen the last of the oceans spanned. Regular scheduled service to Europe, maintained despite war conditions, makes possible transportation of passengers, express, and mail. And only a short time ago, people questioned the ability of our engineers and pilots to build and fly planes which would fly nonstop more than 2,000 miles across vast expanses of water.

Almost 450 years ago, Columbus, with the courage and faith that have since characterized the best type of American pioneers, set forth from a quaint port in Spain. With him was a motley crew of adventurers, some hardy and disciplined, some willing to face unknown dangers only to escape those which they knew lay behind them.

Three small, barely seaworthy vessels made up the ocean caravan destined to light the way to a new record of achievement and to

open a world, hitherto unfathomed and unknown. Columbus was buffeted by storm from without, he faced terror by sea, and was beset by mutiny within his ranks. He knew nothing of his course. The haven he sought was little more than a hope. Navigation aids were a dream and faith's holy spark. For 70 days he struggled, found an enchanted isle, and a new world was known to the men of his day.

More than 300 years later, their own faith stirred perhaps by the courage and convictions of Columbus, two American pioneer adventurers, clear-eyed and determined, made an overland journey half across the continent of America. They struggled for months, up racing streams, over rocky wastes, and through the fastnesses of mountains. Many of their men lost their lives, but after many months of weary travel, the eyes of Lewis and Clark were rewarded in the boundless majesty of the Oregon shore.

There are probably not many mature men and women of America who have not, at some time, in their lives, been thrilled by Jules Verne's Around the World in Eighty Days. It was purely a fantasy when written and, although the story stirred the blood of thousands, after all, it was then very much like the management of a grand opera star, or like living within one's economic means would be today—something that really could not happen. To span the earth in 80 days. What a fabrication of fantasy. What a distortion of fact.

It is related that about a dozen years ago, a citizen of Buenos Aires, named Tschiffley, undertook a journey from that great South American city to Washington, D. C. He traveled all the way by land. He used the methods of transportation that were then available over that long and weary way. He came by horseback, traveling northward, ever northward, and finally, more than 2 years later, reached his destination.

Told again and again, these stories may be superfluous. Already you have drawn from your own memories numerous instances in kind. Yet the men who undertook these journeys typify almost every other living person in this enlightened world. To a degree, they personify the compelling quest that surges within the hearts of all civilized men.

I cannot believe that in travel men seek adventure alone or in exploration struggle for personal renown. This lure of travel is not a selfish urge. It struggles incessantly for a wider arena for development, a higher plane of thought and experience.

A few years ago I visited with Glen Martin, a practical idealist, a dreamer of sane dreams, and a man who puts imagination into blue prints and finds romance in revolving wheels. He spoke confidently of a day when the ordinary traveler might leave New York in the morning and, in the miracle of the flying boat, dine in a capital of Europe the following day. A few hours for a journey much longer than that for which Columbus and the *Santa Maria* required 70 days to complete.

Today the practical dream of Glen Martin is a reality. Huge flying clipper ships wing their sure way across the Atlantic from Port Washington, N. Y., or Baltimore, Md., to European ports in a little more than 24 hours. Already hundreds of persons traveling on business or for pleasure have used this new, this modern, this American manner of transoceanic travel.

Lewis and Clark, in danger, hunger, and disaster, spent weary months back in 1803–4 to achieve the distance that a modern transport air liner can fly in a day. Today, covering the same territory they so laboriously crossed, giant air liners cruise from Chicago to Seattle and Portland in a comfortable overnight journey.

The ships of the sky, flying across the Caribbean Sea and down the coast of South America, now carry mail and passengers from New York to any one of several South American cities across 15 frontiers for a distance of 8,000 miles, soaring above diverse people who speak six different languages, flying over mountains and jungles, as low as sea level and higher than the clouds, kissed by tropical sun and buffeted by zero gales, not in the more than 2 years' travel of poor Mr. Tschiffley, but in little more than a week. * * *

I do not search for miracles or their cause; I seek a place where I may understand in some degree the impelling urge with which man seeks to take the "wings of the morning and fly to the uttermost parts of the earth."

If the *Dixie Clipper*, spanning the Atlantic, or the *China Clipper*, diminishing the vastness of the Pacific, are miracles today, the hard-riding cowboys of the pony express were miracles in another age. Whether we creep, or walk, or float, or roll, or sail, or fly, the desire to move is of the very essence of our life.

Thus progress is made and recorded. In this heroic experience we must find a deeper understanding of life.

None can, and, if a full appreciation of its high purpose is understood, none would stop flying. Neither the capsized canoe in a mountain stream nor the *Titanic's* fearful doom hold boats at their moorings or steamers at their docks. Only the coward would be restrained; only the fool would think that men will be stopped either by fear or disaster, and neither fools nor cowards have achieved a place in America's hall of fame. Aviation, man's most sublime expression of motion, is growing, and will continue to grow in ever-widening circles, for greater distances, to greater heights.

There was a time when men thought flying would be confined to a few thousand feet of altitude. Today men are successfully flying even transport ships at heights of 4 and 5 miles above the earth in complete safety and comfort. There was a time when it took the first mail plane 4 hours to travel from New York to Philadelphia—the time it now takes for a leisurely journey by air from New York or Washington to points beyond Chicago.

But aviation has become more than an instrument of achievement, a conqueror of new worlds.

It has become a force as a liaison between the priest in his cloister, the philosopher in his temple, and those men of action who have given us this great product of their inventive and creative minds and hands.

Despite its employment as a messenger of death on the battle front, aviation was becoming, and in God's good time will become, an instrument of peace and good will. Let a modern air voyager announce his plans to encircle the globe, and immediately the nations he will span offer every help and convenience for his journey. This new, this finer aspect of human relationship promises a better world in which to live.

Flying creates no new philosophy; it enriches and vitalizes the old. It reveals in startling intensity the need to apply it to life that may at times seem confused and complicated with things modern. It is no one's wish that the mind of the inventor, nor the ingenuity of the manufacturer shall too far outstrip the intelligence of average man. These cannot and will not be restrained. These must move forward and discover that that which seemed a menace and a burden may in intelligence become a blessing and a means for security.

Thus, with horizons widened, ocean barriers surmounted, and greater opportunity for enriched international relationships resulting, the progress of flight continues.

To him who finds his pathway in the sky, to him who has conquered the far-flung expanses of the world and dares to dream of the exploration of the universe, to him, in imagination, nations become tiny spots, international boundary lines unseen, selfish dreams of worldly empire an hallucination, and fortifications but a figment of a troubled dream.

While intrepid pilots find new and untried sky lanes, while skilled engineers design new and faster ships, and while visionary inventors develop new and better devices to control and navigate them, others of us may discover a way to define new horizons, adapt an old philosophy to a life whose riches have been multiplied to the end that flying may add to the happiness and not to the danger of a troubled world.

Like religion, and music, and unselfishness, flying is surely effecting a strong kinship and a bond of understanding among those who have tasted the happiness it confers.

The association I represent is exerting all of its power and its facilities to encourage and foster national defense in the air; likewise to encourage and foster a healthy appreciation of what civil and private aviation can mean to this modern world. We also foster and encourage the spirit of sportsmanship and friendly competition to make America lead in the air. All this I heartily endorse and am doing all that I can to advance. But we do this, not to prepare for war but to prepare to avert war, and meanwhile, through this great instrumentality, through aviation, to promote international good will and to widen the scope of our lives.

Beginning with September 11, 750 or more cities in the United States and Alaska, through public meetings like this, in air tours, airport celebrations, junior airplane contests, and in study in the public schools, have endeavored to bring themselves up to date in the great progress which has been made in this new and fascinating activity. After all, I do not come to talk of aviation as a thing of romance but rather as a practicability. It is not simply an adventure in new fields but a growing, forward surge in finding, accepting, and developing a new method to enhance our social happiness, our economic welfare, and our national defense.

During the years of the demoralizing depression, aviation was indeed a small child in the great family of industrial groups. But it, and perhaps it alone, made gain day by day and year by year, while other industries lost. It has now established itself as a practical business enterprise. Every phase of it, scheduled air transport, air mail, military and nonscheduled operations, are growing steadily and satisfactorily. We are slowly beginning to realize that, in the dreary search for means to expand our trade, industries, and employment, aviation shows reasonable hope that it will rapidly become a substantial factor in all. While much has been accomplished, particularly within the last year, there is so much to be done. Aviation is genuinely an institution of public concern, because the people of America as such, dollar for dollar, have a far greater investment in it than have carriers and manufacturers.

That is why in characteristic American fashion the people of America are beginning to express their interest as you are doing today. There is a great work for us yet to do. I cannot, of course, discuss all of the things that should have your careful thought, but rather I must content myself in referring briefly to a few of them. The great field of nonscheduled operations in flying, and included in that are your private fliers, who use the planes for their own business or pleasure, that great backbone of aviation, the private flight instructors, the fixed base operators, including approved schools, are worthy of the backing of sympathetic encouragement, and civic-minded support of all progressive citizens. These have kept aviation alive in lean days. They have paid a price, both in dollars and devotion. They are widely scattered, are unorganized, and it is important that their rights and their potentialities should be kept constantly in view, along with airlines and military air forces. I congratulate the city of Elkins on its vastly improved airport. I hope and believe that you appreciate its value and importance in your civic life. At the present time the airport situation in the country as a whole is one that should cause us all deep concern. During the last few years practically the only money

that has been available for airport extension outside of municipal sponsorship has been derived from relief funds. Under a mandate from Congress the Civil Aeronautics Authority undertook, accomplished, and conveyed to Congress a survey of our system of airports, and a report of what should be done to provide an adequate system. Unfortunately, but little heed has been given to this report. Our airlines are moving rapidly forward in extension of airways and volume of traffic. Great and important additions are being made to our military air forces. Private flying is increasing day by day, but there is no plan yet projected to effect a corresponding increase in airport facilities.

Those are two of the things that I think are of primary importance to you as alert and patriotic citizens. The third I am reluctant to discuss, just as we are all reluctant to face grave dangers which threaten the security of the institutions, the ideals, and the happiness of 130,000,000 people. Nevertheless, I think it is my duty to speak to you on the subject of air defense.

I am not a military expert, and I base the following statement upon that which I believe is the minimum of what the American people want. The last Congress, in a highly patriotic and nonpartisan manner, made commendable authorizations which, when effected, will bring the fighting strength of the Army Air Corps to about 5,500 planes. That is splendid, but it is not enough. Does any reasonable citizen doubt that if America had had, within the past year, an invincible and altogether adequate army in the air, that we would face so great a threat of danger today? Indeed it is doubtful, had we been in that happy situation, if a war in Europe would even have been begun. If I sense American opinion correctly, we want not a good air force, but perhaps the greatest air force of the world. In the interest of peace and security and of ultimate economy I believe that our Army air force should be expended not to 5,500 planes but to at least 10,000 planes and that there should be an annual increase thereafter of at least 1,000 planes in addition to replacements for obsolescence and loss. To those who say that our production capabilities are not sufficient to effect this I will say, that is sheer nonsense. To those who say this would present too great a problem in the necessary expansion of personnel, again I say that is also nonsense. There is a great reservoir of trained manpower available, including those almost forgotten men of aviation who are willing, though rusty, but nevertheless competent, the Air Reserves. To those who say that such an expansion would be economically unsound, there are many answers, but one is enough. The whole crushing cost of war is economically unsound.

If I read American opinion correctly, the tax bearers of the country are perfectly willing to expend the few hundred millions of dollars necessary to provide an air force sufficient to defend us, in the great probability that through such an expenditure a cost of many, many billions of dollars may be avoided. I have confidence in the ability, the patriotism, and resourcefulness of our Air Corps. I believe we can trust their leadership, and I think it is high time that the people of America, whose stake is the lives of their sons and their property and happiness, have come to realize and believe that the greatest war defensive air force in the world is not too much for this the greatest Nation in the world.

Col. E. M. House

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. R. EWING THOMASON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 17, 1939

LETTERS FROM FRANCES B. DENTON AND GORDON AUCHINCLOSS AND AN EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letters, signed by Frances B. Denton and Gordon Auchincloss, with regard to a letter recently placed in the RECORD purporting to have been written by the late Col. E. M. House, and also an editorial upon the subject published in the New York Times:

NEW YORK, N. Y., *October 16, 1939.*

Hon. ROBERT EWING THOMASON,
Room 1730, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I have read with deep interest the questions you asked Congressman THORKELSON on October 13, 1939, and the answers he gave, all of which appear on pages 391 et seq. of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD under date of October 13, 1939. I have also read the extension of remarks of Hon. J. THORKELSON, of Montana, in the House of Representatives on Wednesday, October 11, 1939, which appear on pages 598–603 of the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of October 11, 1939, and which include, in the words of Mr. THORKELSON, "a letter from Col. E. M. House to Hon. David Lloyd George."

For a period of 45 years prior to Colonel House's death on March 28, 1938, I acted as Colonel House's confidential secretary, and as such took all of his dictation and was in charge of all of his papers and was familiar with all of his correspondence. I can state unqualifiedly that the letter which Mr. THORKELSON introduced into the RECORD above referred to, and purporting to be signed by Col. E. M. House, was never written or signed by him.

I notice on page 391 of the RECORD that Mr. THORKELSON states that he has not the original of this letter, and that he has no evidence with reference to the signature, and that he does not vouch for the genuineness of the letter.

I can testify and will be very glad to do so at any time that the letter was never dictated by Colonel House, never signed by Colonel House, never authorized by Colonel House, and is entirely and altogether spurious, purporting as it does to be a letter of Colonel House.

I am a native of Texas myself and I appreciate very much your action as a Representative of Texas in making it perfectly clear to the Congress of the United States and to the people of the United States generally that the presence of this letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is a rank injustice to a man now dead but who during his entire life worked hard as a loyal American citizen for the State of Texas and for the United States of America.

Yours very sincerely,

FRANCES B. DENTON.

AUCHINCLOSS, ALLEY & DUNCAN,
New York, October 16, 1939.

Hon. ROBERT EWING THOMASON,
Room 1730, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN THOMASON: I wish to let you know how much the family of Col. E. M. House appreciate your efforts on October 13, 1939, to protect the reputation of Colonel House, as appears on page 391 et seq. of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that date.

Colonel House, who is now dead, was my father-in-law, and at various intervals during the World War I acted as his secretary on certain of his trips to Europe, including the entire period of the Peace Conference in Paris; and, generally speaking, I was thoroughly familiar with all of his activities during the period in which he acted as an advisor to the late President Wilson.

The letter that Mr. THORKELSON quotes is apparently dated "British Consulate, New York City, June 10, 1919," and is signed "Your humble and obedient servant, Col. E. M. House." On June 10, 1919, and for almost 8 months previous to that time, Colonel House was in Paris acting, first as the President's representative in the pre-armistice negotiations and then as a member of the American Commission to Negotiate Peace, so obviously he was not in New York City on June 10, 1919.

I enclose herewith an editorial which appeared in the New York Times under date of Saturday, October 14, 1939, entitled "A Historical Report." This editorial really makes it unnecessary for me to further characterize this letter, but I will add that from my knowledge of Colonel House's affairs, thoughts, ideas, and general activity I can state that the letter is altogether spurious and was never written by him or authorized by him and never signed by him.

Unfortunately for us, Mr. THORKELSON had to admit, in answer to a question from you, that he did not have the original of the letter, and he simply referred you, when you asked him to give some evidence of the authenticity of the letter, to the American Publishers Society, Bremerton, Wash. May I suggest to you that the Federal Bureau of Investigation report to you promptly with reference to the American Publishers Society, Bremerton, Wash., and that, further, Congressman DIES might be interested to have his committee investigate the activities of this society.

On page 393 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Mr. THORKELSON states, in answer to your contention that he should provide the House with some evidence that the late Colonel House signed the letter in question, "I do not think it makes very much difference, because the question today is not the reputation of any man and it is not a question of the character of any man. We know we were deceived during the World War and we know we are being deceived today." Does it occur to Congressman THORKELSON that he, himself, in his role as a Representative of one of the great States of the Union, is deceiving the people of the United States by sponsoring a clumsy, spurious document, which is also a forgery, by introducing the same into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD? In effect, Mr. THORKELSON, by printing this letter purporting to be signed by Colonel House, is saying to the American people that in 1919 one of their highly trusted representatives was acting as a secret-service agent of the British Government. If Mr. THORKELSON can prove this to be a fact, it is important. If he cannot prove it—and so far he has not made the slightest effort to prove it—it is important that the American people should thoroughly understand the kind of deception which Mr. THORKELSON is willing to sponsor.

Yours very sincerely,

GORDON AUCHINCLOSS.

[From the New York Times of October 14, 1939]

"A HISTORICAL REPORT"

In the Appendix of the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of October 11 Representative JACOB THORKELSON, of Montana, extending his remarks, covered eleven columns and a quarter with a reprint of what he called "a historical document." This purported to be a letter written from the British Consulate in New York, June 10, 1919, by the late Colonel House to Mr. David Lloyd George. On that date both were in Paris. In President Seymour's "Intimate Papers of Colonel House" we find that Colonel House "remained in Paris until June 11." On the previous day his diary records that he "went today to see Sir William Orpen's portrait of the President." Dipping one's nose into the second column of the

historical report one finds reference to a previous report alleged to have been made by the Colonel to the Prime Minister:

"The report I had the honor to submit to you, dated December 1, 1918 (appendix 14), showed that the average angelicization [sic] time for Americans in England had been reduced to 14 days; in America to 29 days 3 hours 16 minutes; that the percentage of angelicization [sic] had risen to 101; that the percentage of failure had fallen to 3.79; and that the cost had been decreased to 53 cents per colonist."

This should have put Mr. THORKELSON on notice. The whole supposed letter is a burlesque so thickly laid on that it becomes almost incredible. Who handed this curious composition to the Honorable JACOB THORKELSON? He doesn't tell us. Some joker must have taken advantage of his innocence. Surely the Honorable Jacob must have accepted this document unread. For instance:

"May I also call your attention to the services of Prof. Richard Gottheil, of Columbia University (the one who pinned the medal on F. D. Roosevelt in 1937 for his distinguished services to the world Jewry), in our campaign against the Hindus."

It was a careless jester who allowed that 1937 to stick out in a letter attributed to 1919, but Mr. THORKELSON, in his large, western way, having plenty of faith, didn't draw on sight. It is a preposterous fake that someone has given him. The American Anglophiles are going to use the League of Nations, of which Mr. Wilson is to be president, to restore the United States to the British Empire. Mr. Wilson's appointment as head of the League would be for life. He would like a privy purse of $100,000,000. "The inventories I have prepared," writes the spurious colonel (appendixes 45–83), show that Mr. Wilson "is now surfeited with diamond stomachers, brooches, bracelets, Gobelin tapestries, mosaics and vases, gold caskets and plates."

This posthumous calumny is so absurd that one can hardly be angry with the author of it. The twinkle in his eye asks for forgiveness.

Our National Defense—We Should Increase and Strengthen Our Pacific Northwest Defenses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN F. SMITH

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 17, 1939

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. MARTIN F. SMITH, OF WASHINGTON, OCTOBER 16, 1939

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I insert the following radio speech which I delivered over the national network of the Mutual Broadcasting System from Station WOL, Washington, D. C., on Monday evening, October 16, 1939:

Friends of the radio audience, may I at the outset express my appreciation to the Mutual network and its coast-to-coast facilities for making this national broadcast possible.

Here in the National Capital the keenest interest and attention are, of course, being directed to the all-important and all-engrossing subject of neutrality and our foreign relations. The debate in the Senate has proceeded in a dignified, orderly, and constructive manner and according to the best and highest traditions of that august body. The Members of the House are standing by and will not be able to decide their exact position until the form and provisions of the neutrality legislation have been shaped by the Senate. In the meantime House Members are following very closely the discussion in the Senate and giving the entire subject the deepest, earnest study and consideration and will be ready to act promptly and intelligently as soon as the Senate has concluded its deliberations and the legislation comes back to the House for final action.

TO KEEP OUT OF WAR IS OUR MAIN OBJECTIVE

It cannot be emphasized too strongly that President Roosevelt and every Member of the House and Senate, and all the officials of our Government have one all-controlling objective in view, and that is to keep our country out of the present European war and to enact neutrality legislation which will most effectively accomplish this purpose. There exists here in Washington an absolute unanimity of opinion and unity of determination in support of this main objective. Patriotic men and women differ only as to the method and formula to be followed to prevent our country from becoming involved. I do not doubt for one moment that the issue will finally be resolved in favor of the best interests of our own country and our own people.

FACTORS IN FAVOR OF CASH AND CARRY

It now appears probable that the determining factors in favor of the cash-and-carry feature will be: First, that the present law does not bar American ships from combat zones; that the proposed pending act would bar them; second, that the law now does not limit responsibility of our Government for goods other than munitions in transit to belligerents, while the proposed law would; third, that the present law bars only munitions and not other commodities; and, fourth, and very important, cash-and-carry neutrality would aid American preparedness and the strengthening of our national defenses. I intend to elaborate on this feature later in my remarks.

Upon the foregoing provisions we predicate our belief and build our hopes that it will be possible—at least, more likely—for our country to keep out of the European war. By forcing American shipping to stay out of combat zones we will be less affected by submarines and air warfare, which was the direct cause of our involvement in the last European war.

We need to look to our interests in the Pacific, with Japan a potential enemy of Great Britain and Russia alined on the same side with Germany, which is one of the most amazing and threatening developments of this war so far as our future interests are concerned. Australia and New Zealand are defenseless; the Philippines are an American obligation until 1946. Nor should we overlook South America and our maintenance of the Monroe Doctrine.

OUR NATIONAL AND PACIFIC COAST DEFENSES

As one of the Representatives in Congress of a Pacific coast State—Washington—it is only logical and natural that the matter of our national defenses, and particularly our Pacific coast defenses, should be of vital concern to me and the people whom I represent.

"WHILE ENGLAND SLEPT"—CHURCHILL

I recently placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD excerpts from Winston Churchill's book, "While England Slept," which consists of speeches Mr. Churchill delivered in the House of Commons during the past 6 years urging war preparedness and warning his countrymen of Germany's rearmament and growing war machine and air forces, now estimated at 16,000 planes. The conclusion is inescapable that England neglected her national defenses while Germany built the greatest war machine in human history and the largest air fleet in the world. If England had also prepared and at least maintained a parity with Germany in the air, it is very doubtful, indeed, that there would be war in Europe today, and the recent history of central and southeastern Europe might have been different. The end is not yet and how costly England's neglect will prove to be time alone will tell.

My countrymen, this is a period in history when it behooves our country to look facts straight in the face without blinking and act accordingly.

DEFENSES ON THE PACIFIC COAST

Do we need a two-ocean naval fleet?

Is our Pacific coast adequately protected?

Are the Grand Coulee and Bonneville Dams and Grays Harbor Jetties adequately protected?

Have we sufficient air and seaplane bases on the Pacific coast?

Have we sufficient fortifications and antiaircraft guns on the Pacific coast?

Have we sufficient air defenses on the Pacific coast?

Are the cities of San Francisco, Los Angeles, Portland, Vancouver, Longview, Seattle, Tacoma, Olympia, Grays Harbor, Spokane, and eastern and western Washington adequately protected?

Are the Columbia River, Puget Sound, Grays Harbor, and Willapa Harbor defenseless and vulnerable to foreign attack?

Is the Panama Canal safe from attack?

Do we need the Nicaragua Canal, the Florida ship canal?

PUGET SOUND, GRAYS HARBOR, WILLAPA HARBOR, AND COLUMBIA RIVER CANAL

Do we need the Puget Sound, Grays Harbor, Willapa Harbor, and Columbia River Canal first proposed by Jefferson Davis while Secretary of War, away back in 1856, as a military measure as well as an aid to commerce? The naval forces at the Puget Sound base are at present limited to the Straits of Juan de Fuca for ingress and egress. The proposed canal would permit more than half the commissioned vessels of the Navy to enter and depart by the canal, declared Rear Admiral Luther E. Gregory, C. E. C., United States Navy (retired), who also says that the two lower canals would accommodate three-fourths of the registered ships of the Navy with the tide at mean sea level.

Plans are completed for a submarine base located on the Columbia River. The sea-level canals would allow the submarines to operate from that base through either Grays Harbor, Willapa Harbor, and Puget Sound, in addition to the Columbia River entrance, and come to the relief or support of any naval unit engaged in battle at the straits. Vessels moving from Puget Sound would have three other exits into the ocean if the canals were constructed. The navy yard at Bremerton is becoming a principal base for construction of cruisers, destroyers, and such craft, and for fleet repairs. The proposed waterways would enhance its value to the Nation.

One of the largest military bases on the west coast, Fort Lewis, is being developed as a principal center of military concentration. The safe and rapid transport of heavy ordnance and munitions between defensive points along the coast is now impeded by highway bridges of light capacity and highways which are inadequate.

The Boeing airplane factory at Seattle, one of the largest such plants in the country, produces large numbers of fighting ships for the Government. This industry deserves the extra protection a canal would give.

At Dupont is situated one of the largest powder plants in the country, and Hogum Bay, near Olympia, is a storage plant of the

Giant Powder Co. These industries will provide huge war supplies in case of conflict, supplies which can best be moved by water transportation. With the canal completed, transportation would be facilitated.

The cost of one battleship would build the canal, and in the time of national danger the existence of the new waterway might easily be worth a fleet of battleships in its strategic value.

GROWING PROXIMITY OF RUSSIA AND JAPAN

A few years ago Russian fliers flew successfully from Moscow over the North Pole to Vancouver, Wash., in my district, and made a second successful flight to California. If they would take off from the Bering Straits instead of far-off Moscow, how much easier their flight would be.

We have two wide oceans, it is true, but they do not afford us the safety and security they once did, with Colonel Lindbergh telling us about the planes which Germany is building capable of flying 500 miles per hour and remaining in the air 48 hours, and which would readily fly across the Atlantic and back.

My friends, because we take out life insurance is no indication that we expect or wish to die immediately, nor do we take out any kind of protective insurance because we want or expect to collect the benefits at once or ever. I liken the wisdom and advantage of our increasing and strengthening our national defenses as a form of insurance, no more and no less than that.

DANGEROUS POSSIBILITIES OF OUTCOME OF EUROPEAN WAR

I do not expect England and France to be defeated by Germany, but our country would be foolish and reckless, indeed, to not take into account in our plans that very possibility, especially in view of Russia's attitude and that of Italy and Japan. Should we shut our eyes to the fact that this war could continue until Germany, Russia, Italy, and Japan—which God forbid—were all allied and fighting against the western democracies? Our interests are not entirely confined to the North American Continent. As a matter of fact, we are pledged to protect and defend all the nations of the Western Hemisphere, including South America, under the Monroe Doctrine.

If Great Britain and France were defeated and Germany were to become master of the British and French Navies and air and land forces, with her powerful allies in the east, would they extend their dominion and exploitation to undeveloped South America, our next-door neighbors?

WE SHOULD IMMEDIATELY STRENGTHEN OUR NATIONAL DEFENSES

Are our Navy and air fleet comparable with those of Germany and Russia and Japan?

My fellow countrymen, this is an hour in our history for sober, serious, hard-headed, practical thinking and prompt, expeditious action. Would it not be the height of folly, extreme stupidity, and criminal neglect of duty for us to fail to substantially increase and strengthen our national defenses? With our two long coast lines and vast continental geographical area to defend, in the interest of the safety, security, and peace of our own people we should take immediate steps without the loss of another single day to build and construct for our proper and adequate national defense the largest and most modern and efficient two-ocean navy, the most complete coastal land defenses and strongest fortifications, the most effective antiaircraft defenses which science can provide, and particularly the largest air fleet in the world, commensurate with the size, area, and distances of our domain—50,000 planes, according to the advice of Capt. Eddie Rickenbacker, World War ace.

Let us be so well prepared that no combination of foreign powers in the world would dare to attack us. Let us be so well prepared that no combination of foreign powers in the world could attack us successfully.

Good night.

Industrial Mobilization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 17, 1939

EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON TIMES-HERALD

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, and to include therein an editorial which appeared in the Washington Times-Herald on October 17, 1939, which is both sound and instructive. This editorial follows:

[From the Washington Times-Herald of October 17, 1939]

TOO MUCH SECRECY

Too much secrecy about the War Department's new industrial mobilization plan is breeding distrust and discontent in Congress and out.

This project is not merely the outline of grand strategy for national defense. It can lead to reorganization of our entire industrial system and affect the life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness of every man, woman, and child in the country.

WAR CAUGHT US NAPPING

Prior to 1914 nobody realized how drastically war would affect life in a modern nation. Consequently the great conflict caught the nations napping, and they had to mobilize industry by guess in the very middle of war's confusion. There was terrible waste, graft, and delay.

To prevent such a catastrophe again the War Department started studying, in 1921, the history and possibilities of mobilizing industry. It brought out in 1931 a rough draft of its findings and proposals for the President's action as soon as he feels war is imminent. Attached also were bills for Congress to enact. These have been revised three times—in 1933, 1936, and again this year. The three prior drafts have always been public documents available at the Government Printing Office.

But the 1939 draft, drastically altering the detailed plan, was suddenly jerked back under cover after being announced in the routine fashion. Copies have become so scarce that, according to the Washington Daily Merry Go-Round, even Attorney General Murphy had to photostat a copy which had fallen into the hands of a newspaperman. None of the congressional Committees on Military Affairs have a copy.

HUSH-HUSH IS FOOLISH

This hush-hush behavior by the War Department is very foolish. It causes people to read into the plan meanings which a more forthright handling of a critical public issue would never stir up. We, for instance, have read the hard-to-get plan and honestly admit we'd like further information on some points. For example:

Industries should be classified as war industries and nonwar industries, according to the essentiality of the materials and services they provide. Labor requirements should then be determined for each of these classes, with primary attention directed toward furnishing adequate supplies of labor for the more important industries, thus keeping the job and the worker together, as far as circumstances permit.

There are four newspapers in this city. If war comes, what chance is there that some second lieutenant of ordnance may declare one newspaper is enough to serve this community as an essential war industry?

The thing is full of jokers of this sort. We think Congress had better get a copy of the 1939 mobilization plan and discuss it in detail for all the country's benefit, whether the War Department likes it or not.

Proposed Argentine Trade Agreement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 17, 1939

STATEMENT BY HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE, OF KANSAS

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement made by me before the Committee for Reciprocity Information:

I desire to express my opposition to the reduction in tariff rates on agricultural products from Argentina as contemplated in the proposed reciprocal trade agreement with that country.

I do not appear here as one who is opposed to an extension of our foreign trade. As a matter of fact, I represent the greatest wheat-producing district in the country, and my constituents are vitally interested in expanding wheat exports. They realize and I realize that if this is to be done it is necessary to give and take and that we cannot have exports without imports.

I do not believe that our general level of tariff rates on agricultural products is too high. On that question I do not want to go as far as President Roosevelt did in his Baltimore speech on October 25, 1932, in which he said: "I know of no effective excessively high tariff duties on farm products. I do not intend that such duties shall be lowered," because I think there are possibly some agricultural commodities upon which there are excessively high tariff rates, just as there are some industrial commodities upon which the rates are excessive. Perhaps adjustments are needed. I do feel, however, that the reductions in agricultural rates made in previous trade agreements have been entirely unjustified and very definitely injurious to agriculture.

One very good reason why the program might in its early years have failed to help agriculture was because the earlier agreements were in most cases made with countries which were our competitors in agricultural production. However, it was asserted, and it seemed with some reason, that as time went on and agreements

were made with countries whose principal interests were industrial, it would be possible to do something for agriculture. Great hopes were held out in connection with the British agreement, but certainly what has occurred during the first 9 months of that agreement has not given us any reason to believe that it will be of any assistance to agriculture. As a matter of fact, the figures show that during the time in which this agreement has been in existence our agricultural exports to Great Britain have declined as compared with the similar period prior to the effective date of the treaty, January 1, 1939.

As far as the product in which I am most interested—namely, wheat—is concerned, such exports as have been brought about during the period of the British agreement have occurred, not because of the agreement, but rather because of a policy which is the very antithesis of the trade-agreement program; namely, an export subsidy. Undoubtedly, had the export-subsidy program not been in effect, our agricultural exports to Great Britain since the agreement with that country went into effect would have made even a poorer showing.

Inasmuch as representatives of the producers of all the products likely to be affected by such reductions in rates as may be made by this agreement are represented at this hearing and will no doubt submit definite figures and specific reasons why no change should be made in the rates affecting particular products, I shall not duplicate what may be offered in the way of statistics and figures, but make my statement as brief as possible and confine it to the general proposition that, in view of the record showing what has been done under the reciprocal trade-agreement program, it is a mistaken policy to undertake a reduction in tariff rates on competitive agricultural products from Argentina at this time.

While I am interested in a fair tariff rate on all agricultural commodities, yet the products under consideration in which I am particularly interested, because they are produced in my district, are beef and veal and their byproducts, including tallow, oleo oil and oleo stearin, and hides; dairy products, including casein and cheese; corn; broomcorn; alfalfa seed; eggs; turkeys; vegetable oils, including linseed; and wool.

Notwithstanding a sharp increase in the price of some of these commodities, practically all of them are today below parity prices, and any reduction in tariff rates cannot help but have a detrimental effect either in reducing prices or preventing prices advancing more nearly to parity. It is true that a few products under consideration, such as wool, have recently passed parity; but whether this is merely due to speculation on account of the war situation or has a more substantial basis it is impossible to say at this time. In any event, any reduction in tariff rates is bound to decrease rather than increase these prices, inasmuch as we are on an import basis on practically all of these commodities.

Irrespective of the merits or demerits of the case as to the individual items under consideration, it seems to me that there are some very cogent general reasons why the reciprocal trade agreement program should not be further extended at this time and particularly should not be extended on competitive agricultural products from Argentina.

In the first place, while I have seen no official announcement as to the items upon which it is proposed that Argentina shall reduce its tariff, press dispatches on the matter suggest that the principal items under consideration are automobiles, cash registers, office equipment, paints, refrigerators, radios, plums, raisins, apples, and lumber. Practically all of these items are noncompetitive so far as Argentina is concerned, while practically every item upon which is contemplated that we will reduce our duties is highly competitive with domestic producers. This very fact, it seems to me, condemns the proposed agreement from the start in that it certainly puts the American Government and the American producer at a disadvantage. Every reduction we make will to some extent injure domestic producers. Every reduction which we make will be upon items which are not needed in this country, because we can supply them ourselves. The items, however, upon which Argentina is expected to reduce its duties are items which Argentina must needs import. They are not competitive with their own producers. Any reductions which may be made in tariff rates will thus directly benefit consumers in that country, while in nowise injuring producers.

Therefore, such concessions as may be given Argentina by reducing our tariffs will be a clear gain for that country with no resulting disadvantages, whereas any advantages which might possibly accrue to industrial concerns in this country are bound to be more than offset by the loss which will be suffered by our agricultural producers. Thus, it can clearly be seen that any agreement with a country like Argentina cannot in any sense be reciprocal, because the advantages are all one way.

A second reason why this proposed agreement should not be entered into is that it would appear to be in direct conflict with the agricultural policy of this country as embodied in the agricultural-adjustment program. This program contemplates a reduction in the acreage and production of our agricultural commodities which go into export trade and an increase in the production of those commodities on which we are normally on an import basis. Thus, the program clearly contemplates a reduction in the acreage of crops like cotton, wheat, and corn and an increase in grass and forage crops and livestock production. This contemplated agreement, however, will, if put into effect, have the opposite result in that it will result in the importation of increased quantities of livestock and dairy products, as well as other commodities like vegetable oils, flaxseed, and poultry products for which there is room for expansion under the present A. A. A. program. Surely, if the present agricultural program is to get anywhere, it must have the cooperation of other branches of the Government.

Furthermore, it would seem to me that the whole philosophy of the reciprocal trade program is so at variance with the general New Deal policies that there is no way of reconciling them. The general policy of reducing tariff rates, which is contemplated under the reciprocal trade agreements program, can, it seems to me, be successful only in the event that we are able in this country to reduce production costs. However, the entire tendency of this administration's program has been to increase production costs through increased wages, increased general taxation, and social security, and other special taxes. In addition there is the certainty of greatly increased taxes in the future in order to pay off existing deficits. Such a program is not consistent with lowered tariff rates—rather it on the contrary assumes the necessity of higher rates, if we are to compete with other countries which have not increased their production costs as we have in this country.

This situation applies to agriculture just the same as it does to all other commodities. His production costs go up along with all others. For years the farmer has been striving to reach a figure known as parity. Today he is practically in the same position as he was 6 years ago. While the price of his products has advanced to some extent, yet the price of the commodities which he buys has gone up in an equal amount, so that today parity is just as far away as it has ever been. If, on top of this present disparity, we are going to further handicap the farmer by taking away some of his tariff protection, it is going to make parity even more a dream which will never be realized.

In addition to what has been said above, it seems to me that this is a particularly inopportune time to tinker with the tariffs on agricultural products. The outbreak of the war has had a marked effect upon the prices of some agricultural commodities. If the war continues for any length of time, still further effects will be apparent. This will no doubt result in shifts in production which will mean great increases in the production of some agricultural commodities based upon war demands. When the war is over, there will necessarily have to be an adjustment. Possibly in some cases lower rates of duty might not have any considerable effect just now, but might have a very detrimental effect when the inevitable readjustment takes place. Whenever changes of this kind are contemplated, it seems to me that they ought to be on the basis of normal conditions. Certainly no one in this country has been injured by reason of the existing tariff rates on the agricultural commodities which are under consideration in this agreement. Even under normal conditions I feel that it would be harmful to American agriculture to effect any reduction in the rates in question. Certainly we are taking even a greater chance if we attempt to deal with them under the existing unsettled conditions.

For these reasons, I feel that it is unwise and dangerous for us to reduce rates of duty on the commodities under consideration. I therefore, sincerely hope that after a thorough consideration of the matter and of the evidence offered at these hearings it will be found advisable to drop these negotiations and proceed no further with an Argentine trade agreement at this time.

The Christian Church's Message to America Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 16, 1939

A SERMON PREACHED BY HARRY EMERSON FOSDICK AT THE RIVERSIDE CHURCH, NEW YORK, N. Y., OCTOBER 1, 1939

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, on October 1 last, Rev. Harry Emerson Fosdick, pastor of the Riverside Church, New York, one of the world's great ministers, delivered a powerful sermon, dealing with the attitude of the Christian Church in the present world situation. By unanimous consent of the House I present his sermon for publication in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

In view of the great disaster that has fallen upon the world, let me speak to you this morning more intimately than usual, as a man speaks to his friends. This new war is the sorriest public tragedy in my lifetime. It means that my generation has failed in meeting one of the greatest opportunities ever presented to mankind.

How better can one begin to face this situation than by trying to disentangle the church's distinctive message from the confused voices in the world outside? To be sure, no one man is commissioned or competent to speak for the whole Christian community. Within the church itself will be deep differences of opinion calling for mutual toleration and understanding. But at least a man can

try to see what it is that, at our best, we ought to expect the church, as the representative of Christ, to say to America today.

To put the matter in New Testament terms, Paul, in one of the great crises of his life, fell back on a description of himself that, as he uses it, sounds like a rallying cry: "We are," he says, "ambassadors for Christ." Paul was a Jew, but in a crisis he could not speak simply as a Jew. Paul was a Roman citizen, but in a crisis he could not speak simply as a Roman citizen. He belonged to Someone greater than his race and nation, and in a crisis his message had to be distinctive of that higher loyalty. First of all, and most of all, he was an ambassador of Christ. Alas for a Christian minister now who does not so test his message.

Indeed, I submit the matter to your judgment. When from the world outside, filled with confused and angry voices, you come into this sanctuary of the one God of all mankind and see the cross above the altar, what distinctive note would you like to hear in the church's message? What characteristic and differential emphasis do you think you ought to hear?

For one thing, you ought not to want to hear from an ambassador of Christ any repercussions of the hatred outside. There will be plenty of that and to spare before we are through. Already one American clergyman has gone into his pulpit and announced to his congregation that he had oiled up his old Army rifle. Already here and there one can catch premonitions of those hymns of hate that war inevitably breeds, and that made the record of our Christian churches in the last war so terrible. You ought not to want to hear repercussions of war's hatreds from an ambassador of Christ.

This does not mean that in the conflict between totalitarian and democratic nations in Europe our personal sympathies are neutral. The gist of our American problem lies in the fact that our personal sympathies are not neutral. I am taking it for granted that, though you feel with me the madness of America's entering this war, few, if any of us, in our personal sympathies, are neutral. The most thoroughgoing pacifist here, I venture, hating war and all its ways, convinced, as I am, that in the long run no good thing can come out of it, when he hears of a victory of Nazi arms, says, "That's bad," and when he hears of a victory of French and British arms feels, "That's better." Our American problem is difficult just because our sympathy is not neutral.

If, then, our sympathies are thus engaged, if we deeply disapprove dictatorial government, and concerning some dictator, like Hitler, feel as Jesus did when to the Pharisees who told Him what Herod Antipas was planning, He replied, "Go, ye, and tell that fox"; how can such sentiments escape becoming hatred when war propaganda does its baneful work, invading even the sanctuary of Christ? The sovereign remedy against such h tred in these days, I suspect, is humility. You ought to want to hear that in the church. You will hear less and less of it outside. You ought to desire that emphasis from an ambassador of Christ.

This world disaster is the work of all of us. No nation comes into this conflict with clean hands. We call the 20 years from 1919 to 1939 a time of peace; but it was an evil peace, full of shameful power politics in which every contestant in this present conflict played a greedy part. Do not, I beg of you, listen to those who say that now all that does not matter—the Versailles Treaty, the perfidy that played false with President Wilson's 14 points, and all that wretched two decades of imperialistic greed; it does matter. We Americans will never keep our heads level, our judgments sane, and be prepared for a wise peace if we forget it.

Granted that Hitler, backed by Stalin, is immediately responsible for this war. Granted that France and Britain did not want it and that Hitler forced it. Still, never forget who it was that made Hitler possible. We all did. At the beginning the German people ridiculed him, feared him, hated him. At a session of the League of Nations in Geneva I heard a German statesman, a liberal and a democrat, plead with the nations to show some recognition of the nascent, struggling German democracy and its problems, cautioning them that if they failed, the German people, desperately though they tried, could not prevent some man on horseback from stealing the show. Bruening, going to Paris, begged Prime Minister Laval to help stay the tragedy latent in the German situation, drifting toward chaos and dictatorship, and he was snubbed. The European democracies easily could have saved democracy in Germany if they had cared half as much about democracy as now they say they do, and they refused. As for us in America, we would not so much as join an international organization to help.

Hitler made this war, but we all helped to make Hitler. Not hatred of any people but humility becomes us now.

Out there in the world we shall face persuasive propaganda, trying to make us see one side of this conflict all white and the other all black. There are two places, however, where that picture will be known to be as false as it really is. First, where serious historians gather; they know the sordid story of that 20 years of power politics. And, second, a Christian church, where a minister dares try to be an ambassador of Christ, and amid the hysteria of an angry world still keep insisting, "All we, like sheep, have gone astray; we have turned every one to his own way."

A member of my family motored through Germany a week before war was declared. I have a letter from her, dated a few days before war broke, from Freiburg in the Black Forest, very close to where it is hot today. She was glad, she said, to have made the trip. The German people were so lovable and friendly; no one, apparently, was thinking or talking about war. They were, she thought, an amiable, kindly folk, and she loved them. My soul! In Britain, France, and Germany the plain people are like the rest of us. Nowhere do they want war. Yet see them plunging, like the bedeviled swine in Jesus' parable, down the steep place into the sea. Not hatred—no; not in a church—but humility and penitence become a minister of Christ.

This leads us further to say that when, from the world without, you come into the sanctuary of the one God of all mankind, you ought not to expect from an ambassador of Christ any idealizing of this war, any picturing of it as a holy crusade for godly ends. This statement may go hard with someone here, some British friend from across the Canadian border worshiping with us today. My heart goes out to you. When a nation is at war, and its sons, brothers, and fathers are going to the front, the people are under an ungovernable coercion to idealize it. When we have to die for something, we have to exalt it as a holy cause—how else can we stand it? This strange tribute human nature pays to high ideals, that even when man does the cruelest things he has ever done—using these new implements of war to wreck a continent of homes—he has to exalt the doing of it as a holy cause in order to make it possible.

Remember, however, that all contestants on both sides in every war do that. The French, British, and Germans alike are doing that. Such idealizing of war is not a factual, realistic judgment; it is a psychological, emotional compulsion. Remember how we idealized America's entrance into the last war as a crusade for Christ. One American minister, picturing Jesus armed to the teeth and going into the trenches, even said Jesus "would take bayonet and grenade and bomb and rifle and do the work of deadliness." How we can throw even over the devil the mantle of our idealization! Don't expect that blasphemy today from an ambassador of Christ!

I am talking, however, not to those in this war, but to citizens of the United States. We are not in this war. If we are wise, we will stay out of this war. But if we are going to do that, we must from the beginning refuse to idealize this war. Whether we succeed in that or not will make more difference to our getting in or staying out than the much-discussed embargo.

If anybody here is seriously tempted to idealize this present conflict, remember the last World War. It did not settle a single basic problem in international relationships. President Nicholas Murray Butler, far from a pacifist or a radical, recently said, "That great war, with all its terrible sacrifice of life, of the comfort and happiness of tens of millions of human beings, and of the world's savings for generations, was absolutely futile." That was the war, was it, in which Jesus would have fought? That was the war, was it, that hundreds of us Christian ministers exalted as a holy crusade? That was the war concerning which some minister said that he could see no difference between a soldier going into the trenches and a missionary going to the ends of the earth to preach Christ. Yet it was absolutely futile. Well, 25 years from now serious minds will be saying that about this war. That is the unspeakable tragedy of it! Don't ask an ambassador of Christ to idealize it!

If someone says, "But this war will rid the world of Hitler," I answer that I certainly hope so. Yet the last war rid the world of the Kaiser, concerning whom we said just such things as we are saying about Hitler, but it did not solve a single basic problem. War can eliminate a Kaiser, but it always increases the things that a Kaiser stands for. War can defeat a Hitler, but by its very nature it creates Hitlerism and sows dragon's teeth from which a crop of other Hitlers springs. Be sure of this—however little you wish to be sure of it—this war will create more problems than it solves. A futile conflict a generation ago issued in an evil peace that, after 20 years of power politics, has issued in an evil war. Don't idealize it.

We shall face powerful propaganda centered on making us feel that here, at last, is a holy crusade of mass slaughter for godly ends. That, I think, is factually false, historically untenable, and, as a guide to America's foreign policy, utterly ruinous. But, whatever else it is, I am sure that it is absolutely un-Christian. May the ministers of Christ in America not fall victims to that pagan delusion! As for me, never again will I prostitute my Christian ministry to the idealizing of any war.

This leads us to say further that when from the world outside you come into the sanctuary of the one God you ought not to expect your ambassador of Christ to be content with the slogan, "Keep America Out of War." That does not go far enough for a Christian. To be sure, that slogan is critically important just now. Shout it from the housetops. I shall not today essay the role of political commentator and discuss the congressional debate as to the proper method to be used, but you may expect me, as an ambassador of Christ, through thick and thin, to the last ditch, to stand against America's embroilment in this war. As war goes on, however, especially if Britain and France are hard pressed, our sympathy with democracy is going to make staying out difficult. Watch that sympathy of yours. Sympathy is a powerful sentiment; it does us honor; but few things in this world can cause more damage when unintelligently used. If sympathy is going to decide this issue in America, if our emotions are to determine whether we go in or not, at least spare a little of your sympathy for home consumption before you plunge this Nation into another European war.

I have before me a letter from an American mother. Her husband was in the last war. He was with the "lost battalion" in the Argonne forest. He has been an invalid ever since; and she, as a school teacher, has supported him. And now as another war breaks out she writes me that she has a 17-year-old son. Well, after 20 years supporting the human wreckage of a futile war a generation ago, must she start all over again with her son in another European conflict? When sympathy rises, when emotion answers war propaganda, that American mother and millions of other American homes deserve at least a little consideration. Before God and my conscience I shall not forget them.

Nevertheless, just to say "Keep America Out of War" is not enough. That slogan by itself is negative. It sounds self-centered. It suggests that we have forgotten the world and that we acknowledge no responsibility beyond our own borders. In that sense no Christian can be an isolationist. Did not Jesus say, "Seek ye first the Kingdom of God"? The question is, Why do we want to stay out of this war? Is it to save our own skins, to make financial profit from the miseries of others, to be at ease while others die? Any Christian who today wants America to stay out of war should face himself with the fact that he is in strange company. Father Coughlin and Father Divine want that; all the pacifists and the American Legion want that; the stockbrokers and the social radicals alike want that. All sorts of motives—good, bad, and indifferent—are massed behind America's nonparticipation in this war. No wonder some 90 percent of our people want to stay out. Why should anybody want to get in?

Surely an ambassador of Christ must have a superior motive for staying out. Surely he must be thinking of the kingdom of God in all the earth. Surely, if he desires American neutrality, it is because he is convinced that only so can America, in the long run, make her greatest contribution to world-wide democracy, liberty, justice, and peace. More than once in these months ahead I shall try to think this through with you. Today let me lay down this basic proposition: As an ambassador of Christ I want America to stay out of this war, because I am convinced that America can make her greatest contribution to the world at large only by staying out, putting her house in order, keeping democracy vital here, aligning herself with kindred-minded neutrals, and, when peacemaking comes, preparing herself to throw into the scale on the side of a just peace and a world organization to sustain it the weight of a free, strong, democratic nation, unimpaired by war.

The one thing that most makes it difficult for many Americans to accept that policy is a picture which they have in their mind's eye about the way this war is likely to come out. Many a letter reveals how prevalent this picture is in the imagination of our people. They see Hitler winning in this conflict, and then they picture Hitler, victorious in the European war, starting out to conquer the world in general and us in particular. And they say, "We had better fight now while the fighting is good, alongside Britain and France, before we have to fight alone against a victorious nazidom with Britain and France whipped." If anything carries America into this war, it will be that picture.

Therefore, by way of contrast, let me draw another picture of the way this war is likely to come out that I think is a thousand times more probable. If Hitler ever should win this war, it is going to take a long time to do it. We can be sure of that. Not in a few months or years will Britain and France lie down under a triumphant Nazidom. Underline this then: In a modern war, long-continued, nobody really wins. Prime Minister Chamberlain, himself, only a few days before war was declared, said again what many a serious student has said before—that no one really wins a modern war. So, at the close of this conflict, if long-continued, the actual situation would not be a strong, victorious Hitler starting out to conquer the world. The actual situation would be all the contestants absolutely exhausted—psychologically, economically, materially exhausted—no one of them able for a long generation to lift their heads again. Europe would be a shambles—with Russia, if she keeps unimpaired, still strong, her morale undiminished, her resources untouched, waiting to start a social revolution in the embers of a wrecked Europe. If America wants to help the world most, she will not add herself to that dilapidated wreckage of the nations, but will prepare herself when peacemaking comes, to be still free, strong, her house in order, her resources unimpaired, to throw into the scales of a lasting peace the weight of a powerful democratic nation.

At any rate, my friends, when from the world outside you come into this sanctuary of the one God, you may expect me, in season and out of season, not simply for America's sake but for the world's sake, to plead for peace.

Argentina Reciprocal Trade Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CARLSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 16, 1939

STATEMENT BY HON. FRANK CARLSON, OF KANSAS, BEFORE THE COMMITTEE FOR RECIPROCITY INFORMATION ON THE PROPOSED TRADE AGREEMENT WITH ARGENTINA

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a statement used as a basis of my remarks before the Committee for Reciprocity Information on Tuesday, October 17, at which time the committee was hearing testimony on the proposed treaty with Argentina. The statement is as follows:

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate very much the opportunity to appear before the Committee for Reciprocity Information during the hearings on a proposed reciprocal trade agreement with Argentina. I do not appear as an expert on tariff schedules or rates, but as a representative from an agricultural district and a farmer and livestock man in my own rights I am greatly concerned as to the final draft of this treaty. Everyone must realize that agriculture will be directly affected by a trade agreement with our neighbor to the south. A reduction in tariff rates or concessions which would allow imports of competitive farm products in great quantities would further hamper an already demoralized agriculture. During the past few years billions of dollars have been paid in the form of farm benefits from the Federal Treasury to the farmers of this Nation, but even this aid has not placed the farmer in a position where he can pay his debts or his farm mortgage. This situation is so serious that recently the Farm Credit Administration ordered a moratorium on foreclosures of farm mortgages. There are 6,812,350 farms in the United States, and approxiatemly 35 percent of these are mortgaged. The total farm-mortgage indebtedness in the United States is $7,000,000,000, of which the Farm Credit Administration holds 40 percent, or nearly $3,000,000,000. Last year there were 80,000 farm-mortgage foreclosures in the United States, and of this number 28,000 were foreclosed by the Farm Credit Administration. I mention this not as a criticism of the Farm Credit Administration or any other lending agency but as proof that agriculture has its back to the wall.

The financial and economic condition of the farmer must be taken into consideration when a trade treaty with Argentina is being considered. Argentina and the United States have large fertile fields, produce the same farm crops under similar climatic conditions, with Argentina having the advantage of virgin sod, cheap labor, and reduced fixed charges in the form of taxes. Our farmers should not be asked to compete with them if we are to maintain our American standard of living. During the recent weeks following the declaration of war in Europe every effort is being made to increase our trade with Central and South American countries, and with this I am in entire accord, but we must keep in mind that all Latin American countries have a shortage of foreign exchange, and therefore any increase in trade will be determined by the amount of products we take from them. This being true, it is only natural that our trade with Argentina will be increased by the amount of meats, grains, hides, wool, fats, oils, eggs, turkeys, and other commodities produced in the agricultural sections of our Nation. Statistics have been and no doubt will be presented showing the great indirect benefits that will be derived from this treaty. It will no doubt be shown that this treaty will have an indirect effect on farm purchasing power, that it will contribute much toward friendly relations with our neighbor, and that it is a great gesture of confidence and peace in a war-torn world.

No group or class of American citizens will go further or give more to promote peace and security than the farmers of this Nation, but recent world-wide events seem to indicate that world peace cannot be attained by trade agreements. This being the case, the farmers should not be asked to pay this price. I hope this committee will give serious study to the proposed changes before final conclusions are reached.

There are several items listed in the proposed schedule that are of vital concern to every farmer in the United States—tallow, casein, oleo, oil, beef and veal, hides, cheese, eggs, turkeys, alfalfa seed, and corn.

The Secretary, in his release of August 23 (No. 338A), mentioned specifically that the list did not include fresh, frozen, or chilled meats. This is most gratifying, as every livestock producer is greatly concerned over abrogation of the sanitary agreement between Argentina and the United States. It is my intention to discuss three items, namely, beef, eggs, and turkeys.

BEEF UNDER THE RECIPROCAL-TRADE AGREEMENTS

The production of cattle and calves ranks first as a source of cash farm income in the United States, amounting to an estimated $909,000,000 in 1938. Though income from cattle is important to farmers in all sections of the country, it is particularly so in the Middle Western States, the Southwestern States, and the Mountain States.

For many years domestic meat packers have been faced with strong foreign competition. This is, of course, harmful to the farmer, as anything which adversely affects the meat-packing industry has a direct effect on the farmer. Thus, imports of meat products reduces the farmer's potential market for cattle by the amount imported. In discussing imports of beef products, the classifications set up by the Tariff Commission will be used. These classifications are: Fresh beef, beef and veal (pickled or cured), and canned beef. Each of these will be discussed separately.

The tariff rate on fresh beef has not been changed by any of the trade agreements concluded thus far. Moreover, the rate will not be altered in the agreement to be negotiated with Argentina. The sanitary embargo imposed on Argentine fresh beef and cattle by the Tariff Act of 1930 is still in force and cannot be changed except by act of Congress or by ratification of the sanitary convention with Argentina by the Senate.

The rate on pickled or cured beef and veal has also escaped altering thus far. This type of beef is, however, included on the list of articles on which the United States will consider granting a concession to Argentina, as it does not come under the sanitary embargo.

The volume of imports of beef and veal, pickled or cured, has been directly tied up with the tariff rate. As will be noted from the table, imports amounted to more than 9,000,000 pounds in 1929. At this time, however, the duty was but 20 percent ad valorem, which amounted to about 2 to 2½ cents a pound. In the Tariff Act of 1930 the duty was raised to 6 cents a pound. The effect on imports was almost immediate. Since 1932 imports have been below 2,000,000 pounds, with the sole exception of 1936.

Volume of imports of beef and veal, pickled or cured

[In pounds]

Year	Total	Argentina	All other countries
1929	9,362,275	3,979,914	5,382,361
1932	813,844	4,314	809,530
1933	657,818	385	657,433
1934	861,866	20,274	841,592
1935	1,466,871	30,683	1,436,188
1936	2,181,185	22,017	2,159,168
1937	1,753,016	74,717	1,678,299
1938	1,559,566	63,866	1,495,700

Source: Foreign Commerce and Navigation of the United States, 1929, 1932–37; office records of the Division of Foreign Trade Statistics, 1938.

Under the authority granted by the Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act, the State Department can reduce a duty 50 percent. In the case of beef and veal, pickled or cured, the duty can be reduced to 3 cents a pound, just a little over what it was in 1929. Another glance at imports in 1929 will indicate what this means to American farmers and workers. Of course, imports may not rise to the 1929 volume, but certainly all indications point to that.

Canned beef, including corned beef, is certain to be the most controversial question discussed in the negotiations. A storm of protest has already been raised against the administration by American livestock producers over this commodity. This was the result of a letter from President Roosevelt to Secretary Hull recommending that the Navy award a contract calling for 48,000 pounds of corned beef to Argentina. In his letter the President said:

"I am impressed with the fact that the price quoted by the Argentine Meat Producers Cooperative is $0.157 per pound, against the lowest bid on an American product of $0.2361. After payment of the duty of $0.06 per pound on Argentine canned beef, the net cost to the Government would be about $0.097 per pound" (New York Times, May 13, 1939).

Argentina, in recent years, has thrived as a result of this wide discrepancy between prices. While imports fell off considerably in 1932, phenomenal increases were made between 1933 and 1937, with only a relatively small decrease in 1938.

Volume of imports of canned beef, including corned beef

[In pounds]

Year	Total	Argentina	Other countries
1929	89,931,947	49,785,434	40,146,513
1932	22,862,125	7,477,481	15,384,644
1933	43,024,989	19,659,546	23,665,443
1934	36,674,372	17,462,280	29,212,092
1935	76,262,515	31,742,847	44,519,668
1936	87,803,509	39,973,136	47,830,373
1937	88,092,351	41,359,582	46,732,769
1938	78,592,092	33,901,697	44,690,395

Source: Foreign Commerce and Navigation of the United States, 1929 and 1932–37; office records of the Division of Foreign Trade Statistics, 1938.

The canning of beef in this country is relatively small compared with other processed beef products. Notwithstanding this, the industry produced 150,000,000 pounds in 1935, with a value of $38,000,000. A reduction of the present duty (6 cents a pound) by the full statutory limit of 50 percent would give Argentina an advantage of 11 cents a pound over American producers. This would mean virtual extinction of the industry in the United States, with the consequent loss to American farmers and workers. It does not seem conceivable that a program dedicated to recovery in the United States should be so warped by its administrators as to include the destruction of an American industry.

EGGS IN THE SHELL AND THE RECIPROCAL-TRADE AGREEMENTS

The production of eggs is one of the most important sources of steady, year-round cash income for the farmer. Nearly every farm produces some eggs. On a large majority of farms they are for home consumption or "pin money," but a considerable number are devoted exclusively to the production of chickens and eggs. This is particularly true in Pennsylvania, New York, Texas, California, and most of the Midwestern States. Whether done on a national scale or a neighborhood one, foreign trade affects every farmer who produces eggs through its influence on price.

In 1929 the United States exported over 12,000,000 dozens of eggs. By 1938, exports had declined to a little over 2,000,000 dozens. Is there any explanation of this? A partial one may be the fact that until the revised Canadian agreement, which did not go into effect until January 1, 1939, the State Department had not obtained one single concession on eggs, although four of the agreement countries are important outlets for American eggs. Apparently the importance of this industry to nearly every farm family was overlooked by the State Department.

Volume of exports of eggs in the shell

	Dozens
1929	12,074,830
1932	2,319,039
1933	1,866,402
1934	1,927,703
1935	1,811,687
1936	2,097,986
1937	2,376,421
1938	2,092,419

Source: Foreign Commerce and Navigation of the United States, 1929 and 1932–37; Monthly Summary of Foreign Commerce, 1938.

The import side of the picture is similar in one respect—that of granting concessions. The United States did not grant a concession until the revised Canadian agreement, and in that agreement the duty was reduced the full statutory limit of 50 percent. Thus, the only course open in the case of Argentina is to bind a rate which Argentina has already received the benefits of under the most-favored-nation policy.

In 1929, imports of eggs amounted to 308,000 dozens. By 1937, imports had increased to 520,000 dozens. In 1938, however, there was a rather sharp decline. The figures thus far available for 1939 are, however, quite revealing. Imports of eggs amounted to 127,000 dozens in the first 7 months of 1938. At 7 months' end in 1939, however, imports had risen to 183,000 dozens, or an increase of 44.2 percent.

Volume of imports of eggs in the shell

	Dozens
1929	307,912
1932	243,784
1933	250,820
1934	196,843
1935	432,076
1936	345,762
1937	520,189
1938	231,784
1938 (7 months)	127,241
1939 (7 months)	183,447

Source: Foreign commerce and navigation of the United States, 1929 and 1932–37; monthly summary of foreign commerce, December 1938 and July 1938 and 1939.

The lowering of the duty on eggs was opposed by farm groups all over the country. The pleas were disregarded by the State Department, however, and the effects will be felt by every farm family in the country.

TURKEYS UNDER THE RECIPROCAL-TRADE AGREEMENTS

Until recent years the production of turkeys had been a small part of regular farm enterprise. Today, however, turkeys have become an important source of cash income for farmers, and are now referred to as a $50,000,000 industry. Rough estimates indicate that there will be an increase of nearly 58,000,000 pounds in dressed turkeys marketed this year as compared with 1938. This increase amounts to approximately 12 percent of last November's dressed beef and veal consumption on a federally inspected basis.

Increased production came as a direct result of experimentation by raisers. The success of commercial hatcheries and raising turkeys in confinement made large-scale production possible. In 1929 production stood at 16,749,000 birds, and by 1936 total production had risen to 20,000,000 birds. With the increase in production came the problem of marketing. As stated in the Agricultural Situation for November 1, 1937: "* * * Production problems have been more or less solved, but much remains to be done to improve marketing methods."

The marketing problem of an industry is no less time consuming than the production problem. To be worked out satisfactorily requires full cooperation on the part of all governmental agencies. Such cooperation has been received from the Department of Agriculture, but the State Department has not only failed to cooperate but has actually hindered the solution of the problem. In the first Canadian agreement the duty on live turkeys was reduced from 8 cents a pound to 4 cents a pound.

The effect of this reduction was almost immediate. From 1935, the last year under the old rate, to 1936, the first year under the new rate, imports from Canada increased more than 4 times. By 1938 Canadian exports of turkeys to the United States were 22 times greater than exports in 1935.

Volume of imports of live turkeys

[In pounds]

Years	Total	Canada	All other
1935	6,234	6,133	101
1936	29,808	25,191	4,617
1937	58,728	44,840	13,888
1938	148,360	135,503	12,857

Source: Foreign Commerce and Navigation, 1935–37; office records of the Division of Foreign Trade Statistics, 1938.

It will be pointed out by many that, in spite of the tremendous increases, imports are still a small percentage of domestic production. Others, however, are more concerned about the trend in imports. Faced with the obvious fact that continuation of the trend indicated by imports in the first 2 years of the agreement would spell severe hardship to turkey raisers in this country, the

State Department did nothing to arrest this trend when the Canadian agreement came up for revision. On the contrary, they actually encouraged and sanctioned it by binding the 4-cent rate for the life of the agreement.

A new danger to the producers of turkeys now looms. In the notice of intention to negotiate an agreement with Argentina, dead turkeys, dressed or undressed, were included in the list of products on which the United States will consider granting a concession to Argentina. Such a concession would be extremely valuable to Argentine producers and very harmful to American producers. Since 1931, the first complete year for which statistics are available, Argentina has been the most important source of American imports of dead turkeys, with the sole exception of the year 1937. The volume of imports has varied considerably since 1931. Since 1934, however, the United States has imported between 250,000 and 300,000 pounds every year except 1936, when 554,000 pounds were imported.

Volume of imports of dead turkeys, dressed or undressed

[In pounds]

Year	Total	Argentina	Other countries
1931	5,208,994	4,321,742	977,252
1932	475,358	252,728	222,630
1933	307,147	302,366	4,781
1934	294,212	286,485	7,727
1935	249,994	179,607	70,387
1936	544,448	418,771	125,677
1937	269,393	12,789	256,604
1938	280,004	136,825	143,179

Source: Foreign Commerce and Navigation, 1931–37; office records of the Division of Foreign Trade Statistics, 1938.

The irregularity of imports, as demonstrated by the above table, would indicate that imports were made to take advantage of special price and demand situations. Thus, the rise in imports in 1936 may be attributed to the drought and the consequent small cold-storage holdings in 1936. In 1937, on the other hand, cold-storage holdings were the highest in history, which had a very deflationary effect on prices. It is not surprising, therefore, that imports from Argentina suffered a severe decline and that of the total imports over 162,000 pounds were special imports which entered free of duty. By 1938, cold-storage holdings had been reduced by more than a third, and imports promptly picked up. Imports from Argentina increased from 13,000 pounds to 137,000 pounds, and of the total imports only 88,000 entered free.

The effect of lowering the duty (now 10 cents a pound) on dead turkeys would be to increase the margin in which Argentine producers could operate. As an example, if under the old rate Argentina could enter the market profitably only when the American selling price was above 25 cents a pound, a reduction of the duty to 5 cents a pound would enable her to enter the market if the price should fall to 20 cents a pound. This has a decided deflationary effect on the price received by American farmers for their turkeys. Thus, American producers would be forced to share an increase in American demand with Argentine producers.

The recent growth of the turkey industry in the United States and its new importance as a source of cash income to the farmers would seem to dictate a hands-off policy on tariff matters pending the final solution of the marketing problem. Any additional interference with the natural play of domestic supply and demand would postpone any effective solution indefinitely.

CONCLUSION

A thorough study of the items in the proposed trade-agreement list leads me to the conclusion that reduction or concessions should not be made on direct competitive agricultural commodities with Argentina. Any reduction will be reflected in the farm income and the present income and economic condition of the farmer is already far below parity. The farmers of this Nation are the greatest potential buying power in our country and their market must be protected. I want to vigorously protest the consummation of this trade agreement.

Thank you.

Toward a Federal World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SOL BLOOM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 16, 1939

ADDRESS OF DR. NICHOLAS MURRAY BUTLER, PRESIDENT OF COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY, DELIVERED AT THE PARRISH ART MUSEUM, SOUTHAMPTON, LONG ISLAND, N. Y., SEPTEMBER 3, 1939

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler at the Parrish Art Museum, Southampton, Long Island, N. Y., September 3, 1939:

This year of grace marks the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary both of the French Revolution and of the organization of the Government of the United States under the Federal Constitution. It is, therefore, an anniversary of commanding importance in the history of man's attempt to arrive at a form of government which shall be both effective and just.

It is not generally realized that the Government of these United States, which came formally into existence a century and a half ago, is now the oldest of all the governments existing in the world. It is the only one which has not been changed in essential principles or revolutionized during the past century and a half. This fact is, of itself, a tribute to the wisdom and the foresight of those whom we so gladly call the founding fathers. On the continent of Europe every government which has not been wholly made over since the World War came into being in its present form only after the Napoleonic wars or, as in the case of France, after the Franco-Prussian War of 1870–71. The Government of Great Britain, responding to the pressure of the steadily growing liberal movement during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, was substantially changed, both as to its center of gravity and as to its governmental procedure, following the reform bill of 1832, the Parliamentary Representation Act of 1867, and the Parliament Act of 1911. The last-named act gave the relations between the House of Commons and the House of Lords their present form. Still later, in 1931, the Statute of Westminster, an act of the greatest importance in the history of constitutional government and public law, brought into existence the British Commonwealth of Nations as now constituted. This act applied the federal principle to legislatively independent members of a great empire scattered all around the world. The governments of the Central American and South American peoples are all younger than the Government of the United States. The governments on the continents of Africa and of Asia have been and still are in a constant state of flux, and it remains to be seen what their more permanent form is to be.

When the Federal Constitution had been agreed upon by the Philadelphia Convention on September 17, 1787, and submitted to each of the 13 independent and sovereign States for their consideration and hoped-for ratification, Benjamin Franklin, most far-seeing of men, wrote these words to Monsieur Grand, a friend in France, under date of October 22, 1787, sending him at the same time a copy of the proposed new Federal Constitution for the American States:

"If it succeeds, I do not see why you might not in Europe carry the project of good Henry the Fourth into execution, by forming a federal union and one grand republic of all its different states and kingdoms, by means of a like convention, for we had many interests to reconcile."

It would seem plain, therefore, that those men who planned with so much wisdom and so much foresight the Constitution of the United States felt that they were dealing with forces and ideals which might well be not only American but world-wide. They were the very opposite of isolationists.

Something of the same sort characterized the chief spokesmen of the French Revolution. They, too, believed that they were building not for France alone but for all Europe. The quick outburst of reaction which marked the 20 years of the rule of Napoleon Bonaparte pushed any such hope and ambition far into the background.

As a result of these happenings of 150 years ago and their influence, the civilized world seemed far on the way toward becoming a world in which the principles of democracy ruled and would express themselves either in the form of a democratic monarchy, as in Great Britain, Belgium, the Netherlands and the Scandinavian countries, or in that of a democratic republic, as in the United States, France, and Switzerland. In almost every other country of the world, even in Germany and in Russia, there were clear signs that the principles of liberalism were, in one form or another, finding steadily increasing expression and influence.

When the Great War came a quarter century ago, it was quickly interpreted by the President of the United States as fundamentally a contest between democratic and anti-democratic principles of government. His famous phrase, a war to make the world safe for democracy, was heard in every land, and was almost universally accepted as both the explanation and the justification of that stupendous struggle. The contradictory and unhappy result is now so obvious as to need no comment. The passions and ambitions which were set loose by that great war have been operating and still operate to do the principles of democracy greater damage than has ever heretofore been inflicted on them from any source. The story of that war is now written large in history. Every single cause for which the Allied Nations fought and for which they made such enormous sacrifices, and which on Armistice day, November 11, 1918, they though had been finally gained, is now seen to have been lost. On the other hand, every cause for which their opponents contended and which was thought to be lost is now clearly seen to have been gained. In short, that great war, with all its terrible sacrifice of life, of the comfort and happiness of tens of millions of human beings, and of the world's savings for generations, was absolutely futile.

What is the lesson to be learned from all this? Surely it is now the clear demonstration of more than a thousand years of nation-building that the doctrine of national sovereignty is both unsound and dangerous. That doctrine can only lead, as it has led, to the notion that each and every established government is a law unto itself and not subject to any limitations or control in its dealings with other governments. Put bluntly, this means that when two of

these so-called sovereign governments cannot agree upon any matter which affects them both, then recourse shall be had to force, which is war. Constituted as they are, human beings in control of the administration of governments that claim to be sovereign will be constantly at war, regardless of the loss of life or of property which must always accompany war, whether successful or unsuccessful.

From a situation such as this there are but two paths of escape. The one is universal world domination by a single government. On a larger or a smaller scale, this end has been sought time and time again for fully 3,000 years. Oriental peoples sought it; Alexander the Great sought it; Julius Caesar and his successors at the head of the Roman Empire sought it. Charlemagne would have been glad to seek it, as would Napoleon Bonaparte a thousand years later. The German Reichsfuehrer of today has it plainly in mind. Surely after all these illuminating experiences it ought to be obvious to everyone that the world canot be unified under a single social, economic, and political control. This could not be done when the world was relatively a very simple place, but now that invention and modern science have made it so complicated, as well as so interdependent in its every part, world domination by a single power has become more impossible than ever. The search for world domination, or even for domination over a considerable part of the earth's surface, means and must mean constant and almost continuous war. Different backgrounds of national history, of language, of social and political experience, to say nothing of climate and of the conditions of life, have made any such form of world unification as the ancient empire builders sought a purely imaginary aim. It has and can have no relation to reality.

If, then, sovereignty be denied to governments of any kind, what is it that in last resort should rule and guide the action of men and shape the public policies of the governments which the several nations may from time to time set up? Obviously, it is the moral law.

This moral law is not difficult to understand. Everyone, however great, knows when he is telling the truth, when he is acting in unselfish regard for the welfare of his fellow men and when he is subjugating the gain-seeking or the power-seeking motive to higher and more constructive principles. The practical-minded man will see this. The theoretical person who loves to deal only with words and with the impressions of the moment, may take some time, perhaps a long time, to learn it. Unless it be learned, however, there is no escape from that barbarism which is return to the jungle.

The alternative to the hopeless attempt at universal world domination by a single government is that world-wide application of the federal principle which has already played so influential a part in modern political history and which alone has the power to make it possible for modern man to solve in permanent fashion, through the cooperation of nations, his unbelievably difficult and complicated problems, both economic, social, and political.

The federal principle and its application upon an increasingly large scale have been before the minds of men for hundreds of years. One seer after another and one far-sighted statesman after another have proclaimed and interpreted the federal principle as essential to the peaceful, orderly maintenance and development of civilization. Few declarations of this principle are more significant or more definite than this prophecy written in autograph by Victor Hugo on the wall of the room in the Place des Vosges, Paris, where he died:

"I represent a party which does not yet exist; the party of revolution, civilization. This party will make the twentieth century. There will issue from it first the United States of Europe, then the United States of the World."

This federal principle must not be confused with group or regional alliances between governments for their own aggrandizement, no matter what may happen to the rest of the world. The federal principle, as supremely manifested in the Federal Constitution of the United States and in the Statute of Westminster which created the British Commonwealth of Nations, makes it not only possible but natural for a Vermont, a South Dakota, an Idaho, and a Utah, or for a Newfoundland, a Union of South Africa, and a New Zealand to enter a political partnership upon equal terms with a New York, an Illinois, and a Texas in the one case or with a Canada and an Australia in the other. Under a properly organized federal system the population or the wealth of a political partner gives no advantage in all that is essential to citizenship and to political liberty. The influence of the more populous and the richer peoples will always be dominant or nearly so but that dominance will be exercised under the limitations of the articles of federation. This will involve no injustice and no discrimination against the less populous and the less wealthy members of the federation.

The practical question is, How can this tremendous and crucial problem be lifted from the region of discussion to that of early and definite action? It is plain that the world cannot wait.

One of the lessons which experience teaches is that in large matters of this kind too much must not be attempted at once. The overwhelming majority of men have to be taught, and it takes a long time to teach them. The Federal Government of the United States stands before the whole world as instructor in what the federal principle may accomplish over an enormous area with a huge and varied population. Nevertheless, if the attempt were made to organize the entire world in a satisfactory federation at once, it would probably fail, either wholly or in large part. The differences of background, of inheritance, of experience, and of language might be found too great to permit an effective world-wide federal union at one stroke. The path of progress obviously is to promote the early organization of a world federation which would include, if not all European and Asiatic peoples, then those which are sufficiently self-controlled and like-minded to make a beginning possible. In due time, and after the value of the federal principle had received new illustration, it would become practicable to go a step farther and begin to bring more of the national governments into a still larger union. There is no reason why those states which are called totalitarian should not be included in such a federal union, provided they will cease striving to extend their areas and their control by force and will accept, honestly and completely, the principles upon which such a federal union is built. We need have no concern with the form of government which any independent people adopts for itself if only it keeps its word and respects its international and federal obligations.

There is nothing new about this proposal to extend the federal principle. If mankind had shown itself capable of learning by experience, great progress would have been made centuries ago in developing a world system of federal unions which might easily have become a single world-wide union long before this twentieth century. The story of these attempts and of the measure of success which they severally achieved will be found in very succinct form in the little volume entitled "Federations: A Study in Comparative Politics," written by D. G. Karve, professor of history and economics at Fergusson College, Poona, India, and published 7 years ago. It will surprise many readers of the present day to learn how clearly this idea of federation was in the minds of men almost from the very beginning of political organization. The Dutch Union between the Provinces of the Lowlands, which lasted for more than two centuries, and the Swiss Federation, which is the oldest of all the existing federal states, are particularly rich in opportunity for study. In fact, the Swiss Federation and the United States of America may be regarded as the two most productive research laboratories in which the student and the builder of new federations may best carry on his work.

The history of Switzerland offers abundant material for guidance in dealing with this problem today. That country has many small towns and cities of only moderate size. Its physical formation, with high mountains, deep valleys, and many streams, provides almost compelling invitation to the development of many small communities, living largely in isolation and in independent social and political life. Some two-thirds of the population speak German and most of the remaining one-third speak French, although there is a very considerable number of those whose language is Italian. The population is divided almost equally between Protestants and Catholics, with a greater number of Protestants. These people, so placed and with such diverse backgrounds, have been successful, it would appear, in working out a plan for national unity which is wholly consonant with civil liberty and with local self-government. If the people of Switzerland have been able to achieve this great end, why should not others be able to follow their example and go and do likewise? Switzerland, of course, has passed through its difficult periods. These were in part due to religious strife and in part to the rivalry between urban and rural cantons. But, taken as a whole and looking back over more than 500 years, it is clear that Switzerland has a most important lesson to teach this modern world.

Had the Republic of Czechoslovakia, at the time of its organization in 1919, been based upon the cantonal system, its history during the past 20 years might have been very different and far happier. A Czechoslovakia composed of, say, five Czech cantons, two Slovak cantons, two German cantons, one Polish canton, and one Hungarian canton, following the example of Switzerland, might well have been able to weather the storms which have marked the attempt to give to this splendid people the independent, economic, and political organization which they desire and should have.

In relation to this vitally important matter we have reached a point where the responsibility of the people of the United States is outstanding and imperative. As economic and political theories have developed and found expression in various governments, whether in Europe or in Asia, it has become impossible, at least for some time to come, for any other government than that of the United States to give the leadership for which the world is waiting. Had our American political acts during the past generation been true to our professions, and had the elected representatives of the two great political parties, when in office at Washington, kept the pledges which those parties had made to the American people in one political campaign after another, this world would today have been far on the way toward successful organization to promote prosperity and to preserve peace.

With the exception of the 8 years of Woodrow Wilson's administration, the Republican Party was in power at Washington from 1896 to 1932. Beginning with President McKinley's notable statement, "The period of exclusiveness is past," made at Buffalo, September 5, 1901, the Republican Party made one declaration after another in favor of definite and progressive policies of international cooperation to prevent war. It would be difficult to find a more definite pledge to the people than this which was contained in the Republican national platform of 1920:

"The Republican Party stands for agreement among the nations to preserve the peace of the world. We believe that such an international association must be based upon international justice, and must provide methods which shall maintain the rule of public right by the development of law and the decision of impartial courts, and which shall secure instant and general international conference whenever peace shall be threatened by political action, so that the nations pledged to do and insist upon what is just and fair may exercise their influence and power for the prevention of war.

"We believe that all this can be done without the compromise of national independence, without depriving the people of the United States in advance of the right to determine for themselves what is just and fair when the occasion arises, and without involving them as participants, and not as peacemakers in a multitude of quarrels, the merits of which they are unable to judge."

Even more striking is this extract from a speech delivered by Senator Warren G. Harding at Marion, Ohio, on August 28, 1920, when a candidate for the Presidency. It is probable that it was this speech which insured his election. Here are his words:

"The other type is a society of free nations, or an association of free nations, or a league of free nations, animated by considerations of right and justice instead of might and self-interest, and not merely proclaimed an agency in pursuit of peace, but so organized and so participated in as to make the actual attainment of peace a reasonable possibility. Such an association I favor with all my heart, and I would make no fine distinction as to whom credit is due. One need not care what it is called. Let it be an association, a society, or a league, or what not, our concern is solely with the substance, not the form thereof."

The Republican national platforms of 1924, 1928, and 1932 contained like declarations, varying somewhat in language, but essentially one and the same. What was done by the Republican Senators and Representatives to keep those solemn pledges to the American people in reference to all which concerned their highest interests?

The record of the Democratic Party is similar. Quite apart from the vision and the influence of Woodrow Wilson, here is the language used by Gov. James M. Cox at Dayton, Ohio, on August 7, 1920, when candidate for the Presidency in opposition to Senator Harding:

"Organized government has a definite duty all over the world. The house of civilization is to be put in order. The supreme issue of the century is before us, and the nation that halts and delays is playing with fire. The finest impulses of humanity, rising above national lines, merely seek to make another horrible war impossible."

Four years later, on August 11, 1924, the Democratic candidate for the Presidency, John W. Davis, spoke these words at Clarksburg, W. Va.:

"We favor the World Court in sincerity. * * * We wish to see America as a nation play her part in that reconstruction of the economic life of Europe which has proven itself so indispensable to our well-being and prosperity."

The Democratic national platforms of 1928 and of 1932 reflected the same point of view and recorded the same purpose.

Why is it, then, that nothing has been done? What has become of responsible government in a democracy if those great ends which the people have been asked to support, and which they have so earnestly supported, are left to die by parliamentary ineptitude and parliamentary cowardice? What wonder is it that the dictators point with scorn to what they describe as the inefficiency and the uselessness of democracy? It must be evident that democracy is only playing into the hands of the dictators when it writes for itself a record such as this. Surely every public interest of the American people, whether moral, economic, or political, calls for their quick leadership in organizing what in President Harding's words may be an association, a society, a league, or what not, of nations, to take over the solution of the world's grave and most disturbing problems.

Let me once again call attention to the amazing resolution which passed both Houses of Congress in June 1910, without a single dissenting vote, and which must remain a high-water mark in the record of the professions, at least of the American people:

"*Resolved*, That a commission of five members be appointed by the President of the United States to consider the expediency of utilizing existing international agencies for the purpose of limiting the armaments of the nations of the world by international agreement, and of constituting the combined navies of the world an international force for the preservation of universal peace, and to consider and report upon any other means to diminish the expenditures of government for military purposes and to lessen the probabilities of war."

What I am pointing out is that nothing remains to be said on behalf of the United States in respect to this greatest of all problems. What remains is to do something. It is for public opinion to compel Members of the legislative branch of the Federal Government to keep the pledges which their several parties have made to the American people.

One has only to lift his eyes from the ground to see that the path which our Government should quickly follow lies open before it. The Permanent Court of International Justice, at The Hague, originally brought into being by the leadership of the American Government, will naturally be the judicial branch and organ of a newly organized or reorganized family or society of nations. The League of Nations at Geneva is the natural point of beginning for that reorganization and readjustment which the past 20 years have shown to be essential in order that it may become the consultative and legislative center of that form of federal union or grouping of nations which has simply got to come into being. The reorganization of the League of Nations must be such as to separate it completely from the Treaty of Versailles and from any unqualified defense of the status quo in Europe.

The lesson taught by the League of Nations since its history began is that it was without the power to provide an effective police force to preserve order in the world out upon which it looked. Even the most law-abiding of peoples require a trained and ready police to meet those emergencies which no one can foresee and which, if not met, become invitations to new disorder and new crime. The resolution of the Congress of the United States passed in June 1910 clearly grasped this fact and presented it to our country and to the world. That fact remains as fundamental and as incontrovertible today as it was then.

If the Government of the United States has the good faith and the courage to go forward with this leadership, it will find that the very first problems to be solved are monetary and economic. Peace of mind and prosperity cannot be restored to the world until the uncertainties and perplexities which now attach to monetary matters and to trade relations are constructively dealt with. The world does not thrive through international speculation in money. It will thrive if there be established an international monetary standard as definite as the meter and the kilogram. The constant shipment of gold from one country to another and the present accumulation of some 60 percent of the world's gold in solitary confinement in the United States are simply a joke. They mark complete incapacity to deal with one of the most pressing problems which the world offers—failure to solve which is a steady temptation to international friction and international ill will.

Much light will be thrown upon the whole problem of building an international stabilized monetary system by study of the history of the Latin Monetary Union, established in 1865 through the cooperation of France, Belgium, Switzerland, Italy, and Greece. This union lasted for some 60 years. The causes of its discontinuance are as illuminating as are those which led to its organization.

Together with the establishment of a fixed international monetary standard, international trade relationships must be dealt with, and promptly. The spread of violent and predatory economic nationalism is certainly the chief cause of the economic depression which holds the whole world in its grip. Indeed, this has come down from economic nationalism to economic localism to such an extent that one would suppose it to be wrong to buy anything whatever not produced by the community in which one lives. Even the States of the American Union are, in flat violation of the provisions of the Federal Constitution, finding ways to levy taxes which are, in effect, taxes on imports from other States. The fact that these are taxes on imports is concealed by their form, but they are nonetheless the forbidden import taxes. They are as harmful and as dangerous as they are anticonstitutional. Unless this practice be promptly stopped by court action or legislative discontinuance, the Federal system in the United States will receive a severe and wholly unexpected blow.

On the other hand, compacts between the States, which are permitted by the Federal Constitution provided they have the approval of the Congress, are increasing in number and are exceedingly helpful. These compacts prove once more the elasticity of a properly organized federal system. Since 1935, 36 States, beginning with New Jersey, have set up permanent commissions for interstate cooperation. Some of the more important compacts now in effective operation are those which established the Port of New York Authority, Colorado River control, jurisdiction over Oregon-Washington fisheries, the Palisades Park agreement, and the New York-Vermont bridge agreement. It may well be that in the United States this movement within the framework of the Federal Constitution will grow steadily in significance and usefulness.

For 5 years past, Secretary Hull and his associates in the Department of State have been patiently and persuasively at work reducing the trade barriers which so grievously affect American industry, transportation, and commerce. While much has been done, much more yet remains to be done, and through an organized society of nations, established in conformity with those sound federal principles which would be applicable to a world-wide situation, genuine and rapid progress might well be made. The gain to the people of the United States would be very great.

In addition to the monetary problem and the problem of trade relationships, there are a thousand and one questions of world-wide importance to be constructively dealt with through a federal organization of nations. These affect education and philanthropy, standards of living, social security and protection against dependent old age, the conditions and rewards of manual labor, the public health, and many other like topics which call for and must have, not isolated and contradictory, but centralized and uniform treatment. Strong appeal will be made to public opinion everywhere by all that concerns improvement in the standard of living of the mass of any of the world's populations. This improvement is essential to the steady and forward-facing development of international trade relations. It must never be forgotten, however, that it is very misleading to judge the standard of living in terms merely of monetary wage or salary. A wage or salary of $50 a day is very inadequate if the daily cost of living be $49.50. On the other hand, a salary of $5 a day might be very comfortable if the cost of living were $2.50 a day. Monetary wages or salary alone have no significance. They must always be judged in terms of and in comparison with the cost of living. Quite as important as the monetary compensation of the worker are his housing and his physical comfort and health. Literally enormous progress has been making in respect to these questions all over the world. In the large cities of the United States, in Great Britain, in Berlin, in Vienna, and in Italy, the housing problem has been advanced toward solution by leaps and bounds. No doubt a great deal remains to be done, but men have learned now how to do it.

In approaching all the pressing international problems which deal with money and with trade, the world of today could have no better guidance than that given by Alexander Hamilton in his epoch marking Papers on Public Credit, Commerce, and Finance, written while Secretary of the Treasury of the United States in 1790, 1791, and 1795. Hamilton saw clearly the ways in which public credit and manufactures might be most wisely and most helpfully built up, as well as the ways in which they might be

harmed by undue Government interference and control. The wisdom of those great public papers is as pronounced today as when they were written. Nothing could be more contrary to fact than to cite Hamilton as the creator or, indeed, as even a defender of the present system of excessively high protective tariffs, which are one of the chief manifestations of that economic nationalism which is wrecking the prosperity of the world and day by day endangering its peace. Why the United States should become a manufacturing Nation and how it might become so were plainly demonstrated by Hamilton, but in terms of the freest possible trade for the various obvious reasons which he was careful to set out in detail. It is no exaggeration to say that if the world could produce another Alexander Hamilton, with the vision, the knowledge, and the persuasive eloquence to do for it what Hamilton did for the American people a century and a half ago, some, at least, of the world's troubles would be at an end.

When one observes those troubles and reflects upon them and their obvious causes, he is tempted to ask whether perhaps modern man has not grown tired of civilization and become bored by it. There are not a few happenings which would lead one to think so. We are surrounded in every land by clamorous and vigorous radicals who have no knowledge of the past and whose only concern for the future is that it shall be as different as possible from the present. All radicals are reactionaries. Their aim is to tear up everything by the roots; to destroy all that has been done and to begin everything all over again. Such a program is as unintelligent and as unpractical as it is dangerous.

A liberal is just the opposite of a radical. A liberal is one who builds upon the foundation of what has been accomplished through the centuries in a growing and widening and deepening civilization, and who goes forward in an open-minded, constructive spirit to guide the development of all this so that it will serve man's highest and finest needs and ideals, and be kept in conformity with changing facts and new needs.

There is every sign that if the world is to be turned over to the radicals it will for an indefinite period be a regimented and government-controlled world, ruled by force, either economic or military, or both. If the liberal is to rule, then the world will be one of steady progress toward carrying economic, social, and political liberty forward to a still higher plane of excellence and practical human service. Man's highest and finest needs and ideals would then be recognized and, so far as human power goes, met. The choice of today, which will determine the character of the world of tomorrow, is between the radical and the liberal.

An evidence that even a wise man does not always see the end of things is found in the title of a volume by the distinguished English historian, Edward A. Freeman. The full title of that work reads: History of Federal Government From the Foundation of the Achaian League to the Disruption of the United States, Volume I. Needless to say, this work was published in 1863, when the American Civil War was at its height. Volume II never appeared.

May it not perhaps be that the failure which now seems to have attended all the recent noble projects for a federal world is not as complete as radical observers would have us believe, and that volume II of their history of that failure will never be written?

A Protest Against Looters of Polish Assets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 16, 1939

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a release I recently issued pointing out the responsibility of Germany and Russia for Poland's debts to the United States and to American investors.

The rape of Poland by the combined Nazi-Soviet forces and the division of the loot between the two aggressors raises the question as to what is to become of the funds which many Americans have invested in the bonds of the Polish Government and the Polish political subdivisions. Exclusive of the amount which Poland is understood to have repatriated, there are outstanding close to $100,000,000 par value of bonds of the Polish Government, the Province of Silesia, and the city of Warsaw. It would seem that, in accordance with the provisions of international law, these obligations should be assumed by the invaders. However, unfortunately, both Germany and Russia are notorious defaulters, having repudiated virtually all contractual commitments.

It will be recalled that following the invasion and seizure of Austria by the armed forces of the Reich, our State Department called the attention of Germany to the responsibility which she would be expected to assume for the debts contracted on behalf of and by the Republic of Austria. Needless to say, the protests proved of no avail. Nevertheless, I believe that we should, merely for the sake of the record, remind both Germany and Russia of their duties toward Poland's American creditors, at least for the period during which they remain in possession of the assets of Poland which originally served as security for the obligations contracted by that country.

In addition, there is owing to the United States Government by the Republic of Poland some $180,000,000, exclusive of accrued interest, in connection with purchases made by Poland in the early days of her existence as an independent nation from the War and Navy Departments, the American Relief Administration, the United States Grain Corporation, and for services rendered by the United States Shipping Board.

Although we are fairly sure of what Germany's reply is going to be because of experiences that we have had with that country on previous occasions in matters of a similar character, it would be of interest to learn of Stalin's attitude.

I presume the State Department will do everything to protect the rights of our Government and our nationals.

America's Neutrality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSH LEE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 18 (legislative day of Wednesday, October 4), 1939

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. JOSH LEE, OF OKLAHOMA

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, as I do not plan to debate the question of neutrality on the floor of the Senate, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address which I delivered on October 17, in order that my position may be a matter of record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Ladies and gentlemen of the air, the question before the United States Senate today is not a question of whether or not we shall have war. The question is not war or peace. If it were, we would all be arguing on the same side—for peace. There would be no division. The question is one of judgment as to how we can best safeguard the peace and security of the United States.

Perhaps no President in the history of our country has steered a straighter course toward peace than Franklin D. Roosevelt. Perhaps no man living today has a better grasp of world affairs than he.

During the last session of Congress he warned us of the eminence of war and asked for repeal of the embargo so that the economic forces of America would be thrown into the balance against war. But his recommendation in that regard was not followed.

Time, however, has certainly vindicated his judgment as against the judgment of those who only last summer pooh-hooed the idea of war and assured the American people there was not going to be any war.

HISTORY OF NEUTRALITY LEGISLATION

The first neutrality bill was passed in 1935. As is true with almost every new law, it has been necessary to make certain changes in it. Consequently, we revised it in 1936. We revised it again in 1937; and now the development of circumstances makes it necessary to revise it again.

STRENGTHENS NEUTRALITY

I favor this revised neutrality bill because it has more safeguards for keeping America out of war than the present law. The revised neutrality bill, or the Pittman bill, which it might well be called, does not repeal our neutrality legislation. On the contrary, by mandatory provisions it vitally strengthens it.

For example, under the present law our ships may carry all of the most dangerous kinds of war materials except arms, ammunition, and implements of war. At present our ships are permitted to carry to belligerents scrap iron, steel, oil, gasoline, cotton, and many other raw materials which have been described by Germany as contraband of war.

This means that every time an American ship loaded with any of these materials leaves the port it is jeopardizing American peace.

It means that every time any ship leaves any port carrying any of these materials belonging to American citizens it is jeopardizing American peace. But under the Pittman neutrality bill this danger to American peace is removed by the title-and-carry provision.

The revised neutrality bill strengthens our neutrality law in almost every particular. Therefore, I maintain that it will more effectively safeguard American peace.

THE EMBARGO PROVISION

The only remaining issue is whether or not we should repeal the embargo on arms, ammunition, and implements of war. The original purpose for placing an embargo on these materials was to prevent our being drawn into war because of the submarining of our ships carrying these materials. But let me call your attention to the fact that belligerents today would just as quickly submarine a ship carrying gasoline or any other of a long list of war materials as it would one carrying rifles. Therefore, to limit our embargo simply to arms, ammunition, and implements of war will not carry out the purpose for which the law was originally passed.

But by removing the embargo and substituting for it the title-and-carry provisions of the revised neutrality bill we will much more effectively carry out the original purpose of the law.

EMBARGO FAVORS AGGRESSORS

I favor the repeal of the embargo because it works a distinct disadvantage to peaceful nations by preventing them from securing weapons to defend themselves against aggression.

Under the law as it now stands, aggressor nations may purchase in times of peace all of the war materials they wish and store them up ready for the day when they wish to strike an unsuspecting, peaceful nation. But the day those aggressor nations start a war against the peaceful nations, the law goes into effect and prohibits those peaceful nations from securing weapons to defend themselves against that aggression.

In the case of the present war, Germany has been preparing for this war for years. She has been purchasing such materials as she needed for a war of aggression. She has purchased materials from the United States and forged them into one of the greatest war machines of modern times. Today her arsenals are stacked full of rifles, cannons, tanks, warplanes, and all manner of war paraphernalia.

But in the meantime her neighbors who have been swept with a peace wave have not prepared themselves for war. For example, during the administration of Ramsay MacDonald, under his policy of "hands across the sea," England allowed her national defense to go down to perhaps the lowest point in English history. While France kept up her army, yet she allowed her air defense to fall to a low ebb.

Then one day, Germany feeling that she had sufficient war materials on hand to accomplish her diabolical scheme, started the war machine moving. England and France were pledged to help Poland maintain her independence, and thus Germany by an act of aggression forced France and England into a war for which they were not prepared. And, mark you, the guns that opened war on Poland closed at the same time to France, England, and Poland the munition plants of the United States and thus shut off that source of supply for weapons of defense.

Therefore, I maintain that this embargo which was passed in good faith works oppositely to what was intended. We intended to throw the weight of America against wars of aggression. I do not believe the people of the United States want the economic forces of this country used to give advantage to aggressor nations. I believe our people are so opposed to war that it is not our intention or our purpose to favor by our economic policy those nations who deliberately plan and perpetrate war upon peaceful nations. We hate war, and we do not propose to aid and abet those who make war. This embargo law was passed with the hope of promoting peace, but it is actually working today to the advantage of those who promote war. Therefore I believe it should be immediately repealed.

STRENGTHENS OUR NATIONAL DEFENSE

Then, again, I favor repeal of the arms embargo because its repeal would strengthen our national defense. It would place our factories on a mass-production basis and thereby make available war materials for our own use in case we should need them.

When we entered the World War our program called for 25,000 American-made planes. Twenty thousand were to be on the front by January 1918. But General Pershing attests the record that not one American-made plane ever reached the front. Although we were in the war for a year and a half, we were not able in that time to adjust our factories to the manufacture of war planes. The result was we had to beg, borrow, and buy such planes as we could get from the Allies. Naturally they used the best for themselves, and the ones we were able to secure were the less efficient, more out-of-date ones. The result was that the casualties among the American fliers were three times as great as those among the Allies. When an American pilot took off, death rode in the cockpit with him in those "flaming coffins," as Colonel Mitchell called them. I believe we should profit by that mistake and repeal the arms embargo in order that our factories might increase their production capacity.

If France and England together had been able to produce as many planes as Germany in September of 1938, there never would have been a Munich. If England's plant capacity for turning out war planes had been equal to that of Germany, Hitler never would have crossed the Polish border, and there would be peace in Europe today.

Therefore, in our consideration of methods of safeguarding the peace and security of America, it is just as important that we look to our national defense as it is that we preserve a strict neutrality. Just here, let me quote in part from a speech I made on the floor of the Senate last February in support of a bill to increase America's defense in the air. I quote:

"Now we come asking for the barest possible increase in our aviation, one that would not put us on a parity with other nations. We are taking full recognition of the natural protection the two seas give us; we are making full allowance for the natural protection that America has by virtue of our location between two oceans. * * *

"* * * The War Department has recommended the smallest possible number of planes necessary for our defense. They will be ample only with one provision, and that is that our factories shall be allowed to sell enough planes to foreign countries so that the factories may be placed on a mass-production basis, so that the mistake of 1918 will not be repeated. Obviously we shall need fewer planes actually in the air if we can get more when we need them, and get them in a hurry."

I am convinced that that is even truer today than it was last February.

The isolationists base their entire argument on the presumption that if we attend to our own business we will never have war. But I submit to you that weakness invites attack and results in war without provocation.

For example, did Ethiopia bring war on herself by meddling into the affairs of other nations? Certainly not. China's only crime was that she did not have adequate national defense. Poland's only crime was that she and her allies were not prepared to repel the German attack.

When dictators decide to make war, their decision is based upon only one question, and that is whether or not they are able to destroy the other nation. The arguments which prevailed at Munich were the comparative number of war planes of the contending nations. The only language dictators understand is spoken from the mouths of cannons with tongues of fire. Therefore, I favor enlarging the capacity of our factories and thereby strengthening our guaranty of peace.

Colonel Lindbergh in his last speech made a statement with which I am in hearty accord. I quote: "This Western Hemisphere," he said, "is our domain. It is our right to trade freely within it. From Alaska to Labrador, from the Hawaiian Islands to Bermuda, from Canada to South America we must allow no invading army to set foot. These are the outposts of the United States. They form the essential outline of our geographical defense. We must be ready to wage war with all the resources of our Nation if they are ever seriously threatened."

But I would like to ask Colonel Lindbergh, How are we going to be ready to wage war with all the resources of our Nation if our factories are closed down by an embargo on arms? In this day of swift-moving mechanized armies, I do not wish to have America left at the mercy of the war machines of dictators during the long months it would take for our factories to gear themselves to mass production.

The Monroe Doctrine is no stronger than the military forces that support it. Therefore, I believe we should follow a policy which, as George Washington said, will place the United States in a respectable posture of defense, and by following such a policy I firmly believe that we shall be able to keep the United States out of war.

I thank you.

Mobilization for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 18 (legislative day of Wednesday, October 4), 1939

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. ALEXANDER WILEY, OF WISCONSIN

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by me over the Columbia Broadcasting System on the evening of October 17, on the subject Mobilization for Peace.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The debate in the Senate of the United States in relation to the so-called neutrality issue is nearly over. Tonight I want to briefly review the main contentions on both sides of this question. When the debate started it was evident that a large number of the people in this country had reached the conclusion that the present law should not be changed. Let me remind you that the present law provides for an embargo on munitions and the implements of war, but permits the sale of all other merchandise to belligerents and permits such merchandise to be sold on credit and transported in American bottoms through the war zone.

I believe now practically everyone in America agrees that certain features at least of the new bill are wise and should be passed. I refer to the following:

1. The requirement that all goods sold to the belligerents must be sold for cash.

2. The belligerents must take title to the same in this country and transport the same in their own ships.

3. No American ships shall traverse the so-called war zones and no American citizen shall travel on belligerent ships.

The features of the new bill which are most in debate are: (1) The repeal of the embargo; (2) the too stringent restriction on American shipping. A third debatable point, the 90-day credit clause, will be taken out of the bill.

The most discussed subject, of course, is the retention or the repeal of the Embargo Act.

It is contended by one side that the retention of the embargo will be conducive to peace, but the same contention for repeal is made by the other side.

Those who do not desire the repeal say it will be the first step in a direction which will lead to expanded credit, opening the doors of this country for Government loans to England and France, resulting in a boom, which will be especially detrimental to American economy after the European war ceases.

The other side who favor the repeal say there is no validity to this contention, since only 13 percent—if we take the same average that obtained in the World War—of the total sales to England and France will be for munitions and implements of war and 87 percent will be for other merchandise. They say that if you do not repeal the embargo you will have the same demand for credit and for placement of bonds and the same conditions which will produce the wartime boom. They claim that the 87 percent will grow to a probable 100 percent for materials, much of which go into the manufacture of munitions and implements of war.

I claim that the answer to wartime boom and profits may be found in limiting overexpansion of plants and in building up our domestic trade and in building up our trade with neutrals.

It is admitted by all contenders that the present act, as it now operates, benefits Germany and, if repealed, the act would operate to benefit England and France. It is contened on one side that it is against international law to change the partial embargo act after the war has started. The other side states that there is nothing to this contention; that America has the right to change its own laws, especially as all the nations of the earth were put on notice by the President and by the pending bill in Congress. One side contends that it is immoral to manufacture and sell arms and implements of war to be used to kill people. The other side replies that if it is immoral to sell arms now, then it is immoral to sell them before war starts, and that to fail to repeal the embargo now puts a premium on aggression, "sharpening the fangs of the wolf and fleecing the wool from the sheep." "Morality is determined by purpose of sale," they say.

In the discussion the word "isolationist" has been applied to those opposing the pending bill. The fact is the administration's bill is more of an isolationist measure than the present law. Every argument for the maintenance of this present law is built upon the assumption that we got into the last war through the sale of arms and granting credit to the Allies. The exponents for the pending bill move on the theory that we got into the World War because American lives were lost and our ships were sunk contrary to the rights of neutrals and contrary to the express promise of the German Government. The German Minister, von Bernstorff, in his book admits that Germany's breach of her agreement with this country and her ruthless sinking of our ships were the immediate cause of our entrance into the war.

On the other hand, anyone who has given study to the situation knows that there were other factors. There was public opinion inflamed over the sinking of the *Lusitania*. There were almost 3 years of stress. There was the rape of Belgium, and there were the blood ties and religious ties. There were the sympathies of folks whose moral sensibilities were shocked and torn.

I know that for years there has been propaganda to the effect that profits and munitions got us into the war, and that line of thinking had considerable to do with the passing of the present Embargo Act, its main purpose being to stop profits. Yet, as we have said before, it affects only 13 percent of the war trade; 87 percent will be in other materials. If the 13 percent is stopped, it is contended that the 87 percent will have profits and probably will grow to 100 percent.

Again, one side contends that American shipping should not be swept from the seas because a German raider might fire on the Stars and Stripes. They say such a policy is likely to encourage aggression and inspire contempt for the United States. They believe that abandonment of the fundamentally American doctrine of freedom of the seas is tolerable only when accompanied by a repeal of the arms embargo to show that this country has not been terrorized to a point where it will abandon all rights at anyone's dictation. They contend that to put our merchant marine in cold storage while simultaneously refusing to sell arms is not good policy but a sign of weakness.

But now let us look at some of the points on which both sides agree:

Both parties agree that we have nothing to gain and everything to lose by getting involved in Europe's war.

Both parties agree that it is not our job to mix in European disputes or get to meddling in European affairs. Both parties agree that we have enough problems in America to look after, and that if we would put our attention toward the solution of these problems we would be much better off than in trying to solve those of Europe. Both parties agree that alliances financial and economic may be as dangerous to our peace as alliances political, and that Washington's advice has special application at this time. Both parties agree if the European war continues for any length of time we will have to prepare ourselves for the shocks and problems which will arise when Europe's war ceases. Both parties agree that there is grave danger that when the war ceases in Europe democracy there will have been blotted out. Both parties agree that there is a great need for sane and deliberate thinking in America; a great need for taking the scare headlines out of newspapers and taking the emotional defeatist off the radio. Both sides agree that the rest of the world offers an opportunity for the placement of American goods, American concept of fair dealing, and an opportunity for the greatest democracy in the world to demonstrate that it has the power and the ability and the common sense to keep out of war.

The debate has developed a lot of "tangents." One side claims the war in Europe is a war over the balance of power. The other side states that there is more than that involved—that Hitler stands for breach of treaties; that his ideology and the ideology of Stalin run counter to the ideology of democracy found in America, England, and France; that it would be safer and better for the Atlantic to remain an English, French, and American pond than for it to become a Russian and a German pond.

Both sides seem to favor the continuance of a policy of building up our Navy, air force, and Army.

Both sides claim that if their contention is followed, it will shorten the war, and both sides say that if their contention is not followed war will be prolonged. Thus it is contended that if England and France can get munitions and implements of war from us there will not only be a beneficial psychological effect felt throughout the world restraining other nations from joining Stalin and Hitler but that the Allies will then be in a position to defend themselves. The opposition contends that failure to sell munitions and implements of war to the Allies will cause them to be more willing to agree to peace.

One side says a "Hitler peace" now would be only an armistice until all the conquered territory had been organized and fitted into a bigger and better war machine by Hitler and Stalin for the conquering of the rest of Europe. Neither side seems to approve the marriage of Nazi socialism with bolshevism, recognizing the potential bad effect upon America.

I want to state emphatically that there is no need for telling the people that a law passed by Congress will insure America against war. Many partisans in this debate have gone beyond reason in their statement or conclusion, indicating that only if Congress follows their course can we avoid war; only by following what they say can America be secure. We had an embargo in 1812, and we got into the war. We didn't have one in 1917, and we got into the war. In fact, from 1812 to 1935 we didn't have an embargo, and we kept out of all the European conflicts with the exception of the World War. In my opinion, the repeal or the failure to repeal the embargo is not of primary importance as far as war or peace is concerned. After all, what is our great objective? We all agree it is the maintenance of peace in America. A night or so ago over another radio network, I talked on peacetime patriotism; tonight I am asking you to mobilize not for war but for peace.

Tonight let me make a declaration of war—a war on war. Tonight let me advocate not preparations for war but preparations for peace.

As we study the welter of confused and jumbled war reports, one salient fact is inescapable. All Europe has drawn the tattered shreds of its economy together in a mobilization for war. Defunct industries have been brought to life, dying industries have been put on their feet, and frozen funds, congealed by economic disorders, have been warmed by an intense nationalism and shot back into the economic blood stream.

In short, the world has again witnessed the phenomenon of an entombed economy, led from its sepulchre to respond lustily, but not wisely to the bugle call.

If these miracles can be accomplished by war, what can we not accomplish by peace? If every human energy can be mobilized arbitrarily for war, why cannot every human energy be mobilized against war?

Do not misunderstand me. I am not advocating war as a cure-all for economic disorders. In fact, I am strongly opposed to any economic stimulant caused by war, because it leaves the patient infinitely worse than he was before the treatment began.

What I am advocating is a voluntary peacetime mobilization against war. If other countries can make these tremendous sacrifices for war, what sacrifices can America make to keep at peace? Our tremendous mail proves that America is eager to make any sacrifice to keep out of war.

Let us then mobilize against war—wage a relentless war on war itself.

We will find that while we are warring on war we will accomplish other constructive purposes, rebuilding the morale and spirit of our people.

First of all, let me repeat that the importance of the outcome of the embargo debate must not be overemphasized. Let us realize that regardless of what happens in this debate, America will not go to war. One side of the debate must lose. I do not want that side to believe that America must then prepare for war. I want all America fiercely determined that whatever happens to this debate, we will still be at peace. If America is so determined, she will be at peace.

Second, let us, instead of a war college, create a peace college to plan ahead—to plan on keeping American economy on an even

keel—to coordinate Federal relief and other Government agencies so that they can meet the challenge which will come when the war boom dies down and normal economy takes over.

Third, let us give some intelligent direction—not regimentation—toward guiding and curtailing the unbridled expansion in wheat raising, in sheep raising, and in any other abnormally expanded market, that cannot be reconciled with peacetime needs.

Fourth, let us not be unduly swayed by incidents. We didn't go to war when the Japanese sunk the *Panay*. England didn't go to war when her ambassador was machine-gunned from a Japanese plane. When the Spanish Loyalists bombed a German battleship, Germany didn't go to war. For once and for all let us realize that incidents are unimportant in themselves; that they become important only when they are used as a pretext for war—only when they are used to inflame public opinion.

Fifth, let us realize for once and for all that America has a unique destiny of its own—a destiny apart from the European cauldron.

Let us then begin to quit worrying about Europe's war and begin thinking of America and where it will be when the red haze of war clears. When the smoke clears over there there will still be visible in America a democracy intact, a people dedicated to peacetime pursuits, in possession of two-thirds of the gold in the world, the world's most efficient industrial machinery, and the world's only untarnished credit. Let us concentrate now on using that tremendous power to outlaw war and to preserve peace.

Sixth, let us turn a deaf ear to any proposals that America step in, as referee, for the European battle. Let us not be jockeyed into a position that will make us cosigners on a demand note to guarantee a patched-up European truce.

Seventh, let us in a peacetime America learn one lesson from war-torn Europe. If they can tighten their belts for war * * * then let us tighten our belts for peace. Let us seize this opportunity to readjust our scale of living, to fit our national economy. Let me repeat: Instead of mobilizing for war let us mobilize for peace.

Neutrality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD P. NYE

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 18 (legislative day of Wednesday, October 4), 1939

EDITORIAL FROM THE SATURDAY EVENING POST

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD what I consider to be the most worthy editorial which has yet been written on the issue which is pending before the Senate at the present time. It is the editorial published on October 14, 1939, in the Saturday Evening Post headed "Phantasy of a Bloodless Sword."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Saturday Evening Post of October 14, 1939]

PHANTASY OF A BLOODLESS SWORD

People were never so stupid as to imagine they could make themselves neutral by passing a law. All the confusion in our minds about neutrality legislation has been owing, in the first place, to the fact that neutrality was not the subject, and, secondly, to bewildering equivocations on the tongue of government. In the dimness of this confusion there has taken place, almost unawares to the people, a perilous change in this Nation's foreign policy. That is the key to any understanding of what has happened. For the record, and while we may, let us tell ourselves truthfully how we arrived at a grave crisis of thought and feeling on this one question: Shall the export of arms and munitions to nations at war be forbidden?

The first act of Congress to be called a neutrality law, imperfectly enacted in 1935, directly proceeded from an idea of the innocents, namely, the idea that munitions makers, international bankers, and profiteers were the war bringers; it was believed that if this three-headed monster could be chained down, the peace of the world would be promoted, and we should be less likely ourselves to be drawn into another European war. It was a law, therefore, to limit the rights of American citizens as neutrals. Their right to sell arms and munitions to nations at war—a right of all neutrals under international law—was absolutely annulled. The right to export raw materials and foodstuffs to nations at war was restricted in three ways: First, even such goods as these could not be carried to a belligerent in American ships; second, title to the cargo had to be transferred to the foreign buyer before it could leave an American port; third, American bankers were forbidden to buy or sell the bonds and I O U's of nations at war, which would be to provide them with credit and perhaps cause in this country another war boom, such as occurred during the first World War. This was called the cash-and-carry or the come-and-get-it-and-pay-for-it policy, to govern the export of materials and foodstuffs. The sale of arms and munitions was forbidden on any terms.

The law was strengthened by amendment in 1936 and again in 1937, with no change of idea. Everybody knew what its demerits were. It was inflexible and might sometime work as we had not wished it to work; it would work always to the advantage of the great maritime nations controlling the seas, which is to say, Great Britain and France on the Atlantic side, and Japan on the Pacific side; furthermore, it surrendered what we had always before been willing to fight for, namely, freedom of the seas for neutrals; and it was a drastic limitation upon all the rights of neutrals in time of war for which the American Government had contended throughout our history. Nevertheless, in the form in which it was finally enacted in 1937 the vote for it in Congress was almost unanimous, public sentiment heartily supported it, and the President signed it.

Now, the first point is that the administration did not begin to attack the law until after its foreign policy had changed.

The change was sudden. In his 1936 Chautauqua speech, the President had been saying, "I hate war"; and, "If war should break out again on another continent, let us not blink the fact that we should find in this country thousands of Americans who, seeking immediate riches—fool's gold—would attempt to break down or to evade our neutrality. * * * To resist the clamor of that greed * * * would require the unswerving support of all Americans who love peace."

How far from that to the quarantine speech in Chicago, in October 1937, when he said there was no escape for us through mere "isolation and neutrality" and proposed that the peace-loving nations of the world combine and make a concerted effort to quarantine and stop the aggressors.

Never since that speech has the administration been neutral in thought, word, or deed. Continuously thereafter high members of the administration, certainly not without Mr. Roosevelt's approval, seized every occasion to incite hatred and fear of the aggressors, who were called by name, and to implant the thought that if Great Britain and France were attacked, we should have to exert our power to save them, in order to preserve the democratic principle in the world. Then the President himself, in his message to Congress last January, made the famous utterance that whereas words were futile, still there were many methods "short of war, but more effective than mere words" whereby aggressor nations could be brought to account.

Shortly after this it became known that the administration was demanding a revision of what it referred to as the so-called neutrality law. There was a White House conference with Members of Congress, at which the President was understood to have made their blood run cold by telling them America's first line of defense was in France. When this had leaked out and had produced a profound and premature political sensation in the world, he denied having said it. Whether he said it explicitly in that way, at that time, does not matter at all. The idea was implicit in the quarantine speech, in his message to Congress, and in many other sayings.

Then there was his farewell to the people of Warm Springs, Ga., "I'll be back in the fall, if we don't have a war," and his endorsement of an editorial that followed in the Washington Post, saying that in using the collective word "we," the President meant to aline this country with the democracies of Europe, and was telling Hitler and Mussolini "that the tremendous force of the United States must be a factor in their current thinking." This endorsement of the Washington Post's interpretation of what he meant was made at a press conference, April 11, which the New York Times reported in the following words: "President Roosevelt strongly implied today that he believed the involvement of the United States in any general European war was inevitable, and that this Nation should stand shoulder to shoulder with Great Britain and France against Nazi-Fascist machinations."

And how far that was from the positive statement that he had made on February 3. "We are against entangling alliances, obviously," he said. "The foreign policy has not changed and is not going to change."

If he meant there had been no change in foreign policy since his quarantine speech, that was probably true. But this was a policy the American people did not yet comprehend and knew very little about.

Nothing was aimless. All this was leading to a certain thing. The President was resolved to get rid of the law that made it unlawful to sell arms and munitions to nations at war. In June he sent to the Capitol his own so-called neutrality law, asking that it be substituted for the one on the books. The law he proposed was amazing. It would have invested the President with almost unlimited discretion to employ the economic power and resources of this country in a foreign war, such resources not only as materials and foodstuffs, but arms, munitions, and all implements of war; also credit and shipping, and then very large control of the private activities of American citizens.

The administration very well knew that the opposition, calling itself "the peace bloc" and derisively called "the isolationist bloc," would make its hardest fight against the repeal of the 4-year-old embargo on the export of arms and munitions to nations at war. Therefore, it put forward Secretary Hull, and after him others, to argue that there was really no logical difference between, on one hand, guns, bombing planes, and explosives, and, on the other hand, the materials out of which the belligerents could manufacture their own war implements, or the food they ate while doing it. The humanitarian might shudder at the thought of selling the lethal

instruments for profit, and that could be understood, but the difference was in logic unreal.

This argument was evasive. Consider it. To manufacture guns, planes, and explosives requires time and equipment. In war, time is vital; and every nation at war may be supposed to be running its full equipment in high gear. If we embargo arms and munitions, the nations that control the sea still have access to our raw materials, our fuel, and our surplus foodstuffs, and that is tremendous advantage; but if we lift the embargo, they have access, besides, to our industrial power. Obviously, the purpose of repealing the embargo on arms and munitions would be to sharpen and lengthen our weapon against Hitler. Logic had nothing to do with it. Policy was acting.

Wanting to know why the President's neutrality law did not continue the embargo on arms and munitions, the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House consulted the State Department. The words that follow are from the minority report of that committee: "When representatives of the State Department were asked whether there was any change in the international situation which should cause Congress to repeal the provision for an arms embargo at this time, our committee was told that Hitler's taking over of 27 munition plants in Austria and the Skoda works and 11 other plants in Czechoslovakia justified the change."

That was to say, because Germany had acquired additional munition plants, therefore it was necessary to give England and France access to American munition plants. The idea is clear. The motive is comprehensible. But when did it come to be the foreign policy of the United States to mind the balance of military power in Europe? Certainly, on February 3, when the President said that there was no change in our foreign policy and that there was not going to be any change, the people did not know that that was our foreign policy. The minority report of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House added: "We are opposed to the President's policy of using the threat of our power to preserve a balance of power in Europe."

Much to the President's chagrin, his so-called neutrality law was defeated. Meanwhile, the come-and-get-it feature of the old law expired in May, leaving the rest of it as it was; the export of arms and munitions to nations at war absolutely forbidden.

That was in July. The struggle between the President and Congress was dramatic. At the very end he called a conference at the White House of both those who supported him and those who opposed him; that was the conference which the Vice President is supposed to have terminated by saying, "It's no use, Cap'n. You haven't got the votes."

And what was the crucial point of that struggle? Not the embargo, really. Not whether or not the sale of arms and munitions to nations at war should be forbidden by law. That was only the fighting point. It is now a curiously twisted pattern. The idea of the so-called neutrality law completed in 1937 was to limit the rights of neutral citizens, for fear they should create circumstances and conditions tending to involve the country in war. But the passionate idea of those who last July defended that same law, against the law the President was trying to put in place of it, was to limit the power of an unneutral government to involve the country in another European conflict.

After his defeat, the President retired to Hyde Park, where he held a press conference, which was reported in the New York Times, July 22, as follows: "Mr. Roosevelt confirmed one of the many utterances attributed to him by those who participated in the White House conference Tuesday night. He said he told the group that he had already fired two shots for peace and wanted a chance to fire a third, should the occasion arise. Reporters were left to infer that he could not fire the third shot unless this Nation were free to ship arms and munitions to belligerents."

He wanted a bigger gun. An economic gun; a shot to be fired for peace. And yet a gun to intimidate Hitler.

Continuing the report of that Hyde Park press conference, the New York Times correspondent wrote: "Because the United States had been eliminated, for the present at least, as a factor to be reckoned with by aggressor nations, who might have hesitated in the face of potential American aid to nonaggressors, the chances of an outbreak of war had been increased, the President explained."

So said Winston Churchill, now First Lord of the British Admiralty, in the New York Herald-Tribune, July 14. "It is of capital importance," he wrote, "that Hitler should not be misled into believing that the recent vote on President Roosevelt's neutrality bill represents the last word which the United States has to speak upon the fundamental issues now at stake. * * * This controversy may be a potential factor in bringing about what all American citizens most desire to prevent"—namely, a European war.

So you see how it may be—and we say it sardonically—that the war which did come was our fault, on the testimony of both the President of the United States and the First Lord of the British Admiralty, because Congress at a certain moment did not give Mr. Roosevelt the economic weapon with which he would have undertaken to redress the balance of power that Hitler had upset in Europe.

When the war came the President did these things, seriatim: He proclaimed an absolute embargo on the sale of arms and munitions, as he was obliged to do under the law he had been unable to get rid of; he proclaimed a limited emergency in order to have a freer hand all around; through the Federal Lending Administrator he announced that the Johnson Act, forbidding American credit to be loaned to America's defaulting war debtors, does not bind the lending agencies of the Federal Government, and that the Government's own Export-Import Bank and its Reconstruction Finance Corporation have plenty of unused credit to finance both the production and the sale of American commodities in benefit of those European belligerents who happily control the sea and can, therefore, come and get them. And then saying he believed public feeling had changed to his view, he called Congress in special session to reconsider repealing the embargo on the sale of arms and munitions.

Historically, the policy of the American Government had been to assert and defend the right of neutrals to sell arms and munitions to other nations freely in peace and war, and there was much to be said for that policy. There is much to be said for it still. Nevertheless, deliberately, in time of peace, we departed from it. Now, with Europe in a state of war, to change our peacetime law forbidding traffic in arms and munitions, and to change it in a way to benefit one side only, is an unneutral act. Let no one be deceived to the contrary. Such an act on the part of a nation that holds the decisive economic power is one the consequences of which cannot be foreseen.

During 2 years of unneutral propaganda the Roosevelt administration, evolving a foreign policy of its own so dangerous that the revelation of it had to be graduated to the Gallup polls, at the same time imposed the hypnotic thought that we can exert the power without ourselves becoming involved in actual war. This we believe to be a phantasy, in contempt of both experience and common sense. There is no such magic weapon, all powerful and yet bloodless.

People cannot be neutral in feeling. That is impossible. We suppose that American sympathies now lie more one way than toward any other foreign war since our history began. All the more on that account should the Government be the image of our reason. No government should know what its own sympathies are. Would that we had at this time a government steadfast in the American tradition of jealous neutrality, and willing, if necessary, to fight for that, instead of one hotly demanding the sword of this Nation's economic power to wield in Europe's war.

Payment by Great Britain and France for Purchases in United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. DANAHER

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, October 4), 1939

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, during the course of my remarks, I asked and obtained unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article from the Baltimore Sun by Mr. J. Fred Essary relating to orders placed in the United States by the British and French Governments for the purchase and payment of goods and materials. I did not have the article at hand at the time. I now ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in today's RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Baltimore Sun of October 12, 1939]

STATE DEPARTMENT INSISTS ALL ARMS BOUGHT IN UNITED STATES HAVE BEEN PAID FOR—ASSERTS ALLIES HAVE NOT LET BIG CONTRACTS—TELLS PITTMAN NO DEBT HAS BEEN NEGOTIATED OR HAS ACCUMULATED—PARTS OF ORDERS WERE EXECUTED, BUT ALL OTHERS WERE HELD UP

(By J. Fred Essary)

WASHINGTON, October 11.—The State Department is authority for the statement today that the Allied governments have not awarded contracts for huge quantities of arms in this country thereby creating a great potential debt if not an actual one.

Assurance to this effect was given to Senator KEY PITTMAN, chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee. The facts were assembled by Joseph C. Green, head of the National Munitions Control Board of the State Department.

It is true that many large orders, chiefly for aircraft, have been awarded to American manufacturers and that a part of these orders have been executed. It is also true that some of the goods have been delivered.

EVERYTHING PAID FOR

But the department insists that every airplane or engine or shell that had been turned over to an Allied government up to the time of the President's neutrality proclamation had been paid for on the barrel head. No debt has been negotiated or has accumulated.

In the memorandum prepared for Senator PITTMAN it was pointed out that at the time of the proclamation Great Britain had let contracts for arms, ammunition, and other instruments of war to the value of $44,800,000.

Of this amount goods to the value of $27,000,000 had been shipped on the date of the proclamation, when deliveries abruptly ended. The Department says the goods were paid for in full.

LICENSES, NOT ORDERS, CANCELED

Licenses for the remainder of the British purchases also were issued, but they were automatically canceled the day the proclamation became effective. The orders, however, were not canceled.

Also, it was announced that France had let contracts amounting to $104,500,000 by the time neutrality was proclaimed. Of that amount, deliveries had been made and shipments were authorized to the value of $20,900,000.

As in the case of the British contracts, the export licenses for the undelivered French purchases were revoked.

PAYMENT ON DELIVERY

"It may be stated categorically," Mr. Green said, "that every contract which the British and French Governments have made with American companies for the purchase of arms, ammunition, and implements of war has provided for payment in advance of delivery and full payment on delivery."

The fact that contracts are outstanding for additional supplies does not create a debt in the judgment of State Department officials. It is known that deliveries in this instance do not mean actual shipment. They merely mean handing over the goods to representatives of the foreign government involved.

As rapidly as the commodities are finished, they are paid for under all contracts known to the Government. The problem of getting the finished products out of the country is no responsibility of the manufacturers, it is said.

So far as can be learned, no contracts with American manufacturers have been canceled. The purchasers expect to get their arms and ammunition if and when the embargo is lifted.

Senator PITTMAN had been angered by statements by Senator JOHN A. DANAHER (Republican, Connecticut) that the proposed neutrality revision program would open the door to sweeping credits to belligerent powers.

The committee chairman said this afternoon that the State Department's figures showed "very clearly that not only have no debts been incurred prior to the President's proclamation but that munitions manufacturers of this country never did have and have no intention now of selling to belligerents except on a cash basis."

"So the whole fear," he continued, "of the accumulation of a great debt by the purchase of munitions has no foundation whatsoever."

There was further discussion today of the War Department's program for increasing the land forces of the country to full peacetime strength.

To do this, the Regular Army must recruit up to 280,000 men, or 53,000 more than is now authorized. The Army's total strength now is about 185,000, and it is recruiting new members to expand its forces to the 227,000 total authorized recently by the President.

The National Guard, if these forces are to attain full peacetime strength, must expand to a much greater degree, officials pointed out.

The authorized strength of the Guard is 450,000. To reach that goal it is necessary to recruit approximately 215,000 more men.

Work of Mixed Claims Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 18 (legislative day of Wednesday, October 4), 1939

ARTICLE BY JOSEPH C. FEHR, ESQ.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Mr. Joseph Conrad Fehr, a distinguished member of the District of Columbia Bar, published in the October issue of the American Bar Association Journal, relating to the work of the Mixed Claims Commission.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the American Bar Association Journal, October 1939]

WORK OF THE MIXED CLAIMS COMMISSION

(By Joseph Conrad Fehr, member of the District of Columbia bar)

With the decision of Mr. Justice Owen J. Roberts, of the Supreme Court of the United States, as umpire of the Mixed Claims Commission, United States and Germany, in holding Germany responsible for the conflagrations and explosions which took place on the "Black Tom" pier of the Lehigh Valley Railroad in Jersey City, N. J., on July 30, 1916, and nearly 6 months later, on January 11, 1917, in the Canadian Car & Foundry munitions plant at Kingsland, N. J., the work of that 17-year-old international tribunal comes to a dramatic close. And having disposed of more than 20,000 claims, large and small, it now goes down into history as the greatest international arbitration ever convened for the purpose of adjudicating the pecuniary claims of one country and its citizens against another.

* * * * * * *

When it is recalled that during the 125 years prior to the World War the United States was a party to 71 different arbitrations, involving 24 other nations, and all manner of pecuniary demands, this arbitration of war claims between the United States and Germany is particularly noteworthy. These 71 prior arbitrations resulted in total awards of less than $93,000,000, including the Geneva award of $15,500,000, a single proceeding known as the Alabama arbitration, in favor of the United States. The Alabama arbitration alone lasted 5 years, the Commission filing a lump-sum award in order to settle 1,701 claims, including 448 for the expenditure of war-risk insurance premiums which were summarily disregarded. As compared with this record the Mixed Claims Commission, United States and Germany, aside from the above-mentioned sabotage claims, required less than 11 years to dispose of 20,425 claims, resulting in total awards aggregating $260,000,000 (including interest).

The United States and Germany began their momentous arbitration on October 9, 1922. Its work can best be appraised through the following figures: Aside from the so-called sabotage cases, there are 6,837 awards to private claimants, carrying the total amount of $193,892,287.92. With the four awards to the Government of the United States in the amount of $84,961,534.18, the entire number of awards is 6,841, aggregating $278,853,822.10. These figures include interest only through September 30, 1935, interest running on at 5 percent per annum on all amounts unpaid. Of these awards, 6,498 have already been paid in full and 304 have been paid approximately the principal amount. Stated in another way, there has been paid the sum of $135,379,216.93 in payment of nearly 7,000 awards to private claimants in whole or in part. Payments are made by the Treasury Department of the United States, under the Settlement of War Claims Act of 1928, out of a special trust fund therein created, the Federal Government having no obligation in respect of payment except to administer the account.

The payments made on account of these awards were made possible by the Settlement of War Claims Act of 1928. Later, on November 7, 1930, Germany, under the debt agreement with the United States of June 23, 1930, deposited in the Treasury of the United States her bonds running to the United States amounting to RM3,169,700,000 (approximately $755,000,000) in order to satisfy her obligations. Of this amount, RM2,121,600,000 ($505,000,000) was to satisfy the awards of the Commission, and the remainder, RM1,048,100,000 ($250,000,000), to meet the costs of the American Army of Occupation in Germany following the armistice. The debt agreement was authorized by an American statute of June 5, 1930, and a German statute of similar tenor.

The late Chandler P. Anderson, of New York and Washington, an outstanding international lawyer, was for many years the American commissioner. Dr. Wilhelm Kiesselbach, of Hamburg, Germany, chief justice of the Hanseatic Supreme Court, was for many years the German commissioner. Since 1934 the German commissioner has been Dr. Victor L. F. H. Huecking. Prior to Mr. Justice Roberts there were three umpires, each of whom died. The late William R. Day, after retiring from the Supreme Court of the United States in 1922, was soon after appointed the commission's first umpire by President Harding. The German Government had requested President Harding to designate an outstanding American jurist. Mr. Justice Day resigned as umpire shortly before his death in 1923 and at the request of the German Government he was succeeded by the late Judge Edwin B. Parker, until then the American commissioner. Mr. Anderson then became the American member on the commission. Following the death of Judge Parker on October 30, 1929, Hon. Roland W. Boyden, of Boston, for several years unofficial observer for the United States at the Reparation Commission in Paris, became umpire on January 9, 1930. Mr. Boyden died on October 25, 1931, leaving the position of umpire again vacant. Upon the invitation of both Governments, Mr. Justice Roberts, of the United States Supreme Court, agreed to serve as umpire in the winding up of the Commission's work. When Mr. Anderson died several years ago he was succeeded as American commissioner by Christopher B. Garnett.

During the past 16 years the United States has been represented before the Commission by the late Robert W. Bonynge, of New York, who succeeded the late Robert C. Morris, also of New York in June 1923. He has since prosecuted before the Commission claims of the United States and American nationals, assisted by a legal staff, of which Mr. Harold H. Martin, of Washington, has been chief counsel. Since practically the beginning of the arbitration, Germany's first agent before the Commission was Dr. Karl von Lewinski, an official high in the councils of the German Foreign Office, who was succeeded in 1930 by Dr. Wilhelm Tannenberg, also an official of the German Foreign Office; and Dr. Tannenberg was in 1933 succeeded by Dr. Johann Lohman, who, in turn, was in 1934 succeeded by Dr. Richard Paulig.

The agreement constituting the Commission required that Germany be notified on or before April 9, 1923, as to the nature and

number of claims the United States intended to present. At that time there were only 12,416 claims filed for arbitration. These demands, comprising many claims since determined to have been unfounded or exaggerated, amounted in terms of claimants' demands to the amazing figure of $1,479,064,313.92, including the Government's claim for the cost of maintaining the American Army of Occupation along the Rhine, estimated as of January 31, 1923, at $255,544,810, subject to adjustments. This particular claim was later withdrawn by reason of the separate arrangement between the United States and Germany known as the Young plan of 1929 (which superseded the Dawes Plan of 1924 and the financial agreement adopted by the Paris Conference January 14, 1925), calling for payment of this item by Germany directly to the United States. Under the subsequent agreement of December 31, 1928 (contemplated by the Settlement of War Claims Act of 1928) about 8,000 so-called late claims were allowed to come within the jurisdiction of the Commission, which have all since been disposed of.

Of the 6,837 awards in private claims, the principal amounts definitely ascertained prior to the awards recently made with reference to the so-called sabotage claims are $2,409,431.31 in awards in the *Lusitania* group, $35,342,105.62 in the marine underwriters' group, and some $30,000,000 in other claims involving deaths and personal injuries (other than through the sinking of the *Lusitania* group), American hull and cargo losses, damage to property in territory occupied by Germany, damages sustained through application in Germany of exceptional war measures, American interests in estates, debts, bank deposits, and bonds. In this connection it should be noted that the reparation demands of the principal Allied and Associated Powers totaled about $32,000,000,000.

The claims put forward by the Government of the United States as such were solely on account of destruction of or damage to ships and cargoes. An award resulted in each case asserted. Totaling $42,034,794.41, exclusive of interest, which runs at 5 percent simple interest per annum, from November 11, 1918, these awards are as follows:

U. S. Shipping Board	$16,500,000.00
U. S. Veterans' Bureau	24,319,095.41
U. S. Railroad Administration	1,215,000.00
U. S. Government Despatch Agency	699.00

The grand total of the principal of all awards is approximately $240,000,000. By adding interest due at the rate of 5 percent from the numerous dates specified in the awards, America's total bill against Germany on account of both private and Government claims is well over $300,000,000. Of this amount there has already been paid to private claimants about $134,000,000, payments on account of the Government awards being deferred, under the aforesaid act, until the private claimants have been fully recompensed.

The war-risk insurance premium claims, aggregating in amount claimed $345,000,000, were, after elaborate arguments and thorough consideration, dismissed by the Commission as ill-founded. Duplications amounting to approximately $100,000,000, including also arbitrary exaggerations in claims, scaled down the amounts demanded even more. As already pointed out, it was not necessary for the Commission to adjudicate the Government's claim for the cost of the army of occupation.

As compared with those entered by the late Judge Parker as the sole Commissioner of the Tripartite Claims Commission, these awards were, indeed, tremendous. That Commission rendered awards against Austria totaling $370,032.14, including interest, which have already been paid. The awards against Hungary totaled some $200,000, including interest.

The United States had also seized certain German vessels which were valued by the Navy Board of Appraisal in 1917 at some $34,000,000. In the suits filed in the United States Court of Claims after the war (dismissed for lack of jurisdiction) the former owners of these ships valued them in excess of $230,000,000. However, the late Judge James W. Remick, of Concord, N. H., the War Claims Arbiter named pursuant to the War Claims Act of 1928, applying the particular rule of fair compensation prescribed by the act, judicially determined in 1930, after very thorough argument and consideration, that the value of the vessels within his jurisdiction was $74,243,000 including interest to January 1, 1929.

Judge Remick concluded his work as War Claims Arbiter on December 15, 1931. The amounts claimed in some 1,200 cases filed with him by claimants probably aggregated some $500,000,000. They were based on 105 ships, about 6,200 patents, and the Sayville radio station. No American had ever before been given sole power of decision without appeal in cases involving such vast sums. The 288 awards entered by the Arbiter in favor of German nationals in the patent cases and the radio-station claim amount, with interest through 1928, to $12,485,387.83. With the ship cases, the awards to Germans aggregate $86,738,320.83, including simple interest at 5 percent per annum from July 2, 1921, through December 31, 1928, as provided by the statute.

The act fixed a maximum limitation of $100,000,000 on the awards. German nationals have already been paid substantial amounts of the awards, and payments on account of the remainder, with interest, will be spread over a long period of years. The Arbiter also made 136 awards in favor of Austrian nationals, aggregating with interest $912,687.94. Eleven Hungarian nationals also got awards, aggregating $53,800.

In the light of the work thus accomplished, the return by the United States of the property seized during the war from then alien enemies presented for a time a difficult problem. This property was seized in retaliation under the original Trading With the Enemy Act enacted October 6, 1917, and as since from time to time amended. The property was specifically set aside under the Knox-Porter peace resolution which declared that in terminating the state of war as of June 2, 1921, the date of its passage, the property was set aside as a sort of pledge or security to insure the payment of America's war claims once their amounts were finally determined.

* * * * * * *

Eighteen years have now elapsed since the signing and ratification of America's treaties of peace with Germany, with Austria, and with Hungary. The Alien Property Custodian of the United States still has in his possession some property belonging to former enemy aliens which is being released as rapidly as ownership can be established. Although much of this property was seized during the World War, some of it was sequestered after the signing of the armistice, even up to the time of the Knox-Porter peace resolution of June 2, 1921.

The property thus taken over by the Alien Property Custodian was, however not confiscated, as many persons believe. The Custodian sequestered the property of enemy aliens in accordance with the Trading With the Enemy Act which authorized outright confiscation only of such property as could be used in the prosecution of the war and even then provided for remuneration, as in the case of patents. So, strictly speaking, the United States never confiscated any property.

The practice of confiscating private enemy property, even though sanctioned by the law of nations for centuries, being contrary not only to the enlightened thought of the world but also repugnant to the long-established policy of the United States, statesmen and economists in and out of Congress for years endeavored to formulate a plan looking to the disposal of the property in the Custodian's hands—at one time valued in excess of $600,000,000—in a manner fair and equitable to the nonresident aliens (formerly enemies) from whom it had been taken, at the same time safeguarding the interests of American nationals whose claims (likewise totaling hundreds of millions of dollars) were in the meantime being adjudicated by the Mixed Claims Commission, United States and Germany.

It was urged by some that the United States make an unconditional return of all enemy property. Others argued that the United States should hold this sequestered property as collateral security, or as a pledge, to insure the ultimate payment by Germany of the yet undetermined American claims. Many insisted that the United States exercise its right to confiscate this property, the courts having held that there is an absolute right of confiscation. It was also suggested that this property be held as a set-off against the American claims that were yet to be adjudicated.

The delay in winding up the affairs of the office of the Alien Property Custodian (now a Bureau of the Department of Justice) has undoubtedly been due to the many proposals offered as to how this property should be returned. Without undertaking to definitely define its post-war policy in the matter, Congress governed itself to a large extent by the nonconfiscatory policy adhered to by the American Government in the past, in the meantime keeping an eye on the American claims against the former enemy nations as they were being adjudicated.

It was of paramount importance that the awards as determined by the Mixed Claims Commission be protected. With this understanding the arbitration proceeded in conformity with the never-failing desire of the United States amicably to adjust all such differences between this Nation and others by justiciary instead of arbitrary methods. This attitude explains why the Alien Property Custodian was never authorized to immediately return property held by him following the reestablishment of peacetime relations with the former enemy countries. The way was paved, however, through various enactments of Congress, amending the Trading With the Enemy Act of October 6, 1917, for the gradual return of the property to its erstwhile owners in a manner that was not confiscatory but at the same time vouchsafed ample time to both Germany and her wartime allies to provide ways and means of ultimately reimbursing the Government of the United States and American nationals on account of all just claims growing out of the World War. Hence, without officially admitting such to have been the case, the events leading up to the winding-up of the work of both the Mixed Claims Commission and the Alien Property Custodian enabled the United States and her wartime enemies agreeably to adopt a policy which in effect made it possible for the United States to always hold enough former enemy property in the hands of the Custodian as security or pledge to insure the ultimate payment of all just American claims against Germany and her wartime allies and nationals.

Time has shown that these necessary delays gave rise to a procedure that has harmonized with the policy of this country as expounded since the days of Washington and as expressly provided for in America's separate treaty of peace with Germany.

The property seized from former enemy aliens has thus from time to time been released in the following manner:

(1) To American citizens (i. e., Americans residing abroad in enemy alien countries and occupied zones at the time the United States entered the World War).

(2) To citizens of allied countries.

(3) To American women married to enemy aliens prior to America's declaration of war.

(4) To citizens of countries newly created by the Treaty of Versailles and the Treaty of St. Germain.

(5) To citizens of central European powers (80 percent to German nationals and 100 percent to the Austrians and Hungarians conditioned on the payment of American claims against those countries).

Turkish and Bulgarian property had also been seized, although war was never actually declared against Turkey and Bulgaria, because these countries were allies of Germany and the former Austro-Hungarian Empire. However, this property was returned to its former owners as quickly as it was possible to do so.

Under the terms of the Settlement of War Claims Act of 1928, which also amended the Trading With the Enemy Act, practically all the property in the hands of the Custodian has rapidly been returned to the former owners or their successors in interest. Out of the $545,228,160.84 worth of cash assets and other property seized by the Custodian from alien enemies, $235,370,096.92 was returned to the former enemy owners prior to January 1, 1924. At that time the Custodian had in his possession cash assets and other property amounting to $309,858,063.92. There were also the German ships seized under the congressional joint resolution of May 12, 1917, and the radio station and patents taken over from German nationals and also those belonging to former Austrian and Hungarian nationals.

During 1928, the first year of the operation of the War Settlements Act passed that year, the Custodian and the Department of Justice paid out cash and securities aggregating in value $31,500,600.67.

Following the passage of the Settlement of War Claims Act of 1928, there were filed with the Alien Property Custodian 3,224 "war claims" pursuant thereto, of which 2,259 have been paid and 687 disallowed, with the exception of 329 claims involving trusts of less than $2,000, which have been paid in full.

Practically all of the Austrian claims were paid before Austria was incorporated into Germany last year.

By means of the tremendous post-war undertakings above described, the Government of the United States and American nationals have the satisfaction of knowing that both private and governmental claims against Germany and her war Allies have, with the exception of the sabotage claims, been settled and adjusted amicably without deviating from the traditional American policies respecting the property of aliens. While our wartime European Allies have ever since the ratification of the Treaty of Versailles insisted upon the recognition of statements of accounts compiled by themselves ex parte in the handling of the reparations and other treaty obligations, the United States has consistently adhered to its practice of arbitrating the claims of her nationals as well as those of the Government through the machinery of a commission on which both Governments are represented, applying principles of international law whenever the express terms of the treaty gave rise to doubt.

It is not unlikely that the United States and Soviet Russia will agree to the appointment of a commission for the purpose of arbitrating the claims of the Government of the United States and numerous American nationals based on losses and damages incurred during the Russian Revolution under Russia's various regimes during and after the World War.

The claims arbitration with Germany as well as the gradual return of the former enemy property sequestered during the war have thus materially enhanced the prestige and authority of international law. Indeed, they furnish, perhaps, the most concrete example to date for the friendly settlement of international controversies to which the seventeenth century Grotius, the father of international law, devoted his life in order to convince a doubting world, beset with many international disputes which had theretofore been causes of war, that arbitration is war's only practical substitute.

Even though war clouds hover about the world as never before, the United States is still in complete agreement with Dante, who, more than 600 years ago, declared: "Peace, universal peace, is the first blessing of mankind."

The Arms Embargo Is in Line With the Customs and Laws of the Other Nations

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FREDERICK C. SMITH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1939

EXCERPTS FROM ARMS-EMBARGO LAWS AND DECREES OF OTHER NATIONS

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include excerpts from arms-embargo laws and decrees by other nations.

There is widespread opinion in our country that our present arms embargo is a departure from the customs and laws of other nations. This is a false notion, as will be revealed by a reading of the following excerpts from acts, decrees, and so forth, with regard to this question. Indeed, it will be seen, the other nations have long since had arms-embargo laws and have increasingly pursued the policy of prohibiting the sale of war materials to belligerents.

An instance of proof of this is reported in the Washington (D. C.) Star of September 28, 1939, which reads:

> Under pressure from all sides and anxious not to tread on the toes of their powerful neighbors, the Scandinavian and Baltic countries have already stopped shipping to belligerents anything that might possibly be regarded as war material.

The following are excerpts of some of the more important neutrality laws, decrees, and so forth, of various countries relating to the prohibiting of sale of war materials by neutral nations to belligerents, edited and annotated by Francis Deak and Philip C. Jessup, published in the form of an advance copy by the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace:

AUSTRIA

(No. 5, p. 37): Imperial decree concerning the observance of neutrality, August 7, 1803:

"* * * we are determined to observe the strictest neutrality in the war between France and England * * *."

(No. 5a): "* * * we forbid all our subjects who are navigators and merchants to transport, for the powers now at war, any of the goods or munitions of war: Cannons, mortars, arquebuses, pistols, bombs, grenades, bullets, guns, gun flints, fuzes, powder, saltpeter, sulfur, pikes, swords, sword belts, cartridge boxes, saddles, and bridles."

(No. 6, p. 42): Circular of the imperial royal central maritime authority to all offices and agencies, April 12, 1854:

"* * * captains of Austrian merchantmen are to be instructed to abstain from the carriage of any kind of contraband for territories of the belligerent powers."

(No. 7a, p. 45): Order of the Ministry of Commerce and Finance regarding the prohibition of export and transit of arms and ammunition, May 31, 1854:

"* * * export of arms and ammunitions over the Austrian frontier to the Russian and Ottoman states is prohibited."

(No. 8a, p. 46): Order of the Ministry of Finance, July 21, 1870:

"* * * the export and transit of arms, parts of arms, ammunition, and articles of ammunition of every kind is prohibited over all frontiers of the Austro-Hungarian customs territory."

(No. 8b, p. 46): Order of the ministries during the war which has broken out between the North German Confederation and the states of southern Germany, on the one hand, and France, on the other, July 29, 1870:

"1. It is forbidden to supply those powers with articles which, according to the general law of nations or to particular regulations made public by the foreign governments concerned, are deemed to be contraband of war."

(No. 8c, p. 48): Supra, No. 8a.

BELGIUM

(No. 14, p. 60): Act regarding restrictions on export and transit of arms and implements of war, September 7, 1870:

"ARTICLE 1. The Government is authorized, up to the end of the year 1870, to prohibit the exportation and transit of the following goods:

"1. Weapons of war of all kinds;

"2. Munitions of war of all kinds;

"3. Military clothing, camp supplies, equipment, and harness;

"5. Sailing and steam ships, machines and parts of machines for use in navigation, ships' tackle and equipment, and all other military and naval articles.

"ART. 4. Approval is hereby given to—

"2. The royal decree of August 5 last, which provisionally prohibits the exportation and transit of arms and munitions of war of all kinds."

BRAZIL

(No. 6, p. 85): Decree No. 11037, general rules of neutrality, August 4, 1914:

"ART 4. The exportation of arms and ammunitions of war from Brazil to any port of the belligerent nations, under the Brazilian flag or that of any other nation, is absolutely forbidden."

(No. 8, p. 94): Decree ordering the observance of complete neutrality in the war between Bolivia and Paraguay, May 23, 1933:

"ART. 3. The agents of the Federal Government or of the Brazilian States are forbidden, directly or indirectly, to export war material or aid its shipment to either of the belligerents."

(No. 10, p. 99): Circular concerning neutrality in the war between the Argentine Confederation and Buenos Aires, July 30, 1859:

"* * * exportation of articles of war from the ports of the Empire to those of Buenos Aires is absolutely prohibited, under the Brazilian flag or that of any other nation. Brazilian vessels must be prohibited from the same traffic in contraband of war * * *."

(No. 12a, p. 106): Circular concerning neutrality in the Spanish-Chilean War, March 10, 1866:

"The exportation of war materials to ports belonging to the belligerents is prohibited."

(No. 15, p. 111): Circular relative to the observance of neutrality during the war between the United States and Spain, April 29, 1898:

"4. The export of warlike articles from the ports of Brazil to those of either of the two belligerent powers, whether under the Brazilian flag or that of any other nation, is absolutely forbidden."

GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND

(No. 2, p. 145): The Customs and Consolidations Act, 1854, provided:

"The following goods may, by proclamation or order in council, be prohibited either to be exported or carried coastwise: Arms, ammunition and gunpowder, military and naval stores, and any articles which Her Majesty shall judge capable of being converted into or made useful in increasing the quantity of military or naval stores, provisions, or any sort of victual which may be used as food by man."

(No. 2, p. 145): Proclamation of November 29, 1861:

"* * * and by this our royal proclamation do order and direct that, from and after the date hereof, all gunpowder, saltpetre, nitrate of soda, and brimstone shall be, and the same are, hereby prohibited either to be exported from the United Kingdom or carried coastwise."

(No. 3, p. 146): December 4, 1861, under the Customs Consolidation Act, 1853:

"* * * And by this our royal proclamation do order and direct that, from and after the date hereof, all arms, ammunition, and military stores (including percussion caps and tubes), and also lead, shall be, and the same are hereby, prohibited either to be exported from the United Kingdom or carried coastwise."

(No. 6, p. 153): The arms export prohibition order, 1931, May 19, 1931:

"Whereas by section 8 of the Customs and Inland Revenue Act, 1879, it is provided that the following goods may, by proclamation or order in council, be prohibited either to be exported or carried coastwise: Arms, ammunition and gunpowder, military and naval stores, and any articles which His Majesty shall judge capable of being converted into or made useful in increasing the quantity of military or naval stores, provisions, or any sort of victual which may be used as food for man;

"And whereas by section 17 of the Finance Act, 1921, it is enacted that section 8 of the Customs and Inland Revenue Act, 1879, shall extend to weapons and munitions of war of every description, and firearms not being weapons of war, and ammunition for such firearms, as it applies to the goods therein mentioned, * * *.

"(1) As from the 1st of June 1931, the following articles shall be, and the same are hereby, prohibited to be exported from the United Kingdom, or to be shipped as ship's stores on vessels proceeding to foreign ports, that is to say:"

Then follows a long list of every conceivable weapon of war, including: "Tanks and armored cars and component parts thereof; * * * aircraft, assembled or dismantled, and aircraft engines. Ship's stores by license only exempted."

(No. 6a, p. 155): June 8, 1937, mustard gas and some 20 other chemicals were added to the prohibitory list.

(No. 12, p. 166): Order in Council prohibiting the exportation of gunpowder, arms, ammunition, etc., to Africa, to the West Indies, or to certain parts of America, February 12, 1816.

Order in Council February 12, 1816, prohibiting:

"* * * prohibit, and command, that no person or persons do, at any time during the space of 6 months, transport any gunpowder or saltpeter, or any sort of arms or ammunition, to any port or place on the coast of Africa, or in the West Indies, or on any part of the continent of America, or ship or lade any gunpowder or saltpeter, or any sort of arms or ammunition, on board any ship or vessel, in order to transport the same into any such ports or places on the coast of Africa, or in the West Indies, or on the continent of America without leave or permission in that behalf first obtained from His Majesty, or his Privy Council.

(No. 12b, p. 169): Order in Council extending the prohibition against exportation from Great Britain to certain foreign places, of gunpowder, arms, and ammunition, to the dominions of the King of Spain, July 12, 1819.

(No. 13, p. 170): Order in Council prohibiting the exportation of cannon and other arms, September 30, 1825:

"Whereas an act of Parliament was passed in the twenty-ninth year of the reign of His Late Majesty King George II, 'An act to empower His Majesty to prohibit the exportation of saltpeter,' etc. * * *

"* * * that no person or persons during the space of 6 months from date of this order, transport in any parts out of this Kingdom, any cannon, mortars, howitzers, carronades, etc., or ship or lade any cannon, mortars, etc., on board any ship or vessel, without leave or permission * * *."

(No. 19, p. 187): Act prohibiting the carriage of munitions to Spain by British merchant ships, December 3, 1936.

CANADA

(No. 51, p. 241): An act to amend the Customs Act, April 10, 1937:

"290. (1) The Governor in council may, from time to time, * * *.

"(b) * * * prohibit, restrict, or control the exportation of arms, ammunition, implements or munitions of war, military, naval, or air stores, or any articles deemed capable of being converted thereinto or made useful in the production thereof, or provisions of any sort of victual which may be used as food by man or beast.

"(c) * * * prohibit, restrict, or control the importation of arms, ammunition, etc."

(No. 55a, p. 259): Order in council (P. C. 1839), applying section 290 of the Customs Act in the Spanish civil war, July 30, 1937:

"* * * to prohibit the export from Canada, directly or indirectly, to any party in the conflict, of arms, war materials, aircraft, aircraft engines, separate parts thereof, and munitions."

BRITISH HONDURAS

(No. 76, p. 300): Proclamation prohibiting the exportation of arms from British Honduras, August 12, 1873:

"* * * whereas a state of hostilities exists in the Republics of Honduras and Guatemala, and we are desirous of observing a strict neutrality therein:

"We do, therefore, hereby prohibit to be exported or carried coastwise, arms, ammunition, gunpowder, and military and naval stores without a license."

GIBRALTAR

(No. 82, p. 317): Ordinance to enable the Governor of Gibraltar to prohibit the exportation of arms and other materials of war, April 30, 1878."

HONG KONG

(No. 89, p. 328): Proclamation prohibiting the exportation of arms and ammunition from Hong Kong, October 1, 1891:

"* * * prohibit either to be exported from the colony of Hong Kong, or to be carried coastwise within the said colony, arms, ammunition, gunpowder, and naval and military stores."

CHILE

(No. 13, p. 365): Circular from the Minister of Foreign Relations to the Provincial Governors, September 26, 1870:

"* * * Sale of articles reputed contraband of war is absolutely prohibited."

(No. 15b, p. 372): Note from the Minister, August 14, 1914:

"No belligerent vessel can load, in Chilean waters, anything except provisions and the objects necessary for the subsistence of its crew."

CHINA

(No. 4b, p. 387): Neutrality regulations February 15, 1904:

"6. It is not allowed to buy up contraband of war for the belligerents nor to manufacture contraband of war within the boundaries (of the neutral territory) to be forwarded for sale to the armies or navies of the belligerents."

(No. 5, p. 393): Presidential mandate on the observance of neutrality during the European war, August 6, 1914:

"* * * No person is allowed to arm and equip for a belligerent or furnish ships or stores and military supplies. * * * Nor are they allowed to supply any of the belligerents with funds."

DENMARK

(No. 1, p. 468): Royal order regulating the conduct and defining the obligations of merchants and mariners in time of war between other maritime powers, May 4, 1803:

"Since according to the generally established principles the subjects of a neutral power cannot be permitted to transport in their vessels goods that would be considered contraband of war, if they were destined for the ports of a belligerent power or if they belonged to its subjects, we have deemed it advisable to define expressly what shall be included under the head of contraband: Cannons, mortars, arms of all kinds. * * *"

(No. 12, p. 491): Proclamation of neutrality rules to be observed in the Russo-Turkish War, May 18, 1877:

"Besides the articles coming under the category of contraband of war, enumerated in the ordinance of the 4th of May 1803, are to be included all such manufactured articles as could be directly used in warfare."

(No. 13, p. 493): Proclamation of the rules which will be applicable to Danish trade and shipping during the Sino-Japanese War, August 24, 1894:

"Prohibited articles named as contraband in article 13 of the ordinance of May 4, 1803—that is, cannons, mortars, fuzes, powder, all types of arms * * *."

(No. 15, p. 496): Proclamation of neutrality in the Russo-Japanese War, April 27, 1904:

"It is forbidden to clear from Danish harbors cargoes of coal directly destined for the fleets of the belligerents.

"* * * * to aid either of the belligerents in their warlike enterprises; as, for instance, by supplying their ships with articles that are considered contraband, * * *."

(No. 17, p. 500): Notice of the Government relative to the renewed application of the ordinance of May 4, 1803, April 20, 1854:

"SEC. 2. In addition to the articles specified in the ordinance of May 4, 1803, all manufactured articles which may be directly converted into articles of warfare, are now deemed contraband of war."

(No. 19, p. 502): Provisional law prohibiting the exportation of horses from Denmark during the Franco-Prussian War, July 27, 1870.

(No. 20, p. 503): Provisional Law No. 72, forbidding Danish subjects to assist belligerent powers, April 29, 1898:

"To assist either on or from Danish territory any of the belligerent powers in their warlike operations, as well as to supply their ships with objects which can be classed as contraband of war, * * *.

"To transport contraband of war for any of the belligerent powers, * * *."

(No. 21, p. 503): Law No. 22, prohibiting the export of weapons and ammunition to China, March 6, 1901:

"* * * the export of arms and parts of the same, of ammunition and of all other war materials from this Kingdom or the Danish colonies is forbidden so long as these are destined for China."

(No. 22, p. 505): Decree of the Minister of Foreign Affairs relative to Danish trade and shipping during the Russo-Japanese War, February 10, 1904:

"No owner or master is allowed to employ his ship for the transporting of contraband of war to any of the belligerent powers or to let or charter ships which are known or supposed to be destined for such purpose.

"As contraband of war—which (it) is forbidden to convey to belligerent powers or to their subjects—are considered: Arms, ammunition, etc."

(No. 27, p. 510): Provisional Law No. 11, prohibiting the exportation from Iceland of goods imported from Great Britain during the World War, June 19, 1915:

"SEC. 1. It shall be forbidden to export from Iceland goods of any kind whatever which are imported thereinto from Great Britain."

(No. 33a, p. 519): Law No. 104, concerning the establishment of a system of observation of ships on account of the civil war in Spain, April 16, 1937:

"* * * that no Danish ship must carry arms or other war material to, or land such material in, Spain, and * * *."

FINLAND

(No. 3, p. 578): Law regarding the prohibition of the export of war supplies to Bolivia and Paraguay, November 24, 1934:

"Export of all kinds of war supplies to Bolivia and Paraguay shall be prohibited."

FRANCE

(No. 3, p. 583): Statute on the manufacture of and the commerce in arms, July 14, 1860:

"ART. 9. The exportation of munitions or parts of munitions of war is allowed, subject to conditions determined by law or by rules of public administration.

"Nevertheless, an imperial decree may prohibit this exportation across a frontier for a particular destination and for a particular period."

(No. 3a, p. 584): Statute modifying the conditions under which the minister of war may prohibit the exportation of arms and ammunition, April 13, 1895:

"ART. 2. Decrees issued * * * may prohibit the exportation of munitions, parts of munitions, and ammunition of all kinds."

(No. 11, p. 594): Decree prohibiting the export of arms, ammunition, and implements of war to Spain in the Carlist Rebellion, March 18, 1873:

"ARTICLE 1. The exportation, reexportation from warehouses, and the transit of the goods (as specified in the schedule annexed to the present decree) across the frontier and destined for Spain are prohibited."

Schedule of objects the exportation, reexportation, and transit of which across the frontier to Spain are prohibited, March 18, 1873:

"First. Munitions of war of all sorts."

(No. 12, p. 595): Decree prohibiting the exportations of arms to Cuba, January 9, 1896:

"The President of the French Republic, considering the law of August 14, 1885, considering the law of April 13, 1895, considering the article IV, title III, of the law of August 6-22, 1791:

"ARTICLE 1. The exportation from France, Algeria, the French colonies and protectorates of all munitions of war, parts of manufactured ammunition destined directly for Cuba is hereby prohibited * * *."

GERMANY

(No. 6, p. 636): Proclamation of the Senate prohibiting the exportation of contraband of war and concerning blockade, April 10, 1854:

"Ammunition, guns, gunpowder, saltpeter, sulfur, balls, caps, all kinds of arms, and, generally speaking, all objects which may be used in warfare, is hereby prohibited to belligerent powers * * *."

(No. 6b, p. 637): Proclamation of the Senate regarding the procedure in shipment of contraband to neutral ports, May 22, 1854:

"* * * The Senate, with respect to the export of articles contraband of war to neutral ports, the prohibition of such articles to the countries of the belligerent powers remaining in force * * *."

Supra, No. 6.

(No. 8, p. 639): Act concerning the maintenance of neutrality in the present war, May 5, 1854:

"The transport to and from the belligerent states of their troops, arms, or munitions, as well as other articles serving for hostile purposes, and regarded by the general law of nations as contraband of war, is prohibited in Hanoverian ships.

"The exportation of the materials mentioned to any one of the belligerent states is forbidden, no matter under what flag it may be intended to take place."

(No. 10, p. 643): Proclamation warning against trade and traffic with Norway, May 25, 1814:

"* * * Honorable council is confident that none of the citizens of Lubeck will, out of greediness, share in war trade * * *."

(No. 13, p. 644): Ordinance of the Senate concerning the export of contraband of war, April 11, 1854:

"The exportation of articles contraband of war for the belligerent powers or their subjects is prohibited."

(No. 14, p. 645): Ordinance of the Grand Duke prohibiting the export of contraband of war, April 15, 1854:

"The export of contraband of war from our states to the states of the belligerent powers is prohibited.

"The following are deemed to be contraband * * *."

(No. 16, p. 649): Royal declaration and ordinance concerning navigation and maritime commerce, April 30, 1781:

"ARTICLE 1. That they shall not take part in the present war under any pretext nor, under the Prussian flag, supply the belligerent powers with any merchandise which is generally regarded as contraband and forbidden, * * *."

(No. 17d, p. 657): Notice issued by the Ministers of Interior and of Finance concerning the prohibition of export of horses, December 18, 1854:

"* * * the export of horses is hereby prohibited * * *."

(No. 24, p. 663): Ordinance prohibiting the export and transit of arms, ammunition, gun powder, explosives, and implements of war, to the territories of the Polish Republic and the Russian Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, July 25, 1920.

(No. 24a, p. 664): Ordinance supplementing the ordinance of July 25, 1920, prohibiting the export and transit of arms, ammunition, gun powder, explosives, and implements of war, to the territories of the Polish Republic and the Russian Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, July 30, 1920.

HAITI

(No. 5, p. 638): Proclamation of neutrality in the World War, August 7, 1914:

"It is especially forbidden to make * * * or to furnish * * * any means of war to any of the belligerents, under penalty of the laws."

(No. 3, p. 682): Declaration of neutrality in the Crimean War, November 18, 1854:

"His Majesty the Emperor, desiring to preserve neutrality in the war which is being waged in Europe between the Allied Powers and Russia, is pleased to decree as follows: * * *

"Subjects of the Empire are forbidden * * * to transport, on ships under the Haitian flag, contraband goods in behalf of any of the belligerent powers."

ITALY

(No. 1, p. 711): Notification prohibiting the carriage of contraband of war, April 7, 1819:

"We forbid, captains, owners of our merchant marine, and merchants to employ ships flying our royal flag, for the transportation of contraband of war, to any port or coast of a nation at war, toward which we maintain strict neutrality, and. * * *

(No. 15a, p. 725): Law of neutrality, July 8, 1938:

"ART. 9. Private commerce. By royal decree, there may be prohibited in whole or in part:

"1. Commerce in arms and in war material by private parties in favor of the belligerent states.

"2. The transportation of the above-mentioned articles across the territory of the state."

JAPAN

(No. 1, p. 737): Neutrality proclamations—revised proclamation of neutrality in the Franco-Prussian war, August 29, 1870:

"ART. V. Japanese vessels are prohibited from carrying troops, arms, or munitions of war for the service of either of the hostile parties."

LIBERIA

(No. 3, p. 749): Proclamation of neutrality in the Spanish-American War, June 20, 1898:

"(2) The supplying or aiding to furnish any guns, ammunitions, or other munitions of war," forbidden. * * *

(No. 5, p. 753): Proclamation prohibiting trade with belligerent powers, June 20, 1916:

"It is prohibited to import or export any article or articles of commerce for and in behalf of any citizen or subject of either of the belligerent states * * *."

(No. 1, p. 783): Act concerning the power to prohibit the exportation of horses and other articles, July 24, 1870.

NOTE.—By two decrees issued in pursuance of the above act on July 24, 1870, exportation of horses and of munitions and gunpowder were prohibited for the duration of the Franco-Prussian War.

Similar decrees prohibiting export of ammunitions to belligerent countries were issued on May 31, 1898, during the Spanish-American War, and on August 30, 1900, during the rebellion in China.

(No. 1a, p. 784): Act regarding the power to prohibit the exportation and transportation of certain articles, August 3, 1914:

"ART. 1. In case of war or threat of war, we shall have power to prohibit altogether or to restrict the exportation of necessary commodities throughout the territories of the Kingdom or in any part thereof."

NOTE.—The above act was modified and amplified by the acts of December 31, 1915, of September 1, 1917, and of June 3, 1918.

In pursuance of the above act, a great number of decrees were issued during the World War prohibiting the exportation and transit of arms, ammunition, and implements of war, raw material, semimanufactured and manufactured goods.

(No. 8, p. 796): Proclamation of neutrality in the war between various South American states, March 17, 1866:

"ART. 6. It is prohibited to deliver arms or ammunition to war vessels of the belligerent parties, as also to assist them in any way in adding to their crew, arms, or equipment * * *."

(No. 9, p. 796): Proclamation of neutrality in the Russo-Turkish War, May 15, 1877:

"* * * And they are not permitted * * * to provide for or convey to them * * * contraband of war * * * or to trade in spoil."

(No. 19, p. 812): Notice by the Ministry for Foreign Affairs warning against carriage of contraband in Dutch ships in the Crimean War, April 14, 1854:

"* * *, in contravention to the obligations imposed on neutral powers by international law, to export ammunition by sea * * *."

(No. 21a, p. 817): Notice of the Government concerning the observance of neutrality in the Spanish-American War, May 3, 1898:

"Furthermore are prohibited:

"(b) The exportation of arms, ammunition, or other war material to the belligerents."

NICARAGUA

(No. 4, p. 826): Laws regarding customs and ports, maritime commerce and vessels of the Republic of Nicaragua, 1928:

"ART. 604. The transit of war materials is prohibited."

NORWAY

(No. 3, p. 832): Declaration of principles of neutrality in case of war between European states, December 15, 1853.

Text: Supra, Denmark, No. 3.

NOTE.—The principles agreed upon between Sweden and Norway on the one hand and Denmark on the other hand.

(No. 4, p. 833): Royal ordinance, May 4, 1803, March 15, 1854:

"ART. 13. As according to the principles generally agreed upon, the subjects of neutral governments are not permitted to have goods on board which are considered as contraband of war destined for, or belonging to, the belligerent powers. * * *

"ART. 16. * * * Nor shall it be lawful for the owner or master of any vessel to let the same be used for the transport of military or naval forces, arms, or ammunition of any description whatsoever."

(No. 5, p. 836): General Penal Code, May 22, 1902:

"ART. 85. Any person who, by acting toward a foreign state in a way contrary to the law of nations, or by abetting such conduct, exposes Norway to war or hostile measures, shall be liable to detention for a period not exceeding 2 years, but if war breaks out, 4 years.

"Under extremely aggravating circumstances imprisonment may be inflicted for similar periods."

(No. 6, p. 836): Ordinance of the Crown Prince Regent respecting the admission of foreign warships to Norwegian ports, April 23, 1904.

Supra, No. 4a.

(No. 7, p. 837): Royal proclamation relative to the regulation of Norwegian trade and shipping in time of war, April 30, 1904:

"All kinds of goods, including those belonging to the subjects of belligerents, may be carried in Norwegian vessels, as neutral, with the exception of so-called contraband of war."

Supra, No. 4a.

Supra, No. 4b.

(No. 14, p. 844): Ordinance prescribing certain regulations regarding shipping during the war between Spain and Peru, March 7, 1864.

Supra, No. 4.

Supra, No. 4a.

Supra, No. 4b.

NOTE.—The above ordinance was put into effect: July 25, 1870, in the Franco-Prussian War; May 5, 1877; February 10, 1904, in the Russo-Japanese War.

(No. 26a, p. 854): Royal resolution concerning the prohibition of aid in the Spanish civil war, April 16, 1937:

"The foreign ministry is empowered to prohibit Norwegian ships from transporting men, arms, ammunition, airplanes, or parts thereof, to Spain * * *."

(No. 29, p. 856): Circular regarding shipping in time of war, February 10, 1904:

"* * * Royal ordinance of March 7, 1864, prescribing * * *."

(Supra, No. 14.)

PERU

(No. 5, p. 872): Proclamation of neutrality in the Franco-Prussian War October 24, 1870:

"The sale of every article reputed as contraband of war is prohibited."

PORTUGAL

(No. 7, p. 905): Royal decree regarding Portuguese neutrality in the war between Austria, etc., and Prussia and Italy, July 2, 1866:

"It is lawful to carry under the Portuguese flag any articles of merchandise of legitimate trade belonging to the subjects of either of the belligerent powers. * * *

"1. * * * except contraband * * *."

SPAIN

(No. 7, p. 933): Royal decree concerning neutrality in the American Civil War, June 17, 1861:

"The transportation of effects of war is forbidden, * * *."

(No. 8, p. 935): Decree concerning neutrality in the Franco-Prussian War, July 26, 1870:

"The transport of warlike effects, * * * for the belligerents is prohibited."

SWEDEN

(No. 1, p. 950): Decree establishing marine regulation, December 23, 1800:

"Swedish ships destined for the ports of a belligerent power must, with the utmost care and under the severest penalties, avoid carrying any contraband. * * *

"A Swedish ship cannot be employed by a belligerent power to transport troops, arms, or any warlike implements."

(No. 2, p. 953): Regulations regarding commerce and navigation with foreign maritime powers in time of war, January 21, 1804:

"It is furthermore forbidden any Swedish captain to allow himself or the vessel he commands to be employed to transport, for either of the belligerent parties, troops or munitions of war as above specified, * * *."

(No. 3, p. 955): Notification of principle of neutrality to be followed by Sweden in case of war, January 28, 1854.

Text: Supra, Denmark, No. 3.

See also supra, Norway, No. 3, editors' note.

(No. 4, p. 955): Decree setting forth regulations to be observed for the security of Swedish commerce and navigation during war between foreign maritime powers, April 8, 1854:

"SEC. 5. All kinds of goods * * * may be carried in Swedish ships as neutral, except contraband of war; * * *.

"SEC. 6. Swedish sea captains are forbidden * * * to carry articles contraband of war for any belligerent power.

"SEC. 7. Vessels belonging to belligerents may bring into or take away from Swedish harbors any and every kind of goods, * * * always excepting contraband of war."

(No. 4a, p. 958): Ordinance determining "lead" to be regarded as contraband of war, September 13, 1855.

(No. 4b, p. 958): Ordinance interpreting paragraph 5 of the ordinance of April 8, 1854, concerning contraband of war, July 29, 1870:

"* * * We have therefore judged it proper and useful to declare that the restriction imposed by the said section upon the right of transporting contraband goods in Swedish bottoms does not apply to cases where goods of this category which do not belong or are not destined to belligerent powers or their subjects are transported in Swedish bottoms between the ports of neutral powers."

(No. 7, p. 961): Royal ordinance relative to Swedish commerce and navigation in time of war between foreign powers, April 30, 1904:

"All kinds of goods, * * * may be carried in neutral Swedish ships, except contraband of war." (Supra, No. 4, 7.)

"The direct transport of coal cargoes from Swedish ports to the ports of belligerent powers is forbidden."

(No. 12, p. 967): Royal decree prohibiting the export of arms and ammunition, December 19, 1930 (as amended by the royal decrees of March 3, 1933, and October 18, 1935):

"ART. 1. It is prohibited to export to foreign countries * * *."

(Here follows a list of some 40 chemical compounds that have uses in war, and some 60 different kinds of war weapons and supplies.)

(No. 14, p. 971): Proclamation regarding the application of the ordinance of April 8, 1854, in the Sardinian War, May 13, 1859. (Supra, No. 4.)

(No. 15, p. 972): Proclamation of neutrality in the Austro-Prussian War, July 4, 1866:

"* * * we wish hereby to caution all persons concerned to strictly observe our proclamation of April 8, 1854 * * *." (Supra 4 and supra 4a.)

(No. 16, p. 972): Proclamation of neutrality in the Sino-Japanese War, August 10, 1894:

"* * * desire * * * to direct attention * * * to the strict observance of the royal ordinances * * *." (Supra, No. 4a; supra, No. 4; supra, No. 4b.)

(No. 17, p. 973): Proclamation of neutrality in the war between Austria-Hungary and Serbia, July 31, 1914:

"* * * all concerned that they are enjoined to strict obedience to the proclamation of April 30, 1904, * * *." (Supra, No. 7.)

SWITZERLAND

(No. 11a, p. 1002): Ordinance of the Federal Council concerning the maintenance of Swiss neutrality, May 20, 1859:

"The Swiss Federal Council, desiring to assure in every event the maintenance of good order upon the boundaries of the theater of war, and to prevent all acts incompatible with the neutral position of Switzerland;

"And in consideration of article 90, section 9, of the Federal Constitution and of the decree of the Federal Assembly of May 5, 1859;

"ART. 1. The exportation of munitions, of powder, and of ammunition of war in general across the Swiss-Italian frontier is forbidden, as is likewise all concentration of goods of that nature in proximity to the said frontier."

(No. 12, p. 1003): Ordinance of the Federal Council concerning the maintenance of Swiss neutrality, June 16, 1866:

"ART. 2. The exportation of munitions and materials of war in general to the neighboring belligerent states is forbidden, * * *."

(No. 30a, p. 1041): Communication from the Federal Council to the Federal commissioners in the canton of Tessin, January 6, 1849.

(P. 1042): "The decree of the Federal Assembly will therefore fail in its purpose if arms, ammunition, * * * are introduced from the canton of Tessin; * * * if anything occurs which is contrary to neutrality or which exposes Switzerland to international embarrassment * * *."

(No. 38, p. 1057): Circular of the Federal department of justice and police to the chief police authorities of the cantons, September 20, 1870:

"* * * concerning the maintenance of Swiss neutrality, by the terms of which the exportation of arms and war materials in general to neighboring belligerent states is forbidden * * *."

(No. 39, p. 1058): Order of the administration of the Swiss postal service concerning neutrality, August 8, 1914:

"The exportation of arms, ammunition, and all other materials of war to the adjacent belligerent states is prohibited * * *."

(No. 15a, p. 1008): Ordinance of the Federal Council concerning the maintenance of neutrality, August 4, 1914:

"There is forbidden and ought to be stopped:

"(a) The exportation of arms and munitions and of all military material into the adjacent belligerent states * * *."

RUSSIA—UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

(No. 5, p. 1072): Declaration of neutrality in the Spanish-American War, April 18–30, 1898:

"The neutral flag covers the enemy's goods, except contraband of war."

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

(No. 7, p. 1088): Joint resolution to prohibit the export of coal or other material used in war from any seaport of the United States, April 22, 1898:

"* * * the President is hereby authorized, in his discretion, to prohibit the export of coal or other material used in war from any seaport of the United States until otherwise ordered by the President or by Congress."

NOTE.—Amended March 14, 1912, infra, No. 9, and repealed by joint resolution of January 31, 1922, infra, No. 13.

See infra, No. 63.

(No. 9, p. 1089): Amending joint resolution of April 22, 1898, March 14, 1912:

"* * * whenever the President shall find that in any American country conditions of domestic violence exist which are promoted by the use of arms or munitions of war procured from the United States, and shall make proclamation thereof, it shall be unlawful to export, except under such limitations and exceptions as the President shall prescribe, any arms or munitions of war from any place in the United States to such country until * * *."

(No. 13, p. 1095): Joint resolution to prohibit the exportation of arms or munitions of war from the United States to certain countries, and for other purposes, January 31, 1922:

"* * * whenever the President finds that in any American country, or in any country in which the United States exercises extraterritorial jurisdiction, conditions of domestic violence exist which are or may be promoted by the use of arms or munitions of war procured from the United States, and makes proclamation thereof, it shall be unlawful to export, except under such limitations and exceptions as the President prescribes, any arms or munitions of war from any place in the United States to such country until * * *."

(No. 15, p. 1100): Joint resolution providing for the prohibition of the export of arms, ammunition, and implements of war to belligerent countries; the prohibition of the transportation of arms, ammunition, and implements of war by vessels of the United States for the use of belligerent states; for the registration and licensing of persons engaged in the business of manufacturing, exporting, or importing arms, ammunition, or implements of war; and restricting travel by American citizens on belligerent ships during war, August 31, 1935.

(No. 15a, p. 1104): Joint resolution extending and amending the joint resolution approved August 31, 1935, February 29, 1936.

(No. 15b, p. 1106): Joint resolution to amend the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution providing for the prohibition of the export of arms, ammunition, and implements of war to belligerent countries:

"* * * Approved August 31, 1935, as amended, May 1, 1937."

(No. 17, p. 1117): An act prohibiting for a limited time the exportation of arms and ammunition, and encouraging the importation of the same, May 22, 1794:

"* * * cannon, muskets, pistols, bayonets, swords, cutlasses, musket balls, lead, bombs, grenades, gunpowder, sulfur, or saltpeter, but the exportation of all the aforesaid articles are hereby prohibited for and during the term of 1 year."

(No. 17, p. 1118): An act prohibiting for a limited time the exportation of arms and ammunition, and encouraging the importation of the same, May 22, 1794:

"* * * cannon, muskets, pistols, bayonets, swords, cutlasses, musket balls, lead, bombs, grenades, gunpowder, sulfur, or saltpeter, but the exportation of all the aforesaid articles are hereby prohibited for and during the term of 1 year."

EDITORS' NOTE.—Substantially the same provisions are contained in sections 1–5 of the act of June 14, 1797, "prohibiting, for a limited time, the exportation of arms and ammunition and for encouraging the importation thereof."

By the act of April 7, 1798 (ibid., p. 549), sections 1–4 of the act of June 14, 1797, were continued in force "for 1 year from and after the present session of Congress and from thence to the end of the next session of Congress * * *."

(No. 24, p. 1140): An act supplementary to an act, * * * March 10, 1838:

"* * * required to seize and detain any vessel or any arms or munitions of war which may be provided or prepared for any military expedition or enterprise against the territory or dominions of any foreign prince or state, or any colony, district, or people coterminous with the United States, and with whom they are at peace, * * *."

(No. 25, p. 1143): Joint resolution to prohibit sale of arms or munitions * * * May 28, 1934:

"* * * if President finds prohibition sale of arms and munitions in the United States to those countries now engaged in armed conflict in the Chaco may contribute to the reestablishment of peace between those countries, * * * makes proclamation * * * it shall be unlawful to sell, except under such limitations and exceptions as the President prescribes, any arms or munitions of war in any place in the United States to the countries now engaged in that armed conflict, or to any person, company, or association acting in the interest of either country * * *."

(No. 26, p. 1143): Joint resolution to prohibit the exportation of arms, ammunition, * * * to Spain, January 8, 1937:

"* * * during * * * civil strife now in Spain it shall, * * * be unlawful to export arms, ammunition, or implements of war from any place in the United States, or possession, to Spain or to any other foreign country for transshipment to Spain or for use of either of the opposing forces in Spain."

(No. 28, p. 1149): Act to suspend commercial intercourse between United States and France, * * * June 13, 1798.

(No. 32, p. 1161): Act to interdict commercial intercourse between United States and Great Britain and France, * * * March 1, 1809.

(No. 32a, p. 1168): Act to amend and continue in force certain parts of the act entitled "An act to interdict the commercial intercourse between the United States and Great Britain and France * * *." June 28, 1809.

(No. 32b, p. 1171): Act concerning the commercial intercourse between the United States and Great Britain and France, * * * May 1, 1810.

(No. 32c, p. 1171): Act supplementary to the act entitled "An act concerning the commercial intercourse between the United States and Great Britain and France * * *." March 2, 1811.

(No. 33, p. 1172): Proclamation of neutrality in the French Revolutionary Wars, April 22, 1793:

"* * * whosoever of the citizens of the United States shall render himself liable to punishment or forfeiture under the law of nations by committing, aiding, or abetting hostilities against any of the said powers, or by carrying to any of them those articles which are deemed contraband by the modern usage of nations, will not receive the protection of the United States against such punishment or forfeiture; and, further, that I have given instructions to those officers, to whom it belongs, to cause prosecutions to be instituted against all persons who shall, within the cognizance of the courts of the United States, violate the law of nations with respect to the powers at war, or any of them.

"GEORGE WASHINGTON."

(No. 49, p. 1189): Proclamation of neutrality in the Franco-Prussian War, August 22, 1870:

"* * * and that while all persons may lawfully, and without restriction by reason of the aforesaid state of war, manufacture and sell within the United States arms and munitions of war and other articles ordinarily known as contraband of war, yet they cannot carry such articles upon the high seas for the use or service of either belligerent. * * *

"U. S. GRANT."

(No. 55, p. 1204): Proclamation of neutrality in the World War, August 4, 1914:

"* * * all persons may lawfully and without restriction by reason of the aforesaid state of war manufacture and sell within the United States arms and munitions of war and other articles ordinarily known as contraband of war, yet they cannot carry such articles upon the high seas for the use or service of a belligerent, * * *.

"WOODROW WILSON."

(No. 63, p. 1214): Proclamation prohibiting exportation of arms and munitions to the Dominican Republic, October 14, 1905:

"* * * joint resolution, April 22, 1898, * * *

"* * * and by virtue of joint resolution, April 22, 1898, * * * export of arms, ammunition, and munitions of war of every kind, from any port in the United States or in Porto Rico to any port in the Dominican Republic, is prohibited, * * *."

(No. 64, p. 1215): Proclamation prohibiting exportation of arms and ammunition to Mexico, March 14, 1912:

"* * * it shall be unlawful to export except * * * any arms or munitions of war from any place in the United States to such country * * *."

(No. 66, p. 1217): Proclamation prohibiting exportation of arms and ammunition to Mexico, July 12, 1919:

"* * * it shall be unlawful to export except * * * any arms or munitions of war from any place in the United States to such country * * *."

(No. 67, p. 1219): Proclamation prohibiting exportation of arms and ammunition to China, March 4, 1922.

No. 67a, p. 1220): Proclamation prohibiting exportation of arms and ammunition to Cuba, May 2, 1924.

(No. 68, p. 1222): Proclamation prohibiting sale of arms and munitions of war to Bolivia and Paraguay, May 28, 1934.

(No. 69, p. 1223): Proclamation defining arms, ammunition, and implements of war for the purposes of the Neutrality Act, 1935, September 25, 1935.

(No. 70, p. 1227): Proclamation prohibiting American citizens from traveling on belligerent ships during the Italo-Ethiopian War, October 5, 1935:

"I do hereby give notice that any citizen of the United States who may travel on such a vessel, contrary to the provisions of the said joint resolution, will do so at his own risk.

"FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT."

(No. 71, p. 1228): Proclamation prohibiting the exportation of arms, ammunition, and implements of war to Italy and Ethiopia, October 5, 1935.

(No. 72, p. 1231): Proclamation prohibiting the exportation of arms, ammunition, and implements of war to Spain, May 1, 1937.

URUGUAY

(No. 1, p. 1265): Decree establishing rules of neutrality to be observed in the ports, roadsteads, and territorial waters of Uruguay, August 7, 1914:

"ART. 14. The following articles are declared to be contraband of war according * * *: All classes of arms, military apparatus, cannon, etc.

"ART. 15. The maritime authorities will see that the merchant vessels load no contraband of war * * *."

A Forum for Views on Neutrality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARTIN J. KENNEDY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 18, 1939

LETTER FROM HON. MARTIN J. KENNEDY TO SPEAKER BANKHEAD AND HIS REPLY TO MR. KENNEDY

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letters.

I believe it would be of great value to the membership of the House to have a forum, as I suggested in my letter of October 4, 1939. The forum would establish a precedent in House procedure, but a precedent which might contribute much to the solution of the problem of unlimited debate which confronts the House when an important issue like neutrality is before the Congress.

OCTOBER 4, 1939.

Speaker WILLIAM B. BANKHEAD,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: In my opinion, the existing arrangement between the Democratic leader and the Republican leader in the House of Representatives concerning the nature and character of legislative business which the House may transact during this special session denies to the membership an opportunity to contribute to the solution of the neutrality problem. It was because of neutrality that President Roosevelt convened this extraordinary session.

From press reports it would appear that the Senate will not be ready to vote on their neutrality bill for several weeks. Until such time as the Senate has had a vote on this bill the House program permits us to do nothing but mark time.

In a closed session the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations considered the neutrality bill passed by the House of Representatives in July. The public and Members of the Senate and House were barred from attending these meetings and expressing their views. The present bill, which has been reported by the Senate committee, is practically an entirely new bill. Under these circumstances the silence imposed upon the House should no longer be enforced.

We have been told by President Roosevelt that the international situation is most acute and requires prompt and positive action by the Congress. Therefore, let the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House meet at least every other day during this emergency. At these meetings all Representatives should have an opportunity to offer suggestions concerning neutrality. The debate in the Senate will not reveal all that is to be known on the subject, nor do the Members of that body possess a monopoly on patriotism and wisdom.

Should my suggestion be adopted, it would not be necessary to have any formal legislation before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. The committee meetings would serve as a forum for House Members who might have valuable information. At these forum meetings each Representative will have an opportunity to give full, public, and official expression to his views on neutrality. Unless the Members are afforded this opportunity now for an expression of their opinion, there will be prolonged, unnecessary delay in the session.

The House of Representatives is a true cross section of the American people. Let the Members of this House give voice to the hopes which all Americans have in their minds and hearts during these difficult days. In this hour, when the United States is the center of political gravity of the world, we must not allow the House of Representatives to become a mere audience in this critical juncture in the Nation's history.

The man on the street looks to the Congress for guidance, the people of the Nation rely upon our judgment, and the countries of the world wait upon our decision. Our solemn duty demands that we work ceaselessly in the cause of peace for our citizens, our Nation, and the world.

Sincerely yours,

MARTIN J. KENNEDY.

OCTOBER 11, 1939.

Hon. MARTIN J. KENNEDY,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MARTIN: I have received and considered your thoughtful letter of October 4, suggesting the desirability of having the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House to meet occasionally during the discussion of the neutrality bill in the Senate in order to have Members offer suggestions and arguments with reference to that bill when it shall return to the House for further consideration.

I am not now prepared to make any suggestions to the Foreign Affairs Committee on this matter. It is my opinion, however, that while Congress is not transacting any other official business it is an excellent idea to afford all Members of the House an opportunity to express their views on this most important question, and I will be glad to recognize any Member who desires to secure time for that purpose. I really believe that this course would be more effective in carrying out your views than to have statements made before the Committee on Foreign Affairs acting as a forum as suggested in your letter.

With best wishes, I am,

Yours very sincerely,

W. B. BANKHEAD, *Speaker.*

The Proposed Trade Agreement With the Argentine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS H. CASE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 18, 1939

STATEMENT BY HON. FRANCIS H. CASE OF SOUTH DAKOTA BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON RECIPROCITY INFORMATION

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my statement before the Committee on Reciprocity Information at the hearing on the proposed trade agreement with the Argentine, Monday, October 16, 1939, as follows:

Chairman Grady and gentlemen of the committee, again I am here to say that trade is a two-way street at home, also. The list of items proposed for consideration in a trade agreement with the Argentine would make one think that the western farmer had been singled out for sacrifice: Livestock, hides, wool, turkeys, flaxseed, and linseed oil, cheese, dairy and meat products.

Are these not the very items which the western farmer has been told to produce to get away from grain farming?

Are they not, in fact, the items on which the western farmer has had to rely for any material income during the past 7 hard, dry years? How, then, will American prosperity be helped by attacking these markets?

Certainly the members of this committee need no argument for the proposition that the domestic farm market is the best market in the world for our manufactured goods, for automobiles and clothing, for machinery, and for shoes. The statement that our national prosperity bottoms on the prosperity of our farmers has been made by every important leader in the country. Why single it out for sacrifice at this time?

Many people are scheduled for appearance. Details of the several items will be discussed by many. Permit me to use one illustration for my general proposition.

In late August a party of about 50 representatives of the various branches of the Department of Agriculture visited my district. They were making a field tour and went from one ranch to another to see what the several Federal programs were doing.

We visited one man who was the star exhibit. He had been down and out; had lost his farm and lost his livestock. The Federal land bank and the Land Bank Commissioner had helped him refinance his farm. The Farm Credit Administration made a crop loan. The Farm Security Administration had provided him with a rehabilitation loan to buy some young cows.

He was running his stock on a pasture aided by the soil-conservation program.

He was taken as the star exhibit of cooperation among the Federal agencies. He told how he had bought the heifers, the increase they had made in weight, and the number of calves they had this year. He had made a good buy on the cattle—they were now worth almost double what he had paid.

He was asked this question: "What is your second line of defense? If the market breaks for cattle, what would you live on?" The rancher thought a minute and said, "I don't know. Guess I haven't got any unless it's ma's turkeys."

His wife had 250 turkeys. Needless to say, the Government has a double interest in the maintenance of fair prices for both cattle and turkeys—the well-being of the citizen and the investment in the farmer's welfare.

Now, the proposals for this trade agreement strike at both of those lines of defense—cattle and turkeys—and in so doing they work at cross purposes with the efforts of the Government to restore self-support to western farmers.

The Argentine farmer does not worry about meeting living costs based on a wage-and-hour law, nor social-security taxes. He ships by water to New York for 2 cents a pound. He sells his turkeys for from 9 to 12 cents a pound. The present tariff on dressed turkeys is 10 cents per pound.

If the tariff is lowered, it will reduce the returns on domestic turkeys and destroy the industry. A nickel cut may mean 50 cents on a bird.

I make this protest on the request of the alarmed growers in my State who this year have 870,000 turkeys to market, and remember that I have used this item only for illustration. Go down the list—livestock, hides, wool, flax, dairy products—and you will find that the items largely proposed for consideration at this time are items that strike at the western farmer, and, striking at him, they strike at the domestic market which supplies the greatest and best market for the domestic manufacturer and worker in factories and mills.

In about 6 months the power granted by Congress for the negotiation of reciprocal-trade agreements expires. Presumably an attempt will be made to get a further extension of time for this program. The record will come up for full review. Be careful what you do. It is undoubtedly true that the people of the United States want friendly relations with the people of the Argentine, but neither Argentina nor the United States will profit by a destruction of the domestic economy of either nation.

I earnestly urge that the committee reconsider the items for consideration and not lay the burden of sacrifice on the western farmer by reducing protection on the items which are the backbone of his buying power.

Raise the Embargo on Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LEMKE

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 17, 1939

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, Members of Congress are receiving hundreds of letters calling attention to a real emergency from farmers and laboring people, stating that they have no money with which to buy food, fuel, or clothing for themselves and their families during the coming winter. These letters come from the drought-stricken grasshopper-infested areas. They come from areas where they have had little or no crop for the last 5 years—where the little grain and livestock the farmer produced, he was compelled to sell below the cost of production.

In the meantime, the bureaucracy—not the democracy—which runs the United States exacted a promise from the chairmen of the committees to consider no legislation except the repeal of the embargo. Some Members are attempting to raise the embargo on legislation. These Members are more interested in helping the destitute farmers and laboring men than in making millions for Morgan and the Du Ponts out of credits and munitions.

Meanwhile, the Departments of State and Agriculture are again busy selling the farmer down the river. This through trade-agreement negotiations with Argentina. They intend to lower the tariff in this agreement on flax, livestock, turkeys, dairy, and other farm products.

I believe that I represent the overwhelming majority of farmers of this Nation when I state that we are opposed to any reduction of the tariff on any agricultural product that we can produce. Why always make agriculture the goat? Are not our own farmers to be preferred to the "landed barons" of South America?

We are especially opposed to any reduction of the tariff in the proposed trade agreement with Argentina on flax or any other grain or grain product. We are equally opposed to any reduction of the tariff on livestock and poultry or on any product of these, such as meat, poultry, or dairy products. We are also unalterably opposed to lowering the tariff on any substitute for these products. These products the American farmer can produce in sufficient amount to satisfy our wants. Why import them?

On these products we do not only favor the present tariffs but feel that they ought to be raised, in place of reduced, until our farmer gets cost of production, plus 10-percent advantage over foreign products or substitutes. Why enslave our own farmers and make them compete with peon labor—with slavery in Latin America?

Ninety-four percent of our trade is with ourselves. Our boundary line to this 94 percent domestic trade is the Atlantic on the east, the Pacific on the west, the Canadian boundary on the north, and the Gulf of Mexico and Mexico on the south. Out of the 6 percent of our foreign trade between 2 or 3 percent consists of trading in international money and credit—stocks and bonds.

Why should our farmer again be made the shock absorber for the international manufacturer and the international banker? Why should we give part of our domestic agricultural market to Argentina so that the international banker can collect on stocks and bonds, and the international manufacturer sell his wares to Argentina at the expense of the American farmer?

Why not develop our own markets—the 94 percent domestic trade? There are still millions among us in want and without purchasing power. It has been foolishly suggested that we loan the Latin American republics more money so as to enable them to buy our manufactured products. Such a policy is unsound and irrational. If we want to loan any money let us loan it to our own people. Then we will at least be dealing with ourselves. Our people will make better use of the loans and consume more of our products than Latin Americans. The money we loan them will continue to do business in the United States, not in Argentina.

Because of mechanical inventions and chemical discoveries all nations have become more and more self-sufficient. This is especially true of the United States. Foreign trade is no longer essential to our welfare. There are still a few things that we cannot successfully produce, but we can always buy them in the world's open market, as long as we have the cash.

Why sell our farmer's market and our laborer's energy to foreign nations who are unable or unwilling to pay unless we give them credit or part of our domestic agricultural market? Is not that policy just as insane as the policy of destroying agricultural wealth in order to bring about the abundant life? Let us forget it. That policy should be a policy of the past, not of the future.

I am not opposed to trading with foreign nations. But rather as a matter of friendship than as a matter of diplomacy. We are the poorest diplomats in the world. We generally trade two or three good horses for an old nag. Let us buy the few things we need from other nations in the open markets of the world without trade agreements.

Likewise, let other nations buy what they need from us in the open markets. Let them buy what they need on the same terms and conditions that our own people buy. Let them pay with their own money. We ought to be through with financing other nations. The more than $14,500,000,000 of broken promises in the United States Treasury should be sufficient education for us.

When the law authorizing these reciprocal-trade agreements was up in Congress, I opposed it on the ground that it was in the interest of the international banker and the international manufacturer at the expense of American agriculture and American labor. I opposed it on the ground that it was unconstitutional, and I still feel that it is unconstitutional. A trade agreement is a treaty, and a treaty must

be confirmed by two-thirds of the Senators present and voting.

The American National Livestock Association and the National Cooperative Milk Producers' Federation, together with other agricultural representatives, have filed splendid arguments against the proposed trade agreement with Argentina. These arguments have been presented in their briefs to the Tariff Commission. I shall not attempt to enlarge on them, but I wish to enter an additional protest in behalf of the farmers' wives, part of whose domestic turkey and poultry market is about to be given to Argentina. It seems to me that we ought to at least protect the labor of the farm women and children in our reciprocal-trade agreements.

Therefore I respectfully suggest that the tariff be not lowered on any agricultural product and especially not on flax or any grain or grain product, nor on any livestock or poultry or any livestock or poultry product, such as meat, dairy, or other products. Let us raise the "embargo on legislation" and keep the embargo on arms, munitions, and implements of war.

The argument by the Departments of State and Agriculture that we must sell our domestic markets in order to live in peace with our neighbors is ridiculous. Friendship which has to be bought is not friendship. It is not worth having. It is worse because it breeds contempt and hatred for our Nation. Let us extend the glad hand of good fellowship to all nations in the open market places. Let us deal fairly and honorably with all.

Let us take care of our own people. Other nations will take care of themselves somehow. Let us not be the instigators or the profiteers of their quarrels or wars. Let us not sell arms, munitions, and implements of war—of death and destruction—to any nation at any time or in any place. To do so makes us an accomplice of assassination both before and after the fact. It will in the end bring upon us the just and earned contempt of the world.

The American Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. KUNKEL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 16, 1939

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, when two opposing groups of American citizens engage in an argument over a debatable and controversial question, the most important point for each group to keep in mind is that both groups desire the ultimate good of the United States of America. We must debate strenuously and intensively. We must try to show errors in our opponents' arguments. We must attempt in every honorable way to convince our opponents. We must not, however, impugn their motives without cause. If we are defeated and if the other view prevails, then we must always remember that that other view represents the American view and we must support it wholeheartedly and without reservation.

Only one set of circumstances could possibly prevent such a result. That would be if the House were not permitted to vote specifically on the one vital question of whether or not the arms embargo should be repealed. If this issue is confused with other issues so that an accurate result on that particular issue cannot be obtained, there doubtless will be many who will deny that the final legislation enacted does represent the true American viewpoint.

The longer the debate over the repeal of the arms embargo continues, the more apparent it becomes that the two opposing views are held because of the fact the holders of them start from different premises. It becomes increasingly clear that those who wish to have the arms embargo repealed desire this result because they feel that the Allies must be helped to win in order to preserve the democracies and democracy as a form of government on the face of the earth. They feel it is essential that the democratic forms of government which prevailed in France and Great Britain prior to the outbreak of the present war must be continued. They feel that democratic forms of government must be spread over the rest of Europe. They feel this is necessary in order that our democracy here may continue. Consequently, they feel that the United States must take steps to insure the victory of her Allies in the last World War. Hence, President Roosevelt's statement in his message to Congress, January 4, 1939, that—

> God-fearing democracies of the world which observe the sanctity of treaties in their dealings with other nations cannot safely be indifferent to international lawlessness anywhere.

On the other hand, those who desire to keep the embargo on arms invariably base their argument on the major premise that this embargo is essential in order to keep us out of war; and on the further premise that unless we do keep out of war the United States will lose its own democracy and democracy will vanish from the face of the earth. They believe that war is not the cure of the various "isms," but, rather, that it is the cause and breeder of them.

Now, the important inference which I draw from the above statements is that practically everyone—no matter which side they take—is actuated by the ambition and desire to attain the same high-minded objectives. Both sides wish to preserve the integrity and institutions of this country. Both sides wish to preserve those ideals which we all love and which we consider essential to our welfare both as individuals and as a nation. Both sides wish to extend those ideals and those institutions which we reverence for the benefit of others in other countries.

So during this debate let us all realize that our opponents have the same purposes and objectives that we have. Let us respect their ideals and motives. Let us honor their judgment and objectives. And when the final result is decided, let us all join together and say, "This is the American view. This is our way, and we all support it."

Equipment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1939

EDITORIAL FROM THE SOMERSET DAILY AMERICAN

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the President, confronted by the failure of practically all of his domestic experiments, none of which has been completely successful, all of which have been extravagantly wasteful, has very skillfully, as any shrewd politician might do, by calling a special session, made an effort to divert the attention of the American people from his own failure to the foreign situation. Like a willful child, beaten at his own game, he turns to another game, that of power politics.

Having demonstrated his total inability, his utter lack of capacity to handle our domestic problems, he now wants to sit in with ambitious power-mad rulers across the seas and play their game. No one would object to this were it not that he wants to use as his stake the destiny of our people. Some of his admirers still cling to the thought that he is a superman possessed of a master mind, and have attempted to set forth his qualifications to meet, on equal terms, the wily,

unscrupulous players in this age-old gamble with the happiness and the lives of the common people.

For some reason best known to themselves, Washington publishers, editors, and columnists, all too frequently permit the sunshine of official favor to dazzle their eyes, becloud their judgment. Back in the country, editors who, unblinded, not overawed by the false glamour which emanates from the White House, are able to think clearly and portray truthfully some of the human characteristics of the President. Among the hundreds of thousands of such editors is Henry Baker Reiley, and from his Somerset Daily American, I insert the following editorial:

EQUIPMENT

Harlan Miller has written several articles which have appeared in the Washington Post to show the qualifications of Franklin Roosevelt for handling the foreign affairs of the United States Government.

The writer recounts that as a small boy Mr. Roosevelt was taken to Europe by his parents 13 times. The visits averaged about 10 weeks each. In all, Mr. Roosevelt has spent 32½ months on the mother continent. The Roosevelts and the Delanos were engaged in shipping and traveled all over the world. Their letters were read at the James Roosevelt family table and the discussions of them provided the boy Franklin with opportunities for acquiring knowledge of the problems of the lands that are embroiled in the present war.

The Post's writer proceeds to tell of the 29 lands which Franklin Roosevelt has visited; recounts that he has talked with Lloyd George, Clemenceau, Poincaré, Nitti, Balfour, King Albert, and a score of other great men, as the world reckons greatness.

The long list of opportunities the President has had to see and hear about foreign affairs might, were knowledge and wisdom contagious, provide him with an abundance of material on which to work out solutions for the problems that confront him as Chief Executive of the United States.

We have been under the impression, though the writer does not mention it, that the portion of the life of Franklin Roosevelt which has not been spent abroad has been spent in the United States, and he has doubtless had even greater opportunities for the study of the problems of America than he has had for familiarizing himself with our foreign relations.

If the mind of Franklin Roosevelt is as muddled as to foreign affairs as evidence indicates it to be as to domestic affairs, probably it would have been just as well for Mr. Roosevelt, even more so for the Republic, if he had never set foot on Europe, Asia, or wherever abroad he may have been.

It may be unfortunate but it is a fact that people judge men by what they do with their knowledge rather than by the time they have spent in its acquisition.

The late Dr. John A. Brashear never went to college as a student, but he went repeatedly to colleges and universities to receive degrees when there wasn't the remotest chance that a favorable appropriation for the educational institution might be the fruit of the bestowal. Plenty of the university officials who voted honors to Dr. Brashear knew more than he about a number of subjects. It was not the proximity of Dr. Brashear to wisdom and knowledge that made him great but the application which he made of that which he mastered.

So it is with President Roosevelt.

If the colleges and contacts were sufficient to qualify for service, the President would rank high.

But the flare for governmental economy, which appeared to him to be the key to national prosperity while he was a candidate for President, evaporated quickly when a servile Congress assumed that his election endowed him with omniscience and omnipotence.

The squandermania that has distinguished the Roosevelt administration shows to what little purpose the President's study of that phase of government has been.

But Mr. Miller is flattering the President's desire to solve foreign problems.

A little more than 3 years ago the President told an audience at Chautauqua, N. Y., what wonderful security against war was afforded by the then new Neutrality Act.

Now Mr. Roosevelt proclaims his regrets that he ever signed that act.

Whether the superficiality in evidence was greater 3 years ago than now may be a proper subject for debate, but who can tell from what he has said and done how the President will view any situation, domestic or foreign, a year, a month, a day hence?

As Mr. Roosevelt, doubtless summoning to his adjudication of the case all the knowledge he has acquired during the 13 voyages to 29 lands, framed his opinion 3 years ago, he declared with enthusiasm, "Industrial and agricultural production for a war market * * * produces disaster."

If the many years Mr. Roosevelt has lived in America have been unable to provide him with settled opinions on the major domestic problems, such as public debt, Treasury deficits, abatement of unemployment, and taxation, isn't it a waste of time to recount his foreign contacts as evidence of his qualifications for handling foreign relations?

Address of the Postmaster General

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM B. BARRY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1939

ADDRESS BY HON. JAMES A. FARLEY

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Hon. James A. Farley, Postmaster General of the United States, at the dedication of the North Beach Airport, New York City, Sunday, October 15, 1939:

I am happy to participate, as a representative of the Federal Government, in the dedication of this airport to the transportation needs of New York City and the Nation.

This fine civic enterprise owes its existence to Mayor LaGuardia and those associated with him who had the bold foresight and the energy to conceive and carry it through. I feel sure, Mr. Mayor, that the people of New York are proud of your accomplishment and proud of this airport, which will soon take its place among the best known transportation terminals in the country.

The history of North Beach Airport is just beginning. Today its name is well known only to those people who live in this vicinity. But before many years have passed, with the constant development and expansion of aviation, the name of North Beach Airport will be on the lips of air-minded travelers not only in this country but throughout the civilized world.

The growth of New York City from a tiny seaport to a metropolis of several millions has been closely bound up with the development of its facilities for communication and transportation. New York has one of the busiest and best harbors in the world—a water gateway through which pours the trade and commerce of countless nations. New York has magnificent railroad terminals to accommodate the heavy flow of its overland traffic. It has an excellent suburban train service and a subway system without peer. From the earliest times New York has always been quick to provide for the comfort and convenience of those who travel through its portals.

It is only natural, therefore, that the city should have desired air facilities in keeping with its other forms of transportation. This ambition is now realized in the completion of this airport. The runways, the administration building, and the other facilities constructed here are designed to take care of modern air-traffic needs in splendid fashion. Those in charge of planning had the wisdom and the vision to make provision not only for the large seaplanes of today but for those larger planes which will be flying the airways a few years hence.

The rapid development of aviation constitutes a stirring and romantic chapter in the age-long struggle of mankind to overcome the elements. Many of those assembled here remember the time, only a few decades ago, when the sight of a plane in the sky brought forth both wonder and amazement. For centuries men dreamed of flying through space, and bold spirits in every land worked and planned for its accomplishment. It remained for an American to be the first to achieve this miracle of the twentieth century. Those early planes awaken only curiosity and a faint sense of amusement now. The birdmen of today call them "crates" and wonder how the intrepid pioneers who flew such frail craft ever got them off the ground or held them together in the air.

The huge air liners which span the continents and the oceans tell better than words the story of the remarkable progress that has taken place since the Wright brothers first launched a plane from the sand dunes of the Carolinas. The speed, comfort, and, above all, the safety of these air liners bear ample testimony to the skill and ingenuity of the men and women who are helping to build this great industry in America.

Although we marvel at the progress already made in aviation, it is safe to say that hardly anyone can foresee accurately the period of expansion that lies ahead. There is no element of speculation in the labor and money invested here. The history of transportation, which, in the past, has played such an impressive role in the development of greater New York, justifies your faith in this project. Air transportation and communication are still in the early years of their growth. The day will dawn when the facilities of this expansive airport will be hard pressed to accommodate the mighty air fleets of the future.

It is only 21 years since the Federal Government first established the Air Mail Service, an experimental route covering the 218 miles which separate New York from Washington. This pioneer service swiftly justified the faith and courage of those who had a hand in its inception. From the start the American public gave its sympathy and full cooperation to the infant industry. After a few years the Federal Government gave up the direct ownership and operation of

the planes and turned over the mail transport to private carriers. The service was constantly improved and new routes added. From this small pioneering venture the system has developed into the world's greatest air transport service.

The system now embraces a network of more than 37,000 route-miles and last year alone the planes in this service flew a total of 52,000,000 miles. The growth of the foreign air-mail transport system has been just as spectacular. The first line covered a distance of 246 miles from Key West, Fla., to Havana, Cuba. This service now covers more than 36,000 thousand route-miles, with the mail going to many foreign lands as a part of the regular service in this far-reaching international system of communication.

A span of 21 years is a comparatively short time in human history. Yet, as we look back to the inception of the Air Mail Service, it is difficult to realize the trials and handicaps which the early mail pilots were compelled to face. They carried your messages of friendship and business in small planes over uncharted airways, with few safety devices to protect them against the hazards of wind and weather. There were no lighted airways in those days and few intermediate landing fields for use in case of emergency. The radiobeacon was unknown, and very often the pilots were forced to rely on blind flying to feel their way through the dark pockets of the night. The Nation owes a debt of everlasting gratitude to these courageous wingmen, the "pony express riders of the air," who brought the mails through and thus helped to lay the groundwork for the mighty air transport system of today.

The air pilots who guide the air liners of the present are worthy successors to the hardy pioneers of 20 years ago. The safety of pilots and passengers has been vastly increased by technical improvements in the construction of planes. But in the final analysis the safety of flying depends upon the cool head and steady nerves of the man at the controls and the excellent safety record compiled by the American air-transport service is due in large measure to the skill and efficiency of its pilots.

A few figures serve to illustrate in striking fashion the growing confidence of the traveling public in air transportation. Someone has pointed out that a fair-sized auditorium could have accommodated the total number of passengers who rode the airways during the year 1926. To be more specific, the whole number that year was under 6,000. Twelve years later, in 1938, there were 1,300,000 passengers, and the total for this year will be even greater. Stated in another way, the number of air passengers carried annually is now equal to or greater than the entire population of a large city such as Detroit or Los Angeles.

There are more than 2,000 prepared air fields in the United States which are being used constantly by 11,000 planes. There are 26,000 licensed pilots to fly these planes. This year witnessed the beginning of regular transport service across the Atlantic. Service across the Pacific has been in operation for some time, and plans are under way for the establishment of regular service to New Zealand and Australia.

The air liners being built in this country seem destined to win the kind of world supremacy which the Yankee-built clipper ships enjoyed for so long a period during the last century. America now leads the world in the development of civil aviation, and under the able leadership of the men who direct the industry, I feel certain that this proud position will be maintained for many years.

The construction of North Beach Airport was made possible by the financial assistance of the Federal Government. This aid was extended through the W. P. A. program, one of the many constructive measures adopted by the administration to provide employment for idle workers. This program has played a vital part in helping to stabilize the national economy, while at the same time rebuilding the Nation's physical plant. I congratulate every official and every individual who contributed in any way to the construction of this great enterprise. It is a lasting monument to all those who gave their skill and labor in its completion.

It is fortunate for us here in the United States that we can gather together to dedicate an airport of this character to the pursuits of peace, without thought of war or conquest or the dread possibility of armed conflict against another power. Mankind has forged a mighty weapon in the airplane—a weapon that may be used for good or for evil, depending upon the will and purpose of those who use it.

We have chosen the way of peace, and, with God's help, America shall continue to employ her vast system of airplanes and airports for the promotion of friendship, understanding, and good will among nations. We are truly grateful for the fact that our country has escaped the destructive curse of war, and the sympathy of the American people goes out to the people of those other countries less fortunate than our own. At the same time we can assure the world that the impressive air fleet which we are now building will never be used for aggressive purposes against any nation, either large or small. America wants peace, not alone for herself but for all mankind.

It is my honest belief that the splendid army of pilots who man the commercial air lines of this country will never be called upon for military service against another power. Yet I should like to point out that the very existence of these air lines, with their excellent equipment and personnel, is a strong guaranty of the Nation's peace and safety. One of the lessons to be learned from recent events abroad is the fact that a nation strong in air power is well fortified to prevent aggression from any source. Let us continue, then, to encourage the construction of these air forces, so that when we extend the hand of fellowship to other nations the world will understand that it is the hand of strength and not the hand of weakness.

This airport stands here as a symbol of man's conquest of the air. In fact, it has brought the entire world closer to your doors. You are but 4 hours from Chicago by air, and the distance in time to other large cities of the country has been reduced proportionately. The mail can leave here today, or a passenger can leave, and be in Europe tomorrow. By the use of the air mail the door of opportunity has been widened for businessmen and those engaged in trade and commerce. You have at your command here outstanding facilities for peaceful communication with other peoples that will become more important as the years go on.

I am happy to have had the opportunity of participating in these exercises. The creation of this great enterprise is a welcome sign that the pioneering spirit of progress is still alive in America. It is the spirit also of the aviation industry. Those who help to foster and sustain it should be happy in the knowledge that they are doing their part to advance the contentment and well-being of the people of this country and of their fellow men.

The Poll Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE E. GEYER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1939

ARTICLE BY WAYNE GARD

Mr. GEYER of California. Mr. Speaker, as is known by the Members of this body, I am the author of a bill that has as its purpose the doing away of the poll tax as a prerequisite for voting. It is my desire that this bill be heard by the proper committee as soon as the session opens in January. I hope that it will be possible for me to have printed in the RECORD from time to time material bearing on this subject.

Below is reproduced an article from the Christian Century. It is entitled "Disfranchised Dixie." The article was written by Wayne Gard.

[From the Christian Century of September 20, 1939]

DISFRANCHISED DIXIE

(By Wayne Gard)

In eight Southern States, where half the otherwise eligible voters are denied the ballot because of their poverty, a revolt is under way. From the green hills along the Shenandoah to the dusty sagebrush on the banks of the Rio Grande, disfranchised citizens are calling for abolition of the poll tax as a prerequisite to voting. Recent victories in Louisiana and Florida have encouraged them to hope for a clean sweep. If they win in time their victory may have a big influence in control of the 1940 Democratic convention.

Thousands of men and women who live in weatherbeaten cabins and dine on sowbelly and turnip greens never have voted because they could not afford the luxury of poll-tax receipts. This tax, which ranges from one to two dollars a year, still exists in Alabama, Arkansas, Georgia, Mississippi, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, and Virginia. Four of these States exempt those voters past 60 years of age, and two exempt all past 45; others require poll-tax receipts of all voters. Some States require receipts for the preceding 3 years, or even proof that all back poll taxes have been paid since the voter was 21. Usually the last day for payment is January 31, months ahead of the election.

KEEPING THE POOR FROM THE POLLS

Denounced by President Roosevelt and by liberal and labor leaders in the South, this archaic tax keeps the poor from the polls and allows cliques of economic royalists to dominate the South and head off progressive legislation. Effects of the tax can be seen by analyzing the vote by States in any national election. In the 1936 Presidential election the poll-tax States—then 9—sent only 24 percent of their voters to the polls, while in the other States 72 percent voted. The vote varied from 13 percent in South Carolina, a poll-tax State, to 88 percent in West Virginia, which does not require tax receipts at the voting booths. In 1928 Herbert Hoover carried Texas by gaining a mere 12 percent of the potential electorate.

Defenders of disfranchisement answer these figures by saying that in the South the election amounts to little, that only the Democratic primary counts. But this argument comes to little when comparison is made between southern and border States that retain the poll-tax requirements and those that have abolished it. Virginia, with 1,300,000 residents of voting age, cast 334,590 ballots in 1936, while Maryland, Kentucky, North Carolina, and West Vir-

ginia—comparable in total and Negro population—cast 624,896, 926,199, 839,462, and 829,945 votes, respectively.

Adopted as a measure to keep the Negro from voting, the poll tax is defended on this ground today. Yet its main effect is to disfranchise the poor white, since the Negro would still be kept from the ballot box by other devices. In Virginia, in spite of its poll tax, Negro votes form a larger proportion of the total than in North Carolina, which abolished its poll-tax requirement many years ago. Yet in the 1936 election, as already noted, North Carolina cast more than two and a half times as many votes as Virginia.

BELOVED BY DEMAGOGUES

Opponents of full suffrage contend also that dropping of the poll-tax requirement would encourage the election of demagogues. As if the poll-tax States did not now put more demagogues in public office than any comparable group. Only voters who paid their poll tax sent to Washington or to the State capitols such rabble-rousers as Cole Blease, Theodore G. Bilbo, W. Lee O'Daniel, and the late Huey Long, whose election took place before Louisiana dropped her poll tax.

The standpatters disclose their real purpose when they defend the poll tax as a bulwark against social and economic reform. They know that, in general, the 8 poll-tax States are the least progressive in the country, the most laggard in labor and health legislation, the lowest in literacy, and the most indifferent to the plight of the impoverished tenant farmer and his rickety children. They know, too, that if the poor whites are allowed to vote some of these conditions may gradually be improved—at the taxpayers' expense.

In many southern counties, the poll tax is a convenient device to keep control of the vote in the hands of a courthouse ring or a handful of industrial employers. With only 20 to 50 percent of the adults given the ballot, the voters are kept in hand much more easily. Despite bans in the statute books, political bosses often pay the poll tax for their ragged retainers, while employers see that the tax is paid for those of their workers who can be counted on to vote as they are told.

AGENCY OF CORRUPTION

Ever since the Romans levied it on subject peoples, the head tax has been an instrument of oppression and injustice. Aristotle described it as a "most ignominious imposition" which "none but slaves paid to their tyrants"; and in 1381 Wat Tyler led English peasants in an armed rebellion against the decree of this inequitable tax. In the American Colonies the British slapped on a poll tax in 1663. Opposition to this levy was a factor in leading North Carolinians a century later to issue the Mecklenburg Declaration of 1775, a forerunner of the Declaration of Independence. Abolished by the Revolution, the poll tax as a prerequisite to voting did not reappear until late in the last century, when 11 Southern States adopted it as a means of evading the fifteenth amendment to the Constitution, which gave Negroes the right to vote. A quarter of a century ago 14 States required voters to show poll-tax receipts.

In addition to seeking individual and social justice, the present movement for repeal of the poll tax seeks to remedy two special conditions that have arisen during the last few years. One is that six of the eight poll-tax States by exempting the aged from the tax give this group an abnormally large representation at the polls. Thus the special interests of the elderly are likely to get more attention than they deserve and legislatures are pressed to enact visionary pension schemes. Texas had an example of this in 1938 when thousands whose last Presidential vote went to Bryan swamped the polls to cast their ballots for W. Lee O'Daniel, who promised that if made Governor he would give big pensions to all the old folks, whether they needed money or not.

LOSS OF PARTY POWER

The other new argument against the poll tax is that it prevents the South from having proportionate representation in the Democratic National Convention. Formerly, with the two-thirds rule for nominations and with the number of seats for each State based on total population figures, the South enjoyed perhaps more power than it deserved at party conventions. But with the 1936 abolition of the two-thirds rule and a change in the basis of representation, this advantage is lost. Since, beginning with 1940, representation will be on a basis of the number of Democratic votes cast in the previous Presidential election, the poll-tax States will find their delegations seriously curtailed.

Despite its name, the poll tax is in reality a voluntary payment for the privilege of voting. Little attempt is made to collect it from all adults. In most of the States affected, the only persons who receive any written notice of the poll tax are those who pay taxes on real estate. Propertyless citizens must mark their calendars or depend on newspaper reminders to pay this levy ahead of the deadline. Those who fail to pay the tax incur no penalty except loss of their right to vote. Essentially the poll tax is a membership fee in a political club that runs the government in eight States.

Repeal of the poll-tax requirement for voters has resulted uniformly in a large increase in the vote cast. Recent Louisiana elections have recorded from 25 to 30 percent more ballots than those held before repeal of the poll tax a few years ago. In 1938 the Democratic primary in Florida—the first held there since repeal of that State's poll tax—brought out the largest vote in the history of the State. Compared with a previous record of slightly more than 300,000, the 1938 primary brought about 415,000 voters to the polls.

In 1938 Texans elected as Governor a dimpled flour salesman who could not vote because he had not paid any poll tax for years. One of O'Daniel's few campaign planks was repeal of the poll tax. But soon after his election he made a truce with the State Democratic machine, which wants the tax retained, and as Governor he has taken no action toward carrying out his campaign promise to abolish this price on votes.

FIGHT COVERS THE SOUTH

Elsewhere the fight against the poll tax has more able leadership. In Virginia, where the levy is defended by machine bosses like Senator CARTER GLASS and Senator HARRY F. BYRD, strong opposition comes from able newspapermen, including Virginius Dabney, editor of the Richmond Times-Dispatch, and from labor unions and organizations of consumers, women, and war veterans. In other States the fight for repeal gains support from Senator LESTER HILL, of Alabama; Barry Bingham, publisher of the Louisville Courier-Journal and the Louisville Times; and John Temple Graves, 2d, who writes a column that appears in a number of southern newspapers.

The slow progress made thus far by the repeal movement has not discouraged its backers. In Tennessee 15 legislatures have turned down bills to do away with the poll tax, but the demand for universal suffrage comes back stronger after every rebuff. The repeal drive has gained fresh momentum from President Roosevelt's outspoken condemnation of the poll tax as a prerequisite to voting and from a similar expression voted unanimously by 29 southern leaders who met recently at Atlanta under sponsorship of the Southern Policy Committee.

Until the eight backward States repeal their poll taxes they cannot fairly call their elections democratic. As long as the ballot is given to the planter and the banker but is denied to the hillbilly and the cotton-cropper, because they do not choose to let their children go hungry for the sake of voting, elections cannot express the popular will. But the new Jacksonian crusade promises to break through the poll-tax barrier against democracy. When it does, the South may have less occasion to be sensitive about shocking health conditions, inferior schools, child marriages, and notoriously lax labor legislation.

Senator M. M. Logan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEVERLY M. VINCENT

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1939

EDITORIAL FROM THE EDMONSON COUNTY NEWS OF OCTOBER 5, 1939

Mr. VINCENT of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I insert the following editorial from the Edmonson County News, of Brownsville, Ky., October 5, 1939:

While the death of United States Senator MARVEL MILLS LOGAN is a distinct loss to the State and Nation he has served so ably, it is here at his old home that his passing becomes a personal loss to every resident, for here he was born, spent his boyhood days, and fought his own way from obscurity to renown unconfined even to the United States. As Grand Sire of the International Order of Odd Fellows he became an international figure, while at the time of his death he was an outstanding member of the greatest lawmaking body in the universe. Had he but lived longer he would have attained even greater honors. A seat on the Supreme Bench had been forecast for the future.

Yet the real bigness of the man was best exemplified by his steadfast love for and loyalty to the place of his birth and his "homefolks." Though MILLS LOGAN had climbed to heights of human achievement, his great heart was always with the common people from whom he sprang. Always he was proud to proclaim the place of his birth and to praise the people of his home town and county.

Early in life he set his goal in this expression:

"I am of the great common people; what benefits them will benefit me; I pray to God that some day I will be able to do something for them."

That prayer was answered—answered because the promise to his Maker was faithfully performed.

MILLS LOGAN earned vast sums of money, yet he amassed no estate. Money to him was but a commodity to be exchanged for the well-being and happiness of others. The extent of his benevolences will never be known to man, yet there are those here, there, and everywhere who have been beneficiaries of his largess. Scores of young men aspiring to the Baptist ministry were enabled to attend a great theological seminary on the funds he supplied. His other charities were innumerable and unpublicized. To him charity extended beyond the realm of dollars and cents. He was charitable to the faults of all men and was charitable to those with whom he may have disagreed or may have "despitefully used him."

He was a devout Christian. His great delight was to teach the Word of God.

As a jurist he was the peer of the world's best talent. Law reports are filled with classics from his pen.

As a statesman he took top rank. In ability, appearance, and address he was perhaps the last of the type of men often described as the "Founding Fathers."

This is but a feeble attempt at a brief résumé of a life that words, though written by an adept biographer, could not adequately portray. Much more than herein written is contained in a sentence suggested to this writer by Mr. H. St. G. T. Carmichael, to whom Senator LOGAN had long been friend and counselor:

"He lived above reproach and died without an enemy."

The Neutrality Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL A. HATCH

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 18 (legislative day of Wednesday, October 4), 1939

ADDRESS OF HON. SAM G. BRATTON

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, recently at Albuquerque, in the State of New Mexico, before the Kiwanis convention a former distinguished Member of this body delivered an address which covers, in part, the pending issue being discussed in the Senate. I ask unanimous consent that the address delivered by former Senator Sam G. Bratton be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Clovis (N. Mex.) News-Journal of October 15, 1939]

"THE UNITED STATES CAN AND MUST KEEP OUT OF WAR," SAID S. G. BRATTON BEFORE KIWANIANS IN DUKE CITY

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—At the Southwest Kiwanis Convention held this past week in Albuquerque the Honorable Sam G. Bratton, judge of the United States Court of Appeals, delivered one of the most outstanding addresses of the convention. Because Judge Bratton is one of the leading citizens of New Mexico, and because he holds an influential position, it is believed that persons of this territory will read with keen interest the message he brought to the Kiwanians. For this reason, Judge Bratton's address is being printed here in its entirety. The address follows:)

World conditions are engaging the thoughtful attention of the American people more than they have during the past 20 years. The European situation is the almost universal subject of discussion in Congress, in the press, over the radio, on the platform, in conventions, and wherever a group is brought together. Accordingly it may not be inappropriate to canvass briefly and sketchily some features of these conditions, particularly the course we should pursue during the difficulties which beset civilization on every hand.

Our participation in the World War was not for the purpose of gaining territory or recovering reparations in dollars and dimes. We did not seek then, and we have not desired since, either to disrupt the territorial autonomy of other nations whether great or small, or to disturb their governmental status for our own gain, and we did not covet their wealth. We joined in that struggle in order to make the world safe for democracy. That was the sublime thought uppermost in our minds, and the high dominant motive which caused us to join with others in an effort to overthrow autocracy. But the events which have occurred during the intervening span of 20 years have bewildered us; and the kaleidoscopic panorama of events in different parts of the world during the past 4 or 5 years causes some to stand in confusion. There is basis for the belief that instead of resting upon a safe and enduring foundation, democracy is endangered and its path is blocked by ignorance and selfish abandonment of moral standards in international relations, and in covetous thirst for territorial expansion and enlargement of power. Wars are being waged on two continents, Europe and Asia. At no time in the past decade has the world been so racked with dissension, conflicts, and economic chaos. One factor in the equation which stands forth with disturbing clarity is that a titanic struggle of world-wide proportions is under way between two wholly different philosophies of government. That struggle is between democracy on one hand and totalitarianism on the other; and the two are so diametrically in opposition that never the twain shall be merged into one.

The very essence of democracy is protection of the individual citizen in the enjoyment of human rights; but the concept of the authoritarian states is the complete supremacy of the government and the absolute regimentation of the individual. There is no mystery about democracy. Almost without exception, it finds its source in revolution which had for its objectives national independence, freedom of human rights, and the perpetuity of free institutions. It is the direct outgrowth of a passionate belief that government can be created and maintained for the preservation and security of human rights. Representative government promotes and fosters ability, talent, initiative, freedom of thought, freedom of expression, right of peaceable assembly, and the privilege of advocating a cause regardless of how unpopular it may be with those in official authority or those in private life. Totalitarianism is the antithesis of all of these. It stifles, restrains, proscribes, and destroys all of these rights and privileges, and it sometimes proceeds in ways which shock right-thinking people throughout the civilized world. Many things which suit the purpose of a despotic power cannot abide in the pure atmosphere of political liberty and human freedom.

Certain major democracies of Europe have gone forward during recent years relying upon the good faith of solemn treaties, devoting themselves to the repair of their domestic affairs and making essential readjustments necessitated by the World War. But during these processes of democratic government their peoples have been free, contented, and happy.

On the other hand, one major authoritarian government in central Europe has pursued a diametrically contrary course. She has been restless and discontented ever since the war; and beginning about 5 years ago, and continuing with frequency since, treaty obligations have been disregarded, deliberate preparation for war has gone forward, and ruthless war is now being waged. It is not too much to say that respect for treaty obligations deteriorated during that time to an unprecented low level. In following that course and in bringing on the existing war she has enslaved her people and is exacting of them terrific burdens and loss of life, but that is the price exacted by governments dedicated to that philosophy. Every student of world affairs is thoroughly familiar with the facts in relation to the Austrian, the Czechoslovakian, and the Polish crises. Free men in all parts of the civilized world have stood in amazement at the lengths to which totalitarianism has gone. Covetous hands have been plunged in many directions. Helpless minorities have been victimized and extinguished. Their property has been confiscated, their governments destroyed, and they have been brought to a condition of servitude. Three great European nations are engulfed in war. It is being waged on land, in the air, on the sea, and beneath the sea. Its length, its destruction of life, and its devastation of property, are matters of speculation and conjecture. No one can forecast with any measure of certainty the course it may take, the area it may involve, the toll it may exact, or the conditions which will exist after its termination. We give thought to this question with the deepest concern. To this brief résumé of conditions in Europe must be added a scant word about the development in the Far East.

War is being waged on China. Territory and resources are the material objectives. One power in the Orient has declared her domination of all eastern Asia. She has announced that she will promulgate what may be called the Monroe Doctrine of the Orient and that she will enforce it. She has thrown overboard the treaty which guarantees the open-door policy in China—a policy which was promulgated by a distinguished Secretary of State of the United States almost forty years ago, at which time the now recalcitrant nation wholeheartedly and enthusiastically subscribed to the doctrine. In strict violation of that covenant, she has sought to restrict trade opportunities of the United States and other nations in China. These stern facts compel a candid realization of solemn truth that despite the idealism with which the democratic nations united in waging and winning the war, the rule of blind and self-seeking force has for the time being established itself in the control of human affairs in a substantial part of the civilized world.

And these tragic occurrences have caused some to wonder whether the basic policies which we have followed thus far in our national existence are adequate for our needs or have become outmoded and should be cast into the discard; and at the same time they have accentuated the solicitude of all for the security of the free institutions of our own Republic. Among nations as among individuals, trouble is far more easily caused than repaired. A cloudburst, a bolt of lightning, a cyclone, or an earthquake may cause more damage in the twinkle of an eye than can be repaired in days, weeks, or months. Indeed, any of these forces of nature may strew devastation in its path which is irreparable, but science and ingenuity meet and combat them without discouragement or loss of heart.

It is the earnest desire of the United States, through human enlightenment, human freedom, development of science and culture, and a spirit of toleration and mutual respect, to maintain and sustain amity and appeasement with all other nations. The cause of world peace, the best interests of democratic government, and of our own continued independence will not be furthered by our participation in the problems of other nations concerning their forms of government or other internal problems. We should decline to be drawn into questions or controversies of that kind. Neither will our continued freedom be advantaged by resort to economic boycotts in concert with other powers against nations that violate our concept of fair and humane conduct in their relations with each other. We should join moral forces with all nations for the betterment of mankind, but we should reject all suggestions of uniting our military or economic forces with those of any other nation

unless our own safety or integrity is imperiled. International conflict usually grows out of three factors. They are political—meaning the ambitious policies of government; economic—meaning loans, trade, and sales of munitions; and psychological—meaning pride, prejudice, or passion. These causes separately and collectively have caused rivers to run red with blood and battlefields to be whitened with bones. We genuinely disclaim each and all of them in our attitude toward other nations. We desire to mind our own business and are happy to have others do likewise. We cannot police the world and we have no intention of endeavoring to do so.

So far as we are concerned, the totalitarian states are privileged to exercise whatever form of government they wish and to which their peoples either subscribe or submit. But we insist that they accord us the same privilege without interference. We likewise demand with emphasis and determination that they refrain from exerting any effort, direct or indirect, to overthrow democratic government in the United States and substitute for it any ism emanating from a foreign source. We propose with grim determination to preserve and perpetuate inviolate democracy in the United States with its free institutions wholly regardless of the cost entailed or the sacrifice exacted.

Moved by these high purposes and noble objectives, the Congress passed and the President approved the so-called Neutrality Act of 1935. It provides that when the President shall declare by Executive proclamation that a state of war exists between or among two or more nations, it shall be unlawful to export arms, ammunition, or implements of war from any place in the United States to any port of such belligerent states, or to any neutral port for transshipment to or for the use of any belligerent country, and further that it shall be unlawful for any American vessel to transport arms, ammunition, or implements of war to any such port for such purposes. The act provides heavy sanctions for its violation. It will be noted that this statute only forbids the exportation or shipment of completed implements of war to belligerent states, but does not interdict the sale, shipment, or exportation of many kinds of uncompleted implements, as well as numerous types of general materials and supplies designed, intended, and essential to the prosecution of war. For instance, it is perfectly legal for Americans to sell and American ships to carry to belligerents all of the parts with which to assemble bombers or other types of planes, but the sale and shipment of the planes themselves is forbidden.

It is entirely permissible to sell and ship brass tubing or steel purchased for the sole purpose of manufacturing shells, but the sale and shipment of the shells themselves is forbidden. Many other similar illustrations could be given but they are wholly unnecessary. They are obvious. The danger of Americans selling to belligerent nations, or to private purchasers in belligerent nations all manner of materials and supplies known to be suited to and intended for use in the prosecution of a war, and of American ships carrying such materials and supplies is perfectly plain. Elaboration is not necessary to demonstrate that a belligerent nation will not stand idly by and permit American ships to transport and deliver enormous supplies of that kind to its adversary. It is manifest that if that policy continues during a stubborn war in Europe our ships will be stopped, searched, and cargoes confiscated, and perhaps serious infractions of the rights of Americans will ensue. So, the Congress was called into extraordinary session, and the President recommended that in lieu of this statute, appropriate legislation be enacted which will permit nations at war to purchase in the United States all kinds of materials and supplies, except munitions, for use in waging the conflict, but the purchase must be made here, payment must be made here, title must pass here, delivery must take place here, and shipment must be made in non-American vessels. Thus American vessels will not traverse danger zones ladened with materials known to be intended for war purposes, and thus the temptation will be diminished of belligerent nations stopping our vessels, searching them, seizing their cargoes, and perhaps going further with complicating eventualities.

The opportunity for all nations to come, make their purchases, and transport them, is equal despite our likes or dislikes, our agreements or disagreements with their respective positions in the war. True, one nation may be better able to take advantage of the opportunities extended under the act than another but these differences grow out of disparities in conditions over which the United States can have no control, and the right of the United States to enact such legislation without transgressing recognized principles of international law. One is to forbid in toto the sale or shipment of any materials or supplies for war purposes. Another is to permit sale and shipment under conditions and restrictions which are fair and impartial. And a third is to permit it without conditions, restrictions, or limitations. The bill also forbids the extension of credit to belligerents, or the floating of loans or sale of bonds by belligerents, and it authorizes the President to declare danger zones from time to time into which American ships cannot go, all of which is within the rights of the United States under international law, and will contribute much to our continued neutrality.

It is my considered belief that the repeal of the existing statute, and the enactment of legislation along the lines of the bill now being debated in the Senate will advantage our neutrality and will reduce the likelihood of our involvement in the conflict. You may disagree. The matter is one on which reasonable-minded, patriotic, and peace-loving American citizens differ widely and deeply. But there is one thing on which we stand united; one feature of the situation on which we do not differ. The United States can and must keep out of the European war. We may agree with one side and differ widely with the other respecting the questions over which the war is being waged. We may think one side is right and the other wrong. We may find ourselves in sympathy with the philosophy of government represented on one side and entirely in disagreement with that represented on the other. But that is not enough to suggest even remotely that we should become involved.

Despite all this there will be propaganda from many sources, of many kinds and types, some insidious and some otherwise, that it is our duty to enter the struggle for the purpose of saving democracy. Your task and mine is to be alert and to oppose all such efforts with every ounce of our strength. Bear steadily in mind that should we go abroad to save democracy, we must give it up in part here. We do not know what conditions will be at the end of a long war. The map of the world may be substantially changed. New conditions, new philosophies, and new elements of strength from different sources may present themselves. The greatest contribution that we can make to the world is to preserve unimpaired and intact democracy here in the United States, and present it as the kind of government best suited to personal liberty and human freedom. Though we may differ in respect of methods and details, let us unite firmly on that principle.

These alarming conditions in world affairs call for discussion as to whether our Army and Navy are reasonably adequate in strength for defense purposes. Those familiar with the facts realize full well that our Navy has been moded and geared with primary reference to the Pacific. Without going into details, the bald fact is that we have depended for a century and a half on one of the major democracies in Europe to mistress the Atlantic. But the time is at hand when we can no longer rely with safety upon any other nation for our own safety and protection in the Atlantic. We must rely upon ourselves. Our safety requires that the Navy be enlarged and conditioned to the point where it will be adequate for our own protection and defense in both oceans. We have been told by sources which seem to be authentic that a fleet reasonably adequate for that purpose would entail the expenditure of $4,000,000,000 or more. An outlay of that stupendous sum should not be undertaken without great deliberation and caution, but it is insignificant as a price for our national safety and security. And some enlargement of the Army seems equally expedient. Whether the program should be undertaken immediately and speedily or staggered over a period of years is a matter for due consideration. But it should be undertaken without undue delay.

In an effort to promote amity and appeasement, the United States has participated actively and sincerely in virtually all of the conferences held during the past century in the interest of world peace; and there is no basis for doubt concerning our willingness and desire to sit at future conference tables in earnest search for fair and reasonable formulas for preserving the peace of the world. Moreover, realizing that economic factors wield an important influence upon the relationships among nations, we have consistently and without interruption pursued a broad and fair and equitable policy toward all nations in respect of trade relations and trade balances—not a narrow, restricted, or unnatural policy. It will be recalled that time and time again the most-favored-nation provision has been inserted in our treaties, as well as other provisions evidencing our desire to avoid unfairness in trade relations with others. And, in addition, we have exerted an active effort at the inter-American conference held in Montevideo 5 years ago, at Buenos Aires 2 years ago, and at Lima in December of last year, to promote better understanding, better trade relations, and closer concert of action among the republics of the Western Hemisphere for the solution of their problems of common interest. A sobering realization of the stern situation is burned more deeply into the mind with one hurried look at a map showing the substantial part of the world in which there is no free press and where writers are denied the privilege of publicizing the facts. So much for world affairs as they relate themselves to free government, except to say that we do not stand alone in zealous and passionate dedication to the principles of democracy. Great Britain, France, Canada, Holland, Belgium, Switzerland, Australia, New Zealand, and the Scandinavian countries are on the roster. They have not capitulated. And that is an imposing and encouraging array of peoples who hold firmly to the belief that human rights and human freedom can best be attained and preserved for the present and future generations under the benign guidance of democratic government.

It would be a trespass upon your time to engage in an extended discussion of domestic affairs. It is enough to say that we must preserve a government of free institutions in which freedom of the press, freedom of speech, the right to trial by jury, the right to own property unless it is taken by due process of law and with reasonable compensation, the right to worship according to the dictates of our consciences, the right to develop our own initiatives, choose our own vocations, hew out our own careers, educate our sons and daughters, and enjoy a fair return upon our own industry, thrift, and frugality; and at the same time not trespass upon the rights of others or disregard the just requirements of society. The task may be fraught with difficulties, but that is no reason for an intelligent and patriotic citizenry seeking to evade it. If we take up where our forebears lay down, we must save democracy in this period of peril. The greatest need of the hour is clear and calm thinking and for Americans to rise to the height of the opportunity for self-government and effective leadership, both at home and abroad. The problem is not one of sectional discord or internal differences. It is one of a unified nation, triumphing over those forces which have for their objective the overthrow of democracy. It is one of making sure that our democratic impulses do not grow weaker under pressure of false doctrines or insidious

propaganda with ulterior ends in view, whether from within or without. It is one of keeping a unified vision upon the substance of institutional arrangements designed to preserve these attributes of freedom, and of being alert to detect any attempt to impair them. I have faith in the wisdom, fidelity, and fortitude of the American people. I confidently believe that in a manner kindred to that in which light meets and battles darkness the victory will be won and democracy will continue to be enshrined in the hearts of men.

Public Enemy No. 1

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYLE H. BOREN
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 18, 1939

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, international problems are of grave importance, perhaps first importance, but let us not forget that we have internal problems of great importance also. The motion-picture monopoly has become public enemy No. 1 in our program to stamp out economic crime.

The motion-picture industry is controlled by a small number of executives who pay themselves prodigious salaries.

On April 7 of this year, the newspapers throughout the country published lists of the highest paid executives in the United States which might well be considered the highest salaries in the world.

The highest compensation went to Louis B. Mayer, production director of Loew's Inc. He topped the list with the stupendous sum of $1,161,753 received from Loew's, and another $134,750 which he received from Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer Corporation, which is Loew's motion-picture-producing subsidiary.

In these times, when over 10,000,000 people cannot find jobs, when 8,000,000 families are continually facing starvation, and 11,000,000 more families are fighting poverty, it is sickening to learn that one man receives a salary greater than the President of the United States, plus the salaries of 96 Senators.

Treasury Department reports indicated that of the 63 salaries of $200,000 or more, 40 were paid by motion-picture companies. In justice it must be stated that about half of these 40 names included actors and actresses whose earning power is usually restricted to shorter periods of years than that of the executives. While still fabulous in terms of the ordinary man, Clark Gable, the highest paid actor reported, received $280,000. That sum represents about 25 percent of Mr. Mayer's salary.

At this point it might be well to debunk a few misconceptions concerning the widely publicized idea that all actors are well paid. An N. R. A. report shows that during 1933, 1,563 actors and actresses, whose rate of pay was not less than $150 per week, were employed in the production branch of the industry. Nevertheless, 25 percent of this group received less than $1,000, about 50 percent received less than $2,000, and about 75 percent received less than $5,000. The above sums are subject to a deduction of 10 percent agent's fee and do not include heavy wardrobe expenses required to secure a job.

The next highest salary paid in the United States went to Mr. J. M. Rubin, vice president of Loew's, who received the princely sum of $651,123. Fourth on the list was the president of the same company, Nicholas M. Schenck, who received $489,600.

These men draw more than the presidents of the Chase National Bank, American Telephone & Telegraph Co., General Electric, and General Motors put together.

In this connection, it is interesting to note that two stockholders of Loew's, Inc., recently brought suit charging that excessive salaries and bonuses had been paid to officers of the company.

Stockholders consider such compensation unwarranted. Diversion of such large sums from earnings on equities seem inexcusable.

Interesting comparisons can be made between salaries paid to film-company executives and the remuneration received by the leaders of other great American corporations.

The most recent figures that have come to my attention—and I suppose there may be later ones—indicate that in 1936 the executives in this industry paid themselves about 6 percent of the industry's net income. Leading industrial enterprises, including the two largest steel companies, the Du Pont Co., General Motors, the Standard Oil Co., and Woolworth, paid their top executives only one-fourth of 1 percent of their net incomes. In other words, the czars of the motion-picture industry exercise such control that they are able to pay themselves 24 times as much of the net income accruing to their companies as other leading industries pay to their executives.

Such a wide disparity in remuneration cannot be accounted for by the mere statement that the motion-picture industry is an art requiring the creative talents possessed by these executives. Frankly, most of them differ very little from the ordinary successful businessman. The vision which leads a producer to pioneer in the field of entertainment is not at all unlike the instinct which springs from any other successful executive who envisions a new process or product which receives wide public approval at the counter instead of at the box office.

Such utter disregard for the public and their own stockholders can only be perpetuated and perpetrated by callous disregard of their managerial responsibilities to their stockholders.

It is the first duty of the Congress to protect the public interest. The motion picture lobby and its puppets are honeycombing the Nation's Capitol and the capitols of the 48 States in an attempt to corrupt the churches, schools, and the Nation's public servants.

I earnestly request that the membership of the Congress give some thought to this problem during this period that the House is marking time on neutrality legislation. At the last session the Senate passed the Neely block-booking bill and we will have that bill before the House committee at the beginning of the regular session. A few of us have prepared, with your aid, to make a comprehensive measure out of the Neely bill. We plan to put more guts and teeth in it.

Today I urge you to look into this industry that has reached proportions comparable to a basic public utility and yet has rarely been of public service; rather has it been guilty of constant propagandizing of a vicious nature. And what is more, there have never been gangsters or bandits in any land or clime that have excelled their talent for robbing the American public. I point to the motion picture industry as the economic public enemy No. 1 of America. I invite your thoughtful analysis to careful comparison of the methods of the Al Capones, the Pretty Boy Floyds, the Dutch Schultzs, and so forth, to those of the movie moguls, the Louis B. Mayers, the Warner Brothers, the Rubins, the Schencks, and so forth.

Salary range of some of the first- and second-class actors and first-, second-, and third-class executives:

Clark Gable, Metro	$289,000
Fred Astaire, R. K. O	271,711
Joe E. Brown, D. L. Loew	267,500
Hunt Stromberg, Metro	265,500
Charles Boyer, Wanger	265,191
Darryl Zanuck, Twentieth Century	260,000
Ernest Lubitsch, Paramount	260,833
Claudette Colbert, Paramount	248,055
William Powell, Metro	246,110
Bob Burns, Metro	242,856
Gary Cooper, Paramount	238,416
Jeannette MacDonald, Metro	238,299
Robert Montgomery, Metro	243,250
Warner Baxter, Twentieth Century	225,961
George Raft, Paramount	219,399
Sonja Heinie, Twentieth Century	210,729
Adolph Zukor, Paramount	210,479
Kay Francis, Warner Bros	209,100
Hal Wallis, Warner Bros	208,083
Wesley Ruggles, Paramount	203,051
David O. Selznick, Selznick, Inc	203,500
Katharine Hepburn, R. K. O	203,751
Herbert Marshall, R. K. O	198,166
Samuel J. Briskin, R. K. O	197,333
Wallace Beery, Metro	190,000

Ginger Rogers, R. K. O.	$184,776
William LeBaron, Paramount	183,929
W. S. Van Dyke, Metro	178,816
Dick Powell, Warner Bros.	176,249
Robert Taylor (listed as Arlington Brugh), Metro	173,362
Jack Conway, Metro	168,621
Frank Lloyd, Paramount	166,208
B. H. Hyman, Metro	165,456
Jack Oakie, R. K. O.	164,416
Carole Lombard, Paramount (also $150,000 from Selznick)	164,000
Sam Goldwyn, S. G., Inc. (also $26,000 as president of United Artists)	163,000
Roy del Ruth, Twentieth Century	162,144
Victor Fleming, Metro	160,000
R. Z. Leonard, Metro	160,000
Clarence Brown, Metro	159,000
E. J. Mannix, Metro	157,500
Sam Katz, Metro	156,000
Louis Ligon, Metro	153,250
Henry King, Twentieth Century	157,444
S. Eckman, Jr., London office of Loew's	154,302
Mervyn Le Roy, Warner	153,517
Myrna Loy, Metro	152,583
Ronald Colman, Selznick	150,000
Eddie Cantor, Twentieth Century	150,000
Walter Winchell, Twentieth Century	150,000
Loretta Young, Twentieth Century	150,000
Preston Sturges, Hollywood writer, Paramount	134,500
Joel McCrea, Goldwyn	106,500
Shirley Temple, Twentieth Century (and her mother received $52,166)	110,256

Numerous others are listed at salaries in excess of that paid the President of the United States, but the foregoing are enough to indicate what occurred in Big Eight circles in 1937.

Importation of Fox and Mink Pelts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSHUA L. JOHNS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1939

JOINT RESOLUTION OF THE WISCONSIN LEGISLATURE

Mr. JOHNS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin:

Joint resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to protect the domestic fox- and fur-raising industry

Whereas in Wisconsin and in the United States there has been developed a domestic fox- and fur-raising industry in the last quarter of a century which constitutes a national business amounting to millions of dollars and which employs large numbers of people; and

Whereas the fox- and mink-pelt production of this country has been primarily sold to the people of our country in the past with only relatively small foreign imports of fox and mink pelts; and

Whereas foreign countries, which produce approximately five times the number of fox and mink pelts produced in this country, have to a very large extent lost their markets on account of the European war; and

Whereas foreign countries are now making arrangements to dump this vast world supply of fox and mink pelts onto the United States market, which can only reasonably absorb our own production; and

Whereas the dumping of this vast quantity of foreign fox and mink pelts onto the United States market will practically ruin the majority of the fox and mink farmers of our country; and

Whereas there is no reason why fox and mink raisers of our country should have their industry destroyed by the dumping of foreign pelts: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the assembly (the senate concurring), That this legislature strongly urges the President of the United States and the proper Federal agencies to set up a quota on importing fox and mink pelts not to exceed the last 3 years average of fox and mink pelts shipped into this country; be it further

Resolved, That restrictions be placed on processed fox and mink pelts which would prohibit the flooding of the American market with these products and thus ruin our domestic fur industry; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, the Tariff Commission, and to all Members of Congress from Wisconsin.

Neutrality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1939

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, the vital question of neutrality which is now presented to the Congress is one of the most important subjects, if not the most important matter of legislations, which has ever been presented to this great lawmaking body. The people of the United States of America are not unmindful of the great importance of this subject. May I say, in passing, the young men and women of our Nation are taking a deep interest in the discussion of our foreign policy in the Congress, because upon them would fall the very great burden of the active participation in a war in the event we should become so involved, and they have the right to that very great interest because it becomes entirely personal; to them would fall the responsibility of the active engagement in the war, and to them, and to their posterity, would fall the very great responsibility of the payment of the staggering cost of the war.

I do not think I misjudge the temper of the average American citizen in this critical period, because I have received untold hundreds of communications from the people of my good district, and from various points in the State of Indiana, on this vital subject and, without exception, every communication stated in unmistakable language, "You must keep our country out of this war." These letters came from the classes and the masses, from the farmers, the laborers, the industrialists, the professions, the mothers and the fathers; all of them truly American and thoroughly patriotic, with the love of our country foremost in their thoughts, but they have the vision of the tragedies of the late World War—they think of the terrible disabilities suffered by my own comrades in that titanic struggle and they seek to avoid any repetition of it in this European crisis; these people, and I speak of all of the people in my district in the State of Indiana, have the vision of their own boy, and the neighbor's boy, who was called to the colors in 1917–18, and who did not come back home after that war was over—because his grave is in France. And these people are thinking of their visits in the various veterans hospitals, throughout this Nation, where they see those boys, once keen, alert, and courageous, who are now suffering the pain and torture of 10,000 deaths—some of them are blind, some are limbless and armless, some of them practically destroyed by that most terrible disability of sleeping sickness—the shock from high explosives, in war, has wrecked their bodies and their lives—and they are thinking of war and its toll and of its destruction.

The people do not want war—they want peace. The people do not want disabled veterans of another war among us—they want strong young men who are able to engage in the arts and trades of civil life and who will aid in the inevitable progress of our Nation throughout the future years. The people of our Nation shudder, too, when they recall that we supported an army of 4,791,172 in the last war. Many of my comrades in that war are now Members of this body, and each one of us is proud of the fact that he was one of that great body of men who followed our flag in that conflict. But the people ponder, and we are saddened, when we realize that from that great number of men 173,274 were lost in action and died from other causes; 205,690 of our comrades were wounded; from exposure, poisonous gases, and other terrifying causes untold thousands of my comrades are suffering disabilities today, the peak of which will not be reached for many years hence. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, the people throughout the length and the breadth of this Nation

are vitally concerned respecting the action which may be taken in the Congress on the pending bill, which relates to our neutrality.

May I say that the staggering loss of life and the disabilities suffered by my comrades are the greatest loss our Nation suffered from the World War, yet, may I add that there has been paid out of the Federal Treasury since the close of the World War the staggering and incomprehensible sum of $7,572,621,751.75 to veterans of that war, their widows, and orphans. The people know that war is a very serious subject. The people are speaking to their Representatives in the Congress, and they are urging us "to keep our country out of this European war."

We must not take that step which will lead our Nation into this war in which we have no concern. We must keep out of it. We must think of America first. We owe a duty to every young man of military age in this Nation to keep our country at peace; we owe a duty to every citizen of these United States, who would be directly involved in case of our participation in this foreign war, to keep free from any involvement in this European conflict; we owe a sacred duty to those comrades of the World War who sleep today, but whose memory is deeply recorded in our hearts, to keep our own country free from any entanglement in this tragic war which, if we should become involved in it, would claim its added toll from the ranks of our boys who have the right to live, to make progress, and the right to expect that you and I will protect them as Americans.

Mr. Speaker, may I say to you and to the Members of this honorable body that I will never cast my vote to take that step which will tend, in any way, to lead our country into this European war. The memories of the last war and the tragedies involved in it are sacred to me. We must think of America first.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in and as a part of my remarks a very splendid editorial written by Mr. Leo Kinman, editor of the Shelbyville Republican, of Shelbyville, Ind., and which appeared in the edition of October 17, 1939, on the subject of American neutrality. In passing, may I say that the sound policy announced in the following editorial should be carefully considered by the Members of the House in determining our policy of neutrality. The editorial follows:

AMERICAN NEUTRALITY

On whatever action is taken by the Congress in the ticklish neutrality situation will depend the question of whether or not America goes to war.

The unbiased observer will readily admit that the present Neutrality Act has its draw-backs. Lacking elasticity, it seriously hampers American operations as a world power. On the other hand, a strict adherence to its provisions would be more desirable than involvement in the European fiasco. Always remembering that a large "if" looms even in the policy of extreme isolation.

There is one course, however, that the Congress must not take. It must not create a new neutrality law, the application of which is left to the discretion of the President. So far as the country as a whole has been able to see, the President has had no consistent policy (other than a rather constant attack on business generally) since his induction into the office.

Moreover, he has made repeated statements toward Germany which are not often used by the head of one nation toward another people with which his country was at the moment at peace (viz: The American frontier is on the Rhine). Such statements lack statesmanship. This country cannot afford to risk its future as the last stronghold of democracy to one who so casually makes such statements.

If the Congress changes the neutrality law, let it go slowly. Let it consider carefully that a cash-and-carry plan can easily become a credit-and-carry plan, and that the involvement of American money abroad becomes a major excuse for intervention with arms; let it be guided by the sordid history of the last World War when American idealism was wrecked on the dismal reef of European statesmen's realism, and the aftermath when Uncle Sam, the benefactor of the world, became Uncle Shylock in his effort to collect a fraction of the sum due him.

Above all, let the Congress stay in session and administer its own neutrality law. In its Members alone is vested the will of the people.

Then and Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERTRAND W. GEARHART

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1939

ADDRESS OF GEN. HUGH S. JOHNSON

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered before the Twenty-first Annual National Convention of the American Legion, at the Auditorium Theater, Chicago, Ill., Wednesday morning, September 27, 1939, by Gen. Hugh S. Johnson:

Commander Chadwick, distinguished guests, my comrades of the American Legion, I am proud to be invited here by my comrades—ex-makers of the world safe for democracy; ex-warriors to end all war. Proud, but timid, too. I'm the guy who ballyhooed just under 2,000,000 of you into uniform to fight the holy war. It was my job to play that tune. Please don't shoot the professor.

Well, we all have an alibi. Twenty-two years ago and we were very young. We have learned a lot—or have we?

It was a magnificent adventure. We flocked to the colors, "to grind every selfish dominion into dust." No war of conquest. We sought no territory—not a dollar of tribute. We were not fighting the German people—only their dictatorial leaders. The only difference between Hitler and the Kaiser is the droop of the drawers and the cut of the mustache. We were out to abolish all former diplomatic games of seven-toed-Pete with deuces wild. Our boys died for "open covenants openly arrived at" to abolish the enslavement of peoples to either conquerors or domestic tyrants. We were for self-determination—no more international shotgun weddings.

With smiles and smirks our associates accepted our childish enthusiasms—while they took our money and our lives. We were the world's prize fat boy with the bag of candy among a horde of hungry urchins. We have been so ever since. As Will Rogers used to say, "We never lost a war or won a conference." And with Tex Guinan's greeting, I salute us all, "Hello, suckers!"

Who won the war—beside the M. P.'s? We never said we did. But nobody can ever deny this: Without us, the Allies were licked. Or this: With no thought of our own present or future interest, we denied no Allied request. We gave everything. We omitted nothing. No nation ever went so trustingly and generously to battle for the Lord.

When the Allies were busted, we simply opened our Treasury. Though they at first scorned our arms when the pinch came, at their desperate prayer we sent them "men in their undershirts"—boys untrained and unready—until we had more men in France than the British ever had. When they were starving, we rationed our people to give them food, without which, as they have admitted, they never could have held. When submarines wrecked their shipping, we almost ruined ourselves to replace it. When their raw materials failed, we supplied them fully. We withheld nothing. We did all this in time to turn certain defeat into accomplished victory.

What did it cost us? In dollars—forty billions. Skip it. Such boxcar figures reach so far toward the infinite that we can't understand. We paid a good half of the whole Allied cost of the war. Yet it was astronomical chicken feed to the real cost—10 years of terrible depression, $200,000,000,000 of lost income and production.

It has loaded our future with debt and taxes that chain our young generations like slaves to the cars of a Roman galley. You and I received this bright heritage of America from our fathers unmortgaged and free—a place where every man in the sweat of his labor could earn a reasonable living. That's the way we got it. We gambled it for Europe. We are passing along a wreck of it to our children. Rich or poor, they must pay 20 percent of all they make for our blunder, and the field of opportunity has been reduced one-third. That's what we paid for our last blunder, and we are not through paying yet.

What did we get for that deadly price? We were told we were going to get "international decency." Boy, look at the damn thing!

Of material things—territory and tribute—we got just what we asked—precisely nothing. We were fighting for treasures of the heart.

"Open covenants openly arrived at?" At the very moment that we marched secret treaties had promised to deliver conquered nations captive.

"No conquests?" Our associates partitioned the world. "No tributes?" Under the guise of fantastical "reparations" tributes

enslaving generations and paralyzing the trade of the world were laid upon the conquered.

"War to end war?" The seeds were then sown of the red horror that now threatens the world.

"A world safe for democracy?" Except here and in a very few places in this hemisphere democracy is dead.

Not a vestige of our aims remains to reward us for all our sacrifice. We were bamboozled in the beginning and defrauded in the end. Faith in the promises of nations seems vanished from the earth. No pot can call any kettle black. Poland and Czechoslovakia will as bitterly accuse Britain and France of double-crossing and running out as they will accuse Germany and Russia. They two-timed us on the debts and threw us a curve on the post-war peace pacts—especially in Manchuria. Nice people! Every principle for which we went to war is a mouthful of dust and burned-out ashes.

Well, have we learned anything? I am not so sure. Nobody wants war; but we hear that we can't keep out, can't avoid doing it all over again with the same associates. The Book of Proverbs says: "As a dog returneth to its vomit, so doth a fool to his folly." Venture the welfare of this peaceful, honest, square-shooting people again into that welching, double-crossing betrayal. It sounds absurd and impossible. But are we surely foolproof against our own folly?

Who says we can't keep out if we want to—and why? This fatalistic dogmatic opinion is almost as dangerous as an outright demand to get in. It relieves our very Government of effort to the utmost to keep us out to the end, for, if it be true that we can't keep out anyway, how can anybody be blamed for getting us in tomorrow, or next month, or next year? Indeed, as professional soldiers, we know that if it were certain truth that we could not keep out in the end, it would be better to get in now. It would be better to gear the tremendous engine of destruction of an armed and mobilized America to its highest efficiency beginning immediately.

But we don't need to make a second fool's sacrifice. We can keep out. As Morton Downey says—England and France have. The argument is that, with the British Navy and the French Army defeated or weakened, we will be the next victim. That doesn't add up to make sense. If the war should stop tomorrow or with any outcome foreseeable in the next 2 years, we should still have the British and French Empires between us and the brutalitarian states. On the other hand, if the belligerents are fools enough to fight it out to a finish, both will be so exhausted that neither would dare take us on for a generation.

Apart from the utter destruction of long-drawn-out modern war is the fact that even conquering nations cannot spread themselves too thin or digest too much. Every one of Hitler's recent conquests have weakened him by presenting problems of territorial organization and the digestion of rebellious and alien peoples. Even in his joint venture with Russia he has simply gone to bed with another murderer. Neither of those political gorillas dares to go to sleep with his thumb in the other guy's mouth. Even a victorious Hitler can't straddle the Atlantic.

No; the war in Europe reduces the danger to the Americas. It is absurd to say we can't keep out. And yet it would be equally absurd to say, "We can't get in."

In one set of circumstances we can be drawn in. Nations have affronted us only when they thought we were weak or wouldn't fight. There is one absolute necessity in keeping out. We must become so strong in the air, on the sea, and the land that no nation dare attack us in this hemisphere.

It is a fashion to say that air force has dwindled our bulwarks of thousands of miles of sea water. That is plain nonsense. We are exposed to greater dangers of raid, but as long as those oceans remain, and we command the seas and adequately prepare on land, no nations can threaten us with armies. It is armies alone that can destroy nations.

The bulwarks are there, and we can defend them. But they must be armed and manned. We have not done that yet. Our Navy is as strong as it was in 1918. But the country does not know the half of the pitiful state of the armament and equipment of our Army. It has almost no modern equipment and no reserves. It is in no sense ready to keep out of war.

This is alarming. Here in the Americas are prizes richer for busted piratical nations than any galleon that ever sailed the Spanish Main. We can defend them. But we must prepare to defend them, and we are not prepared. Why haven't we done so?

That takes us right back to the argument that we can't keep out of this war because we must keep the British Navy and French Army between us and the dictators. In other words, we depend in part on them to defend the Americas and so have remained weak ourselves.

But, in this double-crossing, treaty-breaking world, how can we rely on any nation to defend our interests—even Britain and France? What happened to our reliance on them to support the highest ideals for which you fought twenty-odd years ago?

Every promise stands repudiated or broken. Czechoslovakia and Poland relied on them. Where are those nations now? In this treacherous modern world we can't stake our country in reliance on anybody but the strength of our own right arm and the unity and common purpose of our own people—armed and prepared not merely to keep America out of war but to keep war out of the Americas.

The argument that we can't keep out says that we must get in to destroy dictatorships. We are a democracy—almost the last one left. If we get in there would be more dictatorships than democracies on our side. One thing is certain sure, if we take arms in this war, good-bye democracy here—Kathleen Mavourneen—"it may be for years and it may be forever."

Look at our neighbor, Canada, today. Magna Carta is in the ashcan, and the Bill of Rights is out the window. You have to do that in war today. We did some of it in 1918. But Woodrow Wilson so hated centralized power that he gave up most of his war powers the day after the armistice. This administration also has had emergency powers. So far as I can recall, it never willingly gave up one. On the contrary, its policy has been constantly increased centralization of power, not merely in a Federal Government but in a Federal Governor. If we go to war we must not lose our democracy, but it is a fair bet that George Washington wouldn't be able to recognize it at the end. First, to hear that to keep out of war we must get into it. This argument is equally absurd—to keep our democracy we must give it up. Are we going "hay wire" on any such cockeyed, muddy thinking as that?

There is an even worse threat to democracy here. We entered the World War with trifling debt and taxes. We have multiplied that debt 40 times, and increased taxes to the breaking point. It is that which has hindered our prosperity and made living hard. If we go into a new war, we will double those already unbearable burdens—or worse. Neither our political nor our economic systems can stand the shock. Governments and property rights only exist so that people can work in safety. When any such systems become so hard to bear that people can't stand them—they go down and they should go down. Signing a declaration in this war will be signing a death sentence to democracy, and to everything that we have known and loved as American.

We shall find our way through. We shall, because we will stick to the fundamental principles of Americanism that made this country great. We will retain our forms of democratic government. We will keep out of European quarrels and entanglements. We will defend our own and remain strong enough to do so. Treating both sides at war with cold impartiality, we will rely on nobody but ourselves.

We want the world to know that while we bitterly deplore the destruction of everything we sacrificed and fought for in 1918, we recognize that both sides were in part guilty of that destruction. We hold it against neither. But that experience left us somewhat like the mouse in the cheese-baited trap. We don't want any more cheese.

They must fight their own battles, with this single warning: If they bring that fight westward to threaten us on own shores, we shall rise, as we rose in 1918, with all the power and the majesty of the strongest nation on earth to send them howling home.

Senator M. M. Logan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEVERLY M. VINCENT

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1939

FUNERAL ADDRESS BY JOHN A. LOGAN, AT BROWNSVILLE, KY.

Mr. VINCENT of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I insert the following funeral address of John A. Logan, at Brownsville, Ky.:

Friends, neighbors, and countrymen, on a bleak January day in 1874, there was born in a log cabin, nestling at the foot of this hill, a boy child, delicate in health. He exhibited extraordinary talent, and the divine spark of genius was apparent at an extremely early age. His fame spread rapidly, and before he was out of his teens he had distinguished himself as a scholar and as a teacher. His reputation at this early age had already encompassed his home county and was rapidly spreading in the adjoining counties. He was generally regarded as a paragon of wisdom and virtue by his home people. No such genius could long be encompassed by the confines that bounded the little county of Edmonson. He soon heard the siren call of fame from the outside world. He answered that call.

Honors and distinctions were heaped upon him one after another. He was called to fill many different positions of public trust and confidence, and no one will say that he did not fill each of the positions well. From school teacher, examiner of teachers, county chairman of the Democratic Party, county attorney of Edmonson, his native county, first assistant attorney general and later attorney general of Kentucky, chief justice of the court of appeals, Kentucky's highest court, he was elected to the United States Senate. These were but a few of the honorable positions he held.

If he had held each position to which he was chosen to its termination, it would have required more than 40 years of continuous service without a day of rest. But through it all he found time to teach a Sunday school class every Sunday for more than 30 years without missing a single Sunday.

He also found time to serve the Independent Order of the Odd Fellows in every capacity and office within the gift of this great order, including that of grand sire of the world.

He made public addresses in every county in Kentucky, in nearly every State in the Union, and in many foreign countries.

He practiced law in all the courts of the Nation from that of the justice of peace to the Supreme Court of the United States. It has been truthfully said that the work he did would have been sufficient to keep an ordinary man employed for hundreds of years, and yet he found time to greet every man, no matter how humble, and shake his hand and give him a word of cheer. He found time to worship his God and teach His sacred word for over a third of a century, and through it all he never lost the common touch.

On every suitable occasion and in every land, he praised the county of his birth—his county and your county—and never failed to praise the people whom he so dearly loved, honored, and respected. Your fame and virtues he has extolled from a thousand platforms, and on numberless occasions both public and private. The greatest tribute he has ever paid, and the tenderest testimony he could give to you and his county, showing the love and affection in his gentle and noble heart, was his request at the end of his labor that he be brought to rest with you until the coming of the Lord; that he thereby might be permitted to arise and meet his Saviour face to face, and side by side with you. We have brought him home—home to you.

The world has been the recipient of his wisdom and counsel. The wealth of the Nation was at his command, yet it could not tempt him from his faith in honesty and Christianity, which is the common faith of his native people. His philosophy, belief in Christianity, and everyday honesty, which all of you hold in common with him, is your greatest heritage, and was the greatest factor in promoting and raising him to the pinnacle of distinction and glory to which he arose.

Here we leave him in his glory, but we leave him not alone. The love and respect of his countrymen and his people will hover over him to keep him company in his dreamless sleep. Here he will rest until "the Master of all good workmen shall set him to work anew."

First Prayer Delivered in Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. HOUSTON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1939

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include what is purported to have been the first prayer ever delivered in the National Congress, uttered in December 1777:

O Lord, our Heavenly Father, high and mighty King of Kings and Lord of Lords, who dost from Thy throne behold all the dwellers on earth and reignest with power supreme and uncontrolled over all the kingdoms, empires, and governments, look down in mercy, we beseech Thee, on these American States, who have fled to Thee from the rod of the oppresser and thrown themselves on Thy gracious protection, desiring henceforth to be dependent only on Thee; to Thee they have appealed for the righteousness of their cause; to Thee do they now look up for that countenance and support of which Thou alone canst give; take them, therefore, Heavenly Father, under Thy nurturing care; give them wisdom in council and valor in the field; defeat the malicious designs of our cruel adversaries; convince them of the unrighteousness of their cause; and, if they persist in their sanguinary purpose, let the voice of Thy own unerring justice, sounding in their heart, constrain them to drop the weapons of war from their hands in the day of battle.

Be Thou present, O God of Wisdom, and direct the councils of this honorable Assembly; enable them to settle things on the best and surest foundation, that the scene of blood may be speedily closed; that order, harmony, and peace may be effectually restored and truth and justice, religion and piety prevail and flourish among Thy people. Preserve the health of their bodies and vigor of their minds; shower down on them, and the millions they here represent such temporal blessings as Thou seest expedient for them in this world, and crown them with everlasting glory in the world to come. All this we ask in the name and through the merits of Jesus Christ, Thy Son, our Saviour. Amen.

The American Merchant Marine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSIAH W. BAILEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 19 (legislative day of Wednesday, October 4), 1939

ADDRESS BY ADMIRAL LAND

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I offer for publication in the Appendix of the RECORD a timely and important address delivered by Rear Admiral Emory S. Land, Chairman of the United States Maritime Commission, at the American merchant marine conference, at the Hotel Waldorf Astoria, New York, on October 10, 1939.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The circumstances under which we meet this year are overcast by doubts and dangers. We cannot view even the immediate future with any degree of certainty.

A large part of the world has again succumbed to the convulsion of war. The ultimate bearing this conflict may have upon our country cannot now be measured.

Some of our fellow citizens see civilization about to be consumed in fires of its own kindling. Others, and we hope they are right, see the horizon less darkly. It is my counsel to you that whatever happens we be prepared to meet it; that we meet it confidently and with a purpose inspired by the knowledge that we in America can tip the scales toward peace, justice, and the perpetuation of the best of political systems yet devised by man.

The industry with which we at this meeting are immediately concerned is the first to feel the pressures of the conflict. As time goes on those pressures increase, and, in my opinion, it is of vital interest to our country that our foreign trade and merchant shipping be not squeezed to death by our own hands.

As most of you know, the Maritime Commission was charged by the Congress, upon the Commission's creation in 1936, with the responsibility of returning the American merchant fleet to its proper place upon the seas. In this there was a double purpose. First, that what we may call the arts of peace might be stimulated and more soundly developed through the instrument of a stronger merchant marine; second, that our Navy be provided with a merchant fleet suitable for its needs in times of emergency.

The Maritime Commission adopted a plan to accomplish the purposes of the Congress in a systematic and orderly manner. The keystone was a construction program designed to provide replacements and such additions as might be necessary in a merchant fleet that had declined to such an extent that we stood at the very bottom of the list of the six principal maritime nations in respect to ships with a speed of 12 knots or less. We were next to the bottom among those maritime nations in respect to the advanced age of our tonnage involved in foreign trade.

At the beginning of the World War in 1914 we had scarcely any merchant marine in foreign trade. We were wholly dependent upon services provided by foreign-flag ships. Consequently our shippers, which, of course, included farmers as well as manufacturers, were at the mercy of a freight-rate structure over which we had no control whatsoever. I think most of you recall that little mercy was shown. Our shortcomings at that time cost us dearly. But it was a lesson we had to be taught.

Today, I am happy to say, we have the makings of a fine and substantial merchant fleet into which new life, new energy, and, I think, new enterprise, has been injected during the past 2 years.

During those 2 years the Maritime Commission has ordered for itself or in conjunction with private operators 127 ships, of which 22 have already been launched. Those upon which trials have been held have proved to be the most efficient of any of their types in the world, particularly from the point of view of economical operation. Great strides have been made in engineering and designing merchant ships. The Commission has worked out and placed on the shipways of the country several standard types of cargo vessels. Such a system effects substantial economies in design and construction, and in case of emergency it will not be necessary to lose weeks or months in working out ship designs.

As the months have passed, increasing interest on the part of private operators has been shown in connection with our new vessels. Inquiries and discussions indicate beyond any doubt that given anything like normal trade conditions virtually all of the vessels being built for the Commission's account would be acquired by private operators.

In recent weeks our construction program has been accelerated, but not increased, in point of view of the number of ships it was planned to build. Despite reports to the contrary, our normal program and now our accelerated program are being handled satisfactorily either with existing shipyard facilities or with such additions as private capital has indicated that it is prepared to finance.

Reports that the Commission was preparing to rehabilitate old shipyards or establish new ones are contradicted by the fact that we have neither the authority nor the funds for such purposes. And because orders have already been placed under the accelerated program, the Commission does not at this time intend to go into the market for additional construction.

So great are the problems faced today by our merchant marine that I decline to predict. I can say only that the Commission does not contemplate cancelation of any orders already placed for new ships. In that connection there are two points to be borne in mind; first, as I suggested a moment ago, the power and efficiency of a navy are minimized if not lost without fast and able merchant vessels. These are the ships which feed, fuel, and, to an important extent, house the navy in times of emergency, as well as carrying to our shores the strategic war materials necessary to national defense. The second point involves the future insofar as the necessity is likely to arise for extraordinary merchant services following upon the cessation of war. The extent of that need no one can say. We feel it may be great, for that would indicate that the pursuits of peace have not been wholly destroyed by the effects of war.

I have spoken of uncertainties, particularly in connection with the future. They are just as great as applied to the present with which we must be principally concerned at this time. We are presented with a possibility of legislation by the Congress, which, in effect, may virtually abolish the carriage of foreign trade in American-flag ships throughout the world.

There is reason to believe that our foreign trade may increase substantially, but by that I do not mean into the immediate belligerent areas. The merchant ships of the warring nations are being pressed into services primarily of a military nature. Sailing schedules have been interrupted and in some cases routes have been virtually abandoned. And this in areas remote from the actual scene of conflict.

It seems to me that here is an opportunity, without in any way endangering the safety of our Nation, to improve and to expand our trade relations with distant countries. But such expansion would be impossible were we to be deprived of the merchant ships to carry cargoes which such undertakings would involve.

Again, all the indices and business charts seem to point to a continuance and improvement in our domestic situation. That means there will be an increasing demand for raw materials within those industries, and there are many, which depend upon the products of other nations for their operation. Were we to abandon our fleet and again become dependent upon the speculative ventures of foreign-flag operators, much of the benefit to be derived from this expanding domestic situation would be lost.

During the first half of this year our export trade amounted to slightly less than a billion and a half dollars, and our imports for the same period to something in excess of a billion. These figures indicate that our foreign trade is still above the preceding 5-year average, and taking it on a quantity basis about 52 percent of our various export items showed increases over 1938, as did 71 percent of our import items.

This situation is one which is, of course, reflected in the balance sheets of our ocean carriers—our merchant fleet. A continuance of this trend would mean, I am sure, increasing share in this trade for vessels flying the American flag. And it is important to remember that revenues of the principal American-flag operators in foreign trade need not be increased unreasonably to reduce very substantially the amount of operating subsidies paid by the Government. These are now running substantially less than $18,000,000 a year against former payments of as much as $26,000,000 and $27,000,000 annually.

What we have gained and what we might justifiably hope to gain in the near future would be lost, and much of it perhaps irretrievably lost, were our merchant fleet to be taken off the seas.

With no attempt to criticize legislation now pending which carries this threat, it seems to me that there are a few salient facts which should be known and understood by those who may not be fully informed about our merchant marine.

Should this legislation be passed containing a prohibition against entrance of American-flag ships into all ports of belligerent nations, it would mean simply that American ships could no longer, for instance, carry on our trade at such ports as those of Australia, New Zealand, the Union of South Africa, Canada, British crown colonies and possessions, as well as those of France and Germany. Many of these ports—a substantial majority even—are far from the scenes of actual warfare.

Prudence alone, it seems to me, would exert considerable influence against carrying on traffic in areas of primary danger. That is not to say, of course, that danger zones where peril may be great should not be designated and American ships prohibited entrance into them.

Extending such a prohibition to the remote parts of belligerent nations would affect directly more than a score of American ship companies operating over 200 vessels of better than a million gross tons. This, I might add, is fully two-thirds of our existing merchant fleet in foreign trade.

The effect would be severe and widespread. The livelihood of several hundred thousand people and their dependents would be jeopardized, as well as investments of several hundred million dollars. Trade routes under development which have been considered by the Congress essential to the welfare of our economy and of our national defense would no longer be served. We would again become dependent upon ships flying flags other than our own.

The potentialities attendant upon virtual abolition of our fleet in foreign service seems to me of much more than incidental or minor importance in the whole problem the Congress is now discussing. The ultimate effect of withdrawing our ships from the seas upon our economy and upon our trade relations throughout the world can only be imagined at this time. But I am convinced that it would involve a sacrifice of very grave proportions. The desirability of taking such a crucial step at this time is the problem which the Congress in its wisdom must resolve.

Should it be decided that so great a part of our merchant fleet suspend its present operations in areas remote from the actual belligerent waters, the question arises as to what disposition shall be made of these vessels. At the moment it appears that many of them would have to be tied up and carried in idle status pending future developments. There have been reports that we might allow disposal of large numbers of these ships to foreign nations. No such plan is being considered. In that connection it is well to understand, and I repeat, that a merchant fleet is of vital necessity to an efficient navy.

It is to be hoped that whatever is done will be done without haste and with all the facts before the public, that all may be guided to a sound and dispassionate judgment in so important a matter as the future of our foreign trade and the ships which we hope may carry more and more and more of it to the ports of the world.

Trade With Latin America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 19 (legislative day of Wednesday, October 4), 1939

EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON POST

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Washington Post of the issue of October 13, 1939, under the heading "Too Great Expectations." The editorial has to do with Latin American trade.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post of October 13, 1939]

TOO GREAT EXPECTATIONS

In a letter to James A. Farrell, chairman of the board, National Foreign Trade Council, Jesse H. Jones points out that "trade balances necessarily control foreign commerce, credit can help temporarily, but the only permanent solution is real trade where we buy as well as sell. * * * During the past several years," he adds, "the Government has found it necessary to lend to business of almost every character, and it can continue to assist foreign trade in a modest way principally through loans to private business dealing in foreign trade."

Mr. Jones' wise observations apply with especial force to our trade with Latin America, and carry an implied warning against anticipation of any spectacular increase in that trade.

At first glance the trade openings created there by the outbreak of war in Europe appear extraordinarily promising. In 1937, for instance, Germany exported about a quarter of a billion dollars to Latin America, while Great Britain and France together shipped a slightly larger amount of goods. Since most of Germany's Latin American trade will probably disappear for the duration of the war and French and British shipments will doubtless be reduced, the United States will unquestionably be called upon to supply part of the huge deficiency in imports from Europe.

There are, however, two arresting thoughts to keep in mind when considering the Latin American trade outlook. First, we have to consider whether trade gained because of a war-provoked interruption to normal commercial transactions is likely to be a permanent gain. And, secondly, we must ask ourselves how the trade diverted toward this country is to be financed. The countries to the south of us are, with few exceptions, in open default on debt obligations held abroad, and all of them are pressed to find the foreign exchange with which to meet current payments for necessary imports. In short, it is the old story of being compelled to sell goods in order

to obtain the means for buying them. Indeed, hard-pressed countries like those of Latin America need to sell a good deal more than they buy in order to service foreign indebtedness and pay for needed imports as well.

Unfortunately for our hopes, the loss of European export outlets in Latin America has been accompanied by the loss of Latin American export outlets in Europe. Hence, the ability of Latin America to buy our products—limited at all times—has been further reduced by the war. We must, therefore, either buy more from the other American republics, if we wish to expand our trade with them, or we must be prepared to dispose of goods on credit without proper assurance of repayment.

Credit can help temporarily, as Mr. Jones says, to develop our trade abroad, but it cannot supply the solid foundation upon which all foreign trade, in final analysis, is based. Trade agreements, too, eliminate artificial obstacles to trade with Latin American countries by lowering tariff barriers and removing causes of friction. But these aids to commerce must be implemented, so to speak, by an expansion of buying on our part if we expect to obtain a permanently larger share of Latin American custom.

That means, specifically, that we must be prepared to accept more goods of a type that is in competition with our own products, such as sugar, hides, beef, and other foodstuffs. For increased buying of coffee, bananas, and other noncompeting exports of Latin America certainly could not be counted upon to offset any large increase in our exports. If we are not willing to admit that necessity, we might as well resign ourselves to a very moderate increase in Latin American trade.

Canada and the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES F. BYRNES

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 19 (legislative day of Wednesday, October 4), 1939

ARTICLE BY WALTER LIPPMANN

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Canada and the United States," written by Walter Lippmann, in his column Today and Tomorrow.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Herald Tribune]

TODAY AND TOMORROW

By Walter Lippmann

CANADA AND THE UNITED STATES

There is no subject which it is more important to study carefully, none about which it is more necessary to think clearly and speak responsibly, than the relations between Canada and the United States.

Canada is our immediate neighbor across the longest unarmed frontier in the world. Canada is a small country, with 10,000,000 inhabitants as against our own 130,000,000. The Canadian people have essentially the same culture, the same system of law, the same political philosophy as the people of the United States, and their economic life is closely interwoven with our own.

Canadians are a free, self-governing, independent nation, allied with but in no sense of the word subject to the British Government in the United Kingdom. They are not a British colony; their allegiance to the British Crown comes from no compulsion that Great Britain can exert, but from their own deliberate choice and free consent.

For more than a hundred years we have enjoyed the best possible relations with Canada; our common frontier, 3,000 miles long, is unfortified. Never at any time has this country had designs against Canada; never at any time has Canada seriously felt itself threatened by the United States. The fact that Canada is a part of the British Commonwealth has preserved the Canadian people against that feeling of inferiority, with its attendant fears and suspicions, that weak nations have in regard to powerful neighbors. The fears and suspicions that are so strong elsewhere in this hemisphere have been almost nonexistent in Canada.

We, on the other hand, had learned to recognize that the connection between Canada and Great Britain, plus the unfortified frontier, constituted an absolute guaranty of peace between the British Empire and ourselves. With Canada providing an unmistakable pledge of British good behavior, no one in his senses could look upon the British possessions in this hemisphere as even a potential and theoretical menace to our own country.

In the past weeks our relations with Canada and with the rest of this hemisphere have been disturbed much more seriously than appears on the surface, more dangerously than most people in this country have yet realized. There has been Colonel Lindbergh's speech, which, though this may not have been his intention, seems to say that Canada should disassociate herself from Great Britain and accept the United States as her guide, mentor, protector, and suzerain. There has been the very crude speech of Senator LUNDEEN proposing that we undertake armed aggression against British and French colonial possessions. The people of this country may think these speeches are isolationist and neutral, and evidently the pacifist organizations who are circulating some of them are under this illusion. But everywhere else in this hemisphere and in the rest of the world, these speeches will be taken as a manifestation of American imperialism.

It will be hard for this country to live down those speeches; they will be remembered long after the people of this country have hoped they are forgotten. For the weak who live next to the strong have long memories; they are disposed to fear the strong, and when they have been threatened as the British people in this hemisphere have been threatened, they tend to believe what their weakness has already prepared them to suspect.

This suspicion will haunt us, and it will poison in a degree that it will not be easy for us to remedy, the whole effort of this country to achieve a solidarity of peace and order in the Western Hemisphere. For let us have no illusions whatever about it. We are immeasurably the strongest power in this hemisphere, and the other peoples will never willingly accept our protection if they have reason to suspect that they must submit to our domination. How are they to know whether Colonel Lindbergh's remarks are the unconsidered opinions of an inexperienced young man or whether they express the sentiments of a party which may win the next election? But surely they will in their hearts suspect the worst, especially since the rest of Colonel Lindbergh's speech agrees so perfectly with the proposals of an important faction of his party.

For these reasons we cannot dismiss the matter from our minds as a deplorable incident about which the least said the better. The suspicion which has been planted in the relations of this hemisphere can be eradicated only by full and free discussion which will clarify our true relationship to Canada, and to the British Commonwealth, and to the British colonial possessions, and to all the Latin nations who are within the scope of the Monroe Doctrine.

It would have been better if these great questions could have been discussed in a quieter time, in an atmosphere free of the hysteria of war. But we have no choice; against the spread of such imperialist ideas in this country and the repercussions among all our neighbors in this hemisphere, it is necessary now to erect a barrier of true and sound and responsible opinion.

That will take time and much serious thought. But we must begin, I submit, by recognizing as one of the great circumstances of our life the fact that our nearest neighbor is a member of the British Commonwealth of Nations. We may like or dislike this historic fact; we cannot change it. Indeed, were we to follow Colonel Lindbergh by proposing that Canada separate from the British Commonwealth, we should instantly provide the Canadian people with the invincible reason why they must never separate from the British Commonwealth. For if Canada separated because we asked her to separate, Canada would become in fact, even if not in name, a protectorate of the United States. Being a nation of 10,000,000 to our 130,000,000, the position of Canada would be like that of Cuba.

It follows that Canada will remain a member of the British Commonwealth, even more solidly a member insofar as opinions like those of Colonel Lindbergh and Senator LUNDEEN are believed to be current in the United States.

We have then to recognize, I submit, that whatever the result of the war in Europe, Canada is destined to become a great, interior stronghold of the British system.

Once, Canada was a colonial outpost of the empire; then, it became a self-governing dominion; latterly, it has been an independent nation allied with the other British nations. Tomorrow, it will be an inner citadel, perhaps the inner citadel, of the British world. For since the British Isles are no longer invulnerable to attack by sea and by air, since Canada has grown in industrial maturity, Canada will almost certainly be developed as a vital strategic base of the British power.

This will be one of the great changes of modern history. The change is proceeding rapidly under the pressure of the war, which demonstrates the vulnerability of the British Isles, and under the influence of such measures as the arms embargo, which demonstrate the danger to Britain of her dependence upon uncertain supplies from this country. Indeed, if the arms embargo is retained, the very existence of Great Britain may depend upon the development of Canadian industry.

We must look forward, therefore, to seeing Canada become a strategic base rather than a mere distanct outpost of Britain. Then, obviously, the wise conduct of our relations with Canada will become the paramount question in our foreign policy.

That question will not be disposed of—in fact, it will be made totally insoluble—if we follow Colonel Lindbergh and challenge Canada's right and her interest as a member of the British Commonwealth. Such a challenge must inevitably be interpreted as a threat to Canadian independence and as a threat of imperialism

from the United States. Such a challenge can engender only the invincible suspicion of a weaker people against its stronger neighbor.

That is a dangerously bad atmosphere to create for the discussion of the great problem which is now arising, because Britain and the United States are becoming so much more closely neighbors than they have ever been before. It is a problem, a momentous problem, perhaps in its consequences our greatest problem. It is delicate, difficult, and complex; and if there is any statesmanship in us, let us not begin by poisoning the atmosphere with suspicions like those which have made so tragically difficult an understanding across the political frontiers of Europe.

Let us instead recognize clearly, let us ponder calmly, let us discuss in a cool and generous spirit the fact—the great historic fact—that in our own time, now before our eyes, our northern land frontier is becoming a frontier 3,000 miles long between the United States and a Canada which is destined to be one of the main citadels of the British power.

A fact of that kind shapes the destiny of nations. For when a vital center of the British power is on one side of that frontier and the center of our own power is on this side of it, then for weal or for woe the fundamental policies of the two countries will be weighted with immeasurable consequences. For their policies will have either to remain parallel and reciprocal or to become divergent and antagonistic.

This is the great question which is now already visible on the horizon, and the whole capacity of both nations for sober thought and responsible speech and statesmanlike conduct will be needed to answer that question rightfully.

Effect of Proposed Concession in Argentine Trade Agreement on Domestic Cheese

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. HOOK

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1939

BRIEF BEFORE THE FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a history of the Italian cheese industry in the United States, this being a brief which was filed before the Federal Trade Commission, as follows:

The per capita consumption of cheese in the United States is much lower than it is in most other countries. Comparatively, very little progress has been made in this country in increasing the consumption of cheese, while great progress has been made during the last 15 years in increasing the consumption of ice cream, butter, milk, and cream. The retarded development in the consumption of cheese by the American public is in a large measure due to the limited varieties offered by the American cheese producers to the consumers. Probably no other food is so important as cheese in the diet of the American people. It is only during the last few years that we have made some real progress in increasing the varieties of cheese and, to some extent, its consumption.

There is no doubt but that the strong competition of foreign cheese, in a great measure, is responsible for the retarded development in the production of cheese in the United States. It was felt for a long time that many varieties of cheese, such as the Italian types, Swiss types, and French types could be produced successfully only in the particular localities in which said types had originated. So for a long time it was the general belief that Swiss cheese could be made only in Switzerland; Italian types of cheese only in Italy; Camembert only in Normandy; and Roquefort only in France. Now all these varieties of cheese are made in countries other than the one in which they originated. Swiss cheese, for instance, is produced in Finland, Estonia, Czechoslovakia, Argentina, and in large volumes in the United States. Camembert is produced in Switzerland, France, and in large volumes in the United States. The Italian types of cheese are produced in Albania, Greece, and in large volumes in Argentina and in the United States.

It is true that the different regions are more or less adapted by reason of climatic or pastural conditions, to the production of certain types of cheese. The progress made by the dairy technician and particularly the achievement made possible by the adoption of milk pasteurization and by the use of special cultures, has permitted the cheese producer to overcome the many difficulties originally presented by milk and climatic conditions. Twenty years ago it was considered impossible to produce Provolone cheese in northern Italy. It was also considered impossible to produce good Reggiano, Parmesan, or Romano type of cheese in the United States. Today, however, Parmesan, Reggiano, Romano, and Provolone cheeses are produced in the northern part of Wisconsin and in northern Michigan, and their quality compares favorably with cheese of the same type produced in Italy.

The achievement of the Italian cheese producer in the United States is the result of 25 years of continuous research work and persevering effort. The Italian cheese maker is no longer left alone to cope with poor milk and with unfavorable climatic conditions. The bacteriologists, the chemist, and the engineer are all at his elbow.

The Stella Cheese Co., for instance, has a chemical laboratory in each one of its plants, headed by a very competent bacteriologist and chemist. All milk used in the plants operated by this company is filtered and most of it pasteurized. All its salting and curing rooms are air-conditioned. Every vat of cheese has a fermentation test record, and nothing is left to chance—everything is checked and rechecked. In this manner it has been possible for the Italian cheese industry in the United States to produce Italian cheese in large volumes and to have said cheese take the place of similar types of cheese which heretofore have been imported from Italy. The American food manufacturer, having had the opportunity of ascertaining the enormous progress achieved by the Italian cheese industry, is now almost exclusively using Italian cheese of domestic production, while only a few years ago he was very reluctant in adopting it. A large volume of Italian cheese is now finding its way into American production of spaghetti in cans, soups, meat balls, ravioli, etc.

While a few years ago the consumption of Italian cheese was limited mostly to Italian emigrants residing in the United States, today the American public is the largest consumer of grated Italian cheese used for seasoning. It is for this reason that the production of cheese of the Italian type has about doubled during the last 3 years. The progress made by the Italian cheese industry in the United States would not have been possible if the tariff on this cheese had not been adequate.

The United States tariff on all cheese of Italian types, with the exception of Gorgonzola, which comes under the classification of blue cheese, is 7 cents per pound, or 35 percent ad valorem, whichever is the higher.

The price of milk in Italy during the last 3 years has been at about the same level as the price of milk in the United States. The cost of labor and general overhead expenses in Italy has been and still is about one-fourth of the corresponding cost in the United States. The tariff protection has taken care, to some extent, of the lower cost of labor and overhead enjoyed by the Italian cheese producer. On the other hand, the imported Italian cheese, not so much by reason of its quality but mostly because it is an imported article and because it is sold under well-established and renowned foreign trade-marks, sells in the United States at a price which generally is from 20 to 30 percent over and above the price at which Italian cheese of American production of the same type sells on the American market.

In some of the years preceding the depression Italy exported to the United States as much as 36,000,000 pounds of cheese, which represented more than one-half of the total cheese imported by the United States from foreign countries, both as to volume as well as to value. The volume of cheese imported from Italy to the United States has decreased at about the same ratio at which the domestic production of it has increased. In fact, the total export of cheese from Italy to the United States in 1938 amounted to approximately 24,000,000 pounds, while the production of Italian cheese during the same year amounted to about the same volume.

It is important to take into account the fact that the American market for Italian types of cheese is limited because most of the cheese is used solely in grated form for seasoning purposes. In fact, the exportation of fresh cheese from Italy to the United States has never proved to be successful. The progress made in the United States in the production of cheese of the Provolone type has practically eliminated the importation of this type of cheese from Italy.

We think it advisable to attach herewith a brief study of the Italian cheese industry in the United States, together with 83 authentic photographs taken at the plants of the Stella Cheese Co. The history of the Italian cheese industry outlines the remarkable progress which it has made during the last few years. The photographs of the plants of the Stella Cheese Co. prove the permanency and large investment made in this industry. It is an important fact that at present the largest plants engaged in the production of Italian cheese are to be found in the remote regions of the cut-over lands in northern Wisconsin and northern Michigan, where an adequate market for milk has been in want for many years. It is also important to take notice that while the production of Swiss cheese in the United States decreased from 40,472,000 in 1937 to 38,500,000 in 1938, and while Limburger decreased from 8,844,000 to 7,695,000, the Italian cheese increased from 14,714,000 to 17,647,000 (this according to a bulletin issued by the Bureau of the Census, published December 19, 1938). If we take into account the number of Italian cheese factories that do not report their production and the extensive progress made by the Italian cheese industry in 1938 and 1939, we then reach the total calculated production of 30,000,000 pounds, as indicated in the history of the Italian cheese industry.

We thought it advisable to make special reference to the cheese imported from Italy on account of its close relationship with the Italian cheese imported from Argentina to the United States. Years ago, when there was no production of Italian cheese in Argentina, large volumes of cheese of Italian production were exported from Italy to South America, and some of the largest Italian producers had headquarters in Buenos Aires.

First the European War and then the economical conditions which prevailed in Argentina in the period after the war caused the large producers of Italian cheese to emigrate and transplant their industry in Argentina. They did so, first, in order to take advantage of the extensive consumption of Italian cheese in Argentina, caused by the large number of Italians residing there; second, to take advantage of the cheese protective tariff of Argentina; but principally to take advantage of the low cost of milk, labor, supplies, and low rates prevailing in that country.

We desire to present herewith a statement outlining the comparative cost in the operation of a small cheese factory in the United States and in Argentina. The cost of the milk indicated in said statement is the one prevailing at this writing in Wisconsin and in upper Michigan. The cost of labor and overhead for the American cheese factory is based on certified audited reports of the Stella Cheese Co. as per the year 1938.

Comparative monthly cost of operating a cheese factory engaged in the production of Italian-type cheese, using 4,000 pounds of milk per day, in Argentina and in the United States, as of Oct. 1, 1939

	Argentina	United States
A. 4,000 pounds of milk per day testing 3.5 percent, 4,200 pounds of butterfat, Argentine price 9/10 of a peso or 16.50 per pound	$693.00	
United States price 39		$1,638.00
B. Labor (1 cheese maker and 1 helper). Argentine cheese maker 120 pesos, helper 70 pesos, (at 33 cents per peso)	62.70	
United States cheese maker $150, helper $50		230.00
C. Supplies, warehousing, management, taxes, insurance, depreciation, interest on investment, cost of distribution. In Argentina, ratio of 1/3 to the cost to United States	152.30	457.00
Total	908.00	2,325.00
Butterfat recovered in the manufacture of cheese on the basis of 8/00 on volume of milk (butter in Argentina at 14 cents per pound. In United States at 27 cents per pound)	134.40	259.20
Net cost of cheese	773.60	2,065.80
Total cheese of the Sbrinz and Romanello type produced when ready for market, on basis of 7 pounds of cheese for every 100 pounds of milk—pounds	8,400	8,400
Factory cost of cheese per pound	$0.092	$0.248

The cost price of the cheese indicated in the above statement is net and does not provide for any return on the investment capital.

The cost of milk in Argentina is the one reported by the latest dairy-trade publications; the cost of labor is the one reported by the United States Department of Commerce; and the other items constituting the general overhead, were obtained from trade publications.

Under present conditions, the Argentine producers of Italian-type cheese can well afford to pay transportation to the United States, and our present duty on cheese, and still have a margin in excess of 7 cents per pound over the cost to the United States producers on the same type of cheese. This is proven by the fact that the volume of Italian-type cheese exported by Argentina to the United States has been for several years past—and is now—continually on the increase, as shown by the following statistics furnished by the United States Department of Commerce:

CHEESE IMPORTED FROM ARGENTINA TO THE UNITED STATES

1937: 1,048,000 pounds. Declared value $131,724.

1938: 1,464,000 pounds. No declared value available.

1939: 1,125,000 pounds (first 8 months). No declared value available.

Please take notice that the price of dairy commodities in the United States in 1937 and generally in the world markets, were 15 percent higher than they are at the present time. The per-pound price in 1937 of the Argentina cheese f. o. b. New York was 13 cents, as established by the above statistics. This was also true insofar as the cost, and thereupon, the price of cheese in Argentina is concerned.

COMPARISON OF THE RELATIVE TARIFF PROTECTION ON CHEESE OF ITALIAN TYPES WITH TARIFF PROTECTION ON OTHER DAIRY PRODUCTS

Due to the fact that cheese of Italian types are produced with a very low percentage of moisture and that the workmanship required in their production is very costly, the protection which the cheese manufacturer or the American farmer receives from every 100 pounds of milk, is much less than the protection which the producers of Cheddar cheese or butter receive on the same quantity of milk. The following computation will bring out the accuracy of this statement as shown on the next page.

Tariff protection of 100 pounds of milk at 3 percent butterfat used in the production of butter and its byproducts

From skimming 100 pounds of milk at 3½ percent butterfat (overrun 23 percent), 4.3 percent pounds of butter are produced, which receives a tariff protection on the basis of 14 cents per pound, equal to	$0.602
Dry skimmed milk produced at the rate of 8½ pounds for every 100 pounds of whole milk, tariff protection on same basis of 3 cents per pound	.255
Total tariff protection	.857

Tariff protection on 100 pounds of milk at 3½ percent butterfat used in the production of Parmesan and Reggiano cheese and its byproducts

Parmesan or Reggiano cheese fully cured, aged from 16 to 24 months, produced from milk standardized at 2.8 percent net butterfat, 6.25 pounds. Present tariff protection on same 7 cents per pound, equal to (Note: The Parmesan and Reggiano require longer curing and contain less moisture from Romanello and Sbrinz. All these cheeses are produced in Argentina.)	$0.4375
Butter produced from butterfat derived from the standardization of the milk and from the whey, equal to 0.8 pound of butter, tariff protection on the basis of 14 cents per pound	.1120
Total tariff protection	.05495

Tariff protection on 100 pounds of milk used in the production of American Cheddar and its byproducts

Cheddar cheese obtained from said milk when ready for market, 9½ pounds, tariff protection at the rate of 7 cents per pound, equal to	$0.6650
Butter produced from whey, 0.3 pound, tariff protection on the basis of 14 cents per pound	.0420
Total tariff protection	.7070

The low basic per-pound rate provided by the United States tariff, which would have not given adequate protection to the cheese of Italian types such as Parmesan, Asiago, Provolone, and Pecorino (which are produced with very low moisture content and which require long periods of curing) was intended to be supported by the application of the 35 percent ad valorem clause. But how can this provision be made applicable on Parmesan or Reggiano cheese from Argentina when they are invoiced at 13 cents per pound?

In other words, Parmesan, Asiago, Provolone, and Romano cheese—which require a very large amount of manual labor in their production, a long and expensive curing, and which give a yield per pound of butterfat of less than 65 percent of the yield given by cheese of the Cheddar type—receives no more tariff protection in relation to the Argentine cheese of Italian types than the cheese which is placed on the market 3 days after it is produced.

The data used in the foregoing computation are based on 20 years of continuous experience in the production of Parmesan, Reggiano, and Provolene cheese in Wisconsin and Michigan.

The difference of over 25 cents per 100 pounds of raw milk between the tariff protection enjoyed by the producer who uses this milk in the production of butter over and above the tariff protection given to the producer of cheese of Italian type does not affect the Italian cheese industry in the United States alone, but affects the American dairy industry in general.

The cost of transportation on cheese from Argentina to New York amounts to about 2 cents per pound, while the transportation of the Michigan and Wisconsin cheese to the consuming markets in carlot loads (the eastern seaboard States) is over 1 cent per pound. By adding the United States duty of 7 cents per pound to the cost of production and to the cost of transportation, the Argentine cheese producer is in a position to deliver his cheese in the New York market at 18 cents per pound. This is exactly the price paid today for Argentine Sbrinz and Romanello, which are the types of cheese used in the preceding statement concerning relative cost of production. The average cost of Italian cheese of domestic production delivered in New York is, instead, 26 cents per pound, while the price of the cheese of the same type imported from Italy is about 35 cents per pound. There is, therefore, no room for doubt that Argentine cheese needs no special protection nor any added inducement to enter the United States markets. On the other hand, we find that the production cost of Italian cheese in the United States is rapidly and constantly increasing, due to improved and more costly methods of production, higher wages, higher cost of building, machinery, and supplies—to say nothing about taxes and social security.

For the reasons given on the preceding page the Italian Cheese Producer's Federation earnestly and respectfully wishes to bring to the attention of the competent authorities of the United States Government the following:

1. The importance which the Italian cheese industry in the United States has acquired and the valuable contribution which it renders to the American dairy farmers by lifting the equivalent of 20,000,000 pounds of butter from the surplus dairy production of the nation.

2. The necessity for the United States to render itself self-supporting in its requirements of Italian cheese.

3. The large difference in the cost of production of these types of cheese in Argentina and in the United States (Argentina, $0.092 per pound; United States, $0.246) and the vast margin which the Argentine producer of Italian-type cheese has over the cheese producer of the United States.

4. The discriminating tariff protection already existing between the different products of the dairy industry, to wit, for every 100 pounds of milk used in the production of butter and milk powder, $0.357; for every 100 pounds of milk used in the production of American Cheddar cheese, $0.7070; for every 100 pounds of milk used in the production of hard types of Italian cheese, $0.5495.

5. The necessity of encouraging the development of the Italian cheese industry in the United States now that it has firmly estab-

lished itself and is in a position to make substantial contribution in relieving a large part of the milk surplus of the Nation.

6. To the fact that the market on these types of cheese, which is used almost exclusively in seasoning foods is limited and that the cheese now being imported from Italy, together with similar cheese of domestic production, are more than adequate to take care of the American markets, for which reason the American producer should be given encouragement in further conquering the market now controlled by the cheese from Italy—which sells at a higher price—and not be harassed by special tariff concession in favor of the cheese from Argentina, much inferior in quality to the cheese of American production, and which Argentina cheese for the reasons indicated above sells at prices averaging 30 percent below the cost of production of the corresponding American cheese.

7. To the damage that would derive to the American cheese industry and to the American milk producers should there be any reduction in the tariff covering cheese of Italian types in the proposed new trade agreement with Argentina.

8. To the fact that all the cheese exported by Argentina to the United States, whether they be called Reggiano or Reggianito, Romano or Romanello, Asiago or Goya, Parmesan or Sbrinz, Provolone or Provolie, are all produced by the typical methods used in the production of the corresponding types of Italian cheese—and that, therefore, are intended to take the place of the typical cheese of Italian varieties produced in America.

Report of Northern Lakes States Regional Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 19, 1939

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, on August 5 I placed my remarks in the RECORD dealing with the discussion by President Roosevelt of a report of the Northern Lakes States Regional Committee. At that time I called the attention of Congress to the importance of this report and the need for legislation.

I have said several times that while Congress is in session that legislation needed to carry out recommendations of these committees should be considered right now.

This report which the President transmitted makes certain suggestions dealing with the unemployment problem in northern Minnesota, northern Michigan, and northern Wisconsin. It deals with problems which affect 86 counties in these States and over 57,000,000 acres of territory. The President says that this is a cut-over area. The forests have nearly all disappeared, and there are more people than jobs. I have discussed the situation with Farm Security Administration officials, and they are of the opinion that additional legislation is needed in connection with the program of transforming this area into self-supporting communities. The President, in discussing the report, calls attention to the fact that programs which have to do with forestry should provide opportunities for work for local people. I have just received an interesting letter which bears on this viewpoint. The writer of this letter is from the district I represent, and he suggests that the United States forestry program should furnish residents of the communities with an opportunity to work in the United States forests. I am in entire accord with his suggestion.

Then there is the problem that exists where people have settled on lands unsuited for agricultural purposes. Machinery should be set up to permit these people to be transferred to land that is suitable to agriculture.

The President also calls attention to the need of giving long-time loans to settlers on good land so that they may become self-supporting.

There are other problems which may require legislative action. My purpose at this time is to suggest that while Congress is in session the proper committees could very well hold hearings in connection with proposed legislation. Every Member of Congress knows that we cannot get congressional action unless the different Government departments that have to deal with these problems make their recommendations to Congress. They do this by appearing before the proper committee and discussing the kind of legislation that is needed and the appropriations that will be required.

This report is going to become a dead document unless the different Government departments appear before the committees of this Congress and suggest legislation that will carry out the suggestions made by the President when he transmitted this report on July 31, 1939. I do not subscribe to the view that all Congress has to do is to deal with the neutrality question and then go home. There is nothing more important to our people than sound legislation which will create more opportunities for unemployed men and women to find work and employment. It is my hope that the chairmen of the various committees in the House will hold meetings and discuss this report of the National Resources Committee.

I am sure that I voice the unanimous sentiment of the different townships, counties, villages, and cities in the district involved when I say that they are anxious to appear before the proper committees and make suggestions as to the type of legislation needed.

Effect of War on United States Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. MILLER

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 19, 1939

ARTICLE BY ROGER BABSON

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Roger Babson which appeared recently in the Christian Science Monitor:

[From the Christian Science Monitor]

EXPERT TELLS EFFECT OF WAR ON UNITED STATES TRADE—WORLD WAR CANNOT SERVE AS PATTERN, BUSINESS CONFERENCE HEARS—BABSON SEES STALIN TOP

WELLESLEY, MASS., October 17.—Commodity demand, supply, and prices will not follow the exact pattern of the World War.

Conditions are unprecedented, and the answer to what may reasonably be expected of commodities depends, Henry H. Stafford, commodity specialist, told the Twenty-sixth National Business Conference at Babson Park today, on whether the European conflict will be a long one of years' duration or a short one limited to months.

Assuming a long war, his forecast covered four major points: "Materially higher average commodity prices; a record volume of United States business, some commodity shortages, delayed and uncertain deliveries, and poorer quality; more Government control over commodities and virtual regimentation of business and industry should the United States become involved; some inflation, soaring indebtedness, and ultimate deflation."

VIEW ON COMMODITIES

On a short war, "say within 6 months," Mr. Stafford saw "a sharp decline in the average of commodity prices, with 'war babies' hardest hit; a recession in United States business due to the evaporation of war demand and the necessary adjustments to a peacetime basis; a renewed upswing in United States business and commodity prices following the peace adjustment; a boom in United States business which would be bullish on commodity prices, given a peace settlement inspiring genuine confidence. The outlook is for higher average commodity prices."

Just back from the Orient, Roger W. Babson said it was his conviction that a stalemate has been reached in the Japanese-Chinese war.

"Russia is the controlling factor in the world today. Mussolini has done much for Italy. Hitler has indomitable courage. Chamberlain controls the world's finances. But Stalin is the greatest statesman.

"Stalin's price for helping Great Britain (last August) was that Chamberlain should free India, socialize certain industries of England, and give equal opportunities to all nations and parties."

CITES STALIN'S VIEW

When negotiations between England and Russia failed, Mr. Stalin, according to Mr. Babson, declared: "If a new World War develops,

its duration will not be determined by its navy, army, or air force, but by the revolutions at home."

All the belligerents are apprehensive of Soviet Russia and the spread of communism if the war is fought to a finish, Mr. Babson said. China and Japan share that apprehension, he said. Germany does not want Mr. Stalin to dictate peace terms any more than does Great Britain, France, Japan, or Italy—"in short, the whole world, with the possible exception of Russia, is hungry for a long period of peace," he stated.

Should a second World War come, Mr. Babson declared, "Germany and Japan are likely to be lined up with England and France, all against Russia."

On the position of the United States, he added, "If Congress will now amend the Neutrality Act as Col. Charles A. Lindbergh advises, the United States may never be asked to enter the war."

Advising investors, Mr. Babson said: "I should be very leary about holding too many 'war babies' and should carefully go through my safe-deposit box with the idea of getting rid now of certain 'cats and dogs.' But I should continue to hold good stocks, selected commodities, and productive real estate.

"In short, continue to invest according to fundamental conditions, ignoring the war one way or the other. Continue to avoid low-yielding long-term bonds; select stocks of companies which, when inflation comes, will have their own raw materials, and be sure to diversify broadly.

"Have a little farm somewhere inland as an insurance policy and always keep on hand a supply of gasoline, foodstuffs, flashlights, and cash for emergencies. Above all, lay up spiritual and physical reserves and train your children to do likewise as well as to have a useful education."

The Crusade for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. SCHAFER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 19, 1939

RADIO ADDRESS BY REV. EDWARD LODGE CURRAN, PH. D.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following reply to Hon. Alfred E. Smith over Columbia network, October 7, 1939, by Rev. Edward Lodge Curran, Ph. D., president, International Catholic Truth Society; director, Anti-War Crusade, Brooklyn, N. Y.:

The crusade for peace is the most important issue before the attention of the American Nation today. It is a crusade to preserve our present constitutional form of American democracy. It is a crusade to intensify and expand the defenses of our country so that no "red" or "brown" aggressor may ever duplicate in the United States the cunning and cowardly rape of Poland. It is a crusade to keep the United States out of war. And it is a crusade to keep the United States out of the vestibule to war.

The crusade has expressed itself in letters, in phone calls and in telegrams to Congress demanding that the present embargo on arms and ammunition to foreign belligerents be maintained, no matter what other changes may be made in our present neutrality legislation.

Professional columnists in some of our metropolitan newspapers have referred sneeringly to this expression of an awakened public opinion. The professional columnists should rejoice that we still live in a country where citizens still possess the freedom and the energy to convey their attitude on proposed legislation to the supreme law-making body of the United States. The professional columnists themselves are professional letter-writers, receiving handsome salaries for their daily epistles in the metropolitan newspapers. In spite of the professional columnists we of the antiwar crusade intend to increase and deepen and intensify the voice with which the American people is beseeching the Congress to keep us out of war.

There is no mistaking the message of our voice. It is the composite voice of American manhood and American motherhood—Protestant, Jewish, and Catholic alike. It is the composite voice of all American citizens who remember the blunder and the stupidity and the failure and the deceit of our participation in the last World War. We insist that the Congress of the United States heed our voice.

We shall fight, if need be, to the last drop of blood and to the last breath of our failing bodies against any invasion by any aggressor against the continental, insular, or Territorial possessions of the United States. We shall fight against any dictatorship, either from the right or the left, that raises its hand within the gates and attempts to strangle our present constitutional form of American democracy. But we shall not fight for the European nations that took our money and our blood 20 years ago and then sneered at our peacetime idealism. We shall fight for the defense of our country along every American front, but we shall not fight, anytime or anywhere, for foreign causes upon foreign battlefields.

We beg the Congress of the United States to keep us out of foreign entangling alliances, whether they be the alliances of international politics or the alliances of the international munitions trade. We recognize a difference between arms and ammunition, which are fundamentally and primarily commodities of death, and all other commodities, which are fundamentally and primarily commodities of life, even if the munition makers and their allies, the foreign propagandists, refuse to do so. Therefore, we beg the Congress to keep us out of war by keeping us out of the vestibule to war. The contemplated repeal of the embargo on arms and ammunition to foreign belligerents means the entrance of the United States into the vestibule to war.

There is not a single argument advanced that can justify the removal of the embargo on arms and ammunition. Those who would sell arms and ammunition to all for cash and carry have already given the lie to the title of their amendment by providing for 90 days of credit to the very nations who have been our insulting debtors to the tune of billions of dollars for the past 19 years. If they have not paid in 19 years, how will they be able or willing to pay in 90 days?

Senator KEY PITTMAN, of Nevada, who is eloquent now on the Senate floor for repeal of the embargo on arms and ammunition, was eloquent 2 years ago for the maintenance of the embargo. We wonder who has whispered in his ear. What economic royalist has put pressure on the Senator through the White House? We should love to read the history of the psychological and political transformation by which PITTMAN the embargoist has become PITTMAN the repealist.

Stung by the concentrated expression on the part of hundreds of thousands of American citizens against removing the embargo on arms and ammunition, certain groups in the United States placed Mr. Alfred E. Smith, former Governor of New York State, before the microphone a week ago. There is no one who admires Al Smith more than I. As a fellow American, I love him for his Americanism. As a fellow Catholic, I love him for his Catholicism. He is one of whom all Americans may be proud.

We listened to the speech of Governor Smith with feelings of sadness and surprise. There was not a single argument presented to justify the President's demand that the embargo on arms and ammunition be removed from our new neutrality legislation. Mr. Smith said that the "present Neutrality Act does not work." When, Mr. Smith, did it break down? How and where did it break down? How can an embargo on arms and ammunition cease to work? Even if all other clauses of the present Neutrality Act should be changed, why cannot the embargo on arms and ammunition remain? For the past several years, Mr. Smith, the embargo clause of our present Neutrality Act has helped to keep us out of declared and undeclared wars in both Europe and Asia. It kept us out of the Spanish Civil War when every red in this country was howling for its repeal in order that Stalin might have accomplished in Spain what he has already accomplished in Poland.

You are not true to the record, Mr. Smith. The present embargo on arms and ammunition has worked. "It has not," as you tried to suggest, Mr. Smith, "been weighed in the balance and found wanting." The only balance that has weighed it and found it wanting has been the Fairbanks scales of the Du Ponts and the other munition-making economic royalists in this country.

For the sake of the record, Mr. Smith, we agree with you that the transportation of any goods or any passengers in American ships to warring nations should be prohibited. For the sake of the record, Mr. Smith, we agree with you that American ships and American passengers should be kept out of the export business. For the sake of the record, Mr. Smith, we believe that American markets of international trade should be kept open to belligerent nations for all commodities save arms and ammunition. We should sell all commodities, save arms and ammunition, to any belligerent power that comes with cash and that takes away the purchased commodities in its own ships or the ships of other nationalities. But we are now, and always, dedicated to the retention of the embargo on arms and ammunition, no matter what the President desires and no matter how itchy the palm of the munition makers and the international bankers may become.

Again, Mr. Smith, for the sake of the record, we resent your statement that only those who lack an understanding of the issue will oppose the demand of the President that the embargo on arms and ammunition be repealed. The record of the President is open to the American people for the past 6 years. American citizens have the right to criticize, in public or in private, the record of any citizen or public official of the United States, including the President of the United States. Should any citizen be denied the right to express public criticism of public acts, on the part of public officials, either over the radio or in the press or on the public platform, the moment of that denial is the moment of a collapsing democracy and an incipient dictatorship.

We of the antiwar crusade understand the issue. It is the issue of keeping us out of war by keeping us out of the vestibule to war. It is the issue of isolating and identifying those commodities which are clearly and directly and purposely and immediately weapons of death. It is the issue of refusing to become a party to the contract of wholesale murder by furnishing such arms and ammunition to any belligerent nation abroad.

It is the issue of refusing to allow the munition makers and the international bankers to wax rich and fat on the broken bodies

and the bayoneted breasts of those who are done to death by arms and ammunition manufactured in the United States. It is the issue of remembering that the cash-and-carry policy applied to arms and ammunition 20 years ago became the policy of credit and carry and next, through the flotation of foreign loans in the United States the policy of float and carry, and finally the policy of being carried into the death and destruction and massacre and mutilation of actual warfare. It is the issue of amending and strengthening the present Neutrality Act without canceling a single word of the embargo on arms and ammunition to foreign belligerents.

This is not a Catholic question or a Protestant question or a Jewish question. This is an American question. We of the antiwar crusade who are fighting for the retention of the embargo on arms and ammunition in all neutrality legislation, resent certain recent attempts to identify certain remarks in the Italian newspaper, Osservatore Romano, as semiofficial approval of the President's desire to remove the embargo. They are nothing of the kind. Let it be said to all the world that the Osservatore Romano is not the official representative of the papacy. Let it be said to all the world that in matters purely civic and purely political no American Catholic takes orders from or is bound by the statements in any foreign newspaper no matter in what foreign country the statements may be printed.

This is not the time for participation in foreign affairs either directly or indirectly. This is the time for preparedness. This is the time to perfect our coast defenses and our antiwar craft. This is the time to build an army capable of successfully defending every mile of our boundary line and capable of successfully stopping the advance of any "brown" or "red" aggressor across our Mexican or Alaskan borders. This is the time to build an air force that can plunge every enemy bombing plane, reckless enough to attack us, into oblivion. This is the time to build a navy that can successfully protect both our Atlantic and Pacific coasts at one and the same time. This is the time to protect our country from subversive activities within the gates by removing every Communist and every Nazi from public office in America. This is the time to legislate for peace and prosperity and preparedness here in the United States of America.

Peace legislation means keeping out of the vestibule of war by retaining the embargo on arms and ammunition to foreign belligerents. Preparedness legislation means keeping the products of American makers defenses for the air and land and sea defenses of the United States of America. Prosperity legislation means vitalizing the economic life of this Nation so that 10,000,000 Americans can be put back to work, and so that every American family may be the recipient of a living annual wage.

This is the cause of our antiwar crusade. Billions for defense but not one cent of American money and not one ounce of American blood and not one item of American arms and ammunition for the foreign causes of foreign nations on foreign battlefields abroad.

A Righteous Neutrality With Peace for America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW C. SCHIFFLER

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 19, 1939

Mr. SCHIFFLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I wish to express myself upon that question which is foremost in the mind of every American citizen.

The efforts now being made to amend and repeal the neutrality laws are unneutral and in violation of the spirit and letter of international law and of neutrality. It is an established principle that once war has started a neutral nation has the right to amend its neutrality laws to improve its own condition so long as the same affects all belligerents with equal force and in exactly the same manner. Changes in such laws which create unequal advantages more favorable to one nation or group of nations than to another is a direct violation of the spirit and letter of true neutrality.

This principle has been stated by the most eminent authorities in America on international law and neutrality. Mr. Henry S. Fraser, legal adviser to the late Honorable George W. Wickersham, American delegate of the League of Nations Committee for Codification of International Law, one of these outstanding authorities for this proposition, September 21, 1939, said:

> Germany will instantly have the right under international law to take steps of reprisal and retaliation against American ships. Such reprisals might be taken against ships even in coastwise trade, and even if they were not carrying contraband. There is an established principle of international law that a neutral may not, after the outbreak of war, change its legislation for the purpose of assisting one of the belligerents.

The Honorable W. J. Bryan, as Secretary of State in the Cabinet of President Wilson, on April 21, 1915, so advised the German Ambassador that to amend the then existing neutrality laws would be an unneutral act. He said:

> It will be a matter of gratification to me if I have removed from Your Excellency's mind any misapprehension you may have been under regarding either the policy or the spirit and purposes of the Government of the United States. Its neutrality is founded upon the firm basis of conscience and good will.

The proposals now pending in the Congress of the United States are to completely repeal the arms-embargo provision of our neutrality law; to provide for the sales of arms, implements of war, and munitions; to provide for the establishment by the President of combat zones; to prohibit the travel of American citizens upon ships of belligerents; to prohibit the arming of American merchant vessels; and to prohibit the carrying of arms and munitions of war by American vessels.

Much emphasis has been placed upon the term "cash and carry." Many have been led to believe that the proposal made before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and now before the Senate for consideration really provides for cash and carry of arms, implements of war, and ammunitions. This, in effect, means the complete transfer of title of implements of war and munitions and payment in cash in the United States before it is permissible to export such to warring nations. This is not the case. The bill provides for a transfer of title, but it does not provide in strict terms for cash payment. Even were this so, it would be highly objectionable and would amount to a change in our position on neutrality. Broad authority is given to the President of the United States to permit the extension of credit, and under the provisions of the pending bill it is possible to establish a large credit in the United States, there being no limitation upon the amount of credit that the President may permit. This provision might aptly be termed "tick and take it." It is the back door to the war and the first step to our active military participation in such war. The trinity of foreign credit, foreign trade, and foreign travel involved us in the last war. Any or all of these can get us into the present war, and would likely do so if we recede from our present position of safety and change our laws on neutrality. Many persons are bent upon breaking down those provisions of law, enacted when the Congress was cool in reasoning, calm in judgment, and the world at peace. Under the high-pressure propaganda now being promoted in the shrewdest manner, with the creation of phrases analogous to those used to incite and inflame the American people during the World War, and with the additional illusion of "fools' gold," we are very likely to be propagandized into a high state of emotionalism and consequently lose the power of rational reasoning.

If the American people will read and study the history of Europe and the various underlying causes of the many wars in the past, it should become quite apparent to them that our participation in the present war would be as fruitless and tragic as was our engaging in the last World War. At the very moment we allow indebtedness to be created by the warring nations in the purchase of war supplies, and thus give our economic aid, it is inevitable that our military participation will soon follow. The last war was incited by the use of illusions, idealistic phrases, and an imaginary interest, whereas there was no reasonable cause for our participation as has been pointed out by eminent historians.

Foreign credit was the beginning. Purchases were made in this country by warring nations and the indebtedness was held by international bankers. The condition of that indebtedness became precarious. By propaganda we were made to feel that except for our active help, the world would be lost and civilization destroyed. Incidents occurred, pressure was exerted and we, in this high state of emotionalism, became actively engaged in shipping materials, money, and men to foreign lands. The debts held by the international bankers were paid by the process of America issuing bonds to its citizens, commonly designated "Liberty Bonds." A part of the

proceeds of such bonds was loaned to foreign nations, who, in turn, paid their debts to the bankers. The American taxpayers are yet looking for payment of a substantial part of their bonds, subscriptions for which, in many instances, were made at great sacrifice.

How severely must we be jolted in order to learn the lesson thus taught? The tragic deaths and lonely graves that fill Flanders Fields; the incalculable suffering of thousands of boys now hospitalized in this country; some eighteen thousand who, through shell shock and by other means, lost their reasoning and are hopelessly incurable, as well as the many other thousands crippled and now hospitalized or undergoing medical treatment, fought for a cause since proved futile and simulated by empty phrases such as "the war to end wars" or "the war to make the world safe for democracy." It is senseless and tragic beyond description.

We have a deep sympathy for the sorrow and suffering of those afflicted in Europe today. Let us do all we can in a neutral and peaceable manner to end this tragic chapter in human history. Let us extend the hand of friendship to aid in the solution of the world's problems and to bring to an end this useless and sinful chapter in history. However, let us be ever cautious that we shall not also become, to our everlasting sorrow, afflicted without reason in like manner.

War has prevailed in China for 3 years. The peace-loving, philosophic people of that part of the world have pleaded for assistance against the ravages of an unwanted war. We have shipped to the aggressor in a war of conquest the means to continue that warfare against a people who are stanch friends of our country. We have turned a deaf ear to their appeals. In the meantime, we have supplied the aggressor with all means of warfare. Steel, scrap iron, trucks, cotton for gunpowder, petroleum, copper, and other essentials of war were shipped, all for profit. The consequences of our turning a deaf ear and closing our eyes to these appeals and to this dismal picture will be visited upon us for many generations to come. Soon the white man and his commerce will be extinct in Asia.

We now turn to the European situation with a Messianic attitude and head directly for a bloody and tragic chapter in American history. It is not neutrality we seek in the proposed changes in our laws. It is the first step to alliances. Neutrality is a friendly attitude toward all belligerents. We seek to become partial and to pick favorites. How can the administration justify its rapid about-face?

Our neutrality legislation was enacted at a time when the world was at peace—when it was possible to make appraisal and arrive at a sound, impartial opinion. Such policy was entirely sound and practicable, as is evidenced by the language of all our leaders, including President Roosevelt, who on August 31, 1935, and at the time of the approval of the present basic neutrality law, said:

I have given my approval to Senate Joint Resolution 173—the neutrality legislation which passed the Congress last week.

I have approved this joint resolution because it was intended as an expression of the fixed desire of the Government and the people of the United States to avoid any action which might involve us in war. The purpose is wholly excellent, and this joint resolution will to a considerable degree serve that end.

President Roosevelt also, on October 30, 1935, said:

This Government is determined not to become involved in the controversy and is anxious for the restoration and maintenance of peace.

However, in the course of war, tempting trade opportunities may be offered to our people to supply materials which would prolong the war. I do not believe that the American people will wish for abnormally increased profits that temporarily might be secured by greatly extending our trade in such materials; nor would they wish the struggles on the battlefield to be prolonged because of profits accruing to a comparatively small number of American citizens.

Accordingly, the American Government is keeping informed as to all shipments consigned for export to both belligerents.

President Roosevelt again, on February 29, 1936, said:

I renew the appeal made last October to the American people that they so conduct their trade with belligerent nations that it cannot be said that they are seizing new opportunities for profit or that by changing our peacetime trade they give aid to the continuation of war.

Again, at Chautauqua, N. Y., on August 14, 1936, the President said:

It was the prospect of war profits that caused the extension of monopoly and unjustified expansion of industry and a price level so high that the normal relationship between debtor and creditor was destroyed.

Nevertheless, if war should break out again in another continent, let us not blink the fact that we would find in this country thousands of Americans who, seeking immediate riches—fools' gold—would attempt to break down or evade our neutrality.

They would tell you—and, unfortunately, their views would get wide publicity—that if they could produce and ship this and that and the other article to belligerent nations, the unemployed of America would all find work. They would tell you that if they could extend credit to warring nations, that credit would be used in the United States to build homes and factories and pay our debts. They would tell you that America once more would capture the trade of the world.

The American people look to our honored President to keep his promises to them. These promises were made in the democratic platform of 1936, which contains the following language:

We shall continue to observe a true neutrality in the dispute of others; to be prepared resolutely to resist aggression against ourselves; to work for peace and to take the profits out of war; to guard against being drawn, by political commitments, international banking, or private trading, into any war which may develop anywhere.

How in view of this positive language can the present attitude and proposals to amend the law be justified? Is it conceivable that such an inconsistent change of attitude can be based upon sound reasoning and a desire for impartiality?

We need not look for "fools' gold" in abnormal profits coming from the sale and export of war materials. This is clearly demonstrated by the occurrences of the past month or so. Our present upward trend in business and improved conditions in the employment of idle people indicate that when American markets are protected for American products, prosperity is within our Nation. Exports from European countries, by reason of the hazards of shipments to us from them have been greatly reduced during the past month. Exports from this country to neutral countries have substantially increased. If we can keep our hands clean, manifest a friendliness to the entire world, protect American markets from cheap foreign-made goods, and prosecute our legitimate export trade among neutrals, a wave of sound prosperity shall be our blessing. Let this be our course and seek no "fool's gold," but the honorable and legitimate prosperity that will come to us from a righteous course.

I am opposed to any change in our neutrality laws at this time, the reason being that such is unneutral, unjustified, and provocative of war. I desire for our beloved country real neutrality, prosperity, and a permanent peace, to have adequate protection by a strong, well-equipped, and efficiently trained naval, land, and air force. I shall lend my wholehearted support to obtain these.

I desire, strive, and pray for strict and honorable neutrality; honest dealings with all nations of the world; a preservation of American dignity; and a friendly attitude toward all people. To follow this course will be safe, honorable, and dignified, and will bring manifold blessings to our people.

Celebration in Honor of Senator Wheeler at Hudson, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 19 (legislative day of Wednesday, October 4), 1939

ARTICLE FROM THE BROTHERHOOD OF LOCOMOTIVE FIREMEN AND ENGINEMEN'S MAGAZINE

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, on the 1st of October the city of Hudson, Mass., held a notable celebration in honor of her

illustrious son, our distinguished colleague, one of the outstanding citizens and leaders of our country, the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER]. The story of the celebration is told by Mr. D. B. Robertson, president of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, in an article in the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen's magazine for October. I ask unanimous consent to place the article in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen's Magazine, October 1939]

WHEELING WITH WHEELER ON WHEELER DAY—HUDSON, MASS., CITY OF SENATOR'S BIRTH, CELEBRATES IN HONOR OF ILLUSTRIOUS SON

(By D. B. Robertson, president)

Population of the little city of Hudson, in Middlesex County, Mass., increased some threefold on October 1.

The occasion was the homecoming celebration for the town's illustrious son, Senator BURTON K. WHEELER, of Montana, who was born there on February 27, 1882. Farmers, businessmen, laborers, and townspeople in general, turned out in great numbers. In all, some 30,000 persons, citizens of Hudson and surrounding communities in Middlesex County, participated enthusiastically in the proceedings.

Since June the event had been in preparation. Two hundred committee members covering every phase of activity worked throughout the summer months to give the Senator a hearty welcome. Brother G. A. Henderson, general chairman of our brotherhood on the Boston & Maine, lives in that locality and served on several committees.

Senator WHEELER graduated from the Hudson High School in 1900 at the age of 18. After working 3 years in Massachusetts industries he left his home town to enter the University of Michigan from which institution he graduated with a law degree. Many of his old high-school classmates were on hand at the celebration to greet him.

Upon leaving college Senator WHEELER moved to Montana, where he was admitted to the bar of that State in 1905 and started the practice of law in Butte. Independence of thought and action marked his career, and in him the common people found counsel upon whom they could depend.

After serving 2 years in the Montana House of Representatives he was appointed United States district attorney by President Woodrow Wilson in 1913, resigning at the completion of 5 years' exceptional service largely because of his pronounced views against war.

Progressives were scarce in the United States Senate and liberalism was not so popular when in 1922 Senator WHEELER was first elected to that body. He was reelected in 1928 and 1934. During the more than 16 years he has been on the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce, many of which he has served as chairman, Senator WHEELER has made a study of the railroad industry and its financial practices. His numerous investigations have led to amazing revelations, and the courage, vigor, and intelligence he has displayed during his public career has made him a national figure.

Although the first Member of Congress openly to pledge support to Franklin D. Roosevelt for the Presidency of the United States, Senator WHEELER did not let his friendship for the President alter his characteristic independence. Ever an outstanding example of patriotic leadership in America, he has always fought for progressive legislation in the interest of all the people. Railroad men will never forget his efforts in the last session of Congress to secure enactment of measures designed to aid the workers and to rehabilitate the railroad industry and place it on an equal footing with other forms of transportation.

The homecoming celebration for Senator WHEELER in the town of his birth was an event of majestic proportions. The Boston & Maine Railroad ran special trains to Hudson carrying many from distant points and automobiles lined the highways in all directions. In the great parade that started at 1 p. m. were 5,000 people and several bands with infantry and floats in the line of march. The standard railroad labor organizations were represented in the parade by over 1,000 members, led by Brothers Henderson; F. A. Symonds, Massachusetts State legislative chairman; and F. S. Columbus, New York State legislative chairman. Many of the railroad men wore overalls and caps. The delegation was headed with a band and a locomotive float.

The Senator, some of his senatorial colleagues, and former classmates reviewed the parade near the entrance to Riverside Park in Hudson, where the celebration was held. Near this entrance is the Senator's birthplace, and the town is dedicating a new field house to him.

The park grounds were adequate to accommodate the 30,000 to 35,000 persons in attendance. A great chorus of 500 voices and a band of 60 pieces were in the background of the speakers' platform. Their selections included Hail America; Ol' Man River; Home, Sweet Home; the Hallelujah Chorus from Handel's Messiah; Land of Hope and Glory; Toast to the Flag; and the U. S. A. March.

In attendance, representing our brotherhood, were President Robertson, Assistant President Goff, and Editor and Manager Glenn, along with many of our general and legislative chairmen and local lodge officers in the New England States.

Among the speakers were Senators David I. Walsh and Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., of Massachusetts, and President Robertson of our brotherhood. Senator WHEELER'S address was broadcast over a Nation-wide radio hook-up and is reproduced, as follows:

"It is a pleasure to be back in Hudson and to greet old friends and acquaintances.

"Though the town has changed with the march of progress—though many sites familiar 30 years ago are no more—and though there is increased business activity and many more persons are here, yet the old spirit is the same. I am proud to be numbered among the sons of Hudson, just as I am pleased, beyond my limited description, with the great reception that has been accorded me.

"My obligations to you now are even greater, and I have long known that I owe you much. It was in your public schools that I received my primary education. It was the principal of the Hudson High School who suggested and encouraged my study of the law. Fate has treated me kindly, and I wish to acknowledge my debt to Mr. Charles A. Williams and to Miss Ethyl Rawson, of the Hudson public-school system, for the encouragement which they gave me.

"It was the town of Hudson, the county of Middlesex, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, and the glorious traditions of all New England that furnished the background of which I am so proud. No State, no part of these United States, ever produced greater liberals, greater leaders, or better men than John Hancock, Benjamin Franklin, Samuel Adams, Paul Revere, John Adams, and the host of patriots whose names and whose deeds are so indelibly inscribed on the pages of history of this Nation. They were the liberals of their day. Some called them radicals. Today we honor them as patriots. The liberalism of these farseeing patriots has been a constant source of inspiration to all Americans.

"New England has contributed more than leadership to our great Nation. Democracy on this continent had its birth in the town meeting. I can well remember as a boy clutching the hand of Abe Tyler, my grandfather, as we went to town hall. I thrilled to the discussions. There it was after full and open debate by all citizens who desired to participate that town problems and policies were settled. Such free and open discussion, and the rule of the majority, is real democracy.

"Your forefathers and mine laid down their lives to establish a democratic republic in this land. They were farmers, cobblers, blacksmiths, tailors, merchants, and tradesmen, but with the march of progress the shoeshop became a factory and the cobbler an employee. The small factory or shop with its owner-worker disappeared and in its stead came modern industrialization, combinations, and trusts. Mass production replaced the individual and brought with it severe tests of democracy—unemployment, low farm prices, and poverty.

"Amid economic inequalities, social injustice, and poverty, democracy always labors, if, indeed, it does not fail. Poverty is as needless as it is vicious. It fills the earth with subversive dogmas—endangers our democracy, and hence our freedom. Poverty is the menace of peace, the seed of race hatreds, and the cause of religious prejudice. If man must hate, let us not hate each other; let us hate poverty. If man must make war, let us not fight each other; let us make war on poverty.

"The success or failure of American democracy is dependent upon economic and social conditions—upon the welfare and happiness of the people who compose it and not upon who wins the war in Europe. Men will fight and even die for democracy, but once gained, their children and grandchildren come to accept the privileges of constitutional democracy as commonplace. Lacking employment, food, clothing, shelter, or markets for their produce, they become a fertile field for demagogues. Once Germany attempted a democracy, but its people had been reduced to economic serfdom, and in poverty succumbed to the false promises of economic security. They sold their freedom for the promise of bread. The old saying that "You cannot have bread for nothing" is as true today as ever. You must work for it or you'll be required to give up your liberties for it.

"Through the ages the number one economic problem had been that of producing enough. American industrial genius solved this problem in our country by mass production.

"Now we are told we have too much farm land, too much factory capacity, too many mines, too much food and clothing—so much of everything that starvation lurks at our doors. So much wheat, milk, and meat that farmers are losing their farms, laborers losing their jobs, and people losing faith in their fellow man, if not in their Government.

"What a paradox.

"Let us not forget that it is the very lack of all these things of which we have an abundance that lies at the bottom of the wars in Europe and in the Orient.

"It must be apparent, then, that mass production to be successful must be accompanied by mass consumption—money earned and in the pockets of the people to buy the goods produced.

"We in America must use our genius and our resources in solving this paradox of want in the midst of plenty, if we desire to save the country from financial and moral bankruptcy. We must not use that genius or our great resources in a futile European war. It should never be forgotten that it is the moral and financial bankruptcy of a nation that brings about dictatorship.

"Less than 23 years ago we went into a bloody conflict 'to make the world safe for democracy.' Today, after that so-called victorious holy war, the world knows less democracy than ever before. To say the World War was futile is to be charitable—it was horrible, it was disastrous. I shudder to think of the potential results, direct and indirect, of the present war.

"A quarter of a century ago Kaiserism was to be stamped out; now it is nazi-ism. Both are indefensible; both are repugnant to free peoples. The problem that faces Europe today not only parallels the 1914 situation but is one which is recorded in the pages of European history a hundred times. The characters may be more bold, the names changed, and certainly the villain is equally or more repulsive, but the plot and the climax are as old as European history itself.

"My sympathies are with the Allies, and I know that the American people and all lovers of democracy want Hitlerism crushed. It is the symbol of dictatorship, of bankruptcy, followed by intolerance, bigotry, and prejudice. All this is the product of the last war and should the present war assume the dimensions of the first World War, I am fearful that there will not only be a bankrupt Germany but a bankrupt world—not one Hitler, one Mussolini, or one Stalin, but many.

"Sympathetic as we are with those who find themselves at war with dictators, we must never lose sight of the fact that our entry into war cannot be measured alone in terms of lives lost and dollars spent. The price would surely be loss of democracy and Christianity. They could not withstand the impact of war.

"Our problem is to solve our economic difficulties at home and not the politics of Europe. Our problem is to preserve American democracy and not the balance of power or the boundaries of Europe.

"We are passing through a grave crisis, a trying period. We must be vigilant in guarding our peace. Neither sentiment, propaganda, nor profits must be allowed to influence our determination to avoid our participation in the present conflict.

"Already there has been loosed upon us a flood of propaganda from both sides. Its intensity will be multiplied with the passage of time. Already in Washington the war hysteria rises in full flood. Detectives watch the Capitol, watch the office buildings, and watch each other. It won't be long now before we will be spying on each other and seeing German U-boats in the Great Lakes and enemy airplanes over the Rocky Mountains.

"I sometimes wonder whether we shouldn't be more afraid of the war propaganda originating in Washington than that which emanates from foreign capitals.

"The American people today seem resolved to withstand it. Let us pray that they keep steadfast in the hectic days to come. They realize that our vision may be clouded and our thinking dulled, but they know that the cost of war will be greater today than ever before.

"War profits will destroy true neutrality. They lure and corrupt. War profits may bring a temporary and artificial prosperity—a prosperity which would be only a shot in the arm of our economic system productive of a cheap and murderous jag—but which would end in a disastrous depression. At this moment there is some increase in the price of wheat, sugar, beef, and other basic goods. Certain industries are hastily reemploying men, but for any war-engendered prosperity we will eventually pay and pay and pay.

"We are neither Germans, Poles, Britains, Frenchmen, Italians, nor Russians. We are Americans and in this hour of world strife our country is a haven for peace. We must so maintain it. Cries of nazi-ism, fascism, or communism that we presently hear neither frighten nor interest me. Working democracy can withstand their attacks. The only 'ism' in which I am interested is Americanism. We should build up our national defense so that no nation will dare attack us; we must build up our trade in the Americas where our natural markets lie.

"As a member of the United States Senate I will never vote to send a single American boy across the water to fight on foreign soil. Neither will I, by my vote, approve of a single step that in my judgment may lead this country down the road to war.

"These are some of the reasons why I am not in favor of selling arms and munitions to any of the belligerents. This is why I would insist that all other products be paid for in cash and delivery made in this country. And this is why I would say to all Americans—you travel in troubled waters at your own risk; you cannot and must not involve this country in war.

"America must be kept safe for Americans in America."

Banquet tendered in honor of the Senator at 7:30 p. m. in the State armory was attended by 1,250 guests. Among the speakers there was President Robertson, of our brotherhood. He spoke as follows:

"Speaking for the Railway Labor Executives' Association representing national railroad labor generally and railroad labor in Massachusetts specifically, I congratulate this community on its great welcome of Senator WHEELER. It is evident all groups of people, regardless of occupation, pay this outstanding tribute to an American statesman who has earned the right to this fine recognition by his native town of Hudson.

"Why do we, representing over a million transportation workers, join you in this splendid celebration?

"Our experience with Senator WHEELER over the last 17 years has led us to admire and respect his independence and courage as a leader. We have gone to him on numerous occasions, since he has a heavy responsibility, regarding national transportation legislation. We have found him able and of high capacity. We have found him sound in judgment. We have found him honest and without prejudice—always seeking the truth. At times we have found him severe as a critic, if what we wanted did not appear to him as practicable as it had honestly seemed to us. When he gave his word, however, we could depend on it. We would respect him for his stand, whatever it was, as he would respect us for the stand we took.

"As a result of Senator WHEELER's leadership and great influence, the railroad employees of the United States have today a greater measure of justice to their interests and security for their jobs and families.

"Possibly, for the moment, public policies or principles he advocated would appear unpopular, but the truth he expressed would win, and public sentiment generally confirmed the justice and wisdom of the Senator's course and conduct.

"I can speak from a somewhat intimate contact and knowledge of this man in recent years. We could not necessarily agree with him always, for labor, too, needs education as well as everybody else. But time and again his uncanny sense of what is best for America and the realms of national government usually proved true and righteous altogether. A man who is motivated by an unselfish and honest desire to serve his country in domestic and foreign affairs, if he is intelligent and sound, in most instances, is bound to be right and just. Such a man should always have the leadership in national crises.

"We must not adhere to policies, whatever they are, which may develop causes that in their effects would ruin this American civilization and inevitably bring about complete collapse or insolvency. That is not the road to American democracy. Let us at all costs avoid such a road.

"Meeting dangerous conditions such as this country and the world are now passing through, requires high courage and keen, intelligent thought and action. We will not meet these conditions by hasty action or attitudes of fear. We will meet and overcome these present conditions of conflict only by patiently evolving a solution, based on first and enduring principles of the kind of democratic government that has made our country the greatest civilization in modern history.

"So, Senator WHEELER, my hosts in Hudson, and ladies and gentlemen, permit me to express my deep appreciation personally and on behalf of more than a million railroad workers and their families, of being accorded the privilege of being here and giving you this message."

[Copy of testimonial to Senator WHEELER, which was engrossed and framed and presented to him at homecoming celebration held in his honor in Hudson, Mass., October 1, 1939]

TO

BURTON KENDALL WHEELER
BELOVED NATIVE SON OF HUDSON, MASS.
DISTINGUISHED SENATOR FROM MONTANA
ON THIS THE OCCASION OF
YOUR HOMECOMING
OCTOBER 1, 1939

From this, your birthplace and the town of your boyhood, we, your townspeople, have caused to be enscrolled from our hearts this permanent record, expressive of our love and neighborly appreciation for a life that is being so usefully, courageously, honestly, and unselfishly lived in the service of your fellow Americans and in upholding and interpreting anew for this age the principles of government which have made our United States of America the greatest nation on earth—the one true democracy of friendly peoples in this world today, and, as such, the last bulwark of civilization as we know and cherish it.

May your life and your great talents of statesmanship be spared to the service of this country and its peoples for many more years to come in whatever high offices destiny may place you is the wish of your old friends, classmates, and those younger townspeople who have come to respect and admire you through knowledge of your laudable achievements in the public interest.

We of Massachusetts share you gladly and pridefully with Montana in the honor you have earned and the distinction you deservedly hold as one of the outstanding Americans of this day.

Reciprocal-Trade Agreement With Argentina

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK O. HORTON

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 19, 1939

STATEMENT OF HON. FRANK O. HORTON, OF WYOMING, BEFORE THE COMMITTEE FOR RECIPROCITY INFORMATION

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my statement delivered before the Committee for Reciprocity Information, in the old Land Office Building, Washington, at a hearing on the proposed reciprocal trade agreement with Argentina, as follows:

Mr. HORTON. I want to substantiate everything that was said by the Honorable HARRY B. COFFEE, of Nebraska, and that every farmer and every farm organization that I know of is absolutely opposed

to the so-called reciprocal trade agreements, and I emphasize the word "so-called" because I feel that the agreements, the authority that has been granted by the Congress to draw up these trade agreements, has not been carried out in a reciprocal way, and it is this lack of reciprocity that I object to, and I particularly object to this trade treaty, this proposed trade treaty with the Argentinians because fully 95 percent of the articles which are under consideration are articles that are grown on the farm, and many of them in my own State, and I feel that no minor operation is going to correct the situation that confronts us today. It is going to be a major operation, and the only way we can restore prosperity, not only of agriculture, but of this country as a whole, is to not call them trade agreements any more, but to call them treaties and put them back where they should be and require Senate confirmation.

Tariff concessions on the farm and ranch products listed for consideration in negotiating the proposed reciprocal-trade treaty with Argentina are unwarranted, unjust, and indefensible. Not only would they be contrary to the theory of our trade-treaty policy, but they would defeat the declared purposes of that policy as well. To substantiate this, it is necessary to cite only a few of many grave objections:

1. They would tend to increase instead of to reduce our already unwieldy agricultural surpluses and to drive to still lower levels the prices for farm and ranch products.

2. They would be discriminatory in that they would provide expanding markets for industrial products at the expense of farm products without compensating advantages.

3. They would tend to aggravate instead of to solve the problem of unemployment, the greatest domestic problem which confronts this Nation today, and they would operate to tear down American standards of living through enforced competition with cheap, peon labor working long hours and under conditions intolerable to Americans.

4. They would put American meat products in direct competition with what in fact, if not in theory, amount to products which are subsidized by a foreign government.

5. They would ignore the wishes and be contrary to the best interests of the millions of American farmers and ranchers who would be the direct sufferers.

6. They would make commitments which might prove dangerous and damaging in a time of great international uncertainty and fluctuation in the rates of foreign exchange.

To a far greater extent in this proposed agreement than in any of the other 19 negotiated to date, 9 of them with Latin American countries, would American agriculture have to stand the burden of tariff reductions if concessions are made on the products to be discussed. Fully 90 percent of the items to be negotiated affect American farm products directly. Many of them, such as beef and veal in tins, beef and horse hides, skins, cheese and casein, tallow, tankage, extract of meat, pickled or cured beef and veal, turkeys, corn, eggs, dog food, alfalfa seed, and wool, are articles that will come in direct competition with products of my own State.

At this point I want to note that when you listed those various byproducts of the cow you have got the whole blooming critter coming into this country along with the canned beef. The embargo keeps the live animal out, but this proposed trade agreement lets the dead thing in, so in that respect, at least, you have circumvented the sanitary convention.

In view of our experience with some of the treaties which have been in effect for a period sufficiently long to permit analysis of their effects, I am amazed that this Government should seriously contemplate again trading off the American farm market for the benefit of the eastern industrialists. Agriculture is in no condition to sustain this added blow.

Take the plight of the dairy farmers for instance. Record production of milk during the last 2 years made it necessary for the Federal Government to purchase unmarketable surpluses and to give away these surpluses to persons on relief. Yet this same Government is contemplating action which would fasten low prices upon our farmers for many years as a result of cuts in duties.

One of the products up for discussion in connection with concessions is casein, made from skim milk. The present duty is 5 cents a pound. This duty was the subject of intense controversy in the Congress of 1930, when dairy farmers were lined up against coated-paper manufacturers who wanted to bring this product in at cheaper prices. Does the State Department today think more of the coated-paper manufacturers than it does of the dairy farmers?

There are billions of pounds of skim milk available in this country today. Yet the smaller creameries cannot afford to convert it into casein unless they can get a return at least sufficient to cover the processing cost. Manufacture of casein and manufacture of dry skim are alternate operations depending upon price returns. If the price of casein is lower as a result of tariff concessions, there will be an excess in the dry skim milk market such as will prove absolutely ruinous to skim prices.

Reduction in the duty on cheeses also is to be discussed. American farmers already have had to suffer from heavy price cuts in a wide range of cheeses competitive with the Argentine product in the United States. A cut in duty on this Argentine product would be a heavy blow to dairy farmers, especially in Wisconsin, Minnesota, and Wyoming, which produce close to 2,500,000 pounds of Swiss cheese per year.

Up for discussion also are tariff concessions on turkeys, dead, dressed or undressed, fresh, chilled, or frozen. What will a tariff reduction mean to the thousands of Americans, many of them residents in my home State of Wyoming, who depend upon the raising of turkeys for a livelihood? A clue to the answer is to be found in our experience with the Canadian trade agreement.

That treaty went into effect in November 1935. It reduced the rate of live turkeys from 8 cents to 4 cents a pound.

Government figures show that during 1933, 1934, and 1935, under the old 8-cent tariff, a yearly average of only 3,700 pounds of live turkeys found their way into the United States. In 1936 the tariff was reduced to 4 cents a pound, and we find a yearly average for the 3 years of 1936, 1937, and 1938 of 80,000 pounds entering the United States. Twenty-one times as many turkeys entered the United States when a 50-percent reduction in the tariff was made. Or, if you take the low figure of 1933, when the 8-cent duty held, and compare it with the high of 1938, when the 4-cent duty was really beginning to be appreciated in Canada, you find 148 times as many turkeys entering in 1938 as in 1933.

If they reduced the tariff 50 percent on Canadian turkeys in order to be neutral you will have to follow suit with the Argentine and reduce the present 10-cent duty to 5 cents; and, of course, it is only likely that the same pick-up will occur in dead turkeys from the Argentine as occurred in live turkeys from Canada. During the past 6 years the average yearly imports of dead turkeys has been 350,000 pounds, so to be consistent we will have to multiply this by 21, and when do we find some 7,350,000 pounds of turkeys on the march from Argentina for turkey days of 1940. Yes; and in order to give them full measure, bear in mind that even in these war-scare days 1½ cents per pound is the rate from Argentina to New York, while the rate from Wyoming to New York is 2½ cents per pound.

I might add here that 1½ cents is the price now, after the war scare is on, for turkeys from the Argentine to New York City. Just what it was before that I do not know, but I do happen to know that the rate on, for instance, canned meat, the normal rate before the war scare was $6.50 as compared with $8.50 now. So it is only fair to assume that prior to the war scare it was lower than that which I have just quoted—namely, 1½ cents per pound.

Wool, too, appears on the discussion list. To get an idea of what may be expected here we have only to scan the record of the British trade agreements. When the trade agreement with Great Britain first was suggested we were assured by the administration that the American wool producer would be fully protected. Despite these assurances and in consequence of the mere proposal of the treaty, wool prices in Wyoming for the 1938 clip were off fully one-third from the prices of 1937, even before the agreement was consummated.

That the fears of the wool growers were well founded is shown by the fact that since the British trade agreements have become a reality, imports of wool and mohair, wool waste, noils, and rags have increased roughly 600 percent. Department of Commerce figures show that during the first 6 months of this year wool imports totaled 116,801,000 pounds, compared with 25,415,500 pounds in the same period of last year. Herein is to be found the source of the great apprehension of our flockmasters over the proposed concessions to Argentina.

I realize we are told that these wools to be imported are coarse grades and will not come in competition with United States wool. My answer to that is that even now stranger things than coarse wool are being used as wool substitutes. I remember of having read a number of years ago of a freight-train wreck in which four cars or peanut hulls consigned to a certain virgin-wool manufacturer were busted wide open and strewn over the landscape. If wool concessions are started with the coarse grade, they will be followed by other concessions on all wools until our whole protection is gone. As it is now, less than 50 percent of virgin wool is contained in materials advertised as virgin wools.

Our cattlemen are even more concerned, because, with the present protective tariff of 6 cents a pound on canned beef, they have seen imports jump from 52,000,000 pounds for the first 8 months of 1938 to 57,000,000 pounds for the first 8 months of 1939. If these importations keep up for the full year, close to 100,000,000 pounds of beef will enter this country by the tin-can route.

According to conservative estimates, one average South American cow boils down to a 120-pound tin-can content. On this basis the 100,000,000 pounds of beef just referred to, translated into terms of cattle, would mean that about 850,000 head of cows from the Argentine will enter this country in tin-can form before the end of this year. If this is the situation under a 6-cent duty, how many more will come if that duty is reduced 50 percent? Will we have to multiply 850,000 by 21 (as was the case in live turkeys coming from Canada), and if so, are we face to face with a stampede of more than 17,000,000 tin-can longhorns when the full effect of this proposed treaty really gets under way?

For our cattlemen, the situation with regard to imports of beef and meat products is serious enough now. To further aggravate it would be a mistake of the first magnitude. Department of Commerce figures for the first 6 months of 1939 disclose the following: Imports of cattle, 6 months of 1939, 486,497 head, against 242,584 head for the corresponding 1938 period. Imports of other meat products, which include beef, pork, and poultry, amounted to 79,472,315 pounds for the first 6 months of 1939, against 75,884,822 pounds for the first 6 months of 1938.

I want to note right here that freight rates on canned meat, before the war, per 100 pounds from the Argentine to New York, was 29 cents, and now that the war scare is on, that rate has increased to 33 cents, but the rate from Chicago to New York is 51 cents. So the South Americans have an added advantage in freight other than that which is given by the tariff of 22 cents per

hundredweight. Perhaps not much, but at that the equivalent of a further tariff reduction of nearly one-quarter cent per pound.

Despite the falling prices of American farmers for their hog products, importation of pork continues on a large scale. For the first 6 months of 1939, the imports of cheaply produced pork, hams, shoulders, bacon, and pickled pork amounted to 25,827,000 pounds, against 25,661,000 pounds for the comparable 1938 period. Our domestic market is being flooded also with cheaply produced foreign fats and oils, which also operates to the detriment of all of the farmers in the United States.

It will be remembered that the 1934 amendment to the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act of 1930 authorized the President to enter into trade agreements "as a means of assisting in the present emergency in restoring the American standard of living, in overcoming domestic unemployment and the present economic depression."

It is obvious that none of these purposes would be served by tariff reductions on the items on the Argentine agenda. John D. Miller, president of the National Cooperative Council, an organization of agricultural cooperatives representing some 1,700,000 farmers and substantially all of the major agricultural marketing cooperatives of the country, made this statement, at a recent meeting of the organization's executive committee, in connection with the proposed agreement with Argentine:

"Reciprocal-trade agreements, in accord with the basic policy on which all such agreements are supposed to be based, are sound and helpful. We understand that one of these basic requirements is: that by the terms of such agreements each of the contracting nations receives things it needs in exchange for things that it does not need.

"A study of the various trade agreements made with other agricultural nations during the last 6 years shows that such agreements require this country to receive many forms of agricultural products, either in their original or processed form, of which there were at the time, and still are, surpluses so large that they have a continual price-depressing effect.

"Agreements of this type are a direct and harmful violation of the fundamental rules involved, in that, by their terms, this country is receiving large quantities of things that it does not need.

"In this type of agreement American farmers have been injured far and away more than any other group.

"In addition to all this, we find that the policies of the Government are conflicting and illogical in that some of the departments are paying farmers to reduce production, thus reducing surpluses, while the Department of State, in making these agreements, causes a material increase in the imports of like farm products, thus increasing such surpluses."

Before we take any steps to reduce tariffs on Argentine agricultural products we should remember that all of our experience with reciprocal-trade treaties shows that American products are bought abroad, not because they are cheaper but because they are better, while imported products are exploited here not because they are better but because they are cheaper.

Of course, Argentina can, with her cheap peon labor and inferior living conditions and standards, outsell any American products unless they are protected by an adequate tariff. But if the concessions to be discussed in the negotiation of this treaty are permitted to become effective it will be the workingman, the rancher, and the farmer who will pay the bill. And the more concessions granted, the greater will be that bill. Moreover, to the best of my understanding, the Argentine Meat Producers Cooperative is a government institution and its products are, in effect, subsidized products.

The exact opposite is the case in this country. The American product is certainly not subsidized; on the contrary, crucified is perhaps a more accurate word, and that by our own Labor Department rulings.

The attitude of our farmers and ranchers toward any letting down of the tariff barriers on the canned beef and beef products of Argentina was made unmistakably clear when the President defended, on May 12 last, the purchase of Argentine canned beef for the Navy. At that time D. M. Hildebrand, of Seward, Nebr., president of the United States Livestock Association, issued a statement, in which he said:

"The fact that the present administration has seen fit to buy beef from Argentina when our own livestock producers have been working under a heavy handicap for the last 4 or 5 years indicates that it is not in sympathy with making a market for our feed grains, as the only market the farmer has for corn and byproducts of the farm is livestock.

"With taxes mounting, certainly the livestock producers in the United States should have the first opportunity in the American market. The best aid that agriculture and livestock producers can have is to provide a market for what we produce in the United States."

A statement issued by President Ljungdahl and Secretary Miller of the Kansas State Livestock Association read in part:

"Producers of meat animals throughout our country need every possible help in obtaining the very best market for their products. Recent years of severe drought and unfavorable markets have brought serious losses to livestock producers, and if they survive these losses they must have every advantage possible in marketing meat animals.

"Our beef producers naturally object to being sacrificed upon the altar of so-called good-neighbor policy, and no good neighbor would expect it."

Moreover, any tariff reductions which would tend to increase our imports of canned Argentine beef or beef products would be detrimental to the public welfare for hygienic reasons. There is today an embargo against the shipment of live Argentine beef into this country because of the prevalence of the hoof-and-mouth disease in that country. We cattlemen of the West are fearful that the administration may attempt to make the proposed Argentine agreement by some means an instrument to circumvent this embargo. We know that such action would be fatal, because Argentina never has and and probably never will clean up.

In that respect let me quote from the present Canadian treaty:

"In the event that the Government of either country makes representations to the Government of the other country in respect of the application of any sanitary law or regulation for the protection of human, animal, or plant health or life, and if there is disagreement with respect thereto, a committee of technical experts on which each Government will be represented thereto, on the request of either Government, be established to consider the matter and to submit recommendations to the two Governments."

If a clause of that kind is written into the Argentine treaty, I am telling you that the embargo against the shipment of live cattle into this country from the Argentine is at an end, because such a provision opens the way to get around the embargo, and once live cattle are permitted to be shipped into this country from a country like Argentina, which never has and never will be cleaned up, then you can expect every herd in this country to become infected with the foot-and-mouth disease, and not only domestic cattle, but deer and cloven-hoofed game animals of every kind. Your past records prove that conclusively.

The President recently said: "You can't ship hoof-and-mouth in tin cans." That is probably true, but does the President know that Argentina does can cattle afflicted with hoof-and-mouth disease? Is it not a pretty thought to know that animals afflicted with this, the most loathsome disease known to cattle, are being put into tin cans and sold to the American public as a product "infinitely superior," to use the President's phrase, "to the American made article"? Yet that is exactly what is happening. It is bad enough as it is. Should the Government permit it to become worse?

Let me quote from a statement made by Mr. McKenzie, of the Matador Land & Cattle Co., before the Wyoming cattlemen's convention in 1937. Said he:

"I lived in Brazil and Argentina for 11 years and was constantly in the livestock business so I know the conditions and practices. Whenever a cow was taken with the hoof-and-mouth disease we rushed her to the packinghouse for slaughter. There was no law or provision of any kind against our doing so."

Irrespective of any such considerations, however, the fact remains that the granting of concessions on Argentine farm and ranch products would violate the sound principle that the first consideration of our foreign trade and tariff policies should be what we need to acquire, rather than what we wish to sell. Our approach to tariff problems should be: First, what is desirable and necessary to import. Second, how can we obtain these imports through agreements and gain exports by supplying the things which other countries need and desire.

On the basis of the treaties already made, the record shows that in spite of the large increase in the export of war materials, such as aircraft, motortrucks, scrap iron, pig iron, etc., our imports are gradually increasing and our exports are gradually decreasing.

These are uncertain and perilous times. Moreover, special conditions obtain as to Argentine trade which should make us wary of definite commitments in a period of wartime confusion and economic upheaval. Argentina has long been a British supply base. Great Britain has $2,000,000,000 invested in the Argentine, as compared with $700,000,000 invested by the United States. The British own the greatest Argentine railroad and have consistently taken about 4 percent of Argentine exports. The Argentine peso is rather closely tied to the British pound. As we all know, since the outbreak of the war the pound has been declining. What the future holds in store for the pound none of us can foresee. But that caution is needed in making commitments under such circumstances is clear.

We must not forget that late last August Argentina suddenly changed its trade system to one of import control, freezing foreign exports to Argentina at 1934–36 levels, and then setting import quotas. As recently as October 4 the American consulate general at Buenos Aires informed the Department of Commerce that the Argentine exchange control office had found it desirable to authorize the granting of a preferential exchange rate for many imported products important to American trade.

A circular issued by the Argentine exchange control office set forth a long list of products to which the exchange rate of 15 and 17 pesos to the pound, respectively, would apply. The rate of 15 pesos to the pound, or 3.7313 pesos to the dollar, applies to many products imported by Argentina in the past. The peso today is already off about 2 cents from a year ago. What is the meaning of all this for us? Where will it all end?

We are not clairvoyant, but we can learn much from actual experience. Let us again turn for enlightenment to the Canadian agreement and the behavior of the pound. From November 19, 1938, to September 15, 1939, less than a year, the British pound declined 21.1 percent in relation to the dollar and the Canadian dollar declined 9.7 percent. It is elementary that depreciation of one country's currency in relation to another imposes a heavy burden on the country whose currency remains at the old level. In the first place, with our currency at the old level, it raises the price of American goods to foreign buyers in terms of their depreciated money.

For example, prior to the British-American agreement, Canadian lumber enjoyed a 10-percent preference in the British market. Under the terms of the agreement this preference was reduced to

4½ percent. Even under this rate, American producers had difficulty in competing with Canada. Today, however, Canada's preference, despite the agreement, is greater than at any time before. The Canadian dollar has depreciated 9.7 percent in relation to the American dollar. Add to this the preference of 4½ percent, and Canada has what amounts to a preference of more than 14 percent.

The second and most important effect of trading with countries having depreciated currencies is the new ease with which they can sell to us. Depreciation of one currency in relation to another has the effect of reducing the price of articles imported in terms of United States dollars, or, expressed in another way, of reducing the tariff on the articles.

Of course, we could not foresee the outbreak of a European war and its effect on foreign exchange when the British agreements were signed. But today war is an actuality, and we have before us illuminating examples of the effect of that war on foreign exchange. It is unthinkable that we would have tied our hands in the British agreements could we have foreseen some of the practical effects of our commitments. It would be sheer folly, under present conditions, in which uncertainty has replaced stability throughout all world trade, to make definite and binding tariff commitments to Argentina now.

In conclusion, let me call to your attention the effect that the President's sales talk for Argentine canned beef has had. You will recall that some months ago the President stated that "Argentine canned beef was infinitely better than the American product" and when pressed for an answer why, stated that "he guessed it must be because the Argentine cow was just naturally better than the American cow." Here is the record, which shows that it pays to advertise:

	Pounds
August 1938—canned meat from Argentina	1,393,143
June 1939—canned meat from Argentina	2,440,202
July 1939—canned meat from Argentina	2,934,999
August 1939—canned meat from Argentina	3,518,566

The month of August 1939 shows an increase over August 1938 of 2,125,423 pounds.

If a sales talk alone can deliver such a crushing blow to our cattlemen, what are we to expect from continued sales talk plus a possible 50-percent reduction of the tariff?

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much. There is no authority in the trade agreement to modify our sanitary restrictions. The article you quoted provides only for consultation and recommendation of experts.

Mr. HORTON. May I ask whether you contemplate including that article in this agreement?

The CHAIRMAN. I do not know whether it was contemplated being included or not.

Mr. HORTON. If it is included in the Argentine agreement, would it be so translated as to mean that every other country, under the most-favorable-nation clause, would get the benefit of that agreement with Argentina?

The CHAIRMAN. One government can present its views to the other government and, after consultation, that they must recommend to the committee of experts.

Mr. HORTON. Who are the experts going to be?

The CHAIRMAN. In article XII of the Canadian agreement, which is in every one of our agreements, it is provided that—

"Nothing in this agreement shall be construed to prevent the enforcement of such measures as the government of either country may see fit to adopt," relating to various measures, including the last one, article XII, subsection 2 (a) and (b), "designed to protect human, animal, or plant health or life."

There is nothing in the trade agreement, or in any trade agreement, that we have to come in there to protect sanitary regulations.

Mr. HORTON. Will you make the statement now that the State Department has no idea or authority or intention of any kind of circumventing the sanitary convention?

The CHAIRMAN. It cannot do it.

Mr. HORTON. It could not do it if it wanted to? It will not do it? We can rest assured that it will not be done?

The CHAIRMAN. We cannot tell what the State Department will do.

Mr. HORTON. That is just the trouble. We don't know, either.

The CHAIRMAN. We know the State Department could not, under existing law—certainly not under the trade agreement—do anything to affect the sanitary embargo.

Mr. HORTON. I was trying to see if they could open up the question of live cattle coming into this country.

The CHAIRMAN. Nothing has been done under any sanitary regulations, and nothing can be done under any agreement to affect any sanitary regulation.

Neutrality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. HOUSTON
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 19, 1939

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, Europe had its war of nerves, then its war of peace, and now its war of arms.

The United States is having its war of words. Arguments pro and con in the Congress, over the radio, and in the press have brought forth "dead cats," "red herrings," and partisan political offal.

The bluster about helping the Allies or Germany or any nation other than this one of ours is ill-advised war-breeding talk. Our interests are on this continent, and all debts, real or fancied, have been paid with interest.

Speeches, debates, forums, and name-calling emotional outbursts have so prevented clear thinking that an armistice on neutrality hysterics should be proclaimed.

Repetition, digression, and silly prophesies have been a strain on ears, dimmed vision, and clouded reason.

A jury of one Gold Star Mother, an ex-service man, a farmer, an industrialist, a munitions maker, a shipowner, a naval officer, and an international lawyer could take the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD from September 21 to date, blue-pencil all repetition, partisan politics, pretty compliments, poetry, flag-waving tear-jerking bombastics, self-exaltation, condense the facts into readable and understandable form, and in 1 day arrive at a sensible conclusion as to how the peace of the United States can best be protected.

The existing neutrality law has some good points and some dangerous ones. Under its provisions American ships loaded with American-owned steel, copper, cotton, wheat, oil, manufactured goods except arms and ammunition—all essentials of warfare—and even American citizens, may go into seas infested with mines, submarines, and warships and make deliveries to ports of belligerents. That invites attack.

The legislation needed is that which will provide for the sale of all American products of farm, mine, and factory, except those which our Government may classify as strategic war materials required for our own defense, to all nations, belligerent or neutral, who will pay cash and take title and transport them on their own ships. Americans should not be permitted to travel in war zones or on ships of belligerents. A commission representing the legislative and executive branches of the Government should be appointed, having power to designate combat zones and restrict American commerce and travel in those areas alone.

The entrance into or avoidance of involvement in the European war cannot be controlled wholly by domestic legislation. Too much depends upon the actions of foreign nations, which are unpredictable. All we can hope to do is enact legislation regulating ourselves so as to minimize the chances of becoming involved. The President, the Congress, and the American people are determined to stay out of war as long as peace with honor can prevail. Our greatest need to achieve that end is an adequate defense on land and water and in the air.

"Render Unto Caesar the Things That Are Caesar's and Unto God the Things That Are God's"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 19, 1939

ADDRESS BY HON. OVERTON BROOKS, OF LOUISIANA

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech delivered by me at the dedication of the chapel at Barksdale Field, La.:

My friends, we are gathered here on this Sabbath evening for the purpose of dedicating this house of worship. It is a matter of especial pleasure on my part to see so many of you out for this occasion, and especially is it a pleasure to me to see so many of our people, who have no connection with the Army, attending these exercises. This is indeed a memorable occasion in the

history of Barksdale Field. It marks, in my humble opinion, an epic in the development of this great Army air post.

A number of years before I was elected to Congress I became interested in the possibility of obtaining for this Army post at Barksdale Field, La., a chapel, dedicated to the worship of God. I found that a great many ex-service men, members of the American Legion and other service organizations, had been discussing this matter for a long time, and felt that there should be, at this great Army center, such a building to provide adequate facilities for our soldiers and their families to the worship of God. Several posts of the Louisiana Department of the American Legion actually passed resolutions calling upon the Army for such a chapel. Of course, the ministers of every denomination and creed in north Louisiana have always shown a keen interest in obtaining this magnificent building, and have worked zealously among themselves toward this end.

One of the first things which occurred to me that should be done to bring about a well rounded completion of Barksdale Field was to obtain an appropriation for a chapel. I, accordingly, adopted this as the first objective in my legislative career.

During the first session in which I served, the Subcommittee on Military Affairs of the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives considered appropriations for Army construction throughout the United States. I importuned the members of this subcommittee and urged upon them the vital necessity of completing the development of this flying field. I urged especially the building of a chapel here, and I am glad to say that the members of the committee listened to my plea for this construction and in return suggested that I gather data on the plans and the cost of the building of this magnificent structure, keeping it within the bounds of which they thought at the time the cost could be appropriated for such purpose. The General Staff of the War Department responded to my appeal for this information, and these officers made many helpful suggestions, not only to me but to the members of the committee.

Shortly thereafter Congress passed the appropriation bill making available the sum of $80,000 for the building. Plans were completed in final form by the War Department engineers and actual construction work began. The building is completed and is now to be dedicated. You have but to look at the lines, curves, and graceful form of this building; you have but to examine its interior, its fixtures, its furnishings, and its fine pipe organ to know with what surpassing detail and architectural completeness these plans were drawn and have been executed. This is really an outstanding piece of Federal architecture.

In the city of Washington annually a competitive exhibit is made at the National Museum of the finest types of Federal construction. Models and pictures of all outstanding recent construction are placed in this exhibit and disclose in infinite design and in perfect replica the original buildings located in all parts of the United States and its far-flung possessions. Last year the Army, Navy, and the Public Works program all entered strong exhibits, each claiming parts of their building program as worthy of special mention by the architectural world. This chapel building at Barksdale Field constituted a part of the Army exhibit and we take pride today in knowing that it took a blue-ribbon prize for architectural symmetry and perfection.

Religion has always been closely identified with military history. It is interesting to go through the pages of the past and note the many instances where religion has played such an overwhelming part in the destiny of Christian nations during conflicts. It is a matter of history that no pagan leader has ever been permanently successful and that Christian nations, today warring though they may be, dominate the world. In our own country the history of the past shows how closely identified the worship of God has been with the success of our armies. Those who have had the opportunity of visiting in the environs of the city of Washington may visit the little chapel built along the historic streets of Alexandria, Va., and pause for a minute before the pew which the Father of our Country occupied during times immediately preceding and after the American Revolution. The religious activities of Abraham Lincoln during the Civil War are known to every schoolboy, as well as are known the devotions of the great commander of the Confederacy, Robert E. Lee, and his courageous lieutenant, Stonewall Jackson.

Nor was the experience of the World War different from the instances I have just mentioned. If you pardon a personal reference, I will take you to the scene of the sunrise Easter service with the Army of Occupation in Germany on Easter morning following the close of the last World War. In the center of a great plain, under the open sky, was builded an immense altar made completely white by altar coverings. Priests of the Catholic Church and ministers of the Protestant faith jointly officiated. As the sun arose over the hills to the east its shafts of light fell full upon not one or two thousand soldiers of the American Army, but twenty-five to thirty thousands of our soldiers, who, joining in the service, knelt on the bare ground still wet with dew to offer up their supplications to Almighty God.

It is therefore most appropriate that we should observe the dedication of this chapel as a most outstanding occasion in the development of our air field. All of Louisiana is of course keenly interested in Barksdale Field, and scarcely a day passes but what I talk to our citizens in reference to the work being done at this field. One who is not completely familiar with the manner in which an air post is run, and does not know the personnel of our post and the families, may be inclined to feel that the business of operating an Army post is severe and without normal feelings and emotions. To those of us who have been able to go among you and meet your families and see your children we know that the need for a place of worship here has been extremely acute. It impressed the committee in Washington very much to learn that in the past the gymnasium here on Sundays has been converted into a church for Protestant men and their families, while during the week it has been used for athletics. It impressed the committee to know that the bachelors' quarters had to be used by the Catholic boys and their families as a place of worship on Sunday, and the Jewish personnel at this post had no place at all to go for sacred purposes.

If one would desire to know the real heart of Barksdale Field; if one would desire to feel the real pulsations of the heartbeat of the men who operate this post; if one would know the families of the soldiers who come and go here and know their real, fundamental interests, stripped of all the surface gaiety, levity, and frivolities that naturally goes with all large groups of men brought together, one must know not only the barracks here, not only the concrete aprons, the landing field, the ships that go and come and fly into the azure depths of the sky, but one must also take into consideration the homes on this post and around the post wherein reside the wives and mothers and wherein are found the little children.

That the Army knows this is true is well shown by the keen interest which it has had in building our church. We civilians are inspired by the thought and are given new confidence in the fact that our Army needs and provides for its personnel this beautiful building.

We meet today to dedicate this edifice. It is appropriate that we dedicate the building and its equipment first to the use of the United States of America and to the preservation of its Constitution, its Bill of Rights, and its fundamental institutions. We especially dedicate its use to the United States Army and to its Air Corps, rich in its tradition, its heroism, and its accomplishment. We further dedicate it to the use of the officers and men of this post and their families as a haven of refuge and a place of solace. And, finally, we dedicate this temple to the service of Almighty God.

The Argentine Trade Agreement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 19, 1939

EDITORIALS FROM THE WASHINGTON DAILY NEWS, THE WASHINGTON STAR, AND THE WASHINGTON POST

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorials relative to the proposed reciprocal trade agreement with Argentina:

[From the Washington Daily News of October 17, 1939]

CANNED-BEEF POLITICS

At the first day's hearings on the proposed United States-Argentine trade treaty seven Senators from our cow country exerted their influence and oratory against reducing the tariff on imports of canned beef.

Not one lawmaker appeared to say a word in behalf of the millions of American families who eat canned beef.

Thus it has always been in the matter of tariffs. A few organized ranchers out where short grass and Senators are plentiful have more pull than millions of unorganized consumers.

Very little beef is canned in this country. In Argentina, where there is a great beef surplus, some fine cuts are tinned, but here similar cuts go into the making of hot dogs, hamburgers, and other American delicacies, and thereby bring higher prices to the packers.

The Senators argue that the 6-cents-per-pound tariff on canned beef should not be reduced because that would mean larger imports and more competition with United States beef. But the American housewife who goes to a grocery for a can of beef and decides against the purchase will not instead buy a tenderloin at the meat counter. She is more likely to choose a can of beans or something else her budget affords.

Instead of whittling away at the purchasing power of American workers, it seems to us the cattle Senators might better devote their attention to ways and means of making it possible for these workers to get their teeth into some rich roast beef and thick, juicy steaks, both home grown and imported.

The purpose of the pending United States-Argentine treaty is to start a real two-way flow of trade between the two countries. Specifically, there is immediately at hand in Argentina a market for some $50,000,000 more yearly of United States manufactured products. That is the amount of Argentine trade which Germany forfeited when she went into war. There are other millions in trade which British and French industries can't hold and Americans can get. The same is true in other Latin American countries. But we can't get it unless we are willing to buy what the Latin Americans

have to sell. Only by selling to us can they obtain the dollar credits with which to buy. And what they buy will be produced in United States factories by United States workers getting good wages—wages which should enable them now and then to enjoy a real sirloin off a Texas steer.

[From the Washington Evening Star of October 17, 1939]

THE ARGENTINE AGREEMENT

Of all the countries in the Western Hemisphere, Argentina is the only one which has resolutely resisted the policy of solidarity and unity which the United States has preached since 1933. It has its own good reasons for taking its independent stand, but the United States long has been seeking the means of turning the South American Republic toward a more friendly feeling for its far-northern neighbor. A milestone in the development of more friendly relations between Argentina and the United States is the proposed Argentina trade agreement on which hearings opened yesterday at the Tariff Commission. Of course, the agreement and the proposed American tariff concessions to Argentinian goods will be discussed immediately in the light of their commercial and economic implications. In the long run, however, the agreement will be regarded as a political document, a strengthener of the Argentine-American tie.

Members of Congress from the Western agricultural States have raised the objection that the agreement, with its proposed concessions, will work great harm on the American cattle industry, the American flax growers, the wool growers—indeed, the American raisers of all the agricultural commodities on which concessions are contemplated to Argentina—and to the rest of the world, under the most-favored-nation policy of the agreement. This cry is a good deal like the protest raised against the trade agreements with Canada. In both instances the spokesmen for agriculture contend that the reciprocal trade agreements program harms the farmer in order to provide a larger foreign market for the industrialist.

The same Government which frames the agreement has been pursuing a most lavish policy of subsidizing agriculture during the past 6 years. Only this spring Congress voted more than $700,000,000 of special payments for the farmers. It does not seem probable that the Government would deliberately nullify its subsidies by embarking on a program aimed at the farmer's ruination. Perhaps the farmer will suffer slightly from the Argentine competition. But his benefit is likely to be larger in the end, because the Argentine agreement will, if it is signed, improve the American industrial market and enhance the purse of the domestic buyers of American farm commodities.

The larger commercial question involved in the Argentine agreement is that it can serve to break down Argentina's discrimination against American goods. In recent years Argentina has favored the British through the Rocca agreement and frowned on American traders through import quotas and exchange discrimination. This attitude is a reflection of a political antipathy toward the United States. In times of peace the United States wants the active friendship of Argentina. In the present time of war, the United States needs that friendship, for it is becoming more apparent every day that the New World will be, for a while anyway, almost the whole of our world, commercially speaking.

[From the Washington Post of October 18, 1939]

TRADE WITH ARGENTINA

The proposed agreement with Argentina seems destined to put Secretary Hull's reciprocal trade program to its most severe test. Farmers and their representatives in Congress fear that concessions on competitive Argentine products may add to existing agricultural surpluses in this country. Some legislators have gone so far as to threaten a fight to repeal the trade-agreement act if a larger volume of competitive farm products is admitted to the American market in return for Argentine concessions on our industrial exports.

These fears are based largely upon the list of products on which the United States is considering concessions. Included in this list are casein, linseed oil, canned meat, cheese, corn, cattle hides, and various other agricultural products. Fresh meats would be excluded, however, under the sanitary embargo which still remains in effect.

On the other hand, the negotiations with Argentina are considered by many as an opportunity for the United States to take over part of that country's trade heretofore going to European countries now at war. An agreement with the most progressive nation of South America, it is argued, would strengthen commercial ties with our southern neighbors to the mutual advantage of all countries in the Western Hemisphere.

This desire to extend American trade is, of course, wholly constructive. But it is not simply a problem of inducing Argentina to buy more American machinery, automobiles, and typewriters. The war has made it even more essential that we take a larger volume of South American products if we are to expand our markets in that region. And we must face the fact that most of what Argentina wishes to sell is competitive with the products of our own farms.

Obviously, this proposed agreement should be negotiated with full recognition of its direct bearing upon our domestic agricultural policy. As Senator CONNALLY pointed out to the Committee for Reciprocity Information, Congress appropriated $700,000,000 to aid farmers this year. Much of this money is used to compensate tillers of the soil for reducing the size of their crops. Federal funds have also been used to purchase surplus commodities and to pay export subsidies on wheat and cotton.

It would be a direct contradiction of policy for the administration to grant concessions on competitive agricultural imports while it is paying domestic farmers for not producing similar crops. So the Department of State faces the necessity of reconciling whatever concessions may be granted with the general farm policy of the Department of Agriculture. The whole theory behind the A. A. A. is that it will tend to bring agriculture into a more balanced relationship to industry. Unless that policy is to be abandoned, it would seem to preclude any extensive concessions at the expense of agriculture for the benefit of expanding industrial exports.

A consistent policy does not mean, of course, that no trade agreement with the Argentine can be negotiated. There are a number of products on which concessions can be granted without piling up new agricultural surpluses. The careful defense of domestic interests in all the trade agreements negotiated to date strongly suggests that the pact with Argentina will be similarly safeguarded. For that very reason, however, only moderate increases in our trade with the other American republics can be reasonably anticipated.

Neutrality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. FLANNAGAN, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 19, 1939

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to talk on neutrality—what it is and how it can best be maintained.

Too many these days are talking and writing about neutrality without knowing what they are talking or writing about. It is a catchy word that is sweeping the country like some catchy song because somehow we all think that neutrality means peace, and peace is what we want.

This loose talk that most of us are indulging in is creating a great deal of confusion. To hear those in favor of the embargo and those opposed, and those in favor of "cash and carry" and those opposed talk, the ordinary fellow, who does not pretend to know much about either side, thinks that it is "be damned if we do and be damned if we don't." While the situation is bad enough, no matter what we do, it is not quite that bad, for behind all the gusto, the fervid appeals, the cold reasoning, and, in many cases, the hysteria, you will find a peace complex which is an encouraging sign and is a stronger guaranty of peace than all the neutrality laws that can be passed, because while we can by wise legislation pass neutrality laws that will lessen the danger of war, ever remember we cannot legislate peace. Today I am persuaded that every true American, no matter which course he may be advocating, has the same object in view; namely, a neutrality law that will best serve to maintain peace. Yes; the aim and object of every true American today should be to keep our Republic at peace. There can be no division as to our objective. That we may honestly disagree in the methods employed to bring about our objective is but natural in a democracy that believes in freedom of thought and freedom of speech. I am relying upon the will of the American people to remain at peace more than I am on congressional neutrality legislation to keep us out of the European conflict. "Where there is a will there is a way."

NEUTRALITY—WHAT IT MEANS

Neutrality is the state of being neutral. And neutral—why, "there ain't no such animal"—according to the lexicographers, means having no decided character, indefinite, middling, colorless, and these things add up an imaginary thing known as a nonentity which we commonly call neutrality. Now, it is pretty hard to be good and it is pretty easy to be bad, but this thing of being neither good nor bad, active nor passive, hot nor cold, positive nor negative, acid nor basic, is about the hardest job an individual or Nation ever tackled. And these are the things we have got to be if we ever reach that estate known as neutrality. Well you know and I know that as a practical proposition it is impossible for an individual or nation to be absolutely neutral.

To reach that imaginary estate we would have to be handcuffed, put in a strait jacket, gagged, have our ears plugged, and then for fear of thinking out loud we would have to live in a vacuum. Certainly no one expects the impossible. With respect to nations it can at best only mean that we remain friendly to the belligerents, treating them all alike, not intentionally taking the part of either or any of them. No matter what we say or do one side of the belligerent forces, if so minded, can construe our words or acts as unneutral; and do not think that this will not be done if the interests of one side of the belligerent forces will be better served, because experience teaches that in spite of what is known as the accepted rules of international law the rules of warfare change as emergencies arise. People engaged in the unethical, silly, fiendish business of war are out to kill and destroy and you need not expect them to live up to the ethics of a game that has no ethics. The best we can do when we sin against the law of neutrality—and sin we will in the eyes of one side or the other no matter what we do—is to be sure we sin in favor of our friends and not our enemies.

THE HANDS WE CAN PLAY—WHICH IS THE BEST?

As I said, most of the confusion has come from loose talking and writing. I am sorry to have to state it, but the truth is that many of those who speak and talk with authority could not, if their lives depended on it, tell you what our rights as a neutral are under the present neutrality laws, what our rights as a neutral will be if the Senate bill is passed, or what our rights as a neutral will be if the present neutrality laws were wiped out, the Senate bill failed of passage, and we had to rely upon our rights as a neutral under what is commonly known as international law.

Now, I believe it will clear up a lot of confusion and assist us at arriving at a correct conclusion if we turn the cards face up and look at and study the three respective hands honestly, dispassionately, and prayerfully, with this one question in mind: In order to stay out of the European conflict and remain at peace, which is the best hand for America to play?

I am not afraid of the verdict of the American people—and, my friends, the question should be and will be decided by the American people—if that verdict is based upon a deliberate, conscientious, and prayerful consideration of the true facts. Personalities, ill will, hatred, and the emotions should play no part in the consideration. Out of a multitude of voices cometh forth wisdom. I welcome the composite voice of our people. In such a voice we can in the future, as in the past, look for guidance. The American people are pretty good card players and will know which hand to play and which hand to lay down if the deal is honest and there are no blacklegs in the game. And they will know how to play our neutrality hand if you give them an honest deal and keep the blacklegs out of the game. The only way to give them an honest deal is by a free, frank, and full discussion that presents the real facts; and the only way you can keep the blacklegs out of the game is by both sides looking with disfavor upon anyone who tries to color the facts through prejudice, ill will, or political bias.

Let me deal you the three hands, the cards face up, and in this way assist you in determining which hand the American Government should play.

COMPARATIVE PROVISIONS OF EXISTING NEUTRALITY ACT OF MAY 1, 1937, PENDING SENATE NEUTRALITY BILL OF 1939, AND INTERNATIONAL LAW

1. Transfer of title of goods exported from the United States to belligerents: (a) Existing neutrality law: No provision in existing law. Discretionary authority to require it expired May 1, 1939.

(b) Senate bill: Required by pending bill.

(c) International law: Not required by international law.

2. Loans and credits by American citizens to belligerents: (a) Existing neutrality law: Prohibited by existing law, except that ordinary commercial credits and short-time obligations may be permitted. No limit set on these credits and they can be renewed.

(b) Senate bill: Prohibited by pending bill except that ordinary commercial credits and short-time obligations may be permitted with a limit of 90 days. Renewals not permitted. Moreover, if default is made, all further credit cut off during period of default.

(c) International law: Not prohibited by international law.

3. Carriage of goods to belligerents in American vessels: (a) Existing neutrality law: Not prohibited by existing law, except carriage of arms, ammunition, and implements of war. Discretionary authority to prohibit other carriage expired May 1, 1939.

(b) Senate bill: Prohibited by pending bill.

(c) International law: Not prohibited by international law. Vessels carrying contraband to a belligerent are subject to capture.

4. Export of arms, ammunition, and implements of war to belligerents: (a) Existing neutrality law: Prohibited by existing law.

(b) Senate bill: Not prohibited by pending bill.

(c) International law: Not prohibited by international law, although as contraband such exports are subject to confiscation by belligerents.

5. Travel of American citizens on belligerent vessels:

(a) Existing neutrality law: Prohibited by existing law, although exceptions may be made by the President.

(b) Senate bill: Prohibited by pending bill, except under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed.

(c) International law: Not prohibited by international law.

6. Passage of American citizens and ships through combat areas:

(a) Existing neutrality law: No provision in existing law.

(b) Senate bill: Discretionary authority in pending bill to prohibit American vessels or citizens to proceed through such areas defined by the President.

(c) International law: No well-recognized restriction under international law on passage of neutral vessels or neutral nationals on the high seas, except when destined for a blockaded port.

Now, after you examine the respective hands, I believe you will come to the same conclusion I have; namely, the American people should play the hand outlined by the President in his message to the Congress, which is incorporated in the Senate bill, because it offers greater safeguards than we now have and will tend to reduce the controversies that are likely to draw us into the conflict, and thus minimize our chances of becoming embroiled in a war we had nothing in the world to do with bringing about.

Let us take up these provisions one by one and see if we will not be strengthening the hand of peace in following the President's recommendations and passing the Senate bill.

1. TRANSFER OF TITLE OF GOODS EXPORTED FROM THE UNITED STATES TO BELLIGERENTS

Under the present neutrality law and under international law title does not have to be transferred before shipment. It is true that the Neutrality Act of May 1, 1937, contained a provision requiring the passing of title to goods before shipment, but this provision in the 1937 act expired May 1, 1939. The Senate bill simply restores the passing of title provision contained in the act of 1937, and strengthens same by further providing that no loss incurred by one of our citizens in connection with the sale or transfer of title shall be made the basis of any claim put forward by the United States Government.

The object of the passing of title provision is to safeguard against complications that might arise in the event of the destruction of shipments of goods. We simply say to the belligerent purchasers, "When American goods are loaded on your vessels from then on the goods are yours, title has passed, and if they are damaged or destroyed the loss is yours." There seems to be no controversy over this provision.

2. LOANS AND CREDITS BY AMERICAN CITIZENS TO BELLIGERENTS

Under international law there is no prohibition against the extension of loans and credit. The Neutrality Act of May 1, 1937, prohibits the extension of loans and credits, except ordinary commercial credits and short-time obligations may be permitted, though no specific limit is set on these credits and there is no prohibition against renewals. Under the

Senate bill, while loans and credits are prohibited, commercial credits and short-time obligations may be permitted, provided same do not run for more than 90 days; and the bill contains a prohibition against renewals and provides that if default is made all credit is cut off during the period of default. The Senate bill, therefore, as to commercial credits is nothing more than a cash transaction, because under the usual practice governing export trade, checks and drafts payable in 90 days are considered cash payments. However, in order to allay the fear entertained by many that these permissible short-time credits will be manipulated in such a way as to become long-time credits—probably frozen credits—I would like to see a strictly cash provision.

The charge has been made, and no doubt it is believed by a great many, that we were dragged into the World War by our citizens extending large loans and credits to some of the warring nations. While I do not believe that there was a single Member of the Congress so low in thought or purpose, so inhuman, as to have consciously cast his vote for war in order to attempt to make his Government a collecting agency for these loans, as a matter of fact, I am afraid a great deal of the war propaganda that flooded our country just prior to our entrance into that war was directly traceable to these loans. The human instinct to protect a loan is strong—some people will follow the dollar a long way—and it is but right that we should confine our dealings with the belligerents to cash transactions, and thus remove this war irritant.

3. CARRYING OF GOODS TO BELLIGERENTS IN AMERICAN VESSELS

Under the Neutrality Act of May 1, 1937, the only prohibition against American vessels carrying goods to belligerents is the prohibition against the carriage of "arms, ammunition, and implements of war," as the discretionary authority to prohibit other carriage expired May 1, 1939. There is no prohibition under international law, though, of course, vessels carrying contraband to a belligerent are subject to capture. Under the Senate bill American vessels are prohibited from carrying goods of any kind to belligerents.

This, in my opinion, is one of the most important provisions in the bill. Under the law as it now stands our ships can carry anything to a belligerent except "arms, ammunition, and implements of war," and this enumeration of prohibitive carriage cannot be added to or taken from, because it is defined by legislative enactment. Considered as a practical means of lessening our chances of becoming embroiled in the war, arms, ammunition, and implements of war is but a sounding phrase that, though pleasing to the ear, is misleading to the American people in that, while it has a peace sound, it in no way insures peace by lessening our chances of becoming involved in the war. Let me give you the reason: While there is no doubt about the list of manufactured articles which are defined under the act as "arms, ammunition, and implements of war" being contraband and appearing on the contraband lists of both sides of the warring powers, the contraband lists of the nations engaged in the war already contain many things not defined as being "arms, ammunition, and implements of war," and the lists will be added to from time to time as the war progresses, and there is no prohibition in the present act against American vessels carrying these other things, although they appear on the contraband lists of the warring nations. Now, we know that anything appearing on the contraband lists of the belligerents will be seized and confiscated if found moving to their enemy. With respect to the carriage of goods to belligerents in American vessels, the only way to lessen our chances of becoming embroiled in the conflict is by a prohibitive provision against the carriage of any goods to belligerents in American vessels. The Senate bill contains such a provision.

I realize that this provision will work a heavy loss on American shipping and export industries running probably into the millions, but I am persuaded it is a sacrifice we should make to the end of keeping our country out of a war that will cost the Nation, looking at the question from purely a material standpoint and not taking into consideration the untold suffering and misery that would follow in its wake, not millions but billions of dollars. If we are going to have a neutrality law in order to lessen our danger of becoming involved in the conflict, we should not let the dollar sign warp our judgment in framing the law. A few dollars picked up by assuming a risk that may lead to war is a bad investment. However, it may be possible to work out an exception relaxing shipping restrictions in the Pacific and other waters far removed from the danger zones and areas. Such an exception would seem to be wise if it would not in any way subject us to the danger of having our ships destroyed and our citizens killed. In the event such an exception is written into the bill, it should expressly give the President the right to withdraw same, at any time, in the event it appears likely that our further shipping in these waters will bring on complications.

I said that in my opinion this was probably the most important section in the bill. Now let me tell you why I entertain this opinion. While there were many contributing causes that led us into the World War, the compelling cause—the cause that finally forced us to take the fatal step—was the illegal killing of our citizens on the high seas. When Germany in its desperation announced in January 1917 that its submarines could not safely rise to the surface and search to see if vessels were carrying contrabands, and that thereafter she would, without notice, sink every vessel, neutral or belligerent, found within a certain unmarked zone hundreds of miles out from shore, and commenced to destroy our vessels and kill our citizens without notice or warning, the illegal and inhumane killing of our citizens was such an affront to our national honor and integrity, such an invasion of our rights, that we could not do other than declare war. Now, if we prohibit our vessels from carrying goods of any kind to belligerents, there can be no excuse for a belligerent to destroy one of our vessels, involving, as it will, not only the destruction of the vessel but the illegal killing of our citizens. This provision, if adopted, will, I believe, do more toward lessening our chances of becoming involved in the war than any other provision in the bill.

4. EXPORT OF ARMS, AMMUNITION, AND IMPLEMENTS OF WAR TO BELLIGERENTS

The Neutrality Act of May 1, 1937, prohibits all shipments of "arms, ammunition, and implements of war" to belligerents. No matter in whose vessels—American, neutral, or belligerent—these shipments are carried, the prohibition is absolute as to these things. Such shipments are not prohibited by international law, although under the laws of nations such shipments are considered contraband and if intercepted by one of the belligerents are subject to confiscation. The Senate bill simply repeals the prohibition contained in the act of 1937 as to the shipment of "arms, ammunition, and implements of war."

Now, keep in mind that the present law, which is the act of 1937, only prohibits the shipment of "arms, ammunition, and implements of war." It does not prevent shipment of the raw material out of which "arms, ammunition, and implements of war" are made, the prohibition only applying to the finished product. In other words, we can ship the belligerents the ingredients out of which gunpowder and other explosives are made, knowing they will be promptly mixed or compounded into explosives as soon as they reach their destination, and used in the war to destroy and kill; we can ship the belligerents the ingredients out of which poisonous gases are made, knowing they will be promptly mixed or compounded into deadly gases as soon as they reach their destination, and used in the war to kill; we can ship engines used in bombing planes and the raw material out of which their bodies and other parts are made, knowing that they will be promptly fabricated and assembled into finished planes as soon as they reach their destination, and used in the war to destroy and kill; we can ship the raw material out of which guns and cannons are made, knowing they will be promptly used to manufacture guns and cannons as soon as they reach their destination, and used in the war to destroy and kill, but we cannot ship the finished product.

The idea seems to be that it is immoral and illegal to sell an implement that will kill and destroy forthwith, but perfectly moral and legitimate if you require the purchaser to

put the implement together or do a little work on it—probably on the theory that it will salve our conscience if the purchaser becomes particeps criminis in producing the instrument—before it goes forth on its mission of death and destruction. Such reasoning simply does not appeal to me. To my way of thinking there would be just as much logic in saying to the man who attempts to purchase a loaded pistol with which to commit suicide, "I am sorry, old fellow, that under the law I cannot sell you a loaded pistol with which to commit suicide, but I'll tell you what I can do; I'll sell you a pistol and a box of cartridges, and all you will have to do is to load the pistol and pull the trigger. Oh, this may delay you a few minutes, but it will do the work and kill you just as dead as if you bought the pistol loaded."

Now, the only practical effect such a policy can have is to take business away from industries in America, throwing thousands out of work, and turning the business over to the industries in the belligerent countries. Oh, you say this is a sordid, materialistic way of looking at the matter. In answer, I say I am only facing the facts and telling you what will happen, because pious talk and emotional appeals are not going to keep the belligerents, in the event they cannot purchase "arms, ammunition, and implements of war" from manufacturing them as long as they can obtain the raw materials.

Moreover, to carry on warfare there are many things just as essential as arms, ammunition, and implements of war. How about the fuel for the battleships, the gasoline for the planes, cotton for explosives, food, and clothing? Shipment of these things, all absolutely essential in war, is not prohibited. Take food for instance: Why withhold ammunition and permit the shipment of food, when you know and I know that an army can no more fight on an empty stomach than it can with an empty gun.

Again, the embargo provision in the act of 1937 does not apply until it has been determined a state of war exists. All a belligerent would have to do, seemingly, is not to make a formal declaration of war, which seems to be the fashion these days, in order to purchase all the arms, ammunition, and implements of war it pleases. Take Japan for instance: We all know that Japan and China are at war, yet neither side has made a formal declaration of war and, consequently, either side, although we know they are warring as hard as they can, under the present Embargo Act, can purchase all the arms, ammunition, and implements of war they can come over and get. Of course, we all know that the present Embargo Act gives Japan the advantage, because China cannot send its ships over.

Oh, but I hear the cry that if we repeal the embargo on "arms, ammunition, and implements of war," we will be favoring the Allies and it will be construed by Germany as an unneutral act. Let us see. While I believe it would have been much better to have followed the President's recommendation and repealed the embargo at the last session of Congress, there can be no foundation for the argument that because we are a little late in correcting a mistake that we are committing an unfriendly act. It is just as logical to say that if we fail to make the correction our failure will be construed as an unfriendly act. I admit that probably the act as it now stands gives Germany the advantage because, due to the fact that the Allies have command of the sea, German vessels cannot come over, and the vessels of the Allies, although they can come over, are prohibited from carrying back "arms, ammunition, and implements of war." But, remember, when we wipe the prohibition out by repealing the embargo we are returning to international law, and, as a matter of right, neither side can ask us to do more than observe the laws of nations. Moreover, when we repeal the embargo, remember, we are treating both sides the same way. We are simply saying to all belligerents, "We will sell you all the 'arms, ammunition, and implements of war' you can pay for, carry away in your own vessels, and at your own risk." I realize that as a practical proposition this will probably give the Allies the advantage because they have the cash and will be able to send their vessels over, but, remember, we are not creating the advantage by legislative enactment. The advantage, if any, will be brought about by conditions over which we have no control, namely, by the fact that Great Britain is a great sea power and its exchequer is in much better shape than the exchequer of Germany. As I have said, no matter what we say, no matter what we do, one side or the other of the belligerent powers can, if so minded, say that we have committed an unneutral act. In this case, if Germany so construes our act, we have the consolation that if repeal is a sin against neutrality, then, if sin it be, we have sinned in favor of our friends and not our enemies.

5. TRAVEL OF AMERICAN CITIZENS ON BELLIGERENT VESSELS

While travel by American citizens on belligerent vessels is not prohibited under international law, such travel is prohibited under the Neutrality Act of May 1, 1937, and practically the same prohibition as is found in the 1937 act is carried in the Senate bill.

Of course, to permit American citizens to travel on belligerent vessels is nothing more nor less than an invitation to get killed. Oh, I know back in 1916, when it was proposed that Americans stay off belligerent ships, that the proposal was rejected on the ground that it would cause us to suffer national humiliation if we denied our citizens the right. Well, we learned a good many lessons in the World War, and today the reasons for denying our citizens this right seem to be so obvious that there is no controversy over this provision.

6. PASSAGE OF AMERICAN CITIZENS AND SHIPS THROUGH COMBAT AREAS

The Neutrality Act of May 1, 1937, contains no prohibition against American citizens and ships passing through combat areas or danger zones, and, as the law now stands, there is no restriction against American citizens and vessels entering these areas or zones, as under international law this is permitted unless the ship happens to be destined for a blockaded port. The Senate bill prohibits American citizens and American ships entering combat areas and danger zones.

American vessels can, of course, carry goods to neutral nations. The carriage of goods to neutrals will, in many cases, lead us into waters infested with submarines and other crafts of destruction. And we know just what will happen if our vessels and citizens are permitted to enter these waters. Our vessels will be destroyed and our citizens killed, and the first thing we know we will be right back into another foreign war. Oh, I know we like to talk about our rights as a Nation, and this, that, and the other, but common sense ofttimes tells you that under some circumstances it is the part of wisdom to refrain from exercising some of your rights; and when our national safety is at stake, it behooves us to forego some of our rights, provided we do not compromise our national honor and integrity, if by so doing we will promote the national safety and security.

CONCLUSIONS AS TO THE BILL

The questions involved in the Senate bill are as great and momentous as any ever considered by the Congress. They involve the peace and security of our Nation and hence affect every man, woman, and child who lives under the flag. While I realize the provisions in the bill are a far-reaching departure from the accepted rules of international law under which we have conducted our foreign relations, with a few exceptions, all down through the years; while I realize we are surrendering, for the time being, certain accepted rights we have as a Nation; while I realize we are subjecting our shipping interests and export industries to huge losses; while I realize that we are subjecting ourselves to the criticism from those whose false national pride will cause them to view our action as a national humiliation; looking at these questions from the standpoint of our national interest and welfare—from the standpoint of the peace, happiness, and security of our people—I am persuaded the bill should receive the favorable action of the Congress, because its passage will tend, at least, to lessen our chances of becoming involved in the European conflict and to this extent aid in maintaining American peace. Peace, my friends, is cheap at any price short of our national honor and integrity and I see nothing

in the bill that either reflects upon or jeopardizes the honor and integrity of this Nation.

To those who seemingly view with alarm the discretionary powers vested under the terms of the bill in the President, may I say that the discretionary powers have been reduced to the minimum, that in the very nature of things it is necessary that certain discretionary powers be vested in the President, and that the American people should be thankful, yea, grateful to a kind Providence for placing at the head of this Government, during these days of stress, a man whose "ways are the ways of peace," and whose every effort has been to keep Old Glory floating over a Nation at peace with God and man.

SOME OTHER THINGS WE SHOULD DO IN ORDER TO INSURE PEACE

But in addition to passing the Senate bill, I am definitely of the opinion that there are other things that we will have to do in order to insure our peace and tranquility.

A. KEEP STRONG MENTALLY

In the first place, we will have to keep strong mentally. We will have to keep our own resistance around normal, or over, so we can withstand the propaganda, much of which will be honest and sincere, some of the seductive and insidious type that will be carried in the press, glut the mails, keep the telegraph wires hot, and fill the air with charges and countercharges. When it comes to propaganda, it takes a strong, clear, healthy mind to separate the gold from the dross.

Then we have got to use a little mentality—horse sense, if you please—in our foreign relations. While many these days seem to assume great knowledge and understanding about international affairs which, of course, are carried on through diplomatic channels, I have always been a little leary about foreign diplomats. My honest opinion is that Bret Harte's observation on the ancient Chinee applies with peculiar force to the foreign diplomat. I can paraphrase his lines and give you a fairly accurate description of what I think of foreign diplomats and foreign diplomacy:

Which I wish to remark—
And my language is plain—
That for ways that are dark
And for tricks that are vain
The foreign diplomat is peculiar.

Recent and past events in Europe would indicate that the representatives of some of the nations at least possess the spirit of the old-fashioned horse swapper, and are engaged, more or less, in a game of horse swapping. You know the old-fashioned American horse swapper was a cold, calculating chap, whose conscience recognized no moral obligations, whose representations were made to deceive and not to inform, whose agreements and warranties ended with the conclusion of the trade, and whose philosophy of life was pretty well summed up by David Harum when he said, "Do unto the other fellow the way he'd like to do unto you, and do it first." You know, these fellows helped to talk and trick us into the World War by selling us on the idea that we had to fight to save the world for democracy, and then, after the war, after we had gone in and saved the world for democracy, went ahead and drew up a peace treaty that did more to destroy democracy and bring about autocracy and dictatorships than anything ever written on paper. My advice is to stay away as far as possible from these fellows that think one way and talk another.

Now, as a matter of fact, while very few, if any, of us know a great deal about foreign relations, most of us know a great deal about domestic relations, and we know that if we keep our own house in order we can live in peace and tranquillity, because our time will be fully occupied and we will not have time to horse swap around with the other fellow. Oh, I know they tell us that, due to science and invention, world affairs have changed and that we are just one great big family. But, my friends, while science and invention have wrought many changes, there are some things that they have not changed. Neither science nor invention has changed the spirit of the horse trader or altered his philosophy of life, nor the tongues and mental processes of the foreign diplomats. Neither science nor invention has changed the consequences of "butting in," "nosing around," "meddling," and "sticking your finger in the other fellow's business." And, my friends, neither science nor invention has changed the good old American axioms predicated upon common sense, that it is a good idea to "play in your own back yard," "stay on your side of the high board fence," and "never butt into a family quarrel."

I do not mean by this that I am an isolationist. I am not. We cannot live alone. We are not self-sustained. It is necessary for our national economy and well-being that we have intercourse with other nations. This intercourse should be, however, of a friendly, commercial, and business nature and should never lead us to become entangled in their domestic and international rackets and disputes.

And in order to keep our well-founded or ill-founded convictions from getting out of bounds, we are going to need all of our mental strength. While we all have convictions, and some of us pretty strong convictions, as to who is right and who is wrong in the European conflict; while many of us, no doubt, view with alarm the rise to power of those who arrogantly proclaim themselves foes to God and religion; while many of us, no doubt, shudder at the thought that rulers of certain nations are brazenly exterminating the thought, speech, and movement of their people, not only by intimidation but by force of arms, in many cases silencing the opposition by the hand of the assassin; while many of us, no doubt, tremble at some of the larger nations in some cases wiping out smaller nations by force and in other cases bringing them by force under their dominion and power; and while we entertain these views because these doctrines and these policies are contrary to the lofty ideals and purposes upon which our Nation was founded, I cannot believe that these causes—as grave and menacing as they may be—are so impelling, as long as they do not directly affect the Americas, as long as they do not involve our national safety, honor, and integrity, as to cause us to plunge our country into war in an attempt to correct them by the sword, and in so doing bring economic loss—probably ruin—to our national economy, and misery, suffering, and death itself to untold millions of our people.

Then we will need all of our mental faculties to keep our sympathies from running riot. While I know it is but natural for the sympathies of Christian democratic America to go out to those who are in distress, to those who have been wounded and maimed, to those who are sick in body and mind, to those who have been driven from home and country, to those who are hungry and naked, and to those who are gripped by a fear far more terrible than death itself, and that when we contemplate the scene oftimes our sympathies are turned into hate and resentment against those whose wanton butchery and destruction brought about such needless distress and misery and destruction, I say to you that this is no time to let sympathy supplant reason and let our emotions carry us blindly into a strife that sooner or later would visit the same suffering, misery, and distress upon our own people as they minister to their sick and wounded and mourn their departed dead. I yield to no man in sympathetic impulses, my heart ever goes out to those in distress, and I can share the pangs of sorrow with my friends as they go through their "sorrow's crown of sorrows." But because I can sympathize with my friends in death is no reason why, in order to prove that my sympathy is genuine and sincere, I should commit suicide. The sensible thing, the reasonable thing for me to do under such circumstances is to retain my composure, my faculties, so that I can the better administer to their wants and needs after their trials and while they yet linger down in the low grounds of sorrow and distress. The same is true of a nation. This old world has gone through many periods of grief. I doubt if the sun as it makes its daily round has ever failed to light up some stricken area; and as I view the situation today, I am afraid that unless the Divine hand of Providence intervenes, when the present European conflict is over, the sun as it girdles the earth will reveal more destruction, more human suffering and misery, covering a larger area, than its effulgent rays ever shown upon since the decree went forth, "Let there be light."

When that day comes, I hope, I feverently pray, Christian democratic America will still remain intact, even yet the citadel of peace, standing in her might and majesty as a reminder that the teachings of the Master "that my ways are the ways of peace" cannot be flouted by the sons of men. Then I am willing for sympathy to play upon the heart strings of my fellow countrymen, and I know they will respond with true American sympathy and benevolence. Then, my friends, we can render a true service.

B. KEEP STRONG PHYSICALLY

In the second place, we will have to keep strong physically. This means we must keep prepared at all times, on land, on sea, and in the air, to maintain the honor, integrity, and safety of our Republic, and to withstand any attack made by an aggressor nation. In spite of compelling causes you will find that somehow the aggressor nation always thinks that it has the physical power to avenge the supposed wrong. The nation that runs amuck never attempts to wreak its vengence upon its equals or betters. You will find that nations, like men, think it is better "to bear these ills we have than fly to others that we know not of." Probably we will advance to higher ground somewhere down through the ages, but today, whether we want to believe it or not, the only force recognized by the nation, whose leadership seems bent upon running amuck, is physical force. The best insurance policy against insults that would reflect upon our national honor and integrity or against acts of aggression is a strong Army, a strong Navy, and a strong air fleet. Somehow the bully treats his physical superiors with a great deal of consideration. The chip he carries around on his shoulder is for his weaker brother.

C. KEEP STRONG SPIRITUALLY

And, in the third place, we will have to keep strong spiritually. The nation, like the man, that leaves God out of its life loses all sense of proportion. Christian nations see clearer, think straighter, and act saner than those nations that leave God out of their counsels.

What the American people want—yea, what the people of all the nations want above everything else—if they could but give true expression to their feelings, is peace. And as paradoxical as it may sound, while we abhor war and love peace, we go on as soon as one war is over preparing for another, without giving any real thought, time, or attention to the spiritual force that can alone bring peace. We enter into Kellogg peace pacts, alliances, and hold economic and disarmament conferences, ever leaving vacant at the council table of the nations the seat of the only diplomat capable of working out an alliance among the nations of the earth that will usher in the golden era of peace. When that vacant seat is filled by the Prince of Peace, then and not until then, may we look for peace. May God speed that day. Until it arrives may America walk close to God.

The Arms Embargo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL R. LEWIS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 19, 1939

POEM BY GRACE MARIE PIPER

Mr. LEWIS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the proposal to lift the embargo on arms, ammunition, and implements of war has stirred this country as few measures in my memory have done. It is, of course, known to all of us that this subject is a matter of discussion wherever people meet. It is not so well known that the children in schools are discussing and writing about this matter, and I was considerably surprised to receive yesterday a letter from a little girl, 14 years of age, containing a poem addressed to her high-school class, of Bethesda, Ohio, the subject being On Lifting the Embargo.

As an example of what the children in schools are thinking on this subject, I am glad to present this poem by Grace Marie Piper, of Bethesda, Ohio, to the Members of Congress. The poem is as follows:

ON LIFTING THE EMBARGO

(By Grace Marie Piper, 14 years of age; addressed to her class in Bethesda, Ohio, High School)

I hope the class will listen to me
As I speak on the subject of neutrality.
If we want to stay neutral, we must keep on our shore
And sell no munitions to countries at war.

If we lift the embargo, and ship powder and lead,
We should feed their poor orphans and bury their dead.
We should carry their wounded from fields where they lie
And hear the sad moans of the boys as they die.

We can use their "blood money" to buy butter and bread,
And eat to their blind, their maimed, and their dead.
We can destroy their churches, their homes, and their schools—
Certainly our embargo lifters are either traitors or fools!

If we lift the embargo, we're helping Stalin the "Red,"
Who expects to rule the world when civilization is dead.
Will our good-neighbor policy furnish a shell
That will black-out civilization and sink it in hell?

Leif Ericson's Challenge to This Age

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, October 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, October 4), 1939

ADDRESS BY HON. ALEXANDER WILEY, OF WISCONSIN, BEFORE LEIF ERICSON SOCIETY, CHICAGO

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address on Leif Ericson, delivered by me on October 9, 1939, before the Leif Ericson Society, of Chicago, Ill.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In evaluating any life that has been lived on earth, we cannot simply tell of the deeds and the accomplishments which were wrought by that life; rather we must ask ourselves what is the meaning of this life to this period in which we live; what are the lessons to be learned from that life; what stimulus and courage can we get from recounting the incidents of that life.

I have just returned from the Land of the Midnight Sun. My own parents were born in Norway. My mother was 3 years old when her parents decided to emigrate to America. I had the privilege of visiting her old home, located on the side of a mountain out in Gausdal, which is an offshoot of Gubrandsdalen. I had also the rich experience of visiting my father's home, located by the side of Numedals-Logan in Numedal. For many years I had a longing to see Viking Land—this summer that longing was partially satisfied. I'm going back again sometime.

As we sailed up Bergensfjord in the steamship *Venus*, my mind went back to the days when probably out of this same stretch of water Leif Ericson and other Viking spirits, in their open boats, sailed back and forth between Iceland and Norway. These restless spirits were interested in knowing what was beyond their realm of knowledge, so they sailed forth across unknown seas (Undres mig paa hvad jeg faar et sae over de hoij fjelde). There was an inner urge to go forth to accomplish, to discover. They were explorers—exploring the unknown. On my trip back home just a few weeks ago our boat sailed north of the Shetland Islands, then southwest between the Shetland Islands and the Faeroe Islands. We were practically as far north as Iceland. We were then on those seas that Leif Ericson sailed over in the year 1000 when he reached Norway in his visit from Greenland.

You and I will remember that it was in the year 1000 that he embraced Christianity. It was also in that year that he returned to Iceland from Norway. In about the year 1000 or 1003, Leif

Ericson set sail for Vineland and the best historians agree that Vineland is America and that Leif Ericson spent a winter on American soil. He reached Cape Cod and built a house. A year later he returned to Greenland, later on other Viking discoverers sailed to America.

We do not know the exact date of Leif Ericson's death—it has been put between 1020 and 1025; we do not know the date of his birth. After all, such dates are insignificant anyway. What men do, what they stand for, what they contribute to their day and generation and the ages to come, is what lives after them.

The voyages of Leif Ericson and others, as they were chronicled (and we must remember, in that period that Iceland kept the candle of Christianity lighted and was the center of intellectual growth in Europe) gave impetus to the discovery of America by Columbus in 1492. So today, more than ever before, the things that America does and America stands for will determine the course of world history tomorrow.

What is the meaning of this life to this period in which we live?

Let us realize that Leif Ericson became a Christian. What did that mean? Until he went to Norway in the year 1000 he believed in the old Norse gods, the gods of force, but when he went to Norway he came in contact with the doctrines of the Nazarene. He was a man who sailed the seas in an open boat, the boat was propelled by force of wind and oars; the boat at most probably was not over 50 or 60 feet long. He lived up among the icebergs; he knew the ruggedness of Iceland and the rugged fjords of Norway—Nature in the rough; yet, into his soul came the light of Him who taught, "Love one another," who taught that life was continuous; that the greatest man was he who was the greatest servant; that is, the greatest giver.

Into this rugged soul of Leif Ericson there was lodged the dynamic thought that "God is love," not brute force. Into his being came the tremendous preachments of the Old and New Testaments that "In Him (God), we live and move and have our being," and into this man's great heart came the direction to "Feed my sheep."

As he sailed the wild wastes of water; as he conquered with his little skiff the mountain-high waves; as he at night, while ever sailing on and on, contemplated the starry heavens, something of the meaning, something of the import of these new teachings gripped every fiber of his being. And when he returned to Iceland he saw to it that the people there embraced Christianity.

Then, as he heard rumors of another land beyond Greenland, the Viking spirit in him still dominant sent him forth in this search for undiscovered lands. His discovery in Norway in the year 1000, of the new teachings undoubtedly gave impetus to the thought that there were undiscovered lands to the westward.

So now, from this great character we can learn that great men and people do not stay in a rut. In his day there must have been those who said, "Do not embrace this new religion; do not sail westward; do not explore into the unknown."

Leif Ericson apparently heeded none of their admonitions—he was an explorer. Oh how we need his type today. The world is hungry for men who will reach out and find new continents, men who will dare to get out of the ruts, men who will seek to find solutions to our many, many problems, including that of war. And around us we hear people say there are no more frontiers. Why, my friends, that argument was used against Leif Ericson. There were those who said "Our concepts of the religion of Thor are adequate for us," but he reached out and found a new dynamic faith which gave him added courage, added vision, added incentive, to venture forth to explore. In my opinion human beings haven't touched the outer garment of the knowledge that is to be found. Our Edisons, our Wright brothers, our Franklins, were Leif Ericsons in their field. There are a million frontiers yet to be crossed in every realm of human knowledge. If Leif Ericson were on earth today he would accept the challenge that presents itself to America and the world, the challenge to find a solution to war.

Undoubtedly he would also accept the challenge that exists in this land because of our pseudo politicians to find a solution to our capital-labor problem.

I believe also, if he were alive today, he would tackle the problem of ever-increasing centralization of power—the road to fascism and nazi-ism and communism.

To fully appreciate this leader one must realize, as I have said before, that Iceland in his period was the intellectual oasis of the western world. Here a university existed; here learned churchmen kept alight the things of the spirit; here saga writers delineated adventure and romance and discovery; here thinkers reveled in the realm of thought. So Leif Ericson represented in the year 1000 to the day of his death the mentally alert people of the western world.

What are the lessons to be learned from this life? We have already partially answered that question.

We, as citizens of the New World, the world that he discovered, cannot lie down and say there are no new worlds or things to discover. We cannot quit life before we have lived it. In this age when the world is afire, when war once more strikes at America, we can, at least, learn from his life the need of developing fearlessness, courage, and the desire to do something constructive. When Leif Ericson was filled with the spirit of the Master he was not simply satisfied with getting that truth himself, he disseminated it wherever he went, he became a great giver; he followed in His footsteps.

We in this country are disciples of democracy. You and I were handed this thing we call democracy; you and I were given this citizenship which we call American; we did nothing to create it, but now, in the spirit of Leif Ericson, let us accept the challenge to do something to preserve it, let us become explorers, and, if necessary, sail on uncharted seas to preserve the heritage that is ours—Christianity and liberty.

In the last session of Congress I introduced a resolution for an amendment to the Constitution, which provided as follows:

"The Congress shall have power to declare war when the United States or any of its Territories or possessions have been invaded, or are in immediate danger of invasion, and when any part of the Western Hemisphere has been invaded by, or is in immediate danger of invasion by, the forces of any non-American nation, and shall have power to declare war in other cases only if a majority of those persons voting in a national referendum, held in such manner as the Congress shall by law provide, shall vote in favor of such declaration of war."

You will notice that this proposed amendment provided an added check on war. Jefferson, when he wrote into the Constitution that Congress alone should have the power to declare war, said that he had put a check on the dogs of war. In my joint resolution you will notice that I place a double check on the dogs of war. In other words, I said except in thoses cases above enumerated, before Congress would declare war there must be a referendum favoring war, and even this did not compel Congress to declare war—it would only be a direction.

I believe America should be the lighthouse keeper. The business of a lighthouse keeper is to keep the light burning. It is not the business of a lighthouse keeper to go out and attend to the wrecks. He must keep the light burning so that when the navigators of ships look for the light it will be there. If Europe "goes to pot," it is not our business to "go to pot" with her. It is our business to keep the light of democracy burning, so that in the years that are ahead stricken people everywhere will be able to see the glory and the worthwhileness of democratic principles. If we keep our thinking straight, America will not get mixed up in any future wars.

Speaking in the Storting at Oslo, in August 1939, I said:

"I had not intended to speak, but when it was suggested by the chairman of our delegation that I say a few words I was especially happy to comply with that suggestion for two reasons:

"First, there was a sentimental one. I wanted to speak from the rostrum of the Storting. My parents came from this land. They have both gone on ahead in the journey. If they were alive they would be happy to see me, a representative of America, in their own homeland.

"My first reaction was not to speak, because I remembered that on one occasion one of the great statesmen of this country over a century ago, in the great international crisis when Napoleon was stirring up affairs in Europe, said in response to an inquiry: 'Nu er det tid til a holde kjeft,' meaning that now it was time to keep your mouth shut. But again I realized that in a meeting of this kind—a meeting of the Interparliamentary Union, the only institution of its kind on earth, dedicated to the perpetuation of parliaments—it was my duty to speak.

"The second reason, then, for my speaking, I have already referred to. It is this: To bring to this body of serious-minded men, many of whom have dedicated their lives to this work; men who have come year after year to the meetings of this organization to exchange their points of view to the end that the great parliamentary systems of the world may be preserved; to preserve the great freedoms of mankind; to bring to this great body a reiteration of the old, old need, a quest for God. It is the supreme need of the hour; Goethe called it 'more light.' Others call it a 'spiritual rebirth.' The history of nations is replete with instances when men and nations returned from their waywardness to find inspiration, courage, vision, guidance, and rebirth in the 'things of the spirit.'

"You men know that integrity of the individual man is the great need of mankind today. You men know that it is the 'great business' of parliaments and of the members thereof not only to pass laws but to provide moral leadership in this changing world."

Leif Ericson was a character who didn't live in the past! he lived in the eternal present. He accepted the challenges of the present and went out to meet them head on. We of this generation should conceive of life as he did, as a thing to be lived, a thing to discover the meaning of. Leif turned on "new lights" that never go out.

Yes, my friends, Browning says, "Life has meaning, and to find its meaning is my meat and drink."

Leif Ericson showed that man here does not live by bread alone; that there was something else to live for besides accumulating material things. He knew that life has meaning, and he was trying to find the answer. He knew that life meant, as one great German thinker said, "to transform into light and flame all that we are or meet with." He knew in his day, as we must know in our day, that while these are challenging times, civilization is not in the death throes but in the birth pains of new life. He had not one idea of a defeatist in him; he conquered defeat and hysteria; he was a smasher of false barriers; he was no underling.

Let each American read and understand the lesson of his life, and there will be no underlings among us. May we, too, continue to seek undiscovered continents of national and international law and order, peace, and good will. Then, like Leif Ericson, we will turn on the lights that never go out.

Business and Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, October 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, October 4), 1939

ADDRESS BY HON. JOHN W. HANES BEFORE BOND CLUB OF NEW YORK

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a most able and informative address made by Hon. John W. Hanes, Under Secretary of the Treasury, before the Bond Club of New York at New York City on October 18, 1939.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

May I say at the outset—and with great sincerity—that I am grateful for this invitation to meet with you at your first fall luncheon. I have never received an invitation I appreciated more. Through personal acquaintance, business experience, and contact in public life, I know the caliber of the men in your group, the significance of your function in our national life, and something of your problems. One reason why I am particularly happy to be here is that it gives me an opportunity to acknowledge the friendship, confidence, and sympathetic understanding which you have shown me during the days of my service in Washington.

By that I do not mean to imply that all of you have been in complete accord with my official record. I do assume, however, that you have allowed me credit for trying to do the best job of which I am capable.

If any virtue is to be attached to that job, it must derive largely from this approach, which is neither particularly original nor particularly complex: I have consistently pursued the policy of insisting that the biggest issue in this country is economic recovery. I have never made a public statement or held a private conference or labored with the Congress without urging the necessity for recognizing economic recovery as a condition precedent to the solution of almost every important domestic problem which our Government has faced during this period. After 2 years of public experience I am more firmly convinced than ever that this is the correct approach to the cure of our domestic ills.

When I left New York for Washington I realized my lack of training in public service. Like thousands of other businessmen tremendously interested in national problems, I had not been in a position to consider them as exhaustively as I should have liked. Moreover, I knew little of the science of politics, its conflicts, its compromises, its prejudices, pitfalls, and animosities.

It did not take long to learn that in the last analysis legislation is compromise—compromise between one point of view and another, compromise between what you want and what you can get. I have been compelled to accept as a fact that there are at least two sides to every public question, and to recognize the inevitable necessity, if progress is to be made, for reconciling viewpoints in commonsense solutions. This very process, however, while stimulating in its exposure to a variety of opinions, likewise impresses with the need for maintaining a clear perspective.

I am grateful for that experience. It has been my good fortune to serve under the leadership of Secretary Henry Morgenthau, Jr., a man blessed with an uncommon supply of common sense. I have never known a more faithful public servant or been associated with a man more sincere in the performance of his duties. There has never been a cloud of doubt in his mind that the open way for national well-being lay over the broad road of economic recovery.

The promotion of national recovery is a task of many aspects. I am not an expert or an economist, but it is plain to me that the root of our problem is unemployment. We have several million people in this country today wanting to work and finding nothing to do. Their idleness is not only subtracting from the productivity of the Nation but is causing a heavy drain on the resources of those at work in the form of great expenditures for relief and public-works programs. The cost of our unemployed to the economy of the country is conservatively estimated at more than $20,000,000,000 annually.

We must face and solve this problem both publicly and privately. These millions must either be fed and clothed or put back to work. They cannot be ignored. There has never been in any country a dictator whose origin did not date back to a condition where faith in existing government was gone, where standards of living had collapsed, and men were hungry. Hungry men are the raw material out of which dictators are made.

The primary solution of this problem must lie in the increase of industrial production—the creation of additional national wealth. This can result only from the maintenance of conditions under which private enterprise may make reasonable profits. Profits earned by business, or the prospects of profits to be earned, form the basis for attracting additional credit resources and investment by the public. It is imperative that we direct every effort toward encouraging investment in enterprises which will provide employment.

In this connection not the least of the factors to be considered is that it has been estimated that the investment in plants of industrial companies decreased from approximately $41,000,000,000 in 1929 to approximately $32,000,000,000 in 1937. Under more normal circumstances, plant account should have grown at least $1,000,000,000 per annum during that time, or to a total of, roughly, $48,000,000,000.

May I also point out that it is estimated that the sum of approximately $7,000 of capital assets, such as land, buildings, equipment, and tools, is required to put one man to work. We have approximately 600,000 young men and women each year coming into our employment stream as candidates for jobs. To put these 600,000 people to work we require, therefore, new investment in capital goods at a minimum rate of $4,200,000,000 annually.

Your group should have no sympathy with the view sometimes expressed that we are suffering from a matured economy; that our economic frontiers have disappeared; that there is not ample room in the national economy for new investments in enterprise. We would be sad, indeed, if we found this restricted philosophy accepted. It reflects upon the genius of American science and upon the drive and ingenuity of our people; it is inconsistent with our insatiable demand for an ever higher standard of living; it is repudiated by the achievements of the past and the prospects of the future.

Well do I recall many years ago when I left North Carolina to enter college. The only fabricated wearing apparel known at that time and for 6,000 years prior to that time was of wool, silk, linen, and cotton. Yet in the space of one generation a new fiber has been discovered in a chemical laboratory known as rayon. This new fiber, made from wood pulp, has revolutionized the textile business of the world.

Some time ago I listened to Mr. Kettering, of General Motors, talking to a group of Congressmen and telling them of some 50 items which the research departments of our great industrial organizations have perfected to the point where immediate manufacture is possible. I call your attention to just a few of these developments: (1) Fabrication of silk hosiery from coal; (2) manufacture of wool, not from sheep but from cow's milk; (3) processing of a product resembling glass from wood fiber; (4) manufacture of fireproof cloth from glass; and, lastly, effective coverage of the great field of temperature control in both winter and summer by the same system of heating and cooling.

It should be tremendously encouraging to all of us to know that on the picket line of our civilization there are men like Kettering lighting the fires of ambition and research, stimulating the machinery of private enterprise, and broadening the fields for new investments in the products of American genius. Equally imperative, if less spectacular, must be the drive to bring to all of our citizens more of the products already available to some—better food, better transportation, better housing, better clothing—through increased production at reasonable prices.

We all realize, of course, that the solution of our economic problem cannot be achieved by any single expedient or in any single field. But, in my opinion, one of the important ways in which the Federal Government can contribute effectively to industrial development, reemployment, and economic recovery is through a fair and intelligent tax structure. Taxes may be prosaic in discussion, but they are vital in action.

We now have the most powerful Federal tax system in the history of the country. Including the pay-roll taxes, in the fiscal year 1938 we collected a total of more than $6,200,000,000. There are six main sources of this revenue. They are: (1) Individual income tax, (2) corporation income tax, (3) customs duties, (4) estate and gift tax, (5) excise or sales taxes, and (6) social-security taxes. The largest single source of revenue to the Federal Government is the so-called excise- or sales-tax group.

Prior to going to the Treasury I had never studied the tax problems of the country from the viewpoint of the tax collector. I had, however, become somewhat conscious of one or two problems from the standpoint of the taxpayer. From the standpoint of both, it seems to me, a sound tax policy must be based on three fundamental objectives: First, it should produce the necessary revenue; second, with the least injury to the taxpayers and the national economy; and, third, with the least trouble and expense to both taxpayer and Treasury. To the extent that our present tax system fails to reach these objectives, or sacrifices these objectives for others, it should be revised.

One thing is indisputable about the present tax system. Notwithstanding the enormity of its yield, it does not produce the necessary revenue.

Thus we are brought immediately to these questions: Does it operate in the manner best calculated to foster the national economy? Does it contain elements which, if removed, would at the same time promote the national economy and maintain or increase the tax yield? Can the yield be increased without serious impairment of the economic structure?

In considering these questions it is obvious that we must bear in mind three known factors of outstanding importance: (1) That until a relatively short time ago business was lagging; (2) the shrinkage of industrial plant account; (3) the shortage of venture

capital. To the extent that our national tax system contributed or now tends to perpetuate any of these factors it should be changed.

I think the Treasury has already made some contribution in the right direction, both psychological and material, and that that contribution has been reflected in recent business improvement. As you know, the Congress at the last session enacted the Revenue Act of 1939, embodying various revisions of our tax legislation. Without attempting to detail these changes, I will refer briefly to some of the more important, as follows:

(1) The amendment permitting corporations and individuals to deduct their net operating business losses incurred in 1 year from their profits in the succeeding 2 years. This should be of particular help to new enterprises and the capital-goods industries, ordinarily subject to wide fluctuations in earnings.

(2) The repeal of the undistributed-profits tax and the substitution of a flat tax on corporations with net income over $25,000, and a lower graduated tax on those with smaller income.

(3) The amendment allowing corporations to deduct their net long-term capital losses from the year's ordinary income.

(4) The liberalization of the interrelated capital stock and excess-profits tax provisions, so as to eliminate the uncertainty and inequity theretofore attendant upon the necessity of accurately forecasting business profits for 3 years in advance under penalty of payment of increased taxes.

(5) The liberalization and clarification in various respects of the provisions of the law relating to exemption from taxation on corporate reorganizations.

(6) The amendment permitting corporations in unsound financial condition to scale down their debts or to repurchase their obligations at less than face value without tax liability.

By administrative regulation Secretary Morgenthau has put into effect a program of decentralization in tax administration, by virtue of which disputes now may be settled locally, without the expense and inconvenience of going to Washington.

Much remains to be done, if the abnormal circumstances abroad do not prevent their being accomplished. Recognizing this need, the House of Representatives, before adjourning its regular session, instructed a subcommittee of the Ways and Means Committee to make a thorough study of internal-revenue taxation.

With the approval of Chairman DOUGHTON, of the Ways and Means Committee, and Chairman JERE COOPER, of the subcommittee, we have asked more than a thousand leaders in industry, labor, commerce, banking, and agriculture to give us their suggestions. In requesting this help, we have offered them informal private hearings before the Treasury staff assigned to compile a record of public tax opinion; and digests of these hearings will be presented to the Ways and Means subcommittee. We have received many sincere and helpful suggestions. I shall not undertake to enumerate the range of these suggestions, except to say that they cover vast fields of the explored and the unexplored.

What disposition will be made of these suggestions which have come in, and are coming in, I cannot, for obvious reasons, predict at this time. The Treasury recommendations I hope will be framed in the light of the considerations to which I have already alluded.

A few minutes ago I referred to abnormal circumstances abroad. It is inevitable today that you and millions of our people are thinking in terms of the effect of the war in Europe or its settlement not only upon our domestic economy but upon our country and our immediate personal welfare. We all remember the chaos that occurred in 1914 upon the advent of the World War. It should be some comfort to all of us to contrast the economic shock of 1914 with the relative economic equanimity with which we met the shock of September 1, 1939. In 1914, our Government was utterly unprepared. I think it can be truthfully said that your Government, before September 1 of this year, had rendered by its preparedness an incalculable service to its citizens. For months, before Poland was invaded, we had been working diligently in Washington to cushion the system of this country against the economic dislocations of a European war.

It is interesting to recall that in September 1938 at Munich when the war clouds began to look ominous, the markets, in memory of what happened in 1914, took a nose dive, and again in April of 1939, when the war again looked imminent, fears of collapse appeared and there was another drastic decline in values. Rarely have we seen a more complete reversal of business sentiment than that which occurred in September of this year. You know the story. People went about their business as usual. The Stock Exchange remained open. There were no panic-stricken citizens pounding on the closed doors of avenues of credit. People spoke of an epidemic of confidence, instead of a scourge of collapse.

In spite of the recurring and depressing fears of war in our national psychology, we were already in a period of expanding recovery before the first gun was fired. It seems to me that we have tended to overlook the upsurge that was taking place, and have been disposed to attribute to war an abnormal proportion of the advance that has occurred. I think that we were on the road to economic recovery prior to Poland. Let's look at the facts:

Business activity showed a strongly rising trend. Moreover, there were further improvements in prospect, due, among other things, to the outlook for an early and rapid increase in automobile production, a rebound in crude oil production, and the probability of replenishment of inventories owing to the low levels to which they had been reduced.

In August the Federal Reserve Board index of industrial production had risen to 102, as compared with a low of 92 in April and May. The further rise to about 110 in September was due only partly to the effects of the war. In fact, the level of business activity at the time the war broke out, as shown by the New York Times index, was already sharply higher than the average August level; railway traffic was rapidly increasing; steel activity was rising; the automobile companies were calling for delivery of a large volume of steel products contracted for earlier in the year; electric power production was establishing new all-time highs.

As I have pointed out, the situation in the automobile industry, with indications pointing to a more active demand for cars than in the fall of 1938, was an important factor lending strength to the business prospect. It is significant, therefore, that despite the curtailment of export demand for passenger cars due to the war the industry has reached an output of 75,000 units per week about 3 weeks earlier than in 1938.

All this data points to the conclusion that the present up-swing has not come directly from war psychology and should not be wholly divested of domestic factors, which we may truly claim were developing a clearer and more constructive perspective before our path was clouded with the confusion and conflict of arms.

I think it is safe to say that whether or not the war continues for some time industry is going to require new capital. The utilities, for example, may require perhaps twice as much in some instances as they had planned a few months ago. The machinery for handling this corporate financing is here, and I know it is ready to perform the task. We realize the value of your contribution to the economy in this crisis, and the Treasury is ready to help in every possible way. Speaking a moment for the Bureau of Internal Revenue, may I say that in times gone by you have been most excellent customers. I hope the time will not be too far removed when we can count on you more regularly every March 15.

Just one further observation: You will remember the severe headache that we had in this country following the close of the last war, when we had a tremendous rise in all prices, which terminated suddenly, and the demand for everything ceased so abruptly. It is just this shock that I think our business leaders of today are trying to avoid when published reports from all parts of the country state that manufacturers in basic industries are not going to advance prices in response to a speculative war psychology.

I believe that experience has taught us in this country to expand the economy on a broad, flat basis without getting ourselves on a pinnacle of price levels which will inevitably lead to another collapse.

What the future has in store for our country I make no effort to prophesy. Neither you nor I can penetrate this veil. We must trust to the sound common sense of the American people and appeal to the innate fairness and justice that underlies all differences of calling, class, party, or creed, and which in every hour of national crisis makes us realize more fully the meaning of being able to say, "I am an American citizen."

May I say again how happy I am to return to this city and take part in this reunion with friends and former associates. I shall never cease to be grateful for my experience here, and, likewise, I shall never cease to be grateful for the opportunity of spending 2 years in the nerve center of my Government. I wish government could spend more time with you and you more time with government. I am confident this exchange of scholarship would develop a more cordial and sympathetic understanding between the two.

Effect in Oregon of Reciprocal-Trade Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUFUS C. HOLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, October 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, October 4), 1939

ARTICLE FROM THE OREGON VOTER

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, I request unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article, published in the Oregon Voter of October 14, which pertains to trade agreements and their effect in Oregon.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Oregon Voter of October 14, 1939]

TARIFF TREATY RECIPROCATES IN REVERSE

Senator C. H. Zurcher, of Wallowa County, saw something on a recent trip that convinced him our lumber industry is not the only great Oregon industry that was sacrificed to the buy-British treaty negotiated by the Roosevelt administration under authority of Congress to be without confirmation by the United States Senate.

He was passing through Pasco and found in that vicinity there were some 6,300 Canadian calves, weighing about 250 or 300 pounds

each, that were being fattened for the American baby-beef market by being fed Argentine corn and East Indian molasses. A small duty had been paid on the import of the calves, but Argentine corn delivered was cheaper at Pasco than Iowa corn could be shipped to the same locality, and the ships from the Orient also brought molasses from the East Indies cheaper than our own sugar wastes could be obtained. So long as we are paying American wage rates to workers in our domestic transport, and so long as the costs of agriculture continue high as a result of our efforts to maintain something like an American standard of living on our farms that pay high taxes for our public schools and old-age pensions, America finds it difficult to compete with producers where standards are lower, especially when their products are brought to our ports in foreign ships which are operated at far less costs than those forced on American ships to sustain American standards.

On top of this, we open the gate for more interchange of trade with Canada, for the supposed benefit of our own industry, and find that the commodities which come into our country as a result of this interchange are products, such as cattle, which we already are producing ourselves. The suspicion that all is not well with the reciprocal treaty would appear to have enough foundation to justify the efforts being made by our Senator HOLMAN and Representative ANGELL to have the subject opened up for inquiry.

To sacrifice Oregon lumber, livestock, and agriculture to the national interest may be justified if the Nation is benefited. But to sacrifice them without a compensating benefit to the national economy is something else. We would like to know more of these supposed benefits, if there are such, before we settle down to expire uncomplainingly under the sacrifice.

What War Really Means to Animals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 20, 1939

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, on April 27 last I made some observations in this body addressed to the question, Should America take sides in European wars? My conclusions were then, and I am now of the same opinion, that America should maintain a strictly neutral position; that we should mind our own business, hold aloof from European entanglements, and not take any position that ultimately may lead us to war. Once started down the war road, there will be no turning back. We cannot be half in and half out of this war. We must go in all the way or keep all the way out. As has been so well said, we cannot be the arsenal for one of the belligerents without being the target for the other.

If we should repeal the embargo on arms and munitions, which has now become our fixed foreign policy, we are giving up a neutral position for a partisan one to help one of the parties in the present conflict. The avowed purpose of the repeal of the embargo is to aid one side of the conflict. As I observed on April 27, there is one thing that has caused more heartache and misery in the world than any other, and that is war. The sole objective of war is destruction. Brute force is its mainspring; the dead and the maimed are its harvest. It not only bankrupts nations in their material welfare but it robs them as well of all spiritual values. It not only sets nation against nation but breeds in the hearts of men hate and the desire to destroy and tear down. It never builds; it never ennobles. Worst of all, its fruitage is the death and maiming of the young manhood of the country. It feeds not upon the old and the maimed but devours the flower of the youth of the country, and leaves the living impoverished, sickened, and spiritually weakened for generations, and cast its spell and its burdens upon generations yet unborn.

If we should repeal the embargo and take sides in this conflict, and if this first step toward war should lead to the ones which logically will follow—namely, participation by credits and ultimately by sending our soldiers abroad—we should provide, so far as is humanly possible, to protect not only our armed forces, but we should not overlook the fact that many animals are sacrificed at the same time. The American Humane Society has recently called attention to the part played in the tragedy of war by these dumb animals. I take the liberty, with the consent of the House, of including the statement of this association as a part of my remarks, with the hope that suitable provision will be made to heed the admonitions advanced by this great humane association for the protection of these dumb creatures.

The statement follows:

WHAT WAR REALLY MEANS TO ANIMALS

While many painters have pictured the panoply of war in a spirit of glorification, a few have shown it as it really is. Landseer gave a remorseless rendering of the horrors of war, dead troopers, dying frantic horses, flames and smoke all bearing eloquent testimony to the havoc and madness of battle. There are others, such as Schreyer's Abandoned, and Barker's painting of Napoleon at Bassano with death all around and one lone dog watching over its dead soldier master.

War cannot be made humane to animals or men. Clara Barton wrote in 1900:

"Among the shocking and heartrending scenes of the battlefield the screams of the wounded horses lingered more painfully in my ears, if possible, than the moans of the wounded men. * * * They die slow and hard if left to themselves, and I myself have seen the vultures hovering and tearing at them while life yet remained."

In the Crimean War horses died of starvation, fatigue, and exposure. In the Franco-German War (1870–71), following the surrender of Sedan—

"The starving horses had gnawed off everything, even the bark of trees. Many * * * were in a piteous condition between the houses and walls, motionless, awaiting death by hunger; half broken down, some sat on their haunches, others licked the slime at their feet, and many had sunk down in harness by the carts. * * * Carcasses of horses lay in the morass. * * * It was a hell on earth." (Major General Maurice, C. B.)

If that be viewed as ancient history, being 70 years ago, let us come to the beginning of the present century—the Boer War. Here is what a soldier in hospital told a London reporter, as published at the time:

"I think I pity the horses more than I do the men. Poor beggars. You see 'em all gashed and torn and reeking with blood and staggering as though they can hardly carry their riders; but you know a man ain't going to part with his horse while the horse can carry him and he's under fire."

And here is a horrible recital concerning the horses in General French's forced march to Kimberley:

"Had you seen those bags of bones looming through the twilight it would have startled you no less than it did me and would have brought before you * * * the horrors of war * * *. The less decrepit among this awful band of skeletons had been back from the front about a month. * * * If it be true that for 50 hours the horses of the force had to continue their march without nourishment, no wonder they fell down to die by the roadside in hundreds, or that the great deed of the relief of Kimberley was costly to a degree that makes one shudder for very pity for the poor animals that had to be sacrificed. * * * I care not to call up the remembrance of those angular, almost transparent frames and tottering limbs. Of the whole 600, only 4 could be found against whose hoof numbers one could write 'fit for service.'"

Julian Ralph, Daily Mail war correspondent, wrote these passages:

"In battle their legs are snapped off, their bodies torn, and their heads shattered, and there is nothing to do but to leave them to the aasvogels, as the vultures are called. There is no time in battle to shoot them. * * * Of all the pitiful, heart-rending scenes I have ever seen, none had compared to this view of hundreds upon hundreds of dead and dying horses on this hundred miles of war's promenade * * * to see them shattered by shell and then ripped open by vultures, often before they were dead, was enough to snap the tenderest chords in one's breast.

"But the worst horror was to come * * * only 24 hours after the fight at Driefontein. On this field not nearly all the horses were yet dead. As I came up beside the prostrate body of a beautiful steed it would slowly and painfully lift its head and turn upon me a pair of the most pleading, woe-stricken eyes, full of a hunger to know what I could do for it. And all I could do was to drive on, for I had no firearms, even for my own protection, deep in an enemy's country."

Another brilliant war correspondent, Charles E. Hands, presented this picture:

"More pathetic than the sight of the dead horses was the sight of the living ones There were horses that had been hit, horses that had been broken down with overwork and underfeeding, horses with hideous saddle sores hidden by clustering mounds of flies, horses abandoned for every conceivable defect; some horses for whom death had loosened their riders' control, big English horses, unshod Boer ponies, most of them with hip bones that projected so far as to suggest dislocation; and all along by the side of the river, where they found grazing and water, they were wandering about helpless, forlorn, abandoned creatures, who looked at you dubiously, as though they feared you were bringing them more of glorious warfare; and then, seeing you pass, turn listlessly away, and, hanging down their heads, went on with their dejected grazing."

The war correspondent of another London newspaper has written:

"Do not look at the horses as you go to the front. They rarely unsaddle even a cavalry horse, but if you see one with bare back, it is invariably covered with festering sores 6 inches square. Both the

horses pulling the heavy artillery pieces through all sorts of impossible places, beaten, clubbed, cursed, and those dying, lacerated, dismembered by the bursting shells, as well as the wretched survivors, ruined by the desperate service, call for infinite pity."

The most graphic and the most horrifying picture of horses on the battlefield is that of Erich Maria Remarque in All Quiet on the Western Front. Here are some extracts:

"The cries continue. It is not men; they could not cry so terribly.

" 'Wounded horses,' says Kat.

"It's unendurable. It is the moaning of the world, the martyred creation, filled with terror and groaning.

"We are pale. Detering stands up.

" 'God! For God's sake shoot them!'

"He is a farmer and very fond of horses. It gets under his skin.

"The screaming of the beasts becomes louder and louder. * * * Detering raves and yells out:

" 'Shoot them! Shoot them, can't you? Damn you again.'

"We see a dark group, bearers with stretchers, and larger black clumps moving about. Those are the wounded horses. Some gallop away in the distance, fall down, and then run on farther. The belly of one is ripped open. * * * The men cannot overtake the wounded beasts which fly in their pain, their wide-open mouths full of anguish. One of the men goes down on his knee, a shot—one horse drops—another. The last one props himself on his forelegs and drags himself around in a circle like a merry-go-round; squatting, it drags itself around in circles on its stiffened forelegs, apparently its back is broken. The soldier runs up and shoots it. Slowly, humbly it sinks to the ground."

All this is terrible reading. But no matter what precautions may be attempted, all war is hell and worse for animals. Build all the hospitals you like; provide all the ambulances that can be used; send a thousand veterinarians to the scene of every battle, and you have today far worse war conditions than in 1900. Today with death-dealing air bombs, perfected cannon, and armies shorn of pity and unmindful of blood, war is worse for humans and animals than it ever was.

Accursed be he who brings war to the world.

Neutrality in Warfare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER CHANDLER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 20, 1939

LETTER FROM MR. CLOYD LAPORTE

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

[From the New York Times of October 14, 1939]

NEUTRALITY IN WARFARE—REMOVAL OF ARMS EMBARGO HELD NO BREACH OF INTERNATIONAL LAW

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Professors Charles Cheney Hyde and Philip C. Jessup in their letters to the Times of September 21 and October 4 have taken the position that the removal of the arms embargo under present circumstances would be a breach of international law. They base their position upon two contentions: (1) that there is a rule of international law which prohibits neutral states from changing their neutrality legislation during wartime if the motive leading to the change is the desire to assist one or more of the belligerents, and (2) that such a desire would be the motivating cause of the adoption of the changes now proposed.

The sole authority which they cite for their alleged rule of international law is the Draft Convention on Rights and Duties of Neutral States in Naval and Aerial War, being a part of the Harvard Research in International Law (American Journal of International Law, vol. 33, supp., July 1939). Professor Jessup was himself the reporter who prepared the draft.

NOT A CONSENSUS

The nature of this as authority should be examined. It is, as its title indicates, a draft of a proposed convention designed to regulate neutrality in warfare. Its publication date is as recent as July 1939. It has not been adopted by any government. It does not appear to represent even the consensus of opinion of existing writers on and students of international law. This appears from the following foreword which accompanies the draft:

"The consideration of the Draft Convention on Rights and Duties of Neutral States in Naval and Aerial War revealed fundamental differences of opinion regarding the general organization of the draft, its underlying theories, and a number of specific rules and principles set forth therein. The research nevertheless presents it, without any implication that the draft as published reflects even a consensus of the members of the advisory committee, hoping that its debates upon the problem may be continued among scholars throughout the world with a view to the further clarification of the subject."

The draft convention consists of a number of articles and appended to each article are pages of "comment." It is from a part of this discussion—the comment on article 13—which Professors Hyde and Jessup quote in support of their alleged rule of law to the effect that any change in neutrality laws made in wartime must not be "the result of a desire to aid one or the other belligerent."

PERTINENT FACTORS

The articles themselves, which purport to state the principles to which some of those engaged in making the draft subscribe, do not state any such principle. The pertinent provisions are in articles 4 and 13. Article 4 reads as follows:

"A neutral State, in the exercise of its neutral rights and in the performance of its neutral duties, shall be impartial and shall refrain from discrimination between belligerents."

Article 13 reads as follows: "A neutral State, for the purpose of better safeguarding its rights and interests as a neutral or better fulfilling its duties as a neutral may, during the course of a war, adopt new measures or alter the measures which it has previously adopted, provided, however, that the new measures adopted do not violate any provision of this convention."

It will be noted that article 4 merely requires that a neutral State "shall be impartial and shall refrain from discrimination between belligerents" and that article 13 expressly recognizes the right to alter measures in wartime. Nothing in the proposed article lays down any test requiring a searching into the motives of the lawmakers in adopting a change of rules. The text of the articles would seem to be complied with when the new or altered measures are applied to all belligerents. In fact, the authors of the draft convention state, in their comment to article 13, immediately before the sentence which is quoted by Professors Hyde and Jessup in their letter of October 4:

"As already indicated in the comment under article 4, the impartiality required of a neutral state is a technical rather than a factual impartiality; the neutral state is under no duty to attempt to equalize conditions thrown out of balance by geographical factors or by the relative power of the contesting parties on the sea, in the air, on land, in supplies of raw materials, or in industrial equipment."

INDEFINITE DOCUMENT

Neither the draft convention nor the comment accompanying it indicates to what particular theories the "fundamental differences of opinion" revealed by the research related. In their letters to the Times Professors Hyde and Jessup indicate that the portion of the comment quoted by them is not merely a "theory" upon which there may be fundamental differences of opinion, but that it is law binding upon all neutral states. Yet, interspersed throughout the comment are references to previous action of neutral states, including the United States, which appear to be contrary to this so-called rule of law. Thus, it is stated:

"Indeed, most of the progress in the development of the law of neutrality from the end of the eighteenth century to the present time has resulted from changes introduced while a war was in progress. Some of these changes have been made and justified on the theory that they were designed merely to make more effective the discharge of a preexisting legal duty, but, as in the case of the laws and regulations adopted by the United States in 1793, there was in reality a progression beyond the point then established in international law."

Also it is said that: "The United States passed and lifted several embargo acts during the French Revolutionary and Napoleonic wars," although it is said that these acts may be justified as retaliatory.

The comment further says:

"It is clear, therefore, that in the course of the American Civil War neutrals made changes in their policies although these changes were not required by the then existing international law and although they operated unequally upon the belligerents."

It would seem, therefore, that the test of impartial motive applied to legislation passed during wartime is by no means a doctrine so generally accepted that it may be called a binding rule of law. Assuming, however, without conceding, that there is such a rule of law, it is submitted that the neutrality bill now before the Senate fulfills the requirements of any such rule.

In the first place, the act would be applicable to trade with all belligerents. If some of the belligerents would not be able to take advantage of its provisions because of geographical or other factors, these are factors which, as the comment above quoted indicates, a neutral state "is under no duty to attempt to equalize."

In the second place, the question of motive is not to be resolved by the opinions which Professors Hyde and Jessup say they hear on every side. There are undoubtedly varying reasons which lead individuals to support or oppose the measure. In a democracy all shades of opinion are freely expressed. It is primarily those responsible for legislation whose reasons are entitled to the greatest weight. Among these is the report of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate accompanying the bill which states its purpose to be "to preserve the neutrality and the peace of the United States and to secure the safety of its citizens and their interests."

The best evidence that the purpose of the legislation is to preserve our own neutrality is to be found in the fact that the repeal of the embargo on arms does not stand alone but is coupled with

the imposition of an embargo on shipping and provisions regarding the passage of title and cash payment and short-term credit, which can only operate unfavorably to Great Britain and France.

What is proposed is the repeal of an arms embargo which by itself will operate to the advantage of Great Britain and France, coupled with other drastic provisions which must operate to their disadvantage. Whether the measure will help or harm them in the long run is a question which only the future can answer. The proposed legislation must be considered as a whole.

If there is a rule of law, as contended by Professors Hyde and Jessup, making the motive of proposed legislation determinative of its legality—and the existence of such a rule appears at the least to be extremely doubtful—it is submitted that the neutrality bill meets the requirements of such a rule.

CLOYD LAPORTE.

NEW YORK, *October 11, 1939.*

Establishment of Permanent American Cemeteries in Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS E. MARTIN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, October 20, 1939

MEMORANDUM FROM THE WAR DEPARTMENT

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I am setting out herein an official memorandum of the War Department describing the policy of the War Department relative to the establishment of permanent American cemeteries in Europe. I believe that this memorandum should be given publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this time because of the general interest in all problems connected directly or indirectly with the problem of neutrality.

POLICY OF WAR DEPARTMENT RELATIVE TO ESTABLISHMENT OF PERMANENT AMERICAN CEMETERIES IN EUROPE

It is the fixed policy of the War Department, and has been since 1900, after the Spanish-American War, to return all remains of its military dead to the United States for burial in their local private cemeteries or in national cemeteries.

During the World War, as it was impossible to return the remains of deceased soldiers to this country immediately after death, they were interred abroad temporarily, to be shipped to the United States after hostilities ceased. As the war progressed there was a growing sentiment among relatives in this country to let their dead remain where they fell in battle and the War Department began to consider modifying its policy to allow the permanent interment abroad of those soldiers whose relatives so desired. Impetus was given this sentiment by Col. Theodore Roosevelt's request that the body of his son, Lt. Quentin Roosevelt, should remain where it fell, this request being contained in his expression, "Where the tree falls, let it lie," which has become so well known. The War Department then circularized the next of kin of deceased soldiers as to their choice in the matter. and the results showed that nearly 35 percent desired their soldier dead to remain in their original places of burial. (See press release, War Department News Bureau, July 29, 1919.) Available records are not clear as to exactly when this modification of policy was effected.

Organizations had been burying their dead in selected burial plots whenever practicable to avoid isolated graves or small groups of graves. Every precaution was taken to preserve identities and valuable personal effects. Burials were promptly reported to the Graves Registration Service, an organization of the United States Army established to supervise and coordinate field work, establish cemeteries, and concentrate remains therein from scattered burial places. At the cessation of hostilities, on November 11, 1918, there were about 2,400 American burial places in England, France, Belgium, Italy, Russia, and Germany, in which some 77,000 bodies were interred. As it was obviously impracticable to maintain so large a number of cemeteries, it was decided to concentrate the remains, pending final decision as to their disposition, in a smaller number of carefully selected cemeteries in localities where proper care could be given the graves. The number was thus reduced to about 700.

After sentiment had crystallized as a result of the circularization of next of kin, in November 1919, the task was undertaken of returning to the United States the remains of the soldier dead whose return had been requested and providing for the permanent burial of those that were to remain in foreign soil. An organization was accordingly formed, known as the War Memorials Council, for the purpose of selecting suitable sites for permanent American cemeteries abroad. As a result of several trips abroad, and arrangements with foreign government authorities, it was finally decided to provide 6 cemeteries in France, 1 in Belgium, and 1 in England, as follows:

Brookwood American Cemetery, near London, England.
Flanders Field American Cemetery, near Waereghem, Belgium.
Aisne-Marne American Cemetery, Belleau, Aisne, France.
Meuse-Argonne American Cemetery, Romagne-sous-Montfaucon, Meuse, France.
St. Mihiel American Cemetery, Thiaucourt, N-et-M, France.
Suresnes American Cemetery, near Paris, France.
Oise-Aisne American Cemetery, Seringes-et-Nesles, France.
Somme American Cemetery, Bony, France.

The cemeteries of Meuse-Argonne and Suresnes (with the exception of a small parcel of ground for the entrance of the latter) were purchased by the French Government, which granted burial rights therein to the United States in accordance with an agreement between the French Minister of War and the War Department, free of cost to the United States.

The Somme, Oise-Aisne, St. Mihiel, Aisne-Marne, and ground for the entrance of Suresnes Cemetery were established under an agreement between the United States and the French Government which granted perpetual use of the grounds for burial purposes to the United States, for which the United States paid a stipulated price.

The Flanders Field American Cemetery was established in accordance with an agreement between the United States and Belgium whereby the Belgian Government acquired the ground and granted the United States burial rights therein for its soldier dead, free of cost.

The Brookwood American Cemetery, London, England, was established under an agreement between the London Mecropolis Co. and the United States by which the United States was granted burial rights in perpetuity for a stipulated price.

The above agreements were final, and no additional payments from the United States Government are required for the perpetual use of these cemeteries.

The graves-registration service is no longer functioning, and the American cemeteries abroad are maintained, in a similar condition to the national cemeteries in the United States, by the American Battle Monuments Commission, Washington, D. C., which is under the direction of General Pershing, and has a European office in Paris, France. These cemeteries were turned over to the jurisdiction of the Commission by Executive Order No. 6614, dated February 26, 1934, as amended by Executive Order No. 6690, dated April 25, 1934.

There are some isolated graves in various parts of Europe, containing remains left there at the request of the next of kin, referred to as "Do not disturb graves," which are governed by the rules of the cemeteries in which they are located, and over which the War Department has no jurisdiction.

While it would be practicable to remove the remains of soldier dead now interred in Europe and bring them back to the United States, it is not desirable, especially in view of the fact that they were left to rest where they fell at the special request of relatives. The War Department would therefore oppose any agitation leading toward such a move.

A War Boom Won't Help Anybody

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JERRY VOORHIS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, October 20, 1939

ARTICLE BY LES FINNEGAN

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, the time to prevent the growth of a war-trade boom is now. To delay too long may mean that we will lose our chance to prevent the same series of events as took place between 1914 and 1917. Some people object that "there are no war-trade profits now" or that "profits in munitions will be small." If so, then an excess-profits-tax measure would certainly do no harm. But I submit the following article by Les Finnegan appearing in the Washington News for October 13 to recall the inexcusable profiteering that took place during the last war and to point out that nothing has been done as yet to prevent a recurrence of precisely those same conditions.

[From the Washington Daily News of October 13, 1939]

UNITED STATES ECONOMISTS FEAR RUNAWAY WAR BOOM

(By Les Finnegan)

War profiteering, despite fervent hopes expressed recently by President Roosevelt and Attorney General Murphy against its recurrence, would be almost impossible to check now as it was prior to

and during the last war, Government and business economists contend.

Surveys of existing profit-control legislation show that there is little to prevent a return of the exorbitant profits which were revealed by congressional investigation after the last war and which disillusioned thousands of Americans in the patriotism of many large corporations.

Government economists, who have long argued that the huge industrial returns of 50 to 150 percent were as potent in effecting American entry into the war as American foreign investments, find practically no prospect of new legislation to reduce the attractiveness of war-boom prices to domestic industry.

Only Representative JERRY VOORHIS (D.), California, they point out, has announced his intention of introducing such a bill, and his, calling for an 80-percent tax on excessive profits, has virtually no chance of passage.

A recent confidential report issued by a nationally known tax-research bureau said: "One of the important observations that the Army and Navy Munitions Board has made in its study of price control is that prices cannot be controlled except where there exists physical control over the goods or services. The problem of enforcement is the one greatest obstacle to the imposition of a ceiling over all prices. The board concedes that there probably never can be established a sufficiently powerful body to control all prices, even if it were desired."

The Government's inability to curb profiteering is pointed out in an analysis of the economic shifts caused by a war economy. "Certain conditions in war, particularly in the early stages, disturb the price structure," the report continues. "Among the things which contribute to this are unusual Government demands, diminished available supply for civilian use, reckless Government buying, high-cost production because of the employment of unskilled workers, increased insurance, interest and tax rates, restriction of essential imports, and inflation of currency."

Another report circulated "privately" to businessmen from a Washington bureau has reinforced the conviction of many Government economists that industry's inevitable interest lies in a war boom as the means of recovering from its 10-year depression.

"Further business gains for 1940 depend largely on the size of war orders, and on continuation of the war itself," the report declares. "If war goes on, as is expected, most estimates are that United States production for 1940 will be the highest of any year since 1929."

JOBS AND ORDERS

Business effect of the cash-and-carry amendment "is bound to be stimulating," the report says. "It means orders and jobs. And that's an influence for repeal of the embargo, despite pious talk about 'blood money.' Of course materialistic motives will be denied and deplored."

The recently recorded 10-year high in industrial activity actuated by a flood of foreign orders is seen as verification of industry's interest in the continuation of the European war, even in America's involvement. And this opinion is held in spite of the warnings of the United States Chamber of Commerce and private industrialists that a war boom, whether the United States were involved or not, would be disastrous because of the post-war depression which would follow war inflation.

Producers of materials essential to military operations have by far the greatest stake in a war boom, it is argued. Despite the fact that Army and Navy experts have testified at congressional hearings that the Government could produce the materials at a fraction of the cost it had to pay to private manufacturers almost nothing has been done toward the establishment of federally owned munitions plants.

STEEL PROFITS

Profits made by several steel producers on Government orders since 1920 were said by the Nye Senate Munitions Committee to have been justified by little less than sheer greed.

In one instance when three major steel firms bid $454 a ton for armor plate, Navy officials estimated that it could be produced at $262 a ton. In 1937 Navy Secretary Swanson denounced bids of $21,000,000 for a floating drydock at Pearl Harbor which the Navy estimated it could build for $12,000,000. In 1931 a gunpowder company's own figures showed a 39-percent profit on Government orders.

The imperative need of immediate legislation to discourage industry from building hopes on war orders is seen by this group of economists in figures revealed a few years ago, which showed 139-percent profits made by one United States steel company just before we entered the World War. Two other steel firms, it was disclosed, made profits of 112 percent and 90 percent.

One Government statistician recalled that one of the records for war inflation was made by an airplane firm, which, starting with a $1,000 investment, listed a $11,437,250 income at the end of the war.

During the war, the argument goes, it may have been necessary for the Government, in its extraordinary need, to pay more than 20 percent of production costs, but there was little justification for it in the post-war years.

PEACETIME PROFITS

Only 3 years ago, it is pointed out, one of the three major steel producers admitted that its bid on Navy armor plate gave it a profit of 58 percent. In the same bidding another producer asked a price that would have given it a 91-percent profit. In 1933, investigation showed, the former firm made 42-percent profit on a Navy contract for turret armor, and then increased its prices $40 and $50 the next 2 years.

Profits on flight indicators for the air forces in recent years averaged 54 percent of cost. One company showed a 93-percent profit on each 14-inch shell; another a 65-percent profit on 12-inch guns and 63 percent on 16-inch guns. The same company, testimony revealed, sold pig iron to the Government on the basis of a $75-a-ton production cost, when the actual cost amounted to $51.

Practically nothing has been done to remedy the profiteering record which the Nye committee characterized as "disgraceful," the advocates of profit control assert.

The committee, these experts recall, after noting that Treasury audits showed profits of 90 percent, declared in its report that it could find no assurance that the companies "would suddenly change their spots in the case of another war."

The spots can be changed, it is argued, only by enactment of strong profit-control legislation similar to that advocated by Representative VOORHIS.

Reciprocal-Trade Agreement With Argentina

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 19, 1939

STATEMENT OF HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD, OF MICHIGAN, BEFORE THE COMMITTEE FOR RECIPROCITY INFORMATION OCTOBER 17, 1939, OPPOSING THE RECIPROCAL-TRADE AGREEMENT WITH ARGENTINA

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my statement delivered before the Committee for Reciprocity Information, at a hearing on the proposed reciprocal-trade agreement with Argentina, as follows:

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, it is with regret I open my remarks with the statement that, insofar as I have been able to observe, men who have been in Congress for many years, those who have been here for only a few years, and those who have been here for only 2 or 3 years, carry an inward feeling that little good does it do for them to appear before this committee. The internal organization of the reciprocal trade agreement making machinery, the baffling problems which the whole program presents, the maze of statistics which one runs into when he attempts to obtain a running review of what has transpired since the approval of the original act, the general upsets to international as well as national trade which have occurred since the inception of the program, the favorable and unfavorable factors which have operated in connection with our trade with both agreement and nonagreement countries, and the bold manner in which the State Department marches forward with the execution of the programs, are, I believe, contributing factors to the general feeling and attitude of the Members of the Congress as well as many others. Let me hasten to remind you, however, that I speak only for one Member of that body—myself. If the general situation was not so grave, I certainly would not appear here and absorb your time. But this, Mr. Chairman, is the only manner in which I can make a direct protest, and through the kindness of your committee I am here.

I am mindful of the fact that these hearings are not conducted primarily for the purpose of discussing policies of Government. The Congress saw fit to enact the law. It is now the law of the land. You are part of the administrative machinery. I sympathize with you in your predicament. As I understand the situation, we are here by invitation to discuss the Argentina trade-agreement proposal. At the same time, Mr. Chairman, I do not know of any machinery whereby we, as Members of Congress and directly responsible to the people, while you are not, can get you up to attend sessions of the House and to hear us talk about the program in its generalities. And having in mind some of the statements made before your committee within the last 48 hours, probably it is just as well for us to take a few minutes to point out in a general way to you, as part of the administrative machinery, our attitude; for if in the minds of the people and the Congress the program does fall, the legislative body may, in response to the people involved, repeal the law, irrespective of its benefits or injuries.

COOPERATION IS LACKING

If the program is to prevail or succeed, it is my frank opinion there will have to be more cooperation between the administrators of the act, the Congress, and the people involved, both in agriculture and manufacturing, than there has been evident in the short period the act has been in operation. From statements which have

been made by the Secretary of State, I think we can assume that he feels at times there is great effort being made toward scuttling his program.

Mr. Chairman, with interest and concern I read the State Department press release of August 23, 1939 (No. 339A). I particularly direct your attention to the language which I now quote:

"I believe that a conclusion of the proposed trade agreement with Argentina would represent one of the most outstanding accomplishments under the authority of the Trade Agreement Act, coming particularly at this time, and, indeed, one of the most important accomplishments of this administration in the field of international relations."

Acting Secretary Welles further observed:

"I can think of no better way to promote the good-neighbor policy and the type of relations which it represents than through instruments designed to bring about a mutually profitable increase in trade."

MUST WE PENALIZE OUR FARMERS TO BE A GOOD NEIGHBOR?

Just what did the Secretary mean when he said "coming particularly at this time"? Did the State Department at that moment feel certain war would be declared in Europe? Did the State Department at that hour have in mind that in the event of war generally along the present lines in western Europe, and with the Neutrality Act as it was then in operation, that all of our interests would lie more to the south than they have heretofore? Did the Secretary feel that with Germany at war with England and France, and on account of that situation Germany would not be able to make deliveries of her goods to Argentina and could not operate her ships in the sea lanes to Argentine ports, the hour had arrived for us to strike, and strike hard, and thereby recover some of the trade which we had since 1929 lost to Germany and other European countries who have been more aggressive in consummating with Argentina trade agreements and exchange benefits, giving favors we did not extend?

Just exactly what did the Secretary mean when he said, "I can think of no better way to promote the good-neighbor policy"? What is the circumference of the good-neighbor policy? Where can I, the Representative of the Eighth District of Michigan, with its highly diversified farming and manufacturing, with its farmers generally opposed to the trade-agreement program, and with many of the manufacturers in favor of the program, find an answer to my question? Has the State Department defined the good-neighbor policy in categorical language? If so, will you please inform me where I can find the definition? Does the good-neighbor policy mean that the farmers in my district are to be penalized, specifically so, on sugar, beans, milk products, beef, hides, wool, vegetables, and vegetable and animal oils, fruits, poultry, and poultry products, and furs, and all for the purpose of promoting what—the good-neighbor policy? If they are to be penalized, to what extent? Where is the yardstick for measuring the penalty? If they are to be penalized, who is to be the beneficiary? You propose to go further. Just what attention has the State Department given to the proposition of working out and asking Congress to enact a proposal which will spread the penalties commensurate with the benefits obtained? Exactly what did the Secretary mean when he said "through instruments designed to bring about mutually profitable increase in trade"?

AGREEMENTS HAVEN'T RAISED FARMERS' LIVING STANDARD

The farm people in my district grow the crops I have mentioned. For years these crops have been grown under a protective tariff. The farmers have observed that as one trade agreement after another is consummated the tariff tends to move downward, and we move in the direction of quotas, which are quickly taken advantage of by those countries on the other end of the trade agreement. The farmers in my district are also aware (although they may not be as well technically informed as some) of the great influence on trade which flows from exchange arrangements, blocked currencies, standstill agreements, and the far-reaching arm of government and its policies in influencing consumption requirements along with the means of supplying them. We recognize that countries can retaliate against another country in matters having to do with tariffs imposed. We also recognize that the State Department can, and that it does, as in this case, recommend and proceed to try and undo through a trade agreement something some other country has accomplished by "inside" agreements which it made, for example, with Argentina. Quoting from the press release we find:

"The trade of certain European countries with Argentina has been developing at our expense."

No doubt that is a truthful statement. Now what do we propose to do, offer Argentina a proposition just as attractive, or more so, in a different form perhaps, but sufficiently strong to "pull" their orders back to our factories? And if so, what country will lose the business to us, and just what group of our people will be burdened with the benefits which we extend to Argentina?

Insofar as the labor of these farmers, when measured by the dollar value of the products they sell, is concerned, they do not notice that their standard of living is materially increasing. Naturally these farmers question the finality of the trade-agreement program. They look for the mutuality of benefits. They ask questions. But, Congress having given the State Department a blank check, the representatives of the people can give no clear indication of what the State Department has in mind, to what extent it will go, or what the economic consequences are to be to American agriculture whether in the Eighth District of Michigan or some other area. Such a procedure quite naturally raises grave questions—questions which go directly to the matter of conferring or delegating power, the repeal of that power conferred, the degree of burden that is to be placed on agriculture, and the benefits to manufacturing.

BLIND-FLYING METHOD OF INTERNATIONAL HORSE TRADING

This blind-flying method of arranging international horse trades is unsatisfactory to the victim as well as the legislator. As has been pointed out by Secretary Hull, it may be that the legislator has little opportunity for log rolling, but, the fact remains, as has been so vividly enunciated here the past 48 hours, the Legislature can, if it deems advisable politically, repeal the act and then the particular method of horse trading will have to cease. This will, no doubt, depend very largely on the attitude of the agricultural victim. If the latter is satisfied with results and is willing to suffer the blind-flying method of arriving at those results, probably the legislator will be contented to go along with the satisfied farmer. But, it may be well to take more care in seeing that the farmer is satisfied, with trade agreement results, not just more benefit payments with more foodstuffs being imported.

Mr. Chairman, I am further interested in the statement of the Secretary, where, in the same release, he says:

"The concessions" (referring to the ones we are to give to Argentina) "* * * should, of course, permit an increase in Argentina's exports to this country, but will not have injurious effect upon American production."

That, of course, is the opinion of the Secretary. The important question is: Does the man involved in the transaction—the farmer—agree with that conclusion? I do not think so. It would also appear that the legislative branch of the Government is not in full accord with the conclusions reached by the Secretary.

Further, the Secretary takes the position the trade of certain European countries with Argentina has developed at our expense. To what countries does the Secretary refer? Is Germany included? Does the proposed trade agreement go as far as did Germany in building her trade in peacetimes? Has the outbreak of the war fundamentally changed the situation in the direction of making it unnecessary for the Argentine agreement to be consummated, and this by reason of the disappearance of the keen competition furnished by Germany or England or France or Italy? Can the exact countries to which the Secretary refers now hold the trade which they have taken away from the United States in recent years and at the same time carry out their obligations which war has imposed upon them? When did the United States lose that trade? Why the long delay in proposing the trade agreement with Argentina if the loss of trade was the primary incentive for its making? Specifically, so long as Germany could proceed on her course with Argentina, just what chance did we have of getting the trade through reciprocity? With Germany out of the running, it is now proposed to reach an agreement and claim the credit.

Referring specifically to the table of imports and exports stated on page 167 of the August 26, 1939, bulletin of the State Department, is it not reasonable for us to assume, for all practical purposes, that under the changed conditions due to the war, we may now expect to move rapidly back toward the 1929 import and export volume? We can well understand the conditions that governed from 1929 up to September 1939. But with the greatly changed situation throughout the world, and particularly as it affects Argentina-American relations, why suddenly plunge into the agreement now proposed, and at the specific cost of the American farmer?

The Department may take the position that in the absence of a trade agreement with Argentina at this time, her goods will flow in increasing volume to Europe in the nature of foodstuffs and raw materials to be consumed primarily by warring nations. If Europe supplies the demand for Argentina's goods and can provide the exchange in payment therefor, or, under the stress of war, pay for their imports through shipping back to Argentina the necessary manufactured goods to set off the foodstuffs and raw material imported, then, in that event, how much trade can we pick up with Argentina with the trade agreement in operation, unless we are willing to accept the competitive goods and thus impose the resulting burden, whatever it may be, on our agriculture? If the European countries accept from Argentina her production and pay cash therefor, Argentina could, of course, if she desired to do so, purchase from us and, no doubt, would, to a great extent, if the manufactured goods desired were not forthcoming from Europe or, let us say, Japan. Of course, if we gear our industrial operations to European war demand, sell the goods for cash (gold), or buy back our securities held by Europeans, and let Europe continue the production of peacetime goods for export to Argentina in payment of the imports to Europe from Argentina, that will in no way, as I view the matter, guarantee to us a greatly increased flow of trade with Argentina, although the trade agreement is in operation.

LET US FIRST LOOK AT OUR OWN INTERNAL ECONOMY

It may be out of order technically, to discuss another phase of the program at this particular moment. However, I do wish to submit this observation: While the reciprocal trade agreement program may be the most constructive that has been recommended by anyone during the past few years to bring the international situation back into mesh, we are, I feel, duty bound to first look at its affect upon our internal economy. If we had a sound domestic economy perhaps we would not be so completely en-

tranced by or engulfed in such a trade-agreement program. Will the trade-agreement program largely contribute to a sound domestic economy? If so, how can we best demonstrate the fact it will? Personally, I do not think so. I personally feel that the original philosophy of the trade-agreement program was founded on the fallacious assumption that tariffs are the cause of, and not the effect of unsound economy. I also feel that in this modern world of trade, bilateral trade agreements are not the answer but that we must very largely, if not completely, depend upon multilateral trade relations.

Mr. Chairman, if the committee will bear with me, I desire to quote from a statement recently made by Dr. A. A. Berle, Jr., Under Secretary of State, before Temporary National Economic Committee. His keen observation coming at this time is one, which I personally feel the Committee for Reciprocity Information can well afford to consider. From Dr. Berle's statement I feel one would come to the definite conclusion that the answer to our internal economic troubles does not rest upon the consummation of additional trade agreements as much as they may appeal to those in charge of the administrative procedure. I briefly quote Dr. Berle:

"Beneath the highly technical title of 'capital credit' there is really concealed a tremendous issue. It serves no useful purpose not to state that issue with some bluntness, in spite of the fact that to so state it tends to antagonize a good many interests. Briefly, the private financial system as at present constituted does not work. It has, accordingly, to be supplemented by vast amounts of Federal credit which make up in some measure, but inadequately, for the difficulties in the existing system of private finance. Use of Federal credit by providing relief and by taking care of certain necessary social requirements through public works in a limited field does keep the economic machinery of the country running; but it is not a permanent solution. There is always the danger that the time may come when an economy so organized will reach the end of its tether. We should be getting about the process of reorganization now, instead of leaving it for the more violent processes which always occur when the country is in great stress.

"Most of the sequences of figures with which I am familiar indicate that we will—unless fundamental remedies are adopted—reach a period of stress in any case within a short period of years. Unless there is some distortion such as that which might be caused by a general war, I should think that the next major downturn of the business cycle—due in any case within 4 or 5 years—might present all the factors for an explosive situation. We may, of course, navigate safely through that period, leaving the final reckoning to be made at some later downturn of the business cycle. In any event the next decade will, I think, probably force a show-down.

"Since the United States has at its command all necessary productivity, all necessary technical skill, all necessary energy and labor, and substantially all necessary raw materials, any failure of the economic system must be directly due to malorganization.

"In a democratic economy, the processes of finance are in a large measure relied upon to make it possible for the individuals to organize their energy, the materials obtainable, and other necessary elements to produce and distribute whatever the country may, in reason, desire. I suppose the test of a financial system is whether it approximately accomplishes that purpose. The present system apparently does not, and, a major difficulty appears to be in the system of handling capital finance and capital credit. Conceivably, by solving this question, we may be able to take care of much of the difficulty."

Further, in the same statement, Mr. Berle said:

"There is one other lack in our financial machinery. It is crucial. We have not, anywhere in the banking world, that process of development which has been the lifeblood of the technical development of American industry. There is no one looking for new financial methods, new theories of credit, new means of attacking financial and economic difficulties with the same persistence, freedom to explore ideas, and to state results which the chemical or technical research bureaus in any large industry continuously use in looking for new processes, new products, new developments, and new methods."

We know that Great Britain has long been Argentina's leading export market. This is very natural for two reasons: England's investment in Argentina and her dependence upon foreign areas for foodstuffs and other raw material. However, in 1935, 1936, and 1937 the United States absorbed about 12 percent of the total value of exports for the period as compared to an average of 7.5 percent during the previous decade. We know what happened in 1938 with the great production of foodstuffs in this country, and this obviated the need for imported grain, meats, and fats. And, too, the economic recession caused a decline in the purchase of industrial raw materials. We also observe that in the past Germany has contributed largely toward supplying the iron and steel products of Argentina, but can she continue to do so now? If not, who is to take that market? England or the United States?

The exchange situation which has prevailed, largely due to England being not only Argentina's principal customer, but, in addition, as I have pointed out, being a great investor in Argentina's development, gave England the whip hand over the United States. We can appreciate that there are trade agreements and then there are still other trade agreements. Insofar as Argentina is concerned, the other countries have probably just outtraded us because they occupied a more strategic geographical and investment position. So I seriously question the advisability of this agreement at this moment. If it is consummated, after having first somewhat induced or forced Argentina to remove the exchange differentials which have operated adversely against us, then what guaranty, if any, can be obtained that other countries will not later slip under us, through exchange operations or otherwise, and cut from under us the support our trade was to have through the mechanics of the trade agreements?

Is this trade agreement, like so many others, as I understand, to extend the most-favored-nation clause to all other countries, possibly excepting Germany? If so, by what reasoning do we call it an Argentina trade agreement? Have you, as the administrators of this act, been able to determine exactly just what arrangements have been in operation as between Germany and Argentina, and to what extent the flow of trade in the form of orders from the latter country was controlled by those secret arrangements? Is the administration now in a position to proceed, supplementary to this proposed trade agreement, with a lending or investing policy whereby dollars are to be furnished to the Argentineans with which to make purchases in the United States? If it is the policy of the United States to so furnish dollars for their use, will the increased volume of trade not be due to the dollar arrangement rather than a result of the consummation of the agreement with its concessions? Did England, in addition to her financial transactions with Argentina and England's investing policy, operate under a form of reciprocal-trade agreement on the goods flowing between the two countries? These are questions in which the farmers of my district are interested, and the Congress should be more fully informed on some of the details of this proposed trade before it is concluded, and, therefore, Mr. Chairman, I am here protesting against putting the agreement into operation at this time.

International Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SANTIAGO IGLESIAS

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER FROM PUERTO RICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1939

Mr. IGLESIAS. Mr. Speaker, when President Gompers over 20 years ago appointed a commission to go to Mexico to confer with the representatives of the workers of the Republic of Mexico, he said:

We must safeguard as far as it is possible the principles of autonomy, independence, and democratic pan-American countries from open or insidious attempts of autocratic forms of government.

The conventions of the American Federation of Labor in recent years unanimously passed resolutions and ample recommendations to give authority to President William Green and its executive council to reorganize the Pan American Federation of Labor in order to unite all the labor movements of the Latin republics with the great labor movement of this Nation, and to instill a true conception of the value of human life, and to make humane relations the chief concern of these international relations.

The last convention of the American Federation of Labor, held this month of October 1939, gave out the following report at Cincinnati:

At this time of world crisis it is inevitable that both movements and nations should look to their own defenses. As the 21 nations which make up the Pan American Union meet in Panama to build a defense in the Western Hemisphere against involvement in the present conflict by closer collaboration, so the labor movements of the Americas should be prompt to recognize the importance of closer cooperation. The Pan American Federation of Labor was the creation of the American Federation of Labor. It grew out of the necessities of the time. For many years Samuel Gompers was its president and moving spirit. Its service to the workers in the Central and South American republics was distinctive and helpful. Every reason that called it into being originally is now reinforced by the events of recent months.

Your committee notes with satisfaction that the executive committee of the Pan American Federation of Labor held a meeting in May of this year; that it explored the effective methods of reorganizing the Pan American Federation of Labor and establishing a closer bond of unity between the workers in the Western Hemisphere. One of the direct results of this exploration was the decision on the part of the executive committee to approve a careful survey of labor conditions in the 20 South American republics to learn more definitely the state of the labor movement in these countries and the best way in which they could be brought into closer collaboration with the Pan American Federation of Labor. It was the further decision of the committee when such a survey had been completed that a congress would convene in Habana or Washington to lay the basis for a vigorous reorganized program of the pan-American movement.

Your committee wishes to underline the general conclusion of the executive committee of the Pan American Federation of Labor and to point out the special urgency of the present crisis. It makes any effort for international cooperation in the Western Hemisphere a matter of pressing importance. We, therefore, express the hope that President Green will take it upon himself to inaugurate such a study of the Central and South American republics and carry forward such a program as will make possible a convening of the Sixth Congress of the Pan American Federation of Labor either in Washington or Habana some time in the near future.

The organized working people of the United States are firmly convinced that cordial and friendly relations can be established and maintained between all countries represented in the Pan American Federation of Labor through the development of a perfect and sincere understanding of all the labor movements of the Western Hemisphere.

The working people in the pan-American countries should be guaranteed the right to organize and to cooperate within their respective countries in the furtherance of their legitimate social, industrial, and economic interests. The right of free speech, free assemblage, and free press should not be abridged. Liberty, democracy, and justice should triumph over autocracy and unfreedom in any form.

In more than a dozen of the Latin American nations we may be sure there are movements which would qualify us for remaining affiliates of a revived Pan American Federation of Labor.

Let me go back to the period of the World War for an illustration of the importance of the revival of this movement, which I am glad is going to take place. When the World War broke out Germany was doing everything within its power to make use of Mexico as a means of striking at the United States. Germany had hoped to be able to have Mexico as a back door through which to strike at our country so as to subtract its attention from the primary theater of war in Europe.

Now I call attention to that historical fact merely for the purpose of showing that what was necessary then may become equally necessary at any time. If an alien power hostile to the United States considered Mexico as its easiest route to the United States, as was the case in 1917, then why may we not expect that similar ideas may be held today in some of the chancelories of Europe? As a matter of fact, we know that such ideas are held and that they are not being allowed to remain idle theories.

Through the Pan American Federation of Labor, the American Federation of Labor called upon the Mexican Federation of Labor to close this back door to our Nation. This was done in a conference held on the United States-Mexican border immediately after the convention of the American Federation of Labor which was held in Portland, Oreg. That pledge was fulfilled.

Had there been no Pan American Federation of Labor, no such protection could have been achieved. The work of this peaceful labor conference was much more effective than could have been the work of all the armies we could have mustered. Labor can play a great statesmanlike role. It can defend as well as attack, and very often defense is much more important than attack because proper defense taken in time makes attack unnecessary.

I do not wish to seem to dwell too long upon the subject, but I believe you will agree with me that freedom through the Western Hemisphere is essential to the protection of freedom in the United States.

I am completely in accord with the observations set forth by the American Federation of Labor Convention at Cincinnati.

One of the tragic outcomes of the march of dictatorships in the world is not only the suppression of free trade unions in many lands, but the means that have been employed to suppress racial and religious minorities in one country after the other. Envy, hatred, malice, and intolerance have been let loose by these tyrannical dictators, and the liberties of people have everywhere been jeopardized.

Religious leaders of various denominations have suffered persecution and privations. In some cases they have become martyrs for the faith. Religious institutions, church and synagogue alike—have been closed, in some cases desecrated—in some cases have even been destroyed. Such conditions do violence to the standards of civilized society and cannot be suffered to continue.

Religious persecution is a matter of deep concern to labor, for it is either a forerunner of the persecution of labor or in some cases it has followed the suppression of labor. Organized labor believes in the right of all men to the enjoyment of these civil liberties; again and again in its long history it has opposed any denial of these rights and has insisted upon these basic rights as the privilege of citizenship.

Today the refugee problem has become one of the heart-rending tragedies. Millions of racial and religious minorities have been compelled to seek new homelands, under the threat of persecution and arrest in their homelands. Jew and Christian alike have experienced the pressure of religious intolerance.

I am in accord with what the convention expresses in deep sympathy for all these victims of religious and racial persecutions and affirm the conviction that such conditions are barbaric.

President Roosevelt has expressed his sympathies to meet this need. The Jewish people sought some years ago to create a Jewish homeland in Palestine. The nations of the world have in the past recognized the just claim of the Jews to reestablish their home in Palestine. The Government and the people of the United States have from the very first shown their deep sympathy with this claim. On June 30, 1922, the House and the Senate went on record in favor of Jewish rights in Palestine. Since that time every President of the United States has reiterated this sympathy of the American people. Americans, on their part, have manifested their sympathy and confidence. Thousands of American Jews have settled in Palestine and Americans have invested over $100,000,000 in that country.

Thomas Brackett Reed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE H. SMITH

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1939

Mr. SMITH of Maine. Mr. Speaker, it was extremely disappointing to be unable to attend the memorial so fittingly observed in commemorating the memory of that great statesman, Thomas Brackett Reed, of Maine.

It was, however, my privilege to eulogize his splendid attributes in the Maine Legislature January 28, 1903, little realizing that a similar honor would come to me in the very hall where his courageous and fearless rulings brought fame and distinction to Maine's beloved son.

Unable to add anything to what has already been said on this occasion I will offer my humble words of boyhood days:

Your Excellency and gentlemen of the assembly, it is not my purpose to attempt any extended eulogy on the illustrious life work of this illustrious statesman. It is not for me to seek to penetrate the veil and speak of him in that sphere as husband and father, as neighbor, or townsman. More eloquent lips than mine can tell that which was his noblest calling and highest attainment—his love and affection for family and home. Others are here to tell the story of his kindness and loyalty to friend and kinsman. It is sufficient for me to contribute but a word, to bring a single flower of tender memory, to add my little wreath of affectionate admiration in behalf of his sacred memory. Who of us that have not observed, while scanning the blue heavens above, with her millions of sparkling worlds, scattered sparingly here and there a majestic star pouring forth her richer and more radiant rays, surpassing all others? How true we find this of mankind. The laws of creation, having heir to us now and then a great and natural leader, towering far above his fellow beings, conspicuous among the distinguished sons reared from the rugged hills of the old Pine Tree State is one whose name is not only familiar to the

children of our every village, hamlet, and town, but of the South beneath her sunny skies, in distant California amid her fields of golden rocks, and, yea, in far-away New Zealand, the name of Thomas Brackett Reed is written there.

A soldier has fallen. A hero is dead. Not while on the battlefield, amid the rush of contending parties, nor while in gallant leadership, leading his party onward and onward in her every charge, with victory ever in hand, for he had laid down the gavel and ceased to participate in the great political arena of his life. But we can never forget how we have known of him in this very hall, a leader of leaders, champion of champions. How we have known of him at Washington, confronted with the fiery blasts of jealousy and a divided house; how we have known of him as emancipating his people from the shackles of a filibustering contingent in the National House of Representatives; how we have known of him when our very hearts were beating that he might be selected as our standard bearer and Chief Magistrate over the grandest Nation ever visited by mankind. But he had met his final conquerer and sank beneath his icy breath. Though silent is the grave, death can claim no victory. For that master mind, the handiwork of the eternal God, will shine brighter day by day, while others may grow dim with the space of time. His works are ended. No man can tell the results of his labors. But from memory's shrine his name can never be effaced. The dreams of childhood and visions of old age vanish. Flowers bloom, blush, and fade away. Stars fall from heaven and leave no trace behind them. But a life like Thomas Brackett Reed can never run its course and be forgotten, and when the fettered fangs of eternity were bearing his soul away, his life was just beginning.

Old Liberties and New

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 20, 1939

ADDRESS OF J. WARREN MADDEN, CHAIRMAN, NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD, BEFORE THE NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON CIVIL LIBERTIES, NEW YORK CITY, OCTOBER 13, 1939

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, because I believe it places the right of collective bargaining in its proper place along with other rights of American citizenship and because I consider it a very stimulating address, I am pleased to ask to have printed in the RECORD the following address by Hon. J. Warren Madden, Chairman of the National Labor Relations Board:

This is the year of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the proposal by Congress of our Bill of Rights, the guaranty of certain of our important civil liberties. In this year the condition of civil liberties in the world around us provides a desolate and alarming setting for our study of our own liberties.

Our forefathers had learned by experience and observation that the gravest impairments of the liberties of citizens may come from governments themselves. Many of them or their ancestors had come to this new land to escape such oppression. In setting up the new government their problem was to endow it with necessary powers for preserving internal order and safety from without, and at the same time make it impossible for it to abuse the liberties of its citizens, as European governments had done.

The willingness of a newly created sovereign government, whether that government be embodied in an individual, or in a combination of an elected president and two-house legislature and life-tenure judiciary, to put in writing its agreement that it would not overreach its granted powers, even as against minorities and individuals, is an interesting gesture. But is it more significant than preelection promise by a candidate for elective office? We have learned much in recent years and months about the worthlessness of the solemn promises of sovereigns. If some governments will not keep their promises for even a few months, what reason was there to hope, 150 years ago, that the promises of our new government would be fulfilled? Yet in the year 1939 our people can say to their President and their Congressmen and their judges, "You and those who have occupied your high positions before you have kept the faith. When we consented that they and you should rule over us, you promised us freedom of worship, freedom of speech and press, the right to assemble and to be free in our persons and houses from unreasonable searches and seizures, the right not to be proceeded against except by due process of law, and the equal protection of the law. On the whole, you have done what you agreed. You have thereby made a record unmatched in human history."

It is no accident that this record has been made. The fathers of the Constitution set up the best devices which occurred to their learned and imaginative minds to police these promises. The separation of the executive, the legislative, and the judicial functions, each with some power to checkmate the others, each with the natural human tendency to call attention to any attempt on the part of the others to overreach their functions; this device has been a powerful safeguard. The vigilance of the people, an intelligent and vital interest in civil liberties on the part of many of them, has been a potent force. Organizations through which public-spirited citizens maintain their vigilant watch for violations of civil liberties have had great effect.

I said that, on the whole, the Government had kept its promise. I did not mean that there had not been, during 150 years, lively differences of opinion as to whether or not certain actions of the President or the Congress or the judges or other agents of Government have not infringed upon the civil liberties of the people. Safeguards have been relaxed in times of war and of serious domestic strife. Whether the relaxation or the extent of it was justifiable has been the subject of controversy. Then, too, some of the language in the Bill of Rights is vague, such as "unreasonable searches and seizures," and "due process of law," and leaves much room for argument. Other phrases such as "freedom of speech and of the press," though they look definite enough, are far from certain in their constitutional meaning. I shall say something about some aspects of their meaning later in these remarks.

These civil liberties whose anniversary we are celebrating are, as I have said, promises given by the National Government to the States and the people at the time that Government was created. The necessity of a National Government to provide for the common defense, to remove burdensome restrictions upon trade between the States, to set up a uniform monetary system, and the other advantages offered by the new proposed National Government were hardly sufficient to persuade the Original States and their people to submit themselves to the new Government by ratifying the Constitution, and they were promised that their civil and individual liberties would be preserved by the early adoption of necessary amendments. Thus, the Constitution was ratified in 1788 and the civil-liberties amendments were proposed by Congress in 1789.

Though the National Government guaranteed that it would not by its laws and acts impair civil liberties, yet the citizen was subject not only to the National Government but also, and in more of the affairs of his life, to the government of his State and its subdivisions, such as cities and counties. How was he to be protected in his fundamental liberties against those governments? Most of the States have either before or since the adoption of the National Constitution inserted guaranties similar to the Federal Bill of Rights in their State constitutions, denying to the States the power to infringe civil liberties. In addition, amendments to the Federal Constitution were adopted shortly after the Civil War, in which the National Government guaranteed to individuals that they would not be denied due process of law nor the equal protection of the laws by the States or their subdivisions. The Supreme Court of the United States has held that a State which, by its constitution as interpreted by its courts, denies fundamental civil liberties to individuals, does so in violation of the fourteenth amendment to the National Constitution.

I have said that the National Government, on the whole, kept well its promise not to infringe upon civil liberties. As for the States and their subdivisions, of course, a hundred occasions when civil liberties may be violated arise in the course of State action, to one in the course of Federal action. All the State laws, city and county ordinances, police regulations, and even the actions of policemen, individually and in groups, injunctions, and other decisions of State and local judges, and actions of State and local administrative bodies, each of these actions, of which there are tens of thousands every year, has in it the possibility of a collision between governmental action and civil liberties. In the aggregate there are many violations, but the vigilance of individual victims, lawyers, public-spirited citizens, and public organizations prevent or correct many of them.

For 4 years it has been my privilege to work with a subject matter which is closely related to the traditional civil liberties, and I should like to say something here about that relation. The chief obstacles to the freedom of working people to organize unions and to bargain collectively have not been erected by governments. Judges have, to be sure, upon occasion granted injunctions which have destroyed unions; police and constabulary have prevented or dispersed legitimate union meetings; union leaders have been illegally arrested and imprisoned; the distribution of leaflets has been prevented. All these add up to a large and shameful total of violations of law by agents of governments, most of the violations relating to civil liberties. Yet the most effective opposition to the organization of working people has been not that of governments and their agents but that of private interests. The power to discharge or demote, or threaten to do so, for union activities; the employment of spies; the use of blacklists; the refusal to recognize and deal with unions even if they were organized; these were the real obstacles to the growth of unions. When governments did illegally intervene in the ways that I have indicated, it was usually upon the incitation of private interests. It was they who sought and obtained the injunction, caused the arrest of the union leaders, urged the police to break up the meeting, or prevent the distribution of literature. By the time that the Government intervened, there was usually an economic and frequently a physical conflict going on, and the proper role of government in that conflict was by no means clear. Its action had to be taken in

the midst of a battle, and if it did the thing that seemed immediately necessary, rather than the far-sighted thing, or even the thing that was consistent with civil liberties, it could hardly be criticized. What could be criticized was that government should have stood by and allowed the affairs of employers and their employees to get into such unnecessary and impossible confusion that the action of government, when it did get around to act, was often worse than useless.

This evil was attacked at the source, so far as concerned industries coming within the jurisdiction of the Federal Government, in 1935. The act which popularly bears the name of Senator WAGNER gave to employees the right to organize and took away the legal privilege of employers to destroy their organization. What shall we call the new right which working people have so recently acquired? It is guaranteed by a statute which restrains the private interests which formerly could and did prevent unionization, rather than by an act of self-denial on the part of the Government itself, pledged in the text of the Constitution. Is it, for that reason, inaccurate to call it a civil liberty?

I should suppose that the year 1935 was as propitious a year for the birth of a civil liberty as the year 1789. Indeed, it was a most distinguished year for the birth of a liberty, for it was a year when in the rest of the world old liberties were dying, but no new liberties were being born. In each of those years 1789 and 1935 the Federal Government placed in the body of its law the guaranty of the aspirations of multitudes of its citizens, for which they had struggled for decades.

But let us not quibble about names. However it may be classified, it is a new right which millions of Americans are exercising who never did so before. They have joined A. F. of L. unions, C. I. O. unions, and unaffiliated unions. No one longer denies that they have a moral right to do so. And no one can successfully deny that they needed the protection of the Government in order to be free to exercise this moral right. Suppose that under one of the totalitarian governments of Europe, employers were free to discharge or discriminate against those who attempted to worship in a certain kind of church, and did so discriminate, and only a small number of people attended those churches. Suppose then the Government changed its policy and forbade such discrimination, and thereafter with other conditions remaining the same, large numbers of people attended those churches. No one would deny either the necessity or the effect of the change in the law. That situation would be quite exactly comparable to what has happened in this country under this law. And I may say in passing that, if these rights of working people are not interfered with, the Government, under this law, has no concern whatever with whether or not they join this or that union, or any union. It is not the union, but the liberty, that the Government is interested in. The result may be, and scmetimes is, "Liberty and nonunion" in contradiction of Daniel Webster.

As employers have come to concede the rights of their employees under this law, other troublesome problems concerning civil liberties have been eliminated or simplified in many communities. In the past many of the asserted violations of civil liberties have occurred in industrial towns. In those towns the question of freedom of assembly, speech, or publication nearly always arose in connection with the attempted organization or activity of a labor union. When the principal employers in such communities have begun to obey the National Labor Relations Act and to keep their hands out of the union question the other civil-liberties problems largely disappear. The police do not interfere with assembly, speech, or publication, because no one is asking them to interfere. Magistrates do not jail union organizers under "disorderly conduct" or "suspicious person" statutes or ordinances, because there is no pressure upon them to do so. And if the town is "open" for labor-union meetings there is little likelihood of any interference with speech, press, or assembly for other purposes.

If the law which we administer has had the effect of raising the general level of observance of civil liberties, we are glad. If it will permit such organizations as the one under whose auspices this gathering is held to devote more of their always too limited resources to other situations where their vigilance is needed, we are glad.

It now becomes my duty to tell this gathering of friends of civil liberty whether I myself and the organization with which I am associated have not been more than a little careless with the civil liberties of some of those whose cases have been before us. The charge has been made with much vehemence by many litigants and by some editors and other publicists. Pointed questions have been asked by the American Civil Liberties Union itself. I come before you, then, to answer the charge that, in the administration of a law designed to creat a new civil liberty for employees, I participate in the violation of the civil liberties of employers.

"If it were so, it were a grievious fault."

The charges, so far as I am aware of them, have been with relation to freedom of speech and of the press.

The pertinent language of the first amendment to the Constitution is: "Congress shall make no law * * * abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; * * *." That means also, of course, that no administrative body or court shall so interpret and enforce any law of Congress as to give it the effect of abridging the freedom of speech or of the press. But what does "freedom of speech or of the press" mean, as the words are used in the Constitution?

If our Board had been the first tribunal to which that question had ever been presented, we would have had the responsibility for determining whether the constitutional fathers meant that persons could go about saying or publishing what they pleased, when they pleased, where they pleased, regardless of circumstances and of consequences; or meant that persons could so speak or publish, being liable for the damage caused by their doing so, if they had resources out of which damages could be collected; or meant that persons could so speak or publish if what they said was true or was believed to be true; or meant that they could so speak or publish if the persons to whom their language was addressed were not subject to their physical or economic or social domination and would not be deprived of some legitimate interest by being so addressed.

Such a difficult and unenviable task never fell to the Board. The problem of interpretation had already come before the Supreme Court of the United States in a considerable number and variety of cases. That Court had decided the question as it arose in each case without attempting to spell out a formula for the decision of all cases of all sorts.

The problem for the Board in the cases so far decided by it has been whether it should order an employer who has spoken or distributed literature to his employees for the purpose of keeping them from joining a union to cease and desist from so speaking or publishing. The Supreme Court precedents have seemed to us to be exactly in point. In *Duplex Printing Press Co.* v. *Deering* (254 U. S. 443 (1921)), the Court held that:

"There should be an injunction against * * * using any force, threats, commands, directions, or even persuasion, with the object or having the effect of causing any * * * persons to decline employment * * * or cease working under any person * * * being a purchaser or prospective purchaser of any printing presses from complainant * * *" (at p. 478).

In *Bedford Cut Stone Co.* v. *Journeymen Stone Cutters' Association* (274 U. S. 37 (1927)), the United States District Court for the District of Indiana, pursuant to the opinion and mandate of the Supreme Court, entered an injunction restraining the defendants from, inter alia, "publishing, circulating, or otherwise communicating, either directly or indirectly, in writing or orally, to each other, or to any other person * * * any statement or notice of any kind whatsoever, intimating * * * that the complainants are, or were, or have been, unfair * * *." (The injunction is not reported in the Supreme Court report, but is reprinted in hearings before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary on S. 1472, 70th Cong., 1st sess. (1928), p. 49.)

The cases of *Gompers* v. *Buck Stove and Range Co.* (221 U. S. 418 (1911)), *Hitchman Coal and Coke Co.* v. *Mitchell* (245 U. S. 229 (1917)), and *Tri-City Central Trade Council* v. *American Steel Foundries* (257 U. S. 184 (1921)), are also in point.

In these cases the order made by the Government, through the judicial branch, restrained union leaders or members from speaking and publishing, when the object of their speech or publication was to impair the interest of the employer in getting customers or employees. That being the law of the Constitution as it is applied when employers invoke legal processes against unions, would it be tolerable for the Board to find that the constitutional guaranties mean something different when unions invoke legal processes against employers? If such class distinctions are to become a part of our Bill of Rights, they should be expressly written into the Constitution by an amendment submitted for ratification in the regular way, and not slipped surreptitiously into it by judicial or quasi-judicial interpretation. And if ever the American people are willing to write such a class distinction into what has been the charter of their liberties, the rest of the charter will hardly be worth saving.

I am glad to be with you on this occasion. I am happy to report that, in the field in which I work, the enjoyment of the old and the new liberties bring order and mutual respect and civic decency. All who are interested in liberty are indebted to the American Civil Liberties Union. May it never relax its vigilance.

"That These Shall Not Perish"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD H. REES

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 20, 1939

EDITORIAL FROM THE COUNTRY GENTLEMAN

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, in order to direct the attention of the membership of Congress to a very fine and timely editorial that appears in the November issue of the great national journal, the Country

Gentleman. The editorial is entitled "That These Shall Not Perish," and reads as follows:

The American people have the world's greatest task of conservation. Theirs is now the task of conserving, of keeping alive those hard-won values which make life worth the living.

Elsewhere over the earth these values are swiftly being blacked out. Kindness and mercy, decency and tolerance have been trampled under in one new war after another. Honor, integrity, and truth have been brushed aside by the rulers of great nations, and deceit, force, and brutality exalted in their place. The blood-bought rights of freedom of speech and conscience, the right of a fair trial by jury have been extinguished for millions of people. In their stead have been substituted the spies and informers, the secret trial and the firing squads.

Untold numbers of men and women have died to win these humanities that are now disappearing from the earth. All that gives the individual self-respect and worth as a human being, all that holds hope for our children are embodied in them. Someone must hold fast to them. No matter what happens, a stronghold must be maintained for them here. That is the obligation now resting upon the American people—upon each one of us. These rights and graces of life must be kept enduring realities until the rest of mankind is ready for them again. That time will come.

We have read of periods in history when men and women and youth had something to which they could consecrate themselves. Such, and nothing less, is upon us now. The spirit that it calls for is sounded in those dauntless words of I Corinthians xvi, 13:

"Watch ye, stand fast in the faith, quit you like men, be strong."

Thomas Brackett Reed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. OLIVER

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1939

IN COMMEMORATION OF THE ONE HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BIRTH OF THOMAS BRACKETT REED

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, I regret that it was impossible for me to be present personally on the floor of the House last Wednesday because, representing as I do the First Congressional District of Maine, it certainly would have been most appropriate for me to have participated along with the other Members of this body in the activity commemorating the one hundredth anniversary of the birth of Thomas Brackett Reed, who was for a period of 22 years a Representative from my congressional district. However, I felt that duty called me back to Maine, where I cooperated in formulating a memorial service in his memory at the chapel of Bowdoin College in Brunswick, Maine.

At this point, under leave granted by the House, I am pleased to incorporate in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the remarks which I made on the program which was carried out at Bowdoin College:

President Sills, undergraduates of Bowdoin, and ladies and gentlemen, with extreme humility and with a deep sense of the complete inadequacy of words to express in any worthy manner a fitting tribute to the memory of Thomas Brackett Reed, I approach the responsibility of participating even in a small way in this program today. A man who was a great patriot, an unexcelled statesman, and an American of the highest possible type really needs no extended verbiage to extol his works or his memory. But it is especially worthy for us today in the light of world and domestic conditions to pause and in the passing flight of time record again the character and genius of this noted man.

Today all over the world parliamentary and legislative processes and principles of government are on trial. Man is denying to man the fundamental and basic rights of liberty, freedom, and justice. Nations are denying to nations similar rights. As we look back upon the life of Thomas Brackett Reed we realize that his example shines for us like a star. We realize that his integrity, his honesty of purpose, his morality, and his strength of conviction indicate for us a true illustration of the path which men and nations today must travel if the destiny of mankind is to develop into that type of Christian civilization in which the greatest good is to be the order for the greatest number. Tom Reed was honest and upright in all his dealings with his fellowman. Never was his strong position nor his great power as Speaker of the House of Representatives used for his personal gain. Never did he strike a single, mighty blow on any side but the right. When he did strike he was always felt. In Reed the cause of right had a champion of champions. Maine, America, and the entire world will find in the life of this man the ultimate of those qualities and those characteristics so sadly needed in the public life of this modern civilization. Today we need leaders—leaders who in thought and action will make sincerity of purpose their beacon light. This man whose birth we commemorate here today based every act on the fundamental truth that lack of sincerity is the basest and most reprehensible of all failings of mankind.

At the time when memorial services were being held for him in the hall of representatives in Augusta on Wednesday, January 28, 1903, Hon. Harold M. Sewall, then Representative to the State legislature from Bath, said, "Reed hastened the coming of another day, a day when public service shall be emancipated from the stigma too often attaching to it, the stigma of selfishness, of unworthy motives, and corrupt methods. * * * It shall be a day of intrepidity of intellect." Then, again, at these same services we find these words of Hon. Forrest Goodwin, senator from Somerset County: "Mr. Reed was a kind and lovable man; genial and generous, sympathetic and loyal. * * * He was intensely independent, absolutely self-reliant. Brave and courageous, he never weakened in the face of opposition. He was honest and he was incorruptible."

Having scanned with some care the record of Reed's character and his life, it is my considered judgment that a Reed of today would deprecate in the strongest language applicable the injustices now existing in the family of nations; that he would call a spade a spade in the most forceful words at his command, in connection with our domestic problems; that he would be partisan but would temper that partisanship with the sense of justice which was so inherently a part of his make-up.

To me a study of Reed's life indicated a complete abhorrence for that type of status quo which entailed a stoppage of justice, fairness, and equal opportunity for the large majority of the people of this Nation of ours. Certainly he would not tolerate parliamentary status quo and by the same token I cannot conceive of him enduring a type of economic status quo which entails a continuing unemployment paradox in a land where there is such great need for work. Is it conceivable that such a man believing in the extension of right and justice to all, would long endure without strong protest the continuing existence of a financial status quo which hangs a burden of debt and a load of economic uncertainty and insecurity over millions of our people? Most assuredly his disdain for party pressure toward a course against his better judgment would impel him to a position of leadership against that status quo rather than an abject continuing along the road of the past, just because it was the past. Tom Reeds are needed today as never before in the history of this country. New problems require new answers, and men who merely approach the type of Reed must not and will not long endure these continuing conditions which deny—I repeat—which deny the fundamental and basic rights of liberty, freedom, and justice, both civil and economic.

As long as parliamentary and legislative assemblies convene in this country may we never let the life and memory of Thomas Brackett Reed become in the least forgotten or tarnished. Let the youth of today and tomorrow read and study the character and the works of this great man, a true Christian and a great American.

Relief for Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 13, 1939

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, although the present session of the Congress was called to consider one subject, neutrality, I felt when the session was called and I still feel that such a limitation was unwise, because, important as neutrality is, it still remains a fact we have a number of vitally grave domestic problems unsolved by this administration, problems which are becoming aggravated day by day by the delay incident to the neutrality problem, and there is grave danger these problems may become so aggravated by the delay and neglect on the part of this administration that they may be vastly more difficult to solve than they would have been had we devoted more attention to them.

One of these problems is unemployment, or, rather, permanent employment for our people. Another is the plight of the American farmers, including those of Michigan.

This week I introduced a bill in the House of Representatives to provide a real degree of relief for the farmer. I believe this Congress ought not to end this session after the question of the embargo is finally disposed of, but that it

ought to stay in session and take up immediately these domestic problems, which must be solved whether there is a war in Europe or whether there is not.

As regards the farm problem, the continuation of subparity farm prices of all, or nearly all, commodities and the resulting lowered farm income are phenomena with which we are all familiar.

Foreign farm products are being admitted to the United States in increasingly large quantities. Their importation is being encouraged at a time when American farm prices are least capable of withstanding this competition. This increase of importations are a direct result of the reciprocal trade agreements program. With half the world now in war, the administration still insists that its reciprocal-trade policy is designed to "soften the mind of the world toward peace."

Right now the administration is considering trade agreements with Argentina, Venezuela, Cuba—supplemental—Belgium, Chile, and Uruguay, all agricultural competitors, under which new tariff concessions are contemplated, and presumably will be made in the agreement, on many products competitive with those of American farms.

Many Members of the House on both sides of the aisle have properly protested this procedure, but it is my view that the American farmer is entitled to something more than mere protests. Not only is he entitled to action to prevent the price-depressing effect of these competitive farm imports on an already glutted domestic market but he must have it.

American farmers are entitled to a protection which will insulate the domestic prices at which they are compelled to sell their products against destructive price influences from abroad, including South and Central America. We might just as well take our stand on the basis that American farmers are entitled to the full benefits of the American market to the extent of their capacity to develop and supply it.

As a modest start toward securing this protection for American agriculture, I introduced the bill which provides, in essence, that when the domestic price of any American-grown farm product falls below parity, further importations of that commodity from abroad shall be prohibited until the American price has risen again to parity.

This proposed embargo on the importation of farm products, the prices of which are below parity in the United States, would not affect present tariff rates as established by the Tariff Act of 1930. Neither would the embargo affect the technical structure of the existing trade agreements. Foreign farm products would continue to be admitted at the reduced rates provided in those agreements so long as farm prices of those commodities in the United States were at or above parity.

However, if farm prices fell below parity, under the embargo to be established by this bill, all imports of commodities affected would cease until such time as prices rose to parity.

Thus it will be readily seen the purpose of the bill is to give the American farmer the full benefit of the American market, and protection against these destructive influences arising out of these unneeded imports.

This is an act of legitimate economic self-protection which no foreign nation could properly criticize. It is also a vitally necessary act of economic justice to our own people which it will be dangerous to delay any longer.

Legislative Program of the Regular Veterans' Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MON C. WALLGREN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 20, 1939

Mr. WALLGREN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herein the educational program of the Regular Veterans' Association. The Regular Veterans' Association, headed by Carl Gardner, former officer in the United States Marine Corps and for the past several years editor of Our Army, was founded in 1934. It is composed of men who have served honorably for at least 1 year in the armed forces of the United States Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard. It is founded upon the same patriotic principles as are our war veterans' organizations and has for its major aim the promotion of an adequate national defense in all of its ramifications, true allegiance to the Constitution, protection of the personnel of the armed forces, and complete eradication of all subversive activities which threaten the existence of our American form of government.

The program adopted at the third annual convention of the R. V. A. held in New York City last month, is as follows:

1. Promotion of an adequate and efficient national defense, with a Navy second to none and with an Army of at least 280,000 officers and men.
2. Privileges of hospitalization at all United States Veterans' Administration facilities for former Regulars of the military and naval service.
3. Increase in pensions for widows and dependents of deceased Regulars who have died of service-connected disabilities.
4. Amendment of Public Law, No. 2, Seventy-third Congress, so as to permit any person having an honorable discharge from any of the Regular services to be eligible for admission to the various Veterans' Administration homes.
5. Elimination of regulations which prevent members of the United States Soldiers' Home and of the United States Naval Home from receiving their full pensions while residing in these homes.
6. Amending of present pension laws to cover men who were disabled in the Regular service prior to 1898.
7. Increase in the quarters and rental allowance for all retired personnel to $30 per month.
8. Provisions for retirement privileges for enlisted personnel of the Regular Army after 25 years of service.
9. Upward revision of the present pay scale throughout the Regular Establishments.
10. Opposition to any law that will permit States or other local political subdivisions to apply sales taxes to sales made in post exchanges or similar stores on military and naval reservations, ships, or stations.
11. Retention of the reenlistment allowance until it can be replaced by satisfactory pay schedules.
12. Good-conduct medal for all honorably discharged Army Regulars.
13. Increase of 100 percent in the number of appointments to the Military and Naval Academies from the ranks of the enlisted men of the Regular Establishments each year and increase in the age limit on such appointments.
14. Continued preference to all honorably discharged veterans of the Regular Establishments under all rules and regulations promulgated by the United States Civil Service Commission, and a law that will require this Commission to publish all eligible lists and to make all appointments from the list in the order of merit, with no eligible passed over without legal and adequate reason therefor.
15. Preference to all honorably discharged Regulars in admission to C. C. C. camps and on W. P. A. jobs.
16. Governmental aid for disabled Regulars seeking educational advantages, and a more adequate educational program for Regulars in active service.
17. Uniform law in all States granting full rights of citizenship including the right to vote by absentee ballot, if necessary, to all members of the armed forces of the United States in peace or in war.
18. Elimination of the so-called "green ticket" in the United States Coast Guard.
19. Adoption of a uniform salute to the flag for civilian and soldier alike.
20. Require State soldiers' and sailors' homes that receive Federal funds to admit Regulars on the same basis as other veterans.
21. Grant full citizenship upon request to every alien who holds an honorable discharge from any of the Regular Establishments, provided there is no crime or other blot upon the character of said alien.
22. Formation of a National Armistic Day Association.
23. Creation of the grade of commissioned warrant officer in those branches of the Regular Establishments which have no such grade at present that all advancements to that grade be from the enlisted personnel.
24. Equalization of charges to all veterans residing in the United States Soldiers' Home and the United States Naval Home.
25. Increase of $10 per month in amount now being paid hospitalized Regulars.
26. Burial at Government expense of any veteran who died from disability incurred in line of duty.
27. Retirement privileges for all enlisted personnel of the Regular Establishments after 25 years of service at three-fourths base pay in grade or rating.

In addition to these resolutions, the Regular Veterans' Association will continue to work for several measures that have been on its program for the past year. Among these are:

1. Equalization of pay and allowances among all of the services.
2. First pay, grade, pay, allowances, and rank for first sergeants of the Army and Marine Corps.
3. Brigadier general rank for our Army chief of chaplains.
4. Permanent non-commissioned-officer warrants for noncommissioned officers of the Army, with promotions based on merit as evidenced by tests, record, and examination.
5. Removal of legislative restrictions on Army post exchange.
6. Placing the fixing of Army non-commissioned-officer strength in the hands of the Secretary of War.
7. Making the purchase of Government life insurance by military and naval officers and enlisted personnel possible at any time during active service, instead of 120 days after acceptance of rank or enlistment, as at present.
8. Advancement of one grade in rank upon retirement by officers who served in the Spanish-American War.
9. Outlawing of all foreign-controlled or directed organizations, societies, or parties that adopt un-American programs or tactics which endanger the democratic institutions of our country.
10. Educational institutes for the Army and Navy whereby correspondence, educational, and vocational courses may be made available to personnel of the Army and Navy similar to those available to marines and Coast Guard men through their Marine Corps and Coast Guard institutes.

Profits Versus Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 20, 1939

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, the irresistible lure of profits and gold has manifested itself again. The debate on the question of our foreign policy in this very critical period in our Nation's history has produced that oft-repeated story of "business and profits" as a point in favor of the repeal of the arms and ammunition embargo provisions of existing law. Throughout the various discussions on the subject of our neutrality under the pending bill I have listened patiently for some expression upon the estimate of business enhancement if and when the arms and ammunition embargo is repealed, and a full cash-and-carry policy enacted, but no positive expression has been offered. Therefore, we are led to the most natural question: How much would the unlimited sale of arms and ammunition to belligerents increase business in this country? Who knows? And, too, how many industries, other than the Peters Arms & Ammunition Co. and the Du Ponts, would such unlimited sale of arms and ammunition to belligerents affect? No one has made any suggestion, with any degree of certainty, which approaches these vital questions. I am confident the people of this Nation would like to know, with some certainty, what the result will be in the event a full cash-and-carry policy is adopted.

Mr. Speaker, we do know from our past experience during the World War that the sale of arms and ammunition by this Nation to belligerent nations was negligible. We conducted our warfare in that great struggle in very large part with foreign-made guns and ammunition, and our Air Corps flew the airplanes made by foreign countries. Those countries, our Allies in that great war, made all the guns and ammunition and manufactured all the airplanes required for their own great armies, and in addition thereto they made largely the guns, ammunition, and airplanes which our own great Army required. The dismal story of our attempt to place flying planes upon the front in that crisis is appalling at this late day. They did not get there. However, the argument produced by those who advocate the adoption of a "full cash-and-carry policy in arms and ammunition" will greatly enhance the business in our Nation falls by its own weight, because we know that England and France produced all of the war materials used by them in the last war, which included arms, ammunition, and airplanes, and in addition they produced in quantity an amount sufficient to largely equip our own Army and Air Corps. It is admitted by those who present the "profit argument" that England and France would be the nations now engaged in the present war which would purchase these war supplies from us. These same nations now have their own supplies and their own source of supplies; they are providing for all of their own needs, and they are not required at this time to provide such war supplies to any other country. Therefore their supplies, their guns, and their ammunition are ample. Then, if that be true, so long as that condition obtains, those nations would not become purchasers from us. And we must remember France and England continued the World War for a period of 4 years, and throughout that long period of time they provided their own war supplies and equipment.

May I suggest at this point that we as a nation do not forget that France and England owe to this Nation approximately $11,000,000,000 from the last war? More than 20 years have passed since the World War ended, but those nations have failed to pay that debt. They are debtor nations who owe vast sums of money to our country; they do not pay, and they do not pay the interest, but continue to remain debtor nations. These are the nations who, according to those who argue that vast profits would come to our country if the arms and ammunition embargo should be lifted, would be our customers and purchasers. And any prospective purchaser or customer who has all of the goods and supplies required for its needs of the same type and kind we are selling would not buy more. That is the inevitable conclusion to which we are driven. I am firm in my conviction that a full cash-and-carry plan, such as is proposed, which would embrace the unlimited sale of arms and ammunition to belligerents, that the sales made thereunder would be entirely negligible and in such meager proportions that business in our country would not be appreciably enhanced.

Mr. Speaker, when we weigh the two positions in the balance—the war profits, on the one hand, and human life and bloodshed, on the other hand—can there be any real and comprehensible comparison? I propound that question for the reason that I am convinced that the unlimited and unrestrained sale of arms and ammunition to belligerents in time of war, which embraces the sale of destructive and death-dealing instrumentalities and devices, will create a deep feeling of hostility against our Nation, and the very act of selling implements of war to one side of the controversy would undoubtedly be construed as an unneutral act, and the same might well be our first step into this European war. This must not be. We must keep the United States of America out of this war. We must remember that we cannot weigh profits against human life, because the blood of men is far more sacred than a few paltry dollars, and the calmness of peace is more honorable than the glory of war.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to incorporate in and as a part of my remarks a very illuminating editorial which appeared in the Evening Star of date October 18, 1939, on the subject of war and trade, which has a very close application here, and I sincerely hope each Member of the House will read this editorial, which follows:

WAR AND TRADE

Another warning to American business against overestimating the possibilities of war trade has come from Dr. Harold G. Moulton, president of the Brookings Institution, who sees danger in the expanding production schedules and mounting inventories that are being nourished by a speculative urge rather than consumption needs.

While noting the present slackening in commodity prices, Dr. Moulton emphasizes that the groundwork already has been laid in industry for the familiar distortion of cost factors, with the inevitable threat of a new collapse and another painful period of readjustment.

The Brookings Institution head points out that European purchases may well be much more restricted than is generally assumed, because prospective demand is being viewed in the light of that developed by the World War, although conditions are much different than they were 25 years ago.

In the first place, he explains, the capacity of the principal European nations to buy American goods is much less than it was then,

because their ability to borrow has been impaired, and their resources are not as great.

Also, the price advance in 1915 was enhanced by spirited competition among European buyers, private as well as government, that has disappeared now under rigorous price controls.

Further, France and England are better supplied with munitions now, and, in addition, the dominions and other neutrals also may be expected to get a share of the business, offering another reason, Dr. Moulton adds, why this country will not occupy such a dominating position as a source of supply.

Dr. Moulton's views, expressed before a group of industrialists and financiers at the New York automobile show, coincide with those voiced last month by the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, which pointed out that too much optimism over the foreign-trade outlook was not warranted because the war, while undoubtedly spurring demand, also would create obstacles, financial and otherwise, to militate against the American market.

That business leaders in this country realize the dangers of a boom has been made clear also by other spokesmen and in the end these continued admonitions may have effect. But the lure of profit is a powerful incentive to disregard caution signs and continued vigilance is necessary if this country is to escape the evils of an unwarranted industrial expansion, with its inevitable aftermath of depression.

Mr. Speaker, may I caution the Members of the House that we are dealing with a most serious subject. We must not err. Any mistake on the part of this body, in this most serious deliberation, might wreck the lives of millions of people and it might destroy our Government. The ghastly thought that our Nation, for which men have fought and died, would be lost—that our freedom and liberty might be forever destroyed—is too sordid to contemplate. Let us approach this solemn subject with the seriousness of life itself, and let us think of our country first.

Our Expensive Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OSCAR YOUNGDAHL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 20, 1939

EDITORIAL FROM THE MINNEAPOLIS (MINN.) STAR-JOURNAL

Mr. YOUNGDAHL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial relative to the cost of government.

[From the Minneapolis Star-Journal of October 16, 1939]

OUR EXPENSIVE GOVERNMENT

Speaking of the cost of government, here's an interesting if rather depressing trend:

On November 11, 1918, at the close of the World War, the United States Government had marshaled the greatest number of Federal employees in the history of the country. In the months and years that followed, the number was gradually decreased, but the downtrend eventually stopped, the hiring started over again, until today there are 2,550 more persons on the Federal pay roll than there were at the World War peak.

The total figure as of June 30 this year was 920,310. We shudder to think how long the Federal pay roll would grow if Uncle Sam took up arms again.

Neutrality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. SLATTERY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 21 (legislative day of Wednesday, October 4), 1939

ARTICLE BY JAMES MORGAN

Mr. SLATTERY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by James Morgan, published in the Boston Sunday Globe of October 15, 1939, entitled "One Sure Way to Keep Us Out of War."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Boston Sunday Globe of October 15, 1939]

ONE SURE WAY TO KEEP US OUT OF WAR—MERE NEUTRALITY FAILED IN THE PAST BECAUSE A GREAT PEOPLE IN A TIME OF CRISIS MUST HAVE A POSITIVE POLICY, WHICH SHOULD MOBILIZE THEM TODAY IN A FIGHT TO SAVE DEMOCRACY AT HOME

(By James Morgan)

The Congressman who wanted to know "who we are neutral against" was not as innocent as he sounded. We of this oldest neutral nation are and ever have been the most unneutral neutrals in the world. In the century and a half of our national existence there have been two periods of general warfare in Europe and neutrality laws did not succeed in keeping us neutral in either instance.

By the time of Washington's second inauguration the European powers were in a coalition to stamp out the French Revolution, and he issued the first neutrality proclamation in history.

The weakness of that system was and still is that it proposes a policy too pale for our citizenry while the world is in tumult. When Washington proclaimed neutrality in the wars of the French Revolution, which plunged Europe into a 20-year struggle, our people already were arrayed along the lines of cleavage in the Old World and tagging one another with imported partisan names, Jacobins and aristocrats and all manner of alien epithets. Ultimately Washington himself quit his retirement at Mt. Vernon to organize an army against France in 1798 and was "dumbfounded," as he said, when his successor, President John Adams, returned to neutrality by making peace with the new French Government under Napoleon Bonaparte.

WHEN AN EMBARGO FAILED

When President Jefferson took over the task of maintaining our neutrality he sounded off in his inaugural with the watchwords: "Peace, commerce, and friendship with all nations, entangling alliances with none." He coined a lasting national slogan against entangling alliances, but the only neutral nation in Christendom found itself friendless among the belligerents, with its trade caught between the British sea blockade and Napoleon's continental blockade.

As a last desperate means for keeping ourselves out of the war we resorted to an embargo, not on arms alone, as our present neutrality law provides, but on all commercial intercourse with the embattled continent. That biting off of our nose to spite our face so infuriated the mercantile and shipping interests in our idle ports that we repealed the embargo and let our ships take their chances. When Napoleon had seized 500 of them and Great Britain 900 our patriotic indignation boiled over, and we rushed, divided and unprepared, into the inglorious War of 1812.

THE BURNT CHILD

After a century inflammable Europe burst into flames again in 1914, but it is not necessary to retell here the familiar story of how our policy of neutrality met with the same remorseless fate as before. Now, once more, we are facing this old problem. We are, it is true, fortified with the psychology of the burnt child. We are still under the great disillusionment of the World War, the mock peace, and the defaulted debts. Although we are far more "neutral against" Hitler and Stalin than we were against the Kaiser we are not so "neutral for" the Allies this time. Our crusading spirit, when we went forth to make the world safe for democracy, is a rueful memory.

The change in the national mood is reflected in what is going on in Washington. To save ourselves from fighting for the neutral rights which we unavailingly fought two wars to uphold we are ready this time to surrender them in advance. Whether our shipping interests, just as we have built up our merchant marine until it is second only to the British, will endure this embargo any more patiently than their forerunners bore Jefferson's embargo we shall presently see.

I am not debating the pending neutrality plans. I am only arguing that these do not meet the central question and that Washington is staging what is more or less a sham battle. This is the favorite sport of politics, which ever delights to sidetrack the stern realities of a main issue.

Keeping our ships at home will not avail in the long pull ahead unless we can find a way to keep our minds at home. Despite our unneutrality the people are agreed, as they never were in any other similar crisis, in a desire to stay out of this European war. But neutrality, at best and however framed, is a negation, and it takes an affirmative to win and hold the necessary support of this people.

LET'S MIND OUR OWN BUSINESS

Let's mind our own business. All right, let's. But many who repeat that wise commonplace do not appreciate what a big job it gives us to do. We cannot do it by merely refusing to mind other people's business in Europe. No policy of mere avoidance will do the trick in this any more than it did in the other European wars.

Only some positive and aggressive policy can engage or will deserve to enlist the loyalty of a great and vigorous people. We cannot expect year after year to do nothing but peep at a day of wrong through the little hole of discretion. Soon or late we would inevitably shinny over the fence and get into a game where something was doing.

NEUTRALITY NOT ENOUGH

No; neutrality is not enough. Armed preparedness is not enough, however necessary it may be when military force is rampant at our front and back doors in Europe and Asia. A still more imperative necessity is a social and economic preparedness.

The surest way to keep us out of war would be to mobilize our energies in what William James termed a moral equivalent for war. That means finding a man's-size job for the American people at home. It will be no use to keep our ships at home unless we keep also our emotions at home and diverted to a war on our own problems. Surely these are many and worthy the steel of our national courage and ambition.

President Roosevelt says that one-third of our people are ill-housed, ill-clothed, and ill-fed; ex-President Hoover makes a like estimate. The cancer of unemployment is a world-wide reproach to the richest, most-favored land under the sun. Share-cropping in the South and farm-tenancy in the West are mining and sapping the foundation on which we built a free Nation. These evils are storing up among us the grapes of wrath which produced Hitler and Stalin across the sea.

NO TIME TO ADJOURN POLITICS

Have we not a statesmanship with the imagination and daring to start America to building while Europe is destroying? Leave the New World to twiddle its thumbs and the devil that forever bedevils the Old World will find plenty of mischief for our idle hands to do. Give our people the glow of a far-reaching enterprise of construction and nothing, not all the propaganda of the belligerents, could drag us into a war of destruction.

When the democracy which we have come lightly to take for granted is menaced on all sides it is no time to talk of adjourning politics, which means suspending the democratic processes of government. Rather we should give those processes more gas. To be sure, as Webster said, "Our party divisions should cease at the water's edge." But we cannot stop them there by the merely negative action of adjourning all politics.

Mark the party alinement in the Senate on the question of neutrality. The same lines will cut across the approaching campaign of 1940 as they crossed the campaign of 1916. Our people will divide on European issues if they are not offered American issues instead.

THE GREEKS AT OUR OWN DOOR

We learned by bitter experience that we cannot make the world safe for democracy on foreign battlefields. But we can save democracy right here at home. James Bryce warned Americans that "upon the peaceful and orderly development of their democratic institutions the fortune of the world very largely depends." Confronting us anew is the ringing challenge of Lincoln when he said that "we shall nobly save or meanly lose the last, best hope of earth."

When our always unneutral people were wrought up over the saving of democracy in Greece at the time of her war of liberation from the Turks, a great lady in Virginia sat on her pillared portico, fervently discoursing on our moral duty to aid those far-off people in their gallant fight for freedom. With a sweeping glance at the slaves in the yard of his liberty-loving hostess, John Randolph brought the issue home to her with the remark, "Madam, the Greeks are at your own door."

Comment on Colonel Lindbergh's Radio Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 21 (legislative day of Wednesday, October 4), 1939

ARTICLE BY HERBERT AGAR

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article which appeared in the Louisville Courier-Journal on October 18, 1939, in a column written by Herbert Agar, the article dealing with Colonel Lindbergh's second radio speech.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Louisville Courier-Journal of October 18, 1939]

TIME AND TIDE

(By Herbert Agar)

LINDBERGH'S LOGIC

Lindbergh's second radio speech was, as they say in the detective stories, incompetent, irrelevant, and immaterial. Putting aside the inflammatory foolishness about Canada, the speech boils down to a very bad piece of reasoning.

The colonel tells us that this is not a war for democracy. Of course it isn't a war for democracy. Among the people who disagree with Lindbergh on the arms embargo, nobody has been silly enough to pretend that it is a war for democracy. Yet Lindbergh seems to think he is bringing us news when he points out it is a war to prevent Germany from destroying the French and British Empires.

"This is a war," he tells us, "over the balance of power in Europe." But the whole world had grown accustomed to that idea even before the war began. The seediest politicians and the least informed journalists had caught up to that fact by the time of Munich.

Although the colonel's information is neither new nor startling, the conclusions which he draws from his information are original. After stating that this is not a war for democracy, and that it is a war for the balance of power, he ask that we continue the embargo on "offensive weapons and munitions."

He seems to be saying that since it isn't a war for democracy it doesn't make any difference to us who wins it—that we might just as well continue penalizing the Allies and giving a special advantage to the Germans.

Suppose the colonel found two men fighting in a barroom, and suppose he knew that neither man was a Democrat—would he at once assume that it made no difference which won? But suppose one man was a thief and the other man had just lost his watch? Or suppose one man had murdered the barkeep's daughter, and the other man was trying to hold him for the police?

There are lots of things to fight for, aside from democracy—and some of them make a great deal of difference. The colonel hasn't disposed of the war by saying it's a war over the balance of power.

The balance of power is what exists in Europe when no one nation dominates the entire show. There was no balance of power while Napoleon owned Europe. There would be no balance of power if Hitler owned Europe. It is better, for the selfish interests of the United States, that there should be a balance of power, rather than a Russian-German hegemony over Europe and Asia.

Furthermore, it is far better for the selfish interests of the United States that the French and British systems should not be destroyed by the German and Russian systems. This has nothing to do with sentiment. It has nothing to do with democracy. It has to do with the fundamental institutions of society.

France and England believe in private property. They believe in freedom of thought and of religion. They believe in what is vaguely called the capitalist system of production. The United States, also, believes in these institutions, and is making a serious effort to build a satisfactory way of life in terms of them.

This effort will never be interfered with by the French or the British. It is bound to be interfered with by the Germans and the Russians, if nazi-ism and communism becomes dominant in two continents.

For the Germans and Russians believe in state-controlled property, in slave labor, in the denial of free thought, and in the repression of Christianity. If they dominate half the world they will create conditions that will make the American effort more difficult than it is at present.

It is to our interest, therefore, that the Allies should win. It is to our interest to sell them the arms they need, if we can make them and they can pay for them. And nothing is more irrelevant than the obvious fact that this is not a war about democracy.

Technical Research

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM STEWART

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 21 (legislative day of Wednesday, October 4), 1939

ADDRESS BY HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY OF PENNSYLVANIA AT CORNERSTONE LAYING OF AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH LABORATORY, WYNDMOOR, PA.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY] on the occasion of the laying of the cornerstone of the Agricultural Research Laboratory at Wyndmoor, Pa., on October 20, 1939.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

How easy it is to find the text for the dedication of this research laboratory. It fairly thrusts itself at us from every day's headlines. Great nations locked in a struggle for supremacy—and other nations great in area and population being speedily overrun and conquered. A world theme of latter-day power and what it means to have it or not to have it spelled out for us in every morning's newspapers.

The German conquest of Poland has opened the eyes even of military observers. How was it that that vast land with all its

manpower could be overrun and completely reduced to subjection in 20 days' time? How is it, indeed, that Germany has risen in two decades from virtual collapse up to the remarkable strength that she shows today?

The answer to this question, not alone for Germany, but for England and France and Japan and Russia and the United States is the same. The countries that hold the real world power today did not get it by reason of their size alone nor their manpower nor their natural resources. I will tell you where that strength comes from. It comes, basically, right out of the workshops of the scientists and technical men. The mechanized armies, the floating fortresses, the incredibly swift airplanes and communications—all were born out of the test tubes and microscopes of technicians. They are run by men who also have had a good measure of technical training.

We abhor that such training and skill should be devoted to the pursuits of war. But in peace, no less than in war, the strength of a nation today lies in its technical advancement. That is so true that it is almost trite to say it. The same training and skill that build war machines also build the machines of peace. The things that have lifted the drudgery off the backs of working people, that have given us a standard of living such that the American workmen of today enjoys comforts that the prince of other days could not have, are products of the research laboratory.

My text, then, is that the wise peoples of today are those who are training many men in the fields of technical research and who are equipping good workshops for those men. It is those very men and those very workshops that are our real guaranty of survival just as they are our best hope of advancement in the arts of civilized living. It is a comforting thought to me that this great research laboratory and the three others like it now being dedicated elsewhere in the country are strong assets for national emergency as well as for our normal life of peace.

No institution ever was conceived in more peaceful and civilized objectives than these laboratories. Congress authorized their building as part of the broad program to utilize further the abundant products of our soil. To me that is one thing that puts them right in the American tradition. We have learned how to produce an abundance in this country. Now we propose to learn how to make still better use of it.

These last few years we have faced, in agriculture, what seemed like a formidable surplus problem. For many years before the World War this country was accustomed to sell abroad from 150 to 200 million bushels of wheat, 8 to 9 million bales of cotton, and well toward a billion pounds of pork, in addition to fairly large quantities of tobacco and fruit. In other words, our production of these important items was geared to a substantial foreign demand as well as to a rapidly expanding domestic market.

During the World War prices and production were further stimulated by financial inflation. Then after the war came the period of deflation with its accompanying crash in commodity prices. Farm products and other raw materials were especially hard hit. European buying was curtailed and huge unwanted stocks of American pork, wheat, and cotton piled up on the farms and in trade channels.

It was out of this eventual situation that the whole present agricultural program came into being. These research laboratories are one of the coordinated steps in that program and represent a further line of attack on a problem which already has been engaged upon a wide front.

In creating these research establishments Congress instructed the Secretary of Agriculture to divide the country into four major farm-producing areas. One regional laboratory was to be established in each area. Now, manifestly the agricultural map does not divide itself precisely into four such regions. Nevertheless, the Department of Agriculture did the best it could to follow the mandate of Congress. It didivded the country with rough equity into eastern, western, northern, and southern regions. The eastern region includes the Atlantic States from Maine through North Carolina, embracing also West Virginia, Kentucky, and Tennessee.

Before selecting the locations of these laboratories, the Department set up a committee of technical men which made a survey of the entire country. It spent months at its job, investigating more than 200 possible localities and sending inspectors to examine personally some 80 of these. Their criteria included a long list of essential qualifications, among them the accessibility of the location, housing and living conditions for a large staff, availability of a good site and such essential services as large water supply, sewer lines, gas lines, and electrical power. Without detracting in the least from the excellent qualifications of our sister States I think we in Pennsylvania may rejoice in the circumstances which found this location so well and favorably situated that it was chosen for the site of this eastern laboratory.

The primary purpose in creating these laboratories was to find new industrial uses for farm products. A lot of our overabundance of certain food crops in the last few years has gone to waste. If any of that waste could be diverted to the uses of industry it would seem to be clear gain for the farmers and the country.

Some striking work already has been done in this field. Take corn for instance. We think of corn as the great feed grain. Yet some 80,000,000 bushels a year is now processed for the manufacture of starch, oil, and other products. Cottonseed was at one time merely a waste, if not a nuisance. Then processing for the recovery of cottonseed oil began. Now the cash value of the seed equals about 16 percent of the total cotton crop value.

Synthetic fibers and other cellulose plastics are manufactured in large quantities from cotton linters. Such chemicals as acetone, butyl alcohol, and others are made by control fermentation of corn. The chemical furfural is made from waste oat hulls by processes which originated in the Department of Agriculture laboratories. The wide variety of industrial products that already have been made from products which were surpluses of agriculture is almost a guaranty of further progress that can be made, given the tools for keen research.

I am told that the program which has been up for this eastern laboratory embraces research work, in the beginning, on five important groups of products—tobacco, apples, Irish potatoes, milk products, and vegetables.

We grow an average crop in this country of about one and one-third billion pounds of tobacco, a lot of it, as I have said, formerly going to export. Now we are running into sharper and sharper foreign competition aided by tariffs and other controls. There has been a steady decline in our exports of fire-cured and dark air-cured types. But here, for example, comes along the use of nicotine as insecticides, which offers a broad field for the increased consumption of tobacco products. The laboratory also will explore the uses for other tobacco constituents than nicotine, of which over 30 are now known—some of them peculiar to tobacco.

The average crop of Irish potatoes is around 400,000,000 bushels and usually about 10 percent of the crop is culls. Another 10 percent is wasted by disease, freezing, and shrinkage in storage. So there would seem to exist a definite field for the profitable nonfood use of culls and second-grade potatoes and sometimes for first grade.

In the case of apples, out of an average commercial crop of 90 million bushels in recent years there have been a number of seasons when as many as four million bushels or more have been left unharvested because the market did not pay. In addition something like 120,000 tons of culls are graded out at packing plants in the average year and on top of this thousands of tons of processing wastes are lost at juice, drying, and packing plants, all of which represents a possible industrial resource of unknown possibilities.

The acreage of truck crops has trebled since 1920. An industrial outlet for vegetable products would greatly help that situation.

Our gigantic dairy industry turns out annually more than 100,000,000,000 pounds of milk containing 13,000,000,000 pounds of solids in the form of fats, proteins, carbohydrates, and salts. This enormous output represents roughly 20 percent of the total farm income and approaches the combined value of cotton and wheat and tobacco. The problems of the dairy industry are very complex. However, the economic effects of the seasonal surpluses which weigh down the entire milk business make it highly desirable to push the search for new and more efficient ways of utilization in the industrial field, particularly for casein and milk sugar.

None of us can conceive of the many directions which this research will take once the program is launched and develops itself as it naturally will. It is safe to say that other products will be studied and other fields explored which will take our farm surpluses into the useful channels of industry.

It has been emphasized all along by the Department of Agriculture that they are undertaking here what will be a long-time job. Just as the problem will be a continuing one so the attack on it will have to follow a continuing and broadening program. It is always possible that some of the aggravating causes of what we have come to think of as surpluses in recent years may diminish. A long war might pare down our seeming overabundance. Or the renewal of peace and of world trade might have some of the same effect. But we are reminded that within our own economy the underlying trends that have developed have brought permanent changes. The startling changes in our national pattern of agricultural production are permanent. It is in recognition of this aspect of the situation that the program of research has been formulated for these laboratories so that they may carry forward a logical continuing attack on a long-time problem.

This occasion should not pass without tribute to the Congress and the Roosevelt Administration which have sponsored it and made it possible. I question whether any other period of our history has seen more constructive legislation in behalf of agriculture than the last half-dozen years. In a time of profound economic disturbance and confusion a carefully thought out program has brought the farm business steadily out of its slough of despond and helped to put it back on its feet. It is fitting that at the launching of a scientific enterprise of this kind today recognition should go to Secretary Wallace, who is a scientist of renown in his own right and whose keen perception of research values splendidly fits him to head this work.

But above all, the credit for saving and advancing American agriculture should go to President Roosevelt, who saw that the lessons of conservation, diversification, and scientific farming developed here in the East must become the national farm practice. It was Roosevelt who brought about that political combination of the Southern and Western farming regions with the farms and industries of the East which made the New Deal a program for national recovery through national unity.

It was Roosevelt who took the risks and picked the men—men like Henry Wallace, of Iowa, and Rexford Guy Tugwell, of New York, and M. L. Wilson, of Montana—to administer the farm program. It was Roosevelt who sponsored and stood behind the A. A. A., the C. C. C., the Soil Conservation Service, the resettlement program, the Farm Security Administration, the farm-tenant program, the Rural Electrification, and all the other New Deal measures which saved the farm and the farmer.

And I think that the eastern farmers who have practiced prudent husbandry for generations as a matter of course can take special pride in the fact that President Roosevelt has applied the farming

lessons learned in the East, for 300 years, to the newer lands of the South and West and thus saved American agriculture from the greatest social and economic catastrophe in our history.

The New Deal has shown that the eastern farmers were the pioneers who stayed at home and, instead of seeking new and easy lands to till, developed the scientific basis for a permanent farm civilization in the United States.

Naturally, I scarcely can let this occasion pass without indulging a little modest pride in the circumstances which make Pennsylvania the splendid background for a research establishment of this kind. Here we have a combination of industry and agriculture such as is not to be found everywhere. Pennsylvania is preeminent as an industrial and mining State. Her manufactures created a value of nearly $2,000,000,000 in 1935—the last year for which official statistics are published—and this was more than one-fifth the total value added by manufactures in the United States. In mining, Pennsylvania outranks all others, producing nearly one-third of the country's total value of products of mines and quarries.

The eminence of our State in these fields, however, has tended somewhat to obscure the actual size and quality of our agriculture. Pennsylvania has more cattle on farms than any of nine far-western so-called cattle States. We produce, in point of value, more eggs than any other State of the Union. Our gross income from milk production is exceeded only by New York and Wisconsin. We rank thirteenth among all States in size of farm population and in value of farms and eighth in value per acre.

In this brief review of the prominence of Pennsylvania agriculture, I have purposely deferred mention of that great asset of Pennsylvania's agriculture—the people who till our farms. Without in any way implying a lack of appreciation of the sturdy qualities of the farmers throughout the country, I wish to emphasize that the farmers of my State come from those virile strains of Swedes, English Quakers, Holland Dutch, early Germans, Irish and Scotch Irish, and early American farmers who generations ago settled upon our land. Every observing person traveling throughout the rural countryside of my State will note the splendid appearance of our fields, the attractiveness of our farm homes, barns, and other farm buildings—evidence on every hand of skill and care in farming. This is due only in part to our resources of soil and climate. Much is due to the qualities of the men and women on our farms who are the foundation of our rural life—a large source of our able citizenry.

This close meeting of agriculture and industry within our borders, however, is but typical of the whole eastern region which this institution will serve. We want to emphasize that we regard the location of this laboratory as a welcome responsibility which we shall bear toward all the other States in the region. This laboratory and its work belong to Maine and the Carolinas and the other States no less than to Pennsylvania.

It seems very fitting indeed that here in this eastern setting, where so large a segment of the Nation's industry rubs elbows with its agriculture, this laboratory should be dedicated to its job of finding new industrial uses for farm products. I think it altogether likely that the work of institutions such as this will bring us new appreciation of the interdependence of the people on the farms and those in the factories. The American economy is buttressed by a unique strength that is rooted alike in the soil and in the cities. It seems to me exceedingly important that we should all gain a full understanding of what this means. In those periods when we have been able to arrive at a nice economic balance between agriculture and industry, we have been exceedingly prosperous. Everything which adds to the common understanding between labor, agriculture, and industry is, it seems to me, a clear gain for the community. In a region like this with so large a number of factory workers and likewise with a large farm population, no institution could be more welcome than one that means what I think this laboratory will—that is, an added link tying the products of the soil always more closely into our superb industrial machine.

So, in the recognition that the world map today is being made and remade under the supremacy of technical genius, we dedicate this public institution to research in the art of making our civilization more civilized. May its staff show us how better to enjoy our abundance—or at least how better to survive in an age when the survival of a nation seems to depend mainly on its technicians.

Economic Effects of Cash-and-Carry Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 21 (legislative day of Wednesday, October 4), 1939

ARTICLE BY JOHN T. FLYNN

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, during the course of my remarks I asked and obtained unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article by John T. Flynn dealing with the economic effects of the cash-and-carry policy, published in the Washington (D. C.) News of October 3, 1939, as follows:

[From the Washington Daily News of October 3, 1939]

PLAIN ECONOMICS

(By John T. Flynn)

MIAMI, FLA., October 3.—One question which must be cleared up is this one: Will a cash-and-carry provision in our neutrality law injure Britain and France? Have they the means of buying in this country for cash and without credit?

If the cash-and-carry rule is adopted—and it should be, plus the arms embargo—England and France will proceed in the United States precisely as they did in the last war. They will use their gold reserves and their credits here to buy what they need.

England and France have large gold reserves in this country and they have large bank balances. Britain and France together have about $600,000,000 in cash on balance in American banks. And in addition they own about $1,000,000,000 in securities. On paper they have about $6,000,000,000 in gold, bank deposits, and securities in this country.

This does not all belong to the British Government or the French Government. But the government can commandeer it—that is, require its citizens to turn over their American claims to the government. The government will give them British notes or bonds for their American holdings. Then the government could sell the securities and spend the proceeds, along with the gold and bank deposits in America to buy goods.

But in practice the government could not be too ruthless about this. There are many British firms doing business in America who require their deposits in their business, and the security holdings are equally essential to British trade in America. Also this trade is precious to England now, as she needs all the trade she can get to prevent the balance against her from becoming fatal.

Moreover, we would have to know the amount of the balances against England and France in this country before we could decide just how much of this five or six billions is available for actual spending. But apparently it is a large sum, several billions, and the two countries could buy a great deal with that.

But large as the sum is, if we go in for this war trade, the time will come when these credits in America will be exhausted. It might take 2 years or even a little more. If it be that the actual amount which these two governments can spend is three or four billion, that would surely be exhausted in 2 years.

We would not feel the effect of it the first 6 months so very much. But in the second year we most certainly would increase employment heavily and increase profits. By the end of the second year we might well have a boom—a war boom. Then what? Then would come the moment of danger. For then the balances of these nations in this country would become exhausted. At this point we would be confronted with two alternatives. Either we would have to start granting credits—abandon cash and carry—or see the boom collapse. What would we do then?

What we would do would depend on the kind of propaganda that had been worked on us and the kind of government we had in Washington. But if the propaganda of British and French agents and of our own Government in Washington during the coming months is effective, nothing can save us from abandoning the cash and carry when the critical hour arrives. Nothing can save us but calm, patient, stable, sure-footed statesmanship in Washington. Have we got it?

Discussion on Neutrality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEWIS B. SCHWELLENBACH

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 21 (legislative day of Wednesday, October 4), 1939

AMERICAN FORUM OF THE AIR

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH. Mr. President, on October 8 the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. HOLT], the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. MINTON], the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], Representative VAN ZANDT, of Pennsylvania, and I participated in the program of the American Forum of the Air over the Mutual Broadcasting chain. The subject was American Neutrality. I ask unanimous consent that the discussion be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the discussion was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Announcer MCCORMICK. WOL, in cooperation with WOR, presents the American Forum of the Air.

Tonight, listeners to the coast-to-coast Mutual Network will hear the second of this season's Sunday night broadcasts—emanating from the modern broadcasting studios of the new Department of the Interior Building in Washington, D. C.

The facilities of these studios have been extended by the Secretary of the Interior, Harold L. Ickes, in the interest of free speech on assurances these educational broadcasts will present both sides of a national problem, temperately discussed by the leaders of opposing schools of thought and conducted by a nonpartisan, nonpolitical organization.

Tonight's American Forum of the Air will be presented identical to those which became such widely listened-to programs last year. Under the direction of Theodore Granik, pioneer in educational radio discussion, you first will hear the presentation of both sides of tonight's topic of discussion by outstanding leaders on the subject. Following the formal presentation of opposing views, the issue will be heard in informal discussion by a panel board ready to treat the argument extemporaneously.

And now, our chairman, Mr. Theodore Granik:

Chairman GRANIK. Thank you, Mr. McCormick.

The eyes of the Nation are focused on the Senate of the United States, where the country's distinguished legislators continue their debate on the neutrality bill. Senator KEY PITTMAN, of Nevada, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, in a statement to the press last night, predicted that the administration's bill, which would repeal the arms embargo, and institute a system of cash-and-carry trade with belligerents, would be voted upon by the Senate within the week. Opponents of the bill, however, dispute this claim, contending that their fight to retain the embargo has just begun.

As the debate progresses, Americans watch with interest as Senators on both sides demand that the United States avoid involvement in war.

Those in opposition to the administration's bill are carrying out their battle on several points. First, is their belief that there is no conflict between the embargo provisions, now our national law, and the cash-and-carry provisions of the bill now before the Senate. Some have come forward with an alternative plan which would retain the arms embargo and institute a strict cash-and-carry system for all other supplies sold to belligerents. Many of them believe that the sinking of American ships was one leading reason for our entry into the last war, and they insist that rigid cash-and-carry legislation will limit this danger to a minimum.

And another reason motivating some of those against the bill is a firm opposition to giving the Executive superpower.

But administration forces contend that the adoption of the Pittman resolution, including repeal of the arms embargo, is the most complete and orderly retreat from war that any nation ever executed; that the American people, the Congress, and the President are determined that we shall stay out of this war. They maintain that the President's program for the revision of the Neutrality Act by repeal of the arms embargo, the substitution of a uniform cash-and-carry policy applying without discrimination to all belligerents, and the prohibition of American vessels and American citizens to enter zones of danger, is best calculated to safeguard the neutrality of the United States, to isolate the American people from the horrors of war, and to preserve intact our homes and our democratic traditions.

As we await further congressional debate, the American Forum of the Air is pleased to present a discussion on this vital problem. Our opening speaker will be Senator JOHN H. OVERTON, of Louisiana. He will be followed by Senator LEWIS B. SCHWELLENBACH, of the State of Washington.

Immediately following we will present an informal panel discussion. Our panel members are:

Senators SHERMAN MINTON, of Indiana, CLAUDE PEPPER, of Florida, RUSH D. HOLT, of West Virginia, and Congressman JAMES E. VAN ZANDT—three times Commander in Chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

And now our opening speaker, Senator OVERTON.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR JOHN H. OVERTON

The Congress of the United States is now considering a measure of the most vital importance to every man, woman, and child in America. Our decision on this question may lead us to war or it may keep us in the paths of peace. I submit that we should do everything within our power to keep the United States not only out of the present European conflict but also out of all foreign wars in the future. We should do not simply a few things to keep us out, but everything within reason. We should think first of America and not European or other foreign nations.

Our neutrality resolution should contain both the arms embargo and the cash-and-carry plan, and also, with perhaps some slight modifications, all the other safeguards proposed in the resolution now before Congress. There is no reason whatsoever why we cannot retain the present embargo on arms, ammunition, and implements of war and re-enact the cash-and-carry provision on all other commodities. Up until May of this year we had both the arms embargo and a cash-and-carry policy on all other articles of export. The arms embargo is still the law of the land, but the cash-and-carry requirement expired last May. Let us retain the one and reenact the other. The objection that I have to the neutrality resolution pending before Congress is not by reason of its carrying a cash-and-carry provision, but because it undertakes also to repeal the arms embargo, which is the cornerstone of our neutrality and our strongest legislative safeguard against involvement in foreign wars. Let us, therefore, understand this fact clearly: We do not have to repeal the arms embargo in order to have the cash and carry. We can and should have both.

We adopted the arms-embargo policy in 1935, 1936, and 1937, when our judgment was not warped by either friendships or animosities engendered by the present European conflict. That policy was adopted to meet just such a situation as now confronts us, and for the threefold purpose of keeping us out of war, of refusing to aid other nations with deadly weapons in carrying on war, and of maintaining a fair and just neutrality. The administration officials and spokesmen who approved this policy, declared that it was a "clear" policy, a "wise policy," a "powerful protection" for us. Now that the contingency against which we have been protecting ourselves has in fact occurred, should we now scrap one of the fundamental safeguards agreed upon all sides as a measure calculated to preserve our own peace? The neutrality legislation, with its continuing arms embargo, was American legislation deliberately enacted by the American Congress, not out of consideration for foreign nations, but solely in the interest of these United States.

To repeal the arms embargo would be to take sides officially by act of our Goverment. If the American people are being asked to take sides they shall be so asked frankly and openly—and not through the side-door of the arms embargo repeal. If we begin now to supply one side with arms in this mammoth conflict now just getting under way in Europe, we shall find, as we did in the World War, that gradually we shall be called upon to do more and more and to take step after step on the road that leads us to war. Soon the American dollar will be following our American arms, and then the American flag and the American soldier will be following both to the battlefields of Europe.

We have erected a few barriers against involvement in foreign wars. We should keep every one of them. I favor strengthening them, adding to them, but I am opposed to striking down a single one of them.

Personally, I am against the United States taking sides. Bitter experience teaches us that it is not to our national interest to do so. We took sides once before in the power politics of Europe. We came out of that war without having saved the world for democracy, without putting an end to all wars, without attaining any of the high ideals for which our soldiers fought and died in foreign lands. What we got out of this misadventure was a dishonored debt of over $13,000,000,000 owed us by European nations and a post-war depression from which we have not recovered. We spent for that war, including the default on the war debts, approximately $60,000,000,000. We sacrificed the lives of over 100,000 of our young men and have filled our veterans' hospitals with thousands upon thousands of others, maimed, diseased, bereft of reason. What a tragic reminder of the utter futility of our participating in the wars of European nations or of trying to adjust their racial, religious, territorial, and political differences.

Another World War will take infinitely more of our life, our wealth and resources, our democracy. So strongly do I feel about this that I am unwilling to take a single step toward participating again in the endless and ever-recurring quarrels of European nations, which neither we nor they can apparently ever hope to settle.

Our participation in another World War would bring us a virtual dictatorship in the United States during the course of the war. The nature of modern, totalitarian war makes that unavoidable. The only way to avoid it is to keep the country out of war. Another great war will jeopardize our democracy. You recall the extensive and unprecedented powers which had to be given to our Executive during the last war. They will seem mild compared to the complete controls that another war will put into the hands of any President, regardless of who he may be.

If we ever get into another major war—we may never regain the democracy we will be forced to give up while the war is on. I do not believe we can impose democracy upon all of Europe. But I do believe that we can and must preserve democracy in these United States, encourage its growth throughout this hemisphere, and be prepared to defend it here from all outside attack. I cannot understand how anybody who cherishes our free institutions, our democratic traditions and spirit, our very civilization—can contemplate taking sides now, even just a little, with anything but complete horror. We must perform our task in our own country, and on the hemisphere where we have great opportunities which coincide with our real national interest. We may—and do—have sympathy for certain nations in Europe but we must not allow such sympathies to blind us to what is good, what is possible, and what is practicable for the United States. Our own country, its strict neutrality and avoidance of war, should be our first and last thought.

The neutrality legislation adopted in 1935, 1936, and 1937 after careful study of our previous war experience has become an important part of our national policy. The barriers against easy involvement in foreign war, put up in legislation must not be broken down. The present law includes the arms embargo, the ban on loans and restriction on credits, the prohibition against our citizens traveling on belligerent ships. To these provisions should be added the cash-and-carry proposal and other safeguarding measures. Such action will best serve the interests of the United States. The notice we gave to the rest of the world over four years ago that we would not again become an arms arsenal for any set of belligerents, that we would not again supply in war-time the deadly

weapons of mass murder and wholesale destruction was a sound decision and is still a sound and humane policy.

I take my stand for retention of the arms embargo together with the rest of the present law, and the addition of cash-and-carry provisions as the best insurance to our peace.

Chairman GRANIK. Thank you, Senator OVERTON. You are listening to the American Forum of the Air presenting a discussion on American Neutrality. You have just heard Senator JOHN H. OVERTON, of Louisiana. And now we are pleased to present Senator LEWIS B. SCHWELLENBACH, of the State of Washington—Senator SCHWELLENBACH.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR LEWIS B. SCHWELLENBACH

I don't know whether Mr. Granik will like what I am about to do or not. I was invited here and asked to use up my 12 minutes' portion of this program in making a speech. I am wondering if audiences, particularly radio audiences, are not getting a little tired of listening to speeches upon this question. There has been an average of two or three an evening during the last 2 weeks.

Like every other Senator, I have received a large volume of mail during this special session—so large that it is impossible to give specific answers to each letter. Many of the letters contain definite questions which are very pertinent. Therefore, I have decided to use my time in reading some of these questions and my answers to them. In other words, I am taking advantage of Mr. Granik's invitation to answer my mail by radio. There will not be time to read the whole context of any letter, so I am limiting myself to those portions of the letters which contain the questions, and those portions of the replies which contain the answers to the specific questions.

I had one letter last week from a man in Bellingham, Wash., which contained this question: "My understanding in 1937 was that the Congress had passed a completed neutrality bill. I thought that that bill was permanent, yet I saw by the papers in April of this year that hearings were being held in both the House and the Senate on new neutrality legislation. Then when the Congress decided not to adopt any legislation last session and the war came on, the President called you folks back in special session. What I would like to know is why there was any need for Congress considering neutrality at all this year."

My answer to that question was: "It is true that in 1935 and 1936 and 1937 we in Congress passed neutrality acts. The 1937 act had three main parts: First was the arms embargo; second, a provision requiring all goods shipped to a belligerent to be carried on ships not owned by Americans and with the title to the goods passing to the purchaser before the goods left our shores; the third provision was known as the financial section, and it rather indefinitely restricted financial transactions between our people and belligerent governments. Section 2 of this act, or the carry provisions, expired by the terms of the act on May 1 of this year. Under the law as it now stands, our goods and our people and our ships may travel between the United States and the belligerent countries. It was the fact that that expired which caused us last April to hold hearings on the whole question.

"In the opinion of most of us that was the most important part of the law. As a result of those hearings, everybody in the Senate concluded that it was necessary to restate and strengthen the carry provisions of section 2. Everybody concluded that it was necessary to strengthen the provisions of the financial section. Everybody concluded that it was necessary to prevent our ships, even though destined for neutral countries, to stay away from submarine zones and mine-infested zones, and that our citizens should be kept off belligerent ships.

"For those reasons, about which there is no particular difference of opinion, it became necessary to rewrite the neutrality legislation. In addition to that, a great number of us, and I think the majority, concluded that America's chances of staying out of the war would be much better if the so-called arms embargo were repealed. That is the question around which the present debate is raging, but I think you can see that, regardless of anyone's opinion upon that phase of the question, there must be agreement that some legislation is necessary. I don't think any Member of Congress will seriously disagree on that conclusion."

Another interesting question was posed to me by a writer living at Clarkston, Wash. Clarkston is right near the Idaho line. The letter came to me by air mail, having been written on Wednesday. It said: "Now, I am confused. We here next door to Idaho have always had great confidence in Senator BORAH and when he came out against the repeal of the arms embargo why I thought, of course, that I did agree with him. Then last night Senator NORRIS went on the air and took the opposite side. Personally, I look upon Senator NORRIS as my ideal statesman. Tell me how these two men, with all their experience and with their honesty, can violently disagree on this vital subject."

My answer to that letter was as follows: "I don't blame you for being confused. I agree with everything you have said about both Senator BORAH and Senator NORRIS. Does it not occur to you that what you have asked me is simply an illustration of what a fine thing it is to live under American democracy? There are very few places in the world today where a debate, such as we are now conducting, could be carried on. In many countries if Senator BORAH and Senator NORRIS made the speeches which they did over the radio, one of them would end up in a concentration camp. Here we still have room for differences of opinion. We still have the right to express those differences of opinion. That room and that right must not be destroyed. That's why it is so important that, regardless of the outcome of this legislation, we stick to our determination to stay out of this war. We can endanger American democracy by getting into it."

The next letter is interesting because it comes from a high-school student, and I will read all of it:

"MY DEAR SENATOR: I am a junior in high school and I want to get on my high-school debate team. The subject for the try-out is, '*Resolved*, That the Congress should amend the Neutrality Act as requested by the President.' I have been studying this for the last 2 weeks and I would like to have you help me by explaining what the new bill will do. I have studied all about the arms embargo, and I have made up my mind about that, but what I want you to do is to tell me exactly what the bill will do if the arms embargo is repealed, if it is. Yours very truly * * *."

My answer was this: "MY DEAR RICHARD: I received your letter telling me about your debate try-out. I am sending you, under separate cover, copies of the present law and the proposed bill; also the Senate Committee hearings and six speeches, three on each side of the subject. I am glad to know that you have made up your mind about the arms embargo, and I hope that the speeches of the six Senators will not confuse you.

"You do ask me the specific question about what the proposed law will do, and I will answer that specifically as follows:

"It is a careful, painstaking effort to correct our past mistakes. It is a code of restrictions upon our citizens so as to prevent any one of us from so conducting ourselves as to endanger all of us. It prohibits our ships from traveling to belligerents or from making deliveries to belligerent ships. It prohibits goods owned by Americans being shipped to belligerents. It prohibits our ships and our citizens even though destined for neutral countries to travel through the dangerous submarine- and mine-infested areas. It prohibits our citizens from traveling on ships owned by belligerents. It prevents the arming of our merchant vessels. It prevents our Government and our people from loaning money or extending credit to belligerent governments. It so strengthens the duties of the Munitions Control Board as to give Congress such a check on munitions as to prevent our being dragged into war by munitions sales. It takes away from the President all of the important discretionary power granted in the 1937 act. There is not a word in it giving the President power to name aggressors. Since it treats both sides precisely alike, it is as truly neutral as any law that could be devised. Since it simply restrains our own citizens, neither side has a right to object to it. It tries to substitute a true peace plan for our present dangerous unneutral hodgepodge. If any law can keep us out of war this one will.

"With best of luck to you in your try-out for the debate * * *."

The next letter, from which I wish to read, came from Wenatchee, Wash. In part, it reads as follows:

"What are you fellows trying to do? For the last 5 years I have heard about cash and carry. I thought that meant real honest cash and now I see your bill provides for 90 days' credit. Why are you making that change and giving credit to these governments?"

I answered in this way: "You certainly are entitled to ask the question you submitted in your letter. If, as you say, this present bill would propose to loosen up credit, I would certainly vigorously oppose it. I think it extremely unfortunate that those who oppose the bill have attempted to represent to the people that the new bill does loosen up credits. The fact is, it definitely restricts them. I first ask you to remember that the present law, insofar as it relates to financial transactions, was very largely written by those who now oppose the new law. In 1935, 1936, and 1937 they wrote into the law the financial provisions which prohibit credits, the extension of credits, or the public sale or exchange of bonds or other obligations by any belligerent government. At the end of that section they use this language:

"'*Provided*, That if the President shall find that such action will serve to protect the commercial or other interests of the United States or its citizens, he may, in his discretion, and to such extent and under such regulations as he may prescribe, except from the operation of this section ordinary commercial credits and short-time obligations in aid of legal transactions and a character customarily used in normal peacetime commercial transactions.'

"If you will read that carefully, you will see that it places almost no restriction upon the President. He can grant a 60-day, 90-day, 120-day, or even 6 months' credits under it. Those of us who wrote this new law felt that that was too much discretion to give to the President, and that it should be limited. Consequently, we inserted into the law three definite restrictions.

"We said that the President could not permit the extensions of credit by our citizens to belligerent governments for a period longer than 90 days. It isn't 90 days' credit. The 90 days is the outside limit. Then, we provided that the obligation or contract by which the belligerent government bought goods from our citizens would have to show upon its face that it was not renewable. Our third restriction was that if any government failed to pay within 90 days they then could get no more credit.

"In other words, we took the present law, which was written by the opponents to the proposed law and which was loose and indefinite, and tied it up in three important particulars. Now the opponents of this law, who in 1935, 1936, and 1937 were perfectly satisfied with the indefinite and loose provisions which I have quoted, are trying to make you and other people in the country believe that the Pittman bill opens up the field for extended credits. It not only does not open up the field, it tries to tie up the loopholes in the present act."

The next letter was very short. It just had two sentences. Let me read them.

"You said over the radio last night that the United States will stay out of this war. Do you really believe it?"

My answer was: "I most assuredly do believe the United States will stay out of this war. The chief reason I believe it is that the American people are so determined to stay out. We know the utter futility of getting into another European war. We tried it once, thinking we could help solve Europe's problems. It took them only a short 20 years to get back at each other's throat again. We don't intend to sacrifice the lives, the bodies, and the minds of our young men, nor the resources of our country making that same mistake again.

"Another reason is that the Members of Congress are so determined that we stay out. Since I have been in Washington the last 2 weeks, I have not heard a single Member of Congress express the fatalistic idea that we had to get in. We are all determined that we are not going to get in.

"The third reason is that the President is determined to stay out. I talked to him and I talked to many Members of the Senate who also had conversations with him on the subject. You probably read criticisms of the President in the last few years that when he makes up his mind about something he, to quote the articles, 'gets his Dutch up' and nothing can change him. The President has 'his Dutch up' on this question of staying out of war, and nobody is going to change him on it."

Chairman GRANIK. Thank you, Senator SCHWELLENBACH. And this concludes part I of tonight's forum presentation.

Announcer MCCORMICK. This is the American Forum of the Air, originating in the broadcasting studios of the new Department of the Interior Building in Washington, D. C., and presented over the Mutual Network by WOL in cooperation with WOR.

We return you to the chairman of the program, Mr. Granik.

Chairman GRANIK. And now as part II of tonight's American Forum of the Air we present an informal panel discussion. Our panel members are: Senators SHERMAN MINTON, of Indiana; CLAUDE PEPPER, of Florida; RUSH D. HOLT, of West Virginia; and Congressman JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, former commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

Congressman VAN ZANDT will open the discussion.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. There can be no disagreement in this group about the desire and determination of the American people to keep out of this European war. We all conceive that the big idea behind neutrality is to keep out of war, other people's wars. Remember, that was the sole purpose of the arms embargo. Remember, that law was enacted in peacetime, enacted to preserve neutrality, the security and the peace of the United States, no matter what nations went to war in the future. Now that war is raging in Europe, it is not a question of American people loving one or the other of the warring sides less; Americans simply love a peaceful America more. Is that not so, Senator PEPPER?

Mr. PEPPER. I don't know whether I would say that the people of America love peace less than they ever have before. We have always loved peace, and we have always struggled to preserve peace, and what we are trying to do is to determine the best way by which that peace may still be preserved. After all, the problem is not as complicated as at first it might seem. Back a few months ago in the last session of the Congress, the President proposed that there be a change in the existing neutrality law. He proposed that we might make this law more complete and comprehensive than it then was because all of us recognized that there was a danger of war in Europe, and we were trying to get our house in order before the war got here. We were trying to pass a neutrality law that would pass in peacetime, and the President and a good many Members of Congress did what they could in behalf of that proposal, but there were some who said, "No; let's not try now to legislate upon a set of facts with which we are not familiar. We can do better when a war is here, if it comes at all, in framing our legislation."

Now, unfortunately, some of those who made that statement say, "Well, it might have been all right for us to have corrected our law back in peacetime, but now that war is here, we mustn't tamper with our legislation, because they will say we are taking sides." As a matter of fact, we have all come to appreciate that there is a false distinction which some have tried to make between the repeal of the arms embargo and the adoption of the cash-and-carry proposal. Germany herself has taught us more eloquently than anyone else that in modern warfare there is no difference, for example, between timber production or wood pulp out of which explosives may be made, and the explosives themselves, because Germany in the last few days has sunk the ships of neutral countries, the country of Sweden, to be specific, merely because they were carrying pulp out of which perhaps Great Britain might eventually manufacture explosives, or they were carrying timber which might be used in a coal mine to produce the coal which in turn might be employed in the manufacture of munitions. That indicates, therefore, that this false distinction between an airplane, calling it an implement of war, and the gasoline that runs the airplane, and calling it not; and they will get mad with us for selling the airplanes, but they won't get mad with us for selling the gasoline, without which the airplane cannot run.

I might propose a question to my friend, Senator HOLT, here. I make the distinction between the United States getting into this war or the United States having an interest direct enough to make us want to get into the war, and the United States having any interest in the outcome of this war. And I ask you, therefore, if you will be good enough to suggest to us your opinion whether the next 25 years the United States might be as safe and secure if Germany and Hitlerism were dominant in Europe as we have been the last 25 years, with Great Britain and France dominant in Europe?

Mr. HOLT. Senator PEPPER, I do not feel that we have to worry about what is going to happen in Europe. We have got a number of problems here in the United States to solve, and I realize that the best way that you might appeal to the individuals of the country is that if Hitler wins the war, he is coming over here some dark night and wheel us back in wheelbarrows. I don't think that he is. I think we have a wonderful Army and a wonderful Navy and a wonderful air force, and I feel we should increase it to take care of any emergencies that might arise.

Now, as to the question as to whether we have an interest in the war, I want to say, if we do have an interest in the war, we are on the way to war. You can't have an interest and not be on the way there, and if we get into this war-profit game—and we are going to get into it, don't be fooled about that—we are in the war economically, and if our interest is, as you seem to suggest, to help England and France to beat Hitler, then are we going to limit our interest only to the amount of money that they can give us in the supplies they buy? When they run out of cash will that interest die, or will our interest be that we need a little money to help out, and then, we need some soldiers?

If we are going to stimulate interest in the matter, I think the best interest is not what is best for England and France; what is best is what is best for the United States of America on this side of the Atlantic Ocean.

Mr. MINTON. Well, Senator HOLT, I see that you have the same kind of parade marching that Senator OVERTON had. It is the parade of munitions marching, followed by the march of the dollars, followed by the flag, and followed by the soldiers that takes us into war. I don't think that any more follows by the repeal of the embargo than keeping the embargo means that England and France get beat, Hitler takes their navy, Bermuda, Jamaica, and the Bahamas right at our door, and then tells us what to do. The premises of this kind of affirmation lie wholly within speculation, and therefore they don't lead to anything but a speculative or emotional conclusion. We want to stay out of the war, and as Senators have said here tonight, we are determined to stay out of the war. That is the obligation that we all have to the American people at the present time. But we have to consider what we shall do when we are out of the war, namely, what shall be our attitude as a neutral?

Now I want to ask my colleagues that are assembled here around the table with me tonight, what your attitude would be if you were approaching the thing originally? Suppose there was pending before the Congress of the United States today the question of whether or not in the face of the realities as you see them now, we should pass an embargo act, whether or not you would vote to pass that embargo act?

With the realities such as they are today, I certainly wouldn't vote for any such embargo. Now, then, I want my colleagues to tell me whether or not, as an original proposition, they would want to vote for the embargo today. What do you say, Senator PEPPER?

Mr. PEPPER. Well, I certainly would not. It becomes very obvious, of course, that the existing neutrality legislation, as it is so-called, is not neutrality at all. What it actually does is to make it possible for Germany to buy from the countries around about her, which are contiguous land countries, anything they want to buy, and which recognizes their right to buy those things upon any terms upon which the sellers propose to sell them to them, but Great Britain, which happens to be a nation which is an island, and has to buy all her supplies from countries over the water, is cut off from buying from those countries to which she might have access by her ships because somebody said that while Hitler may buy from all these countries round about him on land without Great Britain getting mad with them and going to war with those countries, yet if we sell to Great Britain, to take home in her ships what they may buy here in our ports, then somehow or other Hitler is going to get mad with us because we are doing something we mustn't do.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I take it that you are very strongly in favor of the repeal of the arms embargo, and I recall the remarks of our President when he addressed the combined session of Congress. You recall he made the statement he wanted to return to international law. International law, of course, is mighty vague to the average citizen, and as you know, once war starts, both sides begin making international law to suit their own purposes. After the World War started in 1914, when the United States proposed an embargo on arms, you will recall that Great Britain protested that she would regard such a law as an unneutral act. The President and Secretary Hull to the contrary notwithstanding, many eminent authorities on international law say the repeal of the arms embargo now would be a direct violation of international law.

One authority cites the established principle of international law that a neutral nation may not, after the outbreak of war, change its legislation for the purpose of assisting one of the belligerents. This authority insists that if we repeal the arms embargo Germany would have the right under international law to take steps of reprisal and retaliation against American ships. It even goes so far as to say that German reprisals might be taken against American ships even in coastwise trade, and even if they were not carrying contraband. Isn't that what the American people wish to avoid at this time?

Mr. PEPPER. What the American people wish to avoid, Mr. VAN ZANDT, is being drawn in any manner into participation in this war. Let's just look a little below the surface and try to answer

your question. Looking at this question of international law, it means that any neutral nation has a perfect right to send its own ships to any belligerent country loaded with any goods which are not contraband goods. It may send contraband goods, but if it does and an effective embargo is being maintained by the enemy of that belligerent country which is the destination of that shipment, these goods may be sunk, or in certain other cases they may be taken into the possession of the enemy country.

We are foregoing all that, but we are doing it voluntarily by imposing a voluntary restriction upon our own nation, and our citizens. In other words, because a mother says to her son, "You can't go to the picture show today," that doesn't mean that forever and a day he can't go to the picture show. He has a right to go to the picture show any day in the week, and while the mother may forbid it one day, that doesn't mean that a permanent policy is adopted that he will always be forbidden to exercise a legitimate right, so certainly no other country has a right to tell us what our domestic law will be. We are merely saying, under this proposal that is now before the Congress, if you want to buy anything that we have to sell, you come over here and get it; you pay for it or make satisfactory terms here in our own ports, you take it home on your own ships. If it is sunk upon the high seas it is your own loss, and the American people are not to suffer any loss in money, they are not to suffer any danger of loss in prestige, and they are not to suffer the possibility of their indignation being aroused that might lead us into the war.

Mr. HOLT. Senator PEPPER, I think you really added two words that are very important in this argument. You said "cash or satisfactory terms." That is what a lot of us are afraid of, those satisfactory terms. Starting with 90 days, and then 900, I wouldn't be a bit surprised. I think the American people want cash on the barrel head. That is what they want. They want cash, if they are going to sell, but I can't believe that the American people want to get into this munitions racket. I do not believe that they want to become merchants of death.

Now there are two reasons for the passage of this repeal of the arms embargo, and let's get down to business. First, it is to help one side; and, second, it is to get the profits. Now, as to the latter, it is just like reaching into a trap. We may get the bait without having the trap close on our hands, but in the World War we didn't, and another thing is to help one side and let our emotions become worked up to the idea of how terrible Hitler is and how beautiful and angelic England is. The nation has been at war fifty-odd times in the last century and a half. They are supposed to be fighting for us and democracy. Oh, they loved democracy when they went to Munich and around a conference table and sat along with Hitler and the rest of the dictators and split up Czechoslovakia because that didn't bother England. And you notice that now they are going to fight to preserve Poland. Well, they have never declared war on Russia, and Russia got a pretty good hunk out of Poland so far as I was able to find out. But it is terrible you know, and that is our part of the question of getting into it. I have no use for Hitler, nor do I have any use for any of the dictators, and because I feel that war will bring dictatorship to America, I am certain that we must stay out, and I am also more interested in the lives of the American boys than I am in the profits of the munitions trade.

Mr. MINTON. Well, Senator HOLT, you say we don't want to get into this munitions trade. We have been in it.

Mr. HOLT. We shouldn't have.

Mr. MINTON. Then we should reverse the policy of this Government for 150 years, because we have always been in that business in peacetime and in wartime, and that is the advice of this law that we are discussing today. As Senator CONNALLY pointed out so clearly in his masterful speech in the Senate the other day, "In peacetime we are permitted to sell all the munitions and ammunition and war supplies that we want to to anybody and take them to them in our own ships if we want to." How does that result? It results in the aggressor arming himself against the day when he will attack the fellow that he wants to attack, and under existing law we have been permitting munitions, yes, not many, but all manner of supplies going to Hitler and the aggressors throughout the world, in order that they may supply themselves with the munitions of war and the machinery of war and the engines of destruction against the day that they will declare themselves, and when that day comes, the people that they are going to attack, who haven't been preparing themselves, will be denied the right to get out and get the weapons to defend themselves. And that is the vice of this law as I see it. In other words, it says to the aggressor, all the arms in the world for offense, but not a single arm for defense. And I am against that law because of that more than any other one thing. I don't want to take sides in this war; I don't want to take Hitler's side, I don't want to take France and England's side, but I don't want to prevent those people from helping themselves, and that is what this embargo does. It has the effect of presenting Hitler with a navy that is big enough to keep England and France from the shores of America, and I say that is not impartiality, and that is not neutrality.

Mr. HOLT. I hope my colleagues will pardon me if I might interject a statement here. Talking about arming the aggressor, history will prove that it was not the United States that armed Hitler. England armed Hitler when they thought they needed Hitler up against Russia, and as far as our arming Hitler, do you know how much arms we sold Hitler the month before the war? We sold him less than $500 worth of arms. We didn't arm the aggressor. The arming of the aggressor has been a gain to the munitions racketeers of the world, arming one country against the other and then going to the other country and saying, "Look at that country, it is arming. You had better buy more arms," and so the arms racket continues.

Mr. MINTON. Why, it isn't the sale of arms, Senator HOLT. It is the sale of supplies. Hitler doesn't need arms. He has the factories to manufacture his own arms. He had been tending to that in peacetime, too. He was setting up the machinery in Germany to manufacture the machinery of war. He doesn't need ammunition from this country. All he needed was steel and copper and brass and cotton, and wherever he could get it, from this country or any other country. But he could get from us under this law in peacetime all the supplies he needed to manufacture the engines of war against the day when he would need them.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I can see that we have a very definite division of opinion on the panel tonight. When cash and carry has been mentioned, I feel sure that Senator MINTON, especially, will recognize it as a misnomer. If we extend the proposed 90-day credit, cash goes out the window, and I wonder if it wouldn't be well to call it, instead of cash and carry, title and tote. There is a division of opinion in the country just the same as there is on this panel tonight, and, of course, the division prevails very strongly in Congress on two points of the arms embargo, and I wonder if the radio audience tonight just knows how many articles are listed under the arms embargo. First, rifles, machine guns, cannon of all sorts, projectiles, bombs, torpedoes, military armored vehicles, armored trains, tanks; second, war vessels of all kind; third, aircraft, assembled and unassembled, and the essential parts of airplanes; fourth, revolvers and automatics, and ammunition; fifth, aircraft, other than the ones specified in section 3; and, sixth, a number of items with unpronounceable names, which are for the most part for gas used in warfare, and for powders for high explosives. Then the other part is cash and carry. There is also a great deal of confusion on these two points. Let's remember we had the arms embargo and the cash-and-carry provision both in the same law until the cash-and-carry provision lapsed by limitation of law on May 1, 1939.

Inasmuch as four-fifths of the articles that Americans support are on the contraband list of both Germany and Great Britain, why can't we Members of Congress keep the arms embargo and reenact the cash-and-carry provisions of the old law on raw materials? Wouldn't that meet the approval of all the American people, and at the same time minimize the danger of the United States becoming involved in this Europeon war?

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH. I wonder if I might get back in this debate a minute, because JIMMY VAN ZANDT has done just exactly what I said the opponents of this law were doing. He criticized the present law as not being cash and carry, and then he referred to that other law as being cash and carry. These people have been going around telling the people of this country for the last 4 years that they put over a cash-and-carry bill, and there wasn't a single word of cash in it. This bill which we propose tightens up the cash provision. Under the bill as I read from the bill itself, the President had complete discretion to grant credits as long as he used some standard of ordinary commercial transaction, and he could have granted those credits for 90 days, 120 days, 6 months, or a year, or even 2 years. But the law which we propose limits those credits to not more than 90 days, and says that they must show on their face that they are nonrenewable, and if they are not paid within 90 days, then that government cannot get any more credit, yet my friend, Congressman VAN ZANDT, persists in doing what every opposing speaker who attempts to tell the people about this portion of the bill, says that they had a cash-and-carry bill. It wasn't cash, there wasn't any cash involved in it. We have tried to put some cash into this one, and just because we happened to write this, then they say it is a credit bill and not a cash bill.

Mr. OVERTON. I would like to say something since Senator SCHWELLENBACH and I, who were on the first of the program have remained here very quietly, and since Senator SCHWELLENBACH has got back into the argument, I think I ought to be allowed to say something. I am not so much concerned about this cash and carry and the 90-day credit, but I am concerned with that question that Senator SCHWELLENBACH has answered, and that is that he takes the position that we ought to supply arms and ammunitions of war in order to be neutral and in order that we might not discriminate in favor of one nation and against another nation. But the proponents of the arms embargo, who are now opposing it, answered that argument in 1935, in 1936, and in 1937, and I think they answered it very effectively. What they said was this, that the United States can't undertake to put other nations on an equality, they can't undertake to arm weak nations and they can't undertake to increase their territorial boundaries or to undertake to say what form of government they should have, or anything like that. What we have got to do is to tend to our own affairs, and not be sticking our nose in the affairs of Europe. Why, we had the arms embargo when Italy was at war with Ethiopa, and there was a complaint on the part of Italy that she had a navy and Ethiopa had none, and we were denying her these arms and ammunitions, and that she ought to have them. But as has been heretofore contended, that is not our concern. We are not to undertake to say that we shall, in the course of war and in the midst of it, furnish the weak nation with arms in order that it may be able to contend with the strong nation.

Now, the other point made is this, and it leads us directly into the war. It makes us partisans in this controversy, and that is that we have got a dictator over yonder. We have a dictator that is on the warpath and wants to conquer everything that he can, and that we ought to stop him. Now, that is really what is back of

this arms embargo. The first step to stop it is to furnish his opponents with as much ammunition of war as we can possibly get over there to them, in the belligerents' own ships, and then, if that isn't enough, we are going to take the next step as we did in the World War, and as I said, the dollars will follow the arms, and the American soldiers will follow the dollars.

Mr. PEPPER. I just want to say this: If it were possible by the repeal of this arms embargo to stop Hitler, I would say thank God we have that opportunity upon such a simple reason. I am glad Mr. VAN ZANDT brought out the question of what is involved in the embargo, because to hear this question stated, you would think there was a clear line of demarcation between these so-called arms, ammunition, and implements of war and all these other things which were totally harmless. You heard that list read out. Those are the embargoed things. What about steel, out of which shells are made? The opponents don't embargo that. And rubber, upon which these mechanized instruments roll, they don't stop that, nor the gasoline that makes all of Hitler's or any other army's motorized equipment move. They don't stop that. They don't stop the telephone wires that send the order that makes the cannon shoot. They don't stop the cotton out of which guncotton is made, they don't stop the nitrate, they don't stop the tin, and they don't stop the wheat, so they are willing for us to help, and they propose to make some false distinction which the belligerents themselves do not recognize.

Mr. HOLT. I can't see why, if we have a hole in the fence, we should tear down all of the fence in order to plug up that hole. The issue is, if all those things are going, why shouldn't we stop them, and also stop arms. And that is what the arms embargo does. We want to keep the arms embargo plus all of these other safeguards we have. We have nothing at stake except preservation of neutrality in the United States by stopping war profits.

Mr. PEPPER. Would you stop every export?

Mr. HOLT. I would if it would save the life of a single American boy.

Mr. PEPPER. So would we all.

Chairman GRANIK. Thank you gentlemen. You have been listening to an informal panel discussion on American neutrality. Our panel members were: Senators SHERMAN MINTON, of Indiana; CLAUDE PEPPER, of Florida; RUSH D. HOLT, of West Virginia; and Congressman JAMES E. VAN ZANDT.

This discussion followed prepared remarks by Senators JOHN H. OVERTON and LEWIS B. SCHWELLENBACH.

And now for a final word from Mr. McCormick.

Announcer MCCORMICK. So we have concluded the second broadcast in this season's series of the American Forum of the Air broadcasts emanating from the broadcasting studios of the new Department of the Interior Building in Washington, D. C.

The facilities of these radio studios have been extended by the Secretary of the Interior, Harold L. Ickes, in the interest of free speech on assurances these educational broadcasts will present both sides of a national problem, temperately discussed by the leaders of opposing schools of thought and conducted by a nonpartisan, nonpolitical organization. The Mutual network will bring you this forum broadcast every Sunday evening from 8 to 9 o'clock, eastern standard time, throughout the session of Congress. Tickets to this broadcast may be had by sending your request to station WOR, New York, or WOL, Washington. In the interest of education there is printed and distributed, free of charge, a limited number of copies of the entire proceedings of these broadcasts. Address your requests and comments to WOL.

The American Forum of the Air is directed by Theodore Granik, who presided as chairman tonight, and comes to you as a presentation of WOR in cooperation with WOL.

This is Stephen McCormick speaking.

This is the coast-to-coast network of the Mutual Broadcasting System.

Dedication of North Beach Airport, New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAT McCARRAN

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 21 (legislative day of Wednesday, October 4), 1939

ADDRESS BY COL. EDGAR S. GORRELL

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, a little change from the tone of the phrases which have been heard during the last several weeks will do no harm. I may say that I seek to have inserted in the Record as a part of the Appendix something of which I am personally very proud. During the years 1934, 1935, 1936, 1937, and 1938 I sought to have enacted by the Congress of the United States a civil aviation authority measure giving to an independent commission the entire matter of civil aviation. That effort was successful, and the law was enacted in June 1938. I am happy that under an act which I was able to formulate the President of the United States appointed a very capable and competent commission, known as the Civil Aeronautics Authority, which now has absolute control, as an independent agency, over everything pertaining to civil aeronautics.

Mr. President, during the time this authority has had control of civil aviation in the United States the number of catastrophes in the air has been reduced to a minimum, so that today those who seek to travel across the continent from any direction may travel with an assurance of safety.

Col. Edgar S. Gorrell, the president of the Air Transport Association of America, in a speech delivered a few days ago bearing on the subject of aviation, and having to do with safety in the air dwelt on this matter at length. I ask unanimous consent that his speech, which is very short and very cogent, may be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Heaven once met earth only on the far horizon, receding always beyond man's reach. Today that union is accomplished at hundreds of airports, available throughout the land. The greatest of all these portals where the airways dip to meet the highways is North Beach Airport, a monument to the eternal exploration of new frontiers which it is man's destiny to pursue in his struggle to break the bonds of time and space.

In how many ways is North Beach monumental?

Since organized society began, one of the Government's most proper functions has been the conversion into useful wealth of raw resources and sterile currency through public works. With characteristic realism our great President has stated bluntly this immutable principle. But never has that function been more faithfully discharged than in the airport program of the Work Projects Administration, launched at a time when airport construction has been crucial to the Nation's commerce, pleasure, postal service, and defense. In North Beach, Col. F. C. Harrington, our far-seeing W. P. A. leader, with the able cooperation of his distinguished assistant, Col. Brehon B. Somervell, has brought that program to a high point with the largest and most important project in any field which his fine Administration has undertaken.

Monumental, too, North Beach is of the vision which has inspired New York City to become the cynosure of the world's trade. Municipal wharves beckoning to the seven seas might have satisfied a less alert community. But under the leadership of a dynamic mayor, the Honorable Fiorello LaGuardia, America's first city has looked restlessly beyond the waves that lap its shores into the skies that provide a boundless avenue to every segment of the globe. New York has responded to the challenge of progress yet to be unrolled beneath the tireless spindle of the sun.

Monumental as well, this airport is of the foresight and accomplishment of the United States Post Office Department. If the Department were to claim the triumphs of civil aeronautics as the children of its dreams, no one could gainsay. In 21 years the route miles of its Air Mail Service have multiplied by 31,400 percent the miles flown by 360,000 percent. Notable in this advance has been the record made under the present Postmaster General, the Honorable James A. Farley, who, with the able support of men unsurpassed in devotion to their duty, has carried on in the best tradition of a matchless Postal Service.

Again, North Beach is monumental of the newest of our agencies of government, for its construction coincides with a period of splendid achievement in air transportation in which the new Civil Aeronautics Authority, now rounding out its first year of life, has played an important part. Some of us may remember days now long past when the traveler by air confronted risks such as those faced by the traveler by rail or water some decades ago. But so swiftly did the efforts of the air lines and of the regulating government achieve safety that we can today look back upon a record surpassing even that of our friends of the railroads, whose enviable record has certainly been the acme of safety. In approximately the past 6 months the domestic air lines flew 450,000,000 passenger-miles without a single fatality. This safety record is 63 percent better than the passenger-mile-per-passenger-fatality record of these great American railroads for the last calendar year.

But most of all, North Beach is monumental of the place assumed by aeronautics in the ordinary life of the American family and in the routine of American business, for your neighbor and mine have taken to the air for business and vacation travel, obtaining relief from the drab scenes of every day, restoring a vision of God's great universe, a vision all too frequently lost in the bustle of modern life.

It is not by caprice that the greatest block of hangars in the world is built here. For the fact is that public enthusiasm for the safe, dependable, swift, and comfortable air liner for travel and shipment has placed America's air transport ahead of all the

world. The most recent monthly figures released by the Civil Aeronautics Authority show that in every one of the six significant items reported—passengers, passenger-miles, seat-miles, pounds of express, express-pound miles, and total miles flown—domestic air transport has reached a new all-time high. In 13 years our travelers by air have increased by 30,000 percent.

The dedication of North Beach Airport, then, is no casual event. Nor is pride in the excellence and the beauty of its construction confined to you who hold its title. The entire Nation recognizes the import of this undertaking and joins New York in acclaim of those who have built so well and wisely. In buckling land and sea and sky together, you have provided a symbol of the contribution which thousands of men have made to the growth of aeronautics and of the promise which aeronautics holds for the welfare and prosperity of America. You have provided for America's greatest city an air terminal, appropriate to that highway, bounded only by the far horizon, where the mind and soul of man can soar to new heights or fulfill childhood dreams. In the world of tomorrow travel by air to New York from all points of the universe will reach beyond your wildest dreams. Today's boasts will seem puny beside tomorrow's accomplishments.

Air transportation salutes you, citizens of New York, and your far-seeing mayor, whose vision and that of his associates have made possible this truly modern air terminal, contributing, as it does, to the enhancement of safety and efficiency in travel and trade by air—a terminal available to every man and his magic carpet—the modern airliner—on voyages of exploration denied to the earthbound.

Testimonial Dinner to Francis P. Matthews

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD R. BURKE

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 21 (legislative day of Wednesday, October 4), 1939

ADDRESS BY HON. PAUL V. McNUTT

Mr. BURKE. Mr. President, on October 17, at Omaha, Nebr., a very able and interesting address was delivered by Hon. Paul V. McNutt, Federal Security Administrator. The occasion was a testimonial dinner honoring an outstanding Omaha citizen, Francis P. Matthews, who was recently elected Supreme Knight of the Knights of Columbus. Mr. McNutt also presented felicitations from President Roosevelt. I ask unanimous consent that the address by Mr. McNutt may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Tonight I bring a twofold greeting to this distinguished gathering, and in particular to its most honored guest—the man whom you have unanimously chosen as the supreme knight of your order. First, in behalf of the President and at his request, let me repeat and reemphasize the message of congratulations he extended to your leader and to all your membership in the letter which Governor Cochran has just read. Second, I want to express my own very genuine pleasure in being here with you. It is a privilege to participate in this great occasion.

It is a privilege which I appreciate the more because, as a member of the American Legion, I count the Knights of Columbus as old and highly valued friends. Your organization made invaluable contributions to the courage, the morale, and the physical welfare of our soldiers and sailors during the war, and to the rehabilitation of our ex-service men after the war was over. I know that from 1917 on, for a period of something like 10 years, you gave, with unstinted generosity, of your time and money; something like $44,000,000 of your funds went into this common cause. The American Legion owes you a further debt of gratitude for the large sum—$85,000 as I recall it—which the Knights of Columbus turned over to it shortly after your own post-war activities had been brought to a close.

These services were of value not only for themselves but also for the spirit in which they were given. The canteens, the first aid, and medical services for men at the front; the hospital care, the training and educational provisions to fit returning soldiers for normal life again were offered in a spirit of true Christian fellowship, without regard to class or creed. This, too, we remember.

In the decade and more that has passed since this wartime chapter in your history closed, your order has been continuously concerned to promote, in peacetime also, the practice and the ideals of American patriotism. This again is in line with the thinking and the objectives of the Legion, and for this again we pay you our sincere respects. No better evidence of the relationship between our two organizations can be found than the numbers of men in all parts of the country who are members of both. To my fellow Legionnaires here present and to all Legionnaires in your local councils elsewhere, I extend my greetings.

But the enjoyment of meeting with friends, old and new, is, it seems to me, only one of the opportunities which this evening offers us. Installation in an office of high trust and leadership always marks a milestone in the life of the individual so chosen and of the group which has elected him to preside over it. For both it is a time to reweigh values and to renew faith. And for all of us who are privileged to share in this testimonial, it may well mark a moment of similar self-examination.

With this in mind, I have been reviewing, during the past week, some of the background for the event we are celebrating tonight. This background—the history of the Knights of Columbus and of its new supreme knight—is, no doubt, far better known to most of you than it is to me. But perhaps, for my present purposes, my somewhat less intimate perspective may give me a certain advantage; I can see in these two life histories—that of the organization and that of the man—a parallel line of growth which to your closer view may not be so apparent. But I am certain you will agree that the course both have taken is one of peculiar significance for us all. Let me trace it briefly:

I trust Mr. Matthews will not object to my pointing out, to begin with, that he and the order he now heads are contemporaries. The Knights of Columbus was founded in New Haven, Conn., only 5 years before Francis Matthews was born in Albion, Nebr. The early days of both—a brief 50 years ago—followed a then familiar pattern. The young organization got its start as a small fraternal group—it had only 11 members, I think—concerned to give each other mutual help in providing for the welfare of their own families. The boy got his start in the equally neighborly small-town setting of our great Middle West. The roots of both struck deep into the traditions of American community life. With passing years these roots have grown still deeper, but the branches have spread far. From its local nucleus, the Knights of Columbus grew from city to city and from State to State, until finally it spread beyond our national boundaries. In the same way, your leader grew from a small-town boy to a man whose interests reach from city to city, from State to State, and even beyond our national bounds.

My reason for reciting these facts is not merely to offer felicitations on these two parallel "success stories"; they speak for themselves. Rather my purpose is to cite them as outstanding examples of the line and the direction which we all must take, if we are to keep pace with the world today. In pushing back their early local horizons, in expanding the area of their responsibilities, this man and this group have been in the vanguard of a movement which has swept us far from the narrow outlook of the past. There are some people of less vision who have been reluctant to accept this changing outlook, who have tried to limit their world by putting on the blinders of local self-interest. Our personal welfare, the security of our families, the stability of the communities in which we live, and indeed the safety of the Nation itself depend not only on events near at hand but also on those that once, in the not-so-distant past, would have appeared remote.

Today, more truly even than ever before, no man can live unto himself. The phenomenal growth of our Nation in the past century has broken down all the old limits of opportunity—and of risk as well. As our life has grown both more complex and more closely interrelated, as the area of social and economic insecurity has expanded, we have been compelled also to expand the area of care, cure, and prevention. The recognition of national responsibility for Nation-wide protection against the widespread and impersonal hazards of modern industrial society, will, in my opinion, prove to be one of the most enduring achievements of our generation. Our private citizens have taken this Nation-wide view. Our organized civic and social groups have similarly expanded their interests. And, most significant of all, our Government has come to utilize all its machinery—Federal, as well as State and local, to promote the general welfare, or as we more often say today, to protect the security of the individual and of his family. What was once a local responsibility began, a quarter of a century ago, to be recognized as a State concern. In our own time it has been accepted also as a national obligation.

During the past 9 or 10 years this movement has been manifest in many directions; the Federal Government has undertaken activities which have appeared new only to those who have failed to see that we are simply employing broader means of attaining old ends, of assuring that the rights of a free people shall not be denied because of personal misfortune. There is nothing new about this; it simply reaffirms a time-honored principle. The Government of the United States was founded on this principle of equal opportunity for all; our history has repeatedly proved that it works. It is working today. But because today we are a vast and varied, yet closely knit Nation of 130,000,000, we must now apply this principle on an equally Nation-wide scale.

Two of our most important steps in this direction have occurred within the past few months—the establishment of the Federal Security Agency in July and the strengthening of the Social Security Act through the amendments passed in August. These steps, of course, were not sudden or unpremeditated occurrences; they followed as a logical sequence in the development of American social legislation. The history of this movement is as well known to you as it is to me, and I shall not review it here. The point I want to make is that through the great series of Government services that are now in operation, the American people are simply

doing on the broadest possible scale—through their Government—what you have been doing for the past 50 years through your fraternal organization: They are uniting their forces for mutual service and joint protection on a Nation-wide base.

The establishment of the Federal Security Agency gave further evidence of and impetus to this trend. It brings together major Government services for the welfare of the family and its individual members—the Office of Education, the Public Health Service, the Civilian Conservation Corps, the National Youth Administration, and the Social Security Board, under which in turn come public assistance to the needy, job insurance, and old-age insurance, expanded by recent congressional amendment to provide insurance also for the worker's family. This reorganization of Federal security activities looks toward economy and efficiency, and much more. It unifies a policy; it sets an objective.

President Roosevelt himself has stated its purpose in the reorganization plan by which it was created: "To promote social and economic security, educational opportunity, and the health of the citizens of the Nation." This is a pledge to every man, woman, and child in the country. It rededicates our Government to its own time-honored ideals.

Security—a sound footing on which to build our individual lives—is a necessity common to us all. Some of us are rich and some poor. But rich or poor, we need today Nation-wide protection against sickness, ignorance, and economic hazards. We all know how one typhoid carrier can wreck the health of a community. We are beginning to recognize that unleashed ignorance is an equally menacing contagion. And we have learned from experience that the worst of all epidemics is economic instability. It has not been so long since we emerged from such an epidemic, and we know its cost not only in dollars and cents, but also in human hopes and happiness. We know that health and education alone will not forestall want—that threats to the people's pay envelopes can be equally devastating.

We recognize too that it takes many kinds of security to protect every group and every age. True, every living human soul needs shelter and food and clothing. But security limited to that alone is the security of a prison or a poorhouse. This is not the security that a free people will tolerate for its children, its youth, its working men and women, its aged. Each of these groups and each person in these groups has individual needs. And of all groups, that which most needs security and which contributes most to individual security, is the family. There—on family security—is where the greatest emphasis belongs; on the security a man builds up for himself and his wife and children during his working years; the security that goes on when he is too old to work; the security that doesn't vanish when he dies. For people with homes and families, however modest, these are the foundations of the kind of life we prize. Our privilege to call ourselves an enlightened democracy depends on how well we meet the needs both of the individual and of the family. That is what we are working toward in all the programs which now come under the Federal Security Agency—security for the individual and for the family.

Through public assistance we are providing for three groups who are already in need—for those who cannot support themselves because they are old, or because they are blind, for children in families that have lost their breadwinner. More than two and a half million men, women, and children are getting this aid from combined Federal, State, and local funds—aid that provides perhaps only for bare necessities, but does at least enable these people and these families to maintain themselves and their place in our social structure.

But we are no longer content to wait until want has already become a reality before we give through to security. Our further concern is to forestall want—to offer working people a means of assuring an income for the inevitable rainy day; to prevent, insofar as possible, conditions which lead to insecurity and destitution. To that end we have established systems of social insurance and we have built up a great series of constructive and preventive services.

More than forty-five and one-half million wage earners now have accounts under Federal old-age and survivors insurance. Broadened and strengthened by the recent amendments, this system now provides monthly benefits not only for aged workers but also for their wives or dependent children; and it provides a similar income for widows, young children, or in some cases, aged parents of workers who die. These benefits begin next year and it is estimated that by the end of 1940 something like 900,000 individuals—workers and their families—may be drawing payments.

Through the new Bureau of Employment Security, recently organized under the Social Security Board, we have brought together on the Federal level, as they already were in the States, two other essential services for wage earners. These are job insurance and employment service. Through this agency, the Federal Govgovernment is helping the States to bring men and jobs together and to provide out-of-work benefits to bridge the gap between the old job and the new. More than twenty-seven and one-half million wage earners now have this protection under laws in all the States.

Through the Public Health Service we are combatting the menace of contagion, epidemic, and other widespread hazards, which may undermine health and so lead to insecurity and want. Through the Office of Education we are stimulating the varied educational opportunities essential to a democratic people, and we are providing vocational rehabilitation so that handicapped workers can again become self-supporting. Through the Civilian Conservation Corps and the National Youth Administration we are giving youth a chance to build up their bodies and their morale; a chance to learn how to work and to get training for future work; a chance to provide for their own support and their families' support; and a chance to contribute to the wealth of the Nation by public work well done. On this front, youth has fought a winning battle against its twin enemies of want and idleness. We have seen across the seas what happens when youth refuses longer to be frustrated and responds to any summons that promises it a future—no matter if that future does turn out to be one of destruction.

The Federal Security Agency and its five member organizations are not the only branches of our National Government which are dedicated to this purpose. In its broader sense, social security embraces all the measures through which the American people are utilizing Government as a channel for joint action and cooperative self-protection—including those that safeguard the health and welfare of children, that deal with wages and hours of labor, that protect the people's savings, that promote agricultural rehabilitation, and that look to the development of decent, healthful housing. In all these fields, a beginning, and more than a beginning, has been made; and continued growth may be expected. In others, we are still only feeling our way—notably in the development of a comprehensive and effective national health program. But the line of progress is clear. In this country all our forces are geared to the conservation not only of our natural resources, but also to our human resources.

We have come a long way toward assuring this kind of security in the past few years. But there is much still to be done. The 1930's presented a problem of Nation-wide need, and we attacked it and solved it in the best and quickest way we knew. Looking back we can see where mistakes were made, where organizations and activities were duplicated. We are profiting by this experience. The 1940's should improve administration and consolidate the gains of the 1930's. The framework has been established. The task now is to simplify and perfect the human relationships involved—between the public servants who administer Government services on the one side, and the millions of our fellow citizens who stand to benefit from them on the other.

I emphasize this human element, this relationship between the men and women who serve and are served. For Government activities are nothing in themselves. The Government machine does not run unless it is manned—and manned by competent, well-equipped personnel. And it runs to no purpose unless it performs the task for which it is intended. In the case of social-security activities, that task is to provide a base upon which individuals may build their own lives, according to their own desires and their own capacities. Our objective is a security founded on self-respect and looking toward self-sufficiency. Its objective is independence, not regimentation.

No man, woman, or child is made a better individual through regimentation growing out of need. We have seen what regimentation has led to elsewhere. And the observation of what has happened to other peoples has made Americans more determined to preserve their time-honored rights and privileges as a democratic people. We believe that pooling widespread risks and providing cooperative protection is one means to that end. We believe that our established mechanisms of government offer an appropriate and effective method of taking democratic action for social security as for other common needs.

But today, as in the past, we expect every citizen to bear his share of this common responsibility and to undertake the individual responsibilities which no government should try to take from him—or can take from him without destroying the qualities of character which we prize most deeply. Individual initiative, individual thrift and industry, individual courage and independence in thought and in action are part and parcel of our heritage.

We do not have to go back to the founding fathers to find men who have stood as exemplars of these qualities. Here in this still young State of Nebraska—where the days of the open frontier are well within the memory of men yet living—you have given the Nation a full and varied quota of such leaders. Offhand, I call to mind William Jennings Bryan, the Creightons, whose contributions included the establishment of the university that bears their name, and among our own contemporaries such distinctive leaders as Senator George Norris, Willa Cather, Roscoe Pound, Edith and Grace Abbott, and though he is a native son of my own State of Indiana, I shall let you claim also for the time being my friend, the Right Reverend James H. Ryan, bishop of Omaha. This is only a scattering of distinguished Nebraska names—each of us can extend the list of those who could say with another earlier son of Nebraska: "I acquired almost by instinct a firm belief in the future. * * * My still youthful imagination had been fired by the limitless reaches of prairie; perhaps it was the pioneer blood in my veins * * * this faith in a new country * * * I had begun to see visions and dream dreams."

That statement, incidentally, was made by the Abbott sisters' father, Othman A. Abbott, in 1867.

This is the spiritual heritage, not only of your own State, but of all the States. It has never been more virile and vital—or more needed—than it is today. The preservation and the enrichment of our great democratic tradition is what we are striving for as individuals, as voluntary groups, and as citizens working throughout local, State, and Federal Governments. Let no one think this is an easy task. It is a challenge—but a challenge which we face

with confidence born of our experience as a united Nation and our deep personal convictions as a democratic people.

In the words of the President: "If we fight with all our strength for the preservation of the ideal of liberty in which this Nation was conceived and the principle of equality on which it was founded; if we recognize and protect ourselves from the dangers that threaten from without and within; if all groups and all classes work together in a spirit of tolerance—then we can be sure that we will not come to the end of our dream."

Some of the steps we have taken in recent years to protect and foster this American way of life I have already outlined; we are well on the road toward safeguarding security within. But we all know that the President spoke truly when he said that dangers threaten us from without as well as from within. Today nations can no more live to themselves alone than can individuals. Our area of interest has indeed broadened; like that of your own organization, it has gone beyond the cities and the States within our own bounds and must look also to world conditions which may affect our own internal welfare.

The first duty of the United States, as indeed of any nation, is to itself. Rightly and properly, our Government has made as its first objective the preservation of our national security, our freedom, and our peace. Patriotism requires this; common sense exacts it. But our duty to ourselves and to the world does not stop there; it necessarily includes concern for the reestablishment and maintenance of peace among nations. Whenever the foundations for peace are threatened anywhere, we are in danger.

People talk of minding our own business, but everything depends on what is meant. It may mean only cowering in the precarious shelter of the narrow Atlantic, until we fly into a panic and plunge into war without knowing exactly who we are in the world or what kind of peace we want. Or it may mean a cool appraisal of world crisis and determined action to avoid being sunk.

The central fact is that America has to be prepared for unpredictable events, the shape and timing of which are beyond our power to control. A year from now, North America may be isolated in a ring of hostile air and naval bases. Or the war may be continuing as an endless progress of destruction. Or there may be a new peace followed by economic collapse, and by the certainty of future wars.

Our own business is not merely to strengthen our external defenses to meet the worst possible outcome of the present war. It is also to build up our internal physical condition and our morale so that no disaster can drive us to panic and internal collapse. Of these, morale is the most vital, as all recent wars have shown.

At the worst, North America may be left as the only remnant of civilization. At best, North America must be the sound nucleus for world recovery after the present fit is over. That is our business, and minding it successfully will be statesmanship that will color the history of the next thousand years.

We are preeminently a peaceful people, with a peaceful history. We have not used peace to organize for war; nor is war and conquest the ideal of national thinking or the goal of national policy. The result has been to release American energy for the greatest peace development known in the modern world. Our national objective remains, as it has always been, construction—not destruction. We like this way of life; and we propose to continue it.

But American life in a world at war, even though we stay out of that war—as we all believe and pray that we shall—is not the same as life in a world at peace. This is why those of us who are engaged in public affairs, and all of us who are here gathered must still pledge ourselves to an active concern for the cause of peace. Even now it is not, at least for us, by any means a lost cause. We are now engaged in an earnest search for the best means to preserve our neutrality—the spirit of neutrality, as well as the letter of the law. We continue to aline all our moral and spiritual forces on the side of enduring peace.

Speaking as a member of the American Legion to members of the Knights of Columbus in the person of your distinguished leader, I know that our thoughts follow the same road out of the past and on into the future. We have both experienced war; we know what it means. Because we have no illusions about war, to us the making and the keeping of the peace are more than words. Because we know what war means, we believe no effort is too great to keep our Nation from being put to this bitter test. May we continue the ways of peace in all our national and personal pursuits.

In today's tormented, confused, deluded, bewildered, and bedeviled world, it may well prove the supreme test of courage to stand firm on the side of peace. As individuals and as a Nation we have that courage. And we are prepared to take the position of leadership for which the United States is so eminently fitted by its material circumstances and by its spiritual ideals.

Peace at home and with all nations—that is our purpose and our prayer. With us, we know, in spite of war and the imminent threat of destruction, are joined all sane men the world over. Those in the warring nations know even better than we the truth of Pope Pius' recent words—"Nothing is lost through peace; all may be lost through war."

And our hearts, through these troubled times, will continue devoutly to echo the message he has given to all peoples and all creeds:

"May God appear and make shine a rainbow of calm peace and harmonious work among nations above this restless world, which is like a tempestuous sea. We should not cease to raise to Him the earnest plea, 'Give us peace, O Lord, in our time.'"

American Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. BORAH

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 21 (legislative day of Wednesday, October 4), 1939

ADDRESS BY PROF. EDWIN BORCHARD

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject of American foreign policy, delivered by Prof. Edwin Borchard, of Yale University, before the American Academy of Political and Social Science, at Philadelphia, Pa., October 14, 1939.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We may assume that the policy to be discussed is the one best calculated to protect the interests of the United States rather than the interests of foreign countries. At all events, I was informed by your President that we might assume that American public opinion is definitely in favor of American neutrality, but that the debate centers around the method by which neutrality can be maintained. On that assumption, the most vital issue of current discussion is whether the proposed lifting of the arms embargo will or will not aid in the preservation of American neutrality.

Perhaps a little recent background is justified. Whereas before 1914 there was hardly an American citizen who would not have insisted that neutrality of the United States in foreign wars was the only sensible policy for this country to pursue, the United States participation in the last European war and the Geneva theory of intervention to punish aggressors has loosened the moorings of American foreign policy. So far as concerns American neutrality, the United States is now a ship without much of a rudder, subject to the violent winds of interventionist propaganda both at home and abroad.

If that propaganda succeeds again, our participation in the last war will not only have been fraught with unadulterated evils to the United States, if not indeed to Europe, but will seem to have been merely a forerunner of our permanent association in the balance of power in Europe. One of the great purposes of the Revolutionary War will thus have been annulled. If the interventionists have their way, the United States will be firmly tied to that destiny; not in the avowed and frank name of power politics, but in the more subtle guise of defending the higher morality. In late years the interventionists, yielding lip service to popular demands, have employed the alluring words of "peace" and "neutrality" to justify their warlike thoughts and advocacy. Hence there is now the utmost confusion, born of the clash between those who want to maintain the peace of the United States by staying out of foreign wars and those who profess to wish to maintain its peace by taking sides in foreign wars. This is the underlying issue. And the confusion is reflected in the fact that the proposed neutrality bill embodies both interventionists and noninterventionist ideas simultaneously. Out of such confusion great danger arises. The function of a commentator is, if possible, to clarify the issue.

The arms embargo has become something of a battlefield for these conflicting views of national policy. But before tracing the legislative struggle, it may be well to point out that the Geneva theory of combined action to punish and coerce "aggressors" came into head-on collision with both the theory and the practice of neutrality. It contemplated that when any country revolted against the established system—and at that time the one of Versailles seemed the desirable one to maintain—it would be denounced by all its associates as an aggressor and the combined use or threat of force would restore the revolter to order. This was supposed to insure peace, and the device became known by the reassuring term "collective security" or "sanctions" to "enforce peace."

The idea rested upon certain assumptions, namely, that the nations had arrived at relative stability, that the world represented primarily a moral order, that the coercers would remain united, that their interests and desires for peace would remain uniform, that the recalcitrant, endowed with the somewhat scurrilous name of aggressor—a concept elusive and altogether subjective—would surrender before a show of force or in contrition would cease and desist. It was assumed that nations judge each other objectively and not in the light of their interests, their alliances, and their prior commitments; that a country can be guaranteed against the consequences of its own ineptitude and against deterioration of its resources, physical and spirtual.

Every one of these assumptions involved delusions of the first magnitude, both historical and psychological, and every attempt to apply the system produced disorders which have been a material

factor in the world's disorganization. This false mechanistic view of a dynamic world of living beings produced the strange thesis that the 90 percent of the peace-loving peoples should quarantine the warlike 10 percent. It is no wonder that these illusions as to how to enforce stability, purveyed to a disordered and essentially unmaintainable post-war world, helped to bring about an astronomical increase in armaments. The theory of combined coercion against aggressors had no roots in human experience and had to meet the fate that usually awaits unsound experiments.

But the most dangerous effects of this false theory were reserved for the United States. Neutrality, a national tradition, became the object of violent and unreasoning attack. And this is not unnatural, for if under the theory of sanctions everyone must join the posse comitatus against an aggressor, neutrality is necessarily taboo. The wisdom, the propriety, and the possibility of America's staying out of foreign wars were derided. The American principle of nonintervention was denounced as cowardly and immoral.

One of the most prominent advocates of this startling theory has characterized neutrality as the negation of law and order:

"Neutrality," he said, "is a denial of the principle of collective responsibility upon which any system of international law must rest. * * * Neutrality must go as a legal conception."

It is quite consistent that this leader should wish the arms embargo lifted, not because it would help American neutrality but "to insure that the aggressor shall not succeed in his criminal act."

I will not stop now to explain the benefits which four centuries of experience with neutrality had given a precarious and harassed world. But in brief, that experience had taught that if war breaks out in this world of motley nations, it is better to limit the area of conflict, to regulate and humanize its conduct, to keep out of war as many nations and peoples as possible, to cultivate philosophic detachment and impartiality toward the struggle, to aid neither side, to permit nonparticipants to continue the processes of life and thus enable the warring nations the sooner to recover from their orgy and restore normal relations. Every addition to the number of belligerents makes more destructive the course of a war and more difficult the conclusion of a sane peace. Under this principle, in spite of frequent wars, a large part of the world before 1914 was usually at peace.

But Europe is older and more sophisticated than the United States. Well-informed men generally realized that the practice, if not the theory, of collective security was a mere device in the uninterrupted maneuvering of power politics. Its idealistic veil in Europe was dropped. Not so in the United States. Here its devotees have worked unceasingly to introduce interventionist ideas into the country, and more particularly into the several neutrality acts and resolutions proposed or enacted since 1928. And they have not labored in vain, for they have won support in the highest quarters. The result has been a continuous struggle between, on the one hand, genuine neutrality, which implies abstention from other people's wars and impartiality in the treatment of belligerents, and, on the other hand, discriminatory treatment against the so-called aggressor.

Before dealing with the statutory development, it may be well to allay a common misconception. It is said that "there is no such thing as neutrality." What is probably meant is that the equal operation of neutral duties upon the belligerents is difficult or impossible to achieve. But the law never conceived neutrality in any such sense. It merely requires that the neutral state must not intentionally hold the scales uneven or exhibit partisanship. It is not the neutral's duty or privilege to equalize the handicaps of a belligerent arising out of geographical and other considerations. Motive is a primary criterion of neutrality. So is candor.

Apparently inspired by the Kellogg Pact, the first arms-embargo resolutions, beginning with the Burton resolution of 1928, were designed to give the President power to discriminate against aggressors. This remained a principle down to the middle of 1933. So when there was added to the McReynolds resolution of 1933 a Senate amendment providing that the embargo was to be applied impartially to all parties to the dispute, the administration lost interest and the resolution was allowed to die.

The pressure of public opinion, however, and the findings of the Nye committee, brought about a reluctant Executive assent to the congressional demand for impartial treatment of belligerents and, finally, to the impartial application of the arms embargo, which by that time, both on humanitarian and practical grounds, had been identified as a means of preserving American neutrality and peace. The gathering tension in Europe fortified this demand for abstention from Europe's wars by means of an arms embargo and other safeguards. The act of August 1935, the fundamentals of which remained in the act of 1937, now in force, received almost unanimous support. There was then relative detachment and objectivity in the American Congress. The act of 1937 passed in the Senate by 63 to 6 and in the House by 376 to 13. In spite of the fact that specialists had in committee hearings expressed misgivings on the long-run effects of embargoes, spokesmen for the administration vied with each other in outdoing Senator NYE in their devotion to arms embargoes as a way to peace, and in support even of commodity embargoes. The Senate hearings on Senate Resolution 3474 in 1936 make instructive reading.

In his Chautauqua address of August 14, 1936, President Roosevelt lauded arms embargoes as a way to keep the country out of war, and he urged resistance against the pressure which in wartime would be directed toward lifting such embargoes. Senators have quoted at length from this speech, but I have not seen quoted one of the profound truths the President then uttered:

"The effective maintenance of American neutrality depends today as in the past on the wisdom and determination of whoever at the moment occupy the offices of President and Secretary of State."

And speaking of the importance of correct Government decisions in maintaining American neutrality, he said, "Peace will depend on their day-to-day decisions." Informed persons are watching those day-to-day decisions.

It is interesting to note that the power to impose an arms embargo is reserved in the reciprocal-trade treaties, and that a mandatory arms embargo was proposed by the United States delegation for adoption by the countries on this continent at the Buenos Aires Conference of 1936. It is safe to add, however, that this devotion to arms embargoes was in part induced by the notion that it furnished a means to coerce "aggressors," a policy actually undertaken during the Ethiopian war to penalize Italy, but again under the guise of discouraging trade to both belligerents in fuel, copper, scrap iron, trucks, tractors, and other commodities. There was actually no trade to Ethiopia. One of the current dangers is that while paying lip service to the popular demand for neutrality and abstention, unneutral devices will be employed which will have precisely the effect of taking sides in a foreign struggle.

II

With this background we may examine the sudden proposal to lift the arms embargo. Why this great change in policy? Where did the demand for it originate? Surely it cannot be designed to protect and safeguard American neutrality, for the obvious and now increasingly avowed purpose is to help the Allies obtain arms, ammunition, and implements of war. Many Senators approve it on that very account, and some concede frankly that it cannot be deemed to strengthen neutrality. Others openly express the belief that an allied victory is in American interest. Perhaps so. But the lifting of the arms embargo is officially defended before the public as an aid to American neutrality.

If military help to the Allies is the motive—and the motive in these matters is all important—then the lifting of the embargo is an act of intervention, and it should be debated as such.

Many neutral countries have imposed arms embargoes during war. And it was always understood as a safeguard or insurance of its neutrality. To say that the lifting of an existing arms embargo is calculated to safeguard neutrality is unprecedented.

Moreover, the assumption that a neutral can change his law so as to help one side defeat the other and yet escape the consequences of war is hazardous. The gamble may be successful, but it is very speculative, for success depends on the inability or unwillingness of the disfavored belligerent to exert the reprisals which he would naturally wish to, and which he is privileged to exert. There may be good reasons why many Americans would like to help the Allies win this European war, but the public should not delude itself into the belief that a hostile act is a contribution to American neutrality.

The suggestion that the present act is unneutral, and hence must be corrected because Great Britain cannot legally secure the arms which Germany could not physically obtain is inaccurate and unsound. It would be more true to say that the naval position of the belligerents enables the United States to supply one side only with everything but arms. There is a practical embargo on Germany. This ought to satisfy the craving for discrimination, and it probably can be defended as legal. The lifting of the arms embargo, I fear, cannot be so defended.

It is proper to say that there are many arguments against an arms embargo. International law does not require a neutral to impose an arms embargo, although many neutrals in the course of history have done so. In the abstract, on historic evidence of the effects of general embargoes, I have been opposed to embargoes and boycotts in any form. And when applied discriminatorily, as so many Americans have been taught to believe was justified, they are particularly obnoxious. They constitute one of the most disturbing political instruments of an age that has been extraordinarily fertile in inventing new devices for provoking conflicts among people. But the arms embargo now under discussion is a special embargo enacted for a particular American purpose. To lift it now, after the outbreak of war, would be an illegal act of intervention.

The congressional demand for the nondiscriminatory arms embargo after 1935 was induced by the special circumstance that the United States had in 1914–17 been converted into an arsenal for one side, and that it was thought that this had an influence in propelling the United States into the war. It was desired to avert a repetition of that role, and the policy had wide support. The United States before September 3, 1939, could have adopted a different policy and maintained the right of American citizens to ship arms to all belligerents as international law permitted.

We find in the majority report of the Committee on Foreign Relations the following sentences:

"The committee is of the opinion that the United States cannot maintain its neutrality so long as such embargo provisions remain on our statute books. It is contrary to the accepted precepts of international law which prescribe that any belligerent may purchase any articles or materials in any neutral country. Belligerents, as well as neutrals, have relied from time immemorial upon this law. * * * It was a voluntary departure from international law by the United States Government * * *."

It would be hard to frame four short sentences containing more misconceptions than these. Apart from the fact that the distinguished chairman of the committee in 1937 made just as earnest an argument for the arms embargo as a preservative of neutrality as he now makes against it, and that never before has an arms embargo been deemed a danger to neutrality, a few legal facts may be stated. International law does not compel neutrals to supply arms to belligerents.

No belligerent has by international law a right to demand arms from a neutral country. But international law imposes no restrictions on neutral traders in selling arms. So far as international law is concerned, a government may permit or forbid its citizens to sell arms. But that is not the present issue. The proposed change in the law to permit an arms traffic now that was prohibited when the war broke out is not a return to international law but rather a defiance of international law.

For the peculiar defect in the proposed change is that it undertakes to lift the embargo during a foreign war with the knowledge, if not, indeed, the intention that it would help one set of belligerents only. This seems to me a clear violation of international law. Just as the United States Government as a neutral government may not legally furnish arms to either belligerent, so it may not at this time by deliberate change in its law help its citizens to furnish such arms, particularly when the effect is discriminatory. I shall read a passage from a commentary on a recent draft code on neutrality prepared under the auspices of some of the specialists of this country, Prof. Philip C. Jessup, of Columbia, being the reporter. That commentary states:

"The task confronting the neutral state (in changing its rules during war) is to make certain to itself and clear to other states that the motive inducing the adoption of a new rule or regulation during the course of a war is the product of its concern to act strictly in accordance with the law of neutrality, and not the result of a desire to aid one or the other belligerent."

In 1915, Secretary Bryan defended on this ground the refusal of the United States to impose an arms embargo, as requested by the Central Powers. He said:

"* * * This Government holds, as I believe Your Excellency is aware, and as it is constrained to hold in view of the present indisputable doctrines of accepted international law, that any change in its own laws of neutrality during the progress of a war which would affect unequally the relations of the United States with the nations at war would be an unjustifiable departure from the principle of strict neutrality by which it has consistently sought to direct its actions, and I respectfully submit that none of the circumstances urged in Your Excellency's memorandum alters the principle involved. The placing of an embargo on the trade in arms at the present time would constitute such a change and be a direct violation of the neutrality of the United States. It will, I feel assured, be clear to Your Excellency that, holding this view and considering itself in honor bound by it, it is out of the question for this Government to consider such a course." (Policy of the United States Toward Maritime Commerce in War, vol. II, p. 299.)

Secretary Lansing made a similar statement on August 12, 1915, in a note to Austria.

It is not true to say that a neutral may not change the rules of law during war. It is during war that most of the rules of neutrality were made. But the rules may only be changed in the direction of insuring and tightening neutral duties, and not in the direction of relaxing them for the benefit of one set of belligerents. This is a hostile act, and its consequences must be carefully weighed. It is inconsistent with that neutrality which official groups profess to wish to maintain.

There has been some effort to meet this contention. It has been said that, as belligerents change their rules frequently during a war, neutrals should have the same right. But belligerents may not change their rules to violate international law, and if neutrals supinely permit such imposition by belligerents, the neutrals are largely to blame. Neutrals may also change their rules, but not so as to violate their neutral duties, and they cannot commit hostile acts while professing to remain neutral. The changes that are permitted to a neutral may be made only to safeguard its neutrality, not to relax it, and never consciously to discriminate in favor of one side. The law has not changed since the declarations of Secretaries Bryan and Lansing in 1915.

It is also said that the proceedings for lifting the embargo began last May. True, although the purpose then was not exactly to protect American neutrality but to impress or deter one prospective belligerent. But, however that may be, the outbreak of war and the United States declaration of neutrality limited the freedom of action of the United States; after that it could not legally undertake unneutral acts, except as an avowed participant in the war. The obligations of neutrality forbid acts of unneutrality. Before September 3, 1939, such obligations did not exist.

The further suggestion that Germany and Austria in 1915 requested the United States to embargo arms is no precedent for the present proposal to lift the embargo. Had the United States seen fit, it could have laid the embargo in 1915 to secure respect by Great Britain for its neutral rights and to insure its neutrality, as many countries had done. It declined to take the step on the ground that it would help Germany alone. Secretary Bryan's answer was legally correct and it is applicable now.

It is not altogether certain that even the substitution of "cash and carry" can escape the criticism that this is unneutral discrimination against one belligerent. If its purpose were to aid one belligerent only, it would be clearly illegal to introduce that innovation after the outbreak of war. But inasmuch as it is a restriction on American commerce, a restriction the practicality of which is open to grave doubts; inasmuch as the provision was embodied in the 1937 act as a peacetime policy and only went out of force on May 1, 1939; inasmuch as it is regarded by our people generally as a safeguard against American involvement, perhaps it may be defended as not unneutral. But the question is debatable, the issue depending, as in the case of the lifting of the arms embargo, on the motive and anticipated effects of the change.

There is, of course, a distinction, historical, psychological, and legal, between the lethal weapons now embargoed and the raw materials not embargoed. Had neutrals in 1914 adequately protected their interests against belligerents, only lethal weapons in principle would have been declared contraband, as a direct military aid to the belligerents. But even though they have not protected themselves against the unlawful extension of contraband lists, the Traffic in Arms Convention of 1925 is proof of the fact that the work makes a profound distinction between the two groups. Raw materials can be used for purposes other than arms manufacture; arms can only be used for war purposes. It is therefore no argument at all to suggest that because we embargo lethal weapons we must in logic embargo raw materials.

And is it not striking that while arms embargoes are decried for the east coast, they are insisted upon for the west coast against Japan? If the embargo would produce war on the east, why would it produce peace on the west? Or if the lifting of the embargo is to preserve our peace and neutrality on the east, why would free trade in arms not have that effect in the west? Is it not possible that in both cases intervention would be promoted by the proposed changes, intervention against the "aggressor," to be sure, but intervention just the same?

And if it is so important that American vessels be kept out of trade to belligerents and out of war zones, represented as a continuing daily danger to the United States, why was the motion of Senator TOBEY immediately to remove that danger defeated? Is it desired to expose American citizens to such further danger for a month, perhaps, in order that these relatively attractive and noncontroversial provisions shall carry on their backs the highly debatable and vulnerable lifting of the arms embargo? Is help to the Allies more important than the immediate protection of the United States against involvement?

If the policy is motivated by the desire to assist the Allies, as is now widely admitted, then the dangers Senator BORAH and others foresee are imminent. For it is natural that if the assistance of arms for cash or short-term credit does not suffice, more assistance will be requested and given. The cash is likely soon to run out. If the motive is assistance, is it possible that credit will be refused? And if that does not suffice, will men be refused? If the desire for Allied victory becomes not merely a personal wish but a national policy, how can neutrality be maintained? And how can we rely on limits to the aid that will be rendered? Thus, the first intervention becomes indicative of a policy and its proponents are likely to become slaves to their interventionist emotions. I venture to believe that it is directly contrary to the interests of the United States to intervene in the European struggle, even more so than the last intervention in 1917. On this issue I call attention to an important book by C. Hartley Grattan just published under the title "The Deadly Parallel."

If then candor is to control our judgment, it must be recognized that lifting of the arms embargo is distinctly unneutral; that it is an act of intervention, exceedingly likely to yield to further interventions. Statesmen of the European belligerents seem to understand this. We need not expatiate on the disastrous effects of war upon the United States. Every person with a stake in the community ought to oppose it, whether on economic, social, or political grounds.

The American experiment will have been made a failure by the men of this generation. They should shrink from such a responsibility.

There are many parts of the present bill which could be accepted. The prohibitions against taking passage on belligerent vessels, against loans to belligerents, against American vessels carrying arms and munitions, all now part of the law, are unobjectionable. More doubtful are the stringent provisions concerning cash and carry, which are likely to take a considerable part of the American merchant marine off the seas. This was designed in good faith to remove American ships and citizens from war risks and to remove temptations from the American people and the administration to regard the sinking even of carriers of contraband as an overt act likely to arouse passions for war. But if the American people could follow Kipling and "keep" their "head when all about" them "are losing theirs," it would be realized that such ships and persons assume the risks of their location, and under no circumstances should the Nation permit itself to be aroused to belligerent feeling. The Scandinavian countries seem to keep their balance. It is the function of the administration to allay unjustified indignation. Even if wrongful sinkings should occur there are other means of vindication than war.

Arbitrations and claims settlements are the indicated course. But if American self-control, following the inept conduct of American neutrality on the last great occasion, is so unreliable as to find causes for war in accidents or acts that are today an incident of maritime war, then it is better to remove temptations from belligerents and from ourselves and suffer the losses. But the proposed bill needs further study, for even under this theory of removing temptation, it exceeds the bounds of reasonableness

in restricting American commerce. If the administration desires neutrality, it might make an effort to defend American neutral rights against all belligerents, a task made more difficult for this administration by the surrenders of the 1915–16 administration.

Moreover, the zeal for embargoes in 1935 was excessive. Why not confine the embargo to belligerent countries? Why include neutrals? The present act prohibits shipment not only to belligerents, but to "any neutral state for transshipment to or for the use of any such belligerent state." Apart from the administrative difficulty of enforcing such a prohibition, it is not the duty of a neutral exporting nation to enforce the doctrine of continuous voyage or transport. That is the belligerent's business. Such an amendment, retaining the embargo on belligerents, but lifting it for neutrals, would not I think be challengeable, for it could not be said to be calculated to help one set of belligerents only. If it were, however, the change would be illegal.

Still more doubtful is the administration policy of admitting armed merchant vessels to American ports, although the act gives the President power to prohibit such admission. The alleged distinction between defensive and offensive armament is specious, for a single shot from a 6-inch gun can undo a submarine. Secretary Lansing realized and admitted his mistake on the armed ship question on January 18, 1916, but by that time there was a vested belligerent interest in his error, and he was not allowed to withdraw from it. It ultimately laid the foundation for American intervention, for President Wilson maintained the strange proposition that it was a matter of "national honor" for American citizens to travel unmolested on armed belligerent merchant vessels. Holland knew better and refused to admit such vessels to its ports. The United States should follow this sound example, if it wishes to escape trouble.

Many of the changes in the proposed bill are designed to strengthen, not weaken, American neutrality. To these there can be no objection. Others, however, like the lifting of the arms embargo, are calculated to relax American neutrality to the advantage of one side in the war. These changes are not privileged and are not reconcilable with neutrality. They expose the country to possible reprisals. Even if it be assumed that the handicapped belligerent will not retaliate, he is privileged to do so, and the possibility of America's remaining at peace is transferred to alien decision. No country professing to desire neutrality should knowingly court such a risk.

An attractive argument has been made that, in view of the almost universal hope here for Allied victory, a refusal to lift the arms embargo will, if Germany seems to be winning, produce an avalanche of emotion in favor of intervention in the war, whereas the lifting of the embargo will be a safety valve for this emotion, and people will then be satisfied that everything has been done to aid the Allied cause short of open intervention.

Naturally, such an argument is debatable. Those who would retain the present embargo for the duration of the war doubtless believe that opening the door to intervention will not cause any diminution in the pressure to open the door still wider in the event that the Allies should seem not to be winning. In view of the Allied countries' capacity for manufacturing, in view of the fact that the arms traffic involves but 10 or 15 percent of the total commerce, in view of the fact that they could obtain American and other arms from neutral countries, it seems to me best not to violate the law to satisfy an emotion which many of us may share.

What I am now concerned about is to avoid the confusion, so common in recent years, that in the name of neutrality and peace hostile acts may safely be undertaken. It is a cause for apprehension that within 2 weeks of the outbreak of a European war discriminatory acts should be contemplated which indicate both a mood and a possibility of intervention. But the proposal should be debated on that platform, and not on the theory that a contribution is thereby made to keeping America out of war or toward preserving its neutrality.

Neutrality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 23 (legislative day of Wednesday, October 4), 1939

THE AMERICAN FORUM OF THE AIR

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a discussion before the American Forum of the Air between the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY], and a panel consisting of several other very distinguished Senators, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Announcer MCCORMICK. WOL—in cooperation with WOR—presents the American Forum of the Air.

Tonight listeners to the coast-to-coast Mutual Network will hear the third of this season's Sunday night broadcasts, emanating from the modern broadcasting studios of the New Department of Interior Building in Washington, D. C.

The facilities of these studios have been extended by the Secretary of the Interior, Harold L. Ickes, in the interest of free speech, on assurances these educational broadcasts will present both sides of a national problem, temperately discussed by the leaders of opposing schools of thought and conducted by a nonpartisan, nonpolitical organization.

Tonight's American Forum of the Air will be presented identical to those which became such widely listened-to programs last year. Under the direction of Theodore Granik, pioneer in educational radio discussion, you first will hear the presentation of both sides of tonight's topic of discussion by outstanding leaders on the subject. Following the formal presentation of opposing views, the issue will be heard in an informal discussion by a panel board ready to treat the argument extemporaneously.

And now, our chairman, Mr. Theodore Granik.

Chairman GRANIK. Thank you, Mr. McCormick.

As the spotlight of international attention centers on the Senate of the United States which continues its debate on embargo repeal, we bring to you another forum to weigh the pros and cons of the latest developments. High lighting a week of lively discussion was the radio address over this network of Col. Charles A. Lindbergh, which resulted in a free-for-all discussion on the Senate floor, some praising and others criticizing the flyer's speech.

Following in part the proposals suggested by former President Hoover in New York this week, Colonel Lindbergh urged:

An embargo on offensive weapons and munitions.

Unrestricted sale by the United States of purely defensive armament.

Prohibition of American shipping to belligerent countries of Europe and their danger zones.

Refusal of credit to all warring nations or their agents.

Senator PITTMAN, chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee and leader of the administration forces, stated: "Colonel Lindbergh's statement is subject to the construction that he approves of the brutal conquest of democratic countries through war or threat of destruction through war."

However, Senator LA FOLLETTE, of Wisconsin, declared Lindbergh rendered a great patriotic service in making the speech, and supported the basic position of those who are opposed to the repeal of the arms embargo and who are determined that America shall not intervene in the European war.

But opposition leaders agree with administration spokesmen that it would be difficult to distinguish between offensive and defensive weapons and supply Europe with only the latter.

And capping a lively day of debate, the Senate heard Senator LUNDEEN, of Minnesota, propose armed United States seizure of British possessions in the West Indies in payment for war debts, evoking another storm of debate and criticism by administration supporters.

Thus the Senate enters another week of debate on this vital issue although administration leaders expect to start voting on important amendments before this week closes. They still claim 65 Senate votes for repeal and a safe margin to pass the bill without the embargo, while opposition forces contend that the fight is just beginning, basing much of their hopes for the embargo on a closer House division.

And so tonight we present six distinguished Members of the Senate in a forum discussion of the subject. We will hear first from Senator CLAUDE PEPPER, of Florida, one of the outstanding administration leaders. He will be followed by Senator CHARLES L. MCNARY, of Oregon, Republican minority leader of the Senate.

Immediately following, we will present an informal panel discussion. Our panel members are:

Senators EDWARD R. BURKE, of Nebraska; LYNN J. FRAZIER, of North Dakota; RUSH D. HOLT, of West Virginia, and ELBERT D. THOMAS, of Utah.

And now Senator PEPPER.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR CLAUDE PEPPER

The eyes of the world are upon America again. For, what we do in the next few days shall, in the judgment of most men, determine not only the course of our country, but the kind of world in which we and those who come after us, shall live.

A war has been thrust upon the world by a great international brigand:

By a man who himself has ordered men shot down without a trial, in his own presence, because they differed with him politically.

By a man who has repudiated religion and man's God, and turned the clock of time back before religion and Christ and the cross.

By a man who has adopted war—the killing of men, the widowing of wives, the orphaning of children, the maiming of men's bodies, the cruel, cold destruction of the finest artistry of man's mind and hands as the chief instrument of his international policy.

By a man who disdains human freedom, who scorns human rights, whose cynical mind ignores human aspirations, who derides the reach of human conscience into the ethereal realms of the spirit.

In the face of the prayers of the world, against the entreaty of men and women of good will everywhere, to satisfy his lust for power and greed for conquest, this man has engulfed the world in the carnage of war.

The whole world could see the terrible scourge of this war hanging over the head of mankind. No man tried harder to stop it; no man prayed and labored more untiringly to stay the unrelenting hand of Hitler than President Franklin D. Roosevelt. While he pleaded with this conscienceless man the world held its breath and prayed and hoped almost against hope that he might succeed. It was all in vain, because this man who aspires to be even more a man of blood and iron than his hero Bismarck was, neither heard nor cared for these appeals which reached to the mind or spirit, for being a man of blood and iron he knew only force for a master.

President Roosevelt knew, as you and I knew, that the safest and surest way to keep this Nation out of war and your son at home was for there to be no war in Europe. He, too, tried to stay the hand of Hitler by giving notice to Hitler and the world that this bloody dictator could not depend upon an unneutral, ill-conceived statute in the laws of America as an instrument to help him flood Europe in rivers of blood.

Everyone knew that the so-called Embargo Act was indefensible in logic, because in modern war there is no real difference between arms, munitions, and implements of war, and steel, gasoline, cotton, out of which the instruments of war are either made or by which alone they may be employed. Everybody knew that in reason there was no difference in morals between selling a truck or a tank, or an airplane, and selling the gasoline without which those instruments would be but monstrous obstructions to the waging of war.

I say, the people knew not only that the so-called embargo law was without basis in reason; they knew it was indefensible in principle, because it worked in actual practice only to the advantage of one like Hitler, who had prostituted a period of peace to prepare for war; who had laid in his store of arms, munitions, and implements of war, while the rest of the world "beat their swords into plowshares and their spears into pruning hooks."

But opposition then as now developed in Congress.

Yes, they said, if we were sure there was going to be a war, we would be glad to enter upon a consideration of that question; but there is not going to be a war.

What poor prophets they were! Only an omniscient judge who knows not only what has been, but what might have been, can know whether this cruel war might have been averted; how many bright eyes might even now be burning with the light of life, which are now dark in death, if Congress, in accordance with the appeal of the President and the oft-expressed sentiment of the American people, had torn his vestige of encouragement to Hitler from the statute books of America in June, July, or even in the first days of August.

How many times we may repeat the lines, "Of all sad words of tongue or pen, the saddest are, 'It might have been.'"

When this war came, the United States was faced with two primary problems: Should we exercise all of our accustomed rights under international law, send our ships upon the seven seas with our goods, and give our citizens free access to the highroads of the world? While tradition and law said, "Yes," the experiences of the last war and the heart of America said, "No."

Then should the alternative be that every vestige of commerce between this Nation and the warring powers, which constitutes at least four-fifths of all of our foreign trade, be destroyed? Should the American flag fade from the seas, where we were building her back to her ancient mastery? We knew that our foreign trade made the difference between good times and bad times; between fewer unemployed and more unemployed; and we did not feel, most of us, that we should give up the very essentials upon which the economic life of this Nation rest, and so we tried to find a reasonable middle ground. We would preserve what trade we could with the belligerents, but we would avoid every possible risk.

We would give up the freedom of the seas, abandon the highroads of the world, bring home every American ship which flew the American flag to a danger zone or a belligerent nation.

While no other nation in the world restrained its commerce or closed its border to any purchaser who came prepared to pay for its goods, we would not venture a single ship, a single sailor, or a single citizen even where war might be upon the high seas, let alone in a country where war was.

We would say to all the warring nations, "If you want our goods, come and get them; take the title to them here in our own harbors; take them home as your own goods, in your own ships, and at your own risk."

This is the neutrality law now pending.

Could any principle ever be fairer than that?

Although no doubt the bill will be amended so as to allow our ships to go to the areas where there is no danger of them being sunk, yet at best, many of our vessels will have to be laid up and we stand a chance to lose a very great commerce which we built up by sacrifice and diligence and governmental efforts. But we are willing to make those sacrifices, because not one of us but would give the whole commerce of America to be assured that the sons of American mothers should never again be forced to sail across the seas, to march under European battle flags, and die upon European battlefields.

But they say our law will be unneutral because Germany may not be able to buy our goods and take them home in their own ships because the British would interfere.

We say the British can't buy from Germany's neutral neighbors in Europe because Germany won't let the goods by.

They say we would bring down upon our heads the wrath of Hitler if we sold goods to all who would come and get them, but Great Britain and France have not declared war upon the neutral countries who sell to Hitler in Europe.

They say it is alright for a land power like Hitler's to buy from his neighbors upon the land, but it is all wrong for sea powers, like Great Britain and France, to buy from their neighbors upon the seas.

They say it is the first step toward war to adopt this neutrality legislation, putting everything in the same category and making those who would, what we have to sell, to come and get it.

They don't deny that we have a right under international law to sell anything here in our own harbors. Then do they mean that Hitler would attack us because we exercised our rights here at home under the laws of the world?

If he is that kind of a person, isn't it all the more imperative that we shall not either neglectively or affirmatively lend him our aid in his mad crusade to conquer the world.

They say if America sells her goods to any purchaser who comes and gets them, it would contribute to the carnage of war.

I say that if America does not sell her goods, the carnage of war will spread.

I say if American goods or guns are bought and taken home by any country who uses them in the defense of human freedom, for the preservation of the Christian religion, for the sanctity of human rights, the sacredness of human hope and aspirations, I thank God for it.

For well do I know and you know, that the battle being fought in Europe now, is for the mastery of Europe. To determine whether the swastika of Hitlerism shall fly upon the ramparts of Europe, Asia, and Africa, or whether the mastery of Europe shall remain in the hands of those who for more than 100 years have lived with us in peace and amity and good friendship. For more than 150 years, the flag of France has meant the flag of a friend to us.

For more than 100 years Great Britain and France have subscribed to our Monroe Doctrine and their territory has lain contiguous or proximate to ours and we have never even fortified one land against another.

Who in America believes that we or any other nation in the Western Hemisphere can be assured of living in that kind of a relationship with a Hitler, whose greedy eyes scan the horizon for mastery over all that he can survey.

I do not propose ever that America shall go to war in Europe again, but I am determined so far as I can prevent it, that no American law shall help to give to Hitler or to any European dictator the power to bring war to where it could prostitute from peace to war, the oceans that touch our shores, or the lands of our 21 American republics which have set in permanent foundations the sentiments and the institutions of freedom in this hemisphere.

They say America's destiny is isolation. I say, if they mean by isolation staying out of Europe's quarrels, not haggling over other peoples' territory, not seeking other nation's conquest, we are all isolationists, but if they mean by isolation that we are disinterested in whether civilization perishes from the earth, whether bloody Hitlerism baptizes the earth, whether dastardly dictatorship encompasses the earth, whether the iron feet of tyrants trample down the free peoples of the world, whether religion is and God is worshipped, whether we have no sense of right, no feeling of wrong, no sympathy for victims, no sentiment for the oppressed, no care for those who are maimed and mangled; if they mean that America is alike without a conscience or a cause; if they mean that America repudiates all her glorious past, that she forfeited all her noble destiny, that she has grown callous to every fine thing that moves the hearts of men and women, I say, "Thank God, I am not that kind of an isolationist."

Now, therefore, in this crucial hour, let America be prayerful, patriotic, calm, cool, solemn, for what we are about is the serious business of preserving all that good and brave men and women have saved out of the wreckage of the past. A united people, one from many, we stand forth before the world to find and to follow a course which is fair, which is right, and which our ancestors before us and the Providence which has guided us, would alike approve.

Chairman GRANIK. Thank you, Senator PEPPER.

This is the American Forum of the Air presenting a discussion on Neutrality. You have just heard Senator CLAUDE PEPPER, of Florida.

And now we are pleased to present Senator CHARLES L. MCNARY, of Oregon, minority leader of the Senate.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR CHARLES L. M'NARY

In discussing proposals for revision of our neutrality legislation I believe that we should concede at the outset that all of us have a common objective, namely, to do that which will keep the United States out of war. I do not believe there is a man in Congress who again wants to see the blood of America's fine youth spilled on foreign battlefields. Each of us, whatever our views on particular questions, wishes to do that which will best protect our own country and its people.

This was the objective we all had in mind back in 1935, when Congress enacted the first Neutrality Act. In that legislation we believed that one of the most effective ways of staying out of war was to refuse to sell arms and munitions to countries that resorted to war. Most of us then felt—and many of us still feel—that our unrestricted sale of arms and munitions during the World War was

a major reason why we became involved in that conflict. We felt that one practical method of avoiding war was to say to our people: "You must forego the profits from the sale of arms and munitions to countries at war in order that the peace of your own country might be preserved." Congress overwhelmingly adopted that resolution, and the President approved it. It became the national policy of our Government.

Some months later Congress again approved an embargo on the exportation of arms, ammunition, and implements of war. On that occasion the vote in the House was 353 to 27, and so unanimous was the support of the embargo in the Senate that a roll call was not demanded. In 1937 Congress again approved an embargo on arms, ammunition, and implements of war in legislation containing other safeguards for our neutrality which are not now in serious dispute. The Senate passed the 1937 legislation by a vote of 63 to 6, while the vote in the House of Representatives was 376 to 13. The President likewise gave his approval to these measures, making them law. Indeed, the President, in the summer of 1936, enthusiastically endorsed such provisions as the arms embargo as "new weapons with which to maintain our neutrality" in time of war abroad. And on that occasion the President warned us to be on our guard against those, seeking "fool's gold," who would, when war came, attempt to "break down or evade our neutrality."

My only purpose in citing this brief bit of history is to indicate to you that the present arms embargo was adopted only after the most thoughtful deliberation, with the approval of the President, repeatedly expressed, and with virtually the unanimous support of all parties and factions in Congress. In this legislation we believed we had taken a practical step, with a minimum of damage to the American economic system, toward avoiding incidents that lead to war. None ever contended it was perfect legislation. You cannot have perfect legislation in regard to neutrality or any other very important subject. But we thought it was a practical and a sound way to safeguard our country from war.

Now we are asked to repeal the arms embargo which has been our national policy for more than 4 years. In view of the purpose for which this law was three times enacted so overwhelmingly, surely the burden of demonstrating why the embargo should be lifted rests on those who advocate such a course. Beyond all shadow of doubt they should prove to us that repeal of the embargo is in the best interests of this Nation. If they do not, then the arms embargo should be maintained.

Unless it can be shown that repeal of the arms embargo will better serve our domestic interests than its maintenance, then it should not be repealed. Reasons which spring out of the effect of the present embargo on other nations are beside the point. The American Congress has a duty to legislate for the best interests of the American people—not for the benefit of some foreign power.

In the several weeks since the Senate started debate on this issue I have not heard advanced a single argument which adequately demonstrates how repeal of the embargo would serve our domestic considerations. Surprisingly, I have heard it suggested that we should repeal the arms embargo in order to give assistance to one group of the nations at war against the other belligerent. This seems to be the real reason why repeal of the arms embargo has been proposed.

Yet I do not wonder at the timidity with which this reason is advanced. It is a shocking suggestion that we should repeal a domestic law, designed to keep us at peace, for the purpose of helping one group of belligerents. Clearly such action, for that reason, would be participation in the war. It would be an unneutral action and it would be an action that might cost us dearly. Indeed, it might be the very means of involving us in the war, which is the very thing we are seeking to avoid. Why should we take that risk?

Those of us who remember the years from 1914 to 1917 know the part which the American export of arms and munitions to the Allies played in arousing the hatred of the German Nation against us. So bitter did the Germans become as they learned that American guns and shells were killing their men that actually they attacked this country in the submarine warfare. They brought the war to our shores through sabotage of our munition plants. They sought to stir up one of our neighboring nations against us. In their desperation the Germans determined to stop the exports of American munitions at all costs. There was nothing for President Wilson to do but acknowledge these attacks on us and ask Congress formally to declare the war which already existed.

I now hear Members of Congress saying that they will never vote for the involvement of this country in war. But what else can they do if the events of 1914 to 1917 are repeated? The important thing is not to undo what we have done to prevent such a chain of events from beginning. The wise thing is to prevent the incidents which force on us the duty of making such a terrifying decision.

Yet it is now contended that there is no real distinction between the arms, ammunition, and implements of war now under embargo and other commodities useful in war. Of course there are distinctions, very real and practical distinctions, and there are psychological differences. There were very important differences 25 years ago. Export of American cotton and wheat and other raw materials would never enrage a people as American exports of arms and munitions to the Allies enraged the Germans in the years 1914 to 1917. It was the sale of arms and munitions in those years which contained the seeds of involvement in war for us.

And what do those who urge repeal of the arms embargo have to say to the proposition that munitions which we would now export may be used a year or two hence against our own boys, should we, and may God forbid it, become involved in this terrible conflict? Who knows the course this war may take? Who knows what alliances may be made if it continues for a year or two? Already we have seen such unexpected developments as the alliance of the Russian Bear and the Nazi swastika. Is it not wiser to keep our arms and munitions out of the hands of the fighting countries? Is it not wiser to keep them at home to build up our national-defense needs? Let us take every precaution possible to keep out of war, but we should do nothing to impair, even in the slightest degree, our own Nation's defense forces.

Entirely aside from repeal of the arms embargo, I am opposed to the pending bill in the Senate because it does impair our national defenses, as I shall demonstrate to you. Advocates of repeal of the arms embargo apparently are aware that if that safeguard is wiped out it will leave a gaping hole in the ramparts of our neutrality. I say they apparently are aware of this because they have made in the Pittman bill, desperate efforts to plug up this hole by drastic and stringent provisions in other directions.

For instance, they have undertaken to make it unlawful for an American ship "to carry any passengers or any articles or materials" to any nation at war. This means that American ships cannot carry passengers or cargoes from the port of Seattle to Vancouver or Victoria in Canada. It means an end, for the duration of the war, of any ocean-born commerce in American ships from Baltimore, New York, or Boston to Canadian ports. It means that American ships must surrender their peacetime business in the Pacific with such places as Australia, New Zealand, and Indo-China and in the Atlantic with Bermuda, the Bahamas, Nassau, Jamaica, and French Martinique. To make it clear, let me repeat that this provision in the Pittman bill forbids American vessels to carry passengers and cargoes to any of these places—not just war material but any kind of cargo.

Now it is obvious that this is an unnecessary and burdensome restriction on American shipping. Our purpose in placing restrictions on our citizens in connection with neutrality legislation is to avoid dangerous contacts which might involve the Nation in war. What danger can there be to American vessels engaged in their ordinary peacetime trade between Portland or Seattle and the Canadian ports of the British Northwest? Does anyone seriously suppose that these ships will be subjected to submarine hazards from nations involved in war in Europe? Of course not. In this restriction we are needlessly harassing our own citizens.

Yet while that restriction has been made too drastic, the sponsors of the pending bill have left in it a loophole large enough to drive an armored car through, as one correspondent has described it. I refer to the omission from this bill of any provision making it unlawful for American ships to carry arms, ammunition, and implements of war to neutral countries for transshipment to nations at war. Under the present law that is forbidden. But if the arms embargo is repealed American ships lawfully could carry bombs and shells and poison gas to certain neutral countries in Europe from whence they could be transshipped to the belligerents. They could do this under the proposed substitute unless the President exercised the discretion granted him to declare combat zones. It may be said that, of course, the President would prevent such shipments by exercising that discretion. Very well, but if the President prescribes combat areas sufficiently extensive to close up this loophole, then he will take American flagships completely out of European and Mediterranean waters. Indeed, American ships will have to confine their foreign activities to the Latin-American and Asiatic trade. Now I am not particularly concerned about the profits which shipowners would lose under such restrictions.

My concern is over what would happen to our merchant marine under such drastic restrictions, particularly if this war should go on for a few years, as some observers think possible. Obviously, we shall not go on building merchant ships if there is no need for them. Obviously, under such restrictions a part of the merchant marine we now have will have to be laid up and will deteriorate. When that happens we have impaired our national defense.

The first line of our national defense has been our Navy and our merchant marine. The theory underlying the hundreds of millions of dollars which the Government has spent in subsidies for shipping has been that we were in reality contributing to our national defense. We have long recognized the American merchant marine as an auxiliary in time of war to our Navy and an integral part of our national defense. Yet in the Pittman bill we undertake to undermine much of the progress made toward an adequate American merchant marine.

What is the more bewildering, there is no real need for such action. If the arms embargo is left in our law many of the problems sought to be reached by such drastic restrictions against shipping will disappear. Let us by every means seek to protect our neutrality, but let us be practical and realistic and let us not do irreparable damage to ourselves. We should keep the arms embargo, and see to it that our national defense is unimpaired and adequate.

Chairman GRANIK. Thank you, Senator MCNARY. This concludes part I of tonight's forum presentation.

Announcer MCCORMICK. Immediately following station identification, we will continue with the panel discussion.

This is the Mutual Broadcasting System.

This is the American Forum of the Air, originating in the broadcasting studios of the new Department of the Interior Building in

Washington, D. C., and presented over the Mutual Network by WOL in cooperation with WOR.

We return you to the chairman of the program, Mr. Granik.

Chairman GRANIK. And now as part II of tonight's forum on neutrality, we present an informal panel discussion. Our panel members are:

Senators EDWARD R. BURKE, of Nebraska; LYNN J. FRAZIER, of North Dakota; RUSH D. HOLT, of West Virginia, and ELBERT D. THOMAS of Utah. Senator BURKE will open the discussion.

Senator BURKE. The arguments for and against repeal of the arms embargo have been ably and eloquently presented by our colleagues Senator MCNARY and Senator PEPPER, but there are some phases of the matter that need a little further exploration. Senator MCNARY says we only passed this neutrality law containing the arms embargo 4 years ago, and we ought not to think about amending it now. Senator MCNARY has been on the Hill a long time, and he knows that there never has been an important piece of legislation passed that we didn't have to start in amending it almost at the next session of Congress. I can say of banking legislation, and every other important piece of legislation in the few short years I have been in Washington, that they have been amended, most of them, at every session of Congress. We have to change the laws to meet conditions as they exist at a given time.

But Senator MCNARY pushes the point a little further and says, "Why should we repeal the arms embargo when we know that by so doing we will be benefiting one of the belligerents, one side in this contest, Britain and France?" The answer to that is perfectly clear. The law as it stands confers an immense and immeasurable benefit upon the other belligerent, Germany, upon Hitler, if you will, and therefore we must amend the law, repeal the embargo, to take away that benefit. And we do it for the reason so eloquently stated by Senator PEPPER, because in this country we do not approve of Hitler and Hitlerism.

This afternoon over the air the Right Reverend Monsignor John A. Ryan, of Washington, declared that in view of the conditions that exist on the other side of the world today it is the moral duty of the United States to do all that it can, short of war, to defeat Hitler and destroy Hitlerism. And why? For the very reasons that Senator PEPPER brought out, because the success of Hitler means the end of Christian civilization in Europe and eventually everywhere in the world. And so why leave upon our statute books a law which may make it possible for him to win in that contest?

But I want to pass this discussion on to another member of the panel. There is one phase of the matter that hasn't been very fully discussed tonight. I think, in the minds of most of us, there is the thought that there is something immoral about selling instruments of death to other people, that may be used to kill someone. On the floor of the Senate the other day Senator WHEELER said: "We surely do not want to see German boys killed." Certainly not one of us wants that; neither do we want, I take it, to see the youth of Czechoslovakia, or Polish youth, along with women and children, killed, and there is this point to remember, that if the German youth had stayed in their own country, there wouldn't have been any killing going on at all. The Polish youth and the other youth had no such chance. They stayed at home, willing to go about their own business and their own affairs, and the other youth came, if you will, with instruments of death. And so, is it immoral to place in the hands of an oppressed and beleaguered people like the Poles the opportunity to defend themselves? I say there is nothing immoral about that, that it is the most moral thing that this country could do, to sell arms and munitions and implements of war to those people who are defending themselves against the attack of a madman bent upon ruling Europe.

I know that my very able colleague from North Dakota feels differently on this question, and I would say this, that in my judgment, there is not, in public life, any man who has a greater abhorrence of war, and the evil that war brings than Senator FRAZIER, of North Dakota, and I am always glad to hear his views. Senator FRAZIER!

Senator FRAZIER. Senator BURKE, I just can't agree with your philosophy about this selling of arms to foreign countries. It does seem to me that there is a moral question involved, and that if we believe that we should have no war, if we believe in world peace and disarmament, as we claim to believe—and we were instrumental, you know, in enacting and getting other nations to agree to the so-called Kellogg-Briand Peace Pact—that we should practice what we preached at that time. It seems to me that there is something just morally wrong in selling arms to other countries, or selling war materials to kill people, and I can't feel that there is any justification in it.

Personally, I believe that we should have an arms embargo or a law against the sale of arms to any foreign country at any time, whether it is in peace or wartime, and especially in war times I would be willing to go the limit and have an embargo against shipments of any kind of products, food or anything else, to countries in war.

In this day and age, after 2,000 years of Christian civilization, if any supposedly civilized countries are selfish and greedy enough to go to war, I don't believe they are entitled to any kind of assistance from a neutral nation.

Now, at the beginning of the World War we had no arms embargo and they were selling arms, of course, to the belligerent nations, and there was a movement started to have a law enacted by Congress to provide for an embargo on arms to the belligerent nations. At that time, of course, France and England were opposed to that change and Germany favored it. The proposition was put up to Mr. Bryan, Secretary of State, and he said, in substance, that change of the neutrality regulations after war had started would be unfair to one side or the other of the belligerent nations and against international law, and it shouldn't be done.

Then a joint resolution was introduced in Congress at that time and advocated and debated, but it was decided after debate to turn it down. They didn't approve of it, apparently, taking the side of Secretary Bryan.

Now the situation is the other way; we have an embargo against the sale of arms to belligerent nations. The war has started just the same as it was at the beginning of the World War when this other question came up. Now Germany is opposed to our lifting the arms embargo, while France and England would favor it. Senator THOMAS, I know you are well posted on these subjects and I would like to know, if that was good philosophy at that time, if there was good reason for Bryan's opinion—and we all know he was opposed to war—and if the Congress was justified in turning down that resolution then at that time, why aren't we now, why isn't the Senate justified in turning down this request to repeal the arms embargo? I would like to hear your opinion on that, Senator THOMAS.

Senator THOMAS. Senator FRAZIER, of course, you will admit that the factors in 1939 are very different from the factors in 1915 and 1916. For example, right after the last war the nations of the world tried to think of substitutes for war. They tried to think of emphasizing neutral duties instead of standing on neutral rights. They tried by various international agreements to bring about situations and conditions which would make it hard to go to war, and our three neutrality acts are consistent with what the whole world has done in that regard.

But in regard to your question, in regard to the changed situation, in 1925 forty-two-odd nations met together and they entered into what is known as the International Traffic in Arms Pact, and that pact just happens to bring us right down to the present situation. That pact made it incumbent upon the nations of the world who became adherents to it—and the United States adhered to it in 1935—to set up licensing commissions to control international traffic in arms, the idea being that if international traffic in arms could be controlled during peacetime, no nation which has conquest in its soul would be able to build up during the period that other nations were trying to disarm and reduce armaments, great supplies.

That treaty found itself wrecked upon one little rock, exactly this same rock that the United States now finds itself on as the result of experience, when the President of the United States, as the result of experience of the United States, suggests that we repeal the arms embargo. Now let me repeat that: 42 nations agreed to put an embargo on arms and retain that embargo during peacetimes, but when it came to embargoing arms during wartimes not a single nation would agree to that proposition because of the changed situation and the need under international arrangements and international covenants that during war nations should come to the rescue of those nations which are being attacked and improperly attacked. Therefore, in this very treaty, it says that the embargo provisions will not hold when war is in the world.

Another thing has been suggested tonight that is new and extremely interesting, the suggestion that Germany got mad at us because we shipped arms. Undoubtedly Germany got mad at us because we shipped arms, but let me cite you just a little bit of history, and the arms shipment had nothing to do with the anger of Germany during this time. It was on June 31, in 1917, after Germany had made a promise to the President of the United States in regard to submarine warfare, which promise came after the sinking of the *Sussex*, that Germany started in her unrestricted submarine warfare, sinking anything that came in sight, and during the month of February 1916, the month that the President of the United States sent back the Ambassador from Germany and when we broke off relations, we broke them off because Germany broke a promise, and during the month Germany wasn't angry at arms shipments; she was just angry at the whole world, and she sank 200 merchant vessels during the single month of February. That is 8 a day.

Now, of these vessels—and remember these facts because Americans have ideas about why we went into the war—there were only 2 American ships out of the 200 sunk, and there were less than 25 American lives lost in those ships. But of the 200 ships sunk, 150 of them, or three-quarters of them, were neutral ships, carrying anything in accordance with the rights of international law. There was where the American wrath arose, there was where an outrageous justice came into being, and that is what took us into the World War. Germany, in establishing unlimited submarine warfare as we know from the very acts that brought it into existence, attempted to make war on England by starving England out. Those are the facts.

Now, one more fact about our national defense, and it is well when we go into these things to remember this. Of course, if we put restrictions upon our American ships, we are going to reduce the amount of traffic carried by American ships; but even as drastic as the present law is, if you will go into the statistics you will find that it affects only 40 percent of our merchant marine.

While I would love to talk on and on, I know that Senator HOLT is just dying to get a chance to get on this program and I give way to him.

Senator HOLT. Senator THOMAS, as I listened to these speeches and many more about the neutrality program, I was just a

youngster and my mind goes back to the time in 1914 and 1917, and since this debate has arisen I have gone back to read the papers, and if you just change the names, I could pick the same words now being used about our duty to go across the ocean and those in 1914 and 1917. As I listened to the attack on Hitler, despicable and terrible as he is, my mind went back to the terrible Kaiser—if we could just get rid of the Kaiser, we would correct all the conditions of the world.

And then also I heard the question of democracy in the world and my mind went back to the slogan, "Make the world safe for democracy," and how the boys went across the sea, fighting and dying for an ideal, feeling they were dying to make the world safe for democracy in a war to end all wars.

Then I also saw another slogan, "A war to preserve civilization." Yes, a war to preserve civilization—thousands of our boys died for that ideal but what happened? Oh, those wonderful ideas were cast aside, those countries in Europe were not interested in ideals. No, England was fighting for democracy in the last World War, they told us, for a durable peace, but they got 994,500 square miles of territory. They say they love Poland but they don't tell you that out of the Versailles Treaty they got territory 6 times as large as Poland, 25 times as large as Czechoslovakia in their quest for democracy and in their quest for civilization and in their quest to stop the Kaiser.

Everybody knows what we all think of Hitler, but Hitler is a symbol of an unfair, impossible condition in Europe that was the result of the Versailles Treaty. You can't starve a nation to death any more than you can starve an individual to death, and if we would get rid of Hitler tomorrow—and remember it is going to take thousands and hundreds of thousands of deaths to do it—that wouldn't stop the conditions that caused Hitler. It is a bad blood condition in Europe. It has been going on for thousands of years and it will continue to go on for thousands of years.

Oh, yes, war will not correct the condition. War doesn't correct it at all, and war brings an army, not for help, not to save civilization, but for the destruction of civilization itself. And when you think about that, I think it is time that we look at our foreign policy that has kept us at peace, and now they say we should be the policemen of the world, that it is our duty as American citizens to go over and stop this madman. Oh, yes. Why? Why should we be the policemen of the world? Because that is a part of the parallel policy Eden spoke of in 1937, in which he said that the United States and England had a parallel policy, and the President of the United States said we should do everything short of war. Yes, short of war, just like the current of Niagara, we may swim it but that current may take us over the falls to our destruction and to our death.

I feel that the greatest opportunity to help democracy in the world today is to continue to make democracy work here in America, and I feel that we are contributing to the destruction of democracy by our entrance into that.

It is said that a long time ago George Washington gave us the very danger that we are now facing about the sympathy with and the hatred of nations. He said in his Farewell Address, and I want to ask you if it is not important today to realize this very same thing is happening. Here is what President Washington said:

"Sympathy for the favorite nation, facilitating the illusion of an imaginary common interest, in cases where no real common interest exists, and infusing into the one the enmities of the other, betrays the former into a participation in the quarrels of the latter, without adequate inducements or justification."

What I am interested in above everything else is neutrality and peace and keeping American boys alive on the American side of the ocean, and we can do it if we stay out of the war. Of course they say we are just going to step one foot in the door, we are just going to take part economically, but the very evidence is that when we take part in an economic way, the next step is men and munitions and money.

Senator BURKE. Senator HOLT suggests this thought. "They say," he says, "that we should start in to police the world and make the world safe for democracy." I doubt if anyone said that here tonight. If they did, I was taking a nap because I didn't hear any of those arguing for the repeal of the arms embargo talk at all about sending any boys to Europe or policing the world or making the world safe for democracy. We merely say this, that inadvisedly we put upon our statute books a law which is working unequally now. It is taking away, as Senator PEPPER so well brought out, the one great advantage to the sea powers of going to their markets to buy things in time of war, and of course operating very greatly to the benefit of land powers. So Hitler has built up his great land and air force and he didn't care if England went ahead building up its navy as long as there was an embargo placed by the most important country in the world, that as soon as he forced them into a war, would be clamped down hard and Britain couldn't come here and buy a thing. That was all that Hitler wanted.

All that we propose to do now is to take off our own statute books a law that is working very unequally and improperly, and we say, incidentally, of course, it confers a benefit upon the other belligerent by taking away an unfair advantage that one belligerent has now. Personally, I welcome that, because I want every advantage possible taken away from that belligerent. When I say that, I don't mean that I am starting out to help Britain maintain its world empire or police the world for democracy, or do anything else, but I would say this in answer to Senator HOLT's question. He says if we were able to put an end to Hitler tomorrow, that wouldn't settle these problems. I agree with him fully on that; these problems probably will never be settled; but I would suggest this question for him and others to think over, that if Hitler isn't checked tomorrow, or the day after tomorrow, or some other day pretty soon, I do not like to contemplate what this world faces.

Senator FRAZIER. Well, Senator BURKE, there may be some danger of Hitler's conquering the world, but I am not alarmed about it at all. Hitler is not going to last forever, any more than we are, and there will be a lot of other folks, you know, that won't last forever, too, along with us. I don't think that Hitler is going to be so dangerous. I don't like his style at all; I don't agree with his philosophy of being a dictator; I don't like dictatorship; I don't like to be told myself what I have got to do and what I must do; it always went against my grain, and I think it always will.

The Senator from Florida made the statement that this present law benefited men like Hitler because he had been arming as fast as he could, and the other nations—I suppose referring to France and Great Britain—had been making pruning hooks of their swords and beating something else into plowshares; but if England and France have been doing anything like that, I haven't heard of it. Why, they have been arming so fast the last few years that they couldn't pay their debt to the United States, the money they had borrowed after the war was over to help put them on their feet; they just couldn't pay that, but they have gone on building navies and arming their men, and building a big army and everything. So I don't think there is much choice between the two; and as far as democracy is concerned, there is mighty little democracy left over there, and we certainly can't benefit any of them or save democracy by going to war. War and democracy just don't go together, and I believe Senator THOMAS will agree with me.

Senator THOMAS. We have agreed on many things and I think we agree on many things tonight, and one of them I am sure we agree on is that if we try to settle the question that is before the Senate of the United States about the repeal of the arms embargo upon the merits of England's stand and the demerits of Germany's stand, or the merits of France's stand and the demerits of Hitler's stand, it is likely that we will talk about those four things and not about the task that is in front of us.

It is a pretty general practice to get away from the real subject. The President of the United States called us into session to do a particular thing because, in the light of experience, that thing should be done, and he suggested that we get back, as far as the arms embargo was concerned, to the practices of the law of nations, but he didn't suggest that we go entirely all the way because he recommended seven points in addition to the ordinary law of nations, which were to be restrictions upon American citizens and American trade.

Now, we must stay in this realm. That means that we are discussing domestic law, that the whole act must be considered as a unit, and that these seven restrictions which are put upon the American citizens must be used to temper the nonrestriction in regard to the shipment of arms; and when we do that we will find that we are keeping entirely within the realm of those measures short of war.

Senator HOLT, you have 3 more minutes to finish us off.

Senator HOLT. There are just two points that came to my mind. When we discussed the question of arming the world, I have heard a lot said that we have armed Hitler up to the hilt, and then when Hitler strikes we step in and say, "You can't buy any more." Of course that creates the impression that we have been arming Hitler in the United States. Well, the facts of history will show that England helped arm Hitler. England helped develop Hitler when they didn't think Hitler would be a great power, but now as his domestic power and his foreign policy reach out, then, of course, Hitler becomes a terrible individual.

But getting back to our arming, do you realize that in the first 8 months of this year, up to the time of the declaration of war, we had arms export licenses to all the countries of the world amounting to $58,500,000 worth of arms being sold, and how much of that went to Hitler in Germany? Only $22,664 worth; and of that $58,000,000, not counting any of their colonial possessions, England and France bought approximately fifty million; so we didn't arm Hitler; we had nothing to do with it.

The second point, and I must hurry, is the fact that it is being changed, it is an evident fact, it is a known fact, that the reason we are being called into session is to change the law so as to help one side in the controversy. We passed the other law in time of peace, we passed it without any question of the sides to be drawn, because at that time the administration was very fond of Russia, and it was then changed and they put the whiskers back on Russia, and so we had no question about sides at that particular time of peace, and a peaceful situation and a peaceful approach was that the United States should not enter the sale of arms and ammunition in order that we would stay out of war, because we had seen the effect of so doing in 1914 and 1917. I know that if two men are fighting, if I start handing a club to one or both, I am going to get in the fight, and that is what I am afraid we are going to do if we don't watch curselves in this particular piece of legislation.

Chairman GRANIK. Thank you, gentlemen. You have been listening to an informal panel discussion on neutrality. Our panel members were Senators EDWARD R. BURKE, of Nebraska; LYNN J. FRAZIER, of North Dakota; RUSH D. HOLT, of West Virginia; and ELBERT D. THOMAS, of Utah.

This followed opening remarks by Senators CLAUDE PEPPER, of Florida, and CHARLES L. MCNARY, of Oregon.

And now for a final word from Mr. McCormick.

Announcer McCORMICK. So we have concluded the third broadcast in this season's series of the American Forum of the Air, programs emanating from the broadcasting studios of the new Department of the Interior Building in Washington, D. C. The facilities of these radio studios have been extended by the Secretary of the Interior, Harold L. Ickes, in the interest of free speech on assurances these educational broadcasts will present both sides of the national problem, temperately discussed by the leaders of opposing schools of thought and conducted by a nonpartisan, nonpolitical organization. The Mutual Network will bring you this forum broadcast every Sunday evening from 8 to 9 o'clock, eastern standard time, throughout the session of Congress. Tickets to this broadcast may be had by sending your request to station WOR, New York, or WOL, Washington.

In the interest of education there is printed and distributed free of charge a limited number of copies of the entire proceedings of these broadcasts. Address your requests and comments to WOL.

The American Forum of the Air is directed by Theodore Granik, who presided as chairman tonight, and comes to you as a presentation of WOR in cooperation with WOL. This is Stephen McCormick speaking.

This is the coast-to-coast network of the Mutual Broadcasting System.

Our Middle-Class Statesman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PRENTISS M. BROWN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 23 (legislative day of Wednesday, October 4), 1939

ARTICLE BY WILLIAM ALLEN WHITE

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, on yesterday the New York Herald Tribune printed a very fine tribute, written by William Allen White, in the form of a review of a book called Democracy's Norris. I do not agree with everything that is said in the article, but I do heartily agree with most of it, and particularly one paragraph of it which I shall read:

Mr. Lief, in his biography, is chary of eulogy. But he might well have closed his story by declaring that GEORGE NORRIS, as a constructive statesman, has to his credit as large an amount of work achieved as any other senatorial leader in American history.

I ask unanimous consent that the book review be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Herald Tribune of October 22, 1939]

OUR MIDDLE-CLASS STATESMAN—DEMOCRACY'S NORRIS

(Reviewed by William Allen White, editor of the Emporia Gazette and of a biography of Coolidge)

Alfred Lief has written a long and interesting biography of Senator GEORGE W. NORRIS, of Nebraska. Mr. Lief's book is not brilliant. In it GEORGE NORRIS does not walk through the pages a living image. Characterization is only incidentally pulled out of the bag of tricks of Mr. NORRIS' biographer. But the thing that does emerge is, perhaps, for purposes of recorded history, more important than personal characteristics—a connected, authentic, intelligent, truthful story of the man who, more than anyone now living, represents middle-class liberalism. President Roosevelt has added considerably more than a jigger of proletarian radicalism to his leadership. But GEORGE NORRIS was middle class and his program was and is still a middle-class program. Industrial legislation has interested him but casually. His biographer here makes this obvious without declaring it. Indeed, most of the value of the Lief story of GEORGE NORRIS is that it expounds by implication rather than by declaration. Mr. Lief does not place GEORGE NORRIS anywhere in a political catalog. NORRIS was, in 40 years of public life, first a regular Republican; second, in the first decade of the century, an insurgent Republican fighting Joe Cannon, and later Senator Aldrich; third, a Roosevelt Progressive Republican with his fingers slightly crossed; fourth, a co-worker of the elder La Follette; fifth, a lone warrior in the administrations of Coolidge, Hoover, and Franklin Roosevelt.

The sum of his activities has been tremendous. But for NORRIS and his leadership in Congress most of the legislation of the Theodore Roosevelt era from 1905 to 1915 would have been lost. We should not have had the constitutional amendment providing for the direct election of United States Senators. We should not have had the income tax. Later, we should not have had the constitutional amendment requiring the inauguration and the opening of Congress after a Presidential election in the January following the November election. We should not have had the T. V. A. and its kind scattered over the Rocky Mountain areas. We should not have had much of the farm legislation, good or bad, which has distinguished the last dozen years. NORRIS was in all these fights, and his presence often was decisive.

Senator NORRIS' activities, which are meticulously described in Mr. Lief's biography, may be cross-indexed thus: Most of them are political and not economic reforms. And those that are political place political power not in the proletariat but in the middle class. His life has been devoted to giving the middle-class man more political power. Incidentally, those measures that are not purely political and have an economic phase are for the protection of the middle class. There is but a narrow proletarian angle in the NORRIS career. He has been a champion of the middle class. He has been a definite foe of a class-conscious money aristocracy. But he has not been deeply interested, nor for long, in problems that concern a class-conscious labor group. Two or three times he has made detours in his career to help labor. But chiefly the reader will find that these detours in the industrial direction are to help labor get out of the proletariat into the middle class. They are only incidentally labor laws.

The reader will learn here that while GEORGE NORRIS risked his political life to support Roosevelt against Hoover and against Landon, he has been rather aloof from the Roosevelt administration. He disagreed definitely with Roosevelt about the Court-packing plan and tried to head off the President in his insistence upon that issue. He has had doubts about most of the proletarian Presidential issues. He has supported Roosevelt in his farm program, but there, also, often with reservation. He has been as independent in the Roosevelt administration as he was in the regimes of Coolidge and Hoover. He has been his own man, a free lance.

Mr. Lief, in his biography, is chary of eulogy. But he might well have closed his story by declaring that GEORGE NORRIS, as a constructive statesman, has to his credit as large an amount of work achieved as any other senatorial leader in American history.

Another biography of NORRIS should be written to disclose more clearly the man, his defeatist temperament, his deep integrity, and his curious, moody aloofness from the social life around him. He has been almost a hermit leader with a sad and terrible sincerity which gave him somehow tremendous power both in his home State and in the United States Senate.

Libraries in the Contemporary Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. TOBEY

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 23 (legislative day of Wednesday, October 4), 1939

ADDRESS BY ARCHIBALD MacLEISH AT PITTSBURGH, PA.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by the Librarian of Congress, Archibald MacLeish, on Founders' Day, at Carnegie Institute, Pittsburgh, Pa., October 19, 1939. The address is entitled "Libraries in the Contemporary Crisis."

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I have known for some months that I was going to have the honor of speaking to you this evening. But it was not until 5 days ago that I learned what I was expected to say. Five days ago I was sitting more or less comfortably at a luncheon table in an Annapolis hotel, with my attention wholly given to the ice cream, when the learned and distinguished gentleman on my left informed me that the new Librarian of Congress was on the point of rising and delivering a speech. When I asked him what the new Librarian of Congress was on the point of rising and delivering a speech about, he said, "That's easy. There is only one thing these people want to know about you. They want to know why on earth you did it."

It is an interesting question. Or rather, it is two interesting questions. The first is a question interesting to that minority—an excessively small minority if the sales of my books are correctly reported—which likes to read my verse. To these rare people—rare in every sense of the term—the question means "Why on earth did you take a job as librarian which will leave you little or no time for your own work?" The second question is a question interesting apparently to a very much larger number of my fellow citizens, but interesting in a somewhat different way. When the New York Herald Tribune asked the new Librarian of Congress why on earth he did it, the New York Herald

Tribune was not concerned for the unwritten verse of A. MacLeish. The question as the Herald Tribune asked it meant, "Why on earth did you take a job for which you are so patently unfitted?"

But interesting though the question is, I doubt if I shall attempt to answer it. There are two persuasive reasons. As asked by the Herald Tribune the question is not answerable—and is not meant to be. As asked by the readers of my books it is answerable only at the cost of a personal history which you would find both long and dull.

There is, however, a question under this question, or within this question, or behind this question, which I should like to try to answer. It is a question addressed not to me but to all men of responsibility. And it is a question which concerns not a particular librarian but the librarians of the Nation.

If you object that I have been a librarian for 2 weeks only and that I know nothing about libraries and that I should therefore not attempt to talk about libraries, I can only reply that the first statement is true, and that the second statement is true, but that the third statement is not true. For some months the librarians of the country have been talking quite freely about me without knowing anything about me. It is only fair that I should reciprocate.

Moreover, ignorance has never stopped the mouths of lecturers. On the contrary, American notions of American poetry are almost wholly formed by people who, if they spoke only out of knowledge, would not speak at all. For one Louis Untermeyer who will patiently present to his audiences the important poetry of our generation in this country—the poetry of Pound and Eliot and Sandburg and Frost and Cummings and Crane—there are a hundred enlighteners of the people who not only do not understand the greater part of the work of these poets but are not even certain, of their own knowledge, that it exists.

There is no doubt that I am ignorant of American libraries. American writers generally are unaware of American libraries except as imposing frontages on important streets, and the fault, I may add, is not altogether with the writers. But ignorant though I am, I have several precedents for speech. And I have also a compelling reason—the reason more compelling than any other—the reason of time.

Our age, as many men have noticed, is an age characterized by the tyranny of time. Never more than at this moment was that tyranny evident. Those of us who are concerned, for whatever reason, with the preservation of the civilization and the inherited culture of this Nation find ourselves in a situation in which time is running out not like the sand in a glass but like the blood in an opened artery. There is still time left to us. But we can foresee and foresee clearly the moment when there will be none.

I do not like epigrammatic condensations of history. I do not like analyses of life which present its situations on the brutal balance of an "either" and an "or." But it seems to me no less than exact to say that the situation which now confronts us in this country is a situation which must be expressed in just these terms.

We face a situation which has an "either" and which has an "or," and we will choose to fail or to choose between them. Whichever we do, we will have chosen. For the failure to choose in the world we live in is itself a choice.

The "either," as I see it, is the education of the people of this country. The "or" is fascism. We will either educate the people of this Republic to know, and, therefore, to value and, therefore, to preserve their own democratic culture, or we will watch the people of this Republic trade their democratic culture for the nonculture the obscurantism, the superstitution, the brutality, the tyranny which is overrunning eastern and central and southern Europe.

Others, I will admit, see the alternatives in different terms. Six and seven years ago at the bottom of the depression, American intellectuals saw the American progress as a race between economic reform and violent revolution. Economics, as you will recall, was then the one, the true religion which explained everything. If you made the economic machine operate, you made everything operate; if you didn't make the economic machine operate everything collapsed. The "either" in those days was economic salvation; the "or" was social ruin. That, however, was before Herr Hitler had demonstrated that men could be led against their economic interests as well as against their spiritual interests if the propaganda was good enough.

Another, and a still popular definition of the American alternatives was, and is, the definition which puts Americanism on one side and a conspiracy of evil on the other. The nature of the conspiracy depends on the angle of observation. To certain good Americans the conspirators are the Communists. There was, and there still is, some disagreement as to what a Communist is (and some of the disagreement is honest), but there is no disagreement as to the general theory. The theory is that America is all right and the Americans are all right and everything else would be all right if only the Communists could be prevented from spreading their insidious propaganda and wrecking the country. It is not, I think you will agree, a very flattering picture of America despite the fact that it is a picture offered by those who are loudest in their protestations of love for the country. It implies that the Americanism of the rest of the Americans is so shaky and insecure, and the appeal to them of Communist dogma is so seductive that only by stopping American ears with legal wax and strapping American arms with legal thongs can American democracy be preserved. I for one have never been impressed by the sincerity of those whose eagerness to save American democracy is so great that they would gladly destroy all the American guaranties of freedom to ask, freedom to answer, freedom to think, and freedom to speak, which make American democracy democratic. I more than half suspect that it is not America but some other institution, something very different, something very much smaller, very much less admirable, these people really wish to save.

But the self-appointed guardians of America have not been the only ones to see the American situation as a conspiracy of the forces of evil. The people they hate most, the Communists themselves, take exactly the same position. They take it, however, with this difference: That the conspiracy as the Communists see it is a conspiracy of evil persons from the other end of the political rainbow. The Communist conspirators are conspirators who meet in bankers' dens furnished with black-leather armchairs and boxes of Habana stogies to plot the ruin of the people.

The shallowness and romanticism of both these pictures of the contemporary crisis are obvious. No one of 12-year intelligence who really thinks about it believes for one moment that American democracy is endangered by conspiracies—least of all by conspiracies like these. If there is any danger in this direction, it is the danger introduced by those who talk about these alleged conspiracies; not by those who theoretically take part. For the only effect of such romantic talk is to distract the attention of the citizens from the actual situation. Those who shout that America is threatened by the "reds" prevent a certain number of their fellow citizens from considering soberly and quietly what it is that really threatens America And those, on the other side, who attribute all our dangers to a Wall Street conspiracy to corrupt the Army and take over the Government, divert the minds of their listeners from the much less romantic but much more disturbing truth.

For the truth is that the threat to free culture and democratic civilization in the United States is the threat not of any person and not of any group of persons but of a condition. Those who, like myself, assert that the threat to a free culture and a democratic civilization in this country is the threat of fascism do not mean by that word what the Communist Party meant by it, or pretended to mean by it, before the Russo-German pact. Those who, like myself, assert that the threat to democratic civilization in this country is the threat of fascism mean that the culture of the Republic is threatened by the existence in the United States of the kind of situation which has produced fascism elsewhere, and that that situation in the United States has already given indications, human and other, of developing in the known direction. In the same way those who say that the alternative to fascism is education do not mean that democracy can be saved by educating the people to see conspirators under the bed, but that democracy can be saved by educating the people to value the kind of life democracy makes possible.

The situation which has produced fascism elsewhere, and which threatens to produce fascism here, is a situation with which education can deal, because it is a situation which failure of education has created. The situation which produced fascism in Germany and in Italy, and which threatens to produce fascism here, is a situation the historical background of which is clear enough. The industrial revolution, with its need for specialized labor, created a new economic class, the so-called lower middle class, above and distinct from the masses of the people who labor with their hands. The capitalist money system, with its tendency to squeeze society into pyramidal forms, froze this new-made class into the social order. The result was to suspend a great mass of people in a kind of limbo just above brute labor, just below comfort and decency and self-respect. Freed on the one side from the discipline of labor by the hand, they were excluded on the other from the discipline of labor by the head. Deprived on the one side of the realism, the hard-headedness, the piety, the traditional human wisdom, the salt sense, the kindness of those who labor the earth and the earth's metals with their bodies, they were equally deprived on the other of that different kindness, that different knowledge, that different wisdom of those whose life is in the mind.

They were, in other words, a class for which the old education of habit and custom had been broken, and for which a new education of intelligence and reason had not been supplied. Fascism is the image of that fact. When this class, driven to revolt by the failures of the economic system which had created it, put forward its leaders—its Mussolinis and its Hitlers—it conducted itself precisely as a class so deserted by the culture of its society might be expected to conduct itself.

The reason why fascism is so brutal, so vulgar, so envious, so superstitious, so childish, so shrewd, is that these are the characteristics of a social class excluded from the moral and emotional and intellectual traditions of its society. The reason why fascism makes flags and parades its symbols is that no other symbols are moving to those who have not been allowed to inherit the culture of their past. The reason why fascism makes war and hate its aim is that those out of whose misery fascism is created are men incapable of imagining any other ends except the ends of hate and war.

But the fact, the evident fact, the fact which must at all times be held in view in the United States, is the fact that fascism is the image of a condition, not the invention of a man, and that the condition which has created fascism in Europe may very easily create fascism here, unless we act, and act now, to prevent it. And the question, the always asking question, the question which history presents to us, and will continue to present to us, no matter how we close our eyes or turn our minds away,

is the question how we shall act? Shall we turn our attention to the war in Europe and do what we can to encourage those who are fighting fascism there? Shall we organize patriotic displays at home and punish those who preach fascism directly or indirectly here? Or shall we, as honestly as we can and as directly as we can and as effectively as we can, attempt to change by education the condition from which fascism results?

To my mind, there is no doubt as to the answer we should give. I am aware, I think, of some, at least, of the difficulties. I am aware that the immediate forces which drive the intellectually and culturally dispossessed into fascism are economic forces and that education is not an altogether adequate answer to those who ask for a chance to work usefully and creatively and to fulfill their lives. I am aware also that there are people in the United States who do not wish to admit that there are large numbers of their fellow citizens who have been excluded from the American tradition and the American culture. But I think, notwithstanding these difficulties and objections and many others, that we have no choice but to make use of the one effective weapon we know ourselves to possess. If we respect prejudice because it calls itself patriotism, we are poor patriots. If we wait for the economic restoration of a world at war, we will wait too long. As things are, in the world as it is, we can either attempt to educate the people of this country—all the people of this country—to the value of the democratic tradition they have inherited, and so admit them to its enjoyment, or we can watch some of the people of this country destroy that tradition for all the rest.

It is this issue, as I see it, which is presented to American libraries, for it is upon American libraries that the burden of this education must fall. It cannot fall upon the schools. There is no longer time to await the education of a new generation which will come in due course to a more enlightened maturity. It cannot be left to the newspapers or the magazines, however earnest their protestations of honesty and disinterestedness. There are honest publishers, but there are no disinterested publishers and there never will be.

It cannot, even more obviously, be left to the moving pictures or the radio. The radio's notion of disinterestedness is equal time to both sides, regardless of the sides; the moving picture's notion of disinterestedness is silence. But this burden can be entrusted to The libraries. The libraries and the libraries alone can carry it. The libraries alone are capable of acting directly upon the present adult generation. The libraries alone are staffed by people whose disinterestedness is beyond suspicion. And though there are occasional directors of libraries and boards of library trustees who will stoop to the exclusion of books which offend their social or political or economic preconceptions—books, let us say, like The Grapes of Wrath—the directors and trustees of libraries are in general men with the highest sense of their duties to their institutions and their country. The libraries, in brief, are the only institutions in the United States capable of dealing with the contemporary crisis in American life in terms and under conditions which give promise of success. They are the only institutions in American life capable of opening to the citizens of the Republic a knowledge of the wealth and richness of the culture which a century and a half of democratic life has produced.

That fact is a fact which should properly fill the librarians of this country with a sense of pride. But it is a fact also which should fill them with a sense of responsibility. For at the present moment, as librarians themselves have been the first to admit, they are not opening that knowledge and that understanding to the citizens of the Republic. The American Library Association has this year published a small but most important, as well as most readable, study of American librarianship by Wilhelm Munthe, director of the University Library at Oslo, in which the achievements of American libraries in this direction are analyzed. According to such studies and surveys as he found available, Dr. Munthe concludes that in "an ordinary good library town" the library card holders comprise some 25 to 30 percent of the population; that half of these are school children; that of the remaining adult card holders "a large portion never use their cards"; that of the remainder of that remainder 50 percent are high-school students, 21 percent are housewives, 2½ percent are businessmen, 5 percent are clerks, 5 percent are skilled labor, and 5 percent are unskilled labor. In other words, clerks, businessmen, and laborers using the library in an "ordinary good library town" amount altogether to less than a fifth of an undetermined portion of 15 percent of the population. This figure, says Dr. Munthe, "is amazingly low." One admires his restraint.

The truth seems to be that American libraries have executed magnificently the first half of their assignment, as that assignment was defined some 50 years ago by my distinguished predecessor in the Library of Congress. They have solved with great brilliance the problem of getting books for readers. They have developed practices of accession, of cataloging, of classification, which enable them to secure books intelligently and to make them readily available to inquirers. But they have not executed the second half of their assignment. They have not learned how to get readers for books. The typical American library borrower can still be described by a friendly but informed and intelligent European in Dr. Munthe's words: "A woman, of 23½ years, with 3 years of high school, who borrows in the course of a month four modern novels of no particular worth, one really good novel, and one popular biography or entertaining travel account." And who are her authors? As Dr. Munthe tells us: "We can safely say that they are not the ones whose names will some day be cut in marble on the face of library buildings. They are people like Berta Ruck, Zane Grey, and Kathleen Norris. * * * Authors with troublesome or radical ideas are definitely avoided."

If the learned doctor is right, the libraries of America have a tremendous distance to go before they can feel that they have found the readers their books deserve. But it is not a journey they must make alone. Behind them, far back but still livingly there, are the men who created the American library system—men like the man in whose memory this day is celebrated. Besides them are the many still alive—writers, teachers, lovers of American liberty—to whom the education of the people for the preservation of their culture is the best and most hopeful undertaking open to our time: The many who believe as I do that we can either educate the people of this Republic to know and therefore to value and therefore to preserve their own democratic culture, or we can watch the people of this Republic trade their democratic culture for the ignorance and the prejudice and the hate of which the just and proper name is fascism.

These are the alternatives our time presents us. They are not alternatives which will remain forever open. We may accept them now or lose them now. "History," says Wystan Auden—

> "History to the defeated
> "Can say Alas, but cannot help or pardon."

History can say Alas to this American civilization of ours as well as to any other. Unless we save it. Unless we act, not only with our words but with our minds, to save it.

Lessons from Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 23 (legislative day of Wednesday, October 4), 1939

ADDRESS BY HON. LOUIS JOHNSON

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, during the course of the debate today I asked and obtained unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address by Hon. Louis Johnson, Assistant Secretary of War, before the joint convention of the International Association of Casualty and Surety Underwriters and the National Association of Casualty and Surety Agents, at White Sulphur Springs, W. Va., on the subject "Lessons from Poland."

The address is as follows:

Ladies and gentlemen, fortunate, indeed, are we who meet here in good fellowship, in a blessed land remote from the war, the strife, the chaos, and the destruction that sweep over Europe and Asia. I doubt whether a meeting of this kind would be possible today anywhere but in America.

We drove to the hotel by automobile without concern about the oil supply of our country. We dared lift our eyes to the heavens without dread of a shower of deadly bombs. We walked calmly into the lobby without gas masks slung over our shoulders. We partook abundantly of food without the presentation of any ration card. We exchanged freely of our ideas without fear of snooping informers. We turned on our lights without fear of a possible blackout. On our way out, we may buy a newspaper without a feeling that it deliberately distorts the truth. We will listen to our radio without risk of concentration camp or firing squad. We will go to sleep secure in our faith in our neighbors, in our Government, and in our institutions.

From the war and the strife that tear Europe and Asia to bits, we still are far removed, not as far as we were before the advent of the long-range bomber and of the protracted cruising submarine, but still far enough for some sense of security. From the causes of such conflagration, we are even further separated. We are not a land-locked nation. We are not hungry for territory. We do not covet others' riches. We have no imperialistic designs. We have no minorities. We have no ambition to foist an ideology on any other people. We have no desire to quarrel with anyone. War, we hate and abhor.

Despite our relative isolation from the wars overseas and their causes, we enjoy no insulation against their portents. We have not forgotten the repercussions that followed a shot in an obscure corner of Europe in 1914 and we must do all in our power to prevent Danzig from becoming another Sarajevo in the history of our country.

We must recognize that affairs in Europe do have a tremendous influence on life in America. From Munich we learned the significance of air power as a threat to world peace and set out to put

our own air defenses in order. Let us now analyze the recent success of German arms in Poland and try to learn therefrom some valuable lessons toward keeping our own territory inviolate and our own rights secure.

Polish territory was overrun in the first place because Polish M day troops were not ready. If the Poles could have had 60 days they would have been able to complete their mobilization and to make a decent showing against their enemy, but Herr Hitler gave no time. Sixty days and a blitzkrieg were inconsistent with each other. Germany was ready for immediate action. She threw her well-prepared battalions into battle at once and the Poles, brave, but outnumbered, suffered defeat in the early stages of the campaign from which they never were able to recover.

We, too, have M day troops and in an emergency they, too, would not be ready. They are our minutemen, our present Regulars and National Guard men, approximately 400,000 in number. If called out today, they would find themselves faced with shortages of combat cars, tanks, machine guns, gas masks, fire-control instruments, and other necessities.

Thanks to the leadership of the President and to the patriotic response of the last Congress, steps have been taken to remedy many of these defects. We have been given money for munitions. We have received appropriations to educate industry in the manufacture of some of the critical items that are not in ordinary use. Despite these constructive steps, we still lack a full supply for our M day troops. Industry is not yet educated to manufacture all of our needs. There is a wide gap between the contract for an item and its actual delivery. There is a long time lag between the placing of an educational order and the readiness of a plant to go into mass production. Besides, when the last Congress was in session, we spoke of M day troops to the number of 400,000 but in the light of present conditions, even the most conservative estimate a need for 600,000.

Based on the experience of Poland, we, therefore, should resolve that our M day forces, once their number is determined, be wholly equipped with all necessary weapons and supplies ready to respond to call at a moment's notice.

The second reason for Poland's debacle is found in the extent of her frontier, which spread over hundreds of miles. To protect herself against invasion she felt that all of her boundaries had to be guarded. On the north she was threatened from East Prussia and the sea; on the west, by Germany; on the south, by Slovakia; and on the east, by Russia; and she lacked the men and the munitions to make a stand on such a far-flung frontier.

The responsibilities of our Army and our Navy in the Western Hemisphere are widely flung. Years ago the Monroe Doctrine pledged us to protect America from Point Barrow to Tierra del Fuego against invasion by any foreign power. The cooperative agreement of today, reached at Lima and at Panama, requires us to be ready to do our part in the defense of the institutions of the Western Hemisphere. Voluntarily, we have assumed this duty. If need be, we must be ready to exercise it. To do so effectively, we need military and naval forces commensurate with our grave responsibilities. In the world of today words and threats, if not backed by force, may have little or no effect upon the conduct of nations. We dare not bluff and have someone "call" us.

We should take steps, therefore, to build up our Army and our Navy so that they may be strong enough to maintain and give reality to our hemisphere policy. We must stand ready to join in protecting the hemisphere should occasion arise.

The Polish campaign has its lessons in tactics and strategy. It shows the extreme danger of permitting an enemy to carry out flanking operations. It emphasizes the need of echeloning forces in depth, adherence to these sound doctrines might have checked the surge of the German hordes.

As for our own tactics and strategy and our own officers, I doubt whether any army in the world has a more intelligent and better trained staff in the theory of warfare than we have today. Note I said theory. As to practice, most of them are untried. Those of World War experience are but few. Peacetime maneuvers until recently had been sadly neglected. In the exercises of this year the lack of training in command in the field made itself conspicuously felt.

This defect we must correct. We must provide for adequate training and annual maneuvers involving full strength units. Our officers and our noncommissioned officers, who are trained under the finest military school system in the world, must get the necessary drill in the field to augment their classroom training.

The principal cause of Poland's defeat, it is fair to say, lay in the complete supremacy of Germany in the modern weapons of war. In aviation Poland was hopelessly outclassed. At the opening of hostilities, German planes set out to achieve two objectives: First, to clear the sky of enemy planes; and, second, to destroy its airdromes. The very first day 11 towns in Poland where airdromes were located were severely bombarded. The second day, pressure on Polish planes decreased, and on airdromes it increased. At the end of 3 days, the Polish air force, for practical purposes, had disappeared. When not attacking airdromes, the German planes were busy destroying depots, railheads, bridges, and interrupting communications, practices which they continued throughout the campaign.

Germany's pre-war estimate of her air capabilities had proved correct. Her threat had proved itself no mere bluff. When Poland called, Germany had a handful of aces and plenty to spare for possible use in other theaters of operations. Air power has become as dominant a factor in warfare as even its most enthusiastic proponents had prophesied.

The lesson to us already had come home. We sensed the full significance of airplanes at the time of Munich, and we received appropriations from Congress to expand our Army Air Corps to reach a balanced force of 5,500 planes by June 1941.

When Congress adjourned, 5,500 planes seemed a satisfactory number and June 1941 appeared a safe interval; but history was made last month and we must keep abreast of developments. Our Air Corps must become an M day force, ready at the outbreak of hostilities to thwart any attack against us from the skies.

We must have skilled operators to fly the planes, trained combat crews to man them, experienced mechanics to maintain them, efficient equipment to protect them, ample bases to support them, experimental facilities to improve them, and men of outstanding leadership to command them. Toward the achievement of these objectives the Army must now give its full attention.

Returning to the campaign in Poland, we find that in mechanization, Germany held the same degree of supremacy as in aviation. Her heavy mechanized forces rolled across the roads and the fields, outflanking and out-maneuvering the Poles at every turn. When the forces met head-on, the Poles, without adequate antitank weapons, were helpless.

How about our own tanks, our combat cars, and our antitank weapons? Had our mechanized units met the German Panzers we would have been outnumbered in combat cars, in light tanks, and in medium tanks. Against them, we could raise but a few antitank guns. We have not even one full-strength mechanized brigade. In Poland alone, Germany used 10 Panzer divisions.

Our mechanization program has only gotten under way in the last few months but we must exert every effort to hasten its realization. Our Army must be manned, trained, and equipped to face any modern mechanized force.

Finally, Poland failed because she placed too much faith in others. She put her trust in Jupiter Pluvius because he always arrived in torrents in early fall, but this year he failed to keep his appointment. She was confident that her strength lay largely in her Allies but their ground forces were stymied by concrete and steel walls and their planes by the total destruction of the Polish airdromes.

In our country, too, there are men and women who look upon the oceans as allies and upon another's navy as our first line of defense. But the oceans are shrinking. The long-range bomber is a growing threat. The far-cruising submarine lurks in our very waters. The navies of other nations are too busy with their own problems.

No, we should depend on no one but ourselves. We should make ourselves so strong on land, on sea, and in the air that potential enemies will stop, look, and listen before trying to invade our territory or to violate our rights as a nation or as individuals.

Long before the Germans invaded Poland, President Roosevelt had sensed the impending course of world events. From history and experience, he had learned that nations heading for war always attack where they expect the least resistance.

To minimize the dangers of attack against America, he proposed, therefore, that we build a navy second to none and of sufficient strength to meet our duties and our obligations. He called for an air corps, expanded to meet our present-day requirements. He demanded an army equipped for modern battle. He asked for cooperation between our armed forces and industry so that the full economic reserves of our country could be used to best advantage in times of emergency.

Behind the President's national defense plans, conceived before the present European conflagration, there has stood a united people. Today, in his efforts to keep us out of war, we must continue to give him our wholehearted support. America calls for united efforts in every phase of our national life. United, we can go a long way to keep out of war. United, we can resist and defeat any foe that would dare trespass against us.

Neutrality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM CONNALLY

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 23 (legislative day of Wednesday, October 4), 1939

EDITORIAL BY PETER MOLYNEAUX

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Texas Weekly, by Mr. Peter Molyneaux, editor and publisher. Mr. Molyneaux is a very distinguished and outstanding editor, and this is a very able article from his pen.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Texas Weekly of October 14, 1939]

If Finland must fight to maintain its independence and freedom, if this valiant little nation is compelled to defend itself against Russia, and thus becomes a "belligerent" in the war, the President of the United States, under the provisions of the Embargo Act, must immediately issue a proclamation forbidding any American from selling it any of the arms, ammunition, or instruments of war enumerated in that act. And the United States Government must impose heavy penalties on any of its citizens who violate the terms of that proclamation in any way. Finland has a population of about 3,800,000, a little more than half as much as Texas. Sweden, the only country that is in a position to give Finland effective aid promptly, has a population of about 6,300,000, slightly more than Texas. Norway has about 3,000,000 population, and Denmark has about 3,750,000. If these three Scandinavian countries should support Finland, their combined population, added to Finland's, would be about 16,850,000, or about half as much as the population of Poland at the time Hitler sent his ruthless armies across her borders. Russia has 10 times as much population as Finland, Sweden, Norway, and Denmark together. Finland will fight rather than surrender its independence and freedom, and it is practically certain that the three other Scandinavian countries will support Finland in such a fight. But their resources are limited, and England and France are engaged in a death struggle with Germany, supported by Russia and possibly by Italy. A war between these Scandinavian countries and Russia would be an unequal one at best. They would be outnumbered by more than 10 to 1, and their combined resources would be very small compared to those of Russia. Under international law, neutral countries have an unquestioned right to permit any belligerent country, to say nothing of a little country like Finland, fighting for its life, to purchase within their borders such arms and instruments of war as it may need. But the American people have forbidden the United States Government to permit anything of the kind. The American people, in this way, have made the world less safe for small, self-governing peoples. They have thus helped to make the world less safe for democracy. In this way they have abandoned completely, absolutely repudiated, the cause for which Americans died in a foreign land in 1917 and 1918. To be sure, the United States Government has had its representative at Moscow to say to the dictatorial Government of Soviet Russia that it hopes nothing will happen to disturb the peaceful relations existing between Russia and Finland. But the Russian dictator knows that this is merely a pious hope; that if it is ignored, nothing will happen.

The United States will do nothing to help Finland. On the contrary, while so long as Finland is not attacked it will permit Americans to sell it all the arms it can pay for (and it pays for what it buys); the moment it is attacked and its need for such things becomes greater, the United States will deny Finland even this small right. Nothing could illustrate more strikingly the unanswerable argument made by Senator TOM CONNALLY, of Texas, on the floor of the Senate that the Embargo Act favors the strong aggressor against the weak country it attacks. The cases of Estonia, of Latvia, and of Lithuania had already illustrated it—the helplessness of the weak in a world in which strong nations like the United States care nothing at all about what happens to them. But Finland, a country which Americans profess to admire, illustrates it more strikingly. It may be, to be sure, that Russia, for its own reasons and for altogether different considerations, may decide not to attack Finland. It may be that Finland, knowing its weakness in the kind of a world that exists today, will make sufficient concessions to postpone Russian aggression for the time being. It may be that Russia may fear an active war with England and France, in spite of the fact that those two countries already have their hands full in their struggle with Germany, and will not press demands upon Finland. But the fact will remain that the independence of Finland has been menaced by a ruthless power, and that if it should be attacked, the United States would refuse to sell it the necessary instruments of defense, even if Finland sent its own ships or the ships of other countries to transport them.

Another point, illustrating the advantage which the arms embargo gives to the strong aggressor country against the weak victim, is the fact that it permits the strong country to buy from the United States all the raw materials of all kinds that it may wish, and to use its superior manpower to manufacture such materials into munitions and instruments of war. If Finland is attacked by Russia, the Russian Government will be permitted to buy here all the materials it may need to manufacture arms and ammunition, airplanes, war tanks, and the like, and to put its teeming millions to work turning these materials into the finished products.

Finland, on the other hand, will need every able-bodied man, whatever his age, to take a place in the ranks. Every man who is set to work manufacturing the instruments of defense will be one man less in its small army. This situation will exist in the case of every small country that is menaced by a stronger and larger one. In such a world no small country can be free. It has no choice but either to submit to any demand made upon it by the strong country or to be overrun and destroyed as Czechoslovakia and Poland were overrun and destroyed. If the Arms Embargo Act protected the United States against the danger of war, there might be some justification for it, in spite of such consequences as these. But it does nothing of the kind. Germany, for example, in prosecuting its submarine warfare, draws no distinction between arms and the materials out of which arms may be manufactured. Whatever danger may be involved in selling airplanes or armored trucks to belligerents is equally involved in selling gasoline and fuel oil and even cotton to belligerents. This danger can be mitigated by restricting the rights of our merchant vessels to deliver such goods to belligerents and the rights of our citizens to travel the seas. Such restrictions would be of much greater economic disadvantage to the American people than the prohibition of the sale of arms. But it would minimize the danger of involving us in the war, and on that ground would be justified. But the prohibition of the sale of arms does not minimize this danger, and it has no such justification. But it does give the aggressor country, with immense manpower to spare to manufacture the implements of war from American materials, a great advantage over its weak victim. And it does this without increasing the security of the United States in the slightest degree. On the contrary, because it does this it increases the danger of our involvement in war, because of its effect upon public sentiment in the United States. Nothing can get the United States into war but the indignant sentiment of the American people, and to place them in the position of helping the aggressor against its victim in this way is to generate such indignant sentiment.

Falsified history is the infirm foundation on which the whole argument of the supporters of the arms embargo is reared. Take away this foundation and the argument collapses. This false version of history sets forth that the United States went into the last war to protect its trade in arms and munitions. That is simply an unmitigated lie. A man died the other day who knew as only few men knew that it is a lie. That man was Count von Bernstorff, German Ambassador to the United States from 1914 to 1917, who devoted all his time, day and night, during those years to untiring efforts to keep the United States out of the World War. Here is what he said about why the United States went into the war: "My task was done when the *Lusitania* incident was disposed of without America's entry into the war. After that the question of peace or war depended not on me but upon the Wilhelmstrasse and the great army headquarters. They knew exactly that a repetition of the *Lusitania* incident or the unlimited extension of submarine warfare would automatically mean war with the United States. But they would not listen." And what was the *Lusitania* incident? It was the sinking of a British passenger steamer by a German submarine without warning, causing the death of 1,198 persons, including 124 Americans. Those 124 Americans and others like them had taken passage on the *Lusitania*, in spite of advertisements in American newspapers in which the German Embassy warned them not to do so. They had a perfect right, under international law, to travel on that ship, but because they exercised this right, the German Government drowned them on the high seas. That incident caused such a wave of indignation to sweep over America that it was almost a miracle that the United States did not enter the war at once. But the American Government did not want to plunge its people into war if it could help it. So when the Imperial German Government solemnly promised that such a thing would not be repeated, the American Government accepted that pledge, with the notice to the German Government that its violation would mean war.

Well, on January 31, 1917, the German Government caused Count von Bernstorff to notify the Government of the United States that, beginning the next day, unrestricted submarine warfare would be resumed, and that even American ships entering a specified zone would be sunk. The United States immediately broke off diplomatic relations with Germany, and when American ships were sunk, the United States declared a state of war to exist with Germany in response to the demand of an overwhelming public sentiment. This is true history and it contrasts sharply with the falsified history on which supporters of the arms embargo base their argument.

Why did we go to war? Because the German Government denied to our ships and our citizens the right to travel on the seas in zones prescribed by that Government, and enforced that edict by sinking our ships and drowning our citizens. We went to war because public sentiment among the American people insisted that we should not surrender this right and because of public indignation over the sinking of our ships and the drowning of our citizens. In going to war, the American Government obeyed the overwhelming will of the American people. The action had nothing to do with our war trade. But even if it did, our war trade prior to 1917 consisted chiefly of the sale to the belligerents of things that are not now included in the embargo. We can still sell most of the things that we sold to belligerents prior to 1917 without violating even the spirit of the embargo proclamation. We didn't sell much arms and ammunition, because we were not large manufacturers of arms and ammunition when the war broke out, and were only beginning to expand such manufacture when we went into the war. We didn't sell many airplanes or armored motor trucks for the same reason. But aside from this, the bulk of our trade was in other things, particularly in foodstuffs, cotton, and the like. If it was our war trade that got us into the war, if we went in to protect it, there is nothing in the Arms Embargo Act to prevent this from happening again. Because we can have quite as much war trade, and even more today, under the arms embargo as we had between 1914 and 1917. And German submarines will sink ships carrying wheat and cotton to England quite as quickly as they will sink ships carrying munitions.

The Nazi Government has already announced that anything that can be converted into munitions or instruments of war is included in its definition of munitions. It has sunk neutral ships carrying

lumber and wood pulp on that ground within the past few weeks. And the arms embargo does not prohibit the sale of such things to belligerents. As a matter of fact, as the law stands today, such things can be delivered to belligerent countries on American ships manned by American citizens without violating the law. What got us into the war in 1917 can get us into this war without violating the arms embargo. It was the sinking of American ships and the drowning of American citizens that aroused public sentiment in the United States sufficiently to cause them to enter the war. It was not our trade in anything, our sale of anything to belligerents, whether prohibited by the arms embargo or not, that aroused the American people in this way. And let it be repeated over and over again that only the aroused sentiment of the American people can get us into the present war.

We will go in again if an overwhelming sentiment of the American people demands that we go in. That is the thing we must concern ourselves about if we really want to stay out of this war. No law of any kind can keep us out of it if the American people demand that we get into it. And that is why the Embargo Act, while not increasing our security a bit, is a dangerous act. We have pointed out before that the sentiment of the American people is overwhelmingly in favor of England and France and against Hitler in this war. And we have said, and we repeat it now, that if the Embargo Act is not repealed at this session, it will be repealed later in response to the demand of an angry and indignant public sentiment. Well, what shall be said of the situation that will arise if Russia attacks Finland, and Finland becomes a belligerent? How long will the American people stand for a measure that favors Russia against Finland? And if this measure is not repealed in time, might it not generate an increasing degree of indignation and resentment and therefore increase the danger of our getting into the war? We think so. And that's why we think the cash-and-carry measure should be substituted for the embargo without delay.

Drafting Money in Time of War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SHERMAN MINTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 23 (legislative day of Wednesday, October 4), 1939

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. JOSH LEE, OF OKLAHOMA

Mr. MINTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix a statement made by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. LEE] during a radio debate held on October 22, 1939, over the Mutual Broadcasting System, sponsored by the American Forum of the Air on the subject, Should the Government Draft Money as Well as Men in Case of War?"

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Ladies and gentlemen, this bill does not propose to deal with war profiteering in the field of commerce and industry. It has to do only with the financing of war, and the prevention of profits in that field.

EXPLANATION OF BILL

In the first place, bear in mind that this proposal does not provide for the seizure of property. It provides for raising money by a series of bond issues. Money would be raised only as it would be needed.

How did we finance the last war? It was by the sale of Government bonds. This plan for financing war is just like the plan we used in the World War, with three major exceptions. First, the purchase of bonds is mandatory; second, each individual must buy according to his ability to buy; and third, there can be no profits.

It is important to realize at this point that there is not enough ready cash in the United States today to finance a major war. Consequently, we must utilize credit. When we think of the wealth of America, we must think in terms of land, buildings, factories, and goods. Therefore, any proposal to draft the wealth of the United States must provide the means of translating that wealth into credit, and borrowing that credit and then provide the means of translating that credit into cash. The proposal we are debating tonight does just that.

Let us see how this plan would work. Suppose a man worth $100,000 has a factory. Suppose he has no cash, or what little he has he needs for operating his business. Now, because he has no available cash, would anyone argue that he should not buy any war bonds at all, although he is worth $100,000? I believe all will agree that he should buy some war bonds. Then should we leave the amount he is to buy to his patriotism, or to a high-pressure committee, or to his desire for profits on the bonds? You will agree with me that none of these are fair criteria for the amount of credit that he should lend to the Government.

But under the proposed plan we establish a definite schedule very similar to the graduated income-tax schedule which would determine exactly the amount that he should lend as his proportionate share of the money to be raised. For example, a bond issue that would require a man worth $10,000 to lend $90 would require a man worth $100,000 to lend $1,890.

In case the individual has difficulty in raising ready cash, the bill provides that the Government may accept his note, bearing a commercial rate of interest and secured by his property, in return for the bonds. The Government may then convert this note into cash either by selling it or by issuing money against it. Since the note would be amply secured, the money would be sound.

In this manner the Government could make liquid the nonliquid wealth of America without placing undue strain upon any individual and without issuing one single dollar that was not backed by a dollar's worth of property.

OBJECTIONS ANSWERED

Now I wish to answer some objections to this. The War Department said in effect that a war, to be successful, must have the support of the people, and if it has the support of the people it would not be necessary to draft money. But why wouldn't that argument be just as good against drafting men? But the War Department is not depending upon the voluntary system of enlistment. On the contrary, it has a carefully worked out plan for drafting men.

The Navy Department's objection is that a system for drafting capital might cause a delay in raising money. Why couldn't that same argument be made against the selective draft of men? It takes time to set in motion the machinery for raising an army of men by the selective-draft system, but when you get it operating you have system instead of chaos. It would take no longer to file the reports and classify the people according to their net wealth than to classify the boys according to their availability and fitness for service.

The Treasury Department objects to the bill because of the difficulty of defining wealth. But we know there is wealth and we know what it is without splitting hairs over the definition of it. It is true that some property might have a sentimental value to the owner, but such values are determined every day by the courts.

It is easier to define wealth than it is for the local boards to determine which boys must go in the first call and which ones must go in the second call and the third and the fourth and fifth calls. If we can determine these human values it is idle to argue that we cannot determine a matter of dollars and cents.

Every person must define wealth before he can get a loan at a bank. He has to submit a financial statement listing his assets and liabilities, and no one raises the question of defining net wealth.

These form-letter objections present no valid arguments against this legislation. Then why don't those who are opposed to this measure have the courage to come out boldly and say, that to them, money is more sacred than men?

REMOVES PROFIT INCENTIVE

The passage of this measure would remove the profit incentive from the financing of war. Mr. Pearson, of the Treasury Department, informed me that up to 1934 we had paid over $12,000,000,000 in interest on the war bonds alone. But we cannot reach this war profit by taxation because the bonds are tax exempt.

But under the proposed plan, instead of holding out the tempting incentive of tax exemption and high interest rates for the use of money, it would say to the Wall Street bankers, "If the United States goes to war, you will be compelled to finance it, and that not at a profit." This would exert a tremendous influence against war.

STRENGTHEN OUR NATIONAL DEFENSE

But if war were forced upon us, this measure would strengthen our national defense by mobilizing our financial resources.

When the voluntary system of financing war breaks down, as it always does when the war lasts long enough, governments turn to the printing presses for money with the disastrous results that always follow the issuance of fiat money.

Germany completely destroyed her monetary system by issuing unsecured paper money. The worthless Confederate currency of the South and the depreciated "greenbacks" of the North remind us of the desperate efforts of those two governments to continue fighting after the voluntary system of financing had broken down.

Financial resources have been referred to as the "sinews of war." At least, we know that two things are essential to win a war. They are men and money. If we are able to supply the one but not the other we are still defenseless. In case of war, the United States should be able to supply these two essentials in a constant stream.

But during the World War it became increasingly more difficult to raise money, as the committees who put on the Liberty bond drives will testify. Yet we are told by those who oppose this plan that the bond issues were all oversubscribed, which statement is true but very misleading, because in your imagination,

perhaps, you see a man at a desk handing out the bonds just as fast as he and his helpers can hand them out, and perhaps you imagine men tiptoeing and waving check books and shouting bids for so many dollars' worth of bonds. And then, perhaps, you see the Secretary of the Treasury close the door while these patriotic millionaires are still begging for a chance to buy more bonds.

But that was not the case. The true picture is that in every nook and corner of the United States we had high-pressure committees going to people's places of business, going to their homes, going to theaters and other public meetings and using all of the modern methods of salesmanship in order to sell their quota of war bonds. At the same time the Government was spending thousands of dollars on colorful billboards, newspaper advertising, and propaganda in order to sell these war bonds.

Naturally the committees in one part of the country did not know how many dollars worth of bonds the committees in the other part of the country had sold until they all came in and totaled up the results of the campaign. Then they discovered they had an oversubscription for these bonds.

Now, let us look at the amount of oversubscription. I think it will tell a story within itself. The first Liberty Loan was oversubscribed 52 percent, the third Liberty Loan was oversubscribed 39 percent, and the last Liberty Loan was oversubscribed only 16½ percent. In other words, with all of the pressure that the Liberty Loan committees could bring to bear, the oversubscription slumped from 52 percent to 16½ percent.

But that's only half of the story. Now let us look at the rising interest rates which it was necessary for the Government to pay in order to coax enough money out of hiding to continue the war. While the enthusiasm for buying bonds was going down, the interest rate to make bonds more attractive was going up. The first bond issue bore 3½-percent interest, the next 4 percent, the next 4¼ percent, and the last 4¾ percent. And if the war had continued long enough, judging from history, we would have reached the point where the Government could not have borrowed money at any rate of interest. Then we would have turned to the printing presses and destroyed ourselves, all for the lack of an efficient system for reaching the wealth in this country.

The War Department already has a plan worked out in detail for drafting the manpower of the United States. The War Industry Board has a plan already worked out for mobilizing the industrial and material resources of the United States. But there is, as yet, no plan for mobilizing the financial resources of this Nation. Apparently the Treasury Department would depend upon this same, clumsy, voluntary method of financing war. The World War showed us that that method is inefficient. It is extravagant, it is unjust, and it breaks down when we need it the most. Therefore, I believe that we should replace this hodgepodge, hit-and-miss, high-pressure method of financing war with a systematic, just, and effective method of mobilizing our financial resources.

Is money more sacred than men? The same people who are now objecting to drafting the millionaires' wealth in case of war were perfectly willing to draft the boys and send thousands of them to their death. But now that we are considering a measure that would draft dollars as well as men, we are running into opposition, because their precious dollars are too sacred to be drafted.

During the darkest days of the Civil War, Abraham Lincoln went to New York to raise more money to feed and clothe and arm the soldiers. He saw that the bankers were holding out for better terms. He stood up with fire flashing from his eyes. He said, "I can draft a widow's only son. I can take her only means of support from between the plow handles and place him at the front of the battle where his life will not last 6 minutes, but I cannot lay my hands on enough money to pay for the food he eats before he is shot."

It was true in the Civil War; it was true in the World War; and unless we do something about it now, it would be true in case of another war.

Labor and Neutrality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SHERIDAN DOWNEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 23 (legislative day of Wednesday, October 4), 1939

ADDRESS BY SENATOR McCARRAN BEFORE AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I ask permission of the Senate to introduce in the RECORD a speech delivered by the junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] before the American Federation of Labor on October 11, 1939.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, my friends, workers of America, it is an honor for any Member of the National Congress to come before this great representative body. Especially do I consider it an honor because I have never had the privilege of being affiliated with one of your great branches nor with your great organization. I am only one who looks on from an individual, independent standpoint; I am only one in whose blood there flows the everlasting spirit of Americanism, the determination to keep my country uppermost, so that when the time may come that a torn world will require an arbiter of their disputes, my country, your country, may serve in that great capacity.

Mr. President, I am reminded as I address your group here today of a little incident that occurred in the city of New York not so long ago. I was present when they sought to organize a new society in a given community in that great city, and they invited to this particular gathering everyone whom they thought would be at all susceptible, at all encouraged to join. So after dinner they called on those who were there, many of them, and in the course of the call an elderly Irishman was questioned as to whether or not he would consider favorably becoming a member of this new organization.

Standing in his place, the Irishman said, "Well, Mr. Chairman, I have never been very much of a joiner, I have never joined much of anything. I joined St. Patrick's parish for the good of me soul, I joined the New York Athletic Club for the good of me body, and then I joined Tammany Hall just to keep body and soul together."

Mr. President, I use this story, this incident, which I think is apropos from a Nation-wide standpoint, because I feel that in the great body of labor today we are keeping body and soul of nationalism and Americanism together.

My friends, may I impose upon your time for only a few minutes that I may recite to you something perhaps that you know, but having known it, you might have overlooked it for the time being; namely, that today as we face the future America, with all of her traditions built into the past, with all of her glory promised for the future, we must listen to the voice of humanity. There is no group in all this country today, there is no power in governmental lines that can transcend the voice of the people, and that voice is today represented in your labor organizations as they assemble here by their duly constituted representatives.

Let us go back and look at the past within our own lives. There is scarcely a man or woman among you who do me the honor to listen to me today who has not passed through the last 25 years, and during that time you have seen what conditions were as regard the awfulness of war. You have seen what it has meant to the toilers of this country and the toilers abroad. Today we are confronted with the expression, coming broadcast over the land by way of propaganda, that if we lend ourselves to foreign troubles and to foreign turmoil we may thereby augment employment in this country; we may thereby bring better wages to the toilers of this country; we may thereby build profits in this country. I will deal with those items one by one.

Let me go into the history of your own organization. Mr. President, when we entered the World War your membership was far greater than it was when we closed the World War. When the armistice was signed your membership was looking to a much less number than it enjoyed in 1917, when this country entered the World War. More than that, from the time we entered the World War until the present day shop unionism grew by leaps and bounds. I am grateful—and when I say that I am grateful it is because I believe in your individual organizations—I am grateful for the fact that you are overcoming that fallacy that has taken so much from the strength of your organization throughout the length and breadth of the land.

Better a thousand times that you have your craft unions extending over the Americas, if you please, than that any organization should be controlled by one particular group or by one particular crowd that controls the lives and the labors and the hearts of those who serve in that particular plant. Because labor is world-wide, individual human liberty is world-wide, and labor represents individual human liberty, and whenever labor loses sight of individual human liberty, then labor will have lost its greatest ally in the battle we must make in the centuries yet to come. Yes, they say that during the World War there was an augmentation of the earnings of the toilers. Yes, between 1914 and 1917, before we entered the World War, wages increased in this country 24 percent; but the cost of living in this country, the cost for the wage workers, if you please, the cost at his tableside, the cost at his hearthside, the cost of maintaining his wife and children went up to 42 percent. Further, when we closed the World War, we found ourselves with a great increase in the number of toilers, but the earning power of each was immediately cut down, thus his scale of living was gradually forced downward until the present day. And so war has never lent anything to labor except a false

idea that a monetary increase in the earning power of the individual might bridge over an unhappy hour.

Mr. President, I am sorry to say that it has been suggested that our country participate—when I say participate I do not mean that we send our boys abroad—it has been suggested that we participate by way of letting down the embargo, and that this participation would lend to decrease the number of the unemployed, would lend to the building of homes. Yes, it may build homes, Mr. President, but history has taught us that into those homes may come the dying, the maimed, and the insane. This is the effect of a blind participation in war.

Would it not be better a thousand times that your great organization could carry on in the battle of decreasing hours of labor and increasing wage earnings, to encourage individualism in industry? Would it not be better a thousand times that the homes created in America should be the hearthside of young men fitted to become better Americans in body and soul than that those homes should be filled with returned soldiers, young men with sick minds and wrecked bodies dying by inches?

I am only reciting to you thoughts that you may take home with you as you go back to your places; that you may give the message to those who will listen to you, because what I express in my homely way here today are thoughts running through the minds of the 95 men with whom I sit from day to day. I draw no lines. I don't believe there is a man of the 95, even though he may differ from me as to the course to pursue, there isn't a man in the United States Senate today who isn't resolved that this country, born under God, this democracy where mothers live in homely homes and rejoice in growing sons—that in this country we shall resolve to keep young manhood at home and at peace. And when I say democracy, I mean the democracy that grew out of the inspiration of the patriots that assembled in Philadelphia and wrote the Constitution under which you and I live, the democracy that has been coveted and imitated the world over, the democracy that has made other countries say that they are democratic, and I refer to our good friends the British and the French. Democracy in the Western Hemisphere, where labor is permitted to assemble as it does assemble here and as it does not dare assemble abroad, where labor is permitted to go back to individual home assemblies and meet there with their brothers—that democracy living in the lowly homes of the toilers of this country shall be a beacon light to the torn and bleeding countries of the world.

Oh, a thousand times better would it be if those who speak of profits coming out of war, if those who speak of profits coming out of the letting down of the embargo, if those who say that we let down this embargo and sell munitions of war we will set our factories to work; oh, better a thousand times would it be if those would say instead, "We will keep our homes happy, we will make it possible for American boys to look into the future where their bodies will be as God ordained they should be, physically fit. We shall look forward to the hour and the time when the great mass of the red-blooded of the toilers of this country, looking to the toilers across the sea, will say to them, 'Take precept and example from what we did in 1939; take precept and example from what we will do in 1940.'"

We are going to keep our country from taking the first step that might lead us into war; we are going to keep this country neutral—and when I say neutral I mean neutral. We have no enemies to punish abroad, no friends to favor so far as our national existence goes. You may have your individual likes and dislikes. I may despise the totalitarian form of government, as I do, because in my heart of hearts I am a Democrat. Democracy is the biggest thing in all the world to me, and so I despise any form of totalitarian government that would use the rank and file as mere puppets in their desire to carry on a balance of power.

You may have your individual views, but remember that that is individual. As a nation we stand neutral today, and as a nation we propose by our neutrality to carry on so that labor, the toiler in the ditch and in the field, in the forest, and in your plants, if you please, may realize the value of the freedom that makes this assembly possible, the value of the right that each individual may stand shoulder to shoulder with his fellow in his particular walk of life. That is the greatest thing that the individual American can have—the consort, the comfort, and the joy of joining with his individual fellow, his colleagues, so that they together, as they walk down the avenue of life, may know—realizing each other's troubles, realizing each other's burdens, realizing each other's toils—that they share together those burdens and they understand their respective sympathies.

And why do I deal with this subject at the outset? What have I behind me of glory in the way of history? At the hazard of repetition, because you have all read it and you have all heard it, may I bring to your attention the words of a great leader in a great democracy. It seems almost prophetic as we read his words today, almost 150 years from the hour in which they were uttered; it seems as though he saw the very scenes that present themselves to you as American citizens and as American citizenry today. May I read the words of a great Democrat, a great American, a great leader of civilization, a great guide to the sons of mankind. He said:

"Against the insidious wiles of foreign influence the jealousy of a free people ought to be constantly awake, since history and experience prove that foreign influence is one of the most baneful foes of republican government.

"But that jealousy, to be useful, must be impartial, else it becomes the instrument of the very influence to be avoided, instead of a defense against it. Excessive partiality for one foreign nation, and excessive dislike of another, cause those whom they actuate to see danger only on one side and serve to veil and even second the arts of influence on the other."

May I pause to talk to those who talk to the millions as they walk and as they toil. May I pause to bring back to your attention the propaganda that led us into a conflict where and out of which we left behind white crosses row on row in foreign fields. May I pause there to dwell upon propaganda that led us into a conflict. You would realize the insidiousness of the propaganda of which I speak if you were to come with me into the hospitals of America today, if you were to go out to Fort Whipple, which is close to my home, and see there the boys suffering the tortures of a living death. They look out onto the western hills without a single hope, save that they look to heaven high and fear lest the next hour may close life for them. They stood on the firing line in France and they are dying today. And here we are today, before they die, thinking of entering into another such conflict. Oh, was not Washington wise when he counseled us not to allow ourselves to become partial to one and hateful to another. Did he not mean that by giving ourselves to "entangling alliances" we destroy the very thing that is fundamental to our great Americanism, whereby and out of which we propose to lead the civilized world when there is no leadership save ours?

Let us go on:

"Real patriots, who may resist the intrigues of the favorite, are liable to become suspected and odious."

May I develop that thought: "Real patriots, who may resist the intrigues of the favorite, are liable to become suspected." We lent ourselves to the intrigues of the favorite, and today we resist the intrigues of any favorite. We resist it with everything within our power—not but that we may have our individual favoritism, that is for us as individuals, but as a Nation we resist the intrigues of the favorite because we are liable to be suspected. Because we are liable to be suspected of what? Of lending ourselves to that phase of the cause, "while its tools and dupes usurp the applause and confidence of the people to surrender their interests."

"The great rule of conduct for us in regard to foreign nations is to have as little political connection as possible." Listen to the prophetic lines that I will now read, and apply them to the hour. One would think that he who uttered these lines had already passed in spirit through the age in which we live. I wonder if he did? Sometimes I think it might be possible:

"Europe has a set of primary interests which to us have none or a very remote relation. Hence she must be engaged in frequent controversies, the cause of which are essentially foreign to our concerns. Hence, therefore, it must be unwise in us to implicate ourselves by artificial ties in the ordinary vicissitudes of her politics, or the ordinary combinations and collisions of her friendships and enemies."

Mr. President, in reciting these lines today I do not say that I may not have my individual views, that every man and woman here today may not have their respective individual views. I recite them to prove that there was but one uppermost thought in the mind of the great Washington when he left that farewell address with his people, and it was that as a Nation we need surrender none of our individual views, but as a Nation we must keep aloof from foreign entanglements.

Mr. President, if I were to hold this convention longer, which I would not deign to do, I might go at length into these things. I only use that great impartial, nonpolitical voice because he was nonpolitical. He was retiring then from the greatest position in all the world.

But they tell us that if Washington were to live today, because of our proximity with Europe, he would change his mind. They recite to us that we are only a few seconds remote from Europe, because of aerial facilities. They say we are only a few moments remote from Europe because of wire facilities; that we are only 5 days remote from Europe because of our water facilities.

But may I bring to the attention of labor that when Washington uttered those lines the flag of France was flying where you and I now sit. The flag of Great Britain was flying and her guns were pointed across the line that we afterwards established as our northern boundary. The flag of Spain was flying where I was born in the great State of Nevada. And I want to tell you something that you may not know. Your President knows it. I was born in Reno, Nev. You have heard many things about my native State. Everyone has heard many things about it, but there is one thing, I take it, that you have never heard. Perhaps you have not studied your geography quite closely enough. Reno is the only inland city in the world—I hope the press gets this—where the "tieds" come in and the "untieds" go out.

To return, Mr. President, when Washington uttered these expressions, the great Golden State of California, the great States of Nevada, Idaho, Utah, Montana, Arizona, and New Mexico were flying the Spanish flag and the Mexican flag. When Washington uttered these expressions every country in South America, save Brazil, which was then under the Portuguese Government, was under the Spanish Government. European interests were closer to Washington than they are today. But with that courageous Americanism he felt that we should remain aloof then, and I feel that we must remain aloof today. Why? Because I know

what is in the offing if we take the first step to go into this war. Federal regimentation is in the offing. It has been written. It has been printed. It is today in the hands of some of your Members—a Federal regimentation that will take from labor everything that labor has won in the last half century. They will subject you to the domination of a military power in which the Army and the Navy have already collaborated in writing the lines, and if anyone doubts it, I have the 1933, the 1936, and the 1939 Federal regimentation, known as the M plan, in my possession, and you are welcome to it. It will take from you everything that you have won by the blood of your brothers. You talk about fascism. Why, fascism will blush if this plan goes into effect.

And so, toilers of America, workers, representatives of the red blood of this country, let us resolve upon the course that we shall pursue. Although my ideas may not be the same as yours, I do not propose to let down on the embargo; but I will vote to keep American citizens off of belligerent ships; I will vote to keep American ships out of combat zones; I will vote to let the world at large have our commodities for the essentials of life, provided we receive cash and they take possession here. I will not vote to allow the accumulation of debt ever to be the asserted agent, whether true or not, of leading us into a foreign conflict.

Men and women of America, your sons and daughters are the ones who will be called. They will be the first in and the last out. Some of them will not come out. Oh, I have heard it repeated time after time, "We will not vote to send our boys into war."

I could have recited lines that came out over 20 years ago to the same effect, but when the hour comes, when the flame of individual national integrity is aroused, then sometimes we forget our resolution. We forgot it in 1917.

Let us never get to the point where we might, perchance, forget it again because, labor of America, it is you who will pay the penalty. In time of war you give the most and gain the least. It is your sons who fight the war and it is you who pay for it. It is your sons and daughters who will go into the firing line, and then when the conflict is over, you will see only the depths of financial chaos. Let me give you this thought in the words of your wonderful President, recited in my presence before the Appropriations Committee of the United States Senate: "Every dollar that is paid in taxes comes from the sweat of the brow of labor." And that is as true as gospel. Whenever labor ceases there is no source to tax.

And so, laborers of America, you who are bearing the burden of the last war, into which you should not have entered, for God's sake let the cry go up by way of a demand, not a resolution, that we will not by selling instrumentalities of death and destruction, take the first step toward a course that might mean for our boys the ghastliness of war, the ghastliness of bodies found hanging over barbed wire entanglements while vultures tear their flesh apart. Let us make a demand now, America, that while we sympathize with those who are in conflict, while we are downcast that there is being spilled the blood of the German people, the blood of the French people, and the blood of the English people, if those people could but express themselves today there wouldn't be any war. Even though they may be living in the hollow of peasant Germany, even though they may be living on the hillsides of the "Heelands" of Scotland, even though they may be living in the lowlands and the highlands of the far away places of Canada, Australia, or New Zealand, even though they may be in the heart of old historic France, they are breathing up a prayer today that this war may end. And God grant that it may end.

Otherwise, I am in favor of keeping the Congress of the United States in session. I am in favor of sitting every day with my 95 colleagues in the Senate, all 95 of them splendid American citizens, resolved to keep this country out of war. I am of the mind that we should remain where we belong, in Washington, and aid by our influence and by our word to the end that this country shall not become a participant in this world struggle.

To that end may we have the voice of the toilers of this country. May we have the encouragement of the homes of this country, represented here by this splendid group.

Mr. President, I have gone a little further in my thought than I should have. I hope nothing I have said transgresses the rules of this great nonpolitical organization. I hope that your great organization, representing the rank and file of America, will always remain nonpolitical. Your greatest power is when you remain aloof from party lines. When you, independently speaking for the toilers of this country, say: "We belong to no party, we speak only for the red blood of the toilers, and we advise you as a representative of the people to look to the virtue in our argument"; as long as you remain in that position, then you will have the greatest power in your hands. Then men will listen to you, and respect you, and then you will hold aloft on high the torch that labor must assume, that labor must carry so that when the bleeding and torn peoples of the world are looking for a leadership, surrounded by darkness, let the light of labor lead, let the glory of the toilers come forward to hold that torch.

Then civilization will send down through the avenue of the ages a resolution of gratitude for the fact that in this great American organization of labor there was a resolve, there was an independence of spirit, there was a studious foresight, if you please, that said, "America, with all your past, with all your future, with all your present, America on whose shoulders rests the civilization of the world, we will be the accepted arbiter of the world's disputes, but we will never send a boy in uniform to die in a foreign land."

Neutrality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RUSH D. HOLT
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, October 23 (legislative day of Wednesday, October 4), 1939

POLL BY WHEELING INTELLIGENCER

Mr. HOLT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a tabulation from the Wheeling Intelligencer of a poll taken by them on the neutrality issue. This paper, one of the outstanding newspapers of my State, favors the cash-and-carry policy.

We have heard much about the preponderant sentiment of the people for repeal of the arms embargo. The result of polls in my State shows that the people do not favor lifting the embargo. Furthermore, the overwhelming majority of the letters I have received are for the retention of the embargo. Some may try to cast that aside by saying the letters are the result of mass propaganda but they cannot successfully substantiate such an unfair indictment. I personally know hundreds and hundreds of those who have written me, and I know they have been influenced by their sincere motive of keeping out of war.

A very interesting thing will be found in these letters, in that the hand-written letters are overwhelmingly for keeping the arms embargo. The veterans who have written to me from my State are, by actual count, more than 4 to 1 for the embargo.

Time after time I have heard Senators say that no one in America wants war. My letters show that the great majority of our people do not want war, but they also show that some do. This poll shows that 24 of the 1,557 do want war. Our task is to see that the sides are not reversed.

There being no objection, the poll was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The result of the Intelligencer poll

I want America to keep out of war	1,533
I favor going to war	24
I favor the present neutrality law	1,112
I favor sale of munitions (to combatants, cash and carry)	321

Views of the News

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LELAND M. FORD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 23, 1939

ARTICLE BY MANCHESTER BODDY

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Manchester Boddy, published in the Los Angeles Daily News and Evening News.

[From the Los Angeles Daily News and Evening News of September 26–27, 1939]

VIEWS OF THE NEWS

(*September 26, 1939*)

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF MANUFACTURERS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
New York, N. Y., September 18, 1939.

MANCHESTER BODDY,
Publisher, Daily News-Evening News,
Los Angeles, Calif.

DEAR MR. BODDY: American industry's attitude on war and peace is not only a matter of first importance to the Nation but is also the subject of much public misunderstanding.

In view of this, I am taking the liberty of sending to you, personally, a copy of a statement by Howard Coonley, president of the National Association of Manufacturers. As you know, the N. A. M. is representative of a large cross-section of American industry, and I am sure you will agree that its statement on war is not only timely but, as well, is nationally important.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM V. LAWSON,
Director of Public Relations.

Following is the statement of the National Association of Manufacturers issued by its president, Howard Coonley, to which Mr. Lawson refers:

"American industry hates war.

"War destroys lives. War wrecks homes. Economic chaos and years of crushing depression are its inevitable aftermath. It imperils representative democracy. Free institutions are among its early victims. Ultimately no one can escape the ruin of war.

"American industry wants peace. Peace is the lifeblood of progress. Peace must be the national objective.

"Industry's position on this matter has been stated repeatedly and there must be no misunderstanding about it.

"The United States can stay out of war.

"Emotionalism can betray us into war.

"A public will to peace, coupled with wise public policies and affirmative action to this end by our Government will keep us out of war. A fatalistic attitude that war is inevitable for us is absurd. It presupposes that America cannot conduct itself intelligently to preserve peace and its own interests.

"Europe's problems do affect us, but our domestic problems still must come first.

"If yesterday industry was the only source of prosperity and reemployment, today it is as well the keystone of preparedness and peace. Under any conditions America must depend on a smoothly functioning, efficient industrial system.

"Manufacturers will not relax their efforts to achieve and maintain sound improvement in our domestic economy.

"Industry opposes profiteering—the utilization of war psychology to boost prices for the purpose of making excessive profits.

"As manufacturers we recognize it to be our responsibility and moral obligation to conduct our businesses so that the prices of the products we produce and sell are related equitably to production costs.

"We pledge our energetic support to this policy.

"The N. A. M. calls upon all its members to exercise vigilance against any price or profit policies not justified by actual cost and anticipated cost of replacement.

"Months ago this association said: 'No sensible person believes that profit can come out of the wreckage of human life and economic dislocation.'

"The use of this crisis as an excuse either to extort unjustifiable profits or to pursue partisan political objectives is not only indefensible and dangerous but reprehensible morally. Nor should pleas of 'emergency' be utilized as an excuse for reaching objectives which the American people would not otherwise sanction.

"The present situation calls for agreement on common objectives, but the democratic process of consultation and criticism must never be abandoned. Otherwise we shall be following in the footsteps of those who believe in government by coercion.

"In a world distraught by force the best way to preserve representative democracy is to practice it."

DEAR MR. LAWSON: I quite agree that American industry's attitude on war and peace is not only a matter of first importance to the Nation but that it is also the subject of much public misunderstanding.

This misunderstanding exists, I think, because the words that proclaim your attitude are not loud enough to overcome the impact of events. Observe I do not say events of your ordering. What I mean to imply is that your attitude becomes unimportant in the midst of the very events that have made the issuance of your statement necessary.

There is no need to elaborate or catalog these events. I interrupt my writing to select these representative headlines from the exchange desk:

"Gains Run to Four Points on Strong N. Y. Market."

"Business Makes Best Strides in 2 Years—American Prices Stimulated by War Outbreak; Inquiries Indicate Pace Will Be Quickened."

"Fight Food Price Rise."

"Metal Markets Join in Upswing."

"Grain Futures Mount Sharply."

It isn't enough that you add to a list of generally accepted platitudes your statement:

"The N. A. M. calls upon all its members to exercise vigilance against any price or profit policies not justified by actual cost and anticipated cost of replacement."

Even it cannot confidently be said (as you do say): "American industry's attitude * * * is a matter of first importance to the Nation" if all of the calamities that you say may befall our national economy as a result of war, befall it regardless of your attitude.

I am particularly intrigued with the statesmanship evidenced in these concluding paragraphs of Mr. Coonley's statement:

"The present situation calls for agreement on common objectives, but the democratic process of consultation and criticism must never be abandoned. Otherwise we shall be following in the footsteps of those who believe in government by coercion.

"In a world distraught by force the best way to preserve representative democracy is to practice it."

In this spirit may I presume to suggest how the N. A. M. can translate its attitude into action?

(September 27, 1939)

(This is the second installment of our letter to the National Association of Manufacturers of the United States of America.)

It is generally agreed that war economy means more production, higher wages, higher cost of living, a boom in local business, with about 53 percent of the new business made on the installment plan.

When war ends—or when nations fall into bankruptcy or internal revolution—immediate economic reaction will occur in the United States. Workers who bought on the installment plan will have no money with which to meet payments.

This will start a cancelation movement that will gain momentum and volume until it overwhelms the national economy. With this will come an acute attack of economic "jitters." Once more we will hear on every hand the hysterical shoutings:

"My God, here we are starving in the midst of plenty."

"Factories everywhere and not a wheel turning."

"I want goods—you want goods—we can't buy any. Why?"

"Who closed our industries? Why doesn't capital do something about it?"

"Share the wealth."

"Turn the jobs over to the fellow who wants to use the products."

Can't you see, my dear Mr. Lawson, how logically, how naturally these conclusions will be reached when war "boom" gives way to the "horrors" of peace? And can't you see how readily such rabble rousing "truisms" will be accepted by the milling masses of bewildered citizens?

There is nothing farfetched about this. It is so obvious that even today United States industry cannot afford to hope for peace in Europe. If Europe should agree to peace right now, the United States would immediately be thrown into a devastating depression, one far more disastrous to the safety of the United States than the war now being fought 3,000 or 5,000 miles away.

A "peace scare" is already fraught with more potential danger to the economy of the United States than a "war scare" ever was.

If this sort of feeling has developed in 1 month, what will be the situation if war lasts 6 months, or a year, or 3 years?

The answer is obvious. We will be forced to perpetuate "war economy." To do this we will have to invoke the dictatorship provisions of the National Defense Act of 1916, section No. 120 of which provides, among other things:

"The President, in time of war, or when war is imminent, is empowered, through the head of any department of the Government * * * to place an order with any individual, firm, association, company, corporation, or organized manufacturing industry for such product or material as may be required. * * *

"Compliance with all such orders for products or material shall be obligatory * * * the President, through the head of any department of the Government, in addition to the present authorized methods of purchase or procurement herein provided for, is hereby authorized to take immediate possession of any such plant or plants * * * and any individual, firm, company, association, or corporation or organized manufacturing industry or the responsible head or heads thereof, failing to comply with the provisions of this section, shall be deemed guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be punished by imprisonment for not more than 3 years and by a fine not exceeding $50,000."

For many years the War and Navy Departments have been working on a plan for the mobilization of the country's economy.

A mobilization plan already adopted by the Army and Navy provides for sweeping economic control, including labor, prices, transportation, power, fuel, and trade generally. Its purpose is to divert materials and services from peacetime to war-making channels.

Surely no one can study these plans and provisions without realizing how thoroughly this country has observed the time-honored injunction:

"In time of peace—prepare for war!"

The purpose of this letter is to urge that your great organization—in the spirit of its expressed attitude on war and peace conceive a new national policy:

"In time of war—prepare for peace!"

If we would preserve fundamental American democracy we must prepare to take definite action now probably along these lines:

Create a permanent peace college to develop ways and means of meeting peace problems just as we have a war college to develop ways and means of meeting war problems.

This peace college should be composed of representatives of industry, labor, transportation, finance, and agriculture on a nonpartisan basis. It should be dedicated to the preservation of American democracy and confine its operations to the utilization of such tried and approved measures as come within the general field of agreement of its various members.

An important function of the permanent peace college should be to plan:

(a) The peacetime utilization of surpluses that are produced during the time lag between the end of war and the return to "normal" peace economy, as a basis for stabilizing international finance and our domestic currency and credit.

(b) The coordination of various forms of government relief, insurance plans, public works programs, relief plans, etc., to meet

anticipated problems that come with the transition from war boom to normal peace economy.

By keeping the "peace college" in continuous session it will be possible to have such plans and programs worked out in a sane and deliberate manner; it will be possible to submit these plans and programs for approval to Congress for democratic action free from the threat of panic and widespread riot.

There isn't much real danger of the United States actually fighting in Europe, but the very nature of the war now going on over there, considered in connection with our national economic situation, leads inevitably to the conclusion that Europe's war probably will come to the United States.

Let's be prepared to keep it out.

In time of war—prepare for peace!

Very truly yours,

MANCHESTER BODDY.

St. Louis Jefferson Memorial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM P. LAMBERTSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 23, 1939

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, after 4 long years of conniving and legal legerdemain, the projected $30,000,000 Jefferson National Expansion Memorial in St. Louis has actually gotten under way, although Congress has never voted an appropriation for it and it never will. The story behind this memorial is a long and sordid one. It reveals that certain agencies of our Government have been willing to accept without question a project that stands revealed as the outstanding achievement of political debauchery in the United States. This memorial has behind it a background of corruption, fraud, and deception, that was fully revealed by the Citizens' Nonpartisan Committee of St. Louis in 1936. The newspapers of St. Louis have carried this story to the Nation, yet this knowledge was no detriment to the promoters when it came to getting the cooperation of the Department of the Interior and the National Park Service in the planning and building of this memorial.

Mr. Speaker, in St. Louis a week ago last Monday, Bernard L. Dickmann, the mayor, ripped out the first brick in a building at No. 7 Market Street to inaugurate the demolition of the buildings in the 37-block area that has been designated for the memorial, which is now being built under the guise of preserving alleged historic sites. On this site were alleged to have started the Oregon Trail, the Santa Fe Trail, and many other historic events, including the place where Lewis and Clark made their preparations for their voyage of discovery into the great Northwest Territory. Although history places the beginnings of these trails elsewhere, and records the fact that Lewis and Clark prepared for their expedition at River Du Bois, in Illinois, history will surely record this memorial area as the starting place from which many political careers in St. Louis were wrecked. To these I may at some future time refer, but for today I want to make a few observations about No. 7 Market Street. It was from this small, two-story, long vacant building that 56 of the 46,252 ghost voters of St. Louis were utilized so effectively in the famous bond-issue election of September 10, 1935. It was from this building that 37 of these ghost voters transferred to No. 22 North Commercial Street, when the heat was on the ballot-box stuffers in St. Louis in 1936.

Mr. Speaker, the mayor of St. Louis must have had feelings of deepest emotion when he approached this building last Monday to destroy the abode of the spirits that had served him so well in the past. The mayor, it is announced, will preserve this brick in his office in the city hall.

Perhaps the ghosts of the departed voters will, in course of time, visit the mayor's office to haunt what remains of their earthly political home. Perhaps it would be appropriate in this particular instance, to encase this brick in gold foil, and place it in a special case in the foyer of the City Hall, just to remind future generations that way back in 1935 someone sold the taxpayers of St. Louis and of the Nation the world's biggest and most useless goldbrick of all time—this second memorial to Thomas Jefferson.

But whether this is done or not the wrecking of these commercial and industrial buildings in St. Louis is just another incident in the wrecking of what seemed to be a most likely political career for his honor the mayor.

The people of St. Louis who now gaze upon this spectacle of destruction are forced to bow their heads in submission to a political triumph—a triumph deplored by believers in civic decency and political honesty everywhere. But this present triumph, Mr. Speaker, would not have been possible without cooperation from Washington. With all the facts of the deception, fraud, and intrigue behind this memorial available or in their hands, the Department of the Interior and the National Park Service have steadfastly lent encouragement to the memorial promoters, have proceeded with this project although it has never been authorized under the Preservation of Historic Sites Act.

Mr. Speaker, Congress has not heard the last of this St. Louis memorial. Once these buildings are wrecked and this property is fully and finally acquired, the promoters will be here for years begging for money to build something, anything to remove an eyesore from the front yard of St. Louis. They will also be here soon clamoring for money to build a new airport in the Mississippi River close to the downtown area. If they are disappointed in getting money for either or both projects, let them be consoled with the fact that Uncle Sam's role of Santa Claus is about played out.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I wish to reiterate my previous observations that I believe this spending of Federal funds for this memorial is unlawful and unauthorized by all fair construction of our laws.

With that thought before the Congress, I shall expect to proceed along all available lines to secure a full and complete congressional investigation of this memorial project from its very inception down to the first steps in its construction.

Were I to sit in this Congress, knowing the facts, and remain silent, when funds appropriated for relief, work relief, and the increase of employment by the building of useful projects are diverted to the use of the real-estate promoters of St. Louis under such a tawdry excuse as the preservation of historic sites, I would feel that I was woefully lacking in my duty to the people of Kansas, whom I have the honor of representing, and to the people of the entire United States whose money is being spent without sanction of Congress.

Civil Liberties

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 25, 1939

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, civil liberties are one of the foundation pillars of American democracy, as they are of all democracies in the world. They mean that men and women shall enjoy the right to worship in accordance with the dictates of their own consciences, that they shall freely exercise the right to speak or print what they believe, that they may meet and assemble together without molestation and that their petitions for redress of grievances will be respectfully listened to by those in positions of public trust. They mean a man or woman in America can call his soul his own.

CIVIL LIBERTIES ARE IN DANGER IN AMERICA TODAY

The depression has given us a group of American citizens, most of whom have had the rather common misfortune of passing the 45-year mark, who cannot find employment in

private industry. They are at present dependent, if they are to work at all, upon public employment. They are citizens of the United States and, as such, they are as much entitled to the rights and privileges of the Constitution as anyone. And yet we hear politicians who would welcome a well-groomed lobbyist with open arms complain that some unpardonable crime has been committed when the unemployed people of the country write them postal cards, or hold meetings, or vote for their opponents in an election. Yet the Constitution gives the right of petition, as I understand it, to everyone, and especially to the poor and the unemployed who need it most. For never in all history has any nation retained its greatness if it denied to any considerable group of its people the normal rights of citizenship and of human life. We cannot expect prosperity, happiness, and freedom for four-fifths of the people if the other one-fifth are pushed outside the economic and political systems of the Nation and then even denied the right of protest and "petition for redress of grievances."

I believe that all people in America have a right to hold such views as they desire to hold. I believe it is the very essence of democracy that it shall stand only so long as the majority of the people wish it to stand. If any group can, in open and aboveboard fashion, persuade a majority of the American people to abandon democracy—which God forbid—and adopt some other form of government, I believe that then democracy must cease because it must always rest upon the free will of the people. But those of us who advocate and defend democracy have only the method of open persuasion and sound argument at our disposal.

Therefore, I do not believe that democracy is called upon to permit minority groups to prostitute the liberty it affords to the purpose of the destruction of that liberty itself. I do not believe that democracy is required to suckle with some of the best milk from her breasts, babes which are not her own but which have been born from the womb of systems that are antidemocratic and destructive of civil liberties. There is a limit even to liberty. That limit is found where the abuse of liberty by a small group endangers the continued enjoyment of it by a much larger group. This is true whether that smaller group consists of powerful financiers or industrialists or of a regimented political organization.

Where democracy and civil liberties have been destroyed in the world, one reason, at least, has been the failure of democratic government to draw a proper and justifiable line between true civil liberties on the one hand and their abuse upon the other. It is not enough to protect civil liberties today. We must see to it that they are protected tomorrow, too. And to either allow the continuance of financial oligarchy or to permit the growth, under a cloak of secrecy and relentless discipline, of organizations subject to the rigid direction and control of foreign totalitarian powers in which civil liberty is a myth, seems to me to amount to a betrayal of American liberty itself. The issue in such a case is not one of the denial of civil liberty to such organizations, but rather of the prudent protection of our system of freedom against totalitarian intrigue and even espionage. A man who does not seek liberty for the people of all nations can hardly be relied upon to effectively protect it in America.

WHO CAN DEFEND CIVIL LIBERTIES

I do not believe it is possible for a person or an organization to effectively defend civil liberties in America and also defend the destruction of civil liberties in Russia or in Germany. Neither do I believe it is possible to build the movement for the defense of civil liberties upon the support of people or organizations which insist upon the right to civil liberties now but whose basic philosophy would require their destruction should that organization ever come to power in the United States. But I believe that the American democracy has not only the right but the evident duty to insist that those who would enjoy its liberty must use the methods of liberty in all their dealings.

To say that there cannot be a German-American Bund or a Communist Party or similar organizations is one thing. I do not believe we should say that—for every person in this country has a right to his opinion whether it accords with majority opinion or not. But to say that if you are going to have these organizations they must be free, not captive, organizations, that they must consist of free people, and that they must freely and openly carry on their work is quite another thing. I believe it would be a good thing to say that. I think it is necessary to say it.

I think America can well say to such organizations: "If you want to have civil liberties you must use them to the full. You must use them to generate more freedom, not to destroy and throttle it." For America, civil liberties stand at the opposite pole from such practices as the building up of private military organizations, the maintenance of secret membership lists, the use of false names, the clandestine exchange of orders and reports between foreign powers and their controlled minions in the United States, or the attempted ordering of the lives and consciences of people in America in accordance with the will of a foreign dictator. These things are certainly—to state it mildly—as much a violation of civil liberties as would be the censorship of the press or radio or the denial of a permit to hold an open meeting.

Our democracy has in my opinion to learn not only to defend the liberty of all who truly desire liberty but also to find a formula for protecting itself and the liberties it affords from destruction at the hands either of economic or financial overlords of the people or of stifling totalitarian movements unwilling to expose themselves to the light of liberty itself. I believe that formula is to be found first in certain essential reforms of our present economic order of finance capitalism; second, in prudent regulations against the building up of private military organizations of any sort; and, third, in a decent well-considered requirement that every political or semipolitical organization in America be required to conduct all its business in open and aboveboard fashion, to state freely all its aims and purposes, and to maintain open membership lists and lists of contributors.

Under the Securities and Exchange Act no one can try to sell stocks or bonds to the American people without registering with the Securities and Exchange Commission. Why is it not equally logical to require that anyone seeking to sell an idea through propaganda literature should also register and give to the proper authorities essential facts concerning himself and his organization. Certainly such measures are no violation of true civil liberties. They are, rather, it seems to me, their logical fulfillment as well as their protection.

Mr. Speaker, I delivered these same remarks to the Conference on Civil Liberties held in New York City on October 13, 1939.

The History of the Italian Cheese Industry in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. HOOK

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 23, 1939

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, the production of Italian types of cheese actually began with the first emigrated Italian herdsmen in California, New York, and New Jersey, who utilized the products of their farms in the production of types of cheese to which they were accustomed in Italy. Industrially, however, the first cheese factories producing Italian cheese sprang up in the northern part of Indiana, in New England, and in the State of New York. The cheese factories in New England had been promoted by Italian financial groups of some importance, but they were not fortunate in their choice of location in relation to milk quality

and in their choice of technical equipment. As a result, after a brief existence, they had to cease operating.

The cheese factories destined to have a lasting influence were the ones of Frigo Bros., of Iron Mountain, Mich., started in 1915 and engaged in the production of Asiago cheese; and the ones of the Stella Cheese Co., now with headquarters at 651 West Randolph Street in Chicago, which company is engaged in the production of Parmesan, Reggiano, Asiago, Romano, and Provelone types of cheese.

The first factory of the Stella Cheese Co. was built at Lake Nebagamon, Wis., in 1918, and the second at Campbellsport, county of Fond du Lac, Wis. This latter plant produces exclusively cheese of the Provolone types. It is provided with a large curing and concentration warehouse and large shipping rooms, from which most of the cheese produced by the Stella Cheese Co., in all its plants in Wisconsin and Michigan, is shipped to different parts of the Nation. This warehouse has a capacity of a million pounds of cheese.

About the same time, in the northern part of Wisconsin, other Italian cheese makers were making headway, among them Cubalichini Bros., Del Santo Bros., Mr. Passini, and others.

In 1928, the Stella Cheese Co. built the first really modern Italian cheese factory in the United States, at Mass, in the Upper Peninsula of Michigan, at a cost of $75,000, with a working capacity of 70,000 pounds of milk a day, provided with warehousing facilities for the storing and curing of a million pounds of Parmesan and Reggiano cheese. In 1934, J. R. Tolibia, of New York, an importer of Italian cheese, purchased a cheese factory at Brownsville, near Fond du Lac, Wis., and engaged in the production of cheese of the Provolone types. In 1935 the Stella Cheese Co. built at Baltic, in the Upper Peninsula of Michigan, what is now known as the largest Italian cheese factory in the world, capable of working 100,000 pounds of milk a day in the production of Parmesan, Reggiano, and Romano cheese. This factory is provided with five large warehouses for the curing and storing of 3,000,000 pounds of cheese. In 1936 a large whey drying plant was added to said plant, in which all the whey of the Mass and Baltic plants is concentrated and dried.

In the same year the Stella Cheese Co. took over from the Clayton Cooperative Creamery Co. at Clayton, Wis., a large plant which had been up to that time engaged in the production of Swiss cheese. This plant is provided with five large warehouses for the curing and storing of cheese, with a total capacity of 2,000,000 pounds of cheese. In 1937 this plant was also equipped with a whey-drying plant with a capacity of 120,000 pounds of liquid whey per day. In this plant the whey of the Clayton and Cumberland plants is concentrated and dried.

Meanwhile J. R. Tolibia started two new plants, one at Brownsville, Wis., and the other at Dodgeville, Wis.

In 1936 the Cudahy Packing Co., operating through the Dow Cheese Co., assigned part of its plant at Washington Courthouse, Ohio, to the production of cheese of the Provolone type.

In 1937 A. Pocci, operating under the name of the Belmonte Cheese Co., started a cheese factory at Mayville, Wis., and in 1938 Mr. Joe Di Santo started a cheese factory at Manitowoc, Wis.

In the same year the Stella Cheese Co. acquired two additional cheese factories, one at Baraga, county of Baraga, Mich., and the other at Ewen, Ontonagon County, Mich. In 1939 it acquired from the Cumberland Cooperative Creamery Co. its plant at Cumberland and at the same time a large plant at Barronett, Wis.

In the same year Paul Sartori and Louis Rossini engaged in the production of Italian cheese at Plymouth, Wis., under the name of S. & R. Cheese Co.

The group of cheese factories operated by the Stella Cheese Co. today use, during the flush season, about 15,000,000 pounds of milk a month, and use in excess of 110,000 pounds of milk per year—all of which is used in the production of cheese of the Reggiano, Parmesan, Romano, Asiago, Modena, and Provolone types.

The group of cheese factories operated by Frigo Bros. produce Asiago cheese—for grating—while the cheese factories of the Tolibia Cheese Co., S. & P. Cheese Co., Fasini, Dow Cheese Co., Belmonte Cheese Co., and Di Santo produce cheese of the Provolone type, and also of the Asiago, Incanestrate, and Parmesan types.

This latter group of cheese factories use about 120,000,000 pounds of milk per year, making a total for the membership of the Italian Cheese Producers Federation of 220,000,000 pounds per year.

In addition to the cheese produced in Wisconsin, Michigan, and Ohio by the members of the association above mentioned, large volumes of cheese of the Jack and Monterey types are produced in California by Italian cheese makers. From a recent report by the president of the California Cheese Producers Association, it appears that over 10,000,000 pounds of cheese of the types above mentioned are annually produced in California. The Jack and the Monterey cheeses are generally used as grated cheese for seasoning purposes. Substantial quantities of cheese of the Romano type are also produced by the goat herdsmen of Colorado, New Mexico, and Wyoming. Numerous small Italian cheese factories are also operating near the metropolitan areas of Boston, New York, Philadelphia, Cleveland, and Chicago. It is safe to state that not less than 400,000,000 pounds of milk are used annually by the Italian cheese industry in the United States—corresponding to about 30,000,000 pounds of cheese having at present a market value of $9,000,000. This industry represents an investment of not less than $2,000,000 in land, buildings, machinery, and equipment. Most of this investment has been made since 1929 and was made possible by the protection afforded by the present tariff on cheese.

This industry employs in its plants as well as in the collection of milk, in warehousing, and in the distribution of its products—not less than 2,000 persons and is utilizing all the milk produced during the year by not less than 7,500 farmers; cultivating not less than 1,000,000 acres of dairy land, most of which is in the cut-over land districts of the northwestern States. It is safe to state that this industry directly provides the livelihood of 10,000 American families—in addition to the employment which it affords to the railroads, to the manufacturers of dairy machinery and equipment, and to the manufacturers of containers, shipping material, paper, salt, and rennet.

The volume of milk utilized by this industry, if skimmed, would produce 20,000,000 pounds of butter which goes a long way in reducing the dairy products which have so seriously concerned the United States Government and the American farmers generally. It is important, further, to take into consideration the following: The total importation of cheese of the Italian types, all of which could be produced in the United States, still represents today 26,000,000 pounds of cheese per year. If all of this cheese were produced in America, we could further eliminate another 15,000,000 pounds of butter from the surplus of the American dairy markets.

Reciprocal-Trade Agreements Wrecking American Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 23, 1939

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, State Senator C. H. Zurcher, of Oregon, recently reported that in the vicinity of Pasco, Wash., he found 6,300 Canadian calves, weighing about 250 or 300 pounds each. These calves were being fattened for the American baby-beef market and were being fed, according to State Senator Zurcher, Argentine corn and East India

molasses. A small duty had been paid on the calves, but the Argentine corn was delivered cheaper at Pasco than Iowa corn could be procured there, and ships from the Orient brought molasses from the East Indies cheaper than our own sugar wastes could be obtained.

This is a striking example of the operation of the reciprocal-trade agreements and the havoc they are working upon agriculture. It shows the impossibility of American agriculture competing with the cheap labor and living conditions of South America and the Orient as long as we maintain the American wage scale both as to agricultural employees and maritime workers. The importation of these Canadian calves and the food products for fattening them, of course, deprive the American farmer of a market for a like amount of his products. It brings forcibly to our attention the fact that the American market is the finest market we have for our agricultural products, and if we trade it away to foreign countries in order to build up the manufacturing industry in America, we are undoing the very thing that the Congress has been attempting to do in solving the farm problem. The Congress appropriated $700,000,000 for the assistance of farmers this year, and immediately thereafter the executive department, through the so-called reciprocal trade agreements, which are in reality treaties, is now considering letting down the bars so that importation of competitive agricultural products may flood the American market.

Public notice of the intention to make a trade agreement with Argentina was given on August 23, 1939. Recently the Committee for Reciprocal Information has been holding hearings in Washington for the purpose of considering the reduction in tariffs on a great many agricultural products. Among others of vital importance to Oregon are beef, hides, casein, cheese, corn, flaxseed, and turkeys. I appeared before this Committee, in common with a great many others of the House and Senate, in opposition to the lowering of the tariff on any of the competitive agricultural products, and particularly turkeys. I also lodged a protest with the Secretary of State. In his reply the Secretary said:

> As you know, the objective of the trade-agreements program, of which the trade agreement with Argentina would form an integral part, is to benefit all sections of the United States. By helping to restore and expand our formerly prosperous foreign trade, the trade-agreements program is doing much to promote the prosperity of the entire country and therefore to enhance the demand for virtually all products. As an indication of the importance of the Argentine market to the United States, I may point out that during the 15-year period 1924–38 United States sales to Argentina amounted to $1,542,600,000, or nearly half a billion dollars more than our purchases from Argentina during the same period, which amounted to $1,055,700,000. The great benefits of this trade to American labor, industry, and agriculture generally should not be overlooked.

While it is true, as stated by the Secretary of State, that the purpose of these agreements is to build up our export trade, on the other hand it is a short-sighted and ill-conceived policy that seeks to build up trade for the benefit of one class of our citizens, namely, those engaged in industrial enterprise, at the expense of the farmer. As was said by Senator CONNALLY, of Texas, at the hearing:

> We don't feel so kindly toward Argentina that we want to hurt our own farmers to help the pampas cowboys. We don't want to build up industry which is already bloated and overextended. Congress appropriated $700,000,000 to help the farmers last year, and we don't want to do something now to harm them.

The turkey industry has come to be of major importance in Oregon. I am told that there are only about six States in the Union that produce more turkeys than does Oregon. It is a thriving industry. However, competition is such that if the tariff is lowered on the importation of turkeys from Argentina, and, of course, with the favored-nation clause, to many other countries, this industry will be put out of business. It was disclosed at the hearing to which I have referred that cold-storage turkeys can be shipped from Argentina to New York for 1½ cents per pound, and it costs twice that amount to ship turkeys from Oregon to New York. Furthermore, with cheap peon labor and low-standard living conditions in South America, turkeys can be produced and laid down in New York for approximately 10 cents a pound, according to reports presented at the hearing. My information is that in Oregon the producer must receive at least 16 cents a pound in order to secure cost of production. It is at once apparent that any lowering of the tariff on turkey importations will disastrously affect this great American agricultural occupation and further complicate the farm problem.

The Washington Post, on the 18th of this month, discussed this trade agreement with Argentina editorially, saying, among other things, that—

> it would be a direct contradiction of policy for the administration to grant concessions on competitive agricultural importations while it is paying domestic farmers for not producing similar crops.

The editorial follows:

[From the Washington Post of October 18, 1939]

TRADE WITH ARGENTINA

The proposed agreement with Argentina seems destined to put Secretary Hull's reciprocal trade program to its most severe test. Farmers and their representatives in Congress fear that concessions on competitive Argentine products may add to existing agricultural surpluses in this country. Some legislators have gone so far as to threaten a fight to repeal the Trade Agreement Act if a larger volume of competitive farm products is admitted to the American market in return for Argentine concessions on our industrial exports.

These fears are based largely upon the list of products on which the United States is considering concessions. Included in this list are casein, linseed oil, canned meat, cheese, corn, cattle hides, and various other agricultural products. Fresh meats would be excluded, however, under the sanitary embargo which still remains in effect.

On the other hand, the negotiations with Argentina are considered by many as an opportunity for the United States to take over part of that country's trade heretofore going to European countries now at war. An agreement with the most progressive nation of South America, it is argued, would strengthen commercial ties with our southern neighbors to the mutual advantage of all countries in the Western Hemisphere.

This desire to extend American trade is, of course, wholly constructive. But it is not simply a problem of inducing Argentina to buy more American machinery, automobiles, and typewriters. The war has made it even more essential that we take a larger volume of South American products if we are to expand our markets in that region. And we must face the fact that most of what Argentina wishes to sell is competitive with the products of our own farms.

Obviously, this proposed agreement should be negotiated with full recognition of its direct bearing upon our domestic agricultural policy. As Senator CONNALLY pointed out to the Committee for Reciprocity Information, Congress appropriated $700,000,000 to aid farmers this year. Much of this money is used to compensate tillers of the soil for reducing the size of their crops. Federal funds have also been used to purchase surplus commodities and to pay export subsidies on wheat and cotton.

It would be a direct contradiction of policy for the administration to grant concessions on competitive agricultural imports while it is paying domestic farmers for not producing similar crops. So the Department of State faces the necessity of reconciling whatever concessions may be granted with the general farm policy of the Department of Agriculture. The whole theory behind the A. A. A. is that it will tend to bring agriculture into a more balanced relationship to industry. Unless that policy is to be abandoned, it would seem to preclude any extensive concessions at the expense of agriculture for the benefit of expanding industrial exports.

A consistent policy does not mean, of course, that no trade agreement with the Argentine can be negotiated. There are a number of products on which concessions can be granted without piling up new agricultural surpluses. The careful defense of domestic interests in all the trade agreements negotiated to date strongly suggests that the pact with Argentina will be similarly safeguarded. For that very reason, however, only moderate increases in our trade with the other American republics can be reasonably anticipated.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that all of us who are interested in the protection of agriculture take steps to prevent, if possible, the consummation of this treaty if it lowers the tariff on any competitive agricultural products.

My State has two major industries—agriculture and lumber—both of which are disastrously affected by the reciprocal-trade agreements. We are thrown in competition with lumber and forest products from Canada and other countries on an unfair competitive basis, due to the difference in wage scales and living conditions of the competitive countries. The pulp industry is a striking example of the way that the trade treaties are working out. America is becoming the dumping ground of cheap foreign competitive products which are un-

dermining agriculture and the lumber industry. I believe it was a mistake for the Congress to authorize the consummation of these trade agreements without the advice and consent of the Senate. These so-called agreements are treaties and under the Constitution must have Senate sanction. We should restore this authority of the Senate and by so doing give an opportunity for any industry or section affected by a proposed treaty to have a voice in the writing of the treaty, as the representatives of every State will be thereby accorded the privilege of shaping the tariff policy.

In common with others I have introduced a resolution in the House providing that no foreign-trade agreement under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930 shall become effective until it shall have the advice and consent of the Senate, as in other treaties.

The Argentine trade-agreement situation was discussed at some length by Mr. John W. White in a special cable to the New York Times, appearing in the Times October 22, 1939. There is much information in this article worthy of consideration in connection with the whole subject matter. I have taken the liberty, with the consent of the House, of including it in my remarks. It follows:

[From the New York Times of October 22, 1939]

ARGENTINA KEEPS CURB ON UNITED STATES' TRADE—FRANCE, NORWAY, BOHEMIA, AND MORAVIA ADDED TO LIST OF MOST-FAVORED NATIONS—TREATY STRATEGY IS SEEN—CONTINUED DISCRIMINATION HELD BARGAINING WEAPON FOR IMPENDING PARLEY

(By John W. White)

BUENOS AIRES, ARGENTINA, October 21.—France, Norway, and Bohemia and Moravia were added this week to the list of countries with which Argentina maintains most-favored-nation trading relations. Although Bohemia and Moravia now form a part of Germany, Argentina continues to treat them separately.

These three countries were admitted to most-favored-nation preferred treatment without any ceremony and virtually no publicity beyond the issuance of three routine circulars by the Exchange Control Committee. The circulars are Nos. 525, 526, and 529 and are signed by the assistant director of the Exchange Control Committee.

UNITED STATES STILL IN THIRD GROUP

Argentina has classified the nations of the world into three categories for trading purposes. First, there is a list of 15 nations that receive most-favored-nation treatment—that is, they receive the same treatment as that accorded to Great Britain under the terms of the Roca-Runciman Treaty. This most-favored-nation group includes Great Britain, Germany, France, Italy, Bohemia and Moravia, Denmark, Greece, Holland, Norway, Spain, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Paraguay, and Uruguay.

Ninety-five percent of the total import trade from these 15 countries is not restricted in any manner. Then there is a group of less-favored nations, composed of Belgium and Luxemburg, Finland, Iceland, southern Ireland, Poland, Sweden, and Switzerland. Imports from these countries are partly restricted by certain quotas which are not applicable to the first group.

Finally, there is a third group composed of the United States, Japan, and countries that are of no importance to Argentine trade. Less than 25 percent of the import trade from these countries is unrestricted. For instance, there are more than 200 groups of United States products that either cannot be imported under any circumstances or against which there are discriminatory quotas that are not applicable to other countries.

Certain concessions were made to Japan this week by the issuance of the Exchange Control Committee's circular, No. 527. This circular permits the entrance of two shiploads of miscellaneous Japanese merchandise, including large shipments of textiles. The circular also permits the entry into the country of all Japanese merchandise now in customs warehouses that arrived here without import licenses.

No such concessions have been made to the United States despite the trade-treaty negotiations. All United States merchandise arriving here without proper licenses must be shipped back to the United States within 2 or 3 weeks or the importers are heavily fined.

In the opinion of leading United States businessmen, this continued discrimination against the United States is incomprehensible unless it is being used as a bargaining weapon during the treaty negotiations. Argentina's argument that it must limit the importation of luxury goods to protect its balance-of-trade payments appears absurd in view of the fact that the importation of such luxury goods is unrestricted from 15 countries.

The United States has been Argentina's second-best customer for 30 years, only Great Britain buying more heavily. United States purchases in Argentina are round 60 percent greater than those from the third-best customer, Germany. Argentina's exports to the United States have been booming all this year.

The consulate general's official figures of Argentine exports to the United States for the first 9 months of this year show an increase of about 50 percent over the corresponding period of last year. The total at the end of September was $40,916,000, compared with $27,318,000 on the same date last year. Yet there has been no easing of restrictions against imports from the United States except on some raw materials and semimanufactured products essential to certain local and vocal industries.

Importation of American catalogs and price lists is prohibited under the embargo against printed matter. It was only recently, and as a result of an outcry by newspapers, that books and magazines were removed from the quota basis.

Success of the present trade-treaty negotiations depends on the ability of the American negotiators to persuade the Argentine Government to accord to United States imports absolute equality of treatment with imports from the 15 countries now on the most-favored-nation list. This would mean complete abandonment of the policy Argentina has maintained toward United States imports for several years. Whether this can be done remains to be seen.

Neutrality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 23, 1939

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, the American Legion, which is one of the great peacetime organizations, and of which I have the honor to be a member, takes a sound and very constructive position respecting our foreign policy in this grave period in our Nation's history. The men who compose the very large membership in this great organization are veterans of the World War, and they do not speak from hearsay upon the subject of war, but they speak from that experience which comes from their own participation in that conflict. These men speak soundly upon this very vital question because they know whereof they speak; they speak upon the subject of war in unmistakable terms because they know the tragedies of it and the suffering it involves; they do not want the American boys of today to encounter the hardships and the suffering which the veterans of the World War endured.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to incorporate in and to make a part of my remarks the resolution adopted by the twenty-first national convention of the American Legion, held in Chicago this year. In passing may I urge each Member of the House to read and study this resolution, which enjoins the Congress to "preserve the peace, sovereignty, and dignity of our Nation." The resolution follows:

THE LEGION ON NEUTRALITY—RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY TWENTY-FIRST NATIONAL CONVENTION

Eight departmental resolutions on the subject of neutrality, widely divergent in character and content, were referred by the resolutions assignment committee to the convention foreign relations committee. Another resolution on the subject, offered by a member of the committee from the department of Delaware, was received and considered. The action and recommendation of this committee on the subject of neutrality is contained in the following resolution, which was unanimously adopted by this committee with all departments except one represented on the committee and present and voting; and for the purposes of this report this resolution is designated as resolution No. 3 of this convention committee:

"The American Legion views with gravest concern the apparently widespread belief that this Nation must inevitably become involved in the present European conflict. We not only believe that this Nation need not become involved, but insist and demand that the President of the United States and the Congress pursue a policy that, while preserving the sovereignty and dignity of this Nation will prevent involvement in this conflict. The American Legion is not a law body. It has often recommended to the Congress the enactment of legislation establishing a permanent or fixed policy on important national problems. The American Legion has always strenuously advocated that this Nation pursue a policy of neutrality and peace. In the present world crisis world conditions may change so rapidly that a pronouncement by the American Legion at this time on specific legislation might be wholly inadequate in the near future. Therefore, with full confidence in the President and the Congress, we demand that the Congress continue in session during the present grave crisis, and that appropriate action be taken to preserve the peace, sovereignty, and dignity of this Nation, and that our armed forces be expanded immediately to maintain our neutrality."

The Flag on Ehrenbreitstein

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES I. FADDIS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 23, 1939

POEM BY JOSEPH MILLS HANSON

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Speaker, during the past 20 years much propaganda has been spread for the purpose of discrediting the entrance of this Nation into the World War. Some of this came from those who wished to make political capital out of the matter; some of it came from those who were disappointed because we entered the war on what they believed to be the wrong side; some of it came from a few individuals who, much against their wills, were forced to discharge their obligations to bear arms in their Nation's cause; some of it came from professional busybodies who delight in belittling any of their Nation's activities; some of it came from those who are violently anti-British; some of it came from crackpots.

So much has been said on this subject that I am afraid many people have taken what has been said for granted and have never stopped to analyze the matter. There is much room for research and study on the subject, and I believe every individual should acquaint himself with the facts before passing judgment.

The fact of the matter is that the United States acquitted herself with great honor in all phases of the matter, and we have nothing at all to be ashamed of.

Below is a little poem which, to my mind, sets forth the truth of the matter as no prose can do.

THE FLAG ON EHRENBREITSTEIN

Between its crag-ribbed summits
And ruined castles gray,
Between its clambering vineyards
And orchards white with May,
The rushing Rhine rolls seaward
And, hard by Coblenz town,
A flag on Ehrenbreitstein
Upon that tide looks down.

Its stripes of white and crimson
Are blazoned forth on high;
Its starry field of azure
Seems part of God's own sky;
By winds that touched his eagles
When Caesar's legions came.
The flag on Ehrenbreitstein
Is fanned to rippling flame.

Below it in the city
The passing townsfolk stare
With eyes of smouldering anger
To see it waving there,
Where once the Prussian war lord
Gazed forth across the land
And dreamed the world lay conquered
Beneath his iron hand.

What make ye of that banner
Ye folk of Coblenz town?
What think ye of the field guns
That from the ramparts frown?
And know ye all the meaning
Of the blue and red and white
That waves from Ehrenbreitstein,
And read ye it aright?

St. George's cross is floating
O'er the spires of Cologne,
Above the roofs of Mayence
The Tricolor is flown;
But now between them flutters
Fair freedom's final sign—
The New World's starry banner
Above the German Rhine.

Because ye dreamed that terror
Could stay the arm of right;
That steel was more than honor,
And justice less than might,
Our strong-limbed western legions
Have put your hosts to rout
And set on Ehrenbreitstein
The flag ye dared to flout.

We have not brought that banner
Through storms of gas and lead,
Through your shell-swept leagues of trenches
That are mounded with our dead
For a tinsel hour of triumph
Above the ancient Rhine,
But to leave you for the future
A warning and a sign.

Ye may bask you in your legends
Of Nibelungen lore;
Of the mighty sword of Siegfried
And the hammer strokes of Thor;
But drink no more the potion
Of gods and supermen,
Or the flag on Ehrenbreitstein
Will cross the seas again.

For the lands that through the decades
Have borne your threats and sneers,
And brooked your clanking armor
And the rattle of your spears
Now guard earth's peace and freedom
With Columbia's steel-blue lance
Beside the English broadsword
And the rapier of France.

We take no meed of vengeance—
Nor gold nor gear nor crust;
Ye dared us to the combat
And we stretched you in the dust.
But touch no more our sister
Whose lord ye hoped to be,
And goad no more our brother
Of the islands of the sea.

Of your creed of blood and iron
The world has had surcease;
Mankind is overweary
To walk its way in peace.
Lift up your eyes, ye people;
Mark well that high-flung sign—
The flag on Ehrenbreitstein
Above the German Rhine.

—Joseph Mills Hanson, *Captain, Field Artillery.*

I Propose True Neutrality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. THORKELSON

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 23, 1939

Mr. THORKELSON. Mr. Speaker, in these days, while the powers that be are beating the tom-toms to raise the martial spirit of a population that wants peace, let me add these few remarks to an article that appeared in the Washington Daily News, Friday, October 20, 1939, page 5:

Section 8, Article I, of the Constitution, gives Congress "the power * * * to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian tribes."

To this quotation I shall add an excerpt from article I, section 8, paragraph 1:

The Congress shall have the power * * * to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian tribes * * * for the common defense and the general welfare of the United States.

We now have the full meaning of the power, and the objective of this power, as set forth in the Constitution of the United States. The words "for the common defense and the general welfare of the United States" should be used in conjunction with all powers granted in section 8, and not forgotten in other legislation.

As to House Joint Resolution 306—the Neutrality Act of 1939—we may ask ourselves, Is this type of legislation for the common defense and the general welfare of the United States? Let us consider it section by section:

First (sec. 1a). To name states at war;

Second (sec. 2a). To tie our ships to the docks;

Third (sec. 2b). To fine our people, the citizens of the United States, $50,000 and imprisonment for 5 years for violations that are not definitely described;

Fourth. To operate under regulations set forth in section 2c, d, and e;

Fifth (sec. 2f). To allow transportation on or over lakes, rivers, and inland waters to nations engaged in war;

Sixth (sec. 2g). To exclude from war zones the whole area from longitude 0° west to 180° and from latitude 30° north to the South Pole;

Seventh (sec. 3b). To again fine our citizens for violation $50,000 or $10,000 and 5 years in jail;

Eighth (sec. 7a). To operate under such regulation as set forth in this section;

Ninth (sec. 7c). To again permit a fine of $50,000 or 5 years in jail against a citizen of the United States.

It is this sort of legislation that knocks the Bill of Rights into a cocked hat, for it destroys the rights which the people have reserved to themselves. We now have laws which, under the flimsy pretext of emergencies, restrict truthful expression in patriotic publications and at the same time allow dissemination of false propaganda in the kept press, which is owned or controlled by our enemies in the invisible government.

We have reached a sorry state, indeed, when Federal intelligence and justice units are employed to investigate patriotic citizens and publications that denounce the Bolshevik, the Socialist, and the Communists who are engaged in destruction of the Republic.

In order to revive memories of free government, I quote amendments 1 and 4, respectively:

> Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.
>
> The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized.

Does anyone dare to say that these two articles have not been violated? I do not think so. We have suppression of truthful speech and patriotic publications. The right of assembly and of petition were denied to a group which came to Washington for that purpose. Businesses, as well as private citizens, have been subjected to illegal search and seizure, and it is now just about treasonable to tell the truth.

What has brought about this deplorable state? Nothing but too much law. The shifting, from Congress to the Executive, of the power to administer, to penalize, to imprison, and to appoint his own judges is the end of free government. Yes; the end of our glorious Republic.

I have said before, when Congress by law removes the people's rights one by one, it will have created, when the last is removed, a despotism. Do you wish to leave such heritage to our Nation's children, to your own sons and grandsons? That is what we do when more and more power is given to one individual. I say, what a miserable record to leave in the archives of Congress.

I shall now proceed with further discussion of the neutrality bill.

Tenth (sec. 9). To sponsor and give support to South American republics engaged in foreign wars. Is not this a little too much for us to guarantee, to fight the foreign wars of South American republics?

Eleventh (sec. 10a). To meddle in neutral shipping, forbid departure of neutral vessels or demand bonds or securities from foreign nations for their own merchant marine, and (c) prohibit departure of neutral ships during the war. Such interference with neutral shipping is an incident that might lead to war.

Twelfth (sec. 12a, b, c, d, e, f, g, h, i). To give the Federal Government this power of regulation of business and of our citizens, and to subject those who violate these regulations to a fine of $10,000 and 2 years in jail, is fraught with danger.

What is the answer to this unwarrantable power given to the Federal Government? Such delegation of power is not only unconstitutional, but can end in a dictatorship, destruction of the United States, and in persecution of the people.

Let me now repeat: Is it for the common defense and for the general welfare of the United States to allow these powers to an Executive and his appointees, or to the Federal Government? The answer is "No," for such delegation of power is unconstitutional and can only end in dictatorship, destruction of the Republic, and persecution of the people.

If we must have a Neutrality Act, let us formulate one that will provide neutrality. For example:

Section 1. Whenever the Peace of the United States is threatened by foreign wars, the President shall, to promote the security, preserve peace and to protect the lives of the citizens of the United States, issue a proclamation, giving notice that a state of war exists between foreign states.

Section 2. Whenever the President has issued a proclamation under section 1, it shall be unlawful to clear ships under American registry and to issue passports to American citizens to nations at war.

Section 3. Whenever the President shall have issued a proclamation under authority of section 1, it shall be unlawful:

(a) To extend credit to nations at war.

(b) To purchase foreign securities or redeem United States securities with gold in the United States Treasury.

(c) To accept any kind of money except a gold dollar that contains 25.8 grains of gold nine-tenths fine, or the equivalent in foreign gold money in payment for war materials sold to nations at war.

(d) Whoever shall violate any of the provisions of this section shall, upon conviction thereof, be fined not more than $50,000 or imprisoned for not more than 5 years, or both. Should the violation be by a corporation, organization, or association, each officer or director thereof participating in the violation shall be liable to the penalty herein prescribed.

Section 4. (a) Whenever the President shall have issued a proclamation under authority of section 1, he may from time to time declare an embargo on any part or production of all commodities manufactured or produced in the United States.

(b) American merchant ships must be marked distinctly and all belligerents notified of such markings. When proceeding to neutral nations in active war zones, arrangements for safe passage must be made with the blockading powers.

Section 5. American vessels trading with nations at war or American citizens traveling on belligerent ships in war zones, do so at their own risk.

Mr. Speaker, in this simple wording, I have tried to bring out a real neutrality act that we can enforce and which is in conformity with international law. It is, however, my desire to raise this point, that no changes must be made at this time in the embargo now in force, because it was in existence when war was declared and must for that reason remain so until peace is established by powers now at war.

I venture to say if this type of neutrality act is adopted, it will aid to bring about peace in Europe, for all belligerents

will know that the United States will maintain strict neutrality. I shall now give my reasons for the statements I have made.

In this simple resolution, the object is the same as that of the Neutrality Act, namely, to promote the security, to preserve peace, and to protect the lives of the citizens of the United States. The difference is that it eliminates all the dangers and objectionable features in the Neutrality Act now under consideration. This act which I suggest also places the penalties where they rightfully belong, namely, on those who by subterfuge or otherwise create incidents for no other purpose except to align the United States in war with the powers they favor.

In section 2, it is a violation of the law to clear ships and issue passports to American citizens to nations at war. It is not, however, unlawful for other nations to charter our ships and sail such ships under their own flags wherever they please. It is, therefore, possible for our ships to carry cargoes under foreign charters at their own risk and to neutral nations under our own flag. Such arrangement will eliminate incidents which may lead to war. It is perfectly obvious and now so admitted by the State Department that we have no jurisdiction or more rights than other nations, outside of our 3-mile limit.

Section 3 makes it unlawful to extend credit to any nation at war, and makes it unlawful to sell contraband merchandise to nations at war for the gold certificates now held by interests outside of the United States Treasury or by the Governors of the Federal Reserve banks. It is also unlawful to sell contraband merchandise to nations at war for commodity money, bonds, securities, and other negotiable papers against the gold held in the United States Treasury. In other words, under this act, we can sell to all belligerent powers for gold which is earmarked or on storage in the United States or brought in grain bulk as cash, in payment for merchandise.

I may say at this point that if this section is enforced, peace will soon prevail, for it is the lust for gold and the power it gives that nourishes war.

Section 3 (d) levies fine and imprisonment where it rightfully belongs and where it can do the most good. If it were possible to fine the internationalists or the international financiers a million dollars apiece and imprison each of them for life, there would be no more war. This group comprises probably little over 300 individuals and it would be a blessing to the world and to humanity if they were rendered inert.

In secton 4 (a) permission is given for declaring embargo as we think best or in conformity with the embargo list issued by nations at war. We are, however, free to use our own judgment as to the merchandise we wish to sell or keep for ourselves.

In section 4 (b) other safety measures are set forth. First, our ships should be marked distinctly, so they will be recognized by all belligerents. Second, when our ships are bound to a neutral nation adjacent to a nation at war, arrangement for safe conduct to port of destination should be made with the blockading power.

Mr. Speaker, peace cannot prevail in the world as long as we have people who sell themselves for gold and greed, and we cannot aid peace by becoming partners in destruction of human life. The great mass, or the so-called common people, do not hate each other. They are not envious of each other, for they ask only for their right of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Why must these people who are friendly at heart be led into destructive wars, which are for no other purpose except to enrich an international group that lives upon the earnings of others? If a sacrifice must be made, why not sacrifice the cause of this unrest, so that civilization may be preserved?

It is my firm opinion that if those now engaged in forcing the world into war do not desist from his ungodly venture, they will, before the war is over, be destroyed themselves.

America's Dairy Land

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEWIS D. THILL

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 23, 1939

LETTER FROM FRED R. ZIMMERMAN

Mr. THILL. Mr. Speaker, Wisconsin is known throughout the country as a charming vacation land. Its hills and valleys, its rivers and lakes, its verdant rural serenity have pleased its thousands of visitors every year.

But to its citizens, living on the many farms in the State, Wisconsin is America's dairy land. Over 2,000,000 head of milk cows and heifers graze on Wisconsin's countryside.

Statistics concerning Wisconsin's production of dairy products will be found in the following letter which appeared in the Milwaukee Journal on September 30, 1939.

[From the Milwaukee Journal of September 30, 1939]

HERE YOU ARE, MOTORISTS

To the Journal:

"Give us the figures" was a headline in From the People, suggesting that the secretary of state gather important and correct pieces of information in regard to why Wisconsin is America's Dairyland, as advertised on the 1940 motor-license plate.

Here they are: 1. Of all the cheese made in the United States, Wisconsin produces 50 percent; of the Nation's American cheese, about 50 percent; of the national output of the brick and munster cheese, 91 percent; of the Nation's Swiss cheese, nearly 67 percent; of the national output of limburger cheese, 65½ percent; of the Nation's Italian cheese, 43 percent; of the cream cheese, 21 percent; of the Nation's creamery butter, 11½ percent; of all the condensery products made in the United States, 28 percent; of the Nation's unsweetened condensed and evaporated milk, nearly 33 percent; of the national output of sweetened condensed whole milk, nearly 13 percent; of the Nation's powdered skim and whole milk, 24½ percent; of the Nation's ice cream, 3⅓ percent.

2. The annual cheese production in Wisconsin totals around 324,300,000 pounds. Of this quantity, about 243,000,000 pounds are American, nearly 32,500,000 pounds brick and munster, about 27,700,000 pounds Swiss, over 9,000,000 pounds cream cheese, 5,300,000 pounds limburger, and almost 6,000,000 pounds Italian cheese. Wisconsin creamery butter production totals approximately 175,659,000 pounds annually. More than 865,000,000 pounds of condensery products are manufactured annually in this State.

3. More than 1,000,000,000 pounds of dairy products, valued at nearly $178,000,000, are manufactured in Wisconsin each year.

4. With a total of 2,157,000 head of milk cows and heifers, Wisconsin leads all other States in the number of milk cows.

5. Milk accounts for about 50 percent of the Wisconsin gross farm income.

6. Wisconsin has almost 2,000 cheese factories, about 500 creameries, 75 evaporated-milk plants, 450 ice-cream establishments, and 120 powdered-milk plants.

FRED R. ZIMMERMAN,
Secretary of State.

MADISON, WIS.

Production Standards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE E. GEYER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 23, 1939

EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON POST

Mr. GEYER of California. Mr. Speaker, several times the past week there has been reference made to the strike now in progress at the Chrysler factory. At no time has anyone intimated that there is more than one side to the question, that of the company. A speaker simply made the statement that

this was nothing but the work of members of the Communists that he claims are interfering with the rights of legitimate workers. People that are really thinking are not going to be willing to take that explanation of the cause of the difficulty. All will be interested in what the Washington Post has to say about it editorially:

[From the Washington Post]

LABOR HAS AN INTEREST

The dispute between the Chrysler Corporation and the United Automobile Workers' Union has produced a bewildering barrage of charges and countercharges.

The company maintains that employees have engaged in a "slow-down" under union instructions, causing serious disruption of production schedules and forcing suspension of operations in the main company plant. Union officials assert, on the other hand, that the company has engaged in "speed-up" methods and that it has fired men for inability to maintain the pace set for them.

Back of this controversy is an issue of major significance. That is whether representatives of the automobile workers shall have a voice in deciding what are reasonable production standards.

In a recent letter to Richard T. Frankensteen, representative of the union, Herman L. Weckler, vice president of the Chrysler Corporation, asserted that: "Production schedules are the management's function. You may as well know now that we do not intend to give your union control of production." However, representatives of the company have since expressed a willingness to consider grievances due to production standards.

Objectively viewed, it would appear that workers have at least as great an interest in determining the amount of work demanded of them within a given time as in the length of the working day or the rates of pay. Indeed, excessively high production standards may prove to be a much more injurious kind of labor exploitation than subnormal wages or excessively long hours. Moreover, employees frequently are much better able to judge the reasonableness of production requirements than is management.

In consenting to discuss production standards with representatives of its employees a company would, therefore, simply be expanding the scope of collective bargaining along rational lines. Such a policy would not entail any surrender of managerial functions. If, after discussion, production standards should be modified in accordance with workers' proposals, operations would be adjusted to meet the new conditions, just as they must be when working hours and wages change.

In a seasonal industry, such as automobile manufacturing, faced by annual changes in the models turned out, there is a great temptation to speed up operations unduly at certain times. That may or may not have been done in the present instance. The company denies it; the union affirms it. But neither company nor union is sufficiently disinterested to be given full credence.

In general, protection against speed-ups would be better assured if the workers themselves had a voice in determining production standards And management under such conditions could properly expect to be protected against slow-down tactics by employees who now complain that the pace is too swift for the endurance of the average worker.

The Twenty-fifth Anniversary of Highway Building

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILBURN CARTWRIGHT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 13, 1939

ADDRESS BY HON. WILBURN CARTWRIGHT, OF OKLAHOMA, CHAIRMAN, COMMITTEE ON ROADS, BEFORE THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF STATE HIGHWAY OFFICIALS, RICHMOND, VA., OCTOBER 10, 1939

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert a speech which I delivered before the American Association of State Highway Officials in Richmond, Va., October 10, 1939, which is as follows:

Mr. President, friends, and lovers of good roads, as soon as I learned from your efficient executive secretary, Mr. Markham, and others, of the plans being made for this celebration of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the organization of the American Association of State Highway Officials, I felt that the Congress of the United States should be officially represented by a special congressional committee authorized to convey to the members of this association the appreciation of the Congress for your fine work and leadership in the field of highway development during the last quarter century.

So, on February 27, this year, I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 10, providing for the establishment of such a committee, to consist of three Senators, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and three Representatives, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House, to attend this meeting and silver anniversary celebration and publicly express deserved recognition of the fine accomplishments of the State highway departments and the Public Roads Administration.

Much credit is due Hon. EUGENE B. CROWE, of Indiana, a member of the House Roads Committee, who, in my temporary absence on account of a leg injury, obtained consent for consideration of the resolution in the House and secured its unanimous adoption. I am glad that Mr. CROWE's sincere interest in roads and his very helpful activity and leadership in behalf of this resolution was recognized by your association officials who invited him to be a special guest at your convention.

Speaker BANKHEAD, on the part of the House, appointed Hon. LINDSAY C. WARREN, of North Carolina, the ranking majority member of the House Roads Committee; Hon. JAMES W. MOTT, of Oregon, minority member of the committee; and myself to serve on the committee for this meeting and present congratulations to the State highway departments for their wonderful accomplishments in road building.

I have the following communication from Mr. WARREN: "Mr. CARTWRIGHT: I have your letter about the breakfast at Washington and the convention at Richmond. It is with great regret that I must inform you that I will be unable to attend either, as I will be in North Carolina at that time." Congressman MOTT is present and you will hear from him when I have finished.

Vice President GARNER appointed the following Senators to serve on this special committee: Hon. CARL HAYDEN, of Arizona; Hon. HARRY FLOOD BYRD, of Virginia; and Hon. CHARLES W. TOBEY, of New Hampshire. Senators speak for themselves.

The committee is pleased to represent the Congress and to convey to the members of the American Association of State Highway Officials at this, your twenty-fifth annual meeting, an expression of public appreciation by the Congress for the splendid results which you have achieved in the vital development of our national highway transportation system.

It is not for us to tell you how many miles of roads have been built on the Federal-aid or State highway systems, nor to recite the demands for additional improvements. That is doubtless more evident to you than to us.

But we have, almost since the beginning of your organization, been in close touch with the road activities in the States. For many years the House of Representatives has maintained a Committee on Roads, whose duty it is to deal exclusively with this subject. Federal contributions toward a cooperative plan of road construction began modestly in 1916.

THE BANKHEADS

Here let us pause and pay tribute to the Honorable John Hollis Bankhead, father of our illustrious Speaker WILLIAM BANKHEAD and the present distinguished Senator BANKHEAD, who for years was a conspicuous leader in highway development in the Congress. Much credit is due him for his vision and activity.

CONSTRUCTIVE ASSISTANCE

Those who are familiar with the legislation of Congress covering this subject are fully aware that we are indebted to your organization for its constructive assistance in formulating needed legislation, and the unprejudiced information which you have so freely given us has been a most excellent guide.

NO CUTS

This is not the time to argue as to what the Federal obligations toward road construction must be. Naturally it must be based on interstate demands, but personally I feel that despite other calls made upon the Federal Treasury for worthy causes, we are making a grave mistake when we cut road appropriations below the modest and orderly planned amounts.

NO DIVERSIONS

The next session of the Congress will need to consider authorizations for another 2-year period. I feel sure the committee upon whose shoulders rest the responsibility to produce the needed legislation will, after reviewing with you the accomplishments of the past 2 years, present for consideration a bill to continue the work and certainly will not approve the diverting to any other purpose the funds secured by the Federal Treasury direct from the road users.

HIGHWAY NEEDS

Even the colorful plea of national defense does not merit reducing expenditures for these important highways, but rather it adds to the argument for increased appropriations.

You recognize that our present highway facilities fall drastically short of present-day requirements. On a national scale, traffic is expected to double within the next 25 years. It appears that there is immediate need to start construction of improvements on the 26,000-mile interregional primary highway system on which the President reported to the regular session of this Congress.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

Now let us think in terms of national defense. In 1917–18 our highways could not cope with our transportation demands. Today our Army is mechanized. When we think of preparedness we must

think of highways. Not only highway builders sense this need, but the War Department has stressed the inadequacy of our facilities. Highways should receive a substantial part of any national defense appropriations in Congress. Remember you cannot drive a car on a battleship.

On the subject of national defense, I don't think I can do better than to repeat what I said at your Dallas convention last year:

"Our highway system is a vital part of our national defense. Without good roads, under conditions of modern warfare, the United States would be seriously crippled in dealing with an enemy attack.

"There is no question that our defense will have to be a mobile defense in the future. Defense not only by guns on wheels to be placed at strategic points upon brief notice, but manpower on wheels to be transported whenever and wherever needed.

"The roads, first of all, will serve our everyday commercial needs, but no army and no navy can move without food and supplies. We must have roads to the farm where the food is produced and roads to the factories where the munitions and supplies are made. These, plus rapid means of transportation, will comprise the heart of successful national defense."

CONCLUSION

Your own members, who are best qualified from experience and duty, will give you at this convention a résumé of highway developments during the past quarter century and make definite suggestions as to your obligations as public officials in the future. It is therefore unnecessary for the committee to do more than to say that we rejoice with you in the attainments achieved and to give you assurance of our cooperation whenever possible in carrying forward this much-needed public service, so essential to the well-being of all our citizens.

Please pardon me for digressing but while the nations of Europe and the Orient are at each others throats in murderous combat, I think the course our Nation should take is fittingly expressed by this poem entitled "That's What Old Caesar Did":

"When Caesar took a westward ride
And grabbed the Gauls for Rome,
What was the first thing he did
To make them feel at home?
Did he increase the people's loans,
No! he dug in and built good roads—
That's what old Caesar did.

"He built good roads from hill to hill,
Good roads from vale to vale;
He ran a good-roads movement
Till Rome got all the kale.
He told the folks to buy a home,
Built roads their ruts to rid,
Until all the roads led to Rome.
That's what old Caesar did.

"And, if our Nation wants to be
The center of the map,
Where folks will want to settle down
And live in plenty's lap;
If this broad land its own abodes
Of poverty would rid,
Then let us plan and build good roads,
Just like old Caesar did!"

Oil From the Standpoint of National Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM P. COLE, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 23, 1939

ADDRESS BY HON. WILLIAM P. COLE, JR., OF MARYLAND, BEFORE THE INDEPENDENT PETROLEUM ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA, OCTOBER 20, 1939, AT FORT WORTH, TEX.

Mr. COLE of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me before the Independent Petroleum Association of America at its annual dinner, Friday, October 20, 1939, at Fort Worth, Tex.:

Enjoying the privilege and honor of representing nearly one-third of the population of the small but great State of Maryland in the National Congress for 12 years, and being born and reared in that State and closely identified with its development and fairly familiar with its history, I feel completely at home in the great State of Texas tonight, and especially in the congressional district represented so very ably by my good friend, the scholarly and popular Representative FRITZ LANHAM. Texas, like Maryland, is known as a sane, progressive, tolerant commonwealth, proud of its past, confident of its future, able to adequately manage its own affairs, and like Maryland it wants to be unmolested in doing just that.

I preface my remarks tonight in this introductory way, knowing the subject before me draws the fire of many citizens of Texas and other oil-producing States because of the threat it possesses, on the part of the Federal Government, to usurp what they consider to be privileges of the State. Furthermore, in the application of our basic law to the ever-recurring problems of the day, it has been my creed and gospel to prefer the path of principle to that of expediency, and to continually advocate that we put more business into government and more self-government into business. Aside from the dangers facing democracy through the development and growth of many despicable "isms" throughout the world—and to some extent within our own borders—we must speedily watch another threatening danger and reestablish within ourselves the determination to preserve the unique and simple system of Federal and State sovereignties with which our country began or suffer consequences highly repugnant to our basic concepts.

The philosophy I have mentioned means just what it implies, but it does not mean opposition to the necessary exercise of regulation by government in the public's interest. Just as we are determined that communism, Hitlerism, socialism, sovietism, shirts of various colors, and any other "isms" and new conceptions of government must not secure a foothold or a comfortable resting place here, so must we insist upon Government, State and National, staying where they belong. This does not mean that there shall be an unchangeable rule that the age of the wheelbarrow shall govern the age of the airplane. Industrial development, through expansion and conduct, compels the adoption of necessary regulatory measures at times.

At this time, in the midst of an important investigation of the petroleum industry, I am therefore mindful of the freedom from Government regulation, both State and National, which it must desire, but at the same time I am keenly aware of the break-down in some instances of the ability of this great industry to handle its own affairs and of the failure of some State agencies to likewise possess the essential regard for the general welfare of a nation of which such State is a part and of an industry the assets of which are an indispensable governmental requirement. Since I have been associated rather intimately with this problem, the foregoing has been the opinion of many of our leading statesmen, governmental officials, and in some instances prominent men identified with the industry. It has, at the same time, been challenged by an equally formidable group. The allegations, however, were of such force and persuasion that following the somewhat voluntary adherence by the industry as a whole to the code regime of 1933 and 1934, congressional action was recommended and seriously threatened.

It is easy, I am sure, for this great gathering to recall the 1934 session of Congress when a determined effort in both the Senate and House was being made for the Federal Government to take over virtually lock, stock, and barrel the petroleum industry and regulate it in every conceivable method. As an illustration I quote from a letter to Congress from President Roosevelt in the early part of his administration:

"My administration for many weeks has been in conference with the Governors of the oil-producing States and with component parts of the industry, but it seems difficult, if not impossible, to bring order out of chaos only by State action. In fact, this is recognized by most of the Governors concerned.

"There is a widespread demand for Federal legislation. May I request that this subject be given immediate attention by the appropriate committee or committees. The Secretary of the Interior stands ready to present any information or data desired."

It so happened that such legislation was referred to a committee of the House of Representatives, presided over by the distinguished Representative from the great State of Texas, the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, now majority leader of the House and one of the great statesmen this State has given to our country. That legislation was the subject of hearings in May and June of 1934. I refer to H. R. 9676, introduced in the Seventy-third Congress by Representative DISNEY, of Oklahoma. A companion measure was introduced, as I recall, by Senator THOMAS of Oklahoma.

The proponents of the legislation, most of whom were from oil-producing States, were in dead earnest, and it looked as though a real fight was ahead for those opposing the measure, possibly a losing fight.

Following the results of these hearings, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, while in executive session, declined to report the bill, and in lieu thereof recommended to the House of Representatives that a thorough investigation of the petroleum problem be conducted. I think I am safe in saying, without divulging any of the proceedings of the executive sessions to which I have referred, that the threatened collapse of the entire petroleum industry, as vigorously advanced to us by representatives of the oil-producing States of this country, did more to influence the decision to which I have referred than any other single consideration.

I was designated by the main committee to introduce House Resolution 441 on June 15, 1934. This resolution inaugurated the petroleum investigation by a subcommittee of the House of Representatives, of which subcommittee I had the honor and privilege of being chairman. The other members of that committee

were the Honorable Samuel B. Pettengill, of Indiana; the Honorable Edward A. Kelly, of Illinois; the Honorable Carl E. Mapes, of Michigan, and the Honorable Charles A. Wolverton, of New Jersey. Many times I have publicly expressed not only my deep affection for all of these splendid gentlemen, but my appreciation for the many hours of hard and tedious work which they put in during the recess months, as well as during the regular session of Congress, on this investigation.

The House resolution authorized and directed our committee to investigate as follows: (1) The production, importation, storage, transportation, refining, purchase, and sale of petroleum and its products for the purpose of determining whether there is an excessive supply of petroleum and its products; whether such excessive supply, if it exists, injuriously affects commerce in petroleum and its products and has the effect of rendering unprofitable the operation of wells of small but settled production and will cause their abandonment before the maximum economic yield is obtained; whether premature extraction of petroleum from natural resources, induced by absence of restrictions upon the quantity which may move in commerce, results in waste and inferior uses; whether restrictions should be placed upon the quantities of petroleum and its products which may move in commerce when an excessive supply exists, and if so, whether such restrictions should regulate and coordinate commerce in petroleum and its products among the several States and with foreign nations, with fair and equitable apportionment among the States and among different operators and sources of supply; and whether commerce in petroleum and its products is of such nature that it may be regarded as a unit for the purpose of establishing quotas irrespective of whether transactions are interstate or intrastate, or whether exportation or importation is involved; and (2) all other questions in relation to the subject of regulating commerce in petroleum and its products.

From a technical standpoint, through the assistance of personnel placed at the disposal of our committee by Secretary of the Interior Harold L. Ickes, the hearings contain a lengthy and interesting study of the following subjects:

GEOLOGICAL SUMMARY

(1) Geological concepts, tracing history of knowledge regarding occurrence of petroleum, including movement of production centers from east to south and southwest. (2) Geological summary of Texas, Oklahoma, and California, with description of major fields in each State. (3) Geological summary of other States, with description of stripper well and minor flush areas. (4) Estimates of reserves in present proven areas, starting with earliest estimates and continuing to the present, with estimates from group of geologists. Method of calculation and probable accuracy. (5) Probable extent of oil supply which may be discovered in areas at present unproven, with estimates from geologists.

TECHNOLOGICAL SUMMARY

(1) How much oil is recovered and how has improved technology increased the recovery? (2) Changes in engineering views from the days when it was thought that oil flowed in underground rivers to the present concept of reservoir energy. (3) History of well spacing and the relationship between well spacing, energy utilization, and prevention of waste. (4) Methods of production and technical changes which have increased production, either through ability to drill deeper or recover larger proportion of oil.

SUMMARY OF DEMAND

(1) History of demand, with changes in characteristics and fundamental reasons for change. (2) Previous forecasts of demand. (3) Forecast of gasoline demand until 1950. (4) Forecast of probable crude-oil requirement to meet demand. (5) Forecast of probable changes in refining which will result. If, for example, gasoline demand by 1950 will double that of present, does this mean twice as much crude oil will be needed or will refineries of 1950 be able to produce twice as much motor fuel from crude as do the present plants? Hydrogenation and its economic status. Other substitutes. (6) Other demand factors, such as increasing efficiency of motors, habits of consumers, etc. (7) Probable future of oil burning, both domestic and industrial.

IMPORTS AND EXPORTS

(1) History of imports and exports. (a) Development of foreign resources by American companies. (b) Particular quality of imports, such as heavy crude for asphalt manufacture and fuel oil for ship bunkering, with decrease in imports of gasoline crudes and of gasoline. (c) Analysis of reasons for decline in exports. (d) Probable future trends in imports and exports.

CRUDE-OIL PRODUCTION COSTS

(1) A regional comparative study of total costs per barrel throughout the United States. Data by unit-areas in which costs are similar, due to similar geological structures, depths of producing sands, and age of fields, important factors in drilling and lifting costs. (2) Labor cost per barrel, covering total United States production. (3) Analysis of all costs relating to the production of crude oil. (4) Operating costs in stripper areas in Kansas, Illinois, and Pennsylvania.

INTERSTATE RELATIONSHIPS

(1) Review of interstate or interregional movement of crude petroleum and products from 1920 to date. (2) Operations under the petroleum code. (3) Well abandonments. (4) Table showing approximate proportion of petroleum which is shipped from major States to other States. (5) Data showing interrelationship between intrastate and interstate shipments. (6) Methods for determining required crude-oil production and its equitable allocation between States.

These gentlemen, then associated with the Government, did a fine job and our committee so acknowledged in its report to Congress. I shall refer later in my remarks to the personnel now working on similar subjects as part of the investigation we are conducting at this time.

In addition to the Thomas-Disney bill, which was the immediate cause for the investigation of 1934, our study uncovered still another measure, known as the Margold bill, found printed at pages 2416 to 2420 of the hearings. It deserved the place it finally and permanently occupied in the padlocked archives of dreams and hopes that some unseasoned brain trusters were willing to sponsor and but for the red light fortunately found at some intersections on Capitol Hill might have got somewhere.

Following the investigation of 1934, concrete recommendations were not made because we felt such should await the outcome of the Panama-Amazon cases then pending before the Supreme Court of the United States, the full report of the National Resources Board, which was then being written, and the result of the Governors' conference on an interstate compact.

In the committee's report of January 1935 are found the following statements, which might be accepted as general conclusions by the committee at that time:

"The petroleum industry, the third largest in the country, represents an investment, based upon present-day values, of more than $12,000,000,000. No argument is needed to establish reasons for the interest of the National Government in the future development and in the operations of many of the present-day activities in the petroleum industry.

"We recommend, therefore, that any legislation establishing permanently the interest of the Federal Government in the petroleum industry should provide for an agency, commission, or board, as it might be designated to absorb some of the activities in various departments of the Federal Government as now constituted. The Bureau of Mines might very easily be revamped for the purpose.

"The subcommittee feels that such an agency should have sufficient personnel and authority to study continuously the status of the petroleum reserves; encourage discoveries of new pools; assist in improving present-day methods of production; study the possibility and expense of repressuring in various existing fields; systemmatically determine the total demand for petroleum and its products, both domestic and foreign; have jurisdiction over the management of oil-producing public and Indian lands; be given jurisdiction to establish pipe-line rates, unless the Interstate Commerce Commission is given greater appropriation to handle more expeditiously this subject now before it; and to study and make report as to the advisability of divorcing pipe lines; recommend at regular intervals to the President of the United States—the President being given authority by Congress to approve—limitations upon the importation of petroleum and its products, including natural asphalt, so as to prevent importation thereof from interfering with current domestic production by supplying an undue proportion of the domestic consumption and export demand therefor; to represent the Federal Government, if need be, in any cooperative interstate compact, agreed upon and approved by the Congress; and, in general, to possess all other necessary authority so as to present that dignity, from a national standpoint, to which the subcommittee believes the petroleum industry is entitled."

Following this report, practically all oil legislation other than that dealing with taxation has passed through our committee. In February of 1935 the original Connally Act was passed; August 1935, the first Interstate Oil Compact was approved. In 1935 President Roosevelt desired some new and more substantial legislation which, from a Federal standpoint, would deal with the petroleum industry. The President invited me to the White House and requested that my subcommittee, known as the Cole committee, formulate a concrete bill embodying the views of the subcommittee on the subject and let him have it for study and consideration. This we did, and after careful perusal of the bill by the President, a conference was called at the White House in which Members of the Senate, of the House, Secretary Ickes, and other participated. The President approved the measure and asked that it be introduced in both branches of Congress. I refer to H. R. 9053 of the Seventy-fourth Congress.

The Connally Act of 1935 was reenacted on June 14, 1937, to remain effective until June 30, 1939.

Under date of August 10, 1937, the Interstate Oil Compact was extended for a period of 2 years, expiring September 1, 1939.

On June 29, 1939, Congress again extended the Connally Act for a period of 3 years, the expiration date of the said act to be June 30, 1942.

On July 20, 1939, Congress extended the Interstate Compact for a period of 2 years, expiring September 1, 1941.

As a group or individually, members of the committee have visited nearly all of the States in which oil is produced. We have seen the veteran pumping wells of the Appalachian region and have traveled lengthwise and crosswise throughout the gigantic east Texas field in which, at the time of our visit, there remained visible evidence of attempts to produce oil in violation of the orders of the Railroad Commission of Texas. By way of contrast, we have seen the Conroe field, with its planned development and judicious

control of reservoir pressures, and the competitive operations in the Oklahoma City area. We have been at Burbank, on the land of the Osage Nation, and have seen new producing methods applied immediately in the shadow of the old. We were in the Texas Panhandle when a billion cubic feet of natural gas was being blown daily into the air. We have visited the fields of the Los Angeles Basin and, recently, I supplemented my California information by visiting Kettleman Hills and some of the coastal fields.

We have talked with many who are engaged actively in the business of producing oil and with most of the State officials who administer the oil and gas conservation laws. During the course of our original inquiry and the two subsequent hearings on the extension of the Connally law, we have come to know the viewpoint of the executive branch of the Federal Government as it relates to the conservation of oil and gas, as well as of those in the industry and in the State offices.

Many of the foregoing experiences were enjoyed by the committee prior to the actual taking of testimony. At the very outset, appreciating the little knowledge we possessed on this important subject at the time I was asked to preside over such important committee, I concluded along with my associates to witness the practical side of the problem before starting to talk about it.

It was but our duty to do this. At the same time I mention it here because it tended to furnish our committee with a greater realization of the magnitude of the problem before us.

In his appearances before our committee Secretary Ickes has recommended consistently the establishment of a permanent policy of oil conservation. The background of support which he has given to this recommendation may be well known to all of you, but a brief summary thereof may be of interest at this time. When Secretary Ickes testified before our committee on April 27, 1937, he said:

"The oil reserves of the United States are limited and oil is an irreplaceable resource. Petroleum and its products are essential to our happiness and well-being as citizens and absolutely indispensable to our national defense. The United States is using up its oil reserves faster than the rest of the world, and an oil shortage in the United States may be expected long before there is an oil shortage elsewhere. As a nation we should not exhaust these resources and be forced to depend upon the more costly substitute fuels in advance of the rest of the world or be required to pay the higher price for oil which foreign producers will demand when our production fails to meet our needs. If we are to avoid this penalty for our past and present extravagance, we should make certain that our present and future reserves of oil will be developed without waste and that our supply of this irreplaceable resource will be made to meet, so long as possible and at reasonable prices, the needs of the Nation."

What I have just read is a restatement of what Secretary Ickes had said at greater length to our committee at its first hearing in September 1934, and, in substance, what he again said when he addressed your association in Houston on October 15, 1937.

Our committee was in substantial accord with that viewpoint. In the report which we presented to the Congress at the conclusion of our hearings nearly 5 years ago we said:

"Statistics of production are also statistics of exhaustion. No one knows how much petroleum there is underground in America. We take the broad position that whether our petroleum supplies are large or small, they should not be physically wasted above or below the ground. Cheap and abundant fuel and power are the very cornerstone of American industry, transportation, and business."

I think there is full recognition and appreciation of the fundamental truth of these statements. Recent figures show that the United States produces 61 percent of the world's oil, while the most favorable estimates credit the United States with less than half of the world's oil reserves. Accurate information on foreign oil reserves is not readily available, but as additional discoveries are made abroad, such as have been reported recently in Colombia, northeastern Venezuela, and in the Persian Gulf area, the relative standing of the United States oil reserves is being progressively lowered.

I recall only one witness before our committee who has been unwilling to support conservation. Some have qualified their viewpoint by saying they favored true conservation. However, when our committee has asked to have conditions in the oil industry interpreted in the light of the witnesses' support of conservation, wide variances in opinion have been encountered. One witness may say that physical waste is to be deplored and then limit his definition of physical waste so as to include nothing but the evaporation losses which might result from lack of storage or from improper handling of oil above ground. Such a witness eliminates any consideration of underground waste. If all the oil which is produced is used, he would say there is no physical waste. Another witness may include the results of inefficient well completion in his definition of physical waste but eliminate or neglect to mention physical waste as related to the operation of a producing well. Some may regard the production of oil in excess of current demand as the most likely source of waste. Others, including those who have testified for the Federal departments, hold that the definition of physical waste should include any avoidable method or practice which, to an unreasonable degree, leaves underground quantities of oil which, through the use of proper methods, could be produced for beneficial use.

In thus reciting some of the differences in viewpoint as to conservation and physical waste, I do not imply that the committee has favored one as against another or that it has formulated any separate opinion of its own. Our committee recognizes that there are distinct differences of opinion on this point, just as there are between wide and close spacing in drilling and between open and retarded flow in production.

It seems that avoidable physical waste still occurs in oil production, and that wasteful practices are to be found in some States which have enacted conservation laws and in some States which do not have such laws. Your association apparently has knowledge of producing conditions which are physically wasteful, as your supply-and-demand survey and forecast which was presented at the Austin meeting of the Interstate Oil Compact Commission on March 15, 1939, contains the following statement:

"There are still some producers of crude petroleum in some of the oil-producing States who are producing oil from wells in such large quantities as to create underground physical waste to the detriment of the industry, the States in which this is occurring, and to the Nation. These conditions can probably only be eliminated in the States that do not have conservation laws, by the enactment and enforcement of adequate conservation laws. Where these conditions exist in States having conservation laws they can be eliminated in most cases through the cooperation of the producers themselves, and in all cases probably by proper enforcement of the conservation laws."

In recent hearings before the T. N. E. C. in Washington, a witness cited Rodessa, La., and Fitts, Okla., as fields which have been poorly controlled. You will recall that it was in the Rodessa field that at least a half billion cubic feet of gas was being blown into the air and burned wastefully each 24 hours when the present Louisiana law was approved in July 1936, and that, in the Fitts pool, reservoir pressures dropped 1,000 pounds in about 800 days, with most of it occurring after the 1935 revision of the Oklahoma conservation law.

New Mexico may have had some difficulty in regulating gas-oil ratios, as the State geologist stated on July 22, 1938, that the majority of the operators had not taken the matter seriously in the past and unless every possible measure was taken to correct high gas-oil ratios, the commission would be forced to adopt a maximum gas-oil ratio for the various fields in that State.

Our committee has been particularly interested in the east Texas field, first, because its reserves form a substantial part of our national source of supply; and, second, because it is recognized generally that the manner in which its reservoir pressure has been regulated during the past 6 years will lead ultimately to a material increase in oil recovery. Through charts which have been shown to our committee we have noted the immediate response in reservoir pressure to an increase or decrease in the permitted rate of flow. We have been acquainted with that field since our visit there in 1934. Earlier this month the present proration order was attacked and the supplemental complaint filed by the plaintiff in civil action No. 31, in a proceeding entitled "*Humble Oil Co.* v. *Railroad Commission of Texas et al.*, defendant," in the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Texas, Austin division, states that the east Texas field cannot produce oil allowable, plus the water withdrawn concurrently, without causing a "great amount of physical waste" and a rapid decline in reservoir pressures, quoting from the bill of complaint, and continued withdrawals at the rate of 600,000 barrels per day, or at any rate materially in excess of 500,000 barrels per day, will cause a rapid decline in reservoir pressures and will result in physical waste, for the reasons stated in paragraph IV (9) of the complaint. The excessive withdrawals of oil and water under proration orders of September 11 and 29 have caused and will cause physical waste which will reduce the ultimate recovery of oil from the field * * *." I quote from the pleadings in this important litigation solely for the purpose of showing how, within the industry itself, present practices even in the State of Texas are said to result in waste and not personally to take sides in the controversy one way or the other.

In the forthcoming hearings we will devote much of our time to a thorough study of any evidence which may be presented to us as to the prevalencc of physical waste in oil production in the United States. We shall be glad to have your association, the individual members thereof, and others tell us of the presence or absence of physical waste in oil operations.

While our efforts were not controlling in that accomplishment, our committee gave considerable encouragement to the oil-producing States in the formation of the interstate compact to conserve oil and gas. The compact, as originally presented to the Congress and on two subsequent occasions for extension, was limited specifically to conserving oil and gas by the prevention of physical waste from any cause, and expressly declared that its purpose was not to authorize the member States to limit the production of oil or gas so as to stabilize or fix prices.

Since its establishment more than 4 years ago the Interstate Oil Compact Commission has held regular quarterly meetings. On August 15, 1939, a special meeting of the commission was called. Promptly after that meeting the regulatory authorities of five oil-producing States—Oklahoma, Kansas, New Mexico, Arkansas, and Louisiana—did as Texas had done on the preceding day, ordered the shut-down of oil production in their respective States for a period which covered approximately the last 2 weeks of August. As a result crude-oil production in the United States was reduced by nearly 2,000,000 barrels daily and 30,000,000 barrels of crude oil were taken out of storage.

In his telegram to the Governors of Illinois and Louisiana, the chairman of the compact commission said that this special meeting was called "on account of the drastic cut in the price of oil which seems to be unwarranted as stocks of all oils are at a 12-year low

and demand is at an all-time peak." This telegram was read into the record at the oil hearings before the T. N. E. C. in Washington. The compact commission chairman was asked whether a meeting called because of a cut in the price of crude oil and to deal with the situation caused by that cut is a meeting called for purposes which legitimately fall within the purview of the compact. The answer was that such action was within the limits of the compact if it would "save the lives of 200,000 stripper wells." During the course of the inquiry other possible reasons for the shut-down were suggested, such as the need to build up reservoir pressure in the east Texas field, and to protect 50,000 stripper wells in Texas with production costs of $1 per barrel.

When this special meeting of the compact commission was concluded, its chairman is reported to have said (I quote from the Oil and Gas Journal, August 17, 1939, p. 23):

"The sovereign oil-producing States are capable of handling their oil-conservation problems. We firmly believe they will promptly and properly control the production of oil within their own States. We feel it will be done with certainty and in a manner that will get results. Each State will handle its own problem in its own way, subject only to the laws of the particular State. We reiterate that State sovereignty will not permit encroachment upon its exclusive police power.

"Under the authority granted us by the legislatures of our States and under the consent of Congress we have exchanged our experiences and have thoroughly discussed ways and means of conserving oil and gas in our own States and each State will take such action as it sees fit, each State making its own announcement."

Obviously our committee does not yet have sufficient information to warrant any conclusion as to this recent action of the Compact Commission, but it is a matter of real concern. The member States of the compact, plus the two others which also shut down production, produce about three-fourths of our crude oil; but the other States, those which have no voice in the compact, consume three-fourths of our gasoline. A serious situation would arise if the Compact Commission, which is authorized only to prevent physical waste, should prove to be a medium through which State authorities representing the bulk of our crude-oil output may, whenever they feel conditions call for it, completely stop the production of crude oil and jeopardize the interests of those who consume petroleum products, and if it is to such an agreement that the Congress of the United States has consented.

The committee also may find itself interested in oil operations on lands owned by the United States. Four years have passed since the Congress authorized the Secretary of the Interior to require the submission of unit plans when public lands were to be leased for the production of oil and gas. Sufficient time may now have elapsed to permit of some valuation of the merits of these plans and whether they are effective in promoting an increased recovery of oil. The committee may be interested in learning if and to what extent operations on properties offsetting the Government units may be affecting the Government's interest as a landowner or proprietor. As to such lands, as well as Indian and naval petroleum reserve properties, it might be pertinent to the pending legislation to inquire into the operating regulations to determine if the prevention of waste on Government lands is keeping pace with technological advances of the oil industry.

In other inquiries the committee has given considerable thought to the organization of the various agencies of the Federal Government which are directly concerned with oil. The bill which was drafted by our committee in 1935 provided for the coordination of Federal oil activities within the agency which was proposed under that measure. Some members of our committee felt that a new agency, compatible with the national importance of the petroleum industry, should be established, while others were of the opinion that an existing agency should be employed. In our report of May 14, 1937, our committee stated that the bill recommended in 1935, with the exception of the recommendation for a new agency, might well be considered as a permanent policy of the Government dealing with the oil industry.

It is to be expected that our committee will review the organization of the oil activities of the Federal Government. We may inquire into the relationships which exist between the Federal agencies and the State regulatory commissions. It is approximately correct to say that the oil-producing States, in the aggregate, appropriate and expand for oil administration approximately the same amount annually as is appropriated and expended by the Federal Government for petroleum research and the administration of existing oil laws. It may be pertinent to our inquiry to know something of the value and the timeliness of Federal research on oil and if the results, when obtained, are being made available to State agencies and the industry without delay.

The critical period through which we are now passing will make it necessary and advisable for our committee to consider national defense in connection with the proposed Petroleum Conservation Act of 1939, known as H. R. 7372 of the Seventy-sixth Congress. The National Resources Committee report on energy resources and national policy states:

"The dependence on petroleum and its products of the Naval Establishment, of the increasingly mechanized Army Establishment, and of the air forces of the two services is so great that the national defense interest alone is sufficient to justify the Federal policy recommendations concerning conservation of this resource which have been outlined in a preceding section of this summary. It has been pointed out, however, that normal peacetime interests likewise make a compelling demand for a program of conservation. The Navy's interests and the Army's interests reinforce that general demand.

"Although the natural reserves of petroleum in the United States are estimated to exceed the proven reserves of any other country, the peacetime industrial demands upon these natural reserves are such that eventually rigid conservation measures will have to be adopted. In a national emergency, the estimated requirements of petroleum products for industry, for the Army and for the Navy exceed by nearly 25 percent the present peacetime production of crude petroleum."

Officers of the Army and Navy assisting with that report will be asked to elaborate thereon. There is a demand that we cover, if time will permit, some important phases of the oil problems from an international point of view. Whether that will be done and if so, to what extent, must await later decisions by our committee in view of conditions existing at the time. It will be of interest, however, in connection with this subject and because of the vital concern the problem embraces at this time to take my audience into the confidence of the committee and refer briefly to an important document now in my possession and which will, at a later date, become part of the proceedings before us. In discussing the naval petroleum reserves and the Navy's position with respect to the oil industry, the Navy Department, in an interesting and instructive statement, has left with me the following observations:

"The importance of petroleum and its products as necessities of modern warfare can no longer be denied and those departments of the Government charged with the defense of the United States must be assured of ample supplies of these vital materials if they are to be able at all times to carry out their missions. To this end the Navy Department is of the opinion that the petroleum resources of the United States must be conserved and the naval petroleum and other naval fuel reserves protected, as far as it is possible to do so, from depletion by operations conducted on both fee-owned and leased land within and without the reserves.

"While many petroleum technologists and economists assure us that the petroleum resources of the United States are ample, that there is no occasion for their conservation, and that there is no prospect of a shortage in the near future, it is my opinion that these so-called vast reserves of petroleum are largely dependent on much higher prices because of the greater development and production costs necessary to reduce the oil to possession. Due to the constantly increasing world demand for oil (over 2,000,000,000 barrels in 1937) the day when oil can be obtained in abundance, quickly, and cheaply from relatively shallow wells is rapidly drawing to a close, at least as far as the resources of the United States are concerned.

"Less than a decade ago few oil wells were producing from a greater depth than 5,000 feet and seldom were "wildcat" or prospect wells drilled more than two or three thousand feet before the "wildcatter" abandoned his well and moved on to explore elsewhere when he failed to find production. Today many wells are producing from depths between eight and ten thousand feet and one prospect well has been drilled to a depth of over 15,000 feet. The present indications are that prospecting for oil will, in the not distant future, even exceed that depth. It is not uncommon today for prospect wells, favorably located, to be carried to depths of over 10,000 feet at costs of hundreds of thousands of dollars as compared with the tens of thousands formerly felt to be justified in such work. These facts cannot be disputed and can only be explained by the acknowledgment on the part of the oil industry generally, that the regions where oil might be discovered at relatively shallow depths and at small expense have nearly all been explored.

"Naval petroleum reserve No. 1, in California, constitutes what is probably one of the few remaining large areas in the United States where, from comparatively shallow wells, it can be reasonably anticipated that, within a relatively short period of time, intensive drilling will develop a daily production of oil sufficient to meet a sudden national crisis. It is not improbable that some day the safety of the United States may depend on the oil remaining in this reserve and therefore it must be protected from further depletion and the Government's lands therein must be consolidated so that the largest possible area will be embraced in a single tract of land.

"With a large increase in the tonnage of the Navy, larger air forces in both the Army and Navy, and the tendency for complete mechanization of various Army units to increase their mobility and effectiveness, the necessity for the Government to possess adequate petroleum reserves in the ground becomes a constantly more important factor in the missions of the country's armed forces to provide properly for the defense of the Nation and its outlying possessions.

"The success of military operations at home and of naval operations at sea is becoming more and more dependent on having available for all requirements ample supplies of the best possible fuels—all of which are dependent on access to large reserves of petroleum. In wartime the facility and speed with which both the Army and Navy can maneuver will unquestionably determine the effectiveness of military and naval operations and will be dependent on an abundance of proper fuels for all purposes during the entire period of action. Any country attempting an aggressive war or fighting defensively, which has limited petroleum resources, against a foe having access to practically unlimited supplies of oil will be, even though it may possess some superiority in armaments,

in the long run, up against a disadvantage almost impossible to overcome.

"Believing that the submerged lands off the California coast in the Pacific and off the coasts of Texas and Louisiana in the Gulf of Mexico probably would be found to contain oil deposits in addition to these already discovered, the Navy Department has given its full support to all proposed legislation which would enable it to secure such oil deposits as additional naval reserves but has strongly insisted that in such legislation all legal rights of others in such lands should be protected and that the controversial question as to whether minerals in submerged lands along our coasts are rightly the property of the Federal Government or the adjacent State should be determined by the courts.

"The American Petroleum Institute estimated the known petroleum reserves of the United States at 17,348,000,000 barrels as of January 1, 1939, or approximately 14 years' supply at the 1938 rate of producton, 1,277,000,000 barrels. This amount of oil, then, represents the Nation's present backlog, a quantity which tends to be augmented in years when discoveries exceed production and decreased when new discoveries fall below production.

"This backlog or producible reserve of oil has gradually accumulated over the past life of the industry as a result of many discoveries each year of relatively shallow (500–5,000 feet) producing areas capable of producing at a slowly diminishing rate over a relatively long period of time. Of late years, however, new discoveries of this type have fallen far below the annual rate of consumption of petroleum, and our reserves have been maintained and augmented by discoveries of deep-seated (5,000–15,000 feet) oil horizons, many of which have been found within or adjacent to the known shallower fields. What the life of production from these deep sands will be is not yet known, but it would seem to be beyond question that production from them will be progressively shorter lived with increasing depth. In my opinion, such deep production will add materially to the oil reserves of the United States but will not add at all to the life of the industry, as it is probable that all deep wells will have ceased production, due to higher operating costs before some of the shallower wells now producing have yielded the last of their recoverable oil.

"In the 20-year period since 1918, world production of petroleum has increased from 503,515,000 barrels in 1918 to 1,992,488,000 barrels in 1938, or approximately 300 percent, while production in the United States has increased in the same period from 355,928,000 barrels to 1,213,254,000 barrels, or 243 percent. The United States produced 70 percent of world production in 1918 but only 60.8 percent in 1938, a fact which would seem to indicate that the United States is slowly falling behind in its position and is therefore using up its oil reserves at a faster rate than other world reserves are diminishing.

"In 1918 the domestic demand for petroleum amounted to 387,760,000 barrels of the 503,515,000 barrels of world production, or 77 percent; in 1938 it amounted to 1,178,399,000 barrels of 1,992,488,000 barrels of world production, or a little less than 60 percent. In 1918 imports of petroleum exceeded exports by 31,852,000 barrels, but in 1938 exports of crude oil exceeded imports by 50,861,000 barrels, seeming to indicate that the world demand for petroleum outside the United States is just in its infancy and will probably increase much faster in the future than will domestic demand. It would seem, therefore, logical to expect exports of crude to continue to increase at the expense of domestic reserves—an unhealthy condition from the viewpoint of national defense. Of the 50,861,000 barrels of crude oil exported in excess of imports, 26,459,000 barrels, more than 50 percent, were exported from the Pacific coast, and represented production from the California fields. It has also been reported that stocks of California crude oil were increased some 6,741,000 barrels during 1938—which oil, together with the more than 26,000,000 barrels exported, amounted to 13.3 percent of California's 1938 production, 249,749,000 barrels. It would then seem that California's production last year could well have been decreased at least one-eighth to the advantage of both the State's petroleum industry and its reserves.

"During 1938 the United States produced approximately 60.8 percent of world oil production and 13.25 percent of the remaining 39 percent was produced in Mexico and South America, areas which in time of war would be dominated by a strong United States navy.

"At the present time the United States, Canada, and Mexico produce approximately 63.25 percent, South America 13.25 percent, Europe 13.68, and Asia and the East Indies 9.84 percent of world production.

"The importance of California oil in a region barren of other cheap natural fuels in connection with the State's commerce and industry, as well as its necessity for the needs of the Pacific Fleet, cannot be too strongly stressed. It is therefore essential that this resource, abundant though it may appear to be at present, must be made to last as long as possible. The conservation of California's oil supplies is deemed by the Navy Department to be of paramount importance in connection with the defense of the country's western border, Alaska, and its Pacific Ocean possessions. The Navy must therefore continue to support all measures taken which have for their purpose the conservation of the State's oil and gas resources to the end that the life of the industry in the State will be of maximum duration."

Many of you have read and perhaps studied the bill which our committee will consider. If you have, you will know that there is nothing in the measure to support recent allegations that a producer would have to go to Washington to procure a certificate of convenience and necessity before he could drill a well or that, if a State should produce more oil than was shown in the estimates of the Bureau of Mines, an administrator would step in and tell the State what it would have to do. Neither is there anything in the measure to support the thought that refining and marketing would be regulated. Those who say it would be necessary to run to Washington must have failed to note the specific provision that all hearings in connection with field investigations must be held in the Federal judicial district in which the field is located. I think it may be fairly said that each word in the measure is there for the single purpose of promoting the conservation of petroleum and cooperating with the States in preventing its waste.

Upon the completion of the difficult assignment now being handled by the employees of the Interior Department and others in revising part 2 of the Petroleum Investigation of 1934, these men being among the leading experts in their respective fields in the United States Geological Survey, the Bureau of Mines, the General Land Office, the Indian Affairs Bureau, and the Petroleum Division, the first public hearings before the committee will be held and at that time, the work done by the experts dealing with the technical phases of the problem will be filed for printing, in order to give the public an opportunity to see just what information the committee has on the subjects covered therein. Included among those testifying before the committee will be representatives of the Army and Navy and other interested governmental departments.

As I have previously stated, it is hoped that this initial testimony can be completed before the present special session of Congress ends, in which event the committee will, in the interim between adjournment and the 1st of January, visit as many fields as possible. This will not, I am sure, permit us to accept the many invitations and suggestions we have received from the various parts of the country to take testimony in their respective States. Some testimony may be taken during these inspection tours by the committee, but that has not been definitely decided by the committee. There will be no rush on the part of the committee to conclude this investigation by January 1, as the resolution does not require that, but it will be the purpose of the committee to conclude the testimony at as early a date as possible.

We shall expect the Federal governmental agencies, in their appearance in support of H. R. 7372, to be able to prove a prima facie case in support of the findings and declarations of policy embodied in the bill. Those findings, while not a part of the law itself, are of extreme importance. To give those who might want to question this statement an opportunity to do so, let me read section 2 of the proposed bill:

"(A) The Congress hereby finds that in the production and storage of petroleum from deposits situated within the United States the employment of methods and practices which are wasteful of petroleum and of the reservoir energy available for the recovery thereof from such deposits (1) is inimical to the maintenance of reserves of petroleum, and of the facilities for the recovery and transportation thereof, available for military and supporting civilian needs in an adequate national defense; (2) burdens and obstructs interstate commerce and causes harmful diversion of such commerce; (3) if not controlled, will further and increasingly burden and obstruct interstate commerce and will unduly limit the usefulness of instruments of transportation in and cause the abandonment of facilities for such commerce; (4) causes interstate commerce to be the means of encouraging such wasteful methods and practices; and (5) constitutes an unfair method of competition in interstate commerce.

"(B) It is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress, through the exercise in this act of its power to provide for the maintenance of an adequate national defense and to regulate interstate commerce, to further the conservation of petroleum by the elimination of the wasteful methods and practices above referred to insofar as such methods and practices may be avoidable, and to encourage and assist the various States in their efforts to prevent the waste of petroleum."

Certainly there is nothing wrong with that statement. I presume all in this audience tonight can adopt it as a creed. The important problem, however, is the law that follows and which represents the Government's interpretation of what that declaration embodies. If the legislation, as the proponents state to me and as in reading it I am frank to say seems to be the case, simply means that if wasteful practices known to and admitted by everybody associated with this industry are permitted to exist and continue, with a flagrant disregard on the part of the industry and of the States as to their duties in the premises, that it then becomes the problem of the Federal Government. Such an encroachment—if it is an encroachment—upon the prerogatives of the States would seem to be justified. This legislation now and at all times in the future will be intended to assist the States and not usurp their duties. Some may not want any assistance. Some may not want the assistance embodied in the bill, but such assistance is apparently becoming one of primary need and importance and it will remain, I am sure, for the calmness and deliberate judgment of our committee and ultimately of Congress, following a complete investigation of the subject, to say to just what extent such is necessary at this time.

Colonel Thompson, a member of the Texas Railroad Commission, and chairman of the Interstate Oil Compact Commission, in a recent statement said: "It (referring to conservation) is simply an

attempt on the part of the oil-producing States, acting through their conservation agencies, to see to it that we wisely apply the simple law of Nature, to the end that Nature will help us to produce and lift to the surface the greatest ultimate amount of petroleum. Nature helps us greatly if we will observe her laws. She takes terrific tolls if abused. This effort has been one to prevent every bit of physical waste that the application of sound engineering principles could achieve. It has taken a lot of patience. Really the old methods were so wasteful that looking back it seems almost criminal the way our oil resources were wasted, but it is no worse than was done with the forests and certainly it was not to be mentioned in the same breath with the prolific waste that we have experienced by our lack of conservation in the use of the soil of America, and when we examine the physical facts, conservation of the soil is as simple as the conservation of oil. We are just now getting around to it. I heard about a man who tried to sell a farmer a book, telling him how to farm twice as good. The farmer replied, 'I don't want to buy that book, I am not farming half as good as I know how now.' "

I approve the foregoing and submit it as an opening statement in the argument advanced by the proponents for the enactment by Congress at a reasonably early date of new legislation dealing with petroleum. H. R. 7372, which I introduced at the request of the present administration, is the bill before us at this time for consideration. At the request of President Roosevelt and of Secretary Ickes of the Interior Department, both of whom have always shown a keen personal and official interest in that status of our petroleum resources and the conduct of the petroleum industry, the proposed legislation was prepared, presumably through the collaboration of a number of interested departments.

A copy of the bill was left with me and at a later date, at the request of the President, a number of us met with President Roosevelt to discuss the entire situation. Along with Chairman LEA, who now serves with distinction in the position formerly held by Representative RAYBURN, as chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I attended that conference. I was asked to introduce the bill, notwithstanding the fact that it did not embody in every particular my views, nor was it in such form in my opinion as our committee would ultimately recommend—if they would recommend at all the reporting of any legislation. Preliminary to the introduction of the measure in question, President Roosevelt addressed a letter to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and to Chairman LEA, which speaks for itself. It is such an important document that I incorporate it at this point in full:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D. C., July 22, 1939.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: On February 15, 1939, I transmitted to the Congress a report on energy resources, by the National Resources Committee, wherein certain recommendations were made relative to oil and gas problems in the United States.

I believe it is consistent with these recommendations to invite the attention of your committee to the desirability of the early enactment of legislation which will provide a coordinated national policy in oil conservation. To my mind the legislation should be designed to prevent avoidable waste in the production of oil and gas in the United States.

As you know, despite the progress which has been made toward oil conservation under State law and regulation, the production of petroleum is attended by waste. In view of the vital part which petroleum plays in the national defense as well as its importance in commerce and industry, the prevention of waste in petroleum production should be the subject of an enactment by the Congress.

I appreciate the thoroughness with which the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce conducted the petroleum investigation in 1934 in response to House Resolution 441; but in the light of changes that have taken place I believe the committee may wish to study developments since that time by investigation and hearings prior to the next session of Congress. To this end, and with a view to the enactment of suitable legislation in the next session, I request that the petroleum conservation bill which I today discussed with you and Representative COLE be introduced at this session.

Sincerely yours,

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

Hon. CLARENCE F. LEA,
Chairman, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, House of Representatives.

Subsequently, as requested by the President, the entire Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce discussed the introduction of House Resolution 290, which was later passed by the House, calling for an investigation in line with the President's proposal. In lieu of the entire committee conducting the investigation, a subcommittee was appointed, of which I have the honor of again being chairman. I am happy to state the same personnel which served with me during the investigation of 1934 and 1935, with the exception of Representative PEARSON, of Tennessee, in place of former Representative Pettengill, constitute the subcommittee.

The resolution refers to H. R. 7372, making it incumbent, as I see it, upon the committee to give special consideration to this concrete proposal. At the same time the resolution is so broad in its scope and purpose that the committee can, and I am sure will, go far beyond the four corners of the legislation and, to the extent the funds available will permit, cover as fully as possible every item mentioned in the resolution.

The work of the committee as directed by the House resolution is broad in its scope. The authority is substantially the same as that given the committee in 1934 under House Resolution 441 of the Seventy-third Congress, except in addition to the 1934 resolution the committee is directed in the pending investigation—

"(b) To investigate the methods and practices employed in the production and storage of petroleum from deposits within the United States, for the purpose of determining whether such methods and practices are wasteful of petroleum and the reservoir energy available for recovery thereof from such deposits; whether the employment of such methods and practices is inimical to the maintenance of reserves of petroleum, and of the facilities for the recovery and transportation thereof, available for military and supporting civilian needs in an adequate national defense; and whether the employment of such methods and practices burdens and obstructs interstate commerce and unduly limits the usefulness of instruments of transportation in, and causes the abandonment of facilities for, such commerce; and to investigate any other matters bearing upon the practicability and abvisability of enacting legislation of the character of H. R. 7372, introduced on July 26, 1939; and

"(c) To investigate methods and practices employed in the production, transportation, and distribution of petroleum and its products for the purpose of determining whether such methods and practices, in or in relation to interstate commerce in petroleum and its products, constitute unfair methods and practices from the standpoint of their effect upon producers and consumers."

Our committee will be just as glad to hear those who may oppose the measure as from those who may favor it, but I believe the committee would be justified in asking that those who speak against or for the measure should first study its provisions. The president of your association is to be commended for the attitude which he outlined in the August issue of your monthly magazine in his statement, "Federal oil bill calls for industry's best thought." On our part, I promise you that the measure will receive the best thought of our committee.

We have recognized and have encouraged the right of the States to handle and control the production end of this industry. We have felt that the problem is not too big for the States if they sincerely want to solve it; at the same time the problem is not one which will tolerate abandonment or trifling by the States. The country as a whole has the right to demand that petroleum, a great God-given resource belonging as a whole to no State or individual but a natural national resource, must be conserved and must not be wasted.

No Time To Show the Yellow Feather

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 23, 1939

EDITORIAL FROM THE MARINE NEWS

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to extend my remarks and include therein a very timely editorial from the Marine News, published in New York in the interests of the shipping business:

[From the Marine News]

NO TIME TO SHOW THE YELLOW FEATHER

In 1812 we went to war to defend the freedom of the seas, and have defended that right continuously since then. Any proposed action now by Congress, or the administration, that would surrender that right must be defeated.

Nobody wants war, but if in order to avoid it we are to surrender our right to the use of the seas, and foreswear our foreign trade, then stop squandering money on building useless ships, and let the Maritime Commission build rowboats for the parks.

While there may be a difference of opinion as to what produces war, there can be no difference of opinion on the inalienable right of the American merchant marine, manned by American sailors to carry cargo to and from our shores and any port on the seven seas.

The freedom of the seas does not mean that American ships must be tied to the docks, must stay out of the war zone, or be rendered helpless while ships of other nations are permitted to sail where and when they please. On the contrary it does mean that a vessel may carry on ordinary commerce to and from any port where its owner or captain believes it should go.

The Marine News believes that Congress, in its present consideration of the Neutrality Act, will commit a fatal blunder if it in any way limits the field of operations of American-flag ships. In doing so it would surrender our blood-bought right. It would undo all that has been accomplished in the last few years in reestablishing our merchant marine. It would be compelled to reverse its own declaration of principle contained in the Merchant Marine Act, and it would drive American ships forever from the seas.

We do not believe that firm insistance on the freedom of the seas would produce war, neither do we believe that Congress or the administration should for any reason, even the avoidance of war, lower the American flag anywhere on the seven seas.

No time to show the yellow feather.

S. WILLSON RICHARDS.

The Menace of Bigotry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH A. GAVAGAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 23, 1939

SPEECH OF HON. JOSEPH A. GAVAGAN, OF NEW YORK

Mr. GAVAGAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following speech, which was recently made by me:

I speak to you today on the menace of bigotry. I shall be specific and direct my address to the particular "menace" that challenges everything I hold dear—philosophically, religiously, and patriotically. I refer to the resurgence of anti-Semitism.

Anti-Semitism—while an attack against the Jew—is in essence an attack on the personality of man—I use the term "man" in its generic sense—meaning thereby the whole human family. Unless we be heathens or unbelievers—and deny the existence of a Supreme Being, we all believe that man is created in the image and likeness of his Creator—God; that man has a spiritual personality, as well as his human personality, and that this spiritual personality is eternal.

The spiritual personality of man makes the whole of humanity akin, binding us all into one brotherhood under the fatherhood of God. This is the religious concept of the personality of man. There are other concepts, for instance, the concept of man as a product of economics is the essence of the philosophy of communism; the concept of man as a biological product, his destiny entirely determined by his racial chromosomes, is the essence of the philosophy of nazi-ism. If we follow the philosophical concept of man from the Communist or Nazi-ist point of view—or perhaps from both points of view—since Hitler and Stalin are today treaty brothers—we can understand prejudice, hatred, and discrimination, whether it be racial, religious, or national. However, if we profess the principles of deistic philosophy we may have no relation with prejudice, hatred, or discrimination. You cannot blow hot and cold together. You cannot proclaim the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man together with intolerance and prejudice.

They are not consistent and compatible one with the other; one of necessity denies the other. You cannot have both, no more than you may have God and Satan together. That is why, philosophically and religiously, I fear the menace of bigotry.

Persecution begets persecution; it cannot be otherwise. We, as Americans, must recognize and guard against the patent attempt to spread amongst us religious and racial hatreds. Bigotry acts much like a virulent drug which, once quaffed, grows an asses' head upon the befuddled individual, as in the story of Bottom, the weaver.

A great Irish statesman, and one of the world's immortal orators—Daniel O'Connell—defined bigotry as follows: "Bigotry has no head and cannot think, no heart and cannot feel. When she moves it is in wrath; when she pauses it is amid ruin. Her prayers are curses, her god is a demon, her communion is death, her vengeance is eternity, her decalogue is written in the blood of her victims; and if she stops for a moment in her infernal flight it is upon a kindred rock to whet her vulture fang for a more sanguinary desolation."

Discrimination against races, whether it takes the form of a petty or major persecution, must at all times meet with the condemnation of men of right instincts. There is a unity in humanity no matter how unconscious various individuals may be of its existence, and unless the aims of humanity take cognizance of this and proceed accordingly it will not be well for mankind.

In the calmer times preceding the days of gloom and anxiety through which we are passing men would generally commend racial tolerance as a desirable thing, as something due to the honor and justice that should prevail among civilized men. Today thinking people regard it as an indispensable condition of anything like well-being or progress. The World War was productive of numberless disasters which few could foresee in 1914, and among the greatest of these was the development of exaggerated racialism. Achievements were claimed for individual races which were the joint production of many. Civilization is a collective thing. Various races contribute to it, and its existence and maintenance depend on factors of various origins.

The ancient classical civilization furnished many factors even though these civilizations were based on slavery. The revelation of which the Jews were the custodians while contributing many new ideas of priceless worth, purified much that was tainted in paganism. The Jews insisted on a personal God who was brought close to them as the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and thus they liberated men from the abject fear of blind fate and the machinations and terrors threatened by irresponsible and wayward deities. In this connection it is significant to note that the Jews, who were surrounded by powerful empires that despised them, survive, and their ancient enemies have vanished forever.

Christ came not to destroy, but to fulfill, and the suffrage which was the prerogative of the Jews was extended to all mankind through the commission given to the apostles to preach the Gospel to every creature. Nothing that was good in humanity was alien to Christianity, and the classics of ancient Greece and Rome were made part of the Christian's training. Just imagine what the Soviets and totalitarians would do to a literature in which many of their most cherished principles were assailed.

The Christian insistence on the dignity of the individual first mitigated the lot of the slave, and then gradually made men realize that slavery was incompatible with the Christian spirit. The racial intolerance that has been spreading with such feverish intensity promises destruction of the great benefits afforded mankind by the ideal and practice of Christian brotherhood, and the ruin of America would be involved in the cataclysm.

I also fear this menace nationally, for it is as opposite to true Americanism as darkness is the opposite to light. You cannot have anti-Semitism and Americanism together—one destroys the other; one is incompatible with the other; they cannot exist together.

One hundred and sixty-three years ago we won our independence and built a representative republican form of government upon the foundation of equality. This principle of equality we have steadfastly maintained as our "pearl of precious price." To our country came millions upon millions of peoples of other nations, who, harassed and persecuted at home, sought our shores for the fuller enjoyment of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. These immigrants contributed to our country the best of their various cultures, with the result that, in spite of foreign carping critics and historical foretellers of doom, America arose from the debris and chaos of revolution, and later civil war, to world leadership, if leadership be judged from the viewpoint of the practical attainment of man's centuries of aspiration—political, religious, and social equality. The dream of Socrates, the hope and aspiration of Aristotle, became the full fruit of enjoyment in our beloved country.

We, as Americans, believe that man has an intrinsic dignity that must be respected by governments and rulers. We believe, too, that majorities are morally bound to respect the rights of minorities. After all, the most certain test by which we may judge if a country is really free is the amount of security enjoyed by minorities. We also recognize and believe there is a supreme or higher law binding upon all mankind. The whole history of mankind bears testimony to the ever-present struggle between liberty under divine authority or liberty under the state. Plato and Socrates—pagan though they were—had a nebulous idea of a supreme or higher law. Yet the Jews were the first, either as a people or a nation, to recognize and declare the supremacy of the divine law over the temporal power of the state. This divine law embraces the principles of love and charity. With these principles dominant in the heart and mind of men there can be no intolerance.

Unity and harmony among men are the crying needs of our time. Unity and tolerance walk hand in hand with religion. We have seen in the instance of Russia how tragic is the effort to promote unity without God. Death for apostasy in Russia is almost as frequent as martyrdom among the early Christians for constancy. The intolerance of Hitler would, in the long run, prove as disastrous as the intolerance of Stalin.

America, though far removed from the European scene, will participate in European disintegration unless it safeguards the virtues that made our Nation great, and among these none is more essential than the tolerance which we advocate. Our sense of tolerance is founded upon our national principle of equality and justice for all. These principles form the bright constellation which has gone before us, and guide our steps through an age of revolution and reformation.

Many misguided and sinister persons are striving to destroy this principle and to promote racial discontent in America. There are already such signs of cleavage among our citizens as would have been thought impossible a few years ago. So that it is not an exaggeration to state that even the most optimistic among us no longer feel that our national stability is something indestructible.

May hate, intolerance, and prejudice cease to play a part in our national life, and may God's greatest political gift to the world—the United States of America—be cherished and promoted by our people forever.

"Then let Fame's banner be unfurled,
Sing paeans for a victory won."

Patriotism of the National Small Business Men's Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE J. McLEOD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 23, 1939

RESOLUTIONS OF THE NATIONAL SMALL BUSINESS MEN'S ASSOCIATION

Mr. McLEOD. Mr. Speaker, as an American, believing in our principles of real freedom and democracy, I have, I believe, through my many years as a Member of this body, by act and deed, proved my sincerity.

I have kept foremost in mind as my creed that to remain great the United States of America must never relinquish its Godlike principles of protection of life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness for its people.

Therefore, in conformity with my beliefs and policy of rendering the most good for our people, I recommend, Mr. Speaker, that the House of Representatives seriously consider the resolutions recently adopted at the second national convention of the National Small Business Men's Association.

It is most timely and opportune that I present to you now—today—before this special session of Congress acts on the embargo question and before appropriation bills are prepared for the regular session in January, this strictly American policy and program.

In national convention assembled this patriotic and effective organization, representing the backbone and builders of the community, took a firm, unanimous, and active stand against the subversive influences that are steadily gnawing at the very vitals of our great American traditions.

These resolutions, I believe, will awaken in all our people a determination to hold fast to the fundamental principles which have been the prime factors in making this country the strongest and greatest democracy on earth.

The following are the resolutions:

PREAMBLE

America's danger comes from within rather than from without. The continued safety of free American institutions is more gravely threatened by incursion of subversive foreign doctrines, than by danger of our involvement in foreign wars. We emphasize the particular value of a steadfast adherence to the simple virtue of loyalty to our American Constitution and our American principles of individual free enterprise.

In troubled times the insidious strategy of crafty ambition magnifies real perils and even invents "red herrings" to serve its own selfish end. We warn against the dangers of too easy acceptance of published opinion, no matter how high the source from which it emanates. We remind ourselves that the highest qualities of restraint must be displayed by government as well as by private interests.

We view the European conflict with horror but it is not of our doing, and we must not take sides nor participate in its bloodshed.

As businessmen we want no share of profits from war, and urge that America shall continue in the paths of peace, strong in the faith and tradition of its past, and confident of its ability to lead the world onward to the goal of greater security and happiness desired by all mankind. By pursuing this road America best serves not only itself but the entire world.

The preservation of our democratic Government is dependent upon the active, intelligent use of the ballot. An alert citizenry must be on constant guard in its own household.

RESOLUTION I

In the belief that this association in convention assembled is without sufficient facts or knowledge upon which to base a sound judgment as to the action the Congress of the United States should take in regard to the neutrality and embargo proposals now pending before it, but convinced that this country should not become enmeshed in any foreign entanglements—

(1) It is resolved that the President and Congress of the United States should at all times so act as to keep us out of war and preserve and guarantee the peace of the United States; that the people of this country will not tolerate any action which would result in the sending of American youth to fight on foreign soil.

(2) That all officials and employees of the Government be required to refrain from making any unauthorized public statements which might be construed as partisan or as an unfriendly act to any foreign government.

(3) That all employees of the Federal and State Governments, irrespective of their positions, whose past conduct, utterances, or affiliations indicate a leaning toward communism, nazi-ism, or other ideologies that are at variance with American principles of government be forthwith dismissed and their positions filled by loyal citizens who believe in and will support at all times our form of government and American institutions.

RESOLUTION II

(1) *Resolved*, That this association publicly commends the activities of the Dies Committee investigating un-American activities and urges Congress to provide it with adequate finances to insure its continuance.

(2) We recommend a strict enforcement of the naturalization laws. Aliens within our Nation who desire the privileges of participating in our Government should be refused citizenship and its attendant right to vote until the proper authorities are doubly satisfied that as citizens they not only understand but will support our free institutions with the undivided respect and devotion which their application for citizenship implies.

(3) That the administration take immediate steps to clean its own house of those whose undivided loyalty to American principles is open to challenge.

(3–a) That this association sponsor a program to awaken the citizens of the country to the need for constant alertness in the selection of public servants; that our members in all cities give close attention to their local municipal affairs and participate actively in the selection of local officials and representatives and exercise their right to vote.

That we sponsor a program to bring about in grade and high schools, colleges, and universities to the establishment of public forums to inform our people on the great economic and social questions essential to a full understanding of present-day progress; that we now examine all systems of education supported in whole or in part by public funds and cause to be eliminated therefrom all subversive teachings and textbooks and dismiss such of the personnel as may teach or advocate theories of government at variance with our American ideologies.

That we seek and provide authentic information on questions of public interest to our members and governmental representatives.

(4) There is no social philosophy which has ever demonstrated its ability to provide common prosperity and happiness for its people in any degree that approaches the American standard of life. We, therefore, reaffirm our belief that the American system of free individual enterprise with the profit incentive is superior to any other social and economic philosophy.

RESOLUTION III. TAXES AND ECONOMY

Too great a proportion of the national income goes into taxes. To make a greater part of this income available for production purposes the cost of Federal, State, and local government must be reduced. The present high rate of taxation decreases production out of which taxes are paid, discourages initiative, freezes capital, increases idle labor, and diminishes the total of tax revenues.

National need and ability of the people to pay, rather than demands of politicians and special interests should govern the tax total.

Those who administer government should end its hostility to business, reaffirm the profit incentive, and provide for an early balancing of the Federal Budget.

Living within its income is just as sound and necessary for Government as for private business.

Wholesale employment on Government projects and vast increases of Federal bureaus and commissions has proved costly and has retarded recovery, which will be speedily stimulated when the country discontinues these experiments that we cannot afford to maintain.

Confidence among businessmen is the first essential to recovery.

We favor direct taxes and broadening the income-tax base as a means of awakening public opinion to the importance of this subject.

We condemn the inconsistency of local groups who advocate Federal economy in the abstract, at the same time using pressure to obtain Federal grants for local projects.

We favor a study of the Federal tax problem by a nonpolitical committee to be created by Congress.

RESOLUTION 4. GOVERNMENT IN BUSINESS

The centralization of control over business has put the Government into direct competition with private capital and initiative in particular in (1) housing, (2) public-utility power and light, (3) capital financing, both long and short, (4) and agriculture.

These are not proper functions of Government. Government operations, undertaken by an administration quick to seize upon the necessities of a temporary emergency, should be liquidated

progressively in all four of the above fields of enterprise and returned to private business where they belong. In the words of our last year's statement of objectives, "The Government should cooperate and not compete."

RESOLUTION 5

We oppose use of national credit for subsidizing insolvent business. We believe that there is no demand for legitimate bank credit which our banks are not eager to meet. Adequate private funds for the capital requirements of small business and for new enterprise would be immediately available if the present tax structure were altered to permit their normal employment without penalty; if the rulings of the bank examining authorities were liberalized to permit the free exercise of experienced banking judgment.

RESOLUTION 6

In line with our stated objective of last year that Congress should repeal all laws under which congressional powers have been delegated to other bodies, we note with satisfaction the recent tendency of Congress to assert itself and resume control over appropriations and appointments instead of issuing blank checks.

Maintenance of our national defense is a big business requiring our most able men in its coordination and direction. They should be selected for their fitness and ability, regardless of party affiliation, and they should be free from dictation or interference from nonresponsible political bureaucrats.

RESOLUTION 7. LABOR RELATIONS

Resolved, That we stand for the restoration and the preservation of the constitutional rights of all citizens * * * the right equally of the worker to work and of the employer to employ, without being subjected to intimidation, coercion, or domination by the leaders of organized groups, and with the full protection at all times of duly constituted civil authorities—local, State, and national.

We recognize the right of workers to organize for the protection and advancement, within the law, of their own individual and group interests and we have no quarrel with labor unionism as such, but we are opposed to the closed shop to the extent that in principle it infringes upon constitutional rights, both of employer and employee, and in practice leads to conditions not conducive to advancement of the interests, well-being, and prosperity of any group, or of any community, or of the Nation.

We recognize collective bargaining by workers as an established fact; while we accept it in principle we deplore its widespread misuse in practice by many labor leaders, by the United States Department of Labor, and especially by the National Labor Relations Board. We hold that employers have the same right of organization and collective bargaining as employees, and that the eventual solution of our so-called industrial problem lies in the voluntary and friendly negotiation of agreements fair to both, with equal responsibility, legally established, on both sides, and fair also to the public, always a third party in interest.

We deplore and condemn that policy of Congress which permits employment of Governmental agencies obviously and flagrantly in the interest of special groups, and in utter disregard of the constitutional rights of the overwhelming majority of American working men and women, of business and industry and of all other citizens not the beneficiaries of this abuse of governmental functions and responsibilities.

We deplore and condemn the present trend toward constantly greater centralization of power in a few hands or in the hands of any one man, and the assumption of ever-increasing control over the lives and liberties of our citizens, workers, farmers, and businessmen alike, and very particularly the unconstitutional delegation of dictatorial powers to appointive bodies and the abuse of those powers by officials not chosen by popular suffrage and apparently accountable to no one but themselves.

We approve governmental intervention in the natural operation of economic laws under our American system of free enterprise only to the extent that it protects all economic groups, individually and collectively, against practices repugnant to the American sense of fair play and common decency and detrimental to national progress, prosperity, and unity. We are opposed unalterably to governmental dictatorship over business, industry, labor, and agriculture as distinguished from fair and reasonable Government regulation.

The preamble of the National Labor Relations Act, commonly known as the Wagner Act, passed 3 years ago, declares its purpose to be "to reduce industrial strife * * *." The record shows that industrial strife almost immediately reached an all-time high and has remained abnormally high; that the administration of this law has cost millions in direct Government expense, has cost industry and business more millions to defend themselves, and has cost the employees themselves most of all through lost wages and increased cost of the things they buy.

Therefore, in the interest of steady and increased employment, higher annual wages, reduction of taxation, the elimination of industrial strife, and the resumption of the march of American progress, we advocate and urge repeal of the National Labor Relations Act, and the enactment of a Labor Relations Act that will reflect fundamental American principles and be fair to employer, employee, and the public at large.

Achievements of the Republican Minority in the Seventy-sixth Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER H. GROSS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 23, 1939

ADDRESS BY HON. CHESTER H. GROSS, OF PENNSYLVANIA, SEPTEMBER 28, 1939

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following synopsis of an address which I delivered on September 28, 1939, at Chambersburg, Pa.:

Speaking before the Chambersburg Republican Club, Congressman CHESTER H. GROSS briefly set forth the achievements of the Republican minority in the recent session. He denied the statement of the President that the Republicans and certain Democrats formed a coalition to block the objectives of the New Deal, but claimed that the support given the Republican leadership by the economy-minded Democrats was nothing more nor less than a spontaneous response to a mighty wave of disapproval arising all over the country against the reckless expenditure of public funds. Under the splendid leadership of Congressman JOSEPH W. MARTIN, floor leader of the House, Congress turned back a proposal to raise the national debt limit above $45,000,000,000, and rejected the $3,800,000,000 spend-lend program which sought to evade the limitation upon the national debt, and once more forbade additional expenditures on the crackpot Florida ship canal.

Under the same aggressive leadership the House and the Senate turned back the administration's attempt to involve America in European politics, and voted vast sums for national defense on land, sea, and air at home.

Likewise tax revision measures have been forced, which will no doubt be extended in the next session, that are going to be of tremendous help to industry in this country in the next year or two.

Social Security was revamped, and the funds now, instead of being dumped into the Federal Treasury to be used for everything except Social Security, will go into a trust fund and will finally find their way to those for whom it was intended. They likewise froze pay-roll tax at the present rate and saved industry and labor hundreds of millions of dollars in the next 3 years. By this wise handling of these funds it will be possible to make upward of one and a half million more people beneficiaries to Social Security.

They have forced audit systems to be established that will keep the taxpayers informed of actual governmental costs in the future, as well as in some degree limited subsidized Government competition with private enterprises.

We have exposed and partially reformed the vicious political manipulation of W. P. A. work relief by the New Deal racketeers.

Overrode militant opposition and passed the Hatch bill, which will compel certain men in high public office from using political pressure in elections.

We have enacted legislation dealing with aliens, Communists, and Fascists within our country.

We have amended the Government reorganization bill and sustained the time-tested constitutional principle of checks and balances, thereby eliminating many of the dangerous powers of dictatorship.

We have forced an investigation of the National Labor Relations Board, the findings of which without a doubt will be as shocking as was the investigation of the W. P. A.

We have forced congressional inquiry into the damage caused to American industry and agriculture by the so-called reciprocal-trade agreements.

The Republican resolution requiring 10 percent cut or savings on all departmental appropriations was received by the administration with only a jeer.

The seventh New Deal deficit on July 1 carried the national debt to the limit allowed by law. New appropriations for the fiscal year 1940 aggregate almost $13,000,000,000 or three times the annual Republican average of the previous decade.

The harmony that prevailed and the solidity of the Republican side of the House threw constant fear into the forces of the New Deal.

NEUTRALITY

The present neutrality law in the face of present world conditions contains many inequalities that will work badly for both the United States and foreign governments. Under the present law American ships will be permitted to enter combat zones, which creates a terrific hazard. Under the present law they can sell munitions to Japan who is waging a ruthless war on China, simply because they have not declared war, while at the same time it forbids us from selling to other countries who have declared war. It also permits this country to sell to Italy who in turn may turn the materials over to Germany, while we cannot sell to our next door neighbor, Canada, whether we would or not.

I believe that the Neutrality Act can be amended and that we can maintain much of our world trade without getting into the war. I believe we owe it to American labor and industry to maintain as much of our foreign trade as possible. Since many of these belligerent countries owe us vast sums of money, which they are never going to pay, I believe that the cash-and-carry program would help us to get back much of the money they owe us and maintain business at a standard in this country that we sorely need.

I shall be very careful in voting for mandatory legislation that it does not give anyone in executive position added powers. I well understand that the Congress could pass the burden of responsibility now resting upon it by giving these powers to the President, and I believe that these powers which the Constitution of the United States places squarely upon the Congress should be retained by that body.

No nation is justified in going to war simply because a ship has been sunk or flag shot at. We only need to stop and think of the World War to come to that conclusion. It cost 10,000,000 lives—20,000,000 broken bodies—spent or mortgaged half of the wealth of the western world. And there is no yardstick adequate to measure the human tragedies never revealed.

I believe if we approach these problems calmly and think and act deliberately we can save our democracy without getting into the war. At the same time we must not overlook the enemies we have within our gates.

I am amazed that the Government of the United States permits communistic propaganda to be handed out and sold by the ton by the Russian Government on the New York World's Fair ground. I have carefully scrutinized their material and find it boasting of the fact that they have eliminated all property holders in Russia, and in all their literature they make no mention or reference to churches of any kind.

The Dies' committee reports there are over 2,800 recognized communists in public office in the Federal Government. I cannot understand why the United States Government should even permit anyone to express his love for any "ism" in America at this time, and much less to tolerate them in public office. I trust the present Congress will take some very definite steps to clean up America now before getting too enthusiastic about pulling someone else's chestnuts out of the fire. I am sure that if we finally do have to get into the war we can go into it much stronger if we have our own house in order.

From the information I gather from the mail I receive, I believe the sentiment in the country now is crystallizing in favor of the cash-and-carry plan as presented by the President. I believe that under this plan the dangers of becoming entangled in the war would be very much less and at the same time it would be better for our country economically.

This one thing I want definitely understood—that my actions in the weeks that lie ahead, on the neutrality question, will not be dominated by partisan politics. I intend to place my Americanism above partisanship when the welfare of the country and the happiness of our people are at stake.

The Repeal of the Embargo Clause of the Neutrality Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN KEE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 23, 1939

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. JOHN KEE, OF WEST VIRGINIA, OCTOBER 21, 1939

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following address delivered by me over the Red Network of the National Broadcasting Co., from Station WRC, in Washington, D. C., on Saturday, October 21, 1939, at 7 o'clock p. m.:

Ladies and gentlemen, as a native-born citizen of the United States, having at heart the best interests of my country, and as a Member of Congress, I am in accord with the proposal now pending before the Congress to repeal the embargo clause in the so-called Neutrality Act.

In my judgment the statement frequently, carelessly, and often deliberately made that a repeal of the embargo provision would get us into war, or will even be a step in that direction, is not supported by reason and is not the conclusion of intelligent thought. There can be no basis for the conclusion that our repeal of an unneutral act would have a greater tendency to drag us into international conflict than would our retention of this act upon our statutes. The embargo was an unfortunate experiment and an error. It was in derogation of international law and reversed a policy this Nation had followed for a century and a quarter. Its repeal will be to correct a grievous mistake.

Daily the advocates of so-called strict neutrality and those who argue the loudest against the repeal of the embargo, point to the Netherlands and the Scandinavian countries as shining examples for us to follow. It is loudly declaimed: "These countries stayed out of the last war, why can't we follow their lead and stay out of this one?" Very well, we can follow them only by a repeal of the embargo. It is true that Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Holland, all stayed out of the World War—all were neutral. Not one of these States, however, embargoed either sales or shipments to belligerent countries. None of them even had a neutrality statute such as ours and certainly no similar embargo clause. Trade was carried from their shores during the war under the rules of international law. Shipments were even permitted in vessels of their own nationals. So, where do these countries fit into the argument of the antirepealists?

The bill now pending before Congress and as reported by the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations will not permit us to go so far in the matter of shipping as did the neutral countries of Europe. It will not permit shipments to be made in American vessels. It will permit the ships of all countries to come to our ports, pay cash for our commodities, take title to the goods purchased, and carry these goods away in their own ships and at their own risk.

No one has yet pointed out just why and how this policy can possibly lead us into war. The mere statement that it will do so is not enough. Such an argument is mere dicta without proof. The self-evident truth is that the embargo clause in the present law is an aid to Germany and to all other nations engaged in aggressive acts. These nations were fully prepared in advance for the undertaking in which they are now engaged.

The fact that the embargo provision in our statutes is an aid to Germany cannot be disputed. On June 27 last, during the debate in the House of Representatives upon the neutrality measure, I made upon the floor this statement: "If we fail to repeal this embargo, our action will be celebrated upon the streets of Berlin." On the day following the passage of the bill with the so-called Vorys amendment—the amendment providing a mandatory embargo against all sales and shipments of arms and ammunition to belligerent nations—the news dispatches from abroad reported that the Nazis were holding in Berlin an enthusiastic celebration of this action of Congress. Thus, while supporters of the embargo clause were here joyously congratulating each other upon a political victory, the followers of Hitler, with equal joy, were in Berlin hailing the fact that the United States Government, the greatest democracy in the world, had again written for Adolf Hitler a blank check to be filled in at the expense of the defenseless nations of Europe.

It cannot be said that the embargo provision was reinstated in the pending Neutrality Act by the House of Representatives either blindly, innocently, or without a full understanding that it would be of aid to Germany and the aggressor powers of Europe. The Members were fully advised of the vital importance to Hitler of a refusal upon our part to permit the unprepared and unready nations of the world to secure arms necessary for their defense against their total destruction or their absorption by the nation which had, in advance, fully prepared itself to accomplish this purpose. By the same provision in the present law we had already given to Hitler a free hand in Czechoslovakia. We had told him to go ahead and take the country, and we would see to it that no help could possibly be secured from us for the unhappy people he had marked for destruction. Hopeless and helpless, these people surrendered to the inevitable. Today their government is no more, their national independence is destroyed; their individual liberty is but a memory.

The operation and effect of the embargo was clearly demonstrated by each new event in Europe, where Hitler, smug and satisfied with the policy we had adopted, was taking everything he coveted without any fear of resistance. And yet with all these facts before us, a majority of the House deliberately wrote into the pending measure a continuance of the embargo. Came then the celebration in Berlin. Came then the march of the Hitler forces into Poland. Came then the sound of guns heralding the beginning of a great war.

Let us mark this: The guns that opened this war did not come from America. They are German guns. They bear the label "Made

in Germany." They were made there for the very purpose for which they are being used—to carry on an offensive against weaker nations. And Germany can continue to make them. Our embargo will never silence those guns. If it serves any purpose whatever, it will but serve to make impossible any defense upon the part of the unfortunate people against whom the "Made in Germany" guns are directed.

We may perhaps never know to what extent the actions of Adolf Hitler were influenced by the failure of the American Congress to repeal the embargo. The fact that such failure was celebrated in Germany and greeted there with cheers certainly stamps the embargo with German approval. It was definite notice to Hitler that the nations against which he contemplated aggressive action could not hope to secure any means of defense from the great United States of America. It was a "go ahead" signal which the dictator must have appreciated. Whether or not he would have gone ahead without the signal we do not know. To my mind, however, the events following our action, or lack of action, at the last session place a heavy burden upon the collective conscience of those who so blithely assumed that responsibility.

It is my firm conviction that had Congress at the last session promptly passed the neutrality measure as it was reported from the Committee on Foreign Affairs, with its repeal of the embargo clause, that action would have given Adolf Hitler pause. It may indeed have been an effectual deterrent. Certainly there would have passed before the dictator the mental picture of a great nation of 130,000,000 people, with productive fields and farms, with unlimited natural resources, with skilled artisans and workers, with great mills and factories, with every facility to fabricate even better things than those labeled "Made in Germany." And with this there would have appeared a companion picture—one showing the sea lanes leading to our open ports and above these ports the sign, "Come and get it." With this picture before—this picture of an open door of promise to the weaker nations of the world—who shall say that Adolf Hitler would not have hesitated before turning his "made-in-Germany" guns upon Poland.

But the embargo clause was not repealed. Gentlemen whose sources of information were, they said, much more reliable than those available to the President, told us there would be no war. What happened is now history. Regardless of our optimistic self-assurance, Germany acted. Today Poland is conquered and dismembered. Her cities and towns have been destroyed and her people slaughtered. The stark forms of her countless dead bear silent witness to the brutal and horrible threat that hovers over the world like a dread shadow. The territory of a once free and independent nation has been carved at the table of international banditry. And now the gentlemen who were so well informed tell us that this is water over the dam and it is therefore too late for us to revise our policy. They voice the assertion that it will be unneutral for us to repeal an unneutral and indefensible act. Their position is the impossible one that our mistake is a fact accomplished and cannot be remedied.

The aggressor nations of the world have not yet reached the goal of their ambitions. Their greed for conquest has not been satisfied, their appetite for dominion has not been satiated, their dreams of power have not been fully realized. Not yet can Adolf Hitler, like Alexander, weep because there are no other worlds to conquer. Not yet can Mussolini order a Roman triumph and wear a Caesar's laurels before his legions. Not yet can the militaristic power behind the Japanese throne report to their sacred Mikado a world remade to their hearts' desire. Not yet can Stalin assure his own timid soul that the world has been purged of all those who dare the treason of independent thought. There are still functioning in this war-torn world a few governments based upon a conception of human rights—governments which do not consider individuals mere pawns upon the chessboard of life. There are still governments with peoples who are yet nurturing and fostering the ideals of democracy. There are still left in this world, organized into national units, peoples who yet retain an unshaken faith in a just and an all-wise God. These are the lands, the people, the worlds that the Hitlers, the Stalins, the Mussolinis, and their like must take in their stride, must subdue, must conquer, must bring under the lash and within the shackles of their brute force or else witness the collapse of the empires they have already builded.

This fight is on now, and no one knows how long it will continue. We do know that unless the dictators are crushed the world must expect to be ruled by brute force alone. So far our own country is not in this fight, and we do not want to get in it. No citizen of this country wants war. As we stand on the sidelines, however, we do know that if this war results in the downfall of the dictators, if the democracies win a victory over nazi-ism and communism, then you and I and our children and their children will through all the future years thank God for that victory.

The world is today facing its greatest crisis. Is there any sound reason why, while humanity's fate trembles in the balance, the United States Government should, through an embargo against the sale of commodities, continue to lend its aid to the forces of evil? Let us write this unneutral act off our statute books. Let us forbid, not the sale of our commodities, but their carriage on American ships through zones of danger.

Let us keep our country neutral—neutral without cowardice, neutral without skulking behind the doors of expediency, neutral according to the precedent we followed since the founding of our Government, neutral without deliberately and knowingly lending our aid to Nazis and Communists in their war to impose the rule of brute force upon mankind.

Domestic Problems Should Have Attention of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 23, 1939

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, this special session of Congress was convened on September 21, and we have been in session ever since that date. It is true that proposed amendments to our present neutrality law have had the consideration of Congress. It is equally true that no other legislation has been considered by any of the committees. When the first session of the Seventy-sixth Congress adjourned on August 5, 1939, there were many domestic problems which were awaiting the attention of the administration and of the Congress controlled by it. Those problems were vital and important. Upon their solution depend the welfare of America. One of those problems was the matter of unemployment. On August 5 last, several million men and women were unemployed in the United States. They had a right to expect that the administration would do something to help them solve their difficulties.

The new World War started on September 1, 1939, and since that date the attention of people generally has been directed toward Europe, and the administration has apparently failed to give thought to the problem of the unemployed at home. I believe a mistake has been made in insisting that only neutrality legislation should be taken up and considered now. I have before me a recent Associated Press dispatch, stating that there are 5,000,000 homeless boys, jobless American youths wandering about the country today. Government agencies are doing something to meet this problem, but to date the program has been wholly inadequate. Legislation should be studied which will in some measure help to keep open the field of opportunity for these young men and thereby make it possible for them to secure some kind of employment. It is the duty of the administration to submit a program to Congress along these lines.

In this connection, I have another dispatch which quotes Col. Francis C. Harrington, Work Projects Administrator, as saying that even the alleged possibility of a European war will not take care of the millions of people who are unemployed. I am talking now about adults and not about the homeless boys of this land. There is going around in our midst frequent statements that this country must mix into the European war in order to give jobs for unemployed. As Colonel Harrington points out, leaving out the ethics of such argument, there is no basis for the claim that the European war will take care of our unemployed problem. It is a domestic problem. A Government program should be initiated which will encourage private industry to open the factories and the mills and to make it possible to increase the number of those who are able to get jobs. Let no one be deceived. The basis of any real prosperity in this country cannot be based on the tragedy of a war across the ocean. This is one reason why, Mr. Speaker, that Congress should stay in session and the Government should consider legislation along these lines.

The National Health Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, October 4), 1939

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER, OF NEW YORK, OCTOBER 23, 1939

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, while democracy has made a marked retreat during the last quarter of a century in the Old World, in this country it has made a distinct advance. I know of no more effective manner of combating the dangerous ideologies of Europe than by strengthening the ramparts of democracy at home. A national health program will have a tremendous effect in fortifying the essential faith of the American people in the processes of democracy. The distinguished senior Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] delivered a valuable address on this subject on a broadcast over a Nation-wide hook-up of the National Broadcasting Co. during the national radio forum of the Washington Star on Monday night, October 23, 1939. I ask unanimous consent to have this address printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

My friends, in addressing you tonight on an important domestic issue, I am mindful that your thoughts are centered for the most part on happenings abroad. The course of events on European battle fronts holds for all of us a morbid fascination, born of horror that such things can be in a civilized age, born of fear that the flames of war may somehow leap the ocean barrier.

In this crisis the President, the Congress, and all the American people are motivated by a single thought and a single objective—to keep this Nation in the path of peace. No appearance of temporary advantage, no ties of sympathy or wiles of propaganda must weaken that peaceful purpose. America's destiny will be fulfilled not by becoming party to the deep-seated rivalries of Europe but by fostering life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness right here at home.

At a time of world upheaval many Americans are concerned about the possible invasion of this continent by philosophies of government alien to our own. To discourage and, if necessary, to repel any armed aggression from without we have built mighty defenses on land and sea and in the air. These defenses must and will be further strengthened. But our citadel of democracy cannot be defended by force of arms alone. The danger of alien encroachment is not lessened if in building up our armaments we neglect to watch on other ramparts. If under the stress of the European war we allow intolerance or subversive movements to spread their contagion in our midst, if we relax our protection of civil liberties, if we permit our social gains to be impaired or their further growth to be arrested, then American democracy will, indeed, have been conquered—conquered without firing a shot. Against any such surrender to the enemy within our gates the American people must redouble their eternal vigilance.

About a year ago, when the morale of the democratic world was at a very low ebb, I stressed a lesson from history which I think it appropriate to recall in the present hour:

"The fatal weakness of a despotic government is internal, just as the enduring strength of a free people lies within themselves. No autocrat has ever had enough armies to protect him in the long run against the resurgence of the human spirit in his own country. No democratic government has ever declined unless it was first undermined from within by a denial of the equality and freedom of opportunity upon which democracy rests."

All our efforts in the last 6 years have been devoted to projecting that ideal of equality and freedom of opportunity into every phase of our economic life. For that reason the steady retreat of democracy overseas has been paralleled by the steady advance of democracy in the New World all about us. New weapons of air power and sea power have been reinforced by the awakened strength of a free people.

And so today, amid the strife and confusion of the Old World, the ramparts we watch must embrace all the instruments for economic and human adjustment we have so recently and so carefully forged—labor standards and market standards; soil, forest, and water conservation; slum clearance; unemployment insurance; security in old age. The protection and advancement of these instruments are as essential to our democratic life as the safety of our geographical frontiers.

None of these economic problems which have engaged our earnest attention in the years since 1933 was created by the great depression. All of them were in some measure part of the price we pay for the material benefits of a machine age. All of them had been aggravated by long neglect. And in each instance our task was to substitute systematic safeguards for haphazard relief, to find ways of preventing the underlying causes rather than dealing with the results after they had gotten out of hand.

A national-health program raises the same challenging issues in a field of human need that extends into every home in the land. We cannot boast of attaining social security so long as that program remains on our list of unfinished business.

In the last few years, under the impetus of Federal health programs guided by the Children's Bureau and the Public Health Service, we have seen greater advances in public-health work than in any similar period of our history. But the record of impartial surveys and the testimony of reliable experts bear witness that the medical needs which remain uncared for dwarf what has already been accomplished.

More than half the counties in the United States have no full-time, trained, public-health officer; hundreds of counties are without public-health nurses; and only a fortunate few have maternal and child-health personnel sufficient to meet their needs under professional standards of adequacy. The combined Federal, State, and local preventive health measures are utterly inadequate to cope with fundamental health problems affecting the welfare of millions of our citizens, such as maternal and child care, venereal disease, pneumonia, tuberculosis, and occupational diseases. Yet these are the fields where comparatively small expenditures now will yield the greatest savings in human life and human suffering. By the prompt application of known and accepted methods of treatment, for example, the annual toll of maternal deaths could be cut in half, the lives of at least 50,000 new-born infants could be saved each year, and hundreds of thousands of physically handicapped children could be restored to normal life.

In measuring the need for health services, reliance on national averages will often conceal rather than reveal the true state of affairs. There are tremendous variations among different localities and income groups in the extent of available care, physicians, and hospitals. The very areas and population groups that need the care and services most are lowest in the economic scale and actually receive them least of all. A majority of the 2,000,000 babies born each year, for example, are born in families having incomes below $1,000 a year. In view of our declining population growth, it is a matter of grave concern that the areas and income groups making the greatest contribution to the national birth rate cannot afford and do not receive adequate medical care for mother and child.

The needs I have been describing are by no means confined to those at the relief level. Tens of millions of families in the lower- and middle-income groups—farmers, factory hands, and white-collar workers—are unable to meet the high and unpredictable cost of serious illness. These families, making up the bulk of the population, ask only that some economic mechanism be devised to enable them to pay their own way.

In addition to these deficiencies in care and services, there is completely lacking any systematic protection of the individual against loss of income in times of sickness. American workers are losing about $1,000,000,000 a year through disability not arising out of their employment. If only temporarily disabled, the wage earner finds his income cut off precisely at the time when medical bills make their greatest drain on his meager resources. If permanently disabled, he finds himself thrown upon the human scrap-heap, unemployed and unemployable. In either event, whether sickness lasts for a week or a lifetime, he has no recourse whatever to unemployment or compensation benefits in the prime of life, or to retirement benefits when he reaches the age of 65.

In the hospital, the laboratory, and on their daily rounds, doctors have labored from earliest times, sacrificing all material gain and often life itself, in order that you and I might live in healthful and productive security. Today, when medical science offers greater promise than ever before, the tragedy is that millions of people have not the means to pay. The national health program was designed to bridge that gap, through the cooperative efforts of all who do or can contribute to the solution of a common problem and the lightening of a common burden.

As outlined in the national-health bill which I have introduced, the program proposes grants-in-aid to the States, for the expansion of public-health services and maternal and child care, the construction of needed hospitals and health centers, the development of general programs of medical care, and the provision of temporary disability insurance. I have also introduced separately a proposal for retirement benefits to wage earners who become permanently disabled, to be paid out of the old-age-insurance fund established by the Social Security Act.

Nothing in this program infringes upon the exclusive province of the medical profession, to determine medical needs and administer medical needs and medical care. It does not create any vast

medical bureaucracy, or raise new barriers between doctors and patients. My sincere purpose is to break down the economic barriers that now exist, and to bring the doctor-patient relationship to the millions who do not now enjoy its solace and its healing benefits.

Nor does the bill project the Federal Government into the exclusive domain of the States. Federal cooperation with the States in matters affecting the public health began long ago, began, in fact, in the administration of George Washington. In this field at least, we have long since passed the time when doctrinaire disputes over States' rights have clouded the cooperative effort toward the common goal. Speaking through their health officers, the States have testified to the value of existing Federal aid, the cooperative spirit in which it is being administered, and the need for its expansion along the broad lines of the program I am proposing. The Federal Government will not dictate to the States the scope and nature of their services or the methods of financing. The bill simply establishes the cooperative basis upon which to build a healthier and a happier nation.

Toward the close of the last session of Congress the appropriate Senate committee, after exhaustive hearings, filed a favorable preliminary report on the national health bill. The committee found unanimous agreement on its objectives, undisputed evidence of its need, and impressive support for its adoption among responsible farm, labor, women's, and professional groups. For myself, I heartily concur in the committee's resolve to give careful study to the many suggestions and criticisms which have been offered, with a view to perfecting the bill and pressing for its passage early in the next session of Congress. I welcome the counsel and the guidance of any person or organization that can contribute to lighting the way.

I want to say a special word for the church and other voluntary hospitals. Their work is being brought home to you now in the annual campaigns of your local community chest. I cannot urge too strongly that you give generously and with a full heart toward the support of these voluntary organizations, which have made such a splendid record of community service. Between them and the public authorities there has always existed a spirit of partnership. Toward the care of needy patients, the voluntary hospitals now receive from State and local governments aggregate contributions at least equal to the aggregate gifts received from private philanthropic sources. The Federal Government makes the fullest possible use of their facilities, in the care of crippled children under the Social Security Act.

The national-health program is framed in that spirit. Where qualified hospital facilities are available for needy patients, our first objective is to encourage their use, by cooperating with the States in extending the necessary financial help. No new hospital construction will be aided except upon a definite showing, through impartial State and local surveys, that existing facilities, private as well as public, are inadequate to meet the clearly demonstrated need. The localities must also show they can maintain any new facilities according to sound financial, medical, and personnel standards. I have pledged, and the Senate committee is agreed, to clarify the intent of the bill in these respects. Every encouragement will be given to the continued and vigorous activity of the voluntary hospitals as an essential part of the national health program.

It has been said—and it will doubtless be repeated—that we cannot afford to make any expenditures now, however modest, toward the health security of the American people. I do not agree, and I believe you do not agree, with any such policy of false economy. Eminent health authorities insist that as a nation we are not only sicker than we need to be but sicker than we can afford to be. The balancing of the health budget presents a real opportunity to help balance the fiscal budget.

It is cheaper to prevent mothers from dying in childbirth than to give aid to dependent children bereft of their mothers' care. It is cheaper to introduce preventive measures now than to carry the burden of home relief, hospitals, and asylums when disease has reached its final stages. It is cheaper to aid needy farmers to develop a program of medical care than to have the security for Federal farm loans impaired by the borrowers' ill health. It is cheaper to help workers build up an insurance fund against loss of earning power through illness than to place the burden for their care upon society at large or upon members of the medical profession, already overworked and underpaid. All this and more I could demonstrate from careful investigations in medical economics on the farm and in the city.

But in the final analysis the issue of cost goes far beyond any such material considerations. Who can measure in dollars and cents the sorrow and frustration of a single family disrupted by death of crippling illness that could have been prevented by proper medical care? Who can put a price on the life and health of a single breadwinner, a single mother, or a single child saved by medical treatment we know about and can apply in time? Who can calculate in material terms the net worth of all the gains the program would bring in national health, vigor, and contentment?

My friends, every civilization is judged by the store it sets on human life and human values. Across the Atlantic and the Pacific millions of our fellow men are being offered up as sacrifices to the gods of war. That sanguinary spectacle we cannot wholly dismiss from our thoughts and our daily contacts. But we can and should reject its brutalizing influence. By the adoption of a national health program now let us demonstrate to all the world that America places human resources first among the assets of an enlightened civilization.

List of Americans Killed and Neutral Ships Lost in World War and European War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSIAH W. BAILEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, October 4), 1939

STATEMENT BY HON. JOSIAH W. BAILEY, OF NORTH CAROLINA

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I have prepared a statement of American lives lost and American ships sunk prior to our entry into the World War and a statement of neutral ships lost in the European War from September 3 to October 23, 1939, which I ask to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN LIVES LOST AND AMERICAN SHIPS SUNK PRIOR TO OUR ENTRANCE INTO WORLD WAR

The records of the Navy Department, Historical Section, disclose that during the period of United States neutrality from the outbreak of the first World War to the rupture of diplomatic relations with Germany February 3, 1917, the lives of only three Americans were lost aboard American merchant ships as the result of submarine and/or raider activities.

All three of these casualties occurred on the tanker *Gulflight*, which was torpedoed May 1, 1915.

The nature of these casualties was explained in a cable from Ambassador Page to Secretary Lansing 4 days later, which stated that the attack on the *Gulflight* occurred shortly before noon:

"Wireless Operator Short and Seaman Charpenta jumped overboard and were drowned. * * * Captain Gunter died during night. Coroner's inquest determines cause of death as heart failure." (Page to Lansing, May 7, 1915—Diplomatic Correspondence, A. J. I. L. XI Special Supplement (1917), pp. 76, 77.)

It is also pertinent to this case to state that the *Gulflight* was at the time of the attack under British naval convoy. This is confirmed by Page's cable of May 10. A published paraphrase of this cable stated:

"Mr. Page reports that it appears that the captain of the *Gulflight* complied without raising any question with the signals of British patrol boats to proceed under their convoy."

Incidentally the *Gulflight* was not sunk, but was towed to port.

The following summary appears in Neutrality for the United States, by Borchard and Lage, Yale University Press, which volume is based primarily upon diplomatic correspondence of the United States as published by the State Department:

"Including the case of the *Gulflight*, 67 lives were lost on American vessels between August 4, 1914, and April 6, 1917, as a result of German submarine activities. Added to this total might be the four killed, one a Spanish stoker, as a result of mine explosions in February 1915. Since it is obviously impossible to state with any degree of accuracy which of the belligerents was responsible for these mine casualties, they have arbitrarily been attributed to German mines by most writers. But the startling fact is that of this total of 71 dead, 64, or 90 percent, were lost between March 16, 1917, and April 6, 1917, i. e., during the last 3 weeks of armed expectancy preliminary to the declaration of war."

[Note by Senator BAILEY: This statement disregards the important fact that the unrestricted submarine warfare did not begin until February 1, 1917.]

"Including the 194 lives on belligerent merchant ships and the 1 lost on a foreign neutral vessel, America's total loss of life, wherever situated, on April 6, 1917, amounted to 266, including the 40 foreigners on American vessels, for whom America was responsible.

"During the 2 years and 6 months between the outbreak of war and severance of our diplomatic relations with Germany, 6 ships (20,866 gross tons) of United States registry were sunk and 1 surrendered. Four were damaged by surface craft and submarines, of which one, the *Rebecca Palmer*, Secretary Lansing was informed, suffered about $200 damage from gunfire while passing through the war zone with no flag flying.

"Losses from mines increased the total for this period to 12 (34,007 gross tons) and 7 were damaged. Nine other ships were sunk during the period of armed expectancy, so that the total figures, confirmed by the Navy Historical Section records, show 21 ships (70,424 gross tons) lost and 7 damaged during the 2 years and 8 months preceding the declaration of war by the United States."

ON BELLIGERENT SHIPS

A summary of American lives lost on ships of belligerent nations before our entry into the war states:

"One hundred and forty-four passengers and fifty sailors—194 American citizens—had been lost on belligerent vessels, of whom 128, or approximately two-thirds, were *Lusitania* victims. Of the remaining 66 cases, 50 were enrolled as crew, 21 of them on a vessel engaged in admiralty service; 17 seamen and 3 passengers were on board vessels admitted to have been armed, and another passenger was on a convoyed troop ship. Thirty of the non-*Lusitania* losses, moreover, occurred when the belligerent vessels attempted either to resist or to escape." (Neutrality for the United States, p. 220.)

NEUTRAL SHIPS LOST IN EUROPEAN WAR FROM SEPTEMBER 3 TO OCTOBER 23, 1939

The New York Times states that 29 neutral ships have been lost since September 8. Below is a list of 24, giving name and nationality of each:

September 8: Dutch minesweeper *Willem Van Wick.*
September 12: Dutch freighter *Mark* lost, reported to have rammed a mine.
September 12: Finland registry *Olivebank.*
September 14: Greek steamer *Katingo Hadjepateres.*
September 16: Belgian motorship *Alex Van Opstal.*
September 17: Norwegian freighter *Ronda.*
September 23: Two Finnish ships—*Martti-Ragnar* and *Walma.*
September 25: Swedish freighter *Gertrud Bratt.*
September 25: Swedish freighter *Silesia.*
September 28: Soviet steamer *Metalist.*
September 28: Swedish steamship *Nyland.*
September 29: Norwegian ship *Takstaas.*
September 29: Norwegian ship *Solaas.*
September 29: Norwegian ship *Jern.*
October 1: Danish freighter *Vendia* (without warning).
October 4: Greek steamer *Diamantis.*
October 4: Norwegian freighter *Hoegh Transporter.*
October 8: Netherland freighter *Binnendijk.*
October 9: Finnish freighter *Indra.*
October 10: Swedish ship *Vistula.*
October 16: Norwegian freighter *Gressholm.*
October 17: Norwegian steamship *Lorentz W. Hansen.*
October 23: Swedish steamer *Albania.*

Centenary Celebration of Baltimore City College

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE L. RADCLIFFE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, October 4), 1939

ADDRESS BY HON. LEWIS B. SCHWELLENBACH, OF WASHINGTON

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, on last Saturday, the 21st instant, at the concluding banquet of the centenary celebration of the Baltimore City College, in Baltimore, Md., my home State, the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. SCHWELLENBACH] delivered an address dealing primarily with the subject of education and the importance of its relationship to the preservation of democracy.

It is a very able, instructive, and informative address on the subject of education and democracy and, in my opinion, of general interest to the people of the country. I therefore ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

When my good friend, GEORGE RADCLIFFE, invited me to participate in this meeting, I was happy to accept. First, because I felt honored to be asked to take part in the celebration of the one hundredth birthday of this institution. Any institution which can live for 100 years must, of necessity, be basically sound. My second reason was a more personal one. In my own life, prior to 1935, a goodly share of my time had been spent in educational work. I was glad of the chance to slip away for even this short time into a college atmosphere.

It may be that because of my interest in education I overemphasize its importance in its relationship with the preservation of our democracy. I believe that our system of education is and has been the bulwark upon which we must depend for the defense of our democratic institutions. That being true, now more than ever before, we must support and protect our educational system and its freedom.

Three hundred years ago education waged a desperate battle for its freedom. An Italian astronomer, Galilei, studied the stars in their heavenly courses. A burning issue arose over his right to tell what he saw. Many feared that if he told what he saw he would undermine religious faith. Galilei was himself a deeply religious man. He was so deeply religious that he had faith that religion had nothing to fear from the truth. He recognized, as all civilized men have come to recognize, that truth has nothing to fear from truth. That is why the freedom of education is the very basis of civilized progress. For it is the freedom of men of learning in the pursuit of knowledge to think and to declare the truth as it is given them to see it.

Since the days of Galilei, until very recently, this has been generally cherished throughout the western world. The most cruel fate up to the present that had befallen the modern educator was indifference or ridicule. By and large, he was permitted to go his way in peace. Society accepted gratefully, if sometimes belatedly, his contributions to the advancement of living.

But today, in many parts of the world, the educator would count himself blessed if he were simply looked on with indifference. In some countries, the educator has become the bond-slave of the ruling political party. He has been forced to lend the cloak of education to what is, in fact, stark brutality. There are many who could not remain in their posts if they would; this because of the accident of their birth. There are many others who could remain if they chose to do so. They, however, have preferred exile and poverty in the cause of truth to personal well-being in the cause of deception. These educators stood firm against intrigue, entreaty, and threats. They refused to lend the name and prestige of educational authority to myths and pseudo-educational propaganda. They chose rather to be homeless wanderers than to forsake the only aspiration that made life for them worth living—the aspiration for knowledge.

Some of these educators we have welcomed to our own shores. We are receiving from them the priceless gifts of their genius. In our universities and colleges they are adding to our knowledge and well-being. To all of these modern martyrs, those who have found refuge and those who have not, we should bare our heads in the profoundest admiration and respect.

In our own country the educator enjoys a liberty as great as at any time in the past. The spirit of intolerance, of bigotry, of brutality, has not penetrated to the academic halls. There are several reasons, I think, why we have preserved our academic freedom. The most important reason has been the acceptance of a doctrine expressed by Abraham Lincoln at Edwardsville, Ill., September 13, 1858. Let me read a short excerpt:

"What constitutes the bulwark of our own liberty and independence? It is not our frowning battlements, our bristling seacoasts, our Army, and our Navy. These are not our reliance against tyranny. All of these may be turned against us without making us weaker for the struggle. Our reliance is in the love of liberty which God has planted in us. Our defense is in the spirit which prizes liberty as the heritage of all men, in all lands everywhere. Destroy this spirit, and you have planted the seeds of despotism at your own doors. Familiarize yourselves with the chains of bondage and you prepare your own limbs to wear them. Accustomed to trample on the rights of others, you have lost the genius of your own independence and become the fit subjects of the first cunning tyrant who rises among you."

So long as educators are ready to refuse to yield to corruption or intimidation, the future of education is safe. No country can afford in the long run to throw overboard the talents of its best minds. A country that is forced to get along with a second-rate education condemns itself in the modern world to being a second-rate country. That is an inexorable truth that we in America understand.

Freedom of education in the full sense can thrive only if economic and political democracy thrives.

But educators and educated men and women must know that the perpetuation of that freedom depends upon the perpetuation of the political freedom of all our people. They cannot and they must not rest the future of this freedom they so much cherish upon the smug satisfaction that they are safe in the cloistered confines of a college campus. They cannot brush aside their responsibilities of citizenship with the curt rejoinder that government is not an exact science and that responsibility for its operation rests in the hands of politicians who are so unscientific.

I will be the first to admit that government is not an exact science. That is particularly true of a democratic one. But it is a process of trial and error. This, after all, is the ultimate in the procedure of the most careful scientist. We do not have opportunity to work under conditions favorable to accuracy which can compare with those of even the most meager laboratory. I will admit that since governments are political they must be operated by what are usually contemptuously referred to as politicians. We make mistakes. I do not attempt to defend them. I only say that we do try so much harder than people generally understand.

And in these troublous times we need the help and the understanding of those to whom has been given the opportunity of training.

Political freedom has been much more difficult of achievement than freedom of learning. Indeed, it has been a much longer and harder struggle for the common man to achieve political freedom than for the scholar or scientist to acquire freedom to pursue

knowledge whither the quest for truth led him. The common man, I believe, has always desired political freedom for himself. He has, however, been slow to learn that his own freedom ultimately depends upon the equal freedom of all, even those whose views of government he may, upon occasion, dislike and even profoundly detest. It was only after centuries of struggle that the common man realized that political democracy was possible only if the right of all men—without regard to wealth, race, or religion—to express their political opinions freely and publicly, was scrupulously safeguarded. Freedom of thought is the very cornerstone of a democratic society.

In Thomas Jefferson's original draft of the Virginia bill for the establishment of religious freedom, we find these words: "The opinions of men are not the object of civil government or under its control." No one, certainly not I, can improve on that language.

We must have an atmosphere of free expression if we are to have the benefit of fearless political discussion. This is the surest guaranty of orderly change and the surest protection against the forces of disorder. Nothing is so dangerous as the belief that any part of our political society should be beyond criticism. No one generation's judgment as to the essentials of good government can be unerring. As the inquiring mind of Galileo made it possible for man to preserve his religious faith on an earth that moves, so political criticism today may point the only way of preserving tomorrow our democratic faith. The earth does move, and it is the spirit of free inquiry, whether in science or in politics, which enables man to adjust himself to its movements.

We must scrupulously maintain freedom of discussion if we are to develop our responsibilities as a people by choosing rationally the path we wish to follow. That is why freedom of thought and freedom of speech, with the resulting duty of making up our minds honestly and courageously, is at the very heart of the faith in democracy necessary to protect the pursuit of knowledge.

The preservation of our rights, privileges, duties, and responsibilities, under a democracy, must be the cause of constant concern to those who believe in democracy. The very nature of those resources is such that they cannot be even intermittently permitted to lie dormant. By their very nature, neglect and nonuse causes them to atrophy and die. Untiring alertness is the price which must be paid for their preservation.

I fear that we are entering into a period when the need for this untiring alertness will be greater than at any previous period in our Nation's history. This for the reason that right now three factors have converged.

First. For a full decade we have undergone a condition of depth-reaching depression. This could not have helped but to have weakened the resistance of our people. False doctrines of government acquire much more attractive color to a depressed than to a prosperous people.

Second. The last two decades have seen the acceptance by the peoples of many nations of political doctrines which are the direct antithesis of those in which we believe. Furthermore, the nations accepting these doctrines have attained some measure of success in the solution of their economic problems. I am convinced that that success is wholly superficial and entirely temporary. Regardless of that fact, it does not detract from the attractiveness of the success in the minds of many of our people.

Third. At the moment, most of the powerful nations of the world either are at war or on the verge of war. This results in a situation in which all the nations participating feel it essential that every possible effort be made by them to influence the attitude of our people toward them and their enemies.

The converging of these three factors presents to us the greatest danger that this Nation has ever seen. Our Government and our people must necessarily afford protection against improper activities conducted from outside sources. The danger comes from the fact that in our desire to defend against improper outside activities, we run the risk of destroying the civil liberties of our people and by so doing destroy our very democracy itself.

All about us, and all too close at hand, we see forces of intolerance at work—forces intolerant of democracy, of science, and even of religion. We have seen them in all too many shapes and forms. They preach a doctrine which is the antithesis of that spirit of tolerance which is so essential to the perpetuation of our institution—democracy. Fear, hatred, distrust, and bigotry, these are the tenets of their faith.

We must realize the grave danger to civilization that lurks behind these forces. They must be dealt with resolutely if the freedom and dignity of the common man is to be preserved. They must also be dealt with resolutely if the freedom and dignity of the scholar and scientist is to be preserved.

That resolute determination must carry with it an understanding of three basic principles of democratic machinery:

First, it must give to every citizen equality of opportunity to participate in government which is free from coercion or fear on the one side and free from impossible promises of reward upon the other.

Second, the minority in a democratic community must recognize the right of the majority to govern. At the same time, the majority must insure to the minority the same degree of justice which it demands for itself. Failing in this obligation, the majority becomes merely a mob. When the majority becomes a mob, democracy fades out.

Third, a democratic government must be a government of law. A civilized democratic community demands that all classes within it respect its law. If respect for law is to be maintained, the law must reflect the community sense of justice and not the demands of any class or group. If the law reflects the community sense of justice, no class or group may defy or set itself above or beyond the law without bringing upon itself the just resentment of the whole community. A civilized democracy demands patience and self-restraint from all its citizens.

These three more or less mechanical requirements of democratic machinery may all be summed up with the simple word—tolerance. It is the very essence of democracy.

You people in Maryland need no outside speaker to preach the doctrine of tolerance. The rich heritage of your historical background makes that unnecessary. It was here that the first statutory recognition of that doctrine was enacted. You who are or have been connected with Baltimore City College may ever be proud of its devotion of tolerance.

That devotion must continue. It must be continued not only here but in every school, college, and university in our land.

For if tolerance is the essence of democracy, it is to our classrooms, our laboratories, and our lecture halls that we look in order that the softened light of tolerance may be kept burning. That shaded torch is in the hands of the educated men and women of America. It must not be extinguished.

Sinking of the "Royal Oak" by Commander Guenther Prien

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAT McCARRAN

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, October 4), 1939

EDITORIAL FROM THE ELKO (NEV.) DAILY FREE PRESS OF OCTOBER 21, 1939

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial appearing in the Elko (Nev.) Daily Free Press of October 21, 1939, which to my mind is a very able editorial from the pen of the editor of that newspaper, entitled "They Decorated Him for Valor."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Elko (Nev.) Daily Free Press of October 21, 1939]

THEY DECORATED HIM FOR VALOR

Commander Guenther Prien, the man who squirmed through a British mine field to Scapa Flow with a submarine and sank the battleship *Royal Oak*, was a hero Wednesday as Berlin celebrated his doughty exploit. This 31-year-old submarine commander received from Adolf Hitler Germany's high war decoration, the Grand Cross of the Iron Cross.

We are not going to question the commander's valor. Certainly his was a brave deed. His entire crew knew that every foot they pressed forward was filled with danger—possibly death. They made it through safely; they made it back; they sank a great ship; and more than 800 men went to their deaths. For what?

Surely he deserved his country's plaudits; the commander is a brave and able man. But how about the 800 who went to a watery grave? How about the heart-rending sorrow of those who were left behind, the wives, the kiddies, the mothers, and fathers, for after all these brave British soldiers are men in early and middle life? How about the heartbreak? And for what? We had almost forgotten. This is war.

Berlin's streets were merry as the celebration of victory rocked the city. A marvelous feat had been accomplished; a German submarine had penetrated Scapa Flow and 800 British sailors were dead. These dead were little different from the Germans who celebrated the victory. Had the English been the victors in the battle there would have been rejoicing in London. But this was a German victory and so the Germans celebrated. And to what end?

Perhaps Commander Prien may take his same submarine to sea next week and it is possible that a British destroyer will find it with a depth bomb and this gallant young commander will be carried, with his courageous crew, to the bottom of the ocean. And the British will rejoice * * * and the Germans will bow in sorrow. How about the children, the wives, the mothers, and fathers of these German soldiers? There will be agony and sorrow and more hatred. And for what? Oh, yes, we almost forgot—this is war.

Wheeler Homecoming Celebration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAVID I. WALSH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, October 4), 1939

ADDRESSES BY HON. BURTON K. WHEELER, OF MONTANA, AND HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR., OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, on October 1 of this year the citizens of Hudson, Mass., extended a homecoming welcome to the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER], Hudson, Mass., being his birthplace. On that occasion my colleague the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] delivered an address complimentary of the Senator from Montana and introduced him to the citizens of Hudson whom he then addressed. I ask unanimous consent to have both addresses printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR., OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, and members of the radio audience, we are meeting here in Hudson today to welcome back to Massachusetts a son of the Bay State who has gone far in the life of the Nation. Senator BURTON K. WHEELER, whose homecoming we celebrate, was born in this town in 1882 and attended the schools and a business college here. We read in Alva Johnston's excellent biography that "After working as a stenographer and clerk in Massachusetts firms, he saved enough money to go to Ann Arbor, Mich., in 1902, where he enrolled in the Michigan Law School. He maintained himself during the school year by waiting on table at the students' boarding house and acting as a stenographer to the dean's office. During summer vacations he traveled through Illinois selling an all-purpose volume abounding in general information—cooking recipes and instructions for the treatment of diseases of adults, children, and livestock. It was printed in English, German, and Norwegian and sold for $1.50 or $3.50 a copy, according to the binding. WHEELER took orders on foot during the summer and delivered the books by horse and buggy during the early fall. At one of the farms he visited he met Lulu M. White, of Albany, Ill., now Mrs. Wheeler.

"After graduating from law school in 1905, WHEELER went to Telluride, Colo., and worked in a law office for 3 months. After that he started looking for a good place to set up law practice. At Butte, Mont., he was offered $50 a month to work in a law office. He declined. He intended to leave town that night, but his train was several hours late. He got into a poker game and was cheated out of all his money, so he took the $50 offer and settled down in Butte, which has been his home ever since."

In 1910 he was elected as the youngest lawyer member of the Montana Legislature. He was later appointed United States district attorney in Montana, and was an unsuccessful candidate for Governor in 1920. In 1922 he was elected to the United States Senate, where he has been ever since.

As we look over this remarkably successful career, we see that Senator WHEELER has been called many things, and that, like every strong character, he has made enemies and friends. He has been charged with being a Bolshevik; he has been accused of being a conservative; he has had applied to him the labels of "Progressive," "Non-Partisan Leaguer," labor man, and Democrat. The record does not show that he has ever been labeled a Republican—but I hasten to add that this does not mean that he has not many sincere friends and admirers in the Republican Party.

It is a career which has interested itself in many great questions. He has sought to regulate public utilities; he has interested himself, and still interests himself deeply, in the railroad problem. He wants to curb monopoly wherever he can.

Let it be noted, however, that he is opposed to monopoly and dictatorship wherever it is found. He hates monopoly and dictatorship if it wears the garb of big business, but he detests it just as strongly if the desire for power comes from those in public office. He hates a tyrant, whether he is in business or whether he occupies a judicial bench. To him the economic royalist and the political royalist are on the same footing.

It was natural that feeling this way he should have taken such a prominent part in the fighting attempt to apply force to the Supreme Court. He broke with his party leadership, and did so at once, not waiting to see which way the wind blew. Whether you agree with him or not—and I do—we can all agree that this was the act of a courageous man. As a freshman Senator it was my pleasure to see Senator WHEELER in that fight and to admire his slashing, vigorous, and bold attack. He had logic, research, and industry on his side; but he had more—moral fervor and strong conviction.

You remember the outcome of the Supreme Court fight—how the course of battle changed from almost certain victory for the administration in January to an afternoon 9 months later, when a ruddy, white-haired man, the Vice President of the United States, walked into Senator WHEELER's office and said: "BURT, write your own ticket." He had won, decisively, unquestionably and without reservation, and in winning he had educated countless numbers of his fellow citizens in the importance of maintaining a truly democratic Government. He had shown the Nation the difference between reform on the one hand and control on the other. All too often do we see the desire to control masquerading as liberalism. His liberalism is the liberalism of reform.

It is particularly precious to have men of courage at a time like the present—men who have proved, as WHEELER has, that he dares to go against the trend, that he is not afraid of being criticized because he opposes the whim and passion of mob spirit. Let it be noted that Senator WHEELER opposed American entry into the World Court and that he declared himself to be opposed to sending our soldiers overseas to fight in foreign causes. America can use public servants with that kind of courage now.

As I have said, his is the liberalism that favors reform rather than control. I think of him as one of that stirring band of Massachusetts reformers which our State has always been able to produce. It is the Massachusetts passion for reform that has given us such a commanding place among the States in social and humanitarian legislation of all sorts. It was the Massachusetts passion for reform and our hatred of slavery which supplied a large—if not a major—part of the emotional and spiritual impetus in the Civil War. BURTON K. WHEELER, son of the Bay State, stands in the shadow of a great tradition which he is ably carrying on. There is scarcely a man who knows him who will not disagree with many of his beliefs, as I do. There is also not a man who knows him who does not, as I do, respect his virile courage and, paraphrasing Shakespeare, say to himself, "This is a man."

ADDRESS BY HON. BURTON K. WHEELER, OF MONTANA

It is a pleasure to be back in Hudson and to greet old friends and acquaintances.

Though the town has changed with the march of progress, though many sites familiar 30 years ago are no more, and though there is increased business activity and many more persons are here, yet the old spirit is the same. I am proud to be numbered among the sons of Hudson, just as I am pleased, beyond my limited description, with the great reception that has been accorded me.

My obligations to you now are even greater, and I have long known that I owe you much. It was in your public schools that I received my primary education. It was the principal of the Hudson High School who suggested and encouraged my study of the law. Fate has treated me kindly, and I wish to acknowledge my debt to Mr. Charles A. Williams and to Miss Ethyl Rawson, of the Hudson Public School System, for the encouragement which they gave me.

It was the town of Hudson, the county of Middlesex, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, and the glorious traditions of all New England that furnished the background of which I am so proud. No State, no part of these United States, ever produced greater liberals, greater leaders, or better men than John Hancock, Benjamin Franklin, Samuel Adams, Paul Revere, John Adams, and the host of patriots whose names and whose deeds are so indelibly inscribed on the pages of history of this Nation. They were the liberals of their day. Some called them radicals. Today we honor them as patriots. The liberalism of those farseeing patriots has been a constant source of inspiration to all Americans.

New England has contributed more than leadership to our great Nation. Democracy on this continent had its birth in the town meeting. I can well remember as a boy clutching the hand of Abe Tyler, my grandfather, as we went to town hall. I thrilled to the discussions. There it was, after full and open debate by all citizens who desired to participate, that town problems and policies were settled. Such free and open discussion and the rule of the majority is real democracy.

Your forefathers and mine laid down their lives to establish a democratic republic in this land. They were farmers, cobblers, blacksmiths, tailors, merchants, and tradesmen, but with the march of progress the shoeshop became a factory and the cobbler an employee. The small factory or shop with its owner-worker disappeared, and in its stead came modern industrialization, combinations, and trusts. Mass production replaced the individual and brought with it severe tests of democracy—unemployment, low farm prices, and poverty.

Amid economic inequalities, social injustice, and poverty, democracy always labors, if indeed it does not fail. Poverty is as needless as it is vicious. It fills the earth with subversive dogmas—endangers our democracy, and hence our freedom. Poverty is the menace of peace, the seed of race hatreds, and the cause of religious prejudice. If man must hate, let us not hate each other; let us hate poverty. If man must make war, let us not fight each other; let us make war on poverty.

The success or failure of American democracy is dependent upon economic and social conditions—upon the welfare and happiness of the people who compose it, and not upon who wins the war in

Europe. Men will fight and even die for democracy; but, once gained, their children and grandchildren come to accept the privileges of constitutional democracy as commonplace. Lacking employment, food, clothing, shelter, or markets for their produce, they become a fertile field for demagogues. Once Germany attempted a democracy, but its people had been reduced to economic serfdom, and in poverty succumbed to the false promises of economic security. They sold their freedom for the promise of bread. The old saying that "you cannot have bread for nothing" is as true today as ever. You must work for it or you'll be required to give up your liberties for it.

Through the ages the No. 1 economic problem had been that of producing enough. American industrial genius solved this problem in our country by mass production.

Now we are told we have too much farm land, too much factory capacity, too many mines, too much food and clothing—so much of everything that starvation lurks at our doors. So much wheat, milk, and meat that farmers are losing their farms, laborers losing their jobs, and people losing faith in their fellow man, if not in their Government.

What a paradox!

Let us not forget that it is the very lack of all these things of which we have an abundance that lies at the bottom of the wars in Europe and in the Orient.

It must be apparent, then, that mass production to be successful must be accompanied by mass consumption—money earned and in the pockets of the people to buy the goods produced.

We in America must use our genius and our resources in solving this paradox of want in the midst of plenty if we desire to save the country from financial and moral bankruptcy. We must not use that genius or our great resources in a futile European war. It should never be forgotten that it is the moral and financial bankruptcy of a nation that brings about dictatorship.

Less than 23 years ago we went into a bloody conflict "to make the world safe for democracy." Today after that so-called victorious holy war the world knows less democracy than every before. To say the World War was futile is to be charitable—it was horrible, it was disastrous. I shudder to think of the potential results, direct and indirect, of the present war.

A quarter of a century ago kaiserism was to be stamped out; now it is nazi-ism. Both are indefensible—both are repugnant to free peoples. The problem that faces Europe today not only parallels the 1914 situation but is one which is recorded in the pages of European history a hundred times. The characters may be more bold, the names changed, and certainly the villain is equally or more repulsive, but the plot and the climax are as old as European history itself.

My sympathies are with the Allies—and I know that the American people and all lovers of democracy want Hitlerism crushed. It is the symbol of dictatorship, of bankruptcy, followed by intolerance, bigotry, and prejudice. All this is the product of the last war, and should the present war assume the dimensions of the first World War, I am fearful that there will not only be a bankrupt Germany but a bankrupt world—not one Hitler, one Mussolini, or one Stalin, but many.

Sympathetic as we are with those who find themselves at war with dictators, we must never lose sight of the fact that our entry into war cannot be measured alone in terms of lives lost and dollars spent. The price would surely be loss of democracy and Christianity. They could not withstand the impact of war.

Our problem is to solve our economic difficulties at home and not the politics of Europe. Our problem is to preserve American democracy and not the balance of power or the boundaries of Europe.

We are passing through a grave crisis, a trying period. We must be vigilant in guarding our peace. Neither sentiment, propaganda, nor profits must be allowed to influence our determination to avoid our participation in the present conflict.

Already there has been loosed upon us a flood of propaganda from both sides. Its intensity will be multiplied with the passage of time. Already in Washington the war hysteria rises in full flood. Detectives watch the Capitol, watch the office buildings, and watch each other. It won't be long now before we will be spying on each other and seeing German U-boats in the Great Lakes and enemy airplanes over the Rocky Mountains.

I sometimes wonder whether we shouldn't be more afraid of the war propaganda originating in Washington than that which emanates from foreign capitals.

The American people today seem resolved to withstand it. Let us pray that they keep steadfast in the hectic days to come. They realize that our vision may be clouded and our thinking dulled, but they know that the cost of war will be greater today than ever before.

War profits will destroy true neutrality. They lure and corrupt. War profits may bring a temporary and artificial prosperity—a prosperity which would be only a shot in the arm of our economic system productive of a cheap and murderous jag, but which would end in a disastrous depression. At this moment there is some increase in the price of wheat, sugar, beef, and other basic goods. Certain industries are hastily reemploying men, but for any war-engendered prosperity we will eventually pay and pay and pay.

We are neither Germans, Poles, Britons, Frenchmen, Italians, nor Russians. We are Americans, and in this hour of world strife our country is a haven for peace. We must so maintain it. Cries of nazi-ism, fascism, or communism that we presently hear neither frighten nor interest me. Working democracy can withstand their attacks. The only "ism" in which I am interested is Americanism. We should build up our national defense so that no nation will dare attack us; we must build up our trade in the Americas where our natural markets lie.

As a member of the United States Senate, I will never vote to send a single American boy across the water to fight on foreign soil. Neither will I, by my vote, approve of a single step that in my judgment may lead this country down the road to war.

These are some of the reasons why I am not in favor of selling arms and munitions to any of the belligerents. This is why I would insist that all other products be paid for in cash and delivery made in this country. And this is why I would say to all Americans: You travel in troubled waters at your own risk—you cannot and must not involve this country in war.

America must be kept safe for Americans in America.

Pending Neutrality Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, October 4), 1939

ADDRESS BY HON. A. B. CHANDLER, OF KENTUCKY, OCTOBER 21, 1939

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very timely address on the subject of the pending legislation delivered by my colleague, the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], at Richmond, Va., on the 21st of October 1939, before the annual convention of the Disciples of Christ.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I have been very much impressed during my 2 weeks as a Member of the United States Senate at the general feeling which unquestionably exists in the minds and hearts of not only the Members of the Senate but all of the officials with whom I have come in contact in Washington. It is the desire of each and all of them to do their utmost to prevent America from participating in this war or any war except in defense of our country when attacked.

In opening I would like to repeat with strong approval the words of the President of the United States at the opening of this special session of the Congress:

"I proceed on the assumption that every Member of the Senate and the House of Representatives and every member of the executive branch of the Government, including the President and his associates, personally and officially, are equally and without reservation in favor of such measures as will protect the neutrality, the safety, and the integrity of our country, and at the same time keep us out of war."

That the present neutrality law is an unneutral law and works to the distinct advantage of Germany and against the Allies is now hardly subject to serious question.

We are trying as best we can to avoid, if possible, the many mistakes which seem to have been made in 1917 and which later resulted in our participation in that war.

It seems not only good sense but good judgment to say to all nations that if you do buy materials and supplies of war you must come to America for them, pay cash when you get them, and carry them over in your own ships.

If the Pittman bill becomes a law it will mean that in the future there will be no occasion for the American Government feeling obligated in any way to protect the lives and property of American citizens who go without justification or authority into war zones. Under the provisions of the Pittman law the President will have the authority to define combat zones, and it is believed by those who favor the passage of the bill that it will result in the ships and citizens of America staying out of the dangerous war zones entirely.

Of course, we still entertain the hope that some day the nations of the earth will realize the absolute futility of war. There is no longer any victor in war. If the nations of the earth persist in having war, it will eventually lead to the extermination of civilization.

Bombing of defenseless cities and of citizens cannot be countenanced by any Christian country. Discrimination and persecution against religions cannot be condoned.

It is, I believe, the general feeling that if there must be war on the face of the earth that it is the duty of the Members of the

Congress of the United States to do all in their power to see that such wars as seem to be incapable of being avoided because of misunderstanding or greed for power and lust should be fought across the seas and not here.

The only hope for the future in avoiding war is for all nations to obey God's own injunction and all of us to devoutly pray for the time when men will beat their swords into plowshares and their spears into pruning hooks.

Of course, there may be honest differences of opinion as to the best means calculated to keep us out of war. During these times of stress and high tension it is of the utmost importance that we keep cool heads and exercise calm and deliberate judgment. It is a time for calm thinking and a clear determination to find as nearly as we can the best solution to this most pressing problem.

I have been deeply impressed with the sincerity of the men on both sides of the question who have carried on during the last few weeks the discussion in the Senate of the United States. They are sincere and honest men anxious, in my opinion, with God's help, to find the best solution for the people of America.

For myself I am determined that I shall not vote to send our American boys across the seas to fight in a foreign war. If ever it becomes necessary for America to take up arms, we are determined that it shall only be in defense of the rights of the people of America and to protect their homes, life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

It is encouraging in these serious times to find laymen of the Christian churches gathering for the purpose of backing those who are in charge of the affairs of the Government, and who are trying as best they can to find the right solution to a desperate situation.

I have, as always, the greatest confidence in the considered judgment of the people of America and their representatives to find with God's help an answer that will best protect the citizens of America. Without His help we are lost, but with the aid of our prayers we feel that He will help us to find the right way.

It is my hope and prayer that some day in some way the spirit of God will so work in the hearts of men that they will find certain and lasting peace.

Neutrality Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD P. NYE

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, October 4), 1939

EDITORIAL FROM THE BALTIMORE SUN OF OCTOBER 1, 1939

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial written by H. L. Mencken, entitled "Sham Battle," published in the Baltimore Sun of October 1, 1939.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Baltimore Sun of October 1, 1939]

SHAM BATTLE

(By H. L. Mencken)

It is possible that the debate over the proposed amendment of the Neutrality Act of 1937, now getting under way in the Halls of Congress, may produce same gaudy hollering and breast beating, full of thrills for connoisseurs of whim-wham, but beyond that it is hardly likely to be of any significance.

Whether the act survives substantially as it stands, or the New Deal scheme to pull its teeth is adopted, or some other and even more disingenuous plan emerges, will be all one, for no imaginable legislation can keep the United States out of the war if the administration itches badly enough to take a hand. That it has begun furiously to itch must be manifest to even the most underprivileged understanding. All its principal spokesmen, headed by the Honorable Mr. Roosevelt himself, have been rooting hard and openly for England since the issue was first joined. What they ask for today is simply a license to give the embattled motherland more direct and effective help, and if that turns out to be insufficient they may be trusted confidently to go the whole hog, license or no license.

There is only one event that can cure their libido, and that is the quick and complete collapse of the arch fiend Hitler, which somehow seems improbable. It is far more likely, at least at the present writing, that if his peace overtures are rejected scotching him will turn out to be an extremely expensive and bloody business, and that before many months have come and gone the altruists engaged upon it will begin to sweat painfully. When that melancholy time arrives the excuse for American intervention on the side of what the Honorable Mr. Roosevelt speaks of as "morality and religion" will be provided by the always ingenious brethren of the English atrocity factory, and the administration certainly will not say them nay.

On the contrary, it may be relied upon to give them a leg up whenever it can, and with loud hosannas. Every time the English clamp down on American shipping, the fact will be delicately passed over, as it was in 1914, 1915, and 1916, and every time the Germans clamp down on either American shipping or English shipping there will be a violent hullabaloo. In a little while note writing, radio crooning, and spy hunting will be in full blast, and after that it will be an easy step to horning in.

In answer to all this the judicious may point out that the Honorable Mr. Roosevelt, in his message to Congress on September 21, declared solemnly and categorically that it was his hope and prayer "to keep us out of the war," and then added, without being asked, that his "candid judgment" told him that "we shall succeed in these efforts." Certainly it would be unreasonable to call for anything clearer than that. But statements by the Honorable Mr. Roosevelt, however clear, no longer carry their face value; in fact, the discount of them is almost as great as the discount on those of Hitler, Chamberlain, Stalin, et hoc genus omne. Since the opening of his first campaign, the honorable gentleman has been making them at frequent intervals, and not 10 percent of them have ever been redeemed in gold. Indeed, the only one so redeemed that I can recall at the moment was his promise to bring back beer.

It is not necessary to ascribe this series of defaults to a deliberate attempt to cozen, though that thesis could surely be argued plausibly; it is enough to remember that the Honorable Mr. Roosevelt is an extremely mercurial, grandiloquent, and unreliable fellow, with little apparent temperamental fitness for the sober responsibilities that lie upon him, and no visible fear that his customers may be intelligent. When he talks to them, as he was talking on September 21, he usually talks "hooey." In very few of his pronunciamentos, whether written or verbal, is there any politeness toward the known facts, and in almost none of them does he resort to rational argument.

There was an amusing example in his message to Congress. "Let no group assume," he said, "the exclusive label of the peace bloc. We all belong to it." All? There can be only two ways to account for this assertion. Either the honorable gentleman was seeking, in the face of the obvious facts, to deny the existence of a formidable war party, with eminent members at his very elbow, or he was confessing that there was no substantial difference between these forthright succorers of "morality and religion" and his own peace bloc. The second of the two alternatives is easier to embrace.

A President of the United States, like any other citizen, has a plain right to an opinion about the rights and wrongs of this or that foreign war, and in his official capacity he may also have a right, and even a duty, to indicate that opinion to the people, though on this point learned counsel are far from unanimous. But neither he nor any other man has any right to pretend to neutrality when he is in fact bitterly partisan, nor to talk loftily against war when he is notoriously planning to promote it. Of the first of these improprieties the Honorable Mr. Roosevelt proved himself guilty in every one of the notes he addressed to Hitler, Mussolini, and company before the war actually began, and in all his speeches on the subject after his Chautauqua speech. Of the second he convicted himself in the very message to Congress which contained his plea for peace.

The head of a great state, speaking ex cathedra, can't indulge himself in the evasions and inconsistencies suitable to a chance debate on a street corner. What he says commits his country, and the least one may ask of it is that it be frank, sincere, and in accord with ordinary notions of candor and fair dealing. He has no right, favoring one side or the other in a foreign war, to pretend to be the honest friend of both, and he has no right, preparing to help one side against the other, to assume hypocritically the character of a lover of peace. When a Hitler, a Mussolini, or a Stalin resorts to buncombe of this sort the whole world snickers, and when a President of the United States does the same thing it snickers no less.

The late Woodrow Wilson's unparalleled talent for such buncombe produced effects that linger to the present day. All over the world the character of the United States is assumed as a matter of fact to be that of a Pecksniff. That notion is by no means confined to the public enemies in the last war, it is especially cherished in England, and contempt naturally goes with it. If we are now to have a second and worse dose out of the same bottle, we'll be embalmed in history as an even worse gang of Pharisees than the English themselves.

I am not arguing here against the theory that the United States, as a matter of self-interest, should support England against Hitler and company, though I do not subscribe to it. It is held by many honest if misguided men, and may be defended without any excess of sophistry and worse. What I am arguing is simply that it is disingenuous, dishonorable, and ignominious for a great nation to profess neutrality and blubber for peace, and at the same time to give all the aid it can to one side against the other, by fair means or foul. It is quite possible to fight gallantly in even a bad cause, but it is not possible to fight gallantly in even the noblest of causes

without standing up like a man, raising a flag without any raincoat over it, and eschewing blows behind the back and under the belt.

The present course of the administration can lead only to dishonor and disaster. The English would never have undertaken the present adventure if they had not been sure of its support, and they will be asking for the full measure of that support if the war goes on, and getting it. No matter which side wins in the end, the United States will come out of it even more ingloriously than it came out of its last adventure as England's prohibition agent. If Hitler is put down by force we'll get no more thanks than we got then, and a bill two or three times as large. And if Hitler is not put down we'll face the just and bitter enmity of the strongest military power on earth, and the disdain and derision of all the rest of the human race.

The Bankheads of Alabama

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, October 4), 1939

EDITORIAL FROM THE ALABAMA JOURNAL

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial written by Mr. C. M. Stanley, the able editor of the Alabama Journal, on our distinguished colleagues WILLIAM B. BANKHEAD, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and Senator JOHN H. BANKHEAD, 2D.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Alabama Journal of October 19, 1939]

TWO BROTHERS

It is a remarkable coincidence that farmers of the United States stricken in recent months by flood, drought, and insect enemies should have as leading national champions of their cause two Alabama brothers. Several thousand of Alabama's farmers have been especially hard hit because their crops were victims not only of boll-weevil depredations, but the floods of July and August finished the damage, with the result that this State has the smallest cotton crop in many years. Other States in the South and West have suffered similarly.

Senator JOHN H. BANKHEAD during his entire public life has devoted major effort to farm problems, with the result that his colleagues in the United States Senate have come to look to him for advice and leadership in all matters affecting agriculture and its problems. Hence it was Senator BANKHEAD who last week called the conference of Senators from States affected by drought, flood, and weevil at which tentative agreement was made to press for a special appropriation of $50,000,000 with which to meet the situation and to tide over the farmers of the stricken regions until they can get another crop planted and get on their feet.

Now comes the other brother, Speaker WILLIAM B. BANKHEAD, of the House of Representatives, who has called a conference of House Members to consider the same subject. Any bill making an appropriation must originate in the House of Representatives; therefore the conference called by Speaker BANKHEAD will decide upon the amount to ask and make suggestion as to its distribution. It is expected that existing governmental agencies will be utilized to make the contacts with those in need, and that the Farm Security Administration will be the chief dependence in seeing that the funds appropriated go where they are needed and where they will do the most good.

From Alabama's standpoint, it should be a source of pride that these Alabama brothers are looked upon both by farm interests in Congress and by the farm organizations of the Nation as their dependable friend and reliance in anything affecting agriculture. Those with historic perspective and knowledge of Alabama history, however, are not surprised that farming is so close to the hearts of these two brothers. Their father, the late Senator John H. Bankhead, was himself a farmer. In the House of Representatives and in the United States Senate the elder Bankhead was known as the "father of good roads" because of his sponsorship of the original laws authorizing Federal aid for highway construction, just as he was the father of the rural free delivery system which has brought the daily mails within reach of every farm homestead in America.

With a heritage of that kind, the BANKHEAD brothers of the present generation might have been expected to have the farmer's problems close to their own hearts.

Drafting of Wealth in Wartime

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHAN GURNEY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, October 4), 1939

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. STYLES BRIDGES, OF NEW HAMPSHIRE, OCTOBER 22, 1939

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address delivered by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] on October 22, 1939, on the subject of the Lee bill, providing for the drafting of wealth in wartime.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

God forbid that this country should ever again be drawn into a war. I do not agree with Senator LEE, the sponsor of this bill, that it will tend to keep us out of war. This country does not have to be bribed into staying out of war. The American people are determined to see that it is not drawn into one.

Since the beginning of the New Deal we have been hearing constant reports that a capital levy was to be presented as another panacea. This bill sponsored by the Senator is it. It is a bill to confiscate the Nation's wealth under the guise of national defense. I read to you from the bill:

"Whenever Congress shall declare war, or shall declare that the imminence of war has created an emergency which in the judgment of the President is sufficiently serious to necessitate an increase in the Military Establishment by the drafting of manpower, the President is authorized and requested to cause to be taken a census of the net wealth of the Nation. Such census shall be taken in such a manner as the President shall by regulations prescribe and by such agency or agencies of the Government as he may designate or establish for such purpose.

"Such regulations shall require every citizen of the United States, every resident alien, and every nonresident alien having any wealth in the United States to file with such person or agency as the President may designate a sworn declaration in such form as the President may prescribe with respect to his gross wealth in the United States and financial obligations therein."

Now, let's see what is wealth. It is not only Wall Street that this bill is striking at; it is not only the economic royalists whom you have heard so much about. It is a bill to take your wealth—the wealth of the people of my own New England, the people of the sunny South, of the people of Oklahoma, whom Senator LEE represents, of the people of the Middle and the far West.

If all of your earthly possessions over and above what you owe are not worth more than $1,000—that much exemption is granted—if your home, your farm, your savings, your business, your insurance, your stocks and bonds, altogether, do not have a net worth of more than $1,000, there is no need for your listening to me further. If they do, I would suggest that you come closer to the radio.

Because all of your net wealth over $1,000—again I quote from the bill—"shall be subject to the borrowing power of the United States" when this act goes into effect.

The bill says "subject to the borrowing power." I say it is a capital levy. It is not borrowing money when money is taken by force.

Let's see if I am not right when I call it a capital levy.

Do you have a farm which you value, over and above your obligations, to be worth $10,000? The Government under this bill "borrows" $450. Do you have net assets, including savings, everything you own, of $3,000; the Government "borrows" $100. In the case of a net wealth of $100,000 (including a business, a home, a farm, everything you have) the Government "borrows" $9,450; a net wealth of $250,000, it "borrows" $31,950; on $1,000,000 the figure is $206,950, and so on.

Under this bill the Government is empowered to borrow this money for a period of 50 years. It does not have to pay any interest at all. And it is prohibited from paying more than 1 percent.

But what happens is this:

Do you have $450 available in your home tonight? If this bill were to go into effect tomorrow, do you have $300 or $10,000, as the case may be, which you can quickly put your hands on? If not, you can do one of three things:

First. The farmer may sell some of his stock or a part of his farm to raise the cash; the businessman may sell part of his business; the investor may sell enough of his securities. Can you imagine the havoc that such wholesale selling would create in the cattle market, the land market, on the stock exchange, if you please?

Second. You can, perhaps, borrow the money, in which event you will have to pay 6-percent interest. The Government may give you no interest, maybe 1 percent. At best, you lose 5 percent for a period of possibly 50 years. This is not borrowing money. It is confiscation.

Third. Under the third course, you can give the Government your note. It takes a lien on your property and charges you 6-percent interest. Again it may or may not pay you the munificent sum of 1-percent interest. Again you lose at least 5 percent. Is this borrowing as you and I understand the meaning of the word?

This third procedure is the one that would most generally be taken.

Under it the Government, in all probability, would come to take over our industries, our larger businesses, our larger plants.

Mr. Henry Ford's wealth is supposed to be in the neighborhood of $600,000,000. He would have to turn over to the Government the amount of $439,000,000. Where do you suppose he would get the cash? The outcome would be the Government taking over his plant.

Frankly, I think that Mr. Ford can make better Fords and Lincoln Zephyrs than Mr. Tommy Corcoran, Mr. Benny Cohen, or Mr. Harry Hopkins.

Now, where does this bill come from? The New Deal has set up the Securities and Exchange Commission to prevent just such trading in our securities markets as would occur with the liquidation necessary under this bill. It has similar control of the commodities markets to prevent panics there.

The Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of War, and the Secretary of the Navy have expressed opposition to the bill on the ground that it would bring about economic dislocation in time of war. The heads of these departments are what have come to be known as conservatives in the New Deal.

The bill, then, apparently comes from the radical wing, those apostles of a philosophy that has brought this country's debt structure to the near breaking point, that has kept millions of our citizens idle for more than 6 years. They are the apostles of a spending policy which would inevitably throw this country into a socialized state. Is this not their purpose with this bill?

Admittedly there have been many influences operating in recent years to debilitate the American people. But they have not yet been pressed to the point where, if war should come, they would not be willing to finance it.

We had no trouble in financing the last war.

The first Liberty Loan was oversubscribed 52 percent, the second 54 percent, the third 39 percent, while the fourth, which was double any preceding issue, was oversubscribed 16½ percent.

The Senator is working on the assumption that what he and his New Deal associates call "financial tycoons" bring about wars for profit. There may have been immediate profits for American finance and industry as a result of the last war, but these communities along with the rest of the American people have long since learned that war simply does not pay.

The financial and business influences are not the ones who are now seeking to work us into a state of excitement. Nowhere, in fact, is anyone more fearful of war than those influences upon whom the new dealers have blamed all of our troubles.

The Senator has a very misleading and seductive approach to the bill. He says: "We draft the men; why not draft the dollars?" I am in favor of drafting the dollars of those able to pay.

If we should ever again be so unfortunate as to get into war, I believe that all the people of our Nation would bear their part of the burden. I have enough faith in the American people to believe they would be glad to make sacrifices at such a time.

We can do this through the drafting of excessive profits. We can do this by making every citizen contribute more heavily of his current income.

However, we should not endanger the little nest egg of the widows and orphans—we should not endanger the homes of our people, their farms, their businesses, and their savings.

This country simply cannot stand for the destruction of its productive energies at any time, most certainly not in time of war.

Senate bill 1650, sponsored by Senator LEE, would do just that.

Neutrality Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, JR.

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 23 (legislative day of Wednesday, October 4), 1939

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. WILLIAM E. BORAH, OF IDAHO

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an able and eloquent speech delivered last evening by the senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] over the National Broadcasting System hook-up.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Ladies and gentlemen, 2 weeks of debate have enabled us to realize the real issue involved in the proposed repeal of the present embargo law. The term "neutrality" is no longer used except as a matter of convenience or through habit. It is now fully recognized and very generally admitted that the pending bill is not a neutrality measure at all. It was not so designed. It is not so understood. And, if it becomes a law, it will not be so administered. I do not mean to imply that the President will not administer the law in accordance with its terms, but its terms will not require administration upon the basis of neutrality. The bill is in fact legislation providing, in effect, for intervention in a great European struggle for power, in the hope by some and the belief of others, but not all, that we will be able to take part in this struggle under such terms and conditions as will enable us to escape the more serious sacrifices of war. It is the theory of the bill and its supporters that we can furnish arms, munitions, and implements of war to one side and counsel and advise with them and yet avoid such involvement as will call for armies and navies. Two weeks of debate have torn the mask of neutrality from the face of intervention, and it is from that dubious countenance we must seek to read our future. If the bill becomes a law, the problem will no longer be how we can avoid intervention, how we can avoid taking sides—that will have been settled in the very fact of our furnishing arms, munitions, and implements of war to one of the groups of nations—but the problem will be can we, will we, be able to limit intervention so as to keep our young men out of Europe; will the demands of intervention be satisfied with arms, munitions, and implements of war, or will these demands call for armies?

The problem, therefore, with which we must concern ourselves is, What are the risks which intervention will impose? It may be possible to limit the risks of intervention to the use of arms, munitions, and implements of war. I can imagine conditions under which it would be possible—such, for instance, as an agreement between Germany and Great Britain similar to that at Munich. But if war continues and the struggle for power, as it now appears, reaches for permanency as between these two nations, it seems almost impossible that we shall be able to limit the risk to the supply of arms, munitions, and implements of war. It is at least a gamble, a frightful gamble, in human blood and human life. It is a hazard which no nation ought to take without the most immediate and commanding reason.

When the supporters of this measure advocate its passage for the avowed purpose of blasting from power a government of 80,000,000 people, of destroying in some way a leader of signal ability, however reprehensible may be his views, all these things present to me a scene of human sacrifice, the fearful shedding of human blood. These things which it is said are the justification for the passage of the bill are not things achieved in any other way than that of war—of the use of manpower and every means known to modern war. A great nation, great in energy, in industrial power, in fighting capacity, in devotion to country, is not easily destroyed or conquered. It calls for fearful sacrifices. If those who lightly announce such to be the justification for intervention will weigh closely the lessons of experience, they will not doubt that they are indicating already a task which means a vast sacrifice of wealth, treasure, and blood. Yet these are the suggestions talked over already.

Once we are a part of the conflict, however limited in the beginning, once having taken sides, is it not hazardous to suppose that we can stay the usual course of war or choose our own methods in waging it? Can we win in such a game? Is it worth while? Is there any justification for taking such a chance? If we take a gamble of that kind, the enemy should be our enemy, the war should be our war, it must be our Government which has been assailed, our country invaded, and our people whose lives are threatened.

Let us consider some of the powerful influences which are already unleashed and determined to take us into the European war should this war continue for any length of time and which influences will be greatly strengthened and greatly advantaged by the removal of the embargo. Do we so soon forget or so magnanimously overlook the fact that the British Government was opposed from the beginning to our embargo law and that from the hour of its passage until the present time the political forces of that Empire have exerted all possible influence to break it down and destroy it, a work in which they are even now actively engaged? These influences were determined that we should not establish a policy of neutrality as against European wars.

I could bring to you a volume of facts and evidence to sustain this statement. But, in the interest of time, one instance must suffice. I quote from a noted British authority. Speaking of the neutrality acts which we passed in 1935 and 1937, acts which our Secretary of State declared and the American people believed were greatly to our advantage in keeping us out of European embroilments, this person declared: "It (the United States) created in the Neutrality Act what it hoped would be a watertight system for preventing the United States from being drawn by economic causes, or the popular bogeys, foreign propaganda, or 'Wall Street' finance into another war. It would not take sides in any future

conflict; it would not sell implements of war to any belligerent; and those who traded with the United States in time of war would only be able to do so on the cash-and-carry plan. The whole of this house of cards was fatally undermined during the last week in September," and so forth. No more respectable term than a "house of cards" could be found for a plan which our President, our Secretary of State, the Congress, and the American people looked upon as of transcendent worth to the Nation. Similar statements involving repeated attacks upon the whole traditional foreign policy of this country might be quoted.

The person who wrote this attack upon the law, the national policy of this Nation, was Lord Lothian, who is now the British Ambassador in Washington, in daily touch and consultation with our Government; and, if reports be true, is most active in advancing reasons why this law should be repealed. With some degree of pride he must look down from the Senate gallery, if he deigns to visit that humble scene, and note the progress toward repeal of a law he so early and boldly denounced. This attack by a foreign power upon a law purely domestic, placed upon our statute books in the belief that it would help to protect our people against involvement in foreign wars, continued from its enactment. Eminent divines came here to speak to us on the subject of how selfish and un-Christianlike we were in our effort to stay out of war. Scholars came to lecture to us as to how America could best serve humanity. All to the end that not only should we not seek to be neutral in any matter in which Great Britain was involved, but that we could not be. From this source came those fatalistic teachings and preachings that we must inevitably be involved in all European wars of any moment. The embargo law, when it passed the Congress, seemed as firmly entrenched in the hearts and minds and purposes of the American people as any law which one can recall. But it was assailed as viciously and falsely by foreign nations as if it had of itself been an attack upon them instead of an effort to bring peace and security to our own people.

What will be the situation should the embargo law be repealed? This first step will have been taken in our entrance into the European war. We will be furnishing arms to one side, intentionally so, and, as arms, munitions, and implements of war are vital factors in war, we will have become a part of the war. The second step will call for further cooperation, as it is euphoniously called.

One of the leading journals of the British Empire states the matter succinctly when it says: "The arms-embargo clause of the Neutrality Act will be repealed for a starter, and the United States of America will be in the war along about the middle of next January." Thus is stated briefly as investigation will show the views entertained throughout the British Empire.

In a letter written by an English father, which I had the opportunity of reading, it is said: "Why should the American boy be considered in any different light than the English boy? The English boy is fighting for civilization. Why should not the American boy take his place alongside of him? He should, and I venture to say he will before long, take his place in this war alongside of the youth of Great Britain. We are all fighting to save democracy."

In another letter written to me from Surrey, England: "This fight is as much yours as it is ours. And may you be forgiven—referring to me—for your betrayal of mankind, not only now, but in the past." Another letter to me from London says: "You evidently suffer under the illusion that the United States is already a Nation. That is not so. She is at present but a commercial institution, as was proved in the last war. Were she a Nation, she would be now fighting by the side of the Allies."

From public men, from private citizens, from the press, the sentiments and the opinions in both England and France are to the effect that we should, after repealing the embargo, move at once with our forces of manpower and do, as one of our distinguished Senators on the floor said a few days ago, end the controversy quickly.

The same influences, the same British leaders, the same argument, the same basis of reasoning, organized and used against our determination not to send arms to Europe, are already organized and will be used persistently against our determination not to send men to Europe.

We do not need to wait and watch these influences, these forces, get into action. They are already in action, and experience and observation ought to have taught us long ago that the power which they exert is not to be lightly regarded. It is true we now declare we will not send our boys to Europe. But can we make a more solemn pledge not to send our boys to Europe than the pledge which we made not to send arms to Europe? The pledge not to send arms to Europe was because we thought it would help to avoid sending men to Europe. If we now repeal the law, have we not removed one of the barriers which we solemnly declared was erected for the purpose of keeping our boys out of Europe? It is true that men will stand up and say: "I will never vote to send our boys into another European war." But is it not equally true they stood up and declared and voted we would never send arms to Europe. When we surrender the first post, we make it more difficult to hold the second post. When we begin sending arms, we make it more difficult not to send men. What war, and the propaganda for war, will do to high-minded and determined men no one can guess. By repealing the embargo for the purpose of aiding England and France, we pledge in moral effect whatever it is necessary to provide in order to insure the victory of England and France.

But in another respect the situation will be deeply aggravated, and our security greatly endangered by repeal. So long as the embargo stands, we have done our utmost to invite the retaliation of no nation. We permit the shipment of arms to no people. But when the embargo is lifted, we permit the shipment of arms but permit the shipment to one group of nations only. No one longer disputes but that under the terms of the pending bill and the facts the lifting of the embargo operates to the advantage exclusively of one group, and that that is the purpose of the bill. Nevertheless, men will grimly declare: Neutrality is untouched.

What is it we are shipping, or permitting to be shipped, to this one group? It is things fit for nothing on earth except to maim and to kill. We are shipping, or permitting to be shipped, among other things, poison gas and such things as are peculiarly fitted for the destruction of women and children. What does that mean? It means hate; it means retaliation; it means that in the hearts and minds of 80,000,000 people we are to be just as bitterly hated as are those who fire the guns upon the field or in the trenches. We are inviting trouble, such trouble as is most likely to rush our young men to the battlefield, as happened 20 years ago. The ruthless retaliation of the Germans and the shrewd and persistent propaganda of the British could put us into the war overnight, and largely by reason of the very things which we are doing in the way of taking sides in the controversy. Why invite such a situation? Why take the chances? Why ask a million young men to commit their future, their health, their hopes and aspirations, their lives, to such chances thus aggravated by our own willingness to gamble on the question of whether we can keep out of the war after we are part of the way in? What, in the name of reason, in the name of a just God, drives us to take such chances with those whom fate and circumstances have for a brief season entrusted to our care and committed to our protection? Hitler—yes; he can gamble with the happiness and the lives of his 80,000,000 people. Stalin can place his 160,000,000 human beings in pawn while he trifles with their destiny. You have doubtless observed with horror, as I have, the trading of peoples about in Europe, lining them up in one place or the other, like dumb, driven cattle on the way to the pens of slaughter. In such way and in such fashion men who have seized power carry on in the sight of the world at the present time. But not so in a republic or a democracy. There the people have a right to speak and in time they will.

There came to my office here in Washington last Wednesday a committee from one of our great eastern colleges. I observed they displayed on their vests some kind of a button. I asked what this button represented. They said it represented independence. I inquired: Independence of what? They said: Independence of Europe. We want a chance to establish our own principles, to live our own lives, without being constantly threatened and harassed by the schemes and ambitions of those to whom we owe no allegiance. I thought it magnificent, and, after complying with their request, sent them on their way. I hope they will organize every precinct in the United States. If we are to escape being drawn into these imperialistic wars of Europe, it will only be through the eternal vigilance of our young men, those who must bear the burden if we become involved.

There is another phase of this subject to which I am bound to call attention tonight. It may be regarded as too late to have further relevancy. But for my own satisfaction I wish to speak of it. Last week there issued from an investment securities firm at 120 Broadway, New York City, a business pamphlet containing, among other things, the following: "Without steel modern war would be impossible—airplanes, tanks, artillery, armor plate, battleships, shells, torpedoes, barbed wire are all principally made of steel. * * * Steel companies, during the last war, were swamped with business which proved highly profitable to them and to their stockholders. * * * Steel stocks have always been among the first to respond to the stimulus of war buying. * * * We have prepared reports on three very attractive steel stocks."

There you have it. The making of money, winning huge profits, building palatial homes out of the suffering, the sacrifices, and the blood of our fellow men and at a time when we have no war with anyone. Whatever else results from repeal—there may be disputes about other things—but that by repeal we return to the war-profit business, the manufacture and sale of armaments for mass murder, there is, there can be, no dispute. That is one of the indisputable results of repeal.

We rejoiced in 1937, the people rejoiced, when we declared that never again would our peace-loving, Christian people seek to make profits out of the wars of other peoples. But we are going back to the old business. And for what? Why? Is this in the interest of the morals, the safety, the security, or the honor of the American people?

During the debate on the pending bill constant reference has been made to nazi-ism, to its teachings and practices, and its menace to civilization. It has been argued that we should send arms and munitions to Europe to destroy nazi-ism and do away with its leader. We may send munitions and arms to Europe, but they will not be used to destroy nazi-ism. They will be used to settle questions of territory and of power. Propaganda may succeed in making nazi-ism the issue of this war in the United States. But it is not the issue in Europe. It never has been the issue in Europe. I venture to believe it never will be. It serves well as an argument with some to justify our sending arms and munitions to Britain and France. But both Britain and France make it perfectly clear that these arms and munitions will not be used in dealing with nazi-ism, wiping that stain off the map, as is contended, but in holding territory and in retaining political power. Reading the replies of Daladier, the Prime Minister of France, and of Chamberlain, the Prime Minister of Great Britain, to Hitler's proposal for peace, the

issue becomes perfectly clear. It is territory, it is political power, not nazi-ism. Nazi-ism has had no better friend since coming into power than the Government of Great Britain. I do not include France, because France has often held back in favoring nazi-ism. Neither do I mean to say that the English people believe in the philosophy of nazi-ism.

But I do mean to say, and most sincerely assert, that from the first entrance of Hitler and his theory of government upon the scene in Europe, they have had the friendliest support of the British Government until the break came over questions of territory and power. Openly and repeatedly the British Government has declared, or made plain, that the questions of "isms" and ideologies and Nazi theories of life and government are not the issues in this controversy. Mr. Chamberlain so declared in plain terms. The British Government connived at the repudiation by Hitler of the military provisions in the Versailles Treaty. It especially agreed to the starting of the building of the German Navy. It urged France to disregard its treaty for the protection of Czechoslovakia that Hitler might obtain Czechoslovakia. It not only consented to, but connived at, Hitler's seizure of Austria. I repeat, this friendly relationship never ceased until the break came over the questions of territory and power. Even at the time we were writing and passing the present neutrality law, Great Britain and Germany were upon the friendliest of terms. The moral question, the question of liberty, or democracy, were never involved during all this period. Of all of these things and for all of these doings, for all this harlotry with the Nazi philosophy and the Nazi Government, it would be irrelevant, if not improper, to speak, because they are none of our concern, if it were not for the fact that we are now urged to regard the issue as Hitler, as nazi-ism, as democracy, as liberty. When it comes to crying out against nazi-ism for obvious purposes in the United States and as a justification for our sending arms and munitions—and later will be made a justification for sending our boys—we are fully justified in resolving the controversy into its real issue. What we are really doing is mixing in a purely territorial, or power, problem in Europe.

Yes; destruction of nazi-ism, of the preservation of democracy and liberty and of free government, are telling subjects with which to arouse the American people. They love liberty and are devoted to free government. But these things as issues in this conflict do not extend beyond the 3-mile limit. It is wholly a foreign war in its origin, in its nature, and in its objective. We are being controlled by wholly foreign problems and foreign conditions—not American problems; not American interests. We are plunging into the very heart of Europe and seizing hold of European problems, to take part in those ancient quarrels and controversies and wars which have divided and torn that continent for decade upon decade.

It was the conviction of two of the greatest statesmen the world has ever known, Washington and Jefferson, that to involve this Nation in European political problems was to undermine and ultimately destroy the whole scheme of our free institutions. They made this conviction the basis of our foreign policy. They regarded such a foreign policy as essential to our independence and to the liberty of our people as the Federal Constitution itself. Give us an American policy, a policy suitable to American institutions and conforming at all times to American ideals. Within its scope and sublime purpose may be found one of the guaranties of independence and security for our own Nation and every duty and obligation we owe to every other nation.

History of Embargo Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, October 4), 1939

ARTICLE BY W. B. HESSELTINE

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article written by W. B. Hesseltine, associate professor of history at the University of Wisconsin, entitled "How Much History Does Franklin Roosevelt Know?"

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW MUCH HISTORY DOES FRANKLIN ROOSEVELT KNOW?

(By W. B. Hesseltine, associate professor of history, University of Wisconsin)

President Roosevelt, speaking for repeal of the embargo, told Congress 3 weeks ago that American policy to belligerent nations had, "with one notable exception," been based on international law. Assuming the role of historian—which he has often done before—he informed the assembled lawmakers that:

"The single exception was the policy adopted by this Nation during the Napoleonic wars, when, seeking to avoid involvement, we acted for some years under the so-called embargo and nonintercourse acts. That policy turned out to be a disastrous failure. First, because it brought our own Nation close to ruin, and, second, because it was the major cause of bringing us into active participation in European wars in our own War of 1812. It is merely reciting history to recall to you that one of the results of the policy of embargo and nonintercourse was the burning in 1814 of part of this Capitol in which we are assembled."

Mr. Roosevelt, in "merely reciting history" to bolster his argument, lays himself open to two questions: First, is he correct in drawing a parallel between the present and the Jeffersonian embargo law, and second, how much history does he know?

What Mr. Roosevelt neglected to tell Congress was that the Embargo Act of 1807 was Thomas Jefferson's contribution to American diplomacy. Mr. Roosevelt has not hesitated to identify himself as the spiritual heir of the founder of the Democratic Party. Moreover, President Roosevelt failed to point out that the only similarity between the embargo of 1807 and the arms embargo of 1935 was in the name. In purpose, in provision, and in operation the two acts were totally dissimilar.

In 1935, when the present arms embargo was enacted, the nations of Europe were nominally at peace, and the congressional enactment was the product of careful consideration. In 1807, when Jefferson proposed an embargo, England and France were locked in mortal combat. Napoleon, whom the British regarded in much the same light as they now consider Hitler, had established himself as master of continental Europe. England, weak on land, had constituted herself the all-but-undisputed mistress of the seas.

Since neither England's Army nor Napoleon's Navy was able to strike an effective blow, the two belligerents settled down to a long economic warfare. England planned to starve France by cutting off all trade with the rest of the world. Napoleon, believing that the English were a nation of shopkeepers, thought he could destroy England's commerce by closing continental ports. In the situation thus created American shippers saw an opportunity, and for a time they profited enormously. But as the lines of battle became tighter the Americans found their commerce in a bad way. The English maintained a "paper blockade" of the coast of France, while Napoleon seized any American ship which escaped the roving British blockade squadron.

Contrary to Mr. Roosevelt's statement, the American position was not a departure from international law. President Jefferson protested to both belligerents against the restrictions they imposed upon legitimate neutral commerce. Moreover, the short-handed British Navy began to impress American seamen. When, in June 1807, a British man-of-war, the *Leopard*, overhauled the American frigate *Chesapeake* and took off four sailors, the American people demanded war.

But Thomas Jefferson had a deep-seated aversion to war, and he believed that since both belligerents (Britain and France) were dependent upon neutral trade, they would withdraw their illegal regulations. In no sense was this policy a departure—as Historian Roosevelt implies—from traditional American practices. It was an effort to use economic pressure to enforce international law. The embargo was Jefferson's alternative to war and was an attempt to use reason and economic pressure instead of arms as instruments of national policy.

In the Embargo Act of 1935 Congress forbade the shipment of arms and munitions from the United States to any belligerent. Jefferson's embargo stopped all shipping—with fellow neutrals as well as with belligerents—of all American products. American ships might not leave port. These regulations brought hardships upon the shipping centers. Federalist New England began to cry that the Jeffersonian policy was ruining the country; that too many sailors were thrown out of work; and that grass was growing on the wharves in New England. After the election of 1808 Congress repealed the embargo.

The repeal of the Embargo Act immediately brought confusion. The mistake of the embargo had been that it stopped all foreign trade. Under President Madison's leadership, Congress enacted a nonintercourse act which opened trade with the rest of the world but prohibited it with France and England. Under this act American commerce sought new markets, increased trade with Latin America, and enterprising captains sought new routes to the Orient. But after a year of nonintercourse neither England nor France had yielded to the American pressure. Impatient for immediate results, Congress passed an act known as Macon's bill No. 2, which opened trade with both belligerents but authorized the President to reestablish nonintercourse for either of the warring nations if the other would withdraw its restrictions on American commerce.

The mistake of Macon's bill No. 2 was that it descended from the high plane which the embargo and nonintercourse had occupied and offered the aid of the United States to whichever belligerent would withdraw its restrictions. Napoleon deceived the United States by pretending to withdraw his decrees. That he secretly restored them was unknown to President Madison. Under the unwise law, Madison had no choice but to restore nonintercourse with England.

The effect of this unneutral act was to anger the English, but they at once attempted to reopen negotiations with the Americans, who, however, insisted upon a complete withdrawal of the orders in

council. England refused on the ground that Napoleon had not really withdrawn his decrees. Finally, however, the American policy, vacillating as it had been, began to have the effect which Jefferson had foreseen. The British began to feel the loss of American produce and food. So on June 16, 1812, the Cabinet withdrew the orders in council. The policy of Jefferson was vindicated. Economic coercion as an agent of national policy had brought the mistress of the seas to recognize American rights.

This is the policy which Mr. Roosevelt told Congress "turned out to be a disastrous failure." It was a failure, says the President, "first, because it brought our own Nation close to ruin; and, second, because it was the major cause of bringing us into the War of 1812." Once again President Roosevelt proves to be an inaccurate historian. Had he even consulted that good Democratic historian, Claude G. Bowers, the President would have discovered that most of the "ruin" brought on by Jefferson's embargo existed in the minds of the Federalist Party. More grass grew upon the wharves in Federalist campaign speeches, according to Bowers' Jefferson in Power, than ever grew on Boston's water front.

But there was a war of 1812. On that point Mr. Roosevelt is absolutely correct. But there is not a reputable historian in America who does not know that the embargo and nonintercourse were not "the major cause of bringing us into active participation in European wars."

Drafting Wealth in Time of War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN R. AUSTIN

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, October 4), 1939

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. CHAN GURNEY, OF SOUTH DAKOTA, OCTOBER 22, 1939

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix a radio address delivered by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] on October 22, 1939, on the subject of the Lee bill, providing for drafting wealth in time of war.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

First of all I would like to say that in the event our country is ever attacked—which I seriously doubt—there will absolutely be no difficulty in raising sufficient money to adequately defend our shores. By passing this bill, Congress would admit there would be difficulty and that would be an admission that our system of government is a failure. For a defensive war, you know and I know, that all the resources of every man, woman, and child would be immediately volunteered.

I am wondering if this proposed system of compulsory loaning is anything but a system of state socialism. The government takes what it wants from your farm, factory, home, or savings, and then tells you you can live and support your family on what remains. If this bill were passed and ever called into use, would it not be but a short step for the Government to take absolute control of your person and worldly goods and dole back to you the bare necessities of life? Let us not try to cover it up by the use of fine-sounding phrases such as "promoting peace" and "strengthening our national defense"—things we all want. As for me, I believe the American people want, and are determined to keep, their system of free enterprise and individual liberties.

The bill provides "the Secretary of the Treasury shall from time to time determine the sums that will be necessary to prosecute to a successful conclusion, any war, etc." When are we to determine when any war is to be successfully concluded? Is any war successfully concluded when an armistice has been declared, or is it when a treaty of peace has been signed, or is it when the armies have been demobilized, or is it when the last veteran of the war has died and the last pension has been paid? If the latter is to be the standard, then we have not yet successfully concluded our last three wars.

The bill declares, of course, that the compulsory borrowing power shall not be exercised after the President proclaims the termination of the war. This is just another sweeping delegation of power to the Chief Executive. I do not believe the people want any President to have such a tremendous amount of power. What if a President did not choose to proclaim the termination of the war? Could Congress compel him to do so? Can we be certain we would ever regain our liberties if this act were adopted?

We have heard many noted men say that strength in arms is not always decisive in war; that the higher the morale of the people, the greater the chances of their eventual success. This bill, with its compulsory liquidation of individual property, would strike directly at our national morale.

We can never lose sight of the fact that we must have a sound and smoothly functioning economy in order to supply our soldiers at the front and our civil population at home. To me this bill would so seriously upset our domestic economy that we would be unable to supply our troops with food, clothing, armaments, airplanes, and in fact, all the things that are vitally necessary in conducting a war.

Our people should study this bill from all angles and not be swayed by emotional appeals such as "if we can draft men, we must draft dollars," and "dollars are no more valuable than the life of a mother's son." Of course, dollars are not, and no man says they are. We must study this bill on the basis of determining what effect it will have on our national welfare, and not from the viewpoint of achieving an elusive ideal.

The bill we are talking about is intended to force the purchase of Government bonds at the beginning of a war. I believe it is not necessary and would not in any way tend to keep us out of war, which could be the only real reason for its enactment. I personally believe a much stronger preventative and a necessary measure for the proper financing of a defensive war would be a fair income-tax measure, taking for the Government's use a great portion of excessive war profits.

The census of property and its appraisal would be tremendously costly. Then various agencies for appraisal would be open to all sorts of political graft and corruption. The cost of administration would be far greater than the difference in interest rates provided for the new bonds and the interest rates paid for bonds purchased on a voluntary basis. The Government in all past wars has been able to raise all the money necessary for their conduct. By method of circular reasoning, the Lee bill accomplishes nothing more than the reduction of interest rates on Government bonds.

I think one of the best ways of showing up the fallacies of this bill is the fact that drafting dollars is not new; taxation is a drafting of dollars

The putting into effect of the provisions of this bill would cause disruption of our stock exchanges in forced liquidation. Further, it would be very unfair to have the appraised value taken as of one date and then the bond buyers forced to liquidate in a sellers' market.

In conclusion, let me say this bill should not even come up for consideration by Congress or the people at this time, because it is based entirely on the erroneous supposition that Congress may declare war. Right now there is a firm resolve held by all our people that we are not going to declare war. This sentiment is also held by every Senator and Congressman in Washington today.

Emergency Executive Powers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD P. NYE

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, October 4), 1939

TELEGRAM FROM FRANK GANNETT

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix a telegram from Mr. Frank Gannett addressed to several Senators, under date of October 2, 1939.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In view of the Senate's unanimous call for an official summary of the emergency powers of the Presidency, the National Committee To Uphold Constitutional Government considers it appropriate to give to Members of the Congress these observations and conclusions. The committee has been for some time searching the statutes covering the emergency powers.

Its research, completed September 23, disclosed unrepealed Executive powers shockingly inconsistent with peacetime needs in a democracy.

We commend the Senate for initiating what we hope will be an immediate and thorough reexamination of those powers. We urge both Houses of Congress to hasten action toward repealing all grants of power which might be used by the Executive to get the Nation into war without consent of the people's representatives.

The President, acting within one of these unrepealed grants, has declared that an emergency exists. He describes it as a "limited" emergency. However, there is no statutory authority for a "limited" emergency. Any emergency proclaimed by the President is legally a complete emergency.

It shocked us, as it will shock the American people, to discover that, by declaring that an emergency exists, the President now can

take advantage of a clause in the Federal Communications Act of June 1934. Under that act, in a state of emergency, the President has absolute, unlimited power to stop free speech over the radio at home. He can take over the entire radio broadcasting of the Nation. He can suppress public discussion by radio of views contrary to his own. He can seize any or all broadcasting stations and turn them over to any department of the Government, for example, to Secretary Ickes, to be run as instruments of administration propaganda.

Hitler has the same power, and no more, over radio in Germany, and he used it to gain a dictator's throne. Stalin has the same control in Russia, Mussolini in Italy. Control of radio has been a stepping stone to dictatorship in Europe; it is too dangerous to be permitted in America, and especially so when decisions vital to the Nation must be made, as now.

Besides seizing and operating or suppressing any or all radio stations, the President, under the most important of his present emergency powers, can do any of the following:

Close all banks in the Nation.

Close every stock exchange and forbid for 90 days at a time the sale of all stocks and bonds.

Prohibit the export of coal or other war materials.

Restrict travel between the United States and foreign countries.

Suspend the 8-hour law on Federal contracts.

Within certain limits, further revalue the dollar.

Reduce the weight of the standard silver dollar.

Commandeer all silver now in the hands of the people, as gold was commandeered in 1934.

Regulate the rates of exchange of all foreign currencies and the amount of such currencies that American citizens may acquire.

The President has already stated that he may prevent shipment of certain war materials such as manganese, crude rubber, and tin. This comes under the power to prohibit export of coal and other war material. The authority is in an unrepealed joint resolution of April 22, 1898. The President has not asked to have this power taken away from him, although he asks Congress to surrender to him its power to embargo shipments of war materials.

It is a debatable but not a constitutional issue whether return to international law would lessen or increase the chances of drawing the United States into war. We are not discussing it here. But we are positive in our conviction that the surest safeguard for American peace is in a Congress responsive to the will of the people. No matter who the President may be, he should not have the unlimited powers which these unrepealed statutes leave in his hands.

As a group of citizens pledged to uphold constitutional government, our present concern is with keeping our country out of war. For we know that war must be prosecuted with dictatorial power, and the tide toward dictatorship is running so strong throughout the world that we fear to surrender our liberties even for a period of emergency, the end of which no one can foresee.

Therefore we repeat our urgent request for reconsideration and prompt repeal of all Executive powers not essential to national defense. The fact that any one man possesses absolute dictatorial power over radio in America has, in our judgment, created a national emergency more immediate and far more dangerous than any other emergency the Nation now faces.

FRANK GANNETT,
Chairman, National Committee To Uphold Constitutional Government.

Mink Imports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEPHEN BOLLES
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 23, 1939

LETTERS FROM CONSTITUENTS

Mr. BOLLES. Mr. Speaker, one of the important industries of the United States is that of the propagation of animals for fur. We have built up in the last few years a very large business in the raising of mink. This industry, however, is in great danger because of the importation of mink skins from foreign countries, particularly from Canada. I ask that two letters on the subject be placed in the RECORD.

Hon. STEPHEN BOLLES,
Janesville, Wis.:

I would like to call your attention to the fact that large shipments of mink skins are made from foreign countries.

These mink skins will be shipped to this country in tremendous quantities and will be dumped on our markets, causing fur prices to slump to very low levels, and ruining our mink and fur industry, which has grown to be quite important to our State.

Immediate or decisive action should be taken to put a tariff on mink skins in order to save the industry and keep it on a paying basis.

Mink imports for the first 6 months of 1938 were 631,945 skins—almost three times as many as were raised in the United States in 1938. It costs from $7 to $9 to raise a mink for pelt. And the average mink pelt sold through the American National Fox and Fur Breeders Association brought $10.04.

Now, with the European war in progress France and England, no doubt, will not be buying furs. Therefore they must all be used in this country.

Hoping you will help us all you can, I remain,

Very cordially yours,

LOUIS HORSTMAN.

OCTOBER 20, 1939.

Hon. STEPHEN BOLLES,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

I am writing you at this time to protest the fact that under the Canadian Trade Agreement raw mink pelts are listed as one of the items on the free list. You probably will know that the mink-ranching industry in the United States is in a very precarious condition at the present time, due mainly to overproduction, and if the estimated crop of 175,000 Canadian ranch mink pelts are allowed unrestricted entry into this country it will throw the whole industry into a state of chaos and probably will result in absolute disaster to thousands of our deserving American mink ranchers.

Therefore we appeal to you and beg that you use your offices to the end that a fair limit or quota be placed upon such imports from Canada, these figures to be based upon a fair average of Canadian imports of mink pelts into this country during the 5-year period preceding and up to December 31, 1938, as per official records of the United States customs.

Very sincerely yours,

F. LAURENCE QUINN,
109 South Fourth Street, Delavan, Wis.

Transfer of Alaska to the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 24, 1939

ARTICLE BY CLARK SQUIRE

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Clark Squire, of Seattle, Wash.:

Seventy-two years ago today the flag of Russia was flying for the last time on the American Continent, where it first had been planted in 1741 by that daring Dane, Vitus Jonassen Bering, explorer for Peter the Great and for Empress Catherine.

After waving for 131 years over Russian America, the imperial emblem bearing a double-headed eagle was hauled down from a 90-foot pine pole and was replaced by Old Glory, with its 37 stars.

The exchange was made at 3:30 p. m. on October 18, 1867, at New Archangel, now known as Sitka.

Afterward the territory which the United States bought for $7,200,000, and which had been known as Russian America, was designated officially by Congress as Alaska.

The ceremony was held in the presence of the United States and Russian commissioners, Brig. Gen. Lovell H. Rousseau and Capt. Alexis Petschouroff, of the Russian Imperial Navy, who had traveled together from Washington, D. C., via Panama and San Francisco.

Unaccustomed to ocean voyages, the general found it to be a tough trip. "I suffered greatly from seasickness," he confessed in his official report to Secretary of State William H. Seward, explaining why the course of the U. S. S. *Ossipee* was changed to the inside passage.

PLEASANT PASSAGE

Back in Portland on December 5 he wrote the Secretary as follows:

"After a pleasant passage, taking it altogether, we cast anchor in the harbor of New Archangel on the 18th of October at 11 o'clock a. m., where we found the troops and supplies had preceded us several days.

"The day was bright and beautiful. We landed immediately and fixed the hour of three and a half o'clock that day for the transfer."

At 3 p. m. 250 soldiers, commanded by Gen. Jefferson C. Davis, went ashore from the U. S. S. *Jamestown* and the U. S. S. *Reseca* and marched up the hill to the residence of Prince Dmitri Maksontoff, thirteenth successor to Alexander Andreevich Baranof, as chief manager of the Russian American company. A company of Russian soldiers marched up and took a position at the left of the flagpole.

Then a color guard, consisting of a lieutenant, a sergeant, and 10 men, came forward with a flag which General Rousseau had brought from Washington.

SIX AMERICAN WOMEN

Russian and American citizens and some Indians moved in close. Among those witnessing the ceremony were six American women (wives of officers) and as many Russian women, including Princess Maksontoff.

Arrangements had been made for the firing of national salutes, the Ossipee and a Russian battery on the wharf to fire alternate shots.

"The troops, being promptly formed, were brought to a present-arms, the signal given to the Ossipee, and the ceremony was begun by lowering the Russian flag," General Rousseau continued in his report. "As it began its descent down the flagstaff, the battery of the Ossipee, with large 9-inch guns, led off in the salute, peal after peal crashing and re-echoing in the gorges of the surrounding mountains, answered by the Russian battery.

FLAG GETS STUCK

"But the ceremony was interrupted by the catching of the Russian flag in the ropes attached to the flagstaff. The soldier who was lowering it, continuing to pull at it, tore off the border by which it was attached, leaving the flag entwined tightly around the ropes. The flagstaff was a native pine, perhaps 90 feet in height.

"In an instant the Russian soldiers, taking different shrouds attached to the flagstaff, attempted to ascend to the flag * * * but they soon became tired * * * and finally came to a standstill."

The general described how one Russian was hoisted in a "boatswain's chair." Upon freeing the flag the man dropped it below and it fell on the bayonets of the Russian soldiers.

Then the Stars and Stripes was hoisted, and the salutes were repeated, the Russian battery firing first.

FORMAL TRANSFER

"The salutes being completed," the general's report continued, "Captain Petschouroff stepped up to me and said: 'General Rosseau, by authority from His Majesty the Emperor of Russia, I transfer to the United States the Territory of Alaska,' and in a few words I acknowledged the acceptance of the transfer and the ceremony was at an end. Three cheers were then spontaneously given for the United States flag by the American citizens present, although this was no part of the program, and on some accounts I regretted that it occurred."

For nearly three-quarters of a century that flag, with an increasing number of stars, has continued to fly over a Territory which has entertained hope of being represented by the forty-ninth star. Until recent years virtually no effort was made to provide for its defense.

Today, however, with modern Russia carrying her red flag westward in Europe and along the shores of the Baltic, the question is being raised whether she may not some day covet the rich Territory she sold for the cost of a couple of modern submarines. Adequate defenses for Alaska now are being demanded.

Also, an international highway to the Territory is under consideration. Survey parties have been collecting data. Commissions from the United States and Canada have been making studies. Congressman WARREN G. MAGNUSON points out that the project would cost less than a modern cruiser.

And from the standpoint of defense alone the highway would be of immensely greater value.

Congress may see fit to act at the coming regular session and keep America for Americans.

Neutrality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES L. GIFFORD

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 24, 1939

LETTER FROM HON. A. LAWRENCE LOWELL

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter received by me from Hon. A. Lawrence Lowell:

SEPTEMBER 30, 1939.

Hon. CHARLES L. GIFFORD,
Washington.

DEAR MR. GIFFORD: Any suggestions I have to make to you about the Neutrality Act are of little value, but you asked me to write them to you in Washington, and I do so for what they may be worth. I have thought much about the matter and have now read the bill prepared by the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate.

There are three possible objects of such a bill:

(1) To keep us out of war. This desire is well-nigh universal among American citizens;

(2) Not to cut off arbitrarily from the free governments all possibilities of obtaining such supplies as it has hitherto been customary for belligerents to obtain from neutrals in time of war;

(3) To maintain so far as possible the status of neutrals in war. This last is, probably, out of the question at the present time, for there are now no recognized neutral rights whatever; and it is notable that since the close of the World War we have made no serious attempts by international negotiation to establish any such.

It may be observed that no statute or regulations can absolutely prevent the possibility of events that might cause our citizens to regard war as less evil than the alternative presented by some belligerent. The object of an act to keep us out of war should be to reduce the danger of wanton injury to our citizens and their property to the practicable minimum, and it seems to me that the proposed bill does so, for it makes the risk of maltreatment of our ships as small as possible unless they are restrained from going to sea at all.

On the other hand, to forbid entirely the customary purchase of munitions here by belligerents, although they pay for them, and carry them off under the cash-and-carry principle, although appearing equal is in fact detrimental, and practically hostile to the belligerents that control the surface of the sea. Such a trade is habitually carried on by most neutrals without causing reprisals, it cannot give rise to incidents that may lead to war, and to prohibit it would be under the circumstances a mistake. Therefore, it seems to me, for our country, the provisions of the first two sections of the bill are essentially wise; and I think, on reflection, the American public will, if they do not now, so believe.

As to some other less important provisions of the bill I have some doubts. For example: In Section 3 it is very well to forbid, that is to make unlawful, the travel of an American citizen through the combat areas in such a way that he has no claim to protection from our Government, but to impose a penalty on him for so doing seems to me going too far.

Section 4 as drawn seems to me unfortunate. It appears to prohibit the transportation by the American Red Cross of medical personnel, medical supplies, food and clothing for the relief of human suffering, unless a safe conduct is granted by the belligerents on both sides.

Again, in section 11, submarines and armed merchant vessels are placed on the same footing. In fact, submarines are only for attack, whereas the arms of merchant vessels are only for defense. It may be that there should be a method of regulating to some extent the armament of merchant ships leaving our ports, but they stand in quite a different position from submarines.

The proposed act confers less discretion on the President than its predecessor, and I think there are many things which had better be done by statute than by executive discretion. However, all these details are of slight importance compared with the main principle of the act, particularly the second section, which seems to me much worth adopting.

If I might make a further comment, which is not practicable politics at present: There might have been certain advantages in not trying to embrace the provisions for this war in a universal statute to apply to cases where they may not be applicable. There might be advantages in beginning a statute in some such way as this:

"Whereas, there exists a state of war between England and France on one side, and Germany on the other; and

"Whereas, it is the universal desire of the citizens of this country not to be drawn into the conflict: Now therefore

"*Be it enacted,* That during the continuance of the said war, etc., etc."

Yours very sincerely,

A. LAWRENCE LOWELL.

Address at Annual Fathers' Dinner, Junior Cavalry of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT L. VREELAND

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 24, 1939

ADDRESS BY HON. ALBERT L. VREELAND, OF NEW JERSEY

Mr. VREELAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me recently at the fathers' dinner of the Junior Cavalry of America:

It is indeed a pleasure to be invited to appear at the annual fathers' dinner of the Junior Cavalry of America, a bill for the incorporation of which I had the honor to sponsor in the Congress of the United States. I have always been and am vitally interested in boys' work and believe in the theory that the boy of today is the citizen of tomorrow. The training and ideals instilled in the minds of the youth while in the plastic stage will be reflected in those who will be charged with the carrying on of our country in the future when our job is done. Discipline, love of country, and respect for law is an undefeatable weapon in the combatting of foreign "isms" and crime. I only hope that in the years to come this organization will grow to be one of the outstanding boys' groups of the country and live to carry on its fine work. Again, might I say I am proud to be in the position to sponsor a bill for the Federal incorporation of this organization, formed and carried on by my good friend and commanding officer, Col. R. Potter Campbell, and you men who have unselfishly given of your time, money, and services.

In considering boys' work I know of no time since 1917 that the boys' future has been so vitally at stake. An error at this time might plunge this country into conflict and take away from us the very boys of whom we are now so proud. I refer to the pending neutrality legislation before the Congress of the United States, and in considering this question I do not want to appear to anyone to be speaking from a partisan angle or in any way influenced by partisan politics. In a question of the safety of our Nation politics have no place, because if war should occur, and God forbid that it does, we will all be soldiers of the United States fighting for a common cause and not members of a political party.

Before we can intelligently discuss the question we must first consider a brief history of neutrality. In 1937 the President exerted his influence to pass a bill known as the neutrality bill of that year, and it was acclaimed by all as legislation ideally worded and intended to keep us out of any conflict which might occur. That bill, briefly, provided that when the President shall find a state of war exists, he shall immediately issue a proclamation levying an embargo on arms, ammunition, and implements of war. I criticized that legislation, much against the protest of many of my friends, and criticized it mainly because it placed in the hands of the President the sole right to determine when powers might be at war. If you will recall, China and Japan, so far as we are concerned, have never been at war. They are only fooling, and therefore we can continue to ship arms, ammunition, and implements of war to either or both sides. I further criticized the bill because it left in the hands of the President the right to determine what the definition of "implements of war" might include. However, that bill was acclaimed by all as the last word in neutrality legislation and held by the President as the greatest move this country has made toward avoiding foreign entanglements. Yet within a short time after the present war broke out and the President saw fit to invoke the embargo, he issued a list of what he considered implements of war. Shortly thereafter an American ship was stopped by a German submarine and advised that if the ship carried contraband it would of necessity have to be sunk, and immediately Germany and England both issued a list of contraband, which included many more commodities than those listed by our President. This leaves us at the present time in a position of being able, so far as the law of this country is concerned, to ship commodities which might cause the sinking of an American boat.

In the spring of this year House Joint Resolution 306—known to the public as the Neutrality Act of 1939, to us in the House as the Bloom bill, and to the Senate as the Pittman bill—was introduced. That bill practically reenacted the present neutrality legislation with several changes, the main change being that it repealed the arms embargo and gave to the President the right to extend credit for a period of 90 days, in his own discretion, and to establish combat areas. It further prohibited American ships from entering the territorial waters of any belligerent country. In the opinion of a great many of us, this bill again gave to the President entirely too much power—and when I say President, I do not mean the present administration particularly, but any President, because, after all, it will be a law, if passed, and might be on the books for a long time to come, and it is too much power not only for the present President but for the President who will take office in 1940. We in this country talk of democracy and hold our heads high that we are under a democracy and criticize totalitarian states. Yet by our own act we turn around and give to our Chief Executive unprecedented powers. We have seen in Europe the fallacy of allowing one man too much power. Had it not been for that, there would be no war today. The Constitution of the United States provides that Congress shall have the sole power to declare war and to promulgate laws concerning embargoes, and why should the Congress deliver this power into the hands of one man? Washington and the framers of the Constitution realized that were this country to survive, it would be necessary to give such questions, going to the very root of our freedom and peace and prosperity, into the hands of the representatives of the people rather than to the executive department.

This bill passed the House in June of this year by two votes. It, however, carried three major changes. There was added in the first section the words "or Congress," where it provides that the President shall levy an embargo when he finds foreign nations at war. It also included an embargo on arms and ammunition only, and it struck from the bill the discretionary power given to establish combat areas. That bill was held up in the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, and in the extraordinary session just called the entire bill after the enacting clause was stricken and an ostensibly new bill presented, which was in substance the bill presented by Mr. BLOOM in the early spring with the House of Representatives amendments stricken from it.

Let us briefly consider the bill as it now stands. There is no embargo on any goods whatsoever, which leaves it open to this country to sell anything to the belligerent powers—arms, ammunition, poison gases, airplanes, or any weapon known to modern warfare. It does, however, restrict it from being shipped on American boats. You know and I know that Germany does not have available the ships to come over to our country to take delivery of anything it may purchase, yet Germany will not allow goods to be delivered in its enemies' ships for destruction of its own nationals, and the result would be in all probability sabotage and the blowing up of ships—true, not American ships, but, nevertheless, ships within sight and hearing of our own shores. Let us consider further, with the discretionary powers in the hands of the President to define and declare combat areas, he might, were he so inclined, declare a combat area around Italy but not around Canada, which in my humble judgment would be a decided unneutral act. There is another section in the bill that provides that title must pass to a foreign nation before goods can leave this country.

You who are lawyers will know that immediately upon payment for any commodity title passes to the purchaser, and there is nothing in the act to the contrary which would prevent Mr. Hitler, for example, from purchasing arms and ammunition, paying cash, taking title, and then advising that he cannot come over in his ships to procure such commodities, and suggesting that the vendor deliver such goods on American ships to Italy, where Mr. Hitler can procure them. Italy not being a belligerent, it is perfectly legal for our ships to make such delivery. You know and I know that England would not allow the delivery of arms and ammunition to her enemy, and for her own protection it would be necessary to take means to prevent such delivery, which might be entirely against the liking of some of our American citizens.

No Member of the House, including myself, has any idea of what form this bill may take before it reaches us, and it would be fallacy on my part to prejudge the case before it is presented. Therefore I am retaining an open mind upon the question until I see the bill in its final form.

I don't care what walk of life any of you come from or what your pleasures may be, but at one time or another, and perhaps even now, all of you enjoyed a football game, basketball, baseball, wrestling, or boxing, and whether you knew the contestants or not, or knew the organizations which they represented, as you watched that conflict you unconsciously, motivated by what you do not know but nevertheless definitely, let your sympathies go to one or the other and immediately made that side your champion. Maybe it was the type of uniforms they wore, the way they played, or maybe just the type of contestants, but nevertheless, as the game progressed, you became more and more in favor of that particular side and more and more incensed against imaginary wrongs committed by the other side, and finally, when the game was over, you were either cheered or depressed, depending upon whether your champion won or not. But, after all, it was only a game, and no matter which side you were on, it made no difference to the contestant.

No one was killed or injured, and the only ill effects suffered by anyone was perhaps your own sore throat from yelling lustily in favor of your own contestant or against his opponent, and today, with this tragic conflict seething abroad, everyone in this room, whether he will admit it or not, has unconsciously taken sides with one side or the other of the nations at war. As time goes on, you are cheered in your own heart when you read in the newspaper that something has occurred to benefit your champion, and you are incited into rage when you read of atrocities committed by the opponent of your champion. But friends, let us not forget that war is not basketball, football, boxing, or wrestling. It does not involve an athletic team—it involves the lives of humans, and if enthusiasm goes too far, it involves the lives of your friends and my friends.

Back in 1917, how many of us read the glaring posters on every corner, Join the Army and Save the World for Democracy, or A War to End Wars, and how many of us, inspired with that great principle, went down to the street corner and enlisted, and how many of the boys who were your neighbors and my neighbors marched down the main street in a nice new uniform with trumpets blaring and drums rolling to martial music, and crowds on the street corners waving flags and believing these boys were heroes, going to war to save you and me? And not many years afterward, how many of those people stood on the street corners and cheered when those boys came home? The ranks were thinned considerably, but nevertheless, in the eyes of those people, they were heroes. They had saved the world for democracy and had completed and won a war to end all wars, and yet, as those boys passed on and went into the next block, how many of those people who had cheered, forgot they even passed. Today, how many of those same people go to the veterans' hospital at Lyons, N. J., or Bath, N. Y., and go in and look at those cripples and slap them on the back and say, "Fellow, you did a good job."

Those kids had a future ahead of them, everything to live for, and they gave all they had. But nobody goes down there now; nobody pays any attention to them. That was in the past. How soon we Americans forget, and when veteran legislation was presented to care for those boys, what a cry went up in protest. It is fine to march down the street in a good-looking uniform, with a bright, shiny, new gun on your shoulder, and your heart full of

conviction that you are doing the right thing. How stirred your breast is with the glamour of waving of flags and the cheering of crowds, but how soon that glamour is lost and you are lying in mud, filth, slime, and dirt, wondering whether the next bullet that comes over the trench has your name on it. There is no more glamour then. It is a grim reality. How cheap life is in the trenches. Many of you have seen it, many of you have been through it, and many of you wouldn't want to see it again.

I am a Reserve officer, as many of you are, and I am willing and ready to go if my country needs me. Europe has been at each other's throats since the beginning of the world in the fight for supremacy, and as long as we have 3,500 miles of deep blue ocean between us there is no reason why we should sacrifice our young manhood for someone else in their struggle for supremacy and greed for territory. Don't be misled by propaganda, and don't let your emotions carry you away. These kids, of whom we are so proud today, we must keep home and not send over to be slaughtered and sacrificed on the field of battle in a foreign nation.

Let us all give this question unbiased consideration with only one thought in mind—that we must not do anything that is going to cause our neighbors' kids and our kids to fight in a war that is at the present time none of our business.

The New Deal and the Farmer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFF CLEVENGER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 24, 1939

EDITORIAL FROM THE HENRY COUNTY (OHIO) SIGNAL

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Henry County Signal, of Napoleon, Ohio:

[From the Henry County Signal (Napoleon, Ohio) of October 19, 1939]

As horrible and hateful as war is, many new dealers believe they see a silver lining in it for them. This is particularly true of the New Deal agricultural theorists and experimenters. To them the war seemed an avenue of escape from the devastating results of their own fallacious thinking and foolish acts.

In brief, these New Deal lads who have tried to make a guinea pig out of the American farmer rubbed their hands in glee over the prospect that the European war would pull them out of the hole into which they had fallen. Secretary of Agriculture Henry A. Wallace was so jubilant that he could not restrain himself from running to the radio and proclaiming, in effect, that "we planned it that way."

The first flush of jubilation within the Roosevelt administration inspired by the belief that the European war would solve our economic and agricultural problems, however, has worn rather thin. The hard and fast rules of economics—which the new dealers always disregard—have come into play, and it becomes apparent that these problems remain with us.

WHEAT PRICES STILL LOW

For instance, at this writing, the price of wheat on the Chicago Board of Trade is about 85 cents. So badly has the New Deal managed our agricultural economy that not even the impact of 1 month of a European war could raise wheat prices to a decent level. A price of 85 cents at Chicago is at least 10 cents more than it is on the farm, and a farm price of 75 cents a bushel for wheat is much less than the "dollar wheat on the farm" which the Democratic propaganda spokesman so glowingly promised last spring.

The price of corn at Chicago at this time hovers around 50 cents a bushel. Such a price is not even sufficient to loans of the last several years without loss. The same situation exists in regard to other major agricultural products. Perhaps the European war one of these days will get these prices up but it will be in spite of Henry Wallace's A. A. A. Nevertheless, we will hear the same old "hooey" about how the New Deal's farm program is succeeding.

Before the picture becomes blurred by the false claims of the New Deal propagandists it might be well to take a look backward and see exactly what the New Deal has done to the American farmer. In doing so, let's turn to an objective, nonpartisan source to get the facts.

FARMERS LOST TWELVE BILLIONS

Richard A. Staderman, president of the American Good Government Society, finds that during the "7 lean years" of President Roosevelt the American farmer has lost in income approximately $12,000,000,000, compared with the "7 fat years" before the advent of the Roosevelt New Deal. And heaven knows that several of those so-called fat years were none too fat for the farmers. Yet in spite of that the farmer fared far better before the Roosevelt administration than after.

Using figures of the United States Bureau of Agricultural Economics, Mr. Staderman compiled the following table:

Total gross farm income, 1926 to 1932, inclusive	$73,718,000,000
Total gross farm income, 1933 to 1939, inclusive, and taking the maximum possible estimate for 1939	[1] 61,000,000,000
Total loss to American farmers during 1933–39, at least	12,718,000,000
Average loss to farmers per year since 1933, about	2,000,000,000

[1] This total included over $2,000,000,000 of Government payments to farmers during 1933–39.

"This is a most astonishing result: Over $12,000,000,000 loss to farmers during the last 7 years," writes Mr. Staderman. "Had it not been for payments by the Government to farmers this loss would have been $15,000,000,000 since 1933. While the conditions necessitated some Government aid for farmers, this was obviously at the expense of the general taxpayer.

RESULTS NO TESTIMONIAL FOR NEW DEAL

"The interesting point is that, in spite of Government payments larger than ever before, farm income declined. The results do not show up auspiciously for the combination of trade agreements, restriction of production, and commodity loans.

"It would seem far better to revise our policies so as to restore the higher farm incomes of the years 1926 to 1932, which included both prosperity and depression and hence a normal average income. If we could restore the 1926 to 1932 farm incomes, the farmer would have more income without asking for Government payments. Farmers are upright, independent citizens who prefer asking no favors of anyone, but they do insist upon their right to supply the American market with American-raised farm products."

Little more need be said in way of comment on Mr. Staderman's findings. His figures cannot be disputed and they speak for themselves. The loss in income cited by him means approximately $1,800 for each farm family in the land. Looking back over the last 7 years, what could you, Mr. Farmer, have done with $1,800 to improve the comfort and happiness of your family?

Importation of Foreign Pulp

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 24, 1939

EDITORIAL BY CHARLES F. DAVIS

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Pulp & Paper Mill News of October 6, 1939:

[From the Pulp & Paper Mill News of October 6, 1939]

STOP FOREIGN IMPORTATION OF PULP

(By Charles F. Davis, president, Pacific Coast Pulp and Paper Mill Employees' Association and Capital Local 230, I. B. of P. M.)

Why the sudden prosperity in the pulp and paper industry on the Pacific coast? That is the question being asked by many thousands of employees in the pulp and paper industry on the Pacific coast, employees who have had part-time jobs, some having had no work in this line for the past 2 and 3 years. Why the sudden prosperity?

The answer generally accepted is that one Herr Hitler and his submarines are disrupting shipping of the foreign producers of cheap products and in this way the American manufacturers of pulp and paper on the Pacific coast have taken over the business that was formerly held by these foreign invaders, which rightfully belonged to the American manufacturer and American labor.

Was it necessary to have a war in order to have prosperity in the pulp and paper industry on the Pacific coast? Is there no way possible to stop foreign producers from dumping their cheap product on the American market in competition with American industry and American labor?

The year of 1937 witnessed the largest imports of wood pulp, paper, and paper products on record. Imports of wood pulp in 1937 increased 5.1 percent in tonnage to 2,394,539 tons, valued at $98,298,022, to set a new record for the third consecutive year.

Within 5 years United States wood-pulp imports have risen almost two-thirds in tonnage, and more than doubled in value. For a number of years past there has been a steady increase of pulp imports to America. Are we going to stand idly by and let this condition continue to exist in the future, permitting these foreign invaders to import their cheap product into America, forcing the American manufacturer to close his doors, placing the employees on relief rolls?

Accepting the war as the answer to why we are enjoying prosperity at the present time in the pulp and paper industry on the Pacific coast, do not overlook this point—war is only temporary; so goes our prosperity, also temporary; then what, after the war? Are we going to stop work again, and wait for another Hitler to come along and start another war?

It is my belief that we should make some effort to stop this foreign importing of pulp in the future, by asking Congress to take some action to correct this mistake, enacting legislation that will protect the American manufacturer and the American workman against these foreign producers. For, Mr. Businessman, and many thousand employees in the pulp and paper industry, that which hurts the pulp and paper industry also hurts you, for this is one of the largest industries on the Pacific coast. Are you in sympathy with such a move? We believe you are. Then let us get busy now, for the war may soon be over, and so will our prosperity.

Pending Neutrality Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 24, 1939

ARTICLE BY S. A. BALDUS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article by S. A. Baldus, managing editor of Extension magazine, published in Chicago, Ill. The article appears in the November issue under the caption The Time Has Come and is as follows:

THE TIME HAS COME

WASHINGTON'S WARNING

"It is important, likewise, that the habits of thinking, in a free country, should inspire caution in those entrusted with its administration, to confine themselves within their respective constitutional spheres, avoiding, in the exercise of the powers of one department, to encroach upon another. The spirit of encroachment tends to consolidate the powers of all the departments in one, and thus to create, whatever the form of government, a real despotism. A just estimate of that love of power, and proneness to abuse it which predominates in the human heart, is sufficient to satisfy us of the truth of this position. The necessity of reciprocal checks in the exercise of political power, by dividing and distributing it into different depositories, and constituting each the guardian of the public weal, against invasions by the others, has been evinced by experiments, ancient and modern; some of them in our own country, and under our own eyes. To preserve them must be as necessary as to institute them. If, in the opinion of the people, the distribution or modification of the constitutional powers be, in any particular, wrong, let it be corrected by an amendment in the way which the Constitution designates. But let there be no change by usurpation; for though this, in one instance, may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed. The precedent must always greatly overbalance, in permanent evil, any partial or transient benefit which the use can, at any time, yield." (From Washington's Farewell Address.)

On October 2 Senator PITTMAN submitted the House Joint Resolution 306, entitled "Neutrality Act of 1939," to Congress. It is known as the administration bill, and in it are incorporated the views and wishes of President Roosevelt and Secretary of State Hull. The President has called Congress into extraordinary session for the specific purpose of enacting the bill into law.

It is possible that before what is written here appears in print, action, favorable or unfavorable, may have been taken by Congress. But even so, discussion of some of its essential features is opportune and important, for I do not recall any bill in the past 25 years that had so many fateful implications for the American people; nor a bill that contained so many confused points—so many angles, so many contradictions, so many obscurities and twistifications. Needless to say, I cannot enter upon a discussion of the bill in its entirety; I can at most touch briefly on a few of the more vital points.

To begin with, the President and the Secretary of State have declared that if the Pittman bill becomes law it will keep the United States out of the present European war. That may be their honest belief; a belief from which it is my privilege to dissent. Nor am I alone in this dissent, for a formidable number of Senators and Congressmen are on record as being opposed to the bill, basing their opposition on an equally honest belief that the Neutrality Act of 1939 instead of keeping us out of the European war will inevitably help to put us into the war. For if the truth must be told, the bill offered is not a neutrality bill, its apparent motive and undisguised purpose are to enable the United States to aid and abet the one side (Great Britain and France) as against the other (Germany and its potential allies). There can be no doubt on that score, for the President of the United States, the Secretary of State (and the author of the bill and its proponents), have practically admitted this; and, had I the time, I could advance an overwhelming array of unneutral actions and utterances that would prove this conclusively.

WHAT IS NEUTRALITY?

In international law neutrality is defined as "the complete abstention of a state from giving material aid or encouragement to either belligerent in an existing war. Legally a neutral state is a friend to both belligerents and endeavors to maintain peaceful relations with each * * *."

"Among the obligations of a negative character resting upon neutrals may be mentioned the duty of abstaining from furnishing money, ships, troops, or munitions to either belligerents * * *" (The New International Encyclopedia).

How do the commentators on international law define neutrality?

Let it be understood that I am not posing as one deeply versed in the subject of international law. I have some volumes dealing with the subject in my library, and every now and then when a question arises which makes it necessary that I consult such books, I give whatever time I can to their perusal and study. Thus I have gone over some of the volumes of John Bassett Moore, LL. D., who is rightly considered one of the ablest and most scholarly American commentators on international law. I have before me as I write volume VII of his monumental Digest on International Law. This one volume alone contains 1109 pages and is an exhaustive treatise on all questions involved in the present neutrality legislation: War, maritime war, contraband, blockade, neutrality, etc.

Another work that has intrigued me is the Treatise on International Law by L. Oppenheim, M. A., LL. D., Whewell professor of international law in the University of Cambridge, member of the Institute of International Law, and honorary member of the Royal Academy of Jurisprudence at Madrid. The volume before me as I write is volume II (710 pp.) entitled "War and Neutrality" (2d ed.), published in 1912. (I understand that a later edition (revised) has been published. But, even so, I prefer the earlier work, for the reason that it was written before the League of Nations tried to create a new world order and establish new principles of international law.)

Oppenheim's definition of neutrality makes a nice distinction between international law and international politics:

"Such states as do not take part in a war between other states are neutrals. The term 'neutrality' is derived from the Latin *neuter*. Neutrality may be defined as *the attitude of impartiality adopted by third states toward belligerents and recognized by belligerents, such attitude creating rights and duties between the impartial states and the belligerents*. Whether or not a third state will adopt and preserve an attitude of impartiality during war is not a matter for international law but for international politics" (Italics, Oppenheim's).

"The question of remaining neutral or not is, in the absence of a treaty stipulating otherwise, one of policy and not of law" (p. 362).

(Parenthetically, it may be stated here that much of the confusion that has arisen over the subject of neutrality could be cleared up if, instead of prating about international law, we would call the thing by its right name—international politics. That is the crux of the whole question, and should be insisted upon by all debaters.)

Generally speaking, in international law the act of supplying arms and munitions of war to the parties to an armed conflict is considered an unneutral act. The following few passages from John Bassett Moore's Digest of International Law, not only stress the unneutrality of selling war materials of whatever kind to belligerents, but also set forth that individuals engaging in such traffic place themselves beyond the pale of the law and forfeit the protection of their governments.

"The supply of materials of war, such as arms and ammunition, to either party to an armed conflict, although neutral governments are not obliged to prevent it, constitutes on the part of the individuals who engage in it a participation in hostilities, and as such is confessedly an unneutral act. Should the government of the individual itself supply such articles, it would clearly depart from its position of neutrality. The private citizen undertakes the business at his own risk, and against this risk his government cannot assure him protection without making itself a party to his unneutral act. * * *

"Says Kent, 'the principal restriction which the law of nations imposes on the trade of neutrals is the prohibition to furnish the belligerent parties with warlike stores and other articles which are directly auxiliary to warlike purposes.'

"'If the neutral (government),' says Woolsey, 'should send powder or balls, cannons or rifles this would be a direct encouragement of the war, and so a departure from a neutral position' * * *" (vol. 7, p. 149).

THE ARMS EMBARGO

The pivotal point of the administration's "neutrality" bill is the sale and shipment of materials to belligerents. Under the present neutrality law the President is required to place an embargo on the exportation of arms, munitions, and implements of war to nations at war with each other. He wants the embargo removed. Lifting the

embargo and substituting what is popularly called a cash-and-carry plan, or, as the Pittman bill provides, "credit and carry," would, theoretically, leave the United States free to sell war goods, not only arms, munitions, and implements of war, but all kinds of materials and accessories entering into the conduct or pursuit of a war, to both belligerents. Actually, and since we know for certain that only one of the belligerents could or would under existing conditions buy such goods from us and carry same home in its own ships in comparative safety, it requires no stretch of the imagination to see that the whole proposal is a rather one-sided arrangement.

But, waving that aside, assuming for the moment that it were possible to sell successfully to both belligerents, where does that leave the President, who has repeatedly declared that he hates war and that he wants to travel the road that leads to peace? May I remind the President that the road that leads to peace is not strewn with dragons' teeth? I find it hard to understand how one can proclaim himself an apostle of peace and in the same breath insist that he be free to send arms, munitions, and implements of war to both, or, more accurately speaking, to one, of the belligerents. It doesn't make sense.

A DANIEL COME TO JUDGMENT

I have read over again—for the third time—Secretary of State Hull's passionate appeal to the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations (July 14, 1939) to enact the neutrality legislation so ardently desired by the President before Congress adjourned. It is the sort of address that should be taken apart and analyzed sentence for sentence and point for point. Obviously, I haven't the time to do this. But let us look at a paragraph or two. In his statement on peace and neutrality, Secretary of State Hull put forth this novel and naive argument:

"Those of us who support the recommendations formulated for the elimination of the embargo are convinced that the arms embargo plays into the hands of those nations which have taken the lead in building up their fighting power. It works directly against the interests of the peace-loving nations, especially those who do not possess their own munitions plants.

"Our refusal to make it possible for them (the peace-loving nations and small countries in particular) to obtain such means of self-defense in a time of great emergency, would contribute solely toward making more helpless the law-abiding and peace-devoted peoples of the world."

Oppenheim has something to say on that point which Secretary of State Hull ought to take to heart:

Strict impartiality—"the duty of neutrals to remain impartial," that was the theory and practice agreed upon as far back as the eighteenth century. Vattel, writing in 1758, defined neutrality as follows: "Neutral nations during a war, are those who take no one's part, remaining friends common to both parties, and not favoring the armies of one to the prejudice of the other."

Twenty-one years earlier Bynkershoek, according to Oppenheim's International Law (vol. II, p. 351), maintained that "neutrals had nothing to do with the question as to which party to a war had a just cause; that neutrals, being friends to both parties, have not to sit as judges between these parties, and, consequently, must not give or deny to one or other party more or less in accordance with their conviction as to the justice or injustice of the cause of each."

CASH AND CARRY

One of the provisions of the present Pittman bill is to sell anything, including arms, munitions, implements of war, materials, and accessories to any belligerents on condition that the parties involved pay cash for the goods purchased (even giving them 90 days' credit) and carry the goods purchased away in their own ships. It is to be observed here that the legislation called for by the Pittman neutrality bill (to enact which the President convoked Congress into extra session as soon as the present European war had begun), specifically covers definite belligerents—namely Great Britain and France on the one side, and Germany (and potentially Russia and Italy) on the other. We will sell to both these warring groups says the bill in effect; we will not discriminate; therefore we claim that we are neutral.

But actually as it would work out and as the President and Secretary of State well know—only one side (Great Britain and France) would be in a position to take advantage; and, therefore, we will be unneutral.

This seeming distinction could be argued at great length, for which, however, I have neither the time nor the space. Instead I choose to quote a few relevant paragraphs from Oppenheim's International Law:

"The duty of impartiality must prevent a neutral from supplying belligerents with arms, ammunition, vessels, and military provisions. And it matters not whether such supply takes place for money or gratuitously. A neutral who sold arms and ammunition to a belligerent at a profit would violate his duty of impartiality, as also would one who transferred such arms and ammunition to a belligerent as a present. This is a settled rule so far as direct transactions regarding such supply between belligerents and neutrals are concerned" (p. 426).

Again:

"If a state remains neutral, it violates its impartiality by furnishing a belligerent with troops or men-of-war. And it matters not whether a neutral renders such assistance to one of the belligerents or to both alike. Whereas convention V does not mention the furnishing of troops to belligerents on the part of neutrals, article 6 of convention XIII enacts that 'the supply, in any manner, directly or indirectly, by a neutral power to a belligerent power, of warships, ammunition, or war material of any kind whatever, is forbidden' " (p. 389).

Again:

"Since neutrality is an attitude of impartiality, it excludes such assistance and succor to one of the belligerents as is detrimental to the other, and, further, such injuries to the one as benefit the other. But it requires, on the other hand, active measures from neutral states. For neutrals must prevent belligerents from making use of their neutral territories and of their resources for military and naval purposes during the war. This concerns not only actual fighting on neutral territories, but also transport of troops, war materials, and provisions for the troops, the fitting out of men-of-war and privateers, the activity of prize courts, and the like" (p. 362).

"Neutrals in their own country, may sell to belligerents whatever belligerents choose to buy. The principal exceptions to this rule" (I shall state only the one exception which is ad rem) "that neutrals must not sell to one belligerent what they refuse to sell to the other * * *." (John Bassett Moore, vol. VII, p. 1108.)

Now, under the proposed "neutrality" legislation we declare ourselves ready to sell to both belligerents; knowing, however, that only one belligerent can take home the goods bought from us.

Furthermore, anything we might sell to the other belligerent has already been declared contraband by the British Government and under international law, "contraband of war is always subject to seizure when being conveyed to a belligerent destination" (Moore).

How nicely our "neutrality" legislation fits into the British scheme of things may be seen from the following item:

On September 4 King George VI of England issued a proclamation specifying articles to be treated as contraband of war, which included the following:

All kinds of arms, ammunition, explosives, chemicals or appliances suitable for use in chemical warfare and the machinery for their manufacture; fuel of all kinds, tools, implements, maps, pictures, currency, bullion, metals, food, forage, coin, clothing, and all means of communication and transport, including animals.

MORE POWER FOR THE PRESIDENT

But the salient point of the Pittman bill is that it seeks to confer on the President an extraordinary power and for which there is no warrant in the Constitution. Section 1 of the bill provides that when the President (or Congress) finds that there exists a state of war between foreign states the President shall issue a proclamation naming the belligerents. We need go no further than that. One thing is certain, that, considering the bestowed, implied, assumed, or arrogated powers the President already possesses, he will beat Congress to it. He will issue the proclamation without the advice or consent of Congress (especially if Congress happens not to be in session); for he actually did this very thing with regard to the present war in Europe. Nay, he did more. He called Congress into extra session on the presumption of authority granted to the Chief Executive by the National Defense Act of February 16, 1914, which permits the President to do many things he otherwise cannot do, "upon the outbreak of war, or when, in his opinion, war is imminent."

My interpretation of that grant of authority is that the United States must be actually involved in the outbreak or imminence of a war before the President has a right to act. However, President Roosevelt seems to interpret it differently, namely, that he has a right to act "upon the outbreak of war or when, in his opinion, war is imminent"—whether in Europe or in any part of the world. Which being the case, we may be sure that he will go further. Not only will he name the belligerents, he will declare who the aggressors are. As a matter of fact, he has already done so on several occasions. Vide his speeches and messages in which he speaks of quarantining "aggressors"; and "acts of aggression" already accomplished or contemplated.

The President is avid for power and jealous of his authority. Discussing an earlier neutrality bill (1935) which contained provisions to which the President objected, John T. Flynn in the New Republic (October 11, 1939), says:

"The President refused to endorse the bill. Instead he took the position, which he still holds, that Congress should not pass any such bill; that it was an invasion of the rights of the Executive; that this had to do with our foreign relations, which were entrusted by the Constitution to the Executive; and that the Executive should be permitted to handle the question of neutrality under international law."

Speaking for the group of Senators who are opposed to the administration's so-called neutrality bill, and who pledged themselves to fight "by every honorable and legitimate means" against the repeal of the embargo, Senator JOHNSON of California said in July 1939:

"We are unalterably opposed to the repeal or modification of the present neutrality law prohibiting the sale or exportation of arms, munitions, or implements of war to nations engaged in war. We are against any discretion being lodged in the hands of any Chief Executive to determine an aggressor or aggressors during any war abroad."

The Founding Fathers were careful not to place too much power into the hands of the President, especially with regard to the subject of war.

SEC. 2. "The President shall be commander in chief of the Army and Navy of the United States, and of the militia of the

several States, when called into the actual service of the United States * * *.

"He shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur; and he shall nominate, and by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint ambassadors, other public ministers, and consuls * * *."

The increase of power the President is seeking can be bestowed only by an amendment to the Constitution.

THE POWERS OF CONGRESS

The Constitution emphatically declares that "Congress (not the President) shall have power to declare war." The Constitution, with great particularity, enumerates the powers of Congress. Among other things, it confers upon Congress the power to provide for the common defense, to raise and support armies, to provide and maintain a navy, to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces, to declare war, and to call the militia into the service of the United States—"to execute the laws of the Union, suppress insurrections, and repel invasions." It empowers Congress "to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States or in any department or officer thereof."

Nowhere do we find that any of these powers have been or shall be delegated to the President; yet we find that Congress, especially during the past 22 years, under the stress of emergencies, has passed scores of laws handing over to the President extraordinary and plenary powers which today are coming home to roost; especially those having to do with war. It is under these clearly unconstitutional powers that the President called Congress into extra session and declared that a national emergency exists.

If Congress now proceeds to enact another law (the Pittman bill) conferring on the President the power, in case war arises in Europe or any part of the world (war in which we are not directly involved) it will have raised the Presidency to a virtual dictatorship. In the language of the Pittman bill, whenever he "shall find that there exists a state of war between foreign States * * * the President shall issue a proclamation naming the states involved; and he shall, from time to time, by proclamation, name other states as and when they become involved in the war."

The enactment of the Pittman bill into law will confer upon the President of the United States all the powers possessed by military despots. Hitler's tyranny proceeded directly from his seizure of military power; the President is demanding of Congress that all military power be vested in himself. Will Congress accede? The fight is between the President and Congress. Will Congress surrender? The destiny of the American people is in the hands of Congress. Will Congress betray the confidence of the people?

Don't deceive yourself. If you bestow upon the President of the United States the power to declare not only who is the aggressor, but against whom the aggression has been committed, you have bestowed upon him the power to plunge our country into war on the side of one of the belligerents—whichever side he may decide. This is the power that President Wilson usurped—and as a consequence he put us into the war without asking "the advice and consent of Congress."

Let us go back 22 years. Did Congress declare war on Germany? No. In the message he read to Congress (April 2, 1917) President Wilson declared that a state of war already exists.

"* * * I advise that the Congress declare the recent course of the Imperial German Government to be in fact nothing less than war against the Government and people of the United States. That it (Congress) formally accept the status of belligerent which has been thrust upon it and that it take immediate steps not only to put the country in a more thorough state of defense, but also to exert all its power and employ all its resources to bring the government of the German Empire to terms and end the war."

The President had declared that we were at war with Germany. Cheering and tumultuous applause greeted this declaration—shouting, clapping, and waving of American flags. The propaganda that had been at work for the previous 3 years had been effective—the propaganda plus the stupid "diplomacy" and truculence of the German Government. However, I am not concerned with those things at this moment. The one point I am trying to stress is that actually the President, and not Congress, had declared war. It was not until 4 days later that the Senate and House of Representatives in a joint resolution formally declared war.

This must never again be permitted to happen. Let Congress stand by its guns.

BEATING THE DEVIL AROUND A BUSH

The President and our Secretary of State at the present moment seem to favor the entire abolition of all neutrality legislation and a return to that nebulous thing called international law. On this point I can only say briefly, without arguing the matter (for that cannot be done in brief form), that that seems to me the easiest way of becoming involved in war—if we want to get into war on the side of Great Britain and France; and that, I regret to say, it appears to me, is the real objective of the administration.

As a matter of fact, there is a lot of hypocrisy about this whole neutrality legislation business. For, whether the Pittman bill is passed as written, giving the President everything he asks for, or whether the embargo is retained and strengthened, the President knows, and the Secretary of State knows, and you know, and I know that, in either case, goods, whether forbidden or declared contraband, will reach the stronger side. Purchases will be made by neutrals and individuals and shipped to neutral ports, reaching the belligerents, perhaps, by a somewhat circuitous route. In like manner a cash-and-carry or credit plan could and would be frustrated. Loans and credits can be extended to individuals instead of governments. Whatever legislation may be enacted it can be circumvented; whatever rules we may lay down can be evaded and made of no avail. Let's be honest about it! Let us not lay ourselves open to the charge of knavery. It is no secret as to where the administration stands.

WHY?

Why, then, if it doesn't make any difference one way or another; if, whether we pass or do not pass the Pittman so-called neutrality bill, Great Britain and France (keeping the present war in mind) will be able by hook or by crook to avail themselves of our resources and stores of goods—should anyone be opposed to the legislation demanded by the administration?

To that question there are several answers.

1. Because it would confer on the President a power which no President should have—the power to put us into any foreign war he chooses. For, keep this outstanding fact constantly before you: all negotiation with regard to our relationship with foreign governments is in the hands of the President and the Secretary of State; and these negotiations, for the most part, are secret. Even the two Foreign Relations Committees (Senate and House of Representatives) do not know what is secretly going on. These two—the President and the Secretary of State, aided and abetted by selected and interested individuals—can so maneuver as to make our entrance into any foreign war a matter of course.

Have we forgotten how we got into the last war? Four men actually put us into that war. They were President Woodrow Wilson; Secretary of State Lansing; Walter H. Page, American Ambassador to Great Britain; and President Wilson's private ambassador, Col. E. M. House. This is not a gratuitous statement. Read the several books written about President Wilson by Ray Stannard Baker and others, and the President's own statements; the Memoirs of Robert Lansing; the Life and Letters of Walter H. Page; the Intimate Papers of Colonel House; and scores of other books establishing this one point—that these four favored and worked for our entrance into the World War—beyond dispute.

2. But this, to my way of thinking, is the most important point at this time: If we enact the Pittman bill into law it is equivalent to serving notice on one of the belligerents in Europe (Great Britain and France) that we are on their side. It will encourage them to continue the present war, confident that, at the crucial moment, we will come to their help by sending an army to help them crush the aggressors—which, by that time, may be not only Germany but also Russia.

Our best contribution to peace in Europe is to let Great Britain and France know that they need expect no help of any kind from us. And this we can do by keeping the embargo on the shipment of all war materials of whatever kind.

By insisting that the embargo be lifted and that we adopt a cash- (or credit) and-carry plan, President Roosevelt is like a man who, holding a flaming torch in his hand, rushes into a powder magazine to look for a leak in a gas pipe. That sentence may sound screwy, for it is more than likely that there are no gas pipes in powder magazines. But I will let it stand because it conveys the idea of an inevitable and terrific explosion—and that's the one thing I want to emphasize. An inevitable and terrific explosion.

The C. I. O. and Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 24, 1939

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, many times on the floor of this House have I charged that John L. Lewis and the C. I. O.'s were using the Communists and the methods of the Communists—that is, violence and disregard for the law and the civil liberty of our citizens—to establish Lewis as a labor dictator. Communists, likewise, have been using Lewis and his C. I. O. to accomplish their purpose of destroying this Government by force.

The President permitted his campaign managers to accept, and he was evidently very glad to get, the support of the C. I. O. and the campaign contribution of Lewis' United Mine Workers of $470,000. Somewhat later Lewis called upon the President to repay this political debt and to a certain extent Franklin D. Roosevelt did so by sitting idly by and permitting his Governor of Michigan, Frank Murphy, to do the same, while Lewis and the C. I. O. defied the law,

drove thousands from their jobs, and raised "hell" generally in Michigan during the sit-down strikes.

Earl Browder, and his communistic gang, likewise endorsed the President and so far as I have heard the President never refused their support or stated that he would not avail himself of their endorsement for a third term.

Sometime ago we learned through the testimony given before the Dies committee that Browder had been using a forged passport to go back and forth between the United States and Soviet Russia on his visits to his international Communist friends.

Yesterday we learned that a Federal grand jury in New York had indicted Browder for a violation of the criminal law growing out of the use, it was claimed, of forged passports.

In Michigan not very long ago, Frankensteen, head of a C. I. O. affiliate, assisted in holding up Government orders for parts which were necessary in the production of airplanes to be used for national defense.

Murphy, the present "glamour boy" of the administration, will have to do something pretty soon about Browder and his Michigan friend, Frankensteen, whom he appointed to aid in distributing relief funds in Michigan not so long ago. It certainly would be a cheering spectacle to see Murphy, as United States Attorney General, prosecuting his friend and political appointeee, Frankensteen, for a criminal conspiracy to subvert by force our Government; to watch him prosecute Browder whose organizations endorsed him for Governor of Michigan. When this comes about Murphy will be forced to agree with Lincoln's statement that, "You cannot fool all of the people all of the time."

So too some of us will watch with a great deal of interest Lewis in his announced drive to throw the Communists out of the C. I. O. Doubtless Lewis has reached the conclusion, so long evident to many of us, that the Communists are a liability in any movement in this country.

It is regrettable that the administration has not come to the same conclusion here in Washington. With that thought in mind let me quote this editorial from the Chicago Tribune of yesterday:

MR. LEWIS' PURGE

John L. Lewis, it is reported, is getting ready to run the Communists out of the C. I. O. This will no doubt prove embarrassing to some of Mr. Lewis' more starry-eyed admirers, who have been contending valiantly that there were no Communists in the C. I. O. Their forthcoming explanations may be awaited with the same interest that greeted recent efforts of the American Communists to explain Comrade Stalin's doings.

There is nothing surprising in Mr. Lewis' action. It has been predicted in labor circles ever since he put the "reds" to work for him. No one has accused him of being a Communist. He was a Herbert Hoover Republican in 1932. He was a $500,000 Democrat in 1936. The only ideology to which he has remained faithful is that he ought to run things. That happens also to be Stalin's ideology, but that doesn't make Lewis a Communist, or Stalin either, for that matter.

Lewis put the Communists to work in 1937 because he could use their considerable talents. They were accomplished "hell raisers," and he was out to raise hell. They were the most experienced saboteurs and revolutionaries on the American scene, and he saw sabotage and threatened revolution as the quickest road to the power he seeks.

Mr. Lewis accordingly invited the Communists into bed with him. Having got them in, he may find it not so easy to kick them out. On that problem Mr. Lewis might well consult David Dubinsky, of the Ladies' Garment Workers' Union, who parted company with him last year.

Mr. Dubinsky knows all about Communists. Some years ago they got into his union. He didn't invite them in, but they got in, anyway. He set out to expel them, and finally did so after several years. But the fight nearly wrecked his union, and would have wrecked it if the American Federation of Labor hadn't come to Mr. Dubinsky's aid with several hundred thousand dollars.

Since Stalin embraced Hitler and sent word to Comrade Browder that when Browder was talking about Fuehrer Kuhn, of the bund, he really meant Prime Minister Chamberlain, the Communists have been the kiss-of-death boys in the ranks of American radicals. Mr. Lewis is not the only one who has been trying to go respectable by repudiating them. The American Labor Party in New York is running a purge also.

But down in Washington the Communists still pursue their happy way, planning for the revolution and sabotaging the machinery of capitalism whenever they get a chance. The Dies committee says there are 2,500 known Communists and fellow travelers working for President Roosevelt. When is the President going to start his purge?

National Welfare Officer of Order of Purple Heart Supports Proposed Referendum on Foreign Wars

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 23, 1939

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, there is tremendous interest throughout the country in the resolution I have introduced—House Joint Resolution 89—which proposes to amend the Constitution so as to give the people the right to vote on proposals to send our boys abroad to fight and die in wars overseas.

While the interest in the proposed amendment is general it is especially noticeable among former veterans, who know from experience what war means and who see in day-by-day developments what appears to them to be a repetition of influences and circumstances that led to our participation in the world holocaust 22 years ago. I will venture to say that if a free and untrammeled expression could be had of the rank-and-file membership of the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and every other organization of veterans, the verdict in every instance would be overwhelmingly in favor of my proposed referendum on foreign wars, just as it was in this House on January 10, 1938, when on a roll call nearly all of the veterans in this body supported my proposal.

There is no veterans' organization in existence that is more entitled to the respect and affection of our country than the Military Order of the Purple Heart, Inc., because it is composed exclusively of veterans who were wounded in action. No veteran, unless he received wounds in the service of our country, can secure membership in this honored organization. As an interesting and important contribution to the discussion of my proposed constitutional amendment I submit for printing in the RECORD the following letter I have received from R. G. Patton, the national welfare officer of the Military Order of the Purple Heart, Inc.:

THE MILITARY ORDER OF THE PURPLE HEART,
NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS,
1172¾ NORTH WESTMORELAND STREET,
Los Angeles, Calif.

Hon. LOUIS LUDLOW,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LUDLOW: I am in receipt of a copy of House Joint Resolution No. 89, which you presented to the Seventy-sixth Congress at its first session.

It is a pleasure for me, speaking individually and as the national welfare officer of the Military Order of the Purple Heart, to compliment you on your courage in presenting such a resolution at this time. First, complimenting you on the bill itself, I do so because it would certainly seem to any reasonably informed person how idiotic it would be for us (United States) to engage overseas in another one of those periodic massacres which the people in Europe and Asia seem to love so much. Is that the only outdoor sport known over there? How can a single Congressman not concur with you in such a policy of remaining aloof from entangling alliances with countries in those war-infested lands? I should think every loyal American Congressman and citizen would rush to support your amendment if they understood it. But, sad to say, I realize the majority of citizens do not understand your proposed amendment and the reason for same, in my humble opinion, is that a great number of newspapers in our country do not print the true text of this proposed amendment. Actually, Congressman LUDLOW, most of the people to whom I have talked have an idea that your bill by giving a referendum vote to the people would prevent the President and Congress from declaring war even if this country were attacked. Yes; the people actually feel that we could be in the midst of an election determining whether we should enter war, while at the same time bombs from an enemy were dropping on our defenseless cities.

Of course, there are reasonable citizens who know your bill would not become effective if it were a case of invasion by an enemy of our homeland, or of our territorial possessions, or even of any country in the Western Hemisphere. Those of us who read and take an interest in our country know that the President and Congress have such wide powers that even the Monroe Doctrine is not affected by your bill, but for some reason clarification of your amendment in the fullest sense is not being made by those who oppose it. I, for one, want to know why this issue is being confused by its opponents.

I was dumbfounded to read a double page editorial in the last issue of the American Legion national monthly taking such a crack at your amendment. At the same time not a word was said about the wide latitude of power given the President regarding countries in the Western Hemisphere. Nearly all of my buddies in my Legion post to whom I have talked regarding this amendment had no idea that this bill is purposely designed only "to keep us out of foreign wars" unless the people as a whole decide that they alone are ready and desirous for it. Also at a Disabled American Veterans district meeting a few nights ago I brought the matter on the floor for a general discussion. Two past national commanders of that organization spoke on it. Both had the idea that your amendment would become effective if we even desired or intended helping a country in the Western Hemisphere outside of our own shores. In fact, one of them said he was against the measure due to the fact that it would violate the Monroe Doctrine policy. When I explained the true purport of the bill every man in the meeting was for it.

In my opinion, before another soldier leaves these shores for Europe or Asia with the purpose of assisting so-called doubtful democracies, I say emphatically let the people vote on it, and we can rest assured that we won't go. Surely we cannot be hoodwinked into another racket like the one perpetrated on us in 1917—all in the name of democracy. Let me tell you, Congressman LUDLOW, that the combat wounded of those famous combat divisions, the combat men who were not wounded as well, know what war was, too. We may not have actually seen the fields run with blood, as did some of the back-of-the-lines observers, but we did see many of our buddies die, others become maimed for life, others lose their reason that will never return, and for what now appears to have been a useless mission. Surely our fine Congressmen assembled there in Washington will not listen to the propaganda flooding our country at present for the purpose of getting us on one side or another, but we are all human—even Congressmen and Senators—and they can be swayed as well as others. Like yourself, and you are certainly honest in your own conviction when you suggest that it might be easier to sway 500 Congressmen than to sway 40,000,000 citizens, I certainly feel the same way about it.

I congratulate you on your courage in the face of such tremendous opposition in not only proposing but in fighting for what my wounded comrades and I think is the most sensible and humanitarian bill ever presented in the House of Representatives. We got medals for taking lives. If your bill goes over, you should get a Distinguished Service Cross for saving lives by the wholesale. You have my permission to print this in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD or wherever you please.

Yours very truly,

R. G. PATTON,
National Welfare Officer,
Military Order of the Purple Heart.

Summary and Conclusions of the Federal Trade Commission in Recent Motor Car Industry Inquiry

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 24, 1939

STATEMENT BY THE FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following report of the Federal Trade Commission on the motor-vehicles industry:

MOTOR-VEHICLES INDUSTRY—SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

(Report prepared and submitted pursuant to H. J. Res. 594, 75th Cong., 3d sess. (Public Resolution No. 87), approved April 13, 1938)

Summary

CONCENTRATION IN THE MOTOR-VEHICLE INDUSTRY

There is a high degree of concentration in the motor-vehicle industry. This degree of concentration is greater in the manufacture and sale of passenger automobiles than in the sale of commercial vehicles. In the Commission's inquiry, a field examination was made of the seven leading passenger automobile manufacturers. In 1937 these seven manufacturers sold 98 percent of the total number of new automobiles sold by American manufacturers, and 93 percent of the combined unit sales of passenger cars, trucks, and commercial vehicles. In 1938 these seven concerns sold 99 percent of the new passenger cars registered.

Three companies, namely, Chrysler Corporation, Ford Motor Co., and General Motors Corporation, acounted for 89 percent of new passenger-car sales in 1937 and for 85 percent of the combined number of new passenger cars and commercial vehicles sold in that year. In 1938 these three companies sold slightly more than 90 percent of the new passenger cars registered.

In 1937 General Motors sold 39.7 percent, Chrysler 23.2 percent, and Ford 21.9 percent of all motor vehicles in the domestic and export trades of the United States, and, in 1938, General Motors had 44.8 percent of new passenger-car registrations in the United States, Chrysler was second with practically 25 percent, and Ford third with 20.5 percent.

The bulk of motor vehicles sold in the United States is in the low-priced class. In 1937 the three lower priced motor vehicles made by Chrysler, Ford, and General Motors, namely, Plymouth, Ford, and Chevrolet, combined, accounted for approximately 57 percent of the total unit sales in the domestic and export markets of the United States. In 1938, of total new passenger-car registrations, Chevrolet had 24.6 percent, Ford 19.2 percent, and Plymouth 15.1 percent.

PHENOMENAL GROWTH AND PROFITS OF LARGE AUTOMOBILE MANUFACTURERS

During about 34½ years from June 16, 1903, to the end of 1937, Ford Motor Co. manufactured nearly 27,000,000 automobiles and sold them for a little under $14,180,000,000. The aggregate profit was nearly $978,900,000. Of this, nearly $262,540,000 was distributed in cash dividends, nearly $106,265,000 was paid as premiums in the retirement of the stock held by minority interests and more than $610,095,000 was retained in the company's treasury or was used in expanding the production and distribution facilities of the enterprise.

Starting with a capital of $100,000 in 1903, the capital employed by Ford Motor Co. was built up by the end of 1937 to $636,155,735, an increase of nearly $636,056,000; and of this, only $14,663,444, representing employees' investments of savings out of their wages, constituted borrowed funds. The remainder consisted either of profits retained in the company's treasury or used in expansion of facilities, or of the products of the investment of cash dividends by the Fords in other Ford enterprises, coal mines, and the like. The company acquired the Lincoln motor business at receiver's sale, and the assets of several parts manufacturers. However, the great bulk of the growth in magnitude of this enterprise represented the use of profits for expansion from within, rather than the consolidation of formerly independent enterprises.

In 1908, General Motors Co., predecessor to the present named corporation, was organized by William C. Durant and associates. Immediately thereafter the company began acquiring the more important manufacturers of motor vehicles and motor vehicle parts and accessories. A controlling interest was quickly acquired in 12 important manufacturers of motor vehicles and parts, including Buick, Olds, Cadillac, and Oakland. Negotiations were conducted with a view to acquiring Ford Motor Co., Reo Motor Co., Willys-Overland Co., and the E. R. Thomas Co. of Buffalo. Except for the lack of cash demanded by the sellers, it is more than probable that General Motors would have acquired these manufacturers. Most of the earlier acquisitions were made through an exchange of stock, but Henry Ford and R. E. Olds of Reo demanded a substantial part in cash and the deal fell through. When the Dodge Brothers properties were put on the market in 1925, General Motors submitted a bid through J. P. Morgan & Co., but the sale was made to Dillon, Read & Co.

In all, General Motors, during its corporate existence, has acquired either the entire interest or a substantial interest in the capital stock or assets and properties of approximately 70 formerly independent corporations. As consideration for these capital stocks, assets, and properties, it gave approximately $500,000,000—mostly in valuation of General Motors capital stocks given in exchange. At the close of 1937 the capital employed by General Motors Corporation, after eliminating appreciation, goodwill, and other intangibles, amounted to $895,247,000.

In later years the expansion and growth of General Motors in the motor-vehicle field has been through the development and expansion of the Cadillac, LaSalle, Buick, Oldsmobile, Pontiac, and Chevrolet lines of cars rather than through the acquisition of established lines. In earlier years the corporation acquired each of these lines, except LaSalle, and, in addition, it acquired not fewer than 12 other lines of cars the production of which was subsequently discontinued. From its very beginning it was active in acquiring manufacturers of accessories and parts and by the close of 1937 it produced practically every finished part needed to build a motor vehicle except rubber tires, window glass, and upholstery.

During the 29 years of operation, 1909 to 1937, inclusive, General Motors made net profits amounting to $3,013,013,048 before payment of income taxes. After setting aside $402,127,492 for payment of income taxes there remained a balance of $2,610,885,556. This balance was disposed of by paying cash dividends to common-stock holders amounting to $1,653,153,244; by paying cash dividends to preferred-stock holders amounting to $164,510,372; by increasing the par or stated amount of common-stock accounts by the sum of $164,189,635 and issuing common stock as stock dividends; by setting aside $3,212,519 for outstanding minority interests; by paying $168,336,996 to executives and employees through profit-sharing plans. The balance remaining after paying dividends and bonuses was used for general corporate purposes or retained in the business. Including the sum added to the par or stated amount of common-stock accounts, the total profits retained in the business were $558,979,376.

During 1937 General Motors Corporation built approximately 40 percent of all motor vehicles built in the United States and approximately 35 percent of all those built in the world. It built motors for virtually every use, from the one one-hundredths horsepower midget for electric fans to the 6,000 horsepower Diesels that pull streamlined railway trains. It not only built motors and motor vehicles, but a long line of refrigeration equipment, air-conditioning equipment, heating equipment, small lighting plants and equipment, electric household appliances, and numerous allied items of equipment. It has substantial investments in Bendix Aviation Corporation, North American Aviation, Inc., Ethyl Gasoline Corporation, Yellow Truck & Coach Manufacturing Co., and in motor-vehicle dealerships. Through other subsidiaries it finances users in purchasing motor vehicles on partial-payment plans and engages in insuring motor vehicles.

General Motors earned more profits for its stockholders during the 11-year period, 1927–37, inclusive, than any other manufacturing corporation in the United States, but its total assets of $1,566,000,000 at the close of 1937 were slightly exceeded by a few other domestic corporations. Its year of greatest earnings was 1928, when a profit of $330,216,167 was earned before provision for Federal, State, and foreign income taxes. In three other years, namely, 1927, 1929, and 1936, its annual profits, on the same basis, ranged from $283,961,144 to $297,341,859. In no year during the 11 years, 1927 to 1937, inclusive, did the corporation fail to show some profit. The year of lowest profit was 1932, when a profit of $10,600,194 was shown on the total operations; however, there was a loss of $1,340,430 on manufacturing operations. This remarkable record in view of the experience of most corporations during the economic depression, was made possible through General Motors' ability to obtain such a large proportion of the motor-vehicle business at substantial profits on unit sales. During the 27 years, 1911–37, General Motors sold approximately 22,000,000 automobiles.

The Chrysler Corporation developed to its present position as one of the largest three manufacturers in the motor-vehicle industry largely through taking over and developing the plants and facilities of Maxwell Motor Corporation, Chalmers Motor Corporation, and Dodge Bros., Inc. The facilities of the three corporations were acquired by exchanging new stocks for the old stocks outstanding of these corporations or assuming their debts. In addition, Chrysler Corporation extended and improved these facilities by reinvesting $82,733,702 of profits. The growth of Chrysler Corporation has been rather remarkable, when it is considered that the corporation sold 134,478 cars in 1925, that its sales had grown to 1,113,900 cars in 1937, and totaled approximately 6,200,000 in the period 1925–37.

During the 13 years of operations, from 1925 to 1937, inclusive, Chrysler Corporation made net profits amounting to $355,049,438 before payment of income taxes. After setting aside $53,831,494 for payment of income taxes, there remained a balance of $301,217,944. This balance was disposed of by paying $174,273,429 in cash dividends to the common stockholders, $6,238,341 in cash dividends to preferred stockholders, and $18,730,000 to officers and executives through profit-sharing plans. The balance remaining after these payments was used for general corporate purposes or was retained in the business.

PROFITS REALIZED BY SEVEN MOTOR-VEHICLE MANUFACTURERS

During the 11 years, 1927 to 1937, the largest seven manufacturers of passenger automobiles realized profits amounting to more than $2,375,000,000 before provision for income taxes. Of this total, General Motors alone accounted for 79.7 percent, Chrysler Corporation accounted for 11.6 percent, Ford Motor Co. 0.10 percent, and the four smaller manufacturers examined together accounted for 8.6 percent.

The profits of General Motors came from the three general divisions of its operations. The motor-vehicle divisions, consisting of the six lines of cars, produced about 61.4 percent of the total, the accessories and parts divisions produced about 22.4 percent, and all other products produced about 16.2 percent of General Motors' profits.

RATES OF RETURN FOR THE LARGEST THREE MANUFACTURERS

The profits of the motorcar manufacturers have varied greatly according to time and circumstances. The path of the industry's growth is strewn with scores of companies that have failed, while on the other hand a considerable number has been absorbed by Chrysler Corporation and by General Motors Corporation, chiefly the latter.

Since 1927 three great companies—General Motors, Ford, and Chrysler—have comprehended a proportion increasing from about 59 to approximately 85 percent of the industry; and they have obtained an even larger share of the profits. Ford, however, has been less fortunate in this respect than the other two, experiencing heavy losses in the severe depression years and also in 1927 and 1928 when changing models and reconstructing his factory.

The profits of General Motors and Chrysler in the 11-year period 1927–37 were very large, and notwithstanding the extremely large investment of capital involved, the rates of return on their investment in manufacturing operations were generally extraordinarily high.

Thus for General Motors the rates of profit from 1927 to 1937, inclusive, averaged no less than 35.5 percent per annum and have ranged from a loss of 0.28 percent in 1932 to a profit of 66.24 percent in 1928. During the same period the average for Chrysler was a profit of 28.59 percent, and the range was from a loss of 9.75 percent in 1932 to a profit of 74.46 percent in 1936. The average rate of return for Ford during the same period was a loss of 0.80 percent, and the return ranged from a loss of 13.89 percent in 1932 to a profit of 15.26 percent in 1929.

RATES OF RETURN FOR SMALLER OR INDEPENDENT MANUFACTURERS

The smaller manufacturers are commonly referred to in the automobile trade as independents. Of the hundreds of manufacturers that have made passenger automobiles, only 11 are active today—the big 3 and 8 independents. In their struggle to maintain or improve their place in the industry, independent manufacturers have been forced to make important contributions to the development of motor vehicles.

In comparison with the above-stated rates of return for Chrysler Corporation and General Motors Corporation, the rates of profit of the leading four important manufacturers, during the same 11 years, were as follows. The return to Hudson Motor Car Co. ranged from a loss of 17.33 percent in 1932, to a profit of 41.39 percent in 1927, and averaged a profit of 9.40 percent per annum. For Nash Motor Co., the range was from a loss of 33 percent in 1934, to a profit of 75.63 percent in 1927, and the average was a profit of 36.90 percent per annum. The return to Packard Motor Car Co. averaged 21.25 percent per annum and ranged from a loss of 29.14 percent in 1934, to a profit of 65.61 percent in 1928. For the Studebaker Corporation the return averaged 6.13 percent per annum and ranged from a loss of 6.59 percent in 1932, to a profit of 16.21 percent in 1928.

NET MARGINS OF PROFIT ON SALES OF ACCESSORIES AND REPLACEMENT PARTS

Numerous dealers complained that the largest three manufacturers coerced and forced them to purchase large stocks of accessories and replacement parts. The examination of the records of the larger manufacturers shows that they made much larger margin of profit on accessories and parts than on cars. For illustration, during 6 of the years of the period 1929–37 the motor-car divisions of General Motors Corporation made an average net profit of 24.85 cents on every dollar of accessories and parts sales as contrasted to 7.18 cents on every dollar on sales of new cars. Chrysler Corporation made an average net profit of 17.3 cents on every dollar of sales of accessories and parts during the 9-year period 1929 to 1937, inclusive, as contrasted to 6.6 cents on sales of new cars. During the last 9 years, 1929 to 1937, Ford Motor Co. lost an average of 0.36 cents on every dollar of new car sales but made 12.07 cents on every dollar of sales of accessories and replacement parts.

The replacement parts and accessories business is an important source of profit to motor-vehicle manufacturers. During the 9 years, 1929–37, approximately $21,655,000 out of $221,628,000 of profits made by Chrysler Corporation in motor-vehicle manufacturing came from sale of parts and accessories. During the same period, Ford Motor Co. netted a loss of $13,085,000 on motor vehicle sales, but had a profit of $49,194,000 on parts and accessories. During 6 years of the period 1927–37, General Motors Corporation netted profits in motor-vehicle operation aggregating $497,662,000; and of this nearly $117,943,000 came from the parts and accessories sales.

PRICES OF PASSENGER CARS

A comparison of factory prices of reasonably comparable four-door sedans, covering roughly the period since 1923, as submitted by each of the seven companies examined by the Commission, shows a net decrease in the price of such motor-vehicles. In general, prices reached the lowest point during the depression years following 1929, but increased somewhat in more recent years. For example, a Chrysler four-door four-cylinder car of 38 horsepower, less Federal tax, sold for $1,095 f. o. b. factory in June 1925, as compared with $708 for an 82-horsepower Plymouth six-cylinder car in September 1938; a 38-horsepower, four-cylinder Nash sold for $1,445 in July 1923 as compared with $1,025 for a comparable six-cylinder car of 105 brake horsepower in October 1937; and a Studebaker six-cylinder of 50 horsepower sold for $1,595, f. o. b. factory in August 1924, as compared with $973 for a six-cylinder, 90-horsepower car in September 1938. Prices of other manufacturers showed a similar trend.

Based upon the cost per maximum brake horsepower and the cost per pound of car weight, the price reductions are even more impressive; for example, for the cars mentioned the reductions were from $29.48 per brake horsepower in 1925, to $8.85 in 1938 for the Chrysler-Plymouth, and from $39.40 in 1923, to $10 in 1937, for the Nash.

In addition to this substantial price reduction, every manufacturer gave the car user greater beauty, comfort, efficiency, and safety.

THE FINANCIAL RECORD OF THE MOTOR-VEHICLE MANUFACTURERS

For many years the automobile industry was regarded as highly speculative and the manufacturers, to a very large extent, had to finance expansion through reinvestment of profits rather than by borrowing. In this respect the industry has furnished a better example than have some other industries. While there have been occasional lapses from sound accounting policies as, for example, in the write-up of property accounts, this factor, at least in recent years, has not been a significant one. It is true that these companies did not have the same incentives to misrepresent their assets, as companies that are generally subject to regulation, as respects rates or charges for services. The large companies have seldom in recent years needed to borrow heavily, thus preserving more securely their financial independence.

PROFITS OF MOTOR-VEHICLE DEALERS

The Commission's data on the profits of motor-vehicle dealers reported to it are neither as comprehensive nor as representative

as was desired, because of the failure of many of the 5,600 dealers addressed to make the returns which were sought. Such returns were requested on the basis of cooperation. The authority of the Commission to require reports does not extend to individuals or partnerships nor to corporations engaged solely in intrastate business.

Several hundred retailers addressed were unable to furnish data because they were out of business, in receivership, or in process of liquidation. Usable answers were confined to about 525 concerns, many of which were partnerships or sole proprietorships. Among this sample 25 percent of those reporting for 1935 and 1937 and 17 percent for 1936 had losses. Notwithstanding this fact; the results for all reporting dealers indicated a substantial average rate of profit for the group.

Reports by retail dealers and dealer-distributors, which were not audited by the Commission's accountants, support their claim that they sell their new cars at little or no profit on account of excessive used-car allowances. The showing of retail dealer reports covering 119,131 new cars of all makes sold in 1937 is that the dealer's average net operating profit per new car sold was entirely derived from sales of parts, accessories, supplies, and services that represented only 15 percent of their total business. For distributor-dealers, whose business combined both wholesaling and retailing, the showing was that nearly 97 percent of their profit of $13.10 per new car sold was derived from sales of parts, accessories, supplies, and service representing less than 12 percent of their total business.

HIGH COST OF INSTALLMENT PURCHASING OF MOTOR VEHICLES

Approximately 60 percent of retail motor-vehicle sales are effected on the installment plan, mostly of 12, 18, and 24 months duration. Prompt financing of these sales, as well as of dealers' purchases, is important from the viewpoint of the effect upon the manufacturer's volume of sales and production and ability to compete with other manufacturers. So also is the minimization of the differential between the time and cash prices of these vehicles. To this end, General Motors Corporation organized General Motors Acceptance Corporation, Ford Motor Co. organized Universal Credit Corporation, Chrysler Corporation acquired an interest in Commercial Credit Co. and entered into special contracts with it, and other manufacturers made special financing arrangements with Commercial Investment Trust Corporation.

Basic finance charge rates of one-half of 1 percent per month on the entire original unpaid purchase prices, including the retail premiums for the insurance protection, of automobiles purchased on the installment plan became generally prevalent in 1936; and these rates constituted a reduction of about 25 percent from the previously prevailing basic rates. These rates, however, imply interest paid by the car purchasers at about 0.91 percent per month, or 11½ percent per annum, on the monthly unpaid balances of the cash purchase prices of their automobiles and insurance. Not all of this is net profit to the finance companies, however, due to the participations in the finance charges that are paid to the vending dealers as loss reserves and bonuses, and to the not inconsiderable operating expenses of the finance companies themselves. During the 3 years 1935 to 1937, inclusive, the average rate of net profit on the total capital employed in the business was 5.94 percent per annum in the case of General Motors Acceptance Corporation, 7.48 percent in the case of the other two finance companies of comparable magnitude, and 8.67 percent in the case of 26 so-called independent finance companies.

Actual finance charges frequently fall below the basic rate because of dealers' errors or special concessions and because the averaged retail insurance premiums charged the car purchasers are frequently less than the actual premiums; and instances have been found in which, consequently, the time prices were actually somewhat less than the cash prices.

Actual finance charges frequently exceed the basic rate because: (a) the actual retail insurance premiums are frequently somewhat less than the averaged premiums charged the car purchasers; (b) in transactions in which the insurance on the car is not placed through the finance company the regular finance charges are often augmented to compensate the finance company for its loss of insurance commission; (c) in some regions the basic finance charges are augmented by documentary-stamp taxes, recording fees, and notary fees—the last being especially large in Louisiana, where the notaries public, appointed for life and limited in number, frequently charge $10 or more per transaction; (d) of the customary addition to the basic charges of a flat charge per car in installment sales of used automobiles; and (e) of additions to the basic charges, or "packs," made by the vending dealers for no extra service rendered. These "packs" are facilitated by the practice of many finance companies in providing the dealers with two or more rate charts based on different rates of charge, so that a dealer can use a chart based on a high rate when dealing with a car purchaser, but will use the chart based on the minimum rate when determining the discount at which to sell the installment contract to the finance company. Some dealers vending automobiles claim that they are specially motivated to insert such "packs" in order to recoup overallowances, forced by keen competition for sales under pressure from manufacturers, on used cars taken in trade. A 12-month new-car transaction was found with a finance charge of 28.25 percent, equivalent to interest at 4.05 percent per month, or 61.03 percent per annum; the insurance was not placed through the finance company. A 12-month used-car transaction was found with a finance charge of 52.87 percent, equivalent to interest at 7.27 percent per month, or 132.15 percent per annum; with an unpaid cash purchase price of only $91.84, the vending dealer added not only the customary flat charge of $7.50 but also a "pack" of $36.55. Such "packs" would largely be prevented if automobile purchasers were so instructed that they could compute the finance charges themselves. The transactions just given were not made by manufacturer-preferred or manufacturer-controlled finance companies.

Commissions consisting of large percentages of the retail premiums for insurance on motor vehicles, sometimes more than 50 percent, are an important source of profit to most of the finance companies—so much so that one finance company stated that the profit, in the financing business, is in the insurance. The system offers opportunity for providing the automobile purchasers with less protection than that for which they are charged; and at least one finance company, among the 30 examined, does this systematically.

Manufacturers' measures in favor of Commercial Credit Co., Commercial Investment Trust Corporation and its controlled Universal Credit Corporation, and the factory-controlled General Motors Acceptance Corporation gave these finance companies such effective advantage over their competitors that they have attained about 78 percent of the business of financing motor-vehicle distribution as compared with about 18 percent done by several hundred independent finance companies and 4 percent done by commercial and small loan banks.

MOTOR VEHICLE MANUFACTURERS' ASSOCIATIONS

The Commission's examination of the records and files of the associations of motor-vehicle manufacturers did not disclose price agreements, or other cooperative activities, that appear to be contrary to the antitrust acts. The apparent absence of price agreements among motor-vehicle manufacturers, particularly passenger-car makers, is partly because their products are commodities so individual in character that they are not easily adapted to price fixing by the ordinary methods; and partly because of the lack of sufficient unity among manufacturers. The reaction of the rest of the industry to the attitude of the Ford Motor Co. was aptly described by R. M. Grant, of the General Motors Corporation, who, as the sales managers' committee of the Manufacturers' Association meeting of December 9, 1932, stated:

"Mr. Ford, who won't play, is pretty much the price-setter in this industry. I'll bet if Mr. Ford's cars were $50 higher ours would be $50 higher."

The Association of Licensed Automobile Manufacturers, one of the predecessor associations, for a time continued in virtual control of the automobile industry and its articles of agreement provided that no licenses should be granted by the Electric Vehicle Co., which had an exclusive license from the patentee, G. B. Selden, without the unanimous consent in writing of the executive committee of the association. The apparent domination of the automobile industry by this association was ended in January 1911 by a United States circuit court of appeals decision in favor of the Ford Motor Co.

The National Automobile Chamber of Commerce, Inc., now the Automobile Manufacturers Association, Inc., comprising most of the important automobile manufacturers, excepting the Ford Motor Co., established a common use of patents in 1915, which made it possible for each member of the cross-licensing agreement to go ahead with the use of any of these patents covering the design and construction of motor vehicles as he deemed most acceptable to the public, without having to worry about patent infringements and infringement suits. It appears, however, that this benefit may have been largely due to the avoidance of controversies pertaining to patents, as the Ford Motor Co., a nonmember, continued the development of its product and today is one of the three leading automobile manufacturers.

It appears that the present agreement pertaining to the common use of patents by most of the members of the Automobile Manufacturers Association, Inc., is an instrument of lessened value when compared with the original agreement. The present agreement, which was executed in 1935, includes only patents acquired prior to January 1, 1930, and also exempts patents held by certain divisions or corporations controlled by parties to the agreement, and as time goes on the number of patents included in the agreement will become fewer and fewer until ultimately there will be no patents included under the cross-licensing agreement.

It appears that the association, through its legislative department, has at times been overenthusiastic in its effort to defeat certain State legislation. A case is cited where the chairman and secretary of that department urged the veto of a measure which had been passed by both branches of a State legislature. In other cases, the association conducted its activities through member manufacturers who were requested to ask their dealers to present certain views to their State legislators. This practice of working through dealers does not appear commendable, as it leaves the impression that the dealers may have been coerced, through fear of manufacturer reprisals, into taking a stand otherwise contrary to their best interests.

The association has been active in furthering highway safety through plans for the disposal of obsolete automobiles which were considered dangerous on the highways. Under some plans, the manufacturers allowed dealers a bonus to apply on their allowances for junked automobiles.

AUTOMOBILE DEALERS' TRADE ASSOCIATION ACTIVITIES

The survey made of the activities of a limited number of State and local dealer associations indicate that although dealers' associations have not been able to accomplish all of their objects respecting improvement in dealer profits and operating conditions; they have, however, accomplished a number of things desired by

their members, especially through legislative activities. The Wisconsin and Iowa associations, for example, have been successful in obtaining the enactment of legislation which they desired. Similar associations in many other States have actively sponsored laws to regulate trade in used cars, especially by limiting the importation of used cars and taxicabs. Also, State associations have sponsored the formation and activities of local dealer associations with varying degrees of success.

Various State associations are affiliated nationally to form the National Automobile Dealers Association which conducts on a national scale various legislative and other activities intended to benefit the interests of dealers. At most, however, the National Automobile Dealers Association represents directly only about 10 to 15 percent of the 40,000 or more automobile dealers of the country. Possibly this is due, in part at least, to the fact that in the past some manufacturers have objected to their dealers becoming members of State and local associations.

In further explanation of this apparent lack of interest of dealers in the national association, a number of dealers have pointed out that many of the key positions among the executive officers and directors of both State and local associations have been occupied by wholesale distributors and manufacturer-controlled dealers. It is further alleged that the interests of such dealers parallel those of the manufacturers with whom they are affiliated, rather than those of the large majority of independent dealers who are not so affiliated. Dealers dissatisfied with the past conduct of the national association claim that the influence of manufacturers, exerted through such key-position dealers, prevented it from really representing the interests of dealers.

BASIS OF MANUFACTURER-DEALER RELATIONS

The larger automobile manufacturers, especially, exerecise extensive supervision over many of their dealers. This statement applies to conditions at the present time as well as in the past, although during 1938 the methods of supervision employed were less direct than in former years. Many instances which were disclosed by the Commission's inquiry confirm complaints of the types made to the Congress at the time the inquiry was under consideration. Under threat or fear of cancelation, some dealers have reported they felt compelled to operate their businesses in such a manner that their profits were wiped out and even their investments were largely dissipated.

This investigation disclosed some cases in which the dealer, upon cancelation of his contract, not only had nothing in prospect but also was burdened with a substantial investment in buildings, leaseholds, equipment, stocks of used cars, accessories, and parts in the liquidation of which he often sustained a heavy loss. Some dealers reported that in fear of cancelation or refusal to renew contracts, faced with such injurious consequences, have, against their best business judgment, accepted terms and adopted policies dictated by the manufacturer.

Many of the dealers have complained of the following provisions in manufacture-dealer agreements:

(1) That the dealer shall make a capital investment that is satisfactory to the manufacturer; that no capital withdrawals may be made without the consent of the manufacturer and that, if the manufacturer so indicates, the dealer must leave in the business such part of the profits thereof as may be necessary to increase the investment to a point satisfactory to the manufacturer.

(2) That the dealer shall at all times maintain salesrooms, service facilities, and signs satisfactory to the manufacturer.

(3) That the dealer shall develop his sales territory to the satisfaction of the manufacturer, including the maintenance of sales and service personnel approved by the manufacturer.

(4) That the dealer shall comply with all of the manufacturer's policies, whether set out in the agreement, or in addenda thereto, or communicated by letters, or even by oral statements of his field agents who make most of the contacts with the dealers.

(5) That in carrying out these policies, the dealer places orders that are binding upon him, but are not binding upon the manufacturer until accepted.

(6) That the manufacturer disclaims all financial responsibility for the dealer's commitments, even though they may have been made at the instance of the manufacturer's field men, who, by the terms of the agreement, cannot bind the manufacturer in any way by statements, promises, or understandings that are not reduced to writing, signed by designated officials of the manufacturing company, and made a part of the dealer's written agreement.

(7) That the dealer must either sell exclusively the line of the manufacturer signing the agreement, or that another, or competing, line may not be handled by the dealer without the consent of the said manufacturer.

(8) That an agreement may be canceled by the manufacturer upon short notice, compared with the dealer's ability to readjust his investment and financial obligations.

Notwithstanding the fact that the dealer agreements, particularly of the three large manufacturers, have been revised since the commencement of this investigation, not all of the bases for dealer complaint have been eliminated.

The manufacturing companies give wide authority to their field representatives, and their general officers may not always be fully aware of the frequency and extent of dealer complaints or the bases therefor. Provision, however, has been made by one of the large companies for appeals to a board, composed of higher company officials.

Some of the smaller manufacturers have recently featured claims of friendliness and fairness as characterizing their attitude toward their dealers and have cited changes in their 1939 contracts as indicating a better deal for dealers under which dealers of independence are given an opportunity to successfully build their businesses on a permanent basis without intrusive factory interference.

PRESSURE ON DEALERS TO TAKE CARS, PARTS, ACCESSORIES, TOOLS, AND EQUIPMENT

This inquiry developed the fact that there has been pressure, especially by the largest three manufacturers, on many dealers, to take and sell new cars. Some manufacturers have canceled the contracts of dealers who do not attain desired volume of sales. This pressure has been less severe since this inquiry was ordered.

Demand for increased volume originates with the manufacturer and apparently increases with successive steps from the manufacturer through the manufacturer's branch and zone selling organizations to the dealer. A practice of manufacturers is to establish sales estimates and, on the basis of these estimates, to assign to their branches or zones more or less definite sales quotas. The branch or zone managements break down these quotas among distributors or dealers, thus assigning these distributors or dealers their quotas. In order to attain the quota assigned them the branch managers exert pressure on their field representatives who in turn press the dealers to take sufficient cars to sell the quotas assigned them or at least to maintain the manufacturer's percentage of new car registrations in that market.

Cases were reported in which dealers were influenced to take such large numbers of cars near the end of the model year that the losses sustained entirely offset the dealers' profits during the following year and in some instances led to the financial failure of dealers. This year-end pressure in general has not been as severe in recent years, and was rarely reported at the end of the 1938 model year.

Conditions similar to those described in connection with forcing dealers to order cars also were found to exist in varying degrees in respect to inducing dealers to purchase unwanted parts, accessories, tools, and equipment. This complaint of dealers, especially with respect to parts and accessories, is closely related to the manufacturers' service policy under which dealers are required to handle and use only "authorized" repair parts and accessories in order to assure satisfactory service as a means of protecting the interest of the car user and manufacturer. Enforcement of this policy may require the dealer to use exclusively authorized repair parts and accessories of the car manufacturer on which the dealer makes a smaller profit than would be made if parts and accessories were purchased from other sources. In addition, some manufacturers have objected to the practice of some dealers of charging prices for accessories that are higher than the manufacturers' suggested resale prices when such accessories are sold with new cars, because the prices charged are regarded as such as to interfere with the sale of the new cars.

MANUFACTURERS' USED-CAR POLICIES AND PRACTICES

For many years there has been a steady increase in the number of new-car buyers who offer used cars for trade as part payment in the purchase of new cars. The records of manufacturers show that in their desire to have their dealers sell the maximum number of new cars, consideration has been given to used-car merchandising as a competitive factor affecting both the number of new cars sold and the profits of retailers who sell them. Manufacturers, especially the larger ones who are the leaders in industry, have had various policies at different times respecting the handling of used cars by their dealers.

Prior to 1925, Ford Motor Co., recognized that the amount of allowances made by dealers on used cars taken in trade could be made the means of indirectly cutting the suggested prices of new cars which Ford Motor Co. wished dealers to maintain, and that competitive overallowances for used cars reduced dealer margins and profits through losses in subsequent merchandising of used cars. Ford Motor Co., therefore, took the position that its dealers should buy and sell used cars on a basis yielding a merchandising profit, or at least no loss, and enforced this policy by canceling as price cutters, dealers who made overallowances on used cars. Later, this position was abandoned in favor of one under which the dealer should so conduct his used-car business as to result in a maximum of new-car sales. Recognition was given to the fact that to do this dealers must often overallow on trade-ins in order to make sales, and the percentage of dealer margin on new-car sales was increased from 17½ to 22 percent in 1930, and later to 25 percent in order to provide larger gross profit on new cars to enable dealers to make larger allowances for trade-ins without suffering loss on the total business done in both new and used cars.

General Motors, on the other hand, as early as 1925, took the position that its dealers should not get business by consistent overbidding for used cars but that in certain instances it might be better to handle used cars taken in trade at little or no profit, or even at a small loss, rather than to lose new-car sales. Somewhat later in the year 1925, the minutes of the general sales committee of General Motors Corporation indicate that it was the concensus of opinion of members of the committee that no definite policy should be adopted respecting encouragement of dealers to make more liberal allowances for used cars taken in trade. It also was concluded that sufficient funds should be provided by the dealer to carry the requisite number of used cars, as well as new cars, over the winter months.

In 1930 General Motors also gave attention to what might be done to reduce dealer mortality due to used-car trading without

decreasing the volume of sales of used and new cars. As the result of this study, the chairman of the general sales committee of General Motors Corporation stated that, in his opinion, it was necessary for each selling division of the corporation to take a positive stand on the subject of used-car trading and, at the same time, to initiate a strong new-car sales promotional effort to offset any tendency of this policy to decrease new-car volume. Used-car policies of other manufacturers have developed along similar lines.

Another method of assisting dealers was through junking plans pursued partly as a matter of safety on the highways and partly as a means of removing from the market the maximum number of used cars as they approached the end of their utility as safe and economical transportation. Extensive accounting and statistical studies also have been made the basis for formulating used-car merchandising plans to be followed by their dealers.

Some of the manufacturers' plans for the merchandising of used cars by their dealers, when considered in connection with pressure claimed to have been exerted to bring about the sale of the maximum number of new cars, have been the subject of dealer complaint to the effect that they were not permitted by their manufacturers to conduct their businesses in accordance with their own best judgment.

EXCLUSIVE HANDLING OF ONE MANUFACTURER'S LINE

For years it has been the general policy of each motor vehicle manufacturing company to limit its dealers to the exclusive handling of its line of cars. This, in general, is true of both large and small manufacturers. Various conditions, however, may make it inadvisable to follow this practice strictly in every instance because the volume of business for a single line may be insufficient to support a dealership. This situation was met during the depression by the establishment of a considerable number of dual dealerships handling the productions of more than one manufacturer. With the return of more normal times there has been a marked decrease in the number of such dual dealerships. This is true of both dealerships handling more than one line made by a particular manufacturer and of dealerships handling more than one line made by different manufacturers.

In setting up multiple-line dealers, the large manufacturers such as General Motors, Chrysler, and Ford, that manufacture several different lines covering a wide price range, have a distinct advantage over their smaller competitors in that they can set up multiple-line dealerships handling only their own lines.

Facts developed in this inquiry indicate that Chrysler Corporation, Ford Motor Co., and General Motors Corporation are the most emphatic in their demands that their dealers shall handle no other manufacturer's line. Some dealers have been canceled by these concerns because they either took on additional makes of cars or refused to discontinue other makes already handled.

Also, General Motors Corporation has advocated the placing of their lines with dealers already handling other manufacturers' lines with the express purpose of eventually eliminating the competing lines. If the dealerships required the handling of more than a single line to operate profitably, the General Motors policy was to replace the line eliminated with a second line of its own. It appears that Chrysler Corporation has pursued a somewhat similar policy in forcing out other manufacturers' lines.

MANUFACTURERS' POLICIES AND PRACTICES RESPECTING DEALER ACCOUNTING

Among the principal interests of the manufacturers in accounting systems of dealers is the question of adequacy of these systems in furnishing the manufacturer with uniform information concerning the details of the dealer's business. This is evidenced by the fact that while some of the manufacturers exert pressure to some extent upon dealers to adopt their prescribed accounting systems, the principal insistence of the manufacturer is that, whatever system is used, it must be capable or supplying the information required by the manufacturer.

The information obtained in audits and in reports required of dealers has been reported to have been used sometimes by some of the leading manufacturers as the basis for pressure on their dealers to increase investments, facilities, and personnel, and otherwise to carry out merchandising plans and policies intended to increase volume of sales of new cars and accessories.

TRANSPORTATION CHARGES IN EXCESS OF AMOUNTS ACTUALLY PAID

Some manufacturers often bill their dealers for transportation in amounts in excess of the actual cost of delivering automobiles to the dealers. It appears that the greatest number of dealer complaints concerning excess freight charges pertain to the manufacturers' practice of shipping automobiles to dealers from nearby assembly plants and requiring the dealers to pay for transportation in an amount equivalent to or even greater than the rail freight rates from the factory to the dealers' delivery points.

The 1938 dealer agreement of the Chevrolet Motor Division of General Motors Corporation provides in part that the manufacturer has the right to ship by whatever mode of transportation and from whatever point he may select, and that the dealer agrees to pay a transportation charge to be determined by the manufacturer based on the all-rail freight charge from Flint, Mich., to the dealer's delivery point. Other General Motors divisions have similar provisions in their dealer agreements. The Ford Motor Co's transportation charges are based on the carload rate from Detroit, Mich., to destination. Both the General Motors Corporation and the Ford Motor Co. have assembly plants in various parts of the country.

Transportation charges in excess of the actual amount paid apparently are not confined to deliveries from assembly plants.

Some dealers regard excess transportation charges as a manufacturer's "pack" and, as the dealers generally pass them on to the consumers, it appears that these excess charges operate especially to the disadvantage of those consumers who reside at points most distant from the factories.

SALES OF DRIVEN CARS AS NEW CARS

The inquiry developed that some manufacturers allowed dealers to take cars from the factory or assembly plants and drive them to distant places for sale to users as new cars. These cars were reported to have been driven with speedometers disconnected, frequently at high rates of speed and even pulling a second "new" car. It was contended by some manufacturers that the regularly constructed passenger cars were not built with sufficient power and strength to pull another car and that if this was done an injurious strain was thereby placed on the towing "new" car. It was further contended that the towed car was not guided, but instead skidded around turns and corners and that this was injurious to the tires and chassis of the towed "new" car.

In numerous instances it was developed that new cars that had been used by dealers as demonstrators or by manufacturer or dealer officials, sometimes driven distances up to 4,000 miles or for a period not exceeding 3 months, were then sold to users as new cars.

Conclusions

The main features of this report that directly affect the conclusions and recommendations that may be of public interest concern three branches of economic activity and their relations to each other, namely, the motor-vehicle manufacturers, the motor-vehicle dealers, and the companies financing the purchase of motor vehicles on installment payments. The conclusions to be considered in this connection relate especially to the competitive conditions and the extent of, or trends toward, concentration, and any abuses prevailing in these fields in the nature of unfair methods of competition or unfair or deceptive acts or practices.

CONCENTRATION IN THE MOTOR-VEHICLE INDUSTRY

The Commission finds that a high degree of concentration prevails in the motor-vehicle industry, there being in 1938 only 11 companies (or company groups) producing passenger cars regularly, and 3 of them had no less than 89 percent of the total unit sales of passenger cars; that among these 3 leading motor-vehicle manufacturers there prevails, apparently, a condition of active competition.

The Commission finds that in the early stages of the industry, when there were many small motor-vehicle manufacturers, the General Motors Corporation had an advantage resulting from the acquisition and combination of several of the leading companies making distinct lines of motor vehicles, some of which included two or more types of cars of different price classes; and that the company now known as the Chrysler Corporation to a less extent obtained a similar advantage through the purchase of the Dodge line, but it was also greatly aided by its development of the Chrysler and Plymouth cars.

On the other hand, the Ford Motor Co. development was characterized substantially by a concentration of its efforts on developing a single line of very low-priced motor vehicles, which for a time put it in the forefront of the industry in unit production.

COMPETITION IN PRODUCTION AND PRICES

There is strong competition for business in the automobile industry both among manufacturers and retail dealers. Price competition in motor vehicles, however, is naturally different from that in commodities that are of the same, or standardized, description and quality for producers generally. The constant effort of a motor-vehicle manufacturer is to emphasize the superiority of his car and the special features it has as a justification for this claim. The retail prices of motor vehicles are widely advertised by the manufacturers, and the dealers are expected generally to conform to them, except in connection with allowances for "trade-ins." In some instances, however, where a low-priced car, for example, of one manufacturer has been reduced, a competing manufacturer has made a corresponding reduction for his car in the same price class; price reductions on current models are sometimes made also for the higher-priced cars just before the annual change to new models.

Competition of manufacturers with respect to passenger cars in the low-price class is more in volume than in prices, though prices are potentially important.

With reference to any question of price fixing in other price classes, the nature of the demand is such, and consumer preference such a vital element of demand, that it would be difficult not only to fix prices but also to establish any quota system of production, even if the retail dealers could be brought into effective cooperation for that purpose.

Policies with respect to exclusive handling of the product of a particular manufacturer by a dealer having a dealership agreement with him tend to restrict competition by making it more difficult for the smaller manufacturers to obtain adequate dealer representation, because in many markets they are unable to establish exclusive dealerships with sufficient volume to operate profitably. Such restriction of competition perpetuates the high degree of concentration already existing in the hands of the three large manufacturers.

Active competition among automobile manufacturers, although some of them have made very large profits, gave to the public improved products, often at substantially reduced prices. In the automobile industry this has been especially true of those manufacturers who are able to obtain large volume of production through competitive improvement in motor-vehicle construction, style, performance, and safety, particularly in the low-priced class. Such competition has been the basis for the remarkable growth of the industry.

Consumer benefits from competition in the automobile-manufacturing industry have probably been more substantial than in any other large industry studied by the Commission.

COMPETITION AMONG MOTOR-VEHICLE DEALERS

The Commission finds that the retail motor-vehicle trade is competitive in the sense that the individual dealer generally pushes actively the sale of the particular make of motor vehicles which he is under contract to sell, and that the prices thereof, as advertised by the motor-vehicle manufacturer, though quite generally adhered to in appearance, are frequently cut by allowances for "used cars" quite generally "traded in" as part payment for new cars. These allowances are sometimes excessive in the sense that, when reconditioned and sold, the prices obtained for them are substantially below such allowances. In a number of instances the Commission found evidence of local combinations among motor-vehicle dealers to prevent competition regarding such allowances made on used cars "traded in."

"PADDING" NEW- AND USED-CAR PRICES

It is also concluded from the study that the practices of dealers of "padding" new-car prices and "packing" finance charges falls most heavily on the minority of automobile buyers who have no used cars to trade. The majority of car buyers who have cars to trade also suffer in case the amount of consumer price enhancement is greater than the overallowance made by dealers.

DEALER PRICE-FIXING ACTIVITIES

The Commission finds that local associations of motor-vehicle dealers in various parts of the country have engaged in the following practices to fix or maintain prices: (1) Fixing minimum prices on new cars, often by means of uniform maximum discounts from the manufacturer resale prices in transactions where no trade-ins are involved; (2) establishing maximum purchase prices or allowances for used cars taken in trade; (3) regulating bidding on used cars taken in trade by means of uniform minimum increases on all bids subsequent to the original bid, or by requiring all bids subsequent to the original bids to be less than the original bid; and (4) adopting published used-car price guides as a basis for maximum allowances for used cars.

The Commission found that in certain instances and in varying degrees General Motors Corporation and Ford Motor Co., or representatives of these companies, cooperated with dealers in the formulation or operation of dealer plans to fix retail prices and limit dealer competition. Ford Motor Co., however, in its 1939 dealer agreements requires its dealers "to avoid in every way such trade practices in connection with dealer's competition with other Ford dealers and in selling company products to the public as are injurious to company's good name and good will or are detrimental to public interest."

LEGAL ASPECTS OF USED-CAR VALUATION OR APPRAISAL BUREAUS

The Commission found that many local associations operate used-car valuation or appraisal bureaus that are essentially combinations of dealers in particular localities who are bound by agreements to restrict competition in used-car trading. A plan in effect in a large city in 1938 entirely eliminated competitive bidding if the prospective buyer obtained his first bid on his used car from the dealer in whose zone, or trading area, he resided.

The question as to whether Federal jurisdiction exists respecting such local association activities depends upon whether interstate commerce is involved. In complaints before the Commission in which cooperation with local combinations of dealers to control used-car trade-in allowances was a factor, upon investigation it was found that interstate commerce was not involved to a sufficiently substantial extent to establish jurisdictional requisites. Consequently, cases have either been closed subject to the Commission's right to reopen them, or dismissed without prejudice. In general, therefore, the regulation of the activities of such local combinations of dealers becomes a matter to be handled by the law-enforcement agencies of the various States, acting under their respective State laws, the terms of which vary greatly among the approximately 40 States that have enacted State antitrust acts.

UNFAIR METHODS OF MOTOR-VEHICLE MANUFACTURERS IN THEIR RELATIONS WITH THEIR DEALERS

The Commission finds that motor-vehicle manufacturers, and, by reason of their great power especially General Motors Corporation, Chrysler Corporation, and Ford Motor Co., have been and still are imposing on their respective dealers unfair and inequitable conditions of trade by requiring such dealers to accept and operate under agreements that inadequately define the rights and obligations of the parties, and are, moreover, objectionable in respect to defect of mutuality; that some dealers, in fact, report that they have been subjected to rigid inspections of premises and accounts, and to arbitrary requirements by their respective motor-vehicle manufacturers to accept for resale quantities of motor vehicles or other goods deemed excessive by the dealer, or to make investments in operating plants or equipment without adequate guaranty as to term of agreement or even supply of merchandise; and that adequate provisions are not included for an equitable method of liquidation of such investments, sometimes made at the insistence of the respective motor-vehicle manufacturer.

MANUFACTURERS' TREATMENT OF DEALERS

In the opinion of the Commission, this inquiry has demonstrated that inequities exist in the terms of dealer agreements, and in certain manufacturers' treatment of some dealers, calling for remedial action.

It is recommended that present unfair practices be abated to the end that dealers have: (a) Less restriction upon the management of their own enterprises; (b) quota requirements and shipments of cars based upon mutual agreement; (c) equitable liquidation in the event of contract termination by the manufacturer; (d) contracts definite as to the mutual rights and obligations of the manufacturers and the dealers, including specific provision that the contract will be continued for a definite term unless terminated by breach of reasonable conditions recited therein.

ABUSES OF INSTALLMENT FINANCING

The Commission finds that in the methods employed by some of the companies engaged in financing the purchaser of a new motor vehicle serious abuses have developed not only in permitting dealers to impose exorbitant charges but also in serious deception, or even direct defraudation, of the purchaser.

In the more general practice by the larger companies, the principal objection was that in the original advertising of the so-called 6-percent plan it was not made clear that the finance-charge rates were not interest rates and that the interest rates implied in the charges were nearly twice as much as 6 percent per annum on the money borrowed. However, the application of this plan constituted a substantial reduction from the rates of finance charge and interest that were in general use just previously.

The more serious deceptions have been engaged in generally by the dealer, often in connivance with a finance company. The practices here referred to relate to the so-called "packs" (padding), which are additions made, for no extra service, by the dealer to the regular finance charges provided in the finance company's minimum rate chart; and certain finance companies provided their dealers with the instrumentalities for such deceptions by furnishing them with two or more rate charts based on different rates of charge.

The Commission found, among the 30 finance companies examined, 1 finance company that systematically failed to afford car purchasers a portion of the insurance protection for which they were charged.

ITEMIZED INVOICE NEEDED FOR CONSUMER PROTECTION

In order that the automobile purchaser may be protected against overcharges, there is need of regulation requiring retail automobile dealers to furnish each retail purchaser with an itemized invoice showing in detail the components of the cash-sale price—stating separately the charges for accessories, Federal excise tax, State or local sales tax, transportation, advertising, "handling charges," service, motor-vehicle license, motor-vehicle title registration, and each other charge included in the cash-sale price of the vehicle as delivered—and the components of charges added to the cash-sale price by reason of the fact that the vehicle is sold on time—the amount and components of the retail insurance premium and the extent of the coverage to be provided for each component, the amounts respectively charged for recording fee, notary fee, and documentary stamp tax, and the amount of the finance charge.

DECEPTION IN CHARGES FOR TRANSPORTATION OF MOTOR VEHICLES

The frequent practice of either motor-vehicle manufacturers or dealers of adding to the factory price a transportation charge to a certain point of delivery based on the published railroad rate, but which is greater than that actually incurred by the manufacturer or dealer because of differing methods of transportation and delivery, is, in the opinion of the Commission, an unjustifiable imposition upon the purchasers of such vehicles, which should be eliminated.

SALE OF DRIVEN CARS AS NEW CARS

The practice of some retail dealers in selling as new cars those which have been towed or driven from the factory or used as demonstrators, unless the full facts, including the miles driven, are disclosed to the purchaser is deceptive and unfair and should be eliminated.

By the Commission.

R. E. FREER,
Chairman, Federal Trade Commission.

JUNE 5, 1939.

Hands Off the U. S. A.!

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN L. SWEENEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 24, 1939

ARTICLE BY J. G. JOHNSTON

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article entitled "Hands Off the U. S. A.!" by J. G. Johnston, which appears in the

October issue of Canadian Business, a trade magazine circulated in the Dominion of Canada. In view of the pending neutrality issue, I consider this article interesting and important. It should be read by every Member of Congress.

The article is as follows:

[From Canadian Business for October]

HANDS OFF THE U. S. A.!

(By J. G. Johnston)

SELF-RESTRAINT NEEDED

It is hoped that Canadians refrain from telling the United States that that country ought forthwith to declare war on Germany. If the United States ever does join in what we Canadians believe is a fight for the liberties which the United States enjoys and must preserve, it will not be because Canadians have told them what to do. They will join of their own accord, if they join at all. Intimations that they are derelict in their duty are more likely to restrain the United States than to urge them forward.

SHELLS FOR ISOLATIONISTS

A most important thing is that Canada continue to have the friendship and understanding of the people of the United States. The tendency of a section of the press to take sides against the isolationists did not help those who were anxious, as a first step against Hitlerism, to enable Britain and France and Canada to buy munitions produced in the United States. On the contrary, Senator BORAH could have cited Canadian criticism of him as an evidence that the Allied cause desperately needed what he opposed.

UNCLE SAM'S OWN REASONS

After all, we Canadians have no right to tell our friends what stand they should take on the war. And it is execrable taste. One does not tell a neighbor how to conduct himself. One may hope that a neighbor might join in helping catch a burglar who has happened to make an entry into our house instead of his, but there is no obligation for him to do so. To excoriate him for his failure to volunteer is merely to impair a friendship. The neighbor may have a fairly good reason, from his point of view, for not helping at once.

COUSINS NOT BROTHERS

In the earlier part of the last war I wrote editorials on a pro-Ally newspaper in the United States. I saw the metamorphosis of United States opinion from a neutral, almost pro-German and almost certainly anti-British attitude, to the uprising of indignation when the *Lusitania* was sunk. I went through the "He kept us out of war" campaign of Woodrow Wilson and I was not yet in my Canadian uniform on that April morning when a state of war was declared to exist between the United States and Imperial Germany.

The excuse for the reminiscence is to give some slight authority to the thought that I may be able, as a borderer to interpret United States thought in Canada and vice versa. On both sides of the boundary we are apt to think that because we wear the same clothes, talk the same slang, and indulge in the same amusements, we are the same people. If we were the same people, it would be easier for a business in one country to be managed in the other. But under the skin we are different.

CANADA'S FAMILY TIES

I am not predicting that the isolationist sentiment will prevail, but it will be understandable if it does, and it should not impair our good relations with our friends across the border. George Washington advised his young country to stand aloof from Europe's quarrels and his words are still highly regarded by the many who do not see, as clearly as we think we see, that the world has grown so small that America today is almost as close to the continent as England was in the eighteenth century.

That is one thing. Another is that even the people of British descent in the United States have not maintained the same family and social ties with Britain that Canadians of comparable length of time on this continent have maintained with relatives and friends in Britain. To the average English-speaking person in the United States the prospect that English homes and English children may be bombed and gassed from the air is horrible and criminal but hardly more personal than the bombing of Warsaw. We must remember that citizens of the United States may be Anglo-Saxon in mentality but that for more than 150 years they have consciously been creating a tradition which is non-British.

"PEACE" WILL COMES FIRST

The views of many sincere isolationists certainly are not today pro-German or Fascist. They are not anti-British views, for the professional Irishman has shot his bolt and is discounted where not discredited. The average citizen is likely to support the Borah view—if he does support that view—for reasons similar to the apparent reasons that gave Mr. Chamberlain the hope that he came back from Munich with a permanent peace. In my view, we cannot blame the United States if it stays out of the war and if it succumbs to the Borah view that the neutrality law, as it has stood for the last 2 or 3 years, is one way of guaranteeing peace in our time in their own country.

In any event, the less we Canadians have to say as to what we might think is their duty the better for all concerned.

Controlling War Profits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 25 (legislative day of Wednesday, October 4), 1939

ADDRESS BY HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, OF WYOMING

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, this afternoon I had the privilege of participating in a forum conducted by the New York Herald Tribune. The subject of the discussion was Controlling War Profits. I ask unanimous consent that the address may be incorporated in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

If we are to deal with realities this afternoon, we shall have to begin by changing the title of this talk. Not "Controlling War Profits" but "Preventing War Losses" is our problem, for modern war holds nothing but death and disaster for everyone it touches. Belligerents and neutrals alike suffer under its blight.

One would scarcely imagine that in a generation which has not yet recovered from the effects of the World War there would be a single, intelligent person capable of believing that another great international conflict could be really profitable to anyone, yet the sudden sharp rise of commodity prices in this country in the weeks immediately following the outbreak of the present European war was a demonstration that in some quarters at least the hope of great profit was entertained. The more recent cessation of these advances may be a sign of a growing comprehension of the real character of modern war, and, if so, it will be our greatest safeguard in what may easily be humanity's most critical emergency.

WAR NOW THE CLASH OF PEOPLES

Science and invention, which have transformed the whole economic scene, which have abolished time and distance, eradicated boundaries and lifted man out of narrow localities, opening whole nations and continents to the scope of his activities, have also changed war from the conflict of professional armies to the clash of whole peoples. When war was carried on with hand-made implements, its effects were as circumscribed as its campaigns, and the masses of the people, unless they found themselves in the immediate theater of conflict, were frequently undisturbed. Certainly, at all events, there were no such dislocations of the entire structure of society and commerce as those which are produced by modern war.

The machine-made weapon has succeeded the comparatively simple implements of war which were in use as late as our own Civil War. The navies of the air and the sea and of the regions under the sea, the monster guns which fortify the lines of concrete and steel that mark the Franco-German frontier, can be produced only by the concentrated activity of whole peoples. The modern nation which turns to war must be content to mobilize all its resources, both human and natural, for the sole purpose of destruction, the disastrous effects of which are felt not alone along the battle front but by every person and every nation, belligerent or neutral, which has contributed to the erection of the war machine.

It is because the people of America have comprehended the frightfulness of modern warfare that there has risen from every section of this country an unmistakable demand that we shall not become involved in the European war. It is the same comprehension, I firmly believe, that is restraining the high command on both sides in Europe from initiating a major offensive. It may be too much to hope that this restraint will continue until unforeseen developments save Europe, and we must, therefore, consider the effect upon our own economy if and when wholesale destruction is unleashed in Europe.

HAZARDS OF TRADE GREATLY INCREASED

He who looks for a profit in supplying materials to belligerent nations—and all materials are war materials in the modern world—is overlooking the facts, first, that the American people are decreeing that no credit shall be extended for the purchase of these materials; and, second, that all American ships are to be withdrawn from trade in the war zones. This means that both the expense of trading and the hazards of payment for the trade will be vastly increased. Moreover, he overlooks an elementary characteristic of all trade; namely, that in the last analysis exports can be paid for only by imports. Trade between nations, like trade between individuals, is the exchange of goods and services. Money is but a symbol, useless in itself save when it can command goods and services; but when two powerful nations clash in modern warfare they undertake to destroy their capacity to produce the

goods and services in which alone payment can be made. This is the reason why the debts of the last war have not been paid. It must be obvious, therefore, that when the property which any belligerent now owns in this country has been exhausted, the power of that country to offer anything in exchange for the supplies it needs will also have been exhausted. It is, therefore, only a limited market that the European conflict opens to American business, limited, first, by the capacity of the belligerents to pay; and second, by the will of the people of America not to permit war trade to involve us in a foreign war.

That there will be a considerable demand for exports from the United States to belligerents nations, and to other nations which were formerly supplied by the belligerents, is nevertheless to be expected. The record of the years from 1914 to 1918 will, however, be scarcely a safe criterion upon which to base expectations. Twenty-five years ago 63 percent of all our exports went to Europe. Today only slightly more than 40 percent of our foreign shipments are destined for that continent. Shipments to Asia have increased from 5 to 17 percent and Latin American shipments have grown to such an extent that they now approximate 19 percent of all our exports. It is true that shipments to the United Kingdom were about 27 percent greater in September than they were in August, but in the same period shipments to France declined by more than 45 percent.

These figures indicate an underlying trend which can only be accentuated by the considerations which I have already mentioned, namely, that the belligerent nations will have comparatively little cash and no credit with which to carry on their trade with us and that the American merchant fleets will no longer sail into European ports.

REACTION BRINGS GREAT LOSSES

Whatever may be the effect of these circumstances upon our trade with Europe, however, it will be a short-sighted policy if manufacturers and exporters yield to the temptation to allow prices to reach speculative levels. The reaction from such levels brings in its wake losses far greater than the temporary profits reaped by the short-sighted trader who chooses to ignore the characteristics of modern war. The fall of the commodity price index from 167 in May 1920, to 96 in May of the following year, a collapse which was registered in a sharp rise of the number of bank and commercial failures, tells the story of an experience which neither business nor government can afford to forget.

Factory wage payments which had risen to high levels during the war tumbled from over $12,000,000,000 in 1920 to only a little over $8,000,000,000 in 1921, and even during the good years of 1924 and 1925, defaulted bonds were telling the story of war inflation—an inflation which did not bring its full and final effects until 1929. If prices are permitted to increase at a rate out of all proportion to increased production, it will be impossible to escape such a rise in the cost of living as was experienced during the Great War; and this, in turn, would lead inevitably to irresistible demands for Government price fixing and stringent laws against profiteering.

The brief experience we have had during the past 6 weeks with price increases has resulted in an avalanche of complaints to the Federal Government. From every corner of the country—from farmers and from housewives, from public officials, from trade unions, from citizens' associations, and from businessmen—the complaints have poured into the Department of Justice of allegedly unjustifiable price increases accompanied by demands for punitive action. I am told that as many as 1,500 of these petitions have already been received, and that they are still coming in at the rate of 100 every week.

PROFITEERING MAY MEAN REGIMENTATION

This is a demand for control, and "control" is the verb which was used in the subject assigned to me today. "Control," in this sense, means Government action. It means the exercise of Government authority to restrain and direct the activity of the citizen. Such authority would involve either the enactment of a criminal statute to prohibit profiteering or the establishment of a civil tribunal to fix prices. The obvious difficulties of establishing an adequate standard by which to differentiate between reasonable and unreasonable prices only serve to emphasize the arbitrary nature of the control that would have to be assumed. This is the condition quite properly described as "regimentation"—a condition which authoritarian states have deliberately imposed upon their people as a matter of policy, and to which democratic states are compelled to turn in the emergency of war. It brings in its train effects from which it is difficult ever again to escape, as witness the fact that among the governmental relics of our participation in the World War we still have at Washington an Alien Property Custodian, a Director General of Railroads, a United States Housing Corporation, and a War Minerals Relief Authority.

Obviously, if a neutral nation like the United States is to avoid such regimentation as a necessary result of existing on the same planet on which a great war is in progress, such a nation must develop a formula for self-organization to protect and preserve its own prosperity and its own democracy. This I hold to be self-evident that a democratic nation cannot be organized upon a punitive basis. The laws of democracy must represent the will of democracy. In a country like ours, no course of action can be imposed by law which the people themselves do not naturally and voluntarily adopt.

EXPLOITATION CAN YIELD NO REAL PROFIT

To protect ourselves, therefore, from the losses of war and likewise from some form of unwelcome government control, we must learn, all of us, whether in business or in government, employer or employee, farmer or artisan, industrial executive or commercial trader, that in the modern world successful business cannot be based upon exploitation. Modern war is a conflict of peoples only because modern industry has outgrown the old local and individual bounds. Over and over again it has been stated that the economic frontiers of our generation have abolished practically all geographical frontiers. The result of this is that our economic life is a unit and that no part of the population can prosper permanently if any part of the population is depressed.

I am deeply sensible of the fact that management in modern American industry is now more keenly alive to its responsibilities to consumers, to workers, and to investors than it ever has been. There is a broader recognition now than ever before that profits are not to be made out of exorbitant prices, but out of increased production and increased distribution, a condition which cannot possibly be brought about under any system of profiteering. Enlightened self-interest, therefore, will prompt every person who has anything to do with the charges which are made for commodities at any stage between the production of the raw material and the sale of the finished article to keep those charges from rising above a justifiable level. The avoidance of exploitation of consumers through profiteering is the only sure and certain way to prevent the development of an irresistible demand for Government control. The price structure today is in private hands. It will stay there if it is not abused, for private power passes to public hands only if its exercise results in wrongs, for which the public insists upon a remedy.

DEMOCRACY AND SYSTEM OF PRIVATE PROPERTY CLOSELY ALLIED

The most important lesson for our people to take to heart in this great emergency—and this applies particularly to the leaders of business—is that the institution of private property and the political principles of democracy are so closely interrelated as to be parts of the same concept. Democracy is the principle of individual sovereignty, individual freedom. The institution of private property is based upon the right of the individual freely to labor and freely to possess the fruits of his labor.

Both democracy and the institution of private property are under attack whenever any individual, group, class, or any government undertakes a program of exploitation. It is clear, therefore, that the profiteer who, by a combination with his fellows or who by independent action of his own, attempts to take advantage of a great emergency to levy unconscionable charges upon the public is an enemy both of democracy and of the capitalistic system.

Given a clear comprehension of the realities of the economic situation on the part of all who play a controlling part in our economic life, I think it is quite possible for our Government, by gathering and coordinating available statistical information and by directing attention to the clear mandates of the antitrust law, to aid business to avoid the ills which will inevitably follow from speculative and indiscriminate price rises. Never before was there a greater need for intelligent, patient, and tolerant cooperation among all classes of our citizens to develop our own resources and to distribute them for the benefit of all. If we would indeed prevent the losses of war, we should make up our minds to put profit into peace. This would mean an end to exploitation and an end to class antagonisms and the beginning of a great democratic movement to distribute equitably among all our people the abundance which Nature provides.

When we look out upon the world and see the manner in which men organize for the tragic and destructive ends of war, surely it must compel us, who proudly call ourselves the leading democratic nation of the world, to organize for the ends of peace.

The first step in such a program will, it seems to me, be a realization that in the modern world business is carried on by huge corporate organizations before the powers of which men as individuals are lost. Too frequently it is overlooked that the powers of government here and throughout the world have expanded in direct ratio to the growth of the modern business corporation.

It is the concentration of economic power in giant corporations that has resulted during the last generation in the gradual transfer of authority from private to public hands. It is a trend that must be acknowledged to be at variance with our traditional belief that government authority over the citizen should be restricted within the narrowest possible bounds, but it is a trend that cannot be stayed so long as the power of economic organizations to dominate the economic life of the masses continues to expand.

ECONOMIC FREEDOM OUR GREATEST NEED

The present problem of price control in a world at war only emphasizes the need of new corporate standards of public authority and responsibility, to be expressed in a national corporation law, standards which shall set business free from arbitrary government control by setting the masses free from arbitrary private control. If we really believe in democracy and the preservation of the institution of private property, we shall immediately set ourselves to the task of making certain that economic democracy is regained.

Make certain of this: Political liberty cannot long endure without economic freedom, and the establishment of new standards for the preservation of economic freedom in a world which science has remade is the greatest need of our times.

Graves of United States War Dead in France

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SHERMAN MINTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 25 (legislative day of Wednesday, October 4), 1939

ARTICLE BY LORENZO MARTIN

Mr. MINTON. Mr. President, there has been a misunderstanding throughout the country about the French Government charging us rent for the graves of our soldiers buried in the soil of France. It has been stated over the radio, I think, by Father Coughlin, and in certain publications that that was true.

Representative COCHRAN, of Missouri, wrote to General Pershing, who is the Chairman of the American Battle Monuments Commission, and General Pershing has given his reply to the effect that there is no truth in this statement.

Mr. Lorenzo Martin, the Louisville Times Washington correspondent, has prepared an able and comprehensive article dealing with this subject. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GRAVES OF UNITED STATES WAR DEAD IN FRANCE EXEMPT FROM RENT

(By Lorenzo Martin)

Statements that the French Government requires payment of rental or concession fees for ground where American soldiers are buried in that country have been branded as false by Gen. John J. Pershing, who commanded the American Expeditionary Forces during the World War, and who is now Chairman of the American Battle Monuments Commission.

Investigation by The Times Washington Bureau of the origin of the recent circulation of such statements, which have caused concern to the French Embassy in Washington and aroused suspicion in some quarters of Nazi propaganda, indicates the source as a misleading press statement issued by the American Legion during its annual convention last month in Chicago. The misleading statement contained in this American Legion press release is reported later to have been reiterated in substance in a radio broadcast by Father Charles F. Coughlin.

Representative JOHN J. COCHRAN, of Missouri, brought the matter to the attention of Congress in an extension of remarks published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. "In these critical days," said Mr. COCHRAN, "when appeals are being made to arouse our citizens on the question of neutrality, many statements are made not based upon facts.

"In a recent address a very well-known clergyman, who uses the radio weekly, made the statement that France charged our Government rent for the ground where American soldiers are buried in that country. I knew the distinguished clergyman was in error, but to make sure I was correct, I wrote a letter to Gen. John J. Pershing, Chairman of the American Battle Monuments Commission."

Mr. COCHRAN then quotes the reply he received from General Pershing. It reads:

"In reply to your inquiry of October 4, I wish to state that the United States Government does not pay rent on the graves of our American dead who are buried in France. In fact, the French Government has exempted us from the payment of taxes or duties of any kind whatsoever on the land on which our cemeteries and memorials are located and on the materials which we have sent to France for these establishments."

The American Legion press statement which appears to have started the circulation of such reports as that mentioned by Representative COCHRAN called attention to the fact that the Overseas Graves Decoration Trust grew to $200,000 during 1939 and, in part, said:

"Under French law a concession fee becomes due on every grave every 15 years. When the first time limit expired following the World War it developed that the bodies of many American soldiers, sailors, and marines faced the possibility of being exhumed and burned in lime pits unless the grave concession fees were paid."

Inquiry by the Times at the War Department, before General Pershing's letter to Representative COCHRAN was made public brought the following information from the Army General Staff:

An agreement between the French and United States Governments, signed July 27, 1922, slightly more than 5 years after the United States entered the World War, made provision for donation by the French Government of grounds for establishment of American military cemeteries there for the burial of American war dead.

Article 2 of this agreement reads:

"The French Government hereby grants to the Government of the United States the free and perpetual use of the grounds so acquired."

Article 3 of the same agreement reads:

"Should the Government of the United States evacuate these cemeteries in whole or in part, the grounds thus evacuated shall be sold by the French Government and the net proceeds of such sales be paid by the French Government to the Government of the United States."

Under the terms of this agreement there are six permanent American military cemeteries in France, and under similar agreements there are two others, located, respectively, in Belgium and England.

The land on which the American military cemeteries in France are located was acquired under a special grant by which the French Government gave to the United States the right to use this land in perpetuity, without payment of taxes or duties of any kind, as a burial place exclusively for members of the armed forces of the United States who lost their lives during the World War. Interment in French civilian cemeteries, of course, is subject to general French law. Tnis provides that a permanent plot called a "concession à perpétuité" may be purchased or that a plot may be rented for a limited number of years with a right to renew.

An indication that it is in reference to American soldiers who remained in France and died after the war that the Overseas Graves Decoration Trust chiefly operates is given in a court authorization obtained by the American Legion in Indianapolis in 1937.

The complete text of the American Legion press statement concerning the Overseas Graves Decoration Trust, issued during the Chicago convention, also tends to substantiate this explanation of the matter. It points out, for example, that only 10 American World War dead were disinterred and reburied with the use of the funds of this trust during 1939.

Several years ago the American Legion, aided by the French authorities and American consular officers, made a thorough census of the graves in French civilian cemeteries of former American soldiers and a considerable number were located. The American Legion then started a project for a Legion plot in the new Neuilly Cemetery, which was chosen as it is in the immediate suburbs of Paris and a considerable number of American ex-soldiers already were buried there. It also is the place of burial for persons who die at the American Hospital of Paris, which is located in Neuilly.

Some burials have already been made, and ex-soldiers, sailors, or marines who served during the World War are eligible for burial in this plot, regardless of whether or not they held membership in the American Legion. Working in cooperation with its Paris post, the American Legion has been engaged in the concentration in its vaults in the Neuilly Cemetery of the bodies of American ex-service men buried in French civilian cemeteries, and it is in this connection that considerable expenditures from the Legion's Overseas Graves Decoration Trust have been made.

"Of the 81,067 American soldiers, sailors, and marines who gave their lives in Europe and European waters during the World War, the number who still remain 'unknown' is 4,431," says an official statement of the American Battle Monuments Commission. "This number includes 1,643 who are buried in unidentified graves in the permanent American military cemeteries in Europe; 1,537 whose grave is the sea; 1,250 whose remains have never been found, and the Unknown Soldier who is buried at the Arlington National Cemetery.

"At the time of the armistice there were approximately 2,400 places in Europe in which American dead were temporarily buried. After hostilities ceased, provision was made for the permanent burial of these bodies in accordance with the expressed wishes of the nearest relatives concerned, and the eight permanent American cemeteries in Europe were established. These cemeteries, with their 30,902 burials, now contain the graves of all members of the American forces whose bodies remain in Europe except as follows: Forty-two men whose bodies were left in their original graves outside the cemeteries at the request of relatives; 18 who are buried beneath the Lafayette Escadrille Monument at Garches, near Paris, where 21 of their former comrades of the Escadrille also are buried; those whose bodies were released to relatives for private interment, and those whose remains have not been found."

At the request of nearest of kin, approximately 46,000 of the American World War dead overseas were returned to this country for final interment.

There are now buried in permanent American military cemeteries abroad 30,902 American World War veterans, of which 368 are in the Flanders Field Cemetery in Belgium and 468 in the Brookwood Cemetery in England, while 30,066 are buried in the 6 such cemeteries in France, as follows: Fourteen thousand two hundred and forty in the Meuse-Argonne; 6,012 in the Oise-Aisne; 4,157 in the St. Mihiel; 2,288 in the Aisne-Marne; 1,833 in the Somme, and 1,541 in the Suresnes.

"The work of removing bodies to their final graves from the 2,400 American burial places which existed at the time of the armistice," says an official publication of the Battle Monuments Commission,

"began shortly thereafter and was completed in 1922. These removals were made in such a way that the relative sizes of the battlefield cemeteries now give a good idea of the comparative importance of each of the principal American operations with respect to the others."

Governor James

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 25 (legislative day of Wednesday, October 4), 1939

EDITORIAL FROM PITTSBURGH PRESS

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Pittsburgh Press (Scripps-Howard) of Sunday, October 22, 1939. I am sure the majority of my colleagues on the other side will enjoy reading this editorial when they notice the title: "James Runs for President at Public Expense."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Pittsburgh Press of October 22, 1939]

JAMES RUNS FOR PRESIDENT AT PUBLIC EXPENSE

The advertisements which the James administration is running in national periodicals, at a cost of nearly $11,000 per month to the taxpayers, border on outright dishonesty.

Not only do they contain half-truths and un-truths, but the nature of them is obviously political—intended to boost the national reputation of Gov. Arthur H. James.

If you do not believe this, we ask you to turn to page 87 of the current Saturday Evening Post and see for yourself, and then to send for the booklet described in the advertisement and also to examine it.

This administration, which has so bitterly attacked the honesty of the previous Democratic regime, is using taxpayer's money in a method which we charge is immoral and unfair.

We call your attention to a story on page 1 of today's Press by Robert Taylor, our Harrisburg correspondent, which analyzes the claims made in the latest James advertising and compares them with the actual facts.

Everybody knows that Governor James is running—or thinks he is running—for the Presidency. He even has a Presidential campaign manager, Col. Carl L. Estes, a Texas newspaper owner and oil man, who moved to Harrisburg to direct his Presidential boomlet.

And now it develops that the Governor also has a Presidential publicity bureau, operating under the name of the newly created department of commerce, which has a $113,700 advertising fund for the type of material now appearing and another $227,700 for advertising designed to attract tourists. So, in addition to the copy now appearing, you may soon expect to see some tourist advertising containing the Governor's picture and telling how he has improved the beauty of Pennsylvania.

Four hundred thousand dollars was taken from the State motor funds—formerly used exclusively to build and maintain highways—to finance the new department which has been turned into a James publicity bureau.

The claims contained in the current advertisement are amazing. Among them is a contention that State pay rolls have been cut 17 percent and administrative expense has been cut 20 percent.

There's just one answer to such extravagant claims: If true, then why did the James administration reenact every one of the $163,000,000 of emergency taxation imposed by the Earle administration, and which the Governor attacked during his campaign as driving business from the State? Why, if true, is Pennsylvania now faced with a special legislative session to raise through new taxation an additional $150,000,000 in relief funds not provided for at the regular session?

The advertisement declares that 175,000 persons were taken off relief rolls from January 7 to June 3—but the records of the department of public assistance shows 704,999 on State relief January 7 and 717,835 on State relief June 3—an actual increase.

The Pennsylvania booklet recently prepared by the Department of Commerce starts off with a full-page picture and message of Governor James, and then proceeds to tell of great industrial developments during his administration, among which are construction of the Carnegie-Illinois Co.'s Irvin works and the new J. & L. strip mill and the electrification of the Pennsylvania Railroad—all of which took place under the Earle administration, but for which neither that nor any other administration was entitled to any credit.

Such things as this, we contend, are false and misleading; and the expenditure of State funds to boost the personal stock of the Governor is a gross misuse of public money.

Dedication of Calvin Coolidge Bridge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 25 (legislative day of Wednesday, October 4), 1939

ADDRESS BY HON. DAVID I. WALSH, OF MASSACHUSETTS, OCTOBER 12, 1939

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an address by my colleague the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] delivered on the occasion of the dedication of the Calvin Coolidge Bridge at Northampton, Mass., on Columbus Day, October 12, 1939.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The name of Calvin Coolidge cannot be emblazoned too often or in too many places throughout the length and breadth of this Republic. It stands for and represents all that is best in good citizenship and for all that is outstanding among the attributes that make for an honorable public official.

Particularly fitting it is that here in his home city of Northampton we should dedicate a bridge to his memory—the solid material and strength of which so well typifies the strong and incorruptible character of the man. Even more appropriate, it seems to me, is the erection of this beautiful arch across the Connecticut River. While Calvin Coolidge spent most of the years of his life as a resident, honored citizen, and faithful public official of the city of Northampton, he belonged in a very special way to New England. He typified those fine qualities that men everywhere associate with the New England stock from which he sprung—industry, thrift, caution, prudence, a profound conception of the dignity of citizenship, and a rigid compliance with the trusteeship of public office.

Most appropriately, I repeat, do we emblazon the name of Calvin Coolidge across the Connecticut River. This beautiful stream in the very heart of New England, sweeping down from the mountaintops, its waters on the way to the sea kissing the shores of four of the New England States, winding its course through rocky hills, fertile valleys, and wooded fields, reflects a real picture of New England. On its banks were unfolded the life of those sturdy pioneers of New England early days, the men and women who converted its rocky pastures into cultivated fields. Here along its banks were harnessed the rushing waters that provided the necessary power for the establishment of New England's early industries. Here in the distance from this bridge can be seen the smokestacks belching out huge clouds of smoke, indicating the presence of the many industries wherein men and women toil in the present-day struggle to earn a livelihood for themselves and their children under the mass-production methods of our day. Small villages, large cities, the homes of the poor, the mansions of the rich, the struggles of the farmer, the problems of the toiler, all the problems that represent American life are here. Calvin Coolidge embraced and knew them all in his long years of service and sacrifice for his fellowmen. This majestic river over which this bridge has been built will embrace for generations all the hopes and all the aspirations of the free people of New England, and we must seek as he did to solve them rightly in our day.

Almost the entire life of Calvin Coolidge was given to the public service. He moved in a steady course from the simplest and humblest position in the service of his fellow men to the highest in State and Nation. A public career that is a striking example of the equality of opportunity that Americans consider one of our priceless heritages under our free institutions. I like to think of Calvin Coolidge, and I am sure that people of America like to think of him not only as a great American and executive but as a man whose sterling character elevated any office which he held to exceptional heights of dignity and respect. As President he is to be particularly praised for his instincts of sound finance and economy, which marked his whole career from beginning to end and which were bred deep in his New England character. He was transparently honest, genuinely cautious, courageous, but not blatantly so; modest, laconic, the antithesis of demagoguery. All of these fine traits in the performance of his official trust won for him the respect of all who knew him.

No man of our time has made a more marked impression on his fellow men, largely due to his simple tastes, his unpretentiousness, personal modesty, and his personal probity. His name will be a gospel and inspiration to future generations. This bridge dedicated to his memory will help not only to perpetuate his memory but will be an incentive and inspiration to all who pass here to emulate his fine qualities that we have inherited from his sterling career. May the spirit of Calvin Coolidge guide and direct us to preserve his ideals, to live his fine public virtues, and to bequeath to posterity a record as glorious as his.

Subversive Activities in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSH LEE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 25 (legislative day of Wednesday, October 4), 1939

STATEMENT BY REV. REMBERT GILMAN SMITH

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I think the Dies committee of the House is doing a good job. I am for it. I am glad they are turning the light on subversive activities in this country. They have my full support in that effort. I hope they will continue to tear the mask from all the Communists and Fascist organizations in this country. Furthermore, I hope they can bring to light and have discharged such Government employees, if any, who support un-American activities.

In that connection, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement from the Reverend Rembert Gilman Smith, representing the Oklahoma League Against Communism, Nazi-ism, and Fascism.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPEAL THE EMBARGO!

(By Rev. Rembert Gilman Smith, Tulsa, Okla.)

The Congress should at once repeal the embargo against the sale of war materials to warring nations of the earth, and we should sell all we can make to nations that have the money with which to buy them and ships in which to carry them from our ports.

To do this would not be a violation of neutrality as a principle, to which our Government is now committed. Though the repeal of the embargo would likely help Great Britain and France, such repeal would not be a violation of the neutrality of our Government, which cannot justly be blamed for the naval inferiority of Germany and Russia, and their greater distance from our ports. It is neutral to sell to none, and equally so to sell to all.

The manufacture and sale of war materials would improve our financial condition. Millions now idle would be put to work, and dividends would increase. We have done all in our power to prevent the outbreak of war, but in vain. It is likely that the European war will last for years, and our business may well adjust itself to this reality.

The repeal of the embargo may be of decided aid to Great Britain and France. Their ability to get war materials in this country might even be the factor which would make their victory possible. Our Government is neutral, but our citizens are not, and, as President Roosevelt (with more wisdom than President Wilson showed in 1914, when he asked for neutrality in thought) admitted that such neutrality is impossible. There are citizens who wish the victory of Germany and of Russia, but they are very few in number. Most of our people are in favor of Great Britain and France.

The success in arms of Great Britain and of France would safeguard our peace, but that of Germany and Russia would endanger it. Nazi-ism and communism are avowed and active enemies of our traditional political doctrine. By propaganda and by organization, planted within our country, they have been and are seeking to sabotage and to destroy our freedom. In this diabolical work they have secured the aid of certain deluded or corrupted citizens, some in places of prominence in church, state, education, and business. They are the descendants of Simple Simon or of Benedict Arnold. It is high time to purge the influence of these traitors to American representative democracy. Those who were born in Germany, or in Russia, ought to go back, carrying with them every acquired American comrade. Russia and Germany have not declared war on the United States pro forma, but communism and nazi-ism are waging a shrewd and sinister war on our principles and institutions.

European dictators not only strive to destroy representative democracy, they lust with insatiable appetites over our vast wealth. Hitler stole $400,000,000 from the Jews, and $58,000,000 out of the banks of Prague; Stalin plans and plots to take property away from persons and corporations that now own it in all capitalistic nations, and to put it in the possession of a small number of commissars who will rule with ruthless cruelty. No other nation equals Russia in the matter of the highly concentrated control of wealth. They mockingly call this communism, and some fools even call it democracy.

Servants of Hitler and Stalin are working with shrewdness and zeal in the United States. They are supposed to be deadly enemies, but they will likely become allies here, at the psychological moment, as in Europe.

The embargo should be repealed so that Great Britain and France can get war materials here. In contrast with Russia and Germany, they are not invading this country with propaganda and spies; they are not disturbing and destroying the loyalty of our weak-minded or money-loving citizens. There are no organizations which display at the same time the Stars and Stripes and the flags of Great Britain and France; there are organizations which float the swastika and the hammer and sickle above the Stars and Stripes.

If Great Britain and France win the war, our peace and safety will be confirmed; if Germany and Russia win it, our peace will crash. The opinion that our first line of defense is not in France is correct whether or not we send a single soldier to Europe. Communism and nazi-ism have programs for the penetration of the United States by propaganda, by spies, and by organization, and they are being carried out. These programs would be continued if Stalin and Hitler were to die today. The bibles of these two systems are the Communist Manifesto of Marx and Engels, German Socialists, and Mein Kampf, by the furious Fuehrer himself.

Hitler and Stalin are endangering civilization as it has not been endangered since Charles Martel won the Battle of Tours. They have won at Warsaw; if they win at the Maginot line, in the North Sea, at Paris, and at London, a new dark age will begin.

We should immediately proceed to the large-scale production of war materials, selling all we can spare to other nations. By doing so, we will be getting ready for war, if it comes, and it likely will. The war spirit inflames the nations, the weapons of war are multiplied with the setting of the sun. Our vast actual and potential wealth is coveted by other nations; we hold a political doctrine which the dictators detest and are determined to destroy.

Our Army and Navy should be increased; our agricultural, mineral, and industrial resources should be converged on the making of war materials, some of which we should sell, and much of which we should save for our own use. The planet Mars is in the ascendant now. We must "sell our cloaks and buy swords."

Propaganda, Peace, Preparedness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAVID I. WALSH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 25 (legislative day of Wednesday, October 4), 1939

ADDRESS BY HON. DAVID I. WALSH, OF MASSACHUSETTS,

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I ask permission to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by me on last Labor Day at Holyoke, Mass., and also delivered over the National Broadcasting Forum, on the question of propaganda, peace, and preparedness.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

For months past I have repeatedly urged the absolute necessity for the United States to maintain a policy of complete detachment from the diplomatic intrigues and military alliances which have recently harassed practically every part of the Old World. I have alluded to our experience in the World War, wherein we sent men and treasure to the battlefields of Europe in the idealistic belief, then loudly proclaimed, that our intervention would establish a new world order based on justice and democracy. It is now obvious that instead of promoting peace the treaty written after that war laid the groundwork for constant discord and the present war. In the many years I have been a Member of the United States Senate, I have never heard a Senator or other public man defend its basic justice.

We were asked by the terms of that treaty to join in preserving, in the language of the Covenant proposed, "the territorial integrity and political independence" of virtually the entire world.

The framers of that treaty miscalculated the facts; they failed to realize the impossibility of suppressing for all time the aspirations and deep-seated instincts of intrinsically proud and ambitious peoples, however debatable their concept of justice.

Whether this analysis of the situation is all inclusive or not, it is an incontrovertible fact that our people long ago positively determined not to become embroiled in the bitter strife proceeding constantly from territorial disputes resulting from the Versailles Treaty.

As human beings and Americans, we are imbued with deepest sympathy for the masses of people now confronted by the horrors of war. We can well understand the sentiments they harbor over the terrifying prospects of the present internecine strife in Europe. How tragic and how helpless is their plight, facing with fear and

trembling, hostilities that will destroy their homes, lay waste their lands, visit innocent noncombatant populations with poverty, death, and with slaughter of their youth. The man or woman would be indeed unfeeling who is not profoundly moved by the inhuman situation in Europe.

We are prepared, I am sure, to use every means at our disposal short of involving our own Nation to bring about amicable settlements of the questions responsible for this grave situation. In fact, the country has generally approved of the overtures already made to certain foreign powers by President Roosevelt in the interest of peace and his efforts to safeguard innocent women and children.

Let me speak plainly to you, my fellow countrymen. The noninvolvement of the United States in the war now raging in Europe is almost entirely within the control of your Federal officials, the President, the State Department, and the Congress. They are the sole agencies that can involve this country in this war. We must cooperate with them wholeheartedly as long as their attitude is one of strict neutrality.

We must, however, be on guard to bring the full force of public opinion against any position of an unneutral character that the executive and legislative branches of our Government takes. I repeat, whether we shall continue to enjoy peace and keep American youths out of this slaughter depends upon the capacity of your public officials to act regardless of their sympathies. Is this impossible? Many believe we cannot avoid being drawn in, because of our strong and largely one-sided sympathies. It is expressed in the phrase "We cannot keep out."

It is difficult to be master over one's sympathies when they are intense, as they are likely to be and especially when one's sympathies are exhilarated by propaganda and stories of atrocities. When we read these stories let us remember that war is a bestial game and let us become more determined than ever to keep our sons out of war.

Our present position is obvious. It is clearly mandated by the will of practically all of our citizens.

Certain events are transpiring in our country today which render it increasingly difficult for us to retain this much desired strict neutrality. I refer to the very intensive propaganda campaigns that will be staged. This is not new for America, nor surprising. It has happened before. It occurred before the World War. It has continued in relation to the questions of the foreign debts, the World Court, and other European power-diplomacy objectives.

Between 1914 and 1917 this campaign to embroil us in war reached its zenith. Recall, for they will now be repeated, the atrocity stories, terrifying in every detail, since proved in large measure to be without authentic foundation. Remember the great moral issue that was drawn at that time between democracy and autocracy. Recall the appeals to our self-interest: "If you do not fight this enemy of democracy on European soil, you will have to fight it in America." Remember the flood of trained lecturers, even ministers of the Gospel, who overran the country delivering these very same arguments.

Recall also the prophecies of disaster to trade and loss of commercial loans if we did not fight side by side with the Allies.

The results that followed are well known. Over 50,000 American youth were killed in France, hundreds of thousands more wounded, permanently maimed, disabled, or bereft of reason. Billions of dollars spent in the struggle. Billions more loaned to our Allies—never repaid—but constituting in the resentment aroused by our efforts to collect them, living proof of the old Shakespearean adage: "A loan oft loses both itself and friend."

Today history is repeating itself. Instead of being saved for posterity—the asserted objective of the World War—democracy has been crushed and destroyed in many great nations.

Do you believe the propagandists will not again feverishly start to work as they did in the World War years, disseminating the same fallacies calculated to lead us into another world holocaust?

Let me allude to some of the principal fallacies. They will have a familiar ring. Perhaps you have unconsciously been impressed by some of these specious arguments which have already flooded the country.

First and foremost, now that war rages in Europe, the United States will not be able to keep out of it. This argument rests on the false premise that we are bound to take sides with the so-called democracies. Otherwise two harrowing consequences will ensue: Democracy will be destroyed in the world and we will be the next marked for extinction; our trade, commerce, and financial relationships would be decimated by the victorious, ruthless dictators. Such assertions assume that if we do not fight in Europe we will be forced to fight here. The answer to this fallacy is plain. If we must fight in self-defense, by all means, let us be prepared to make a fight that will insure a smashing defeat of our aggressors. Let us build an army, navy, and air force not only adequate for our self-protection, but that will command the respect and forbearance of the world. Let us spend billions for self-defense but not one penny to send American boys to death on foreign soil.

Secondly, the claim will be made by these propagandists and supported by some of our own high-minded citizens, who have sympathy, based on blood ties or imagined identity of interests with the alleged democracies to preserve order in the world. While I am on the subject of the natural sympathy which some of our citizens have for their kinfolk in foreign countries who are liable to be victims of aggression should war start, let me make this observation. We are all prone to our sympathies for one side or another in a conflict. That has been true in the past and contributed to our attitude and final action in the last war. But the basic issue is clear; it is, Are those who bespeak sympathy and favor intervention—I note most of them are beyond the war age—prepared to send their sons, husbands, and fathers into war in these foreign lands to mayhem and death?

I have my sympathies and you have yours, but I conceive that during my 25 years of public life I have never had a more serious or solemn obligation to my countrymen than that which confronts me now—the solemn duty and grave responsibility of keeping America from participating in the present European war.

According to this view, we are, as they would have us believe, under an almost divinely imposed obligation to enter into selected foreign disputes and be prepared to fight, if necessary, to settle them. This contention, it may be, is theoretically idealistic and commendable in purpose, but it fails to acknowledge the incontrovertible fact that where a nation interferes in international complications it must expect inevitably to suffer the consequences of involvement in war.

Thirdly, other propagandists argue that Germany and Russia are godless nations and hate religion. Both are alleged to be intent upon destroying organized religion as we know it in the Christian world.

I hold no brief for any government or any people apart from the American Government and the American people. I am a sincere believer, as most Americans are, in the American system of individual liberty, free enterprise, and constitutional rights of freedom of religious worship.

Foreign philosophies which deny basic rights to the people are in principle and method equally unsatisfactory to me, whether they be totalitarian Soviet states, which suppress belief in God and deny the rights of private property, or the totalitarian Nazi state, which discriminates against class or creed.

While most regrettable, these un-American theories are immaterial so far as our diplomatic and business relations are concerned. Any other view is unmindful of our history wherein we have from the very beginning striven to maintain friendly relations with all foreign peoples irrespective of their religion or political philosophies. As Americans, desiring to live in peace with the world, we must be tolerant of the beliefs and views of others, however contrary to our ideals; and acknowledge their right to establish systems of government of their own choosing. It is indeed unfortunate if anywhere people are enslaved. However, we cannot jeopardize our own self-interest to free them unless we desire to wage continuous warfare in all parts of the world where inalienable rights are denied.

Apart from our sympathies, we should play no official favorites. Above all, we must fix our minds upon the one objective most to be desired by our people—peace. Let us resolve never on any pretext or at any behest, however appealing and subtle, to be drawn into another vortex similar to that of 1917.

If we must fight for democracy, for liberty, for justice, for home and fireside and family, for the priceless possessions of American citizenship, let it be on American soil when we are attacked, our lands invaded, or when enemies make warlike movements toward contiguous territory of the American Continent which would directly endanger our security.

There will be other varieties of propaganda, designed to cloud the issues and confuse our people. These were and will be employed in the campaign for a new neutrality law by authorizing what is now denied by the law of the land, namely, permitting our citizens to trade with belligerents in munitions and supplies of war. This proposed law would put us in the same position we occupied in the years 1914 to 1917. We would furnish arms and munitions to one side and retain them from the other. It is asserted that in continuing in effect the present neutrality law which we enacted for our peace, when no war threatened the world and which prohibits all traffic in arms and munitions of war, that we are in fact stripping England and France of the advantage they would enjoy if permitted to obtain war weapons from us because their powerful navies could restrain other nations. This may be true. By prohibiting trading in arms and munitions which would enrich us and then plunge us in war, we may be withholding the advantage which superior sea power has given the Allies. But we are remembering what is to our own advantage—namely, keeping out of war.

I repeat, we must think not in terms of advantage to other nations but advantage to our own people, and particularly to those who would be the sacrificial victims of any war which would follow by furnishing arms and munitions to one set of European belligerents and withholding them from another.

Until a few days ago, other advocates of our participation in European affairs urged that we do "everything short of going to war" to dissuade the Central Powers from aggressive action. With strange inconsistency, it seems to me, our State Department recommends that our ships be barred from war zones, loans to both sides forbidden, our citizens prohibited from travel in war areas—indeed, every effort save one would be strained to effectuate an appearance of neutrality. Militantly, however, they demand in the name of neutrality one reservation; that one thing is the most dangerous, the most certain to result in trouble, namely, furnishing arms, munitions, and materials of war to the belligerents of one side. If it is real neutrality to bar our ships, forbid loans and citizens from war zones, in simple logic and plain common sense, what more effective and practical neutrality could we pursue than to refrain from trading with any of the belligerents. Furnishing one side with the deadly weapons of war is the most definite sort of favoritism, the rankest unneutrality.

To my mind, it is unthinkable that we can escape involvement in the European war, and at the same time advocate intervention.

It is real intervention to threaten before or during a war to sell death-dealing instruments to one of the belligerents.

The United States, more than any other country in the world, is free from the possibilities of starvation, invasion, and economic domination. There may be some justification for countries taking sides in a war between two rival groups of foreign powers, who fear these perils, but we have no such excuse. Furthermore, it seems to me, it is ridiculous to say that anything like a real invasion of this country can be made unless all other nations of the world should combine against us.

It is certain, if anything is certain, that a world bristling with national enmities a world divided into warlike groups, can be no menace to us while we remain definitely neutral. We ought to do this for no other reason than that, if all the rest of the world crumbles, we shall preserve for humanity a haven of safety, containing all the elements on which we may continue to build a prosperous democracy.

Present events in the world have not emerged overnight nor over nothing. They have been developing slowly over a period of years as a result of the injustices which some nations felt, and still feel, rightly or wrongly, were perpetrated by the Treaty of Versailles.

Regardless of our sympathies these quarrels are not our quarrels. They result from and belong to long-existing European intrigue. Let European intrigue settle them. We have more urgent and compelling problems requiring our full time, attention, energy, and ingenuity right here in America.

We are a peaceful people. The plain people of America ardently desire the opportunity under the protection and guidance of their own benevolent Government to find some secure basis for the employment of their abilities, their talents, their labors—to live like normal Americans of generations past, to work, to marry, to raise their children in prosperity and peace. This is their modest appeal to their public officials. We must not fail them.

They will resent the efforts of our people who would disturb the peaceful course of this Nation and attempt to make them victims of death and destruction on the blood-drenched soil of Europe. They will be deeply aroused at foreign propaganda whether conducted by paid professionals, English, French, German, Italian, Russian, or other kind, or whether emanating from misguided individuals or groups sympathetic to one side or the other.

They insistently proclaim that the United States must keep out of war. They are already enraged by the misrepresentations of those who would involve us on pretext of saving alleged democracies in Europe. They are not so ignorant of history as not to realize that nations in the past kept themselves free from European wars and troubles. Sweden, Finland, Denmark, Switzerland, Spain, Norway, and others found no difficulty in remaining out of these disputes, and they and other nations are finding no difficulty now in resisting efforts to embroil them. To be sure, these nations are small, but apparently to some Americans the bigness and wealth of some nations stultify the moral courage to be neutral.

A preponderant and overwhelming mass of our citizens demands the United States follow this wise example of noninvolvement pursued by these smaller nations, even in the face of geographical proximity, as contrasted with the vast ocean that separates us from Europe.

America should be ready for any eventuality, however remote, which threatens the security of our ideals and institutions in the future; be prepared to meet any enemy or any combinations of enemies which may seek to undermine or overthrow our American Government. When the time comes to fight—and it well may, even before we expect it—whether it be fascism, nazi-ism, communism, or any other "ism" or power, in defense of American soil, American principles, and aspirations of freedom, equality, and justice, let us be equipped to annihilate such aggressors. Till that day comes, while making ready for any challenge to our rights, let us be tolerant of others, neutral in word and deed, repel all smooth talk or propaganda hostile to our safety, and continue ceaselessly to work to avert war and preserve peace.

I conclude and repeat by paraphrasing the words of an immortal American—billions for defense of our own country and its institutions, but not one penny to send American boys to slaughter and death on foreign soil.

Address of Commander in Chief of the Military Order of the World War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFTON A. WOODRUM

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 25, 1939

ADDRESS BY COL. E. M. WENTWORTH

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I have the honor of inserting the very splendid and able address of Col. E. M. Wentworth, commander in chief of the Military Order of the World War, which was delivered at the national convention of that order held in the city of Roanoke, Va., October 18–21, inclusive. The address is a report of the commander in chief, and the convention was a notable occasion. In attendance, among other distinguished members of the Service, were Gen. George C. Marshall, Chief of Staff of the United States Army; Maj. Gen. James K. Parsons, commander, Third Corps Area; and Rear Admiral Reginald R. Belknap.

The address is as follows:

The Military Order of the World War has just completed a most successful season. Our membership has grown, our finances have improved, and our influence has broadened. Our counsel has been sought in many fields during the past year and our activities, especially in the field of meeting foreign propaganda, have been numerous. From a geographical standpoint the name of our order has appeared in the newspapers more frequently than ever before.

Despite the fact that I should like to claim a measure of credit for this situation, I feel in all honesty that it has been due to the work of other officers of the order, and as commander in chief I merely happen to be the fortunate beneficiary of their efforts. In fact, I am much like the embarrassed man whom the magician calls out on the entertainment floor in order to remove from his vest pocket the watch or jewelry of some nearby friends. Such a man seems guilty because the magician found the valuables on him. Similarly I cannot explain why the order has done so well this year, but its success is nevertheless an accomplished fact.

May I express my extreme appreciation to Commander Mills for his fine work on chapter activities; to Colonel Allen for his vigorous efforts toward increased memberships, while traveling from coast to coast; and to our corps area commanders—especially in the third, fourth, and sixth corps—for their active prosecution of membership campaigns, and their inspiring stimulation of chapter activities. May I refer especially to the remarkable efforts of Capt. Ben Hogue who not only helped create our new chapter of the past year, but whose driving stimulus has put more chapters above their membership quota than in any other corps area. Of his 11 chapters, 9 finished above 100 percent, and 5 of them were included in the first 11 in percentage of membership quota standing for the entire order.

One can never express adequately our appreciation of Major Sanders' service in connection with Army Day, Chaplain McCallum's efforts in connection with the massing of the colors service, and the development of a flexible form for chapter meetings, or of George Ijams, Jr., building up of hereditary memberships. All will receive further recognition as the convention proceeds. Finally, everything that can be said of the endeavors and accomplishments of our adjutant general, Major Bettelheim, is far too little. Alert, on the trigger every moment, promoting our contacts in important offices of government and industry, he serves our order more faithfully and effectively with each year.

VALUE OF MEMBERSHIP

As we close our fiscal season we can be more certain than ever of the value of membership in our order and the work and prestige of its personnel. I have met with the members of our chapters this past year in as widely separated points as Boston and Los Angeles, Detroit and Dallas, San Francisco and St. Louis, Washington and Wichita, and Milwaukee and Chicago. In every place I have found men with that character of leadership and that unselfishness of ideal which we demand and cultivate.

This trait of our membership is one that we must not lose. Our influence can never be based on mass or numbers, although the physical strength of our order must always depend on adequate financing and a distribution of chapters that can influence opinions in all sections of the country. But we can never attain political importance by a massing of members' votes. There were not enough officers in our entire World War forces, from which our membership could be drawn, to give us national influence of a numerical nature. If we are to contribute to national defense and national welfare we must do so because our ideas are worth while, because our service is unselfish, and because we would more willingly give than receive.

Probably this last concept is outmoded, and I may appear naive in mentioning it, but fortunately such a fashion is fleeting. One thousand or one million workers in the electrical trades might elect mayors, Congressmen, Senators, or Presidents, but their mere numbers would never have invented the telephone of Alexander Graham Bell, the phonograph of Thomas Edison, or the radio of Marconi. These men stand out above the mass because they looked for what they could create, not for what they could receive.

Many times we hear prospective members ask what they can obtain in return for their membership dues. Why should they care what they get? The thing that counts is that they are permitted to give—they have an opportunity to serve in company with unselfish comrades for the future security of our Nation. Lest this opportunity be too easily overlooked, I have asked a committee to make a special report on our objectives to the general staff and to the convention to clarify and dramatize them so that they may appeal to that tiny remnant of the sense of chivalry possessed by every man—the sense that made possible the Crusades or that led to the quest of the Holy Grail. It is fashionable to sneer at the tradition of knighthood, but in abandoning its frailties the moderns have abandoned its romance and strength.

The Military Order of the World War assembles, and seeks the comradeship of, those men who find only the highest associations belonging in human relations and who believe unlimitedly in the traditional ideals of the Republic. We are not blind worshipers of tradition—we have proved, by our military service, our willingness to defend all of those intangible qualities that give character to our Nation, and from our vantage point of practical experience, we continually urge the necessity for that national security that can alone guarantee their survival.

May I call your attention to our program subjects and committee objectives? Not a single report asks anything from outside sources for our order or its members. We are truly trying to obtain those measures of national security which our judgment and experience tell us are necessary. Each action of this convention is directed toward that objective, toward the dissemination of accurate information on which the public may base a judgment, or toward the strengthening of our order so that the two preceding objectives may be more readily attained.

LIFE MEMBERSHIP

In considering the development of the order, I must urge continued efforts toward life membership. In a sense the latter title is a misnomer, for the membership is truly perpetual. Even though a member dies, the fund that he has established continues to work for the support of our objectives, and in many cases may carry forward the activities of an hereditary member as well. It has been somewhat disappointing this last year that our returns from the life-membership fund have been so small, due entirely to decreased earnings on investments. The custodians of our life-membership funds have rightfully laid chief emphasis on the preservation of the principal, and the reduced business profits of the last few years have naturally been reflected in our returns. This year we received only five-eighths of the income that accrued in 1937, but as the business pendulum reverses its swing, we should see entirely different results. Certainly the stability of the order in the long run will be greatly influenced by the size and the security of our life-membership investments.

SUPERVISION OF THE ORDER'S ACTIVITIES

As your commander in chief, I made one slight change in policy inside the staff without consulting either staff or membership. Supervision of the activities of the order is a great problem, not because of complexity but because of the necessity for effectiveness. In the past it has been customary to make some member of the staff responsible for the activities in a particular corps area, usually as corps area commander. For several years I accepted certain responsibilities in connection with the Sixth Corps Area and the Ninth Corps Area. On becoming commander in chief, it seemed to me that we would have better results if for administrative purposes our senior vice commanders in chief could have direct responsibility for working with the officers in charge of each corps area, and to this end I divided the United States into three regions, asking Commander Mills to keep in touch with the Fourth and Eighth Corps Areas; Colonel Allen to keep in touch with the First, Second, Third, and Fifth Corps Areas; while I continued contact with the Sixth, Seventh, and Ninth Corps Areas. The results have been particularly satisfactory, and while I believe no action by the staff or membership is necessary, I do commend to my successor the effectiveness of the idea.

THE PRESENT WAR

Twelve months ago, when your present staff took the oath of office at the New Orleans convention, there was no intimation of the dire situation which involves the world of today. No one could foresee that the two strongly contrasting systems of government—democracy and dictatorship—would have reached that impasse where blood again would have to flow in defense of human freedom. In a literal sense, the privileges of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, for which our forefathers struggled, are again cast in Europe's balance, and it is a serious question as to whether they can overweigh the lust for personal power of a few individuals and the flock-minded behavior of their continental followers. Why these people are willing to endure paternalistic tyrannies instead of facing individually, with full freedom, the relatively mild struggle for existence which characterizes the modern world, is not undestandable to the citizens of a democracy, despite the partial evidence of such behavior as we have glimped in our own people during the last decade. America is not insulated against the effect of this struggle, despite her geographic aloofness, and it is quite possible that the symptons of radicalism which we have observed in the United States are sporadic occurrences of the same disease that infests so much of Europe eastward of the Rhine.

AMERICAN RESPONSIBILITY

Many believe that the geographical separation of the United States from Europe gives us such an aloofness of problems that we are really intruding on the family affairs of others if we take sides in the current struggle. They seem to feel rather honestly that we become "nosey neighbors" if we interject our opinions in any way into the situation. They profess to believe that any settlement which would bring about peace would be to our advantage, regardless of which side won or of the relation of their ideas and philosophies to our own. Such a viewpoint is, of course intolerable. Ninety percent of American citizens oppose the dictatorships.

There was a time in human history when we could avoid the contacts with Europe because of our isolation, but fast-moving ocean liners, airplanes, cable, and radio throw our lives in daily contact with the lives of other nationals all over the world. We have the same ethical responsibility to participate in the settlement of the current warfare that the so-called "good" element in any community has to participate in all movements promoting the cause of law and order. I hesitate to make any remark that might be construed as a casting of ephithet, but I do not believe the situation in Europe can be described better than to say that over two hundred millions of her people are in the clutches of "international hoodlums and racketeers" whose methods, except for scale, differ very little from those with which we are familiar in American life. As people who feel a responsibility for future generations, I do not see how we can avoid opinion, and even action, as time goes on.

THE NEUTRALITY ACT

It will be impossible for our convention to avoid discussion and consideration of the questions surrounding the modification of the Neutrality Act. Regardless of the significance or lack of significance of the proposed amendment from a military standpoint, the subject has been on the lips of almost every American citizen. The public has come to believe that changing the Neutrality Act will increase the chances of involving us in the war. Hence a tremendous opposition has developed, varying from pacifists who would submit to any degradation rather than become involved in conflict, through those who are afraid to face the issues of war, to the political opposition which feels that the threat of war would provide the current administration with opportunity for continuance in office without the usual mechanism of election—and extending even to the fear that a dictatorship might develop in the United States. All of these reasons are cogent to one indulging in these beliefs, but it is perhaps well to examine the question somewhat materialistically from a number of viewpoints.

LEGAL ASPECTS

Perhaps the first aspect to be mentioned should be the legal one. I am not a lawyer, but I have talked with students both of international and domestic law and find that there are as many flaws as jewels in the current act. Unquestionably, under international law, we have the right to change our neutrality stand without violating international authority. Our current restrictions are of domestic origin and have domestic power only. If we change the law so that it works somewhat more to the disadvantage of one set of combatants than the other, we may be charged with an unfriendly act, but it would certainly be in the direction of the group defending the position favored by the majority of American citizens. We would not be violating the customs of neutrality of the past so long as we do not overstep them.

Since the Neutrality Act was placed in effect we have dealt in arms and ammunition both in Ethiopia and China, justifying ourselves by the legal fact that war had not been declared in either case. Yet the obvious objections to the munitions trade with those countries applied just the same as they do today. Perhaps there was little likelihood of our being involved in Ethiopia, but there were many occasions when there was danger of our becoming involved with Japan. Fortunately the good sense of both nations tended to prevail.

One wonders if any combatant who is denied access to our markets by enemy action will accept any refined distinctions on our part as to what we consider to be military or unneutral supplies and what we consider passable. It has been suggested that modification of the act would bring about sabotage of munitions factories in this country, with all the concomitant difficulties. Does not the same danger exist to copper mines, sheet-metal plants, and other factories that produce raw or partially prepared materials? In this country companies that manufacture motors for automobiles, trucks, or other transportation can see their motors diverted to army trucks and tanks—in some cases to motorboats or even mine layers and mine sweepers. Are representatives of combatants adversely affected likely to respect these differences? After the current large harvests of grains have been consumed, can we be assured that our grains, flours, and meats are going to be considered innocuous aids to the opponents of a starving nation? The safety in the present act is much overrated, especially when one realizes the possibilities of evasion by operating through other countries not at present engaged in the war.

One also wonders whether combatant nations are likely to accept distinctions between smuggled and legally exported supplies. If the stories that have been floating around about smuggled supplies in the case of the Ethiopian and Spanish civil wars are true, there was enough illegal movement to irritate any nation with its back to the wall. Perhaps changes that will bring such movements to light of day would be preferable to illicit acts.

ETHICAL ASPECTS

It has always been a question of ethics as to whether a nation should profit by the misfortunes or conflicts of others. We have not forgotten the Uncle Shylock epithets of the World War period, nor have we dismissed our awareness of the so-called profiteering problem. No nation is required to solve all the problems of the world, nor is any nation free of them. If countries might criticize change in our Neutrality Act as an attempt to reap blood profits, we must counter with the fact that we have domestically a problem of unbalanced budgets as well as terrific indebtedness, extending to coming generations, that can be as destructive of our future as a war. There is always more misery in the world than the forces of euthenics can alleviate, and the curing of one evil ever accentuates the effect of another evil. Calling names has always been the

refuge of the man or nation that cannot meet the logic of any situation. As a nation we shall have to run the risk of being criticized whether we preserve the present act or modify it. Throughout the whole gamut of human relations there is no single action that cannot draw more criticism than praise, regardless of how meritorious it may seem to its proponent.

ECONOMIC CONSIDERATIONS

On the basis of our experience in the last war, many people believe that a repetition of the economic collapse of that time would completely destroy civilization. The total of world indebtedness has not declined during the past two decades, and a new series of obligations in addition would break the world's back. Such viewers with alarm state that this condition of economic exhaustion is just what is desired by the forces of communism and allied social theories so that they may take over Europe as a whole. There is much to be said in support of this viewpoint, but one wonders just why it is better by our inaction instead to let such agencies overwhelm human freedom by brute conquest. If the forces of democracy in Europe prove unable to prevail, is there any likelihood that American forces of democracy can prevail at a later date? If we do not lend essential help, are we not subscribing unfavorably to an old maxim of war, for we make it possible for the leaders of the "isms" to defeat the advocates of a citizen's liberty in detail separately and at their leisure?

MAKESHIFT SOLUTIONS

There are many who believe that we can preserve our comfort, serenity, and liberty without stirring a finger, merely by keeping out of the conflict in every way. Even if we could preserve our wealth, could withstand the shock of losing our foreign trade, could live in a self-contained economy, and could maintain our system of government, we still could not be isolated, for even though we succeeded in all of these efforts we would be the fatted calf in a world of hungry wolves. Perhaps military exhaustion would prevent their early attack, but we would have to continue our isolation as we still would be unable from an economic and political viewpoint to pay them gold for such raw materials or manufactured goods as they might offer, which we are able to produce ourselves. Our participation in world trade would be necessary for international recovery, and past post-war experience shows that we would have to share our surpluses by low prices, unbalanced trade, or defaulted obligations, in a manner that would cost almost as much as participation in the war.

There are others who believe that we can permit the warring nations to fight toward exhaustion, after which we could intercede in time to dictate the peace. This idea holds great popular favor, because it would permit the building up of our defense forces without their actual commitment to conflict. It partakes greatly of the old wish to have one's cake and eat it, too. It is not impossible to develop such a policy and obtain such a political effect, but if we should use our forces in such a manner would we develop the design and wisdom to approve an effective settlement of Europe's problems? Her economic frontiers are not her racial frontiers and any settlements taking the first set of circumstances into account will violate the second. Our idealism intervened in the peace of Versailles, and we will never know whether we muddied or clarified those troubled waters. I suspect that it will never be revealed whether we were benefactors or culprits, and in either case the net result was small.

But we are no better qualified to adjust Europe's problems today than at that time. If any settlement were possible, someone among Europe's leaders, living on the ground, so to speak, would have advanced an idea that could rally support due to its obviousness or practicality. But such ideas that could appeal to the European multitudes have never been advanced. What chance then has a distant American, dealing only in the abstract, to provide a solution that could settle Europe's problems or create a peace of satisfactory duration?

RECOMMENDATIONS

One point, which is obvious, is that immediate steps must be taken for the equipment of a field army, which shall be fully ready for offensive or defensive duty. This does not insinuate that war action will immediately follow; it is simply one of the diplomatic chips we will need if we participate in any future negotiations. We need many others. The Panama Canal should be impregnable against attack. We should establish more air bases, encourage civil aviation, set up a National Guard in Alaska, restore discipline in the merchant marine, give training to C. C. C. enrollees, and provide some method for taking over jurisdiction of labor disputes so as to avoid delays in essential supplies and equipment for our armed forces. A war crisis is no time to permit either strikes or excessive production costs and profits. We still require a Navy second to none, supreme on both oceans, and we should soon have our Regular Army and National Guard at full peacetime strength, with enough raw materials available to keep a full million men in the field for at least 1 year. Only when we are in such a position can we expect our views to be respected and our opinions heeded.

WAR RESOURCES BOARD

In the face of these requirements I think we can feel quite disturbed over the dissolution of the War Resources Board, created a few weeks ago to help the Army and Navy organize plans for our industrial mobilization. While its mission was purely advisory, and it was announced that its existence was only temporary, it was generally understood that it would be molded into a permanent organization. It contained real leaders of industry and production, rather than theorists, and offered the most practical and experienced support that our military forces could expect. It seems too bad that the political charge, that it made us appear to be heading too fast toward participation in the war, should nullify as practical an action as the establishment of the War Resources Board.

TIME IN WHICH TO PREPARE

People who look on such a move, which is purely of the nature of insurance, as a definite act of aggression, little realize the time that is essential in the preparation of effective military forces. If we had had available, in a fully trained and equipped condition, one-third of the forces we assembled for the World War, we would probably never have been required to call into service the rest of our young men, and we would certainly have had only a fraction of the losses. Morale, bravery, and skill are required, but morale does not exist without skill, and bravery by itself is of small avail. I have often pointed out that it makes little difference on a high railroad trestle which of two men caught there by an oncoming train is brave and which is cowardly—they both meet the same end. In the same way the brave man, without training and equipment, is just as futile in resisting a modern mechanized attack as the craven. Reports say that the individual soldiers of the Polish Army were brave and resourceful, but without adequate equipment. An attacking German Army of less than one-fourth the Polish strength, surrounded and completely destroyed their defense. It is not fair to our men who must bear the brunt of battle, if we deny them equal or superior equipment to that of their enemy.

RESPONSIBILITY OF GOVERNMENT

No patriotic or veteran society can dictate to the members of our Government just what they should provide in time of emergency, but they certainly can point out what the requirements are and, insofar as they know, what emergencies must be met. The changing situations of the present conflict make some advice worthless shortly after it has been given, but every recommendation I have made is useful, whether we are forced to participate in the war or whether we remain at peace. They are the elements necessary to make our national policy effective, whether that policy be one of war or peace. We cannot support a policy of peace without the means to enforce it, and there is scarcely a point emphasized that was not recognized as a required essential for national strength and defense 20 years ago. It is indeed a commentary on our intelligence and effectiveness as a Nation, that we have approached no nearer to realizing these objectives during the intervening period.

The responsibility for the American future lies with the Government—with the legislative branch as well as with the executive branch. It is no time for candidates for office to hold their ears to the ground listening to every constituent's whisper. There comes a time in every legislator's life when he must act as a representative of the people and not as an interpreter of them—when he must use the judgment and common sense he was supposed to possess when elected, rather than to interpret the whims of his homefolk. Today is one of those times, and the Military Order of the World War urges every member of the Government to take that step which he believes will preserve the Nation and transmit human freedom to the future, rather than to safeguard his own election by cheap demagoguery.

FOREIGN PROPAGANDA

When the Communists upset the Chinese Republic of Dr. Sun Yat Sen, their military advance was screened by a cloud of propagandists that broke the spirit of the people and overcame their resistance. Fragmentary reports suggest a similar technique in the German invasion of Poland. Perhaps the most important enemies we must face are the representatives of types of government which are trying to undermine our own loyalties by propaganda that would destroy our unity. The Dies committee, whose operations we have endorsed and backed, has found unending evidence of communistic propaganda, of Nazi activities, and of British efforts for sympathetic action on our part. Perhaps we can stand up against such a barrage from within our midst, but many would doubt it. We can only be safe when we deny refuge in our own country to the conflicts and disputes of European social and governmental theories.

RESPONSIBILITY TO THE FUTURE

Regardless of whether the United States is or is not involved in the war, she carries an unescapable responsibility to the future, to the terms of the so-called peace which will follow Europe's economic and spiritual exhaustion, and to the civilization which we should bequeath to generations not yet conceived. With such a moral obligation it would seem that everything we can do to facilitate the success of our former Allies would make our participation the less likely. War has always been a human phenomenon, and it is doubtful whether it can ever be eradicated. As long as boys have fist fights, or girls gossip, or families quarrel, the instinct that leads to war will have been preserved. Would we not be wiser to face the issues practically rather than to rely on hair-splitting distinction to save human liberty? It is quite possible that America's decisions and activities today will produce more effect on that distant future than the uninfluenced military success or failure of the European democracy. Let us hope that the Military Order of the World War retains its mental balance and by the soundness of its policies and decisions proves able to affect wisely public opinion and national action.

Hoping for Peace But Promoting War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD W. CREAL

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 25, 1939

Mr. CREAL. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, for many long weeks the press, the radio, congressional debates, and the citizens wherever gathered have viewed and reviewed the European war with the chief thought in mind how to keep America out of war. There has been honest difference of opinion as to how to insure this, and this difference of opinion is but natural.

However, the fine part of it all is the almost unanimous opinion that, come or go what will, that we will never enter and never send our boys to foreign soil to render direct aid to the nations we favor.

The repeal or failure to repeal will not affect that. When the neutrality law as a whole is enacted as desired by the President, it has all the safeguards in it to prevent our becoming involved and seeks to correct all the mistakes we made in the World War.

It keeps our people from riding on belligerent ships.

It prevents our merchant vessels from going into danger zones.

It prevents our people from investing money in foreign bonds and then becoming war propagandists to save their money if it appeared the nation was going to lose where their investment was made.

We had none of these safeguards during the World War, and these were the things that caused us to become involved.

The President is very wisely taking every precaution to make it impossible for us to get involved.

I have two sons, fit specimens for military service, and I am a great deal more interested in seeing them kept out than about any other question. To others who have sons I would say that we are in the same class and the requests to keep us out of war finds us in the same mind.

In the first address in my district after being nominated for Congress 4 years ago, I stated emphatically that if our boys went to Europe to fight they would never get there by my vote.

In their fear the people should remember that the question of war has to be voted on in Congress, and as long as I am doing that voting for our district you may be assured that my vote will be for the boys to stay at home.

THE EMBARGO

Now about the embargo provision around which all the talk has been centered and for which the President called a special session of Congress to consider. I am aware that perhaps the question will be voted on before these remarks reach my district, but they will be mailed to many who have not followed a daily paper nor listened to radio.

We are the only country in the world that has a law which provides that our people cannot sell certain articles to any nation, if that nation is at war. All other nations sell anything they have to sell to either side. No nation at war has ever taken offense at this, for it is in accord with international law.

When we speak of repealing the embargo some seem to think that it is breaking an ancient custom or tearing out a part of the Constitution. It was breaking international law 150 years old when we attempted to impose an embargo on our own people by a law 3 years ago. There was no war on then and no great interest taken about it and no one knew how it would work in practice.

The way it works in the present war between Germany on one side and England and France on the other is very largely to the benefit of Germany. Germany has been storing up war materials in preparation for this war for several years. England has been hoping and hoping for peace by arbitration and peaceful settlement.

To allow Germany to buy from us and get ready when other nations had their minds on nobler things, and then become the victim of Germany's war machine is to put a premium on a dictator's robbery, murder, seizure, and enslavement of other people and to put a penalty on peaceful nations for supposing there is such a thing left in the world as mercy, conscience, and right.

Russia and Italy, sympathizers of Germany, can come to America today and load up with war materials and take them home only to pass them on to Germany. On their way back no submarine will attack them. They are not at war. But if England or France, our friendly nations, call at our ports to get some of the same, they find the door closed by reason of their being at war with Germany.

In practical effect it is the same as if we had sat around the council table with Hitler and plotted the murder and destruction of the others. When he got well ready, and at the first boom of the guns, we shut off commerce from the nations he attacked.

Is that neutrality? Those who speak of an ideal neutrality, a neutrality that neither helps nor harms either side, are challenged to point out how any law of any kind could have the same effect on all alike. If we act or fail to act, sell or fail to sell, it affects one side more than another.

Germany can buy from the nations on its east side and the Allies cannot because they cannot get there. If the Allies can buy from us and Germany cannot get here, that is not our making.

If we undertook to supervise distribution of what we sold then we wade into deep water.

BRYAN OPPOSED EMBARGO

The greatest advocate of peace at any price in the last half century was William Jennings Bryan. He was so conscientious that he resigned as Secretary of State in the Wilson Cabinet before he would send certain notes to Germany for fear it would produce war. He later went on Henry Ford's peace ship to Europe, hoping to talk them into stopping the war.

But even he vigorously opposed the suggestion that this Nation pass an embargo and said that such would be a most unneutral act.

The only perfectly neutral act so far as trade relations go is to let nature take its course, to trade with all comers just as if we did not know that any war existed.

That course of action has been accepted as perfect neutrality for centuries. When German propagandists in America say that our following that course now would be unneutral, we ask why they do not complain against some of the other 67 nations of the earth doing the same. Is it for Germany to tell America that we are the only nation on earth which cannot sell what we have like all others do?

During the World War little nations under the sound of the guns in Europe maintained perfect neutrality by continuing trade with all sides. They are doing the same now in this war. It is the only way in which they could preserve their neutrality. It is the only way they preserve it now.

Should we become involved with Japan some day would we expect European countries or Canada to close the door on us or to treat us as if they were offended and shut us out?

It is right to pass laws and to keep our own children in the back yard when there is danger out front, for they are subject to our jurisdiction. But when we pass laws here like an embargo intended for the main purpose of reversing international law and custom for ages, intended to have a direct effect on the people of other nations, affecting their God-given right of self preservation, it is openly becoming an ally of the aggressor. We are aiding in putting on a blockade and squeeze as much as if we had a fleet of our own on the seas stopping other neutrals also from shipping to them.

If it is the fine thing to do and the moral thing to do to see that England and France have no resources for defense, then why not endeavor to get all other nations to

follow our example? Why not actually prevent others from trading by use of our strong fleet as policemen. Such would be as neutral as going a mile upstream to change the course of a spring branch so it would not flow by your neighbor's barn lot. Why send iodine, other antiseptics, and tons of medicine to nations at war. It is well known that such saves lives, and soldiers so treated will be back fighting in a month or two. Why not let them die and shorten the war if the other reasoning be sound?

WHERE DRAW THE LINE?

Where are we going to draw the line as to what is war aid? Cotton for explosives, trucks, all kinds of metal, gasoline, coal, timber, shoes, rubber, coats, butter, bread, and meat are as much essentials of war as ammunitions. No nation can wage war without them. The only embargo to be consistent with other arguments would bar trade of every description.

Men in other generations, as well as in this generation, wiser than you or I, have pondered this question on various occasions, and the sum total of the wisdom of the ages is that an embargo is an unneutral act and not an act of neutrality. Let the water flow its natural course and commerce do the same. Do not change the stream or laws of nature and call it neutrality, that is meddling to affect the other fellow's business.

Do not try to pass laws in America which are intended solely for the purpose of affecting the amount to eat, wear, or other use by the people not under our jurisdiction.

We all abhor war and hope for the day when war is no more, but in this hour when neutrality for us is the immediate question let us diligently seek what neutrality is. In being neutral let us not become a partner, a plotter, and a coconspirator with the assassins of the world. There is no distinction between the sins of omission and the sins of commission. In avoiding the supposed sins of commission let us not commit greater ones of omission.

These are my conclusions and my sincere judgment as to the best way to keep out of war and at the same time discharge our duty as a nation to all the world.

EMBARGO WOULD BREED WARS

If an embargo is a good policy, then it should be adopted by every nation on earth. Let us see what would happen then—the 67 nations are of various sizes and of different strength.

Aggressor nations headed by dictators who respect no laws of God or man would buy in peacetime all the war material they could pile up. Peaceful nations with higher ideals and nobler purposes would not be so prepared.

Then the aggressor could move with mathematical certainty to victory, for he would know in advance that his victim could obtain no outside aid. All he would have to do would be to get better prepared before starting and measure his certain success.

When he fired the first gun, like touching an electric button, every nation would instantly cease to sell to his victim; which would, in effect, make all embargo nations allies of the aggressor. It places a premium on brute force and places a penalty on the innocent who are peacefully inclined. Middle-sized nations would devour the little ones and the big ones would eat the middle-sized ones.

INTERNATIONAL BANKRUPTCY

This situation would cause all nations, large and small, to keep armed to the last dollar they had to spend, for they would know that no other nation would sell them after the invader set foot on their soil. This would bankrupt the world for armaments and halt all progress in the things worth while.

All nations armed to the breaking point would be a situation not conducive to peace.

This is the situation embargo laws would place the world in. Those who talk peace by the embargo method would be prompting more war conditions than the world ever heard of in all its history. Embargoes would not lessen the number of casualties in any given war, but only make one nation a butcher and the other a slaughter pen.

The Neutrality Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT J. CORBETT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 25, 1939

EDITORIAL BY THE PRESIDENT GENERAL OF THE SONS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial by the president general of the Sons of the American Revolution is exceptionally lucid and sane. Because a large percentage of the Members of Congress would not otherwise have an opportunity to read it, I have asked for and secured permission to have it included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

[From the Quarterly Bulletin, National Society, Sons of the American Revolution, October 1939]

THE PRESIDENT GENERAL'S MESSAGE

During recent weeks I have been inundated by requests from members, from the press, and from other organizations and individuals for a statement as to how our society stands on the Neutrality Act, which is up for amendment or repeal by Congress as I write this message. I know of no better indication of how far we have allowed ourselves to be influenced by foreign issues than this extraordinary pressure emanating from a foreign crisis. I believe the great majority of our people view with horror the possibility of our becoming involved again in a European war, and it is therefore essential that nothing should be done which might lead to our becoming implicated. I strongly feel that participation in this war would certainly end the principles of freedom which we cherish.

Twenty-five years ago, when war broke out in Europe, it was, of course, front-page news in this country. But it did not crowd all other news off the front page. Today both the most sensational tabloids and the most conservative newspapers devote their front pages to flamboyant headlines about the European war and relegate news and pictures of local affairs to subordinate positions on inside pages, and our ears are constantly assailed with war news on the radio. But this means we are readily subject to propaganda of the most flagrant sort. The result is to inflame our people to active interest in a war which but for these agencies would seem remote and of no paramount concern to us; also to incline us to take hurried and ill-considered actions.

It, therefore, becomes important to analyze the arguments put forward for the repeal or amendment of our Neutrality Act, as well as the arguments for its retention, in order that emotion or imagined self-interest do not play unduly in the result. That act was made into law in 1937 by an overwhelming majority in Congress (3 dissenting votes in the Senate and 13 in the House, I believe) and duly signed by the President. It cannot be disputed but that the motive behind the enactment of this law was to prevent exactly such eventualities as face this Nation today. There was no important war when the law was passed or prospect of one. Now that there is war, the act, for the first time, is put to the important test of facing realities. There is a widespread demand for its repeal or amendment, and it is likely that a part of the demand for amendment today comes from the same sources which demanded the enactment of the law 2 years ago.

Is it not advisable to consider carefully both sides of the arguments both for its retention as well as its repeal before hasty action is taken? On a momentous question as to the welfare, safety, and existence of our country, our Representatives in Congress should become acquainted with the will of their constituents, a majority of whom I firmly believe are determined not to go to Europe and are entitled to decide the best way to keep out.

When our neutrality law was enacted it marked a departure from the practices laid down and developed since Grotius wrote the first treaties on international law some 300 years ago. It was our law of neutrality when the war began. Before we return to the very practices which were claimed to be outworn but 2 years ago when the neutrality law was placed on our statute books, let the result of repeal be carefully weighed.

The purpose of those who favor the amendment of our neutrality law should be considered as well as the motive of those opposed. Those opposing repeal claim that the issue is practically one of peace or war. On the other hand, there are two groups seeking repeal; one is composed of those who feel that because of our neutrality law they are deprived of opportunities for "war boom" prosperity such as was enjoyed from 1914–1917; the other group is composed of those whose sympathies are so evidently and preponderantly on one side of the existing European war that they have no hesitancy in declaring that they wish the law repealed or amended so that we may furnish material support to one group of belligerents. Are either of these motives in themselves sufficient?

The first group may consider the suggestion that they turn their eyes from the east to the south and cease seeking material advantages from furnishing war supplies to Europe. Why not avail ourselves of the rare opportunity which the war has given America to recapture the markets of South America, our natural sphere of trade, and where for 20 years past we have been gradually pushed out by British, German, and even Japanese competition. This is much more humane and, in the long run, of more lasting benefit. The Monroe Doctrine could be applied to our export trade in the hemisphere where the Monroe Doctrine has prevailed for over a century.

To the second group I may say their own declaration of their sympathies and motives in itself should make us cautious. It is natural to suppose that those who wish very ardently to see one side in the present war win, in the course of time if amendment of our Neutrality Act alone be not sufficient to gain victory for their side, will equally ardently favor our actual participation in the war itself.

It is contended, too, that it is our duty to give such aid as we can to one side of the present European war in order to save those things which we, as Americans, believe should be defended and preserved. They forget that the principles and ideals in which we Americans believe have never existed or been defended or preserved to any appreciable extent outside of America. We once dedicated ourselves to making the world safe for democracy with disastrous results.

It is an old saying that "charity begins at home," but it has its present-day application in the paraphrase that "defense begins at home." One of the principal reasons why American ideals have developed here so fruitfully and have attracted so many Europeans to them is that we are and have been completely free from the age-old jealousies, hates and feuds, and boundary disputes which have predominated European thought since European history was first written.

It has been contended that the industrial activity which supplying war material would put under way would make prosperity for America, but are we to forget that similar activity 25 years ago brought us only momentary prosperity and itself eventually involved us in a holocaust from which we have never recovered?

I feel our society has the grave responsibility of advocating a policy that we feel is best for the perpetuation of the principles and traditions which our society was established to serve.

We should, therefore, turn for guidance to that genius whom we were fortunate to have as our first President. The record is clearly written and well preserved of his actions during those trying moments when opinion in this country was bitterly divided between those who felt we should become involved in France's war with Great Britain and those who felt that absolute neutrality was our best policy. President Washington's own Secretary of State, Thomas Jefferson, split with his chief on this issue.

Citizen Genet, then Ambassador from the French Republic, arrived here on a mission to get the neutrality proclamation withdrawn. Never was such propaganda hurled on America's head except perhaps at this moment. Genet had reason to believe the emotions of the country France had succored would cause America to come to her aid against England, America's hereditary enemy. Acting upon that assumption and encouraged by sympathizers, he committed most astonishing outrages by utterances and by outfitting privateers. Washington never wavered, met all criticism with firmness, had Genet recalled, and maintained our neutrality.

My conclusions, therefore, based on our national principles, our national traditions, and our national interest, are that we should be neutral in this present European conflict. They are the conclusions of my head if not of my heart, and I recommend to my compatriots in this society and to my fellow citizens outside the society that they, too, subjugate their emotions to their reason and that they realize that the first thing and the one thing and the most important thing for us in this Nation to do at the present time is to refrain from succumbing to propaganda or doing any act which will result in entangling ourselves once again in the labyrinth of European diplomacy and intrigues which out of every victory during the past thousand years has made nothing but the reasons for the next European war.

MESSMORE KENDALL,
President General.

Preserve Democracy Here

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH J. O'BRIEN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 25, 1939

ADDRESS BY FRANK GANNETT, DELIVERED AT INDIANA STATE FAIRGROUNDS, INDIANAPOLIS, IND., SEPTEMBER 23, 1939

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by Frank Gannett at the Indiana State fairgrounds, Indianapolis, Ind., September 23, 1939, when "Hoosier Round-Up" rally attracted an audience of 40,000:

Never have I seen a more inspiring gathering than this! It must be encouraging to all of us to know that countless thousands are assembled here in the interests of our great country, and to make our party a leading force to insure America's future.

We are, first of all, loyal Americans and then loyal members of the Republican Party.

None of us can get from our minds the agony across the sea. Heartsick over the horrors of war, we pray that some way may soon be found to end this terrible slaughter. Our sympathies are deep for those fighting the theory that might makes right, and that brute force should determine the destiny of countless millions of people.

What is going on in Europe involves the fate of freedom and democracy here in our own country. The war raises the greatest issue any of us shall ever have to face. That issue is the question of war and peace.

But, in spite of what may seem to be our obvious sympathies, we must keep out of this war. I repeat, we must keep out of this war! We must keep out of it not only because involvement might cost the lives of millions of our finest youths and untold billions of wealth; we must keep out because if we do not, our constitutional system of government will perish.

In wartimes a nation must give its government great powers to prosecute the war. Then personal liberties and rights disappear. If we should surrender our precious rights, it might be impossible, in a world of dictators, to recover them, and our democracy might be destroyed.

However this tragic conflict in Europe may end, we must not lose this last best hope on earth. No matter how intense our sympathies, we must put the interests of America first of all.

No one can foresee tomorrow, but if this terrible war drags on, it will mean the slaughter of the flower of this generation, bring bankruptcy, disaster, and complete ruin to all involved.

If we get into this war, instead of fighting to save democracy, we will be fighting to destroy democracy; a dictatorship here in America will be virtually assured.

To prove that there is this great danger, let me recall the May bill which was introduced in the last session of Congress. The May bill, had it been passed, would, in case of war, have given to the President powers as unlimited as has any dictator in Europe. He would have had power to raise or lower wages, fix prices, change leases or contracts; he would have had absolute control of mine and mill, field and factory; complete domination of our lives—and all of this control would have been without redress in the courts. He would, further, have had in his hands the authority of life or death over business, finance, agriculture, labor organized and unorganized. No limit was set.

This May bill, mind you, was devised in time of peace and won some support in Congress. But it was, thank heaven, pigeonholed. But once we get into war we shall see enacted laws just as evil as the May bill. Have no illusions, in time of war private rights perish, the government becomes master of our lives and possessions.

Today, we have forty-five billions of debt and a peacetime deficit of four billions a year.

WAR'S TREMENDOUS COST

If we had the expenditure of another war, which I say we must not enter, we shall add another $50,000,000,000 to our debt. Our public debt would rise to ninety or one hundred billions of dollars. It could not be repaid. Paper-money inflation would wipe out the thrifty, substantial, self-supporting middle class—the owners of savings-bank deposits, the 60,000,000 men and women holding life insurance policies. If this great, thrifty self-supporting class were gone, the bulwark of democracy itself would have disappeared; the wage earner and the unemployed would suffer most.

Men who know Europe best predict universal bankruptcy there. Our entry will bring the same fate to us. But, more disastrous than the loss of our material possessions will be the destruction of the rights and constitutional liberties which we enjoy and which we hold too lightly. I mean, of course, the freedom of religion, freedom of speech, right of assembly, trial by jury, protection against the invasion of the home, freedom of the press, of radio. If we go into this war, we will be deprived of these rights and I fear we may never regain them.

Recently President Roosevelt asked for an adjournment of partisanship. In a national crisis, we need unity and patriotic support of our Government. Partisanship should end where the ocean begins, but this must not mean any ban on the fullest discussion of foreign policy. This is no time to stop debate. Not in that way is national unity attained.

NEED FULL DISCUSSION

We are not at war with any nation. We are not involved in any great emergency. It is utterly wrong for any man, group, or party, to assume the right to decide fateful policies without fullest discussion.

Hitler silenced all political opposition and established one-man rule under the excitement of the burning of the Reichstag. We Americans must see to it that the democracy of our two-party system does not perish in the flames of war.

You will recall that when Woodrow Wilson in October 1918, in the midst of the war, asked for the election of a Democratic Congress in November, he was overwhelmingly defeated, because

the country did not want an adjournment of political discussion in those critical days.

A spokesman for the New Deal recently stated that the European crisis would help the party in power and that it would cause people to stop worrying about debt limits, taxes, precedent, and the Constitution.

The Republican Party must see to it that debt limit, taxes, and the Constitution are not forgotten in any crisis.

Even before this war, we faced staggering problems at home. Today those problems are multiplied and intensified. Because Europe is fighting is no reason why America should be silenced. We must not be lulled into tolerating misgovernment at home or in the adoption of unsound policies because of war abroad.

DEMAND GOOD LEADERSHIP

Our Government is built on a system of two parties. An opposition party is vitally needed and this opposition party must be strong and vigorous as it is today. No White House edict can abolish this two-party system and destroy our right to protest against administrative acts which we consider detrimental to the country. Today we need cool, sober judgment and clear thinking. We must guard against emotion and view the situation with calm deliberation. We need today, more than ever, our country's wisest, most experienced leadership.

The war in Europe resulted from acts of dictators, not from the will of the people. These dictators rose to power because of unbearable economic conditions. People who are hungry, in distress, in want, will listen to the false but alluring promises of any demagogue. One by one, the peoples over there gave up their liberties until they had no voice in their government, not even a voice in determining whether or not they should go to war.

A few years ago when in Europe I met, face to face, several of the dictators. I saw people under nazi-ism, fascism, communism. I saw what it meant to be deprived of those liberties that we enjoy. I saw fear everywhere, fear of the government, and fear of government agents. I saw how the people are kept ignorant of what is going on. I saw them deprived of life and property without any protection of their rights. So long as the dictators control the machine guns there is nothing that the hapless people of those lands can do but remain vassals of the state.

America has had 10 years of depression. For 7 years we have had some of the same conditions that brought dictatorship in Europe. We must correct these conditions to escape the fate that has overcome many nations over there.

We should support the President in any policy that will keep us out of war. Even we who have disagreed with him in the past should support him as wholeheartedly as his closest friends on every sound proposal to that end.

Yet this war in Europe must not blind us to the great failures of the Roosevelt administration. We must realize that, war or no war, this country cannot continue New Deal policies that have brought us great distress. With millions unemployed, with crushing taxes, staggering debt, and restrictions on production of wealth in field and factory, Government policies that kill incentive, that check expansion and development, open the doors to dictatorship.

BEWARE TEMPORARY EASE

Temporary improvement in business may come because of the war. Prices may rise and, for a time, we may seem to be prosperous. But we must not be fooled by this, for until we correct the basic causes of our prolonged depression we shall not be safe. If we build up a false and evil boom on the bodies of those dying in Europe, we shall find ourselves, after the inevitable crash, in much worse condition than we are today.

We have before us three great duties:

First, to keep out of war.

Second, to preserve our constitutional government and ward off dictatorship.

Third, to restore prosperity.

On these three issues the Republican Party must take a position that will command complete public confidence.

As to keeping out of war, I rejoiced to hear the President assure the Congress and the country last Thursday that the Government must lose no time and effort to keep the Nation from being drawn into war. I was heartened by his prediction that we shall succeed in this effort. I do not question his sincerity of purpose. I agree with him that "no man or group in any walk of life should assume exclusive protectorate over the future well-being of America," and that "the mantle of peace and of patriotism is wide enough to cover us all."

WORDS NOT SUFFICIENT

Again, with all due respect to the President and to his sincerity, I must say that the people of America want not merely a statement that we will keep out of war, but they want action that will back up such a resolution and effectively keep us out of war. Unfortunately, Mr. Roosevelt's record has been such that many of us are troubled about his attitude on international affairs.

Let us look at facts.

On April 11, at his Washington press conference Mr. Roosevelt endorsed and made his own, an editorial published that day in the Washington Post. This editorial was, in effect, a plea for intervention by the United States. It stated definitely that all attempts to shelter the United States from war would be futile if England and France went to war. It spoke of our involvement as "a virtual certainty" if England and France should fight Germany. It classed the United States among the western nations that would be obliged to match Hitler's force by their force.

It is only too clear that by endorsing and making his own this editorial of April 11, the President, in effect, led the European powers to expect that if they were forced into war with Germany, we would fight at their sides.

This change in the President's attitude from the position he took in April to that which he takes today is gratifying. We hope he clings to the attitude taken in his message Thursday when he said, "Our acts must be guided by one single, hard-headed thought—to keep us out of war," and again, "This Government must lose no time or effort to keep from being drawn into the war," and he added, "In my candid judgment, we shall succeed."

OUR CHANGED VIEWPOINT

When the President gave that interview public opinion was very different from what it is now. Our antiwar emotions and convictions had not been crystallized. The administration for some time had been maintaining a warlike attitude toward the dictatorships, but against this attitude the country had not yet fully reacted.

The country then, as now, was deeply indignant at the lawless and brutal course of the totalitarian dictatorships. Then, as now, it was sympathetic with the democracies. Nevertheless, as yet we had developed no real consciousness of the true meaning of our entry into another World War. We did not realize the huge price we would have to pay in loss of life, in frightful suffering, in crushing expenditures that would keep our children and their children in poverty for generations to come. We did not sense the thorough and terrible loss of democracy, of government by the people, of a free society, which it would mean.

Let me repeat, the day we go to war, that day in this country a complete dictatorship will end the America you and I love.

But you say, and say truly, that when England declared war on September 3 the President took a stand very different from that he took in April. In a broadcast from Washington he reversed himself completely and promised the country—I quote: "As long as it remains within my power to prevent it, there will be no black-out of peace in the United States."

We all know Mr. Roosevelt is an able politician. But, alas, that is unfortunate in this situation. He can change his views with lightning rapidity. At one moment he promises to balance the Budget, the next he raises the Government's expenditures beyond all chance of balance. One moment he assaults democracy by attempting to seize the powers of all three branches of the Government; the next he declares himself democracy's warm friend. One moment he decrees a purge of all Congressmen and Senators who oppose him, even those in his own party; the next he pleads for good will and harmony at the Capitol. One moment he promises business appeasement and a breathing spell, and the next he launches vindictive reprisals.

SOME OMINOUS SIGNS

So it is not surprising, though exceedingly troubling, that the President should in April, in effect, declare for our entry into a European war, and in September state emphatically that, if he can prevent it, there will be "no black-out of peace."

All who are in touch with what is going on in Washington fear that, in spite of all that is said to the contrary, the United States is driving steadily toward eventual participation in the war. All plans are being made to that end. According to dispatches, they are getting everything ready in Washington so that a draft may be put in force at a moment's notice. That fact disturbs the peace of mind of every father and mother.

Remember what happened in 1916 and 1917. There were promises we would keep out of the European war. But European nations began to borrow money here. Then they began to buy supplies here. Next, we were promised if we went into the war no troops would be sent to Europe. How sadly we were misled. Soon plans were laid for sending 4,000,000 of our finest young men into the hell of war.

Let no appeal for adjournment of partisanship restrain us from opposition to any act that will lead us into this war. The Republican Party, representing the opposition, must watch every move, see to it that no misstep results in sending our boys to fight Europe's battle.

So, also, must we preserve our constitutional form of government. Never was it more important that we protect the Constitution, that great charter of our liberty.

Our form of government and our rights will be safe only so long as we protect and preserve our Constitution. It is our only hope of escaping the tragic fate of Europe.

THE PRESIDENT'S ATTITUDE

Some of us fear we have as President one who is not deeply concerned about our Constitution.

Even Mr. Roosevelt himself has said, "We have built up new instruments of public power which, in the hands of political puppets, would provide shackles for the liberties of the people."

Let me quote from him again in addressing a committee of Congress: "I hope that your committee will not permit doubts as to the constitutionality, however reasonable, to block the suggested legislation."

These quotations show no great concern on his part about the Constitution.

Even more significant was his attack on the Supreme Court when he proposed to pack it so that this keystone of our Constitution would be destroyed. His plan would have clipped its power and strangled any of its efforts to protect the people against the tyranny of the majority that happened to be in office.

The Constitution offers us many commandments for preservation of our form of government. Let me name four: First, that the right of the several States to regulate their own affairs must remain inviolate. Second, that we entrust no official with autocratic power. Third, that arbitrary powers shall never be lodged in any majority; and, fourth, that limitation on officials shall be maintained by the Supreme Court of the United States.

I charge that these commandments of the Constitution have been violated again and again by the policies of the Roosevelt administration.

"Arbitrary power always marks the end of liberalism, and true liberalism is civilization's finest fruitage," someone has well said.

Washington said, "Arbitrary, irresponsible power can never be trusted in human hands"; and Jefferson well said, "When all government shall be drawn to Washington as the center of all power it will become penal and oppressive."

Andrew Jackson, in his farewell address, said, "There are those who wish to enlarge the powers of the Central Government. Their attempts should be firmly opposed. One evil example will lead to other measures still more mischievous."

How the acts of the Roosevelt administration conflict with these words of wisdom!

MUST RESTRICT POWER

Let us grant no more power to President Roosevelt or any President.

We cannot attempt to preserve or defend the democracies of Europe, but we can and must defend our own democracy. If democracy fails here, is there hope for it anywhere? The fate of the world rests with us. It is a challenge to America.

In this crisis we must cling closely to our Constitution and our constitutional form of government. Once we lose it it will be difficult, if not impossible, to regain it.

Again, we must restore prosperity if we are to preserve our democracy.

Our Constitution makes possible the free-enterprise system. It gives the individual, rich or poor, opportunity to make the most of himself, to realize his ambitions, to profit from his efforts, to engage in any field of activity which does not injure others—in short, it leaves to every individual the right to regulate his own life. This system of free enterprise, with the incentives that it affords, brought about the great development of America, the greatest development the world has ever seen.

If we preserve our Constitution and our system of free enterprise, who can place a limit to what may be done in America? Despite the long depression the country is far from finished. We may geographically have reached our last frontier, but new and greater frontiers are opening up to us every day.

PLENTY OF OPPORTUNITY

In hundreds of laboratories throughout the land research is developing new products and finding new uses for old products. In a few years the entire world about us will be changed. Machines, unjustly blamed for our ills, will be reemploying millions of workers. They will be producing for us abundantly the things we need and want. Under our system of free enterprise, we shall amazingly enlarge, enrich, and beautify our lives.

Our country is blessed with almost unlimited resources, with great productive capacity. We have an intelligent, inventive, resourceful people. We stand at the gates of plenty. We need only to make our system of distribution function, to afford employment to all willing workers, abolish poverty, sickness, distress, and bring happiness and prosperity to all.

Only under our form of government and under our Constitution can such dreams be realized.

These are critical days for America. What may happen in the next few weeks or months may determine our entire future. Every citizen must take a deep interest in public questions and must exercise his full rights as a citizen. We must make no mistake that will cloud the promising outlook for America.

Our task is to make America strong and great. We must keep the flame of liberty blazing undimmed in the Western Hemisphere.

Under wise leadership we can attain such happiness and well-being that by force of example, we may help to lead the free peoples of the world to forms of government that will make for sanity and peace.

To this great task the Republican Party must dedicate itself. We must enlist the support of every citizen, and by persistent effort see to it that this continues to be a land of freedom and liberty.

The patriots in Washington's time risked all, gave all, for their country. The blessings we enjoy were obtained only by the greatest sacrifices. We cannot hope to retain these blessings if we are not ready also to make sacrifices for them.

CHALLENGE TO REPUBLICANS

The issue today is far more important than was the great issue of Lincoln's time. The question that confronts us now is whether all men shall remain free, or whether they shall become the helpless pawns of the politicians in power whom we call the state.

In Lincoln's time, when our country was in its second great crisis, the Republican Party rose to the emergency and saved the Union. In this third crisis, America calls upon the Republican Party to render a greater service to our people. It will be a service to all mankind. The country now looks to it for leadership and wise administration of our Government. The party must meet this challenge.

Yet it falls upon the individual to determine the future of our country. If we all take a deep interest in our Government, if we do our full duty to our party and take part in its affairs in our own precincts, then we can accomplish results; 1940 will be a year of tremendous, fateful decisions. The election next year may determine which way we shall go—toward a perpetuation of our democracy or toward dictatorship.

I have faith in the American people. In spite of reverses, in spite of discouragement, I have faith that a great unseen power is directing our destiny and we shall triumph in this crisis as we have in others. I have faith that we shall all do our full part, that there will be glorious days ahead for America, and that government "of the people, by the people, and for the people shall not perish from the earth."

Required Reading for Europeans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN J. KENNEDY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 25, 1939

EDITORIAL FROM THE SATURDAY EVENING POST OF OCTOBER 28, 1939

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, the Saturday Evening Post offers to its readers editorials on current topics which are always worthy of serious reading. The following editorial is both timely and interesting, and I hope that the entire membership of the Congress will also find time to read the article.

[From the Saturday Evening Post of October 28, 1939]

REQUIRED READING FOR EUROPEANS

Ever since Europe has had any history at all, it has been a history marked by continual disputes, culminating at intervals in bloody and ruinous wars. As the drama continues its long run, the villains change, the heroes change—sometimes with bewildering rapidity, as witness Soviet Russia—but the plot remains essentially the same.

The villains are no doubt very real, and the heroes as well, but we can still wonder why the old stock situations come up again and again, so that speeches and arguments used against Napoleon or Kaiser Wilhelm could serve almost unchanged as propaganda against Hitler. It seems remarkable that after so many centuries, the statesmen of Europe were able to contrive only the unquiet intermission of 1919–39, instead of the looked-for happy ending. The excuses given are plausible enough at first sight; racial and religious differences, trade rivalries, boundary disputes, all form so many unbridgeable chasms between the European states.

But differences just as wide and deep have been bridged on this continent. An Englishman who traveled in America in 1759–60 wrote:

"Fire and water are not more heterogeneous than the different colonies in North America. Nothing can exceed the jealousy and emulation which they possess in regard to each other. The inhabitants of Pennsylvania and New York have an inexhaustible source of animosity in their jealousy for the trade of the Jerseys. Massachusetts Bay and Rhode Island are not less interested in that of Connecticut. The West Indies are a common subject of emulation to them all. Even the limits and boundaries of each colony are a constant source of litigation. In short, such is the difference of character, of manners, of religion, of interest in the different colonies, that I think, if I am not wholly ignorant of the human mind, were they left to themselves, there would soon be a civil war from one end of the continent to the other; while the Indians and Negroes would, with better reason, impatiently watch the opportunity of exterminating them altogether."

Virtually all competent observers of the time agreed that union between the colonies was impossible. And yet it was achieved. It might be a good idea if Europeans made as close a study of the way to peace as we are now making of the ways of war, as exemplified in Europe.

The Newspapers in This Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEPHEN BOLLES

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 25, 1939

ADDRESS BY HON. STEPHEN BOLLES, OF WISCONSIN, OCTOBER 20, 1939

Mr. BOLLES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent, at the earnest request of members of the Illinois Press Association, to insert in the RECORD an address of mine at the seventy-fourth annual banquet of that great organization of newspaper editors and publishers of Illinois, at the University of Illinois, Friday evening, October 20. The address follows:

I come to you from the Inland Daily Press Association at its meeting in Chicago—an organization taking in its membership the daily press of the great Central West, from Pennsylvania to the Rocky Mountains. I talked about Congress there, more particularly in the relationship of the newspaper to the Congress of the United States than as a page from a guidebook, which explains what Congress is. A trite statement that I hear frequently, as you have, is that we are living in a very critical period. We have always lived in a critical period. There never has been a time when there was not an impending crisis. I remember when the automobile took to the highways, with linen duster drivers and goggled eyes, and the women stormed the outfitting shops and the horses on a thousand highways snorted in fear and ran away. I remember a speech in the Ohio Legislature by an early member who advocated the abolition of the automobile in its entirety. I remember also that ministers of the gospel, swept with enthusiasm, spoke in earnest denunciation of golf and that this new importation from Scotland was a manifestation of the devil's powers. We have survived these volcanic changes, both of which have had an enormous influence on American life.

The automobile revolutionized industry, changed rural and village life, sent cities out into sprawling suburbs, extended neighborhoods, ordered a new social life, colored the landscape with chromatic filling stations, built garages by the thousands, put a million people at work.

One of the old—and I may say probably the oldest—indoor sports for newspapers since the adoption of the Constitution and the institution of a free elective government in the United States has been the inherent right of the editor to make fun of Congress and those holding political office. Many an editor has written what he thought was a rib tickler concerning this body of men in Washington. To many Congress is looked upon as a necessary evil, like the road hog, the Mormon cricket, the grasshopper, the corn borer, the locust, and the army worm.

But I wish you would remember, all of you, that 435 Members of the House of Representatives, representing districts in this Nation of 48 States, and 96 Senators, elected by the people of each State, are responsible to the 130,000,000 people for all the statute laws of this Nation and must stand or fall by what they do and the records they make.

Whenever a large number of people want a special thing we hear it said that there is a public sentiment in its favor. The Member of Congress must separate this supposed public sentiment and discover for himself whether this desire for a certain thing may be simply the outcome of narrow personal interest and may, in no sense, deserve the name of public sentiment or public spirit. And the next step is to find out whether people who write you as a Member of Congress are writing for their own personal interests, the interests of their business, or their hope of profits if certain legislation is passed or not passed, or whether it has in it the element of a widespread benefit to the general public. The mail of almost every Congressman is burdened with the demand from people who want things done because it is profitable to them. I am not saying that this is not justifiable in most instances, but it puts a burden on the Congressman to separate that personal interest particularly from what might be beneficial to the general public.

Arthur Twining Hadley, former president of Yale, said once that "Public sentiment represents each man's share in that political conscience which is as important for the ordering of the affairs of the individual. Public opinion is a judgment formed in accordance with the dictates of this political conscience and representing a theory which a man is prepared to apply against himself as well as against others."

And then President Hadley continues: "Where it exists such public opinion is not only powerful but all powerful. It can accomplish more than any other coercive agency in the world."

Now, I may say that as a Member of Congress I am confronted with these things. I must realize to the fullest extent my own responsibility. The syndicate writers, with the sophistry of words, and all the others who indulge in something outside of public sentiment which reaches the stage of propaganda, are creating public opinion.

Propaganda is that thing spoken or written which has for its purpose, justifiable or not, the attainment of a definite object in creating public opinion. Its truth or falsity is no concern of the propagandist. There is a milder form of propaganda that is found in a flood of Government press releases, purporting to be reports on ordinary affairs but nevertheless with a most definite objective—to give the public an idea of the overwhelming interest of bureaus and departments in the welfare of the American people. Now, propaganda is differentiated from news acceptable to the newspapers by news being pure at its source. It is a record of fact only and not vitiated by opinion subtle or openly.

This literary propagandic epilepsy finds its way into the newspapers in spite of wastebaskets. The public may be fed arsenic in small doses and live; it may be fed opiates with its morning coffee or its afternoon tea; it may not know it is taking either and will probably deny any effect, but nevertheless it is being changed by its newspaper reading of propaganda, subtly, unconsciously, and thoroughly.

I want to call your attention to the necessity of the newspapers represented by the Illinois Press Association and all other newspaper organizations in the United States of trying to separate propaganda from the news. The most beneficial thing we may have for the establishment of a right public opinion and the creation of a genuine public sentiment is the elimination of this weight of propaganda. In the American Society of Newspaper Editors' statement of ideals it is said, "The press must stand guard over itself, that it may be worthy to stand guard for the public."

As a Member of Congress and also a lifetime newspaper reporter or editor, I have a hard task in winnowing the actual truth from propaganda. It is frankly recognized that public sentiment will not meet all those evils which need to be corrected or abolished, or accomplish all those objects for which numbers of people now desire legislation. It is quite well that this is so. If all things were done which are called for in the name of public sentiment and passed into laws by the Congress of the United States we would lose all the freedom of America. Over and over again, bowing to what was supposed to be public sentiment expressed in elections or by mass attack through letters, telegrams, and petitions to the Members of Congress, laws have been passed and rules of conduct established which in the end have proved to be extraordinary failures.

We must have one principle which shall be unchangeable. That principle is that a just government is based on the consent of the governed. Even though the government possesses for the moment a majority at the polls, without that consent we have neither just government, self-government, nor freedom in its true sense.

And now I want to talk to you for a minute about the responsibility of the newspapers, the responsibility of your own press association, the responsibility of those who are learning to be newspapermen, through journalism courses at this and other universities. It is too often a fact that when Members of Congress in Washington and political candidates talk about the freedom of the press they do not have in mind the real press of the United States. That real press is not in the great metropolitan newspaper but in the 700 or more daily newspapers and hundreds more of weeklies distributed daily or weekly to 70 percent of the population of these great central States. Not in the seaboard cities with polyglot populations, not in the great metropolitan field where people buy newspapers, is the power of the press. The power lies in the people who subscribe for a newspaper and do not buy it on the street. Just so long as the people who subscribe are a militant majority, there will be no censorship of the newspapers of this country, and no possibility of a curtailment of press freedom. Power given to any administrative official or the creation of the unnumbered bureaucratic organizations, unchecked by the legislative body of the United States, which is Congress, in order to carry out that power may find it necessary to check the press itself, perhaps censor it and to take over the domination of communication. I make no dire prophesy about this, but I do warn you that it is necessary to be on the watchtower against the insidious and erosive movement to question the position of the press or to attempt in any manner its censorship or curtailment of its constitutional rights.

Let us keep before us the figure of that young German, Peter Zenger, and the historical figure of white-wigged Andrew Hamilton, whose legal masterpiece in Zenger's defense remains even today as the unmovable cornerstone of our own press freedom. Once we have a censorship in America we have taken a step backward into the Dark Ages of absolutism and dictatorship.

There are more ways than one of censorship. Most recent is the organized campaign against advertising. This is a "boring from within" which you find it hard to combat. You hear it on the floor of the House—the domination of newspapers by the advertiser, the higher prices paid by consumers for advertised commodities. May I say to you that you must meet this challenge in your own community.

I challenge one and all to this, that the press—and when I speak of the press I mean newspapers, daily and weekly—has

never been more powerful or had more freedom than at this hour of our history. There can be no national freedom without a free press, and by the corollary there can be no free press without a free nation.

I want to say to you here that if by some strange metamorphosis of public mind and a wave of new hysterical insanity in Congress through public opinion and sentiment imposed upon it, we go to war, there will be blood spots on every newspaper, no matter how great or how lowly it may be. You as well as I have a great responsibility here.

I was intensely interested at your session this morning in the discussion of an editorial page. And why? To me the editorial page of any newspaper breathes its personality. One is not called upon to quarrel but to lead. This is after all a world of commonplaces, of small things. They make up the daily life of each household and in the aggregate, the community life. In that community each week arise a dozen topics for comment, not in news columns but in the editorial page. There is your place of interpretation of the news, your homely contributions to your community. The most widely publicized editorial I ever wrote was on a pumpkin pie. It stirred all New England because I proved that no matter its origin, Wisconsin was the real home of pumpkin pie. And do not wait for a man who has done things for your community to tell about it. Better is one rose on the breast of the living than a blanket of forget-me-nots on the mahogany coffin of the dead.

You have also a larger, wider responsibility in going further. Most of this world is voiceless, inarticulate. It has no way, no means of expressing itself. In America we are blessed with newspapers. The paper must provide the articulation. If it does not it is failing in its job.

I make no apology for the newspapers. They are just as perfect as is the human race and no more. There is a record of only two persons in either profane or sacred history that so reached perfection as to be translated to Paradise while still living—Enoch and Elijah. I say to you that whenever one of you feels that his newspaper on any day is perfect, there will be a chariot of fire right at the front door to take you without checking the speed limit to the gates of the New Jerusalem.

One-third of the population of the United States, in figures, reads daily newspapers; two-thirds read the weeklies. The most potent power in this Nation for the decline of illiteracy is the newspaper daily and weekly. It can and does do more than any other instrument to build public sentiment than any other force. It can take a peanut politician out of oblivion and make him a Congressman of the United States. It can take a Negro roustabout from the slums of Detroit and make him a national figure. It can take a gum-chewing girl who doesn't know the difference between syntax and sandstone and make her a formidable star in the movies. It can turn obscurity into public prominence. It can paint a gangster into a daring bandit and give him a high place in criminal history. It can make a mediocre scion of a degenerate nobility something of world-wide consequence.

The newspapermen plants and prunes a vine, fertilizes it with its best phrases, and may find at last that it withers to the touch and its beautiful flowers fade and fall. It is the profession of all professions. Science would find its discoveries valueless, invention hidden in dark-caved mystery, progress in the doldrums, a free people uninformed, the government slowed up with brakes on every axle, if it were not for the newspaper. It is the one profession or vocation where every scrap of knowledge ever gained or accumulated can be used.

Therefore the newspapers have a responsibility at this particular time in our history, when we are involved in a great discussion of what is best for the United States, with all the world involved either in war or tremulously watching war developments. You have a coequal responsibility with your Congressmen and Senators to the people of this Nation, to the whole world in general, for the preservation of civilization. We need the newspaper now as never before. Remember the road between political partisanship and constructive statesmanship is a winding highway without a warning sign.

Civilization is not preserved by bombing it to death from the air, ambushing it in the sea by U-boats, or shooting it into graves in mass frontal attacks. And so I'm opposed to war to settle any question, or to handing to anybody shooting irons with which to preserve civilization by killing somebody else.

No dictatorship can exist with a free press, uncensored and untrammeled. Almost the first step in a totalitarian state is the suppression of the newspapers.

When Napoleon Bonaparte lost his throne there was erected the Holy Alliance in 1815. It was the first League of Nations. There was a covenant for the maintenance of the status quo as to boundaries, rulers, and governments. The Holy Alliance has been called the strongest and most effective international union which the world has ever known. It was in autocratic hands, where parliaments need not be consulted. It died eventually because it met a new power unforeseen and not cataloged—the power of public opinion and its ally, the spirit of popular government.

The guiding genius of the alliance—a devil may be a genius—was Prince Metternich of Austria. Its powerful backers were Alexander of Russia, Talleyrand of France. Its originators were Russia and Austria but in a few years the protocol had been signed by every power and nation of Europe except Great Britain, the Sultan of Turkey, and the Pope. It declared that the alliance: "Has no other object than the maintenance of peace and the guaranty of those transactions on which the peace was founded and consolidated * * * the repose of the world will be constantly our motive."

What a hollow mockery! Later on, the Holy Alliance became more arrogant and declared in 1821 that all legislation in all the states which it had "taken into its holy keeping must emanate alone from the free will, the reflected and enlightened impulse of those whom God has rendered responsible for power."

In other words, all nations in the alliance must make no new laws unless first submitted to the Holy Alliance. It was one of the world's boldest pieces of arrogant impertinence. In the Congress of Verona in 1822 the Duke of Wellington withdrew as Britain's representative because in the treaty, ready to be signed was a clause which said that: "As the liberty of the press is the most powerful means used by the pretended supporters of the rights of nations to the detriment of those of princes, the high contracting parties promise reciprocally to adopt all proper measures to suppress it, not only on their own states but also in the rest of Europe."

Wellington withdrew, Britain refused to remain in the Holy Alliance. Following the battle by John Wilkes, the freedom of the press in Great Britain had been established after a long and bitter struggle 70 years before. It had become a part of the British unwritten constitution and the greatest support of the British Government was its growing and more powerful daily newspaper press.

Thus came black days for the Holy Alliance in Europe. Greece struck at Turkey and became free. The Spanish nations in the Western Hemisphere revolted and became free, and almost every other nation in Europe stepped forth into a new atmosphere of liberty and individual expression.

If so dark a night could come to peoples in Europe, and so great an attempt for consolidated autocratic power could die as did the Holy Alliance, I may say that I have historical precedence for a belief that out of the gloomy murk of a dictated Europe of 1939 the people will emerge once more in the brilliant light of a greater freedom.

I shall try and do my part, both as a newspaper editor and a Member of Congress. I ask you to do yours. I want to see a new spirit of optimism. There is too much dark pessimism, too much of defeatism, and too much of a belief that America is involved in all of these quagmires of European politics. For remember, my friends, we blazed our own trail, we forded the rivers, we cleared the prairies and the forests, we built the roads and the railroads, we put the steamboats on the rivers, we constructed the mills and the factories, we built the schoolhouses and the churches, we established the little academies, the colleges, and the universities, and these are still ours. Let us keep them so. Our history over a hundred years was a struggle for peace. Let us not be weary on this present battle front for peace.

Never yet—

Share of plow was vainly set
In the world's wide fallow;
Other hands shall sow the seed,
Other hands from hill and mead
Reap the harvest yellow.

Industrial Price Policies in This Emergency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 25, 1939

ADDRESS BY HAROLD G. MOULTON

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address recently delivered by Mr. Harold G. Moulton, president of the Brookings Institution:

As everyone knows, the outbreak of war in Europe resulted in an immediate and striking advance in commodity prices in the United States. In the first 2 weeks of September the wholesale-price index of all commodities rose some 6 percent and many raw-material prices advanced as much as 25 percent. The question of the hour became, Are we entering upon a new era of inflation comparable to that of the World War period? The advance ended in mid-September, and the last 4 weeks have shown a slight recession. Hence the present moment of suspense is a highly propitious one in which to discuss industrial price policies in this emergency. If we are to analyze the problem adequately, it is essential that we place the American financial situation in a world setting.

Financial trends throughout the world in recent years have been highly disquieting. The disorganization of the international exchanges and the break-down of monetary and financial systems during the great depression were not followed by a period of financial reconstruction and normal business expansion. Instead of a restoration of international economic equilibrium, we have

witnessed a continuance of foreign-exchange controls and a further great shift of liquid financial resources to the United States. In lieu of a well-balanced world recovery from a world depression, we have had widely varying degrees of business activity in different countries, reflecting in the main the intensity of the stimulus applied in the form of Government expenditures for relief purposes or for military objectives. In place of a progressive reduction in public indebtedness and a lightening load of taxation, Government debt has nearly everywhere been increasing at a rate comparable to that of wartime. At the end of 6 years which should have been years of sound recovery and expansion, it cannot be said that world financial stability had been achieved, or even approached.

In the light of this background, it is hardly too much to say that the coming of a new war in Europe raises economic and financial problems of wholly unprecedented importance for the entire world. The imposition of new war costs upon already overburdened financial systems imperils economic and financial reconstruction everywhere—in the United States and other neutral nations as well as in the countries which are at war.

This statement is made in full consciousness of the fact that at the moment of speaking, the economic situation in the United States appears—on the surface of things—to be highly promising. Even before the outbreak of war abroad, corporate earnings were showing a somewhat unexpected improvement; and now with the added stimulus of war demands the outlook for dividends in the near future appears indeed promising. Production is expanding, employment increasing, purchasing power broadening, and national income rising. The recent increase in food and raw-material prices is—in the main—regarded as helpful rather than otherwise, bringing about a better equilibrium between various segments of the economic system. Superficially, at any rate, it would seem that our prayers are at last being answered.

But sober reflection warns of lurking dangers. Are we not stocking up with inventories and expanding production schedules at too rapid a pace? What if the war should end suddenly? Even if it proves to be of long duration, what will be the ultimate repercussions upon this country? Are we not even now riding the wind and promoting a business boom, with the familiar distortion of prices, wages, and other cost factors? Are we not sure to see sooner or later, and perhaps sooner rather than later, a new collapse and another protracted period of painful readjustment?

It is no part of my purpose to venture a prediction as to the probable magnitude of the present expansion movement or its possible duration—for I know of no scientific formula whereby one can resolve a compound made up of economic, political, psychological, and military elements, and read the future with unerring eye. My sole object is to discuss what I conceive to be the fundamental economic requirements of the present situation and the industrial policies necessary to achieve the desired ends. I would make it clear at the outset that the analysis is based on the assumption that the United States will not become a participant in the European war.

THE NATIONAL ECONOMIC GOAL

As a foundation for the consideration of business policies at this time, we should obviously have in mind a clearly defined national economic objective or goal. I would state the desirable objective in the following terms: The economic goal of the United States at this time should be to make a full utilization of our economic resources in expanding production without permitting a general inflation of prices and a destruction of equilibrium in the economic system.

Under any circumstances, the maintenance of a well-balanced economy is essential to orderly progress. In view of the present world situation the preservation of financial and economic stability in the United States is a paramount necessity. It is not too much to say that economic developments on the North American Continent in the coming months may well prove of decisive importance to the whole future of industrial civilization.

FUNDAMENTAL FACTORS IN THE ECONOMIC SITUATION

If we are to view the national economic problem in fundamental terms, we must look beyond, and for the moment forget, cost accounting and financial issues as they affect particular industries or companies. In other words, we must begin with an engineering approach and survey the national situation in terms of the supplies of primary materials and the capacity of our existing productive plant and equipment to expand output.

The first fact to be noted is that we have exceptionally large accumulated stocks of most primary agricultural and industrial raw materials. Food supplies also have been so large relatively to demand that the trend of prices has been persistently downward. It is unnecessary to present detailed statistical information in respect to food supplies and raw materials, for as everyone knows, Government agencies, as well as producing groups, have been preoccupied, not with shortages but with the problem of how to get rid of surpluses "overhanging the markets."

We also had, and now have, the capacity to produce still greater supplies of basic raw materials. In order to keep surpluses down, the Government has been restricting agricultural production, while mineral output has been held in check by inadequate demand. In both fields the volume of production could readily be greatly increased. So far as domestic production is concerned there is thus, in general, no present or prospective shortage of raw materials. (Scrap iron is an important exception.) The situation is, of course, different with respect to materials which have to be imported. It is possible that in some cases serious shortages might develop.

In the fields of manufacture and distribution the situation with respect to productive capacity is similar. Except in a few lines the scale of operations has been far below capacity. Moreover, existing capacity could, if necessary, be expanded without great delay. Railroad facilities might show some temporary shortcomings, but our transportation system as a whole has ample actual or potential capacity to care for probable national requirements.

The situation with respect to labor cannot be stated in such unqualified terms. In the aggregate, unemployment runs into many millions; but a program of business expansion under the stimulus of European war demands would doubtless result in serious shortages of certain types of skilled labor, requiring extensive apprentice-training programs. With this reservation, the labor supply must also be regarded as imposing no restrictions upon a very large expansion of production.

It is hardly necessary to point out that there is no shortage of what used to be called "the life blood of business," namely, money and credit. The supply is superabundant, and interest rates the lowest ever known.

There is thus no scarcity basis for a great advance in the general level of commodity prices. Indeed, when one looks at the situation in terms of the effective utilization of productive energy, it would seem clear that as output expands, unit costs of production should for a time fall. This is for the simple reason that we would be making use of otherwise idle plant and equipment. When productive resources are not fully employed, there is obvious waste; and the elimination of idle resources means—in terms of human energy—a reduction of costs.

But is not the approach that we have been making unreal and impractical, in that it ignores the money cost, price, and profit problems which confront individual business enterprises? Obviously, the analysis would be incomplete if it did not give careful consideration to the practical problems which must be faced and solved by business executives who are responsible for meeting pay rolls and fixed charges and earning dividends for impatient stockholders. They are not in a position to control the economic system as a whole. They must take cost factors as they find them and make the best profit showing they can under constantly varying conditions.

Manufacturing industry is, at the moment, confronted with the fact that raw-material prices in general are now some 10 percent higher than in August, and that in many cases the advance has been as much as 25 percent. Regardless of the situation with respect to aggregate national productive capacity, higher material prices mean for manufacturing enterprises higher money outlays, which cannot be ignored in a profit-making economic system. Before attempting to indicate the bearing of such increased costs on profits, a brief analysis should be made of the factors involved in the advance in raw-material prices.

The sharp increase which has occurred in the prices of raw materials is the result of demand from two sources: (1) from speculators seeking to make profits by anticipating price advances based on expectations of war-time inflation; and (2) from industries desiring to expand inventories to take care of immediate and prospective requirements. The speculative element enters here also, since an expected price advance prompts heavy advance buying.

While available data are far from adequate, there is much reason for believing that the great upsurge in raw material buying which has occurred since August has resulted in a greater price advance in many raw materials than is warranted by the fundamental supply and demand factors in the situation. Much of the speculative buying has been based upon exaggerated notions about world wide inflation. Inventory purchases have also been on a plane which may well be above that warranted by the demand from ultimate consumers. There is clear evidence that the current level of production is substantially above the current level of consumption. While consumptive demand may be expected to increase as employment expands, the question remains, Has not inventory accumulation once again been excessive? The answer will depend in no small degree on the probable magnitude of European war demands.

FACTORS AFFECTING EUROPEAN DEMANDS

European purchases may well be of a much more restricted character than has been generally assumed. The present situation differs from that of the World War period in several significant respects. First, the capacity of the principal European nations to buy goods in our markets is very much less. In 1914 their ability to borrow appeared almost limitless, whereas today it is gravely impaired. It is possible to compute for England and France many billions of foreign purchasing power by counting all of the gold resources of these countries held at home and in the United States, and by including investments, bank deposits, and speculative holdings of British and French citizens abroad. However, to mobilize these individual holdings, it is necessary for the governments concerned to obtain possession of them through requiring their exchange for government bonds. In view of the credit strain with which these countries are confronted, the mobilization of these holdings is not a simple matter. Moreover, it is in any case of the utmost importance for these countries to preserve, just as far as possible, their liquid financial resources. Accordingly they may be expected to use such resources just as sparingly as possible.

The advance in prices in 1915 was greatly enhanced by frantic competition among European buyers, participated in both by

individual purchasers and by governments. This time the purchase of American supplies will come from fewer countries and they will be pooled in the interest of interallied economy. At the same time rigorous measures for controlling prices are being instituted at the very beginning of the conflict. In this war the European belligerents are harboring no illusions that normal business can go forward as usual or that the standards of living of the masses can be raised or even maintained. British mobilization plans call for a restriction of consumption in the interests of procuring maximum war production and maintaining financial equilibrium.

Finally, the need for American materials and supplies may well be much smaller than was the case in the World War. To be sure, there will be intense demands in special lines, notably airplanes and machine tools, causing distortion in our industrial structure. But, by and large, the demands are likely to be restricted. Both France and England have much larger accumulated supplies of munitions than in 1914, and both countries have greatly expanded their capacity to produce munitions. Belgium and other neutral countries may well be important sources of supply. The Dominions also have increased capacity and will be given preference.

Moreover, there is much reason for believing that the present conflict may not involve infantry and artillery operations of a magnitude comparable to that of the last war when the western front was not protected on both sides by almost impregnable fortifications. If this war is fought by England and France chiefly by means of an economic blockade as both military and economic considerations seem to dictate, French and English purchases in the United States would be of comparatively modest proportions.

Speaking generally, I think it may be safely stated that further advances in raw-material prices would not be advantageous to raw-material producers. This is because they serve to restrict foreign purchases. The sharp rise which has already occurred both in the prices of raw materials and foodstuffs, intensified for foreign purchasers by the relative rise of the dollar, has played directly into the hands of competing areas. Other sources of supply are naturally being given priority.

The implication of this analysis obviously is that the magnitude of European war demands may well have been misgaged. If so, the increases in production schedules and in raw material prices have overshot the mark. The point I am chiefly interested in is that industrial plans for the near future need not necessarily be based on the assumption that raw material prices are certain to go higher; there is quite as much reason for believing that they may go lower.

INDUSTRIAL PRICES

We now proceed directly to the question of industrial price policy in the present situation. Thus far the prices of manufactured goods have not advanced materially. As a matter of sound policy—in the interest of stability—the managements of leading industries have refrained from marking up prices. However, the sharp advance in the price of numerous classes of raw materials, coupled with more moderate increases in some other cost elements, has been leading many to the conclusion that industrial prices must inevitably be advanced in the not distant future.

There can, of course, be no doubt that if operating costs in manufacturing industry should continue to increase it would eventually be necessary to advance prices in order to prevent the elimination of profit margins. The only question at issue is whether an increase in prices is necessary at this time. It is obvious that no answer can be given to this question that is equally applicable to all lines of business. One can only speak in general terms.

At this place the analysis ties back with our earlier discussion of unutilized productive capacity. Not only do costs, in terms of human energy, fall as unused plant and equipment is put to work but financial costs also decline.

As a result of habitual modes of thinking, there has been a tendency for all of us to overlook the bearing of the volume of output on unit costs and profits. So long as an industry is operating well below capacity, an increase in volume, which distributes the burden of overhead over a larger number of units, will offset large increases in direct operating expenses.

The tremendous importance of volume to nearly any corporation one might care to name is strikingly revealed in the financial data for the expansion period of 1936. In a certain group of companies, for example, an increase in the scale of operations from 53 percent in the first quarter of 1936 to 69 percent in the second quarter meant more than a threefold increase in net earnings. In the interval there was a slight decline in prices. Ten companies in one industry, which operated for the year 1935 as a whole on a 47.9-percent basis, earned $41,000,000. In 1936, operating at 67-percent capacity, they earned one hundred twenty-eight millions. Meanwhile, average prices had risen less than 1 percent. Moreover, during this period both raw material prices and wages were rising. To carry the story into the first half of 1937, a still increasing scale of operations raised profits still higher, notwithstanding the fact that wages and raw material costs advanced very much more than the prices of finished manufactured product.

The significance of increased volume has long been recognized in connection with such industries as transportation and public utilities. It is regarded as a self-evident proposition that the current expansion in railway traffic will materially improve net earnings, bringing the roads as a whole from the red well into the black. It is not assumed that increases in the cost of fuel, labor, and equipment will promptly necessitate an advance in rates either in the railway or public-utility fields. But curiously enough in the case of manufacturing we tend to assume that increases in operating costs must be promptly followed by some, if not proportional, advances in prices. The difference between manufacturing industry and railroads and public utilities is only a difference in degree.

In order not to make too sweeping a generalization, I now emphasize that the importance of the principle under discussion varies widely in different divisions of manufacturing industry. An increase in direct expenses is obviously more important in lines where the cost of labor and materials bulks large in relation to overhead expenses than where the reverse is true. Moreover, the gains resulting from an expansion of output in any industry obviously tend to diminish as maximum capacity is approached.

The argument is often heard both in business and academic circles that the moment costs begin to rise in consequence of the utilization of less efficient plant and equipment a price advance is called for. If such a price increase could be applied only to these last units of supply, something might be said for it. But to hold that the level of costs in the obsolescent portion of an industry's plant and equipment should govern the price of the entire product, seems to me clearly untenable.

When the demand is temporarily so intense as to call for a volume of output in excess of the capacity of the more efficient plant and equipment, one alternative is to hold the selling price where it is in the knowledge that such price will more than cover direct operating expenses in the obsolescent plant, thus contributing something to general overhead. If, however, the obsolescent plant is so inefficient as to make it impossible to cover direct out-of-pocket expenses at a level of prices in line with the general state of technological advancement in the industry, this would be prima facie evidence that it would be sound policy to refuse further business instead of allowing the whole price structure to be distorted. The result would merely be to postpone a portion of the orders, thereby spreading production more evenly. If there is reason for believing that the high level of demand will prove to be of a sustained character, the need then is for the prompt installation of new low-cost capacity. In any case, genuine industrial progress over the years can be achieved only by constantly applying the results of new scientific and engineering developments to the processes of production. The road to progress is well exemplified in the achievements of one industry during the course of the past 15 years, in which expanding capital investment and increasing efficiency made simultaneously possible (1) a gradual reduction of prices, (2) an increase of wages, both hourly and aggregate, (3) an increase in employment, and (4) a high level of profits. At the same time there was a continuous improvement in the quality and variety of commodities produced, some of which ministered directly to the satisfaction of human wants and others to increasing productive efficiency in a wide range of other industries. I hasten to add that I am not referring to the automobile industry.

Returning to the present situation, the analysis which we have been making clearly leads to the conclusion that there are no compelling economic reasons why there should be any general advances in price at this time. It would be presumptuous of any individual, without detailed knowledge of the situation which confronts particular companies, to say that no price advances are warranted. But, in general, the increases in raw-material prices have not been sufficiently great as to offset the gains resulting from increased volume of output. The price index for raw materials as a whole is even now well below the level of 1935 and 1936 and very much below the level of 1937. Even when account is taken of the high level of wage costs, it does not appear that profit margins are in immediate danger of being snuffed out by high operating costs.

The great need in a period of business buoyancy is to keep the industrial eye fixed upon the second, third, and fourth steps ahead. It should always be borne in mind that an increase in the prices of all those forms of manufactured products which enter into succeeding stages of production appear as costs in each succeeding stage, just as the prices of raw materials appear as costs in the first stage of manufacturing. The process of price advance is cumulative and tends to gain in rapidity as it spreads throughout the entire economic system, and involves wage as well as price advances. Accordingly, if the well-known vicious spiral is to be checked, it must be checked in its early stages.

At the beginning of this address it was stated that the economic goal of the United States at this difficult and uncertain period should be to make a full utilization of our economic resources in expanding production without permitting a general inflation of prices and a destruction of equilibrium. If this national objective be accepted, it follows that advances in industrial prices at this time should be resisted to the utmost. We should be content to make increased profits by a fuller and a steadier utilization of capacity and by ever-increasing efficiency in production.

Similarly, labor policy in this emergency should be focused upon the realization of gains through more and steadier employment instead of upon hourly wage increases. The advances in hourly wages during recent years have not been accompanied by corresponding increases in weekly wages.

On the contrary, weekly and annual wages have on the whole declined. A farsighted labor policy can also contribute much to the maintenance of financial stability.

The only real profits, like the only real wages, are those which arise from increased production. Speculative profits resulting merely from purchasing goods at one price and selling them at

an advance are not of a constructive character; that is, they are not backed by tangible goods and services and thus add nothing in primary terms to the wealth of society. Moreover, such profits are in the main illusory, for when utilized in the replenishment of inventories or the construction of new plant and equipment which have also risen in price, a dollar of profits will not go as far as before. Thus the apparent gains are nullified. Meanwhile, thanks to our system of accounting, a substantial portion of these paper profits may be gathered by the tax collector. In any case, such price advances, as our industrial history proves, lead to collapse and depression, the losses of which more than offset any temporary gains that may have been realized.

If all groups in the body politic will work together at this juncture in clear realization of the fundamental requirements of the situation, it will be possible not only for all classes of the American people to receive higher levels of real income, but also for this Nation to maintain financial and economic stability, and thereby make its most effective contribution to the eventual restoration of economic stability and progress in the world as a whole.

The Arms Embargo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK O. HORTON

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 25, 1939

RADIO ADDRESS BY FORMER PRESIDENT HOOVER

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address delivered recently by former President Hoover:

The question of whether we repeal or do not repeal the embargo has produced a conflict among our people that is growing in bitterness, when we should have national unity in our relations abroad.

Then days ago I made a proposal of a substitute to either repeal or no repeal. I proposed that in what we do we seek for a firm basis in broad humanity rather than among the quicksands of international politics.

I did not insist that this substitute answers every argument on either side of this question. But it suggested new ground upon which dangers could be avoided and extremes lessened.

That proposal was specific: That we on one hand prohibit the sale of the weapons used to terrorize and attack civilians, that is bombing planes, their ammunition, poison gas, and submarines. And on the other hand, that we sell the instruments which can be used to defend civilian populations against such attacks. That is pursuit planes, light observation planes, anti-aircraft guns, their ammunition, and any other instruments that can be used to protect open cities and women and children. And I proposed that for the present we limit our arms business right there. This war is only 50 days old. The forces moving in the world will continue to shift violently. And Congress is always nearby.

Tonight I shall give the reasons for this proposal. But I wish especially to protest the sale from the United States of poison gas and bombing planes and submarines under any form of legislation.

TWO KINDS OF WAR

A revolution has taken place in war itself. War now consists, on the one hand, of war on fighting men and, on the other hand, war on civilians, which includes women and children. This revolution in method is so far reaching and so conclusive that only those who refuse to face facts fail to recognize its import.

By threats of superior bombing fleets to destroy open cities and to kill hundreds of thousands of women and children, nations are being intimidated into sacrifice of their independence without a chance. And it is not only threats. Where people have refused to surrender their independence we have seen this holocaust of terror let loose. In China, in Spain, in Ethiopia, and in Poland literally hundreds of thousands of non-fighting men, women, and children have been massacred.

Before I proceed I wish to clear up a misimpression as to this proposal. I have not proposed that we divide every kind of weapon used in war into defensive weapons and offensive weapons, nor that we embargo such offensive weapons and sell such defensive weapons on that basis. What I have proposed is to limit our basis of action, first, to that part of war carried on against civilians and, second, that we confine our action to certain specific weapons which I have named.

I mention this because some of the writers upon this proposal are under a misimpression that I have proposed to cover all kinds of war weapons. That wider field was indeed proposed by myself in 1932 and by Mr. Roosevelt in 1933. Starting from this misimpression, these writers have lost themselves in a maze of discussion as to what, where, and when a weapon is aggressive and when it is defensive.

Whether different weapons can be used for either benevolent or malevolent purposes between fighting men is not what we are discussing. The distinctions are not so difficult.

Every child in Europe knows its destruction comes from bombing planes and poison gas. Equally every child knows that pursuit planes, observation planes, searchlights, antiaircraft guns, and gas masks are its defense. Every child in Europe can tell these weapons apart.

Moreover, I can give some information on what soldiers themselves have thought of these distinctions. When I proposed to the World Disarmament Conference in 1932 that certain weapons should be abolished in war, the American General Staff, whom I naturally consulted, informed me that so far as a distinction between weapons devoted mostly to attack on civilians and weapons devoted mostly to their defense was concerned, it was a feasible and practical distinction.

Later on, when the proposal was submitted to the technical committee of the World Disarmament Conference, that body, representing the general staffs of the entire world, also agreed that the distinctions were entirely possible and practicable. Later on in 1933, when Mr. Roosevelt again proposed these ideas, I must assume he did so with the approval of the American General Staff. But I am not now arguing what will be best for war in general. I am discussing war on women, children, and nonfighting men.

OUR STAND AGAINST WARS ON WOMEN, CHILDREN, AND NONFIGHTING MEN

First. My first reason for this proposal is that the time has come for America to take a clear and explicit stand upon these wars against civilians.

There was a time when armed men stood up and, like men, fought with other armed men for their obligations and their countries. When they were killed, they were killed in a fight in which they had a chance.

This bombing from the air and use of poison gas on civilians means that the world has gone back to savagery, where armed men killed women and children and burned cities. It is one thing for men to stand up in battle to defend their faith. It is another thing to sneak around behind and kill unarmed men, women, and children and destroy their homes. That is not the work of brave men. Chivalry is certainly dying in our world.

It is, of course, contended that the purpose of bombing planes is to destroy the enemy's industrial works and his air fields. Not even a simple mind can go over the history of the last 5 years and have any such an idea. It is nonsense to say that this is their sole purpose. And if that were so, why do we today see every city in the war countries of Europe blacked-out at night? Why do we see millions of children separated from their mothers and evacuated? Why is every child carrying a gas mask strapped over its shoulder? These children know too well what bombing planes and poison gas will be used for.

The question then we have to ask ourselves is: Shall we sell instruments which can and will be used for wholesale attack on open cities? Likewise, are we prepared to withhold the sale of instruments by which women and children can be protected?

Certainly whatever else may be done about the embargo, America should not sell bombing planes, their bombs, poison gas, or submarines.

Second. My second reason is, that we should make the use of these weapons of attack as little successful as possible. I would, therefore, have America sell freely the weapons to protect open cities and women and children from barbaric attacks of this kind. If, by the grace of God, it could be proved by these defense weapons that attacks on women and children are a futile operation, the world would be saved infinite calamity.

It would do much to protect the independence of nations from gangster governments.

MORALS AND HUMANITY

Third. My third reason for this proposal is that such wars on women, children, and nonfighting men are immoral and inhumane.

There are such things in the world as moral and humane standards, despite all the dialecticians to the contrary. I confess at times that it seems of little avail to raise these banners aloft, but unless they be raised, unless there be some check on this world degeneration, there will be nothing left of this civilization. After all, whatever our scientific discovery and inventions may produce, those things will vanish in rust unless they be supported by standards of moral conduct.

During the great war I went through several air raids. They were puny affairs then compared to these days. But I saw the terror of women and children, rushing to the cellars frantically to escape from an unseen enemy. I saw the indelible impression made upon the minds of children by these terrors. I saw the destroyed homes and I saw the innocent dead in the streets.

I cannot bring myself to believe that the United States should ever sell this kind of weapons to anybody at any time anywhere. I have no sympathy with the killing of women and children of any race, no matter what the ultimate objective may be.

I have said before I do not like to think of the day when bombing planes, engaged in the killing of women and children, on both or either side in this war, will be identified as the product of American industry.

THE ATTITUDE OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE HITHERTO

Fourth. My fourth reason is that I do not want to see the American people abandon, even by implication, an attitude held consistently by them for over 20 years.

Ever since the Great War we have protested, negotiated, and demanded that war shall not be made upon civilians. We have said time and again that bombardment from the air of unarmed men, women, and children is wicked in the sight of God and man. We have said that to shower poison gas upon them is unspeakable. We have grown indignant and threatening to other nations about it. Year after year our press, our public men, our Congress, and our Government have denounced these acts.

In the years of 1919, 1921, 1922, 1925, 1932, 1933, and even 1939 we have proposed to other nations that they must be stopped. We have proposed several times that these weapons should be abolished. We were supported by a great majority of the nations in 1932. Secretary Hull as late as a year ago indicated to our manufacturers that they should not sell bombing planes to Japan. And today we propose to pass laws authorizing such sales. There are here no dual moral standards, one for us and one for our neighbors. There is here a question not of formalistic exactitude but of moral purpose. We have tried time and again to suppress these weapons by international agreement. There is no hope of such international action between nations that are now at war.

The American people, true to their own faith and their own morals, their own civilization, based upon humanity, should refuse to sell such weapons. We are proved hypocrites out of our own mouths if we sell bombing planes or poison gas.

And we in effect condone the practices which we ourselves have condemned.

NEUTRALITY

Fifth. My fifth reason is that this proposal avoids the major charge of unneutral action.

The advocates of retention of the embargo assert that if it is repealed we are turning American industry into an arsenal for the benefit of one side.

The advocates of repeal are convinced that if the embargo is not repealed we are arbitrarily favoring Germany by depriving Great Britain and France of weapons.

It must not be forgotten that under the present law we can sell bombing planes, poison gas, and submarines to Japan, Russia, and Italy, who can indirectly transfer them to Germany or use them against civilians themselves. Under repeal Germany can buy them and use them against France and England.

The proposal I have made shifts our whole basis of action away from both horns of this dilemma of repeal or no repeal.

In supplying pursuit planes, observation planes, antiaircraft guns, and any other such instruments we help the British and French to save their cities, to save their sources of supplies, and their women and children. That today is their greatest danger. And likewise it protects German women and children, their cities, and their sources of supplies from bombing by planes of our manufacture. If it is not the intention of either the British and French or the Germans to so use these weapons against civilians and homes, then neither of them can complain of our refusing to sell to them, and neither side can complain of our sale of defensive arms against them. There can be no substantial claim of unneutral action.

THE EFFECT UPON OUR ECONOMIC SYSTEM

Sixth. My sixth reason is that this proposal avoids the more extreme economic dangers of repeal or no repeal.

Those advocating that we hold the embargo on all arms and instruments of war assert that the repeal will inflate American industry; that it will create large profits out of war for a few individuals; that unemployment will be increased by the bursting of the arms bubble; that the workers will be the sufferers; and it is significant that organized American industry takes this view also.

Those who would repeal the embargo assert that we would benefit in our own preparedness by this increase in arms-manufacturing capacity at foreigners' expense. That it would give profits to business and jobs to many of our present unemployed.

Both of these conclusions are true. I do not believe either of them contains elements of complete goodness.

The program I have proposed will not create either of these extremes. We would not be building up an excessive munitions industry. We would give some employment; we would create some preparedness capacity for defense of our own women and children.

NATIONAL UNITY

Seventh. The seventh reason for this proposal of a substitute for repeal or no repeal of the embargo is to find on this or on some other basis more unity in our own people. I have said this conflict has begun to take on a bitterness that threatens our national solidarity in face of dangers. Patriotic men and great groups whose sole purpose is American interest are being denounced as pro-Hitler or pro-British, when in fact they are pro-American. Gradually we are dividing into two camps over a question that is after all very secondary to the dominant question of keeping America out of this war.

CONCLUSION

Like all Americans, I resent violently the ravishing of Czechoslovakia and Poland by Hitler. Equally I resent the ravishing of Poland and the Baltic States by Stalin. I do not attribute these actions to the great body of either the German or the Russian people.

My sympathies are with the Allies. Nevertheless, my deepest conviction is that America must keep out of this war, and it is in the interest of the whole world if we are to be of any help to rebuild this civilization when the war is over.

The most difficult job we have in these months before us is to remain at peace. Keeping out of war is only in small part either legal formulas or laws. It is a matter of our resolute national will to keep out, and our will is determined not by our emotions and sympathies but by our reason.

If we fail to hold to peace it means the loss of millions of our sons. It means America is for all time deprived of the blessings that their energies and their minds would have brought to us. It means a large part of our people are condemned for another quarter of a century to be unemployed and impoverished. It means we shall accept immediate dictatorship to fight the war. It means we shall remain a dictatorship for a generation afterward if not forever. The hope of happiness and achievement in America will have been extinguished.

In conclusion, I submit the course I have recommended avoids many international dangers. Above all it contributes something constructive to the world by way of humanity and moral standards.

I am protesting that, whatever be done in this legislation, America shall neither be a party to the killing of women, children, and nonfighting men nor the destruction of their homes. And equally that it shall not be a party to depriving them of the primary arms of their defense.

I am interested in America holding to moral foundations in these times when civilization itself is rocking. I am asking America by action and not by words alone to hold to her standards. I do not believe my voice will be alone.

Missouri River Follies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. HOUSTON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 25, 1939

EDITORIAL FROM THE KANSAS CITY JOURNAL

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I quote a letter dated September 18, 1939, to a shipper from the general agent, Inland Waterways Corporation, operating the Federal Barge Lines, as follows:

Due to the low stage of water in the Missouri River, we are encountering considerable difficulty in the movement of our tows.

Would therefore suggest for your own protection, until such time as the river improves, that you discontinue use of our service through Kansas City.

We are not in a position at this time to indicate when this condition may change, as considerable rain must fall in the upper stretches of the Missouri before we will have any improvement.

It is evident from the following editorial which appeared in the Kansas City Journal of October 20, 1939, that the general agent of the corporation was not too pessimistic:

[From the Kansas City Journal of October 20, 1939]

MISSOURI RIVER FOLLIES

Three loaded barges of the Inland Waterways Corporation are stranded on a sandbar in the Missouri River near Jefferson City. Perspiring stevedores are transferring the cargoes of wheat and merchandise to railroad cars, a necessary step if delivery is to be made before next spring.

The stranded barges are visual evidence of the folly of spending millions on the Missouri in a hopeless attempt to make it navigable. They cannot be ignored by the Mississippi Valley Association, which this week renewed its stand for a 9-foot channel from Sioux City to the mouth.

The association and other waterways evangelists have an answer. When the Fort Peck Dam is completed, they say, sufficient impounded water can be released to keep the channel navigable.

We are told that it is as simple as falling off a log. When dry weather lowers the Missouri, an engineer at Fort Peck will open a valve and release impounded water into the channel. Taking into account water lost by evaporation and seepage into the dry river bed, enough will eventually reach Kansas City—1,400 miles distant—to keep barges off the sandbars. Or so the theory goes. It may work, but it recalls "Fatty" Arbuckle's trick of attempting to extinguish a burning house with a tin cup.

That isn't the half of it. The Fort Peck Dam itself is a monumental piece of foolishness, authorized on pressure from waterways advocates.

It is being built for the double purpose of generating electrical energy and of stabilizing the Missouri's channel. As for electricity, the dam will provide an abundance of power for a Montana area populated mostly by groundhogs and coyotes. As for the Missouri River, $84,000,000, the cost of the dam, is not a bargain price for keeping barges off sandbars at Jefferson City, especially when the

Government has spent an average of $197,722 a mile for channel stabilization between Kansas City and St. Louis.

The farce should be ended at once by permanently suspending the Missouri operations of the subsidized Inland Waterways Corporation and confining river work to scientific flood control. In these troubled times a little humor now and then is welcome, but in the case of river navigation the comedy comes at too high a price.

Law Enforcement in a Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH J. O'BRIEN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 25, 1939

ADDRESS OF J. EDGAR HOOVER, DIRECTOR, FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by J. Edgar Hoover, Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation, United States Department of Justice, before the annual New York Herald Tribune Forum, October 24, 1939, New York City:

Of supreme importance at the moment is the necessity of protecting all phases of American life and traditions. Every nation's history is marked by periods of unusual stress. At this time, when the ominous clouds of strife hang heavy over distant lands, the thunder of their wars awakens us to the possibility of threats to our own America. There has never before been the need that now exists to seek the truth and to recognize the facts as they are. While other peoples are regimented and assembled to hear the pronouncements of government, we gather to seek the truth without the crushing hand of dictatorships directing our deliberations, or determining in advance what shall or shall not be said.

Upon us of this generation has fallen the responsibility to defend the cherished principles of Americanism. There are times, to be sure, when the cost of peace is too great to endure. No price in peace or war, however, can be put upon our American heritage. Its maintenance means the preservation of life and liberty itself. The internal security of a peaceful nation today is at stake.

As in the days of the early pioneers, the call goes out to the enlightened and courageous spirit of American womanhood to enlist her intelligent aid in the solution of our present-day problems. The home still remains supreme as the basis of our social order. The very forces that attack the home attack the Nation, which is the aggregate of all our homes.

The American home—presided over by you women of America—holds the key to many of our most perplexing problems. In preserving the security of the home, we safeguard the security of the Nation. The time has come to erect defensive walls to protect our homes and our body politic from the insidious and malignant germs of foreign "isms" and the subversive forces of lawlessness. That is the task of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and American law enforcement, aided by every loyal American citizen.

We must unite to resist the insidious propaganda designed to foment unrest and bring about the destruction of our national ideals. There was a time when America was proudly known as a melting pot, in which all peoples living within our shores were fused into truly American citizens, whose hearts and minds were wholly centered upon the future of this land. These citizens in turn were guaranteed all the benefits, the securities, and the opportunities that the Revolutionary patriots fought and died for, in winning our highly prized independence. In recent years, something has happened to that melting pot. It is unfortunate but true that there has come into being a subsurface element, shifty, malicious, and dishonest, which with wanton effrontery seeks to turn a great melting pot into a catch-all for the things that could never fuse with our ideals.

Our generation has had greater advantages, even in the depths of our depression, than were ever known by those whose alien ways of living, whose foreign "isms" have slowly but gradually filtered into our land. Despite the freedom, the liberties, and the opportunities guaranteed to all within our midst, there are those who have betrayed America by chiseling at the foundations of this great edifice of freedom. The foes within our gates, like termites, have sought by every scheming means to inculcate their alien ideas into our social order, fouling our cradle of liberty.

There is no place in our land for the pinkish "fellow traveler," for the regimenter, or the blustering type of martinet who, steeped in the bloody-handed egotism of gangster conquest, seeks to make us all goosestep and salute before him. This is a time when we must think straight and not be misled by the exotic and Utopian pratings of those whose allegiance is pledged abroad.

A good citizen must be on guard against subversion in all its forms. Call it communism, fascism, or what you will—it is un-American. Our patriotism can best be judged by our diligence in protecting American ideals from the rapists of justice and common decency. To stem the insidious machinations of such enemies, to thwart their plans, to preserve our traditions and ideals, is a sacred and supreme task. Here is a battle between priceless God-fearing principles on the one hand and pagan ideals and godlessness on the other. Principles and not men must prevail. Democracy is totally alien in deed and thought to the tactics of ruthless racketeering dictators. Yet that is what these festering foreign "isms" stand for, while they insult our intelligence and blaspheme Americanism by calling communism "Twentieth Century Democracy." What a travesty!

Evil forces in America today seek to undermine law and order. Naturally, these forces do not operate in the open. Evil does not seek the light. It assumes the garments; it adopts the slogans; it hides behind the banners of democracy. These evil, subversive forces menace freedom of speech, freedom of thought, and freedom to worship in every village, town, and city in the land. And they go further, in actually seeking to move into position where they might cripple the vital instruments of our national defense through sabotage.

Fortunate, indeed, is the rising tide of patriotism on the part of so many of our citizens. It is indeed heartening to those of us in the Federal Bureau of Investigation and American law enforcement, who are charged with the duty of protecting American people, not only from the onslaughts of criminals, but from the devious machinations of those who reflect in their pernicious activities the desires of enemy modes of thought and action. This battle cannot be successfully waged until our citizens recognize the dangers that confront us.

Every hour of the day must be devoted to the support of law and order. Dedication to this effort is true Americanism. You can help by being ever alert in order that any suspected act of sabotage, espionage, or neutrality violation, designed to undermine internal defense, can be called to the attention of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Every sincere and earnest American should consider himself an integral part of law and order in this war against the enemies of democracy. This cooperation should be limited, however, to passing on to the proper officials all questionable facts or rumors which may come one's way. But our efforts must not develop into a witch hunt. Bands of vigilantes, no matter in what manner they act, or what high ideals they may proclaim, are un-American, unpatriotic, and subversive of the very things the Nation now has the most need of preserving. To successfully cope with the spy demands intelligence, good judgment, and, above all, justice and calmness in meeting every situation.

The present task of law enforcement—the battle against alien-minded mongrels and against criminals—is of the same kind and type. A law-abiding nation is a peaceful nation. Only a law-abiding nation can survive. The F. B. I. is receiving complaints of espionage, sabotage, and neutrality violations at the rate of approximately 214 a day. In addition, every 24 hours 4,000 major crimes are committed in these United States. Every 24 hours there are committed in our land an average of 33 murders, 160 robberies, 800 burglaries, 2,200 larcenies, and 120 aggravated assaults. This does not include the 36,000 lesser infractions that occur daily.

An immense threat lies in America's crime army of 4,750,000 persons who have exhibited their lawlessness. It cannot be denied that a certain lack of patriotism exists in the craven make-up of anyone who deliberately and maliciously violates our laws. Spydom, you can be sure, will find the ranks of lawlessness fertile grounds for recruiting traitors and Benedict Arnolds. To the lawless, America means only a place in which to rob, to thieve, to destroy, and plunder. Therefore, in these troubled days, when you strengthen the hand of law enforcement, you add power to the muscles of liberty and safeguard our greatest bulwark of peace, the barricades of neutrality.

I am happy to advise you today that every possible precaution is being taken to prepare us to meet any emergency which may arise. The foundations have been laid; the walls have been erected. Trained and competent men of law enforcement spot the land. America's "West Point of law enforcement," the F. B. I. National Police Academy, has already graduated a national faculty of over 400 police instructors. Competent and highly trained, these representatives of law enforcement are located in every State of the Union.

They constitute a reserve force for the F. B. I. Beyond that, most of them are engaged in police training in their home communities. They are the men upon whom our people can justly depend for protection. Unfortunately, the citizens in some communities have not been fully alert to the availability of these men, otherwise some of them would not have been the victims of petty jealousies and corrupt political machinations, which have prevented them from initiating local police-training programs so necessary for improved scientific crime detection and our internal defense. The duties which law enforcement now must assume are such that these officers must have the support of all civic-spirited citizens in order that once and for all this great body of public servants may be freed from the stifling influences of greedy and corrupt political domination.

Our national defense demands well-equipped and well-trained army and naval forces. Our internal security demands the best in law enforcement, with adequate facilities and equipment manned by public servants of the highest degree of character and intelligence. And greater yet, these men of law enforcement must

be backed by an unflinching bulwark of determined citizens, consecrated to holding high the banners of law and order.

Every father and mother in the land must train their children in decency, honesty, and the sacredness of citizenship. There must be a reaffirmation of the sanctity of the home and greater diligence in the discharge of family responsibility. There must be reestablished in American youth a respect for lawful authority and truly American traditions. This must be done in the home which still controls the educational system in our democratic order. We need a rededication of old-fashioned discipline and less experimentation with unsound theories and unholy philosophies.

The fact that some Americans lack moral fortitude does not mean that the church has failed; on the contrary, it has not been given a chance. What we need today is a return to the principles of decency and honesty and charity among men. What we need is an inculcation of the immortal lessons of the Ten Commandments and the Sermon on the Mount in the hearts and minds of all Americans. This is the surest antidote to stem the rising tide of lawlessness. It is indeed a national disgrace that 12 percent of all murderers, 29 percent of all robbers, 33 percent of all thieves, 46 percent of all burglars, and 54 percent of all automobile thieves are under voting age.

In solving the crime problem and in insuring internal defense, there can be no greater motivating force than the women of America who can demand and insist that the profession of law enforcement be placed upon a high plane of efficiency, honesty, and integrity in every community in America, free from the lecherous barnacles of venal politics. This would accelerate public consciousness to meet the crisis of today, embodying as it does a conflict between Americanism and alien ways of thinking and living, which threaten our peace and security and everything basically American.

Let us resolve, here and now, to enlist our time, our energy, our spirit, and our prayers in the preservation of our American heritage. Let America defend itself first from within. No American could have a greater ambition than the consummation of this worthy task. It would spell doom to the spies and termites within our midst.

Conscription of Wealth in Times of War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL E. MAPES

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 25, 1939

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. FOREST A. HARNESS, OF INDIANA

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following remarks of Hon. FOREST A. HARNESS upon the conscription of wealth in times of war or the imminence of war, as proposed by the Lee bill, S. 1650, delivered during the National Forum of the Air, a feature program of the Mutual Broadcasting Co., Sunday evening, October 22, 1939:

At the outset I want to stress the fact that I, fully as much as any of the proponents of this legislation, want to insure that America's productive capacity shall share with America's manpower the burdens and losses of any future war. In fact, having served in the front line as a soldier in the last war, for 20 years I have actively and consistently supported the theory of universal service, which would drastically reduce, if not entirely eliminate, the profits of war.

Proponents who say that this measure promotes peace because it takes the profits out of war are arguing upon an amazing fallacy. I see nothing in the bill which says that a man working in comparative security in a munitions factory or a shipyard may not earn $15 to $25 a day while his brother faces the hardships and dangers of active service at the front for a dollar a day. I find nothing to prevent the factory, which, by some miracle is able to survive this proposed capital levy, from amassing fabulous profits while America's young manhood is sacrificed on the battlefields.

This is not a conscription of profits and productive capacity by any stretch of the imagination. It is simply a drastic capital levy which would demoralize productive capacity and destroy the American system of free enterprise at a single stroke.

The Senator from Oklahoma must have foreseen the fact that this measure in no sense touches profits, for in his report of this measure, it says at page 9—I quote:

"There is a provision in the bill that the Government may pay these bonds at its discretion any time it has the money. Therefore, by passing a war-profits tax bill and using the money thus collected from war profits to retire these bonds, it is likely that they would be paid off before maturity."

The thinking of the gentlemen who wrote that report, and who support this proposal is, to say the least, bizarre.

Senator BRIDGES has quite ably demonstrated the fact that the terrific impact upon the American economy resulting from the application of this proposal would inevitably result in the most drastic deflation. But let's look at an individual example or two:

An average progressive Indiana farmer with 160 acres of land may have gross wealth of twenty to twenty-five thousand dollars. Deducting indebtedness, he may have a net wealth of $15,000, which is subject to a levy, or "forced loan" if you please, of $950. Not one Indiana farmer in a thousand has $950 cash on hand, so he must market stored crops or livestock within a specified time to acquire his bonds. But the same thing is happening to millions of other farmers in the country. Result: Markets are glutted and prices collapse. With his crops and livestock unmarketable, then, he has only one other recourse. He must sell part of his land. But again, millions of other farmers and home owners are trying to sell land for the same reason—and consequently the market for real estate is destroyed.

Suppose an individual has an appraised net wealth of $25,000, practically all in securities. He is forced to sell some $2,000 of his stocks to accept his forced loan. I don't need to tell you what would happen to our stock market if 10 percent, or even 5 percent of all the $150,000,000,000 in stocks and bonds held in this country was to be dumped on the market within a relatively short period. It is not likely that he could sell his entire holdings for the amount of his levy, and he would then face 5 years in a debtors' prison.

Again, suppose a widow has an insurance estate, the net worth of which is twenty or twenty-five thousand dollars. Suppose that estate comes to her in the form of annuities, legally bound by the terms of the will. Her sole source of income is the twelve or fifteen hundred dollars she receives each year from the estate. How, then, will she meet her obligations to subscribe for some $2,000 worth of these war bonds?

What will happen to the industry that must liquidate from 10 to 75 percent of its net worth? Do you suppose for a minute that it could find a market for its securities? It is fantastic even to hope that it would. It would, of course, have to deposit its note and securities with the Treasury, provided, of course, that the President in his discretion was willing to accept notes in lieu of cash, and contribute a 6-percent penalty in interest.

Those are conditions which would be multiplied literally by the thousands upon the application of this measure. Complete chaos would inevitably follow. But beyond that point, there is still a provision in this measure which is breathtaking in its implications. Section 7 (b) says:

"Whoever shall fail to purchase the amount of bonds which he is required to purchase under the provisions of this act or shall fail to purchase such bonds within the time prescribed under the provisions of this act shall upon conviction thereof be fined not more than $100,000 or imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both."

Here it is not only proposed to repeat all the worst and most vicious features of administrative law as we have seen them developed and displayed under this present administration. Here, actually, is criminal liability for violation of administrative rulings which have the force and effect of criminal law, such as we saw at its worst under N. R. A. and the triple A's "Hot Potato" law. Here again is the possibility of that device of the Middle Ages—the debtor prison. Under this measure, an American citizen could be "imprisoned not more than 5 years" for his inability to meet his obligation.

This measure would undoubtedly be the boldest step yet proposed away from a government of laws and toward a government of men. The very existence of our system of free enterprise would be in the hands of a single individual. If that individual were inclined toward dictatorship, we could scarcely place in his hands a more effective weapon. In the present grave international crisis, for instance, a President who desired to involve America in war could undoubtedly do so in spite of anything we could do to prevent it. Once involved, and with a law like this in the statutes, he could assume unlimited authority at a stroke.

It would be the end of Democracy as we know it under our Constitution. It would be the surest and most effective means of establishing a dictatorship and destroying capitalism and our free enterprise system.

Keep America Out of War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEWIS D. THILL

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 25, 1939

ARTICLE FROM THE PARKERSBURG (W. VA.) NEWS

Mr. THILL. Mr. Speaker, the lack of democracy in Europe, the diabolical war now raging there, our thousands of war

dead, our crippled soldiers, and billions of dollars in war debts still unpaid tell us stronger than words that our idealistic efforts 22 years ago were in vain and that we should stay out of the present war. No doubt those who want us to get into the European conflagration will stamp us and ridicule us as cowardly. They will appeal to our sympathies by strong emotional tales of oppression and war horrors. Propaganda will be unloosed, as it was during the last war, in order to sway public opinion in America. Atrocity stories will gain credence even though they are manufactured in the propaganda laboratories of foreign belligerent powers. We know that tall tales were printed in the American newspapers during the last war which told us that French civilians had had their ears and tongues cut off and that women and children were inhumanly treated. Arguments will again be raised to have America enter the war for humanity's sake or to stop foreign ideologies. Americans must guard themselves against this vicious propaganda, and they must actively and energetically participate in a campaign to keep this country at peace. They must talk to their relatives and talk to their friends with firm conviction and tell them to maintain a peace attitude in spite of those incidents which might arise and bring about the cry for war. They must lay emphasis on the fact that they can stay out, that they should stay out and that they must stay out of war. It is up to Congress to devise constructive measures to keep this country out of war. The people are anxiously praying that Congress at this special session take no step that might lead to war, just as they hoped and prayed last June when the House considered the neutrality bill. Permit me to incorporate at this point in my remarks an article which appeared in the Parkersburg News of West Virginia on September 19, 1939.

[From the Parkersburg (W. Va.) News of September 19, 1939]

"OUR FATE IS IN YOUR HANDS" IS PLEA TO CONGRESS THEME—REPRESENTATIVE THILL SOUNDED SENTIMENTS OF MAJORITY IN READING POEM TO LAST CONGRESS

(By Charles Brooks Smith)

WASHINGTON, September 18.—The eyes of the Nation are anxiously focussed on the doors of Congress which are about to swing open for an extraordinary special session. Upon the outcome of the proceedings so soon to begin, mass opinion holds the answer to, "Shall we have peace or shall we have war?" That this is the fact, who would dispute?

In sum, what the American people are saying to Congress is, "Our fate is in your hands." And so it is. At this critical hour, the climax is in the keeping of Congress, to make what disposition of it a majority will decide is for the best to keep the United States out of the European war with its diplomatic mess of double-crossing, lies, pressure politics, and all other collaterals and sidelines to be imagined and assembled in a world dominated by Machiavelism and frenzied from a Macaber orgy featuring the dance of death.

PRAY FOR WISDOM

The Chaplains in their respective Houses will, at the opening, pray for wisdom and strength and Divine guidance for Senators and Representatives. And, of course, for the President and "all in authority." While everywhere throughout this land millions of "unknown men and humble women" will feel a prayer within them struggling for expression, which most of them will be helpless to give. Yet they know, and will feel relieved, reassured, consoled by the faith which is theirs, that their inarticulate prayers will be heard as though spoken.

These are the people of whom President Woodrow Wilson spoke, in an address June 13, 1916:

"I get a great many letters, my fellow citizens, from important and influential men in this country; but I get a great many other letters. I get letters from unknown men, from humble women, from people whose names have never been heard and will never be recorded, and there is but one prayer in all of those letters: 'Mr. President, do not allow anybody to persuade you that the people of this country want war with anybody.' "

DON'T WANT IT NOW

Short of a year "unknown men and humble women" got that which they did not want. They just as earnestly do not want it now. They are looking today to the 531 men and women of Congress for the answer—more than to any other. Do you doubt it?

Came another June 30th, 23 years later—1939. The National House of Representatives was in session. A period of enforced limited debate had been reached. A roll call was near on the Bloom misnamed neutrality bill. Quiet and solemnity were settling in over the historic scene.

And the voice of the last to speak was heard "in conclusion." It was the voice of one LEWIS D. THILL, of Wisconsin, a Member in his first term, "fresh from the people," intoning:

Our Father who art above,
Instill in our hearts a greater love,
For the glorious liberties we have today,
Before it's too late and they're taken away.

Continue to give us our daily bread,
And grant us the power to keep our head
When radicals rave of their favorite "ism,"
With which they'd displace our Americanism.

Forgive us for meddling in foreign affairs;
Teach us to mind our own business, not theirs;
To 'tend to our problems, and ours alone;
To better conditions right here at home.

Lead us not into war with the modern-day Neroes,
That would cost the lives of American heroes,
And wipe out democracy, or worse still,
Subject us all to a dictator's will.

Deliver us, our Father, who art above,
From the loss of these rights we cherish and love,
So that each night when we kneel and pray,
We can say, "Thank God for the U. S. A."

Yes, we knew that by all the canons and meters this wasn't poetry, but under the emotional spell of this solemn scene, we thought it to be the loveliest prayer-poem we'd ever heard. We heard in it the beat of the heart of "unknown men and humble women." Through it we caught the spirit and the soul of the common people.

"Let me read a poem, written by one of my constituents, which I feel we should adopt as a prayer tonight," THILL was saying. And we saw a picture of a toil-scarred man in a dim light, at a battered table, a cheap writing pad before him, a stub of a pencil—a poet of the common people—struggling to put down in rhyme a prayer which suffused and thrilled his very being, and filled his eyes with a light that was never seen on land or sea!

Proposed Special Committee to Investigate Emergency Powers of the Chief Executive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN McDOWELL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 25, 1939

EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial recently published in the New York Herald Tribune:

[From the New York Herald Tribune]

LEGITIMATE CURIOSITY

Much dangerous nonsense is likely to characterize the efforts of Congressmen from time to time to "curb the President's war powers." However critical this newspaper has been of Mr. Roosevelt and the New Deal, it has always opposed, and will continue to oppose, the tendency at the Capitol to hamper and hamstring the Executive through rigid legislation in its conduct of our foreign affairs. Especially in the situation created by the war in Europe, with its unforeseen emergencies calling for quick decisions, does it seem to us the height of folly to tie the President's hands in advance. His constitutional authority in the circumstances should be preserved intact.

On the other hand, it seems equally important that Congress should follow with a watchful eye his use of this authority, and to this end we welcome the proposal by Representative MCDOWELL, of Pennsylvania, that the House appoint a special committee to investigate, tabulate, and report the emergency powers possessed by the Chief Executive under various existing laws. Scattered throughout the statute books are something like a hundred laws containing clauses which authorize the President to depart from the letter of their mandates when in his opinion a national emergency exists. Attention was called to them on the occasion of his recent proclamation of a "limited" emergency and his exercise of a few of his milder emergency powers. He made plain at the time that it was his intention to use such authority as sparingly as possible and only as conditions clearly demanded it. But it seems a sensible precaution that Congress should familiarize itself in detail with these laws and not be caught off guard when and if their emergency clauses are invoked.

Mr. MCDOWELL told the House Members, whom he circularized in behalf of his resolution, that Attorney General Murphy had declined to make a similar tabulation and report to the Senate. Perhaps he considered the job too much of a chore, but in any case

his refusal sounds both churlish and short-sighted. It augurs no mistrust of the Executive for our lawmakers to want to check up on their commitments to him.

Neutrality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE B. CROWE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 25, 1939

Mr. CROWE. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, the debate and discussion on the proposed Neutrality Act at both ends of the Capitol have been very interesting. Many of the statements that have been made by Members of Congress are statements that almost everybody agree to.

First. In my opinion there is not a Member of Congress who does not desire wholeheartedly to keep out of war. That is true on both sides of the aisle and both branches of Congress. Personally, I am genuinely and sincerely opposed to our entry into any foreign war. I am sincere and honest in my convictions. I grant to every other Member of the House and to every Member of the Senate their right to decide which way they shall vote on this most important matter.

Second. Every Member of Congress knows of the horrors of war. All are agreed upon that. It is not alone the late wars that are wars of horror. Wars back in Bible times were vicious. Heartless rulers had the innocent and helpless murdered the same as they did the soldiers in combat. Wars from Genghis Khan, Frederick the Great, through all the so-called "greats" of Europe, on through the reign of Napoleon and the late World War, have been hideous and horrid. General Sherman said, "War is hell." We all know that, so we might well leave both the above premises out and discuss briefly the purposes of the proposed legislation.

Which will best serve to keep us out of war? Let American ships go into combat zones and into the ports of belligerents or not permit our ships to go into combat zones and into belligerent ports. The answer, "Keeping them out of combat zones and away from belligerent ports" is by far most likely to keep us out of war. Combat areas, section 3, of the Neutrality Act, is plain and conclusive. I quote:

> Whenever the President shall have issued a proclamation under the authority of section 1 (a), and he shall thereafter find that the protection of citizens of the United States so requires, he shall, by proclamation, define combat areas, and thereafter it shall be unlawful, except under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed, for any citizen of the United States or any American vessel to proceed into or through any such combat area.

The seizure of the *City of Flint* by a German naval vessel is enough to convince everyone of the dangers under our present law. That ship did not appear to carry guns nor munitions of war. The list included lard, cereals, canned meats, flour, canned goods, apples, wax, lubricating oil, cotton, sewing machines, plows, tractors, asphalt, pitch, grease, shade rollers, machinery, silk, commercial chemicals, abrasive grains, disinfectants, feathers, rags, coffee, lumber, gauze, hair, and wallboard.

The war, mind you, in Europe is not well under way. Had the struggle been more intense and more devastating, something might have happened in this case, which would have inflamed the Nation. Certainly we cannot call the items carried on this ship munitions of war except that, as a matter of fact, I know of nothing which any ship could take to a belligerent which would not be necessary to any and all belligerent nations. Armies do not depend alone on guns and munitions by any manner of means. Soldiers wear caps, clothes, and shoes. They eat foods the same as civilians. Belligerents use wheat, bacon, and lard. Cotton is used in the manufacture of some munitions. Gasoline and oils are just as important in modern warfare as are airplanes and bombers. These statements cannot be controverted. Accordingly, the matter resolves itself into which is the best way to pursue to keep the United States out of war. Accordingly, in my opinion, the best way to keep us from engaging in this conflict is the present neutrality proposal of cash and carry; pay for the merchandise, take title to it, and carry it away in their own ships.

Dr. Gallup Will Ask Another Question

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 25, 1939

LETTER FROM DR. GEORGE GALLUP AND REPLY OF HON. KARL MUNDT, OF SOUTH DAKOTA

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, a number of days ago I inserted in the RECORD a copy of my letter to Dr. George Gallup, calling to his attention what I considered some serious and significant fallacies in the conclusions which the Institute of Public Opinion based on the statistics reported in their release of October 11 in the Washington Post and other daily newspapers. This letter to Dr. Gallup appears in the Appendix of the RECORD, pages 285 and 286, and at the time I inserted it in the RECORD I stated I would be glad to do Dr. Gallup the courtesy of placing his reply in the RECORD so those of my colleagues interested in the facts and fallacies of polls of public opinion and the dangers of error incident thereto would have access to the whole correspondence.

I now have a reply from Dr. Gallup, and under leave granted me by the House I am inserting his letter en toto at the conclusion of these remarks. His letter is self-explanatory and a reading of it will reveal the thoughtfulness with which Dr. Gallup has studied my analysis of his poll of October 11, my criticisms of its questions, and the incompatability of its conclusions with relation to the interrogatories upon which they are based. I appreciate the courteous and receptive nature of Dr. Gallup's reply and trust that he will make available to the Members of this body, before it comes our time to vote on the foreign-policy bill to be sent us by the Senate, the findings which his interviewers discover as to the attitude of the American public on the specific question of whether or not Congress should repeal the existing arms embargo in our neutrality legislation so that nations at war can buy arms, munitions, and implements of war from the United States. I am sure we would all be interested in a scientific analysis of American public opinion on that specific question which to date has not been examined through a straightforward question by any Nation-wide, scientifically conducted poll.

Mr. Speaker, I have just one other observation to make before inserting in the RECORD the letter received from Dr. Gallup and my reply thereto, which is being sent to him today. I call attention to the suggestion made by Dr. Gallup in paragraph five of his letter in which he offers to submit the wording of the question to any committee representing both sides of this issue. Unfortunately, it is, of course, too late to define a new question and conduct interviews on it in time to be of any value to this body in making its decision on the question of repealing the arms embargo. I am therefore pleased that Dr. Gallup has indicated that he has already acted upon the suggestion of my first letter and sent out ballots containing the precise question with which we are to be confronted on this issue; it is possible that we can have a public report of these findings before the issue comes before us for a vote as I feel certain the administration leadership will grant this body full and adequate time to debate the neutrality legislation and in that event it will

be from 2 weeks to a month before a vote is taken in the House. I do think, however, that his suggestion of a balanced committee to approve the wording of questions on controversial political or patriotic issues has considerable merit and I commend the suggestion heartily and hope it will be followed in the future as I am positive such a procedure would have prevented the confusing situation presented as a result of the present poll on neutrality legislation. For example, a wording satisfactory to both Senator PITTMAN and Senator BORAH on the problem of neutrality and foreign policy would have produced a clear-cut question upon which Americans could have registered their opinion on what is undoubtedly one of the most far-reaching and thought-provoking problems to be decided by an American Congress in connection with our relationship to foreign nations at war.

There follows the letters of Dr. Gallup and my reply of this date to him.

LETTER FROM DR. GALLUP TO MR. MUNDT

AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF PUBLIC OPINION,
New York, N. Y.

Representative KARL MUNDT,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. MUNDT: I appreciate your constructive suggestions regarding the polls of the American Institute of Public Opinion on the subject of the Neutrality Act, particularly in reference to the wording of the question which we put to voters.

As you know, the institute from the beginning has regarded itself merely as a fact-finding organization functioning in the realm of public opinion. We are very proud of the fact that we have no axes to grind; that we have no interest whatsoever in legislation; or, in fact, in influencing the opinions of the voting public. Our job ends when we have found the facts of public opinion and have reported these facts as impartially as we know how.

We are interested, therefore, in your criticism that the wording of the question reported on October 11 is prejudicial and that the interpretations go beyond the facts.

The question which you suggest, we believe, is not substantially different from the one we are currently asking except in one important respect, namely, that it leaves out the fact that England and France would benefit from the proposed repeal of the embargo provision. It seems to me that since this is an important fact, acknowledged certainly by both sides in the neutrality debate, it is not realistic or accurate to disguise or overlook this point in any question which we put to voters.

This represents our best judgment. However, the institute would be willing to submit this point to any committee representing both sides of this issue which you might like to name, and be guided by its decision.

May I comment briefly on two or three other specific points in your letter:

1. In our survey the expression "change the neutrality law" has been used as a rough equivalent of the more precise "repeal the existing arms embargo," because—at the beginning of the debate, at least—the term "arms embargo" was relatively unfamiliar to many Americans, while "neutrality law" was a very familiar concept.

2. We have also used the less precise expression "war supplies" rather than "arms, munitions, and implements of war," because in tests of the two terms we have found the voters make no real distinction between them, and because "war supplies" is a simpler concept to grasp. In this case, however, I believe that your suggestion has much value, and that the more precise phraseology is preferable to the simpler.

3. You have pointed out that since our question did not contain the words "arms embargo," we are not justified in saying in the text of our report that a majority of voters polled favored repealing the arms embargo. You are quite correct in this detail. Perhaps a more exact statement would be that a majority favored changing the neutrality law so that England and France and other nations could buy war supplies, etc., which means, in effect, substantially the same thing, you will admit.

Now to return to your own suggestion which is: "Do you think Congress should repeal the existing arms embargo in your neutrality legislation so that nations at war could buy arms, munitions, and implements of war from the United States?"

I see no fundamental objection to this question except that "airplanes, tanks, etc.," might be substituted for "implements of war," if that is what is meant by this term. Likewise, I should suggest that the word "the" be substituted for "your" in referring to neutrality legislation, and that the phrase "in the United States" be substituted for "from the United States," because a few persons might erroneously believe that these sales were to be official sales from the United States Government.

Moreover, as I indicated above, I think that this question does not cover the entire issue now being debated. To cover the entire issue, it seems to me, it would be necessary to add at least one additional question:

"If the repeal of the arms embargo would work to the advantage of England and France, as opposed to Germany, would you favor such repeal?"

Certainly an analysis of the facts which we have gathered in recent weeks indicates that the vote on the neutrality issue is not strictly a vote on neutrality. A lot of people frankly admit their reason for wanting repeal of the embargo is to help England and France.

For this reason, we have taken particular pains in the writing of our press releases not in any way to indicate that the vote that we get is a vote on pure neutrality.

Now, to sum up, let me say that the chief point of difference, as I see it, between your views and ours is that we are trying to measure the sum total of opinion favoring the change in the Neutrality Act (for any or all reasons) while you would limit the issue to one concerning neutrality. If I am mistaken in this assumption I shall be very glad to have your views.

I do not know, and I would not want to guess, just what vote we shall get if we put your question to the public; but certainly I see no reason for not trying it out. I am, therefore, planning to put your question, incorporating the suggestions made above, on one of our next ballots, and we shall give you a report of our findings. If, for any reason, you object to these changes, we shall be glad to hear from you.

Again let me say that I am greatly appreciative of your suggestions. The institute is as eager as you to measure opinion free of all bias on this most important issue.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE GALLUP.

LETTER FROM MR. MUNDT TO DR. GALLUP

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., October 25, 1939.

DR. GEORGE GALLUP,
Director, American Institute of Public Opinion,
110 East Forty-second Street, New York City.

MY DEAR DR. GALLUP: I am happy to have your reply to my recent letter with regard to what appeared to me as being certain inaccuracies and fallacies in the relationship of the text and the statistics published in your release of October 11 conveying findings of the Gallup poll. Permit me first of all to express my appreciation for your vindication of my confidence that you would accept my suggestions in the spirit in which they were written.

So that my colleagues may know of your decision to ask your interviewers to sample American opinion on the precise question of lifting the arms embargo as well as be advised of your whole attitude in this matter, I am inserting your letter in the Appendix of the RECORD for this day and date, together with a copy of this reply thereto.

Your categorical statement in paragraph 4 of your letter stating that the question I propose "leaves out the fact that England and France would benefit from the proposed repeal of the embargo provision" is probably correct. However, there are Members of Congress who have argued that this repeal might aid Germany fully as much as her adversaries on the assumption that Italy, Russia, and Japan, as well as other countries, might call for and buy with cash, arms, munitions, and implements of war and resell them to Germany. Others contend that Japan would be the big beneficiary of repeal since it would officially authorize the United States to sell her all the munitions she can pay for and remove her from the shadow of an impending embargo preventing American munitions makers to arm her as extensively as she deems necessary to force the complete capitulation of China. Still other Congressmen and Senators still contend that repeal of the arms embargo would improve the quality of American neutrality and that such is the purpose of repeal rather than to provide an opportunity for openly and admittedly taking sides in the war. I must grant, however, that the members of this last group are gradually dropping this "camouflage of neutrality," and with candor and intellectual honesty are now frankly admitting that repeal is at least intended to aid England and France, as you have so clearly pointed out.

However, since the bulk of the American public still indicates a greater desire for remaining neutral and maintaining American peace than for passing legislation designed to help either side, I feel that a straightforward question on repeal of the arms embargo without any qualifying modifications would produce evidence of maximum helpfulness to Members of Congress. I am therefore highly gratified that your letter states you have already sent out ballots propounding the question I suggested in my letter of October 12, with but very minor changes. Your conformity with this request is a real indication of your sincere desire to find and report facts—let the chips fall where they may.

Since you ask for my comment on the three points of your letter, as enumerated, I am happy to comply with that request.

Point 1. While it may have been true that at the very beginning of the debate many citizens used "change the neutrality law" and "repeal the existing arms embargo" interchangeably, I am sure you now agree this is no longer the case, since "changing the neutrality law" now involves a great many other issues, most of which are practically noncontroversial in nature. The one is a general statement involving many features; the other is a specific question probing the public mind on the specific point in controversy.

Point 2. Your agreement with me that the precise phraseology of "arms, munitions, and implements of war" is preferable to the

ambiguous phrase "war supplies" is gratifying and removes this objection which I raised.

Point 3. You also agree with my position that the statements in your release of October 11 relative to America's attitude toward the "arms embargo," when your interrogatory does not anywhere contain the words "arms embargo," is not justified. I am sure that we both regret that these statements were thus erroneously based and have given rise to fallacious quotations from your poll to the effect that it has measured public sentiment on the arms embargo. That damage to clear thinking and sound logic has now been done; the corrective, of course, lies in your early publication of the findings of your interviewers on the precise question of repealing the arms embargo, if you can supply it to us before a vote is taken in the House. It will obviously be impossible to get this information to the public before the Senate votes on this measure.

Your changes to my proposed questions are all entirely agreeable to me, and I believe they are all improvements over my suggested phrasing. Using the words "airplanes, tanks, etc." (to which should be added poison gases, ammunition, guns, and a few other items), is certainly clearer than "implements of war." You make a splendid point in changing "from the United States" to "in the United States." Substituting the word "the" for the word "your" in referring to neutrality legislation also seems desirable. While personally I am not convinced of the wisdom or necessity of asking the secondary question you propose, with its leading implications and its suggestion of unneutrality in the proposed changes, I can see no harm and no great possibility of again invalidating the soundness of findings and conclusions by such a follow-up question. All in all, I think you should get a fair and honest cross section of public opinion on repeal of the arms embargo from the reports of your interviewers on the two questions you advise me they are now asking. I only hope you can make public the results within the next week or so.

Let me say in conclusion I appreciate the cooperative spirit you have manifested in this exchange of correspondence. A fact-finding and fact-reporting service such as yours can render a great service or inflict a great disservice, depending upon the care and candor with which it is conducted. In a great republic such as ours, enjoying the fruits of self-government, the very basis of our success depends upon the distribution of honest information to voters and to their representatives in State and Federal office. I therefore hope you will cling tenaciously to the high ideals which gave your institute its inception and remain ever an agency to report and never to influence the public opinion of America.

Cordially yours,

KARL MUNDT, M. C.

American Federation of Labor Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHAN GURNEY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 25 (legislative day of Wednesday, October 4), 1939

ADDRESS BY HON. ROBERT A. TAFT, OF OHIO, OCTOBER 6, 1939

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I deem it an honor and privilege to ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] to the American Federation of Labor convention at Cincinnati, Ohio, on October 6, 1939.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Fellow citizens, as a lifelong citizen of Cincinnati, it is a pleasure to welcome the American Federation of Labor convention to the happiest and most American city in the world; at least it was the happiest until the two recent baseball games in New York. It is an honor to be invited to address the largest and most representative gathering of laboring men anywhere in the world. You are, in fact, a great democratic institution. You have no dictators and you take no orders. Each one of your unions is a self-governing institution, and you come here to confer and work out the best solution of your common problems. There may be more dissent and difference of opinion in your organization than in some others, but if there were no dissent or difference of opinion it would mean that there would be no freedom of thought.

I come here from Washington, where the Senate is still debating the proposed amendment of the neutrality bill. During the 2 weeks I have been there I have been tremendously encouraged. I have been encouraged because I feel confident today that we are determined to stay out of the war and that we can stay out of the war. Regardless of the result of this particular debate, the American people are united in their determination that we shall not become involved in European quarrels. That determination is not going to be changed. In the World War there was a desire to stay out, but there was nothing like the positive determination to remain at peace which exists today. The American people have sometimes changed their minds, but it has taken many years to do it, and in the present case the reasons against our becoming involved in the European war are so strong that that point of view will not be changed.

My own position is a simple one: What things as a practical matter will keep us out of war? We were dragged into the World War principally because our ships were sunk and our people drowned. Under present conditions I do not think our ships or people belong in the war zone. The best way to prevent such incidents is to prohibit our ships going to Europe and to limit the travel of our citizens to that which is absolutely essential.

Another element which may create a feeling for war is the extension of credit to England and France, creating a financial interest in their success. Credit extended to Europe at best is likely to inflate artificially our manufactures, resulting in a serious reaction when the war is over. So, from our own economic standpoint, as well as from the point of view of peace, credits should be limited. This is the cash-and-carry plan, and I believe it is the one plan which will tend to reduce the chances of our becoming involved.

People do not seem to realize that the embargo on arms is very limited. In the World War 87 percent of our shipments were of materials other than arms, ammunition, and implements of war. Foodstuffs and steel, and machine tools and materials for ammunition are being shipped today in American ships through the submarine zone, and are just as likely to be torpedoed as if the ships contained arms. The Germans and the British recognize no distinction between arms and most of the other things which are not forbidden by our embargo. The importance of the shipment of arms has been greatly exaggerated.

As for the arms embargo itself, I have never approved of the policy. I see no difference between shipping arms and shipping the materials with which arms are made. I see no difference between shipping automobiles and shipping airplanes. An arms embargo in time of war helps those countries which have built up a tremendous armament in time of peace. It discriminates against the peaceful countries which have not fully prepared to meet the onslaught of an aggressor. It either discriminates against every little country, or forces it to build up its own munition plants and take all its people away from productive enterprise. Today we can ship arms to Mexico and Japan and Russia and Italy, but we cannot ship arms to Canada and England and France. The importance of the embargo is overestimated. If the embargo is not repealed, airplanes will be made in Canada instead of the United States. Some of the parts and materials will be made in the United States and shipped across the border.

I see no reason why the removal of the embargo tends toward war. The most neutral position for us to take, it seems to me, is to say to all nations: "If you come to this country, pay cash, and take the goods away in your own ships, you may buy in wartime whatever you may buy in peacetime." If this bill is adopted, however, let no foreign nation feel that it indicates any desire on our part to interfere in the outcome of the European war.

We should not let the war excitement divert us from our domestic problems. These problems are just as important as they ever were. In all probability the happiness of the people of this country depends much more on their solution than on the kind of neutrality act which we adopt. The question whether the New Deal has failed in its main purposes must still be decided by the people at the polls in 1940. There are many questions pending before Congress and its committees of vital importance to industry and to labor in the United States.

I wish to discuss today, very briefly, the question of amendments to the National Labor Relations Act, pending before the Committee on Education and Labor, of which I am a member. We have had elaborate hearings, and I doubt if any more complete facts can be gathered by the House committee which is now making its investigation of the Board. My conclusions are formed after hearing some of the testimony and reading the rest.

The National Labor Relations Act marks a great step in the history of labor. I must give credit to your representatives, to Senator WAGNER, and others, who worked out the theory of the law. All parties had long recognized the right of labor to bargain collectively. They had recognized it in theory. Before 1932, I do not know that anyone considered a method by which it might be protected by law. It was a new idea, which all political parties approved when it was proposed. With the protection of the law, many unions have been organized, where before the employers had effectively prevented unionization. The law is responsible for the spread of unions, although it is rather significant that the strongest unions are still those which organized themselves and do not rely entirely on Government support. There must be a natural desire to form a union, and an advantage to its members, or it is likely to fade away. In view of the situation, it is essential that amendments to the act do not weaken, in any way, its basic purpose to insure the right of collective bargaining.

Unfortunately, the administration of the act has been biased and prejudiced. In my own opinion, some of the decisions of the Board have resulted in the grossest perversion of justice which this country has ever seen. In case you think my statement too strong, I would like to read the conclusions which your own leaders have reached. Mr. William Green told the committee: "The act, once hailed as labor's Magna Carta, has been distorted into an instrument of oppression by the partial and biased administration of the present

Board. * * * The Board continued on its course of usurping and abusing powers."

Your convention in 1937 adopted resolutions which said: "It is with deep regret that frankness impels us to report to you that the National Labor Relations Board has administered the act contrary to its letter, spirit, and intent, with manifest bias and prejudice against the American Federation of Labor, and in favor of dual and rival organizations."

Judge Padway said: "The Board wouldn't change the rule for us. But when their pet baby, the C. I. O., is in there and is going to be wiped out, the rule is suddenly changed. That is talking as frankly as I can. That is my conclusion of it."

I can say that the statements of your officers in convention are fully borne out by the evidence given to the Committee on Education and Labor. Your officers have been concerned about a distinct prejudice in favor of the C. I. O. against the A. F. of L. There has also been in some cases an intense bias and prejudice against the employer. While you are not so directly concerned, nevertheless, you wish justice to be done; and there is a real danger that continued unequal administration of the act might wipe away the act itself, and the essential rights which it guarantees.

In my opinion, if the act had been impartially administered by a board anxious to encourage unionization, but discourage unnecessary strife, there would be few proposals to amend today. The Board is given such wide power that it could have corrected inequalities in the act itself. But the manner of administration has shown defects to exist which should and can be corrected without affecting the basis of the act. I have not reached complete or definite conclusions as to what the amendments should be, but I can outline my tentative conclusions:

First. There should be a new Board, as you, the A. F. of L., recommended. Whether under the present administration this would result in the appointment of persons less prejudiced than the present Board, I do not know. Therefore it is no all-inclusive remedy for the situation.

Second. I believe that Mr. William Green's suggestion of a complete outlawing of company unions, dominated or controlled by the company, together with a wider latitude to the employer to express his opinion as between other unions, so long as it does not amount to coercion, is a wise amendment. The Board has used the provisions intended to discourage company unions as a weapon against the A. F. of L. It is natural that employers should wish to deal with the more responsible, long-established unions and express some preference for such unions as against those whose history is one of irresponsibility and violence. Yet the slightest expression of opinion has been used as an excuse for invalidating elections and even invalidating contracts with the older union.

The Chairman of the Board told us that if an employer stated to his employees that the organizers of a C. I. O. union were Communists, even though they were Communists, it would amount to a violation of the act, which would invalidate an election if those employees then voted for a more American labor union. Such a policy not only discriminates against the older unions but violates the employer's freedom of speech. How any employer's opinion can result in coercion of a workman voting at a secret-ballot election it is hard to see.

The amendment which you suggest is entirely practical, because it is always easy to distinguish between a company union and a real union. A board which cannot tell the difference between an A. F. of L. union and a company union ought to be dismissed, while men with real labor experience are appointed in their place. The Board has repeatedly abrogated contracts with A. F. of L. unions, contracts made in good faith and entitled to respect.

Third. The right of craft unions to exist, the right of members of the craft to decide whether they wish to join a craft union or be merged in a general plant union should be safeguarded by the act. The Board has repeatedly destroyed craft unions and shown its desire to assist the philosophy which demands their destruction. These unions are the oldest in the country. They recognize the special treatment to which skilled employees are entitled. Their existence is entirely consistent with the unionization of other employees in other unions. They should be protected.

Fourth. The question of elections should be definitely regulated by law. The Board has used its power to call elections at times thought favorable to one union as against another. It has arbitrarily refused to hold elections. It has refused to entertain employer petitions. In my opinion, the Board should be compelled to order an election on the petition of a labor union or an employer, provided that an election has not been too recently held, that there is a reasonable basis to suppose that the men desire a change in the conditions which exist, and that the petition is brought in good faith. While I think the Board should act promptly to fix the date of an election, I would give it power to postpone the election for a considerable period so that all parties would have ample opportunity to present their case to the voters.

The act should also prescribe the form of ballot and require that all unions, other than company unions, be entitled as of right to a place on such ballot.

Fifth. The law should be amended so as to limit the Board's discretion in the matter of evidence and subpenas, which has been so arbitrarily exercised. Anyone should be entitled to subpenas unless obviously sought in bad faith. There should be no secret files containing evidence to which the parties are refused access.

Sixth. In my opinion there should be a separation of the judicial and prosecuting functions of the Board. This has not been recommended by your committee, but it seems to me obvious that a man cannot be a prosecutor and a judge in the same case. However, I do not favor Senator BURKE'S amendment providing that the judicial end of the job be handled by the district courts. I would rather incline to a judicial section in the Department of Labor, similar to the Board of Tax Appeals in the Department of the Treasury, which has worked well. I see no objection to having the same department appoint the judicial board and the prosecuting division, but neither one should be appointed by the other. It seems obvious to me that a man cannot be impartial in a case which he himself has originated, and the prosecution of which his subordinates have prepared.

Seventh. Senator BURKE'S bill provides for various unfair labor practices on the part of employees. I do not agree with the principle of this proposal. The whole purpose of the act is to encourage collective bargaining, and even if there are unfair labor practices on the part of unions, it should not be a cause of action against such unions. On the other hand, it seems unreasonable that men who engage in illegal acts, break union contracts, engage in sit-down strikes in violation of contracts, or perform other illegal acts, should have any right to back pay, or even in some cases to reinstatement. The Supreme Court has recognized the unfairness of some of the Board's orders in this respect, and the principles laid down by the Court might be recognized in some specific provisions of law.

I feel very hopeful that amendments to the act may be adopted at the next session of Congress. Hearings were delayed by the administration itself. Those who oppose every correction of present conditions have many friends on our committee, but the injustice of the present situation is so clear, popular demand for amendment so insistent, that action will surely be taken. The act can be amended now without any weakening of its basic purposes, but if resentment against unjust administration becomes too strong, there is real danger that public opinion will destroy the act without distinguishing between sound principle and unjust administration.

Pending Neutrality Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD P. NYE

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 25 (legislative day of Wednesday, October 4), 1939

ARTICLE BY JOHN T. FLYNN

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article appearing in the Washington (D. C.) News, of September 30, 1939, by John T. Flynn, entitled "Plain Economics."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Daily News of September 30, 1939]

PLAIN ECONOMICS

(By John T. Flynn)

CHICAGO, September 30.—In many western cities the struggle going on in Washington about the Neutrality Act is being described as a battle between two plans to remain neutral. One plan is the arms embargo. The other plan is called the cash-and-carry plan. The impression created in many minds is that the President favors the cash-and-carry plan and the opposition Congressmen favor the arms-embargo plan but are against cash and carry.

This impression is being industriously fostered by those who want to kill the arms embargo. It is responsible for much of the support for the repeal of the embargo.

The facts, of course, are quite different. The first cash-and-carry plan was proposed by Senators NYE and CLARK on April 9, 1935. The plan represented the views of NYE and CLARK but also of Senators VANDENBERG, BONE, LA FOLLETTE, and others who are generally referred to as the neutrality bloc. This is the group of Senators who are now opposing the President in his effort to repeal the embargo on arms.

On April 9, 1935—4½ years ago—they proposed in the Senate a joint resolution which declared that in the event of war between foreign countries it shall be unlawful for any person to lend any government or national of such government any money or to extend credit for the purchase of any article declared to be contraband of war by any belligerent government.

The arms embargo proposed at the same time forbade the shipment under any circumstances of arms and munitions and directed the President to list such munitions. But it required that no credit could be extended for that large list of aricles which warring governments define as contraband.

There is no contradiction between the arms embargo and the cash-and-carry plan. There is no reason why the Congress should not adopt both. Congress should adopt both. The neutrality bloc opposing the President is willing to adopt both. But the President wants a weaker plan—he wants the cash-and-carry plan without the arms embargo.

But it is important to remember that what the President is asking for and what he wants are two different things. The President told the unity conference, and he repeated it in his address to Congress, that he wants no Neutrality Act at all. He wants the whole neutrality legislation wiped from the books and a return to international law, which would leave the whole subject in his hands, unhampered by congressional statute. He was told by his own leaders that Congress would never give him this. He is asking for the cash and carry merely because he cannot get what he wants, which is the abolition of all neutrality laws, including embargoes, cash and carry, etc.

The Path to Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN R. AUSTIN

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 25 (legislative day of Wednesday, October 4), 1939

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. W. WARREN BARBOUR, OF NEW JERSEY, OCTOBER 24, 1939

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address delivered by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] on October 24, 1939, over the National Broadcasting Co. network, on the subject The Path to Peace.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

As I speak here tonight, through the courtesy of the National Broadcasting Co., I should like to feel that we were sitting down and talking as quietly together in your own home. For we Americans are not told what to do, as so many Europeans are. We reach our decisions as individuals and in family council. We share alike in the effort to understand and act intelligently on the grave problems which confront us. And it is the opinions so formed which govern us, translated as they are into political action in our frequent elections. This is democracy at its best, and it is worth keeping, along with the free speech which makes it possible.

Now, for a few minutes, I should like to talk to you about the neutrality problem which the Senate has been debating, and on which it will shortly vote. We call it a neutrality problem, but it is more than that. What we are trying to do is not so much to formulate a policy of academic neutrality as find the path to peace. We Americans are looking for a formula which will prevent us from becoming involved in Europe's hell on earth, and, at the same time, allow us to pursue, peacefully, the normal processes of our national life.

One of the great things about this Senate debate, to me, has been the absence of rancor and unreasoning partisanship. The Senate has risen to its responsibility in the spirit of its best tradition. Naturally we have differed. In discussing the problem with you, I can tell you only how it looks to me. We live in a realistic world. I am trying to be realistic.

It is idle to think in terms of a nonexistent neutrality, in a world at war. Neither is it intelligent to quibble over the customs and understandings among peaceful nations which we like to call international law, when peace no longer exists. When great nations go to war these things fall by the wayside. Desperation drives them to do things they have agreed not to do. Treaties become scraps of paper, neutrality an abstraction. International law gives way to international anarchy.

I do not defend this disregard of morals and agreements. I look upon it sorrowfully. We would all bring about a better order of things if we could. Since we cannot, we must face the facts as they are. While reason surrenders to war, and the voice of the Prince of Peace is drowned in the roar of guns, we must take thought for our own safety and welfare.

As to the almost unanimous purpose on the part of Americans to keep out of the present war there can be no question. No true American can possibly wish to send another army of American youth to the bloody battlefield of Europe to try to make the world safe for anything. We ought to know by this time that we cannot change the habits of the Old World.

There is only one way out of Europe's wars—one cure; one remedy. It is to be found in the teachings of religion. These offer the only hope of enduring peace among the racially different groups of men who are crowded now into that part of the earth's surface. If they cannot learn to live peaceably together, compromising the differences which lead to war, it should be their funeral, not ours.

For weeks now we have been hearing that this course or that will keep us out of war.

The advocates of the repeal program are convinced their method is the best.

A second group would sell no war materials to France and England, but would sell them wheat and cotton, as important in the conduct of the war as steel and powder.

Then there is a third group, the 100-percent isolationists, who, in effect, would have us tie up our ships at the docks, turn our backs to the rest of the world, build a Chinese Wall around the United States, and trade with no one until the war ends.

Let's see how these three programs would work out.

Take program No. 1: The cash-and-carry plan preserves our natural character as a trading nation, but one which, learning its lesson from the last war, will sell its goods only for cash, knowing that if the war lasts none of the belligerents will be able to pay their debts, even if they should want to do so. Coupled with this provision, in the pending bill, is a further requirement that warring nations who wish to buy anything at all in the United States, whether wheat, cotton, airplanes, or steel shall carry the purchases away in their own ships.

This is literally the cash-and-carry principle of the modern grocery store applied to international trade. The ships are the market basket. The seas are the highway. Our goods remain on our shelves until purchasers come for them, pay for them, and take them away. We make no deliveries except across the counter.

To say this will get us into war is as senseless as to argue that a grocer who sells for cash to the customers who can reach his store will incur the undying enmity of other would-be customers who, unable to reach his place of business because of bad roads, have to trade in some other town.

But there is an even stronger argument of all for the cash-and-carry program, in its contribution to our national defense.

There are two aspects of this problem. One is the wisdom of making it possible for Canada to equip herself for defense against possible attack from overseas, since an attack on Canada would necessarily bring us into the war, under the Monroe Doctrine, in defense of American sovereignty and democracy. The other is the vital necessity of expanding our own output of weapons for defense.

Under existing law we can sell planes or any other war weapons to atheistic, communistic Russia, which has its spies and secret agents among us this very moment. Yet we cannot sell the same planes or any other war weapons—not even a coast-defense gun—to our good neighbor, Canada, because Canada has declared war. This is an ostrich-like attitude and is one of the conditions the cash-and-carry program would correct.

Beyond that, the cash-and-carry program would enable us to expand our production of defensive weapons at a time when our capacity to turn them out in large quantities on short notice might mean the difference between keeping out of war and getting into it. A Polish officer remarked bitterly after the rape of Poland, "We had to fight tanks with machine guns." It was the superiority of Russian and German weapons, rather than courage, which made it possible for her enemies to conquer Poland in 3 weeks. There has never been any question as to the courage of the American soldier. But we must not allow him to be sent into battle, if we ever have to defend ourselves, to "fight tanks with machine guns."

Nor, in proposing to sell war supplies to those who may wish to buy them, can we distinguish between offensive and defensive weapons. The only distinction lies in their use.

As a final defense against war we propose to keep our own ships out of the war-carrying trade and also out of the more dangerous war zones. In this manner we would avoid the pitfall into which we walked in the World War, when the torpedoing of American vessels by German submarines ultimately drew us in.

Like every red-blooded American, I approve and applaud the principle of the freedom of the seas. But the lives of American youth are more important than the false pride we would sacrifice in taking this precaution.

I think that is the best answer also to the advocates of program No. 2, who would sell wheat, cotton, and other commodities to belligerents while refusing to sell them guncotton, planes, and other weapons of war. A ship carrying wheat or cotton is as likely to be torpedoed as one carrying guns or planes, with similar consequences.

As to program No. 3, that of the American who asks, "Why do we have to sell anything to anybody? Why can't we shut ourselves up at home and let it go at that?" the answer is that some trade with other countries is as much a part of our lifeblood as trade among ourselves. Without it we would have no silk, no rubber for raincoats or automobile tires, no cork, bananas, chocolate, tea, or a hundred other things which we use every day. There would be no breakfast coffee in this Nation of coffee drinkers. Your daily paper is printed on wood pulp imported from Canada or northern Europe. Our clothing and blankets contain Australian wool.

In exchange for those and other imports we send the countries which produce them our automobiles, sewing machines, typewriters, machinery of all sorts, our textiles, chemicals, our shoes, oil, wheat, cotton, and other products.

From every viewpoint, therefore, it seems to me that, considering our own security and our own necessities, we shall be doing right in adopting the repeal program, safeguarded as it is. I believe most Americans are coming to see it in that light.

But, however we look at this or other problems which may arise later, we must think and act only as Americans. And, of course, we shall.

We must keep our heads, no matter how strong our sympathies may be, and remember always that for Americans there can be only one side. That is the American side. We must think of our own sons, our own country.

It is time the neutrality debate ended. The issues have been discussed fully. I hope we shall pass the proposed revision promptly.

This, as I see it, is the most hopeful path to peace.

Emergency Powers of the President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. WILLIAM DITTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 25, 1939

SUMMARY PREPARED BY THE NATIONAL COMMITTEE TO UPHOLD CONSTITUTIONAL GOVERNMENT

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Speaker, on September 8 the President proclaimed the existence of a national emergency, which gave him the right to exercise certain powers that otherwise would be beyond Executive authority. Many of these powers are far-reaching in their effect. Many of them are in conflict with the spirit of our established system of checks and balances in government. Many of them appear to be more in harmony with a totalitarian than a democratic philosophy.

Widespread public interest has been aroused as the people contemplate possible conditions incident to the President's proclamation. The whole subject of emergency, discretionary, and war powers of the President has come to the attention of the American people for reexamination and reappraisal. The question that has presented itself is not what will be done but what might or could be done under the present circumstances by virtue of the proclamation. This is both a proper and a timely inquiry. It should receive commendation. It reveals a vigilant not a suspicious citizenry. It is simply the reexamination of its own acts and a reappraisal of their worth in the light of experience.

I have received, as probably you have received, a number of requests for information on this important subject. The National Committee to Uphold Constitutional Government has prepared a summary of the discretionary, emergency, and war powers of the President, which I submit herewith.

I am persuaded, Mr. Speaker, that the majority could render no better service to the country than to exert its influence to reclaim for the Congress those powers which in times past have been surrendered to the executive branch of the Government, and which are not a part of the duties of the President under the Constitution, or necessary for him to exercise for the successful operation of an adequate national-defense program.

The summary is as follows:

A. UNREPEALED DISCRETIONARY POWERS

POWER TO SEIZE SHIPS

1. Act of March 4, 1909 (35 Stat. 1090; U. S. Code 18:26): President authorized to employ land or naval forces of the United States, or militia, for taking possession of and detaining, in order to enforce execution of prescribed prohibitions and penalties, vessels which are fitted out and armed, etc., contrary to the provisions of said act.

POWER TO DETAIN SHIPS

2. Act of March 4, 1909 (35 Stat. 1091, as amended; U. S. Code 18: 37): President authorized to employ such part of land or naval forces of the United States, or militia, as he may deem necessary to compel any foreign vessel to depart from the United States or any of its possessions in all cases, by the law of nations or treaties of the United States, it ought not to remain, and to detain or prevent any vessel from so departing in all cases in which, by the law of nations or the treaties of the United States, it is not entitled to depart.

POWER OVER CARGO

3. Act of March 4, 1909 (35 Stat. 1091; U. S. Code 18:29): Collectors of customs shall detain any vessel manifestly built for warlike purposes, and about to depart from the United States, the cargo of which principally consists of arms and munitions of war, when it appears probable that such vessel is intended to be employed by the owners to cruise or commit hostilities upon subjects or properties of foreign countries with which the United States is at peace, until decision of the President is had thereon, etc.

POWER TO INSPECT

4. Act of August 18, 1914 (38 Stat. 699, ch. 256; U. S. Code 46:83–236): President is authorized to suspend citizenship requirements for inspection of certain foreign-built vessels.

POWER OVER NAVIGATION

5. Act of March 4, 1915 (38 Stat. 1053, sec. 7; U. S. Code 33, p. 471): Secretary of War authorized to establish and make regulations for navigation of anchorage grounds, etc.

6. Act of July 9, 1918 (ch. 143 XIX; U. S. Code 33: 3): Secretary of War is authorized to make regulations for use of navigable waters near Army proving grounds, etc.

POWER TO MANUFACTURE

7. Act of June 10, 1920 (41 Stat. 1072; U. S. Code 16: 809): The United States may take over certain powerhouses, dams, etc., for purpose of manufacturing nitrates, explosives, or munitions of war, or for any other purpose involving the safety of the United States "when in the opinion of the Persident * * * the safety of the United States demands it," paying just compensation for use.

POWER OVER EXPORTS

8. Act of January 31, 1922 (42 Stat. 361; U. S. C. 22:236): Whenever the President finds that in any American country, etc., conditions of domestic violence exist, which may be promoted by use of arms or ammunition procured from the United States, and makes proclamation thereof, it shall be unlawful to export, except under such limitations and exceptions as the President prescribes, any arms or ammunition of war from any place in the United States to such country until otherwise ordered by the President or Congress.

B. DISCRETIONARY POWERS SINCE 1933

1. Act of May 12, 1933 (48 Stat. 37 (c); F. C. A. 7:610): Regulations by Secretary of Agriculture to carry out Agricultural Adjustment Act. (With President's approval.)

POWER TO REVISE RATES

2. T. V. A. Act of May 18, 1933 (48 Stat. 66, No. 13, 14; F. C. A. 16:8316–831m): Revision of T. V. A. Board percentages of gross receipts from sale of power, paid to Alabama and Tennessee; findings of Board as to value of dam No. 2, etc. (With President's approval.)

POWER TO FIX GOLD CONTENT OF DOLLAR

3. Act of January 30, 1934 (48 Stat. 340–343; F. C. A. 31:821–822b): President has power to approve orders, etc., to be promulgated by Secretary of Treasury for regulating the gold content of the dollar and stabilization of exchange value of the dollar. (This power extended through June 30, 1939, subject to earlier termination by the President by act of January 23, 1937 (50 Stat. 4c, 5). Again extended July 5, 1939.)

POWER OVER SILVER

4. Act of January 30, 1934 (48 Stat. 342–343; F. C. A. 31:823): President may issue silver certificates, reduce the weight of standard silver dollar, etc.

POWER OVER TRADING

5. Act of June 6, 1934 (48 Stat. 898, No. 19 (4); F. C. A. 15:785 (4)): Summary suspension by Securities and Exchange Commission of trading on national securities exchanges for not exceeding 90 days. (With President's approval.)

POWER OVER SILVER MINING

6. Silver Purchase Act of June 19, 1934 (48 Stat. 1179, No. 7; F. C. A. 31:316a): President may require delivery of all silver to United States mints.

POWER TO MAKE LOANS

7. Act of January 31, 1935 (49 Stat. 3, No. 5; F. C. A. 15:606l): Loans by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to national mortgage associations. (With President's approval.)

POWER OVER OIL

8. Act of February 22, 1935 (49 Stat. 31, No. 4; F. C. A. 15:715c): President may suspend provisions prohibiting interstate shipment of contraband oil.

POWER ON HIGH SEAS

9. Act of August 5, 1935 (49 Stat. 517, ch. 438; F. C. A. 19:1701a–b): President may establish customs-enforcement areas on the high seas to prevent unlawful introduction or removal of merchandise, etc. (Antismuggling Act.)

POWER OVER PROPERTY

10. Act of August 31, 1935 (49 Stat. 1076, No. 3; F. C. A. 16:831c (k)): Disposal by Tennessee Valley Board of real property no longer needed. (With President's approval.)

POWER OVER TIN PLATE

11. Act of February 15, 1936 (49 Stat. 1140, ch. 74; F. C. A. 50:86–87): President may grant licenses for export of tin-plate scrap.

POWER TO BAR PHOTOGRAPHS

12. Act of January 12, 1938 (52 Stat. 3, No. 1; Public, No. 418; F. C. A. 50:45): President may define vital military and naval defensive installations which are not to be photographed.

POWER TO RECRUIT

13. Act of April 25, 1938 (52 Stat. 221, ch. 171; Public, No. 491; F. C. A. 10:343): President may prescribe regulations for the organization, etc., of Regular Army Reserve as a part of the Regular Army.

POWER OVER MUNITIONS

14. Act of June 16, 1938 (52 Stat., ch. 707–458; Public, No. 639; F. C. A. 50:91): Contracts entered into by Secretary of War to familiarize concerns with manufacture, etc., of munitions of war. (With President's approval.)

POWER OVER AIR TRANSPORT

15. Act of June 23, 1938 (52 Stat. 1014, No. 801; Public, No. 706; F. C. A. 49:601): Certificates issued by Civil Aeronautics Authority authorizing air carriers to engage in overseas or foreign air transportation under Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938. (With approval of President.)

POWER TO LEASE OIL LAND

16. Act of June 30, 1938 (52 Stat. 1253; Public, No. 786; F. C. A. 34:524): Lease by Secretary of the Navy of portion of naval petroleum reserves, contracts to alienate use, etc., acquisition of privately owned lands for conservation of naval petroleum; direct expenditure of sums authorized to be appropriated for carrying out act.

C. UNREPEALED EMERGENCY POWERS

POWER TO SUSPEND 8-HOUR LAW

1. Act of March 4, 1917 (39 Stat. 1192; U. S. Code, 40:326): President authorized to suspend 8-hour law in emergencies.

POWER OVER PORTS

2. Act of June 15, 1917 (40 Stat. 220; U. S. Code, 50; 191–194): Secretary of the Treasury authorized to make, subject to the approval of the President, regulations governing vessels in ports of the United States during emergencies.

POWER TO SEIZE PLANTS

3. United States Code, title 50, section 80. President authorized to take possession of any manufacturing plant refusing to give preference to Government contracts or manufacture for a fair price arms and ammunition or other necessary material in time of war or when war is imminent.

POWER TO ALTER APPROPRIATIONS

4. Act of July 12, 1870 (16 Stat. 251 (R. S. sec. 3679), as amended; U. S. Code 31:665): Authorized the waiver or modification of monthly apportionments of appropriations for governmental departments and agencies for expenses during the fiscal year "upon the happening of some extraordinary emergency or other unusual circumstance which could not be anticipated at the time of making such apportionment."

POWER TO GIVE PREFERENCE

5. Act of February 28, 1920 (41 Stat. 476–477; U. S. Code, 49:1 (15)): Interstate Commerce Commission authorized to direct preferences and priorities upon certification by the President that such preferences and priorities are essential to the national defense and security "in time of war or threatened war."

POWER TO ERECT FORTS

6. Act of April 11, 1898 (30 Stat. 737; U. S. Code 50:178): President authorized to order the erection of any temporary fort or fortification upon the written consent of the owner of the land upon which such work is to be placed "in case of emergency."

D. EMERGENCY POWERS SINCE 1933

POWER TO GOVERN GOLD EXPORT

1. Act of March 9, 1933 (48 Stat. 1, No. 2; F. C. A. 12:95a, 95b): The President may regulate foreign exchange export, etc., of gold during a national emergency.

POWER TO SUSPEND WAGE LAW

2. Act of August 30, 1935 (49 Stat. 1013, No. 6; F. C. A. 40:276a–4): The President may suspend, in time of emergency, provisions of act relating to rate of wages for laborers and mechanics employed on public buildings.

POWER OVER ALIEN OFFICERS

3. Act of June 29, 1936 (49 Stat. 1993 (h); F. C. A. 46:1132h): The President may, at his discretion, suspend provisions relating to citizenship requirements of licensed officers of documented vessels during a national emergency.

POWER OVER SUGAR

4. Act of September 1, 1937 (50 Stat. 916, No. 509; F. C. A. 7:1179): The President may suspend operation of quota provisions and conditional-payment provisions of the Sugar Act of 1937 in time of emergency.

POWER OVER SHIP CHARTER

5. Act of June 29, 1936 (49 Stat. 2010; U. S. Code 46:1202): Maritime Commission vessels' charters may be terminated "in any national emergency as proclaimed by the President."

POWER TO REQUISITION

6. Act of June 29, 1936 (49 Stat. 2015; U. S. Code 46:1242): Maritime Commission may requisition any vessel documented under laws of the United States "during any national emergency declared by proclamation of the President."

E. UNREPEALED WAR AND EMERGENCY POWERS

POWER OVER NATIONALS

1. Act of July 6, 1798 (Rev. Stat., sec. 4067), as amended by act of April 16, 1918 (40 Stat. 531, U. S. C. 50:21): "Whenever there is a declared war between the United States and any foreign nation or government, * * * and the President makes proclamation of the event, all nationals of hostile nations of the ages of 14 years and upward, within the United States and not naturalized, shall be liable to be apprehended, restrained, etc., as alien enemies." The President is authorized by proclamation to direct the conduct to be observed by and toward such aliens, etc.

POWER TO ACQUIRE LAND

2. Act of July 2, 1917 (40 Stat. 241, as amended; U. S. C. 50:171): Provides for acquisition of land for military purposes "in time of war or the imminence thereof."

POWER OVER METALS

3. Act of July 1, 1918 (40 Stat. 671; U. S. C. 50:144): Director of the Bureau of Mines authorized, under regulations of the Secretary of the Interior, to limit sale, possession, and use of platinum, iridium, palladium, and their compounds.

POWER TO RESTRICT TRAVEL

4. Act of May 22, 1918 (40 Stat. 559; U. S. C. 22:223–226): President authorized to restrict travel between the United States and foreign countries.

F. CERTAIN WARTIME EMERGENCY ECONOMIC POWERS

POWER OVER COMMUNICATIONS

1. Act of June 19, 1934 (48 Stat. 1104, No. 606): The President may direct that preference be given certain communications in time of war; employ armed forces to prevent obstruction of communications; suspend, during war, etc., regulations prescribed by the Federal Communications Commission.

POWER OVER ELECTRIC PLANTS

2. Act of June 10, 1920, as amended by section 213, act of August 26, 1935 (49 Stat. 848): Federal Power Commission authorized to require such temporary facilities and such generation, etc., of electric energy as in its judgment will best meet the emergency and serve the public interest "during the continuance of any war in which the United States is engaged, or whenever the Commission determines that an emergency exists by reason of sudden increase in demand for electric energy," etc.

Legal Aspects of Neutrality Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 26 (legislative day of Wednesday, October 4), 1939

REPORT OF THE AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I desire to have inserted in the RECORD a very interesting report from the section of international and comparative law of the American Bar Association. This report, in my opinion, is an illuminating document. It is a legal opinion arrived at after much study and considerable research work. It was prepared by men who had the qualities of experts. It defines, in my judgment, our rights under existing circumstances. The men who prepared this report, which I wish to have inserted in the RECORD, include the following:

James W. Ryan, chairman of the committee, who was formerly special assistant to the Attorney General of the United States and who is now a member of the council of the Ameri-

can Bar Association section on international and comparative law;

John Foster Dulles, who is a member of the firm of Sullivan & Cromwell; who was secretary of the Hague Peace Conference of 1907, and counsel in 1918 and 1919 to the American Commission to Negotiate Peace;

Maj. Gen. Allen W. Gullion, United States Army, who is the present Judge Advocate General of the Army.

Arthur K. Kuhn, who was formerly president of the American branch of the International Law Association, and is one of the advisers on rights and duties of neutral states in naval and aerial war of the Harvard University Research in International Law.

The remaining members of this committee are equally well and favorably known.

This report, after clearly and carefully analyzing the subject before us, arrives at the determination that the majority are well within their right in the enactment of the pending legislation in harmony with domestic law and in keeping with the highest tenets of international law.

The report of the American Bar Association's Committee on Law Protecting Americans and Their Property in Foreign Countries and on the High Seas, which will also be included in my extension, is well worthy of consideration of the entire membership of the Senate.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the matters to which I have referred.

There being no objection, the matters referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION,
SECTION OF INTERNATIONAL AND COMPARATIVE LAW,
New York, N. Y., October 23, 1939.

Hon. JAMES M. MEAD,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MEAD: Both sides in the Senate debate on repeal of the arms embargo now agree that under international law a neutral may trade in any kind of goods with belligerents, provided the decision to do so is made in order to further the neutral's domestic welfare, even though the decision is made after outbreak of war. The question still in dispute is whether the new neutrality statute will advance our domestic welfare, and is so intended by the majority in Congress. The majority say it will. The minority say it will not, and is intended to advance the welfare of France and England. The fundamental issue, therefore, is one of fact, whether the new statute will promote our welfare or national defense. If it will, it follows that the majority in Congress so intend, and the contention is without merit that merely incidental benefits to France and England should prevent us from taking measures necessary to our welfare.

The report of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations states that the intent in enacting the new neutrality statute is not to commit an unneutral act or favor one belligerent as against another, but is "to preserve the neutrality and the peace of the United States and to secure the safety of its citizens and their interests," and the Senators supporting it say that its enactment will accomplish those results. They say that the new statute will further our national defense by accelerating and increasing our industrial capacity in production of armaments to meet our own armament needs, and will prevent large industries of that kind now in the United States and essential to our national defense from moving to Canada or other foreign country because of the embargo provision of the old Neutrality Act, which interferes with plant operation on a mass-production basis and reduces the capacity or unit-per-month production rate. And they say that aside from this benefit of increased production for our own needs conjointly with the increased export trade, there is the important fact that our Government, as the territorial sovereign, will take over the newly enlarged armament plants and their products exclusively for our own national-defense needs at any time that such action becomes desirable or necessary. They say that laws already on the books become effective immediately in any national emergency, and authorize the President to require all armament plants located in this country to produce war materials for our needs before producing them for anyone else. They say that the new statute will, therefore, enormously increase our military strength without requiring any appropriation from Congress or additional burden on the taxpayers. They further say that repeal of the present act will incidentally eliminate a wholly unintended and unneutral result flowing from that act by stopping our giving aid to, and unfairly discriminating in favor of, one of the belligerents. They say that at the present time, for no reason of national interest, we are refusing to trade on a commercial basis with countries who need our products, and with whom, until the present embargo statute became practically effective a month ago, we had maintained friendly trading relations for a hundred years, and that these countries have been our largest customers for so long that trade with them has become an essential part of our national life.

If these facts are true, then these purposes of the new statute in advancing our domestic welfare are obviously legitimate purposes under international law and in no way conflict with our duty as a neutral. A foreign aggressor by starting a war with another foreign country cannot deprive us of those rights or freeze them so that they cannot be later asserted in a form not in conflict with the rules of international law. No foreign country or belligerent has the right to determine our policy, or, what is the same thing, to prevent us from changing our policy as our national interests require at any time, provided we do not actively aid one of the belligerents and unfairly discriminate against the other.

If passage of the new statute will advance our national defense, it seems to be quite immaterial that one of its minor effects will be an economic benefit to one belligerent resulting from the temporary inability of the other belligerent to send ships to us to buy and carry away the goods which we are offering to sell on the same terms to both belligerents. A neutral is under no duty to try to equalize the trading abilities of the belligerents. On August 12, 1915, Secretary of State Lansing in a letter to the Austro-Hungarian Ambassador repudiated the "novel principle" that neutral nations are obligated to place an embargo on arms and ammunition because one of the belligerents cannot obtain them through commercial intercourse. And on October 15, 1914, the State Department announced, regarding the sale of munitions to belligerents, that although these articles were considered contraband and were subject to seizure by an enemy of the purchasing government, it was the enemy's duty to prevent the articles from reaching their destination and that if the enemy "should be unable to do this that is for him one of the misfortunes of war; the inability, however, imposes on the neutral government no obligation to prevent the sale."

The contention that the supposed individual sympathies of the President or other administration officials determine the intent of Congress in the new bill, no matter what Congress' real or expressed intent may be, has been answered by pointing out that Congress and not the Executive is the legislative body, and that therefore any possible expression by executive officials of intent or reasons for supporting the new statute is immaterial on the question of the intent of Congress.

Moreover, the supporters of the new statute say that, even if there were an intent to aid or make a gift to one of the belligerents, that would not be an unneutral act unless what was done constituted an aid or gift. They say that the new statute contains no language which on any reasonable construction could be regarded as constituting an aid or gift to a belligerent or to anybody. This seems to be so because the bill is limited to authorizing trading on a commercial basis with all belligerents. When a country trades on a commercial basis with another country it isn't giving away anything. It takes an equivalent for what it sells or delivers. The contention that by merely trading on a commercial basis with another nation our country would be aiding or making a gift to it appears to be without support in any municipal law or international law that has been mentioned. Indeed, Hague Convention V, concerning the rights and duties of neutral powers and persons in case of war on land, signed at The Hague on October 13, 1907 (36 U. S. Stat. L. 2310), to which both Germany and the United States were parties, expressly provides to the contrary in chapter III, as follows:

"ART. 17. A neutral cannot avail himself of his neutrality * * *.

"(b) If he commits acts in favor of a belligerent * * *.

"ART. 18. The following acts shall not be considered as committed in favor of one belligerent in the sense of article 17, letter (b):

"(a) Supplies furnished or loans made to one of the belligerents * * *."

There is no rule of international law prohibiting citizens of a neutral country from trading with belligerents in any and all kinds of goods. Indeed their right to do so can hardly be questioned because our country and all other countries have always asserted it and have in almost every instance exercised it. Article 7 of Hague Convention V of 1907 expressly recognizes the right. Those opposing repeal admit that we had that right and would have it still excepting for the fact that certain belligerents started a war, and at that time we were not exercising the right. As the right could be exercised only during a war, it is difficult to understand on what logical basis a contention can be maintained that failure to exercise a right at a time when it could not be exercised constitutes a waiver of the right.

Those opposing repeal further say that international law prohibits our trading with belligerents in armaments, because a month ago, when the war started, Congress was not permitting us to so trade. The contention in substance is that an act of Congress or national legislation has enlarged or restricted international law or our rights under that law. This conflicts with the rule that no single nation's statute can amend or repeal international law. The contention further implies that Congress' power in furtherance of our national defense or interests over questions closely connected wtth war or peace is impaired and made impossible of exercise merely because two foreign countries have started a war.

It is further said by those opposing repeal of the embargo that in a few instances Secretary of State William Jennings Bryan, and on one occasion Lansing, disclaimed the right of a neutral to change national policy during progress of a war for the purpose of aiding one of the belligerents. Those precedents are, of course, irrelevant unless the fact of aid or gift to one of the belligerents is established in the present instance. Moreover, those instances appear to be

greatly outnumbered by the instances in which our country, while neutral, has changed its national policy during progress of a war, more particularly during the Napoleonic wars extending from 1792 to 1814 (with one short intermission), and during the World War in the period from 1914 to 1917, and by the instances in which other neutral countries have changed their policies during war. While neutral we changed our national policy and lifted or imposed embargoes during progress of a war in 1793, 1794, 1795, 1806, 1807, 1808, 1809, 1810, 1811, 1812 (2 months before June 18, 1812, when war was declared against England), 1914, 1915, 1916, March 12, 1917, and 1934. Germany while neutral changed her policy during the progress of the Crimean War between England and Russia, and in 1870 asked England to change her policy during the Franco-Prussian War, and in 1914 and again in 1915 asked us to change our policy during the progress of the World War. Austria-Hungary made the same request of us on June 29, 1915. The few instances cited to the contrary seem, therefore, insufficient to show a settled rule of international law and are rather exceptions to the rule than the rule itself.

On careful consideration of the facts and points brought out in the Senate debate thus far it would seem that the majority is clearly right in saying that repeal of the present Neutrality Act will further our national defense and will not violate any rule of international law or lead to war.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES W. RYAN, *Chairman.*

REPORT OF AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION'S COMMITTEE ON LAW PROTECTING AMERICANS AND THEIR PROPERTY IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES AND ON THE HIGH SEAS

Pursuant to direction by the chairman of the section of international and comparative law of the American Bar Association that this committee consider and report promptly on the question of the legality under international law of a neutral nation's changing its policy during the progress of a war, and after careful consideration of the matter, your committee is of the opinion that action to avail of rights open to neutrals under generally accepted international procedure, if taken because of considerations of domestic welfare, involves no violation of legal neutrality, even though the action occurs after the outbreak of hostilities, and would not give rise to valid claims for the indemnification of belligerents who might be injured thereby.

Submitted, October 19, 1939.

James W. Ryan, chairman; John Foster Dulles; Maj. Gen. Allen W. Gullion, U. S. A.; Arthur K. Kuhn; Robert T. Swaine; Ralph N. Carson; and Thomas W. Palmer.

National Foreign Trade Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 26 (legislative day of Wednesday, October 4), 1939

ADDRESS BY JAMES A. FARRELL

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, the chairman of the National Foreign Trade Council, Mr. James A. Farrell, of New York, delivered a very able address at the Twenty-sixth National Foreign Trade Convention, held at New York, October 9, 1939. His address dealt with a problem which is under consideration here in connection with neutrality legislation, namely, American foreign trade in wartime.

I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Farrell's address printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, we meet again in a convention confronted by wartime problems. The number of delegates present is evidence of the deep concern shown in both the immediate and lasting effects of wartime limitation on freedom of trade. The speakers who will address this and other sessions are fully equipped by knowledge and experience to examine a situation obscured by the regulations which the United States and other countries are enforcing in respect both to merchant vessels and cargoes.

As in previous years, we welcome the presence of so many representatives of governments of other nations and, in particular, the attendance of the commissioners who are in charge of exhibits at the New York World's Fair. These include countries whose governments exist now in exile, but with whom the United States retains diplomatic relations. The policy of the United States is opposed to wars of conquest and to recognition of the fruits of such conquests. We believe that peaceful relations between nations rest upon a moral code which recognizes the sacredness of treaties, the rights of property, and the freedom and independence of other nations.

The wishful thought that wars of conquest may be averted by economic measures which would strengthen the foundations of peace has little support in the diplomatic documents preceding the present war.

PROBLEMS AFFECTING WORLD TRADE

While this convention is concerned chiefly with problems affecting world trade and bars political discussions, it cannot remain indifferent to the economic consequences of political conflagrations that shut American traders from overseas markets and which have forcefully terminated our trade agreement with Czechoslovakia and our satisfactory trade relations with Poland, and challenged our right to trade with China. As a neutral nation we are not without the power to protect our economic interests against discriminations by nations that are not wholly independent of the buying power of the United States. The abrogation of trade treaties and resort to the flexible provisions of the tariff act give warning that the United States has the means to protect her domestic economy and her right to the open door in world markets.

The determination of the Americas to resist economic encirclement by countries seeking to make them mere economic vassals has been significantly proclaimed by the countries gathered at the recent Panama Conference, at which the United States was represented. I do not propose to dwell upon a subject which will be discussed at the pan-American session. I merely refer to it as further evidence that the combined economic resources of the nations on this Western Hemisphere are capable of being mobilized against all attempts to deprive them of their economic freedom and of their rights as neutrals. The effects of our trade agreements have been neutralized over a wide area by wars of conquest in Asia and Europe. We must be prepared to counteract this narrowing of our trade opportunities by exploring the possibilities of increased inter-American trade and in other areas influenced by our trade agreements.

NO ABANDONMENT OF TRADITIONAL RIGHTS

Whatever may be done by Congress, with the object of keeping the Nation out of war, ought not to carry with it the implication that the United States has abandoned its traditional right to the freedom of the seas. This, of course, recognizes the rules of blockade and the rights of belligerents as to visit and search.

The true statesman legislates not for today only. He keeps ever in view the danger of creating precedents which at some future time may rise to plague and confound him. It is not in keeping with our national spirit to have the United States presented to the world as a country dominated by its fears. What has become of preparedness? Are we, as a country, willing to scrap our long-deferred shipbuilding program, of which 1,000,000 tons of new ships are now under construction to replace old and obsolete ones, and which, with our naval program, has been heralded as one of our Nation's strongest guaranties of peace? Our present overseas fleet of 400 American-flag vessels carrying one and a half million tons of cargo is expected to lay up and turn our commerce over to neutral ships of foreign flags. We are told that as an alternative American ships can proceed in ballast to distant ports of the world to bring home cargoes of essential raw materials, not produced here, in sufficient quantities for our domestic manufactures. This would entail large losses to the shipowner; a one-way voyage in ballast would not be compensatory, as the revenue from a return cargo would be insufficient, aside from its impracticability.

Are we to allow our merchant fleet to rust in our harbors, and to suffer the shrinkage of trade and loss of markets and consequent unemployment of large numbers of people engaged in the maritime industry, under the pressure of foreign propaganda that international law and neutral rights no longer exist?

From the earliest days the United States has vigorously defended the doctrine of the freedom of the seas as being of the essence of national sovereignty and independence.

FEARS CREATED BY PROPAGANDISTS

We should not fail at this time, when propagandists are so busy in ascribing unworthy motives, to disclaim on the part of American business any desire to regard this war from the standpoint of the opportunities that may be presented of profiting by wartime production, or by diversion of trade from other countries. The history of the last war and of its economic consequences reminds us only too ominously that, whether as a neutral or as a belligerent, we stand to lose in the final accounting in a war of major proportions and of devastating effects upon the normal lives and peacetime economies of the nations with whom we trade. At the close of 1930, which ended a post-war era of American lending and constructive aid to countries crippled financially by the war, the huge sum of $8,000,000,000, in foreign bonds and stocks, was held by private American investors. The stigma, so often attached abroad to America, of being a war profiteer is in sharp conflict with the figures representing America's generous but futile efforts to establish permanent peace in Europe by resuscitation of the internal economies of stricken nations.

The stimulation of trade by wartime production in 1914 and after had but one profitable advantage for the United States. Manufacturing problems necessitated a closer combination between industry and science to meet the demands upon production. We gained immeasurably by the discovery of more efficient methods of production and by scientific discoveries that added a number of new industries that enter into our foreign trade and which have opened new avenues of employment.

LATIN AMERICAN TRADE

We gained also by a better knowledge of marketing and of the psychology of countries that turned to the United States for supplies no longer available in Europe. We found in Latin America a potential market for finished products and a source of essential imports. Despite keen competition by other countries, today we hold 36 percent of this trade and were considering at Panama how the United States and Latin America may mutually profit by a realization of the aims of the Lima Conference for a return to economically sound relations. A gratifying sign of the awakening of the United States to the potentialities of this trade is to be found in the loans and credit extensions made to some of these nations through the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and the Export-Import Bank. Constructive efforts to strengthen the exchange situation in Latin America are an essential part of any program aiming at the recovery of these markets as an outlet for our finished products.

FURTHERANCE OF IMPORT TRADE

We meet at this convention not only to gain a clearer insight into our immediate wartime problems but also to consider how our needs for export markets can be furthered by finding new sources for an increase in imports not injuriously competitive. With an average 90 percent and more of the domestic market, neither the farmer nor the industrialist has reasonable grounds for denying to the countries to whom we sell the opportunity we ourselves claim in foreign markets—the right to equality of treatment. We have lost much ground in the past by a refusal to face realities. Farmers and manufacturers, who themselves are dependent on foreign markets, but who doubt the wisdom and advantages of our trade agreements in stimulating both our domestic and overseas trade, are adding to the difficulties which the war has brought about of insulating our economic system against the effects of wartime disruption of international trade relations. An export balance of nearly a billion dollars annually as a creditor nation may well be critically examined, with a view to its reconcilement with the economics of healthy and progressive world commerce.

WARTIME TRADE INHIBITIONS

The inhibitions created by the assertion of belligerent rights will occupy much of the time of this convention. It is interesting to recall that, during the Spanish-American War, the United States designated only a limited number of articles as "conditionally contraband"—coal, materials for railroad or telegraphs, and money and provisions destined for the enemy's forces. At the time of the Russo-Japanese War in 1904 the United States and Great Britain both protested against Russia's inclusion of foodstuffs as contraband and secured a modification of the regulations. The great extension of the contraband list by ourselves and the belligerent nations in the World War showed how modern war reaches into ever-increasing numbers of trade fields.

PRECAUTIONS FOR THE FUTURE

Looking to the future, the task lies ahead of planning precautionary measures to prevent as far as possible the effects on our economic system of a sudden transformation from wartime to peacetime production. It is a time for closest cooperation between Government and business; for insuring that wartime controls shall not continue, at the close of the war, to prevent a return to freedom of private enterprise.

It is gratifying to know that this convention is attended by a large number of Government officials, and that Secretary Hull, despite the heavy burden of State affairs, will address the delegates at the world trade dinner. He has led courageously in the attack upon excessive trade barriers and enjoys the confidence of businessmen who look for more prosperous times through greater freedom of world trade.

We meet in anxious and perplexing times. We know not what the future may have in store. Of this, however, we are convinced, that right in the end must triumph; that America can make no greater contribution to the strengthening of the foundations of world peace than by carrying on in a manner to proclaim its resolute determination to guard its shores against the inroads of doctrines and organizations that are subversive of the liberties and independence of a free people.

American Neutrality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUFUS C. HOLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 26 (legislative day of Wednesday, October 4), 1939

ARTICLE FROM THE TIMBER TRADES JOURNAL OF LONDON, ENGLAND

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article published in the Timber Trades Journal of London, England, under date of September 1939 entitled "America Takes the Cash."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Timber Trades Journal, London, England, of September 30, 1939]

AMERICA TAKES THE CASH—QUESTION OF RAW MATERIALS

The alteration of the neutrality laws of the United States on the grounds put forward by the President is a foregone conclusion. The policy of America for the moment is to save her skin and take the cash, but in the light of the experience of the last war, that attitude is liable at any time to undergo alteration. From the trade point of view there are two things to be said about the new arrangements. America under the Neutrality Act was free to send us aluminium, called by the President "alloominum," and other raw materials, but she was not free to send them "in processed form." She can now send the aluminium in the form of aeroplane wings, and so with other materials. The first point is that we shall take all the raw material we can and process it ourselves as far as we can, only paying American wages for manufacturing insofar as we have not sufficient facilities.

The next point, and one of far more importance, is that when we have to import war materials, or anything else, we should strive wherever possible to buy them in markets which are open to Germany. Mr. Amery uttered one of the few bits of wisdom that Parliament hears when he said that it would be worth while to pay a higher price to buy goods that might otherwise go to Germany. In the meantime, the definite decision of America to keep out of the war may at least stiffen others in the same attitude and help to localize the conflict.

Civil Aeronautics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAT McCARRAN

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 26 (legislative day of Wednesday, October 4), 1939

ADDRESS BY HON. HARLLEE BRANCH

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, aside from the question which is now uppermost before this body, as a matter which I think entirely appropriate at this time, I desire to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech delivered by one of the outstanding aeronautical authorities in America, the Vice Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Authority, a man who has had wide experience in the matter of civil aeronautics. The speech bears on the subject of the Federal moneys that have been expended in the way of the development of civil aeronautics in this country in the past few years, and further dwells on a matter which I propose to bring before this body for its attention at the regular session, namely, the establishment by the Federal Government of airports in municipalities throughout the United States. I refer to the speech of Mr. Harllee Branch, of the Civil Aeronautics Authority of the United States, and ask that his speech, delivered recently, be inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be inserted in the RECORD, as follows:

The question as to whether the Federal Government is going to spend money on civil aeronautics is, of course, already answered. The Federal Government has been spending money on civil aeronautics since 1918 when it first began, through the Post Office Department, spending money on an experimental Air Mail System.

From that modest and historic beginning the Federal Government has assumed heavy obligations for the inauguration and maintenance of an adequate domestic and international air mail and air transportation system and for the general development of civil aviation.

Government support of the Air Mail System, including domestic and international services, has grown to the point where, even deducting the amounts received from air-mail postage revenues, the Government's payments for the carriage of air mail during the past 20 years totals approximately $150,000,000.

The early steps in furnishing a few beacon lights at emergency landing fields for the experimental Air Mail Service have resulted in the present extensive Federal airways system. To safeguard air transportation the airways in this system are equipped with revolving beacon lights, radio ranges which project courses over

the route flown, teletype circuits, continuous weather reports, intermediate landing fields, and other air navigation aids. To date the Federal Government has expended for these aids approximately $78,000,000.

Since 1927 the Federal Government has borne the cost of inspecting and certificating all aircraft manufactured in this country and the cost of inspecting, certificating, supervising, and regulating all types of civil flying. It is estimated that $11,000,000 have been expended for such services.

During the past 5 years the Government has spent more than $170,000,000 on airport projects in connection with its relief program. All of these expenditures by the Federal Government are independent of the amounts expended by the Government for military aviation purposes.

At its last regular session the Congress appropriated $4,000,000 for a civilian pilot-training program and more than 400 colleges and universities throughout the country have been selected to provide the courses of study and training called for by this program.

While this program is an expansion of vocational education and training and in nowise a subsidy, nevertheless it is an expenditure of Federal funds to encourage and develop civil aviation. I might say in passing that it is my opinion that this program will do more to encourage and develop civil aviation than any program yet offered.

The Federal aid for civil aeronautics over the period of the last 20 years has totaled over $400,000,000, or an average annual expenditure of more than $20,000,000. Such sums can hardly be called excessive when viewed in the light of the results obtained or from the standpoint of the value of civil aviation to this country.

Therefore, there is little meaning to the question, Is the Federal Government going to spend money on civil aeronautics? A more appropriate inquiry would be, At what rate is the Government going to continue to spend money on civil aeronautics? It is my opinion that there is no present prospect that the Federal Government can hope to avoid maintaining and even increasing the present rate. So important has air transportation become to the national economy; so important are our airports, our airmen, and our airplane factories to the national defense, and so great is the industrial promise of private flying that no one would even venture to suggest that the Federal Government should discontinue its policy of supporting civil aeronautics.

Aviation is a costly but necessary enterprise. Every nation has come to this realization, and all the major nations of the world are appropriating vast sums for civil as well as military aviation.

The manufacturing branches of the aviation industry are now not only self-supporting but in numerous instances are making a substantial profit. There are indications that the domestic air transport operations may soon be largely self-supporting. Although the Civil Aeronautics Authority has granted increases in the rates of mail pay to a number of air lines, reliable statistics indicate that the cost of this rapidly increasing service to the Post Office Department may soon be equaled by the constantly increasing income received by the Government from air-mail postage. The international air transportation ledger is not yet in such a satisfactory financial balance, but the current volume of international air mail is almost double that of a year ago. Overseas operations are much more costly than the domestic overland operations, and up to this time the postage income received by the Government represents only 31.80 percent of the total mail payments for the international services rendered during the last 11 years.

The cost of maintaining the Federal airways and the cost to the Government of the certification, inspection, and regulation of aircraft, airmen, and air transportation companies necessarily will increase as these air activities expand. These functions of the Authority are essential to safety in aviation, and safety must continue to be the watchword for the Authority and for all branches of the aviation industry.

Another item in the air-transport picture which has implications of increased Federal expenditures is the demand for the extension of the present air-line network. At present there are more than 80 applications for certificates for new routes on the docket of the Authority, and many of these petitions are from new companies. The Authority is faced with very grave responsibilities in passing upon these applications. It must be careful not to authorize new routes which cannot be justified on the basis of the value of the services which they will perform. It must avoid placing upon the Public Treasury the heavy financial burdens incident to the permanent operation of air lines which have no prospect of ever becoming self-sustaining and which at best can expect but a nominal mail and passenger traffic. It must assure itself that the proposed new routes will fit into an economically integrated national air transportation system.

An important factor to be considered in connection with new air lines is that under existing law the Federal Government provides through mail pay a very substantial portion of the revenues of such lines. It would be unfortunate, indeed, if the Authority were to permit air lines to spring up like mushrooms all over the country with no greater justification than that those promoting them will establish for themselves a remunerative business which largely would be financed and supported in perpetuity by the Federal Government. Anyone who is familiar with the disastrous consequences which resulted from haphazard railroad promotions 30, 40, and 50 years ago, or with the more recent uneconomic and planless development of power utilities in many areas of the country will appreciate the gravity of this question.

In still another field of aviation the Federal Government has assumed financial obligations, namely, private flying. The entire time and attention of one of the divisions of the Authority is devoted to the interests of private flyers and much of the work of the inspection force of the Authority is given over to the examination and certification of private flyers and the inspection of the aircraft they fly.

There are at present approximately 27,000 certificated civilian pilots, and it is estimated that by the end of 1941, largely as a result of the stimulus provided by the civilian pilot training program, this number will be increased to more than 75,000.

I know you are all interested in the aeronautical activities I have just mentioned, but undoubtedly at this time you are more interested in the development of airports. Everyone must agree that such activities are of little value if we do not have adequate airports. Yet, on the other hand, without these other activities there would be little need for airports. Consequently, all phases of aeronautical development must move forward together.

Some spokesmen for municipal and civil aviation organizations recently have been quite critical of the Authority because it did not in some way induce the last Congress to appropriate and make immediately available millions of dollars for airport construction. While the Civil Aeronautics Authority has no desire to shirk any of its responsibilities, it must be remembered that the Authority is an independent agency of Congress, whose powers and functions are fixed by law. The Civil Aeronautics Act definitely imposes upon the Authority the duty of advising Congress upon aeronautical matters, at the same time prescribing the procedure by which that advice shall be given. It is not the proper role of the Authority to draft bills and lobby them through Congress, no matter how desirable such legislation might appear to the Authority or to any other person interested in aviation. The Authority legally cannot and morally should not constitute itself a high-pressure agency for influencing the Members of Congress. However, it can and should advise the Congress in the manner prescribed and sanctioned by law as to what legislation in its opinion is necessary to the sound development of civil aviation. And it has done just that in the matter of airports.

The Civil Aeronautics Act which created the Authority required it to make a national airport survey and recommend to the Congress (1) whether the Federal Government should participate in the construction, improvement, development, operation, or maintenance of a national system of airports; and (2) if Federal participation is recommended, the extent to which and the manner in which the Federal Government shall so participate. The Authority made such a survey, and in its report to Congress last February made such recommendations.

To be specific, the Authority advised Congress that in its opinion the Federal Government should participate in the construction of airports, particularly those airports which are vital to the Federal system of airways and to the national defense. The Authority's report said: "In passing upon applications for Federal expenditure on airport development or improvement, the highest preference should be given to airports which are important to the maintenance of safe and efficient operation of air transportation along the major trade routes of the Nation, and to those rendering special service to the national defense." The Authority pointed out in its report that during the year ahead a total sum of $125,000,000 could be efficiently used for these purposes.

At the time the Authority made its national airport survey and its report to Congress the Federal Government was appropriating large sums for relief and had for several years devoted a sizeable portion of these funds to airport construction. With the relief problem still acute and the apparent certainty that Congress would for some time continue to provide appropriations for relief, the Authority thought that it would be wise specifically to allocate a certain percentage of the relief funds for airport construction, and it recommended an allocation of $100,000,000 of the 1940 relief appropriation for airports. In addition it recommended that a supplemental appropriation of $25,000,000 be appropriated for those airport-construction projects which could not be provided for from relief funds because of the limitation specified in the relief appropriation act on the ratio of expenditures for labor and for materials, thereby providing funds for those airport-construction projects which call for a larger percentage of the allocated funds for material and a lesser proportion for labor.

The Authority made it quite clear in its report to Congress that when the relief appropriations were reduced to a point where it would no longer be practicable to construct airports with relief labor, the Government should, through special appropriations, make provisions for such necessary construction. The Authority did not at the time it sent its recommendations to Congress, and does not now, hold to the opinion that the Federal Government should assume the full burden of airport construction. It feels that this burden should be reasonably shared by the municipal, county, and State governments.

We do not believe that there can be any uniform and universally applicable rule covering the division of costs among the various units of Government. Some airports exist primarily in the interest of the locality; others are of regional or of national importance. It is hardly possible to imagine an airport so placed that it would not be useful to somebody, but that does not mean that every conceivable location becomes a matter of national importance and of proper Federal concern. There are an indefinite variety of cases, and it has seemed to the Authority indispensable that there be a corresponding flexibility of procedure, and that there should be some discretion as to the extent of Federal participation in order that it may be directly related to the circumstances of the particular

case. We have so expressed ourselves in our airport report, but we may have erred in not making that part of our recommendations emphatic enough, since it seems to have been very commonly overlooked in the subsequent discussions of the Authority's proposals. A discretionary role is not an easy one to occupy, and a flexible rule is not an easy one to administer. It would be far simpler from the point of view of Federal authority to have some such uniform rule as that the Federal Government will bear a fixed proportion of the total cost of every airport project that meets a certain minimum standard of acceptability, but we do not think that a uniform rule, despite its simplicity, would give the best results that can be obtained from a given amount of money.

We are justly proud of the advanced development of civil aviation in this country; that we have more privately owned aircraft and civilian pilots than any other nation; that our air-transport companies fly more miles and carry more passengers, with an unequaled record of safety; that we have more and larger and better airports serving an aviation-minded public; and that our aircraft manufacturers produce the best and latest in civil aircraft. All of this has been made possible by the continued cooperation of the States, municipalities, the industry, and the Federal Government. There is no problem confronting us today which cannot be answered if we have the unified support of all who are interested in aviation. The Authority hopes for the continued cooperation and the sustained help of these same agencies and groups. With it the limitlessness of the air space is our only barrier.

The Question of Embargo Repeal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 26 (legislative day of Wednesday, October 4), 1939

RADIO ADDRESS BY RT. REV. MSGR. JOHN A. RYAN

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address delivered by the Right Reverend Monsignor John A. Ryan, director of the social action department of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, over the Columbia Broadcasting System last Tuesday, October 24, on the subject Shall the Embargo Be Lifted?

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In this broadcast, I am neither representing nor appearing under the auspices of any organization or institution. I am speaking only for myself, as an American citizen who believes that he knows something about the principles of international morality.

Much time has been wasted and millions of words uttered, within and without Congress, in an empty and futile dispute concerning the meaning of neutrality. Those who denounce the existing embargo on the sale of munitions to the belligerents maintain that it is unneutral because it favors Germany and is unfavorable to England and France; the opposing group declares that to lift the embargo would be unneutral because it would help England and France and injure Germany. Both groups are right.

In the present critical situation, the primary concern of our people and our Government is to keep out of the European war. Both the champions of the embargo and the proponents of repeal agree about this. Some of the arguments advanced by the former are illogical and unfair. They declare that to lift the embargo would be to take the first step toward involvement. This is a misleading metaphor and an unproved assertion. The only semblance of proof brought forward rests upon the assumption that history repeats itself. Selling arms to one belligerent party, we are told, "got the country into the last war and would have a similar effect now." As a matter of fact, history never repeats itself in exactly the same way after a change has taken place in the environment. Now, the knowledge, the determination, and the attitude of American people with respect to participation in war, have greatly changed since 1917. Moreover, it is simply untrue to assert that the sale of munitions was the one, or even the principal, cause of our entrance into the great war. Other factors contributed mightily to that unfortunate decision. Some of those no longer exist.

Happily, the repeal of the embargo would not only be consistent with our national welfare and safety but would be in conformity with the precepts of morality and religion. Some of the utterances by isolationists, both inside and outside of Congress, imply that our country has no obligations of love and charity to any other country. These men advocate not only political but moral isolation. They contend that the injustice inflicted by the Hitler government upon the peoples of Poland, Germany, and Austria, and the manifold injustices which it will perpetrate over wider areas if it is successful in this war, are no moral concern of ours. They remind us unpleasantly of Cain, who scornfully asked, "Am I my brother's keeper?" They imitate the priest and the Levite who passed by on the other side, "remaining neutral" to the suffering and helplessness of the man who "went down to Jericho and fell among robbers." The person who asserts that we should be impartial and indifferent in our attitude toward the conflict between the Hitler government and the Allies, repudiates not only Christ's gospel of brotherly love but the principles of natural morality.

States, no less than individuals, are subject to the moral law. And they are bound not only by the precept of justice but likewise by the precept of charity. In the present crisis our country is morally obliged to do all that it reasonably can to defeat Hitler and destroy Hitlerism. Victory for this evil genius and his evil principles in this war would mean the destruction of Christian civilization throughout a large part of Europe. This tragic result would follow inexorably from the Nazi philosophy and the Nazi policies which have been pursued during the last 5 years.

Upon what specific grounds do I base this assertion? First, the Hitler government has been continuously engaged for more than 5 years in a cruel and insidious campaign for the destruction of the Christian religion in Germany, and latterly in Austria. In a joint pastoral letter issued about 4 years ago by the hierarchy of Germany, the bishops protested against "the propagation of a new paganism," and declared that the Hitler government was attacking not merely "a particular article of faith but the very essence and fundamentals of the Christian religion * * *" Three years later, or about 1 year ago, another joint pastoral letter of the German bishops declared that in the intervening 3 years the persecution of religion had become "more hostile and more violent," and that the government was striving for "the uprooting of Christianity in general and the introduction of a faith that no longer has the least relation to belief in God and the Christian belief in a future life."

In December 1937 the late Pope Pius XI declared that there had seldom been a religious persecution "so serious, so terrible, so painful, and so sad in its deepest consequences" as that carried on in Germany. "It is," the Holy Father continued, "a persecution where neither the use of violence nor the pressure of menaces nor the deceptions of cunning and the lie are missing."

The attitude of the American hierarchy toward the present regime in Germany was expressed at their annual meeting held in Washington in November 1937:

"Today the sense of all religious-minded men and women throughout the world is outraged by the satanic resourcefulness of these leaders of modern paganism and by the incredible excesses committed by them in their attempt to exterminate religion and to blot out from the minds of the German people all true knowledge and love of God."

Second, the Hitler government has consistently and continuously flouted and denied the principles of charity, justice, truth, and liberty which were brought to Germany by St. Boniface more than 1,200 years ago, and which have been diffused, developed, and made effective by Christian teaching alone.

Third, the Nazi philosophy and the Nazi Government have substituted the absolute and totalitarian state for democracy, for a government of and by the people. They have outraged in a hundred ways the dignity of the individual and the decencies of life in Germany; they have brazenly and contemptuously violated all the natural rights of German men and women. These enormities have, indeed, been most severe and most conspicuous against the Jews but they have been quite as deliberately and as definitely inflicted upon the Catholics and the Lutherans.

Fourth, while we do not know what Stalin will do, we can be certain that he will derive greater encouragement from a Hitler victory than from a Hitler defeat.

No genuine believer in Christianity or in the moral law can be neutral, or impartial, or indifferent in this awful situation. No intelligent man who holds that states as well as individuals have duties of charity to one another will deny that the United States is under moral obligation to do all that it reasonably can, to employ every means that can be employed without disproportionate inconvenience, in order to defeat Hitler and save Christian civilization in Europe. The United States is not morally bound to participate directly in the conflict, and it ought not to do so, but it is morally obliged to use every means short of war to prevent the moral, spiritual, and economic devastation that would follow the triumph of Hitlerism. To permit the sale of munitions and other materials under a cash-and-carry system would not cause us unreasonable inconvenience or grave risk. On the contrary, it would help to keep us out of the war. Supplying Britain and France with munitions would enable them to win a speedier victory and to make the war shorter. The shorter the war the less likely are we to be drawn into it.

The moral question confronting America is not that of "punishing villains in Europe," whether living or dead. It is the question of contributing so far as we reasonably can contribute to the valiant effort now being made by Britain and France to prevent the triumph of paganism and barbarism in Europe. As the president of Fordham University, Rev. Robert I. Gannon, S. J., said recently, "Hitler is the most pestilential and altogether infuriating character of all times." In order to find enemies of the human race comparable with this moral monstrosity one has to go back to the fifth century Hun, Attila, who came to be called the Scourge of God, or to the twelfth century Mongol, Genghis Khan, who believed that he had

a divine call to conquer the world. And it is a question whether Hitler's capacity for evil is not greater than was that of either of those terrifying and devastating barbarians.

Result of Radio Survey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN L. SWEENEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 26, 1939

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, after months of work, and I might say after a great deal of time and effort, I am prepared now to give the House the result of a postal-card survey I personally made of the broadcasting situation as it exists today. I made this survey in an effort to show that the action of the Federal Communications Commission in denying clear-channel stations additional power to meet the demands of rural listeners was arbitrary, unwarranted, and capricious.

You will recall that last May the Federal Communications Commission, and after a stormy hearing that lasted several months, decided—I might say against the weight of all social and economic evidence—to deny clear-channel stations a power output in excess of 50 kilowatts. This decision meant that people living in rural areas in many States of the United States would be left with poor, and in a very great percent of the instances, without any satisfactory radio reception. At the time the Commission arrived at this strange decision to put aside the public interest and to administratively legislate for a very small minority in the broadcasting field, I criticized this finding and called attention of Members of the Congress to this unexplainable act. At that time I did not have many facts and figures available other than the information which was brought out at the hearings. Because I found such a great deal of interest both in the House and on the outside in my criticism of the Commission I decided to make a survey of my own and see what the situation was at the present time.

With this in mind, I sent out 25,000 cards to rural route box holders in Louisiana, Kentucky, Michigan, Florida, Virginia, Kansas, Missouri, West Virginia, Alabama, North Carolina, Mississippi, Ohio, Indiana, and Arkansas asking them to select the first 4 stations of their choice both in the daytime and at night, and to also give me their comment on the business of broadcasting. I got back, to date, a 10 percent return on these cards and the result has been amazing, not only to me but I am sure it will be likewise amazing and probably very interesting to the Federal Communications Commission. The survey card which I sent was almost an exact duplicate of the one sent out by the Commission in 1935 and again in 1937, and bears out exactly what I said on the floor of this House on Tuesday, May 16, 1939, when I made the statement that rural America stands condemned to the "tongueless silence of the dreamless dusk." That rural and suburban America depend upon and listen to clear-channel stations has been demonstrated by the returns of this survey. This is unquestionably substantiated by the fact that in the 14 States mentioned, the clear-channel stations which now have the greatest amount of power are almost alone in the field of preference of the rural radio listener. Rural America depends upon the clear-channel stations and if I am to believe the comments contained in the cards that I got back, most of this cross section of the country, not only are anxious, but demand power that will put them on a par with their metropolitan brothers in the matter of radio reception.

In this connection I might add that many of the cards came back to me with the notation to restore the power of the Ohio station which was the only one permitted to operate in excess of 50 kilowatts for a specified time. The survey demonstrates beyond the shadow of a doubt that this station, in its experimental operation, was able to furnish good radio reception to the rural areas, a condition that cannot now be approached since the station was arbitrarily reduced from 500 kilowatts to 50 kilowatts power last March. From every section of the country comes the demand that Congress should take in its own hands the business of permitting clear-channel stations to operate on power greater than 50 kilowatts. If the Ohio station served the rural listener so effectively, I cannot see why the Commission does not probe the question a little further, and should it do this I am sure it will reach the unalterable conclusion that the only answer to reception parity in radio is power. If the Commission would decide to grant licenses to clear-channel stations for power in excess of 50 kilowatts the answer would be automatic in the affirmative.

I might add that when the Commission decided to reduce the Ohio station from its power output of 500 kilowatts to 50 kilowatts, many of the rural listeners, especially in the South and the Southwest were left without service except that furnished by XERA and other Mexican stations. This is not a surprising result. The people in the United States who are certainly entitled to the best radio reception within the power of the Commission to give them, found that they could not tune in on a good American station, so naturally to get any reception at all they were forced to pick up a wildcat operator selling goat glands and any such like commodity. Just how long these good people in the South and Southwest and many in the northern part of the United States will have to depend upon XERA and the other Mexican stations is a matter for the Federal Communications Commission and its new chairman, James Lawrence Fly, to decide. This station is blanketing certain areas in the United States with a signal beamed for American consumption. The operator of that station is reported to be using an output of 800,000 watts effective power, while regulations in the United States limit station operators to one-sixteenth of that amount.

From the foregoing it can be deduced that because of the unprecedented action of the Federal Communications Commission in denying radio reception to people in the rural areas, these good American listeners must turn now to Mexico and be bombarded by a station that thrusts upon them not only the relative merits of goat glands but the machinations of crystal gazers, fortune tellers, astrologers, and the like. My contention is that the Commission has in its power the right to give these people a chance to listen to American broadcasters and just as soon as licenses are issued to operators in the United States for power in excess of 50 kilowatts you will hear nothing more of stations like XERA and its ilk.

It will be noted from the break-down that I am including with my remarks that these people in the rural areas cannot get good service from local or regional stations despite the fact that there are hosts and hosts of these local and regional stations in the States where this survey was made. The rural listener in these areas therefore must necessarily depend upon the signal he gets from the clear-channel group of stations. In many instances this signal is not even strong enough to give him service because of the edict of the Federal Communications Commission, which says in effect "you can't increase your power above 50 kilowatts despite the fact we know there are hundreds of thousands of people in the United States who do not get satisfactory radio reception and must turn to the reception afforded by the questionable operators of other nations."

The break-down of the survey is made by States: I am attempting to show the listener preference for stations by individual States. Taking a typical State as an example, I direct your attention to the break-down for West Virginia. You will note that Station WLW of Cincinnati was selected by 57.8 percent of the people of West Virginia who responded to the survey as the station of first preference; and that 43 percent of the replies from that State named WLW as their second choice; and that 27.2 percent of the replies received placed it in third position; and that 14.2 percent of those responding to my questionnaire said it was the fourth station of their choice. In several instances a single station was the choice in all positions. This percent is based on the total for day and night reception in a particular State. The other stations, in the way they were selected by rural

listeners who replied to the questionnaire, follow in consecutive order on the chart. I invite your attention to the fact that only the clear-channel stations were selected in any great number by all of the rural listeners replying to the questionnaire scattered in each of the 14 States, the small local and regional stations eliciting only a small percent of the total. This clearly indicates that the type of service which these stations furnish is wholly inadequate to the needs of that great proportion of the American population in the continental limits of the United States living outside the metropolitan areas.

Result of a postal-card survey on the broadcasting situation as it exists today conducted by the Honorable Martin L. Sweeney, of Ohio, during the past few months

WEST VIRGINIA

	Choice in percent of total returns for both day and night reception			
	First	Second	Third	Fourth
Clear-channel stations:				
WLW, Cincinnati	57.8	43.0	27.2	19.2
KDKA, Pittsburgh	17.1	14.3	21.3	22.0
WSM, Nashville	8.5	9.6	11.8	6.4
WBT, Charlotte	3.8	11.8	8.3	7.7
WLS, Chicago	2.8	3.6	3.5	11.6
WHAS, Louisville	2.0	8.4	7.1	6.4
WJZ, New York	2.8	4.8	4.7	6.4
WOR, Newark	.9	0	2.4	5.1
WGY, Schenectady	.9	0	0	0
WBBM, Chicago	0	0	1.2	2.6
WEAF, New York	0	0	1.2	2.6
WTAM, Cleveland	.9	1.2	3.5	1.2
WJR, Detroit	0	0	1.2	2.6
WHO, Des Moines	0	0	0	1.2
WSB, Atlanta	0	0	1.2	0
WENR, Chicago	0	0	1.2	0
WGN, Chicago	0	0	0	1.2
KMOX, St. Louis	0	0	0	1.2
WWL, New Orleans	0	0	1.2	0
All other class stations totaling 31	2.5	3.3	3.0	2.6

FLORIDA

Clear-channel stations:				
WLW, Cincinnati	54.0	24.0	37.2	20.0
WSB, Atlanta	16.3	13.4	19.8	16.8
WSM, Nashville	10.8	18.6	4.8	6.7
WWL, New Orleans	10.8	15.9	12.4	6.7
WENR, Chicago	2.7	0	0	3.4
WHAS, Louisville	0	2.6	0	6.7
WBT, Charlotte	0	2.6	9.9	16.8
WLS, Chicago	0	0	4.9	3.4
WJZ, New York	0	10.6	2.5	3.4
KMOX, St. Louis	0	2.6	0	0
KDKA, Pittsburgh	0	0	2.5	6.7
WEAF, New York	0	5.2	2.5	0
KFI, Los Angeles	0	0	0	6.7
All other class stations totaling 43	5.4	4.5	3.5	2.7

OHIO

Clear-channel stations:				
WLW, Cincinnati	63.0	26.1	16.1	13.1
WTAM, Cleveland	11.8	15.1	19.9	22.7
WJR, Detroit	13.1	32.4	26.1	20.1
KDKA, Pittsburgh	4.7	7.3	9.9	11.3
WSM, Nashville	1.4	3.1	5.0	5.3
WLS, Chicago	1.4	1.6	5.6	2.7
WOR, Newark	1.7	1.6	0	.9
WGN, Chicago	.6	.9	5.0	4.4
WHAS, Louisville	.4	3.5	5.0	6.1
WBT, Charlotte	0	0	.6	.9
WMAQ, Chicago	0	.9	0	2.7
WENR, Chicago	0	.9	0	0
WSB, Atlanta	0	0	.6	0
WJZ, New York	0	2.2	.6	1.7
WABC, New York	0	.9	0	0
All other class stations totaling 16	1.9	3.5	5.6	8.1

INDIANA

Clear-channel stations:				
WLW, Cincinnati	48.0	24.5	22.5	10.7
WLS, Chicago	23.0	32.0	9.8	19.0
WGN, Chicago	10.0	9.4	10.5	14.0
WHAS, Louisville	6.9	5.5	9.0	8.2
WMAQ, Chicago	2.5	6.1	15.0	6.6
WJR, Detroit	2.5	5.5	6.0	10.7
WENR, Chicago	1.3	2.2	6.8	2.5
WBBM, Chicago	3.0	6.7	7.5	14.0
WSM, Nashville	.9	2.7	3.0	5.0
KMOX, St. Louis	0	0	3.0	.8
WHO, Des Moines	0	.5	0	0
WTAM, Cleveland	0	.5	0	.8
KOA, Denver	0	.5	0	0
WSB, Atlanta	0	0	.7	.8
KDKA, Pittsburgh	0	0	0	.8
All other class stations totaling 10	1.9	3.9	6.2	6.1

Result of a postal-card survey on the broadcasting situation as it exists today conducted by the Honorable Martin L. Sweeney, of Ohio, during the past few months—Continued

MISSISSIPPI

	Choice in percent of total returns for both day and night reception			
	First	Second	Third	Fourth
Clear-channel stations:				
WLW, Cincinnati	25.7	14.7	15.4	13.8
WWL, New Orleans	34.6	16.8	14.4	12.2
WSM, Nashville	12.1	25.2	21.5	23.0
WLS, Chicago	5.6	1.0	7.2	6.1
KMOX, St. Louis	3.2	7.4	5.1	6.1
WOAI, San Antonio	1.6	1.0	3.1	0
WSB, Atlanta	.8	7.2	6.1	4.7
WFAA, Dallas WBAP, Fort Worth	.8	0	4.1	4.7
WEAF, New York	.8	0	0	0
WMAQ, Chicago	1.6	0	0	0
WHAS, Louisville	0	2.1	2.1	1.5
WENR, Chicago	.8	0	1.0	1.5
WBT, Charlotte	0	3.1	3.1	0
WGN, Chicago	0	3.1	1.0	3.1
KDKA, Pittsburgh	0	1.0	1.0	0
WJZ, New York	0	0	0	1.5
WHO, Des Moines	0	0	1.0	0
All other class stations totaling 11	12.4	17.5	13.9	12.8

MISSOURI

Clear-channel stations:				
WLW, Cincinnati	14.8	13.7	11.7	26.4
WSM, Nashville	11.1	8.6	7.3	9.4
WHO, Des Moines	17.3	11.9	11.7	3.7
KMOX, St. Louis	21.0	18.4	23.4	17.0
WLS, Chicago	8.6	10.3	13.1	9.4
WOAI, San Antonio	6.2	6.9	4.4	1.9
WGN, Chicago	2.5	3.5	5.8	5.7
WENR, Chicago	1.2	0	0	0
WWL, New Orleans	1.2	3.4	1.5	1.9
WSB, Atlanta	0	0	0	1.9
WBT, Charlotte	0	0	1.5	0
KDKA, Pittsburgh	0	0	1.5	1.9
WBBM, Chicago	0	0	0	1.9
KOA, Denver	0	0	0	1.9
WMAQ, Chicago	0	1.7	1.5	0
All other class stations totaling 10	16.1	21.6	16.6	17.0

KENTUCKY

Clear-channel stations:				
WLW, Cincinnati	45.6	35.3	24.1	22.3
WSM, Nashville	17.0	11.5	33.1	23.3
WHAS, Louisville	28.5	40.5	18.2	16.2
WLS, Chicago	3.0	5.3	5.2	11.1
WBT, Charlotte	1.1	.4	3.2	1.0
WGN, Chicago	1.5	1.6	3.2	6.1
KMOX, St. Louis	.7	1.2	3.2	3.0
WMAQ, Chicago	.7	.4	.6	0
WHO, Des Moines	.4	.4	.6	0
WWL, New Orleans	.4	.4	.6	1.0
WOR, Newark	.4	0	0	1.0
WSB, Atlanta	0	.4	1.9	3.0
WJR, Detroit	0	0	.6	2.0
WJZ, New York	0	0	1.2	1.0
KDKA, Pittsburgh	0	1.6	1.9	4.0
WTAM, Cleveland	0	0	0	1.0
All other class stations totaling 32	.7	1.0	2.4	4.0

LOUISIANA

Clear-channel stations:				
WWL, New Orleans	54.1	27.5	29.6	23.0
WLW, Cincinnati	17.6	25.9	16.0	16.9
WOAI, San Antonio	9.4	11.3	4.6	8.4
WSM, Nashville	7.0	8.1	9.1	10.5
KMOX, St. Louis	3.6	6.5	16.0	10.5
WGN, Chicago	1.2	0	9.1	6.3
WLS, Chicago	1.2	6.5	4.6	0
KOA, Denver	1.2	0	0	0
WBT, Charlotte	0	3.2	0	2.1
WENR, Chicago	0	3.2	0	0
KNX, Hollywood	0	1.6	0	0
WJZ, New York	0	0	0	2.1
WHO, De Moines	0	0	0	2.1
WABC, New York	0	0	0	4.3
WSB, Atlanta	0	0	0	2.1
WMAQ, Chicago	0	0	0	4.3
All other class stations totaling 16	4.7	6.2	11.0	7.4

MICHIGAN

Clear-channel stations:				
WJR, Detroit	50.6	24.0	21.1	8.1
WLS, Chicago	15.5	13.8	11.2	17.0
WLW, Cincinnati	11.4	22.7	21.8	28.4
WMAQ, Chicago	11.4	10.0	7.9	8.1
WGN, Chicago	5.9	17.7	16.5	15.4
WSM, Nashville	1.8	.5	2.0	2.7
KDKA, Pittsburgh	.5	.5	1.3	1.4
WABC, New York	.5	0	0	0
WBBM, Chicago	0	5.0	6.6	6.7
WTAM, Cleveland	.5	.5	1.3	.7

Result of a postal-card survey on the broadcasting situation as it exists today conducted by the Honorable Martin L. Sweeney, of Ohio, during the past few months—Continued

MICHIGAN—continued

	Choice in percent of total returns for both day and night reception			
	First	Second	Third	Fourth
Clear-channel stations—Continued.				
WENR, Chicago	0	.5	4.0	4.1
WGY, Schenectady	0	0	0	1.4
WSB, Atlanta	0	0	.7	0
KMOX, St. Louis	0	1.8	1.3	1.4
KFI, Los Angeles	0	0	.7	0
KOA, Denver	0	0	0	.7
WWL, New Orleans	0	0	0	.7
All other class stations totaling 18	1.9	3.0	3.6	3.2

ARKANSAS

Clear-channel stations:				
WSM, Nashville	29.2	22.7	11.5	15.0
WLW, Cincinnati	25.2	25.0	32.3	10.0
WOAI, San Antonio	11.7	2.3	9.2	5.0
KMOX, St. Louis	15.5	13.5	16.2	30.0
WLS, Chicago	5.8	18.2	6.9	10.0
WHO, Des Moines	1.9	2.3	2.3	5.0
WWL, New Orleans	0	2.3	4.5	10.0
WGN, Chicago	0	0	2.3	2.5
KOA, Denver	0	0	0	2.5
WJZ, New York	0	0	2.3	0
WHAS, Louisville	0	2.3	0	0
WJR, Detroit	0	0	2.3	0
KDKA, Pittsburgh	0	0	0	0
All other class stations totaling 10	10.7	11.4	10.2	10.0

KANSAS

Clear-channel stations:				
WFAA, Fort Worth WBAP, Dallas	15.8	12.3	14.2	14.7
KOA, Denver	44.1	37.0	31.3	20.6
WLW, Cincinnati	12.5	14.8	11.4	20.6
WOAI, San Antonio	6.2	4.9	8.5	8.8
WHO, Des Moines	3.1	0	5.7	0
WLS, Chicago	3.1	4.9	11.4	2.9
KSL, Salt Lake City	3.1	12.3	0	5.9
WSM, Nashville	3.2	4.9	2.8	8.9
WJR, Detroit	0	0	0	2.9
KMOX, St. Louis	0	0	5.7	0
WGN, Chicago	0	2.5	0	5.9
WWL, New Orleans	0	0	2.8	2.9
All other class stations totaling 46	8.9	6.4	6.3	5.9

VIRGINIA

Clear-channel stations:				
WLW, Cincinnati	38.6	21.9	14.9	14.1
WSM, Nashville	17.4	15.9	6.7	11.0
WJZ, New York	8.7	5.6	14.9	9.3
WBT, Charlotte	13.7	18.3	17.6	17.3
WOR, Newark	5.0	8.6	16.2	9.3
WEAF, New York	2.5	9.8	4.0	7.9
KDKA, Pittsburgh	2.5	7.4	8.1	7.9
WTAM, Cleveland	2.5	0	0	0
WSB, Atlanta	1.2	2.4	2.7	7.9
WJR, Detroit	1.2	1.2	2.7	0
WWL, New Orleans	0	0	0	1.6
WHAS, Louisville	0	3.6	4.1	4.7
WLS, Chicago	1.2	1.2	2.7	1.6
WHO, Des Moines	0	0	1.3	0
WENR, Chicago	0	0	0	1.6
WBBM, Chicago	0	0	0	1.6
All other class stations, totaling 33	5.5	4.1	4.0	4.2

ALABAMA

Clear-channel stations:				
WSM, Nashville	32.3	24.7	14.7	17.0
WLW, Cincinnati	23.4	27.7	19.0	23.0
WSB, Atlanta	26.7	25.7	25.2	20.6
WWL, New Orleans	8.9	4.9	11.5	8.5
KMOX, St. Louis	.8	1.0	5.2	6.0
WLS, Chicago	.8	5.9	7.3	2.4
WBT, Charlotte	.8	2.0	8.3	6.0
WJZ, New York	.8	0	0	0
WOAI, San Antonio	.8	0	0	0
WHAS, Louisville	0	0	1.0	3.6
KDKA, Pittsburgh	0	0	1.0	2.4
WENR, Chicago	0	1.0	0	2.4
WHO, Des Moines	0	1.0	0	2.4
WGN, Chicago	0	0	1.0	0
All other class stations totaling 7	4.7	6.1	5.8	5.7

NORTH CAROLINA

Clear-channel stations:				
WBT, Charlotte	42.3	28.5	25.0	12.6
WLW, Cincinnati	17.5	15.9	14.9	20.0
WSM, Nashville	14.5	17.9	9.4	8.4
WSB, Atlanta	5.7	8.6	6.3	8.4
WEAF, New York	9.8	8.0	8.6	5.2
KDKA, Pittsburgh	1.5	2.6	8.6	4.1

Result of a postal-card survey on the broadcasting situation as it exists today conducted by the Honorable Martin L. Sweeney, of Ohio, during the past few months—Continued

NORTH CAROLINA—continued

	Choice in percent of total returns for both day and night reception			
	First	Second	Third	Fourth
Clear-channel stations—Continued.				
WGN, Chicago	1.5	0	0	1.0
WJZ, New York	1.0	4.0	7.0	12.6
WOR, Newark	1.0	3.3	5.5	8.3
WHAS, Louisville	.6	1.3	3.9	2.1
WLS, Chicago	0	1.3	2.3	2.1
WWL, New Orleans	0	.7	0	0
WABC, New York	0	2.0	3.1	4.2
WJR, Detroit	0	0	0	1.0
WHAM, Rochester	0	1.3	0	0
WGY, Schenectady	0	0	0	1.0
WENR, Chicago	0	0	0	2.1
WTAM, Cleveland	0	0	.8	0
KOA, Denver	0	0	0	1.0
All other class stations totaling 21	4.6	4.6	4.6	5.9

The Debate on Neutrality Reviewed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SOL BLOOM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 26, 1939

EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON POST

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial The Debate Reviewed, from the Washington Post of October 26, 1939, as follows:

[From the Washington Post of October 26, 1939]

THE DEBATE REVIEWED

Five weeks ago today President Roosevelt asked Congress, assembled in extraordinary session, for amendment of the existing neutrality law. During the intervening period the subject has been debated from many angles in the Senate, to say nothing of its discussion in less important forums in every American community. To the arguments which have been given such full expression little or nothing remains to be added. The final vote which is now approaching in the upper House is overdue.

On both sides there have been some outstanding speeches during the Senate debate. It has served to clarify a number of points on which there has been much public confusion. But on the whole the discussion, in retrospect, seems disappointing. That is because it has been unnecessarily protracted.

From the outset it was apparent that no fundamental issue divides the two camps. Both sides are, above all, insistent upon securing the peace of the United States. Both sides are anxious to formulate a policy that will meet all the requirements of traditional neutrality. Both sides are willing to sacrifice unquestionable national rights in order to strengthen insurance against American involvement in the present war.

For that reason the division of opinion has revolved around matters of procedure rather than of principle. It is not the propriety but the practical desirability of the suggested revisions which has been at issue.

Probably the most important of the issues thus clarified is the desirability of the existing embargo on the shipment of arms to belligerents. Since neutrality in international law has always envisaged such shipments, this issue has been examined from the viewpoint of whether a proper policy is also a wise policy. The Senate has in effect concluded that it is wise as well as wholly proper for us to let Great Britain and France purchase munitions in this country, provided the supplies are paid for in cash and transported in foreign ships.

From this decision, soon to be confirmed by vote, few will differ. Indeed, considering the overwhelming hostility of Americans to the philosophy underlying the present German Government, no other verdict could be regarded as possible. Opponents of embargo repeal have throughout been in the invidious position of seeming to favor a government which repudiates every principle for which America stands. That is why there has been so little heart in most of the speeches directed against embargo repeal.

The opponents of embargo repeal, however, have had one seemingly reasonable argument which has provided the second issue of consequence in the Senate debate. There are some who feel that while the arms embargo should never have been written into the

law, it is nevertheless there and cannot be changed, during the course of hostilities, without taking an unneutral action. This is perhaps the most forceful argument advanced by those who argue that the embargo should be retained. None the less, it has been unable to stand up under scrutiny.

As the discussion has brought out, belligerents continuously change their policies in wartime. To say that a neutral cannot do the same, as long as measures taken apply to all belligerents, is to say that the rights of those at peace are determined wholly by the interests of those at war. Such an attitude accords neither with international law nor with traditional American policies.

The third real issue which has commanded practical attention in the Senate debate is the desirability of the sweeping restrictions on American shipping which were at first projected. To an increasing extent, as the debate proceeded, it has been made clear that many of these restraints would seriously damage our merchant marine without in any way serving as safeguards against war. So there has been revision here based on the reasonable argument that every surrender of a neutral right must be balanced by some positive advantage in behalf of peace.

National thinking on the subject of neutrality has been raised to a more intelligent level by the Senate debate. Even the time devoted to speeches which contributed nothing was not wholly wasted. But there is certainly no point in further reiteration of well-worn arguments when the measure gets to the House.

There are many Members of that body who are at least as expert on the subject as the Senate has shown itself to be. For that very reason they should be the more anxious to avoid further repetitious oration, and to press for the final vote which a patient administration has the right to expect at the earliest possible moment.

The Crimson Trail

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. C. ARTHUR ANDERSON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 26, 1939

POEM BY JOHN W. DODD

Mr. ANDERSON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a brief but beautiful and timely poem composed by Mr. John W. Dodd, of St. Louis, Mo., formerly Corp. J. W. Dodd, One Hundred and Twenty-eighth Field Artillery, Thirty-fifth Division, A. E. F., with whom I served in France. The poem is as follows:

THE CRIMSON TRAIL

O'er rolling hills, through valleys wind
A crimson trail on towards the Rhine,
O'er which some million men had passed,
To live and die, or choke from gas.

A trail of life, of death and pain,
Where men had fought through fog and rain;
From shattered trees and shell holes deep,
Machine gun bullets danced and leaped.

Where trees once grew with foliage green,
And waving wheat, for miles was seen,
Came guns of hate, with shell and gas,
To blot all memory of its past.

All little towns along the way
Were crushed and battered as of clay;
While fields that once grew poppies red
Became a roaring hell of lead.

On misfit homes or mud-soaked trench
Hit screaming shells, to tear and wrench
The life and limbs from every man
Who saw his shelter crushed as sand.

With dugouts deep, now concrete made,
Came little nests, where guns were laid,
Then mustard gas and liquid fire
Joined hands with rows of treacherous wire.

Where guns were roaring day and night,
And planes above swept left and right;
Men waited the hour to move ahead
Through fog, mist, and machine gun lead.

When orders were given and maps were read,
And every man had then been fed,
The hour comes, at break of dawn,
And men went over to carry on,

To take some hill, or woods, or town,
Where shell and pill box cut them down;
Or rows of wire held them fast
To die from wounds or choke from gas.

Where bayonets clashed or grenades were thrown,
Where hundreds died as mines were blown,
Where rats and lice and knee-deep mud
Were churned anew with bones and blood.

Where men went blind or nerves were shattered,
While others lay, their bodies battered;
Where all men lived on borrowed time,
For months and months in muck and slime.

Where valleys green, and quaint old towns,
Were scarred or leveled to the ground;
Beneath it all, five million sleep
This countless toll that war has reaped.

Who they are, from whence they came,
We do not know their town or name;
They rest in peace where valleys wind
With rolling hills up to the Rhine.

—*John W. Dodd.*

Democracy at the Crossroads

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. HUNTER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 26, 1939

ADDRESS BY DR. EDWARD J. McCORMICK BEFORE THE MICHIGAN STATE MEDICAL ASSOCIATION

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Dr. Edward J. McCormick, A. M., M. D., F. A. C. S., F. I. C. S. (Geneva), before the Michigan State Medical Association, at Grand Rapids, Mich., September 19, 1939:

The United States of America is, beyond all question of doubt, the greatest country in the world and the greatest country in the history of the world. Its future possibilities, if the course outlined by its founders is pursued, challenge the imagination of a modern Jules Verne. And why, we may ask, are these facts now beyond dispute? The answer is in the Declaration of Independence:

"We hold these truths to be self-evident: (1) That all men are created equal; (2) that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; (3) that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; (4) that to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed."

Those who first dared the threats of ocean and the wildness of North American shore came willing to sacrifice and give their all that their children might have outlet for initiative, opportunity, dignity, equality, freedom of speech, freedom of worship, freedom of thought, that they might escape persecution, serfdom, and regimentation. As a matter of fact, they were actually fleeing from the totalitarian philosophy of their day as many Europeans are trying to escape it in our present day. They realized that there could be no progress and no enduring success, collectively or individually, in lands where class hatred and discrimination existed, where the mentally and physically weak were frequently born to the scepter and purple, and where man was stripped of his likeness to God and relegated to the plane of the beasts of burden. They sought a government which existed for them, the people; they were tired of existing as pawns for a government, without right or privilege. History is replete with man's efforts to break the chains of slavery and the advance of civilization to its present status is evidence of his success.

We Americans owe a great debt to those pioneer forefathers who recognized the "inalienable rights" given to man by the Creator and not by form of government and who realized that men are created equal. Because of them and through their efforts, we in America have gained a higher degree of social and political equality than the people of any other country. We are constantly striving for equality of dignity and opportunity and economic equality, remembering, of course, that as Dr. Butler has said, "We cannot hope to shackle the more efficient that they may not outrun the less efficient."

So democracy, a government "by and for the people" was born in America, fathered and mothered by sturdy, God-loving men and women who then turned their hopeful faces and strong bodies in the direction of the setting sun to conquer the forests, the hills, the swamps, the rivers, the lakes, and the plains. They advanced from the Atlantic to the Pacific and earmarked for their posterity the

United States of America. A free country for free, unshackled people.

Because of their desire for freedom and opportunity, because they suffered untold hardships, because they remembered God and His law and man's relationship to God, because they died on many battlefields to gain their and our "inalienable rights," because the Creator had fashioned for them a rich country, we, of America, control a large share of the world's gold; we use a great proportion of the world's telephone and telegraph facilities, more people in America own their own homes, possess stocks and bonds, and buy more insurance policies than the people in any other country or group of countries. Likewise, we Americans operate the greater percentage of the world's motorcars, and it has been said that the housewives of the State of California own and operate more modern household equipment than any country outside of the United States. So have our schools and colleges come to represent millions and millions of dollars and our educational systems, public and private, to be superior to those of any other land and some of our States to have more and better elementary schools and high schools and colleges than are possessed in some instances by entire nations.

Our universities and professional schools now lead the world. America's cathedrals and art museums can fearlessly challenge those of the Old World. The skyline of New York City is a source of amazement to the educated European visitor. "See America first" is good advice, for nowhere under heaven's canopy can its wonders, its advances be remotely approximated. We are ahead of any country or group of countries in any department of necessity or luxury which one can care to mention. God has blessed us with fertile lands, with hills that are filled with gold and silver, with a great supply of timber, with coal and oil and gas. The climate in the United States is varied, and one can pick his or her own weather conditions. These things, and freedom of speech, of the press, of worship, and social and political equality are yours and mine. because we live in a democracy. Our engineers, our jurists, our writers, our financiers, our statesmen, and our medical and surgical men, though young as groups, have in every instance walked as world's masters in their various vocations.

Medicine in America has been in the vanguard of advance under democracy. Our medical schools, our medical centers, our great clinics, our hospitals, are now the envy of the civilized world. Those who have traveled in foreign lands in search of medical lore know this to be true. The greatest advances in medicine in the last half century have been made here by our physicians and research workers. They have written the most brilliant chapters in disease prevention and therapy in the history of medicine.

In spite of these facts and with American medicine at the head of the medical world, there are those who feel that the doctor's rights should be taken from him—medical men regimented and the treatment of the sick taken over by the Government, the first step in democracy's downfall and the beginning of the end of initiative and progress. This idea is based largely on the fallacious thought that medical service is not available and within the means of a large percentage of the people, and the idea is constantly emphasized by self-seeking politicians, job hunters, and others who are in some instances selfish, in others uninformed, and in still other instances, desirous of promoting basic changes which would eventually bring to us dictatorship or, to say the least, wreck democracy. It is safe to say that these individuals will not stop when medicine has been socialized.

Those who have studied the medical situation know, however, that "the number of physicians in the United States is greater by approximately 19,000 than the combined number of physicians in Great Britain, Germany, Austria, France, Poland, Belgium, and Holland, despite the fact that the combined population in these 11 countries exceeds the population of the United States by 90,000,000." In 1886 there was 1 physician for every 662 persons in the United States; in 1938 there was 1 physician for every 786 individuals. In addition, there have been great improvements in transportation and means of communication. In physician's and nurse's training, and in auxiliary personnel and equipment, we Americans occupy a position of leadership in the medical world. We have recognized quality rather than quantity, and medical standards and requirements in our country are exceptionally high by comparison and well-trained medical men have been distributed over our great land to the extent that in 1936 there were only 241 counties in the United States that had more than 2,000 persons per physician, which is a more equitable distribution than is to be found in the older and more thickly settled countries of Europe. This has been accomplished with an elevation of medical education standards for the protection of the public of our country against treatment by physicians who are inadequately prepared and gives assurance to all, throughout the land, of the highest type of medical training available in the world. It has been pointed out that trains, automobiles, and airplanes, today, can bring patients a hundred or even a thousand miles for treatment more easily than the patient of a generation ago could be transported over dirt roads to a doctor 10 miles away, and yet the supply of physicians in rural districts is far better in the United States than in any country which boasts "state medicine" or government control. The survey made by the American Medical Association, with the aid of State and county medical groups, though incomplete on August 1, 1939, showed that 25 percent of physicians gave free care to 3,000,000 individuals, and rendered 2,000,000 hours of free care to hospitals and clinics. It has been estimated that each day the physicians of this country contribute more than $1,000,000 in medical service, or the staggering sum of $365,000,000 a year in voluntary free service, to those unable to pay. Every doctor in the country has a part pay and a free clientele.

The elevation of standards in medicine in our country have progressed to a point where a physician must meet certain requirements before he can become a specialist in any field of medicine or surgery. There are now 13 boards which examine prospective specialists and if found sufficient in all requirements, certify him as proficient in his specialty. The so-called general practitioner today is a man who has completed high school, college, medical school, and 1 or 2 years' internship and taken postgraduate work at intervals. If he desires to specialize, several additional years of apprenticeship and study are necessary. The medical man of today has spent more time and money learning his profession than any man in any other profession or business. The system of private practice in the United States has offered a desirable field to a larger number of individuals in relation to the population to enter than any country in which state medicine prevails, and consequently we have more and better trained physicians per small-population quota. Free choice of physicians makes it possible for the doctor to be judged by his patients and to increase his practice according to his ability and his willingness to serve, and this system has gone further in the conquest of disease and the postponement of death, as shown by actual statistics, than the systems in any country that have abandoned private practice.

From 1928 to 1938 there was an increase of 61,987 hospital beds in the United States. During this period the number of unoccupied beds increased by 8,919. In 1938, there was an average daily census of 132,454 empty beds in general hospitals. A study of the distribution of hospitals shows that less than 3,000,000 persons throughout the vast area of the United States are farther than 30 miles from a hospital registered by the American Medical Association. We can rightfully ask, therefore, Why the proposed unwarranted expenditure of your moneys and mine for additional hospital beds when no real need has been shown? And why should the Government be expected to become the competitor of the private hospitals which have been serving and struggling and sacrificing through the years? In 1938 there were 132,454 empty beds each day in our general hospitals—if present construction trends continue, there would be 147,000 vacancies in 1942, but if the proposed construction program, now before our country's lawmakers, comes to pass, we would have 526,000 general hospital beds with a probable corresponding increase in vacancies. What a headache for our community-chest directors! As a matter of fact, what a headache for all of us!

Much has been said about morbidity and morality in States where the population has lower incomes, among so-called poorer people, and this has been advanced as an argument in favor of government medicine. But no amount of physicians and building of additional hospitals will substitute for lack of food, clothing, and housing. Give the people of these localities health education, proper and decent food, clean homes, toilet facilities, and shoes, and decent wages, and the incidence of malaria, hookworm, and pellagara, and other diseases will decline, Senator WAGNER to the contrary notwithstanding. Recent death-rate statistics prove that despite our large Negro population, which in some localities has a death rate of twice the white population, we in America have accomplished more than any other large nation, and it is pertinent to observe that in Australia and New Zealand, which countries have for years had the lowest mortality rates in the world for the entire population and also for mothers and infants, that those who have sought political and financial advantage from sickness insurance and government medical control have never ceased to fight to obtain it; and Australia, having spent $5,000,000 in preparation for its introduction, became convinced of its undesirability, and early in 1939 the Government withdrew its support.

I tell you of America's supremacy and greatness and of medicine's development to focus your attention upon the fact that under democracy a free people have captured world leadership in all phases of human endeavor. To the shores of this land of ours have come men and women who have realized that here the rail splitter would be given equal opportunity to prove himself worthy of the highest office in the land. Initiative of the individual has not been curtailed, and America is today the youngest, yet the greatest of countries.

Despite legion evidence of development, prosperity, and world leadership, we now find democracy and all that it represents threatened in many and devious ways; and there is danger, unless we become less complacent, that the very medium which made us great in art, in science, in finance, and in medicine will be taken from us.

I have but to remind you that in our public-school systems and in our great colleges and universities there are men and women who have cast God out of their hearts, who have turned their backs upon "government by and for the people," and who are openly advocating changes in our form of government that, to say the very least, would bring us to the brink of communism and totalitarianism. Like individuals have made their ways into city, State, and governmental agencies; they are holding offices in labor unions, stirring up strife and discord and doing everything possible to interfere with economic progress to the end that democracy may be discredited. I have said many times that labor is the backbone of democracy. We know that under democracy labor has made great strides and that the laboring man occupies a position in this country far above the plane on which he is placed in any other land, but you know and I know that unless labor relieves itself of the services of communistic racketeers the failure of labor is in-

evitable. The chains of regimented serfdom are likely to replace the full dinner pail and the machine in every garage. Recent investigations point to the so-called Workers' Alliance, an organization composed largely of W. P. A. workers, as being dominated by communistic individuals who are sowing seeds of discord, stirring up class hatred, and planning interference with all the orderly principles of government, preaching communism to its members, opposing all the ideals of Americanism, and encouraging the workers to scuttle the very ship that has saved them. I can but remind you this evening that one of the leaders of this sort of thing in America has written in his book, "The revolution does not simply happen, it must be made." The Dies committee has pointed out that documentary evidence indicated that "Communist leaders assumed great credit for the organization of steel, automobile, and other industries and the direction of the strikes which followed." "This committee has established," one reads in its report, "on the basis of the Communist Party's own literature, that Communists are actively boring from within churches, schools, youth organizations, and every other organization and institution into which they can find entrance." I feel that they are boring from within as far as medicine is concerned. All reports indicate that the largest of Communist front movements in the United States is the American League for Peace and Democracy, formerly known as the League Against War and Fascism.

Second only to this organization is the Workers' Alliance. Communism is definitely on the march in America. Likewise, I would warn you that the godless philosophy which has worked its reign of terror in Germany, is rapidly penetrating the United States and that many Fascist organizations, disguised as patriotic and Christian groups, are spreading a type of hatred and intolerance which is incubated on foreign soil and brought here to grow, and foreign dictators are using and will use every possible method to cause disintegration of democracy in the United States of America. The future of dictators is in danger so long as a free nation exists marching on to greater triumphs. The German-American Bund and the Italian Black Shirts have no place in the United States but they are here.

Can any sane American question the advance of paternalism, of socialistic tendencies, and communistic teachings? And who is there with the courage to state that socialized medicine is not a part of this type of philosophy? When government takes over medical facilities and personnel, it is only a step to similar control of dentistry, law, and business. Socialized medicine forms the opening wedge, not only for the loss of initiative and progress in medicine, but the loss of initiative and progress in all other fields. It is sponsored largely by job seekers and politicians who know little or nothing of medicine but who desire to create another political football and build a greater stadium for the massacre of the hapless taxpayer.

We voters, whether Republicans or Democrats, must soon realize that genuine prosperity must come from the productive industry of the citizens of our Republic. The Twentieth Century Fund has said, "That in the long run no government can continue year after year to incur substantial deficits and to increase its debts steadily if it wishes to maintain its credit." It likewise states that the total Government debts, of all governments, in the United States, "are the largest that any nation has ever had." It is fallacious indeed to believe, as the Honorable HARRY BYRD has said, "that a national debt is a national blessing and that recovery is born of debts and deficits." The proponents of the Wagner bill have the courage to propose to appropriate over $600,000,000 for its purposes and it is likely that the cost will exceed even the report of the Technical Committee on Medical Care of the Interdepartmental Committee on Coordination of Health and Welfare Activities of the Federal Government, which estimates that the Wagner bill, for the period 1939–42, would require $1,700,000,000. It is entirely in the realm of possibility that the Wagner bill program could double the present Federal Budget within the next decade. "Serious depression occurred in the summer of 1937," according to a bulletin of the Ohio State Chamber of Commerce, "and in the opinion of business and tax students, this depression was chiefly caused by excessive tax burden imposed by the Social Security Act, together with other high Federal taxes imposed upon business." Can the United States stand the shock of the Wagner program without another depression? The school child could answer that question.

Knowing that local medical facilities are adequate in the vast majority of all of our subdivisions, that local administration of health matters in the various States is to be preferred, and feeling that Federal interference is not needed and that all States can intelligently look after the medical needs of their indigent, and realizing that no adequate survey of supposed needs has been made, feeling that thousands of private institutions should not be forced to compete with Government institutions, recognizing the fact that the great structure of medicine in our Nation would be destroyed and inferior service given to all the people, and resenting political domination and useless expenditure of Government's funds, our money, and gigantic increase in the Nation's debt—believing that socialization of medicine is the first blow at the foundation of democracy, we, as citizens and physicians, are in duty bound to condemn Senate bill 1620, known as the Wagner bill, or any similar bill designed to undermine medicine and eventually destroy our democracy. Our system of free enterprise is at stake.

Every man and woman should give a part of his or her time each day to an interest in city, county, State, and National Government. Democracy has and will continue to function if each of us will take the time and trouble to do his duty. Physicians must come to realize that while they were born to heal, that they must likewise do their share in the preservation not only of the sacred traditions of medicine but in the preservation of the rights of man. Democracy in America is at the crossroads. Shall you and I permit the selfish, the unthinking, and the un-American to guide her onto the road of socialized medicine, in the direction of totalitarianism and communism, or shall we take our places in the political picture and fight for democracy, the very soul of American greatness and

Freedom of the Seas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 26, 1939

ARTICLE BY HON. JOSEPH A. CONRY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a very interesting article written by Hon. Joseph A. Conry, of Boston, former Member of Congress, which appeared in the Daily Republican, of Springfield, Mass., on October 20, 1939.

The article is as follows:

[From the Springfield (Mass.) Daily Republican of October 20, 1939]

FREEDOM OF THE SEAS—PROPOSAL FOR ADHERING TO THE INTERNATIONAL LAW DOCTRINE

To the EDITOR OF THE REPUBLICAN:

Our metropolitan newspapers are devoting much editorial space to the matter of the plight into which Congress would push our merchant marine by way of the so-called neutrality bill. First, our shipowners were told they must keep out of the ports and harbors of belligerents; also out of adjacent waters where the belligerents were looking for game. Examination of the bill disclosed that this would most effectually drive American ships to their mooring berths at their home ports.

It is true the overwhelming sentiment of Americans is with the Allies at the present time. The brutality and wickedness of Hitler have aroused the hatred and abhorrence of the American people, stimulating their blood sympathy for England and sentimental affection for France.

Notwithstanding these facts, senatorial debate has aroused the American people to inquire, "Why should we be compelled to surrender our rights on the sea because two or more nations decide to enter war?" We are answered that to avoid every possibility of involvement in this war, our ships are forbidden by American law to enter certain danger zones, areas occupied by fighting ships of the belligerents. Thus the sharp juridical sword of modern war extends its sweeping reach and scalping edge from old-time 3-mile limits of port blockades to vast ocean spaces.

We may be reluctant to admit its justice, but we are compelled to recognize its potency. The United States has the industrial capacity to fabricate all the war weapons needed by world belligerents. As evidence of our acceptance of the rights claimed by the warring powers to establish so-called danger zones and our willingness to renounce our rights to freely sail the open seas, Congress has proposed that American ships must give up their rights to carry commerce, even of the most harmless nature, if any belligerent sails a submarine into a quiet haven for rest and observation. At the same time we invite all foreign ships to enter our ports to buy any and all goods they wish to carry, our only stipulation being that cash shall be paid for the goods before the foreigner leaves our harbor.

By forbidding American vessels this highly profitable trade we have presented to British shipping a magnificent monopoly, at the expense of the American taxpayer. When this fact is made clear, doubt appears in American minds as to the wisdom of the pending legislation. Our sympathies have destroyed our commerce on the sea.

Grotius, one of the earliest writers on the subject, insisted that every nation is free to travel and trade with every other nation, the fundamental theory of the freedom of the seas. Our own Admiral Mahan displayed a better theory in his Influence of Sea Power on History, where we learn that sea power is the decisive factor in war.

Beginning with our first treaty of amity and commerce with Prussia, in 1785, we have consistently sought protection for all private property not contraband of war, from capture and destruction by belligerents. Three of our wisest men, John Adams, Benjamin Franklin, and Thomas Jefferson, negotiated that treaty which employed the slogan in article 12, "Free vessels make free goods."

Congress emphasized this doctrine by resolution of April 28, 1904, and our delegates to the second Hague conference, in 1907, brought this principle before the convention, securing 21 votes out of a possible 44.

Due to recent contemptuous dismissal of treaties, as well as our experience in the World War, common sense teaches us that freedom of the seas in time of war between two powerful maritime nations is a mere airy abstraction. We have renounced all we ever sought, abandoned our ideals, and have agreed with the belligerents to erect a lightning rod electric sign, "no trespassing," for American vessels, but open to any other ship which cares to make the try.

Vattel says, "A nation that without any other motive than the prospect of gain is employed in strengthening my enemy, without regard to how far I may suffer, gives me a right to consider and treat it as an associate of my enemy."

Our outspoken sympathies are for the Allies, yet we hope to preserve an outward appearance of neutrality. Are we facing a dilemma? Are we not inviting Germany to partake of a Barmecidal feast, while the Allies get their fill of everything?

Of course, we have the right to legislate for the sale and delivery of our own goods. We enjoy the absolute right of possession and sale, with all the rights of imposing conditions. Let us agree to sell war materials to all nations under the conditions that the goods shall be delivered in American ships and with a firm agreement with warring powers that no American vessels shall be attacked on any water of the world.

By this arrangement we favor no one, we exercise our right and privilege without fear or favor. It is beyond belief that any belligerent will refuse to accept these equitable terms as evidence of the full and absolute neutrality of the United States.

We advocate the freedom of the seas for all, we insist upon this freedom for American ships. If any nation declines to join with us in this wholesome rule of law, let him look for no assistance in his battles from the United States.

JOSEPH A. CONRY.

BOSTON, *October 15, 1939.*

United States Exports of Agricultural Products

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WADE H. KITCHENS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 26, 1939

Mr. KITCHENS. Mr. Speaker, trade data released by the Department of Commerce today showing the foreign trade of the United States for September 1939 reveal some highly satisfactory increases in exports of agricultural products compared with September 1938.

Exports of unmanufactured cotton increased from a value of $20,511,000 in September 1938 to $35,661,000 in September of this year. In addition to the exports of cotton there were increases in exports of canned fruit, dairy products, lard, flour, vegetables and vegetable products, and other foodstuffs.

During the earlier months of this year the value of total exports of agricultural products was somewhat lower compared to the totals of last year. In a very large measure this falling-off was due to the necessity which European countries faced to purchase abroad huge quantities of articles for national-defense purposes. The enormous expenditures required for such purchases left foreign countries with very little available foreign exchange with which to buy certain other products from the United States, notably agricultural products. The value of total agricultural exports for September of this year rose to $74,579,000, or nearly the same value as in September 1938. Though exports of grain, fresh fruit, and tobacco were smaller in September of this year compared to the same month of last year, the increases in cotton, dairy products, canned fruit, flour, lard, and vegetables nearly counterbalance the decline in other items. Shipments of cotton to the United Kingdom, France, Italy, Spain, and a number of other European countries were much larger in September 1939 than in September 1938.

The following table shows United States exports of agricultural products for September 1938 and 1939:

United States exports of agricultural products

Items	September	
	1938	1939
Cotton, unmanufactured	$20,511,000	$35,661,000
Tobacco, unmanufactured	23,150,000	9,860,000
Wheat	3,483,000	2,530,000
Corn	4,788,000	1,121,000
Fruits, fresh, dried, evaporated, and canned	10,339,000	8,977,000
Meat products	2,179,000	2,384,000
Lard	1,670,000	1,906,000
Dairy products, except fresh milk	693,000	837,000
Wheat flour	1,646,000	2,434,000
Oil cake and meal	775,000	701,000
Vegetables, fresh, dried and canned	1,003,000	1,513,000
Other foodstuffs	4,772,000	5,607,000
Total	75,009,000	73,531,000

The gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] in a colloquy this morning was complaining of our trade treaty on vegetables. It will be observed that our vegetable exports have increased 50 percent in 1 year.

The outbreak of armed hostilities on the European Continent brings into sharp relief against the background of our sad experience during the past quarter of a century the necessity to give intelligent support to the efforts of our Secretary of State, Cordell Hull, in expanding the trade-agreements program in order to increase our commerce and promote more friendly feelings with our South American sister republics in order to cushion as much as possible the impact of the extraordinary conditions arising from the European conflict.

But there is a larger economic consideration involved in the desirability to expand and implement the reciprocal trade agreements program. Wars come to an end, and if we are to avoid the impairment of normal international economic relations which so disastrously retarded our material progress during the period of reconstruction following the first World War, there must be kept alive somewhere in the world a clear understanding of the failures of the recent past and of the dangers which lie ahead if these failures are repeated.

Repeal the Embargo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT G. ALLEN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 25, 1939

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. GIFFORD PINCHOT

Mr. ALLEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me I include in my remarks a speech delivered over the radio by former Gov. Gifford Pinchot of my State. Governor Pinchot has eloquently defended the cause of those who are trying to repeal the unneutral arms embargo.

The address is as follows:

I am for repealing the embargo and for cash and carry, and I am here to give you my reasons. My first and most important reason is that we want—we all want—the United States to keep out of this war.

To begin with let's get politics out of the way. I am a Republican, but I am an American first. I am for the administration's plan of embargo repeal and cash and carry, but not because it will be good for the Republican Party or good for the Democatic Party or good for any party or individual whatsoever. I am for it because it will be good for all the people of the United States, regardless of party.

This question is too big to be dealt with on political lines. Through its influence on the world this war will affect every

human being in America, and for the matter of that every human being in the whole earth, before we see the last of it. To play politics with so great a question would be cheap and small beyond description.

Now, let's get down to brass tacks. There are two main reasons why I believe every American ought to be for no embargo and cash and carry. The first reason for no embargo and cash and carry, I repeat, is that the sure way to keep us out of war is to do all we can to see that the Allies are able to win the war without us. If they win, we know that we shall be at peace.

The second reason is that we do not want to live in a world armed to the teeth and dominated by international gangsters and burglars. Yet that is precisely what Hitler's victory would mean.

With all the strength and conviction I can express, I say that it is vitally necessary for us—for the United States—that justice and not force shall rule the world of which we are a part.

That is what this war is about. This is a war to decide whether force shall rule the world, or whether justice shall have a chance. It is a war to decide whether small nations shall have a right to be safe, and whether great nations can be safe only when armed to the teeth. It is a war to decide whether we are to live in a world controlled on the principles of the wolf pack, or a world controlled on the principles of the New Testament—a world in which the faith of nations can be trusted.

This is a free country. We mean to keep it so, at any cost. We want to live in a free world. We want to live with and trade with free peoples. Therefore we cannot be indifferent to whatever threatens to destroy the freedom we prize.

Our country is the great example and apostle of freedom and democracy. We believe in those things. And if we believe in them for ourselves we must believe in them for others also. Naturally, we sympathize with the defenders of freedom and are opposed to the spread of totalitarian tyranny.

The extension of dictatorship in the world is wrong, and it is against our interest; the extension of freedom in the world is right, and it is for our interest. On that point we took our stand long ago when President Monroe enunciated the Doctrine which bears his name.

This war will decide whether we can live at peace and security, or whether we must be eternally on the watch, armed and ready to keep the abominable Hitler system of tyranny, paganism, concentration camps, blood purges, lying-for-conquest, and conquest by force out of this hemisphere. To Hitler right and wrong are just words. But it means something to us when principles are at stake.

If the Allies win, we know by long experience their victory will bring no threat to peace in the Americas. But if Hitler should win, the story will not be the same. Remember that the Nazis have already given abundant notice of their desire to dominate certain South American countries.

Have you thought what might happen if Hitler should win and should attempt to take over the English and French colonies on this side of the Atlantic—Bermuda, Nassau, and the Islands of the Caribbean? How would you like it if a despotism whose god is force, which denies to its people all the liberties guaranteed to us by the Constitution, which looks on small nations as its natural prey, and whose word is utterly worthless—how would you like it if such a tyranny should undertake to extend its military rule to America? We would stop it, of course, but how much trouble that would mean no one can tell.

Have you thought what it would mean to the world if Nazi victory should spread the Nazi standards of faith and conduct over the earth? What chance would there be of world cooperation for peace if Hitler should win the war? Can the world cooperate for peace with a despotism whose law is force? And yet world cooperation for peace is one of our greatest needs.

Do not get me wrong. If Hitler and his Nazis should win this war—which Heaven forbid—I do not believe he would send soldiers to invade the United States. But I do believe that a victory by Hitler would in the end force us to defend the freedom of this hemisphere against nazi-ism and all that goes with it.

I am deeply convinced that the United States ought to keep out of this war and can keep out of this war. But whatever we do we cannot keep from being affected by the war, and whatever we do we cannot avoid affecting the outcome of the war.

If we maintain the embargo, we shall be helping Hitler; if we repeal the embargo, we shall be helping the democracies. We are neutral and we ought to keep on being neutral. But whatever we do, we cannot help helping one side or the other.

We are neutral and we ought to be neutral, but there is no use hiding our heads in the sand. It is no more a violation of neutrality to repeal the embargo, which will help the Allies, than to maintain the embargo, which is helping Hitler right now. The question is, Which course will be best for the people of the United States? There can be but one answer to that.

General Washington was right. We want to stay away from purely European questions. But this is not the same kind of a world as when Washington spoke. Then it took a month or two to hear from a friend in Europe. Today the clippers make it in a day or two. Today you can telephone to a man in Europe and get him in 5 minutes. It's a whole lot smaller world than it used to be.

The time has long gone by when any nation on earth can live to itself alone in a watertight compartment. As President Cleveland said, it is a condition and not a theory that confronts us. We must deal with things as they are and not as they used to be. We must do the thing that will keep us out of this war today—and that is no embargo and cash and carry.

Not long ago Senator BORAH assured us there would be no war. Well, there is a war. It is just possible that he may be equally mistaken when he assures us that isolation is the answer to the maiden's prayer.

As a matter of cold fact, there is no such thing as isolation any more. Perhaps there was in 1492, when Columbus sailed the ocean blue, but not today. Whatever we do or whatever we don't, we are still a part of the world in which we live, and nothing that happens between nations can fail to affect us either for good or for evil.

I repeat that there is no such thing as isolation is the world today. Indeed, the embargo itself is a denial of isolation. Unless and until we can move to the moon, there is no way we can keep the actions and the affairs of the other nations of the world from having an effect upon us. Whether we like it or not, that is the fact.

So much for BORAH. What about Lindbergh?

For Lindbergh, the flyer, we all have the greatest admiration. But I see nothing whatever in his record that gives him authority to tell the American people what they ought to do in the face of a great war. Neither can I see the slightest sense or reason in his amazing demand that Canada shall give up her membership in the British commonwealth of nations.

In spite of the overwhelming demonstration now being made in Europe that a strong defense is often the most powerful attack, Colonel Lindbergh, like Mr. Hoover, wants us to make a distinction between offensive and defensive weapons for export to the Allies. To my mind, this Hoover-Lindbergh distinction is just what Major Eliot called it—"emotional nonsense." Perhaps Colonel Lindbergh can tell us on which side of his distinction a rifle in the hands of an infantryman would fall.

Furthermore, and far more important, this is the second time Lindbergh has given Hitler a helping hand. The first time was when his report on the air strength of Hitler and the Allies had so large a part in bringing on the surrender at Munich. And now, again, the Nazis are comforted and encouraged by what Lindbergh has to say.

Another matter. You may not like England or you may not like France. You may hear it said that France and England are not democracies. If that were true, how did it happen that the people of France and England refused to stand for Hitlerism when their Governments were sunk in appeasement? But it was Hitler who forced this war, and not the German people, who wanted and still want peace.

You may hold it against the Allies that the war debts have not been paid. You may charge them with having acquired many parts of their empires by methods of which today we do not approve. But when you make that charge, don't forget that times have changed, and especially don't forget that nothing either France or England ever did in times gone by begins to compare in brutality and outlawry with what Hitler has done in the last year.

The Allies are charged with imperialism. I could argue that point. But if we admit it, which would you rather have, the imperialism of the Allies or the nazi-ism of Hitler? It seems to me there is only one choice.

Suppose a gang of burglars had begun to operate in your town and had broken into and robbed the houses of people you knew and thought well of. Suppose the chief of police had not always led a model life, that he owed you money, and that you did not like him anyhow; would you let that keep you from encouraging him to put down the burglars? I don't think it would. Yet that is precisely the kind of situation which faces us as between Hitler and the Allies.

The sort of thing Hitler stands for we can't stand for. We know that if the Allies win, this will be a better world, for Hitlerism will not be on top. If the Allies win, there will be a chance, and I believe a good chance this time, for a peace that will last—a peace in which no nation will be deprived of what it needs to live.

But we know that if Hitler wins it will be a worse world—a very much worse world, a world in which force and not justice will be on top. You who are listening to me know that just as surely as I do.

There is not a man or woman listening to me tonight who is more anxious to keep out of war than I am. I don't want my son to go to war any more than you want yours. What I do want above all lesser matters is to see the sons and daughters of American fathers and mothers freed from the threat of service overseas. I am for no embargo and cash and carry because that is the way to keep them home, because that is the way to peace, because that is the best thing for America.

We are fortunate indeed that other nations across the sea are fighting the things we hate—cruelty, aggression, the ruthless rule of force. If they win, the whole world, ourselves included, will win with them.

The way for us to stay out of war, now and in the future, is to help in every way we can short of war to prevent the victory of Hitler and the spread of Hitlerism over the earth. And the more we postpone doing what Hitler does not want us to do, the longer we put off repealing the embargo, the harder will be the task of keeping freedom alive.

It is almost unthinkable that we should be helping the unspeakable Hitler, as we are doing by maintaining our embargo. That we should not only be helping Hitler but helping him against the right and against our own interest—that is just simply ridiculous.

Let me repeat. Like you, I am for America, first, last, and all the time. I am for staying out of the war. No embargo and cash and carry—there you have the answer.

Chronology of American Foreign Policy From July 1937

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD P. NYE

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 26 (legislative day of Wednesday, October 4), 1939

STUDY PREPARED BY HON. GERALD P. NYE, OF NORTH DAKOTA

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a study of the chronology of American foreign policy which I have prepared.

There being no objection, the chronology was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Here is a chronology of important events, including excerpts from speeches, relating to American foreign policy from the summer of 1937 to date. It indicates the trend of the administration's foreign policy since the dramatic "quarantine" speech by the President on October 5, 1937, which was a startling reversal of the Democratic Party platform pledge respecting neutrality and the President's Chautauqua speech. The purpose of this foreign policy has been twofold: The first of these is to have the United States play a decisive role in the affairs of Europe and the Far East. The second is to throw the weight of the United States toward helping England and France in every possible way, short of war. The latter has been manifest in the administration's support of the foreign policy of England and France, whatever it happens to be at a particular time—nonintervention toward Spain, appeasement toward Hitler and Mussolini through Munich and up to March 1939, a united front against Germany since then. It identifies our own national interests with those of England and France and is based on the assumption that they are our first line of defense. This chronology must be read against the background of popular American determination to steer clear of foreign quarrels and stay out of foreign wars—as manifested in the neutrality legislation of 1935, 1936, and 1937.

The proposed repeal of the arms embargo, the proposed weakening of the credit provisions of the act, the proposed repetition of the armed-merchantmen-submarine controversy, the proposed discretionary power to the President on war zones—all these are only the latest, but evidently not the last, measures and indications of an attitude of partisanship and involvement from 1937 to 1939.

(NOTE.—The Washington Information Service (W. I. S.) used sometimes as a reference in the following pages, is written by William T. Stone, vice president of the Foreign Policy Association.)

—

JULY 1937

JULY 16. OUTBREAK OF ARMED CONFLICT IN FAR EAST—SECRETARY HULL LAYS DOWN PRINCIPLES OF INTERNATIONAL CONDUCT

On outbreak of fighting in Far East, Secretary of State Hull, on July 16, issues circular note to nations of the world laying down principles of international conduct. The United States stands, he says, "for the maintenance of peace. We advocate national and international self-restraint. We advocate abstinence by all nations from use of force in pursuit of policy and from interference in the internal affairs of other nations. We advocate adjustment of problems in international relations by processes of peaceful negotiation and agreement. We advocate faithful observance of international agreements. Upholding the principles of the sanctity of treaties, we believe in modification of provisions of treaties, when need therefor arises, by orderly processes carried out in a spirit of mutual helpfulness and accommodation. We believe in respect by all nations for the rights of others and performance by all nations of established obligations. We stand for revitalizing and strengthening of international law. We advocate steps toward promotion of economic security and stability the world over. We advocate lowering or removing of excessive barriers in international trade. We seek effective equality of commercial opportunity and we urge upon all nations application of the principle of equality of treatment." (And So to War, by Hubert Herring, p. 25.)

—

AUGUST 1937

AUGUST 6. SENATE RESOLUTION DEMANDS WITHDRAWAL OF TROOPS FROM CHINA

Resolution demanding withdrawal of American troops and naval units now stationed in China (S. Res. 170), introduced by Senator LEWIS (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, August 6, 1937, p. 8351). On August 9, the resolution was referred to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, August 9, 1937, p. 8518.) No action taken by the committee.

AUGUST 7. LEASING OF NAVAL VESSELS TO AMERICAN REPUBLICS

Senate Joint Resolution 200 was introduced on August 7, sponsored by State Department, authorizing President to lease destroyers to the American Republics. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, August 7, 1937, p. 8482.) Project postponed because of opposition in United States and in Latin America.

AUGUST 10. HELIUM BILL

Senate debates bill authorizing Government monopoly for production of helium gas and providing for export under license of helium to be used for commercial purposes. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, August 10, 1937, p. 8603.) Approved August 11. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, August 11, 1937, p. 8694.)

AUGUST 17. SENATORS DEMAND APPLICATION OF NEUTRALITY ACT

In a statement released to the press on August 17, Senators NYE, BONE, and CLARK ask application of Neutrality Act in Far East.

AUGUST 23. REPLIES TO HULL'S STATEMENT ON PRINCIPLES OF INTERNATIONAL CONDUCT

Great Britain, France, Oslo powers, many Balkan states, most Latin-American states, and Russia agree to policy laid down in Secretary Hull's July 16 note. Commenting on the replies, Secretary Hull said:

"This Government does not believe in political alliances or entanglements, nor does it believe in extreme isolation. It does believe in international cooperation for the purpose of seeking through pacific methods the achievement of those objectives set forth in the statement of July 16." (State Department Press Releases, August 28, 1937, pp. 166–167.)

—

SEPTEMBER 1937

SEPTEMBER 5. PRESIDENT TELLS AMERICANS TO GET OUT OF CHINA

President Roosevelt issues press conference statement saying "all the 7,780 Americans in China have been strongly urged to get out and any who remain after that warning do so at their own risk." (New York Times, September 7, 1937.)

SEPTEMBER 9. SECRETARY HULL SAYS AMERICANS IN CHINA WILL BE PROTECTED

Following many protests produced by President's statement, Secretary Hull, on September 9, reassures Americans in China that United States Marines and the Asiatic squadron will stay in China as long as trouble lasts. (New York Times, September 10, 1937.)

SEPTEMBER 14. UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT SHIPS BARRED FROM CARRYING MUNITIONS TO CHINA

Presidential order says Government owned ships may not carry munitions to China. (State Department Press Releases, September 18, 1937, p. 227.)

SEPTEMBER 22. STATE DEPARTMENT PROTESTS BOMBARDMENT OF NANKING

State Department protests bombardment of Nanking, reserves "all rights" of United States Government and nationals, and objects * * * "both to such jeopardizing of the lives of its nationals and of noncombatants generally, and to the suggestion that its official and nationals now residing in and around Nanking should withdraw from the areas in which they are lawfully carrying on their legitimate activities." (State Department Press Releases, September 25, 1937, p. 256.)

SEPTEMBER 25. ADMIRAL YARNELL ON PROTECTING CITIZENS IN CHINA

September 21, Admiral Harry E. Yarnell, commander in chief of the American Asiatic Squadron, sent out an order to all units under his command:

"The policy of the commander in chief during the present emergency is to employ United States naval forces under his command so as to offer all possible protection and assistance to our nationals in cases where needed. Naval vessels will be stationed in ports where American citizens are concentrated and will remain there until it is no longer possible or necessary to protect them or until they have been evacuated.

"This policy, based on our duties and obligations, will be continued as long as the present controversy between China and Japan exists, and will continue in full force even after our nationals have been warned to leave China and after an opportunity to leave has been given.

"Most American citizens now in China are engaged in businesses or professions which are their only means of livelihood. * * *

"In giving assistance and protection our naval forces may at times be exposed to dangers which will in most cases be slight, but in any case these risks must be accepted." (New York Times, September 25, 1937.)

—

OCTOBER 1937

OCTOBER 3. LONG-DISTANCE BLOCKADE OF JAPAN

On October 3 the New York Sunday News carried in its pictorial section a two-page map of the Pacific under the caption "Long-distance blockade." A swinging dotted line was drawn from the northern tip of Alaska, passing west of Hawaii, north of New Guinea, south of Borneo, to Singapore. This line was divided in two parts, one of which was labeled "Blockade line controlled by British Fleet," and the other, "Blockade line controlled by United States Fleet." (And So to War, by Hubert Herring, p. 30.)

OCTOBER 5. PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT'S "QUARANTINE" SPEECH AT CHICAGO

President Roosevelt delivers "quarantine" speech at Chicago, in which he declares: "* * * The peace-loving nations must make a concerted effort in opposition to those violations of treaties and those ignorings of humane instincts which today are creating a state of international anarchy and instability, from which there is no escape through mere isolation or neutrality. * * *

"It seems to be unfortunately true that the epidemic of world lawlessness is spreading.

"When an epidemic of physical disease starts to spread, the community approves and joins in a quarantine of the patients in order to protect the health of the community against the spread of the disease.

"It is my determination to pursue a policy of peace and to adopt every practicable measure to avoid involvement in war. * * *

"War is a contagion, whether it be declared or undeclared. It can engulf states and peoples remote from the original scene of hostilities. We are determined to keep out of war, yet we cannot insure ourselves against the disastrous effects of war and the dangers of involvement. We are adopting such measures as will minimize our risk of involvement, but we cannot have complete protection in a world of disorder in which confidence and security have broken down.

"If civilization is to survive, the principles of the Prince of Peace must be restored. Shattered trust between nations must be revived.

"Most important of all, the will for peace on the part of peace-loving nations must express itself to the end that nations that may be tempted to violate their agreements and the rights of others will desist from such a cause. There must be positive endeavors to preserve peace.

"America hates war. America hopes for peace. Therefore, America actively engages in the search for peace." (State Department Press Releases, October 9, 1937, pp. 277–279.)

OCTOBER 6. STATE DEPARTMENT SAYS JAPAN VIOLATES TREATIES

State Department issues memorandum declaring that in "the light of the unfolding developments in the Far East, the Government of the United States has been forced to the conclusion that the action of Japan in China is * * * contrary to the provisions" of the Nine Power Treaty and the Antiwar Pact. (State Department Press Releases, October 9, 1937, pp. 284–285.)

OCTOBER 22. HULL SPEECH AT TORONTO REITERATES PRINCIPLES OF INTERNATIONAL CONDUCT

Reiterates sentiments expressed on July 16. He went on to say:

"It is the common duty of all nations not only to practice such relations with respect to each other but to stand ready to contribute, in every practicable way, toward the creation of conditions and toward the formulation and application of specific measures which will render possible the upbuilding of a peaceful and prosperous world." (State Department Press Releases, October 23, 1937, pp. 318–320.)

—

NOVEMBER 1937

NOVEMBER 17. M'REYNOLDS DEFENDS PRESIDENT'S FAILURE TO APPLY NEUTRALITY ACT

In reply to Congressman FISH'S criticism of the President's failure to apply the neutrality law in the Far East, Congressman MCREYNOLDS defended administration policy on the following grounds: (1) That the President was acting within his legal authority in declining to recognize a state of war; (2) that the purpose of the neutrality bill was to keep the country out of war and the present policy followed this idea; (3) that the policy of the State Department has been the wisest policy that could be pursued. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, November 17, 1937, p. 93.)

NOVEMBER 20. EDEN WANTS UNITED STATES AT BRUSSELS

"I would go from Melbourne to Alaska to get the United States to the [Brussels] Conference," Anthony Eden told the House of Commons. (New York Times, November 21, 1937.)

NOVEMBER 24. UNITED STATES ATTENDS BRUSSELS CONFERENCE

Brussels Conference of signatories to Nine Power Treaty convenes November 3, with Norman Davis as United States representative, adjourns November 24 without tangible results (text of report adopted by conference, State Department Press Releases, Nov. 27, 1937, p. 396).

NOVEMBER 27. STATE DEPARTMENT MAKES PARALLEL REPRESENTATIONS WITH BRITAIN AND FRANCE TO JAPAN

State Department on November 27 makes representations (parallel with Britain and France) concerning the taking over by Japan of the Chinese customs organization in Shanghai. (New York Times, November 28, 1937.)

—

DECEMBER 1937

DECEMBER 4. CONGRESSMAN CASE QUESTIONS STATE DEPARTMENT ON FOREIGN POLICY

November 24, Congressman CASE introduces H. R. 364, asking the Secretary of State nine questions on our foreign policy in the Far East. In replying December 4, to a question regarding application of the Neutrality Act Secretary Hull says:

"The entering into force of the restrictive provisions of the Neutrality Act of May 1, 1937, is left to and is dependent upon decision of the President by a finding that 'there exists a state of war.' The policy of the Department of State in reference to this act is dependent upon that decision. The Department of State keeps constantly in mind the fact that the principal purpose of the act is to keep the United States out of war."

In reply to a question regarding United States armed forces in the Far East, Secretary Hull says:

"American armed forces in China are there for the protection of American nationals, primarily against mobs or other uncontrolled elements. They have no mission of aggression." (State Department Press Releases, December 11, 1937, pp. 415–417.)

DECEMBER 14. WAR-REFERENDUM PETITION FILED

War-referendum discharge petition completed December 14. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, December 14, pp. 1517–1518.)

DECEMBER 12–14. BOMBING OF "PANAY"

U. S. S. *Panay* bombed in Yangtze River by Japanese planes December 12. Following day President Roosevelt instructs Secretary Hull to tell the Japanese Ambassador "that the President is deeply shocked and concerned by the news of indiscriminate bombing * * * and that he requests that the Emperor be so advised." (State Department Press Releases, December 18, 1937, p. 447.) December 24 State Department receives Japan's formal apology for sinking of *Panay*. (State Department Press Releases, December 25, p. 497.)

DECEMBER 21. EDEN SAYS SANCTIONS MEAN WAR

Foreign Secretary Anthony Eden, speaking in House of Commons on December 21, states that, "There are two possible forms of sanctions: Ineffective, which are not worth putting on; and effective, which means a risk if not a certainty of war. No one can contemplate any action of that kind in the Far East unless they are convinced that they have overwhelming force to back their policy." (New York Times, December 22, 1937.)

—

JANUARY 1938

JANUARY 6. PRESIDENT'S LETTER OPPOSING WAR REFERENDUM

Speaker BANKHEAD, on January 6, reads the President's letter to the House in which he characterized the war-referendum resolution as "incompatible with our representative form of government." He stated further:

"Such an amendment to the Constitution as that proposed would cripple any President in his conduct of our foreign relations, and it would encourage other nations to believe that they could violate American rights with impunity." (State Department Press Releases, January 15, 1938, p. 99.)

JANUARY 8. HULL'S LETTER OPPOSING WAR REFERENDUM

On January 8 Secretary Hull addressed a letter to Congressman McReynolds in which he said:

"It is my judgment that under our present form of government 'of the people, by the people, and for the people,' our foreign affairs can be conducted far more efficiently from the standpoint of keeping this country out of war than would be at all possible under the operation of any such plan as the Ludlow resolution proposes. After the fullest consideration I am satisfied that this plan would most seriously handicap the Government in the conduct of our foreign affairs generally, and would thus impair disastrously its ability to safeguard the peace of the American people." (State Department Press Releases, January 15, 1938, p. 100.)

JANUARY 10. WAR REFERENDUM REJECTED

January 10, House rejects Ludlow war referendum amendment by vote of 209 to 188. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, January 10, 1938, pp. 282–83.)

JANUARY 10. SENATE REQUESTS DATA ON AMERICAN INTERESTS IN CHINA

The Senate, on January 6, approved Senate Resolution 210, requesting information from the State Department on American investments, nationals, and armed forces in China. Secretary Hull writes Vice President Garner in reply to resolution on January 10:

"There is a broader and much more fundamental interest which is that orderly process in international relationships be maintained." (State Department Press Releases, January 15, 1938, p. 101.)

JANUARY 11. THE PRESIDENT ANNOUNCES THAT PHILIPPINE ECONOMIC TIES ARE TO EXTEND TO 1960

A plan for cushioning the economic impact of independence on the Philippine Islands has been agreed to in principle, and only the details remain to be worked out, President Roosevelt announced today. The projected arrangement envisages a gradual imposition of American tariffs against Philippine products from now until about 1960, he explained. * * *

As outlined by the President, the plan would envisage the retention for a certain number of years of a preferential tariff for the Philippines, for which there is adequate precedent in existing relations with Cuba. (New York Times, January 12, 1938.)

JANUARY 13. UNITED STATES NAVAL VESSELS TO VISIT SINGAPORE

Navy Department reveals on January 13 that three American cruisers will attend ceremonies at opening of new British naval base at Singapore, February 14, at the invitation of the British Government. (New York Times, January 14, 1938.)

JANUARY 26. MESSERSMITH DISCUSSES "LAW AND ORDER" IN STATEMENT ON FOREIGN POLICY

Assistant Secretary of State Messersmith, speaking before annual meeting of the National Council of Jewish Women in Pittsburgh, January 26, says:

"Beyond our frontiers we are already on the defensive; and, incredible as it may seem, the forces undermining law and order appear not to be content with interfering with our lawful activities

and the rights of our citizens beyond our frontiers, but are making attacks on our ideals and institutions from within the country itself." (State Department Press Releases, January 29, 1938, pp. 181–189.)

JANUARY 28. THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE TO CONGRESS ASKS A NAVAL INCREASE

In his message to Congress, January 28, the President says:

"Adequate defense means that for the protection not only of our coasts but also of our communities far removed from the coast we must keep any potential enemy many hundred miles away from our continental limits.

"We cannot assume that our defense would be limited to one ocean and one coast and that the other ocean and the other coast would with certainty be safe. We cannot be certain that the connecting link—the Panama Canal—would be safe. Adequate defense affects, therefore, the simultaneous defense of every part of the United States of America." (State Department Press Releases, January 29, 1938, pp. 190–191.)

JANUARY 28. STATE DEPARTMENT PROTESTS JAPANESE INSULT IN CHINA

State Department, on January 28, publishes protest against slapping of Third Secretary Allison, of American Embassy, in Nanking by Japanese soldier, presented to Japanese Government January 17. (State Department Press Releases, February 5, 1938, pp. 196–197.)

JANUARY 31. LEAHY TESTIFIES ON WHAT NAVY IS FOR

Admiral William D. Leahy, on January 31, testifies before House Committee on Naval Affairs that the Navy must be "maintained at a strength which will prevent a serious challenge by any nation or nations to any of America's vital national policies, which will insure respect by foreign states and their people for our citizens abroad and which will make an attack on any part of our territory too costly and too hazardous for any foreign nation or nations to attempt." (Hearing before the Committee on Naval Affairs of the House of Representatives, January 31, 1938, p. 1940.)

JANUARY 31. PRESIDENT SPEAKS OF OUR RESPONSIBILITY TO THE WORLD

Speaking to a group of Protestant clergymen he is receiving at the White House. the President on January 31 expresses his gratification over the "spiritual awakening" which has come about in America. "It makes me realize more fully that we do have, in addition to the duty we owe our own people, an additional duty to the rest of the world. Things have been going on in other countries—things which are not spiritual in any sense of the word—and that is putting it mildly. * * * I must make a confession. I did not realize until the last few years how much influence America has in the world. I did not really, deep down in my heart, believe very much in church missions in other lands. Today I do." (New York Times, February 1, 1938.)

—

FEBRUARY 1938

FEBRUARY 1. PITTMAN STATES FOREIGN POLICY AS NONINTERFERENCE AND NONINVOLVEMENT

Senators JOHNSON and BORAH criticize the "vague and dangerous trend" of our present foreign policy. In reply, Senator PITTMAN declares our policy to be one of "noninterference and nonintervention in the domestic relations of other governments." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, February 1, 1938, p. 1326.)

FEBRUARY 5. UNITED STATES WARNS JAPAN ON WARSHIP BUILDING

United States joins Britain and France in serving notice on Japan that three powers will scrap existing limitations on battleships and cruiser building unless Japan agrees by February 20 to divulge naval building plans and abide by qualitative limits of London Naval Treaty of 1936. (State Department Press Releases, February 5, 1938.)

FEBRUARY 5. NEWSPAPERS REVEAL SECRET VISIT OF CAPTAIN INGERSOLL TO LONDON

No clear light as yet has been thrown on the visit here (London) last month of Capt. Royal E. Ingersoll, head of the United States Navy War Plans Division. * * * Although the Embassy denies reports that he used a false name on his passport, it is a fact that he did not use his title, and he was known at the Admiralty either as Mr. Smith or else watch officer.

His presence in London was ordered kept secret, and even now, after the visit has been revealed by Washington, both the Embassy and the Admiralty are preserving the strictest silence on the purpose of the visit. It is indicated that these orders came direct from President Roosevelt. (New York Times, February 6, 1938.)

FEBRUARY 7. SENATOR JOHNSON ASKS IF WE HAVE ALLIANCE WITH GREAT BRITAIN

Senator HIRAM JOHNSON introduces formal resolution demanding that Secretary of State "advise the Senate whether or not any alliance, agreement, or understanding exists or is contemplated with Great Britain relating to war or the possibility of war." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, February 7, 1938.) Secretary Hull answers with catagorical denial. (Department of State Press Releases, February 12, 1938, p. 251.)

FEBRUARY 8. NEW INDUSTRIAL-MOBILIZATION BILL INTRODUCED

February 8, Congressman MAY introduces new industrial-mobilization bill, H. R. 9391. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, February 8, 1938, p. 1679.) This bill, allegedly aimed at taking the profits out of war, did nothing but give its blessing to the idea. Actually, the bill proposed to clothe the President with authority for a virtual dictatorship over the economic life of the Nation in time of war.

FEBRUARY 9. "GOODWILL" MISSION TO ARGENTINA

Six Army bombers are sent to Argentina to help celebrate inauguration of Dr. Roberto M. Ortiz as President. (New York Times, February 10, 1938.)

FEBRUARY 7–10. REPRESENTATIVE LUDLOW ASKS WHAT NAVY IS FOR

Representative LUDLOW asks Secretary Hull "Whether all of the ships and auxiliary services provided for in the proposed program are regarded as necessary for defense of our homeland and our possessions, or whether the program contemplates the use of some of the units in cooperation with any other nation in any part of the world." Secretary Hull denies that we have any "understandings" or "alliances" and adds that "While avoiding any alliances or entangling commitments, it is appropriate and advisable, when this and other countries have common interests and common objectives, for this Government to exchange information with governments of such other countries, to confer with those governments, and, where practicable, to proceed on parallel lines, but reserving always the fullest freedom of judgment and right of independence of action." (State Department Press Releases, February 12, 1938, pp. 251–255.)

FEBRUARY 15. PRESIDENT WARNS OF WAR ON BOTH COASTS

"On February 15, 1938, the President in his press conference assured the country that it was important * * * to remember * * * we might be faced with a war on both sides of the continent." (And So To War, by Hubert Herring, pp. 58–59.)

FEBRUARY 11. VINSON PROPOSES STATEMENT OF NAVAL POLICY

Congressman VINSON proposes an amendment to naval bill, stating United States naval policy. Amendment says in part:

"It is declared to be the fundamental naval policy of the United States to maintain an adequate Navy in sufficient strength to guard the continental United States by affording naval protection to the coast line, in both oceans at one and the same time; to protect the Panama Canal, Alaska, Hawaii, and our insular possessions; to protect our commerce and citizens abroad; to maintain a Navy in sufficient strength to guarantee our national security, but not for aggression; to insure our national integrity, and to support our national policies.

"It is further declared to be the policy of the United States that an adequate naval defense means not only the protection of our continental coast line, the Canal Zone, Alaska, Hawaii, and our insular possessions, but also a defense that will keep any potential enemy away from our shores. (New York Times, February 12, 1938.)

FEBRUARY 24. ANOTHER INDUSTRIAL-MOBILIZATION BILL INTRODUCED

On February 24, the industrial-mobilization bill, introduced by Congressman MAY on February 8, was withdrawn and a substitute bill introduced, H. R. 9604. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, February 24, 1938, p. 2408.) This bill is substantially the same as previous May bill, see page 15.

FEBRUARY 25. UNITED STATES HOLDS JAPAN RESPONSIBLE FOR INJURIES TO AMERICANS

February 25, 1938, Ambassador Grew delivered to the Japanese Foreign Office a note serving notice that Japan will be held responsible for all injuries to Americans or their interests by Japanese armed forces in China. The American note, according to the summary released by the State Department, assured Japan that "there rests upon American officials and other American nationals in China no obligation whatsoever to take precautionary measures requested * * * if American nationals or property are injured in consequence of the operations of Japanese armed forces, the United States Government will be compelled to attribute to the government controlling the armed forces responsibility for the damage." (And So To War, by Hubert Herring, p. 60.)

—

MARCH 1938

MARCH 2. BILL INTRODUCED FOR WITHDRAWAL FROM FAR EAST WAR ZONES

Senator FRAZIER, on March 2, introduced S. 3574, requiring withdrawal of all American nationals, troops, and naval vessels from Far East war zones. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 2, 1938, p. 2660.)

MARCH 2. WAR PROFITS BILL ATTACKED AS DANGER TO DEMOCRACY

Defended by a majority of the House Military Affairs Committee as "a statement of broad policies * * * seeking to avoid" legislating in advance of war, the May bill was bitterly attacked by the minority [Maverick, Anderson, and Kvale] in an accompanying report (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 2, 1938, p. 2721), as "unnecessary, full of pretense * * * and a serious danger to democracy. It does none of the things it says it does. It takes absolutely no 'profits out of war,' it 'equalizes burdens of war' in no manner whatsoever; it does not 'promote peace.' Yet in its title it claims to do all these things.'" (Washington Information Service, March 15, 1938, p. 7.)

MARCH 4. HULL SAYS OUR FOREIGN POLICY IS NEUTRALITY AND NONINVOLVEMENT

On March 4 Secretary Hull made public a memorandum on American foreign policy during the last 5 years, in which he said, "We avoid entering into alliances or entangling commitments but we believe in cooperative effort by peaceful and practicable means. * * * This Government has scrupulously adhered to the fundamental principle of neutrality; it has followed a policy of noninvolvement and nonparticipation in conflicts within and between

other nations." (State Department Press Releases, March 5, 1938, pp. 288–292.)

MARCH 12. GERMANY MARCHES INTO AUSTRIA

Austria collapses as independent state. (New York Times, March 13, 1938.)

MARCH 14. M'NUTT CALLS FOR REEXAMINATION OF PHILIPPINE INDEPENDENCE

Paul V. McNutt, High Commissioner to the Philippines declared in a Nation-wide broadcast on March 14 that the whole question of Philippine independence "should be reexamined in the light of recent disquieting world events." In private conversations he voiced his personal opinion that Philippine independence would be a "tragedy" for the United States and the islands. (Washington Information Service, March 15, 1938, p. 3.)

MARCH 17. HULL OUTLINES PRINCIPLES OF AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY

In a speech before the National Press Club on March 17 Mr. Hull said:

"On July 16, 1937, I issued a public statement setting forth the fundamental principles to which our Government adheres in the formulation of its foreign policy. * * *

"The most important of these principles, which are indispensable to a satisfactory international order, are as follows:

"Maintenance of peace should be constantly advocated and practiced.

"All nations should, through voluntary self-restraint, abstain from use of force in pursuit of policy and from interference in the internal affairs of other nations.

"All nations should seek to adjust problems arising in their international relations by processes of peaceful negotiations and agreement.

"All nations should uphold the principle of the sanctity of treaties and of faithful observance of international agreements.

"Modification of provisions of treaties, when need therefor arises, should be by orderly processes carried out in a spirit of mutual helpfulness and accommodation.

"Each nation should respect the rights of others and perform scrupulously its own established obligations; in brief, international law and the spirit which underlies it must be revitalized and strengthened.

"Steps should be taken toward promotion of economic security and stability the world over through lowering or removal of barriers to international trade, according to effective equality of commercial opportunity, and application of the principle of equality of commercial treatment.

"National armaments should be limited and be progressively reduced; at the same time, realizing the necessity for maintaining armed forces adequate for national security, each nation should to that end be prepared to reduce or increase its own armed forces in proportion as reductions or increases are made by other nations.

"Apart from the question of alliances with others, each nation should be prepared to engage in cooperative effort by peaceful and practicable means in support of these principles.

* * * * * * *

"The crucial issue today is whether these principles will be vitalized and be firmly established as the foundation of an international order, or whether international anarchy based on brute force will inundate the world and ultimately sweep away the very bases of civilization and progress. * * *

"On August 17, and with frequent reiteration thereafter, I stated that we did not intend to abandon our nationals and our interests in China.

"From time immemorial it has been the practice of civilized nations to afford protection by appropriate means and under the rule of reason to their nationals and their rights and interests abroad. This policy has been pursued by the Government of the United States throughout the existence of our country.

* * * * * * *

"In a world in which the rule of force has not as yet been firmly and surely supplanted by the rule of law, it is the manifest duty of a great nation to maintain armed forces adequate for its national defense. * * *

"It is my considered judgment that, in the present state of world affairs, to do less than is now proposed would lay our country open to unpredictable hazards. * * *

"* * * Prudence and common sense dictate that, where this and other nations have common interests and common objectives, we should not hesitate to exchange information and to confer with the governments of such other nations and, in dealing with the problems confronting each alike, to proceed along parallel lines—this Government retaining at all times its independence of judgment and freedom of action. * * *

"In the present far-eastern emergency we have consistently collaborated with other peace-seeking nations in the manner I have just described. I have said often, and I repeat again, that in this collaboration there is not a trace of alliance or involvement of any sort. * * *

* * * * * * *

"We have affirmed on every possible occasion and have urged upon all nations the supreme need for keeping alive and for practicing sound fundamental principles of relations among civilized nations. We have never entertained and we have not the slightest intention to entertain any such notion as the use of American armed forces for 'policing the world.' But we equally have not the slightest intention of reversing a tradition of a century and a half by abandoning our deep concern for and our advocacy of the establishment everywhere of international order under law, based upon the well-recognized principles to which I have referred. It is our profound conviction that the most effective contribution which we, as a nation sincerely devoted to the cause of peace, can make—in the tragic conditions with which our people, in common with the rest of mankind, are confronted today—is to have this country respected throughout the world for integrity, justice, good will, strength, and unswerving loyalty to principles.

"The foregoing is the essence of our foreign policy. * * *

* * * * * * *

"* * * The interest and concern of the United States—whether in the Far East, in any other part of the Pacific area, in Europe, or anywhere else in the world—are not measured alone by the number of American citizens residing in a particular country, or by the volume of investment and trade, or by exceptional conditions peculiar to the particular area. There is a much broader and more fundamental interest, which is that orderly processes in international relationships, based on the principles to which I have referred, be maintained.

* * * * * * *

"It would be absurd and futile for us to proclaim that we stand for international law, for the sanctity of treaty obligations, for nonintervention in internal affairs of other countries, for equality of industrial and commercial rights and opportunities, for limitation and reduction of armaments, but only in one-half of the world, and among one-half of the world's population. * * *

"Those who contend that we can and should abandon and surrender principles in one-half of the world clearly show that they have little or no conception of the extent to which situations and developments in any part of the world of today inevitably affect situations and conditions in other parts of the world.

* * * * * * *

"* * * we will continue to give full and sincere adherence to the fundamental principles which underlie international order; we will continue to urge universal acceptance and observance of these principles; we will continue, wherever necessary and in every practicable and peaceful way, to cooperate with other nations which are actuated by the same desires and are pursuing the same objectives; we will persevere in appropriate efforts to safeguard our legitimate rights and interests in every part of the world; and we will, while scrupulously respecting the rights of others, insist on their respecting our rights." (New York Times, March 18, 1938.)

MARCH 18. KENNEDY IN LONDON SAYS OUR POLICY MISUNDERSTOOD

Ambassador Kennedy, speaking before the Pilgrims' dinner in London on March 18, said: "My country is unwilling to bind itself to any course of action in the future without an opportunity to examine the situation in the light which then envelops it.

"It seems to me, to judge from conflicting and contradictory reports which reach us from abroad, that this attitude of the United States is not well understood. In some quarters it has been interpreted to mean that our country would not fight under any circumstances short of actual invasion. That is not accurate, in my opinion, and it is a dangerous sort of misunderstanding to be current just now. Others seem to imagine that the United States could never remain neutral in the event a general war should unhappily break out. That, I believe, is just as dangerously conceived a misapprehension as to the other." Department of State Press Releases, March 19, 1938, p. 388.)

MARCH 21. HULL STATES SPANISH EMBARGO WILL STAND

In reply to a letter from Raymond L. Buell made public March 22, in which Mr. Buell pointed out that the conditions which caused the President to issue the proclamation on which the Spanish embargo rested had ceased to exist, Secretary Hull wrote: "I am of the opinion that there has been no change in the situation in Spain such as to warrant the President in revoking his proclamation of May 1, 1937." * * * Furthermore, the "joint resolution of Congress approved January 8, 1937 (Spanish embargo) * * * is likewise still in force." (State Department Press Releases, March 26, 1938, pp. 398–399.)

MARCH 21. UNITED STATES ASKS INDEMNITIES FOR "PANAY" AND MERCHANT VESSELS

United States submits indemnity note to Japanese Government, March 21, "regarding the attack upon the U. S. S. *Panay* and American merchant vessels on December 12, 1937, by Japanese armed forces," and asks a total indemnity of $2,214,007.03. (*Panay* was convoying American oil tankers.) (State Department Press Releases, March 26, 1938, p. 410.)

MARCH 31. UNITED STATES AND BRITAIN ABANDON 35,000-TON-BATTLESHIP LIMIT

Department of State issues note saying that the United States "finds it necessary to exercise the right of escalation reserved in paragraph (1) [of the 1936 London Naval Treaty] and of effecting a departure from the limitations and restrictions of the treaty.

"The above action is motivated by the fact that upon the receipt of reports to the effect that Japan is constructing or has authorized the construction of capital ships of a tonnage and armament not in conformity with the limitations and restrictions of the treaty, the Government of the United States addressed an inquiry to the Japanese Government and the Japanese Government did not choose to furnish information with regard to its present naval construction

or its plans for future construction." (State Department Press Releases, April 2, 1938, p. 437.)

Britain takes same action. France "will persist in respecting, insofar as regards naval construction, the qualitative limitations fixed by the Treaty of London so long as no continental power departs from that standard." (State Department Press Releases, April 2, 1938, pp. 437–438.)

—

APRIL 1938

APRIL 13. AMBASSADOR WILSON'S SPEECH IN BERLIN

Speaking to the American Chamber of Commerce in Berlin on April 13, Ambassador Hugh R. Wilson said, "There are people in our country who believe that we would under no circumstances go to war; there are also people who believe that our participation in any major conflict is inevitable. Neither of them can be sure of their assertions." (State Department Press Releases, April 16, 1938, pp. 482–486.)

APRIL 18. PRESIDENT ASKED TO NAME TREATY VIOLATORS

Congressman Scott, one of the leading supporters of the "quarantine" policy, introduced House Resolution 465, "reputedly administration supported" (New York Times, April 19, 1938) asking the President to name the nations that have violated treaties to which the United States is a party. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, April 18, 1938, p. 5499.) The following day the President read a prepared statement to the press conference. He "recalled that this Government has always supported 'maintenance of international law and order,' and the 'promotion of peace through the finding of means for economic appeasement.' Without passing on 'political features' of accords such as that between Britain and Italy, this Government viewed the conclusion of this particular accord with 'sympathetic interest' because it was proof of the value of peaceful negotiations." (Washington Information Service, May 1, 1938, p. 1.)

Measure reported adversely April 26. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, April 26, p. 5791.)

APRIL 21. PRESIDENT SAYS REPEAL OF SPANISH EMBARGO WOULD VIOLATE NEUTRALITY OBJECTIVES

On April 21 President Roosevelt in a press conference "voiced some dissatisfaction with the Neutrality Act, as he has done before. He implied that its application to Spain had not been entirely satisfactory. But he declined to give much comfort to these leading the movement for a change in policy at this time. The neutrality law, he said, had two objectives—to keep the United States out of war, and to avoid giving aid to one side against the other in armed conflicts anywhere. While the law had been difficult to operate, he felt that neutrality had been applied to Spain as well as was possible under the act, and to change the act now would violate the second objective. By indirection, he implied that it would not be possible to apply the act against Germany and Italy." (Washington Information Service, May 1, 1938, p. 2.)

—

MAY 1938

MAY 2. NYE RESOLUTION TO LIFT SPANISH EMBARGO

Senator NYE introduced Senate Joint Resolution 288 to lift the embargo and allow export of munitions to Spain on a cash-and-carry basis on May 2. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 2, 1938, p. 6017.) Tabled by vote of Senate Foreign Relations Committee after committee received letter from Secretary Hull opposing change in present law. (State Department Press Releases, May 14, 1938, pp. 578–579.)

MAY 7. HULL DENIES ARMS SHIPMENTS TO GERMANY VIOLATE TREATIES

Secretary of State Cordell Hull vigorously defended administration foreign policy at an unusual press conference today, when he clashed with Drew Pearson, coauthor of a newspaper column entitled "Washington Daily Merry-Go-Round." * * *

The issue involved American neutrality policy, and especially the policy of the United States in issuing export licenses for shipment of munitions to Germany, which Mr. Pearson had asserted was in violation of treaties and law. This Mr. Hull emphatically denied. (New York Times, May 7, 1938.)

MAY 20. REPORT ON PHILIPPINES—RE EXTENSION OF PREFERENTIAL TRADE RELATIONS

Report of Joint Preparatory Commission on Philippine Affairs (signed in Washington May 20) provides for an extension of preferential trade relations until 1960.

"The basic plan underlying the recomendations of the committee is that, instead of assessing the full tariff duties on each other's products in 1946, the two countries will then assess 25 percent of their prevailing rates of duty, and thereafter annually increase these rates by 5 percent of the prevailing duties, until the complete elimination of preferences is brought about at the close of the year 1960." (State Department Press Releases, May 21, 1938, pp. 603–604.)

MAY 28. HULL REMINDS GERMANY AND CZECHOSLOVAKIA OF THEIR OBLIGATIONS

An urgent reminder for Germany and Czechoslovakia to observe their obligations under the Kellogg-Briand Pact and compose their difficulties by peaceful means was issued unexpectedly by Secretary of State Cordell Hull today in a statement referring to the central European situation as "critical" (New York Times, May 29, 1938).

Secretary Hull's statement says: "That pledge is no less binding now than when it was entered into." (State Department Press Releases, May 28, 1938, p. 619.)

JUNE 1938

JUNE 1. HULL EXPRESSES CONCERN TO JAPAN OVER INTERFERENCE WITH AMERICAN RIGHTS

Secretary Hull sends note to Japan expressing concern over interference with property and other rights of missionaries and businessmen. (State Department Press Releases, June 4, 1938, pp. 635–637.)

JUNE 3. WELLES PROTESTS BOMBING OF CIVILIAN POPULATION

Acting Secretary of State Sumner Welles protests that "any general bombing of an extensive area wherein there resided a large population in peaceful pursuits is contrary to every principle of law and of humanity." (State Department Press Releases, June 4, 1938, pp. 642–643.)

JUNE 3. HULL CALLS FOR "WORLD ORDER BASED ON LAW"

Speaking before the Tennessee Bar Association on June 3, Secretary Hull called for "strong and united" backing of a program to restore throughout the world the principles of "order under law."

"The rise of 'international anarchy,' and 'savagery' makes urgent the need for action to reverse 'the present disastrous trends,'" he declared. * * *

Declaring "isolation" not only a "bitter illusion" but harmful and dangerous to the Nation as well, Mr. Hull went on to outline the United States program for world cooperation. * * *

In measured words the Secretary denounced "anarchy" and traced the emergence of "international order under law" with the rise of civilization since the Dark Ages. * * *

"The most important problem now confronting the human race," he declared, "is that of establishing throughout the world, as the foundation of further progress, an unshakable regime of order under law. * * *

"I can wish for our country no more glorious course than to be a leader in devotion to these principles and in service of their preservation and advancement.

"* * * Attempts to achieve national isolation would not merely deprive us of any influence in the councils of nations but would impair our ability to control our own affairs." (New York Times, June 4, 1938.)

JUNE 5. UNITED STATES AND GREAT BRITAIN AGREE ON BATTLESHIP TONNAGE

The United States and Great Britain will announce shortly an agreement on the size of new superbattleships and the heavy guns that they will carry, a State Department official said today.

The official could not tell details of the agreement, but reliable information indicated that it would be somewhat along the lines of the recent American proposal for 45,000-ton ships armed with 16-inch guns. (New York Times, June 6, 1938.)

JUNE 6. SAYRE CONDEMNS SUPINE INACTION

When forces of lawlessness are abroad, supine inaction in effect means siding with evil against the good. The strongest encouragement which can be given to lawless aggressors is to make it quite clear that they have nothing to fear from those with power to withstand them.

The United States cannot afford to be a cipher at this crucial moment of the world's history. We must be resolute and prepared, if necessary, to withstand the aggression of the lawless. (New York Times, June 7, 1938.)

JUNE 11. HULL DISCOURAGES SALE OF AIRPLANES TO JAPAN

The United States is taking measures to discourage the sale of American airplanes to Japan because of the repeated bombing of the Chinese civilian population at Canton and other cities.

This was revealed today by Cordell Hull, Secretary of State, who said the policy was to let everyone know that this Government condemns the aerial attacks and material encouragement of them through supplying means for the operations. The position is being made known repeatedly, he added, to foreign countries, to the American people at home, and especially to the manufacturers of bombing planes. (New York Times, June 12, 1938.)

JUNE 13. YARNELL REAFFIRMS POLICY OF PROTECTION

Admiral Harry E. Yarnell, commanding the American Asiatic Fleet, has "reaffirmed" the American policy of protecting American citizens wherever they might be found in Chinese territory.

Navy officials said that Admiral Yarnell in reaffirming the policy previously enumerated by the State Department had reiterated that Japanese military authorities must hold themselves responsible for attacks on American property and lives under all circumstances. (New York Times, June 14, 1938.)

—

AUGUST 1938

AUGUST 11. UNITED STATES AND BRITAIN EXTEND HOLDINGS IN PACIFIC BY JOINT AGREEMENT

On August 11 United States and Great Britain announce they have "agreed to set up a regime for the use in common of the islands of Canton and Enderbury in the Phoenix group and for the employment of these islands for purposes connected with international aviation and communication, with equal facilities for each party." (State Department Press Releases, August 13, 1938, p. 114.)

AUGUST 16. HULL SPEAKS FOR ADHERENCE TO INTERNATIONAL LAW

Speaking over the radio on August 16, Secretary Hull declared that "the reestablishment of order under law in relations among nations has become imperatively necessary." Our program is "economic reconstruction; adherence to the basic principles of international law as the guiding and governing rules of conduct among

nations"; "respect for and observance of treaties [including modification]"; "abstention from the use of force"; and from "interference in the internal affairs of other nations"; reduction of armaments; "collaboration between and among representatives of the nations"; "international cooperation" for the "advancement of this program."

"Whatever may be our own wishes and hopes, we cannot when there is trouble elsewhere expect to remain unaffected * * *

"When the dignity of the human soul is denied in great parts of the world, and when that denial is made a slogan under which propaganda is set in motion and armies take the field, no one of us can be sure that his country or even his home is safe." (State Department Press Release, August 20, 1938, p. 117 ff.)

AUGUST 18. PRESIDENT MAKES PLEDGE TO CANADA ON DEFENSE

Speaking at Kingston, Ontario, on August 18, the President said: "* * * The Dominion of Canada is part of the sisterhood of the British Empire. I give to you assurance that the people of the United States will not stand idly by if domination of Canadian soil is threatened by any other empire." (State Department Press Releases, August 20, 1938, pp. 123–125.)

AUGUST 19. ROPER OPPOSES NEUTRALITY APPLICATION BECAUSE OF DAMAGE TO TRADE

Secretary of Commerce Roper on August 19, said, according to the New York Times:

"From the point of view of foreign commerce, Mr. Roper said, there must always be taken into consideration that even a temporary derangement of economic relations may result in a permanent transfer of trade from this country to some other nation.

"* * *'from our standpoint here, we do not wish to sacrifice our proper trade relationships and opportunities.'"

AUGUST 20. PORTUGAL TELLS UNITED STATES TO STOP PREACHING

In answer to Secretary Hull's July 16 statement the Portuguese Government sent a message which said in part:

"On general grounds * * * no objection can be raised against the assertions, advices, or wishes as a whole, of the Secretary of State; everyone desires peace, everyone proclaims the sanctity of treaties and the faithful compliance therewith, everyone desires that there be less difficulties in international trade, and everycne wishes to have the burden of armaments removed or lightened. Difficulties begin only when it is sought to pass from the field of intentions into that of action or, more concretely, what is to be done so that the events—in the development of which it is very difficult to establish individual or national responsibilities—will not contradict the good intentions.

"The repeated affirmation, especially on the part of the great powers, of the principles advocated by the Secretary of State, the intellectual or sentimental adhesion of many to the said principles, their inclusion in many treaties between nations or in a document of greater scope aiming at defining the rules of life common to all states, will have, we believe, the effect of a certain moral pressure, but will produce rather limited practical action. We would be mistaken if we were to expect important results therefrom.

* * * * * * *

"Now, in the political field, it is pertinent to ask whether the internationalism of our days is a factor of peace or of war. It seems to us that internationalism, covering as it does pronounced leanings toward national imperialisms, is a source of complications and dangers. The idea of the supernational organization and the tendency toward 'world citizenship' are either essentially erroneous and humanly impossible or are so far removed from present conditions that they can only act—even if the fact noted above did not exist—as perturbing elements.

* * * * * * *

"In commenting at length on the note of the Secretary of State, the Portuguese Government did not intend to indicate solutions or the best way to find them. This would be an excessive presumption. However, the nations are attached to false ideas, and have taken the habit of entrusting the solution of grave external problems to vague formulas and inconsistent combinations; and to acknowledge by means of an impartial examination the inanity of the efforts made in that direction appears to this Government to be the first step and the indispensable preparation of the ground for any constructive work." (State Department Press Releases, September 18, 1937, pp. 229–234.)

—

OCTOBER 1938

OCTOBER 3–26. FOUR IMPORTANT POLICY PRONOUNCEMENTS—WELLES SAYS TIME IS RIPE FOR NEW WORLD ORDER

October 3: Under Secretary Welles, in a Nation-wide radio broadcast, voices the opinion that "today, perhaps more than at any time during the past two decades, there is presented the opportunity for the establishment by the nations of the world, of a new world order based upon justice and upon law. (Washington Information Service, November 1, 1938, p. 1.)

AMBASSADOR KENNEDY CALLS ON DICTATORSHIPS AND DEMOCRACIES TO COOPERATE

October 19: Ambassador Kennedy, in a Trafalgar Day speech in London, expressed the view that "it is unproductive for both democratic and dictator countries to widen the division now existing between them by emphasizing their differences which are self-apparent. Instead of hammering away at what are regarded as irreconcilables, they could advantageously bend their energies toward solving their common problems by an attempt to reestablish good relations on a world basis." (Washington Information Service, November 1, 1938, p. 1.)

ROOSEVELT DECLARES NO PEACE IF NATIONS ADOPT THREAT OF WAR POLICY

October 25: President Roosevelt, in a speech to the New York Herald Tribune Forum on World Affairs, declares that "there can be no peace if national policy adopts as a deliberate instrument the threat of war. * * * Greater reassurance than can be given by words must be provided if we are to 'be relieved' of the necessity of increasing our own military and naval establishments." (Washington Information Service, November 1, 1938, p. 1.)

STATE DEPARTMENT REVEALS TEXT OF NOTE TO JAPAN

October 26: State Department makes public full text of a note presented to Japan on October 6, calling attention to repeated violations of the open-door principle by Japan and hinting at possible reprisals if Japan fails to take prompt and effective measures to safeguard legitimate American rights and interests in China. (Washington Information Service, November 1, 1938, p. 1.)

OCTOBER 26. PRESIDENT REAFFIRMS MONROE DOCTRINE

A strong reaffirmation of the Monroe Doctrine, which the Buenos Aires Conference declared was a doctrine for all the American states, was found in President Roosevelt's speech of October 26, in which he said, "We are determined to use every endeavor in order that the Western Hemisphere may work out its own interrelated salvation in the light of its own interrelated experience." (Washington Information Service, November 1, 1938, p. 4.)

OCTOBER 28. STATE DEPARTMENT REFUSES EXPORT LICENSES FOR AIRPLANES DESTINED FOR SPAIN VIA NEUTRAL STATES

Secretary of State explained that export licenses for airplanes had been refused because it was discovered that the goods were actually, though not ostensibly, destined to the Spanish Loyalists. (State Department Press Releases, October 29, 1938, pp. 293–294.)

—

NOVEMBER 1938

NOVEMBER 7. STATE DEPARTMENT MAKES REPRESENTATIONS TO JAPAN ON NAVIGATION RIGHTS

State Department makes representations November 7 regarding navigation rights on the Yangtze River. Since British and French shipping is also affected by the Japanese restrictions on the river traffic below Hankow, parallel but not identical notes were delivered in Tokyo by the three Governments. (Washington Information Service, November 15, 1938, p. 5.)

LATE NOVEMBER—FOUR MAJOR FOREIGN-POLICY DEVELOPMENTS

These developments include:

Ambassador Wilson recalled from Berlin: "(1) The return of Hugh R. Wilson, our Ambassador to Berlin, for 'consultation and report' and the subsequent departure of Dr. Hans Dieckoff, the German Ambassador." (Washington Information Service, December 1, 1938, p. 1.)

New defense program formulated rapidly: "(2) The rapid formulation of the administration's all-embracing national-defense program." (Washington Information Service, December 1, 1938, p. 1.)

British trade agreement signed: "(3) The signing of the long-awaited trade-agreements program with Great Britain and Canada." (Washington Information Service, December 1, 1938, p. 1.)

Japan's reply to "open door" note of October 6: "(4) Japan's reply to Secretary Hull's 'open door' note of October 6, in which Tokyo affirms its purpose to establish a 'new order' in east Asia." (Washington Information Service, December 1, 1938, p. 1.)

NOVEMBER 27. AUSTRIAN DEBT SERVICE

United States holds Germany responsible for Austrian debts. Calls attention to fact that Germany is servicing similar Austrian debts to European nations. Germany denies legal responsibility and declares Germany does not have export surplus with United States to make foreign exchange available for debt service in United States. United States objects to discrimination. (State Department Press Releases, December 3, 1938, pp. pp. 375–379.)

NOVEMBER 29. PHILIPPINES

Joint Preparatory Committee on Philippine Affairs declares advancement of independence date would increase difficulties of Philippine adjustment problem. Recommends negotiations of treaty, to effectuate recommendations applicable to period after independence. (State Department Press Releases, December 3, 1938, p. 383.)

—

DECEMBER 1938

DECEMBER 10. BERLE DENIES MILITARY ALLIANCE OF AMERICAS

The second indication of restraint (first was President's denial of "pump priming" in armaments program) came on the eve of the opening session of the Eighth Pan-American Conference at Lima, in the form of a broadcast by Assistant Secretary of State Adolf A. Berle, Jr. In a carefully worded statement, Mr. Berle declared that the United States had no thought of "proposing a military alliance" among the nations of the Western Hemisphere. "It is perfectly plain," he added, "that the American Continent does not feel that a system of military alliances is needed" for the defense of the New World. (Washington Information Service, December 15, 1938, pp. 1–2.)

DECEMBER 15. WELLES PROTESTS ANTI-JEWISH DECREE LAWS

On December 15, Acting Secretary Sumner Welles made public another sharp note protesting against the application of Germany's

anti-Jewish decree laws to American citizens. (Washington Information Service, December 15, 1938, p. 3.)

DECEMBER 15. $25,000,000 CREDIT TO CHINA

Evidence of a stiffer policy is found in the $25,000,000 credit extended to China by the Export-Import Bank on December 15, coupled with the announcement by Secretary Morgenthau that the Treasury will continue to allow credits against Chinese gold held in this country. (Washington Information Service, January 4, 1939, p. 2.)

DECEMBER 31. STATE DEPARTMENT REJECTS JAPANESE THESIS

Evidence of a stiffer policy is found in the State Department note of December 31 to Japan, firmly rejecting the Japanese thesis that a "new order" has arisen in eastern Asia, and reserving "all rights of the United States as they exist." (Washington Information Service, January 4, 1939, p. 2.)

—

JANUARY 1939

JANUARY. THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE TO CONGRESS ON METHODS "SHORT OF WAR"

In President Roosevelt's message to Congress the President further clarified the position taken in his Chicago speech, and extended the theory set forth there. In his message the President not only expressed his attitude toward "aggressor nations," but advocated action against these "aggressors." The President stated:

"Swords may be futile, but war is not the only means of commanding a decent respect for the opinions of mankind. There are many methods short of war, but stronger and more effective than mere words, of bringing home to aggressor governments the aggregate sentiments of our own people.

"At the very least, we can and should avoid any action, or any lack of action, which will encourage, assist, or build up an aggressor." (Washington Information Service, January 4, 1939, p. 1.)

STEPS TOWARD A POSITIVE POLICY—PITTMAN ASKS COUNTRY TO OSTRACIZE JAPAN

The public statement on January 1 by Senator PITTMAN, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, declaring that if the Japanese Government does not make a satisfactory reply to recent State Department notes, this country should ostracize the Japanese. (Washington Information Service, January 4, 1939, p. 2.)

UNITED STATES REJECTS GERMAN PROTEST ON ICKES' SPEECH

The blunt rejection of Germany's protest against the speech of Secretary Ickes, and the tentative decision not to send Ambassador Hugh Wilson back to his post until the German Government gives satisfactory assurance that American citizens will not be discriminated against on grounds of race or creed. (Washington Information Service, January 4, 1939, p. 2.)

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OPENS COMMERCIAL CREDITS TO LATIN AMERICA

The opening of commercial credits through the Export-Import Bank to finance American exports in Latin America in competition with German, Italian, and Japanese trade. (Washington Information Service, January 4, 1939, p. 2.)

TURKISH TRADE AGREEMENT INITIALED

Initialing on December 18 of a new trade agreement with Turkey (which lies in the path of Germany's trade expansion in the Balkans and Near East) providing for unconditional most-favored-nation treatment. (Washington Information Service, January 4, 1939, p. 3.)

FORTIFICATION OF GUAM

Plans were discussed for the fortification of the island of Guam in the Pacific:

"A fortified base, while difficult to defend, would extend the offensive power of the American Navy well into Japanese waters, and would doubtless be interpreted in Japan as a direct threat against that country." (Washington Information Service, January 15, 1939, p. 4.)

CRASH OF PLANE WITH FRENCH OBSERVER IN CALIFORNIA

The airplane crash near Los Angeles involving a representative of the French Air Ministry aroused considerable public curiosity. In a secret session of the Senate Military Affairs Committee, the President was reported to have said:

"That in the event of war in Europe, the frontiers of the United States would be in France; and that the responsible heads of European democracies know the position of the President with respect to furnishing supplies in time of war * * *." (Washington Information Service, February 1, 1939, p. 4.)

—

FEBRUARY 1939

FEBRUARY 3. PITTMAN ON THE BALANCE OF POWER IN EUROPE

The administration began to formulate its program for keeping America out of war. On February 3 Senator PITTMAN handed a prepared statement to Washington correspondents:

"The only thing, in my opinion, that could prevent war in Europe and the possibility of its extension to the United States in the future would be such an equal balancing of military power that neither side to a controversy would be willing to undertake the chance of a defeat." (Washington Information Service, February 15, 1939, p. 1.)

FEBRUARY 3. THE PRESIDENT STATES BASIC PRINCIPLES OF AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY

President Roosevelt stated in press conference what he considered the basic principles of American foreign policy: "We are against any entangling alliances, obviously. We are in favor of the maintenance of world trade for everybody—all nations—including ourselves; we are in complete sympathy with any and every effort made to reduce or limit armaments. As a Nation—as American people—we are sympathetic with the peaceful maintenance of political, economic, and social independence of all nations in the world." (Washington Information Service, February 15, 1939, p. 2.)

FEBRUARY 14. MORE AIRPLANES FOR FRANCE

The trade in war materials continues to mount. On February 14 the French military mission in the United States announced the purchase of 500 new war planes, at a cost estimated at over $60,000,000. (Washington Information Service, February 15, 1939, p. 3.)

FEBRUARY 20. PITTMAN ATTACKS DICTATORS. OUR PEOPLE WILL DIE FOR CHRISTIANITY, MORALITY, JUSTICE, AND LIBERTY

Senator Pittman, denouncing dictator states as intent on dominating the world, declared tonight that Americans would die if necessary to preserve the things they "consider worth more than life."

Ridiculing the British policy of appeasement and the American isolationists, the Chairman of the Senate Foreign Affairs Committee called for a firm stand in defense of American rights "throughout the universe."

"The policy of appeasement has not only been unsuccessful and ultimately destructive but has been immoral. It is evident that a person can die but once, and the period of life is limited, and that it is far better that he die a few days earlier for Christianity, justice, and liberty than that he live a little longer in cowardice and degeneracy." (New York Times, February 21, 1939.)

—

MARCH 1939

MARCH 1. SECRETARY HULL COMMENTED AGAIN ON THE LUDLOW WAR REFERENDUM

He spoke as follows:

"There was no question more acutely in the minds and purposes of the founders of this Republic than that of keeping the American people out of war.

"After the fullest deliberation they reached the conclusion that the representative form of government by the people which they established was best calculated to accomplish this end.

"Needless to say, experience has proved the wisdom and the practical judgment of the patriots and statesmen who founded our system of free institutions, and I believe that most of our people, upon careful examination, will desire to continue unaltered this thoroughly successful system of representative government as thus handed down to us over a period of 150 years." (State Department Press Releases, March 4, 1939, p. 159.)

MARCH 9. THE EXPORT-IMPORT BANK ADVANCES CREDITS TO BRAZIL

Credits were advanced to Brazil in an endeavor to counteract Fascist influence in Latin America and meet the Nazi barter menace.

MARCH 13. ARMS FOR LATIN AMERICA

Senator PITTMAN and Representative BLOOM introduced a bill authorizing the War and Navy Departments to sell ordnances, naval vessels, and other war materials to Latin America.

"The resolution permits transmission to Latin American republics of 'restricted and confidential plans, specifications, and information' on United States armaments sold to them, provided this information be kept secret for a year and is not resold to any country outside of South America." (Washington Information Service, March 15, 1939, p. 6.)

MARCH 17, 18–20. FURTHER STEPS IN ADMINISTRATION POLICY—WELLES CONDEMNS "LAWLESSNESS"

1. Under Secretary Sumner Welles' condemnation of "wanton lawlessness and arbitrary force" on March 17. (Washington Information Service, April 3, 1939, p. 3.)

UNITED STATES APPLIES COUNTERVAILING DUTIES AGAINST GERMAN IMPORTS

2. The Treasury Department's announcement of March 18, applying countervailing duties of 25 percent against imports from Germany. (Washington Information Service, April 3, 1939, p. 3.)

UNITED STATES DECLINES TO RECOGNIZE CONQUEST OF CZECHOSLOVAKIA

3. The State Department's formal note of March 20 reasserting its condemnation and declining to recognize the legality of Germany's absorption of Czechoslovakia. (Washington Information Service, April 3, 1939, p. 3.)

—

APRIL 1939

APRIL 8. SECRETARY HULL'S STATEMENT REGARDING THE INVASION OF ALBANIA ON APRIL 8

"The forcible and violent invasion of Albania is unquestionably an additional threat to the peace of the world. It would be shortsighted not to take notice of this further development. Any threat to peace seriously concerns all nations and violates the will of all peoples in the world that their governments shall lead them, not toward war, but along paths of peace. It is scarcely necessary to add that the inevitable effect of this incident, taken with other similar incidents, is further to destroy confidence and to undermine economic stability in every country in the world, thus affecting our own welfare." (State Department Press Releases, April 8, 1939, p. 261.)

APRIL 9. "IF WE DON'T HAVE A WAR"

On leaving Warm Springs, Ga., the President remarked: "I'll be back in the fall if we don't have a war." Two days later the Washington Post editorialized:

"None knows better than the President that his office makes the most casual public observation subject to interpretation as a matter of national policy. And no President was ever more skillful than Mr. Roosevelt in making the most of every opportunity." (Washington Information Service, April 14, 1939, p. 2.)

APRIL 14. PRESIDENT ASKS GERMANY AND ITALY FOR 10-YEAR NONAGGRESSION PLEDGE

On April 14 the President requested, in identical messages to Chancelor Hitler and Premier Mussolini, a 10-year nonaggression pledge from Germany and Italy, in return for which he promised American participation in a prompt discussion of the armaments problem and economic matters. (State Department Press Releases, April 15, 1939, p. 291 ff.)

APRIL 15. SURPRISE ORDER RETURNS FLEET TO PACIFIC

Most of the United States Fleet was ordered suddenly today to return to the Pacific. The reasons for the surprise order were kept secret by the Government. President Roosevelt personally approved the order, White House attachés revealed. (New York Times, April 16, 1939.)

APRIL 27. SANCTIONS

On April 27 Senator PITTMAN "introduced a resolution giving the President authority to embargo exports to or imports from Japan or any violator of the Nine Power Treaty." (Washington Information Service, May 2, 1939, p. 2.)

—

MAY 1939

MAY 17. FAR-EASTERN POLICY STIFFENS

American, British, and French naval vessels were dispatched to Amoy and Ambassador Grew in Tokyo delivered a reply to Japanese demands for changes in the administrative status of the international settlement of Shanghai. (Washington Information Service, June 1, 1939.)

MAY 27. SECRETARY HULL'S SEVEN-POINT NEUTRALITY PROGRAM

On May 27 Secretary Hull, in identical letters to Senator PITTMAN and Representative BLOOM, set down a seven-point neutrality program, which included repeal of the arms embargo. (State Department Press Releases, June 3, 1939, pp. 475 ff.)

—

JUNE 1939

JUNE 7. VISIT OF KING AND QUEEN OF GREAT BRITAIN TO UNITED STATES

(State Department Press Releases, June 10, 1939, p. 496.)

JUNE 9. STRATEGIC MATERIALS PROGRAM EXPANDED

President signs strategic materials bill providing for an expenditure of $100,000,000 over a 4-year period to acquire reserves of strategic material needed in time of national emergency.

JUNE 13. BLOOM RESOLUTION REPORTED TO HOUSE

House Foreign Affairs Committee reports Bloom resolution (H. J. Res. 306), repealing arms embargo. (Washington Information Service, June 15, 1939.)

JUNE 19. HULL EXPRESSES UNITED STATES CONCERN ON TIENTSIN DISPUTE

At his press conference on June 19 Secretary Hull issued a statement expressing the concern of the United States over the "broader aspects" of the Tientsin dispute. This statement was supported by two protests delivered at Tokyo on the same day. (Washington Information Service, August 1, 1939, p. 1.)

JUNE 21. AMERICAN DIPLOMATS IN CHINA PROTEST JAPANESE BLOCKADE

On June 21 Secretary Hull announced that the American Consul General in Tientsin, utilizing a statement drawn up by the local American Chamber of Commerce, had formally objected to the adverse effects of the blockade on the interests and general welfare of the American nationals in the city. Finally, on June 22, Admiral Yarnell, commander in chief of the American Asiatic Fleet, bluntly rejected a Japanese demand that American nationals and naval vessels be withdrawn from Swatow, which Japanese military forces had just occupied. Similar action was taken by the British naval commander, and additional British and American naval vessels were dispatched to Swatow. (Washington Information Service, August 1, 1939, pp. 1–2.)

JUNE 30. HOUSE APPROVES MODIFIED ARMS EMBARGO

The House, by a vote of 214 to 173, rejects the administration's request for repeal of the arms embargo and approved House Joint Resolution 306 with a modified embargo limited to "arms and ammunition." (Washington Information Service, August 1, 1939, p. 2.)

—

JULY 1939

JULY 6. SENATE APPROVES COTTON BARTER WITH BRITAIN

The Senate on July 6 passed S. 2697 designed to effectuate the exchange of American cotton for British rubber, approved by the Senate on June 30. The measure, sponsored by Senator BYRNES, provides for exchange of surplus agricultural commodities produced in the United States for reserve stocks of strategic and critical materials produced abroad. (Washington Information Service, August 18, 1939, p. 5.)

JULY 14. NEUTRALITY ACTION DEFERRED BY SENATE FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE

Senate Foreign Relations Committee defers action on neutrality by 12 to 11 vote. (State Department bulletins, p. 43.)

JULY 14. THE PRESIDENT SENDS NEUTRALITY REVISION STATEMENT TO CONGRESS

President sends message to Congress transmitting a statement for neutrality revision by Secretary Hull, which stated:

"Those of us who support the recommendations formulated for the elimination of the embargo are convinced that the arms embargo plays into the hands of those nations which have taken the lead in building up their fighting power. It works directly against the interests of the peace-loving nations, especially those which do not possess their own munitions plants." (State Department bulletin, July 15, 1939, p. 45.)

JULY 26. NOTICE OF TERMINATION OF JAPANESE TRADE TREATY

United States gave notice that it wished to terminate the Treaty of Commerce and Navigation of 1911 with Japan. (State Department bulletin, July 29, 1939, p. 81.)

—

AUGUST 1939

AUGUST 24. ROOSEVELT'S APPEAL TO HITLER AND MOSCICKI FOR PEACE

President Roosevelt appeals to Chancelor Hitler and President Moscicki, of Poland, for settlement of the Polish dispute by direct negotiation, impartial arbitration, or conciliation. The President said:

"Both Poland and Germany being sovereign governments, it is understood, of course, that upon resort to any one of the alternatives I suggest, each nation will agree to accord complete respect to the independence and territorial integrity of the other." (State Department bulletin, August 26, 1939, p. 157.)

AUGUST 24. ROOSEVELT'S MESSAGE TO KING VICTOR EMMANUEL

President Roosevelt sends message to King Victor Emmanuel of Italy asking Italy to "formulate proposals for a peaceful solution of the present crisis * * *." (State Department bulletin, August 26, 1939, p. 158.)

AUGUST 25. SECOND COMMUNICATION TO HITLER

President Roosevelt sends second communication to Chancelor Hitler. (State Department bulletin, August 26, 1939, p. 160.)

AUGUST 26. MESSAGE TO KING OF BELGIUM

President Roosevelt expresses approval to King Leopold, of Belgium, for Belgium's appeal for the maintenance of peace. (State Department bulletin, August 26, 1939, p. 161.)

—

SEPTEMBER 1939

SEPTEMBER 1. GERMANY INVADES POLAND—BOMBARDMENT OF CIVILIAN POPULATION

President Roosevelt appeals to European nations to refrain from "the ruthless bombing from the air of civilians in unfortified centers of population * * *." (State Department bulletin, September 2, 1939, p. 181.)

SEPTEMBER 3. WAR DECLARED

England and France declare war on Germany.

SEPTEMBER 3. THE PRESIDENT'S FIRESIDE CHAT

President Roosevelt in a radio address said: "This Nation will remain a neutral nation * * *." (State Department bulletin, September 9, 1939, p. 202.)

SEPTEMBER 5. PROCLAMATION OF NEUTRALITY

President Roosevelt invokes Neutrality Act. (State Department bulletin, September 9, 1939, p. 203.)

SEPTEMBER 8. STATE OF LIMITED NATIONAL EMERGENCY

President Roosevelt proclaims state of "limited national emergency." (State Department bulletin, September 9, 1939, p. 216.)

SEPTEMBER 14. HULL WARNS WORLD ON NEUTRAL RIGHTS

Secretary Hull issued a statement on September 14 which said: "The Government of the United States has not abandoned any of its rights as a neutral under international law." (New York Times, September 15, 1939, p. 14.)

SEPTEMBER 21. ROOSEVELT ASKS REPEAL OF ARMS EMBARGO

President Roosevelt requests Congress to repeal the arms embargo of the present neutrality law. (H. Doc. 474, 76th Cong., 2d sess.)

SEPTEMBER 22. HULL WARNS AMERICAS GUARD SAFETY

Secretary Hull speaking at the New York World's Fair warned the world that: "Each of our republics is ready to defend itself against any threat to its security that may come from any part of the world." (New York Times, September 23, 1939, p. 10.)

SEPTEMBER 25. WELLES SPEAKS AT PANAMA CONFERENCE

Under Secretary of State Welles addressing the conference urged * * * "desirability of our reaching some uniform standards of approach with regard to the steps which we may individually take in determining and asserting our rights and obligations as neutrals.

"There is no moral justification for any nation to loose war upon humanity when the resort to peaceful procedure for the solution of controversies or of iniquities is available." (New York Times, September 26, 1939, p. 16.)

SEPTEMBER 26. BRITISH ISSUE BLACKLIST

Copies of England's widely discussed blacklist, containing the names of companies in all parts of the world that are regarded as her enemies because of alleged affiliation with German merchants, reached foreign traders here (New York City) yesterday. The list, containing close to 300 names, more than 100 of which are individuals and companies trading in Latin America, does not include a single United States firm. (New York Times, September 26, 1939, p. 12.)

—

OCTOBER 1939

OCTOBER 2. AMERICAS SET UP SEA SAFETY ZONE

The Panama Conference approved a declaration of "a fixed neutral zone within which belligerent activities would be regarded as a danger to American peace." (New York Times, October 3, 1939, p. 4.)

(Newspaper stories estimate the safety zone will extend 200 or 300 miles offshore around the United States, Mexico, Central and South America.)

OCTOBER 2. HULL STATES UNITED STATES CONTINUES TO RECOGNIZE POLAND

Secretary Hull announced on October 2 "that the United States * * * continues to regard the Government of Poland as in existence * * *." (New York Times, October 3, 1939.)

OCTOBER 4. AVOID WAR ZONES, HULL ADVISES SHIPS

In a statement given out at his press conference on October 4 Secretary of State Hull said:

"Information reaching the Government of the United States indicates the probability that there may be intensification of warfare on merchant shipping in Atlantic and Baltic waters adjacent to European belligerent shores.

"The Government of the United States does not recognize the legality of unrestricted interference with American ships and commerce. Nevertheless, under the special circumstances at present, it is believed advisable to warn all American merchant vessels, except American passenger ships which do not carry cargoes to belligerents and are engaged in bringing home Americans from European countries, of the special danger incurred in entering such waters." (New York Times, October 5, 1939, p. 15.)

OCTOBER 5. BRITISH CRITICIZE SECURITY ZONE

A New York Times dispatch from London says British diplomatic comment on the proposed "security zone" around the American Continent is "critical." The dispatch cites comment on the immense difficulty of policing the zone, and calls its enforcement without "any sanction in international law and would amount to an act of war." (New York Times, October 5, 1939, p. 12.)

OCTOBER 5. BRITISH OPPOSE SAFETY BELT AROUND AMERICAS

This opposition [British] took official form today (October 5) when the British Ambassador called on Secretary Hull and sought information concerning the neutral zone proposed by the conference meeting at Panama. (New York Times, October 6, 1939, p. 16.)

OCTOBER 5. BRITISH START CONVOY SYSTEM FROM SOUTH AMERICA

As a result of the sinking of the British vessel *Clement* off the Brazilian coast, it was revealed here [Rio de Janeiro] today, a convoy system with escorts by warships will be used in the future to protect all ships bound for Europe from South American ports. There is now forming here a convoy of six French and British freighters due to leave this week under the protection of British cruisers. (New York Times, October 6, 1939, p. 6.)

OCTOBER 5. ATTORNEY GENERAL REFUSES WAR-POWER RULING

Attorney General Murphy replies to Senate request (S. Res. 185) adopted September 28, pertaining to the emergency and war powers of the President. The reply refused the Senate's request for a report on these powers and merely listed the statutes covering the situation. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, October 5, 1939, p. 109.)

Tactics of the Dies Committee Chairman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 26, 1939

EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON POST

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an interesting and intriguing editorial from the Washington Post of Thursday, October 26, 1939. Under the guidance of its publisher, Eugene Meyer, the Washington Post has developed into one of the outstanding newspapers of the United States. Its brilliant editor, Felix Morley, one of America's greatest thinkers and intellectuals, has added even more luster to its columns. Its staff of scholarly and eminently fair reporters, both men and women, have given complete coverage to all activities in Washington. I am proud that such a newspaper exists in the National Capital, a newspaper the quality of which is worthy of its location in the shadow of the legislative Halls of Congress, a newspaper the editorial policy of which is transcendently fair and just to all causes and individuals on every occasion.

I include this editorial because it expresses a view entertained by the vast majority of intelligent and fair-minded citizens of our country. The editorial embraces sentiments to which I substantially adhere and is a restrained warning of the reaction of the people of America to the recent antics of the committee majority. The editorial is as follows:

[From the Washington Post of October 26, 1939]

MR. DIES EXPLAINS

In seeking to justify publication by his committee of the local membership and mailing list of the American League for Peace and Democracy, Chairman DIES was careful to state that "the committee is not charging that the Government employees affiliated with the league are members of the Communist Party." He added: "There is no evidence to this effect."

It is good to have Congressman DIES' disclaimer of any intent to pin the Communist label on all of the 563 Federal and District employees whose names are on the published list. It is certainly no crime, in this democracy, for a citizen to belong to any organization which does not contravene the law. It is neither a crime nor a misdemeanor for any Government employee to join such an organization. Nor is there any disgrace in being openly identified with it.

There is much to be said in favor of having continuously available to the public the membership lists as well as the financial backing of all organizations that espouse a particular political, economic, or social philosophy, be they conservative or radical. At least one State—New York—already has a rule of that kind on its statute books. Only those organizations which have something to hide, which to survive must operate behind a carefully guarded cloak of secrecy, have anything to fear from such publicity. The others cannot be harmed by it.

It is one thing, however, to have such publicity applicable to all organizations. It is quite another to single out, as the Dies committee has done in the case of the local branch of the American League for Peace and Democracy, a particular organization for special action along those lines.

What was the purpose? Evidently it was not to provide a Who's Who of Communists in the Government service. Such a list, if authentic, would be a valuable public document, and Mr. DIES, at one time, threatened to publish one. But the present list is, by his own admission, something else again.

If the local branch of the American League for Peace and Democracy includes, as one must now assume that it does, individuals of varying or no particular political faith, why focus on it at this time the spotlight of publicity?

An answer to this question is perhaps to be found in the rest of Chairman DIES' statement accompanying the published list of Government employees on the rolls of the organization.

In that statement, the Texas Congressman indicates that the intent of publication was punitive. Nine months ago, he says, his committee adopted a report in which the American League for Peace and Democracy was branded as a Communist-front organization. Yet the Government employees affiliated with it did not, as a result of this report, resign. Having ignored the committee's warning, they are now to be punished by having their affiliation with an allegedly "red" organization exposed.

Under the circumstances it is difficult not to agree with Congressman DEMPSEY, that the primary purpose of publishing the list is to "smear" a number of Government employees who, using their own judgment of the nature and purposes of the league, refused to quit it as a result of the committee's ukase.

For all of its valuable labors, this action indicates that the committee has not yet got over that habit of irresponsibility which has marked its conduct from the first.

Neutrality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARVE TIBBOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 26, 1939

Mr. TIBBOTT. Mr. Speaker, one of the deepest sentiments in the human heart is love of country. We in America have our customs and our institutions. We have our thoughts and

our methods of life. I hesitate to think of an American who has so little love for his country that he could forget America and her traditions.

We in America are conservative in foreign affairs, I suppose, because we started with such doctrines as our first President, George Washington, preached, which have made us wary of mingling in the affairs of foreign countries. Upon this theory we do not permit foreign countries to dictate to Americans the policies and form of government to which we will submit for the welfare of the United States. In the course of recent events our relations to Europe have been totally revolutionized by the temper of the world with respect to war.

There was no glory in the last war. There was nothing that has contributed to the American welfare, nothing but sorrow and death. We have more at stake than anyone else in avoiding a repetition of the World War. Causes grow out of national policies as well as out of disputed rights of nations. Causes of war will arise and will continue to arise between other countries. I do not believe that it is our problem to prevent these causes from arising, but knowing that the causes have arisen, it is our duty to the American people to prevent our country from becoming embroiled in the conflicts of other nations.

The people of the United States are a peace-loving people. We do not wish to interfere with or harm in the least any other nation. We cannot barter away our independence or our sovereignty. We should never again entangle ourselves in the evils of Europe. We should never permit Europe to intermeddle with our affairs.

When the United States entered the great World War in 1917 three important measures were necessary to make our entrance effective:

First. Financial relief to the Allies.

Second. The raising of a very large army promptly.

Third. Sending that army across the seas to aid the Allies.

In our hospitals and institutions and on our streets we can see the effects of our entrance into the last war. We see the lame, the dismembered, and the blind. This reminds us of our promise to do what we could to prevent war in the future. It seems that if we were zealous enough to fight with foreign countries 21 and 22 years ago in order to put an end to a war that was forced upon us, they should be zealous enough to cooperate with us now for the purpose of preventing another such war.

During these critical times we have many serious problems of our own, and it is our duty to maintain a vigilance such as was proposed by President Washington in order to preserve the freedom which was transmitted to us by the founders of our Government.

It seems to me that the American people are entitled to understand more clearly what goes on in our country in the nature of foreign propaganda. In the language of George Washington:

> Against the insidious wiles of foreign influence I conjure you to believe me, fellow citizens, the jealousy of a free people ought to be constantly awake, since history and experience proves that foreign influence is one of the most baneful foes of republican government.

I conclude with the following editorial from the Johnstown Democrat:

[From the Johnstown (Pa.) Democrat of October 25, 1939]

NOT UNCLE SAM'S BUSINESS TO FRAME EUROPE'S PEACE

None of the warring nations in Europe have drawn up a list of their war aims. Such declarations, however, are evidently in the making. When they appear, they will probably carry features designed to attract neutral and world opinion to the causes they represent.

If Europe is to continue its war for very long, the people should know "what all the shootin's fur." The American Declaration of Independence begins, you know, with the proposition that "a decent respect to the opinions of mankind requires that they should declare the causes which impel them to the separation." Sooner or later the war will get around to the stage where the nations will frame formal statements of what sort of a settlement they propose to make—if they win. Obviously, the only chance either side has to attract neutral support is the promise of a sort of world adjustment that will make less likely a repetition of 1939.

Just as the outbreak of the present European war found all countries better prepared for it than in 1914, so the coming of peace, which must fall some time, should find the peacemakers better prepared with plans for a promising settlement. Dr. Julian Huxley, the eminent biologist and writer, in a recent article says: "Our present American statesmen must provide a platform on which the neutral countries can take their stand with the view of playing an active part in the eventual settlement."

Of course, it is necessary for the neutral countries to be a bit wary. Efforts are being made to induce Uncle Sam to take a seat at the European council table. We did that once before—and to our sorrow. Those who frame peace terms for Europe must assume responsibility for the enforcement of the terms. Many Americans believe Europe must "learn its lesson" and that, therefore, the United States should not attempt to speak with a decisive voice when Europe frames its ground-arms program.

President Wilson was keenly conscious of the power the neutrals could exert. Many of his actions were guided by his determination to do nothing which would prejudice the position of the United States as a possible mediator. The democrat is not enamored of the mediator role. We mediated once upon a time between Russia and Japan. Following the mediation, the Japanese staged riots for the purpose of protesting against the terms which had been forced upon them. The Russians, in their turn, were convinced the United States had "betrayed them."

And so, while it's all very well and quite consistent of sound policy for the warring nations to tell the neutrals what they are fighting about, it isn't Uncle Sam's business to sit in and write the peace treaties. Europe must learn its lesson. It has been mulling over its own particular situation for at least 3,000 years. Quite evidently peace takes time. Not even the United States is big enough to enforce peace upon a "passel" of European countries inhabited by warlike people, a majority of whom wants to fight because somebody in Europe quite evidently wants to fight.

There's no use to argue Europe is at war because there's such a deep love for peace in the hearts of the people; and so, while it is quite all right for European nations to state their peace aims, a European war should lead up to a European peace rather than one imposed upon Europe by America.

Neutrality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 26, 1939

LETTER FROM FRANK S. DAVIS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a very interesting letter received from Frank S. Davis, manager of the Maritime Association of the Boston Chamber of Commerce, the contents of which are constructive and worthy of profound consideration in connection with a provision of the pending neutrality bill.

MARITIME ASSOCIATION OF THE
BOSTON CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Boston, Mass., October 17, 1939.

Hon. JOHN W. McCORMACK,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: There is widespread apprehension in New England that enactment of the Neutrality Act of 1939 (H. J. Res. 306) in its present form and without an amendment that would permit normal, peacetime cargo shipping services to Canada, West Indies, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, India, French Indo China, Hong Kong, Straits Settlements, and other noncombatant territories, would have a disastrous effect upon the industrial, commercial, maritime, and shipping activities of this section, and that the principal hardship would probably fall upon labor.

New England industries depend largely, and many of them entirely, upon raw materials originating in the noncombatant territories named, and if the normal, peacetime American steamship services to these territories were prohibited, as proposed in the pending bill, shortage of steamer space, exorbitant transportation costs, and loss of commerce to our ports would inevitably result.

It appears to be the general sentiment here, from all that I have been able to gather, and as expressed in local press editorials, that the American steamship services could be continued to the remote noncombat areas named without defeating or jeopardizing the objectives sought by the pending Neutrality Act, and with vitally important beneficial results to all New England.

We are informed that the United States Maritime Commission has submitted a proposed amendment to Senator BAILEY, and which he will probably soon bring before the Committee on Foreign Relations, which will define the combat area prohibited to American vessels to north of 30° north latitude and east of 55° west longitude.

Such an amendment would be acceptable and would afford the protection sought for New England. If it should develop that such

an amendment, if proposed, would be defeated rather than have the Neutrality Act adopted in its present form, we would request that careful and favorable consideration be given to the amendment which we understand will be proposed by Senator JOHNSON as reflecting the sentiment and desire of the Pacific-coast interests. Senator JOHNSON'S amendment, however, would not, as we understand it, include permission to continue normal, peacetime cargo services to and from Nova Scotia and Bermuda.

While the Neutrality Act in its present form would apparently permit American-flag vessels to go empty to the noncombat areas mentioned, and return with cargo from such combat areas, no steamship line could afford to operate on such a one-way cargo basis and unless American-flag vessels were permitted to operate normal, peacetime cargo shipping services to and from such noncombat areas New England would be seriously affected as indicated, probably more so than any other section of the country.

I thought you might wish this expression of our views, and trust that you will do what you consistently can to give effect to the proposed amendment of the Maritime Commission, if and when brought up by Senator BAILEY, or if this amendment should not be adopted that the Johnson amendment receive your favorable consideration.

Respectfully,

FRANK S. DAVIS, *Manager.*

Resolution of Allegheny River Improvement Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN McDOWELL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 26, 1939

RESOLUTION BY THE ALLEGHENY RIVER IMPROVEMENT ASSOCIATION

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

Be it resolved, That Allegheny River Improvement Association, in convention assembled in the city of New Kensington, Pa., this 14th day of October 1939, does commend the Congress of the United States and the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army for the splendid progress that has been made on construction of Tionesta, Crooked Creek, Mahoning, and Loyalhanna Creek flood-control dams in valleys tributary to the Allegheny River; and be it further

Resolved, That Allegheny River Improvement Association recommends that Congress continue to appropriate adequate funds for the purpose of flood control until the entire system of protective works projected for this basin is completed.

GEORGE D. STUART.

Tough Lines for Farmers in the Proposed Trade Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD H. REES

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 26, 1939

BRIEF OF THE NATIONAL GRANGE

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I have asked unanimous consent of the membership of this House to insert in the RECORD a very fine brief that was submitted by Fred Brenckman, Washington representative of the National Grange, to the United States Tariff Commission in opposition to the proposed trade agreement with the Argentine.

The farmers and livestock men of this country are deeply concerned about the proposed reciprocal treaties that are being submitted by the administration whereby it is proposed that the tariff be lowered on many of the products that come in direct competition with the American farmer.

It just does not seem fair to the farmers and producers of this country, who are fighting with their backs to the wall, that the Government should permit the proposed schedules to go into effect. In each and every case it is proposed that the tariff rate be lowered, and in not one single instance do they offer to further protect the American farmer. I hope every Member of Congress will take the time to carefully examine this statement.

We are impressed by the fact that almost without exception the items or articles upon which the State Department has signified its willingness to make tariff concessions in the proposed trade agreement with Argentina, are such as will be brought into direct competition with the products of the American farm.

The list includes casein, which is made of skim milk and is used in the manufacture of paper and certain plastic materials; linseed oil and combinations and mixtures in chief value of such oil; tallow; oleo oil; oleo stearin; extract of meat; beef and veal, pickled or cured; beef and veal, prepared and preserved; turkeys, dead, dressed or undressed, fresh, chilled, or frozen; eggs in the shell; corn or maize, including cracked corn; dog food consisting of an admixture of grains or grain products, with other feedstuffs unfit for human consumption; grapes in bulk; grapes in barrels or other packages; pears; flaxseed; grass seeds; asparagus; wools of certain types; hides and skins of cattle, and dog food, manufactured, unfit for human consumption.

All of the foregoing commodities are dutiable under the tariff act. In addition to this list, the State Department is considering the advisability of binding on the free list various other commodities that are not now dutiable.

THE MANUFACTURE OF CASEIN

Beginning with casein, the present duty on this commodity is 5½ cents per pound. When the present tariff act was being framed 10 years ago, the farm and dairy groups made a special effort to secure a reasonable duty on this commodity. Domestic production of casein has increased rapidly during recent years. According to the United States Department of Commerce, there were 316 factories in the country manufacturing this product in 1931. By 1937 the number of factories had increased to 664. These plants are situated in 24 different States. Under the present rate of duty, domestic manufacturers have demonstrated their ability to supply the home market, so that it is no longer necessary for us to depend upon imports.

Statisticians of the dairy industry indicate that in round figures there are 53,000,000,000 pounds of skim milk produced annually in the United States. We have enough skim milk to make annually more than 20 times as much casein as is consumed today. The fact is that millions of gallons of skim milk are thrown away every year, because there is no profitable use to which it can be put. The little creameries throughout the country cannot afford to make this product unless the price therefor will at least pay the cost of manufacturing. The manufacture of casein and the manufacture of dry skim milk are alternate operations, depending upon the price return. Lowering the tariff on casein and thereby bringing about a corresponding reduction in price will cause the flooding of the dry skim milk market, and this, in turn, will ruin farm prices for skim milk. As is well known, we have a surplus of dairy products and the Surplus Commodities Corporation every year makes large purchases for distribution among those on the relief rolls and in the effort to stabilize the prices of dairy products. Under these conditions, as we see it, there is no justification whatsoever for reducing the present tariff on casein.

Tallow is one of the commodities on which the Grange and other farm groups succeeded in securing an excise tax in 1934 to equalize competitive conditions. The tax on the first processing of the imported article was written into the general revenue legislation after a long fight in both Houses of Congress. This tax cannot be lowered in making a reciprocal-trade agreement. Our concern in the present situation is that it should not be bound against any possible future increase that Congress may deem wise and necessary for the protection of American producers.

Considering beef and veal, pickled and cured, while this is a different classification from canned beef, it is beef, nevertheless. The bulk of the canned beef consumed in the United States is imported. According to our information, for every pound of canned beef produced in the United States we import 12 pounds. It will be recalled that in the last session of Congress, when the President of the United States advocated the purchase of Argentine canned beef for the use of the American Navy on the ground that it was better and cheaper than the domestic article, there was a distinctly unfavorable reaction both in Congress and throughout the country. Since American producers of beef and other farm commodities are taxpayers and contribute their proportionate share toward the support of Government, it would seem, in all fairness, that they are entitled to first consideration.

Any reduction in the duty on cheese in the proposed agreement with the Argentine would benefit other countries more than the Argentine itself, because that country is not the principal supplier of this commodity. The cheeses we import from other countries are competitive with those produced in New York, Minnesota, Wis-

consin, and other dairy States. A reduction in duty on this commodity would be another severe blow to the dairy farmers of the United States.

TURKEY GROWERS DESERVE PROTECTION

There is no justification for lowering the present duty of 10 cents per pound on turkeys. Two years ago, there was such a surplus of turkeys in the United States that the growers made a special plea to the chain food stores to help them market this surplus, the stores responded to this appeal, performing a noteworthy service to agriculture. The average production of turkeys in the United States from 1931 to 1935, both inclusive, was a little more than 21,000,000 birds; the figure for 1936 was 27,725,000; while in 1938, it was 26,279,000. According to a circular issued by the United States Department of Agriculture on September 20, 1939, this year's turkey crop will be 22 percent larger than that of last year, with an indicated production of nearly 32,000,000 turkeys. With abundant crops of grain available at reasonable prices, it is likely that turkeys will be heavier than the average this year.

The principal States in the production of turkeys are Texas, California, Minnesota, Oklahoma, Iowa, North Dakota, Oregon, Missouri, Ohio, Kansas, Idaho, and Virginia. Rockingham, a single county in Virginia, is producing 500,000 turkeys this year. It is not only the commercial growers of turkeys who would feel the adverse effects of a reduction in duty, but the losses entailed would reduce the income of hundreds of thousands of farmers throughout the country. Nothing could be clearer than the fact that it is not necessary for us to import turkeys in order to have a plentiful supply at fair and reasonable prices to the consumer.

The duty on eggs of chickens in the shell was reduced from 10 cents a dozen to 5 cents in the revised trade agreement with Canada, which became effective on January 1, 1939. Since this is the maximum reduction permitted under the Reciprocal Tariff Act, we assume that the inclusion of eggs in the list of commodities scheduled for possible tariff concessions in the proposed trade agreement with the Argentine means that the existing rate of 5 cents per dozen is to be bound against change for the duration of the agreement. We have long had a surplus of eggs in this country. Aside from commercial producers, this is an item of particular interest to farm women in every State of the Union. In many instances it is the farmer's wife who takes care of the farm flock and she depends upon the income thus derived to furnish many of the necessities of the household. According to the United States Department of Agriculture, on August 15, 1939, the average price received by farmers for eggs at local markets throughout the country was 17.5 cents per dozen, which is below the cost of production.

HAULING COALS TO NEWCASTLE

In considering the wisdom and fairness of reducing the tariff on corn, it is proper to say that the United States produces the bulk of all the corn or maize grown in the world. We plant more than 90,000,000 acres of corn or nearly one-third of the tilled acreage of the United States. While we had a shortage of corn in the drought years 1934 and 1936, we had bumper crops in 1937 and 1938. The prospects are that this year's corn crop may reach a total of 3 billion bushels. Hundreds of millions of bushels of corn produced during the past 2 years are under Government loan and sealed in cribs throughout the 12 states of the Corn Belt. As the Grange sees it, no sound and justifiable reason can be given for reducing the present duty on corn. On the contrary, there is every reason why the present tariff rate on this commodity should be maintained.

What excuse could be offered to the grape growers of California, Michigan, New York, Arkansas, and many other States, for reducing the present tariff of 25 cents per cubic foot on this commodity? We nearly always have a surplus of grapes, and prices as a rule, when viewed from the viewpoint of the producer, are pitifully low and inadequate.

The present tariff act contains a duty of 65 cents per bushel on flaxseed. During recent years the farmers of the spring wheat belt, in particular, have been urged to grow flax and correspondingly reduce their acreage of wheat. The present tariff was intended to give them some encouragement to follow such a course. During 1936 production of flaxseed in the United States totaled 5,273,000 bushels. The figure for 1937 was 6,974,000 bushels. The net imports of flaxseed for 1936 amounted to 26,060,000 bushels. A reduction in the present duty on this commodity would be well calculated to drive the flax growers of the United States out of business.

THE DUTY ON WOOL

When we cut the duty on woolen rags in half in the British trade agreement, it was a blow to the wool growers of the United States, because under present conditions it is possible for manufacturers of reclaimed wool or shoddy to sell their product as an undisclosed substitute for virgin wool. If we should reduce the duty on new wool to the Argentine, it would react to the distinct detriment of our domestic wool growers.

No argument is needed to prove that we have a surplus of nearly all the products listed for possible tariff concessions in the proposed trade agreement with the Argentine. To reduce the tariff on commodities contained in this list would infallibly result in reducing the prices received by domestic producers of farm products. According to the Monthly Price Index of the Department of Agriculture, issued on August 29, just before the outbreak of the European war, the exchange value of farm products as compared with industrial commodities at that time stood at 74 percent of the 1909–14 level. Under these conditions, what justification can be offered for deliberately pursuing a policy that cannot fail to further depress farm prices and throw countless thousands of farmers into bankruptcy? Against the continuance of such a misguided and ruinous policy we desire to register an earnest and most emphatic protest.

The Higher Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH B. SHANNON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 26, 1939

ADDRESS BY HON. WILLIAM H. SEWARD IN THE SENATE, MARCH 11, 1850

Mr. SHANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a speech made by William H. Seward in the United States Senate March 11, 1850.

The speech of Senator Seward was known as the "higher law," as it affected the Negro slaves of that period. I think it is as tenable today applying to the lives of the youth of America, and should be invoked to prevent propagandists from carting American youth off to foreign wars. American youth has a right to live.

The speech is as follows:

But it is insisted that the admission of California shall be attended by a compromise of questions which have arisen out of slavery! I am opposed to any such compromise in any and all the forms in which it has been proposed. Because, while admitting the purity and the patriotism of all from whom it is my misfortune to differ, I think all legislative compromises radically wrong, and essentially vicious. They involve the surrender of the exercise of judgment and the conscience on distinct and separate questions, at distinct and separate times, with the indispensable advantages it affords for ascertaining the truth. They involve a relinquishment of the right to reconsider in future the decision of the present, on questions prematurely anticipated. And they are a usurpation as to future questions of the providence of future legislators.

Sir, it seems to me as if slavery had laid its paralyzing hand upon myself, and the blood was coursing less freely than its wont through my veins, when I endeavor to suppose that such a compromise has been effected, and my utterance forever is arrested upon all the great questions, social, moral, and political, arising out of a subject so important, and yet so incomprehensible. What am I to receive in this compromise? Freedom in California. It is well: It is a noble acquisition; it is worth a sacrifice. But what am I to give as an equivalent? A recognition of a claim to perpetuate slavery in the District of Columbia; forbearance toward more stringent laws concerning the arrest of persons suspected of being slaves found in the free States; forbearance from the proviso of freedom in the charter of new territories. None of the plans of compromise offered demand less than two, and most of them insist on all these conditions. The equivalent then is, some portion of liberty, some portion of human rights in one region, for liberty in another.

It is true indeed that the national domain is ours. It is true it was acquired by the valor and the wealth of the whole Nation. But we hold, nevertheless, no arbitrary power over it. We hold no arbitrary power over anything, whether acquired by law or seized by usurpation. The Constitution regulates our stewardship; the Constitution devotes the domain to union, to justice, to welfare, and to liberty. But there is a higher law than the Constitution which regulates our authority over the domain and devotes it to the same noble purpose. The territory is a part, no inconsiderable part, of the common heritage of mankind bestowed upon them by the Creator of the universe. We are His stewards and must so discharge our trust as to secure in the highest attainable degree their happiness. This is a state, and we are deliberating for it, just as our fathers deliberated in establishing the institutions we enjoy. Whatever superiority there is in our condition and hopes over those of any other kingdom or estate, is due to the fortunate circumstances that our ancestors did not leave things to "take their chances," but that they added amplitude and greatness to our commonwealth

by introducing such ordinances, constitutions, and customs as were wise. We, in our turn, have succeeded to the same responsibilities, and we cannot approach the duty before us wisely or justly, except we raise ourselves to the great consideration of how we can most certainly "sow greatness to our posterity and successors."

And now the simple, bold, and awful question which presents itself to us is this: Shall we, who are founding institutions, social and political, for countless millions, shall we, who know by experience the wise and just, and are free to choose them, and to reject the erroneous and unjust; shall we establish human bondage, or permit it by our sufferance to be established? Sir, our forefathers would not have hesitated an hour. They found slavery existing here, and they left it only because they could not remove it. There is not only no free State which would now establish it, but there is no slave State which, if it had had the free alternative, as we now have, would have founded slavery. Indeed, our revolutionary predecessors had precisely the same question before them in establishing an organic law, under which the States of Ohio, Michigan, Illinois, Wisconsin, and Iowa have since come into the Union, and they solemnly repudiated and excluded slavery from those States forever.

Columbia's Peace Prayer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRIK SHIPSTEAD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 26 (legislative day of Wednesday, October 4), 1939

POEM BY JENS K. GRONDAHL

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a poem entitled "Columbia's Peace Prayer," written by Jens K. Grondahl, editor, Daily Republican, Red Wing, Minn.

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COLUMBIA'S PEACE PRAYER

(By Jens K. Grondahl, editor Daily Republican, Red Wing, Minn.)

I am keeper of the treasure—God protect the sacred trust.
Teach us, in this hour of peril, to be calm and meek and just.
Thou hast kindled here a beacon that shall guide mankind aright—
While the world is plunged in chaos, God of Peace, preserve the light.

I am keeper of the treasure—all that human hand hath wrought,
All the heart-throbs of the ages that have crystallized in thought,
All the blessed benefactions Thou hast vouchsafed unto man—
Let me keep them pure, unsullied, until peace shall reign again.

I am keeper of the peace-pact—if in battle that should burn,
In the final throes of conflict whither might the nations turn
For a friendly hand to lead them to disarmament and peace?
Guide my sons to walk in wisdom in portentous days like these.

May our brothers o'er the seas revere this haven in the West—
Neither touch nor tempt our eagles in the fratricidal quest;
May our own sons leash their strength, although provoked and unafraid,
And revive a world in anguish when its sacrifice is made.

The best blood of every nation floweth strong within my veins,
I have mothered every people from the foreign hills and plains,
I have welded them together, wreathed with liberty their brow,
'Neath the Stars and Bars they flourish—we are all Americans now.

We shall keep alive the culture of the Old World and the New,
Safe from taint of war and hatred, Lord, so lead us that we do—
Keep in motion wheels and spindles and the garnering of grain,
That this land of countless blessings succor may the realms of pain.

Thou, O Lord, who seest the hearts of men and all the struggling horde,
Thou who knowest where injustice draws the keen, avenging sword,
Waken Thou the battling hosts to know that war is darkest crime;
Spare this Nation, born of nations, for the noblest task of time.

I am keeper of the treasure—in my hands, Lord, may it be,
That the Nation, born of nations, thus may serve humanity—
An oasis in the desert whence new life shall come again
To the famishing, the stricken—God of Peace, hear us. Amen.

A Moral War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD P. NYE

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 26 (legislative day of Wednesday, October 4), 1939

EDITORIAL BY H. L. MENCKEN

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial by H. L. Mencken entitled "Notes on a Moral War," published in the Baltimore (Md.) Sun of October 8, 1939.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Baltimore Sun of October 8, 1939]

NOTES ON A MORAL WAR

(By H. L. Mencken)

Five weeks have sufficed to blow up all the lofty pretensions on which the current combat in Europe was set going. The English went into it, so they announced on September 1, to make good on a solemn promise to protect Poland against the archfiend Hitler, but they actually never made a single overt move in that direction, and by the end of the first week they had forgotten the Poles altogether. The chief Polish jobholders, both military and political, took in that fact at once and immediately loaded the Polish gold reserve on trucks and eloped with it over the border. But the poor soldiers penned up in Warsaw, being less well informed, fought on to the bitter and bloody end, hoping against hope that the promised aid would reach them. No such aid was ever sent or ever intended.

The English are in the war for a simple and single reason, to wit, their desire to prevent the rise of a powerful rival in Europe, offering an inevitable challenge to their general supervision of the world. That is why they went to war the last time, and that is why they go through the motions of being at war today. It is a rational reason, but it is as devoid of moral content as a theorem in algebra or a college yell. If the English, with the help of the French, American, and other mercenaries, manage to scotch Hitler, and Poland is restored, they will try to operate it as a puppet state, just as they operate Egypt and Iraq. And if Hitler turns out to be unscotchable, they will gladly let him collar as many Polands as may be needed to quiet and content him, just as they let him collar Czechoslovakia when Czechoslovakia seemed enough.

That the majority of Americans appear to have fallen more or less for the English pretension to altruism, and even favor supporting it with munitions and money, not to say men, is only one more proof that human beings learn little by experience. Certainly anyone who sets the full powers of his intellect to the job must be able to recall what happened the last time. When the war was over England had the loot and the United States had a headache and a huge file of bills. In Congress the other day a Congressman, whose name I forget, was trying to figure out the sum total of those bills. He concluded that, with pensions and other trimmings added, they have run to more than $60,000,000,000 to date, with new ones still coming in every day.

This calculation, it seems to me, was extraordinarily modest. For one thing, it took no account of the useful lives lost, the young men crippled and ruined, the wreck of families, the huge destruction of earning power. And, for another thing, it quite overlooked the twin curses of prohibition and the New Deal, both of which we might have escaped if we had minded our business in 1917. I have seen estimates that prohibition cost the country, first and last, fuly $10,000,000,000, and everybody knows that the New Deal has already set us back at least $25,000,000,000, with more and worse to come.

What did we get out of it? The most I can think of is the pleasure of looking at an American Legion parade once a year. All our professed objects in the war failed. The chief product of the salvation of democracy was the creation of the Russian colossus—the most formidable enemy to democracy that has been seen on earth since the fall of the great Asiatic empires of antiquity. Self-determination, having served its term as a shibboleth, converted itself into a whole series of preposterous puppet states, all of them outfitted with oppressed minorities. And the Kaiser had hardly cleared out before Hitler began to edge in.

England got more, in fact, a great deal more. It not only gathered in millions of square miles of new territories and an almost endless store of miscellaneous loot, it also made secure—or, at all events, apparently secure—its hegemony throughout the world. International law at the end of the war was hardly more than a series of decisions by English prize courts. No other country had

any right that England admitted itself bound to respect. It owned and operated the sea and, owning and operating the sea, it had a firm grip upon the land. It ran Europe, it ran Africa, it ran more than half of Asia, and at both ends of the Americas it was triumphant and dominant.

The United States not only acquiesced in this huge access of power; it even promoted it, and at no cost to the beneficiary. We acted precisely like an English colony; indeed, we were even more complacent than any actual English colony of ponderable importance, for both Canada and Australia hastened to get something for themselves, and so did South Africa. In Europe, France rebelled very quickly, and was slapped down only with difficulty; it is a forced and unwilling ally at this moment, and may be trusted to prove it if the war goes on. Russia got off the reservation by 1920 and Italy by 1923. Germany, by 1930, began to prepare darkly for a new "Tag," and Japan was ready to throw off the yoke in Asia by 1935. But the United States, despite an occasional groan over the unpaid war debt, continued idiotically in the English orbit, and there it is today.

Worse, we are now asked to strengthen our bonds with more money and more blood. Once again, it appears, the world is to be made safe for democracy. Once again the wicked Kaiser, in the person of his even more wicked heir and assign, is to be prevented from ravaging our coasts, burning our cities, and selling our people into captivity. Once again we are to fall for the old "hooey," and hail with hosannas a return engagement of the old bills. It sounds incredible, but there is the plain fact. Let it revolve a bit in your mind.

I am the last man on earth to object to the English effort to preserve and extend their great Empire. It is a magnificent edifice, and no rational people, having once erected it at large cost and made it pay, would willingly let it go. To be sure, a great deal of sharp dealing and worse went into its erection, and it is maintained today only by a constant resort to brigandage and false pretenses. But it is clearly absurd to hold great states to the simple morality of private men, beset alike by the police and the fear of hell. They operate at levels far above, or below, the common levels of right and wrong. All of them that history records have engaged freely and gloriously in acts that would land you and me in jail, if not in the death house, and the same line, I suppose, will be followed by all that come hereafter, world without end. Even the United States, though it may be better than most, has engaged in frequent proceedings of an excessive dubiousness.

But why should the United States dedicate itself to the dirty work of another country, traditionally our enemy and only transiently, and for revenue alone, our contemptuous, patronizing, and deadbeat friend? Why should we convert our own country into a mere client and goon of England, and waste our men and money protecting and augmenting England's empire and fighting England's rivals? Why should we denounce and threaten the Germans because they object to being hedged in and ruined by English bribery and intrigue, or the Italians because they rebel against living in an English lake and under English guns, or the Japs because they believe that the affairs of China, which lies at their very gates, are of more concern to them than to the English, 10,000 miles away?

The answer we get is that England is a great Christian nation, the guardian of civilization, the consecrated fosterer of "morality and religion," radiating a special and incomparable virtue, and with a special mission to protect the United States.

That answer is buncombe. England is a country exactly like all the rest, no worse and no better. Its one aim and purpose is to promote its own interest; it has no other whatsoever. It was willing and eager, only 6 weeks ago, to embrace Comrade Stalin as a brother, and it is trying to buy him back even now, just as it is trying to buy Mussolini, Franco, and the Turks. So long as the Japs kept their paws off China it was their ally and buddy, and if Hitler manages to survive the present moral crusade it will make terms with him quickly and gladly—at the expense of France, even at the expense of the United States.

To admire such a great and successful nation is one thing, and quite reasonable; to fall for its Pecksniffery, pay its bills, and tote its slops is assuredly something else again.

Gold Star Mothers' Day Observance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAVID I. WALSH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 26 (legislative day of Wednesday, October 4), 1939

ADDRESS BY HON. DAVID I. WALSH, OF MASSACHUSETTS, SEPTEMBER 24, 1939

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by me at the Gold Star Mothers' Day observance in Washington, D. C., Sunday, September 24, 1939.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Presidential proclamation, pursuant to an act of Congress, we have gathered together to observe, in the Nation's Capital, Gold Star Mothers' Day—a day set aside for reverential recognition of the mothers of America who gave their sons to war and death.

We honor and respect them for the sacrifice so unselfishly made, but especially, on this day, we recall our inexpressible debt to them, one that we cannot too often acknowledge.

My regret is that because of the genius, inspiration, and sympathy that such an occasion demands, no words of mine can fittingly portray the services given, and the sacrifices made on the altar of patriotism by the war mothers of America.

Dark and ominous clouds hang over mothers all over the world today. Mothers hate war. All American mothers today are praying and pleading that they be spared your experience.

Well they realize that what is taking place in Europe at this hour is increasing the number of brokenhearted, disconsolate, and impoverished war mothers by the millions!

Here, in the presence of you, surviving victims of the sacrifices made by American mothers during the World War, can we not visualize millions of American mothers with uplifted eyes and hands, pleading to the God of Mercy to bestow upon the officials of our Government the wisdom and courage to keep us free from the devastating plague now waging in Europe.

It was men, not mothers, who invented arms and munitions of war for the slaughter of human beings. If mothers had their way, they would not only prevent American-made instruments of human destruction being sent to all belligerents but they would make such war weapons unavailable to any nation at any time for the shedding of blood.

They would permit the making of arms and munitions solely for ourselves, to be used only when our homes and firesides were attacked and our democratic institutions threatened.

In order that the homicidal strife now waging in Europe may effectively be barred from America, may you, Gold Star war mothers, living symbols of war's unspeakable cruelties and sufferings, proclaim aloud your heartbreaking experiences to other and younger mothers and thereby assert your power and influence for peace.

Counteract by your tears and sighs the barrage of propaganda that seeks to divert America from peace. In the midst of this war-involving propaganda, let it be your mission to portray the irreparable human and social losses of war, to make known the horror of the conflict's aftermath, the foulness and fever of the hospital, the maimed and shattered humanity beneath its canvas, the torn fields disfigured with broken forces of glory, the days of pain and the nights of anguish of mothers at the bedside of the victims of the battlefield which call for that pity and patience and courage that are inherently in the hearts and souls of women.

Tell America, lest she forget, that the trials and perils, that the roar and rush of conflict know nothing of, come to test the very fiber of the souls of mothers; that the patriotic work of mothers is done amid the silence and pathos of the home where few come to cheer and where silent women sit, amid the confusion and consternation of news from the battle, wondering what sorrowful and harrowing message of affliction will come to them after the guns have ceased to speak.

After the war only the women, the mothers, the handmaids of pity, remain to bear the cross and to suffer the human losses the shouting world has forgotten.

Instead of pleading for traffic in arms or war profits, your plea must be against every possible step that will lead to traffic in human lives—the youths of America.

No living being contends that we are morally bound to sell implements of war to any nation at any time. We are free to sell or not to sell.

Our present policy, the Federal law, now forbids sales.

Candor compels me to state that I think of nothing that threatens more certain to involve us in the present European holocaust than to deliberately reverse our present policy of positive refusal to sell war weapons to any or all belligerents, and now that war has swept over Europe, by solemn enactment offer the output of our munitions' factories for sale, knowing that only one group of belligerents can be our customer.

How long would Switzerland, Holland, or any other neutral country remain at peace if it declared in advance of war that it would not sell arms, and following the outbreak of war, turned its munitions plants over to supply death bombs to one group of belligerents?

Why, if we really seek peace, should we dare, merely because we are not adjoining the war fields of Europe, and merely because we are larger in area and population and wealth, do what we conceive no other neutral nation would dare do unless it deliberately sought involvement in war?

If our sole and only problem is safety for ourselves, instead of removing existing restrictions to help keep us out of war, let us strive mightily day and night to increase and multiply these restrictions.

To my mind, the repeal of the arms-embargo law will be tragic. It will enormously increase our present serious peril. It is tragic enough to become involved in war by having a public opinion favoring peace changed to one of war through the ordinary mute incidents of war, our hatreds, our fears, or our sympathies, but it is

criminal to plunge a free people into war by incidents and situations which are resultant from efforts made to make war profits. War through financial entanglements is the most indefensible of all wars.

Mothers have a great opportunity at this hour. I know of no higher or nobler way on this Gold Star Mothers' Day to honor our war mothers than to rescue the mothers of today from the horrors of war now being borne by millions of frenzied mothers and starving children in other lands.

May the Prince of Peace spare the mothers of America the dark and dreary days, the nights of pain and suffering which you mothers experience from the horrifying thoughts and the woeful losses of the seamy side of war.

America will keep out of this war if America places above all other considerations the happiness of mothers, and unceasingly demands the God-given right of every mother to protect her children from becoming cannon fodder.

Embargo History

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD P. NYE

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 26 (legislative day of Wednesday, October 4), 1939

EDITORIAL FROM THE SATURDAY EVENING POST

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Reciting History," published in the Saturday Evening Post of October 28, 1939.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Saturday Evening Post of October 28, 1939]

RECITING HISTORY

"The single exception was the policy adopted by this Nation during the Napoleonic wars, when, seeking to avoid involvement, we acted for some years under the so-called Embargo and Nonintercourse Acts. That policy turned out to be a disastrous failure: First, because it brought our own Nation close to ruin; and, second, because it was the major cause of bringing us into active participation in European wars in our own War of 1812. It is merely reciting history to recall to you that one of the results of the policy of embargo and nonintercourse was the burning in 1814 of part of this Capitol in which we are assembled." (President Roosevelt, addressing the Congress, September 21, 1939.)

If this is reciting history, we are afraid the President must be given a bad mark. In the first place, Jefferson's embargo, which was in force from December 1807 to March 1809, cannot be compared to the present arms embargo. It was complete and absolute. No American ship could clear for any foreign port, and foreign ships could sail only if their holds were empty of cargo. The Nonintercourse Acts of 1809, 1810, and 1811 modified this policy so as to apply it only to England and France. The object was to demonstrate by economic pressure that England needed our products as much or more than we needed hers. Jefferson thought that by cutting off our commerce with England we might force her—by a method "short of war"—to observe the ordinary usage of international law and to abandon her claim to impressment.

But it should be remembered that at that time we were already deeply involved in the Napoleonic wars. The English orders in council and the Emperor's Berlin and Milan decrees had virtually outlawed American shipping in European waters. The direct cause of the embargo was the *Chesapeake-Leopard* incident, when an English warship fired on an American frigate within sight of Cape Henry. Three sailors were killed and 18 wounded. The *Chesapeake* was forced to haul down its flag and submit to the impressment of four of its crew. Faced with this outrage, Jefferson said the choice before him was embargo or war, and he preferred embargo.

His policy was not a failure. According to contemporary English testimony, the embargo was decidedly effective. Workingmen rioted in the Midlands because the lack of cotton and other raw materials from America closed down their places of employment. Nor was this country brought to the verge of ruin. American shipping interests generally were badly hurt, as were the southern planters. But modern historians agree that it gave American industry a golden opportunity. For the first time we discovered that we could process our own raw materials. The necessities imposed by the embargo created new factories and foundries throughout the Middle Atlantic States and New England. This was an unforeseen dividend of Jefferson's peace policy, but a very real one nevertheless.

Finally, the burning of the Capitol at Washington can hardly be blamed on the Embargo and Nonintercourse Acts, even indirectly. The British captured Washington only because we were disgracefully unprepared. They set fire to the Capitol, in all probability, as a retaliation for the burning of the capitol of Upper Canada by General Dearborn's troops in 1813.

Whatever may be the fate of the arms embargo, it should be discussed realistically for what it is—an act to keep us out of the munitions trade with belligerent nations. As such, it has no precedent in our history, and can no more be compared to Jefferson's embargo, either in purpose or probable result, than it can be compared to the gold embargo of 1933.

America's Commercial Air Transport Industry Makes Rapid Progress; Serves as Backlog for National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 26, 1939

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, the commercial air transport industry in the United States is rapidly becoming of major importance. Americans generally take justifiable pride in the strong strides being made by the air lines which operate throughout the United States.

NEW LINES ESTABLISHED

Our people have in recent years taken an added interest in all phases of aviation. New services have been added in many parts of the country and rapidly our operating network is becoming the envy of the other nations of the world. This is due in large measure to the splendid, effective management, the carefully trained personnel, the safe and modern equipment, and the aid and encouragement from the Federal Government.

We like to think of this advancement in the days of peace, and yet we are acutely aware of the fact that the great commercial air-line industry would be of tremendous value to this Nation in time of war. We shall continue fervently to hope and work to the end that America will remain at peace. If conflict should come to our Republic, this great industry would be of real value in our national-defense program.

BUSINESS ON INCREASE

As an indication of the present status of our operating air lines, I quote the following article by John L. Beckley, Associated Press statistician, as carried yesterday in the press:

NEW YORK, October 24.—Air travel is booming. Maybe it's the war, maybe it's the business revival, or perhaps it's just the fact that America is becoming air-minded; but at any rate the usual fall slump in passenger traffic hasn't materialized. For the first time summer schedules are being carried right through the fall without reduction in service.

Instead of the customary let-down at this time, a survey today of several leading air lines disclosed that the flow of passengers over the Nation's airways is setting new high records.

BETTER THAN IN 1938

Transcontinental and Western Air reported that September revenue passenger-miles were 47 percent greater than a year ago and were the highest in the history of the company. It was the seventh consecutive month that total revenue passenger-miles had established a new record. October traffic was estimated to be running 40 to 45 percent ahead of a year ago and keeping pace with September.

Eastern Air Lines stated that last Friday marked the fourth time in the last 10 days that their planes had set a new record for the number of passengers carried on one day. The performance was unusual at this time because the company's business usually picks up in November and reaches its peak in March, when the previous high occurred.

Another instance of the increasing air-mindedness of travelers was cited by American Air Lines. On October 15, a Sunday, ordinarily a dull day in a relatively inactive month, the system had the fourth largest day it has ever had for passenger traffic out of New York City. Each month of this year the company has established successive new highs for passenger traffic.

NO LET-DOWN IN TRAVEL

United Air Lines estimated that September and October business was running about 37 percent above a year ago and also failed to note the customary fall let-down. Volume was said to be not quite up to the 50 percent increases over last year experienced during the summer months, but was holding up exceedingly well.

The Pan American Airways system has also felt the increase in air travel. Flights between here and Europe are not booked to

capacity as they were for a short time after the outbreak of war, as nationals on both sides of the oceans scrambled to return home, but travel was said to be holding up well in view of tightening restrictions. Mail loads are setting new highs.

In South American traffic the company is enjoying an unprecedented rush of business. Increasing travel for both pleasure and business purposes lifted the September passenger traffic of Pan American-Grace Airways 100 percent above the same month a year ago. During the summer months the volume was about 50 percent better than last year.

Patriotism Versus Neutrality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 26, 1939

ARTICLE BY ADOLPH STARR, OF LA FAYETTE, IND.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include therein a very interesting article written by Adolph Starr, of La Fayette, Ind., who is the national chaplain of the Navy Club, which article appeared in the La Fayette Leader, of date October 6, 1939. The article is upon the subject of Patriotism versus Neutrality, and follows:

PATRIOTISM VERSUS NEUTRALITY

What is it? My answer is simply this: The Golden Rule, practiced and exemplified. The supremacy of God, spirit, principle, love, and good must be demonstrated. The universe must be interpreted by science from the divine principle God, so that it may be truly understood. When we try to explain the universe on the basis of physical sense and represented as subject to growth, maturity, and decay the universe remains a puzzle, an enigma like man. Life is spiritual and not material. The Holy Scriptures say that God made everything that was made and it was very good, like Himself. You will find that "In the Saxon and many other tongues good is the term for God." So it must be that the spiritual universe is good, and that it reflects God as He really is. Patriotism, therefore, is not sole regard for the place or town where a man was born, not at all; this is not the character of the virtue we call patriotism, it soars much higher for its object. It is not self-love, mingling with all the pleasures and joys of life; but, the Golden Rule applied to the service we render to our fellow men. We obey the laws of society because they are what society calls the laws of virtue. In their authority we see the image of venerability, upon which we look with honor and deference, not upon the soil and land of our country, but its people and the virtues which our neighbors practice, and to hold in mingled love and honor with something of sacred fear, as for that which, while lovely, is sublimely exalted and brings upon us by contrast a sense of our unworthiness or inferiority; it is to revere our country's honor which is entirely and wholly a spiritual act. Every good citizen should make that honor his own and should cherish it not only as precious, but also as sacred. He should be willing to give up his life in its defense, and be conscious that he gets the protection from his government in authority while he does so; when a state violates, or disregards the principles which make for the security and safety of its people, then, what rights of a citizen will be deemed inviolable?

Or let us say today as war is threatening America, if his life should not be invaded or interfered with, what could his enjoyments really be living in a country regarded with disgust or aversion, foul and infamous in the eyes of other people, and dishonored in his own. It certainly is not expected of such a one to look with veneration and affection to that country as his parent to love and cherish; he would be made to blush for his patriotism; that is, if he had any left, and justly so, for to him it would be a vice. He would be a man without a country or a banished citizen in his own community. Therefore, I hope and trust in God, that the American citizens—the veterans of all wars will at this time join that hope and trust with me—that they be not without reason, principle, and honor in this trying time and not be swayed by false newspaper and radio propaganda, and that the issues in this European war be not confused; I am not confused. I am once and always decidedly pro-American—an ex-service man who has had experience in war—and have traveled around the world, and understood life in other countries. I speak from experience, which is mankind's greatest school, and we must not forget our lessons of the last World War. I know from experience and contacts with well-informed people abroad and so far as the nations of Europe are concerned, I feel justified in saying that they are all aggressors, persecutors of minorities, repudiators who refuse to pay or acknowledge their debts to other nations. None of them has ever understood or even tried to uphold the right of the Golden Rule; none of them knows the meaning of a "bill of rights"; none of them has ever been influenced in international dealings by international law or by the Sermon on the Mount. History proves that for more than 300 years the leading nations of Europe have been practicing greed for possessions, land grabbing on all six continents and trying to dominate the seven seas.

For over 250 years they have been fighting each other for the lion's share in extent of land and value. England won that distinction and for 150 years has been a boaster of pride that the sun never sets on her domain. Germany and Italy have been nations since 1870, Japan since 1852, all less than 150 years ago; they demand places in the sun. England and France don't want them to expand: Why? Because of the reasons already stated. These big four nations of Europe have no doubt developed great social and cultural values which have grown out of their genius which the world cannot afford to lose, and so it behooves America to stay out of their own family quarrels, their envies, and jealousies, and not arouse any of their enmity. Let's mind our own business. Keep our sons out of this bloody fight; keep our cash and credit; take no sides, and stay within our laws of neutrality; but be ready to advise all to a rational and spiritual understanding for a profitable and durable peace. Let's be Americans in deed as well as in spirit. If we sell to one, let's sell to all; don't take sides or we will surely get into trouble, as that is just how all trouble starts, domestic, State, and National. May God bless America and keep us out of war. Practice the Golden Rule and not the rule of gold and neutrality will become a reality. Let's practice patriotism, Christianity, and Americanism, and then democracy will automatically save itself. No one ever won a war; every nation bears a loss.

ADOLPH STARR, M. S., LL. B.,
National Chaplain, Navy Club, United States of America.

Address by Secretary Ickes to the National Coal Association at New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. BANKHEAD, 2D

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, October 27 (legislative day of Wednesday, October 4), 1939

ADDRESS BY HON. HAROLD L. ICKES

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address recently delivered by Hon. Harold L. Ickes, Secretary of the Interior, to the National Coal Association at New York, on the subject of national fuel resources and supplies, including coal, oil, gas, and electricity, their conservation and control, and the administration of the Bituminous Coal Act in his Department. The address is an important one, of much value, and should be appropriately disseminated and preserved.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman and members of the National Coal Association, when the President, under the Reorganization Act charged me with the task of supervising the administration of the Bituminous Coal Act, I accepted a responsibility that I had not asked for, with full appreciation of the difficulties of my task. I knew that this act was of tremendous importance to the producers and consumers of coal as well as to half a million miners and their families. I realized that, although most of the industry was eager for help and willing to cooperate, there was a persistent minority determined to resist any effort of the Government to aid the industry as a whole.

For many years your association and those engaged in the same business have realized that the task of stabilizing the coal industry is closely related to the management of other natural resources—oil, natural gas, and water power—in all of which the Department of the Interior is interested and has administrative responsibilities. Since the problem of the conservation and utilization of all natural resources is a national one, the Federal Government has taken vigorous steps to coordinate the various phases of it. The administration fully recognizes that conservation is not a hodgepodge of independent objectives. For instance, you cannot separate the coal problem from the oil and natural gas problems. All of the resources of the Nation form one large pattern and must be treated as a whole.

Your industry has recognized this. As you well know, coal has been losing markets to competing fuels, principally to oil and natural gas. The reasons for this lie partly in the last war. At

that time there was a tremendous increase in the demand for oil as well as for coal. High prices brought a great boom to oil and gas, new fields were found and exploited to the fullest extent possible. But coal, likewise, shared in the war boom. Prices rose sharply. For some 3 years after the war shortages of coal and high prices recurred. Then came the inevitable reaction. By 1923 coal and oil went begging. Coal sold for whatever buyers would pay. Even during the boom years from 1925 to 1929, when business as a whole enjoyed a champagne prosperity, coal could only watch the bubbles rising to the surface from a distance. To a certain extent, it may be said that the general business boom of that period was purchased at the expense of our resource industries.

The difficulties of coal during this time were due partly to an overabundant supply, partly to the collapse of its price structure, partly to labor difficulties, and partly to the competition of oil and natural gas. To be sure, much of the oil and gas was availed of for uses for which coal was not adaptable, and therefore they did not compete directly with coal. Undoubtedly, however, much coal has been displaced by these other fuels.

The success of oil and natural gas as a competitor was due, not merely to their own availability, such as convenience of use and price, but also to the demoralization of the coal industry. The desperate financial condition of the industry and its internal strife prevented adequate coal research or cooperative promotion. Under the pressure of invested capital and overhead charges—which piled up whether or not coal was being mined—and the necessity of supplying a livelihood, meager as it might be, to miners and their families, producers continued to hunt desperately for purchasers at any price. When these facts were added up the sum amounted to a disastrous depression in the bituminous-coal industry—a sort of industrial suicide.

To these factors, we must add a major social demand of the post-war years—the desire of the people to have the conveniences which accompany electric power, and to have them cheaply. This led to the development of water power. But while some coal has thus been displaced, we should not exaggerate its effects on your industry. Comparing the production of water power in the United States for the year 1937 with that for the year 1918, we find an increase of 188 percent in kilowatt-hours generated. But the increase in the amount of coal displaced is nowhere near as large as this figure would indicate. This is due to the remarkable increase in the efficiency of combustion during this period. For instance, in 1918, electric-power stations consumed an average of 3.35 pounds of coal per kilowatt-hour; in 1937 only 1.42 pounds.

I am convinced, however, that if the development of water power does succeed in demonstrating the social possibilities and advantages of cheap power, the long-time results will be helpful to the fuel industries. The way to enlarge the use of power is to make it abundant at the lowest possible cost. The experts tell us that future increases in power must come chiefly from fuel, since there are not many water-power sites left which can be developed at low cost. Nevertheless, I recognize that the competition between coal and water-power development is of present concern to you, although it is far less important than the effects upon your industry of oil and natural-gas competition.

This competition is not merely your problem; it is a national problem. This Nation's future is largely dependent upon its resources of fuel. Our world of tomorrow is likely to be shaped by the availability of coal, oil, and natural gas. Our industrial progress, the well-being of our population, and indeed, the very nature of our political organization, are largely contingent upon these resources.

The National Resources Committee, of which I was chairman until recently, a short time ago issued a report on energy resources which analyzed this situation in detail. It found that our coal resources, though great, were not unlimited. Coal reserves in the United States have been estimated at 3,000,000,000,000 net tons, enough to last for more than 1,000 years. However, more than half of this represents low-grade bituminous coal and lignite. It is worth noting that 85 percent of our present production is from east of the Mississippi River. Almost 70 percent of our total reserves lie in the semi-arid plains or in the Rocky Mountains, far from our centers of population and industry. The depletion of our eastern reserves and a shift to these more plentiful but distant ones in the West would be likely to raise grave problems of economic and social adjustment, involving dislocations of business and population.

It is important to note that, while we are rich in total reserves of coal, our known supplies of high-grade coals are definitely restricted, and that the best coal beds are being mined at a rapid rate. Some of them, indeed, are well on their way to exhaustion. The anthracite deposits of Pennsylvania, for example, are more than 29 percent depleted. The high quality, smokeless coals of southern West Virginia in seams now considered mineable will last only about 85 years, at the 1929 rate of production. The life of the great Pittsburgh bed in Pennsylvania, the committee reports, is limited to 100 years by the same measurement, and Connellsville coking coal, which contributed heavily to the development of the American iron and steel industry, probably will be sufficient for only from 20 to 30 years.

The situation in oil and natural gas is much more critical. Our resources of these fuels are definitely and seriously limited. The National Resources Committee states that our proven oil reserves have been estimated at 15,000,000,000 barrels, which is only about 12 times our consumption in the 1 year of 1937. Our natural-gas resources have been estimated at from sixty to one hundred trillion cubic feet, or, at most, about 50 times the 1937 production. Despite this, we are allowing our oil and natural-gas resources to be exploited without that careful regulation that would have regard for both the immediate and the future needs of the Nation. This heedless exploitation is harmful to everybody concerned, not only producers but the Nation as a whole. We continue to deplete our reserves of oil faster than does the rest of the world. Unless we adopt a more conservative policy we will prematurely be forced to turn to synthetic gasoline or to expensive substitutes for our supply of liquid fuel.

To return to coal, we have not yet succeeded in dealing comprehensively and wisely with this vital resource. According to the careful studies of the John Hays Hammond Commission, the avoidable loss of bituminous coal in mining averages 20 percent. In a year of really active demand this means 150,000,000 tons a year, an amount sufficient to supply the entire annual requirements of France, Italy, Spain, Belgium, and Holland, with the three Scandinavian countries thrown in for good measure.

No other country in the world, I believe, would tolerate such shocking waste. It is the greatest of all the many wastes of our fuel resources. To make matters worse, there has been a reckless use of our limited supply of high-quality bituminous coal for ordinary steam-generating purposes when inferior grades, which we have in abundance, would do just as well. It would be just as sound economy to build a temporary shack out of some rare and expensive wood. We are burning for boiler fuel large quantities of these fine grade coals which would bring more money for the higher uses to which they could be put. We are doing this sort of thing because the people who own these coals are in business to make money in a market dominated by cutthroat competition. The first and indispensable step toward reducing these wastes is to place the mining and marketing of coal on a stable and orderly basis.

These problems are thrown into relief today by the wars in Europe and the Orient. In wartime, coal and oil are commodities that sell at a premium. Earl Grey said after 1918: "The Allies floated to victory on a sea of oil." Already orders for oil and coal have multiplied and prices have risen. Consequently, we must, so far as we can, survey the situation and take care that the unhappy consequences of the last war be avoided this time.

You all remember how ruinous those consequences were. The collapse of purchasing power in the coal industry after 1923 was felt directly by such businesses as food, clothing, household furnishings, and automobiles. The collapse spread like a cancer through the country, crippling and closing factories. Whether we like to admit it or not, we—the Nation as a whole—cannot afford to let any major industry, no matter how much it wants to do so, bankrupt itself. Every business and industry is an integral part of a whole, like the strands in a tapestry. You cannot tear one without damaging the whole fabric.

For the sake of the Nation we must prevent the rape of our natural resources. Naturally, we must, and can, supply all reasonable demands; but, at the same time, we must, and can, observe the principles of sound economy and good husbandry. So far as we can, we must so conduct our affairs as to avoid another post-war collapse in our natural-resource industries. In time of war one must prepare for peace. Our problem today is not merely to avoid actual participation in the current international madness; it is also to avoid the danger that the economic effects of war and its aftermath will reduce us, as well as the belligerent nations, to the despair that is the result of destitution.

I know that intelligent self-restraint, which must be the basis of the conservation of our resources, is difficult, even in peacetime. But now the important task of conservation is especially hard, because it calls for moderation after a number of lean years; it demands that those who have hungered for volume and profits proceed with caution when they catch a glimpse of a rich feast. Let there be no mistake about it, however. The problems which I am discussing are not problems created by the war. They are problems which are and have been with us both in war and in peace. War conditions abroad have merely accentuated the situation.

The coal industry is in a comparatively good position to deal with these problems. As I have said, unlike oil, there is no prospect of a general shortage of coal in the early future. The problem of conservation is essentially an obligation of preventing unnecessary waste. In large part, such waste is the result of prices that are so low as to offer no real incentive for a higher recovery of the coal underground. Such prices cause cutthroat competition which results in debasing the market value of even high-grade coals.

But the bituminous-coal industry can do something to improve its price structure and marketing practices. It has experience dating from the N. R. A. At the present time the coal industry, in cooperation with the Bituminous Coal Division of the Department of the Interior, is in the process of fixing prices below which the various sizes and grades of coal may not be sold. It must be clear that price stabilization and improvement of mining practices in this industry are fundamental to any attempt to bring order to our fuel resources.

Ultimately this Nation may take steps to coordinate the conservation of all of our fuel and energy resources. Such a coordination necessarily would, of course, take into account not only the interests of the Nation as a whole, but also the welfare of those in each of the affected industries; it would have a duty to proceed with justice and fairness to all who had a stake in them, and this would include the consuming public.

The Government recognizes that each of the three great fuel industries has its own special problems which require separate consideration. The interests of the oil industry must not be sacrificed

to aid the coal industry, nor should the welfare of the coal business be sacrificed in the effort to assist oil and gas. However, no unprejudiced person would deny that it is essential to the Nation and to the industries themselves that the petroleum and natural-gas businesses should be conducted on an orderly basis, without waste of either oil or natural gas; and that the prices and practices of the coal industry should be both reasonable and orderly.

I hope that the fixing and enforcement of prices will bring your industry into its own as a stable, well-organized unit in the national economy. I believe that the result will be to put an end to further economic wreckage resulting from wasteful methods of mining, and that it will stop the crumbling of the investments and the wastage of the livelihoods of thousands of persons engaged in the coal industry. You have cause to rejoice because, alone among our industrialists, you are in a favorable position to prepare yourselves to cope with the economic aftermath of the European war. You are ready to enjoy whatever benefits may derive from a possible war boom with comparative confidence that you are not neglecting your long-time interests. If a war boom should come—I am not prophesying that it will—you can face the possibility of a post-war depression with the assurance that there will be a bottom to prices for your coal, a level which can be readjusted, but which cannot drop so low as to bring ruin and destruction to you, your stockholders, and your workers. You are indeed fortunate because you have this legal machinery by which you may now prepare yourselves for peace and protect yourselves against the too great hazards of an unpredictable future.

We have been pressing forward to fix prices for coals. Many of you may feel that they are somewhat overdue. I was given direction of the Coal Division on July 1. I can only say that we are doing our utmost to expedite the work. Moreover, I am satisfied that the job is being done as carefully, objectively, and thoroughly as is possible. I know that some of you honestly feel that any effort of the Government to aid your industry—particularly through this Coal Act—is objectionable, and I respect your opinion, although I do not agree with it. I am aware also that in your industry, as in others, there are a few who are in a favorable position to prosper in the midst of economic chaos.

To these all I can say is that I hope they will realize their obligation not only to their industry as a whole but to the Nation; that they will cheerfully subscribe to the theory that the concern of government necessarily is the greatest good of the greatest number. No one, whether in the coal business or otherwise, can afford to adopt the policy, "may the devil take the hindmost." I trust that the entire industry, whatever differences there may be between individuals, will cooperate in the fixing of minimum prices in accordance with the law, and that when prices are actually fixed, the industry will cheerfully work with the Government in a genuine effort to give the Guffey Coal Act an adequate opportunity to prove its worth.

Similarly, I hope that the consumers of coal will appreciate what the Government and the industry are trying to do, and will not regard the Coal Act as an evil, because it may raise somewhat the price of their coal. Actually, the average increase in bituminous coal prices will be small. The average per-ton increase over prices in the last 9 months of 1937, necessary to return to producers the average cost of production, has been estimated at only about 11 cents per ton. In 1937, the Interstate Commerce Commission authorized an increase in freight rates which raised the 1938 cost of bituminous coal 10 cents per ton. This rise in price was accepted by the consuming public with hardly a murmur of protest. If the consumer is willing to accept an addition of 10 cents to cover the cost of transporting coal, it is not unjust to ask him to accept a comparable increase to cover the cost of mining the coal.

I have a great interest in fair treatment for consumers—whether of coal or of other commodities, and I have fought many battles in their behalf. I shall insist that, in the administration of the Coal Act, consumers be given the consideration that is their right and that their interests be protected. As you know, the act itself requires that the well-being of the consuming public be safeguarded. The Consumers' Counsel Division, which is in the Solicitor's office of the Department of the Interior, fulfills the requirements of the Coal Act by lending aid and assistance to all consumers. Lest you might think that I am an American version of a Gilbert and Sullivan Pooh-Bah, let me hasten to explain that the Consumers' Counsel functions independently of the Division which administers the Coal Act; in fact, the Counsel serves as a watchdog over the activities of the Coal Division in the interest of the consumer. Not being a Pooh-Bah, I know what the Coal Act is supposed to accomplish and whom the Consumers' Counsel is supposed to represent; and knowing these things, I shall continue to insist that each perform its independent functions as provided by the law.

I want to assure you that I shall do my utmost to supervise and direct the administration of the Coal Act so that it will benefit the industry and the public. This law is the result of a chaotic condition of long standing. It represents the demands of a large portion of the producers of bituminous coal, as well as of the miners, for governmental aid in helping to rescue the industry from the depths to which it has been plunged as the result of prolonged price cutting. It is therefore only fair that industry and labor should join hands with the Government in giving the Coal Act a fair and honest trial. This is not the time to press for a new or different act. We must first see whether the one that we have will work. I promise you as honest, efficient, and impartial an administration of this statute as I am capable of giving. I also promise you that if it is given a fair trial and then proves wanting, I will join you in seeking its modification.

First and last, this task is a cooperative undertaking. Industry without government cannot do the job; and government without the support, aid, and counsel of both industry and labor must inevitably fail to accomplish it. Individual producers, your district boards, and labor, as well as the public, must participate actively in the price-fixing process and in the enforcement of the act; they must participate, not with a view to extracting the utmost possible satisfaction of their personal desires but in order to make the act work on a fair and just basis for the benefit of the whole industry, as well as for the country as a whole. The successful administration of this complex statute requires from the Government sympathetic understanding and statesmanship. It requires from those in your industry, including your district boards and your trade associations, as well as from labor and the public, understanding, forbearance, at least a modicum of unselfishness, and statesmanship.

It is my earnest hope that we shall work together in harmony for success.

Investigation by Fortune of Price-Pegging System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAT McCARRAN

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, October 27 (legislative day of Wednesday, October 4), 1939

PRESS RELEASE BY FORTUNE MAGAZINE

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a press release by Fortune relative to the operation of the price-pegging system.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATION-WIDE INVESTIGATION BY FORTUNE REVEALS HOW PRICE-PEGGING SYSTEM WORKS IN ALMOST EVERY CITY

NEW YORK, October 25.—Retail milk prices can be brought down as much as 4 cents per quart in almost every American city, Fortune magazine will declare tomorrow in its November issue.

"Careful inquiry has convinced the editors that the milk enigma is not just another one of those incurable ills of our times, and that the answer is, in fact, currently being found in practice. It is now possible to say that:

"If fluid milk is 5 cents to farmers and 12½ cents to housewives, then with adjustments that will do no violence to present economic beliefs milk can be distributed so as to bring the farmer the same 5 cents or better and cost the average housewife from 9 to perhaps 10 cents at the outside. In fact, one large chain of stores is in a position to sell milk 4½ cents under the average home-delivered price and still make a profit."

In urging the necessity for a readjustment of milk prices, Fortune will point out that the $3,500,000,000-a-year milk business is one of the biggest in the country, accounting for 19 percent of all farm income and 5 percent of the entire national income from all sources.

"The trouble with milk is price," Fortune will declare. "From 1929 to 1936 per capita consumption of milk in the United States dropped 6.8 percent, and it would be vain indeed to look elsewhere than to the steady high price of milk to the consumer for an explanation. In 1938 the milk price index stood at 91, the cost of living index at 83, the food component at 78.9, clothing at 82.3, and rent at 69.5.

"Most Americans know that there is a milk problem. They know it because milk is continually in the news, and the news is always bad.

"It is news of farmers who, having milked the American cow, proceed to dump her product into the country lanes in fierce milk strikes. It is news of racketeering and of upset milk delivery wagons in the city streets. It is news of endless investigations into the milk trust.

"But behind the headlines Americans know there is a milk problem in a very practical and specific sense," Fortune will point out. "They know that whereas the farmer gets between 3 and 5 cents for his milk, housewives are asked to pay from 9 to 16 cents for it. They know that this is neither equitable to the farmer nor to the consumer. They know that the average American drinks 80 less quarts of milk each year than his minimum health requirement.

"American ingenuity and American business have a long record of bringing products such as the automobile and the radio and a hundred other marvels to the ever-larger public. But in the case of the basic commodity, milk, it might be said that the last great landmark seems to have been back in 1893, when pasteurization came into use.

"And the problem of low-price mass distribution remains unsolved.

"The one solid and immediate hope that more people can get the milk they want and need lies with the store method of distribution," Fortune will declare. "With maximum economies it is fair to say that the store price of milk would be at least 4 cents under the home delivered price and at least 2 cents under any home delivered price that is remotely possible.

"Why, then," Fortune will ask, "are stores in some cities forced by law to sell at the same price that is charged for doorstep delivery? Why, in other cities, are they limited by law to a 1-cent differential? Why, in cities where there is no such regulation, do stores fear to reflect the full differential in their prices?

"There must be powerful pressures so to dam up the workings of a supposedly free economy," Fortune will state, proceeding to cite detailed instances of racketeering and Government restrictions resulting from "a type of play in which the farmer runs with the ball while the union makes interference and the big milk companies sit on the bench and coach."

"On learning of the appalling obstructions to the sale of milk at low prices, the first feelings of the enraged citizen suggest that 'there ought to be a law.' But one of the chief troubles with the milk business is precisely that there already are laws," and Fortune will call particular attention to the one distributor in Chicago who tried to bring milk to consumers at a lower price and found himself in trouble with the law.

"The important point to keep in mind is that the present price of milk is set by the cost of home delivery, a service that many people cannot afford," Fortune will declare.

"Stores now make over half of all sales of milk in a few big city markets, and the trend to stores is apparently on the increase. There is no disputing the fact that store distribution is intrinsically cheaper than home delivery, no disputing the fact that there is a powerful body of law and sentiment trying to keep that differential from appearing."

Fortune will cite examples from all over the country to show that lower prices under store distribution are an established, practical fact:

"Meadowmoor Dairies has managed to make a dent in the milk price and the milk business of Chicago by low-cost selling through independent grocery stores. But here it turns out that a company that has tried to make money by getting milk to the consumer at low prices has had to fight labor, big business, and the Department of Agriculture itself.

"George Johnson in Detroit has sold milk at retail from central stations at prices that have ranged from 2 to 4 cents a quart under the going price.

"Highland Farms in Washington, D. C., set up a chain of milk stations selling at 11 cents when the normal price was 14 cents and is reported to have netted its owner $75,000 in 1 year on an investment of $100,000.

"There is Ralphs' in Los Angeles, a chain of supermarkets that runs a creamery of its own and reports a whopping return on the investment. Ralphs' had led many of the price-cutting moves in the market, and when the law was invoked to fix a narrow differential between store and home-delivery price, Ralphs' put out a high-quality ice cream at around 25 cents a quart.

"The position of the big grocery chains throws more light on the central aspects of the problem Fortune will point out. Take the case of the progressive First National chain, which started to sell milk in its Boston stores at 2 cents under the home-delivery price and was increasing its business rapidly until a new law forced a 1-cent differential as a maximum and, for good measure, added that milk sold in paper containers (which reduce delivery cost) should be priced 1 cent above bottled milk. After that law went into effect, milk consumption in the Boston area dropped 100,000 quarts a day.

"More illuminating still is the current embarrassment of Safeway Stores. In many communities its stores are forced by law to sell milk at the going home-delivery price, and Safeway is in the uncomfortable position of making much more money out of milk than it thinks is proper.

"For Safeway, delivering milk to 29 units in its chain in 18 towns in the San Bernardino-Riverside area, discovered that the cost of delivery, including truck maintenance, depreciation, and wages, came to only four-tenths of a cent a quart, and the whole cost from farm to consumer, including pasteurization done by Safeway itself, was 3 cents.

"These operations and others like them prove that milk can be distributed much more cheaply when a large-volume come-and-get-it system is used.

"The motives of the Milk Wagon Drivers' Union to keep the store price up are as obvious as its methods are sometimes questionable," Fortune will also explain. "The union men want to keep their jobs and they want to be paid a good, sound wage for performing their work, so quite naturally they use their influence to preserve the home-delivery system.

"And hand in glove with the big farm cooperatives all over the country and towering above the local and regional milk companies in size are the two great national holding companies, National Dairy and Borden, whose subsidiaries distribute fresh milk in most of the dairy regions.

"The motives that actuate the big milk-distributing companies to preserve home delivery and go easy on store sales are harder to discern because the milk companies claim they make little or no profit from fluid milk.

"Their immediate incentive, however, is clear. With their own salesmen, the milk drivers, calling on the home, the companies have a relatively closed market. They are in far more competition with other suppliers of milk, actual and potential, when they sell to storekeepers.

"As for the farmers, the reason they almost always play the big distributors' price game is that they have been convinced that the costs of distribution are irrevocably fixed and a lower home-delivered price means a cut in the price paid to them.

"There are a great variety of ways in which price parity may be achieved and the general level of retail milk prices held up," Fortune will explain. "Generally speaking, the big farmer cooperative is a rather clumsy and arbitrary instrument, coming into action chiefly on price negotiations with the milk companies, but it does exert a powerful influence through the State and Federal Governments to keep the price of fluid milk up.

"San Francisco has an ordinance that pasteurization plants must be within the city. Since city land is very high in price, new plants have been discouraged and 'raiders' kept out.

"San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties in California require all milk sold to be pasteurized and bottled within the county. A similar regulation in Minneapolis was found unconstitutional by the State supreme court.

"In New York the union succeeded in having public milk stations, opened by Mayor LaGuardia, shut down. In San Francisco union members called on grocery stores and asked them not to buy from Clara-Cal, a small group of dairy farmers selling through independent grocery stores at 1 cent below the going store price.

"Across the bay in Oakland another cooperative met the same treatment and was further discouraged when only 25 percent of its bottles came back intact.

"The high point of labor tactics on another occasion was the needling of paper containers with a hypodermic syringe filled with lemon juice. The milk inside was soured, and the brand got a bad name with the housewife.

"An even more powerful weapon in price maintenance is the ability of health authorities to limit the milk supply by refusing to inspect and license farmers who want to sell in the city. * * *

"It looks like a deadlock," Fortune will conclude. "And so, for the moment, it is. But it is a deadlock that is ready to be resolved, and the speed at which this foreseeable unwinding will proceed is largely up to the consumer."

The Monroe Doctrine and the War in Europe—Repeal of the Embargo an Act of Self-Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 27, 1939

STATEMENT BY HON. THOMAS HEWES

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent granted to me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting, by request, a comprehensive statement made with respect to the Monroe Doctrine and the war in Europe, prepared by the Honorable Thomas Hewes, formerly Special Assistant to the Secretary of State, as well as formerly an Assistant Secretary of the Treasury.

The statement follows:

In considering the proposal to modify the existing Embargo Act and deciding upon a course of action which will be for the best interest of the United States, it is unquestionably necessary to endeavor to envisage, as far as practicable, the ultimate effects, if any, of the present war in Europe on this country. In doing this, I, for one, have reached the conclusion that among the effects is a probable challenge of the Monroe Doctrine by Germany if that country should be successful. If this conclusion can be demonstrated to be sound, then I think it can be established that it would be more advantageous to us than not to alter the Embargo Act to permit trade with any ccuntry in any commodity. To do so on a cash-and-carry basis will, at the moment, aid England and France. To thus aid these countries would, in my judgment, be a clear-cut act of self-defense, anticipatory in nature but, nevertheless, the most effective and the least costly form of future protection now available.

The Monroe Doctrine is a name applied to a principle of American foreign policy, namely, that the establishment in the Western Hemisphere by a European nation of any political control or ownership of land, other than that which existed at the beginning of the last century, is dangercus to the safety of the United States, and, therefore, would not be permitted by us if we could prevent it. The English equivalent, for example, of this doctrine is that Belgium, the Netherlands, and France must be either friendly or neutral so that a protective land belt will lie between the channel and the North Sea and any other European power. This policy of

England, which is entirely a matter of self-preservation, has more than once been the cause of war.

As long ago as 1823 the United States, through President Monroe, speaking to Congress, asserted that it was vitally concerned in the activities of foreign countries beyond its territorial borders. In effect, that not alone by direct attack might the welfare and safety of this Nation be jeopardized; that, in reality, our welfare required that we should constantly be on guard against the occurrence of acts, even though geographically remote, that contained the seed of destructive forces which in the natural course of events would imperil our people. He clearly was not an isolationist; and in days of sailing ships seemed convinced that the waters of the Atlantic were not a sufficient and solely to be relied upon safety zone. "In the wars of European powers in matters relating to themselves we have never taken any part, nor does it comport with our policy so to do. It is only when our rights are invaded or seriously menaced that we resent injuries or make preparations for our defense."

President Grant, in 1870, elaborated this principle of hands off, saying: "The doctrine promulgated by President Monroe has been adhered to by all political parties, and I now deem it proper to assert the equally important principle that hereafter no territory on this continent shall be regarded as a subject of transfer to a European power."

President Cleveland, in 1895, further extended it by intervening in a boundary dispute between British Guiana and Venezuela.

Thus, since the beginning of our Nation we have viewed the course of events beyond our own borders with eyes continually open to the effect of these events upon our own well-being. This sound principle, accepted for a century and more, has no demonstrable geographical limitations on the origin of the cause of concern. Only the end of the chain is limited to this hemisphere. And this lack of restraint on the source of necessity must be true if the test is, as it certainly is, our own self-interest. The utility of the doctrine has been demonstrated to the complete satisfaction of generations of Americans.

So, when we view the European conflict from a selfish point of view, we are not embarking on a new venture. Our ancestors early recognized the need of security, acted as required from time to time, and did not shrink from risks if the end seemed to warrant them. This same courage, happily, is as visible today as in 1789.

While circumstances in our past history have focused the doctrine at the moment of application to situations limited initially to this hemisphere, that is coincidence merely and not a restriction of the doctrine. We are entirely familiar with the principle of elasticity in construing our Constitution, the need arising out of changing conditions. In like manner, as requires no great elaboration, modifications in the world political, economic, and social picture may demand the expansion of the field of circumstances which call into play a particular foreign policy. To name a few changes, we find growing populations allegedly pressing on the subsistence of inadequate land areas, as for example in Japan; we have increasing urban numbers, relying for life as they must on manufacture, demanding indispensable raw materials, as for example in Germany. If these are not available in an ordinary way, they will be sought in another. It is simply primitive self-preservation which compels this country to observe these modern phenomena and quaere their ultimate effect on ourselves. And, if in doing so we have sufficient foresight to recognize the probability of a future invasion of this hemisphere flowing as a matter of course from a current situation, it is clearly the duty of statesmen to determine whether or not it is better to endeavor to forestall that invasion instead of waiting for its impact. Can anyone successfully demonstrate that the principle of the Monroe Doctrine does not extend to such a case?

Let us now be specific. If Germany defeats England and France, and assuming as we must in making a currently required decision that no new and unpredictable factors will develop which, if we could know them, might affect our decisions, will we or will we not in all probability be face to face with a challenge of the Monroe Doctrine? I think that the answer, more probably than not, is "yes," and because of the very seriousness of the threat we must give considered weight to the significance of this probability.

The avowed and implicit object of Hitler's military policy is the securing of a living space. This living space of necessity contemplates a physical area of abode and equally important sources or supplies of raw materials. Raw materials are required for ordinary living and also as the food of factories for export. Some raw materials are available in Germany's neighborhood; others are not. If a raw material source can at the same time furnish a market for finished goods, so much the better. As partially illustrative, witness Japan's attempt to create monopolistic market in China. Such a one is infinitely preferable to a competitive market so far as the exploiter goes. Hence, in a degree, Germany's demand for colonies.

If Germany wins this war, she is going after raw materials at places and in a manner most suitable to her, and what better available places are there than the British dominions or colonies and Central and South America? The Far East would seem to be out, but not necessarily Africa. Canada is certainly one of the possibilities. To the south of us, a peaceful invasion of years' standing facilitates a more aggressive front.

If these assumptions are reasonable, and they certainly seem so, they obviously involve the Western Hemisphere. And is it going too far, knowing the German approach, to anticipate that at some point force or power will manifest itself? This is certainly true, I think, so far as Canada goes, and I can easily picture the attempt to the south. Naval and air bases in the Carribean are obvious possibilities. Garrisons are not improbable. Any of these eventualities of course run straight into the Monroe Doctrine. If you say that this is getting too remote or far ahead, I say, why not? Desperate things are abroad in our world, as we all know, and why under Heaven should we assume that our part will be free from the desire and will of nations impregnated with the poison of superiority and the virtue of force?

Now if the doctrine is thus challenged, what are we going to do about it? Obviously we must fight if diplomacy fails and the past 3 years have proven that diplomacy will fail if the other side thinks it is more powerful or can work a bluff. Suppose then we must finally fight to keep the Western Hemisphere free—solely as a matter of our own self-protection. What of a Canadian border of 3,000 miles under German control? What of the need of guarding the Pacific and Atlantic coasts? What of the Panama Canal approaches? What, in addition, of the possibility of an actual theater of war several thousand miles away?

England and France are fighting today for their very lives, and they are in this strait because enough people thought that it couldn't happen to them.

I submit, therefore, that from the American point of view, the Monroe Doctrine is decidedly in issue in Europe today. The presence in the political world of relatively friendly nations like England and France, embracing in a general way our own concepts of right and wrong and international good manners, has heretofore rendered the doctrine potent and self-operative, merely by its pronouncement by us, plus, of course, the unwelcome possibility of a war. With this balance of power gone and force in the saddle over great sections of the world's surface, who can say that the doctrine will thus persist in its automatic efficacy? Japan, as we all know, looks with favor on American markets. Is it beyond the possible that she might cooperate with a victorious Germany, in seeking it?

To me the conclusion is inexorable.

The present Embargo Act is acknowledged by all to be potentially helpful to Germany and harmful to England and France. Because, from the foregoing, I hope it is clear that it is to our advantage to aid England and France, the act should be changed to accomplish this effect. Furthermore, in doing so, we obtain on the proposed cash-and-carry basis, a partial restoration of foreign trade. As the most powerful Nation in the world and acknowledged to be such, why must we abandon our right to trade, the case for which has been set forth so cogently by the President. We didn't start this war and we are vitally concerned in free access to foreign markets, and vice versa.

The arguments against any change in the Embargo Act are familiar. They can be briefly stated.

It is urged by millions of voices that to repeal the Embargo Act will, without doubt, lead us into war. This is pure conjecture. It is equally reasonable to assert that it will not lead to war, that it will prevent war. My own feeling is that it will aid the avoidance of war rather than otherwise. But I suggest that war is not the issue before Congress. The one and only issue is, What course of action will be for the ultimate best interest of the United States? Can we really say in the light of the great swings of history and of peoples that no end is worth fighting for; that no cause is worth a struggle of arms? I don't feel that Americans think that.

It is claimed that to now change the law would be unneutral. First, it should be noted that strictly speaking neutrality is simply a word to describe a legal concept, a principle of international law. It is immensely complicated and subject to contract changes. But I have not heard that the proposed methods of sales to belligerents has been attacked as technically unneutral. Neutrality, however, has no virtue in and of itself. It is entirely a matter of national self-interest. It is assumed or rejected as an instrument of foreign policy solely because of its expected effect on the common good. What people really have in mind is that the result of the passage of the proposed law would amount to taking sides and that this might get us into trouble. There is no doubt that at present one side would be more benefited than the other; this might really change overnight. On the general proposition of taking sides I am wholly in agreement that this should not be done unless in pursuit of what we deem our benefit, and in such pursuit, of course, we must take into account the consequences which can be anticipated. To my way of thinking, individual sympathy or interest should have no conclusive place whatever in a sound American foreign policy. Our complex population, if there were no other cause, would be a sufficient reason.

It is clear that only the service of all can warrant the United States in intruding in matters beyond its borders. If that coincides with a general sympathy well and good, but entirely incidental. Thus, while as individuals, many of us may be violently aroused by the destruction of Poland, the threat to the Scandinavian countries by Russia, or the possibility of the conquest of England and France, none of these events by themselves could possibly support any act of intervention or intrusion on our part. Territorial struggles have marked the history of Europe for centuries and may possibly continue to do so but the United States can have no part in the issue of which country shall dominate affairs for the time being, provided, always, that this country is not unduly affected. But if the country is so affected then the whole business of being unneutral has to be appraised in that light.

We must of necessity take sides. To do otherwise is unreal. If we are convinced that the defeat of England and France will be decidedly harmful to our common good, and if, while maintaining a

position of neutrality wholly defensible in international law, the result will be beneficial to our Nation, we are simply fortunate in not having to do more. Under these circumstances there can be no significance to the charge of being unneutral or taking sides. It is only under circumstances where the common good of the United States is not materially affected that the charge of taking sides can be maintained.

While it is characteristic of current thinking to assert that the influence of the United States should at all times be on the side of what we consider good morals, this is far different from the attitude that we should by force be or become international police in affairs that are strictly none of our business examined in the light of our own self-interest. For example, while we might publicly and officially deprecate Japan's assault of China, this is really a local matter unless we can clearly see that we are really involved. The same is true of Italy's capture of Abyssinia.

In summary, I suggest as a matter of considered judgment that the Monroe Doctrine is clearly involved in the war in Europe, because if Germany defeats England and France it is more probable than not that the United States will be called upon to declare a hands-off policy in the Western Hemisphere. If our position is challenged, it must be defended.

Therefore, if this conflict can be averted, it is to our advantage to do so. One act which will tend to avert it is the repeal of the embargo law, which for the moment will aid England and France. This is tantamount to an act of self-defense. If this leads to war, better a war under present conditions than later on when we alone shall face a possibly embattled world.

The situation is none of our making, but, nevertheless, it is as it is and we are in and of it. However we might with all our hearts desire to live and let live, we cannot under all possible conditions attain to this. Therefore, if we would be free, we must be brave.

Reciprocal-Trade Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT GORE
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 27, 1939

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, recently so many statements, unsupported in fact, have been made regarding the operation of the reciprocal-trade agreements by partisan critics, who seemingly close their eyes to the fact that a nation must buy as well as sell, and to the fact that the basis of any real and lasting international peace and friendship is mutually beneficial two-way trade, that I have here prepared answers to certain current questions on trade agreements and their relationship to farmers.

First. Are American farmers better off or worse off under the trade-agreements program than they were under the Hawley-Smoot tariff of 1930?

Answer. Compare the following figures for 1932, under the 1930 tariff, and for 1938 and later periods, under the trade-agreements program, and give your own answer:

	1932	1938	1939
Cash farm income (billions of dollars)[1]	4.6	7.5	[2]7.6
Average farm price index (1909–14=100)	65	95	-------

[1] Excluding Government payments.
[2] Estimated by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, Oct. 24, 1939.

	Year		First 9 months, 1939	Sept. 15, 1939
	1932	1938		
United States monthly average farm prices of:				
Wheat (cents per bushel)	38.8	66.1	59.7	72.7
Corn (cents per bushel)	28.1	49.0	47.4	56.2
Hogs (dollars per 100 pounds)	3.34	7.74	6.55	7.06
Beef cattle (dollars per 100 pounds)	4.25	6.53	6.86	7.07
Butterfat (cents per pound)	17.9	26.3	23.0	24.7
Wool (cents per pound)	8.6	19.1	21.2	24.3

Second. Just how competitive are our agricultural imports?

Answer. Take 1938 for example. In 1938 imports of agricultural products of all kinds were valued at slightly less than $956,000,000. Of this total, one-half were of types such as rubber, coffee, silk, and so forth, not produced in the United States; nearly 30 percent were of types imported over the tariff because the United States did not produce enough of them to meet domestic requirements; 14 percent were accounted for by sugar, imports of which were controlled throughout 1938 by the quotas; and the remaining 7 percent were accounted for by minor miscellaneous items falling in one or another of these groups.

Third. In the trade agreements thus far negotiated, has the United States obtained more concessions for industrial exports than for agricultural exports?

Answer. No. Just the reverse. Including all concessions obtained to date, but using 1937 import figures of the trade-agreement countries as the latest available for such analysis, it appears that the United States has obtained concessions—including bindings of duty-free entry—for 47 percent of its total agricultural exports and for 24 percent of its total nonagricultural exports. Such are the actual facts, in spite of allegations to the contrary. But, in any case, the concessions obtained for nonagricultural exports benefit farmers by creating more employment and more purchasing power in our cities for farm products; just as, in the same way, the concessions obtained for agricultural exports benefit industry by creating more purchasing power on our farms for industrial products.

Fourth. Has the United States made duty reductions on a greater proportion of agricultural than of nonagricultural products?

Answer. No. The United States has granted duty reductions, under trade agreements, on agricultural commodities which, in 1937, made up 14.1 percent of total agricultural imports into the United States in that year. Duty reductions on nonagricultural products granted by the United States cover items which in 1937 made up 21.6 percent of total United States nonagricultural imports in that year. The 14.1 percent referred to above includes Cuban sugar which, in 1937, accounted for 6.6 percent of the total agricultural imports. Imports of sugar, up to September 12, 1939, have been controlled by legislative quotas. Cancelation of these quotas on September 12 automatically restored the duty on Cuban sugar to its preagreement level.

The duty reductions on agricultural products are carefully safeguarded where necessary; and by assisting in a general program of foreign-trade expansion they are helpful, rather than injurious, to American agriculture as a whole.

Fifth. Have the trends in our agricultutral exports and imports since 1932 been favorable or unfavorable for the American farmer?

Answer. On the whole, they have been distinctly favorable. Exports have increased, and that is obviously to the good. Imports have also increased, but this increase has not prevented a marked rise in both farm income and national income; in fact, it was itself partly the result of improved economic conditions which were reflected in rising farm and national income.

The key figures are as follows:

Agricultural foreign trade

[In millions of dollars]

	1932	1937	1938	First 6 months	
				1938	1939
Exports (things actually produced on American farms)	662	797	828	413	268
Imports (one-half of types not produced in United States; remainder competitive in limited degree if at all)	668	1,579	956	477	520

As to exports, it will be observed that the figures in 1937 and 1938 were far above those for 1932. In the first 6 months of 1939 as compared with the same period in 1938, exports declined because of unsettled conditions abroad and, in the important case of cotton, because of the pegging of the American price above the world price.

As to imports, while, as already stated, they have in recent years been well above the 1932 level, so also has farm

income (see I above). It will also be noted that imports have receded from the high level attained in 1937, at which time they reached a high peak owing in part to the effects of the severe droughts of 1934 and 1936, and in part to the fact that 1937 was a relatively prosperous year which led to large increases in imports of agricultural raw materials, mostly of types not produced in this country.

Sixth. How have trade agreements affected exports of farm products?

Answer. Maintaining and reopening foreign markets through trade agreements is definitely assisting farm exports. Exports of farm products to trade-agreement countries have fared much better than have exports to other countries. Comparing 1938 with 1935 (when few trade agreements were in effect), the figures are:

	1935	1938	Percent change
Total agricultural exports	$747,000,000	$827,000,000	+11
To trade-agreement countries	174,000,000	260,000,000	+49
To other countries	573,000,000	567,000,000	−1

While United States exports of all types declined in the first 6 months of 1939 as compared with the same period in 1938, total exports to trade-agreement countries fell only half as much as did exports to other countries.

	First 6 months		Percent decrease
	1938	1939	
Total exports, all commodities	$1,591,000,000	$1,415,000,000	11
To trade-agreement countries	887,000,000	824,000,000	7
To other countries	704,000,000	591,000,000	16

Regulation of Oil Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WESLEY E. DISNEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 27, 1939

ADDRESS BY HON. LEON C. PHILLIPS, GOVERNOR OF OKLAHOMA

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Hon. Leon C. Phillips, Governor of Oklahoma, at the 10th annual meeting of the Independent Petroleum Association of America, Fort Worth, Tex., October 19, 1939:

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, members of the Independent Petroleum Association of America, ladies and gentlemen, I am happy to be here. I always enjoy the hospitality of this great State. Its traditions inspire me. I have great respect and admiration for its citizenship as well as its glorious history. Since this is the greatest oil-producing State in the Nation it is fortunate that this historic meeting should be held here. Here in Texas is the spirit of independence and self-reliance which characterizes the spirit of the great Southwest that I love.

I am happy to meet with the independent oil men of America. Their willingness to risk has discovered for the Nation vast hidden treasures for the benefit of mankind. The independent operator has been and always will be the pioneer of the industry. It was the realization of the wildcatter's dream that made these United States the greatest oil-producing Nation. Some 15 years ago there was great concern that the petroleum reserves would soon be exhausted but his ingenuity, courage, and determination have discovered and made available vast reserves so that now instead of a scarcity of oil we have an abundance. Since 1925 the Nation has produced and consumed twice as much oil as we then thought we had and still we have three times as much reserves as was then calculated to be recoverable. So the problem at this time is not how to find more oil but how to properly produce and use that oil which has been discovered.

It was the discovery of the great oil fields and the rush to produce them that brought about the conservation laws in the various oil-producing States. The sovereign States in the exercise of their police power enacted laws to prevent avoidable waste of this great resource. The Supreme Court of the United States in the Champlin case held that this was a constitutional exercise of power. These laws have been amended from time to time and brought down to date. Experience and sound engineering principles have been incorporated into those laws until now every major oil-producing State in the Nation with one exception has such law. In that State a special session of the legislature will soon be called and at this moment they are working out a law based on these sound principles. I feel sure that they will enact a good law in the near future and that it may then be said that each major oil-producing State has a fine conservation law.

In order to coordinate this police power exercised by each of the sovereign States, the Interstate Oil Compact Commission was established. You are familiar with its organization and its functions. Its meetings furnish a forum for the discussion of the problems of the various States. A study is made of the problems of conservation, and the representatives return to their States with sound recommendations. Of course, each sovereign State may and does exercise its own judgment in solving its problems and in enforcing its laws, but I am happy to say there is a fine spirit of cooperation between the States in this difficult and important undertaking. In addition to the representatives from the compacting States, other oil-producing States from time to time send their representatives to the meetings of the Compact Commission. The interest generated by these meetings has stimulated the conservation program throughout the Nation. In 1939 Arkansas, California, and Michigan enacted conservation statutes. The oil industry subscribes to this conservation movement and gives fine cooperation.

As a result the oil States are getting the job done. The reserves of available oil in sight have constantly increased; oil is being produced under sound engineering practices to insure the largest recovery for the use of civilization. Oil is plentiful. By advanced methods of discovery, production, refining, and transportation the industry is furnishing this valuable product at constantly decreasing prices to the consumer. Gasoline is cheaper in the United States than in any other nation of the world. The Nation need have no fear; the oil industry is ready to answer the roll call in any emergency. There is plenty of oil for the Nation's needs. All this without Government aid or subsidy. There has been no Government edict requiring the prospecting for oil, nor has there been a bonus or subsidy by the Government; yet the oil industry has met the challenge of civilization and is carrying on. I think you might well be proud of this accomplishment, and I congratulate you.

The oil industry has had its trials and tribulations, but now appears to be reasonably prosperous. No doubt there are some, however, who, following the trend of the times, would run to the Government with their problems in the hope and expectation that magic can be performed. They doubtless hope that some legislative legerdemain can be accomplished and they can have the benefits of governmental sleight of hand, overlooking entirely the sad fact that, for benefits promised, intolerable burdens are imposed. Be not deceived; look the situation squarely and fairly in the face. Do not let the Pied Piper of Hamelin lead you astray, for regimentation and bureaucracy must follow as night follows day.

At this meeting you will discuss the many complex problems confronting your industry. One of those problems now confronting you is the question of the position you will take in regard to the regulation of your business by a Federal bureau. There has been introduced in Congress a bill, commonly called the Cole bill, to regulate the production of oil by a national agency. This bill is being studied by Congress. It is being considered by you at this meeting. This organization will be expected at this meeting to approve or disapprove this pending legislation, and you should study the question with utmost care and consideration. I understand that Representative COLE of Maryland, who introduced the measure in Congress, has been invited to address this meeting and will speak to you tomorrow on the subject.

No doubt Representative COLE will tell you that the Secretary of the Interior favors the enactment of the law. Apparently, the Secretary of the Interior is willing to assume the added responsibility imposed upon his office by this law. It will, of course, greatly enlarge the functions, authority, and power of his office. I do not believe there is any necessity for the Federal Government to undertake to do that which the States are doing and have demonstrated they are able to do; namely, prevent avoidable waste in the production of oil. As I have stated, the States do this under their fundamental police power. The National Government is without police power, but the Cole bill asserts as a declaration of policy that to maintain an adequate national defense and regulate interstate commerce it is necessary for Congress to prevent avoidable waste of petroleum products. This bill is purely a conservation bill. The question of market demand or demand and supply is in no way considered. By its terms the bill is an unqualified endorsement of the methods and practices invoked by the oil-producing States in their conservation laws and recommended by the Interstate Oil Compact Commission. The sound engineering principles for the production of oil to prevent waste which are already embodied in the laws of the oil-producing States and in the recommendations of the Interstate Oil Compact

Commission are incorporated in the bill. There is one exception and that is in the provision whereby it is provided in effect that an operator must secure the consent of the Commissioner to abandon and plug a well.

Generally I find no objection to the purposes expressed in the bill. Surely, the prevention of waste of this valuable irreplaceable resource is a worthy purpose. It is generally approved by the industry and the oil-producing States. It is already incorporated in the laws of practically all the oil States. The question which now confronts us is whether or not there is need for Federal legislation on the subject. I subscribe to the view that there is no need for the duplication of effort and expense in the matter. Unless we admit that the States are not preventing avoidable waste surely there is no need to set up a long-range expensive Federal bureau empowered to control the production of oil from every well in every field in the United States. Most of the State laws are superior to the proposed Federal legislation in that they take into consideration the fact that the production of oil in excess of market demand is waste, while the proposed Federal legislation omits entirely consideration of that form of waste. Not only do the States prevent the waste of oil by sound engineering principles, but they consider the reasonable market demand as reflected by the Bureau of Mines' estimate. The States through the Compact Commission have found the Bureau of Mines' estimate helpful in this regard and generally follow these estimates.

Then, too, the State laws are fairer and more equitable than the proposed Federal legislation because they provide for ratable taking, commonly called proration. The States in their laws take cognizance of correlative rights of operators and of the different fields, and in administering the law are bound by equitable principles. In the proposed Federal act the Commissioner is empowered to make rules and regulations to define wasteful methods and practices, which have the force and effect of law. It does not appear that the Commissioner is obliged to consider the correlative rights of the owners of the property or to require ratable taking.

Of course, the enactment of the Cole bill will not destroy the fundamental rights of the States to exercise their police power in the enactment of and enforcing their conservation laws. If enacted into law, this bill would simply furnish an additional policeman to the oil industry. The State government, under its police power, would regulate the production of oil and the Federal Government, under the interstate commerce theory, would likewise regulate. Surely the oil industry would be well regulated. It is conceivable that the State, in the exercise of its sovereign rights, would prescribe certain regulations while the commissioner, the Federal authority, employing a different set of engineers and experts, would prescribe different rules. In such case it will be seen at a glance that the producer would be confronted with quite a trying situation. If he ignored the Federal rule and observed the State rule, he would be subject to heavy penalty. If he ignored the State rule and obeyed the Federal rule, he would be subjected to the penalties provided by the State. Thus, it is possible that he might experience difficulty in faithfully serving two masters. The provisions in the law whereby the Federal commissioner may cooperate with the State authorities is optional with the commissioner. He is only authorized, and not directed, to do so. A real conflict of authority is not only possible but probable.

As I view it, there are many objectionable features in the Cole bill. Like many modern laws, it sets up an appointive official with despotic powers. The appointive official is granted the right to enact legislation by prescribing rules and regulations. These rules and regulations have the force and effect of law and a violation of same or failure to obey any order of this commissioner is punishable by heavy fine or imprisonment or both for each day's violation. By the terms of the bill the pumper, the gager, the superintendent, and the president of the company can each be indicted by the Federal court in any State in the Union and found equally guilty of the same violation. To determine whether any person has violated or is about to violate any provision of the act or any rule of the commissioner, the commissioner is constituted a court of inquiry and may require the accused to give evidence against himself under oath by requiring him to file a statement in writing concerning the matter to be investigated.

The Commissioner is empowered to file a written complaint against a person before himself and after 5 days' notice to try him, and may make findings against him and issue a desist order. The accused has the privilege to appear in person or by counsel and present evidence under such regulations as the Commissioner may prescribe. The rules of evidence prevailing in the courts are not controlling in such hearing. The judgment of the Commissioner is conclusive in all courts if supported by substantial evidence. The Commissioner is permitted to fix the time and place of this hearing as he may elect. It is obvious that it would be most convenient to the Commissioner to have such hearing in Washington, D. C. The only appeal allowed the accused from the rule or order is to the circuit court of appeals. It is provided, however, that this court is bound by the findings of the Commissioner if supported by substantial evidence. The Commissioner may enforce his rules and regulations by injunctions or mandamus in any Federal district court without bond. The bill conveniently provides that the District Court of the District of Columbia shall have jurisdiction of such suits and any persons. Civil or criminal proceeding may be instigated by the Commissioner in any State of the Nation.

By the terms of the bill the Commissioner is vested not only with legislative, judicial, and executive power but he is granted broad discretionary powers. Repeatedly, the bill uses the words, "The Commissioner is authorized and empowered." Nowhere is he directed. It may truly be said that the powers granted to the proposed Commissioner are dictatorial. I do not believe in vesting such unusual powers in any appointive Federal official. Such power if exercised should be kept nearer home. Elected State officials are more responsive to the will of the people.

In my judgment this is a historic meeting. What you do here is of vital importance not only to the oil industry but to the entire Nation. There are many who view with alarm the tendency of the States to surrender their sovereignty. Federal control of the oil industry, of course, is of vital importance to you from a business standpoint. If ever the blight of Federal control is imposed on the oil industry of the Nation, the day of the independent operator has passed and I will never again have the opportunity to see an independent oil operator put down a test well near my home town of Okemah, Okla., to add to the wealth of my State and the Nation. It will likewise result in further centralization of power in the Federal Government and a corresponding surrender of individual liberties. Any Federal oil-control bill would necessarily be a further surrender of rights heretofore reserved to the States. It should be considered from that standpoint as well as from the standpoint of the businessman engaged in the industry. You have in your organization clear-thinking, patriotic minds. I have no doubt that you will approach the subject in a patriotic manner. The eyes of the Nation are upon you.

I thank you.

Cost of the World War, 1914–19

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEWIS D. THILL

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 27, 1939

Mr. THILL. Mr. Speaker, the following data were gathered with a view toward getting some estimate of the cost of the World War.

Statisticians differ in the amounts they specify as World War costs. That the amount of money spent to carry on the last war was tremendous nobody can deny. Many of the disastrous results of the war cannot be measured in dollars and cents, such as the suffering, misery, and heartaches of millions. Other costs can be measured only roughly. Under those circumstances, we must view the following estimates in a tolerant light, realizing full well there cannot be laboratory accuracy and exactness.

THE DIRECT AND INDIRECT COST OF THE WORLD WAR

The net direct cost of the World War has been estimated at $186,233,637,097. According to figures compiled by the Swiss Bank of Geneva, the average daily expenditure for the first 3 years of the war was $123,000,000; during the fourth year this rose to $244,000,000—an hourly cost of $10,000,000. This appalling figure does not include indirect costs of the war such as destruction of property, loss of life, disease, or depreciation of capital which amount to almost that of the direct cost. Nor does it account for the more far-reaching and disastrous effects of race deterioration—both physical and moral—economic disorder and social unrest which cannot be measured in terms of money. The measurable indirect costs of the last war can be outlined briefly as follows:

Capitalized value of human life, including soldiers and civilians	$67,102,552,560
Property losses on land and sea	36,760,000,000
Loss of production	45,000,000,000
War relief	1,000,000,000
Loss to neutrals	1,750,000,000
Total	151,612,552,560

By adding this indirect cost of $151,612,552,560 to the direct cost of $186,233,637,097, we have a total expenditure of $337,846,189,657 as the price exacted by the last World War.

The above information was obtained from Preliminary Economic Studies of the War, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, Oxford University Press, 1920.

DIRECT AND INDIRECT COSTS OF THE WORLD WAR TO THE UNITED STATES

The gross cost of the World War to the United States has been estimated at $32,080,266,968, including advances to the Allies of $9,455,014,125.

The following table gives the estimated indirect costs of the war:

Capitalized value of lives lost	$517,972,800
Expenditures of relief agencies	625,015,028
Loss of property (vessels and cargo)	371,437,650

In addition to the costs listed, there was also a loss of production for each man transferred from civil to military duties. This loss has been estimated at approximately $500 a year per soldier:

Casualties during the period 1914–18 are shown below:

Known dead	107,284
Seriously wounded	43,000
Otherwise wounded	148,000
Prisoners or missing	4,912

This information was obtained from Preliminary Economic Studies of the War, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, Oxford University Press, 1920.

UNITED STATES WORLD WAR COSTS

The following summary of the World War costs to the United States was printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD (vol. 61, pt. 4, p. 3355) of the Sixty-seventh Congress, first session, at the request of the late Senator S. P. Spencer, of Missouri. This table gives the expenses with reference to the authority from which the information was obtained:

Military cost, as per report of Secretary Houston	$24,010,000,000.00
Extra cost of Government functions under war conditions, as per report of Secretary Houston	4,500,000,000.00
Red Cross contributions	978,512,225.00
Other relief contributions to organizations—Salvation Army, Knights of Columbus, Young Men's Christian Association, etc.—estimated at one-half Red Cross	490,000,000.00
Governmental contributions to relief from war supplies, etc. (see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 24, 1921, p. 3181)	648,000,000.00
American citizen claims against Germany, as per report of Secretary of State (see S. Doc. No. 419, 66th Cong., 3d sess.)	221,133,231.21
Confiscated American-owned property in Germany, as per same document	191,147,346.76
Confiscated property of American prisoners in Germany, as per same document	12,560.08
Pension costs, estimated by comparison with Civil War pensions; wounded in Civil War were 246,712 and in World War, 224,089; Civil War pensions up to June 30, 1919, were $5,299,859,509.39 (see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 20, 1921, p. 2908)	5,000,000,000.00
Obligations of foreign governments absorbed in the United States by private interests since Aug. 1, 1914 (see report of Secretary Glass in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 24, 1921, p. 3181)	4,129,820,344.11
Governmental loans to Allies, with interest	10,000,000,000.00
Total	50,168,625,707.16

Capt. Eddie Rickenbacker, America's ace of the air during the World War, has stated that, figuring the cost to the world of the last war as $250,000,000,000, we could have taken that staggering sum, built homes at $2,500 each equipped with $1,000 worth of furniture, built on $500 lots, and given such a home to every family in the United States, England, Scotland, Wales, Ireland, Holland, Belgium, France, Italy, Germany, Russia, and Australia.

To every 40,000 people in those countries could have been given a $2,000,000 library, a $3,000,000 hospital, and a $10,000,000 university. The balance, invested at 5 percent, could have paid annual salaries at $1,000 each to 125,000 teachers and 125,000 nurses.

Such a vast sum of money could have been used to make over the entire world and rid it of so much misery and suffering. It is hoped that the day will come when mankind will turn away from destructive devices and utilize its energy in constructive endeavors.

An Example of Sanity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. HOUSTON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 27, 1939

ARTICLE BY ERNEST K. LINDLEY

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, during these critical days the United States is fortunate indeed in having in the Honorable Harry H. Woodring, of Kansas, as Secretary of War, an official whose influence is characterized as beneficent "on the side of caution and coolness," and under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Ernest K. Lindley, which appeared in the Washington Post of October 27, 1939:

[From the Washington Post of October 27, 1939]

AN EXAMPLE OF SANITY

(By Ernest K. Lindley)

OUR ARMY AND NAVY

One of the more reassuring aspects of the debate over American foreign policy is the sanity which prevails in the War and Navy Departments. This assertion stands in spite of the recent furore over the War Resources Board.

At almost any given moment during the last few years there has been less evidence of war hysteria in the War and Navy Departments than among top-ranking New Dealers in other branches of the Government.

Secretary of War Woodring has turned out to be a persistent opponent of foreign adventures. In the early days of the Roosevelt administration, while he was Assistant Secretary, he was suspected of being a professional patriot, perhaps even a kind of firebrand. He put his name to one or two ill-considered magazine articles. And, of course, he made as strong a case as he could for improving the Army, which was in a bad state.

WOODRING DISPLAYS CAUTION, COOLNESS

He was also eager to please his boss, Franklin D. Roosevelt, to whom he is utterly loyal. But as the European crisis has edged into war, Woodring's influence has been exerted more and more on the side of caution. Frequently his advice has not been taken. For example, he advised against the French airplane deal almost a year ago, and when he saw that the President was determined to go ahead, he urged that it be done publicly. The President chose secrecy instead, and was greatly embarrassed when the arrangement was brought to light by the crash of the bomber which the French were considering buying. The whole affair received 10 times the attention which it would have received if Woodring's advice had been followed.

Although he has worked for a larger, better-equipped, and better-trained Army, Woodring looks upon the Army as a defensive instrument. And he seems to be wholly committed to the idea that our lines of defense should be in the Western Hemisphere, not on the Rhine or the Yangtze. In recent months nobody in the Cabinet has a more beneficent influence on the side of caution and coolness.

Louis Johnson, Assistant Secretary of War, has been more militant, more war-minded. He is by nature a more aggressive man than Woodring, and he is quick, energetic, and ambitious. Yet in the speeches for which he has been criticized by the isolationists he only followed the main line of policy laid down by the White House—where every one of his important utterances was O. K.'d before it was delivered. Johnson's eagerness to cooperate in every way was one of the qualities which made him a favorite with the White House group until a few weeks ago, when he riled the New Deal crowd by the men he picked for the War Resources Board. These selections were approved by the President, however. And it was the President who decided that it was time to play up the industrial mobilization side of national defense—and then changed his mind when he found out that the War Resources Board was being regarded as a sign that he was getting ready to put us in the European war.

JOHNSON TAKES RAP FOR MISCALCULATION

Johnson, like many another lieutenant, has had to take the rap for a miscalculation higher up.

The long-standing feud between Woodring and Johnson is not pleasant to behold and is not conducive to the best administration of the War Department. But the two men complement each other and if Johnson had not been led to believe he would get Woodring's job, they could have made a strong team.

President Roosevelt, who knows more about naval strategy and tactics than probably all of our other Presidents combined, has

been his own Secretary of the Navy. The concern of Acting Secretary Charles Edison has been with the business and organizational sides of the Department. He has stood apart from the whole controversy over foreign policy.

The professional heads of the armed services have been faithful to the tradition that their job is to support our foreign policy, not to make it. In both branches, however, there is a wholesome scarcity of jingoism, and the under-cover influence has been, on the whole, on the side of caution.

Since a precedent for mobilizing a huge Army for overseas service was set in the World War, the Army has to bear in mind the possibility of fighting again on a foreign continent. Its industrial-mobilization plans were originally drawn with a repetition of the World War experience in mind. The recent trend, however, has been toward more flexible industrial mobilization plans, on the theory that, if we get into another war, the main brunt of the fighting will be borne by the Navy and air forces, and that we will need only a small, highly trained Army for protecting our outlying naval bases and as a reserve line of defense.

Continental defense, not adventuring beyond the seas, seems to be the dominant idea in the Army.

The Navy is less isolationist. It must think always with reference to the other great navies. It has roots in maritime trade and imperialistic ambitions. For years it has been educating officers in far eastern affairs, through service in the Asiatic Squadron and the Yangtze patrol. The Navy is accustomed to looking to East and West instead of North and South. Consequently, it hasn't done or thought much about the defense of the Western Hemisphere below the Equator.

Arms Embargo Should Not Be Repealed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT J. ENGEL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 27, 1939

LETTER OPPOSING THE REPEAL OF THE ARMS EMBARGO

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter received by me from a Polish Catholic priest, a friend of mine. The father wrote me this letter which represented my own views so well and demonstrates that Americans of Polish descent are not hyphenated Americans but real Americans whose Americanism comes first, I asked his permission to insert this letter in the RECORD. He gave me that permission, but because he had no desire for publicity he asked me to withhold his name. This I have done. The letter follows:

OCTOBER 10, 1939.

The Honorable ALBERT J. ENGEL,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ENGEL: Maybe you have wondered that I didn't express my opinion, or rather conviction, on the present neutrality bill, with embargo clause. The reason is that I desired to acquaint better. I have studied the matter, and my opinion is now a conviction that the Honorable Senators VANDENBERG, BORAH, NYE, JOHNSON, etc., are more interested in peace and America, than in the suspicions, hatreds, and battles of Europe.

We know from history that Europe never has been living in peace. The people there don't know the meaning of that word. That's why Washington, Von Steuben, Lafayette, Kosciuszko, and others came here, because Europe looked hopeless to them. That's why many of our immigrants, our fathers and forefathers came here; because they do not want to hate and fight, but to live and let live in peace.

Naturally my sympathies are with Poland, the land of my parents and forefathers, but my patriotism and loyalty belong to the United States. Why should the United States help Poland, Germany, England, or any other nation? I hope we have not, so soon, forgotten the lesson of the last World War. The world fought in vain, as every fight is futile; it settles nothing. War only stirs people to a frenzy; and how, for God's sake, can one in a frenzy think clearly or sanely? That's what the warmongers are again trying to do. They are merely working upon the sentiments, sensibilities, and weaknesses of the people. But, thank God, we still have honest, clear-thinking leaders of men, who will not be swept off their feet or knocked silly, either by the rattle of guns nor the outbursts of the agents of warmongers or propagandists. I sometimes wonder if the finger of God is not again visiting mankind. Christ came to bring "Peace to men of good will"; chaos is the devil's child. There is no good will. There is too much hatred, jealousy, and bitterness in the world. How then will our selling ammunition, implements of war, foodstuff, etc., to warring nations (or their Allies) bring about peace, as the proponents of the embargo repeal contend? It's so silly to me. But maybe we American people are supposed to be dupes, suckers for half-truths, propaganda, and sophistry. No; let's get at the bottom of things and take care of our own troubles here, before we act as a big brother or policeman towards Europe.

The above is my honest conviction, Mr. ENGEL, and is not intended at all to influence your honest conviction. I know it is only one of the many letters you have received.

With sincerest personal regards,

———.

The State of the Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE E. HANCOCK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 27, 1939

ADDRESS BY HON. CHARLES A. EATON, OF NEW JERSEY

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Hon. CHARLES A. EATON, of New Jersey, before the Good Government Club, Somerville, N. J., on Thursday evening, October 26, 1939:

The Good Government Club of Somerset County, through its leader, Mr. Grover Kipsey, has asked me to speak tonight upon The State of the Nation as viewed from Washington.

Within the limits of a brief address it is impossible to do more than sketch in barest outlines one or two of the more fundamental problems now confronting our people, and to present what seems to be the most reasonable among a host of contradictory proposals offered for the solution of these problems.

The first of these urgent problems has to do with our inescapable relations as a great and powerful Nation with the rest of the world. The second concerns our domestic well-being.

We find ourselves today in what, for want of a better term, we may call a World Age. During the nineteenth and twentieth centuries the revolutionary achievements of science as applied to the forces and resources of nature for the service of man, not only have profoundly changed the economic and social conditions of the individual citizen, but have created a new and complicated framework for civilization itself. For the first time in history all nations and communities are now in complete and continuous contact. Time and distance are practically annihilated. No movement, incident, or idea of interest or importance but becomes almost instantly the common property of mankind. The world is shrunken to a neighborhood. No region is left unexplored. It is now impossible for human beings anywhere to isolate themselves from contact with the rest of the world. Commerce flows from country to country, and continent to continent in ever-increasing value and volume. Airplanes shuttle back and forth across all international boundaries. Vast migrations of peoples have brought varying moral standards and mental levels with new contacts and conflicts. Under these conditions no nation can live or die unto itself.

This progressive creation of a New World civilization unified upon principles of peace, justice, good will, and friendly cooperation among classes, communities, and nations was shattered to its foundations by the World War of 1914, which was without doubt the greatest single calamity that has ever befallen mankind. The whole world, including America, is still wallowing in the backwash of that suicidal struggle, and a hundred years will not suffice to heal its material wounds or rebuild its spiritual ruins.

The moral collapse, the mental confusion, the economic and political chaos resulting from the World War made possible the rise to power of a hydra-headed plan of life which now threatens to destroy what is left of civilization in Europe and which challenges every principle of liberty, right, and justice believed in and practiced by the free peoples of the world. Communism, which produced a Stalin, and nazi-ism, which produced a Hitler, are simply two sides of the same thing. Both are mortal enemies of every form of freedom, of democratic self-government, and of the Christian religion. Both rest upon fear and force. Stalinism breeds class hatreds. Nazi-ism breeds racial hatreds. The announced objective of both is world domination, to be achieved by propaganda, by diplomatic deceit, and bluffing where possible; by armed force and ruthless warfare when necessary, as in the destruction of Poland and the present war with England and France.

Our attitude, as a nation, toward this world-wide confusion and conflict constitutes our foreign policy. On our fundamental principles our people of all breeds, creeds, classes, interests, parties, and sections are united as never before, for the soundest of reasons—moral, economic, and political. We are opposed to war as an instru-

ment for the settlement of international disputes, and we are resolutely determined to take no armed part in the present war.

This attitude of our Government and people is nothing new. After the World War we held disarmament conferences and even went so far in the cause of peace as to scuttle a substantial portion of our own Navy.

We entered into solemn covenants with many of the nations of the world, in which they and we agreed to renounce war forever as a means for the settlement of international disputes. We loaned vast sums of money to help other nations build up an economy of peaceful trade and commerce. During his entire term of office our Secretary of State, Mr. Hull, has with indifferent success sought to pave the way for world peace by setting up trade agreements between our country and other nations.

In 1935, Congress passed the so-called neutrality law, which with subsequent amendments in following years placed an embargo on arms, ammunition, and implements of war and drastically curtailed the rights and liberties of our citizens, which they had hitherto always enjoyed under recognized international law. It was an act without parallel in history for the strongest nation in the world to thus deliberately abandon its neutral rights recognized for hundreds of years under international law, and virtually turn over the seven seas to the absolute control of foreign nations who happened to be at war. Whatever may be said as to the methods employed, the motives behind this law were beyond reproach.

As a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, I sat through the hearings, helped in the preparation of this law, and voted for it on the floor of the House. I did this because of my sympathy with the wholesome moral revulsion of the American people against the idea of profiting by the sale of weapons for the destruction of human beings. But I did not believe then, and I do not believe now that a mere statute law will put us into war or keep us out of war. In my judgment nothing could be more unjust or contrary to the truth than to say that a vote for or against the legislation now pending in Congress is a vote for or against the involvement of our country in the present European war. Countries ruled by dictators go to war when their masters decide they must. Free nations like America go to war when the people are convinced that their rights and liberties are endangered. If the Senate bill when it reaches its final form in the House carries dangerous delegations of discretion and power to the President, and shuts our shipping off the seven seas, I shall vote against it. If these provisions are substantially modified, I shall vote for the bill.

Regardless of the present or any other statute neutrality law, there are certain grim realities which as a Nation we must be prepared to face with courage, wisdom, and unflinching resolution.

World expenditures for armament have risen from 3.8 billions in 1932 to 17.5 billions in 1938. Most of this vast treasure was spent by Russia, Germany, and Italy, although England and France were forced to spend on armaments three and a half times as much in 1938 as they did in 1934, and they have only got started on this ruinous waste of treasure.

Here in America we, too, are now forced to incur enormous armament expenditures. No matter what the cost for the protection of this Western Hemisphere, we must create a navy equal or superior to any in the world. We must create an equally effective air force, and our land defenses must be enormously increased. This is the burden that Mr. Stalin and Mr. Hitler have placed upon the American taxpayers.

Our most urgent problems lie in the Pacific. If Russia rescues China from Japan, communism will sweep Asia. If Japan becomes the oriental overlord, as is her purpose, we shall face an equally dangerous challenge to our economic and national safety.

When the present European war ends, and we pray that the end may come soon, it will be our duty as the strongest free nation left in the world to lead in finding a basis for peace among the distracted European peoples which shall give them a reasonable opportunity for economic prosperity and political stability.

With these and countless other dangerous and difficult questions before our country, I am convinced that Congress ought to remain in session so that the judgment and will of the people may register directly through their representatives in all the momentous decisions which the President, as our Chief Executive, will have to make.

In the brief time allotted me, I can only make a passing reference to our most urgent and important domestic problems. This war scare has served for the time at least, as a complete blackout of conditions here at home. The fog may hide the abyss from our view for the moment, but the danger is still there. We need to take a good long look at ourselves, free from the glamour of experimental politics and wishful thinking. After all, the best insurance against involvement in war abroad is good government, prosperity, and peace at home.

We must admit that since the World War we have failed to work successfully the institutions of our country. We have wrapped the individual citizen in the grave clothes of Government support and control, entirely totalitarian in method and purpose, and by so doing we have softened his moral fiber, confused his thinking, and undermined his native courage, initiative, and self-reliance. The Army of the unemployed is the only arm that we have to face. The most gigantic public debt in all peacetime history, mounting taxes, continuing deficits, lowered standards of living, industrial strife, agricultural distress, class hatreds, unequal and inequitable distribution of wealth, increasing unbelief in and disloyalty toward the fundamental principles of our American system—these are the enemies already within our gates which must be faced and mastered if we are to keep our place in the forefront of civilization.

I cannot, if I would, deceive myself as to the reality of these conditions. Nor am I willing to deceive my people with soft words about these hard facts.

Rather I would sound tonight the battle cry for a new courage; a new fighting spirit among our people. Let us quit jousting windmills, chasing shadows, squabbling over unessentials and secondaries. Let us renew our faith in ourselves, our country, and our God. Let us rededicate ourselves afresh to those great ideals which have made America the hope of the world; God's best gift of opportunity to the common man. Our heroic fathers, barehanded, with invincible courage wrested this wilderness continent from savage men and savage beasts and cemented with their blood the foundations of our great Republic. That is our heritage. We have the manpower, the brains and character and material resources to solve every national problem, to meet and master every natural foe and thus assure for ourselves and our children free and full enjoyment of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Affiliation of Government Employees With Communist Party Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 27, 1939

ARTICLE BY DAVID LAWRENCE

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by David Lawrence which was printed in the Washington Star of yesterday:

[From the Washington Evening Star]

CONGRESS CAN END "FRONT" IN GOVERNMENT—HOLDS PURSE STRINGS OF MEMBERS IN EMPLOY OF UNITED STATES

(By David Lawrence)

Officials of the Government who have just been disclosed to be members of what the Dies committee unanimously terms a "Communist-front" organization may soon face a choice between continued membership or loss of their respective jobs.

It is a simple thing to introduce and probably as easy to have Congress vote at its January session an amendment to any current appropriation bill which shall provide explicitly that none of the funds may be used to pay salaries of Government employees affiliated directly or indirectly with Communist Party activities.

Such a proposal would be in line with the restrictions already placed upon Government employees under the Hatch law. The latter statute plainly deprived Government employees of privileges enjoyed as to party politics by private citizens generally, but the constitutional authority for such a step is the well-established principle that Uncle Sam, as an employer, may impose any restrictions or qualifications he pleases upon those in Government posts.

OFFERED A CHOICE

Anyone who dislikes the restrictions is at liberty, of course, to resign and get another job thereafter and keep his membership in the Communist Party or any other organization of a radical type.

The Dies committee, of course, has been none too popular from the outset of its hearings with the so-called liberals in government, who have felt that the committee was using the Communist argument as a smoke screen against them for their left-wing beliefs and doctrines. But the Dies committee has assailed Fascist and right-wing organizations with vigor, too, so that it has become a matter now of a battle against "isms" as such.

The committee may or may not be going too far in its implications that members of a Communist-influenced organization or those on a mailing list are to be held up to criticism, but the committee's point is that members of the American League for Peace and Democracy—the organization in question—have had since last January to detach themselves from a league whose connection with the Communists was unanimously held by committee members to be proved.

HOSTILE CONGRESS SEEN

Some advocates of freedom of opinion will insist that individual liberty is to a certain extent circumscribed by what the committee has done, but whether they are right or wrong as to abstract or concrete acceptance of communistic philosophy by individuals outside the Government, there can be no doubt about the probable mood of Congress so far as persons employed by the Government itself.

The appointment to a Government position carries with it a necessary separation from private interests of all kinds, and it would seem to be inevitable that some legislation barring from the Government any one connected with the communistic organizations or their affiliates will very soon be adopted by Congress.

Influence of Minority Groups on Legislative Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFTON A. WOODRUM
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, October 27, 1939

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I herewith attach a letter from Bushrod Washington to his distinguished brother George Washington, and George Washington's reply. The subject under discussion was the advisability or propriety of organizing minority groups or committees for the purpose of influencing legislative action.

LETTER FROM BUSHROD WASHINGTON TO GEORGE WASHINGTON

We have lately instituted a society in these lower counties called the Patriotic Society. As it is something new, and there are a few men both good and sensible who disapprove of it, it will be a high gratification to me to know your sentiments of it, if you will be so kind as to communicate them. The object of the institution is to inquire into the state of public affairs; to consider in what the true happiness of the people consists, and what are the evils which have pursued, and still continue to molest us; the means of attaining the former and escaping the latter; to inquire into the conduct of those who represent us and to give them our sentiments upon those laws which ought to be or are already made.

It will also be a considerable object to instill principles of frugality into the minds of the people, both by precept and example. If any real good should result from such a society, we hope similar ones will be generally instituted through the State; and if so, they may establish a very formidable check upon evil-disposed men who, clothed with power, make interested motives and not public good the rule of their conduct. These are the general outlines of the institution; and, whether in the event it may be beneficial or not, I think that it has taken its rise in virtuous motives. We have had a considerable meeting of the most sensible and respectable gentlemen in this part of the country, and another is to be held on Tuesday next, previous to the meeting of the assembly. Our design is to hold another as soon as the assembly has risen, the first to instruct our delegates what they ought to do, the next to inquire what they have done.

BUSHFIELD, *September 27.*

The following is George Washington's reply:

TO BUSHROD WASHINGTON

MOUNT VERNON, *30 September, 1786.*

DEAR BUSHROD: I was from home when your servant arrived, and found him in a hurry to be gone when I returned. I have company in the house, and am on the eve of a journey up the river to meet the directors of the Potomac Company. These things combining will not allow me time to give any explicit answer to the question you have propounded.

Generally speaking, I have seen as much evil as good result from such societies as you describe the constitution of yours to be. They are a kind of imperium in imperio, and as often clog as facilitate public measures. I am no friend to institutions, except in local matters, which are wholly or in a great measure confined to the county of the delegates. To me it appears much wiser and more politic to choose able and honest representatives, and leave them, in all national questions to determine from the evidence of reason, and the facts which shall be adduced, when internal and external information is given to them in a collective state. What certainty is there that societies in a corner or remote part of a State can possess that knowledge, which is necessary for them to decide on many important questions that may come before an assembly? What reason is there to expect that the society itself may be accordant in opinion on such subjects? May not a few members of this society, more sagacious and designing than the rest, direct the measures of it to private views of their own? May not this embarrass an honest, able delegate, who hears the voice of his country from all quarters, and thwart public measures?

These are first thoughts, but I give no decided opinion. Societies, nearly similar to such as you speak of, have lately been formed in Massachusetts, but what has been the consequence? Why, they have declared the Senate useless, many other parts of the Constitution unnecessary, salaries of public officers burthensome, etc. To point out the defects of the Constitution, if any existed, in a decent way was proper enough; but they have done more. They first vote the courts of justice in the present circumstances of the State oppressive; and next by violence stop them; which has occasioned a very solemn proclamation and appeal from the Governor to the people. You may say no such matters are in contemplation by your society. Granted. A snowball gathers by rolling. Possibly a line may be drawn between occasional meetings for special purposes, and a standing society to direct with local views and partial information the affairs of the Nation, which cannot be well understood but by a large and comparative view of circumstances. Where is this so likely to enter as in the General Assembly of the people? What figure then must a delegate make, who comes there with his hands tied, and his judgment forestalled? His very instructors, perhaps, if they had nothing sinister in view, were they present at all the information and arguments, which would come forward, might be the first to change their sentiments.

Hurried as this letter is, I am sensible that I am writing to you upon a very important subject. I have no time to copy, correct, or even peruse it; for which reason I could wish to have it or a copy returned to me. I am, &c.

G. WASHINGTON.

The above correspondence may be found in The Writings of Washington, by Sparks, volume 9, pages 198–199.

"Red" Milkmen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE E. GEYER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, October 27, 1939

EDITORIAL FROM THE CHICAGO DAILY NEWS OF OCTOBER 5, 1939

Mr. GEYER of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Chicago Daily News of October 5, 1939. It should be of interest to all at this particular time.

[From the Chicago Daily News of October 5, 1939]

"RED" MILKMEN

"Last night I saw upon the stair
A little man who wasn't there.
He wasn't there again today.
Oh, how I wish he'd go away!"

The full extent of the "red" peril which menaces Chicago is revealed by the Dies committee seizure of records of the Communist Party, indicating that the Communists have a Chicago sucker list numbering some 2,000. This is not an alarming total, considering that Chicago is a community of more than 3,000,000 inhabitants; but a break-down of the list is full of horrendous implications. By far the biggest occupation representation is among the milkmen.

Consider, then, if you are a Chicago householder, the probabilities that a Communist may be sneaking up your back stairs in the dark of every dawn, invading the sanctity of your home, familiarizing himself with the lay of the land, and jotting down memoranda concerning such military objectives as garbage cans, ash heaps, and clothesline posts.

Does the Dies revelation mean that we must change our concept of the milkman? We hope not. We have always regarded him as one of the minor blessings of the capitalist system, a sort of miracle man, a good fairy who slipped up back stairs while folk were asleep and left a precious gift. To millions of city children who have never seen a cow, the milkman must be the personification of that gentle and beneficent animal. The love that country children have for bossie was admirably expressed by Robert Louis Stevenson:

"The friendly cow, all red and white,
I love with all my heart;
She gives me cream with all her might
To eat with apple tart."

City moppets didn't know much about cows. They do know about milkmen. Had Stevenson been writing a generation later for urban youngsters—a Child's Urbs-in-Horto of Verses, so to speak—we feel sure that he would have glorified the milkman, not the cow. He would have written:

"The milk-y man, all red and white * * *"

Or, perhaps, in view of the Dies committee's revelations, he might have said:

"The milk-y man, all red * * *"

Somehow we just can't bring ourselves to view the milkman as a "red" menace or an agent provocateur. We will continue, despite Mr. DIES, to think of him as a good fairy, the ambassador of bovine good will. We will think of him as the envoy extraordinary of the moo-cow, not of Moscow.

Regulation of the Bituminous Coal Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. C. ARTHUR ANDERSON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 27, 1939

ADDRESS BY HON. CHESTER THOMPSON

Mr. ANDERSON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, on October 17 a distinguished former Member of this body, Hon. Chester Thompson, of Illinois, delivered an address to the annual convention of the Mississippi Valley Association in St. Louis, Mo. I ask unanimous consent, under leave to extend my remarks, that Mr. Thompson's fine address be printed in the RECORD.

The address is as follows:

Without a constant and unfailing supply of energy no commerce or industry can exist in this or any other nation of the world. Without it civilization, our very living, would be impossible; so it is natural that we should be vitally interested in any and all matters affecting an important—in fact, the most important—source of energy. That is why, in the wise judgment of the leaders of this fine organization, a discussion of bituminous coal is having what might be properly termed, in the language of the theater and circus folks, "top billing" at this convention or annual meeting.

Those of us who are interested in the success of river transportation cannot overlook the importance of soft coal in the channels of such transportation and its effect upon those communities and those industries which have a right to look to water transportation of their energy sources, as well as their other raw materials and finished products, in their efforts to compete in the markets—all of the markets—of this country and of the world.

Many new and fine industrial plants have been built in recent years in locations where water transportation is available, for the same reasons that our forefathers built the great cities of the United States where such form of transportation was accessible. Community life has benefited by such placement of new plants and businesses, as well as by the expansion of existing facilities—new homes, new schools, new retail businesses have been substantially added to existing cities and towns along the navigable streams of the Nation. The threat to wipe out any advantages that low-cost water transportation affords such communities, be they large or small, will be, and is so regarded by all thinking businessmen as being, a real danger demanding the entire attention of all who are in a position to do something about it. The very economic existence of some industrial centers located on the rivers of the Middle West is seriously threatened by the proposal of the Federal Government to establish minimum prices on soft coal under the so-called Guffey Coal Act of 1937, now being administered by the Bituminous Coal Division of the United States Department of the Interior.

To say that it is alarming that such a small number—comparatively speaking, at least—of businessmen and industrial leaders seem to realize the far-reaching effects of the Coal Act is understatement. In an effort to bring the importance of this question to the attention of those in attendance here and through them to the "folks back home," I will devote the balance of the time allotted me to a discussion of the history of coal legislation, to the efforts—yes, the futile efforts—that have been made to put it into effect, and to the result, if such efforts be successful. upon business and industry of the great Mississippi Valley.

During the World War days of 1917 and 1918 we had a Federal Fuel Administrator (as a war measure, of course), whose duty it was to conserve the coal resources of the Nation, to see that those industries working on war necessities had ample supplies of coal, and to regulate the top or maximum price of coal for both industrial and domestic uses. Unquestionably this was necessary, and I do not know of anyone in the coal industry or elsewhere who complained much about such governmental control of a basic industry as strictly a war measure.

If war again comes to us, undoubtedly some similar arrangement will have to be made in order to conserve the coal resources of the Nation and guarantee, as far as is possible, the proper supply of this all-important fuel to those most needing it for the successful defense of the United States, and at the same time see that the domestic needs of our people are taken care of at a reasonable price. War naturally changes everything; in fact, constitutional government is practically set aside, and all are expected to devote their every energy to the success of it. And in this we Americans have never failed and never will.

The first peacetime effort to fix prices and control the coal industry by governmental mandate came under the ill-fated N. R. A. of 1933. Of course, under that law the coal-code authorities were set up to determine costs and selling expenses, and thus fix prices. The soft-coal industry had been losing money during the late twenties and early thirties, so the fixed prices under the N. R. A. codes, with the increased business that came in the late 1933 and in 1934, looked good to many coal operators—in other words, they had "tasted of the apple." It should be pointed out, however, that under the coal codes of the N. R. A. there was no frozen-price condition, and operators entered into term contracts with consumers, distributors, and jobbers. When the coal codes "blew up" and the act itself was thrown out by the Supreme Court in the Schechter case, there was a complete collapse of price fixing, and no more contracts were consummated at prices and under conditions that satisfied either the producers or the consumers. To say that chaos prevailed in the basic industry of soft coal is putting it mildly. But the seed was planted, and so it was little wonder that the Congress was asked to enact the first Guffey Coal Act, better known as the Snyder-Guffey Act of 1935. This measure contained provisions relating to labor used in the mining of coal, and in a short time it was also declared unconstitutional on the grounds that the mining of coal itself did not constitute interstate commerce, and therefore was beyond the power of Congress to regulate. This happened in 1936, and an effort was made in the closing days of Congress of that year to pass another coal law without the labor provisions, but it failed in the Senate of the United States, and the Seventy-fourth Congress adjourned sine die without any valid coal-control legislation on the statute books of the Nation.

After the elections of 1936 and the convening of the Seventy-fifth Congress in January of 1937, a new bill similar in practically every respect to the one that failed in the previous Congress was introduced, and, with little or no active opposition, passed, and became law on April 26, 1937, upon the signature of the President. That is the present law, and since that date efforts have been made to carry out the purposes thereof, with no success as yet, but with millions of dollars of expense to the consumers and the operators, as well as to the Government itself. In other words, the whole affair has been a headache to all having anything to do with it, and it will be worse than a headache to consumers if it ever does become effective and minimum prices are established and sustained.

Since July 1, the Coal Act of 1937 has been administered by the Bituminous Coal Division of the Department of the Interior. I am generous in employing the word "administered." The Coal Division is successor to the lately dissolved National Bituminous Coal Commission. The transferral of authority was a part of the President's program of administrative readjustments under the Reorganization Act of 1939. The Guffey Act sets up an elaborate machinery of 23 expensive district boards, and remaps the country into "marketing areas."

These district boards are elected in the 23 districts by producers upon a tonnage basis, and by representatives of labor. Their expenses, including attorney's fees, are borne by assessment against the tonnage produced by companies and individuals in such districts. Generally speaking, the assessments have amounted to more than 1 cent per ton. This is in addition to the 1-cent-per-ton Federal excise tax levied by the Coal Act itself and collected upon every ton of coal produced for domestic or industrial purposes in the United States. It should be noted that the soft coal industry is the only business in the United States that is subjected to a special tax for its own regulation and policing by a Government agency.

Beginning in April of 1937, the now defunct and abandoned National Bituminous Coal Commission worked on a set of coal prices and attempted to put them into effect on December 16 of that year. There was a furious storm of protest. Many consumers, communities, and railroads, as well as producers, went to court, and the Commission got "cold feet" and withdrew such prices in February of 1938. They had been in effect only 72 days.

The Commission then continued its processes of attempting to have the district boards promulgate prices and coordinate prices among various districts from which coal flowed into common consuming markets. The law contemplates that the district boards themselves should do the coordinating of prices, but in this they utterly failed. The result has been that the Coal Commission was obliged to take over such work before setting prices for final hearings, as provided in the law. Even before the Commission did publish such prices, the order for its abolition was issued by the President and approved by Congress, and since July 1 the Coal Division in the Interior Department has been working on the problem.

The Coal Division began hearings before a board of examiners on July 24 of this year, and at that time intimated that the hearings would not last more than 3 or 4 weeks. They are still going strong, and attorneys and others familiar with the processes and procedure do not hesitate to say that such hearings are slightly more than one-third complete, certainly not more than one-half, even today. Now this means that minimum prices cannot be proclaimed under the act until at least after January 1. Doesn't this seem to prove conclusively the impossibility of fixing minimum prices by Government mandate? Especially is this belief strengthened when it is recalled that one or another agency of Government has been working—rather, playing—with price fixing since the early part of 1937, with no tangible results other than prolonging a distressed, chaotic condition inflicted upon an industry all-important and wholly vital to our national economy by the uncertainty and inflexibility of the operation of this ridiculous law.

The crux of the statutory abomination is without a doubt the provision that minimum prices shall reflect the relative market values of all sizes and qualities of coal, taking into account transportation methods and charges and their effects upon a reasonable

opportunity to compete on a fair basis, and at the same time preserve as nearly as possible existing fair competitive opportunities with due regard to the interest of the consuming public. It is fair to point out that practically all other attempts at governmental price fixing were in the direction of fixing maximum or ceiling prices, but that under the present Coal Act the effort is confined entirely to the fixing of minimum prices or the fixing of a floor below which coal prices cannot fall. There is a provision in the statute about maximum prices, but maximum prices cannot be established or fixed under this law until after minimum prices are determined and published, for such maximum prices must bear a definite relationship to the minimum prices. It is mentioned in the statute that prices must, in addition to reflecting relative market values, be just and equitable among producers in a single district and between producers in districts whose commodity meets in a common consuming marketing area.

The law further provides that the Coal Division shall fix the tipple price of bituminous coal, commonly called f. o. b. mine price; and in order to meet the other provisions of the law that coal must flow into common marketing areas upon a relative-value basis, the transportation of coal therefore becomes a most vital factor in determining the f. o. b. mine price. In other words, if a mine is located, say, 300 miles from a certain market, it would probably carry a freight charge of maybe $2.50 a ton; whereas a mine less than a hundred miles from the same market would only have to add a freight charge of $1 a ton. Assuming that these coals are the same in analyses—have the same burning qualities, the same amount of ash, and practically the same number of B. t. u.'s—the coal at the nearby mine would, under the interpretation placed upon the law by those charged with administering it, have to be increased $1.50 per ton f. o. b. mine in order to meet the requirements of the law.

It will be immediately seen that this is the application, pure and simple, of the now discredited Pittsburgh-plus system, about which so much complaint was made many years ago in the steel industry. It will also be observed that this practice, if it becomes effective, totally destroys the benefits accruing to any business or industry, as well as to any mine owner or employee thereof, because of proximity to market. Many large industries have been built close to good coal fields because of the advantage of obtaining fuel at low costs, principally because of the small amount of transportation involved, and if this Coal Act is permitted to stand as it is all of those advantages will be completely destroyed, and naturally the investments made therein practically dissipated.

The transportation of soft coal has reached major importance in the waterways system of the Nation, as it has long been important in the matter of intercoastal shipping. Hence it is obvious that this grcup must be vitally interested in the administration of any law that seeks to destroy the advantages of cheap water transportation to communities and industries situated so as to reap the advantages of low-cost water-borne transportation.

I do not have the exact amount of coal, in tons, that has moved on the inland-waterways system of the Nation during the last year, but I do know that it is substantially increasing each and every year, and that thousands and thousands of barges of coal have moved out of West Virginia, Pennsylvania, Kentucky, and Ohio into the Ohio River, destined to practically all sections of the United States. Likewise, hundreds of thousands of tons of coal have come from the fields of Illinois, Indiana, and other States adjacent to the waterways system of the country. Many large expenditures of funds have been made not only by the water carriers themselves but also by communities, industries, and coal dealers along the rivers in building and maintaining special facilities for the economical handling of coal by barge. To destroy these is practically to wipe out the investments and otherwise seriously to handicap those cities and towns which have seen fit to spend their money in order to obtain soft coal, their principal source of energy, at a reasonable price, in turn permitting them to compete in the markets of America and of the whole world with their commodities, because of low-cost energy.

I mentioned the fact that the crux of the Coal Act is that question of relative market value. Unfortunately, Congress did not clearly define it in the organic Coal Act, and many variant interpretations have thus been placed upon the language. It is contended by some that there is no difference in coal, whether it move to market by rail, by truck, or by water carrier—in other words, "coal is coal." A careful analysis of this situation definitely reveals that this is not a fact; that there is a distinct difference in the relative value of coal because of the means employed to carry it to market. For instance, coal that is transported by water gets extra handling because it must be moved, usually by rail, from the tipple to the coal dock, which results in breaking, consequently changing the sizes and classifications of such coal. In order to handle coal economically by water it must be done by barge, which means larger storage facilities and, as I have pointed out, generally expensive unloading equipment. The fact is that water transportation while cheaper is much slower, and therefore exposes the fuel to the elements for a greater length of time; for when coal is piled in a barge perhaps for several weeks, it thereby causes heating to take place, which results in some deterioration of fuel energy. For this reason, those who desire to ship coal by water transportation are entitled to lower rates and thus to cheaper coal in any market into which that coal can be economically placed by reason of water facilities.

Fortunately, there are substantial numbers of producers in every coal-bearing State of the Union who earnestly oppose the principles of the Coal Act; who believe that the industry should be permitted to work out its own problems without interference by government. The fact that bituminous coal has lost a large tonnage to competing fuels, such as oil, natural gas, and hydroelectric power, has apparently been overlooked or disregarded by those individuals who sponsored, and are now supporting, the so-called Guffey Coal Act. If the coal industry is to survive and meet the inroads made on it by these competing forms of energy, it must be given a free hand to meet competitive conditions as they exist in different sections of the country and in different markets. Nor can the industry be tied down to a horizontal price, fixed by a bureau in Washington, without any apparent regard for many of the real problems of mining, transporting, and consuming coal. Those opponents of the existing act to whom I refer have formed an organization, with headquarters in Washington, the Committee for Amendment of the Coal Act, for whom I speak. They are actively engaged in promoting amendments to the Coal Act which will do away with all price fixing and the costly machinery therefor, including the extravagant district boards, the tax on coal, and, more important, the expense of being obliged to defend themselves against unsound, unfair, and inequitable orders, proclamations, and ukases of an agency of their Government charged with the dictatorial control of their business.

The program of this group is embodied in a bill (H. R. 6325) introduced in the House of Representatives by Representative ROBERT G. ALLEN, of Pennsylvania, which is now pending before the House Committee on Ways and Means. They believe that this bill, if enacted into law, will save the bituminous-coal industry from almost total destruction, or at least from complete socialization and regimentation, and will preserve the markets for soft coal against the inroads being made by other fuels.

The Allen bill will completely remove any semblance of the Pittsburgh-plus system of pricing coal which, without a doubt, is most detrimental to water transportation of the Nation.

It will give a minimum of governmental control over the industry through the approval of prices proposed by marketing agencies authorized to be set up as the need may present itself. The bituminous coal industry will be given a free opportunity further to develop its own business, to continue its vast employment of a minimum of half a million American citizens, and further to serve the consuming public of the Nation by research work looking for additional uses of soft coal.

The Committee for Amendment of the Coal Act is thankful for the interest that the Mississippi Valley Association has taken in the current coal hearings now going on in the Nation's Capital, and is exceptionally pleased that the officers of your organization saw fit to intervene in these proceedings. This action on your part naturally costs time and money; but if the present coal act is permitted to stand such expenditure will be more or less continuous, because consumers and producers alike will be obliged to maintain a constant guard in Washington to preserve and protect their rights in the matter of coal prices.

Wouldn't it be much better to eliminate by congressional action all reference to price-fixing and let a great industry, which through the years has proved its ability to supply the demands of American industry and the American people with fuel at a reasonable price, conduct its own business?

Let us hope, therefore, that the active support of your powerful organization will be continued in an effort to accomplish the enactment of the Allen bill, and to do away with all the many objectionable features of experimentation with the price-fixing of a basic fuel upon a national basis.

Neutrality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. JONES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 26, 1939

ARTICLE FROM THE LIMA (OHIO) NEWS

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include this article published in the Lima News on October 22 on the subject of neutrality. This city editor indicates that the New Deal changes its shades with more aplomb than a chameleon.

The article is as follows:

NEUTRALITY

(By Jim Blissell, city editor, the Lima News)

That old "Off agin, on agin, gone agin.—Finnigin," catch line seems to fit this situation quite aptly. But it is no more inconsistent than previous pronouncements of administration leaders on neutrality, including President Roosevelt himself.

The record is clear; the words are the President's; a little research will turn them up. In the light of these utterances, Senator

BORAH'S inquiries as to "Why are we asked to repeal this law?" is vitally pertinent.

But first let us turn back briefly the pages and see what Mr. Roosevelt thought of neutrality just a few years and months back.

President Roosevelt, on signing the first Neutrality Act in August 1935, said: "I have approved this joint resolution because it was intended as an expression of the fixed desire of the Government and the people of the United States to avoid any action which might involve us in war. The purpose is wholly excellent, and this joint resolution will to a considerable degree serve that end."

The Chief Executive's commentary in his public papers regarding his signature to the first Neutrality Act had this to say: "This Government has for several years observed a definite policy of refusing to promote and encourage the export trade in arms, and of forbidding its representatives abroad from taking any action which might be construed as an effort to increase the sales in foreign countries of implements of war manufactured here."

Just 3 years ago, in his annual message to Congress in January 1936, President Roosevelt again had this to say: "As a consistent part of a clear policy, the United States is following a twofold neutrality toward any and all nations which engage in wars that are not of immediate concern to the Americas. First, we decline to encourage the prosecution of war by permitting belligerents to obtain arms, ammunition, or implements of war from the United States."

Extension of the arms embargo, February 26, 1936, brought this from the President: "By the resolution approved August 31, 1935, a definite step was taken toward enabling this country to maintain its neutrality and avoid being drawn into wars involving other nations. By the resolution I have just signed (the extension of the arms embargo) the operation of the August resolution is extended and strengthened."

Just think of it; after lauding the embargo, and emphatically setting forth that our neutrality resolution was "extended and strengthened," the Chief Executive has the temerity to call Congress into special session and, in his message, tell its Members: "I now ask (again) that such action (repeal) be taken in respect to that part of the act which is wholly inconsistent with ancient precepts of the law of nations—the embargo provisions. I ask it because they are, in my opinion, vitally dangerous to American neutrality, American security, and American peace."

There may be some words it would be possible to say in defense of such an absolute "about face," but, if there are, we have failed to hear them.

All of this brings us back to the question posed by Senator BORAH, "Why?" Did the cry for repeal originate, or does it come from the people of this country? Did the voice of labor initiate the agitation for repeal? Did the call for a rejection of this policy come from the farm, from the pulpit, or the pew, from the homes of America, from the families of America? Did it come from the young men who are just now hoping to enter a business or a profession? Where did the call come from? Could it be the wining and dining of English royalty recently in the sacred temples in Washington had anything to do with it?

Lord Beaverbrook, British publishing tycoon, in the August 1939 issue of the American Mercury, had this to say: "It is remarkable how slow a nation is to learn by bitter experience, how readily it forgets painful lessons.

"The Crimean War, so painful in its memories for the British people, sprang out of a situation similar to that with which we recently have had to deal in the war between Italy and Ethiopia.

"In that case the British Government egged on the Turks to defy the power of Russia. Left to their own devices, the Turks would have submitted to the Russians in the trifling dispute which arose over the possession of the holy places in Palestine. In the end there came a war, not only upon Turks but upon Britain also—a long, weary, bloody war on which the Nation looked with gloomy horror."

Lord Beaverbrook's passages might well have been written over the Czechoslovakian or Polish situations. Don't be misled for a moment that a corner or righteousness belongs to any nation. Britain and France certainly "egged on" Poland, but time alone will reveal their motives, hidden so far by false claims of rushing to the defense of a weak, struggling nation.

Neutrality Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, October 27 (legislative day of Wednesday, October 4), 1939

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. JAMES F. BYRNES, OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES] has deservedly enjoyed for many years, in this Chamber and in the House of Representatives, a reputation for clear thinking, clear statement, and persuasive logic. These qualities he exemplified last night in a radio address in the New York Herald Tribune forum on current events. The Senator from South Carolina delivered an address on neutrality legislation of such simplicity and convincing logic that I feel that this debate would not be complete unless it were made available in the RECORD. I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that the address may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Every Member of the Congress is sincerely desirous that this Nation stay out of the war. The pending issue arises out of the difference in views as to whether we can best accomplish this declared purpose by retaining the present law or by adopting the policy of the bill now before the Congress.

The existing law places an embargo upon the sale of arms, ammunition, and implements of war. But it permits the sale on credit to belligerent governments, of iron, steel, copper, cotton, and all other raw materials that enter into the manufacture of weapons of war. It permits the delivery of these war materials by American ships at the ports of belligerents.

The bill pending in Congress repeals the embargo and permits the sale of the products of our farms and factories, provided they are purchased in the United States for cash and the purchaser not only takes title to the property in this country but transports it in foreign ships. It provides for cash payments, because it makes it unlawful to "extend any credit to any such government, political subdivision, or person." It makes this prohibition apply to a sale of implements of war by a person in the United States to a person in a belligerent state. And it makes a violation of the cash provision punishable by a fine or imprisonment. It permits such sales in the United States, but it places an embargo upon American vessels, American citizens, and American property going into the zone of war.

To illustrate: The steamship, the *City of Flint*, captured by the Germans this week, could, under the existing law, transport contraband materials to a belligerent government. Under the administration proposal, the *City of Flint* could not legally enter the zone of war. Every thoughtful person knows that we entered the World War not at the behest of the bankers and munition makers, not even to save the world for democracy, but because when we exercised our right under international law to have our ships sail the Seven Seas, Germany sank those ships, killed our citizens, and destroyed our property.

Under the administration proposal, we sacrifice our right to sail the seas. By the cash requirement we sacrifice the right even to send American property on the ships of other nations into the zone of war. By this sacrifice we remove the cause of our entering the World War, and the cause most likely to result in our entering another war.

The argument that we cannot now change this law is unsound. Whether or not a government will establish an embargo is a question of domestic policy. Because it is a domestic policy, it can be modified or repealed whenever a neutral deems it necessary to protect its rights or its interests. To hold otherwise is to surrender to warring nations the right to legislate for neutral nations. Germany cannot contend that in declaring war she relied upon the existence of our statute and had reason to believe it would not be repealed. Germany knew that since last January the President of the United States insisted upon the repeal of the embargo. Germany knew that when action upon the bill in the Senate was deferred last August, the President announced he would insist upon action at the next session.

I urge that the embargo be repealed now not only because the adoption of the present bill will most likely keep us out of war, but because the existing embargo is unfair to the weaker and peace-loving nations, and because it is an unwise policy from the standpoint of our national defense. It is unfair because by this policy we aid those governments that seek to destroy peace-loving nations. Aggressor nations can accumulate weapons of war; they can purchase from us air bombers and poison gas, and when they have declared war they can smugly rest assured that we will refuse to sell even defensive weapons to the nations they attack.

It is unfair, for while it prohibits the sale of an antiaircraft gun or an airplane to our peace-loving neighbors in Canada, it permits the sale today of implements of war to Russia and Italy, from which countries they can be shipped to Germany without fear of detection. It is unfair because even if the munitions were not reshipped to Germany, Mussolini and Stalin could retain our American supplies for their own purposes and sell to Germany the products of their own factories.

Applying the same doctrine to your own community, it would mean that if the man across the street should decide to destroy your home and your family, he could visit a hardware store, purchase ammunition, and start shooting with the knowledge that you would be unable to purchase from that hardware store a single weapon with which to protect yourself and your loved ones. It is a policy that benefits the highwayman and the aggressor, while it penalizes the peaceful citizen who does not want to carry a pistol or convert his home into an arsenal.

It is unfair because it takes sides between belligerents. Germany is a land power. To supplement its military supplies it can look

to Russia, to Italy, and to the Balkans. Great Britain is a sea power. It has not maintained great stores of military supplies. It has relied upon its navy to enable it to purchase supplies should the nation become engaged in war. By this embargo law we change our policy and say that because Germany cannot come here and purchase our supplies we will refuse to sell implements of war to any other government willing and able to purchase them upon our soil. That is taking sides. It is taking sides with Hitler. I do not want my Government to do that.

I urge repeal because our embargo policy is a menace to the safety of the United States itself. It is a menace because we cannot adhere to this policy without causing other nations to adopt the same policy toward us under similar circumstances. Should that happen, we would be isolated and our safety endangered by a Frankenstein of our own manufacture.

Unable to rely upon purchasing abroad in case of attack, it will be necessary for us to appropriate enormous sums in order to store munitions of war required by a two-ocean navy and an army of millions of men. If every other nation pursues the same policy, we will contribute to converting every land into an arsenal. When every man in a community carries a pistol in his pocket, it is only a matter of time until the shooting will begin. What is true of individuals is true of nations.

We have argued that if we ever should be attacked from the west we could bring in needed supplies from nations beyond the Atlantic; that if an attack should come from our eastern seaboard the Pacific Ocean would be the adequate avenue through which essential supplies could reach us. Should other nations follow our example and adopt our embargo policy, it will nullify the protection our geographical position and sea power should afford us.

During the World War we learned that it required 12 months to revamp factories so they could produce the essential military supplies. The armies of France and Great Britain, during this period, were holding the enemy at bay, while the British Fleet controlled the seas. During our year of readjustment we were able to equip our soldiers only because our Allies provided the guns, ammunition, airplanes, and other supplies. We cannot rely upon the armies and navies of other nations to preserve our freedom.

If we assume that this Nation can under no circumstances become involved in war, then we may as well save our expenditures for the Army and the Navy. But if we admit that "it can happen here," then let us consider whether or not we are prepared for war. For the sake of argument, let us assume that Germany conquered the Allies, controlled the English Fleet, and, unable to look to the Balkans for additional territory, looked to South America. Let us further assume that we undertook to defend one of the South American republics against such attack. What is the status of our army and land defenses?

Today we have approximately 430,000 men in the Regular Army and the National Guard. We have not the arms, ammunition, and implements of war for this Army. Notwithstanding the large appropriations made for this fiscal year, the objective of the War Department today is to have 20 months hence, on June 30, 1941, an Army of only 500,000 men, with the necessary military supplies.

We read of plans to draft an army in case of war. For what purpose? If today we increased the Army to 4,000,000 men, as in the World War, we would have only 10 percent of the military supplies for that Army. If, as a result of the embargo, we could not purchase implements of war elsewhere, it would take us 3 years to supply that Army. While it takes 1 year to train a soldier, it takes 2 years to produce the essential military supplies for that soldier.

If we were attacked from the air today, how do we stand as to antiaircraft guns? The objective of the War Department is to have on June 30, 1941, for the defense of the entire Nation, a number of antiaircraft guns, which number is just one-half of the antiaircraft guns provided for the protection of the city of London today.

Some of our industrial plants can be converted to military use, but considerable time would be required for the production of the necessary machine tools. For the production of some guns and some munitions, inasmuch as they are produced only in Government arsenals, we would have to build new plants.

Of course, should our enemy agree to withhold her attack for 3 years in order to give us time to equip an army and manufacture antiaircraft guns, we would have no fear of the result; but if she were disposed to be rude about the matter and insist upon a lightning war and, because of the embargo, we could not purchase implements of war abroad, Uncle Sam, with his great wealth and great manpower, would stand with his hands tied, unable to defend the United States, much less the Western Hemisphere.

If it be argued that, under such circumstances, we should increase the manufacture of munitions and store them instead of selling them abroad, I answer that while it will be necessary to increase our store of supplies, such supplies may be obsolete within 5 years because of the inventive genius of men. The fighting plane of the World War no more resembled the modern pursuit plane or bomber than did the model T Ford of a bygone era resemble the luxurious automobiles of today. What we need is the capacity to produce and reproduce, so that should we ever call upon our boys to fight we can equip them with the most modern weapons. By repealing the embargo and selling to foreign purchasers, we can develop plant production, and keep abreast of developments in the modernization of weapons.

For our comfort, we can look to the Navy. Daily increasing in power and efficiency, it gives to us assurance that even if it could not prevent the landing of an enemy on the Western Hemisphere, certainly it would delay it a sufficient time to enable us to acquire the necessary military supplies for an army, provided we can purchase munitions abroad. Those who advocate the continuance of the embargo may be motivated by the best intentions, but when we realize that this policy may be adopted by other governments with the result that in our hour of need it would be impossible for us to equip an army, common sense dictates that we should repeal the embargo and make certain our ability to preserve the freedom of the American people.

Hands Off

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, October 27 (legislative day of Wednesday, October 4), 1939

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS, OF NORTH CAROLINA

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by me last night, October 26, over the network of the Columbia broadcasting stations from their Washington, D. C., station upon the subject of neutrality, entitled "Hands Off."

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am indeed happy to have this opportunity to talk with you on one of the most important subjects of our times—neutrality legislation. For more than 30 days the Members of the United States Senate have been discussing the pros and cons of this program to keep America out of war. It concerns each and every one of the 130,000,000 of people residing within the confines of the United States. It is of particular concern to the mothers of America. I say this because if the Congress of the United States should make a false step and enact legislation that might lead us into the struggle abroad, the mothers of America would be called upon to give their sons to the gods of war. Every youth 18 years of age and over would be eligible for conscription. Should we be drawn into war everyone would pay dearly. Our sons would pay with their lives. Our mothers with their grief and tears. Our already heavily burdened taxpayers would pay with their dollars.

We must stay out of this European conflict. This is the thought of the President and of every Member of Congress. It is also the thought of every citizen. We in the Senate of the United States have no differences in our aim to keep this country at peace. Some of my colleagues (most all of them I believe) who do favor repeal, do so for one reason. They think that by providing dynamite in our country to blow off the heads of people in Europe they can thus solve its problems. I yield to no one in my love of liberty, freedom of speech, freedom of action, and freedom of worship. I loathe as they do any form of government that destroys or curtails these blessings. But I want to be sure that they are first preserved intact for our own people. I point to the convincing proof of history that we here in America can neither solve the problems of Europe, nor correct the existing abuses. If Europe were at peace today I contend there is not a statesman in America who would even approach this difficult task. Why then sacrifice our principles as a friendly and peace-loving nation by making the bullets that are destined to end the lives of others in such vain attempt.

The sole objective of pending legislation is to keep us out of war. The war over there is but one of the hundreds that have been fought upon the soil of Europe within the past several centuries.

Let us not, therefore, form any entangling alliances or make any commitments, or pass any laws that might lead us into another World War. I hope that our experience of 1917 and 1918 is fresh in our memories. We participated in the great struggle from April 8, 1917, when we declared war, until Armistice Day, November 11, 1918, and we solved nothing. At the close of the war the United States had in uniform and under arms approximately 4,000,000 men. Our casualties were small in comparison with those of the other nations of the world. Yet, none of them was justified in the light of present events. During that struggle about 9,000,000 of all lands were killed. More than 22,000,000 were injured. The losses sustained by the United States on the battlefields of Europe brought indescribable sorrow to 60,000 American mothers—mothers whose sons were killed in action. That war has already cost the American people $68,000,000,000. Before we will have finished paying, it probably will cost us $100,000,000,000. This tragic loss of lives and this vast mortgage on our future brought no lasting benefit to anyone.

It has been a quarter of a century since the end of the last World War. Yet today our veterans' hospitals have not facilities sufficient to provide hospitalization for those who are entitled to

Government care. Today the Allies whom we aided are indebted to us in principal and interest to the extent of more than $14,000,000,000.

I am in favor of neutrality. I favor that sort of neutrality which will best assure the greatest safeguards to the United States. Let the chips fall where they may. I seek neutrality legislation to keep America out of Europe's eternal conflict. In other words, this country wants legislation solely in the interest of our people. I favor very strongly that phase of current legislation which would prohibit Americans from traveling upon the ships of any nation engaged in war.

I advocate keeping any and all of our ships out of actual war zones. Let's sell our cotton, our tobacco, our potatoes, our textiles, our lumber, and manufactured goods. Let's sell them on a real cash-and-carry basis—title to be transferred at the dock, paid for in cash, and carried from our shores in the ships of the nations at war. But I do not favor—in fact, I strongly disapprove—selling arms, ammunition, and instruments of war to any nation or nations in any amount or under any circumstances whatsoever.

If we sell instruments of death, we are placing deadly weapons in the hands of human beings across the sea for the purpose of destroying other human beings. If we do that, most certainly we would be at least an indirect party to wholesale destruction. I will not become a party to any such international criminal action. I shall follow the dictates of my conscience. I shall and do oppose that part of the proposed legislation which would lead to our participation in any such unthinkable slaughter. I shall and do now oppose the lifting of the arms embargo. It would permit us to sell to the belligerents, nations at war, lethal instruments of death.

We should not encourage the continuation of war in Europe or elsewhere by providing one side or both sides with deadly weapons. We should not become a party to another world massacre in the hope and delusion of saving democracy, sparing civilization, and stopping all wars for all time. I cannot subscribe to any theory based upon the assumption that we are going to save civilization by blowing people and nations to pieces.

Back in 1935, 1936, and 1937, when the world was at peace, we enacted neutrality legislation. We enacted this legislation not for the purpose of stopping war in Europe. That was and is beyond our control. It was for the sole purpose of keeping us out of war, if war should come. When the present neutrality law was passed in 1937 and approved by the President, I was convinced, as he was, that it was sound and served the best interest of this country. Today I am still convinced he was right then, and regret that I cannot follow his recommendation for its repeal.

I want to be fair about this whole thing. I want to see our cotton farmers, our tobacco farmers, our corn farmers, and our wheat farmers prosper. But I do not want war. If we can sell the products of farm and factory on a cash-and-carry basis without danger, I say let's give our farmers and our industry the benefits. We do not want innocent victims of war to go hungry and without clothes. But I strongly oppose the sale of arms. We are told that if we lift the arms embargo and sell instruments of war we will be better prepared and our factories will be ready if war comes. This is predicated on the age-old saying that in time of peace prepare for war. I say let's confine our efforts to guaranteeing our own defenses. I am sure we can always do that.

How can the sale of arms abroad serve to bring the peace we all seek? Would you give your son a pistol to teach him love for his neighbor? I have the utmost respect for my colleagues whose opinions differ from mine. I know they conscientiously seek the same objective that I do—safeguards against war. But we are no longer amateurs in international affairs. We have learned a lot since 1917. We started out then selling arms, and we had to follow with our sons. We must not repeat that mistake. We must learn, once and for all, that the United States cannot control all the international intrigues of Europe.

In conclusion let me say that, if we must go to war, then let's mobilize now against unemployment, poverty, and crime in this country. Before we send any troops to Europe for the purpose of crushing nazi-ism in Germany or communism in Russia, we should destroy those foreign "isms" here before they destroy us. Let's clean house here before we attempt to clean up over there. Our place is here on American soil. Our first duty is to our homeland—our country, our citizens—first, last, and always.

I thank you.

Neutrality Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. TOBEY

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, October 27 (legislative day of Wednesday, October 4), 1939

ADDRESS BY HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR., OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] last night at the New York Herald Tribune forum, dealing with questions involved in the pending legislation.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am grateful as a Senator for the opportunity to address such an influential audience; I am especially gratified, however, as a former Herald Tribune man to be once again working under its auspices. Some of the happiest and most valuable years of my life were spent as a member of the Herald Tribune staff. I am glad to make my small contribution tonight to its work of public enlightenment.

The great issue before us transcends our personal sympathies just as it transcends any political considerations. We can imagine nothing more despicable than for a public official to consider political consequences on a matter involving the life and death of his fellow citizens. It would be equally wrong for a public official to allow his personal sympathies to influence his judgment. I frankly state that I like the Allies and that I detest Hitlerism. Like so many other Americans, my own flesh and blood is in Europe within sound of the guns on the west wall. The fact that I have these personal ties is no reason, however, why America should be made to suffer. Above all, we love America.

We are confronted in Congress by a twofold proposal. The first proposition is: Shall we or shall we not repeal the existing embargo on arms, ammunition, and implements of war? While of the highest importance as a symbol of our attitude, this question is limited in its material effects. It would not be surprising to find, for example, that the arms embargo does not apply to more than 10 percent of our total trade. It by no means covers all arms, ammunition, and implements of war.

What is the argument for repeal of the embargo? As it is made to me I gather that there are a few persons who sincerely believe that repeal of the embargo will enhance and increase American neutrality. I cannot follow their argument. It is not denied, for instance, that the principal reason for repealing the embargo is to change the balance of power in the present European war. Surely if we drastically change the balance of power while this war is in progress, we are committing an act which is neither neutral nor noncombatant. Obviously, if we repeal the embargo we at least make a gesture in support of the Allies, who knew this law was on the books when war began. Whatever the merits of such a gesture maybe it cannot be contended that this is neutrality.

Most of those who urge me to repeal the embargo, however, do so because they frankly want to help England and France by safely selling them supplies. These people are perfectly willing to abandon neutrality because of their belief that by helping England and France they will promote the peace of the United States. What are their reasons?

They say that to repeal the arms embargo will increase employment and bring some prosperity. In my view, this is dangerously short-sighted. Repeal might bring a quick, temporary recovery "jag," but it would be followed finally by a deathly economic collapse.

They contend that repeal would build up the munitions industry in this country and thereby create an asset to our own national defense. Is it not better to build up our munitions industry and keep the produce of it for ourselves instead of letting it go abroad?

They further contend that repeal of the embargo will promote peace for America on the ground that if England and France "crack" we will surely enter the war; we should therefore help them to win in order to keep ourselves out. I submit that the chances of England and France being defeated are slim indeed. The choice seems to be between a defeat of Germany on the one hand and a stalemate on the other. I further contend, however, that even if Germany were victorious and desired to conquer the United States she never could do so. No European power can occupy or vanquish the United States, and it is fanciful to suggest that it could. Fortunately, our national safety is not at stake.

Those who would repeal the embargo say that it is an incomplete affair, that it covers only a few munitions. That is true. It is only a small step toward preventing the growth of a large war-supported foreign trade, but it is a step; and, as I shall show later, a step in the right direction.

Finally, the advocates of embargo repeal base their contention on the moral ground that it is our duty to civilization to do this unneutral and nonpeaceful thing. As one who could serve a moral cause with enthusiasm, and who recognizes that American history is built in large part on wars for ideals, I deny that this war has yet developed an ideal for which we should give the lives of our sons. Clearly England and France are fighting in self-defense for their homelands and for their families. These are splendid ideals. Let us hope that we, too, would fight as well if our homeland and our families were equally threatened. There is enough glory in fighting for one's country without wanting to strain all the facts in order to call it a war for civilization. They are fighting gloriously for themselves. That would be enough for me were I in their place. I cannot believe that it is not an all-sufficient and soul-satisfying pretext for them. They are not fighting our battles, and I do not believe that they wish to be told that they are.

To sum up. The proposal to repeal the embargo—the first administration proposal which I am discussing—would certainly tend to augment our war-supported trade, and to that extent to increase the risk of our getting into war. Because it would admittedly change the balance of power while the war is on, repeal would destroy our neutrality. When we deliberately take an unneutral position we may expect retaliation, and as a self-respecting

people we would bitterly resent retaliation. America, hating aggressors, should not herself be an aggressor.

So much for the question of repealing the arms embrago.

What does the rest of the administration proposal embody? How far does it reduce or eliminate our risk of involvement in war due to credit, shipping, or commerce—that 90 percent of our foreign trade which is now not limited at all?

The administration proposal does not contain a true, watertight cash-and-carry system. Insofar as cash is concerned, the bill contains no cash requirement; merely a provision that the title to goods which are shipped to belligerents shall be transferred before shipment is made. Insofar as shipping is concerned, the bill contains no provision requiring American shipping to go at its own risk, which would be the soundest way to mitigate the dangers of embroilment in war inherent in our shipping. Insofar as preventing the transshipment of goods from neutrals to belligerents is concerned, the bill does not prevent Hitler from getting American supplies from neutral nations. Insofar as preventing the growth of a large war-supported foreign trade is concerned, the bill does absolutely nothing.

Yet who can deny that the sudden growth of a large war-supported trade is a threat to our peace and lends itself to propaganda for war and to profiteering? Let us not forget that the growth of such a trade in the World War was one of the factors which resulted in a public sentiment which eventually impelled us into the conflict.

Of course, a complete embargo on all our foreign trade would work tremendous hardship and would not be feasible. A provision which limited all our foreign trade to the averages of peacetime years, however, would not cause hardship and yet would avoid the dangers of a rapid trade growth. I therefore propose that American foreign trade for the duration of the current war be held to the average of peacetime years, and, in order to prevent transshipment to belligerents, I propose that this limitation apply to neutrals and belligerents alike. Such a limitation would not only represent the most that Government can be expected to do to preserve peace; it would also tend to increase and enhance our neutrality by preserving the balance of power in the current war insofar as such balance is affected by the United States.

I further propose that we should extend the present arms embargo to all neutrals and thereby prevent the shipment of arms to Japan in the east and to Italy and to communistic Russia for transshipment to Germany. Such a step would be truly neutral because it would tend to preserve the balance insofar as this depends on the United States. The only Americans who would be adversely affected would be the arms manufacturers. Above all, such a step would help America stay out of the conflict and, in the tragic event that we become engaged, would at least ward off the shocking possibility of American boys being killed by American-made bullets fired from American-made guns.

We should wait to repeal the embargo until the first overt act has been committed against us. Let us then use repeal of the embargo as a weapon of military strategy and as an act of self-defense. When we have done so, let us follow it up with still more direct and effective measures. If a great and damaging overt act is committed against America, we should not only give our Allies groceries on a cash-and-carry basis; we should jump in with both feet and fight for our country and our God shoulder to shoulder with them. Not for us will be a vacillating and ignoble policy called "short of war"; not for us will there exist a counsel of being half in and half out, of bringing in by the back door what we are ashamed of at the main gate; not for us a policy of "scuttle and run," of eating one's cake and having it, too; of getting all the advantages while striving to avoid all the risks. No. Once the war becomes our war, whether for economic, military, or moral grounds, let us get into it, and get really in. But until we have cause to get in, let us stay out.

Like strong men, let us not be the first to provoke. Let someone else do that. Let us not stick out our chin truculently to invite a blow. Someone will strike it, and we probably would not—and should not—stand for it.

It is for these reasons that I feel so strongly that this is the time, the place, and the opportunity to debate the question of peace or war for America. There may not be another. I greatly fear that if we take this step the succeeding ones will follow with the inevitability of Greek tragedy. We shall then have done what no nation in Europe has done—engaged ourselves in a war which was not our war, embarked on a crusade which was not our crusade, and plunged our people into a tragedy which was easily avoidable. In such wanton negligence I want no part. From such suicidal disregard for our heaven-sent mission in this world may God deliver us.

Let us, as George Washington said, "establish a national character." If in times of foreign dispute every American sides with the country where his ancestors came from, we shall have no country at all. We ask as much patriotism here as we find on foreign shores.

We want nothing that is smug or selfish or cautious. We are willing to risk everything in a crusade, but let it be an American crusade. America, in its 150 years as a nation, has taken great strides toward creating a way of life which is different and better than any the world has ever seen. No foreign state, no foreign people, no foreign civilization, has the potentiality that we have here in America. Before we embrace a foreign ideal, therefore, let us achieve our own. It is the world's best and only hope. In our faithfulness to it we best do our duty to ourselves; we best do our duty to humanity.

Colonel House Letter Admitted and Proven To Be a Fraud

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES H. LEAVY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, October 27, 1939

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Speaker, on October 11, on page 598 of the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, under the caption "Good Neighbor Policy," there appeared an extension of remarks by the gentleman from Montana [Mr. THORKELSON], which was in the nature of a letter under date of June 10, 1919, addressed to the Right Honorable David Lloyd George and signed by Col. E. M. House. Since this has been inserted in the RECORD the gentleman from Montana has publicly admitted, as I shall show by quotations from the RECORD, that this letter is not at all what it purports to be; however, it has gone throughout the Nation to many parts of the world, bearing the stamp of authenticity, given by being made a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Its deceptive character has created doubts in the minds of many good people. It is not my purpose to necessarily condemn a Member of this body who has, from my point of view, shamefully abused the privileges accorded a Member, but with the hope that some of the same people who read this shameless libel on the good names of some of America's great men, will likewise read this statement and then have a fuller understanding of the whole situation and be able to free themselves from doubts that might have been provoked by this fraudulent letter.

To show how far-reaching has been the effect of the publication of this spurious document, I quote a letter that I received from an outstanding citizen of my district, and one of the leading educators in the State of Washington:

WENATCHEE, WASH., *October 23, 1939.*

Hon. CHARLES H. LEAVY,
Congress of the United States, Washington, D. C.

DEAR JUDGE LEAVY: In checking through the [daily] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of October 11, current session, I found on page 598 the beginning of a document that was startling, to say the least. It is the extension of remarks by Mr. THORKELSON, of Montana, and purports to be a letter from Colonel House to Lloyd George.

Of course, I was aware there has been a superb propaganda campaign by the British Government, but nowhere have I seen anything as complete as this report.

I am writing to you at this time for information as to whether or not this document is authentic. It colors every headline I read and every speech I hear. I do not wish to quote from it or use it in our history classes unless I can be sure that it is not in itself primarily a piece of fiction. There may have been a time when Americans believed all they read, but now the danger is that we may not be willing to believe anything in print. My hope is to be able to help some of these high-school youngsters establish values and develop ways of checking sources.

Cordially yours,

JOHN SHAW.

Now, for proof that the letter published by the gentleman from Montana is spurious and viciously false, I quote from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of October 13, pages 391 and 392:

Mr. THOMASON. I do not want to interrupt the gentleman in the course of the remarks to which he expects to address himself today. I rise at this time to make an inquiry, more than anything else. I observe from the daily RECORD that on Wednesday, October 11, beginning at page 598, there appears six small-typed pages of an extension of remarks by the gentleman from Montana, purporting to be a letter signed by Col. E. M. House, and addressed to the Right Honorable David Lloyd George, from the British consulate in New York City on June 10, 1919, in which Colonel House, in effect, proposed, as the gentleman from Montana suggests, an "invisible government" for world domination. May I ask the gentleman if this is the late Col. Edward M. House, of Texas, and one time an intimate of President Wilson?

Mr. THORKELSON. That is who it is supposed to be; yes.

Mr. THOMASON. Supposed to be? Does the gentleman have positive information that it is the same Colonel House?

Mr. THORKELSON. What does the gentleman mean by "positive information"?

Mr. THOMASON. I do not mean to question the good faith of the gentleman; but, having known Colonel House more or less casually and quite well by reputation, I am anxious to know the authenticity of this letter.

Mr. THORKELSON. I think if the gentleman will read the letter, if he will review the things that happened since the letter was written

and what happened before the war; if he will take into consideration that the Prince of Wales was over here dancing around after the war, as stated in that letter; and if he will take other things into consideration, I think he will find that the letter is authentic in the manner it is written.

Mr. THOMASON. Will the gentleman state, for the benefit of the Members of the House, many of whom have serious doubts about the authenticity of the letter, from what source he obtained the letter and what evidence he has of its authenticity?

Mr. THORKELSON. The gentleman may read the letter and draw his own conclusions.

Mr. THOMASON. I have read the letter with amazing and unusual interest. Knowing Colonel House and his life work in a way, I, along with many of my colleagues from Texas and, I believe, many of my colleagues in the House, have serious doubt about the authenticity of the letter, and I therefore would welcome the gentleman placing in the RECORD some evidence of its authenticity.

Mr. THORKELSON. The letter has been published. The letter, of course, does not itself refer particularly to England. It refers to the power that rules England. Let me give the gentleman a little history.

Mr. THOMASON. Does the gentleman have the original of this letter?

Mr. THORKELSON. No; I have not.

Mr. THOMASON. Can the gentleman tell me if the original did bear the date line "British Consulate at New York City" and if it was signed "Col." E. M. House?

Mr. THORKELSON. I presume it does.

Mr. THOMASON. Does the gentleman have any evidence of that fact?

Mr. THORKELSON. No.

Mr. THOMASON. Will the gentleman furnish to the House some evidence of the authenticity of this letter?

Mr. THORKELSON. May I refer you to the American Publishing Society, Bremerton, Wash.?

Mr. THOMASON. I do not mean to trespass upon the gentleman's time, but may I say in that connection that Colonel House is not here to defend himself, and I think a rank injustice may have been done a very distinguished citizen.

Mr. THORKELSON. It is not a rank injustice. I do not care if the man who wrote that letter came from Texas or anywhere else.

Mr. THOMASON. But he was a great American citizen, and it is the rankest kind of an injustice if this is not a genuine letter signed by him. I want to know if Col. E. M. House signed this letter, and if the gentleman will be kind enough to furnish to the House evidence of that fact. I do not know whether it is his genuine signature or not, but I do not hesitate for 1 minute in saying that I have very serious doubt about it. I think, in view of that doubt, the gentleman ought to furnish evidence of its genuineness and its authenticity to the House, and I will ask him if he will not do so.

Mr. THORKELSON. The fact remains that the history in that letter speaks for itself.

Mr. THOMASON. I am not speaking of the contents of the letter. I want to know if Col. E. M. House signed this letter.

Mr. THORKELSON. I did not see Colonel House sign the letter, but the letter contains factual history which proves itself, and the publishers who published this letter employ the following title:

"British Secret Service Report, 1919. The answer to all questions about how, when, and who caused America, 'the richest nation on earth,' to have a depression."

Mr. THOMASON. Will the gentleman say that he has evidence that Colonel House did sign the letter or that there ever existed a genuine, bona fide letter of that kind that was signed by the late Colonel House?

Mr. THORKELSON. I do not know that positively; no.

Mr. THOMASON. The gentleman will not say that it is genuine, then?

Mr. THORKELSON. No; except as far as history speaks within the letter itself.

Then on October 17, pages 522 and 523, when the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MILLER] addressed the House, he touched upon this matter, as follows:

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, before I proceed with the remarks I have prepared on the subject of neutrality, I wish to refer briefly to three subjects that have already been discussed here in the House.

I followed with a great deal of interest the questions asked by our colleague from Texas [Mr. THOMASON] regarding a letter inserted in the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by the gentleman from Montana [Mr. THORKELSON]. Twenty-one years ago Colonel House befriended me when I was 3,000 miles from home. I have always had a very warm spot in my heart for Col. E. M. House. For that reason, if for no other, let me state that I have read what purports to be a letter written by Colonel House inserted in the daily RECORD by the gentleman from Montana, and I want to state for the RECORD that I sincerely doubt its authenticity and feel very sure that the letter could not have been written and was not written by Colonel House. At this time when we are starting debate on a bill that is going to have a great effect on the future peace of this country, it seems to me to be ill-advised to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD anything that would stir up racial or religious hatred. I express the hope that the gentleman from Montana [Mr. THORKELSON], in view of all the circumstances and in view of the fact that he has stated on the floor that he does not know positively that the letter is authentic, that of his own volition he will withdraw that letter and keep it out of the permanent RECORD of the House.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. MILLER. I yield.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, may I say to the gentleman from Connecticut that I hope he and every Member of the House will read certain letters I will insert in the RECORD today under permission granted me a few minutes ago, one of them being from the secretary to the late E. M. House, who served him, I believe, some 40 years, and the other from his son-in-law, stating in very positive terms that that letter is a spurious document. So I join with the gentleman in the request that he makes and the hope he expresses, because it does seem to me that of all documents in this day and time that should reflect the absolute truth it is the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I am sure every Member of the House at all times, when he knows the facts, wants to preserve that as an honest, truthful record. I hope my friend will read these letters I am putting in the RECORD today which condemns that as a spurious document.

Mr. THORKELSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. THORKELSON. When I put the letter in I did not say it was Colonel House. I made no claim to that effect. Another thing, I said to disregard the signer at the end of the letter, and in my remarks, if you will turn to the RECORD, I made that statement. I said to only read the substance matter of the letter and then compare that with conditions that have happened in the past 20 years. I have looked it up. It is stated in the letter that General Rodman was knighted by the British Government, and the record is over here in the Congressional Library.

Mr. MILLER. I cannot yield any further unless the gentleman wants to withdraw the letter.

Mr. THORKELSON. I just wanted to clear that up.

Mr. MILLER. The gentleman stated on the floor of the House that the letter was signed by E. M. House, and in response to a question asked by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON], he stated it was the Colonel House who was associated with President Wilson. His answer may be found on page 391 of the RECORD. I hope it will not be necessary to object to future unanimous-consent requests, which may be made by Mr. THORKELSON, which many of us feel constrained to do, unless the letter is withdrawn.

And again, on October 18, on page 581 of the RECORD, when the gentleman from Montana was addressing the House, the following colloquy took place:

Mr. THOMASON. I hold no brief for the late Colonel House, for I believe his name and fame will live long after many of us are forgotten. My principal interest right now is in the preservation of an honest, truthful CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Now that the House letter has been, I think, proven to be a spurious document by the letters I placed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 334, in extension of my remarks, does not the gentleman feel that in justice to himself and his colleagues in this House and to a truthful RECORD that the entire letter ought to be expunged? Because, if the gentleman will recall, he said when he referred to that letter and the signer of it that it was the Col. E. M. House who was the intimate friend and associate of the late President Wilson. So, in the interest of fairness and justice, not only to a dead man but to an honest RECORD, does not the gentleman think that letter should be expunged from the RECORD?

Mr. THORKELSON. Let me say to the gentleman from Texas that I believe the letter was signed "Col. E. M. House." Edward M. House, the friend of President Wilson, never signed his name "Col. E. M. House." This is supposed to be a report that came from the British secret files, and I do not believe that the House who was adviser to President Wilson ever was engaged by Great Britain and sitting in the British consulate. It must therefore have been someone else.

Mr. THOMASON. Does the gentleman now admit that it is not the Col. Edward M. House whom the gentleman from Connecticut spoke of in such high admiration yesterday? Does the gentleman now admit that he is not the man who wrote that letter? If so, I say that in all fairness the letter should be expunged from this RECORD.

Mr. THORKELSON. I never said that this Colonel House was the Edward M. House, President Wilson's adviser. As a matter of fact, I said, "Disregard both the writer and the recipient of the letter."

* * * * * * *

Mr. MILLER. I understood the gentleman to say that the letter he put in the RECORD signed "Col. E. M. House" did not purport to be the Colonel House of the Wilson administration.

Mr. THORKELSON. I said, "Do not take the writer into consideration. Do not consider the origin of the letter, but read the substance of it." I said that in my remarks. There was no reason to assume that it was the Edward M. House who was connected with the Wilson administration. I do not know who it was. My letter was inserted in the RECORD for one purpose alone, and that was to give information to the American people. I think they are entitled to it.

And finally, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of October 19, on page 611, the gentleman from Montana admitted that he was convinced the letter he had caused to be inserted in the RECORD should be stricken from the RECORD, and secured unanimous consent to do so in the following language:

THE HOUSE LETTER

Mr. THORKELSON. Mr. Speaker, in respect to the letter inserted in the daily RECORD on October 11, I find it has already been considered

in the Geneva Conference held in 1929 and 1930. The matter was brought up at that time because Lord Northcliffe, proprietor of the London Times, the Daily Mail, and other English newspapers, was over here in charge of British propaganda in America.

Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as the authorship of the British Secret Service communication of 1919, which I placed in the daily RECORD on October 11, has been identified by the wire which I received during the debate yesterday and in this book, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the whole article, in justice to Mr. E. M. House. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, as I stated at the outset, it is not my intent or purpose to do other than make clear to the thousands of people who might have read the letter, so unjustly and unfairly given publicity through the columns of the RECORD, shamelessly slandering the good name of a great American who has long since gone to his reward, that I have taken the time and effort to prepare these remarks. Another Member of this House, the Honorable JOHN MARTIN, of Colorado, who is one of the most respected, trusted, admired, and able Members of this body, and has been for many years, on October 20, on page 662 and through to page 666 has analyzed the letter and has characterized it in so appropriate and fitting a style and manner that I here desire to repeat certain extracts of it and place my stamp of approval on what the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. MARTIN] says of it:

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I have read with the utmost amazement the curious document inserted in the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of October 11 by the Member from Montana [Mr. THORKELSON]. It must be the most scurrilous, the most reprehensible, the most un-American document ever printed within the two covers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It could only have been conceived by a mind poisoned against America and all its leaders and all its activities, and it could be credited by no man with sufficient knowledge and intelligence to occupy a seat in the American Congress, no matter by what fortuitous chance of politics elected.

I have read but one document in my lifetime which could compare with it in the impress of falsity, of spuriousness on every page, in every paragraph, in every sentence, in every line—the most damnable tissue of falsehood the human mind could conceive.

* * * * * * *

Withdrawing such a defamatory and injurious document from the permanent RECORD does not suffice. What is written is written. It has been scattered to the ends of the earth in the daily RECORD. Its sponsor should be dealt with in such a manner as to visit the official condemnation of the House of Representatives upon him and it, not simply withdrawing it at his request, while still standing on his avowal of its truth.

* * * * * * *

If any Member is not satisfied with my performance, he may analyze this astounding document for himself, with my assurance that he will find therein not only all I have quoted but innumerable other lies, inventions, and distortions. When he finishes he will not need my assurance that he has read the greatest number and variety of transparent lies and calumnies ever uttered in the same number of words. [Applause.]

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am sure that anyone who might even remotely have been influenced by the reading of the spurious letter inserted in the proceedings of this great legislative body will completely disabuse his mind of any influence whatever it might have had by the citations I have here given from the RECORD. If there still be any doubt as to the authenticity of anything contained in this letter, an extension of remarks by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON] will be found in the Appendix of the RECORD, on page 334, which establishes beyond every doubt the fact that the so-called Colonel House letter is a fake and a forgery.

Guarding Religious Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 27, 1939

ARTICLE BY HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH, OF WEST VIRGINIA

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article written by me and published recently in Liberty, a magazine of religious freedom:

[From Liberty]

GUARDING RELIGIOUS FREEDOM

(By the Honorable JENNINGS RANDOLPH, Member of Congress from West Virginia)

When the story of American culture is finally written, foremost among the basic factors influencing the development of American life and customs will be that unique contribution of the American people to the civilization of mankind—the principle of religious freedom. Nowhere else in the Christian world prior to the adoption of the American Constitution, except for the Edict of Milan, in 313 A. D.—really an edict of toleration and not of liberty—during the reign of the Roman emperor, Constantine,[1] had the principle of religious freedom been accepted by any nation, America stands alone as the world's most famous example of a nation the government of which, from the start, has been predicated upon the separation of church and state.

Curiously enough, the Encyclopedia Americana devotes several columns to the subject of "Religious Liberty," while the Encyclopedia Britannica omits this topic. In many parts of the world today the value of religious freedom has not been fully recognized, and in some parts it is not even a matter of polite conversation.

THE AMERICAN PRINCIPLE OF LIBERTY

The American doctrine of separation of church and state did not come about suddenly, nor was it an accepted principle in early colonial days. Circumstances peculiar to the American scene at the time of the founding of the United States account largely for its incorporation in the Constitution. The profound remark of Bancroft, in his History of the United States, illustrates this point. "American law," he said, "was the growth of necessity, not the wisdom of individuals. It was not an acquisition from abroad; it was begotten from the American mind, of which it was a natural and inevitable, but also a slow and gradual, development." In fact, the Colonies started with the Old World principle that the church and the state were inseparable. Most of the colonial governments, however, were tolerant of religious groups other than the one associated with the government. This tolerance represented a departure from Old World ideas largely in the degree of its toleration. In many cases, restrictions attended the toleration extended by the Colonies, and often consisted of the denial of specific civil rights, such as the right to vote or otherwise to participate in the affairs of government, unless one belonged to the politically accepted church.

This toleration as practiced in the American Colonies, which was far more liberal than most of the Old World views and practices with respect to the relationship of church and state, laid the foundation for the fully developed religious freedom that was ultimately to become one of the greatest principles of American life. One of the last colonial States to be formed was the first to proclaim the principle of religious freedom the equal treatment of all faiths and creeds with respect to the government of the State. Rhode Island thus became the cradle of American religious freedom.

Idealism "begotten from the American mind" undoubtedly played a large part in the final acceptance of the principle of religious freedom by the Constitutional Convention; yet a very practical consideration is probably overlooked or undervalued, for the important part it played in permanently establishing the principle of religious freedom in the American system. That practical consideration was the fact that among the many religious groups then flourishing in the New World, no one of them could reasonably hope to gain enough strength to force a church-state union in its own favor to the exclusion of the others. Under such circumstances, more certain was the gain if all creeds and beliefs agreed to a permanent separation of church and state wherein not only all men but also all religious groups would be equal before the law of the land. Had there been one established church and only one or two dissenting groups, as was characteristic of the situation in the Old World in many instances, it is doubtful whether the principle of religious freedom could have been established in this country, even with the support of the high idealism that motivated the founding fathers.

It is just another case of American law resulting from necessity, for, if the state was kept separate from any church domination, such a separation was the best possible insurance for the unmolested existence and growth of each and every creed and belief which had gained a foothold on the shores of the American continent. It is reasonable to suppose that so long as the practical considerations

[1] Constantine had no conception of the modern meaning of the separation of church and state. As a ruler he granted toleration to both pagans and Christians by the Edict of Milan. But as emperor, and hence really the state, he mixed in religious affairs continually. The Edict of Milan further did not grant the same rights to the members of the Jewish community that were enjoyed by pagans and Christians. Three short quotations from the Catholic Encyclopedia, volume 4, page 299, set forth conditions of the Edict of Milan very clearly.

"As pontifex maximus he watched over the heathen worship." "Without realizing the full import of his actions, Constantine granted the church one privilege after another," and among other things, "placed Sunday under the protection of the state. * * * It should not be forgotten that the Jewish communities had also their own jurisdiction, exemption, and immunities, even if in a more limited degree."

upon which American religious freedom is founded remain relatively unchanged, there is little danger of the loss of this freedom.

RELIGIOUS FREEDOM CHALLENGED

Forces are at work today, however, which tend to change the conditions and to alter the practical considerations to such an extent that the ideal of religious liberty is in danger of being undermined. One of these forces may be found in the dictatorial form of government now popular in some parts of the world.

Dr. John Alexander MacKay, president of Princeton Theological Seminary, has explained in the New York Times how the principles of dictatorial government affect religious freedom. He says: "The totalitarian state, whether in its Communist or its Fascist form, embodies three revolutionary principles. First, it equates a single group in a national society with the whole of that society. This principle has launched Russia upon an era of class conflict, and Germany upon an era of race conflict. Second, it equates society with the state. This principle has destroyed the structure of democracy, or at least the democratic trend, in some important countries, by abolishing free institutions and organized minorities. Third, it equates the state with God. The state is divinized and makes demands upon human personality which only God has a right to make."

Contrast the basic American principles of government with these totalitarian concepts. First, all men are created equal before the law. The American state recognizes no individual or group of individuals as superior to any other individual or group. This has a dampening effect on class hatreds, religious jealousies, and race conflicts.

Second, government of the people, by the people, and for the people, as carried out in a representative form, and by the rule of the majority, encourages the growth and development of free institutions and permits organized minorities to exist under the same conditions as organized majorities.

Third, the complete separation of church and state makes it possible for every man to follow Christ's teaching, "Render to Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and to God the things that are God's." There is no confusion of allegiance, no tyrannical concentration of control over men who were born to be free. The American state derives its authority from the people. It makes no claim to divinity through a religious association. Consequently, there is no attempt on the part of one to achieve its ends through the power or influence of the other.

WHAT WE SHOULD GUARD AGAINST

These contrasting principles make clear the points at which we must constantly be on guard to protect our heritage of religious freedom. First, we must guard against the domination of any one political party by a single religious group. In the event that such a combination develops, and the political party in question ultimately gets into power, the danger to the freedom of religious worship will become acute. Much will then be said about tolerance. But tolerance is not a substitute for true religious freedom that will be long accepted by the American people. The combination of one religious group with the state through a political party will threaten the equality of other religious groups before the law. No effort should be spared to avoid such an unhappy situation.

Second, we must guard against the promulgation of the totalitarian principles of the union of church and state. These principles hold more than one danger to religious freedom. Either by divinizing the state itself or by utilizing the organization of one religious group to strengthen the power of the state the adoption of these principles will jeopardize the right to worship according to the dictates of conscience through the imposition of penalties and restrictions of mere tolerance or by the brutal cruelty of intolerance.

Practical considerations of modern times may dictate many changes in our social structure. To be able to make these needed changes as occasion demands is essential to the health of the Nation. But every American must be on guard to see that these changes do not violate the very principles which make such changes possible. One of the most important of these principles is the cherished American heritage of freedom of religious worship.

We Must Keep Out

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 27, 1939

ARTICLE BY HON. HERBERT HOOVER

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am glad to comply with several requests and offer for inclusion therein an article entitled "We Must Keep Out," written by former President Hoover, and which appears in the October 28 issue of the Saturday Evening Post.

The article follows:

[From the Saturday Evening Post of October 28, 1939]

WE MUST KEEP OUT

(By Herbert Hoover)

The American people will be confronted with the issue of war or peace as long as this war in Europe lasts. That is the most fateful issue that can come to a people. Each generation faces new issues, new problems, and seeks new solutions. But the invisible forces which make war, peace, and revolution are old, and they repeat. And to make sound progress nations, like individuals, must test their solutions with the stern and often inhibiting measure of human experience. And like individuals, the memories of nations are sometimes short.

I spent nearly a score of years from the outbreak of the Great War in 1914, dealing with these forces, and I may sum my conclusions at once: America must keep out of these wars. It can keep out of these wars. It has nothing to fear for our own independence from the result of these wars. This is no case of "hope" that we may stay out of war; it is the time for will and inflexible resolution to stay out. Our greatest service is a strong America to aid the rebuilding of a European world which will be tottering no matter who the victors in this war may be. Our greatest service to civilization is to put our own house in order and maintain true liberty upon this continent. For it may be that otherwise liberty will sink for centuries in the night of despair.

War and peace are not cold mathematical problems. Our decisions will be determined by our emotions as well as our reason. Today we have two dominant attitudes. We are against joining in the European and Asiatic wars. That attitude is the dominance of reason. We are incensed at the dictatorships, their ideologies, and their aggressions. We sympathize with Great Britain, France, and Poland. Our danger is that our indignation will displace our reason.

WHAT MAKES WAR IN EUROPE

First, let us examine the invisible forces which drive the fates in Europe.

To many American eyes Europe consists of magnificent cities, historic cathedrals, art, music, literature, great universities, monuments of human heroism and progress. It possesses peoples of fine hospitality, of the widest cultivation and attainments. For four centuries since the Renaissance men in Europe have fought and died to build the structure of personal liberty, to lift the dignity of men, to bring security and peace. And from every country—England, Germany, France, Russia, and all the others—we have received magnificent inheritances of human thought upon which our civilization has built.

But Americans too often see little of the gigantic but invisible forces of disintegration that so often dominate these peoples. Here are 26 races of 400,000,000 people, outside of Russia, living cheek by jowl in an area two-thirds the size of the United States. Through them surge the forces of nationalism, of imperialism, of age-old hates, memories of deep wrongs, fierce distrusts, and impellant fears. There are the conflicts of religions and persecution. Long before the World War these forces were in added ferment because of new ideas from the industrial revolution. There is here a hell's brew of malign spirits.

And these spirits find tangible expression in the rivalry of economic development, the setting up of barriers of trade, the struggles for political independence, the pressures of population, the grabs and quarrels over vast areas of the earth for colonization and for exploitation. These all add to the centrifugal forces.

The existence of great areas of mixed populations makes exact boundaries between nations almost hopeless. In every one of these zones some races are separated from their fatherland. On both sides the existing governments unceasingly seek to impose their national language and customs upon these minorities. The outcries of these oppressed to the sympathies of their racial brothers across the borders are unceasing stimulants to friction. And these boundaries shift from every war and the conflicts flame up in new areas.

To all this must be added the destruction of the last war and the loosening of moral restraints.

And periodically there boils up among these peoples some Pied Piper with silver tongue calling some new Utopia, or some man on horseback calls followers to wars of aggression. History, even since the foundation of our Republic, has been a succession of Napoleons, Kaiser Wilhelms, Lenins, Stalins, and Hitlers.

Resistant against all these furies there are the benign forces of human liberty, of religion, of education, and of morals which have fought these evils over centuries. And among these peoples are great leaders of thought and of men, whose aspirations and whose life services have been given to allay these evils and to build up hope and faith and peace.

Yet, with a vicious rhythm, these malign forces seem to concentrate at some spot and drive peoples, like the Gadarene swine, over the precipice of war.

During the whole of our relations with them, Europe has had only intervals of unstable peace. It has lived always on a war footing. Its periods of peace have been a groping for a balance of power through groups and alliances based upon fear and upon arms.

The job of European statesmen of good will is to engage incessantly in power politics, by which aggression is checked and the

malign forces allayed, in order that tenuous peace can be extended a little longer. It is a delicate job in which loyalties to agreement by any of them constantly give way to expediences and self-preservation.

As the years have gone on, with the growth of economic interdependence, of communications between nations, of power in weapons, all the world has been affected more and more by these wars in Europe and their destructions. The interest and sympathies of nations 5,000 miles away are enlisted. Our own people suffer in unemployment and misery from this world dislocation. The effect of European wars upon early American life was but a faint echo of the thunderous blows we receive today.

We, therefore, are increasingly sensitive to every force that moves Europe, for good or evil. And we have our opinions about these forces. But being 3,000 miles away, unable to appraise their movements in half a billion people, with our own form of government based upon slow-moving public opinion, idealistic in its approach and impossible of continuity in foreign policy, with racially divided emotions, we are wholly unequipped to take part in the hourly shifting power politics.

The voice of experience calls out sternly that we cannot solve the problems of, or keep the peace in, Europe.

THE PERIOD BEFORE WE CAME INTO THE WORLD WAR

We have had over a century and a half of constant repercussions from these forces. But 22 years ago, for the first time, we joined in their wars. However, that was not the first cry from Europe that we should join to save civilization. Students of history will find much of interest in the propaganda that America should join to save the French Revolution and, later, that we should save the world from Napoleon—and it created bitter dissension in our country.

Be that as it may, our next really dangerous experience was 1914. During the 3 years of the Great War before we joined in it, two violent forces poured upon us. The first was the call and the propaganda that we must join to save civilization. The second was the economic impacts. And despite the dangers, we did little in military preparedness to secure respect from nations at war.

PROPAGANDA

In the World War the good opinion of neutrals for the first time loomed up as a vital factor in victory. If they were friendly, even though neutral, they could facilitate supplies and credit. If neutrals were unfriendly, they could be embarrassing, even if neutral. Of far more importance was to persuade neutral states to join in the war on one side or the other.

The old-fashioned processes of persuasion rapidly developed into a new science of propaganda. And it was of threefold purpose: To inflame hate for the enemy; to secure favor to one's self among neutrals; and to discourage the enemy people. And propaganda became a weapon no less potent than tanks, guns, and men.

All people in war are convinced that they are fighting for their firesides and their independence. Their boys are being sacrificed in hourly holocausts. Under these racks people unhesitatingly justify immoral use of words and lies. War sanctifies killing of men. It sanctifies the killing of truth. Truth, justice, tolerance are thrown to the winds when a mere lie promises to save a life or gain an advantage.

The major fact is that, in this period before we entered the Great War, propaganda was organized without moral restraint and was poured upon us with all the genius of war strategy. And do not let us be smug accusers. We did it ourselves the moment we entered the Great War.

For 3 years I saw the pernicious technique of propaganda develop. Almost every month, in directing the works of the Belgian Commission, I crossed the lines to the capitals of all the major nations at war to deal with their leading officials. On both sides I witnessed the incidents of war, while dealing with its backwash and its thousand tragedies and miseries.

Armies are not pink teas. Dreadful things were done to civilians. But daily I read of atrocities on both sides that, to my knowledge, were sheer inventions. They were invented by the thousand to create hate. I read of bloody revolutions in the streets of the enemy over which I had peacefully passed at the very time. I read all these things and a thousand others constantly reflected to the American press. I read false incidents and false news of cunning design to build up hate, malice, and dissension in America from all sides.

Every nation at war clamps down strict censorship. It is not alone censorship to prevent leaks of military information. One great object of censorship today is to control the news and create propaganda. There is not a dispatch out of Europe that is not tainted by half-truth or untruth. And it is not the fault of our correspondents; under the conditions imposed upon them they do the best they can.

In the World War we were called upon hourly by the democracies to witness the wickedness of despots. They would overwhelm the world with their savagery. We would be the next victim. Liberty could live only if we joined in the struggle. We were told by the Central Powers that it was a war to destroy their trade and competition, to rob them of colonies and foreign possessions.

That we joined in the Great War because of propaganda, no man will say. But we can say that the public mind was conditioned to high indignation at any incident, no matter how minor or how defensible. How quickly the public mind can shift is shown by the fact that 6 months before we went into the war we elected a President on the cry, "He kept us out of war."

One effect of propaganda and the events of war was to focus our whole emotions and our thoughts upon the incidents and the peoples at war. We lost sight of our own country. Fascinated by this fight in the ring, we forgot our family at home. Our sense of right and wrong in those quarrels became our dominant discussion. When we concluded as to who was wicked, it was but one step to the feeling that somehow, someway, we had a duty to see right triumph among our neighbors. And we went out "to lick the Kaiser."

The major purpose of propaganda is to build up hate. Hate is the most potent of war emotions. It is the most malign of all human emotions. With a little urging of hate we can be made to forget even the fine inheritances of our own civilization. We can be made to forget Goethe, Schiller, Beethoven, Luther, or Rodin, Voltaire, Pasteur or Tolstoy, or Dante, Michelangelo, Verdi, and Cavour, and a thousand others. Do these hates make an inheritance for our children?

ECONOMIC IMPACTS

And the voice of experience from the economic disruption of the last war has advice for today. Prior to our joining the war the demand for supplies and munitions created riot in our economic system. We expanded our farms and our factories; we speculated madly in goods and stocks; we advanced prices. We loaned money recklessly to warring nations, which would never have been repaid, even had we not gone into the war. We utterly disregarded the inevitable impoverishment of the world after war, and its certain demoralization, whether we joined or not. We had built for ourselves a castle of economic cards that would have collapsed had we stayed out.

Some of this cannot be prevented in the situation today, but the voice of experience says right here and now:

We should not expand our equipment beyond that which we can later on employ for peace purposes. We should not sell to belligerents on credit. Our industries should seek their workmen from the already unemployed and not draw men away from their steady jobs into war industries that will shrink and displace these men from their livelihood at the end of the war. Our business world should be content that increased volume will bring increased profits, and should, for the sake of its own soul and its future, not raise prices except insofar as abnormal increases in wages or raw material necessitate. We should remember that profits and stock prices will collapse in the general impoverishment of the world when it is all over.

Here is a case for voluntary action, for business statesmanship. These results cannot be secured by government without making us a Fascist state.

PREPAREDNESS

The period before we came into the Great War was marked by our unwillingness to build an adequate Army and Navy. Had we built much more strongly, we would have gained a respect that might have saved us from attack by Germany. The voice of experience says that governments at war get contemptuous of unarmed neutrals.

THE WAR

We finally joined in the last European war. We did it because some of our citizens were attacked on the high seas by the dictator of that time. But the dominant impulse was idealism to protect liberty in the world and bring the end of wars to mankind.

After a few weeks of muddling and resisting, we accepted the inexorable fact that no democracy can fight a modern war with the processes of democracy. They are made for peace. They are too slow in action; there is no time for debate and for meeting of minds. We became an effective dictatorship. We had to if we were to bring quick strength upon the front. We conscripted all our boys. By direct and indirect means, the Government took control of production, of prices, of labor. It rightly seized about 85 percent of all war profits. The Government took over the railways. It directed credit. And by direct and indirect means it partially suppressed free speech and free press. It told the people what to eat and to wear.

As I had been called back from Europe to head the Food Administration, and to sit as a member of the President's War Council, I speak of what I know. We were in the war but 18 months. Every month we tightened the clamps of fascism—we did not know the word then—tighter and tighter. Had we been required to go on another year with the war most of the voluntary regulation we installed would have gone by the board for full compulsion.

If that war had been a long war, its economic demobilization would have been even more difficult. But even as it was, had it not been for a great believer in free enterprise—Woodrow Wilson—it would not have been demobilized.

At the President's request, I personally drafted numerous cables from Paris, combating arguments that this or that war measure should be given extension or developed into what we now call compulsory economy. Many cried out that we must do this to prevent immediate collapse. In so short a period we had built up organizations of industries, of agriculture, labor, and finance which liked the noncompetitive system. They had privileges and subsidies. They had already grown vested habits and vested interests. They turned instantly into pressure groups, intent on saving all or part of these privileges. And they have never forgotten them, as witness the attempt to restore them in the N. R. A. and A. A. A.

And today we have so learned the need of dictatorship in war and have so accustomed ourselves to the idea that we have the legislation all worked out and prepared for introduction to the

Congress. I recommend those who are skeptical to read the May bill and the War Department report on powers for the President. A further recommended course of reading is the war-tax bill introduced by 50 Senators. There is little in the Nazi system except the mysticism that is not included in all this legislation.

The voice of experience calls a double alarm. In 1917, when we joined in the war, the sense of private enterprise was unimpaired. We had no Fascist taint of planned economy. We had no Socialist taint of Government operation of enterprise. We had no centralization of credit. We had no deficit. We had a debt of only one and a quarter billions. We would start another war with a weakened sense of private enterprise. We would start with a four-and-one-half-billion-dollar deficit in peace expenditures. We would start with over $40,000,000,000 debt. We would have to rearrange the debt by some sort of repudiation or devaluation or capital levy to make room for another forty billion.

When we emerge from another world war, our industry and agriculture will be far more distorted and demoralized. Our taxes will be still more increased. Then we will face the inevitable depression, with all its unemployment and misery, which must follow every great war. The pressures for continued Government regimentation of economic life in peacetime will have been multiplied. Yet we cannot increase, control and direct the economic activities of a people without compulsion. We cannot compel men without undermining their intellectual and spiritual progress. That hideous lesson stands out not only in theory but by practical example. It has been just such forces that have destroyed 12 democracies in Europe. If we go into another world war, liberty will be lost to America.

Surely the voice of experience calls to us that we are little likely to emerge again without great impairment, if not total loss, of our American system of liberty. What shall it profit a nation that loses its own soul?

Our boys fought a magnificent fight in that war. They showed glorious sacrifice and courage. Our people at home showed a vast sense of self-sacrifice and discipline. We know there is no diminution of our national fiber or softening of valor. The world knows we are not afraid to fight.

THE TREATY OF VERSAILLES

We then went to Europe to make the peace.

I have stated elsewhere that President Wilson went to Paris with the prayers of the common people of the whole world that these malign forces in Europe should be wiped away and that a new era should be brought to the world.

I was there, representing our Government in what amounted to a second great American intervention in Europe. Acting through an allied council, the job was to restore economic life and order in Europe, so that peace could be made and life could be restored. We reduced blockades, we opened harbors and canals. We restored telegraph and railway and water communication between new nations and their old enemies. We set up advisers to guide new nations in the unfamiliar paths of governmental organization of finance and public order. We distributed food, raw materials, credit, ships, and railway equipment. We laid the foundations of reconstruction. We were inspired with the hope that this second intervention of America would contribute to build a new world. In the course of that job I was brought again into intimate contact with the heads of all the 26 governments and forced to observe and study the invisible forces of destruction and of revolution again at work.

Again I may repeat what I have said many times elsewhere. There were good men at the peace conference and there were high aspirations. But the malign forces of age-old hates, revenge, of imperialism, of nationalism, and of greed raised an ugly domination of that conference. Moreover, as the conference went on, the unsolvable problems of European boundaries and Europe's economic life contributed more and more to the demoralization of the peace.

President Wilson worked valiantly to combat these evil forces. He laid American idealism on the peace table. He cried out and argued for reason and justice. He knew that Europe must turn its face to the future and its back on the past if there was to be hope of real peace.

He secured the freedom of races who had seen centuries of bondage. He obtained a formal agreement to replacement of the balance of power and power politics by cooperative security, with conciliation and arbitration as its moral forces. In the absence of the United States this very agency soon turned into an instrument of oppression and a cover for expropriation of vast territories.

Our President refused to accept for America an inch of land or a dollar of indemnities, in which we had a right to participate. We wanted nothing but peace.

After all, Britain and France are highly imperialistic democracies. They had great losses to recoup for their people. They secured a total area larger than the United States east of the Mississippi. Italy received a total area about the size of Vermont. Under their irresistible sense of wrongs they demanded punishment and reparations by which the German and Austrian people would have been condemned to abject poverty for two generations. There was a certain contradiction in war and peace. During that war we professed we were fighting only the dictator over the enemy people. Then we punished the enemy people for the war.

However, the only point I wish to make is that the ideals of America are not fitted to solve these problems of Europe. Self-determination by many peoples is impossible because of boundaries or economic life. America cannot, by words of a contract, substitute the processes of justice for hate and fear. We destroyed the expedients of balance of power, of power politics, by which alone Europe secures a periodic peace. Indeed, that peace sowed those dragon teeth of more dictatorships. Worse, it defeated the advances of centuries toward liberty and light in many parts of Europe.

The voice of experience says we can make war in Europe, but we cannot make enduring peace.

THE AFTERMATHS IN EUROPE

Even so, for a time after the peace it looked as if a new era had come. The splendid triumph of democracy gave hope to the peoples of Europe that liberty of men could produce cooperation, good will, and the progress of mankind. To the banners of representative government came Germany, Austria, Serbia, Bulgaria, Poland, Rumania, Greece, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Estonia, Lithuania, Latvia, and Finland.

Nor was it a difficult transition. These peoples already had the foundations of liberalism, with some degree of free speech, free press, the right of free assembly, freedom of worship, trial by jury, and recognition of the dignity of the individual man. These nations already had economic systems under which men could choose their own callings and had the rights of free enterprise.

Thus, after the war, they mostly rid themselves of the last forms of feudalism. And for a few years after the peace, they blossomed forth as self-governing peoples.

But in 15 years came the downfall of most of the new and some of the older democracies and the rise of dictatorships or totalitarian governments, a dozen of them. The immediate cause was economic. How much of the economic pressure was due to war destruction or the treaties or to the Carthaginian attitudes of the victors, or the older inherent malign forces, or the shift of ideas in the industrial revolution is simply speculation. One thing was universal. That was the starry-eyed and the ideologists and the demagogues seeking to cure unemployment by government interference with the proper play of free enterprise, of agriculture, and labor. They impaired or destroyed the initiative and enterprise of their systems. Unemployment became chronic, relief and governmental spending made deficits chronic, government credit weakened or failed. Pressure groups of industry, agriculture, labor, and social reform added to the chaos by their demands for subsidies, privileges, and new ideologies. Men were elected on compromises and promises. Parliamentary bodies became mere quarrels.

Finally, these peoples, despairing that democracy could solve their difficulties, willingly surrendered to dictatorship as the only way out. And over 250,000,000 people, once largely free, voluntarily voted all authority to dictatorship or totalitarian government and sacrificed not only the liberties they acquired after the war but most of those they had built for two centuries. In two more countries—Czechoslovakia and Spain—freedom was crushed by violence.

During all this time since the Great War the United States has tried to be helpful in rebuilding stability in Europe. As I have said, we asked for no reparations or possessions. We reduced the war debts to about 50 percent. We twice participated in revision of reparations to give Germany a chance. Making the largest sacrifice ourselves, we carried through a moratorium upon debts between all governments, including German reparations. We proposed the Kellogg Pact.

In the wider field of general economic regeneration, we have proposed time and again fundamental remedies for the growing difficulties of Europe. In the 12 years after the war we secured or proposed half a dozen conferences for promotion of greater economic stability. Nothing came of them. We asked for the limitation of naval armaments, which imposed great tax burdens upon every toiler in the world. We secured full cooperation in Europe from Great Britain alone. In 1932 we proposed a simple method of reduction of land arms to accord with their own peace treaties. If it had been adopted, this war would not be possible today.

The voice of experience says we cannot create liberty and self-government in Europe. We cannot reconstruct Europe. The social regeneration of nations must come from within. It cannot come from without.

A WORLD WHERE NATIONAL INTEREST COMES FIRST

What have been the attitudes of Europe toward us during this period since the Great War?

Has Europe ever indicated that she would be willing to sacrifice one single small item that might be helpful to us?

After the armistice, when we need not have parted with a dollar, our Government loaned huge amounts of our taxpayers' resources to aid Europe in reconstruction. The victors and the old enemy combined in power politics to bring pressure against us and finally to repudiate even the money we loaned for their own rebuilding. In the meantime, they have accumulated balances and assets in this country several times the amount of the payments.

When our agriculture wallowed in misery from its overexpansion in the war to furnish them food supplies, did they not, all of them, rush to other markets, impose quotas that favored nations which had given them no aid?

We have never complained. We do not now. We realize the nature of selfishness in all nations. We realize too well the age-old malign forces of Europe. We realize the poverty and despair under which these people live. But the voice of experience again calls to us never again to assume that nations do not put their own interests first.

THE WAY IN WHICH WARS END

There is another experience that Europe has demonstrated from the Great War and its aftermath which becomes important at this moment. We are again told that unless we join in, western civilization may be destroyed and we will be the next victim. Therefore, eventually, why not now? That is propaganda to condition the American mind for entry into this war.

Aside from the fact that Britain and France with their empires can defend themselves, if they stay on the defense, great wars do not end that way.

Great wars often enough end in peace before either side is the victor. When one side is the victor in modern wars it is because the other side has become exhausted. At that moment the victors are but one lap behind in the race of exhaustion.

Neither at the armistice in 1919 nor at the end of any other war were the victors or the vanquished ready for or desirous of starting another war. In other words, not even the victor is going to pounce upon a powerful armed neutral. Especially they do not attack 130,000,000 people 3,000 miles overseas, who have a capacity of 10,000,000 soldiers and 25,000 airplanes.

Moreover, there are other factors that enter at the end of any great war. The victors want indemnities and possessions. Indemnities can be paid only from the productivity of a people. Nations cannot be made to work by force. They have to be given hope. That means the national independence of the enemy must be preserved by the victor. World trade has to be restored. In other words, even victors have to return to the paths of peace if they wish to restore their own exhaustion.

Beyond all this, when all great wars end, all the peoples take out their sufferings upon their leaders, either by putting them out of office or by revolution. And therefore the whole setting changes.

The voice of experience says we should discard these forebodings about being the next victim.

THE AFTERMATHS TO THE UNITED STATES

What was the result, to us, of the Great War? We won a military victory. But what did it cost? The 350,000 killed and maimed brought lifelong loss and sorrow to hundreds of thousands of fathers and mothers. Youth made the supreme sacrifice who could have furnished genius and guidance to our people. War placed nearly half a million persons on the national pension list—and the day will come when the number will be many times that. It cost us a huge burden of taxation which will drain our standard of living for generations.

And there were other costs. To fight the war we inflated credit, prices, and ideas, which had to bump down to earth with immense losses to our farmers and unemployment to our workers. Out of the war expansion of industry we had years of maladjustment. Out of the war expansion of agriculture, we plowed up 60,000,000 acres of pasture, and the surplus from this cultivation has been demoralizing to agriculture down to this day. We could have made our own recovery long since, but the constant shocks from Europe have defeated us time and again. Ever since the war we have lived in a hectic economic world.

For 10 years after the war the inflations and reconstructions of the other parts of the world gave us a foreign market. The "new era" was born. Our country, mad with easy money, refused to listen to any words of caution. Finally the war aftermaths, eating at the vitals of world economy, threatened its collapse. And here again we committed a violent error.

Our Federal Reserve Board in 1927 yielded to the power politics of European banks. It tried to stave off this European collapse by inflation of credit. It was a most potent drink from the Mississippi bubble of inflation. We could have got over its headache by 1930, but then came the inexorable collapse of Europe's financial structure and a world-wide depression. The headlines since have been unemployment, bankruptcy, misery, national relief measures, and deficits. With misery came the birth of our Utopias—planned economy, and all the others.

For the first time in the recent history of America we shall show decreased national wealth in this decade of the thirties. We have had about one-third of the American people existing below a decent standard of living. If the wealth we spent and taxes we paid were not in the equation, these people would not be in this plight.

The voice of experience warns us that whether we participate in this war today or not, we face a further quarter of a century of difficulty. If we do participate, we can expect another quarter of a century of impoverishment.

A FEW OTHER CONSIDERATIONS FROM EXPERIENCE

What is the menace today that calls us again to join in European war? We are told we must join in a "holy war" against ideologies that threaten the world.

But our citizens who advocate an American Don Quixote role of tilting at the windmills of lawless and obnoxious ideologies have certain elements of inconsistency. Their emotions have been concentrated on the ideologies of nazi-ism and its softer manifestations of fascism. They studiously overlooked communism until the Hitler-Stalin pact.

During the whole of these twenty-odd years since communism has become ascendant in Russia, from that base communism has been subsidized to undermine democracies everywhere. Yet none of these abolitionists of ideologies had suggested that we go to war with Russia.

If we are going to clean up the noxious ideologies of the world, we will not have succeeded until we have also cleaned up Russia, as well as Germany and some 12 other totalitarian nations.

This experience with Russia proves still another thing. It is not true that we cannot somehow live at peace in the same world with an obnoxious ideology.

And here again must we listen to the voice of experience. You cannot defeat an idea or an ideology with military force. These can be educated out of people only by their own experience. Did the Great War extirpate the idea that might makes right? Did it really implant the noble ideals of peace, of cooperation, and of human liberty?

The voice of experience says America cannot correct the world every time it goes wrong. We should destroy our physical and moral strength in a decade if we set ourselves to police the conduct and ideas of the world. And our service to mankind would end.

SERVICE TO MANKIND

But today Europe is in agony. Our every instinct cries out to help in some way.

What is the greatest service that America can perform for Europe and mankind in this situation? I may repeat:

First. We can strengthen our Army and Navy to a point where no soldier dare land on the Western Hemisphere, irrespective of who wins the war in Europe. The building of that strength is the only warning that counts. It guarantees the peace of one-half the globe.

Second. We can put our own house in order. We can demonstrate that self-governing, free people can solve the problems imposed by the industrial revolution. We can restore employment and end its sufferings. We can build up humane measures of security, of increasing standards of living for all the people. We can wipe out of our midst the disintegrating forces of corruption and coercion of men.

Third. We can thus make a demonstration on this continent that true liberalism is not dead. We can hold alight to a crumbling world the lamp of liberty as the guide to regeneration. We can prove that the hope of humanity lies not in killing or regimenting men but in preserving them and in enlarging their lives.

Fourth. We can from our strength again heal many wounds of war. We can aid the starving, succor the distressed, and care for the innocent.

Fifth. We can aid those who sit at the peace table, not by entanglement but by counsel to mitigate malignance. We can, as President Wilson did in 1919, secure some justice, some freedom, some hope to the world.

We shall never be in position to contribute even this small portion to the salvation of mankind if we ever become a participant in this war.

America, too, has a duty wholly to her own people. From them is coming a stern demand that we must not again sacrifice our youth for a useless hope. I know whereof I speak. My daily mail is heavy with their concern. Our young men are ready to die on our own soil for our own country, but they are defiant against their sacrifice for others' quarrels. Their mothers and fathers, who have skimped and denied themselves that their sons might be even better equipped to serve their country than they have been able to, are filled with anxiety lest the hope of their life service be lost. Our sympathies for the democracies will be drawn upon heavily in the days to come. Our duty to our sons is to hold reason in power over emotion. It is to hold the long vision of America's future. It is to keep out of these wars.

Address by the President of the United States in New York Herald Tribune Forum

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, October 27 (legislative day of Wednesday, October 4), 1939

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a radio address delivered last evening from the White House, in the New York Herald Tribune Forum, by the President of the United States, over the National Broadcasting chain.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am glad to say a word in this forum, because I heartily approve the forum idea. After all, two eighteenth century forums in

Philadelphia gave us the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States.

It is the magic of radio that has so greatly increased the usefulness of the forum. Radio listeners have learned to discriminate over the air between the honest advocate who relies on truth and logic and the more dramatic speaker who is clever in appealing to the passions and prejudices of his listeners.

We have had an example of objective reporting during recent weeks in the presentation of international subjects, both in the press and the radio. Right here I should like to throw bouquets to the majority of the press and the radio. Through a period of grave anxiety both have tried to discriminate between fact and propaganda and unfounded rumor and to give their readers and listeners an unbiased and factual chronicle of developments. This has worked so well in international reporting that one may be pardoned for wishing for more of it in the field of domestic news. If it is a good rule in one, why is it not a good rule in the other?

From the end of the World War onward this country, like many others, went through a phase of having large groups of people carried away by some emotion—some alluring, attractive, even speciously inspiring, public presentation of a nostrum. Many Americans lost their heads because several plausible fellows lost theirs in expounding schemes to end barbarity, to give weekly hand-outs, to give everybody a better job, or more modestly to put a chicken or two in every pot, all by adoption of some new financial plan or some new social system. And they all burst like bubbles.

Some proponents of nostrums were honest and sincere—others, too many of them, were seekers of personal power; still others saw a chance to get rich on the dimes and quarters of the poor. All of them, perhaps unconsciously, were capitalizing the fact that the democratic form of government works slowly, that there always exists in a democratic society a large group which champs at the bit over the slowness of democracy. That is why it is right for us who believe in democracy to keep the democratic processes progressive—moving forward with the advances in civilization. That is why it is dangerous for democracy to stop moving forward, because any period of stagnation increases the numbers of those who demand action, and action now.

There are, therefore, two distinct dangers to democracy—the peril from those who seek the fulfillment of ideals at a pace too fast for the machinery of the modern body politic to function—people who by insistence on too great speed foster an oligarchic form of government such as communism, or nazi-ism, or fascism.

The other group, which presents an equal danger, is composed of that small minority which complains that the democratic processes are inefficient as well as being slow, people who would have the whole of government put into the hands of a little group of those who have proved their efficiency in lines of specialized science or specialized private business. They equally, and in most cases unconsciously too, are in effect advocating the oligarchic form of government—communism or nazi-ism or fascism.

Extreme rightists and extreme leftists should not be taken out by us and shot against the wall, for they sharpen the argument and make us realize the value of the democratic middle course—especially if that middle course, in order to keep up with the times, is just a little bit left of center.

I am reminded of four definitions:

A radical is a man with both feet firmly planted—in the air.

A conservative is a man with two perfectly good legs, who, however, has never learned to walk.

A reactionary is a somnambulist walking backward.

A liberal is a man who uses his legs and his hands at the behest of his head.

It has been a good thing that during the past 20 years we have seen the effect of organized propaganda even when it has been based on nostrums of prejudices.

It has been a good thing for the country that the Congress of the United States has been deluged from time to time by organized propaganda. Members of the House of Representatives and the Senate begin to discriminate nowadays between honest, spontaneous, unsolicited expressions of opinion on the part of voters and the propaganda type of mass appeals.

Because the country is so profoundly interested in the world situation today, I do want to leave with you one thought bearing on international relations. I make bold to do this because the topic of this evening's discussion, as I understand it, is The War's Challenge to the United States.

In and out of Congress we have heard orators and commentators and others beating their breasts and proclaiming against sending the boys of American mothers to fight on the battlefields of Europe. That I do not hesitate to label as one of the worst fakes in current history. It is a deliberate setting up of an imaginary bogey man. The simple truth is that no person in any responsible place in the national administration in Washington, or in any State government, or in any city government, or in any county government, has ever suggested in any shape, manner, or form the remotest possibility of sending the boys of American mothers to fight on the battlefields of Europe. That is why I label that argument a shameless and dishonest fake.

I have not the slightest objection to make against the amateurs who, to the reading and listening public, discourse on the inner meanings of the military and naval events of the war in Europe. They do no harm, because the average citizen is acquiring the gift of discrimination—and the more all of these subjects are talked about by amateur armchair strategists the more the public will make up its own mind in the long run. The public will acquire the ability to think things through for themselves.

The fact of the international situation—the simple fact, without any bogey in it, without any appeals to prejudice—is that the United States, as I have said before, is neutral and does not intend to get involved in war. That we can be neutral in thought as well as in act is, as I have said before, impossible of fulfillment, because, again, the people of this country, thinking things through calmly and without prejudice, have been and are making up their minds about relative merits of current events on other continents.

It is a fact increasingly manifest that presentation of real news has sharpened the minds and the judgment of men and women everywhere in these days of real public discussion—and we Americans begin to know the difference between the truth on the one side and the falsehood on the other, no matter how often the falsehood is iterated and reiterated. Repetition does not transform a lie into a truth.

Neutrality Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD P. NYE

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, October 27 (legislative day of Wednesday, October 4), 1939

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. HIRAM W. JOHNSON, OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a very able address delivered by the senior Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] over the National Broadcasting chain on the evening of Tuesday, October 24, 1939.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

America wants no war. Above all the highly financed far-flung propaganda, all the League of Nations internationalists, all the speeded-up moving pictures, all the war babies of Wall Street, and all the controlled press portraying in lurid colors our supposed duty to democracy and civilization, above them all can be heard the clarion tones of Americans yet true to themselves and their country in the determined unshakable cry, "We want no war."

Indeed, if no other success has come from the 3-weeks' debate in the Senate, at least every Senator has gone on record shouting that he never again will send American soldiers to fight on foreign soil. Of course, this may be discounted. When the bands begin to play, the flags are unfurled, and the soldiers march amid the cheers and the tumult, this promise may be forgotten, but there are some of us who will insist then on its being kept, and will endeavor to hold those whose hands have been raised to Heaven to the literal fulfillment of the pledge. I have said I would rather have the pledge before we entered any war, or before we risk entering the war, and then we might be sure we never would become involved. But this little has been won in the 3 weeks of debate. It may be of consequence hereafter. Watch it, Americans.

A well-known writer, Mr. John T. Flynn, recently said in the Washington News:

"Civic groups in particular find they have utterly lost the ear and the interest of the community.

"Some of this is due to the inherent interest of the war itself. Some of it is due to the effort of propagandists to raise the fears of the American people into supposing that they are in some immediate danger.

"Everybody was geared to protect himself from propaganda from Europe. But the propaganda has been pouring upon us from America, from the Government itself.

"We have been told we are in an emergency. Then the President starts a spy scare and hunt. Then he announces that submarines are prowling off our coasts. Then he invokes the old Espionage Act. People are asked to adjourn politics. The result is that they adjourn almost everything. And thus an unhealthy and artificially stimulated war psychology is generated which operates to distract the American people from their own affairs and their own problems.

"This will be serious unless some power operates to calm the people. What power is there to compete against the Government's power to arouse and frighten them?"

And in this atmosphere and this psychology we come to our task.

We have fortunately the light of experience which may aid us in the solution of our problem. We were participants in one great World War, and the events leading up to it parallel what today the American people are undergoing. It may be necessary for us to go through the same welter with the same false propaganda, to go through the same emotional strain of 20 years ago. It may be necessary for us to learn anew the lesson of those days; but, however much the representatives of the people have forgotten, the people themselves need no second baptism to awaken their recollection. Again we are told by specious arguments and statements, without foundation, that no harm can befall us, and thus we permit ourselves by day-to-day events to be eased into a perilous position.

The great question before us is the repeal of what is known as the arms-embargo law. What is this law? It is simply an act prohibiting the sale of arms, munitions, or implements of warfare to countries at war. It cannot be too often emphasized that the embargo provision has been for some years upon the books, that it was a measure advocated by the President, and it was notice to all the world of the policy we intended to pursue. It was applicable to all nations. It fulfilled every requirement of such a law. It is prohibitory, impartial, and nondiscriminatory. The United States had determined, and in this it was supported not only by the people but by the present administration, to prohibit the sale of arms, ammunition, and implements of warfare to warring nations. We decided our people would not go into the business of arms selling, and we determined there was but one way to stop it—prohibit it entirely. This has been the law for more than 4 years, enacted when we could quietly judge its merits or lack of them, during a time of quiet and peace. To repeal it now, at the instance of one belligerent is simply to do as that belligerent desires, and to commit an unneutral act. To continue the enforcement of this law is simply continuing in force a law of the land that for years has been acquiesced in by legislators and the President himself.

It is claimed by those whose sympathies are with Great Britain and France that Germany has long been preparing for this day. Let me dispose of the oft flung charge that we who oppose repeal do so because of friendliness for Hitler. I do not belong to that class. More than most men, I think, I detest and abhor cruelty in government, or government which may be directed against classes. I detest all dictators, whether actual or potential; and the difference between me and some of my fellows, who are most anxious to aid the British, is that I want to aid no nation at war. I am neither pro-British nor pro-French nor pro-German nor pro-Russian. I am simply a humble American, with my whole heart bound up in the United States, with no other love for any nation except my own, and I am deciding this question of the repeal of the embargo solely as an American. It is not very fashionable these days to be simply an American. But I have been through times like these before. With the English propaganda, with the innumerable distinguished Englishmen among us lecturing to our people and telling Americans what they ought to do, and how they ought to fight, with nearly every medium of publicity in the hands of Englishmen, there is little opportunity for an American's voice to be heard. I thank God for just common people. They know they have to bear the bloody effects of war, and with them rests the hope of America. To them I speak.

Maintaining the embargo provision of our law does not favor Germany save in a negative way. In a positive way it affects all alike. Germany gets nothing under the embargo. She will get nothing if the embargo shall be repealed, but for another reason. Germany, therefore, gets no actual benefit from the law. She gets no benefit from the embargo law at all, because the embargo law embargoes all equally.

In 1936 it was the President's clear policy that the United States should have a "twofold neutrality" and to "decline to encourage the prosecution of war by permitting belligerents to obtain arms, ammunition, or implements of war from the United States." He then declared "through a well-ordered neutrality to do naught to encourage the contest." How different is the role he plays in 1939. He wants now by repeal to have our munitions factories working for England and France. Whence comes the mighty movement to repeal the arms embargo? Surely it cannot be to safeguard American neutrality for this was the national policy declared by the President, and yet it throws neutrality out of the window. It can have but one purpose which so often we have heard—taking sides in the war, and taking sides is not neutrality. If we are to take steps leading to war, there should be the best reasons for taking them. There should not be any acting on false assumptions and wrong premises. For a long time here the people who were insisting on the repeal of the embargo disguised their reasons, but of late many have thrown off the disguise and have made perfectly plain what stalks behind. We, poor Americans, have been subjected to a bombardment day in and day out of propaganda, and, perplexed and confused, have forgotten our past sad experience. We forget that the propaganda of 20 years ago on an emotional urge and for less worthy reasons caused us to take part in a war, and send our boys to fight upon foreign soil. They went full of enthusiasm and idealism to make the "world safe for democracy," and they won, though the world was not made safe for democracy, and we enslaved hundreds of thousands of human beings under dictatorships. Not alone this, but we found that we had to pour forth without stint of our wealth, even for the rehabilitation of countries, and then found that the recalcitrant debtors laughed at us and refused to pay their just debts. The billions that we loaned them are now upon the backs of the American taxpayers. The reasons for which we fought the war were utterly false, and we returned from it a disillusioned people. Are we about to be disillusioned again? Are our memories so short we don't recall what happened to us before? Can America afford to play that role?

The repeal of the embargo can serve but one purpose, and in Washington that is frankly and freely avowed, to have us take sides in a war to which we are not parties by "methods short of war" at first, but inevitably by methods that will make us wholly partisans.

Some Senators have said they would repeal the embargo because it would help the Allies, and that an Allied victory is in American interest. But this is a mere gamble. Such stakes are involved in the gamble that I decline to participate in it. It is a mere gamble that we can change our law so as to help one side defeat the other and yet escape the consequences of war. The gamble may be successful, but it is very speculative, and I will not gamble with American lives. Great Britain and France, because of their mastery of the sea, can obtain everything they desire save the few items in the embargo. Germany, by reason of her position, can obtain none of them. This ought to satisfy the craving for discrimination of Senators and press and internationalists.

The embargo when enacted was a people's law. It is still a people's law. The people of the United States demanded its passage, and the people of the United States should see that it is retained.

It is an American law, enacted by Americans for the protection of America and Americans.

The same old threadbare talk which lured us almost to ruin 20 years ago, was a few months ago the reason given for the repeal of the embargo. Now that we have stripped some of the pretense for this repeal, we're told the reason is to aid Great Britain and France and to destroy Hitler. But it is not our war. We had nothing to do with its making.

(1) We did not participate or acquiesce in the destruction of Austria.

(2) We were not parties to the taking of Memel.

(3) We did not sit in at Munich to destroy Czechoslovakia together with Great Britain and France.

(4) We were not parties to the terrible dismemberment of Poland.

All of these horrors were a part of the power politics played by Britain and France and Germany. We neither participated in them nor had anything to do with them. In no sense could we be said to be parties to them; and yet we are asked by one of the perpetrators who committed the wrongs—Great Britain—to come in and fight their war.

If we repeal our embargo law we're half in and half out of the war. We know from bitter experience in the past how easy it will be to shove us along until we're fully in. We'll be gently pushed about in relation to the present European war once we repeal the embargo until we're in a position from which we cannot extricate ourselves. We'll be pushed about by those wily men who play the game of power politics until they, and those who aid them in America, have succeeded in their design.

The League of Nations' partisans are very much in evidence in this controversy. No longer is it a badge of honor to belong to that moribund society, and the few who are left by artifice and subterfuge argue for repeal. Every one of them from the west coast to the east coast is taking his little part with the brilliant Englishmen who are now in this country telling us in beautiful language, soft and sweet, we must aid Great Britain, that it is our plain duty in this crisis.

The argument most frequently heard in support of the repeal is that if we do not help to stop Hitler now he will conquer Europe and we'll be the next. It is crippling to one's intellect to argue this. Yet the remark "We'll be next" echoes over the land from the Atlantic to the Pacific. If we were not afflicted with a war psychology we'd merely laugh at such a reason for repeal. Hitler will never conquer Europe. It has never been done by anyone yet. Countless efforts have been made to establish hegemony by force, and none have succeeded. The closest approach to it was by Napoleon; and to compare Hitler with Napoleon is absurd.

There is no danger whatever of our being next. How often were we told 20 years ago we had to fight to save democracy and had to fight for the sanctity of treaties. We were repeatedly told—do you not recall it?—that if we did not aid the Allies in stopping the Kaiser, the Kaiser would take us next. How absurd that fact seems now but it has been resurrected with Hitler's coming.

Who knows at this time what this war is about? One day we see the Prime Minister of England full of "appeasement." The next day we see him doing something else. The next day we see him courting Stalin and forgetting all the abhorrence of the Russian. Again, we find England and France "doing business" with Turkey; and contemporaneously with a very large loan to Turkey, we find them all entering into an alliance, and this was a great diplomatic victory for Chamberlain, so the English newspapers said. We do not know what they are doing with Stalin, or what he ultimately will do with them. Nobody knows. And the sinister figure of the "bear who walks like a man" may be seen lurking in the shadows.

The question resolves itself into just this: The absolute prohibition of arms, ammunition, and implements of warfare to all belligerents, or the sale of these in unlimited quantities to Great

Britain and France. All of you know the advice of our first President, which we have preserved so well that each 22d of February his Farewell Address is read to both Houses of Congress.

Thomas Jefferson, when Secretary of State, said: "It was the solemn duty of any neutral nation to prohibit such action as would injure one of the warring powers." He added, "No succor or assistance should be given to either party of foreign wars. No men, arms, or anything else directly serving for war."

John Quincy Adams went further when he said, "Neutrality avoids the consideration of the merits of the contest."

Every one of our earlier Presidents spoke in like vein, and there was no dissent among them that we should hold ourselves aloof in a war that did not concern us, and maintain strict neutrality, and this, notwithstanding the merits of the dispute or the causes of the war. We're a strange people, impulsive and emotional. Our emotions have been aroused on behalf of one of the belligerents now, and with some it threatens to overcome their prudence and their judgment, and the strict rule our Nation has ever followed.

In the course of this debate I have received telegrams from the southern part of the State of California of like import. They read:

"LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

"Senator JOHNSON,

"*Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:*

"You above all Senators should vote for the repeal of the arms embargo. You represent a State whose major industry is the manufacture of airplanes."

Here you find the issue boldly stated. It is demanded that I vote for the repeal of the embargo because of certain manufacturing interests that are to a large extent in the State I represent. We repeal the arms embargo that somebody may manufacture instruments of death and coin the tragic circumstances into money. As between the life of one American soldier and of the profits that could be made from the manufacture of death-dealing instruments, I choose to act for that one life. Here is the picture complete. Anyone with the slightest imagination can see it. I must vote to repeal the embargo because of the great industry in southern California, no matter what the consequences may be. Out with this sort of argument. I will have none of it.

Which course should this Nation pursue? The absolute prohibition of arms, ammunition, and implements of warfare to one belligerent, or the sale of these in unlimited quantity to Great Britain and France? Of course, if we think American, there is but one answer. What should decent, God-fearing people choose? Should they choose the course that would make us an arsenal for one of the belligerents or the course which makes us an arsenal for none? Should we as God-fearing, Christian people choose the profits of selling arms, ammunition, and implements of warfare, or should we choose the prohibition of the sale of weapons of death and destruction? There should be but one answer, and yet the President requires another.

In the press of Washington I have read that everything is ready for the fatal day. It is expected to reenact the days of 1917. The draft law is already prepared, and unquestionably the blanks for the casualty lists are ready. The Government, finance, industry, all are in a war state of mind, ready to accept the inevitable. Oh, my American brethren, don't wait for what Washington thinks is inevitable. Don't wait for long casualty lists to come to us. Don't be misled by expressions, "We're not going into the war"; "We'll take measures short of war." Measures "short of war" today may take us into war tomorrow.

There are other reasons why we should not take this mad step aside from the futility and folly of taking sides. I will not dilate upon its terrors and horrors of war, its maiming and crushing of human bodies, how it swallows in its maw the finest and best of those we have, and the inconsolable woe of the survivors. We need but a quickening of the memory to recall all this. Don't you realize what war will do to the United States? No longer would free America exist. There would be price-fixing, regimentation, men told at what they should work and for what; others told what they should sell, how much they could buy, and all things would follow that follow a dictatorship. Our finances would very soon reach the breaking point. No longer would democracy exist. The war would leave us after fighting to maintain democracy with none of our own. And, remember, preparations of all these things, according to the press, are being made. I cry out against it. It is not our war. We want none of it.

We have our part to play, a proud part. In our international relations, there's just one course to pursue, just one method to render real service—speak our voice, frankly and boldly, be true to our own institutions, hold to our own ideals, be fair and just to all peoples, but standing upon our own shores, remain the master of our destiny.

You may answer, I take too seriously the great risk, but wars have ever grown out of choosing the sides, and from the choice of sides has come the desire to help, and then helping as we do by selling arms, ammunition, and implements of warfare, and then full panoply, the military assistance will march to patriotic tunes. It will be at that time a mere step to sending a fleet abroad, and then soldiers. There is no occasion for us to take such a risk, and I insist that it shall not be done. Americans should help and demand of their public servants that it be not done.

And as I began I close—Americans awaken, do not risk our heritage. Take not the first false step. America keep out of war.

Neutrality Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PRENTISS M. BROWN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, October 27 (legislative day of Wednesday, October 4), 1939

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN, OF RHODE ISLAND

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered today by the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] over the National Broadcasting system dealing with the pending neutrality legislation.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

My fellow citizens, the pending Pittman neutrality joint resolution was favorably reported to the Senate by its Foreign Relations Committee, of which I am a member. It has now been under discussion in the Senate and in the newspapers and in many an American home and meeting place for over a month. An hour and a half ago the Senate passed the joint resolution by a vote of 63 to 30. It now goes to the House of Representatives.

It has puzzled me greatly in following this discussion to find how often intelligent people, from the same facts, reach directly opposite conclusions. I think this is partly because there is confusion as to what the words and phrases mean which we are constantly using.

For example, we speak of the "present neutrality law" and the "proposed neutrality law," but neither of these laws has neutrality as its object. They are domestic legislation to prevent American citizens from exercising rights which they undoubtedly have under international law. The purpose of sacrificing these rights is to make it less probable that events will occur, like the killing of Americans on the high seas, which may excite the American people to go to war. The American people want peace, peace at home and peace in the world.

Again, for example, great numbers of people have been led to believe that neutrality legislation will keep us at peace. So-called neutrality legislation may help to that end, but it only helps. We Americans have the will to stay at peace, but does it follow that we will not be forced into war by some foreign power? Ethiopia and China and Albania did not want war. Do you think that the Czechs surrendered their sovereignty because they were tired of freedom? I know Poland and know that the Poles had done a marvelous piece of work since the Great War. They had resurrected a nation and united the parts into which it had been divided a century before by the great powers. They were developing this newly united country and wanted peace. I know Finland, too, and I do not believe that the Finns today are seeking war, and I hope that that gallant nation may enjoy the peace it needs and deserves.

There were other and more fundamental reasons than unneutrality which dragged those countries into war against their will, and if America is ever again at war, as I trust she may never be, I firmly believe that it will not be because she wants to attack another nation, it will be because some other nation wants something we have and decides to try and take it if she can and attacks us.

War is a terrible thing. I could not, if I would, too strongly emphasize its essential cruelty, its barbarity, its waste of life. War debases and brutalizes. It brings death and suffering, not only to the men in uniform, but to the women and children, the aged, and the infirm, who, somehow, must struggle on behind the front.

War destroys property and prized possessions. It dislocates industry and commerce. It enlists all human endeavor in the dreadful task of destruction.

And, necessarily, war curtails the liberties of the citizens. Even the best-intentioned governments, when face to face with war, must for their own defense and to insure the success of their own cause restrict or deny altogether those individual rights which, taken together, spell freedom for the common man.

Members of Congress have better sources of information and better opportunities to make use of them than private citizens, but it is well to bear in mind that the personal feelings of these chosen representatives of the people are just the same as those of the people themselves. Most of them have sons or other near relatives liable to military service in case of war, and all of them are earnestly trying not for personal reasons but for patriotic reasons to keep us at peace. They are trying to do what is best for America. And all of us must try to do the same. Let no interest

in a foreign country, no matter how deep our affection for it may be, prevent any American citizen from placing our America first.

The question before us is not what course would have been best a generation ago, or what might have kept us out of the last war, or what might be of assistance if world conditions were otherwise than they are, or what might further some vague ideal. The question we must answer is: What course is now best for the security of the United States of America in a world where only force is respected?

The enactment of the present law was a sincere effort to answer that question, but later circumstances proved the answer to be mistaken, partial, and illogical. The arms-embargo provision turned out to be a help to an aggressor nation preparing to attack and a handicap to its victim when attacked. So it helps those nations overthrowing established international law and order in the world and hinders those nations which fight to sustain them. It proved to be unneutral in fact though neutral in purpose.

That law, although it forbids the shipment of arms and ammunition and implements of war to warring powers, does not prohibit the shipment to them of a great many articles which are included on every contraband list and so are subject to seizure or destruction by the countries at war. And it permits all this contraband to be shipped into war zones on American vessels and at the risk of American shippers. The law as it now stands does not require a transfer of title to the foreigner prior to shipment.

Let us suppose that a cargo, owned by American shippers, sails for a belligerent port. The ship may be sunk, American lives lost, the cargo seized, and American property taken. What would be the effect on American public opinion if this should happen? Yet current news reports telling of the seizure of the American ship *City of Flint* and of the sinking of neutral vessels show that this is a real and not an imaginary danger. This result is possible under our existing law—a law which, so its supporters would have you believe, is an infallible guaranty against war.

The distinction in that law between arms, ammunition, and implements of war, which are embargoes, and the raw materials and manufactured articles equally necessary for the conduct of present-day warfare, which are not embargoes, is neither substantial nor logical. There may be a sentimental difference, but certainly there is no substantial one, and whether a soldier dies because of lack of food or is killed for lack of ammunition makes little difference to the victim or to our responsibility.

I am reminded of the distinction which some well-meaning folk make between defensive weapons, which they approve as desirable, and offensive weapons, which they denounce as wicked. But is there any real difference? Take a bombing plane. If it attacks an open town it is an offensive weapon. If, on the other hand, it sinks a hostile fleet attacking our shores, surely it is a weapon of defense. And the distinction between implements of war and materials of war is certainly no more real.

The proposed Pittman law provides that no American vessel would be permitted to carry goods or passengers to warring nations. This would effectually prevent any risk to American lives or ships. Since the joint resolution was introduced it has been altered to limit the exercise by American vessels of their rights under international law only so far as is necessary to avoid obvious risks.

Next, title to all goods shipped to nations at war must pass to the buyer before shipment. That means that all transportation is at the buyer's risk.

And there would be no restriction at all on the kind of goods that could be shipped. Arms and ammunition are treated just like gasoline and cotton. But—and this is the important point—all war business would be open to all comers on the same terms, "cash and carry."

I am convinced that the pending proposals will help to keep us out of war because they avoid many of the risks and incidents which might bring on war.

To be sure, these proposals involve sacrifices, real sacrifices. We cut off all shipping to belligerents, and sharply restrict trade otherwise. We handicap our merchant marine. Temporarily we hold in abeyance our national policy of the freedom of the seas for which we have fought in past years. Yet we must make such sacrifices if we are to give to our citizens the larger degree of security which they demand, a security which we attain only by preventing the occasions which might incite public war feeling.

The proposed Pittman law is, therefore, in my opinion, clearly preferable to the law now in force. I do not question the sincerity or fair-mindedness of those who oppose these proposals. As the President said in his recent message, "The mantle of peace and of patriotism is wide enough to cover us all."

The question of permitting the export of arms under the rigid restrictions of the proposed amendments is simply a question of national security in an aggressors' world. Almost all are agreed, I take it, that our own defenses must be substantially strengthened beyond existing levels. We need not only to enlarge our Army and Navy, but also to equip them. We need not only to equip them in the first instance, but we must somehow provide that, in case we are called upon to defend this country, there may be a constant stream of arms and munitions for the use of our armed forces. This calls for munition plants not only equipped with special machinery, but also manned with specially trained workers. These munition plants must be prepared in advance. Private industry can provide them and foreign sales will make it possible for them to do so. Let us be realistic about this matter, for surely in a world where right is respected only insofar as it is supported by might, we cannot afford to neglect our defenses. When houses around us are being robbed, it is no time to let our own burglary insurance lapse.

But it is suggested, we should not change our law now that the war has started. This argument comes illogically from those who assured us, only a few months ago, that there was no occasion for amending the law then, because there would be no war. Furthermore, they themselves now wish to amend the existing law by adding new provisions of their own. And on the merits the objection is not substantial. To change from one to another form of nondiscriminatory legislation, which we conceive to be more in our own national interest, is surely no proper concern of any belligerent. I certainly cannot concede that Congress is under any legal or moral obligation to refrain from legislating for the duration of the war merely because some of the nations at war may not like our legislation.

Some over cautions people argue that we must do nothing even within our rights to offend any warring country. Let me ask you whether the victors in the present war will regard with more respect a cowardly United States than a courageous one? If we run away from our responsibilities, if through fear we fail to protect our own interests, we shall be fair game for any aggressor. This appeasement policy has its limits, as we have seen in Europe. Let us not forget that the United States is a first-class power, potentially one of the strongest if not the strongest in the world. Let us therefore act like one in protecting our interests.

And now, one final thought. The proposals which I am supporting tonight are still in process of being debated in the Congress. They are subject, as they should be, to full and free discussion. But after such discussion, especially in times as critical as the present, there comes a time when further talk is mere obstruction, impeding the democratic processes of representative government. Our democracy is built on the principle of majority rule: After discussion, we vote, and after a vote we abide by the result. Any delaying of that vote past the time when action is imperative is a blow at the very foundations of our Government. Let us not give color to the claim of totalitarian governments that democracies are inefficient. And surely in these troublous times, when the lights of free institutions have been either extinguished or dimmed elsewhere in the world, we will not countenance here in America anything to cast doubt on the ability of representative government to function in a crisis, and to enact into law the decision of its duly constituted majorities.

Washington Teachers' Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL A. HATCH

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, October 27 (legislative day of Wednesday, October 4), 1939

ADDRESS BY HON. JERRY VOORHIS OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech delivered by Hon. JERRY VOORHIS, Representative from California, before the Washington Teachers' Union on the 17th of this month.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Throughout the length and breadth of America tonight there are millions of people who are afraid. They are afraid because they have no assurance that tomorrow or next month or next year they will be able to provide through constructive labor a decent living for themselves and their families. They are afraid because the American Congress has not yet had the wisdom, courage, or patriotism to solve the economic problem of poverty in the midst of plenty. Upon the solution of that problem—and it will not solve itself—depends the future of democracy in America.

Teachers must help solve it. They must be free to help solve it. And the children they teach must be free to think about it, too. For God has given to the American people very rich gifts, and unless we use them well and for the benefit of all our people, His judgment must certainly rest upon us.

The teacher's job is twofold: First, to prepare the youth of America to live in the world as it is. In this field fall all phases of vocational education, training in all the tool subjects such as mathematics, English, and the like, and the teaching of the basic facts regarding history and government of our country. Second comes the job of preparing youth to live in the world as it ought to be and of inspiring young people to build that better world. In

this field come all the arts, most of the studies about the peoples of the world, their history and cultures, literature, and the social sciences.

In a dictatorship only the first kind of teaching can be done. The last word in human development has been spoken by the dictator. It is for teacher and pupil alike to follow that word obediently. Let us work to the end that this may never happen to the schools of America.

I know no better organization to do that job than unions of school teachers, banded together to see to it that they may be allowed to do their job better and better as time goes on. But in these teachers' unions there must, I am convinced, be no trace of control by any regimented group which is itself committed to an authoritarian philosophy. Even as we want to keep our schools free to work forward toward that better America in which we all believe, so we must see to it that the teachers' unions are always free to follow whatever policy is best for American teachers, American schools, and the American labor movement in its broadest sense. This they cannot be in any case where the influence of people whose primary allegiance is not to America or her schools or her teachers is strong.

In seeking to defend democracy we must be careful that we do not destroy its fundamental principles. All people in America have a right to differ from the majority opinion. They have a right to criticize the Government. They have a right to question the economic order. It must be so or we lose some of the most essential things in American democracy. In all that I have to say tonight I want it distinctly understood that I am pleading only for understanding, knowledge, and true freedom, and I am not talking about suppression or denial of constitutional rights to anyone. But we can I believe devise ways and means of putting an end to foreign domination of the actions and consciences of people in America and we can, I believe, require that all organizations seeking to influence American public opinion give full publicity to their memberships, aims and purposes, financial transactions, and methods of propaganda From that point on we must depend on the good sense of the American people.

There are some things I believe we must frankly face. I have an abiding faith in the strength of American democracy. I do not believe it is going to be destroyed either by conquest or by war or by boring from within. I think the size and extent of really subversive movements has been exaggerated and I know there has been a tremendous lot of irresponsible name calling. But having said all that, I hasten to add that we would be foolish indeed not to realize that the menace of continued financial feudalism in America is real, that the Nazi menace within the United States is real, and that the Communist menace within the United States is real. I speak not as an alarmist who sees Nazis or "reds" under every chair and table, but as a citizen of a democratic nation who does not wish to see our liberties impaired either by the conduct of groups fundamentally opposed to our national democratic tradition or as a result of a hysteria which the very presence of these groups may produce in this country.

We have at present in America certain forces which must be understood and fairly combatted. These are the Communists, under direct and full control of a foreign government, and the Nazis, under direct and full control of a foreign government. I object not to the economic views of these groups, though I differ with them; but I do object to their doing the bidding in America of foreign dictators. I think that is bad, serious, a real menace. To talk about a united front under these circumstances is, I believe, to counsel defeat for true democratic progress. Then there are those persons who call everyone a Communist who differs with them and who believes in a social program of any kind, and those, on the other side, who call everyone a Fascist who disapproves of the dictates of the Communist Party line.

From these incongruous, incompatible sources there is grown a concert of discord. They all will contribute alike, if we let them, to the unmaking of America, to the disruption of democratic government, to the destruction of the institutions through which democracy must be preserved, and our American life made better.

Each group needs some attention. We had hoped that when the alliance between Russia and Germany was concluded that the evident hypocrisy of both dictators would destroy their camp followers in America. To some extent this is happening, but we were wrong in thinking it would be complete. Now, to the loyal Communist, Germany is not the enemy nation; but wicked England and France are. And to the bund members has gone out the word to let up on calling Communists bad names and to center the attack on the American Government itself.

The Committe on un-American Activities has shown that the Communist Party is essentially a branch of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, that the German-American Bund is loyal to Hitler first and America afterward, that each of these organizations has cleverly spread its influence to other organizations most of whose membership doesn't realize that this has happened. The committee has also shown that on the basis of a psychology of fear and hatred, self-seeking individuals have made a very good thing financially out of fake organizations and movements purporting to combat communism and to be saving America from some menace or another.

Few people realize, however, how very much false and exaggerated lists of alleged Communists or "reds" help out the real Communists. When Mrs. Dilling compiled a so-called list of "reds" and included in it Senator BORAH; Harold Swift, of Chicago; Lorondo Taft; Mrs. Franklin Roosevelt; Mahatma Ghandi; Glenn Frank, of the National Republican Party special committee, Ramsay MacDonald, and hundreds and hundreds of others like them—all lumped together, living and dead—lumped them with a few real Communists, like Lenin and Trotsky, Browder, and Foster, and their followers, she actually laid the groundwork for the most serious threat that today exists to the effective work of anyone attempting to work against the real Communist movement.

She made an attack on real Communists appear ridiculous in the eyes of some of the best people of this country, for she made it possible for real Communists to say, "What, me a 'red'? Sure, I am listed with Swift and Glenn Frank and Senator BORAH."

In my opinion the real battle for America and all she stands for will have to be fought by the people in the ranks of labor, in the churches, in the various mass organizations of the country. We need more and truer religion divorced from any trace of either race or religious prejudice or fear of championship of the cause of the poor. We need a stronger labor movement not a weaker one. And we need more organizations of our people for good causes of every sort. So while we are combatting Communist or Nazi domination of any of our organizations we must realize one more group of enemies. The Tom Girdlers, the silent forces behind the Associated Farmers, and others who exploit workers and attempt to keep them divided for their own gain. Like the Mrs. Dillings they are the best friends the real Communists have. For they make recruits faster than any Communist organizer can possibly do.

To you as teachers I would especially speak, first, because your duties and responsibilities in this matter are great; and, second, because I, as a teacher, want to share those responsibilities with you. To you as members of the teachers' union I want especially to speak because I am a member of the teachers' union.

I believe in the teachers' union as one of the most effective means of preserving democracy in and for our schools. I believe in the teachers' union because it takes the teacher out of the limit of academic walls and places him in the community, where he must function if he is to be a successful teacher.

I am proud of the record of the teachers' union. From 1916 it has fought for the best ideals and traditions of our country; fought courageously, constructively, effectively. Tenure, pensions, salaries, abolition of child labor, care of the health of children, decent school buildings, a practical social curriculum are matters in which you have worked—worked well. I congratulate you—us—may I say.

Tonight I want to congratulate this local—Local 8—for its contribution in the three mighty big fights:

1. Local 8 was the only teacher organization in the United States which fought actively for the repeal of the Sumners amendment to the District of Columbia appropriation bill in 1926 and had that un-American provision repealed—the law which, in effect, could have prevented the teaching of the theory of evolution, of comparative history, and of American political history.

2. Local 8 of the American Federation of Teachers was the first teacher organization in the country to open fight against the "red" rider in 1935 and it fought until that un-American piece of legislation was repealed.

3. Local 8 was one of the first teacher groups in this country which opened a vigorous and intelligent fight against attempts at Communist domination of the American Federation of Teachers.

Since 1935 this local has made a splendid fight, often against great odds, to rid this country of the treacherous tactics of the Nazi bund and the Communist Party. I congratulate you on your vision and your courage. More power to you.

I hope I have made myself clear. In a word, what I want to leave with you is this warning. Don't be misled by those who tell you there is nothing threatening to the institutions of America in the regimental organizations dominated by foreign powers like the bund and the Communist Party. Both are real things, and don't be misled either by those who try for political or monetary gain to charge everyone who opposes them or tries to improve the lot of the American people with being Communists, Fascists, or Nazis.

The Church and the Underprivileged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS T. MALONEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, October 27 (legislative day of Wednesday, October 4) 1939

ADDRESS BY HON. FRANCIS T. MALONEY, OF CONNECTICUT

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address which I delivered at the National Conference of Catholic

Charities in Denver, Colo., on Sunday, August 6, 1939, entitled The Church and the Underprivileged.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A convention of the leaders and workers in the Catholic Charities of America assumes a special significance in these times of political and social distress among peoples in other parts of the world. Throughout all its history the church has been a courageous and steadfast custodian of the light of charity. Fierce struggles and bitter materialistic forces have not prevailed against it. In humanity's hour of deepest despondency the church has held up the light to illumine the hearts and minds of men, and to guide them once more toward peace and good will. That light and that guidance are needed in the world today. This convention is a signal to distressed peoples everywhere that the light still shines and that the church still holds it forth.

Equally significant is the fact this convention is held in the land of a free people. Just as the world looks more than ever to the church for spiritual guidance, it turns also to our own country as the protector of the sacred principles of democracy. There is a direct relation between political freedom and the charitable activities of an unoppressed church. The loss of a people's right to govern themselves most often follows a denial of the right to worship, and the loss of religion means a renunciation of charity. This is the most disastrous effect of totalitarianism. It not merely beclouds the minds of men—it also smothers their souls. Peace among nations is not only threatened—men and women themselves become cruel and selfish. Neighbor is set against neighbor—blind passions are aflame—persecution is rife—and charity dies.

In magnificent contrast to such catastrophes, we meet here to renew the work of our church in all the communities of our country. That we are permitted to assemble under the auspices of our own religion—that we are privileged to give expression to the principles of our own faith—is the great blessing of America. The broad program for Nation-wide charity to which, by this convention, we again dedicate the church, is our response to that blessing—one of our contributions to the enlightened land in which we live.

The close association of charitable activities with religion is characteristically American. Catholic charities flourish best in this country because it is recognized that the church is the proper agency for translating a spiritual virtue into effective action. The charities undertaken by other churches also flourish here. No one could live, as I have, in a typical city of New England without learning to appreciate the collective value of the charitable activities of all religions. In such a city the Jewish, Protestant, and Catholic charities function side by side, and out of that common effort arises a better community and a more harmonious spirit among the people.

That is as it should be. Charity can be the exclusive virtue of no single group, and I know of no religious group against whom one would charge a lack of charity. On the contrary, I know well of the innumerable good things that all churches have done in the name of charity. Religious persecution, even religious prejudice, cannot survive a common interest in charity. Even during periods of temporary conflict in this country no religious group has been denied the right and opportunity to foster and promote charity among its own members. The day will never come in America when the people of any faith will be denied the sacred prerogative of performing the corporeal works of mercy.

Out of this association of charity with religion comes a widespread popular support of charitable activities. This is especially true of Catholic charities. Not only are more men and women enlisted as actual workers than at any previous time in the history of the church, but also the entire body of Catholics in this country are unified in their charitable undertakings to an extent hitherto unattained. This unity of purpose suggests, I believe, a growing social consciousness among our people—a realization that in a complex modern world the function of charity is to provide broad and comprehensive adjustments rather than to give particular and isolated assistance.

We know too well that the obligation of charity no longer can be discharged by tossing coins to beggars in the streets. The job of charity today goes far beyond casual almsgiving. What is needed now is a broad program carefully planned and effectively coordinated to uplift the entire Nation, to root out the festering defects that lie beneath the surface of our communities, and to rebuild the structure of living on sounder values and better social foundations.

In this great work of reconstruction the church will play a decisive role, because the major task is to give spiritual significance to the American way of life. The mad rush for material riches which so characterized the wild and speculative era of the 1920's was bound to be disastrous. It ignored the eternal truth that wealth alone can make no person truly happy and no nation truly great.

During the past 10 years we have witnessed unprecedented changes in our whole social and economic structure. These changes were so rapid that it was difficult for us to keep pace with them in our thinking and planning. Even now as one travels the country he finds that large numbers of people are leaving the land and drifting into industrial centers to further burden the labor market. Plantation owners in the South and Southwest can no longer engage the same number of tenant farmers—not even one-half the number—they have employed in the past. Everywhere one hears of large surpluses of agricultural workers. In many States they are the most important element in the unemployment situation. We find that the development of certain types of large-scale farming in the United States has brought about a great increase in the number of migratory workers. The Farm Security Administration estimates that there are some 350,000 such workers, who with their families make up a tremendous army of people none too happy. These folks are constantly on the move. It is impossible for them to maintain normal standards of home life. They suffer severe wounds and constant worry.

We have in a number of communities in the United States great groups of stranded industrial and mining populations. This is in part due to the changing locations of industries and to a diminishing demand for certain types of products. While many of the people in these centers have, with characteristic American initiative and ingenuity, adjusted themselves to the situation by finding new outlets for their talents and labor, there are many for whom there is yet no outlet excepting employment on Government projects.

In every industrial center there is an increasing mechanization and acceleration of industrial processes. The factory, like the farm, no longer requires the same number of workers to turn out the same amount of work. Machinery has cast men into the vortex of strangling unemployment. We need God's help to find the solution to the problem, and His help is certain if we undertake and carry to a successful conclusion a much-needed program of spiritual rearmament. He has endowed us with an everlasting free will, but has taught us by way of His own suffering and sacrifice that earthly and eternal happiness are available through the practice of charity, mercy, and brotherly love.

As in other times in human history, we find that the changes of these recent years have brought some development of ideologies that are completely at variance with the American tradition and way of life. We find these ideologies a threat equally to government and religion. False prophets are taking advantage of the sufferings of the people, and because men feel neglected we sometimes find a faltering faith. Those who indulge in the pagan practice of preying upon the distress of the poor are a challenge to every person who believes in the sacredness of the home, in the inviolability of religious beliefs, and in the fundamental principles of democracy. They are a challenge to the church and its agencies of charity, and compel us, for social and economic reasons as well as to earn the favor of God, to maintain close contact and sympathy with the underprivileged. They are a challenge to the Christian spirit of charity and of service. They create the demand for spiritual rearmament. They show us the way to work out our eternal salvation and earn a place amid the everlasting beauties of eternity.

The industrial changes of the past decade have created welfare problems that are unprecedented in American history. First and foremost is the problem of unemployment. This has ever been a problem of an industrial civilization. Even during that period which seemed to be one of great prosperity, we had as many as two and one-half million of our people unemployed. The present problem of unemployment is not due merely to the ordinary ups and downs of the business cycle. It is due to fundamental changes in our whole structure of industry and agriculture.

Next in importance to the problem of unemployment is that one of the terrifying insecurity of old age. This problem has been aggravated by natural hazards to which working people are exposed during the years when they are contributing their physical and mental energy to the benefit of our national economy. It is accentuated by the economic losses due to ill health and by the failure of many workers who have passed their summertime of life to secure employment. When industrial conditions were fairly stable, the workers devoted their lives to one industry and lived in one community. The changes of recent years have dimmed the light and hope of many people just past 40. New industries, and old industries located in new areas, have preferred younger people. The whole process has led to the premature superannuation of large numbers of industrial workmen.

Ill health is a continuing threat to a great class of our wage-earning population and reduces many families to poverty.

In our struggle with the perplexing questions of unemployment and old age the American people must not overlook the particular problem of dependent childhood. For more than a hundred years the care of the underprivileged child has occupied the center of the stage in our welfare programs. The Catholic people have devoted more of their resources to the care of children than to any other form of charity. I am sure that this interest in the underprivileged child will continue to occupy the greatest space in the hearts of all of those engaged in Catholic charity work. The child is the hope of the future. Neglected children of this period would grow up to plague each other, and the Nation, in another generation. Radical movements concentrate on children and young people. Leaders of such movements know that the young are flexible and can be molded more easily. Thus the need of a continuing provision for the religious and material well-being of underprivileged children.

The changes of the past decade have brought the problems of security against the industrial hazards of life to our attention in a very dramatic way. Within a few years we have become social-security conscious. That is why there has been rapid progress in social-security legislation. Though it is as yet far from perfect, we have, through the Social Security Act of 1935, set up a Federal-State system of old-age assistance under which grants are now being provided for 1,838,359 aged persons in this country. We have not yet attained our ideal in our old-age pension system, but we have

made progress. In the Social Security Act we have established a national system of old-age insurance which will soon begin paying benefits to nearly a million people. The plans further add to this old-age insurance program a system of survivor's insurance providing protection for the widows and children of forty-odd-million insured persons.

The Social Security Act has also provided a system of unemployment compensation which in the past 2 years has tided nearly 3,000,000 people over temporary unemployment.

In the social-security program our Government has made provision for mothers with dependent children, for crippled children, for the blind, and for the physically incapacitated. There has been a great expansion in the public-health facilities of the various States and local communities. This program presents a great challenge to leaders and workers in Catholic charities. You have had a better chance of acquainting yourselves with this program than any other group in the country. You are giving a great part of your lives to the welfare of the people whom this legislation is designed to serve. Those who are entitled to security benefits, as well as the people as a whole, look to you for guidance in the sound administration of the program.

While so much is at stake in the life of the Nation, you must not be satisfied with limited and isolated programs. You must consider it a part of your duty to maintain close contact with the entire public program. It is your responsibility.

The bitter lessons of the depression have been well learned. We know that to rely solely upon machine-made prosperity is to place the happiness and security of most of our people in jeopardy. We know that when the momentum of the machine is increased it runs roughshod over the lives of men and women. Ten years ago the efficiency and versatility of the productive forces in this country amazed the world. We were hailed as the harbingers of a new era—and we basked in the glory of our superiority. It was only when our marvelous machine had become stalled that we realized how superficial had been its accomplishments. We were the wealthiest nation in the world, yet millions of our own citizens were uneducated, undernourished, and poorly housed. We proudly proclaimed our billion-dollar enterprises, but we were blissfully ignorant of the fact that more than half our people faced advancing age with no assurance of security.

We confidently announced that poverty had forever been banished, when the very machine economy we hailed was taking away the jobs of our citizens. We know now the fallacy of our earlier ways, and we are resolved that the America of tomorrow will lead the world, not as the country with the most riches but as a nation of enlightened and happy people.

The first step in this remaking of America is already under way. It is to reconstruct the status of our fellow citizens who have not yet had the full advantages of the living that America should provide.

The program already espoused by our National Government is directed toward the elimination of the chief obstacles in the lives of these underprivileged Americans. But the more important work must be done by the church. The Government can improve living conditions—but it remains for the church to reconstruct the lives of these Americans. We want not merely better homes—we need better families. Security in old age from the anxieties of material want is a laudable goal for governmental action—but we need also the inspiration and example of elderly men and women whose lives have been good.

The most impressive governmental program to improve the conditions of the poor would be empty and ineffective, unless there were added to it the priceless ingredient of spirituality. That is why the church's program for social action, as represented by this convention, is important to America. The people themselves have already decreed that the program for aiding the underprivileged will be backed by all the resources of the Nation. It remains for the churches to give to that determination the spiritual guidance that will raise it to a holy crusade for justice.

How heartening it is to see in action at long last a government dedicated to the principle that it is the function of the state to rescue its citizens from the misfortune and insecurities of modern life. We Catholics should be proud that the traditions of our church, and the action of our own charities, have prepared us to join in this crusade. The encyclicals of our pontiffs have defined our obligations to our underprivileged brethren. These definitions are wholly compatible with the purposes of our Government. If the man who earns his bread by the sweat of his brow finds himself more definitely a part of the government of his country today, he has attained the dignity which the teachings of our religion have always proclaimed for him.

If the poor, the sick, and the afflicted, see new hope in the America of tomorrow, it is because at last in this country the principles of charity have become the platform of national policy.

Thus it is that humanitarian government in a free nation moves jointly with the flowering of religious teachings. Thus it is also that our own church, with other churches, finds new opportunities to fulfill its ageless mission of charity. To this work, we, as Americans, and as Catholics, rededicate our energies and our activities—and to the new and enlightened America, where none is persecuted because of race or religion, where none is oppressed by class or by dictator, and where all are exalted by renewed faith in the goodness of man, we pledge our allegiance and devotion.

Neutrality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, October 27 (legislative day of Wednesday, October 4), 1939

RADIO ADDRESS BY COL. THEODORE ROOSEVELT

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address delivered by Col. Theodore Roosevelt over the Mutual Broadcasting System on October 16, 1939. I wish particularly to call to the attention of the Senate these statements from Colonel Roosevelt's speech:

Make no mistake, if you take the first step you must take the last. Make no mistake, many of those who are urging the first step upon us mean us to take the last as well.

No one is threatening our peace under the embargo as it stands. In the name of peace, therefore, why should we change it? Our Ark of the Covenant is our American representative government. It will be destroyed if we engage in war. I believe we should retain the embargo.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A grim war is tearing Europe today. Our attitude toward it will determine the future of our Nation. It is, therefore, the duty of every American, particularly those in power, to use one yardstick to measure their decisions, and that yardstick must be the welfare of the United States and her citizens.

We can be sure that if we don't look after our country, nobody else will.

I have no patience with those who are always thinking of the interests of other people and neglecting the interests of our people. They urge us to fly to the defense of London and Paris. Who is there in Europe who would fly to the defense of Boston or Chicago?

Many in this country are covertly or openly urging us as a nation to take sides in this war. The majority of people urging us to war-like acts are well-meaning. The premises from which they reason, however, are entirely wrong.

One group is those who have not become at heart American and who have a divided loyalty. This type is well illustrated by a man who told me a few days ago that he was 75-percent English.

All belonging to this group are thinking crooked, because they are not thinking of America but of other countries.

Next there is the group that says that we must be prepared to go to war to defend other democracies.

This is wrong also. Our mission is to defend our American democracy.

Some 22 years ago, with 2,000,000 other young Americans, I went to a war in Europe. We were told it was a war to make the world safe for democracy; a war to end wars. I, for one, believed this. Theoretically we won the war. The condition of the world is a bitter commentary on the value of our victory. Not only did we gain nothing for the world, but we hurt ourselves and damaged our own democracy.

Our Ark of the Covenant in this country is our representative democracy. It was shaken by the last war. I do not believe it would survive another. The reasons are clear. During a war we should have to adopt a dictatorial form of government. The economic chaos following war would rivet that dictatorship upon us.

We would not make the world safe for democracy any more than we did in the last war. We would merely ruin ourselves.

Another argument used by the people who believe we should take sides in the war is that if England and France were defeated, Germany and Russia would be hammering at our shores immediately. This type of individual is apt to voice the old cliche that it is the British Fleet that is standing between us and Germany. Nothing of the sort is true. The British Fleet is standing between England and Germany. If it did not exist, we would still be perfectly capable of defending ourselves and South America. Our fleet, not England's, is standing between this hemisphere and Germany. Any military or naval man knows that the farther a unit operates from its base the infinitely weaker it becomes. It would be an impossibility for a navy less than two or three times our strength to attempt to engage our vessels near the shores of our Nation. Obviously, this being the case, such a thing as an expeditionary force to attack us is unthinkable.

We tend to fear that which we do not know. Therefore many of our people have been misled into believing that fleets of airplanes could assail us. They could not. If we control the seas

no enemy can establish air bases on this side of the ocean. They would have to attempt to fly to our country from great distances. The farther from the base an airplane operates, the more ineffective it becomes. Airplanes could not take off from a great distance and arrive in this country carrying sufficient bombs to injure us and sufficient fuel to return to their bases.

Not only is this the case, but the power of airplanes has been greatly exaggerated. General Fuqua of our army inspected a large munitions factory near Valencia after the Spanish civil war. He checked the record which showed airplanes dropped 5,551 bombs on the plant that covered eight city blocks. Only 21 hit, only 6 did real damage, and none caused the plant to shut down.

Neither Franco in Spain nor the Japanese in China were able, with control of the air, to destroy railroads that were vital to their plans.

With the Atlantic and Pacific to bulwark us, we can defend ourselves from aggression either from Europe or Asia, and we can defend South America as well.

Then there are those Americans who say, "I don't want to get into war, but I am sure we will be dragged in eventually." This is trash. There is no reason whatsoever that America need be dragged into war, providing she makes up her mind that she will not be.

What is more, if we go in now we will be permanently entangled in Europe and will never be able to shake free of her bitter, ancient feuds. We will be caught like a fly on a flypaper.

I say our attitude must not be that "we hope we can keep the United States out of war." It must be that we intend to keep the United States out of war.

Personally, I am not afraid to fight, but I am afraid to have the American people fight.

We must not go to war. Nobody wins a war. The victor loses as well as the vanquished.

So much for those who wish us to engage in the conflict or who believe that we cannot help being engaged in the conflict. I believe them in the minority. I believe that the great majority of the American people feel as I do, and wish us to maintain peace. The problem, therefore, is how best can we maintain peace.

The law of the land today is the so-called Embargo Act, prohibiting the shipment of munitions to all belligerents. There is under consideration a measure abolishing this act and substituting for it the so-called cash and carry. The cash and carry in its essence means that we will accept orders from anyone who will pay us spot cash here in this country and transport the goods themselves.

I believe that some of the proponents of this plan are those who would like to see the United States profit through orders for munitions. I believe, however, that by far the largest number of its backers represent individuals who wish to help England and France. Some say so honestly, as Senator NORRIS did. Others say so by inference, as Henry L. Stimson did. Still others merely say they believe it to be the best way to maintain peace. I believe we should maintain the embargo.

I do not believe we should change to cash and carry because I believe by adopting the cash-and-carry plan we are moving one step toward being involved ourselves.

Lincoln said this country could not exist half free and half slave. It could be said with equal truth that we cannot as a nation be neutral and partisan at the same moment. We must be either one or the other.

What is more, if we start being partisan we have started down the road that leads to war. One step invariably leads to another. It is impossible to limit objectives. We theoretically will start by selling for spot cash, then the cash will run out and our customers will demand credit. All those who are making money will then demand that credit be extended. We can see this already in the 90-day-credit provision suggested.

We as a country will be geared up to furnish the munitions. Soon we will find that the nations buying munitions owe us a very large sum of money, and we will be told that the only way to make our debt good is to help them further. In that fashion we will gradually be edged over the precipice.

I call on history to prove my point. We disapproved of Germany's actions in 1914, as we disapprove of Germany's actions today. At the beginning of hostilities England and France endeavored to arrange credits in this country. The national administration hesitated to give approval, stating that we wished to maintain a strictly neutral attitude. Eventually the administration conceded the point. The credits were granted. Then came the question of the sale of bonds. Again we went through the same formula, and again eventually the administration conceded the point. As late as 1916 President Wilson won his election on the slogan "He kept us out of war." All through this procedure we were assured as each step was taken that we had as a nation no intention of going further, certainly not to the extent of declaring war. In spite of this, only 6 months after the election had been won on the slogan I have cited, we declared war.

At that time we were assured by President Wilson, who was undoubtedly sincere, that the war could not involve American troops; merely our Navy would be used. However, we soon found ourselves with more than 4,000,000 Americans under arms, and half of that number overseas. Make no mistake; if you take the first step you must take the last. Make no mistake; many of those who are urging the first step upon us mean us to take the last as well.

No one is threatening our peace under this Embargo Act as it stands. In the name of peace, therefore, why should we change it? If it needs modification, let us modify it, but let us stand by the principle. Our Ark of the Covenant is our American representative government. It will be destroyed if we engage in a war. If we preserve it, we will be a beacon toward which other nations may struggle from the mires of tyranny. If we lose it, the light will have gone out not only for this country but for the world.

Seizure of American Ships

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURTON K. WHEELER

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, October 27 (legislative day of Wednesday, October 4), 1939

ARTICLE FROM THE NEW YORK EVENING POST OF OCTOBER 26, 1939

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article which appeared in the New York Evening Post on October 26, 1939, headed "As the Crow Flies," by Ernest L. Myer.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Evening Post of October 26, 1939]

AS THE CROW FLIES

(By Ernest L. Meyer)

This is no time for headline skimming. People who depend on headlines for a fair appraisal of the complex issues involved in the war abroad and our relation to that war will gain an estimate which is highly distorted.

The seizure by the Germans of the American merchantman *City of Flint* is a case in point. Headlines splashed the news. It seemed sensational. It seemed unprecedented. It seemed an act of near piracy committed by a government for which we have, and with all justification, no liking.

It was only by assiduous reading into the long body of the story, however, that another fact came to light. The Maritime Commission official at Washington, who confirmed Germany's seizure of the United States vessel, admitted—after questioning by reporters—that "the British Government was at present holding four or five American-flag merchant ships, three of them reportedly in the English Channel."

SUPPRESSION BY STRESS

And here is the amazing aspect of the case: The seizure by England of "four of five American-flag merchant ships" was not even announced by the Maritime Commission or any other agency in Washington. But when one American merchant ship was taken by the Germans the news made screaming headlines.

The headlines will be remembered. The casual "follow-up" story of Great Britain's holding of five American vessels will not.

This is not a case of actual news suppression. Yet it might be called a kind of suppression by stress. That is, by exploiting sensationally one angle of the story and subordinating the other, the act of Germany stood out as a heinous and unique offense.

This type of suppression is extremely dangerous. It operated to draw us into the last war. What stands out in memory is the *Lusitania* case and the German submarine "schrecklichkeit." What we forget is that Great Britain destroyed more neutral trade and confiscated more American property than did the Germans. What we forget is that up to our declaration of war Germany torpedoed only one American boat, the *Gulflight*, with the loss of American lives.

We forget these facts because the newspapers of the day did not stress them, and it takes impartial history a long time to catch up. And the newspapers of our day are falling into the same pattern. Thus headline skimming yields but a distorted picture of events, and you who are interested in remaining neutral must dig deep for neutral news.

"THIS IS MY WAR WORK"

This distorted picture is abetted by word of mouth as well as by the press. The Dies committee has made much of Communist and Nazi propaganda peddlers in America. Mr. Dies demands their registration, to which no one can object. Very well, then why not also register propaganda peddlers like Alfred Duff Cooper, former First Lord of the British Admiralty, who has arrived here for a lecture tour?

Mr. Duff Cooper is here as a recruiting sergeant for the Allies and to try and nudge us into war. He has not said so in so many words, but his wife, the former Lady Diana Manners, who came with him and will accompany him on his tour, was asked whether she was doing any war work. She laughed and said: "This is my war work."

It is charming that she can laugh it off. We can't.

Pending Neutrality Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAVID I. WALSH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, October 27 (legislative day of Wednesday, October 4), 1939

EDITORIAL FROM EXTENSION MAGAZINE

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a portion of an editorial written by Managing Editor S. A. Baldus and published in the November issue of the Extension Magazine, on the subject of neutrality, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the portion of the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Extension Magazine of November 1939]

THE TIME HAS COME

On October 2 Senator Pittman submitted the House Joint Resolution 306, entitled "Neutrality Act of 1939," to Congress. It is known as the administration bill, and in it are incorporated the views and wishes of President Roosevelt and Secretary of State Hull. The President has called Congess into extraordinary session for the specific purpose of enacting the bill into law.

It is possible that before what is written here appears in print, action, favorable or unfavorable, may have been taken by Congress. But even so, discussion of some of its essential features is opportune and important, for I do not recall any bill in the past 25 years that had so many fateful implications for the American people; nor a bill that contained so many confused points—so many angles, so many contradictions, so many obscurities and "twistifications." Needless to say, I cannot enter upon a discussion of the bill in its entirety; I can at most touch briefly on a few of the more vital points.

To begin with, the President and the Secretary of State have declared that if the Pittman bill becomes law it will keep the United States out of the present European war. That may be their honest belief, a belief from which it is my privilege to dissent. Nor am I alone in this dissent; for a formidable number of Senators and Congressmen are on record as being opposed to the bill, basing their opposition on an equally honest belief that the Neutrality Act of 1939 instead of keeping us out of the European war will inevitably help to put us into the war. For, if the truth must be told, the bill offered is not a neutrality bill; its apparent motive and undisguised purpose are to enable the United States to aid and abet the one side (Great Britain and France) as against the other (Germany and its potential allies). There can be no doubt on that score, for the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, and the author of the bill and its proponents have practically admitted this; and, had I the time, I could advance an overwhelming array of unneutral actions and utterances that would prove this conclusively.

WHAT IS NEUTRALITY?

In international law neutrality is defined as "the complete abstention of a state from giving material aid or encouragement to either belligerent in an existing war. Legally, a neutral state is a friend to both belligerents and endeavors to maintain peaceful relations with each * * *."

"Among the obligations of a negative character resting upon neutrals may be mentioned the duty of abstaining from furnishing money, ships, troops, or munitions to either belligerents * * *." (The New International Encyclopedia.)

How do the commentators on international law define neutrality?

Let it be understood that I am not posing as one deeply versed in the subject of international law. I have some volumes dealing with the subject in my library, and every now and then when a question arises which makes it necessary that I consult such books I give whatever time I can to their perusal and study. Thus I have gone over some of the volumes of John Bassett Moore, LL. D., who is rightly considered one of the ablest and most scholarly American commentators on international law. I have before me as I write volume VII of his monumental Digest on International Law. This one volume alone contains 1109 pages and is an exhaustive treatise on all questions involved in the present "neutrality" legislation: War, maritime war, contraband, blockade, neutrality, etc.

Another work that has intrigued me is the Treatise on International Law, by L. Oppenheim, M. A., LL. D., Whewell professor of international law in the University of Cambridge, a member of the Institute of International Law and honorary member of the Royal Academy of Jurisprudence at Madrid. The volume before me as I write is volume II (710 pages), entitled "War and Neutrality" (2d ed.), published in 1912. (I understand that a later edition (revised) has been published. But, even so, I prefer the earlier work, for the reason that it was written before the League of Nations tried to create a new world order and establish new principles of international law.)

Oppenheim's definition of neutrality makes a nice distinction between international law and international politics:

"Such states as do not take part in a war between other states are neutrals. The term 'neutrality' is derived from the Latin *neuter*. Neutrality may be defined as *the attitude of impartiality adopted by third States toward belligerents and recognized by belligerents, such attitude creating rights and duties between the impartial States and the belligerents.* Whether or not a third state will adopt and preserve an attitude of impartiality during war is not a matter for international law, but for international politics" (p. 361). (Italics Oppenheim's.)

"The question of remaining neutral or not is, in the absence of a treaty stipulating otherwise, one of policy and not of law." (P. 362.)

(Parenthetically, it may be stated here that much of the confusion that has arisen over the subject of neutrality could be cleared up if, instead of prating about international law, we would call the thing by its right name—"international politics." That is the crux of the whole question and should be insisted upon by all debaters.)

Generally speaking, in international law, the act of supplying arms and munitions of war to the parties to an armed conflict is considered an unneutral act. The following few passages from John Bassett Moore's Digest of International Law not only stress the unneutrality of selling war materials of whatever kind to belligerents, but also set forth that individuals engaging in such traffic place themselves beyond the pale of the law and forfeit the protection of their governments.

"The supply of materials of war, such as arms and ammunition, to either party to an armed conflict, although neutral governments are not obliged to prevent it, constitutes on the part of the individuals who engage in it a participation in hostilities, and as such is confessedly an unneutral act. Should the government of the individual itself supply such articles, it would clearly depart from its position of neutrality. The private citizen undertakes the business at his own risk, and against this risk his government cannot assure him protection without making itself a party to his unneutral act. * * *

"Says Kent: 'The principal restriction which the law of nations imposes on the trade of neutrals is the prohibition to furnish the belligerent parties with warlike stores and other articles which are directly auxiliary to warlike purposes.'

" 'If the neutral (government),' says Woolsey, 'should send powder or balls, cannons or rifles, this would be a direct encouragement of the war, and so a departure from a neutral position * * *." (vol. VII, p. 749).

THE ARMS EMBARGO

The pivotal point of the Administration's "neutrality" bill is the sale and shipment of materials to belligerents. Under the present neutrality law the President is required to place an embargo on the exportation of arms, munitions, and implements of war to nations at war with each other. He wants the embargo removed. Lifting the embargo and substituting what is popularly called a "cash and carry" plan (or, as the Pittman bill provides, credit and carry) would theoretically leave the United States free to sell war goods, not only arms, munitions, and implements of war, but all kinds of materials and accessories entering into the conduct or pursuit of a war, to both belligerents. Actually, and since we know for certain that only one of the belligerents could, or would under existing conditions, buy such goods from us and carry same home in its own ships in comparative safety—it requires no stretch of the imagination to see that the whole proposal is a rather one-sided arrangement.

But waving that aside, assuming for the moment that it were possible to sell successfully to both belligerents, where does that leave the President, who has repeatedly declared that he hates war, and that he wants to travel the road that leads to peace? May I remind the President that the road that leads to peace is not strewn with dragon's teeth? I find it hard to understand how one can proclaim himself an apostle of peace and in the same breath insist that he be free to send arms, munitions, and implements of war to both (or, more accurately speaking, to one) of the belligerents. It doesn't make sense.

* * * * * * *

CASH AND CARRY

One of the provisions of the present (Pittman) bill is to sell anything, including arms, munitions, implements of war, materials, and accessories to any belligerents on condition that the parties involved pay cash for the goods purchased (even giving them 90 days' credit) and carry the goods purchased away in their own ships. It is to be observed here that the legislation called for by the Pittman "neutrality" bill (to enact which the President convoked Congress into extra session as soon as the present European war had begun), specifically covers definite belligerents—namely, Great Britain and France on the one side, and Germany (and potentially Russia and Italy) on the other. We will sell to both these warring groups, says the bill, in effect; we will not discriminate; therefore we claim that we are neutral.

But actually, as it would work out, and as the President and Secretary of State well know—only one side (Great Britain and France) would be in a position to take advantage; and therefore we will be unneutral.

This seeming distinction could be argued at great length, for which, however, I have neither the time nor the space. Instead I choose to quote a few relevant paragraphs from Oppenheim's International Law:

"The duty of impartiality must prevent a neutral from supplying belligerents with arms, ammunition, vessels, and military provisions. And it matters not whether such supply takes place for money or gratuitously. A neutral who sold arms and ammunition to a belligerent at a profit would violate his duty of impartiality, as also would one who transferred such arms and ammunition to a belligerent as a present. This is a settled rule so far as direct transactions regarding such supply between belligerents and neutrals are concerned" (p. 426).

Again:

"If a state remains neutral, it violates its impartiality by furnishing a belligerent with troops or men-of-war. And it matters not whether a neutral renders such assistance to one of the belligerents or to both alike. Whereas Convention V does not mention the furnishing of troops to belligerents on the part of neutrals, article 6 of Convention XIII enacts that 'the supply, in any manner, directly or indirectly, by a neutral power to a belligerent power, of warships, ammunition, or war material of any kind whatever, is forbidden'" (p. 389).

Again:

"Since neutrality is an attitude of impartiality, it excludes such assistance and succor to one of the belligerents as is detrimental to the other, and, further, such injuries to the one as benefit the other. But it requires, on the other hand, active measures from neutral states. For neutrals must prevent belligerents from making use of their neutral territories and of their resources for military and naval purposes during the war. This concerns not only actual fighting on neutral territories, but also transport of troops, war materials, and provisions for the troops, the fitting out of men-of-war and privateers, the activity of prize courts, and the like." (P. 362.)

"Neutrals in their own country may sell to belligerents whatever belligerents choose to buy. The principal exceptions to this rule" (I shall state only the one exception which is ad rem) "that neutrals must not sell to one belligerent what they refuse to sell to the other * * *." (John Bassett Moore, vol. VII, p. 1108.)

Now under the proposed "neutrality" legislation we declare ourselves ready to sell to both belligerents; knowing, however, that only one belligerent can take home the goods bought from us.

* * * * * * *

WHY?

Why, then, if it doesn't make any difference one way or another; if, whether we pass or do not pass the Pittman so-called "neutrality" bill, Great Britain and France (keeping the present war in mind) will be able by hook or by crook to avail themselves of our resources and stores of goods, should anyone be opposed to the legislation demanded by the administration?

To that question there are several answers:

* * * * * * *

To my way of thinking, this is the most important point at this time: If we enact the Pittman bill into law it is equivalent to serving notice on one of the belligerents in Europe (Great Britain and France) that we are on their side. It will encourage them to continue the present war, confident that, at the crucial moment, we will come to their help by sending an army to help them crush the aggressors—which, by that time, may be not only Germany but also Russia.

Our best contribution to peace in Europe is to let Great Britain and France know that they need expect no help of any kind from us. And this we can do by keeping the embargo on the shipment of all war materials of whatever kind.

By insisting that the embargo be lifted and that we adopt a "cash (or credit) and carry plan" President Roosevelt is like a man who, holding a flaming torch in his hand, rushes into a powder magazine to look for a leak in a gas pipe. That sentence may sound screwy, for it is more than likely that there are no gas pipes in powder magazines. But I will let it stand, because it conveys the idea of an inevitable and terrific explosion—and that's the one thing I want to emphasize. An inevitable and terrific explosion!

Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL A. HATCH

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, October 27 (legislative day of Wednesday, October 4), 1939

ARTICLE BY DAVID S. MUZZEY

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, so much has been said during the course of this debate about freedom of the press, democracy, and various other matters, that I desire to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an article written by Prof. David S. Muzzey, professor of American history at Columbia University, which was published in the New York Times Magazine of January 22, 1939. The article is entitled "All Is Not Lost in the Fight for Democracy."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times Magazine of January 22, 1939]

ALL IS NOT LOST IN THE FIGHT FOR DEMOCRACY—THE DAWN WILL COME, SAYS A HISTORIAN; AND THE MORE WE HAVE FAITH, THE SOONER IT WILL BREAK

(By David S. Muzzey, professor of American history, Columbia University)

The score of years which have passed since the armistice and the Treaty of Versailles, that vain attempt to found lasting peace on the basis of injustice, have been a dismal period in the history of mankind. Repeated honest efforts of men of good will to substitute cooperation for conflict, order for confusion, and a sense of security for persistent trepidation have been thwarted at every turn. Disarmament conferences have degenerated into "fencing matches" between the participating nations, each of which has been bent on gaining the maximum concession to strengthen its own position in the struggle which they all speak of as hypothetical while they really believe it to be inevitable. Engaged in an enterprise ostensibly to encourage peace, they have actually been concerned with their preparations to meet war. The result has been the constant enlargement of armies and navies, with a fivefold increment in military expenditures since the pre-war days.

Primarily to buttress their military strength, the nations have adopted "autarchic" devices as destructive of President Wilson's third point, the removal of economic barriers to international trade, as the feverish military programs are destructive of the fourth point of reducing national armaments to the lowest level consistent with domestic safety. High tariff walls, import restrictions, quotas, embargoes, currency manipulation, and similar short-sighted interferences with the free flow of goods and credit have wrought havoc with international trade and finance, in an era in which the autarchic nation is as anachronistic as the feudal manor. Science, technology, rapid communication, mass production, and the demand for ever-widening markets have made of the world a vast economic complex in which political isolation can only react as a boomerang against the nation which attempts to practice it.

Obviously, we are facing a crisis. But facing crises has been the lot of man ever since civilization began its long, painful, and oft-interrupted upward march from the Paleolithic age. If the present crisis seems "so particular" and fateful to us, it is because we are living in the first half of the twentieth century and not in the days of confusion and welter of impredicabilities which followed the break-up of Alexander the Great's empire, or in the darkness which descended upon the world with the eclipse of Roman power and civilization, or amid the devastation of the Thirty Years' War in Germany, or in the troubled years when liberal Europe lay prostrate and paralyzed under the iron heel of the Corsican tyrant.

Naturally, the evils with which we have to grapple loom more portentous than those which we read about in history, just as the girding for an impending conflict dims the memory of an accomplished victory. This is in no wise to minimize the seriousness of the present crisis. We must face without blinking or burking the dismal facts: the Treaty of Versailles sabotaged; the fourteen points erased; the League of Nations flouted and deserted by nation after nation; democracy derided by its foes and doubted by many of its friends; the ideal of collective security yielding to an intensified reliance upon national self-sufficiency; international trade and finance thrown into utter confusion; hate, greed, persecution and war erected into avowed and boasted national policies; instead of a world made safe for democracy, democracy desperately seeking to make itself safe in the world.

It is not the purpose of this article to enter into competition with the hordes of writers and speakers who are advocating specific political or economic policies for the remedy of the distressing situation in which we find ourselves, or to discuss the relative merits of the conflicting policies advocated: Cooperation or isolation; neutrality legislation or Presidential prerogative; reciprocal trade pacts or the most-favored-nation principle; nationalization of the munitions industry or immunity of the "merchants of death" from Government interference; the "quarantining" of pestiferous nations or the drawing of a "cordon sanitaire" around our own.

These are all problems of great moment, and we must all agree that they demand the deepest thinking of the most enlightened leaders that we can find and follow. But, leaving on one side these highly important questions, let us direct our thought to an aspect of the present situation which has received far too little attention in the excitement of voices crying lo! here and lo! there, but which nevertheless is of fundamental import for any concrete plan or policy advanced, namely, the moral effect of the present crisis on the American people.

Some years ago the eminent philosopher Alfred N. Whitehead used the phrase "the climate of opinion" to define the mental and moral atmosphere in which a given society lives. That atmosphere for the present generation has been a miasmic one, propagating the germs of pessimism and defeatism. One scarcely meets a man who is not a prey to gloom and fear.

The burden of our dinner conversation is the hopelessness of the present outlook. Impending disaster is accepted with a

fatalism tempered with a reluctant sigh, and we "speak of the coming war as of the coming winter." Our courage dwindles, in the simile of Lord Morley, to a puny hope that things may be better, shivering beside the gigantic conviction that they are bound to be worse. The contagion of pessimism spreads like a scourge of influenza or cholera, or, in the words of an old Greek philosopher, "like contagion among sheep."

The multitude, unfortified by the prophylaxis of calm reason or historical perspective, falls into the fallacy that we are living in the worst possible of worlds. They talk freely of the "return to barbarism" and the "collapse of civilization." They do not read Spengler, but they are nevertheless unconscious disciples of the prophet of the "Decline of the West."

Yet no set-back, however serious, to any particular diplomatic démarche or project of political reform or economic recovery is so disastrous as the weakening of faith in the worth whileness of the effort. For faith, which is but another name for courage, is still "the substance of things hoped for and the evidence of things unseen." If the infection of a conforming cowardice is allowed to spread to those whose talents mark them for leadership, instead of the courage of the latter communicating itself to the people at large, then we shall indeed take the downward path. Above even the sore need for wise counsel in the present crisis is the need for a courageous spirit. All great ages, said Emerson, have been ages of faith. For faith, or courage, is creative, while despair is always destructive.

Nor is this faith mere pollyanna-ism or wishful thinking, except it be divorced from a frank recognition of the realities of our situation and an honest effort to better that situation. "Faith without works is dead," because it is out of work that faith is born. When value is denied to human endeavor all other values turn to naught, desire fails, and the grasshopper becomes a burden.

History offers us many a sad example of such let-down in social morale. Take, for instance, the period following the death of Alexander the Great (already alluded to), to which Prof. Gilbert Murray applies the apt slogan of "the failure of nerve." The Greeks inaugurated the age of reason with the Ionian physicists and the Attic philosophers, dramatists, and historians, confident that the secrets of Nature, the duty of man, the model structure of the state, and even the attainment of the divine harmony of the good, the beautiful, and the true were to be found through the assiduous cultivation of the intellect.

Their creative work in the centuries from Thales to Aristotle is a priceless heritage and "an everlasting possession." But, when their creative faith bogged down into the Hellenistic Age, reason gave way to superstition, fickle Fortune was enthroned as a goddess, the standards of culture and the canons of art were debased, and there followed one of those dips in the curve of human progress which have always waited for upward rectification upon the recovery of social morale.

Here let us not allow our tendency to rationalization to tempt us to put the cart before the horse and confuse cause and effect. Our history textbooks speak of the barbarian invasions, for example, as a cause of the fall of Rome, whereas, in truth, the fall of Rome—its loss of civic virtue, its social corruption, its financial demoralization—was the cause of the barbarian invasions. So individuals and nations lay the flattering unction to their souls that their failure are due to the very circumstances which their own moral apathy has engendered.

Can any sane man doubt today that the depression under which we have been suffering for a decade is no visitation of inscrutable fate, but the predictable (and, indeed, sporadically predicted) result of an orgy of materialistic intoxication, ruthless exploitation, and reckless speculation that will forever brand the nineteen twenties, for all their bull markets and boasted conquest of poverty, as one of the most disgraceful decades in American history? The pendulum swings from the fatalism of inevitable progress to the fatalism of irremediable disaster; and both are equally unjustifiable by the experience of history and corrosive of the supreme human function of an intelligently directed will. Life is conditioned, to be sure, but it is not fated. Every moment, no matter how heavily weighted with the inheritance of past follies, is a new start. And it is not only a myopic but a craven attitude to let the follies of the past paralyze the courage and initiative of the present.

Let us face the worst. What has been done is irrevocable. Not a line of the past can be erased. Manchuria, Ethiopia, Spain, China, Austria, Czechoslovakia—the dismal record is there. But it is due to the ignorance, timidity, and faithlessness of men that we are afflicted with our present evils, and, by the same token, we shall be delivered from them by the wisdom and courage of men.

If the prospect for peace looks dark, there is all the more call for redoubling the efforts for peace. If our complicated economic and social structure puts a heavier strain on the girders of democracy, that is no reason for abandoning democracy, but the most cogent argument for strengthening the girders. We believe that, with all its faults, democracy is the best form of government that the world has known, and the only one that holds the promise of the free development of human personality and the realization of the great society of peaceable and progressive nations.

Certainly we are not going to abandon the noble experiment of democratic government at the bidding of bullies, who have no more understanding of what democracy really means than to call it, as Hitler does, "a ludicrous chicken farm where everybody cackles," or to shout with Mussolini that "the plain truth is that men are tired of liberty," and that the restless and hardy youth of today want to "pass over the decayed corpse of the Goddess of Liberty" to "order, hierarchy, war, and glory." That is not "the plain truth," but an outrageous lie, devised to throw dust in the eyes of the multitude, so that they may blindly follow the "pied pipers of hysteria" and servilely support the inordinate ambitions of tyrants.

Now just because life is conditioned (though not fated) a certain amount of adjustment to the conditions facing us is necessary. Ideals may, and should, move in the upper air of theory; but policies must be devised and executed to meet the complex situation of the moment. Hence we have to do many things, from a short-time point of view, which, from the long-time point of view of our ideals, we disapprove and deplore.

Compromise is a word of unpleasant connotation; but Lincoln was a wiser leader than Garrison in a former great crisis of our Nation. To take the most conspicuous example of this enforced compromise, we vote a war budget of a billion dollars, while we abhor war as a relic of barbarism. At a cost which would go far toward stamping out the white plague or furnishing comfortable houses for people who live in hovels, we build a battleship which is destined in a score of years for the junk heap. From the point of view of our ideals it is sheer folly; from the point of view of the conditions with which we are confronted it is a stern necessity.

Is the situation, after all, as bad as the prophets of gloom and doom would have us believe? Is the crisis worse than many a former one through which mankind has fought its way back to sanity and progress? Are there not assets in the present situation which we have overlooked or minimized in our preoccupation with the serious liabilities?

In the first place, the United States and those nations of western Europe which still strongly hold to the principles of democracy and freedom far outweigh in economic and military resources the dictatorships east of the Rhine. It is not in the countries which have had a long experience in democratic rule that the totalitarian tyranny has prevailed, but in lands where the irresponsible autocracy of czars, the stiff politico-military discipline of Hohenzollerns, and the clamorous pseudo-parliamentarianism of an always disunited Italy have kept the people from developing their capacities for self-rule.

Moreover, no country enjoying a fair amount of economic prosperity and security has given itself over to the mercy (or the mercilessness) of dictators. They are the product of misery, jealousy, bankruptcy, and desperation—adventurers whom civil disorder and social confusion have thrown to the top to strut for a brief time as heaven-sent deliverers. If history has any lesson at all, it is that their day will be short. Even wise Thales, more than 25 centuries ago, declared that one sight the world would never see was "a tyrant growing old."

Napoleon, with more political and military genius in his little finger than the "sawdust Caesars" of today have in their whole body, lasted about 20 years. When the first cracks appeared in the edifice of despotism which Napoleon had raised, the people from Spain to Russia rose to demolish that edifice and send its architect to die in exile on the barren island of St. Helena. Drunk with power which breeds ambition for more power, he had dared to challenge the historic process of the emergence of political, religious, and economic liberty out of the bondage of feudal proscription and royal absolutism. For all his great gifts, he failed; and are we to believe that his feeble imitators, fighting with the noble weapons of purges, persecutions, confiscations, concentration camps, and castor oil, will succeed where he failed? Histrionics against the majestic march of history.

Finally, even if the situation were 10 times worse than it is, we should not despair. Defeatism will get us nowhere. To throw in our hand and quit the game is sheer cowardice. "If hopes were dupes, fears may be liars." Who knows how soon the dawn may succeed the dark? At any rate, it will be the sooner the greater the number of courageous souls whose only fear is that fear may seize their people. A Washington and a William the Silent could lose every battle and win the war. If we cannot have the superb courage and endurance of such as these, we at least can have the pluck of Milton's Satan, who surveyed his fallen host and cried, "What if the field be lost, all is not lost."

Pending Neutrality Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAVID I. WALSH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, October 27 (legislative day of Wednesday, October 4), 1939

STATEMENTS BY HON. DAVID I. WALSH, OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD two statements on the question of neutrality made by me at different times and published in

the press during the time the joint resolution has been pending before the Congress.

The first is entitled "Who Urges Repeal of Our Neutrality Law?" The other is entitled "The Background of Our Neutrality Law."

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHO URGES REPEAL OF OUR NEUTRALITY LAW?

The most serious question confronting the United States since our entrance into the World War is now awaiting imminent official action. It is: Shall we repeal the arms embargo provision of the present neutrality law and thus permit the sale, by American manufacturers to the belligerents now engaged in war, of death-dealing materials and instruments of destruction?

I have received thousands of letters from all over the country on this all-important question. The overwhelming portion of them urge me to oppose war and every possibility of war; others urge me to favor the repeal of the present neutrality law.

Those who support the continuance of the present neutrality law and who oppose any change therein insist that we mind our own business, keep aloof from the war in Europe, and avoid every possible contact with the belligerents that even remotely would tend to involve us.

They admit having strong sympathies, but insist that the interest of America and the protection of American youth is paramount to every other consideration. This is my position.

THREE ARGUMENTS

On the other hand, those who urge the repeal of the present neutrality law, invariably give expression to at least one of these reasons for their position.

First, hatred of Hitlerism, the basic practices of which appear to be so abhorrent to believers in the American system.

Second, an obligation upon our part to help England and France—in brief, to stand by the alleged democracies in Europe.

Third, German success in the present conflict might result in Germany waging war against us later.

The first two reasons advanced clearly indicate a state of mind subordinating American interest to prejudices and sympathies, which, in the minds of those urging them, obligate this Government to interfere in the rivalries and hostilities of Europe. The third reason, namely, that we will be forced to fight ultimately is easily answered.

Instead of getting involved in European war, let us build up our Army, Navy, and air force and be fully prepared to defend ourselves against any eventuality that may follow at the end of the European war, or at any other time.

PROFIT VERSUS BLOOD

There is another group, powerful and determined, advocating the repeal of the arms-embargo provision which at present prohibits traffic with belligerents in arms and munitions. It is to be noted that under the present law trade in all supplies and commodities, other than actual weapons and materials of war, is not forbidden.

Their theory (entirely ignoring the certain gains in our trade in South America and many other neutral countries because of the inability of the European belligerents to supply these markets) is that America will profit financially by booming business and stock-market inflation which are certain to follow the lifting of the embargo, and we should do this even though it involves the danger of our getting into war.

This position is best expressed in the phrase, "Let's take a chance." It is clearly playing with fire. It is the tipping of the scales downward that measures the sufferings, sacrifices, and slaughter of Americans as against the lure of profits inuring to American industry from the sufferings, sacrifices, and slaughter in Europe.

ORGANIZED PRESSURE

This organized pressure, already widespread, to repeal the neutrality law which we passed for our peace and protection in 1937 before the present law is not new.

It was strongly urged in order to enable us to assist the Loyalist cause in Spain by those whose sympathies were with the Loyalists. It has been urged during the conflict between Japan and China, though the operation of the neutrality law for some undetermined reason was never invoked in that war.

Who can doubt that repeal is now being urged to take sides in the present war in the same sense that it has been urged in previous wars and revolutions, declared and undeclared?

It is appropriate to point out that the repeal of the arms-embargo clause is not being urged at this time by our youth or their fathers and mothers. For the most part it is being sponsored by persons beyond the war age, who write me fervent pleas to favor the so-called democracies by enacting legislation to permit traffic in death-dealing instruments.

Some of these do not conceal their true intentions by mere professions of sympathy but actually insist that our country enter the war at once to save democracy. We heard these same pleas before, much to the sorrow of the mothers, fathers, sisters, and brothers of more than 50,000 American boys who were butchered in the last European war and hundreds of thousands of others who returned from that holocaust wounded, disabled, and shell-shocked.

The position this group advocates means, if the law is repealed and honestly administered, not only that we are in imminent danger of involvement in this present war, but also that every powerful nation in the world may rely upon our assistance at any future time against the aspirations of the weak in their struggle against the tyranny of the strong. It means that we are willing, for the sake of financial gain or attachments for selected countries in Europe, to participate directly and indirectly in the sale of arms and munitions in every bloody war which henceforth shall be waged in the world.

Apart from the present conflict in Europe, if my views could prevail, I would forbid the sale to any people, any country, at any time, of death-dealing instruments of war. It would be a fine example of peaceful intention and of our concern for world humanity. In other words, our arms and munitions should be solely reserved for our purposes of self-defense, but not available to any power to promote the shedding of blood elsewhere in the world.

VOTE OF CONGRESS

The present neutrality law was enacted by a vote of 63 to 6 in the Senate and 376 to 13 in the House, and was signed by the President.

This was the sentiment of Congress when it was free from propaganda and concerned solely with American interest. I have resisted every attempt to repeal this bill, and repeal has never been sought except when efforts were made to have us take sides in some war which did not concern us.

I shall continue to resist repeal of the arms embargo because I hate war and because I am striving to think more of the happiness of American fathers and mothers and of the lives of their sons and the protection of our democratic institutions than I am of the horrors and sufferings today afflicting Europe, lamentable though they be, or the profits of the industrial and financial interests of America.

INTENSELY OPPOSED TO OUR ENTRANCE

I can conceive of no cause existing now in the world, or likely to arise in the future, except one actually necessary for the protection of our own shores and homes, which warrants the sacrifice of American youth.

I am unalterably opposed to war for any purpose save our own self-defense. If it is an offense for a public official to stand forthright for America first and for the protection of American blood and the preservation of our happiness and freedom above everything in the world, I am prepared to take the responsibility for my avowed and unswervable determination to do all in my power to keep the country out of war.

I am convinced that a vastly overwhelming portion of the American people are intensely opposed to our entrance into the war.

When they come to realize that the repeal of the arms embargo is the first step in our involvement in war, as I sincerely believe it to be, a wave of public opinion will flood Congress with protest.

Only precipitate action by the Congress before this antiwar sentiment is adequately expressed will permit the repeal of the arms embargo.

THE BACKGROUND OF OUR NEUTRALITY LAW

Too little has been said about the background of the present neutrality law. Since 1936, committees of Congress have held hearings for weeks during three different sessions and have consulted the best authorities in the country on international relations.

These hearings largely dealt with the various phases of the risk of involvement in wars between belligerent nations.

This study, it is to be noted, was made when the country was absolutely free from propaganda, and we were interested solely in America avoiding war.

TWO COURSES TO WAR

It was clearly demonstrated that any of two courses of action by our country would certainly lead to war involvement. First, an acceptance by the United States of world moral responsibility; and second, the conviction on the part of the American people that the avoidance of war by us was impossible.

Those who accept either of these views are already advocating our participation in the present war—disregarding the fact that the United States has consistently refused to participate in any international scheme that might lead to the point that war would result as a possible eventuality.

Necessarily serious consideration was given to the European in contrast with America's world position. In Europe, nations invariably claim to enter into war to protect their domestic welfare.

The United States has no European problem such as overpopulation; it has no desire to obtain natural resources necessary for self-sufficiency and national defense; it seeks no colonies; no longing to revenge ancient rivals. None of these European ambitions concern us and that is why our domestic welfare prompts us to avoid war, and by a rigid policy of neutrality avoid involvement.

UNITED STATES FREE FROM COERCION

The United States because of its relative physical security is almost alone among the world powers to keep itself free from

coercion to join its foreign policy to that of any other nation. The situation in Europe is very different.

European nations have been forced to make alliances and agreements under special conditions. Not confronted with the pressure that exists in Europe, the United States has avoided international alliances and agreements.

Though European nations may have no choice between war and peace, the United States' geographic position and nonalliance policy protects it from ever going to war except when attacked.

The sole question before Congress during these years was, What should be the conduct of American foreign relations when other nations are fighting?

What course of action should American determine in advance that would best preserve peace for us when other nations were at war? After this study, the Congress decided in the interest of peace to establish a neutrality law with rigid restrictions.

The purpose of the restrictions was solely to reduce the possibility of Americans becoming involved through the growth of commercial and financial ties with belligerents.

CONGRESS PASSES ACT

To accomplish this purpose with scarcely an objection from the country the Congress almost unanimously passed a neutrality act embodying an embargo on arms, munitions, and implements of war. It set up a code of regulations on trade, transportation, and financial transaction between the United States and belligerent nations.

The provision of this Neutrality Act, when and if invoked by the President, applies equally to all parties of the conflict.

The temptation to join hands with friendly and favored belligerents was to be avoided and also the temptation to prevent the establishment of a close community of interest with the warring nations.

Congress had fully in mind that one of the greatest tests of our neutrality policy would involve a European war in which nations particularly friendly to us would be engaged.

It has been well known for years that any war of major proportions in Europe would be expected to involve nations with whom America had long established friendly and commercial relations.

It was well understood and known that the maximum pressure for participation of the United States in the European war would be exerted if particularly friendly nations to us became belligerents.

The very situation that exists today was foreseen and understood and seriously considered when we undertook to define our policy of neutrality.

Furthermore, it was well recognized that an effective neutrality policy could not be accomplished by the United States without industrial, commercial, and financial costs. Congress after weighing all costs—the cost of keeping out and the cost of going in—almost unanimously decided the cost of human lives, human suffering, and human sacrifices far outweighed the cost in possible monetary losses.

This is the background of our neutrality law made in anticipation of just what has occurred and to protect us against the present war propaganda.

COST OF WAR

Consider in more detail the cost attached to a policy that will keep us from being drawn into a general war in contrast with the cost of war.

We have seen, due to our own experience in the World War, what the cost is when a nation is drawn into a general war. The spectacle of what is taking place in Poland today demonstrates the suffering entailed by war.

The damage to society because of the loss of human rights, to say nothing of the economic and social maladjustment, is tremendous.

Conscription of men and materials in the event of war would completely change the status of labor and capital; private property rights of every kind would have to be revised; all industry would be nationalized; increased taxation and inflation would be inevitable, both during and after the war.

The realization of these human and inhuman costs is why the people of America were and are determined never to go to war, except for purposes of self-defense.

To avoid this stupendous cost, Congress believes that all possible measures to resist war should be put into effect before a crisis appears.

We are now dealing with a crisis that has actually developed, and it is now proposed that we repeal the measures heretofore made to resist our involvement.

A neutrality policy deals not with impartiality but with a peaceful nation's conduct with belligerents. The present issue, therefore, is whether or not we shall nullify our views and decisions made for our peace in time of peace and embark upon the old and unrestrained course of foreign relations that leads to war, and thereby become an economic basis of supplies for one of the European belligerents?

We seek peace for ourselves and the world. We desire in every possible way to discourage injustices and aggression.

A strong and genuine policy of neutrality, however, prevents any commitment that may in some circumstances lead to war. Unlike European nations, America does not accept war as inevitable.

Neutrality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, October 27 (legislative day of Wednesday, October 4), 1939

EDITORIAL BY VICTOR MURDOCK

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial by Victor Murdock in the Wichita (Kans.) Eagle. Mr. Murdock served with distinction in the House of Representatives from Kansas; still later he was a member of the Federal Trade Commission. I believe he states the fundamental things involved in the pending neutrality legislation in a nutshell; and I recommend his editorial to my colleagues.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wichita (Kans.) Morning Eagle]

AMERICA, STAY OUT!

(By Victor Murdock)

Many citizens are now mentally following this formula largely without giving it expression: (1) We must keep out of this war, (2) the way to keep out is to stay out of it completely, (3) inevitably we will find ourselves in it.

How can America deliver itself from this defeat of so evident a desire?

It can do so by keeping itself as remote as possible from the conflict and reducing to a minimum those provocations which can plunge America into it.

America, by its very temperament, cannot be wholly neutral in thought. It never has been that in any contest and it will not be so in this.

But America can insulate itself physically from this conflict and America should.

Threatening the preservation of that insulation there can be one fatal step. It is the first step. That step is in following the fallacy that America can get into the war a little bit and not get in head over heels.

The way to keep out and stay out is to let the existing neutrality law, with its embargo, strictly alone. That law in 1937 passed the Senate 63 to 6. It passed the House 376 to 13. The President signed it. It was not Democratic. It was not Republican. It was American.

It was enacted in the belief that Europe's wars are not our wars. The belief is just as well-grounded today as it was 2 years ago. America won the last war and got the worse of it. It can win this war and again get the worse of it. Good sense, morals, material well-being, and devotion to the principle of democracy all sound the signal: America, Stay Out!

Keep America Out of War by Repealing Arms Embargo and Substituting Cash and Carry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LUTHER A. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 30, 1939

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. LUTHER A. JOHNSON, OF TEXAS

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my address made over the red network of the National Broadcasting Co., Sunday night, October 29, 1939, from Washington, D. C., as follows:

I am grateful to the National Broadcasting Co. for the privilege of speaking to the people of the United States upon a subject in

which they are vitally interested—the preservation of peace and the prevention of our involvement in foreign wars.

The Congress of the United States has been in session since September 21, having been called into extraordinary session on that date by President Roosevelt to enact legislation for this purpose. The Senate has acted. After 5 weeks of debate, during which the subject has been discussed from every angle, every avenue of thought having been explored and every suggestion, fantastic and otherwise, analyzed, debated, and considered, the Senate has, by a vote of 63 to 30, over 2 to 1, passed a measure which, in their deliberate judgment, is best designed to keep our country out of war.

The measure now comes to the House for its consideration. We are hopeful of early action by the House. Under the House rules, which restrict debate while the Senate does not, no bill consumes as much time in the House as it does in the Senate. With a House membership more than four times larger than that of the Senate, if unlimited debate were permitted in that body the enactment of legislation would be almost impossible. Then again the neutrality bill does not come to the House as an original measure. We passed it in the House at the last session of Congress, after a prolonged debate, and the Senate has simply amended the House bill and consideration in the House now will be restricted to a consideration of the changes made in the bill by the Senate.

Furthermore, during this special session of Congress, while the Senate has been debating the bill, speeches have been made almost daily in the House upon the subject, and further prolonged debate there is not required. While the House leadership promises liberal debate, it is our hope that within a week's time the measure may be finally passed and become a law.

It is imperative that early action be taken, since the war is now raging in Europe and we have only a partial neutrality law in effect at this time, for the reason that on May 1 a major portion of our neutrality law expired. We now have no law, such as we did have prior to May 1, regulating the sale and shipment of commodities other than arms and ammunition and implements of war to warring countries; and we have no law now, such as we did have prior to May 1, by which American ships could be regulated and prohibited from carrying goods to nations at war.

If the present partial neutrality law is not changed or amended, the United States is certain to be in this war, and that within a very short time.

President Roosevelt is to be commended for acting promptly on the outbreak of war in Europe by calling Congress into special session to pass an adequate and a complete neutrality law to safeguard in every way our interests and to prevent our involvement in the war. It is not the fault of President Roosevelt and Secretary Hull that such legislation was not passed at the last session of Congress. If Congress had passed such a bill at the last session of the Congress, as President Roosevelt and Secretary Hull insisted and urged that they do, there would have been no necessity for this session of Congress, and there is a possibility that there might have been no war in Europe at this time.

The House did pass a neutrality bill on June 30, though in an imperfect form, but the Senate failed to consider it. The bill which passed the Senate Friday night is in many respects an improvement over the House bill. While many of its provisions are identical with the House bill, four material changes were made:

(1) The Senate repealed outright the arms embargo, while the House bill, under the Vorys amendment, only repealed it in part.

(2) The Senate eliminated from the House bill the provision giving the President discretionary authority to except from its operation loans for a period of not more than 90 days, and also the so-called short-time obligations customarily used in normal peacetime commercial transactions, and prohibited outright, without exception, any person within the United States from purchasing, selling, or exchanging securities or other obligations of a nation at war, or to make any loan or extend any credit to any such warring government of any character whatsoever. The 90-day loan feature caused a great deal of adverse criticism, and its complete elimination from the bill will, I am sure, receive public approval.

(3) The House bill had no provision whatever with reference to regulation or control of American ships, while the Senate bill contains a provision making it unlawful for any American vessel to carry any passengers or commodities of any kind to any nation at war.

This provision is most essential, and without it incidents are likely to arise at any time which will involve us in war. The American people are incensed at the recent seizure of the *City of Flint*, but if the provision I have been discussing had been the law this incident would not have occurred, for the *City of Flint* was an American vessel carrying cargo to a belligerent country, which is prohibited under the pending bill.

(4) The "combat area" section, authorizing the President, when he finds that the protection of our citizens so requires, to define combat areas, and thereafter it shall be unlawful, except under such regulations as may be prescribed, for any citizen of the United States, or any American vessel, to proceed into or through any such combat area.

Our entry into the last World War did not arise from the sale of arms, ammunition, and implements of war, but from the sinking of our ships, causing the death of our citizens and the seizure and confiscation of property of our people upon the high seas, and the law as it now stands makes no provision to prevent a repetition of these happenings.

Before our entry into the World War German submarines sank or attacked 28 American vessels, and 8 other American vessels were sunk by mines, with a loss of 70 lives. Hundreds of other Americans lost their lives while traveling as passengers upon the vessels of belligerent nations, and a vast amount of goods belonging to Americans was sunk upon vessels other than those under the American register. It was the loss of lives upon the sea and the destruction and sinking of our ships and confiscation of the property of American nationals which so inflamed the passions of our people that our Government became a participant in that great war.

Under the pending bill American citizens are prohibited from traveling upon vessels of a belligerent nation, and Americans are prohibited from selling goods of any kind to belligerents, unless the title of all such goods shall have been transferred before their shipment so that if the ship is sunk or the goods are lost no American citizen will suffer any loss or have any claim in the matter, but the loss will be that alone of the foreign countries who bought and paid for the goods.

They talk about the ocean being our defense. It is a barrier and a measure of defense, but it is also the cause of our involvement in European wars, since every foreign war in which we have been a participant, save only the War with Mexico, has arisen due to some incident occurring on the ocean. What we are trying to do in this legislation is to remove the causes by which our citizens may lose their lives, their goods, or their property so that we can keep out of the war.

The Senate bill should also appeal to those who have heretofore opposed neutrality legislation on the ground that it vested too much discretionary authority in the President. No neutrality bill was ever considered by Congress that conferred as little discretion on the President as does the pending bill. To substantiate this statement, I call attention to the following:

(1) Existing law confers upon the President alone the right to determine that a state of war exists before neutrality legislation can be invoked, while under the pending bill either the President or Congress by concurrent resolution may determine that a state of war exists and neutrality legislation be invoked.

(2) Section 2, or the so-called cash-and-carry provision of the law, which expired on May 1, left it discretionary with the President whether or not such provision should be invoked, and this was true both as to regulation of American ships and also the transfer of title, but the pending bill provides that when the President finds that a state of war exists, or Congress so finds, the inhibition against American ships and the transfer of title shall automatically go into effect, and it is not required that the President shall find the need for such restrictions, as was the case in the law which expired.

(3) As I have already pointed out, the Senate bill eliminates the discretion under existing law, and in the House bill, whereby the President, under the credit section, could exempt short-time loans and could permit loans for the period of not more than 90 days under regulations which he might prescribe. The pending Senate bill vests no discretion whatever with the President in regard to loans and credits, but makes same automatically in effect whenever the neutrality law is invoked.

But opponents of the legislation say that it is bad because it repeals the arms embargo. It does. It repeals the embargo on arms and treats all commodities alike. It treats all countries alike. We agree to sell to all countries—to England, to France, to Germany, to Italy, to Russia, and to all countries on the same terms—that is, that they transport their own goods and deliver them themselves. We have no interest in it, and our ships shall not carry such goods, and our people shall have no interest in the goods while they are being transported on the high seas. This is the so-called cash-and-carry plan. It was first suggested many years ago by the lamented Will Rogers, who was not only a great philosopher but one who possessed an abundance of sound common sense.

As he expressed it, "If warring countries want our goods, let them come and get them, put the money on the barrel head, and take them home themselves."

The opponents of the legislation say that you must not repeal the arms embargo, for if you do, it will get us into war, but I have yet to hear any of those who make this assertion give a satisfactory reason why the repeal of the arms embargo will get us into war.

Those who think that an arms embargo alone to belligerent nations will keep us out of war have not given thoughtful consideration to this subject. I assert that the retention of the arms embargo will not keep us out of war, and its repeal will not get us into war. If countries regarded only arms, ammunition, and implements of war as contraband, then there might be some logic in saying that they must be embargoed and treated differently from other commodities. The law of contraband we all know; that is, if a neutral nation ships articles designated as contraband to either belligerent, the right of search and seizure and confiscation rests with the other belligerent. Under the old-time definition contraband was defined as arms, implements of war, and navy supplies. That was absolute contraband. Then there was a conditional contraband, but in time of war we have learned that law does not determine or rather control what is contraband. The nations at war make up their own lists of what they say is contraband, and if they have the power to enforce it, it is effective, regardless of international law. During the

World War the countries engaged in that conflict had lists of articles of contraband, which covered practically every commodity, and I have before me a statement which I secured from the State Department, reproducing what was furnished it by the British Government on September 13, 1939, listing what they denominated as contraband in the present war; and I also have a statement issued by our own State Department on September 19, giving a list of articles and commodities that the German Government has said they will regard as contraband. It is not limited in either particular to arms and ammunition and implements of war. They cover almost every commodity; they cover all food, all clothing; they cover the things that go into clothing; they cover tobacco. Cotton, oil, gasoline, wheat, wool, and many other commodities are included under the definitions listed as contraband.

The 28 American merchant ships that were sunk or attacked by German submarines before our entry into the World War, and the 7 American merchant ships that were sunk by mines before our entry into the World War did not carry arms, ammunition, and implements of war, but other commodities. In only one instance do the records show that they contained war supplies. The cargoes on those ships consisted of wheat, oil, flax, rice, copper, pig iron, foodstuffs, and various commodities other than war materials.

If the warring nations do not treat arms, ammunition, and implements of war differently from other commodities but assert the right to seize and sink ships carrying all such commodities, whether they be arms or not, why should our Government place them in a different category?

Opponents of repeal assert that the arms embargo is the heart of our neutrality law. In this they are wholly in error. All legislation passed upon this subject, including the original act of 1935, contained numerous other features, all designed to restrict our citizens in the shipment of goods and the transportation of passengers, so as to avoid circumstances that might involve us in war.

The arms embargo will not tend to keep this country out of war. It is not the sale of arms or other commodities, but rather their transportation and delivery upon the ocean that gets us into war.

It was never claimed for the arms-embargo feature that it would prevent us from becoming involved in war. Its sole purpose was to discourage war on the part of other countries. It was to set an example to other countries which we hoped they would follow, and thereby prevent war; but instead of discouraging them it has encouraged the arming of dictator nations, and in view of present conditions, and of developments that have taken place, I am now constrained to believe that our arms embargo, instead of discouraging, has encouraged other nations to commit aggressions, and instead of promoting peace has encouraged and caused war.

The repeal of the arms embargo is not an unneutral act, because when we do repeal it we conform to international law, which gives us that right which permits all nations to sell arms and commodities of all kinds to belligerent nations, which right we exercised for 150 years, or until 1935, and no one can claim that international law is unneutral, and the exercise of our right thereunder cannot be charged as being unneutral. But some say that since the European war has already begun, it would be unneutral to repeal the arms embargo now. As was said in the House debate, "You cannot change the rules of the game after the whistle blows," to which we reply, "The United States is neither the referee nor a participant in the European war and does not propose to become either, and in amending our neutrality law we are not making any rules for the conduct of the war in Europe but only regulations concerning the conduct of our own citizens." Every country has the right to change its own domestic laws at any time, whether in peacetime or wartime, provided it treats all countries alike, and the proposed law makes no discrimination but treats every country on the same basis. If we do not have the right to repeal the arms-embargo feature of the neutrality law, we have no right to change the neutrality law in any respect. If we cannot take that provision out, we cannot add anything to it. If it is unneutral to repeal the arms embargo because it might hurt Germany, it will be equally unneutral to add a new provision restricting our ships from carrying goods to England and France because it would hurt them. Such is the position assumed by those opposing the repeal and favoring the cash-and-carry plan. It is wholly illogical, inconsistent, and indefensible, and reveals the weakness and the fallacy of their arguments that we cannot change the law since war has begun. If such a position be sound, the United States, with only a partial neutrality law in effect and a major war starting in Europe, must wait until the war ends before we can pass an adequate and complete neutrality law. Surely we cannot afford to take that risk, and under international law we do not have to do so.

A practical reason for the repeal of the arms embargo is that we have found difficulty in its enforcement. It has not worked out in a practical way. We have tried it for 5 years, and only twice has it been invoked—once in the Italian-Ethiopian War, and again in the Spanish Civil War. Those are the only times we have tested it. A representative of the State Department testified before the Foreign Affairs Committee that its enforcement caused much concern and much difficulty even in those two minor wars, since it prohibits the shipment of arms, ammunition, and implements of war to belligerent nations, or to neutral nations for reshipment to belligerent nations, and it is always difficult to find out whether a shipment to a neutral nation is to be reshipped to a belligerent or not. Since there was much difficulty, even in those two minor wars, how much more difficulty would we experience in its enforcement in a major war with many countries involved. It is easily conceivable that its retention might involve us in war, since it would afford grounds for belligerents to accuse us of being unneutral in its enforcement.

Another reason for its repeal is that while the arms embargo is neutral in fact, it is unneutral in effect, in that it denies to weaker and unarmed nations the right which they have under international law to buy arms, and penalizes and imperils the safety and preservation of smaller countries that are unarmed and at the mercy of dictator governments.

Surely the United States, always a firm believer in international law, and a friend of the weak and oppressed, does not want to retain upon its statute books any law that will give aid and comfort to aggressor and dictator nations, and that is exactly what the arms embargo has done and is doing.

To those who fear that the repeal of the arms embargo might result in huge profits to the munition makers, let me say that if the arms embargo is repealed, I shall favor, and I am assured that legislation will be enacted to levy such a high tax on munition makers that it will prevent profiteering in those commodities. The munition makers know this to be true, and for that reason there is no active support on their part for the legislation to repeal, and some of them are even opposing its repeal.

But the opponents of repeal say that it is immoral to sell arms. They speak of blood money, and wax eloquent in picturing the death and destruction caused by arms which may be bought in this country. It is just as immoral to sell the materials of which arms are made as it is to sell arms in the finished product. There can be no moral difference.

Morality cannot be predicated on a definition. We cannot salve our conscience when we know that the materials shipped are intended to be converted into arms or weapons of destruction. Some of the opponents of repeal realize that the arms embargo should be modified. The Vorys amendment, adopted in the House, modified the arms embargo by repealing that portion of it relating to munitions of war and left the inhibition against arms and ammunition still in effect. It is just as immoral to sell munitions of war as it is to sell arms and ammunition, and one's conscience cannot be palliated by supporting the Vorys amendment.

Another school of thought, realizing that the Vorys amendment does not meet the requirements of conscience, have suggested that the arms embargo be modified so as to permit the sale of defensive but not offensive weapons, but this suggestion is so fantastic and impracticable that it was not given serious consideration in the Senate and, I predict, will not be considered in the House.

The only practical way, the only logical way, the only sensible way to handle this matter is to treat all commodities alike and to require a transfer of the title here, and the belligerents to do their own carrying. It is easy to enforce such a law, because its enforcement will take place in this country. If the present neutrality law is difficult to enforce, how infinitely more difficult would it be to enforce a law that required our enforcement agencies to determine whether the weapons were for offensive or defensive purpose, and whether they were munitions of war or arms and ammunition.

The embargo on arms should either be retained as it is now written or repealed in its entirety. There is no middle ground.

The Senate's action in repealing outright the arms embargo was the sensible thing to do, and the House should, and I believe will, concur therein.

I have sought in a calm, dispassionate manner, without appealing to your emotions or your prejudice, to discuss this important question. I have not decried the evils of war. You all know that. Those of us who favor the repeal of the arms embargo are just as much opposed to war as those who favor its retention, and we are just as anxious to keep our country out of any foreign war. But we realize that shouting shibboleths of peace or denouncing those who oppose us will not solve the problem, and based upon the experience and history of the past, we are seeking to enact legislation that will safeguard our rights and prevent our involvement, and we have looked at the question solely from the standpoint of America and America alone.

To those who seek to frighten the American people by telling you that we are on the verge of war, let me quote a sentence from the radio address of President Roosevelt, delivered last Thursday night. I quote:

"The fact of the international situation—the simple fact, without any bogey in it, without any appeals to prejudice—is that the United States, as I have said before, is neutral and does not intend to get involved in war."

That is the position of the President of the United States; that is the position of the Secretary of State; that is the position of Congress. America is at peace and will remain at peace, and the enactment of the neutrality bill, in substantially the same form as passed by the overwhelming majority of the Senate last Friday night, will, in my judgment, be the most effective means at our command to preserve our peace and prevent our involvement in any foreign war.

The Senate has spoken; the people have spoken in no uncertain tone in the various polls, all registering their approval, and it only remains for the House to carry out the will of the American people, and that I sincerely expect it to do.

I thank you and good night.

House Joint Resolution 388. To Establish a Joint Committee To Prepare a Revision and Recodification of the Judicial Code and Other Provisions of Law Relating to the Judiciary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER CHANDLER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 30, 1939

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. Speaker, permit me to invite the attention of the House to House Joint Resolution 388, introduced on October 5 and referred to the Committee on Rules. Its purpose is to bring about the establishment of a joint committee, consisting of five members of the Judiciary Committee of the Senate and an equal number from the Judiciary Committee of the House, to prepare a revision and recodification of the Judicial Code and other provisions of law relating to the judiciary; and, in view of its importance, I am sure that the Committee on Rules would appreciate the benefit of such consideration as Members of the House may have the time to give to the subject between now and the next session of Congress.

The Judicial Code was enacted on March 3, 1911, after 2 years' study. Almost 30 years have passed since that study was made. The code which was adopted has been amended about 200 times, but has not been revised or reenacted as a whole. The remainder of title 28 of the Code of the Laws of the United States was enacted at various times from 1874 to 1938. There have been numerous amendments of those provisions, but no revision or reenactment since June 22, 1874. The assembling of all the provisions of title 28 of the United States Code has been of the highest practical value; but, since that is merely prima facie evidence of law, it is not an adequate substitute for a revision and reenactment.

To describe in detail the many questions which naturally will arise in the work of revising, modernizing, and recodifying the Judicial Code and other provisions of law relating to the judiciary would be comparable to doing the work itself; but with the rapid changes which have taken place in the Federal judicial system, a reexamination of the entire subject by a specially selected group of Senators and Rrepresentatives, with the aid of the bench and bar and of experts in the field of codification, and the enactment of a comprehensive, up-to-date code would be a great step forward in the perpetuation of the Federal judicial system.

The new Internal Revenue Code has just been adopted and is the first Federal act of its kind since 1874. The National Bankruptcy Act has been revised after 40 years' operation under the act of 1898 and amendments. The time has come in this year of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the passage of the Judiciary Act of 1789, I submit, to begin to revise, recodify, and bring down to date the basic law forming our Federal judicial system.

The growth of administrative absolutism, as its enemies are encouraged to call it, is proof positive of the necessity for keeping the Federal judicial system as efficient and as effective as legislators, the bench, and the bar can devise. If for no other reason, when conditions change, as they always do, those who would sidestep the courts today will yearn for the fullest judicial control.

Mr. Speaker, Congress has recognized the prime importance of eliminating delays in the trial and disposition of causes by adding to the number of circuit and district judges of the United States courts, by authorizing the Supreme Court to promulgate unified rules of civil procedure, by simplifying appeals, by expediting the proper determination of constitutional questions through the authorizing of three-judge courts, and by the creation of an administrative office for the coordination of the work of the Federal courts; and the House Committee on the Judiciary has been conducting studies relating to the better distribution of the work of the district courts, rearranging the boundaries of the Federal circuits, reducing court costs and fees, expediting patent litigation, speeding up the work of the Court of Claims and the Customs Court, and allied subjects, all designed to popularize, if I may use the word, the Federal courts by guaranteeing speedy trials, inexpensive to poor and rich, and removing a growing desire among certain groups to remake the social order so as to operate outside the law and the courts.

Dean Roscoe Pound, one of the greatest law teachers, said recently that he could hear someone, a modernist, I suppose, saying:

> We are in a different age. The times demand that things be done speedily and efficiently. They call for short cuts to social ends. We can't stop to do equal and exact justice. We can't even stop to hear both sides.

The purpose of those interested in "administrative rule" is to turn over to experts, comprising administrative boards, the final decision of vital questions affecting human and property rights, particularly where speed is an essential factor. One justification for eliminating the courts is that boards and commissions can act promptly, unhampered by rules of evidence and legal procedure. It is unnecessary to pursue the thought further here, and we need merely ask ourselves: Shall we build up this new doctrine and substitute administrative agencies for the courts in the widely expanding fields of governmental regulation, or shall we retain the judicial system, streamline it to meet the demands of present-day haste and impatience, and preserve the original design of those who drafted the Federal Constitution and the Bill of Rights?

Perhaps an extreme question has been stated, but the possibilities have not been overstated, and it is not an exaggeration to say that the Federal courts, except the Supreme Court, have never been popular with the great majority of the people. This is not as it should be, and I submit that the remedy lies in the maintenance of such an efficient judicial system that men and women who find it necessary to resort to the courts for equal and exact justice will enter the Federal courts with confidence in the courts' ability to deal promptly, effectively, and humanly with their legal problems.

Mr. Speaker, I do not mean that administrative boards and commissions do not have their indispensable place in government. With the growth of our Nation and the rapidly expanding responsibilities of Congress, delegations must be made of functions which otherwise would be the direct tasks of the legislative branch. However much some of our citizens may regret it, commissions, boards, and bureaus are here to stay, but they are not constructed or intended as substitutes for our courts. Now, let us turn to some of the subjects needing study and revision in the Judicial Code.

In most of the States the work of the United States district courts is unequally divided. Many district judges are overworked, while others have far less than enough to do; and proper realinement of the boundaries of the judicial districts is essential. Obviously this is the work of a code committee.

The Federal circuits should be rearranged so as to equalize the work of the different circuits by relieving those which are overloaded, and probably by creating an additional circuit. The lawyers will not want to change the circuits to which they have been appealing cases, but the interests of litigants and the public are paramount. Some of the Federal judicial circuits are years behind in their dockets, and sessions are held in some circuits more than a thousand miles from the places where the cases have been tried.

Special courts, such as the customs court, should be fitted into the judicial system. Conflicting decisions on questions of jurisdiction can be reconciled by recodification of the Judicial Code, obsolete provisions can be deleted, and appropriate reexamination of the entire subject will reveal opportunities for great improvement in the enactments controlling the jurisdiction and functions of the Federal judiciary.

Turning to the annoying details which perplex the bench and bar, and which illustrate the need of thorough-going revision, there are many provisions relating to the judiciary which never have been expressly repealed, and it is not at all clear that they have been superseded by later legislation;

yet, they are not included in title 28 of the United States Code or in supplement IV. In conjunction with a recognized authority, Mr. W. H. McClenon, of the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, the following tabulations have been made to emphasize the importance of immediate attention to this problem by codifiers or appropriate committees of Congress:

PROVISIONS RELATING TO THE JUDICIARY NOT EXPRESSLY REPEALED WHICH SHOULD BE REPEALED OR INCORPORATED IN A NEW EDITION OF THE JUDICIAL CODE

Revised Statutes, section 846, first part.

Eighteenth Statutes, page 113, section 2, last part; classification as between title 1 and title 28 doubtful.

Nineteenth Statutes, page 269, section 4, in part, as amended by Twentieth Statutes, page 27, chapter 26; classification as between title 1 and title 28 doubtful.

Twenty-sixth Statutes, page 50, section 3; classification as between title 1 and title 28 doubtful.

Thirty-first Statutes, pages 1420–1421, sections 1541–1545, 1548.

Thirty-sixth Statutes, page 830, second proviso; classification as between title 8 and title 28 doubtful.

Thirty-sixth Statutes, page 1104, sections 62–64. (See 28 U. S. C. A., sec. 123; editorial comment.)

Thirty-sixth Statutes, page 1149, section 207, fourth, as amended by Thirty-eighth Statutes, page 219, and district court rule 81 (b).

PROVISIONS INCLUDED IN TITLE 28 OF THE UNITED STATES CODE WHICH HAVE BEEN AMENDED OR SUPERSEDED BY LATER LEGISLATION FOUND ELSEWHERE IN THE EXISTING COMPILATION

There are a number of places in which provisions included in title 28 of the code, or code supplement IV, are affected by later legislation included elsewhere in the code, or code supplement IV, but the text of the section does not take account of the later legislation.

(a) In some of these places the later provision is referred to in a note, but without any indication as to its effect on the text. Such are:

Section	How affected by provision cited in note
46	Superseded.
567, 580	Amended.
593, 600, 601	Largely superseded.
602	Superseded by sec. 600d.
672, 861, 862, 867, 868	Probably superseded.
869	Amended.
871–874, 878–880	Probably superseded.

(b) In other places there is no indication at all in the sections in question that they are affected by later provisions. Such are:

Section	Affected by—		How affected
	Title	Section	
3	28	3a (Supp.)	Amended.
20, 21, 24, 25	28	17	Probably amended.
113	35	72a	Amended.
114	28	186	Do.
119	28	548	Superseded in part.
178	28	178a (Supp.)	Amended.
213	28	213a–213d (Supp.) 213f, 213g.	Do.
213a	28	213b (Supp.), 213e, 213f.	Superseded in part.
230	28	723a	Amended.
260	28	288	Do.
268, 290	28	251	Probably superseded.
310	28	308	Amended.
334	5	597a–1 (Supp.)	Do.
381	29	107–109	Do.
381–383, 386–390	49	5	Do.
387	28	717	Do.
452	28	463 (Supp.)	Superseded in part.
482, 491	48	643	Amended.
496	28	497, 498	Do.
497	28	498	Do.
511	48	109	Do.
523	28	525	Probably superseded.
546	28	544, 567	Probably superseded in part.
548	11	80 (Supp.)	Amended.
558	28	559	Do.
560	5	823	Probably amended.
568	28	567	Amended.
570	28	557	Do.
606	44	322	Largely superseded.
654	21	337 (Supp.)	Amended.
721	28	721	The second sentence is inconsistent with itself.
751	19	1605–17	Possibly superseded.
770	28	773	Amended.
786	31	462	Do.
866	28	548	Probably superseded in part.
871	28	344	Amended.

PROVISIONS INCLUDED IN TITLE 28 OF THE UNITED STATES CODE WHICH HAVE BEEN AMENDED OR SUPERSEDED BY LATER LEGISLATION NOT MENTIONED IN THE EXISTING COMPILATION

Section	Affected by—	How affected
250 (3), 253	37 Stat. 591, sec. 3	Amended.
270	47 Stat. 405, sec. 207; 406, sec. 210.	Amended. (See 12 Dec. Comp. Gen. 125, 190.)
334	49 Stat. 1921, ch. 804	Amended.
374	47 Stat. 405, sec. 207; 406, sec. 210.	Amended. (See 12 Dec. Comp. Gen. 125, 190.)
563–566	49 Stat. 1921, ch. 804	Amended.
579	46 Stat. 1005, sec. 2	Do.
594, 600a, 600c	49 Stat. 1921, ch. 804	Do.
649, 650	32 Stat. 540	Superseded in part.
901	49 Stat. 1921, ch. 804	Amended.

PROVISIONS INCLUDED IN TITLE 28 OF THE UNITED STATES CODE WHICH HAVE BEEN AFFECTED BY THE RULES PROMULGATED BY THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT FOR THE FEDERAL DISTRICT COURTS

The numerous procedural changes which have been brought about through the adoption of the new rules of civil procedure for the United States district courts furnish additional reasons for recodification of the Judicial Code. These rules were authorized by Congress, have the force of law, and the following references will emphasize the extensive bearing which the new rules have on the present Judicial Code. The section numbers in title 28 are given, and the effect of the new rules on those sections is shown:

Section	Affected by—	How affected
45	District Court rules 3, 4 (d), 7, 12, 55.	Amended.
45a	Rules 2, 24	Do.
72	Rule 81 (c)	Do.
111	Rules 2, 54	Do.
228 (Supp.), 228a	Rule 73	Do.
377	Rule 81 (b)	Do.
384, 397, 398	Rule 2	Largely superseded.
400	Rule 57	Amended.
520, 572	Rule 81 (b)	Do.
635–637	Rule 2	Do.
639–641, 643, 644, 646	Rule 26 (a)	Do.
722	Rule 4 (b)	Do.
723	Rule 2	Do.
724	Rules generally	Superseded.
725	Rule 43 (a)	Amended.
726	Rule 64	Superseded.
727	Rule 69	Amended.
730	Rule 2	Do.
734	Rule 42	Do.
762	Rule 3	Do.
763	Rule 4 (d)	Do.
766	Rules 3, 4 (d)	Do.
769	Rule 40	Do.
773	Rules 38 (doubtful), 52	Do.
776	Rules 46, 75	Largely superseded.
778	Rule 81 (b)	Amended.
790	Rule 2	Do.
840	Rules 59 (c), 62 (b)	Amended (unless superseded by 36 Stat. 1167).
862, 863	Rule 75	Amended.
864–866	Rule 54 (a)	Do.
865, 866	Rule 75	Do.
867	Rule 73	Probably superseded.
872	Rule 73	Amended.
874	Rules 62 (d), 73 (d)	Do.
875	Rules 46, 52, 75	Do.
902	Rule 4 (d)	Do.

The foregoing references by no means cover the matters which will require attention in the revision of the Judicial Code. There are provisions relating to the Federal courts in a majority of the titles in the Code of the Laws of the United States, and those provisions should be connected in an appropriate manner with the Judicial Code. In some instances entire titles can be consolidated in a revised Judicial Code. House Joint Resolution 388 is sufficiently expansive to permit

the consideration of new matter, and the presentation to Congress of a thorough, concise, and adequate document for enactment as a Judicial Code.

Questions will be raised as to the probable cost of doing this work and as to the preferable manner of its accomplishment. Personally, I hope that the Committee on Revision of the Laws will have a part in the work if the resolution is adopted. That committee has had much experience, is equipped to participate very beneficially, and has jurisdictional connection with work of this character. Very valuable cooperation will be furnished by local, State, and national bar associations, and the facilities of the new administrative office, as well as the Department of Justice and the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, can be utilized advantageously and economically.

While public hearings will be necessary, and should be held, I cannot believe that the cost will be a material item. Certainly, benefits of a most substantial character, far outweighing the expense and extending over a long period of years, are bound to follow the completion of this work, which will represent a landmark and another milestone in the evolution of our Federal judicial system.

When Last We Were Neutral

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. THORKELSON

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 30, 1939

ARTICLE FROM THE AMERICAN MERCURY

Mr. THORKELSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to insert my own remarks in the RECORD, I include an article entitled "When Last We Were Neutral," by Harry Elmer Barnes, appearing in the American Mercury of November 1939.

Mr. Speaker, it is refreshing to read an article which gives truthful and unbiased information about conditions as they existed 24 years ago. These conditions, of course, are generally known among certain groups, but withheld from the public. I hope many will read this article and that it will be distributed freely, for nothing will straighten us out sooner than the knowledge of the intrigue and rot which has been and is undermining this Republic.

The article in question qualifies other information that I have inserted in the RECORD, in which the same personalities are involved, as set forth and so ably discussed in this article. The writer brings out clearly and distinctly the fact that we were not neutral during the World War, because we did not have neutral employees in the Government.

It is now high time that we cut adrift from the proforeign groups and replace them with pro-American. If an ordinary citizen engaged in the same activities in which the personalities in this article were engaged, he would be held for treason. It is well for us to bear in mind that we have no more right to be pro-German, pro-English, pro-French than we have to be pro-Ethiopian or pro-Scandinavian. It is difficult to understand what excuse one may find when he deliberately sends our Nation into a destructive war against a friendly nation. The article which I have asked to be inserted gives the inside story as seen by a neutral observer.

[From the American Mercury for November 1939]

WHEN LAST WE WERE NEUTRAL

(By Harry Elmer Barnes)

The United States could not have been more perfectly set up for neutrality than it was in July and August 1914. Woodrow Wilson was a lifelong and conscientious pacifist. His convictions were not emotional and impressionistic but were based on deep study and prolonged reflection. Moreover his wife was noted for her firm convictions on pacifism; she strongly backed up her husband in his pacific beliefs and policies. Secretary of State William Jennings Bryan was one of the outstanding pacifists then alive—courageous and willing to stick to his guns in the face of criticism.

In addition, Mr. Wilson was uniquely well informed on the essentials of the European situation before war broke out in the summer of 1914. He had sent his personal representative, Col. Edward M. House, to Europe to study the situation. Sizing up matters that May, Colonel House concluded his observations with the statement that "whenever England consents, France and Russia will close in on Germany." Years of scholarly investigation of the war origins since 1918 have underlined the sagacity of Colonel House's verdict, whatever his later mistakes.

When war came, the President's statements were a model of neutrality procedure. He issued a formally correct neutrality proclamation and went on to exhort his countrymen to be neutral in thought as well as in action. There is no doubt that he was completely neutral in August 1914. We thus started out most auspiciously along the path of minding our own business. Yet within less than 3 years we had become involved in the war to make the world safe for democracy, with Mr. Wilson proclaiming that we must apply to this crusade "force, force to the uttermost, force without stint or limit." What were the influences and pressures that drove us from that path and enmeshed us in the European carnage?

With another World War—direct offspring of the first—under way, the question is far from academic. It would be banal to insist on absolute parallels; modern history is too complex for such oversimplification. But it would be foolish and cowardly to blur the facts or ignore the lessons of the earlier period. Our transition from perfect neutrality to total immersion in the conflict provides a valuable case study in the A B C's of getting into a European war. Whatever the implications for our own day it is ineffaceable history.

In case we are catapulted into the new war, Americans should realize that there will be costs beyond heaped-up deaths, bereavements, and economic destruction. The moment we join the war the New Deal and all its promises of a "more abundant life" will fold up, as did the new freedom of Woodrow Wilson in 1917. Our civil liberties will be more thoroughly suppressed than in the first World War—there has been immense progress in the technique of bigger and better suppression of the world ever since then. Mobilization plans already drawn up call for a regimentation of American life unmatched by anything that existed in 1917–18. There are reasons for fearing that this regimentation would carry over into peacetime and transform the United States into an American style of totalitarian society. Under these circumstances an open-eyed, realistic understanding of the process of our entry into the first World War seems an irreducible minimum of knowledge for Americans.

I would summarize the forces which pushed us into the trans-Atlantic calamity as follows: First, a violent change in Mr. Wilson's personal attitude toward the merits of the struggle. Second, economic interests which drove us first into unneutrality, then headlong into war. Third, an inconsistent and unneutral line of diplomatic procedure. Fourth, psychological factors that impelled us toward intervention. How far the same factors operate today is not within the scope of this article to explore. Let us turn our attention to the essential facts, considered purely as history.

II

No circumstances could have forced us into the war if the President had not, by the spring of 1917, been favorable to our entry. We must therefore discuss briefly some of the reasons why he altered his point of view.

Primarily we must take into account the fact that Mr. Wilson's intellectual perspective was predominantly Anglo-Saxon. He had little knowledge of, or sympathy with, continental European culture and institutions. His greatest intellectural heroes were such English writers as Milton, John Locke, and Adam Smith. He did graduate work at the Johns Hopkins University Seminar, where the Anglo-Saxon myth reigned supreme. He was a student and admirer of the English Constitution, and frankly regarded the British system of government as superior to ours.

Then Mr. Wilson had in his Cabinet, and among his Cabinet, and among his ambassadors, men who were intensely pro-English or pro-Ally in their sympathies—Secretaries Lindley M. Garrison and David F. Houston, and Walter Hines Page, Ambassador to London, who frequently went to such extremes in his Anglomania as to annoy even the President. When Bryan was succeeded by Lansing, the most crucial post in the Cabinet went to another vehemently pro-English sympathizer. The biases of Page and Lansing made it difficult to pursue forthright diplomacy with Great Britain.

Mr. Wilson was also deeply influenced by the criticisms of prominent Americans sympathetic to the Allies and intervention. He was stung by the speeches of Theodore Roosevelt, and by Mr. Roosevelt's reference to his diplomatic statements as "weasel words." He was especially annoyed by Elihu Root's statement that "first he shakes his fist and then he shakes his finger." On the other hand, he was human enough to take note of the praise which was showered upon him by the press when he made a bellicose statement or led a preparedness parade. This contrasted sharply with the bitter criticism when he made such remarks as that a country might be "too proud to fight," or that the only desirable peace would be "a peace without victory." He was also profoundly moved by the British atrocity propaganda, particularly after James Bryce lent his name to the veracity of the stories. When Bryce sponsored the propaganda lies, Wilson came to believe that they must have a substantial basis in fact, which in turn helped his rationalization that England was fighting for civilization.

Personal matters also played their role in the transformation of the President's attitude. When his first wife died, a strong pacific influence disappeared. Then he married a dashing widow friendly to the Allied cause. Bitterly resentful of the criticism to which her husband was subjected because of his refusal to be stampeded into intervention, the second Mrs. Wilson appears to have wished him to shame his critics by an even stronger stand for intervention. The publication of her memoirs does not make it necessary to modify this statement.

Having been converted to intervention by these various influences, Mr. Wilson rationalized his change of mind in terms of noble moral purpose. As he told Jane Addams in the spring of 1917, he felt that if there was to be any hope of a just and constructive peace, the United States must be represented at the peace conference following the war. Mr. Wilson could only be at the peace conference if the United States had previously entered the conflict.

III

The influence exerted by American finance upon our entry into the World War has been revealed in Ray Stannard Baker's Life and Letters of Woodrow Wilson, in the volumes of the Nye investigation, and in Prof. C. C. Tansil's America Goes to War. At the outset the international bankers were by no means all pro-Ally. Some, like the Morgan firm, were pro-British, and had been for years; others, like Kuhn, Loeb & Co., manned chiefly by men of German derivation, were pro-German. But the financial interests of all of them soon became pro-Ally. Credit and loans to Germany were discouraged, while large loans were made to the Allied Powers.

On August 15, 1914, at the beginning of the war, Mr. Bryan declared against loans to any belligerent on the logical ground that financial credit is the basis of all forms of contraband. President Wilson backed him up firmly for the time being. This decision did not operate seriously against the Allies; the balance of trade and investment was against the United States and the Allied countries could pay for their purchases here by canceling the debts owed abroad by Americans. But Allied war purchases soon became so extensive that by the autumn of 1914 there was a credit crisis. The National City Bank wrote to Robert Lansing, then Counselor of the State Department, on this matter on October 23, 1914, advocating short-term credits to European governments. Lansing immediately talked the matter over with President Wilson, and the latter agreed that the Government would not interfere with such an arrangement. This information was transmitted orally to Willard Straight, of J. P. Morgan & Co., on the same night. Shortly after, H. P. Davidson, of the Morgan firm, went to England and signed a contract to become the British purchasing agent in America. A similar contract was soon made with France.

These short-term credits sufficed for some months. By the summer of 1915, however, Allied purchases had become so extensive that the bankers knew they must float loans here for the Allied countries, if the latter were to continue to buy munitions on a large scale in this country, so they made strong representations to Colonel House and to Secretary of the Treasury McAdoo.

On August 21, 1915, McAdoo wrote to President Wilson pointing out that great prosperity had come to the country from the sale of munitions to the Allies, but that this prosperity could not continue unless we financed it through open loans to the Allies—i. e., by selling Allied bonds in our own financial markets. On September 6 Lansing argued similarly in a letter to the President stressing the crisis that faced American business if the earlier ruling on American loans to belligerents were not rescinded. McAdoo and Lansing won. On September 8, 1915, Wilson assented to the sale of Allied bonds, and the Morgan firm was once more given oral information. Soon the first public loan—the $500,000,000 Anglo-French loan—was floated.

These formal loans, amounting in all to about $2,500,000,000, financed the Allies' purchases for a little over a year, but their buying was so heavy that even the great investment banking houses could not take care of their needs. By January 1917 the Allies had overdrawn their credit by nearly $500,000,000. Only Uncle Sam could save them, and then only if the United States were at war with Germany; we could not, as a nation, lend money to a belligerent unless we were at war with its enemy.

At this time the Germans renewed unrestricted submarine warfare. The United States could now be led into the war, and the bankers would be repaid—as they were to the last cent. When the war was over, Thomas W. Lamont stated with commendable candor the facts relative to the attitude of the firm of Morgan toward the World War and the belligerent powers:

"At the request of certain of the foreign governments the firm of Messrs. J. P. Morgan & Co. undertook to coordinate the requirements of the Allies, and then to bring about regularity and promptness in fulfilling these requirements. Those were the days when American citizens were being urged to remain neutral in action, in word, and even in thought. But our firm had never for one moment been neutral; we didn't know how to be. From the very start we did everything we could to contribute to the cause of the Allies. And this particular work had two effects—one in assisting the Allies in the production of goods and munitions in America necessary to the Allies' vigorous prosecution of the war; the other in helping to develop the great and profitable export trade that our country has had." (Manchester Guardian, January 27, 1920.)

It is well known that Mr. Wilson was not personally cordial to the bankers before 1917, and that members of the Morgan firm rarely entered the White House until war was declared; hence it has been persistently maintained that the bankers could not have influenced the President. No one, however, should be naive enough to imagine that the bankers walked into Mr. Wilson's office and demanded that he sign on the dotted line. The bankers exerted their pressure on the men sympathetic to them—on House, Lansing, McAdoo, and others. So even if Mr. Wilson did not personally pay attention to the bankers, he was directly and powerfully influenced by those who did.

It has also been asserted that the bankers were not alarmed by the fact that, by the close of 1916, the Allies had overdrawn their account to the tune of $500,000,000. This overdraft, it is said, was covered by securities deposited with the bankers. But it takes considerable simple-mindedness to believe that the bankers would have wished to confiscate these securities, reveal the bankruptcy of their powerful clients, and otherwise embarrass their creditors abroad. Even if the bankers did not have any overt financial worries about getting their money from the Allies, they had psychological and moral worries in this crisis. It is worthy of note that the bankers were paid back every cent, with interest, by the Allies; only Uncle Sam has been compelled to hold the bag.

Some observers have said that the bankers learned their lesson during the World War. The only lesson they learned was that great profits may be realized from financing the right belligerents.

Naturally most American industrialists shared the attitude of the bankers. Since England controlled the seas, sales were mainly to the Allied powers, and industrialists wished to see the Allies continue the war and win it. Upon Allied purchases depended most of our sales and prosperity, and upon Allied success and solvency depended our payment in the end. The vast trade in munitions carried us from depression, in 1914, to boom years in 1915–17.

There has been much dispute as to whether we were forced into war by the loans and sales to the Allies or by the resumption of German submarine warfare early in 1917. In an important article on "Neutrality and Economic Pressures, 1914–17" (Science and Society; Spring 1939), Prof. Paul Birdsall, of Williams College, shows that the two were inseparably involved. By abandoning his neutral financial and industrial policy in favor of the Allies, President Wilson made it possible for the Entente Powers to have an enormous advantage over the Central Powers in getting war supplies. The only way for the Central Powers to overcome this advantage was to resume unlimited submarine warfare and try to sweep from the seas the ships that were carrying these supplies to the Allies. Our financing of the Allies led to the resumption of German submarine warfare, which furnished the "incident" that enabled the war party in this country to put us into the conflict. Thus economic pressure and financial favoritism were the crucial factors which led us into war.

No one need hold that the President was moved primarily by any tender sentiments for the bankers. Both McAdoo and Lansing argued that it was essential to American prosperity as a whole to finance the Allies. It was this broader consideration of continued prosperity in 1915–16, and the relation of this to the prospects of the Democratic Party in the election of 1916, rather than any direct banker pressure on the White House that bore in on Mr. Wilson's consciousness in the late summer of 1915 when he let down the gates to financing the Allies.

But the net result was precisely as though Mr. Morgan had walked into the White House and asked the President to sign on the dotted line. Only the method was more adroit and the approach more indirect.

IV

As a result of personal prejudice, powerful economic factors, and Allied propaganda, President Wilson thus slowly slipped away from the neutrality with which he met the outbreak of the war. This was particularly true after Secretary of State Bryan resigned in protest against the increasing unneutrality of our diplomacy. Thereafter Wilson and Lansing followed one line of diplomatic reasoning and international law for the Allies and quite a different line for Germany. They allowed Great Britain to run wild in the violation of international law and of our neutral rights, while they insisted on holding Germany "to strict accountability" in the literal observance of such law.

England started out in 1914 by making a scrap of paper out of the Declaration of London, governing contraband in wartime. Next it made use of armed belligerent merchantmen as though they were peaceful commercial vessels. England violated our neutral rights far more extensively between 1914 and 1917 than she did before the War of 1812—even to the point of flying the American flag. Mr. Wilson came to believe, however, that Great Britain was fighting for civilization and that international law must not be allowed to stand in her way. His Attorney General, Thomas W. Gregory, tells of the rebuke which Mr. Wilson administered to certain Cabinet members when they protested British violations of our neutral rights:

"After patiently listening, Mr. Wilson said, in that quiet way of his, that the ordinary rules of conduct had no application to the situation; that the Allies were standing with their backs to the wall, fighting wild beasts; that he would permit nothing to be done by our country to hinder or embarrass them in the prosecution of the war unless admitted rights were grossly violated, and that this policy must be understood as settled."

Secretary Lansing, in his Memoirs, admits that he made no real pretense of holding England to the tenets of international law. He tells us that, after the sinking of the *Lusitania*, he thought we should be fighting on the side of the Allies, and that he was determined to do nothing which would prove embarrassing to us when we took our position as a military comrade of the Allied powers. He persisted in this attitude, even though he was later honest

enough to say that in 1917 we had as good, if not better, legal grounds for fighting Britain as for fighting Germany. Ambassador Page even went to the shocking extreme of collaborating with Sir Edward Grey in answering the protests of his own government, a procedure which, when revealed, outraged even so pro-Ally journal as the New York Times. We thus encouraged and perpetuated the illegally extensive British blockade, which in turn provoked German submarine warfare. Further, from the studies of Prof. Charles C. Tansil and others it would seem that on the rare occasions when Wilson and Lansing became outraged over the grossest British violations of our neutrality Colonel House invariably appeared on the spot to prevent any show of American firmness.

The psychological factors which headed us for war were numerous and powerful. The active campaign for preparedness and intervention was engineered by leaders of the war cult in the United States—such men as Theodore Roosevelt, Leonard Wood, Henry Cabot Lodge, Gus Gardiner, and others—who led in steps to stimulate the martial spirit. While there were exceptions, the majority of our newspapers were pro-Ally and prointerventionist. Many were honestly sympathetic with the Allies, others were deeply involved in Allied propaganda, some were heavily subsidized by the Allies, still others were bought outright by Allied interests. The newspapers also had a natural affinity with the bankers and industrialists who were their chief advertising clients.

In the matter of propaganda, the Allies had a notable advantage. They controlled the seas, the cables, and other agencies of communication. The Germans had only a crude and temporary wireless contact with the United States. Further, Allied propaganda was better organized and supported, and was also far more adroit, than the German. Consequently, a majority of Americans were led to believe in the veracity of the mass of anti-German atrocity stories. In a moment of unusual candor, Lord Northcliffe, in charge of British propaganda, stated that the Americans were more gullible than any other people, except the Chinese, and called us a "bunch of sheep."

The net result of all this was that we entered the war in April 1917. Americans went into the war feeling that there was no other course; that our self-respect and national honor demanded it. The fallacy of this was revealed in the investigations and disclosures of the facts of the World War causes in the era of disillusionment after 1918, some of which have been summarized in this article. Our great good fortune in obtaining these facts so quickly should not, it seems to me, be thrown away frivolously in the present critical period. It provides us with a treasure of historical experience that, with the exercise of calm reason, should be useful as a brake on our national conduct in the fateful years just ahead.

Some Factors of the Farm Price Equation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 30, 1939

ADDRESS BY HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON, OF VIRGINIA

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my address before the annual meeting of the Virginia State Grange at Winchester, Va., October 26, 1939, as follows:

Mr. President, ladies, and gentlemen, it is an inspiration to travel through our beautiful Shenandoah Valley at this season of the year when the blue haze of Indian summer has softened the rugged outline of our mountains; when the hardwood trees, yielding to the Midas touch of fall, are saying farewell to summer in a riotous flame of color; when the wheat is in the bin, the corn in the shock, and the apples in the shed—mute evidences of how a beneficent Providence will deal bountifully with a Christian people dedicated to the principles of peace.

Since I have been a member of the National Grange for a number of years and deeply interested in its program to advance the interests of agriculture, the invitation to address your meeting today was greatly appreciated. During my service in the House I have found myself in accord with the legislative program of the Grange and have found it a pleasure to cooperate with Grange officials in pressing forward to the goal. "In the building of a long-time farm program," states the legislative program of the Grange, "we must not lose sight of the fundamental American principles of self-help, equality of opportunity, and independence of thought and action. Agriculture asks for fair treatment rather than special privilege. It seeks economic justice rather than subsidy. The Grange declares for a program in legislation and administration that will establish and maintain prices for agricultural products that will provide for reasonable profits, as determined by farm costs."

I would think that all genuinely interested in the welfare of the farmer could support that type of program. Certainly the splendid district I have the honor to represent does, and hence I feel that the selection of Winchester as your meeting place this year was an appropriate one. Winchester is a city that is progressive and modern in every respect, yet one that is filled with historic memories and one that extends to the visitor within its gates a gracious hospitality that is reminiscent of the best of the Old South.

We celebrate this month the tenth anniversary of the greatest stock-market crash in the history of the exchanges and one of the most trying periods through which agriculture has ever passed. In previous depressions we have liquidated unsound positions and consolidated the economic front on a better fortified line. In the depression that started with the October 1929 market crash we have preferred a lingering illness to heroic medicine, yielding to the delusion that the depression was solely due to the money changers and economic royalists and that they could be made to bear all of its burdens. But we now realize that the distribution of wealth through Government spending means increased taxation for all and not just for the rich and is not God's answer to a farmer's prayer.

There are some occupations involving greater physical hazards than farming, but few greater financial ones. He can sow and yet not reap; he can reap and yet not sell; he can sell and yet not make buckle and tongue meet. And since he sells in an open market and buys in a protected market, he should know something of both to properly chart his course.

It is my purpose today to briefly outline some of the factors of the farm-price equation. Of course, in any discussion of the outlook for American agriculture today it is necessary to take into account the new situation that farmers must face because of the European war. Most people will form their opinions of the probable effects of the present war on the basis of what they remember to have been the effects of the last one. This is only natural. But the trouble is that our memories are short. We remember, first of all, that the last war brought us a boom. We forget too quickly that its real harvest was the depression.

When war came in Europe last month domestic farm prices had been relatively stable, although somewhat below 1938. In September of this year, however, farm prices rose sharply. This rise was due only in part to the war. It reflected in a large measure increased purchases by domestic buyers and speculators, who expect further advances because of wartime demand. Also, the incomes of consumers had been rising for some time previous, and in August the people who buy the things the farmer sells had the biggest volume of purchasing power at their command in 2 years. There was every reason to expect a continuance of the improvement in industrial production and consumer income before the outbreak of war in Europe.

What effect the war in Europe will have on our industry and agriculture remains to be seen. If we look back to the World War and to 1914 we are impressed by the fact that domestic prices did not rise appreciably until in 1916, although we were selling all of our products, including arms and ammunition. But even in the fall of 1916 our exports of arms and ammunition constituted only 1 percent of our commerce. On that phase of the problem Willard L. Thorp, economic adviser to the Secretary of Commerce, wrote me on October 17:

"The retention or repeal of the present embargo on the export of war materials would seem to be a relatively minor factor in the over-all situation, although it is, of course, important to specific industries. The bulk of war exports will undoubtedly be comprised, in this war as in the last, of materials and manufactures not covered by the embargo. Furthermore, while the repeal of the embargo would no doubt result in substantial exports of war materials, its retention would in many cases merely result in the shipment of semifinished goods for final fabrication in Canada or other belligerent countries."

And, if we propose to use 1914 as a basis of prediction for what may happen to our economy this year and next, it will be well to bear in mind the difference that 25 years have wrought.

In 1914 we were in a period of declining business activity. Today every indication points toward recovery, regardless of war. In 1914 we were a debtor country with obligations to meet abroad. Today that position has been reversed. In 1914 the world wheat crop was off 435,000,000 bushels because of short crops in Canada, Australia, and Russia. Today the world has the largest carry-over of wheat on record; by July of next year world stocks of wheat are expected to reach 1,400,000,000 bushels. Today there is a supply of 25,000,000 bales of American cotton which compares with seventeen and four-tenths million bales in 1914. Sugar supplies, both in this country and abroad, are more than ample. There is not likely to be anything like the situation that confronted us with regard to sugar in the last war.

A survey of the Nation's food supplies made by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics indicates that they are ample. The supply of meats through the first half of 1940 will be the largest in 5 years, mostly in pork. Although the beef supply is slightly smaller this year than last it will increase in the next 12 months. There will be no shortage in dairy products although the record productions of last year will be slightly reduced. More poultry and eggs than were available in 1938–39 are indicated for the coming year. An increase of 8 percent in poultry and 2 percent in eggs may be expected.

As far as farm income is concerned, the farmer's cash income increased in August over July, and in August of this year was above the same month in 1938. Income in the first 8 months of this year

is only slightly under the same period in 1938. The rise in farm prices which came in September will tend to raise total farm income for the year. Before the September price rise a total farm income of seven and nine-tenths billion dollars was indicated. Last year's income was slightly over eight billion.

One respect in which the farmer's situation differs from recent years is in the stocks of grains now held on farms. In the case of corn on farms October 1, 1939, there were 546,000,000 bushels, the highest since October 1 stocks were first reported in 1926. In the case of wheat 45 percent, or 332,200,000 bushels, was still on the farms. Although this is smaller than last year, it is larger than October 1 farm stocks in any year since 1932 excepting 1938. Eighty-one percent of the 1939 oats crop, or 765,000,000 bushels, is still on the farms.

The significance of this fact is that whatever increase in price takes place in these commodities in the immediate future, a larger proportion of it will go directly into the hands of the farmer who raised the crop. Government loans and the ever-normal granary plan have contributed toward the retention of larger stocks on farms.

The world supply of wheat is the largest on record, but in the case of the United States the domestic supply is 100,000,000 bushels under that of last year. We will have available 990,000,000 bushels of wheat, which is about the same amount we had in 1914. We are likely to consume 695,000,000 bushels, and exports will probably reach 70,000,000 bushels, which will leave a carry-over of 225,000,000 bushels on July 1, 1940. Since world supplies of wheat are 2,000,000,000 bushels larger today than they were in 1914, we cannot expect the same increase in exports to follow the outbreak of war in Europe today as was the case in 1914. Wheat prices remained fairly stable throughout all of 1914. Farm prices of wheat in United States averaged 85 cents in August 1914, the month in which war was declared. In September they averaged 93 cents, 95 cents in October, 92 cents in November, and 97 cents in December. This advance was only partly the result of the war and partly a reflection of the very small crop in Canada that year. Subsequently there was a crop failure in Australia. However, in spite of the higher general price level and the very large United States and Canadian crops, the 1915 domestic crop sold at prices slightly lower than the previous crop. It was not until the latter part of August and September in 1916 that wheat began its steady price advance. The war in Europe had then been going on for 2 full years. Wheat exports were three times as large in 1914 as the pre-war average, and in 1915 they were twice that average. The 1938 wheat exports are slightly over the average of the pre-war period and there is little prospect of an increase in our foreign shipments in the current situation. In considering the probable effect of a European war on wheat exports and agricultural exports in this country generally, there is one important post-war development that should not be overlooked. Virtually every European country has been doing all it could to become economically self-sufficient. England and France are raising more of their own wheat now than they ever did, and Italy is on an export basis for wheat, whereas it used to import wheat. All over Europe this trend toward self-sufficiency has been growing for a decade. This sort of a program makes these countries less dependent on foreign sources of supply for food and other commodities.

Although cattle prices advanced sharply early in September of this year part of the gain was lost as a result of increased marketing and a falling off in the speculative demand. Slaughter supplies of grain-fed cattle will be larger this fall and winter than last. Total cattle slaughter may be smaller, because of smaller slaughter of cows and heifers and grass steers. This in turn will be offset by heavier average weight as a result of the increased proportion of feed cattle.

Supplies of hog products are likely to be increased and consumer demand is expected to improve over the next few months. Exports of hog products were much larger in the marketing year just closing than in 1937–38, and the war in Europe is expected to bring an increase in them.

A large seasonal increase in hog marketings is in prospect for the next few months, reflecting the big pig crop of last spring. Pig production this year has been at pre-drought levels, except in the Corn Belt, where the number raised will be somewhat below the 1929–33 average. Supplies of hogs will be much larger than last. Hog production may be increased in 1940, since feed is abundant in most areas, but the increase probably will not be as large as in 1939.

In the dairy industry prices of fluid milk and butter advanced seasonally and increased consumer demand for dairy products is expected this fall and winter as a result of the anticipated expansion in industrial activity and consumer income. The consumption of dairy products was larger during this summer than last due in part to the distribution of butter for relief, but there has also been a noticeable increase in the trade output of butter through regular commercial channels. As far as war is concerned, its effect on the dairy industry is likely to be felt mostly in an increased demand for concentrated milks. In the World War exports of cheese and concentrated milk increased. Nevertheless the milk equivalent of exports during 1915 and 1916 represented a very small proportion of the total United States production of manufactured dairy products.

The number of layers in farm poultry flocks is greater this fall than last but their number is below the average for the last 10 years. The large increase this year is in the West North Central and South Central States, reflecting recovery from the drought. Fewer layers this fall than last are reported in the highly commercial North Atlantic and far western areas. Egg production per hen continues at a high seasonal rate. In addition to layers the number of pullets not yet of laying age are about the same this September 1 as last in the South Atlantic States. The ratio between feed and egg prices may be less favorable to producers the remainder of this year compared with last. This means that farmers may market a larger proportion of their hens and pullets.

The turkey crop has been estimated at 32,000,000 birds, a 22 percent increase over 1938 output. The largest previous production was 27,700,000 turkeys in 1936. Producers report early marketings—12 percent in October or earlier, compared with 10 percent in 1938. November marketings may be 38 percent against 41 percent in 1938. These figures indicate large quantities for Christmas and later markets.

The most significant current development in tobacco was the announcement by Secretary of Agriculture Henry A. Wallace on October 9, 1939, of plans for financing a portion of the remainder of the 1939 crop of flue-cured tobacco.

Under these plans, which have been approved by the President, the Commodity Credit Corporation will make purchases of, or loans on, that portion of the crop normally taken by foreign manufacturers. These foreign concerns, which now have at least 2 years' supply of flue-cured tobacco on hand, are handicapped in making additional purchases this year because of exchange difficulties.

Increased acreage and yields have resulted this year in the largest crop of flue-cured tobacco on Government record. It is slightly more than 1,000,000,000 pounds as compared with 800,000,000 in 1938. The prospective supply of flue-cured tobacco, when carry-over is added to current production, amounts to 2,000,000,000 pounds. August prices were the lowest in 6 years. When British buyers withdrew from the markets following outbreak of European war in September the auctions in flue-cured districts were closed. This greatly reduced the incomes of flue-cured producers, who marketed $46,000,000 worth of this tobacco in September a year ago.

Tobacco is likely to suffer seriously from the drastic restrictions on civilian consumption in the United Kingdom. The price of tobacco to the English consumer has recently been increased 16 percent, his purchasing power has been sharply reduced by tax increases, and the effect of these measures is reinforced by the sharp rise in the price of dollars to English importers. Since in 1938 the English took $110,000,000 worth of our total tobacco exports of $156,000,000 and since exports constitute around 30 percent of the total domestic crop, it is obvious that the export market of the tobacco farmer will be severely curtailed.

Commercial apple production was indicated at about 103,000,000 bushels as of September 1. This is about 25 percent more than the 1938 crop and 7 percent more than the 10-year average. It is expected that exports to Great Britain may be materially reduced this season.

The large supply of apples and other fruits in the United States and in foreign countries are unfavorable factors in the marketing situation for the current season. But an increase in domestic-consumer buying power during the season and the program undertaken by growers, aided by the Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation, to divert apples of less desirable grades for fresh consumption into commercial byproducts or other outlets will tend to offset the unfavorable elements in the situation.

Exports of fresh apples from the United States during the 1939–40 season are expected to be considerably below the 12,000,000 bushels exported during last season. Large fruit crops are expected in most European countries and American apples will meet keener competition from domestic supplies in the important importing markets than obtained last season.

As a result of the war, several new factors are expected to adversely affect the export outlook. Shipping space and the foreign exchange available for fresh fruit are likely to become serious problems, as both tonnage and exchange are expected to be reserved to a considerable extent for the purchase and transportation of commodities that are considered more vital than fresh fruit in the present emergency. Consumer demand in Europe is expected to shift toward foods that are less perishable.

In addition to the factors already mentioned, there are several others which cannot safely be ignored. One of these is taxes. The chart which I hold in my hand, and which I hope all of you will have an opportunity to carefully examine, pictures in a graphic way the flow of Federal, State, and local government funds into the respective treasuries and out again for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1938. You will note that the Federal receipts, including pay-roll taxes, totaled $7,691,000,000, State receipts $4,358,000,000, and local receipts $6,150,000,000. All of these sums, plus $2,207,000,000 of borrowed money, or approximately 31 percent of the produced national income of that year, was expended for governmental functions, including education, relief, and social security, agriculture, national defense, police protection, interest, debt retirement, etc. The principal taxes paid by farmers are property taxes, sales taxes, and concealed taxes. For the year in question the property tax raised $4,892,000,000 and sales taxes raised $4,298,000,000.

The other type of tax paid by the farmer is called the concealed tax, meaning the tax that is paid by the manufacturer and passed on to the consumer as an item of the cost of doing business. For the year in question, corporations paid income taxes amounting to $1,762,000,000 and pay-roll taxes amounting to $1,450,000,000. Just what percent of that tax burden was passed on to the consumer in higher costs of the finished product, no one can tell, but I recently saw an estimate from a reliable source that the average man of small income was paying 15 percent of his current income in sales and concealed taxes. The complete tax figures for the fiscal year that ended June 30, 1939, are not yet available, but the principal differences between the figures for 1938 and 1939 are

that in 1939 tax receipts were somewhat smaller than in 1938 and expenditures somewhat larger, especially for the Federal Government. The session of the Congress that adjourned on August 5 appropriated over $13,000,000,000, and the Treasury estimated the Federal deficit for the current fiscal year at $3,400,000,000. In recent weeks there has been great rejoicing at the Treasury over the prospect that the deficit will possibly not be that large, but as yet there are no indications that the deficit will be less than $3,000,000,000, which, in my opinion, is not a situation over which we can rejoice. I have already indicated to you my belief, based upon careful estimates of the United States Bureau of Agricultural Economics, that there will be no major pick-up in farm income for the months that lie immediately ahead. As for industry, increased domestic purchasing power plus a marked increase in exports will be required to sustain the present ratio of industrial production. The cost of living in 1915 was the same as in 1914. In 1917 it was only 27 percent higher. But in 1920 it was approximately double the 1914 level, due to credit inflation arising out of war financing and speculation. Out of that credit inflation developed a land boom which we now know was a great curse to the farmers rather than a blessing. "Too many forgotten yesterdays make a lost tomorrow." Surely we would not rush blindly into another inflationary cycle of that type.

It should therefore be apparent to all that while the terrible holocaust in Europe, which may possibly end in a destruction of democracy in Europe is at the moment our most absorbing interest, we cannot afford to lose sight of domestic factors that may imperil the perpetuity of representative democracy in our own land. In the past it has been the belief of leading economists that taxation that exceeds 20 percent of the produced national income will shortly be reflected in hardships, unemployment, and a lowered standard of living. Our tax rate already exceeds that figure, and we are drawing heavily by means of deficit financing upon the productive labor of the future. On this subject the legislative program of the Grange states:

"It cannot be too strongly emphasized that enormous bond issues and a consequent increase in the national debt, which has attained menacing proportions, mean the same thing as deferred taxation. There must be a limit to investing borrowed money that future generations will have to repay. The Federal Budget should be balanced at the earliest practicable date, primarily by reducing expenditures. As a first step, Congress should refuse to make any further lump-sum appropriations to be expended at the discretion of the Executive."

The economy votes I have cast in the Congress have been in line with that policy. When we say the Federal Budget should be balanced at the earliest practicable date, emphasis of course must be placed on the word "practicable." But equal emphasis must be placed upon the necessity for making a start in that direction, because where we will ultimately land is determined not so much by the speed at which we are going as by the direction in which we are traveling. Pay-roll taxes, which last year produced a billion and a half dollars at a rate of 2 percent for old-age annuities and 3 percent for unemployment compensation, will progressively grow heavier as the 2 percent automatically rises to 3 percent, and ultimately to 6 percent, but having no bearing whatever upon a balanced Budget since every dollar of pay-roll tax is a special allocated fund. As a matter of fact, at the expiration of 20 years, and possibly in less time, a 6-percent pay-roll tax for old-age annuities may be insufficient to meet the scheduled payments by as much as $300,000,000 per year, which of course must be taken from the General Treasury. Old-age annuities are operated on what the Chairman of the Social Security Board calls "an open-end appropriation," meaning of course that the full schedule of benefit payments must be met regardless of what is paid into the earmarked fund. Agricultural workers do not share in the distribution of this enormous annuity fund, though all consumers contribute to the fund by means of concealed taxes.

Another trend that will ultimately make against parity prices for agriculture is the law that proposes to limit the hours of labor in industry to 40 per week and the minimum wage to 40 cents per hour. Such a work and pay schedule is utterly impossible on the farm, and yet the farmer will be required to purchase goods at increased costs manufactured upon those terms.

I am sure you would not wish me to close this discussion of economic factors affecting agriculture without making some reference to our foreign policy. We are determined that our Nation shall stay out of this war, and the pending changes in our present neutrality law are being considered from that standpoint. According to the old adage, "While there is life there is hope," if we can stay out of war, and I firmly believe we can, we should certainly have brains, energy, and patriotism enough to work out our present domestic problems. We have the same natural resources we had in the boom days of 1929. We have more gold, more money in circulation, and more bank credit than we had then. We have learned more about the art of mass production, which means more value for less money, or a greater abundance for the people of the good things of life. What we do need, however, is more courage, more faith, more charity, and more self-denial. And we need more unity of purpose and of action. When I say we need more faith I do not refer solely to faith in the economic soundness of our social system. We must likewise include faith in "a destiny that shapes our ends, rough-hew them as we may." The Bible tells us that Asa placed his faith in the doctors, and Asa slept with his fathers. Hitler has placed his faith in his cannon; but Hitler, as Ingersoll said of France's impersonator of imperial force and murder, will go down to the tongueless silence of the dreamless dust.

We, as a representative democracy, inscribe on our coins, "In God we trust." If we treat that motto as the ignorant superstition of an earlier generation, it may some day be said of us as it has been said of the Russian exiles in Siberia:

"Only in after years when their sins have taught them charity, and their despair has taught them hope, and their loneliness has led them to faith, they shall listen again to the sound of bells coming across the field and comprehend and reverence the symbolism of the cross."

Let Us Clean Up Our Domestic Mess and Then Worry About Foreign Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. OLIVER
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 30, 1939

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. JAMES C. OLIVER, OF MAINE

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted to me to extend my remarks, I am pleased to incorporate herewith a radio broadcast made by me on Saturday, October 21, over station WCSH, of Portland, Maine:

Citizens of the First District, through the courtesy of radio station WCSH, it is again my privilege to speak to you over the air and to discuss national affairs of vital interest to each and every one of you.

As you are aware, the extraordinary session of Congress called by the President to consider neutrality legislation continues, with the House of Representatives compelled to await action upon the part of the Senate before taking any hand in the proceedings. When the Senate will conclude debate and arrive at a decision remains a question. So divergent are the opinions held by the various Senators, it appears the House must continue to mark time for some time to come before reconciliation of Senate differences can be effected and action be taken. On the other hand, it may be but a matter of days before the decision of the Senate is reached and the whole problem passed over to the House for consideration and action. In the meantime, we are prohibited from attacking the many other problems confronting the Nation, denied opportunity to render the service to the Nation which is our duty, and barred from acting upon anything at all. In other words, the hundreds of Members of the House of Representatives might just as well have gone fishing until the gentlemen of the Senate finished with the business for which Mr. Roosevelt hustled us to Washington. It seems, and it unquestionably is, a sad waste of time and opportunity. We could be busy with sorely needed legislation, busy earning our salt, busy doing some of the many, many things we will be called upon to do at the regular session in January. But the opportunity is denied us, and we have no choice but to continue marking time.

I need not dwell upon the activities of the Senate. Your newspapers and radios continuously have supplied such a flood of information concerning the speeches pro and con, the opinions expressed and the activities of this and that Senator as to have your brains wearied and at a loss to determine the meaning of it all. You are being bombarded constantly with propaganda from every conceivable angle and through every conceivable medium, exactly as we of the Congress are being bombarded in greater volume. The tune is not a new tune. Its very discords are reproduced without variation from their clamor of 1914, 1915, 1916, and 1917. The same old emotional appeals are being attempted, warmed over and camouflaged with a dressing of fresh hope of befuddlement. Those of us, whose blood inclines sympathy toward one or another of the European belligerents, are being spurred to hearken to the call of that blood and to thrust aside the dictates of common sense and reason and obligation to this, our Nation. Prejudice, ignorance of true facts, racial and religious inclinations, pride, greed, sympathies, all of these are being appealed to with cunning, calculated guile. But the tune is an old tune. A remembered tune. And I sincerely hope a clearly remembered tune. You heard it in 1914. America listened to its piping then and let it lead us into the World War. It came from the same sources as it comes now and for the same purpose. It is a sorry tune—a mortally dangerous tune. But it cannot harm us if we but turn our backs upon the pipers and refuse to be misled; if we but insist upon a return to genuine neutrality instead of wasting breath discussing the pros and cons of a wholly unneutral position, such as the proposed legislation now before the Senate would have us adopt. The sorry old tune that led us into one war cannot lead us into another if we do not listen to it, cannot befuddle us if we refuse to forget the horrible pit into which it beguiled us when last it was sung. It cannot harm us unless we abandon one cardinal truth—that there is just one way to stay out

of a war and that is to stay all the way out. Let me repeat that, my friends. Mark it well in your hearts and your brains for future reference. There is just one way to stay out of a war and that is to stay all the way out. All the way out! There stands the keystone of the very foundation of our hope for a continued peaceful existence. That is neutrality.

Woodrow Wilson, before his unfortunate defection from adherence to sound, historic American principles of neutrality, described America's relationship to the European war of 1914 in words equally descriptive of our relationship to the European war of today, words each and everyone of us should repeat to ourselves every time the blast of propaganda assails. Mr. Wilson saw—"the war as a distant event, terrible and tragic, but one which did not concern us closely," and he called upon the United States to be "impartial in thought as well as in action * * * neutral in fact as well as in name."

Neither the millions of words, the mountains of printed propaganda, the fiery speeches, nor all the other efforts now being made to accomplish or prevent the lifting of the arms embargo can have the slightest effect upon the unchangeable definition of genuine neutrality. No nation can remain half neutral and half partisan nor concern itself with the wars of other nations unless it invites war itself. Yet this Congress has been summoned to attempt to provide legislation that will enable America and Americans to be unneutral under the pretense of being neutral. For what sincerely neutral individual can deny the utter hypocrisy of what the administration is attempting to have Congress do?

And so, my friends, the Senators talk on and on and on and the mills of the propagandists roll and the sad and sorry tune of 1914 echoes again throughout our land. Allied propaganda, German propaganda, Russian propaganda, propaganda of all description, lies upon lies upon greater lies, befuddle and irritate and agitate Americans who have no business whatsoever anywhere but in America. Congress wastes millions of words and untold thousands of dollars and week upon week of time desperately needed for the solution of America's own problems, while it debates altering our laws in order to benefit this or that nation abroad; and all the while, all the desperate while, the welfare of our own land, the problems such as those of unemployment, of adequate provision for the care of our aged, of supplying the needy with food and with clothing and with opportunity to rise from destitution and again become self-respecting and self-supporting citizens of a self-respecting land—all these vital problems, ladies and gentlemen, are ignored and thrust aside even as the hapless are forgotten.

What nonsense this, to turn from our own suffering people, from our own economic misery, from our own war against poverty and injustice here at home, to excite ourselves and squander the time of our lawmakers over the self-created plight of people in some foreign land. What folly all this talk of sending war planes and armaments and munitions from a land so pitifully lacking in these very things as to be the laughingstock of the entire world. What madness to propose sending abroad the fruits of our factories and of our fields, the real wealth of our Nation, in return for gold and paper and promises never to be kept—what utter insanity this, when we have no slightest need for gold or paper or worthless promises, but do have such terribly dire need for all the fruits of our factories, all the fruits of our fields, all the wealth of our Nation, all we have with which to care for our own fellow Americans. How can true patriots speak of sending guns abroad when they lack guns for the protection of their own land? How can intelligent citizens consider sending war planes from a land pitifully unable to guard its own skies? How can sensible Americans wax excited over the fate of some distant nation, while their own fellow citizens, millions upon millions of them, face each day, uncertain of their very bread?

No, my friends, do not let the propagandists turn your heads and beguile you into turning your faces from your own land, from your own interests, from your own people, from your honest desire to dwell in peace and decency in a free and better America. Do not let all this furore about what goes on abroad blind you to what goes on at home. Do not forget that the gold now offered for the betrayal of your own national interest is "fool's gold," and we the fools who must pay the horrible penalty for the taking. Forget Europe and its troubles. Let's mind our own business and look about us at the sorry mess at home.

All the oratory streaming from the United States Senate isn't changing the American unemployment picture in the least. All the furore in Washington these days isn't having the slightest effect upon the sorry plight of our millions on relief. All the buzzing of brains and mouths among the big wigs isn't doing one particle of good toward supplying adequate care for the aged and the destitute and the other deserving citizens of America. And all the talk of supplying Europe with everything under the sun hasn't clothed an American back nor fed an American starveling, nor lessened the plight of one American unemployed citizen. There's talk enough of whom we should succor in Europe and how tough it is for the people of European nations, but there's no mention of how tough it is to be hungry and unemployed and destitute or old and penniless and dependent upon public relief right here in the United States of America.

Those are the things to be remembering, my friends—the things that are your business and mine. Let us remember that some 20,000,000 and more of our own people are living off Federal relief-supported jobs right now. Let us remember that millions upon millions of Americans are still waiting for a solution of the unemployment problem. Let us not forget the misery of honorable, self-respecting millions compelled to eat the horrid bread of public support right here within our own borders. Let us not forget that this very administration, now so eager to supply things to Europeans, hasn't been able to supply our own people with anything better than promises and the pap of existence wages for the millions after years of endless experimenting and spending and the saddling of America with a national debt that staggers the very imagination. And let us remember that we are not going to solve any of our own problems by running away from them or by letting ourselves be beguiled into minding somebody else's business while our own goes to pot.

We needn't go to Europe to get into a mess. We have one right here at home. And it's a mess that grows worse with every passing day. Forgetting it while we worry about the messes of England or France or Germany isn't going to improve matters one iota. And you can bet your bottom dollar that neither the people of England, France, Germany, nor any other foreign nation are worrying the least bit about the sad condition of America's unprotected aged, the hunger of American babies, the destitution of American workers, the millions of suits of clothes and tons of food nor the billions of other things Americans could use if American leadership were competent to solve America's own economic problems and find the way to get our idle mills and our idle earthly wealth back to work supplying America.

These are the problems, my fellow Americans, with which to occupy your thoughts—the American problems—this business here at home that affects the well-being and the future and the happiness and the comfort and the security of every one of us. These are the things for Americans to worry and fret and talk about, not the problems of Europe. Making America right, making America safe for ourselves and our loved ones, means keeping America out of war, out of foreign entanglements, out of other peoples' business.

So, as we strive to keep our thoughts American and our attention focused on the real issue presented to us by this foreign war madness, let us remember that every foreign war ever fought has been waged because of the ambition of some ruler, be he dictator or king or leader by any other designation, to secure territorial gains or trade supremacy. There may have been other causes or subterfuges offered but the real basic reason for foreign conflicts wherever and whenever fought has been the hope, the ambition and the aspiration of those in temporary control of governments to obtain material gain. Almost always, the song of idealism has been sung for the purpose of window dressing but back of the gilded front will always be found the sordid, grasping, and self-serving hand of imperialistic greed and avariciousness. Remember that it was only yesterday that France and England were delivering goods and materials of warfare to Germany and it was only a few hours ago that England made her trade agreement with Russia to deliver in return for Russian lumber, ton upon ton of British tin and British rubber, both of which are essential and critical war materials. Now, in the name of sweet reasonableness, what place does the ideology or philosophy of government have in this picture of international intrigue, materialistic selfishness, and double-crossing? Let us be Americans first and then saviors of the world only when the world shows some evidence of wanting to be saved. Let us profit by the example of that great neutral nation, Switzerland, and keep our American nose clean by remaining absolutely neutral and completely out of this foreign embroilment.

In closing, let me repeat again that there is just one way to stay out of a war and that is to stay all the way out. There stands the unalterable truth. With that securely in mind, fear not the poison of the propagandists, for truly the Good Book declares "* * * ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free." To stay out of war is to stay all the way out. All the way out!

Until 2 weeks from tonight at the same time over this same station, good wishes and good night.

Let Us Be Genuine Neutrals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. MOUTON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 30, 1939

Mr. MOUTON. Mr. Speaker, House Joint Resolution No. 306, entitled "Neutrality Act of 1939," is a measure that should command the earnest consideration of all citizens of the Nation. It is of such import as to warrant careful study as well as full and free discussion. No person, whether in public life or otherwise engaged, should hesitate to express honest views that are informative and helpful. We have the good fortune to live in a democracy where liquidation before a firing squad or the terror of a concentration camp are not the consequence of free speech, a situation that, happily, permits presentation of both sides of the issue in detail, without restriction or limitation. As a consequence we have heard or

read, over the radio, in legislative debate, or in the press, all of the views for and against the measure. And it is comforting to feel that in this somewhat tense situation, where the future welfare of the Nation may hang in the balance, alinements on both sides of the question are free from political partisanship, and that leaders here and elsewhere have expressed honest views without thought of political gain or loss.

It is my fervent hope that the people of the Nation, before forming definite opinions, will have due regard for the source and the motives behind some of the information being disseminated concerning this legislation. Two classes of individuals are lined up on one side or the other. There are those who are inspired by the loftiest motives and who sincerely and honestly believe that their convictions best serve the interests of their country. And then we find those whose opinions come from interests that are completely alien to the welfare of the Nation. The former are unselfish patriots, regardless of their views; the latter are unscrupulous hirelings, prepared to sell their birthright and their country for a mess of foreign pottage. The auspices under which they speak are most disarming. The organizations they represent, flaunt slogans featuring "peace," "Americanism," "democracy," and other alleged objectives designed to capture the unaware, the gullible, and the uninformed. For this reason it is important to know definitely who and what are behind these individuals and organizations that are busy attempting to mold public opinion one way or the other in connection with the measure.

I think it is important that we who are Members of this great legislative body take a definite stand with respect to the measure, and that our views, whether pro or con, be expressed clearly and without equivocation. This is no time for pussyfooting. The fate of civilization hangs in the balance. The future peace and security of the Western Hemisphere may well be at stake.

The issue involves the degree of our neutrality in the present European war. Most people in the Nation seem to be in accord on the proposition that neutrality must be of such a character as will insure against involvement in the war. Few Americans, in their right senses, could bring themselves to support a policy that would send the youth of the Nation to die on foreign battlefields. And we can be certain that our great President, knowing as he does the horrors of the last war, will not sponsor such a policy. Those who advocate repeal of the present neutrality law are convinced that its continuance on the statute books eventually will involve us in the war, while opponents of repeal—those who are against the measure now before us—are certain that the proposed change will draw us into that conflict. Repealists believe that we should adopt all measures necessary to avoid the possibility of participation in a military sense, but they feel that, as neutrals, our industries have the right and should be free to sell to any warring nation, provided sales are consummated here in the United States, provided merchandise so sold is paid for in cash and transported away from these shores in vessels not of American registry—in other words, picked up here and transported by vessels of the nations making the purchase. Those who think we should stand pat on existing law advocate what amounts to a virtual status of isolation so far as trade relations with the combatants are concerned. Such a course, they believe, is the only means for avoiding involvement.

Those of us who participated in the last war need no reminder of what happens to the youth of the Nation in these senseless conflicts. I served with the Marine Corps during that emergency and still am enrolled in the Marine Reserve. Experience at veterans' hospitals and with veterans' cases stamped indellibly on my memory, the utter horror and futility of it all. And I would be the last person to advocate a measure that in anywise and by any construction could lead our youth into another malestrom of blood and slaughter. And for that reason I have endeavored to examine both sides of the present issue calmly and dispassionately. I have weighed the possibilities of the proposed measure carefully, and I have tried also to view our position with respect to the present European war realistically.

Experience has taught that the nation well prepared—the nation with formidable defensive arms—need have but little fear of molestation by other powers. The present national-defense program makes for our security in that connection. And certainly no sane person in this country would have the temerity to advocate a war of aggression. We cherish no ambition for conquest; and regardless of the rather infantile radio pronouncement of one of our national heroes, we harbor no designs against any territory in this or in any hemisphere of the world's surface. That being the case, how could the occasion arise for the dispatch of our troops to any land beyond the limits of our own country? And is it logical to visualize the aggressor nations of the world—those with the lust of conquest—occupied as they now are, to invade our shores or possessions? And what basis would exist for an act of war against us? We know from what has transpired in Europe and in Asia that aggressor nations need no basis to justify acts of aggression when embarked on a policy of conquest. They make their own. But what, on the basis of international law or the known rules of war, would form the basis for an attack against our security?

I know of no precept of international law, or of any rule or regulation governing the conduct of war, which prohibits a neutral nation from commercial intercourse with combatant nations, provided that such commercial intercourse is strictly impartial and unbiased. Nor do I know of any precedent that enjoins neutral nations from selling merchandise of any type within the confines of their own borders to any nation whether combatant or noncombatant. Is it not a little illogical to argue that because there happens to be a war somewhere, in some part of the globe, nations in another part must immediately dismantle all machinery of commerce so far as that warring power is concerned? And is it not a bit unreasonable to ask that because of such a war neutral nations should stand by and witness the collapse of important export industries, the shutting down of factories, and the augmenting of unemployment rolls? Surely nobody can successfully argue that neutral nations in past wars followed such a course. Have not we had the spectacle, right in our own time, of Germany and Italy supplying nationalistic Spain with munitions and even men, and of Soviet Russia doing likewise for Loyalist Spain? And have not practically all of the nations of Europe supplied arms or other sinews of war to China in the present Asiatic war? And can it be said that any nation in the world has ever had any compunction about selling anything and everything possible to warring powers? Such a contention would fly right in the face of history. And right at the present, are not Germany and the Allied powers purchasing everything possible from the neutral nations of Europe? Apparently we are expected to be a sort of extraordinary suit-the-convenience-of-one-or-the-other-combatants neutral. The proposition that would close the doors to our commerce and industry, while other neutrals benefit by the open door, is so ridiculous as to be untenable not only in logic but in reason. Why should we not sell everything and anything we desire to sell within the limits of our national boundaries, and to all comers who have the wherewithal to lay the purchase price on the line, and the ships to transport it through the blockade or the submarine zones? Since when has any nation, any representative of a nation, or any organization backed by any alien power the right to tell our manufacturers, industrialists, or exporters, and the people of this Nation that because the nation they represent happens to be behind the military "eight ball" we must stifle commerce and industry within our borders, that we must close down manufacturing plants if necessary, and that we must abandon enterprises that give employment to thousands of our citizens?

Two thousand years ago, or more, the Chinese erected a great wall about the ancient kingdom. One thousand four hundred miles of solid masonry, 20 feet in height and with fortified towers every hundred yards, it was the most formidable defensive rampart of its age. No force was thought capable of penetrating it. When it was completed the Chinese sat

back and contemplated their future with a sense of complete security. The kingdom, they thought, was safe forevermore. It was secure against assault or penetration by the ruthless, savage, barbarian hordes. But was it? Did isolation—did cutting itself off from the rest of humanity benefit China and the Chinese? The answer that history gives is in the negative. Isolation served neither to protect China from invasion nor to keep it out of war. On the contrary, it brought about a feeling of self-complacency and self-sufficiency that weakened the fiber of the people, lessened military vigilance, made the nation the more vulnerable to attack, and eventually brought the once great kingdom to the lowly status of an impotent power. And for centuries, the heritage of isolation—of the Great Wall—has been economic decay, nationalistic disintegration, and military vulnerability. Let those who would have us erect a figurative Chinese wall about our Nation look to the fate of China. And let them remember, too, that no nation ever was, or ever can be, self-sufficient long; and that especially, in these times of teeming populations in the industrial centers of the Nation, trade with the outside world must prevail and be profitable.

I favor House Joint Resolution 306 for many reasons, and I regard the arguments that it will serve to lead us to war as so much argumentative buncombe. If, as contended, sale of munitions and other sinews of war brought us to the last European conflict—and I do not believe that was as much the cause as the war madness and psychological stupidity of the German war lords—but if, as argued, such transactions did bring us into it, it was because our ships were used to transport the merchandise. The proposed measure would remove any likelihood of such a contingency in the present conflict by specifying that transport must be made by and in ships other than those under American registry. I favor the proposed measure because I feel that, under existing law, we penalize the power than can maintain a successful blockade—and a blockade is one of the recognized instruments of war. In other words, because the Allied Powers happen to have superiority at sea and can block off approaches to Nazi Germany, and because Nazi Germany cannot come here and purchase supplies, we are expected by those opposed to the bill to refuse to sell to the Allies, who are in a position to come and get supplies. Our position is that of a neutral, and a neutral is concerned, and should be concerned, with impartial dealings with all of the warring powers, and such a course, favoring Germany as it does, I submit, is not an impartial act of neutrality. The fact that Germany is blockaded is not our concern, so far as neutrality is concerned. Neither would it be our concern if the reverse were true and the Allies were blockaded.

I favor this measure because, frankly, like approximately 110,000,000 other Americans, I desire the forces of civilization to prevail over those of barbarity, savagery, brutality, and Godlessness. Because I choose to view the present conflict as a show-down between the democracies of the world and totalitarian forms of government—if it may be called government. Because I loathe and detest the type of man or men that crush liberty-loving peoples who are powerless to defend themselves; that advocate the rule of might over right; that take children and plant in their breasts the seeds of racial hatred, of brutality and Godlessness; and that persecute ruthlessly helpless people because they happen to be born of another race or religion.

Why We Must Keep Out of War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 30, 1939

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, history does not repeat itself. It is we who repeat history. The mistakes, the follies, the absurdities of one generation are not automatic in their recurrence. Men must make the mistakes. They must commit the follies. They must be guilty of the absurdities if they are to occur.

One major truth has been revealed to the people of America by the brilliant neutrality duel in the United States Senate. In our country the spokesmen of our people are unanimously against war. Even those who regard England and France as fighting the battle of civilization and humanity are utterly opposed to military action by our people across the seas. We are united on this issue as we have never been before. And, in the course of the argument, too, it has become clear that neither the proponents of the arms embargo nor the advocates of cash and carry can claim that their position will guarantee the security of America.

What will determine our ability to remain out of this war is the attitude of the American people. Already the propaganda machinery has begun to function. A wave of "incidents" is already beginning to occur. Threats are being broadcast. Tales of sabotage are selling millions of newspapers daily. The campaign to rouse the Nation to fever heat in the American "white war of nerves" has already begun. All of this is designed to sway American public opinion, to prepare our minds to accept a war which is not of our choosing.

We must be on our guard if we are not to fall prey to this second edition of 1914–17. In all the turmoil which war must rouse everywhere, reason, logic, intelligence are the first to flee. Men become maddened by rage and hatreds. They lose sight of reality in a willingness to accept every tale of barbarism. No one denies for a moment that destruction undreamed of in years gone by is being perpetrated from the air. Innocent men, women, and children are being slaughtered in the streets. Yet before we rush hastily into the holocaust we must ask ourselves the vital question, "Will our participation in any way lessen the horrors we see across the ocean? Will we be able to prevent these things from occurring by stepping in ourselves, adding one more potential target to the already long list of eligible victims?"

The struggle of 1914–18 was portrayed to us in America as a battle between the forces of light and those of darkness. Wilhelm was described as a modern Attila. His forces were labeled "Huns." We entered that war to save the world for democracy and peace. The fight was the same, though the "isms" were differently named. We have seen the cost of that war. Our participation achieved nothing, because we refused to impose our will upon the entire European continent. We are still refusing to impose our will across the seas. The only result of this war will be another temporary redrafting of the map of Europe. Peace will not be assured until the power politics of the Old World are replaced by an honest desire for justice and fairness, taught through generations of education.

For our people to rush headlong into this conflict will be to spread the ruin of civilization from the mother countries of the Old World to the New. Our culture must be preserved. It will not be preserved by armed force.

Keep Out of Europe—Let's Solve Our Own Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 30, 1939

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, there is not a man or woman in America today who does not find himself deeply concerned over the happenings in Europe. War, wherever it may occur, has always called forth the sympathy and charity of our people. The victims, whether they were on the side of those

whose cause we supported or on the side of those whose conduct we condemned, were always certain to find us generous and tolerant. In the face of human suffering, the people of our Nation have always responded nobly. To the International Red Cross, to the relief of refugees, the United States has contributed more freely and less questioningly than any people on earth. No one can deny or doubt the motives of this Nation.

In the last great World War we were the only participant whose purposes were entirely free from self-seeking advantage. We sought no territory, no new people to govern, no money, at the conference of Versailles, no matter what naïveté we may have displayed, our representatives worked only to carve out a just peace. That they did not succeed was not their fault. We were innocent lambs at a dinner of wolves.

The world is once more engaged in the process of choosing up sides for another vast conflict. How utterly sordid the nations of Europe have become in their battle for power must be apparent at a glance. Allies are frankly bought up by promises of financial aid, by pledges of territorial acquisitions. Calmly and insolently whole nations are wiped off the map by even the most "civilized" peoples. At Munich, Britain and France agreed to the destruction of Czechoslovakia, the only important democratic state in central Europe. In the nonintervention farce which they played with Spain, the Spanish Republic was equally destroyed. To those who argue that the war today is the battle for the preservation of a democratic principle, these illustrations must constitute a damning exhibit A in rebuttal.

This is clearly not our war. We have ours right here in the United States. It is a war which the President of the United States himself recognized only a few brief years ago as a war whose outcome was vital to the future of our people. For almost 10 years the number of our unemployed has remained constant in the neighborhood of 10,000,000. Ten million wage earners out of a job mean more than 30,000,000 men, women, and children living under desperate circumstances. It means 3,000,000 workers on W. P. A., getting along on a bare subsistence level. It means 7,000,000 families struggling to "get by" on direct relief, meager old-age pensions, or family loans. It means farmers unable to market their products at a fair price, driving them in turn to Federal agencies for the basic necessities of their lives. America has troubles of its own when its farmers must borrow funds to purchase seed for a crop which it may not pay to harvest.

This is our war in the United States. We have unemployment brooding like a vulture over the land, waiting for the weak, the unfortunate to fall by the wayside.

We have, too, a growing menace to the spirit of friendly cooperation which has made possible the American standard of living. Labor and capital are standing at opposite sides of the pit, like gamecocks awaiting their release to spring at each other's throat. The horror of class conflict, with labor suspicious of capital, and capital hostile to labor, is developing before our eyes. We see one branch of labor gathering recruits in an effort to destroy another. We find public officials in this great classless democracy frankly wondering whether or not class warfare is wholly undesirable. There are growing numbers of our people who regard continued economic privation as a sure step toward bitter internal dissension here at home. Millions of men and women, faced by continued difficulties, have come to regard themselves as proletarians, a description packed with the most dangerous social dynamite.

This is our war in the United States, a war on unemployment, a battle to restore peace between industry and labor, to rebuild the feeling of cooperation which made our country's progress possible.

Right here in our great country there are millions of families whose resources are so limited that they cannot face 30 days of unemployment. There are millions more who could manage for 2 to 6 months. Over half our people could not survive for even 1 year if their job holders were suddenly thrown out of work.

Despite our years of prosperity, despite our amazing mechanical achievements, we are still on the border line of national economic collapse. No other term will do. Our people are so far removed from social security that they fall victims to every get-rich-quick proposal. They succumb to the temptation of the New Deal to spend our way back to prosperity. Our vision becomes obscured by one financial mirage after another. Why fight abroad? These are enemies to rout right here.

Statisticians present evidence of sickness, undernourishment, to the American people. We know that there must be more sickness, more undernourishment, in lands not favored as we have been. Yet everyone admits that these are evils which we must eliminate at home before we venture abroad.

These are no more serious than the pestilences of economic disaster. When a mother finds her child ill upon his bed she does not rush to attend the sick neighbor. Her concern is with her own. Europe is sick today; perhaps deathly sick. The contagion is spreading. It is leaping the boundaries of the oceans, infecting our shores as well as its own. We must build for ourselves stout bulwarks against the invader.

There is but one way in which we may resist the plague. We must build up for ourselves an immunity which will repel the poisoned virus. To build this immunity will require the work of every available man, woman, and child in our land. We shall have none to spare for foreign conflicts. We shall require the mobilization of all our people in a vast army of thriving, healthy citizens.

They must be given economic health first. Jobs to keep our people employed are the only assurance we can have of the safety of our Republic. Work to raise the standard of American living is the guaranty of our future civilization. Funds in the husband's bank account to secure the continuity of his family's well-being will do what cannon and bullets can never do. They will make life instead of destroying it.

This is America's war. It is a war of social reconstruction rather than a war of ammunition. It is a war to end uncertainty, to prove to the world that a great nation, devoted to its traditions, can achieve happiness, contentment, and the advancement of civilization. The people of America are ready to fight their own war. They are ready to join forces in the battle to end unemployment, to achieve security, to conquer illness. Europe's misery is a source of the greatest pain and sorrow to us. We have nothing but pity in our hearts for those who must suffer innocently because a handful of men are arrogant and cruel. But our job is here at home. It is our business to solve our own problems before we contemplate solving those of others.

Americans, these are our problems—unemployment, industrial warfare, social insecurity, disease, hopelessness. This is our war. Let us win it on our own soil. Let us demand that our National Government fight America's battles before we fight Europe's.

The Way Out for America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERTRAND W. GEARHART

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 30, 1939

ARTICLE BY PAUL C. SMITH, EDITOR OF THE SAN FRANCISCO CHRONICLE

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, during the interim recess of the Congress there appeared in the columns of the San Francisco Chronicle, one of the Nation's greatest newspapers, an article from the capable pen of Paul C. Smith which, I am certain, will excite the interest and engross the attention of the entire country.

Because of the timeliness of that concerning which Mr. Smith wrote, the forcefulness of his comments, and the cogency of his suggestions, I ask the unanimous consent of the membership of the House of Representatives to include Mr. Smith's article which he has entitled "The Way Out for America" in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. Smith's article follows:

THE WAY OUT FOR AMERICA

(By Paul C. Smith)

ARTICLE I

America, our America, is the one nation in the world of today with a destiny brimful of hope. It is the one nation of the earth which can preserve the ideals of democracy—we the one people capable of mobilizing our forces in bristling defense of liberty—the one people able to construct a citadel of human progress out of a rickety modern civilization.

To save not only America but the entire world, we but need to captain our soul and master our fate.

We need only to know where we are, realize who we are, and determine where we are going.

The American people have unlimited "guts," intelligence, and imagination. Action and leadership can and must guide this driving power toward a solution of our economic and social problems, and America will not only save herself but will be a symbol of the whole world's hope.

There are omnipotent human forces in America, and raw materials from which those forces may fashion the greatest civilization in the known history of the world. Application and coordinated direction of our inexhaustible supply of spiritual, moral, and intellectual energy will bring America out of the woods under her own power, leading the rest of a confused world by the hand.

At times we do not realize our own strength. I have just examined America, and in every nook and cranny of this great Nation I find the power to fulfill a destiny which is our obligation to modern civilization—a power vested in the whole American people.

I find moral strength, spiritual hunger, humor, tolerance, and fortitude in a youth craving but one thing—leadership.

Fundamentally, there is but one burning desire searing the breasts of the unemployed—the desire for a chance to work as productive units in the reconstruction of America.

Basically, there is but one real yearning in the hearts of the "underprivileged" the yearning for a decent place in a decent society of free men.

Primarily, there is but one basic passion governing the brains of the "privileged" the passion to go over the top for their country, if leadership will but plot an American course across a no man's land pocked and pitted with isms and theories.

Yes, of course, there are exceptions; but they are exceptions which only prove the rule, for these are the true, elemental characteristics of the present American state of mind.

These are the real, deep-rooted feelings of the American people of 1939; these the desires, the yearnings, the hopes. And the desires can be achieved, the yearnings satisfied, the hopes realized.

America has before it an exciting, thrilling chance to lead the world of today and to create the civilization of tomorrow. America can do it, will do it, must do it.

We are a greater people, a better people, a sounder people today than we were 10 years ago. The depression of the past decade has been good for us. It has been hard, but it has kicked the smugness out of us. We are ready now, we are rugged enough now to hit the hard trail out of the wilderness, and we can find that trail; we can blaze it for the entire world to follow.

We can conquer the forces of deep reaction which lie today in ambush of the American people. We can vanquish the despair and chaos of Communist destruction; defeat the oppression and indignities of fascism.

The Roman Empire collapsed because it got pudgy and soft. The French aristocrats lost their heads because they were heedless, lazy, and self-indulgent. Those democracies of the world which have blundered into the limbo of history were lost only because of the pudginess, laziness, and selfishness of their citizens.

It is an axiom of history that a nation will go to pieces every time its citizens lie down and forget what their nation is about. There is no reason to let that happen here. America is too young, too alive, its citizens too alert for our leaders to permit such a disaster to overtake us.

We do not need any new revolution here in America. All we need do is finish the job we started with the American Revolution of 1776. All we need do is remember that the fundamental strength of that revolution is not destruction, but creation.

America has been built by the implements of creation; not by the hammers of destruction.

If we lose sight of that truth, we shall lose both the ideals and material objectives of the American Revolution. But if we keep that truth alight we can win the American fight our fathers began to wage at Lexington a few years back.

Remember Donn Fendler? Donn is a 11-year-old Boy Scout who was a sensation on the east coast 3 weeks ago. Straying from camp, he got lost in the thick woods of Maine. After 6 days the searching parties gave him up for dead. The afternoon of the eighth day Donn stumbled, naked and emaciated, into a summer camp on a remote creek 45 miles from the point of his disappearance.

"I ate wild berries and sometimes found water in stagnant pools. I found a little dry creek on the side of the mountain, and knew it must go somewhere, so I followed it," he said.

Donn was a mass of insect stings, his wiry little legs lacerated by rock and brush cuts. His clothes has been torn completely off as he crawled day after day through thick underbrush. Wild animals howled at him from the pitch blackness of midforest nights.

"Sometimes I got scared and pretty weak, but I guess I'm all right now," Donn told reporters after he had staggered out of the forest under his own power.

"Donn, I love you," was all his choking father could say when the boy was finally returned. Sure. America loves Donn, because Donn is the real America.

And it is because that kid is the real America, that America can fight its way through the woods in which we are lost, even if the searching parties have given up hope.

There is no economic bramble too tough, no social cut too deep, no political sting too poisonous, no wild howl too calamitous to keep us from coming through under our own power, if we but give form and force to our full quota of plain American guts.

But one thing more. Donn came through in the last analysis not only because of his typical American fortitude but because he found a line of direction and followed it.

Remember Donn: "I found a little dry creek on the side of the mountain and knew it must go somewhere, so I followed it."

That was resourcefulness, as well as courage. Donn had a little knowledge. He applied it. He made a decision, and he had the nerve to stick to that decision. He didn't leave his line of direction, once it was established in his mind. He didn't eat a wild berry and sit whimpering by the bush waiting for Providence to grow another.

Parched and dry, he didn't lie by the first stagnant pool he found, afraid to leave for fear he would never find another.

The howls of the wild animals scared Donn, yes; but there can be no courage where there is no fear. He overcame his fear and fought his way back to civilization.

America will do that, too. America can do it and will do it.

America is ready for the solution. Americans are prepared for any supreme sacrifice, any effort that will transform the abstractions of today's democracy into a concrete fortress of liberty and human dignity.

And there is a solution. A visionary solution, yes; but a practical, workable solution which the American people themselves have the power to unfold.

ARTICLE II

From the American people—from you and you and you—can come the will and the plan by which America may be saved from the false things which menace the existence of our Nation.

The class conflict, the hate, the strife, the intolerance, the demagogy which have become a part of American life during the past 10 years are not representative of the spirit of America today.

The real America is sick of all those false and malicious forces, tired of their destructive handiwork. America is prepared to take up the implements of creation, and work and fight toward a better civilization.

The first step in development of the will and the plan is for the people to demand that certain leaders of American group, class, and partisan opinion gather together round a conference table with this express intention.

First. To establish a national unity of purpose by reaching agreement upon a clear, comprehensible definition of the principles and objectives of present-day American democracy, which definition shall be called the doctrine of American democracy, or simply the doctrine.

Second. To solve the problem of mass unemployment within the framework of the doctrine.

The first will give the American people a clear understanding of the high purpose for which they live. The second will build a sound material foundation for the spiritual quality of the doctrine.

This can be done and shall be done if the people themselves—and, to repeat, that means you and you—will put their unlimited moral strength behind a simple but specific movement to set up the machinery necessary to accomplish the job practically and realistically.

That specific movement begins with a request to the President of the United States to initiate one simple, unselfish, nonpartisan action; simple, unselfish, nonpartisan, and so high-purposed as to make for him a permanent place in the all-enduring honor roll of world history.

The request will be that the President shall appoint, at the earliest possible date, a 25-member advisory commission which will be called the "all-American council."

The membership of the all-American council shall be as follows:

Council chairman, Hon. Charles Evans Hughes, Chief Justice, United States Supreme Court.

Herbert Hoover, former President of the United States.

John L. Lewis, president, Congress of Industrial Organizations.

William Green, president, American Federation of Labor.

Eleanor Roosevelt.

Robert Gordon Sproul, president, University of California.

William Gibson Carey, Jr., president, United States Chamber of Commerce.

Howard Coonley, president, National Association of Manufacturers.

Harry L. Hopkins, United States Secretary of Commerce.

Robert M. Hutchins, president, University of Chicago.

Roy W. Howard, publisher, Scripps-Howard Newspapers.

Owen D. Young, chairman of board, General Electric Co.

Harper Sibley, agriculturist and industrialist.

Thomas J. Watson, president, International Chamber of Commerce.

Jesse H. Jones, Federal Loan Administrator.
Morris Fishbein, editor, American Medical Association Journal.
Nicholas Murray Butler, president, Columbia University.
Charles A. Beardsley, president, American Bar Association.
Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., chairman of the board, United States Steel Corporation.
Wetmore Hodges, rancher, industrialist, former Harvard professor.
William S. Knudsen, president, General Motors Corporation.
J. J. Pelley, president, Association of American Railroads.
George McGregor Harrison, chairman, Railway Labor Executives' Association.
Edward A. O'Neal, director, American Farm Bureau Federation.
Stephen F. Chadwick, national commander, American Legion.

This commission, immediately after its appointment, shall meet at Philadelphia where, on September 5, 1774, the First Continental Congress met to breathe the life of liberty and independence into the twitching body of an infant nation.

Its members shall be guided by the same unselfish wisdom and tolerance that led the founding fathers to resolve their differences to a common purpose that America might become a nation of freemen.

The members of the all-American council shall not surround themselves with batteries of secretaries, body servants, or personal entourages. They shall meet simply as great Americans with the unlimited power of the American people behind them.

They shall meet because they have recognized the President's appointment as a command from the whole American people. The President himself shall have made the appointments regardless of superficial personal feelings and at the command of the people.

Thus will be assembled the leaders of the most influential economic and social groups in the Nation, the leaders of great spheres of class and factional thought. They can and will weld conflicting views into a unified American philosophy of action.

Without tolerance, without understanding, without unity, these 25 Americans represent battle commanders in the destructive war of American against American. With tolerance, understanding, and unity they represent the general staff of an invincible American army prepared to grapple with any destroyer of modern civilization.

There is nothing remotely impossible of achievement about the vision of these Americans sitting together around a table. Of course, seated together for the first time, some at first will be embarrassed by the record of bitter public opposition to each other.

But the embarrassment will soon pass, for within the heart of each is honesty of purpose, within the brain of each the capacity to create—and creation is the first principle of the American Revolution.

Each is a hard fighter for what he believes to be right, each able and tough like the vast majority of the American people.

That is why each has risen to his present position of group leadership. Now, guided always by tolerant understanding of the true spirit of America, each may rise with the help of the others to new pinnacles of national leadership.

Each, being of the American people, is fundamentally fair and square. And most important of all, any close study of the great public records of all will reveal that common denominators of understanding already exist among them.

There is plenty of ground, both philosophic and material, upon which these leaders of American factional opinion may meet at once for the common good of the whole American people. More ground will be discovered as soon as they come together in their first session.

Perhaps some change in the list of proposed members is possible, but no change should be made which would menace the theory of representation for the socially and economically important elements of the American struggle.

In the initial stages of the work of the all-American council, superficial differences shall be put aside in the approach to all questions entering into development of the doctrine. However, the council need not be asked to pass any judgment to the American people which does not meet with the approval of the whole council. Force and form still can be given to American life by a doctrine developed even under these human limitations.

Now is the time to weld the works of 10 years of class struggle into a solid structure of national unity, and this all-American council can accomplish the job. It can and will be done by unselfish effort, and with the American people behind the council, the destructive conflict of American against American shall be brought to an end, and the new spirit of unity and creation will drive our people onward to a new place in the history of civilization.

Is this not better, is this not wiser, than having our childish class struggles brought to an end by some one man on horseback, who even now may be lurking in an obscure corner of the wilderness through which we wander so aimlessly?

By raising themselves above partisan politics and restricted class consciousness, the American people can, through the machinery of this all-American council, unseat any of the little men who might attempt to "ride horseback" into the American scene of today and tomorrow.

The will and the power of the people can create the all-American council, and with the moral support of the people of the council can materialize America's innate power to stop class conflict, arrest the forces of degradation, and demonstrate to the world how a great Nation can be made greater without hate and intolerance, oppression, and bloodshed.

Shall we call these leaders to the supreme service of America?

ARTICLE III

Meeting primarily to establish a national unity of purpose by agreeing upon a modern doctrine of American democracy and to solve the problem of mass unemployment within the framework of the doctrine, our all-American council, named yesterday in these articles, should hold its first session in Philadelphia, near the site of old Carpenters' Hall, where, on September 5, 1774, the founding fathers met as delegates to the First Continental Congress.

Hovering over the council table, as Chairman Charles Evans Hughes calls the meeting to order, will be the spirits of George Washington, Patrick Henry, John and Samuel Adams, John Dickinson, Roger Sherman, Christopher Gadsden, the Rutledges, and the others who modified their personal views and subdued their factional animosities, that the raw Colonies might be assembled into a strong young nation.

The fathers will be thinking of that nation, still young and strong, when they murmur into the ears of the all-American council of 1939: "We met here at the birth of the United States of America. There were personal and class disagreements among us, too, but we laid down the foundations for the great nation with whose very life you now are concerned. We laid the cornerstone of the great structure it is your duty to complete. Put your disagreements aside and go about the job of fulfilling the hopes of our day and the fervent prayer of yours."

The chairman of the all-American council, Hon. Charles Evans Hughes, Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court, a great judicial statesman, will at once realize his responsibility. He will be self-effacing, tolerant, strong, will seek no publicity and no glory.

Under his leadership the discussion will begin, at first uneasily, then more intently, but with increasing ease. Warm courtesy, and again tolerance, will be the governing spirit from the very beginning of the deliberations.

There will be no gallery to play to, no inclination to play to it were there one.

The press, in a spirit of cooperation, will wait outside for jointly issued announcements of progress.

The initial meeting will not break up at lunch. Trays will be brought in, from which the members of the all-American council will eat lightly that first noon, preoccupied with sudden realization of the full power of joint discussion of problems with which, till now, most had been concerned only as leaders of factional thought.

Late that first night the members will emerge from the council room, not tired and haggard, but brightened and stimulated by the day's discussion.

A brief written statement will be handed the waiting press, and no individual member will make any additional comments. The statement probably will say: "We have uncovered many points of common understanding. We believe we can announce an agreed formula for American progress some time within the next few days."

There will be no additional comment, but the country will need none, for John L. Lewis, William Green, Herbert Hoover, and Owen D. Young, by coincidence perhaps, emerge from the council room together. They stand for the photographers and, though silent for the moment, the very pictures, distributed throughout the Nation, broadcast a mute but eloquent message to a waiting, hopeful people.

The all-American council convenes again next day and plods through the whole maze of group and factional opinion, on to a definition of national purpose. After a few days the press is called in for a momentous announcement. The all-American council has developed a doctrine of American democracy, to which each of its members subscribes.

The doctrine is released to the press and broadcast to the American people.

Copies are transmitted immediately to the President of the United States, who orders the doctrine telegraphed to every Member of Congress and conveyed to every member of Federal, State, county, and municipal governments in the United States.

"This is the code by which we shall live," John L. Lewis telegraphs as he dispatches the doctrine to his regional C. I. O. leaders for distribution to the membership.

"This is the philosophy of our lives as American citizens," wires William Green as he hastens to inform the officials of A. F. of L. labor councils of the new guide to American order.

The Republican Party and the Democratic Party immediately arrange to insert the doctrine into their platforms.

The United States Chamber of Commerce broadcasts the doctrine to their hundreds of units throughout the Nation, and local chambers of commerce meet by the thousands to set up the doctrine as a living, vital force in the conduct of local business affairs.

The Manufacturers' Association spreads the word throughout its membership, and a new tone immediately vibrates throughout the vast industrial machinery of the Nation. The economic heartbeat of America paces up.

All organizations not directly represented on the all-American council meet to embrace the doctrine and affiliate themselves in spirit with the work of the council.

The school children and university students of the Nation absorb the doctrine as the philosophic formula for modern American citizenship.

Labor, capital, the arts and crafts, Republicans, Democrats, farm and city, rich and poor, rally round the doctrine as the guiding principles of American democracy, the blueprint for a new and greater Nation.

And from this rallying point, in this high-spirited, hopeful atmosphere the all-American council proceeds to the job of solving

American democracy's No. 1 social and economic problem—mass unemployment.

Relief of the unemployed continues, of course; but it is no longer approached as a hopeless, perpetual, national handicap.

The captains of industry and finance, the leaders of labor, working within the spirit of the doctrine and through the machinery of the all-American council, go about releasing the unlimited stores of economic energy lying latent within the borders of the now greatest and most high-spirited democracy within the known history of the world.

Problems are met head-on as problems and not as questions of partisan prejudice. Only honest information is dealt with, honest and complete.

Congress is called back into session by the President as the all-American council reaches agreement on necessary legislative reforms. Congress, working within the spirit of the doctrine, effects the legislative changes advised by the council free from the myopic interferences of regional pressure groups.

The great obsolescence in the vast American industrial plant is to be restored through cooperation among the potent group forces now welded together into an omnipotent national power.

The rich store of new inventions banked in the technical laboratories of the Nation is released under the impetus of a revived spirit of confidence and mutual understanding.

The whole system of production and distribution is given a thorough overhauling by the great experts on the all-American council, who seek and get the advice of many of the other great experts of the Nation.

This phase of the work of the council will take time, but piece by piece the national economy is studied, and recommendations are made to the legislative and administrative divisions of government, to industry and science, and from it all emerges an American chart for the contemporary road to a better future.

The all-American council continues to function as an advisory board; government, agriculture, business, and labor go about executing the proposals of the council under the guiding principles of the doctrine of American democracy, and a new day dawns.

The Nation forges ahead, its boundless energies directed by a unified consciousness of destiny. There is employment for all employables, liberty for all men within the democratic framework of the doctrine.

America marches on, and the oppressive, despotic dictatorships of the world crumble before its shining brilliance.

Armageddon is averted without bloodshed, and the dignity of the human race is restored, bringing with it a new and greater civilization.

Through it all looms America, an example to the brotherhood of nations approaching in importance the example of Jesus to the brotherhood of man.

Visionary? Yes; of course.

But America must do it, will do it, can do it.

The whole thing is largely up to you—you as an individual and as an American.

ARTICLE IV

Where are we, who are we, where are we going?

If America is to achieve her destiny, preserve the ideals of democracy, mobilize in defense of liberty, construct a citadel of human progress out of a rickety modern civilization, that question must be answered.

The answer must put before the American people a national unity of purpose, the vision of a goal to be achieved. And from the vision and the will shall come the energy and the fortitude to evolve a social and economic order based upon the principles of creation and equality of opportunity.

These articles, of which this is the fourth and final for the time being, have not attempted to give that answer. They merely have suggested a method by which the answer can be found. This fourth article is a frank talk with you about that method.

Probably the suggestion is not perfect in detail. Human ideas, human methods, human institutions seldom are. But is it a better method, is it a better way to find the trail out of the wilderness than any methods now being pursued?

Is it better to exhaust our energies and our resources in a senseless struggle with each other, ignoring the real forces progressively attacking our institutions, or is it better to combine our energies and our resources in protection from the forces of destruction?

Is it not better to create than to destroy? Is it not better to displace a weak institution with something stronger and better, rather than to exhaust our national energies in destruction without replacement?

Is it not better to live in peace and amity than in strife and hate?

Is it not healthier to live dynamically and purposefully, rather than statically and without purpose?

Each of us will answer these questions but one way, of course. Our aims, our ideals, our hopes, our desires are the same, generally speaking.

Then what is all the shouting about?

The shouting usually is about methods, only rarely about fundamental differences in objectives.

The fundamental goal of most Americans is to preserve and improve the capitalistic economic order and the democratic political order. It is a twofold job, but it is one job, with one purpose—a better ordered civilization.

That is why this method, the machinery of an all-American council, has been suggested.

That is what is behind the selection of personnel for the proposed council.

Many will object to some of the selections. Perhaps the council should be larger. Perhaps it should be smaller. Perhaps there should be substitutions made for some of the names suggested. Perhaps women should have more representation. Certainly some method should be evolved for giving the youth of the country a better representation.

But it should be remembered above all that the primary aim is to bring the giants of industry, agriculture, labor, and government together, in the belief that a definition of common purpose and a modern doctrine of democracy will emerge.

The primary aim is to find the way to end the class struggle, uncover the unquestionable facts of a complex, modern life, and drive that spirit of tolerance and mutually accepted truth forward to the common good.

The professional little mercenaries of the class war will not like it, of course. Where are they if class war is stamped out of American life?

The small-minded, predatory, stuffed shirts will not like it, of course. Where are they in an order where ability is rewarded and equality of opportunity prevails?

The intellectually dishonest political demagogue will not like it, naturally. Where is he in an America of high moral tone, unlimited spiritual quality, and mental honesty? Where is he in an America whose works are inspired by a single, high democratic purpose?

But those people are few and far between in America. Most difference of opinion in this country is honest difference of opinion; most opponents sincere in their opposition to each other.

There are common denominators of understanding, however, which may be realized by such men when they get together. That is why the all-American council need not be balanced perfectly in its numerical representation of group opinion, for it will not be necessary for the council to codify principles which are not acceptable unanimously to the council.

Even under this limitation, such a council will be capable of giving form and force and purpose to American life.

Even under this limitation, such a council can do much to find the answer to the question, "Where are we; who are we; where are we going?"

Would it not be better, for example, for such a council to spend a few millions for jointly directed research to get the facts, instead of the Nation continuing to dissipate billions in response to factional pressures stemming from no factual knowledge?

These things can be done. This series of articles, representing but a suggestion from one humble American, barely has scratched the surface of possibilities.

Let skepticism and cynicism be thrust aside for one brief hour of our lives while each of us explores the possibilities with his own mind.

There has been much discussion of moral rearmament. This is one way to implement the purposes of moral rearmament. And the crisis in America is primarily moral.

There is hate and intolerance abroad in the world. Not one of us but all of us like to think we would make most any sacrifice to rid the world of hate and intolerance and oppression.

This is our chance to make of America a brilliant example to the world, a world which wants to live without hate and intolerance and oppression, but doesn't know how. This is our chance really to avert war.

But these things cannot be done without the spiritual force and the moral energy of the American people behind the effort.

The first step is for all of us, each of us, to rally round the general idea.

The second step is for all of us, each of us, to make his hope and his desire known to the President of the United States, for he is the man with the power to bring American group leadership together in this great common effort. And American group leadership cannot and will not let the American people down.

Write it, think it, talk it, live it, and some such program will become a vital force in the direction of American life.

It is through your energy that the all-American council can be put to the job of finding the answer to the question, "Who are we; where are we; where are we going?"

If you act now and don't give up, America can do it, will do it, must do it!

The Revenue Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERE COOPER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 30, 1939

ADDRESS BY HON. JOHN W. HANES

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address

recently delivered by Hon. John W. Hanes, Under Secretary of the Treasury:

In the fiscal year 1939 the Federal Government spent $9,268,000,000 and collected in total revenues $5,668,000,000, leaving an excess of expenditures of $3,600,000,000. The 1939 situation was not unique. There had been similar years in the past and we may face similar ones in the future.

I am going to pass over many important questions: to assume without argument the present level of expenditures, and also without argument the necessity over the long run of meeting expenditures with equal revenues.

There have been many periods before in our history when our Government faced serious financial problems. In fact, our first Secretary of the Treasury, Alexander Hamilton, faced the task of bringing the public credit out of chaos and of providing a revenue system which would produce sufficient funds to pay operating expenses, and interest on the debt, and to retire that debt systematically. The picture today is greatly enlarged. But it is the same kind of problem. The annual revenues for the first 10 years of our national life averaged only about $6,000,000. The problem was met successfully then, as is shown by the fact that there were times before the Civil War and in the 1880's when the revenues were more than adequate to meet the needs and when fiscal policies were adopted to dispose of surplus revenues rather than to secure new ones.

The prospect of greatly increasing our revenue appears more difficult today. The functions and cost of government have increased both absolutely and also relatively to our national income. We no longer rely merely on customs duties as we did before the Civil War or on customs and taxes on tobacco and liquor, as we did for several decades after the Civil War. Our taxes have reached out in many directions.

If the present cost of government is to be maintained at present national income levels, the problem is to get an additional three or four billion dollars without regard to the need for funds to retire outstanding debt. In order to answer the question—How are we going to raise the additional money?—it is necessary to look first at existing taxes from which we received approximately five and one-half billion dollars in 1939.

One great source of revenue has been the personal income tax which produced about $1,000,000,000 in the fiscal year 1939. A second is the corporation taxes which produced approximately $1,277,000,000. A third source is the estate tax with its related gift tax, which brought in $361,000,000.

The remainder of Federal revenues, exclusive of pay-roll taxes, amounted to $2,094,000,000 in 1939, deriving from excise taxes on sales and other transactions, most important of which were liquor, $588,000,000; tobacco, $580,000,000, or about the same amount; sales taxes on other manufactured products, $397,000,000; miscellaneous taxes, $210,000,000; and customs duties, $319,000,000. But suppose we tried raising existing rates sufficiently to produce the additional amount. The personal income tax is often suggested as the method. In recent months many have said that the way to increase our revenue is to broaden the income-tax base by lowering personal exemptions. As a matter of taxation principle, I subscribe to that for two reasons: First, the added revenue; second, the tax consciousness that would result. We might be able to substitute direct for indirect taxation. If and when the tax is made visible, the citizen starts challenging the disposition of his money. That is all to the good. Broadening of the base might operate as a brake on the ever-upward tendency which even in peacetime has brought us to where 22 cents out of every dollar of national income is needed to pay for government—Federal, State, and local; 9 cents being strictly Federal.

Various exemption levels have been suggested; among them perhaps most frequently, $800 for single persons and $2,000 for married couples. Quite aside from the advantages which might flow from bringing into our income system approximately 1,500,000 new taxpayers, it should be pointed out that this will not produce very much additional revenue. Perhaps $60,000,000, of which less than one-fourth would come from the new taxpayers. If all of a widely discussed group of amendments were enacted, we would increase the revenue by less than $250,000,000. That would certainly be something. But not enough.

Substantial increases in income-tax revenues might be produced by increasing the rates, which now range from 4 to 79 percent. Any increases would have to be in the middle and lower brackets since the upper brackets are perhaps already too high for the production of maximum revenue. In my opinion, they have passed the point of diminishing returns. That involves the matter of tax-exempt securities and other elements which I should like to discuss at length but cannot in the time allotted. Thus, if we try to collect twice the present amount from the personal income tax, the middle, and especially the lower brackets, would need to be more than doubled and in some cases much more than trebled. It would require a brutal increase in rates to produce as much as $1,000,000,000 additional revenue at the national income level for 1939.

The corporation income rate, except on the smaller corporations, is 18 percent, an all-time high. Even if we doubled that rate, and if, for purposes of argument, no diminution resulted in tax base or revenue elsewhere, the increase would be only $1,125,000,000.

Estate and gift taxes run as high as 70 percent. Here again an enormous rise in rates, especially in the middle and lower brackets, would produce not more than $400,000,000.

Thus, outside the sales or excise taxes, we cannot hope to raise more than about $2,500,000,000, even with rates more drastic than have ever been seriously contemplated. To bring in that much at present national income levels would require really shocking tax increases and would, I believe, defeat the object sought.

No matter how heavily we tax we cannot raise three or four billion dollars from present sources unless we get more on which to levy. That means more business, more employment, more national income; and I am convinced that this is the only logical way to improve our financial situation if we are to maintain our present economic system.

We now have the most powerful tax system in our history. If we could put substantially all our present unemployed back to work, the accompanying increase in national income would go far toward solving the problem. If, for example, the national income should rise to $80,000,000,000, the revenue would be about $8,000,000,000 instead of $5,000,000,000. Such an income would automatically decrease the necessity for many types of public expenditures, such as, for example, unemployment relief, which should decrease as national income increases.

All of us in government and in private life must put our emphasis on adding to the national income. We must realize that since we live in a capitalistic system the healthy business of the country is our business; that without volume we go broke because of the overhead, whether the business be private or public.

After taking all possible precautions and setting up all possible regulations against bad and crooked business, let us find every means we can devise to encourage honest business.

I contend it is equally to the interest of every private citizen and every official in every branch of our Government—Federal, State, and local—to add the weight of his influence to the recovery of business in every legitimate line.

You, the American public, have the final control. Demands from back home upon the Congress for more and more Federal expenditures, for less and less needed projects, are at least a partial source of our difficulties.

We have developed in our country a $10,000,000,000 appetite with a $5,000,000,000 pocketbook. I think our problem is not so much when we balance the Budget as where. In other words, how much Federal expenditure are you going to demand and how do you propose that the Government raise the funds? In the Treasury we can only deal with the problem after appropriations have been made.

Remember that the Members of Congress have been elected by you. They are the servants of their constituents. Every effort on your part to put your shoulder to the administration of your local affairs and your intelligence to their direction will most certainly clarify your collective opinions to your representatives in government. Every effort to take up the enormous slack of unemployment through enterprising expansion of your personal affairs will inevitably have cumulative effect toward increasing the national income, and it cannot fail to diminish proportionately the direct financial burdens which must of necessity now be levied upon you by your Government.

A True Neutrality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. MILLER

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 30, 1939

ADDRESS BY HENRY S. FRASER

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, the following address by Henry S. Fraser before the Association of New York State Republican Clubs, Inc., at Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y., on October 28, 1939, contains enlightening information to those who are about to vote on the proposed repeal of the arms embargo. Mr. Fraser is known the world over as an outstanding authority on international law.

If the present European war is "our war," and if one set of belligerents is "fighting our battles," the United States should no longer hesitate to declare war and to take its place at the side of its Allies. For the United States to stand by while other people fight its battles, while other people bleed and die in its cause, would justly bring upon us the charge of cowardice and the contempt of history. Moreover, if the battle be ours and we do not take up arms, then what still greater shame would be our portion if we place a cash box at the shore line to receive the profits from the sale of the guns, which should be upon our shoulders.

If, on the other hand, the present European war is not "our war," and if one set of belligerents is not "fighting our battles," then the

duty of the United States, and of those responsible for its policies, is to maintain the neutrality of this country. No middle course is possible. A neutral government cannot remain neutral and at the same time give aid to one set of belligerents. If, nevertheless, the foolhardy neutral deliberately does give such aid, at that moment the neutral intervenes in the war. By its own act the so-called neutral has thus produced a casus belli, and whether the neutral is thereafter to be subjected to force of arms by the offended belligerent is a question to be determined only by the offended belligerent. Perhaps the belligerent which has been discriminated against will not declare war against the government guilty of violating its neutral duties—perhaps the offended belligerent will be content with the reprisals which it may legitimately take in retaliation. Or perhaps the only harm resulting to the guilty neutral will be the infamy which it has earned. But such a neutral should not be blind to the risks it runs; it should not be unmindful of past wars caused under circumstances such as these.

What is the meaning of neutrality? The essence of neutrality is impartiality. When a neutral government ceases to be impartial—when, for example, it enacts or repeals laws for the purpose of aiding one set of belligerents—then it forfeits its status as a neutral and its right to the privileges and immunities of a neutral. It has departed from the impartiality which constitutes the cornerstone of neutrality.

At the present time a bill is pending in Congress to repeal the embargo on arms, ammunition, and implements of war. This raises the issue whether, or to what extent, a neutral government may, after the outbreak of war, adopt new measures or alter measures previously adopted. Of course, a sovereign state has the power to enact or repeal any law. This is not to say, however, that such state will not be answerable under international law for such action. A neutral state may choose to exercise its municipal powers, but if its acts violate the rights of other sovereign states under international law, the guilty state may have to account on the field of battle.

There is no doubt that under international law a neutral state may, during the course of a war, adopt new measures or alter old measures, provided that the motive for such action is not to assist one belligerent against another. Hence it would be justifiable for a neutral state, after the outbreak of war, to pass a new law forbidding all belligerent warships to enter its territorial waters, where it was found that belligerent warships had engaged in hostilities within its coastal waters. Obviously such new law would be for the purpose of better safeguarding the neutral's rights or of better enabling it to fulfill its duties as a neutral. On the other hand, would it be justifiable for a neutral to relax its statutes or regulations existing at the outbreak of war? To be specific, would it be justifiable under international law for the United States now to repeal the arms embargo which has been on the statute books since 1935?

It seems clear to me that the lifting today of such embargo would be an unneutral act and would constitute intervention in the war. Indeed, the supporters of the bill have, for the most part, long ago ceased to deny that its object is to make possible a supply of arms to one set of belligerents only. It has been repeatedly said on the floor of Congress that it is necessary for this country's welfare that the Allies "win" and that the purpose of the bill is to assist England and France to an early victory. Such affirmations at least have the virtue of candidness, although exhibiting an alarming readiness in their authors to speculate as to the repercussions consequent upon repeal. At least, such individuals do not pretend that a present relaxation of our statutes through repeal of the embargo would be a notable contribution to neutrality.

As recently as the Second Hague Peace Conference, in 1907, when the thirteenth convention, concerning the rights and duties of neutral powers in naval war, was under discussion, the British declared that an instance where neutrality would be served by the relaxation of a neutral's legislation after the outbreak of war was "inconceivable." At that meeting Sir Ernest Satow, the British delegate, requested that specific mention be made of the fact "that, in his opinion, it is inconceivable that a neutral state would ever be obliged to adopt less stringent measures in the course of a war in order to protect its rights, but that English doctrine has always recognized the fact that neutrals have the right to enact stricter measures for this purpose."

The above British view, which is in accord with international law, was recently referred to by Dr. Van Eysinga in a paper read in 1933 before the Grotius Society on the subject of Dutch neutrality during the World War. Dr. Van Eysinga mentioned the case of the *Princess Melita*, an armed British merchantman, which had twice been refused access to the Hook van Holland on the ground that she was assimilated to a warship and hence, under Dutch law, to be excluded from Dutch ports. "A sharp exchange of views ensued," said Dr. Van Eysinga, "in which the Netherlands took up a very strong position inter alia by appealing to the point of view of the British Government at the Second Peace Conference, namely, that a neutral state may only tighten and not relax its neutrality regulations during a war. We did not give in, and on September 13, 1917, the British Minister informed the Dutch Government again that his Government did not wish to continue the discussion."

The pending bill to lift the arms embargo is a self-evident proposal to relax our legislation after the outbreak of war. That the purpose of the executive branch, as well as of the administration supporters in the legislative branch, is assistance to the predominant sea power engaged in the war does not admit of successful contradiction. Not only is such purpose implicit in the nature of the bill itself, but such purpose is open and notorious and has found expression from the mouth of the President himself. The President's aim was foreshadowed last January in his message to Congress, when he asserted that there are many methods "short of war" in dealing with an aggressor; he again foreshadowed it in his radio address of September 3, after the war had begun, when he referred to "the invasion of Poland by Germany" and stated that he could not ask Americans to remain neutral in thought; he indicated it in press conferences wherein he did not disguise his dislike for the manner in which the statute operated; and he revealed his heart's desire over and over again in his last message to Congress on September 21.

How otherwise are to be interpreted the passages in his message referring to "further acts of military conquest"; "an ordering of society which relegates religion, democracy, and good faith among nations to the background. * * * The United States rejects such an ordering and retains its ancient faith, we know what might happen to us of the United States if the new philosophies of force were to encompass the other continents and invade our own. We, no more than other nations, can afford to be surrounded by the enemies of our faith and our humanity."

Was he speaking of England and France in these passages? Was Canada the enemy of our faith seeking to encompass us? Obviously, Germany is intended. Indeed, the President could not have been more outspoken if he had been urging a declaration of war itself. His purpose is manifest. If anything further were needed to prove his object, it is his statement in the same message to Congress that, "We have learned that when we deliberately try to legislate neutrality, our neutrality laws may operate unevenly and unfairly—may actually give aid to an aggressor and deny it to the victim." And, finally, only last Thursday evening the President, speaking on the radio, expressly condemned nazism as an oligarchic form of government and a danger to democracy.

Ladies and gentlemen, we must not forget that however our sympathies may be aroused by the unhappy struggle abroad, our intellects should warn us of the danger of involvement if those sympathies are translated into political action. We must not forget that the repeal of the arms embargo requires an act of Congress. This affirmative action of government, taken for the purpose of enabling private individuals to sell arms to the belligerents, becomes a Government act to aid that belligerent which controls the sea, namely, Great Britain. By repealing the embargo the United States Government would in law make itself a party to the contemplated sale of arms by its citizens. The sale of arms by a neutral government to a belligerent is universally condemned as constituting participation in the hostilities. The sale of arms by a citizen of a neutral country, which sale could not take place except for an explicit enabling statute enacted by government, is the exact equivalent of a sale of arms sponsored by government itself.

The converse of the present situation arose during the World War when, in December 1914, after the outbreak of war, bills were introduced in Congress to place an embargo on the exportation of munitions. Sir Edward Grey thereupon indicated to our Government that he considered the adoption of such a law would be "special legislation passed while war is in progress" and, therefore, would constitute "an unneutral act toward the belligerents that can profit by it." President Wilson and Mr. Lansing, then Counsellor of the Department of State, agreed with the British view. The German Government urged that such legislation ought to be adopted, but Secretary Bryan replied in a note of April 21, 1915, to the German Ambassador in the following words:

"This Government holds, as I believe Your Excellency is aware, and as it is constrained to hold in view of the present indisputable doctrines of accepted international law, that any change in its own laws of neutrality during the progress of a war which would affect unequally the relations of the United States with the nations at war would be an unjustifiable departure from the principle of strict neutrality by which it has consistently sought to direct its actions. * * * The placing of an embargo on the trade in arms at the present time would constitute such a change and be a direct violation of the neutrality of the United States. It will, I feel assured, be clear to Your Excellency that, holding this view and considering itself in honor bound by it, it is out of the question for this Government to consider such a course."

Thus, in 1915, when no arms embargo was in effect, our Government rightfully refused to permit one to be imposed. The State Department at that time adhered to the established principle that a neutral government is not required by international law to prevent the shipment of arms and other contraband by private traders.

But it is claimed today, in the report of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations accompanying the bill now pending, that the precepts of international law "prescribe that any belligerent may purchase any articles or materials in any neutral country," and that the enactment of the original arms embargo was "a voluntary departure from international law by the United States Government." In making this amazing claim the administration supporters turn from the sound rule of law that a neutral government is not under duty to forbid the private sale of contraband, to the fantastic notion that a belligerent has a right to make such purchases and that the neutral government is under duty to allow such sales.

In point of fact, however, the trade in contraband is unlawful from the international point of view, since the goods are liable to seizure and confiscation by belligerents. Such business is undertaken wholly at the risk of the trader, and if his cargo is seized he has no redress, nor may his government give him protection without becoming associated with him in an effort to supply contraband to a belligerent.

Contrary, however, to the claims of the Senate committee, it is not a departure from international law for a state to forbid private traders from selling arms or other contraband to nations at war, where such embargo is laid for the purpose either of conserving its own supplies or of safeguarding the state's neutrality. If, as claimed by the Senate committee, international law denied to the United States the right under proper circumstances to impose an embargo on the shipment of arms, the result would be absurd since it would mean that even reasons of national defense would be insufficient to sustain such an embargo.

Modern history is replete with instances of arms embargoes laid not for the illicit purpose of aiding a belligerent, but for the permissible object of conserving the supplies of the neutral or of safeguarding the rights of the neutral. One historical example, selected from many, was the Belgian prohibition on the export of arms during the Franco-Prussian War in 1870. More recent instances were similar embargoes in effect during the World War in Italy, The Netherlands, Denmark, Norway, Switzerland, and so forth. If there were any lingering doubt as to the right under international law of a neutral state to embargo the export of arms in order to avoid controversies that might impair its peace, the answer would be found in the declaration of the legal adviser of our Department of State at a hearing conducted during the Seventy-fourth Congress, second session, on the subject of the general right of a neutral government to lay embargoes. He said: "Arguments against the right of a sovereign state to control the export of commodities either in peacetime or in time of war would seem to fall of their own weight." Also pertinent is the statement set forth in 1933 in a memorandum submitted by the State Department to the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, then considering a resolution for an arms embargo in view of the Sino-Japanese struggle, in which memorandum the Department expressly held: "There never was a right in the belligerent to buy arms." The same memorandum closed with a citation from Oppenheim to the effect that the sale of arms is dictated by greed and will disappear with better standards of public morality.

But, some Members of Congress have recently said, all these points are today legalistic and unreal—there are higher considerations. An aggressor is loose in the world. We should do everything in our power to help in putting him down.

To those gentlemen in Congress I answer this:

1. The saddest tragedies of history mark attempts to justify the means because of the end sought. Today we behold on every side, in this country and abroad, the spectacle of officials of government breaking their word at will, scorning their written pledges, violating statutory and customary law—all in the name of the higher justice and manifest destiny. Shall we point our finger while we ourselves burst the bonds of law? Can we remain the champion of international law if we ourselves vote to set it at naught?

2. The United States, as a neutral nation, should refrain from acts based upon the designation of one belligerent as an "aggressor." By what right does our Government sit in judgment while the Nation is at peace with all belligerents? Upon what basis do we in our ivory tower hold one nation an aggressor while absolving its opponents which even now are seeking an understanding with Russia? The recognition of the Russian occupation would be a small price to pay, says a member of the House of Commons, for the support of a major nation in the current attempt to maintain the European balance of power. Europe is under no delusion as to the underlying base upon which has been erected the picturesque scaffolding labeled "collective security," "sanctions," and "aggression." The United States likewise should not be the last to realize that the drumming up of a posse to put down a European aggressor is an invitation to dine at the table of Mars. More than one foreign government can play at Machtpolitik. Let the United States, I say, have no part of it.

Finally I would quote from the Farewell Address of the Father of our Country. The years have only served to magnify the greatness of George Washington. His words are those of a statesman for the ages. He speaks to us at this hour. I read:

"So, likewise, a passionate attachment of one nation for another produces a variety of evils. Sympathy for the favorite nation, facilitating the illusion of an imaginary common interest, in cases where no real common interest exists, and infusing into one the enmities of the other, betrays the former into a participation in the quarrels and wars of the latter, without adequate inducement of justification. It leads also to concessions to the favorite nation of privileges denied to others, which is apt doubly to injure the nation making the concessions—by unnecessarily parting with what ought to have been retained and by exciting jealousy, ill-will, and a disposition to retaliate in the parties from whom equal privileges are withheld; and it gives to ambitious, corrupted, or deluded citizens (who devote themselves to the favorite nation) facility to betray or sacrifice the interests of their own country, without odium, sometimes even with popularity—gilding, with the appearances of a virtuous sense of obligation, a commendable deference for public opinion, or a laudable zeal for public good, the base or foolish compliances of ambition, corruption, or infatuation."

For Cash and Carry and the Embargo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE BARTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 30, 1939

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. BRUCE BARTON, OF NEW YORK

Mr. BARTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an address delivered by myself last evening over the network of the National Broadcasting Co. urging that the neutrality measure as passed by the Senate be amended to retain the arms embargo, as follows:

Some editorial writers and commentators have expressed impatience at the length of the Senate debate. Such comment seems to me to reflect a lack of appreciation of the unique significance of this discussion. Ours is the only great country in the whole world where representative government still functions unimpaired. The Parliaments of England and France convene, but only to register the decrees of war governments clothed with dictatorial powers. In Washington alone can the freely chosen representatives of a free people meet and present the arguments from both sides, and repeat those arguments, if necessary, until the minds of the people understand and are ready to decide. The debate has gone on not only in the Halls of Congress; it has gone on in every city, hamlet, and crossroads; in country stores and filling stations; in clubs and lodges; on railroad trains; and in front of the open fires of millions of homes. What we have been witnessing is the spectacle of a mighty people coming gradually to a vital decision. This is democracy at its best. Thank God that here, at least, it dares to be unfettered and unhurried.

The Senate has rendered its part of the decision. The obligation now comes to us Members of the House of Representatives—a body closer to the electorate and in recent years more independent of administration pressure. We now must decide how best to carry out the people's mandate to keep them out of war.

TWO CONTRADICTORY PROPOSITIONS

Some of the people understand, though many do not, even yet, that the bill as passed by the Senate presents two contradictory propositions. It is first a neutrality or "keep us out of war" bill, placing certain restrictions on our citizens and our own shipping and reenacting the cash-and-carry sections which expired on April 30. This part of the bill could pass both Houses immediately. No authority on international law disputes our right to pass it, or contends that in so doing we would commit an unneutral act or involve ourselves in any danger. We would incur some sacrifices, but that is a decision any people have a right to make at any time.

The second part of the Senate proposal is the "lift the embargo" or the "we must help beat Hitler" provision. And here we face a very different problem. When the bill was before the House in June, I spoke and voted against the embargo. I said on June 28:

"* * * Why is it not wiser to effect the repeal now before any hostilities begin and while our action may perhaps serve in some small measure to prevent their beginning? If we wait until the war has started, our action becomes an act of war. Will that not more seriously threaten our peace than as though we face the facts and act now?"

Perhaps the words "act of war" were too strong. But distinguished Members on both sides argued that to lift the embargo after the outbreak of European war would be an unneutral act. Among those supporting this argument were some of the House's ablest authorities on international law.

TWO DEMOCRATIC SECRETARIES OF STATE

They had strong ground for their position. Our own State Department in the World War left no doubt as to what is and is not neutrality. Germany and Austro-Hungary protested to our Government in 1914 and 1915 that our shipments of munitions to the Allies were in such quantities as to make us practically a belligerent. They proposed that we do something about stopping that flow of shells and guns to Europe.

Replying to Germany on April 21, 1915, Secretary Bryan held that "any change in its (the United States) own laws of neutrality during the progress of a war which would affect unequally the relations of the United States with nations at war would be an unjustifiable departure from the principle of strict neutrality." He added that "the placing of an embargo on the trade in arms at the present time would constitute such a change and be a direct violation of the neutrality of the United States."

Some 4 months later another Secretary of State, Robert Lansing, reiterated this position in replying to a protest from the Austro-Hungarian Government. These were not paid or prejudiced opinions. They came from two Democratic Secretaries of State

who were seeking patriotically to follow the best course for their country. The bearing of these precedents on the present issue is positive and specific. If "the placing of an embargo" after war has started is a "direct violation of the neutrality of the United States," then the lifting of an embargo after war has started must be also. To argue otherwise is a plain denial of the facts.

SHOULD HAVE A SEPARATE VOTE ON EMBARGO

My first point, therefore, is that the lifting of the embargo is a decision separate and apart from the decision in respect to the other sections of the bill. The other sections deal with American neutrality; lifting the embargo is an announcement to the nations of the world that we have abandoned neutrality. These two sections are mutually contradictory, and should be debated and voted on separately. Members of the Senate sought for an opportunity to debate and vote on them separately, but the administration denied that right. The administration denied it because the administration knows that, while the neutrality sections have almost unanimous support, the lifting of the embargo cannot pass if the House is given a chance to debate and vote on it alone.

If we had lifted the embargo last summer it might or might not have prevented the war. Arthur Krock wrote in the New York Times on August 31:

"It cannot be proved that the act of the Senate committee was a factor of any size, or was at all an element in bringing about the crisis in Europe. Only Hitler can testify in chief whether it was or not and until and unless he does so it would seem wiser for the President to abandon this speculation."

I agree with Mr. Krock. But last summer I was ready to do almost anything short of war to prevent the outbreak of war. And, since the President held that Hitler might be halted by our action, I was willing to give his argument the benefit of the doubt.

Now, however, we are asked to commit a palpably unneutral act. We are told that this involves us in no danger; with impatient vehemence the supporters of the administration deny that it can be a first step toward war.

SUPPLYING ARMS WAS THE FIRST STEP TOWARD WAR

To this I answer that we cannot possibly know whether in 1939 the sale of arms, ammunition, and implements of war will be a first step toward war. But we do know positively, in the light of history, that in 1914 the sale of arms, ammunition, and implements of war was the first step toward war.

We Americans, being somewhat childlike in international affairs, did not then realize that we were taking the first step. But the shrewd, sophisticated statesmen of Europe realized it. Says David Lloyd George in his memoirs: "Thus by the end of the year 1914 the traffic in war materials with the Allies had become deeply entrenched in America's economic organization and the possibility of keeping out of the war by the diplomacy of neutrality, no matter how skillfully conducted, had reached the vanishing point."

Mark the date, "the end of the year 1914." We did not enter the war until 1917. But by the end of 1914 Lloyd George and other calculating Europeans knew that our entry was inevitable; that by engaging to provide arms and ammunition to the Allies we had so far committed ourselves that our chance of staying out had already, in his words, "reached the vanishing point."

EUROPEANS BELIEVE WE WILL ENTER WAR

Whatever we may say now about our determination to keep out of war, Europe will believe that the lifting of the embargo makes our protestations meaningless.

News Week, in reporting the session of Congress of September 21, 1939, when the President delivered his neutrality message, said: "As Mr. Roosevelt walked from the room the Members stood, cheering. And the cheers echoed across a troubled world. In London and Paris, Englishmen and Frenchmen heard that stabbing thunder of applause during their radio dinner hour, and officials privately congratulated each other on what the majority of them regarded as the first step toward bringing America in."

Those of you who have friends abroad and are receiving letters from them are left in no doubt as to their conviction: The people of the Allied countries fully expect that we shall be in the war within a year, or perhaps 6 months, and are assured that our action in lifting the embargo is an implied promise.

As for the German people, there can be no doubt about how they will interpret our action. They will regard it as an act of war. We shall be inviting the same ruthless sinking of our ships and sabotage of our arms and ammunition factories that constituted Germany's reprisals in the months before our entry into the World War.

WHY ARMS ARE DIFFERENT FROM OTHER MATERIALS

Those who argue that there is no distinction between the furnishing of arms and ammunition and the furnishing of other commodities and articles essential to a nation at war are seeking to set up a disastrous confusion in the public mind. All history cries out against this sophistry. It was not our shipments of cotton and petroleum, of wheat, and copper that enraged the Kaiser to such a degree that he refused for months even to receive James Gerard, our Ambassador. Wrote Colonel House to President Wilson from Berlin on March 20, 1915:

"The Chancelor is out of town for a few days, but Zimmerman is to arrange a meeting as soon as he returns. He also suggested that the Emperor might want to see me. Gerard says this is impossible, that he has not seen him for months because of his intense feeling against us on account of our shipment of munitions of war to the Allies."

And again from Berlin to the President, on March 26, 1915:

"The bitterness of their (the German people's) resentment toward us for this (supplying arms) is almost beyond belief. It seems that every German that is being killed or wounded is being killed or wounded by an American rifle, bullet, or shell. I never dreamed before of the extraordinary excellence of our guns and ammunition. They are the only ones that explode or are so manufactured that their results are deadly."

WHY OUR SHIPS WERE SUNK

Read that extract from our own diplomatic history, and do not let your minds be confused by specious argument. It was not our shipments of food, materials, and commodities which fanned the flames of Germany's hatred. Our ships were sunk, our sailors drowned or slaughtered, and 53 of our munitions and airplane plants sabotaged for just one reason—the German people had been made insane with anger because it was our guns, our shells, our gas, and our airplanes that were murdering their sons.

There can be no question of the sequence. German hatred gave birth to unrestricted submarine warfare and wholesale sabotage. And the hatred was born on the day when we began to provide arms, ammunition, and implements of war to the Allies. This was the first step. It is this first step which the administration, in spite of its public protests to the contrary, is asking the American Congress to take now.

WE HAVE NOT BEEN FRANK WITH THE PEOPLE

The time may come when the Members of the House would be willing to take this first step. If so, let the decision be made, and the American people informed, with unqualified frankness. Let them be told that we are taking this unneutral step because only by so doing can we preserve our own peace and security. Let us warn the people solemnly that this is the same first step along the same road that led us into war in 1917, and that by taking it again we are definitely incurring the kind of retaliation which may move us toward war again. Let us tell the people, when the time comes to cast that vote, just what the objectives of the warring nations are. No one of us now knows what those objectives are. What are the secret agreements? What sort of peace is it planned to establish if and when Hitler is defeated? How can we be sure that it will not be merely another Versailles Treaty, lasting only until another crop of baby boys has grown up to the age of cannon fodder?

If the time comes when we are persuaded that America must underwrite the victory of France and England, as a matter of self-protection, let the question be put squarely to the American people: Are you ready to ship arms and ammunition, with the full understanding that in 1914 this was the first step toward war? That is the only honest way to phrase the issue. It is not being honest with the American people to wrap up in a so-called Neutrality Act a section admittedly unneutral, with all the tragic possibilities that unneutrality involved before.

THIS DEBATE MAY HAVE SAVED THOUSANDS OF LIVES

I have said that I doubt if the decision of the Senate committee on this measure last summer had any effect on Hitler's attitude or decision. But it seems very probable that the debate in the Senate this fall may have had a profound effect on the conduct of the war thus far. The Allies and Germany both give the appearance of waiting for our decision. If this be true, then the debate in our Congress may temporarily have halted the bombing of cities and saved thousands of lives. If the Allies and Germany both are waiting to see what we shall do about this embargo, I say let them wait—the longer the better. I say let us pass that part of this bill which has to do with neutrality, and keep that part which has to do with unneutrality—the lifting of the embargo—suspended like a sword over the belligerents' heads. The longer they hesitate, the more their people will be asking: What is the purpose of this war? What are its objectives? Why can we not make as good a peace right now as we can after millions have been slain and our cities crumbled into ruins? The more they question, the better the chance for peace, and in an early peace of some sort lies the only hope of European civilization.

EUROPE HAS ALWAYS HAD HITLERS

I say European civilization, not American civilization. For I resent with all my soul the repeated argument that we are only a tail to Europe's kite, that what happens to Europe must necessarily happen to us. The other night I took down from the shelves the little old history of the world which we studied when I was a boy in grammar school. It is long since out of date, and even out of print, but the maps are still good and profoundly interesting. There was a map of the Holy Roman Empire, and a map of Charlemagne's empire; there was a map of Europe when the Spanish were dominant; a map of Napoleon's empire, and of Europe under the unholy "Holy Alliance"; there was a map of Frederick the Great's empire, and a map of Europe as it was before the World War.

For 2,000 years there has usually been a Hitler in Europe, trampling upon the rights of minorities, inflicting his will on small countries by means of murder and pillage. Sometimes it has been an Italian Hitler, sometime an Austrian Hitler, sometimes a French Hitler, sometimes a Prussian Hitler. But the game of reshuffling the boundaries of Europe has gone on and on. Only once did we allow ourselves to be drawn in. In 1914 our feelings were so aroused, our fears so played upon, that we were induced to take a hand. It might have happened before. If there had been the cable and newspapers and radio in those days, we might have been called upon to stop Napoleon. I say it might conceivably have happened before. But never with my vote will it happen again.

THE FRIEND WHO MAKES PEACE

If we are to be of any service at all to Europe, that service cannot be in making ourselves a factory for bombing planes and poison gas

and the instruments of war. It can be only to remain so correct in our conduct, so neutral in our official acts, that when the day comes we shall be able to bring together for peace and friendship people who now must hate each other. If America has any role in Europe it must be the role of the beloved friend, the friend of all peoples, the friend who makes peace.

To vote today for a repeal of the embargo would not end or shorten the European war. Nor would it result in a just peace. It would only increase the bitter despair of the German people. It would only strengthen them in their conviction that they must fight to a finish—whose finish? It would drive them closer to the cynical and sinister Stalin. It would lessen the restraint of the Allies and divert them from a war for principle to a war for victory—and again, I ask, whose victory?

I am thinking far beyond this bill. I am thinking of the headlines in newspapers, of the blaring voices on the radio, of the pontifications of writers. I am thinking of the hundreds of millions of simple folk in Europe who must believe what they are told because they hear nothing else. I am thinking of the despair and hopelessness of that great mass of humanity who want only to live their few years in this vale of tears with as little misery as possible. I am thinking not of experts in international law and learned pundits in universities; nor of general staffs nor of foreign office officials. To all of these repeal of the embargo is a technical question without a soul.

HOW WE CAN BEST SERVE THE ALLIES

But to the masses of England, France, Germany, and Russia repeal means that we have already entered the war; it will mean that when the war ends we shall stand not as a friend of all mankind, but as a partisan shackled by the agreements and trades and deals of partisans.

America can better aid mankind by making no move at this point which can be used by either side to fan the propaganda of hate. By adhering to strict neutrality we not only serve our own national interest, but make ourselves most serviceable to the Allies. We keep ourselves in a position to work for peace. Any other vote may weaken or stifle the growing demand of the people of all Europe for a clearer statement of the war's objectives; it may tend to prolong the war and so increase immensely the risk of our eventual participation in it.

Why Be Foolish Again?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 27, 1939

EDITORIAL FROM THE DETROIT FREE PRESS

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, this House is faced with as grave a responsibility as any in its history. The action we take this week on the administration unneutral neutrality bill will govern to a very large degree whether we are to repeat the ghastly mistake of 22 years ago.

The administration, in its demand that the Congress now repudiate a position it has twice taken, and which has been twice approved by the President himself, and repeal the embargo on arms, ammunition, and implements of war in the present Neutrality Act, is guilty of unneutrality, and it is so recognized by every nation in the world. The proposed action fools nobody—not even those who claim they will vote for the bill on the grounds that by so doing they are voting to keep this country neutral during the war in Europe.

Mr. Speaker, everyone knows—and some few are frank enough and fair enough to acknowledge—that this bill is proposed for the sole purpose of aiding Britain and France as against Germany. These few frankly concede that keeping the country neutral carries no weight with them. They propose that we shall take a part in this war by providing one side of the controversy with war supplies of every character. I maintain it is an insult to the intelligence of the American people to attempt to make them believe we can be more neutral by supplying one side with everything it needs than we can by doing as the law now provides—refusing to sell either side these war supplies.

Mr. Speaker, the American people do not want war. They want this country to remain at peace with all nations. All we have to do to completely meet their wishes is to keep our collective noses out of other people's business. We cannot do it by injecting ourselves into a war which, contrary to the arguments of the proponents of this bill, does not and cannot concern us unless we ourselves decide otherwise by taking affirmative action on the bill before us.

Mr. Speaker, I say that if the Members of this House will rise to their responsibilities and confirm their former action and put back into this bill the embargo on arms, ammunition, and implements of war, and if the administration will do its utmost to keep this country neutral instead of unneutral, as is proposed by this bill, we will have peace. If these things are not done I shall be gravely apprehensive as to what the near future shall hold for us.

Under permission to extend my remarks I offer the following editorial from the Detroit Free Press of Sunday, September 24, 1939:

[From the Detroit Free Press of September 24, 1939]

WHY BE FOOLISH AGAIN?

We in America separated from Europe and put an ocean between ourselves and that continent because we wanted to live more free, more wholesome, more comfortable, and saner lives than could be lived there.

We came to America because we wanted to get away from the silly, festering quarrels and enmities of the Old World, from its barbarous wars, and from its miasmic morals.

We came to America because we didn't want to be ruled by an overlord or a military caste, or by autocratic fiat, but wanted to rule ourselves.

Then in 1917 we found ourselves inveigled and bullied into going back and wallowing in the old mess.

This was in part because we listened to seductive propaganda, and in part because we had neglected to maintain a power of self-defense which would have made even reckless belligerents respect our rights.

The rewards for our foolishness were the lives and limbs of thousands upon thousands of the best of our youth, a war debt of billions of dollars, a moral and economic upset from which we have not yet recovered, and flagrant, and in some cases abusive, ingratitude from those we had aided.

And all we did was a total loss. We did not help Europe, and we hurt ourselves grievously and dangerously.

Now efforts are being made by all sorts of propagandists to induce us to do the same foolish thing a second time.

These propagandists try to appeal to our sympathies and to our sentimentality, to our prejudices, and to our hates. They undertake to flatter and scare us. They try to tempt us with promises of gain and to intimidate us with threats of loss.

We are told by people who wag their heads mournfully that we "can't stay out."

But all this is just the old gold-brick game, whether it is run from Washington or London or Paris or by whisperers in parlors and clubs and on street corners.

Twenty-two years ago we allowed ourselves to be led across the ocean by the nose to grovel in the chronic slaughterhouse which is Europe. We know what the reward was. Why in the name of common human intelligence should we fall for that sort of thing again?

America Must Stay Out of War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEWIS D. THILL

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 30, 1939

Mr. THILL. Mr. Speaker, in the light of history it is fairly well acknowledged by authorities that, in addition to emotional pressure and financial involvement, one of the motivating forces which drove us into the last war was our futile attempt to maintain certain neutral rights. America was neutral from 1914 until 1917, and during that period the President announced a policy of maintaining all American commercial rights accorded to us under international law. In our endeavor to maintain commerce on the high seas throughout the war area we were subjected to bad treatment by both the Allies and Germany. The belligerent nations were challenged and condemned by America for violating our neutral rights. They destroyed our ships, captured our vessels in

midocean, torpedoed our merchant marine without warning, and forced our ships and mails into belligerent ports. Our neutral rights established under international law were not recognized by the great powers at war.

Today not one of our neutral rights is recognized or will be recognized to any greater extent than between 1914 and 1917. Just a short time ago we read that Great Britain had taken our mails and that both Germany and England had seized our ships. Outside of protesting and sending bitter notes to the government that injures us, there is no way we can defend our neutral rights except by going to war.

We realize that during the last war financial entanglements resulted from the sale of arms to belligerents. In that connection let me quote from a letter I received from eight organizations who have made a study of our entrance into the World War:

> Arms were sold, at first for cash, loans having been held to be "unneutral." To meet the demand for arms, munitions plants were rapidly expanded, Du Pont stock rising from $20 to $1,000 a share. When the expanded munitions industry was threatened with collapse, because cash for purchases had given out, our policy in regard to loans was reversed. (In any future war it is unlikely that, once sale of arms is permitted, a prohibition on loans would be retained.) The steps by which our policy was changed in 1914–16 were as follows: Reversing his refusal under the influence of Secretary Bryan, to permit loans, the President authorized Secretary Lansing to give bankers the "impression" they were free to extend credits; when credits were exhausted, Secretary McAdoo wrote the President, "to maintain our prosperity we must finance it." The President then authorized Lansing to convey "orally" to the bankers the opinion that the Government would take no action if loans were extended.

In 1916, when the Allies were hard-pressed, our Ambassador to England sent a cablegram to President Wilson which contained the following:

> Perhaps our going to war is the only way in which our present preeminent trade position can be maintained and a panic averted.

That the selling of arms to belligerents drew America into the last war is stated in Baker's life of Woodrow Wilson. There we read:

> Thus, by the end of the year 1914, the traffic in war materials with the Allies had become deeply entrenched in America's economic organization, and the possibility of keeping out of the war, by the diplomacy of neutrality, no matter how skillfully conducted, had reached the vanishing point. By October, perhaps earlier, our case was lost. While British diplomacy maneuvered with skill to involve American industry and finance in the munitions traffic, it is certain that American business needed no compulsion to take war orders.

In view of what took place in 1914–17, is it not reasonable to say that, if we repeal the arms embargo, we will, in all probability, be taking a step in the direction of war; that by lifting the arms embargo we will change our economic set-up so severely that our industry will be geared to supplying war materials for European countries; that our internal economy will then be tied up with the fortunes of Europe; that, when those who are buying war materials from us on a cash basis, run out of cash, we will virtually be forced into granting them credit so that an economic depression will not strike this country. When the belligerents no longer have cash, think of the thousands of men employed in the booming munitions and related industries who will then beseech Congress to extend credit so they might keep their jobs.

Practically all articles and materials are listed by both the Allies and Germany as either contraband or conditional contraband. Under these circumstances it would be foolhardy to send our ships with such materials to belligerents and risk those incidents which paved the way for our entrance into the last war. We must be willing to take the loss in trade and investments resulting from a wartime restriction in order to escape the greater economic loss which follows in the wake of war.

In addition to sacrificing profits, Americans, if they want to remain neutral, must be willing to forego the personal desire to make justice triumph all over the world. Whether the present war in Europe is one to promote principles of justice or whether it is one to gain or protect empires is not agreed upon by authorities. Suffice it to say that the war is not of our own making. We won the last war, but had practically nothing to say concerning the peace terms. In fact, the Balfour document showed us that before we went into the war on the side of the Allies they had divided the spoils of war. Nobody knows what arrangements they have made to parcel out conquered lands after a victory in the present war. That the Allies will again be victorious is the opinion of most Americans. Germany has few resources and about 86,000,000 people. Great Britain has vast resources and an empire consisting of about 500,000,000 people. France, with its great Army, will be a tremendous factor in the war. All three nations are well prepared to carry out a long fight, and if the war continues for 2 years or longer, those nations will end up prostrate. They will be wrecks morally, physically, and financially. It is then that America can be of aid in rehabilitating those lands and peoples.

No one can deny that the American people detest unjust aggression, as well as those foreign "isms"—communism, fascism, and nazi-ism—which are contrary to our ideals and form of government. My heart bleeds for the people of Poland, who so valiantly defended their homeland against the attacks of Hitler's armies on one side and Stalin's hordes on the other. After Poland was conquered, the dictators divided their bloody booty. But this division will not last for long. The world is too small for both Hitler and Stalin. Russia wants to communize the world. I now make the prediction that "red" Russia and Nazi Germany cannot live in peace side by side. Sooner or later these two ideologies will engage in a death struggle. After the ravages of that war have taken their toll, I fervently believe that freedom of speech, of the press, and of religion will become the law of those lands.

At this stage in our national development America is not powerful enough to rule the world and enforce principles of justice therein. We learned through sad experience during the last war that we cannot make the world "safe for democracy."

The lack of democracy in Europe, the diabolical war now raging there, our thousands of war dead, our crippled soldiers, and billions of dollars in war debts still unpaid, tell us stronger than words that our idealistic efforts 22 years ago were in vain, and that we should stay out of the present war. No doubt those who want us to get into the European fight will stamp and ridicule us as cowardly. They will appeal to our sympathies by strong emotional tales of oppression and war horrors. Propaganda will be unloosed, as it was during the last war, in order to sway public opinion in America. Atrocity stories will gain credence, even though they are manufactured in the propaganda laboratories of foreign belligerent powers. We know that tall tales were printed in the American newspapers during the last war, which told us that French civilians had had their ears and tongues cut off and that women and children were inhumanly treated. Arguments will again be raised to have America enter the war for humanity's sake or to stop foreign doctrines. Americans must guard themselves against this vicious propaganda, and they must actively and energetically participate in a campaign to keep this country at peace. They must talk to their relatives and talk to their friends with firm conviction and urge them to maintain a peace attitude in spite of those incidents which might arise and bring about the cry for war. They should lay emphasis on the fact that they can stay out, that they should stay out, and that they must stay out of war. Americans can perform a more noble task, can be heroes to civilization, by making democracy work here.

If war should come to America, it would set in motion those processes which give rise to dictatorships. Legislation now sponsored by the New Dealers is a step toward totalitarianism. On May 17, 1939, Senate bill 1650 was reported favorably by the Senate Committee on Military Affairs. This bill, if passed, will require everyone to file a sworn declaration detailing his gross wealth and financial obligations. This wealth can then be borrowed by the United States as it sees fit. During wartime, by successive drafts, the Government can take all of this wealth by giving you bonds bearing 1 percent interest payable in 50 years. Under the terms of this bill, if it is impossible for you to raise cash, the Government will seize your goods, take your services, or force you to give a mortgage

on your property plus a note on which you must pay 6-percent interest per annum. This is dictatorship at its worst. Some of my friends were startled to hear of this legislation. "That won't pass," they said. It will not? The bill has come out of the Senate Military Affairs Committee with a recommendation that the bill do pass.

Many of those who favor repeal of the arms embargo believe that it will create tremendous war profits. What fools they are. Drastic legislation is now being prepared, and some has been drafted to take the profits out of war and to regiment industry. A short time ago House Resolution 7545 was introduced, and this bill proposes to tax net profits 80 percent. War profiteering should be stopped, but to do this by socialization of industry and destruction of private enterprise will ruin our country and our form of government.

On May 31, 1939, House Resolution 6572 was introduced in the House of Representatives. Under the terms of that bill, billions of dollars of the American taxpayer might be taken to finance marine insurance for other nations. If enacted into law, this bill would, to a great extent, make the United States the insurance banker of warring nations in Europe. It would present the American Government with a new international policy of financing the shipment of munitions to foreigners and would almost inevitably lead to war.

Even now plans are on foot to put through a plan which is astounding to every American. It is called the industrial mobilization plan. Under it, it is proposed that the War and Navy Departments take over not only all material resources but the control of all industry, trade, and commerce. This country is not at war, and if my voice and efforts will count for anything, it will never become embroiled in the present European war.

Why did the President on September 8 proclaim that a national emergency exists? By declaring an emergency exists, the President can take advantage of a clause in the Federal Communications Act of June 1934 and he can stop free speech over the radio; he can suppress public discussion by radio of views which he does not like; he can take over broadcasting stations and turn them over to any department of the Government. Equally strong powers over the radio are held by Hitler, Mussolini, and Stalin, and in those countries the people get only the news the government wants them to receive. I pray that the President will never use this power over radio, because America is practically the last refuge for democracy and free speech.

Many Americans do not realize that under emergency powers the President can close all banks in the Nation, can close every stock exchange, can prohibit the export of coal or other war materials, can restrict travel between the United States and foreign countries, and can suspend the 8-hour law on Federal contracts.

The tide toward dictatorship is running strong. If war comes to America, it will be prosecuted with dictatorial powers; we will be regimented; we will be socialized; we will surrender our liberties, perhaps never to see them again. May God forbid that to happen.

Navy Day Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 30, 1939

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my Navy Day address over station WFBG, Altoona, October 26, 1939, as follows:

Ladies and gentlemen of the radio audience, since the World War, when I served in the Navy as an enlisted man, Navy Day always gives me a glow of patriotic pride. No matter how modest your place may be, the Navy gets under your skin. There never was a sailor, from "gob" to admiral, who failed to take pride in his service.

Navy Day, 1939, however, brings something beside patriotic pride and sentimental recollections to me and to every thoughtful American. Once more the awful word "war" is on every American lip. Again, the wishful word "neutrality" twists every American tongue. I call neutrality a "wishful word" because it merely holds the promise of peace. We must have a will and a way to maintain our neutrality in a world at war if we are to have peace.

The words "war" and "neutrality" are stern reminders of the real purpose behind Navy Day. Of course, Navy Day is the traditional day of open house to the American public, when the Navy is glad to welcome the people of the country to board their own ships and to visit their shore stations. But Navy Day has a far deeper significance than just a pleasant custom.

Navy Day was not set aside as a social occasion or to satisfy idle curiosity. It was intended to give all Americans an opportunity not only to inspect their fleet but to really learn something about their first line of national defense. It also was designed to assure the American people they are getting their money's worth—that their Navy can and will preserve the peace they desire, guarantee the security they demand.

Even with 3,000 miles of ocean between us and the European battle front, every gale that sweeps across the Atlantic scatters sparks from the war flames among us. That is enough to make us truly thankful we are at peace. We may be truly thankful we have a Navy to keep that war away from our shores. For the American people intend to remain at peace.

Navy Day naturally reminds us of our naval history, and that history teaches us the most valuable lessons on how to keep out of war. History is our safest guide for the present and the future. It is when we forget the lessons of the past that we begin to gamble with the future.

No more profitable lesson can be learned from our naval history than this—naval weakness has been one of the chief reasons for getting us into war in the past. On the other hand, naval strength has favored our ability to remain at peace in the few instances it has been available. And, when we have been unable to avoid war, the Navy has been a vital factor in bringing victory to American arms.

By sad experience we have learned the only way to enforce our neutrality is through naval strength. We know now that we must keep the Navy strong if we hope to safeguard our essential interests and at the same time keep out of war. Let us pray our Navy will prove equal to that test now.

Without detracting one whit from the valor and glory that belong to John Paul Jones and other gallant commanders of the little Continental Navy, it was the victory of the French fleet off the capes of the Chesapeake that forced the surrender of the British Army at Yorktown and won independence for the Colonies. That fact was recognized by George Washington and in a letter to Lafayette, in 1781, he stated:

"No land force can act decisively, unless it is accompanied by a maritime superiority."

Soon after the Revolution, our little Navy vanished and for 14 years we indulged in a noble experiment of complete naval disarmament. It was a sad failure. England, France, Spain, Algiers, Tunis, and Tripoli preyed upon our thriving ocean commerce.

Much has been written about our traditional friendship with France, but little is said now about the 3 years of naval warfare against France, in which we captured about 85 French armed ships. We started that war without a man-o-war on the sea. Our Navy was composed of armed merchant vessels. Our naval weakness was a prime factor in that war and we paid a heavy price for it. French privateers were active even on our home coast.

The folly of our naval weakness was proven again when we tried the futile expedient of paying tribute to the Barbary Coast states of northern Africa, to protect our rich Mediterranean trade. When we stopped paying tribute Tripoli declared war on us. We found it an economy to equip a Navy and taught Tripoli a lesson. Algiers, Morocco, and Tunis took the hint and left our ships alone.

The Napoleonic wars brought about a situation similar to the present relations between Europe and the United States. Then, as now, Europe looked to America for products essential to the conduct of the wars. We were eager to keep out of the wars, but we were glad to reap the short harvests and high prices for war supplies. The warring European powers naturally resented supplies being sent from America to their enemies. From 1803 to 1807, the British seized 528 American ships and the French seized 389 of our vessels. That is another example of a neutral with a weak navy.

Despite our naval weakness, but as a consequence of it, we reached the limit of our endurance of high-handed British methods and went to war with England again in 1812. In that war Commodore Perry's victory on Lake Erie prevented a large part of what is now our Middle West from becoming permanent British territory. Commodore Macdonough's squadron on Lake Champlain saved New York from a crippling invasion. Commodore Patterson's ships at New Orleans contributed to Andy Jackson's brilliant victory. But because of our naval weakness we suffered the humiliation of having the British sack the Capitol and burn the White House.

While we were in the throes of the Civil War, France seized Mexico, in violation of the Monroe Doctrine. At the end of that

unhappy internal strife we had the strongest navy in the world. That was sufficient to get France out of Mexico without war. Thus did naval strength prevent war while securing our interests.

If our Navy had commanded more respect, we might have avoided war with Spain in 1898. It was a great surprise to European authorities—especially in Spain—when America's Navy proved superior in that test.

That brings us down to the World War. Our sad experience in that war should be a more valuable lesson in every way right now. We strove for more than 2 years to remain neutral. In the end we got into that war principally because we lacked an adequate navy to back up our diplomatic efforts to stay out of it.

The history of the World War is still fresh in our minds. We all remember, or we have read, how the German high command blew hot and cold on ruthless submarine warfare. We all know how the Kaiser gambled on American naval weakness. General Ludendorff, in his memoirs, tells how it was carefully calculated that the combined efforts of the British and American Navies could not cope with the ruthless submarine warfare. It was upon that erroneous assumption that Germany resumed unrestricted submarine warfare in January 1917.

It is apparent that if the German high command had believed the American Navy, in cooperation with the Allied Navies, was strong enough to nullify and defeat their submarines, as subsequent events proved, ruthless submarine warfare never would have been renewed, and in all probability America would have remained at peace. Our Navy was weak, indeed, at that time, for a first-class power. That is one of the most glaring instances in our history when a strong navy might have kept us out of war and saved hundreds of thousands of lives, billions in money, untold grief, and an economic depression that has harassed us virtually since the World War ended.

As we observe this eighteenth annual Navy Day—the eighty-first anniversary of the birth of that great and far-sighted American and advocate of a strong Navy—Theodore Roosevelt—with the great European powers at war, we well may heed his solemn warning to keep our Navy strong. As Theodore Roosevelt so aptly said, "The Navy of the United States is the right arm of the United States and is emphatically the peacemaker. Woe to our country if we permit that right arm to become palsied or even to become flabby and inefficient."

I always have been content to accept the word of military and naval authorities on what constitutes an adequate national defense. However, I do venture to say that with the eastern world at war, and with our commitments to defend the territorial integrity of the western world, it would be wise for the United States to start now to build the strongest navy in the world. No matter how high the cost might be, any price would be worth the preservation of our neutrality and peace, the protection of the heritage of America, the only real democracy on the face of the earth.

Fire All Communists From United States Pay Roll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. HOUSTON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 30, 1939

EDITORIAL FROM THE WICHITA (KANS.) BEACON

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Wichita Beacon of Thursday, October 26, 1939, as follows:

[From the Wichita (Kans.) Beacon of October 26, 1939]

FIRE ALL COMMUNISTS FROM UNITED STATES PAY ROLL

The names of 563 men on the Government pay roll have been made public by the Dies committee as men who were members of, or sympathetic enough to, the American League for Peace and Democracy to be placed on that organization's mailing list. Considerable indignation has been voiced at the action of the committee in making public these names, charging that some innocent men have been injured.

That may be true in some cases but it should be a small minority for the nature of the organization, its communistic origin and support, have been a matter of public record, and should have been apparent to these men after only a short study of the literature sent them.

The Dies committee did the right thing in making public the names. It did not go far enough and make public the names, of the other Communists and Communist sympathizers who are on Government pay rolls, taking money drawn from the taxpayers of this country at the very time their sympathies and actions are directed toward tearing down the Government that is providing them with a livelihood.

No other nation on the face of the globe would permit such national treachery as is permitted in the United States. We do not mean that all nations would go to the extreme measures that have been adopted in Germany or in Russia. Even tolerant Netherlands has seen fit to protect itself from Nazi attempts to undermine the Dutch Government by strict measures against Nazi agents. Communists have been dealt with severely in every country, with the lone exception of this Nation, except in those countries that have distinct communistic leanings.

Resignation of every man who is an avowed Communist or sympathetic to the Communist movement should be only the first step. The second step should be definite action that will effectively prevent them from any further actions detrimental to democracy in the United States. Our forefathers, at the time they founded this Government, never had the idea that freedom of speech should be stretched to include men and women engaged in destructive action against the Government that is giving them this protection.

The time for a general house cleaning of all Communists, of all Nazis, and of all Fascists, along with their sympathetic friends, is long past due. No government can operate efficiently when its functions are placed in the hands of men bent on its impairment or destruction. There is room here only for loyal Americans.

Would Be Unneutral

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD KNUTSON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 30, 1939

LETTER FROM SECRETARY HULL

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, under permission generously granted me by the House, I submit for incorporation in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter written by Secretary of State Cordell Hull, on May 12, 1938, setting forth his views on a proposal to lift the embargo on arms to the Loyalist faction in the Spanish civil war.

The views so ably set forth by Mr. Hull as being applicable at that time are equally applicable today, when it is again proposed that we take part in the quarrels and hates of old Europe. Especially, do I commend to my colleagues a careful reading of the second, fifth, and sixth paragraphs of the Hull letter. If what Mr. Hull declared was true, as it applied to a small restricted civil war, how much more true is it now, when there is being waged a war between three of Europe's great powers.

My colleagues, I appeal to you not to take a step that surely will force us into a situation that may destroy democracy at home. Of one and all I urge a careful reading of Secretary Hull's letter to Senator PITTMAN.

This is a good time for Congress to consider the present and future. Let us not be swept off our feet by propaganda, prejudice, and misrepresentation. Rather, let us keep ever before us our plain duty to the American people. They insist that we stay out of the European war and commit no overt act that may draw us into that war. To change our neutrality law while a war is on, especially where it will favor one side to the injury of the other, would be an overt act. If we lift the arms embargo, we will be drawn into the European war as surely as the rising of tomorrow's sun.

At this point it may be timely for me to remind the membership of the House that the mothers of America now have the ballot—something they did not have back in 1917, when Congress voted to cast our lot with the Allies, an act we now regret most bitterly. To our participation in the war we may blame the present depression; also the millions of home and farm foreclosures, the thousands of bank failures that swept away the life savings of millions of our people. In fact, nearly all the political and economic ills that now beset us may be traced to our participation in the World War. Let us not repeat our folly of 1917.

Mr. Hull's letter follows:

MAY 12, 1938.

MY DEAR SENATOR PITTMAN: I have received your letter of May 3, 1938, enclosing a copy of Senate Joint Resolution 288 "repealing the joint resolution to prohibit the export of arms, ammunition, and

implements of war from the United States to Spain, approved January 8, 1937, and conditionally raising the embargo against the Government of Spain," and requesting my comment.

In recent years this Government has consistently pursued a course calculated to prevent our becoming involved in war situations. In August 1936, shortly after the beginning of the civil strife in Spain, it became evident that several of the great powers were projecting themselves into the struggle through the furnishing of arms and war materials and other aid to the contending sides, thus creating a real danger of a spread of the conflict into a European war with the possible involvement of the United States. That there was such a real danger was realized by every thoughtful observer the world over.

Twenty-seven governments of Europe took special cognizance of that fact in setting up a committee designed to carry out a concerted policy of nonintervention in the conflict. In view of all those special and usual circumstances, this Government declared its policy of strict noninterference in the struggle and at the same time announced that export of arms from the United States to Spain would be contrary to such policy.

The fundamental reason for the enactment of the joint resolution of January 8, 1937, was to implement this policy by legislation. This joint resolution was passed in the Senate unanimously and in the House of Representatives by a vote of 406 to 1.

In the form in which it is presented the proposed legislation, if enacted, would lift the embargo which is now being applied against both parties to the conflict in Spain, in respect to shipments of arms to one party while leaving in effect the embargo in respect to shipments to the other party. Even if the legislation applied to both parties, its enactment would still subject us to unnecessary risks we have so far avoided.

We do not know what lies ahead in the Spanish situation. The original danger still exists. In view of the continued danger of international conflict arising from the circumstances of the struggle, any proposal which at this juncture contemplates a reversal of our policy of strict noninterference, which we have thus far so scrupulously followed and under the operation of which we have kept out of involvements, would offer a real possibility of complications. From the standpoint of the best interests of the United States in the circumstances which now prevail, I would not feel justified in recommending affirmative action on the resolution under consideration.

Our first solicitude should be the peace and welfare of this country, and the real test of the advisability of making any changes in the statutes now in effect should be whether such changes would further tend to keep us from becoming involved directly or indirectly in a dangerous European situation.

Furthermore, if reconsideration is to be given to a revision of our neutrality legislation, it would be more useful to reconsider it in its broader aspects in the light of the practical experience gained during the past 2 or 3 years rather than to rewrite it piecemeal in relation to a particular situation. It is evident that there is not sufficient time to give study to such questions in the closing days of this Congress.

Sincerely yours,

CORDELL HULL.

War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED J. DOUGLAS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 30, 1939

COLUMN BY ED SULLIVAN IN THE NEW YORK DAILY NEWS OF SEPTEMBER 5, 1939

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a column entitled "Soliloquy," by Ed Sullivan, which appeared in the New York Daily News under date of September 5. I trust every Member of Congress will avail himself of the opportunity of reading the very timely expression of Mr. Sullivan.

[From the New York Daily News of September 5, 1939]

SOLILOQUY

SEPTEMBER 5.

I talked about the war to a man in front of the Palace Theater last midnight because, alone of the crowds on Broadway, he knew something about it. * * * I had to tilt up my head to carry on a conversation with him, because the man was Father Francis P. Duffy, chaplain of the One Hundred and Sixty-fifth Infantry, and he stands on a slab of marble in the little triangle where Broadway and Seventh Avenue meet and break apart.

"Do you be hearin' the sound of marching feet in Europe, father?" I asked him * * * He nodded, or so it seemed to me, and there was pain in his eyes. * * * "When the noise of the subways under your statue dies away, father, can you hear on the Atlantic breezes the thunder of bombs and guns and planes—and the thin wailing laments of the women?" * * * He said he could hear all of it, and he motioned me to come closer to him so that he could speak.

"Do our boys have to go again?" he whispered. * * * I told him that Roosevelt had said over the radio that he was going to try to keep us out of it. * * * "Pray to God that he can," he said. * * * "War is dirty stuff, dirty stuff, I know. The Sixty-ninth had more than a taste of it. I'm here, but too many of the boys of the Sixty-ninth are in foreign graves—and to no avail, because I can hear the troops marching again to new graves."

A moon was riding in the sky, just peering over the top of the Empire State Building. * * * "I'm thinking of a moon that was just as bright as that," he said. "The boys of the One Hundred and Sixty-fifth were going up to the front lines for the first time, and just outside of Noyamont we met another New York regiment, the Seventy-seventh. It was a wonderful thing to be sure, these New York regiments meeting on a silvered road in France and they called out to each other as they passed. A boy in the Seventy-seventh called, 'Anybody in your outfit from the Bronx?' And boys from the Bronx called back. But I remember best when two brothers, one in the Seventy-seventh and one in the One Hundred and Sixty-fifth, discovered each other. They were very young, but they were soldiers and they didn't want to cry. One of them said, 'Ma told me to tell you be sure to keep your chest covered, Tom.' For 30 seconds they stood together, outlined in the moonlight, and then they had to march along."

"War is dirty stuff," he repeated. * * * "Like that morning when Hunt, of Company E, was killed by a hand grenade. We took him into the first-aid dugout and we stripped off his jacket and a piece of paper fell out. It was a cablegram from home that his young wife had just given birth to a 7-pound boy—whose father had just been killed.

"I can see Almendinger, a fine lad, going off to the hospital to have his eye taken out; I remember Joe Miller, his leg blown off by a shell, coming back to the lines on the shoulders of Lieutenant Bootz; I can see Harry McCoun holding up the stump of his left arm, after a shell had landed in our midst, and calling out, 'Well, boys, there goes my left wing.'

"At Camp Mills, before we sailed, quite a few of the One Hundred and Sixty-fifth married the girls they were leaving behind. One of the bridegrooms was Corporal Dunnigan, a fine, decent, likeable lad. In a few short months, I was to officiate at his funeral in France."

"Joyce Kilmer, too. The bayonets and the bullets had enough to feed upon without destroying a great poet like Joyce. I'm remembering the first March 17 in France, a St. Patrick's Day celebration at Recroi. I read Kilmer's 'Rouge Bouquet,' and at the end of each stanza, which is arranged for the notes of 'Taps,' Sgt. Pat Stokes blew the notes tenderly. But Kilmer was killed, too, because there is no reason to a bullet, no appreciation of beauty in the tip of a bayonet."

"But, Father Duffy," I broke in, "you picture war in terms of men who were killed, in numbers of legs blown off and eyes gouged out, in terms of weeping women. Isn't war actually gay—what about the parades and the bands playing and the lively music, and the crowds cheering along the sidewalk? That's pretty exciting, isn't it?"

"Parades are nice enough," he agreed. "I remember when the One Hundred and Sixty-fifth paraded to the ferry that was to take us to Camp Mills. Alongside of me was 17-year-old Eddie Kelly. A few rows away were Norman, Ahearn, Britt, Sullivan, Adkins, Meagher, Moylan, and Leffey. They looked grand in their uniforms. I saw them in France—all dead. Parades are fine enough, but death comes without any flags flying or crowds cheering or bands playing."

There was the ringing noise of a bell that grew louder and louder. With a start, I woke from a sound slumber. A bellboy had a telegram. I took it from him and walked to the window of the Hotel Astor room. Below on Broadway was the statue of Father Duffy, outlined in the clear moonlight. On the chair was the copy of his book I'd been reading when I dozed off.

What War Means to Animals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS H. CASE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 30, 1939

STATEMENT PREPARED BY THE AMERICAN HUMANE ASSOCIATION, 135 WASHINGTON AVENUE, ALBANY, N. Y.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, to me war is man's greatest inhumanity to man; but in a picture of war's full meaning it seems that a statement of its meaning to

animals is not out of place. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement prepared by the American Humane Association:

WHAT WAR REALLY MEANS TO ANIMALS

While many painters have pictured the panoply of war in a spirit of glorification, a few have shown it as it really is. Landseer gave a remorseless rendering of the horrors of war, dead troopers, dying frantic horses, flames, and smoke, all bearing eloquent testimony to the havoc and madness of battle. There are others, such as Schreyer's Abandoned and Barker's painting of Napoleon at Bassano, with death all around and one lone dog watching over its dead soldier master.

War cannot be made humane to animals or men. Clara Barton wrote in 1900:

"Among the shocking and heartrending scenes of the battlefield the screams of the wounded horses lingered more painfully in my ears, if possible, than the moans of the wounded men. * * * They die slow and hard if left to themselves, and I myself have seen the vultures hovering and tearing at them while life yet remained."

In the Crimean War horses died of starvation, fatigue, and exposure. In the Franco-German War (1870–71), following the surrender of Sedan:

"The starving horses had gnawed off everything, even the bark of trees. Many * * * were in a piteous condition between the houses and walls, motionless, awaiting death by hunger; half broken down, some sat on their haunches, others licked the slime at their feet, and many had sunk down in harness by the carts. * * * Carcasses of horses lay in the morass. * * * It was hell on earth." (Major General Maurice, C. B.)

If that be viewed as ancient history, being seventy years ago, let us come to the beginning of the present century—the Boer War. Here is what a soldier in a hospital told a London reporter, as published at the time.

"I think I pity the horses more than I do the men. Poor beggars! You see 'em all gashed and torn and reeking with blood and staggering as though they can hardly carry their riders; but you know a man ain't going to part with his horse while the horse can carry him and he's under fire."

And here is a horrible recital concerning the horses in General French's forced march to Kimberley:

"Had you seen those bags of bones looming through the twilight it would have startled you no less than it did me, and would have brought before you * * * the horrors of war. * * * The less decrepit among this awful band of skeletons had been back from the front about a month. * * * If it be true that for fifty hours the horses of the force had to continue their march without nourishment, no wonder they fell down to die by the roadside in hundreds, or that the great deed of the relief of Kimberley was costly to a degree that makes one shudder for very pity for the poor animals that had to be sacrificed. * * * I care not to call up the remembrance of those angular, almost transparent frames and tottering limbs. Of the whole six hundred only four could be found against whose hoof-numbers one could write 'fit for service.'"

Julian Ralph, Daily Mail war correspondent, wrote these passages:

"In battle their legs are snapped off, their bodies torn, and their heads shattered—and there is nothing to do but to leave them to the aasvogels, as the vultures are called. There is no time in battle to shoot them. * * * Of all the pitiful, heart-rending scenes I have ever seen, none had compared to this view of hundreds upon hundreds of dead and dying horses on this hundred miles of war's promenade * * * to see them shattered by shell and then ripped open by vultures, often before they were dead, was enough to snap the tenderest chords in one's breast.

"But the worst horror was to come * * * only 24 hours after the fight at Driefontein. On this field not nearly all the horses were yet dead. As I came up beside the prostrate body of a beautiful steed it would slowly and painfully lift its head and turn upon me a pair of the most pleading, woe-stricken eyes, full of a hunger to know what I could do for it. And all I could do was to drive on, for I had no firearms, even for my own protection, deep in an enemy's country."

Another brilliant war correspondent, Charles E. Hands, presented this picture:

"More pathetic than the sight of the dead horses was the sight of the living ones. There were horses that had been hit, horses that had been broken down with overwork and underfeeding, horses with hideous saddle sores hidden by clustering mounds of flies, horses abandoned for every conceivable defect; some horses for whom death had loosened their riders' control, big English horses, unshod Boer ponies, most of them with hip bones that projected so far as to suggest dislocation; and all along by the side of the river where they found grazing and water, they were wandering about helpless, forlorn, abandoned creatures, who looked at you dubiously, as though they feared you were bringing them more of glorious warfare; and then, seeing you pass, turn listlessly away, and hanging down their heads, went on with their dejected grazing."

The war correspondent of another London newspaper has written:

"Do not look at the horses as you go to the front. They rarely unsaddle even a cavalry horse; but if you see one with bare back, it is invariably covered with festering sores 6 inches square.

"Both the horses pulling the heavy artillery pieces through all sorts of impossible places, beaten, clubbed, cursed, and those dying, lacerated, dismembered by the bursting shells, as well as the wretched survivors, ruined by the desperate service, call for infinite pity."

The most graphic and the most horrifying picture of horses on the battlefield is that of Erich Maria Remarque in All Quiet on the Western Front. Here are some extracts:

"The cries continue. It is not men; they could not cry so terribly.

" 'Wounded horses,' says Kat.

"It's unendurable. It is the moaning of the world, the martyred creation, filled with terror and groaning.

"We are pale. Detering stands up.

" 'God! For God's sake, shoot them!'

"He is a farmer and very fond of horses. It gets under his skin. The screaming of the beasts becomes louder and louder. * * * Detering raves and yells out:

" 'Shoot them! Shoot them, can't you? Damn you again.'

"We see a dark group, bearers with stretchers, and larger black clumps moving about. Those are the wounded horses. Some gallop away in the distance, fall down, and then run on farther. The belly of one is ripped open. * * * The men cannot overtake the wounded beasts, which fly in their pain, their wide-open mouths full of anguish. One of the men goes down on his knee; a shot—one horse drops; another. The last one props himself on his forelegs and drags himself around in a circle like a merry-go-round; squatting, it drags itself around in circles on its stiffened forelegs; apparently its back is broken. The soldier runs up and shoots it. Slowly, humbly, it sinks to the ground."

All this is terrible reading. But, no matter what precautions may be attempted, all war is hell for animals, too. Build all the hospitals you like, provide all the ambulances that can be used, send a thousand veterinarians to the scene of every battle, and you have today far worse war conditions than in 1900. Today with death-dealing air bombs, perfected cannon, and armies shorn of pity and unmindful of blood, war is worse for humans and animals than it ever was.

Accursed be he who brings war to the world.

Navy Day Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. SUTPHIN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 30, 1939

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. CHARLES EDISON

Mr. SUTPHIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio speech of the Honorable Charles Edison, the Acting Secretary of the Navy, over the Columbia Broadcasting System on Navy Day, October 27, 1939:

Ladies and gentlemen of the radio audience, today we celebrate Navy Day as sponsored by the Navy League of the United States. Throughout all States of the Union there have been school exercises, speeches, and patriotic tribute paid to the sea heroes of the Nation and the achievements of the Navy, as well as factual presentations of the strength of our sea power. These exercises have aided in familiarizing our people with the mission of the Navy, its far-flung duties, and its importance to our citizens at this crucial hour of history. There has been nothing bellicose in the celebration, no taunts to other powers, and no boasting of the might of the United States. Rather has the tone been that of a Navy to preserve the peace—a Navy so strong and so efficient that no foreign power would deliberately and premeditatedly attack the United States. We shall bend every effort to keep out of the conflict. We shall concentrate our efforts on the preservation of American neutrality.

We also celebrate today the eighty-first anniversary of the birth of Theodore Roosevelt, who did so much for the Nation and the Navy. This distinguished American said: "The United States Navy is the surest guarantor of peace which this country possesses." And he added, "It is earnestly to be wished that we would profit by the teachings of history in the matter." I feel that as never before in our history, Americans are becoming deeply conscious of the effect of sea power, and, in particular, of what a major factor it is—in insuring the peace, the safety, and the mental ease of the citizens of this country.

This interest in the Navy has quickened since the outbreak of the holocaust in Europe and continues to grow. Free men are determined that this country will never be invaded by a foreign foe. If such a threat comes, the well informed realize that the speed of surface ships and airships compel the Navy to meet a foe on far-sea frontiers—there an enemy must be stopped and defeated.

The personal pride that our citizens take in the Navy has been a source of profound satisfaction to me and to those in authority.

It is truly a Navy of the people and for the people. The officers and men of the fleet comprise one of the most accurate cross sections of our population. All the races that merge into the great American racial stream are represented. There is no monopoly by race, class, or creed. They rightly believe that they are the defenders of the American way and the American tradition. That is why they have no interest in foreign philosophies of government. And because of the treatment received, the advantages offered, the cause believed in, it is often remarked that the morale is unsurpassed by any military organization in the world. It is a volunteer Navy, after all; no impressments and no conscripts.

But it must never be thought that life in the Navy is one of ease. It is a life of work and discipline. The training of officers and men is never relaxed. Drill, tactical exercises, and war games are carefully planned and regularly executed in order that the great team of the Navy may be kept in a high state of training and discipline. The fleet must be ready to move on short notice. Time is a vital element in a national emergency; therefore every effort must be made to have sufficient ships in full commission and with well-trained complements ready to take the initial shock of the emergency which may come without warning. The Navy would be derelict in its duty if it did not do its level best with what it has.

We realize keenly that we can never attain adequate preparedness until sufficient reserves are trained to take their proper places in the Navy.

At the present time we are giving all the training and the instruction to the Reserve Force that is possible with the funds allotted. It is our hope to bring the efficiency of the Reserves to such a state that they may take their place in the Regular Navy with dispatch and maximum preparation for the duties assigned. The time that the Reserve officers and men give up to their naval work is appreciated. This means considerable sacrifice on the part of many.

Few citizens realize that about 82 cents of every dollar that goes into shipbuilding is returned to the taxpayers in labor or personal services. Modern shipbuilding with the material needed for the construction and maintenance of our fleet requires products of every description drawn from every State in the Union. I wish that I had the time to give the products drawn from the various States, for the Navy provides work for agriculture, mines, and factories, and is ever absorbing from the American market its surplus products.

Economy is a watchword in the Navy. This is, among other reasons, caused by endeavoring to keep as many ships in operation and as many men in training as possible on the funds allotted. It has been the policy for many years to operate the fleet on fuel allowances carefully calculated to give minimum cost. Ships of the Navy are on a strictly competitive basis; standings are accurately computed, with awards of distinctions and commendations for officers and men who excel in saving expenditures and operating with maximum efficiency. Superior performances in gunnery are always rewarded. It is well to point out that keen and strict competitive operation of naval ships in order to emphasize that those who direct the policies of the Navy strive to gain maximum efficiency with the funds provided. Every check and every means of supervision and inspection is devised to insure that every dollar we spend will give a full and efficient account of its aid to preparedness.

When the present administration began to build up the Navy in 1933, the United States was dwindling as a naval power. We had tried disarmament by treaty and disarmament by example. This country alone of all the major naval powers had a naval-building holiday from 1922 to 1933. The shipbuilding industry had deteriorated from disuse for 11 years. There was little opportunity for the naval architect in those years; expert technicians or ships constructors had gone into other fields; shipwrights and skilled labor had turned to industry. All of these handicaps had to be overcome. This we have accomplished and are now commissioning our ships on time; many ahead of time. They are unsurpassed by any warships in the world and are adapted to fulfill their mission in the American plan of sea defense.

We are observing as closely as possible all phases of naval action in the present conflict. We shall make a meticulous examination of each type, on the surface, under the surface, and in the air. This study and evaluation will be made with an open mind. For the officers who may fight our ships want the best in types and design. To date nothing has happened abroad to change our minds as to the policy that we have pursued, namely, a homogeneous surface fleet, with battleships as its backbone, supported and defended by a strong sea air arm. Should time and actual results alter this conception of a well-balanced fleet, then the Navy will hasten to conform to the lessons of experience.

In 1934 the President of the United States said:

"From the very beginning of our national life, the Navy has always been, and justly deserves to be, an object of special pride to the American people. Its record is indeed one to inspire such sentiments. I am glad to say both Congress and the country understand what we are doing in building up the Navy and about its use. The Navy is not only the first line of defense but it is the most important line of defense."

I am pleased to report that the cooperation between the Army and Navy is highly satisfactory. As never before in history, the two services through the media of the joint board, joint planning committee, and personal liaison are discussing and studying all mutual problems. All questions of possible conflict of authority are resolved by amicable joint agreement. We are very proud of the shoulder-to-shoulder effort of the Army and Navy. I shall make every effort to insure that it continues.

The Navy—and that includes the country's efficient Marine Corps—is fully aware of the trust reposed in it by the Commander in Chief and the people. It is a heritage that involves grave and arduous responsibilities. The task that may confront the United States Fleet in this hemisphere is formidable. The building up of the fleet will continue as an expressed wish of Congress. There will be no cessation in the training and the exercises necessary to keep our fleet in a ready condition. To preserve the peace requires preparedness. That means a navy adequate and competent to secure and defend the blessings of liberty and peace to ourselves and our posterity.

The Month in the Orient

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL HINSHAW

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 30, 1939

ARTICLE FROM ASIA

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the November issue of Asia:

[From Asia for November 1939]

THE MONTH IN THE ORIENT

One month after the war began in Europe (and 1 year after Munich) the "peace offensive" was afoot both in Europe and in Asia, with Soviet Russia the dominant factor on both continents, but with the latent power of the United States looming large in the background.

The "red" army marched into Poland at dawn on September 17, Moscow declaring that the Polish state had virtually ceased to exist. The next day the German and Russian invaders met at Brest-Litovsk. On the 20th the German commander told his army that operations in Poland were completed, and on the 27th Warsaw surrendered, after heroic defense. Ribbentrop flew to Moscow again, and after a stiff negotiation a "pact of friendship" was announced on September 29. Poland was partitioned, with Germany getting the richer slice but the one peopled by the most rebellious Poles, while Russia took the area in which are the white Russian and Ukrainian population and the wheat, oil, and timber—and the border that blocks the east.

The pact also called for peace, on the grounds that Poland was gone and that Britain and France would be to blame if the war went on. And it pledged the German and Soviet Governments to consult about "necessary measures" in the war. But in the hours just before, Russia had also signed up little Estonia in a pact under which the Soviets will have naval and air bases on the Baltic, and a standing Red army on Estonian soil. "Russia has pursued a cold policy of self-interest," said Winston Churchill. "When Herr von Ribbentrop was summoned to Moscow last week, it was to learn the fact, and to accept the fact, that Nazi designs upon the Baltic states and upon the Ukraine must come to a dead stop. * * * Russia has warned Hitler off his eastern dreams."

Meanwhile the Turkish Foreign Minister was waiting in Moscow, not too patiently, for an understanding about the Black Sea and the Balkans, and working for a pact that would strengthen Turkey's grip on the Dardanelles, would not conflict with her alliance with Britain and France, and would "prevent the war from spreading into a world war." A Turkish military mission arrived in London. Istanbul reported that Turkey was resisting demands that would lead to a Russian hold on the Balkans.

Italy's role—whether as spearhead of the "peace front" or as Germany's ally in a war spread to the eastern Mediterranean—was still in doubt. Count Ciano, Italian Foreign Minister, arrived in Berlin on October 1 and left the next day bearing Hitler's message to Mussolini.

Japan's unlucky military and financial mission sailed home from Italy, although General Terauchi went on to Germany for sightseeing on both fronts. In her isolation, Japan talked largely of devoting all her energies to cleaning up the China affair. On September 15 the hostilities between Japan and Russia on the Mongolian border were stopped by agreement. Reports that this was the prelude to a nonaggression pact were denied at Tokyo as "nonsense" and the Japanese Ambassador at Washington said, "There is no reason to regard it as preliminary to a nonaggression pact or to any move toward a close association of Soviet Russia and Japan." Belatedly the Japanese admitted that they had had heavy casualties in a "disastrous big battle" with a superior mechanized Soviet-Mongol force.

The Japanese also denied that the terms included a promise that the Soviet would stop giving aid to China.

But the armistice enabled Japan to withdraw from Manchoukuo troops which had been sent north from China. A drive in China began at once—the first major attack in many months—with Changsha as the objective, and Japanese planes fiercely bombed many cities with the idea of terrorizing the Chinese into swallowing peace terms. The fall of Changsha was predicted, although the city was no great prize, having been mostly burned by the Chinese themselves months ago. As a diversion, the Chinese attacked Japanese garrisons in the vicinity of Hong Kong. One of the greatest battles of the entire war—according to the Japanese—was being fought along the Hankow-Canton Railway. Chinese planes bombed the Japanese airfield at Hankow for the first time.

Chiang Kai-shek, speaking before the People's Political Council at Chungking, declared: "The European war will make us fight Japan with greater vigor. * * * Our present military strength, compared with that at the outbreak of the war, is more than doubled. * * * Japan has exhausted her manpower and is already defeated."

The council called upon the government to convene the national assembly and set up a constitutional regime and to safeguard the rights of free speech, free press, and assembly. Chou En-lai, the Communist leader, flew to Moscow to confer with Soviet officials after a long series of party discussions at the Communist center in Yenan. There were reports that large bodies of Soviet troops had entered the far western province of Sinkiang, and that great quanties of Russian war supplies were reaching the Chinese Communist forces. It was also implied that Moscow might be seeking a foothold in Afghanistan to extend Soviet influence in the middle east and on the northern frontier of India.

Floods in the Yellow River Basin and drought in Shantung caused crop losses and threatened 25,000,000 people with bitter suffering this winter.

The former Premier of China, Wang Ching-wei, formed a "shadow cabinet" and went on arguing with his lesser rivals, the puppets of the Peiping and Nanking regimes. Once again the Japanese hopefully said that the shrewd old war lord Wu Pei-fu was about to come out of retirement and lend his aid.

On September 27 the Chinese Foreign Minister, Wang Chung-hui, suggested that the United States persuade Japan to accept President Roosevelt as mediator, "because it is to Japan's own interest to terminate an unprofitable war and let her industries enjoy the benefit which the European war will yield to every neutral in a position to supply European belligerents."

In Japan the national mobilization act, under which the government has complete power over the economic life of the nation, was removed from the partial control of the army and put under the Premier. and a trade ministry was created to expand exports and increased foreign exchange holdings through a unified policy. Admiral Nomura was appointed Foreign Minister. He is regarded as pro-American and the choice was taken as an effort to better relations with Washington. The British military attaché, Colonel Spear, who had been held by the Japanese at Kalgan since May 25, was released at Peiping on September 8. Toward the end of the month reports went out from Tokyo that the Anglo-Japanese talks, interrupted in August, would soon be resumed, and that Japan thought Britain was now more ready to make concessions.

The British Empire stood at bay. "We have," said Winston Churchill, "the freely given, ardent support of the 20,000,000 of British citizens in the self-governing dominions of Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and South Africa. We have the heart and moral convictions of India on our side." Australia and New Zealand called up troops. The entire Australian wool clip was taken by England for the duration of the war, as well as all surpluses of Australian dairy products, eggs, meat, and canned fruit, and a substantial part of the wheat surplus. Palestine Jews volunteered for war service in large numbers. Egypt went on a full war footing. Iraq broke off relations with Germany. Amir Abdullah of Transjordania pledged his support.

India was obviously torn between hatred of fascism and the recent vote of the congress not to support Britain in a war. Many of the Indian princes offered their loyalty and their resources to the King-Emperor. Gandhi on September 5 expressed sympathy with Britain and France "from a purely humanitarian standpoint." On the 26th, Gandhi was called in by the viceroy for a long conference, on which he reported to the war committee of the congress on October 2. Jawaharlal Nehru and Rajendra Prasad, president of the congress, visited the viceroy on October 3 to ask for a declaration of Britain's war aims.

One reading between the lines of carefully censored despatches could discern that a momentous struggle was going on. It was apparent that the working committee of the congress, in a manifesto, had stressed the internal issues and domestic difficulties of India, and that "an appeal had been made for the immediate creation of a federal organization consisting of the Princes, Moslems, and the congress."

The Philippine Assembly was called into special session to adopt emergency war measures. In a heated debate, José Romero proposed postponement of independence. The majority attacked this view as "moral cowardice," and the assembly voted by 53 to 7 to reaffirm the stand for independence in 1946.

A fleet of American patrol planes and the carrier *Langley* were shifted from Honolulu to Manila, and more planes and ships of the Pacific Fleet moved from the California coast to the base at Pearl Harbor.

The conference of cotton-exporting countries, called at Washington to devise control of world production and distribution, was a failure because of the abnormal conditions produced by the war.

An elaborately prepared expedition for scientific research in the waters of the south Pacific was abandoned, postponing indefinitely the gaining of useful knowledge of magnetism, weather, ocean currents, marine biology, earthquakes, and geology.

Neutrality was proclaimed by the United States on September 5, and Congress was called into special session to consider revision of the neutrality law, and particularly repeal of the embargo on shipment of war supplies to belligerents, and reinstatement of the cash-and-carry requirement which lapsed in May. What may prove to be one of the greatest debates in American history began in the Senate on October 2, with the veteran Senator BORAH insisting: "Let's stay out of this war. It is not our war."

Twenty-one foreign ministers of the American republic met at Panama to plan protection against the European war. They agreed to ask belligerents not to perform hostile acts or to search or seize neutral vessels within "the continental American seas," a safety zone around both continents up to the Canadian border, covering the steamship lanes used in inter-American commerce and reaching out as far in one place as the Galapagos Islands, 730 miles off the coast of Ecuador.

It is the major task of American statesmanship to keep the war away from this hemisphere. The United States particularly is the only English-speaking nation and the only great influential nation that is still free of censorship and of wartime prejudices. It must remain neutral and strong and clear-headed, because only here can the aims of peace be openly discussed, only here can the work of making peace begin.

R. J. W.

Clothes Make the Soldier

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 30, 1939

EDITORIAL FROM THE BOSTON POST

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Boston Sunday Post of October 29:

[From the Boston Sunday Post of October 29, 1939]

CLOTHES MAKE THE SOLDIER

There was a time, and it seems long ago now, when to be a soldier was to be a grand and heroic figure. The spirit of courage and sacrifice which is the common characteristic of all soldiers, was then reflected in the uniform a man wore. From the horse-haired helmets of the Roman legionnaires to the dress uniforms of European régiments, each article of military attire through the centuries has been designed to emphasize and to articulate the impression that here is a man set apart from the ordinary walks of life, to serve a cause so high that either death or glory is its reward.

During the World War man went to live in ravines of his own making, amid the mud floods of Flanders, and there were thrown away the gleaming helmets, the busbys, the sabers, and the trappings of 5,000 years of war.

The bands put away their instruments and took up stretchers for the wounded. The flags were furled. The color of that tawny, glutinous mud was used for the uniforms of ours and others of the contending armies. The mud was glorified by draping it over the bodies of heroes; a dank, mud-colored sheen permeated the landscape and the massive lines of marching troops.

The experts of the armies tested the colors for camouflage value. The Germans, forever attacking out of the east, found best protective coloring in the hue of the dead gray dawns that lightened the horizons at their rear, during the mad zero hours.

The French, most of them, used horizon blue, for the mud color was a dismal touch to the fervent Gallic soul. The Foreign Legion used the color of mud. Many French regiments gradually changed to mud color as the war went on. The British and the Canadians and the Australians were all dressed like mud; the mud which seemed to crawl out of the trenches, back through the waste areas which quivered with the impact of the shells, back across the still inhabited fields, to the mills where it was dyed in the fibers of the wool.

Dun and drab, it sapped the brilliance of human nature and the glory that once was a soldier's. It brutalized the already inhuman character of the whole insane scheme of war. The rough texture, the depressing color, the aura of common ugliness, and the misshapen fit of the shoddy attire sank into the despairing souls of the men who wore the uniforms. Not one soldier out of 20 was fitted correctly, not one out of 50 felt the mighty lift to the spirit that dashing appearance can give.

The uniform finally achieved a sanctity in the minds of all of us, because we made it golden with the ardor of our admiration and appreciation. But when the Army later gathered as veterans and

formed the American Legion, it went back to the neat blue which is the traditional uniform of the American soldier. The marines returned to their flashing colors. The French returned to the clean, sweet horizon blue. The Germans held to their field-gray, but a lighter, shining gray. The British regiments restored their kilts and bright coats and metals.

But the American soldier still struggled with the color of mud. The men who wore, loved, and were proud of the uniform tailored it with infinite care; they rubbed regulations raw as they skirted the uncompromising details, they made the dark buttons gleam like gems.

A couple of years ago, feeling that the Army should dress up again, the men in command ordered a gradual return to blue. People began to see certain regulars who were not engaged in repairing leaky barracks roofs on work details, or who were not in the woods perfecting the C. C. C. wearing the dark blue blouses and light blue trousers. But this idea has not lasted.

Officers who studied the war conditions in Spain and China found that the men at the front are content in baggy suits, looking for all the world like the overalls worn by men who spend their days working under automobiles, an ideal coverage for hard, greasy work. But these mechanics change their attire at 5 o'clock. Not so the soldier.

As a concession to something of the former glory of arms, the brass hats in Washington decided that even if they were to make a soldier a more shapeless mass than ever before, they would change the color. So they had the new suits made up in dark blue. They experimented with them at various posts. The other day they sent word to the Army that blue would not do. It was too easily discerned by enemy eyes. So the color of mud is back, staining in drab the new uniform. New, but old.

There is no question that the best minds of our military tradition are in that establishment. The opinions of the sidewalk generals count for little. When fighting is the program, or when, as now, the development of a powerful army is good insurance against trouble, inevitably the Army furnishes the leadership and the science which is needed to guide it.

These leaders in peace must be guided by practical and utilitarian motives. But if there must ever and forever be soldiers, why must it be that the brief moments of glory and adulation—before horror and death—cannot be clothed in the traditional military manner, with the brightness that matches the courage that America expects in every soldier son?

In asking for permission to extend my remarks by inserting the above editorial, I find myself greatly disturbed, because the War Department has changed its mind about putting the Army into peacetime blues. At this time such a move is very significant. There seems to be no danger of this country having an internal war; there seems not the slightest chance of any foreign country invading our shores. Thus the only interpretation that can be placed upon the action is that our soldiers are being dressed for overseas duty. I have followed the matter very closely, for I felt for a long time our Army should be taken out of the wartime uniforms. The men in the service wanted it. There is an Army fort in my own district, and I have heard men ask if they might buy their own blue uniforms in order to get out of the belligerent khaki. I was told by the War Department that the decision had been made to put the men into blues. Now that this has been changed it is most frightening.

Support for the Dies Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS H. CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 30, 1939

TELEGRAM FROM R. P. HARMON

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following telegram from R. P. Harmon, department commander of the American Legion, relative to the work of the Dies committee in their endeavor to suppress un-American activities:

WATERTOWN, S. DAK., *October 26, 1939.*

Hon. FRANCIS CASE,
Washington, D. C.:

The Associated Press reports that the Dies committee is being criticized for publishing names of those on Government pay roll who hold membership in communistic and affiliate organizations.

If these organizations are aggressively American as claimed, why are they not proud of such membership as are members of the American Legion and other patriotic and benevolent organizations? We feel the Dies committee should have fullest support from our representatives in Congress in their endeavor to suppress un-American activities.

R. P. HARMON,
Department Commander, American Legion of South Dakota.

Housewives and Commercial Users Get Department of Agriculture Assurance of Unexcelled Quality of Beet Sugar

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 30, 1939

LETTER FROM D. E. MONTGOMERY

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, the high quality of beet sugar, long acknowledged in the sugar-beet-producing areas throughout the whole world has been publicly and definitely confirmed suitable for the housewife and commercial sugar users by the consumers' counsel of the Department of Agriculture.

Through years of scientific progress in the processing and refining of beet sugar by those who operate the sugar-beet plants of the United States, a degree of purity of product has been attained which is so satisfactory and which so completely meets the requirements of technical uses as well as for home cooking purposes that the latest statement of the Department of Agriculture is conclusive.

In an effort to further erase from the minds of the people the stigma placed on beet sugar by interests unfriendly to the industry, I took occasion on October 13 this year to present Members of the House of Representatives with the facts, and at that time I quoted from Farmers Bulletin No. 1637, which opens with the very positive statement that—

Sucrose, the sugar of commerce and kitchen, is extracted from the tissues of the sugar beet and the sugarcane. Whichever plant it comes from, the product, when pure, is identical in all properties and for all purposes.

I am now in possession of a letter from Mr. D. E. Montgomery, Consumers' Counsel of the Department of Agriculture, which confirms what I have previously said about the high quality of beet sugar, and in his letter he includes such an authoritative statement as—

When both cane and beet sugar are properly refined, there is no need for any distinction.

And still another statement that—

Cane and beet sugar are chemically identical except for traces of impurities * * * in both cases the impurities amount to a small fraction of 1 percent.

In my October 13 speech here in the House of Representatives I pointed out that a serious false statement appeared in the June issue of Consumers' Guide, in which the claim was made that Federal specifications for ice cream required cane sugar. At that time I pointed out by reading to you and submitting as evidence a copy of the Government's ice-cream specifications, which make no reference whatever to either beet or cane sugar, but merely use the word "sugar."

This letter I hold here from Mr. Montgomery admits the incorrectness of that printed statement. I am glad to have his frank admission of error in order that the record may be kept straight and that housewives and commercial sugar users may know the truth.

Mr. Montgomery states that "the Consumers' Guide erred in implying that only cane sugar is sucrose. Actually, both cane and beet sugars are sucrose."

He has termed the false statement in the article I have condemned as an "accidental mistake" and has assured me

that the forthcoming issue of his publication, which is a Government periodical, will carry a statement of correction.

I am pleased to submit at this time this letter from Mr. Montgomery, which not only verifies what I have previously said about the high quality of beet sugar, but admits the incorrectness of the article which I criticized. His letter follows:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., October 17, 1939.

HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CRAWFORD: A most unfortunate and regrettable error which appeared in the June issue of the Consumers' Guide, a publication of this Office, has led you and others to believe that there is intent on the part of this Office to injure the beet-sugar industry of the United States and to propagandize on behalf of competitive cane-sugar interests.

I am writing to assure you personally and, I hope, through you those interested in the beet-sugar industry that there is absolutely no foundation for such a belief.

This charge of intentional misrepresentation rests solely on an error of fact contained in two paragraphs appearing in an article entitled "A Quiz on Ice Cream." The paragraphs read:

"The Federal Government's buying specifications require that ice cream contain at least 12 percent butterfat, at least 16 percent of sucrose (cane sugar), and not more than one-half of 1 percent high-grade gelatin.

"The insistence on cane sugar is aimed at the possible substitution of other kinds of sugar for cane. The other varieties are less sweet than sucrose and therefore must be used in larger amounts. Ice cream made from these other sugars must be kept at lower temperatures."

I want to make clear, first of all, that the Federal Government's ice-cream specification does not, as our parenthetical insertion of "cane sugar" implies, define sucrose as cane sugar. Nor does it define sucrose in any way. Our insertion of "cane sugar" was incorrect. The second paragraph should be rephrased to read:

"Sugars which are less sweet than sucrose obviously must be used in larger amounts, and ice cream made from such sugars must be kept at lower temperatures."

The Federal specification for ice cream, effective as of the date this article was published, and still in effect, calls for "sugar solids (sucrose)." I am informed that a revision of this specification has been drawn up but not yet officially promulgated, and that it modifies the sugar requirements for frozen desserts. In the case of ice creams, the proposed specification will call merely for a certain percentage of "sugar"; in the case of sherbets and ices, it will call for "sucrose and/or other approved edible sugars." As to what are "other approved edible sugars," the Federal specification does not say. The usual practice is for the Federal Specifications Executive Committee to accept the judgment of the Food and Drug Administration in such matters. This Administration has always taken the position that beet and cane sugars alike qualify for ice-cream standards and also other edible sugars may be desirable sweetening agents.

The article appearing in the Consumers' Guide erred in implying that only cane sugar is sucrose. Actually both cane and beet sugars are sucrose. As one well-recognized authority states: "Cane and beet sugar are chemically identical, except for traces of impurities * * * in both cases the impurities amount to a small fraction of 1 percent." He goes on to say: "When both cane and beet sugar are properly refined, there is no need for any distinction." The same authority reemphasizes the interchangeability of these sugars by saying an ice-cream manufacturer may use beet sugar "with the positive assurance that his ice cream will not be inferior in any way." (See Theory and Practice of Ice-Cream Making, by Hugo S. Somner, 2d ed., 1935, p. 399.)

We claim no infallibility, but we do make a strenuous effort to check and countercheck the accuracy of statements appearing in the Consumers' Guide in advance of publication. On the whole, I feel that the staff of Consumers' Guide does a remarkably good job of translating technical material into interesting and accurate reading matter for consumers. Our aim is to provide consumers with unbiased and objective information which will enable them to buy wisely, economically, and intelligently. Since this is the case we can have no interest whatsoever in promoting the sale of one product over another.

I am aware, as, of course, you are, that unintentional errors of fact may do as much injury as intentional deception. When they occur the remedy is to make frank admission of error. This the Consumers' Guide will do. A forthcoming issue will carry a statement of correction. A copy of this will be sent you.

Since the accidental mistake in the Consumers' Guide was made an occasion for criticism on the floor of the House, I shall appreciate it if you will do me the courtesy of inserting this letter into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Very truly yours,

D. E. MONTGOMERY,
Consumers' Counsel.

This should conclusively prove to the American housewife and to those using sugar commercially that we have here in America an industry of which we may be proud and a branch of farming producing beets for sugar and greatly contributing to our national defense.

As the farmer prospers, so tends the Nation to prosper, and Americans interested in our national well-being will act wisely in giving due consideration to the domestic beet-sugar industry.

Peace Assured Through Senate Neutrality Resolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, October 31, 1939

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. KEY PITTMAN, OF NEVADA

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a very able address delivered last evening over the National Broadcasting System by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN], on pending neutrality legislation.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Ladies and gentlemen of the radio audience of America, through the invitation and courtesy of the Washington Evening Star, I have this opportunity of submitting to you my opinion as to the character and effect of the peace legislation just passed by the United States Senate, and which I have no doubt will pass the House of Representatives this week and be signed by the President.

Sixty-three Senators voted for the passage of the act, while 30 Senators voted against its passage. The act, in my opinion, eliminates every reasonable possibility of a recurrence in this war and in future wars of incidents and controversies which forced us into the World War. It enables our Government to safeguard the lives of our citizens and the peace of our country. This opinion is concurred in by at least 63 peace-loving, patriotic Senators. I say "by at least 63" because I believe that all, or nearly all, of the 30 Senators who voted against the act realize that the cash-and-carry provisions will do more to keep us out of this and future wars than any legislation we could possibly enact, and that they would have voted for the act but for the fact that in their public speeches and statements they had consciously or unconsciously greatly exaggerated the importance of the embargo law and its necessity to the peace of our country.

When the former cash-and-carry law was before the Senate in 1937, 63 Senators voted for its passage, while only 6 voted in the negative. The law expired by its own terms May 1 of this year. There is today no cash-and-carry law upon our statute books.

The cash-and-carry law of 1937, while requiring belligerents to pay in cash as a general proposition, contained a proviso which granted to the President the discretion to permit short-time credits to belligerents. The act that passed the Senate on Friday strikes out that provision and makes the cash requirement mandatory. The cash-and-carry law of 1937 made it lawful for our American vessels to engage in commerce with belligerents. It is true that under such law there were restrictions as to the carrying of certain kinds of goods. The fact remains, however, that under such old law our vessels were permitted to carry goods to the belligerents of the character that caused the submarining of our merchant vessels in 1917 with the loss of the lives of our seamen.

The carry provisions of the cash-and-carry law as enacted last Friday by the Senate absolutely make it unlawful for our American vessels to engage in commerce with belligerents wherever war exists, or wherever there is any danger of the destruction of the lives of our citizens on board our merchant vessels. The act passed by the Senate imposes heavy penalties for the violation of the cash-and-carry provisions. Such penalties not only apply to the vessel but to the owners of the vessel and the officers and directors of any corporation that owns or operates the vessel. The penalty provision provides for a fine of not exceeding $50,000 or incarceration in the penitentiary for not exceeding 5 years. The penalty in the old law was merely nominal and was an inducement to its violation.

You must remember that the embargo provisions of the law of 1937, now existing, and the cash-and-carry provisions of the old law, which expired on May 1, 1939, apply and applied only to warring powers. It is true that the cash-and-carry provisions of the act passed by the Senate also deal with belligerents alone. It was obviously necessary, therefore, to protect the lives of our seamen

on our merchant vessels even in carrying on commerce with neutrals, if the warring powers should proceed to destroy such merchant vessels without notice and the lives of the seamen on board, even though such merchant vessels were engaging in commerce with neutrals.

So, therefore, a provision was included in the act passed by the Senate entitled "Combat Areas." It directs that when the President shall "find that the protection of citizens of the United States so requires, he shall, by proclamation, define combat areas, and thereafter it shall be unlawful * * * for any citizen of the United States or any American vessel to proceed into or through any such combat area."

That is one of the most important provisions incorporated in the law. It was not incorporated in the act of 1937 and is not the law today. This provision may not have to be used. Its use would have been necessary, however, during the submarining of our merchant vessels by Germany in 1917, because most of such vessels so destroyed were not engaged in commerce with belligerents but with neutrals. If the same situation should arise in this war as arose in March 1917, there would be only one way to protect the lives of our seamen against destruction, and that would be by designating such areas of destruction as combat areas and prohibiting our merchant vessels from entering such areas.

As I said before, it may not be necessary to establish combat areas. The old law—which is the existing law—prohibits our merchant vessels from arming if engaged in commerce with belligerents. That law was not sufficient. A submarine could not know whether our merchant vessel was carrying goods to a belligerent or a neutral until it searched the ship. The submarine claimed it could not search a ship that might be armed for defense because the danger of the destruction of the submarine was too great. The law passed by the Senate makes it unlawful for our merchant vessels to arm at all if engaged in foreign commerce. That includes commerce with neutrals as well as belligerents. Every American vessel that departs for any of our ports can be identified so that the belligerent powers will know that it is an American vessel; that it is not armed; and that it will submit to visit, search, and, if necessary, seizure in accordance with international law.

Under such law there will be no excuse for the submarining or destruction of an American merchant vessel without notice and without giving an opportunity for the preservation of the lives on board such vessel. It is true that the belligerent, upon searching the vessel, may find contraband, and may condemn both the ship and the cargo, but the lives of those on board will be preserved. The question of the legality of such condemnation can be tested in prize courts, either during or after the war. Such condemnation may arouse the indignation of our citizens, but certainly not to such a degree as to cause them to consider war.

On the other hand, if the lives of our citizens on board our merchant vessels are destroyed without notice and without opportunity to escape, then it will be necessary for the President to establish the combat area as provided in the act.

Let it be remembered that if the act had been defeated in the Senate, or if it is defeated in the House of Representatives, that then there will be no cash-and-carry law or any combat-area law on our statute books. If the act is defeated, then our vesse'ls can legally engage in commerce with warring powers as they did in 1917, and can carry guns for defense while engaged in commerce with neutrals adjacent to belligerents, and these vessels will be sunk, in all probability, as they were sunk in 1917. And the lives of our seamen will be lost, and our people will become excited, indignant, angry, hysterical, and violent, and they may demand war, as they did in 1917.

It was not the loss of money or the illegal destruction of our property that inflamed the minds of our citizens and engendered the uncontrollable spirit of war in 1917. For over 2 years we bore the illegal destruction of our property without threat of war. While our people unqualifiedly condemned, with righteous indignation, the illegal and inhuman sinking of the *Lusitania* without notice, resulting in the great loss of life, including the lives of 128 of our citizens, our Government, realizing the horrors of war and longing for peace, did not declare war then, as urged by Theodore Roosevelt, because our citizens were not without blame. The *Lusitania* was a British ship. It was sailing from the United States to Great Britain. It was carrying contraband of war to German's enemy. Germany had warned American citizens before the *Lusitania* sailed to keep off the ship. It is true that our citizens, under international law, had a legal right to travel upon such ship. During over 2 years others of our citizens lost their lives on belligerent vessels, but there was no necessity for their being upon such vessels, and they had been warned by our Government of the danger.

It is now made unlawful for our citizens to travel upon belligerent vessels.

I do not recite these facts in justification of the brutal submarining of passenger vessels without opportunity for the preservation of the lives of those on board. I recall to your mind these facts to emphasize the absurdity of the slanderous charge that our Government was influenced by munition makers or bankers or by loss of property or the danger of lost moneys loaned to the belligerents.

Certainly when we restrained ourselves, even in such conditions, we could not have been influenced to war because of the mere loss of property.

Then the question naturally arises, What acts did force us into the war? The answer is definite and certain. It was the unlimited submarine warfare conducted by the German Government against our neutral commerce and our merchant vessels in March and April 1917. From March 12 until April 4 the Germans submarined and sank 8 of our merchant vessels on the high seas without notice, resulting in the loss of lives of 63 American seamen.

These vessels were not sunk upon the excuse that they were carrying arms and ammunition. No such protest was ever made by Germany. No American vessel was sunk for any such alleged cause. They were sunk because they could legally carry anything to Germany's enemy. Germany was fighting just as fiercely to prevent wheat, cotton, iron, steel, copper, and other raw materials, not now included on the embargo list, from reaching her enemy as she was to stop the delivery of arms and ammunition.

If our embargo law had been on our statute books and in effect during the World War, would it have prevented Germany from submarining our merchant vessels in 1917? Obviously, it would not. Would the Embargo Act have any effect during this war? Certainly not. Then how will the embargo on arms and ammunition even tend to save the lives of our seamen, when our vessels can carry everything else to belligerents?

If the act that passed the Senate passes the House, then no goods can be carried by American vessels to belligerents in the war area. We have got to save the lives of our citizens from destruction by warring powers by keeping them off belligerent vessels, and by preventing our own vessels from trading with such belligerents, or going into combat areas. Unless this is done it is probable that we will be dragged into the present and future wars. If the Senate act passes the House and becomes law, there need be little fear for the lives of our citizens or the peace of our country.

Is there any intelligent, peace-loving, patriotic citizen who would be willing to see such act defeated by reason of leaving out the embargo provisions, or for any other excuse whatsoever? Does not every intelligent citizen know that our first duty is to protect the lives of our citizens from destruction by warring powers, and that the most effective way to accomplish this is to keep our citizens off of belligerent ships and out of combat areas, and to protect the lives of our seamen by keeping our American vessels from trading with belligerents and from entering combat areas? Is this not the surest way to keep out of war? If this be so—and I know that all thinking citizens will admit it is so, unless they are confused by misleading and illogical arguments and appeals to groundless fear—they will pray for the enactment of the Senate act.

Those who will have the Embargo Act or nothing, present three main arguments:

(1) That it is unneutral for our Government to change the law during war;

(2) That it is inhuman to furnish weapons for the mass murder of people by warring powers; and

(3) That the repeal of the embargo law constitutes intervention in the present war, and is the first step that will inevitably lead us into the war.

Now, let us calmly consider these arguments.

It is the overwhelming opinion of international lawyers that the change in a domestic law of a neutral even after war has arisen is not unneutral if in its changed form it operates equally as between the belligerents. A neutral may, according to the best interpretation of international law, enact any law that it deems essential for the protection of its citizens and for the protection of its peace, without regard to its effect on belligerents.

Much is made of the fact that nearly all of the 63 Senators who voted to repeal the embargo law voted for it in 1935 and 1937. I introduced the acts, both in 1935 and in 1937, and supported them on the floor of the Senate. I believed then that it might have a deterrent effect on war. It has become obvious that that conjecture was erroneous. I believe then that it could be administered equally and justly as between all belligerents. Subsequent events have proven conclusively to my mind that I was in error as to such conclusion. The impossibility of administering the law justly was demonstrated in the conflict between Japan and China. China, having no munition works, had to have the manufactured arms and ammunition. Japan, having vast munition works and ample cheap labor, preferred to acquire and did acquire the raw materials out of which arms and ammunition were made. The Embargo Act did not include in its list raw materials. Had the embargo been placed upon Japan and China, Japan could have gotten everything she needed, while China would have been deprived of getting the only thing she could use—that is, arms and ammunition.

And then the war broke out between Great Britain, France, and Poland on the one side and Germany on the other. The President, under the existing law, put in force and effect the Embargo Act against such warring powers. The act absolutely prevents France and Great Britain from obtaining arms, ammunition, and implements of war from us. Germany, on the other hand, can obtain unlimited quantities of our arms, ammunition, and implements of war through Russia, Italy, Rumania, or any other neutral European power. Russia is neutral. Italy is neutral. They can obtain all the arms, ammunition, and implements of war they desire from the United States because the law only applies to belligerents, and such countries are not belligerents but are neutrals.

The distinguished Senator from Idaho in his colloquy with me at the time of his speech on October 2, stated that Italy is in alliance with Germany, and that our arms, ammunition, and implements of war should not be permitted to go to Italy. I then called to his attention the fact that the law only applies to belligerents and unless the law is changed we cannot place the embargo against Italy.

Russia has a mutual-aid treaty with Germany, and yet Russia, under the law—and no one has offered any amendment to change the law—can obtain all of the arms, ammunition, and implements of war she desires. There is no way that the United States can prevent such arms, ammunition, and implements of war from going into Germany through Italy and Russia, or even through Rumania, which Germany dominates.

I could not have anticipated such a condition at the time that I voted for the Embargo Act. At the time I voted for it I thought it could be administered justly. Now I know that it cannot. If we enacted a law which at the time we believed just, and afterward we discover that it is unjust, we should repeal it.

There is still another grave injustice in the Embargo Act. It permits a country like Russia to arm to the hilt through the purchase of arms, ammunition, and implements of war from the United States, and then, when prepared, prevent countries like Finland, Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania from preparing for defense by simply starting war against them. When she starts war against them the Embargo Act goes into effect as to all of them.

Now as to the second argument; that is, that it is inhuman to permit arms and ammunition to be exported to belligerents.

How any citizen can support such argument so long as his Government permits its citizens to furnish to warring powers the scrap iron that makes the bomb, and the gasoline that runs the airplane that drops the bomb, is beyond my imagination.

Now as to the third one, namely, that the repeal of the embargo constitutes an intervention.

It is not seriously denied that passing the law would not be an intervention, and, therefore, it is difficult to see how having no domestic law would be intervention. Under the international law as it has existed from time immemorial, it is not unneutral for a neutral government to permit belligerent governments to purchase arms, ammunition, and implements of war in its country, or to purchase any other kind of material. In fact, the great writers on international law have contended that such was the only safe way to be neutral. All writers on international law agree that no change in the domestic law is unneutral if it bears equally upon the belligerents. I believe that I have shown that the law at present operates unequally and injures France and Great Britain and aids Germany. I think it is obvious that if we have no embargo law both belligerents will obtain equally our arms, ammunition, and implements of war.

We hear it reiterated that the repeal of the embargo will be the first step toward war. I contend that it will be the first step away from war, because it is the only act on our books that will subject us to taking sides, thus arousing the hatred of people.

It has been said that if we repeal the Embargo Act that, then, next we will repeal the cash provisions of the act and extend unlimited credit, and that, then, when Great Britain and France have exhausted their securities, we will give them more credit without security and that, then, it appearing that Great Britain can't win and can't pay her debts unless we send soldiers over to help win the war, that we will send soldiers over to help them win the war.

That argument might be denounced as the height of absurdity if it were not pitiable in that it brands a majority of the Members of the Congress of the United States as weak, pusillanimous individuals who have not sufficient will power to do what is right today for fear they will do what is wrong tomorrow. It brands the majority of the Members of Congress as inhuman, as men and women who would be willing to sacrifice the lives of thousands, possibly millions, of our boys to save some money.

The only excuse for such arguments is to blind the reason of our citizens and to influence them against an American law—the strongest law we could possibly enact—to preserve the lives of our citizens and keep us out of war. They have attempted to arouse the animosity of some of our citizens against Great Britain. I hold no brief for Great Britain. I am seeking solely, and as intensely as I ever performed any act in my life, to preserve the lives of our citizens and to make it possible for the United States to keep out of this war.

In commenting upon my answer to Colonel Lindbergh's last speech, a newspaper published that "PITTMAN drops the mask which administrators and leaders have employed—the mask that repeal of the embargo will make us more neutral. He says the major object of repeal is to help England and France." This is the character of unmitigated falsehood that is published to accomplish base deception.

It is intimated that the 63 Senators who voted for the Senate bill are under the direction and domination of the statesmen of Great Britain. There is absolutely no foundation for any such statement. Those that charge this seem totally oblivious to the facts that the German press have had their pictures in many issues and have praised them to the skies as patriots. They seem oblivious to the fact that the head of the bund in this country has admitted that he has engaged in propaganda against the repeal of the embargo. They seem oblivious to the fact that the press of Russia is condemning the 63 Senators who voted for the act as traitors to their country, while praising those Senators who felt that we should retain the Embargo Act.

No; the 30 Senators who voted to retain the Embargo Act are able, sincere, and patriotic men and have not been influenced by any propaganda, nor have those who voted for the cash and carry and the repeal of the Embargo Act been influenced by any propaganda.

We are all seeking the same end, and that is to preserve the peace of our country and protect the lives of our citizens and to keep out of war. We are all determined to accomplish these ends.

Neutrality Joint Resolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. KING

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 31, 1939

STATEMENT BY HON. CARTER GLASS, OF VIRGINIA

Mr. KING. Mr. President, the able senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], who, unfortunately, has been indisposed for some time, was unable to be present when the final vote was taken in the Senate on the so-called neutrality joint resolution. He has, however, prepared a strong statement expressing his views respecting the proposed legislation. I ask that his statement may be inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of October 30, 1939]

GLASS SEES HITLER SOLE UNITED STATES WAR PERIL—SENATOR, ILL IN BED, SAYS CONGRESS ONLY HAS POWER TO TAKE US INTO CONFLICT

WASHINGTON, October 29.—Senator CARTER GLASS said today that only one person could get the United States into the war—"this wretched creature," Adolf Hitler.

The elderly Virginia Democrat declared it was "the sheerest drivel" to say that the President could involve this country in a foreign conflict. Saying that only Congress has the power to declare war, he added:

"The only person who may drag this Nation into war is Hitler. His pledged word is not worth a thrip. He is a fervent believer in the immoral Machiavellian doctrine of the end justifying the means, however vile the end may be.

"He has repeatedly lied as to his purposes since the deplorable Munich conference, and it may confidently be expected that under his wretched domination Germany still regards written treaties as mere scraps of paper."

PRINCIPLE HIS SONS FOUGHT FOR

Senator GLASS granted an interview in his sickroom at a Washington hotel. Attired in blue-trimmed white pajamas, he propped himself on a pillow and asserted that he still believed in the principles he enunciated in 1916 when he spoke against a bill which would have had Congress warn Americans that they traveled in belligerent vessels at their own risk.

At that time, Senator GLASS, speaking of his two sons, said that he "would rather be pursued through time and eternity by the pitiful apparition of their shattered forms than to see my country dishonored and its flag hauled down in disgrace."

The Senator glanced across the room at pictures of Gen. John J. Pershing, his children, and his grandchildren.

"One of my sons was gassed, and the other was a combatant soldier," he remarked.

"But a nation without spirit or an elevated soul is as bad as a derelict on the seas, and must be devoid of self-respect and unworthy of the respect of other nations.

"This country should not be content simply to eat and sleep and go to the movies. That would be a sorry contribution to modern civilization."

SHIP CURB IN FEAR OF ASSASSIN

Senator GLASS, who has been ill for a month, said he was "distinctly distressed" at his inability to cast his Senate vote for repeal "of the abominable Embargo Act."

He expressed sharp disapproval, however, of provisions in the bill which would prohibit American ships from trading with belligerent nations as "expedients to contravene immemorial requirements of international law through positive fear of a Central European assassin."

"The only person on earth who may drag this Nation into war is Hitler, and the action of the Senate in passing the cash-and-carry feature of the embargo bill, as it seems to me, distinctly in anticipation of Hitler doing this very thing, is brutal disregard of international law," he said.

Not Britain, or France, or Italy, "or even Russian" was expected to sink American ships without warning, he said.

"It is only Hitler who is expected to do it," he added.

"We are spending approximately a billion dollars to create an effective merchant marine, and are now deliberately proposing to paralyze the industry by preventing it from going to sea except in restricted areas."

The Senator said he would have voted against the so-called cash-and-carry provisions of the neutrality bill and, while conceding that the action was "expedient," added that "even with the harsh and unprecedented restrictions upon our merchant shipping, there is no assurance that Hitler's submarines and bombers will not disregard all requirements of international law."

"This country went into the World War to vindicate its rights on the high seas, and now to relinquish these rights through fear of Hitler is to dishonor our dead," he said. "The proposition is utterly destitute of courage and moral sense."

STATEMENT BY SENATOR

Senator GLASS's statement of his views on neutrality was as follows:

"Although distinctly distressed at my inability, due to severe illness, to be in the Senate and personally cast my vote for repeal of the abominable Embargo Act, I derive measured satisfaction from the overwhelming vote in favor of repeal. I was paired in favor of repeal, and to that extent my vote counted as much as had it been cast personally.

"I do not take much satisfaction in the inclusion in the embargo repeal bill of the so-called cash-and-carry feature. I think no other nation on earth has thus voluntarily abandoned its undoubted rights in international law on the subject of neutrality.

"Not in my eighty-odd years of life have I known or heard of a more humiliating spectacle than that presented by the legislative body of a great, rich, and powerful nation spending months in devising expedients to contravene immemorial requirements of international law through positive fear of a Central European assassin.

"In my view, the talk about the President or any other personage in this Nation 'dragging the country into war' is the sheerest drivel. The Congress has the sole constitutional right to declare war; the President is not granted the power to either approve or veto the decision of Congress in this respect. So that if we are to be dragged into the war or to stay out, as we undoubtedly should do, it must be by action of the Congress.

"HITLER THE ONLY WAR MAKER

"The only person on earth who may drag this Nation into war is Hitler, and the action of the Senate in passing the cash-and-carry feature of the embargo bill was, as it seems to me, distinctly in anticipation of Hitler doing this very thing in brutal disregard of international law.

"No sane person conceives that either Great Britain or France is going to sink any of our merchant vessels, or ruthlessly drown any of our nationals without warning and in shameless violation of international law. Nobody has ventured to suggest that Italy or even Russia is capable of doing anything of this kind.

"It is only Hitler who is expected to do it, and it is in fear of this wretched creature, dripping with the blood of women and children and noncombatants, boasting of his ravages of open towns in one of his conquered nations, that we have the shocking spectacle of this great Nation relinquishing its rights on the high seas and excessively penalizing its own shipping industry for carrying on its legitimate business.

"We are spending approximately $1,000,000,000 to creat an effective merchant marine and are now deliberately proposing to paralyze the industry by preventing it from going to sea except in restricted areas.

"AMERICA'S RIGHTS ON SEAS

"Should our ships be permitted to assert their rights on the high seas, they would, of course, be subject to the requirements of international law and alone responsible for any hazard taken contrary to the requirements of international law. 'Search and seizure' are sanctioned by all civilized nations, and our merchant marine fully understands this.

"This whole subject of American rights on the seas was exhaustively and intelligently discussed by the Congress just prior to our entrance in the World War. Over and over again Lansing, Acting Secretary of State, vehemently asserted the rights of American shipping and warned Germany that we would not tolerate any attempt to violate them or any breach on Germany's part of the prohibitions or sanctions of international law.

"To enforce his contention, Lansing reasserted the doctrine proclaimed by Chief Justice Marshall in the *Nercide* case of 1815, reaffirmed time and again by the Supreme Court of the United States in all judicial determinations by the Court up to this time.

"Hence, had I been able to attend the Senate sessions, I would, upon full consideration, have dissented from the cash-and-carry feature of the embargo bill. However, I imagine the circumstances were such, unhappily, to make the action taken expedient if not desirable.

"Nevertheless, persons actuated by reason and not by considerations of pseudo-humanitarianism could well wish that the United States would not be taken to the verge of poltroonism, as was so cogently expressed in 1916 by Senator Sutherland, since a notable member of the Supreme Court of the United States.

"MORAL SENSE OF NATION

"Even with the harsh and unprecedented restrictions upon our merchant shipping, there is no assurance that Hitler's submarines and bombers will not disregard all requirements of law. His pledged word is not worth a thrip.

"He is a fervent believer in the immoral Machiavellian doctrine of the end justifying the means, however vile the end may be. He has repeatedly lied as to his purposes since the deplorable Munich conference, and it may confidently be expected that under his wretched domination Germany still regards written treaties as mere scraps of paper.

"This country went into the World War to indicate its rights on the high seas, and now to relinquish these rights through fear of Hitlerism is to dishonor our dead. The proposition is utterly destitute of courage and moral sense. A nation without spirit or an elevated soul is as bad as a derelict on the seas, and must be devoid of self-respect and unworthy of the respect of other nations.

"This country should not be content simply to eat and sleep and go to the movies. That would be a sorry contribution to modern civilization.

"The talk about the munitions industry dragging this country into war, either past or present, is incredible fiction. As a matter of fact, in the World War our munitions industry was utterly incapable of supplying our own demands, and American troops at the front had to be supplied with rifles by France."

Repeal of Arms Embargo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SHERMAN MINTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 31, 1939

LETTER FROM HON. JAMES E. WATSON, FORMER SENATOR FROM INDIANA

Mr. MINTON. Mr. President, on October 30, 1939, in the Washington Evening Star, there appeared a splendid letter by a former distinguished leader of the majority here in the Senate, a former Senator from my State. I am sure that his colleagues will be interested in the views of Hon. James E. Watson, former Senator from Indiana, on the question of the repeal of the arms embargo and the passage of the so-called Pittman Act. I therefore ask unanimous consent that his letter may be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star of October 30, 1939]

FORMER SENATOR URGES REPEAL OF EMBARGO—PASSAGE OF PITTMAN BILL HELD BEST PEACE INSURANCE

To the EDITOR OF THE STAR:

It is very evident that, had Congress never passed an embargo act, it would not enact one now, and especially the kind that is on our statute books today.

Probably not a half dozen Senators could be induced to vote for it as an original proposition, for it immediately would be construed all over the world as a nonneutral act.

And it seems to me quite evident that the present act is nonneutral for it undoubtedly inures to the benefit of one country. This was not intentionally done when the act was passed, but circumstances have so completely changed in Europe that our present law works to the advantage of Germany and discriminates against England and France.

In order to be perfectly neutral we should do neither, but the present temper of our people is for our Nation to be just as helpful to Britain and France as we possibly can without getting into war ourselves.

Before the passage of this law in 1935 everybody believed that we were entirely neutral in all of our international relations, and, therefore, it is manifest that the Embargo Act is the only obstacle that stands in the way of at least a partial restoration of that status and feeling.

It seems quite certain that, with that act repealed, we would be well-nigh restored to the condition that existed before it was passed, and hence it is altogether desirable to repeal it, unless we encounter greater difficulties by repealing it than now exist, and that has not yet been demonstrated by any facts adduced or any argument advanced by the advocates of the existing law.

Both sides to the controversy are convinced that international law has nothing to do with this proposition. We had the right to

pass the Embargo Act and we have the right to repeal it. It is wholly a domestic matter and we are under no obligations to present the question to any other nation before taking action.

Under international law we have always sold everything we had to sell to other nations that wanted to buy, even in time of war, and our right to do so has never been questioned.

The Embargo Act was passed with the very best intentions, but it now seems to have gotten us into a difficulty from which we cannot be extricated unless we repeal it, and that repeal undoubtedly could be effected without interfering with international law, or with our relations with any other nation, with the possible exception of one.

To retain the Embargo Act is, therefore, to the advantage of just one nation and to the disadvantage of many others.

Germany cannot complain if we want to restore the condition of neutrality that existed before this act was passed; and England and France, on the other hand, would undoubtedly be delighted to have it done.

It is said that if we pass the proposed law, Germany will not have access to our markets because she has no navy. That is unfortunate for her only. It is not our fault, but her misfortune, and there is no requirement of international law and no item in the comity of nations that compels us to prevent England and France from taking full advantage of their fortunate situation in this regard.

With the Embargo Act repealed and a cash-and-carry plan adopted, all nations can come here and buy whatever they have the money to pay for and carry it away in their own vessels, subject to whatever dangers naturally accrue in time of war.

When a Member of the Senate, I voted for the World War, but that problem did not rise to disturb us at any time during that conflict, for, under the rules of international law, as far as they could be observed in time of war, every nation had the right to buy or sell in any market where the articles they desired could be obtained.

We were literally forced into that war because Germany engaged in a ruthless attack upon our commerce upon the seas. Her submarines sank many vessels, destroyed many cargoes, and killed many Americans, and these outrages so aroused our people that Congress was compelled to go to war as our only recourse.

Now, the simple truth is that all of those outrages can occur under our present existing law and doubtless will if it remains on the statute books; whereas if it is repealed, and if substituted for it the proposition now before the Senate is enacted into law, such losses cannot occur for the simple reason that both ships and property will be prevented from sailing into danger zones where such destruction can occur. In other words, there is not a shadow of doubt but that the proposed law would keep American ships out of present regions of danger.

Therefore the present law, or anything that could be done pursuant to its provisions, is not a guaranty against our involvement in war, whereas the proposed law necessarily would prevent our being dragged into war by reason of the destruction of our property on the high seas.

Let it not be forgotten that no arms, munitions, or implements of war can be carried on our own ships under any conditions if this proposed law be enacted, nor could anything in any of these categories be carried in foreign ships from our shores until all title to them has been transferred to the foreign buyer.

So it is very plain that if any materials, or the ship, or the crew, or the passengers on such foreign vessel should be destroyed there would be no action for our Government to take that would involve us in war because of such destruction. This is just as plain as that 2 and 2 make 4.

JAMES E. WATSON,
Former United States Senator from Indiana.

OCTOBER 22.

The Late Cardinal Mundelein

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES M. MEAD
OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 31, 1939

STATEMENT BY HON. JAMES M. MEAD, OF NEW YORK, AND COMMENTS BY VARIOUS PERSONS

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, recently many expressions of sympathy were evoked and much comment was made on the great loss suffered by the Nation in the passing of Cardinal Mundelein. I represent, in part, the great State of New York. This noted figure of the church was born and raised on the East Side of the city of New York. He was raised there among an illustrious group. I am setting forth in a statement prepared by me, which I ask to have published in the RECORD, comments on his death by many who knew him in his childhood and many who knew him as a young man in school and later on in the university.

The story of the unusual capacity for knowledge of this immigrant's son, the experience he gained in the atmosphere in which he was reared, his unusual attainments in college and in the university, and his great contribution to the well-being of the church, of which he was a leader, and to the Nation in which he was a great constructive force for good, in my judgment, constitute an epic that merits the attention and study of every American.

So, Mr. President, I ask to have included with my remarks, comments on this great figure by President Roosevelt, by the Archbishop of New York, by the Postmaster General, and also by others who knew him and particularly by those who were associated with him on the great East Side of New York, where many of the leaders in the political and religious life of the Nation received their start.

There being no objection, Mr. MEAD's statement and the comments were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MEAD

The State of New York, Empire State of the Union, has distinguished itself on many occasions and for many reasons, but its production of many of the foremost leaders of the Nation in every walk of life marks one of its most valuable and enduring contributions. Of all of these men none have excelled in the qualities which reflect greatness the late lamented George Cardinal Mundelein. He was a product of New York City's great East Side. He rose to spiritual and scholastic heights which commanded the respect and admiration of an entire Nation.

The death of George Cardinal Mundelein sorrowed the Nation because he was not only a devout Christian leader but a great humanitarian whose lofty, democratic ideals enriched the lives of all who came within his influence. He will take a place among America's immortals because he served this country with matchless patriotism in spiritual, social, and philosophical fields. He generously served all of society and from his noble deeds sprung a force for good among all his fellow men.

Every American youth is taught of the possibility for his rise from humble origin to distinguished leadership. It is a truthful tradition in this land that helps to weave more tightly the fabric of our democracy. Cardinal Mundelein's career followed the golden pathway of American opportunity. With enthusiasm and zest he grasped each precious advantage. He dearly loved his country and he served it with unselfish devotion. He never forgot his early circumstances nor the plight of those less fortunate than himself.

Cardinal Mundelein was born on July 2, 1872, at 35 Avenue C, in New York City. He was of nine children of an early immigrant family which had come to New York from Germany. His father was Francis Mundelein; his mother, the former Mary Goetz.

He began his educational career at St. Nicholas Parochial School on Second Street in New York. From there he transferred his studies to De La Salle Academy and still later he entered Manhattan College. His application to his studies resulted in his graduation from Manhattan College at the age of 17. He had already established a splendid reputation in scholastic endeavors and his fine physical preparation is evidenced by the fact that, through the interest of friends of his family, President Cleveland offered him an appointment at the United States Naval Academy at this time. The young student declined the honor, however, because he had cherished from childhood the ambition to become a priest.

Without interruption in his studies, he entered St. Vincent's Seminary, in Beatty, Pa. He completed his course there in record time and, thereafter, engaged in 3 additional years' intensive training before entering the priesthood.

The unusual vitality and capacity for knowledge of this immigrant's son from the streets of New York is emphasized by the fact that he was the youngest graduate of the De La Salle Academy; the youngest graduate of St. Vincent's Seminary; and became the youngest cardinal of modern times. This same record held true likewise in his elevations to the posts of bishop and archbishop.

Cardinal Mundelein's distinguished ecclesiastical career began with his assignment as rector of the Lithuanian Church in Brooklyn and as secretary to Bishop McDonnell, of Brooklyn. Later, he became rector of the All Saints Church, in Brooklyn, which he built, and still later he became rector of the Catholic church at Long Beach, Long Island, which he also built.

From 1897 to 1909 he served as chancellor of the diocese of Brooklyn. During that period Pope Pius X appointed him a domestic prelate, with the title of Right Reverend. He also had been appointed censor by the Liturgical Academy. In 1909 he was made Titular Bishop of Loryma, and soon later auxiliary bishop of Brooklyn. He served in this post until 1915, when he was directed to Chicago and appointed archbishop of Chicago. From that date he has been more actively identified with Chicago. He became a cardinal in March 1924.

The barest factual résumé of Cardinal Mundelein's contributions to his church and to the Nation would be an enormous undertaking. His accomplishment in directing the construction of

hundreds of churches, schools, hospitals, and orphanages; the tolerance and piety of his numerous religious utterances; and the force of his statements on matters of civic and public interest are best known of his contributions to the betterment of society. But to those who knew him intimately, it seems that, after all, these may not have been his richest contributions to human happiness. He was a man who reaped his riches of happiness from little personal acts of sacrifice and kindliness.

Illustrating the friendships that bound this man of God so closely to his fellow men, I desire to list a few of the recent public tributes to his memory:

President Roosevelt: "A career of great goodness and usefulness has been brought to an untimely close with the passing of Cardinal Mundelein. He served his day and generation with unfailing fidelity to the highest principles of Christianity. As a citizen who glorified in our American democracy, he was an advocate and exemplary of justice and righteousness, whether in the relationship of the individual to the state, or in the field of international affairs. His influence was always potent for peace. My personal acquaintance with Cardinal Mundelein began when he was bishop of Brooklyn, and I mourn the loss of a true friend—a close friend for many years."

William Cardinal O'Connell: "I am profoundly grieved at the news of the sudden passing of my illustrious and revered colleague, Cardinal Mundelein. I have known him since he was a young bishop, and I have always admired and respected him as a truly noble character, a devoted churchman, and a sincere and loyal American. His death is a severe loss to the church and the Nation that he loved and served so well. May his noble soul rest in peace."

Secretary of State Cordell Hull: "I was privileged to enjoy Cardinal Mundelein's friendship over a long period of years. A great American of unusual ability and capacity, he was ever ready cheerfully to give the utmost of his splendid talents to the public service."

Archbishop Francis J. Spellman, of New York: "I am shocked and sorrowed by the news of the death of Cardinal Mundelein. His eminence was outstanding as an American citizen and as a Catholic priest and bishop. His work for God and country was monumental and constructive. Courageously and charitably he labored until the end."

Postmaster General James A. Farley: "The sudden death of His Eminence George Cardinal Mundelein grieves me deeply. For many years he has been an outstanding member of the hierarchy of the Roman Catholic Church and his work as cardinal and archbishop of the Chicago diocese has done much for the advancement of the church in this country, the benefits of which will accrue through the years to come. He was highly regarded by persons of every religious belief and his passing is a severe loss to the church. Cardinal Mundelein was an outstanding American as well as a great churchman, and he never lost an opportunity to let the people know of his attitude on any great public question. Personally, I knew His Eminence well, and I mourn the loss of a dear friend."

The Most Reverend Amleto Giovanni Cicognani, Apostolic Delegate: "The church has lost not only an outstanding administrator but a truly great churchman. Numerous churches as well as educational and charitable institutions in the archdiocese of Chicago are a monument to his active and fruitful zeal."

Secretary of Commerce Harry L. Hopkins: "Cardinal Mundelein, through deed and work, always served as an inspiration."

Mayor Fiorella LaGuardia of New York City: "The death of Cardinal Mundelein would mean a great loss at any time, but it is an irreparable loss at this time. Few persons had the intimate and accurate knowledge of European affairs that he had. His whole mind and soul were devoted to the cause of clarification of the situation leading toward permanent peace. He was a kindly churchman and a courageous and outspoken statesman."

Hon. Alfred E. Smith, former Governor of New York: "I am shocked at the sad news of the death of Cardinal Mundelein, a friend of mine of many years standing. Born on the East Side of Manhattan Island, he was an outstanding American citizen and a great churchman."

Rabbi Louis L. Mann, of New York: "In the passing of Cardinal Mundelein not only our Catholic brethren but the entire religious world has lost a devoted and consecrated figure. He dared defy nazi-ism in the name of God and humanity."

Brother A. Victor, F. S. C., president, Manhattan College: "The Christian Brothers of Manhattan College faculty and the alumni learned with keen sorrow of the passing of George Cardinal Mundelein, who, marking the golden jubilee of his graduation, was singled out by his alma mater for special honor this year. A brilliant student, a forceful and fearless leader for the right of God, church, and country, we feel his loss profoundly."

Bishop Waldorf, of New York: "I am sure I speak for the Methodist people everywhere in extending our sincere sympathy and expressing our sense of loss to the church universal."

Rabbi I. H. Levinthal, of New York: "Cardinal Mundelein's death is a grievous loss not only to the Catholic Church, of which he was one of the prominent leaders, but to all Americans. He was a religionist, and his death represents a distinct spiritual loss to the forces of righteousness in America. All people, regardless of race or creed, will mourn his passing."

Rev. Alfred G. Walton, of New York: "Cardinal Mundelein has been a powerful and effective leader in the Roman Catholic Church in the direct sense of the word, preaching and practicing in his own life the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man."

World Broadcast on Moral Rearmament—A World Philosophy Adequate for World Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 31, 1939

WORLD BROADCAST ON MORAL REARMAMENT

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, on Sunday, October 29, a world-wide broadcast in behalf of moral rearmament was held, preparatory to a world-wide radio program over the week-end of December 1, 2, and 3. Among those taking part in the broadcast were the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN]; Dr. Frank N. D. Buchman, founder of the Oxford Group and the world movement for moral re-armament; Rear Admiral Richard E. Byrd, U. S. N., commanding officer of the United States Antarctic Service Expedition; and Herbert H. Elvin, chairman of the British Trades Union Congress, 1937–38, and fraternal delegate to the American Federation of Labor Annual Convention in Cincinnati in October 1939.

The spirit that moves the sponsors of that which today is called moral re-armament is not new. It is a spirit that has moved the hearts of men for centuries. It was expressed by one great ancient philosopher who taught that in order to have peace in the realm there must be peace in the heart of the ruler. If the ruler shall rectify his kingdom he must first rectify himself. Moral re-armament accepts this theory and assumes that if the hearts of the people of the world are full of peace the world will reflect those heart desires. As the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] took part in this world-wide broadcast, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD the proceedings of this great event.

There being no objection, the broadcast was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY HON. HARRY S. TRUMAN, OF MISSOURI

It is an honor and privilege to speak to you in this world broadcast on moral rearmament. I speak from the Nation's Capital at Washington, where 4 months ago I first met Dr. Buchman at the great national meeting for moral rearament at Constitution Hall. This great hall was thronged with the leaders of Washington's civic, political, and diplomatic life on that occasion. We were stirred as we had never been before by the evidence from men and women representing nations all over the world from every walk of life who had found in this new, yet old, way a satisfying and constructive answer for themselves and for their Nation.

I had the honor at that time to present the following message from the President of the United States, which opened that great assembly: "The underlying strength of the world must consist in the moral fiber of her citizens. A program of moral rearmament for the world cannot fail, therefore, to lessen the danger of armed conflict. Such moral rearmament to be most highly effective must receive support on a world-wide basis."

This great gathering was sponsored by Cabinet officers and Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives. The invitation to the meeting contained messages from former President Hoover; the Secretary of State; the Secretary of War; the Attorney General; the Honorable William B. Bankhead, the Speaker of the House of Representatives; the Honorable Alben Barkley, the majority leader of the Senate; the Honorable Joseph W. Martin, Jr., the minority leader in the House of Representatives; Senator Capper, of Kansas; and Senator Wagner, of New York. A message was also received from Gen. John J. Pershing, commander of the armies of the United States in the last war, which I quote:

"This moral rearmament should enlist the support of all thinking people. There is a spiritual emotion which underlies all true patriotism, and good citizenship itself is dependent upon the high sense of moral obligation of the people. Today, confronted by conditions so threatening to world peace, we must rededicate ourselves to the faith of our forefathers if we are to be worthy of our heritage."

There was a message from the House of Lords of Great Britain signed by 25 members of that body, and a message from the House of Commons signed by 242 members of that body. Messages also

came from the Parliaments of eight other countries, from British industry and labor, and from great diplomats the world over.

During the last 4 months we have seen our people from the farms, in the cities, from the work shop, and in the homes answering this call for moral rearmament. The hope of a new world—united, strong, and free as never before—has come to the hearts of Americans from coast to coast as they have watched this new spirit unite husband and wife, parents and children, employer and employee, statesman and citizen. The battle is for a new world—a world of peace and love. We have been gratified to see this Nation-wide response in America to the challenge of moral rearmament. In every walk of life, our citizens are awakening to those Christian virtues of honesty, purity, unselfishness, and love which form the bedrock of national character, and which enlist the citizens of a democracy in constructive national service.

The World Assembly for Moral Rearmament, which took place on the west coast, began with the gathering of some 25,000 people in the Hollywood Bowl at Los Angeles in July. It brought leading representatives from over 20 nations to its deliberations and closed with the day for moral rearmament at the Golden Gate International Exposition in San Francisco. That assembly marked a great contribution to the life of America and all the world.

The essential condition of any lasting world peace is a new spirit among nations. Without such a new spirit no general settlement will be possible. With it there might be achieved a realistic reordering of world affairs which would endure. A well-known statesman, who with others has taken an active part in furthering the spirit of moral rearmament in his own nation has said: "The battle for peace must be fought in the heart of the individual, and thus throughout the community, if it is to be won in the world. Victory in this battle is the one thing needful for the world in which we live. It implies first of all a change of heart. Experience has proved that such a change can take place, and that it comes to those who turn from judging others and their systems to a sense of their own faults and a determination to live under the guidance of God. The strength of a nation is shown in the courage to admit her own faults. The glory of a nation is to have a creative message for the world."

It is rare in these days to find something which will unite man and nations on a plane above conflict of party, class, or political philosophy. I am sure that I voice the sentiment of all those who are listening, when I express gratification at a response so remarkable to a need so urgent, and I am confident that America will play her full part in this great cause. I believe that the future of civilization must largely depend upon the success of moral rearmament.

ADDRESS BY FRANK N. D. BUCHMAN, FOUNDER OF THE OXFORD GROUP AND THE WORLD MOVEMENT FOR MORAL REARMAMENT

I am grateful for the statesmanlike words in which Senator TRUMAN has referred to the widespread work and influence of moral rearmament in this and other countries. He has struck a brave blow for that realistic reordering of world affairs of which he spoke.

I am speaking today to the millions across the world who in these anxious days are increasingly looking to moral rearmament as the one hope for the future. Especially as I speak I am thinking of the men on the front-line trenches, the men faced with the hard realities, the men who know what war is.

Yet where are the front-line trenches today? Today in many countries every civilian carries a gas mask. Every garden has its air-raid shelter. It is a new phase in war, where everybody is responsible and every home is a front-line trench.

Our arts of reconciliation have not kept pace with the arts of war. The art of destruction is beginning to outpace the art of living. Today we have reached the parting of the ways. Civilization, man-controlled, is faced with collapse. The long-endured cycle of moving from crisis to crisis must end. Nations must move beyond crisis to cure. A new world philosophy is needed, a world philosophy capable of creating a new era of constructive relationships between men and nations. A new statesmanship, a new leadership, will ensue from this heightened quality of thinking and living. A nation's first line of defense is the character of her people. As Maurice Browne, the producer of that wartime drama, Journey's End, so compellingly reminds us, "Never in the known history of mankind has there been such general, clear, and instant need for the application by each one of us to our hourly lives of the four cardinal principles—honesty, purity, selflessness, and love." Here we have the touchstone of moral rearmament.

This world philosophy will emerge as people begin to get their direction from the living God. It will be within the framework of a hate-free, fear-free, greed-free quality of living.

Think of the cost of hate, fear, and greed. Millions of men and women must carry gas masks today because men the world over have been living behind masks for years. Millions of men and women must grope through darkened cities because the nations have been living in a spiritual black-out. Millions of men and women today must listen to air-raid warnings because nations have not listened to the voice of God in days gone by. Yet dark nights of waiting may prove a blessing in disguise, for guidance is a staple necessity that is not rationed.

Man today is ready to believe that human wisdom has failed. A situation is growing up in which people will want God to speak to them. They will have nothing else between themselves and desperation, as they read the changing chimerical headlines that no one wants. Men need some adequate voice to interpret and mold events. All our values are slipping, as currencies slipped after the last war. As my friend, the great Oxford philosopher, Dr. Streeter, said, "A race that has grown up intellectually, must grow up morally or perish." Times of crisis reveal the bankruptcy of our thought and action. Then we resort to feverish improvisation and expediency. Sheer economy of time and energy and ultimate bankruptcy may force us to God-control. Expediency must be supplanted by guidance. These days will see a change in all of us in every nation, a change which will bring a new realization of our need. We cannot permanently go on expecting other nations to repent first.

Moral rearmament was never more urgently needed than today. It stands for a prejudice-free level of living. It stands for a common denominator of immediate, constructive action for everyone above party, class, race, creed, point of view, or personal advantage. The morally rearmed have learned to live under a crisis-proof, fear-free discipline. They are a panic-proof, singleminded, and intelligent trained force at the disposal of all who put their country before selfish interest.

A word of gratitude must go to the men in every nation who have met moral rearmament and for what has been accomplished and for the far-reaching service they have been able to render. These people, far-visioned and sagacious, see that moral rearmament is the highest patriotism.

The aim of moral rearmament is twofold: First, to restore God to leadership as the directing force in the life of nations; and then to work for the strengthening of morale within a country and so build a healthful, national life. In the words of a statement by Lord Baldwin, Lord Salisbury, and chiefs of the armed forces, that has become historic: "Were we, together with our fellow men everywhere, to put the energy and resourcefulness into this task that we now find ourselves obliged to expend on national defense, the peace of the world would be assured."

Moral rearmament will be the focal point for the new national unity where God is the constant and final arbiter in every conflict. This philosophy will become the mainspring of the spirit of the Nation, the magnet that will draw all positive forces together. It will give a new unity to capital and labor, and bring the answer to industrial conflict and unrest. It will give the answer to war in the home and to war in the world. It will train that leadership which is adequate for the gigantic work of reconstruction to rebuild a world on the brink of ruin. As a statesman has said: "What are needed are God-guided personalities to make God-guided nationalities, to make a new world. All other ideas of economic adjustment are too small really to touch the center of the evil."

The chief sin is that we have no adequate philosophy for life. Our conception of living is wrong—easy, soft, protective; indulgent. We need a whole new content and conception of life. The brains, the thinking of the world must have been sabotaged and squandered for a very long time to create such destruction of men and nations. We need a whole new level of thinking about peace. If peace had demanded as much of us as war, war would have been outlawed long ago.

But someone must always make peace. Peace is not an idea. It is people becoming different. You know what it is like at home when there has been a quarrel. You don't just get the idea that peace would be a good thing. Someone pockets his pride and says, "I'm sorry." But most of us want to make peace by repenting of the other fellow's sins. That is how the world would like to do it. The moral rearmament way is to start by being different yourself. Honest apology is the highroad of lasting peace. An army general said to me recently, "Either I sacrifice my selfishness for the sake of my nation, or I sacrifice my nation for the sake of my selfishness. And either we sacrifice our national selfishness for the sake of the world, or we sacrifice the world for the sake of our national selfishness." War is the price of the selfishness of nations. Most people are selfish enough to want a peace that permits them to wage their own private wars and foster their own petty indulgences.

Without this new spirit we shall pay heavily for our selfishness. Taxes will and do overtake us. We grumble and pay, because we would rather pay than pray. Today men share whether they want to or not. We cannot make peace between the nations when the people in the nations are in a state of permanent personal warfare. Strikes, labor difficulties, and war are inevitable until we change our whole thought and quality of living.

We need a national mobilization for unemployment on the same scale and carried out with the same personal care that the warring nations have given to everyone who needed to be taken to a place of safety. The unemployed must have the safety and security that comes from knowing that they are needed and that there is a job for them to do. Our aim should be that everyone has not only enough of the necessities of life, but that he has a legitimate part in bringing about this moral rearmament, and so safeguards the peace of his nation and the peace of the world.

God has a nation-wide program that provides inspiration and liberty for all and anticipates all other political programs. A labor leader says, "I have seen the labor movement triumph and felt, in the midst of triumph, an emptiness. Moral rearmament gave my life new content. I see in its message the only key to the future of the labor movement and of the industry the world over."

Industry can be the pioneer of a new order when national service replaces selfishness and where industrial planning is based upon the guidance of God. When labor, management, and capital becomes partners under God's guidance, then industry takes its true place in the national life.

Here I wish to bring you the message of two British labor leaders, who as chairmen of the Trades Union Congress represented 6,000,000 British workers. I quote first from Mr. H. H. Elvin, who this last month was fraternal delegate from Britain to American labor. He had hoped to be here to speak in person, but urgent duties recalled him to Britain a few days ago. He says in a message sent specially for this program:

"Can we as Christians be really satisfied with our witness in these times? Is there a message of hope for the world? I believe that there is. The keynote of that message is: Repentance, reparation, and regeneration.

"Repentance: Turn right about.

"Reparation: Redress wrongs done.

"Regeneration: Live a completely new life.

"Repentance: The first step must be the recognition that the life already lived is wrong and that a new road must be taken. This can apply not only to the non-Christian but also to the Christian. 'Ye cannot serve God and mammon.' Many are trying to do the impossible.

"Reparation: This applies not only to the individual life, but also to national and international life. If, as Christians, we think objectively, we must admit that wrongs done to nations by other nations are the cause of present international life. Men have failed to act justly, and as citizens we have condoned injustices, although this may be largely due to lack of thought. Nonetheless, our responsibility is there.

"Regeneration: I mean the regeneration of the whole man, not in part. Change of heart is the first essential, but this must be followed by change of outlook and change of life.

"Moral rearmament, if it is to be fully effective, must touch all human relationships. Selfishness must not be the keynote of living. God must enter all departments of life."

The second message has just arrived from Mr. Joseph Hallsworth, present chairman of the Trades Union Congress. He makes this striking statement, "The need for moral rearmament is more urgent than ever. I promise you all the support in my power." Both these men in their official capacity joined with 15 other leaders of British labor in the following statement: "Basically the world unrest is to be found in the root disease of materialism showing itself in widespread selfishness, fear, and greed, not in this nation or in that, but in all. We are all guilty." That is the conviction of great leaders of labor in Britain.

The Catholic Workers Union of a European state met recently in response to the call for moral and spiritual rearmament made by the ruler of that country, "In the whole world," they declared, "and in our own country we are glad to note a leaning toward new spiritual life. This must strengthen in us the consciousness that we have to lead the way to a new and better and solid community, not only with words, but with deeds." And then these workers reached this striking conclusion which I ask you carefully to note, "In the new community there is no room for class war or racial war. In the new community there is no room for strikes and lockouts; in the new community, neither personal interests nor desire for gain have the upper hand; social justice and social love shall be the pillars on which the community of the future will rest."

New men, new homes, new industry, new nations, a new world.

The world must declare a moratorium on hate, greed and fear, personally and nationally. The new peace pact must have as its preamble, that all contracting parties, all nations live on the basis of no hate, no fear, no greed. And the necessary prelude to this happier pact is that every individual, in every nation, begins that new quality of living now, and does not postpone it to some future armistice. Then we shall be true patriots. Then there will be law and order in Europe and the world, within your hearts and within the boundary of your nation. Then we shall be able to say, "Behold how these nations love one another."

As I am speaking here, within a fraction of a second I can reach my friends in many countries. My friends in the front-line trenches, the men in the lonely outposts whose only touch with the outside world is through the friendly radio beam, which meets all alike—my friends in the far Nordic north, on India's northwest frontier, on the African veldt, and in far-off Australia and New Zealand.

We accept as a commonplace a man's voice carried by radio to the uttermost parts of the earth. Why not the voice of the living God as an active, creative force in every home, every business, every parliament?

Men listen to the King when he speaks to his people over the air. Why not also to the King of Kings?

An all-powerful God is the most intelligent source of information in the world today. He has the answer to every problem. Everywhere when men and nations will let Him, He is teaching them how to live.

The world needs a miracle. Miracles of science have been the wonder of the age. But all those miracles have not brought peace and happiness to our homes and nations. A miracle of the spirit is what we need.

There must come a spiritual dynamic which will change human nature and remake men and nations. There must come a spiritual authority which will be accepted everywhere, by everyone, the adequate authority that does not have to resort to war. Only so will order come out of chaos in national and world affairs.

This miracle is undoubtedly the divinely appointed destiny of mankind. Who can believe less than that? Its advent depends on and awaits the emergence in every country of firm and resolute God-guided men with all the conviction, fire, and fervor of early Christians. Their ever-widening influence would be invincible. A new national spirit would soon be born; a new, cooperative relationship between the nations, if in every country there would arise a new leadership free from the bondage of fear, rising above personal and national ambition, and responsive to the direction of God's will. A leading Afrikaans paper in South Africa, Die Burger, expresses the conviction of a nation that is facing her problems with the aid of moral rearmament: "We need supernatural strength, a national unity with united mind, controlled and coordinated by the Supreme Being."

Such a philosophy has been stated as the historic basis for nationhood by the prophets of old and has withstood the test of centuries. The prophet Isaiah says: "And all thy children shall be taught of the Lord, and great shall be the peace of thy children. Nations that knew not thee shall run unto thee because of the Lord, thy God." The man charged with the foreign affairs of a great nation said: "What we need today are men of the type of the prophet Amos." British labor in conference, sent their message to the American Capital with these words: "We need men who will make real the vision of the prophet Micah."

Moral rearmament is recapturing, revitalizing, reliving the message of the prophets. It is tried, it is true, it is tested. God calling the world is becoming a daily experience in the lives of hundreds of thousands. Now the call is to every man in every last place to be guided by God.

We have tried thinking and living as we want; now try thinking and living as God wants; try living as we want the other fellow to live; try living as we want the other nation to live; then our Nation will be the spearhead of a new world order.

We must now think what God can do through an army of a hundred million men mobilized, taking their daily orders and direction from Him. God has a program adequate for the world and for each nation. Thus each individual who has enlisted in that program can find a job he can do that will affect the civic, industrial, and national welfare. Thus each nation can use all its resources and find its truest security. The program now is for a hundred million people listening to God during the week end of December 1, 2, 3, a program which is being prepared in each country, as the circumstances in that country permit. We are grateful to those heralds of the new world order who have made the radio and press available for these world broadcasts.

"M R A" has this achievement in its favor, that during this last year it has gone with lightning speed throughout the world. It has made friends everywhere—in every nation, among every class. Think of the vast forces available—Catholic and Protestant, Jew and gentile. Think of the spiritually rearmed everywhere who may be the pacemakers for the peacemakers of tomorrow. "M R A" is open to all creeds and bars none. It is a quality of life. You don't register with "M R A"; "M R A" registers with you. You don't join; you can't resign. You live a life. In the words of a miners' leader, "'M R A' provides all men everywhere with an open line to God for guidance."

The world is waiting an answer. A hundred million people listening to God can give the answer. We must have some simple, workable basis available for everyone and one that can be applied by all. We need people trained not only to make an adequate peace but also to keep it. Now is the time to enlist for the duration in this world war against selfishness. We must maintain the whole war conception of peace. We need to be "fighters ever in the battle for peace."

The secret lies in listening to God. A truly united nation comes from a directing God. Man, unaided, cannot make peace. Men and nations must be trained to make peace and maintain it. We must begin to develop the framers of the just and lasting peace of the future. We need to live a quality of life that will change masses of people. It will provide a public opinion that will have the added weight of an irresistible army to maintain a world battle for peace, with a sacrifice as sustained as that which force compels men to make in times of urgent world crisis. The united mind of a hundred million people listening to God will give a new fund of information and source of inspiration that will provide the secret of united action. The Oxford group has been in action since the last war training men for the moral rearmament of the nations. It is bringing a new force into play, an indispensable force, necessary for the lifeblood of every nation. Through lack of this quality nations will sell their birthright.

A general in another army, after a disarmament conference, sent me this program on a post card. It was in the form of a picture of a man's face, and underneath was written, "God gave man two ears and one mouth. Why don't you listen twice as much as you talk?" This is the first step in reorientating our minds to God. Listen twice as much as you talk. Here lies the strategy to win the world from her egocentric ways, for immediately self is the center of the picture, there war has begun, whether in individuals or in nations.

Guidance is when we are in communication with God. Guidance is an absolute necessity and the irreducible minimum to keep millions spiritually and physically alive. It is the nation's lifeblood—without it nations perish. Television points to a great truth. The ordinary man, every man, and the statesman must discover the counterpart on the spiritual plane. Guidance is this counterpart. Just as television is that space-conquering vision on the material plane, guidance is the far-seeing perception on the spiritual. It is limited only by our capacity for discipline. At one time there was

one incandescent bulb and now infinitely more than a hundred million enjoy the gift of light. The next great discoveries must lie in the realm of the spiritual. Statesmen living this new quality of life will make it possible for the mind of God to become the mind of nations.

Fear is another kind of guidance. People are afraid and so they will not daily fight the battle for peace. I am reminded of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-Shek's forceful phrase, "If we perspired more in times of peace, we should bleed less in times of war." The program for the hundred million listening over the week end of December 1, 2, 3 is that we perspire in time of peace, that we learn truly how to sacrifice for our country. We are waging the greatest battle of history in this World War against selfishness. Every man to his guns. We must call out the moral and spiritual forces. It is because we had no such adequate action during the last decades that we are compelled to make the costly sacrifice of war. The way to outlive the forces of destruction is to build better and more wisely than we are building now. "If we are not governed by God, we will be ruled by tyrants," said William Penn. The lack of such a program in peacetime has meant that a hundred million and more are engaged in a program of action that no one really wants. Moral rearmament is the great central revolutionary force. I was personally at war. An experience of the Cross made me a new type of revolutionary. Moral rearmament teaches us to sacrifice for our country. Its immediate aim is a hundred million people mobilized in the battle for peace—everyone disciplined, everyone taking part. A statesman spoke recently of the world-wide devastation and sorrows of war. He spoke of hundreds of millions who are called upon to suffer. Is it too much to think of 100,000,000 enlisting to bring the answer not only for suffering men and women but for nations in turmoil. This is our goal.

A national labor leader in San Francisco had a bold vision for an American membership of his organization of 10,000,000. The united forces planning for moral and spiritual rearmament in the world must think in terms of at least a hundred million taking their orders from the living God. Such a force will be an incomparable, unconquerable, irresistible army, with advanced knowledge of tactics and a program that will fire men's hearts and radically alter their thinking and living.

Within the limits of one broadcast it is not possible to give a complete answer convincing and satisfying to everyone. It may, however, cast a light on your path and furnish you with information and direction that will be ready in a time of crisis and put the torch that is available to all within your grasp.

This broadcast is only a trial mobilization in preparation for December 1, 2, 3. Moral rearmament must be a call to all the nations and every individual in the Nation. I hope you will write into station WRUL, or care Moral Re-Armament, Fairmont Hotel, San Francisco, making suggestions for Moral rearmament, December 1, 2, 3. You can each help in this momentous task.

Our instant need is a hundred million planning for the new world peace. Not only a few statesmen meeting, but the united forces of the world backed by daily living and action that will support them—waging the eternal war against selfishness. Then we can begin to approximate to what is needed. The call is to every man, the ordinary man, and the statesman unitedly to carry the burdens of their country. Responsibility has too often been delegated to the few in the belief that the statesman is expected to do the thinking, planning, and living that must become the concern of every man, the ordinary man.

We must re-make the world—the task is nothing less than that. We, the re-makers of the world—is that not the thinking and willing of the ordinary man.

A world philosophy will be brought to power through the cumulative effect of millions of people beginning the experience of listening to God. True, it may be only an initial experience. Enlistment does not immediately make the trained soldier. But we can all begin. God can communicate with man direct. We stand at zero hour on the threshold of a new world order.

It will be an age of happy homes and laughing children, an age from which fear has been lifted like the smoke-pall from an industrial city, when we shall look for care-worn faces and find none.

It will be an age in which mothers and children will know no want, and husbands will not fear that next week there may be no pay envelop for them to take home to their wives.

It will be an age of peace, lasting peace in heart, home, and between nations—a peace which will be not alone the absence of war, but the liberation of all our energies to build a new world.

A world in which society has no enemies because society makes no enemies.

A fear-free, hate-free, greed-free world.

God calling the world is becoming a daily experience in the lives of hundreds and thousands of people in the more than 60 countries where "M R A" is at work.

We need unitedly to recapture the world once again for a program of sanity and security. Events are focusing for us the only program of sane control—God control. The only sane people in an insane world are those guided by God. We have not yet tapped the great creative sources in the mind of God. God has a plan and the combined moral and spiritual forces of the nations can find that philosophy adequate for world crisis.

"A mighty fortress is our God,
A trusty shield and weapon,
He helps us free from every ill,
That hath us e'er o'ertaken."

ADDRESS OF ADMIRAL BYRD, COMMANDING OFFICER OF THE UNITED STATES ANTARCTIC SERVICE EXPEDITION, ON THE EVE OF HIS DEPARTURE FOR THE ANTARCTIC

I speak from Boston. Greetings to all you who are listening, no matter what country you may be in. It was on my lonely vigil during the long polar night that I learned the power of silence—of quiet times. The values and the problems of life sorted out when I began to listen.

I went exploring because I was fired by those pioneers of history who felt the urge of charting uncharted seas and discovering unknown places. However, today, in the crisis which threatens to destroy freedom and civilization, the most important pioneering to be done is in the realm of the spirit.

America's first line of defense is the character of her citizens. Character cannot be taken for granted. If we are going to preserve freedom, it has to be battled for by every man, woman, and child—every day and every generation. Without character, man doesn't deserve freedom, so he loses it. A man of character has a deep sympathy for his fellow man. He wishes his neighbor well. We are all neighbors today.

The building of character is moral rearmament. That is the fight of America and of the world. That is the only armament that can stop armament for destruction. On the eve of my departure for the Antarctic, I want to say that I believe that in this way lies the hope for peace.

Moral rearmament—the fight for a new world—strong, clean, united—should fire the hearts of all red-blooded Americans and stir their wills to action.

ADDRESS BY HERBERT H. ELVIN, CHAIRMAN, BRITISH TRADES UNION CONGRESS, 1938–39, FRATERNAL DELEGATE TO AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR ANNUAL CONVENTION, OCTOBER 1939

Sometime ago I was invited to meet a number of leading persons in France. At that meeting one said to me: "We in France have been trying to bring about an ideal state on the basis of a materialistic conception of life, and have failed."

Does not this apply to other countries, too? The world today contains thousands of disappointed men and women. Hopes raised in 1919 have been dashed in 1939. Aspirations have failed. Disappointment has been followed by despair. The rule of force, said to be destroyed in 1919, has reared its head again in a more terrible form. Another world disaster is on the horizon.

In these days of darkness and depression, is there really a message for a stricken world?

Is it a fact that an ideal society cannot be secured by a materialistic conception of life? France, with its motto of liberty, equality, and fraternity, has not the ideal society. So is it with America, although it proclaims democracy, liberty, union. Also Great Britain is far from being the land of the free.

Humanism has failed, but must we not honestly ask if the organized Christian community meets the bill? Can we as Christians be really satisfied with our witness in these times? Is there a message of hope for the world? I believe that there is. The keynote of that message is repentance, reparation, and regeneration.

Repentance: Turn right about.

Reparation: Redress wrongs done.

Regeneration: Live a completely new life.

Repentance: The first step must be the recognition that the life already lived is wrong and that a new road must be taken. This can apply, not only to the non-Christian but also to the Christian. "Ye cannot serve God and mammon." Many are trying to do the impossible.

Reparation: This applies not only to the individual life but also to national and international life. If, as Christians, we think objectively, we must admit that wrongs done to nations by other nations is the cause of present international life. Men have failed to act justly, and as citizens we have condoned injustices although this may be largely due to lack of thought. Nonetheless our responsibility is there.

Regeneration: I mean the regeneration of the whole man not in part. Change of heart is the first essential, but this must be followed by change of outlook and change of life. Too many stop at the first with great loss to themselves and the world. In fact, one cannot stop at the first. Because so many attempt it they come under the condemnation of Matthew 25: "Inasmuch as ye did it not unto one of these ye did it not unto Me."

This is where moral rearmament comes in with its message of absolute truth, absolute honesty, absolute love, and absolute unselfishness.

Absolute truth: The power to face facts, pleasant or unpleasant.

Absolute honesty: Seeking to do the right thing regardless of consequences, leaving these to God.

Absolute love: The highest form of human love possible equally given to God and the world, expressed in—

Absolute unselfishness: "If any man will come after Me, let him abandon himself."

"Thou shalt love thy neighbor as much as thou lovest thyself" means that all the good things we desire for ourselves we must seek absolutely to obtain for others. "Do unto others as ye would that they should do unto you" declares that as it is essential that all hindrances to the development of one's personality must be removed, so we must work to the utmost that all human hindrances to divine perfection in others must be removed, such as unemployment, injustices, and inequalities in industrial and social life,

bad housing, vice, lack of opportunity to develop one's life to its full, etc.

Moral rearmament, if it is to be fully effective, must touch all human relationships. Selfishness must not be the keynote of living. The policy of "safety first" can only lead to a betrayal of moral and Christian principle and a breaking of solemn obligations entered into. God must enter all departments of life.

It is because those who have experienced moral rearmament know what it means to dedicate themselves to God for service to man, bringing to them not an attenuated but a full, complete gospel covering the whole man and his needs, that they suggest that this is the message which the world needs at this time and ask—urged you to try it.

Annual Dinner of the National Guard Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 31, 1939

ADDRESS BY HON. HARRY H. WOODRING AND COMMENTS THEREON BY ERNEST K. LINDLEY

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by the Honorable Harry H. Woodring, Secretary of War, on the occasion of the annual dinner of the National Guard Association of the United States at Baltimore, Md., the night of October 27. I consider the address a sane and constructive analysis of our problem of national defense and commend it to my colleagues.

I also ask unanimous consent to have printed, following the address of Secretary of War Woodring, and as part of the same insertion in the Appendix of the RECORD, the analysis and comment of the Secretary's speech by Ernest K. Lindley, well-known columnist and commentator, as published in the Washington Post of October 28.

There being no objection, the address and the analysis and comment were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The National Guard Association of the United States has convened its annual convention at a most momentous and critical time. In the Far East war covers the countryside with a dark blanket of death and destruction. Across the Atlantic war stalks gloomily over the hills and valleys, blots out the blueness of God's skies, rolls rapaciously the surfaces of the seas, and extends its horrors into the very depths of the oceans. The peoples of our New World stand aghast, fearful that to the shores of the Americas may eventually reach the dread mailed fist of Mars.

War is despised, hated, abhorred by most of the peoples of the globe. Yet war's dismal shroud now enfolds many nations. For even in these days of advanced civilization—or should I say so-called civilization?—war still remains a tool in the hands of ambitious and unscrupulous political stewards for the aggrandizement of their political power and as a weapon of conquest in their expansion of empire.

Americans, since their bitter and disillusioning experiences in the world conflict which terminated some 21 years ago, have advanced materially in their recognition and knowledge of the utter futility of armed conflict. And during the past two decades there has continuously developed in them the determination to avoid completely involvement in war—save war forced upon them in the defense of their own Republic, their own homes, and their own liberties. And in all sincerity and in all honesty let me tell you there is no man in public life today who is more determined than your Secretary of War that your sons and my sons shall not march forth to war.

Dangerously prevalent among some of our people today, however, is the assumption that intervention by the United States—and I refer to overseas participation in the conflict now raging in Europe—is inevitable; that the fates have decreed the youth of America eventually must be transported across the seas to wage battle on the Old World's soil, blood-soaked through the centuries.

Those who in public utterances pronounce the inevitability of our entrance into this second World War do grave injustice to this Republic of ours. They arouse suspicion among our more gullible citizens toward the efforts of the Federal Government to assure complete neutrality. They breed mistrust in the determination of the national administration definitely to assure peace for the Western Hemisphere. Those who preach the inevitability of war are prone to interpret every purely precautionary and defensive measure taken by the Government as likely—if not as deliberately intended—to lead the American people into war. They paint the wholly false picture of American business and industry, in a blind greed for profit, intentionally attempting to involve the United States in the present European conflict.

To create, knowingly or unknowingly, such a psychology on the inevitability of our participation in the war now in progress is to deny that most Americans—the vast majority of Americans—are convinced that our democratic form of government can be maintained and our national destiny assured only through continuance of peace.

The War Department, the Secretary of War, and the personnel of the Regular Establishment, the National Guard, the Organized Reserves—we who are primarily and personally concerned with the slight progress recently attained in the promotion of the efficiency of our land protective forces—we must not stand idly by while amateur strategists pronounce war's inevitability. As a nation we are not prepared for the formation of expeditions to wage offensive war; we do not wish to prepare to wage offensive war; we see no inevitable war, offensive or defensive.

Our Commander in Chief, President Roosevelt, has sounded, and sounded in unmistakably determined beats, the tocsin of peace—peace in the Western Hemisphere. It is the bounden duty of each individual in any way connected with the Military Establishment to exert all his intelligence and all his influence to insure there be no misinterpretation by any single citizen of the United States of the fact that every item in the current program for the augmentation and modernization of our defensive forces, and every thought behind that program has but one object in view—the preservation of peace.

In these days when the ancient and gruesome ideology that "might makes right" again strangles much of the world in a vise-like grasp, how can we best assure the preservation of peace? Only through defensive preparation—military, naval, industrial, economic—which will serve as a very positive and very definite deterrent to any and all aggressive designs.

We American "peace at almost any price" advocates have long since come to the realization that unpreparedness for defense eventually turns out to be far more costly and a far greater menace to our homes, our liberties, and our national existence than a powerful, well-equipped, adequately trained defensive force. We picture our national defense not as a rattling sword but as a protective shield.

The United States does not now require the maintenance of military forces beyond the authorized peace strengths provided by the National Defense Act for the three components of the Army of the United States—the Regular Army, National Guard, and Organized Reserves. We require no considerable augmentation of civilian military-training activities. The Reserve Officers' Training Corps and the citizens' military training camps will suffice for the accomplishment of their primary missions—the production of an adequate reserve of young commissioned officers and the training, on a purely voluntary status, of those patriotic youths who desire to prepare themselves in time of peace to answer the Nation's call in the hour of its need. General Pershing recently told me that the combat casualties among green, unseasoned, untrained American troops during the World War far exceeded those suffered by trained and experienced soldiers. Our defensive requirements demand the maintenance of no huge reserve of soldiers for the permanent establishment. The enlisted reserve established last summer for the Regular Army, which eventually will attain a total of 75,000 men, is ample.

The security of these United States does, however, demand the maintenance of an Army in being at all times—those minimum defensive elements which will permit this Nation to speak with authority for peace and assure the continuance of our national existence. This force must be fully, perfectly equipped, and adequately trained at all times—not only to meet the eventualities of today and tomorrow, but those of the days to come.

These land defensive elements must include an ever-ready striking air force. I refer to a "striking" air component; yet only a moment ago I said that offensive war is not contemplated in our military preparations. There has been some controversy over the term "offensive—defensive weapons." There are but few, if any, instruments of warfare which can be classified as distinctly offensive or distinctly defensive. On the field of battle, with its continuous shifting of the tides of combat, the offensive weapon of today ofttimes becomes the defensive weapon of tomorrow.

However, there are some purely defensive military installations—for instance, the fixed seacoast defense guns which afford protection to the Panama Canal. And as purely defensive as are the roles of those fixed guns would be the missions of heavy long-range bombers employed to disrupt the activities of hostile air or naval bases established to menace the Panama Canal and its defenses. Whatever may be the method of employment of a weapon of war in Europe or Asia, let me assure you that, under our plans, the same type of weapon, in the hands of American soldiers, would be used for purposes of defense, and defense only.

But being potentially strong in men and matériel is not sufficient guaranty for the assurance of peace. We must obtain adequate training of personnel and efficient employment of matériel. We must, from time to time, concentrate our defensive units to practice the plays of the team. Otherwise we expend our efforts and our moneys on the forging of strong links for an unlinked chain, and, unlinked, we have no chain at all.

Hence the recent decision of the War Department to assure the maximum effectiveness of the units of the Regular Army by means of concentrations for extensive field maneuvers during winter months in southern areas. Infantry divisions, now undergoing reorganization as "triangular" rather than "quadrangular" organizations will first be afforded opportunity to familiarize themselves with the modernized formations. They will later be further concentrated for corps maneuvers with special auxiliary corps troops heretofore nonexistent in our peacetime permanent establishment. We thus take advantage of favorable climatic conditions to form an actual and an experienced first-line combat team from the mobile troops of the Regular Army. And in the so doing we correct one of the gravest defects in our present national-defense set-up.

This winter's concentrations, to be fully effective, must be molded into a continuous revolving program covering the next 2 or 3 years. If the commanders of troops and the troops themselves do not become accustomed to operating in large, well-balanced, cohesive units—under conditions as closely approximating war as peacetime limitations permit—the personnel of our Regular divisions, we must confess, will be playing at the soldier game. Our soldiery must be real, not toy.

The National Guard, of course, enters prominently into this picture of an animated, modernized national defense. Our initial protective force comprises the Regular Army and the National Guard. For example, Baltimore's National Guard units are as integral a part of this Nation's first line of land defenses as are the Regular Army organizations stationed at nearby Forts Howard, Hoyle, and Meade. Were it not for the existence of the National Guard, this country would be forced to maintain a permanent professional military establishment of far greater strength than that which we now support. The American public must not lose sight of the fact that in our scheme of national defense the National Guard plays a role of paramount importance from the standpoint of economy in the maintenance of our Military Establishment.

The President, by recent Executive order, has directed—at the discretion of the Governors of the various States—an increase of about 42,000 in the enlisted ranks of the National Guard. Most gratifying has been the progress thus far in the attainment of the allotted quotas. The augmented strengths of units will permit far more practical and efficient organizational training, for heretofore unit strength has been too low to permit the manning of weapons assigned to organizations. Ordinary, unavoidable absenteeism also greatly retarded the effectiveness of units, both in armory and field training. The increase provided by the Executive order promises much for greater unit proficiency; the extra drill periods recently provided will greatly promote individual proficiency. Observance of the winter maneuvers of Regular Army units by National Guard higher commanders and their staffs will not only be an educational factor of no mean importance but will go far toward promotion of that cooperation so essential between the primary elements of the initial protective force.

To the citizen-soldiers of the National Guard, the people of this country are greatly indebted. And I feel I am on very safe ground when I state that never before have the missions of the National Guard been so fully understood by the public, nor the patriotic endeavors of its personnel more fully appreciated.

For 150 years our land defense has been based upon a 2½-mile-per-hour speed of movement. We must now readjust ourselves to the fact—one demonstrated so recently on the plains of Poland, the plateaus of Spain, and the deserts of Ethiopia—that today war on the earth's surface is a 30- to 40-mile-per-hour business, and that the birds of war cleave the skies at 300 to 400 miles per hour. Our Army—Regulars, Guardsmen, and Reservists—must have not only mechanical mobility, tactically and strategically, but also mental mobility.

Let us not overlook that other strong right arm of the Nation's defense—our fine United States Navy, which today commemorates its glorious traditions and its splendid record of achievements in peace and in war. Upon our sea forces devolve the responsibility for the security of long water routes over which our trade is transported to the four corners of the globe, and for the defense of 40,000 miles of homeland and insular coast lines. To our Navy—as to our Army—we must give the means for the accomplishment of its manifold missions.

This program for rearmament—rearmament for peace—is costly. Our people are determined, however, to preserve the neutrality of the United States so long as the dread four horsemen—War, Famine, Pestilence, and Death—ravage Europe and Asia. Our people are likewise determined that the barbaric hoofbeats of those same four horsemen must be confined to spheres other than the Americas.

Not a doubt is there in my mind that the American people—be the financial cost what it may—will render wholehearted support to their Government in its efforts to maintain neutrality and to assure complete security.

Every man and every dollar necessary for the defense of America, but not one man, not one dollar to fight the wars of other nations.

[From the Washington Post of October 28, 1939]

PAX AMERICANA

(By Ernest Lindley)

TWO CABINET MEMBERS SPEAK OUT

For those who believe that this war in Europe is not our war and that we should keep out of it, no matter which side wins or loses, October 27 must be underlined. For on that day two members of the Roosevelt Cabinet—Harry H. Woodring and Henry A. Wallace—crashed through with speeches which committed them to this view just about as irrevocably as words can do.

These speeches are not important as reflections of the President's views. The White House okays, which both of them presumably received, may have been given only because they serve incidentally to allay fears about the ultimate aims of the President's foreign policy, and so help the neutrality bill.

But neither speech was written or delivered for that purpose. Each is a personal testament; each is rooted deeply in convictions which both men have often expressed privately but never before so forthrightly in public.

Secretary Woodring's speech was composed by himself and came as straight from the bottom of the heart as any speech ever made by a responsible Government official. As his colleagues in the Cabinet and his friends know, he was not exaggerating when he said:

"And in all sincerity and in all honesty let me tell you there is no man in public life today who is more determined than your Secretary of War that your sons and my sons shall not march forth to war."

To friends he has gone a little further and vowed: "No American boys will be sent to fight on European soil so long as I am Secretary of War." His speech to the National Guard Association on Friday amounts to saying that.

Woodring shares to the fullest the determination which, in his speech, he ascribed to the American people: "The determination to avoid completely involvement in war—save war forced upon them in the defense of their own Republic, their own homes, and their own liberties."

Woodring did not content himself with saying he hoped we could stay out of this war. He denounced the fatalistic assumption that our intervention in the European war is "inevitable"—"that the fates have decreed the youth of America eventually must be transported across the seas to wage battle on the Old World's soil, blood-soaked through the century." He asserted that our democratic form of government and our national destiny can be assured "only through the continuance of peace." The significant word is "continuance." The peace he refers to is our peace, peace in the Western Hemisphere, not the peace of Europe or of Asia.

Most important of all, Woodring translated the "keep out of Europe" policy into terms of our own preparedness. He is for national defense, but against preparation for fighting beyond our ocean barriers. This means that we do not need to train or to prepare to equip a large army. We do not need a vast plan for total mobilization of our material and human resources based on our experience in 1917–18.

Woodring sees no need for maintaining military forces beyond the authorized peace strengths of the Regular Army, the National Guard, and the Organized Reserves. He says we don't need compulsory military training activities. The enlisted reserve of 75,000, authorized last summer to backstop the Regular Army and the National Guard, is, in Woodring's view, "ample."

What we do need for our continental defense, he says, is a highly trained, perfectly equipped, mobile army, accustomed to operating in well-balanced, cohesive units.

The Woodring credo, in his own words, is: "Every man and every dollar necessary for the defense of America, but not one man, not one dollar, to fight the wars of other nations."

In his address to the Commonwealth Club of San Francisco on "Pan America—the Road of Our Destiny," Secretary Wallace was almost as emphatic as Secretary Woodring in declaring our independence from the struggles on the continents of Europe and Asia. Wallace frankly asserts that the efforts of Secretary Hull to revive a world of free-flowing trade have failed, and that the outbreak of the European war compels us to reappraise our economic and political relationships with the rest of the world.

Wallace concludes that our future, at least our immediate future, should not lie in close association with the Old World, but in the Western Hemisphere, which, for the most part, has broken away from the imperialistic systems which dominate Europe, Asia, and Africa. Wallace believes we can achieve and maintain hemispheric solidarity based on "democracy and not on imperialism," regardless of which ideology comes out on top in the European struggle. This is not an off-hand opinion, but the judgment of an intelligent man who has been studying the problems of hemispheric insulation and self-reliance with diligence, and frankly acknowledges that they present some serious difficulties. Wallace is ready to undertake the readjustments in our agriculture and in our whole economy which must come about if we are going to seek our destiny in the New World.

The commitment to a Pan-American policy is the result of a gradual but rather steady change in the thinking of Henry Wallace during the last 5 years. He entered the Roosevelt Cabinet a thorough-going economic internationalist, intent upon reopening the European markets for agricultural products, and in close intellectual harmony with Secretary Hull. He wrote a tract "America Must Choose," which was widely read and discussed, and was extremely influential in persuading many American citizens that the road to continental self-sufficiency would be disastrous, and that our destiny lay in the revival of a world-wide system of free-flowing trade.

But Wallace is no doctrinaire. He has faced the facts as he sees them. He has come to see that his earlier vision was impracticable and to believe that his earlier fears of the perils of continental economic self-reliance were exaggerated.

He now emerges as a wholehearted advocate of Pan-Americanism. There are escape clauses in his speeches. "Our strength is today not equal to the task of composing the differences which exist in Europe and Asia," he says, but we must stand ready "to furnish leadership looking toward international peace and international trade among the peoples of the Old World," and Wilson's dream of a League of Nations will always appeal to us "as an ultimate ideal."

Nevertheless, in Wallace's opinion, our road now points "not east and west, but north and south along the Americas.

"Our task, in cooperation with the 20 Latin American republics is," he says, "to do a first-class job of laying a foundation for democracy on this hemisphere—for the kind of democracy that will conserve our soil and people for thousands of years to come."

Wallace's conclusions are almost on all fours with those of Senator ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, whose speech on American foreign policy was the most comprehensive, the best documented, and, to my opinion, the best thought-out of all the speeches made during the Senate debate on the neutrality bill. Both veer sharply from the policy set forth in recent years by the President and Secretary Hull. While the President and Hull have done more than any of their predecessors to win the good will of Latin America and to work toward hemispheric solidarity, they have also sought to tie us closely to the affairs of Europe and Asia.

Their policy has been international, almost world wide, rather than hemispheric. Neither has ever declared the New World's independence of the Old in language so definite as Wallace's and Woodring's. The lines of policy laid out by these two Cabinet officers run with the main stream of American policy from Washington, through Jefferson, Monroe, and down almost to our costly and fruitless effort to settle the affairs of Europe by armed intervention in 1917 and 1918. Every day there appear more signs that the thoughts and instincts of a great majority of the American people are flowing in that main stream and that it will be far more difficult to divert them into armed intervention on the continents of Europe and Asia than it was in 1917.

Plea to Uphold the President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEWIS B. SCHWELLENBACH

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 31, 1939

LETTER BY REV. MARK A. MATTHEWS

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter appearing in the Spokesman Review, of Spokane, Wash., written by Rev. Mark A. Matthews, pastor of the First Presbyterian Church of Seattle, and former moderator of the Presbyterian Church of the United States.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Spokesman Review, Spokane, Wash.]

SUSPEND CRITICISM AND BACK PRESIDENT AS DUTY

To the EDITOR OF THE SPOKESMAN REVIEW:

Let us declare a moratorium on criticism. We are in troublesome times. In fact, we are in war. The President of the United States deserves your sympathy, your prayers, and your assistance. He is the commanding general. When a general is on his horse leading the force in any conflict, he cannot take time to pay attention to criticism.

It is silly, unpatriotic, disloyal, and disreputable to criticize the President while he is leading the forces for the stability of the Nation, for the safety of the Nation, for the protection of the Nation, and for the security of the Nation. He is doing his best to keep this Nation out of war.

When a madman is loose and running amuck against society and every restraining force, he is a menace. Mr. Hitler is a madman. He is trying to destroy the inherent rights of people and to control their boundaries. Let us keep out of the war. But if he forces himself within our boundaries, it will be just as much our duty to protect the Nation as it would be to protect the family if an insane man were attacking the children.

But in the meantime let us support the President and cease to criticize. This is not a political question. It is a question of self-preservation. It is a question of the inherent right to defend and protect one's nation.

Let us declare a moratorium on criticism. We are all one in any conflict. The President is the President of us all. If we were in a political debate we would have a perfect right to differ from one another. But in a conflict we have no right to discourage our leader or be disloyal to the commanding officer of our forces.

Let us suspend criticism, support the President, defend the Nation, and thus keep our boys out of war. The President is doing his best. He has made honest statements to us. Let us believe him. It is our duty to support him.

I know what they did to my beloved friend, Woodrow Wilson. They assassinated him with criticism. He was the first casuality of the war. We must not repeat that tragedy.

Suspend your criticisms. Support our President. Defend our Nation. Be calm, cool, serene, and remember God is on His throne and the Government at Washington is safe.

MARK A. MATTHEWS,
Pastor, First Presbyterian Church, Seattle.

Plea for Christianity and Americanism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAT McCARRAN

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 31, 1939

RADIO ADDRESS BY THE MOST REVEREND F. J. BECKMAN

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, when those of us who are either partisan or biased make statements to the public they are sometimes taken with allowances, so to speak, but when a great churchman, a great leader of the Christian faith, an outstanding, world-recognized, and respected man with no partisan views whatever, sees fit to make a statement over the radio so that the people of the country may listen, naturally it has its place in the history of the country and has its place to sway human thought. I therefore ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD a radio address entitled "A Plea for Christianity and Americanism," delivered by the Most Reverend F. J. Beckman, archbishop of Dubuque, on Sunday, October 29, 1931, over the National Broadcasting System hook-up.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

My dear fellow Americans, I realize that it is somewhat unusual for a member of the hierarchy to venture as far as have I into the present neutrality debate by our Congress. I want to say that in doing so I have, before God, not been motivated by a spirit of disunity or disrespect for existing authority. I want to say now that I have been motivated in taking my stand against the lifting of the embargo by two vitally important reasons, the first being that I could stand no longer to see the Catholic Church of America being used for private and political ends; the second reason being that I am firmly convinced of the fact that the present European war is a most unjust and un-Christian conflict—an economic war based on greed which will only benefit international communism. Convinced of this fact, I could not do otherwise, in conscience, than to condemn, for my flock, at least, any governmental action which would contribute to the continuation of that war.

The present war is not, in my well-advised opinion, a just war, much less a "holy war." It is propagandized as such by the sinister forces of international communism. The Communist anti-Christs want America and all Christian nations to engage in this war. Their agents here will stop at nothing to involve us, for well do they realize that a war-exhausted America is the only hope of communism for America. Some of our would-be Catholic leaders have already succumbed to the propagandists and taken recent occasion to proclaim with them, "This is a holy war! Stop Hitler! America with the Allies! Christianity against communism," etc., etc. To these misguided individuals I would say (and, I trust, with the full approval of thinking Americans): "We Catholic leaders are not by any stretch of the imagination in sympathy with Hitlerism; we detest the antireligious implications in that word; we abhor with our Supreme Pontiff, Pius XII, the spread of pagan ideologies and materialism throughout the world, but we cannot as Christians be in sympathy with an internationalist, godless group which has provoked and is endeavoring to sustain this war. It is only the international Communist who, entrenched in high governmental positions of many nations, could so cleverly mask a plot to destroy Christian civilization with the slogan, "This is a holy war."

Communism, my friends, like a cancer in the vitals of Christianity, depends upon growth for its survival. It feeds and fattens on international chaos, and war is its choicest bread, war with its unspeakable horrors, which tears to pieces not only mortal bodies but, what is most terrible, destroys the spiritual in the soul of man; war with the ensuing hatred and bitterness of peoples against the false leaders who betray them into it.

If there could be a prayer on the lips of the Communist, rest assured, my dear Christian friends, that prayer would be: "Lord, give us war! Give us the chaos of hell! Away with reason and order! Give us war!" That is the private cry of the godless horde today. It is the Communist hymn of hate. If we listen well we can hear that hate theme running through all the pretty phrases of the propagandists who shout for our distraction: "This is a holy war!"

There is an old saying, "Fool me once, shame on you; but fool me twice, shame on me." Many of us were tricked and fooled by the propaganda in the last war. It was simpler then for we were easily won over on the slogan "Make the world safe for democracy." It should not be so simple this time. I, as but one member of the hierarchy of the Church in America, am standing at this microphone today because I know, with good Christian people everywhere, that our religious leaders cannot afford to be duped again. Our people demand, and justly so, that we take the leadership in preventing any possible encouragement by the United States of that frightfully unjust and immoral war in Europe. Our people demand that we, as their spiritual shepherds, uphold the right, clarify the issues, and fight to the last man of us against any attempt to make this glorious America an ally of internationalism. Our people demand that with one united voice, and courageously throwing off the shackles of those who would encumber us—they demand that we rise up and brand the Communist traitors in our midst for what they are. With all our strength we are morally obligated to cry: "This is no holy war, people! The Holy Father has not proclaimed it as such! Look well! This is the Communist war. This is an economic war based on greed and under no circumstances may we lend comfort to either party in the conflict."

Why has not Great Britain declared war on a Russia which invaded poor Poland? Why do we read so little in the secular press about the persecution of religion already underway in sovietized Poland, 13,000,000 of whose population Great Britain and France mercilessly handed over to Soviet Russia? Why, in the near past, was an embargo on arms good enough when the so-called Loyalists had the upper hand, but not good enough when the tables were turning in favor of Christian Spain? These questions all merit the same answer: Look for the Communist motive. And if in the face of any altruistic reasons which may be advanced for such action—if we, the spiritual leaders of America, yield to this "holy war" propaganda a second time, and lend any sanction whatsoever to the parties of this conflict—if we do these things, then shall we be delivering Christ himself into the bloody hands of the international Communists.

We hear any number of cries today that the church is in politics. If a clergyman talks for the Government, it's not politics; but let a clergyman talk against the Government, no matter how wrong it may be on a given issue, then immediately the cry, "The church is in politics." How my Christian blood does boil when I hear such. The answer to this charge must be clearly given: The church is not in politics; but politics is shamelessly attempting to use certain churchmen. As Christ, in anger, drove the money changers from His temple so must and shall we drive the politicians out of the church they would use for their own ends. Christ through all His ministry rarely demonstrated anger, but there came a day when even His patience with the hypocrisy and the effrontery of the times was exhausted. Then in a righteous rage He set an example of courage for spiritual leaders the world over to defend with physical force, if need be, the principles of right.

Taking our precedent from Him who so nobly set it, we are today fast growing out of patience with those who would use us for their ignoble ends. There are individuals aplenty who need a retreat from the glamor of government and governmental patronage. There are those aplenty, my dear friends, who call themselves Christians and disgrace their God-given religion by employing it as a "front" for questionable activities! To these individuals we would say: Where is the integrity we taught you to respect and cherish? In the name of Heaven, what has happened to your perspective of the right? If you have not the vision to see the right, at least have you the courtesy of remaining silent while others fight your battle for you? You have no right before God to deliver the church at the back door of politics. Be a credit to us, not a debit. Keep faith with those to whom you owe everything. Keep faith with God, yourself, and your fellow man.

We all love America. We have a solemn obligation to support our leaders in all measures which are just and good. But we also have a grave obligation to fight fearlessly any measures which are clearly not based upon a Christian morality. Our people look to us for a constant defense of truth; they expect that we will at all times vigorously espouse the cause of right as against wrong. Further, they have a right to expect that we will stand united for the right despite abuse, criticism, or persecution. Our religious leadership should be of such strong character as to insure proper governmental leadership by inculcating in a people the desire for such. But if and when the spiritual leadership of any nation becomes forfeit to governmental leadership regardless of right or wrong, then indeed is the beginning of national catastrophe.

It was the great John Henry Newman, who later became the outstanding Cardinal Newman, who said, "There can be no safety for religion except under constitutional government." That statement has certainly proven itself through the wreck of religion in Communist Russia and the suppression of religious liberty in Nazi Germany.

In our beloved America only, today can it be said that the fires of constitutional government are still alight. But many things have happened lately to give us cause for worry. I say, and I firmly believe, that unless the spiritual leaders of this country are quick to act in unitedly demanding with their people that representative government be representative, that democracy be democratic, that right be recognized and clearly cited to those who are the servants, not the masters, of the people—I say that unless we act quickly in the proper discharge of our moral obligations, the causes of constitutional government in this country will be seriously endangered. The embargo issue now before Congress has many deeper implications than most of us realize, among them being the recent disgraceful repudiation of the American people, the pleas of whom for the retention of the embargo have been scorned publicly as coming from "inspired sources." In my opinion, this action constituted an unprecedented threat to representative government.

Our eyes now turn to the House of Representatives, where we have good reason to hope are the men of the people—men who have stood aghast and watched one legislative group ignore the voice of America; men who are and should be weary of "being told" and who now prepare to do a little telling on their own account; men whose every decent, democratic impulse cries out against those who are attempting to belittle them as legislative Members. These are the people's representatives, the last guardians of democracy. They will not break faith with us, if we are clear and firm in our expression to them. We have a solemn obligation to call for and register conscientiously, immediately, that expression with our representatives. That expression, my dear American friends, will be our only defense if the youth of this country will not be betrayed again into the European trenches. That expression we pray will be entirely consistent with the recent words of a young man who brought a typical message to our attention. I readdress it direct to the Members of our House of Representatives. It concludes: "Remember, our blood is not for Europe; it is for America only. But in the warmth of our young hearts there is love enough for all men. Please extend that love by keeping and extending the embargo on hate."

In response to that message, I tell my people now that they can never expect to keep faith with their youth if they do not keep faith with Christian morality as pointed out to them. I tell my people now that the time is near when, unless they act quickly, democracy and communism will be at swords' points in America. If war comes (and we may apply it as coming to us), in the words of our Holy Father, "All may be lost." If that time comes, let it not be said that my voice was inarticulate for the right.

Courage now. Do the right thing fearlessly. God bless and keep the America we love.

Peace Proposals of Pope Pius XII and President Roosevelt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 31, 1939

NEWS RELEASE FROM THE NATIONAL CATHOLIC WELFARE COUNCIL NEWS SERVICE

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have published in the RECORD a news release which is a comment on an editorial from the L'Osservatore Romano with reference to the similarity of the peace proposals of Pope Pius XII and those of President Roosevelt.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the National Catholic Welfare Council News Service]

COMMENT ON AN EDITORIAL FROM L'OSSERVATORE WITH REFERENCE TO THE SIMILARITY OF THE PEACE PROPOSALS OF POPE PIUS XII AND PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT

(By Msgr. Enrico Pucci)

VATICAN CITY, October 9.—In his editorial in which he pointed to the "almost literal identity" of the peace proposals put forth by the Holy Father and those suggested by American statesmen, Count Giuseppe Dalla Torre, editor of L'Osservatore Romano, began by saying:

"Every country, large or small, rich or poor, is recognized in the 'family of nations' of America with full equality of rights, of consideration, of relations; discipline for all, individual liberty; the sovereignty of the state, international law, civilization based on justice, inviolability of signed pacts; their revision or reform admitted only through peaceful negotiations."

Then, after mentioning that President Roosevelt in his message to Congress had completed the program enunciated by Secretary of State Cordell Hull with a noble appeal to religion, Osservatore's

editor said that this vade mecum of peaceful consortium expressed in the simple and sober style of practical men cannot but recall other words—the words of the Pope.

"Pius XII," he wrote, "in his Easter allocution, in those to the Sacred College and to the Venetian pilgrims, in the message of August 24, in reply to the Ambassador of Belgium, placed, as a basis, individual order as well as collective and international; the sacrosanct rights of human dignity and the liberty of all creatures; respect for and the teaching of religion; cooperation among individuals, among classes, and among peoples in the proper distribution of the goods and riches that God has profusely given to the world; a mutual understanding among the nations on the common way of civil progress; the safeguarding of the honor and liberty of peoples; the observance of pacts; a policy inspired by morals; justice rendered to the weak no less than to the strong; justice that is affirmed by the force of reason and not by recourse to arms."

"It is impossible," the editorial continued, "not to perceive the almost literal identity of the essential points enumerated by the statesmen of one of the most powerful nations in the world and the principles exposed by the highest spiritual authority on earth. For the sovereign pontiff, teaching springs from revealed truth; for the man of government it springs from concrete experience."

The editor of Osservatore then called upon men in politics to meditate upon this comparison of the two peace proposals, saying that in decisive hours, in times of extreme evils, at the turning point of history, rather of the preservation of civilization and humanity, life, experience, practice has in its cry the accent of the Lord, has in its word the very admonition of God.

The editor then quotes the Holy Father, saying that the Church of Christ is "the inexhaustible source of life for souls," and "the illustrious benefactress of civil consortium."

Attitude of Flint Glass Workers on Reciprocal-Trade Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUSH D. HOLT

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 31, 1939

LETTER BY M. J. GILLOOLY

Mr. HOLT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD a letter in protest against reciprocal-trade agreements written by Mr. M. J. Gillooly, president of the Flint Glass Workers' Union of North America.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the National Glass Budget of October 14, 1939]

FLINT GLASS WORKERS FILE BRIEF AGAINST TRADE TREATY

A vigorous protest against the sacrificing of the best interests of flint glass workers by the creation of a reciprocal-trade agreement between the United States and Belgium was registered in a brief filed by M. J. Gillooly, president of the American Flint Glass Workers Union, on September 26 with the Committee on Reciprocity Information. Text thereof follows:

SEPTEMBER 26, 1939.

COMMITTEE ON RECIPROCITY INFORMATION,
United States Tariff Commission, Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: On behalf of the 35,000 American citizens, dependent for their livelihood on the continued operation of American glassware factories, we most respectfully protest against the reduction of any of the present rates of tariff duties levied on imports of glassware produced in Belgium, Japan, Germany, or other countries, through our entry into a trade treaty with Belgium.

The purposes of the Trade Treaty Act, which provide that through our entry into a trade treaty with a foreign nation such foreign nation will accord the products of the United States of America such additional opportunities for sale in such foreign nation that employment opportunities will be promoted in the United States, cannot be complied with under existing world conditions, especially in Belgium.

The action of those entrusted with the carrying on or the negotiation of trade treaties in alleging or assuming that they believe, through our entry into a trade treaty wtih Belgium, a nation interested at the present time in maintaining its very life, they can increase job opportunities for American workers, only through securing a reduction in our present tariff duties on imports from Belgium, to our mind, well illustrates the hypocrisy which underlies our present trade-treaty policy.

Any reduction in the present tariff duties on glassware articles, through our entry into a trade treaty with Belgium, will benefit only the products of Japan and will enrich only those distributors of Japanese glassware in the American market by depriving American glassware workers of their means of a livelihood.

With Belgium worried about its very existence as a nation, properly fearful of a repetition of what happened in 1914, with almost every European nation bending every effort to enlarge its war machinery, we respectfully protest against our governmental officials, assured of a substantial sized pay check every 2 weeks, inflicting worry, distress, and possible privation upon those American workers dependent for their jobs on the continued operation of the American glassware industry. Our workers have every right to fear that through reduced tariff duties levied on imports of glassware products of Japan, delivered into American stores at total delivered costs which are less than our costs of delivering comparable American glassware articles into the same American stores, they will be deprived of the scant job opportunities they now have.

The interest of American workers, dependent for their job opportunities in the American glassware industry, in tariff matters is not one of theory or possible world peace. With the workers this is a question of bread and butter for the workers and their families. Further, as home owners in many of the small communities wherein these American glassware factories are located, it is a question which vitally interests them as citizens. In many communities the existent glassware factory is the sole means of employment for the workers, the wages of the workers the sole dependence of the local merchants, and, the continuance of the community itself, as such, the continued operation of the glassware factory.

A few years ago the newspapers of the Nation were filled with heart-rending stories of how the coal miners of Pennsylvania, unable to secure work at their trade, resorted to bootlegging coal in order to secure the funds necessary to maintain their families. Many of these workers sacrificed their lives through their ignorance or their inability to properly protect themselves from the caving in of some of these bootleg mines.

The transfer of jobs of American glassware workers to workers in foreign countries, as a result of inadequate tariff protection, has resulted in the creation of a similar, but, thank God, a less dangerout condition among glassware workers in some communities.

Unable to secure work and conversant with their skill and ability to produce hand-blown glassware, comparable to any produced in any country in the world, and desperate to secure work, these unemployed workers, in several cases, have banded together and formed what is termed "cooperative glass companies." In order to get started these workers have drawn from the banks and life-insurance companies their life savings and invested in such cooperative factories. After a short time these workers have found that they cannot secure even a decent wage for themselves because of the low prices at which glassware distributors can purchase comparable articles, the products of workers of foreign countries. In many cases these workers have been disillusioned and have found that the products of their labor, for they have received or taken in wages less than one-half what they would have been paid for the production of similar products in regular glassware factories, must be sold for less than actual costs of production in order to meet the competition of imported articles.

Naturally, when workers themselves find that the products of their skilled labor are not salable in the American market, in competition with the low-wage-produced products of Belgium and Japan, they realize how dependent they are on adequate tariff protection.

We have quite often heard the theorists and well-paid Government officials refer to the small percentage of imports of products of foreign countries compared with what they term "the domestic production," thus, the necessity, to their minds, for reduction in present tariff rates. However, we have never heard either these theorists or well-paid Government officials state what percentage of the American market should be turned over to the control of foreigners while able and willing American citizens are unable to find employment in the production of comparable articles or products.

The American glassware industry is located, for the most part, in small communities in our Midwestern or Central States. The products of the glassware workers are necessarily fragile, and the costs of transportation to the principal consuming markets, especially along the Atlantic coast, are much higher than costs of transportation of comparable glass products of Belgian and Japanese workers to the same markets.

It is our belief that the only item in which the Belgian glassware industry can justly, or should, ask for reductions in tariff duties is on imports of hand-blown ware. From our calculations, taking into consideration the Belgian-declared foreign values of such imports, adding to it the tariff duties levied on such declared foreign values, and adding thereto what we believe is a fair cost of delivering such articles into American markets, we have every reason to believe that at the present time imports of Belgian hand-blown glassware control more than 35 percent of the sales of such glassware in the American market.

Is it fair to contend that with the products of Belgian glassware workers controlling the sale of 35 percent of the American glassware market, in any item that American citizens, dependent for their livelihood on their ability to secure work in American glassware factories, have no reason to worry about the possible reductions which might be made in tariff duties through our entry into this proposed trade treaty with Belgium?

The American glassware workers have reason to question the sincerity or the ability of those handling the negotiating of trade

treaties to properly care for their interests. Some 16 months ago those governmental officials handling the negotiation of trade treaties issued an analysis of their work in consummating a trade treaty with Czechoslovakia. They attempted to show that American production of glassware is largely machine-made, while the competing imports were the product of hand labor. This statement is not only false but, to the American glassware workers, indicates either the lack of interest in or the ignorance these officials possess as to what constitutes American industry today.

The workers in American glassware factories, conversant with the ignorance or lack of interest of those who would issue such a false and deceptive finding of fact, have very little confidence in the willingness or the ability of such Government officials to properly protect the job opportunities of those American workers, many thousands of whom, when employed, produce hand-blown glassware exclusively.

In addition, it might be well for those handling the negotiation of these trade treaties to know that considerable high-grade American pressed glassware, the product of American glassware workers, competes in the American market with the products of workers of foreign countries.

Thousands of our workers have contended that one of the principal purposes of our entry into these trade treaties with foreign countries and the seemingly exclusive policy of reducing our present inadequate tariff duties, is to reduce the wage standards of all American workers.

While President Roosevelt very properly calls upon all American citizens in these troubled times to lend every assistance to their Government, we find the officials of the Department of State inflicting worry and distress upon those American workers dependent for their livelihood on the production of articles which compete in the American market with manufactured products of workers in foreign countries, and, which foreign-made articles may deprive our American workers of their job opportunities, if our present tariff duties are reduced.

When the farcical public hearings were held on the question of our entry into the trade treaty with Czechoslovakia our organization, through Vice President Harry H. Cook, appeared and presented glassware products of Czechoslovakia and comparable articles produced by American workers. He very vividly displayed the difference in delivered costs and demonstrated beyond any reasonable doubt that glassware products produced in foreign countries, comparable to products of American workers, were delivered into American stores at total costs which were less than the costs of producing and transporting comparable American-made articles to the same American stores. Those samples were turned over to your committee.

While those foreign-made articles were the product of Czechoslovakia, similar and comparable samples of Belgian and Japanese glassware articles would tell the same story today.

It might be well for your committee to bear in mind that the wages paid to American glassware workers in the production of hand-blown glassware articles represent some 60 percent of the cost of production of such articles.

We sincerely trust that your committee, in view of the present unsettled world conditions, realizing that the purposes of the legislation which authorizes our entry into trade treaties with foreign nations, cannot now be secured, will have the courage to publicly recommend the indefinite postponement of our negotiation of any more trade treaties, including the present proposed trade treaty with Belgium. By so doing we can assure your committee you will relieve the minds of many thousands of American glassware workers at the present very fearful of the possible loss of their job opportunities.

Respectfully submitted.

AMERICAN FLINT GLASS WORKERS
UNION OF NORTH AMERICA,
By M. J. GILLOOLY, *President*.

Foreign Trade Committee—Tampa Chamber of Commerce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES O. ANDREWS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 31, 1939

ADDRESS BY MARTIN CARABALLO

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered on September 12, 1939, by Martin Caraballo, Esq., before the Foreign Trade Committee, the Pan American League, and the League for Inter-American Relations. Mr. Caraballo is a very distinguished and able lawyer of Tampa, Fla.; he comes from a very distinguished Latin American family, and if there is anyone in that section of the country who is familiar with the question of inter-American relations and how they may be improved, it is Mr. Caraballo. He was recently president of the State bar association and has held many other honorable positions in Florida, to which State he came in his early childhood. I ask that the address referred to be inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, I could begin this talk by using the time honored formula which goes something like this, "Once upon a time the Western Hemisphere," and go on from there because my talk will deal primarily with this part of the world. But as its history is well known to all of you, that part may be omitted. We know that at one time various nations of Europe dominated, if not entirely controlled, the Western Hemisphere. As time went on and men realized more and more that they should be, and actually were, something higher than slaves or beasts of burden, the first cry of their souls was the cry for liberty. The cry for freedom, for the right to live, and for the right to think, gathered momentum, and one by one almost all the nations of the Western Hemisphere secured for themselves the right to live their lives as they saw fit. With the throwing off of the parental yoke came the freedom to trade in the most favorable markets, and at the same time there arose the necessity, on the part of the former "bosses," of wooing these markets, since they were no longer able to force their merchandise down the throats of the liberated people. This courting process, if I may so call it, has not been uniform nor constant but it has steadily progressed. At one time, because of our proximity, we were the favored ones, and while, for the same reason and for others that could be mentioned, we still retain a large part of this trade, we have by no means retained all. When times were good, our merchandise practically sold itself. All we had to do was display it and buyers surged from everywhere with the wish to buy and the money to pay for what they bought. Then came hard times, as hard times have a habit of recurring, and no longer were sales automatic. A buyer's market necessarily resulted with the consumer holding the purse strings. In this situation European countries, and particularly Germany, renewed their assaults upon those markets and by the use of numerous devices increased the infiltration of their merchandise in what we smugly had called our market. And then the pinch began to be felt. No longer were we able to say "take it or leave it" because we had to meet strong competition, a competition carried on, it is true, with merchandise produced with what amounts to slave labor and at other times with merchandise of inferior quality. No one, and least of all myself, would like to lower the standards of living which obtain in our country and, hence, if the people to the south of us considered price more important than quality, then there was nothing we could do about it unless we intended to embark on a program of education which, besides being costly, was rendered very difficult because of the diversity of language. Awakened to the situation, we continued to fight for our markets, with here and there a victory, here and there a loss. And this brings us down to September 3, 1939.

On that day a new and alluring vista appeared in the horizon of our commerce. You have no doubt read of the discontinuance of the services to South and Central America by certain European air lines. You, of course, know that the superiority of the British and French Fleets of war have driven German commerce from the seas. No longer will it be possible for Germany to continue to exploit those markets. Great Britain and France have their troubles and need their ships for other purposes. Internal conditions being what they are in a country at war, all efforts must be bent to the production and importation of war material; there is little or no time to produce merchandise for sale.

This then is the picture today and this then is our opportunity today. Argentina finds a ready sale for its beef and wheat, and other countries for their minerals and foodstuffs. It is reasonable to assume that, at least for the duration of the war, prosperity will descend upon our southern neighbors. They therefore will have the means with which to buy what we produce. The question that arises in my mind is, Are we going to tackle this new opportunity in the same way in which we mismanaged those we have had before? The answer to this depends upon whether we have learned to understand our Latin neighbors or whether we are going to sit back and depend upon a seller's market where our goods will again sell themselves from sheer necessity. If we follow this latter course, rest assured that we will prosper only for as long as war exists and just as surely go back to the doldrums when the war is ended. On the other hand, if we have learned our lesson, or even if we simply desire to learn what we overlooked before, then there is hope, in fact almost a certainty, that we will be able to keep our markets after the war is over.

I think the first lesson that we should learn is the fact that each nation has the inherent right to live its own life as it thinks best. We do not look with favor upon Russia in its attempt to force communism upon the world, nor those of Germany to force its Nazi doctrines outside of its own borders. If this is so, are we consistent when we try to force the Latin American republics to do business our way, to think our way, and to act our way? No; decidedly no. In my own feeble way I shall attempt to show you some of the particulars in which we have failed to understand our Latin neighbors.

Let me sketch for you two of the leading members of your club. There is Smith, an able man, a man of sound principle and ideas, who has made a great success of his business. Smith, however, is so imbued with his own importance that he is constantly extolling his shrewdness and successes. He is afraid that you may not have heard the things that he has accomplished so he embarks on their description with slight or no provocation and his talks revolve around the vertical pronoun. On the other hand there is Brown, a man equally as capable, just as successful, or perhaps more so, than Smith. It is difficult to draw out of Brown anything pertaining to himself. He has the rare attribute of modesty, not the modesty that is sometimes confused with an inferiority complex but the modesty of the strong, the modesty of a man who is sure of his ground but who believes that there are many other men as capable as he, a thing which Smith is not willing to concede, except for the grudging admission that, if there are other such men, he has not heard of them. You know both of these men, they are prototypes of their respective schools of thought and you will find them in all the walks of life.

With that picture before you, is it any wonder that the crowds around Brown are larger and more respectful and attentive than the numbers that congregate around Smith? Perhaps one of the greatest reasons why we have not been able to capture the South American markets is that we, as a nation, are suffering from the same inflated ego of our friend Smith. Because our mode of living is different, because we like our way of doing business, and because we are rather pleased with ourselves, we have not stopped to consider that the ways of the Latin businessman are just as dear to him as ours are to ourselves. We become impatient at what we are pleased to describe as their slowness, their "mañanas." Did it ever occur to you that they can think and reason as well as we, and that perhaps the terrific pace that we have established for ourselves is considered by them as a mild form of insanity, pathetic in its own futility? They live and love and progress, but above all they lead happier lives than we do, since they are not obsessed with the idea that money is made only to be piled up, and believe that it should be made for the happiness it will bring to themselves and to their fellow man. To one who knows both points of view, theirs is the saner existence.

One of the finer qualities of our southern neighbors is their unfailing courtesy, something which, at least in our larger cities, is fast disappearing. Some of us go to the point of believing that courtesy is a sign of weakness. I have no quarrel with those who hold such a belief so long as they keep it to themselves or exhibit it only toward those who are themselves lacking in courtesy. Our fatal error is in crediting the Latin courtesy to weakness instead of giving it its true value which is that this sign of good breeding is the outward manifestation of a desire to live at peace with others. In this sense our friend Brown is courteous while I am afraid that Smith falls far short.

From a purely commercial point of view, is it wise to mock those who buy from us? You can find the answer to this question by asking yourselves another one; how long would you continue to deal with your grocer if he would let you see that in his opinion, you are a weak sister? How long would you continue to deal with such a man if he went to great pains in telling you how far superior to you he considered himself? It didn't take you 10 seconds to answer those questions, did it? Why is it then that our businessmen have not found the same answer in the many years that they have been dealing with Latin America? They appear not to be acquainted with a Latin proverb which, as most of them are, is a mirror of truth, and I quote, "Courtesy does not detract from valor."

Another of our pet peeves with the Latin businessman in his generosity with his friends, and we sometimes lose patience with them when we see that they have not chosen to buy our product but have purchased from a friend what is perhaps inferior merchandise. Our very souls rebel at the thought that we have lost a sale to such a rival. Friendship counts but little in our business life; it is the mainspring of the Latin temperament. How much wiser would it be to cultivate his friendship and thereby gain his good will than to stand on the side lines watching our sales fall off and venting our chagrin in mental castigation of the man who dealt with his friend at a monetary sacrifice. Wise men have said that it is only the truth that hurts and of course any criticism of ourselves is unpopular, as unpopular as I am perhaps making myself at this moment, but we must be made to understand that we can never expect to have the friendship of the people to the south of us until we ourselves become friendly. If this be treason, then make the best of it. Not long ago I was a guest in a very prominent club in the city of New York and heard a man boast of how he had cleaned out his friend. "I took him to the cleaners" were his words, and yet the victim was a man who had called upon this vulture in a social way and whose families were very friendly with each other. Is this business? If so, the Latin man wants none of it. We are an able and intelligent people, of this there can be no doubt, and yet we close our minds to the many admirable qualities of the Latin people.

A question may arise in the minds of some of us as to how we are to obtain knowledge of the customs, habits, likes, and dislikes of the Latin people without going to South and Central America. The answer is in your own community. It can be just as truly found here as in any other American city where Latin people congregate and live. The book is open to you; you have but to glance at its pages. We are prone to criticize these people because they live together forming their own communities and do not freely mingle with our people. This, however, is only true of the older generations, for the younger generations have been assimilated into our life and we are just as familiar with the names of Fernandez, Garcia, Gonzalez, and numerous others as we are with Brown, Smith, and Jones, and as the offspring of these younger generations increase more and more will these names be written into the pages of our history. Turning then to the older generations, is it strange that they should congregate together? They came to America as the land of promise, loving its liberty and freedom, mainly because it did not exist where they came from, but they spoke a different language, their habits and customs were different, and they found a friendlier greeting among their own kind than they found among the rest of us. Their living together is not strange; what is strange is that they have not become embittered. Having an understanding mind they have overlooked our deficiencies, conceding us the right to make mistakes, something which apparently we are not willing to concede to them. The younger generations born and raised in our country are not different than your children or mine. Study, then, their fathers and mothers if you really wish to know what the Latin people are like.

The Latin business and professional men possess a certain amount of innate dignity, and because we are a more democratic people and dislike anything that savors of stiffness, we are apt to classify them as "stuffed shirts," and we are wrong. The native dignity of the Latin is a concomitant of his courtesy and is the natural result of his desire to avoid the unseemly. Properly understood and treated, it adds charm and stature; treat it lightly or sarcastically and you have lost a friend.

Let me draw you another picture. Your doorbell rings, and when you answer it you find a man holding in his hands something which it is apparent to you he is trying to sell you; but lo! and behold! when he opens his mouth, strange sounds come from it indicative of a foreign language. He speaks no English, although, perhaps, he can say, "Best in the world," or at least something that sounds like that to you. Are you likely to buy what he has, when around the corner there is a man who speaks your language and who keeps merchandise somewhat similar to what this man is selling, but with which merchandise you are more familiar? The answer is obvious, isn't it? You will, of course, tell him "No" in such a tone of voice as his good looks, or lack of good looks, prompts you to use; but just the same it will be "No." Isn't it strange, then, that a number of our large national commercial enterprises send to Latin America managers—and, yes, even salesmen—who have no knowledge of Spanish or, at best, a very imperfect rudimentary knowledge of that language? This is not a new situation. It has been going on for decades. Yet we have not taken the trouble of teaching our emissaries the language of the people whose business they are going over there to seek.

By this time most of you will have come to the conclusion that I am holding a brief for the Latin people. Frankly, I am. Apart from the fact that I can never forget that those to whom I owe my very existence were and are Latins, and that I am just as proud of my Latin ancestry as I am of my American citizenship. I recognize their virtues, without thereby overlooking their faults, for perfection in humanity has not yet been reached, and the happenings of recent weeks in Europe can well cause one to ponder if it will ever be achieved, even in a relative sense. I have merely given you the benefit of my observation of some of the particulars in which we have failed to understand the Latin temperament.

The above is not all. Even the most strict observance of all that I have pointed out will do nothing more than give you the social approach to those markets. Cuba, Mexico, South and Central America jointly form a vast country, one republic alone, that of Brazil, containing approximately three and a quarter million square miles with a population of over 40,000,000 inhabitants. Out of a total population of over 100,000,000 perhaps only 15 or 20 percent are able to consume a share of all of the goods we manufacture, but even a complete market of only fifteen or twenty million persons is something to think about. On the other hand, all of them need some of our products. The first and perhaps the most important thing is the development of their resources, thereby increasing their purchasing power. Their vast natural resources are almost untouched. The crying need is for the capital to exploit them and the experience to direct such enterprises. Here is where we can be of help to them and thereby of help to ourselves. This, however, is not as simple as it sounds. The shrewd investor demands security for his capital. Because the last American frontier has been crossed, pioneering work has been completed, and hence we have settled down to doing business on a solid businesslike foundation. If we desire this form of ironclad security, we will lose those markets more and more to other powers who are content to pioneer. European powers, notably Germany, have not hesitated to penetrate that country with a system of barters and of development work. Are we to lose our most natural geographical markets simply because they are not yet ready to do business our way?

We have sustained losses in foreign investments, it is true, but have we not likewise sustained losses in domestic development work? Does not the so-called ironclad security at times become mere scraps of paper? Are not our courts crowded with litigation of investors trying to save something from the wreck? No one can deny this, but there is this distinction; we take our home losses in our stride but when we lose on foreign investments we set up a hue and cry for the Federal Government and the marines. I fully believe that more intelligent management, a better cooperation with the native officials, a genuine desire to understand their problems, and a toning down of our superiority complex will keep

down those losses to the level of the normal hazard of such enterprises. After all, it is axiomatic that greater risks go hand in hand with greater profits.

There is another reason why we should try to be on good terms with our southern neighbors and it is by no means a commercial one. We cannot act as an international policeman nor can we, as did Don Quixote, set out to right all wrongs. We, therefore, must come to the conclusion that our national safety lies in the close cooperation of the people of the Western Hemisphere. The isolation provided by the oceans will mean nothing if warlike European nations establish a foothold in the Western Hemisphere, thereby bringing to our doors their brutal and barbaric methods of conquest, conquests not dictated by the will of the people but by the whim of an arrogant lunatic whose mere existence is proof that our vaunted civilization is still in its infancy. The American Republics to the south of us look upon us as their natural leader, not only because of our commanding position as a world power and our leadership in the world of finance and commerce but also because of our genuine love of freedom, a love of freedom which they know is not just a catch phrase, a love of freedom which is separated by a vast gulf from the so-called "liberation of minorities" of which we hear so much at present. Because we are powerful the greater the necessity of enlightened cooperation with those nations, thereby earning not their fear and the hate which it engenders, but the love and respect of brothers united by a common cause. We can earn the respect of these nations by eschewing all intolerance and by exhibiting the desire to understand.

I have heard the question asked, Where does all this help Tampa or even Florida? I cannot say, of course, what benefit we may derive in dollars and cents, except to say that because of our geographical location we are bound to receive our share of such commerce. But I feel that even if we profit not one cent in money we will receive a vastly greater benefit from such improved relations. In common with the other States of the Union, we will share in the security, peace, and contentment of the Western Hemisphere. Let us as a Nation so comport ourselves toward our southern neighbors and toward the world that whenever anyone puts together alternate stripes of red and white and sews upon one corner a square of blue sprinkled with five-pointed stars, a transformation will immediately occur. Gone will be the bunting lately held in his hands and there shall arise from his labors a symbol of freedom, of peace, and of harmony. A symbol under whose protecting folds the harassed and worried sons of man can find a haven of rest, a symbol of what is good to live for, a symbol of what is worthy of dying for.

National Nonpartisan Committee for Peace Through Revision of the Neutrality Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES F. BYRNES

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 31, 1939

TELEGRAM BY WILLIAM ALLEN WHITE AND LIST OF MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a telegram by William Allen White inviting participation in the National Nonpartisan Committee for Peace Through Revision of the Neutrality Law, and a list of those who have joined the organization.

There being no objection, the telegram and list were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Will you join with me and several hundred others in a National Nonpartisan Committee for Peace Through Revision of the Neutrality Law?

The present Senate bill to revise the neutrality law goes as far as human ingenuity can to lessen the danger of American involvement. Moreover, by repealing the arms embargo our country is no longer aiding Hitler to the disadvantage of the democracies who are resisting the spread of dictatorship.

Obviously debate may reveal places where the present Senate bill may be improved but we are inviting you to join us on the principle of this bill and the international aims which will be secured by the application of that principle.

The American Union for Concerted Peace Efforts will act as the committee's secretariat. Address me at 8 West Fortieth Street, New York City.

WILLIAM ALLEN WHITE.

NONPARTISAN COMMITTEE FOR PEACE THROUGH REVISION OF THE NEUTRALITY LAW, WILLIAM ALLEN WHITE, CHAIRMAN

James Truslow Adams, Southport, Conn.
Cyrus Adler, president, Jewish Theological Seminary of America.
Allen D. Albert, sociologist and past president, International Association of Rotary Clubs.
Gordon W. Allport, professor, Harvard, University.
Mrs. Larz Anderson, Washington, D. C.
Henry A. Atkinson, general secretary, World Alliance for International Friendship Through the Churches.
Frank Aydelotte, president, Swarthmore College.
Mrs. Dana Converse Backus, Port Washington, L. I.
Tallulah Bankhead, New York, N. Y.
George Gordon Battle, New York City.
James Baxter III, president, Williams College.
Harry Best, professor, University of Kentucky.
Charles E. Beury, president, Temple University.
Mrs. Emmons Blaine, Chicago, Ill.
Frank G. Boudreau, Milbank Memorial Fund.
Raymond D. Bragg, First Unitarian Society.
Mrs. Henry Breckenridge, New York City.
Mrs. Arthur Brin, past president, National Council of Jewish Women.
Arlo Ayers Brown, president, Drew University.
Mrs. Edward Browning, Philadelphia, Pa.
John S. Bryan, president, William and Mary College.
Henry M. Busch, professor, Cleveland College, Western Reserve University.
Robert H. Cabell, Chicago, Ill.
Henry Seidel Canby, professor, Yale University.
Newcomb Carlton, chairman of the board, Western Union Telegraph Co.
Carrie Chapman Catt, honorary chairman, National Committee on the Cause and Cure of War.
Zechariah Chafee, Jr., professor, Harvard University.
Harry Chandler, publisher, Los Angeles Times.
Harry Woodburn Chase, chancelor, New York University.
W. L. Clayton, Houston, Tex.
Rufus E. Clement, president, Atlanta University.
Robert C. Clothier, president, Rutgers University.
Henry Sloane Coffin, president, Union Theological Seminary.
Martin J. Collins, president, Graham Paper Co., St. Louis.
W. W. Comfort, president, Haverford College.
Frederic R. Coudert, New York City.
William H. Cowley, president, Hamilton College.
Paul Cruikshank, head master, Taft School.
George B. Cutton, president, Colgate University.
Harvey N. Davis, president, Stevens Institute.
Rufus C. Dawes, Chicago, Ill.
Munroe E. Deutsch, provost, University of California.
Robert C. Dexter, secretary, Department of Social Relations, American Unitarian Association.
Hoyt M. Dobbs, Episcopal bishop, Birmingham, Ala.
Melvyn Douglas, Hollywood, Calif.
Paul H. Douglas, professor, University of Chicago.
Michael Francis Doyle, Philadelphia, Pa.
J. Roscoe Drummond, editor, Christian Science Monitor.
Stephen Duggan, Institute of International Education, New York City.
J. Stanley Durkee, Plymouth Church of the Pilgrims, Brooklyn, N. Y.
Clyde Eagleton, New York University.
Frederick H. Ecker, chairman of the board, Metropolitan Life Insurance Co.
Sherwood Eddy, New York City.
William A. Eddy, president, Hobart College.
Frederick M. Eliot, Boston, Mass.
Samuel A. Eliot, Arlington Street Church, Boston, Mass.
Haven Emerson, Columbia University.
Silas Evans, president, Ripon College, Ripon, Wis.
Frederick L. Fagley, General Council of Congregational and Christian Churches, New York City.
Geraldine Farrar, Ridgefield, Conn.
Samuel S. Fels, president, Fels and Co., Philadelphia, Pa.
Charles G. Fenwick, Bryn Mawr College.
Marshall Field, New York City.
Thomas K. Finletter, New York City.
Morris Fishbein, editor, Journal of American Medical Association.
Edgar J. Fisher, Institute of International Education.
Dorothy Canfield Fisher, Arlington, Vt.
D. F. Fleming, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tenn.
Guy Stanton Ford, dean, Graduate School, University of Minnesota.
Douglas S. Freeman, editor, Richmond News-Leader, Richmond, Va.
Alfred C. Fuller, president, Fuller Brush Co.
Helen Gahagan, Hollywood, Calif.
Francis P. Gaines, president, Washington and Lee University.
Frank S. Gaines, Berkeley, Calif.
James W. Gerard, New York City.
Mrs. Douglas Gibbons, New York City.
Virginia Gildersleeve, dean, Barnard College.
Arthur J. Goldsmith, New York City.
R. K. Gooch, professor, University of Virginia.
Mrs. Henry F. Grady, Washington, D. C.
Frank P. Graham, president, University of North Carolina.

John Temple Graves II, the Birmingham (Ala.) News.
Clifton D. Gray, president, Bates College.
Samuel R. Guard, editor, the Breeders Gazette.
John Gunther, Washington, D. C.
William B. Hale, Chicago, Ill.
Grover C. Hall, editor, Montgomery (Ala.) Advertiser.
Helen Hall, Henry Street Settlement, New York City.
Roswell G. Ham, president, Mount Holyoke College.
Henry I. Harriman, chairman of the board, New England Power Association, and past president United States Chamber of Commerce.
Arthur A. Hauck, president, University of Maine.
Arthur Garfield Hays, New York City.
Victor G. Heiser, New York City.
A. D. Henderson, president, Antioch College.
Mrs. Elinore M. Herrick, New York City.
Mrs. William G. Hibbard, Winnetka, Ill.
Melvin D. Hildreth, Washington, D. C.
Hamilton Holt, president, Rollins College.
Ernest Martin Hopkins, president, Dartmouth College.
Walter M. Howlett, secretary, Greater New York Federation of Churches.
L. H. Hubbard, president, Texas State College for Women.
Walter Hullihen, president, University of Delaware.
Wiley Lin Hurie, president, College of Ozarks, Arkansas.
Franklin W. Johnson, president, Colby College.
Fannie Hurst, New York City.
S. Shepard Jones, World Peace Foundation, Boston, Mass.
Paul Kellogg, editor, the Survey Graphic.
Paul B. Kern, Methodist Episcopal bishop, Nashville, Tenn.
Frank Kingdon, president, Newark University.
Freda Kirchwey, editor, the Nation.
Col. Frank Knox, publisher, the Chicago Daily News.
Mrs. James Lees Laidlaw, New York City.
James M. Landis, dean, Harvard Law School.
William Lassiter, major general (retired), United States Army, Santa Barbara, Calif.
Roberta Campbell Lawson, former president, Federation of Women's Clubs.
Morris S. Lazaron, rabbi, Baltimore, Md.
Max Lerner, professor, Williams College.
William Draper Lewis, director of American Law Institute.
Irene Lewisohn, New York City.
Arthur O. Lovejoy, professor, Johns Hopkins University.
William T. Manning, Episcopal bishop of New York.
Daniel L. Marsh, president, Boston University.
Mrs. Eleanor Wilson McAdoo, Santa Monica, Calif.
Frederick C. McKee, Pittsburgh, Pa.
Peter Molyneaux, publisher, the Texas Weekly.
Hugh Moore, chairman of the board, Dixie-Vortex Co.
Walden Moore, professor, University of Rochester.
George W. Morgan, St. Paul, Minn.
Felix Morley, editor, Washington Post.
Mrs. Dwight W. Morrow, acting president, Smith College.
Mrs. E. K. Morrow, Salina, Kans.
J. L. Newcombe, president, University of Virginia.
G. Bernard Noble, professor, Reed College, Portland, Oreg.
G. Nollen, president, Bankers Life Co., Des Moines, Iowa.
J. S. Nollen, president, Grinnell College, Grinnell, Iowa.
George Norlin, president emeritus, University of Colorado.
G. Ashton Oldham, Episcopal bishop, Albany, N. Y.
William Church Osborn, New York City.
Marion Park, president, Bryn Mawr College.
James G. Patton, member executive committee, Farmers Education and Cooperative Union of America.
Lewis Perry, principal, Phillips Exeter Academy.
Joseph H. Proskauer, former justice of the Supreme Court of New York.
Mrs. Ogden Reid, New York City.
Aurelia Henry Reinhardt, president, Mills College.
F. D. G. Ribble, dean, University of Virginia.
Edward G. Robinson, Hollywood, Calif.
Henrietta Roelofs, president, National Peace Conference.
Chester H. Rowell, San Francisco, Calif.
George Rublee, Washington, D. C.
William F. Russell, dean, Teachers College, Columbia University.
Monsignor John A. Ryan, professor, Catholic University, Washington, D. C.
George C. St. John, headmaster, Choate School.
Harry Scherman, president, Book-of-the-Month Club.
William Jay Schieffelin, New York City.
Walter Dill Scott, president emeritus, Northwestern University.
Ellery Sedgewick, Boston, Mass.
Henry D. Sharpe, president, Brown & Sharpe Manufacturing Co.
Guy Emery Shipler, editor, the Churchman.
Father Maurice Sheehy, Catholic University, Washington, D. C.
Robert E. Sherwood, New York City.
James T. Shotwell, professor, Columbia University.
Kenneth C. M. Sills, president, Bowdoin College.
Minot Simons, All Souls Unitarian Church, New York City.
Robert G. Sproul, president, University of California.
Anson Phelps Stokes, Washington, D. C.
Clarence K. Streit, New York City.
Herbert Bayard Swope, New York City.
Horace D. Taft, head master, Taft School.
Ida M. Tarbell, New York City.
Dorothy Thompson, New York City.
E. B. Tucker, president, Austin College.
Clifton M. Utley, director, Chicago Conference of Foreign Relations.
Tertius Van Dyke, head master, Gunnery School.
George E. Vincent, former president, Rockefeller Foundation.
Sarah Wambaugh, Cambridge, Mass.
W. W. Waymack, editor, Des Moines Register.
Herman B. Wells, president of University of Indiana.
Stephen S. Wise, rabbi, Free Synagogue, New York City.
A. F. Whitney, president, Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen.
C. C. Williams, president, Lehigh University.
R. E. Wood, chairman of the board, Sears, Roebuck & Co.
Mary E. Woolley, president emeritus, Mount Holyoke College.
Quincy Wright, professor, University of Chicago.

Farmers Union Convention, Glasgow, Mont.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURTON K. WHEELER

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 31, 1939

ADDRESS BY M. W. THATCHER

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the address delivered by Mr. M. W. Thatcher, national legislative representative for the Farmers Union. Mr. Thatcher spoke to the Farmers Union Convention in Glasgow, Mont.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, my friends and delegates to the 1939 convention of the Farmers Union of Montana, ladies and gentlemen of the radio audience, I wish you could know how pleased I am to be back here again with you and thus enjoy the opportunity to talk as frankly and realistically as I know how about things as they have been and are today. The only reason conditions in this farm State and other farm States are not better than they are is because too many people are too lazy to think.

We could feel differently about this if nearly all of the people of this State belonged to some organization trying to do something about the intolerable state of affairs. But the cold fact is there is only one farm organization in this State, and out of some 50,000 farmers only 5,000 farmers belong to that farm organization. Put it another way—this means that 45,000 farmers out of 50,000 are not paying dues into an organization which is giving all of its time and energy trying to meet the problems of this State and all the other States of the Union. Maybe the Farmers Union is not the organization they want; maybe a better one can be set up. If so, it ought to be done.

The only point we are trying to make is that no individual can be worth a whoop in meeting a national calamity. He must join an association with other people, accept chosen leadership to carry on the battle for reforms that are required to protect him in his industry as a farmer, a storekeeper, a professional man, or what have you. To put it another way, individualism is not only impotent, it is dead as a door nail.

Conversely, the people organized can have anything they demand. No sympathy can be wasted on the individual who cries, "They have done me wrong." He is only entitled to sympathy if he is awake, studies, and participates in joint movement with his class to demand corrections in the national economy that are required if the farmer, or the banker, or the businessman, or the professional man is to survive. That's the essence of democracy. For those who do not want a democracy, who do not want liberty, free speech and those blessed things which have been lost in most of the world, of course, they are doing the proper thing by remaining individualists and not belonging to any organization.

There can be no purpose of a convention such as this if we don't frankly and realistically deal with the problem we have tried to present in these opening remarks. We challenge any man in Montana; we challenge any woman in Montana; we challege any adult anywhere in the United States to ask the question, "How are we to get out of the economic mess in which we now find ourselves, except in joint action?" We study the problems, debate the problems, and agree, under a majority-rule system, what is likely to be the best for the country. Individuals must support such an activity by being a part of such an activity, if there can be any hope of correcting what is admittedly unbearable in this Nation today.

Farm prices below the cost of production; ten to fifteen million people unemployed; farmers continuing to go busted over the Nation, being dispossessed of their farms; unemployed people being dispossessed of their homes; college graduates and professional

people forced onto the relief rolls; business stagnant; money afraid to go into circulation; fear all over the land; war all about us—what in the world is required to shake the sense of people to bring them to a realization that they can no longer remain individualistic or aloof from these wrecking problems; make them realize security for each depends upon his joining the other in joint action for correction.

Now, these statements are true and everyone who listens to them knows they are true. Everybody accepts them as being true, but too few people have energy enough to think and join in common action to work out the required corrections and insist upon their being put into operation. Now, what group of people have been doing something about this national calamity? What people have been doing something about it? Who has not done anything about it? What has been done and what is to be done?

Now, we are going into that. That's why we are here. That's why we have a farmers union. That's why it holds a convention. That's what it is all about. If you people of the radio audience will give us 1 hour of your time out of the year, you still may not feel like urging farmers to join our organization, but you will learn something about what has been done for your State and what we intend to do during the next year for the State of Montana, all its people, and the people in the other States. Just be patient with us for a few moments.

Did you know, or did you realize, that when that little fellow with the little mustache carried a keg of dynamite into Poland on September 1 that you probably said goodbye to one-quarter of the market for your wheat? Does it mean anything to cut your wheat production from 60,000,000 bushels down to 45,000,000 bushels? Does it mean anything to the State of Montana to lose a market for 15,000,000 bushels of wheat? Does it mean anything to the State to have lost ten to fifteen million dollars of wheat income? Did you realize that when that little fellow with the little mustache started blowing up Poland that it caused the tobacco market in the United States to close up? That thousands of farm families in the tobacco States who depend upon the sale of their tobacco, all in one day found they could not sell 1 pound of their tobacco? Did you know, or do you know, that one-third of our tobacco crop is annually bought by England and on that one day in September England blandly announced that she would buy no more tobacco?

To put it another way, hard-working, persevering farm families, growing their hazardous crop of tobacco, which requires so much work and for which they have been so pitifully paid, in one day found themselves confronted with closed tobacco markets and not a pound could they sell. Down on their arms went their heads, fathers and mothers and children, weeping, wondering from where would come the money with which to keep alive, to keep the home. Through the years they have built up the farm home, cared for their soil, been doing what they thought was right. Then, in a single day, one man, with one thought, with one purpose, moved a great nation over into another nation and began blowing its people out of their homes. The people who were fighting were losing. The people who were shelled were losing. The tobacco farmers were losing.

The same is true of cotton for over half of its crop. It is true in corn and hog production for parts of its crop. It is true with all of our surplus crops including wheat. Does that mean anything to the United States? Does that mean anything to the tobacco States, the cotton States, the corn States, the wheat States? What is to be done about it?

Well, a great deal has been done about it by organized farmers and a friendly New Deal government. Just this week the tobacco market has been opened for those poor tobacco farmers, thousands and thousands of those farm families, because of the farm legislation which organized farmers had carried through Congress. There is a Commodity Credit Corporation because we supported the appropriation for its operations. It has money to work with. The Commodity Credit Corporation, with that money, has gone to the relief of the tobacco growers. It is too long a story to tell over this radio. It is real life's story for those poor tobacco growers. It is a human story of the fight made through the years, to put on the statute books the laws that could meet any impact suffered from the action of an international bandit.

The Commodity Credit Corporation, with its millions and millions, has now worked out an agreement with England and in this country, so that the farmers now can store away their tobacco and receive for it a higher price than was being paid for it just before their tobacco market closed. If the international mess continues, we will have to use these national programs and the funds appropriated to meet the continuing distressing problems of the cotton farmer also, and that problem is now worse because of the war situation abroad. It is going to be true of the other surplus commodities, and here I should pause to call the roll and I am going to be what some people might call mean about it. What have the private grain and livestock commission firms been doing about this through these years? What have the "line elevators" been doing about these problems through these years? What have the unorganized farmers been doing about these problems through these years? It is only the organized groups that have been busy through these years. It is only the organized farmers, through their spokesmen, who have done anything about it through these years. The Farmers Union has been in the forefront of that work and development through these years. What if there had been no farm organizations? What if there had been no cooperatives to carry on this work? Where would we find the wheat farmers of the spring-wheat area today? Where would the cotton farmers be today? Where would the tobacco farmers be today? Where would the dairy farmers and all the others be today? They would be far worse off than they are. Thousands upon thousands of them would have been off the farms. To be frank about it, no one dare deny that except for this work of the national farm organizations and the cooperatives, we would have had revolution all over this country.

In view of all this, I ask, "Why do farmers continue to support systems of marketing which are either unfriendly to the things we are here discussing, or are neutral or indifferent and do nothing about these problems?" I can stand here before you and talk to the people over the radio and testify as to the facts, because I have been at the arena where for many years this battle was being fought out, and that fight is in the arena at your National Capitol, Washington, D. C. Through these years, there have been the different farm programs proposed. These programs have been brought before the committees of Congress, where those who wish may testify for the program, or against it. Never once in all these years have the representatives of the private grain or livestock commission companies, or the "line-elevator" companies, or any other of them, appeared before these committees of Congress in support of any of these national farm programs that are now more than ever needed to protect agriculture against complete collapse.

Is it unfair to state the truth? The only time that any of these groups have ever appeared before committees, their testimony has been in opposition to the corrections which we were seeking. They fought us for 3 years against the enactment of the Commodity Exchange Act, which now, today, most members of these grain exchanges admit has brought great improvement and greater integrity into the market places. That was the National Farmers' Union fight, and I know because I lived with that legislation for 3 years, and I know about some of the money that was collected and sent to Washington to defeat that legislation; I know that you put up your money year after year to support it. Your good money won the battle against their foul money. The only grain organization in the whole Northwest that has been putting time and money into this program for national legislation is the Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association and its affiliated farmers' elevators out over the Northwest. The only livestock house which has been supporting this program for national legislation is the Farmers Union Livestock Commission Co. The only cooperative sales agency doing business with the farmers, in carrying supplies to them, which has supported this national program for agricultural improvement, has been the Farmers Union Central Exchange, and its affiliated cooperative oil companies. Put it down in your notebook because that's the actual history. In this whole spring-wheat area, the three organizations I have enumerated, that is, the Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association, the Farmers Union Livestock Commission Co., and the Farmers Union Central Exchange, together with their affiliated cooperative elevators, livestock-shipping associations, and cooperative oil stations, are the ones—and the only ones—which have contributed their energy and their funds to the enactment of the group of laws now on the statutes of the Federal Government; laws to help the farmers through the past few years, and to help farmers meet the international and national impacts which now threaten so much destruction to their annual income account.

Now, this being true—and it is true—will you people of Montana tell me one reason why there is any farmer who is thinking in Montana who would fail to belong to the Farmers Union and to support the cooperative grain-marketing and livestock-marketing agencies, or who would fail to support the cooperative bulk-oil stations, operated under the banner of the Farmers Union Central Exchange? If what we have stated is true—and it is true—why can't we expect to treble our business in the next year? Professional men of Montana, businessmen of Montana, where do you get your money? Our organizations are working as much for you as anyone else because you receive the farmer's dollar. Why aren't you all supporting this movement? If it needs improvement, why don't you tell us what to do to improve it? If you don't like its name, maybe it ought to be changed. If you don't like its leadership, help the farmers correct the leadership and get those who are better able to serve. All we are attempting to do is to pose the question: How can Montana improve its economic situation? How can any State improve its economic situation? How can all the States improve their economic situation? There can be only one way, and that's through organized, intelligent effort; through study, debate, concluded judgment, and backing leadership to represent that judgment, and furnishing funds to carry on the work. That's just all there is to it. You will live or decay, as you meet that proposition.

Now, let's analyze that a little further. Net earnings from our cooperative institutions are used for just two purposes, and those are, to expand the usefulness of cooperative distribution on the one hand, and to use some of the earnings to carry on our educational and legislative work to improve the economic conditions of all. We covered this in our address last year. We mentioned the portending things that were hanging over us. There is no need to repeat it here, but the fears we expressed in our appearance before you a year ago are now realities, and we are threatened with a new type of ideology, just as we discussed it a year ago.

Now, let's review the year's work. This is the time we give an accounting of our year's work. Last year this convention of the Farmers Union of Montana adopted specific resolutions to guide the work for the ensuing year. Other Farmers Union States did the same thing, and, finally, the National Farmers Union, in its annual

convention, adopted resolutions to guide its work for the ensuing year. It is those adopted programs of a year ago which directed our work during the year. Now, let's quickly review the high spots of that program you adopted a year ago and let's account for what has been done about it. Your organized folks did the only thing that can be done. First, you paid your dues, and then as you worked through your locals and counties you came up finally to your State convention a year ago. There you adopted your program. Then you folks contributed your pennies and your nickels and your dimes to a legislative fund, and our local cooperative associations over the Northwest contributed their dollars, and then our business activities, with headquarters at St. Paul, contributed their large sums, and out of it all we had a working force working on a definite program, and the funds with which to carry on the work; and that's the way we get things done.

So, again repeating, let's account for your orders as to what you wanted done. Now, you people of the radio audience, please be patient with us and follow a 13-point program adopted by the farmers of your State a year ago and which we have worked on during the past year, and let's see what's been done about it.

No. 1. Continued relief payments until required corrections are effectuated: Well, it took a great deal of hard work and a lot of money to get the appropriation for the Farm Security Administration to continue its good work. The lower House of Congress was very niggardly about this, but we fought it out in the Senate and in the end won our fight for the full appropriation, and that was an amount of many millions of dollars in excess of the Government's projected Budget. So we completely won on point No. 1. That means that during the past year, and during the coming year, thousands of farm families in the State of Montana without funds will continue to receive help from the Federal Government, and they will take that money down on Main Street and buy food and clothing, medical supplies, etc. Main Street, as well as the farmers, should rejoice over this. Some of that money even gets into the State treasury and helps carry some of the tax load that otherwise would be imposed on the more fortunate farmers who still can pay taxes.

No. 2. Debt adjustment based on ability to pay: As you well know, I was designated by the National Board of the Farmers Union to act as chairman of a committee to deal with this question, and I was ably assisted by our North Dakota president, Mr. Glenn J. Talbott, and Mr. K. W. Hones, president of the Farmers Union of Wisconsin. It was not long after this job had been committed to our committee that our debt-adjustment bill was introduced in the Congress of the United States, known as Senate bill No. 2549, by Senator BURTON K. WHEELER. Of course, there was a great deal of work incident to the preparation of this bill and, of course, we had our 4 years of debt-adjustment work to fall back on as a basis for preparing the bill. There have been no hearings on that bill as yet, but oh, what has happened since? Shortly before Congress adjourned and while the Senate was considering Senate bill No. 2864, generally and better known as the spending-lending bill, we stopped in to see Senator WHEELER and submitted to him an amendment to be offered in connection with that huge financing bill. This amendment is known as farm-mortgage refinancing and it became section No. 21 of that bill. Senator LA FOLLETTE of Wisconsin joined with Senator WHEELER, and our bill, by amendment, became known as the Wheeler-La Follette amendment. Senator SHIPSTEAD made a real contribution in connection with this same important amendment.

To simply state it so that you will understand it, it provided over a billion dollars as a revolving fund to go to the rescue of farmers who were losing their farms by foreclosure, or were in imminent danger of such loss because of their failure to pay taxes, interest, and principal, and for which they had no money available. The Senate engaged in long debate on this subject and they really painted the picture on the floor of the Senate to the full satisfaction of ourselves, and when the debate was ended and the vicious processes of foreclosure were fully made known, the United States Senate, by a vote of 74 to 8, adopted the substance of our program for farm-debt adjustment.

The Senate finally passed the whole bill, and it went over to the lower House of Congress, and over there the Banking and Currency Committee unanimously approved our program. The House of Representatives never acted on the big bill because of the chicanery of handling legislation in the House, and simply stated the big, powerful Rules Committee refused to give a rule to permit the bill to come out on the floor of the House for discussion, and, to put it in very simple terms, that meant murder. But a very interesting and happy sequence follows that successful effort of ours through the United States Senate. Not long ago Governor Hill of the Farm Credit Administration put out a release, which amounts to a temporary moratorium, which has stopped Federal farm mortgage foreclosures in the United States. They have just quit foreclosing on Federal Land Bank farm mortgages. I think that's the outstanding contribution that has been made by the Farmers Union in all its history. I think the No. 1 job of the Farmers Union is to battle until we are successful in creating and gaining, by action of the Federal Government, a brand-new philosophy of agricultural credit. I think it is the job of the Farmers Union, and it is my personal determination as chairman of your debt adjustment committee, to try to successfully lead in this fight to provide that a farmer's inability to pay his debt to the Federal Government because of crop failure, or price failure, can no longer be used as a basis for a mortgage foreclosure; that when confronted by uncontrollable and unfavorable circumstances, the farm family can live at home and not be forced into the middle of the road, headed for hopelessness and despair.

I think the No. 1 job of the Farmers Union is to protect the farmer in his little castle. That must be his kingdom and that's where he must have his queen and his princes and princesses. There can be no satisfied and contented people unless the Government, with its power to tax and get money with which to protect, declares that honest, industrious people shall be protected in their homes when their inability to pay arises because of lack of opportunity to work, lack of crops, or lack of prices. That must be the first line of defense for democracy. The first trench to dig is home security for honest, industrious people. That must be the No. 1 job of the Farmers Union. I accepted it as my No. 1 legislative job, to fight for such an agricultural credit philosophy until it becomes the law and the understanding and the will of the Nation. If we can be protected in our homes, we will in some way be able to eke out food and clothes to keep the wife and the brood together. But we can't do it by being dumped out in the road or in the middle of Main Street. The policy of the national administration up to date has been to protect the man who bought the mortgage bonds, almost at all costs, and to let the farm family take their chance and unhappiness out of such a policy. That is unendurable. It is unbearable. It cannot last. It must be stopped. It must be replaced by the philosophy of protecting people who are doing their best to meet their debts.

I firmly believe that with the record we have made in Congress and with the present attitude of the Farm Credit Administration, as expressed by their moratorium on debt foreclosures, and with the sympathetic attitude of the Secretary of Agriculture, who now is responsible for the Farm Credit Administration, that we will be, within the next year or two, successful in attaining this goal for protecting our honest farmers in a program that will provide their security in their home. When that day shall have arrived, we shall have a more contented farm people; there will be less suicides; there will be less broken hearts; and there will be more security in the Nation.

No. 3. Cooperative distribution of farm products: We have gained the sympathetic consideration of the Farm Security Administration and the Farm Credit Administration, and, as most of you know, we have really established the Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association as the largest cooperative grain marketing organization in the United States, a very successful institution, a rapidly growing institution. During the past year we set up 75 new cooperative elevator associations, affiliated with the Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association. Beginning on June 1, 1938, and up to September 30 of this year, we took the Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association from zero to a net worth today in excess of $600,000. We couldn't have hoped to have done that without first the approval of the President, which we got, the approval of Secretary Wallace, the support of the Department of Agriculture, particularly the Farm Security Administration, and the very generous treatment that we have received from the Farm Credit Administration. I want to state here that the Central Bank for Cooperatives, a branch of the Farm Credit Administration, at Washington, D. C., has given us every cooperation and financial assistance that any Farmers Union member could hope for.

To illustrate, very recently when the demands were heavy upon us in facilitating the wheat-loan program, we needed a very substantial amount of additional unsecured capital, and, by telephone, they thought enough of our operations and our management to give us an additional $500,000 without any security and at a low rate of interest. You will also be glad to know, in this direction, that our net earnings in our first 16 months of operation have now passed the quarter million mark; that is, in excess of $250,000. That isn't for privateers' trips to Europe, Florida, or California; it is to expand the cooperative movement and to carry on our national legislative work.

You will also be glad to know that the Farm Security Administration approved for another year a continuance of our development of cooperative elevator associations here in the spring-wheat area. What we secured for ourselves from the Federal Government we secured for other regional cooperative grain-marketing associations. You will also be glad to know that last February we federated these regional cooperative marketing organizations in the West into what is now known as the National Federation of Grain Cooperatives. We have the pleasure, as president, to represent them and are authorized by them to cooperate with our National Farmers' Union, our Northwest Farmers Union legislative committee, and our wheat conservation conference. You will also be glad to know that all of these regional grain cooperatives are now operating very successfully and are expanding their membership at a rapid pace.

No. 4. Minimum futures price at fair exchange value below which no one may trade in futures: We have not gained our attainment on that No. 4 problem, but you are all aware of the fact that the loan program has held the future prices anywhere from 30 to 40 cents a bushel higher for wheat than prices would have been without the loan program. Put it another way: With the huge wheat surplus as a part of the world market our prices have run 30 to 40 cents above what we would have received in shipping our wheat under the old system, dependent upon the Liverpool price.

No. 5. Processing taxes to provide funds for benefit payments to equalize parity income: Well, you are all familiar with our wheat income certificate bill, known as Senate bill No. 2395, that meets this problem in a very realistic and practical way. That has been introduced by Senator WHEELER, and we have had our first hearings on it. We will prosecute that legislation in the next session of Congress, and we will do all we can to secure its favorable passage. Secretary Wallace is behind it, and I am glad to state that Senator

RUSSELL, from Georgia, has introduced the same type of bill for cotton. The same type has already been introduced by Senator ELLENDER, of Louisiana, for rice. The millers are deadly against our bill. If, as, and when our wheat income certificate bill is passed, we shall have little use for some of the Federal farm programs now in operation, and it will put an end to calling upon the Federal Treasury for many hundreds of millions of dollars a year which is now being appropriated as a subsidy to agriculture.

No. 6. Continuation of present use of custom receipts to relieve market of burdensome surpluses: In that we have not only been successful but we participated in a program to increase the amount by $113,000,000, and after a real fight, in which we spent a lot of money, we were able to see it come through the Congress and the appropriation made available. As the result of this large appropriation, we now have what is known as the "stamp plan." That simply means that the Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation, with the large amount of money available to it, is furnishing food stamps to relief people and needy people so that they can buy twice as much with these stamps as they otherwise could buy with money, and the things that they may buy are listed as surplus farm commodities. We, therefore, now have unfortunate people eating bread, biscuits, butter, milk, cheese, fruits, vegetables, etc., that they otherwise could not have bought, and which, of course, otherwise the farmers couldn't have sold nor the stores handled. Fortunately, this is having the general approval of the Nation and particularly the Congress and the stores on Main Street. You will also be interested in knowing that, based on the additional consumption in cities where this "stamp plan" is now being used, if all the cities and towns in the United States were enjoying the "stamp plan" system of getting rid of surpluses, our present farm output could not supply the total products required. To put it another way, there is such a tremendous underconsumption in this country that if it were properly met in furnishing all families just a reasonable diet that they should have it would take more than the present output of all the acres in the United States under cultivation. Maybe we have something there. Maybe we have found something more important than many of us first thought. You will read more about this from articles in our Herald.

No. 7. Soil-conservation practices: We received an appropriation again for $500,000,000 for this character of work in our total program. Of course, this program will be improved as time goes on. One important improvement that we secured during the year to help you people out on your acreage for the soil-conservation program is in connection with flaxseed. As you now know, we were able to get flaxseed taken out of the list of soil-depleting crops, and thus, under certain conditions, permit you to put to use more of your acres in the production of flaxseed. This added thousands of acres to flaxseed production and brought a tremendous additional income to the farmers of the Northwest. Everybody ought to let us take a bow on that one.

No. 8. Adjustment of acreage to yield domestic and worth-while world requirements: This simply means an adjustment of production and distribution to lift prices. Of course, everyone knows that we are working on that and the National Government is working on that.

No. 9. Ever-normal granary in control of producers and Federal Government. We have that in full force.

No. 10. Exports in control of producers and Federal Government: Nobody would question that we have that in full operation.

No. 11. Marketing quotas to protect cooperators and punish noncooperators: That's being applied in many industries, notably in milk, vegetables, nuts, etc. It has been applied in tobacco, and the tobacco people have just now put it into use again. In the forepart of our statement, we pointed out the pitiful plight of the tobacco growers. Just this week they voted to again invoke the quota system to protect them in the supply of their production and the price thereof for the next year.

No. 12. Credit to bankrupt farmers to aid them in taking out first-year crop insurance: We got our bill through in March of this year to meet that problem, which simply means, as you all know, that the Secretary of Agriculture, through the A. A. A., loans the money without interest to the farmers to pay their premium on crop insurance. We got it in time for this last spring-wheat crop and, as a result, North Dakota became the No. 1 State in crop insurance in the entire United States. The Southwest winter-wheat growers certainly went for it this fall, with a bigger sign-up than ever, and 85 percent of those payments for crop-insurance premiums in the Southwest this fall were made on the basis of this credit from the Triple A. The Farmers' Union certainly can look upon that as a signal victory and a part of its year's work. Now, I know the Farmers' Union did it, because I handled the legislation in Washington that brought this program about. No other farm organization in the United States had anything to do with it. Senator Wheeler handled this bill for us and, with his usual diligence and skill, put it through the Senate.

And now, really, ladies and gentlemen of Montana and the United States, let the Farmers' Union take a real bow for making credit available to farmers to enable them to pay their crop-insurance premiums, which meant the taking care of something over 40,000 farmers in the spring-wheat area this year. Now, let's see what it is doing this fall for the winter-wheat farmers. Last year we had 170,000 wheat farmers participate in crop insurance. We now have 270,000, all in the area where winter wheat is produced, who have taken out crop insurance. It covers 7,500,000 acres; it has put 10,000,000 bushels of wheat away in store, in reserve; and means that these 270,000 farmers are guaranteed a crop next year of over 70,000,000 bushels, let come what may. No, 85 percent of all these 270,000 farmers took advantage of our crop-insurance-credit bill. That is to say, our bill enabled them to borrow against their future Soil Conservation payments and, without any interest, the money with which to pay for their crop-insurance policies. Putting it another way, 230,000 farmers have already taken out loans against future Triple A payments with which to insure themselves against crop loss in 1940. When the spring-wheat farmers come into the program next spring, it is likely we will have considerably in excess of 300,000 wheat farmers in the United States in the wheat-crop-insurance program.

Sure, it isn't all you want of it, but the poor kid is only a year old. Let's treat it halfway right until it gets on long pants. It is one of the real, fundamental laws that have been passed by Congress. We confidently believe that the Congress is going to put cotton under crop insurance at the next regular session of Congress. When the day comes that wheat and cotton have crop insurance, we then will have a bloc formed in Congress that will keep crop insurance for posterity.

No. 13. Commodity Credit Corporation controlled within the Department of Agriculture: Well, we certainly worked hard on that one and on the first reorganization order put out by the President within his powers under the reorganization bill passed by the Congress this year the President transferred from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to the Department of Agriculture the Commodity Credit Corporation. The Farmers Union, at least, ought to be one of those who may stand up and take a bow for that accomplishment. As most of you know, it is the Commodity Credit Corporation that fixes the loan rate on your wheat and outlines the policies for making the loans. In that connection the Farmers Union also will take a bow for having gotten, in addition to the loan price, as much as 1 to 9 cents a bushel as consideration for protein content in your loan price this year for your bread wheat.

Now, we have discussed the 13 proposals that were passed upon and approved by your convention last year. We have met all 13. Some of them are entirely successful, some of them partially so, but every one of the 13 points have been hit on the nose. And in this connection we wish to discuss what we believe is a very important point. The common thing we hear over the country is that the Farmers Union takes credit for things which it had nothing, or little, to do with. There isn't a single thing in this discussion of these 13 points of your last year's legislative program which I have discussed but that is supported by the files of our organization in briefs, in explanations before committees, in letters, in telegrams, etc. We have given you an accurate account of our stewardship in connection with your work during this past year. If anyone doubts our statement, we suggest that he write to your senior Senator, Hon. BURTON K. WHEELER, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

This convention will decide its course of action for the next year, and, of course, that will be our guide for our work. Now, in this connection, I want to take a few minutes to discuss the so-called Frazier-Lemke cost-of-production bill. Since the authors of this bill are both from the wheat country, we feel we should say something at this time. Both of these gentlemen are old friends of mine of long standing. There is no one in the United States Senate for whom I have more respect for his integrity than Senator FRAZIER. There is no office in Washington that has received us always more courteously or cordially than Senator FRAZIER'S and his staff. It has been very unfortunate that we have come into head-on collision with a piece of legislation in which he so thoroughly believes and for which he has so diligently worked. This situation has caused me some distress. But, after all, it is not Senator FRAZIER or Congressman LEMKE who are under discussion, it is their proposed legislation that has confronted us. Those of us in Farmers Union who have been delegated to represent you and to prosecute the programs adopted by you arrived at two points. One was that we believed the Frazier-Lemke bill, known as Senate bill No. 570, is thoroughly unworkable and would not serve the interests of agriculture, that mechanically it is impossible. The second point is that the bill is in conflict with the programs which the Farmers Union people adopted a year ago. We believe in the declaration of purpose of the bill and its objectives just as much as do the authors.

I am not going to take the time, because I have not the time, to discuss that bill in its entirety, but I would raise this question: How would it work now if it had become the law of the land, with the present world consumers about to be completely upset because of the war in Europe and the pending bill now before the present session of Congress? Now, let me explain that. The Frazier-Lemke cost-of-production bill provides that there should be a fixed price for all agricultural products, the value of which exceeds $10,000,000 annually. That would include fruits, nuts, vegetables, as well as the more staple basic agricultural commodities. Let us illustrate with wheat. The Frazier-Lemke bill would provide that the Secretary of Agriculture, upon hearing, etc., and following standards set down in the bill, would fix the domestic price of wheat for that portion to be domestically consumed. It is assumed that he could determine how much wheat would be consumed in the United States in the ensuing year. The surplus wheat would be turned over to the Secretary of Agriculture. The Secretary would then sell this wheat in the world's market for what it would bring, paying all of the expenses, and divide up what was left with the farmers as their share, according to the bushels which they had put into the surplus wheat pool.

That sounds all right, but there are a few things wrong with it. No one can make the consumers buy at a fixed price the quantity

that the consumers of the country are supposed to use. The consumer decides for himself how much he will buy. The consumer also decides what grade of product he will buy—whether it is butter, eggs, cheese, potatoes, onions, or anything else. He will also decide whether he wants to buy a hen or a rooster, when he wants chickens. He'll also decide whether he wants a fat one or a thin one, and he won't let any Secretary of Agriculture tell him whether he is to buy a hen or a rooster, a fat one or a thin one, an old one or a young one.

Now, going back to wheat. Let's assume we have a surplus of 150,000,000 bushels, and the wheat farmers of this country are supposed to turn over that surplus to the Secretary of Agriculture and, thereafter, he is supposed to ship it to the world's markets for what it will bring. Well, Congress did not pass that bill, and while they were in adjournment, that little fellow with the little mustache carried dynamite over into Poland and started blowing up the people in that country. Then the navies in Europe got busy. Then the submarines got busy, and mines were placed in the waters, and then the different nations over there at war began to declare what commodities are contraband. Well, this made a pretty mess, and nobody in this country wants war; that is, the great majority of people do not want war.

The President called the Congress in special session to repeal the Arms Embargo Act and to stop all of our boats and people from going over into those European waters. Now, if the Frazier-Lemke bill had been passed last year, the Secretary could have determined by this time the cost-of-production price for the United States, and if the Secretary thereafter found that the farmers were turning over to him 100,000,000 or 150,000,000 bushels of surplus wheat, I now want to ask the question, What would the Secretary of Agriculture do with that 100,000,000 or 150,000,000 bushels of wheat? There is a chance Congress is going to put a ban on our ships carrying commodities into those European waters. England is one of our big outlets. How would Secretary Wallace get rid of 150,000,000 bushels of wheat? Whose boats would haul the wheat? What country would they take it to, and how much would we get for it?

There is a question as to how long we can export wheat to Japan and China. You know they are still cuffing each other around the ears. The plain truth is, that if the present session of Congress passes the proposed legislation, and it looks like they will, our foreign markets will all be blown to pieces and with it the Frazier-Lemke bill S. 570.

On the other hand, the present farm bills that we have are designed to meet all complications. I believe that the facilities now used under the Federal agricultural laws, which we have helped to pass, are serving the tobacco growers (who need help now) infinitely better than the so-called cost-of-production bill, S. 570, could have served them. Maybe I am wrong about this. If I am, I want to be put right. After all, it is not for me to make the decision. The problem is here in front of you; you are now here at the convention to discuss everything and anything. You have all had an opportunity to read the bill S. 570, the Frazier-Lemke cost-of-production bill. You have heard Mr. LEMKE and others discuss it over the radio. You have heard them discuss it from the platform. You have read their reports, properly sent out under their franking privileges. You really have received a lot of stuff. I think everything has been done to give you full information about the Frazier-Lemke bill S. 570. It is not for me to decide what you should do about it. That's for you to decide. Both of these men have long been my friends. I have long been their friend. There is nothing I should like better than to be able to work with all of our wheat Senators and Representatives at all times. If you believe bill S. 570 will best serve the needs of agriculture, this is the place to approve it. If you think it needs amendment to make it work, then suggest the amendments, but let's get the record clear here and now. This is your responsibility and not the responsibility of your hired men.

None of you people are traitors to American agriculture. None of your representatives have stabbed agriculture in the back. We have carried on the work which you prescribed for us. If you want that changed, this is your golden opportunity to do whatever you want and outline the work for your hired men for the next year. This cost-of-production bill, known as S. 570, has been on the Senate calendar for months. If 23 Senators are sponsoring that bill, why don't they ask for it to be made the order of business before the Senate? I know something about that show down there and I know that 23 Senators can bring any bill on the Senate calendar before the Senate as the present order of business and keep it before the Senate until it is debated and voted upon. We haven't kept the Senate from considering that bill and voting upon it. The Senators themselves are responsible for that. It is hard to believe that 23 Senators want it and still do not see that it is debated. The charge that the Farmers' Union is keeping that bill from consideration in the Senate is just horseradish. The way to get it before the House of Representatives is to get the Senate to pass it and then it will go over to the House for consideration.

Since the matter is on the doorstep of the Senate, I wish the Farmers Union in this State and other States, and the national convention, would pass a resolution stating that if, as, and when the Senate considers the bill S. 570, and if, as, and when it may pass it and it goes over to the House, that your representatives do everything they can to get the House of Representatives to bring it before the House for debate and vote.

I am taking more time on this matter than I expected, but I want the record clear and honest and so that we can stop others from making false statements about our position. So far as I am personally concerned, it is in your hands and the hands of the other States and the National Farmers Union. The responsibility that your representatives have is for the brief which we compiled and filed with the Members of Congress, stating why we opposed it. Wasn't that our responsibility? Wasn't that our duty, and isn't that the honest, democratic process in which we are all supposed to work? Please let's clear the air while we now have the opportunity and thus put an end to false statements, implications, and innuendoes that have been going out during the past months—statements which implied that we are traitors or crooks or have been bought off by the United States Department of Agriculture.

I know only that I have never received a 5-cent piece from the United States Department of Agriculture for services or expenses; that I have not even seen in all my life a check issued by the United States Department of Agriculture—not even a wheat benefit check. Any statement to the contrary is based on inaccurate information to the party making the statement, or that party has deliberately lied.

As having concluded a statement with reference to some of our work for the year and accounting for the manner in which we have handled the program which you adopted last year, may we suggest proposals for your consideration as to some legislative work which we should consider for the next year?

We urge the following to be considered as part of your program for the next year:

1. Support of the wheat income certificate bill, to give parity income to wheat farmers, based on cost of production or parity prices, whichever is higher. Senator WHEELER has introduced this bill.

2. Readjustment of the farmers' debts, accompanied by variable payments, which will provide him an opportunity to pay according to his ability. Senator WHEELER has introduced this bill.

3. An amendment to crop insurance, to provide that the first 75 percent of the crop loss will be insured, rather than imposing the first 25 percent of the loss on the farmer. Senator WHEELER has introduced this bill.

4. A vigorous effort to expand the usefulness of the cooperative movement.

5. An expansion of the usefulness of the Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation through increased appropriations, so that it may continue to carry more and more of the surplus agricultural products to those who need them and are unable to buy them.

6. Additional appropriations for Farm Security Administration for the expansion of the usefulness of the Farm Security Administration in taking care of farmers in need and to provide rehabilitation loans at low rate of interest, to sustain farmers in an effort to get them back on an independent basis.

In conclusion, we wish to again emphasize the forces that have been working, to procure the changes so needed by the people of Montana and the other States. As during the past year, that work will be carried on by the Farmers Union and its cooperative business institutions. Now, in connection with cooperative business institutions, I believe some work has to be done by the producers in the Nation. Unfortunately, most cooperative institutions are particularly engaged in building their business, strengthening their balance sheet, increasing net earnings, and insulating the management against loss of jobs, etc. There can't be very much value to a cooperative institution whose only interest is in its own balance sheet and net profits. The very life of a cooperative is dependent upon the secure condition of its patrons.

Speaking for the Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association, there could be no interest to the management of that organization if its first interest weren't dedicated to the security of the farmers who patronize the local cooperative elevator, which, in turn, patronizes the terminal marketing association. Further, why will farmers patronize country elevators or commission merchants who are either neutral on the problems we have discussed, or who have done nothing about them, or who are opposed to them? To those of you who believe in the work we have done and the work we will do, you can make your contribution by joining the Farmers Union and paying a penny a day for your dues, and by shipping your grain and livestock to our regional marketing houses, the Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association and the Farmers Union Livestock Commission Co., and patronizing the cooperative bulk-oil stations all over the Northwest, which are affiliated with the Farmers Union Central Exchange. Also, ship your turkeys to our Great Northern turkey cooperatives.

It takes money to do the job we are doing and it all rests upon patronage. The more patronage we get, the larger we will build our cooperative institutions in the country and at the market places; the larger will become our financial resources; the greater will be the service that we can render to you; and the more men and money we will have to prosecute State and National programs in the interest of the farmers, the businessmen, professional men, and all. As our farmers' income increases, so will their purchasing power increase; as their purchasing power increases, so will employment increase; as employment increases, so will there be further purchasing of farm products. The spiral can go either up or down, it all depends upon the intelligence of the people, the understanding of the people, the willingness of the people to cooperate and do something about it. As they join our organization, as they support our cooperatives, we are thus better able to prosecute the programs for the benefit of agriculture. So will the benefit come to the business people, the professional people, and the laboring people. It is so simple; it is so reasonable; it is so realistic; it is so truthful; it is so essential; it staggers one in his attempt to try to reason and to understand why the people

of the towns and the country fail to shake out of their sleep and go to work on the problems which, of necessity, are the problems of every one of us.

Then again, may we refer to who's who? Tell me the independent elevator man; tell me the "line elevator" man; tell me the private commission merchant; tell me the private oil company or the local livestock buyer; tell me any of these groups who are amongst us who are turning hand or putting up a dollar in connection with the most important work that is before the Nation today. In all fairness and honesty, about all that can be said for those who do not belong and cooperate in our efforts is that every 2 or 4 years they somehow get up enough energy to go to the polls and vote for a Democrat or a Republican that they even didn't have any choice in selecting. They vote for people running for office and try to make some money, and that constitutes their total contribution in preserving and building a democracy. That's not enough. We went broke under that system. It wouldn't work. They all must change and do it a better way.

We have outlined our program. We have explained our experience. We have told what we have done about it and we now ask all farmers, and business people, and professional men of this State to join hands with us and support us. Again repeating, if we are wrong, tell us where we are wrong so we can study your suggestions for corrections. Don't fight us; don't be neutral—help us. Our Nation is worth it. Our farmers are worth it. We give you all this for whatever you may think of it; however, in the future you may apply it in Montana. We give it to you for what it is, all there is, and we are proud of it—the Farmers Union and its cooperative business institutions.

Thank you.

Mr. Broun and Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, October 31, 1939

ARTICLE BY HEYWOOD BROUN

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article by Heywood Broun denying the charge of communism made concerning him before the Dies Committee.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IT SEEMS TO ME

(By Heywood Broun)

I wish to arise to a question of personal privilege, but in part the subject does lie in the domain of public interest. Once upon a time it was a general newspaper practice to give a man a chance to reply when some damaging charge was made against him. Now it seems increasingly customary to shoot the yarn out and let the injured party try to catch up under his own steam. And once a story has a start of 12 or 20 hours a denial has to be extremely agile ever to catch up with it.

On Saturday a man named Joseph Zack told the Dies committee that I had been a member of the Communist Party for 2 years. He said I joined in 1928. Out goes the story over press association wires and into the columns of the newspapers by which I am directly employed. The New York Times was the only paper with sufficient courtesy and devotion to good journalistic practices to call up and ask what I wanted to reply. I have never seen or heard of Zack to the best of my knowledge and belief, and I doubt whether he is familiar by name or reputation to any city editor or managing editor.

On several occasions I have stated that I have never been a Communist. And something over a year ago I testified to this fact before the Dies committee. Now I am neither a liar nor a perjurer. I have been in the newspaper business continuously for more than 31 years. And so it makes me good and sore when some unidentified stranger can get up and take a crack at me without any newspaper offering me a chance to reply before publication. I realize that Stamford is a 30-cent phone call. It makes me particularly sore when the paper for which I work does a thing like that to me. And I also say it's bad newspaper work, because it is a matter of not particularly obscure record that during the time Zack assigns me to membership in the Communist Party I ran for Congress on the Socialist ticket and took a pretty thorough shellacking in the columns of The Daily Worker, which always referred to me as Hey Gin Broun. And The Worker also carried some excellent cartoons in which I appeared in a perambulator being wheeled around by Norman Thomas.

I am not arguing right now about political or economic interpretation of this or that. Or "radical" or "liberal." I simply state again for the tenth and, I hope, the final time that I have never been a member of the Communist Party for 2 years or 2 minutes. And that, I think, is enough or maybe too much of personal note. However, there is a public stake in such matters. A single item can do enormous damage to persons far more important and infinitely more virtuous than myself. I know enough of the time element in the making of a newspaper to realize that there are situations in which it is not possible to get both sides of a story immediately. But even if the story can't wait there ought to be an obligation to set forth the fact that the party of the second part has not yet had a chance to say his say. It isn't a question of redress. It's a question of fair play at the beginning. Libel suits are no good in circumstances where they may seem to be warranted. That's a sucker's game in the first place, and the practice might be abused into constituting an actual threat to free press. There used to be a day when indignant citizens stormed into newspaper offices with horsewhips, but even up here in rural Connecticut it's years since I've seen a horsewhip. Additionally I might, on occasion, find myself on the wrong end of the whip. And punching people in the nose never gets you very much after you have turned 50. I guess I'll just have to take it out by saying in this single column that I'm good and sore, and that I'm going to continue that way. When I swear that a thing isn't true, then no newspaper and no prattling Zack can pin it on me. I won't go for it. After all, I've saved up $84, there are bullheads in the pond behind the house and the woods abound with edible roots and wild berries.

The Proposed Reciprocal Trade Agreement With Chile

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED BRADLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 31, 1939

LETTERS FROM WALTER F. GRIES, CHAIRMAN OF THE SOCIAL WELFARE COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF MICHIGAN

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, it has come to my attention that the Department of State is contemplating the drawing up of a reciprocal-trade agreement with Chile which may vitally affect two products of importance in my district and seriously affect the employment conditions prevalent in the industries producing both of these commodities.

In view of the fact that I feel the same commodities might likewise be adversely affected in other districts of the country, I feel it advisable to extend in the RECORD at this time two communications which have come to me from Mr. Walter F. Gries, chairman of the Social Welfare Commission of the State of Michigan. I have previously called these communications to the attention of the Secretary of State and sincerely hope that the State Department will give due consideration to the possible deleterious effects on the employment situation in our State before consummating the proposed agreement with Chile.

The letters above referred to are hereby extended in these brief remarks:

STATE OF MICHIGAN,
SOCIAL WELFARE COMMISSION,
Lansing, October 17, 1939.

The Honorable FRED BRADLEY,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The following item appearing in "Steel" magazine, dated October 9, on the subject of a reciprocal-trade agreement with Chile which may affect copper, is brought to your attention, since such an agreement would tend to have a direct bearing on the relief burden in the State of Michigan:

"State department has announced it intends to negotiate a reciprocal-trade agreement with Chile. November 11 will be the closing date for the submission of briefs and also for hearing applications. Public hearings will be November 27.

"Included in the list of products on which the United States will consider granting concessions to Chile is iron ore, including manganiferous iron ore which is on the free list. Under the Trade Agreement Act no commodity can be changed that is on the free list other than to freeze the commodity on the free list. Copper ore is another article which the Department will consider,

but this is also on the free list, subject, however, to an import tax of 4 cents a pound of copper content. Copper-bearing ores and concentrates are dutiable at 4 cents a pound on the copper contained and these also will be considered when the trade agreement is considered."

In view of the information we have received from various sources permit us to point out to you several facts:

1. Chile is now producing copper at a much higher rate of its estimated capacity than is the United States.

2. Chile is now marketing its huge output of copper and does not need any help in this direction.

3. Chile's cost of producing copper is about 4 cents per pound lower than in the United States, but Chile has kept the price of its copper up to our domestic price and occasionally at a higher level. This does not promise cheap copper to the American consumer.

4. Opening our ports to foreign copper definitely means the closing of many mines in this country. These mines are 100-percent employers of American labor and consumers of domestic merchandise.

5. The closing of American copper mines will place an intolerable burden on the relief agencies of our several States who even now are unable to meet the present demands.

6. Copper is an indispensable commodity in peace as well as war, and the copper-mining industry of the United States, which already is handicapped by leaner ore bodies and high-cost labor, should not be further jeopardized by any favoritism to foreign powers.

Inasmuch as the consequences of the inclusion of copper in the trade agreement with Chile would have a direct effect on the relief problem in the State of Michigan, we wish to urge that you go on record as being opposed to such action by the State Department or by Congress, and to urge that no reciprocal agreement be made with Chile which may disturb our present import tax of 4 cents a pound on copper in its various forms.

Your cooperation, we feel sure, would be very helpful in reducing the relief burden in this State.

Very sincerely yours,

MICHIGAN SOCIAL WELFARE COMMISSION,
By WALTER F. GRIES,
LOUIS C. MIRIANI,
CARLTON H. RUNCIMAN,
L. G. CHRISTIAN,
M. CLYDE STOUT,
Commissioners.

STATE OF MICHIGAN,
SOCIAL WELFARE COMMISSION,
Lansing, October 27, 1939.

The Honorable FRED BRADLEY,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: We have been informed that the Federal Department of State is about to negotiate a reciprocal-trade agreement with Chile, and that one of the items on which it is considering granting a tariff concession is dried beans. Since such an agreement would tend to have a direct bearing on the relief burden in the State of Michigan, permit us to submit the following facts which we have received from a source we consider reliable:

1. The production of dried beans is one of the many large industries in Michigan, employing many people whose livelihood depends upon the producing, processing, and marketing of dried beans.

2. Practically all varieties of beans produced in Chile are similar to the varieties produced in Michigan, and, when imported into the United States directly, compete with Michigan beans, and thus adversely affect the price paid Michigan producers.

3. The production of beans in Michigan for the past several seasons has been equal to, and in some years, particularly the past two seasons, greater than domestic consumption.

4. For the past two seasons the Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation has made large purchases of Michigan beans for relief purposes. The past season these purchases approximated 536,000 bags of 100 pounds each.

5. In spite of these purchases, the carry-over of Michigan beans for 1939 is estimated to be at least 500,000 such bags.

6. Another crop has just been harvested, which is estimated by the United States Department of Agriculture at 4,205,000 bags, whereas for the past 10 years the average yearly consumption, seed requirements, etc., of Michigan is estimated at about 3,700,000 bags, with the result that prices are far below the cost of production, and to lower the duty would, we fear, make permanent the unfortunate plight of producers and their employees in one of Michigan's principal cash crops.

Inasmuch as the consequences of the inclusion of dried beans in a tariff concession with Chile would have a direct effect on employment in Michigan and therefore upon the relief problem, we wish to urge that you go on record as being opposed to such action by the State Department or by Congress, and to urge that no reciprocal agreement be made with Chile which may disturb our present import duties on dried beans.

Your cooperation in this matter, we feel sure, would be very helpful in reducing the relief burden in this State.

Very sincerely yours,

MICHIGAN SOCIAL WELFARE COMMISSION,
By WALTER F. GRIES, *Chairman.*

New England Light and Power Rates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. RANKIN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 30, 1939

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, sometime ago Mr. Samuel Ferguson, president of the Hartford Electric Light Co., of Hartford, Conn., spoke to the people of New England over the radio on the subject of Federal control of electric utilities. In that address he attacked public ownership of power facilities, especially the Tennessee Valley Authority and its yardstick rates, and finally wound up by referring to me and what he called "Congressman RANKIN'S absurd statements" concerning the overcharges in electric light and power rates in New England. I shall answer Mr. Ferguson on those points at this time.

Electricity is now one of the necessities of our modern life and it must necessarily be handled by a monopoly since it would be too expensive for two, three, or more different agencies to attempt to supply electricity to the same community. Therefore, since it is a monopoly of a necessity of life, it is necessarily a public business and one in which the Federal Government or the municipality has the right to engage—and especially when handling public power generated by the waters of a navigable stream.

Why should a great private monopoly with its inflated valuations and watered stocks stand between the people of New England, or any other section of the country, and their own water power, and exact tribute of millions of dollars annually to provide exorbitant profits to the favored few, or to pay dividends on watered stocks?

According to the T. V. A. rates the people of the six New England States were overcharged for electric lights and power last year $83,348,791.

The enemies of public power would have you believe that these overcharges were absorbed by the taxes paid by the private power interests, when as a matter of fact the T. V. A. pays 5 percent of its gross revenues in lieu of taxes, and practically every municipality that distributes T. V. A. power pays into the city treasury in lieu of taxes an amount equal to, if not exceeding, that paid by any private power company in any municipality of the same size.

But even if the T. V. A. and its distributing agencies paid no taxes at all, the argument of the private utilities would fall flat, for the record shows that all the private power interests operating in the New England States in 1936—according to the 1935–37 report of the Federal Power Commission on rates, taxes, and consumer savings—paid in taxes of all kinds, including State, Federal, and municipal, and even income taxes, together with all cash contributions and free services, only $26,476,619; which amount taken from last year's overcharges of $83,348,791 would still leave a net balance of $56,872,172 in overcharges paid by the power consumers in New England last year—according to the T. V. A. rates—and for which they received absolutely nothing in return.

In the State of Connecticut alone the overcharges last year, according to the T. V. A. rates, amounted to $17,605,938, and the taxes paid by the private power interests in 1936, including State, Federal, county, and municipal taxes, together with all cash contributions and free services, amounted, all told, to only $4,821,124. Even if we give T. V. A. and its distributing agencies credit for no taxes at all, this would still leave an unquestioned net overcharge of $12,784,814, for which the people of Connecticut received absolutely nothing in return.

Let us hear Mr. Ferguson explain that overcharge away.

Private power interests in Connecticut paid in taxes, cash contributions, and free services only 11.8 percent of their gross revenues in 1936 while public power systems in Connecticut

paid 29.1 percent of their gross revenues in taxes, cash contributions, and free services.

I would like for Mr. Ferguson to explain that difference.

Power generated by the Tennessee Valley Authority is sold at wholesale to the municipalities and cooperative associations within the distribution radius, and they in turn sell it to the ultimate consumers at the yardstick rates, or at rates based upon the cost of generation, transmission, and distribution.

At the rate they are going, the Tennessee Valley Authority will pay out and return to the Federal Treasury every dollar of investment in the T. V. A. within the next 30 years.

If they had a New England Power Authority similar to the T. V. A. or the Ontario power system, generating and distributing the power in their navigable streams and their tributaries and delivering it to the consumers at the Ontario rates, the people in the New England States would have saved $93,555,986 last year on their light and power bills. Take from that $26,476,619, the amount paid by private power interests in New England in taxes, cash contributions, and free services, and you will still have a net overcharge of $67,081,367, according to the Ontario rates.

Last year the people of Connecticut used 1,284,372,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity, for which they paid $38,986,091. Under the Ontario rates the cost would have been $18,725,507, or a savings to the people of Connecticut alone of $20,260,584. Take from that the $4,821,124 paid in taxes, cash contributions and free services, and it will leave an overcharge paid by the people of Connecticut last year, according to the Ontario rates, of $15,439,460, for which they got nothing in return.

I should like to hear Mr. Ferguson explain that overcharge.

Last year the people of Maine were overcharged $5,333,122, according to the Ontario rates, after deducting all taxes, cash contributions, and free services paid by the private power companies; the people of Massachusetts were overcharged $34,437,504 after deducting the amount paid by private power companies in taxes, cash contributions, and free services. The net overcharges in New Hamphsire amounted to $3,267,155; in Rhode Island, $3,412,850; and in Vermont, $2,926,019.

How can the people of New England continue to stagger under this stupendous burden of overcharges, amounting to more than $67,000,000 a year, after all taxes, free services, and cash contributions are deducted?

Probably Mr. Ferguson can answer that question.

These overcharges are simply a tax levied upon the consumers by this great utilities supergovernment which has been described as a utility fascisti, that now seems to control the economic life, if not the political destinies, of New England.

The Ontario Power System has an investment of about $400,000,000. It generates and distributes about one-twelfth the amount of electricity generated and distributed by private power companies in the United States. Therefore, the private power interests in this country should have an investment of not more than 12 times that of the Ontario power system, or about $4,800,000,000.

Yet they claim an investment of $13,000,000,000, or $8,200,000,000 more than is necessary. What does that $8,200,000,000 represent except watered stocks and inflated valuations?

Let Mr. Ferguson answer that question.

What they need is a New England power authority to develop their own water power, their last great natural resource, and distribute it at the yardstick rates, in order to lift this enormous burden from the shoulders of the power consumers of the New England States.

I have no personal interest in this controversy. I am not a candidate for any national office, and therefore there is nothing the people of New England can ever do for me. But I have my heart set on saving the water power of this Nation for the American people and providing electricity for every home and every business establishment throughout the Nation at reasonable rates.

I have done this for the people of my home district, and I expect to keep up the fight as long as I am in public life, or until we get electricity supplied to every consumer at rates based upon the cost of generation, transmission, and distribution, and to every farm home in America at these rates.

I hope to marshal behind this cause the moral support of the 25,000,000 electric consumers throughout the Nation who are now paying an annual overcharge for electricity of more than $1,000,000,000 a year.

This is going to be one of the leading issues from now on until the power consumers of America receive justice in the rates they have to pay.

This will mean more to the people of New England than anything else that could be accomplished during your day and mine. New England has no coal, no gas, no oil, and her timber supply is vanishing. Her only chance to secure electricity generated with her own resources is the development of her water power; and the only chance they have to get this power, at reasonable rates, or at rates based upon the cost of production and distribution, is through some form of public operation such as the T. V. A. or the Ontario power system.

The only way for private power interests to head off this movement, even in conservative New England, is to squeeze the water out of their stocks, eliminate the inflated valuations from their books, and reduce their rates at least to the rates now charged in the T. V. A. area, and then gradually adjust them downward as time goes on.

We are in this fight to a finish and are not going to let up until we bring these rates to every electric consumer in America—from Maine to Mexico.

One Hundred Percent Protection Against Competitive Imports Produced by Alien Peons and Foreign Sweatshops

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 31, 1939

ARTICLE FROM THE AMERICAN GOOD GOVERNMENT REVIEW FOR OCTOBER 31, 1939

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, in looking over some old CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS I noticed in the RECORD of August 5, this year, the gentleman from Kentucky, Congressman VINCENT, attacked both the motives behind trade-agreement opponents as well as attacking the facts and statistics I inserted in the RECORDS of August 2 and August 5. The gentleman from Kentucky, Congressman VINCENT, further attempted to indict the motives of the American Good Government Society because they published an article exposing the fallacies of the administration's trade-agreement policy, which has now brought so many American farmers and raw materials' producers to their knees and deprived them of honest income that an ever-increasing number of sincere Democrats are joining the Republicans, who have been criticizing these unconstitutional and unworkable trade agreements from their inception soon after the advent of the Franklin Roosevelt regime.

Since last August opposition to these trade agreements—and it should always be remembered that these are not trade treaties in any sense of the word, since they are promulgated without ratification by the United States Senate—has continued to grow, and American producers now faced with the new trade agreements with Argentina and other countries are becoming increasingly alarmed about continuing low prices caused by unfair and unequal competition from cheap foreign producers, using cheap labor, and depriving both the American producers of raw materials and the American workingman of an opportunity to enjoy the American standard of living as he should.

Under leave granted me by the House, I am herewith inserting a new article from the American Good Government Review for October 31, which effectively points out the errors in the line of reasoning pursued by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. VINCENT] in his defense of existing farm prices and rural conditions. I commend this article to the consideration of all of you for your study, since the administration's drive to extend these agreements is taking on new force, and hope for American economic recovery is consequently growing more futile.

[From supplement to American Good Government Review of Washington, D. C., October 31, 1939]

ONE HUNDRED PERCENT PROTECTION AGAINST COMPETITIVE IMPORTS PRODUCED BY ALIEN PEONS AND SWEATSHOPS

(By Richard A. Staderman, president, the American Good Government Society, Washington, D. C.)

In the August 2, 1939, issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the able Representative from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] chose to quote an article, "Seven Fat Years Versus Seven Lean Years: Or How Our Farmers Have Lost $12,000,000,000 Since 1933," written by the present author and several of his colleagues of the American Good Government Society and published as a supplement to our Review. Subsequently Hon. Franklyn Waltman, publicity director of the Republican National Committee, quoted our study extensively in one of his press releases mailed to newspapers in many parts of the United States. Various of these papers quoted the study in full.

Due apparently to the fact that our statistics showed that present policies of trade agreements, restriction of production, and crop loans have not been favorable to the farmer's pocketbook, the Representative from Kentucky [Mr. VINCENT] arrived at the conclusion that bias was present in our data. In a statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Mr. VINCENT belabors opponents of present trade-agreement policy with choice epithets and inferences, and concludes that the "nonpartisan" character of the American Good Government Society is open to question.

We regret that the gentleman from Kentucky has misunderstood one of our fundamental principles. Ours is a patriotic, educational organization dedicated to a happier United States. We oppose all alien "isms." We oppose sending good American dollars abroad to "invest" in properties promptly confiscated by other governments. We oppose "lending" money to foreign nations who pay us interest out of the principal as long as we lend them more, only to default on what they owe when our lending stops.

WHAT OF THE TOBACCO AND COTTON GROWERS?

In the matter of foreign trade, there are several fundamental considerations of national policy which many of our fellow citizens forget until the boomerang comes back to them. For example, the farmers who raise flue-cured tobacco have had many headaches since Mars took command in Europe. As soon as hostilities started British buyers withdrew from the tobacco market, resulting in the closing of the markets. It is admittedly difficult to palliate this crisis for tobacco growers, though some makeshift efforts are under way.

Physicians prefer preventive medicine, which prevents diseases from starting, rather than trying to cure them once started. In the case of tobacco, the preventive measure would have been for the growers to have raised other crops in part, rendering themselves independent of the whims of international politics. Many tobacco-raising regions could turn in part to raising sweetpotatoes out of which commercial starch can be made, provided our tariff policy keeps out starch we now import. Soybeans and other crops can likewise make good replacements for present tobacco acreage by voluntary action of the grower, provided he is insured by adequate tariffs against imports which compete with his products.

Recent years have witnessed improvement in reforestation, irrigation, and soil protection. These are commendable tangible accomplishments which few can criticize. Likewise we say more power to the arm of President Roosevelt in his plan announced at his October 24 press conference, wherein he exhibited an electric meter costing only half as much as present styles. He advocated use of this by the Rural Electrification Administration, as well as a plan by which honest farmers would be allowed to read their own meters each month, with a verification by the seller of current every 6 months, thus reducing cost of meter reading from an average of 15 cents to 3 cents a month.

SENATOR LOGAN'S PASSING REGRETTABLE

We join with Mr. VINCENT in regret at the untimely passing of his former law partner, Senator Logan, of Kentucky, who was rated a friend and political supporter of the Roosevelt administration. It was our privilege to closely cooperate with Senator Logan and with a committee of the American Bar Association in advocating passage of the Logan bill—S. 915. This is the so-called administrative law bill which, briefly, would enable citizens to obtain speedier justice if wronged by a Government official. Our stand of strongly advocating passage of S. 915—passage we hope will be accomplished before adjournment of Congress in 1940—appears in the inside of the cover of our magazine the American Good Government Review for September 1939, which Mr. VINCENT may verify by consulting a copy at the Library of Congress or the District of Columbia main library. Does not our advocacy of a bill sponsored by the late distinguished Democratic Senator refute the partisanship implication laid upon us by Mr. VINCENT?

A law case is difficult to decide by testimony of the defendant alone. Independent testimony is always of greatest value.

We of the American Good Government Society are constantly assembling clippings, pro and con, on many questions of vital public interest. Thus we have a background of facts on which to base anything we say or do.

REPRESENTATIVE COX SAYS PROGRAM NOT PARTISAN

During the past 2 or 3 weeks we have had some 50 or 100 clippings on the pros and contras of the reciprocal-trade program accumulate in our files. On page 959 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, of October 26, 1939, the energetic Representative from Georgia, Mr. COX, appears as a defender of the trade-agreements program; nevertheless, on the next page he admits that "our reciprocity program is not necessarily a partisan program," thus verifying what we have maintained all along. At first many persons hoped that the program would be used to facilitate imports of things we didn't produce. Thus, if we could import reserve stocks of tin, tungsten, rubber, and other strategic items in return for shipping more foodstuffs or automobiles abroad, our national defense would be aided without injuring the domestic producer. We care not which political party is for or against trade agreements. We oppose them as now conducted because we feel they are bad economics, as we elaborated in a study quoted in the Appendix of the RECORD, page 3738, by the capable Representative from Iowa, Mr. THOMAS MARTIN.

During the past several weeks the number of Senators and Congressmen publicly defending trade agreements has been conspicuous by their paucity. One could count them on their fingers: Messrs. BUCK, KITCHENS, KEFAUVER, COX, and several others. As for trade-agreement opponents, they seem to be springing up from the earth, partly through prodding of worthy sons of the soil, as if another Roman of old had planted certain teeth in the ground from which seed soldiers sprouted and sprang forth. Our clippings show the following opponents to the Argentina trade agreement, according to items in newspapers and the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

TABLE I.—*United States Senators reported opposed to the Argentine trade agreement*

Mr. ADAMS, Democrat, of Colorado.
Mr. BYRD, Democrat, of Virginia.
Mr. CAPPER, Republican, of Kansas.
Mr. CONNALLY, Democrat, of Texas.
Mr. FRAZIER, Republican, of North Dakota.
Mr. GURNEY, Republican, of South Dakota.
Mr. HOLMAN, Republican, of Oregon.
Mr. JOHNSON, Democrat, of Colorado.
Mr. LA FOLLETTE, Progressive, of Wisconsin.
Mr. MCCARRAN, Democrat, of Nevada.
Mr. O'MAHONEY, Democrat, of Wyoming.
Mr. TAFT, Republican, of Ohio.

Source of data: Clipping file of American Good Government Society.

TABLE II.—*Members of United States House of Representatives reported opposed to Argentine trade agreement*

Mr. ALEXANDER, Republican, of Minnesota.
Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN, Republican, of Minnesota.
Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN, Republican, of Minnesota.
Mr. ANGELL, Republican, of Oregon.
Mr. BOLLES, Republican, of Wisconsin.
Mr. BURDICK, Republican, of North Dakota.
Mr. CARLSON, Republican, of Kansas.
Mr. CASE, Republican, of South Dakota.
Mr. COFFEE, Democrat, of Nebraska.
Mr. CRAWFORD, Republican, of Michigan.
Mr. DWORSHAK, Republican, of Idaho.
Mr. HAWKS, Republican, of Wisconsin.
Mr. HOFFMAN, Republican, of Michigan.
Mr. HOPE, Republican, of Kansas.
Mr. HORTON, Republican, of Wyoming.
Mr. IZAC, Democrat, of California.
Mr. JOHNS, Republican, of Wisconsin.
Mr. KLEBERG, Democrat, of Texas.
Mr. KNUTSON, Republican, of Minnesota.
Mr. KUNKEL, Republican, of Pennsylvania.
Mr. LECOMPTE, Republican, of Iowa.
Mr. MASON, Republican, of Illinois.
Mr. MUNDT, Republican, of South Dakota.
Mr. MURDOCK, Democrat, of Arizona.
Mr. O'CONNOR, Democrat, of Montana.
Mr. PIERCE, Democrat, of Oregon.
Mr. PITTENGER, Republican, of Minnesota.
Mr. REED, Republican, of New York.
Mr. REES, Republican, of Kansas.
Mr. RICH, Republican, of Pennsylvania.
Mr. ROBERTSON, Democrat, of Virginia.
Mr. ROBINSON, Democrat, of Utah.
Mr. TREADWAY, Republican, of Massachusetts.
Mr. WEST, Democrat, of Texas.
Mr. WOODRUFF, Republican, of Michigan.

Source of data: Clipping file of American Good Government Society. In addition to above, Mr. HOOK, Democrat, of Michigan, is opposed to concessions on cheeses in the Argentine agreement.

In both tables I and II, it is possible that some of the gentlemen listed oppose only part of the Argentine agreement, though the majority seem opposed to the entire agreements program.

These lists reflect the views of only some of those most recently quoted. Obviously incomplete, the list shows that among the Senators recently quoted as above, there are more Democrats who spoke out recently than Republicans, though in the House the opposite is true. With this bipartisan showing, and even ultra-liberal Mr. LA FOLLETTE, opposition to trade agreements certainly cannot be termed partisan.

In his critique of our study appearing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 2, Mr. VINCENT presented certain tables of his own purporting to show that the people of the United States were less prosperous under high tariffs than under the lower tariff reciprocal-agreements program. Suppose we see what the facts are as summarized for the past high-tariff periods in table III:

TABLE III.—*National income of all persons in United States following the tariff increases under the Dingley Act of 1897 and under the Fordney-McCumber Act of 1922*

Year	Total national income	Per capita national income [1]
Under Dingley tariff:		
1899	$15,600,000,000	$209
1900	16,200,000,000	213
1901	18,300,000,000	235
1902	20,800,000,000	262
1903	21,100,000,000	261
1904	21,600,000,000	262
1905	25,100,000,000	298
1906	27,600,000,000	322
1907	28,200,000,000	322
Increase from 1899 to 1907 under the higher Dingley tariff	12,600,000,000	113
Percent increase	81	[1] 54
Under Fordney-McCumber tariff:		
1922	61,700,000,000	562
1923	69,800,000,000	626
1924	69,600,000,000	615
1925	77,100,000,000	671
1926	78,500,000,000	674
1927	77,200,000,000	653
1928	80,500,000,000	671
1929	83,000,000,000	683
Increase from 1922 to 1929 under the higher tariffs of the Fordney-McCumber Act	21,300,000,000	121
Percent increase	34	[1] 22

[1] With the population of the United States growing year by year, the per capita figures do not increase as rapidly as the total ones. There are several methods of calculating national incomes, which vary on such matters as accruals, etc. Alternative methods do not change the conclusions to be drawn, however.

Source of statistics: American Good Government Society, compiled from published data of National Industrial Conference Board, of Dr. Warren M. Persons, of National Bureau of Economic Research, and of various Federal Government departments. Data are authenticated estimates.

Table III poses this question to reciprocal-trade advocates: If high tariffs were unfavorable to the prosperity of our great United States, how could it have possibly happened that in two long periods of more than 7 years following a raising of tariff rates, that we should have prospered? Certainly no one can deny that a rising national income denotes a rising average prosperity.

In our study in the August 2 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD we felt it was a true and equitable test to compare the 7 years 1933 through 1939, under the present administration and its policies with the 7 years preceding, 1926 through 1932, and the policies followed then. Both these 7-year periods included years that were better and years not so good. We did not, for example, try to compare the boom period 1923 through 1929 with the 1933 through 1939 period, though such a comparison would have shown up the recent period to be even poorer in farmers' national incomes than shown by our study.

The tables presented by Mr. VINCENT in the August 5 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD conveniently takes the 4 best years under New Deal policies, namely 1935 through 1938, and compares them with the 4 lowest years that can be found, namely 1930 through 1933. Although 1933 was primarily a New Deal year, the justification given by Mr. VINCENT for combining it with 3 pre-New Deal years is that 1930 through 1933 represents the period under "Hawley-Smootism," as compared with the trade-agreements year 1935 through 1938.

It is true that the national income and farmers' income during 1935 through 1938 was greater than 1930 through 1933. But does the Vincent comparison really prove anything? As a former teacher of statistics, I challenge the Vincent comparison on several grounds.

HONEST STATISTICS NEEDED

In the first place, the Hawley-Smoot tariff did not become law until June 18, 1930. As a practical matter, due to inventories on hand, the practical results of the tariff did not come into full operation until the end of 1930. At most one might theoretically claim the last half of 1930 as part of the Hawley-Smoot period, though from the standpoint of honest statistics, the year 1930 would have to be considered too mixed and indecisive to be an accurate Hawley-Smoot measure.

In the second place, the Vincent comparison conveniently omits 1934. This was the year the Trade Agreements Act was passed. However, no actual trade agreements were signed that year except the reltaively minor Cuban one toward the end of 1934. As a practical matter, every unbiased student of the subject would admit that there were no effects of the Cuban agreement sufficient to substantially affect our national income or farmers' incomes in 1934. Therefore it is correct to say that the Hawley-Smoot law was practically in full operation in 1934. If Hawley-Smoot were bad, then why is it that the national income rose from some $42,000,000,000 in 1933 to about $48,000,000,000 during 1934?

The two preceding points are merely negative. We show that the Vincent comparison is defective, but we still haven't explained that 2 years of lowered national income and depression followed the Hawley-Smoot Act. According to table III, we ought to expect years of economic prosperity to follow an increase in our tariff protection, just as followed the Dingley tariff of 1897 and the Fordney-McCumber tariff of 1922.

SPECULATION THE REAL CULPRIT

The explanation is this: In the latter twenties we witnessed various booms, principally in the stock market. Farmers were selling their homes on Main Street and moving into big cities to watch Wall Street tickers. City workers and businessmen were spending more time in sitting in customers' rooms in brokerage offices than in acquiring more skill in their trades or in managing their productive businesses. Swindlers, like the suicide Kreuger, were on the loose and many unsound houses of cards like the Insull companies and the Hulswitt group were destroying the real wealth of our people. Small wonder it was that smashes occurred in October and November 1929 and that severe depression followed.

With our entire financial house and economic system in chaos, no one measure could prevent a drastic liquidation and readjustment. The Hawley-Smoot Act was no exception. If we had had normal conditions, the increased tariff would have given a sound lift to our economic system and enabled us to prosper on a firmer fundamental basis of freedom from the whims of foreign politicians, foreign peons, and foreign sweatshops.

By the time the Hawley-Smoot tariff was signed, in June 1930, the depression had been in full swing for over 8 months since October 1929. By the time the results of the tariff were fully felt, the depression had been tobogganing full blast for at least a year. With these facts at hand, is there any fair-minded person who can say the Hawley-Smoot tariff caused the depression?

HAWLEY-SMOOT PREVENTED A WORSE DEPRESSION

As a practical matter, the Hawley-Smoot tariff of 1930 proved to be an unexpected blessing in preventing the depression from becoming still worse. Britain and other countries depreciated their currencies in 1931, which amounted to destroying part of our protection from the products of foreign sweatshops. The British currency depreciation worked in this way: A British merchant can make a profit if he sells an article for, say, 1 British pound sterling. When the pound was at $4.86 before 1931, this meant that if the United States price of the article was $6 and our tariff $2, the article would not be imported because all the Britisher would get back would be the British equivalent of $4, or less than pound sterling needed to make a profit. The $4 equivalent would really in most cases be less than the Britisher's cost of production.

But what of this case in 1931, after Britain went off the gold basis and depreciated its currency? The pound dropped to below $3.50, and the British merchant could ship the product over here, pay the $2 duty, take the $4 and trade $3.50 of it for the pound sterling needed to cover costs and give him a normal profit. In addition, he could take the remaining 50 cents as an extra speculative profit at our expense.

Let us assume that the above is what would have happened if there had been no Hawley-Smoot tariff, but just the previous $2 tariff. Let us further assume that the Hawley-Smoot Act has raised the tariff on the hypothetical item to $3.10. After paying this $3.10, the Britisher would find that he had only $2.90 left from our $6 selling price. This $2.90 would bring him less than a pound sterling, he would not make a profit, therefore the item would not be imported to undersell a United States factory and perhaps close it and throw its owners and workers out of employment. Many of the tariff raises under "Hawley-Smootism" prevented just this and so prevented the 1932 depression from being still worse, a worsening which might have endangered our very Government of, for, and by the people.

TRADE-AGREEMENT ARGUMENTS LIKE GHOSTS

When finally broken down in this way the allegations of the proponents of the reciprocal remind one of the ghosts discussed in that delightful but authoritative new book on early United States history entitled "Intimate Glimpses of Old Saint Mary's" written by George Morgan Knight, Jr., lecturer and historian, and published by the Lincoln Press, 994 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.

The "two old lady ghosts who walk by day," according to page 102 of the book, are no more unreal than the way the proponents of the agreements try to always pick the depression low of 1932 as a fair year to make comparisons with more recent years, as for example does the Representative from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] on page 442 of the Appendix of the RECORD.

TARIFFS AND POLITICAL PARTIES

We maintain that tariffs are an economic problem, and should not be issues between political parties. Yet it has figured in past campaigns. Some years ago it was my privilege to have been a graduate student with Prof. Frank W. Taussig, of Harvard University, revered as the dean of American economists and the first Chairman of the United States Tariff Commission. In his book, a standard text entitled "The Tariff History of the United States," seventh edition, 1923, page 418, Professor Taussig states that President Woodrow Wilson's concept of a "competitive tariff" was virtually the same thing as the Republican plea for equalizing costs of production.

If one reads the leading party platforms of 1928, one finds that the Republican position is virtually the same as the Democratic. There is no difference in principle between the Republican declaration of 1928 and the Democratic advocacy of tariffs providing "actual difference of cost of production at home and abroad, with adequate safeguard for the wage of the American laborer."

NEEDED—100 PERCENT PROTECTION AGAINST COMPETITIVE IMPORTS

In the Appendix of the RECORD, page 3739, we elaborated on "Suggested Improvements" and "True Rule of the Foreign Trade Program." We shall not here repeat these previous views. Instead we shall carry our specific suggestions further, assuming the reader has read the article.

The American Good Government Society scientific tariff plan is as follows:

Section 1: All commodities or products for which there are, or for which there soon could be, adequate production facilities to take care of our own demand at around present prices should be subject to an import duty of 100 percent calculated on the average prices paid by the United States buyer of such respective commodities during the 15 years next preceding the time of such import.

Section 2: All commodities or products which the United States does not produce, or which we produce in minute quantities, shall be admitted free of duty, except as the Congress may levy duties for revenue only.

Section 3: For the intermediate group of products of which we produce only part, and which we could not produce an adequate total of in the near future, there should be a system of quotas, or tariffs, or both, arranged in such a way that the United States producer shall be given preference in first selling what he can produce and at a fair profit, before the foreign producer may compete with him. The foreigner may then supply the deficiency, so as to avoid scarcity such as would skyrocket prices to the consumer. (End of plan proper.)

WHAT PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT THINKS

At this writing no leader of either major party has seen this 100-percent plan. Therefore we cannot quote anyone upon it. Nevertheless, we are unable to see how it would be inconsistent with the views of President Franklin D. Roosevelt in the message he delivered before the session of Congress now sitting. The President said, as reported in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 21, 1939, page 11:

"From a purely material point of view, what is the advantage to us in sending all manner of articles across the ocean for final processing there when we could give employment to thousands by doing it here? Incidentally, and again from the material point of view, by such employment we automatically aid our own national defense."

We do not know whether the President meant these words to be of general applicability. However, he has not qualified the statement, therefore, unless he otherwise indicates, we must assume that "all manner of articles" means just that.

Taking the President's statement at face value, we commend it highly as an excellent, statesmanlike utterance. However, the business of the Nation runs on action. "We must act," as the President has often said. Action in this case would discontinue those parts of trade agreements, present, past, and future, which give less than 100-percent protection on imports which compete with our own producers.

The President said years ago that he believed in trying things, and that if they didn't work, he would be the first to suggest a change. We hope that the President's statement just quoted indicates a change of heart on his part regarding the trade-agreements program, in view of recent experience that under it our exports have been falling, and our imports rising, which was particularly true of the Anglo-American agreement from the time it went into effect until the present war started.

Under our 100-percent protection plan, the mechanics would work as follows: If anyone, as a matter of taste, wanted an imported Swiss cheese, or imported Italian spaghetti, or some French lace, or some Argentine corned beef, he would be permitted to acquire it, providing he paid the full United States price to the United States Treasury as duty, and in addition paid the foreign seller whatever the foreigner demanded as the price of the product. The theory behind this is that if our citizens are unwilling to patronize their own neighbors here in the United States, they should still be required to pay our citizens as a whole in the form of the Government, the United States price, which amount could be used to help balance the Federal Budget and pay off the United States debt.

Section 2 is obvious. Section 3 is the most difficult, and from experience in bill drafting, I grant that it would not be easy to draft into a bill or to subsequently administer. However, the difficulties of recent years in writing and administering tariffs would be greatly reduced by taking what is probably the majority of products, namely those in section 1, and putting them in the relatively simple administrative and legislative status that section 1 provides. Next to above proposal we favor passage of the bills by Congressman COFFEE, Nebraska Democrat, and Representative WOODRUFF, Michigan Republican, requiring United States Senate ratification of all trade agreements.

Editor and Columnist Speak on Neutrality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN J. KENNEDY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 31, 1939

EDITORIAL AND ARTICLE FROM THE NEW YORK WORLD-TELEGRAM

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, nothing I might add to these splendid articles on neutrality could possibly be as effective as to present the articles in full for your consideration:

[From the New York World-Telegram of October 30, 1939]

BETTER LAW, BUT NO PANACEA

Applying the only test that should be applied—the best interest of the United States—what about the neutrality bill as it now comes before the House?

We believe it better law than the existing one. Because of its cash-and-carry provisions and those for keeping American shipping out of danger zones, it eliminates two great hazards now being so strikingly evidenced in the case of the *City of Flint*.

But we have no illusion that the act is a panacea which will function automatically against our participation. Nor do we fail to realize that, inherent in the sale of arms, there are certain elements which tend to stir up emotions at home and abroad—more at home, we think, than abroad.

So we believe the worst thing that could happen in America would be for our people either to assume a "well, that's that" attitude, with the neutrality legislation out of the way, or to get worked up into a high heat in the closing days of the House debate. The first would be false security, the second a dangerous substitution of feeling for thinking. Let's continue to rely on our heads rather than on our glands.

Whether we stay out of Europe's war will be determined by no law. It will depend on whether we continue to maintain that same unanimous resolve which was so spontaneously expressed by our people when the conflict started, which was reiterated in the President's address opening Congress and in all the debate in the Senate, where, though opinions as to methods differed widely, there was no difference as to objective.

It would be well for us at this important stage to rededicate ourselves to the proposition that this is not our war and to review these governing facts:

That we went into the last war because we stirred ourselves into a frenzy of what we thought was idealism.

That, thus inspired, we mixed into a contest of cross and double-cross which had been going on for centuries; a contest we didn't start and didn't know how to finish.

That we were cruelly disillusioned.

That we didn't save the world for democracy. Instead, that we acquired only the bitter fruit of tragedy and bad debts. That we got not even gratitude.

That our only possible dividend was experience, and that unless we now can benefit from the experience, it's nobody's fault but our own.

That sometime we may render a service—and a great one—but only by keeping out; by keeping fit and adequately defended against the time when this latest fever of power politics has run its course and we then may offer aid as convalescence sets in.

Final passage of a neutrality bill should neither lull us to sleep not stir us to anger.

For it's not our war.

[From the New York World-Telegram of October 30, 1939]

IT SEEMS TO ME

(By Heywood Broun)

It seems to me that Pope Pius XII spoke eloquently to men and women of many faiths in his encylical. He spoke for peace, but in terms of security for all the world. Decidedly he gave no aid and comfort to the philosophy, "Let them stew in their own juice." Nor did he condone the immorality of broken pledges and treaties swept aside by sudden force of arms. And yet the spiritual head of the Catholic Church was both forceful and crystal clear in

dashing the hope that international brotherhood may be achieved through the triumph of arms.

"To hope for a decisive change exclusively from the shock of war is idle," said the Pope, "as experience shows. The hour of victory is an hour of external triumph for the party to whom victory falls, but it is, in equal measure, the hour of temptation. In this hour the angel of justice strives with the demons of violence; the heart of the victor all too suddenly is hardened; moderation and fair-seeing wisdom appear to him weakness; the excited passions of the people, often inflamed by the sacrifices and sufferings they have borne, obscure the vision of even responsible persons and make them inattentive to the warning voice of humanity and equity which is drowned in the inhuman cry, 'Vae Victis—Woe to the conquered.' There is danger lest settlements and decisions borne in such conditions be nothing else than injustice under the cloak of justice."

In all this the Pope speaks not only as a spiritual leader but as a wise statesman. When he says, "as experience shows," undoubtedly he means secular as well as religious experience. And I think there are few who will deny the tragic dangers of a victor's peace. However, peace by stalemate leaves the warring nations precisely where they started, and at the cost of bloody sacrifice. But there is one sort of peace which fits within the formula laid down by the Pope. I refer to the kind of peace which could be won by the neutral nations if they insisted upon a settlement through conference.

The neutrals have nothing to gain by a continuance of the war, and everything to lose. Even any shabby hope of financial profit is illusory in the long run. It may be said that few of the nations which lie outside the whirlpool are wholly neutral in their judgment. Even so, they are less wracked by passion than the countries which fight. And that tide of hate among the combatants is certain to increase rather than diminish. And so it does not seem to me that the spokesmen for those lands beyond the present area of slaughter should wait for hints or official requests from the combatants before making precise, practical, and immediate suggestions for a peace conference. There is, to be sure, the tragic contingency that a true will to peace may be lacking in some belligerent quarters. Obviously the early advantage lies with Hitler, and there has been small note of pacifism in his more recent addresses.

Accordingly, I hope that the House will not delay long in lifting the arms embargo, for if it fails to do so there is the distinct chance that the Fuehrer may choose to press forward rather than listen to any voice of reason. When the conference comes it must be broad enough in its scope to mean that we are not going back to the Old World, and that all the nations will refuse to reenlist in the war of nerves.

We shall want to know each other better rather than worse if we are to found a world of freedom for the body and soul of man. Labor standards must be preserved up to the highest scale and not the least, and we must begin to trade freely with one another. It is a large order, but since the stake is life or death, it surely is worth trying.

Neutrality Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 31, 1939

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, it is regrettable that the rule now before the House which fixes the procedure for the consideration of the neutrality bill recently passed by the Senate is not more liberal in its terms. The effect of the rule will be to limit debate and restrict the offering of amendments. The welfare of our people is vitally concerned in the type of neutrality legislation to be adopted. Therefore there should be no attempt to stifle debate or restrict the right to offer amendments. A "gag" rule has no proper place in the procedure of this House when a matter of this importance is under consideration. The welfare of our people demands that the fullest opportunity of expression be given to the membership of this House as representatives of our people. The rule is unfair and unjust because of the severe limitations it places upon the consideration of this bill. I shall, therefore, vote against its adoption in the hope that thereby the neutrality bill may be returned to the Committee on Foreign Affairs for further consideration and reported to the House under a rule that will permit full and free debate with opportunity for such amendments as may seem necessary.

EMBARGO AGAINST WAR MATERIAL AND CASH AND CARRY FOR OTHER COMMODITIES

I am strongly in favor of retaining the present embargo against shipment of arms, ammunition, and implements of war, of any kind or character, to belligerent nations. I shall therefore vote against repeal of the embargo as provided for in the Senate bill. I also favor retention of cash-and-carry provisions with respect to all other commodities than war materials that may be shipped to nations at war, together with all other restrictions against American ships and citizens traveling in war zones and other restrictive measures that will tend to prevent our involvement in present and future wars.

I have given the matter of what should be our neutrality policy serious and thoughtful consideration. It is needless to say that no thought of partisanship has entered into my consideration of the subject nor influenced my decision. Party division has no proper place in any matter that relates to our national defense or security. With respect to such we must at all times be Americans first, forgetful of party affiliations, in our desire to protect and make sure our national welfare and security.

The reasons that actuated me in the decision I have made, as to what should be our national neutrality policy, are based upon the fundamental desire to keep our Nation out of war and our boys at home. They are as follows:

1. EMBARGO OUR NATIONAL POLICY

I voted for the present embargo provisions in 1935 when the bill was passed by almost the unanimous vote of both House and Senate and approved by the President and Secretary of State. I voted again for its continuation in 1937 when it also received the approval of the President and his Secretary of State. In both instances approval of the embargo was expressed by both of them in the strongest possible language. In June of this year, when the neutrality bill was before the House, I again voted for the embargo feature. All of the belligerent nations entered the present war with full knowledge of our national policy with respect to an embargo on munitions and implements of war. There has been no sufficient reason advanced to convince me that the policy previously approved is now wrong.

No guaranty can or has been given that the repeal of the embargo will prevent our being drawn into the war. I prefer to remain on the safe side and adhere to the thought previously expressed by the President, that repeal would be a step toward involvement in foreign wars, and therefore to be avoided. It is my judgment that there is more to sustain the correctness of his first viewpoint than there is now to change it.

2. SHIPMENT OF ARMS AND MUNITIONS IS INCONSISTENT WITH OUR PEACE AIMS

Our Nation has been the foremost exponent of peace and good will among the nations of the world. We have led every movement for the banishment of war as a means to settle international differences. It was through our influence that the Kellogg Peace Pact, as a means to abolish war, was approved by all nations, including those now at war. It is inconsistent with our peace aims to assist in the prosecution of war by the shipment of implements of war, the primary purpose of which is to bring horror, misery, death, and destruction. I am unwilling to trade our peaceful aims for blood money. To do so is to undo all the good we have sought to do and advertise to the world that we believe in peace and are against war only when war does not exist, but, when it does come then our desire for war profits, or "fool's gold," as the President originally termed it, takes precedence. This is the time to show the world that we are firm in our opposition to war and will have no part in it.

3. BULLETS, THEN BOYS

If we ship war material to any of the belligerents upon the theory that the principles of democracy are under attack, and it is our duty to participate, then this theory, if carried to its logical conclusion, would require us to send our boys in the event that the shipment of munitions was not sufficient to bring victory. No one who argues for repeal of the embargo, upon the basis of our duty to again fight the battle of democracy, would dare propose, or admit the possible future use, of our boys in the conflict; yet, once we become committed to participation the possibility or need of this future

use of our boys remains ever present. I am unwilling to take this first step that may lead to such a deplorable result.

4. REFERENDUM ON FOREIGN WARS

If there is no intention of ever using our boys in this or any foreign war not directed against us, then why do those who favor the repeal of the embargo law oppose an amendment to the bill that would preclude the possibility of it, at least, without a referendum to our people? This would permit them to decide whether the issue in a foreign war is sufficient to justify sending our boys to foreign battlefields. An amendment of this character was defeated in the Senate by the vote of those who favored repeal of the embargo. I believe that such an amendment would go a long way in removing the fear that now exists among mothers and fathers throughout our land. Unfortunately, under the present rules of the House no one will be permitted to even offer such an amendment to the Senate bill, nor will administration leaders permit any change in the rules at this time that would make such an amendment in order.

5. NECESSITY FOR ADEQUATE DEFENSE

A neutrality bill, just because it is called such, does not prevent our involvement in the war now raging. Its effectiveness depends upon the provisions it contains. It is my opinion that the present bill would be much stronger if it contained the embargo feature, the referendum to which reference has been made, and then provision for building at once our national defense to a point that would leave no doubt of our ability to defend ourselves and maintain our national security. If war prosperity is desired as a means of providing work for some of our unemployed, then let it be by producing that which is now necessary to give our own Nation that security we all desire instead of sending it to foreign nations for a foreign war. I am a strong believer in adequate defense as a means of preserving our national peace.

In conclusion, may I again repeat that it is unfortunate that the rules of the House, the procedure adopted by the administration leaders in the House, and the few hours allotted for debate preclude the full consideration that should be given by the House membership to this important measure. It will also bear repetition to state that it is wrong to have a gag rule on a bill that so vitally affects the welfare of our people. The fullest opportunity should have been given for consideration, and Congress should remain in Washington, ready to deal with any emergency that may arise. Instead, the administration leaders have not only cut short debate but have also laid their plans to get Congress out of Washington at the earliest possible day. Furthermore, there are the unsolved domestic problems that keep 12,000,000 unemployed without jobs and millions more upon relief. Notwithstanding all of this, both foreign and domestic, Congress is adjourned and sent back home. The proper place for Congress to be right now is in Washington, watchful and alert to keep America out of war, provide for our national defense, and solve our own problems and thereby promote our own peace and security.

Proposal to Lift Arms Embargo Violates International Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 31, 1939

MEMORANDUM ON ILLEGALITIES OF THE ADMINISTRATION'S POLICY IN ENFORCING NEUTRALITY

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks I desire to include the following memorandum:

ILLEGALITIES OF THE ADMINISTRATION'S POLICY IN ENFORCING AMERICAN NEUTRALITY

I

The proposal to lift the arms embargo which is now concededly designed to aid Great Britain and France and not to preserve American neutrality, is a distinct violation of international law. A neutral may, after the outbreak of war, change his law, but only in the direction of strengthening his neutrality and safeguarding it against any or all belligerents, and not in the direction of relaxing it in behalf of one. Such relaxation is incompatible with neutrality and is an act of intervention. This was pointed out by Secretary Bryan in his reply to the German Government on April 21, 1915, when that Government sought to persuade the United States to impose an arms embargo because this country had become an arsenal for the Allies alone. Mr. Bryan said:

"This Government holds, as I believe Your Excellency is aware, and as it is constrained to hold in view of the present indisputable doctrines of accepted international law, that any change in its own laws of neutrality during the progress of a war which would affect unequally the relations of the United States with the nations at war would be an unjustifiable departure from the principle of strict neutrality by which it has consistently sought to direct its actions, and I respectfully submit that none of the circumstances urged in Your Excellency's memorandum alters the principle involved. The placing of an embargo on the trade in arms at the present time would constitute such a change and be a direct violation of the neutrality of the United States. It will, I feel assured, be clear to Your Excellency that, holding this view and considering itself in honor bound by it, it is out of the question for this Government to consider such a course." (Policy Toward Maritime Commerce in War, vol. II, p. 299.)

Secretary Lansing made a similar statement to the Austrian Government on August 12, 1915.

If the United States now professes great respect for international law it ought first of all to observe it itself. It may need to invoke international law. It preaches it to foreign governments.

Even though the United States does not itself furnish the arms, ammunition, and implements of war it is deliberately changing its law in order to facilitate such shipment by its nationals. This is unneutral and illegal. It is practically the same as if the Government itself determined to ship the arms, ammunition, and implements of war.

The suggestion of the President that the change would be a return to international law indicates the vagueness of his conception of that subject. International law does not require that a neutral government either permit or stop the shipment of arms to belligerents. It leaves each country free to choose its own policy, but not to change it during a war. Heretofore, numerous neutral governments have imposed an arms embargo during a war as a means of promoting and insuring their neutrality. It is unprecedented to argue that the lifting of an arms embargo can promote neutrality. This is disingenuous.

II

The United States is continuing to admit armed merchant ships, armed with heavy guns, into American ports. This is highly dangerous. Such ships are exposed to attack at sight, for they are armed to fight submarines. The supposed distinction between defensive and offensive armament is nonexistent in the case of guns that by one shot may undo a submarine.

The Havana Convention of 1928 on the rights and duties of neutral states requires in article 12, section 3, that armed merchant ships be treated as "ships of war." The Harvard Research Draft, article 28, provides:

"A neutral state shall either exclude belligerent armed merchant vessels from its territory or admit such vessels on the same conditions on which it admits belligerent warships."

The Government of the Netherlands maintained its point of view as against Great Britain from 1915 to 1917 that they would not admit armed ships to Dutch ports, for these had the character of warships and lost the immunity of merchant ships. Great Britain had to throw off the guns of British ships and enter Dutch ports unarmed. The admission of such ships requires that they at least be treated as warships and not be refueled and revictualed as would merchant ships. The President used the illustration of the *Alabama* in justification of the *Bremen's* detention. Here is a far more extreme case than that, for these ships are being provided with the materials which enable them to undertake hostile acts.

Secretary Lansing admitted his error in treating armed merchant ships as innocent ships in a memorandum of January 18, 1916, when he proposed that unless Britain disarm its ships it cou'd not claim immunity for them from unwarned submarine attack. He realized that the admission of such armed ships to American ports had been an error. President Wilson agreed, but the allied pressure to prevent this change in America's erroneous ruling was so great that Balfour and House persuaded Wilson to exert pressure on Lansing to withdraw his memorandum, so that the United States returned to its error and stuck to the error to the bitter end. It was that error which mistakenly led the Wilson administration to oppose the Gore-McLemore resolutions, which merely provided for the simple rule that American citizens take passage on armed belligerent merchant ships at their own risk. Wilson insisted that such American citizens as a matter of "national honor" had the right to travel unmolested on armed belligerent merchant ships. This was a preposterous claim, and

it furnished the pretext for America's intervention in the European war. It is surprising how little Senators seem to have read of the diplomatic history back of America's intervention.

III

On September 6 the President proclaimed the barter agreement with Great Britain by which the United States is to exchange some of its surplus cotton for British rubber. Both these commodities are intended as war reserves, and cotton is doubtless to be treated as contraband, as it was over America's half-hearted objection in the late war. No neutral government may supply contraband to a belligerent government. This is distinctly an unneutral act; and even though the barter agreement was concluded before the war, its execution after the outbreak of war becomes an illegal act.

IV

It is proposed that fully equipped bombing planes be supplied to the allied governments. A neutral government is obliged to prevent the shipment from its territories of military aircraft, as it is of warships. It does not matter whether the supplier is the neutral government itself or citizens of the neutral state. Such bombing planes constitute military assistance in the most direct sense. Neutral states do not have the privilege of supplying such direct military assistance to a belligerent. Such supply is an unneutral act, and therefore illegal. Article 46 of the Hague Draft Convention of 1922 on the use of radio and aircraft in time of war provides:

"A neutral government is bound to use the means at its disposal—

"(1) To prevent the departure from its jurisdiction of an aircraft in a position to make a hostile attack against a belligerent power, or carrying or accompanied by appliances or materials the mounting or utilization of which would enable it to make a hostile attack, if there is reason to believe that such aircraft is destined for use against a belligerent power."

Article 99 of the Harvard Research Draft on neutrality provides:

"A neutral state shall use the means at its disposal:

"(a) To prevent the fitting out or arming within its territory of any aircraft which is intended to engage in hostile operations against a belligerent.

"(b) To prevent, subject to article 94, the flight from its territory of any aircraft which is intended to engage in hostile operations against a belligerent, or which is intended to perform services of a military character for a belligerent."

The National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW J. MAY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 31, 1939

AN ADDRESS BY SECRETARY WOODRING AND AN EDITORIAL RELATIVE THERETO

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address recently delivered by the Secretary of War and an editorial published in the Washington Herald relative thereto:

ADDRESS BY SECRETARY WOODRING

The National Guard Association of the United States has convened its annual convention at a most momentous and critical time. In the Far East war covers the countryside with a dark blanket of death and destruction. Across the Atlantic war stalks gloomily over the hills and valleys, blots out the blueness of God's skies, roils rapaciously the surfaces of the seas, and extends its horrors into the very depths of the oceans. The peoples of our New World stand aghast, fearful that to the shores of the Americas may eventually reach the dread mailed fist of Mars.

War is despised, hated, abhorred by most of the peoples of the globe. Yet war's dismal shroud now enfolds many nations. For, even in these days of advanced civilization—or should I say so-called civilization?—war still remains a tool in the hands of ambitious and unscrupulous political stewards for the aggrandizement of their political power and as a weapon of conquest in their expansion of empire.

Americans, since their bitter and disillusioning experiences in the world conflict which terminated some 21 years ago, have advanced materially in their recognition and knowledge of the utter futility of armed conflict. And, during the past two decades, there has continuously developed in them the determination to avoid completely involvement in war—save war forced upon them in the defense of their own Republic, their own homes, and their own liberties. And in all sincerity and in all honesty let me tell you there is no man in public life today who is more determined than your Secretary of War that your sons and my sons shall not march forth to war.

Dangerously prevalent among some of our people today, however, is the assumption that intervention by the United States—and I refer to overseas participation in the conflict now raging in Europe—is inevitable; that the fates have decreed the youth of America eventually must be transported across the seas to wage battle on the Old World's soil, blood-soaked through the centuries.

Those who in public utterances pronounce the inevitability of our entrance into this second World War do grave injustice to this Republic of ours. They arouse suspicion among our more gullible citizens toward the efforts of the Federal Government to assure complete neutrality. They breed mistrust in the determination of the national administration definitely to assure peace for the Western Hemisphere. Those who preach the inevitability of war are prone to interpret every purely precautionary and defensive measure taken by the Government as likely, if not as deliberately intended, to lead the American people into war. They paint the wholly false picture of American business and industry, in a blind greed for profit, intentionally attempting to involve the United States in the present European conflict.

To create, knowingly or unknowingly, such a psychology on the inevitability of our participation in the war now in progress is to deny that most Americans—the vast majority of Americans—are convinced that our democratic form of government can be maintained and our national destiny assured only through continuance of peace.

The War Department, the Secretary of War, and the personnel of the Regular Establishment, the National Guard, the Organized Reserves—we who are primarily and personally concerned with the slight progress recently attained in the promotion of the efficiency of our land protective forces—we must not stand idly by while amateur strategists pronounce war's inevitability. As a nation we are not prepared for the formation of expeditions to wage offensive war; we do not wish to prepare to wage offensive war; we see no inevitable war, offensive or defensive.

Our Commander in Chief, President Roosevelt, has sounded, and sounded in unmistakably determined beats, the tocsin of peace—peace in the Western Hemisphere. It is the bounden duty of each individual in any way connected with the Military Establishment to exert all his intelligence and all his influence to insure there be no misinterpretation by any single citizen of the United States of the fact that every item in the current program for the augmentation and modernization of our defensive forces and every thought behind that program has but one object in view—the preservation of peace.

In these days when the ancient and gruesome ideology that "might makes right" again strangles much of the world in a vise-like grasp, how can we best assure the preservation of peace? Only through defensive preparation—military, naval, industrial, economic—which will serve as a very positive and very definite deterrent to any and all aggressive designs.

We American "peace-at-almost-any-price" advocates have long since come to the realization that unpreparedness for defense eventually turns out to be far more costly and a far greater menace to our homes, our liberties, and our national existence than a powerful, well-equipped, adequately trained defensive force. We picture our national defense not as a rattling sword but as a protective shield.

The United States does not now require the maintenance of military forces beyond the authorized peace strengths provided by the National Defense Act for the three components of the Army of the United States—the Regular Army, National Guard, and Organized Reserves. We require no considerable augmentation of civilian military training activities. The Reserve Officers' Training Corps and the citizens' military training camps will suffice for the accomplishment of their primary missions—the production of an adequate reserve of young commissioned officers and the training, on a purely voluntary status, of those patriotic youths who desire to prepare themselves in time of peace to answer the Nation's call in the hour of its need. General Pershing recently told me that the combat casualties among green, unseasoned, untrained American troops during the World War far exceeded those suffered by trained and experienced soldiers. Our defensive requirements demand the maintenance of no huge reserve of soldiers for the permanent establishment. The enlisted Reserve established last summer for the Regular Army, which eventually will attain a total of 75,000 men, is ample.

The security of these United States does, however, demand the maintenance of an Army in being at all time—those minimum defensive elements which will permit this Nation to speak with authority for peace and assure the continuance of our national existence. This force must be fully, perfectly equipped and adequately trained at all times, not only to meet the eventualities of today and tomorrow, but those of the days to come.

These land defensive elements must include an ever ready striking air force. I refer to a "striking" air component; yet only a moment ago I said that offensive war is not contemplated in our military preparations. There has been some controversy over the term "offensive-defensive weapons." There are but few, if any, instruments of warfare which can be classified as distinctly offensive or distinctly defensive. On the field of battle, with its continuous shifting of the tides of combat, the offensive weapon of today ofttimes becomes the defensive weapon of tomorrow.

However, there are some purely defensive military installations—for instance, the fixed seacoast defense guns which afford protection to the Panama Canal. And, as purely defensive as are the roles of those fixed guns, would be the missions of heavy, long-range bombers employed to disrupt the activities of hostile air or naval bases established to menace the Panama Canal and its defenses. Whatever may be the method of employment of a weapon of war in Europe or Asia, let me assure you that, under our plans, the same type of weapon in the hands of American soldiers would be used for purposes of defense, and defense only.

But being potentially strong in men and matériel is not sufficient guaranty for the assurance of peace. We must obtain

adequate training of personnel and efficient employment of matériel. We must from time to time concentrate our defensive units to practice the plays of the team. Otherwise, we expend our efforts and our moneys on the forging of strong links for an unlinked chain and, unlinked, have no chain at all.

Hence the recent decision of the War Department to assure the maximum effectiveness of the units of the Regular Army by means of concentrations for extensive field maneuvers during winter months in southern areas. Infantry divisions, now undergoing reorganization as "triangular" rather than "quadrangular" organizations will first be afforded opportunity to familiarize themselves with the modernized formations. They will later be further concentrated for corps maneuvers with special auxiliary corps troops heretofore nonexistent in our peacetime permanent establishment. We thus take advantage of favorable climatic conditions to form an actual and an experienced first-line combat team from the mobile troops of the Regular Army. And in the so doing we correct one of the gravest defects in our present national defense set-up.

This winter's concentrations, to be fully effective, must be molded into a continuous revolving program covering the next 2 or 3 years. If the commanders of troops and the troops themselves do not become accustomed to operating in large, well-balanced, cohesive units—under conditions as closely approximating war as peacetime limitations permit—the personnel of our regular divisions, we must confess, will be playing at the soldier game. Our soldiery must be real, not toy.

The National Guard, of course, enters prominently into this picture of an animated, modernized national defense. Our initial protective force comprises the Regular Army and the National Guard. For example, Baltimore's National Guard units are as integral a part of this Nation's first line of land defenses as are the Regular Army organizations stationed at nearby Forts Howard, Hoyle, and Meade. Were it not for the existence of the National Guard this country would be forced to maintain a permanent, professional military establishment of far greater strength than that which we now support. The American public must not lose sight of the fact that in our scheme of national defense the National Guard plays a role of paramount importance from the standpoint of economy in the maintenance of our Military Establishment.

The President, by recent Executive order, has directed—at the discretion of the Governors of the various States—an increase of about 42,000 in the enlisted ranks of the National Guard. Most gratifying has been the progress thus far in the attainment of the allotted quotas. The augmented strengths of units will permit far more practical and efficient organizational training, for heretofore unit strength has been too low to permit the manning of weapons assigned to organizations. Ordinary, unavoidable absenteeism also greatly retarded the effectiveness of units, both in armory and field training. The increase provided by the Executive order promises much for greater unit proficiency; the extra drill periods recently provided will greatly promote individual proficiency. Observance of the winter maneuvers of Regular Army units by National Guard higher commanders and their staffs will not only be an educational factor of no mean importance, but will go far toward promotion of that cooperation so essential between the primary elements of the initial protective force.

To the citizen-soldiers of the National Guard the people of this country are greatly indebted. And I feel I am on very safe ground when I state that never before have the missions of the National Guard been so fully understood by the public nor the patriotic endeavors of its personnel more fully appreciated.

For 150 years our land defense has been based upon a 2½-mile-per-hour speed of movement. We must now readjust ourselves to the fact—one demonstrated so recently on the plains of Poland, the plateaus of Spain, and the deserts of Ethiopia—that today war on the earth's surface is a 30-to-40-mile-per-hour business, and that the birds of war cleave the skies at 300 to 400 miles per hour. Our Army—Regulars, Guardsmen, and Reservists—must have not only mechanical mobility, tactically and strategically, but also mental mobility.

Let us not overlook that other strong right arm of the Nation's defense—our fine United States Navy, which today commemorates its glorious traditions and its splendid record of achievements in peace and in war. Upon our sea forces devolve the responsibility for the security of long water routes over which our trade is transported to the four corners of the globe, and for the defense of 40,000 miles of homeland and insular coast lines. To our Navy—as to our Army—we must give the means for the accomplishment of its manifold missions.

This program for rearmament—rearmament for peace—is costly. Our people are determined, however, to preserve the neutrality of the United States so long as the dread four horsemen—war, famine, pestilence, and death—ravage Europe and Asia. Our people are likewise determined that the barbaric hoofbeats of those same four horsemen must be confined to spheres other than the Americas.

Not a doubt is there in my mind that the American people—be the financial cost what it may—will render wholehearted support to their Government in its efforts to maintain neutrality and to assure complete security.

Every man and every dollar necessary for the defense of America, but not one man, not one dollar to fight the wars of other nations.

[From the Washington Times-Herald of October 30, 1939]

Another big fight in Congress on war and peace is scheduled to break out as soon as the problem of appropriating for national defense in the next fiscal year is opened up at the regular session.

Various peace societies and international leagues which have been trying to prevent a change in our neutrality program are going to attack the administration's proposals for admittedly tremendous expenditures for the Army and Navy as leading to "inevitable war."

Their main line of argument is that no possible combination of forces loose in the world can move into our hemisphere with sufficient power to crush the United States Navy as it stands today. The Army is already the beneficiary of 5 years' superexpenditure for new weapons and training, so the only excuse for further expansion, they argue, is preparation to send forces overseas.

CAN'T QUARREL WITH PEACEMONGERS

We can't quarrel outright with any peacemongers. The more people who talk about peace, the better. But we do feel these societies could spend more of their energy on making peace efforts in London, Berlin, and Paris, since they are international-minded, and less in trying to gum the works here without evidence to back their suspicions.

The people of the United States have a pretty good system of checking up on the experts of national defense, the generals and admirals, before giving them money.

In the first place, standing committees of House and Senate, made up of men who have spent years studying military matters, call the admirals and generals before them to demand evidence and testimony justifying every request for money. When the hearings are completed, a full printed record is published for all the world to read. And when the committees' work is done and appropriation bills offered, both Houses of Congress debate the proposals publicly and for the records. There are no secret appropriations here nor any possibility of a serious conspiracy to organize an expeditionary army unbeknownst to all of us.

WOODRING'S SPEECH NEEDS PUBLICITY

Aside from the machinery of Congress to check loose-running generals, a pretty good idea of the Army's self-discipline and realization of the country's feelings can be gathered from looking over a speech Secretary of War Harry Woodring made to the National Guard Association in Baltimore. That speech, what with the *City of Flint* maneuvers, didn't get half as much attention as it deserved, so we quote rather liberally from it for the especial consideration of those who fear we may spend ourselves into an expedition of France:

"We must not stand idly by while amateur strategists pronounce war's inevitability. As a nation we are not prepared for the formation of expeditions to wage offensive war, we do not wish to wage offensive war, we see no intevitable war, offensive or defensive."

Mr. Woodring certainly expresses the average man's feeling there, and as a member of the President's Cabinet he is bound to be speaking for the administration, too. We are not prepared to fight a foreign war, mentally, financially, or physically. It's not on the books. We can't do it. And everybody who isn't day dreaming knows that.

"Those who preach the inevitability of war are prone to interpret every purely precautionary and defensive measure taken by the Government as likely—if not deliberately intended—to lead the American people into war."

That's true, too. People lacking the won't power to keep on insisting we can stay out of war find it easy to slide right on into agreeing that somebody can shove us into war even though we are against going. Nothing could be sillier. As long as the people of the United States let the Government know they refuse to fight a foreign war, no government can trick them into it, no matter how it might try. Mr. Woodring speaks a language we can all understand in saying:

"There is no man in public life today who is more determined than your Secretary of War that your sons and my sons shall not march forth to war."

How much stronger can a man put his pledge against entanglement? There is only one way to interpret Mr. Woodring's speech—that he speaks for the administration and for the Army in promising to keep us out of Europe's war, no matter who "wins" or loses.

On that promise, common sense argues that we must not get too excited when the military appropriations—and they will be staggering—are rolled out before us in January.

Plain common sense tells us that preparedness against the worst is our safest course for continued peace.

Investigation of Un-American Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE STARNES

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 31, 1939

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. MARTIN DIES, OF TEXAS

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered recently over the radio by Hon. MARTIN DIES:

At the very beginning of our investigation into un-American activities, I made it clear that I would not embark upon the work of our committee with any spirit of partisanship or fear. Again, when the House of Representatives, by the overwhelming vote of 344 to 35, continued the life of our committee, I stated on the floor of the House that I would not permit considerations of political partisanship or fear of powerful groups to interfere in any manner with giving the American people all the facts about the subversive agencies and activities which our investigation might disclose. I made a covenant with the American people that I would keep faith with them, and with them alone, on a matter which rises above all party interests and considerations.

I am a Democrat and expect to remain a Democrat as long as I live. With us in Texas, the Democratic Party is a political habit of which we are proud. My father before me represented the State of Texas in the Congress of the United States for 10 years. When a great national issue was before the Congress and the American people 20 years ago, he did not hesitate to break with the leaders of his party when his conscience persuaded him that the interests of his country transcended those of his party. I would be faithless to my father's memory and to my public trust if I failed to put America first. I cannot and will not bow to the leadership of my own political party when my conscience tells me that the vital interests of America and the views of my party's leadership are in conflict.

I know that you will understand me when I say that I have been deeply grieved by the President's characterization of the procedures of our committee as "sordid." I have not sought and will not now enter into controversy with the Chief Executive of my Government. Neither will I say that my wisdom and judgment are superior to his, but I do know that the Federal Government has Communists in key positions, and nothing will deter me from exposing them to the people. I know, furthermore, that there are hundreds, yes, thousands, of members of the Communist-controlled organizations scattered throughout the departments and agencies of our Federal Government, and nothing will deter me from apprising the American people of this fact.

There is nothing new about this latest attack by the administration upon the work of our committee, nothing new except the occasion which prompted it. I profoundly regret that the President and all the members of his Cabinet have not from the beginning supported our committee with that same unanimity of support which we have received from the people of this country. I am as pained as the Communists and their fellow travelers are pleased at the President's continued unfriendliness toward our committee. I wish it were otherwise, and I am compelled to state that, unless there is a change in the administration's attitude, it will be extremely difficult, if not impossible, for our committee to produce the results which the country has every reason to expect.

When a list of leaders of the German-American Bund was made public by our committee, there was no charge of sordid procedures. When a mailing list of William Dudley Pelley's Silver Shirts was spread upon the record, there was no charge of sordid procedures. Why then this sudden fury of attack upon the procedures of our committee when the membership of more than 500 officials and employees of the Federal Government in the Communist-controlled American League for Peace and Democracy is disclosed to the American people?

The list of Federal employees which went into our record this week was a membership list obtained from the Washington branch of the American League. Mr. Lamberton, chairman of the Washington branch, testified before the committee that there are 700 Government employees who are members of the league. But the list we secured from him only contained the names of 563 Government employee. We did not say that the members of this organization are members of the Communist Party. Leaders of the Communist Party, like leaders of the German-American Bund, say that they have destroyed their membership lists for fear of exposure. Therefore, it is impossible to prove who are the members of the Communist Party by membership records which do not exist. In this circumstance, we must resort to the next best proof, such as the testimony of former Communists as to who are members, the writings and activities which disclose that persons follow the Communist Party line, and membership in organizations, such as the American League, which are shown to be Communist controlled.

Can it be true that some of the names on that membership list were too big for release to the public? Can it be true that anyone wants the American people kept in the dark with respect to the connections, innocent or otherwise, of high-salaried executives with organizations which the Communist Party has set up for purposes that are utterly un-American? You, the American people, pay the salaries of these Government employees. You are entitled to know such facts about their connections with a Communist-controlled "front," as we are able to bring to light.

In the conduct of our investigation into Communist tactics, aims, and agencies, we refuse to single out the poor and illiterate citizens of our country who have been caught in the toils of the Communist network. If we are not free to reveal the identity of the parlor pets of Moscow who plot the overthrow of our Government over their teacups, then we can have no investigation worthy of the name. Furthermore, I wish to serve notice upon the country and upon the administration that if I am to remain as chairman of this investigation into un-American activities, and if this investigation is to be continued—which is necessary—I will not stop in the pursuit of the facts, at the outskirts of official Washington. I, for one, will have no part in an inquiry which spends all of its time on the subversive activities of private citizens and is afraid to enter the tax-supported officialdom of the Nation's Capital.

Now, let us see if the disclosure of the names of these 500 Federal employees who are members of the American League for Peace and Democracy was a "sordid procedure." I think we can all agree that it is, indeed, a sordid thing for a man to take his salary from one government and then allow himself to be used by an organization that was established to serve the interests of another government. I think we can all agree that it is a sordid thing to have as many as 500 such persons on the pay roll of the United States Government. Furthermore, I believe we can all agree that it was a disagreeable necessity for any committee of the United States Congress to reveal this fact to the American people.

Now, as to the history and the character of the American League for Peace and Democracy, let us take a look at some of the facts of record. Since the beginning of the life of our committee, nine Members of the House of Representatives have participated in our investigation. Every one of these nine men has had the opportunity of weighing the facts about the American League, and every one of the nine is now on record in branding the organization as a "front" of the Communist Party. During the present year two Members have been placed on our committee to fill vacancies which had occurred. Both of these new members had voted against the continuation of our committee last January, and both were appointed by the Speaker of the House whose loyalty to the administration has not be questioned. I wish to emphasize that these two new appointees to our committee, along with the others who have served with us, have gone on record with respect to the Communist control of the American League.

According to its own publications, the American League for Peace and Democracy was originated at the Amsterdam World Congress Against War in 1932. That Congress was convened on the call of the famous French Communist, Henri Barbusse, acting under instructions of the Communist International. It was attended by 2,196 delegates, of whom 830 were avowed members of the various Communist parties of the world. In addition to these avowed Communists, there were 291 delegates who styled themselves Social Democrats but whose position, according to their own proclamation, was in complete agreement with the Communists. These alleged Social Democrats pledged themselves to work for civil war in their respective countries in the event of another international conflict. The Amsterdam Congress unanimously adopted a program which declared that it would not allow the Soviet Union "to be touched." This program was adopted as its own by the American section of the world committee which was set up at Amsterdam.

The American section of the Amsterdam movement called itself the American Committee for the Struggle Against War. It was this committee which called the first United States Congress Against War, at which the founding of the American League Against War and Fascism took place.

The first national chairman and one of the first executive secretaries of the American League testified before our committee that the league was Communist-originated and Communist-controlled. They explained the exact manner in which the Communist Party sets up a "front" organization and controls it.

In three successive programs adopted by the annual congresses of the American League, the organization boldly declared its first objective to be the work of sabotage of our national defense. Point 1 in these programs stated:

"To work toward the stopping of the manufacture and transport of munitions and all other materials essential to the conduct of war."

At its second annual congress, Harry F. Ward, present national chairman of the American League, declared that this program was "sound." Shortly before that, the vice chairman of the American League, Earl Browder (who was also general secretary of the Communist Party at that time), had gone in person to Moscow to report to the executive committee of the Communist International that the program of the American League was "politically satisfactory."

Browder, the vice chairman of the league, also described the league, when he was in Moscow, as "our most successful application of the united front."

According to one of the recent minutes of the Washington branch of the American League, it was decided "to set up league committees in the unions of Government agencies with our present membership in those agencies as a nucleus." These nuclei of the league are now formed in more than a score of Government agencies, including one nucleus in the navy yard.

Both the financial secretary of the Communist Party of the United States, Mr. William Weiner, and the national chairman of the American League for Peace and Democracy, Dr. Harry F. Ward, testified under oath before our committee that the Communist Party is the only national organization which contributes any apprecible sum of money to the work of the American League. This amounts to two or three thousand dollars annually, according to these two witnesses, and represents approximately 15 percent of the total annual budget of the American League. This financial contribution from the Communist Party has continued down to the present moment, despite the fact that the Communist Party formally severed, for tactical reasons, its affiliation with the American League almost 2 years ago.

The Chicago branch of the American League for Peace and Democracy sent out a letter in which its executive secretary boosted

the Communist Party's newspaper, the Midwest Daily Record. The secretary wrote:

"I have sent you about a dozen copies of the May 10 Record under separate cover. I am sending copies of this issue to all our branches, calling attention to the invaluable role of the Midwest Record in this important phase of our activity and urging their support by subscriptions, etc. It is a shame that the Midwest Record does not have one hundred times its present circulation."

When the American League backs an avowed Communist Party publication in that manner, it is clear that the league and the party have a link with each other that the leaders of the two outfits have attempted to conceal from the public.

A member of the national committee of the American League appeared before our committee and told how a radio speech which she had been asked to deliver under the auspices of the American League was completely revised by the secretary of the Communist Party of the State of Wisconsin.

It is of the highest significance that among the changes which the secretary of the Wisconsin Communist Party made in the radio address of this national committeewoman of the American League was the deletion of uncomplimentary references to Adolf Hitler who has now become linked in alliances with the "red fuehrer" of Moscow.

If any further evidence were needed to stamp the American League with the Communist Party label, it is found in the amazing statement on the Soviet-Nazi pact prepared by the Washington (D. C.) branch of the American League. This statement reads, in part, as follows:

"This pact is a real contribution to world peace and to the peace and security of the United States. * * * The signing of the nonaggression pact between the U. S. S. R. and Germany is not a war alliance between the two powers. It is not an agreement for the partition of Poland. * * * In this sense the pact between the U. S. S. R. and Germany is the only real contribution to the security of Poland that has been made to date. * * * In doing this, the Soviet Union has made a real contribution to an understanding of the present crisis in Europe. It has made a real contribution to the peace and security of Europe, the world, and the United States."

During the present year one of the vice chairmen of the American League resigned his position in this Communist "front" organization in order to accept an appointment by the administration as secretary of the Virgin Islands. For years this man served with Earl Browder as cochairman of the American League.

Conceived in Moscow, delivered in Amsterdam, nourished in its infancy in America by the famous French Communist, Henri Barbusse, the American League for Peace and Democracy has from its beginning served the interests of the Soviet Government. It has been the chief "transmission belt" for drawing "innocents" into the united front network of the Communist Party. It has fostered sabotage in our basic and war industries. It was intended to serve as a reserve force for the espionage activities of the Communist Party. It was intended as a recruiting agency for spies of the Soviet Government in the United States.

Under the slogan of peace inscribed on its shield, it has enabled the Communist conspiracy to invade our peace. Behind its banner on which is written the word democracy, it has marshalled the forces which sap the foundations of our democracy. Its constant aim has been to break down our defense against the coming Soviet attack on civilization. The American League, in short, is simply the Communist Party traveling on one of its many false passports under the aliases of peace and democracy.

It is high time that innocent and gullible people who call themselves liberals begin to learn to discriminate between organizations that are controlled by the Communist Party for its own purposes—the purposes of Stalin—and organizations which truly represent legitimate American interest. It is high time that leaders in government and trade-unions cease lending their names as propaganda assets to the Communist Party and its front organizations. Otherwise they must be prepared to take full responsibility for their connections with these un-American and subversive groups. For any of our leading citizens to continue to play into the hands of the Communist Party, after the true nature of the front organizations has been made clear by our committee, properly opens them to the suspicion of being closer to the Communist Party and its line than they are willing for the public to know. The decision rests with them. Our committee should continue fearlessly to make public the facts, regardless of the high positions which the persons affected may hold in government, trade-unions, or elsewhere.

I believe that more consideration is due the person who openly and aboveboard accepts a Communist Party membership card than is due the fellow traveler who conceals his real political alinement from the public by professing to be interested only in the advancement of worthy causes, such as peace and democracy. Abundant testimony before our committee has made it clear that one of the tactics of the Communist Party is to use strategically placed persons who do not hold party membership cards but who follow, just as faithfully as those who do, the line laid down by the foreign office of the Soviet Union.

The time has come for us to consider the necessity of continuing this investigation which will shortly expire and strengthening our laws to cope with the agents of foreign governments who are engaged in subversive activities here. In dealing with a thousand matters that affect our national life but which are not more important than the matter of subversive activity, we are accustomed to bring together the best experts in the land who are provided with all the necessary resources for framing legislation that will protect our national heritage. Our forest, our mines, our transportation and communications, our public health, and our education are matters upon which we expend stupendous funds and expert knowledge in order that they may be administered for the common good. Surely we must do as much for the protection of our priceless heritage of freedom and democracy. The Nation must be informed by fearless investigation of every menace of those who would steal from us this heritage of free men—the menace of those who hate the Bill of Rights even while they are clamoring for its protection from the exposure of their own misdeeds.

In urging that we begin to consider the necessity for continuing this investigation, I wish to make it clear that great as is the necessity for continuation I had rather see the committee expire on January 3 than to be a party to a cowardly whitewash. I think, therefore, that the time has come when the country and those in control of the Government should determine whether or not we shall be permitted to continue the investigation along fearless and nonpartisan lines or be constantly handicapped, embarrassed, and thwarted by Washington officialdom. In order to make the issue perfectly clear, I here and now declare that I will have no part in any other kind of investigation. I do not want the House of Representatives and the administration to continue the investigation on any other assumption. Since we must also begin to consider the necessity for framing more effective legislation against subversive elements, I desire to add that it is equally important for us to exercise eternal vigilance against the temptation to resort to repressive measures that would detract from the dignified strength of free men. This is no hour for panic. We are not afraid. Dictatorial methods are the hastily improvised devices of cowards and weaklings. Liberty is born of the confidence of strong men. Our American democracy must continue to demonstrate the capacity of man for self-government—with tolerance for all that is nationally tolerable, and without fear in exposing and punishing that which is nationally intolerable.

There must be a new insight into the true meaning of liberalism. Whether men call themselves conservatives or progressives, all those who love America and its free institutions can unite on a platform of liberty. Of one thing we may be certain, conservatives and progressives alike, and that is that economic security and economic progress depends upon the preservation of liberty, upon maintaining inviolate the Bill of Rights. Many peoples in the modern world have sacrificed their hard-won liberty in the pursuit of economic security. They have been rudely awakened to find that both their liberty and their economic security are gone. They have followed demagogues who promised them economic security in exchange for their liberty. They have found, at the end of that road, that their economic insecurity is multiplied a hundred times in the loss of their liberty. All those who believe that liberty is the keystone in the arch of our social structure are true liberals. They may call themselves conservatives or they may call themselves progressives, but together they can unite in rejecting all forms of totalitarianism.

To the people of America I refer my case. After all, this is your investigation, and if you want it continued along honest, courageous, and nonpartisan lines; if you want those in high positions as well as those in low positions exposed when they are guilty; if you agree with me that this is no time for concealment or soft-pedaling on account of partisan interests, you have but to make known your views and wishes to your servants in Washington. As for me, I shall not swerve from the path of duty as God gives me the light to see it.

May the God of our fathers vouchsafe to us the light and the strength to keep America the land of the free.

The Arms Embargo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 30, 1939

ADDRESS BY WILLIAM J. GROSS

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, one of my best friends and most distinguished constituents, William J. Gross, editorial editor of the Fort Wayne (Ind.) News-Sentinel, and a member of the Republican program committee, has won wide acclaim for his courageous and potent editorials on the neutrality question. His views on the embargo issue are contained in the following speech, which he delivered before an overflow meeting of the Allen County Republican Club, of Fort Wayne, on October 18, 1939:

KEEP THE EMBARGO

It is with deep regret that I have observed on the part of many of my fellow Republicans, usually alert to contemporary challenges, a certain apathy toward what is unquestionably the most momentous issue to confront the American people since the great League

of Nations debate and the ensuing "great and solemn referendum" of 1920. * * *

I cannot be unmindful of the fact that there presently exists a great temptation for a great many persons, weary of the New Deal's futile struggle against the continuing crisis in our home affairs, to seek escape in the war crisis in far-off Europe. But those who would continue to lead a free party in defense of a free people should combat this deadly mesmeric trend toward surrender to the combined pressures of propaganda and desperation.

For it is appallingly evident that our complex problems here in the United States are being cruelly consigned to the limbo of neglect, as the administration at Washington shrewdly avails itself of every instrumentality to expedite a public absorption in a war 3,000 miles away. Unemployment, farm prices, mortgage foreclosures, idle capital, idle factory capacity are no longer topics of rational concern by those charged with the weighty responsibility of steering this great Republic through the economic crisis that sprang directly from the last World War, in which the last Democratic administration needlessly enlisted the United States as a participant.

There are even ominous and cold-blooded suggestions that a war boom would help to solve these problems which grew out of another war boom. In the direction of this drift lies disaster for America.

In such an hour the Republican Party and its leaders and spokesmen can have no more urgent mission than to repudiate the vicious and stupid idea that we cannot possibly solve our domestic problems without resort to the temporary and artificial stimulus to business that results from American boys wading into the slaughter pens of Europe to be butchered like brute beasts.

In such an hour the Republican Party and its leaders and spokesmen can have no more urgent obligation than to issue solemn warnings against a policy of inviting a business boom based upon a volume of exports which cannot indefinitely be maintained—a boom which will collapse the minute peace comes or our customers exhaust their ability to buy.

Just as a practical political proposition, do you suppose for a single minute that this political-minded, power-grasping administration at Washington will sit by and permit such a collapse before the 1940 elections if the price to pay means only transformation of our blood business from a cash to a credit or loan basis—or even if it means sending American troops to hold up the props of its synthetic prosperity?

There is nothing in our history to indicate that the present administration would do other than its Democratic predecessor, the Wilson administration, did. In all this talk of "cash and carry," let's not forget that we started out in 1914 on at least the "cash" part of this scheme. President Wilson strongly opposed any loans for the Allies at the beginning of that war of a quarter century ago. But he was eager to have the cash business in order to lift the country out of the trough of panic into which it had been plunged by drastic tariff slashes under the Democratic Underwood bill of 1913. And once the old blood-business boom got started, there was acquisition of such a tremendous American vested interest in Europe's slaughterhouse activities, that Wilson dared not risk slipping into an even worse panic by suddenly transferring our national economy from a war to a peace basis.

So Wilson (first secretly, then openly) relaxed the restrictions on loans and credits; and the vested interests of the munitions makers and others kept growing and growing. At length, to make a long story short, our nauseatingly pro-British Ambassador to Great Britain, the late Walter Hines Page, sent his famous cablegram, from which I quote:

"London.—The financial inquiries made here reveal an international condition most alarming to the American financial and industrial outlook * * *. She cannot continue her present large purchases in the United States * * *. Orders by all the Allied Governments will be reduced * * *. This will of course cause a panic in the United States * * *. This condition may soon come suddenly unless action is quickly taken to prevent it. France and England must have a large enough credit in the United States to prevent the collapse of world trade and of the whole European finance * * *. If we should go to war with Germany, the greatest help we could give the Allies would be credit * * *. All the money would be kept in our own country * * *."

(Note the honeyed bait offered to support what President Roosevelt today guilefully calls "the material point of view.")

"All the money," said Page, "would be kept in our own country, trade would be continued and enlarged until the war ends, and after the war Europe would continue to buy food and would buy from us also an enormous supply of things to reequip her peace industries. We should thus reap the profit of an uninterrupted, perhaps an enlarging, trade over a number of years, and we should hold their securities in payment."

(Yeah, we're still holding them—in default.)

Continued Ambassador Page: "Unless we go to war with Germany our Government, of course, cannot make such a direct grant of credit * * *. I think that the pressure of this approaching crisis has gone beyond the ability of the Morgan financial agency for the British and French Governments. The need is becoming too great for any private agency to meet * * *. Perhaps our going to war is the only way in which our present prominent trade position can be maintained and a panic averted * * *."

Were there, you ask, no minds shrewd enough to see through this ghastly fallacy? Yes; there were. But then, as now, the propaganda was scattering hysteria throughout the land; and greed was blended with lofty idealism to perfume a stinking charnelhouse and give it the appearance of holiness.

From this and from whole volumes of evidence available to any citizen who is not too lazy to consult it, there emerges clear proof that our aid and favor for the Allies from 1914 to 1916 led to a very considerable war boom and inflation. This boom extended, of course, beyond munitions to auxiliary supplies and equipment, as well as to agricultural products. But it was the munitions trade which supplied the spark plug actuating the disastrous inflationary movement. Such a policy, if repeated now, cannot help but produce an identical or similar situation.

So much by way of a pitifully brief summary of the long, complex story of what catapulted us into Europe's slaughter pens 23 years ago—a story which stands as an indelible indictment of the same internationalist forces now so frenziedly laboring to chain this Republic once more to the imperial chariot wheels of a Britain from which, by the grace of God and the high courage of patriots, we once won our independence. * * *

America has—if she will not spurn it—a great and lofty destiny. I believe we are yet to bring about on this continent a further extension of our already promising beginning—an evolution of a new and workable system of liberty and happiness and human brotherhood. But if we are to realize that purpose and achieve that destiny, we shall have need of the best and strongest of our sons.

All of us have cherished the great American dream of a great and happy America peopled with strong and confident men and women. I do not want to see that dream butchered and gassed to death on ancient Old World battlefields in a quarrel over frontiers and boundaries—battlefields unworthy of being even the death place of a free-born American.

I do not wish to see another generation of boys—many of whom have not yet been permitted to enjoy the normal operation of American institutions (thanks to the "red" bunglers who have operated from the White House since 1933)—I do not wish, I say, to see another generation of American boys come home in flag-draped coffins, or wracked with wounds, or coughing blood from gas-rotted lungs, or shell-shocked into lifelong feeble-mindedness. I do not wish to see the rest of that straggling company along "the road back" from another war overwhelmed by the revolutionary excesses which another great post-war economic collapse must surely precipitate.

So let me say at once that not a shred of sound argument supports the claim that we need the help of either the British Navy or the French Army to defend this Nation or this hemisphere. There is no real sanction by any real military expert to support any such contention.

As for the hysterical fear that Nazi doctrines and Nazi concepts of government might somehow overwhelm us if we don't rush overseas to stamp them out, that's just plain silly. It is silly because, in the first place, under this administration's so-called industrial mobilization plan, the very moment we enter a war we come under a complete, out-and-out Fascist military dictatorship, with Hitlerism fully enthroned at Washington in the person of the President, who for all these many years has been surrounded by an insolent coterie of pro-Soviet advisers. Thus the moment we go a-crusading for democracy we will have scrapped democracy for an indeterminate period—not for the duration of the war but "until 6 months after the President shall have proclaimed the end of the emergency." In the second place, Nazi doctrines and the Nazi way of life do not flourish naturally in a nation that is economically stable and reasonably prosperous. But the dislocations of another great war, with its debt, inflation, and post-war collapse, would plant the seeds of nazi-ism—and after that of Godless communism—in fertile soil. There is no better way of inviting nazi-ism, or worse, into this country than to destroy America's internal resistance by engagement in a costly and futile involvement in other people's imperialist wars.

If we fall for the preposterous progaganda of the British Empire and its associated hate-saturated seekers of revenge against Hitlerism, we shall be overlooking some mighty important considerations. The first is that all that is said about the necessity of crushing Hitlerism was said once before about crushing Kaiserism—an effort which produced Hitlerism. The second consideration is that we are still holding the bag for the money we advanced to this same British Empire and its French associates in the last war, by which they enormously increased their empires' flar-flung holdings. And the third consideration is that both these empires are guilty of all the brute force, bad faith, injustice, oppression, and persecution which they are now so eloquently pleading against the Nazis. * * *

But even assuming academically, and purely for purposes of argument, that our national interest would be well served by joining up with imperial France and Britain, why not be frank and honest about the whole thing? Why deceive the people? Why talk about peace while whetting a sword? Why not toss in the wastebasket all the trumped-up symbols of hate, the phony issues and pious fol-de-rol about "real neutrality"?

Then once having been honest with ourselves and the people, let's frankly face certain inescapable eventualities which our participation in the war will bring:

First. The disappearance of every vestige of free, republican government for a generation; the substitution of a one-man, one-party, bastard American version of Nazi-communism; the indefinite suspension of free institutions, including all civil liberties, free speech, free press, etc.

Second. The certainty of dead and mangled and insane young men at a time when we should be having a strong, healthy manhood to accomplish our eventual redemption.

Third. The collapse of the institutions of private property, as debt, inflation, and repudiation smash our economy and open the way to a collectivist economy from which, if experience is any

guide, disillusionment, lax morals, irreligion, atheism, and cynicism combine to propel us into a sinister world dictatorship allied with the Moscow Kremlin.

Then, facing those eventualities, let us finally ask ourselves, before taking a single step, this question: "Is it worth it?"

As we ponder that question let us note that already Britain has served notice that the forthcoming elections will not be held in that country until further notice. Let us note that France is under a complete dictatorship. Let us be certain that if we don't go directly and officially into war ourselves before the 1940 elections we will have built up out of the munitions racket a spurious prosperity which is very likely to perpetuate the Roosevelt regime in office. And let us be equally certain that once elected to a third term Roosevelt will, either from choice or the necessities of irresistible economic pressure, take us quickly into the slaughter pens. That will mean the industrial mobilization plan and dictatorship. It will mean not only the end of our Republican Party, but the end of the Republic itself.

Isn't it about time we did something about this business? For too long now we have been just talking about it.

In conclusion, I permit myself some strong language. The hour approaches when free speech may be a thing of the past, so we had better make the most of our lingering opportunities.

For years the "red" trail left by missionaries of the godless Kremlin has crossed the White House lawn and recrossed the White House portico. It is a trail of systematically planned violence, dressed up in the garments of social reform. It is a trail of enmity for everything that has contributed to the greatness of the Republic. Unless the meanderings of the beast which has left that trail be promptly halted it will devour the soul of our republican democracy in the hell of its hate-inspired war. It will feast upon the carrion of our sons and befoul every sanctuary which their sires and grandsires have held sacred.

If there must be war, let it be waged—and bloodlessly—against the forces which intend the attack to our own citadels, not a blood-letting, enervating, futile contest waged 3,000 miles away. With God as my judge, I say to you with the deepest of conviction that our frontier is not upon the Rhine but upon the Potomac.

I do not plead for violence. I plead for the bloodless force of an awakened party conscience, an awakened American spirit, proud of its heritage, scornful of the spurious pretenses of those who would identify our interest with greed for a fool's gold which already has imposed great penalties upon us. Let us stay the hand of the madmen who would commit our sons to a new blood bath in the slaughterhouses of Old World hatreds, and thereby rob our sons and our son's sons of the immeasurable blessings which our fathers bequeathed to us.

Our course as patriots is clear. We must rip off the disguises of this pending proposal to scrap the prohibitions on the munitions racket. We must stay out of Europe and Asia, which would drain our blood, our manhood, and our wealth forever. We must concentrate on making free, representative, republican democracy work here in the last great industrial nation which has a chance of making it work in the modern machine world.

We must preserve our civil liberties and the American concept of life and government. We must keep ourselves in readiness to render effectively healing aid to a stricken world when both victor and vanquished shall have collapsed. We must defend the American continent and provide the national defenses necessary for that purpose rather than ship those defenses miles away for the service of others.

We must, therefore, keep the embargo on armaments, while enacting all the other features of the pending measure designed to reduce incidents likely to lead to war. We should limit the trade in other commodities to a strict cash-and-carry basis.

Fellow Republicans, we have a great opportunity to build up a secure intercontinental economy here in the West. We can provide an army and navy to defend it for a fraction of the cost of our involvement in a war 3,000 miles or more away. We can find better solutions for our domestic problems than the employment resulting from trade dependent upon butchery across the ocean.

We can use our idle manpower, productive capacity, and idle capital to restore the base of our natural resources; to rehabilitate and conserve our human resources; to develop this great hemisphere into the greatest and happiest homeland of humanity the world has ever seen. Do we seek a "rendezvous with destiny"? Then let us keep that rendezvous here in the great West of boundless promise and opportunity—the dynamic America of our dearest dreams and, please God, of our indomitable faith.

Martin Luther

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER H. GROSS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 31, 1939

EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON POST OF OCTOBER 31, 1939

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, today we celebrate the four hundred and twenty-second anniversary of Martin Luther nailing his 95 theses to the church door in Wittenberg. This was one of the greatest events in the world's religious history. It was probably one of the turning points in the world's history. It meant religious tolerance and liberty to millions of souls in that day and it means the same today. It was probably the greatest contribution to the development of democracy in the world. If Martin Luther were living today I am sure he would be pointing to the same Bible he opened 422 years ago. And I am convinced he would be saying "Herein lies the solution to your present problems."

Mr. Speaker, I include an editorial appearing in this morning's Washington Post:

[From the Washington Post of October 31, 1939]

FOUR HUNDRED TWENTY-TWO YEARS LATER

It was 422 years ago today that Martin Luther nailed his famous 95 theses to the door of the Castle church in Wittenberg.

That event was one of the great turning points in the history of modern times. It shattered the doctrinal unity which had existed in Christendom. But it also helped to bring about the liberation of the individual and thus contributed mightily to the development of democracy in the Western World.

Luther himself did not always understand the fullest implications of his own position. That freedom of interpretation which he espoused for himself he was not always prepared to extend to others. Great as he was the forces which he helped unleash and to which he gave direction were greater than he.

Vast doctrinal differences still divide Christendom. Creeds and sects are multitudinous. But in the face of the evil forces that seek to undermine conscience and freedom, that reduce the individual to the status of an obedient cog in an all-important machine operated by an all-powerful dictator, there has been an inevitable drawing together of all religious elements.

Past differences, real though they continue to be, are today overshadowed by the common heritage, common aspirations, and a common allegiance to the great ethical ideals which underlie the divergent sects and creeds. And it is these aspirations and ideals which are now in mortal danger from those powerful forces which threaten to destroy all civilization.

As a fighter for freedom of conscience, Luther made a contribution to human development which not only his direct followers but all who believe in religion have need to defend with all the force at their command.

Neutrality and the Constitution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 31, 1939

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE, OF INDIANA

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including the following excerpts from a radio address delivered by myself over station WOWO, Fort Wayne, Ind., on the evening of September 18. The occasion was the annual celebration of Constitution Week. The partial text follows:

Fellow citizens, 8 months ago on the floor of the House of Representatives in Washington, I took an oath to preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States. I took that oath as I became a Member of Congress. I took it seriously and solemnly.

Tonight it is my distinct honor to speak to you on the anniversary of the first Constitution Week, 152 years ago, when the fathers of our Republic gave to our country and to all mankind the first draft of our Federal Constitution. * * *

In these days when there are, according to the latest reports, so many conspirators and influences spreading the dark doctrines of fascism, communism, and every other "ism" except patriotism, we need to teach all the people, without regard to race, color, or religion, that they are absolutely equal under the law and entitled to the protection of the Constitution.

Dangers to our Constitution in this our day lie not so much in violations of its prescriptions as in hostility to its fundamental purposes. During recent times attempts have been made to concentrate power and to subordinate departments of government to the Executive. These efforts have been very promptly and very successfully resisted. We must continue to resist them.

I am one of those who believe that the Constitution of the United States will never be destroyed, and I want to point out one significant and encouraging fact in this connection. There is not today a single community in the United States where any man could be

elected to office on a platform advocating a change in our form of government.

At this moment when the countries of Europe are in the throes of a tragic, senseless war, or governed by dictators who suppress all liberty of speech and religion, our prime obligation is to preserve our rights under the Constitution, strengthen our neutrality laws, and retain our strong will for peace. We ourselves never want to engage in another war. And we will stay out if we have the will to stay out.

During the last few days I have received hundreds of letters from citizens in every part of northeastern Indiana urging me to stand firm in my support of the embargo provision of the present Neutrality Act. Many of the writers were mothers of boys of soldier age who are hoping and praying that their sons will not have to be sacrificed on foreign battlefields.

To these mothers—and to all my friends who have taken the trouble to write to me—I wish to say, I am going back to Washington tomorrow prepared to do everything in my power to keep the United States at peace.

It is my sincere conviction, and the conviction of many thinking people, that the best way to accomplish this is to avoid taking sides in the European conflict, regardless of our sympathies for the democracies.

We must keep the embargo on arms and munitions. We must never again permit war profiteers to sell instruments of death and destruction to favored nations.

Why should anyone make a profit out of the tears, the blood, and the agony of nations engaged in war? Why should we sell army or navy planes or munitions or armaments to nations with whom we may ourselves sometime become involved in war?

Let us have real neutrality. Let us keep the law which makes it a crime to sell arms, munitions, and war materials to belligerent nations. Let that be the American doctrine.

In my judgment, the United States will not repeat the mistake of 1917. We have learned our lesson. We know that the quarrels of Europe are not our quarrels, that the life of one American soldier is worth more than all the blood money of munitions makers the world over.

What we need most of all today is faith in our institutions and the courage to maintain strict neutrality. Faith and courage. We live in the land of the free. Let us see to it that we stay free.

I thank you.

Another Instance of the Administration's Duplicity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 31, 1939

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the President and his Corn-Wallace Secretary of Agriculture may think they are successful in not letting "thy left hand know what thy right hand doeth," when dealing with the farmer; but the farmers are not the "hicks" that politicians and some city folks think them to be. By nature, because of many "trimmings," they are suspicious of the "city slicker" or the politician who comes bearing gifts.

When Roosevelt first began to play Santa Claus they wondered what it was all about. Some of them took the checks passed out, which represented a small proportion of the money which they and their small-town neighbors contributed to the Federal Government—after, of course, the politicians had taken a rake-off—but they were looking for something rotten in Denmark somewhere. And the trade treaties have at last shown them that Roosevelt and his "brain trusters" are more interested in a good-neighbor policy which may for the moment work to the advantage of the industrialists' foreign market, but which will in the end destroy the industrialists' home market—the farmers' buying power.

And they have now discovered that Roosevelt is aiding his friend John L. Lewis, with his C. I. O., who are

SKIMMING THE MILK

Grandmother poured the milk in shallow, wide pans, put it down cellar so the cream might rise to the top and be readily skimmed off for the making of butter. A farm hand who liked milk but preferred cream would slip down and with a saucer skim the milk and drink the cream. Grandmother thought he was getting a little more than his share as well as upsetting her program for butter making.

Today the factory worker is demanding and receiving higher wages and shorter hours while the farmer who feeds him has been seeing his prices go lower and his hours of work remain as before. The factory man demands and gets a 42-or-less-hour week, a 30-cent-per-hour minimum wage. The farmer many times is busy from sunup to sundown, not 5 but 6 days a week, and Sundays he does the chores, feeds and milks the cows, dairying being a 7-day-a-week industry. Nor is his return 30 cents per hour.

Just why should the unions limit the workers in industry to members of their organizations and by an increase in wages and a shortening of hours raise the prices on every single thing the farmer must buy, without a corresponding increase in the price to the farmer for his products? When is this one-sided skimming of milk (the cream off of the national income) in favor of the factory worker, to the disadvantage of the farmer, going to end? Not until farmers insist that, if there is a factory job open, when the factory worker is not satisfied with his job, he give the farmers a chance at it, and that they receive a comparatively fair price for their work. Not until the Government quits backing union racketeers (as distinguished from factory workers) and ends its inconsistent treatment of and discrimination against the farmers.

I am not finding fault with the wage paid the factory worker, but the wage the farmer receives should more nearly match it.

Government checks may or may not be handed out in future years, and the amount of those checks is always uncertain and their distribution subject to political favoritism.

Once destroyed, the farmer's market is gone for years. The farmer's home market, his domestic market, has always been his chief reliance. Upon it depends his day to day and year to year security. Let us keep the home market for the American farmer.

The argument that factory workers should receive a high wage in order that they may buy the farmer's products sounds all right but, if there is anything in it, we might just as well turn it around and say that by giving the farmer a fair price for what he raises he may buy what the factory worker produces. How about it? Why not try it? Why let the union man take all of the "cream"?

THE FARMER GETS IT IN THE NECK AGAIN

This administration is talking about a reciprocal-trade treaty with Argentina whereby the duty is to be reduced on farm products, among which are casein, linseed, flaxseed, vegetable oil, oleo oil, tallow, beef, veal, cheese, turkey, eggs, corn, broomcorn, grapes, pears, wools, and hides. All of the above are produced here in substantial quantities, perhaps not in your particular section of the country, but somewhere in the United States.

Chile seems a long way from Michigan, but with cheap Indian labor it grows beans, wonderful melons, peaches, and other fruits which under modern refrigeration reach American markets by the shipload.

In spite of the fact that the Social Welfare Commission of Michigan the past season purchased approximately 536,000 one-hundred-pound bags of beans, the Michigan carry-over of beans for 1939 is estimated to be at least 500,000 such bags.

The Department of Agriculture estimates the new crop for Michigan to be 4,205,000 bags, while for the past 10 years the average yearly consumption, seed requirements, and so forth, of Michigan is estimated at about 3,700,000 bags, which would give us a carry-over of 505,000 bags, or 50,500,000 pounds of beans for which there is no present market.

The administration has in mind a trade treaty with Chile which will permit the beans, melons, and fruits of that country to be sold in the farmer's market at a price which is less than his cost of production.

It is all very well for the New Deal to give the farmers checks for this, that, and the other, and no doubt those checks are welcome, but if in the end the market for the things which our farmers raise is destroyed by products brought in from foreign countries, where they are produced at starvation wages, is not the ultimate result disaster for the farmer?

It Is Time That Congress Took Back the Many Powers Granted to the President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 31, 1939

EDITORIAL FROM THE BLOCK PAPERS

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, many editorials have been written upon the subject of the vast power which has been conferred upon the President of the United States, and many of our people are expressing their condemnation of the Congress because such great power has been given to the President. I am happy to express my freedom from any participation in this wild orgy of giving the President more power. I have advocated on many occasions that much of the power which the majority in the Congress has vested in the President should be removed and taken away from him. The people of our Nation are the rulers in this Republic, and may it ever be so.

I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein a very interesting editorial which appeared in the Block newspapers of recent date, which editorial should invite the careful attention of every Member of the Congress and which follows:

[From the Block newspapers]

IT IS TIME THAT CONGRESS TOOK BACK THE MANY POWERS GRANTED TO THE PRESIDENT

The United States is not at war. We are at peace and, if the will of the majority of our citizens prevails, we will remain at peace.

This being so, we cannot let the present conflict in Europe, however serious it may become to us, wholly overshadow our domestic welfare. We faced grave problems here at home before the war began; despite the war, these problems remain and we must deal with them.

We cannot forget the need for Government cooperation with business for the sake of recovery. We cannot forget the constantly increasing national debt and the necessity for Government economy to check the growth of the indebtedness. We cannot forget our ruinous tax laws. We cannot forget, above all, the real threat to our democratic form of government created by granting more and more power to the Executive, especially in times of so-called emergency.

Frank Gannett, prominent newspaper publisher and chairman of the National Committee to Uphold Constitutional Government, recently called to the attention of the Members of Congress the wide dictatorial powers now held by the President.

Of particular importance are the powers whereby the President, without consulting Congress, may censor or close down radio stations, may close the banks and stock exchanges, may change, within limits, the gold content of the dollar, may raise or lower the tariffs, may control farmers' crops, and may do numberless things which should, in a democracy, remain in the hands of the people's representatives.

Further Executive powers, for example, allow the President to restrict trade and travel with foreign countries, to regulate foreign exchange, to extend or withhold money or work or farm relief, to seize or detain ships under certain circumstances, to require all silver to be delivered to the mint, to seize manufacturing plants which do not give precedence to Government contracts or which do not manufacture arms and munitions at a fair price, to requisition any vessel, and to do many other things wholly on his own authority.

It therefore becomes the duty of Congress to review fully all of the grants of power it has made to the President beyond those rightfully granted him by the Constitution. Democracy is threatened by totalitarian government in almost every quarter of the world today; it is consequently all the more important that we in this country assure ourselves that no one man possess sufficient authority to undermine the precious heritage of our free government.

The Arms Embargo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 31, 1939

LETTER FROM W. B. SWANEY

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter received by me from Hon. W. B. Swaney, of Chattanooga, Tenn.:

CHATTANOOGA, TENN., *October 25, 1939.*

Hon. ESTES KEFAUVER, M. C.,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR ESTES: I am in receipt of your letter of recent date requesting that I give you my opinion in regard to the Embargo Act.

As you know, I have been an assiduous student of the life and teachings of Thomas Jefferson for many years and have written on that subject to some extent.

In my judgment, there should be no question about the policy of the United States at this time, and that the Embargo Act should be repealed.

The United States is in a very different position to what it was in 1807 when the first embargo law was enacted during Jefferson's administration. I have read an account of this given by Claude G. Bowers who is an authority on this phase of Jefferson's life and teachings. His latest great book being Jefferson in Power. Also the volume entitled "The Jeffersonian System" written by Edward Channing, which treats the matter fairly and impartially, as well as other authors on this subject.

To begin with, at the time of Jefferson's embargo he had to deal with both England and France, both of which great nations would not consider the United States as having reached the dignity of a nation worthy of notice. Both treated the United States with contempt and disregarded our rights upon the high seas.

The history of Jefferson's embargo shows conclusively that it was not enforced and could not be enforced, and, in my judgment, the present embargo cannot be enforced.

The United States is now a world power, and both the English and French Governments represent the same set of ideas which have been developed in this country, and the reflex action has caused both England and France to become more democratic. The American people, in my judgment, are in entire sympathy with England and France at this time.

Not to repeal the Embargo Act would not only be a gross injustice to the commercial interests of this Nation, but would show a hostile attitude toward both England and France and would work to the benefit of both Germany and Russia.

Independent of this consideration and the history of legislation of this character, in my opinion, the American people, regardless of politics, have confidence in Hon. Cordell Hull, Secretary of State, and his conduct of the Department of State, and if left to a vote, would uphold him in his judgments and opinion in this regard.

No one has ever better expressed the wisest policy of the Government with foreign nations than Jefferson in his first inaugural address, when he said:

"Peace, commerce, and honest friendship with all nations, and entangling alliances with none."

To repeal the present embargo law would be the best safeguard against entrance into what appears to be a second World War.

With kindest regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

W. B. SWANEY.

Pending Neutrality Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 31, 1939

WASHINGTON NEWS LETTER BY HON. NOAH M. MASON, OF ILLINOIS

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to insert my own remarks in the RECORD, I include my Washington news letter

which appears in the newspapers of the Twelfth Congressional District of Illinois this week:

PERTINENT FACTS OF THE NEUTRALITY QUESTION

Do you know that under the present so-called neutrality law the President has wide discretionary powers over commercial credits in time of war; that he may set any time limit he may desire to set—90 days, 6 months, 1 year, or more? The new neutrality bill removes the President's powers in connection with commercial credits and contains a provision for "cash on the barrel head." This is a great improvement over the present so-called neutrality law and will go a long way toward keeping the United States from becoming involved in the war.

Do you know that under the present so-called neutrality law the President has the sole power to declare when a state of war exists? He has not so declared in the case of the war in China, yet every school child in America knows that a state of war exists in China. Under the new neutrality bill either the President or the Congress may declare that a state of war exists. This makes certain that when the President fails to act, as he has in connection with the war in China, the Congress can and will act. This is a step toward getting the war power back in the hands of Congress, where it belongs.

Do you know that England and France have between them $8,000,000,000 on deposit in this country today, set aside for the purchase of needed war supplies, mostly raw materials and airplanes? About $5,000,000,000 of this vast sum is in gold and $3,000,000,000 is in securities and investments that can be readily converted into cash. This will buy a lot of airplanes and raw materials.

Do you know that most of the letters that have been sent to Congressmen concerning the neutrality problem indicate that the writers think that the President is trying to repeal the present neutrality law? No such proposal has come before the Congress. Actually the proposal now before Congress is to amend the present neutrality law, by removing the discretionary powers given to the President in 1937 by a rubber-stamp Congress; to establish a cash-and-carry program; and to prevent our ships and citizens from going into the war zone. This should reduce the likelihood of our becoming involved in the war.

Do you know that all kinds of war supplies, except arms and ammunition, can be, and are being, shipped to the warring nations under our present so-called neutrality law? These include steel, scrap iron, oil, chemicals, machine tools with which to make guns; alcohol, cotton, and cellulose with which to make ammunition. Do you know that all these goods and materials are contraband of war, subject to seizure, or to be sunk, and they are being shipped today in American ships right into the war zone where submarines are active? Do you know that arms and ammunition amounted to only 13 percent of the total war shipments in the World War, and that in the present war arms and ammunition would not amount to over 5 percent of the total war orders, even if the arms embargo is lifted? These are facts that shed light upon the neutrality debate.

Do you know that our greatest danger of becoming involved in the war comes from the prevalent but false idea that this Nation must eventually enter the war? Three out of every four persons on the street say, "We will be in the war within 6 months." "We will be in it before it is over." "If it lasts long enough, we will be dragged in." Such statements express a defeatist attitude. They express a "what is the use" attitude, a fatalistic attitude. However, every Member of Congress has definitely made up his mind that we can and will stay out. We are not going to make the mistake we made 20 years ago. "A burnt child dreads the fire."

Foreboding

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. U. S. GUYER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 31, 1939

POEM BY MABEL FREER LOVERIDGE

Mr. GUYER of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under leave, by unanimous consent, to extend my remarks in the RECORD to include a quotation from the Miami Republican (Paola, Kans.) I insert the following poem written by Mabel Freer Loveridge, which is apropos to the present discussion of neutrality and the determination of the people of our country to keep out of a European war:

FOREBODING

When I am rocking you, my son,
And singing lullabies,
Someone is planning stouter planes
For Death to ride the skies.
While I am dressing you, my son,
In little boyish suits,
Someone is making uniforms
And sturdier soldier boots.

While you are chasing butterflies
Amid the tangled grass,
Someone is testing chemicals
To make a deadlier gas;
And while you eat your simple fare,
Perhaps the war lords sit
To start again the bugle notes
That only call the fit.

While I would build a splendid man
So fine and strong, my son,
Someone, in secret, tries to make
A farther-reaching gun—
A gun that on some distant day,
When drums of battle roll,
May leave me with a golden star
And iron in my soul.

—*Mabel Freer Loveridge.*

Neutrality and the Shanley Resolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 31, 1939

TELEGRAM BY HON. COMPTON I. WHITE, OF IDAHO

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, that my colleagues may have an expression of my views on neutrality and the pending resolution, I insert herewith a copy of telegram to four of my constituents in Idaho:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *October 31, 1939.*

FRED L. VIEL,
OWEN T. STRATTON,
T. J. STROUD,
W. C. SMITH,
Salmon, Idaho:

Thanks for your telegram. I firmly adhere to principles of neutrality on which this country was founded as laid down by Washington and Jefferson. I am in close accord and sympathy with ideals of President Wilson. Advocate strict neutrality now and disarmament all nations with creation of Supreme International Commission with police power to enforce peace and fair dealing by all governments.

COMPTON I. WHITE, M. C.

Comparative Print of Neutrality Bills

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE LEWIS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 30, 1939

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I desire to renew my unanimous consent request that a comparative print showing the Neutrality Act of 1937, which is still the law, with House Joint Resolution 306 as it passed the House amending that act, and the joint resolution as it passed the Senate on Friday last be printed in the RECORD in parallel columns, three columns on the page, subject to the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to is here printed in full as follows:

COMPARATIVE PRINT OF THE NEUTRALITY ACT

The present law approved May 1, 1937
[Public Resolution—No. 27—75th Congress—1st Session]

JOINT RESOLUTION

To amend the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution providing for the prohibition of the export of arms, ammunition, and implements of war to belligerent countries; the prohibition of the transportation of arms, ammunition, and implements of war by vessels of the United States for the use of belligerent states; for the registration and licensing of persons engaged in the business of manufacturing, exporting, or importing arms, ammunition, or implements of war; and restricting travel by American citizens on belligerent ships during war," approved August 31, 1935, as amended

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

That the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution providing for the prohibition of the export of arms, ammunition, and implements of war to belligerent countries; the prohibition of the transportation of arms, ammunition, and implements of war by vessels of the United States for the use of belligerent states; for the registration and licensing of persons engaged in the business of manufacturing, exporting, or importing arms, ammunition, or implements of war; and restricting travel by American citizens on belligerent ships during war," approved August 31, 1935, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"EXPORT OF ARMS, AMMUNITION, AND IMPLEMENTS OF WAR

"SECTION 1. (a) Whenever the President shall find that there exists a state of war between, or among, two or more foreign states, the President shall proclaim such fact, and it shall thereafter be unlawful to export, or attempt to export, or cause to be exported, arms, ammunition, or implements of war from any place in the United States to any belligerent state named in such proclamation, or to any neutral state for transshipment to, or for the use of, any such belligerent state.

"(b) The President shall, from time to time, by proclamation, extend such embargo upon the export of arms, ammunition, or implements of war to other states as and when they may become involved in such war.

"(c) Whenever the President shall find that a state of civil strife exists in a foreign state and that such civil strife is of a magnitude or is being conducted under such conditions that the export of arms, ammunition, or implements of war from the United States to such foreign state would threaten or endanger the peace of the United States, the President shall proclaim such fact, and it shall thereafter be unlawful to export, or attempt to export, or cause to be exported, arms, ammunition, or implements of war from any place in the United States to such foreign state, or to any neutral state for transshipment to, or for the use of, such foreign state.

"(d) The President shall, from time to time by proclamation, definitely enumerate the arms, ammunition, and implements of war, the export of which is prohibited by this section. The arms, ammunition, and implements of war so enumerated shall include those enumerated in the President's proclamation numbered 2163, of April 10, 1936, but shall not include raw materials or any other articles or materials not of the same general character as those enumerated in the said proclamation, and in the Convention for the

As passed the House, June 30, 1939
[H. J. Res. 306—76th Congress—1st Session]

NEUTRALITY RESOLUTION OF 1939

Whereas the policy of the United States in foreign wars not affecting the defense of the United States is a policy of neutrality in accordance with the rules of international law; and

Whereas the United States stands for restating and strengthening the rights of neutrals at the earliest practicable time; and

Whereas it seems advisable, until these rights can be restated, to diminish the risk of this Nation becoming involved in foreign wars by restricting the exercise of certain neutral rights of our citizens: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

PROCLAMATION OF A STATE OF WAR BETWEEN FOREIGN STATES

SECTION 1. (a) That whenever the President or Congress by concurrent resolution shall find that there exists a state of war between foreign states, and that it is necessary to promote the security or preserve the peace of the United States or to protect the lives of citizens of the United States, the President shall issue a proclamation naming the states involved; and he shall, from time to time, by proclamation, name other states as and when they may become involved in the war.

(b) Whenever the conditions which have caused the President to issue any proclamation under the authority of this section have ceased to exist, he shall revoke the same.

SEC. 2. Whenever the President shall have issued a proclamation under the authority of section 1 (a) it shall thereafter be unlawful to export, or attempt to export, or cause to be exported, arms or ammunition from any place in the United States to any belligerent states named in such proclamation.

As passed the Senate, October 27, 1939
[H. J. Res. 306—76th Congress—2d Session]

NEUTRALITY SUBSTITUTE OF 1939

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

PROCLAMATION OF A STATE OF WAR BETWEEN FOREIGN STATES

SECTION 1. (a) That whenever the President, or the Congress by concurrent resolution, shall find that there exists a state of war between foreign states, and that it is necessary to promote the security or preserve the peace of the United States or to protect the lives of citizens of the United States, the President shall issue a proclamation naming the states involved; and he shall, from time to time, by proclamation, name other states as and when they may become involved in the war.

(b) Whenever the state of war which shall have caused the President to issue any proclamation under the authority of this section shall have ceased to exist with respect to any state named in such proclamation, he shall revoke such proclamation with respect to such state.

Present neutrality law—Continued

Supervision of the International Trade in Arms and Ammunition and in Implements of War, signed at Geneva June 17, 1925.

"(e) Whoever, in violation of any of the provisions of this act, shall export, or attempt to export, or cause to be exported, arms, ammunition, or implements of war from the United States shall be fined not more than $10,000, or imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both, and the property, vessel, or vehicle containing the same shall be subject to the provisions of sections 1 to 8, inclusive, title 6, chapter 30, of the act approved June 15, 1917 (40 Stat. 223–225; U. S. C., 1934 ed., title 22, secs. 238–245).

"(f) In the case of the forfeiture of any arms, ammunition, or implements of war by reason of a violation of this act, no public or private sale shall be required; but such arms, ammunition, or implements of war shall be delivered to the Secretary of War for such use or disposal thereof as shall be approved by the President of the United States.

"(g) Whenever, in the judgment of the President, the conditions which have caused him to issue any proclamation under the authority of this section have ceased to exist, he shall revoke the same, and the provisions of this section shall thereupon cease to apply with respect to the state or states named in such proclamation, except with respect to offenses committed, or forfeitures incurred, prior to such revocation.

Bill as passed the House—Continued

"EXPORT OF OTHER ARTICLES AND MATERIALS

"SEC. 2. (a) Whenever the President shall have issued a proclamation under the authority of section 1 of this act and he shall thereafter find that the placing of restrictions on the shipment of certain articles or materials in addition to arms, ammunition, and implements of war from the United States to belligerent states, or to a state wherein civil strife exists, is necessary to promote the security or preserve the peace of the United States or to protect the lives of citizens of the United States, he shall so proclaim, and it shall thereafter be unlawful, except under such limitations and exceptions as the President may prescribe as to lakes, rivers, and inland waters bordering on the United States, and as to transportation on or over lands bordering on the United States, for any American vessel to carry such articles or materials to any belligerent state, or to any state wherein civil strife exists, named in such proclamation issued under the authority of section 1 of this act, or to any neutral state for transshipment to, or for the use of, any such belligerent state or any such state wherein civil strife exists. The President shall by proclamation from time to time definitely enumerate the articles and materials which it shall be unlawful for American vessels to so transport.

"(b) Whenever the President shall have issued a proclamation under the authority of section 1 of this act and he shall thereafter find that the placing of restrictions on the export of articles or materials from the United States to belligerent states, or to a state wherein civil strife exists, is necessary

TRANSFER OF TITLE

SEC. 4. (d) Whenever the President shall have issued a proclamation under the authority of section 1 (a) it shall thereafter be unlawful, except in accordance with such rules and regulations as the President shall prescribe, to export or transport, or attempt to export or transport, or cause to be exported or transported, from the United States directly or indirectly to any state named in the proclamation, any articles or materials until all right, title, and interest therein shall have been transferred to some foreign government, agency, institution, association, partnership, corporation, or national. The shipper of such articles or materials shall be required to file with the collector of the port from which they are to be exported a declaration under oath that there exists in citizens of the United States no right, title, or interest in such articles or materials, and to comply with such rules and regulations as shall be promulgated from time to time by the President. Any such declaration so filed shall be a conclusive estoppel against any claim of any citizen of the United States of right, title, or interest in such articles or materials. Insurance written by underwriters on such articles or materials shall not be deemed an American interest therein, and no insurance policy issued on such articles or materials, and no loss incurred thereunder, shall be made the basis of any claim put forward by the Government of the United States. The provisions of this subsection shall not apply to trade on or over lands, lakes, rivers, and inland waters bordering on the United States.

Bill as passed the Senate—Continued

COMMERCE WITH STATES ENGAGED IN ARMED CONFLICT

SEC. 2. (a) Whenever the President shall have issued a proclamation under the authority of section 1 (a) it shall thereafter be unlawful for any American vessel to carry any passengers or any articles or materials to any state named in such proclamation.

(b) Whoever shall violate any of the provisions of subsection (a) of this section or of any regulations issued thereunder shall, upon conviction thereof, be fined not more than $50,000 or imprisoned for not more than 5 years, or both. Should the violation be by a corporation, organization, or association, each officer or director thereof participating in the violation shall be liable to the penalty herein prescribed.

(c) Whenever the President shall have issued a proclamation under the authority of section 1 (a) it shall thereafter be unlawful to export or transport, or attempt to export or transport, or cause to be exported or transported, from the United States to any state named in such proclamation, any articles or materials (except copyrighted articles or materials) until all right, title, and interest therein shall have been transferred to some foreign government, agency, institution, association, partnership, corporation, or national. (Issuance of a bill of lading under which title to the goods shipped passes to the purchaser unconditionally upon delivery of the goods to carrier, shall constitute a transfer of all right, title, and interest therein within the meaning of this subsection.) The shipper of such articles or materials shall be required to file with the collector of the port from or through which they are to be exported a declaration under oath that he has complied with the requirements of this subsection with respect to transfer of right, title, and interest in such articles or materials, and that he will comply with such rules and regulations as shall be promulgated from time to time. Any such declaration so filed shall be a conclusive estoppel against any claim of any citizen of the United States having knowledge of such shipment or of such declaration of right, title, or interest in such articles or materials. No loss incurred by any such citizen (1) in connection with the sale or transfer of right, title, and interest in any such articles or materials or (2) in connection with the exportation or transportation of any such copyrighted

Present neutrality law—Continued

to promote the security or preserve the peace of the United States or to protect the lives or commerce of citizens of the United States, he shall so proclaim, and it shall thereafter be unlawful, except under such limitations and exceptions as the President may prescribe as to lakes, rivers, and inland waters bordering on the United States, and as to transportation on or over land bordering on the United States, to export or transport, or attempt to export or transport, or cause to be exported or transported, from the United States to any belligerent state, or to any state wherein civil strife exists, named in such proclamation issued under the authority of section 1 of this act, or to any neutral state for transshipment to, or for the use of, any such belligerent state or any such state wherein civil strife exists, any articles or materials whatever until all right, title, and interest therein shall have been transferred to some foreign government, agency, institution, association, partnership, corporation, or national. The shipper of such articles or materials shall be required to file with the collector of the port from which they are to be exported a declaration under oath that there exists in citizens of the United States no right, title, or interest in such articles or materials, and to comply with such rules and regulations as shall be promulgated from time to time by the President. Any such declaration so filed shall be a conclusive estoppel against any claim of any citizen of the United States of right, title, or interest in such articles or materials. Insurance written by underwriters on any articles or materials the export of which is prohibited by this act, or on articles or materials carried by an American vessel in violation of subsection (a) of this section, shall not be deemed an American interest therein, and no insurance policy issued on such articles or materials and no loss incurred thereunder or by the owner of the vessel carrying the same shall be made a basis of any claim put forward by the Government of the United States.

"(c) The President shall from time to time by proclamation extend such restrictions as are imposed under the authority of this section to other states as and when they may be declared to become belligerent states under proclamations issued under the authority of section 1 of this act.

"(d) The President may from time to time change, modify, or revoke in whole or in part any proclamations issued by him under the authority of this section.

"(e) Except with respect to offenses committed, or forfeitures incurred, prior to May 1, 1939, this section and all proclamations issued thereunder shall not be effective after May 1, 1939.

(The above section expired May 1, 1939)

"(d) Whenever the President shall have revoked any such proclamation issued under the authority of section 1 of this act, the provisions of this section and of any regulations issued by the President hereunder shall thereupon cease to apply with respect to the state or states named in such proclamation, except with respect to offenses committed prior to such revocation.

(See Section 3 (d) present law.)

Bill as passed the House—Continued

(e) Whenever the President shall have revoked any proclamation issued under the authority of section 1 (a), the provisions of this section and of any regulations issued by the President hereunder shall thereupon cease to apply with respect to the state or states named in such proclamation, except with respect to offenses committed prior to such revocation.

Bill as passed the Senate—Continued

articles or materials, shall be made the basis of any claim put forward by the Government of the United States.

(d) Insurance written by underwriters on articles or materials included in shipments which are subject to restrictions under the provisions of this joint resolution, and on vessels carrying such shipments shall not be deemed an American interest therein, and no insurance policy issued on such articles or materials, or vessels, and no loss incurred thereunder or by the owners of such vessels, shall be made the basis of any claim put forward by the Government of the United States.

(e) Whenever any proclamation issued under the authority of section 1 (a) shall have been revoked with respect to any state the provisions of this section shall thereupon cease to apply with respect to such state, except as to offenses committed prior to such revocation.

(f) The provisions of subsection (a) of this section shall not apply to transportation by American vessels on or over lakes, rivers, and inland waters bordering on the United States, or to transportation by aircraft on or over lands bordering on the United States; and the provisions of subsection

Present neutrality law—Continued

Bill as passed the House—Continued

Bill as passed the Senate—Continued

(c) of this section shall not apply (1) to such transportation of any articles or materials other than articles listed in a proclamation issued under the authority of section 12 (i), or (2) to any other transportation on or over lands bordering on the United States of any articles or materials other than articles listed in a proclamation issued under the authority of section 12 (i), and the provisions of subsections (a) and (c) of this section shall not apply to the transportation referred to in this subsection and subsections (g) and (h) of any articles or materials listed in a proclamation issued under the authority of section 12 (i) if the articles or materials so listed are to be used exclusively by American vessels, aircraft, or other vehicles in connection with their operation and maintenance.

(g) The provisions of subsections (a) and (c) of this section shall not apply to transportation by American vessels (other than aircraft) of mail, passengers, or any articles or materials (except articles or materials listed in a proclamation issued under the authority of section 12 i)) (1) to any port in the Western Hemisphere south of 35° north latitude, (2) to any port in the Western Hemisphere north of 35° north latitude and west of 66° west longitude, (3) to any port on the Pacific or Indian Oceans, including the China Sea, the Tasman Sea, the Bay of Bengal, and the Arabian Sea, or (4) to any port on the Atlantic Ocean south of 30° north latitude. The exception contained in this subsection shall not apply to any such port which is included within a combat area as defined in section 3 which applies to such vessels.

(h) The provisions of subsections (a) and (c) of this section shall not apply to transportation by aircraft of mail, passengers, or any articles or materials (except articles or materials listed in a proclamation issued under the authority of section 12 (i)) (1) to any port in the Western Hemisphere, or (2) to any port on the Pacific or Indian Oceans, including the China Sea, the Tasman Sea, the Bay of Bengal, and the Arabian Sea. The exceptions contained in this subsection shall not apply to any such port which is included within a combat area as defined in section 3 which applies to such aircraft.

(i) Every American vessel to which the provisions of subsections (g) and (h) apply shall, before departing from a port or from the jurisdiction of the United States, file with the collector of customs of the port of departure, or if there is no such collector at such port then with the nearest collector of customs, an export declaration (1) containing a complete list of all the articles and materials carried as cargo by such vessel, and the names and addresses of the consignees of all such articles and materials, and (2) stating the ports at which such articles and materials are to be unloaded and the ports of call of such vessel. All transportation referred to in subsections (f), (g), and (h) of this section shall be subject to such restrictions, rules, and regulations as the President shall prescribe; but no loss incurred in connection with any transportation excepted under the provisions of subsections (g) and (h) of this section shall be made the basis of any claim put forward by the Government of the United States.

(j) Whenever all proclamations issued under the authority of section 1 (a) shall have been revoked, the provisions of subsections (f), (g), (h), and (i) shall expire.

(k) The provisions of this section shall not apply to an American vessel whose voyage was begun 7 days or more in advance of (1) the date of enactment of this joint resolution, or (2) any proclamation issued after such date under the authority of section 1 (a) of this joint resolution.

Present neutrality law—Continued

"TRAVEL ON VESSELS OF BELLIGERENT STATES

"SEC. 9. Whenever the President shall have issued a proclamation under the authority of section 1 of this act it shall thereafter be unlawful for any citizen of the United States to travel on any vessel of the state or states named in such proclamation, except in accordance with such rules and regulations as the President shall prescribe: *Provided, however,* That the provisions of this section shall not apply to a citizen of the United States traveling on a vessel whose voyage was begun in advance of the date of the President's proclamation, and who had no opportunity to discontinue his voyage after that date: *And provided further,* That they shall not apply under 90 days after the date of the President's proclamation to a citizen of the United States returning from a foreign state to the United States. Whenever, in the President's judgment, the conditions which have caused him to issue his proclamation have ceased to exist, he shall revoke his proclamation and the provisions of this section shall thereupon cease to apply with respect to the state or states named in such proclamation, except with respect to offenses committed prior to such revocation.

"ARMING OF AMERICAN MERCHANT VESSELS PROHIBITED

"SEC. 10. Whenever the President shall have issued a proclamation under the authority of section 1, it shall thereafter be unlawful, until such proclamation is revoked, for any American vessel engaged in commerce with any belligerent state, or any state wherein civil strife exists, named in such proclamation, to be armed or to carry any armament, arms, ammunition, or implements of war, except small arms and ammunition therefor which the President may deem necessary and shall publicly designate for the preservation of discipline aboard such vessels.

Bill as passed the House—Continued

TRAVEL ON VESSELS OF BELLIGERENT STATES

SEC. 3. (a) Whenever the President shall have issued a proclamation under the authority of section 1 (a), no citizen of the United States shall travel except at his own risk on any vessel of the state or states named in such proclamation, unless in accordance with such rules and regulations as the President shall prescribe.

(b) Whenever the President shall have revoked any proclamation issued under the authority of section 1 (a), the provisions of this section and of any regulations issued by the President hereunder shall thereupon cease to apply with respect to the state or states named in such proclamation, except with respect to offenses committed prior to such revocation.

Bill as passed the Senate—Continued

COMBAT AREAS

SEC. 3. (a) Whenever the President shall have issued a proclamation under the authority of section 1 (a), and he shall thereafter find that the protection of citizens of the United States so requires, he shall, by proclamation, define combat areas, and thereafter it shall be unlawful, except under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed, for any citizen of the United States or any American vessel to proceed into or through any such combat area. The combat areas so defined may be made to apply to surface vessels or aircraft, or both.

(b) In case of the violation of any of the provisions of this section by any American vessel, or any owner or officer thereof, such vessel, owner, or officer shall be fined not more than $50,000 or imprisoned for not more than 5 years, or both. Should the owner of such vessel be a corporation, organization, or association, each officer or director participating in the violation shall be liable to the penalty hereinabove prescribed. In case of the violation of this section by any citizen traveling as a passenger, such passenger may be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned for not more than 2 years, or both.

(c) The President may from time to time modify or extend any proclamation issued under the authority of this section, and when the conditions which shall have caused him to issue any such proclamation shall have ceased to exist he shall revoke such proclamation and the provisions of this section shall thereupon cease to apply, except as to offenses committed prior to such revocation.

AMERICAN RED CROSS

SEC. 4. The provisions of section 2 (a) shall not prohibit the transportation by vessels under charter or other direction and control of the American Red Cross, proceeding under safe conduct granted by states named in any proclamation issued under the authority of section 1 (a), of officers and American Red Cross personnel, medical personnel, and medical supplies, food, and clothing, for the relief of human suffering.

TRAVEL ON VESSELS OF BELLIGERENT STATES

SEC. 5. (a) Whenever the President shall have issued a proclamation under the authority of section 1 (a) it shall thereafter be unlawful for any citizen of the United States to travel on any vessel of any state named in such proclamation, except in accordance with such rules and regulations as may be prescribed.

(b) Whenever any proclamation issued under the authority of section 1 (a) shall have been revoked with respect to any state the provisions of this section shall thereupon cease to apply with respect to such state, except as to offenses committed prior to such revocation.

ARMING OF AMERICAN MERCHANT VESSELS PROHIBITED

SEC. 6. Whenever the President shall have issued a proclamation under the authority of section 1 (a), it shall thereafter be unlawful, until such proclamation is revoked, for any American vessel, engaged in commerce with any foreign state to be armed, except with small arms and ammunition therefor, which the President may deem necessary and shall publicly designate for the preservation of discipline aboard any such vessel.

Present neutrality law—Continued

"FINANCIAL TRANSACTIONS

"SEC. 3. (a) Whenever the President shall have issued a proclamation under the authority of section 1 of this act, it shall thereafter be unlawful for any person within the United States to purchase, sell, or exchange bonds, securities, or other obligations of the government of any belligerent state or of any state wherein civil strife exists, named in such proclamation, or of any political subdivision of any such state, or of any person acting for or on behalf of the government of any such state, or of any faction or asserted government within any such state wherein civil strife exists, or of any person acting for or on behalf of any faction or asserted government within any such state wherein civil strife exists, issued after the date of such proclamation, or to make any loan or extend any credit to any such government, political subdivision, faction, asserted government, or person, or to solicit or receive any contribution for any such government, political subdivision, faction, asserted government, or person: *Provided,* That if the President shall find that such action will serve to protect the commercial or other interests of the United States or its citizens, he may, in his discretion and to such extent and under such regulations as he may prescribe, except from the operation of this section ordinary commercial credits and short-time obligations in aid of legal transactions and of a character customarily used in normal peacetime commercial transactions. Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to prohibit the solicitation or collection of funds to be used for medical aid and assistance, or for food and clothing to relieve human suffering, when such solicitation or collection of funds is made on behalf of and for use by any person or organization which is not acting for or on behalf of any such government, political subdivision, faction, or asserted government, but all such solicitations and collections of funds shall be subject to the approval of the President and shall be made under such rules and regulations as he shall prescribe.

"(b) The provisions of this section shall not apply to a renewal or adjustment of such indebtedness as may exist on the date of the President's proclamation.

"(c) Whoever shall violate the provisions of this section or of any regulations issued hereunder shall, upon conviction thereof, be fined not more than $50,000 or imprisoned for not more than five years, or both. Should the violation be by a corporation, organization, or association, each officer or agent thereof participating in the violation may be liable to the penalty herein prescribed.

"(d) Whenever the President shall have revoked any such proclamation issued under the authority of section 1 of this Act, the provisions of this section and of any regulations issued by the President hereunder shall thereupon cease to apply with respect to the state or states named in such proclamation, except with respect to offenses committed prior to such revocation.

[See Section 3 (d) present law.]

Bill as passed the House—Continued

FINANCIAL TRANSACTIONS AND TRANSFER OF TITLE

SEC. 4. (a) Whenever the President shall have issued a proclamation under the authority of section 1 (a), it shall thereafter be unlawful for any person within the United States to purchase, sell, or exchange bonds, securities, or other obligations of the government of any state named in such proclamation, or of any political subdivision of any such state, or of any person acting for or on behalf of the government of any such state, issued after the date of such proclamation, or to make any loan or extend any credit to any such government, political subdivision, or person: *Provided,* That if the President shall find that such action will serve to protect the commercial or other interests of the United States or its citizens, he may, in his discretion, and to such extent and under such regulations as he may prescribe, except from the operation of this section for a period of not more than 90 days without renewals ordinary commercial credits and short-time obligations in aid of legal transactions and of a character customarily used in normal peacetime commercial transaction; the President shall make public every 90 days any and all exceptions granted under this proviso, together with the amounts of credits involved.

(b) The provisions of this section shall not apply to a renewal or adjustment of such indebtedness as may exist on the date of the President's proclamation.

(c) Whoever shall violate the provisions of subsection (a) of this section or of any regulations issued thereunder shall, upon conviction thereof, be fined not more than $50,000 or imprisoned for not more than five years, or both. Should the violation be by a corporation, organization, or association, each officer or agent thereof participating in the violation may be liable to the penalty herein prescribed.

SOLICITATION AND COLLECTION OF FUNDS

SEC. 5. (a) Whenever the President shall have issued a proclamation under the authority of section 1 (a), it shall thereafter be unlawful for any person within the United States to solicit or receive any contribution for or on behalf of the government of any small state named in the proclamation or of any association, organization, or person acting for or on behalf of such government.

Nothing in this section shall be construed to prohibit the solicitation or collection of contributions to be used for medical aid and assistance, or for food and clothing to relieve human suffering, when such solicitation or collection of contributions is made on behalf of and for use by any person or

Bill as passed the Senate—Continued

FINANCIAL TRANSACTIONS

SEC. 7. (a) Whenever the President shall have issued a proclamation under the authority of section 1 (a), it shall thereafter be unlawful for any person within the United States to purchase, sell, or exchange bonds, securities, or other obligations of the government of any State named in such proclamation, or of any political subdivision of any such State, or of any person acting for or on behalf of the government of any such State, issued after the date of such proclamation, or to make any loan or extend any credit to any such government, political subdivision, or person. The provisions of this subsection shall also apply to the sale by any person within the United States to any person in a state named in any such proclamation of any articles or materials listed in a proclamation issued under the authority of section 12 (1).

(b) The provisions of this section shall not apply to a renewal or adjustment of such indebtedness as may exist on the date of such proclamation.

(c) Whoever shall violate any of the provisions of this section or of any regulations issued thereunder shall, upon conviction thereof, be fined not more than $50,000 or imprisoned for not more than five years, or both. Should the violation be by a corporation, organization, or association, each officer or director thereof participating in the violation shall be liable to the penalty herein prescribed.

(d) Whenever any proclamation issued under the authority of section 1 (a) shall have been revoked with respect to any state the provisions of this section shall thereupon cease to apply with respect to such state, except as to offenses committed prior to such revocation.

SOLICITATION AND COLLECTION OF FUNDS AND CONTRIBUTIONS

SEC. 8. (a) Whenever the President shall have issued a proclamation under the authority of section 1 (a), it shall thereafter be unlawful for any person within the United States to solicit or receive any contribution for or on behalf of the government of any state named in such proclamation or for or on behalf of any agent or instrumentality of any such state.

(b) Nothing in this section shall be construed to prohibit the solicitation or collection of funds and contributions to be used for medical aid and assistance, or for food and clothing to relieve human suffering, when such solicitation or collection of funds and contributions is made on behalf of and

Present neutrality law—Continued

[For comparative language to these paragraphs, see section 3 (a) of the present law.]

"EXCEPTIONS—AMERICAN REPUBLICS

"SEC. 4. This act shall not apply to an American republic or republics engaged in war against a non-American state or states, provided the American republic is not cooperating with a non-American state or states in such war.

"USE OF AMERICAN PORTS AS BASE OF SUPPLY

"SEC. 7. (a) Whenever, during any war in which the United States is neutral, the President, or any person thereunto authorized by him, shall have cause to believe that any vessel, domestic or foreign, whether requiring clearance or not, is about to carry out of a port of the United States, fuel, men, arms, ammunition, implements of war, or other supplies to any warship, tender, or supply ship of a belligerent state, but the evidence is not deemed sufficient to justify forbidding the departure of the vessel as provided for by section 1, title V, chapter 30, of the Act approved June 15, 1917 (40 Stat. 217, 221; U. S. C., 1934 ed., title 18, sec. 31), and if, in the President's judgment, such action will serve to maintain peace between the United States and foreign states, or to protect the commercial interests of the United States and its citizens, or to promote the security or neutrality of the United States, he shall have the power and it shall be his duty to require the owner, master, or person in command thereof, before departing from a port of the United States, to give a bond to the United States, with sufficient sureties, in such amount as he shall deem proper, conditioned that the vessel will not deliver the men, or any part of the cargo, to any warship, tender, or supply ship of a belligerent state.

"(b) If the President, or any person thereunto authorized by him, shall find that a vessel, domestic or foreign, in a port of the United States, has previously cleared from a port of the United States during such war and delivered its cargo or any part thereof to a warship, tender, or supply ship of a belligerent state, he may prohibit the departure of such vessel during the duration of the war.

Bill as passed the House—Continued

organization which is not acting for or on behalf or in aid of any such government, but all such solicitations and collections of contributions shall be subject to the approval of the President and shall be made under such rules and regulations as he shall prescribe.

(b) Whenever the President shall have revoked any proclamation issued under the authority of section 1 (a), the provisions of this section and of any regulations issued by the President hereunder shall thereupon cease to apply with respect to the small states named in such proclamation, except with respect to offenses committed prior to such revocation.

AMERICAN REPUBLICS

SEC. 6. The foregoing provisions of this joint resolution shall not apply to any American republic.

USE OF AMERICAN PORTS AS BASE OF SUPPLY

SEC. 7. (a) Whenever, during any war in which the United States is neutral, the President, or any person thereunto authorized by him, shall have cause to believe that any vessel, domestic or foreign, whether requiring clearance or not, is about to carry out of a port of the United States, fuel, men, arms, ammunition, implements of war, or other supplies to any warship, tender, or supply ship of a belligerent state in violation of the laws, treaties or obligations of the United States under the law of nations and the supreme law of the land, but the evidence is not deemed sufficient to justify forbidding the departure of the vessel as provided for by section 1, title V, chapter 30, of the act approved June 15, 1917 (40 Stat. 217, 221; U. S. C., 1934 ed., title 18, sec. 31), and if, in the President's judgment, such action will serve to maintain peace between the United States and foreign states, or to protect the commercial interests of the United States and its citizens, or to promote the security or neutrality of the United States, he shall have the power, and it shall be his duty, to require the owner, master, or person in command thereof, before departing from a port of the United States, to give a bond to the United States, with sufficient sureties, in such amount as he shall deem proper, conditioned that the vessel will not deliver the men, or any part of the cargo, to any warship, tender, or supply ship of a belligerent state.

(b) If the President, or any person thereunto authorized by him, shall find that a vessel, domestic or foreign, in a port of the United States, has previously cleared from a port of the United States during such war and delivered its cargo or any part thereof to a warship, tender, or supply ship of a belligerent state, he may prohibit the departure of such vessel during the duration of the war.

Bill as passed the Senate—Continued

for use by any person or organization which is not acting for or on behalf of any such government, but all such solicitations and collections of funds and contributions shall be in accordance with and subject to such rules and regulations as may be prescribed.

(c) Whenever any proclamation issued under the authority of section 1 (a) shall have been revoked with respect to any state the provisions of this section shall thereupon cease to apply with respect to such state, except as to offenses committed prior to such revocation.

AMERICAN REPUBLICS

SEC. 9. This joint resolution shall not apply to any American republic engaged in war against a non-American state or states, provided the American republic is not cooperating with a non-American state or states in such war.

RESTRICTIONS ON USE OF AMERICAN PORTS

SEC. 10. (a) Whenever, during any war in which the United States is neutral, the President, or any person thereunto authorized by him, shall have cause to believe that any vessel, domestic or foreign, whether requiring clearance or not, is about to carry out of a port or from the jurisdiction of the United States, fuel, men, arms, ammunition, implements of war, supplies, dispatches, or information to any warship, tender, or supply ship of a state named in a proclamation issued under the authority of section 1 (a), but the evidence is not deemed sufficient to justify forbidding the departure of the vessel as provided for by section 1, title V, chapter 30, of the act approved June 15, 1917 (40 Stat. 217, 221; U. S. C., 1934 ed., title 18, sec. 31), and if, in the President's judgment, such action will serve to maintain peace between the United States and foreign states, or to protect the commercial interests of the United States and its citizens, or to promote the security or neutrality of the United States, he shall have the power and it shall be his duty to require the owner, master, or person in command thereof, before departing from a port or from the jurisdiction of the United States, to give a bond to the United States, with sufficient sureties, in such amount as he shall deem proper, conditioned that the vessel will not deliver the men, or any fuel, supplies, dispatches, information, or any part of the cargo, to any warship, tender, or supply ship of a state named in a proclamation issued under the authority of section 1 (a).

(b) If the President, or any person thereunto authorized by him, shall find that a vessel, domestic or foreign, in a port of the United States, has previously departed from a port or from the jurisdiction of the United States during such war and delivered men, fuel, supplies, dispatches, information, or any part of its cargo to a warship, tender, or supply ship of a state named in a proclamation issued under the authority of section 1 (a), he may prohibit the departure of such vessel during the duration of the war.

(c) Whenever the President shall have issued a proclamation under section 1 (a) he may, while such proclamation is in effect, require the owner, master, or person in command of any vessel, foreign or domestic, before departing from the United States, to give a bond to the United States, with sufficient sureties, in such amount as he shall deem proper, conditioned that no alien seaman who arrived on such vessel shall remain in the United States for a longer period than that permitted under the regulations, as amended from time to time, issued pursuant to section 33 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917 (U. S. C., title 8, sec. 168). Notwithstanding the provisions of said section he may issue regulations with respect to the landing of such seamen as he deems necessary to insure their departure either on such vessel or another vessel at the expense of such owner, master, or person in command.

Present neutrality law—Continued

"SUBMARINES AND ARMED MERCHANT VESSELS

"SEC. 8. Whenever, during any war in which the United States is neutral, the President shall find that special restrictions placed on the use of the ports and territorial waters of the United States by the submarines or armed merchant vessels of a foreign state, will serve to maintain peace between the United States and foreign states, or to protect the commercial interests of the United States and its citizens, or to promote the security of the United States, and shall make proclamation thereof, it shall thereafter be unlawful for any such submarine or armed merchant vessel to enter a port or the territorial waters of the United States or to depart therefrom, except under such conditions and subject to such limitations as the President may prescribe. Whenever, in his judgment, the conditions which have caused him to issue his proclamation have ceased to exist, he shall revoke his proclamation and the provisions of this section shall thereupon cease to apply.

"NATIONAL MUNITIONS CONTROL BOARD

"SEC. 5. (a) There is hereby established a National Munitions Control Board (hereinafter referred to as the 'Board') to carry out the provisions of this act. The Board shall consist of the Secretary of State, who shall be chairman and executive officer of the Board, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of Commerce. Except as otherwise provided in this act, or by other law, the administration of this act is vested in the Department of State. The Secretary of State shall promulgate such rules and regulations with regard to the enforcement of this section as he may deem necessary to carry out its provisions. The Board shall be convened by the chairman and shall hold at least one meeting a year.

"(b) Every person who engages in the business of manufacturing, exporting, or importing any of the arms, ammunition, or implements of war referred to in this act, whether as an exporter, importer, manufacturer, or dealer, shall register with the Secretary of State his name, or business name, principal place of business, and places of business in the United States, and a list of the arms, ammunition, and implements of war which he manufactures, imports, or exports.

"(c) Every person required to register under this section shall notify the Secretary of State of any change in the arms, ammunition, or implements of war which he exports, imports, or manufactures; and upon such notification the Secretary of State shall issue to such person an amended certificate of registration, free of charge, which shall remain valid until the date of expiration of the original certificate. Every person required to register under the provisions of this section shall pay a registration fee of $500, unless he manufactured, exported, or imported arms, ammunition, and implements of war to a total sales value of less than $50,000 during the 12 months immediately preceding his registration, in which case he shall pay a registration fee of $100. Upon receipt of the required registration fee, the Secretary of State shall issue a registration certificate valid for 5 years, which shall be renewable for further periods of 5 years upon the payment for each renewal of a fee of $500 in the case of persons who manufactured, exported, or imported arms, ammunition, and implements of war to a total sales value of more than $50,000 during the 12 months immediately preceding the renewal, or a fee of $100 in the case of persons who manufactured, exported, or imported arms, ammunition, and implements of war to a total sales value of less than $50,000 during the 12 months immediately preceding the renewal. The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby directed to refund, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated the sum of $400 to every person who shall have paid a registration fee of $500 pursuant to

Bill as passed the House—Continued

SUBMARINES AND ARMED MERCHANT VESSELS

SEC. 8. Whenever, during any war in which the United States is neutral, the President shall find that special restrictions placed on the use by the submarines or armed merchant vessels of a belligerent state of the ports and territorial waters of the United States will serve to maintain peace between the United States and belligerent states, or to protect the commercial interests of the United States and its citizens, or to promote the security of the United States, and shall make proclamation thereof, it shall thereafter be unlawful for any such submarine or armed merchant vessel to enter a port or the territorial waters of the United States or to depart therefrom, except under such conditions and subject to such limitations as the President may prescribe. Whenever, in his judgment, the conditions which have caused him to issue his proclamation have ceased to exist, he shall revoke his proclamation and the provisions of this section shall thereupon cease to apply.

NATIONAL MUNITIONS CONTROL BOARD

SEC. 9. (a) There is hereby established a National Munitions Control Board (hereinafter referred to as the "Board"). The Board shall consist of the Secretary of State, who shall be chairman and executive officer of the Board, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of Commerce. Except as otherwise provided in this joint resolution, or by other law, the administration of this joint resolution is vested in the Department of State. The Secretary of State shall promulgate such rules and regulations with regard to the enforcement of this section as he may deem necessary to carry out its provisions. The Board shall be convened by the chairman and shall hold at least one meeting a year.

(b) Every person who engages in the business of manufacturing, exporting, or importing any of the arms, ammunition, or implements of war referred to in this joint resolution, whether as an exporter, importer, manufacturer, or dealer, shall register with the Secretary of State his name, or business name, principal place of business, and places of business in the United States, and a list of the arms, ammunition, and implements of war which he manufactures, imports, or exports.

(c) Every person required to register under this section shall notify the Secretary of State of any change in the arms, ammunition, or implements of war which he exports, imports, or manufactures; and upon such notification the Secretary of State shall issue to such person an amended certificate of registration, free of charge, which shall remain valid until the date of expiration of the original certificate. Every person required to register under the provisions of this section shall pay a registration fee of $100. Upon receipt of the required registration fee, the Secretary of State shall issue a registration certificate valid for 5 years, which shall be renewable for further periods of 5 years upon the payment for each renewal of a fee of $100.

Bill as passed the Senate—Continued

SUBMARINES AND ARMED MERCHANT VESSELS

SEC. 11. Whenever, during any war in which the United States is neutral, the President shall find that special restrictions placed on the use of the ports and territorial waters of the United States by the submarines or armed merchant vessels of a foreign state, will serve to maintain peace between the United States and foreign states, or to protect the commercial interests of the United States and its citizens, or to promote the security of the United States, and shall make proclamation thereof, it shall thereafter be unlawful for any such submarine or armed merchant vessel to enter a port or the territorial waters of the United States or to depart therefrom, except under such conditions and subject to such limitations as the President may prescribe. Whenever, in his judgment, the conditions which have caused him to issue his proclamation have ceased to exist, he shall revoke his proclamation and the provisions of this section shall thereupon cease to apply.

NATIONAL MUNITIONS CONTROL BOARD

SEC. 12. (a) There is hereby established a National Munitions Control Board (hereinafter referred to as the "Board"). The Board shall consist of the Secretary of State, who shall be chairman and executive officer of the Board, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of Commerce. Except as otherwise provided in this section, or by other law, the administration of this section is vested in the Secretary of State. The Secretary of State shall promulgate such rules and regulations with regard to the enforcement of this section as he may deem necessary to carry out its provisions. The Board shall be convened by the chairman and shall hold at least one meeting a year.

(b) Every person who engages in the business of manufacturing, exporting, or importing any arms, ammunition, or implements of war listed in a proclamation issued under the authority of subsection (1) of this section, whether as an exporter, importer, manufacturer, or dealer, shall register with the Secretary of State his name, or business name, principal place of business, and places of business in the United States, and a list of the arms, ammunition, and implements of war which he manufactures, imports, or exports.

(c) Every person required to register under this section shall notify the Secretary of State of any change in the arms, ammunition, or implements of war which he exports, imports, or manufactures; and upon such notification the Secretary of State shall issue to such person an amended certificate of registration, free of charge, which shall remain valid until the date of expiration of the original certificate. Every person required to register under the provisions of this section shall pay a registration fee of $100. Upon receipt of the required registration fee, the Secretary of State shall issue a registration certificate valid for 5 years, which shall be renewable for further periods of 5 years upon the payment for each renewal of a fee of $100.

Present neutrality law—Continued	*Bill as passed the House*—Continued	*Bill as passed the Senate*—Continued
this act, who manufactured, exported, or imported arms, ammunition, and implements of war to a total sales value of less than $50,000 during the 12 months immediately preceding his registration.		
"(d) It shall be unlawful for any person to export, or attempt to export, from the United States to any other state, any of the arms, ammunition, or implements of war referred to in this act, or to import, or attempt to import, to the United States from any other state, any of the arms, ammunition, or implements of war referred to in this act, without first having obtained a license therefor.	(d) It shall be unlawful for any person to export, or attempt to export, from the United States to any other state, any of the arms, ammunition, or implements of war referred to in this joint resolution, or to import, or attempt to import, to the United States from any other state, any of the arms, ammunition, or implements of war referred to in this joint resolution, without first having obtained a license therefor. In the application for license the applicant shall set forth a description of such exports or imports together with the terms of sale as to credit or payment.	(d) It shall be unlawful for any person to export, or attempt to export, from the United States to any other state, any arms, ammunition, or implements of war listed in a proclamation issued under the authority of subsection (i) of this section, or to import, or attempt to import, to the United States from any other state, any of the arms, ammunition, or implements of war listed in any such proclamation, without first having submitted to the Secretary of State the name of the purchaser and the terms of sale and having obtained a license therefor.
"(e) All persons required to register under this section shall maintain, subject to the inspection of the Secretary of State, or any person or persons designated by him, such permanent records of manufacture for export, importation, and exportation of arms, ammunition, and implements of war as the Secretary of State shall prescribe.	(e) All persons required to register under this section shall maintain, subject to the inspection of the Secretary of State, or any person or persons designated by him, such permanent records of manufacture for export, importation, and exportation of arms, ammunition, and implements of war as the Secretary of State shall prescribe.	(e) All persons required to register under this section shall maintain, subject to the inspection of the Secretary of State, or any person or persons designated by him, such permanent records of manufacture for export, importation, and exportation of arms, ammunition, and implements of war as the Secretary of State shall prescribe.
"(f) Licenses shall be issued to persons who have registered as herein provided for, except in cases of export or import licenses where the export of arms, ammunition, or implements of war would be in violation of this act or any other law of the United States, or of a treaty to which the United States is a party, in which cases such licenses shall not be issued.	(f) Licenses shall be issued to persons who have registered as herein provided for, except in cases of export or import licenses where the export of arms, ammunition, or implements of war would be in violation of this joint resolution or any other law of the United States, or of a treaty to which the United States is a party, in which cases such licenses shall not be issued.	(f) Licenses shall be issued by the Secretary of State to persons who have registered as herein provided for, except in cases of export or import licenses where the export of arms, ammunition, or implements of war would be in violation of this joint resolution or any other law of the United States, or of a treaty to which the United States is a party, in which cases such licenses shall not be issued.
"(g) Whenever the President shall have issued a proclamation under the authority of section 1 of this act, all licenses theretofore issued under this act shall ipso facto and immediately upon the issuance of such proclamation, cease to grant authority to export arms, ammunition, or implements of war from any place in the United States to any belligerent state, or to any state wherein civil strife exists, named in such proclamation, or to any neutral state for transshipment to, or for the use of, any such belligerent state or any such state wherein civil strife exists; and said licenses, insofar as the grant of authority to export to the state or states named in such proclamation is concerned, shall be null and void.		
"(h) No purchase of arms, ammunition, or implements of war shall be made on behalf of the United States by any officer, executive department, or independent establishment of the Government from any person who shall have failed to register under the provisions of this act.	(g) No purchase of arms, ammunition, or implements of war shall be made on behalf of the United States by any officer, executive department, or independent establishment of the Government from any person who shall have failed to register under the provisions of this joint resolution.	(g) No purchase of arms, ammunition, or implements of war shall be made on behalf of the United States by any officer, executive department, or independent establishment of the Government from any person who shall have failed to register under the provisions of this joint resolution.
"(i) The provisions of the act of August 29, 1916, relating to the sale of ordnance and stores to the Government of Cuba (39 Stat. 619, 643; U. S. C., 1934 ed., title 50, sec. 72), are hereby repealed as of December 31, 1937.	(h) The provisions of the act of August 29, 1916, relating to the sale of ordnance and stores to the Government of Cuba (39 Stat. 619, 643; U. S. C., 1934 ed., title 50, sec. 72), are hereby repealed as of December 31, 1937.	
"(j) The Board shall make an annual report to Congress, copies of which shall be distributed as are other reports transmitted to Congress. Such reports shall contain such information and data collected by the Board as may be considered of value in the determination of questions connected with the control of trade in arms, ammunition, and implements of war. The Board shall include in such reports a list of all persons required to register under the provisions of this act, and full information concerning the licenses issued hereunder.	(i) The Board shall make an annual report to Congress, copies of which shall be distributed as are other reports transmitted to Congress. Such reports shall contain such information and data collected by the Board as may be considered of value in the determination of questions connected with the control of trade in arms, ammunition, and implements of war. The Board shall include in such reports a list of all persons required to register under the provisions of this joint resolution, and full information concerning the licenses issued hereunder: *Provided*, That, if the President shall have issued a proclamation under the authority of section 1 (a), the Board shall thereupon make public an immediate report containing all the information herein provided, and shall make public a similar report each 90 days thereafter so long as such proclamation shall be in force.	(h) The Board shall make a report to Congress on January 1 and July 1 of each year, copies of which shall be distributed as are other reports transmitted to Congress. Such reports shall contain such information and data collected by the Board as may be considered of value in the determination of questions connected with the control of trade in arms, ammunition, and implements of war, including the name of the purchaser and the terms of sale made under such license. The Board shall include in such reports a list of all persons required to register under the provisions of this joint resolution, and full information concerning the licenses issued hereunder, including the name of the purchaser and the terms of sale made under such license.

Present neutrality law—Continued

"(k) The President is hereby authorized to proclaim upon recommendation of the Board from time to time a list of articles which shall be considered arms, ammunition, and implements of war for the purposes of this section.

"AMERICAN VESSELS PROHIBITED FROM CARRYING ARMS TO BELLIGERENT STATES

"SEC. 6. (a) Whenever the President shall have issued a proclamation under the authority of section 1 of this act, it shall thereafter be unlawful, until such proclamation is revoked, for any American vessel to carry any arms, ammunition, or implements of war to any belligerent state, or to any state wherein civil strife exists, named in such proclamation, or to any neutral state for transshipment to, or for the use of, any such belligerent state or any such state wherein civil strife exists.

"(b) Whoever, in violation of the provisions of this section, shall take, or attempt to take, or shall authorize, hire, or solicit another to take, any American vessel carrying such cargo out of port or from the jurisdiction of the United States shall be fined not more than $10,000, or imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both; and, in addition, such vessel, and her tackle, apparel, furniture, and equipment, and the arms, ammunition, and implements of war on board, shall be forfeited to the United States.

"REGULATIONS

"SEC. 11. The President may, from time to time, promulgate such rules and regulations, not inconsistent with law, as may be necessary and proper to carry out any of the provisions of this act; and he may exercise any power or authority conferred on him by this act through such officer or officers, or agency or agencies, as he shall direct.

"GENERAL PENALTY PROVISION

"SEC. 12. In every case of the violation of any of the provisions of this act or of any rule or regulation issued pursuant thereto where a specific penalty is not herein provided, such violator or violators, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than $10,000, or imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both.

"DEFINITIONS

"SEC. 13. For the purposes of this act—

"(a) The term 'United States,' when used in a geographical sense, includes the several States and Territories, the insular possessions of the United States (including the Philippine Islands), the Canal Zone, and the District of Columbia.

"(b) The term 'person' includes a partnership, company, association, or corporation, as well as a natural person.

"(c) The term 'vessel' means every description of watercraft (including aircraft) or other contrivance used, or capable of being used, as a means of transportation on, under, or over water.

"(d) The term 'American vessel' means any vessel (including aircraft) documented under the laws of the United States.

Bill as passed the House—Continued

(j) The President is hereby authorized to proclaim upon recommendation of the Board from time to time a list of articles which shall be considered arms, ammunition, and implements of war for the purposes of this section.

REGULATIONS

SEC. 10. The President may, from time to time, promulgate such rules and regulations, not inconsistent with law, as may be necessary and proper to carry out any of the provisions of this joint resolution; and he may exercise any power or authority conferred on him by this joint resolution through such officer or officers, or agency or agencies, as he shall direct.

GENERAL PENALTY PROVISION

SEC. 11. In every case of the violation of any of the provisions of this joint resolution or of any rule or regulation issued pursuant thereto where a specific penalty is not herein provided, such violator or violators, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 12. For the purposes of this joint resolution—

(a) The term "United States", when used in a geographical sense, includes the several States and Territories, the insular possessions of the United States (including the Philippine Islands), the Canal Zone, and the District of Columbia.

(b) The term "person" includes a partnership, company, association, or corporation, as well as a natural person.

(c) The term "vessel" means every description of watercraft (including aircraft) or other contrivance used, or capable of being used, as a means of transportation on, under, or over water.

Bill as passed the Senate—Continued

(i) The President is hereby authorized to proclaim upon recommendation of the Board from time to time a list of articles which shall be considered arms, ammunition, and implements of war for the purposes of this section.

REGULATIONS

SEC. 13. The President may, from time to time, promulgate such rules and regulations, not inconsistent with law, as may be necessary and proper to carry out any of the provisions of this joint resolution; and he may exercise any power or authority conferred on him by this joint resolution through such officer or officers, or agency or agencies, as he shall direct.

UNLAWFUL USE OF THE AMERICAN FLAG

SEC. 14. (a) It shall be unlawful for any vessel belonging to or operating under the jurisdiction of any foreign state to use the flag of the United States thereon, or to make use of any distinctive signs or markings, indicating that the same is an American vessel.

(b) Any vessel violating the provisions of subsection (a) of this section shall be denied for a period of three months the right to enter the ports or territorial waters of the United States except in cases of force majeure.

GENERAL PENALTY PROVISION

SEC. 15. In every case of the violation of any of the provisions of this joint resolution or of any rule or regulation issued pursuant thereto where a specific penalty is not herein provided, such violator or violators, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than $10,000, or imprisoned not more than 2 years, or both.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 16. For the purposes of this joint resolution—

(a) The term "United States" when used in a geographical sense, includes the several States and Territories, the insular possessions of the United States (including the Philippine Islands), the Canal Zone, and the District of Columbia.

(b) The term "person" includes a partnership, company, association, or corporation, as well as a natural person.

(c) The term "vessel" means every description of watercraft and aircraft capable of being used as a means of transportation on, under, or over water.

(d) The term "American vessel" means any vessel documented, and any aircraft registered or licensed, under the laws of the United States.

Present neutrality law—Continued

"(e) The term 'vehicle' means every description of carriage (including aircraft) or other contrivance used, or capable of being used, as a means of transportation on or over land.

"(f) The term 'state' shall include nation, government, and country.

"SEPARABILITY OF PROVISIONS

"SEC. 14. If any of the provisions of this act, or the application thereof to any person or circumstance, is held invalid, the remainder of the act, and the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances, shall not be affected thereby.

"APPROPRIATIONS

"SEC. 15. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated from time to time, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the provisions and accomplish the purposes of this act."

Approved, May 1, 1937, 6.30 p. m., Central Standard Time.

Bill as passed the House—Continued

(d) The term "state" shall include nation, government and country.

SEPARABILITY OF PROVISIONS

SEC. 13. If any of the provisions of this joint resolution, or the application thereof to any person or circumstance, is held invalid, the remainder of the joint resolution, and the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances, shall not be affected thereby.

APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 14. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated from time to time, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the provisions and accomplish the purposes of this joint resolution.

REPEAL OF ACTS OF 1935, 1936, 1937

SEC. 15. The Act of August 31, 1935 (Public Resolution Numbered 67, Seventy-fourth Congress), as amended by the Act of February 29, 1936 (Public Resolution Numbered 74, Seventy-fourth Congress), and the Act of May 1, 1937 (Public Resolution Numbered 27, Seventy-fifth Congress), and the Act of January 8, 1937 (Public Resolution Numbered 1, Seventy-fifth Congress), are hereby repealed: *Provided*, That such repeal shall not affect the validity of the Proclamation Numbered 2237 of May 1, 1937 (50 Stat. 1834), defining the term "arms, ammunition, and implements of war" or of certificates of registration or licenses issued pursuant to the provisions of section 5 of the Act of May 1, 1937.

Passed the House of Representatives June 30, 1939.

Bill as passed the Senate—Continued

(e) The term "state" shall include nation, government, and country.

(f) The term "citizen" shall include any individual owing allegiance to the United States, a partnership, company, or association composed in whole or in part of citizens of the United States, and any corporation organized and existing under the laws of the United States, as defined in subsection (a) of this section.

SEPARABILITY OF PROVISIONS

SEC. 17. If any of the provisions of this joint resolution, or the application thereof to any person or circumstance, is held invalid, the remainder of the joint resolution, and the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances, shall not be affected thereby.

APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 18. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated from time to time, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the provisions and accomplish the purposes of this joint resolution.

REPEALS

SEC. 19. The joint resolution of August 31, 1935, as amended, and the joint resolution of January 8, 1937, are hereby repealed: *Provided*, That such repeal shall not affect the validity of certificates of registration or licenses issued pursuant to section 2 of the joint resolution of August 31, 1935, or section 5 of the joint resolution of August 31, 1935, as amended, or the validity of proclamation No. 2237, of May 1, 1937 (50 Stat. 1834), defining the term "arms, ammunition, and implements of war", which, until it is revoked, shall have full force and effect as if issued pursuant to this joint resolution: *Provided further*, That offenses committed and penalties, forfeitures, or liabilities incurred under either of such joint resolutions prior to the date of enactment of this joint resolution may be prosecuted and punished, and suits and proceedings for violations of either of such joint resolutions or of any rule or regulation issued pursuant thereto may be commenced and prosecuted, in the same manner and with the same effect as if such joint resolutions had not been repealed.

SHORT TITLE

SEC. 20. This joint resolution may be cited as the "Neutrality Act of 1939".

Amend the title so as to read: "Joint resolution to preserve the neutrality and the peace of the United States and to secure the safety of its citizens and their interests".

Fritz Kuhn Should Be Deported

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. PARNELL THOMAS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 31, 1939

EDITORIAL FROM THE BERGEN EVENING RECORD, HACKENSACK, N. J., OCTOBER 23, 1939

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Bergen Evening Record, Hackensack, N. J., on October 23, 1939:

[From the Bergen Evening Record, Hackensack, N. J., October 23, 1939]

FRITZ KUHN SHOULD BE DEPORTED

Fritz Kuhn, Nazi bund leader in the too-tolerant United States, told the Dies Committee that in his widely publicized audience with Herr Hitler 3 years ago there was no discussion of the Nazi bund's pernicious activities in America. His "of course not" might be the truth, but most intelligent and informed Americans will nevertheless believe that arrogant Fritz is an unmitigated liar.

Not unlike the Prussian thickheads who so underrated American psychology in 1917, Kuhn now expects Americans to believe that this common—very common—citizen by adoption was received by almighty Hitler solely because such an insult to tolerant American citizenship was born in Germany. Unheard of in his fatherland, Kuhn came to the United States and was widely publicized for his efforts in sabotaging American tolerance of racial and religious minorities among neighbors and fellow citizens. He has been tolerated too long by liberty-loving Americans. He has too often

converted the liberties of citizenship into license to deny equal liberties to his fellow citizens. He is as stupid in his utterances as the Baron Dumba who called us "damfool" Yankees in his devastating—for Germany—cable in the months that preceded America's entry into the war which brought arrogant Prussia to her knees.

Real Americans—and we question whether Kuhn can be so classified—love liberty not only for themselves but also for their neighbors and fellow citizens. Their patience has become exhausted, and they want to know who this loud-mouthed Kuhn and his silly goose-stepping bund are and why they are not placed under restraint. They want to know how much longer the traditional tolerance of American citizenship compels them to stand for these adopted Germans who renounced their foreign allegiances in our naturalization courts and now self-evidently preach and practice a divided national allegiance in their glaringly un-American bund activities.

Bellowing, Kuhn stated in substance that his movement is designed to provide political representation for millions of citizens of German birth or German ancestry in this country. This writer doesn't know how other citizens of German antecedents feel about Kuhn's assumption of leadership and his made-in-Germany ersatz (synthetic) civic virtue, but for himself he wants to say that his grandfather sought individual freedom and opportunity when he left Germany in 1859 to come here. He doubtless was impressed by what he found, for in 1863 he gave his life to the country that adopted him and that gave to his children and his children's children a priceless heritage. That heritage, Mr. Kuhn, is theirs to use, but, more important than that, it is theirs to preserve for their posterity against the un-American activities of all the Kuhns who may from generation to generation try to sabotage it.

The writer rejects emphatically this impudent goose-stepper's assumption of leadership in anything and everything even remotely connected with American citizens of German ancestry. He and millions of other Americans of German antecedents are thoroughly fed up with Kuhn and his pseudo-American Nazi bund. They would gladly lead any legal movement to kick Kuhn and his silly Nazi followers out of the country whose hospitality they have abused. Their preachments and their practices have amply demonstrated that while their bodies are in the land of freedom their hearts and their minds are in Nazi Germany. They have proved their unfitness for tolerant American citizenship, and they should be sent back to the government which they have tried so cleverly here to serve.

Those are the considered thoughts of this American of remote German ancestry, and they are supplied herewith for the perusal of brazen Kuhn and his un-American Nazi bunders. The writer sheds the cloak of editorial anonymity to permit them to identify him as—

JOHN BORG, *Publisher.*

Reciprocal-Trade Folly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FOREST A. HARNESS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 1, 1939

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. FOREST A. HARNESS, OF INDIANA

Mr. HARNESS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address which I delivered last night over the radio:

Tonight you and your neighbors are preparing for the series of weird and amusing antics which will briefly ruffle the dignity of the neighborhood. You will be no more than mildly surprised if you find a collection of the community's domestic animals on your front porch in the morning, and if there is a spark of youth left in your heart your annoyance will melt in mirth at the sight of the tribulations which have been visited upon your neighbors. In spite of the fact that modern plumbing has gone far to frustrate the marauding spirit of youth on the loose, Halloween is still Halloween and not even a Presidential proclamation has intervened to alter or confuse the fact.

This occasion is as good as any to remind us that we in America are still following the peaceful traditions, comparatively untouched by the storms rocking the rest of the world. True, war news has absorbed our attention. Our Congress has worked with deadly seriousness on the problem of preserving American peace. But, now that we have unmistakably demonstrated our determination to stay out of war, we should find ourselves wondering if we haven't been devoting more time and thought to the matter than we should have, in view of the fact that our domestic problems remain essentially what they were 6 weeks, or 6 months, or even 6 years ago. We may wonder if, during this distraction fostered by the dramatics in Washington, we haven't neglected domestic affairs equally vital to American interests.

Our State Department, which has been the very storm center of the neutrality debates, has still found time, while our attention was diverted, to complete the negotiations of a trade agreement with our South American neighbor, Argentina. It has found time to proceed with negotiations which will lead to a parallel agreement with Chile and Uruguay.

Repeatedly in the past I have protested against the New Deal tariff policy. Heretofore I have stressed the fact that while the trade agreements have seriously injured American agriculture, the primary damages have been inflicted upon American industry and labor. But in the present instance the man on the farm is the direct, the immediate, and practically the sole victim.

You will find that every one of the items on the list under consideration in this proposed treaty with Argentina is a raw product. You will be surprised that every one of them now paying duty, with two exceptions, are the everyday things you find American farmers producing.

And why is the American farmer now being sold down the river? Henry Wallace, our starry-eyed idealist in agriculture, cannot possibly tell you. In fact, if you were to investigate with the Department of Agriculture, you would detect a squirming, but voiceless resentment of the program being pursued by the State Department. Secretary Wallace has fought for, and executed, a series of programs which have pumped literally billions of dollars back to the distressed American farmers during the past 6 years.

No one realizes more keenly than our Secretary of Agriculture the fact that the State Department can, with a single stroke of the pen, tear down everything that he has tried to accomplish, at terrific expense to the country. In fact, Mr. Wallace confessed the utter inconsistencies of the New Deal domestic program and its tariff policy in a speech at Little Rock, Ark., on May 26 of this year. He high-lighted that speech with many unintended, but nevertheless bitter, commentaries on the utter absurdities of the New Deal philosophy.

For 6 long years the New Deal's whole domestic program has been based on the assumption that high prices make prosperity. Of course, the President and his vague theorists have always had the cart before the horse in their childish assumption that prosperity depends upon any given price level. Whether the New Deal philosophy is right or wrong, however, is beside the point. The fact remains that this philosophy has guided every domestic activity undertaken by the New Deal.

The history of the series of farm programs is familiar to all of you. Working on the theory that we could pump prosperity back into agriculture, we have spent billions of dollars in the effort. Striving desperately to restore parity prices, our elevators, our warehouses, and our farmers' bins and cribs are choked with surplus commodities, pegged at artificial prices at terrific cost. As a single example, look at the condition of corn. With practically all of the current bumper crop still standing in the fields, there are 255,409,964 bushels sealed in cribs in the north central region, which embraces the great Corn Belt. That corn is pegged at a minimum price of 57 cents per bushel under Federal loans, representing a total of $145,583,671.48.

In view of that fact, do you wonder that the Agriculture Department must squirm at the thought that corn is one of the items due for tariff reduction under the agreement with Argentina? If the artificial price for corn on our domestic markets induces Argentina to ship corn here in spite of a tariff barrier of 25 cents per bushel—and we have imported a considerable amount of corn—what will inevitably happen if we cut the tariff rate on corn in half? The absurdities inherent in these new treaties are obvious. And remember that corn is only one of a large group of items which will directly affect American farmers.

If Secretary Wallace and the New Deal philosophy have been right for the past 6 years, the President and his State Department cannot possibly be right now. Or if these proposed treaties are defensible, we may as well face the fact that the billions of dollars which we have poured into American agriculture, culminating with the all-time-high appropriation of $1,200,000,000 in the last regular session of Congress, is an utter waste of time and money.

We might as well recognize the fact that the New Deal has always been, as it still is, desperately trying to go in two directions at the same time. You recall how the President tried to justify the amazing fact that the United States Navy has been buying canned beef from Argentina by assuring us that it was not only cheaper but better beef than our own. It must have struck you that this was deplorably bad advertising for American livestock producers and packers. But, even more important, the President's remarks must have impressed you as an admission of the complete inability of the administration to understand the economic factors with which it has been so blithely tinkering.

If American beef is too high-priced for our own Navy, who in the world made it that way but the new dealers, who have put American farmers in a strait jacket by restricting production, hampering marketing, and generally increasing our production costs? If Argentine producers can deliver superior products on our own markets more cheaply than our own farmers, who are still not receiving parity prices, then how in the world will we ever arrive at that stage of parity prices which has been such a fetish of the New Deal, unless we maintain protective tariff around our American markets?

The current excuse is that we are attempting to establish a more friendly and cordial relationship with the nations of the Western Hemisphere. This, in other words, is the good-neighbor policy in action. But good neighborliness begins at home. We wish our neighbors well, and will do much more than our share to treat them well and live with them in harmony. But our first responsibility is always to our own family.

Good neighbors in your community and mine have fences—not because they hate the family next door, but simply to protect their own property. It would never occur to you that you must knock down your fence, or open your gates, to permit your neighbor's chickens or livestock to run in your garden. It would scarcely occur to a good neighbor to resent your exclusion of his livestock.

The internationalist argument for free and uninterrupted world trade is a plausible one. It is especially well supported when, as at present, it is admittedly wise to encourage the solidarity and friendliness of the American nations in this time of strife. But that does not alter the fact that good neighborliness implies a relationship of give and take, whereas all that is apparent in our relationship with the other nations of this hemisphere is a giving on our part, and a taking on theirs. It further does not alter the fact that the success and prosperity of our own farmers is far more important to you and me than the advancement of the agricultural interests of a South American nation which is farther removed, geographically, than the nations of western Europe.

Another amazing fact stands out upon examination of this proposed treaty. All the figures for trade between this country and Argentina indicate that we will be called upon to accept agricultural imports so that the exports of American automobiles and implements may be increased. It strikes me that the automobile and implement manufacturers in this country are less in need of help than our farmers. If they want export trade, let them develop it, but not at the expense of the American farmer.

I sincerely want every one of the nations in the Western Hemisphere in a solid, friendly working relationship. But I will not concede for 1 minute that we must sacrifice the interest of our farmers—or, for that matter, the interests of any other group of American citizens—to accomplish this purpose.

We have, by long odds, the richest markets of the world right within our own borders. Naturally, every other nation in the world wants to sell here where the selling is easiest and best. But we simply cannot lose sight of the fact that this country has developed a standard of living and a system of economic measurements which are unknown anywhere else in the world. We must not lose sight of the further fact that the footless idealism of the New Deal has imposed a new degree of artificiality and restriction upon the American system which makes it more nearly impossible than ever for us to compete successfully in world markets.

I will not concede the superiority of Argentine beef, which the President professes. But granting that it were so, I would still prefer my meat grown on an American farm. I do not even agree that the automobile or tractor manufacturer will lose any profits if we keep it this way. For I know that as a result our own manufacturers will eventually send that product which they might have sold in Argentina onto an American highway or an American farm to the mutual benefit of everyone concerned in our own economy.

Amusement and Entertainment for the Present Generation; the Payment of Debt for Future Generations

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 1, 1939

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, this administration is intent upon providing amusement and entertainment at public expense for the present generation, no doubt trusting that the voters will reply in continuing support of the political policy of the President. The inevitable result is the fixing upon future generations of the obligation to pay the debts now created to purchase political support.

The present administration has—

NO CONSIDERATION FOR YOUR CHILDREN, NO RESPECT FOR YOUR DEAD

During the past few years throughout the world, assaults have been made upon the liberty of the average man. Abroad dictators in three great countries have by force compelled many under control to work when and where ordered, at designated tasks, have issued food cards which limited the kind and quantity of food which children, women, and men might eat from day to day. Thus, exercising their arbitrary power, the dictators, through oppressive taxation, destroyed the prosperity of their people, compelled them to give over their earnings so that forts, submarines, airplanes might be built; so that millions of dollars worth of guns and munitions of war might be accumulated. Many of those opposing their ambitions were shot, others were beheaded, and thousands, yes, some authorities have it, millions, were imprisoned and starved.

Then came what one dictator thought was his opportunity, and hundreds of thousands of young men and boys were put into the battle lines, and as a result, in Europe, beyond question, more than a million men will die, sacrificed on the altar of one man's political ambition.

Here in America the action, though less violent and bloody, proceeds toward the same end along similar lines but with somewhat different methods. Here we have so far no shooting, no beheading, but we have had a course of conduct which has retarded the return of prosperity, brought our Nation to the verge of national bankruptcy, destroyed in many instances the liberty of the individual.

As the President truthfully said when we had a $4,000,000,000 deficit, continued borrowing would bankrupt us nationally. Knowing this, he has for more than 6 years caused an annual deficit of more than $3,000,000,000. He has done the very thing he said would bankrupt our Nation. Why?

It was the Saviour who said, "Suffer little children and forbid them not to come unto Me: for of such is the kingdom of heaven."

Roosevelt has professed great sympathy for the unfortunate, expressed the desire to lessen the burdens of the taxpayers, but by his acts, upon which he must be judged, he has already placed upon the shoulders of the children of this and the next generation an interest charge of approximately a billion dollars a year, which must be paid in taxes earned through the sweat of their bodies. Your children and mine, yes, even unto the third and fourth generations, will be paying interest on the debt created by Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Roosevelt for all of his expressions of sympathy, of concern for the welfare of those who must work, has nevertheless forged the bonds of slavery upon the little arms and limbs of the children of today, of the unborn generations of tomorrow.

ROOSEVELT IS RUTHLESS

"Honor thy father and thy mother; that thy days may be long upon the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee." So sayeth the scripture.

To further his experiments, his extravagant plans, his nightmarish dreams, this man in the White House is flooding thousands of acres of land in Illinois to create Crab Orchard Lake, a place of amusement for the people. In doing this he has not only, at exorbitant expense, moved families from their comfortable homes on fertile acres but he proposes to flood the graves in 22 cemeteries, or to move the bones of the dead from the places where they have long lain buried.

Roman emperors in days of old sacrificed the Christians to the savage beasts so that the people might be entertained. Roosevelt would destroy cemeteries, turn the flood of waters into the graves of our ancestors, some of whom no doubt fought for the preservation of this Nation.

HE WOULD SEND YOUR HUSBAND AND BOY TO WAR

Today, meddling in foreign affairs, raising false issues, seeking to divert attention from his failure here at home, he is following a course of conduct which, if he is not stopped, will send your husband, your sons, to fight in a foreign war.

If you believe that he is wrong in this, that we have no need to join in this world conflict, then write your Senator and your Congressman and tell him in no uncertain terms that if your husband or your children are taken from your home to be offered as a sacrifice in a war across the sea, you will do your utmost to see that that Senator, or Congressman, receives a command at the next November election to remain in his home, while you send to Congress someone who will fight for the preservation of your Government, of your liberty; who will endeavor to make America safe for democracy his first concern.

New Deal Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY C. DWORSHAK
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, November 1, 1939

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, although the Federal deficit for the first quarter of this fiscal year was approximately $1,000,000,000, there is a steady increase in the personnel and pay roll in the executive branch of the Government, according to figures recently released by the United States Civil Service Commission.

Civil employees during August totaled 932,953, an increase of 4,758 since July. The pay roll for August was $141,670,976, as compared to $138,975,099 in July. The number of employees in the District of Columbia totaled 124,610, both totals reaching new peaks for Federal employment. These figures do not include legislative or Army and Navy personnel, and show constantly increasing totals with the exception of the Public Works and Works Projects Administrations.

During August 1938 the executive branch employed 872,347 persons, compared to 932,953 in the same month this year, or an increase of 60,606. The pay roll for August of 1939 was $141,670,976, an increase of $9,286,153 over the pay roll of August last year, which amounted to $132,384,823.

During the past year there has been considerable publicity given in the National Capital to administration proposals for reorganization and economy in Federal bureaus and agencies, but the August pay roll shows that the annual cost of operating the executive branch of the Government approximates $1,700,000,000. It also indicates that, instead of economy, thousands of employees are being placed on the Federal pay roll to help swell the gigantic deficit which threatens to exceed $4,000,000,000 during this fiscal year, despite the Reorganization Act to minimize duplication and to reduce expenditures.

The feverish war activity and hysteria thus are serving as a smoke screen for the extravagance of the administration. While this country and its officials direct their attention to European countries and attempt to interfere with their affairs, our own domestic problems remain unsolved, bureaucracy is in the ascendancy, and financial chaos is around the corner.

The August report released by the United States Civil Service Commission contains the following:

TABLE 1.—*Civil employees in the executive branch of the U. S. Government, July 1939 and August 1939*

Item	August	July	Net change	
			Increase (+) or decrease (−)	Percent
Entire service:				
All employees	932,953	928,195	+4,758	0.5
Full-time:				
Regular	794,558	796,609	−2,051	−.3
Force-account	91,837	88,205	+3,632	4.1
Part-time	46,558	43,381	+3,177	7.3
In the District of Columbia:				
All employees	124,610	124,015	+595	.5
Full-time:				
Regular	118,314	117,795	+519	.4
Force-account	5,903	5,805	+98	1.7
Part-time	393	415	−22	−5.3
Outside the District of Columbia:				
All employees	808,343	804,180	+4,163	.5
Full-time:				
Regular	676,244	678,814	−2,570	−.4
Force-account	85,934	82,400	+3,534	4.3
Part-time	46,165	42,966	+3,199	7.4

Thomas Bracket Reed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT J. ENGEL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, November 1, 1939

ARTICLE FROM THE LOS ANGELES EXAMINER OF OCTOBER 27, 1939, BY GEORGE ROTHWELL BROWN

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial by George Rothwell Brown:

[From the Los Angeles Examiner of October 27, 1939]

THE POLITICAL PARADE

(By George Rothwell Brown)

WASHINGTON, October 26.—One of the saddest spectacles the Capitol has presented in many years was that of a skeletonized, rubber-stamp House of Representatives, pausing in the midst of its enforced dawdling at White House command, to note the centenary of Thomas B. Reed.

That, indeed, was a sight for the gods!

The observance, by significant chance, fell almost upon the 30th anniversary of the revolt against the rules of the mighty czar of the House, which began in the winter of 1909, and which has culminated today in a President who has been for 7 years the real leader of the House, and in a Speaker and a leader who have become little more than a couple of messenger boys.

It is incredible that Thomas B. Reed would have stood for the encroachment by the Executive upon the magnificent constitutional powers of the House of Representatives, as a succession of weak and complacent Democratic speakers have stood for it, and bowed to it.

Thomas B. Reed was a man of a stature no longer to be observed in the American House of Representatives. There are but two or three of that heroic cast left in the Senate.

The appearance of such a man in the House today would constitute the greatest hope we could have of an eventual restoration of the power, the dignity, and the intellectual integrity of the House, and through that the restoration of the constitutional system of checks and balances, the only thing which has made our Government work for 150 years.

The enormous parliamentary powers which Tom Reed inherited from Clay, Blaine, and Randall were destroyed under Uncle Joe Cannon.

By this destruction the leadership of the House was transferred to the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue in the course of 25 years or so. Not the Speaker but the President was the boss.

Mr. Roosevelt was not to blame for this. He found a condition at the Capitol and turned it to his own use.

From time to time events must be reexamined and reappraised. It was once the habit to refer to Reed as the czar of the House and Uncle Joe Cannon as a despot.

But if the strong speakers, from Clay to Cannon, were at times ruthless, they at least governed well, and they preserved the majesty of the popular branch of the legislative.

Their powers were not usurped. They came to them from the British House of Commons, who had won them in blood and toil, and from the Commons through the American colonial assemblies.

The strong speakers of the Colonies stood between the rights of the people and the encroachments of the royal Governors.

It was a magnificent power which Thomas B. Reed exercised as the chosen servant of the House of Representatives.

There were no "must" bills in those days. Tom Reed would have stood out against a $4,800,000,000 lump-sum appropriation until hell became a skating rink for Sonja Henie.

Will the "Reed rules" ever come back to the House? Most Members would answer with an emphatic "no."

But I am not so sure. The Presidency, under Mr. Roosevelt, has certainly become too strong. It has become dangerous.

Mr. Roosevelt himself has frankly said that in the hands of certain others—puppets, I believe he called them—these powers might become instruments of tyranny. Indeed they might.

To put a check on a too-strong President, it may be necessary some day for the House of Representatives to restore the power of the Speakership.

Imagine a condition in which a political party held control of the House by a very narrow margin, six or eight votes.

Against a determined minority it might not be able to function at all.

To save the House from chaos it might be essential for that party to organize the House, adopt the Reed rules, and place a strong man in the chair.

Anyhow, at last the present House, in its pitiful state, at least has become Tom-Reed conscious.

That's something.

Embargo and the "City of Flint"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 1, 1939

EDITORIAL FROM THE JACKSON (MICH.) CITIZEN-PRESS

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Jackson Citizen-Press, of Jackson, Mich.:

[From the Jackson (Mich.) Citizen-Press]

EMBARGO AND THE "CITY OF FLINT"

Advocates of repeal of the embargo on shipment of arms to belligerents are pointing to the seizure by the Germans of the steamer, *City of Flint*, as evidence of need for changing the neutrality law. They are right in one respect. Under a cash-and-carry plan of commerce with belligerents the *City of Flint* would not have been carrying contraband to Great Britain thereby inviting German attack. But the fact is that those Senators and Representatives in Washington who favor retaining the embargo plan likewise approve the cash-and-carry idea. That is the only change they would make in the present neutrality law.

When advocates of repealing the embargo make the claim that their plan would segregate us more completely from war they are insincere. The very incident of the *City of Flint* illustrates the danger of their position.

The Germans captured the *City of Flint* because it carried a cargo calculated to harm Germany as a participant in the current war. Even those of us who most heartily sympathize with the Franco-British Allies cannot fail to understand Germany's position in this situation. Britain, using her huge navy, completely blockades German ports, preventing all commerce from entering. That is sound war strategy and probably will win the war. But it likewise is sound strategy for Germany, to such extent as she is able, to undertake to prevent contraband from reaching her enemies.

From such a position it is going to be unfortunately easy for the German mind to follow along to the point where, with the embargo repealed, she will attempt to handicap American production of munitions for her enemies. We all remember how during the last war German secret agents bombed American plants making war munitions for the Allies. If now we return to the business of making arms for one side when the other side cannot buy them, do the advocates of repeal think that Germany will fail to act? And then supposing the Germans, who are notoriously stupid in anticipating American reactions, do bomb an American plant which is making munitions for Britain, isn't that going to carry us to the brink of war and perhaps over the brink?

If we want to stay out of this war—and a vast majority of Americans do want to stay out—hadn't we better stay out altogether?

Outline of Details of 1940 Objectives of Veterans of Foreign Wars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 1, 1939

STATEMENT BY MILLARD W. RICE, NATIONAL LEGISLATIVE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE V. F. W.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, while we are discussing the present European war, we must not overlook the fact that we have a tremendous responsibility left to us from the last war.

Practically every man in the House is pledged to the proposition of keeping America out of the present conflict, although we may differ as to the methods of reaching that laudable end.

As chairman of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, I am ever conscious of the devastation wrought among the young men of 20 years ago; and I pray God that America may not be drawn into another conflict that would probably cost the lives of millions of the boys of this generation, to say nothing of the women and children whose lives might be destroyed by high explosives and poison gas.

Under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting a statement issued by Mr. Millard W. Rice, national legislative representative, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, giving an outline of the details of the 1940 objectives of the V. F. W.

The matter referred to follows:

POINT 1. SECURITY FOR AMERICA

A. ARMED FORCES

1. An expanded Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, as well as National Guard, C. M. T. C., R. O. T. C., and Reserve Corps, amply equipped with scientifically developed, modernized, mechanized, and motorized matériel, sufficient to protect America against any possible aggressive force.

2. Natural resources:

a. Detailed plans for effective mobilization of men and money, labor, and industry in event of war.

(1) A graduated part of wealth of every resident to be subject to conscription, for purchase of taxable, low-interest-bearing, nonnegotiable, short-term Government bonds.

b. Constructive Nation-wide natural resources conservation programs.

c. Acquire island Navy bases as proposed in Senate Joint Resolutions 119, 120, 170–174.

d. Rigid governmental control of manufacture and sales of all munitions.

e. Sale of helium gas to foreign countries for peacetime purposes only.

3. Personnel provisions:

a. Increased pay for enlisted personnel and lower-grade officers.

b. Government insurance for all active members of United States armed forces.

c. Transportation home for all fleet reservists and their families.

B. ACTUAL NEUTRALITY AS TO WARS OUTSIDE OF THE AMERICAS

1. Adequate mechanized, motorized matériel, and mobilized men for armed forces.

2. No foreign entanglement which might lead America into war; renounce war as an instrument of international policy; recognize state of war regardless of its formal declaration.

3. Proclamation by the United States that it will not engage in any war of aggression, but that it will support and defend the Monroe Doctrine. No change in United States Constitution as to declaration of war.

4. Withdraw armed protection to American citizens, after a period of warning, during their continued travel or residence in any country at war or in any war danger zone; prohibit such travel by American citizens.

5. Continue compliance with provisions of so-called Johnson Act; prohibit extension of credit or loans by United States, or any of its citizens, to any country, or its citizens, which is engaged in war.

6. Permit sale of supplies to any nation at war only if paid for, and only if ownership thereof is transferred at our shore lines, without any protection or responsibility whatsoever by United States Government as to same.

7. Prohibit any American merchant vessels from becoming armed; provide for their clear identification during wartime; disclaim any responsibility for protection of those which carry any merchandise to any country at war or into any danger zone, but permit clearance of such American vessels only if adequate private insurance is carried on such vessels and their crew members.

8. Take the profits out of any possible future war by steeply graduated personal and corporation income taxes.

9. Adequate provisions for all disabled veterans, and the dependents of all deceased veterans, of all wars, past and future.

10. Encourage peaceful international negotiations to adjust most irritating deficiencies, differences, and inequities.

11. Conduct a program of education as to all of the costs of war.

—

POINT 2. SECURITY FOR AMERICAN CITIZENS

A. PROMOTION OF AMERICANISM

1. Maintenance of our constitutional rights of free speech, a free press, religious freedom, petition and assembly, and education as to value of same as compared with communism, fascism, nazi-ism, or any other "ism."

2. Promotion of general education of our children, of our citizens, and of those on their way toward citizenship; promotion of public forums.

3. Educational and inspirational activities among our Nation's youth.
4. Cooperation as to all noncontroversial constructive community activities.
5. Joint unified veteran organization ceremonies in Arlington National Cemetery on Armistice Day.
6. Dissemination of information concerning social-security laws and other Federal laws which directly affect many citizens; steps to assure efficient administration of such beneficial laws.
7. Adoption of a national-flag code:
a. No importation, purchase, or use of foreign-made United States flags.
b. School pupils to be instructed in proper flag etiquette.
c. Display of United States flag on or near all Federal and school buildings.
8. Reduce crime by rehabilitation of criminals.
9. Expand Federal Bureau of Investigation activities.
10. Promote voluntary fingerprinting of all Americans.
11. Constitution Day, September 17, to be made a national holiday.
12. All patriotic holidays to be recognized on all American vessels.
13. Offer of Veterans of Foreign Wars members and units to serve in case of national emergency.
14. Preservation of the *Constitution*, *Constellation*, *Hartford*, *Olympia*, and *America* as historic naval relics.

B. PROTECTION OF AMERICANISM

1. Our threefold form of government to be perpetuated.
2. All governmental employees to take oath of allegiance.
3. Governmental employment only for American citizens willing to serve in emergency; all persons who receive checks for payment of services, employment, contracts, loans, or other benefits from any Federal agency, or from any federally supported agency, to be fingerprinted.
4. Vigorous opposition to and investigation of agencies of communism, fascism, nazi-ism, or any other form of dictatorship or regimentation.
5. Make it a crime to advocate or promote overthrow of the United States Government by force or violence.
6. No old-age assistance, pensions, or other governmental benefits to aliens.
7. Register, fingerprint, photograph, and identify all aliens in and coming into the United States.
8. Reduce immigration as to all countries down to 10 percent of present quotas.
a. Exclude those likely to become a public burden, or to replace the employment of any citizen, or who believe in use of force to overthrow United States Government.
b. Prevent smuggling of aliens into country by increased border patrols.
9. Deport all undesirable aliens.
a. Criminals, those ineligible for citizenship, those who advocate use of force to overthrow present form of government, and those who are public charges—on relief, or in penal or mental institutions.
10. Island dependencies not to be admitted as States of United States.

—

POINT 3. SECURITY FOR AMERICA'S VETERANS AND THEIR DEPENDENTS

A. LIBERALIZED PROVISIONS FOR SERVICE DISABLED

1. Ten-percent minimum rating for combat disabilities.
2. Restore full compensation for presumptives.
3. Compensation to be barred by misconduct only if felonious.
4. Statutory award of $35 for loss or loss of use of a limb in all cases.
5. Causative-factor requirement as to disabled emergency officer's retirement benefits to be liberalized.
6. Service-connected disability ratings to be increased by 10 percent of basic ratings for each additional 5 years of age after fortieth birthday.

B. LIBERALIZED PENSIONS FOR DISABLED VETERANS

1. War veterans with permanent total non-service-connected disabilities to receive pensions of $60 per month.
a. Pension to be barred by misconduct only if felonious.
2. Honorably discharged, 90-day, disabled World War veterans to receive pensions at same rates as granted to disabled veterans of Spanish-American War: $20 per month for 10-percent disability, $25 for 25 percent, $35 for 50 percent, $50 for 75 percent, $60 for total disability, and $100 if in need of an attendant.
3. Honorably discharged, 65-year-old, 90-day World War veterans to receive pensions of $60 per month.

C. LIBERALIZED PENSIONS FOR DEPENDENTS OF VETERANS

1. Pensions of $30 per month for dependent widows of all deceased World War veterans honorably discharged after 90 or more days of service, plus allowances for dependent children same as for children of deceased veterans of Spanish-American War.
2. Pensions of $40 per month for dependent widows of all deceased World War veterans who, prior to death, were suffering with service-connected disabilities but whose deaths were caused by other disabilities.
3. Pensions of $50 per month for widows of all deceased World War veterans who died by reason of service-connected disabilities or who had permanent total combat disabilities.
4. Pensions for widows and orphans of pensionable disabled Regulars at same rates as for dependents of service-connected World War veterans.
5. Widow to be eligible for pension if married to and living with veteran for 3 years preceding his death, or if she had a child with veteran as father.
6. Receipt of pension by parents of one deceased World War veteran not to affect entitlement to pension on basis of death of other sons.
7. Pensions to minor children of deceased Spanish-American War veterans until age 18, or until age 21 if attending accredited school.
8. Accrued compensation or. pension to dependents of deceased veterans.
9. Adequate social-security benefits for all dependent children.

D. MEDICAL TREATMENT FOR VETERANS

1. Hospitalization for all war, campaign, and expedition veterans.
2. Medical treatment for American veterans residing abroad.
3. No compensation reduction during first 3 months of hospitalization.
4. Increase allowances of compensated and pensioned veterans in homes or hospitals up to not less than $25 per month.
5. Dentures from contract dentists where not feasible to complete dental work started while in Veterans' Administration hospital.
6. Prosthetic and orthopedic appliances for non-service-connected cases.
7. Veterans' Administration facilities to be located according to veteran population needs.

E. BONUS LEGISLATION

1. Enactment of Philippine travel pay bill.
2. Bonus and disability-retirement eligibility for provisional World War officers.
3. Duplicate adjusted-service certificate to be issued where veteran is unable to secure possession of original certificate.

F. INSURANCE FOR VETERANS

1. Government insurance to be incontestable after 2 years.
2. Remove limitation dates as to all war-risk insurance claims and suits.

G. BURIAL BENEFITS AS TO VETERANS

1. National cemeteries to be in all States.
2. Optional noncorrosive metal headstones for veterans' graves.
3. Grave markers for veterans whose last discharges were not dishonorable.
4. Same burial rights for the widows of deceased enlisted men buried in national cemeteries as granted to the widows of officers.
5. Same burial allowance as to service-connected disabled regulars, and as to campaign-badge veterans, as now provided for as to war veterans.

H. SERVICE RECORDS OF VETERANS

1. Fingerprints of all war veterans to be classified according to type.
2. Discharges because of minority to be made honorable for all war, campaign, and expedition veterans.
3. Review boards in War and Navy Departments, with authority to give honorable discharge certificates.
4. Engraved honorable discharge certificates for all former members of United States armed forces.
5. Remove time-limitation date (June 25, 1928) for granting of awards, decorations, and citations for World War service.
6. Purple Heart Medal to any war combat veteran who was hospitalized because of such service, together with one gold bar for each bleeding wound sustained by the veteran.
7. War service credit to railroad employees for retirement purposes.

I. ADMINISTRATION OF VETERAN BENEFITS

1. All service-connected claims rated as less than 10 percent, and all informal claims, to be reviewed by Veterans' Administration.
a. Retroactive adjustment of all erroneous Veterans' Administration adjudications.
2. Modify Veterans' Administration regulations so as to resolve benefit of doubt against veterans concerning medical and other evidence, on basis of facts, not mere belief.
3. Permanent total disability to be determined on individual basis.
a. To be measured by individual's inability to follow any substantially gainful occupation, on same basis as for Spanish War veterans.
b. Modify Veterans' Administration regulations to permit permanent and total rating when there are present two or more disabilities, affecting different functions, one of which shall be 45 percent disabling (now 65 percent) and sufficient other disability to make a combined rating of 65 percent (now 85 percent), or when there is present one disability rated at 60 percent (now 70 percent), accompanied by unemployability.
c. Permanent and total ratings for all active tuberculars, and for severe diabetics requiring insulin periodically.
4. Veterans' Administration annual reports to classify beneficiaries as to overseas service.
5. All limitation dates as to veteran-benefit applications to be removed.

6. Greater uniformity of benefits among the several groups of veterans, and the dependents of veterans, where equitable and feasible.

7. Benefit payments to be resumed, where discontinued because of fraud, if claimant is found not guilty before a duly constituted court.

8. Veteran to be given ample opportunity to present his contention before apportionment of his pension is made to his separated wife.

9. Mileage allowance of 4 cents per mile where transportation vehicle is furnished by attendant of veteran.

J. EMPLOYMENT FOR VETERANS

1. Federal civil-service preferences for veterans as to:

a. Examinations:

(1) Ten points to be added to earned ratings of: Service-connected disabled veterans, their wives, war veterans over age of 55, and widows of all deceased veterans; placement at top of civil-service register.

(2) Five points to be added to earned ratings of all other veterans, and names of war veterans placed next in order on civil-service register.

(3) Quarterly examination privilege for all war, campaign, and expedition veterans, for 6-year-service veterans, and for 10-point persons.

(4) Veterans' Administration to certify to Civil Service Commission only as to service-connected disabilities without stating degree.

(5) Age and physical requirements waived if otherwise qualified.

(6) Educational prerequisites waived if otherwise qualified.

(7) Include war service as part of experience prerequisite time.

(8) Credit experience gained in voluntary civic, social welfare, and veterans' service work, with same credit as if on paid basis.

b. Appointments:

(1) Appointing officer to submit adequate reason for skipping over a veteran to Civil Service Commission; its reaction thereto to be available to the veteran or his representative.

(2) Names of all appointees to be published.

c. Retention, upon reduction of forces, in all Federal agencies.

d. Removal only on basis of written charges; protection against lower job or salary status; transfers with same job classification and salary, as to handicapped veterans, if possible, rather than dismissal or retirement.

e. Reinstatement from furloughed, resigned, or dismissed status, and after recovery from retirement disability.

f. Appeal Board to consider appeals on all Federal employment matters; veteran or his representative to review records and present evidence.

g. Local postmasters to make permanent appointments of veterans in same order as original substitute appointments.

h. Retention in civil-service status of veteran employees of Bureau of Marine Inspection and Navigation, without annual examination.

2. Same preferences as to all Federal positions, contracts, public works, P. W. A., W. P. A., etc.

a. Effective preferences as to all war, campaign, and expedition veterans, the wives of unemployable veterans, and the widows of veterans who have been certified by any governmental agency as in need of employment, as to all administrative, supervisory, and work-relief employment for which they are qualified and available under the Work Projects Administration.

b. Military-records projects for unemployed veterans in every State.

3. Civil service for all non-policy-making full-time Federal employees.

4. Preference to American citizens as to all governmental employment, services, contracts, loans, grants, and other assistance.

5. Optional civil-service retirements for civil-service employees.

6. Optional quarters, subsistence, and laundry for Veterans' Administration employees.

7. Increase veterans' quota in Civilian Conservation Corps from 30,000 to 50,000 and make veterans eligible for immediate reenrollment.

a. Reserve officers with World War service to have preference for all civilian positions.

8. A census of all veterans in each community and State, cross classified as to ages, occupations, able-bodied and disabled, employed, partially employed, and unemployed; and as to those:

a. Employed by the Federal Government, by States, counties, and municipalities, with and without civil-service status.

b. Employed under Federal, State, and local relief projects.

9. Intensified employment service and veterans' placement service maintained under a separate budget.

a. Urge employers, especially those who are veterans, to extend employment to qualified veterans.

10. A coordinated program of vocational training and placement in suitable employment of all unemployed employable older persons, particularly veterans.

a. Extend homestead preferences for veterans up to 1950.

11. Effective veteran employment and civil-service preference laws by all States, counties, and municipalities; greater uniformity of beneficial State laws relative to veterans, their dependents, and their organizations.

12. Cooperation of local, State, and National employment committees of Veterans of Foreign Wars with other veteran organizations, governmental agencies, and private employers to take such steps as will assure to all ex-service men the opportunity for permanent, suitable, gainful employment.

Neutrality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 31, 1939

ADDRESS BY RIGHT REV. MSGR. JOHN O'GRADY

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an address delivered by Rt. Rev. Msgr. John O'Grady, for years secretary of the National Conference of Catholic Charities, over the Blue Network of the National Broadcasting Co. at Spokane, Wash., October 19, 1939.

The address follows:

Two weeks ago I was in Washington, D. C. Europe was locked in war; Congress was locked in debate. Everywhere in the Nation's Capitol there was a sense of determination, but also of great uncertainty.

Day after day we were faced with the realities of war; the ruthless invasion of Poland; the burning of cities; the flight of the starving, homeless people caught between two advancing armies and not knowing where to turn. Day by day we awaited with horror new evidences of ruthlessness. To me the realities of the situation stood out in striking contrast to the debate on Capitol Hill. After the wonderfully clear speech of the President in which he stated that the best way to keep this country out of war was to repeal the embargo, the debates appeared to be getting increasingly out of touch with the temper of the American people. Some who opposed repeal voiced their distrust of the President; some accused the Members of Congress who wished to raise the embargo as warmongers. The suggestion was made, in an utterly irresponsible way, that now that Great Britain was locked in a life-and-death struggle against the Nazi aggressor, we should take the opportunity of robbing her of her possessions on this hemisphere. Thus were they mimicking the aggressor whose aims were utterly at variance with our philosophy of government and our Christian ideals of life.

Our Holy Father, Pope Pius the XII, is fully aware of the implications of this war for Christian civilization. In his address to the new Lithuanian Minister to the Vatican yesterday he said: "As supreme pastor I could not close my eyes when, precisely for the salvation of souls arise new incommensurable dangers—when on the face of Europe, Christian in its fundamental lineaments, the sinister shadow of thoughts and deeds of enemies of God casts itself close and more threateningly every day." This is the fundamental thought the Holy Father would have all Christians and all believers in religion keep in mind. It is of far greater importance than any delimitation of boundary lines or struggles for racial supremacy. If nazi-ism and communism succeed in eliminating God and Christianity, then we are all facing dark days.

It was with the sense of confusion and relief that I left Washington to come to the West. I have stopped in town after town and spoken to hundreds upon hundreds of people. Here the false values that we have had thrust upon us are replaced by real values. In my contacts with the people in the middle and far West, I have become more keenly aware of the realities of the spirit.

In Washington even Senators and Congressmen who have come from immediate contact with their people were confused about the true sentiment that existed at home. After traveling 3,000 miles, every mile filled with human experiences and human contacts, I am no longer confused as to the true attitude of the American people. It is becoming more and more definite every day.

The American people are fully alive to the issues involved in this war. They want to maintain in this country the ideals and practices of democracy—they want to maintain the principles and practices of Christianity. While they are aware of the problems involved in the European conflict, they have serious doubts as to how far war will solve these problems. After the war is over, they ask themselves "will the problems and conflicts of Europe be solved—will European countries be closer to our democratic ideals—will the defeat of Hitler bring democracy in Germany—will it weaken the influence of communism—will it make an end of racial and national quarrels?" The people of this country do not want to become involved in purely European quarrels, they do not want to become involved in the adjustment of the European boundary lines. They feel that European nations must develop a leadership that is capable

of solving their own probems. They are convinced that the problems of Europe cannot be solved without reference to the principles of democratic government.

The great majority of Americans with whom I have spoken believe that the issue of American neutrality is an American issue and must be dealt with solely from the standpoint of American ideals and interests. They will not permit European racial interests and antagonisms into this issue. They have no sympathy for those who would introduce European quarrels into this country. From my contacts throughout the middle and far West, I am certain that the President of the United States reflected the true temper of the American people when he said that we can and must keep out of war. After speaking with Americans in all walks of life, I am certain of another conviction that rests in their mind. I am certain that they have the utmost faith in the word and ability of the President of the United States. I am certain that our people trust the President. I am certain that they believe he knows what is best when he says that repeal will lessen the chances of American participation in the war, as he knew best last summer when he stated that war was imminent and that the maintenance of the Neutrality Act would make it certain. Our people, from what I have seen of them, are convinced that at this dangerous time, the President needs all the trust and confidence in him that we can give him if he is to steer this country through and maintain its neutrality. By undermining the President at the present time we are undermining the strength and the influence of America.

What else could I believe when I, as everyone else, have seen the amazing increase in the President's popularity in the last 4 months as illustrated by the Gallup poll?

The American people believe in their own right that repeal of the embargo is a measure that will keep us out of war. "Why," they ask, "if it is a warlike measure, does it include cash and carry, the greatest safeguard we possess at this time against attack by hostile powers?"

Our people, I am sure, see nothing immoral in the export to Britain and France of the means by which they may halt Nazi aggression and maintain their independence and their freedom. And I believe our people are more intelligent than some Members of Congress believe. They understand that the true issues of isolation and benevolent neutrality are not contained within the terms of the repeal of the arms embargo. It has been pointed out, trade in the goods included in the embargo represented no more than 13 percent of our total exports to the Allies during our period of neutrality in the Great War. Our people understand that 13 percent in itself cannot create the economic suction that might lead us into war. They understand that if we are to cut off that economic suction as a means of keeping this country out of war, it is the 87 percent and not the 13 percent that we must eliminate. Isolation, in an economic sense, involves cutting off all our exports. The people know very well what this would mean for American industry and agriculture. This is real economic isolation and it is a policy which no supporter of the arms embargo has yet dared to put forward.

Our people know that an isolationist policy is not a realistic one. They know that the practical policy is one that recognizes their sympathies for democracies, which reiterates our demand to keep out of war and which strives to advance our economic welfare, as the best method of guaranteeing the security and contentment of the people of this country.

I found one last conviction everywhere among the people of the West. I found the conviction that nothing in this war must be allowed to interfere with the peaceful processes of the liberal readjustment which our country has undertaken during the past 7 years. I found a renewed devotion to the principles of our national administration. I found a new determination to continue the programs that have been inaugurated for the general betterment of the people. No abandonment, I am sure, of the national program under the pretext of wartime appeasement or other misleading slogans will be tolerated. Real wages must not be allowed to decline—our civil liberties must not be curtailed—the rights of labor must be maintained and extended—profiteering in war exports must be prevented—our social-security program, our national youth program, the work program, and the national housing program must be maintained. It has been my proud privilege to have had a small part in the development of these programs. I know what they have meant to the people of the United States. They represent a type of progress of which the American people can well feel proud.

Scarcely less than the involvement in war, our people fear the righteous condemnation of us by the rest of the world; that we profited by death and were content to sit back and reap profits while others gave their blood on the battlefield. All the regrettable mistakes, and perhaps unavoidable ones, such as the nonpayment of war debts, would fade into insignificance beside the dreadful judgment upon America if she were solely concerned in making profits out of the disasters of others.

As a Catholic priest who has given his life to the extension of charity I have not abandoned hope in these dark days. I believe that individuals and nations will again return to Christ and to the practices of His sweet love. I know that mankind will soon tire of the error of its ways and will find its consolation in Him in whom alone it can be found.

In this hour of tragedies I, like other members of Christ's army throughout the world, look for guidance and inspiration to the great common father of christendom, Pope Pius XII. He is constantly encouraging the Christian world to pray for peace and return to sanity and Christian ideals. Let us hope that the leaders of Europe may soon hearken to his voice. Let us hope that they may avail themselves of his wisdom and world-wide understanding when they finally gather around the council tables of peace. It is indeed consoling to us to know that the neutrality program of our great President is so close in all respect to that set forth by the Supreme Shepherd of our church.

Pending Neutrality Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT G. ALLEN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 1, 1939

EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON POST OF NOVEMBER 1, 1939

Mr. ALLEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from today's issue of the Washington Post:

[From the Washington Post of November 1, 1939]

NEUTRALS HAVE RIGHTS

Certain conscientious Members of the House who strongly favor repeal of the arms embargo as a matter of national self-interest are nevertheless in doubt as to the propriety of such action at this time. They argue that repeal involves a change in national policy in the midst of an international conflict and is, therefore, unneutral.

If neutrality is regarded as a strait jacket, fettered upon a nation at peace by the action of belligerents, that contention would have a measure of plausibility. Actually neutrality has never had any such meaning in international law.

If neutrality implied wholesale surrender of rights by a nation at peace, it would follow that in time of war only belligerents possess freedom of action. As Secretary Hull has pointed out, belligerents have never hesitated to change their rules, practices, methods, and policies in various directions during the progress of hostilities. In making such changes, combatant nations are properly guided by reasons of national self-interest. It is well to remember that this standard is an equally valid guide for neutrals. The only restraint imposed upon the latter by international law is that their rules and regulations regarding neutrality should apply to all combatants.

On that score there is no room for any criticism of the administration bill. President Roosevelt and Secretary Hull sought modification of the existing neutrality law many months before war broke out in Europe. When thwarted by the failure of the Senate to act during the closing days of the last session, notice was given that modification of the law would be urged when Congress reconvened. The repeal of the embargo and the other proposed changes in the neutrality law thus follow a line of policy advertised to the world long before Germany invaded Poland.

Even if no such prior notice of intent had been given, the United States would not be precluded from changing its neutrality policy whenever national interest seemed to make such change desirable. Statutes defining that policy are a matter of domestic legislation. And to suggest that we have no right to change our laws because Hitler or Stalin might not like the alteration is equivalent to saying that, in this particular field, Hitler and Stalin control the policy of the United States.

Obviously under existing circumstances, the lifting of the arms embargo would operate in favor of Great Britain and France. It would permit them to make use of the traditional advantages that arise from the possession of superior sea power. It is equally true, however, that the so-called cash-and-carry provisions are certain to operate to the disadvantage of Great Britain and France.

At a time when their shipping is being subjected to the hazards and depredations of submarine warfare, the British and French will have to divert merchant vessels to transport supplies purchased in the United States. The new law also drastically changes the rules regarding credit in their disfavor. But there is nothing unneutral about this, since these restrictions apply theoretically to Germany, just as the advantages of embargo repeal are also theoretically available to the Nazis.

Both embargo repeal and the cash-and-carry provisions constitute a change in American policy, both changes to be made applicable in wartime. If the one change were "unneutral," so would the other be. If international law opposed modification of the ban on the sale of arms it would similarly oppose any and all other changes in the existing neutrality law. But the fact is that no such restrictions are imposed on neutrals by international law.

There is also the argument of those who agree that there would be nothing at all unneutral in repealing the embargo if the intent

behind that action is neutral. But the intent, these critics assert, is to assist France and Great Britain at the expense of Germany.

Since the Allies would have to pay cash down for any munitions and then transport them in their own ships, it cannot be said that the "intent" of helping the Allies is very pronounced. It might with equal reason be said that there is an unneutral intent to help Germany in hedging the sale of munitions with restrictions which are in no way necessary in a policy of real neutrality.

Even in the simplest of private cases the question of motive is difficult to establish. It is all but impossible to prove in the complicated field of international law. Certainly in the present debate this artificial complication need not bother the most scrupulous of Congressmen. His conscience will be clear if his intent is to vote in the way he thinks America's interests lie. Whether Hitler or Stalin or Chamberlain or Daladier dislikes that vote need not for a moment concern him.

Neutrality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER G. ANDREWS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 1, 1939

STATEMENT BY A CONSTITUENT

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a statement referring to the present Neutrality Act by a student of international law residing in the congressional district which I have the honor to represent.

The statement is as follows:

THE NEUTRALITY LAW MAY NOT NOW BE CHANGED WITHOUT THE CHANGE CONSTITUTING AN UNNEUTRAL ACT BY THE UNITED STATES

If a neutral nation violates one of these provisions, it subjects itself (1) to financial responsibility for loss caused by such act and (2) gives the belligerent country affected by such act a right to treat the previously neutral country as an enemy. Although various international-law text writers have questioned the soundness of the principle which permits nationals of a neutral country to supply arms, ammunition, and implements of war to both sides, all international-law text writers admit that for a country to supply these articles only to one of the belligerents may be properly interpreted by the other belligerents as an unneutral act. It has also been recognized that though the nationals of a neutral are entitled to trade with both belligerents in the usual course of trade, the neutral country cannot itself assist either side or so regulate its affairs as to be of assistance to one side. These distinctions will be found in Moore, International Law Digest, vol. 7, pp. 955 et seq.; Wharton's International Law Digest, vol. 3, pp. 516 et seq.; Hall, International Law, 5th edition, pp. 598 et seq.; Snow, Cases on International Law, pp. 461 et seq., and Fiore Droit International, 2d edition, pp. 1561 et seq.

As far back as 1796 Attorney General Lee (see 1 Opinions of the Attorney General, 61) pointed out that though belligerents may come into the territory of a neutral nation and there purchase or removed any article whatsoever, unless the right so to do was denied by statute or order it would be a clear violation of neutrality nevertheless it would be a clear violation of neutrality as defined under international law if the statute or order was made with the object of impeding the operation of either belligerent power.

Again, on October 13, 1855, in a communication of Mr. Marcy, Secretary of State, to Mr. Buchanan, Minister to England (British and Foreign State Papers, 421, 424), it was specifically pointed out that in upholding the right of American nationals to trade with the enemy that "as this Government has had no connection with these proceedings, neither belligerent has any just ground of complaint against it."

Again, during the war between Chile, Bolivia, and Peru, in a communication of Mr. Buchanan, Minister to the Argentine Republic, to Mr. Hay, Secretary of State (No. 584, December 1, 1898), it was said:

"While it is generally conceded that the traffic in arms and munitions of war by private persons without intent to aid either belligerent, is admissible as a commercial transaction, subject to the risk of capture, yet that, when the shipment is made by agents of the belligerents on a scale so large as to convert them into important aids to the war, neutral governments should use due diligence to prevent such traffic with one of the belligerents, so that it may not be required to sanction similar operations on the part of the other belligerent and thus tolerate the conversion of its territory into a center of expeditions in conflict with its neutral character."

In the case of *The Bermuda* (3 Wallace, 514), Chief Justice Chase, speaking for the United States Supreme Court, said:

"Neutrals in their own country may sell to belligerents whatever belligerents choose to buy. The principal exceptions to this rule are, that neutrals must not sell to one belligerent what they refuse to sell to the other. * * *."

Mr. Moore, in his International Law Digest (vol. 7, p. 973), summarizes the distinction between what a citizen of a neutral may lawfully do and the activities of the government of the neutral which would involve a breach of the international law principles of neutrality, thus:

"But, there is also a broad distinction between what a neutral government may permit its citizens to do and what it may do itself. This distinction was altogether lost sight of by Senator Matt. Carpenter, when, in discussing the sale of arms during the Franco-German War, he expressed the opinion that the Government of the United States might have freely sold arms to France without violating the duties of neutrality. Nothing should be clearer than that a neutral government is bound to abstain from doing any act whatsoever that is in its nature unneutral. It should seem obvious that a neutral government cannot itself sell arms to a belligerent without a flagrant violation of neutrality any more than it can itself supply money to a belligerent without a breach of neutral duty. When France supplied arms and money to the United States in the early days of the American Revolution she showed her sense of the real nature of the transactions by conducting them indirectly through a fictitious commercial firm; and when, in February 1778, she formally became the ally of the United States she merely avowed her real position. And yet no one now contends that Great Britain, France, and Germany failed in their duty when they omitted to prevent their citizens from selling arms to the United States and purchasing the bonds of the United States in 1861–65 and 1898, or that the United States failed in its duty when omitting to prevent its citizens from selling arms to Britons or Boers or from purchasing British consols during the Boer War, or that it has failed to perform its duty in similar respects during the Russo-Japanese War."

Again in 1872 a question was raised in the United States Senate as to the propriety of sales by the United States of certain ordnance stores which were found to be unusable by the Government. The Senate Committee on the Sale of Arms on May 11, 1872 (Senate Rept. 183) took the position that "a national policy (had been) adopted by us prior to the commencement of hostilities" to sell these arms to any purchaser neither belligerent could claim that the continued sale after hostilities constituted a belligerent act. In spite of this communication by the Senate committee, all of the international text writers criticize even as limited an expression as this on the ground that there is a distinction between nationals and the Government may not do any act such as sell arms to ether side during a state of hostilities. Thus Hall, in his treatise, says:

"The vendor of munitions of war in large quantities during the existence of hostilities knows perfectly well that the purchaser must intend them for the use of one of the belligerents, and a neutral government is too strictly bound to hold aloof from the quarrel to be allowed to seek safety in the quibble that the precise destination of the articles bought has not been disclosed."

Mr. Snow, in his cases on international law, states that he hopes the Senate report "does not express the settled law of the United States on this subject. It confounds the rights and duties of a neutral state with those of the private citizens of a neutral state, which is a very different matter."

Again, in 1914, much the same question was raised. An embargo bill was then pending before Congress, and Great Britain indicated through its Minister that it would consider such an embargo an unneutral act. Both President Wilson and Secretary of State Lansing communicated to Great Britain the view that such would be an unneutral act, and the embargo bill was not passed.

Again, in 1915, Germany, I am informed, urged the United States to pass an arms embargo. In a note by the State Department to the German Ambassador it was said:

"Any change in its own laws of neutrality during the progress of a war which would affect unequally the relations of the United States with the nations at war would be an unjustifiable departure from the principle of strict neutrality."

All the reasons which have been assigned by the President and his various published statements show that his reason for desiring the repeal of the neutrality law now on the statute books is so that the United States may furnish to England and France the materials with which they may successfully continue their war. There would be adequate authority, therefore, for showing that the repeal was intended and did in fact operate as a favor to one side and a harm to the other. This would come specifically within the definition of an unneutral act. Germany would therefore instantly have the right, under the rules of international law, to take steps of retaliation or reprisal against American ships, and might, in fact, have a right to indemnity or other pecuniary payment. Germany might even take such steps against our coastal trade if her submarines were in a position so to do. This would only be a proper application of the principle of international law that a neutral may not after the outbreak of the war so modify its legislation as to assist one of the belligerents.

Although Fortune's poll shows that the American people are about equally divided as to whether we should supply materials to England and France or not, the poll shows overwhelmingly that the American people desire to remain neutral. Those who favor supplying materials have been informed by the President that they may do this and still remain neutral. As appears in the above memorandum, this is impossible, and we must there-

fore conclude that the American people overwhelmingly would not approve of the repeal of the Neutrality Act if they realized that this would constitute an unneutral act and might involve us immediately in the war.

The Thirty-sixth Division Association Endorses Cash-and-Carry Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JED JOHNSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 1, 1939

RESOLUTION BY THE THIRTY-SIXTH DIVISION ASSOCIATION

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, the World War veterans who served in the Thirty-sixth Division, one of the several National Guard divisions, with a record of outstanding service and accomplishments on the front lines, recently held an annual convention in the city of Fort Worth, Tex. This association of Oklahoma and Texas men, after much deliberation, went on record wholeheartedly endorsing the proposal of the President of the United States to lift the present embargo and enact a strict cash-and-carry law in its stead. The resolution of the Thirty-sixth Division Association is as follows:

Resolved, That the Thirty-sixth Division Association, composed of World War veterans of the said division from the States of Texas and Oklahoma, endorse the plans and purposes of the President and Commander in Chief of the Army of the United States as reflected in the legislation sponsored by him, now pending in Congress, providing for the abolition of the arms embargo and the establishment of a cash-and-carry plan and other things, and the members of this association from both said States call upon the congressional representatives from both States to support the adoption of such legislation; and that this resolution be communicated to said congressional representatives and to the press.

I, Dallas J. Matthews, secretary of the Thirty-sixth Division Association, certify that the foregoing is a true copy of a resolution adopted at a regular meeting of said association held in the city of Fort Worth on October 8, 1939, as the same appears on the minutes of said meeting.

Witness my hand and the seal of said association this the 10th day of October 1939.

DALLAS J. MATTHEWS, *Secretary.*
Gen. JOHN H. HULEN, *President.*
JED JOHNSON, *Vice President.*

Neutrality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH E. CASEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 1, 1939

RADIO ADDRESS BY RT. REV. MSGR. JOHN A. RYAN

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by the Right Reverend Monsignor John A. Ryan, director of the Social Action Department of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, over the Columbia Broadcasting System, Tuesday, October 24. His topic was Shall the Embargo Be Lifted?

In this broadcast, I am neither representing nor appearing under the auspices of any organization or institution. I am speaking only for myself, as an American citizen who believes that he knows something about the principles of international morality.

Much time has been wasted and millions of words uttered, within and without Congress, in an empty and futile dispute concerning the meaning of neutrality. Those who denounce the existing embargo on the sale of munitions to the belligerents maintain that it is unneutral because it favors Germany and is unfavorable to England and France; the opposing group declares that to lift the embargo would be unneutral because it would help England and France and injure Germany. Both groups are right.

In the present critical situation, the primary concern of our people and our Government is to keep out of the European war. Both the champions of the embargo and the proponents of repeal agree about this. Some of the arguments advanced by the former are illogical and unfair. They declare that to lift the embargo would be to take the first step toward involvement. This is a misleading metaphor and an unproved assertion. The only semblance of proof brought forward rests upon the assumption that history repeats itself. Selling arms to one belligerent party, we are told, "got the country into the last war and would have a similar effect now." As a matter of fact, history never repeats itself in exactly the same way after a change has taken place in the environment. Now, the knowledge, the determination, and the attitude of American people with respect to participation in war, have greatly changed since 1917. Moreover, it is simply untrue to assert that the sale of munitions was the one, or even the principal, cause of our entrance into the Great War. Other factors contributed mightily to that unfortunate decision. Some of those no longer exist.

Happily, the repeal of the embargo would not only be consistent with our national welfare and safety, but would be in conformity with the precepts of morality and religion. Some of the utterances by isolationists, both inside and outside of Congress, imply that our country has no obligations of love and charity to any other country. These men advocate not only political but moral isolation. They contend that the injustice inflicted by the Hitler government upon the peoples of Poland, Germany, and Austria, and the manifold injustices which it will perpetrate over wider areas if it is successful in this war, are no moral concern of ours. They remind us unpleasantly of Cain, who scornfully asked, "Am I my brother's keeper?" They imitate the Priest and the Levite who passed by on the other side, "remaining neutral" to the suffering and helplessness of the man who "went down to Jericho and fell among robbers." The person who asserts that we should be impartial and indifferent in our attitude toward the conflict between the Hitler government and the Allies, repudiates not only Christ's gospel of brotherly love but the principles of natural morality.

States, no less than individuals, are subject to the moral law. And they are bound not only by the precept of justice but likewise by the precept of charity. In the present crisis our country is morally obliged to do all that it reasonably can to defeat Hitler and destroy Hitlerism. Victory for this evil genius and his evil principles in this war would mean the destruction of Christian civilization throughout a large part of Europe. This tragic result would follow inexorably from the Nazi philosophy and the Nazi policies which have been pursued during the last 5 years.

Upon what specific grounds do I base this assertion? First, the Hitler government has been continuously engaged for more than 5 years in a cruel and insidious campaign for the destruction of the Christian religion in Germany, and latterly in Austria. In a joint pastoral letter issued about 4 years ago by the hierarchy of Germany, the bishops protested against "the propagation of a new paganism," and declared that the Hitler government was attacking not merely "a particular article of faith but the very essence and fundamentals of the Christian religion * * *." Three years later, or about 1 year ago, another joint pastoral letter of the German bishops, declared that in the intervening 3 years the persecution of religion had become "more hostile and more violent," and that the government was striving for "the uprooting of Christianity in general and the introduction of a faith that no longer has the least relation to belief in God and the Christian belief in a future life."

In December 1937 the late Pope Pius XI declared that there had seldom been a religious persecution "so serious, so terrible, so painful, and so sad in its deepest consequences" as that carried on in Germany. "It is," the Holy Father continued, "a persecution where neither the use of violence, nor the pressure of menaces nor the deceptions of cunning and the lie, are missing."

The attitude of the American Hierarchy toward the present regime in Germany was expressed at their annual meeting held in Washington in November 1937:

"Today the sense of all religious-minded men and women throughout the world is outraged by the satanic resourcefulness of these leaders of modern paganism and by the incredible excesses committed by them in their attempt to exterminate religion and to blot out from the minds of the German people all true knowledge and love of God."

Second, the Hitler government has consistently and continuously flouted and denied the principles of charity, justice, truth, and liberty which were brought to Germany by St. Boniface more than twelve hundred years ago and which have been diffused, developed, and made effective by Christian teaching alone.

Third, the Nazi philosophy and the Nazi government have substituted the absolute and totalitarian state for democracy, for a government of and by the people. They have outraged in a hundred ways the dignity of the individual and the decencies of life in Germany; they have brazenly and contemptuously violated all the natural rights of German men and women. These enormities have, indeed, been most severe and most conspicuous against the Jews, but they have been quite as deliberately and as definitely inflicted upon the Catholics and the Lutherans.

Fourth, while we do not know what Stalin will do, we can be certain that he will derive greater encouragement from a Hitler victory than from a Hitler defeat.

No genuine believer in Christianity or in the moral law can be neutral or impartial or indifferent in this awful situation. No intelligent man who holds that states as well as individuals have duties of charity to one another will deny that the United States is under moral obligation to do all that it reasonably can, to employ every means that can be employed without disproportionate inconvenience, in order to defeat Hitler and save Christian civilization in Europe. The United States is not morally bound to participate directly in the conflict, and it ought not to do so, but it is morally obliged to use every means short of war to prevent the moral, spiritual, and economic devastation that would follow the triumph of Hitlerism. To permit the sale of munitions and other materials under a cash-and-carry system would not cause us unreasonable inconvenience or grave risk. On the contrary, it would help to keep us out of the war. Supplying Britain and France with munitions would enable them to win a speedier victory and to make the war shorter. The shorter the war, the less likely are we to be drawn into it.

The moral question confronting America is not that of "punishing villains in Europe," whether living or dead. It is the question of contributing so far as we reasonably can contribute to the valiant effort now being made by Britain and France to prevent the triump of paganism and barbarism in Europe. As the president of Fordham University, Rev. Robert I. Gannon, S. J., said recently, "Hitler is the most pestilential and altogether infuriating character of all times." In order to find enemies of the human race comparable with this moral monstrosity one has to go back to the fifth century Hun, Attila, who came to be called "the Scourge of God," or to the twelfth century Mongol, Genghis Khan, who believed that he had a divine call to conquer the world. And it is a question whether Hitler's capacity for evil is not greater than was that of either of those terrifying and devastating barbarians.

Relief for Drought- and Flood-Stricken Areas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JED JOHNSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 1, 1939

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago a meeting was called by the Speaker of the House of Representatives of many Members of Congress representing the flood-stricken area of the South and the large drought-stricken area of the Central, Midwestern, and Western States of the Union to consider immediate relief for such drought- and flood-stricken areas of the United States.

At this meeting I presented a resolution to the conference urging that it go on record in support of the following program to meet present distressing conditions in such areas:

First. The appropriation or allocation of additional emergency funds to adequately meet the situation and to be expended as follows:

(a) Extension of soil-conservation work in all the drought- and flood-stricken areas;

(b) Extension and improvement of farm-to-market roads in order to relieve the desperate unemployment situation;

(c) Construction of deep surface ponds and the building of dams for the conservation of water and the prevention of floods.

Second. The early consideration of legislation to extend crop insurance to cotton.

Mr. Speaker, I believed then as now, that this Congress cannot ignore this unusual drought and flood situation. Although the floods have devastated and ruined the crops in Alabama, Mississippi, and other Southern States, we have had an unprecedented drought in Oklahoma and other Midwestern and Western States that has wrought havoc to farmers over a wide area.

It is, of course, encouraging to know that the President of the United States has made it known that the drought and floods should be treated as a major disaster and is willing to borrow and trim other appropriations in order to meet this emergency. This action will, of course, be helpful. But at best it is only temporary relief. The tax-burdened, drought-stricken farmer must receive considerably better prices for his products if he is to longer remain on the farm. Today I have received a resolution passed by the Farmers Union of Oklahoma and sent to the Oklahoma delegation dealing with this drought and unemployment problem in Oklahoma. The resolution in question is as follows:

Whereas continued general drought in Oklahoma has deteriorated growing cotton crops to extent it probably won't mature to exceed 50 percent of a normal crop in the State of Oklahoma; and

Whereas the 1938 farm program provided a minimum 52 percent of parity loan to farmers on their wheat and cotton; and

Whereas said loan has not been vitalized by Department of Agriculture for season 1939: Therefore be it

Resolved, We petition your honorable delegation urge upon President Roosevelt and Secretary Wallace immediate need setting up necessary regulations to vitalize loan legislation on cotton. If something is not done immediately, farmers are going to be forced to sell their cotton to pay mandatory debts and big syndicate cotton speculators will own the cotton at a time when there might be possibility of the farmer getting decent prices for his cotton crop owing to the abnormal war conditions.

Investigation of Un-American Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 1, 1939

EDITORIAL FROM THE SKIPPER

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial, appearing in the November issue of the Skipper, a school publication of Columbus University, Washington, D. C., expresses an opinion on the continuation of the Dies committee that is reflected in the Gallup Poll, and at the same time the article reflects the change in public opinion that has taken place all over this land concerning the work of the Dies committee.

[From the Skipper of November 1939]

THE DIES COMMITTEE

Most congressional investigations are a waste of the taxpayers' money. Many of them are prompted by the selfish political interests of Senators and Representatives up for reelection. Politicians live on favorable publicity and an investigation in Congress is an excellent springboard for front-page stories regarding the statesman's fervent activities in behalf of his constituents. Even a hasty perusal shows that little legislation of a constructive character has been enacted as a result of these congressional investigations.

The current inquiry by a House committee into un-American activities is a notable exception to our blanket indictment. At its inception we were inclined to believe that it was merely another witch hunt designed to bring its author onto page 1 of the country's newspapers. Events have proved us wrong on our original assumptions. The committee, headed by Representative DIES, Texas Democrat, and more familiarly called the Dies committee, is performing an excellent job and one that deserves the admiration of every thinking American. The committee may have made minor mistakes; it may make more of them. On the whole, however, we believe that the few dollars allowed by Congress for this inquiry are a mere bagatelle in contrast to the work achieved by this committee.

Not so long ago we agreed with liberals of every color that the name "Communist" and "Fascist" should be used sparingly. Only a year ago, it seems, a Communist was a worker who asked for more money from his employer. The word was so commonly used that it almost completely lost its original connotation. The same is true of the use of "Fascist." Everyone not a Fascist, according to the Fascist, was a Communist, and vice versa. In short, the words became a meaningless household joke.

Came recently, however, such startling disclosures by the Dies committee that we must perforce admit the existence in this country of a menace that should be stopped in its tracks.

We are not advocating the suppression of free speech or of the right of any man or woman in the United States to join political parties of his own choice. We are merely supporting the Dies committee policy of bringing to light some of the nefarious and ambitious schemes of Communists and Fascists working zealously for the destruction of this Government. The disclosures themselves, we believe, will have the desired effect. Communism and fascism, if brought to light with all of its weird ramifications, will not thrive among a democratic people. Public opinion, without laws and repressive legislation, will kill both of these foreign germs.

The blatant arrogance with which Communist and Fascist organizations operate in this country is what amazes us. In their own countries this gentry would be suppressed, fined, jailed, and executed within 24 hours. Yet here they are treated with a great

deal of sympathy, if not with downright grace. This is one of the paradoxes of a democratic form of government. The Government and its people foster, aid, and treat with gentility the very people who are seeking their destruction. Perhaps it is better that a minority be allowed to exercise its prerogatives rather than touch the foundation stones of a democracy, a very sensitive structure which, history shows, can topple with great celerity.

We are indebted to the Dies committee for disclosing the officers, members, and finances of these Communist-Fascist organizations. We know now better where we stand. We know where they stand and we shall know how to deal with these people in the future.

We cannot understand all the noise sent up from the Communist-Fascist camps over the Dies "persecution." To brand the investigation a "persecution" is just so much nonsense which carries no weight in intelligent circles. If they have nothing to hide it is difficult to understand the secrecy that shrouds their activities. It is almost an obvious principle that representatives of organizations appearing before congressional investigations have nothing to fear if their houses are in order. The secrecy with which Communist-Fascist organizations operate in this country creates a definite suspicion of their "noble" goals and accomplishments. Why do they seek to hide their financial backers? Where are the headquarters of these organizations? What are their real purposes as contrasted with their avowed purposes? Why do they not operate in the open and why do their members become embarrassed when their names are disclosed?

The Dies committee has offered an answer to some of these queries. But it should be continued, especially in these days of foreign conflicts. Congress should appropriate sufficient funds for the continuation of this work which, we believe, is one of the most important safeguards against attacks on American democracy that we have today.

The Arms Embargo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. BOEHNE, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 1, 1939

LETTER BY HON. JAMES E. WATSON, FORMER SENATOR FROM INDIANA

Mr. BOEHNE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter, dated October 22, 1939, by the Honorable James E. Watson, former United States Senator from Indiana, addressed to the editor of the Evening Star, and which appeared in that paper on October 30, 1939:

[From the Washington Evening Star]

It is very evident that, had Congress never passed an embargo act, it would not enact one now, and especially the kind that is on our statute books now.

Probably not a half dozen Senators could be induced to vote for it as an original proposition, for it immediately would be construed all over the world as a nonneutral act.

And it seems to me quite evident that the present act is nonneutral, for it undoubtedly inures to the benefit of one country. This was not intentionally done when the act was passed, but circumstances have so completely changed in Europe that our present law works to the advantage of Germany and discriminates against England and France.

In order to be perfectly neutral, we should do neither, but the present temper of our people is for our Nation to be just as helpful to Britain and France as we possibly can without getting into war ourselves.

Before the passage of this law in 1935 everybody believed that we were entirely neutral in all of our international relations, and, therefore, it is manifest that the Embargo Act is the only obstacle that stands in the way of at least a partial restoration of that status and feeling.

It seems quite certain that, with that act repealed, we would be well-nigh restored to the condition that existed before it was passed, and hence it is altogether desirable to repeal it, unless we encounter greater difficulties by repealing it than now exist, and that has not yet been demonstrated by any facts adduced or any argument advanced by the advocates of the existing law.

Both sides to the controversy are convinced that international law has nothing to do with this proposition. We had the right to pass the Embargo Act and we have the right to repeal it. It is wholly a domestic matter and we are under no obligations to present the question to any other nation before taking action.

Under international law we always sold everything we had to sell to other nations that wanted to buy, even in time of war, and our right to do so has never been questioned.

The Embargo Act was passed with the very best intentions, but it now seems to have gotten us into difficulty from which we cannot be extricated unless we repeal it, and repeal undoubtedly could be effected without interfering with international law or with our relations with any other nation, with the possible exception of one.

To retain the Embargo Act is, therefore, to the advantage of just one nation and to the disadvantage of many others.

Germany cannot complain if we want to restore the condition of neutrality that existed before this act was passed, and England and France, on the other hand, would undoubtedly be delighted to have it done.

It is said that if we pass the proposed law Germany will not have access to our markets because she has no navy. That is unfortunate for her only. It is not our fault but her misfortune, and there is no requirement of international law and no item in the comity of nations that compels us to prevent England and France from taking full advantage of their fortunate situation in this regard.

With the Embargo Act repealed and a cash-and-carry plan adopted, all nations can come here and buy whatever they have the money to pay for and carry it away in their own vessels, subject to whatever dangers naturally accrue in time of war.

When a Member of the Senate I voted for the World War, but that problem did not rise to disturb us at any time during that conflict, for, under the rules of international law as far as they could be observed in time of war, every nation had the right to buy or sell in any market where the articles they desired could be obtained.

We were literally forced into that war because Germany engaged in a ruthless attack upon our commerce upon the seas. Her submarines sank many vessels, destroyed many cargoes, and killed many Americans, and these outrages so aroused our people that Congress was compelled to go to war as our only recourse.

Now, the simple truth is that all of those outrages can occur under our present existing law and doubtless will if it remains on the statute books; whereas, if it is repealed, and if substituted for it the proposition now before the Senate is enacted into law, such losses cannot occur for the simple reason that both ships and property will be prevented from sailing into danger zones where such destruction can occur. In other words, there is not a shadow of doubt but that the proposed law would keep American ships out of present regions of danger.

Therefore, the present law, or anything that could be done pursuant to its provisions, is not a guaranty against our involvement in war, whereas the proposed law necessarily would prevent our being dragged into war by reason of the destruction of our property on the high seas.

Let it not be forgotten that no arms, munitions, or implements of war can be carried on our own ships under any conditions if this proposed law be enacted, nor could anything in any of these categories be carried in foreign ships from our shores until all title to them had been transferred to the foreign buyer.

So it is very plain that if any materials, or the ship, or the crew, or the passengers on such foreign vessel should be destroyed, there would be no action for our Government to take that would involve us in war because of such destruction. This is just as plain as that two and two make four.

JAMES E. WATSON,
Former United States Senator from Indiana.

OCTOBER 22.

The Small Town Editors of Arkansas on Neutrality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE T. ELLIS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 1, 1939

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, since the convening of this extraordinary session of the Congress on September 21 for the purpose of deciding the American course of neutrality during the present European war, much has been said in the two Houses and throughout the Nation about the attitude of the American press on the subject. As is so often the case, the masses on both sides have been charged with being influenced by certain militant minorities. There has been much comment about editorials appearing in the larger newspapers of the Nation; that the reason most of them favor revision of the present neutrality law is that they are simply catering to big business, which is another way of saying "big advertisers." Those papers which have favored not disturbing the present law have been charged with being influenced by German propaganda.

My district is on the Ozark plateau. Ninety-eight percent of its people are American-born. Ninety-nine percent of

them are Anglo-Saxon. The largest town in the district is less than 10,000 in population. We have no big business. There is no racial issue. There are no American bund organizations. My people are principally home owners. They are comparatively well educated. There are two great universities, one of them the State university, in my district. The newspaper editors in the Third Arkansas District are well educated and do their own thinking. Why, then, should theirs not be a good cross section of American opinion? Why should they not be as free to make up their own minds and to arrive at a safe and sound conclusion as have been the leaders of American thought at any time in American history?

It is my pleasure, therefore, to quote from various editorials.

Editor Grover S. Lindsey, writing in the Benton County Democrat, at Bentonville, on October 5, says:

It is our sincere hope that opponents of the Roosevelt administration will not allow their personal political convictions to dictate to their better reasoning when the proposed repeal of the arms embargo act is brought to a vote. Several Republican leaders, perhaps with an eye toward the Presidency, have announced that they will fight the President's proposed revision of the 1937 arms-embargo act to a bitter finish.

It is a deplorable state of affairs when political beliefs are allowed to curb legislation that is undoubtedly for the good of the country. Surely no one doubts the President's sincerity in his attempts to keep the United States out of war. His opposition is largely from the ranks of his political enemies.

We are fairly sure that the Congress will see fit to alter the present so-called neutrality legislation to meet the needs of the country, but it is probable that such a change will come only after many time-wasting debates and a great amount of arguing by New Deal opponents, both within the Democratic Party and without.

John R. Newman, editor of the Harrison Daily Times at Harrison, said in his paper of October 11:

The people of northwest Arkansas, lacking any appreciable foreign population and getting along nicely without any communistic or bund movements, are willing to trust President Roosevelt and go along with him in his avowed purpose of maintaining peace.

The United States is entitled to trade and traffic in goods and materials just as much as other neutral countries. These other countries have not been accused of trying to enter the war because they sell to belligerent nations. The cash-and-carry plan, which entails keeping our ships out of dangerous waters, would avoid the pitfall which plunged us into the last war.

We have no sympathy with the pro-German idea that we must penalize England and France in order to avoid the appearance of favoring them. That smacks a little of intimidation, and it doesn't work in the United States. The bully-boys of Europe should confine their propaganda, along with their wars, to their own continent.

Editor Tom Shiras, writing in the Baxter Bulletin at Mountain Home on September 22, said:

A great many people do not comprehend the significance of the present neutrality law, which the President tried to get the last Congress to revoke. This present war has cut off our foreign markets, and if this law is not repealed our surpluses will climb and climb. The repealing of this law does not mean that we have to help any particular nation, but means that we can sell them all. If this law is not repealed, unemployment will continue to get worse instead of better, and we will drag on for another 3 years or more, getting worse and worse off all the time. If this law is repealed everyone will have a job and we can go ahead full steam, and catch up on some of the big losses we have suffered for the last 8 years. This section of Arkansas will be helped by the repealing of this law. It will start our zinc, lead, and manganese mines going again, and in a few months, if the World War can be taken as a precedent, they will be bringing north Arkansas over a million dollars a year additional income. It will also stimulate prices for all farm products and livestock and give us a chance to get ahead. If this country should run head-on into a war, we would be going full speed instead of having to spend a year getting fire under the boilers and steam up. Our opinion is probably no better than yours. We do not think that repealing of this law would be liable to get us into war any sooner than if we did not repeal it. We believe that at least 9 out of 10 people want to see Hitler licked. It won't make any difference if we sell the European democracies or if we don't. If we get into war it will be because France and England begin to skid. That is our greatest hazard. If they hold their own we are safe. If the Germans begin to pound them down we think we will get into it, laws or no laws. We had better be ready with full pocketbooks than empty ones.

O. Klute Braswell, editor of the Star Progress at Berryville, in his issue of September 28, said:

So far as we have been able to estimate the facts, the one thing on which the American people, almost without exception, are united, is a deep and sincere desire not to be drawn into the European war—or any war.

We are hearing and shall hear more arguments and debate on the question whether the proposed changes or repeal of the Neutrality Act will or will not bring us closer to war. There is no living man who can answer that question with certainty. Only the event can decide. The answer may come in a few months or in a year or two.

There is no doubt whatever that the vast majority of Americans are sympathetic with the British and French and Polish and bitterly antagonistic to Hitler. Whether the desire to see Hitler defeated and Hitlerism and all it stands for wiped off the face of the earth will become so overpowering as to swing American sentiment toward taking an active part in the war is another question to which no one today can give a true answer.

Certainly, if acts of the dictator nations infringe violently upon the rights and liberties of America as a nation, it would be hard to stem the urge to fight for the freedom for which we have fought before. But if this country should ever go to war, it will this time be with a firm determination to make the peace that will follow victory a far more just and enduring one than was the peace negotiated at Versailles. The seeds of the present war were sown by the terms imposed upon the vanquished nations in the peace treaty.

America would never stand for another victory of that sort.

Ed W. Coulson, editor of the Journal Advance at Gentry, wrote on October 11:

As our foremost aviator, Col. Charles A. Lindbergh has been quite a popular hero. As a radio commentator he surely got off on the wrong foot when he censured Canada for joining England in her fight against Hitlerism.

Tom West, editor of the Lincoln Leader at Lincoln, said on October 12:

The people of the United States have agreed on one thing, and that is that we must stay clear of this war as long as it is humanly possible to do so.

To have enacted legislation that will aid in keeping us out of war is the reason that the President called this special session of the Congress. There is at present on the statutes a law that forbids the sale of certain so-called war commodities to belligerent nations. These include finished products, such as ammunitions, airplanes, etc., but under the present law all other items that are salable, such as wheat, iron ore, aluminum, etc., may be sold and transported on ships of this Nation. Therein lies the danger, for almost anything is considered contraband and war materials by fighting nations. Ships that are caught carrying these items are either confiscated or sunk. The sinking of an American ship might be the spark that would send us into this affray as it did in the last war.

In recognition of this fact the President suggests a measure that will keep our ships from carrying anything to nations at war, thus preventing an excuse to sink any boats of our Nation. At the same time he wishes the embargo lifted so that we may sell anything to any belligerent country, so long as they pay cash for it here and carry it away on their own ships. This seems to me the only safe and sane way out of the dilemma that we are in.

In the past month I have asked many people in this district their opinion on this subject, and last week I ran the questionnaire in the paper about it, to which there was a good response, and I have as yet to find the first person in this district who does not favor the measure that the President suggests.

Mrs. Abbie K. Grammer, writing in the Gravette News Herald, Gravette, on October 20, said:

Just now we would like to see the Embargo Act applied in such a way as to prevent the sale and shipment of arms in anybody's ship. We all want to keep America out of war. To do that we must be neutral. It seems to us that the repeal is to favor one side or the other, or else why repeal the embargo at this time?

Editor Everett W. Pate, of the Rogers Daily News, Rogers, said in his Ediscope of October 10:

The present trend of events in Europe makes me more firm in my belief that the proper course for the United States to pursue is one of independent aloofness and honest neutrality. Yes, isolation, if you will.

My conviction grows that every European nation loves the United States for just what they can get out of us. If we should become embroiled on the side of England and France, either in a commercial or military alliance, we would be thrown overboard the very minute such action would advance the cause of either England or France, regardless of any fine-spoken assurance of undying brotherly love. The memory of the fates of Czechoslovakia and Poland is horribly fresh in my mind.

Former State Senator Festus O. Butt, of Eureka Springs, writing in his paper, the Carroll Courier, in the September 14 and 21 issues, said:

Neither the present nor the proposed law seems ideal. The proposed new law lets down the bars as to selling war materials. Under the present neutrality law it is hard for us to nose into the

quarrel, but if our good President can get it changed as he wants it, it will not only cease to be hard to nose in but almost impossible to keep out.

Do not allow "saving democracy" to make shivers run up your back. We tried it once and mighty nearly destroyed democracy by our butting in.

It is not our scrap.

Editor J. Milam, writing in the Informer, Jasper, said on October 7:

We talk about not arming the belligerents. We have already armed them. We shipped junk to Japan that was shaped into guns to kill Chinese. The Germans secretly armed themselves before they became talkative, and the motors of the ships they use to fly over cities to drop explosives were made in America.

Editor George L. Wright, of the Boone County Headlight, Harrison, said on September 21:

We are inclined to agree with the President that there is nothing unneutral in offering to sell any nation anything it wants to buy, to be paid for on delivery at our own ports.

Don Matthews, editor of the Mountain Echo, Yellville, said in his issue of October 11:

The cash-and-carry cohorts have the edge now but the isolationists haven't given up the ship by a long shot and they have potent weapons at their disposal.

If both sides insist that victory for the other side would make American armed intervention certain, a lot of people may believe it whether or not it is true and thus make a drift into war easy.

Editor Lessie S. Read, of the Northwest Arkansas Times, Fayetteville, said in the issue of October 17:

We agree with President Roosevelt's program in every essential. We believe that it is far better for us to be allowed to furnish supplies to belligerents in Europe, including Germany, than for American men, American dollars, and American labor and industry to be drafted for the defense of our shores. Let's keep the war in Europe by all means.

And Mrs. Roberta Fulbright, also of the Northwest Arkansas Times, wrote in the October 17 edition:

It is unthinkable that these United States should not repeal the embargo.

It is interesting to note that although the editors disagree as to the advisable course, there are two vital points upon which they agree:

First. That we must and shall stay out of the war.

Second. That we are now ready to retreat from our freedom-of-the-seas policy.

Holding on to the embargo is a partial retreat. Repealing the embargo and forbidding our ships from entering the combat zones is a complete retreat.

As it appears to us now, either a partial retreat or a complete retreat from this same freedom-of-the-seas policy that helped to involve us in three other wars is in the interest of peace.

Goose-stepping Is Not the American Way—Too Many Military Officers Are Being Named to Government Posts Traditionally Held by Civilians

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 1, 1939

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, while enactment of neutrality legislation, so-called, holds the spotlight of national attention, there are certain omens in the wind which demand the attention of this House, and particularly of those Members who claim to be champions of American liberties.

Before Members of this Congress even entertain a single thought of adjourning this special session, and I am convinced we should not adjourn, we owe it to our people whom we represent to ascertain just how far the iron heel of American militarism is to be imbedded into the daily routine of this peaceful Nation.

We should also dispel the fog that has encircled the "industrial mobilization plan revision of 1939."

We should further determine, through a study, just what emergency powers the President has for his discretionary use in this national emergency which was proclaimed effective on September 8, 1939, by President Roosevelt.

This Nation is at peace. The President, in his fireside chat, expressed the belief we could maintain that peace. The administration leaders have held, although I have not agreed with them, that repeal of the embargo would contribute to that peace.

Then in the name of peace why do we find the military being shoved to the fore on so many fronts here? Let us not be unmindful of modern history in Europe which has revealed that where the military, with its dictator, has moved in, the liberties of the people are "blacked out."

Surely we will not let pass unnoticed recent maneuvers by President Roosevelt, whereby high-ranking Army-Navy men have been placed in key strategic positions in the Federal Government. The most recent can hardly be brushed aside without thought or consideration. I refer to the appointment of an Army officer to an all-powerful position over the industries and labor of this Nation; namely, Chief of the Wage-Hour Division of the Department of Labor. I say "all powerful" because, acting as "administrator" under the provisions of the wage-hour law, he can obtain for the Government unlimited information and data through his prerogatives to enter industrial plants "to determine whether any person has violated the provisions of this act or which may aid in the enforcement of this act."

This appointment appears to be merely another step in the growing tendency of President Roosevelt to supplant civilians in high Government positions with military or naval men. Lt. Col. Philip Fleming, who has been detailed by the President as head of the Wage-Hour Division, was obtained from the Army Engineers. I am advised he has been a highly competent engineer and administrator in that branch of the armed force, and I cast no reflections on his personal qualifications.

GOOSE-STEPPING IS FOREIGN TO AMERICA

However, when such steps continue, I am compelled to pause and survey the situation and raise the question as to whether the President is moving toward placing this country under the "crack-down" tactics too familiar to these men who have been drilled and trained in the way of the military. Furthermore, industry and labor alike have reason for deep concern. After all, goose-stepping is something foreign to the American way.

Other occasions when President Roosevelt, already famed for breaking traditions, gave posts traditionally held by civilians to military and naval officers include the assignment of Admiral William D. Leahy, United States Navy, retired, as Governor of Puerto Rico; Col. F. C. Harrington, United States Army, as W. P. A. Administrator; Rear Admiral Christian Peoples, United States Navy, Director of the Procurement Division of the Treasury Department; and Brig. Gen. Edwin M. Watson, former military aide of the President, recently made one of the three high-ranking secretaries at the White House and now reported headed for a foreign post for this Government. There have been others in positions of somewhat lesser importance.

DISPEL THE FOG AROUND I. M. P.

Likewise we cannot overlook the fact that Mr. Roosevelt is now the full-fledged, active Commander in Chief of the United States Navy and can switch from the chair of the Chief Executive at the Cabinet meeting to the chair of the Secretary of the Navy. By his failure to fill the vacancy caused by the recent death of the Secretary of the Navy, President Roosevelt is now in the position of also holding that portfolio.

With industry and labor alike under the control of an Army man in the Department of Labor, with an Army man in charge of 10,000,000 unemployed workers, and with the wheels of industrial mobilization already being oiled, the

matter becomes of vital interest to every man, woman, and child in the Nation.

Again I say, if there is to be any headway made toward prosperity under free enterprise in the United States, the fog surrounding this industrial-mobilization plan should be dispelled by President Roosevelt and some assurance given industry relative to just what the Federal Government intends to do while acting in the name of the national emergency already proclaimed by the President.

Secretary of Commerce Hopkins recently declared that there is need in the United States for "greater consumption by the public as well as increased capital expenditures by business." Coming from a new dealer, that is news, but the distrust that is being bred throughout the country as the result of the hush-hush behavior of the administration toward this industrial-mobilization plan will certainly not be conducive to carrying out the expression of Secretary Hopkins. There will be no increased capital expenditures by business as long as it is concerned about the prospects of the military authorities moving into their establishments or controlling their activities. Our investing public is not trained to invest private funds to be controlled by a military.

It occurs to me that the President is already superseding the 1939 industrial-mobilization plan in the national emergency which he has declared.

In part 2 of the plan I find this paragraph under the heading of "Army and Navy procurement planning in time of peace":

> In the preceding pages there has been discussed the types of supervision and control that may be required for the utilization of our national resources in the event of a war emergency of major proportions. The organization proposed for obtaining this coordination has also been outlined. It has been pointed out that, while Army and Navy officers, with the cooperation of qualified civilians, are responsible for the preparations of plans for the establishment of these coordinating agencies, their operation will be undertaken by civilian administrators appointed by the President.

In part 1 of the plan it is revealed industries would be classified as war industries and nonwar industries and that the War Labor Administration is to maintain "close cooperative relations between labor, industry, and government."

The administrator of the wage-hour law is in a key position in respect to this provision. Even under the industrial mobilization plan civilian administrators are provided. But did the President appoint a civilian wage-hour administrator? He did not. He went to the military forces for his administrator.

WHO KNOWS EMERGENCY POWERS OF PRESIDENT?

Then, too, there is the question of powers of the President in time of national emergency. The Senate has tried to learn what powers exist, but even the United States Attorney General admitted his compilation made for the Senate is not complete and "that the Executive has powers not enumerated in the statutes."

Concentration of vast peacetime powers in the hands of one man is alien to American principles. The Attorney General has informed the Senate that to ascertain what emergency powers have been given the President since the founding of our Government and which are still at the disposal of the Chief Executive may be ascertained only "by careful and painstaking search of the entire body of Federal statutory law." As the law making body of this Nation, it is about time we determined for ourselves and for our constituents just what the President can do when he declares a national emergency. If he can effect a complete social and industrial reorganization of the lives of our men, women, and children through powers of national emergency, then let us so inform the people and ourselves. For that reason I am in sympathy with the proposal for a determination at this time of the authorized powers of the Presidency during a state of emergency such as the Nation is now in, as the result of Mr. Roosevelt's proclamation of September 8.

DUTY OF CONGRESS TO REMAIN IN SESSION

Under our Constitution, if this session of Congress adjourns sine die, there is no way by which we may reconvene ourselves before January 3 irrespective of what may develop. We can only convene in the interim at the will of the President. Mr. Roosevelt has declared that an emergency exists. Under such an emergency the place for the Representatives is in the National Capitol, close to their Chief Executive, close to their Cabinet officers, and close to the source of accurate reports of happenings abroad—such events being the reason for this special session.

This attitude is no reflection upon the President. It is just common sense. The people who elected us to represent them, the people who hired us, expect us to be on the job in times of national emergency, and inasmuch as the President has declared that such an emergency exists, I feel that the place for us to be is here at the seat of government and center of activity. Therefore, I have today introduced a resolution calling for the continuous session of this Congress until the date provided in the Constitution for the beginning of the next regular session in January.

Neutrality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. THORKELSON

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 1, 1939

RADIO ADDRESS BY MOST REV. F. J. BECKMAN, ARCHBISHOP OF DUBUQUE, OCTOBER 29, 1939

Mr. THORKELSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a radio address delivered by the Most Reverend F. J. Beckman, archbishop of Dubuque, on Sunday, October 29, 1939, over the national hook-up.

This address is timely, for we are now led to believe that this is to be a religious war, or a war of hatreds based upon the suppression of religion. This propaganda is issued by the very people that have abandoned their belief in God—the Communists and those who adhere to their philosophies.

Here is a representative of a religion that is supposed to have suffered from persecution, yet he comes out boldly and declares himself against socialism and communism. In other words, the gentleman who spoke is a pro-American, and believes in the principles set forth in the Constitution of the United States.

It is this point that I am anxious for the Members to observe because it follows the line that I have been advocating as a Member of the Congress of the United States. This Nation cannot survive unless we return to the fundamental principles upon which it came into being, and conditions today within the United States should be sufficient evidence that we are departing not only from the principles of the Government but from the advice of the first President of the United States, George Washington. Had we adhered to his advice, there would have been no entangling alliances. We would not be here today considering an act which is for no other purpose than to involve the United States in an entangling alliance with nations now at war in Europe, in a struggle in which every citizen of all countries have no interest and to which they are strictly opposed at this time. When I say citizens, I mean the common or middle-class of people—the people who must bleed, suffer, and die in all wars. I believe it is time that this great group of people asserts itself and aids in shaping national destinies instead of leaving them in the hands of international exploiters.

I shall ask you to read these remarks and give them serious consideration because they are pertinent at this time. The address is as follows:

> My dear fellow Americans, I realize that it is somewhat unusual for a member of the hierarchy to venture as far as have I

into the present neutrality debate by our Congress. I want to say that in doing so I have, before God, not been motivated by a spirit of disunity or disrespect for existing authority. I want to say now that I have been motivated in taking my stand against the lifting of the embargo by two vitally important reasons: The first being that I could stand no longer to see the Catholic Church in America being used for private and political ends; the second reason being that I am firmly convinced of the fact that the present European war is a most unjust and un-Christian conflict—an economic war based on greed which will only benefit international communism. Convinced of this fact I could not do otherwise, in conscience, than to condemn, for my flock at least, any governmental action which would contribute to the continuation of that war.

The present war is not, in my well-advised opinion, a just war, much less a holy war. It is propagandized as such by the sinister forces of international communism. The Communist antichrists want American and all Christian nations to engage in this war. Their agents here will stop at nothing to involve us, for well do they realize that a war-exhausted America is the only hope of communism for America. Some of our would-be Catholic leaders have already succumbed to the propagandists and taken recent occasion to proclaim with them. "This is a holy war. Stop Hitler America with the Allies. Christianity against communism," etc. etc. To these misguided individuals I would say (and I trust with the full approval of thinking Americans): "We Catholic leaders are not by any stretch of the imagination in sympathy with Hitlerism; we detest the antireligious implications in that word; we abhor with our supreme pontiff, Pius XII, the spread of pagan ideologies and materialism throughout the world; but we cannot as Christians be in sympathy with an internationalist godless group which has provoked and is endeavoring to sustain this war. It is only the international Communist who, entrenched in high governmental positions of many nations, could so cleverly mask a plot to destroy Christian civilization with the slogan: 'This Is a Holy War.'"

Communism, my friends, like a cancer in the vitals of Christianity, depends upon growth for its survival. It feeds and fattens on international chaos, and war is its choicest bread—war, with its unspeakable horrors, which tears to pieces not only mortal bodies but, what is most terrible, destroys the spiritual in the soul of man; war, with the ensuing hatred and bitterness of peoples against the false leaders who betray them into it.

If there could be a prayer on the lips of the Communist, rest assured, my dear Christian friends, that prayer would be: "Lord, give us war! Give us the chaos of hell! Away with reason and order! Give us war!" That is the private cry of the godless horde today. It is the Communist hymn of hate. If we listen well we can hear that hate theme running through all the pretty phrases of the propagandists who shout for our distraction, "This is a holy war."

There is an old saying: "Fool me once, shame on you; but fool me twice, shame on me." Many of us were tricked and fooled by the propaganda in the last war. It was simpler then, for we were easily won over on the slogan "Make the world safe for democracy." It should not be so simple this time. I, as but one member of the hierarchy of the church in America, am standing at this microphone today because I know, with good Christian people everywhere, that our religious leaders cannot afford to be duped again. Our people demand, and justly so, that we take the leadership in preventing any possible encouragement by the United States of that frightfully unjust and immoral war in Europe. Our people demand that we, as their spiritual shepherds, uphold the right, clarify the issues, and fight to the last man of us against any attempt to make this glorious America an ally of internationalism. Our people demand that with one united voice, and courageously throwing off the shackles of those who would encumber us, they demand that we rise up and brand the Communist traitors in our midst for what they are. With all our strength we are morally obligated to cry: "This is no holy war, people. The Holy Father has not proclaimed it as such. Look well; this is the Communist's war. This is an economic war based on greed, and under no circumstances may we lend comfort to either party in the conflict."

Why has not Great Britain declared war on a Russia which invaded poor Poland? Why do we read so little in the secular press about the persecution of religion already under way in Sovietized Poland, 13,000,000 of whose population Great Britain and France mercilessly handed over to Soviet Russia? Why, in the near past, was an embargo on arms good enough when the so-called loyalists had the upper hand, but not good encugh when the tables were turning in favor of Christian Spain? These questions all merit the same answer: Look for the Communist motive. And if, in the fact of any altruistic reasons which may be advanced for such action—if we, the spiritual leaders of America, yield to this "holy war" propaganda a second time, and lend any sanction whatsoever to the parties of this conflict—if we do these things then shall we be delivering Christ Himself into the bloody hands of the international Communists.

We hear any number of cries today that the church is in politics. If a clergyman talks for the government its not politics; but let a clergyman talk against the government no matter how wrong it may be on a given issue—then immediately the cry: "The church is in politics." How my Christian blood does boil when I hear such. The answer to this charge must be clearly given: "The church is not in politics; but politics is shamelessly attempting to use certain churchmen." As Christ, in anger, drove the money changers from His temple so must and shall we drive the politicians out of the church they would use for their own ends. Christ through all His ministry rarely demonstrated anger, but there came a day when even His patience with the hypocrisy and the effrontery of the times was exhausted. Then in a righteous rage He set an example of courage for spiritual leaders the world over to defend with physical force, if need be, the principles of right.

Taking our precedent from Him who so nobly set it, we are today fast growing out of patience with those who would use us for their ignoble ends. There are individuals aplenty who need a retreat from the glamour of government and governmental patronage. There are those a plenty, my dear friends, who call themselves Christians and disgrace their God-given religion by employing it as a "front" for questionable activities. To these individuals we would say: "Where is the integrity we taught you to respect and cherish? In the name of Heaven what has happened to your perspective of the right? If you have not the vision to see the right at least have you the courtesy of remaining silent while others fight your battle for you. You have no right before God to deliver the church at the back door of politics. Be a credit to us, not a debit. Keep faith with those to whom you owe everything. Keep faith with God, yourself, and your fellow man."

We all love America. We have a solemn obligation to support our leaders in all measures which are just and good. But we also have a grave obligation to fight fearlessly any measures which are clearly not based upon a Christian morality. Our people look to us for a constant defense of truth; they expect that we will at all times vigorously espouse the cause of right as against wrong. Further, they have a right to expect that we will stand united for the right, despite abuse, criticism, or persecution. Our religious leadership should be of such strong character as to insure proper governmental leadership by inculcating in a people the desire for such. But if and when the spiritual leadership of any nation becomes forfeit to governmental leadership regardless of right or wrong, then, indeed, is the beginning of national catastrophe.

It was the great John Henry Newman, who later became the outstanding Cardinal Newman, who said: "There can be no safety for religion except under constitutional government." That statement has certainly proven itself through the wreck of religion in Communist Russia and the suppression of religious liberty in Nazi Germany.

In our beloved America only today can it be said that the fires of constitutional government are still alight. But many things have happened lately to give us cause for worry. I say and I firmly believe that unless the spiritual leaders of this country are quick to act in unitedly demanding, with their people, that representative government be representative, that democracy be democratic, that right be recognized and clearly cited to those who are the servants, not the masters, of the people—I say that unless we act quickly in the proper discharge of our moral obligations the causes of constitutional government in this country will be seriously endangered. The embargo issue now before Congress has many deeper implications than most of us realize, among them being the recent disgraceful repudiation of the American people, the pleas of whom for the retention of the embargo have been scorned publicly as coming from "inspired sources." In my opinion, this action constituted an unprecedented threat to representative government.

Our eyes now turn to the House of Representatives where we have good reason to hope are the men of the people; men who have stood aghast and watched one legislative group ignore the voice of America; men who are and should be weary of "being told" and who now prepare to do a little telling on their own account; men whose every decent, democratic impulse cries out against those who are attempting to belittle them as legislative members. These are the people's representatives, the last guardians of democracy. They will not break faith with us if we are clear and firm in our expression to them. We have a solemn obligation to call for and register conscientiously, immediately, that expression with our Representatives. That expression, my dear American friends, will be our only defense if the youth of this country will not be betrayed again into the European trenches. That expression we pray will be entirely consistent with the recent words of a young man who brought a typical message to our attention. I readdress it direct to the Members of our House of Representatives. It concludes, "Remember, our blood is not for Europe; it is for America only. But in the warmth of our young hearts there is love enough for all men. Please extend that love by keeping and extending the embargo on hate."

In response to that message I tell my people now that they can never expect to keep faith with their youth if they do not keep faith with Christian morality as pointed out to them. I tell my people now that the time is near when, unless they act quickly, democracy and communism will be at swords points in America. If war comes—and we may apply it as coming to us—in the words of our Holy Father, "All may be lost." If that time comes let it not be said that my voice was inarticulate for the right.

Courage now. Do the right thing fearlessly. God bless and keep the America we love.

Pending Neutrality Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, November 1, 1939

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, as I stated on this floor only day before yesterday, 647 speeches have been made in the Congress concerning the pending neutrality legislation and therefore I feel that no further speech here would change a single vote. It was my purpose the day before yesterday only to explain the rule and the procedure under the rule covering the consideration of this epochal measure. As nearly the full membership was present, I wished to authentically familiarize all with the unusual procedure covered by this special rule, which has regrettably and erroneously been designated and heralded throughout the press by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] as a gag rule. It is gratifying to realize that nearly every Member, Democrat and Republican, was, after my explanation of the rule, satisfied that it is a most liberal and fair one, giving ample opportunity for more debate, allowing amendments, and opportunity for at least five different yea-and-nay votes.

If there had not been so much nefarious and willfully false propaganda leveled at this pending measure, I would not request permission to extend these remarks in the RECORD. This extension of remarks will, of course, have no effect upon the votes of Members, because the vote on the proposed legislation will have been taken shortly after these remarks reach the country, and a real Neutrality Act, the product of a patriotic and intelligent Congress, and signed by an equally patriotic and intelligent President, will be law despite the willfully mischievous, diabolical, reprehensible, regrettable barrage aimed at it by a small portion of our less worthy citizenry through the press, on the air, and by the machinations of the German-American bunds and other Communist-Nazi-Socialist organizations. Let the vote of this Congress be the most effective answer to those machinations.

The United States, a great Christian nation, in the absence of a declaration of war by Japan or China, unfortunately has permitted, by an iniquitous so-called neutrality law enacted in 1935, the shipping of munitions and airplanes for the bombing of unfortified cities and women and children of China against all concepts of international law and elemental humanity.

Another totalitarian country, Soviet Russia, would stamp out the very consciousness of God for all humanity if it were possible to do so. And that unfortunate country may under our neutrality law buy unrestrainedly airplanes and munitions in this country and reship them to Germany.

It has been undeniably demonstrated that in these totalitarian countries there is not a vestige of political, civil, or religious freedom.

The Embargo Act of 1935, for which I myself voted, I am sorry to confess, soon after its effective date demonstrated that it contained important defects. That is, of course, the history of much of our legislation, and we all realize that when we enact legislation. Time and application must show the defects and how to remedy them to the best advantage.

The pending proposed neutrality law, which would supplant the ill-conceived Embargo Act, will to a greater extent safeguard our beloved country from being drawn into the holocaust inspired by the insane, bloodthirsty, uncivilized Hitler regime, only recently wed to Stalinism. What an unholy alliance!

In my humble opinion the best way to keep the United States free from war is to change the Embargo Act by a cash-and-carry provision so that those who are opposing aggression may stop Hitler before the United States becomes involved.

Our present so-called Neutrality Act is helping Germany by cutting off the democracies from a natural source of supplies, while Italy, Russia, and Japan can buy here to build up their war machines and divert part of their production to Germany. Four totalitarian aggressors may soon threaten the democracies, and if they go down the United States may have to defend democracy in both North and South America with very little help.

The present embargo on arms, ammunition, and instruments of war gives Germany a distinct and unmerited advantage. It puts a premium upon aggression deliberately planned and prepared for. It penalizes the British for building during many years and at very great cost a large and efficient navy.

Looking at this matter from the purely materialistic side—and this is of least importance—will Members of Congress actually insist that the workers of America who need employment shall continue to walk the streets or live on relief appropriations while contracts for supplies are turned down, or will the Nation insist that America take her position on the firm ground of international law and sell to all countries who are willing to pay for the goods and carry them home?

It is not necessary to answer, or try to answer, many of the charges and accusations hurled here and there upon the floor of the House. Following the enlightened suggestion of President Roosevelt that we refrain from injecting politics into this all-important question, I have not answered or tried to answer some of these untruths, half truths, false accusations, and groundless charges.

Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen, I readily concede that we have many thousands of honest men and women who have been for years members of various worthy peace organizations. I myself have been a member of and contributed to practically all such organizations because I, like practically every other good American, am definitely opposed to war.

As I stated on the floor in March 1938, I helped to defray the expenses of several lecturers who spoke before university assemblies in 1912 and 1913 for universal peace in an effort to ward off the oncoming war. I am not a stranger to wars and their devastating results. My stand now is as it always has been. I have not changed my attitude to inconsistently meet occasions and the thoughts of others. I am and always have been opposed to militarism, and I am, like you, a believer in a real democratic form of government.

Many of the peace organizations we have in mind have during the last year and a half endorsed President Roosevelt's worthy preparedness program. These organizations have sensed the Nazi-Communist multiplying encroachments and subversive propaganda in this country, and they have fallen into line to help our leader combat them. Yet, on the other hand, we have many thousands of well-meaning fellow citizens who have not sensed that they are being used and being influenced by this malevolent, liberty-destroying pubilicity emanating from the sources I have mentioned.

It is regretted that many columnists and publicists have through the press and on the forum for political and other selfish purposes misrepresented our President by saying that he is trying to involve us in war. Think of that! A President of the great United States trying to embroil 135,000,000 peace-loving citizens of the United States in a war. Nonesense, I say. Some of these marplots have gone so far as to aver that the President has reached a secret agreement that calls for our joining the democracies in war. Shame! I might as well identify these culprits. I refer to the German-American bunds, the German-American National Alliance, and Coughlin.

It is far from my purpose to indict the Germans en masse. The self-appointed leaders in Germany are solely responsible. I have not read history without purpose, and therefore I know the valuable contributions in many fields of useful endeavor of the Germans of yesterday. We all know that, in the absence of a representative government in Germany, the commonalty had no voice in making the current

war. I am happy to record that I know very many outstanding, intelligent, patriotic citizens of my own city who are of German extraction, and am still happier to record that they all deeply and consistently resent the baneful activities of Hitler and the bunds.

The President has repeatedly said he not only hopes sincerely that the United States can steer clear of the impending barbaric conflict, but he believes we will be able to escape the catastrophe if we chart the proper course. He pledges himself and his administration unreservedly to exert every possible effort toward avoidance of the whirlpools and crosscurrents of involvement. Our President is doing all possible to keep our country out of war. Our governmental regulation at this time will not even permit a single American to travel on a ship of a belligerent.

I want to ask the good but misguided men and women of America whether they think the yellow journalists and voluble pulpiteers of the Coughlin stripe are in a better position to judge the foreign policy of this great country than is the President of the United States with his accurate and thorough sources of information created by our great and good diplomatic service. As for myself, recognizing the profound knowledge and patriotism of the President and our Secretary of State concerning foreign affairs, because, as I have said, of their accurate and thorough avenues of approach, and reposing infinite confidence in their plans and purposes, I am wholeheartedly supporting the President's proposal as the best means of becoming and remaining neutral in fact, and avoiding involvement in the existing conflict.

It is a joyful reflection that there is so much freedom in our country, a degree of freedom not enjoyed elsewhere on the globe. For this we all are profoundly grateful. We would not have it otherwise. In practically every other country the newspapers and other publications that put out these false articles about our President's attitude as expressed in the pending legislation would be banned; and the pulpiteers, lecturers, lobbyists, and propagandists would be charged with high treason.

I have in my humble way, from the beginning of the public debate concerning this important subject, taken the view that the President's attitude is absolutely correct, and tried to point out that the more violent opponents of the plan, who are maligning the President day in and day out without restraint and without reason, are Nazi-Communist inspired, with the result that I myself have been continually attacked. These attacks have been and are so ridiculous, so ill-founded, so illogical, so senseless, that I have ignored them, and I shall for the time being continue to do so.

Let us not be deceived by this propaganda about our young men and their parents. As I have tried to point out, it all comes from the Nazi sympathizers, such as the German-American National Alliance and the bunds, who aver that repeal of the embargo will aid the democracies and will be to the disadvantage of Hitler and Stalin. It is not the safety of the American youths and the comfort of American parents that are concerning these Nazis. They seek solely to advance the cause of Hitler and Stalin; but they will not succeed, as will be shown by the vote soon to be taken on the pending bill. As has been stated by the venerable Senator GLASS, more than 88 percent of the American people are in sympathy with the democracies of Europe, according to a Gallup poll. This does not mean that the remaining 12 percent do not favor the democracies; it simply means that they were not heard from or did not care to take sides in the impending controversy. If our action on the pending bill should aid the democracies, will it be against the best interests of our country? Indeed not. If so, it would be a blessing to America and the democracies and will have a tendency to eliminate future wars and their deplorable consequences. It will enable willing and honorable men and women to live normally and free from fear of force and regimentation.

In conclusion, at this time the hands of the President and his advisers should be free to take advantage of every favorable opportunity to safeguard American interests; yet he finds himself and the State Department denied necessary freedom of action by a dangerous remnant of the 1935 so-called Neutrality Act, a provision that when the President recognizes the existence of a state of war between two or more nations, or when war is declared, he must proclaim an embargo on shipments of arms, ammunition, and implements of war to the belligerents. This should be changed, by a return to international law, which we have, except for a brief period, consistently followed, and the accepted practices of all other countries.

Every Gainfully Employed Person Over 18 Years With a Gross Income in Excess of $1,000 Should Be Required To File an Annual Income-Tax Return

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER CHANDLER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 1, 1939

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. Speaker, with the increase in annual incomes of those gainfully employed in the United States, it is believed that the time has come for the Congress to consider amendments to sections 51 and 54 of the Internal Revenue Code for the purpose of providing that each individual over 18 years of age, single or married, having a gross income in excess of $1,000 shall be required to file a verified tax return or report with the Department of the Treasury.

At first blush this suggestion may seem of doubtful soundness, but careful consideration of the proposal will make clear the justice and the wisdom of the idea.

Let us analyze the problem briefly:

There are approximately 46,000,000 employed persons in the United States. Department of Commerce reports indicate that of the entire number 15,000,000 people are employed in manufacturing industries, 9,000,000 persons are employed in service industries, 7,000,000 in trade and finance, and 15,000,000 in agriculture and other pursuits. Recent social-security statistics show that in 1938 there were over 30,000,000 holders of social-security cards, with an average annual income of about $900 per worker. Therefore, there should be at least 10,000,000 employees earning over $1,000 per annum. Actually, a study of consumer incomes published by the National Resources Committee reveals that 10,668,000 families receive incomes in excess of $2,000 per annum. In addition, it is safe to estimate that there are several million people throughout the United States who are now liable for income tax but who never file returns. Approximately 5,000,000 individual income-tax returns are filed annually. It should follow, therefore, that from 10,000,000 to 15,000,000 additional income-tax returns would be required by the proposed amendments, with additional income taxes from $10,000,000 to $15,000,000 per annum, probably much more.

Mr. Speaker, it is quite obvious that our revenue laws have placed the burden of taxes upon a comparatively few people, while thousands of citizens who are not tax conscious or are negligent, possibly dishonest, have been able to evade their entire tax liabilities by filing no returns whatever. The reasons for these omissions need not be discussed here. Suffice it to say that the proposed amendments will not increase the tax burden of anyone now paying income taxes but will cause many who are evading their tax obligations to be compelled to meet them.

Moreover, the proposed amendments, if enacted into law, will make millions of our citizens and alien residents conscious of the fact that taxes are essential for the operation of government, and will emphasize that they, in common with others, have a responsibility for the maintenance of our institutions and the proper discharge of their necessary govern-

mental functions. The effect in many instances will be to challenge the citizen's interest in more economy and greater efficiency in government. It will cause him to realize that, when government costs increase, more taxes are inevitable, and smaller exemptions will be unavoidable.

The honest citizen will not object to or resent being called upon to file a simple tax return under oath, while those who avoid their tax liability will be discovered and compelled to obey the law. However diligent the Internal Revenue Department officials and employees have been or might be in apprehending tax evaders, it is well-nigh impossible under the existing income-tax laws to find large numbers, say, millions, of people who keep no records, and whose names are not on pay rolls, or dividend reports, and whose net incomes are well above $1,000 per annum. If these assertions are correct and accurate, and I have abundant reason to believe that they are, steps should be taken promptly to correct abuses of the law, and bring intentional violators before the courts. The proposals herein made will be of great aid in performing that duty.

Simple amendments would be sufficient to meet the purposes intended. For example:

Section 51. Individual returns: Paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 51 should be entirely eliminated and (1) inserted to read as follows:

(1) Every individual over 18 years of age, single or married, having a gross income in excess of $1,000.

This would eliminate the necessity for any discrimination in this section due to marital status, as "every individual" would include husband and wife—today rightfully so, as many wives are gainfully employed.

Section 54. Records and special returns: This section should be changed as follows:

(a) By taxpayer—Every person over 18 years of age receiving gross income of any kind in excess of $1,000 during any taxable year or period must file a return under oath, keep such records, render under oath such statements, make such returns, and comply with such rules and regulations, as the Commissioner, with the approval of the Secretary, may from time to time prescribe.

Similar changes may also be made throughout the act, where required to meet the changed wording of sections 51 and 54.

Mr. Speaker, I am not sufficiently informed as to the probable cost of printing and distributing the additional forms, but believe that the expense would be negligible in contrast to the amount of additional revenue that would be realized if the code is amended and the program put into effect. The working out of the details can be left safely to Treasury Department officials. The simplest method would be the best. A small sheet or card, some color other than white, might be included with or attached to every 1040–A tax-return blank and distributed in the same manner as employer and employment cards were distributed by mail carriers when the N. R. A. was in effect. All such cards, where the individual is not subject to tax and where the gross income from all sources is less than the fixed minimum, could be returned with control figures only. For example:

Nontaxable return

Name _____
Address _____
Salary or wages _____ $_____
Other income _____ $_____
Total gross income _____ $_____
Less all allowable deductions _____ $_____
Net income _____ $_____
Less credits _____ $_____
Excess:
Over deductions and credits _____ $_____
Over gross income _____ No tax due.

Signature _____
Affidavit:

Let me repeat, Mr. Speaker, that this proposal, if enacted, will not increase the taxes of any person now complying with the revenue laws. It is a means of bringing in taxes due but escaping collection. No injustice is being worked. The proposition simply is intended to insure fair play to the taxpayer and common honesty from the tax dodger.

The Challenge to the American Army

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE LEWIS
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, November 1, 1939

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE LOUIS JOHNSON, THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF WAR

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Louis Johnson, the Assistant Secretary of War, on Thursday evening, October 26, 1939, in connection with the New York Herald Tribune Forum in the Waldorf Astoria ballroom in New York City, delivered an address on The Challenge to the American Army. This realistic discussion of what is "adequate national defense" for the United States deserves serious consideration by all citizens. The address follows:

Ladies and gentlemen, the challenge to the American Army is a distinctly modern problem. It is freely said in some quarters that a democracy cannot defend itself; that the process of modern defense is incompatible with democratic ideals. I have no use for this kind of defeatism. In this respect the challenge is especially a challenge to the American people. In our national life the Army is the servant and not the master of the body politic. By law it is under the command of the President and under control of the Congress. By tradition it limits its public appearances to occasions when the American people desire its presence. By experience it faithfully prepares for all contingencies. But it never knows in advance what its theater of operations will be, should it be called on to take up the burden of national defense.

Accordingly, before we challenge the American Army to prove its competence, we must clarify in our own minds the true military objective. What we all want is adequate national defense, and on this everyone agrees. The problem arises when we try to settle what is meant by the word "adequate." In this realm mere slogans will not do; for you will find that every slogan has concealed beneath it some assumption of a political, rather than a military, objective. You cannot define "adequate national defense" by talking about a navy strong enough to dominate both oceans; or by saying "two ships for one"; or by talking loosely about a standing army powerful enough to send an expedition of military crusaders across the seas to make the world safe for democracy. These attempts at definition are too extreme to be worthy of serious consideration as national policy.

Let me frankly confess that I know of no definition of "adequate national defense" which will cover every conceivable situation. Adequacy is a relative term. What was adequate yesterday we know is not enough today. What may be enough to protect us when the present armament program is realized may prove wholly insufficient in the future. Since the American object is defense, we do not have the privilege of the last word on our military needs. We have to meet world conditions and armament developments.

Consider, for instance, the change that has taken place in the public mind in the conception of the term "adequacy" as applied to the air. Five years ago the Baker board urged a program calling for 2,320 airplanes of all types by 1940. Its members and the Congress which enacted the program into law firmly believed that such a force would protect us against any enemies from the air. Two years ago doubts began to arise. We heard rumors of a mighty air armada that Germany was developing, but still we felt that the recommendations of the Baker board were sufficient. Then, in 1938, we saw the development of the Munich crisis, a development which revolved in considerable measure around the fact that one of the parties to that controversy claimed to have an enormously powerful air fleet. Learning from that crisis, we again scrutinized our air policy, and the President reconsidered the adequacy of our air defense. In January he sent a special message to Congress pointing out the changes that had taken place since the days of the Baker board and urged a new program which, with the whole-hearted support of Congress, we now have enacted. Today we have embarked on a national-defense program which will give the Army a minimum of 5,500 planes by June 1941 and the Navy 3,000 planes by 1944.

I wish we could feel that the program already enacted will suffice us for all time. But who dares be so bold as to foretell the future? All we can hope to do is to meet the national-defense issue in terms of world facts. That we have done in the past. That we must continue to do in the future. Every year we must reexamine our military status in the light of changing developments.

As a minimum today I think all Americans interested in adequate national defense will readily agree to this fundamental consideration:

Our Army and our Navy must be powerful enough to strike on land, on the sea, and in the air at a moment's notice in defense of our avowed policy to thwart all unfriendly efforts toward the establishment of hostile bases on the Western Hemisphere.

The safety of the United States and the safety of every republic in this hemisphere is predicated on the maintenance of American ideals. We are a happy family of nations on this continent. We strive to understand each other. The American family of nations has kept at peace by that method. We have also within our membership a number of law-abiding colonies that belong to European nations—possessions of Great Britain, of France, of Holland—but these colonies have observed the ideal of the peace of the Americas. They have been good neighbors. We have no fear that any of them will try to dominate this hemisphere and we live with them in tranquillity, but we are committed, along with the other American republics, to the proposition that, aside from these recognized European colonies, no overseas power shall acquire territory or threaten the integrity of any nation within the New World. That is our understanding of the Monroe Doctrine, now made into a cooperative pact by the declaration of Lima and given immediate reality by the very recent declaration of Panama a few weeks ago.

Time and again, in the past, we have had to invoke the Monroe Doctrine against un-American influences on this continent and each time we successfully thwarted them. In 1866 we compelled Maximilian and the France of Napoleon III to drop their imperialistic designs in Mexico. In 1895 we checked Great Britain from venturing further into the Caribbean Sea. In 1902, when the German Fleet visited Venezuela to carry out the policy of its imperialistic Government, President Theodore Roosevelt forced it to withdraw.

In the future, as in the past, we must be ready to defend our American policy against hostile intervention. In these days of the long-range bomber and the protracted cruising submarine, the security that our oceans have afforded us against the traditional methods of attack has become less potent. Our armed forces must therefore be strong enough to defend America against the newer, as well as against the old, weapons of aggression.

To achieve adequate national defense for our Army today we need men. We need money. We need munitions. We need physical reserves of supplies to cover at least the first 6 months of any major emergency, or better, until our industry can go into mass production and mass delivery of war supplies. We need civilian factories trained in the art of producing munitions so as to be able to guarantee our fighting forces a flow of materials throughout a war of any proportions.

All these needs are cogent, but above them all is our greatest need, the element of time.

Time to enlist, train, and equip men; time to spend money wisely, so as to assure ourselves a maximum result for our investment, time to manufacture munitions, many of which have no counterpart in civilian life; time to train a civilian industry to shift from a peace to a war basis with a minimum of waste, delay, and confusion; time to plan, time to experiment, time to perfect. Time! That is the challenge to the American people. That is the challenge to the American Army. Adequate national defense rests as much on adequate organization as on any other single factor; and organization takes time.

In 1917–18, time worked for our Army but only because our Navy and our Allies were able to overbalance our weakness on land. While we were selecting men and mobilizing resources, British Tommies and French poilus, backed by their peoples, were giving lives and pouring out treasure. While we were transporting soldiers to cantonments for training, our ships were convoying Allied troops to concentration points for battle. We declared war in April 1917 but it was May 1918 before we were able to put a full division in the front lines.

When our now famous First Division struck at Cantigny on May 28, 1918, in our first offensive, American doughboys went over the top wearing British helmets and carrying British gas masks. Our artillerymen in support came rolling along in caissons drawn by horses belonging to the French Government. They computed their ranges and their deflections with French aiming circles and French "scissors" instruments. They fired French 75's, using French ammunition.

In the World War the blunt fact was that the Allied armies in Europe gave us the luxury of 14 months to get ready. Will that be true again? If another emergency comes, will we be acting behind a screen of allies, or indeed, will we have allies at all? Can we really expect, when that day comes, that our enemies will concede us time to organize?

How vital this factor is was illustrated by the war now in progress. If the Poles could have had time to mobilize fully, the lightning speed might have been lost from the remarkable Blitzkrieg. If the Germans could have had time to build up complete reserves, the weapon of the British blockade would have given them little concern. If the British could have had time to complete their air forces, the threat from the skies would have caused them no terror. Time, now as always, plays a dominant role in the destiny of nations.

To meet the challenge of time we should, in my judgment, provide the Army right now with sufficient funds for the training, the organization, and the equipment of an initial protective force of Regulars and National Guardsmen of at least 600,000. Such a force, while larger than any before in our peacetime history, is commensurate with the grave responsibilities that we at this time hold toward the American Hemisphere.

You will notice that this is a force designed to be used on this hemisphere; it does not suggest in the slightest training for warfare overseas. As we see matters today adequate defense does not require the training of an Army for operations beyond the sea.

But this relatively small and strictly defensive land force does need adequate tools with which to work. They must have modern guns and ammunition, modern tanks, combat cars, and airplanes—all the matériel necessary to enable them to serve as a first line of land defense in any emergency.

Further, these must be M day troops. That means they must always be prepared for any contingency. They must be ready to serve when needed—not after the development of mobilization or production plans which can be made effective only in a distant tomorrow. They must be on call today and every day.

These are our needs. They are our needs now. When we tackle the job of meeting them in the shortest possible time, however, we find serious obstacles. Here is what we have done: We have already launched a program for airplanes to the number of 5,500 and have set June 30, 1941, as the date for its completion. Try as we might, we could not achieve the objective far short of that time without sacrifice of quality. We already have embarked on an armament project toward the equipment of an initial protective force. Yet, despite our fervent desire, and our determined efforts to hasten delivery, we must face a lapse of 18 months before the job is completed. We have already agreed that the need for an expansion of our existing land forces is compelling, yet months may elapse before the funds provided for the increase can be translated into soldiers, recruited, equipped, and trained.

Let me emphasize training; and that, too, requires time. Discipline, that cool ability enabling many men to work together in time of stress, cannot be attained in a hurry. No brief periods of training can supply it. Campaigns may bring it, at a fearful price; but the real method is daily experience, in hardship and in endurance. In 1917 and 1918, we gained it but only after months of intensive combat and bitter experience in battle.

Important as discipline always has been and still is to the soldier, warfare today adds another challenge to the man in arms. He must be not only a disciplined fighter but a skilled mechanic. Be he officer or enlisted man, he must have a firm grasp of the powers and the capabilities of his weapons, as well as the strength and the courage to use them efficiently and intelligently. Guns, tanks, planes, and the other numerous battle accessories today call for craftsmen skilled in handling machines, as well as fighters bred in maintaining discipline. Any ordinary chauffeur can drive a car, but the pilot of a heavy tank who must traverse varied terrain, climb over steep hills, drive through thick forests, wade across deep gullies and speed along wide-open fields while planes from above and artillery from the flank shower him with a deadly spray, must indeed be a mechanic in arms.

The final challenge to the American Army is to its leadership. Here more than in any other country in the world, a rare combination of qualities is required. Not only must they develop in the ranks the skill of the artisan and the discipline of the soldier; not only must they create in the services of supply the smooth-working organization of transport; not only must they be able to mobilize in production the mass manufacture which lies behind defense; they must also have that rarest of qualities, the ability to be master in one field and servant in another. For the national defense is not a policy in itself. It is the servant of the peacetime policy of a peaceful people. The measures of defense are not methods of revolution; they are methods to safeguard our free democratic institutions. Our commissioned officers, from the subaltern to the ranking general, merely direct an arm of an essentially civil government.

And this, it seems to me, is the fundamental assumption in dealing with the problem of adequate national defense. The institutions we create, the mobilizations we work out, the plans we make, must not determine our national objectives. They must not place any businessman in fear lest defense be used as an excuse for revolution. No laborer must be allowed to think that a defense program can be used as a pretext to deprive him of his recognized rights. No free American must believe that the defense of democracy on this hemisphere means losing democracy in the process.

It is true that the keynote of our defense policy must be flexibility; we do not make world conditions. It is true that as processes of war involve increasing strata of population our defense measures must cover a greater segment of the national life. It is true that the discipline of defense has ceased to be the discipline of an army and has become the discipline of a nation. But this very discipline, this very increase in area, and this very flexibility must be dominated by the ultimate goal—the defense of our institutions as we like them. This is, and must always be, the underlying premise of an adequate national defense; it is, and must always be, the challenge to the American Army; it is, and must always be, the challenge to the American will to keep America free.

St. Lawrence Waterway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 1, 1939

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, one undertaking of great interest to the people of this country is the so-called St. Lawrence waterway project.

We are all familiar with the fact that this undertaking will mean that ocean-going ships can sail the Great Lakes and that the people of the Midwest will be accorded the benefits of lower freight rates on account of water transportation.

I am glad to note the news dispatch that Canada has advocated a willingness to resume formal diplomatic conversations with the State Department of the United States. This press dispatch indicates that Premier Mitchell Hepburn, of Ontario, is adopting a friendly attitude and that he is now favorable to the St. Lawrence Waterway Treaty so that ocean-going vessels may sail from the Atlantic to the Great Lakes.

I hope that these press dispatches are true and that an understanding may soon be reached by the Secretary of State in this country and the Premier of Canada, Mr. King, so that a treaty may be submitted to the Senate for ratification. From the newspapers the other day I quote the following significant paragraphs:

President Roosevelt announced today that he was reviving negotiations for the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterways treaty.

He said at his press conference that he was reorganizing the International Joint Commission which drafted a treaty some time ago so the draft could be taken off the shelf at the State Department and dusted off.

This is good news for the northwestern section of the United States. It is my purpose to confer with the new International Joint Commission and to render whatever assistance I can toward bringing about a treaty between the United States and Canada.

The Test of Patriotism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEWIS B. SCHWELLENBACH

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, November 2, 1939

ADDRESS BY HON. FRANK MURPHY

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Hon. Frank Murphy, Attorney General, at the National Conference on Civil Liberties in New York City on October 13, 1939. The address is entitled "The Test of Patriotism."

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Five months ago, when the Western World was still clinging to an uncertain peace, I was privileged to meet with a group of municipal officials and to discuss with them the subject of civil liberties. I had occasion to say that in my settled conviction the finest contribution which America has made to civilization is our loyalty to the idea of civil liberty.

Tonight, when much of the Western World is torn by a fierce and bloody war, I want very heartily to reaffirm that conviction.

It is true that in certain parts of the world, might for the moment appears to be triumphant over right. It is true that in many countries the traditional civil and religious rights of the individual are no longer recognized.

These are realistic facts that we must realistically face. Common sense dictates that with virility and courage we must prepare ourselves to guard all the magnificent physical and spiritual resources that make up our national heritage. To let our defenses weaken, to be soft or infirm in our attitude toward national security, would be a faithless and unworthy thing.

But while we must be strong to protect our democratic heritage, we can and must still recognize that the heart and soul of our heritage is the civil liberty of the individual, and that in protecting our physical wealth we must not destroy our spiritual wealth of freedom. For civil liberty is still the finest possession of the American people. It is still that priceless thing without which life loses its dignity and becomes only a hopeless form of spiritual slavery.

And by the same measure that civil liberty is precious to us, we must be willing and determined to defend it against the forces that threaten to destroy it.

In a world filled with many uncertainties, there are some things that are certain.

We know that in the hearts of the American people there is a great, steadfast desire to keep out of war. It is a desire for peace that no public servant or political leader in this land can afford to underestimate.

But we also know that in a world where force has been unleashed, the mere desire for peace is not a guaranty that a peace-loving nation can remain at peace.

It is not enough for us merely to say that we want peace and that we abhor war—that we will have no part of war. When the world is aflame with war, or gravely threatened by war, it is the duty of a responsible government to do something more than talk peace. First, it must take active steps to prevent unnecessary involvement. Second, it should make itself ready to resist attack—not only attack from without, but attack from within as well—attack by sabotage and subversive activities.

I am concerned tonight to discuss our defense from internal aggression. For we cannot be unmindful of the fact that the present attack on peace and liberty in Europe originated in the internal aggression of powerful groups against the democratic authority of their own lawfully established governments.

But in our zeal to protect ourselves from internal aggression, we must be on guard that we ourselves are not guilty of aggression against the civil liberties of our own citizens. We must not fall victim to the infection of despotism that in recent years has been sweeping the world. For if we suppress civil liberty, we suppress democracy itself.

In our own land, this generation has seen a little of what happens when a crisis develops and the Government is not prepared to protect its people against internal attack. I have in mind the period of the World War and some of the wrongs against liberty that were done in the name of patriotism.

I believe we all should recognize that however tragic the wrongs that were done, they sprang from misdirected zeal rather than evil intent.

We should remember that in the feverish, wartime atmosphere—an atmosphere which inevitably is dangerous to liberty—average citizens—normally calm and reasonable—became so imbued with the rightness of their cause that opposition or criticism was intolerable to them. Not only could they brook no open disagreement with national policy, but the failure of others to share their own attitude became in their eyes evidence of lack of patriotism. We remember, some of us, the outrageous treatment heaped upon that great patriot and statesman, Robert La Follette, who today is so ably succeeded in the United States Congress by his fine, courageous son, Senator LA FOLLETTE.

From suspicion and distrust, it was for some people an easy step to violence and vigilante activities. In some communities, irresponsible, extra-legal organizations assumed functions that belonged properly to the civil authorities. And in some cases the civil authorities themselves were carried away by a hysteria of fear. Defenseless men and women were mistreated by such groups on mere suspicion. On many occasions, the constitutional right of peaceful assembly was violated, and homes were invaded and searched in the dark of night for evidence of disaffection and disloyalty. In their zeal to help defend their country, well-meaning people resorted to methods which in the calm of peacetime would not be considered.

Even if we recognize—as we must—that this condition was not general, it is a picture that friends of democracy have every reason to regret. But I want to emphasize how much I believe that instead of viewing it with rancor toward anyone, we should keep two things carefully in mind.

First, we should remember that much of this was done sincerely in the name of patriotism and national defense.

Second, we should keep in our minds and hearts a firm resolution that while making the security of the country our first and greatest concern in this troubled hour, we will injure not one of the qualities that have made this Nation the strongest haven of democracy and freedom on earth.

I know there are sincere individuals who earnestly believe that in a period like the present, when the country is seeking ways to avoid war but yet must prepare its defense, it is not possible to maintain both civil liberty and a strong defense against internal attack at one and the same time. They are convinced that we must choose between the temporary suppression of civil rights and a weak and ineffective internal defense.

I do not believe that we face any such choice. I do not believe that a democracy must necessarily become something other than a democracy in order to protect its national interests. I am convinced that if the job is done right—if the defense against internal aggression is carefully prepared—our people need not suffer the tragic things that have happened elsewhere in the world and that we have seen, in less degree, even in this land of freedom. We can prevent and punish the abuse of liberty by sabotage, disorder, and violence without destroying liberty itself.

At the time of the World War the country's defense against internal attack was not fully prepared, and events took their natural course. The civil authorities were not trained for their new responsibilities. The door was wide open for irresponsible organi-

zations to set themselves up as agencies of law enforcement. That is precisely what happened.

Today the picture is quite different. The delicate business of combating espionage has been coordinated under the Department of Justice. Under responsible direction, it will be carried on, as it is today, not by overzealous, inexperienced laymen but by men who have been equipped for the work by careful training—training that includes instruction in the rights of the citizen as well as in methods of crime suppression. And we have every reason to expect them to be worthy of their training and instruction.

This work should be done and will be done by responsible employees of the Federal Government, acting in cooperation with the duly constituted law-enforcing agencies of State and local governments. There will be no alignment with agents of vigilante groups or private industrial organizations which are concerned primarily with industrial disputes and labor problems. Enforcement officials will themselves obey the law of the land.

We need, and we earnestly ask, from every citizen and every government an unswerving resolve that for as long as this crisis endures we will keep our heads; that we will not abandon our Bill of Rights: that whatever measures we may adopt for our defense against subversive activities, we will use them just as calmly and judiciously as we do firmly and resolutely.

But given a thoroughly prepared internal defense, given the proper mental attitude of calmness and cool reasoning, we need something more. We need a sound sense of direction—a clear understanding of our own policy and our own position.

First, we need to remember that in an emergency it is right and just for our democracy to be on guard not only against internal attack by foreign agents but obstructive activities by people in our own ranks as well.

We have a right to expect that once a policy has been formulated and adopted by constitutional, democratic procedure, it will be accepted and observed by all as an expression of the sovereign will of the people until such time as the policy is changed by constitutional methods. Even those who disagree with it should do their part to make it effective. This is the democratic way in peacetime; it is the democratic way in time of war.

And here we can take our lesson from those democracies abroad that failed to deal vigorously with illegal activities against the democratic process and that now are only memories in the minds of men.

The second thing we need to remember is that an emergency does not abrogate the Constitution or dissolve the Federal Bill of Rights. That is not only good sense, it is good constitutional law.

Seventy-three years ago—1 year after the Civil War—the Supreme Court declared in the famous Milligan case that, "The Constitution of the United States is a law for rulers and people, equally in war and in peace, and covers with the shield of its protection all classes of men, at all times, and under all circumstances."

To the many friends of civil liberty gathered at this conference I want to give the emphatic assurance that in this emergency, as well as in time of peace, the Department of Justice embraces that policy without reservation. And because we are convinced that it represents the wishes of the overwhelming majority of the American people, we are determined to apply it and to practice it as thoroughly and intelligently as men are capable of doing.

We are aware, and the people should also be aware, that this will be no simple task. It is a problem of steering an even course that will invade neither of the two boundaries that I have mentioned. In brief, it is a problem of finding a sound basis for maintaining public safety without encroaching on the Bill of Rights.

In enforcing some laws, we must not violate other laws. In upholding the Constitution, we must not infringe on the priceless heritage of civil liberty which the Constitution guarantees. To do that—to suppress or suspend the Bill of Rights—would be to destroy the very democratic principles that we are seeking to preserve. It would be to yield to the same autocratic psychology that we want to keep out of this country. We must not let that come to pass. We must have it understood that while we will oppose firmly and vigorously any illegal activities, we will do so in a responsible manner and within the orbit of the Constitution. That is the American way.

The immortal Justice Holmes laid down a formula which I believe will help us to keep a true course. In a celebrated wartime case involving the very things we have discussed here tonight, he wrote these lines:

"When men have realized that time has upset many fighting faiths, they may come to believe even more than they believe the very foundations of their own conduct that the ultimate good desired is better reached by free trade in ideas * * *. While that experiment is part of our system, I think that we should be eternally vigilant against attempts to check the expression of opinions that we loathe—unless they so imminently threaten immediate interference with the lawful and pressing purposes of the law that an immediate check is required to save the country."

The willingness, the determination, the ability, to follow that democratic principle, so ably stated by a great friend and interpreter of democracy, will be, in my estimation, a real test of patriotism in this or any future crisis.

The true citizen of America will remember that loyalty to our tradition of civil liberty is as much a part of patriotism as defense of our shores and a hatred for treason. He will never forget that civil liberty under the American system is a legal right in time of war as well as in time of peace—that, whatever the time, it is liberty for all, irrespective of the accident of birth.

The true American will remember that, whether it be peacetime or wartime, there could be nothing more unpatriotic in this land of many peoples and many creeds than the persecution of minorities and the fomenting of hatred and strife on the basis of race or religion.

He will realize that if, in the atmosphere of war, we allow civil liberty to slip away from us, it may not be long before our recent great gains in social and economic justice will also have vanished. For a nation that is calloused in its attitude toward civil rights is not likely to be sensitive toward the many grave problems that affect the dignity and security of its citizens. We must not let this crisis destroy what we have so dearly won.

Many years ago, in the midst of another great emergency, Abraham Lincoln put this question to the Congress of the United States: "Must a government of necessity be too strong for the liberties of its own people, or too weak to maintain its own existence?"

Let us, in this troubled hour, answer that question as befits a great and enlightened democracy. Let us prove for all time that ours is a twofold strength—the physical strength of self-defense and the moral strength of unflinching devotion to our own ideals.

The Arms Embargo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ZEBULON WEAVER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 2, 1939

LETTER FROM WORLD WAR VETERAN

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter written by a former World War veteran to Col. Charles A. Lindbergh:

OCTOBER 14, 1939.

Mr. CHARLES A. LINDBERGH,
Care of Radio Station WOR, Newark, N. J.

DEAR SIR: Last night, October 13, I heard your radio address in which you enunciated certain views of yours concerning the arms embargo, these views being, as I understood them, the prohibition by this Nation of the sale of bombing planes and offensive weapons of war to any belligerent nation. In the course of your address you also made certain remarks concerning the sovereignty of the Dominion of Canada and the bond between the United States and Europe.

Your address is so inconsistent with Americanism as handed down to me by my forefathers, who helped to create the United States, and is so opposed to the fundamental concepts of freedom upon which this Nation is based that I do not believe any real American should permit your address to go unanswered.

Insofar as your remarks concerning the mandatory prohibition of the sale of offensive arms and airplanes are concerned, let it suffice to say that a nation is justified in resorting to war in defense of itself or in order to right a wrong to its friends, particularly a wrong to a weak friend who could not defend itself. Such has been the teaching of theologians, such has been the policy of this Nation since its beginning, such is the natural law of mankind as exemplified in the law of self-defense, and such is the law of Christianity as concerns a neighbor or friend unjustly attacked. Certainly, Poland was most barbarously attacked by Germany and no one knows who would have been next. Did you know? You did not say.

Thus, it is self-evident that both England and France are justified in waging war against Germany, in fact they must do so if the pledged word and honor are to guide the relations between man and man and between nation and nation. To do otherwise would be to exalt force above justice, lying above truth, and brutality above charity. Would you want that? You did not say. Since England and France are justified, in fact, required by honor, in waging war upon Germany, the aggressor, it naturally follows that those nations are rightfully permitted to use all lawful weapons of war, defensive and offensive. Why then, Mr. Lindbergh, do you draw the line between pursuit planes and bombing planes, between antiaircraft guns and heavy siege artillery?

Is it solely because you believe the bombing plane and the siege gun are barbarous and inhuman weapons? If so, did you tell Mr. Hitler that while you were in Germany being wined, dined, feted, and decorated by the Nazi Government? If you did not, when you knew and fully appreciated the methods Mr. Hitler intended to pursue against his neighbors to gain his ends, why didn't you? Do you believe the bombing and destruction of Poland a barbarous and inhuman event? Have you ever said so?

Why not? If you did not understand and fully appreciate the methods intended to be used by Mr. Hitler, why your purported advice before the Munich Pact, of the folly of opposing Mr. Hitler? If you did know the methods intended to be used by Mr. Hitler, why did you not then publicly condemn any resort to such weapons either by Mr. Hitler or anyone else? Can your continued silence in this respect be construed as the act of a sincere lover of peace and justice, and if not, how should it be construed?

Since it is a principle of military science that the best method of defense is often the attack, how can you truthfully say or logically prove that the use of bombing planes and heavy guns by the Allies is offensive rather than defensive, particularly when the original aggressor, the nation that started the offensive, was Germany?

So, Mr. Lindbergh, is it not reasonable to conclude, since it is lawful for England and France to use bombers and heavy guns, that it is not unneutral or un-American for the United States to sell such instrumentalities to any belligerent who can come and get them? Is it not true that neither international law nor justice requires a neutral nation to cease or prohibit the sale of any of its goods, commodities, or manufactured products to a belligerent nation?

As to your remarks about Canada, Mr. Lindbergh, do you believe that Canada has a right to tell the United States what her relations should be with other nations? If not, on what lawful or just basis do you tell Canada what hers shall be? Since, according to American traditions and principles, the right to rule resides in the people of a nation, and since the people, and they alone, have the lawful power to choose their form of government, haven't the people of Canada the right to choose their own form of government and through that government to exercise the various forms of sovereignty, including that of waging war? Has Canada ever asked the United States whether she should go to war or not? Why not? Because the United States is a sovereign nation and exercises the rights of a sovereign nation, just as Canada does.

So, Mr. Lindbergh, you show your complete lack of understanding of the principles on which the United States was founded and which she has consistently upheld, including the principle of self-determination by a free people of their form of government. What you ask for, Mr. Lindbergh, is not a free and sovereign Canada, but a Canada under the control and domination of the United States, perhaps not quite in the same manner that Austria and Czechoslovakia are under the control of Germany, but at least in the manner that Estonia and Lithuania are under the control of Russia. That is not Americanism, Mr. Lindbergh, but its very opposite, for it recognizes no real liberty of action by a small nation but merely the exercise of such privileges as its larger neighbor permits.

Be a real American, Mr. Lindbergh, understand and expound the ideals and principles of the United States, and get down on your knees and thank God that the American people created a liberty-loving Nation which fully respects the rights of all nations, great or small. The United States has given you everything you have, Mr. Lindbergh, and the least you can do is to respect and uphold the principles of freedom and justice on which the United States is based.

Therefore, Mr. Lindbergh, respect the sovereignty of Canada, and again get down on your knees and thank God, this time that our Canadian neighbor has been a good neighbor and a true friend for many years to the United States; yes, perhaps even before your first ancestor ever set foot upon the soil of the United States. Reflect upon the fact that the announcement of the establishment of great air-training schools in Canada does not even cause a ripple of excitement in the United States, because all true Americans know such air bases are no threat to the United States. Is any more tangible evidence possible of the deep and abiding friendship that exists between these two free nations? Yet such a friendship does not satisfy you? Why? It does not satisfy Mr. Hitler, either. Finally, would we in the United States have the same feeling of security if Canada was allied with certain other nations of Europe, Germany for example? I know the answer and so do you. No.

You say the source of the bond between the United States and Europe is of race and not of political ideology. Again you do not understand American traditions, Mr. Lindbergh. We speak the English language, our laws are fundamentally based upon the English common law, and to a great extent our concepts of liberty and freedom come from the English. What claim did the American colonists assert at the start of the American Revolution? Was it not their rights as British subjects, which rights were being withheld and abrogated to a great extent through the influence of a German who at that time sat on the throne of England?

Of what racial descent was Washington, Jefferson, Madison, Monroe, Adams, Franklin, and the vast majority of those who fought the American Revolution, wrote the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution, and who guided the destiny of this Nation when it was small and weak, and who finally welded a great Nation? Yes; our racial bond here was with the British Isles but I am American enough and thus fair enough to admit that the sons and daughters of other nations helped some then and later came in large numbers to America and have shared in its development, and all praise to them.

There are bonds, however, Mr. Lindbergh, which unite more permanently than those of racial descent. These are the bonds of ideals and customs, namely, religious, political, and legal and civil and ethical. Of these, our religious ideals are from Christianity (although religious freedom is permitted), as is exemplified by words in the Declaration of Independence and even by words on our coins. Our political and legal and civil ideals are derived fundamentally from those of England, refined and adapted, of course, to America. Our ethical ideals are those of fair play and honor, which we inherited from our British colonists. So we have a bond with Christianity. We all know how Christianity fares in Germany as compared to how it fares in England, France, and Canada. You never mention Christianity, however; that is the trunk from which stem the branches of freedom and the rights of man. We have a bond with political and legal and civil liberty and we all know how they fare in Germany as compared to England, France, and Canada. We have a bond with the ethical concepts of fair play and honor, and we all know how they fare in Germany as compared with England, France, and Canada. Those things represent the higher things for which man has striven through the ages. They are the ties that bind freemen everywhere. So you see, Mr. Lindbergh, there are bonds between the United States and some other nations deeper than the bonds of race. As a matter of fact, from the viewpoint of race, we should all be Americans without any hyphens. Racial superiority is a German theory, not an American, Mr. Lindbergh.

So, Mr. Lindbergh, the bonds that unite; the things that represent the very soul of America; the traditions that, thank God, have been handed down from generation to generation for over 300 years in America—are the superiority of Christianity over paganism and atheism, the superiority of free political and civil institutions over totalitarianism, and the superiority of honor and justice and fair play over lying, injustice, and cheating.

You are famous, Mr. Lindbergh. I am not, but I do not envy you after listening to your address. Quite the contrary, for I have the priceless heritage of having in my veins the blood of those who helped to settle Maryland in 1634 and to give the world religious freedom and all that stems from that; the blood of those who fought in the Revolution, the War of 1812, and the Civil War; and the blood of those who, in high positions, helped to guide the footsteps of a new nation and to set up its institution. From those ancestors I have inherited that deep devotion for those ideals which have made the United States great. My task has been to receive those ideals from those who went before me, honorably uphold them, and then pass them on to my children. That is a larger task than it may appear at first glance, but it is an honor. I have tried to fulfill my duty.

My prayer is that I may always do my duty to God and America. I, too, deplore war with its destruction, death, and despair. I also pray that it may never again come to America or be the lot of Americans. This for my sons, for your sons, and for all of my fellow citizens. When I pray, I do so as one who volunteered and went overseas in the World War, who shed his blood at the front in France, and who returned home crippled for life physically. I did my duty then, and if need be—which God forbid—I am willing to again offer the last measure of devotion, wherever and whenever I can be of service to the United States, at home or over the seas. Honor, duty, and patriotism were handed to me by my forefathers unsullied; I shall try to hand them to my sons in the same condition, and I hope that they will be able to do so to their sons.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES W. TISDALE.

The Arms Embargo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS E. MARTIN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 2, 1939

ARTICLE FROM CHICAGO HERALD-AMERICAN OF OCTOBER 23, 1939

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Chicago Herald-American of October 23, 1939, entitled "Political Parade":

[From the Chicago Herald-American of October 23, 1939]

POLITICAL PARADE—WE NEED THOSE ARMS OURSELVES

(By George Rothwell Brown)

WASHINGTON, October 23.—The cold-blooded, callous indifference to the critical necessities of this country which has been shown thus far in the extra session by the House of Representatives marks a new all-time low, even for "rubber-stamp" New Deal Congresses.

The subservience of the so-called Democratic leaders to White House command increases as election year, 1940, draws on apace, and the conviction deepens in the politician's mind, as he thinks of his job security, that the war will break down the two-term

tradition, and that the President will again be renominated, this time for an indefinite term—that is to say, for the rest of his life.

Not a finger has been lifted by House Democrats, in absolute control of that body, to remedy any of the Nation's existing ills.

Under the supine leadership of RAYBURN and BANKHEAD, not a thought has been given to the 10,000,000 people still out of jobs in the United States.

For 7 of the 11 years of this artificially prolonged panic, the Democratic New-Deal coalition is clearly responsible.

Today one senses at the capital that the party which in July anticipated defeat in next year's elections today counts solely upon being saved by the European war.

The national defense in this country today is in a deplorable state.

There need be no concealment about it. Every foreign spy knows it.

Yet at the Senate there is no thought whatever in responsible quarters for safeguarding the defenses of America, but thought only of safeguarding the defenses of Great Britain and France.

Not once in the debate, so far as this writer knows, not even by the opponents of embargo repeal, has any statement been made tending to show how devastating to the national defense of the United States the repeal of the arms embargo might prove to be.

The hypocrisy which originally clothed the demand for repeal of the arms embargo has been stripped off.

Only congenital idiots doubt that the whole purpose is that the United States may aid France and England in defeating Germany, a country with which we are at peace.

If the embargo is repealed, and munitions and airplanes and airplane parts are supplied by American industries to the allied European powers, this can only be at the expense of our own defenses.

It will be argued in rebuttal that the munitions industries will be stimulated in this country, that they will go into heavy production, and that in the event of an emergency—meaning our own involvement in the war—we can instantly cause the cancelation of foreign contracts, and begin at once to draw upon these munitions plants for our own Army and Navy requirements.

This begs the question. The scarcity of arms, munitions, and armaments for our own armed forces is acute and immediate.

Congress is poorly informed, or informed not at all, upon some of the most vital situations.

The airplane contracts with France have stripped the United States of the finest pursuit bombers we possessed.

Congress has made lavish appropriations for airplanes for the Army, and it is true that contracts have been let, but it will take a year to build them.

Before the Senate votes finally on repeal of the arms embargo, a committee should call before it the experts of Army and Navy, and get a complete picture of the possible consequences to our own national defense.

Such a committee would learn plenty. Why vote in ignorance?

Preservation of Property Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LELAND M. FORD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 2, 1939

RESOLUTION BY THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF REAL ESTATE BROKERS

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution adopted by the National Association of Real Estate Brokers:

Whereas the very foundation of a democracy such as the United States of America and the preservation of its social institutions and of a stable society within it is dependent upon widespread ownership of the land on the part of the citizen and his full enjoyment of the rights that flow from that ownership; and

Whereas legislative acts in various States and in the Congress of the United States have been introduced and in certain cases still are pending, the effect of which would be to impair the benefits of land ownership; and

Whereas some of such acts even go to the extreme of attempting to defeat existing titles established over long periods of time: Be it

Resolved by the National Association of Real Estate Boards at Los Angeles, Calif., October 27, 1939, That we deprecate attempts on the part of government, whether municipal, State or Federal, to acquire certain benefits of ownership by legislation under the guise of the public interest or to deprive citizens of their rights of property without due process of law and adequate compensation.

NOTE.—This is a statement of a general principle, intended to cover, among other things, such cases as have arisen in Texas, California, and other States where an ownership question has arisen as to submerged lands on navigable waters.

Anniversary of Gift of the Statue of Liberty to the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VITO MARCANTONIO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 2, 1939

STATEMENT AND ADDRESS

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herein the following statement and speech delivered on the occasion of the fifty-third celebration of the anniversary of the gift of the Statue of Liberty to the United States by France:

STATEMENT BY REV. HERMAN F. REISSIG, CHAIRMAN, AMERICAN COMMITTEE FOR PROTECTION OF FOREIGN BORN

It is important, in celebrating the anniversary of the dedication of the Statue of Liberty, that we pause to recall the great role played by the immigrant in the building of America. Too often do we overlook the debt we owe to the foreign-born while certain people, as a result of the war in Europe, are today intensifying their efforts to besmirch the name and intentions of the foreign-born. On this day, dedicated to the memory of the Statue of Liberty and all the statue signifies in our American history, it is incumbent upon all clear-thinking and conscientious Americans to give the lie to those who would attack the foreign-born and deprive them of their rights.

Those forces seeking to bring the foreign-born into disrepute are in reality seeking a means of attacking the rights of all Americans. We must on this birthday of Lady Liberty—who has always welcomed the immigrant and held her torch of freedom outstretched toward him—rededicate ourselves and our country to those principles of equality and justice which have always characterized our dealings with the immigrant in our midst.

The American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born calls to the attention of the American people the urgent need to revise our naturalization laws to enable all noncitizens to become naturalized American citizens. In this way can we best fulfill the promise of freedom and equality which the Statue of Liberty has always held out to native- and foreign-born.

ADDRESS BY LEONARD COVELLO

Friends and fellow Americans, when I first saw the Statue of Liberty in New York Harbor I was 10 years old. My mother and I, together with my small brothers, were coming from Italy to America to join my father, who had preceded us to the United States to prepare a home for us here. On the voyage across there had been a storm at sea. We were glad when we were at the end of our long journey and saw the great Statue of Liberty rising out of the sea with arm extended in welcome.

At the close of the World War I stood again on the deck of an incoming ship, straining my eyes for a sight of that statue and the skyline of New York City. It was not the first time since I had become a citizen of the United States that I had been to Europe and home again. Many times I had watched for the sight of land in the ocean that meant that America was near. But in 1919, returning from war service overseas, the figure of Liberty in the harbor was like that of a friend, waiting to welcome me home again. I was glad to be back, and I was stirred by a new sense of appreciation of what America means and stands for.

Many of the sons of immigrant Americans had gone overseas. As Americans they had tried to serve the cause of democracy. And in Europe they had learned how the souls of men crave freedom and equality, of which the Statue of Liberty has become a symbol to the world.

As a man, experienced in the knowledge that only war can give, I was better able to understand the meaning of the words "liberty," "equality," "tolerance," and "justice," which are the essence of the American ideal. The symbolism of the beacon light in the uplifted hand of the Statue of Liberty is clearer to a man than it is to a child. But, even as a child, I would sometimes remember how the Statue of Liberty looks, as it stands in the harbor, arm uplifted, a light for the world in its hand. I used to feel that I wanted to give something fine to America, because of the way in which America gives, to immigrants of all lands, the opportunities that are a part of freedom and democracy.

The children of Americans of foreign birth were born on American soil. They are a part of America; they belong to America and America belongs to them; it is their native land. Today, there are 42,000,000 people of foreign origin in the United States. I believe that most of these Americans of foreign origin feel—as I have often felt—that they would like to give worth-while services and contributions to America, in appreciation of what America has endeavored to give to the peoples of the world.

To the immigrant and his children, the ideals of liberty are not a myth. The immigrants that came to the United States brought

with them memories of wars and of sacrifices made by themselves and their forbears for the cause of freedom. For freedom is a natural heritage that belongs, by right, to all mankind; and liberty, I think, has a deeper meaning for those who have made sacrifices for the sake of liberty, more, perhaps, than it does for those who have never been called upon to make sacrifices for the cause of freedom; and I know that both foreign-born Americans and native-born Americans share a common tradition of sacrifice, made by past generations of men and women who have fought and died—or lived and served—in the cause of liberty.

For all of us, it is significant that this great Statue of Liberty, in the harbor of New York City, came to us as a gift from one of the freedom-loving nations beyond the ocean. This fact, it seems to me, is symbolic of the common bond of brotherhood that exists among all men: a bond which shall, in time, find expression in a larger world freedom—a freedom strengthened by a brotherhood among men that shall make hatreds and wars impossible.

This gift to the United States from France—this Statue of Liberty—stands not alone for liberty; it stands, as well, for understanding and comradeship among nations. Out of such understanding and comradeship, there shall come, finally, peace and brotherhood, for which all men are constantly striving.

War—by which peace and freedom are being destroyed throughout the world today—only strengthens in the hearts of men, a desire for peace; it makes all the brighter the torch of liberty in a war-darkened world.

Peace, good will to all mankind, equality, tolerance, freedom, justice—a haven of refuge for the oppressed—these are the things for which America stands in the minds and hearts of the foreign-born peoples that have founded their homes in the United States. And to these people, the Statue of Liberty is a sign to the world that eventually—as Thomas Jefferson hoped—freedom, like a consuming flame, shall destroy—wherever they may exist—intolerance and hatred and oppression among the peoples of the world.

Sam D. McReynolds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, November 2, 1939

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I should certainly be derelict in a sacred duty if I completed my first session in the Halls of Congress without paying tribute to my distinguished predecessor, the late lamented Judge SAM D. MCREYNOLDS. The post I occupy is hallowed with the memory of the services he rendered to his State and his Nation. I bring to this assembly, not only my personal lament, but the voice of the entire Third District of Tennessee, united in its sorrow for the passing of the man whom they loved and honored.

Judge MCREYNOLDS for 20 years graced and distinguished the bench as judge of the Sixth Judicial Circuit in the Volunteer State. His personality softened the accuracy and correctness of his decisions, his mien dignified the court, and his brilliant mind left deep its impress on the jurisprudence of the State.

When elected to the National Congress in 1922, he brought to his seat the mellowness and maturity of a life most men would then have been willing to acclaim as a fulfilled and successful career. A larger and more useful public service was in its incipiency. Seventeen consecutive years the citizens of the Third District were privileged to be represented in Washington by this man who so consecrated his personal life to a sacred public trust.

In 1932, his elevation to the chairmanship of the Committee on Foreign Affairs marked the beginning of the final glorious chapter of a man whose life had been dedicated to the public weal. As chairman of this important committee during a period of international unrest, his service transcended the local bounds of a congressional district and his stature assumed national importance. His leadership stamped him forever with the imprint of statesmanship. When on July 11 of this year Judge SAM D. MCREYNOLDS was called home to his well-earned rest and reward, this earnest east Tennessee patriot's passing was mourned by a sorrowing Nation. The United States had truly suffered a loss. Yet, for all of his glorious public service, the most compelling memories of Judge MCREYNOLDS are associated with his private life which, as so many of his colleagues have said, was most exemplary. He was truly a kind husband, an indulgent father, and a warm and consistent friend. Add to this his ability as a lawyer, his service as a judge, and his accomplishment as a statesman and the dimensions are those of a man who has been truly destined to receive the blessings of history.

Address Before Conference on War Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH E. CASEY
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, November 2, 1939

ADDRESS BY HON. JOSEPH E. CASEY OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me:

No man of intelligence today would even attempt to address an audience on a subject remote from war. It is our immediate and omnipresent concern. Nevertheless, the issues of war and peace as such are not before us. This Nation, after proclamation by the President, is a neutral nation—at peace. And I pray God that it may ever remain so.

But neutral though we may be, we are not insulated from the effects of war abroad. And it is about one of these effects that I propose to talk today—the effect of war on prices generally and the cost of living.

For most consumers the cost of living is never low. It is always too high in terms of their wage, salary, and, perhaps, other income. Most consumers just never seem able to bring both ends together in a friendly gathering. This is true during periods of falling or stable prices as well as during periods of rising prices. Rising prices simply make a bad situation worse. And if there is a substantial rise in prices the cost of living becomes higher than too high.

My first thought, as was yours, when we witnessed the market jump of the last 2 months, was what happened during the last war. And the record shows that the really significant price increases did not start on a broad sweep until late in 1915, although certain commodities did get out of line almost immediately. Once prices gained momentum, however, they reached for the sky. Wholesale prices, as a matter of fact, increased by 75 percent during our period of neutrality.

Without stopping to detail the breadth and degree of price rises, it suffices to say that even before April 1917 it became imperative for the Government to take action—action, in many cases, of the most drastic kind.

Some of you may even remember the War Industries Board and the Price Fixing Committee, the Food Administration, and the Fuel Administration, and the Railroad Administration. Prices were fixed and priorities granted, business and industry was licensed, and profit margins determined.

There are those who feel that each generation must learn its own lesson—but a few lessons we learned during the last war we will not soon forget.

In the first place we learned that government can't abdicate in a time of crisis, and permit the economy to be manipulated by self-appointed conservators. For we learned that when business is left to its own devices, it boosts prices—profits, wages, production, inventories, and even patriotism to the contrary notwithstanding.

In the second place we learned to our bitter regret that when we finally did devise certain price controls, it was too late. The damage had been done long before they were in effective operation.

And we learned another lesson. We learned that price controls based upon the idea of "business self-regulation" in the sense of self-regulation through the devices of trade associations and the like, are deceptive and misleading. They are not controls—but simply another form of the illusion that a man is the best judge of his own case.

We learned by trial and error; and we made many mistakes—mistakes, however, which we shall not repeat again.

But the pessimists who say that we never learn by experience have some evidence at their side. Since the outbreak of the European war, there occurred sharp price increases which, in my opinion, can be explained only on the hypothesis of ignorant speculation or downright profiteering.

Buyers and bidders who were not seeking goods for their own use, flooded the markets with orders for the sole purpose of obtaining goods for resale at a higher price. Without stopping to analyze the basic differences between 1914 and 1939; without pausing to consider where new buyers were coming from or how goods accumulating on the shelves would be paid for; and

ignoring, as if it were a casual thing, the repercussions on the Nation as a whole, they bought, stupidly and blindly, but they bought.

They bought so much so fast that in 1 week, to take a single example, the price of sugar jumped 34 percent. Was there a shortage of sugar? There was not. Was there an increase in the consumption of sugar? There was not. Was there ever a reasonable possibility, a suspicion, that the sources of supply would be closed or inadequate? There was not. Nevertheless, the price of sugar jumped 34 percent.

Despite large existing sources and supplies of sugar, the poignant memories of wartime shortages and high prices proved too much—professional traders and housewives alike succumbed to the dread epidemic of panic buying.

Wholesale food prices have gone up 18 percent; cotton goods, 12 percent; woolen and worsted goods over 21 percent. On the average, wholesale prices have gone up about 5 percent. Should this rate continue for a full year, wholesale prices would be more than 30 percent above the August level.

Prices at retail have also taken a rise as you all know. On the average the increase has probably been of about the same magnitude as the wholesale price rise. But for many commodities, advances have been marked. In 12 typical cities scattered over the Nation the retail price of butter showed increases as much as 19 percent; of flour as much as 28 percent; and lard, essentially a meat-packing byproduct, as much as 35 percent.

Certain of our businessmen, as well as our consumers, had apparently forgotten (1) that the increase in exports late in 1914 was due largely to the fortuitous circumstances that European crop yields during that year were poor; (2) that industrial activity in the United States did not turn up until well into 1915; and (3) that the upward sweep of commodity prices did not begin until the latter part of 1915. And not content with disregarding the experiences of the last war, they distorted its lessons by telescoping the developments of 18 months into a period of a few weeks.

If commodity speculation continues long, it leads not only to higher prices for the products you buy, but also piles up burdens of indebtedness. Temporary profits on inventories are capitalized, securities are issued, and property is passed from hands to hands. But when the boom breaks, as it must, the country finds that it has added nothing to its means of production and must bear the heavy weight of ever-growing debt.

Unless the inventories now being accumulated are matched by increased purchasing we shall experience the same inevitable consequences as we did in 1937. In fact, many expert observers are of the opinion that a recession is in store for the winter of 1940.

That profit seekers and price boosters have not changed their habits since 1916 is shown by the 1936–37 experience. Opportunities for high profits were available through an expansion of output, but business—particularly big business—was not willing to make them in the way best suited for the Nation as a whole. Instead, prices were boosted, so that the inevitable result was the sharpest industrial decline on record.

Today we find many examples of the same type of greed. Within the last 2 months the price of cylinder oil has risen 68 percent, while the price of crude oil, from which it is made, has mounted only 11 percent; the price of zinc has, for no logical reason, gone up 34 percent; copper has risen 20 percent; and oleo oil has advanced 43 percent. These commodities are all produced domestically in adequate quantities for domestic needs.

I want to give a concrete illustration of the boom and aftermath aspects of the current situation. Cotton textiles is as good as any. The price of raw cotton to mills has been little affected by the European war. In fact, it is lower today than during the summer months. Yet cotton-textile prices are up 23.3 percent, and the mill margin is 50.6 percent higher. There can be little question but that profits have increased. At the same time inventories have piled up, as is indicated by the recent report that print-cloth sales were estimated at only 50 to 60 percent of current production. Certainly prices have not been set so as to permit high levels of consumption. The law of supply and demand is being applied by mills to net them a speculative profit on the inventories now being accumulated. Unless someone here or abroad comes along to buy up those inventories, sooner or later there will be a slump, and a serious one, in cotton textiles. Until then the consumer pays—as he always does—by higher prices.

Inventory speculation is one danger; but another, and perhaps more serious danger, lies in the field of administered prices. I state it as a fact that there exist areas in our economy where prices are privately set and privately controlled with little or no regard to market demand and supply—areas in which the impersonal controls of a competitive economy are inoperative. For the moment I'm not interested in the mechanics of private price control or the legality of private price control—these problems are now being investigated by the Temporary National Economic Committee, which begins its study of the steel industry next week. But I am deeply concerned by the fact that it is in these industries, too, that prices frequently shoot up at the first sign of increased demand, regardless of the fact that the particular industries are operating below capacity.

Think of it: at a time when increases in the rate of operation are lowering unit costs and increasing profits many times over, the costs of living are further increased by deliberately planned increases in prices. In time of peace, these monopolistic price practices are at best dangerous, and lead to recurrent depressions; but in times of emergency, they constitute a menace to the safety and well-being of the nation which may not be tolerated.

There are those who seek to justify such increases on the ground that business today has a right to profits that otherwise would be deemed inordinate in order to make up for the lean years of the past; that business has a right to exorbitant charges in order to raise the average of profits over the years.

The argument, however, is suspiciously one-sided.

Will business also concede that labor is entitled to a fourfold or higher return as compensation for years of part-time employment and depressed wage rates? Will business agree that farmers are entitled to double or triple prices for livestock and dairy products and produce, because there were times when crops were left to rot in the field and livestock was slaughtered to avoid the effects of increased supply?

By no means. Nor do the farmers or laborers make any such suicidal demands. Reasonable wages and reasonable prices are all that they ask. And reasonable returns, based upon existing conditions, are all that any businessman can expect.

I say with emphasis that the consumers of this Nation will not guarantee the profits of business or insure business against its losses. And any attempt to exact such a guaranty by hold-up prices will be met by measures as stringent and severe as any that a long memory of wartime conditions will recall. Business banditry of this kind will not be endured. We will not soon forget that during the war profits after taxes were 225 percent of the pre-war figure.

Consumers already are demanding that something be done. Hundreds of complaints are pouring into Federal agencies from consumers all over the country. They are demanding not only that measures be taken to prevent further boosts but also, and more emphatically, that reductions be brought about.

To combat profiteering on the part of producers, consumers as private individuals have only two methods which they can adopt to prevent not only the decline in current purchasing power but also the drastic aftereffects of rising prices. First, they can refuse to buy from the worst offenders, and, second, they can attempt to match cost-of-living increases with wage increases. Both of these I recommend.

But in all candor I do not believe that prices can be kept within bounds by such limited weapons. After all, consumers' strikes have only a limited scope and wage increases are bound to be obtained only slowly if at all. For this reason I believe the chief reliance for preventing unwarranted increases in the cost of living must be upon the Government.

I do not like glib analyses in pat categories, particularly the kind which pose their dilemmas on the brutal balance of an "either" and an "or." But I affirm that the economic situation which confronts us today must be expressed in just those terms.

The "either," as I see it, is an intelligent price-and-purchasing policy on the part of business. The "or" is Government regulation in the best interests of consumers and producers. Business must either exercise its public powers in the public interest or government, in response to deep-rooted demand, will better serve those interests by management or regulation.

Nor is the Government today unprepared if the threat of price inflation should become real. The present situation, I hasten to reassure you, is far different from that in 1914.

Monetary and fiscal powers are already lodged in the Treasury, the Federal Reserve Board, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, and the State Department. These provide almost complete means for the control of credit, internal and external.

The speculative exchanges are subject now to the supervision of the Securities and Exchange Commission and the Commodity Exchange Administration.

Transportation, communication, and power rates and service are under the supervision of the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Federal Power Commission, the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Maritime Commission, the Federal Communications Commission, and the Civil Aeronautics Authority.

Housing and construction are deeply influenced by, if not dependent upon, the various lending and guaranty agencies—P. W. A., W. P. A., H. O. L. C., F. H. A., F. C. A., and others.

In the commodity field international movements may be largely regulated through the several import and export controls, the Maritime Act, and neutrality legislation.

Direct price mechanisms already exist for coal, oil, and farm products.

These, I know, may prove insufficient. And the moment that price inflation appears, if it does, Congress will not hesitate to act.

Data of price behavior and movements are already being gathered by the great departments of Government—Justice, Treasury, Commerce, and Labor, by the Federal Trade Commission, by the Federal Reserve Board, by the Bureau of Mines, and by others. Complete information will be available.

The President, moreover, has asked the Temporary National Economic Committee to be watchful of prices and undue price rises. Extraordinary increases by particular industries will be met by Government subpenas and public hearings.

If excessive profits threaten the balance of the economy, excess-profits taxes will be imposed with a speed that will belie the traditional languor of the democratic process.

If antitrust laws are being violated, prosecutions will follow with a vehemence spurred by the existence of an emergency.

If literal compliance with the clumsy prohibitions of the Sherman law still leaves room, as it well may, for dangerous antisocial activity, the full light of Government investigations and publicity will be turned on, at once, without hesitation. For there is no force stronger in a democracy—this democracy—than the power of

an enlightened public opinion. If there is profiteering this Nation of consumers will know where the guilt must be placed.

If the Government's own procurement program is hamstrung by unwarranted pricing, the Government might well enter into production on a competitive basis for the products of which it has need. If the less direct controls fail to stem the flood of profiteering, the principle of the yardstick can be extended from power to other fields.

If bottlenecks appear in production, and there are complaints of inadequate resources, a system of priorities will be adopted, to direct the flow of raw materials to the industries where they are most needed.

And if chiseling and profiteering persist, a system of direct price control will be instituted either of particular strategic commodities in the raw material or semifabricated stages, or general price control throughout the various steps in production and distribution.

One thing is clear: That the Government will not—indeed cannot—stand by, unconcerned if price inflation and dislocations appear. For it is on the avoidance of these things that our welfare depends. Our national defense will be decimated by undue price rises. And from the point of view of our internal welfare, it is imperative that we meet our national shortages in essentials such as housing, transportation, medical equipment, services and supplies, power, and the other demands of a civilized nation.

Some there are who purport to disregard the possibility of peacetime regulation, on the ground that somehow, something in the Constitution guarantees their right to blackmail the Nation because of their strategic position in the economy. And the Supreme Court is looked to as the citadel which will affirm that right.

But cases are made on legislation already enacted—and the N. R. A. was law for 2 years before its validity was questioned by the Court. Moreover, I venture to suggest that a different court may take a different view of the power of the Government to govern. I cannot believe that the powers of the Congress of the United States—the only body to which the people may look for relief—are so circumscribed and so weak that it will be unable to protect the Nation against the most vicious and dangerous kind of internal attack—profiteering

I am told, however, the "business" is "property," and that the due-process clause forbids the Congress to regulate or take such property.

Let me answer this in the words of Mr. Justice Holmes, a name not unknown in Boston:

"Delusive exactness is a source of fallacy throughout the law. By calling a business 'property' you make it seem like land, and lead up to the conclusion that a statute cannot substantially cut down the advantages of ownership existing before the statute was passed. An established business no doubt may have pecuniary value and commonly is protected by law against various unjustified injuries. But you cannot give it definiteness of contour by calling it a thing. It is a course of conduct and, like other conduct, is subject to substantial modification according to time and circumstances both in itself and in regard to what shall justify doing it a harm" (*Truax* v. *Corrigan*, 257 U. S. 312, 342–343 (1921)).

And here, too, I find Mr. Justice Brandeis concurring: "We must not forget," he tells us in the words of Marshall, "that it is a Constitution we are expounding * * * this Court has repeatedly sustained the exercise of power by Congress, under the various clauses of that instrument, over objects of which the fathers could not have dreamed * * *. We have likewise held that general limitations on the power of government, like those embodied in the due-process clauses of the fifth and fourteenth amendments, do not forbid the United States or the States from meeting modern conditions by regulations which 'a century ago, or even a half a century ago, probably would have been rejected as arbitrary and oppressive.' * * * Clauses guaranteeing to the individual protection against specific abuses of power must have a similar capacity of adaptation to a changing world" (*Olmstead* v. *United States*, 277 U. S. 438, 472 (1928)).

I note with satisfaction that the Holmes-Brandeis tradition has not been ended on the Supreme Court. Indeed, it has just begun.

Letter to Members of House Appropriations Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 2, 1939

LETTER BY HON. JERRY VOORHIS OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, as I stated on the first day of this session, it is my earnest conviction that something should be done toward the repeal of the 18-month provision contained in the Relief Appropriation Act of 1939, which was passed by the Congress.

It seems to me that since we have experienced a sharp increase in the cost of living, an adjustment should be made also in the "security wage" to make it more in accord with the rising cost of living.

I am, therefore, asking permission to include with my remarks the following letter to the Honorable EDWARD T. TAYLOR, chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations, copy of which was sent to all members of that committee, asking their earnest consideration of proposals which seek to bring about adjustments in the Relief Appropriation Act immediately after the passage of the neutrality bill.

OCTOBER 26, 1939.

Hon. EDWARD T. TAYLOR,
Chairman, Committee on Appropriations,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. TAYLOR: When the House passed the Relief Appropriation Act for 1939 last spring, it contained one provision against which there were most serious objections. This was the provision requiring that anyone who had been employed by the W. P. A. for 18 months must thereafter be summarily dismissed for a period of 30 days.

I realize that there was nothing in the law to prevent the reemployment of these people at the end of that time. As a practical matter, however, in view of the large number of people certified and in need of employment in certain areas, the 30-day lay-offs have actually turned out to be permanent dismissals. Furthermore, the people who have suffered from this provision have, I am certain, not been people who were unwilling to try to find jobs in private industry or so-called "chiselers." Rather, they have been women employed on sewing projects, attempting to support their children, and older men who have passed the age where industry will offer them employment. For these two groups, W. P. A. is more important perhaps than for any other group in the country.

I have received a very large number of communications, not only from my own district, but from all over the Nation, pointing out the difficulties to which this provision has led and expressing the earnest hope that it could be modified. In Southern California, there have been a great many protests from sponsors of projects to the effect that persons in very great need of W. P. A. employment, who were competent to perform the work of given projects, have been laid off and other persons absolutely unqualified placed in key positions out of necessity due to this requirement of law. The result has been not only great suffering on the part of individuals and their families, but also a decided reduction in the effectiveness of the W. P. A. program itself.

I believe I am not the only one who has introduced bills to change this provision. I believe also that a very large number of Members of Congress, even among those who voted in favor of this provision originally, would be very glad if it could be eliminated. I can see no good reason why action should not be taken on this matter at once.

In addition to this, we find that all people in the Nation are up against the problem of a sharply increased cost of living. The price of foodstuffs in particular has sharply increased. Since the W. P. A. wage is supposed to be a "security wage," it seems to me that some adjustment of this wage in accordance with the rising cost of living would be entirely necessary and proper at this time.

Of course, we all hope that the time will come when the fundamental solution for unemployment will be worked out and put into effect. Until that time comes, however, I think it is evidently true that the strength of our democracy depends in large measure upon the provision in the best and most effective way at our command for keeping people who would otherwise be compelled to subsist upon some form of dole busy at constructive work.

I am writing to ask most earnestly if the Appropriations Commitee would not be willing to consider these matters immediately after the conclusion of the vote on the neutrality measure.

Sincerely yours,

JERRY VOORHIS.

Dies Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 2, 1939

EDITORIAL FROM BOSTON EVENING TRANSCRIPT OF OCTOBER 26, 1939, AND ARTICLE BY JAY FRANKLIN FROM THE WASHINGTON EVENING STAR

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herein an

editorial and an article by Jay Franklin. The editorial is from the Boston Evening Transcript of October 26, 1939, and the Franklin article is from the Washington Evening Star. I commend their reading to the Members of Congress and to the readers of the RECORD as indicative of common-sense views on the publication of a mailing list of a left-wing organization and the consequent harm and injustice visited upon innocent people.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest that by the same logic and by analogy, it can be charged that every Member of Congress belongs to the Silver Shirts because we are on the mailing list of Mr. Pelley's magazine Liberation, published at Asheville, N. C., and the official organ of his pro-Nazi and Jew-baiting organization. We are likewise all affiliated with Father Coughlin because we are on his mailing list, and there is regularly sent to us issues of the weekly magazine Social Justice through the columns of which one may be regaled by startling and mysterious stories about Jew mendacities, international bankers contemplating the destruction of mankind in their own interests, "red" Communists with and without beards and with and without bombs in either hand, lurking under every bed or office desk.

So, Mr. Speaker, if one is to be adjudged guilty of complete subservience to and membership in an organization by the fact that his name has been placed upon the mailing list of such organization, I very much fear that the Members of the Congress are lost to all patriotism and hope of salvation. It is a crisis which must give us all pause. Let us take drastic steps now to anticipate the dread future which impends with all of these "reds" running around loose, all plotting dire things against the whites! It amazes me that the membership of this body is so complacent and contains men who are still able to show a sense of humor and crack jokes occasionally, and who manage somehow to heed Caesar's plea in the Shakespeare's Julius Caesar:

> Let me have men about me that are fat;
> Sleek-headed men, and such as sleep o' nights.

So, accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I submit these two editorials in the interests of general enlightenment. They are fair samples of many others which might be placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as an indication of a viewpoint entertained by writers throughout this country. No one can accuse the Boston Evening Transcript of being a Communist-front newspaper. As for me, Mr. Speaker, I am most delighted that the President of the United States and his charming and talented wife have each individually expressed their disagreement with the publication of the mailing list of the Washington, D. C., branch of the American League for Peace and Democracy in no uncertain terms.

The articles are as follows:

[From the Boston Evening Transcript]

SUICIDAL POLICIES

The Dies committee in one action may have torn down much of the respect and support it had been building up for its work during its second series of hearings. When it published the names of 536 Government employees yesterday on the grounds that they were either members or on the mailing list of the allegedly Communist-dominated American League for Peace and Democracy, it has unquestionably revived most of the charges that were first made against it.

During the first year of its hearings this committee was charged with fomenting "red" scares, with striving to embarrass the Roosevelt administration, and particularly with endeavoring to smear the National Labor Relations Board and thus to fortify a resurgent open-shop drive. When the committee buckled down to its second session it seemed that it would give the lie to most of these accusations. Its procedure was improved; it had added a liberal member, it balanced its investigations better as between Communist and Fascist groups, and it had abandoned its policy of providing anyone with names to call with a national rostrum.

But its latest action must make its recent converts draw back. Mr. DIES has admitted that all members of the League for Peace and Democracy are not Communist. Yet he knows that the odor of radicalism will stick to those whom he names. Moreover, he has presumably released the names of those who were merely on the mailing list and whose contact with the league may have been merely the donation of funds to the Spanish Republic.

Special suspicion will be aroused, in view of earlier charges against the Dies committee, by the inclusion of Edwin S. Smith's name. Mr. Smith is one of the more vigorous members of the National Labor Relations Board, presiding over the act which DIES has been accused of wanting to impair and weaken. One must wonder what good reason can possibly be accomplished by the publication of these names.

The spontaneous anger of Representative DEMPSEY, one of the committee's own members, and his denunciation of the action as a smear campaign furnishes further doubt of the committee's wisdom in this instance.

The publication of these names followed another rash outburst from the Dies committee, this time exclusively from its chairman, Mr. DIES. The indictment of Earl Browder, American Communist leader, apparently went to his head, for he promptly proclaimed that:

"There isn't a leader of any of these organizations (Fascist or Communist) who hasn't violated some penal law." He said there was ample evidence to prove this.

Well, if that is so, there seems slight need for continuing the Dies committee. We doubt, however, if Mr. DIES wants to end his work now.

With the outbreak of the European war, there was special need to walk quietly and to speak calmly. It is easy to convert the tense and hysterical emotions of wartime into witch hunts and "red" scares. The "red" hunt conducted by A. Mitchell Palmer at the close of the World War swept this Nation with such winds of intolerance that the Bill of Rights was all but uprooted. It would be easy, with rumors of espionage and sabotage rife, to whip up those same winds today.

All in all, we think the Dies committee has some fence mending to do if it is to continue its potentially useful work.

[From the Washington Evening Star, October 27, 1939]

WE, THE PEOPLE—WATCH YOUR STEP BROTHER ELK, YOURS MAY BE A COMMUNIST GROUP FRONT

(By Jay Franklin)

After consulting the precepts of the political bible, I am seriously considering having my Phi Beta Kappa key beaten into an ornamental gold toothpick for presentation to Representative MARTIN L. DIES, of Texas. For I have no desire to find myself in jail because I left my car parked eight inches from the curb.

Here's how it works. Mr. DIES has just made public a long list of Government employees who were members of the League for Peace and Democracy. It used to be the League Against War and Fascism, but changed its name when it seemed likely that there might be a war against fascism. Now it seems that some American Communists were members of the League for Peace and Democracy, so Mr. DIES announces that it is a Communist "front" organization and singles out its members in Government service for the uneasy honor of publication—as though a desire to prevent war and preserve democracy were an "un-American activity." And at the same time Mr. Earl Browder, a native-born Kansas boy who ran for President on the ticket of an American political party in '36, is arrested for being leader of the Communist Party. Sure, the charge is some monkey business with passports but everybody knows that he was arrested because he was a Communist leader, just as everybody knows that Mr. Fritz Kuhn was arrested for being the leader of the German-American Bund and not because Mr. Thomas E. Dewey [and not the bund members] believed that he had embezzled the bund's funds.

PHI BETA KAPPA—SH-H

So I am worried about my membership in Phi Beta Kappa. It is entirely possible that I have been misled in assuming that my possession of the little gold key is the reward for getting a flock of "A's" at Yale twenty-odd years ago. It is possible that the society's proclaimed belief—that "love of wisdom is the guiding power of life"—is a front for the Illuminati, the Jacobins, the Know-Nothings, or the Elders of Zion. After all, the letters "Phi Beta Kappa" are Greek and Greeks are foreigners, aren't they? And foreigners are aliens and aliens are suspects and suspects are agitators and agitators are "reds" and "reds" are Communists.

For that matter, how can I feel whether some of these desperate members of the League for Peace and Democracy are not also members of Phi Beta Kappa? They might be. Wheels within wheels, and the red star of Moscow dangling in masquerade on my unsuspecting abdomen all these years. Why not? If there are Communists in the League for Peace and Democracy that make the league a Communist "front," and if members of that "front" are also members of Phi Beta Kappa, that makes Phi Beta Kappa another Communist "front." And that makes me a Communist. Q. E. D.

PRACTICALLY IN JAIL

So I am worried. For if I am a Communist, as defined by Mr. MARTIN L. DIES, of Texas, in his efforts to perpetuate his House Committee on Un-American Activities, then I am exposed to the rigors of the law which punishes gangsters for rum running by sending them to prison on income-tax charges; that punishes Kuhn for leading the bund by charging him with the theft of his own organization's money; that lacks the courage to arrest Earl Browder for being a Communist—which is entirely legal—but indicts him because of what he allegedly did with his passport application. If it is to be open season on me, I am vulnerable on a thousand fronts. Sometimes I cross a street before the lights change. Sometimes I park overtime. I don't always pay my bills on time. Perhaps my chimney smokes; perhaps my income-tax return was not precise to the last decimal point. Perhaps I have been lacking in respect for some of our elected officials.

The rest of you can take your chances—Elks, Red Men, C. I. O., Masons, Knights of Columbus, Ladies' Aid Society, Father Mathew

Society, and Epworth League. But I'm worried. I think I stood near a Communist in the New York subway last winter and, since communism is the scarlet fever of congressional politics, I may have contracted the "red" rash without even knowing that I had accidentally become un-American.

Neutrality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILL M. WHITTINGTON
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, November 2, 1939

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, the most satisfactory neutrality legislation is based on international law. I have thought about neutrality from every angle. The causes of all wars are different. The nations of Europe are armed camps; armaments inevitably make for war. Every country should be free to deal with the crisis resulting from each war as it arises.

My whole thought with respect to neutrality is to promote the interests of the United States and to keep the United States out of war. There is much misunderstanding in the country and there have been many loose and unsound statements made on the floors of Congress respecting neutrality. The United States should continue its policy of good neighbor among the nations of the world. We accord to other nations the form of government under which they desire to live. At the same time we assert our right to maintain the form of government under which we live. Other nations are entitled to their forms of government and to foster their political ideals and ideologies so long as their attitude does not undermine American ideals.

We stand for freedom in religion and in government. We believe in the right to worship God according to the dictates of our own conscience. We stand for freedom of the press. We accord to other nations similar rights, but we oppose all efforts to undermine the freedom for which we stand. It has been asserted that if we retain the existing embargo, England and France will stop the war. The implication is that England and France are responsible for the war. Who started this war? If England had not supported Poland, the world would have had no respect for the British Empire. Whatever may be the ideologies of Great Britain and Europe, the world knows that Neville Chamberlain, Prime Minister of Great Britain, did his dead-level best to prevent war. The world knows today that Hitler started the war and that only Hitler can stop it.

Again there has been loud denunciation of communism, nazi-ism, and fascism. These ideologies are repugnant to me. I cannot understand a denunciation in one breath and an advocacy of measures that promote these policies in another. Existing arms-embargo legislation discriminates against Great Britain and France and favors Germany, Italy, and Russia.

DELUSION

It is a tragic delusion to say that the sale and transportation of munitions involved the United States in the World War. It is equally tragic to say that the repeal of the embargo will involve the United States in the present war. Only 13 percent of our total war exports to the Allies in the 30 months immediately preceding 1917 were of munitions, while 87 percent were of other commodities. Again, the one thing that got us in the World War was the destruction of American lives and American ships by German submarines. Not one of the ships sunk by the German submarines carried munitions. All of the loose and extravagant arguments in behalf of retaining the arms embargo to keep us out of war are based upon foundations that are false and upon a tragic delusion.

In the light of the World War it is clear that the only danger of our involvement lies in the fact that our ships under the existing law are free to traverse the seas with cargo for belligerents. Keeping American ships out of combat areas is the key to the peace of the United States. It is time for the Congress of the United States to consider the question from a national viewpoint. As individuals we are entitled to our sympathies and religious views, but as Representatives we act for the people of the United States in passing legislation with respect to our relations with other nations.

CASH AND CARRY

All concede that our neutrality legislation should be amended. The so-called cash-and-carry provision expired by the passing of time on May 1, 1939.

OBJECTIVES

The Senate bill is preferable to the House bill, which I sought to amend and which I supported. The pending legislation has two aims: The repeal of the present Arms Embargo Act and a comprehensive program regulating our commerce. It strengthens the cash-and-carry provision of existing law and it regulates the commerce of the United States with belligerent nations. These are the two objectives.

Under existing law American citizens and American vessels may enter war zones and may also enter the ports of belligerent nations. Under the Arms Embargo Act, arms, munitions, and implements of war cannot be sold to belligerents, but their ingredients and constituents can be sold. Cannons and airplanes cannot be sold, but scrap iron, gas, oil, corn, cotton, and wheat can be sold, and under existing law they can be delivered in American vessels.

THE PURPOSE

The purpose of the Senate bill is to strengthen existing neutrality legislation all along the line. It provides for the passing of title before shipment to any and all property that may be sold to belligerents. It thus eliminates the cause of involvement of the United States with any belligerent. American vessels are prevented from carrying on any kind of trade with belligerents. American citizens cannot travel on any vessel of a belligerent. It prohibits the arming of any American vessel in combat areas. It prohibits credit to belligerents. It strengthens existing law against making loans to belligerent nations. It provides that all commodities leaving the United States shall be paid for before they leave the port and that they shall be carried in foreign vessels.

MUNITIONS SOLD IN PEACE BUT NOT IN WAR

Under existing law arms, munitions, and implements of war may be sold in peace but not in war. Nations may buy to prepare for war. They may buy for offense but not for defense.

There is no inhibition against the sale of gas, oil, and scrap iron, and the raw materials that are used in the manufacture of munitions. Nations that are pursuing the path of peace are thus discriminated against by their inability to buy munitions when they are attacked and war is declared against them.

INTERNATIONAL LAW

Under international law the sale of arms, munitions, and implements of war is allowed. A mistake was made by adopting an arms embargo in the years 1935, 1936, and 1937, just as a mistake was made during the administration of Thomas Jefferson in adopting an embargo on commodities in 1807, which was repealed in less than 2 years. In repealing the Arms Embargo Act the United States is thus returning to the policy that has been pursued since the Republic was founded except for a period of the past 4 years. All concede that the regulation of the sale and transportation is for the Nation to deal with as a domestic problem. The pending bill places safeguards on the sale and transportation of arms and ammunition as well as commodities. In fact, to keep out of war we are waiving and sacrificing our rights and our freedom on the high seas. The United States is within its rights under general or international law in safeguarding the Nation and protecting the United States from becoming involved in war.

PEACEFUL NATIONS

The smaller and peaceful countries of the world have depended upon international law to purchase munitions when war is forced upon them. The small and peaceful countries

are therefore helpless unless they can enjoy this privilege. I assert the United States cannot remain neutral as long as the arms embargo remains on the statute books.

PARTIALITY

It has been stated by the advocates of the Arms Embargo Act that to sell arms, munitions, and implements of war to belligerents is to encourage mass murder. What about their sale in peacetime to be stored for use in war? Again, raw materials such as cotton and scrap iron can be used to manufacture bombs that will be used to destroy innocent populations, and they can be sold to belligerents.

UNNEUTRAL ATTITUDE

It has been strenuously asserted that to repeal the Arms Embargo Act would aid Great Britain and France and discriminate against Germany.

Germany found fault with the United States before the war. Germany will seize on any pretext. It will be impossible to please Germany. The fact is that the existing embargo contributes to the plans of Germany and her associates. The purpose of the repeal is not so much to aid England and France as it is not to give aid and comfort to Germany. If we are not willing to aid England and France in the war, we should not be willing to aid Germany. Russia is not at war. Italy is not at war. Yet, under the existing law, arms, munitions, and implements of war may be sold to Russia and Italy. It is true that there is an inhibition against the sale or reshipment to a belligerent. However, there is no reason why Italy cannot use the arms and munitions made in the United States and sell their manufactures in Italy to Germany. There is no reason why Russia cannot follow the same policy. Existing embargo operates in favor of Germany and against Great Britain and France. The provisions against export and reshipments may be violated, but if not violated they can be avoided.

If the embargo is not repealed, England and France have no authority to obstruct the shipments of implements of war to Italy or Russia. The arms embargo operates in favor of the nations that are bent on war and against the nations that have stood for peace.

Something is said about offensive and defensive weapons. The United States manufactures both. One will kill as quickly as the other.

CRITICISM OF ENGLAND AND FRANCE

It does no good to criticize the Government of England and France. All have made mistakes. So has the Government of the United States. If England has extended its empire, the United States has extended its domain. The one desire of the people of the United States is peace with all nations.

REPEAL NOT UNNEUTRAL

Under international law, in her own interests, the United States may repeal the embargo. Such was the policy during the administration of Thomas Jefferson. Such was the policy during the Ethiopian and Spanish conflicts, when the embargo was enacted. Moreover, the House had passed a partial repeal of the embargo before the present European war broke. The President of the United States announced that if war occurred in Europe, the Congress would be convened in extraordinary session to amend existing neutrality laws.

Warring nations have always been permitted to buy, and neutral nations have enjoyed the right to sell munitions. Belligerents have the right of blockade. Neutral nations today, under international law, can sell arms, munitions, and implements of war with the sole exception of the United States. But it is said that some nations have adopted an embargo on arms. These nations are small and are in the war area. Ours is the largest and greatest nation in all the world. I favor the policy pursued by Washington, Lincoln, and Wilson.

Again it is said that if we repeal the Embargo Act, warring nations will sink our ships. Denmark is a neutral country, but only recently one of her ships carrying a cargo of butter was sunk. Sweden is a neutral, and yet but a short time ago a Swedish ship carrying wood pulp was sunk. The arms embargo does not offer any assurance of peace. It only discriminates; it makes for war.

It will be difficult for the United States to stay out of the European war. We tried to stay out of the Napoleonic wars and finally we fought the War of 1812. We tried to stay out of the World War, and finally we were engaged in the greatest of all wars. The United States should remain neutral in deed and in truth. Congress should repeal legislation that is in favor of one belligerent and discriminates against the other. The Embargo Act should, therefore, be repealed.

We do not plan to lend money to England or France. We do not plan to engage our country in war. We do not plan to send our sons across the sea to fight another war.

LESSON

We have learned our lesson. Twenty-two years ago we determined to make a European war our own. We spent money without limit. We gave the flower of our young manhood. We sent battleships to Europe. We sent volunteers, and that not being enough, we conscripted and sent over there shipload after shipload until 2,000,000 of our men stood upon French soil. We spent $40,000,000,000 or more, and when we asked for the payment of our war debts when Europe was beginning to prepare for the present war, we were called Shylocks. The people are determined to keep out of European wars that have been raging intermittently for a thousand years. We stand for America first and America always.

The repeal of the arms embargo with the safeguard embodied in the pending Senate bill should contribute toward the neutrality of this country. The welfare of the human race demands that the United States remain at peace. We must make sacrifices to salvage civilization following the European war.

British Propaganda in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD P. NYE

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, November 2, 1939

ARTICLE BY PORTER SARGENT

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Porter Sargent on propaganda.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BRITISH PROPAGANDA IN THE UNITED STATES—THE EFFECTIVE MACHINE THAT GOT US INTO THE LAST WAR IS BEING OILED FOR NOISELESS ACTION AGAIN

(By Porter Sargent)

England in the last war was able to marshal the nations and the resources of the world against the Germans. No such widespread cooperation can be counted on today. The aid of the United States, then, is even more vital. Not only must Germany be smashed but the traditional enemy Russia and the menace of communism must be eliminated if British Empire and trade are not to vanish.

To bring us into the last war Britain put her best brains into her propaganda efforts. Now for 3 years an improved technique under skilled and trained propagandists has been working on us. The most essential feature of the propaganda is to keep it concealed, to deny that it exists. Such denials come chiefly from the mouths of American stooges and Anglophiles. To detect, to uncover, and to attract the attention of Americans to this subtle under-cover propaganda is a difficult and ungrateful task, but the most needed.

The clumsy Germans make no bones at all of claiming the unprepossessing Goebbels a propaganda genius—and in his noisy broadcasts it is perfectly apparent that he agrees with that view. As 25 years ago, with the coming of the new war the British set up a "Ministry of Information," whose improvised propaganda machinery under Lord Macmillan clanks so noisily it has become a matter of ridicule. But behind it the Foreign Office and its associated intelligence services with subtle political sense have perfected a miraculously smooth working organization under their No. 1 propagandist, Sir Robert Vansittart.

The British Empire was the conception of Disraeli. Flattering Victoria as Empress of India, he managed her skillfully. But England's politician statesmen continued to deride his imperialistic bombast. It wasn't till the eighties that the English were really sold on the empire idea. Kipling was one of the most successful in building up the idea that the islanders carried the "white man's burden." The vilified and "filthy Boers" gave them pause. But until long after Victoria's jubilee the Empire rode high, unchallenged, with a world-be-damned attitude, its only fear the Russian "bear that walked like a man."

Not until Germany grew in strength so as to threaten British trade and necessitate her being set back, did it become necessary to establish propaganda agencies. Clumsily organized at first during the war, before the end they had developed a far-reaching organization and a technique that changed the views and opinions of all the peoples it reached. Such measures as had been taken before the war to educate the British people, the people of the colonies, or the foreign neutrals, were still truthful. Nicolson in his Diplomacy tells us it wasn't till the war was on that it became necessary to tell lies. And today the one lie most successfully put forth by the propagandists in England and America has been that there is no British propaganda organization.

The key men of England who, behind the scenes, are now playing an important part in Britain's imperialistic adventures are referred to in England as "Lord Milner's Kindergarten."

"Milner's young men," the builders of empire, most of them Oxonians, were brought together and trained by Lord Milner, who was British High Commissioner in South Africa after the Boer War.

The core of the group was Fellows of All Souls, a nonteaching college, practically an exclusive imperialistic club of aristocrats. There were Geoffrey Dawson, then known as Robinson, now editor of the London Times, who was for a time one of Lord Milner's private secretaries; and Robert Brand, who with Philip Kerr (now Lord Lothian) reorganized the South African railways, but later went into the "City" and became a banker.

Lionel Curtis was regarded as the intellectual leader of this group. He acted as town clerk of Johannesburg, and later was one of the founders of the Royal Institute of International Affairs at Chatham House, of which he was honorary secretary from its inception in 1921 until 1929, and in which he is still active. Chairman of its council is Lord Astor of Cliveden.

Closely associated with Cecil Rhodes in the building of his South African empire, Lord Milner, founder in 1902 of the "kindergarten," acted as the Government representative for Rhodes. Lord Lothian has been secretary of the Rhodes Trust since 1925. It is natural then that Rhodes scholarships would eventually effect the union of the Anglo-Saxon nations and bring the erring colonies back under the crown.

LOTHIAN, BRITISH AMBASSADOR

"As Ambassador, it will be Lord Lothian's duty to win new friends for Great Britain in the United States, and to do all that he legitimately can, under accepted diplomatic proprieties, to swing American public opinion to Britain's cause," the Boston Transcript recognizes in an editorial, September 9, 1939. "There will be ever-increasing pressure, as in 1914, to bring the United States into the European conflict * * *. The pressure will come from within and without—from Americans who believe that the United States should again send an army overseas 'to make the world safe for democracy,' and from propaganda agents of the British and French Governments."

As early as May 7, 1939, before the date of Lothian's arrival was announced, Henry Ehrlich, Washington correspondent of the Boston Herald, anticipated: "He is coming here to identify American interest with the British, and there has been no secret about it."

Lothian comes to mop up after royalty and to ingratiate himself. "On the inside," Paul Mallon tells us, "they say the new British Ambassador, Lord Lothian, was instructed only by his Government to 'do anything the Americans like.'"

After his immediate 1½-hour conference with Roosevelt, the President's policy became more ingratiating. For England's No. 2 propagandist is a man of great adaptability, with "an unexcelled record of enthusiastic bandwagon-jumping," as Time, September 11, 1939, puts it. Sharer of Tory hatred of the Russian "reds," he recognized after his trip to Russia that "the existence of the Russian experiment has raised an issue which more and more will have to be faced by western civilization * * * the divine right of property." After visting Hitler in 1935 he reported, "I believe he is sincere," and in 1938 addressing the Royal Institute during the Austrian crisis explained that Hitler "has at last realized the dream of the German people * * * to be a united people. * * * Up to the present Hitler's objective has been justifiable."

The Chamberlain appeasement policy, Willson Woodside wrote in Harpers, December 1938, "is perceptibly shaping itself in accordance with ideas enunciated by Lothian * * * who, as Lloyd George's private secretary and alter ego, carried the Foreign Office round in his attaché case for 2 or 3 years after the war."

Lothian visited Germany immediately after Hitler's accession to power and is said to have played an important part in arranging the British loan to Hitler, of £750,000 in the spring of 1934. He played his part in getting the Tories to accept Hitler as their best defense against the "reds." In an address before the Boston Chamber of Commerce he once remarked, "No country can exist half-capitalist and half-Communist. It is one or the other."

In the series of articles he wrote for the London Observer, Lothian warned that, "If American sentiment became persuaded that the United States was being maneuvered into commitment to war by foreign intrigue or for reasons of politics or finance, it might equally swing back violently to the ultra-isolationism of the Ludlow amendment, requiring a referendum before the United States entered a war."

He shows an intimate understanding of the American attitude and reveals a clear conception of what must be done to bend it to British ends.

After 16 trips to this country Lothian found overwhelming sentiment that France and Britain should be assisted "to buy in the United States all the armaments they need." As for the President, "there is no doubt whatever where his own sympathies lie * * * that it is morally impossible for the United States to ignore the issue which is arising." He found even Hoover, who opposes war, admitting that 7 out of 10 Americans would say that if there is a world war, there is no possible means whereby the United States could keep out. This is told with all complacency, as evidence of the effectiveness of British propaganda.

It is not merely that England Expects—but that it subtly and effectively aids—Every American to Do His Duty. Quincy Howe, in his recent book by that title, explains just how the agencies of British propaganda have functioned in America during the past dozen years. The English Speaking Union is the "spearhead of England's cultural drive on the United States." Interlocking with it is the League of Nations Association, and to some extent the Foreign Policy Association, on the board of whose quarterly organ, Foreign Affairs, sit many members of the union. Howe follows the "British network" into the House of Morgan, which "found it impossible to be neutral;" into the Du Pont empire, associated with Lord McGowan's I. C. I., and into Pan American Airways. Through common directors he sees our radio featuring, as indeed it is now doing, pro-British broadcasters. Publishers and newspapers from the Anglophile New York Times down begin to fall in line behind the pronouncement of Richard H. Waldo, head of the McClure Newspaper Syndicate, who with delightful frankness admitted that "Perhaps the American Revolution and the War between the States were merely growing pains. * * * The whites must stand together. * * * Only the Anglo-Saxon people can provide the leadership, and only the British have the knowledge to make that leadership effective."

The parade these past 3 years of the wooden soldiers of the British army of propaganda through American drawing rooms, clubs, newspaper offices, over speakers' platforms, to the State Department and the White House, may have been wholly fortuitous. But to one who has closely watched the sequence, it would seem that some central intelligence must be at work. Pro-British speakers have been available without fee for every occasion. British authors, statesmen, and Anglophiles have been afforded opportunity to visit this country to address academic and civic bodies. We know from R. H. Bruce Lockhart (Guns and Butter) that such programs were planned for the Balkans by Sir Robert Vansittart.

If Vansittart did not play his part in this wave of advances upon us, then he certainly failed to do what was expected of him. He had been detached from other duties in order that he might coordinate all agencies and efforts and means of enlisting America in the next war. And he had been sedulously screened from public view that he might work unhampered by publicity.

It seemed innocent enough when John Buchan, Lord Tweedsmuir, was planted in Canada as Governor General. Buchan, "kindergartner," official chronicler of the war, apologist for the Government and the Empire, was director of information under the Prime Minister, 1917–18. Skilled, tactful, propagandist, he knows his job. But did Roosevelt know what his job was, when they exchanged visits and Roosevelt pledged allegiance and the blood and treasure of America to defend the Dominion? That was a safe and harmless boast. But it opened the way to more dangerous ventures.

Lothian was not here alone last fall. Lionel Curtis was here. Even Vansittart was here. Probably they met to compare notes and make further plans since carried out. Runciman, before he was sent to Czechoslovakia to prepare for Hitler, was sent to Washington to prepare our administration for what was to come to us.

English newspaper correspondents planted in Washington or metropolitan centers, like Sir Willmott Lewis of the London Times, or casual visitors like Sir Arthur Willert, former chief press officer of the British Foreign Office and former correspondent of the London Times, have skillfully presented views in their addresses or writings which have had their influence on public opinion.

THEN CAME ROYALTY

The more tactful approach of these men, skilled operators, has taken the place of the brusque bumptiousness of the majors and colonels who used to pop up in town halls and forums with their obviously pro-British sentiments. All these prepared the ground for royalty's advance agent, Anthony Eden, the white knight, who took innumerable pawns in the business world and the administration, opening the way for the Queen, who saved the King from being checkmated. Of course our gullible National Association of Manufacturers was led to invite and pay Eden, and the King and Queen condescended to make this side trip after their arduous conquest of Canada. England has always made us scramble for the opportunity to sacrifice ourselves and pay well for it.

Meantime, Americans in England were being "given the works," and Kennedy, our Ambassador, had come to heel of British tory influence and from half a dozen British and Scottish universities received honorary degrees. All this was on the highest social plane. C. S. Kent, business manager of the London Times, when he came for strictly business during February and March 1939, announced that his visits to the chief newspaper offices were merely social. Immediately following the headlines and lead paragraphs in our

leading Anglophile newspapers became more strongly pro-British. In the next few weeks millions of Americans became convinced that war was inevitable, that we should have to go in. That was the purpose.

With the approach of war itself the really heavy propaganda tanks began to rumble. But quietly, almost unnoticed, Lord Beaverbrook, Max Aiken, formerly of Nova Scotia, arrived September 30 on "personal business" and soon the result of his "personal" influence was apparent in our daily press, in new organizations.

Those directing the campaign proved again that Lord Northcliffe was right. When in 1917 Northcliffe visited American newspaper publishers to intensify Sir Gilbert Parker's propaganda, he remarked, "They dress alike, they talk alike, they think alike * * *. What sheep!" And he may well have added, "It's an easy job we have here." It was in 1917—will it be in 1939?

America's Parlor Pinks Are Indignant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. PARNELL THOMAS

OF NEW JERSEY

Thursday, November 2, 1939

EDITORIAL FROM THE BERGEN EVENING RECORD, HACKENSACK, N. J.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial appearing in the Bergen Evening Record, Hackensack, N. J., on October 30:

[From the Bergen Evening Record, Hackensack, N. J.]

AMERICA'S "PARLOR PINKS" ARE INDIGNANT

Congressman MARTIN DIES has incurred the anger of many groups by his sensational disclosures of the ramified organizations which are accused of working secretly to overthrow a form of government founded on the so-called capitalistic system in this priceless land which gives them free education, speech, press, assembly, and opportunity. It gives them also the right to publicly purge their political opponents with ballots in the time-tested American way. Just now his bitterest critics are certain leaders of the euphonious American League for Peace and Democracy, which succeeded the late lamented League Against War and Fascism.

Whether the new organization is honeycombed with subversive communism camouflaged by a front of "parlor pinks" and collegiate intelligentsia, we do not of our own knowledge know, but DIES and his committee seem to have gotten painfully under their collective skins. They protest vociferously the publication of a partial membership list, and challenge DIES to waive his congressional immunity to let them sue him for libel. We think they protest too much—that is, unless the company in which the collegiate "pinks" now find themselves is too crimson a blot on their lily-white escutcheons.

But why blame DIES? He didn't inveigle these members of the intelligentsia into joining an organization which witness after witness has sworn is merely a front for working Communists who take their orders direct from Moscow; and, if those witnesses lied, why all the bitter denunciation of DIES for publishing the roster of what purports to be an American patriotic organization? Surely, if the American League for Peace and Democracy is like Caesar's wife, its members ought to be proud to stand up and be identified by their American friends and neighbors.

But the suspicion grows that thousands of Americans of respectability and liberal tendencies have lent their names to organized euphemisms which cannot stand the careful scrutiny of their neighbors. Their errors have been mostly in their omission to properly investigate rather than in their commission to secretly effectuate the hidden purposes of the national organizers of such pseudo-patriotic organizations. Most of them never inquired about the antecedents of those organizers, how they lived, or who paid them for their work. American joiners seldom do. Too many of them listen to a plausible story of a short cut to an ephemeral human goal; they join, repeat a ritual, wave a figurative flag, and later often hold the bag.

Their legal right to do all this cannot be infringed, and that's the main reason why the land of the free is such a fertile field for the Nazis, Communists, or what have you. All of them—goosesteppers, amateur "pinks," and professionad "reds" alike—can thank their stars that tolerant America is a government of law, not of men. Were it otherwise, a figurative Mr. Dies instead of giving them a blast of publicity in a free press might give them a blast of gunfire in a dark cellar.

Admittedly our American elective, legislative, and juridical way to human rights and progress is tedious and slow, but it is infinitely cheaper and healthier for the ruled and the rulers alike. Ballots are much safer and more humane than bullets in the land where speech is free but where talk is often too cheap. Where the Russian "reds" and the German Nazis come from, the price of opposition talk is death or at least the concentration camp. These adopted citizens know all that, but our native-born parlor "pinks" have not yet had such revealing contacts with the ideologies of their preceptorial dreams. If they were compelled to spend 3 months in those lands of totalitarian slavery, they would jump the first ship back and kiss the soil of the free United States when they arrived.

Yes, they would then see the vast gulf that separates totalitarian enslavement and democratic freedom. In the one, opposition mouths are closed with regimented guns and bullets; in the other, opposition eyes are opened with untrammeled logic and reason. If that editorial conclusion may seem too harsh and terse, it might be well to remember that dictatorial death is even harsher and terser. A trip to Russia or Germany should convince the most rabid American "pink" or Nazi of the logic of that conclusion.

Neutrality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 2, 1939

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, in discussing the question of American Neutrality and the lifting of the embargo we are all united on one and the most important thing, and that is, a sincere and steadfast desire to keep America out of war. On that point there is no difference of opinion in this House, no partisanship, no compromise.

As to the means and the methods of preserving our neutrality and keeping out of the European war there are varying shades of opinion among the Members on both sides of the aisle. Certainly it will be admitted that neither party as represented in this body has a corner on patriotism and the love of peace. Democrats and Republicans will resist every effort to inveigle America into the war which, however much we may be inclined one way or another toward the belligerents, is admittedly a foreign affair and one to be settled by themselves.

I am interested however in preserving the traditional and fundamental rights of America and her citizens. Under no circumstances will I yield to threats or pressure from either the Nazi-Communist side or, for that matter, the side of the democracies.

It is now and always has been the privilege of America to control her internal policy. We always enjoyed the privilege to manufacture and sell any and all products whether of the mine, mill, or factory. Foodstuffs and manufactured goods under our policy could be and were sold or refused to nations without regard to their reactions. That is our privilege, our sacred God-given right.

We chose as a nation to employ the embargo on more than one occasion against various nations and we have that same unabridged right at the present time. Whether we want to use it or not is, of course, a debatable question.

Whatever the outcome of our collective action here in the Congress it will be the will of the majority, the will of the great bulk of our American citizens.

As I appraise the feelings of our people, and particularly those in my district, the attitude is overwhelmingly in favor of the cash-and-carry provision of the bill under consideration. Certainly there is no doubt about the intended restriction to be imposed upon our shipping and travel in the designated danger zones, and I am confident that the question of lifting the embargo is equally supported by the vast majority of our people.

There will be a sharp reaction among the belligerents and we will be applauded and condemned by one side or other, depending upon whether we change the present law or permit it to remain unchanged. If the embargo is lifted the Commu-Nazi alliance will charge violation of neutrality and will gnash their teeth and threaten dire consequences; if we fail to do so the democracies will complain bitterly and may go equally as far in their expressions of disappointment.

Doubtlessly our votes are important and might have a bearing on the outcome of the European war. In fact, I believe

that the lifting of the embargo, restricting our shipping and our travelers, along with the cash-and-carry provision, will be the prime factors in keeping America out of war. On the other hand, if my vote will, purely as an incidental matter, help to strangle and strike down the international thugs and rapists who, under the banners of the Communists and Nazis, enslaved millions of their own people, subjugated and destroyed Austria, Czechoslovakia, and martyred Poland, imposed a reign of terror, persecution, and Godlessness upon Catholics, Protestants, and Jews, suppressed trade-unionism, Masonry, and personal liberties, brutally murdered priests, ministers, rabbis, monks, and nuns, then I want to say that my vote will be doubly valuable and truly American. I have always been taught by my church and by the example of our great American forefathers that all mankind has the right to enjoy these God-given privileges which we Americans enjoy.

I will not be charged as having contributed to the permanent establishment of fiendish militarism by my vote or as having aided and abetted the forces of antichrist which are rampant and threaten the security of the great and peaceful Scandinavian nations of Sweden, Norway, Denmark, and heroic and progressive Finland. I will not be called upon to strike my breast and sorrowfully acknowledge my guilt should Belgium, Holland, or Switzerland, singly or together, be victimized by the war-crazed Nazis.

The fangs of the Commu-Nazis have been bared to the vision of the struggling Balkan nations, and in the path of this peaceful group lies as a prospective victim a great and cultured, peace-loving people within the boundaries of Hungary. The safety and happiness of these people is admittedly not our problem or responsibility, but our votes may be, as an incidental, their salvation. The main purpose of my vote is to preserve traditional American rights and to keep America out of war.

I will not be charged with open, or even tacit, alinement with Commu-Nazis, the murder of Dolfuss, the torture of Schuschnigg, the destruction of peaceful sovereign states, or the murder of countless thousands of peaceful citizens and their spiritual shepherds.

In closing let me express my complete approval of the remarks of my distinguished colleague the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], and let me add that the slippery, slimy Communists are acting, as expected, in a treacherous, underhanded manner. While reaping the benefits of a neutral, their actions are clearly those of a belligerent and unfriendly to the United States.

In the instance of the *City of Flint*, Communist Russia is acting as a fence for the disposition of the swag and booty of her criminal ally. An international pickpocket would be classed on a higher plane because of the sporting chance of apprehension and penalty which would follow detection.

Shall We Make Free Speech Responsible?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 2, 1939

STATEMENT BY HON. EMANUEL CELLER, OF NEW YORK

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following release I recently issued entitled "Shall We Make Free Speech Responsible?":

SHALL WE MAKE FREE SPEECH RESPONSIBLE?

GROUP SLANDER, GROUP LIBEL

I am a firm believer in the Bill of Rights and wholeheartedly agree with John Milton, who 300 years ago argued for the utmost freedom of press and speech because he felt that the contest between truth and falsehood is an equal one. But today the situation is an entirely different one. The contest is no longer equal, free, or open. Lying by propaganda has changed the aspects of the encounter between truth and falsehood. Although truth is mighty and must prevail, the process consumes long time, and meanwhile much damage is done. There have emerged expert propagandists, who may worst, if not blot out, free speech and free press. Adolf Hitler discloses a technique in his book Mein Kampf which has been aped successfully in this country by the Coughlinites, the Pelleys, the Kuhns, the Deathereges, and the Christian fronts. They all agree with Hitler that a lie should be told with "unqualified impudent inflexibility," for "of even the most impudent lie, something remains and adheres."

Most of these propagandists have repeated, for example, the alleged lying statement about the Jews attributed to Benjamin Franklin, a statement that has been proved again and again as a diabolical forgery. Yet hundreds of thousands of copies containing this brazen lie are continually being disseminated.

The so-called Protocols of the Elders of Zion have been proven to be a clumsy fraud time and again. Yet even Father Coughlin frequently reprints these discredited "protocols" in his magazine Social Justice.

Not so many moons ago, the Catholic Church was the subject of similar repeated calumnies and falsehoods, which led to the destruction of convents and the burning of monasteries. Most of us remember the machinations of the Ku Klux Klan. We have read with shame the damage wrought by the anti-Masonic party.

HISTORICAL BLOTS ON OUR ESCUTCHEON

In 1777 John Jay, great as he was, sought to deny citizenship to Catholics in New York State on the ground that their loyalty to the Pope meant allegiance to a foreign power. This statement was reechoed a myriad number of times and did great damage to Catholicism.

In 1834 Samuel F. B. Morse, the inventor of the telegraph, writing under the name "Brutus," claimed that the Catholics owed exclusive loyalty to the Pope. The lie was continuously repeated. (The contemporaries of Morse could have said, as we the contemporaries of Lindbergh today can say: "Shoemaker, stick to your last.")

In the same year the sermons of a Congregational minister, the Reverend Lyman Beecher, father of Henry Ward Beecher, led to the burning of Catholic churches.

In 1850 the Know-Nothing Party revived such accusations.

They were revived again in 1890 by the American Protective Association.

And again in the Presidential campaign of 1928 they were revived once more with devastating effect.

Thus history continually repeats itself. Today the Jews are the victims. Yesterday it was the Masons. The day before the Catholics. What shall tomorrow bring forth?

Shall we continue to allow the forces of Nazi-Fascist-Communist propaganda to spread their germs of anti-isms over the radio, through the press and in public assembly, and thus pollute the very structure of our democracy without some antidote?

Shall we do nothing about this wave of prejudice which is manifested in such attacks against minority groups, or shall new legal remedies be employed?

I have offered two bills, one to provide civil remedies for group libel and slander and the other to provide criminal prosecution and punishment for those found guilty of libel and/or slander against minority groups. Attached hereto are copies of both bills.

"A bill relating to defamation of groups—civil remedies

"Be it enacted, etc., That whoever shall send or transmit, or shall cause to be sent or transmitted in interstate or foreign commerce or through the mails any written, printed, or oral communication which is defamatory of any religious, racial, national, fraternal, industrial, commercial, labor, or any other group of persons subject to the jurisdiction of the United States shall be liable for damages to members of such group. A civil action to recover such damages may be brought by any member or members of such group in behalf of all. Other members of such group shall have the right to intervene as parties plaintiff in such action. The pendency of one such action shall constitute a bar to any other action in respect to the same communication, unless it appears that such pending action is not being prosecuted diligently, efficiently, or in good faith. The proceeds of any recovery in such action shall be distributed under the direction and control of the court as follows: The plaintiff or plaintiffs who incurred or contributed to the expenses of the suit shall first be recompensed for all their disbursements and the balance shall be distributed pro rata among the plaintiffs who instituted such action or intervened therein. In any such action, the defenses of truth and privilege shall be available to the extent to which they are available in a civil action for libel or slander. The courts of the United States shall have jurisdiction of any action under this act."

"A bill relating to defamation of groups—criminal remedies

"Be it enacted, etc., That the criminal code, approved March 4, 1909, as amended, is further amended by adding thereto an additional section to be known as section 346, and to read as follows:

" 'That whoever shall send or transmit, or shall cause to be sent or transmitted in interstate or foreign commerce or through the mails any written, printed, or oral communication which is defamatory of any religious, racial, national, fraternal, industrial, commercial, labor, or any other group of persons subject to the jurisdiction of the United States shall be liable for imprisonment for a term not exceeding 1 year, or to a fine not exceeding $5,000, or both. In any prosecution under this act defenses of truth

and privilege shall be available. The courts of the United States shall have jurisdiction of any prosecution under this act.'"

CIVIL REMEDIES

There is set up in this bill the right to bring civil action for damages in the Federal courts against any person or persons who use the radio or the mails or the press in transmitting in interstate or foreign commerce printed or oral defamatory, slanderous, or libelous statements concerning any religious, racial, national, fraternal, industrial, commercial, or labor group. The civil suit for damages may be brought by any member or members of the group so maligned and shall be brought in behalf of all the members of said group. Any member of such group shall have the right to intervene as party plaintiff in such action. The proceeds of any recovery in such action shall be distributed in part to the plaintiff or plaintiffs who incurred or contributed to the expenses of the suit, and the balance shall be distributed pro rata among the plaintiffs who instituted such action or intervened therein. In such action the defenses of truth and privilege shall be available as in a civil action for libel or slander.

CRIMINAL REMEDIES

Similarly, any person or persons who shall by radio or by press or through the mails send or transmit, or shall cause to be sent or transmitted, in interstate or foreign commerce any written, printed, or oral communication which is defamatory of any religious, racial, national, fraternal, industrial, commercial, or labor group shall be liable for imprisonment for a term not to exceed 1 year, or to a fine not to exceed $5,000, or both. In such action, as in the civil action, the defenses of truth and privilege shall be available.

DIFFICULT PROBLEM

I am well aware of the difficulties attendant upon such suggested remedies. In the case of civil remedies for group libel and slander, I do not believe there is impinged the right of free speech. Simply, damages are assessed against any person or persons found guilty of having libeled or slandered a minority group. That bill follows the traditional liability for libel and slander which has existed in our State courts ever since we have been a nation. There is no jail penalty provided for in this bill. However, where the defendant is judgment-proof, the situation is an unfortunate one, for in such case the remedy would be an ineffectual one.

In the case of criminal remedy for group libel and slander I am on less firm ground. There may be involved the limitation of free speech and free press, for here a jail sentence and/or a fine faces the offender. Such serious penalty must give us pause, since it may have a frightening effect on the editor of a newspaper, on the radio announcer, and even on the private citizen who honestly seeks redress against wrongs. The proposition is, therefore, one fraught with considerable doubt and difficulty. The cure may be worse than the disease.

The remedies involved in the last-mentioned bill may be too drastic. The evil aimed at us may soon blow over. Our present economic disturbances have undoubtedly contributed to the desire on the part of certain persons to set up the Jews as scapegoats. With the coming of better economic conditions there may be no need for such scapegoats. In any event, I seek enlightenment and welcome opinions as to these proposed remedies.

IN FRANCE

It is interesting to note that in France the right exists for representative(s) of any group to sue for slander or libel against the said group. The experience of the French in the operation of this statute has been successful.

The bills above mentioned will be referred to the House Judiciary Committee, of which I am ranking member. I will take no further action at this junction other than the introduction of these measures. I await public reaction.

Nonpartisan Committee for Peace Through Revision of Neutrality Law

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS T. MALONEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, November 2, 1939

LETTER BY WILLIAM ALLEN WHITE AND JOINT STATEMENT BY PROMINENT CLERGYMEN

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have published in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter which I have received from William Allen White concerning the neutrality proposal now under consideration. I need remind no one that Mr. White is among our country's most distinguished citizens.

In connection with the letter, I ask unanimous consent that there may be published with it a joint statement of a number of prominent American clergymen, brief statements of many well-known and outstanding American leaders, and a list of the committee members associated with Mr. White, and their professional and business connections.

There being no objection, the letter and statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NON-PARTISAN COMMITTEE FOR PEACE
THROUGH REVISION OF THE NEUTRALITY LAW,
New York City, October 28, 1939.

The Honorable FRANCIS T. MALONEY,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MALONEY: There are two sides to this embargo question and if we take either side we are liable to be drawn into war if the hard-boiled will of the American people does not keep us out of war. I am enclosing herewith some material which seems to me most interesting and convincing about my side of this controversy.

I most earnestly hope you will not drop it in the waste basket. Here are many of the independent leaders of the United States strongly pleading for the repeal of the embargo and revision of the Neutrality Act.

They are entitled to a hearing by every open-minded Congressman, and I am addressing you in the hope that whatever your views, you will consider this appeal of men who have no political ambitions, who are in touch with public sentiment and who are well known in their communities and in the Nation as men of sober common sense.

I know that you will pardon my intrusion and will give this letter your serious consideration. I do not presume to urge that there is only one side to this question, but when I hear a man venting his emotions and clamoring for the retention of the present neutrality law with all of its dangers to American shipping and to the lives of American seamen, I can only say to him "I would to God I could be as sure I am right as you are sure that you are right."

This letter is written in the spirit of a kindly suggestion and is in no sense contentious. May I end as I began, that there are two honest sides to this controversy and I ask only the opportunity to state my case backed by the opinions of others more intelligent than I. And may I add my kind personal regards.

Sincerely yours,

W. A. WHITE.

THE JOINT STATEMENT OF THE CLERGY

We who sign this statement are firmly for repeal of the embargo law because we cannot be ethically or spiritually indifferent in the face of the present universal menace to man's religious liberties. We support revision because we believe its safeguards are not only best calculated to keep us out of war but will throw the vast moral and material weight of this country on the side of liberty in which alone religious institutions can flourish.

We therefore urge our Congress to stand fast and express the will of the people by revising the present law, which puts this country in the false position of supporting wrong, encouraging its spread, and condoning the destruction of all the religious and other liberties that mankind holds precious:

Dr. Cyrus Adler, president, Jewish Theological Seminary of America.

Dr. Robert A. Ashworth, educational secretary, National Conference of Jews and Christians.

Dr. Arlo Ayers Brown, president, Drew University, Madison, N. J.

Dr. Henry Sloane Coffin, president, Union Theological Seminary, New York City.

Rt. Rev. Benjamin D. Dagwell, bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Diocese of Oregon.

Dr. F. Slade Danzoll, St. Michael's Church, New York City.

Rev. William Horace Day, pastor emeritus, United Congregational Church, Bridgeport, Conn.

Dr. Robert C. Dexter, secretary, department of social relations, American Unitarian Association.

Dr. Ralph E. Diffendorfer, corresponding secretary Board of Foreign Missions of the Methodist Episcopal Church, New York City.

Rt. Rev. Hoyt M. Dobbs, Methodist Episcopal bishop of Louisiana and Mississippi.

Rev. J. Stanley Durkee, Plymouth Congregational Church of the Pilgrims, Brooklyn, N. Y.

Dr. Samuel A. Eliot, Arlington Street Church, Boston, Mass.

Rev. Frederick J. Fagley, associate secretary, General Council of Congregational and Christian Churches.

Dr. John W. Frazer, presiding elder, Methodist Church, Mobile, Ala.

Rev. Frederick B. Harris, Foundry Methodist Church, Washington, D. C.

Rt. Rev. Henry W. Hobson, bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Diocese of Southern Ohio.

Dr. Lynn Harold Hough, dean, Drew Theological Seminary, Madison, N. J.

Dr. Edward L. Israel, rabbi, Har-Sinai congregation, Baltimore, Md.

Dr. Morris S. Lazaron, rabbi, Baltimore Hebrew Congregation, Baltimore, Md.

Dr. Justin W. Nixon, professor of theology, Colgate-Rochester Divinity School, Rochester, N. Y.

Rt. Rev. G. Ashton Oldham, bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Diocese of Albany.

Rev. Harold C. Phillips, First Church Baptist, Cleveland, Ohio.

Rev. Daniel A. Poling, editor in chief, Christian Herald, Baptist Temple, Philadelphia, Pa.

Dr. George W. Richards, president, Theological Seminary of Reformed Churches in United States, Lancaster, Pa.

Most Rev. Bernard J. Sheil, auxiliary bishop, Catholic Diocese of Chicago.

Dr. Minot Simons, All Souls Unitarian Church, New York City.

Dr. Harold Paul Sloan, editor, The Christian Advocate, New York City.

Dr. Robert E. Speer, formerly secretary, Presbyterian Board of Foreign Missions and Moderator Presbyterian Chuch in United States of America.

Dr. Joseph A. Vance, First Presbyterian Church, Detroit, Mich.

Dr. Stephen S. Wise, rabbi, Free Synagogue, New York City.

THE PERSONAL STATEMENTS OF MANY LEADERS

"We members of the Catholic faith in the United States must do everything in our power to strengthen the President in his mighty task of guiding America to safety.

"That should give the key to the attitude of American Catholics on the recommendations of the President now before the Congress to keep the country out of war." (The Most Reverend Bernard J. Sheil, auxiliary bishop of the Catholic Diocese of Chicago, quoting the late Cardinal Mundelein.)

"Cannot overstate my convictions in regard to necessity of revision if we are to have any chance of avoiding involvement." (Ernest M. Hopkins, president, Dartmouth College.)

"I firmly believe in my heart and soul that the amendments suggested by the President are best calculated to save us from the scenes that we witnessed in 1917 when our American boys were starting for France. I am appealing to the American people to stand solidly behind the President because he is so clearly right, so obviously on the side of common sense and sound judgment of patriotism that only those who lack an understanding of the issue will oppose him." (Hon. Alfred E. Smith, former Governor of New York.)

"I advocate general revision, particularly repeal of the embargo." (Msgr. John A. Ryan, Catholic University, Washington, D. C.)

"I believe the arms embargo should be repealed and the cash-and-carry plan substituted." (Ida M. Tarbell, historian and writer.)

"Present neutrality law is inadequate; I favor more stringent measures to prevent American involvement." (Robert G. Sproul, president, University of California.)

"We all want to keep the United States out of war. We want to protect our country against involvement in this conflict. We believe it is necessary in this crisis that the strongest of the nations should be in a position to bring its influence to bear upon shortening the war and finding the terms of a just peace.

"The proposed legislation gives the maximum protection to the United States and * * * does nothing that will unnecessarily contribute to the victory of Germany." (Prof. Charles G. Fenwick, Bryn Mawr College.)

"Arms-embargo repeal will keep war farther from our shores than present so-called neutrality law."—Guy Stanton Ford, president, University of Minnesota.

"Reason for supporting repeal is that our chances for peace are greater than under existing legislation."—James M. Landis, dean, Harvard University Law School.

"The United States is now in the position of a bungling amateur magician who puts on handcuffs and then forgets how to extricate himself.

"The people in the United States are going to find out sooner or later that under existing legislation we are an active participant in this war on the side of nazi-ism and communism."—Rev. Maurice Sheehy, head of the department of religious education, Catholic University.

"I favor revision along lines proposed by the President."—Daniel Willard, president, Baltimore & Ohio Railroad.

"Revision would strengthen neutrality. Unrevised act penalizes democracies in favor of dictatorships."—Stephen S. Wise, rabbi, Free Synagogue, New York.

"Today in our great country there is much talk of isolation and neutrality. Those citizens who preach isolation are without doubt thoroughly sincere; they are not aware there is no such thing as isolation. Those citizens who preach neutrality are earnest and honest; they do not realize that neutrality in the face of crime is crime itself."—The Most Reverend Robert E. Lucey, bishop of the Catholic diocese of Amarillo, Tex.

"The repeal of the embargo provision of the present Neutrality Act will increase possibilities for a just and sound international peace, and thereby also promote the peace and security of the United States."—Henrietta Roelofs, former national public affairs secretary, Young Women's Christian Association.

THE NONPARTISAN COMMITTEE FOR PEACE THROUGH REVISION OF THE NEUTRALITY LAW, WILLIAM ALLEN WHITE, CHAIRMAN

W. Lewis Abbott, professor, Colorado College; Chauncey A. Adams, secretary, Vermont Congregational Conference; James Truslow Adams, Southport, Conn.; Cyrus Adler, president, Jewish Theological Seminary of America; Allen D. Albert, Paris, Ill.; Gordon W. Allport, professor, Harvard University; Mrs. Larz Anderson, Washington, D. C.; Paul Shipman Andrews, dean, college of law, Syracuse University; Mrs. James Rae Arneill, Denver, Colo.; Henry A. Atkinson, general secretary, World Alliance for International Friendship Through Churches and Church Peace Union; Frank Aydelotte, president, Swarthmore College; Mrs. Dana Converse Backus, Port Washington, N. Y.; Tallulah Bankhead, New York, N Y.; George Gordon Battle, New York, N. Y.; James P. Baxter, 3d, president, Williams College; Laird Bell, Chicago, Ill.; Harry Best, professor, University of Kentucky; Charles E. Beury, president, Temple University; Hon. Barry Bingham, president, the Courier-Journal, Louisville, Ky.; Mrs. Emmons Blaine, Hubbard Woods, Ill.; T. D. Boardman, San Francisco, Calif.; Dr. Frank C. Boudreau, Milbank Memorial Fund, New York City; Raymond B. Bragg, First Unitarian Society, Minneapolis, Minn.

William A. Brandenburg, president, Kansas State Teachers' College; Mrs. Henry Breckinridge, New York, N. Y.; Mrs. Arthur Brin, Minneapolis, Minn.; Robert C. Brooks, Swarthmore, Pa.; Arlo Ayres Brown, president, Drew University; Dr. Cornelia J. Browne, East Orange, N. J.; Mrs. William Thayer Brown, West Orange, N. J.; Mrs. Edward Browning, Philadelphia, Pa.; Esther Caukin Brunauer, Washington, D. C.; John Stewart Bryan, president, William and Mary College; Edith Burr, Pemberton, N. J.; Jane Humbird Burr, St. Paul, Minn.; Henry M. Busch, professor, Western Reserve University; Rear Admiral Richard E. Byrd, Boston, Mass.; Robert H. Cabell, Chicago, Ill.; Robert J. Caldwell, New York, N. Y.; Henry S. Canby, professor, Yale University; Newcomb Carlton, chairman of the board, Western Union Telegraph Co.; O. C. Carmichael, chancelor, Vanderbilt University; Mrs. Carrie Chapman Catt, New York, N. Y.; Zechariah Chafee, Jr., professor, Harvard University; Harry Chandler, publisher, Los Angeles Times; C. C. Chapman, editor and publisher, Oregon Voter; Harry Woodburn Chase, chancelor, New York University; Mrs. Arthur Osgood Choate, New York, N. Y.; Elizabeth Christman, Washington, D. C.

Thomas C. Chubb, Greenwich, Conn.; William L. Clayton, Houston, Tex.; Rufus E. Clement, president, Atlanta University; Robert C. Clothier, president, Rutgers University; Dr. Henry S. Coffin, president, Union Theological Seminary, New York; Martin J. Collins, president, Graham Paper Co., St. Louis, Mo.; Frederic R. Coudert, Sr., New York, N. Y.; William H. Cowley, president, Hamilton College; Paul F. Cruikshank, headmaster, Taft School; George B. Cutten, president, Colgate University; Virginius Dabney, editor, Times-Dispatch, Richmond, Va.; Rt. Rev. Benjamin D. Dagwell, bishop, Protestant Episcopal Diocese of Oregon; Rt. Rev. Thomas C. Darst, bishop, Protestant Episcopal Diocese of East Carolina; Thurston Davies, president, Colorado College; Harvey N. Davis, president, Stevens Institute of Technology; Rufus C. Dawes, Chicago, Ill.; Rt. Rev. J. Lloyd Decell, bishop in charge, the Methodist Church, Southeastern Jurisdiction; Monroe E. Deutsch, vice president and provost, University of California; Dr. Robert C. Dexter, secretary, Department of Social Relations, American Unitarian Association; Ralph Diffendorfer, corresponding secretary, Board of Foreign Missions, Methodist Episcopal Church, New York, N. Y.; Rt. Rev. Hoyt M. Dobbs, Methodist Episcopal Bishop of Louisiana and Mississippi; Melvyn Douglas, Hollywood, Calif.; Paul H. Douglas, professor, University of Chicago.

Michael Francis Doyle, Philadelphia, Pa.; Miss Mary E. Dreier, New York, N. Y.; Roscoe Drummond, editor, Christian Science Monitor; Stephen K. Duggan, New York, N. Y.; Rev. J. Stanley Durkee, Plymouth Congregational Church of the Pilgrims, Brooklyn, N. Y; Clyde Eagleton, professor, New York University; Frederick H. Ecker, chairman of the board, Metropolitan Life Insurance Co.; William Alfred Eddy, president, Hobart College; Sherwood Eddy, New York, N. Y.; J. Stanley Edwards, Aetna Life Insurance Co., Denver, Colo.; Rev. Frederick M. Eliot, Boston, Mass.; Samuel A. Eliot, Boston, Mass.; Dr. Haven Emerson, Columbia University; Silas Evans, president, Ripon College; Hazle B. Ewing, Bloomington, Ill.; Rev. F. L. Fagley, associate secretary, the General Council of the Congregational and Christian Churches; Geraldine Farrar, Ridgefield, Conn.; Samuel S. Fels, president, Fels & Co., Philadelphia, Pa.; Charles G. Fenwick, professor, Bryn Mawr College; Marshall Field, New York, N. Y.; Thomas K. Finletter, New York, N. Y.; Dr. Morris L. Fishbein, Chicago, Ill.; Dorothy Canfield Fisher, Arlington, Vt.; Edgar J. Fisher, Institute of International Education, New York; D. F. Fleming, professor, Vanderbilt University; Guy Stanton Ford, president, University of Minnesota; Kirk Fox, editor, Successful Farming, Des Moines, Iowa; Jay Franklin, Washington, D. C.; Rev. Dr. John W. Frazer, Methodist Church, Mobile, Ala.; Douglas S. Freeman, Richmond, Va.; Alfred C. Fuller, president, the Fuller Brush Co..; Helen Gahagan, Hollywood, Calif.; Francis P. Gaines, president, Washington and Lee University.

Hon. Frank S. Gaines, mayor, Berkeley, Calif.; Bennett E. Geer, Greenville, S. C.; Hon. James W. Gerard, New York, N. Y.; Mrs. Douglas Gibbons, New York, N. Y.; Harry David Gideonse, president, Brooklyn College; Virginia Gildersleeve, dean, Barnard College; Charles W. Gilkey, dean of the university chapel, University of Chicago; Arthur J. Goldsmith, New York, N. Y.; Robert K. Gooch, professor, University of Virginia; Mrs. Henry F. Grady, Washington, D. C.; Frank P. Graham, president, University of North Carolina; John Temple Graves, II, the Birmingham News; Clifton D. Gray, president, Bates College; Roger S. Greene, World Citizens Association, Chicago, Ill.; Samuel R. Guard, editor, Breeders' Gazette, Spencer, Ind.; John Gunther, New York, N. Y.; William B. Hale, Chicago, Ill.; Grover C. Hall, editor, Montgomery Advertiser; Helen Hall, Henry Street Settlement, New York, N. Y.; Sidney B. Hall, superintendent of public instruction, Richmond, Va.; Roswell G. Ham, president, Mount Holyoke College; Henry I. Harriman, chairman of the board, New England Power Association;

Livingston Hartley, Washington, D. C.; Arthur A. Hauck, president, University of Maine; Arthur Garfield Hays, New York, N. Y.; Dr. Victor G. Heiser, New York, N. Y.; A. D. Henderson, president, Antioch College; Mrs. Elinore M. Herrick, New York, N. Y.; Mrs. William G. Hibbard, Winnetka, Ill.; Melvin D. Hildreth, Washington, D. C.; Mrs. John C. Holman, St. Paul, Minn.; Hamilton Holt, president, Rollins College; Ernest M. Hopkins, president, Dartmouth College; Miriam Hopkins, Hollywood, Calif.

Walter M. Howlett, secretary, department of religious education, Greater New York Federation of Churches; Palmer Hoyt, publisher, the Oregonian, Portland, Oreg.; L. H. Hubbard, president, Texas State College for Women; James Edwin Huchingson, president, Colorado Woman's College; Walter Hullihen, president, University of Delaware; Louise Hunnewell, Wellesley, Mass.; Wiley Lin Hurie, president, the College of the Ozarks; Fannie Hurst, New York, N. Y.; Rev. John W. Inzer, First Baptist Church, Asheville, N. C.; Franklin W. Johnson, president, Colby College; Dr. D. Shepard Jones, World Peace Foundation, Boston, Mass.; Paul Kellogg, editor, Survey Graphic; Rt. Rev. Paul B. Kern, bishop, Methodist Episcopal Church South, Nashville, Tenn.; Frank Kingdon, president, Newark University; Freda Kirchway, editor, the Nation; Col. Frank E. Knox, publisher, Chicago Daily News; S. Stanley Kreutzer, New York, N. Y.; Mrs. James Lees Laidlaw, Port Washington, N. Y.; Mrs. Florence H. Lamont, New York, N. Y.; James M. Landis, dean, law school of Harvard University; William Lassiter, Santa Barbara, Calif.; Mrs. Roberta Campbell Lawson, General Federation of Women's Clubs, Tulsa, Okla.; Dr. Morris S. Lazaron, rabbi, Baltimore Hebrew Congregation; Max Lerner, professor, Williams College; Miss Inez Johnson Lewis, State superintendent of public instruction, Denver, Colo.; William Draper Lewis, director, American Law Institute, Philadelphia, Pa.; Irene Lewisohn, New York, N. Y.; Charles A. Levin, Hartford, Conn.; Walter L. Lingle, president, Davidson College; Arthur O. Lovejoy, professor, Johns Hopkins University; Most Rev. Robert E. Lucey, bishop, Catholic Diocese of Amarillo, Tex.; Miss Cornelia B. Lusk, St. Paul, Minn.

Mrs. C. D. N. MacLennan, Tacoma, Wash.; F. A. Magruder, Oregon State College; Rt. Rev. William T. Manning, bishop, Diocese of New York; Hon. Theodore Marburg, Baltimore, Md.; Daniel L. Marsh, president, Boston University; Charles E. Martin, University of Washington; Mrs. Eleanor Wilson McAdoo, Pasadena, Calif.; Hon. Andrew F. McBride, Paterson, N. J.; Mrs. Arthur J. McGuire, St. Paul, Minn.; Frederick C. McKee, Pittsburgh, Pa.; Spencer Miller, Jr., director, Workers Educational Bureau, A. F. of L., New York, N. Y.; Robert A. Milliken, chairman, executive council, California Institute of Technology; Sedgwick Minot, New York, N. Y.; Mary A. Graham Mitchell, Pittsburgh, Pa.; Peter Molyneaux, publisher, Texas Weekly, Dallas, Tex.; Hugh Moore, president, Dixie Vortex Corporation, Easton, Pa.; Walden Moore, professor, University of Rochester; Edward A. Moree, New York, N. Y.; George W. Morgan, St. Paul, Minn.; Felix Morley, editor, Washington Post; Victor P. Morris, dean, University of Oregon; Mrs. Dwight W. Morrow, acting president, Smith College; Mrs. E. K. Morrow, Salina, Kans.; William B. Munro, professor, California Institute of Technology; Mrs. Burton W. Musser, Salt Lake City, Utah; J. L. Newcombe, president, University of Virginia; G. Bernard Noble, professor, Reed College; G. S. Nollen, president, Bankers Life Co., Des Moines, Iowa; John S. Nollen, president, Grinnell College; George Norlin, president emeritus, University of Colorado; Robert Lincoln O'Brien, Washington, D. C.; Rt. Rev. George Ashton Oldham, bishop, Episcopal Diocese, Albany, N. Y.; William Church Osborn, New York, N. Y.

Marion Edwards Park, president, Bryn Mawr College; B. L. Parkinson, president, Mississippi State College for Women; Mrs. Edgerton Parsons, New York City; James G. Patton, Farmers' Educational & Cooperative Union of America, Denver, Colo.; Lewis Perry, principal, Phillips Exeter Academy; Hon. Gifford Pinchot, Milford, Pa.; Mrs. T. J. Preston, Jr., Princeton, N. J.; Hon. Joseph M. Proskauer, New York, N. Y.; Mrs. Elinor Purvis, Princeton, N. J.; Mrs. Ogden Reid, New York Herald Tribune; Mrs. Aurelia Henry Reinhardt, president, Mills College; F. D. G. Ribble, dean, University of Virginia; Frank M. Richardson, editor, Baltimore Southern Methodist; Edward G. Robinson, Hollywood, Calif.; Henrietta Roelofs, New Canaan, Conn.; Chester Rowell, San Francisco Chronicle; George Rublee, Washington, D. C.; William F. Russell, dean, Teachers College, Columbia University; Monsignor John A. Ryan, professor, Catholic University; George St. John, head master, the Choate School, Wallingford, Conn.; Harry Schermann, president, Book-of-the-Month Club, New York; William Jay Schieffelin, New York, N. Y.; Miss Rose Schneiderman, secretary, New York State Department of Labor, New York, N. Y.; Walter Dill Scott, president emeritus, Northwestern University; Ellery Sedgwick, Boston, Mass.; Henry D. Sharpe, president, Brown & Sharpe Manufacturing Co., Providence, R. I.; Vincent Sheean, New York, N. Y.; Rev. Maurice Sheehy, professor, Catholic University; Robert E. Sherwood, New York, N. Y.; Rev. Guy Emery Schipler, editor, the Churchman, New York, N. Y.; James T. Shotwell, professor, Columbia University.

Enoch W. Sikes, president, the Clemson Agricultural College; Kenneth C. M. Sills, president, Bowdoin College; Dr. Minot Simons, All Souls Unitarian Church, New York, N. Y.; Robert G. Sproul, president, University of California; Eugene Staley, Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy; Hon. Ben C. Stapleton, mayor, Denver, Colo.; Robert L. Stearns, president, University of Colorado; Chauncey Stillman, New York, N. Y.; Rev. Dr. Anson Phelps Stokes, Washington, D. C.; Silas H. Strawn, Chicago, Ill.; Clarence K. Streit, New York, N. Y.; Herbert Bayard Swope, New York, N. Y.; Horace D. Taft, Watertown, Conn.; Ida M. Tarbell, New York, N. Y.; Dorothy Thompson, New York, N. Y.; E. S. Tucker, president, Austin College; Gene Tunney, New York, N. Y.; Clifton M. Utley, director, Council on Foreign Relations, Chicago, Ill.; Tertius Van Dyke, head master, Gunnery School, Washington, Conn.; George E. Vincent, Greenwich, Conn.; Miss Sarah Wambaugh, Cambridge, Mass.; J. Skottowe Wannamaker, president, American Cotton Growers Association, St. Matthews, S. C.; W. W. Waymack, editor, Des Moines Register; Charles A. Webb, Asheville, N. C.; Mrs. E. K. Wedelstaedt, St. Paul, Minn.; Herman B. Wells, president, University of Indiana; A. F. Whitney, president, Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen, Cleveland, Ohio.; C. C. Williams, president, Lehigh University; Dr. Stephen A. Wise, rabbi, Free Synagogue, New York, N. Y.; Rufus Woods, Wenatchee, Wash.; Mary E. Woolley, president emeritus, Mount Holyoke College; and Quincy Wright, professor, University of Chicago.

Neutrality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 2, 1939

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, there is only one real issue before this House. That issue is not neutrality in any academic sense. It is the big idea behind neutrality. It is keeping out of war—keeping America out of this strictly European war.

Neutrality is a big subject. It covers a wide field in international law. That may account for the debate on this so-called neutrality bill becoming somewhat confused with side issues. Some of that confusion, of course, comes from the lack of candor on the part of some advocates of repealing the arms embargo. Certainly there have been some clumsy efforts to camouflage and conceal the true purpose behind this proposal. But no matter whence it comes, no matter what may be the cause of this confusion, it has complicated a very simple matter. It has beclouded the real issue before the House.

So, let us get down to cases once more. Let us consider first things first. Let us try to clarify this issue. Let us see what dire consequences may lurk in this miscalled neutrality bill. Let us see what not only might happen, but probably will happen if Congress adopts this proposed change in the established American neutrality policy in the midst of this European war.

During this debate, we have heard some strained and strange meanings placed on the word "neutrality." Neutrality means only one thing. It means impartiality. It means taking no part, directly or indirectly, in a war between two powers. The big idea behind neutrality is to keep out of other people's wars. No change in the state of world affairs ever has or ever can change the meaning of the word "neutrality." Nothing can change the fundamental purpose of a neutrality policy. The meaning, intent, and purpose of neutrality always has and always will remain the same—to keep out of war—to keep out of other people's wars.

Whenever a government ceases to be impartial it ceases to be neutral. Whenever a government departs from impartiality, which is the cornerstone of neutrality, it forfeits the status of a neutral. It loses the immunities of a neutral. Whenever a nominal neutral in any way aids a belligerent or set of belligerents, it is subject to retaliation and reprisal from other belligerents. It usually winds up in war.

Now, let's get down to cases. Congress was called into special session because of the emergency arising from the war in Europe. Two months ago Germany invaded Poland. England and France, having guaranteed the territorial integrity of Poland, declared war on Germany. Before England and France could get their war machines out of low gear Germany's "lightning war" was an accomplished fact, with some slight assistance from Russia. Hitler and Stalin already have split poor Poland between themselves, with

Stalin getting the bigger chunk of territory. Now, poor Poland exists only on old maps, in the hearts of patriotic Poles, and in an expatriate government in Paris.

Allied England and France now have settled down to a "slow war" with Germany. All the other nations of the world are supposedly neutral. Strange as it may seem, Germany's allies, Italy and Russia, now are standing on the sidelines. These neutrals in name only are in fact the active allies of Germany. Yet neither England nor France has declared war on either Red Russia or Fascist Italy.

Across the Pacific lies Japan, erstwhile ally of Germany. It shocked and grieved Japan when Hitler signed up with her foe, Russia, with which she had been conducting a lively but undeclared border warfare for the last year or more. In any event, Japan, even if she had not been double crossed by Hitler, is too busy with her conquest of China and too far away to take a very active part in the European war.

That leaves only one great neutral power in the world—the United States of America. That has raised the biggest question in the mind of the world today. What will the United States do? Will America remain neutral in fact, as well as in name? Will the United States eventually be drawn into this war as it was drawn into the World War?

On September 21, President Roosevelt called Congress into special session to deal with this war emergency. He had already invoked the present neutrality law, declaring the neutrality of the United States to the world. He appeared in person at a joint session of Congress to ask that Congress repeal our established neutrality policy, a policy adopted in peacetime, which places an embargo on arms to any and all warring nations. He asked in its stead that Congress adopt the so-called cash-and-carry policy of selling arms to any nation, at war or at peace, which has the cash to pay for arms, ammunition, and implements of war, and the ships to carry them home.

For nearly 6 weeks now, Congress has been formulating the answer to the question of whether the United States will remain neutral in fact or merely neutral in name. That question is the most momentous question that has been before Congress and the American people in this generation. For upon the decision of Congress on the question of neutrality in fact or neutrality in name, may depend peace or war for the American people.

Some impatient persons in Congress and out have been inclined to sneer at the "great debate" on the question of neutrality in fact or in name. Some confusion may have arisen from some arguments for neutrality in name, but not in fact. But no time has been wasted on this issue, which is vital to the American people. On the contrary, every moment of this 6 weeks' debate, which has been in progress throughout the country as well as in Congress, has been well spent.

Above all else, this debate has developed the one real issue before the House—keeping America out of this strictly European war. This debate has demonstrated the determination of the American people to remain neutral in fact, as well as in name. This debate has brought Congress a clear and unmistakable mandate from the American people. That mandate, written in boxcar letters, reads: "Keep America Out of War."

The American people are not interested in legalistic hairsplitting. They want to keep out of war. The American people are not concerned with strained and strange arguments endeavoring to justify an unneutral change in our established neutrality policy in the midst of war to aid either side. They want to keep out of war.

No amount of tricky word juggling can convince the American people that it would be a neutral act to change our policy now to aid one side in this war. Even those who propose this unneutral change in our policy profess to oppose any step that might lead America into war. Indeed, they deeply resent any such suggestion, but they have yet to find any formula for converting unneutrality into neutrality, to make neutrality in name neutrality in fact.

No matter how much the American people may hate Hitler and despise all dictatorships, they cannot be deceived, nor can they deceive themselves, into believing a fundamental change in our neutrality policy now would be anything but an unneutral act. No amount of assurance to the contrary can allay the fear of the American people that such an unneutral act may not lead us into war.

Every authority on international law in the world is in complete agreement on this one point: No nation, after the outbreak of war, may change its neutrality law or policy to aid one of the warring sides without being guilty of an unneutral act. Of course, any nation has the power to enact or repeal any law. However, in the case of a neutrality law, nations changing their laws will be held accountable under international law. A nation may exercise its power to change its laws, but if that change violates the rights of another nation under international law, the guilty nation may be held accountable on the battlefield.

This rule of international law does not apply to a neutral nation, during the course of a war, enacting, repealing, or changing old laws, if that action does not aid one belligerent against another. Some gentlemen have been very evasive about the purpose of this proposed change in our neutrality law at this time. Other gentlemen in responsible places, however, have made no bones about the purpose. They state frankly and openly that the purpose, of course, is to aid allied England and France against Germany. This is one of the measures short of war intended to be used against aggressor nations.

There is no question about a neutral nation, even after the outbreak of war, passing a law to better safeguard its neutral rights, such as barring belligerent battleships from engaging in hostilities in neutral waters. But this proposed change in our neutrality has no such safeguarding motive in view. On the face of the proposal, and according to the outspoken statements of its leading advocates, the avowed purpose of the so-called cash-and-carry bill is to aid England and France against Germany.

President Roosevelt; Secretary of State Hull; Senator Pittman, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee; the gentleman from Texas, Mr. Luther A. Johnson; the able gentleman from New York, Mr. Wadsworth, all advocates of this proposed change, all are on record on this point. All of them have held in the past that any change, such as the cash-and-carry proposal, after war has begun would be an unneutral act, and thus lay the United States open to reprisals. Reprisals against our shipping led the United States into the World War. Remember that!

Now, let us look at the record and see what these eminent advocates of changing our law from neutrality in fact to neutrality in name only had to say. Let us look at the arguments they used before the outbreak of this European war in an effort to force a change in our law.

The President once told a press conference that repeal of the arms embargo after the event of war would be an "unneutral" act. Such ardent advocates of repeal of the arms embargo as Arthur Krock, Washington correspondent of the New York Times, now seeks to apologize for the President's statement and explain it away by saying he said such an action "would produce assertions that the act was unneutral." Mr. Krock insists that the President refused to accept that charge as true, however. If Mr. Krock's version is correct, he places the President in a class all by himself as an authority on international law. All of the President's advisers on this measure, which they now are advocating, are on record as holding such an act to be unneutral.

Chairman PITTMAN, of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, is on record any number of times as boldly asserting that it would be unneutral for a neutral to change its law after the beginning of war. On March 3, 1937, in the Senate, Senator PITTMAN declared:

> Undoubtedly if anything on earth would arouse unfriendliness on the part of a belligerent against us it would be discrimination by our government in favor of its enemy. We are speaking of a time when war exists, not of peacetime, and if Canada were engaged in war with a foreign country, and we were at peace with both of them, we would certainly arouse the intense anger and probably the unfriendly disposition of any country against which we discriminated in favor of any other country.

The prophetic Senator visualized exactly the situation as it is today, with Canada at war with Germany and evidence of Germany's "intense anger" already is beginning to appear, even before any unneutral action is taken. We have not yet heard the last of the *City of Flint* incident.

Speaking of changing our Neutrality Act so as to aid one belligerent against another, Mr. WADSWORTH stated last June, in the midst of the neutrality debate, "When we change a rule that we ourselves have made, after the game starts, then we have done an unneutral act." He added that "when we change those [rules] after the conflict starts we are in grave danger of getting into trouble."

Lest my purpose in quoting these eminent authorities on international law be misunderstood as criticism, let me hasten to assure them that quite the reverse is true. I quote their words of wisdom in the most friendly spirit, with approval and even gratitude in my heart. However, I cannot refrain from advising them that if they have occasion to reverse their position in the future, they might find it less embarrassing if they did not suffer a change of heart so quickly and if they do to remember the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is a public document.

It is noteworthy also that Great Britain took the same view of a proposed change in our neutrality act in 1914, during the World War, that Germany might be expected to take if we changed our law now. When the late Senator Hitchcock of Nebraska proposed an arms embargo the British Government protested vigorously that it would be an unneutral act because it would favor Germany against allied sea power. Our State Department and President Wilson took the same view of the proposal and assured the British Government they had not been consulted by the Senator and no action was taken by Congress. It also is noteworthy, because it indicates the universal acceptance of this rule in international law, that both Germany and Austria conceded it would be unneutral to impose an embargo. They urged this Government to take steps that would insure equal treatment for all belligerents in the American arms market, however.

In view of the expressions from that array of authorities, I cannot believe that anybody will challenge the assertion that any change in our neutrality law now that war rages in Europe would be an unneutral act, that it would invite reprisals, and, in fact, be the first step toward war.

President Roosevelt never has sought to conceal his deep aversion to nazi-ism. On the contrary, he has made this plain repeatedly and on October 26, in a radio speech, expressly condemned nazi-ism as an oligarchic form of government and a danger to democracy.

I would be the last person in the world to condemn the President for entertaining the same personal views on the question of nazi-ism as I do. In his radio address on September 3, referring to the invasion of Poland by Germany, the President said he could not ask Americans "to remain neutral in thought." I certainly would not ask the President to remain neutral in thought. Surely, the President is entitled to his personal views on any subject, the same as the humblest citizen.

I submit, however, that the President's personal views, his personal prejudices, are one thing and his official acts as the head of this Government are quite another matter. The President's official acts and statements are the official acts and statements of the Nation and a grave responsibility rests upon him as a consequence.

It is inconceivable to me that any President would jeopardize the peace of America to gratify his personal prejudices or to achieve any personal ambition, and I certainly make no such suggestion now. We may differ with any President on domestic affairs, but when it comes to the peace and security of America we must repose our confidence in him.

We all know the European war has imposed new and greater burdens on the President. Perhaps this added strain to steering the Nation in the paths of peace has made the President overwrought and supersensitive. Otherwise he might not have lashed out last week at orators in and out of Congress, commentators and others, "beating their breasts and proclaiming against sending the boys of American mothers to fight on the battlefields of Europe." The President declared that was "a deliberate setting up of an imaginary bogeyman," and denounced it as "a shameless and dishonest fake."

Perhaps the President has heard some orators and read some commentators I have not. Otherwise there should have been no cause for his outburst, for neither in this House nor outside of it have I heard any responsible person suggest that the President or any other responsible official in Federal, State, or city government ever suggested in any shape, manner, or form the remotest possibility of sending the boys of American mothers to fight on the battlefields of Europe.

Without beating my breast, I do now protest against any change in our present neutrality law, the arms embargo, or the adoption or pursuit of any policy which might involve the "remotest possibility of sending the boys of American mothers to fight on the battlefields of Europe." Certainly no American in Congress or out of it can be condemned for protesting against that awful possibility. Certainly the President should be the last man to condemn the arms embargo, which he approved so wholeheartedly. The President placed his stamp of approval on that neutrality law with these solemn words:

> I have approved this joint resolution because it was intended as an expression of the fixed desire of the Government and the people of the United States to avoid any action which might involve us in war.

Again and again during the last few years, the President has praised the arms embargo as—

> a definite step * * * taken toward enabling this country to maintain its neutrality and avoid being drawn into wars involving other nations.

It is because the American people, having faith in the President as a man of peace, have accepted his wholehearted endorsement of the arms embargo as an instrument of peace, now are so reluctant to see it repealed. It is because the American people have been assured and reassured for more than 4 years that the arms embargo embodies true neutrality—that it is the safest and soundest insurance again war ever devised by the mind of man—that they now fear the consequences if that bulwark against war is removed in the midst of this European war.

In opening this special session of Congress, the President told the American people that "repeal of the embargo and a return to international law are the crux of this issue." The President then made his "pocketbook" appeal for lifting the embargo. He was frank about the purpose he had in mind when he asked:

> From a purely material point of view what is the advantage to us in sending all manner of articles across the ocean for final processing there when we could give employment to thousands by doing it here? Incidentally, and again from the material point of view, by such employment we automatically aid our own national defense.

The President himself prepared the best answer to the "blood money" argument. Speaking at Chautauqua, N. Y., on August 14, 1936, when he was a candidate for reelection, Mr. Roosevelt rose to magnificent heights of scorn as he denounced the suggestion. He declared:

> Industrial and agricultural production for a war market may give immense fortunes to a few men; for the Nation as a whole it produces disaster. It was the prospect of war profits that made our farmers of the West plow up prairie land that should never have been plowed, but should have been left for grazing cattle. Today we are reaping the harvest of those war profits in the dust storms which have devastated those war-plowed areas.
>
> It was the prospect of war profits that caused the extension of monopoly and unjustified expansion of industry and a price level so high that the normal relationship between debtor and creditor was destroyed.
>
> Nevertheless, if war should break out again in another continent, let us not blink the fact that we would find in this country thousands of Americans who, seeking immediate riches—fool's gold—would attempt to break down or evade our neutrality.
>
> They would tell you—and, unfortunately, their views would get wide publicity—that if they could produce and ship this and that and the other article to belligerent nations, the unemployed of America would all find work. They would tell you that if they

could extend credit to warring nations that credit would be used in the United States to build homes and factories and pay our debts. They would tell you that America once more would capture the trade of the world.

It would be hard to resist that clamor; it would be hard for many Americans, I fear, to look beyond—to realize the inevitable penalties, the inevitable day of reckoning, that comes from a false prosperity. To resist the clamor of that greed, if war should come, would require the unswerving support of all Americans who love peace.

If we face the choice of profits or peace, the Nation will answer—must answer—"We choose peace." It is the duty of all of us to encourage such a body of opinion in this country that the answer will be clear and for all practical purposes unanimous.

To that magnificent plea for neutrality, peace, and sound prosperity the American people responded "Amen!" And they reelected Mr. Roosevelt for a second term as President, a President who stood for peace against war profits.

Both Houses of Congress passed the arms embargo by all but unanimous votes. Since that time, Members of Congress, like the President, Democrats and Republicans alike, have been telling the American people the arms embargo would keep them out of war—would keep their boys from fighting on foreign battlefields.

The President was the leader, but he espoused the arms embargo and secured its enactment in response to the demand of the American people themselves. The American people, like the President, abhor the very thought of war profits at the expense of human lives and human misery.

There has been no change in the desire and the determination of the American people. They want now just what they wanted when the arms embargo was adopted—peace and security. However, a change has come over the President. War has broken out again "in another continent," and, just as the President predicted, "thousands of Americans who, seeking immediate riches, fool's gold," now are attempting to break down or evade our neutrality.

"Unfortunately," just as the President predicted, "their views * * * get wide publicity." But more unfortunately still for 130,000,000 Americans, the President now sees eye to eye with those now attempting to break down or evade our neutrality—our bulwark against war.

What brought about that change in the President's attitude, I shall not undertake to say. But that change was evident on September 3, when the President said:

We seek to keep war from our firesides by keeping war from coming to the Americas.

No statement could be clearer. Mr. Roosevelt would give us peace by helping to destroy Germany now, so that later she cannot carry war to the Americas. I would not declare the President was guilty of "a deliberate setting up of an imaginary bogeyman" and then denounce it as "a shameless and dishonest fake."

"Imaginary bogeyman" or not, such a statement coming from the President of the United States, coupled with the success of Germany's "lightning war" in Poland, aroused my fears, just as such a statement and such events did in millions of other Americans. I wanted to know how Germany, win or lose in the present war, could carry a war to our shores. I am fortunate in enjoying the confidence of an officer in our military service, a man who is recognized by all who know him as possessing one of the keenest, shrewdest, and soundest military minds in America. I consulted him, and this is what he told me:

If we really want peace, we can have it, for no power on earth can carry war to this hemisphere. If we get into a war, we shall have to go at least 3,000 miles to find one.

For obvious reasons, I cannot name my informant. But for the sake of others who may be haunted by this imaginary bogeyman, I will elaborate further on what he told me about Hitler's chances of conquering the United States or any part of the Western Hemisphere. He said Hitler's military machine was geared for a lightning war, and naturally he would have a year's jump on the Allies while they are getting to their peak.

In the meantime, he pointed out, Hitler's forces would be spending their strength. He offered no definite period for the duration of the war, but he, like other military experts, was positive that Hitler could not win. For the sake of argument, however, he assumed that if Hitler did win, what would America have to fear from him? In that event he asserted that Germany as well as every other nation engaged in this war would be exhausted. Moreover, if Russia remains nominally neutral in this war, husbanding its strength, what will happen when Hitler must settle his score with Stalin? You may draw your own conclusions.

Even assuming that Hitler wins and then settles or amicably adjusts any differences with his war partner Stalin, what then has America to fear from that quarter? Assuming that Hitler would be able to muster his war strength in another generation as he has in the last generation, what then?

"Hitler," said my friend, "would then be well past the allotted threescore and ten. Men of that advanced age do not make wars. It is more probable that Hitler will be dead long, long before he arrives at the retirement age. Suppose his successor is another warmonger? Suppose he has a dream of empire and wishes to take over all or part of the Western World? If the United States and the other nations of this hemisphere stay out of this war and wax fat while the Old World is bled white and we fail to prepare our defense to meet any foe coming across 3,000 miles of ocean on one side and 6,000 miles on the other, then we deserve no better fate than we get."

Some day, I predict that my informant will be in a position where he can speak openly and give the American people the benefit of his sound military knowledge. I believe it will help to render this country immune from war scares in the future, as well as actual wars.

Let us assume, however, that my friend is wrong. Let us assume he changes his mind about the security of America, just as the President has changed his mind about the safeguards of the arms embargo. Let us assume to keep war from our firesides we must keep war from coming to the Americas. Let us assume, after all, as do some gentlemen, that this is our war and one set of belligerents is fighting our battles.

If that assumption be true, why should we dally with measures "short of war"? If our "frontier is in France," why stand we here idle? Why hesitate; why deal with half measures while the French and British fight our battles, while brave British tommies and French poilus bleed and die for us? Why not declare war at once, today; draft another American Expeditionary Force of 2,000,000 men, with another 2,000,000 to stand guard at home to drive off Hitler's fabulous air squadrons? When the second American Expeditionary Force arrives in France, let the commanding general emulate General Pershing and visit the tomb of our Revolutionary War friend and say, "Lafayette, we are here."

Mr. Speaker, I assume nothing of the sort; but if any other Member of this House does assume that situation to be the fact, then let him act upon it. Let him offer a joint resolution—a declaration of war on Germany. And then, Mr. Speaker, let him defend his rash act in this House and before his constituents at home. I dare say we would meet when the next Congress convenes, but we would miss him. Yes, Mr. Speaker, we would miss him, because his people would retire him permanently to private life.

Even if the House is foolhardy enough to "rubber stamp" this Senate resolution, designed to place the United States in a position to intervene in this war by deliberately giving aid to one side while the British Navy withholds it from the other, I hope and pray my worst fears never will be realized. I hope and pray this unneutral action, which some gentlemen last June described as "an act of war," never will produce the fearful consequences that it might; and drag America into this war. It would be small satisfaction to be able to say "I told you so." I would rather be wrong about this than be President.

Before you gentlemen vote to put the American people to the risk of war that abides in this unneutral measure let me remind you of the ghastly lesson we learned in the World

War. We learned the utter futility of America trying to make the world safe for democracy. We learned, or we should have learned, that our own democracy will be endangered, if not lost, if we are foolhardy enough to mix in this Old World war. Surely we ought to be wise enough never again to risk the loss of America's precious heritage, liberty.

We paid a high price for that lesson. But no price is too high to pay for wisdom. Now is the time to reap our profits. Not a harvest of "blood money" for weapons of war for the destruction of human life, the arms to snuff out the lives not only of soldiers in the field of battle but innocent women and children in their homes behind the lines. Now is the time to reap the harvest of peace that leads to prosperity and insures the blessings of liberty.

Every American knows in a general way what the World War cost him or her. Few realize the enormous cost to the Nation, tangible and intangible cost. A part of the tangible cost rests as a tax burden upon every American today, a burden that will be passed on to future generations. And every American is bearing a share of the intangible cost in the loss of health and happiness.

Lest we forget, let me cite a few figures. But, appalling as they are, cold figures cannot begin to tell the awful price we paid for that war. Losses in human values cannot be computed on an adding machine.

America's immediate human cost of the World War was 126,000 American boys killed in action or died of wounds, and 234,000 wounded, most of them incapacitated for civil life. Staggering as those totals are, they are insignificant in comparison with the entire toll of human life taken in the World War. Let us look at the casualty lists of the World War armies and navies once more. Here is that stark and stunning record: Soldier fatalities, 8,500,000; wounded, 21,000,000; civilian fatalities, 10,000,000.

Wars are supposed to be fought by soldiers on the battlefield, but 10,000,000 civilian fatalities again remind us that in modern war the innocent victims, the women and children, the aged and helpless, outnumber the soldier dead. With weapons of war more devastating than ever, God help the women and children of Europe in this war. We do not want their blood on our hands.

The money cost of the World War was only slightly less staggering than the human cost. Direct war costs—expenditures for the destruction of human life and property—were $200,000,000,000. Property and production losses added another $150,000,000,000 to bring the money cost to a total of $350,000,000,000. Three hundred and fifty thousand million dollars, earned by the sweat of the brows and the aching backs of the peoples of the world, spent for what? Spent for slaughtering human beings, utterly wasted.

It would be beyond belief that supposedly civilized peoples, including us Americans, could be so stupid, if we did not have this bill rendered by the god of war before us. Yet there it is—a bill still unpaid. High as that price was, it would not have been too high if we got what we fought for. That was supposed to be "the war to end war." But we were fooled. In the light of the almost continuous succession of wars that have followed, with another threat of a World War upon us, "the war to end war" was a hideous mockery.

After paying that awful price of death, destruction, and waste and achieving nothing, it is even less conceivable that the peoples of the Old World powers can be at war again. Yet the war is on. God only knows when or how it will end. We shudder to think of the war bill that eventually will be rendered. Only one generation and another bill to pay, a bill in death, destruction, and waste. No matter what that bill may be, it must be paid. No matter how long it takes, no matter how many generations yet unborn it may require to pay it, it must be paid in the end by somebody.

Now, let us look again at America's World War costs. It has been figured variously, but one of the most recent and most reliable estimates fixes America's money costs at nearly $51,000,000,000. Even that figure does not bring it down to date. It includes the costs in the war years of 1917–18 and since, down to 1937.

That figure, however, does not include more than $12,000,000,000 we, the American people, loaned the Allies. We might as well add that to the money cost now as later, for it never will be paid. In more than 20 years, none of the big debtor nations made more than a gesture to repay us. If ever we had a Chinaman's chance of collecting that money, that chance went a glimmering when war again enveloped Europe in flames.

America's World War money costs still are mounting. War costs never end with the firing of the last shot in battle. It will require several generations more to liquidate that debt and it never will be paid if we pile the cost of another war on top of it.

I hope to live to see the day when a grateful nation liquidates its debt in full to its defenders in the World War as it has done and still is doing for the veterans of our seven major wars, from the War for Independence to the World War. America has paid pensions and adjusted compensation to the veterans of all her major wars.

Already we have paid, and justly paid, more than $7,500,000,000 in compensation to the World War veterans. Sooner or later, we will follow the precedent established by a grateful Nation after the Revolution. We should grant pensions to all worthy World War veterans and to their widows and orphans, as we always have done in the past. We can do that without undue burden on the taxpayers, who, after all, are the beneficiaries of the sacrifices of these World War veterans. We can do it if we stay out of this European war and reap the harvest of prosperity that comes in the piping times of peace.

Estimates of the cost of the economic depressions that have come as an inevitable consequence of the World War run into billions and billions of dollars. It is impossible to calculate the dearest of all war costs—the price already paid and the continuing cost in human misery.

There are 84 veterans' hospitals and facilities in the United States. As the commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, it was my duty and privilege to visit them—some of them many times. In those hospitals, where a grateful Government makes the disabled veterans as comfortable as possible, is where you will find the cruelest cost of war.

Some of you gentlemen who are about to vote for this Senate bill as a "measure short of war," which may bring war to America again, some of you who never have seen this cruelest cost of war might do well to visit Walter Reed and Mount Alto Hospitals today.

More than 20 years after the last shot of the World War was fired in France and peace restored to a war-sick world, there you will find hundreds of American veterans still paying the price of war, the price of trying "to make the world safe for democracy." That noble slogan has a hollow ring in their ears today.

There you will find middle-aged men paying the price of patriotism in their valorous youth. They are paying with broken bodies, wounds that will not heal, tubercular lungs, and shadowed minds. To many of them, death would be a welcome release from constant agony.

There you will get a glimpse of the cost of war that will make you hesitate before you cast a vote that even has a remote chance of condemning boys of today to years of living hell. The World War will come back to you in all its horror. It will tear at your heart and grip you by the throat. You will turn aside to hide unmanly tears that come in spite of you. You will wish you had not seen it. Most of all, you will wish you could forget it. But you never will, gentlemen. I know.

Before you gentlemen cast your votes, I ask you to add up that cost sheet and see what you get. You will get the answer to America's opposition to war, any war, and especially a European war. Add up that cost sheet and you will discover why the American people are determined to stay out

of this strictly European war. The American people know the best they can get out of war—any war—is the worst of it.

That is why the American people demand neutrality in fact not merely in name. That is why the American people, judging by the past, fear to gamble on the future filled with danger to themselves, their loved ones, and their beloved land. That is why the American people distrust this virtual war alliance with the Allies.

And that added up is why I am going to vote to keep the arms embargo, to keep America out of this European war. I will vote with a clear conscience, a conscience that will allow me to look any American mother in the eye and say, "I voted for the arms embargo because I believed it would reduce to the remotest possibility the danger of sending the boys of American mothers to fight on the battlefields of Europe."

The Farmer and Neutrality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, November 2, 1939

LETTER BY EDWARD E. KENNEDY

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, in the heart of Pennsylvania there is to be found many of the finest farms in the United States. The farmers in the great Keystone State are noted for their industry and their progressive methods that have caused their production to compare favorably with any State in the Union.

For years the farm industry has been afflicted with many ills, notably a lack of a fair market for the products of the farm where prices will not compel the farmer to take less than even the cost of production.

Agriculture is a great basic industry of this Nation and presents a problem that commands our undivided and immediate attention.

I would like permission at this time to publish herewith a letter received from Edward E. Kennedy, manager of the Farmers' Washington Service, this letter calling to our mind the plight of the American farmer and the urgent need that we give appropriate attention to the evils confronted by this large class of substantial American citizens:

NOVEMBER 1, 1939.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The first 9 months of 1939, compared with the first 9 months of 1938, indicates a great increase in agricultural imports into the United States and a great decrease of agricultural exports from the United States. In the 9 months of 1939 we imported farm products for consumption in the amount of $794,700,000, while in the same period in 1938 we purchased farm products in the amount of $711,600,000. For the same periods our agricultural exports declined from $602,700,000 in 1938 to $418,400,000 in 1939.

While all in the United States are being diverted from consideration of serious problems of agriculture and unemployment by the present dramatic attempt to lift the embargo and increase the exports of arms, munitions, and implements of war, little is being said and nothing is being done to protect our farmers from imports at below our cost of production prices or to sell our excess food and fiber to the world.

To lift the embargo now, would we not be choosing between the munitions makers and warmongers on the one hand and our Nation's 6,800,000 farmers on the other—choosing between "fools' gold" and fools' profits on the one hand and our own peace and security on the other—choosing between the national defense of a foreign state and the national defense of our own beloved country?

Is there even one valid, patriotic reason why we should lift the arms embargo now? Would it not be both patriotic and wise to retain the embargo on arms, munitions, and implements of war—settling this question decisively? Then, at once, turn our attention to assuring our farmers the cost of production, plus a profit; protect our home farm market from invasion by foreigners; build our prosperity upon our own basic industry—agriculture; give employment opportunities to our own labor at an adequate annual wage?

"Why quit our own to stand on foreign ground—why by interweaving our destiny with that of any part of Europe, entangle our peace and prosperity in the toils of European ambition, rivalship, interest, humor, or caprice?"

Why quit our own?

Sincerely,

EDWARD E. KENNEDY.

Sufficiency of Chemicals Assured United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEWIS D. THILL
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, November 2, 1939

ARTICLE FROM THE WASHINGTON TIMES-HERALD OF NOVEMBER 2, 1939

Mr. THILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news article which appeared in the Times-Herald, Washington, D. C., on November 2, 1939. This article is both timely and interesting, and presents the thesis that America could build a fence around itself and get along great. Many of us remember our dependence upon Germany and other European countries prior to the last war for dyes and various other chemicals:

[From the Washington Times-Herald of November 2, 1939]

SUFFICIENCY OF CHEMICALS ASSURED UNITED STATES—NATION CAPABLE OF SUPPLYING ALL MEDICAL AND INDUSTRIAL NEEDS IN WAR, EXPERT SAYS

NASHVILLE, TENN.—Every American industrial and medicinal need can be filed by American factories and laboratories, according to L. F. Livingston, manager of the agricultural extension service of E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co.

"Self-sufficiency of American industry today," he said, "is in sharp contrast with the United States dependence upon imports during the World War. During the last war," Livingston said, "numerous industrial activities were dependent upon imports.

PEOPLE'S HEALTH PERILED

"Employment of millions of our workers was threatened," he said. "Even the health of our people was endangered because the importation of many important medical supplies had been cut off."

"Now," he said, "America could build a fence around itself and get along great."

"This is due in no small degree to the accomplishments of American chemistry during the last two decades. The products of the industrial chemical plant symbolize a measure of the economic security and the industrial independence of our country in contrast with conditions of a quarter of a century ago when the World War shut off so many supplies.

"This country did not have a single plant in 1914 to extract nitrogen from the air and transform it into the nitrates and other chemicals so vital to agriculture, industry, and national defense. We were almost completely dependent upon the importation of natural nitrates from Chile. Today America is self-sufficient in nitrates through chemistry.

NO LACK OF POTASH

"When the World War began, the United States was almost wholly dependent upon Germany for potash, which is so essential to agriculture and industry. In recent years, methods have been devised for the economic recovery of potash from America's mineral deposits. This country now produces a major part of the potash it consumes and, if necessary, it can produce all its needs.

"A highly essential material is rubber, imported from far-away lands under foreign control. It presented a grave problem during the World War as supplies dwindled and prices pyramided.

"That need not happen now. The chemical rubber made from coal, limestone, and salt, has every promise of functioning satisfactorily. Based on small production, its price is less than the cost of rubber during the World War days. Moreover, it is actually superior to natural rubber for many uses."

American Peace and Neutrality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VINCENT F. HARRINGTON

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 2, 1939

ARTICLE BY WILLIAM WILMOTH

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, this is a pamphlet written by and published at the expense of William Wilmoth, a Washington, D. C., businessman who has given much thought to the possibility of his country's involvement in the European conflict. This is not a partisan paper. Mr. Wilmoth voted for Mr. Roosevelt in 1932. He has since favored much of the New Deal legislation. I think his paper should be read by every American anxious for peace.

The article is as follows:

AMERICAN PEACE AND NEUTRALITY AND FOREIGN WARS—THE FACTS ABOUT THE PROPOSED BILL BEFORE CONGRESS TO REPEAL THE EMBARGO ON THE SUPPLY OF ARMS, MUNITIONS, AND IMPLEMENTS OF WAR TO FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS AND THE CONFUSED MUDDLE IN AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

I believe the President in his message read to the Congress on September 21, deliberately confuses the issue involved by bringing in subjects wholly foreign to that issue in order to make out a case for what he desired to accomplish. The President brought in the subject of aggressor nations and their danger to Christianity and civilization, neutrality and international law, while the question involved is embargoes; the right and desirability of the Nation to prohibit the export or import of certain commodities, which is purely a matter of domestic or municipal law.

As a matter of domestic policy, tariff laws prohibit the import of commodities subsidized by foreign governments; they likewise prohibit the export of helium gas and implements of war. No one will contend that these domestic regulations are the concern of international law or neutrality, yet the President brought them in to confuse the issue and to justify his demand for the repeal of the embargo on the export of arms and ammunitions. The President also said that such embargoes, which were departures from international law, had proved dangerous to the Nation in the past, and was the major cause of the War of 1812, and therefore likely to be the cause of other wars.

Now there is not a shred of history that I can find to justify that contention. Prior to 1812, England and France seized and confiscated hundreds of American ships and their cargoes bound to the opposite countries. The embargo was made to prevent these seizures and confiscations, and the war, therefore, was not caused by the embargoes but by the seizure of the ships and cargoes, and the barbarous course of the British Navy in going aboard American ships on the high seas and seizing native and naturalized American seamen and forcing them to serve on ships of war against their own country and against others with which it was at peace. Theodore Roosevelt, in his history of the Naval War of 1812, says: "The wrongs inflicted on our seafaring countrymen by their impressment into foreign ships formed the main cause of the war." He says further, "That the principles for which the United States contended in 1812 are now universally accepted, and those so tenaciously maintained by Great Britain find no advocates in the civilized world." So that the War of 1812 was not caused by embargoes, but was fought to establish and maintain the principles of international law.

The President would have been less disingenuous and far more accurate if he had said that the entry of the United States into the so-called World War in 1917 was the result of the Government's departure from international law. President Wilson's insistence on the right of Americans to travel unharmed on armed belligerent ships was wholly contrary to long-established international law. Chief Justice Marshall decided in 1815, in the Nereide case, that an armed merchantman was a ship of war. This has been the accepted basis of international law ever since, and in compliance with it Holland excluded armed merchantmen from her ports during the World War. But President Wilson permitted himself to be deceived by the British Government into taking the position that a merchant ship, armed for defensive purposes, was entitled under international law to enjoy the status of a peaceful trading ship in neutral ports.

"Thus," says Professor Borchard, "the President, and the House and Senate also, were misled into taking a position which had no foundation either in law or common sense." So the President found that it served his purpose to misstate the cause of the War of 1812, and to ignore the causes by which the country was dragged into the war of 1917. For he said in his message, "Our next deviation by statute from the sound principles of neutrality and peace through international law did not come for 130 years. It was the so-called Neutrality Act of 1935." The embargo resolution to which the President refers was not a so-called or actual act of neutrality, nor did it affect in any way the concepts of peace or the principles of international law, but was a municipal regulation concerning the export of certain commodities.

We are not now concerned with the wisdom of this act, but what we are justly concerned about is the demand for its repeal, because of the exigencies of a new war between certain European nations; that the domestic and foreign policy of the United States is thus to be determined by European governments as it was in 1914 to 1919—that its repeal now would be unneutral, like the action on armed belligerent ships, and like it a step toward war. If, under the influence or coercion of the Executive, Congress repeals the embargo, it will be but a repetition of the methods of President Wilson by which he led the country into war in 1917.

The President also made the astonishing assertion that the embargo "had the effect of putting land powers on the same footing as naval powers," and denied to sea powers "the ancient right to buy anything anywhere" and to treat the high seas as private property. The President in his zeal forgets that one of the cardinal principles for which America fought in the World War was the freedom of the seas. The second clause of President Wilson's 14 points declared that the seas should be free in both peace and war outside of territorial waters for the movement of peaceful commerce. Great Britain contemptuously scrapped that resolution at the peace conference. Now President Roosevelt justifies Great Britain in discarding the principles of President Wilson for which Americans were told they fought the war.

The President says again that the repeal of the embargo and the manufacture of arms and munitions in this country for Great Britain and France will relieve unemployment, but to what purpose? It would increase employment and enable a few to get rich, but how will it profit the American people as a whole to use up the Nation's essential mineral resources, its capital and labor, in the production of munitions of war and receive therefor useless gold to bury in the ground, gold that no foreign nation wants, and of as little utility in our national economy as the old defaulted bonds. Great Britain and her Allies bought in the United States during the World War a total of $11,500,000,000 worth of all commodities. They paid about $2,000,000,000 on account of these purchases, or about 17 percent. The balance of $9,500,000,000, or 83 percent, was advanced by the United States Treasury from Liberty loans, for which it took the I O U's of Britain and her Allies. The I O U's subsequently converted into bonds have never been paid, and the American taxpayer has been and is still paying off the Liberty bonds which indirectly paid for the nine and a half billion dollars' worth of purchases in this country by Great Britain and her Allies. Profits for a few, but disaster for the many.

The message, because of its inaccuracy, is not a good lawyer's brief for one of the belligerents; much less is it the work of a responsible statesman whose words and acts determine so vital an issue as peace or war.

THE NEUTRALITY BILL

The administration's so-called neutrality bill just reported to the Senate shows to what extremes of inconsistency and contradiction men will go once they have embarked on an unwise and hazardous course. When President Roosevelt departed from the wise and historic course of the founders of the Republic of strict noninterference in the controversies and wars between foreign nations and resorted to violent denunciation, threats of quarantine, and acts short of war against foreign governments he violated the fundamental duties and principles of neutrality and thereby forfeited the rights of a neutral and embarked the Nation on a sea of uncertainty. Further pursuing this dubious and unwise course Mr. Roosevelt was the first President of the United States to proclaim a conditional and partial neutrality in a foreign war. Even President Wilson in 1914 declared for a course of strict and impartial neutrality but under the influence and machinations of Colonel House at the dictates of the British Government, he was prevailed upon step by step to depart from that course and at last to plunge the Nation into war. Certainly this gross betrayal of national interest is no precedent nor justification for any administration thereafter to play shuttlecock with the interest, peace, and safety of the Nation, or to depart from its long-established course of honest neutrality and nonintervention in disputes and wars of foreign governments.

As evidence of the inconsistency and confusion in which the administration has involved itself and the Nation, it now proposes to remove the embargo against the supply of arms and munitions to nations at war and substitute therefor an embargo on American merchant ships to exclude them from 80 percent of the trade routes of the world. Thus, it is more important to make the country a base of supply of munitions of war for foreign governments than to maintain our peaceful ships of commerce on the sea. As our Nation grew strong and pursued a course of impartial neutrality, it was able to assert and maintain its neutral rights to carry on peaceful commerce throughout the world for a century, despite all the wars that ensued. It is only in the last and present wars when Great Britain, a naval power, is at war with a constitutional power and we become a quasi belligerent that our ships are endangered or as now proposed to scuttle them from

the seas. If in disregard of the Nation's vital interest, peace, and security, the arms embargo is repealed at the behest of foreign government, even then there will be no necessity because of this to embargo the American merchant fleet from the seas, except in the immediate war zones in western Europe. Despite the fact that our Government took sides in the last war almost from the beginning, our loss in ships was trivial. For the 3 years 1914 to 1917, when diplomatic relations were severed with Germany, the loss in ships was but 20,000 tons and the loss in lives only three, and these were seamen on an American tanker in a British naval convoy. These losses were but a small fraction of the annual peacetime losses from storms and accidents at sea. The immediate issue that brought the declaration of war was the sinking of armed British ships with Americans aboard.

This alien-motivated, ill-considered, and unbaked proposal, obviously derived from no American interests, registers zero minus in American statecraft.

Yes, we will gain some temporary employment in the manufacture of munitions, but what is to become of the half million employed on our ships and in foreign commerce? Does the Government propose to stop its merchant shipbuilding and let those ships it has built at enormous cost rot at the docks? The proposal to withdraw American ships from the seas in consequence of the administration's dangerous, revolutionary, and un-American foreign policy is preposterous and is no solution of the imbroglio in which it has involved the Nation. As a sop to the unwary, the act provides that munitions and implements of war are to be sold on a cash-and-carry basis, and then provides for their sale on credit to nations whose repudiated credit obligations now clutter up the vaults of the United States Treasury. It is safe to predict that once they have this Government committed in this nefarious business, their resourceful brains will devise means to escape payment as they did before.

Then the act empowers the President to do this, that, and the other by decree. The Constitution makes no provision for government by decree. The American people do not wish Congress to abdicate its constitutional powers to make all laws. If Congress does not know what to do under given circumstances, it should do nothing rather than thrust doubtful powers into the hands of the Executive, for history shows that it was the abuse of power again and again by the executive that caused the downfall of the Roman Republic. It was the abuse of executive power by President Wilson that enabled him to involve the country in the European World War. President Washington and the cofounders of the American Republic formulated its foreign policy which was reaffirmed in the Monroe Doctrine in 1823 in the following words: "Our policy in regard to Europe, which was adopted at an early stage of the wars which have so long agitated that quarter of the globe nevertheless remains the same, which is not to interfere in the internal concerns of any of its powers; to consider the government de facto as the legitimate government for us; to cultivate friendly relations with it and to preserve those relations by frank, firm, and manly policy."

Does anyone believe that if Mr. Roosevelt had followed his country's long honored foreign policy, and during the numerous European crises had taken a calm and judicious course befitting the responsible head of a great and always peaceful nation that ours has been, and when war came, he had proclaimed an honest and impartial neutrality, as every President before him had done, in like circumstances, there would now be such doubt and anxiety among the people for the future, and fear of the Government involving them in another European war? If there is fear and uncertainty about the course of the Government it is because of its preoccupation and emotional emphasis on war; that instead a fixed and steadfast policy, the pursuit of a personal and whimsical "day to day" policy in foreign affairs; the decreeing of a "temporary emergency" when no conceivable emergency exists; the movements of fleets and councils of war; what means all these?

It must be obvious to all that the proponents of this bill protest too much. Apart from lifting the arms embargo, its real purpose, the rest is but sugar coating to make the dose palatable. The other provision of the bill, if enacted, will create such muddled and chaotic conditions that they will have to be promptly repealed once the removal of the arms embargo is achieved.

The emergent call of Congress for the enactment of this bill and the dissimulating course of the administration raises grave suspicion in the public mind that these may be similar tactics to those pursued by the Wilson administration in regard to the last war, as Secretary Lansing reveals in his memoirs. Colonel House had written to Ambassador Page and Sir Edward Grey, British Foreign Minister, "that 90 percent of the American people did not want the President to involve them in the war," that the people must be "guided," that the President was doing that, and thinks as "we" do. Lansing, in his memoirs, page 101, records that it was necessary "to determine upon a general course of action which would not abruptly challenge that opinion, but would guide it in the right direction. We had to show that everything had been done to avoid war to arouse a public demand for war."

It was by such tactics that the American people were befoozled into quitting their homes and country to fight in a foreign war; a war about which they cared little and knew nothing. The American people now, as then, have no cause or desire to go to war with any other people on earth, nor have any other people cause or desire to go to war with them, but the American people and their vast resources constitute the greatest war prize in the world if by intrigue or betrayal it can be captured and made to serve a European belligerent as in 1917. Because of this, there is a white war raging against the people of this country with all the resources that money and brains can devise to capture and draft America and Americans into another and redder war on the battlefields of Europe.

The wise old sovereign, Queen Elizabeth, of England, when her ministers got bellicose and talked of war, would point her finger and cry "No war, me Lords, no war." The sovereign people of the American Republic cannot point their fingers at the Executive and Congress where peace is kept or war is made, but they can meet in assembly as of old, in every city, town, and hamlet and by resolution, letter, and telegram to the White House and the Capitol proclaim as in one voice, "No war, me Lords, no war." Americans must make another Declaration of Independence against foreign dominance of their country and all who would make it a vassal of European empires.

The foregoing is not prompted by partisanship, for I supported Mr. Roosevelt with all the means at my disposal, for one reason, I thought his experience in public affairs and during the war would be a safeguard against the very situation that now confronts us.

WILLIAM F. WILMOTH,
Washington, D. C.

Julien N. Friant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ORVILLE ZIMMERMAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, November 2, 1939

RESOLUTION BY MISSOURI DELEGATION IN CONGRESS

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution, unanimously adopted by the Missouri delegation in Congress at a special meeting held in the city of Washington, D. C., on the 31st day of October 1939:

Whereas on the 27th day of October 1939 death removed from the office of Special Assistant to the Secretary of Agriculture, Hon. Julien N. Friant, one of Missouri's most outstanding citizens and a recognized national leader: Therefore, be it

Resolved by the Representatives in Congress from Missouri, in special meeting assembled

1. That in the sudden and untimely death of Hon. Julien N. Friant, the Missouri delegation in Congress, and each member thereof, has lost a loyal friend who was always willing to render every possible assistance to them in the performance of their official duties.

2. That in his death not only has the State of Missouri, which he loved so well, lost one of its most widely known and useful citizens, but the Nation has lost one of its most outstanding leaders.

3. That we deeply mourn his passing and join with a nation of friends, and especially Members of Congress, in extending to his devoted family our deepest sympathy at this sad time in their lives.

4. That a copy of these resolutions be mailed to his family.

M. A. ROMJUE,
Chairman of Missouri Delegation in Congress.
ORVILLE ZIMMERMAN,
Acting Secretary.

Repeal of Embargo at Present Time Constitutes an Unneutral Act Under International Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, November 2, 1939

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the question of what should be the neutrality policy of this Nation has created such widespread interest that it now seems that every possible argument for or against repeal of the arms embargo has been advanced. No question since the World War has been more widely and seriously considered by all

classes of our people. And yet, notwithstanding this general, almost universal, discussion, it does not seem to me that any adequate answer has been given to the charge that if we change our national policy of embargo, now that the war is under way, that we are thereby committing an unneutral act. There is no doubt that it is the fundamental desire of our people to remain neutral. The fear of involvement, with the consequent use of our boys in another European struggle, is so great that there is a unanimous demand that we shall remain neutral and commit no act that, directly or indirectly, has even the appearance of being unneutral.

Recognizing as we all do the necessity and advisability of avoiding any act that would place our Nation on one side or the other of the conflict, it seems to me that we cannot change our existing embargo policy without creating the thought that we have done so in order to benefit one of the belligerent parties as against the other. The fact is that the present policy of embargo was adopted as our national policy in 1935. It was reestablished in 1937 and is the law today. In each instance it had the approval of nearly the entire membership of both Houses of Congress together with the approval of the President and Secretary of State. It represented, without a doubt, the thought and desire of our people. There were two basic reasons that led to its adoption: First, an abhorrence of war and our unwillingness to be a party either directly or indirectly to the cruelties incident to war; and, second, to keep this Nation free of involvement in any and all wars. No policy of this Nation, foreign or domestic, adopted at any time in the entire history of our Nation, ever had greater or as great a unanimity of support from our people as the embargo policy, the repeal of which is now being sought. The nations of the world have recognized and accepted it as our national policy. The nations now engaged in war entered into hostilities with full knowledge that it was the law of our land. No nation can or will claim that it was not within the right and power of this Nation to adopt such an embargo policy if it so desired. Thus, the only question that is raised by the effort to repeal it is whether it is right to do so during a war between contending nations. The charge is made that to do so indicates a desire to favor one of the belligerent parties and will thereby constitute an unneutral act. It does not seem to me that this all-important question has been satisfactorily answered by those who seek to repeal the embargo.

It has not been made plain to me during the debate in the Senate and House as to how this Nation can be considered neutral when it deliberately changes its neutrality policy in an important feature so as to give aid to one of the belligerent parties. To do so cannot be construed in any other way than that we have intervened and thereby destroyed our vaunted neutrality and become a party at least indirectly, if not directly. What effect it will have upon the offended belligerent remains for the future. To say the least it creates a situation that may result in a course of conduct by such belligerent that would carry us against our present intention and desire into the war. Thus, even though our present action to repeal the embargo now existing may seem to some at this time only an indirect violation of our duty as a neutral, yet, it can, and I hope it would not, have the effect of taking us eventually into war. If the offended belligerent should feel justified in its own protection to commit some act against our Nation, sufficiently great to create national resentment upon our part, it would not be beyond the realm of possibility that the emotions of our people could be raised to the point where it might seem necessary to them to enter the war to sustain our national honor and dignity. All this can, and in all probability would, be avoided by our not changing at this time, while the war is in progress, our national policy with respect to an embargo against the shipment of arms, ammunition, and implements of war to belligerents. We must not be blind to the danger that can easily arise as a result of our changing our neutrality policy in this important matter at this time.

The very meaning of neutrality is violated as soon as a neutral government changes its course to show partiality to one of the contending belligerents. The fact that we may have sympathy for one side or the other is not sufficient justification for changing our neutrality policy to assist that party. When it is done we lose our status as a neutral, in the true sense of the word and its accepted meaning in international law, because we thereby cease to be impartial. No one can contend that when such action occurs that we can rightfully continue to claim to be a neutral. Neutrality is judged by actions and not mere words declaring neutrality.

If consideration is to be given to established principles of international law, then there can be no doubt that to change our embargo law at this time, to benefit one of the belligerent parties, is an unneutral act. Time and again this principle has been advanced and accepted by our own Government and others. I do not believe it is disputed by those who are now seeking to repeal our embargo. Many of them have in fact directly or indirectly acknowledged it. It is too well established to do otherwise.

As an illustration of the adherence of our own Nation to this principle, permit me to recall the conditions that prevailed during the World War and the position taken by our Government with respect to changing our law, after the war had started, with respect to the shipment of arms and ammunition to Great Britain. At the time war was declared there was no embargo against shipment of arms and ammunition to nations at war. Consequently Great Britain and her Allies, having control of the seas, took full advantage of it and shipment of arms and ammunition to them was carried on. In December 1914, after the outbreak of war, several bills were introduced in Congress to place an embargo upon the shipment of war material to belligerent nations. The British Government immediately, through Sir Edward Grey, protested to our Government that the enactment of such a law would be "special legislation passed while war is in progress and therefore would constitute an unneutral act toward the belligerents that can profit by it." Thus, it will be recognized that Great Britain based its claim upon the same principle of international law that is now involved. The only difference is that in that instance Great Britain claimed the benefit of a principle that it now seeks to have this Nation deny. In other words, to use a common expression, the shoe is on the other foot, and it pinches.

It is equally interesting to see what position our Government took in that case which, as a lawyer would say, is on all fours with the present case so far as the principle involved is concerned. President Wilson and Mr. Lansing, counselor of the Department of State, upheld the British view that to change our law in such an important feature after hostilities had commenced would be an unneutral act toward one of the belligerent parties, namely, Great Britain, which at the time was in a position to profit by the absence of any restriction or embargo.

The position of this Government with respect to the principle of international law raised by Great Britain and, which I repeat, is the same principle now raised by those who oppose repeal of the embargo, was declared in a note issued April 21, 1915, as follows:

> This Government holds, as I believe Your Excellency is aware, and as it is constrained to hold in view of the present indisputable doctrines of accepted international law, that any change in its own laws of neutrality during the progress of a war which would affect unequally the relations of the United States with the nations at war would be an unjustifiable departure from the principle of strict neutrality by which it has consistently sought to direct its actions.

Thus, in 1915 our Government adhered to the established principle of international law that a change in our neutrality policy, in an important matter vitally affecting one of the belligerent parties, would be a direct violation of the principles of neutrality. It is this same principle that opponents of embargo repeal now claim governs the present issue; and to disregard it by repeal of the Embargo Act is to place our Nation in the undesirable position of committing an unneutral act and thereby destroying our status as a neutral. Other and equally pertinent illustrations of the acceptance of this principle could be given, all of which would demonstrate that our Nation, as well as the other nations of the

world, have accepted and acknowledged this principle as established by international law. To repeal the present embargo will, therefore, mean a reversal upon our part of our long-established practice of recognition of established principles of international law in our dealing with other governments. The result of such a change at this time would be to create an uncertain future fraught with danger.

Strange as it may seem, many of those now advocating repeal of the embargo, adopted by Congress and accepted by the people of our country as the best possible means of demonstrating our desire to avoid the horrors of war and remain at peace, are willing to concede that such a repeal at this time is an unneutral act, but, justify it upon the ground that this is in effect "our war," and that we are in duty bound to participate to the extent of shipment of arms, ammunition, and implements of war. This is a dangerous philosophy if carried to its logical conclusion. Condemnation of the methods used by aggressors, though sufficient to create natural sympathy for those who have been the subject of aggression, is not sufficient to justify the thought that it is "our war" when another nation, with rights it deems necessary to protect, declares war. Neither sympathy or prejudice should dictate our national course to the extent of taking sides in a European war. To do so is to set in motion circumstances that may lead us to grave consequences. We cannot afford at this time to adopt any course that would mean, either now or eventually, the abandonment of our status as a neutral. We can only preserve our right to the privileges and immunities of a neutral by observing our duties as a neutral. We cannot discard the duties of a neutral without losing the rights of a neutral. The safe and sane course for our Nation to pursue in these troublesome and treacherous times is to remain neutral in the fullest sense of the word, and, as such, be entitled to the rights and privileges accorded a neutral as well as accepting the duties incident thereto.

It would be well to ponder, in times such as these, the words of advice and counsel contained in that memorable Farewell Address of the greatest of all American statesmen, the immortal Washington, reading as follows:

> So, likewise, a passionate attachment of one nation for another produces a variety of evils. Sympathy for the favorite nation, facilitating the illusion of an imaginary common interest, in cases where no real common interest exists, and infusing into one the enmities of the other, betrays the former into a participation in the quarrels and wars of the latter, without adequate inducement of justification: It leads also to concessions to the favorite nation of privileges denied to others, which is apt doubly to injure the nation making the concessions, by unnecessarily parting with what ought to have been retained and by exciting jealousy, ill will, and a disposition to retaliate, in the parties from whom equal privileges are withheld. And it gives to ambitious, corrupted, or deluded citizens (who devote themselves to the favorite nation) facility to betray, or sacrifice the interests of their own country, without odium, sometimes even with popularity; gilding, with the appearances of a virtuous sense of obligation a commendable deference for public opinion, or a laudable zeal for public good, the base or foolish compliances of ambition, corruption, or infatuation.

Reflect and consider the application of these words to the issue that now confronts us. To do so will show the judgment and wisdom of retaining without change at this time the embargo features of our neutrality policy.

Thankful for Fine Folks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. NELSON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 31, 1939

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Speaker, I have many times given expression to the thought that I am one of the most fortunate men in the world, privileged to represent almost 300,000 of the best people to be found. Truly they are fine folks—yes; they are Missouri "folks," not "folk."

During discussion of the neutrality question, I have felt myself especially favored. While I have heard frequent reference to bitter or threatening letters received by Members of Congress, few such have reached me, and almost without exception these have not been from the Second Congressional District of Missouri, which it is my privilege to represent. In fact, I could count on my fingers all the real mean letters I have ever received from constituents, and this covers more than a dozen years in Congress.

A flood of letters seldom reaches my office. The folks back home, while knowing that I am always glad to have their opinions on any subject, apparently are willing to trust me to take such action as seems best. In this connection I quote from a letter the like of which I am sure any Member of Congress would be glad to have:

NEW FRANKLIN, MO., *October 25, 1939.*

Hon. WILL L. NELSON, M. C.,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. NELSON: I read in the papers that there are plenty of people telling other people to write to their Congressmen how to vote on the neutrality bill. Now, Mr. NELSON, my opinion is that about 98 out of every 100 do not know a gol darn thing about that bill. I will admit I do not, and I read all the time about the bill. You vote to your own satisfaction on the neutrality bill. We elected you to attend to the business for us. As far as I know, you have made good.

Wishing you all of the good things in life and success for you, also your good family, let me sign myself

Your friend and supporter,

———.

Because the people I represent have been so tolerant, kind, and considerate, I am glad publicly to express my deep appreciation.

It is true that at a time like this, when real problems perplex, when it is difficult to know what is best, and when many, and this applies to both sides of the question, are influenced by gross exaggeration or propaganda of large proportions, we may expect strong expressions of individual views. At such times we would do well to remember the words of Abraham Lincoln, who said, "If we could first know where we are, and whither we are tending, we could better judge what to do and how to do it."

All of us are equally earnest in our desire for peace. "If we could first know," all of us would be together. Personally, in supporting the neutrality bill, it is my view that it is better to let our goods go and keep our boys at home.

But getting back to the Thangsgiving thought I had in mind, I am truly thankful for such a constituency as is mine, and I would add, thankful for such a country as is ours. As we approach another Thanksgiving Day, with our country at peace with all the world, and God grant that it may continue so, it seems to me that there should be no debate as to the proper Thanksgiving date. Every day should be a Thanksgiving Day in America. Voicing this view, I recently received a post card from a constituent, who said, "It's great to live in a country where you carry a camera instead of a gun, and a picnic lunch instead of a gas mask."

So, Mr. Speaker, I challenge any colleague, even the Speaker of the House, sir, to show that he represents finer people than are to be found in the heart of Missouri.

America's Chance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WESLEY E. DISNEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 2, 1939

BOOK REVIEW FROM WASHINGTON EVENING STAR

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following review of a

book entitled "America's Chance of Peace," by Duncan Aikman and Blair Bolles:

[From the Washington Evening Star of November 1, 1939]

AMERICA HELD ABLE TO STAY OUT OF WAR—NEW BOOK SURVEYS PEACE PROSPECTS AND FINDS THEM BRIGHT

America's Chance of Peace: By Duncan Aikman and Blair Bolles. Published by Doubleday, Doran & Co., Inc., New York

On the Labor Day week-end when war broke out in Europe, America was deeply apprehensive, fearful that history would repeat itself to the point of drawing us into a new holocaust not of our making. Nervously fatalistic, too many people uttered dire prophecies that "we'll be in before Christmas."

To many who preferred not to be dogmatic about the future but were seriously disturbed at the prospects, it seemed unbelievable that our Government could find any justification for leading us into Europe's war. But many of the words and the small actions of the Government were far from reassuring; intentionally or otherwise, they were spawning a definite war psychology within our own country.

Fortunately, at least from the viewpoint of those who want no part of another war, the first month of hostilities brought some revisions in the pattern which had first appeared to be taking shape. In the first place, no swift shambles of either civilian or military death occurred to outrage the neutral world. In the second place, the fundamental unwillingness of the American people to rush into Europe's war apparently became more fully impressed upon Washington officialdom. The time had fully arrived for a careful and realistic appraisal of America's chances for remaining at peace.

Against this background, Duncan Aikman and Blair Bolles set out to do a newspaperman's job, namely, to write an accurate and informative piece and to do it in a hurry. In the opinion of this reviewer, they succeeded well and when more exhaustive histories of these important years are being written it is probable that no more pertinent comparisons between 1939 and 1914 will be drawn than those hustled into print by these two.

Of America's chance of peace, they found, in brief, much that was most encouraging.

They found, for instance, that machinery not only was in existence to cushion the economic and financial effects of a major war upon our domestic economy but that almost without the pushing of an extra button that machinery operated effectively when the war began. It was not so in 1914.

They found that instead of being prepared for neither peace nor war on the industrial and military fronts as in 1914, today we have at hand and partly in operation programs of mobilization which by making us strong should help to keep us at peace.

They found, and perhaps this is most important of all, that we are smarter today than in 1914, both as a people and as a Government; in other words, that we are not accepting the glib propaganda with which Europe flooded this country 25 years ago, and that official Washington today is getting its "inside stuff" from a smart, hard-working bunch of reportorial diplomats instead of the ingenuous tea-tilters of those other days.

In one of the very best chapters of their book, the authors describe how Secretary of State "Scoop" Hull and his staff of foreign "correspondents" have consistently been on top of every European development (except the Russo-German pact) days or even months before it became public knowledge. The importance of this accurate alertness in permitting this Government to chart its own course for peace is obvious; the excellence of the job is magnified by comparison with the diplomatic fumbling of 1914–18.

Boiled down, their conclusion is that we are on a relatively even keel today because there has been intelligent foresight displayed; from now on the most important requirement is that we "think things through." Following such a formula, the authors believe, America need never go to war unless or until her true self interests dictate that such course should be followed.

In the minds of many, these true self-interests do not cross the lines of Europe's power politics.

J. C. H.

We Are All American or No Part American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 2, 1939

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, with the European war becoming more and more serious, it is high time that we attend to our own problems on this side of the Atlantic Ocean. For some time I have been concerned about the alien activities in this country; and I have repeatedly expressed myself publicly on this score. For a time, in fact, I had thought that Congress had really begun to curb these activities and that, at least for the time being, we as a Nation were safe from within. I now learn that the lull which we noticed in the program of un-American activities throughout the Nation has perhaps been due to the fact that these forces were being utilized in an underground and subversive manner, being kept from the light of day and from the glare of publicity.

The business of conducting a government in this great country is really serious business even in normal times, but with the great conflagration in Europe it is doubly serious. In my opinion, this is no time to mollycoddle the alien and no time to be very deferential to his views. It is true that we want to preserve the Bill of Rights which guarantees free people certain "inalienable rights" everywhere. On the other hand, we as a nation cannot hope to maintain the very guaranties of which we boast and at the same time to continue to permit the gnawing processes of the bund and the Communist to proceed without interruption and without molestation.

We are engaged at the present time in the effort to maintain this Nation in a state of peace and tranquility. We know what war is and I, for one, do not want to see a great peaceful people thrown into the jealousies, the hatreds, and the strife of the Old World. Our task is difficult, but the obstacles, while great, are not insurmountable. We must not relax our vigil, but we must continue our efforts to keep this Nation at peace.

While we are engaged in the tremendous work, the subversive interests ply their nefarious designs. The Dies committee established by the House of Representatives has recently uncovered much evidence of alien influence and propaganda. While I know nothing regarding the credibility of the witnesses who may have come before the committee, the number of them and the multiplicity of the charges made, without contradiction, indicates, in my opinion, only too well the lurking presence of these under-cover activities which have for their purposes the undermining of our institutions and our form of government. That groups of people in our own land can continue to praise foreign governments at the expense of our own Government and can continue to foment trouble at home when the world is literally on fire is unthinkable.

A number of days ago the Dies committee, which was established by the House of Representatives and is maintained by the Government funds, published a list of 558 Government employees who, it was said, were members of the American League for Peace and Democracy. It was further reported that this organization claims a membership of almost 4,000,000 people in the United States. The Dies committee has been engaged in investigating un-American activities and in making regular reports to the press throughout the country. Accumulated facts have proven that the American League for Peace and Democracy is a "Communist front" organization. Earl Browder, head of the Communist movement in America, has always been vice chairman of the league. The Communist organization in the United States is the heaviest single contributor in funds to the League for Peace and Democracy. Its program has been essentially communistic.

I do not pass judgment upon any single individual whose name appears on this list. It is possible that many employees of the United States Government, also members of the League for Peace and Democracy, may not have known the history and fundamental purposes of the league. It is entirely possible that some of those whose names appeared on the list may never have been members of the organization and their names may have been included in this list through error. Some, however, have already openly admitted membership, and a few Government employees have stated that they were proud of this membership.

A public servant is paid by funds raised from the entire public by taxation. Before taking over his office, he is required to swear that he "will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic"; that he "will bear true faith and allegiance to the same." A Government employee owes a higher duty

to the Nation as a whole than does the average individual; and he should set an example of loyalty and patriotism to his Government. A real Communist cannot bear "true faith and allegiance" to his Government nor can he "support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic."

The public has watched the work of the Department of Justice in the Earl Browder case with great interest. I personally hope that this case marks the beginning of real efforts on the part of the Justice Department to bring to account a large number of the Communists who have assiduously worked, both by day and by night, to build up a great organization in America with fundamental principles at varience with those of democratic government and with objectives intended to break down our Constitution and our Bill of Rights.

I have read with much concern the news of sabotage in Government contract factories and espionage in some of the agencies in our Government—especially that of the Army and the Navy. I have been informed of the delivery of contracts for both Army and Navy being held up because of alien and un-American activity in the manufacture of merchandise very necessary for our own safety.

The debates in the House of Representatives during the past few years have shown conclusively the effect of a widespread passport fraud racket. This racket has its ramifications into foreign nations and should be broken up. Evidence has been presented to some of the committees in the House of Representatives to show that in certain instances that the German Bund has been engaged in military drills and in carrying arms in this country. As evidence proceeds in rapid pace in the present critical condition of world affairs, I will not be surprised to see increased alien activity, more widespread sabotage, and intensified activity on the part of those who in thought, principle, and allegiance daily strive to render our Government powerless.

As a Member of Congress, each week I receive literature and publications written by Communists for the benefit of the Communist movement in America. Only today I received a magazine entitled "The Communist," and with the inscription on its front cover stating "Twenty Years of the Communist Party of the United States of America, 1919–39." This magazine shows on its first pages the editors to be Earl Browder, Alex Bittlemen, and V. J. Jerome. Numerous persons are contributors to its writings, and it is interesting to note that titles of several articles are as follows: First, "Remarks on the Twentieth Anniversary of Communist Party of the United States of America"; second, "Twenty Years of Communist Trade-Union Policy"; and, third, "The Soviet and the American People." These magazines, booklets, and writings come from I know not where, but I do know that they use the United States mail as a means of circulation.

The fact that the Communist Party is actually entering candidates for election in local and congressional elections in a number of States throughout the Nation constitutes a matter of vital concern to our people. The fact that these candidates poll an insignificant vote should not justify us in overlooking a serious situation.

We have reached a time in the history of our Nation which is critical. We have met in this Congress for the purpose of preserving American neutrality. Influences from across the oceans seek to influence our actions and to affect our unbiased judgment. At this critical time the Communist and the German Bund intensify their subversive and slimy activities. We do not want, and will not countenance, any infringement of our rights of freedom of speech and of conscience. At the same time, if these rights are to remain inviolate, our Government must remain powerful enough to enforce them. The time for action has then come. No better reason can exist tomorrow than existed today. Vigorous, unrelenting, and determined action to ferret out all of these subversive activities, to break them up, and to bring them to the bar of justice is immediately necessary. Investigation should exonerate those upon whom the shadows of suspicion have unjustly fallen and should penalize severely those who have been guilty of subversive activities and by doing so violate our laws. At this critical time we are either all American or no part American. And speaking in behalf of the overwhelming majority of 130,000,000 of our people, in the language of the poet, I say we are—

Not for Moscow,
Not for Berlin,
Not for Rome!
But for country,
God, and home!

American Rights Upon the High Seas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFTON A. WOODRUM

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 2, 1939

LETTER BY WOODROW WILSON

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I wish to insert in the RECORD the following letter from President Wilson to Senator William J. Stone. The letter makes pertinent observations relative to American rights upon the high seas:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D. C., February 25, 1916.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I very warmly appreciate your kind and frank letter of today, and feel that it calls for an equally frank reply.

You are right in assuming that I shall do everything in my power to keep the United States out of war. I think the country will feel no uneasiness about my course in that respect. Through many anxious months I have striven for that object, amid difficulties more manifold than can have been apparent upon the surface, and so far I have succeeded. I do not doubt that I shall continue to succeed. The course which the Central European Powers have announced their intention of following in the future with regard to undersea warfare seems for the moment to threaten insuperable obstacles, but its apparent meaning is so manifestly inconsistent with explicit assurances recently given us by those powers with regard to their treatment of merchant vessels on the high seas that I must believe that explanations will presently ensue which will put a different aspect upon it. We have had no reason to question their good faith or their fidelity to their promises in the past, and I, for one, feel confident that we shall have none in the future.

But, in any event, our duty is clear. No nation—no group of nations—has the right, while war is in progress, to alter or disregard the principles which all nations have agreed upon in mitigation of the horrors and sufferings of war; and if the clear rights of American citizens should very unhappily be abridged or denied by any such action we should, it seems to me, have in honor no choice as to what our own course should be.

For my own part I cannot consent to any abridgment of the rights of American citizens in any respect. The honor and self-respect of the Nation is involved. We covet peace, and shall preserve it at any cost but the loss of honor. To forbid our people to exercise their rights for fear we might be called upon to vindicate them would be a deep humiliation, indeed. It would be an implicit, all but an explicit, acquiescence in the violation of the rights of mankind everywhere, and of whatever nation or allegiance. It would be a deliberate abdication of our hitherto proud position as spokesman, even amid the turmoil of war, for the law and the right. It would make everything this Government has attempted, and everything that it has accomplished during this terrible struggle of nations meaningless and futile.

It is important to reflect that if, in this instance, we allowed expediency to take the place of principle the door would inevitably be opened to still further concessions. Once accept a single abatement of right, and many other humiliations would follow, and the whole fine fabric of international law might crumble under our hands piece by piece. What we are contending for in this matter is of the very essence of the things that have made America a sovereign Nation. She cannot yield them without conceding her own impotency as a Nation, and making virtual surrender of her independent position among the nations of the world.

I am speaking, my dear Senator, in deep solemnity, without heat, with a clear consciousness of the high responsibilities of my office, and as your sincere and devoted friend. If we should unhappily differ, we shall differ as friends, but where issues so momentous as these are involved we must, just because we are friends, speak our minds without reservation.

Faithfully yours,

WOODROW WILSON.

Senator WILLIAM J. STONE,
United States Senate.

Conditions in China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT LUCE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 30, 1939

STATEMENT BY ROGER W. BABSON, OF WELLESLEY, MASS., MADE IN HONOLULU OCTOBER 9, 1939

Mr. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement made in Honolulu by my constituent, Roger W. Babson, well-known economist, upon returning from a 2-month stay in the Orient:

The Japanese people are an industrious and friendly group, but the Japanese military compares only with Stalin and Hitler at their worst. The attack upon China will go down into history as most brutal and unjustified. These uncontrolled Japanese military leaders attacked China only because China at last was trying to make something of itself. They feared what China might do to Japanese business when the Chinese secured machinery and got into production. They boldly admit that it was "now or never" for them.

ASTOUNDED BY DESTRUCTION

I was astounded at the destruction which I saw with my own eyes. In addition, I talked personally with trustworthy consuls, businessmen, and missionaries who had just come from the interior. They all agree that the Japanese soldiers—of which there are now over a million in China—are acting like a bunch of ruthless, disappointed wild men. Murder, rape, torture, and destruction are mild words for their crimes.

The Chinese who normally are a peace-loving race have become tremendously stirred. They have reacted as ruthless madmen. In self-defense they have resorted to the most brazen trickery and guerrilla warfare. There are almost no military battles but the war consists of the burning of cities and the shooting of one another in small groups everywhere and anywhere.

The most hopeful sign to the whole "incident" is the movement of 40,000,000 Chinese from the crowded cities of eastern China to the rich and undeveloped Provinces of western China with their machinery, tools, and livestock. Hundreds of factories—both large and small—have been moved bodily a thousand miles into the interior. Railroad tracks are being taken up today and carried on the backs of coolies hundreds of miles inland while thousands of new cooperative industries are being started in this new western territory.

SMUGGLING IS COMMON

Japan today holds China's ports, although a tremendous amount of smuggling is going on both in and out. The cities and highways are controlled by the Japanese miltary westward from the coast to a line running south from Peiping through Hankow to Canton. Yet there are millions of Chinese in this territory who have never yet seen a Japanese soldier.

West of this line there remain 300,000,000 Chinese who continue to go about their work as usual—raising crops and raising children.

In the meantime, Chiang Kai-shek and his central government are now impregnably situated at Chungking. About once in 2 weeks this capital is bombed, but these bombers do little harm. But how long can they continue without funds?

It is foolish for anyone to forecast how long this Japanese-Chinese war will last. It is generally believed that the Chinese birth rate alone will ultimately crowd the Japanese Army out of China. From what I saw in Japan the war is becoming a great strain, and the Japanese probably are sorry that they started it. On the other hand, unless Chiang Kai-shek is given more loans by the United States, or, at least, unless we shut off supplies to the Japanese Army, he is in a very precarious condition.

In reality, China is fighting our battles for us. This especially applies to the people of our industrial areas. The present attitude of the United States in helping the Japanese military put China out of business seems suicidal to me. Our people should make every effort to at least support Chiang Kai-shek until the present European war is over when England and France are free to take a hand. In doing so the United States will accomplish five things:

1. Check Japan in its determined fanatical religious belief that it is destined to rule all Asia, including the Hawaiian Islands.

2. Head off Russia from forcing communism upon China as payment for helping China defend itself against Japan.

3. Perform a humane service by saving from murder and torture 25,000,000 innocent men, women, and children.

4. Save valuable American trade and shipping which we greatly need to restore employment in the United States.

5. Protect $500,000,000 worth of missionary property which has taken us 100 years to establish and which is doing a tremendous amount of good.

In short, we are now tolerating wrong. If we continue to do this, we some day will be punished.

The Arms Embargo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 2, 1939

LETTER BY EDWARD E. KENNEDY

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, shortly we will have finished the neutrality legislation. During its consideration the leaders of the Congress determined that the Congress would not take up any other legislation until neutrality legislation was out of the way. As a result, the House has stood idly by for over a month, when it could have been giving consideration to many important matters. I hope that the Congress will not adjourn at this time but will continue in session during the remainder of the year, and take up the domestic problems which are knocking at our doors for solution. We have the unemployment problem, farm legislation, and many other very urgent matters of legislation before us, which should have consideration at an early date. Furthermore, during the progress of the European war it is very essential that the Congress remain in session, so that it may be available for consideration of any emergency legislation that may arise. Particularly is that true with reference to the neutrality legislation itself which we will have passed. It may require amendments which will present themselves as soon as the statute is put into operation. Bearing upon these problems, I include as a part of my remarks a letter I received today from Mr. Edward E. Kennedy, under date of November 1, 1939. Mr. Kennedy is a student of farm problems, and his observations are noteworthy. The letter follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *November 1, 1939.*

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The first 9 months of 1939 compared with the first 9 months of 1938 indicates a great increase in agricultural imports into the United States and a great decrease of agricultural exports from the United States. In the 9 months of 1939 we imported farm products for consumption in the amount of $794,700,000 while in the same period in 1938 we purchased farm products in the amount of $711,600,000. For the same periods our agricultural exports declined from $602,700,000 in 1938 to $418,400,000 in 1939.

While all in the United States are being diverted from consideration of serious problems of agriculture and unemployment by the present dramatic attempt to lift the embargo and increase the exports of arms, munitions, and implements of war, little is being said and nothing is being done to protect our farmers from imports at below our cost-of-production prices or to sell our excess food and fiber to the world.

To lift the embargo now, would we not be choosing between the munitions makers and warmongers on the one hand and our Nation's 6,800,000 farmers on the other—choosing between "fool's gold" and fools' profits on the one hand and our own peace and security on the other—choosing between the national defense of a foreign state and the national defense of our own beloved country?

Is there even one valid, patriotic reason why we should lift the arms embargo now? Would it not be both patriotic and wise to retain the embargo on arms, munitions, and implements of war—settling this question decisively. Then, at once, turn our attention to assuring our farmers the cost of production, plus a profit—protect our home farm market from invasion by foreigners, build our prosperity upon our own basic industry, agriculture, give employment opportunities to our own labor at an adequate annual wage.

"Why quit our own to stand on foreign ground; why by interweaving our destiny with that of any part of Europe, entangle our peace and prosperity in the toils of European ambition, rivalship, interest, humor, or caprice?"

Why quit our own?

Sincerely,

EDW. E. KENNEDY.

Minneapolis—W. P. A. Persecution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE E. GEYER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 2, 1939

Mr. GEYER of California. Mr. Speaker, I believe the Members of the House of Representatives, meeting to pass an adequate neutrality law, should know how, in Minneapolis, Minn., another law recently passed by this body is being used in an attempt to destroy the civil rights of labor, to persecute American citizens, and to further the political advantage of certain individuals and groups.

The basis of this vicious attempt is the Minneapolis W. P. A. strike and the present mass trials of 163 defendants charged with criminal conspiracy as a result of participating in that strike.

It is not necessary to go into detail about the strike itself. It is sufficient to understand: (1) the strike began spontaneously when W. P. A. employees learned of the provisions of the Woodrum Act, undermining their already precarious existence; (2) that unions finally offered leadership in order to give the mass protest orderliness and direction; (3) that strike leaders requested Minnesota W. P. A. administrator, Linus Glotzbach, to close projects in order to relieve tension and establish a situation where calmness and reason could be applied to settle the difficulties—a request which was refused; (4) a false report was given Nation-wide circulation that a Minneapolis policeman was killed in the strike, arousing bitter public resentment against the strike and against the W. P. A. workers; (5) that the strike came to an end after the sewing project violence occurred in which scores were wounded and a bystander was killed.

In this atmosphere of bitterness and public tension, the Federal grand jury was called to investigate charges of violence in the strike. Out of that investigation came the 163 felony indictments, the excessive bails amounting to nearly a million dollars, and the present mass trials.

No one contends that those who participated in violence should be excused. I am not speaking in defense of lawlessness and disorder. I am, rather, deploring the inept manner in which public officials handled the situation; I am putting myself on record in protest against permitting under the name of "prosecution of lawlessness" the persecution of scores of decent, law-abiding fellow citizens. I am maintaining that under the cloak of bringing the guilty to justice we should not permit an attack upon labor's hard-won rights to organize and a further attack upon the basic rights of citizens generally, guaranteed in the first 10 amendments to the Constitution, namely, the right to free speech, the right to nonexcessive bail, and the right to a fair and impartial trial—referring to the mass characters of the trials.

In viewing the situation in Minneapolis these questions arise: If some strikers become hot-headed and get into fist fights, why were they not dealt with as police-court cases, which is customary? Why were they, instead, charged with conspiracy and faced with penitentiary terms? Is this awful consequence of strike participation a threat to intimidate labor? Why was there such a wholesale round-up of Minneapolis people whose crimes were no greater than mere presence where a fist fight occurred, or who were not even present but were simply officers of a group agreeing to leave their project when the picketing began, while in no other city in the country where W. P. A. employees participated in the Nation-wide strike were strikers prosecuted?

One of my main reasons for bringing this situation to your attention is that with a war abroad, partisan groups are seeking to take advantage of war emotions at home to destroy the rights of fellow Americans in order to advance their own political or partisan interests.

Mr. Speaker, I protest the use to which the Woodrum Act is being put in Minneapolis. I protest it to the Congress of the United States, I protest it to the Attorney General of the United States, I protest it to the President of the United States; and I invite every man present who believes in the fundamental rights of the people to join me in this protest so that the people in Minneapolis and elsewhere in the country may know that there are men on the floor of Congress who refuse to allow such flagrant attacks upon their and our civil liberties to go unchallenged.

The Arms Embargo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM J. MILLER
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 2, 1939

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, I have just sent to the House Foreign Affairs Committee a resolution presented by a committee of three young women, Miss Hazel Smith, Miss Mildred Hotchkiss, and Miss Gladys Nystrup, signed by a group of representative citizens of my own home town, Wethersfield, Conn. Wethersfield is the oldest town in the State of Connecticut, having been settled in 1634. The history of Wethersfield proves that its sons have fought in every war in which the United States has participated. Many of her young men gave their lives in the Civil War, Spanish-American War, and, during the World War, she far exceeded her quota.

At the present time, however, the citizens of Wethersfield, as indicated by the petition I have filed, are unanimous in the desire that the United States keep out of the war now going on in Europe. They are opposed to repealing the embargo on arms, ammunition, and implements of war. When 300 residents of a small community turn out on a rainy night to listen to an address on neutrality and repeal of the arms embargo, it indicates unusual interest. This audience was overwhelmingly in favor of retention of the arms embargo.

Repeal of the Arms Embargo—Road to War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAMILTON FISH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 2, 1939

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. HAMILTON FISH, OF NEW YORK

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks, I include the following radio speech delivered by me over the National Broadcasting System, Saturday evening, October 28, 1939:

I hope there is a large unseen radio audience listening to my remarks this evening, and that they will be aroused to their responsibility to make known their wishes to their Representatives in Congress to stop the sale of arms, ammunition, poisonous gas, and deadly weapons to belligerent nations and our march toward war.

Never, in almost 20 years of service in the Congress, have I spoken on any issue that was so close to my heart, and upon the outcome of which I believed the safety and security of the American people and our Nation depended.

The Senate, by a vote of 60 to 33, repealed the arms embargo last night, and the scene of conflict has now shifted back to the House of Representatives. As ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the responsibility falls upon me to lead the fight in the House to restore the arms embargo and thereby serve notice on the nations of the world that we intend to keep out of all foreign entanglements and wars, unless we are attacked

or the Monroe Doctrine is violated by the invasion of the American continent by the armed forces of European or Asiatic nations.

The magnitude of the task appalls me, but if the people back home will do their part by letters and telegrams to their Representatives, regardless of party affiliations, we will win through to victory this week and stop the selling of lethal weapons and poisonous gas by a close vote in the House of Representatives.

I appeal to you in behalf of a great American issue that transcends all party lines. The final vote may determine whether we will have peace or war within the next 6 months or a year.

On such an issue there can be no compromise, shadow boxing, or pussyfooting. Win or lose, the fight must be fought out to a final showdown. Every Member of Congress that votes for repeal will have to face his peace-loving constituents and explain his reasons for gambling with the lives of their sons in order to sell arms and ammunition for blood money and war profits.

I appeal particularly to the people of New Jersey, for if they will cooperate in asking that their representatives vote for the arms embargo, as they did last June, we will avoid the first step toward war and possibly hasten peace in Europe. I am fearful that the sale of deadly weapons and poison gas may prolong the disastrous European war.

As a veteran of the World War, who served 15 months in Europe in the last war, I shall never vote to sell deadly weapons for profit and thereby help dig the grave of a single American soldier in foreign lands.

The arms embargo in itself may not be the decisive or compelling factor, but it is the symbol as to whether we are to take sides and participate in the European war. I do not, from a careful study of the facts, believe that England and France want or need our arms and ammunition, as they have huge factories employing scores of thousands of women making cannon and shells at much less than the cost in America. They have built enormous airplane plants which in the next few months will be producing more than Germany. They do want the repeal of the arms embargo as a symbol that we are ready to intervene on their side as the first step. They think—and possibly rightly—that the two next steps will follow logically—that of financing the war after we are sufficiently involved and later on sending our soldiers to the shambles of Europe.

I honestly believe that the arms traffic will be followed by the traffic in the lives of our sons. The question is, Do the American people want to send their boys to blood baths in Europe for sake of the dollar sign? Do they want to hire them out like Hessians for 30 pieces of silver that some Americans may reap a harvest of war profits? The people alone can stop it, and stop it now, by swamping their Representatives with requests to vote against the repeal of the arms embargo.

I endorse wholeheartedly and without reservation the remarks made by President Roosevelt at Chautauqua, N. Y., in 1936, in favor of prohibiting the sale of deadly weapons to belligerent nations: "If war should break out again in another continent, let us not blink the fact that we would find in this country thousands of Americans who, seeking immediate riches—fools' gold—would attempt to break down or evade our neutrality. * * * To resist the clamor of that greed, if war should come, would require the unswerving support of all Americans who love peace. * * * If we face the choice of profits or peace, the Nation will answer—must answer—'We choose peace.'"

In order not to inject partisanship into this great American issue of trying to keep America out of war, I will refrain from making any comments on the President's changed attitude. The people can judge for themselves and make their own conclusions.

The sale of arms and ammunition to belligerent nations for sake of blood money and war profits is an utterly unmoral, un-Christian, and vicious system, turning the United States into a slaughterhouse to kill people with whom we are at peace, and dragging us into wars all over the world.

I have devoted 20 years of my life in trying to promote the welfare, peace, and security of the American people, and I am not willing to sacrifice their lives at the siren call of war profits and the almighty dollar, or to fight other people's battles.

All of Europe's blood-smeared dollars are not worth the life of a single American soldier.

We went to war once, as we were told, to make the world safe for democracy, and what a mockery and tragedy that turned out to be. Most of the European nations have gone to the left or to the right into dictatorships and autocracies, such as communism, fascism, nazi-ism, or pseudodemocracies. It is none of our business what form of government exists in Communist Russia, Fascist Italy, or Nazi Germany, any more than it is their business what form of government exists in the United States of America. We went to war once to throw out Kaiser Bill, who was then the villain of the piece, and we helped to do it. However, England and France succeeded through the harsh exactions of the Versailles Treaty, which we repudiated, in destroying the only democratic government Germany ever had under the Weimar Convention and paving the way for Hitler.

I do not like dictators of any kind, here or abroad, but I don't want to see any American lives sacrificed to oust Hitler and pave the way for communism in Germany, and possibly in the rest of Europe. I predict if Germany is beaten to her knees, bled white, and exhausted by a long war that communism will be the natural and inevitable result.

That is why I am for peace now, on a sane and honorable basis, before millions on both sides are slaughtered, Europe laid waste, and its civilization and Christianity destroyed. I am an isolationist from the horrors of foreign wars but not from the principles of arbitration, mediation, and peaceful settlements of international disputes.

I would uphold the hand of President Roosevelt tomorrow if he could bring about a 30-day armistice, for if he did, neither the people nor the soldiers would go back to mass murder to settle their disputes and quarrels.

Modern war is the greatest human folly, futility, and curse. Even the victor loses along with the vanquished, and all become bankrupt and the prey to communism, anarchy, and chaos. The people do the fighting and dying and, after the war, pay the bill through poverty, misery, and unemployment.

Let those in America who want to take sides and fight go to foreign lands, but not try to ease us into conflicts in Europe or elsewhere arising over power politics, ancient blood feuds, colonies, and imperialism. We did not start this war and have no responsibility for finishing it.

If the arms embargo is repealed, however, I predict that a full-fledged propaganda campaign will be launched to make the American people believe that it is our war, and even that we started it. We are the biggest saps and push-overs for foreign propaganda when the bands begin to play and our emotions run away with our reason.

Every one of the nations now at war is motivated by its own self-interests, yet we are expected to again hold the bag, do our share of fighting, and not even be thanked for our trouble.

I suggested the proposal for an arms embargo in the Foreign Affairs Committee 12 years ago, after a research into the reasons and factors that caused the World War. No one will deny that one of the causes or factors, and not necessarily the only one, was the sale of arms and ammunition for war profit. It cannot help but excite hatred and hostility among the soldiers and in the nations against which they are used. The made-in-America mark on shells and ammunition are not exactly ambassadors of good will, and never will be.

The only motive and purpose behind the arms embargo was to keep us out of war. War is man made. It is not made by some devil or demon from another world. We put the arms embargo into the neutrality bill to act as a barrier or obstacle to involvement in foreign wars. That was its genesis and purpose—to keep us out of wars when they began. The burden of proof rests squarely with those who would repeal it to show how it would help to keep us out of war, and they cannot do it.

That is the tragedy of the situation, when the mania for war profits or the desire to take sides and intervene in European wars are the only reasons that can be given to repeal a well-founded and carefully considered plan to keep America out of war.

If it were not for all the power, patronage, and propaganda of the administration in favor of repeal, it would be beaten by over a hundred votes in the House, if the Members voted their untrammeled convictions. As it is, the vote will be so close that no one will know until the final vote is counted.

I predict that if the plain people of America, the farmers, wage earners, business and professional men, veterans, and mothers will make their views known in no uncertain terms in the next few days they can influence the votes of at least 40 Members of Congress still undecided. If we can obtain a majority of these votes it will insure a substantial majority in the fight to maintain the arms embargo.

The outcome depends largely upon the will, interest, and determination of the people back home, in all walks of life, who take enough interest to write to their Representatives in Congress and make their views and wishes known.

This is the last call to retain the arms embargo and stop the insidious propaganda that war is inevitable and that we will have to get into it. A vote to repeal the arms embargo, in view of its origin and motives, is a half a vote for war. It is a vote to take sides and amounts to intervention on one side against another. Neutrality means not to take sides, or to lend any active aid to any belligerent nation.

The attempt to repeal the arms embargo, backed by all the internationalists and interventionists in America and foreign propaganda from abroad, is a stab into the vitals and very heart of the neutrality bill. No European nation sells any arms and ammunition to any belligerent nations. Why should we repeal the arms embargo, which has for its sole motive and purpose keeping us out of foreign wars? If we do, we automatically become a partner in the European war.

There has been a lot of misunderstanding and confusion regarding the cash-and-carry plan. Now that the 90-day credit clause has been stricken from the bill, it is entirely satisfactory. There is no conflict between that and the arms embargo. I am for both, to make our security doubly safe. Yet the people have been led to believe that they had to choose between them, and could not support both. Consequently some of the polls in the newspapers have been distorted.

If we are eased or forced into foreign wars against totalitarian nations we will become a dictatorship ourselves in 24 hours, and our liberties, free institutions, and even American democracy will be blacked out.

The fight to maintain the arms embargo is no easy one to win. We have the entire power of the Administration against us, backed by foreign propaganda and all those elements who desire to involve us in war.

The final answer rests with you, the American people. I am giving you for the last time on this great American issue, the Macedonian cry, of come over and help. The stake may be the security, happiness, and peace of America, and the lives of its sons.

The Neutrality Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 2, 1939

TELEGRAM BY ROSS McINTYRE

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, with reference to the neutrality bill now before the House, I include the following telegram I have this day received from Mr. Ross McIntyre, President of the Portland Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. McIntyre calls attention to the discriminatory features of the bill with respect to shipping from the port of Portland. There are no American lines serving the port of Portland, and by reason of the cash-and-carry provisions Oregon shippers will be subjected to the cash-and-carry provisions, as shipping must go out in foreign bottoms. I call this matter to the attention of the House conferees and urge that they give consideration to these objections, and modify the bill so as to relieve Oregon from this discrimination.

The telegram is as follows:

PORTLAND, OREG., *November 1, 1939.*

Hon. HOMER ANGELL,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

As neutrality bill passed Senate American ships can carry cargo to belligerent countries in Pacific area, etc., without title on said cargo having passed. Foreign ships even though neutrals cannot load same cargo unless title on it has passed. We submit this as apparently contrary to terms of our treaties of commerce and navigation with neutral countries. Under it Swedish, Norwegian, Danish, Dutch, etc., ships cannot transport from here to ports of belligerents in Pacific area on same terms as can American vessels. Oregon is without benefit of subsidized American flag service to Orient, thus shipping from Oregon must be on cash-and-carry basis, while shipments from San Francisco can be on usual commercial terms. We cannot eliminate neutral foreign ships and carry on commerce of Pacific. These provisions also apply to the heavy ship charter business carrying the basic cargoes of Oregon and Washington abroad. Since American ships are not available to handle commerce of Oregon, Washington, California, this penalty on neutral foreign ships in effect penalizes producers and shippers here.

ROSS MCINTYRE,
President, Portland Chamber of Commerce.

Pope Pius XII's Encyclical

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM I. SIROVICH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 2, 1939

TEXT OF THE POPE'S ENCYCLICAL LETTER

Mr. SIROVICH. Mr. Speaker, Tuesday afternoon I delivered a speech on the floor of the House on the subject of the philosophy of neutrality. In the peroration of that address, as delivered on the floor of the House of Representatives, I said:

Mr. Speaker, greater than any material cash-and-carry concern that the United States may have in an ultimate Allied victory is a mighty spiritual stake. A little more than a century ago the final defeat of Napoleon inaugurated an era of black reaction in every land of Europe; the spirit of democracy and liberty was driven underground with the forces of autocracy and tyranny marching roughshod everywhere. A hundred years later the victory of the democratic World War Allies over the despotic Central Powers secured the post-war world to freedom and democracy for a dozen years. To the victor of the current European war will belong the spiritual destinies of the post-war world to be. An all-conquering, all-consuming Third Reich will provoke every Fascist tendency, every sworn enemy of democracy, every lover of atheism, despotism, racism, and authoritarianism against the democratic traditions and institutions prevailing in the lands of North and South America. The broad Atlantic may preserve us, for the present, from enemy bombing planes and overseas battle fleets, but against the passage of ideas there are no frontiers of land or sea. On the other hand, a triumphant Britain and France will spell the destruction of the Nazi venom everywhere, with the affirmation of the sprit of liberty, democracy, and Christianity. A Nazi victory will be a spiritual Big Bertha pointed at our American institutions; a Nazi defeat, a monument to humanity, decency, and the rights of man.

The Nazi's bible is Hitler's Mein Kampf; the Frenchman's bible, Rousseau's Social Contract; the Englishman's political bible, Locke's Treatise on Government. A Hitler victory in the European war must spell victory for Hitler's bible Mein Kampf in virtually every civilized land on earth and disaster to the pattern of life represented by the Social Contract and the Treatise on Government that confirm the supreme sovereignty of the people.

An outcome of that description will be a sinister menace to the American political bible—the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States. These inspiring and spirit-refreshing documents, glorifying man's inalienable rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, were framed in the spirit of Jean Jacques Rousseau's Social Contract and John Locke's Treatise on Government. Accordingly, the victory of Mein Kampf would cast a heavy shadow over that spirit and over the American ideals of liberty, democracy, and equality, for which Jefferson struggled, Jackson suffered, and Lincoln perished.

Mr. Speaker, His Holiness, the brilliant, gifted, and inspired shepherd of the great Catholic Church, Pope Pius XII, only yesterday in an encyclical from the Vatican pilloried and condemned modern dictators responsible for treaty breaking and racial bigotry and intolerance.

His Holiness decried the destruction of the spiritual dignity of mankind and cried aloud to Heaven to prevent the exploitation of man and pleaded that mankind must not be used as a means to an end, but must remain an end to himself, and that the modern state must be the means to preserve that end. To preserve modern democracy throughout the world we must follow the brilliant counsel of that learned and distinguished scholar His Holiness Pope Pius XII. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, the United States must keep out of European war. The flower of our American young manhood shall not be sacrificed again to the bloodthirsty Moloch of war. But in compensation the arms embargo must be lifted to strengthen the democracies of Great Britain and France—our first line of defense. Such aid, by providing the European democracies with the means to attain a final victory in their unwanted conflict, will help to preserve man's spiritual dignity and protect his integrity upon this earth.

Mr. Speaker, from this catastrophic holocaust of war in Europe, there must come forth a better democracy for mankind to live in, and make true the shibboleth of our former great President Woodrow Wilson—that the world must be made safe for democracy to live in, and that the lives of our patriotic American youths, whose lifeblood hallows the sacred ground in which their mortal remains are buried, shall not have been sacrificed in vain. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, having thus paid tribute to His Holiness Pope Piux XII for his denunciation of the dictators of Europe, as well as excoriating those who utilized racial bigotry and intolerance to inflame religious passion and who were responsible for destroying the spiritual dignity of man, I desire to insert in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, Pope Pius XII's encyclical from the Vatican to the peoples of the world:

ENCYCLICAL LETTER TO OUR VENERABLE BRETHREN, THE PATRIARCHS, ARCHBISHOPS, BISHOPS, AND OTHER ORDINARIES IN PEACE AND COMMUNION WITH THE APOSTOLIC SEE

POPE PIUS XII

Venerable brethren: Health and apostolic benediction.

In the very year which marks the fortieth anniversary of the consecration of mankind to our Redeemer's most sacred heart the inscrutable counsel of the Lord, for no merit of ours, has laid upon us the exalted dignity and grave care of the supreme pontificate; for that consecration was proclaimed by our immortal predecessor Leo XIII at the beginning of the holy year which closed the last century.

And we, as a newly ordained priest, then just empowered to recite:

"I will go into the altar of God" (Psalm, xlii: 4) hailed the encyclical, Annum Sacrum, with genuine approval, enthusiasm, and delight as a message from heaven. We associated ourselves in fervent admiration of the motives and aims which inspired and directed the truly providential action of a pontiff so sure in his diagnosis of the open and hidden needs and sores of his day.

GRATITUDE TO PROVIDENCE

It is only natural then that we should today feel profoundly grateful to Providence for having designed that the first year of our pontificate should be associated with a memory so precious and so dear of our first year of priesthood, and that we should take the opportunity of paying homage to the "King of Kings and Lord of Lords" (I Timothy vi: 15; cf. Apocalypse xix: 6) as a kind of introit prayer to our pontificate, in the spirit of our

renowned predecessor and in the faithful accomplishment of his designs and that, in fine, we should make of it the alpha and omega of our aims, of our hopes, of our teaching, of our activity, of our patience, and of our sufferings, by consecrating them all to the spread of the kingdom of Christ.

As we review from the standpoint of eternity the past 40 years in their exterior events and interior developments, balancing achievements against deficiencies, we see ever more clearly the sacred significance of that consecration of mankind to Christ the King; we see its inspiring symbolism, we see its power to refine and to elevate, to strengthen and to fortify souls. We see, besides, in that consecration a penetrating wisdom which sets itself to restore and to ennoble all human society and to promote its true welfare.

It unfolds itself to us ever more clearly as a message of comfort and a grace from God not only to His church but also to a world in all too dire need of help and guidance—to a world which, preoccupied with the worship of the ephemeral, has lost its way and spent its forces in a vain search after earthly ideals.

It is a message to men who in ever-increasing numbers have cut themselves off from faith in Christ and, even more, from the recognition and observance of His law; a message opposed to that philosophy of life for which the doctrine of love and renunciation preached in the Sermon on the Mount and the divine act of love on the cross seem to be a stumbling block and foolishness.

MIGHTY CRY OF ENTREATY

Even as the Precursor of the Lord proclaimed one day to those who sought and questioned Him, "Behold the Lamb of God" (St. John i: 29), in order to warn them that the Desired of the Nations (cf. Aggeus ii: 9) dwelt, though as yet unrecognized, in their midst, so, too, the representative of Christ addressed His mighty cry of entreaty, "Behold your King" (St. John xix: 14), to the renegades, to the doubters, to the wavering, to the hesitant, who either refused to follow the glorious Redeemer, living ever and working in His church, or followed Him with carelessness and sloth.

From the widening and deepening of devotion to the divine heart of the Redeemer, which had its splendid culmination in the consecration of humanity at the end of the last century, and, further, in the introduction, by our immediate predecessor of happy memory, of the Feast of Christ the King, there have sprung up benefits beyond description for numberless souls—as the stream of the river which "maketh the city of God joyful" (Psalm xlv: 5).

What age has had greater need than ours of these benefits? What age has been, for all its technical and purely civic progress, more tormented than ours by spiritual emptiness and deep-felt interior poverty? May we not, perhaps, apply to it the prophetic words of the Apocalypse: "Thou sayest: I am rich, and made wealthy, and have need of nothing: and knowest not that thou art wretched, and miserable, and poor, and blind, and naked" (Apocalypse iii: 17)?

Can there be, venerable brethren, a greater or more urgent duty than to preach the "unsearchable riches of Christ" (Ephesians iii: 8) to the men of our time? Can there be anything nobler than to unfurl the "ensign of the King" before those who have followed, and still follow, a false standard, and to win back to the victorious banner of the cross those who have abandoned it?

What heart is not inflamed, is not swept forward to help at the sight of so many brothers and sisters who, misled by error, passion, temptation, and prejudice have strayed away from faith in the true God and have lost contact with the joyful and life-giving message of Christ?

"SOLDIERS OF CHRIST" EXHORTED

Who among "the soldiers of Christ"—ecclesiastic or layman—does not feel himself incited and spurred on to a greater vigilance, to a more determined resistance, by the sight of the ever-increasing host of Christ's enemies; as he perceives the spokesmen of these tendencies deny or in practice neglect the vivifying truths and the values inherent in belief in God and in Christ; as he perceives them wantonly break the tables of God's commandments to substitute other tables and other standards stripped of the ethical content of the revelation on Sinai, standards in which the spirit of the Sermon on the Mount and of the cross has no place?

Who could observe without profound grief the tragic harvest of such desertions among those who in days of calm and security were numbered among the followers of Christ, but who—Christians unfortunately more in name than in fact—in the hour that called for endurance, for effort, for suffering, for a stout heart in face of hidden or open persecution, fell victims of cowardice, weakness, uncertainty; who, terror stricken before the sacrifices entailed by a profession of their Christian faith, could not steel themselves to drink the bitter chalice awaiting those faithful to Christ?

FEAST OF CHRIST THE KING

In such dispositions of time and temperament, venerable brethren, may the approaching Feast of Christ the King, on which this our first encyclical will reach you, be a day of grace and of thorough renewal and revival in the spirit of the Kingdom of Christ. May it be a day when the consecration of the human race to the divine heart, which should be celebrated in a particularly solemn manner, will gather the faithful of all peoples and all nations around the throne of the Eternal King, in adoration and in reparation, to renew now and forever their oath of allegiance to Him and to His law of truth and of love.

May it be for the faithful a day of grace, on which the fire, that our Lord came to cast upon the earth, will kindle with ever greater light and purity. May it be a day of grace for the lukewarm, for the weary, for the afflicted, that their hearts, which have become faint, may give proofs of interior renewal and regeneration of spirit.

May it be a day of grace also for those who have not known Christ or who have lost Him; a day when from millions of faithful hearts will raise to Heaven the prayer that "the light which enlighteneth every man that cometh into this world" (St. John i: 9) may make clear to them the way of salvation; that His grace may stir in the "troubled heart" of the wanderers a homesickness for things eternal, a homesickness that impels them to return to Him, Who from His sorrowful throne of the cross thirsts for their souls also and who is consumed by a desire to become for them, too, "the way, and the truth, and the life" (St. John xiv: 6).

As with a heart full of confidence and hope, we place this first encyclical of our pontificate under the seal of Christ the King, we feel entirely assured of the unanimous and enthusiastic approval of the whole flock of Christ. The difficulties, anxieties, and trials of the present hour arouse, intenstify, and refine, to a degree rarely attained, the sense of solidarity in the Catholic family. They make all believers in God and in Christ share the consciousness of a common threat from a common danger.

DISPLAY OF SOLIDARITY

We witnessed a consoling and memorable display of this Catholic solidarity, greatly intensified in such difficult circumstances, the serried ranks, the assurance, the resolution, the will to win, in those days when, with faltering step but with confidence in God, we took possession of the chair left vacant by the death of our great predecessor.

We cherish the memory of the many testimonies of filial attachment to the church and to the Vicar of Christ, and of the ovation so genuine, so enthusiastic, and so spontaneous accorded to us on the occasion of our election and coronation; and we gladly take this opportune occasion to address to you, venerable brethren, and to all who belong to the flock of the Lord, a word of sincere gratitude for that orderly manifestation of reverent love and of steadfast loyalty to the papacy, in which one could see recognition of the God-given mission of high priest and of the supreme pastor.

For, we well know it, all those manifestations were not and could not have have been addressed to our poor person, but to the singular and exalted office to which the Lord had raised us. And though from that first moment we felt all the great weight of responsible cares inseparable from the supreme power given to us by divine Providence, it was a consolation to see that magnificent and tangible demonstration of the indissoluble unity of the Catholic Church rallying all the closer to the impregnable Rock of Peter, to form around it a wall and a bulwark as the enemies of Christ become bolder.

This same manifestation of world-wide Catholic solidarity and of supernatural brotherhood of people around their common Father, seemed to us all the richer in fair hopes in view of the tragic circumstances, both material and spiritual, of the moment. That memory has continued to comfort us also in the first months of our pontificate, in which we have already witnessed the toil, the anxiety, and the trials with which the path of the Spouse of Christ across the world is strewn.

GOOD WISHES FROM OTHERS

Nor can we pass over in silence the profound impression of heartfelt gratitude made on us by the good wishes of those who, though not belonging to the visible body of the Catholic Church, have given noble and sincere expression to their appreciation of all that unites them to us in love for the person of Christ or in belief in God.

We wish to express our gratitude to them all. We entrust them one and all to the protection and to the guidance of the Lord, and we assure them solemnly that one thought only fills our mind: To imitate the example of the Good Shepherd in order to bring true happiness to all men: "That they may have life, and may have it more abundantly" (St. John x: 10).

But we must, in obedience to an inner prompting, make special mention of our gratitude for the tokens of reverent homage which we have had from the sovereigns, heads of states, and governments of those nations with which the Holy See is in friendly relations. Our heart is joyous especially at the thought that we can, in this first encyclical directed to the whole Christian people scattered over the world, rank among such friendly powers our dear Italy, fruitful garden of the faith which was planted by the Prince of the Apostles.

For, as a result of the Lateran pacts, her representative occupies a place of honor among those officially accredited to the Apostolic See. "The peace of Christ restored to Italy," like a new dawn of brotherly union in religious and in civil intercourse, had its beginning in these pacts. We pray God that, in the serene atmosphere of that peace, He may pervade, revivify, strengthen, and fortify the heart of the Italian people, so close to us, in the midst of which we live, with which we share the very air we breathe.

PLEA TO PEOPLE OF ITALY

We hope and trust that that people, so dear to our predecessors and to us, may be faithful to its glorious Catholic tradition, and experience through the divine protection evermore that truth of the Psalmist: "Happy is that people whose God is the Lord" (Psalms cxliii: 15).

This happy, new juridical and spiritual position, which that achievement destined to make an indelible mark in history, has secured and sealed for Italy and for the whole Catholic world, never appeared to us so impressive in its unifying effects as when from the lofty loggia of the Vatican basilica we opened and raised our arms and our hand for the first time in blessing over Rome, Rome the seat of the papacy and our own dear birthplace,

over Italy reconciled with the church, and over the peoples of the entire world.

As vicar of Him who in a decisive hour pronounced before the highest earthly authority of that day the great words: "For this was I born, and for this came I into the world: that I should give testimony to the truth; everyone that is of the truth heareth My voice" (St. John xviii, 37), we feel we owe no greater debt to our office and to our time than to testify to the truth with apostolic firmness: "To give testimony to the truth."

This duty necessarily entails the exposition and confutation of errors and human faults; for these must be made known before it is possible to tend and to heal them. "You shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free" (St. John viii, 32). In the fulfillment of this our duty we shall not let ourselves be influenced by earthly considerations nor be held back by mistrust or opposition, by rebuffs or lack of appreciation of our words, nor yet by fear of misconceptions and misinterpretations.

We shall fulfill our duty, animated ever with that paternal charity which, while it suffers from the evils which afflict our children, at the same time points out to them the remedy; we shall strive to imitate the divine model of shepherds, Jesus the Good Shepherd who is light as well as love: "Doing the truth in charity" (Ephesians iv, 15).

EFFORTS TO DETHRONE CHRIST

At the head of the road which leads to the spiritual and moral bankruptcy of the present-day stand the nefarious efforts of not a few to dethrone Christ; the abandonment of the law of truth which He proclaimed and of the law of love which is the life breath of His kingdom.

In the recognition of the royal prerogatives of Christ and in the return of individuals and of society to the law of His truth and of His love lies the only way to salvation.

Venerable brethren, as we write these lines the terrible news comes to us that the dread tempest of war is already raging despite all our efforts to avert it.

When we think of the wave of suffering that has come on countless people who but yesterday enjoyed in the environment of their homes some little degree of well-being, we are tempted to lay down our pen. Our paternal heart is torn by anguish as we look ahead to all that will yet come forth from the baneful seed of violence and of hatred for which the sword today plows the blood-drenched furrow.

But precisely because of this apocalyptic foresight of disaster, imminent and remote, we feel we have a duty to raise with still greater insistence the eyes and hearts of those in whom there yet remains good will, to the One from whom alone comes the salvation of the world—to One whose almighty and merciful hand can alone calm this tempest—to the One whose truth and whose love can enlighten the intellects and inflame the hearts of so great a section of mankind plunged in error, selfishness, strife, and struggle, so as to give it a new orientation in the spirit of the kingship of Christ.

Perhaps—God grant it—one may hope that this hour of direst need may bring a change of outlook and sentiment to those many who till now have walked with blind faith along the path of popular modern errors, unconscious of the treacherous and insecure ground on which they trod. Perhaps the many who have not grasped the importance of the educational and pastoral mission of the church will now understand better her warnings, scouted in the false security of the past.

No defense of Christianity could be more effective than the present straits. From the immense vortex of error and anti-Christian movements there has come forth a crop of such poignant disasters as to constitute a condemnation surpassing in its conclusiveness any merely theoretical refutation.

HOURS OF DISILLUSIONMENT

Hours of painful disillusionment are often hours of grace—"a passage of the Lord" (cf. Exodus xii: 11), when doors which in other circumstances would have remained shut, open at our Saviour's words: "Behold, I stand at the gate and knock" (Apocalypse iii: 20).

God knows that our heart goes out in affectionate sympathy and spiritual joy to those who, as a result of such painful trials, feel within them an effective and salutary thirst for the truth, justice, and peace of Christ. But for those also for whom as yet the hour of light from on high has not come, our heart knows only love, our lips move only in prayer to the Father of Light that He may cause to shine in their hearts, indifferent as yet or hostile to Christ, a ray of that light which once transformed Saul into Paul; of that light which has shown its mysterious power strongest in the times of greatest difficulty for the church.

A full statement of the doctrinal stand to be taken in face of the errors of today, if necessary, can be put off to another time unless disturbed by calamitous external events; for the moment we limit ourselves to some fundamental observation.

The present age, venerable brethren, by adding new errors to the doctrinal aberrations of the past, has pushed these to extremes which lead inevitably to a drift toward chaos. Before all else, it is certain that the radical and ultimate cause of the evils which we deplore in modern society is the denial and rejection of a universal norm of morality as well for individual and social life as for international relations; we mean the disregard, so common nowadays, and the forgetfulness of the natural law itself, which has its foundation in God, Almighty Creator and Father of all, supreme and absolute lawgiver, all-wise and just judge of human actions.

When God is hated, every basis of morality is undermined; the voice of conscience is stilled or at any rate grows very faint, that voice which teaches even to the illiterate and to uncivilized tribes what is good and what is bad, what lawful, what forbidden, and makes men feel themselves responsible for their actions to a supreme judge.

REVOLT AGAINST MORALITY

The denial of the fundamentals of morality had its origin in Europe, in the abandonment of that Christian teaching of which the Chair of Peter is the depository and exponent. That teaching had once given spiritual cohesion to a Europe which, educated, ennobled, and civilized by the cross, had reached such a degree of civil progress as to become the teacher of other peoples, of other continents. But, cut off from the infallible teaching authority of the church, not a few separated brethren have gone so far as to overthrow the central dogma of Christianity, the divinity of the Saviour, and have hastened thereby the progress of spiritual decay.

The Holy Gospel narrates that when Jesus was crucified "there was darkness over the whole earth" (Matthew xxvii: 45); a terrifying symbol of what happened and what still happens spiritually wherever incredulity, blind and proud of itself, has succeeded in excluding Christ from modern life, especially from public life, and has undermined faith in God as well as faith in Christ.

The consequence is that the moral values by which in other times public and private conduct was gaged have fallen into disuse; and the much-vaunted civilization of society, which has made ever more rapid progress, withdrawing man, the family, and the state from the beneficent and regenerating effects of the idea of God and the teaching of the church, has caused to reappear, in regions in which for many centuries shone the splendors of Christian civilization, in a manner ever clearer, ever more distinct, ever more distressing, the signs of a corrupt and corrupting paganism: "There was darkness when they crucified Jesus" (Roman Breviary, Good Friday, response 5).

Many perhaps, while abandoning the teaching of Christ, were not fully conscious of being led astray by a mirage of glittering phrases which proclaimed such estrangement as an escape from the slavery in which they were before held; nor did they then foresee the bitter consequences of bartering the truth that sets free for error which enslaves.

WHAT WAS NOT REALIZED

They did not realize that, in renouncing the infinitely wise and paternal laws of God and the unifying and elevating doctrines of Christ's love, they were resigning themselves to the whim of a poor, fickle human wisdom; they spoke of progress, when they were going back; of being raised, when they groveled; of arriving at man's estate, when they stooped to servility. They did not perceive the inability of all human effort to replace the law of Christ by anything equal to it; "they became vain in their thoughts" (Romans i: 21).

With the weakening of faith in God and in Jesus Christ, and the darkening in men's minds of the light of moral principles, there disappeared the indispensable foundation of the stability and quiet of that internal and external, private and public order, which alone can support and safeguard the prosperity of states.

It is true that even when Europe had a cohesion of brotherhood through identical ideals gathered from Christian preaching she was not free from divisions, convulsions, and wars which laid her waste; but perhaps they never felt the intense pessimism of today as to the possibility of settling them, for they had then an effective moral sense of the just and of the unjust, of the lawful and of the unlawful, which, by restraining outbreaks of passion, left the way open to an honorable settlement.

In our days, on the contrary, dissensions come not only from the surge of rebellious passion, but also from a deep spiritual crisis which has overthrown the sound principles of private and public morality.

ERRORS OF AGNOSTICISM

Among the many errors which derive from the poisoned source of religious and moral agnosticism, we would draw your attention, venerable brethren, to two in particular as being those which more than others render almost impossible or at least precarious and uncertain the peaceful intercourse of peoples.

The first of these pernicious errors, widespread today, is the forgetfulness of that law of human solidarity and charity which is dictated and imposed by our common origin and by the equality of rational nature in all men, to whatever people they belong, and by the redeeming sacrifice offered by Jesus Christ on the altar of the cross to his Heavenly Father on behalf of sinful mankind.

In fact, the first page of the Scripture, with magnificent simplicity, tells us how God, as a culmination to His creative work, made man to His own image and likeness (cf. Genesis i: 26, 27); and the same Scripture tells us that he enriched man with supernatural gifts and privileges, and destined him to an eternal and ineffable happiness.

It shows us, besides, how other men took their origin from the first couple, and then goes on in unsurpassed vividness of language to recount their division into different groups and their dispersion to various parts of the world. Even when they abandoned their Creator, God did not cease to regard them as His children, who, according to His merciful plan, should one day be reunited once more in His friendship (cf. Genesis xii: 3).

The apostle of the gentiles later on makes himself the herald of this truth which associates men as brothers in one great family when he proclaims to the Greek world that God "hath made of one, all mankind, to dwell upon the whole face of the earth, determining appointed times, and the limits of their habitation. That they should seek God" (Acts xvii: 26, 27).

A MARVELOUS VISION

A marvelous vision, which makes us see the human race in the unity of one common origin in God, "one God and Father of all; who is above all, and through all, and in us all (Ephesians iv: 6); in the unity of nature which in every man is equally composed of material body and spiritual, immortal soul; in the unity of the immediate end and mission in the world; in the unity of the dwelling place—the earth—of whose resources all men can by natural right avail themselves to sustain and develop life; in the unity of the supernatural end, God Himself, to whom all should tend; in the unity of means to secure that end.

It is the same apostle who portrays for us mankind in the unity of its relations with the Son of God, image of the invisible God, in whom all things have been created: "In Him were all things created" (Colossians i: 16); in the unity of its ransom, effected for all by Christ, who through His holy and most bitter passion restored the original friendship with God which had been broken, making Himself the mediator between God and men: "For there is one God, and one mediator of God and men, the man Christ Jesus" (I Timothy ii: 5).

And to render such friendship between God and mankind more intimate, this same divine and universal Mediator of salvation and of peace, in the sacred silence of the supper room, before He consummated the supreme sacrifice, let fall from His divine lips the words which reverberate mightily down the centuries, inspiring heroic charity in a world devoid of love and torn by hate: "This is My commandment: that you love one another, as I have loved you" (St. John xv: 12).

These are supernatural truths which form a solid basis and the strongest possible bond of a union that is reinforced by the love of God and of our divine Redeemer, from whom all receive salvation "or the edifying of the body of Christ: until we all meet into the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the age of the fullness of Christ" (Ephesians iv: 12, 13).

In the light of this unity of all mankind which exists in law and in fact, individuals do not feel themselves isolated units, like grains of sand, but united by the very force of their nature and by their internal destiny into an organic, harmonious mutual relationship which varies with the changing of times.

MISSION OF THE NATIONS

And the nations, despite a difference of development due to diverse conditions of life and of culture, are not destined to break the unity of the human race, but rather to enrich and embellish it by the sharing of their own peculiar gifts and by that reciprocal interchange of goods which can be possible and efficacious only when a mutual love and a lively sense of charity unite all the sons of the same Father and all those redeemed by the same divine blood.

The church of Christ, the faithful depository of the teaching of divine wisdom cannot, and does not, think of deprecating or disdaining the particular characteristics which each people with jealous and intelligible pride cherishes and retains as a precious heritage. Her aim is a supernatural union in all-embracing love, deeply felt and practiced, and not the unity which is exclusively external and superficial and by that very fact weak.

The church hails with joy and follows with her maternal blessing every method of guidance and care which aims at a wise and orderly evolution of particular forces and tendencies having their origin in the individual character of each race, provided that they are not opposed to the duties incumbent on men from their unity of origin and common destiny.

CHURCH'S GUIDING STAR

She has repeatedly shown in her missionary enterprises that such a principle of action is the guiding star of her universal apostolate. Pioneer research and investigation, involving sacrifice, devotedness, and love on the part of her missionaries of every age, have been undertaken in order to facilitate the deeper appreciative insight into the most varied civilizations and to put their spiritual values to account for a living and vital preaching of the gospel of Christ.

All that in such usages and customs is not inseparably bound up with religious errors will always be subject to kindly consideration and when it is found possible will be sponsored and developed.

Our immediate predecessor of holy and venerated memory, applying such norms to a particularly delicate question, took some generous decisions which are a monument to his insight and to the intensity of his apostolic spirit. Nor need we tell you, venerable brethren, that we intend to proceed without hesitation along this way. Those who enter the church, whatever be their origin or their speech, must know that they have equal rights as children in the house of the Lord, where the law of Christ and the peace of Christ prevail.

In accordance with these principles of equality the church devotes her care to forming a cultured native clergy and gradually increasing the number of native bishops. And in order to give eternal expression to these our intentions, we have chosen the forthcoming feast of Christ the King the raise to the episcopal dignity at the tomb of the apostles 12 representatives of widely different peoples and races.

In the midst of the disruptive contrasts which divide the human family, may this solemn act proclaim to all our sons, scattered over the world, that the spirit, the teaching, and the work of the church can never be other than that which the Apostle of the gentiles preached: "Putting of the new (man), him who is renewed unto knowledge, according to the image of him that created him. Where there is neither gentile nor Jew, circumcision nor uncircumcision, barbarian nor Scythian, bond nor free. But Christ is all and in all."—Colossians III, x: 11.

LOVE OF COUNTRY

Nor is there any fear lest the consciousness of universal brotherhood aroused by the teaching of Christianity, and the spirit which it inspires, be in contrast with love of traditions or the glories of one's fatherland or impede the progress of prosperity or legitimate interests. For that same Christianity teaches that in the exercise of charity we must follow a God-given order, yielding the place of honor in our affections and good works to those who are bound to us by special ties; nay, the Divine Master Himself gave an example of this preference for His own country and fatherland, as He wept over the coming destruction of the holy city.

But legitimate and well-ordered love of our native country should not make us close our eyes to the all-embracing nature of Christian charity, which calls for consideration of others and of their interests in the pacifying light of love.

Such is the marvelous doctrine of love and peace which has been such an ennobling factor in the civil and religious progress of mankind and the heralds who proclaimed it, moved by supernatural charity, not only tilled the land and cared for the sick, but above all they reclaimed, molded, and raised life to divine heights, directing it toward the summit of sanctity in which everything is seen in the light of God.

They have raised mansions and temples which show to what lofty and kindly heights the Christian ideal urges man; but above all they have made of men wise or ignorant, strong or weak, living temples of God and branches of the very vine which is Christ. They have handed on to future generations the treasures of ancient art and wisdom and have secured for them that inestimable gift of eternal wisdom which links men as brothers by the common recognition of a supernatural ownership.

Venerable brethren, forgetfulness of the law of universal charity—of that charity which alone can consolidate peace by extinguishing hatred and softening envies and dissensions—is the source of very grave evils for peaceful relations between nations.

ANOTHER PERNICIOUS ERROR

But there is yet another error no less pernicious to the well-being of the nations and to the prosperity of that great human society which gathers together and embraces within its confines all races. It is the error contained in those ideas which do not hesitate to divorce civil authority from every kind of dependence upon the Supreme Being—first cause and absolute master of man and of society—and from every restraint of a higher law derived from God as from its first source.

Thus they accord the civil authority an unrestricted field of action that is at the mercy of the changeful tide of human will, or of the dictates of casual historical claims, and of the interests of a few.

Once the authority of God and the sway of His law are denied in this way, the civil authority as an inevitable result tends to attribute to itself that absolute autonomy which belongs exclusively to the Supreme Maker. It puts itself in the place of the Almighty and elevates the State or group into the last end of life, the supreme criterion of the moral and juridical order and therefore forbids every appeal to the principles of natural reason and of the Christian conscience.

We do not, of course, fail to recognize that, fortunately, false principles do not always exercise their full influence, especially when age-old Christian traditions on which the peoples have been nurtured remain still deeply, even if unconsciously, rooted in their hearts.

Nonetheless, one must not forget the essential insufficiency and weakness of every principle of social life which rests upon a purely human foundation, is inspired by merely earthly motives and relies for its force on the sanction of a purely external authority.

Where the dependence of human right upon the divine is denied, where appeal is made only to some insecure idea of a merely human authority and an autonomy is claimed which rests only upon a utilitarian morality, there human law itself justly forfeits in its more weighty application the moral force which is the essential condition for its acknowledgment and also for its demand of sacrifices.

It is quite true that power based on such weak and unsteady foundations can attain at times under chance circumstances material successes apt to arouse wonder in superficial observers. But the moment comes when the inevitable law triumphs, which strikes down all that has been constructed upon a hidden or open disproportion between the greatness of the material and outward success and the weakness of the inward value and of its moral foundation. Such disproportion exists whenever public authority disregards or denies the dominion of the Supreme Lawgiver, who as He has given rulers power, has also set and marked its bounds.

FUNCTION OF THE STATE

Indeed, as our great predecessor Leo XIII wisely taught in the encyclical, Immortale Dei, it was the Creator's will that civil sovereignty should regulate social life after the dictates of an order changeless in its universal principles; should facilitate the attainment in the temporal order by individuals of physical, intellectual, and moral perfection; and should aid them to reach their supernatural end.

Hence, it is the noble prerogative and function of the State to control, aid, and direct the private and individual activities of national life that they converge harmoniously toward the common

good. That good can neither be defined according to arbitrary ideas nor can it accent for its standard primarily the material prosperity of society, but rather it should be defined according to the harmonious development and the natural perfection of man. It is for this perfection that society is designed by the Creator as a means.

To consider the state as something ultimate to which everything else should be subordinated and directed cannot fail to harm the true and lasting prosperity of nations. This can happen either when unrestricted dominion comes to be conferred on the state as having a mandate from the Nation, the people, or even a social class, or when the state arrogates such dominion to itself as absolute master despotically without any mandate whatsoever.

If in fact the state lays claim to and directs private enterprises, these, ruled as they are by delicate and complicated internal principles which guarantee and assure the realization of their special aims, may be damaged to the detriment of the public good, by being wrenched from their natural surroundings, that is, from responsible private action.

Further, there would be danger lest the primary and essential cell of society, the family, with its well-being and its growth, should come to be considered from the narrow standpoint of national power, and lest it be forgotten that man and the family are by nature anterior to the state, and that the Creator has given to both of them powers and rights and has assigned them a mission and a charge that correspond to undeniable natural requirements.

RIGHTS OF THE FAMILY

The education of the new generation in that case would not aim at the balanced and harmonious development of the physical powers and of all the intellectual and moral qualities, but at a one-sided formation of those civic virtues that are considered necessary for attaining political success, while the virtues which give society the fragrance of nobility, humanity, and reverence would be inculcated less, for fear they should detract from the price of the citizen.

Before us stand out with painful clarity the dangers we fear will accrue to this and coming generations from the neglect or nonrecognition, the minimizing and the gradual abolition of the rights peculiar to the family. Therefore we stand up as determined defenders of those rights in the full consciousness of the duty imposed on us by our apostolic office. The stress of our times as well external as internal, material and spiritual alike, and the manifold errors with their countless repercussions are tasted by none so bitterly as by that noble little cell, the family.

True courage and a heroism worthy in its degree of admiration and respect are often necessary to support the hardships of life, the daily weight of misery, growing want, and restrictions on a scale never before experienced, whose reason and necessity are not always apparent.

Whoever has the care of souls and can search hearts knows the hidden tears of mothers, the resigned sorrow of so many fathers, the countless bitternesses of which no statistics tell nor can tell. He sees with sad eyes the mass of sufferings ever on the increase; he knows how the powers of disorder and destruction stand on the alert ready to make use of all these things for their dark designs.

No one of good will and vision will think of refusing the state, in the exceptional conditions of the world of today, correspondingly wider and exceptional rights to meet the popular needs. But even in such emergencies the moral law, established by God, demands that the lawfulness of each such measure and its real necessity be scrutinized with the greatest rigor according to the standards of the common good.

SOUL CANNOT BE DEMANDED

In any case, the more burdensome the material sacrifices demanded of the individual and the family by the state, the more must the rights of conscience be to it sacred and inviolable. Goods, blood it can demand; but the soul redeemed by God, never.

The charge laid by God on parents to provide for the material and spiritual good of their offspring and to procure for them a suitable training saturated with the true spirit of religion cannot be wrested from them without grave violation of their rights.

Undoubtedly, that formation should aim as well at the preparation of youth to fulfill with intelligent understanding and pride those offices of a noble patriotism which give to one's earthly fatherland all due measure of love, self-devotion, and service. But on the other hand, a formation which forgot or, worse still, deliberately neglected to direct the eyes and hearts of youth to the heavenly country would be an injustice to youth, and injustice against the inalienable duties and rights of the Christian family and an excess to which a check must be opposed, in the interests even of the people and of the state itself.

Such an education might seem perhaps to the rulers responsible for it a source of increased strength and vigor; it would be, in fact, the opposite, as sad experience would prove. The crime of high treason against the "King of Kings and Lord of Lords" (Timothy vi: 15; cf. Apocalypse 1: 6) perpetrated by an education that is either indifferent or opposed to Christianity, the reversal of "Suffer the little children * * * to come unto Me" (St. Matthew xix: 14), would bear most bitter fruits.

On the contrary, the state which lifts anxiety from the bleeding and torn hearts of fathers and mothers and restores their rights, only promotes its own internal peace and lays foundations of a happy future for the country. The souls of children given to their parents by God and consecrated in baptism with the royal character of Christ are a sacred charge over which watches the jealous love of God. The same Christ who pronounced the words "Suffer little children to come unto Me" has threatened, for all His mercy and goodness, with fearful evils those who give scandal to those so dear to His heart.

MISDIRECTED FORMATION OF YOUTH

Now, what scandal is more permanently harmful to generation after generation than a formation of youth which is misdirected toward a goal that alienates from Christ "that way and the truth and the life" and leads to open or hidden apostasy from Christ?

That Christ from whom they want to alienate the youthful generations of the present day and of the future is the same Christ who has received from His eternal Father all power in heaven and on earth. He holds in His omnipotent hand the destiny of states, of peoples, and of nations. His it is to shorten or prolong life; His to grant increase, prosperity, and greatness.

Of all that exists on the face of the earth, the soul alone has deathless life. A system of education that should not respect the sacred precincts of the Christian family, protected by God's holy law, that should attack its foundations, bar to the young the way to Christ, to the Saviour's fountains of life and joy (cf. Isaiah xii: 3) that should consider apostasy from Christ and the church as a proof of fidelity to the people or a particular class' word: "They that depart from Thee shall be written in the earth" (Jeremiah xvii: 13).

The idea which credits the state with unlimited authority is not simply an error harmful to the internal life of nations, to their prosperity, and to the larger and well-ordered increase in their well-being, but likewise it injures the relations between peoples, for it breaks the unity of supranational society, robs the law of nations of its foundation and vigor, leads to violation of others' rights, and impedes agreement and peaceful intercourse.

A disposition in fact of the divinely sanctioned natural order divides the human race into social groups, nations, or states, which are mutually independent in organization and in the direction of their internal life. But for all that, the human race is bound together by reciprocal ties, moral and juridical, into a great commonwealth directed to the good of all nations and ruled by special laws which protect its unity and promote its prosperity.

Now, no one can fail to see how the claim to absolute autonomy for the state stands in open opposition to this natural way that is inherent in man—nay, denies it utterly—and therefore leaves the stability of international relations at the mercy of the will of rulers, while it destroys the possibility of true union and fruitful collaboration directed to the general good.

So, venerable brethren, it is indispensable for the existence of harmonious and lasting contacts and of fruitful relations that the peoples recognize and observe these principles of international natural law which regulate their normal development and activity. Such principles demand respect for corresponding rights to independence, to life, and to the possibility of continuous development in the paths of civilization; they demand further fidelity to compacts agreed upon and sanctioned in conformity with the principles of the law of nations.

The indispensable presupposition, without doubt, of all peaceful intercourse between nations, and the very soul of the juridical relations in force among them, is mutual trust; the expectation and conviction that each party will respect its plighted word; the certainty that both sides are convinced that: "Better is wisdom than weapons of war" (Ecclesiastes ix: 18), and are ready to enter into discussion and to avoid recourse to force or to threats of force in case of delays, hindrances, changes, or disputes, because all these things can be the result not of bad will, but of changed circumstances and of genuine interests in conflict.

But, on the other hand, to tear the law of nations from its anchor in divine law, to base it on the autonomous will of states is to dethrone that very law and deprive it of its noblest and strongest qualities. Thus it would stand abandoned to the fatal drive of private interest and collective selfishness exclusively intent on the assertion of its own rights and ignoring those of others.

TREATIES CAN BE MODIFIED

Now, it is true that with the passage of time and the substantial change of circumstances, which were not and perhaps could not have been foreseen in the making of a treaty, such a treaty or some of its clauses can in fact become, or at least seem to become, unjust, impracticable, or too burdensome for one of the parties.

It is obvious that should such be the case, recourse shou'd be had in good time to a frank discussion with a view to modifying the treaty or making another in its stead. But to consider treaties on principle as ephemeral and tacitly to assume the authority of rescinding them unilaterally when they are no longer to one's advantage, would be to abolish all mutual trust among states. In this way, natural order would be destroyed and there would be seen dug between different peoples and nations trenches of division impossible to refill.

Today, venerable brethren, all men are looking with terror into the abyss to which they have been brought by the errors and principles which we have mentioned, and by their practical consequences. Gone are the proud illusions of limitless progress. Should any still fail to grasp this fact, the tragic situation of today would rouse them with the prophet's cry: "Hear ye deaf and ye blind, behold" (Isaiah xlii: 18).

What used to appear on the outside as order was nothing but an invasion of disorder—confusion in the principles of moral life.

These principles once divorced from the majesty of the divine law have tainted every field of human activity.

But let us leave the past and turn our eyes toward that future which, according to the promises of the powerful ones of this world, is to consist, once the bloody conflicts of today have ceased, in a new order founded on justice and on prosperity.

Will that future be really different; above all, will it be better? Will treaties of peace, will the new international order at the end of this war be animated by justice and by equity toward all, by that spirit which frees and pacifies? Or will there be a lamentable repetition of ancient and of recent errors?

TEMPTATION IN VICTORY

To hope for a decisive change exclusively from the shock of war and its final issue is idle, as experience shows. The hour of victory is an hour of external triumph for the party to whom victory falls, but it is, in equal measure, the hour of temptation. In this hour the angel of justice strives with the demons of violence; the heart of the victor all too easily is hardened; moderation and far-seeing wisdom appear to him weakness; the excited passions of the people, often inflamed by the sacrifices and sufferings they have borne, obscure the vision even of responsible persons and make them inattentive to the warning voice of humanity and equity, which is overwhelmed or drowned in the inhuman cry, "vae victis—woe to the conquered."

There is danger lest sentiments and decisions born in such conditions be nothing else than injustice under the cloak of justice.

No, venerable brethren, safety does not come to peoples from external means, from the sword, which can impose conditions of peace but does not create peace. Forces that are to renew the face of the earth should proceed from within, from the spirit. Once the bitterness and the cruel strifes of the present have ceased, the new order of the world, of national and international life, must rest no longer on the quicksands of changeable and ephemeral standards that depend only on the selfish interests of groups and individuals.

No; they must rest on the unshakable foundation, on the solid rock of natural law and of divine revelation. There the human legislator must attain to that balance, that keen sense of moral responsibility without which it is easy to mistake the boundary between the legitimate use and the abuse of power.

Thus only will his decisions have internal consistency, noble dignity and religious sanction, and be immune from selfishness and passion. For true though it is that the evils from which mankind suffers today come in part from economic instability and from the struggle of interests regarding a more equal distribution of the goods which God has given man as a means of sustenance and progress, it is not less true that their root is deeper and more intrinsic, belonging to the sphere of religious belief and moral convictions which have been perverted by the progressive alienation of the peoples from that unity of doctrine, faith, customs, and morals which once was promoted by the tireless and beneficent work of the church.

REEDUCATION OF MANKIND

If it is to have any effect, the reeducation of mankind must be, above all things, spiritual and religious. Hence, it must proceed from Christ as from its indispensable foundation; must be actuated by justice and crowned by charity.

The accomplishment of this task of regeneration, by adapting her means to the altered conditions of the times and to the new needs of the human race, is an essential and maternal office of the church. Committed to her by her Divine Founder the preaching of the Gospel, by which is inculcated to men truth, justice, and charity and the endeavor to implant its precepts solidly in mind and conscience, is the most noble and most fruitful work for peace. That mission would seem as if it ought to discourage by its very grandeur the hearts of those who make up the church militant.

But that cooperation in the spread of the Kingdom of God which in every century is effected in different ways, with varying instruments, with manifold hard struggles, as a command incumbent on everyone who has been snatched by divine grace from the slavery of Satan and called in baptism to citizenship of Kingdom of God.

And if belonging to it, living according to its spirit, laboring for its increase and placing its benefits at the disposition of that portion of mankind also which as yet has no part in them, means in our days having to face obstacles and oppositions as vast and deep and minutely organized as never before, that does not dispense a man from the frank, bold profession of our faith. Rather, it spurs one to stand fast in the conflict even at the price of the greatest sacrifices.

Whoever lives by the spirit of Christ refuses to let himself be beaten down by the difficulties which oppose him, but on the contrary feels himself impelled to work with all his strength and with the fullest confidence in God. He does not draw back before the straits and the necessities of the moment but faces their severity ready to give aid with that love which flees no sacrifice, is stronger than death, and will not be quenched by the rushing waters of tribulation.

COMMENDS AID OF LAITY

It gives us, venerable brethren, an inward strength, a heavenly joy, for which we daily render to God our deep and humble thanks, to see in every region of the Catholic world evident signs of a spirit which boldly faces the gigantic tasks of our age, which with generous decision is intent on uniting in fruitful harmony the first and essential duty of individual sanctification, and apostolic activity for the spread of the kingdom of God. From the movement of the eucharistic congresses, furthered with loving care by our predecessors, and from the collaboration of the laity formed in Catholic action toward a deep realization of their noble mission, flow forth fountains of grace and reserve of strength, which could hardly be sufficiently prized in the present time, when threats are more numerous, needs multiply, and the conflict between Christianity and anti-Christianism grows intense. At a moment when one is forced to note with sorrow the disproportion between the number of priests and the calls upon them, when one sees that even today the words of our Saviour apply, "The harvest indeed is great, but the laborers are few" (St. Matthew ix: 37; St. Luke x: 2). The collaboration of the laity in the apostolate of the hierarchy, a collaboration indeed given by many and animated with ardent zeal and generous self devotion, stands out as a precious aid to the work of priests and shows possibilities of development which justify the brightest hopes.

The prayer of the church to the Lord of the harvest that He send workers into His vineyard (cf. St. Matthew ix: 37; St. Luke x: 2) has been granted to a degree proportionate to the present needs, and in a manner which supplements and completes the powers, often obstructed and inadequate, of the priestly apostolate. Numbers of fervent men and women, of youth, obedient to the voice of the supreme pastor and to the directions of their bishops, consecrate themselves with the full ardor of their soul to the works of the apostolate in order to bring back to Christ the masses of peoples who have been separated from Him.

PATERNAL GREETING GOES OUT

To them in this moment so critical for the church and for mankind go out our paternal greeting, our deep-felt gratitude, our confident hope. These have truly placed their life and their work beneath the standard of Christ, the King; and they can say with the Psalmist: "I speak my words to the King" (Psalm xliv: 1). "Thy kingdom come" is not simply the burning desire of their prayers; it is, besides, the guide of their activity. This collaboration of the laity with the priesthood in all classes, categories, and groups reveals precious industry and to the laity is entrusted a mission than which noble and loyal hearts could desire none higher nor more consoling.

This apostolic work, carried out according to the mind of the church, consecrates the layman as a kind of "minister to Christ" in the sense which St. Augustine explains as follows: "When, brethren, you hear our Lord saying: "Where I am there, too, will My servant be, do not think solely of good bishops and clerics." You, too, in your way, minister to Christ by a good life, by almsgiving, by preaching His name and teaching to whom you can. Thus, every father should recognize that it is under this title that he owes paternal affection to his family. Let it be for the sake of Christ and for life everlasting that he admonishes all his household, teaches, exhorts, reproves, shows kindness, corrects; and thus in his own home he will fulfill an ecclesiastical and, in a way, an episcopal office ministering to Christ, that he may be forever with Him. (On the Gospel according to St. John, tract 51, N. 13.)

In promoting this participation by the laity in the apostolate, which is so important in our times, the family has a special mission, for it is the spirit of the family that exercises the most powerful influence on that of the rising generation.

As long as the sacred flame of the faith burns on the domestic hearth, and the parents forge and fashion the lives of their children in accordance with this faith, youth will be ever ready to acknowledge the royal prerogatives of the Redeemer and to oppose those who wish to exclude Him from society or wrongly to usurp His rights.

FAMILY IS CHRISTIAN REFUGE

When churches are closed, when the image of the crucified is taken from the schools, the family remains the providential and, in a certain sense, impregnable refuge of Christian life. And we give thanks to God as we see that numberless families accomplish this, their mission, with a fidelity undismayed by combat or by sacrifice. A great host of young men and women, even in those regions where faith in Christ means suffering and persecution, remain firm around the throne of the Redeemer with a quiet, steady determination that recalls the most glorious days of the church's struggles.

What torrents of benefits would be showered on the world, what light, order, what peace would accrue to social life, what unique and precious energies would contribute toward the betterment of mankind, if men would everywhere concede to the church—teacher of justice and love—that liberty of action to which, in virtue of the divine mandate, she has a sacred and indisputable right. What calamities could be averted, what happiness and tranquillity assured, if the social and international forces working to establish peace would let themselves be permeated by the deep lessons of the gospel of love in their struggle against individual or collective egoism.

There is no opposition between the laws that govern the life of faithful Christians and the postulates of a genuine humane humanitarianism, but rather unity and mutual support. In the interests of suffering mankind, shaken to the depths, both materially and spiritually, we have no more ardent desire than this: That the present difficulties may open the eyes of many to see our Lord Jesus Christ and the mission of His church on this earth in their true light, and that all those who are in power may decide to allow the church a free course to work for the formation of the rising generation according to the principles of justice and peace.

URGES LIBERTY OF CHURCH

This work of pacification presupposes that obstacles are not put to the exercise of the mission which God has entrusted to His church; that the field of this activity is not restricted; and that the masses, and especially youth, are not withdrawn from her beneficent influence. Accordingly we, as representatives on earth of Him who was proclaimed by the prophet Prince of Peace (Isaiah ix: 6), appeal to the rulers of the peoples, and to those who can in any way influence public life, to let the church have full liberty to fulfill her role as educator by teaching men truth, by inculcating justice, and inflaming hearts with divine love of Christ.

While the church cannot renounce the exercise of this her mission, which has for its final end to realize here below the Divine plan and to "Reestablish all things in Christ that are in Heaven and on earth" (Ephesians i: 10), her aid, nonetheless, is shown to be indispensable as never before, now that sad experience teaches that external means and human provisions and political expedients of themselves bring no efficacious healing to the ills which affect mankind.

Taught precisely by the sad failure of human expedients to stave off the tempest that threatens to sweep civilization away, many turn their gaze with renewed hope to the church, the rock of truth and charity, to that chair of Peter from which, they feel, can be restored to mankind that unity of religious teaching and of the moral code which of old gave consistency to pacific international relations.

Unity, toward which so many answerable for the destiny of nations look with regretful yearnings as they experience from day to day the vanity of the very means in which once they had placed their trust! Unity, the desired of those many legions of our sons who daily call upon the God of peace and love! (II Corinthians xiii: 11.) Unity, the hope of so many noble minds separated from us, who yet in their hunger and thirst for justice and peace turn their eyes to the See of Peter and from it await guidance and counsel.

PRINCIPLES STAND TWO THOUSAND YEARS

These last are recognizing in the Catholic Church principles of belief and life that have stood the test of 2,000 years; the strong cohesion of the ecclesiastical hierarchy which, in union with the successor of Peter, spends itself in enlightening minds with the teachings of the Gospel, in guiding and sanctifying men, and which is generous in its material condescension toward all, but firm when, even at the costs of torments of martyrdom, it has to say, "Non licet! It is not allowed!"

And yet, venerable brethren, the teaching of Christ, which alone can furnish man with such solid basis of belief as will greatly enlarge his vision and divinely dilate his heart and supply an efficacious remedy to the very grave difficulties of today—this and the activity of the church in teaching and spreading that doctrine, and in forming and modeling men's minds by its precepts, are at times an object of suspicion, as if they shook the foundations of civil authority or usurped its rights.

Against such suspicions we solemnly declare with apostolic sincerity that—without prejudice to the declarations regarding the power of Christ and of His church made by our predecessor Pius XI, of venerable memory, in his encyclical Quas Primas, of December 11, 1925—any such aims are entirely alien to that same church which spreads its maternal arms toward this world, not to dominate but to serve. She does not claim to take the place of other legitimate authorities in their proper spheres but offers them help after the example and in the spirit of her divine founder, who "went about doing good" (Acts x: 38).

The church preaches and inculcates obedience and respect for earthly authority which derives from God its whole origin and holds to the teaching of her Divine Master, who said: "Render therefore to Caesar the things that are Caesar's" (St. Matthew xxii: 21); she has no desire to usurp, and sings in the liturgy: "He takes away no earthly realms who gives us the celestial" (hymn for feast of Epiphany). She does not suppress human energies, but lifts them up to all that is noble and generous and forms characters which do not compromise with conscience.

NO PEACE RESISTING GOD

Nor has she who civilizes the nations ever retarded the civil progress of mankind, at which, on the contrary, she is pleased and glad with a mother's pride. The end of her activity was admirably expressed by the angels over the cradle of the Word Incarnate when they sang of glory to God and announced peace to men of good will: "Glory to God in the highest; and on earth peace to men of good will" (St. Luke ii: 14). This peace, which the world cannot give, has been left as a heritage to His disciples by the Divine Redeemer Himself: "Peace I leave with you, my peace I give unto you" (St. John xiv: 27); and thus following the sublime teaching of Christ, summed up by Himself in the twofold precept of love of God and of the neighbor, millions of souls have reached, are reaching, and shall reach peace.

History, wisely called by a great Roman "the teacher of life," has proved for close on 2,000 years how true is the word of Scripture that he will not have peace who resists God. (Cf. Job ix: 4.) For Christ alone is the "corner stone" (Ephesians ii: 20) on which man and society can find stability and salvation.

On this cornerstone the church is built, and hence against her the adversary can never prevail: "The gates of hell shall not prevail" (St. Matthew xvi: 18) nor can they ever weaken her; nay, rather, internal and external struggles tend to augment the force and multiply the laurels of her glorious victories.

On the other hand, any other building which has not been founded solidly on the teaching of Christ rests on shifting sands and is destined to perish miserably. (Cf. St. Matthew vii: 26, 27.)

APPEALS FOR POLAND

Venerable brethren, the hour when this, our first encyclical, reaches you is in many respects a real "hour of darkness" (cf. St. Luke xxii: 53) in which the spirit of violence and of discord brings indescribable suffering on mankind. Do we need to give assurance that our paternal heart is close to all our children in compassionate love, and especially to the afflicted, the oppressed, the persecuted? The nations swept into the tragic whirlpool of war are perhaps, as yet only at the "beginnings of sorrows" (St. Matthew xxiv: 8), but even now there reigns in thousands of families death and desolation, lamentation and misery. The blood of countless human beings, even noncombatants, raises a piteous dirge over a nation such as our dear Poland, which, for its fidelity to the church, for its services in the defense of Christian civilization, written in indelible characters in the annals of history, has a right to the generous and brotherly sympathy of the whole world, while it awaits, relying on powerful intercession of Mary, help of Christians, the hour of a resurrection in harmony with the principles of justice and true peace.

What has already happened and is still happening was presented, as it were, in a vision before our eyes when, while still some hope was left, we left nothing undone in the form suggested to us by our apostolic office and by the means at our disposal, to prevent recourse to arms and to keep open the way to an understanding honorable to both parties. Convinced that the use of force on one side would be answered by recourse to arms on the other, we considered it a duty inseparable from our apostolic office and of Christian charity to try every means to spare mankind and Christianity the horrors of a world conflagration, even at the risk of having our intentions and our aims misunderstood.

PEACE COUNSEL DISREGARDED

Our advice, if heard with respect, was not, however, followed; and while our pastoral heart looks on with sorrow and foreboding, the image of the Good Shepherd comes up before our gaze, and it seems as though we ought to repeat to the world in His name: "If Thou * * * hadst known * * * the things that are to thy peace; but now they are hidden from thy eyes" (St. Luke xix: 42).

In the midst of this world which today presents such a sharp contrast to "the peace of Christ in the reign of Christ," the church and her faithful are in times and in years of trial such as have rarely been known in her history of struggle and suffering. But in such times especially, he who remains firm in his faith and strong at heart knows that Christ, the King, is never so near as in the hour of trial, which is the hour for fidelity.

With a heart torn by the sufferings and afflictions of so many of her sons, but with the courage and the stability that comes from the promise of our Lord, the spouse of Christ goes to meet the gathering storms. This she knows: That the truth which she preaches, the charity which she teaches and practices, will be the indispensable counselors and aids to men of good will in the reconstruction of a new world, based on justice and love, when mankind, weary from its course along the way of error, has tasted the bitter fruits of hate and violence.

In the meantime, however, venerable brethren, the world and all those who are stricken by the calamity of the war must know that the obligation of Christian love, the very foundation of the kingdom of Christ, is not an empty word but a living reality. A vast field opens up for Christian charity in all its forms. We have full confidence that all our sons, especially those who are not being tried by the scourge of war, will be mindful, in imitation of the divine Samaritan, of all these who as victims of the war have a right to compassion and help.

CHURCH AWAITS HAND OF CHRIST

The "Catholic Church, the city of God, whose king is truth, whose law love, and whose measure eternity" (St. Augustine, Ep. cxxxxiii ad Marcellinum, c. 3, n. 17), preaching fearlessly the whole truth of Christ and toiling as the love of Christ demands with the zeal of a mother, stands as a blessed vision of peace above the storm of error and passion awaiting the moment when the all-powerful hand of Christ, the King, shall quiet the tempest and banish the spirits of discord which have provoked it. Whatever we can do to hasten the day when the dove of peace may find on this earth, submerged in a deluge of discord, somewhere to alight, we shall continue to do, trusting in those statesmen who before the outbreak of war nobly toiled to avert such a scourge from the peoples; trusting in the millions of souls of all countries and of every sphere who call not for justice alone but for love and mercy; above all, trusting in God Almighty, to whom we daily address the prayer: "In the shadow of Thy wings will I hope, until iniquity pass away" (Psalm lvi: 2).

God can do all things. As well as the happiness and the fortunes of nations, He holds in His hands human counsel and sweetly turns them in whatever direction He wills; even the obstacles are for His omnipotence means to mold affairs and events and to direct minds and free wills to His all-high purposes.

Pray then, venerable brethren, pray without ceasing; pray especially when you offer the divine sacrifice of love. Do you, too,

pray, you whose courageous profession of the faith entails today hard, painful, and not rarely heroic sacrifices; pray you suffering and agonizing members of the church, when Jesus comes to console and to heal your pains, and do not forget with the aid of a true spirit of mortification and worthy practice of penance to make your prayers more acceptable in the eyes of Him who "lifteth up all that fall: and setteth up all that are cast down" (Psalm cxiv: 14) that He in His mercy may shorten the days of trial and that thus the words of the psalmist may be verified: "Then they cried to the Lord in their affliction: and He delivered them out of their distresses" (Psalms cvi: 13).

ASKS PRAYERS OF CHILDREN

And you, white legions of children who are so loved and dear to Jesus, when you receive in holy communion the bread of life, raise up your simple and innocent prayers and unite them with those of the universal church. The heart of Jesus, who loves you, does not resist your suppliant innocence. Pray everyone, pray uninterruptedly: "pray without ceasing" (Thessalonians v: 17).

In this way you will put into practice the sublime precept of the Divine Master, the most sacred testament of His heart, "that they all may be one" (St. John xvii: 21) that all may live in that unity of faith and of love, from which the world may know the power and efficacy of Christ's mission and of the work of His chuch.

The early church understood and practiced this divine precept, and expressed it in a magnificent prayer; do you associate yourselves with those sentiments which answer so well to the necessities of the present hour: "Remember, O Lord, Thy church, to free her from all evil and to perfect her in Thy love; and sanctify and collect her from the four winds into Thy kingdom, which Thou hast prepared for her, because Thine is the power, and the glory for ever" (doctrine of the 12 apostles, c: 10).

In the confidence that God, the author and lover of peace, will hear the supplications of the church, we impart to you all as a pledge of the abundance of divine grace, from the fullness of our paternal heart, the apostolic benediction.

Given at Castel Gandolfo, near Rome, on the 20th day of October A. D. 1939, the first of our pontificate.

PIUS PP. XII.

Neutrality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 2, 1939

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN, OF NEW YORK

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address delivered by me yesterday:

Ladies and gentlemen, the term "neutrality" has been misinterpreted by friend and foe alike. Some people are under the impression that neutrality means being entirely disinterested in the fortunes or misfortunes of the particular countries at war. Such, however, is not the case. Neutrality means taking no sides in the war itself, but it does not prevent a neutral from believing the one or the other side to be right.

Now what are the facts in this present European conflict? No one can, for a moment, hesitate in giving his sympathy to those nations whose conception of life and way of living correspond to our own. We all must necessarily wish success to the democracies. But because we wish success to them, it does not follow that we cannot remain neutral in the war.

But as neutrals we have certain rights. We have the right, under international law, to sell to all parties. There has never been a conception of international law which would prevent a neutral, just because he happens to be one, from trading with countries at war. In fact, neutrals usually have the bulk of belligerent trade, and Germany's good friend, Italy, has announced to the whole world that she is planning to develop her industries now that Germany is at war. It has always been the case, in the history of the world, that where great nations will be fighting each other, neutrals by not taking sides were able to help themselves by building up their own trade and commerce at the expense of warring nations.

A few years ago this country became very much alarmed by conditions in Europe, and as a result it determined that in any future conflict the United States would remain neutral and prevent incidents from coming into being which would involve us in a war. There can be no incident involving us in a war if we keep strictly neutral, mind our own business, and do not take sides. However, our neutrality legislation as enacted some years ago, and as reenacted from time to time down to the present day, went much further than international law requires. In our desire to be absolutely fair and to keep out of any European quarrels we passed a very stringent neutrality law which forbids us to sell ammunition and other implements of war, and seeks to keep our citizens away from belligerent ships in times of war. Much of this legislation goes a great deal further than the circumstances warrant. Much of this legislation, indirectly, plays into the hands of aggressors, because it puts all belligerents on the same basis, and does not differentiate between an aggressor and a country which is attacked. The same attitude has been rather disastrous to countries which, like Ethiopia, Albania, and to some extent China, lost their independence because of the act of the aggressors. Perhaps if we were not so scrupulously neutral we might have helped these countries to maintain their independence by selling them supplies. But this is all a matter of the past.

The overwhelming sentiment in this country today is opposed to a complete embargo of the type our existing neutrality legislation compels. This embargo is detrimental both to Europe and ourselves. There surely can be no harm in selling to Europeans supplies which they need for peacful activities, and there is no reason why our ships should be driven off the seas simply because Europe chooses to be at war. Until our neutrality laws were enacted no nation would dream of preventing this country from indulging in legitimate trade in articles of commerce used in ordinary peaceful pursuits simply because war has again been unleashed upon Europe. Peaceful trade is something which should never be enjoined, and with our supplies seeking markets all the time there is no reason why we should stifle our own trade simply because Europe is at war, particularly where there is no desire to prevent our own merchants from engaging in the same type of business which is not forbidden to other neutrals. Other neutrals are buying and selling in the European market. We are prevented from doing so by our neutrality laws.

Nor can there be any real objection to the sale of products to some nations if they are willing to take the risk in carrying their merchandise in their own ships and paying us in cash.

The debate conducted in the last few weeks in the public press, on the platform, on the radio, and in the other branch of Congress clearly demonstrated to the country the great benefits which we will derive from sales to belligerents on a cash-and-carry basis.

We have large surpluses of merchandise seeking an outlet. We have the facilities to trade, we have the desire to furnish the world with goods which they can use and which are only surplus to us, and I expect great profits to flow from the sale of our surplus stocks without detriment to anyone and without causing an untimely war inflation. We do not want to grow rich at the expense of our neighbors, but there is no reason why America should not participate in the business which Europe seeks and which other nations are furnishing.

I believe a sane attitude adopted by our people will make it perfectly clear that our selling goods to belligerents under the provisions of the neutrality bill as passed by the Senate is not going to involve us in any war. Sentiment for peace is very strong in the United States. We have no quarrels with any European country; we may dislike their dictatorial methods, but we do not seek to change them or impose our own philosophy on unwilling European states. If these states believe that totalitarianism is more beneficial to them than the type of government which we call our own, that is their concern and does not make any difference to us.

One hundred and fifty years ago George Washington proclaimed the doctrine that Europe has a set of interests peculiarly its own with which we have no concern and which should make no difference to our own manner of living or form of government.

The lapse of 150 years did not change the necessity of our keeping out all "entangling alliances." At the end of the last World War we refused to join the League of Nations because we did not want to be involved in any territorial disputes which Europe habitually suffers from, nor did we want to become the underwriters of the order of things created by the Treaty of Versailles. Let Europe go on its own way, and those who like the types of government they have there may glory in them and derive all the pleasure they can from them. As for ourselves, we want to continue to follow our American way of living, believing, as we do, that only in the individual dignity of man lies the solution of the age-old problem as to what is best for mankind.

No one can fail to be impressed with the solemn words of warning addressed by His Holiness Pope Pius XII to the totalitarian rulers of Europe. They seek to make the state supreme and destroy every vestige of love for God and family which the founders of our Republic believed to be the cornerstone of our American way of living. Ours is a God-fearing, home-loving, individualistic Nation, and it is my hope that we shall remain such in spite of any totalitarian whisperings from abroad.

A neutrality law permitting us to continue to trade with the world will not be the opening wedge for our being involved in a bloody war. If Europe cannot settle its problems any other way, America will not become a party to the quarrels with which we have no concern.

After all, the conduct of our foreign affairs is entrusted by our Constitution to the President. Our President has repeatedly stated his position and assured this country that he will do everything in his power to keep us out of war. With faith in our President and animated by our desire to remain neutral, there is no doubt of our remaining neutral in this world of strife, as our traditional policy of American aloofness from Europe will be aided by the great love of peace of the President of the United States.

National Youth Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 2, 1939

LETTER BY AUBREY WILLIAMS, ADMINISTRATOR OF NATIONAL YOUTH ADMINISTRATION

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, in the interest of fair play to one of our most devoted public servants, I should like to call to the attention of the House, and to include with my remarks, the following letter of Mr. Aubrey Williams, Administrator of the National Youth Administration:

OCTOBER 31, 1939.

The Honorable CHESTER H. GROSS,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN GROSS: I have read your statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of October 27 which quoted me as saying that "the American system of government is wrong." I made no such statement.

What I said was that "any industrial system which leaves out one out of every five people cannot hope to continue to have the confidence and support of any nation." I was careful to draw a distinction between the form of government and the form of industrial pattern by which people make their living. I even went on to point out that people have tried to confuse these two matters and have tried to mislead the people into believing that a particular pattern of industry connotes a particular form of government.

I also resent very much the statement you made that I talked like a "red." I have not the slightest sympathy with the industrial and political arrangements they are trying to work out in Russia and I resent very much having anyone impute to me an approval of such objects and aims when I was attempting to express hope that we would work out the problems of our industrial life in order to make more sure the continuation of our present form of democratic government.

You have done me a very great wrong by this flagrant misstatement of what I said and inasmuch as you have made this in a public statement I expect you to have the fairness to make a similar public statement correcting the injustice you have done me.

Sincerely yours,

AUBREY WILLIAMS,
Administrator.

In Last War Boom Union Wages Went Up 14 Percent, but Food Prices Jumped 56 Percent, So Where Will the Wage Earner Profit in Business From Embargo Repeal?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 2, 1939

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, the wage earners of America will again be the losers in the war boom that is expected to follow the repeal of the embargo provisions of the Neutrality Act. In the last war boom union wages went up 14 percent, but food prices jumped 56 percent.

Yesterday I pointed out in my remarks on the neutrality legislation that it is highly essential that we maintain the arms embargo to prevent the citizens of the United States from being again made victims of another post-war boom economic collapse.

I pointed out that repeal of the arms embargo would possibly bring a buying spurt from England and France that will have one result—higher prices for the things our citizens buy.

This morning every Member of this House received a document which should serve as conclusive proof that our citizens—your constituents and my constituents—were the victims of the last war boom. I hold in my hand a copy of the current issue of the Labor Information Bulletin, an official publication of the Department of Labor, and let me quote what it says happened to the citizens of our country in the last war boom. This statement, mind you, is in an official Government publication. It says:

Wages also advanced, but the increases did not keep pace with retail prices and cost of living.

Even more startling in revealing heavy losses of wage earners in the last war boom is the statement of the Labor Department expert that—

In May 1917 union hourly rates of wages were 14 percent higher than in May 1913, while food prices were 56 percent higher.

In other words the war boom hiked prices many times greater than it did wages.

This study shows the effects of a war boom in 1914–17 as anything but beneficial to the wage earners. The same will be true today. If the embargo is repealed and profit-hungry manipulators and the campaign contributing munitions industry get in the saddle again, the wage earners will find his rent going up, clothing will become more expensive, and prices of his food will increase.

Wage earners have nothing to gain by embargo repeal's war boom.

Inasmuch as this article is issued at this timely hour and is based on the effect the European war is bound to have, I desire to read it into the RECORD for your consideration.

It follows:

AMERICAN LABOR IN THE WORLD WAR, 1914–17

(By Witt Bowden, Bureau of Labor Statistics)

The present European war is bound to bring with it serious and complicated economic dislocations not only to the nations at war but also to the nations that remain neutral. The recent sudden and unjustified spurt in the retail price of some of our most important foodstuffs, such as sugar, was the first warning of how rapidly such changes can occur and how seriously they may affect the welfare and standard of living of workers in the United States.

During the last quarter of a century, and particularly since 1933, the social and economic pattern of the United States has undergone a profound change, largely beneficial to the masses of people who earn a living by working for wages and salaries. Workers now have the legal right to organize and bargain collectively with their employers through representatives of their own choice. The large majority of employers have accepted this change and have come more and more to regard collective bargaining as the most effective method of dealing with their employees. There exists also a large body of other Federal and State social and labor legislation designed to protect and enhance the welfare of workers. Organized labor, too, has grown in power and membership, and when united should offer a solid protection to workers against encroachment from war profiteering. Although business and economic conditions in the United States are now in many respects considerably different from what they were in 1913, it is deemed desirable, nevertheless, to look back and examine on the basis of such data as are available the effects of the World War on wholesale and retail prices in the United States, on employment conditions, and on wages and earnings of American workers.

WHOLESALE PRICES

The World War began on July 28, 1914, at a time when the trend of wholesale prices in the United States had been downward. The first effect of the war was, therefore, to halt this downward trend, although some prices continued to decline for several months. It was not until the last quarter of 1915, however, that the level of wholesale prices in the United States turned sharply upward. In March 1917, 1 month prior to the entrance of the United States into the World War, the level of wholesale prices was 60 percent higher than when the war started. Some commodities especially required for war purposes—such as grain, iron and steel, and chemicals—more than doubled in price.

COST OF LIVING

The Department of Labor is now equipped to study and report on changes in the cost of living at comparatively short intervals, but no such facilities were available when the war broke out in 1914. It was not until 1916 that the first attempts were made by the Bureau of Labor Statistics to determine the effects of the war on the cost of living of wage earners. This study was first limited to the District of Columbia, but was later extended to cover several important shipbuilding centers and a number of other industrial cities. These surveys revealed considerable increases in the cost of living of wage earners and low-salaried employees since the beginning of the war. Rents had increased slightly, fuel and light costs somewhat more, and the cost of miscellaneous goods, such as laundry, carfare, medical care, etc., still more. The largest increases occurred in the important items of food, clothing, and housefurnishings. By December 1916 the average cost of living for the cities covered by the survey was 16.6 percent higher than in 1913. In December 1917 it was 38.3 percent higher.

More detailed information is available on the trend of retail prices of foodstuffs for which the Bureau of Labor Statistics had been collecting monthly figures in a number of cities. These figures showed a substantial increase during the first 2 months immediately following the beginning of the World War. With 1913 as the base, or 100, the index of retail food prices rose from 102.2 in July 1914, to 106.5 in August, and 107.4 in September. Then food prices began to decline, and at no time during the whole year of 1915 did the index rise to the level of September 1914—the second month of the war.

This trend was sharply reversed in 1916 and, with the exception of 2 months, prices of foodstuffs advanced each month of the year. From a low of 106 in February, the index rose to 126.1 in December, an increase of 19 percent. It continued to advance in 1917 and reached 132.5 in March of that year.

EARNINGS AND HOURS OF WORK

Wages also advanced but the increases did not keep pace with the rise in retail prices and the cost of living. In May 1917 union hourly rates of wages were 14 percent higher than in May 1913, while food prices were 56 percent higher. Not all the cities and not all the industries recorded the same increases in union wage rates. For instance, in Baltimore, the increase averaged 22 percent, while in New Orleans it was only 7 percent. Again, the metal trades recorded an increase in wage rates of 27 percent, as against an average of about 14 percent for all trades.

Weekly earnings, however, advanced more rapidly than wage rates. War orders from abroad and the increased armaments program in the United States stimulated employment. The reduction in part-time work and a considerable amount of overtime work greatly added to the weekly earnings of workers independently of changes in wage rates. From June 1914 to March 1917, 55 industries in the State of New York reported an average increase of about 25 percent in the weekly earnings of the workers employed.

The increases in New York State ranged from 9 percent in the printing and paper goods group to 30 percent in stone, clay, and glass. Some industries reported declines in employment and comparatively slight increases in average earnings.

The influences that affected rates of pay, hours of work, and weekly earnings in the State of New York were not operative to the same extent in other parts of the country. The nature of the industries in New York and the geographical location of the State gave it a prominence in filling war orders, and the earnings of the workers employed in New York advanced more rapidly than in the country as a whole. Even the wage rates of hired farm workers advanced more in New York State. The increase for New York was approximately 15 percent, as against an average of about 10 percent for the country as a whole.

EMPLOYMENT

The beginning of the World War found the United States affected by serious and widespread unemployment which continued through the first year of the war. A survey in New York City indicated that in February 1915, 18.8 percent of male workers and 9.2 percent of female workers were unemployed. Widespread unemployment was found in a survey of 16 other cities in the East and Middle West. It ranged from 4.3 percent in Bridgeport, Conn., to 20 percent in Duluth, Minn. Part-time employment varied even more widely.

However, as the war continued in Europe, unemployment in the United States began to decline, first slowly, and then at a more rapid pace. While in March 1915 employment in 55 industries in the State of New York was 6 percent lower than in June 1914, it was 23 percent higher in March 1917, just prior to the entrance of the United States into the war.

The detailed figures on employment available for the State of New York also indicate the extreme manner in which employment fluctuated in the different industries. In the manufacture of firearms, tools, and cutlery, for example, the number employed in March 1917 was more than twice as large as in June 1914. This was in contrast with the brick, tile, and pottery industries, which during the same period registered a reduction in employment of 40 percent. The largest increases in employment were recorded for the most part in industries affected by wartime demands.

Although no such detailed data are available on conditions of employment in the country as a whole in the war period, it is fairly certain that the increases in employment in other parts of the country were not so large as in New York and that the contrast between conditions of employment in the different industries was not so violent.

Night Mail Pick-Up Successful in Test

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 2, 1939

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, on many occasions I have spoken in this House on the development and possibilities of the air-mail pick-up and delivery device system.

I feel certain an increasingly large number of the Members are becoming aware of the progress being made. It is in this connection that I insert the following newspaper article from the Wilmington (Del.) Morning News of October 30, 1939:

The first public demonstration of the use of an airplane to pick up mail at night was given before officials of the Post Office Department and of the Civil Aeronautics Authority last night at Bellanca Field.

Three times a plane piloted by Holger Hoiriis swooped down, dropped its mail bag, and picked up another suspended between the two 40-foot masts, the tops of which were neon-lighted.

Each time it was greeted by cheers as the demonstration of the system which now serves 58 communities during the daylight hours went off without a hitch.

TO START NOVEMBER 15

At the close, Richard C. du Pont, president of All-American Aviation, Inc., which operates the system, announced that the new equipment for night use will be placed in operation on November 15 on the company's Philadelphia-Pittsburgh route at the stations at Grove City, Butler, and Natrona, Pa., where it will be tested under actual operating conditions.

Ambrose O'Connell, Second Assistant Postmaster General, declared the experimental service of the air pick-up system "is making good" and that night flying will unquestionably benefit hundreds of the smaller post offices throughout the country.

"I am extremely hopeful that the night service will be adopted by the Department and the daylight service extended," he said. "It will bring the advantages of air-mail service to small communities which may be scores of miles from the large transcontinental air terminals.

ADVANTAGE POINTED OUT

"The great advantage of the night service is that a businessman in a small town may drop a letter in a post office in the afternoon and know it will be delivered before noon next day in a city hundreds of miles away. Then, too, the greatest volume of mail moves at night."

The work of developing the night-flying equipment was conducted under the supervision of Mr. du Pont and James G. Ray, vice president of the company. Mr. Ray was one of the Nation's first air-mail pilots and has an international reputation as an autogiro operator.

Mr. Hoiriis, who piloted the plane last night, is a regular pilot on the route between Philadelphia and Pittsburgh. The pick-up operator in the plane was William Burkhart, of Martinsburg, W. Va., who is regularly employed in that capacity.

EQUIPMENT SIMPLE

The night-flying equipment is, like the rest of the system, simple, economical, and easily installed and operated.

The air station is lighted by outlining with red neon the flag that rests on the top of each of the two 40-foot masts comprising the station. The flying range is marked by a 12-foot horizontal bar of red neon mounted on a frame 10 feet above the ground.

Regular installation calls for a range light on each side of the station at a distance about 175 feet in a straight line from the masts so that an approach may be made from both directions.

Ordinarily current will be wired into the station, but at stations where this can be done only at prohibitive expense storage batteries will be used. The storage-battery system was used at Bellanca Field last night.

FIFTEEN-MINUTE LEEWAY

In regular operation the station attendant will switch on the station lights 15 minutes in advance of the arrival of the plane and turn them off immediately after the delivery and pick-up have been made.

As to the safety of the new night-flying equipment from the pilot's standpoint, Maj. Hal Bazely, operations manager of the company, who has been the pilot on experimental flights, reported that the lighted station under normal conditions can be seen plainly from the air at a distance of 6 miles.

This is farther than it can be seen in daylight. The pick-up can be made as easily at night as it is by day, he added.

NO CHANGE IN SCHEDULES

The introduction of the night system at the three Pennsylvania towns will not mean a change in the present schedule of the system, officials said last night. Due to the shortening of the days with the advent of autumn, these towns at the end of the route will be in darkness when the plane arrives there.

Later, should night flying prove successful, schedules will probably be introduced providing for regular day and night service.

The two air-mail routes on which the air pick-up is now in regular daily use extend through four States—Pennsylvania, West Virginia, Ohio, and Delaware—and serve 58 communities, which, with the exception of Philadelphia and Pittsburgh, range in population from 799 to 106,000. Many of these communities have no airfields. Schedules require 75 pick-ups a day.

OFFICIALS PRESENT

Among the officials who witnessed the demonstration last night were C. M. Knoble, assistant superintendent of air-mail service of the Post Office Department; Richard S. Boutelle, director of the Bureau of Safety Regulation of the Civil Aeronautics Authority; Edward Yuravich, chief of the air-carrier inspection section of the Civil Aeronautics Authority; J. E. Whitbeck and Edward K. Mills, Jr., both of the legal division of the Civil Aeronautics Authority.

Representative JENNINGS RANDOLPH, of West Virginia, who sponsored the legislation authorizing the Post Office Department to establish the present air-mail routes for the test of the air pick-up system, also attended.

Others from out of town included Dr. Lytle S. Adams, of Irwin, Pa., pioneer in the development of the air pick-up and member of the board of All-American Aviation, Inc., and Blaine Stubblefield, of Washington, D. C., news editor of Aviation magazine.

Mr. Speaker, I was privileged to see this demonstration, and it is my opinion, based on careful study, that the equipment which will be placed in operation this month on one of the experimental air-mail routes, will be highly successful. This further development will definitely enlarge the scope of service which can and will be given to the American people. I am certain that no one receives a greater degree of satisfaction in these accomplishments than does Dr. L. S. Adams, inventor of the automatic pick-up and delivery device. It shall be my continued purpose to cooperate in every possible way in the increased use and expansion which I feel certain will take place.

Embargo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, November 2, 1939

TELEGRAM FROM NEW ENGLAND CONFERENCE

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following telegram from pastors of the New England Conference of the Lutheran Augustana Synod against lifting the embargo:

LOWELL, MASS., *October 31, 1939.*

To the Representatives of the New England States, care Hon. Edith Nourse Rogers, 1155 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.:

Pastors of the New England Conference of the Lutheran Augustana Synod, representing 35,000 members, in conference assembled, respectfully ask you to use your great influence to keep America out of war and to work for good will among men. We greatly feel that lifting the embargo would be a step toward getting us involved in European warfare.

JULIUS HULTEEN, *President.*
HARRY CARLSON, *Secretary.*
P. E. NORDGREN HOST, *Pastor.*

Interpretation of Hatch Political Activities Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL A. HATCH
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, November 3, 1939

RULINGS BY ATTORNEY GENERAL

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, late in the last session of the Congress I placed in the RECORD my own interpretation of certain rules issued by the Civil Service Commission on the bill passed by the last Congress relating to political activities. Since that time the Attorney General has made various rulings and interpretations of that bill. I have them all with me, and I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the interpretations and summary of the so-called Hatch law as given by the Attorney General.

I wish to say, in connection with the work being done by the Attorney General of the United States, that I think the Attorney General has given the country a first-class and splendid effort in the interpretation and enforcement of this law.

There being no objection, the interpretations were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
Washington, D. C., August 10, 1939.

CIRCULAR NO. 3285

Re: Hatch Act provisions most important to Federal Government employees.

To all Officials and Employees of the Department of Justice and United States Courts:

The provisions of the Hatch Act (Public, No. 252, approved August 2, 1939) that are of the most general interest to Federal Government employees, and most likely to cause inquiry and concern, are sections 2 and 9, as follows:

"SEC. 2. It shall be unlawful for any person employed in any administrative position by the United States, or by any department, independent agency, or other agency of the United States (including any corporation controlled by the United States or any agency thereof, and any corporation all of the capital stock of which is owned by the United States or any agency thereof), to use his official authority for the purpose of interfering with or affecting the election or the nomination of any candidate for the office of President, Vice President, Presidential elector, Member of the Senate, or Member of the House of Representatives, Delegates, or Commissioners from the Territories and insular possessions."

"SEC. 9. (a) It shall be unlawful for any person employed in the executive branch of the Federal Government, or any agency or department thereof, to use his official authority or influence for the purpose of interfering with an election or affecting the result thereof. No officer or employee in the executive branch of the Federal Government, or any agency or department thereof, shall take any active part in political management or in political campaigns. All such persons shall retain the right to vote as they may choose and to express their opinions on all political subjects. For the purposes of this section the term "officer" or "employee" shall not be construed to include (1) the President and Vice President of the United States; (2) persons whose compensation is paid from the appropriation for the office of the President; (3) heads and assistant heads of executive departments; (4) officers who are appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and who determine policies to be pursued by the United States in its relations with foreign powers or in the Nation-wide administration of Federal laws."

Provisions similar to the foregoing are found in Civil Service rule 1, section 1. Many of the questions and situations currently arising under the Hatch law have previously been considered and ruled upon by the Civil Service Commission in construing the provisions of the civil-service rules. These rulings have been published in Form 1236, issued by the Civil Service Commission in August 1936, entitled "Political Activities and Political Assessments," and are binding upon civil-service employees.

While the rulings contained in Form 1236 are not necessarily controlling as to non-civil-service employees, they will be found instructive and helpful in dealing with many of the problems that will arise under the Hatch law. Where a particular situation is not covered by these rulings or where, for substantial reasons, it appears to require a different interpretation, a determination of the question can be obtained from the Department.

Civil-service employees are required by the civil-service rules to confine their opinions on political subjects to private expression. From the corresponding provision of the Hatch law, on the other hand, the word "privately" was omitted. Accordingly, as stated by the President in his message to the Congress approving the Hatch bill, non-civil-service employees would not violate the act "if they should merely express their opinion or preference publicly—orally, by radio, or in writing—without doing so as part of an organized political campaign."

It should be noted that while the penalty for violation of section 9 is removal from office as in the case of the corresponding rule 1 of the civil-service rules, the penalty for violation of section 2 is a fine of not to exceed $1,000 or imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both.

The provisions of section 2 apply to all persons employed in administrative positions in the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of the Federal Government, whereas section 9 applies only to employees of the executive branch. Other provisions of the Hatch law relating to the improper use of relief appropriations for political purposes, intimidation of voters, and the like, apply to all persons, including employees of State and local governments and private individuals.

FRANK MURPHY, *Attorney General.*

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT TO THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Washington, October 18, 1939.

CIRCULAR NO. 3298

To All United States Attorneys, United States Marshals, Assistant United States Attorneys, Deputy Marshals:

Your attention is again invited to the following provision of section 9 (a) of the act of August 2, 1939 (Public, No. 252, 76th Cong.), known as the Hatch Act:

"No officer or employee in the executive branch of the Federal Government, or any agency or department thereof, shall take any active part in political management or in political campaigns."

For an officer or employee of the executive branch of the Federal Government to hold any office in any political party organization or political club, or to be a member of any committee of any political party organization or political club, is deemed a violation of the foregoing provision. Accordingly, if you hold any such office or committee membership, you should forthwith resign therefrom, or from your present position under the Federal Government.

You are requested to acknowledge receipt of this circular immediately, and in the event that you have been holding office in any political party organization or political club, or membership in any committee of any political party organization or political club, to state whether or not you have resigned therefrom and the date of such resignation.

EDWARD G. KEMP,
Assistant to the Attorney General.

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Washington, D. C., October 26, 1939.

CIRCULAR NO. 3301

In the interpretation and application of the Hatch law a number of cases have arisen under section 9 (a) in which doubt has been expressed and the Department has been called upon to make a ruling. In issuing this circular it is the aim of the Department merely to summarize these rulings for the benefit and information of Government employees and the public generally. It is not the purpose to enumerate or describe all the activities and positions to which the law may or may not apply.

Accordingly, the circular should not be regarded as a complete or comprehensive statement of all the positions and activities to which section 9 (a) applies. The law is general in scope and (with a few prominent exceptions) forbids all officers and employees of the executive branch of the Federal Government to take any active part in political management or political campaigns.

The pertinent provisions of section 9 are as follows:

"No officer or employee in the executive branch of the Federal Government, or any agency or department thereof, shall take any active part in political management or in political campaigns. All such persons shall retain the right to vote as they may choose and to express their opinions on all political subjects."

I

It has been ruled that the following officers and employees in the executive branch of the Federal Government, among others, are affected by the provisions of section 9 of the Hatch Act:

1. United States attorneys and marshals, their assistants and deputies.
2. Special attorneys of the Department of Justice and special assistants to the Attorney General.
3. Temporary employees, substitute employees, and per diem employees, during the period of their active employment.
4. Reserve officers of the United States Army, Navy, and Marine Corps during the period of their active duty.
5. Furloughed employees and employees on leave, whether with or without pay.
6. Officers and employees of governmental agencies such as the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and the Public Works Administration.
7. Officers and employees occupying administrative and supervisory positions in the Work Projects Administration, the National Youth Administration, and the Civilian Conservation Corps.

NOTE.—Persons employed in any administrative or supervisory capacity by any agency of the Federal Government whose compensation or any part thereof is paid from funds authorized by the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1939 should consult section 31 of that act, which limits their public expression of opinions on political subjects more strictly than does the Hatch Act.

II

Section 9 of the Hatch Act has been construed as not applying to the following:

1. Officers and employees of the legislative branch of the Federal Government, including secretaries and clerks to Members of Congress and congressional committees.
2. Officers and employees of the judicial branch of the Federal Government, including United States commissioners, clerks of United States courts, referees in bankruptcy, and their secretaries, deputies, and clerks.
3. Officers and employees of State and local governments, even though their employment involves the expenditure of Federal funds.
4. Persons who are retained from time to time to perform special services on a fee basis and who take no oath of office, such as fee attorneys, inspectors, appraisers, and management brokers for the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, and special fee attorneys for the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.
5. Persons who receive benefit payments, such as old-age assistance and unemployment compensation under the Social Security Act, rural rehabilitation grants, and payments under the agricultural-conservation program.
6. Retired employees.

III

It has been ruled that the following acts constitute taking an "active part in political management or in political campaigns" within the meaning of section 9 of the Hatch Act:

1. Holding office in a political party or a political club.
2. Attending political conventions as a delegate or alternate.
3. Serving on committees of a political party or a political club.
4. Distributing buttons or printed matter in support of any candidate or party.
5. Serving at party headquarters or as watchers at the polls, or otherwise assisting a party or candidate in any primary or election campaign, whether or not Federal offices are involved.
6. Being a candidate for elective office—Federal, State, or local.
7. Soliciting funds for a political organization or campaign fund.

NOTE.—Severe penalties are provided under section 5 of the Hatch Act for those who solicit or receive any assessment, subscription, or contribution for any political purpose from a person known to be receiving compensation, employment, or other benefit provided for or made possible by any act of Congress appropriating funds for work-relief or relief purposes. Such persons include the administrative and supervisory personnel of relief agencies as well as the actual recipients of relief.

IV

The following activities are not considered to be prohibited by the Hatch Act:

1. Holding membership in a political organization and attending its meetings otherwise than as an officer or delegate.
2. Participating in the activities of civic associations and educational groups, provided the activities in question are divorced from the campaigns of particular candidates or parties.
3. Holding a State or local office (but see III (6) above).

NOTE.—An Executive order of January 17, 1873, forbids persons holding a Federal civil office by appointment from holding any State or municipal office, with the exception of positions such as justice of the peace, notary public, commissioner to take acknowledgment of deeds or bail or to administer oaths, and positions on boards of education, school committees, public libraries, and in religious or eleemosynary institutions. Special exceptions are made in subsequent Executive orders.

Circulars summarizing additional rulings will be issued as the necessity arises.

FRANK MURPHY, *Attorney General.*

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
Washington, D. C., October 26, 1939.

CIRCULAR NO. 3302

To All Officers and Employees of the Department of Justice:

Your attention is invited to the following provision of section 9 (a) of the act of August 2, 1939 (Public, No. 252, 76th Cong.), known as the Hatch Act:

"No officer or employee in the executive branch of the Federal Government, or any agency or department thereof, shall take any active part in political management or in political campaigns."

For an officer or employee of the executive branch of the Federal Government to hold any office in any political party organization or political club, or to be a member of any committee of any political party organization or political club, is deemed a violation of the foregoing provision. Accordingly, if you hold any such office or committee membership, you should forthwith resign therefrom, or from your present position under the Federal Government.

You are requested to acknowledge receipt of this circular immediately and to state whether you have been holding office in any political party organization or political club, and, if so, to state whether or not you have resigned therefrom, with the date of such resignation.

Your reply should be transmitted through the head of the division or bureau to which you are accredited.

EDWARD G. KEMP,
The Assistant to the Attorney General.

Emergency Powers of the President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN G. TOWNSEND, JR.

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, November 3, 1939

ADDRESS BY HON. ROBERT A. TAFT, OF OHIO, BEFORE THE INDIANAPOLIS BAR ASSOCIATION

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] before the Indianapolis Bar Association on October 30, 1939. The subject of the address is Emergency Powers of the President.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Congress and the country have been so much engaged on the question of neutrality that little attention has been paid to the

increase in the Executive power resulting from war. But that increase in power is provided for in countless statutes dealing with nearly every phase of Government activity, and by the Constitution itself. Some extraordinary powers granted by the Constitution, and by so-called New Deal emergency statutes become more important and more likely to be used in time of war. Some special war powers arise merely from the existence of a war between other nations, and the emergency conditions incident to such a war. Other extensive statutory powers come into existence when the United States itself becomes involved in war.

I am convinced that whatever may happen to the present Neutrality Act, the United States will not become involved in the present European war, but nevertheless we should be interested in preparedness, and preparedness involves many fields besides the Army and Navy. Furthermore, we should realize what a tremendous change may be effected in our whole political and economic status if we become involved in war. The danger of a complete and perhaps permanent change in the American way of life, and American democracy itself, is a strong argument against war of any kind which is not forced upon us as a matter of defense.

I do not say that the President should be stripped of emergency wartime powers. Unfortunately, certain extraordinary powers are necessary in time of war. My purpose in discussing these powers is to show how extensive they are and may become, and to point out the dangers to democratic processes attendant upon modern warfare, rather than to criticize the present Executive. However, I do believe that the prospect of these powers being exercised should give more cause for concern in view of the philosophy of government regulation and a planned economy which dominates the present administration.

CONSTITUTIONAL POWERS

There can be no doubt that, regardless of statutes, the President's power is greatly increased in time of war. The Constitution specifically provides that the President shall be commander in chief of the Army and Navy of the United States, and under this power, once war is declared, and even before war is declared, the President may give such orders to the Army and Navy as to cause them to engage in military operations. There are several statutes which expressly provide that the President may employ the land and naval forces of the United States to carry out the purposes of the statute, but the necessarily implied powers are much greater.

Under his powers as Commander in Chief, President Lincoln issued the Emancipation Proclamation and effected a profound change in the whole economy of the United States. Under this same power President Wilson established a rigid censorship over telephone, telegraph, and cable systems by an Executive order issued on April 28, 1917. Upon the declaration of war with Germany, and on later occasions, President Wilson placed restrictions upon German insurance companies doing business in the United States and made regulations with regard to German patents. His proclamations stated that his action was based on "the authority vested in me as such President." (Proclamations of April 6, May 24, and July 13, 1917, published in U. S. Stat., 65th Cong., 1st sess., pp. 10, 23, and 40.) The President under the Constitution (art. I, sec. 9, par. 2) may suspend the writ of habeas corpus in cases of rebellion or invasion. The Constitution does not say expressly who has the power to suspend, but the courts have held that it lies with the President.

Undoubtedly there are many other powers which may be exercised by the President as Commander in Chief. They must have a direct relation to the conduct of a war, but there are few important activities in a country at war which may not be argued to have a fairly direct relation to military operations.

STATUTORY POWERS RELATING TO ARMED FORCES

The constitutional powers of the President, furthermore, have been supplemented by extensive statutory regulations. Many of these have been on the books for years. Others were adopted during the World War, but are applicable to any war. Others have been adopted deliberately as part of the preparation for another war.

It is natural that extensive statutory powers should be given to increase the Army and Navy in case of war or threatened war. President Lincoln ordered a large increase in the Regular Army at the outbreak of the Civil War without congressional authority of any kind, but it was considered, even by President Lincoln himself, that his act was clearly beyond his powers. By a proclamation issued on May 3, 1861, based solely "upon existing exigencies" and his own position "as President and Commander in Chief," he increased the Regular Army by 22,714 officers and men and the Navy by 18,000 seamen. He also issued a call for volunteers and ordered the addition of 19 vessels to the Navy.

Today the law implies a power on the part of the President to increase the Army indefinitely. It reads:

"Except in time of war or similar emergency when the public safety demands it, the number of enlisted men of the Regular Army shall not exceed 280,000, including the Philippine Scouts (10 U. S. C. 602)."

A somewhat similar provision but imposing an outside limit on the President's powers, relates to increasing the authorized strength of the Navy:

"The permanent authorized enlisted strength of the active list of the Regular Navy shall be 131,485: *Provided*, That the President is hereby authorized, whenever in his judgment a sufficient emergency exists, to increase the authorized enlisted strength of the Navy to 191,000 men (34 U. S. C. 151)."

The President on September 8, 1939, issued a proclamation of national emergency, proclaiming "that a national emergency exists in connection with and to the extent necessary for the proper observance, safeguarding, and enforcing of the neutrality of the United States and the strengthening of our national defense." Just what the purpose or legal effect of this proclamation was I have not been able to discover, as specific orders under the various statutes must still be based on a definite finding of emergency in the order itself.

The President, however, on the same date, went on to issue some of these specific orders. By Order No. 8244, he provided for an increase of the Regular Army to 227,000 men, and by Order No. 8245 he ordered an increase in the Regular Navy to a figure not exceeding 145,000 men, and an increase in the Marine Corps to 25,000 men. The naval increase was made under the emergency statute, but the Army strength is still well below the statutory authorization. The real purpose of these proclamations was to remove the statutory limitation which requires appropriations to be expended more or less equally over the 12 months of a fiscal year. Both of these Executive orders authorized the Department concerned to waive or modify the monthly or other apportionments of its appropriation for contingent expenses or other general purposes for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940.

The statutory limitation referred to was enacted to prevent departments from using all their appropriations early in the year and then presenting to Congress the choice between deficiency appropriations and the complete suspension of the department's activities. But the statute (31 U. S. C., sec. 665) contains an exception for emergencies:

"Such apportionments shall not be waived or modified except upon the happening of some extraordinary emergency or unusual circumstance which could not be anticipated at the time of making such apportionment."

The President's order will not result in any exceeding of the appropriations for the Army and Navy until some time next spring, but in January Congress will undoubtedly be asked for a deficiency appropriation and will be forced to grant it to make possible the continuance of the armed forces until July 1, 1940.

All of these moves pertaining to increases in the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, and National Guard are clearly within the authority granted to the President in an emergency not foreseen by Congress.

On October 3, 1939, however, the President announced that he had ordered the War and Navy Departments to ignore statutory prohibitions against budgetary deficits in carrying out his orders to spend money on housing and hospitalization for the Army and Navy and on the reconditioning of many destroyers. Money for such expenses cannot be spent without direct authorization by Congress, and there has been no such authorization, and of course no appropriation. If the President proceeds he will act in clear violation of the existing laws. Whatever may be condoned in time of war, there is certainly no justification for any such usurpation of authority, particularly when Congress is in session and could act very quickly if the expenditures appear to be justified.

NEUTRALITY LEGISLATION

On September 5, 1939, shortly after war was declared the President issued several neutrality proclamations; the first was in general conformity with neutrality proclamations issued by the United States during previous international conflicts. It was described as having to do "with our activities as a neutral under the rules and procedure of international law and those of our domestic statutes in harmony therewith." It would have been issued if there had been no Neutrality Act of 1937 in the books. The others were issued to carry out the provisions of the Neutrality Act of 1937.

The first proclamation calls attention to, and makes effective, many statutes of the Penal Code of the United States and of the act of June 15, 1917 (18 U. S. C., 31–38), which make unlawful various unneutral acts; such as serving one of the belligerents in a military capacity or enlisting others to do so, fitting out armed vessels to be employed by any belligerent, supplying a belligerent vessel with arms, men, or supplies, and a number of other acts contrary also to international law. The proclamation then proceeds to prescribe rules for the conduct in our waters of the commercial vessels and armed vessels of belligerent states. This proclamation may be found in the Department of State Bulletin for September 9, 1939, volume 1, No. 11, publication 1376.

The second proclamation finds that a state of war exists between Germany, France, Poland, the United Kingdom, India, Australia, and New Zealand. It then lists the several categories of arms, ammunition, and implements of war, the export of which is expressly forbidden by the Neutrality Act of 1937, now in force, wherever such a proclamation has been issued. This proclamation may also be found in the Department of State Bulletin for September 9, 1939.

Under section 11 of the Neutrality Act of 1937, the President has the power during any war in which the United States is neutral to place restrictions on the use of the ports and territorial waters of the United States by the submarines or armed merchant vessels of a foreign state whenever he finds that such action will serve to maintain peace between the United States and foreign states. President Roosevelt has recently acted under this authorization insofar as submarines are concerned. Whether or not action on submarines and lack of action on armed merchant vessels is neutral in spirit it is clearly within the authority of the law.

Under the Neutrality Act of 1937, as under the amending resolution adopted Friday by the Senate, there are a number of provisions

relating to the prohibition of credit to belligerent governments which are put into effect by the issue of the proclamation finding a state of war to exist:

"It shall thereafter be unlawful for any person within the United States to purchase, sell, or exchange bonds, securities, or other obligations of the government of any belligerent state, or to make any loan or extend any credit to any such government."

Under the Neutrality Act of 1937 the President may except from the operation of this section ordinary commercial credits and short-time obligations in aid of legal transactions and of a character customarily used in ordinary peacetime commercial transactions, and he did so by proclamation on September 6, 1939. But this exception will be nullified by the provisions of the new neutrality resolution if and when it is passed.

He also put into effect on September 5 the provisions of the Neutrality Act prohibiting the travel of Americans on the ships of belligerent nations.

Under the neutrality resolution now before Congress the arms embargo will come to an end, but many other provisions will become effective on proclamation of the President. The President is not required to act even if war exists, but Congress then by concurrent resolution may force him to act. On the issue of a proclamation shipments of all goods on American vessels to belligerent countries in Europe become unlawful, and similar shipments on foreign vessels are unlawful unless title has been transferred to foreigners.

Restrictions similar to those provided in existing law for credits to belligerents, travel in belligerent ships, and regulation of the use of American ports are proposed to be reenacted in the pending bill. In general, the chief differences in the pending legislation and existing law are the repeal of the arms embargo and the enactment of strict cash-and-carry provisions for all merchandise, including arms.

EMERGENCY POWERS OVER BUSINESS

The emergency powers I have referred to deal directly with wars between other nations and with our own preparedness. There are many other statutes, however, giving the President extensive powers over business of all kinds in the United States. Some of these powers may be exercised without waiting for war. For instance, under section 606, paragraph (c) of title 47 of the United States Code:

"Upon proclamation by the President that there exists war or a threat of war or a state of public peril or disaster or other national emergency, or in order to preserve the neutrality of the United States, the President * * * may cause the closing of any station for radio communication and the removal therefrom of its apparatus and equipment; or he may authorize the use or control of any such station, and/or its apparatus and equipment by any department of the Government under such regulations as he prescribes upon just compensation to the owners."

As a practical matter, in other words, the Government could take over all the radio stations in the United States tomorrow.

He may not, apparently, take over the telegraph and telephone systems without further statutory authority, because paragraph (a) of the section quoted above merely states that:

"During the continuance of a war in which the United States is engaged the President is authorized, if he finds it necessary for the national defense and security, to direct that such communications as, in his judgment, may be essential to the national defense and security shall have preference or priority over any carrier subject to this chapter * * *."

It appears, therefore, that his powers with respect to telephone and telegraph systems are much more limited, and even then may only be exercised in time of war. But we saw that President Wilson imposed a strict censorship in the World War without statutory authority.

Certain emergency power with relation to the railroads is contained in section 1 (15) of the Interstate Commerce Act, giving the Interstate Commerce Commission powers in emergencies to direct priorities in shipments and require joint use of cars, tracks, and terminals, as may be necessary. The Interstate Commerce Commission, in time of war or threat of war, is required to act when the President certifies the necessity of any preferences and priorities. But the President himself may go further in time of war. Section 1361 of title 10 of the United States Code, which became law on August 29, 1916, reads as follows:

"The President, in time of war, is empowered, through the Secretary of War, to take possession and assume control of any system or systems of transportation, or any part thereof, and to utilize the same, to the exclusion as far as may be necessary of all other traffic thereon, for the transfer or transportation of troops, war material, and equipment, or for such other purposes connected with the emergency as may be needful or desirable."

Under this statute there is no doubt that the President could take over the railroads, just as President Wilson did in the World War, and settle the terms of compensation at a later time.

But the President's power over industrial plants is even wider. Under section 80 of title 50 of the United States Code, the President, "in time of war or when war is imminent," may:

"Place an order with any individual, firm, association, company, corporation, or organized manufacturing industry for such product or material as may be required, and which is of the nature and kind usually produced or capable of being produced by such individual, firm, * * *. Compliance with all such orders of product or material shall be obligatory on any individual, firm, etc., * * * and shall take precedence over all other orders and contracts theretofore placed with such individual, firm, etc."

Should any such individual or firm which is equipped to fill the orders given it refuse to do so at a reasonable price as determined by the Secretary of War, or refuse to give the United States preference:

"The President through the head of any department of the Government * * * is authorized to take immediate possession of any such plant or plants and through the Ordnance Department of the United States Army, to manufacture therein in time of war, or when war shall be imminent, such product or material as may be required * * *."

Under this authority the Secretary of War might find such low prices to be reasonable that the manufacturer would prefer to let the Government take his plant and rely on the courts to fix a fair compensation later. And the power may be exercised "when war is imminent," or the President says that it is imminent.

Section 82 of the same title gives the President even greater powers over industries but in time of war only. This section permits the President to modify or cancel any existing contracts for the building, production, or purchase of ships or war material, and to require the owner or occupier of any factory in which ships or war material are built or produced to place at the disposal of the United States the whole or any part of the output of such factory. Under this section the President may "requisition or take" over for use or operation by the Government any factory or any part thereof without taking possession of the entire factory, whether the United States has or has not any contract or agreement with the owner or occupier thereof.

It would be possible under these sections for the Government to take nearly every factory in the United States, leaving the question of compensation to be determined later by the courts. These statutes existed during the World War and were passed shortly before we entered the war. No plants were taken over as far as I know, but the threat to take them over formed the basis of the power through which the War Industries Board directed the manufacture of materials related in one way or another to the war.

WHEN WAR IS IMMINENT

When can war be said to be imminent, and who determines it? Presumably, this means a war in which the United States is engaged, but there is a statute which authorizes the President to designate an officer of the Army to assume exclusive authority over the operation of the Panama Canal in time of war or when, in his opinion, war is imminent (U. S. C., title 48, sec. 1306). On September 5, 1939, by Executive Order No. 8232, which may be found in the Federal Register of September 6, 1939, the President took action under that statute and designated such an officer to take charge of the Canal Zone. The order does not contain any specific finding that war is imminent, but it refers to the statute and can only be supported by such a finding. It seems that in this matter the President has exceeded his authority, although the statute in that case perhaps should have permitted the authority to be exercised in the case of war between other nations.

However, the President's action illustrates the fact that the person who construes these statutes in the first instance is the Executive himself, and he is likely to construe them as broadly as possible. It is very difficult for anyone to question the Executive power in the courts in most cases, so that many emergency powers in practice are actually much broader than attorneys are likely to realize on a first reading of the statutes.

BANKING AND MONETARY POWERS

The President has various emergency powers with relation to the banking system which are not necessarily connected with war.

The proclamations President Roosevelt issued on March 5, 1933, closing the banks, were made under the authority of the Trading with the Enemy Act of October 22, 1917, although there was no war at that time and the act was on its face only operative in time of war. Extensive powers do arise in time of war, however, relating to foreign dealings. Section 5 (6) reads as follows:

"(b) That the President may investigate, regulate, or prohibit, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, by means of licenses or otherwise, any transactions in foreign exchange, export, or earmarkings of gold or silver coin or bullion or currency, transfers of credit in any form * * * and transfers of evidence of indebtedness or of the ownership of property between the United States and any foreign country, whether enemy, ally of enemy, or otherwise, or between residents of one or more foreign countries, by any person within the United States."

In the act of March 9, 1933 (12 U. S. C. 95), the President is given powers over the banking system which may be exercised in time of emergency whether or not a state of war existed, but perhaps more likely to be exercised when war occurs. Provisions of this section are as follows:

"In order to provide for the safer and more effective operation of the national banking system and the Federal Reserve System, to preserve for the people the full benefits of the currency provided for by the Congress through the national banking system and the Federal Reserve System, and to relieve interstate commerce of the burdens and obstructions resulting from the receipt on an unsound or unsafe basis of deposits subject to withdrawal by check, during such emergency period as the President of the United States by proclamation may prescribe, no member bank of the Federal Reserve System shall transact any banking business except to such extent and subject to such regulations, limitations, and restrictions as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury, with the approval of the President."

The President can close the banks or tell them in detail how they may run their business.

In any consideration of emergency banking powers we should refer to certain powers granted to the President under the provisions of some of the New Deal legislation. The power to devalue the dollar was originally granted in the Gold Reserve Act of 1934, partially exercised at that time, and last July was renewed over strenuous opposition. The President may still devalue the dollar from its present value of slightly over 59 cents to 50 cents. While not a war power, administration spokesmen have compared it, as a weapon in economic warfare, to a powerful navy in actual warfare. The President, through the Secretary of the Treasury, has also almost unlimited power over the operation of the stabilization fund. Conceivably in time of war it could be used to stabilize the currency of a belligerent nation by buying such currency in large amounts, creating purchasing power for that nation in this country. Secretary Morgenthau has stated that he will never use the fund for such a purpose without consulting Congress, but the power exists, nevertheless. The President also has still the power to issue $3,000,000,000 in greenbacks, which he might use to finance a war, as many wars have been financed throughout the world in the past.

POWER OVER ELECTRIC PLANTS

When the safety of the United States demands it (a unique method of referring to an emergency) the President has certain powers through the Federal Power Commission over transmission and sale of electric energy and water-power projects.

Section 16, United States Code 809, provides:

"When in the opinion of the President of the United States the safety of the United States demands it, the United States shall have the authority to enter upon and take possession of any project (meaning a water-power project) or part thereof, constructed, maintained, or operated under said license, for the purpose of manufacturing explosives, or munitions of war, or for any other purpose involving the safety of the United States, to retain possession, management, and control thereof for such length of time as may appear to the President to be necessary to accomplish certain purposes * * *."

With respect to other producers of electric energy, the Federal Power Commission has certain powers either in war or other emergency under paragraph (c) of section 824 (a) of title 16 of the United States Code:

"During the continuance of any war in which the United States is engaged, or whenever the Commission determines that any emergency exists by reason of a sudden increase in the demand for electric energy or shortage of electric energy, or facilities for the transmission or generation of electric energy or of fuel or water for generating facilities, or other causes, the Commission shall have authority * * * to require by order such temporary connections or facilities and such generation, delivery, interchange, or transmission of electric energy as, in its judgment, will best meet the emergency and serve the public interest."

This section, while it does not specifically give the Power Commission the right to take over electric utilities, provides that it may virtually dictate how they shall operate, and it is possible that under the statutes, which I have previously mentioned, pertaining to industrial plants, the President might have sufficient power to requisition power plants and other facilities for the generation or transmission of power.

PROPOSED WAR LEGISLATION

The conclusion from an examination of the statutes is that the war legislation and the other statutes giving emergency powers to the President are haphazard and casual, but broad and capable of infinite application. It is important that the statutes be more definite on the question of the time when the various powers may be exercised. Some fields are not covered at all, so that it may even be necessary to supplement these laws. In general, however, they seem to give the President such extensive power that an administration desiring to substitute for the present economic organization of the United States a completely socialized system could go a long way in that direction.

Furthermore, these powers are proposed to be supplemented by various bills now pending before Congress. Senate bill 1650, introduced by Mr. LEE, of Oklahoma, in the present Congress, and actually recommended by the Senate Committee on Military Affairs, requests the President in time of war to take a census of the net wealth of the Nation, and makes the net wealth of each individual subject to the borrowing power of the United States, roughly, as follows: $1,000 to $100,000, 5 to 10 percent; $100,000 to $1,000,000, 15 to 25 percent; $1,000,000 to $100,000,000, 75 percent. Sums borrowed are to be represented by bonds payable in 50 years and bearing 1-percent interest. Neither principal nor interest are tax-exempt. This in effect is a capital levy, with all the difficulties incident to forcing everyone to sell his property at the same time to provide the Government with the money he is forced to lend it. Trying to meet this difficulty, the bill authorizes the President to accept notes or other obligations bearing 6-percent interest and secured by liens upon specified property, and to issue currency against these notes, an ingenious form of inflation resembling that used in the French Revolution.

Another milder bill, introduced by Senator BONE, proposes that in time of war the income tax shall be increased until it takes practically all income of individuals. The surtax is increased so that it amounts to 50 percent of all surtax net incomes in excess of $6,500; 70 percent of all such incomes in excess of $8,000, and 93 percent of all incomes in excess of $20,000. It has been pointed out that when State income taxes are taken into consideration, the combined taxes in many cases will amount to more than 100 percent of income.

Both of these bills are based on the theory that if men are to be conscripted in time of war wealth should also be conscripted. There can be no doubt that taxes should be greatly increased in time of war, and that war expenses should be financed as largely as possible through taxation rather than by borrowing. But, after all, the purpose of war legislation should be to assist the country to win this war, and these bills in their present form, together with other powers already existing and those which will be demanded, are likely so to disrupt the entire economic system of the United States as to hurt rather than help in organizing the country for war. If a man is kept busy selling everything he has, and filing petitions in bankruptcy, he is not going to enter wholeheartedly into the job where he can be of most value in prosecuting the war.

In 1936 an industrial mobilization plan was adopted by a commission appointed for that purpose, approved by the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy. It advocates a scientific approach to this question of preparation of war and lays down the general principles which must guide such mobilization. This plan is well worth reading as a whole, but I quote from some of the general principles stated:

"The measures adopted must be such as to minimize damaging effects of such changes in industrial activity and to maintain an approximate economic equilibrium throughout the Nation. No radical changes in normal economic relationships between individuals and between an individual and the Government should be instituted. The methods and customs of peace must be employed as far as practicable, otherwise confusion and chaos will result. The attempt should be to guide and to influence the operation of natural forces rather than to oppose them by arbitrary and unnecessary regulations."

Unfortunately, the bills prepared to carry out this plan hardly seem to be in accord with these principles. A bill was introduced in the Seventy-fourth Congress, known as H. R. 5529, which was designed to provide much of the machinery outlined in the industrial mobilization plan. This bill was passed by the House of Representatives and was considered by three Senate committees, but was not enacted into law. It provided for a draft of industrial management by which registered persons in any industrial plant might be brought into Government service under the control of the War Department. It provided that the President could fix prices, regulate commodity exchanges, establish a system of priorities or rationing. It granted other powers which would have given the President almost exclusive control over the entire industrial and economic activity of the country.

A bill very similar to this one was introduced in the present Congress (S. 2160), entitled "A bill to provide revenue and facilitate the regulation and control of the economic and industrial structure of the Nation, for the successful prosecution of war, and for other purposes."

The provisions of the bill are to become effective upon the declaration by Congress that a state of war exists between the United States and any foreign government and that the existence of such state of war creates a grave national emergency.

Title I provides for reasonably increased income-tax rates and the dropping of the exemptions to $800.

Most corporations will be taxed on their incomes at rates from less than 1 to 77 percent, depending on the ratio between undistributed net income and adjusted net income. A flat rate of 25 percent is imposed on banks, China trade corporations, insurance companies, domestic corporations in receivership, and nonresident foreign corporations, and 40 percent on resident foreign corporations.

Under title II, to be called the Industrial Management Act, the President may require registration of persons engaged in managing or controlling industry. They may be subjected to War Department control and may be drafted, if necessary, for service in the War Department. Such persons shall receive no compensation except as shall be fixed and paid by the President.

Title III, called war-resources control, gives the President the power to fix and establish just and reasonable maximum, minimum, or absolute prices or rates or rentals for any product, foodstuff, material, real property, or right declared by him essential for the national security and defense in the prosecution of war; to close any commodity exchange or to publish rules and regulations with the force and effect of law for the government of such commodity exchanges as are not closed. The publication of prices in any form may be prohibited.

Paragraph (1) of section 502 of this section, however, is worthy of full quotation. It reads as follows, speaking of the powers of the President after a finding by him that such action is necessary:

"To requisition and take possession of any product, foodstuff, materials, commodity, real property, or right, and on such terms as he may deem advisable to sell or otherwise dispose of such product, foodstuff, material, commodity, real property or right."

The bill provides for compensation for any such requisition to be determined by the President. Any person who is not satisfied with the compensation shall be paid 75 percent of the price at once and at the close of the war may sue to recover such sum which, added to the 75 percent, shall be deemed sufficient.

Title IV of the bill gives the President power to close any or all security exchanges and prevent any public or private sale of any securities which might be handled by such exchange.

Title V of this bill is called the War Finance Control Act. It creates a five-man War Finance Control Commission. No member appointed may refuse to serve nor shall he receive any compensation from any source directly or indirectly regulated or affected by the provisions of this title. No security shall be registered with the S. E. C. until it has been previously approved by the Commission. The Commission is also empowered to loan or

advance funds to any industry, establishment, or agency which requires it owing to inadequate capital plant or other inadequate financial resources which impair the efficiency or usefulness of any such industry, establishment, or agency for the successful prosecution of war.

SUMMARY

It is impossible to predict what kind of a bill may be adopted if we become involved in war, but it seems probable that the Government would require absolute power to regulate every business in the United States and do exactly what a government would do under a Socialist plan of life. It is likely that some such bill would be passed. Personally, I do not believe that such arbitrary powers are necessary. There should be a complete plan for mobilization of those resources which have a direct relation to war, but I believe practically every object could be accomplished by permitting the continued operation of private enterprise and dealing with the question of excessive profits through a greatly increased taxation. With the powers which exist, and the general patriotic spirit of cooperation existing in wartime, I believe the Government could secure all the production, transportation, and other services which it could obtain under strict compulsion. If they can be obtained through a spirit of voluntary cooperation, more work will be done and more support given the war than if every normal personal status and all individual initiative are destroyed. Even in an army we see the development of a deadening bureaucracy. If the same thing is extended to industrial production, we are likely to find it a serious handicap to the successful prosecution of the war.

Some of the bills are drafted and introduced on the theory that wealthy individuals in some way involve us in war and should be discouraged. I do not believe in the basic premise. Any wealthy person who does not see in war the destruction of his own material welfare ought to be placed in an asylum. At best we face a tremendous increase in the socialization of the United States. During the last war emergency powers were exercised by men with at least sympathy toward the existing economic order, but inspired, as I saw them, solely with the desire to make effective the Nation's resources for the winning of the war. In my opinion, the same policy should prevail during the next war. But it will depend on the spirit in which the laws are administered, because existing or future laws will certainly make the President a potential dictator in times of war. The present administration has shown its intense interest in a planned economy in time of peace, and its belief that the Government can produce prosperity by the regulation of agriculture, commerce, and industry. I thoroughly disagree with that philosophy, and I would fear that an administration dominated by it would not restrain its wishes when war power is granted. I sincerely hope that no emergency, with or without war, may ever be regarded by any official as an excuse for bringing about a permanent change in the whole economic system of the United States. Possibly the people may desire such a change; and if they do, they can bring it about. But it should only be brought about on its own merits, after a thorough public discussion and debate, and not by the use of emergency powers granted for war purposes alone.

Proposed Repeal of Arms Embargo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD P. NYE

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, November 3, 1939

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. JOHN A. DANAHER, OF CONNECTICUT

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER] over the National Broadcasting Co.'s network on October 14, 1939.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A few short years ago we often heard a current popular tune entitled "Smoke Gets in Your Eyes." I believe that song has been dusted off and brought out as the theme song of the interventionists—of those who would plunge the United States into European politics. They would have us intervene in a war which is not of our making. The issue has been so thoroughly and consistently misrepresented that I wish to undertake to clear the atmosphere and to get the smoke out of your eyes.

The interventionists have told you that we must repeal the embargo provisions of our law which today prohibit Americans from selling arms, ammunition, and implements of war to those nations engaged in war. They tell you that our Nation should put the shipment of arms and other supplies on a so-called cash-and-carry basis. This plan very plausibly makes an appeal to a great many of our people.

I have opposed the plan of repealing a reasonable and just protection for the American people which has been our law for several years. I believe that American arms and American munitions should not be sent overseas to be used in killing people and in bombing their countries. There is no reason why we cannot retain the arms embargo and forbid entirely the exportation of munitions, and at the same time, if you wish, write legislation which will put all other supplies on a cash-and-carry basis.

If we do not ship arms and munitions to one side in the war, we certainly cannot be drawn into that war because of our failure to send such arms to Europe. If we repeal our protecting statute, and if we ship arms to one side in the war, we can be drawn into the European turmoil on that account. Should we take that chance?

If we undertake to furnish munitions and implements of war to one group of belligerents, we are no longer neutral. We will have intervened in that war.

As Col. Charles A. Lindbergh said in his broadcast only last night:

"If we repeal the arms embargo with the idea of assisting one of the warring sides to overcome the other, then why mislead ourselves by talk of neutrality? Those who advance this argument should admit openly that repeal is a step toward war. The next step would be the extension of credit, and the next would be the sending of American troops."

People are beginning to get the smoke out of their eyes and are beginning to see through the pending bill. They have discovered that if this bill shall pass, the first and immediate effect of it is to repeal all the neutrality legislation now upon our books. They are discovering that the first eight sections of the bill which purport to deal with our neutrality status will not come into effect in any way whatever until and unless the President shall issue a proclamation as provided for by section 1 of the bill. But when he shall issue it and whether he shall issue it at all or not will depend entirely upon the exercise by him of his discretion. Thus he will have it in his power to say whether or not a state of war exists, and, of course, we all realize that there is one, but he need not say that it is "necessary" to promote the security of the United States that he shall issue his proclamation. This is a new condition. This is not in our present law.

The President thus has it within his power to postpone the issuance of the proclamation until any date in the future which may serve his purposes or the policy he chooses to carry on. He may even decide that he will never issue it.

You have been told that the bill provides for a so-called cash-and-carry plan. As a matter of fact, there is no requirement in this bill that even 5 cents of cash be paid. The bill simply provides that title or ownership in the goods to be exported shall pass from American citizens before the goods leave our shores. But the President again in this bill is authorized, in his discretion, to except ordinary commercial credits and short-time obligations for a period of 90 days, which exception will apply to any number of transactions and apply to every possible kind of merchandise. The real fallacy in this section of the bill, which deals with credits, has never been explained to you by the interventionists. They didn't tell you that they wrote into this bill section 7 (b), which reads that "the provisions of this section shall not apply to a renewal or adjustment of such indebtedness as may exist on the date of such proclamation." Thus, if a foreign agency representing the nations which our country wishes to favor should tomorrow place orders in this country for 1,000,000 bushels of wheat, an indebtedness is created. If such an agency, representing such foreign nations, shall next week place orders for airplanes, the contract for such manufacture and sale of airplanes will create indebtedness. There is no limitation whatever on the amount of such indebtedness; there is no limitation whatever on the terms, whether it be for 90 days, 2 years, or any other given period. There is no limitation whatever on the kind of supplies which may be ordered to create such indebtedness; and hence this indebtedness may run to rifles, bombers, machine guns, wheat, cotton, or any other supplies. So, no matter how much the indebtedness may be or on what account, just so long as it may exist at some future date when the President shall issue his proclamation, all that indebtedness is taken out of this bill and credit provisions will not apply, and there is no restriction whatever upon it. What becomes of this cash-and-carry idea you have been hearing about?

It is perfectly apparent, isn't it, the way the law works now, no arms or implements of war may be exported to any warring nation? Then why do they want our law repealed? Some of them have said on the floor of the Senate that the way the law works now we may sell munitions to a neutral country and these munitions may then be transshipped to a warring nation. The law forbids this course, but if that's all they are worried about, all we have to do is to keep our present law and simply pass an amendment which will forbid the exportation of munitions and implements of war even to neutral countries. Then we won't be furnishing such arms either to warring nations or to neutral nations. Then American people will not be furnishing bombs to blow up and destroy cities and the subjects of nations with which we are at peace.

Well, the truth is beginning to come out. You can hear one Senator say that he wants to "crush Hitlerism." Who is going to do the crushing? Should we? If the real purpose of that particular gentleman's vote is to repeal the arms embargo so that American weapons and American bombs can be used to destroy Hitlerism, I assume that he has decided that Hitlerism must be crushed. Suppose that Great Britain and France try to do so but fail, must we then go in and crush Hitlerism to satisfy his aims? Is that neutrality?

I heard another Senator on the floor of the Senate say that he wants to render assistance to Great Britain and France. Assistance

to do what? To win a war, of course. To satisfy this Senator's aims we must repeal the arms embargo and begin to send bombs and munitions and airplanes to Great Britain and France. But suppose that furnishing these munitions will not be enough, just suppose, if you will, that Great Britain and France ought to win but cannot even with such assistance. If they should not win, are we then going to be asked to follow our munitions overseas and to join these countries in helping them to win?

What do we know of the political aims of the 13 political parties in France? What do we know of how far Great Britain and France actually wish to permit Hitler to go? France had an alliance with Czechoslovakia and you know what happened then. Great Britain had an alliance with Poland and you know what happened then.

The interventionists will tell you that Great Britain is our first line of defense in the Atlantic Ocean. But what do you suppose our Navy is doing in the Pacific? If we were really in any danger of attack by Hitler, why is our Navy in the Far East? Isn't it perfectly apparent that Great Britain and France, with their hundreds of millions of subjects, with their vast armies and navies, are more than a match for Germany, and if that were not so, do you suppose for one minute that our Navy would be in the Pacific? Well, if Great Britain is defending us in the Atlantic, she must at least be interested to know and be happy at the thought that our Navy is in the Orient, for Great Britain had no commercial or financial interests whatever in Poland, but she has billions in the Orient.

The plain fact of the matter is that our Nation, for reasons of policy not known to you and never disclosed to you, wants to repeal the arms embargo so that this Nation of ours may intervene by giving active assistance to belligerents in an overseas war.

Let me ask you people, Did you clamor for this special session? Was it your idea? Did the lawyers, and the clergymen, and the public-spirited citizens of your town demand that the Congress should take this step or repeal our neutrality laws?

The way this bill is drawn, a manufacturer of soap in Cleveland, Ohio, can't send his own soap to his own branch warehouse in Toronto.

This isn't a neutrality bill; this is a "Help Great Britain and France bill."

In 1914, when the World War broke out, we commenced to sell munitions and other supplies to the Allies. When the available cash they had ran out the Allies received credits in this country.

When the credits became extended they floated bond issues and obtained loans in this country. In a thousand ways propaganda gradually whipped up American sympathy to a frenzy of interest. How rapidly it can be done again will become evident from realizing how rapidly it happened before. In November of 1916 President Wilson was reelected on the platform that "he kept us out of war." Less than 40 days after his inauguration as President in 1917 the United States was in the war. I saw it happen then, and I don't want to see it happen now.

I want no part of a European war. I have no disposition to see our Nation undertake to become the policeman of the world.

So I am opposed to the repeal of the embargo on the exportation of arms. If anything need be done, we can forbid the shipment of arms even to neutral countries. We can place the exportation of supplies on a real cash basis—not this spurious, unlimited-credit plan contained in the pending bill. But this much is certain: The way to keep out of Europe's wars is to stay out of them, and the way for us to be neutral is to help neither side. Let us build up our own Nation.

And then let a peace come—not a dictated peace, not an enforced peace. Let us, after a negotiated peace, be in position to restore an economic balance in the world. The issue is clear, and repeal of the embargo on arms is the first step toward war, which inevitably and inexorably, just as in 1914, will entwine us in foreign entanglements and lead us into the war.

I am opposed to repeal of the arms embargo; what do you say?

Negotiated Peace in European Conflict

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, November 3, 1939

EDITORIAL BY DAVID LAWRENCE

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a brilliant, timely, and constructive editorial by David Lawrence which appeared in the United States News of October 23, 1939. In this editorial Mr. Lawrence sets forth a plan consisting of 10 well-considered points as a basis for an honorable negotiated peace. I hope that this splendid editorial may be brought to the studious attention of every citizen of our country.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the United States News of October 23, 1939]

PEACE NOW!—INEVITABLY THERE MUST BE A JUST PEACE—THE TERMS AND CONDITIONS ARE KNOWN NOW SO WHY NOT SKIP THE WAR AND GO DIRECTLY TO THE MAIN ISSUES WHICH ARE ECONOMIC?—A FORMULA IS OFFERED AS A BASIS FOR AN ARMISTICE

(By David Lawrence)

The war can go on until the Allies win—or the war can go on until Germany wins. But in the end there must be a peace conference.

And if a peace treaty with unjust terms is signed there will subsequently be another war. Peoples do not continue indefinitely in subjugation. Absolute victory based on a dictated peace of injustice is never permanent.

The civilized world knows today—or should know—the elements of a just peace. The concessions and adjustments that must be made are known in the inner hearts and minds of statesmen on every side.

So why continue the war? Why not skip the months of bloodshed and murder and destruction and get to the peace conference now?

Immediately it will be demanded: "Make peace with Hitler? And what about restoring independence to Poland and Czechoslovakia?"

The answers are simple if we care to be realistic. Neither the continuance nor abdication of Herr Hitler is the real issue any more than the political boundaries of large or small states constitute insuperable obstacles to peace.

SETTLEMENT MUST BE BASED ON ECONOMICS

The main questions are economic. The existence or nonexistence of a Polish corridor or a port for Poland on the Baltic is not the fundamental point. What difference does a Polish corridor or a criss-cross road or a port on the seacoast make if hereafter an economic and not a military concept is to prevail in the life of Europe?

If, of course, we are to dedicate this world to permanent war, then the strategic line-up alone is of importance. If Europe is to commit itself once more to the balance-of-power doctrine, then peace cannot come till war has exhausted humanity's fighting powers and the world has learned the futility of suicide as the only answer to national and international problems.

But it must be assumed that the world desires political questions with their devastating influence to cease breeding unrest internally and externally among nations. If so, then there must be economic understandings first.

If countries have an economic set-up which makes it possible for them to live and give economic opportunity to their citizens, then dictators have less chance to exploit peoples. Unemployment always sows the seeds of political unrest and enables one-man governments to come into power. Herr Hitler is no exception to the age-old rule that when peoples are starved they rally behind the leader who affords them hope of sustenance.

REVIVAL OF WORLD TRADE IS NEEDED

What difference would it make who held the title of Chancelor of Germany if never again one man could have in his hands the casting of the die for war or peace or the suppression of human liberty? What possible reason would peoples have for giving up their liberties to fascism or communism hereafter if they were assured an economic living space in the world?

Germany needs outlets for her exports and for her large population which is congested in a relatively small area. Britain and France need the economic advantages of peace because they must maintain trade routes to their colonies and also give their peoples employment.

All the world, including America, wants employment resumed and trade revived. Credits must flow across boundaries again, and capital must be restored to peacetime uses. No economic settlement in Europe can be made without America's whole-hearted cooperation. The best way for America to avoid war, therefore, is to start now to assure peace in the world.

The necessities of the hour are economic. Once the economic problems of Europe are solved, the economic problems of all the world are solved, and so are the political issues.

When there is reciprocal trade and economic freedom, and when small nations as well as large are deprived of the power to put their neighbors into economic subjection, the occasion for resort to force is removed and peace reigns once more.

What must be rearranged are the economic sovereignties of mankind—the nations that have wealth must realize that they cannot forever hold selfishly all their possessions while the "have-not" nations struggle desperately for a livelihood.

The Thirteen Original Colonies in America would have sown the seeds of perpetual strife on this continent had they not perceived the need for surrendering economic sovereignties. European states must do likewise. Then there will be no need for "buffer states" and "corridors" and "mutual assistance" treaties.

America as a powerful neutral can initiate peace negotiations now. To the outcry that this would be "premature," it need only be said that it has always been "premature" heretofore to offer peace until one side or the other is exhausted. That formula has not abolished but stimulated wars. It is never premature to offer peace before a war resolves itself into a war of exhaustion.

There must be, as Woodrow Wilson said early in the last war, a "peace without victory." It does not mean surrender by one side or the other, but concessions from both sides toward a common objective. This is the humane course and the sensible course, for in no belligerent country today is there the slightest enthusiasm for the organized murder that is being carried on at the front.

To enable the discussion to get started it is desirable that neutral opinion be mobilized first. Governments have to await the crystallization of opinion, but citizens, and particularly the members of the press, have a duty to urge that formulas for peace be debated now.

A FORMULA TO SOLVE CHIEF PROBLEMS

We are presenting, therefore, on this page such a proposal. It is not designed to settle all questions at once, but to insist that the economic problems be tackled first and the political afterward.

Does anybody have any doubt if the economic points mentioned in the formula were acceptable that there would be any difficulty in resolving the question of boundaries or of political sovereignties?

The plan here presented is intended as a start toward the discussion. Other editors better qualified will have points to add or subtract or modify. But that we should skip the war and go direct to the peace conference seems a saving of human life as well as treasure.

This plan is submitted wholly on the initiative of The United States News and does not represent the view of any government, being published only in the hope that all belligerent governments will give this, or a similar plan, their earnest consideration. The plan follows:

1. The appointment of a peace committee of nine, to consist of one representative of each of the Governments of Germany, Great Britain, France, Italy, Russia, Japan, one representative of the northern neutral governments of Europe to be chosen by their mutual consultation, and one representative of the southern neutral governments of Europe to be chosen by mutual consultation (and in the event of disagreement final selection to be made by the Pope), and one representative to be selected by mutual consultation among the members of the Pan American Union—this delegate to represent the Pan American Union rather than any one government.

AN ECONOMIC FEDERATION OF ALL EUROPE

2. Agreement in advance by the peace committee to consider all ethnological and all economic questions which have been the cause of international friction in Europe in the last 25 years.

3. Agreement that an economic federation of European states shall be formed and governed by a council of nine representatives to be chosen from European governments, belligerent and neutral, on the basis of individual capacity rather than nationality (and in the event of disagreement the selection to be made from a panel to be submitted by the participating governments to the Pope at Rome) or by a committee of three neutral governments mutually agreed upon by the members of the peace committee, with the understanding that the decision of the three neutral governments shall be final as to personnel.

4. It should be understood in advance that all agreements are subject to ratification by the respective governments when the peace committee shall have concluded its sessions, and that this joint agreement of the European governments represented on the peace committee shall remain in force for a period of 12 years.

5. The economic federation shall be entrusted with the power to arrange a formula for trade agreements and customs duties as between members of the federation, on the one hand, and as between members of the federation and nonfederation states in other parts of the world.

6. The agenda of the conference should include consideration of a plan for the flotation, under the auspices of the economic federation, of a $10,000,000,000 loan to finance the transition from armament building to productive peacetime pursuits. Arrangements for the flotation of the loan could be handled on the basis of $2,000,000,000 subscriptions each year for the next 5 years, the details to be arranged by the Bank of International Settlements in collaboration with the central banks of Europe. The plan could include subscriptions to the loan by members of the Pan American Union as well as by European and Asiatic states, the amounts to be subscribed to be in proportion to the percentages of world trade possessed by each nation, taking an average for the period from 1932 to 1939.

PROTECTION FOR RIGHTS OF MINORITIES

7. The economic federation is to be entrusted with the power to arrange for financial consortiums embracing former German colonial possessions and permitting a new economic participation by all Europe.

8. Agreement that the economic federation should arrange for the repatriation of populations wherever practicable but that minorities in all countries shall be protected by uniform regulations insuring their status on an equality with the majorities in each country but in no case are minorities to enjoy any privileges or immunities greater than those permitted to majorities under the domestic laws of each country.

9. Agreement that an armistice shall be proclaimed immediately upon acceptance of the whole plan by the belligerent governments and that a military and naval status quo shall be maintained during the armistice with the right on the part of all countries now belligerents to resume trade with each other and with neutral countries free from interference, the quantities or quotas of imports and exports not to exceed, however, the amounts normally imported or exported in the same corresponding months, using the average for the preceding 3 years as a basis of arriving at the fixed quotas. An international committee would be appointed to issue trade licenses.

THE OBSTACLES TO MAKING OF ARMISTICE

10. Agreement in advance that sessions of the Peace Committee shall last not longer than 3 months from date of the beginning of the armistice, unless extended by majority vote of the conference and then only for a period not longer than 3 months thereafter.

What are the real obstacles to the acceptance of the foregoing 10 points? Pride of governments may be set down as foremost with the desire to retain for all times what is already possessed.

But pride is not justified if we know at heart that we are in the wrong or that we are using our properties for selfish purposes.

The British and French do not pretend that their post-war policies have been wise or that the Versailles Treaty was a just settlement. Their spokesmen have lately made healthful acknowledgment of error.

What, then, prevents peace now? We are told that "Hitler must go" or "Hitlerism must be extinguished first" and that the "word of the German Government" cannot be accepted. But it may be that if we will approach the matter properly we can obtain the written word of the German Nation. Once economic questions are settled, the peace committee can insist that all European nations agree hereafter that a national referendum, free from coercion of any kind, must be taken before there is resort to war.

The so-called Ludlow constitutional amendment referendum pledging the American people not to go to war except when their territory is actually invaded contains the germ of the new means of preventing political questions from provoking war. But this principle of human freedom must be internationally adopted to become effective. Only when territories are invaded should governments be permitted to order immediate resistance.

What we really are discussing are guaranties of peace by peoples and not by ephemeral governments. To ask for these is not novel. No victorious belligerent ever wants to stay constantly under arms. Recurrent mobilization is not conducive to mutual faith or trust.

If the belligerents will agree on the first steps, the development of guaranties will be forthcoming. The very act of negotiation now would mean the transfer from the hands of one-man governments to the hands of peoples the power to continue war or establish peace. It is not a mere change of personnel, but a new political and economic system which Europe needs, and which the whole world must help to maintain.

Role of the United States in Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. DAVIS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, November 3, 1939

LETTER FROM HERBERT HOOVER TO WOODROW WILSON

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter published in Collier's Weekly of the issue of November 4, 1939, written by Hon. Herbert Hoover to President Woodrow Wilson under date of April 11, 1919, together with the brief editorial statement appearing with the letter.

There being no objection, the statement and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Collier's of November 4, 1939]

OUR ROLE IN EUROPE

More than 20 years ago Herbert Hoover saw the continuing conflict of European ambitions that broke out this year in Adolf Hitler's frenzied attack on Poland. In a hitherto-unpublished letter to President Wilson, Mr. Hoover prophesied forcefully the struggles that have eventuated in the second great European war of the twentieth century. His penetrating analysis was written before the Versailles Treaty was written and long before the severity of that treaty had aroused opposition in the democratic nations. The question Mr. Hoover raised is once again in the minds and hearts of Americans.

APRIL 11, 1919.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: If our experience in the last 4 months counts for anything, the practical result always is that the Allied Governments, knowing our disposition, necessarily ask for more than they expect to get, and that we find ourselves psychologically and, in fact, politically on the side of the enemy in these negotiations, and, in a constant desire to find practical working formulas, we are frequently forced to abandon some measure of what we consider sound statesmanship. The continuation of this relationship will bind us for a long period of years to a succession of compromises fundamentally at variance with our national convictions. I am not attempting to dispute the righteousness of any Allied

demands, but merely to set up the fact that our viewpoint is so essentially different.

Our other practical result of our experience already is that the Americans who sit on such commissions, if they don't acquiesce and assist in enforcing any propositions from various government officials, become immediately and personally subject to attack as being inimical to their interests, and, with the powerful engines of propaganda which they employ in Europe and our own country, no such man can endure for long. These governments, if they were faced with the sole responsibility for their actions, would not attempt the measures which they seek under our protection. Therefore, for all reasons, I do not see that we can effect any real justice in these matters.

If we continue to sit in the enforcement of this peace, we will be, in effect, participating in an armed alliance in Europe, where every change in the political wind will affect the action of these commissions. We will be obliged to participate in all European questions, and we will be firmly tied definitely to one side, unless we precipitate a break and lend ourselves to the charges that we have been traitors to the "common cause."

I am convinced that there has grown up since the Armistice the policy, perhaps unconscious but nevertheless effective, of dragging the United States into every political and economic question in Europe and constantly endeavoring to secure pledges of economic and political support from us in return for our agreeing to matters which we consider for their common good, where we have no interest, and constantly using us as a stalking horse economically and politically, solely in the interests of internal political groups within the Allied governments.

These objectives and interests may be perfectly justified from their point of view, but it forces us into violations of our every instinct and into situations that our own people will never stand. For instance, I don't see how we can remain in these enforcement commissions unless we participate in the military enforcement with its enormous cost and risk, and the tendency will always be to exact the political objectives with the military strength of the United States as a background.

I have the feeling that revolution in Europe is by no means over. The social wrongs in these countries are far from solution, and the tempest must blow itself out, probably with enormous violence. Our people are not prepared for us to undertake the military policing of Europe while it boils out its social wrongs.

I have no doubt that if we could undertake to police the world and had the wisdom of statesmanship to see its gradual social evolution, that we would be making a great contribution to civilization, but I am certain that the American people are not prepared for any such measure and I am also sure that if we remain in Europe with military force, tied in an alliance which we have never undertaken, we should be forced into this storm of repression of revolution, and forced in under terms of coordination with other peoples that would make our independence of action wholly impossible.

It grows upon me daily that the United States is one great moral reserve in the world today and that we cannot maintain that independence of action through which this reserve is to be maintained if we allow ourselves to be dragged into detailed European entanglements over a period of years. In my view, if the Allies cannot be brought to adopt peace on the basis of the 14 points, we should retire from Europe lock, stock and barrel, and we should lend to the whole world our economic and moral strength, or the world will swim in a sea of misery and disaster worse than the dark ages. If they cannot be brought to accept peace on this basis, our national honor is at stake and we should have to make peace independently and retire.

I know of nothing in letter or spirit of any statement of your own, or in the 14 points, that directly or indirectly ties the United States to carry on this war through the phase of enforcement, or the multitudinous demands and intrigues of a great number of other governments and their officials. It does appear to me that your conception of the League of Nations was with view to the provision of a dominant court, where these difficulties could be thrashed out, and if we sit as one of the prosecutors, the court will have no judge.

Faithfully yours,

H. H.

George Bernard Shaw's Inquiry as to British War Aims

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRIK SHIPSTEAD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, November 3, 1939

EDITORIAL FROM THE MINNEAPOLIS MORNING TRIBUNE OF NOVEMBER 1, 1939

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Mr. Shaw Asks a Question," published in the Minneapolis Morning Tribune of November 1, 1939.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Minneapolis Morning Tribune of November 1, 1939]

MR. SHAW ASKS A QUESTION

Conceding that George Bernard Shaw is a tiresome and cantankerous old man, he can still propound wicked questions to harass those with whom he disagrees. Of Prime Minister Chamberlain, for example, he has just asked, "What in the devil's name is it all about, now that we have let Poland go?" Mr. Shaw is referring to the war with Germany. He thinks that Great Britain doesn't "care two hoots about Poland," and that the war is simply being fought "on our old balance-of-power lines to disable Germany, which we now call abolishing Hitler." If there are nobler reasons for continuing the conflict, he would be pleased to have Mr. Chamberlain present them.

The Prime Minister might reply, of course, that Great Britain is still fighting for Poland; but that can be only an incidental issue. The truth is that a considerable portion of Poland is now in possession of Russia and cannot be wrested away from the Soviet by methods short of war. If Britain is fighting against German aggression, why not fight against Russian aggression? Why not save Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, which are now virtually puppet states of Moscow? Or why ignore Albania, the little Adriatic state that was steam-rollered by Mussolini's army?

Mr. Shaw might devise such questions endlessly, but the Prime Minister would not thank him for his labor, for all of them invite the admission that Great Britain is not fighting against aggression per se so much as it is fighting the particular power which most seriously threatens Britain's dominance of Europe. That is precisely what Mr. Shaw seeks to prove—that the war is preeminently a war for control, and that there are no elegant moral issues involved. And that is precisely what no responsible British official will admit.

The matter of war objectives has more than a little pertinence for this country because Lord Lothian, the British Ambassador to the United States, is already asking what contribution we intend to make to the consummation of a peace secured by the establishment of "overwhelming power behind law." Until the purposes for which the present war is being waged are better clarified, an answer to that question is quite impossible. But it can be rather safely said that the United States will take no part in a peace which merely seeks to create a new pattern of power politics in Europe or to underwrite the old status quo. The cynicism generated by Versailles and its aftermath still survives. We should like to know, with Mr. Shaw, what "it is all about" before we pledge our services as peacemaker. "Overwhelming power behind law" is a neat phrase, but what purposes will be so reinforced, and who will make the law? From London, Paris, and Berlin come professions of virtuous intentions, but the real test of those intentions will be presented at the peace tables. If the United States is to be invited to another Versailles it will not be difficult to frame an answer. It should be in the immortal words of Sam Goldwyn, "Include me out."

American Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, November 3, 1939

ADDRESS BY FORMER GOV. ALFRED M. LANDON

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by former Gov. Alfred M. Landon, of Kansas, before the Men's Brotherhood, First Methodist Church, Shenandoah, Iowa, on November 1, 1939. The address deals with some fundamentals of a responsible foreign policy for the United States. I consider it well worth careful reading and consideration by my colleagues.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Concern for peace is uppermost in the mind of every American today. That concern is rightly awakening a new interest in events and questions of our foreign policy.

A few months ago no one could risk the attention of his audience even to mention foreign affairs. Now he can hardly risk talking about anything else.

It is my earnest hope that such concern and interest will not diminish, because the crucial fight over our foreign policy lies in

the months to come. Every citizen needs contribute his part in thought and discussion in order to formulate a truly American foreign policy. Such a policy is of more vital importance to every one of us than we are in the habit of recognizing. Not only is it vital to keep us out of war now, but to lay the foundations for tomorrow's peace in the policy we adopt today.

There is mighty little isolated life left anywhere in the world. It seems like yesterday when the world was nothing more than a collection of loosely knit, isolated, self-sufficient communities. Now the hitherto most self-sustaining village in Europe wants gasoline and radios. Our own once isolated village sees the Nation pass in review before its gasoline filling stations.

So every day's world events are of real significance to our national life. We realize now that we cannot ignore what is going on in Europe, any more than Europe can ignore what is happening here. But we must be able to weigh properly the events and happenings abroad. Then, too, we must be just as able to evaluate our actions at home and appreciate the importance of such actions to our relationships abroad. We must not overemphasize or overdramatize such acts. When the sum total of the opinions of the average American on any question is reached the question is decided that way.

Frankly, I am afraid we have always overemphasized the importance of neutrality legislation. It is important; yes. But it is not more important than our entire foreign policy. And by overstressing neutrality legislation we have been detracting from the larger questions abroad and at home. We cannot just pass a law and have peace. It is not so simple as that. Our real fight to keep out of war will only begin once Congress has taken definite action. Many will feel secure and let up in their vigilance, once "we've got a law," just as the earnest and conscientious drys let down in their campaign of education for the cause of temperance after national prohibition came.

"We can keep out of war if those who watch and decide have a sufficient detailed understanding of international affairs, to make certain that the small decisions of each day do not lead toward war and if, at the same time, they possess the courage to say 'no' to those who selfishly or unwisely would let us go to war."

These words are not mine. They were uttered by the President himself just a little over 3 years ago. They are of great significance today. I agree with them. The first President of the United States practiced in principle what these words express. He went far in upholding the declaration of neutrality at a time when American public opinion was treading the heights of emotion in favor of the new French Republic. He was so careful not to excite the feelings of Americans by either word or deed that he "refrained as far as possible" from seeing refugees from France. He refrained thus even though "in many cases the maintenance of this attitude has tried his feelings severely, for the exiles were not infrequently men who had fought or sympathized with us in our day of conflict." Washington realized that a melodramatic overemphasis of emotional incidents was dangerous to the peace of America.

All of us must realize the great burden which rests upon those responsible for the acts of our Government at this time. For that reason I profoundly regret that the administration at Washington insisted that the present session of Congress consider no other legislation than the neutrality bill and asked adjournment immediately after neutrality has been acted upon.

The Congress in session is our greatest safeguard for peace. It is far more important than any automatic legislation. It brings a broader wisdom for the "small decisions." In session it keeps its hands upon the reins of government. Furthermore, it is in line with our constitutional conception that the Chief Executive is not alone in his responsibility for foreign affairs. If the Nation is in peril, as the President's proclamation of "limited emergency" indicated, our Congress is needed on the job in Washington.

Before attempting to consider the general principle of a clear and consistent foreign policy based on our strength, interest, and dignity of position in foreign affairs, let us glance in retrospect and see if we occupy a different position today than we have in the past.

There is a curiously interesting similarity between our situation now and our international affairs in Washington's time. About the only difference is our size and new methods of warfare. As usual, our visibility is very low. As usual, we are attempting to settle everything in black and white.

Then, as now, we were in hearty sympathy with France, our former ally. Then public sentiment was overwhelmingly against England, as it is now overwhelmingly against Hitlerism. Then, as now, we were stirred by the principles involved. The rights of man were stirring our blood and ringing in our ears with all the enticement of Woodrow Wilson's "making the world safe for democracy." Then, as now, the question of who should dominate Europe was mixed up with the ideologies we enthusiastically believed in. Then, as now, our emotions were tangled with our national interests.

As we look back on how many times the European countries have been lined up on one side and then another since Washington's time, we note that international politics, like domestic politics, makes strange bedfellows.

The thing that added to our difficulty at the time of Washington was the smallness and weakness of our new Nation. Now, we are too big a nation to be disregarded. By the same score, we are too large to ignore what is going on elsewhere in the world.

Now, we have more gold than all the rest of the world. We are the most industrialized nation of all, and we are capable of the greatest industrial output. We have the greatest storehouse of raw materials, with the widest diversification of any country in the world. Now, we have all of these great assets with their accompanying responsibilities. And now we are even more fortunate in our geographical location than we were in the early days of our independence. At that time, Spain and France, as well as England, were on our frontiers. The maintenance of our geographical advantage must be the cardinal principle of our foreign policy. We cannot, for instance, tolerate the penetration of any foreign power into Mexico by subversive methods.

From the standpoint of men, resources, and potential military might we are in a better position to defend ourselves against a foreign foe than we have ever been in the past. In recent years we have weakened ourselves in only one respect. That weakness is in our national fiscal policy. No one can deny that the National Budget too long has been unbalanced. And the relationship of a sound fiscal policy to military defense is obvious to all. It takes money to build armaments, train men, or carry on a long war. A sound fiscal policy is important to our morale in either peace or war. No matter on what grounds it is considered, sound financing is fundamental to our national interest as well as to our broad international policy. It is unquestionably important in war. The better shape we are in financially the more intelligent contribution we can make to peace after the war in Europe is over.

Every nation in the world today knows our potential military power. The world learned of that in 1917 and 1918. But military strength isn't the answer alone. A major determining factor in shaping our foreign policy must be the principle that the tail is not going to wag the dog.

After the amazing achievement of putting 2,000,000 soldiers on European soil, after we had won the war for our Allies, they sprung their secret treaties on us. They ignored, in these treaties, the 14 points which Woodrow Wilson had held up to the Central Powers as the basis on which the German people could surrender. Our Allies, too, had given their tacit approval to these points, since they had helped to publicize them among the German people. Therefore, in comparison with our part in winning the war, the secret treaties were like letting the tail wag the dog.

And after the armistice, a national administration that believed as the present one does, that Uncle Sam could not go broke, dished out the money and helped to rehabilitate Europe. And when it came to repayment—well, the tail wagged the dog again.

We are looking upon a situation in Europe now that might easily be similar to that of 1917 and 1919. Therefore, we cannot blindly follow our emotions and our sympathies. We still do not believe in the imperialistic policies of the British Empire. At the same time, we cannot ignore the fact that Hitler challenges everything we hold dear as the rights of a people.

Furthermore, within recent years England as well as Germany, has worked to block our policies and best interests in South America.

The intensity of our feelings will be stirred time and time again. Events both touching us and shocking our hearts and conscience will strike emotional sparks within us. It is important we talk these things out frankly, always keeping in mind American interest. Suppressed emotions are more dangerous than frank, calm, and balanced discussion. If we discuss these events and their implications with normal intelligence, we have less to fear than if we try to sit on the lid by imposing a voluntary censorship upon ourselves.

The foreign policy of the United States must not be built upon either sympathy or hate for foreign governments. Neither can it be built upon meddling in their domestic affairs which are no concern of ours.

The first definite object of our foreign policy should be to maintain our own interests with dignity and honor. Always these should be maintained in a manner that makes for peace. As a primary means of achieving this, we must, of course, maintain an adequate defense. Our self-interest must be based on just and fair claims. Then we must be prepared to enforce them. In other words, "speak softly but carry a big stick."

These policies should be made permanent and traditional with us. They should be carefully thought out, and never must we "get out on a limb," so to speak. We must be in a position that we can defend.

We ought to hold tight to the principle that we will adopt and announce no policy we are not prepared to enforce. We must do that for the sake not only of our dignity and prestige but for the sake of our future influence. We cannot expect to have other people take us at our word if we continue to show, as we have repeatedly, that we ourselves only wish they would. The history of American foreign policy is regrettably full of such instances. The open door for China, for example, captured our imagination. But what have we done about enforcing it? It was violated many times before the Manchurian incident of 1931, and many times since. We have simply written notes "for the record"—notes which no one took seriously because it was apparent that we would not enforce them. All we have done has been to make diplomatic faces, to indicate that we did not like what was going on but that we really did not intend to say or do more than that.

For the sake of our dignity and prestige we ought not to adopt any policy that we are not prepared to enforce.

The declaration of Panama is an illustration of this type of policy; so soul-satisfying, but so difficult to administer. This declaration is a proposed agreement between ourselves and the nations to the south of us. It sets up a hazy new zone on the

high seas within which we would be supposed to enforce a streamlined and dramatic kind of neutrality. Its status is still uncertain, to say the least. Without more accurate information than has been given the country, it is difficult to discuss this new doctrine intelligently. But we know enough that it raises many questions full of peril to our neutral position.

The country and the Senate must demand full particulars, and through debate come to an understanding of the risky possibilities it presents.

This declaration of Panama so well illustrates the President's enthusiasm for new and dramatic things. I say to you that in our international affairs we have no law and are considering no bill which is as full of dangerous possibilities as this one. To undertake the enforcement of this declaration would be taking on the greatest job ever assumed by any nation in history. Of course, this assumes we have the ability to enforce it, which ability we do not come near to having now. It is certain that the duty of enforcement falls solely upon us and our Navy, although it does represent the desire of all the South American republics.

You ask, naturally, how large a navy this would require. No one knows. I have yet to find anyone, expert or no expert, who can answer that question with any degree of certainty.

All the pertinent questions put by reporters to the administration have been left unanswered. But the questions are such as to give warning of the complexity and the hazardous nature of what we undertook to do at Panama. These questions must be answered fully and completely before we ratify such a declaration.

However, we must, as Washington did, constantly make it clear that we value the friendship of the democracies. Actually, judging from the post-war attitude of our 1917 Allies, we probably valued their friendship more than they valued ours. Now we can still be honest and sincere in our friendship for them. But that does not mean we must fight European wars.

We departed from the traditional American policy of Washington in 1917 to fight for our friends. Let us now make the wisdom of the Father of his Country a primary part of our foreign policy. That wisdom is as fitting in the 1940's as it was in the 1780's. It will fit the vital needs of the Nation today and tomorrow.

A policy founded upon this wisdom means that we will not be extreme isolationists, nor internationalists. We will take our rightful place in the world, minding our own business, and with dignity and honor keep our own best interest foremost.

We cannot have peace automatically merely by passing a law. The road away from war depends upon the grim determination of the American people not to fight anyone else's war.

No matter how much we sympathize with England and France, we must keep an intelligent control over our own prejudices. We need an alert, watchful, public opinion. We do not wish to shirk our responsibilities in this modern world, but we do not propose to be pawns in anybody else's game.

Peace may be had if we work for it intelligently. But having it depends upon the wisdom and determination of whoever at the moment may occupy the White House, head the State Department, and interpret our foreign policy. It depends also on the vigilance of our representatives in Washington in the Congress.

As we meditate around our fires while men fight again on European fields, let us remember and let the administration remember the adage, "In for a penny, in for a pound."

We have deep and wide interests beyond our own land. The roots of our economic difficulties extend into a disorderly world. We know we cannot separate ourselves from the solution of these problems. But we can and will solve them as far as we are concerned in our own way. That way is not Europe's way, with a war every generation. Once and for all, we are through spending our blood and our money on European soil. If our cooperation is wanted in Europe it will have to be on terms other than that. We cannot too often repeat and diffuse these sentiments. These are the watchwords on which our very existence as a nation depends. Our thoughts are of peace, not of war. We know that as long as America stands civilization cannot perish.

Progress of American Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SHERMAN MINTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, November 3, 1939

NEWS ARTICLE

Mr. MINTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article in the form of an Associated Press dispatch showing the progress being made by American industry. The article is headed "American Industry Is Setting Fastest Pace Since 1929."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN INDUSTRY IS SETTING FASTEST PACE SINCE 1929—WHOLESALE TRADE IS UP BILLION OVER LAST YEAR

The Federal Reserve Board announced today that American industry was rolling out products at the fastest pace since 1929 and probably would continue at as rapid a gait until the end of the year at least.

At the same time, Secretary of Commerce Hopkins said wholesale trade during the first 9 months of the year aggregated $15,000,000,000, an increase of $1,000,000,000 over the corresponding period of 1938.

Figures from the Bureau of Domestic and Foreign Commerce showed that half the wholesale gain was accounted for in July, August, and September. September sales of wholesalers were 16½ percent higher than in September 1938.

OPTIMISM TEMPERED

The Reserve Board tempered its optimism with the comment that "unless there is considerable increase in the consumption of goods, the accumulation of inventories which is now under way is likely to reach substantial proportions."

This meant that, unless people and businesses buy and use up newly produced goods faster than they now are doing, factories soon might reach the point of shutting down temporarily to get rid of all their present stocks.

However, moderate increases in retail sales and plant expansion, together with continued active residential construction, also were reported.

The Board estimated the October rate of production at 120 percent of the 1923–25 average, compared with a revised figure of 111—formerly given as 110—for September; 92 for the low 1939 months of April and May, and 96 in October 1938.

"Industrial output, employment, and pay rolls," the Board said in its monthly bulletin, "have shown further rapid advances following the buying wave and rise in prices that began with the outbreak of war.

"In many industries the volume of orders on hand appears to be large enough to sustain activity at a high level at least to the end of the year.

"In most primary markets, buying was especially active in the first half of September and has since subsided. Demand for semifinished and finished products, however, has been maintained in large volume, although recently new orders for some products have decreased from earlier high levels.

"Consumption by individuals, utilization of materials through outlays for capital goods, and commodity exports have increased much less rapidly than production.

"Buying of equipment and expenditures for improvement of plant have expanded, particularly in the metalworking and railroad industries.

"Residential building activity has been for some months at the highest level of recent years, and contracts for this type of building have continued large in recent weeks.

"Retail distribution of general merchandise has shown a rise, beginning before the outbreak of war, and sales of electrical equipment, furniture, and other durable consumers' goods are reported to have increased considerably. Department-store sales are at the level reached in 1937, and sales by mail-order houses and chain stores have risen above 1937 levels."

Steel Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, November 3, 1939

ARTICLE FROM THE WASHINGTON POST OF NOVEMBER 1, 1939

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article taken from the Washington Post of November 1 on the subject of steel production and employment in the steel industry.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post of November 1, 1939]

STEEL'S HIGHEST OUTPUT OPENS 79,000 JOBS—530,000 AT WORK—PRODUCTION 6,000,000 TONS MORE THAN IN 1937

PITTSBURGH, October 31.—An almost unparalleled spurt in the Nation's steel production—which has boosted output to the highest tonnage rate in history—has opened up jobs for approximately 79,000 workers in the last 3 months, a survey of principal operators disclosed today.

The American Iron and Steel Institute reported 451,000 at work in the industry in July, a figure that had increased to 502,000 by the end of September. Additions in October, operators estimate, has boosted employment to approximately 530,000.

Pay rolls have advanced $12,000,000 beyond the July mark to $69,735,000.

The Federal Reserve Bank of Cleveland said the 91 percent of capacity rate reached on October 21 was the best since the middle of May 1937, "but because of increased producing capacity, output at the present is at the highest rate in history, or close to 64,000,000 tons on an annual basis."

In 1929, the best year on record, the industry turned out 56,000,000 tons and employed an average of 458,000 workers, who drew $841,253,000 in wages. Production in 1937 totaled 50,568,000 tons, and the pay roll for 572,244 employees amounted to $976,000,000.

Crime

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, November 3, 1939

ADDRESS BY DR. WILMER SOUDER

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, now that the problem of directing the path of our international policies is about determined, there may be time to turn our attention to some of our domestic problems.

It has been my privilege, on a previous occasion or two, to invite attention to the valuable and efficient operations of the Federal Bureau of Investigation in punishing offenders of the law. It might be equally well to invite attention to an address delivered on October 21, 1939, before the International Convention of the Disciples of Christ at Richmond, Va., in which are set forth some means by which the extent of crime may be reduced.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address by Dr. Wilmer Souder, a member of the scientific staff of the Bureau of Standards, and a member of the board of elders of the National City Christian Church of this city, on the subject Crime—the Church Must and Can Meet It. The address was delivered at the laymen's session of that convention.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CRIME—THE CHURCH MUST AND CAN MEET IT

INTRODUCTION

Mention of the church and crime in the same breath may bring to some a feeling of resentment. If, however, it can be shown that crime touches the church and that the church can make a definite contribution toward the eradication of crime, no apologies are necessary. The following text is broad enough for our remarks: "Be not deceived; God is not mocked; for whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap. For he that soweth to his flesh shall of the flesh reap corruption; but he that soweth to the Spirit shall of the Spirit reap life everlasting." Fifteen years of experience in crime detection, as an official of the United States Government, furnishes no occasion to protest this text.

TYPES OF CRIME

It will aid us if we catalog a few of the crimes now afflicting our Nation. Gambling is undoubtedly our most nearly universal crime. Churches have been known to wink at the practice, in the bingo party, and other games of chance employed to raise money. The stupidity of the individual who permits his superiority complex to cause him to feel that he can consistently win in games of chance over others similarly complexed is difficult to explain. The man who pushes his money into a machine designed, constructed, adjusted, and tested to keep more than it returns is dumb in one corner of his brain, regardless of all intelligence ratings.

A shrewder type of crime is embodied in the keen investing organizations and holding companies. With the assistance of a good attorney and careful manipulations it is possible to take large amounts of cash from simple folks who can be persuaded to believe that the promoters wish to make a fortune for the investors.

A third type of crime finds expression in what we popularly designate as rackets. The set-up consists of an organization prepared to give "protection." Perhaps you will not admit ever having contributed cash to any form of racket. Consider one type of protection before being too positive. The fish merchant may find it more economical to pay one cent a pound for every pound of fish sold to him wholesale, than to find a load soaked with gasoline when delivered. The soaking is easily done when the truck is delayed in traffic. The driver will not put up much resistance after taking a look at the husky stranger who climbs on the truck with a small can of gasoline. The head of the racket organization must deliver effective "service" in his territory. This must be done speedily and quietly. Murders may be necessary but they must not be traceable to the organization. The St. Valentine Day's murder in Chicago, in which seven members of a rival gang were lined up against a garage wall and mowed down by machine guns is typical of such expressions of force.

The confidence man pays an individual no compliment when he approaches with schemes to secure the valuable property of another at a price much below its worth, with a plan to secure money or property from an elderly or sick person through feigned friendships, with a magic box to turn out "genuine" money in $10 and $20 bills at the will of the operator, or with a sure plan to win from a "yokel" in a card game. Inspector MacDonald, of Berkeley, an expert in breaking up such rackets, advises that the confidence man must locate a man with larceny in his heart before he can trap him and trim him. When the confidence man approaches and starts explaining his plan for making easy money, just remember he feels sure your ideals in dealing with your fellow man are no higher than his own and, furthermore, that he expects to trim you.

The political leader who promises to guard the welfare of his constituents and then betrays them by accepting graft money in awarding contracts or in misappropriating moneys is a traitor and criminal of no less degree than the racketeer or the thief who manages the soulless holding company or finance corporation.

The annual cost of our crime is variously estimated from ten to twenty billion dollars. If you are an average American citizen and have a family of two children, you are paying approximately $400 annually to crime.

Foremost among the themes which lead to crime should be placed cash, power, and privilege. At all periods of American history there have been exploitations and alluring promises of exceptional bargains. We started with a mysterious fountain of youth. Then came the deposits of (fool's) gold in Virginia, opportunities to dig fortunes in California gold fields, opportunities to retire after investing all savings in watered stock or foreign bonds.

THEORIES OF CRIME

Time does not permit a discussion of all of the theories of crime. To say that the devil is responsible for crime is to refuse to meet the situation. Corresponding reasoning would give God credit for our virtues. This would leave us as mere tools in the hands of superiors. While we might be willing to charge all of our weaknesses to the devil, we usually want to be given full credit for our few good deeds and sacrifices. My version of the creation of man translates as follows: "God breathed into man's nostrils the breath of life and gave man the opportunity of developing a living soul." The soul is the supreme component of the individual. Jesus confirms this translation when he asks: "What shall it profit a man if he shall gain the whole world and lose his own soul?"

To the man who refuses to give serious thought to facts and attempts to escape responsibilities by saying he was born into the world without his consent or that the world owes him a living and he will decide as to what efforts he will put forth we have a ready answer. If left alone, he is sure to drift into crime, for he will demand food and shelter. These are not always available in our country for the asking. The man is, indeed, in a strange country. He is, however, less than 6,000 miles from his home. The Tropics supply food without effort. The climate is uniform. Clothing is not necessary. Transportation to this land, ideally suited to the needs of the specimen, can be supplied by those of a more purposeful and more generous school of thought. Soon the unfortunate can be placed where he may let nature support him. We need not discuss educational, social, mutual, hygienic, medical, or governmental protections, for these blessings have come of people with different ideals. Our specimen is not interested in such ideals.

A more subtle theory of crime has developed from the followers of Lombroso, an Italian of the last half of the nineteenth century. His followers teach that our criminals are the results of biologically inherited tendencies. They inherit typical features, such as thick hair, large protruding ears, receding foreheads, massive jaws, unsymmetrical heads, etc., which are accepted as the outward manifestations of criminal tendencies. The acceptance of this theory denies the existence of the free will of the individual, denies our right to punish, and leaves us victims of a God who sends condemned children into a severe world. The whole idea puts these unfortunates in much the same position as that of our animals. Those of you who live in rural communities know that, free will or no free will, remarkable cooperative traits can be developed in the meanest animals. The wildest horses have been made safe for the owner and safe for themselves through the applications of definite restraints and positive orientations.

There is much to be said for the theme that we invite, encourage, and perhaps enjoy our crime. We as a nation apparently insist upon the fullest personal liberty for every individual. Restraints are said to destroy initiative and prevent development. It is claimed that society will develop more safely and sanely if there are fewer restraints.

One of our popular southern cities discharged its chief of police a few years ago because of his crusading tendencies. The city felt

sure prosperity would blossom if a wide-open policy were adopted. Horse racing, gambling, dog racing, roulette, and other types of "entertainment" were spread over the day and night. Disorders broke out, culminating in a $100,000 hotel robbery. There were others besides the city officials who enjoyed personal liberty. The underworld organizations came and collected and appreciated the opportunity.

Such experiences show the effects of losses in moral reserves and show our tendency to discredit temporarily the idea of any value to physical, mental, moral, or spiritual reserve. Reserve is today in many respects an obsolescent item. It must be revived. We pay large forfeits for our carelessness. An example of our crowding to the limit comes from a New England city where, during a sleet, 14 autos came over a hill and crashed into an obstruction a short distance beyond the crest of the hill. Not one of the 14 drivers could see the necessity for suffering the inconvenience of slowing down and driving with a reserve space between himself and the man in front.

The disruption of our family unit by our modern civilization is bringing untold misery. We see distracted fathers and mothers plead before officials of the law insisting that their children could not possibly have committed the crimes for which they are being held. Ministers are implored to give assistance in an attempt to break the hold of the law. Investigations show that these parents took little interest in the associates of their children, made no efforts to find where or how they spent their leisure minutes.

The typical development of juvenile crime begins with small offenses, such as picking pennies off papers at a newsstand, taking food from stores or materials from construction sites. Next comes trips across town on the rear of trucks to pick up bicycles which are later sold through the assistance of dealers who ask no questions. If not caught, they continue to such crimes as burglarizing houses and hold-ups. Three boys, properly deployed, can be surprisingly effective in going through a house while the owners are out. They will be caught, but the months or years of growing petty crimes and a few quick, easy dollars develop a habit. It is extremely difficult to reorient these children to the theme of earned rewards for honest labors.

A popular scapegoat for our present-day crime is to attribute it to the influences of science. Unemployment is charged to science and our machine age. An analysis of one industry will show the fallacy of this position. Prior to the advent of the automobile there were about 1,000,000 wagon and smith workers who took care of our transportation equipment. Ten million employees are necessary to care for our demands on the motorcars. The same analysis will blast the charges against science in other fields. The developed methods of science have indeed put a few individuals on the shelf of unemployment. The perfection, power, and definite responses of scientific equipment demand clear thinking and honest acceptance of full responsibility for results. The employee who was so successful in explaining all accidents as the fault of associates is certain to get a surprise when he attempts to blame the precision machine. The machine will not accept the blame. Some of our careless operators have discovered these facts too late.

THE GARDEN OF EDEN STORY

The Garden of Eden story of the first crime is too accurate to be discarded as an amusing story. In that report we see an owner and superintendent with rights, an assistant who, by honest labor, may earn much of food, enjoyment, and safety. As the assistant contemplated the idea of rights he developed a complex. Without properly balancing the rights of a creator and owner, entitled to privileges greater than that of an assistant, he decided to act upon the theory that all things within his reach belonged as much to him as to anyone else. That becoming as gods was only a question of the possession of material items regardless of the ennobling training and development incident to earning them. This assistant later discovered those consequences which follow the taking of unearned rewards and in violating fundamental laws. The verdict and punishment were severe and direct. They are the same whether you read them in the book of Genesis or in the experiences of modern humanity.

Other causes of crime could be reviewed but we must close with the experiences of the sexual sophisticates who think they can catalog all human misfits as victims of sex influences. To them there are no mysterious physical or spiritual developments between virtuous members of opposite sexes. They grab, they handle, they live entirely in the physical animal realm. Things spiritual scarcely exist to these realists. The idea of God knitting two souls into one or in any way whatever blessing a union of two lives is beyond their credulity.

Frequently there comes a realization that life is not all physical. With the increasing advent of mental and nervous ills into an apparently healthy physical body we find it necessary to expand our thinking. By the use of officers, armies, and munitions we hold back our crime. With medicines, vaccines, and surgical instruments we have little fear of many of those plagues of the physical body which were so destructive in former centuries. The barbitals may relieve our physical pains but they are not specifics for mental afflictions. "Evil spirits" trouble millions today. The present age is making this sad discovery.

FROM WHENCE COMETH OUR HELP?

With what shall we combat these mental ills which result from magnified material ideals and neglected starving souls? How long shall we be able to continue our battle of physical force against general crime at an annual cost of $100 for each individual man, woman, and child? There are some observers who predict a crash at an early date.

Those who observe the actions of some of our political organizations and compare achievements with promises see too many exceptions and special favors to hope for much aid from political officeholders. Naturally officers elected by a political party, if they expect to continue in power, give some thought to the welfare of the party. Political campaigns cost money. Will an official disregard the power that elevated him to the office? Will delegates nominate a candidate from whom they have no commitments?

A study of newspaper and radio advertising reveals that one of their functions is to loosen up purses and to sell items, many of which develop destructive habits. The spender is made the center of attraction. Not much assistance will be expected from these agencies if only we remember they are commercial adventures and are not likely to bite the hand that feeds them.

We are entitled to our doubts regarding effectual aid from the movies as we see them today parading the assumed virtues of the cocktail and the good fellowship tied up with the abundant servings of liquor and unrestrained liberties. No ill effects are pictured. In fact, our children are led to believe that liquor and comedy are synonymous and that liberty is the key to all happiness.

Our universities are one of our best agencies in the fight against crime. Many schools are giving courses on the origins of crime, on the developments of rackets, and delineating their effects on society. They realize the seriousness of the situation and the stalemate which exists between the efforts of the law and the escape of so many criminals.

THE CHURCH CAN MEET THE PROBLEM

The title of this paper declares the church must and can meet the crime situation. Shall we advocate delegating legal authority to the church? It would be a mistake to permit the church to attempt to handle legal matters. Jesus refused to enter the controversy over dividing an estate, although He was asked to do so. He was not interested in prosecuting the woman taken in adultery, though the law was clear on the situation. He lost his life by reason of a legal official accepting a church verdict rather than giving the protection to which the subject of the Roman Empire was entitled. The church's records in temporal sovereignty in the Middle Ages and more recently in Spain and in Russia are not strong arguments for its ability to cope with temporal affairs.

An analysis of the methods of our legal machinery, when it functions, shows that it deals largely in one realm only. Our laws say pay $5,000 damages and go free, go to prison 5 years and all will be forgiven, separate from that woman and forget the past or go to the chair and give up a life. The church can never speak this language. Such measures are, however, effective, and until we recruit the first lines of defense the Nation must depend upon them. The criminal is punished in terms of things which rate high in his evaluations. Obviously such punishments may not redeem him or reach deep enough to remedy the cause of the crime. After spending 5 years in prison he may repeat the crime, feeling certain he will not be caught again. Tacitus, the Roman historian, saw the futility of dependence upon laws when he wrote, almost 2,000 years ago, "Corruption abounds in the state and the state abounds in laws."

Most certainly the church will not be regarded as an intruder if it attempts to make a more specific contribution in solving the crime problem. In fact, its opportunity to function in this field is almost universally recognized. The law extends an unusual privilege and responsibility to pastors to whom erring members make their confessions and ask for guidance. It will not compel the pastor to reveal the confession. Courts recognize the sacredness of the situation and the powerful redemptive influences at the disposal of the pastor. Pastors and churches must not fail to meet this responsibility.

WILL GOD AID?

A carefully studied interpretation of the Old Testament seems to indicate that God did aid His children in overcoming their enemies and in supplying many of their needs. May we expect Him to aid us in suppressing crime? There seems to be an abundance of evidence that God gives us aid today, but not in doing those material things we can and should do for ourselves. This change in God's methods, if there has been a change, should strengthen rather than weaken our faith. Let me illustrate. At some time in the past (whether it be 6,000 or 6,000,000,000 years matters not) man was less skilled, less able to protect himself, less able to provide for his needs, and less able to command the services of natural agencies. Some power guided his development. Some power protected him. Some power placed in his body instincts of preservation, toleration, and service. Some power elevated him. We are not able to relive the past and witness the growth of these miracles. We may, however, witness a similar miracle in the lives of some of our present-day animals. The bird which has never observed the building of a nest—in fact, it may never have seen a nest—will next season at a definite time construct a nest. This nest will be so specialized and so accurately constructed that the ornithologist will accurately name the bird which built the nest.

Try as I may, I cannot explain where and how the nest design is stored with the bird. Why not accept the easiest explanation and see where it leads? Assume that the Master of Life gives personal assistance to the bird and that He has more than a passing interest in the creatures of His creation. It does not destroy one's personality or make him ashamed to attribute such acts to a benevolent Guardian of all creation. Yes; God aided us yesterday, He aids us today, and He will aid us tomorrow.

GOD'S CREATION DOES NOT MOCK HIM

It is not uncommon for the popular leaders of our own generation to fail to grasp this theme. Barnes, in his Society in Transition, ties himself up unnecessarily on several occasions, and hopelessly so, when he rates our behavior as the result of strict causation as invariable as the law of gravitation, and later, on the same page, says: "If one wishes to lessen the volume of crime, he must endeavor to eliminate those social habits * * *," etc. How, under causation as invariable as the law of gravitation, can one "wish" or "endeavor"? Wells, in his recent book, The Fate of Homo Sapiens, is reported to have pictured the universe as bored with man and to have predicted that the race will eventually end in the disease-soaked ruins of a slum.

It is unfortunate indeed that minds get into such cul-de-sacs. Surely the unfoldings and developments of the race and the advances of science during the years of recorded history have charmed, if not inspired, these minds. Can it be that they are victims of their own physical, animal developments? As their bodies have developed they have doubtless admitted developments in other fields; but now as the physical and mental infirmities of age begin to demand recognition these minds are helpless. They naturally anticipate similar reactions for the entire creation. Leaders frequently betray their mental ages and corresponding fears by constantly referring to impending crises in their specialized fields. The church must substitute confidence of eventual victory where these frightened prophets proclaim disaster. The poet's picture of a mysterious journey and safe arrival, "soothed and sustained by an unfaltering trust," is too bright for their limited or distorted visions. Apparently they cannot conceive of a continuing advancement of humanity or a major power for good maintaining control for ages after they have departed. Such minds and predictions have appeared in all ages of the past. They are in no sense unique to our generation.

If we should admit that the race can be maintained in the status quo for several years to come by armies, prisons, and fears, we cannot picture an all-powerful and all-wise Architect interested for centuries in seeing only repetitions on the part of His creations. The set-up demands advancement. It has shown advancement during past centuries. Jesus gave us a glorious thought when He said, "My Father worketh and I work." He did not say my Father watches for His own entertainment. Let us make it possible for God to aid us in combating the crimes which threaten to hide the advancements gained through centuries of toil.

LET THE CHURCH COMPLETE THE STORY

The church has the solution to the problems of crime. Its hands are clean. It can meet the situation effectively, and with divine aid it can develop that living soul in man which will not support crime. The soul responds and develops as it meets and comprehends the true themes of lives and associates these with the corresponding rewards. If the church can accurately portray the themes and experiences of criminals, it can reduce the present-day tendencies and cause more and more victims of misguided leadership to abandon those temporarily attractive roads which lead eventually to disappointment, miseries, and despair. Criminals stripped of their weapons, associates, and newspaper publicity will be recognized as yellow cowards rather than as heroes. Few young people will care to imitate them when they discover the truth about their lives.

When the movie shows the apparent enhancements of social position or centers of attraction and amusement associated with cocktail etiquette, drunkards' antics, sex liberties, or other vices, let the church continue the story. Part of it can be found at the homes where the headaches are slept off, where the debts tend to pass the income. More of it may be found in the courtroom or in the morgue as the now sober and penitent (if alive) hero of the party tells his story. Some of the story can be found on the hospital or asylum charts. Another chapter can be found in the bank accounts of the saloon keeper and parlor hostess and in the spending accounts and the luxuries enjoyed by the owners and promoters of the crime industries. Compare these with the net balances of the drinker, the dope fiend, and the gambler. Lionel Barrymore, as Dr. Gillespie, preached a sermon in a few words when he advised his patient he might now use either whisky or beer to his heart's content. The patient, surprised, reminded the physician that a few years earlier he had advised him differently. Dr. Gillespie admitted the truth of the statement but reminded the patient he had not taken the advice then and that now it was too late. His prompt dismissal of the doomed man with a harsh "Call the next patient" was an effective and proper disposal of the case. Men will choose safety and make right decisions when they are convinced of the accuracy of the picture of their future.

This situation raises the perennial question of the advisability of persistent begging and insistance that the victim abandon his criminal habits. With a sufficient amount of begging and pleading, most men will promise to reform. Too frequently they do not reform. Further pleadings may cause them to again promise to reform. In fact, it may be much easier to promise than to be pestered with the pleadings. There is little to be said for attempting to force the rescue of individuals who have no interest in being rescued. Jesus did not commission a group of his disciples to restore Judas at any cost. He dignified the value of our free will and of a man's own soul by saying in effect, "Judas, make up your mind and act accordingly." Unless we can in some manner develop a genuine desire to be rescued we may find it more effective to devote our efforts to those who truly wish to reform. Judas went down in shame and served as exhibit No. 1 among his associates.

WHATSOEVER A MAN SOWETH

Many church members are, by virtue of their simple trusting natures and uniform honesty, easy victims for high-pressure exploitations. A bit of flattery, the personal touch, and an enthusiastic appeal and the victim is caught. The young man or woman enjoys the companionship of the evening and may match the indulgences of the crowd, little dreaming of the price to be paid. Road signs are dignified messengers though they may proclaim only a "blind alley." The egotist makes his ventures, takes his risks, and feels safe. He is sure he will never be exposed. He decides to drop one vice for another and is surprised to find himself a victim of blackmail. Any minister or teacher can illustrate these statements with examples from current experiences of people, as relayed to him by his associates in other communities. Experiences in the locality should be transmitted to other localities. Let me illustrate by cases from my own records. A young man was purchasing a home on the installment plan. He was employed and was happy with his wife and small daughter. For some reason he started betting. He took chances on all sorts of gambling devices. He found himself unable to meet the payments on his house. He borrowed from the manager of the gambling house. He continued to gamble, part of it on credit, and lost. The manager demanded payment on the loans. The victim gave a check on a bank in which naturally no funds were deposited to his account. The mortgage was being foreclosed. One day the manager of the store received a printed note asking him to prepare a package containing $1,000 and wait for further instructions at the peril of being bombed or of having his child kidnapped. Next day a phone call advised the manager to give the money to a boy who would come to the store. Later the young man was caught, identified, convicted, and sent to prison. Many people felt it would have been more satisfactory if the manager of the store had also been sent to prison. But it was not so arranged by the lawmakers who license gambling.

The second case concerns a young office clerk who, in the performance of his duties met the charming daughter of a wealthy member of the top social register. He decided to put forth every effort to win the girl for his wife. Her tastes called for costly dinners, elaborate parties, trips, gifts, and all those expensive expressions of affection. His $35-a-week salary and $200 savings account were not sufficient to complete the courtship. Rather than tell the truth and probably lose the girl he forged checks on the firm's accounts. He had married the girl before he was caught and sent to prison. He discovered to his sorrow and to the humiliation of the girl, that although all things may be fair in love, our laws are not so generous.

So many similar wrecks of careers are paraded before us daily that one feels like shouting to the church and its organizations to wake up and make a definite attempt to prevent some of these wrecks. It is the duty of the Sunday school and the church to educate its members and to show them the natural and logical results of such ventures. The criminals study their intended victims and pool their ideas and plans for attack. Shall we stand by and hope the Lord will educate and protect the innocent against the snares of keen criminal wits? Secure texts from the library and inform your people on the fruits of crime.

VICTORY BY MENTAL FORTIFICATION

Recent methods for criminal reform include repetitions of the details of crime, explaining consequences, placing strong emphasis upon making right choices, and showing how it is possible to achieve victory. The victim interested in reforming himself is drilled through the mental cycle many times. The proper choice becomes a part of his nature and later, when the real temptation arises, the correct method of escape also arises with it. The man seriously interested in returning to society will make the proper response just as the well-drilled soldier makes automatically the correct movement though in the confusion of battle.

The church can with dignity and with spiritual and financial profit aid its weaker members who are prone to do as they are told to do, its trusting members who accept all men as truthful, its young people who are great imitators, and its visitors who seek evidences of worth in modern religion by inoculating them against crime. Why wait until the wife and children are in rags and starving or the murder has been committed before offering advice? Look up your concordance on "beware." Jesus and his disciples knew the significance of the word and made definite applications in their uses of the word. It is time to use it again in an occasional sermon or in a Sunday-school lesson. Our International Sunday School Committee might well expand the temperance lesson to a more modern subject such as Lawlessness, Crime, Fruits of Crime, or Enemies of Body and Soul. Alcohol is not the only enemy of the church. If those writers who give us such excellent expositions of the lesson would spend a few days in court and familiarize themselves with the events which developed into the entanglements with the law, they would find it difficult to limit their lesson comments on crime to the space available.

TANGIBLE EVIDENCES

Occasionally one discovers some fact that surprises him by its plainness and simplicity. One such discovery came to me several years ago, and proved to my satisfaction that few witnesses can speak with the force and convincing manner of the consecrated church member. The wise attorney does not press them on cross-examination. My first opportunity to hear such testimony came in a midwestern city where a 70-year-old Kentucky mountain mother was called to testify in the trial of a prison guard. This guard had written the mother that her son was dangerously ill in prison and that morphine was necessary to save his life. She was

deceived. She purchased two ounces of morphine and shipped it as a box of cigars in accordance with the instructions from the guard.

The Government discovered the facts in the case and arrested the guard. Naturally the mother was subpenaed to appear as a witness at the trial. Finding her son in excellent health was a pleasant surprise to her. He had never been ill. There were conjectures as to whether she would complete the case for the Government by admitting her part in purchasing and shipping the opium as in so doing she would incriminate herself. Careful questioning by the prosecution brought out the facts without complete incrimination. The defense attorney felt that he could cause her to weaken her testimony by reminding her that an admission of any part in purchasing or shipping the narcotic would make her liable to imprisonment. She had been deceived, she had committed a crime. The situation was tense. Everyone was anxious to see how this saintly lady who, as reports had informed us, "was religious," would maneuver while in the shadow of a prison sentence. Would she deny her guilt or would she follow the teachings of her religion and make a full confession and trust the law to give her that forgiveness and pardon which her religion would give? We were given the answer promptly. In less than 5 minutes she rehearsed every detail of the case, from the receipt of the letter telling of her son's illness (the son had not been ill) to the shipping of the narcotic disguised as a box of cigars. Attempts by the defense to stop her were of no avail. Her story was responsive, competent, relevant, and material to the case. There was now no doubt of a technical incrimination of herself but that did not bother her. Her face disclosed ease, confidence, and integrity. She left the stand with the step of a victor. No one had any question as to the truth of her statements. The guard was convicted and sent to prison. She was given a short sentence and the sentence was instantly suspended. There are millions of this type of people in America of whom we can truly say, "They are religious." We need millions more. As the church builds such lives it builds our first line of defense. It is upon the inherent honesty and unquestioning faith of such individual lives that the security of our future rests.

A review of years of the history of mankind shows that God has released to this generation more secrets and blessings to save us from physical and mental diseases and sufferings than were ever released to any people in any previous age. The message of assurance, if repeated today, might say, "I have reserved to myself more than 7,000 souls who have not bowed the knee to the image of Baal." He is ready and willing to have His earth support us in more ease, luxury, and safety than ever before if only man in proper reverence will accept the blessings. He alone offers the cure for many mental ills. Let the church inventory its sources of power and proudly proclaim its strength. The gates of hell shall not prevail!

We have traced many of our present curses to a lack of understanding of that universal freedom given to man. God wished man to be free and daily offers evidences that true freedom can be made to work to man's welfare rather than to his destruction. All benefactions can be traced to God's interest in His creation. There are thousands of proofs of the upward pull of His power. He can and will save us from crime when we put forth our own efforts and do our part. God is not the author of failures in the mineral, vegetable, animal, or planetary kingdoms. Why should we anticipate failure on man—His most glorious creation?

We are daily surrounded and encouraged by clouds of witnesses in the realms of physical science, nutrition, life, and those supreme realms of mental and spiritual influences which echo our text: "Make no mistake—a man will reap just what he sows; he who sows for his flesh will reap destruction from the flesh; and he who sows for the spirit will reap life eternal from the spirit."

Cost of Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUSH D. HOLT

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, November 3, 1939

STATEMENT BY HON. RUSH D. HOLT, OF WEST VIRGINIA

Mr. HOLT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by me to the citizens of West Virginia on the subject of the cost of government.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF RUSH D. HOLT TO CITIZENS OF WEST VIRGINIA

The cost of government is going up.

While the cost is mounting, the records show that the amount given to the aged is going down.

Too many have been looking across the ocean to the war in Europe and forgetting the United States. Too many have been thinking about the terrible conditions in Europe and forgetting the terrible conditions here. It is time to look after America by looking after the American people.

The West Virginia old-age pension in September 1937 amounted to $14.63 average per month. In September 1939 this had declined to $12.48 average.

Two dollars and fifteen cents may not seem much but it means a lot to those who get but twelve to fourteen dollars a month. If we cut expenses, let's start some place else than on the aged.

The average per family for dependent children in West Virginia for September 1937 amounted to $22.16 per month. This declined to $19.47 in September 1939. Think of reducing the amount to care for dependent children by $2.69 a month while the taxpayers' money is wasted by the millions.

The blind in West Virginia had their monthly average reduced. In September 1937 they received $17.94 average. This was cut to $15.90 by September 1939, a reduction of $2.04 a month.

There are plenty of places to economize before reducing the allotments for the old, for the blind, and for the dependent children.

The Challenge to Civilization—Cost of Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, November 3, 1939

ADDRESS BY HON. LEWIS W. DOUGLAS

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an able address delivered by Hon. Lewis W. Douglas, former Budget Director and Member of the House of Representatives, before the New York Herald Tribune Forum on Wednesday, October 25, 1939.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mme. Chairman, may I express my appreciation of your invitation to speak on this platform under the general title, the Challenge to Civilization, and under the more specific lead, Cost of Government.

Challenge to civilization means, I presume, challenge to the variety or social, political, and economic structure which has marked the development of human culture in western Europe and the Americas during the nineteenth century and the early part of the twentieth, a structure deriving its strength and vitality from the conviction that the emancipation of mankind can be had by creating an environment in which the individual is free to develop and, indeed, enjoys the opportunity to develop his qualities of mind and heart according to his talents, a structure resting on the view that the individual is endowed with dignity and nobility and possesses a capacity for reasonable action and self-restraint, a structure preserving for the individual in all its fullness the fundamental and treasured right to dissent.

It seems necessary to make this presumption because civilization is never destroyed; civilization changes.

In a period when we are all preoccupied with events across the seas and speculating on the consequences of those events on our own destiny, it is well to remember—the forum compels us to do so—that what we do here at home may have as profound an effect on our future as what others do abroad.

In speaking of the cost of government may I first make the observation that it cannot be completely understood when examined as an isolated phenomenon separated from its social setting, from economic strains and stresses, from its monetary and international environment, and from a cavalcade of subjects which go to make up the whole of a certain type of public policy. And, second, that high cost of government cannot be viewed as something which is wholly indigenous, as it were, to our own country. In fact, it is a phenomenon which is observable in varying forms in every major country of the world.

The phrase "cost of government" requires definition. By it I do not mean whether budgets are in balance or out of balance. I do not mean whether the level of public expenditures can with reasonable expectancy be equaled over considerable periods of time by the level of public income derived from reasonable taxes levied on the national income. I do mean that level of public expenditures which can only be equaled, if it can be equaled at all, by public income when industrial, commercial, and agricultural activity has risen to an unnaturally high stage and when the tax structure imposes excessive exactions on the national income. I do mean a cost of government so high that only the peak of an economic boom, combined with a very onerous tax structure, can

produce sufficient revenue, if it can be produced at all, to bring expenditures into equilibrium with income The cost of government—spending—so defined becomes a legitimate, if not a necessary subject for debate.

So defined it is, indeed, a challenge to civilization. For those who attach no significance to the lessons of experience, this may appear to be an exaggerated statement. But for those who would attempt to learn from history without at the same time imposing the dead hand of the past on the future, this observation cannot be lightly brushed aside. Too often in recent history liberal governments have been wrecked on the rocks of loose fiscal policy. A survey of the last quarter of a century confirms this conclusion. Public spending, undertaken for reasons however legitimate and humanitarian, has invariably had consequences uncalculated and unforeseen at the time spending was commenced, consequences which, among other things have expressed themselves in a complete remolding of the structure of national and even international life. Spending initiated as a measure for the protection of liberalism and human rights has almost always become ultimately one of the most powerful and ruthless forces of reaction.

In a major part of the world, more particularly, perhaps, here at home, there have been advanced during the course of the last 7 years four principal justifications for spending.

In 1931 and 1932, when the full impact of falling prices and deflation was undermining the private credit structure of the country, it was urged that the public credit be used for the purpose of preventing a complete debacle.

In 1933, when the full impact of the intensity of the deflation manifested itself in the form of unemployment on a terrifying scale and when local resources were no longer adequate to carry the burden, it was urged that the public credit be used for relief purposes—to prevent the complete impoverishment and even starvation of those who, seeking employment, anxious to work, were unable to find it.

Later, when recovery lagged behind the calculated speed of its upward trend, it was urged that public spending—the use of the public credit—would prime the pump—would, in fact, be an instrument of recovery.

And still later, in the more immediate past, when pump priming produced so delicate an economic readjustment that a relatively small reduction in expenditures contributed to causing a devastatingly sharp recession, it was urged that opportunity for the investment of private funds had permanently disappeared and that, therefore, the Public Treasury must become the spender.

These four justifications can be classified into two major groups, differing from each other in one profoundly significant respect. The first two—that is to say, the use of the public credit to prevent a collapse of the institutions of private credit and to provide relief—presuppose that public spending is bad, but that it is the lesser of two evils. The second major group—that is to say, public spending as an instrument of recovery and public spending as a substitute for private investment—rests on the premise that spending in and of itself is good. Thus the rationale of spending has progressed from one end of the spectrum of public finance to the other—from something which was bad but nevertheless better than its alternative to something which is inherently of unqualified advantage and permanent benefit to the Nation.

This perspective of the progressive shifting of the justification for spending reveals the extent to which we have in the short span of 7 years moved away from the traditional convictions of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. We must understand the implications of this startling shift if we are to understand the issue it presents.

With the view that public expenditures, however bad, are sometimes necessary, whether to provide for the national security or to relieve human physical distress, no one can seriously take issue. Many may question the extent to which the public credit has been, or is being, used for relief. Many may disagree with the administration of public expenditures for this purpose. Many may believe that the division of financial responsibility between Federal, State, county, municipal, and local agencies should be readjusted. Many may think that money previously expended on other purposes should have been diverted to the more pressing needs of relief. But no one who has witnessed the discouragement, the futility, even the terror in the faces of those who confront starvation can legitimately for a moment question the objective.

With the two justifications for the use of public credit which presuppose public spending to be unqualifiedly beneficial, many, myself among them, disagree on wholly objective and impartial grounds.

The theoretical argument advanced in favor of priming the pump is that by expending public expenditures during a depression purchasing power will be augmented, private spending will be increased, a spiral of recovery commenced, Government expenditures reduced, the Budget balanced, and public debt liquidated. Implicit in this theory, for which experience provides no support, is the abstraction that a government, having claimed the credit for fostering a recovery, will accept the blame for inducing a depression that may follow a reduction of expenditures commenced at the wrong time or in the wrong amount. Implicit in this theory is the unalterable fact that some agency of public authority must make two highly technical and exceedingly delicate decisions—first, when in the business cycle shall public expenditures be reduced; and second, by how much. Can the Congress of the United States or any parliamentary body make this sort of a judgment, requiring, as it does, an impartial nonpolitical and professional review and evaluation of a complicated array of statistics and estimates of quantitative and qualitative business activity? And if a parliament cannot make these two difficult decisions, must not the responsible representatives of the people lose their control over the public purse strings by committing the task to an irresponsible body?

Perhaps these questions are unanswerable. Perhaps government, or public authority, will be unwilling to run the risk of inducing a depression by retrenchment. In this event the policy of spending must be continued by administering ever-increasing doses of public funds in an effort to maintain a rising or even a stationary level of economic activity.

As the more recent experiences in Europe, indeed as all experiences reveal, this volume of public spending ultimately produces economic disintegration manifested by the threat, if not the fact, of widespread public distress. Attempts to minimize these consequences require the use of totalitarian measures and totalitarian techniques—measures and techniques designed to control, to regulate the prices at which goods and services may be sold, the quantities in which they may be produced, with what they may be exchanged in the market places of the world; these techniques at last become necessary to direct the investment of capital and even to expropriate pools of private savings. The decision for us to make is whether this totalitarian system is compatible with responsible representative, constitutional government. History provides us with a categorical answer in the negative.

Many will probably dismiss these observations and questions as being indicative of exaggerated fears—ghosts under the bed. But the least that can be said for them is that they present a serious enough picture to require convincing and impartial answers.

Finally, the last justification for spending, that is, that our frontier has disappeared, our economy has matured, that there is no opportunity for private investment and that, therefore, public authority must become the spender, should be reviewed, too, in terms of its implications.

The frontier in the United States officially disappeared in 1890. Why, then, 40 years later, should its disappearance be the cause of a sudden, amazingly, abrupt, and profound change in our national economy? Does the geographic frontier offer the only incentive for private investment? Are there not other frontiers which would invite private investment on a large scale if some of the present uncertainties were eradicated? It is indeed a simple matter to make the assumption that there is no opportunity for private investment and then by a series of public acts to create an environment in which it does not and, in fact, cannot occur. If there is no place for private investment, then on what basis is public investment made? If for purposes which are not sufficiently productive to reproduce their capital costs, then is not such public spending essentially a process by which our store of capital and our national wealth become slowly depleted? Fundamentally, does not this theory presuppose a declining national capacity to work and to produce goods and services? Does not an increasing volume of public investment continuously made in projects, which, over a given period of years, reproduce their capital cost, presuppose ultimately Government operation and ownership of the means of production in a very large part of the area of our economic life? And if it does, what sort of a government, vested with what sort of powers, exercising them through what sort of agencies, and under what sort of restraints, is its counterpart?

Experience provides the answers to these questions. Logic may give us the same or different ones. It is for us to insist that these answers reveal the full implication of a policy of public spending and disclose its ultimate effects on the set of values which has come down to us from the early days of the Republic.

Neutrality and the National Defense

REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS E. MARTIN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 2, 1939

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit certain tables to supplement those submitted with my speech on neutrality and national defense on November 1, which appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at pages 1263 to 1268.

Naval aircraft expenditures (exclusive of ordnance for aircraft)

1920	$4,616,000
1921	4,531,000
1922	5,380,000
1923	6,167,000
1924	5,853,000
1925	4,923,000
1926	8,235,000
1927	12,340,000

Naval aircraft expenditures (exclusive of ordnance for aircraft)—Continued

1928	$8,554,000
1929	18,480,000
1930	14,245,000
1931	12,199,000
1932	8,715,000
1933	7,208,000
1934	12,273,000
1935	20,691,000
1936	26,561,000
1937	20,963,000
1938	27,265,000
1939	24,238,000
Total	253,437,000

Estimated expenditures

1940	$75,494,000
1941	68,148,000
1942	71,545,000
1943	70,819,000
1944	65,248,000
Total	351,254,000

Navy Department, Office of Chief of Naval Operations.

Expenditures of the Bureau of Ordnance, Navy Department, for munitions (including armor, guns, mounts, ammunition, and explosives) during the years 1925–39, inclusive

1925	$7,463,316
1926	7,049,199
1927	9,589,387
1928	12,818,683
1929	16,859,709
1930	17,635,214
1931	15,941,615
1932	13,762,340
1933	13,120,299
1934	22,105,699
1935	42,336,135
1936	60,113,936
1937	56,215,705
1938	59,756,154
1939	73,026,169

On the basis of the existing Navy, including provisions for the 10-year building program now in progress (which should, it is believed, enter into an estimate of this nature), the following estimate is furnished of the annual needs of the Navy for munitions, including armor, for fiscal years 1941–45, inclusive:

Estimate

1941	$120,000,000
1942	135,000,000
1943	135,000,000
1944	130,000,000
1945	125,000,000

Navy Department, Office of Chief of Naval Operations.

United States exports of crude sulphur to selected foreign countries, 1929–38

[Long tons]

Year	France	Germany	United Kingdom	Canada	Japan	China	Total
1929	136,732	169,474	43,856	200,012	----------	270	855,183
1930	56,190	120,569	28,683	166,943	----------	150	593,312
1931	73,457	82,218	23,635	111,958	----------	195	407,586
1932	60,591	31,275	18,129	95,800	----------	1,005	352,610
1933	84,093	69,139	47,149	122,954	----------	----------	522,515
1934	71,829	38,819	63,734	145,384	----------	2,500	507,115
1935	45,455	42,839	56,252	119,554	----------	----------	402,333
1936	73,660	42,534	79,004	155,700	----------	4,750	547,199
1937	107,111	47,349	104,067	193,947	----------	9,000	675,297
1938	98,751	32,817	99,000	83,000	----------	(1)	575,957

[1] Not quoted.

Source: Foreign Commerce and Navigation of the United States, 1929–37. Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, bulletins on trade of United States with France (May 1939), Germany (March 1939), United Kingdom (May 1939), Japan (April 1939), China (May 1939), Canada (May 1939).

United States exports of refined and scrap copper to selected foreign countries, 1929–38

[Thousands of pounds]

Year	Refined, ingots and bars	Old and scrap	Total
FRANCE			
1929	175,265	2,654	177,919
1930	141,237	4,578	145,815
1931	109,481	7,867	117,348
1932	62,367	3,196	65,563
1933	72,885	4,608	77,493
1934	116,318	2,986	119,304
1935	64,346	550	64,896
1936	81,744	3,466	85,210
1937	78,394	3,017	81,411
1938	64,221	4,008	68,229
GERMANY			
1929	178,879	19,189	198,068
1930	98,360	14,288	112,648
1931	58,283	37,910	96,193
1932	30,447	19,121	49,568
1933	34,762	8,928	43,690
1934	72,762	10,127	82,889
1935	49,833	11,702	61,535
1936	65,279	13,948	79,227
1937	75,070	23,716	98,786
1938	148,666	23,701	172,367
UNITED KINGDOM			
1929	175,450	1,958	177,408
1930	142,789	2,220	145,009
1931	94,249	5,453	99,702
1932	59,950	4,056	64,006
1933	26,597	2,006	28,603
1934	82,415	1,235	83,650
1935	109,043	382	109,425
1936	61,096	669	61,765
1937	105,582	784	106,366
1938	61,231	(1)	61,231
CANADA			
1929	38,692	4,463	43,155
1930	13,764	1,341	15,105
1931	7,119	817	7,936
1932	187	3	190
1933	92	1	93
1934	162	46	208
1935	208	1	209
1936	380	387	767
1937	4,922	1,662	6,584
1938	1,563	(1)	1,563
JAPAN			
1929	7,954	4,129	12,083
1930	3,187	1,756	4,943
1931	188	2,502	2,690
1932	448	2,716	3,164
1933	28,158	7,399	35,557
1934	113,769	4,828	118,597
1935	106,265	3,243	109,508
1936	79,852	5,355	85,207
1937	145,689	10,839	156,528
1938	217,880	3,805	221,685
CHINA			
1929	5,604	54	5,658
1930	5,627	27	5,654
1931	4,723	----------	4,723
1932	740	76	816
1933	4,071	2	4,073
1934	3,755	55	3,810
1935	3,485	----------	3,485
1936	5,096	67	5,163
1937	8,938	----------	8,938
1938	952	----------	952
TOTAL, ALL COUNTRIES			
1929	822,454	37,635	860,089
1930	594,115	33,886	628,001
1931	405,396	67,177	472,573
1932	221,955	34,358	256,313
1933	249,164	28,437	277,601
1934	524,733	39,651	564,384
1935	521,471	19,083	540,554
1936	440,781	26,447	467,228
1937	590,127	41,828	631,955
1938	741,091	43,621	784,712

[1] Not quoted.

Sources: Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, Foreign Commerce and Navigation of the United States, 1929–37. Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, Bulletins on Trade of United States with France (May 1939), Germany (March 1939), United Kingdom (May 1939), Canada (May 1939), Japan (April 1939), China (May 1939). Monthly Summary of Foreign Commerce of the United States, December 1938.

Twelve Months Under the New Rules of Civil Procedure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 2, 1939

ADDRESS BY HON. ALEXANDER HOLTZOFF

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an address delivered by

Hon. Alexander Holtzoff, Special Assistant to the Attorney General, at the Judicial Conference for the Third Judicial Circuit, held on Friday, September 22, 1939, in Atlantic City, N. J., entitled "Twelve Months Under the New Rules of Civil Procedure."

The address is as follows:

In accepting the invitation kindly extended to me by the senior circuit judge to discuss Twelve Months Under the New Rules of Civil Procedure, I felt a considerable degree of delicacy. It seemed to me that it involves some presumption on my part to speak on this subject before this select group, for it is you and your colleagues throughout the Federal judicial system that have breathed the spirit of life into the new rules and made them a vital and virile force. On the other hand, I am very much in the position of an observer reporting on the results of a battle to the generals who had borne the brunt of the fighting. In spite of my hesitation and misgivings, however, Judge Biggs' courteous invitation leaves me no alternative but to venture on this interesting and important topic.

In the history of law reform the year 1938 will mark noteworthy epoch. The adoption of the new Federal civil procedure ranks in its importance and significance on a par with the abandonment of common law pleading in England as a result of the adoption of the Hilary Rules in 1834, and the inauguration of the present simplified procedure in that country in 1875. President Roosevelt has recently characterized this far-reaching step as a notable accomplishment and as "an outstanding milestone along the road of law reform."

The separation between law and equity, which persisted in the Federal courts in spite of its abrogation in most of the States, and the many varieties of procedure in actions at law, which were necessitated by the Conformity Act, led to a bewildering complexity in the field of Federal civil procedure. The third circuit afforded a striking illustration of this condition. Each of the States comprising this busy jurisdiction has a different type of pleading and practice, which it was incumbent upon the Federal courts to follow.

The new Federal procedure has met with universal acclaim, as, in addition to possessing the virtue of uniformity, it may be said to constitute the quintessence of simplicity. Occasionally a few lawyers, momentarily oblivious of the fact that the function of the courts is to administer justice rather than to cultivate an artificial and useless science, have uttered sighs of regret because the rules have cast into oblivion much abstruse and laborious learning relating to minute points embraced in such intriguing subjects as forms of actions, refinements of pleading, joinder of parties and of causes of action, counterclaims, and other similarly enlivening topics too numerous to mention. It is perhaps this general attitude, which is at times exhibited by some members of the legal profession, that Shakespeare had in mind when he put in the mouth of Rosalind this quip, in answer to the question, With whom does time stand still? "With lawyers in vacation, for they sleep between term and term, and then they perceive not how time moves."

The purpose of the new procedure has been to throw into discard the technicalities that acted as a brake on the progress of a lawsuit; to abolish what has been so aptly termed as "the sporting theory of justice"; to provide efficient machinery for the ascertainment of truth; and to expedite a determination of each controversy on the merits. The watchword of the new procedure is found in rule 1, which provides that the rules "shall be construed to secure the just, speedy, and inexpensive determination of every action." Anyone who has followed the application of the rules during the first 12 months of their existence must inevitably reach the conclusion that this principle has been kept in view and observed by the courts. The rules have been interpreted and administered in the liberal and flexible spirit contemplated by their framers. The courts are entitled to strong commendation on the effective manner in which they have adopted and applied the new procedure. They are justified in feeling a sense of achievement.

The path of every outstanding reform and every notable innovation is, however, beset with pitfalls. The new Federal procedure was no exception. It was menaced by two serious dangers. First, there was lurking the possibility that the new rules might be destroyed in a bog of technical decisions. The history of the New York Code of Civil Procedure stood out as a horrible example of what may eventually happen to a simple practice code. Fortunately, the Federal courts have not exhibited any tendency of this nature, and so far this peril has been avoided. The second danger confronted by the new procedure was the possibility that such variations might gradually arise in the interpretation and application of the rules in the 85 districts as gradually to cause a departure from the uniformity envisaged by the framers of the rules, and eventually lead to a development of 85 varieties of procedure—one of the serious conditions which the new rules were intended to remedy. This hazard, however, has likewise been averted.

The courts, which have been piloting and steering the new craft, have charted a safe course. So long as there is no deviation from it there is no danger that the ship may be stranded on the shoals of technicalities or wrecked on the rocks of divergent interpretations. Continued vigilance is, however, indispensable in order to preclude even a possibility of such a frustration of the purpose and objective of the new procedure.

It may be of interest to examine some of the principal problems that were presented to the courts for solution during the first 12 months of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and to summarize some of their experiences, which may prove of general interest.

An inquiry has been occasionally propounded whether the Conformity Act is still in effect and may be enforced as auxiliary to the new procedure. Section 1 of the act of June 19, 1934, however, which empowered the Supreme Court to promulgate rules of civil procedure, clearly repeals the Conformity Act. The new rules must be regarded as the sole guide to Federal civil procedure, except, of course, in respect to matters which are expressly excluded from the operation of the rules by their very terms.

A topic that seems to be appropriate for consideration in this discussion is that of pleading. Brevity and simplicity of pleading is one of the principal objectives of the rules. In order to assist in attaining this goal, illustrative forms are included in the appendix to the rules. One of the questions that has arisen is, What constitutes a sufficient averment of negligence? Among the forms contained in the appendix is a complaint in an action for personal injuries caused by the negligent driving of a motor vehicle. It is alleged in the complaint that the defendant negligently drove a motor vehicle against the plaintiff, but no statement is made as to the negligent acts or omissions with which the defendant is charged. This form appears to have been a source of considerable perturbation. A doubt has been raised as to whether the form contains a sufficient statement of a cause of action, or rather a claim, for the term "claim" has happily superseded the phrase "cause of action."

Curiously enough, it is a peculiar paradox that in this respect common law pleading was simpler than code pleading. At common law, an allegation of negligence without specification of the acts of negligence sufficed, while some authorities under the codes have insisted that such an allegation must be expanded, in order to indicate the particular negligent acts or failures to act of which the defendant was being accused. Last January, in the southern district of Ohio, the form contained in the appendix to the rules was sustained and a mere general charge of negligence without specification was held sufficient.[1] Subsequently, the circuit court of appeals for this circuit rendered a progressive opinion, approving a similar form, and sustaining the sufficiency of a general allegation of negligence,[2] thus allaying any doubt that may have existed on this point.

Another question that has aroused a considerable amount of interest in connection with pleading under the new rules relates to the subject of contributory negligence. Rule 8, subsection (c), enumerates certain defenses that must be pleaded affirmatively. Among those listed is contributory negligence. It has, of course, been the general rule in the Federal courts that in a negligence action the burden of pleading and establishing contributory negligence is on the defendant. On the other hand, in some of the States, New York and Illinois for example, the absence of contributory negligence must be pleaded by the plaintiff and proved as a part of his prima facie case. On April 25, 1938—almost 5 months after the rules were promulgated—the Supreme Court handed down its opinion in *Erie Railroad Co.* v. *Tompkins*, which has already become a cause celebre.[3] It overruled the doctrine of *Swift* v. *Tyson*,[4] that on matters of general jurisprudence the Federal courts might develop their own common law and held that on all questions of substantive law the Federal courts were bound to enforce the law of the States irrespective of whether it was statutory or common law.[5]

This decision, as has been remarked by one district judge, has "legally speaking turned the world upside down."[5] One of the necessary consequences of the doctrine of *Erie Railroad Co.* v. *Tompkins* has been a change in the Federal rule that contributory negligence is an affirmative defense. This, indeed, remains the rule applied by the Federal courts in those States in which it constitutes the law of the State. In States like New York and Illinois, however, in which the opposite doctrine prevails, it becomes incumbent on the Federal courts to require the plaintiff to establish the absence of contributory negligence as a part of his case. What, then, happens to the enumeration of contributory negligence as an affirmative defense in rule 8? This subject was discussed at length in a well-considered opinion in the eastern district of Illinois.[6] The conclusion was reached that in a jurisdiction in which the burden of showing the absence of contributory negligence was on the plaintiff, the defendant was not required to interpose contributory negligence as a defense, but where the burden of establishing contributory negligence was on the defendant, it was necessary to plead it affirmatively. The court suggests that this conclusion is not inconsistent with the plain meaning of rule 8 (c), since the rule should be construed as merely requiring contributory negligence to be pleaded affirmatively whenever it is used as a defense, but not if it plays a different role in the litigation. In other words, if the defendant has the burden of proving contributory negligence, he must plead it affirmatively in order to avail himself of the defense, and is not at liberty to advance it under a general denial. He does not have to plead it where the plaintiff carries the onus of showing freedom from contributory negligence. This solution seems entirely reasonable and satisfactorily reconciles the doctrine of *Erie Railroad Co.* v. *Tompkins* with the provision of rule 8 (c).

---

[1] *Hardin* v. *Interstate Motor Freight System*, 26 Fed. Supp. 97.

[2] *Sierocinski* v. *E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co.*, 103 F. (2d) 843 (C. C. A. 3rd).

[3] 304 U. S. 64.

[4] 16 Pet. 1.

[5] Wham, J., in *Francis* v. *Humphrey*, Eastern District of Illinois, 25 F. Supp. 1, 3.

[6] *Francis* v. *Humphrey*, *supra*.

Considerable debate has been engendered in regard to the proper scope and function of bills of particulars. It must be observed at the outset that there is a sharp differentiation between bills of particulars in the code States and bills of particulars under the new rules. Under the codes, bills of particulars are generally ordered after issue is joined, for the purpose of furnishing information needed by the moving party in preparing for trial. Under the new Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, an application for a bill of particulars lies only before the answer is served. In fact, it has been held that under the new rules motions for a more definite statement and motions for bills of particulars are interchangeable and coextensive. The purpose of such relief is to obtain only such information as is required by the moving party in order to enable him to plead. On the other hand, information needed in preparation for trial is secured by interrogatories. It must be borne in mind in this connection that procedure by interrogatories does not exist under some of the codes, and that, therefore, liberal use of bills of particulars is essential in the local courts in such jurisdictions.

This limitation on the employment of bills of particulars has been worked out in a number of cases decided under the new rules, most of them in the southern district of New York. It appears to be a desirable restriction, since it assists in expediting joinder of issue and thereby the trial. This result is due to the fact that a defendant who moves for a bill of particulars is not required to serve his answer until he receives the bill. Therefore, a liberal use of bills of particulars would tend to prolong litigation rather than to speed it. On the other hand, no prejudice results from circumscribing the scope of bills of particulars, since the desired information can readily be secured by interrogatories without postponing the joinder of issue.

My summary of the development of the law on this point would not, however, be complete were I to fail to observe that the cases are by no means in unison. Different judges have reached divergent conclusions. Some decisions have been rendered which give to bills of particulars a broader scope than seems to accord with what I may perhaps denominate as the majority rule.

An important and far-reaching innovation in legal procedure is to be found in third-party practice, which makes it possible to avoid circuity of action by enabling a defendant to bring in as a third-party defendant either a person who is liable over to him on the plaintiff's claim or who is originally liable to the plaintiff. This procedure is not entirely a novelty in the Federal courts, for it has been known in admiralty for a great many years. Moreover, in those few States in which it formed a part of the State procedure, it was employed by Federal courts in actions at law, pursuant to the requirements of the Conformity Act. The rules, however, make third-party practice an inherent feature of Federal civil procedure.

At the very inception, a vital question arises in connection with the use of this contrivance, namely, Is it necessary that there exist an independent ground of Federal jurisdiction for the third-party complaint? In other words, if the original suit is based on a diversity of citizenship, must there be a like diversity between the defendant and the third-party defendant? The solution of this fundamental problem would seem in turn to depend on the answer to the query whether a third-party proceeding is to be regarded as ancillary to the main suit or as an independent proceeding. If the former, obviously an independent ground of Federal jurisdiction is not needed. If the latter, a third-party complaint may not be maintained unless the defendant can show Federal jurisdiction for the controversy as between him and the third-party defendant. Manifestly, if the narrow view were adopted, third-party practice could be but rarely invoked, especially in cases in which jurisdiction is based on diversity of citizenship. Frequently, there may be a diversity of citizenship as between a plaintiff and defendant without the existence of this element as between the defendant and some person who has agreed to indemnify him, or who is liable to contribution.

The circuit courts of appeals do not seem to have spoken on this matter as yet. The district courts, however, guided perhaps by the inspiring judicial admonition that "we must let our minds be bold," fortunately, are, one by one, adopting the view that a third-party proceeding is ancillary or auxiliary to the main action and, therefore, does not require an independent ground of Federal jurisdiction. This conclusion has been reached in two districts in this circuit, the western district of Pennsylvania and the dictrict of New Jersey.[7]

Third-party practice under the new rules covers a more extensive field than third-party practice under some of the codes, for it is not limited to cases in which the third-party defendant is secondarily liable to the original defendant, but extends also to instances in which the third-party defendant is directly liable to the plaintiff. This distinction was comprehensively discussed in a case decided in the District of Columbia.[8]

The next topic to which I should like to advert is pretrial procedure. A wealth of experience elsewhere formed a substantial background for the introduction of pretrial procedure into the Federal courts. In England, where it is known by the appellation of "summons for directions," it has been in vogue a great many years. Every case is regularly subjected to this process for the purpose of defining and restricting the issues to those actually in controversy. Some years ago it was introduced in the local courts in Detroit with a view to reducing inordinate arrears and excessive congestion of the dockets. It proved highly successful and was transplanted to Boston, where it met with equally gratifying results. It has been particularly effective where the court dockets are overcrowded, and some expedient is needed for breaking the jam and speeding the disposition of cases.

Within a few weeks after the rules went into effect, pretrial procedure was adopted as a regular feature in the district court for the district of Massachusetts. The entire jury docket was called for pretrial procedure by one of the judges, who was assigned to devote his entire time to this work. The session consumed 3 weeks. During that period 313 cases were filtered through this mechanism. The result was a final disposition of 130 cases, or over 40 percent of the aggregate. As to the balance, stipulations in respect to facts, documents, and similar matters were frequently made, which considerably shortened the trials. The result was a substantial reduction in the congestion of the docket and in the waiting period for trial as regards cases that were ready for disposition. So successful was the experiment in respect to jury cases that this fall it is planned to extend the practice to nonjury cases.

The district of Oregon likewise adopted pretrial procedure for every case as a matter of ordinary routine. Its experience is equally favorable. Many other districts have invoked pretrial procedure to a greater or less degree. Among them is the district of New Jersey, where a very large percentage of all the cases on the docket has been subjected to the process. The universal conclusion, wherever this practice has been invoked, is that it invariably results, at the very least, in abbreviating trials and thereby expediting the progress of litigation through the judicial mill.

It may be of interest to observe that the district court for the District of Columbia has recently adopted a rule on the subject and has announced that commencing this month a pretrial docket will be called as a regular feature of the business of the court, and that one judge will devote his entire time to this activity. It is believed that the success thus far attained indicates that pretrial procedure has passed the experimental stage and is a device that may be adopted as part of the regular routine throughout the entire Federal judicial system.

One of the noteworthy features of the new rules is found in their treatment of the subject of discovery. There is provided a veritable arsenal of different discovery weapons, all, however, fashioned to achieve the same end. Their field of usefulness is limited practically only by the ingenuity and resourcefulness of counsel. It will be recalled that these weapons are five in number: Depositions, or "examinations before trial," to use the terminology of the codes; interrogatories; production and inspection of documents and other objects; requests for admissions; and physical and mental examinations. The purpose of discovery is to afford a means, not only for securing evidence which the moving party needs in support of his case or defense, but also for procuring information which may be of help in preparing for trial. Consequently, the moving party may take depositions not only for the purpose of obtaining evidence on issues on which he has the burden of proof, but also for the purpose of inquiring into matters relating to his adversary's case. Similarly, the mere fact that the matters regarding which discovery is sought happen to be within the knowledge of the moving party, is no objection to taking a deposition of the adverse party or filing interrogatories in respect thereto. The reason for this conclusion is obvious. Frequently it is not sufficient for a party to have knowledge of the facts. It is necessary for him to transform them into such shape as would render them admissible in evidence. Moreover, it is manifestly useful and desirable, with a view to diminishing the expense of trials and the time consumed by them, to ascertain in advance to what extent the facts will be admitted by the adverse party.

Requests for admissions have a cognate purpose. If the party on whom such a document is served either is familiar with the facts or else has the facilities for readily ascertaining their accuracy, there is no reason why he should not admit the truth under penalty of being required to recompense the adverse party for the expense incurred in proving the facts at the trial. The philosophy underlying this procedure is that a lawsuit should not be conducted as a controversy at arm's length, or as a game of chess, in which the most skillful player secures the palm of victory. On the contrary, it is assumed that litigation is to be regarded as an efficacious mode of determining the truth and adjudicating rights. Whatever pertinent information is in the possession of either party must be made available to his antagonist prior to the trial.

An interesting illustration of the use of requests for admissions is found in a case decided in the eastern district of New York.[9] It involved an action brought to recover under the double-indemnity provisions of a life-insurance policy. Whether the plaintiff was entitled to receive double indemnity depended on whether or not the deceased died an accidental death, as alleged in the complaint. The insurance company took the position that the death was not accidental, but was the result of a participation on the part of the deceased in a fracas which had been caused by pouring too many libations to Bacchus.

In addition, the defendant contended that the policy had been obtained by misrepresentations, consisting of a concealment of the fact on the part of the insured that he had received considerable medical attention during a specified period preceding the presentation of the application for insurance. Counsel for the defendant

[7] *Bossard* v. *McGwinn* (W. D. Pa.), 27 F. Supp. 412; *Kravas* v. *Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co.* (W. D. Pa.), 28 F. Supp. 66; *Satink* v. *Holland* (N. J.), 28 F. Supp. 67.

[8] *Crim* v. *Lumbermen's Mutual Casualty Co.*, 26 F. Supp. 715.

[9] *Walsh* v. *Connecticut Mutual Life Insurance Co.*, 26 F. Supp. 566.

served a request for admissions, composed of a long series of sentences or short paragraphs, each comprising a separate detail or distinct fact bearing upon these two issues. The court upheld the propriety of this course.

I have just briefly epitomized the principal rulings that have been handed down on the subject of discovery during the past 12 months. There have, indeed, been a few decisions that have taken a somewhat narrower view of certain phases of the matter. I believe however that my résumé represents the predominant doctrines.

An ingenious approach on the part of the framers of the new rules to the subject of evidence lends considerable interest to this vital topic. The person whose resourceful mind originated the idea embodied in rule 43 that the Federal courts should apply either the Federal or the State law of evidence, whichever happens to be the more liberal for the moment, is entitled to the gratitude of both the bar and litigants. Naturally, as rulings on questions of evidence are made in the course of a trial, few opinions are rendered in this branch of the law by nisi prius courts. The circuit courts of appeals have not as yet been called upon to construe the new rule on this point or to define its scope and application. Notice has been attracted, however, to the consideration given to the matter in the Southern District of New York during the protracted trial of the action brought by the Government under the Sherman antitrust law against the Aluminum Co. of America. On one occasion during the proceedings, when a close question of admissibility of a certain item of evidence was presented for decision, the presiding judge observed:

"Rule 43 does not deal with the law as to what testimony should be excluded. It deals only with what is admissible under the law of the United States or the law of the State in which the particular court sits. It is intended to liberalize admissibility of testimony, but has nothing to do with what should be excluded."

It so happened that in that particular instance the State law required the exclusion of the evidence. The Federal cases had not settled the question or worked out a Federal rule. The judge indicated that he was not bound by the New York rule, but that, since the question was an open one in the Federal courts, he was free to develop a Federal rule on the subject. He concluded that, if the Federal rule evolved in this manner should admit the evidence, he was free to overrule the objection.

Among the important advances made by the new rules is that relating to summary judgments. This is a practice that is thoroughly familiar to lawyers practicing in many of the code States. It has had a potent effect in discouraging defenses interposed solely for the purpose of delay and in enabling a party who can show that he is clearly entitled to recover and that there are no material issues really in controversy, to secure a judgment without waiting until the case can be set and reached for trial. The experience of the State courts, as well as of the English tribunals, had established the usefulness of this device long before it was transplanted into the Federal judicial system. The Federal courts during the past 12 months have readily adopted this practice and permitted its utilization in a variety of instances. It has been invoked, not only in cases in which the plaintiff was able to show by affidavits or other similar means that no material issues were raised by the answer, but also in instances in which the defendant interposed an affirmative defense, such as the statute of limitations or res adjudicata, and was able to show that the plaintiff could not successfully meet the plea. Incidentally, it was held in the eastern district of New York in an action against the United States under the Tucker Act, that the Government was subject to summary judgment procedure to the same extent that another defendant would be under parallel circumstances.

The new rules have destroyed one of the traps for the unwary that theretofore beset the practitioner in the Federal courts. I have reference to the metaphysical and esoteric doctrine that if both the plaintiff and the defendant move for a directed verdict, they must be deemed to have waived a trial by jury, although if only one of them makes such a motion, no waiver follows. Incidentally, this was one of numerous instances in which the Conformity Act did not rise to the rescue of the lawyer who practiced principally in the State courts and entered the portals of the Federal tribunals only on rare occasions. Even in such jurisdictions as New Jersey, for example, in which under the State law no waiver of a jury trial was inferred from the fact that the parties had joined in a motion for a directed verdict, the Federal rule to the contrary nevertheless governed, presumably on the theory that the Conformity Act exacted conformity only "as near as may be." A great deal of satisfaction has been derived by the bar from the change in Federal procedure in this respect. Needless to say, no deleterious effects have been observed as a consequence of its introduction into the Federal courts.

Equally welcome was the rule which permits the court to take the verdict of a jury subject to a later determination of the questions of law raised by the motion for a directed verdict. The result is practically to introduce into Federal procedure motions for judgment non obstante veredicto—a practice that is, of course, especially familiar to Pennsylvania lawyers.

Rule 83 is perhaps worthy of some attention. It authorizes each district court to adopt local rules on all points not covered by the general rules. Such a provision was obviously indispensable, and yet it was not entirely lacking in a potential danger. Implicit in this rule was the possibility that local rules might gradually lead to divergencies in procedure, one of the principal evils which the act of June 19, 1934, sought to cure. There was also the possibility that some districts might adopt detailed rules dealing with minutiae that might prove as cumbersome and as technical as some of the codes in the code States. The judicial conference a year ago noted the need for uniformity and simplicity in local rules. It expressed the view that such rules should be few, simple, and free from unnecessary technicalities. It created a committee composed of three district judges to examine the various district rules and make recommendations in order that the greatest practical degree of uniformity throughout the country might be secured. The work of this committee is now in progress.

In the inauguration of any far-reaching reform the period of transition and adjustment is likely to give rise to some temporary difficulties. In this connection the principal problem confronting the courts was what should be done in respect to pending actions that had been instituted prior to the effective date of the new procedure. The Supreme Court in rule 86 provided that the rules should govern "all further proceedings in actions then pending, except to the extent that in the opinion of the court their application in a particular action pending when the rules take effect would not be feasible or would work injustice, in which event the former procedure applies." In other words, as is usual with changes in adjective law, the new procedure is applicable to pending cases and is not restricted only to cases thereafter filed. It is only in the extraordinary case, in which it appears that the application of the new rules would not be feasible, or might result in an injustice, that an exception is to be made.

The courts have resolved the questions that have arisen in connection with pending cases in a manner that facilitated the transition from the old procedure to the new. Generally, it may be said that the validity of a proceeding in a pending action is dependent on the law as of the date that the proceeding was taken. In other words, if the date was earlier than September 16, 1938, the action is to be tested by the law then existing; if subsequent to the effective date of the new rules, the latter should govern. Pleadings filed prior to September 16, 1938, remain, and repleading has not been required merely for the purpose of conforming to the new rules. On the other hand, pleadings filed subsequently, even in such an action, must conform to the new procedure, rather than that prevailing when the suit was instituted.

As a corollary of the general doctrine to which I have just referred, the sufficiency of pleadings filed previously to September 16, 1938, has been generally tested by the law in effect as of the date of filing. There is one exception to this course, however, in the interest of liberality and expedition. If a pleading would have been insufficient under the law prevailing as of the date of filing, but meets the requirements of the new rules, it would seem futile to rule that such a pleading is defective. Such a decision would be but brutum fulmen, for obvicusly the party against whom it was rendered could immediately replead, in which event the sufficiency of the new pleading would be tested under the new rules. Although the prevailing tendency has been in accordance with what seems to be the practical view, there have been a few decisions to the contrary.

It has been universally held that the new rules relating to depositions and other forms of discovery should apply to pending cases. A salutary exception has, however, been evolved in respect to those few cases that had been pending for a long time and in which the taking of depositions under the new procedure would have the effect of postponing the trial for a considerable period.

It will be recalled that the new rules abolished writs of mandamus. Nevertheless, it has been held by the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia that mandamus proceedings instituted prior to September 16, 1938, may be maintained and brought to a final conclusion. This consummation is obviously desirable, since otherwise the relator would have had to dismiss his proceeding and institute a civil action under the new rules, thereby losing considerable time and incurring needless expense. In this connection it may be observed that although the new rules purport to abolish writs of mandamus entirely, the rules are intended for the guidance of the district courts and do not affect the circuit courts of appeals, except in respect to appeals. Consequently, in those cases in which circuit courts of appeals issue original writs of mandamus, the writ still exists and should not be deemed abrogated by the rule which provides for the abolition of the writ. For example, some months ago the Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit entertained and passed on the merits of an application for an original writ of mandamus directed against a district judge.

Some questions have arisen in connection with appeals in pending cases. All of the courts are inclined to adopt the principle that any appellate step taken, or which should have been taken, prior to September 16, 1938, must meet the requirements of the law then existing. Any step taken or to be taken subsequently to that date need conform only to the new rules. For example, it has been held in the first and ninth circuits that compliance with the requirements as to severance is to be exacted in the case of an appeal taken prior to September 16, 1938.

A question of this type was presented to the Supreme Court in *McCrone* v. *United States*, which was decided last April.[10] It may be interesting to note, in passing, that this is the only decision thus far rendered by the Supreme Court in which that tribunal construed or interpreted the new rules. It involved a contempt proceeding. A judgment finding the contemnor guilty and committing him to jail was rendered by the district court. An appeal was taken in his behalf to the Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit. Deeming the contempt to be criminal,

[10] 307 U. S. 61.

rather than civil, counsel filed a notice of appeal under the criminal-appeals rules, instead of filing a petition and securing an allowance of the appeal. The Supreme Court concluded that the contempt was civil, rather than criminal, and that therefore the appeal had not been properly taken. Counsel argued that, since the new rules permitted civil appeals to be instituted by notice, he was within the rules in any event. The Court called attention to the fact, however, that the notice of appeal had been filed on May 2, 1938, when the controlling statute required a petition and allowance of an appeal in a civil case. It consequently held that the validity of the appeal depended on his compliance with the law then existing and could not be determined under the new rules. The appeal was dismissed.

So satisfactory has the new procedure proved after it has been in operation for a short time that the Supreme Court in the Orders of Bankruptcy, which became effective last February, provided that the rules shall be followed as nearly as may be in proceedings under the Bankruptcy Act. On September 1 the new rules similarly became applicable to copyright suits as the result of an amendment made by the Supreme Court to the Copyright Rules.

The great reform in Federal procedure has thus been safely launched and is successfully making rapid headway, due very largely to the sympathetic attitude on the part of the judiciary and the effective manner in which the members of the bench have construed and applied the new rules. While this outstanding measure is of momentous importance to the Federal judicial system, its significance extends far beyond its effect on Federal jurisprudence. Perhaps the greatest tribute that has been paid to this notable accomplishment is found in the fact that in numerous States movements are afoot and in some of them steps have already been taken to secure the assimilation of the new Federal rules or at least such of them as are appropriate, into the local courts. One may well envisage the existence in a not too distant future of a simple, uniform civil procedure throughout all the Federal and State courts. When that consummation is reached, inconsequential controversies over points of pleading, practice, and procedure which hamper and retard the determination of substantive rights, and which rightly seem of no importance to the litigants, will be reduced to a minimum. The law will then be freed from some of the procedural fetters by which it has long been shackled.

Prospective Increase in Latin American Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, November 3, 1939

ARTICLE BY FELIX COTTEN

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Felix Cotten, published in the Washington Post of Sunday, October 22, 1939, on the subject of the prospective increase in trade between this country and Latin America.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post of October 22, 1939]

WITH RIVALS AT WAR, UNITED STATES EXPECTS SPURT IN LATIN AMERICAN TRADE—TRADE TO STRENGTHEN MONROE DOCTRINE TIES—WITH GERMAN AND BRITAIN FORCED OUT OF THE MARKET, AMERICA HAS OPPORTUNITY TO CULTIVATE SOUTH AMERICAN RELATIONSHIPS

(By Felix Cotten)

American business, so far as its Latin American customers are concerned, is in pretty much the same position as the general merchandise store whose chief rival has gone out of business.

That is, the war has forced Germany, with its cumbersome array of barter agreements, out of the Latin American market. Germany in recent years has ranked second to the United States as an exporter of manufactured goods to that region.

Translated into political terms, this means that American business right now has an excellent opportunity to bind still closer, through trade relationships, the ties which have given life to the Monroe Doctrine.

The administration, naturally, has not been slow to sense the situation. "Pep talks" to business were begun shortly after war broke out. Businessmen were urged to take advantage of their opportunity and yet were cautioned to build goodwill for the future rather than to strive for maximum immediate profits. Under Secretary of Commerce Noble has taken the lead in this missionary work.

THE NEW BUSINESS HAS ITS PROBLEMS

But the problem is by no means so simple as much of the discussion has indicated. It is like the case of the storekeeper who finds himself without his chief rival, and yet faces a multitude of complexities in trying to take over the new business which suddenly has started banging at his door.

In the first place, Latin America comprises a widely scattered lot of customers. There are more than 120,000,000 of them, and they live in an area which spreads in most irregular fashion over about 8,000,000 square miles. They are citizens of the 20 republics of Central and South America and certain oversized islands, like Cuba. Their foreign trade in 1937 was valued at more than $4,000,000,000.

The United States is this vast region's biggest customer. In addition, it sells in normal times more than twice as much merchandise to this region as any other exporting nation. In 1937, for example, 34.2 percent of the dollar value of Latin American imports was from the United States, 15.3 percent from Germany, 12.6 percent from the United Kingdom, 2.9 percent from France, and 34.9 percent from other countries. The latter figure includes Japan, whose trade with Latin America in 1938 dropped to 53 percent of the 1937 figure, due presumably to the stress of the Chinese conquest. It also embraces such countries as Italy and the trade among the Latin American countries themselves.

In 1937, 31.1 percent of the dollar value of Latin American exports was taken by the United States, 17.6 percent by the United Kingdom, 8.7 percent by Germany, 4 percent by France, and 38.6 percent by other countries.

WAR SLOWS UP TRAFFIC WITH EUROPE

The war means presumably that the trade of England and France with Latin America will be drastically curtailed temporarily, although they are not confronted with the same situation that faces Germany. In other words, England, with her superior navy, is able to control ocean trade and to impose a blockade on Germany so far as ocean-going commerce is concerned. But belligerents usually are too busy at home turning out equipment, munitions, and supplies for their fighting forces to devote much attention to trade which absorbed their energies in peacetime.

American business, therefore, has been freed of its chief rival in the Latin American market. The countries now at war with this rival will not be able to do nearly as much business in that market as they have been doing.

IT MIGHT HAVE BEEN DIFFERENT—IF * * *

If the Latin American republics had relied on the United States all along for needed manufactures, of course, they would not have been faced with such an emergency. But the matter is not that simple.

The countries to the south, being big producers of agricultural products and various kinds of raw materials, have had to look for markets for their products in all parts of the world, and they have naturally bought goods from countries where they have sold goods, particularly when the countries buying their goods offered inducements of one kind or another.

Some indication of the probable effect of the present war on Latin American trade may be obtained from an examination of figures covering the period of the last war. From 1910 to 1914, 24.8 percent of the dollar value of imports of the Latin American republics was from the United States, 24.8 percent from the United Kingdom, 15.9 percent from Germany, 7.9 percent from France, and 26.6 percent from other countries. The United States, in this period, took 34.1 percent dollar value of the exports of these countries, the United Kingdom 20.9 percent, Germany 11.4 percent, France 7.9 percent, and other countries 25.7 percent.

In the war period of 1915 to 1919, however, the United States sold Latin America 49.3 percent of its outside purchases. The share of the British Isles dropped to 17.2 percent. France's share declined to 4 percent, and that of the other countries rose to 29.1 percent. In the case of Germany, it was a black-out, due again to the British blockade.

During this period also purchases of the United States jumped to 45.6 percent of the exports of these countries. British purchases increased slightly to 21.3 percent, and French moderately to 8.4 percent. Purchases of other countries dropped to 24.6 percent. Again, and for the same reason, no German purchases were shown.

The feeling that American business now has a rare opportunity—one that may never present itself again—is practically unanimous, both among business leaders interested in Latin American trade and Government officials. Nevertheless, students well versed in the problem have a word of caution for those inclined to expect too much. They are able not only to point to the above figures on the experience of the last war, but to cite many other circumstances showing that the United States will have no monopoly on the trade suddenly cut off from Europe, and in some instances will not be able to take advantage of it even if American businessmen should be so inclined.

Administration participation in the situation has divided into two general courses of action. Aside from encouraging businessmen to take full advantage of their opportunity, and warning them not to try to exploit this region, efforts are being made to foster trade expansion through trade treaties, extension of credits, and the development of markets in the United States for Latin American products.

It is inevitable, of course, that this activity should be interpreted in some quarters as in part a rather opportunistic attempt to take advantage of England and France by snatching their trade.

So far as Germany is concerned, there has been no display of sensibilities, since the Nazis have not been particularly noted for sentiment anyway and have been suspected of having political designs, not entirely friendly to the United States, in their aggressive development of trade with Latin America.

Due to a desire not to offend England and France and their interests in Latin America, there is a growing tendency among Government authorities to veer away from any appeal to the mercenary instincts of American business. Stress is placed on fair dealing. Use horse sense, Undersecretary of Commerce Noble told representatives of American export and import organizations here a short time ago. Don't try to profiteer at the expense of Latin American buyers. Don't sell them shoddy goods at high prices, as was done too often during the last war.

The official attitude now apparently stacks up something like this: Latin American countries are to a large degree against it. They are in a disadvantageous bargaining position because they must look to us for supplies. Therefore, we want to help them all we can. We are going to try to see to it that they get a fair deal. Meanwhile, we realize that the diversion of a great deal of the trade from Europe is a temporary thing, and that it will revert back to Europe when the war is over.

Experts on Latin American trade say the people of those countries resent the suggestion that American business regards the war dislocation as an opportunity to get all their trade. Countries that trade heavily with England, moreover, don't like the idea that the United States may be taking advantage of England. On the other hand, there is no historical evidence anywhere that trade ever gave much heed to sentiment, and British trade, it is pointed out, certainly has been no exception to this rule.

Regardless of the official attitude, the Government will do what it can to foster trade with Latin America. Officials most concerned with political relationships in this hemisphere are anxious to use trade ties to the fullest possible extent to cement political ties.

For one thing, the administration is trying to develop markets in this country for Latin American products in order that Latin America will have more dollar exchange with which to buy American goods. This is the point where the most constructive work may be done, Noble has emphasized, since a shortage of dollar exchange has been one of the obstacles to trade expansion with some Latin American countries.

LONG-RANGE PROGRAM UNDER WAY

It would be a mistake, however, to imply that efforts to build up markets for products of these countries was only started recently. It has been a continuing thing. In fact, a long-range program, designed to promote American markets for such articles as rubber and manila hemp, has been sidetracked in favor of an immediate program aimed at finding markets for things which may be produced immediately.

The object in this case is to enable the countries to the south to increase their dollar exchange immediately, since the necessity for buying a greater share of their supplies in this country will aggravate dollar exchange shortages and may cause hardships in some cases.

Panama hats for women is one thing which officials are trying to encourage. Ecuador [not Panama] has been making panama hats for American men for a long time. Could they develop some designs for American women? Then there are a lot of handicraft articles, such as fancy textiles, laces, leather specialty goods, women's gloves, glassware, woodenware, native pottery, and the like, for which markets might be found in this country. Brazil, Chile, and Argentina are leading producers of these articles.

They are being produced right along to some extent, and production presumably may be stepped up. In the case of rubber, however—well, it takes 8 years to grow a rubber tree that will produce rubber.

The Commerce Department is calling in department-store representatives in the near future to find out what handicraft and similar articles they might use, the amount they can use, and the prices they are willing to pay. This information will be relayed to representatives of the South American governments.

The conference is simply one of a series of conferences with trade groups for the purpose of promoting Latin American trade. Representatives of organizations trading with Latin America, in response to admonitions by Noble, assured him that there would be no unwarranted or unusual price increases in goods sold to this market.

BRITAIN NOT OUT OF MARKET

It is not to be assumed that Great Britain is turning its head the other way while the United States is trying to foster trade with Latin America. Government experts point out that exchange-control devices put into effect by England after war broke out may be used to prevent Latin American countries from using sterling exchange obtained by sales of goods to England to buy merchandise from the United States.

This would mean that an effort would be made, at least in some degree, to force Latin American countries to take British goods to the extent that England bought Latin American goods. Considerable trade which otherwise would go to the United States might be diverted in this way, some experts feel, since England's purchases from Latin America increased in the last war. Evidence, however, is that it would not work out this way in reality, since England simply will not be producing manufactured goods for sale to Latin America to the extent that she would be buying its raw materials.

Principal export items of United Kingdom to Latin America in 1937

[In thousands of dollars]

Articles	Argentina	Brazil	Chile	Colombia	Mexico	Peru	Uruguay	Venezuela
Total	99,094	34,838	9,411	14,963	8,596	5,931	11,418	8,788
Coal	10,838	2,922	------	------	------	------	1,436	------
Cotton:								
Piece goods	15,895	275	1,386	7,304	623	790	1,157	3,109
Thread	1,860	558	505	515	------	------	992	------
Yarns	3,602	1,076	555	628	378	------	------	------
Disinfectants, etc	1,298	------	------	------	------	------	------	------
Electric goods and apparatus	2,694	712	364	26	56	146	54	145
Iron and steel manufactures	17,270	3,312	1,137	519	1,489	541	835	1,060
Locomotives, trams and parts	1,923	6,162	65	153	------	457	98	------
Machinery and parts	6,292	5,112	609	800	1,164	511	449	591
Motor vehicles and aircraft	1,747	1,057	166	------	221	102	670	------
Paper, cardboard	1,110	169	118	83	------	42	78	38
Pottery, ceramics	1,093	365	80	31	------	84	114	61
Rayon and silk manufactures	1,165	176	201	123	303	60	111	64
Sodium compounds	1,024	1,573	154	------	88	68	122	------
Spirits	1,196	299	47	484	214	145	234	228
Woolen and worsted tissues	10,852	405	1,260	1,787	300	560	1,054	584

Principal export items of Germany to Latin America in 1938

[In thousands of dollars]

Articles	Argentine	Brazil	Chile	Colombia	Mexico	Peru	Uruguay	Venezuela
Total exports	59,174	64,863	24,310	16,587	18,407	12,432	14,405	15,391
Coal	1,597	4,516	------	------	------	9	106	29
Paper and wares	2,227	680	593	611	1,307	434	506	------
Clay and earthenware	1,886	478	315	371	428	294	330	272
Pharmaceuticals	2,567	3,743	975	2,057	2,486	639	371	849
Steel and iron pipes	1,821	1,240	488	499	390	229	193	2,197
Iron bars, shapes and other iron wares	9,173	7,627	3,098	2,235	462	333	2,620	1,839
Leather and textile machinery	1,301	3,152	496	447	526	172	408	149
Locomotives	1,902	1,700	59	------	------	11	41	------
Power machinery	1,371	1,477	636	263	466	314	189	317
Printing machinery	1,213	733	391	125	155	364	137	121
Motor vehicles and aircraft	2,729	3,417	3,208	283	324	880	1,155	397
Electrotechnical equipment	4,545	3,718	2,150	712	855	622	1,281	560
Chemical products and dyes	4,261	4,025	597	526	663	207	276	172
Precision instruments and optical	1,109	1,635	403	298	488	270	106	332
Textiles (cotton and wool)	1,593	782	2,361	1,665	510	1,558	465	804

All War Casualties Are Not Human Beings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 31, 1939

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, not all of the casualties of war are human beings. Horses and mules, poor dumb creatures, are mercilessly sacrificed on the fields of battle or in the titanic struggles to move supplies behind the lines. Some of the most pathetic stories brought back from the front are stories of the suffering of dumb animals.

Our hearts should bleed for them, but we should not be content with mere indulgence in sympathy, however straight it may come from the heart. Somewhere there should be authority to stop the exportation of horses and mules for service on the foreign fields of carnage, and if that authority does not now exist it should be provided, either by Executive action or by statute.

This should be done at once, for the representatives of foreign belligerents are already in America arranging for the purchase of untold numbers of horses and mules for use in the war.

Secretary of State Hull informs me that there are now no legal restrictions on the exportation of horses and mules to any foreign country. This is much to be regretted for war shows no mercy to dumb animals, and there is imminent danger that many horses and mules raised in America may soon be destroyed, perhaps frightfully mangled, in European battle zones.

The American Humane Association is doing a splendid service in calling to the attention of the President and others in authority the pathetic fate that awaits many horses and mules unless something is done to put a stop to this unholy traffic. In a letter to me Sydney H. Coleman, president of the American Humane Association says:

I have had reports, but no definite truth, that the French Government has agents in this country at the present time looking over the situation with the view of buying a number of thousand of animals. I have no doubt that all the warring countries are doing the same thing, but I have not been able to learn that any large shipments have yet been placed.

I addressed letters of inquiry to Secretary of State Hull and James W. Young, Director of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, and because of the widespread interest in this subject I present their replies for publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, October 27, 1939.

MY DEAR MR. LUDLOW: I have received your letter of October 18, 1939, requesting information in regard to the number of animals that are being shipped abroad for the use of belligerents.

In reply I have to inform you that this Department does not maintain statistics regarding exports of materials other than arms, ammunition, and implements of war. I am, therefore, transmitting a copy of your letter to the Secretary of Commerce in order that such material as may be available in the Department of Commerce concerning the number of animals that are being shipped abroad for the use of belligerents may be sent to you.

I may add that there are no restrictions on the exportation of horses and mules to any foreign country.

Sincerely yours,

CORDELL HULL.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
BUREAU OF FOREIGN AND DOMESTIC COMMERCE,
Washington, October 24, 1939.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: With reference to your letter of October 18, we have been unofficially informed that representatives of the French Government are going to Texas to purchase horses and mules. We have no information as to the extent of these contemplated purchases at the present time but will gladly advise you if we hear anything further in this connection.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES W. YOUNG, *Director.*

Letter Carriers' Convention Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARTIN L. SWEENEY
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, November 3, 1939

ADDRESS BY HON. MARTIN L. SWEENEY, OF OHIO

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an address delivered by me at the Thirty-second Convention of the National Association of Letter Carriers, at Milwaukee, Wis., Labor Day, September 4, 1939.

The address is as follows:

The Chair will now recognize Secretary M. T. Finnan.

Secretary FINNAN. My brothers, no occasion in which I have participated in the long years of this association has brought me greater pleasure, nor has it found in me greater response, than the duty which I am about to perform. I am to introduce to you a man who needs no introduction. I am to introduce to you one of the greatest, outstanding Members of the House of Representatives; a man who has given the best that is in him to the constituency of his district, and that district has honored him by reelection from time to time, and in doing so they have honored themselves.

This gentleman has been your champion, your friend, and your counselor. His name is a household word wherever a letter carrier's family resides, from Hawaii in the west to Puerto Rico in the east. He is one of the most learned, able statesmen in Congress. He is a man who has made a deep study of postal affairs. He is a man who has stood ready at all times to advance measures that would improve the working conditions of letter carriers—and God bless him and his family for a piece of legislation that has been enacted that will make the name of SWEENEY forever remembered. [Applause and cheers.] I present Hon. MARTIN L. SWEENEY, of Cleveland, Ohio.

(Those present arose, applauded, and cheered.)

Hon. MARTIN L. SWEENEY. Mr. Chairman, national officers, delegates to this golden-jubilee convention, ladies, and gentlemen, my congratulations to this great organization gathered here at Milwaukee to celebrate a very important event—the founding of this great organization 50 years ago. I hope that you will have a very successful convention; in fact, I know you will, and the regret that I have is that I must leave today to go to your brother clerks' convention in Houston, Tex. Otherwise, I would be very happy to stay here and properly celebrate this golden jubilee as it should be celebrated.

I salute the delegation from Ohio here today, who are my fellow Buckeyes, and I salute especially Branch 40, of Cleveland, Ohio. [Applause and cheers.] I want to let you in on a secret. It is not a secret any longer. It is public knowledge. Branch 40 is an enthusiastic branch of the letter carriers. It is a militant branch with a conscientious membership. They made elaborate preparations to come to this golden-jubilee convention. They were going to be arrayed like Solomon in all his glory. They secured very nifty uniforms and, lo and behold, last Thursday afternoon when delivery was made to the post-office building, it was discovered that all the shirts had been stolen. [Laughter.] I was at a loss to know whether they could get suitable uniforms in the short time; in fact, I expected them to come here in their B. V. D.'s, but I am glad to see them here in the substitute uniforms that they have secured.

I am going to recommend that you adopt a constitutional amendment—in fact, if you do not adopt it, I am going to make an appeal to the President of the United States, who is now changing our holidays, as you know [laughter], to issue a proclamation to prohibit the letter carriers and clerks from having their convention at the same time. It makes it tough for Members of Congress with bad "dogs" to get around to both of them. [Laughter.] It would be a fine thing if you could space the time a little, because I know that you exchange greetings with the clerks and they are your coworkers. You are both part of the great American Federation of Labor. You have so many things in common many of us would like, if the time permitted, to attend both conventions.

I am very happy to follow the last speaker. I want to pay this tribute to Jess Donaldson. I have watched many men in that Department. They are all fine individuals, but I do not know of a more conscientious servant in the entire Federal service than Jess Donaldson. [Applause.] Kindly, courteous, efficient, recognizing his responsibility to the Department that he represents, and recognizing his responsibility to the great army of men in that Department, we have always found him a very helpful individual in the problems that confront the Post Office Committees of the House and Senate. In fact, I want to say now that our recent victory in meeting the ruling of the Comptroller General that the substitutes were not part of the Post Office Department was due in a large measure to the kindly advice, the encouragement, and the assistance of Jess Donaldson. We were able to pass that bill for whatever it is worth (it is a start) and to escape a veto.

Just yesterday I received the Comptroller General's opinion and have not had time to digest it personally. However, your national officers will consider it in the discussions of this convention, I think, and if there be any doubt about some of the rulings or the opinions, there is no question in my mind that if correction must be had, when Congress convenes in January our committee will take under advisement a proposal to make those corrections.

The big thing is this: We now have a law that the suffering substitutes are part of the Post Office Department. [Applause.] It has been a hard fight, a tremendous fight, for substitutes to get that recognition over a span of many years. Many of us recall the lean days, before the advent of the 40-hour week or the 44-hour week, what distressed conditions the substitutes experienced, and how we had to plead again and again to the Congress to give us some aid. This is another demonstration of the activity of your national officers in battling for this legislation and kindred legislation.

You may well be proud of President Gainor—you may well be proud of him I say—because his has been a labor of love to the organization that he has represented over a quarter of a century. I must say with a great deal of pride that he stands here in the city of Milwaukee and his heart throbs as he remembers the pioneers of 50 years ago who laid the cornerstone of this organization, proud that he was privileged for 25 years—a little more—to follow in their footsteps, unflinchingly, though the road was hard at times. As the verbal torpedoes were directed against the ship of state that he was steering, he knew that as long as men are human and they have human traits, there will be misunderstandings and differences of opinion, but he knew that his objective always was right and good for this organization that has honored him. I have watched him in the harness in Washington. I have watched him with his able worker, Mike Finnan, make the rounds of Congressmen's offices, appearing before the committees, representing your viewpoint, carrying out the mandates of this and every other convention honestly and without fear of contradiction from any man, standing up for what he believed to be right.

I at this time salute those two able workers of your organization, President Gainor and Mike Finnan. [Applause and cheers.]

I have always made it a practice, as those of you who have heard me speak before know, never to lose sight of an opportunity in any public address to a group of postal workers to encourage them to strive and strive again for better conditions, and so, as I read President Gainor's report in the letter carriers' magazine, I read of what took place here in Milwaukee 50 years ago when they laid the foundation for this organization, when

they set up a program in their agenda, when they said, "We are going to strive to get for letter carriers $100 a month." One hundred dollars a month may sound a little out of place now, but that was the standard wage for which they were striving—a living wage at that time.

It was the beginning of the drive to knock at the doors of Congress and to present the legitimate demands that they always do present, without being in fear or trembling of any political postmaster, of any political President, if you will. Civil service is a fine institution, but civil service must never be used to the point where men's minds are shackled, where their mentalities are suppressed, and they cannot speak openly to benefit their own conditions and that of their fellow men. [Applause.]

Certainly no one wants to have the letter carrier on his beat stopping every 5 minutes talking with the housewife about the election of a town clerk or judge or engaging in promiscuous political activity. Certainly, no one wants to see the clerk at his box, throwing his schemes, become inefficient by discussing partisan politics with his colleague or coworker, but once that day's work is done, once that man comes to the meeting of his branch, he certainly has a right to speak on public questions and local questions. [Applause.] He certainly has a right to speak to the Congressman who represents him. They are only public servants, and he has a right to register his appeals and to lay his appeals before the legislative body, the only body to which he can look for relief.

The last Democratic Postmaster General before the present one goes down in history as not a friend of the postal service. You remember those days when the service was demoralized—and I say this with kindness to the individual who is now departed, but I am relating a historical fact—by the arbitrary attitude of an individual who said, "We are going to effect economies in government at the expense of the postal employees. We are going to put the Post Office Department on a paying basis, pay as you go, if you will." Certainly, anyone who has studied the great Postal Service knows that that is not the philosophy of this great service. The late Clyde Kelly went all over this country preaching that doctrine. [Applause.] Again and again he stood up in the Congress of the United States to destroy that fallacy. Later he was aided by that champion of all champions, Senator JIM MEAD, who again fearlessly proclaimed the proposition that the Post Office Department is based on service and is not a commodity to be sold at a profit; that it is not to be run on a penny-wise, pound-foolish basis. We have been successful in carrying out that philosophy of service.

I think the great American public has a fine feeling toward the Post Office Department. It is the closest of the Federal departments to their firesides. Their contact with their Government is first with the Post Office Department. The letter carrier all over the country is respected by his constituents, by his neighbors. They see in him epitomized the Government itself. They watch his efficiency. They know how, in season and out, in heat or cold, he is doing his duty efficiently, and I say there is no group of men in the entire Federal service who give more efficiency than the post-office employees of Uncle Sam. [Applause.]

I say that with your auxiliary, the strong arm of this organization, you can do great things. You have security, as compared to other groups today, but better still, you want to retain that security. Who knows but that in the next session of Congress, an economy wave may start again? Who knows but that an attempt may be made to inflict the vicious furlough system? Who knows but that a penny-wise, pound-foolish administration of government may be in vogue again, as it was in 1933 for a while when the Economy Act was perfected?

You just can't effect economies in government by destroying the purchasing power of the personnel. It just can't be done. Somehow, big interests seem to think that is the way to do it. Why, I wouldn't doubt but that in a few months those who shout "Balance the Budget," those who say "You are building up an army of indigents on W. P. A.," may come to Congress and point out "Why, if we can hire people for $60 a month on W. P. A., we can certainly cut the letter carrier who gets $2,100 a year, or the post-office clerk who gets a like figure, and bring them down to that starvation wage."

Oh, I say, that's a possibility. I hope that no Member of Congress, no colleague of mine, will ever sponsor such a silly philosophy. [Applause.] I would like to see, and I hope there always will be, the employees of this great service militantly setting a standard for Government employees, setting the high standard that you fought for to date.

Through all the struggles of 50 years, you have had some accomplishments; you have made considerable gains, and those gains have trickled down somehow to the little fellow who is unorganized. Your constant fight for recognition, aided by the great American Federation of Labor, has brought in my opinion, encouragement to the great masses who are now organized in many parts of the country, and to the hundreds of thousands more still unorganized, who ought to be organized for their mutual benefit, for the protection of their wives and families, who believe in collective bargaining [applause], who believe that men must unite and get together to meet the challenge of the machine age that is slowly crushing civilization in this country.

Those are gains that you helped to pioneer; those are gains you may well be proud of now as you sit here in this session 50 years after the pioneers built this organization, and say, "We did something in those last 50 years in the field of labor."

We can sympathize, we can resolve and congratulate organized labor everywhere today, Labor Day, in the progress they have made in our present day and generation. The selfish industrialist today has no place in modern society. He has to meet the issue; he has to recognize that those who toil are part and parcel of a joint enterprise; that they have to share in those profits. He has to insure for those individuals and their families a decent annual living wage—I was proud to see the American Federation of Labor, of which your President Gainor is a vice president, declare in its council meeting in Atlantic City—and probably will reaffirm its statement again in its convention in October—that they are striving now for an annual living wage for all employees. [Applause.] When that day comes—and I hope it does come rapidly—it will dispel the fear that hovers over the homes of hundreds of thousands of families today, of men who are in seasonable work, like the automotive industry, who may work only 4 or 5 months a year, and then after their unemployment compensation has run out, become victims of charity, on the dole, or receive local assistance.

So I believe I am correct in saying that the letter carriers and the postal employees of this country can take a lot of credit for the advancements made by labor up to this year of our Lord 1939. [Applause.]

I want to pay a tribute now to the Postmaster General of the United States. I made a reference to a former Postmaster General, and I may say I made it with a degree of charity, speaking from a historical standpoint only, in an effort to bring before you the distinction between individuals, sometimes, and their respective philosophies. Perhaps I can say better than any man in this country, as a Member of the House Post Office and Post Roads Committee, what I think of the Postmaster General of the United States. He is of my political faith, yet I can disagree with him, and I do disagree with him. There are some things about the New Deal that are screwy, but there are certain substantial things about the New Deal that I do glory in. [Applause.] I glory in the fact that the New Deal made possible collective bargaining in this country by law. [Applause.] I glory in the fact that the New Deal is responsible for a wage and hour bill [applause] that lifts up from serfdom the track walker in Texas who got 19 cents an hour, to at least a minimum of 25 cents an hour; that takes out of industry child labor—wherever it exists—and assures a minimum wage and shorter hours for those who were helpless before this sort of legislation.

Those things I credit the New Deal with, and I am part of that philosophy and go along with it. I am here to say that I can say with truth—because I am at variance with some of the political issues of the New Deal and its chairman, who is the chairman of the Democratic National Committee as well as Postmaster General—that there never was a Postmaster General in the United States who was more efficient, who was more kindly, who was more humane toward employees of the Post Office Department than Jim Farley. [Applause and cheers.] I want to give credit where credit is due—and that is a fact. He has been efficient; he has been a gentleman all the way through. His fine staff of men, the personnel under him, contact our committee daily when we are in session. They contact your national officers and legislative committees. They know full well that what I say is true.

Time will not permit me to go further. I want to review your great parade and experience the thrill that I know your officers will get when they commemorate the memory of those who built this organization. I would like to stay in Milwaukee a long time. I belong to the Consumers' League [laughter and applause]—if you know what I mean. I understand the police force of Milwaukee have issued a standing order throughout the country notifying the police departments elsewhere that if any native of Milwaukee at any time or any place becomes a victim of amnesia [laughter], all they have to do is go out and get a bottle of Schlitz and hold that before him, and after he drinks one bottle he will tell you he is from Milwaukee, and after he drinks two he will tell you his first name. [Laughter.]

I do hope you will have a very enjoyable, successful convention. It has been a pleasure to be here, and I hope when we go back to the next session of Congress we will carry out as far as we are able to the mandate of this convention as expressed by the majority vote when you get into your deliberations within a day or two.

Thank you very much. [Rising applause, cheers.]

Milk in Chicago

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, November 3, 1939

ARTICLE FROM FORTUNE MAGAZINE

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD portions of an article published

in the November issue of Fortune magazine on the subject Milk in Chicago.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Fortune for November 1939]

MILK IN CHICAGO—WHEN MEADOWMOOR DAIRIES CUT THE PRICE OF MILK 2 CENTS, THE BOMBS BEGAN TO BURST—THEN CAME THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT WITH CHARGES OF CONSPIRACY

Most Americans know that there is a milk problem. They know it because milk is continually in the news and the news is always bad. It is of farmers who, having milked the American cow, proceed to dump her product into the country lanes in fierce milk strikes. It is of racketeering unions who upset milk-delivery wagons in the city streets. It is of endless investigations into the Milk Trust, wherein the National Dairy Products Corporation and the Borden Co. are damned for manipulating the prices of milk and milk products to the benefit of their shareholders. But behind the headlines in the news Americans know there is a milk problem in a very practical and specific sense. They know that whereas the farmer gets between 3 and 5 cents for his milk they are asked to pay from 9 to 16 cents for it. They know that this is neither equitable to the farmer nor to the consumer. American ingenuity and American business have a long record of bringing products such as the automobile and the radio and a hundred other marvels to an ever larger public. But in the case of the basic commodity milk it might be said that the last great landmark seems to have been back in 1893, when pasteurization came into use. Since then, to be sure, there have been many advances in providing a clean milk supply. But the problem of low-price mass distribution remains unsolved. Between 1926 and 1936, indeed, the per capita consumption of milk dropped by 3 percent.

Because the milk business is so antediluvian when compared to other departments of American industry, it would seem that there should be easy and simple remedies. Yet the inquirer into the problem of milk is well advised to proceed with some amount of caution. A quart of milk delivered at the doorstep—cold and white and pure—should be easy to understand. It has been squirted into a pail by the hands of a farmer or by a milking machine. It has been transported by train or truck to the city where it is pasteurized and bottled.

There is nothing in all this that is not A B C to the average intelligence. But the economics of milk as opposed to its physical production is not simple. The very subject of milk pricing, the manner in which a subsidiary of National Dairy Products Corporation decides to charge the consumer 14 cents for a quart of milk, involves one in an Alice's Wonderland of accounting practice and a metaphysics all its own. But quite aside from the technicalities, the subject of milk is complex, because it leads out into about every problem connected with the American economy. On the one hand, a quart of milk packages in itself the entire farm problem. On the other hand, it poses that central problem of American business—the recurrent problem of whether Americans want a free competitive economy or a price-regulated, monopolistic economy.

It is that particular question which it is well to have in mind in any discussion of milk and milk pricing. But so big and so complex is the milk business that we shall here consider it in two different ways. In the article that appears on page 83 the reader will find a discussion of some of the larger problems of the dairy business and a practical suggestion as to how milk might be brought to the consumer cheaper. Here we shall be looking at a specific city to see how the forces operate that today tend to keep the price of milk so high. Those forces form a pattern, and they might be seen as readily in terms of New York, or Philadelphia, or Boston, or San Francisco, or almost any large American metropolis. But one city above all others invites study, and that city is Chicago. Not only has Chicago milk been subject to prolonged Federal investigation—an investigation that ended in 1938 in the indictment of practically everyone of prominence in its milk business—but the record of Chicago, although fairly typical in its outlines, has produced some shocking extremes. For here it turns out that the one company that has tried to make money by getting milk to the consumer at low prices has had to fight labor, big business, and the Department of Agriculture itself.

That fight constitutes the story of Chicago milk in recent years, but before coming to it it is well to reconnoiter the terrain where it occurred.

There are today about 140 dealers who pasteurize or distribute milk in Chicago. Of these about 42 get all of their milk via the Pure Milk Association, the rest from outside farm cooperatives; but the 42 distribute about 75 percent of the city's total supply. About 50 percent of all Chicago's milk is handled by two large companies. The biggest is the conservative, family-controlled Bowman Dairy Co., which is headed by taciturn Dr. D. B. Peck, but still largely owned by the Bowman family. Last year it did a business of about $26,000,000, of which about $15,000,000 was in fluid-milk and cream sales, the balance in dried milk and other manufactured products, on which it makes all of its profits. The second-largest distributor in Chicago is Borden-Wieland, a kicked-about division of the Borden Co., which last year did a $15,000,000 business, largely in fluid-milk and cream sales. It has been losing about $300,000 a year since 1923, largely owing to the fact that it makes no profitable manufactured products, and is the headache of the Borden management.

Yet it is with a chiseler that the modern story of Chicago's milk really begins, and his tactics have loosened up the tight relations of farmers, dealers, and labor that we have outlined above. The name of the chiseler is W. R. Schaub. And the name of his company is the Meadowmoor Dairies, whose headquarters are in the heart of Chicago's tough West Side, just off Maxwell Street, that half-black, half-white thoroughfare where the pushcart venders sell anything from vegetables to second-hand girdles.

He has broken just about every rule there is in the milk game, both in getting his supply and distributing his product. In his relations with farmers, Schaub disregarded the normal method of payment obtaining in the Chicago area and in most great milksheds. This is the classified or multi-price system. Stripped of its technicalities, this system means that a farmer is paid one price for the milk that a distributor uses in fluid form, another price for milk used for cream, and another price for "surplus" milk that is used for evaporated milk, butter, cheese, and other manufactured products. The actual price received by the farmer is a blend or weighted average of all of these. Thus in December 1930, when prices were high in the Chicago market, farmers in the Pure Milk Association received $2.67 per hundredweight (5.6 cents per quart) for class 1 milk, $1.29 for milk for cream, $1.07 for surplus, and the average or blend worked out to $2.44.

When Schaub came into the market in 1933 the depression had driven prices far below these levels. Farmers were frantic and were selling their milk for any price they could get at roadside stands. So hectic did conditions become that during the summer of 1933 Secretary Wallace, acting under the Agricultural Adjustment Act, stepped in to try to stabilize prices. In November, or about the time Schaub's operations began in earnest, the price of class 1 milk was pegged at $2.10 per hundredweight (4.5 cents per quart) and in that month farmers received a blend price of $1.83. The A. A. A. agreement also attempted to peg the consumer price of milk at 12 cents.

Schaub, along with other independents, fought the agreement in court, and meanwhile, in defiance of the Department of Agriculture, bargained with his farmers on a much less complicated basis. He guaranteed them a flat price of $1.85 per hundredweight, or about 4 cents per quart for all of their milk no matter how used. His farmers were glad to get this price, since it was slightly better than the blend price for milk that other farmers were receiving. Obviously he had a considerable advantage costwise over the bigger dealers who, if they lived up to the agreement, had to pay 4.5 cents a quart for their fluid milk.

Meanwhile Schaub was breaking unwritten laws in other directions. Back in 1932 Meadowmoor had adopted a system of distribution known as the vendor or peddler system. Under this system instead of employing milk drivers, Meadowmoor sold its milk for cash off its platform. Here it was picked up by vendors who then peddled it along their own milk routes. Most of these vendors had been former employees of the large companies and members of 753, but had been laid off in the depression. They bought trucks and went to work for themselves for whatever living they could make. On this system they could deliver Meadowmoor milk for 1 cent under the big companies.

Schaub took over this system but adapted it to store sales, and by means of the stores established larger savings in costs. Whereas a driver or a vendor can deliver only about 300 quarts of milk per day to the home, he can deliver about 1,000 or more quarts to stores, since he sells in larger quantities and makes fewer stops. Getting his milk from his farmers for 4 cents, Schaub sold it off the Meadowmoor platform for 6. The vendor delivered to the store for roughly 7, and the store sold it for about 8½ cents. This was 3½ cents below the price of Bowman and Borden milk. They soon had to come down, but Schaub has usually kept 2 cents under their delivered price.

In the beginning big stores would not handle Meadowmoor milk, and the company had to induce small independents to enter the field. In a single week during 1933 Schaub claims that one of his drivers helped start 10 or a dozen small shops. The whole method of store mechandising was hateful to Local 753, because store sales mean fewer drivers. While Chicago dealers had always had some store sales, they had never pushed them hard. A storekeeper is a far more changeable person and a far shrewder bargainer than is a housewife, and many a storekeeper treats with 3 or 4 companies at once playing one off against the other. It was not, indeed, until 1938 that Borden and Bowman milk was sold in stores at 2 cents under the price charged on their delivery routes.

THE STRIKE

Schaub got his first taste of the wrath of the organized interests of Chicago during the milk strike of January 1934—just 3 months after he took over. The strike was touched off when the Department of Agriculture gave up its first milk-marketing code as a bad job. Immediately the officials of Pure Milk and the big Chicago dealers met to try to reach a price agreement of their own. The dealers, pressed by competition from Meadowmoor and other independents, demanded a reduction in the price of milk paid to farmers. The Pure Milk Association refused. The strike was called on January 6, and 3 days later the tie-up was nearly complete.

Nevertheless, a few independents, among them Meadowmoor, decided to run the blockade. They had a stormy time of it. Along the country roads armies of irate farmers marched to and fro, dumping milk trucks, stopping trains, and puncturing milk tanks. In the city, members of Local 753—temporarily thrown out of work and hating the "guts" of the independents anyway—did their bit. In a single night half a dozen trucks were dumped into the Chicago River. The big dairies could do little to stop the fracas. The independents, however, were quick to interpret the strike as a gang-up against them.

For this they had reason. The Pure Milk Association stated that the strike had three purposes: (1) To get the Federal marketing agreement reestablished; (2) to keep distributors from hammering down prices; (3) to drive the cut-rate dairies out of business. In an embattled statement the independents blurted out to the papers: "Developments which are now apparent to everyone indicate collusion by the Milk Trust to put the independents out of business. * * * The independents insist that public demand make necessary the continuance of the cash-and-carry milk store. The public is entitled to milk at the lowest possible price."

The strike, the worst in Chicago's history, was finally called off on January 11, and before the month was out the Department of Agriculture was back in the market with a second marketing code, which lasted until March 1935, when the Department again withdrew. Schaub disregarded the second marketing order as he had the first, and continued to pay his farmers on a flat price basis. Meanwhile his store method of selling continued under heavy attack, until finally Meadowmoor Dairies got out an injunction against Local 753 prohibiting picketing and violence. Appeals have kept it in and out of the courts ever since. The case reveals a long and bitter record.

THE INDICTMENTS

Such is the stuff out of which the lawsuit of *Meadowmoor Dairies* v. *Local 753* is written. But the suit was not to remain simply the quarrel of a cut-rate dairy company and a union, for it was undoubtedly the reverberations of the case that led Assistant Attorney General Thurman Arnold to give the Chicago milk situation a long and searching inquiry during 1937. The investigation resulted in grand jury indictments returned in 1938 against just about everyone of any prominence in the industry from President D. B. Peck of the Bowman Dairy Co. and Charles L. Dressel, president of Borden-Wieland, to Mr. Fitchie and Mr. Sumner of the union. The indictments charged that between 1935 and 1937 a conspiracy existed to fix prices in the area to producers and to consumers and to keep independents out of the market. Pure Milk and the big distributors, so the charges ran, fixed the prices. Pure Milk then refused to sell to anyone not adhering to them; the dealers in their turn made it tough for chiselers through their control of the Milk Dealers' Bottle Exchange, which refused to return bottles to independents. Local 753, it was charged, chipped in with acts of violence, and finally the Board of Health discriminated against producers and distributors not adhering to the price scheme.

The Government's case has not been tried and the evidence is still locked up in the safe of Leo Tierney, the government prosecutor. Certainly it opens up new vistas. Dr. Bundesen, for example, has always been fair to Meadowmoor, according to Schaub, and his troubles come from a different direction. Back in 1933, as we have already noted, he made it difficult for independent farmers to get adequate inspection. More recently he has been under attack for his dubious role in the failure of Chicago to allow paper milk containers to be used in the city. The Mayor Kelly milk ordinance of 1935 makes it mandatory that milk be sold in bottled form and this has been interpreted to mean glass. At present both the American Can Co. and the Ex-Cell-O Corporation and an independent dairy, Fieldcrest, have suits against the city to force it to allow containers. Dr. Bundesen says the whole matter is up to the city council. But the pressures on the city council are obvious. Distributors have a big investment in bottling equipment and labor knows full well that paper containers tend to facilitate store sales.

The Government's case has not come to trial because last summer the indictments were quashed by Federal Judge Charles E. Woodward, reinforced by a remarkable opinion. The opinion held that an antitrust suit will not stand up in the case of the marketing of milk because the Sherman Act has here been completely abrogated by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act, which was passed in 1937 to supersede the A. A. A. As interpreted by the judge the act makes the Secretary of Agriculture solely responsible for the manner in which milk products are marketed in every shed of the country. "The Sherman Act," said the judge, "embodied the philosophy of unrestrained competition. Later legislation has embodied the philosophy of collectivism and harmful competition."

THE PAY-OFF

Judge Woodward's are weighty words and happen to be prophetic. Mr. Arnold has taken his case up to the Supreme Court, but meanwhile the forces of collectivism are hard at work in the Chicago area. For this summer the Department of Agriculture moved in with a third marketing order at the instance of a majority of the farmers, dominated by a tremendous vote of the Pure Milk Association. The new order will cut directly across Meadowmoor's tactics of paying a flat price for its milk, arrived at by independent bargaining. It will force every dairy in the shed to report monthly on how it has sold its milk—its net effect will be to make every dealer pay precisely the same price for milk going into fluid use. It will take away from Meadowmoor the competitive advantage we have noted it enjoyed over its larger rivals in the matter of its milk supply. The order is disconcerting to Schaub, especially as many of his own farmers voted for it. "They brought it in, now let them see how they like it," he says. He is bitterly opposed to it both because it will cut down on profits and because business to him means open bargaining. He sees no more reason why he should be told how to buy his milk than why he should be restricted in his manner of selling it.

His is a fair question. Here is a small company that, in the course of 6 years, has built up sales of $2,000,000 during the time that Bowman and Borden have both seen a decline in their sales volume. Here is also a company that has done something that older companies have not been able to do—make a profit on fluid-milk sales. And here finally is a company that for a profit has reduced the price of milk to the public. Yet it has met the opposition of labor, the scorn of larger companies, and again faces the Government itself.

So far as the Government is concerned, Meadowmoor faces a losing fight. The American dairy farmer is no longer a competitive animal, and, living in an industrial world, probably cannot afford to be. Mr. Schaub's method of payment to his farmers had the virtue of simplicity, but it is also well to note that he profited by it only because a huge bloc of farmers in the area was trying to enforce a different scheme. Whether their system is better or not would lead far into the realm of milk pricing—"from whose bourne no traveler returns"—and to no purpose. A majority of farmers voted for the agreement, and Mr. Schaub is going to have to abide by it.

So far as Mr. Schaub's distributive methods are concerned, he has a great deal on his side. It is charged that Meadowmoor sweats its labor, and it is unquestionably true that Meadowmoor venders work longer hours than do the members of Local 753. But the vender system of distribution is not the important part of Meadowmoor's technique. The important thing is that the company has aggressively pushed and dramatized the cut-rate method of store distribution. This method has spread in Chicago until at present about 50 per cent of the business of Borden and Bowman is of this kind. But, as the article on page 83 shows, this method of selling milk might be pushed much further if the chain stores took a larger hand in it. For already they have shown that in some cases it is possible to pay the farmer 5 cents for his milk and sell it for 9.

But the significance of Meadowmoor does not lie entirely in results achieved. The significance lies precisely in that epithet that is most often heard hurled at Schaub's head, the word "chiseler." Schaub has been a "chiseler." He has even broken the law. But the "chiseler" and nonconformist has his virtues. For a dozen years the large dealers have declared themselves to be in a jam. They have pointed to the demands of the farmer on the one side and the demands from labor on the other, and, having given that defense of rigid milk prices, have felt vindicated and gone their way. Occasionally there arises a small company that, not too scrupulous as to its means, shows that something can be done, and does it. And, like a sputtering match which throws light over a room and reveals its shapes and outline, such a company illuminates an industry. The milk business needs such illumination, and the light defines the two alternatives that now seem open: Either the industry will drift until it is made an outright public utility or the big units will reduce prices and return to the competitive wars with some faith that they are worth winning.

Agricultural Exports and Imports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 3, 1939

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, while the farmers' markets are being bartered away under the trade-agreement program, I feel that the record of agricultural exports and imports should be kept current, therefore I am inserting a table covering a 9-month period.

Agricultural exports, imports, and trade balances, 9 months ending September 1938 and 1939

Agricultural products	9 months ending September—		Increase (+), decrease (−)
	1938	1939	
Total agricultural:			
Exports	$602,674,000	$418,441,000	−$184,233,000
Imports	711,647,000	794,700,000	+83,053,000
Import balance	108,973,000	376,259,000	+267,286,000
Total trade	1,314,321,000	1,213,141,000	−101,180,000
AGRICULTURAL EXPORTS			
Cotton, unmanufactured	160,550,000	121,964,000	−38,586,000
Tobacco, unmanufactured	92,822,000	61,317,000	−31,505,600
Foodstuffs (total)	331,369,000	216,604,000	−114,765,000
Corn	86,890,000	12,253,000	−74,637,000
Wheat	70,410,000	34,199,000	−36,211,000
Wheat flour	17,790,000	18,534,000	+744,000
Oil cake and meal	6,929,000	6,595,000	−334,000
Vegetables [1]	9,824,000	11,863,000	+2,039,000
Fruits [1]	62,509,000	57,040,000	−5,469,000
Meat products	21,048,000	24,392,000	+3,344,000
Lard [1]	13,587,000	15,397,000	+1,810,000
Dairy products [2]	4,429,000	5,104,000	+675,000
Other foodstuffs	37,953,000	31,227,000	−6,726,000
Other agricultural products	17,933,000	18,556,000	+623,000
Total agricultural exports	602,674,000	418,441,000	−184,233,000

[1] Fresh, dried, and canned.
[2] Except fresh milk.
Source: U. S. Department of Commerce figures (Oct. 26, 1939).

The Relief Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE J. CONNERY
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, November 2, 1939

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Speaker, now that the House and Senate have acted on the neutrality measure, the most important matter which faces Members of Congress is the working out of some of our all-important domestic problems. Let me say right here that I believe the Congress should remain in session if for no other reason than to provide some relief for the millions of unemployed and needy in our country.

One year ago this time approximately 135,000 persons were working on W. P. A. in Massachusetts. During the past year this number has been cut to 73,000, causing untold misery and distress. I have been told that 3 weeks ago there were on file in the W. P. A. Massachusetts headquarters at Boston more than 100,000 certifications of those in need for these 73,000 jobs. Mind you, each and every one of these 100,000 persons have been declared as needy and eligible for relief.

Under the present law, those employed on W. P. A. for 18 months or more are forced to take a 30-day lay-off. With reference to this 30-day lay-off group in Massachusetts it has been estimated that 90 percent of those dropped from the rolls are striving to be reinstated, being compelled to do so because of the absolute impossibility of their securing work elsewhere.

Many of those included in the quota-reduction groups—those persons who were laid off in May and June because of dwindling appropriations—have been reinstated, taking the places of those later laid off under the 18-month rule. A few newly certified cases also received assignments to projects. It can readily be seen, therefore, that the greater portion of those laid off under the 18-month rule cannot be reassigned and at the same time private industry has made provisions for but very few. I am told that the point has been reached in Massachusetts where it is impossible for the officials to grant an assignment to one person until another is laid off under the 18-month rule, dies, or quits the W. P. A. of his or her own volition.

Hardly a day passes that I do not find attached to the pleas of these unemployed ample evidence of their eligibility, distress, and plight in the form of rent bills, doctors' bills, notices advising gas and electricity are to be shut off, pawn tickets, and other such proofs.

All sorts of cases can be cited. It is pitiful when a man with a pawn ticket for his suit of clothes, on which he received $2, cannot get any help. I have another case of a woman with four children, all of school age. Formerly on a sewing project, she was dropped under the 18 months' rule and has now been unable to secure any income for 8 or 9 weeks; her husband was recently taken to a State hospital and she has received an eviction notice effective in a week. A special plea has been made in her behalf, but the harassed W. P. A. officials could only reply that the quota is filled and that they will endeavor to do the best they can in her behalf.

It is no exaggeration to say that it is common for me to receive from eligibles threats of suicide because of their desperation and destitution.

All of these conditions, Mr. Speaker, have been caused by the failure of this Congress to appropriate sufficient funds to care for our needy citizens, who surely have a greater claim upon the Congress than the insurance companies and banks which we rescued a few years ago from potential bankruptcy. To my mind, the greatest danger our country faces is not from without but from within—from those driven to desperation by the unwillingness of Congress to properly provide for their temporary needs.

The appropriations committee on deficiencies will, I understand, meet within the next few weeks. Why not now? Congress could very properly ask the deficiency committee to meet early next week and report within a few days a deficiency appropriation which would permit of our providing funds for the needy. Personally, I sincerely trust that every Member of the House will vote against adjourning this session of Congress until we have shown our interest in the welfare of our people by appropriating sufficient funds to provide shelter, clothing, and food for those of our citizens in real need.

In addition to the ten or twelve million people unemployed, Members of the Congress should bear in mind and consider the plight of the 15,000,000 American school and college graduates, a large percentage of whom have never yet been privileged to find employment. To my mind immediate consideration should be given to providing some means whereby these school and college graduates, many of whom made many sacrifices to obtain an education, will be privileged to place their talents at work. Surely young America, as well as other Americans, is deserving of consideration on the part of the Congress.

Twenty-first Convention of the National Federation of Post Office Clerks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT THOMAS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, November 3, 1939

ADDRESS BY HON. MARTIN L. SWEENEY, OF OHIO

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, I include therein the following speech by the Honorable MARTIN L. SWEENEY, of Ohio, which was delivered before the Twenty-first Convention of the National Federation of Post Office Clerks, held in Houston, Tex., September 6, 1939:

Mr. Toastmaster, distinguished guests, ladies, and gentlemen, at the outset I want to extend to you the greetings of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads of the House of Representatives. I also want to extend to you the greetings of the chairman, Congressman MILTON ROMJUE. He asked me to make this personal statement to you: That due to unforeseen circumstances he was prevented from being here tonight. I am sure if he were here

you would extend to him a very hospitable greeting, because he is a very fine Member of Congress; a worker in your behalf for many years in his long term of service on that committee. If you will permit me to indulge, I would like at this time to pay a tribute to the man who represents this city in Congress—this district—the Honorable ALBERT THOMAS, who is on his way by boat, but will not be here until Friday. He is a splendid type of American, a good legislator, and a good friend of the post-office employees. [Applause.] He always comes to our aid when we appeal to him in behalf of legislation affecting your interest.

I want to extend my congratulations now, lest I forget, to this convention in its action today in making unanimous the election of the "Big Four," as we call them, which insures their return to Washington again. From my contact with them in the past 8 or 9 years in Washington, I know of no greater group, a more sincere group, or a more modest group, if you will, than your splendid chairman, Leo George, Bill Horner, Bill Otte, and Johnny Torka. They are not the belligerent type of lobbyists or legislative agents; they reflect credit to your organization. Sometimes they don't get what they want, but always with a smile and always with a gentlemanly attitude they present their legitimate demands. It is well that you should place your confidence in men of that type. It is well that you should remember that Leo George was fired from his Government position for his activities in behalf of your organization.

It is well for the younger members to bear in mind that he was suspended for speaking out and exercising his constitutional right to speak out as an employee of the Post Office Department on matters concerning the welfare of the employees at a time when it was dangerous in the city of Chicago, and in the Nation, some years back. That is all history to the older members. I always take the occasion, whenever I speak to a group of postal employees, be it in some obscure hamlet or in a metropolitan center, to encourage you to stand up like Americans always for your constitutional rights, always remembering that you are civil-service employees; that the Government expects and does get from you a certain degree of efficiency in return for the security wage they pay you, and in return for the benefits that you have in serving Uncle Sam; but no Congress, no executive, has the right to foreclose your voice or your lips from speaking out as American citizens on any fundamental question that affects the welfare of you and your fellow citizens and your family. Of course, that doesn't mean that the letter carriers as a group can engage in a political argument with the corner grocery man, or that the clerks can stop arbitrarily and discuss politics, or discuss the ball game, or anything of that kind with his fellow clerks to the detriment of the Service. You don't do that, because you are highly trained, but once you take off that uniform, if you are a carrier, and once you leave the post office, if you are a clerk, and you go to your branch meetng or you participate in matters concerning your welfare and that of your families and your Nation, you are exercising your constitutional rights, and no man, no power, no Congress, can ever take that away from you. [Applause.]

I am glad to bring you the greetings of the great convention that is being held in Milwaukee. Your fellow workers are having a splendid convention celebrating their golden jubilee of organization. Theirs is a historical convention. They are having a great time up there. They picked a good town in which to have a good time. [Applause.]

I was up there the other day and the only complaint I have to register is that some of us who were invited to be guest speakers, like Jesse Donaldson, representatives of the Post Office Department, some of the Congressmen, Senator MEAD, and others, had to fly back and forth to make both conventions. You don't give us much chance to even get beered up in Milwaukee; that is, those of us who are members of the consumers' league. We ought to have time to finish up in Milwaukee, then get rested up and take a plane down here to the Lone Star State, and, if we so desire, to get "oiled up" down here. [Laughter.] I don't think your convention is going to take any action about changing the date of your convention. I have been thinking seriously of talking turkey to the President. You know he has control of Thanksgiving Day now. [Laughter.] He has advanced Thanksgiving a week. I am going to make a plea to Mr. Roosevelt the first time I meet him and see if he won't issue a proclamation spacing these conventions about 2 weeks apart, so that we Congressmen won't have to be flying back and forth to keep engagements.

The convention that I am privileged to attend here is significant to me because it marks my first visit to the Lone Star State and completes now my record of being in every State in the Union. [Applause.] I am visibly affected by the atmosphere, the environment of this metropolitan city of the South. Its real hospitality and friendly atmosphere almost meets you everywhere you go. It is a typical American city, like a giant stretching and expanding, destined, I believe, to be one of the greatest cities in the world. The committee in charge of this convention is doing a splendid job to make the visit of everybody here a pleasant one. I want to register my personal thanks to your local committee for the fine work they have done in making this, a great convention, the success that it is. [Applause.]

I was buttonholed out on the street this morning by some of the delegates. They got hold of me and said, "You are going to talk tonight, and we want you to put in a plug for a certain town east of the Rockies that wants the convention." "What town is that?" I asked. "That is Cincinnati," "Well, how can I put in a plug like that?" They said, "Well, you can say this, can't you; that on your way to Houston you passed through Cincinnati. Tell the convention that." [Laughter.] Then I walked down the street, and another gang buttonholed me and said, "We understand you are going to talk tonight and we want you to put in a plug for St. Louis." "How can I do that?" I asked. [Laughter, applause.] Then they said: "Well you can tell the audience that on your way home you are going to pass through St. Louis." So I am between the devil and the deep blue sea, and the only way I can square myself is to go out for the golf tournament and take sides with an open mind.

CONDEMNS FALSE ECONOMY

We have just finished the first session of the Seventy-sixth Congress, and I am just going to take a moment to talk about that. Perhaps it will not go down in history as some of the previous sessions will, or have gone, with its record of advancement of legislation that affects your group, but we did make some gains, and we did recognize the fact that we wanted to get legislation through that would escape a veto, possibly, and make a steady gain. I should say the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads of the House is a nonpartisan committee. It is a splendid group of gentlemen who are actuated only in serving the Government and serving the great employees of the Post Office Department; they reached the conclusion that we were going to hold the line in this session of Congress. We were not going to allow any false economy or false philosophy to penetrate the deliberation of that body. In other words, we were not going to permit wage cuts at a time when we thought it was dangerous; we were not going to follow the penny-wise pound-foolish administrators of government at this or any other time, who think that is the way to save money and effect economies—by wage cuts.

Many of us are still on the committee who remember the rigid Economy Act of 1933 that unbalanced the budget of every poor postal employee and made no material gain for the country. It caused hardships in the homes of countless thousands of postal employees, and, as you all know, every vestige of that was repealed in 18 months. So this committee was determined not to have a repetition of that again, and I say to that we have been successful. There was no attempt at a furlough; there was no attempt to cut wages; and gains heretofore made by the allied postal groups of the country are safe. And, so far as I am concerned—and I think it is true of the other members of the committee—they will be safe for a long time to come. [Applause.]

We passed the substitute bill; we made some progress. Perhaps this measure was not the kind of bill all of us would have agreed upon, but we did meet the objections of the Comptroller General, who ruled that the substitutes were not employees of the Post Office Department, even though they paid into the retirement fund, and were compelled to report every day. Now we have a law that declares that they are part of the Post Office Department; they are employees. Substitutes are given their annual leave and sick leave under proper rules set up by the Department, which are now published. If it needs any correction, that can be made next session of Congress.

Let me say in passing, I want to pay tribute to the fine part your organization played in passing that substitute bill, the splendid cooperation of your legislative agent, Bill Horner; Leo George, your president; and others down the line; and the fine presentation made by the charming lady who is the head of your auxiliary, who appeared before the committee, Mrs. Herman Lowe [applause], who went out courageously on behalf of the wives, families, and children of the substitutes in the Postal Service. I say it is a good omen, it is a fine sign, to have your auxiliary leaders come before a committee and present the women's viewpoint, the wife's viewpoint, the mother's viewpoint, the housewife's viewpoint, the woman who has to balance her budget, and tell the committee just what is in the minds of their membership. So I take my hat off to you, Mrs. Lowe, for the fine presentation you made on that occasion.

I also take this opportunity to pay tribute to one of the finest public servants that I have ever had the pleasure of knowing in my congressional career for the last 8 or 9 years, a man who goes out of his way, not only to assist your legislative agents, but also Members of Congress, bringing the experience of 33 years to our doorstep, to we younger Members of Congress the supreme knowledge that he has. A career man, a man who is outstanding in the service of the Post Office Department, doing a good job for his country, doing a good job for his Government, coming down before the committees of the House and Senate, making his presentation according to his conscience and according to his lights as affecting his Government and the welfare of the employees, and who aided us splendidly in our substitute legislation when we had to make compromises—I refer to our friend who is here tonight, Jesse Donaldson, of the Post Office Department. [Applause.]

So, outside of the substitute bill, the abandonment of Saturday in the computation of time for annual leave—and that was a step in the right direction—again your organization played a prominent part in that, by assisting the committee and by assisting the Members of Congress in voting for that measure.

TAKE PRIDE IN YOUR AFFILIATION

The most important thing, to my way of thinking, is the affiliation of this organization with the great group known as the American Federation of Labor. [Applause.] I take no part in the controversy that is known to all of us that now exists, the division that exists among the leadership of the ranks of labor in this country. I hope to God it is settled; I hope to God there is an adjustment made in the near future; because, if not, this breach only satisfies the selfish industrialist, the class who never measures up to his responsibilities and who not only characterizes

but interprets the man who works for him as a chattel. They follow the old axiom of the Napoleons and Caesars of old, "Divide and conquer." They alone may benefit by this division. You are affiliated with a great branch of this labor group, and I can only speak from experience as one who was an officer in that organization for 10 years, and as one who carried membership in that organization; as one who watched its progress during the past 35 years, and familiar with the gains accomplished.

It was a happy thing to know that the Federation of Post Office Clerks and the Letter Carriers of the country, the national associations, are part and parcel of the great American Federation of Labor. The American Federation of Labor has marched shoulder to shoulder with your legislative agents in every critical battle in Washington. They aided you in the days when Congressman Reilly started the 8-hour law referred to by the distinguished Third Assistant Postmaster General. They aided you back in the days of the 44-hour bill, and again under the leadership of JIM MEAD, when the 40-hour bill was passed. The American Federation of Labor went on record in their convention, notified their members, and put out a campaign by letter and telegram and by personal appeal to the Members of Congress. They gave us great support when those measures were under consideration. So I hail this as a gain, to be affiliated with an organization like that, and I know your membership will grow and it will be gaining strength because not only of the friendship but also the attachment of this organization with the American Federation of Labor.

We have an obligation in this day and age, and I am not going to discuss national affairs very much tonight; it has been discussed already. I think we all know the temper of the people of the Nation. In this room, probably 80 percent of the audience here assembled have a vivid recollection of that last World War. Many of them are men who carried the musket and went across to Flanders Field, who slept in vermin-infested trenches, who came back with weakened lungs from gas, poison gas; and other physical injuries. Others have children who went over there; youngsters, 21 and 22 years of age, who never came back. This is a time to be calm, but it is also a time to remember that the President of the United States has asked us to be neutral, but not in thought.

We have a right to think, as he said, and we can't control the thinking apparatus of anybody, but we should not give any false expression that might stir up anybody. With the recollections of that last World War fresh in our memory in these critical days, we want this country to go forward toward a solution of our domestic problems. We have our own domestic war on our own hands. The tragedy that we have seen as Members of Congress for the past 4 or 5 or 6 years is appalling. When I recite to you—and I think I can give you the experience of most Members of Congress in metropolitan centers—that I have to talk to a hundred persons each day, a hundred citizens who come to me crying for an opportunity to work on W. P. A.; college men, laborers, lawyers, doctors, who under our dislocated economic social system want to support their families, and are glad to get $60 a month, now cut down to $59 per month in some of the metropolitan centers on the W. P. A. That is not a living wage. Stand out, you Federated Post Office Clerks, for a change in this economic system and see that the W. P. A. worker, your brother, is brought up near the level that you enjoy today, that he may get a living wage. [Applause.] Assist the industrial worker who works in the factory and on the railroad, in the commercial activities of our country; assist him in his struggle now, sponsored by the American Federation of Labor, to insure to him an American annual living wage; assist in taking the fear out of the homes of these people, people who work where they are able to work in industry, 4 and 5 months in a year of seasonal activity, literally strapped to the lever of a machine in the mass-production practice of our land. You see them as you go through those factories. Men are picked because of their muscles, their sinew. No man over 45 is called for employment—selfish industrialists want the cream of muscle and sinew. We have to meet the challenge of the machine age. It is part of your duty, part of mine as a public official, part of our duty to speak out. Let the chips fall where they may.

I am not a hundred-percent new dealer. I think some of the New Deal measures are screwy. That is the only way I can put it. [Laughter and applause.] But I say this: That the part of the New Deal program, if it is called New Deal, attempting to salvage humanity, has been unmatched by any administration. [Applause.] That feature of the New Deal that gives consideration to suffering humanity, prevents starvation, that puts clothing on naked citizens, that gives shelter to those who have no shelter—that is justice; the kind of justice that God Almighty expects of a government. It took courage in the face of a lot of criticism to even go that far under our capitalistic system. I do acclaim these advances. That program I do support. There can be no balancing of the Budget when we have 12,000,000 men out of work; there can be no balancing of the Budget when we have bread lines of individuals forming every day to get surplus-commodity food to supplement their meager relief budget or starvation wage on W. P. A. There can be no progress in this country when little children are deprived of the natural food that they need.

MAKE PEACE IN DOMESTIC WAR

We talk about the last World War and we see each day the stream of humanity passing before us; veterans with their limbs off, their health shattered; men 42 or 45 now; and we feel sorry for them. A kind government gives them a pension; a kind government gives them a preference for work. But we haven't started to compile the tragedies that are yet to come in this domestic war of ours today. I mean the casualties that will result from the tremendous loss of life, when thousands of children who for the past 5 or 6 years have been deprived of the kind of food that contains the necessary vitamins to build up sturdy systems, who have been living on cabbage and prunes and potatoes—the only variation next day being potatoes, cabbage, and prunes. That is not the kind of food that they are entitled to today; when these youngsters get to be 16 or 17 they are not going to have resistance to ward off tuberculosis and other diseases; they are going to fall by the wayside; there is going to be a tremendous increase in the mortality rate in the very near future.

That is the tragedy of this period we are going through. We can help—yes—by cooperating together. Pay no attention to the calamity howlers. I say to those who call themselves "rugged individualists," who would go back to the laissez faire of 25 or 30 years ago, "That day is over; we have got to march forward now." And by the same token I say let's concentrate on this domestic war in this country and not on any fight across the sea that doesn't belong to us, nor is of our creation. [Applause.]

To explain just what I think about that over there, I will probably have to tell Senator JIM MEAD's story to make myself clear. JIM MEAD tells a story about the fellow who was in the barber shop getting a shave, and he had a white apron around him. He was lying back in the chair, with his face all lathered with soap, and the barber ready to shave him. He heard a fire engine going down the street, sirens blowing. About that time a little street urchin stuck his head into the barber-shop door and hollered, "Shultz's home is on fire; Shultz's house is on fire." The fellow jumped out of the chair and rushed down the street, apron flying in the breeze, soap all over his face. He ran about seven city blocks and then stopped and said, "What the hell am I running for? My name ain't Shultz." [Laughter.] Shultz's home is on fire. We probably sympathize because of the Shultz fire abroad, but we didn't start the fire. It is not our house. We can sympathize with them in what is going on over there, and we can sympathize tonight when human beings of German and Polish blood engage in mortal combat over an imaginary boundary line in the so-called Free City of Danzig. If those warring factions could come to a free city like Houston, Tex., to bask in the sunshine of Texas; to breathe the free air of America; to understand how people can live in harmony in this great Lone Star State and every other State in the Union, they might take a lesson from the solidarity of America, a nation of all bloods, all creeds, all phases of humanity, all shades of political beliefs, who get together and understand each other and treat each other as members of a common brotherhood. We wish for them that opportunity, but I am afraid it is too late. I am afraid we will just have to wait for results and be guided accordingly.

This has been a great convention. I shall carry from it pleasant memories, and I want to express my thanks to the committee for inviting me to come here. I may say to you that I go back to the next Congress fortified with the knowledge that we have made no mistakes; that the thing to do is to legislate and legislate and legislate some more, always having the objective in mind to better your condition and not to pull down the other fellow.

I don't doubt but that in the future some of the classes or groups that I referred to before may sponsor an economy drive, may say to the Government: "Why, you have kept 4,000,000 people alive on $60 a month. You are paying too much when you give a clerk $2,100 a year or $1,800 a year. The fellow in the factory doesn't get that. Come on down to the selfish industrialists' level, Uncle Sam." That may happen. So I say you are justified in watching legislation day in and day out, all the time, striving to get not only for yourselves more and more security, to hold what you have, but helping to improve that other fellow, that $60-a-month Government employee, if you will, not civil service, who does not have the security you have; retirement benefits, annual leave, sick leave—those fine benefits you have today. He is your brother. He is your fellow American; we have got to lift him up, and at the same time elevate your own position higher and higher. By doing that you will bring him up in proportion. That has been the philosophy of the American Federation of Labor. It has been your philosophy from the start, so I greet you and say, "Keep it up." It is the only sane, sensible way to go forward as a militant organization of Federal employees. [Great applause.]

Facts Versus Folklore—An Adventure in Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. T. V. SMITH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 3, 1939

ADDRESS BY JOSEPHINE WILKINS, OF ATLANTA, GA.

Mr. SMITH of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I, as a reconstructed rebel and a proud southerner

and northerner, include an address by a gentlewoman, Josephine Wilkins, of Atlanta, Ga. She is a member of the coordinating committee, citizen's fact-finding movement, as president of the Georgia League of Women Voters.

The address is as follows:

I come from the South. I was born in the South. Most of my life has been spent in the South, where several generations make me part and parcel of the region. Irrespective of any of its alleged idiosyncrasies—I love the South. That fact I wish to make clear, and firmly establish at the outset.

Physically and geographically the South is part of the Nation. Yet social and economic lines bound it as definitely as might a foreign boundary. It is bound by mountains of sensitive pride, which too long have stood as the natural result of the search—the very human search—for some compensation on the part of a proud people humiliated through defeat—a people who have found that compensation in thought on glories of the past. Naturally this habit of looking backward has established a pattern of thought which revolts against the new—which rebel against change. The South is bound by valleys of economic depression, with all of the social ills which poverty so freely breeds—by hillsides of economic and social erosion due largely to the slow draining away of its resources through an economic unbalance brought about by such national factors as the American tariff and freight-rate differentials.

Any social program planned to serve the South must necessarily take its traditional attitudes into consideration. These attitudes find expression in the folklore of its people. In my own State, for instance, they take form in such widely heralded slogans as "It's great to be a Georgian" and "The Empire State of the South."

An experience of my own is an illustration. As a child I was taught at the feet of a greatly revered southern lady. Even now I can hear her: "Which was the first State (to do this)?" "Which was the first State (to do that)?" And after each question, in a deep, throaty voice—fairly caressing the word—she would answer, "G-e-o-r-g-i-a." One of my greatest disillusions came when further knowledge caused this childhood halo to vanish from my State.

However, a little story that I heard a few days ago is pertinent. Some men stopped on a corner where a group of small boys were playing baseball. One of the men asked a little fellow, "What's the score, son?" "Twenty-seven to nothing, against us," the boy replied. "That's too bad," the man said. And the little fellow came back with this, "No; it ain't so bad—we ain't been to bat yet!"

The South "ain't been to bat yet."

I shall not belabor you with an analysis of national practices which have contributed so largely to the fact that my region has remained in a colonial status for these many years, though the temptation to do so is great. Suffice it to say, what no doubt is common knowledge to most of you, that some way must be worked out whereby part of the wealth, long drained from the South, can be replaced. It must be done for the good of the Nation as a whole—for the good of other regions, as well as the South. For the South is the new market—the new frontier.

A SOUTHERN STATE LOOKS AT ITSELF

Your president, Paul Kellogg, has manifested encouraging interest in the effort being made by one Southern State to look realistically at itself, and has asked that I tell you of it. I refer to the Citizens' Fact-Finding Movement of Georgia.

Many of you saw Jonathan Daniel's story of the venture carried in the March issue of Survey Graphic. Those of you who saw it probably recall the cut carried on the front cover. It was an outline map of Georgia with a group of little silhouettes, representing the organizations engaged in the fact-finding program, shown as lifting up the top layer of the State and peering down inside to see what was going on. Mr. Daniels served our pride well when he began his article: "In Georgia the most important thing may be happening since Sherman's march through."

In my State the public utility which furnishes most of the power and light is the Georgia Power Co. This program which I shall discuss has interestingly been called the real Georgia Power Co. It has been said that "it is generating the power which is lighting the minds of the people of Georgia."

The foregoing comment can be well used to illustrate the work. The Power and Light are reports on various aspects of the State. These reports, the Power and Light, are generated by well-known Georgians who are experts in their chosen fields, and are distributed monthly in the form of booklets. They are prepared at the request of the official heads of 17 State-wide organizations, such as men's luncheon clubs, women's clubs, farm associations. The State heads of these groups serve as distributing centers. They send the reports to their 5,000 affiliated groups in communities throughout the State. The heads of these local groups are the substations. Through programs based on the reports, they electrify their local membership, which represents a combined total of 250,000 persons. In addition, from a central distributing plant maintained jointly by the organizations the reports are sent directly to 7,000 other individuals who have requested them—you might call this direct electrification. Thus, 12,000 reports—12,000 units of this Power and Light—are flashed out monthly over far-reaching lines. Although consumption in kilowatt-hours cannot be definitely known—and short circuits, of course, exist—there is abundant evidence of wide use.

WE WILLED A WAY

The program came about in this manner. In the spring of 1937, 2 years ago, a number of individuals began discussing among themselves the paradox of the State—its natural wealth and its human poverty. Participating in these discussions were the official heads of a number of State-wide organizations. In the offices of the men, on the porches and in the living rooms of the women, we talked about the State and the region. The discussions centered around the fact that the southeast has the three natural requirements of a high order of civilization. It has natural wealth, admittedly unsurpassed by any region of the Nation. It has fine climate. It has people. Yet it is the poorest section of the Nation. That this does not make sense is evident.

We talked of the drain of wealth from the region—drain through unfavorable trade balances, through migration of skilled workers, through migration of youth educated at public expense. We recognized that the section was going yearly into the red. Any business house going into the red would immediately take an inventory, would check up on its assets and liabilities, would review its policies. We discussed taking an inventory of Georgia. And gradually a proposed coordinated program took form.

In August we came together. We met to consider the program collectively. At that meeting around a dinner table in a little hotel room in Atlanta, the Citizens' Fact Finding Movement was launched.

In the meantime we had found our first fact. We found that it was the exception when the head of one of our organizations knew personally the head of another. Yet the aim of each group, in broad principle, is to raise the social level of the State. In working toward this common aim, we recognized that more basic information about the State would increase the effectiveness of each separate group.

I cite the program of one group by way of illustration. It is a well-known men's civic club. It has a program for the blind. In assisting those so handicapped, it is doing a fine job. It buys canes for the blind and glasses for the blind, has operations performed, and provides instruction and libraries in Braille. But in Georgia half of the babies have no medical attention at birth. Midwives attend many. Too often there are no drops in the infants' eyes. Georgia is continually breeding a new crop of blind children for this civic club to buy canes for. The club will not soon run out of a program.

As for my own group, the League of Women Voters, we have found through this fact-finding venture that we had been missing the mark in our approach to many of the things we advocate.

PROGRAM PLANS PROJECTED

Georgia organizations represented at the aforementioned meeting and those which have since developed the fact-finding program are: The men's civic clubs—Civitan, Exchange, Kiwanis, Lions, and Rotary; a feminine counterpart of these, the Pilot Club; the Association of University Women, the Business and Professional Women, the Congress of Parents and Teachers, the Federated Church Women, the Federated Women's Clubs; the Education Association, the Library Association, the Press Association; the Home Demonstration Council (composed of 1,100 small groups of rural women), the United Georgia Farmers, which recently was organized in the State; and my own group, the League of Women Voters. These are all State-wide organizations and each has affiliated local units which meet regularly throughout the State (with the exception of the press and the library associations and, to some extent, the education association). As I have said before, they are composed of 5,000 local groups and have a combined membership of 250,000 persons.

Let me briefly describe the program as we planned it when we met together. We based it on the principle of a State inventory. Twelve subjects were selected on which concise factual reports on Georgia would be obtained. Georgia—Past and Present, was chosen as the first in order to orient the program through a brief historical sketch of the State. Other subjects selected were: Natural Resources, Agriculture, Industry and Commerce, Health, Education, Public Welfare, Penal System, Political System, Tax System, Federal Activity, and Religious, Civic, and Social Forces. In connection with the last subject we sought to obtain an index of the organized forces of the State, together with some discussion of their relation to the information we expected to gather.

We agreed that the reports should be limited to facts, with no opinion included. The type of information we had in mind would not necessarily require new research. We wanted known facts about the State brought together in tabloid form so that they could be easily used by average people like ourselves—key information which usually one can gather only by searching through many volumes in libraries.

We also agreed that the reports should be made by outstanding Georgians—our own people—Georgians recognized as being well versed in knowledge of the State. We realized that the reports would require great time and labor and that we could not logically expect such work to be done for any one of our organizations singly. However, the scope of our collective plans led us to believe we would receive the cooperation which we planned to ask. We would use our best judgment in selecting these persons—selecting those whom we considered sufficiently free of economic and social ties to permit them to give us unbiased information.

We would issue monthly reports over the period of a year. These we would reproduce in sufficient quantity to allow us to send one copy to each of our affiliated groups in communities throughout the

State, to assist in program making—as research material for speakers, round-table discussions, study groups.

Thus we planned to open up channels—existing channels—to reach people with information about themselves and their State. On this information we would endeavor to focus public thought and discussion simultaneously.

The program thus planned was put into effect. Approximately 2 years have intervened. In the meantime the undertaking has grown to far greater proportions than we dared hope when it was begun.

If any one thing is responsible for such success as has come to this fact-finding venture, that one thing undoubtedly is the looseness of the framework set up for carrying it forward. There is no superorganization. The program is developed by each group independently, none losing its identity. The work is coordinated through a committee composed of the State heads of the groups, together with two alternates for each. One alternate is permanent; the other rotates so that key members of the respective organizations can have direct contact with the committee work. This provides three members from each group and still keeps the committee small enough to be workable. We share leadership responsibility. The coordinating committee has no permanent chairman. The chairmanship rotates monthly. The committee holds monthly dinner meetings, alternating them between two of the largest cities of the State, Atlanta and Macon. The sessions are divided between business and an informal discussion of the report for the given month. The authority who has prepared the report meets with us. We have in addition a working subcommittee, the membership of which also rotates. A jointly maintained central office carries out the wishes of the committee.

SIDELIGHTS

While the fact-finding reports were originally designed to serve only the organizations which undertook the program, public demand has broadened the distribution of the reports. Over 7,000 additional copies go monthly to persons who have asked for them. These requests have come from deep down among the people as well as from the higher economic and educated strata. They have come on engraved stationery, and they have come on tablet paper.

Two thousand copies a month are being used by the extension division of the University System of Georgia—used by 50 circuit teachers who in turn instruct teachers. Others are being used in some classes by practically every institution of higher learning in the State. They are being used by the common schools in connection with debates and commencement addresses. They are being used by church societies and business groups.

We recently received a request from Babson Institute, asking for 25 copies of our second series for use in a course on the South. It is the scope of the requests that encourages us most. Little stories center around so many of them. For instance, a communication came from a woman—evidently, judging by the shaky handwriting, an elderly woman. It was written in pencil on lined pad paper. It said, "You know these facts these organizations are getting up about Georgia. Well, if you'll get me a copy of these facts, I'll send you a bottle of pickles." The contract was carried out. The pickles were served at the next meeting of the coordinating committee.

One of the finest aspects of the work is the generous manner in which leading Georgians have given so freely of their time and knowledge in preparing the reports. We have had the cooperation of such men as the Dean of the College of Agriculture, the former chancellor of the university system, and men of this caliber in fields other than education.

Then there is the spirit of camaraderie which has developed among the organization leaders who compose the coordinating committee. Meetings of this committee have been taking place regularly for nearly 2 years on the first Friday of each month, and its members come from all over the State.

Let me tell you of an incident in connection with one of these gatherings. One day last July, you will recall, the afternoon papers of the Nation carried front-page streamers on President Roosevelt's dramatic statement terming the South the "Nation's No. 1 economic problem." It happens that while those papers were being read throughout the country there were assembled around a table in Macon, Ga., the official heads and representatives of 17 of the State's organizations. They had come together to discuss the very subject dealt with in those newspaper stories. Federal activity was the subject of the report for the month. I have thought back many times to the table display that night. We have, by the way, thus pictured the subject of the report at each meeting. That night it followed so closely the information contained in the report on the South later made to the President that, in retrospect, it is of added interest.

The display took the form of an elongated triangle. The three points were dramatized as: Georgia, Industrial Areas, and the National Government. We used for the last a white plaster paris replica of the National Capitol—a beautiful object, about 4 feet high. Train tracks connected the three points of the triangle. A train was shown as moving away from each point to the other. The one from Georgia going to Industrial Areas was labeled "Migration of wealth through unfavorable trade balances," "Migration of skilled workers," and "Migration of youth educated at public expense." An arrow pointing in the same direction informed that the train had been running on "frequent schedule over many years." The train going from Industrial Areas to Washington carried a carload of stage money labeled "Taxes." The arrow bore the statement "More frequent schedule recently." The train going from Washington down to Georgia, thus completing the triangle, also carried money. It was marked "Federal grants and services." The arrow this time stated "More frequent schedule needed." Whether the return of that wealth comes about in this manner or some other, that is our story. Buying power is the need of my region.

I cannot resist describing one more of these displays, the one on the political system of Georgia. Incidentally, it made a box on the front page of one of the State's major newspapers.

Georgia has an excessively long ballot. In fact, we elect everything literally "down to the dog-catcher." We unwound a roll of heavy white paper and had it run from the entrance of the hotel dining room, across the floor, up on the banquet table, over the top of the cocktails, and on up to the speakers' table. It carried broken black lines indicating printing, with these words at the top, "Official Ballot, State of Georgia." Certain instructions were given: "Note—Make yourself comfortable while marking ballot. Get ticket at the right for lounging robe and slippers, reading chair and lamp. Lunch will be served in interim." Georgia ballots also carry a unique little number. With this number it is possible for those who have access to the voting lists to ascertain how a given elector votes. We put a number on our ballot. Under it we added: "Note—To promote efficiency and to expedite matters sign name under this number."

This ballot was removed from the table and other decorations were revealed. A puppet, about 3 feet high, stood on a platform supported by posts marked "Campaign contributions from corporate interests" and "Campaign contributions from private interests." Some of the planks in the platform on which this candidate was running, were missing. They were lying loose on the table and were labeled "Public issues." The planks he stood on were marked "Vilification of opposing candidates." Strings from the puppet, controlling his mouth, his hands, and his feet, were held at some distance by two large hands labeled "Campaign contributors." Of course, there was also the whisky bottle and the cigar.

This candidate had thrown out a lasso toward a barrel marked "pork." In front of it four little men marched, one by one, down the center of the table, supporting a large card marked "Candidates' Campaign." They were labeled: "Workers in State-at-Large," "Workers in 159 Counties," "Workers in 694 Incorporated Cities," "Workers in 1822 Militia Districts." Each carried a "Ticket to the Public Trough." The "public trough" just ahead was piled high with stage money.

Circles at each committee member's place held a brightly colored little hat, flaunting a cocky feather. The member's "hat was in the ring"—and the ring held the words "To raise the social and economic level of Georgia."

GEORGIA'S RESPONSE

In discussing this Georgia program, I would not mislead you into thinking the response to the reports—reports which have thrown spotlight as sharply on our liabilities as on our assets—has been favorable without exception. A number of misgivings were evidenced shortly after the start. You may recall the editorial referred to by Jonathan Daniels. It was entitled "What in the World Has Happened to Georgia?" In no uncertain terms this particular editor made clear that he had been reared to think the State was different from the picture of it given in the fact-finding reports. He said one would think these reports were coming from persons outside the State but instead they were coming from its own people. "What in the world has happened to Georgia?" he asked. Then he added this postscript, "By the way, is this Georgia in the United States or Georgia somewhere near the Caucasus Mountains?"

With few exceptions the State has evidenced fine spirit in response to the work. It has recognized the sincerity of those engaged in the undertaking. The constructive value of such frank self-appraisal has been generally commended. The accuracy of the information has not been challenged. And recognitions from a distance have justly developed a certain amount of State pride in the work.

MONEY MATTERS

The fact-finding reports are sent out without charge. This procedure was adopted early in the program when requests for the reports began coming in. We argued that a charge might result in their reaching only those already actively interested in the State. You naturally question how we have financed the venture. I could answer you, "On a shoestring." But, amplifying, it has been financed through contributions. A few have been relatively large; most have been small. The sum acquired last year reached the handsome total of $5,000. But we have free office space, and the workers are largely volunteers. In fact, we have had a personnel expenditure of only $50 a month. Two young college women gave their time regularly at the office. Also, we have the assistance of N. Y. A. students in assembling the material for distribution.

You might be interested to know that we originally prepared these reports on a mimeograph machine—the first month, on one operated by hand. Many a boy friend of the attractive little office secretary served his term cranking that machine. This method was used until the monthly distribution reached 10,000; it was then no more expensive to print the reports.

Of course, our meager finances have kept us from taking advantage of many opportunities to make the program more effective. They have also placed on some of us work too excessive for the human machine to stand up under for a very long period. Frankly, there have been times when we have questioned whether, after all, we had not created a Frankenstein. But this year we have

adopted a more appropriate budget. The work is now sufficiently established to merit it. Our budget is this: One cent for each person in the State of of Georgia toward a program which has as its objective the raising of the people's income 100 percent, in order to bring it up to the national average. There are 3,000,000 people in my State. One cent for each of them would total $30,000. We have broken down our budget in this manner: $10,000 to be obtained in grants from foundations, for the lower one-third underprivileged group; $10,000 in goods and services from Georgians, for the middle-income group with little margin between income and outgo; and $10,000 in financial contributions from Georgians, for the upper one-third privileged group.

As for our progress in raising this budget, all of the goods and services have been pledged by Georgians, and we have made some headway on both of the budget divisions which relate to actual funds, though there is yet quite a distance to go. Funds are difficult to raise down my way.

However, there is one source from which we should be able to take ample care of the financial side of work such as this. It is estimated that a minimum of $3,000 is required to rear and educate a child. Our capital investments of this type, it so happens, frequently move elsewhere to be put into operation as soon as they are completed. And it seems that those in whom we invest most are usually the very ones who go elsewhere to produce. To illustrate, in the last United States census my State shows a net loss in the migration of native-born people equal to one-fifth of the population given for the State. Capitalize this loss and you have a staggering sum. Well, we would like to start a "Georgia Three-percent Club." We would like 3 percent on our investments. We might even strike a bargain and base the yield on the minimum. Even that would handsomely finance work such as ours. You might mention it to your migrated southern friends, by the way.

CURRENT AND FUTURE PROGRAM

Some months ago we completed the inventory on which the first year's program was based and with the last report we sent a query to Georgians. Did they wish the program continued? If so, what did they want? Fully three-fourths of the responses asking that the work be continued proposed that it take the form of suggested solutions to problems presented in the factual reports. Only one reply asked that the program be stopped. "Just such abortions," this response said, "have misled the President into thinking the South is the Nation's economic problem No. 1."

Thus we have based our current work on this public response. The 20 authorities have agreed to give their services to the State again. They will serve as a committee to reconsider the subjects on which the factual studies were made and to chart possible solutions to the problems revealed. The reports consisting of possible solutions as seen by this committee will be issued without indicating the minority or majority opinion of the committee members. In this way it will be left to Georgians to decide what they consider wise future action.

Distribution of this series of reports will start in the fall. Meanwhile we are issuing, monthly, sections of the now well-known Report on Economic Conditions of the South, which we have annotated from our Georgia factual reports. In this manner we are obtaining a picture of the State in comparison with the South as a whole.

TOWARD WHAT END?

This program is directed toward what end, you may ask. It is truly an adventure in democracy. Confidence in the theory of the democratic process leads us to believe that such widespread thought will ultimately find expression in action. If the Nation can continue to maintain itself as a democracy, then this thought on the part of Georgia citizens should eventually find some expression. If we as a nation lose our democratic form of government, then the information and thought stimulated through this program should still be of assistance to Georgians, irrespective of what their situation may be.

A few days ago I was thinking of how closely the present challenge to democracy parallels with marriage. Those of you who have entered into such a union, most probably, exterted yourselves no little before it was consummated. This is generally true of the woman as well as of the man. After marriage, more often than not, the union develops into a more or less accepted state. It is taken as a matter of course. Then frequently there comes a period of—a few side glances here and there. The union requires a little more wooing or it is apt to go on the rocks. We have come to call it "the dangerous age."

As for this democratic union—this union of Uncle Sam and the Goddess of Liberty—we most certainly exerted ourselves before we brought it about. We even went so far as to have physical combat with our English parents because consent was withheld. However, for a long while now we have given it little personal attention. We have let it rock along—have thought of it in terms of permanency.

But we have come to a time when there is a little flirting with other alliances. There are definitely side glances on the part of some of us. There are even rumors of trysting places. This democratic union has arrived at "the dangerous age." We, Uncle Sam, cannot neglect Liberty as we have done and at the same time expect to hold her. Though we have lived with her little, she is still our ideal. In my opinion, unless we evidence greater understanding and appreciation of her, we deserve to lose her.

In this present challenge to democracy do not take too lightly my region. There you will find the Ku Klux Klan, the Silver Shirts, and the Knights of the White Camelia. Take my State, for instance. It is an agricultural State, yet two-thirds of its farmers are landless. Half of these landless are a dispossessed, hopeless people, moving yearly from farm to farm. In cities around industrial plants others are equally as hopeless. Is it not natural that they should listen when new hope is offered? They have followed demagogs. Until their lot is bettered they will follow demagogs again.

Do not take too lightly my region. Its mountains of pride might easily respond to the cultivation of a "superman" philosophy. Its valleys of depression yearn longingly for richer harvests and might readily reach out to whatever promises abundance. Its socially eroded hillsides are fertile for seed which seem bright. Some seeds take root easily in wasted land. Do not take too lightly my region.

Coming from the "Bible Belt," I need not feel it inappropriate to close with a quotation from that book which is so widely read and so little understood. The quotation is one which has great meaning when it is vitalized: "Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free." Many are seeking the truth in Georgia. May it make and keep us free.

Neutrality and American Foreign Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SOL BLOOM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 2, 1939

ADDRESS OF REV. EDMUND A. WALSH, S. J.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein the following address by the Reverend Dr. Edmund A. Walsh, S. J., vice president of Georgetown University, and regent, School of Foreign Service, delivered at the opening session of the Annual National Foreign Trade Convention, Hotel Commodore, New York City, on Monday, October 9, 1939:

This convention meets under domestic circumstances and during international developments which make this occasion by far the most important date in the long and fruitful series of similar conferences sponsored by the National Foreign Trade Council. Hitherto your objectives have been the strengthening and facilitating of overseas commerce—the defense of foreign trade as an indispensable element of an integrated national economy—the creation of an adequate merchant marine—the improvement of export and import technique, and the financing of a reciprocal flow of commodities in a manner advantageous to seller and buyer alike. Such were the eager hopes of men who still breathed the air of peace and sought to promote the solidarity of the human race by cultivating the amenities of civilized living. But the tragic events of these recent weeks have shattered the very foundation of international relations, particularly with Europe, and presented to the Nation, to the Government, and to the business community, a problem not concerned with perfecting peace or developing foreign trade but involving the very existence both of peace and foreign trade. That is the stark reality confronting us at this hour.

With the Far East still exhausting itself in prolonged warfare, with the Spanish Peninsula well-nigh prostrate as a result of a devastating civil war, with eastern Europe resounding to the ominous tread of communism as its hordes march exultingly westward, and with central Europe aflame with another ghastly conflagration, it would seem that faith in human sanity and hope for human progress now find their last refuge in the two Americas. London, as I left it a few days before the outbreak of war, was a city preparing stoically and methodically for a seige. Hundreds of thousands of children were being rushed to safe places in the interior or southwest. Waterloo Station was piled high with luggage and filled with children being evacuated from the metropolis. Trucks were drawn up before business houses, banks, insurance offices, and similar establishments, loading the records, files, and furniture for removal to a safer zone.

The precaution against air raids, the underground refuges, the sandbags piled around buildings, the trenches in Hyde Park, and the public appearance of gas masks all conspired to dramatize one of the most appalling aspects of modern warfare. Wars were previously wars of governments, of cabinets and ministries—of Talleyrands, Metternichs, and Castlereaghs. Today, as we know, wars will be fought by and against the civilian population as much as by and against the regular army. The use of airplanes against populous cities, begun in the Sino-Japanese and in the Spanish Civil War, was as it were, only a prelude to the full crescendo of destruction from the air now hovering over Europe. Should it reach the climax of indiscriminate bombardment which now seems threatened, the effects on the accumulated treasures and hard-won fruits of western civilization may well stagger the imagination. For the preservation of this last precious haven of

peace in the Western Hemisphere and for the safeguarding of our national welfare, we shall have need of cool heads at every conference table and steady hands on the wheel of the ship of state. And both industry and commerce will have need of much self-discipline, much self-sacrifice, much consciousness of the common welfare as opposed to private gain in the difficult days that lie ahead.

From the tone of Herr Hitler's speech to the Reichstag last Friday and from the available reactions of France and England, it now seems fairly clear that not peace but continued and savage warfare must be expected for a very long period. I agree with that thoughtful analysis advanced by Mr. Herbert Hoover last week in which the former President of the United States maintained that Germany, with all its increased power, territory, and population, cannot decisively defeat France and England, because of the preponderant economic resources capable of being mobilized in a test of endurance by those two powers.

On the other hand, candor compels me to agree with the German Chancelor that the combined military forces of his present opponents cannot conclusively crush Germany. Hence, unless some unforeseen element intervenes, the conflict promises to resolve itself into a weary, demoralizing war of attrition, during which both combatants will consume enormous stores of manpower, of material wealth, and human resources until downright exhaustion declares a stalemate—with neither side victorious. In that eventuality, the only victor will be the Bolshevik, who is already taking his preliminary steps by acquiring increased territory in Poland, by assuming virtual military control over the Baltic states, and by advancing into the Carpathians—all without loss of a man. When the two major belligerents have reduced one another to exhaustion, the commissars will be in the strategic position they have always dreamed of—as final arbiters of the fate of a degenerate bourgeoisie ripe for the avenging sword of world revolution. Should that hoped-for hour arrive, the followers of Lenin will have reason to be twice thankful to a German High Staff. For it was Berlin that first introduced the disintegrating virus of Marxian communism into imperial Russia by transporting Lenin and his fellow conspirators from Switzerland to Petrograd in 1917. Once again they have furthered the cause of world revolution by the recent alliance which advanced bolshevism hundreds of miles nearer western Europe over the bleeding body of Poland. It will not be long, I suspect, before the first Soviet horseman will appear in the Khyber Pass spying out the road that leads to India.

But we are more concerned in this convention with the effects of the war on American interests, particularly on American foreign trade. As the conflict continues and settles into that test of endurance which now seems probable, we must be prepared for increasing dislocation of normal commerce not only with Europe but with other affected area. We must be prepared, moreover, for new dangers to our neutrality as each belligerent will seek to weaken his opponent either by increasing contraband lists or by efforts, direct and indirect, to ease the United States into the conflict. With respect to the latter danger, may I voice a feeling that has been growing among many thoughtful men? No responsible person in the United States has thus far openly advocated our militant entrance into the war. On the contrary, it has been declared from the President downward that there must be no black-out of peace in this land. But some of the reasons now being advanced for the repeal of the embargo are so patently untrue that much uneasiness has been created as to the real and controlling motives underlying those arguments. Thus, it has been repeated over and over again that the present embargo should be repealed because it is contrary to international law. We find that contention not only in speeches of individual Senators and other proponents of repeal, but even in the official report of the majority group of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. The last paragraph of that document reads:

"The committee was of the opinion that the provisions in existing law providing for an embargo on arms, ammunition, and implements of war should be repealed and not reenacted in any form. Therefore, such provisions are not carried in the present proposed substitute.

"The committee is of the opinion that the United States cannot maintain its neutrality so long as such embargo provisions remain upon our statute books. It is contrary to the accepted precepts of international law which prescribes that any belligerent may purchase any article or materials in any neutral country.

"Belligerents as well as neutrals have relied from time immemorial upon this law. It has, for hundreds of years, been recognized by both belligerents and neutrals to govern their conduct toward each other and is today so recognized by the governments of the world with the exception of the United States. It was a voluntary departure from international law by the United States Government, and cannot, in the opinion of the committee, be administered in an equitable or neutral manner nor will it serve to maintain the peace of the United States."

Now, I am not here raising the substantive question of repeal or retention of the embargo on arms, ammunition, and implements of war. That * * * vital issue should be debated on its merits. Possibly it should be repealed. Possibly cash and carry for all commodities, arms and ammunition included, is the indicated policy for the United States in the present crisis. Possibly the time has come to drop pretext and involved legalistic arguments for a frank show of sympathy for France and England. I do not question the sincerity, the patriotism, or the integrity of those who honestly advocate such a policy—as Senator NORRIS and former Secretary of State Stimson have done. But I do express my unqualified amazement at the repeated and unsubstantiated claim that an embargo on arms is contrary to international law as it deprives a belligerent of his right to purchase arms and ammunition in a neutral country. Not only has that untruth been heard on the floor of the Senate and read into its official report, but it has been widely disseminated by men who should know better.

In no place and at no time did international law ever enunciate such a contradiction of the attribute of national sovereignty. International law, recognizing the supreme legal competency of every nation to sell or not to sell any commodity in accordance with its own judgment as to what constitutes its vital interest, merely affirms the right of each belligerent to buy arms and ammunition on a parity with all other belligerents, if the neutral is willing to sell. But the belligerent has no right in law, in equity, or in precedent to purchase on his own demand. That would connote an obligation on the part of the neutral to sell, since right and obligation are correlative terms. The only obligation devolving on the neutral is to sell impartially to all belligerents in case he sells at all.

In pursuance of this right to embargo arms and ammunition, a long series of prohibitions has been enacted by different governments from time immemorial without the slightest violation of belligerent rights. An extensive list of such embargoes will be found in the American Journal of International Law (vol. 33, supp., p. 283–ff.). The present legal advisor of the Department of State, Mr. Green H. Hackworth, told the Foreign Relations Committee in 1936 that an arms embargo creates no legal difficulty; our present highly respected Secretary of State, Mr. Hull, supported a treaty at the Buenos Aires Conference in December 1936, which included an article forbidding the export of arms, ammunition, and implements of war to any two or more Latin American republics at war among themselves. And the United States twice imposed an embargo on arms to Mexico since 1912, and also during the Chaco controversy, with no subsequent consciousness of having violated international law.

Whence, then, this late discovery that an embargo violates international law? The answer is not far to seek. The discovery is a thin cover for a deep conviction entertained in many quarters that we should take every step short of outright war to assist France and England. The present debate, in truth, is not on neutrality, but on the broad question of American foreign policy, particularly on the advisability of entering into an emotional, a moral, and an economic alliance with the two western democracies against the totalitarian combination. To a very large extent, we have already suspended, if not entirely abandoned, one cardinal principle of American diplomatic tradition—the freedom of the seas. The neutrality debate is rapidly coming down to the next case and revealing that what is being reexamined at Washington is not an incidental clause of a law passed in 1937 but another tremendously important and hitherto cardinal principle of our political philosophy. I am firmly convinced that we are passing through a truly great and historic moment in our national history, one comparable to the periods of fierce debate during the administrations of Washington, Adams, and Jefferson. The country was dangerously divided in its sympathies then, some favoring conservative England, as Hamilton did, and others leaning toward revolutionary France. The argument of the pro-English party was crystal clear—the French Revolution favored by Mr. Jefferson was a potential menace to the tranquillity and peace of the United States; they would all be murdered in their beds if its world-wide ambitions and subversive philosophy were not halted before they reached the shores of the new Republic of the West. It is a chastening historical paradox to recall that the United States in 1812 declared war, not on France, but on conservative England. National interest fanned by the "war hawks" of the Middle West and popular indignation at England's repeated violation of neutral rights finally turned the tide in spite of ideologies and emotional attachments. It was by no means, however, a universally popular war.

The present phase may be further compared to 1823, when James Monroe published to a solidly monarchial Europe his daring doctrine that the New World was no longer a field for future colonization by them but reserved to the American republics. An analogous declaration has just proclaimed that the American republics will erect a neutral barrier for 300 miles of sea around the two Americas—a safety zone, a cordon sanitaire—within which European belligerents will not be permitted to engage in hostilities. Some 5,000,000 square miles of water are thus brought within the new Monroe Doctrine of the sea recently proclaimed at Panama. Whether Europe will accept this latest unilateral revision of international law remains to be seen. England has politely but formally expressed her reservation, and all students of Shakespeare will remember the scene between Hotspur and Glendower in the first part of Henry IV, act III, scene 1:

"GLENDOWER. I can call spirits from the vasty deep.

"HOTSPUR. Why, so can I; or so can any man:

"But will they come, when you do call for them?"

Perhaps the time has come, as many honestly believe, for a third substantial change in our foreign policy. In many quarters it is felt that the United States should drop the pretense of impartiality and abstention respecting a titanic conflict 3,000 miles away and frankly take our stand, short of war, on the side of those belligerents

whose principles and ideals more nearly resemble our own. In 1917 we entered into mortal conflict with the Imperial German Government, post factum, after certain rights of navigation had been violated; in 1939 the debate is raging over the advisability of almost going to war with Nazi Germany in advance of being hurt out of loyalty to the ideals of democracy actually imperiled elsewhere and hypothetically menaced here if Germany should win. Prudence and foresight counsel such a decision, it is argued, and there is, moreover, a moral obligation incumbent on America to throw her great weight and prestige into the balance against totalitarianism before it is too late. That is the unspoken but true issue before Congress today; it is taboo in the Senate, although the true alternative is being fully and openly discussed throughout the land, from the Gallup poll down to the village store. The embargo is merely the symbol of an underlying conflict of beliefs. I am not arguing for or against repeal, but against that continued misrepresentation of international law and of recorded fact which in some cases savors strongly of Machiavellian skulduggery.

Whether the embargo on arms be repealed or retained, one thing is certain. Many other provisions of the proposed neutrality legislation seem assured of legal enactment and public approval. Cash-and-carry, the exclusion of American shipping from danger zones, and the Draconian limitations on sea-borne commerce and travel in general must undoubtedly affect adversely our foreign trade. The closing of so many markets will call for courageous readjustments and prompt ingenuity to seek substitute openings elsewhere. Not only do the North Atlantic routes fall within the category of danger zones from which American commerce may be excluded but under section 2 (A) of the proposed Neutrality Act the trade routes to such remote areas as New Zealand, Australia, and South Africa, to Mediterranean ports, to India, and the whole Far East may be closed to American-flag ships. It has been estimated that American exports to belligerent areas, excluding Europe but including Canada, have reached a total of $815,104,283 per annum. If no solution of this grave problem be found, what is to happen to that important balance wheel in our national economy supplied by foreign trade? Even if the productive capacity of domestic industry should be maintained and find an outlet in foreign bottoms operating at their own risk within a cash-and-carry program, what will happen to our merchant marine just at the moment of its most promising rebirth under the present energetic program of the Maritime Commission? Shall we be faced with a new frustration and behold those ships for which we have pleaded for 20 years tied up by hundreds in home ports or seeking in desperation to operate under foreign registry?

The motives underlying these provisions, the determination to safeguard American neutrality, the firm resolve to foresee and eliminate, as far as possible, all provocations leading to our involvement in war are wholly understandable and commendable. Even our foreign trade, important as it is, cannot prevail against the peace and security of the United States, nor against the lives of its citizens and the dangers of war. This does not mean, however, that too sweeping surrender must be made of neutral rights. The history of international relations plainly reveals the universal tendency of belligerents to whittle away the rights of neutrals in favor of their own. It is the duty of the Government of the United States to safeguard not only the Nation's peace but its legitimate rights as well.

There is one bright spot on the overcast horizon. Already a flock of trade inquiries has arrived from Latin American countries now cut off from purchases customarily made in Europe. Trade with those areas has never yet been fully developed and still remains the most promising potential recompense for losses in other quarters of the globe. In the spirit of the recent conference of Panama a concerted and vigorous effort should be made to respond to those inquiries and to the enlarged opportunities they embody. Credit facilities must be studied and a two-way flow of commodities encouraged in order to facilitate payment for imports. Statistics reveal that our trade with Latin America is much less than it was 2 years ago. That should be remedied and still further advances made. Then, if certain trade routes, particularly to remote belligerent areas, must eventually be closed as the lesser of two evils, every resource must be mobilized to employ American shipping in beckoning markets of the Americas. That undoubtedly would require painful readjustments, new organization, and much versatility in adapting old ideas to new emergencies. The robust initiative of the American character created this great country; it will not lose that vigor when confronted with the supreme responsibility of keeping it great. It is not unreasonable to suggest that special Government assistance be provided for the purpose of enabling affected lines to adjust themselves to new routes or otherwise indemnify them for losses incurred in sacrificing established trade connections as a contribution to keeping America out of the war.

One closing consideration. Our neutrality can be maintained, and America spared the tragedy that has again befallen Europe, only by a firm policy in defense of the rights of both the Americas and by stubborn resistance to partisan propaganda. But I see a very real complication arising from another direction. Is Canada an American state within the meaning of the Monroe Doctrine? If she is, and if her territory is attacked by a European power, must the Government of the United States take affirmative action calculated to guarantee the security of our northern neighbor and respected friend? Although the Monroe Doctrine in itself does not exclude warfare between an American state and a European power, and although it embraced only those colonies which had achieved independence and complete separation from European monarchies, excluding those which retained political bonds with Europe, it has been definitely interpreted in recent times, and in very high official quarters, to forbid even military operations against Canada. That is a formidable extension of our defense liability. Since military operations may be launched from the air, or by submarines as well as by land and naval forces, such a possibility with respect to Canada is not a strained nor fanciful idea. That situation needs further clarification, since, in my opinion, it offers a source of involvement which in the rapid and unpredictable evolution of modern warfare may become as proximate and specific as any violation of American rights on the high seas.

Poultry Industry in Need of More Statistical Information

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY B. COFFEE

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 3, 1939

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today H. R. 7616, a bill to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to furnish additional statistical information and marketing service for the benefit of the poultry industry. Efforts will be made to secure early consideration of this measure by the Committee on Agriculture at the next session of Congress. The important poultry industry is entitled to more recognition than the Department of Agriculture is now authorized to accord to it.

During the past 15 years the annual farm value of chickens and eggs has exceded $1,000,000,000 annually. The typical poultry-producing unit is the farm flock, which accounts for the fact that about 85 percent of all farms in the country produce poultry. Aside from the fact that all but 15 percent of the farms in the country are interested directly in poultry production, it is safe to say that practically 100 percent of the population consumes poultry products in one form or another. The importance of this industry is thus self-evident.

The Agricultural Marketing Service now conducts five lines of work dealing with the field of poultry marketing. These include: (1) Production, processing, and storage reports; (2) market news; (3) grading and inspection; (4) research; and (5) regulatory work under title V of the Packers and Stockyards Act.

While these lines include the necessary elements for a comprehensive marketing program, it has never been possible to develop any one of them satisfactorily because of a lack of funds and inadequate personnel. With this situation existing, it has been necessary to undertake the activities in small pieces and under joint arrangement with other activities.

At the present time the Agricultural Marketing Service is expending approximately $175,000 on poultry work, of which about $60,000 is required for the administration of regulatory activities under the Packers and Stockyards Act.

PRODUCTION AND PROCESSING REPORTS

Under this heading a number of reports have been developed dealing with the production and processing of poultry and poultry products. These include monthly reports of the average number of hens and pullets per farm flock, average number of eggs laid, number of eggs per layer, and index prices of eggs and chickens. The cost of feed used in poultry ration is published only as an average for the United States. Once a year the income and utilization of poultry and poultry products is published by States. A monthly report is also issued on hatchery production, egg breaking, and canned poultry.

Adequate provision has never been made for the collection, compilation, and publication of production and marketing statistics. This work has been developed about as far as possible with present funds and facilities. There is need for

considerable expansion and improvement in this field of reporting, as follows:

(a) Monthly and annual statistics are needed in respect to commercial flocks, which are increasing in their importance, and the present farm flock report is in need of expansion. Improvement in statistics relating to numbers of birds on farms, numbers of chicks raised and eggs produced will greatly assist farmers in their production program and will be of extreme value to marketing agencies.

(b) There is need for information by principal breeds and classes of poultry, since there are varying demands for eggs of white and brown shell color and poultry meat of different qualities.

(c) The specialized production of broilers has been expanding rapidly but no reports on this important branch of the industry are issued and are vitally needed.

(d) To guide the industry there is a need for more information on intentions of farmers in respect to their flock expansion or contraction; the time, size, and weight of the poultry they expect to market; the degree of flock culling they expect to practice; the percent of eggs and poultry produced, which is consumed on the farm.

(e) Farmers are buying an increasing percentage of the chicks and turkey poults from commercial hatcheries. The hatchery industry has therefore expanded. At present there is issued during the hatching season a monthly hatchery report. This, however, is in need of expansion. It should represent reports from more hatcheries. It should include information relating to the breeds and classes of chicks produced. The number of hatcheries and their capacities should be kept up to date annually and more should be known of their practices.

MARKET NEWS

The market-news project is designed to cover the short-term aspects of the current market situation. This work is now conducted in connection with the dairy market reporting service and consists principally of supplying local market prices and storage stocks of eggs and poultry in a few of the larger markets. Live poultry prices are collected and published covering San Francisco, Philadelphia, Washington, and Baltimore. Wholesale prices of eggs are published for Boston, Philadelphia, Seattle, and San Francisco. Daily storage holdings are collected for a few of the larger markets, and weekly storage holdings cover a total of 35 markets.

One of the principal deficiencies in the poultry market reporting work is that the coverage is entirely inadequate. The service should be extended to many more markets and should cover these markets more completely than is now possible. Some of the additional work that should be done in this field is as follows:

(a) Reports on market receipts of eggs and poultry are in need of improvement particularly in respect to receipts by truck. Nothing is known of the various proportions of the different qualities of eggs and poultry, and this knowledge would make for improved marketing. Market-receipts information is obtained only at a few markets—New York, Boston, Philadelphia, Chicago, and San Francisco. This information should be issued for several more of the important cities and on a more widespread geographical basis.

(b) No adequate and representative figures are available to measure the consumption of eggs and poultry and there is needed a satisfactory report probably from retail outlets which will more properly indicate actual conditions of consumer demand.

(c) Market price information is not readily available except from a very limited number of markets and should be expanded to include many more of the important markets. Prices paid to farmers are reported only monthly and it is believed that farmers and marketers would be materially aided by at least supplemental weekly reports.

(d) Practically no information is currently available on retail prices and this should be reported at least weekly for a number of representative cities.

(e) The reports now issued on canned and eviscerated poultry, liquid and frozen canned eggs, and dried eggs are greatly in need of expansion.

(f) The relation of feed costs as measured by egg-feed ratio and poultry-feed ratio is covered in a very limited way and is in need of improvement and expansion.

GRADING AND INSPECTION

The object of this work is to investigate and certify to shippers and other interested persons the class, quality, and condition of poultry products when offered or prepared for interstate shipment or when received at important central markets.

The service consists of the grading of poultry products in terminal markets and at shipping points for class, grade, quality, and condition; supervision of the inspection of dressed poultry for condition and wholesomeness at canning establishments and at establishments packing full-drawn poultry. Practically all this work is carried on under cooperative agreements with States or other agencies.

To properly safeguard the public interest there is a need for expansion of this service and for its proper functioning there is required additional funds which will enable more effective supervision on the part of the Department and the ability to more adequately educate the producer, marketer, and consumer, of the economic and protective value of graded products.

RESEARCH

The research work carried on at the present time is perhaps the weakest phase of the whole program for poultry and poultry products. All that has been done has been accomplished with an absolute minimum of funds and this field is in urgent need of attention. Sound and economical marketing is not possible without the establishment of standards and grades which indicate various degrees of quality and condition. Work should be done in the following fields:

(a) To properly develop egg standards and grades, there is need for study of such factors as candling light intensity, color filters, candling apparatus as well as the factors which are reliable and true measures of egg quality and condition.

(b) More information as to the consumer preferences and consumer usage is needed to form a sound basis for the development of standards and grades of eggs and poultry and their products.

(c) To be more beneficial to producers there is need for information as to the various qualities of products which can be economically produced.

(d) With present facilities little or no fundamental scientific work can be done to determine the basic factors which would form a sound and economical basis for developing standards and grades for live and dressed poultry, canned and eviscerated poultry, liquid and frozen canned eggs, and dried eggs. These problems should receive immediate attention.

The Arms Embargo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. O. BURGIN

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 2, 1939

LETTER BY HON. GIFFORD PINCHOT

Mr. BURGIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter written recently to the Washington Post by Hon. Gifford Pinchot, former Governor of Pennsylvania:

[From the Washington Post]

THE BEST WAY TO KEEP OUT

To the EDITOR OF THE POST.

SIR: There are, as I see it, two things practically all Americans are for in this war: We want to stay out of it, and we want Hitler

stopped. We can, I am convinced, get both of these things by repealing the embargo and enacting cash and carry.

The best way for us to keep out of the war is to help the Allies to win it without us. The Allies ought to win the war, first because it is right, and also because that is the best thing for the United States.

This war will decide whether we shall continue to live in peace and security, or whether we must be armed and ready to keep the unbearable Hitler system—tyranny, paganism, persecution, blood purges, faith breaking, and conquest by force—out of this hemisphere.

The Nazis have already given unmistakable notice of their desire to dominate certain South American countries.

Allied victory will bring no threat to peace in the Americas. But would it be good for our peace if a despotism whose law is the law of the wolf pack, which hates freedom, despises religion, looks on small nations as mere loot, and keeps no faith should try to extend its military rule to Canada and the French and British colonies in America?

What chance would there be for permanent world peace if Hitler should win? Can world peace be based on raw force? But if the Allies win, there will be a chance, and this time I firmly believe a good chance, for a peace based on justice and the right of each nation to its fair share of natural resources.

You may not like England or France—because of imperialism, past wars, war debts, or whatever. But suppose burglars were breaking into the houses of your friends. And suppose the chief of police had not always led a model life, owed you money, and was personally objectionable. Would that make you side with the burglars?

This is a free country. We keep our word. We want to live with and trade with free peoples who keep their word also.

I am just as anxious to keep out of war as anyone can be. I do not want my son to go to war. I am for cash and carry and repealing the embargo because that is the way to keep our sons and daughters at home.

We are neutral, and we must stay neutral. But it is no more unneutral to repeal the embargo, which will help the Allies, than to maintain the embargo, which is helping Hitler right now.

Other nations across the sea are fighting the things we hate—cruelty, aggression, the ruthless rule of force. The way to stay out of war is to help them win without us, and so prevent the spread of Hitlerism over the earth.

That we should be helping the unspeakable Hitler by maintaining our embargo is almost unthinkable. That we should help him not only against the right but also against our own interests—that is just simply ridiculous.

Like you, I am for America first, last, and all the time. I am for staying out of the war. Cash and carry and no embargo is the answer.

GIFFORD PINCHOT.

WASHINGTON, *October 31.*

How Our Government Is Revising the Constitution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 3, 1939

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, among the students of our great legal systems, none stands out more indisputably above the clamors and passions of the day than the former dean of Harvard University's famous law school, Roscoe Pound. His reputation for clarity of thought, objectiveness of viewpoint, and love of the American system is everywhere unquestioned. When he speaks in terms of our national future, all of us, Republican, Democrat, or dissenter, must pay heed, listening intently to his views.

Recently Dean Pound has spoken, and his words sound a warning to our Nation which cannot be ignored. Everywhere in the world today, he tells us, liberty and justice, the supremacy of law above men, are on the defensive. They are rapidly being forgotten in the midst of an era of chaos and superstitious worship of man-made power. Absolutist governments are superseding the era of equality of opportunity. "Rights, property and human, are regarded as the creations of the moment, subject always to the whim of the powerful, capricious rather than rooted.

To be sure, this trend is most notable in Europe, where dictatorships stridently mount the rostrum to proclaim their deification of brutality to the world. Yet even in our own Nation there are growing evidences of this new spirit. Administrative absolutism may be practiced in a variety of forms. The dictator may mask his designs, or he may shout them from the housetops. The agencies by which power may be asserted are as various as the governments which establish them. Here in the United States, Dean Pound points out:

> Things which would have shocked the American people in the past century seem to be accepted today without a murmur or even to be actually approved. One-sided statutes, one-sided administrative proceedings, may be seen in almost every statute book, every report, and every treatise on politics.

We have drifted far, far from the original views of those who founded our Nation and drafted the Constitution of our Government. To be sure, there are always those who observe too speedily that the times have changed. New conditions breed new demands. Social objectives cannot wait the morrow. They must be met today. Justice must be occasionally set aside in the need for speedy and necessary action. Individual rights must be sacrificed in the interest of the state.

Dean Pound does not hesitate to point out the basic weakness of this line of reasoning. Surely no one can pretend to the divine knowledge which assures us of the righteousness of our causes. We have seen men and women who were completely convinced of the worthiness of their goals repudiated by experience. But why is administrative tyranny gaining momentum in the world today? To find its causes we must look back into the nineteenth century. The early Communists regarded law as a technique devised for the maintenance of a propertied class. Justice and jurisprudence were viewed as schemes to defraud the gullible. Justice becomes mere superstition. Law becomes a mere threat, and rights deemed sacred are no more than claims secured by threats.

In America we have rejected these views. For us, the method of balancing competing claims and interests is the technique of law. We picture justice and law as a set of scales, forever weighing contending forces, striving to achieve a balance between them. No one claims for a moment that human beings, fallible, prejudiced, subject to all the whims that flesh is heir to, have succeeded in this effort to achieve a perfect balance. Yet we have sought to approximate an objective viewpoint which has given men the most pervasive sense of freedom which our world has ever known.

Let us but throw aside objectivity and impartiality as goals for one moment, and the system upon which our law is framed collapses. Yet precisely this is what some of our Federal commissions are doing today. Recently a former commission head declared in almost these very terms his skepticism and bias. Law and principles cannot, he declared, be administered objectively and impartially. If this become the theory upon which we are to operate in the future, our law, our courts, and our principles may be tossed into limbo.

There are four basic propositions which underlie administrative absolutism as it is advocated in our country today. (1) It is asserted that laws are illusory, objectivity is impossible; and hence a bureau deciding each case as it chooses is an efficient unit for doing whatever must be done in any event arbitrarily. (2) The advocates of the administrative agency argue that they are set up at the outset for partisan reasons, or to protect the interests of one class at the expense of another. It follows therefore that when the agency is organized, it is justified in hearing but one side, for that is its original purpose. (3) Still a third proposition declares that there are no such things as basic rights, and those who complain that a bureau is depriving them of something are claiming nothing to which they have a right. (4) And lastly, the theory is put forth that law, being no more than a threat of society, may be as arbitrary as it chooses.

Each of these positions is in complete accord with the ideas of the dictatorships. Each of them is directly antagonistic to the established order of the English-speaking world, in which liberty, equality, rights, reason, and justice to all have become the ruling ideals of mankind. American institutions are utterly opposed to the vesting of arbitrary

power in one place. We have never placed confidence in a body of "supermen administrators with infallible hunches, guided by a super-superman at the head of an absolute hierarchy."

The absolutist argument permits the determination of issues upon the basis of secret conferences with one side and indifference to the other. It looks with complacence upon tribunals which are at once investigators, prosecutors, and advocates as well as judge. When hearings are conducted as a mere formality with the ultimate conclusion determined long in advance, justice becomes an empty formula.

This is our problem today. It is a problem which requires the interest of every thoughtful citizen of our Nation. For we must rally to keep law in balance. We must summon our forces and gird up our loins to prevent the destruction of the ideals of justice in a world which has learned to scoff but not to cherish.

Challenge to America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES HAWKS, JR.

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 3, 1939

ADDRESS BY HON. STYLES BRIDGES, OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

Mr. HAWKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Hon. STYLES BRIDGES, of New Hampshire, delivered at the annual dinner meeting of Indianapolis Association of Credit Men, Columbia Club, Indianapolis, Ind., November 3, 1939:

The history of America is a saga of enterprise, of private initiative, and of the courage of men. Not since the beginning of time have men more justified their presence upon earth. Not since the beginning of time have they more fulfilled the purpose of nature. What they have wrought is an enduring monument to the possible accomplishments of men when left free to pursue the creations of their minds.

Down through the years—from the early colonists of Jamestown and of Plymouth, to the men of our time who fly in the planes through the skies and over the seas—the procession has been that of free men of initiative—of men unafraid.

From the travail in which our Government was born and the travail which, time and time again, has invested it since, the same calvacade has emerged to march on—the calvacade of unfettered energies which knew no defeat.

Ours is a land representative of the conglomerate abilities of the Anglo-Saxons, the Irish, the Germans, the Poles, the French, the Scandinavians, and the peoples of southern Europe who left their native heaths because of religious persecutions, because of political or economic motives—but who left above all because they were men and women of initiative, of daring, and of enterprise.

Men who left the shores of Europe in hardly more than skiffs for the darkness over the horizon were not quitters or white corpuscled sissies. They were not afraid or uncertain of themselves—these men who hewed an American way of living out of the wilderness which greeted them. They were not quitters or shuddering men who pushed westward across the Oregon trail in 1842, who went to the Mormon country in '47, and a-seeking California gold in '48.

They were men of free initiative and daring.

I might interject that neither were they intellectuals stopping along the road to quibble over the "isms" of Europe which they had just left.

Pressing forward into the unknown, they could not have been aware of what the future held for them—save for one thing. They were determined that the future return them not to the ideologies and the persecutions of their past.

My friends, those central Europeans and Irish who came pell-mell to our shores in the decade between 1840 and 1850 were not quitters or men without faith in themselves; neither were the 400,000 Scandinavians who by 1890 had come to just one State of our Union.

Indeed, there is no chapter of history that casts a clearer light on the restlessness of men than the babbling tongues of Ellis Island early in this century, when thousands arrived daily from Europe seeking a free outlet for their abilities. It was the pilgrimage of a people fleeing from the oppression of initiative. They were not quitters or frightened men.

My friends, everything we have today—the wealth of our Nation which, from 1790 to 1939, has increased well over three hundredfold—is the result of free initiative. The free initiative of men has brought us through our wars, our panics, our epidemics, and our plagues to become the mighty Nation that we are. Free initiative is our very lifeblood.

It has brought us through the catastrophe of the Civil War, through our sockless Jerry Simpsons, our Henry Georges, our Knights of Labor, our homestead strikes, the World War—down a glorious road of enlightenment and betterment for the people of our country. It must be our sole regret that we could not have lived all through it—could not have come skipping down the road with it—with that abandon of youth which was its characteristic.

But now a challenge has come to America—another challenge. I suppose the present is always more serious than the past, but I believe today's challenge to America is the most serious in her glorious parade.

The panorama of America today is one of millions of people broken in morale, frightened by what the morrow may bring; millions of persons whose initiative and spirit of free enterprise are checked; millions haunted by the specter of war. We find our people clamoring for an indefinable, intangible something known as security when the very state of mind to which they have been driven pushes them farther away from, not closer to, that security which they seek.

And may I say in passing, in connection with this deceptive word "security" that in all of man's struggles from the primitive to his present state, the nearest approach to security is that of the Arab of the desert, who, untroubled by the worries of richer minds, builds his castle with a blanket on the sands of the night.

Surely that is not what the clamorers for the more abundant life desire.

Whence comes this challenge to America? What is it that is tapping our life stream? It is not an enemy from beyond our gates, my friends. No foreign foe is massing her troops against us. There is alarm among our people over a conflict 3,000 miles away, but that alarm is not caused because we are within range of enemy guns.

Ours is an alarm that has its roots somewhere else.

The challenge to America is right here in America.

Coursing our body politic, like the meanderings of a polluted stream, is a fear, a feeling of uncertainty, a weakening of morale. This is the enemy that stands menacingly over America. This is the challenge to America, and tonight I shall try to define it, to bring its many aspects into focus so that we may study its significance.

We have heard so much in recent years about graphs and charts as describing the state of our welfare, that I shall try to draw this picture in similar form.

Thus at the top of the chart we have a centralization of government with an overspreading tyrannical bureaucracy that is pressing our people down.

Our people, whose forefathers fled the compressed existence of Europe years and years ago, are figuratively being huddled for a return to the fatherland. Oh, we won't need boats for this epochal migration. We won't have Hitler's transportation problems in his effort to repatriate the Germans from eastern European states. We solve that problem by letting the American people stay right here while the fatherland's bureaucracy and straight-jacketed way of living is brought over to encompass them. It would thus seem that our intellectuals who are shaping the vast migration are more efficient than their European brethren, though there is scant comfort for us in that.

The American people, my friends, are being calculatingly pressed into a state where they no longer consider their government a sort of necessary evil but rather as something to which they look for sustenance. They look upon their Government not as something to which they give part of their earnings that it may serve as the arbitrator of their affairs; or to act as their servant in matters for which they haven't time—but rather as something that is becoming more and more their master.

More serious still is the way in which American lives and destinies are beginning to revolve around the personality of one man regardless of whether that man be good or bad, whether he be mediocre in ability, or of the stature of a superman.

This is the challenge to America; this is the attitude that is responsible for the people's feeling of insecurity; what is taking out of them that assurance and confidence, that private initiative which has made this country what it is, and our people what they are.

The spectre of European regimentation is rising, out of the mess which the Europeans have made of their lives, to seduce them. The story of our country is coming to be an American odyssey.

Indeed, we have come down a long way from the majesty of State government to a period when it became necessary for the Federal Government to more actively participate in our highway building; down to a period when our growth of interstate commerce gave the Federal Government a more active supervision of our affairs.

In 1887 we set up the Interstate Commerce Commission; in 1890 the Sherman antitrust law was passed—radical departures from the sufficiency of the States. Those things were necessary to our growth. They were enacted after great thought and study.

But in one apparently desperate leap, since 1933, we have attained the state of civilization in which the Federal bureaucracy looks upon the State governments as mere ornamental appendages to decorate our map. The mayors of our cities, one must believe, have as their chief mission the trip to Washington for greater hand-outs.

In our world affairs we don't consider any more that the United States Government exchanges notes, for instance, with the governments of Germany, Great Britain, or Russia. Now our international relations are judged by what F. D. said to Hitler, Chamberlain, and Stalin, and what they said in reply.

The American people have not come voluntarily to this state of affairs. They would not have willingly thrown away their heritage of private initiative, of free play of energies and abilities. It is their Government that has done this to them, their national leadership—and the vehicle that has stolen this heritage has been debt.

A steadily mounting debt has had as its underlying purpose the control of the country's credit system, and when a nation's pocketbook is controlled that nation is effectively strangled.

This is the challenge to America; this is what is bewildering our people, weakening their fiber, and preparing them for their rendezvous with the ugly witch of dictatorship.

Every minute in the day the Federal Government is spending $23,500. And every minute of the day it goes $11,500 deeper in debt. We are now approaching the statutory debt limit of $45,000,000,000, but those in charge of the Government have no intention of letting even that limit stop them. It is up to the American people—reasserting themselves, the American people drinking once more from that golden cup of their ancestors and acting through their Congress—to stop them. This is what the people did, too, in the matter of the spend-lend bill at the last regular session of Congress. This bill was a subterfuge to get around the statutory debt limit, but it did not prevail. You can imagine, though, the fight that confronts the Congress now, what with the European conflict tending to divert the country's attention and very possibly coming to serve as the new avenue of approach on the part of those who want to regiment our lives.

But it is debt that is responsible for the nervousness of our people; it is debt that was responsible for the confusion in which we have been considering a matter that is so vital to all of us—the conduct of our Government during the turmoil abroad.

Let me digress right here to give you some comparisons between this country's position in 1914 and now, 1939, as we contemplate the second world war. You will see what a long way we have come down the road of what is affectionately called progress.

In 1914 the financial establishments of the important governments rested on something as tangible as gold; today all countries are on an inconvertible paper standard and even Great Britain no longer has any gold backing for currency. We have apparently gone out to corner the world's supply of gold in order to plant it underground in Kentucky. Maybe we do this on the assumption that more gold will sprout.

In 1914 a sound currency and a balanced budget were regarded as essential to economic prosperity. Now this Government believes an unbalanced budget to be the key to a newer and better world.

In 1914 our Federal debt was $1,193,000,000 and Federal expenditures were $7.17 per capita.

Today the national debt, including the guaranteed debt, exceeds $46,000,000,000, and the per capita annual Federal expenditures amount to $75.

There was no income tax in 1914. Today the maximum personal income tax is 79 percent.

Do you wonder that the Senate's consideration of the neutrality bill was so hazy?

It is debt that has given a sprawling and insolent army of bureaucrats their grip on the people. It is debt that has brought the Washington government into the intimacy of your lives, made you groggy in the drawing room or in the marts of trade.

And it was planned that way.

From the very first emergency appropriation of more than $3,000,000,000 back in 1933 to relieve distress and to serve as pump priming, the conception of the spenders has never been that primarily of relieving distress or priming the pump, as they claim, but rather to wrap the people for purposes of control in the tentacles of a bureaucracy.

Manifestly, pump priming was not a purpose, because the spending of these billions, and the billions that have followed, has been accompanied by a browbeating, hamstringing of business, of private initiative against which neither business nor initiative could have possibly reared its head. And it is a fact that relieving distress has been secondary to using the money to carry out "reforms"—reforms the most apparent accomplishment of which has been the stirring up of class hatreds, the stirring up of bitterness between employer and employee, between the farmer and the city laborer, between one section against another.

Out of it all, millions of our citizens are still unemployed—a situation which may now be partially relieved by a war boom. Oh, the absurdity of it.

Is there any wonder that millions of our citizens have tended to waste away; is there any wonder that a generation of our people is probably lost?

To find solutions to these serious problems is the challenge to America today.

Is it any wonder that millions of people, instead of being propelled from day to day by the private initiative which sent our products to all four corners of the globe and our men to top heights of inventiveness, are clamoring for an indefinable something called security?

I should like to ask those of you who, perhaps, several years ago asked a women to forego any career which she may have had in mind, and become your wife and the mother of your children, and who has given up her life to that great work and necessarily hasn't been able to keep abreast of the multitudinous commercial aspects of life. Do you know of any way in which you can guarantee her security after your death?

Oh, I know there are many ways—the best that man can devise under the circumstances. But can you honestly look her in the face and say, "In return for the love and assistance you have given me I have arranged that you will never have to worry about food, clothes, and a roof over your head during your life"?

No; you can't promise that. Because neither you nor I can tell what the morrow will bring.

A personality to whom millions pay daily homage is apparently the stability of our dollar, the stability of our securities, the stability of our business, the stability of our lives.

Our whole debt structure, the value of our money, a so-called managed currency, hinge, apparently, upon this personality—his whims and his judgment of what is best for us. Our entire economic fabric is tending more and more to range around him. In fact, he is threatening to become the fabric.

If I may make light of such a dismal picture, our very living is apt to become as mercurial as the Gallup poll, which purports to reflect the popularity of this man from week to week and month to month. One time his stock is up and again it is down.

I talked a few days ago with a businessman who had been quite a critic of the President, but who now said he was coming to believe that he was all right.

"I have been making money the last 3 months," he explained, and it was apparent he felt a distinct sense of gratitude to the President for letting him make it.

But, I say, my friends, that when we as a people come to placing our whole destiny in the hands of one man—to applaud him when we eat and blame him when we don't—then we are ready for the figurative return to the fatherland, with its regimented way of living.

Let me give you an example of how nearly we have come to that:

The assets of the six largest Government corporations total more than $9,000,000,000. The six largest private industrial corporations have assets of only slightly more than $7,000,000,000.

Here are some figures which may be interesting. The assets of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation are $1,694,400,000; of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation $3,106,600,000; of the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation, $1,614,200,000; of the Federal land banks, $2,328,000,000; Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, $469,800,000; Commodity Credit Corporation, $389,900,000.

Now we break down the assets of the six largest private corporations, as follows:

Standard Oil Company of New Jersey, $1,894,900,000; United States Steel Corporation, $1,822,400,000; General Motors Corporation, $1,491,900,000; Socony-Vacuum Oil Co., Inc.; $789,700,000; Standard Oil Company of Indiana, $693,500,000; the Ford Motor Co., $681,600,000.

If you happen to be a stockholder in any one of these private corporations, you are protected by a maze of laws, regulations, regulatory commissions, and bureaus. The officers of the corporations are subjected to penalties of fines and jail imprisonment for misdeeds, and the law requires that full and complete reports must be made at stated intervals.

You unquestionably have a stake in the Government corporations. Yet, I challenge you to try to find out anything about their operations, their bookkeeping, their items of the red and of the black.

They operate completely around the personality we have been talking about.

Then do you wonder that a general uneasiness has crept over the land to debilitate our people and draft heavily of their energies?

This situation is America's challenge today.

But there is one class, you may rest assured, who have not suffered any lessening of morale. They have, instead, become emboldened. Nowhere in the world do I know of a more confident people than those so-called social conscious bureaucrats.

I would like to give you just one example of their cockiness. The Dies Committee Investigating Un-American Activities recently uncovered the fact that some 600 high and low troops of the Washington bureaucracy belonged to what has generally been considered a Communist-front organization—the American League for Peace and Democracy. The organization admittedly receives its greatest single financial contribution from the Communist League.

But has this disclosure excited any of the administration heads? Not in the slightest. Instead, the Dies committee has been denounced for publishing the names of those employed by the Government and holding membership in the league. You would be surprised at the contempt in which Congress is held by the Washington bureaucrats or, rather, the new dealers among them.

It is not at all infrequent these days for a group of Government employees to meet and formally condemn Congress. Now, there is no suggestion anywhere that these people should be denied freedom of speech. It is simply a question of the advisability of

having them with their philosophies scattered advantageously throughout the Government for which the American people pay.

But it does not disturb the heads of the Government. I suppose their tolerance is what they have in mind when they bellow that they are a proletarian government, a government for the masses. Those masses which have been taken into the bureaucracy may well feel they have found a government with a social-consciousness, as the term goes, but God help those millions who have been caught in the economic maelstrom of the past 6 years.

My friends, in conclusion I want to state my conviction that when our forefathers left their European closed existences, when they left a living that was parceled out to them, when they left economic and political systems which stifled rather than loosened the energies of men, they had no idea that their sons would ever return, or rather that they would permit that sort of life over here.

There are many things we can get from Europe. For example, the culture of many of its peoples. We can take its great background of history too—but as something to keep in the background.

What we do not want to do is to adopt a way of living on which our grandfathers and great-grandfathers turned thumbs down in generations past.

I have not the slightest doubt that the world is round, but it does not follow that we, after attaining such great heights through the private initiative of our people, should end up whence our forefathers sprang. I pray that our country may be spared such folly.

Education for "The Same" and for "The Different"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. T. V. SMITH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 3, 1939

ADDRESS BY HON. T. V. SMITH, OF ILLINOIS

Mr. SMITH of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address recently made by me.

This address was made at the inauguration as second president of Brooklyn College, New York, October 19, 1939, of Dr. Harry D. Gideonse, a brilliant young economist and publicist of parts. He now presides over an institution where some 13,000 young Americans are working for college degrees. It is this type of work, under this type of leader, upon which we must rely, beyond even the wisest laws, for the preservation of peace and the restoration of prosperity in America, instruction in political leeway, in personal probity, in social tolerance.

The address is as follows:

There is going on in American education, as there is going on throughout the world of power, a struggle between those who want to glorify what is common to men and those who seek to celebrate what is different. One group is for solidarity and order, the other for freedom and variety. Were it not for the struggle between the two, with the shifts in academic population which it sometimes entails, you of Brooklyn would today be inaugurating a different president, I fancy; and we at the University of Chicago would still be enjoying the lively company of this beloved colleague, Harry D. Gideonse. These competing attitudes toward life we need to characterize as clearly as possible for education, not in order to make an "either or" but a "both and" accommodation. For of course both the same and the different are essential parts of life, and so both are proper aims of education. But which comes first and why—and with what strategy shall we treat what comes second?

I. ON EDUCATING FOR THE SAME

If we place exclusive emphasis, as do folk-worshippers, upon the sameness of human nature, then woe to the Jews, for they are different; woe to the capitalists, for they are different; woe to the Catholics, for they are different; then woe at last to the Protestants and even to the Democrats, for they too are different. When indeed we view the different with suspicion, there is nothing that is not different enough to become suspect. This is the psychological meaning of Marxism: since the "class war" requires a class to war against, any group may get marked for liquidation as "a class" in that curious relativity of misplaced malevolence.

I say "misplaced"; for what men hate who professionalize envy is really themselves, though at one time they see themselves projected as kulaks, another time as fascists, and another time as capitalists. Now the same is a hardy plant in the garden of humanism, and needs little cultivation; whereas the different is more delicate and must be nurtured to come to its best. The same seems indeed to grow wild in the bypaths of life, flourishing without attention, until we begin to take our aggressions out on the different. Then it is the same which disappears rather more than the different, as all men drift apart in a social distance of mutual distrust and suspicion. The same grows larger when men are allowed to think differently and are encouraged to individualize their talents.

The moral of this paradox is neatly put in a legend that clusters around a meteor which fell long ago in Africa. The story has it that the massive hulk was pure gold when it landed at the meeting place of three tribal lands. When the neighboring tribes fell to quarreling over it, the gold turned to silver, and later when they fought over it, it turned to iron. Now the base material appears robbed of all its magic.

Nature has indeed laid in us the pure gold of common sympathy and glad understanding. She has made us much alike, and has placed us in a common environment which itself remains largely constant. Whether she has given men an equal measure of political virtue to enable us, as in Plato's beautiful myth, to stand together in strength against the craft of the stronger brutes, she certainly has endowed us with the potency of sympathy and has equipped us with organs and aptitudes that are very much the same. Have we not all eyes? Have we not hands, organs, dimensions, senses, affection, passions, fed with the same food, hurt with the same weapons, subject to the same diseases, healed by the same means, warmed and cooled by the same winter and summer? If you prick us, do we not all bleed? If you tickle us, do we not all laugh? If you poison us, do we not all die?

Yet in spite of all that Nature has done to prosper our similarity, some men make it their business to monopolize this emphasis as though it were wholly neglected by both nature and custom. The Cult of the Folk is such a carrying of coals to Newcastle. The Cult of the Comrade is another such carrying of coals to Newcastle. What is a virtue in the mean can become by overemphasis a vice and even a crime in the extreme. When sociality turns to pure gregariousness, the social same becomes the curse of civilization. For civilization connotes a reverent regard for variation as well as appreciation of similarity. Particularly is this true in the free field of fancy. In nothing are there such easy and such innocent differences as in the proliferations of ideology, political, religious, cultural.

Yet orthodoxy has invaded even that fine, free field to censor the different and to enforce the same. And this has been as true of secular orthodoxy as of the sacred. No inquisition has ever been more ruthless against ideological deviation than the blatantly secular sacerdotalism known as dialectical materialism and its present bloody brother in arms called nazi-ism. Yet I would not willingly withdraw any of the historic dishonor acquired by zealots in behalf of sacred orthodoxy. Both are bad enough. Inquisitions are not made less inquisitive, nor less odious to civilized men, by changing their complexion from sacred to secular or from secular to sacred again. Even as generous a mind as that of Plato at his best, uniting the sacred and the secular, perpetrates in a frenzy of friendliness this joint infamy. Not only was he willing to prescribe a "little gentle violence" for the dissenter's own good, but he was also willing to liquidate those who dared to differ from him on sacred matters of secular metaphysics.

Indeed, we may borrow from Plato the rule stick of overdevotion to the same. It was his conviction that proper objects of thought validate methods of inquiry rather than the methods of inquiry validating objects of belief. In that antithesis we have made conspicuous the logical watershed as between the ancient and the modern civilized world. I say "civilized" world advisedly, for those among us who give way to the undertow toward the same are the barbarians of our time. They have the outlook which Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes once described as perfectly natural, which, of course, it is. Natural also is sadism; so, too, are murder and rape. Natural they all are, but not civilized. Said the great Justice: "Persecution for the expression of opinion seems perfectly logical. If you have no doubt of your premises or of your power and want a certain result with all your heart you * * * naturally sweep away all opposition." This same civilized man, though professing full devotion to truth, admitted that he was not God and, indeed, that he did not know "the truth of truth." Nor do those know more who do not admit it. Affirmation cannot conjure sameness where it does not exist, though it summon it ever so loudly through the metaphysics of power or even through the power of metaphysics.

Unity, however, which cannot be coerced or even metaphysically cajoled may yet be permitted through forbearance or nurtured in strategy. Indeed, without any attention whatsoever, the same, we may now guess, grows more prolific than is requisite for the best balanced social life. As a mere matter of strategy, then, the first emphasis of educational statesmen should be elsewhere; should, in fact, be upon preserving and cultivating the different.

II. ON EDUCATING FOR THE DIFFERENT

It is precisely because being alike is both so natural and so easy to us gregarious animals that it becomes imperative for us to prize more the equally precious, that wherein we are different. Otherwise, returning too ardently to the folds of each other's warmth, we will stagnate in a veritable cesspool of simi-

larity. Art, stifling spontaneity, will be degraded into more and more of the same. Science, inattentive to negative instances, will lose itself in dogma ever repeated so. Religion, ceasing to affirm divine creativeness through human hands, will become sordid superstition exploited in the name of bogus control. All in all, men can easily nuzzle themselves back to savagery in luscious enjoyment all the while of human sameness. That indeed is the direction toward which education as indoctrination points, as, of course, it is the illusive road being blazed for their peoples by all totalitarian tyrants. Beware, too, the scholarly forerunners of fascism who tell you that Gemeinschaft is to be preferred to Geselischaft, that is, that societies that rest upon unconscious sociality are better than those that raise civic relations to a conscious art and celebrate similarity by that legal meeting of minds called contract.

The nurture of the different goes on at two levels. There is the level of tolerance tinged as it is with negativity, and then there is the summit of growth marked by positive embracement of variety as the greatest good. Now it is enough for ordinary social purposes that we maintain the level of tolerance, though individual fulfillment requires more. Tolerance means a hands-off policy with reference to those who disagree with us, giving the young thereby a chance to breathe the air of ideological choice. That much assured, society can grow in the interstices of many a "no man's land." Even this negative virtue is so hard to achieve, however, that it is perhaps all we politicians have a right to ask of educators, or they to demand of us, especially during these days hazardous to any form of sociality save antipathy. The danger is indeed that we politicians at least shall be driven to limit even tolerance to those who are themselves tolerant.

This much, however, is absolutely indispensable to the maintenance of moderate civilization. Think concretely what sustained intolerance would mean to that civilized form of demeanor known as religion. Suppose there was only Judaism in the world, or but Roman Catholicism, or even united Protestanism alone. If you can entertain with pleasure the thought of any such monopoly, then you love provincialism rather than life and light; for life has given birth to all religious "isms" and each of them has shed and does shed some light upon our common path. Civilization could more easily do without all of them than it could do with either of them alone. With either alone piety would sink to superstition, whereas divested of them all our fecund Mother Nature would again produce their counterparts in forms gallantly pluralistic as before.

What I say of religion you will say with equal truth of politics. You know what braying ass the Democratic Party would become, prizing only its provender and kicking at all comers, were it not for the Republican Party to keep alive another order of civic pulchritude, elephantine in proportions. And I know equally well how poor a thing the Republican Party would become, did become, without a strong Democratic Party to keep it circumspect. It is a linguistic token of the pluralistic nature of political virtue that from the beginning in America we have on Monday, Wednesday, and Friday called our country a republic, and on Tuesday, Thursday, and Saturday called it a democracy. Sunday we have long reserved for moral relaxation in the hinterland of theocracy.

When Communists learn the A B C's of American manners they too may join us Democrats and Republicans at the table of power without grabbing all the food above and kicking all the shins below the linen of civil decency. Surely if Communists can sleep with Fascists, they ought to be able to eat civilly with capitalists. Indeed, having stomached the very dregs of tolerance, Communists as Stalinists might now, it would seem, meet Communists as Trotskyites without spitting at each other in streets as clean as Brooklyn's under LaGuardia. It is but infantile obstreperousness to live on dung and to spit poison when the pantry of power is groaning with viands. With "comrades" and "kamerads" now walking together, let every "Tommy Gallager's Crusade" relax a little toward tolerance and later widen into generosity. For—

"* * * the world is wondrous large,—seven seas from marge to marge—
And it holds a vast of various kinds of man;
And the wildest dreams of Kew are the facts of Khatmandhu,
And the crimes of Clapham chaste in Martaban.

"Here's my wisdom for your use, as I learned it when the moose
And the reindeer roared where Paris roars to-night:—
'There are nine and sixty ways of constructing tribal lays,
And—every—single—one—of—them—is—right!'"

—*Rudyard Kipling.*

III. ON EDUCATIONAL STATESMANSHIP FOR BOTH THE SAME AND THE DIFFERENT

If educational statesmanship could present to America a generation nerved to see how much of the different can be allowed rather than how much of the same must be exacted, we should at last have entered culturally upon our long heritage of political freedom. The common bond between freemen is surely not to be assumed more tenuous or less precious than the social bond between the unfree. There is a law of compensation which holds that those who lose their unity through freedom shall find it, and those who find their sociality through coercion shall lose it. The message of the college to its students then should but repeat in terms curricular the moral of the poet's age-old wisdom:

Only this gift I beg of you—
Let me be
Swift wings to bear you on your skyward journey—
A sword to cleave your bonds and set you free!
Then, though you drop both out-worn sword and pinions,
I shall not care,
Knowing I gave you wider skies to wander,
And of my love made freedom—not a snare!

—*Jamie Sexton Holme.*

Or in language less lofty, educational statesmanship will conspire to further what science and democracy unite to illustrate. That is a method the same for all scrupulous minds. Science does not start with objects or beliefs given as sacred, but it starts with a method which, when honestly applied, yields sameness of belief as the reward of effort.

"That that I ask of you," said the great Pasteur to his admirers, "is what you again in your turn demand of the disciples who gather round you; and for the investigator it is the hardest ordeal he can be asked to face—to believe that he has discovered a great scientific truth, to be possessed with a feverish desire to make it known, and yet to impose silence on himself for days, for weeks, sometimes for years, whilst striving to destroy those very conclusions, and only permitting himself to proclaim his discovery when all the adverse hypotheses have been exhausted. Yes; that is a difficult task. But when, after many trials, you have at length succeeded in dissipating every doubt, the human soul experiences one of the greatest joys of which it is capable."

Such is the method of science which constitutes all the sameness that honest and bold minds require until through it they can create more in the name of truth. Such is the virtuosity of science which renders it one of the humanities of our age. One but only one, prerequisite for the humane life. Truth indeed is not the only value which our culture enshrines and which educational statesmanship seeks to perpetuate. The other humanities remain, too, of indispensable importance for the life of mind which colleges serve. Beyond truth lie both goodness and beauty. What of sameness survives in these fields to save their freedom from the bedlam of cultivated differences? In these vaguer regions the spirit of democracy must obtain, as the spirit of science prevails in the realm of stricter logic. The social technique of forbearance saves beauty from bedlam, and the political method of compromise, as practiced by us politicians, prevents good men from destroying good men in the name of goodness itself. Democracy is not a dogma any more than science is prescribed canon. Democracy is whatever can be arrived at democratically, and not another thing. Like science, then, it is a method of our getting ahead without leaving any of us behind. I commend to the "essentialists" in education these two essentials—science and democracy—for conserving the same and for enlarging the different.

In this gallant enterprise of weaving democracy and science into a way of life, you have now a leader, today officially inaugurated, who I think will not fail you in exploiting to the full the cultural potencies of Brooklyn. Indeed, I count on his building many a Brooklyn Bridge from here to connect with every section of our great country. His prospects I envy from an experience of my own.

When I stood for the Illinois Senate some years ago from the Hyde Park district in Chicago, I did so in part because of the extraordinary complexity of the population. Differences that were the raw stuff of community richness were being wasted through suspicion and conflict. My constituency was, speaking generally, half white and half Negro; one-third Jewish, one-third Catholic, one-third Protestant; it was one-half rich, one-half poor; it was half sophisticated, with the proud University of Chicago at its center, and half underprivileged, educationally speaking. What a chance to begin with the negative virtue of tolerance and to drive toward the positive goal of appreciation of variety as the chief ingredient of the best life of man.

The Borough of Brooklyn offers something like the same challenge educationally, I fancy, which Hyde Park offered politically. You have just the man to do this job. You might have searched the world over, as perhaps you did, and not found a person better equipped, temperamentally and philosophically, to shame provincialism into tolerance and to educate tolerance into magnanimity. If I know Gideonse—and we have been together through personal thick and ideological thin—this challenge is probably the chief reason he was willing to leave the rich life of scholarship to undertake this fuller life of educational administration.

Gideonse comes to Brooklyn under hardships that favor preeminent success. The conflict abroad sharpens this problem of the same and the different at home. He brings to the task a free hand. Nobody told me so; but I know Gideonse. There has been no politics in his appointment, and there will be no favoritism in his administration. Nobody told me so; but I know Gideonse—and, incidentally, I know the educational record of LaGuardia, your mayor; and, less incidentally, I know the capacity and sagacity of Ordway Tead, the chairman of your progressive board. Gideonse is not here because he shares the politics now prevailing in either New York City or in Washington. I remark it sadly. I have certainly done my own best, privately and publicly, to set him right; and he and I will shortly be debating

publicly again. But he remains independent, treating politics as he treats education, a nonpartisan opportunity to make social life more fruitful and personal life more happy and wholesome.

President Gideonse approaches his task here not only independently but confidently. The world has given him a problem, which he prizes; your board has given him a commission, which he respects; and experience has provided him already with wise cues for fruitfully beginning his task, the task of creating finer human hungers at a time when elemental fear and suspicion threaten to return us all to the level of the pack. As much as any man I know, President Gideonse has the proper slant upon this supreme task of educational statesmanship. I say so because he has right convictions upon the sacredness of the same, sound appreciations of the significance of the different, and the strategy of courage required to interthread the two like the warp and the woof, which they are, of social life.

All of this is but to say that Gideonse has a scientific mind yoked to a very democratic heart. The democratic heart insures against the intellectual conceit which in others ripens into cynicism. It promises that at Brooklyn College, students will be junior partners, faculty members, colleagues in leadership, and citizens the custodians of this community enterprise which he leads. The scientific mind is insurance against every type of provincialism and against one peculiar form of self-deceit. Such a mind does not submit to the impulsion to believe merely because others must dogmatize. Its holder, it so sensitizes to the different, that he knows that all ideas as ideas are equally good. Only those that can be proved true are any better. Since appreciation of ideas does not depend upon their being true—for there remain goodness and beauty as independent bases of appreciation—proof of truth becomes but the burden of science, as tolerance of variety remains the guerdon of the democratic spirit. What cannot be proved to the satisfaction of all trained minds is no matter of truth to be urged by any, but a matter of free appreciation to be tolerated by all and to be enjoyed by such as enjoy it.

Such a mind, I repeat, we induct today into the presidency of this magnificent municipal institution of learning. He will carry forward with considerate courage the honest work of others which he inherits. In doing so, he must be bold for without it the past will peter out in the present. He must be reverent, for without it he will undo all the past and have nothing left on which to build for the future. In this spirit of reverent boldness may Gideonse for many a year become and be the master builder for the Borough of Brooklyn. As earnest of proper orientation, I bequeath to him now this poetic testament of beauty and wisdom—

"THE PALACE

"When I was a King and a Mason—a Master proven and skilled—
I cleared me ground for a Palace such as a King should build.
I decreed and dug down to my levels. Presently, under the silt,
I came on the wreck of a Palace such as a King had built.

"There was no worth in the fashion—there was no wit in the plan—
Hither and thither, aimless, the ruined footings ran—
Masonry, brute, mishandled, but carven on every stone:
'After me cometh a Builder. Tell him, I too have known.'

"Swift to my use in my trenches, where my well-panned groundworks grew,
I tumbled his quoins and his ashlars, and cut and reset them anew.
Lime I milled of his marbles; burned it, slacked it, and spread;
Taking and leaving at pleasure the gifts of the humble dead.

"Yet I despised not nor gloried; yet, as we wrenched them apart,
I read in the razed foundations the heart of that builder's heart.
As he had risen and pleaded, so did I understand
The form of the dream he had followed in the face of the thing he had planned.

"When I was a King and a Mason—in the open noon of my pride,
They sent me a Word from the Darkness—They whispered and called me aside.
They said—'The end is forbidden.' They said—'Thy use is fulfilled.
Thy Palace shall stand as that other's—the spoil of a King who shall build.'

"I called my men from my trenches, my quarries, my wharves, and my sheers.
All I had wrought I abandoned to the faith of the faithless years.
Only I cut on the timber—only I carved on the stone:
'After me cometh a Builder. Tell him, I too have known.'"

—*Rudyard Kipling.*

Neutrality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. THORKELSON

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 3, 1939

Mr. THORKELSON. Mr. Speaker, the world will soon realize that Congress in repealing the arms embargo has taken the first step toward the destruction of civilization. In this capitulation to the international financiers and ammunition makers, Congress has not given due consideration to the people who must die because of its act. Congress, in allowing the free sale of ammunition, war materials, and extension of credit by Government corporations, opened the door for a war in Europe that may lead to the destruction of millions of innocent lives.

It is selfish to look at this issue purely from our own viewpoint. A Canadian citizen came into my office a week ago, and said that he hoped we would continue in session for 6 weeks more, so as to give the people now at odds in Europe an opportunity to adjust their differences. This gentleman said that there would be no war in Europe if we retained the arms embargo, and even if we held off our decision for a month or more he believed all the troops would be withdrawn from the battle fronts. He further said that the Canadian people and the British people did not want to fight this war, and that the French soldiers were beginning to realize that this war was for Great Britain, to the last Frenchman.

Mr. Speaker, that is what we should have done, instead of standing on the floor shouting war threats to build up hatreds, and start young men marching to their deaths. The talks given on the floor yesterday were about the most unneutral, unreasonable, and unjust remarks that I have ever heard, and with as little consideration for the consequences as had England, when she banished her own people to penal colonies in the Bay of Bengal and the Pacific Ocean. Little consideration was given to the farmers in the United States, and to the small-business man and to the common people when Congress voted credit for the contemplated war to the same powers that grabbed all the colonies, upset the peace of Europe, and did not even have the honor to pay their honest debts to us. The Members in Congress who voted against the embargo and for this credit did not help the English people but instead helped the internationalists or the invisible government of Europe and the United States to make more money, to enhance their world control, which is ultimately to rule the United States by a dictator chosen from their own ranks.

As further evidence how the people feel about this war in Canada, I shall quote one of the letters which I have received:

DEAR SIR: This line is to thank you for copy of CONGRESSIONAL RECORD covering your speeches, September 25 to October 5, 1939, inclusive, which was sent to me in answer to a letter of mine to you.

I read every word of it—would that there were more like you in Congress.

My first letter was written because of my profound distrust of F. D. Roosevelt, first; and secondly, it is needless to say that anything in the war line the U. S. A. does affects us profoundly here. For instance, the U. S. A. at war would mean immediate conscription in the U. S. A. We here would follow suit just as soon.

The Quebec elections of October 25, hailed far and wide as endorsement of Canada's war efforts, was in part a vote against conscription because every one of the Ottawa ministers who came here to work for the Liberal cause used the slogan, "We are your rampart and bulwark against conscription." "A vote for us Liberals is a vote against conscription," etc., and anyone who knows French Canada, who feels Canada is their only land, home, and interest, and who have no interest in empire, knows their reaction to conscription of their boys of 19 to 21 for England's imperial wars.

The fact is that if this war lasts a few years, this country will be as poor as Panama, and the sooner the U. S. A. takes us and protects us from perpetual British exploitation the better; the better for us anyway.

This is one of several letters I have received from Canada and is similar to the many, many other letters which I have received from our own people. Nobody wants war, and no one has any more desire to see foreign children killed with our ammunition than they have to jeopardize the lives of their own children.

It is for that reason I voted for the arms embargo, and against extension of credit from any source whatsoever to nations now marking time on the battle fronts of Europe, waiting for a green light from us to go ahead.

I am not so afraid of our becoming involved in war, because I do not believe Congress will vote for war, if the Members listen to the wishes of the people they represent.

However, the bill is now passed, and we are not operating under international law, but we are instead operating under an act which is not, as the name implies, a neutrality act but is instead a most vicious and dangerous piece of legislation.

We are in a sad plight indeed, and I am not writing this into the RECORD to reform Congress or to change the Federal Government. I am instead writing it into the RECORD to warn the American people that they are going to lose their Government and be led into another war if they fail to express themselves in a very forcible manner.

I shall ask the people who read this act to study it very carefully. It is printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, under the caption "Bill as Passed the Senate," pages 642 to 652. May I first call your attention to the heavy penalties in subsection (b) that may be levied against anyone that innocently or otherwise fails to understand the provisions of this act. When I say, "fails to understand," I mean just that, because it is worded in such manner as to deceive a casual reader.

Subsection (c), after "Transfer of Title," makes it impossible for any citizen of the United States to present a claim for merchandise through the Government of the United States. Now what is the purpose of this? If it is a cash transaction, no transfer of title is needed. But for credit, transfer is necessary. Any business firm, to consummate sale of merchandise, will be forced to operate subject to regulation applied by the Presidential appointees.

Subsection (d) makes it impossible for a United States citizen who insures a ship or cargo in a foreign company to collect such claim by forwarding it to the Government of the United States. Both of these subsections are for the protection of Great Britain, instead of our own business people, for our own merchants can neither collect for merchandise sold to foreign governments, or for insurance if underwritten in foreign companies, by forwarding their claims through the Government of the United States. Everyone must therefore sell for cash alone, and insure in American companies, in order to be protected. The idea is fine, but when this begins to operate, the merchants will also discover that there will be no cash at hand.

Subsection (f) makes it possible for American vessels to carry contraband to foreign nations.

Subsection (g) makes it possible for our ships to carry contraband from longitude 66 west, to the Caribbean Sea, or the east coast of Africa, and as far south as the Tasman Sea, which lies between New Zealand and Australia. There are many other provisions in this act that we cannot enforce, or if we attempt to enforce, which can only lead us into war with such powers as insist on their international rights.

Now let us see what is going to happen. Our ships will leave with contraband cargo to neutral ports, consigned to firms now on the British blacklist. These ships will be hailed and diverted by the English navy to British ports, and cargoes confiscated. This was done during the World War, and it will happen again in this war. During the World War, British cruisers even came within the territorial waters—our 3-mile limit. For further evidence, I refer you to the RECORD of November 1, page 1274.

Other American ships bound to the ports of nations at war, or their territories, will be hailed by German submarines, which they have a perfect right to do, outside of the 3-mile limit. If such ships are loaded with contraband cargo, the German war vessels, not having access to their own ports because of the British blockade, will, to prevent deliveries of such contraband cargo, sink such ships in retaliation to the British blockade of German ports. As long as our merchant ships are not armed, and are distinctly marked, it is my opinion that they will be hailed and the crew transferred or allowed to leave the ship. However, should we decide to arm our merchant ships, they will be considered war craft and sunk without warning. It was such unrestricted submarine warfare that was used during the World War to aline us with Great Britain, and the same attempt will be made in this war when our merchant ships suffer from undersea attack.

The question now arises: Who is responsible for this? And the answer is Congress, for enacting legislation that is clearly unconstitutional, and for allowing the President to enforce such laws as no other nation in the world would attempt to enforce.

Those who have read the papers can readily see what is in the President's mind. He now speaks of the safety band, set aside at the Panama Conference as our territorial waters, when nothing could be more difficult to enforce. Great Britain herself said, shortly after this conference, that if the United States Navy attempted to enforce safety to shipping in these 300-mile zones, it would mean war for the United States, and nothing else. Please understand that this statement was made by officers in the British Admiralty.

Will it be worth while for us to insist on these rights, which have no sanction under international law, outside of our own 3-mile limit, at the expense of loss of ship, cargo, and maybe lives? I think not; but that is what we may expect if we attempt to enforce the present Neutrality Act.

There are many other features in this legislation which will be disputed by all neutral nations. For instance, we have no right to investigate neutral ships, or to inquire into or investigate the source and disposition of their cargoes after they have been cleared from our ports. We are not the world policemen, and if we assume that position, the ultimate outcome can readily be visualized by anyone who understands these problems.

What did the Congress of the United States do in the repeal of the Neutrality Act? The Congress enacted into legislation, as I have said before, a most unneutral act which is for no other purpose except to give the President and his appointees, under the sanction of law, the power to involve this country in war. He did not want the embargo clause, for if our ships were sunk, under this clause responsibility would fall upon the Federal Government for violation of the law, or clearing such ships to nations at war. As it is now responsibility falls entirely upon Congress, so the President is still in the position in which he has always been in relation to Congress: It is heads he wins, and tails Congress loses. The President's attitude toward Congress is better expressed by himself, when he accepted an invitation to go to Chicago in April. He said he would accept the invitation "if Congress will behave."

The majority in Congress did behave on November 2, because the majority stood stanchly by the President, and equally solidly against the wishes of the American public. So the President should have no complaint on that score, in spite of the fact that he said he would leave the legislation alone. President Roosevelt has never left any legislation alone, but has instead used every resource to chisel more and more power from the supine Members of Congress who have forgotten their obligation to the people.

Congress, in voting for this act, committed the youth of Australia, Canada, England, France, Germany, and other nations that will become involved in this war to a slaughterhouse on the battlefields of Europe. The people in none of these countries wanted war. They did not want to become involved in this conflict, for all of them realize that it is for no other purpose but to satisfy the desire of the internationalists so that they may, true to their stripe, vent their hatred upon a nation that has selected to get along without them. If it were in my power, I would see that this crowd of international exploiters were all represented in the first shock unit to enter this fray. It would be a blessing to civilization if we could get rid of them now and forever. If that were possible, the world could again enjoy peace and harmony.

Let us now visualize what may happen—and I insert these remarks in the RECORD with the hope that they may be distributed among the people of the United States, so that they

will not again be fooled when the war mongers begin to loosen their barrage of propaganda. Under this act the President may, with little or no restriction, send American ships, not only loaded with contraband but with war material as well, to nations in war zones and also to nations at war. What will this mean? It will mean nothing else except that American merchant ships will be hailed by enemy craft, examined, and if they are found to carry contraband cargo, or any cargo to nations at war, they will be sunk. The American people must now realize that it is strictly within the rights of belligerent powers to sink such ships, whether they belong to us or any other neutral nation. Other neutral nations realize this and make no complaint when such misfortune befalls them. Such ships are, of course, running the blockade of enemy powers and must, therefore, take the consequences.

President Roosevelt is not going to accept such losses without wailing to high heaven that his mandate has been violated. He does not know that the jurisdiction of the United States ends at the 3-mile limit. The zones which Congress has set aside are in direct conflict with international law, and the President's proclamation is not recognized by belligerents or any neutral nation.

I hope that Members of Congress will realize, as I have said in previous remarks, that the dangerous part of this legislation was in the act itself and not alone in the arms-embargo clause. This action of Congress may have a very far-reaching effect, but whatever happens it is an injustice to everyone who will be compelled to put on a uniform and die in an attempt to place world powers under domination of the international money barons. It will not be long until we will begin to sustain losses, and when such losses are registered in our daily papers, I want the fathers and mothers in these United States to remember that the majority that voted for this act, the majority that sustained the wishes of the administration, is solely responsible for such losses. When the reports begin to come in, the people should demand that Congress repeal the powers given to the President by repealing the present so-called Neutrality Act. The people should also demand that the Executive Department be shorn of all unconstitutional power that has been granted over a number of years, until that Department comes strictly within Article II of the Constitution of the United States. It is only in that manner that this country can be saved for future generations. I dislike to make such statements as these, but I feel it my duty, as a citizen, as a Member of Congress, and a Representative of my people in Montana, as well as of the United States, to adhere to my obligations to preserve, to protect, and defend the Republic of the United States against all enemies.

Neutrality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 3, 1939

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, undeniably, the French and the English and even Americans who cherish a democratic form of government, who look upon their independence, freedom of speech, and the right of worship as they choose as something indeed precious and worthy of every endeavor to preserve, are here publicizing the cause of the Allies. Americans do this because they believe in a democracy and its fine institutions, which permit them to speak openly, as they do without fear or undue favor. They have in great numbers placed themselves strongly and unreservedly on record as favoring a revision of the present so-called neutrality law. Now, there are also those who call this propaganda, and it may, perhaps, be properly designated as propaganda. But I cannot bring myself to find fault with this type of honest and informative propaganda, because it is in the last analysis born of true Americanism and carries no tinge of malevolent alien philosophies.

There is another type of propaganda for which I have not the slightest sympathy. I refer to the propaganda that springs, not from Americanism, but from ties with foreign countries that do not share our beliefs in freedom and equal opportunity for righteous development. It comes from sources that unmistakably place the interests of alien peoples above our own. Some of this homicidal extravaganza clearly comes from sources readily identified as inimically foreign. I mean, for example, the recent putrid emissions of the Russian, Molotov, emissions given wings on the eve of an important vote in this Congress and plainly calculated to influence our action. That type of propaganda must be criticized as coming from the selfish; and even more open to justifiable criticism is the inane drivel disseminated, many times for cash, by individuals and organizations that cloak their real identity with duty and patriotism, and while emphasizing that they are American citizens indeed attack and attempt to destroy all that we true Americans hold dear.

I would not expect one of European birth to forever forget his native land, even after he acquired American citizenship; but I do expect, and this country has the right to demand, that he take seriously the oath of allegiance he swears to this country, and place its interests above the interests of any other country whatsoever.

I cannot too strongly condemn the man who freely becomes a citizen of the United States, accepts all the benefits thereof, and then gives time and effort to conduct that falls little short of treason. In saying this I refer specifically to the conduct of such men as Ten Ecks and Walter Silge, both former German Army officers who served in the World War, and who are now American citizens. These men have the colossal audacity to accept citizenship in this great country, in which every citizen is a sovereign, but in which no one cares to wear a crown, and they join hands with others in the diffusion of misinformation and poison tending to encourage insidious machinations looking to causing this very Congress to take action detrimental to the national welfare.

Some of these men I have in mind, who are citizens of the United States by suffrance only, do not content themselves with an appeal to reason and logic, they do not stop at patent and befogging contradictions, they do not stop at cajolery and flattery, but they go the limit and threaten and try to intimidate the Members of this Congress in the conscientious discharge of a serious duty to be performed here. These notorious, national rascals have received an answer from the Members of Congress. The vote on the pending legislation puts them in a most unenviable position, especially with their own dupes.

Let me read a letter I have received from the Deutsch-Amerikanisch Einheitsfront—translated it becomes the German-American National Alliance, Inc. Its address is post-office box 492, Chicago, Ill. The letter says:

SEPTEMBER 1939.

HON. ADOLPH SABATH,
United States Representative from Illinois,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: We attach hereto a list recording the voting of the Members of the House of Representatives in matters of the Bloom fake neutrality bill. We have tried to correctly set forth therein the vote of each Member and would appreciate to have you check the list concerning your vote. If an error or omission has taken place, kindly so advise us, so that we may change the list accordingly before we give it national publicity through the various channels open to us.

In the event of a special session of Congress and further voting on the matter of neutrality by the House of Representatives, we shall revise the list according to the vote then given before giving it wide circulation.

Permit us to state that we are aiming to pledge all of our members and members of all organizations which are or may become affiliated with us to assist in preventing by lawful means any person from ever again holding a public office who votes for the enactment of legislation or termination of existing laws as a result whereof the sale of arms, munitions, and implements of war would be permitted in the matter of the present European conflict.

We are convinced that such action on part of Congress would lead us into the present European war, which is of no concern to our country.

Very truly yours,

GERMAN-AMERICAN NATIONAL ALLIANCE,
PAUL F. WARNHOLITZ,
Chairman of Committee on Public Affairs.

This is one of the most arrogant pieces of propaganda that has ever tried to insult my intelligence. This character of the individual and this organization he represents has no place in the public life of a true democracy. The letter just read shows clearly that its author and those he represents believe in intimidation and force, as practiced by the Nazis they ape, rather than the orderly democratic processes of our Government and society.

From Chris Claussen, secretary of the German-American Citizens' League, Chicago, Ill., one who is very active in the bund, I have the following letter under date of October 31, 1939:

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The German-American Citizens' League at its regular delegate meeting on October 30, passed a resolution instructing the secretary to write our Representatives in Congress requesting them to cast their vote against any change in the present Neutrality Act, and any attempt to repeal the arms embargo, thereby keeping our country out of any future war.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS CLAUSSEN, *Secretary.*

Again, from the National Federation of American Citizens of Germanic Descent, Chicago, Ill., I have this telegram, which is equally as insulting as the communication of the German-American National Alliance, dated October 31, 1939:

Don't join warmongers, "pork barrel" beneficiaries, munitions makers, and Benedict Arnolds in betraying American youth in gambling their lives to fight British wars. Defeat the counterfeit neutrality bill; keep arms embargo and keep America out of war.

Mr. Speaker, I deplore this to a greater extent than the intimidation and insinuations of voluble Father Coughlin and the Nazi leaders, with their cascades of lies, because I consider it potentially dangerous to our democratic institutions, and sooner or later may create fundamental disturbances, seriously undermine confidence in our form of government and in its institutions. As history shows, people are easily misled or deceived. With such dangerous discussion, I fear it may become necessary that a firm stand be taken against all offenders against our peace and tranquillity.

As I stated on the floor a few days ago, a majority of those opposed to the repeal of the Embargo Act do not take this position because to do so may lead us in war but that it may aid the democratic nations. As Senator GLASS and others have stated, and as the Gallup poll shows, about 98 percent of the American people condemned Hitler when he shamefully deprived the Austrians of their country, when the brave, peace-loving and liberty-loving Czechoslovaks were forced under Nazi domination, and when he without justifiable reason or remorse brutally destroyed the Polish Republic and robbed all of the peoples of those countries not only of their liberty of action but also their right to worship according to their dictates. Do the Nazi-Communist leaders believe they can continue their nefarious activities to bring discord in our land? If they do, they are overestimating the tolerance of the American people for their subversive activities.

Mr. Speaker, many Americans of German descent have expressed to me their displeasure for such communications as I have read to you. They are the kind of naturalized citizens that take the allegiance they swore to this Nation seriously. They are unselfishly interested in our country because it is their country, too. I know that the majority of naturalized Germans in this country are loyal to their oaths of allegiance and our form of government. I speak not against them, because I know them to be the finest type of citizens. I know their sterling worth, their patriotism, honesty, and integrity, and I am proud that many of them are my good friends. Of the other class, the unpatriotic fomenters of discord, the Nazi-Fascist-led goose-steppers and their mouthpieces, the bellowing and bristling rhetoricians who continually emit for cash reward immeasurable platform and press sewage, I can speak only with contempt. Their unredeeming disgrace is that they publicly exhibit their unworthiness to be called citizens of the United States, whose flag is loved while many other flags are feared.

Mr. Speaker, as between the late Cardinal Mundelein, bishop of the Catholic diocese of Chicago, and hundreds of outstanding clergymen of our country, among whom are Rt. Rev. Benjamin D. Dagwell, bishop of the Protestant Episcopal diocese of Oregon; Rev. J. Stanley Durkee, Plymouth Congregational Church of the Pilgrims, Brooklyn, N. Y.; Rev. Frederick B. Harris, Foundry Methodist Church, Washington, D. C.; Rev. Harold C. Phillips, First Baptist Church, Cleveland, Ohio; Dr. George W. Richards, president, Theological Seminary of Reformed Churches in United States, Lancaster, Pa.; Dr. Minot Simons, All Souls Unitarian Church, New York City; Dr. Joseph A. Vance, First Presbyterian Church, Detroit, Mich.; Dr. Stephen Wise, rabbi, Free Synagogue, New York City; Dr. Morris S. Lazaron, rabbi, Baltimore Hebrew Congregation, Baltimore, Md.; and the Nazi-inspired fulminations, I chose to follow the pleas for repeal of the embargo law by these eminent churchmen, in that revision will insure safeguards best calculated to keep us out of war. Further, I was strengthened in my decision to vote for the lifting of the embargo by consideration of the appeals of hundreds of patriotic American organizations on the one hand and the threat of the bund and the German-American National Alliance on the other. It has been easy for me and everybody else to line up with the proper force. As between those who fear that the neutrality bill may aid the democratic countries against pagan Germany, they thereby showing a greater interest in the Hitler regime, and the thousands of letters coming from real Americans who have the interest of our country at heart first, last, and all the time, I feel it is our duty to follow the latter, who reflect in undimmed splendor the desires and policies of our great leader, the President of the United States.

I am making this statement for the following reasons: Since Monday I have received a large number of letters inspired, I am sure, by Father Coughlin and the German-American National Alliance. Some of these communications carry what I consider outrageous threats, and I shall read a few of the intimidations.

Hitler-Nazi representatives here, such as Fritz Kuhn, with the ululations of the congenital liar he is; Father Coughlin, with his phantasmagoria of pulpit oratory; and many others, even though they were not here during the World War, have unworthily charged, simply to try to shape opinion against this administration on the subject of neutrality, that President Wilson promised the country at the time of his campaign for reelection to keep us out of war and within a very short time thereafter he unjustifiably plunged us into war. The inference is, of course, that President Roosevelt, although promising to keep us out of war, will by the new Neutrality Act force us into war.

To those who make that charge against that great American, Wilson, I answer that it is absolutely false, and I ought to know, because I am the only sitting Member of this House who was during the World War a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Those who lived as adults at that time and scholars will remember that during 2 years preceding our entering the World War the press generally and a large sector of our citizens under the leadership of Theodore Roosevelt urged that we enter the war. Sentiments and passions ever ran high in some quarters after the sinking of the *Lusitania* on May 7, 1915, with loss of 1,134 lives, including 144 Americans. Fortunately, though, President Wilson, great historian that he was, remained adamant in the presence of a white-heat pressure that was not easy to withstand in the face of the German submarine campaign and many and multiplying depredations against our domestic property under the planning of those arch-plotters Von Bernstorff and Dumba and execution of their understraps, Von Papen and Boy-ed.

At this time I will make part of the RECORD an article by Parke Brown in the Chicago Tribune of October 1, 1939, the

very organ that now so viciously and unwarrantably attacks the President, showing the results of these conspiracies. It says:

REIGN OF TERROR IN PRE-WAR ARMS DEALS RECALLED—NATION RAVAGED BY PLOTTERS IN 1914–16 ERA

(By Parke Brown)

The experience of the United States in manufacturing munitions for belligerents while attempting to maintain its own neutrality was recalled yesterday by an examination of newspaper files covering the period of the World War prior to the entrance of this country into the hostilities.

During that period of approximately 20 months there were scores of explosions in munition plants, incendiary fires were frequent, attempts to dynamite railroad trains and bridges were common, spy plots were directed at ships carrying war supplies, and there were some attempts at assassination. An effort to start a Mexican war was made.

TOLL NEVER COMPUTED

As far as is known, there never has been an accurate, official counting up of the cost in lives and property.

In spite of the secrecy with which all of these forms of violence was surrounded, Federal agents repeatedly traced crimes to representatives of belligerent nations. Official representatives of those nations were recalled upon demands from President Wilson. Some of the unofficial representatives were convicted and sent to prison.

The extreme nature of some of the disturbances was illustrated in the newspaper files by the actions of one man—Frank Holt, alias Erich Muenter, formerly a teacher in a Chicago private school. On July 2, 1915, he attempted to blow up the Capitol Building in Washington, D. C., and the following day tried to kill J. Pierpont Morgan in his home in Glen Cove, Long Island. He said his motive was to stop the exportation of munitions.

BOMB PLACED IN OFFICE

Holt, or Muenter, placed his Washington bomb in the reception room of Vice President Marshall, adjoining the Senate Chamber. The explosion occurred at 11:40 p. m., when that part of the building was unoccupied except for a guard, who was thrown off his chair. The damage was limited to walls, windows, and furniture.

When Holt went to the Morgan home he forced an entrance by pointing two revolvers at a butler. He found Morgan on the second floor and fired two shots at him, both of which struck his victim in the hip. The wounds were not serious.

Examination of the newspaper files was limited to crimes within the borders of the United States, all mention of violations of international law at sea or in other countries being ignored. Developments in the diplomatic situation which ended in war also were disregarded.

DISTURBANCES ARE REVIEWED

The files showed, as strictly domestic disturbances due to the sale of munitions to belligerents, the following events:

1914

August 29: Pompton, N. J., Du Pont powder storehouse blown up; one killed.

December 23: Picatinny, N. J., Government arsenal mixing house set on fire.

1915

January 18: Trenton, N. J., plant of John A. Roebling Co., making chains for French Army, destroyed by fire believed caused by bomb; damage, $1,500,000.

February 12: Haskell, N. J., explosion in Du Pont plant; three injured.

March 6: Haskell, N. J., explosion in Du Pont plant; five killed.

April 1: Alton, Ill., explosion in Equitable Powder Co. plant; five killed.

April 30: Carneys Point, N. J., Du Pont plant mixing house destroyed by explosion; six injured.

May 12: Wellington, N. J., Anderson Chemical Co. guncotton storehouse wrecked; three killed.

May 15: Carneys Point, N. J., Du Pont Co. stillhouse destroyed by two explosions.

June 26: Wayne, N. J., Du Pont mill demolished by explosion.

July 13.—Jefferstontown, Ky., United Safety Powder Co. mixing building wrecked by explosion, three killed; Carneys Point, N. J., two Du Pont Co. buildings wrecked by explosion; one killed, three injured.

August 3: Philadelphia, explosion in Frankford Arsenal; three killed.

August 16: Simamahoning, Pa., explosion in plant of Aetna Explosives Co.; five killed.

August 25: South Bethlehem, Pa., shell explosion in Bethlehem Steel Works; two killed.

August 30: Baltimore, Md., E. J. Dodd shrapnel plant burned.

August 30: Official letter from Constantin T. Dumba, Ambassador of Austria-Hungary to United States, seized and disclosed he planned to "disorganize and hold up for months, if not entirely prevent, manufacture of munitions in Bethlehem, Pa., and Middle West, which, in opinion of German attaché, is of great importance and amply outweighs expenditure of money involved."

September 10: Ambassador Dumba's recall demanded by President Wilson.

October 12: Pompton, N. J., explosion in Du Pont powder plant; seven injured.

October 16: Kane, Pa., explosion in Aetna powder mills; three Germans arrested.

November 10: South Bethlehem, Pa., machine shop of Bethlehem Steel Co. burned; loss, $5,000,000.

November 12: Trenton, N. J., munitions plant of Roebling & Sons destroyed by incendiary fire; loss, $1,500,000.

December 1: Wilmington, Del., explosion in Du Pont powder mills; 31 killed.

December 3: United States asked Germany to recall Captain Boy-ed, military attaché, and Captain von Papen for "improper activities in military and naval matters."

December 10: Hopewell, Pa., entire town destroyed and Du Pont powder plant burned with loss of $2,000,000.

1916

February 15: Brooklyn, N. Y., two British ships burned at docks; loss, $1,000,000.

March 31: Horst von der Goltz disclosed plot to invade Canada, blow up Welland Canal, and admitted enlisting Germans in Baltimore.

April 19: Government seized papers of Wolf von Igel, former secretary to Captain von Papen, in New York "advertising office." State Department later said they disclosed maintenance of a spy system, financing a bureau to stir up labor troubles in munitions plants, "the bomb industry and other related activities," financing of propaganda and subornation of American writers and lecturers.

July 30: Black Tom, N. J., ammunition trains blown up; four killed; loss, $45,000,000.

1917

January 11: Franz Bopp, German consul general in San Francisco, and Baron George W. von Brincken convicted of conspiracy to injure American shipping, railroad trains, bridges, and munitions plants, and sentenced to 2 years' imprisonment.

January 12: Kingsland, N. J., munitions plant of Canadian Car & Foundry Co. destroyed by explosion; loss, $16,000,000; Haskell, N. J., explosion in Du Pont powder plant blows up 400,000 pounds of powder, shaking four States.

February 21: United States published note from German Foreign Secretary Zimmermann proposing alliance with Mexico, for which Mexico would be paid by annexation of Southwestern American States; New Britain, Conn., set afire by incendiary bombs in 20 places; loss, $300,000.

March 22. Capt. Franz von Rintelen, of German Navy, and two others convicted in New York of conspiracy to interfere with shipment of munitions.

April 2: Six Germans convicted in New York of conspiracy to destroy munitions ships by bombs; attempt made to burn naval training station at Great Lakes, Ill.

On April 2, 1917, Congress met in special session. On April 4 the Senate passed the war resolution. The House passed the resolution April 6, and it was signed the same day by President Wilson. The formal declaration of war against Germany was issued immediately.

Only a few days ago, after 20 years' investigation, the United States-German Claims Commission awarded the United States $50,000,000 on account of the Black Tom, N. J., ammunition explosion of July 30, 1916, caused by German sabotage within our borders.

Here are the historical facts: On February 3, 1917, President Wilson laid before the Congress the extraordinary announcement of the Imperial German Government that on and after February 1, 1917, it was its purpose to put aside all restraints of law or of humanity and use its submarines to sink every vessel that sought to approach either the ports of Great Britain and Ireland or the western coasts of Europe or any of the ports controlled by the enemies of Germany within the Mediterranean. That had seemed to be the object of the German submarine warfare earlier in the war, but since April 1916 the Imperial German Government had somewhat restrained the commanders of its undersea craft in conformity with its promise to us that passenger boats should not be sunk and that due warning would be given to all other vessels which its submarines might seek to destroy when no resistance was offered or escape attempted, and care taken that their crews were given at least a fair chance to save their lives in their open boats.

That new policy swept every restraint aside. Vessels of every kind, whatever their flag, whatever their character, their cargo, their destination, their errand, were ruthlessly sent to the bottom without warning and without thought of help or mercy for those on board—the vessels of friendly neutrals along with those of belligerents. Even hospital ships and ships carrying relief to the sorely bereaved and stricken people of Belgium, although the latter were provided with safe conduct through the prescribed area by the German Government itself and were distinguished by unmistakable marks of identity, were sunk with the same reckless lack of

compassion or of principle. In short, the German Government promised us that her submarines would operate according to international law and humane principles, and she then broke that promise, which led to our entering the war.

Again, that Germany during the World War meant to stir up enemies against us at our very doors, the intercepted note of the German Foreign Minister, Zimmerman, to the Government of Mexico is positive evidence. In that matter, you will recall, the Germans promised to partition the southwestern part of the United States between Mexico and Japan if they would join her in warring on us.

These are the circumstances under which we entered the World War. We entered that war only after there had been very many serious offenses committed by the Central Powers, any one of which offenses was sufficient to cause war.

I wish to point out that it was not the kind of cargo our vessels carried that brought us into the World War; it was not what they had on board. As I have pointed out, what brought us into the World War was the unrestricted submarine warfare, when German announced she would sink all kinds of vessels carrying on commerce with her enemies. Our neutral ships were going about their own lawful business out on the high seas, where they had a right to be. They were on the high seas under the sanction of international law, under the sanction of law which had been venerated and observed by the nations for hundreds of years, and American citizens on those ships were murdered and sent to the deep. Those American ships, not carrying arms, not carrying ammunition, but carrying general cargoes, were sunk. That is why we voted a war—because of the murder of American seamen and other American citizens and the destruction of our property, while they were in the pursuit of their lawful business upon the peaceful highways of the sea.

I give a list of American vessels and their cargoes sunk by German submarines. First is the *William P. Frye,* sunk by a German raider on January 28, 1915. It carried a cargo of wheat.

The *Cushing,* on April 28, 1915, was attacked by a German airship. It carried a cargo of petroleum, no arms, no ammunition. Of course, it may be said that petroleum is used in warfare, and that is true. Wheat is also used in warfare, just as I have been saying. What leads to the sinking of the ships is not that they carry arms and ammunition; it is the fact that they carry anything useful in war, and in modern warfare nearly everything is useful. The ships will be sunk with the Embargo Act on the statute books just as they sank them during the World War.

The *Nebraska,* on May 1, 1915, was torpedoed by a German submarine. She was in ballast. The *Nebraska* carried no arms, carried no munitions, carried no implements of war. It carried no war supplies at all. It carried only water, water in ballast, and yet the Germans sank that ship.

The *Gulflight,* on May 20, 1915, was torpedoed by a German submarine. It carried a cargo of oil. It carried no munitions, no implements of war. Yet it was sunk. Such a ship can be and would be sunk under the present embargo law because there is no limit on these things.

The *Leelanaw* was sunk by torpedo and shell fire, July 25, 1915. It carried a cargo of flax. Again I wish to invite the attention to the fact that the *Leelanaw* carried flax. It carried no arms, no munitions, and no cannon, but carried a little bit of flax. The Germans sank that ship just as they will sink ships carrying flax in the present war. Unless we repeal the embargo law and put a real neutrality law on the books, the Germans can sink American vessels carrying flax to warring nations.

The *Oswego,* on August 14, 1915, was fired on 10 times, but made port. Well, she was lucky.

The *Petrolite,* on December 5, 1915, was fired on by the Austrian submarine repeatedly after vessel had stopped. The vessel carried a cargo of oil.

The *Seaconnet,* on June 18, 1915, was damaged by mine or torpedo. It carried a cargo of timber. Timber! It carried no arms, no munitions, no implements of war, but carried some timber, possibly from Oregon or Washington. But someone may say, "The enemy might make clubs from that timber and fight with the clubs." The Germans did not ask whether or not that would be done. They said, "This ship carries a cargo of timber. We are going to sink her. The enemy might make fortifications out of the timber."

I do not want to burden the House with reading the long list of ships which were sunk during the World War. I have not been able to examine the cases in detail, but, so far as I have examined them, not a single one of those ships carried arms, munitions, or implements of war; yet they were sunk.

During the World War and prior to the United States entering that war Germany sank or attacked the following steamships:

William P. Frye, January 28, 1915. Sunk by German raider *Prinz Eitel Friedrich.* Crew taken off. Carried a cargo of wheat (American Journal of International Law, vol. 9, 1915, special supplement Diplomatic Correspondence Between the United States and Belligerent Governments Relating to Neutral Rights and Commerce, p. 180).

Cushing, April 28, 1915. Attacked by German airship. Carried cargo of petroleum. (New York Times, May 1, 1915, p. 1, column 7.)

Nebraska, May 1, 1915. Torpedoed by German submarine. In ballast. (New York Times, May 27, 1915, p. 1, columns 4, 5.)

Gulflight, May 20(2?), 1915. Torpedoed by German submarine. Proceeded. Carried cargo of oil. (New York Times, May 3, 1915, p. 1, column 8.)

Leelanaw, July 25, 1915. Sunk by torpedo and shell fire. Carried cargo of flax. (New York Times, July 27, 1915, p. 1, column 8.)

Oswego, August 14, 1915. Fired on 10 times, but made port.

Petrolite, December 5, 1915. Fired on by Austrian submarine repeatedly after vessel had stopped. Carried cargo of oil. (New York Times, December 8, 1915, p. 2, column 1; December 9, 1915, p. 3, column 2.)

Seaconnet, June 18, 1915 (1916). Damaged by mine or torpedo. Carried cargo of timber. (New York Times, June 21, 1916, p. 6, column 3.)

Kansan, October —, 1916. Fired on by *U–53,* leaving United States. Struck mine after reaching other side. Six men injured in mine explosion. Carried cargo of war supplies and horses. (New York Times, October 15, 1916, sec. 1, p. 2, columns 4–6.)

Lanao (Philippine), October 28, 1916. Destroyed by German submarine. Carried cargo of rice. (New York Times, November 7, 1916, column 4, p. 1.)

Columbian, November 7, 1916. Sunk by German submarine.

Chemung, November 26, 1916. Sunk by Austrian submarine. Carried a general cargo, including 5,760 plates of spelter, 854 tons pig iron, 300 coils of copper wire, 36 barrels of copper, 200 bales of cotton, 153 cases of iron wire, and quantities of provisions; no ammunition or powder on her manifest. (New York Times, November 29, 1916, p. 1, column 1.)

St. Helens, December 10, 1916. Attacked by German submarine.

Rebecca Palmer, December 14, 1916. Fired on by German submarine. Damage light.

Galena, December 15, 1916. Fired on by German submarine.

Sacramento, January 9, 1917. Fired on by German submarine.

Westwego, January 21, 1917. Stopped by German submarine, but allowed to proceed.

Housatonic, February 3, 1917. Sunk by German submarine. Carried a cargo of contraband. (New York Times, February 4, 1917, sec. 1, p. 1, column 5.)

Lyman M. Law, February 13, 1917. Burned by submarine.

Communipaw, December 3, 1915. Fired on, but proceeded. Carried cargo of oil. (New York Times, December 8, 1915, p. 1, column 8.)

Algonquin, March 12, 1917. Sunk by German submarine. Carried cargo of foodstuffs. (New York Times, March 15, 1917, p. 1, column 8.)

City of Memphis, March 18, 1917. Sunk by gunfire. In ballast. (New York Times, March 19, 1917, p. 2, column 8.)

Illinois, March 18, 1917. Sunk by submarine. In ballast. (New York Times, March 19, 1917, p. 2, column 1.)

Vigilancia, March 18, 1917. Sunk by submarine. Carried general cargo. (New York Times, March 19, 1917, p. 2, column 3.)

Evelyn, sunk by mine outside war-zone limits. Carried cargo of cotton. (February 22, 1915, p. 1, column 8.)

Carib, sunk by mine off German coast. (February 24, 1915, p. 1 columns 5, 8.)

The Congressional Library compiled this information with respect to American Merchant ships sunk or attacked prior to the United States' entry into the World War.

Several weeks ago it was asserted in responsible quarters that millions of dollars had been deposited in this and other countries to the credit of Hitler, Goebbels, and other high German officials. I have positive information that these moneys have been deposited in America for propaganda purposes.

The Task of the People in Maintaining Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL T. CURTIS

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 3, 1939

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the Congress of the United States has spoken on our neutrality legislation and on our foreign policy. I fervently hope and pray that it will turn out for the best. I want the United States to remain at peace, and not be dragged through the devastating experience of another war. I do not find it necessary to reiterate the horrors of modern warfare or the unsound economic situation that will follow.

The foreign policy of the United States is now fixed. I believe that it is the prayer of every American that America will be successful in steering clear of war, and that those in charge of executing that policy will be guided by a spirit of strict neutrality and absolute impartiality.

There is a task for the people. The people are the authors of public opinion. If we are to have peace, the people must not let up on their determination to stay out of the present conflict in Europe.

Mr. Speaker, may I submit for the consideration of the Nation a few suggestions for the people to follow in doing their part to maintain neutrality in the United States?

First. We should be tolerant and give due respect to the opinions of our fellow Americans. The throttling of free speech and of truth are steps toward war and not toward peace.

Second. We should turn our attention to the unsolved problems of our Nation. Give the farmer the American market. Give employment to our unemployed. We should loosen the bonds that strangle business and begin to reduce our national debt.

Third. We should be neutral in our attitude, our conversation, and our actions. Whenever any citizen undertakes to condemn any foreign government, they are playing with the lives of American boys.

Fourth. We should resist all the propaganda that arouses the passions of hatred and war that comes to us in the newspapers, over the radio, or in the theater. "As a man thinketh in his heart, so is he." If we are to have peace we should be peace loving and not inflame the passions of hatred and savagery.

Fifth. We should keep in mind that no nation wants the United States in this war as their enemy. If we are dragged into this war it may be by the trickery, false propaganda, and lies of those nations who would desire to have us as their ally. Again I say, no nation wants the United States as their enemy, for it would mean sure defeat to them. A deluge of "isms" will follow in the wake of the war in all countries participating.

Sixth. Under any plan of neutrality there may be the loss of American lives and property. If we are to be a neutral, we must pay the price. The worth-while things in life cost something. We should prepare ourselves now for the shock of such losses and keep in mind that war does not settle anything. In view of the firm determination of the American people to stay out of this war, all of our citizens traveling abroad are now proceeding at their own risk.

Seventh. The American people should pray as they never have prayed before that the God of peace will guide and direct the minds and hearts of those in whose hands the destiny of America lies. With God, nothing is impossible. He alone can melt the hearts of the warmongers.

Mr. Speaker, again I repeat I am opposed to the United States policing the world, and I do not want the life of one American boy sacrificed on the battlefields of Europe.

When the Game Is Power Control by Captains of Munitions, Mere Men Only Fight and Die for Barbarism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 3, 1939

EDITORIAL FROM THE OREGON SUNDAY JOURNAL

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which was printed in the Oregon Sunday Journal of October 29:

[From the Oregon Sunday Journal of October 29, 1939]

WHEN THE GAME IS POWER CONTROL BY CAPTAINS OF MUNITIONS, MERE MEN ONLY FIGHT AND DIE FOR BARBARISM

"Steadily the conviction strengthens that in this great war, political leaders and captains of industry, more than at any time in history, have plucked the actual control from the generals. The command to advance, or order for an air raid, or lack of such command, is apparently determined far from the front line, more than ever before. Strictly military decisions are weighed on scales of diplomacy and economics." (John O'Donnell, discussing in the New York News the military quiet on the western front.)

The comment is in line with events of the intricate game for power control now going on in Europe. One shrinks from accepting the notion that diplomats, carrying out the long-range plans of industrialists and financiers, could and would be willing to permit the sacrifice of the Polish people, could and would permit the death of French and British soldiers and sailors running into thousands, to further a perfectly cold-blooded scheme to "help business"—and that they could and would use the human impulses of patriotism, of Christianity, and reverence for human dignity and human freedom, as the devices under which these elaborate sacrifices to Mammon should be made.

Nevertheless, the suspicion is there. The suspicion grows and finds itself uttered by an increasing chorus of commentators and observers and common folk in the street.

Back in 1934 the world was given the inside story of the Briey Basin deal early in the World War.

Briey Basin, with its mines and smelters, fell into the hands of the Germans early in the war, and during the second battle of Verdun these mines and smelters were turning out tons of material to be used in killing French soldiers.

Upon the records is the testimony of Pierre Flandin, later minister of finance under Tardieu, and the affirmation of Deputy Barthé, in the Chamber of Deputies in 1919.

Flandin testified that French artillery was forbidden to bombard Briey Basin when the chance existed and when such bombardment would have broken Germany's army and brought the war to an end nearly 2 years sooner.

Barthé spoke even more pointedly:

"I affirm that, either by the fact of the solidarity of the great metallurgy companies, or in order to safeguard private business interests, our military chiefs were forbidden to bombard the establishments of the Briey Basin which were being exploited by the

enemy during the war. I affirm that our aviation service received instructions to respect the blast furnaces in which enemy steel was being made, and that a general who wished to bombard them was reprimanded."

French industrialists eventually got back Briey undamaged.

Chesterton, in his bitter and tragic poem, The Secret People, which tells of the heart of England as few others' poems do, put into words the suspicion that grows in the heart of the military man, and the man on the street:

They have given us into the hands
Of new, unhappy lords,
Lords without anger, or honor,
Who dare not carry their swords.
They fight with shuffling papers,
They have bright, dead, alien eyes,
And they look on our love and laughter
As a tired man looks on flies.

Effects of Repeal of the Arms Embargo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CARLSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 3, 1939

ARTICLE BY HENRY T. GORRELL

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend by remarks, I am including an article taken from the Washington Times-Herald under date of Friday, November 3, 1939. This article was written by Mr. Henry T. Gorrell, United Press correspondent in London, under date of November 2, 1939:

[From the Washington Times-Herald of November 3, 1939]

BLOW TO UNITED STATES EXPORTS SEEN IN ARMS VOTE—SHARP CUT IN BRITISH IMPORTS EXPECTED TO ALLOW UNLIMITED FLOW OF MUNITIONS ABROAD

(By Henry T. Gorrell)

LONDON, November 2.—Revision of the United States arms-embargo law, while opening the way for large British arms and munitions purchases, was expected tonight to lead to a drastic curtailment of British imports from the United States, such as industrial and agricultural products.

One authoritative source estimated that British imports of certain American industrial products and foodstuffs would fall off as much as $150,000,000 a year.

DRASTICALLY REDUCED

Importers of American products said Britain's anticipated heavy purchases of war supplies from the United States would be offset to a substantial degree by curtailing imports of nonessential industrial and agricultural products.

These so-called nonessentials in normal years yield scores of millions of dollars to American exporters.

The curtailment will be necessary, it was explained, to protect exchange and permit unlimited purchases of arms and munitions from the United States.

The importation of many American commodities, including tobacco, automobiles, women's apparel, shoes, hosiery, dried fruits, and California barley already has been reduced drastically since the outbreak of the war.

HITS FILM INDUSTRY

The effect of the reduction of imports from the United States undoubtedly will be felt keenly over widespread areas of New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Michigan, the Grain Belts of the Middle West, the tobacco districts of the South, and the fruit zones of Florida and California.

Hollywood's film producers also inevitably will be affected, and it is indicated that the sale of American-made motion pictures in Britain will be reduced by many millions of dollars annually.

The estimated income of the American film industry from the European market, it was understood, is being reduced by about $30,000,000 a year as a result of the war, and a large part of this loss is in Britain.

COTTON UNAFFECTED

Imports of American automobiles, usually amounting to about $12,000,000 a year, virtually have ceased.

Likewise, British agents are reported to have ceased attending tobacco auctions in the United States. The United States' annual tobacco business with Britain has been approximately $85,000,000.

It is believed cotton imports will not be affected to any great extent, but canned vegetables and fruits already have been restricted, and grapes no longer are arriving from the United States.

Importers indicated American fresh fruits soon would be restricted.

BLOW TO BARLEY BELT

Imports of office machinery from the United States also have been curtailed to a considerable extent, and hardly any American grains with the exception of small amounts of feed are coming in.

The British have reduced American imports of hops, lard, and cereals.

It was believed in trade circles that the Pacific Coast Barley Belt, whose shipments to Britain last year were roughly $6,000,000, would be hard hit.

Common Sense Wins

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. HOUSTON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 3, 1939

EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON POST

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from today's issue of the Washington Post:

[From the Washington Post of November 3, 1939]

COMMON SENSE WINS

Those who wished to see the arms embargo retained set great store by the House vote. In spite of the smashing Senate verdict for repeal they were optimistic right up to the balloting yesterday afternoon. It was argued that the House, subject to complete replacement every 2 years, would be more responsive to propaganda than the Senate. And nobody knows the strength of the propaganda against repeal better than those who were made its victims.

The large majorities by which the bill was yesterday hastened to final passage therefore possess a significance even greater than that of the legislation now happily on the verge of enactment. They show that the House is no less a deliberative body than the Senate. They show that Congress as a body cannot be stampeded by feverishly whipped-up pressures. Those ballots yesterday show, in short, that the American system of representative government is still functioning. Our democracy has not yet degenerated into mob rule.

Unquestionably the great majority of those who opposed embargo repeal did so with perfect sincerity. But the arguments used by this side were for the most part emotional rather than rational. Without a scintilla of effective evidence it was asserted that repeal is of itself likely to involve the United States, to prolong the war, to "put the blood of millions on our heads," as a group of self-styled "peace organizations" asserted no later than yesterday. This sort of outcry is virtually hysteria.

What the legislation actually does has been almost lost to sight amid the shrieks and shouts, the groans and moans, with which it has been enveloped. Actually the United States is about to put into effect a sweeping self-denying ordinance, scrapping the doctrine of the freedom of the seas, abandoning traditional and unquestionable neutral rights, all for the sake of strengthening the safeguards against war. As a small offset to this wholesale surrender the administration is mildly reasserting the right of American nationals to sell munitions, provided they are bought for cash and shipped in foreign bottoms.

Because there is a point at which the country does not propose to surrender its sovereignty in behalf of belligerents, a furious and wholly emotional storm has been whipped up by organizations whose antecedents are, in some case, of dubious character. The pacifist propaganda is understandable. There are some people, and they are wholly honest, who would rather see the United States destroyed than take arms to defend it. The complete isolationist viewpoint is also understandable. But these and other honorable groups alone did not account for all the sound and fury of the embargo advocates.

Included in the strange line-up against repeal were all the Communists, all the bund adherents, all the quasi-Fascist groups, all the professional Anglophobes. Together they made a formidable, if chaotic assortment, sufficiently numerous to bring to their side many of the disillusioned, the ignorant, the credulous, and the self-seeking. Not by reasoning, but merely from its own momentum, the embargo movement gained many adherents who could not have advanced a single cogent argument against repeal.

Like "ham and eggs" in California, a movement of this sort, partly emotional, partly wishful, and partly self-seeking, can easily become a serious problem for a democracy. The effective arguments—legal, moral, patriotic, and economic—always favored repeal. But it almost seemed for a time that common sense might

be overwhelmed and the vital congressional function of analysis subordinated to an essentially ridiculous mass emotionalism.

That danger has happily been averted. But it was more threatening to the United States than any of the bogies conjured up by the opponents of repeal.

The Pressure Boys

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE E. GEYER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 3, 1939

BOOK REVIEW BY W. F. SHELTON

Mr. GEYER of California. Mr. Speaker, since I suggested to my colleagues the other day that all Members read Pressure Boys, so many have asked me to tell them what it is about that I have decided to have printed in the RECORD a review of that book.

The San Francisco Chronicle carries the following under date of October 22. The review is by W. F. Shelton. It appears along with other book reviews on the page entitled "Books and Their Writers." The review follows:

[From the San Francisco Chronicle of October 22, 1939]

THE PRESSURE BOYS

(By Kenneth G. Crawford. Reviewed by W. F. Shelton)

This book, subtitled "The Inside Story of Lobbying in America," pretends to be neither calm nor unbiased. Its author openly admits that he is working off his repressions as a Washington correspondent; he is writing footnotes to the news, footnotes which are not revealed until after the news itself has become stale.

Certainly The Pressure Boys is sensational stuff. It names names, dates, and places with an offhandedness which is more effective than the loudest shouting; it deals with events so recent that our interest in them must be a good deal more than historical. As might be expected, many of Mr. Crawford's sources of information remain undisclosed; but, on the other hand, a considerable part of his evidence is drawn from such open records as those of the Black, La Follette, and Nye investigations. And the disturbing thing is that even if only a part of what he claims is true, its going to be pretty hard to deny the justice of his bitter irony.

An astonishing amount of material has been packed into the book. No important pressure group which has been active during the past quarter of a century escapes Mr. Crawford's eye and pen. There are chapters devoted to the 1913 exposé of the tariff lobby, and to the course of profiteering during the first World War—but they are merely interludes in the main story, which concerns the contemporary lobbying activities of utilities, drug manufacturers, the movies, steel, shipping, sugar, railroads, insurance companies, farmers, and labor. The scope and persistence of these activities, as Mr. Crawford sees them, are almost beyond belief. His thesis is that lobbying today is fundamentally the same as ever, although its technique has become more involved; nowadays, for example, it involves appealing direct to the electorate as well as putting pressure of one kind or another on legislators. He also says that lobbying has been immensely stimulated by the New Deal—with which he is broadly in sympathy—since all sorts of interests have been seeking to protect themselves during the creation of new legislation.

As a matter of fact, it is the inside stories of recent national issues which make the most sensational reading. There is much new or hitherto ignored material concerning the lobbying and propaganda by utilities in 1935 against the Holding Company "Death Sentence" Act; the fight led by Girdler against labor's attempt to organize Little Steel, which culminated in the 1937 Memorial Day incident at Chicago; the terrific pother about the President's first Government reorganization bill; the ingenious means used by railroads to oppose the growth of trucking; and the ghost-raising activities of the Dies committee.

A relatively mild sample of the book's contents would include the information that among the "pressure boys" are such figures as Homer Cummings, Donald Richberg, Pat Hurley (President Hoover's Secretary of War), and Joe Tumulty (secretary to President Wilson). We are told that the Liberty League, in addition to being one of the most ineffectual of lobbies, is unique in that it has been completely honest about its purpose from the start. It is said that Will Hays is only very incidentally the "czar" of the movie industry; his real job is maintaining a supercolossal lobby. It is charged that when the drug and liquor price-fixing law was pushed through in 1937, the law firm of its sponsor, Senator TYDINGS, was being retained by a national druggists' organization and a large distilling company.

The threads of the story, moreover, are quite long enough to span the continent. There is more than one reference to the Associated Farmers, principally in connection with the Dies committee; we are reminded of the famous check sent unsolicited to Representative GEARHART, of California, during the reorganization battle, and mention is made of the former Dollar Line in the chapter on shipping subsidies.

The Pressure Boys is not a soothing story; it will find very few readers from either left or right whose confidence in some organization or another will emerge unscathed. Mr. CRAWFORD believes that democratic government will remain ineffective so long as special groups can exercise a power out of proportion to their numbers and he spares no blows in driving his point home.

The book has been written in bitterness and anger, and no doubt allowance should be made for that fact in any evaluation of its accuracy—but there is still more than enough undeniable truth in the picture to make anyone wince. It may not be the whole truth, but it is a part which cannot forever be ignored.

Fred S. Purnell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOBLE J. JOHNSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 2, 1939

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, on October 21, 1939, Hon. Fred S. Purnell, a distinguished former Member of Congress, passed away.

For 16 years he represented the old Ninth District, a part of which, including Fountain County, his home county, is now in the Sixth Congressional District, which I have the honor to represent at this time.

Mr. Purnell had a most interesting career. He was born in Fountain County, Ind., near Veedersburg; was educated in the schools of that county, where he became firmly imbued with the great Hoosier philosophy of life, and at Indiana University, where he graduated with the degree of LL. B. in 1904, he was an excellent student, an eloquent and forceful speaker, and developed a great aptitude for leadership. After completing his college education he entered the practice of law, locating in Attica, Ind., where he served as city attorney for 4 years. He was elected to Congress in 1916 and served his district faithfully and well for eight terms. His sterling qualities, his outstanding ability as a statesman and a leader were soon recognized by the Members of Congress. He served on the important Committee on Agriculture, Committee on Rules, and on the steering committee—he was ranking member on the Agriculture Committee.

He was vitally interested in and understood the problems of agriculture and through his efforts much legislation beneficial to agriculture was enacted into law.

He was an able legislator, taking a leading part in debate and in other activities of Congress. His fine personality, his keen sense of humor, his tireless diligence, his sterling character, his fearlessness in the cause of right, his ability for clear thinking, and his industry will always be remembered by those who knew him.

He had a great career, a life full of action in things worth while. His friends numbered all who knew him. He accepted the responsibilities of his office and of life itself and performed his duties in a most energetic and righteous manner. He was a true public servant, always laboring in the interest of his district and of his Nation.

Mr. Purnell was a devoted Republican, believing firmly in the fundamental principles and policies of the Republican Party, but was always fair and honorable in politics as well as in business, and his excellent public record will be a monument to him as long as time lasts. His life was a record of service, and he brought great honor and distinction to himself, his home county, and his district.

It was my privilege to serve with him as a Member of Congress for three terms. He took a kindly interest in new Members of Congress who sought his advice and counsel, which he was always happy to give in his efforts to assist them, and he never missed an opportunity to uproot a thorn and plant a flower along life's road.

Surviving him are his devoted wife, Elizabeth S. Purnell, and two sons, Samuel and Frederic. In his passing, his wife and children have lost a devoted husband and father, the community a great citizen, the Nation a great leader, and I have lost a friend.

Neutrality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES A. SHANLEY
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 3, 1939

Mr. SHANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I wrote to several distinguished jurists in international law, men of outstanding renown and prestige in their profession, on the question of the repeal of the embargo.

I have asked unanimous consent to extend and revise my remarks and include therein their answers. The first is from the distinguished doyen of international authorities in this country, a man in fact of international reputation, the Honorable John Bassett Moore:

DEAR MR. SHANLEY: Your letter of October 27 in relation to the question of the repeal of the arms embargo has just been received, and I herewith enclose a copy of a statement which I am on the point of sending to News Week for publication tomorrow. By the terms of their request it appears that they have solicited expressions of opinion from a number of persons, and the responses may be mixed as well as abundant. I have tried precisely to define the aspect of the question as it appears to me. I would not go so far as to say that a government may not change its neutrality legislation during war. Our first neutrality statute was passed during the wars between Great Britain and various other powers on the one hand, and France on the other hand, growing out of the French Revolution. In this conflict, as you know, President Washington proclaimed our neutrality, and legislation was subsequently adopted for the purpose of making our neutrality effective. Later, in 1818, the legislation then existing was superseded by the comprehensive statute of 1818, which was passed during the wars between Spain and her revolted American colonies, which had declared their independence. With all this you no doubt are familiar, and I rehearse it only as a clarification of the situation with which we are now confronted. The propensities of our people are not so peaceful as they imagine, and in this they share the general, and perhaps inevitable, fate of humanity. On one point, however, I am clear, and that is that we shall not advance our own interests or contribute to peace and good will on earth by taking up arms for the enforcement of our judgment as regards the merits of all foreign quarrels.

Believe me to be, with best regards,

Sincerely yours,

J. B. MOORE.

[Enclosure]

STATEMENT OF JOHN BASSETT MOORE ON OCTOBER 28, 1939

Neutrality involves considerations both of law and of fact. International law, while not forbidding the export of arms to warring countries, authorizes the latter, by visit and search on the high seas, to prevent them from reaching the enemy; and, as this opens the door to misunderstandings and disputes, some governments have, when neutral, prohibited such export. The United States, by recent legislation, adopted this policy, and, by reversing it in time of war, would invite suspicion to its motives and enhance the perils of the traffic. A neutral country cannot possibly equalize as between belligerents the benefits or the disadvantages of what it exports, and the attempt to do so would savor of jugglery.

Everyone who pursues the study of international law has the profoundest admiration and respect for this great scholar. I add a lifetime of the fullest usefulness far beyond the Biblical three score and ten.

His life—

Moore, John Bassett, lawyer; b. Smyrna, Del., Dec. 3, 1860; grad. U. of Va., 1880; LL.D., Columbian, 1899, Delaware Coll., 1900, Yale, 1901, U. of Chile, 1910, Brown U. 1914, McGill U., 1921, U. of State of N. Y., 1923, Univ. of Pennsylvania, 1924, Columbia Univ., 1927; Washington Coll., Chestertown, Md., 1932; Law clerk Dept. of State, 1885–86; 3d asst. sec. of state, 1886–91; prof. internat. law and diplomacy, Columbia, 1891–1924, also chmn. administrative bd. Legislative Drafting Fund, 1911–15. Asst. sec. of state, Apr.–Sept., 1898; sec. and counsel Spanish-Am. Peace Commn., Paris, 1898; agt. of U. S. before U. S. and Dominican Arbitration Tribunal, 1904; U. S. del. 4th Internat. Am. Conf., Buenos Aires, 1910; spl. plenipotentiary to Chilean Centenary, 1910; mem. Internat. Comm. of Jurists, 1912–22; counselor Dept. of State, with power to sign as secretary of State, 1913–14. Mem. Permanent Court of Arbitration, The Hague, 1912–38; judge Permanent Court of International Justice, 1921–28 (resigned); del. Pan-Am. Financial Congress, 1915, and vice-chmn. Internat. High Commn. then organized; ambassador extraordinary, U. S. del. and pres., Internat. Conf., The Hague, 1922–23, on Rules for Artcraft and Radio in Times of War. Director and mem. exec. com., Equitable Life Assurance Soc., New York. Hon. mem. Institut de Droit International; member Institut Colonial International, American Philos. Soc. Pan-Am. Soc. of U. S. (hon. pres.), Hispanic Soc. America (vice pres.); hon. mem. Coll. of Lawyers of Costa Rica; corr. mem. Mass. Historical Soc., Royal Academy History of Spain, Instituto de Ordem des Advogados Brazileiros; member Royal Acad. Sciences of Netherlands; corresponding member Instituto Saumartiniano; pres. of Am. Polit. Science Assn., 1913–14, Mohonk Conf. on Internat. Arbitration, 1914, 15; mem. Pa. Hist. Soc.; fellow Am. Acad. Arts and Sciences; incorporated Am. Nat. Red Cross; mem. Central Com. and exec. com. N. Y. Co. Chapter, 1914–20. Awarded Roosevelt Distinguished Service Medal, 1927. Clubs: Century, Bar Association (New York); Cosmos, Metropolitan (Washington, D. C.); Authors' (London, England). Author: Report on Extraterritorial Crime, 1887; Report on Extradition, 1890; Extradition and Interstate Rendition (2 volumes), 1891; American Notes on the Conflict of Laws, 1896; History and Digest of International Arbitrations (6 volumes), 1898; American Diplomacy, Its Spirit and Achievements, 1905; Digest of International Law (8 volumes), 1906; Four Phases of American Development—Federalism, Democracy, Imperialism, Expansion, 1912; Principles of American Diplomacy, 1918; Internat. Law and Some Current Illusions and Other Essays, 1924; Pending Neutrality Proposals, their False Conceptions and Misunderstandings, 1936. Editor: The Works of James Buchanan (12 volumes), 1908; International Adjudications, Ancient and Modern, together with mediatorial repts., advisory opinions and the decisions of domestic commns. on internat. claims, with hist. and legal commentaries (8 vols.), 1937, and more to follow. Address: care Chase Nat. Bank, 11 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.

The opinion of Professor Edwin M. Borchard of Yale is probably as well known as that of any other man in the country but to complete the record I take advantage of my unanimous consent to insert it.

Surely it cannot be designed to insure the protection of American neutrality, for the obvious purpose is to help the Allies obtain arms, ammunition, and implements of war. If that is the motive—and the motive in these matters is all-important—then the lifting of the embargo is an act of war and intervention, and it should be debated as such. The assumption that a neutral can change his law so as to help one side beat the other and yet escape the consequences of war is hazardous. The gamble may be successful, but it is very speculative, for success depends on the inability or unwillingness of the disfavored belligerent to exert the reprisals which he would naturally wish to, and which he is privileged to exert. There may be good reasons why many Americans would like to help the Allies win this European war, but the public should not delude itself into the belief that a hostile act is a contribution to American neutrality. The suggestion that the present act is unneutral and hence must be corrected because Great Britain cannot legally obtain the arms which Germany could not physically get is inaccurate and unsound. It would be more true to say that the naval position of the belligerents enables the United States to supply one side only with everything but arms. There is a practical embargo on Germany. This ought to satisfy the craving for discrimination, and it probably can be defended as legal. The lifting of the arms embargo, I fear, cannot be so defended.

It is proper to say that there are many arguments against an arms embargo. International law does not require a neutral to impose an arms embargo, although many neutrals in the course of history have done so. They have done it to safeguard their own neutrality. In the abstract, on historic evidence of their effects, I have been opposed to embargoes and boycotts in any form. When applied discriminatorily, however, as to many Americans have been taught to believe was justified, they constitute one of the most disturbing political instruments of an age that has been extraordinarily fertile in inventing new devices for provoking conflicts among people.

The peculiar defect in the present requested change, however, is that it is proposed to lift the embargo during a foreign war with the knowledge, if not indeed the intention, that it would help one set of belligerents only. This seems to me a clear violation of international law. I shall read a passage from a commentary on a recent draft code on neutrality prepared under the auspices of the specialists of this country, Prof. Philip C. Jessup, of Columbia, being the reporter. That commentary states:

"The task confronting the neutral state—in changing its rules during war—is to make certain to itself and clear to other states that the motive inducing the adoption of a new rule or regulation during the course of a war, is the product of its concern to act strictly in accordance with the law of neutrality, and not the result of a desire to aid one or the other belligerent."

It is not true to say that a neutral may not change the rules of law during war. It is during war that most of the rules of neutrality were made. But the rules may only be changed in the

direction of insuring and tightening neutral duties, and not in the direction of relaxing them for the benefit of one set of belligerents. This is a hostile act and an act of war, and its consequences must be carefully weighed. It is inconsistent with that neutrality which official groups profess to wish to maintain. In support of the change, it is only fair to say, the argument is advanced that the legislation was under consideration long before September 3, 1939, that a belligerent ought not to prevent the adoption of an American statute and that it is proposed in the interests of the United States. It is a matter of regret to me that these arguments leave me unconvinced.

It may very well be that the Neutrality Act should be changed in certain respects. I should find nothing unneutral in the application of the cash-and-carry principle to commodities other than arms, ammunition, and implements of war, though I have always been skeptical as to the practical operation of this plan. Only "carry" is important, including transfer of title to the buyer, for Americans are not likely to extend much credit now. Nor do I like the idea of taking American shipping out of the European trade, although under present circumstances possibly it may have justification. Moreover, I see no reason why the United States should not permit the shipment of arms, ammunition, and implements of war to neutral countries "for transshipment to a belligerent." Why such excessive zeal? The administrative difficulty of enforcing such a rule should alone have condemned it. But in addition there is no reason why a neutral should enforce the doctrine of continuous voyage or transport. American citizens need not be prohibited from traveling or serving on belligerent ships if the statute and the country are clear on the point that they have always traveled or served there at their own risk and that under no circumstances can the country be involved when they travel under the protection of a foreign flag. Nor should the act apply to civil wars or promise discrimination in Latin American wars. These changes would not relax American neutrality to the advantage of one and the handicap of another actual belligerent. For that reason such changes are permissible. Other changes are not, if the country professes neutrality.

To sum up, acts intended to aid one belligerent only should be understood to be hostile, not neutral acts. No reasons have been given as to why the supply of arms to the Allies, much as this may be desired, would promote American peace or neutrality. On the other hand, it is not unreasonable to suppose that such shipments will, under existing circumstances, be construed as a form of intervention. If they are so construed, the possibility of America's remaining at peace and out of the war may have passed to alien decision. The measure therefore requires the utmost deliberation. Let us hope that a sound conclusion will be reached.

Professor Borchard's collaborator, William P. Lage, in his provocative and challenging Neutrality for the United States, writes and insists that—

I have no hesitation in condemning the present proposal to repeal the arms embargo.

The embargo was on the statute books before the present war started; it was invoked by the President, and is at this moment in force. To weaken this law now, for the purpose of helping one side, is a participation in the war; for when changes in a neutral's laws are made during war, the purpose of the changes is all-important. That is why the addition of cash and carry for general commodities would not constitute intervention, for its purpose is solely and obviously to help preserve our neutrality.

This legal position cannot be seriously questioned. As a result, the advocates of repeal of the embargo have been forced to adopt a series of specious contentions whose purpose can only be to becloud the issue in the minds of the general public.

Foremost among these has been the contention that it is unneutral to keep the present embargo. That is just not so. When Congress passed the act in 1935 we put the world on notice that we wouldn't supply arms during future wars. We had an undoubted right to pass the act at that time and we would have an undoubted right to repeal it today if the world were still at peace. But war has broken out, and we have not the right to pose as a neutral, claiming to be treated as a neutral, and at the same time weaken our present law in order to help one side defeat its enemy. To do this is to commit an act of hostility which the injured nation has every right to treat as an abandonment of neutrality and an act of war.

Moreover, one of the cardinal principles of international law is that a neutral government, as such, shall not take any action designed to influence the outcome of the war. This rule is particularly involved at the present time with respect to repeal because it will require affirmative action by our Government to effect that purpose. It is not merely a question of allowing private citizens to trade in munitions; it is a question of the American Government, as such, taking positive action to change its laws in order to assist one belligerent to overcome its enemy, thus causing our participation in the war.

But it is said: "Germany wouldn't dare declare war on America because of repeal." Perhaps so; but why indulge in speculations as to what Germany might do? When we knowingly and willfully commit such an act of hostility we leave to Hitler the decision as to whether that act will mean peace or war for this country.

Now that is a sorry position for America to put itself in. Far better, if this country feels it necessary to commit hostilities, to put the question of joining the war squarely up to our Congress, not leave it to the whim of some foreign government.

On the other hand, if we want to stay out, then we should stay out completely. There is no half in and half out in this game; no place for hostile "measures short of war." The minute we commit acts of hostility we open ourselves to—we even invite—reprisals which will inflame public opinion to the point of demanding war.

Two other distinguished scholars have answered and I have taken extracts from their illuminating letters:

EARLHAM COLLEGE,
Richmond, Ind., October 30, 1939.

The Honorable JAMES A. SHANLEY,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SHANLEY: I have your letter of October 28, in which you do me the honor of asking for an expression of my views in the matter of the repeal of the arms embargo. I greatly appreciate the opportunity to answer your question to the best of my ability in the limited time which is available to me today since in this matter time is of the essense.

I am opposed to the repeal of the embargo on arms, ammunition, and implements of war, first, because I believe that repeal at this time, while a war is in progress, would be an unneutral act—a violation of the duty of the United States under international law; and, second, because I believe that repeal would be the first step on the road to war, and that the United States for every reason, unselfish as well as selfish, ought to avoid involvement in the present European war.

First, as to the matter of neutrality. The President of the United States and his official supporters advocate repeal on the ground that it is in the interest of "real American neutrality," while Senator AUSTIN, Senator BURKE, and the ordinary repealer who is not charged with official responsibility, advocate it on precisely the opposite grounds, namely, because it is unneutral. As Senator BURKE puts it, "Repeal of the arms embargo will not operate equally. * * * It checks the belligerents that I want checked. It favors the belligerents that I want favored." I submit that, all technicalities aside, as a matter of common sense, Senators AUSTIN and BURKE and the unofficial repealers are right. Technicalities aside, who would seriously advocate that the way for a nation to stay neutral in a war is suddenly to commence to sell arms to one side only, which is practically what repeal means, as we all know. I submit that this is one of the times—and they occur far more frequently than the critics of the law are willing to admit—when law follows the dictates of common sense.

The rule of international law was stated with substantial accuracy when this very situation arose with "reverse English" in 1914–15. At that time the Great War was on and our citizens were selling arms in large quantities to the Allies, as they had a perfect right to do under international law and under our municipal law as it then stood. A number of people, some pro-German and some anti-British, but a great many of them fine American citizens who were shocked at the enormous trade in the implements of death which was developing, appeared before the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives asking for legislation to embargo arms and munitions of war. (Hearings before Committee on Foreign Affairs, House of Representatives, 63d Cong., 3d sess., on H. J. Res. 377 and 378, December 30 and 31, 1914.) The German and British Governments both interested themselves in the legislation. Under date of April 4, 1915, the German Ambassador transmitted a memorandum of his Government requesting action on our part to correct the existing situation, which, it was claimed, was not in accordance "with the spirit of true neutrality." Secretary Bryan replied on April 21, 1915, saying, among other things, "This Government holds, as I believe Your Excellency is aware, and as it is constrained to hold in view of the present indisputable doctrines of accepted international law, that any change in its own laws of neutrality during the progress of a war which would affect unequally the relations of the United States with the nations at war would be an unjustifiable departure from the principle of strict neutrality by which it has consistently sought to direct its actions. * * * The placing of an embargo on the trade in arms at the present time would be such a change and be a direct violation of the neutrality of the United States. It will, I feel assured, be clear to Your Excellency that, holding this view and considering itself in honor bound by it, it is out of the question for this Government to consider such a course." (Foreign Relations of the United States, 1915 Supp., p. 160 at p. 162.)

* * * * * * *

Second, repeal as a road to war. It does not need any citation of authorities to prove what the reaction to repeal is likely to be in England and Germany, respectively, but the returns are already coming in. Here are a few excerpts from the London papers, reported in special cables to the New York Times on October 28 and 29:

"The United States to sell arms to the Allies."—The Express.

"Allied victory in the United States."—The Daily Mirror.

"Thus the aggressors are penalized, and that is the policy President Roosevelt has been aiming at. By this amendment he is able to give material help to the Allies as a means of avoiding giving them military help—and, indeed, such aid as this is worth far more than regiments of soldiers. Britain and France propose to spend no less than £90,000,000 sterling on aircraft in the United States, and even now scores of planes are waiting to be shipped across the Atlantic."—The Sketch.

"Arms from the United States will shorten the war."—The News.

"Germany must interpret this decision as another defeat for her cause."—Lord Beaverbrook's Evening Standard.

"Better than a battle."—The Star, a liberal evening paper.

No wonder that the Sunday Times, "The Thunderer," said, "Passage by the American Senate of the bill to repeal the arms embargo was the most important event of last week." No wonder, also, that "sources close to the Wilhelmstrasse" are quoted by the United Press as saying, "This might cause us to hurry up."

It might help us to gage Germany's feelings in this matter to recall our own feelings during the Civil War when the English were selling arms to the Confederates, which they had a perfect right to do (the belligerency of the Confederacy had been recognized), and Lowell's Hosea Bigelow was singing,

You wonder why we're hot, John,
Your mark was on the gun,
The neutral guns that shot, John,
Our brothers and our sons.

The reaction in Great Britain and Germany to an unneutral act cannot be expected to be favorable to neutrality. But after the psychological effect we must consider the economic effect—first, war profits—"fool's gold"—then as cash gives out pressure for credits to the Allies in the interest of American prosperity and in the name of democracy and morality. I do not say, of course, that repeal of the embargo will necessarily mean that we shall be dragged into the war. I say it is the first step and a step which will make every subsequent step much easier. Once it is taken the position of those who oppose our involvement in hostilities will be much more unfavorable than it is today, although a resolute will to peace on the part of our people and our Government, a will to peace such as George Washington showed in 1794, can keep us out of war, embargo or no embargo.

* * * * * * *

Needless to say, all this does not involve the slightest condonation of Hitlerism at home or abroad. It simply involves distrust in American intervention in European wars as a remedy for anything and a specific disbelief in its efficacy as an instrument of peace and democracy.

* * * * * * *

Thanking you for doing me the honor to request an expression of my views on this subject and with appreciation for the stand you are taking, and all personal good wishes, I am,

Very respectfully yours,

WILLIAM C. DENNIS.

P. S.—You may make such use of this letter as you see fit.

YALE UNIVERSITY, INSTITUTE OF INTERNATIONAL STUDIES,
NEW HAVEN, CONN., *November 1, 1939.*

Hon. JAMES A. SHANLEY,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: On the whole I agree with your opinion in regard to the repeal of the arms embargo. It would be hard to say anything on the subject at this date that you have not already heard many times before, and hence I shall not set forth in detail the reasons for my views.

Obviously, the question divides itself up into two parts, the first, what action would be more likely to keep us out of the war, and second, what action would be in accord with our duties as a neutral under international law?

In regard to the first question, the arguments in favor of repeal seem to turn on the assumption that it will aid the Allies to win the war gainst Germany. If this is so, it is certain that the German Government will resent the action very strongly and will take desperate steps to break up the resulting trade in arms with the Allies, possibly including acts of sabotage in this country. It seems quite likely that such action would provoke strong feelings in this country and increase our chances of being involved in the war. If, on the other hand, the repeal of the embargo would not make the difference between defeat and victory for the Allies, then there does not seem to be very much of an argument in support of it.

In regard to the second question, I think there would be a possibility that if our action in repealing the embargo should come before an international tribunal at the close of the war it would be held to be a violation of our legal duties as a neutral. If it could be shown that the sole motive for lifting the embargo was to aid the Allies, that would not seem to be in accord with the duty of impartiality required of neutrals by international law. It could be argued, of course, that the main purpose of repeal was to enable this country to stay out of the war and not to help the Allies. If that could be shown, then I think that repeal would be justified under international law, even though the result was to enable the Allies to defeat Germany. However, it seems fairly clear that the sentiment in favor of repeal is directly associated with the desire to aid the Allies in winning the war.

Sincerely yours,

FREDERICK S. DUNN.

A distinguished practicing attorney and recognized authority on international law, Mr. Henry S. Fraser, of Syracuse, N. Y., says:

There is no doubt that under international law a neutral state may, during the course of a war, adopt new measures or alter old measures, provided that the motive for such action is not to assist one belligerent against another. Hence it would be justifiable for a neutral state, after the outbreak of war, to pass a new law forbidding all belligerent warships to enter its territorial waters, where it was found that belligerent warships had engaged in hostilities within its coastal waters. Obviously, such new law would be for the purpose of better safeguarding the neutral's rights or of better enabling it to fulfill its duties as a neutral.

* * * * * * *

As recently as the Second Hague Peace Conference in 1907, when the thirteenth convention, concerning the rights and duties of neutral powers in naval war, was under discussion, the British declared that an instance where neutrality would be served by the relaxation of a neutral's legislation after the outbreak of war was "inconceivable." At that meeting Sir Ernest Satow, the British delegate, requested that specific mention be made of the fact "that, in his opinion, it is inconceivable that a neutral state would ever be obliged to adopt less stringent measures in the course of a war in order to protect its rights, but that English doctrine has always recognized the fact that neutrals have the right to enact stricter measures for this purpose."

We must not forget that however our sympathies may be aroused by the unhappy struggle abroad, our intellects should warn us of the danger of involvement if those sympathies are translated into political action. We must not forget that the repeal of the arms embargo requires an act of Congress. This affirmative action of government, taken for the purpose of enabling private individuals to sell arms to the belligerents, becomes a Government act to aid that belligerent which controls the sea, namely, Great Britain. By repealing the embargo the United States Government would in law make itself a party to the contemplated sale of arms by its citizens. The sale of arms by a neutral government to a belligerent is universally condemned as constituting participation in the hostilities. The sale of arms by a citizen of a neutral country, which sale could not take place except for an explicit enabling statute enacted by government, is the exact equivalent of a sale of arms sponsored by government itself.

The converse of the present situation arose during the World War when, in December 1914, after the outbreak of war, bills were introduced in Congress to place an embargo on the exportation of munitions. Sir Edward Grey thereupon indicated to our Government that he considered the adoption of such a law would be "special legislation passed while war is in progress" and therefore would constitute "an unneutral act toward the belligerents that can profit by it."

The pending bill to lift the arms embargo is a self-evident proposal to relax our legislation after the outbreak of war. That the purpose of the executive branch, as well as of the administration supporters in the legislative branch, is assistance to the predominant sea power engaged in the war, does not admit of successful contradiction.

Genuine Neutrality With Cash and Carry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 3, 1939

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, it is my solemn and earnest conviction that America should remain out of the present European war. I am in complete agreement with the President of the United States when he says that we should and that we can remain at peace. My vote as a Member of this Congress will, as the occasion arises, always be cast for peace.

The temper of this Congress, and the temper of the American people are such that war will never be declared unless an attack is made upon our sovereignty. Of this the American people may be assured, this Congress will not involve our Nation in Europe's quarrels. Our present problem it seems to me is: How and what can we do to make certain that this determination of the American people to remain at peace shall not be frustrated?

Our experiences of 25 years ago taught us a lesson that we ought now to have clearly stamped in the forefront of our minds. America was brought into the World War by the sinking of American ships which were carrying through the war zones merchandise intended for one or the other of the combatants. Our ships were attacked without regard to the

character of their cargoes. Ships carrying wheat and other foodstuffs were subject to attack the same as ships carrying munitions.

Another cause of our entry into that war was the stirring of the emotions of the American people by the attacks made upon, and the sinking of foreign ships upon which Americans were permitted under our then existing laws to become passengers.

Still another cause of our involvement in the World War was the financial interest that so many of our citizens had in the success of the Allies. We permitted foreign governments to borrow great sums of money from our banks and our investing public with which these foreign governments purchased the products of our farms, our factories, and our mines. Certain of the foreign governments became heavily involved in debt to the American people and American business. Unless the governments that were in our debt won the war, those Americans who had made the advancements stood to lose their money. All this created a sort of vested interest here in America in favor of the Allies. We permitted our citizens to have a stake in the European war.

The natural tendency, the inevitable result of the course we pursued 25 years ago was to drag us into war. Let us profit by that experience.

The Senate of the United States, after extended debate, after the most careful consideration by a vote of 2 to 1, has passed on to this House an amended neutrality bill. Let us examine it in the light of the conditions that brought us into the last war.

The bill, as it comes from the Senate, proposes that any foreign nation may come to our shores and purchase any goods that any of our citizens desire to sell. The foreigner comes with his own ships; he sails away with the goods in his own ships, at his own risk; he must pay with cash for them before they leave our shores. It is a strict cash-and-carry program.

The Senate amendment further provides that no American shall, for the period of the war, travel in the ship of a warring nation; it further provides that no American ship shall travel in the war zones. The Senate amendment, in line with its cash-and-carry provision, precludes Americans from furnishing goods to warring nations on credit. In a few words, we Americans may do business with all foreigners who desire to do business with us, but whatever business is done must be done at the foreigner's risk, and with no risk to Americans.

A calm, dispassionate analysis of the Senate amendment discloses that it provides against just those conditions and circumstances that led to our involvement in the World War.

Now, one word on the subject of our right to ship arms and munitions. If it is morally wrong to ship arms and munitions to a warring nation, it is equally immoral to ship them to a nation at peace, for the nation at peace can only be purchasing them against the day when it will be at war.

If the Senate amendment is defeated and the law remains as at present, we are in this position: France cannot purchase an airplane in America, but Russia is completely free to stock up with guns, airplanes, and munitions. Japan has been for several years purchasing war material in vast quantities from us. She may still continue to stock up. If a year hence she determines to join in the war against France, she may use what she is now buying in America against France; but France, under our present law, cannot now buy a single airplane in America, though she is ready to pay for it in cash and take it away in her own ships at her own risk.

I submit this is not neutrality. Genuine neutrality consists in treating all foreign nations alike. If the one is the better able to do business with us because it has the cash and the other has not the cash, or because it has control of the seas and the other has not, this is not a situation of our creation.

To deny to the democracies the right to trade with America, because the dictator nations are not in a position to send their ships here, is in my judgment taking sides against the democracies and in favor of the dictators.

As the European situation stands today, we have on the one side the democracies, on the other side Hitler and Stalin. I need not say that I make a distinction between Hitler and the German people. This war is not a war of the German people; they want it no more than you and I. It is the German people who are the real sufferers; it is to them that our sympathies go.

It is understandable enough that there can be no peace in Europe unless the nations of that continent have some faith and confidence in one another. It is easy to understand that Poland could not stand by and meekly submit to Hitler's crushing it. The Poles are a great people; they have a glorious history; they are as attached to their Poland as you and I are attached to America. Yet Hitler, notwithstanding his sworn pledge of security given to Poland, ruthlessly destroyed it. But Poland will rise again.

The Czechs are a peace-loving people; they had their right to their place in the sun. Nothing that they had done justified the attack which was made on Czechoslovakia. They, too, had been assured against aggression. European civilization is much in debt to the great Czech people. They have made a glorious contribution to the advancement of our civilization. Yet, today, we see the heel of the aggressor on the heart of Czechoslovakia.

Finland, small that it is, has its right to live. It, too, is threatened by Hitler's ally, Stalin, as he threatened Lithuania and Estonia.

Where will the aggression end? What will satisfy the greed and avarice of these two mad dictators? Everything that we hold dear—religion, liberty, peace, security—they brutally destroy.

Why then should America, made up as it is of people who trace their ancestry back to all the nations of Europe, take sides against the democracies and in favor of the dictatorships? A neutrality bill that enables Russia to have our airplanes and denys them to France is a delusion and a snare. Communism, with all that it means in the destruction of religion, morality, and civilization, stands to profit by our present unneutral law, which allows Russia to buy and ship munitions in American ships, while denying to the democracies now under attack by Russia's ally, the right to trade with us for munitions even though carried in their own ships.

Let us profit, I repeat, by our experiences of World War days. Let us do the things that will keep us out of war. Let us at least be as fair to the democracies as we are to the dictators. Let us say to all nations alike—we will sell any goods to any and all nations who have the cash, and who will carry them away in their own boats at their own risk. If this principle may work to the present advantage of the democracies, this certainly can be no reason for our interfering against them.

This is what the Senate amendment provides, and for this reason I will vote for it.

Neutrality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES F. O'CONNOR

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 2, 1939

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, each Member of the House on this day was called upon to make a decision that may have far-reaching effect upon the future of this country. It was argued that the repeal of the embargo on the sale of arms, ammunitions, and implements of war would cause us to enter into war, or cause us to remain at peace with the world. Personally, I could not agree with either statement. As I said while the question was up for debate in the House, I do not believe that we can write a law that will, of itself, keep the United States at peace. Every Member of Congress who voted upon this

measure performed his duty conscientiously, courageously, and patriotically with but one purpose in mind, namely, to keep this Nation out of war. We disagreed, however, as to the methods to be employed.

It is my own view that the people of the country can do more to keep our Nation out of European embroilments and to remain at peace with the world than any other force, if in spirit as well as in fact they will remain neutral, hold their heads, and attend more to our internal problems. As I said upon the floor of the House, when the subject was under debate, I cannot help but feel our real problems remain within the United States, namely: A staggering national debt of $45,000,000,000 and the specter of millions of men out of work with enemies of our form of government boring from within.

These conditions, my colleagues, in my judgment, are far more dangerous to the future of the democracy of this country than any condition affecting European nations removed from us 3,000 miles.

I desire to assure the Members of this House that it was with the most profound regret that I found myself in disagreement with the leaders of my party upon the questions before the House. To say the least, the decision I reached to vote to retain the embargo on the selling for profits the agencies of death was not easy, nor a pleasant one.

My conscience alone decided my course.

I trust that I may with propriety quote from the message of the President of the United States to the Congress when he called us here in extraordinary session to consider revision of the Neutrality Act:

> Let no man or group in any walk of life assume exclusive protectorate over the future well-being of America, because I conceive that regardless of party or section the mantle of peace and of patriotism is wide enough to cover us all. Let no group assume the exclusive label of the peace bloc.

Again let me quote from the concluding paragraph in the President's message:

> In a period when it is sometimes said that free discussion is no longer compatible with national safety, may you by your deeds show the world that we of the United States are one people, of one mind, one spirit, one clear resolution, walking before God in the light of the living.

Let us remember the President's words.

Now that the Neutrality Act will be revised, let us all work with unanimity of purpose to keep this Nation at peace. Let us tighten our belts and stand firmly against insidious propaganda from all sources to eventually have this country take the steps that may in the end cause our boys who have had no voice in the matter to again make the supreme sacrifice.

I wish to say, before the curtains drop, that I regret more than any other one thing in connection with the entire presentation to see political cleavage in the vote. I construed the President's message to mean that there were no partisan politics involved, but a question of honest-to-God Americanism.

I repeat now, in conclusion, what I have said before, that I will fight to the last ditch any future action on the part of any agency to ease the way for this country to enter this insane war. I also wish to state that I am firmly of the opinion that our President, in the exercise of almost plenary power in external matters, will steer this Nation clear of the shoals of war.

Upon the people themselves and upon the shoulders of the President now rests the selection of our course.

Legislation ultimately represents a composition of the many and divergent views of the representatives of the people. The proposed legislation is not to my liking. God grant that it may serve its purpose is my one and only wish. I, for one, shall do my utmost, now that Congress has spoken, to make the measure work toward peace.

Congress, in the proposed legislation, has placed large discretionary powers in the hands of the President. His responsibility is great and the burden of it all will rest heavily upon him. Let us all pray that God may give him strength to bear it all.

The War and American Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK C. OSMERS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 3, 1939

ADDRESS BY HON. FRANK C. OSMERS, JR., OF NEW JERSEY

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me on September 25, 1939, at the American Small Business Day, New York World's Fair:

Because of the fact that "big business," those great ponderous units actually so few in number, receive such vast attention in the public eye, it is easy to forget that "small business is America." At least the mills, factories, farms, and stores that are controlled either individually or by small groups constitute the backbone of our economy.

As a small-business man myself it has always been difficult to bring the viewpoint of our great group to the various official bodies in which I have served. It is, therefore, heartening to see so many leaders of the small-business groups throughout the United States gathered here in a spirit of friendly cooperation, attempting to solve the problems of today and those of the world of tomorrow.

When this meeting was conceived, we were concerned primarily with one aspect of the national welfare—taxes. Now our prime concern is taxes' partner—death.

In the brief months that have passed since last spring, the desperate international situation has passed from crisis to chaos. To believe that we can placidly ignore it is witless. Every shell fired in Europe echoes in the United States.

For this reason all businessmen in our country are asking themselves these questions: Will the war abroad help them or hurt them? Will America enter the war, if so, when? How long will it last? Should we trade with belligerents? Is cash and carry right or wrong? Should we keep the arms embargo? Are prices going up or down? Should long-term commitments be made or canceled? These, and a thousand like questions, have for the moment relegated the subjects of taxes, social security, balanced Federal budgets, wage and hour regulations, and other domestic measures to minor roles.

In all the confusion, one great truth transcends all else. American manhood, womanhood, American progress and prosperity, labor and capital, American business can only suffer as a result of our participation in any European war. We must stay out of war. Who can forget the fool's paradise of our wartime prosperity and who will ever forget the deflation that followed the inflation as inevitably as the night follows the day. Think of the failures, bankruptcies, unemployment, and even starvation that were ours as a result of the last war.

Ladies and gentlemen, we are still suffering from the cancer of the first World War. Mad Europe, unable to pay off its debts of the last war, plunges merrily into this one with the same self-righteous insanity. Many of you have rightfully viewed our growing national debt with alarm, but our present debts and deficits will be but the proverbial drop in the bucket in comparison with those in wartime.

A small but persistent minority is trying in every way to instill in the minds of America the insidious thought that great good and prosperity will be ours as a result of the European war. Our neutrality and peaceful future are threatened more by this group than any other. It is truly an invasion from within.

There are several things that we must remember as businessmen during these troubled times. We must build a dam against the endless flood of propaganda that threatens to engulf us from abroad. Each contending government and group will attempt to justify its case in the eyes of America and thereby gain our support for its own selfish objectives. Second, pressing domestic problems must receive full attention toward their solution. Politicians who have failed should not be allowed to use the war crisis to mask their failure. Certainly the European war is not the answer to our pressing fiscal and labor problems.

It would seem that America should be emergency proof after our experience of the last few years, when we have had them in great profusion and confusion. But again I seem to detect the creation of a national state of nervousness as a result of almost daily pronouncements, bulletins, and rulings that come out of Washington. We want no politics in our foreign affairs. The reply to the appeal of Alfred M. Landon, who has asked the President to make clear his position on a third term, will determine whether there will be. We want no repetition in 1940 of the 1916 slogan, "He kept us out of war."

We will inevitably hear appeals for national unity to present a solid front in dealing with our European problems. The importance of united action at such a time cannot be understated. But we must beware of the loss of individual thought, independent opinions, and the right to decide for ourselves lest we be stampeded into disaster.

Why Should We Be Neutral?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK C. OSMERS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 3, 1939

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. FRANK C. OSMERS, JR., OF NEW JERSEY

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me over the radio yesterday:

As I came to the studio tonight through the streets of New York with their brilliant lights, traffic, gaiety, and good cheer, I was naturally struck with a comparison that one must inevitably draw between our own great cities and the dark, sad capitals of Europe. I saw no human rat-hole air-defense shelters, no anti-aircraft guns, no gas masks, no splendid buildings piled in ruins, no homes gutted, no wounded limping back from the front, I saw no row of pine boxes at the railroad station containing the pitiful remains of some mother's hopes. There were no tears on the faces of those I saw, no sad goodbyes at the train platform, but here and there we have signs that once we had been at war. Not signs that the harried pedestrian sees very often, but those that occupy much time for us in Government. We have our veterans' hospitals with our living dead, we have our orphans and cripples. We have our war cemeteries. If only all of you would walk through a veterans' hospital just once a year there would be less glib talk about the synthetic need of our entering another European war. An amazingly large group of us for reasons that defy ordinary intelligence seem to be resigned to the fact that sooner or later we must again plunge ourselves headlong into the ancient and hungry greeds and hatreds of Europe.

I speak to you tonight as a Member of Congress to try in some way to stop this hypnotic drift toward war which has apparently drugged the thought and intelligence of so many of us. Without question the Treaty of Versailles is at the bottom of much of the present difficulty in Europe. It was a European prostitution of American idealism. It should forever stand as an example to the American people of the final end of their good intentions.

We all remember the slogans: "Make the world safe for democracy," "the war to end wars," and "peace without victory." What happened to them at Versailles? As a result of that treaty we have had victory without peace and not peace without victory. Yet many patriotic Americans would take our high-school and college boys, our sons, brothers, and fathers, and have them pour their blood on Europe's battlefields to win the same hollow victory. Once more would the American taxpayers be required to pay not only our own full cost of the war but a substantial portion of the cost of other belligerents as well. The defaulted war debts of our former Allies and the defaulted private credits of post-war Germany are your bills and mine. Once again we would lay a firm foundation for the next great depression. It would be a greater one than the one in which we now find ourselves and which has nearly broken our economic back.

The time has come when Americans must decide whether their hate for European imperialism and totalitarianism is greater than their love for American democracy. The great common interest between European nations and ourselves has for some mysterious reason never been demonstrated by anything more tangible than words or anything more profitable than bad debts.

America must stay out of war and mind its own business. And it needs a lot of minding. Partisanship must stop at the water's edge. But clear, fair thought on our own domestic problems knows no frontier. Our internal economy has broken down. Our business, industry, and agriculture are unable to afford 10,000,000 of our citizens the employment they seek and need to support their families. Let me say here and now that statesmen whose only cure for these economic ills is the fool's gold of swollen war profits are not the men needed by America in her present emergency.

At noon today one of the most momentous debates in American history began on the floor of the United States Senate. It will be long and bitter and its final outcome is, of course, in doubt. It is not my purpose tonight to discuss either side of the highly controversial question now before the Senate. There are many in the country who would have this Nation return to the so-called established code of international law. I believe that such a step would be a national calamity and would assure our quick entrance into the European war. It was under international law that our Nation was slowly sucked into the last war. To return to that code would be deliberate folly. International law rests principally upon the freedom of the seas for neutrals, and it was the violation of this code by British search and seizure of our ships in 1915 and 1916 that brought us to the brink of war with Great Britain. Unrestricted German submarine warfare starting in February 1917 drove us almost immediately into the war. Therefore it seems to me imperative that this Nation place mandatory restrictions upon its commerce and upon its citizens to prevent a repetition of the fatal events of 1914 and 1917. Petty desires of a few willful citizens who wish to travel in war areas, the craze for profits by a small fraction of our industry should never again be allowed to plunge a nation of 130,000,000 free citizens into a war definitely not of their own choosing or making. As important as the debate on neutrality legislation will be, the final decision on peace must be made by the citizens of our country and not by its political leaders. It is therefore with a profound sense of patriotic duty that I urge upon you to curb your emotions and control your minds for the best of your country. The future salvation of America, its democratic form of government, its wealth, its resources, its youth, and all its people lies solely in the peaceful pursuit of its destiny. It is the last great stronghold of human rights on the face of the earth.

Let us remember it is impossible to win a modern war. The loser often gains more than the winner, and in any event both sides are bled white, bankrupted financially, decimated physically, and disillusioned spiritually. The boom that comes with war is a mirage. While some businesses may prosper temporarily, all business ultimately suffers if it does not collapse.

I am no pacifist. I would fight to defend the United States from attack or invasion. But I am a realist. I know that the United States would win any war in Europe, but we can never dictate a just peace, so our help means simply the death of our men, the suffering of our women, the collapse of our industry, and the impairing of our finances, while Europe lays the groundwork for the next war at the conference table.

Modern war is complete. The terrorizing and the starving of women and children constitute an important element of victory. Did you see the pictures of childless London in yesterday's newspapers, with its empty playgrounds. Millions of children will never know the taste of milk for the years of the war. They will become the rickety, sickly generation known as "war babies." In fact we can call the youth of any war period truly a lost generation.

We all remember the debauchery, crime, and atheism that followed the last war and can only imagine what will follow the next. When millions of humans are concerned only with the starvation, destruction, and death of other humans, God's influence is very low in the world. Even some churches plead passionately for the annihilation of the foe. What a mockery of the peace and brotherly love that forms the background of all religion. But that is war. Why did our forefathers come here? They wanted to be rid of the never-ending feuds and brutalities of the Old World. And yet there are those among us so light-hearted and light-headed that they would destroy this priceless peace and security. Upon the declaration of any war we would immediately lose all our precious rights and liberties. Our men would be ripped from their homes and loved ones, wrapped in a uniform, and shipped off to Europe to do or to die. Is that why our forefathers came here? No.

I think it is fair to divide Americans into three classes. First, a small selfish group who see in any war an opportunity for huge personal profit and power. They might be called the blood-money brigade. Second, also a small group, we have our world savers. They are brave crusaders who are determined to build a new world, generally with someone else's blood. And third, we have the vast majority of our people who want peace and security, law and order, liberty and freedom, a home and a family. This third group, though not organized, constitutes the backbone of our country. Should they stand firm against the blood-money brigade and the world savers, peace for America is assured.

But can our people stand firm against the never-ceasing flood of words and pictures emanating from at home and abroad, the sole purpose of which is to soften our resolve for neutrality?

What was known a few years ago as lies today passes as propaganda, the backbone of terroristic government, the cloak for official and governmental libel, and the product of a highly specialized, intricate business. Propaganda today is as important to winning a war as food and guns.

Sometimes propaganda, for all the care and deviltry used in its preparation, is so obvious that even we in the United States, inclined to be credulous and naive, see through it. For instance, a British air force attacks a German naval base, and Mr. Churchill says many direct hits were scored and no losses suffered. But Mr. Goebbels has another version. No ships were hit, but four British planes were shot down.

It is not that sort of obviously false report of which we must beware. Propaganda, to be good propaganda, must be insidious. It should not and generally is not recognized as propaganda, and we with our free press and open discussion, are perfect targets for it.

I cannot impress upon you too strongly the need to believe nothing you read and nothing you hear. Be patient. Even the most interesting dispatch in 48 hours will generally be found false. But even that is not enough. Like the carriers of some diseases, we ourselves are often carriers of propaganda, and like those same carriers of disease, would shudder and vehemently deny it.

The repetition of unfounded rumor, the word-of-mouth dissemination of what someone else's cousin heard from his boss's secretary, back-fence gossip, the careless charge, the hasty conclusion, make us all tools of the propagandist.

Let us not be fooled again.

In all this talk of pressure, dictation, might and right, democracy and aggressor, and in all the horror of the conflict now raging in Europe, strive to remember this one thing: There is only one power in the United States that can declare war, and that is the Congress of the United States.

Months ago, when the peace of Europe hung in the balance, I made a pledge to the people of my own community. It was this: That I shall never vote to send American troops to foreign soil even if I am the only Member of Congress to vote against it.

If you would exact that pledge from your Member of Congress and if a majority of the Members of Congress would make such a pledge, the particular form of neutrality legislation would be of secondary importance.

So I want to leave this one message with you. Ask your Congressman to give you this solemn pledge: "I will never vote to send American troops into any conflict on foreign soil."

The men who have died to make this Nation free and great look to us, the living, to carry on in peace.

Theodore Roosevelt-Navy Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VITO MARCANTONIO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, November 3, 1939

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, on October 27, throughout the country, all patriotic Americans celebrated Theodore Roosevelt-Navy Day. I notice that several people have been trying to usurp the credit for the founding of this patriotic occasion. I feel duty bound to set the record straight, and hereby establish that the suggestion came from an ex-service man and one of my constituents, Mr. Joseph J. Bruno.

Navy Day was actually inaugurated by the Navy League in Washington sometime in 1922. At that time the newspapers carried the headline "No date set for Navy Day." Whereupon, Mr. Joseph J. Bruno, who had faithfully served our country in the Navy during the World War, wrote a letter sometime in September 1922 to the then Assistant Secretary of the Navy, Col. Theodore Roosevelt, suggesting that the celebration of Navy Day take place on October 27, as this date marked the anniversary of the birth of President Theodore Roosevelt.

It will be remembered that President Theodore Roosevelt had devoted himself to the establishing of a sound naval policy for the United States of America. Mr. Bruno pointed out that President Theodore Roosevelt had written a naval history of the War of 1812, a work of such great merit that it was incorporated into Clowe's Royal Navy, a monumental history of the British sea service.

Mr. Bruno also pointed out that as Assistant Secretary of the Navy, and finally as President, Theodore Roosevelt strenuously impressed upon the American people the necessity for an adequate navy, and sought through his leadership to realize that ideal. October is also the month in which the American Navy was founded in 1775 by the Continental Congress.

The following letters received by Mr. Bruno from Col. Theodore Roosevelt attest to the fact that it was Joseph J. Bruno who actually and originally did make the suggestion that Navy Day fall on October 27, which is the date of the anniversary of President Theodore Roosevelt.

Mr. Speaker, I do hope the proof submitted herein will establish once and for all that the idea of celebrating Navy Day on October 27, the date which marks the anniversary of the birth of Theodore Roosevelt, was originally suggested by my constituent, the good, patriotic American, Joseph J. Bruno.

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
ASSISTANT SECRETARY'S OFFICE,
Washington, November 11, 1922.

Mr. JOSEPH J. BRUNO,
American Legion, 2127 First Avenue, New York City.

MY DEAR MR. BRUNO: Many thanks for your letter. Indeed, I showed your original suggestion to everyone concerned in Washington.

With best wishes,

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
ASSISTANT SECRETARY'S OFFICE,
Washington, September 19, 1922.

Mr. JOSEPH J. BRUNO,
2127 First Avenue, New York City.

MY DEAR MR. BRUNO: Thank you for your letter. Navy Day will be October 27, and there has been some talk about having it made identical with the celebration of my father's birthday. However, you can see that this matter must rest entirely with the Navy League. It would not be practical for me to make any suggestions thereon.

I hope you are going to be at Syracuse this week. If you are, be sure to come and speak to me.

With best wishes,

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

Neutrality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAM C. MASSINGALE
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, November 2, 1939

Mr. MASSINGALE. Mr. Speaker, the House has under consideration House Joint Resolution 306, containing the Senate amendments to the neutrality bill. There is a great deal of misunderstanding about what neutrality is and just the effect of the proposed changes in the law, and here I call attention to the essential differences between the several neutrality acts and the proposed Neutrality Act.

ESSENTIAL DIFFERENCES IN THE SEVERAL NEUTRALITY ACTS

The present Neutrality Act passed in 1935, as amended in May 1937, forbids the exportation of arms, ammunition, and implements of war from any place in the United States to any belligerent state or to any neutral state for transshipment to or for use of a belligerent state; and further provides that no articles or materials whatever shall be shipped from the United States to any neutral state for transshipment to a belligerent state unless the title to such goods shall first be transferred to some foreign government or agency thereof.

The bill as passed by the House of Representatives in June 1939 was substantially the same as the amended act of 1937 in respect to the shipment of goods. The present House Joint Resolution 306 as amended by the Senate, in broad language makes it unlawful for any American vessel to carry passengers, or articles, or materials to any belligerent state, and there is no exception to this except the general exception that is in the law as amended in May 1937, and the proposed law passed by the House in June 1939, which makes the laws inapplicable to such countries as Canada and Mexico.

The main difference between the two laws is that under the existing law as amended in May 1937, an American ship may transport to a neutral country materials other than arms, ammunition, and implements of war; while under the Senate amendment House Joint Resolution 306, no American ship is allowed to carry such articles or any materials to any belligerent state.

The law as amended in May 1937 is specific in forbidding exportation of arms, ammunition, and implements of war to a belligerent state; whereas the House Joint Resolution 306 as amended by the Senate is general in its terms and prohibits shipment of any kind of articles or materials to a belligerent state. Under the amended law of 1937, anything may be shipped from the United States to a belligerent state or for a belligerent state other than arms, ammunition, and implements of war; while the House Joint Resolution 306 makes it unlawful for an American ship to carry such articles and materials to any belligerent state but leaves open the right of foreign ships to transport from an American port any articles or materials to a belligerent state and does not include or forbid the carrying from an American port of arms, ammunition, or implements of war by other than American ships to a belligerent state.

CASH AND CARRY

There is nothing magic in the term "cash and carry" and it is not new in the neutrality legislation of this Congress. The law of 1935, as amended in May 1937, provided for cash and carry. See section 2 (b).

The bill as passed by the House of Representatives in June 1939 also carried the same provision with reference to so-called cash and carry, except it provides for 90 days' credit, if authorized by the President. See section 4 (d).

House Joint Resolution 306, with Senate amendments, likewise carries the same provisions with reference to cash and carry.

I mention this simply for the reason that the newspapers and many of the speakers on the Neutrality Act and the proposal to repeal or modify it urge as a reason therefor that House Joint Resolution 306, as amended by the Senate, is pioneering in the cash-and-carry thought. In addition to the fact that the proposed Senate amendment is not a pioneer thought on cash and carry, it is wholly compatible with the President's wish to have cash and carry in the bill with reference to everything except shipment of arms, ammunition, and implements of war. I am sure from the President's statements and from what I know of him that his sincere desire is to so conduct the foreign policy of this Government as to save the people of America from the unpredictable consequences of another World War. He does not want it, and I do not believe any Member of Congress wants it.

I want to see put back into the law a prohibition against the shipment of arms, ammunition, and implements of war because it is my belief that if such amendment should carry, and no arms, ammunition, or implements of war should be sold by this country to any one of the warring powers, there would be less danger of our involvement than there will be if we set up an arsenal in the United States to ship such destructive agencies to any one of the warring powers. Therefore, I am going to vote for what is known as the Shanley amendment. That amendment is to the effect that the Senate amendments shall be amended by prohibiting the exportation of arms, ammunition, and implements of war from any place in the United States to any belligerent state or to any neutral state for transshipment to or for the use of any belligerent state. It further provides that the President shall from time to time by proclamation definitely enumerate the arms, ammunition, and implements of war, the export of which is prohibited by this amendment. The arms, ammunition, and implements of war so enumerated shall include bombs, torpedoes, poison gas, flame throwers, and other articles heretofore enumerated, but shall not include raw materials. The exclusion would take into consideration such items as cotton, wheat, and goods necessary for the protection of human life and comfort. The thought is unbearable to me that a great Nation and powerful Government like this should be manufacturing and sending abroad to any of the warring powers such destructive and abominable agencies of death as poison gas, flame throwers, and the like.

I do not want my Government to be in that kind of business, and largely for that reason I am going to support the Shanley amendment. I do not believe that any Member of the House would willingly prefer to see his Government ship that kind of death-dealing machinery to England or France or elsewhere to enable those countries in this war to more speedily kill and destroy old men, women, and children, even if they are citizens of Germany or elsewhere. I should like to go along with the President on this bill, for I have gone along with him on practically everything that he has asked since I have been a Member of Congress. But I cannot do it without first doing my best to include an embargo against arms shipments; and as between the choice of doing what I would like to do and doing what I have to do to satisfy my conscience, I am going to choose the latter course.

Much has been said about the neutrality or the unneutrality of the laws of 1937 as compared with the proposed House Joint Resolution 306 as amended by the Senate. I think a frank statement would require a person to say that both the laws of 1937 and the proposed House Joint Resolution 306 as amended by the Senate are wholly and patently unneutral. I do not see where there can be any question about this statement. For instance, throughout the law of 1937, and also in the Senate amendment to House Joint Resolution 306, there are specific exceptions to the territorial operation of the respective acts. Neither one proposes to interfere with the right to ship arms, ammunition, and implements of war to such countries as Canada and Mexico or republics of South America. With such provisions in a law or in a proposed law, it would be unneutral.

Personally, I do not believe that in any great world tragedy, such as the war raging in Europe today, the human mind is capable of being neutral. Whether we express it or not, each member here must feel his unneutrality, and I do not censure any man for his sentiment regarding the participants in that war. I do not take much stock in many of the speeches that have been made attacking England or France or Germany, for such argument, if it can be so dignified, is merely an expression of sympathy or hostility toward the particular people attacked. In our saner moments, I am sure each one of us realizes the tremendous debt of gratitude that we owe to the English people and to the French people; and I am sure that all of us, whether we are favorable to the French or English or not, are bound to concede that America owes as much to the great German people as it does to any other people of the earth. Sturdy stock has been transplanted into this country of ours from Germany, and it has contributed too much to the greatness of our Nation for us to try to learn the hymns of hate that others sing against them. The sins of Hitler are no more chargeable to the German people than are the sins of Al Capone to the American people. This is a period of great danger to the American people for it is a period of sentiment making. The best thing that America can do for its own protection just now is to endeavor to subdue the passion and prejudice resulting from what is taking place on the continent of Europe. I do not believe that that war is justified, and I think it is a cruel and unnecessary one, but why should we work ourselves into a lather by abuse and condemnation of one side or the other?

The tragedy is terrible enough if we let it alone. We can make it worse for ourselves if we are eternally saying mean things about those involved in it. It is a difficult thing for a Member of Congress to tell whether or not his vote for repeal of the present law is more dangerous to the people of America than continuing the present law would be. I am sure that everybody who is to cast a vote on this most important matter is endeavoring to cast such a vote as will in his judgment better prevent America's becoming involved in that European war. I voted for the arms embargo clause when this matter was for consideration in the House in 1939, and while I do not subscribe to those debaters who contend that we have no right to change a particular law when we discover that it is operating unfairly between others, I do believe that we ought to try to be as consistent and clear about it as it is possible for us to be. It would be of particular value to call to mind these statements from Washington's Farewell Address:

> A passionate attachment of one nation for another produces a variety of evils. * *· * It leads also to concessions to the favorite nation of privileges denied the others, and produces jealousy and ill will and a disposition to retaliate on the part of the one from whom equal privileges are withheld. * * *
>
> The great rule of conduct for us in regard to foreign nations is, in extending our commercial relations to have with them as little political connection as possible. So far as we have already formed engagements, let them be fulfilled with perfect good faith. Here let us stop.

We told the people of the world by the act of 1937 that we are not going to permit the shipment of arms, ammunition, and implements of war from the United States to any belligerent country or to any other country for transshipment to them. As stated, I believe we have a right to change that law when we find that it is operating unfairly, but I am just wondering if the admonition of George Washington is not potent enough to cause us to hesitate to change this law. In other words, where he advises us, "Here let us stop," is about the best advice that we can get. I believe

George Washington would say that the law of 1937 is an engagement that we made and it ought to be fulfilled with perfect good faith. I am inclined, therefore, to keep the embargo on the shipment of arms, ammunition, and implements of war in the law as it has been since 1937. Speaking as an individual, I prefer a rigid and virile American foreign policy with regard to our merchant marine, but the devastating blight that would fall upon this Nation in the event of its involvement in this war is sufficient to overcome that feeling that I personally entertain. In matters of this magnitude, the gravity is such that I do not believe any Member of Congress ought to cast any vote unless he knows that he is speaking his own sentiments after having advised with his God about it. Surely no man should vote a contrary vote because he does not like the President of the United States; and no man should vote favorably just because he favors the President of the United States. Not many in this House are going to have the opportunity of rendering a more distinct service to the Government of the United States and to the people of the country than this occasion presents, if we cast our votes according to the very best consideration that we can give the bill. We ought to be careful that in this instance, at least, we do the thing that will accomplish what the American people most desire, and what civilization demands of us, and what God expects us to do. We ought to bear in mind that there is plenty of time to get into war, if it is war that we want. Once we get into it, the only way out is to fight our way out, and we know what the price will be, both in blood and in treasure.

I trust that the law will be amended by restoring the embargo against shipment of arms, ammunition, and implements of war to any of the warring powers. Under the Senate amendment, America has retreated from the high seas insofar as its commerce is concerned. We are voluntarily giving up the use of ships that cost probably half a billion dollars, merchant marine ships, and putting them into drydock or running them into some haven and forgetting all about our commerce and trade, in order to avoid the danger of our involvement in this war. That is a great sacrifice, and very few nations would make it. If we can make that sacrifice in our trade and commerce, ought it not to be an easy thing to say that we will go further and do a thing which will not cost the Government of the United States a dime, by simply saying that we will not ship the death-dealing bombs, poison gas, flame throwers, and other agencies to murder people? The only ones who will reap any benefit out of such transactions will be those who make the devices mentioned. The only benefit, if any, that the Government of the United States will get out of the shipment of arms, ammunition, and implements of war will be jobs that a few men will get in the factories that make them. We know this will be inconsequential. Our retreat from the high seas with our merchant ships will cost millions of dollars in loss of trade and will affect everybody in America that raises or manufactures anything that will be required for the people of Europe to live on, for we may expect that all American ports and warehouses and elevators will be choked with American-made goods, manufactured articles, and farm products because the ships will not be available to transport them. If we can forego that much, why is it not better to take another step and stop the shipment of arms and ammunition to the warring countries of Europe? We must not forget that our interest in European affairs must necessarily not be concerned with state boundaries in Europe or political power on that continent. True, we share and have a right to share, all the abhorrence of war; but this war is not ours. We did not make it. We did not contribute to it in the very remotest degree. I think it behooves us to stay at home, strengthen our domestic affairs, and make sure that we shall never be in any war unless some brute undertakes to come here to enforce his will upon us—and if such should happen, and I am sure it will not, I hope we are prepared to make a summary ending of it. I do not look for war, but there is always danger of our being involved as long as the world is inflicted with war.

After the War, Peace!

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN G. ALEXANDER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 3, 1939

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, 181 against to 243 for is the sad record of the roll-call vote this afternoon, November 2, 1939, in the House of Representatives on the question of repeal of the embargo against the sale of arms and munitions of war. My heart sinks when I realize the meaning of such a vote. I was never so forlorn or so filled with despair as I am tonight as I approach the thankless task of trying to pick up the wreckage after the storm, to use a descriptive phrase with which we are all familiar.

I know of no better time, however, than right now to start to build on the broken pedestal of hope for a real peace after the war which we cannot escape, I fear, after the action of the House today.

In a great majority of the hundreds of speeches I have made on many and varied occasions in the past 12 years I have stated that there is a way to a real and lasting peace, a way as yet untried, a way open to us after all else—all human experimentation—has failed—a sure way, because it is the way appointed by the Creator of Mankind.

I suggested it in my address in the House on February 22, last, entitled "Is Democracy in Guam," again on May 9, in my "The Only Road to Peace"; also in my neutrality address of June 28, and again yesterday, when I suggested in my remarks before the House that we should, as a corollary to our vote here today, demand the right to write the terms of the next treaty of peace when this war has finally burned itself out after years of destruction.

The future welfare of this Nation and of humanity in general greatly depends on how well we write that peace treaty, consequently, I want to cut the pattern for it now, to set out a formula. I want to have it ready for the great minds—if any be left then—who will sit around the peace table in that day and year after travail and shedding of blood have wrought the reform we need, and have burned the word "honesty" into our hearts and souls, which the oratory of the Congress could not do this year, even though supported by the voices and letters of thousands of our citizens begging us not to traffic in war materials.

WE GO TO WAR

Religious, racial, political, economic, and patriotic prejudices destroy peace and the edifice of humanity. As long as these prejudices prevail, humanity will not ever have rest. How can we best remove them? How? Did you ever ask yourself that question? If so, and if you found the answer, you are to be highly congratulated for you are one of God's noblemen.

For a period of 6,000 years history informs us about this world of ours. During these 6,000 years we have not been free from war, strife, murder, and bloodthirstiness. In every period war has been waged in one country or another and that war was due to business competition fought under a cloak of either religious prejudice, racial prejudice, political prejudice, or patriotic prejudice. Consequently the answer to the problem must be found in the removal of these prejudices as all are destructive of the human edifice. As long as these prejudices persist, the struggle for existence must remain dominant, and bloodthirstiness and rapacity continue.

Therefore, today, in this twentieth century, even as was the case in the past, the world of humanity cannot be saved from the darkness of nature and economic rivalry, and cannot attain illumination except through the abandonment of prejudices and by the acquisition of the morals of the kingdom as enunciated by Jesus Christ over nineteen hundred years ago.

Consider if there is prejudice and enmity on account of religion. Religion should be the cause of fellowship, otherwise it is fruitless. And if this prejudice be the prejudice of nationality, all mankind are of one nation; all have sprung from the tree of Adam. That tree is one and all these nations are only the branches, while the individuals of humanity are like leaves, blossoms, and fruits of the branches. Therefore it is ignorance and selfishness which sets one nation up against another in war.

As to the patriotic prejudice, this is also due to absolute ignorance, for the surface of the earth is everyone's native land. Everyone can live in any spot on this globe. All the world is man's birthplace. These boundaries, and the red and blue lines on the maps, are devised by selfish man. In the creation, such boundaries were not assigned. Europe is one continent; Asia is one continent; America, Africa, Australia are each one continent; but some, from personal motives and selfish interests, have divided each one of these continents and considered a certain part as their own country.

NO FRONTIER

God has set up no frontier between France and Germany; they are continuous; yet selfish souls for the promotion of their own interests fight over these imaginary lines on the maps. And this situation will continue indefinitely, if this conception of patriotism remains limited within a certain circle, and it will be a primary cause of the world's destruction. No, my friends, the terrestrial globe is the motherland of us all and not any restricted area, for is not man the son of God and is not God also the creator of the earth—therefore the property of each individual by right of inheritance. In fact it is not only ours to live on, but it is also in death our eternal tomb. Is it worth while that we should engage in bloodshed and stage war after war as we are now and always have, over this eternal tomb?

SIGNS OF IMPENDING CHAOS

Not only have we widespread war in progress, but never, indeed, have there been such widespread and basic upheavals, whether in the social, economic, or political spheres of human activity, as are now going on all over the world. Never have there been so many and varied sources of danger as those that now threaten the structure of society. How long will humanity persist in its waywardness? How long will injustice continue? How long is chaos and confusion to reign among men? How long will discord agitate the face of society? The signs of impending chaos and convulsions can now be discerned, inasmuch as the prevailing order appears to be lamentably defective.

The disquieting influence of over 30,000,000 souls in minorities living under precarious conditions in Europe; the vast and ever-swelling army of the unemployed here, with its crushing burden and demoralizing influence on governments and peoples; the wicked, unbridled race of armaments swallowing an ever-increasing share of the substance of already impoverished nations; the utter demoralization of the international financial markets; the onslaught of secularism invading what has hitherto been regarded as the impregnable strongholds of Christian orthodoxy—these stand out as some of the grave symptoms that bode ill for the future stability of the structure of modern civilization. Little wonder that one of Europe's preeminent thinkers, honored for his wisdom and restraint, should have been forced to make so bold an assertion: "The world is passing through the gravest crisis in the history of civilization." "We stand," writes another, "before either a world catastrophe, or perhaps before the dawn of a greater era of truth and wisdom." It is in such times that religions have perished and are born.

Might we not already discern, as we scan the political horizon, the alignment of those forces that are dividing afresh the continent of Europe into two camps of combatants, determined upon a contest that may mark, unlike the last war, the end of an epoch, a vast epoch, in the history of human evolution?

Are we, the privileged custodians of a priceless faith and a great principle of government, called upon to witness a cataclysmical change, politically as fundamental and spiritually as beneficent as that which precipitated the fall of the Roman Empire in the west? Might it not happen, perhaps, that out of this world eruption there may stream forces of such spiritual energy as shall recall, nay eclipse, the splendor of those signs and wonders that accompanied the establishment of the faith of Christianity? Might there not emerge out of the agony of a shaken world a religious revival of such scope and power as to even transcend the potency of those world-directing forces with which the religions of the past have, at fixed intervals and according to an inscrutable wisdom, revived the fortunes of declining ages and peoples? Might not the bankruptcy of this present, this highly vaunted materialistic civilization, in itself clear away the choking weeds that now hinder the unfoldment and perfection of God's struggling faith?

GUIDING PRINCIPLES OF A NEW WORLD ORDER

Shall we strive to attempt or venture to obtain a glimpse of the first streaks of the promised dawn that must, in the fullness of time, chase away the gloom that has encircled humanity? Let me point out in broad outline what appears to be the guiding principles underlying a new world order.

That the unrest and suffering afflicting the mass of mankind are in no small measure the direct consequences of the World War and attributable to the unwisdom and shortsightedness of the framers of the peace treaties only a biased mind can refuse to admit. It would be idle, however, to contend that the war, with all the losses it involved, the passions it aroused, and the grievances it left behind, has solely been responsible for the unprecedented confusion into which almost every section of the civilized world is plunged at present.

Is it not a fact—and this is one of the ideas I desire to bring out—that the fundamental cause of this world unrest is attributable, not so much to the consequences of what must sooner or later come to be regarded as a transitory dislocation in the affairs of a continually changing world, but rather to the failure of those into whose hands the immediate destinies of peoples and nations have been committed, to adjust their system of religious, economic, and political institutions to the imperative needs of a rapidly evolving age? Are not these intermittent crises that convulse present-day society due primarily to the lamentable inability of the world's recognized leaders and preachers to read aright the signs of the times, to rid themselves of their preconceived ideas and fettering creeds, and to reshape the machinery of their respective governments or positions according to a new standard—the standard that is implicit in the declaration of the oneness of mankind, the chief and distinguishing feature of the faith Christ proclaimed? Consider that question carefully and see if your answer is not the same as mine. Do you not recall that in every dispensation the light of divine guidance has been focused on one central theme? In this glorious century of ours the foundation of the faith of God and the distinguishing feature of His law are the evidences and the consciousness of the oneness of mankind.

How pathetic indeed are the efforts of all those leaders of human institutions who, in utter disregard of the spirit of the age, are striving to adjust national processes, suitable to the ancient days of self-contained nations, to an age which must either achieve the unity of the world or perish. At so critical an hour in the history of the world, great and small, whether in the east or in the west, whether victors or vanquished, whether aggressors or peacemakers, all must give heed to this clarion call and arise manfully to carry out in its entirety the one remedial scheme He, the Divine Physician, has prescribed for an ailing humanity. Let them discard, once for all, every preconceived idea, every national prejudice or human subterfuge, and give heed to this sublime counsel.

WE NEED A UNITED STATES OF THE WORLD

Here in America, I am convinced, we can best serve our country by striving in our capacity as a citizen to assist in

the eventual application of the principle of federalism underlying our own Government, to the relationships now existing between all the peoples and nations of the world, so that we may have a United States of the World.

Such an ideal requires great leadership. True civilization will unfurl its banner in the midmost heart of the world whenever a certain number of its distinguished and high-minded leaders—the shining exemplars of devotion and determination—shall, for the good and happiness of all mankind, arise with firm resolve and clear vision to establish in this way the cause of real and universal peace—universal peace, and not the fake, nationalistic peace most of us have been pursuing without satisfactory results. The cause of peace must be made the object of general consultation, built on a union of the nations and peoples of the world. We must conclude a binding treaty and establish a covenant, the provisions of which shall be sound, inviolable, and definite. It must be proclaimed to all the world and obtain the sanction of all the human race. This supreme and noble undertaking—the real source of the peace and well-being of all the world—should be regarded as sacred by all that dwell on earth. All the forces of humanity must be mobilized to insure the stability and permanence of this great covenant, the world's great need. In such an all-embracing pact the rights and limitations of each and every people and nation should be clearly fixed, the principles underlying the relations of governments toward one another definitely laid down, and all international agreements and obligations ascertained and determined.

In like manner the size of the armaments of every government should be strictly limited, for if the preparations for war and the military forces of any nation should be allowed to increase they will arouse the suspicion of others. The fundamental principle underlying this solemn pact should be so fixed that if any government later violates any one of its provisions all the governments on earth should rise to reduce it to utter submission; nay, the human race as a whole should resolve, with every power at its disposal, to destroy that government. Should this greatest of all remedies be applied to the sick body of the world it will recover from its ills and will remain safe from war, without the least bit of doubt.

INDOMITABLE DETERMINATION REQUIRED

Some timid souls, unaware of the power latent in human endeavor, consider this suggestion as highly impracticable; nay, even beyond the scope of man's utmost efforts. Such is not the case, however. On the contrary, thanks to the unfailing grace of God, the loving kindness of His favored ones, and the unrivaled endeavors of wise and capable souls, nothing whatsoever can be regarded as unattainable. Endeavor, ceaseless endeavor, is required. Nothing short of an indomitable determination can possibly achieve it. Many a cause which past ages have regarded as purely visionary now in this day has become an accomplished fact. Why should this most great and lofty cause—the cornerstone of true civilization, of the advancement, the well-being, and the success of all humanity—be regarded as impossible of achievement?

THE LIGHTS OF UNITY

In cycles gone by, though harmony was established, yet, owing to the absence of means, the unity of all mankind could not have been achieved. Continents remained widely divided, so that, even among the peoples of one and the same continent, association and interchange of thought were well-nigh impossible. Consequently, understanding and unity amongst all the peoples and kindreds of the earth were unattainable.

In this day, however, means of communication have multiplied, and the five continents of the earth have virtually merged into one. In like manner all the members of the human family, whether peoples or governments, cities or villages, have become increasingly interdependent. For none is self-sufficiency any longer possible or desirable, inasmuch as political ties unite all peoples and nations, and the bonds of trade and industry, of agriculture and education are being strengthened every day. Time and space have virtually been eliminated as elements in world conditions. Hence, the unity of all mankind can in this day be achieved. Actually this is none other but one of the wonders of this wondrous age, this glorious century. Of this, past ages have been deprived. This century—the century of light—has been endowed with the miraculous unfolding of a fresh marvel every day, but none greater than that which I have just described, because it makes possible the true road to peace.

As foundation stones of that accomplishment there are seven elements of unity which will needs accompany it, if its benefits are to be permanently enjoyed. The first is unity in the political realm, early glimmerings of which have been discernible for some time. The second element is unity of thought in world undertakings, such as crime curing, temperance, and disease controls. The third is unity in freedom. The fourth is unity in religion. The fifth is the unity of nations, causing all the peoples of the world to regard themselves as citizens of one common government. The sixth is unity of races, and the seventh element is unity of language. Each and every one of these will inevitably come to pass inasmuch as the power of the Kingdom of God has, is, and will assist in their realization.

"But," I hear someone say, "there will be opposition." Yes; there is and will be, and yet are we not justified in deriving fresh encouragement when we observe that the very consideration of such proposals is in itself an evidence of their steady growth in the minds and hearts of men? In the organized attempts that are made to discredit so exalted a conception, are we not witnessing the repetition, on a large scale, of those stirring struggles and fierce controversies that preceded the birth, and assisted in the reconstruction, of our own present unified action in this country?

THE FEDERATION OF MANKIND

To pursue this illustration further, how confident were the assertions made in the days preceding the unification of the States of the North American Continent regarding the insuperable barriers that stood in the way of their ultimate federation! Was it not widely and emphatically declared that the conflicting interests, the mutual distrust, the differences of government and habit that divided the States were such as no force, whether spiritual or temporal, could ever hope to harmonize or control?

And yet, how different were the conditions prevailing a hundred and fifty years ago from those that characterize present-day society! It would indeed be no exaggeration to say that the absence of those facilities which modern scientific progress has placed at the service of humanity in our time made of the problem of welding the American States into a single federation, a task infinitely more complex than that which confronts a divided humanity in its efforts to achieve the unification of all mankind into a United States of the World.

Upon the consummation of this colossal and glorious enterprise will depend the fulfillment of the prophecies uttered by the prophets of old when swords shall be beaten into plowshares and the lion and the lamb lie down together. It alone can usher in the kingdom of the Heavenly Father as anticipated by the faith and by the prayer of Jesus Christ, whose main point in His philosophy proclaimed the oneness of mankind. Surely the world, contracted and transformed into a single highly complex organism by the marvelous progress achieved in the realm of physical science, by the world-wide expansion of commerce and industry, and struggling, under the pressure of world economic forces, amidst the pitfalls of a materialistic civilization, stands in dire need of a restatement of the truth of that philosophy.

Into such a period and condition, overshadowed by such moral and social gloom, we are now steadily and irresistibly moving whether we will it so or not. Amidst the shadows

which are increasingly gathering about us we can faintly discern the glimmerings appearing fitfully on the horizon of history. To us, the generation of the half light, living at a time which may be designated as the period of the incubation of the world commonwealth, has been assigned a task whose high privilege we can never sufficiently appreciate and the arduousness of which we can as yet but dimly recognize. We may well believe, we who are called upon to experience the operation of the dark forces destined to unloose a flood of agonizing afflictions, that the darkest hour that must precede the dawn of the golden age of our faith has about struck.

UNIVERSAL FERMENT

If we view the world carefully, we cannot miss the clear evidence of that universal fermentation which, in every continent and in every department of human life, be it religious, social, economic, or political, is purging and reshaping humanity in anticipation of the day when the wholeness of the human race will have been recognized and its unity established.

A twofold process, however, can be distinguished, each tending in its own way and with an accelerated momentum, to bring to a climax the forces that are transforming the face of our planet. The first is essentially an integrating process, while the second is fundamentally disruptive. The former, as it steadily evolves, unfolds a system which may well serve as a pattern for that world polity toward which a strangely disordered world is continually advancing, while the latter, as its disintegrating influence deepens, tends to tear down, with increasing violence, the antiquated barriers that seek to block humanity's progress toward its destined goal. The constructive process stands associated with the faith of Jesus and is the harbinger of the new order which that faith must ere long establish. The destructive forces that characterize the other should be identified with a secular civilization that has refused to answer to the expectation of this new age and is consequently falling into chaos and decline.

A titanic struggle, unparalleled in its magnitude, yet unspeakably glorious in its final consequences, is being waged as a result of these very opposing tendencies. The hollow and outworn institutions, the obsolescent doctrines and beliefs, the effete and discredited traditions which these forces represent, have, in certain instances, been undermined by virtue of their senility, the loss of their cohesive power, and their own inherent corruption. The perversion of human nature, the degradation of human conduct, the corruption and dissolution of human institutions, reveal themselves, under such circumstances, in their worst and most revolting aspects. Human character is debased, confidence is shaken, the nerves of discipline are relaxed, the voice of human conscience is stilled, the sense of decency and shame is obscured, conception of duty in both high and low places, of solidarity, of reciprocity, and loyalty are distorted, and the very feeling of peacefulness, of joy, and of hope is gradually extinguished.

ELEMENTS OF A DECADENT SOCIETY

The reappearance of religious intolerance, of racial animosity, and of patriotic arrogance; the increasing evidences of selfishness, of suspicion, of fear, and of fraud; the spread of terrorism, of lawlessness, of drunkenness, and of crime; the unquenchable thirst for, and the feverish pursuit after, earthly vanities, riches, and pleasures; the weakening of family solidarity; the laxity in parental control; the lapse into luxurious indulgence; the degeneracy of art and music, the infection of literature, and the corruption of our press; the extension of the influence and activities of those "prophets of decadence" who refuse to regard the procreation of children as the sacred and primary purpose of marriage, who denounce religion as an opiate of the people, who would, if given free rein, lead back the human race to barbarism, chaos, and ultimate extinction—all these appear as the outstanding characteristics of a decadent society, a society that must be either reborn, or perish.

With this situation, compare and consider the character and philosophy of Christ. Instead of the recrudescence just described, He pushed every good trait of human character and condition of life to its utmost limit of perfection. His forgiveness was unbounded, His generosity was untiring, His patience was inexhaustible, His mercy was immeasurable, His courage was illimitable, His wisdom was unfathomable, His kindness was interminable, His faith removed mountains, His hope had no shadow in it, His love was infinite.

Of these two pictures of a pattern for life and for a basis for social, economic, political, and religious stability and success and peace, which do you choose as the ultimate winner? Does anyone doubt which philosophy of life will be the eventual winner? And then remember that the central feature in the real Christian philosophy points and leads to the unification of the whole of mankind.

Unity of family, of tribe, of city, State, and Nation have been successively attempted and fully established. World unity is now the final goal toward which a harassed humanity is slowly striving. Nation building seems to have come to a standstill, except perhaps temporarily and artificially by force of arms. The anarchy inherent in state sovereignty when carried to its ultimate is moving us all toward a climax. A world growing to maturity must abandon this fetish, in the interest of all our fellow men, recognizing the oneness and wholeness of human relationships, and establish once for all the machinery that can best incarnate this great fundamental principle of its life.

We blame the munitions makers, the international bankers, crooked diplomats, and unwise statesmen for war. But what, if they are the cause, are we going to do about it? After so placing the blame it seems to me that we have done absolutely nothing about it of a constructive nature. All corrective measures at least have failed. By the vote of this Congress we have even removed the restrictions against the sale of munitions. Is it not evident therefore that something new and untried must be the answer, rather than the false cures and remedies we have so unsuccessfully sought to apply?

How can we control international problems except with international machinery? Our mistake is that we have tried to do it with local or national laws. I suggest an international organization for peace and contend that the preordained unity of the human race implies the establishment of a world commonwealth in which all nations, races, creeds, and classes are closely and permanently united, and in which the autonomy of its state members and the personal freedom and initiative of the individuals that compose them are definitely and completely safeguarded as we have here in the United States.

This commonwealth must, so far as I can visualize it, consist of a world legislature, whose members will, as the trustees of the whole of mankind, ultimately control the resources of the component nations, and will enact such laws as shall be required to satisfy the needs and adjust the relationships of all races and peoples.

A world executive, backed by an international police force contributed on a proportional basis, will aid in preserving the peace of the world and in seeing that its international laws are obeyed and its organic unity is safeguarded. A world tribunal must adjudicate and deliver its compulsory and final verdict in all disputes arising between the various nations. That would be better than settling disputes by war, would it not? At least that is the way we settle disputes in this country between States and between people, so I assume it is a qualified method.

A world script, a world literature, a uniform and universal system of currency, of weights and measures, will simplify education, trade, and business problems and will produce a better, friendlier understanding among the nations and races of mankind. In such a world society, science and religion, the two greatest forces in human life, could be reconciled and would work together instead of out of harmony as they seem to be now as we practice the art of war.

If these words and thoughts which I have expressed are not true and if they are not in complete accord with the experience and wisdom of the ages; if they are not in accord with the eternal laws of the Creator, then they can but fail of realization. But if they are true, then is it not the duty of yourself and all of us to bring them into fruition and realization with every ounce of energy and talent at our command, and in the name of peace?

Monica Williams has penned a poem just fitted for this occasion. What more fitting conclusion can I append than this:

LOVE WILL NOT FAIL

There are no words with which to voice our grief
That war has come—no tears with which to weep,
For hearts in anguish a deep silence keep,
And minds are lulled to kindly unbelief.
It cannot be! There is no laurel wreath,
No joyous song of triumph that will leap
From muted throats; we know we can but reap,
The sorrow which all cruel wars bequeath.

And yet we wonder why such things must be;
Have we but built our house upon the sand,
Is there no good that evil shall prevail,
No God of Love to guide humanity?
Then let us look within and understand
That when we serve God first love will not fail.

Reciprocal-Trade Treaty With Uruguay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, November 3, 1939

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the announcement which has gone forth from the office of the Secretary of State that a reciprocal-trade treaty will be negotiated with Uruguay, I am in receipt of a letter today from a man in Oatman, Ariz., in which he says:

Relative to the enclosed clipping, am also enclosing label of one kind of imported canned beef for sale in this locality.

For several years there has been no American canned meats on sale in this section.

Before this administration the tax rolls for this county showed about 370,000 head of cattle, and there are about one-tenth as many now. Taxes have trebled. Tax delinquent property list has doubled and business and activities unprofitable, and one-third of the population on relief.

There was enclosed with the letter a label off of a can of corned beef stating "Fray Bentos Brand Compressed Cooked Corned Beef Made in Paraguay." It will be noted from the letter of my correspondent that, according to his figures, there were formerly about 370,000 head of cattle on the tax rolls in that county, whereas now there are only about one-tenth of that number, and that taxes have trebled and delinquent property tax lists doubled and business activities are unprofitable, and one-third of the people are on relief.

Arizona, like many of the other Western States, was formerly extensively engaged in stock raising. The same was true of my own State, Oregon, where the herds have diminished almost to the vanishing point in many localities. Notwithstanding this, we are importing increased amounts of meat products of all kinds from abroad, and particularly from South American points.

I most sincerely urge all of my colleagues, and particularly those from agricultural districts, to give serious consideration to this proposed trade treaty with Uruguay, as well as that with Argentina, upon which hearings were recently held. I have pending in the House, H. R. 7592, requiring all trade treaties hereafter to have Senate approval, as required by the Constitution. If the right to make treaties with respect to our foreign importations was again placed in the Senate, where it belongs under the Constitution, there would be an opportunity given to all of us as representatives of the several States to have a voice in determining what importations should be allowed, so that no agricultural products, particularly, should be permitted to be imported in direct competition with similar products produced here.

Cash and Carry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, November 3, 1939

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, on June 5, 1934, just after I was first nominated and before I was elected a Member of Congress, I received a letter from a very distinguished friend of mine, an eminent lawyer and a beloved citizen of my district, Mr. James H. Pou, Sr., of Raleigh, N. C., the brother of my very able predecessor, Hon. Edward W. Pou, who for 33 long years served with honor and distinction as a Member of this body, and was at the time of his death the dean of the House of Representatives and chairman of the Committee on Rules. The souls of both of these eminent and distinguished men have entered upon new careers in the regions of immortality but the tomb cannot enclose or retain the fine virtues of their lives. These brothers did much to enrich the lives of those who knew them and who felt the tolerance of their spirits and the kindness of their hearts, and their splendid contributions to the welfare and progress of their State and Nation will live long in our memory.

Mr. Speaker, sincere human affection inspires me to insert in the RECORD excerpts from the letter to which I have just referred as a tribute to the profound wisdom, foresight, and patriotism of the eminent lawyer, James H. Pou, late of the city of Raleigh:

RALEIGH, N. C., *June 5, 1934.*

Hon. HAROLD D. COOLEY,
Nashville, N. C.

DEAR MR. COOLEY: I feel like suggesting to you a theme for your campaign speeches and for your activities in Congress, which I think well worth while as a service to the Government and as an introduction of you into national life. It is that you consider favoring congressional action which would authorize the President, in case of war breaking out between foreign countries, to issue embargoes regulating commerce with belligerents and with nations within the war zone by American citizens.

War in Europe and war in Asia are strong possibilities for the near future. We have no direct interest in either; and we can easily maintain our neutrality, if we do not undertake to trade in the war zone, either with the belligerents or with their close neighbors. If we undertake to enforce strict technical neutral rights (unless an effective blockade be maintained against that country, this is a recognized right), then I feel that we will almost inevitably be drawn into the next foreign war, even though we desire to maintain peace. If we place the enforcement of our trading rights as a neutral nation in the balance against our desire for peace, if we wait until war comes, we will find that the clamor for war will silence the prayers for peace; and we will be in the war without our wishes, as happened in 1812 and in 1917.

On the contrary, if we consent before the war begins to give the President the right to regulate commerce in the war zones, we can, without loss of prestige or pride, remain out. And I think that will be to our advantage—even our pecuniary advantage. Nine-tenths of our commerce is local; one-tenth is foreign. No war could destroy all of our foreign commerce. We could still do business with Canada, Mexico, and, in all probability, South America. If the war is European and not Asiatic, we can do additional business with China and Japan. Therefore an embargo could not cost us anything like all of our 10-percent foreign trade. It would probably cost us very little. Even if there were some net costs, that would be a mere trifle in expense and inconvenience in comparison with the cost of another war.

The conditions in which the world finds itself require a reexamination and a restatement of many of our old doctrines. One of these is the doctrine of neutral rights. I think a great self-contained

nation like ours can well afford to say that, if our customers choose to fight among themselves, while it is a matter of great regret to us, in order that we may not be involved in the trouble we will forego trading with them except upon a cash-and-carry basis. If any of the belligerents wish to trade with us, will bring the money and come after our products, we will be glad to sell to them on this side; but we will not undertake delivery on the other side nor will we sell on a credit.

I think there is serious danger, within the next 2 or 3 years, of a foreign war; and, if we undertake to carry on commerce according to technical neutral rights, there is grave danger that we will become involved, no matter how much we desire to keep peace. It will be too late to vest this power in the President after war has begun. Too many of our people will see a profit. They will raise a patriotic cry and denounce everyone who favors embargo or staying out of war as a coward. The time to do it is before war begins; and I am strongly of the opinion that Congress could well afford to vest this power in the President. In fact, it is a power that cannot be practically exercised by Congress. It must be exercised, if at all, by the Executive. We had something like this during Jefferson's administration. After the rupture of the Treaty of Amiens in 1803, the embargo system was adopted. Our commerce suffered greatly because at that time our country was not nearly so well self-organized or self-contained as it is now. Suffering occurred, but Jefferson stayed out of the war. Gradually people adapted themselves to new conditions and manufacturing rapidly increased. While the inconvenience was serious, it was nothing like the inconvenience we suffered during the two and a half years after we went into war. In 1812, in the Presidential crisis, President Madison and Congress decided to declare war on Great Britain. Telegraphy was then unknown; and it is a tragic fact that the same week we declared war against Great Britain that country rescinded the ordinances against which we objected. We went to war and fought two and a half years about a grievance which had been removed. Had Congress delayed a month until the arrival of ships with the news we need not have gone through the War of 1812.

The embargo under Jefferson did not effectually stop trading. The people in New England carried on very actively commerce with Great Britain and with France; but they did so at their own risk and did not necessarily involve the United States in their troubles. They became rich under this contraband commerce without involving us in war. When war came and this commerce ended, they suffered greatly and showed a disposition to secede from the United States. I mention this to show that there will be compensations to persons who wish to trade at their own risk if an embargo were declared. In short, an embargo would simply be notice to the American people: "You must not trade with the countries at war or with the countries within the war zone."

If a war should break out between France and Germany, we could not trade with Holland, Denmark, Spain, or Portugal, because they would be supplying things to the belligerents, and immediately would be justified in sinking ships carrying contraband to these adjacent countries.

If you are interested in this, I would be glad to discuss it with you fully. I have been thinking about the subject a great deal. I foresee danger of a foreign war, and I am most earnest in the hope that we may stay out. I believe we can, provided we take appropriate action before the war begins.

(The remainder of the letter is more or less personal, is not pertinent, and is therefore not included.)

With much respect and best wishes, I am,

Your friend,

JAMES H. POU.

Within the next few hours Congress will enact legislation which will confer upon the President of the United States the right to regulate and to control and to prohibit commerce with belligerents. The legislation will authorize and empower the President to designate war zones, combat areas, and places of danger to our ships and our citizens. The legislation will provide for a cash-and-carry plan and will in all respects conform with the ideas and views expressed to me by Mr. James H. Pou in the letter which is dated June 5, 1934, and I indulge the hope entertained by my friend at that time that we will by staying out of the vestibule of war be able to avoid the vortex of war.

It will no doubt be recalled that I, together with others, in June before war was declared in Europe, sought to provide safeguards for the peace and security of our Nation which would prevent our citizens traveling in submarine-infested seas upon floating arsenals into war zones, combat areas, and belligerent ports. While I regret that the House was not willing at that time to provide such safeguards, I am happy in the thought that this body will within the next few hours approve a measure carrying a cash-and-carry plan which will enable us to maintain our strict neutrality and remain away from the conflict in which our Nation is not now immediately concerned.

Discussion on Neutrality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LUTHER PATRICK

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 3, 1939

THE AMERICAN FORUM OF THE AIR

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following program of the American Forum of the Air:

Announcer MCCORMICK. WOL, in cooperation with WOR presents the American Forum of the Air.

This is the fifth of this season's Sunday night broadcasts—emanating from the modern broadcasting studios of the new Department of the Interior Building in Washington, D. C. The facilities of these studios have been extended by the Secretary of the Interior, Harold L. Ickes, in the interest of free speech, on assurances these educational broadcasts will present both sides of a national problem, temperately discussed by representatives of opposing schools of thought and conducted by a nonpartisan, nonpolitical organization.

Tonight's American Forum of the Air will be a departure from the routine generally followed on these widely listened to programs.

Under the direction of Theodore Granik, pioneer in educational radio discussion you will hear four outstanding American newspaper columnists first state their respective stands on the American neutrality policy. Following this formal presentation of viewpoints the issue will be taken up in extemporaneous discussion.

And now, our chairman, Mr. Granik.

Chairman GRANIK. Thank you, Mr. McCormick.

On Friday night last, after 4 weeks of almost continuous debate, the United States Senate approved the administration's neutrality bill by a vote of 63 to 30. Among its important features, the bill—

Directs the President to put the act in effect when he, or Congress, finds that a state of war exists and the President determines that operation of the law is necessary to preserve the peace and security of the United States;

Repeals the present embargo and permits arms sales to belligerents for cash. Forbids American ships to carry arms to any belligerent port in any part of the world;

Bars American vessels from transporting supplies or passengers to belligerent ports, with certain exceptions;

Empowers the President to establish danger zones around either belligerent or neutral ports, including the areas exempted in the shipping sections, in which American ships could not go;

Prohibits the purchase, sale, or exchange in this country of bonds, securities, or obligations of belligerents; forbids United States citizens to make loans or extend credit to any belligerent state, or its agency; forbids solicitation of funds for belligerents, except for medical aid, food, and clothing to relieve suffering;

Authorizes the President to restrict the use of American ports by belligerents' submarines or armed merchant vessels;

Forbids Americans to travel on belligerent ships, with minor exceptions;

Makes it unlawful for an American merchant vessel to be armed, except with small arms.

The measure has been dispatched to the House of Representatives which will consider it on Tuesday. The Democratic leadership in the House hopes for final Congressional action by the end of this week.

Speaker BANKHEAD announced that the leadership would move to send the bill to a joint Senate-House conference committee to compose the wide differences between the measure approved by the Senate and that which passed the House last summer. The chief difference is that the House bill provides for a modified embargo. It would prohibit the shipment to belligerents of arms and munitions, but not such "implements of war" as airplanes.

After a conference with Majority Leader RAYBURN, Speaker BANKHEAD expressed confidence that the House would reverse its vote of June 30.

"I am confident now," said the Speaker, "that we have a majority in the House to sustain the major features of the Senate bill."

But Representative FISH, of New York, leading the fight for retention of the embargo, contests these claims, stating that a floor fight of major proportions appears assured when the House machinery gets under way.

And as the Nation awaits House action, the American Forum of the Air is pleased to present four distinguished columnists in a round-table discussion on America's neutrality policy. They are Dorothy Thompson, Ernest K. Lindley, Jay Franklin, and Boake Carter. Each will have a few minutes for prepared remarks, to be

followed by an informal extemporaneous panel discussion. And to lead the panel discussion we have invited Congressman T. V. SMITH of Illinois, noted lecturer and writer, to act as guest chairman.

And now to open our program—Miss Dorothy Thompson.

ADDRESS BY DOROTHY THOMPSON

It seems I am the first to serve in this set of doubles. This neutrality debate has changed a lot of alinements. There's Mr. Boake Carter and Mr. Lindley, with whom I've often agreed, on the other side; and here's Mr. Jay Franklin, with whom I almost never agree, on the same side with me.

Now, for the Neutrality Act itself.

I think it is unfortunate from every point of view that the Neutrality Act had to come up for reconsideration after the conflict in Europe had started. For that, we certainly cannot blame the administration. The President and the State Department were extremely anxious to have the issue settled before the last Congress adjourned. You remember that the Congress, which was hot and tired from a long session, laid the measure aside, and certain Senators, among them Senator BORAH, ventured the opinion that there was nothing pressing about the matter, because no war was likely to break out during the summer or fall. That, by the way, was the opinion of numerous people, including most of the international bankers, who are usually thought to be extremely well informed, and whenever there is going to be a war to be in on the plot.

At any rate, the war did start, and the Congress has had to conduct its debate in the midst of strain, a great amount of natural popular anxiety, and under terrific pressure from organized groups, most of whom, if I can judge from my own mail and the petitions that have come into my office in shoals, were against lifting the embargo. I think it is a great testimonial to the cool-headedness, wisdom, and common sense of the United States Senate, that in spite of all the hullaballoo, and in spite of the charges wildly made from many sides that to lift the embargo was tantamount to a declaration of war, and that the next step would be that our boys would be slain on the fields of France, in spite of all this, the Senate has taken the administration's view of the matter and adopted the administration's measures, and lifted the embargo on arms. I have every confidence that the House will do the same thing.

Most of us who have been publicly opposing the Neutrality Act began to do so long ago, and on the ground that it was not a neutrality act at all, but a questionable piece of legislation that greatly limited neutral rights in time of war, set dangerous precedents for neutrals, and encouraged false expectations on the part of would-be aggressors. We argued that in time of war, it would militate against our best customers and rig things in favor of large land powers with high industrial capacity, and with most of their resources on their own soil, or transportable by land, against all small nations, and against nations that had to get most of their supplies by sea, and also against nations with limited industrial capacity. It was also an act bound to encourage programs of autocracy, or economic self-sufficiency, instead of stimulating and encouraging world commercial intercourse.

One has only got to think of the situation that would exist if every nation, and particularly every nation with large resources and industrial capacity, should pass the same kind of Neutrality Act and clamp an automatic embargo on arms the moment two nations were at war. Not a single small nation on earth could continue to keep its independence. Every one of them would be at the complete mercy of any aggressor.

My own stand on the Neutrality Act was taken nearly 3 years ago, a long time before this war began. I remember that I said then that if the act were on the books when a major war broke out, it would almost certainly be changed, and that the very act of changing it would be interpreted in some quarters as an unneutral gesture.

Actually, if the House backs up the vote of the Senate, we will be in a much firmer neutral position than we were at the outbreak of the war, and, incidentally, we shall be more in line with most of the other neutrals—Russia excepted—and that also seems to me a step in the right direction. This is certainly the opinion of most of the people in this country who, from a long study of foreign relations and international law, have the right to be considered as having a somewhat expert opinion. Personally, I am not unqualifiedly enthusiastic about the administration's bill, either. Under the Constitution, the conduct of foreign affairs is in the hands of the administration and the Senate, except for actual declaration of war. I dislike seeing this country tie its hands with legislation in a crisis which is quite unpredictable. I would rather have seen the Neutrality Act repealed, and a national defense council of both major parties appointed to consult with the President continually. I should like this country to have greater freedom of action—I also dislike seeing us retreat from our historic standpoint on the freedom of the seas. But the administration's bill seems to me infinitely preferable to the present legislation.

Chairman GRANIK. Thank you, Miss Thompson. And now, Mr. Ernest K. Lindley.

ADDRESS BY ERNEST K. LINDLEY

The really fundamental question in this discussion is, Where does our national interest lie in this European war? To answer this we must put aside emotions, sweeping generalizations, and slogans, and try to make a cool appraisal.

Does our national interest require the restoration of Poland and, if you like, Czechoslovakia as independent states? The answer, I think, is "No." I am not in the least sure that the restoration of these states is required even by the national interests of Great Britain and France. Neither of them existed during Great Britain's century of supremacy following the Napoleonic wars.

Does our national interest require the destruction of Germany as a great state? The answer, I think, is "No." Here again I am not at all sure that the destruction of Germany as a great state would be to the advantage even of Great Britain and France. For the destruction of Germany would remove the main barrier to the westward expansion of Russia.

Does our national interest require the destruction of the Nazi regime? We can all agree that we don't like Hitler and that we are profoundly opposed to everything for which nazi-ism stands. But it does not follow that our interests require the destruction of nazi-ism in Germany or in Central Europe any more than it requires the destruction of the Communist regime in the great expanses of the Soviet Union.

Does our national interest require the preservation of the British Commonwealth, the British Empire, and British naval power? Here we get onto more debatable ground. My answer to the question is "No." We stand as a great power, probably the greatest power. Nearly every material thing we need for our well-being can be found within our borders or within those of our neighbors in the Western Hemisphere. From a military viewpoint we are impregnable or can be made so.

If we go about it intelligently and energetically we can build a fine civilization in this hemisphere, regardless of what happens in the remainder of the world.

Now, change the question slightly and ask: "Is it to our advantage to have British naval power and the British Commonwealth preserved?" The answer, I think, should be "Yes." It is preferable, but not necessary. Great Britain is a "satisfied" power harboring no ambitions inimical to our well-being. Its institutions and traditions are similar to ours. The downfall of British power would almost certainly bring the downfall also of the other highly civilized democratic nations on the western fringe of Europe. The ultimate consequences are unpredictable, but we would enter upon a long period of rapid changes in Asia, Europe, and Africa.

The sound policy for us is to give the British and their Allies the "breaks," but not in such a way as to commit us to their cause. We must not allow our hands to be tied or our minds to be fixed. We must preserve complete freedom of action. Most of all we should avoid any step which might later compel us to give active military aid to the Allies.

Once in this generation we have intervened in a European war. The cost was tremendous. And we now witness the result. If our economic and military power is again necessary to preserve the British and French Empires, it would be cheaper and wiser to let them go under, and take our stand in the Western Hemisphere.

We should avoid deep emotional entanglements in this war. We should do what we can to avoid incidents which will inflame our emotions. We should avoid building an economic stake in the war, and especially in the victory of one side. We should build up our own defenses in the Western Hemisphere and keep cool.

Chairman GRANIK. Thank you, Mr. Lindley. And now we present Jay Franklin.

ADDRESS BY JAY FRANKLIN

Fellow Americans, it seems to me that most of the people who talk about President Roosevelt's program to keep war away from the Americas and to keep Americans away from the war—by revising the so-called neutrality law—are either trying to play President or to play Providence—or perhaps just to play politics with a highly emotional and very serious issue.

I can't argue with those who are trying to play politics with neutrality. It is part of the fair price we pay for democracy to expose our major national decisions to the play of narrow partisanship, selfish interest, personal ambition, meanness, spite, and revenge.

As for those who are trying to play Providence, to administer divine punishment to Hitler or Stalin or Chamberlain or Mussolini or even on Fritz Kuhn or Earl Browder—all I can say is that there is no man wise enough to say what is actually going to happen in this or any other war and that no man and no nation is in a position to pass moral judgment—even in the name of the loftiest idealism—on other men and other nations.

But playing President is perhaps the most dangerous of all political pastimes in this neutrality crisis. It is dangerous because those who play President are not actually in charge of this country's foreign policy, do not have access to the flow of continuous, confidential, and expert information on what is really happening, and have no direct public responsibility for the result of their hasty or emotional decisions.

In this crisis President Roosevelt is clearly entitled to our trust. Under the Constitution, he is responsible for our foreign policy. He commands the confidence and loyalty of great masses of our people, particularly of the poor, the inarticulate, and dispossessed, whose political trustee he has become, and he was right in warning of the dangers of a European war last summer when the Senate and congressional groups, which blocked action on neutrality last July, guessed wrong. Since these are the same groups which are now opposing amendment of the neutrality law and are telling the country that they must not trust Roosevelt in this crisis, I wonder if they

realize that they are arguing that we ought to trust their mistakes rather than his correct estimate of the world situation.

Now, I submit that it is not only not easy to construct a completely war-proof policy for America in this crisis. It is impossible. For it takes only one side to make a war, even if it takes two to make a peace. And I agree with some of the critics of the neutrality bill that it ought to be called a national policy bill—or a national security bill—for it is an attempt to find the best and safest national policy for this country in the face of disturbing and dangerous political and military events in Europe. Even so, the neutrality bill is only part of our national policy in the war crisis.

In the bill we try to make our economic resources, including munitions, available to France and England, in order that they may make headway against Hitler. If these two great empires can't win or draw under these circumstances, it is certain that our active intervention could not save them in this war of blockades, machines, and pressures. So another A. E. F. seems to be definitely out. At the same time, we try to balance the books by a cash-and-carry program which is not in the interest of France and England and so far as it helps anyone, helps Hitler. We do this to avoid the risk of being accidentally drawn into the war by risking our ships, our goods, and our citizens in the combat zones. Then, entirely outside the bill, we are keeping our Navy in the Pacific and are having frank diplomatic talks in Tokyo, with a view to preventing the spread of war in the Far East. And finally through the declaration of Panama, we are trying to build up a pan-American bloc which will make the Western Hemisphere the world's official peace zone in this conflict.

Taken all together, these separate parts of the President's program add up to a total which seems to me, at any rate, the most prudent possible course we could take with any responsible view to our interests and safety.

There seems to be no completely safe and perfect course to follow. If we were really isolated—a hermit crab nation—we might stay clear. But we are not isolated. We have important interests—commercial, cultural, social and political—in Europe, Asia, and Latin America. But because we are no hermit crab, it does not follow that we should be a Peter the Hermit, preaching a crusade against the distant infidels and sending our men and our money on great emotional adventures. What we must do is to consider all things, the future as well as the present, the past as well as the future, and try to follow the course which will be best for us and our chi'dren in the long run.

That is my understanding of what President Roosevelt is trying to do. Certainly it is what he ought to do, and I think that the record of last summer—when he was right and the BORAHS and HIRAM JOHNSONS and HAM FISHES were wrong—entitles him to the benefit of the doubt and the trust of his fellow citizens in his leadership. Since he was right last summer and the isolationists were wrong, why should we trust them any further for leadership? We can respect, like, and even admire the isolationists but that does not mean that we can trust them to be wise in October when they were foolish in July.

Chairman GRANIK. Thank you, Mr. Franklin. And concluding the first part of the program—Boake Carter.

ADDRESS BY BOAKE CARTER

I assume it is the desire of all of us to help keep America out of foreign wars. No one pretends we can produce, as a Nation, a 100-percent guaranty of neutrality. But it seems to me the best way to keep out is to remove as many causes as possible which involved us in past wars. It should be domestic legislation—American legislation designed to help primarily the United States. There is no proper place in such legislation for dangerous attempts or ideologies to insure peace throughout the world, to punish far-distant aggressors, or to equalize existing inequalities among nations. Unequal application of neutrality laws is plainly and simply intervention, or still further it is applications of sanctions—a method discarded even by the nations of Europe as useless and leading to war. My own view is the same as President Roosevelt's expressed in August 1936—peace, like charity, begins at home. We are not isolationists, except insofar as we seek to isolate ourselves completely from wars." I further believe that cash and carry should not be exchanged for the munitions embargo, but that cash and carry should be added to the embargo; that the loophole to prevent transshipment of munitions through neutral countries to belligerents should be plugged; that American citizens who enlist for service in foreign armies should have the right to do so as individuals; but, by law, be deprived of their American citizenship on the grounds that they are embarrassing the neutrality efforts of their Government; that United States ships be barred from war zones; that the Pacific be kept open for trade for our ships; that Congress encourage American ship operators to go after trade abandoned by belligerents in neutral countries by increasing their subsidies in the amount it costs American operators to compete with lower-paid and lower-cost neutral-flag ships; that our old merchant ships, owned by the Government be sold to South American nations, encourage them to build fleets to trade with the United States, and again make up the difference in operating costs to the United States shippers in increased subsidies, enough to provide profit incentive to continue operating; discretionary restriction of armed merchant ships to our ports. I still further believe that the United States should try to redouble its trade with all neutral nations, which should more than compensate for trade lost with belligerents; that the allied governments of France and British can quickly overcome Germany, if the United States Government makes it clear that they must do that job themselves and by themselves, without counting on United States support in money or men; that the popular story that if we "don't go over there to help now, the Allies will be defeated and it'll be our turn next," is so much bosh and propaganda, which, in my opinion, does not square with facts already on the record—to give Miss Dorothy Thompson's column a plug, but which gives my column a plug—thereby providing two plugs, which means taking a neutral position; instead, I believe that if we are to proceed on the principle of emotion, instead of facts, which appears to be the premise on which we are now traveling as a nation—the best help it can give toward saving democracy is to first make democracy safe for the world before attempting to make the rest of the world safe for democracy and abandoning it completely in order to enter this supposed war of ideology and holiness.

A Democrat who starts off to join somebody else's fight with a $45,000,000,000 national debt hanging round his neck, would indicate he will have to put his own people through the misery of inflation in order to pay for his Sir Galahad adventure, before he's through. And when I find Great Britain excusing Russia's entry into Poland first on the ground that since Germany started this habit of hi-jacking, Russia's grab was all piety and purity and on the second ground that the hi-jacking is quite proper and respectable because a British statesman had suggested the new Russian frontier 20 years ago at Versailles, then I humbly suggest we either be honest enough to declare openly we are not for redistribution of wealth outside in the world, though we say we are at home, and go to war on that basis, or cease talking about this being another crusade for us to preserve some ideology with a fancy name to it, and content ourselves with trying to solve our own domestic problems at home and confine our foreign playgrounds to this hemisphere—which at least is legitimate, I submit, reasonably intelligent and more likely to preserve free thought, free press, free religion than trying to play judge, jury, and executioner all over the map.

Chairman GRANIK. Thank you, Mr. Carter. This is the American Forum of the Air. You have been listening to remarks by four of the Nation's distinguished columnists on America's Neutrality Policy—Miss Dorothy Thompson, Ernest K. Lindley, Jay Franklin, and Boake Carter. This concludes part I of tonight's presentation.

Announcer MCCORMICK. Immediately following station identification, we will continue with the extemporaneous discussion.

This is the Mutual Broadcasting System.

This is the American Forum of the Air, originating in the broadcasting studios of the New Department of the Interior Building in Washington, D. C., and presented over the Mutual network by WOL in cooperation with WOR.

We return you to the chairman of the program, Mr. Granik:

Chairman GRANIK. And now, as part II of our forum presentation, Miss Dorothy Thompson, Ernest K. Lindley, Jay Franklin, and Boake Carter return for an informal extemporaneous panel discussion. We have invited Congressman T. V. SMITH, of Illinois, noted lecturer and writer, to act as guest chairman. Congressman SMITH.

Congressman SMITH. Mr. Granik, fellow pugilists, my fellow countrymen, I am only an ignorant man and a Congressman, myself, but I welcome the chance to sit in on the wisdom of these "spinal" columnists of the American intelligentsia upon a question that is very pressing upon us politicians today. We have tonight a graceful, almost a Sabbath intermission between congressional talk and congressional talk. As I have been, myself, listening in person and by radio to some of the talk on the irresponsible fringe that has gone on before tonight, I may say, catching something of Mr. Boake Carter's closing mood, which I thought was a little facetious for so grand a subject, I must say that I sometimes think—

> I would rather crow and be a rooster
> Than to roost and be a crow,
> But I don't know.
> A rooster, he can roost also—

as this unknown poet goes on—

> Which don't seem fair when crows can't crow,
> Which may help some; still I don't know.
>
> Crows should be glad of one thing, though,
> Nobody thinks of eating crow;
> While roosters, they are good enough
> For anyone unless they're tough.
>
> There are lots of tough old roosters, though,
> And anyway, a crow can't crow,
> So maybe roosters stand more show,
> It looks that way, but I don't know.

I think this facetious poem by some unknown poet expresses the attitude of more American citizens tonight than is expressed by any dogmatism about a subject that is a matter of life, and may well become a matter of death, to a great many American citizens.

Before turning back, I am giving these pugilists a moment for a breathing spell, as all fighters are entitled to. I may ask each one of them to take an assessment of himself in the light of a story that Mr. Charles A. Beard, who has been having his say on this neutrality matter, told me a week ago. It is the story of an ancient swordsman whose pride was in his sword and an ancient armor maker whose pride was in the strength of his armor. The swordsman said, "There isn't any armor under heaven I can't cut through with one blow of my sword." The armor maker said,

"I can make armor you can't cut through, and as evidence of my confidence in myself and my skill I will put myself inside my armor and let you whack at me."

Upon the appointed day he did, and the swordsman, spitting upon his hand, came down with a resounding whack. The armor maker said, "Hah! You didn't touch me."

And the swordsman said, "Shake yourself." He shook himself and fell in two.

I wonder if we are all intact here now.

Mr. CARTER. Congressman, may I break in?

Congressman SMITH. Certainly, sir; Mr. Carter, shake yourself.

Mr. CARTER. What I wanted to say is that you put me on the spot, shall I say?

Congressman SMITH. By imitating you.

Mr. CARTER. Oh, come; imitation is the sincerest form of flattery. Thank you. But you said I was facetious in the closing remarks I made, so I look back at them and I find that I said merely that the substance of my remarks were these, that we try and preserve some ideology that we have here and try to make the United States safe for democracy before trying to make democracy safe for the world, and I don't see why that necessarily should be called facetious, because may I say also that Professor Beard is a very good friend of mine, whom I revere extremely, and furthermore, I also went through the World War, part of it, as a flier, and I know exactly what war is, and I have felt all along as an ex-Englishman who became an American citizen, who went through that war, and having two children of my own, putting it purely on that partially emotional basis, that if this conflict abroad is for the preservation of democracy, as we are told so often, therefore it seems to me or to my opinion or my view, then, at any rate, that the best thing that the United States can do is to preserve this democracy that we have in this country, try and establish it as strong as we can on this hemisphere, so that after the people have finished destroying themselves in Europe, if that is what they are going to do, the people are going to be disillusioned, the people are going to be distressed and distraught and downtrodden and weary; they are going to want to know where to turn, and if we join that conflict and we lose by joining that conflict our own democracy as democracies so often do and put on a cloak of authoritarianism, surely we shall not be providing, shall I say, the light like a lighthouse for these people to cling to after they have got absolutely no illusions left whatsoever. Surely it is our duty, is it not, to preserve this democracy here so that these people can turn to somewhere and get an example after they finish fighting.

Congressman SMITH. Thank you, Mr. Carter. Miss Thompson, do you want to rise to a matter of personal privilege?

Miss THOMPSON. No; not personal privilege. Mr. Lindley and Mr. Carter both seem to me to be arguing that war is a bad thing. Now, I don't think there is any difference of opinion at this table on war being a bad thing. I am not enthusiastic about war. I am not enthusiastic about this war or any other war. Mr. Carter seems to go on the assumption, also, that the Allies are going to win. I notice that happens all the time: We don't need to help save democracy for the world because the Allies are going to win the war. Maybe they are; maybe they are not. We don't know yet. I would like to ask Mr. Carter whether he really thinks, honestly, that given the case—let's play with the idea—let's consider the possibility that Germany wins this war thumbs down, wins it and takes over the whole of western civilization on the European continent, takes over France the way she did Czechoslovakia (and believe me she would), and makes a totalitarian Europe; I want to ask him whether he really thinks we would keep democracy on this soil and what he thinks we would do with the Nazis in this country.

Suppose the Communists and the Nazis go together, as I think they are going to—maybe I am wrong, but I think they are going to go together—just suppose they set out dividing the world between them; I don't say they will; I say that what stands between their doing it is France and Great Britain. Suppose they do, I want to ask him whether he thinks we will have an awfully easy time preserving peace and democracy in the Western Hemisphere, preserving it, for instance, in South America where, dearly as I love and hope for peace in South America, I have never known it yet to be (let's tell the truth) an exact citadel of democracy and freedom. Not quite.

I think this is a very serious war indeed, and I think it is much more serious than a matter of whether Poland is going to be restored. In fact, I don't quite see how they are going to restore Poland since Russia has come into Europe and changed the whole complexion of things there. And I certainly don't think it is a question of the destruction of Germany. Certainly, I don't know any Englishman who wants to see anything except a strong Germany, and if Russia is coming into Europe, certainly they will have to have a strong Germany, but I think there are much more fundamental issues. I think this war is part of a world revolution which is going to decide how the human race is going to live on this planet before this war is over.

I think we are going to get ourselves into a very difficult position for our own democracy if we begin thinking that neutrality requires impartiality. We are getting to be very mealy-mouthed in this country, I must say. Three months ago we had a very clear opinion about totalitarianism. We thought it was a menace. We said so. We had even broken off diplomatic relations with Germany because of it, and all of a sudden we begin to be a little bit tender, and those of us who had exactly the same opinion which they had 3 months ago are considered a little bit dangerous and in fact called emotional. And I would like to say apropos of emotionalism, Mr. Lindley, that emotionalism is the way your opponent presents his facts.

Mr. CARTER. Dorothy—I am going to call you Dorothy because I read your column every day in order to get mad at myself—may I say this: You have asked about 10,000 questions and I am going to take the first one first, about Hitler and winning the war. Let us assume that he does. I don't assume that he will, on these grounds, that when the Allies won the World War, they, combined, were unable to keep one nation down for more than 20 years.

Miss THOMPSON. We were with them.

Mr. CARTER. Quite, but nevertheless that adds to the number who were unable to keep down the one nation. Now then, supposing, therefore, that one nation, we will say, gains the upper hand, I don't concede for one moment that one nation can keep down a great number of countries when those numbers of countries were unable to keep down that one nation.

Miss THOMPSON. Those nations, Mr. Carter—you are dealing with a quite different thing now. After all, the Treaty of Versailles was a great humane, liberal document compared with what has been done to Czechoslovakia and Poland. The Allies never made the attempt to keep down Germany in the sense that the totalitarian powers think of keeping it down. Never! They never went in and organized a permanent espionage system, for instance.

Mr. CARTER. No; that is true, but may I say that the English have all sorts of ways of skinning a cat, and they can do it in a very gentlemanly way, and we have done it—I use "we" because I used to be an Englishman, and because I once in a while lapse back into being one, but I escaped all that and came over here looking, God knows, into the future with hope. But they have various ways of skinning the cat, and they have various ways of covering their sins—and I accuse them of sin—by using such slogans as "bearing the white man's burden" and "saving the world for democracy."

Miss THOMPSON. That is a German slogan now.

Mr. CARTER. It is also a British slogan. That being the case, I cannot see that there is any difference in the kind of oppression that is being applied by force of arms to Czechoslovakia and to Austria and to Poland and the pressures applied by the power of economics and the power of finance to a country that has been defeated in war.

May I make this clear and very definite at this particular moment, having been accused of being Fascist, and goodness knows what else, because I have tried to present the other side of the story, that I haven't the slightest desire at the present moment or any time whatsoever to see Germany win any war whatsoever, insofar as the Allies are concerned; but we are not discussing Europe; we are discussing, to my view, not who is going to win the war in Europe, but what are the best possible chances of the United States keeping out of that war. That seems to me to be the issue we are discussing tonight, and I think we are liable to get off the track if we are going to try to find out who is going to win the war in Europe.

Congressman SMITH. Mr. Lindley, are you willing to comment on that?

Mr. LINDLEY. I would be delighted to get in a word. Let me say, in reply to Miss Thompson, that I did go on the assumption that the Allies might lose the war. I remember asking the question whether or not British naval power and the preservation of the British Commonwealth are necessary to us, and I answered that question in the negative. I think it is a wise policy always to proceed on the theory that the worst may happen.

Now, Miss Thompson believes that this movement of Germany and of Russia is a sort of fused world revolution. She may prove to be right; but, so far as events have demonstrated, the behavior of both nations is completely in accord with the well-established rules of power politics as recognized over a long period in Europe; and the Russians, far from being in close collaboration with the Germans so far, seem to me to have been taking advantage of the situation in which Germany takes the risk and Russia gets the benefits.

I should certainly not be foolhardy enough to predict what may come out of that, but so far as events so far have occurred, there has been no fusion.

While I am on that theme, may I refer to one thing that Jay Franklin said that has been said in Washington so many times that I have become very weary of it: That is, that the Executive and our experts in the executive branch of the Government, having access to continuous confidential information, are in a far better position to decide what American policy should be than a great many other people. I am sure Jay Franklin has had the same experience that I have had with the people who have this continuous supposedly confidential information. You go into the State Department and consult with one expert and he tells you all they have on that is what they are getting through the press dispatches. A week later he gets a little bit of confidential information. You get his opinion of what the Russian policy may be, say, in southeastern Europe. You go down the hall a few feet and talk to another expert and he has a completely different theory on what has happened, and I am sure, from a personal experience, that that has happened with respect to every important move in Europe over a period of several years. The experts

with their access to the information are in continual disagreement, just as we here are in continual disagreement.

Congressman SMITH. Mr. Franklin, I think that makes it your turn.

Mr. FRANKLIN. I would like to comment on that because I have worked for the State Department. I have been one of those experts, and journalistically speaking, that is generally right but administratively speaking it is quite wrong, because it is the synthesis of information, the combination of factors, which is a function not performed in many editorial offices, certainly in very few Washington press bureaus, and is possibly confined to the State Department and some of the congressional committees, an attempt to get the whole picture and see how the parts fit together, and, of course, the President has other sources of information besides the State Department. Among other things, he has direct access to the ambassadors of foreign countries who can come in and inform him directly and confidentially of certain aspects of their national policy which bear on American interests.

Coming back to the main track, however——

Congressman SMITH (interposing). What is the main track, Franklin?

Mr. FRANKLIN. The main track seems to be Miss Thompson thinks that we have a relation to the rest of the world which is endangered by the war in Europe, particularly by Hitler and the combination of the Nazis and the Communists. I agree with that. I think Mr. Carter is inclined to be a little cavalier about making the world safe for democracy, etc., making democracy safe for the world. I think our job is to try to make the world safe for America in any way we can. Now, that is the point I understood we were discussing, not whether and how we are going to keep out of the war. We assume if we pursue a prudent course we can keep out of it, if the war develops along certain lines. I personally think that if——

Mr. CARTER (interposing). But, if I may interrupt, who is threatening America so we have to make the world safe for America?

Mr. FRANKLIN. The world is what we have been living in. What we have been living in is changing. We don't know whether those changes will be compatible with our interest and our safety. You don't know. Certainly you don't know.

Mr. CARTER. I don't know any more than you do.

Mr. FRANKLIN. I don't pretend to know.

Congressman SMITH. Some may know. Some of the columnists may know.

Miss THOMPSON. Mr. Carter always stimulates me. I am not nearly so interested in this war as I am interested in finding some way to get world peace. I don't believe we or anybody else can go on living indefinitely as we have lived for 20 years in a world which is given over to war, revolution, and anarchy.

Mr. CARTER. Dorothy, we have done that for 2,000 years.

Miss THOMPSON. No, we haven't done it for 2,000 years. We didn't do it from the year 1812 to the year 1914.

Mr. CARTER. Oh, may I differ!

Miss THOMPSON. There hasn't been for 20 years a single stable money in the world, there hasn't been a single bit of freedom of movement for anybody in this world, and this war is a result of our failure in 1918 to make a peace. Now, I am going to rise up and say a very unpopular thing, and that is, when people say, once in this generation, as you said, Mr. Lindley, we intervened and it cost us a lot, and now look at the result, that makes me sick. That is self-righteousness. We intervened and then got out. We had a responsibility for sticking through and seeing that something decent came out of that sacrifice of life, and instead we rushed home and got behind our borders and said, "We are isolated and it is none of our business and we will have nothing to do with those dreadful Europeans."

Mr. CARTER. With that I totally agree.

Miss THOMPSON. All right, here we are 21 years later with another war. I hate to think what kind of a world we will have to live in if that continues. I don't believe we can have little scraps of democracy and little scraps of civil liberties and little scraps of countries. I agree with the Pope who made a very, very great speech, a very great encyclical, when he said there has got to be a limitation to national sovereignty; nations have not got the right to commit crimes just because they are sovereign nations.

It is my answer to Mr. Lindley. Can we live in the same world with nazi-ism? My answer is if there is enough of it, we can't. We can live with a little.

Mr. CARTER. Dorothy, you are going on at a great rate. Let us get a word in. May I ask this question: Do you think the British Empire was established by the aid of love and kisses?

Miss THOMPSON. I certainly don't. But look here, Mr. Hitler said when he was defending himself, "When the British Empire was young it was cruel and avaricious, now it is old and virtuous." The answer is, I prefer the old and virtuous to the young and avaricious, and I think the world ought to learn something from imperialism. After all, we ought to be able to learn something.

Mr. CARTER. Then I agree with you a hundred percent on this ground. You at least, may I say, are one of the few people who write who are consistent, because you are consistent in that you do not agree with Mr. Roosevelt's principle of redistribution of wealth within the United States. Neither do you agree with it outside the United States.

Miss THOMPSON. No; that is not true. Yes; it is true. Wait a minute. I don't believe what you think I believe. I do not believe you can redistribute the wealth of the world, and I think that is the issue in this war. The Germans say you can. I do believe that you can organize the wealth of this world so that everybody can use it, and if we don't do that we are going to have war indefinitely.

Mr. CARTER. Therefore, "I have the whole swag. I am going to keep it."

Miss THOMPSON. I don't think that is true. I don't think that is the dominant British opinion.

Mr. CARTER. Dorothy, you weren't a Britisher. I was.

Miss THOMPSON. I read the British newspapers.

Congressman SMITH. Mr. Franklin, I think you had better bring us back to fundamentals.

Mr. CARTER. I need some help.

Mr. FRANKLIN. At this point it might be interesting to turn the direction of the debate slightly into what is going to happen about the neutrality bill, which, after all, is not yet passed. You are a Congressman. How about the official moderator stepping down and saying what he thinks is going to happen to this neutrality measure, highly imperfect as it seems to be, in the House of Representatives?

Congressman SMITH. Rather than make prediction, I think when in the presence of columnar omniscience we ought to avail ourselves of the full time there. What do you think we could do in the House to improve the bill? Let's put a remedial question here.

Mr. FRANKLIN. The single greatest improvement would be to repeal the whole measure in toto.

Miss THOMPSON. Hurray!

Congressman SMITH. And go back to what, international law?

Mr. FRANKLIN. Go back to the essence of international law and get away from the idea that you can pass a law about a world crisis or that you can swallow a little legislative pill which will work while the public goes to sleep.

Congressman SMITH. Mr. Lindley, what do you advise us to do about it in the House?

Mr. LINDLEY. I think the neutrality bill ought to be strengthened in several respects. The present bill seems to me to serve, as well probably as any piece of legislation can, one of the purposes of the whole series of neutrality acts that we have had in recent years: To avoid the incidents which led to, or at least were the occasion for, our entry into the World War in 1917, the incidents arising from interference with our maritime commerce with Europe and with the travel of American citizens to Europe, on belligerent ships, and secondarily on our own ships.

Another purpose of the Neutrality Act as originally conceived seems to me to have been lost sight of, and that is to avoid the growth of an economic stake in this war, and also to prevent our economy from being thoroughly distorted by this war. Whether the arms embargo is retained or not does not seem to me to be so important as whether we limit our exports to Europe. Whether the arms embargo is repealed or retained, we will continue to be a source of supplies for this war, at least for the British and French. To avoid building up a temporary war boom which might eventually have to be kept going with credits, if the war should develop into a full-fledged war and should be kept going over a long period, and a boom which would give us a headache when the war ends; I think we should limit by quotas our exports to belligerents to the normal peacetime amounts, at least in the major categories of our exports.

Congressman SMITH. That is not for the sake of keeping us out of danger abroad but keeping us out of danger at home.

Mr. LINDLEY. Yes.

Miss THOMPSON. I agree with Mr. Lindley, for once, that we ought to be careful about overexpansion in this war, but one of the things which we learned in the last war is very present in the minds of most businessmen, and that is, nobody ain't going to have no economic stake in this war. Nobody believes today, certainly not Great Britain or France, that this war is going to help the capitalistic system. They firmly believe it is going to be the beginning of socialism all over Europe in one form or another, so there is not going to be nearly the impulse on the part of businessmen to get an economic stake in this war because I think they are going to be very skeptical as to just how sound that economic investment will be. I think they are going to be much more skeptical than they were in the last war.

Congressman SMITH. Mr. Carter, do you want to add your word of comment to Congress itself on the bill in the House?

Mr. CARTER. I think Mr. Lindley has covered it very well. I would like you good gentlemen to try and see if you can do something toward plugging this continuous voyage and ultimate destination that has not been touched in the Senate yet. So far, shippers can go ahead and ship various kinds of products to a nation and transship them and there has been no question or discussion so far as that is concerned in the Senate, as far as I can see, and there has been little safeguard as far as I can see, again, toward the prevention of private trade with belligerent nations.

Congressman SMITH. You know, don't you, why it has not been plugged? Nobody knows how to do it. It is out of our province.

Mr. CARTER. There are all sorts of various ideas, Congressman, but I don't know that it has been discussed to a great extent in the Senate.

Congressman SMITH. Now, if this is our joint wisdom for the House, would you think it worth while commenting for a moment on advice to the American people to whom we are speaking tonight? Miss Thompson, what is the greatest illusion we as a people are subject to that you think we might correct?

Miss THOMPSON. I think the greatest illusion we are subject to is the illusion that we don't quite live on this planet. You know, it

is a round world. For instance, I think it is an illusion that we are awfully near South America. That seems to be a general illusion. Nobody seems to realize Rio is farther from New York than Marseille is from New York, and I think it is an illusion that we can live off South American trade without very radically changing our economic order. After all, something like 50 percent of our total trade is with Great Britain and her dominions and France—nearly 50 percent of our total trade.

As for the restrictions on shipping, it is all very well now; I think the bill is all right as it stands, but suppose the war spreads—maybe it is going to contract, but suppose it spreads to the whole seven seas—are we going to take our merchant marine off the seas? Who is going to bring us rubber from the Dutch East Indies if the war spreads that far?

Congressman SMITH. Miss Thompson, do you think the agreement with Panama might help us to convert our traditional isolationism which you think is our great illusion, and the oscillation which is the result of it, into insulation through new-found cooperation here in the Western Hemisphere?

Miss THOMPSON. No; I don't.

Congress SMITH. You don't?

Miss THOMPSON. No; I am sorry, I don't. I am very enthusiastic about the Panama agreement because I think it is a very good example to the rest of the world; but, after all, there are in the whole of North and South America, the whole of them together, less than half of the people that there are in western Europe. We are not going to be able to preempt South America and 90,000,000 in an enormous continent, and the problem of the world is an economic problem, it is a problem of colonization, it is a problem of new markets, and they aren't going to let us have it in the long run.

Mr. CARTER. Why are they not going to let us have it?

Miss THOMPSON. Because they need it and we don't know what to do with it.

Mr. CARTER. The British know what to do with it.

Miss THOMPSON. Of course.

Mr. CARTER. Why can't we learn the same lesson?

Miss THOMPSON. Because we have a very different situation from Europe as far as South America is concerned. South America produces the things we do, with certain notable exceptions. What are we going to do with a lot of cotton from South America? What are we going to do with a lot of meat from South America?

Mr. CARTER. Well, we can ask the meat lobby from Texas.

Miss THOMPSON. We don't know what to do with cotton of our own. And the 90,000,000 people in South America—not the majority of them, quite—with a very low standard of living, are not going to buy our automobiles.

Congressman SMITH. Mr. Lindley, do you think it worth while to comment on this further?

Mr. LINDLEY. Miss Thompson starts, it seems to me, with the assumption that our welfare is necessarily bound up with the situation in Europe.

Miss THOMPSON. With the world.

Mr. LINDLEY. We all know we live on the world and we are part of the world, but it may be impracticable or impossible at the present time, as it has been in the past, to organize the whole world. We seceded from the British Empire and the European system some time back, and it has probably been the most consistent policy of this country from the days of the founders up until the turn of the century to make this side of the ocean our citadel. I resent the notion that we are so weak or that we are merely something on the fringe of civilization. I think we are the center of it, or can become the center of it.

Miss THOMPSON. Then we have to be willing to use our power if we are going to be the center of it.

Mr. LINDLEY. I want to use our power in the way that will be the most effective.

Congressman SMITH. Mr. Franklin, you ought to have a half minute here.

Mr. FRANKLIN. We are fundamentally a peace-loving people, and I think Senator NORRIS brought out very aptly that we have never gone to war yet unless the people of the country were enthusiastically in favor of it.

Congressman SMITH. If we can correct this folklore of fatalism that we have to get into it against our will, I should say we have done something tonight in the way of agreement—and strengthening of American morale.

Chairman GRANIK. Thank you. You have been listening to the American Forum of the Air presenting a discussion on America's Neutrality Policy.

Our speakers were Miss Dorothy Thompson, Ernest K. Lindley, Jay Franklin, and Boake Carter.

Our guest chairman for the panel discussion was Congressman T. V. Smith, of Illinois.

And now for a final word from Mr. McCormick.

Announcer MCCORMICK. So we have concluded the fifth broadcast in this season's series of the American Forum of the Air programs, emanating from the broadcasting studios of the new Department of the Interior Building in Washington, D. C. The facilities of these radio studios have been extended by the Secretary of the Interior, Harold L. Ickes, in the interest of free speech on assurance these educational broadcasts will present all sides of a national problem, temperately discussed by representatives of opposing schools of thought and conducted by nonpartisan, nonpolitical organizations.

The Mutual network will bring you this forum broadcast every Sunday evening from 8 to 9 p. m., E. S. T., throughout the session of Congress. Tickets to this broadcast may be had by sending your request to station WOR, New York, or WOL, Washington.

In the interest of education there are printed, free of charge, a limited number of copies of the entire proceedings of these broadcasts. Address your requests and comments to WOL. The American Forum of the Air is directed by Theodore Granik, who presided as chairman tonight, and comes to you as a presentation of WOR in cooperation with WOL.

This is Stephen McCormick speaking. This is the coast-to-coast network of the Mutual Broadcasting System.

Congress Should Stay in Session

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEWIS D. THILL
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, November 3, 1939

Mr. THILL. Mr. Speaker, now that the arms embargo has been lifted, we must make doubly certain that America will remain at peace. Congress should stay in session as long as the crisis in Europe and a war emergency exists, with one purpose in mind—to keep America out of war. This will not cost the taxpayers one additional cent for salaries of Members of Congress, because the Representatives and Senators are paid a yearly salary on a monthly basis whether Congress is in session or not. The mileage fee given to Members of Congress is paid only once during a session for their trip to Washington and return. If Congress remains in session, it will eliminate certain reasons advanced for giving the President more power. It will be a comfort to those Americans who have lost faith in our President and those who feel that the President's international-minded spirit might get us into war. It will give Congress an opportunity to take up many matters, including agriculture and unemployment, which must be solved before we can have national prosperity.

Keeping Youth in Trim

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, November 3, 1939

EDITORIAL FROM THE BOSTON HERALD OF OCTOBER 8, 1939

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Boston Herald on Sunday, October 8:

[From the Boston Herald of October 8, 1939]

KEEPING YOUTH IN TRIM

Congress at its last session was unexpectedly generous with the N. Y. A., or National Youth Administration, enlarging the appropriation from $77,000,000 to $100,000,000. This has made possible the extension of the N. Y. A.'s work in Massachusetts, which John L. Donovan, the new State administrator, announced a few days ago. Heretofore the N. Y. A.'s work or apprentice-training program has been limited to young members of families supported by welfare or the W. P. A. Now young folks of any family in need will be eligible for help.

The N. Y. A.'s work is not generally well understood by the people. It is divided into two major programs—student aid and work training. Under the first, about 12,000 Massachusetts boys and girls are enabled to continue their education in high school or college. These are selected or certified by the school or college authorities, not the N. Y. A. High-school students so aided get about $5 a month—usually about enough to pay their carfares—and college students $19. All of them are required to do a certain number of hours of work, in addition to their usual school work, in return for their Government allowances.

The work program is open to unemployed young men and women between 18 and 24. It consists, in the main, of vocational training, with classes in carpentry, machine-shop work,

automotive repair, plumbing, welding, etc., for boys, and classes in sewing, laundering, domestic service, etc., for girls. The pay is about $20 a month. Emphasis is laid not so much on the work accomplished as on encouraging the boy or girl to discover some trade which he or she has a knack for and can probably become proficient in.

Any inclination to make a career of N. Y. A. work is discouraged. Indeed, the higher the rate of turn-over of its workers, the happier the N. Y. A. is, for that means many of their young men and women are going into private employ. In September 14 percent of their 5,000 workers in Massachusetts obtained jobs.

The Government's paying boys and girls to go to school or to learn a trade seems ridiculous to many people. But the alternative to the practice, in most cases, is allowing them to remain completely idle, with consequent rusting of what vocational qualifications they possess and with great danger to their morale.

Unemployment among old people is often pitiful. Among young people it is perilous. The N. Y. A. seems to be performing a necessary work. Mr. Donovan and his associates do it intelligently and constructively.

The Motion-Picture Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYLE H. BOREN
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, November 3, 1939

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, I urge the American people and our democratic Government in all its branches to focus its attention on the motion-picture industry, analyze its influence, examine its methods and tactics, and become acquainted with the full import of the growth and perpetuation of its un-American monopoly.

On several occasions I pointed out reasons why the Congress should give particular attention to pending legislation affecting the motion-picture industry. I might add that my colleagues would find it interesting to examine the record of the trial of Judge Manton. It struck me as particularly peculiar that while the borrowing of Judge Manton was given considerable publicity, the fact that Judge Manton borrowed from Harry Warner when Warner was in difficulty before this court was not publicized, though it is a matter of record.

Joe Schenck, Zanuck, Goetz, and other moguls of the motion-picture industry are now before the Federal grand jury.

Let me urge each of you to some investigation of the situation existing in the motion-picture field. America had its Teapot Dome scandal, but it was small compared to the story behind motion pictures.

Mr. Speaker, our attention should be directed to the utter failure of the motion-picture industry to live up to the production code of ethics, which was drawn up in 1934 to satisfy the justly aroused public opinion against the evils of motion-picture influences of that day. That code of ethics requires that the history, institutions, and citizenry of nations shall be represented fairly.

Where was Will Hayes when they produced Mr. Smith Goes to Washington? Where was Joseph J. Breen when they produced Honeymoon in Bali? Will Hayes, Pettyjohn, and Joe Breen are supposed to hold in the motion-picture industry the responsibility of carrying out the 1934 code of ethics. Religious leaders, P. T. A. leaders, and so forth, at one time banded together in a Legion of Decency, and it is undoubtedly time for the American people to join hands again to meet the responsibility which these administrators of the production code of ethics have failed to meet.

Mr. Speaker, I have pointed out here some of the things that are taking place in the movie industry in violation of law and ethics, and I would like to emphasize that these things are taking place at the same time these same people participate in a combine to force the raising of admission prices from 10 to 25 cents and more in the small theaters in the villages in your districts.

T. V. A. Agricultural Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, November 3, 1939

LETTER FROM EDWARD A. O'NEAL AND RADIO INTERVIEW WITH DR. HARCOURT A. MORGAN

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest and most beneficial phases of the T. V. A. program is that relating to agriculture. The T. V. A. has done a great job in the promotion of an agricultural program. This was recently called to the attention of the members of the American Farm Bureau Federation by a letter from the president of that organization, Mr. Edward A. O'Neal, transmitting a copy of a radio interview of Dr. Harcourt A. Morgan, Chairman of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Mr. O'Neal's letter and Dr. Morgan's interview are set forth as follows:

AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,
Chicago, Ill., October 17, 1939.

To State Farm Bureau Presidents and Secretaries:

I am enclosing herewith a copy of a radio program in which Dr. H. A. Morgan, Chairman of the Tennessee Valley Authority, explains something about the program that the T. V. A. is pushing.

The work of the T. V. A. is of vital interest to agriculture because of its fertilizer experiments, its practical power development, its work in controlling erosion, and in determining proper land use. I thought you might like to read the transcript of this short radio program so as to refresh your mind on what is being done there.

The report of Dr. Morgan indicates the continuing success of the project, and it promises much for the future of agriculture in the entire Nation. The fertilizer work that is being done is of great consequence to agriculture everywhere.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

EDW. A. O'NEAL, *President.*

DR. HARCOURT A. MORGAN, CHAIRMAN, TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

INTERVIEWER. Dr. Morgan, in reading the act of Congress which created the Tennessee Valley Authority, I was greatly impressed with the broad scope of activities delegated to your Board, such as national defense, the development of navigation channels, the control of floods, the generation and sale of electric power, the production of new and better fertilizers, and a readjusted agriculture for water control. Isn't that a rather large order?

Dr. MORGAN. So itemized, it seems that way, but the physical effort—the building of dams, for instance—is work that can be done in an orderly manner by the engineers and other technicians. That is really the easiest part of the work—the big job comes in adding up all this so as to produce the greatest results in human betterment.

INTERVIEWER. It had not occurred to me to look at your work in just that light. I guess I had paid too much attention to your engineering works and not enough to human values. Of course, results in human betterment do count most.

Dr. MORGAN. Yes—that is what the President meant when, in asking Congress to set up the Tennessee Valley Authority, he spoke of its program as one which "touches and gives life to all forms of human concerns."

INTERVIEWER. Dr. Morgan, where do you start in tackling such a vast problem?

Dr. MORGAN. The start was made by the President and the Congress which set up the Tennessee Valley Authority in a bold effort to give greater flexibility to government. When Congress adopted the President's suggestion that the Authority be established in corporate form "clothed with the power of government, but possessed of the flexibility of a private enterprise," it sent into the field an agency whose job it was to face and coordinate all the problems of a region and to present an integrated program for their solution. In that lies our strength to translate physical works in terms of human betterment.

INTERVIEWER. Dr. Morgan, you just used the expression that Congress had sent the Tennessee Valley Authority "into the field." Do you mean by that a decentralization of Federal efforts?

Dr. MORGAN. Exactly. It has permitted us literally to go down to the crossroads in the area to discuss the people's problems with the people at their own firesides. Out of such conferences precise formulas adapting the Federal program to meet varying local situations can be discovered. The people are eager and willing to help themselves. They only need a little help here and there by the Federal Government to make real their program.

INTERVIEWER. Their program? Do you mean that the Authority's program is the people's program and that it is largely through their efforts that its benefits are being achieved?

Dr. MORGAN. Exactly.

INTERVIEWER. That sounds to me like democracy really in action.

Dr. MORGAN. You are correct. And that is why the help which Congress and the President set up for the Valley region in the T. V. A. Act has become a cooperative undertaking. It is a program that has won the confidence of citizens in the area, a confidence essential to success and which is now reflected in formal or informal cooperative agreements between the Tennessee Valley Authority and a host of local, State, and regional agencies, with colleges, farmers' associations, city councils, boards of health, and even sportsmen's clubs participating.

INTERVIEWER. It certainly means getting down to the grass roots. It suggests to me that perhaps you are developing a new frontier of public administration.

Dr. MORGAN. From the beginning we have shared our responsibilities with other agencies of the Federal Government whenever common interests were involved. There has been no jealous hoarding of authority. Today we have informal relationships with almost every governmental department in Washington and in approximately 100 cases those relationships are set down in written agreements or formal contracts. To many of the Government agencies our Board has formally delegated jurisdiction over projects particularly suited for their supervision.

INTERVIEWER. In other words, Dr. Morgan, you have helped to mobilize the technical experience of our Federal departments and to harmonize their varied activities toward a common objective?

Dr. MORGAN. Yes; a common objective—human betterment.

INTERVIEWER. And such an objective, Dr. Morgan, requires vast physical effort. Will you describe some of these activities and fit them into their proper place in your integrated program?

Dr. MORGAN. That is not difficult if we keep in mind that, basically, the program or the Tennessee Valley Authority is concerned with the control of water, and control of water in a humid region like the Tennessee Valley, with its average annual rainfall of 52 inches, may be subdivided into two major problems—the control of water in the publicly controlled river-channels and control of water on the privately owned land. The solution of those two problems brings in its wake a third, the proper utilization, in the public interest, of the vast amount of water power created thereby.

INTERVIEWER. Dr. Morgan, I think it would be helpful if you would first describe your plan to control the water in the river channels.

Dr. MORGAN. Certainly. Let us take water control in the rivers first. The property losses alone from uncontrolled water in the river channels amount to untold millions of dollars.

INTERVIEWER. Yes; I realize that. The great floods of recent years, with their tremendous destruction of human life and property, have brought the importance of river control home to many who never thought of it before. What is the Authority's plan for coping with the rivers, Dr. Morgan?

Dr. MORGAN. By high dams. Multipurpose dams high enough and so strategically placed that they can serve three purposes—navigation, flood control, and power. The plan for development of the Tennessee River from Paducah, Ky., to Knoxville, Tenn., proposes nine high dams. And to control the flow into the Tennessee we propose high storage dams across several of the principal tributaries. And this is very important because the slope at the eastern end of the valley is very steep. The operations of all these will be integrated to produce the greatest total public service.

INTERVIEWER. That sound like really putting a river to work.

Dr. MORGAN. It is exactly that. When completed this system of dams will transform the Tennessee River into a navigable waterway 650 miles long; it will reduce floods on the lower Mississippi River by 2½ to 3 feet; it has already reduced flood heights by as much as 5 feet on the Tennessee, and it will creat a large block of electric energy useful to the people of the region and to the Nation.

INTERVIEWER. But, Dr. Morgan, I am also curious about control of water on the land.

Dr. MORGAN. We call it controlling "the floods you do not see." In the past we have always thought of a flood as being a dangerously large volume of water out of control and trying to force its way down a narrow river channel. We never thought of the damage that water did before it collected in the river channel. Given the slope and other conditions, the damage can be appalling. Our 52 inches of rainfall annually, on just 1 acre of land, weigh about 6,000 tons. That is a lot of water. It falls on land that seldom freezes. It falls on land that invariably slopes. And as it falls it cuts deeply into the soil, the farmer's only capital. Erosion—the result of the floods you do not see—clogs the rivers and reservoirs with silt, strips the unprotected land of its fertile topsoil, turns the uplands into arid gullies. In the Tennessee Valley, this destructive process has seriously affected 10,000,000 acres, more than a third of the region.

INTERVIEWER. How does the Tennessee Valley program deal with this problem, Dr. Morgan?

Dr. MORGAN. The first step in any plan to control water on the land must be the restoration of the soil's fertility. Plant foods that have been taken from the soil by overcropping and erosion must be restored. It is here that our program combines the use of the wartime munitions plant at Muscle Shoals and the power from the high dams in the river channel to furnish plant foods in peacetime for soil-protecting cover crops.

INTERVIEWER. What kind of plant foods have you experimented with?

Dr. MORGAN. We have adapted a portion of the munitions plant at Muscle Shoals to the production of phosphatic plant foods. Our first product was a triple superphosphate containing about three times the amount of plant food carried by the phosphate fertilizer now in common use. This triple superphosphate, produced by electric furnaces, is being tested by agricultural agencies in more than 42 States of the Union. It is also being given practical tests on more than 25,000 farms, the farmers receiving the fertilizer through the various State agricultural extension services. With this work well under way, we then sought an even higher concentration, and succeeded in developing an entirely new form of fertilizer known as calcium metaphosphate. This contains approximately 65 to 70 percent plant food.

INTEVIEWER. Just how do such high concentrations aid the farmer, Dr. Morgan?

Dr. MORGAN. They make possible large savings in such costs as bagging, handling, and transportation. The processes we have developed are of national significance, for they can be applied to the vast phosphate deposits out in Idaho, Montana, Utah, and Wyoming and these resources made available to farmers all over the Nation at reasonable cost.

INTERVIEWER. I can see how such research can help the farmers to establish better land-management practices on a truly widespread scale. I am sure that this gives rise to many related activities. Will you tell us, briefly, something about them?

Dr. MORGAN. There are many others. The factors controlling the economy of any region are so interrelated that the development of one resource more or less affects all the others. Adjustments with the existing economic situation are necessary. For example, the Authority is actively engaged in malaria control along these new reservoir shore lines, it is concerned with reforestation and with the aquatic life in its reservoirs from the standpoint of inland fisheries resources. It is concerned with the coordinating of the Tennessee waterway with other forms of transportation so that the region may have an integrated transportation system. It is interested in maintaining a merit system of employment and good labor relations. Consequently the Tennessee Valley Authority conducts considerable research, frequently at the suggestion of local groups or agencies, on such subjects as highway planning, scenic resources, and recreation possibilities, industrial development of mineral resources, population studies, and many others.

INTERVIEWER. Dr. Morgan, I have been greatly impressed by the manner in which you are tackling the problems of an entire region in the interests of, as you have said, human betterment.

Dr. MORGAN. Yes. If we can assist this great area to achieve a better living and a more nearly balanced economy, not only the Tennessee Valley region, but the Nation, as well, will be benefited.

Resolution of Convention of United Rubber Workers of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 3, 1939

RESOLUTION BY THE UNITED RUBBER WORKERS OF AMERICA

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, seldom have I read a more forceful and effective statement of fundamental principles of American government and life than is contained in the following resolution passed by the United Rubber Workers of America at their convention in La Crosse, Wis., in September of this year.

I appreciate very deeply the fact that this resolution was sent me by Mr. Baque, the secretary of local No. 117 of the United Rubber Workers, which local is situated in my own district.

Whereas we fully recognize and defend the inalienable rights of the people, as set forth and guaranteed in the Bill of Rights, an integral part of the Constitution of the United States—the right of assembly—the right of religious freedom—the right of free speech—the right of freedom of press: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, the delegates of the United Rubber Workers of America, in convention assembled, do strenuously object to and condemn all those who live in this country and who enjoy the benefits as hereinbefore stated and, particularly, those who hold public office and obtain their compensation from public funds paid to them for services rendered through the established units of our Government who, in their thought, in their words, and by their acts as citizens, guests, or public servants, betray their trusts to the people whose confidence they enjoy, by practicing or teaching, or publicly encouraging any system or form of government—Federal, State, or local—that, in any way would weaken or abridge the foundation principles of this Government, of and by and for the people—as guaranteed in the Bill of Rights and the fourteenth amendment of the Constitution of the United States; be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be spread upon the minutes of this convention and that copies of same be sent to the Honorable Franklin D. Roosevelt, President of the United States; John L. Lewis, president of the Congress of Industrial Organizations; Senator ROBERT LA FOLLETTE, Committee on Civil Liberties, and through the locals, to their own representatives in Congress and the Senate, and also to the press.

Centennial Anniversary of the Birth of Frances E. Willard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE H. SMITH
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, November 3, 1939

LETTERS AND STATEMENT

Mr. SMITH of Maine. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter received from Arthur C. Jackson, of Maine, together with his statement and letters from chief executives of 22 States, all in recognition of the centennial anniversary of the birth of Frances E. Willard.

The matters referred to are as follows:

WASHINGTON, *October 23, 1939.*

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN SMITH: World safety is now, or should be, the prayer of every rational human being. Day by day we are appalled by the increasing number of fatalities on our public highways, a startling proportion of which are directly attributable to the liquor traffic. Our State of Maine should lead the way to total abstinence from all intoxicating beverages. The recent celebration of the centennial of St. Frances of Evanston, suggests the inclusion of the enclosed matter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a practical contribution to world safety.

Sincerely yours,

ARTHUR CHARLES JACKSON,
President, World Safety Council.

[The Frances Willard Centennial Total Abstinence Society, Arthur Charles Jackson, president, Portland, Maine, United States of America]

September 28, 1939, is the centennial anniversary of the birth of Frances E. Willard, one of the noblest women of all time, as well as one of the greatest of any age or nation.

The story of her faith in the conquest of evil by good should be a mighty inspiration alike to old and young, of this and succeeding generations.

The Master's message was at once her guaranty and her command. The Bible was to her, in very truth, divine.

What immeasurable and increasing influence that book has wielded over the minds of men and women and the destiny of the world!

If it be the word of God, as we profoundly believe, surely it comes to human ears and understanding with all the dignity and peace and power that His word should command. If it be the work of man, then even the doubter must admit that the ancient Hebrews had miraculous skill to cast a spell across millenniums which, strengthening with the years, spreads wider today than ever and embraces the future as far as even the eye of imagination can behold. Not all invention, or all statesmanship, or all of literature, have so touched and bettered human life as this one book. And it was the Bible that gave Frances Willard her mission, her strength, her hope, her argument, and her inspiration.

Thus prepared and thus equipped she went out into the world and to her work. No method can measure what she did. The half million of women whom she brought into organized cooperation in the Woman's Christian Temperance Union is but a suggestion of the real results of her activities. Indeed, the highest benefits her life bestowed were as intangible as air and as full of life. She made purer the moral atmosphere of a continent—almost of a world. She rendered the life of a nation cleaner, the mind of a people saner. Millions of homes today are happier for her; millions of wives and mothers bless her; and countless children have grown into strong, upright, and beautiful maturity who, but for the work of Frances Willard might have been forever soiled and weakened.

To aid in appropriate, timely, world-wide enduring commemoration as well as perpetuation of this noble life and work, the Frances Willard Centennial Total Abstinence Society seeks your cooperation and membership as well as that of all men, women, and children who believe in God, sobriety, nobility of character, the beauty and sanctity of home, the true grandeur of nations, peace on earth and good will.

The presidents of all women's organizations, all clergymen, and all teachers, who will abstain from the use of intoxicating beverages, are hereby appointed vice presidents of the Frances Willard Centennial Total Abstinence Society, and each is urged to contribute for the world-wide work of the society a nominal annual membership fee of 10 cents, and to secure 10 or more others, men, women, or children, who will endeavor to promote the aims and purposes of the society and contribute the same small membership fee. Each group of 10 or more may and is urged to organize as a branch of the parent organization and report as regularly as convenient to the Frances Willard Centennial Total Abstinence Society, Portland, Maine.

Let us cherish the memory, the sweetness, and light of Frances Willard—St. Frances of Evanston—by imitating, insofar as we are able, her beautiful life and service.

We believe that every child of God of whatever age, race, or religion should have a right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, unmenaced and unpolluted by the frightful evils of the liquor traffic, a traffic regarded by millions of Christian men and women all 'round the world as one of, if not the deadliest, enemy of the human race.

STATE OF WYOMING,
August 30, 1939.

DEAR MR. JACKSON: I accept with pleasure honorary membership in the World Safety Council, in accordance with your letter of August 23.

Yours truly,

NELS H. SMITH, *Governor.*

STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA,
August 28, 1939.

DEAR MR. JACKSON: I accept with pleasure your invitation to become a member of the World Safety Council.

In these days of world unrest, it is indeed, reassuring to know that our leaders of thought in all parts of the world are devoting their time and talents in the interest of peace.

Cordially yours,

JOHN MOSES, *Governor.*

STATE OF NEVADA.

GENTLEMEN: Relative to your letter of August 22, I am pleased to accept honorary membership in the World Safety Council. Due to the heavy responsibility in my office, I am unable to take an active part in any organization, and I understand from your letter that this would not be required.

With kind regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

E. P. CARVILLE, *Governor.*

STATE OF TENNESSEE,
October 5, 1939.

MY DEAR DR. JACKSON: I am highly honored to accept an honorary membership in the World Safety Council, and will be very happy to cooperate in any way I can in the furtherance of the aims of the council.

With many good wishes, I am,

Very sincerely yours,

PRENTICE COOPER, *Governor.*

COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS,
August 23, 1939.

DEAR MR. JACKSON: Governor Saltenstall expresses his thanks to you for receiving him into honorary membership in the World Safety Council. He is glad to accept and heartily supports every effort to promote world safety, peace, and good will.

Sincerely yours,

RUSSELL GAROULD,
Assistant Secretary to the Governor.

STATE OF MARYLAND,
August 24, 1939.

DEAR MR. JACKSON: This will acknowledge receipt of your letter of August 22, addressed to Governor O'Conor.

The Governor has requested me to express his appreciation of your kindness in making him honorary member of the World Safety Council, which he accepts with pleasure.

It might be interesting to you to know that at the present time Governor O'Conor is instituting a safety movement here in Maryland. Again thanking you, and with kindest personal regards, I am,

A. J. BOURBON,
Acting Executive Secretary.

STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA,
August 31, 1939.

GENTLEMEN: Thank you for your recent letter extending to me an honorary membership in the World Safety Council.

I have just recently appointed a South Dakota Safety Council and we are doing everything we can to promote safety upon the highways of this State.

Sincerely yours,

HARLAN J. BUSHFIELD, *Governor.*

STATE OF MAINE,
AUGUSTA, *February 8, 1939.*

DEAR MR. JACKSON: Let me assure you, I very much appreciate the designation as one of the honorary officials of the International Longfellow Society. Thank you.

Very truly yours,

LEWIS O. BARROWS, *Governor.*

STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE,
CONCORD, *March 7, 1939.*

DEAR MR. JACKSON: It is with pleasure that I received your notification of my election as an honorary president of your society. I am in complete accord with the society's wishes to secure the birthplace of our poet Longfellow and to preserve it as a memorial to him.

Yours sincerely,

FRANCIS P. MURPHY, *Governor.*

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA,
Raleigh, February 9, 1939.

MY DEAR MR. JACKSON: I have your letter advising me that I have been elected honorary president of the International Longfellow Society, which honor I am pleased to accept. With best wishes, I am,

Yours very truly,

CLYDE R. HOEY, *Governor.*

STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA,
Bismarck, February 10, 1939.

DEAR MR. JACKSON: I thank you most sincerely for the honor you have conferred upon me by electing me an honorary president of the International Longfellow Society. I accept with pleasure.

Respectfully yours,

JOHN MOSES, *Governor.*

STATE OF OHIO,
Columbus, February 16, 1939.

MY DEAR PRESIDENT JACKSON: I appreciate the opportunity to give recognition to the beneficent activities of the International Longfellow Society. Any boy who read McGuffey's Readers in country school knows he is better for his knowing the work of your beloved poet Longfellow.

Cordially yours,

JOHN W. BRICKER, *Governor.*

STATE OF OKLAHOMA,
Oklahoma City, February 17, 1939.

DEAR MR. JACKSON: I wish to thank your society for the honor bestowed upon me by electing me honorary president.

With kindest wishes, I beg to remain,

Yours very truly,

LEON C. PHILLIPS, *Governor.*

STATE OF OREGON,
Salem, February 11, 1939.

MY DEAR MR. JACKSON: This will acknowledge your letter of February 6, in which you advise I have been elected an honorary president of the International Longfellow Society. I thank you very much for this honor.

I have long been an admirer of Longfellow and like to take down the volume of his poems which I inherited from my father's library and read from it.

Yours sincerely,

CHARLES A. SPRAGUE, *Governor.*

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA,
Harrisburg, February 13, 1939.

DEAR DR. JACKSON: I am happy to accept the honor of being an honorary president of your society. All the days of my life the poetry of Henry Wadsworth Longfellow has been an inspiration and a blessing to me.

Sincerely yours,

ARTHUR H. JAMES, *Governor.*

STATE OF RHODE ISLAND,
Providence, February 9, 1939.

DEAR MR. JACKSON: Thank you very much for yours of the 6th, in which you advise me that the International Longfellow Society has elected me one of its honorary presidents.

I deeply appreciate this honor and want to thank you and the other members most sincerely.

With best wishes and again many thanks for your letter, I am

Very sincerely,

WILLIAM H. VANDERBILT,
Governor.

STATE OF ARIZONA,
Phoenix, February 11, 1939.

DEAR MR. JACKSON: This letter will serve to express my very deep apreciation upon my election as an honorary president of the International Longfellow Society.

With kindest personal regards and best wishes for the continued success of this worthy association designed to perpetuate the memory of a great American poet, believe me,

Very sincerely and cordially yours,

R. T. JONES, *Governor.*

STATE OF CALIFORNIA,
Sacramento, February 14, 1939.

DEAR MR. JACKSON: It is a real pleasure to me to accept the honor conferred by the International Longfellow Society, of which your letter of February 6 advises me.

It is gratifying to note that through your society the anniversary of the birth of Henry Wadsworth Longfellow will be celebrated so widely throughout our country, whose homes and whose literature have been enriched by the interpretations of this poet.

Gratefully yours,

CULBERT L. OLSON, *Governor.*

STATE OF DELAWARE,
Dover, February 8, 1939.

DEAR MR. JACKSON: I appreciate your letter notifying me of my appointment as honorary president of your society.

Since you are doing a very worth-while work in commemoration of this great American poet, I am pleased, indeed, to accept the honor you have accorded me.

Yours very truly,

RICHARD C. MCMULLEN, *Governor.*

TERRITORY OF HAWAII,
Honolulu, February 17, 1939.

DEAR MR. JACKSON: I have your favor in which you advise that I have been elected an honorary president of the International Longfellow Society.

Will you kindly convey to the society my appreciation of the honor thus conferred upon me.

Very truly yours,

J. B. POINDEXTER, *Governor.*

STATE OF INDIANA,
Indianapolis, February 8, 1939.

DEAR MR. JACKSON: This will acknowledge receipt of your recent letter stating that I have been elected an honorary president of the International Longfellow Society. I consider this an honor, indeed, and am glad to accept.

Very truly yours,

M. CLIFFORD TOWNSEND, *Governor.*

COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY,
Frankfort, February 8, 1939.

MY DEAR MR. JACKSON: My election as an honorary president of the International Longfellow Society is much appreciated.

I want to extend my warm good wishes to you and to all of those who are interested in perpetuating the name of the beloved Henry Wadsworth Longfellow.

Faithfully yours,

ALBERT B. CHANDLER, *Governor.*

STATE OF LOUISIANA,
Baton Rouge, February 25, 1939.

DEAR MR. JACKSON: Many thanks for your letter notifying me of my election as an honorary president of the International Longfellow Society. I am pleased to join this movement to honor this great American and poet.

With kindest personal regards, I am,

Yours very truly,

R. W. LECHE, *Governor.*

Agricultural Exports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEPHEN BOLLES
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, November 2, 1939

LETTER FROM EDWARD E. KENNEDY

Mr. BOLLES. Mr. Speaker, I desire unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter from Edward E. Kennedy, of the Farmers' Washington Service, in reference to the farm problem. The letter follows:

The first 9 months of 1939 compared with the first 9 months of 1938 indicate a great increase in agricultural imports into the United States and a great decrease of agricultural exports from the United States. In the 9 months of 1939 we imported farm products for consumption in the amount of $794,700,000, while in the same period in 1938 we purchased farm products in the amount of $711,600,000. For the same periods our agricultural exports declined from $602,700,000 in 1938 to $418,400,000 in 1939.

While all in the United States are being diverted from consideration of serious problems of agriculture and unemployment by the present dramatic attempt to lift the embargo and increase the

exports of arms, munitions, and implements of war, little is being said and nothing is being done to protect our farmers from imports at below our cost of production prices or to sell our excess food and fiber to the world.

To lift the embargo now, would we not be choosing between the munition makers and war mongers on the one hand and our Nation's 6,800,000 farmers on the other—choosing between "fools' gold" and fools' profits on the one hand and our own peace and security on the other—choosing between the national defense of a foreign state and the national defense of our own beloved country?

Is there even one valid, patriotic reason why we should lift the arms embargo now? Would it not be both patriotic and wise to retain the embargo on arms, munitions, and implements of war—settling this question decisively? Then, at once, turn our attention to assuring our farmers the cost of production, plus a profit—protect our home farm market from invasion by foreigners—build our prosperity upon our own basic industry—agriculture, give employment opportunities to our own labor at an adequate annual wage?

"Why quit our own to stand on foreign ground? Why by interweaving our destiny with that of any part of Europe, entangle our peace and prosperity in the toils of European ambition, rivalship, interest, humor, or caprice?" Why quit our own?

Sincerely,

EDW. E. KENNEDY.

Pending Neutrality Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY R. SHEPPARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 2, 1939

RESOLUTION BY THE LONG BEACH DEMOCRATIC CLUB, CALIFORNIA

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution of the Long Beach Democratic Club of California, relative to the neutrality legislation:

Whereas there is now pending before the Congress of the United States a measure intended to repeal the embargo on munitions of war to belligerent nations and to enact in lieu thereof a cash-and-carry provision applicable to all belligerents; and

Whereas it is the constant aim and desire of all the American citizens to see conducted the affairs of this Nation so that we will not be drawn into the present European conflict; and

Whereas the cash-and-carry amendment to the present Neutrality Act strongly buttress and support that aim, and will aid in that position: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Long Beach Democratic Club, in regular meeting assembled, endorses the said proposed amendment of cash and carry to the Neutrality Act and urges all Members of the Congress to vote for said amendment or such other measure as may be presented and supported by the administration; and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary be, and she is hereby, directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the California Senators, and to all Members of the California delegation in the House of Representatives.

MABEL C. AGEE,
Secretary.
FRANK H. JAQUES,
Chairman of the Board.

OCTOBER 9, 1939.

Why the Old Discredited Embargo Tariff Hurt the American Farmer and the New Hull Trade Agreements Help Him

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH McKELLAR

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, November 3, 1939

TEXT OF LETTER FROM THE SECRETARY OF STATE, THE HONORABLE CORDELL HULL, TO THE HONORABLE ARTHUR CAPPER, UNITED STATES SENATE, NOVEMBER 1939

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, under permission granted me on November 3, 1939, page 1351, I wish to have inserted in the RECORD Secretary of State Hull's letter to Senator ARTHUR CAPPER relative to the proposed trade agreement dealing with agriculture. The letter is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
November, 1939.

The Honorable ARTHUR CAPPER,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR CAPPER: I have received your letter of October 17, 1939, in which you comment further upon the proposed trade agreement with Argentina. Elaborating the expressions of apprehension concerning the possible effects of this agreement upon agriculture which were contained in your previous letter, you discuss at some length certain of the agricultural items which were listed in our public announcement as being open to consideration for the granting of possible concessions to Argentina.

It would manifestly be improper for me, while the negotiations are in progress and before any decisions have been reached concerning these and other pending items, to attempt to anticipate the results of the very careful study which will be given to all such items by the best practical experts from the various departments of the Government which are collaborating in this work, including, of course, the Department of Agriculture. I note that you have sent a copy of your letter to the Committee for Reciprocity Information with a request that it be made a part of the statement which you submitted to the committee at the hearings on October 16 You may be assured that this additional expression of your views will be carefully considered by the interdepartmental trade-agreements organization.

Your views appear to be broadly similar to those expressed before the Committee for Reciprocity Information at the recent hearings on the Argentine agreement by various other Members of Congress, and also by representatives of certain organizations speaking, or purporting to speak, for the farmer. Hence I should like—speaking also for the farmer as well as for the rest of the country—to take this opportunity to point out some of the salient facts which should be borne in mind in connection with this whole matter.

First of all, I want to emphasize that attempts to prejudge the case by forecasting all sorts of dire happenings to agriculture, in consequence of an agreement with Argentina which has not yet been negotiated, are wholly premature, and are in no sense justified by the experience in connection with earlier agreements. Expressions of fear and sweeping assertions of this type have been heard every time trade-agreement negotiations have been undertaken with another country. Invariably this occurred before the negotiation of the particular trade agreement had been completed. Invariably the clamor subsided as soon as the actual terms of the agreement were made public and the moderate and careful nature of the tariff adjustments made by us was revealed.

Second, I want to emphasize that neither you, yourself, nor any of the others who have expressed opposition to the negotiation of a trade agreement with Argentina, on the ground of alleged injury to agriculture, can possibly have more at heart than I do the interests of the farmers of this country. There cannot be any question of that. The point at issue is wholly different. I am convinced that the trade-agreements program has been highly beneficial to our farmers and to the Nation as a whole. You, apparently, are not. I am confident that the proposed trade agreement with Argentina, which is a part of the program, will not be injurious to our farmers, but, on the contrary, will be helpful both to our agriculture and to the economic well-being of the Nation as a whole. You, apparently, are not. Let us look at the facts.

In most of the recent discussions of the proposed agreement with Argentina, including your own observations, I note a decided tendency not only to prejudge this prospective agreement in the absence of any knowledge of what its actual terms will be, but also to weigh it solely by itself, entirely separate and apart from the remainder of the trade-agreements program. That, I submit, is wholly untenable and unfair. I recognize, of course, that each agreement must be appraised, in the first instance, on its own merits; but I cannot, in fairness to the interests of the farmers themselves or the Nation as a whole, agree that responsible consideration of the matter can stop at that point.

As regards the prospective agreement with Argentina, obviously it cannot be appraised on its own merits until its actual terms are determined. At the present stage of the negotiations, neither I nor any one else concerned with the negotiations can possibly know precisely what commodities will be affected and in what measure—except that, as was invariably the case in all previous negotiations, the well-being of our farmers, as well as of all other groups of the population, will be fully and carefully taken into account.

As to the wisdom of negotiating an agreement with a country like Argentina, it should be noted, first of all, that during the past 15 years our sales to Argentina amounted to $1,543,000,000, which was $487,000,000 in excess of our purchases from Argentina. The agreement now under negotiation is necessary in order to safeguard and expand this important foreign market for American products as a necessary means of expanding our domestic market as well. Shall we throw away this mutually beneficial trade relationship and the increased purchasing power for both agriculture and industry resulting from it, simply because of exaggerated fears—entirely unwarranted and, in too many instances, unfairly fostered—that American farmers might be injured by an agreement containing, among its other features, limited adjustments of tariffs on a few agricultural products, some of them largely or wholly noncompetitive and all of them supplementary to our own production?

The whole question of negotiating a trade agreement with Argentina or any other country is one which can be fully and properly evaluated only in conjunction with the entire program. In the conduct of trade negotiations there is neither justification in principle nor authority in law for deliberately discriminating between agricultural and nonagricultural countries in choosing the field for negotiation. If we are to proceed seriously with this broad program for the reopening of the channels of trade, we must be prepared to negotiate either limited or comprehensive agreements—as circumstances warrant—with all countries whose trade policies are such as to afford a basis for negotiation under principles laid down in the Trade Agreements Act.

Almost without exception, opponents of this agreement—even those who, in all sincerity, have been making public statements in opposition to it—have failed to grasp the fundamentals of the issue. The problem is one of promoting the economic welfare of the entire Nation through increase of purchasing power and expansion of markets, at home and abroad, to the benefit of American agriculture, industry, and labor. To do this requires that we exert every effort—without materially impairing, even temporarily, the interests of any established and reasonably efficient domestic industry—to lower or remove excessive barriers to international trade. Agriculture, dependent as it is not only upon foreign markets but also upon the general prosperity of the Nation, has probably more to gain from such a program of trade liberalization than any other major branch of the Nation's economic life.

This is the central problem which we have been seeking to solve through trade agreements. It is because of the vital bearing of a constructive foreign-trade policy on our national prosperity that the President and his entire administration have made the trade-agreements program an essential part of their unceasing effort to rehabilitate our agriculture and our whole economic life.

The trade-agreements program has had, and now has, no purpose more essential than that of benefiting American agriculture. Notwithstanding reckless and grossly unfair assertions to the contrary, we have made great headway in the face of difficulties of the most serious character. Now, however, as we enter upon negotiations with Argentina, it is violently asserted in certain quarters that we should forego the unquestionable advantages of a trade agreement with Argentina on the spurious and unsupported plea that certain branches of American agriculture would be injured in the process. It is even sweepingly alleged, without one scintilla of supporting evidence, that agriculture as a whole will suffer from this agreement.

However sincerely such feelings may be held, they are not, I repeat, founded upon a full understanding of the facts. They rest upon premises which are so erroneous or so narrow that the entire picture is distorted. The allegation that the Argentine agreement will be injurious to certain branches of American agriculture is based upon two false assumptions: (1) That whatever tariff adjustments are made will not be as carefully considered and as adequately safeguarded as those made in agreements already negotiated; and (2) that every additional pound or bushel or other unit that is imported deprives the domestic producers of that much business. This second assumption entirely overlooks the fact that the domestic market is not a fixed or a static market but, on the contrary, expands or contracts under the influence, among other factors, of a prosperous or a depressed foreign trade.

The inherent fallacy involved in the assumption that the domestic market is a static one is nowhere better demonstrated than by our own experience under embargo tariffs. I have discussed that experience so often and so fully in the past that it is surely unnecessary to repeat it here. The essential facts are, as our Hawley-Smoot experience painfully demonstrated: First, that it is impossible to grant embargo tariffs to some groups and withhold them from others, and that, once political trading of this sort gets under way, there is no stopping short of prohibitive tariffs all along the line; and second, that the net result of such an embargo tariff policy is a disastrous decline in our foreign trade which leaves in its wake a prostrate agriculture and a prostrate nation.

Far from being preserved, the farmer's home market—as well as his foreign—is drastically reduced as a result of embargo tariffs. We have learned from experience that to embark upon such a policy is ruinous. For well-meaning persons assuming to speak for agriculture still to cling, despite all that happened after 1930, to the delusion that the farmer has something to gain from embargo tariffs, or from resisting a program for adjusting such tariffs below the embargo level while still providing thoroughly adequate safeguards, is folly compounded. Most of those who are today attempting to destroy our trade program by making insupportable charges that it is injuring agriculture are the same false prophets who solemnly assured the farmers that the Hawley-Smoot embargoes would guarantee to them full and permanent prosperity; whereas, in actual fact, within 2 years from the enactment of the 1930 tariff, millions of farmers found themselves in, or on the verge of bankruptcy.

The plain truth is that farmers in this country have everything to gain and nothing to lose from a carefully administered program for the reestablishment of our foreign trade to the fullest extent that international conditions will permit. It is either such a course of moderation, with expanding markets for American products at home and abroad; or else it is embargo tariffs all around, with consequences that we have already seen.

Moreover, there is no basis in fact for truly astounding statements that the program in actual operation has injured American farmers. The very reverse is the case.

The facts are that we have secured extremely valuable benefits for agriculture through the safeguarding and expanding of foreign markets for our farm surpluses. The improved facilities for the marketing abroad of the products of our farms were one of the major factors responsible for the rise in our agricultural exports from $662,000,000 in 1932 and $694,000,000 in 1933 to $828,000,000 in 1938, as contrasted with their drastic decline from a level of $1,693,000,000 in 1929. In addition, of course, the farmer's home market has expanded in consequence of increased domestic employment and purchasing power for farm products, partly brought about by trade-agreement concessions obtained for American exports of both agricultural and nonagricultural commodities.

The trade agreements thus far concluded are with countries which take about 60 percent of our total exports. In these agreements we have obtained valuable concessions, including binding of duty-free entry, for 47 percent of our exports of farm products to all countries. These concessions cover about three-fourths of our exports of farm products to the trade-agreement countries themselves. Old markets have been safeguarded and new markets have been opened up for all surplus-producing branches of our agriculture. A few illustrations will suffice.

After a prolonged period of domestic shortage, the corn-hog industry is again becoming heavily dependent upon export outlets. Reduction of barriers against our exports of pork, ham, or bacon has been obtained in 10 countries. On lard 9 countries have reduced barriers, while 3 others have agreed not to impose new restrictions. Of special significance is the removal in the agreement with Great Britain of a burdensome preferential duty on lard, originally imposed in retaliation for some of the superprotectionist provisions of the Smoot-Hawley tariff.

On grains and grain products, foreign-trade barriers have been lowered in all but five of the agreements now in effect, and in three of the remaining five agreements the foreign countries concerned have bound existing favorable duties against increase. Great Britain has removed its duty on wheat, also originally imposed in retaliation for our action under the Smoot-Hawley tariff, and has bound corn and cotton on the free list.

Fruits, vegetables, and a long list of other farm products have benefited from the concessions obtained in the trade agreements.

Analysis of the results obtained under the trade-agreements program reveals that between 1935 and 1938 our exports of farm products to trade-agreement countries increased by nearly 50 percent, whereas to other countries they actually declined slightly. It is a stupendous fact that this progress in reopening market outlets was attained in the face of such formidable obstacles as the continuation in many countries of exorbitantly high trade barriers, the existence abroad of an extraordinarily low level of purchasing power, the increasing diversion of purchasing power to the procurement of commodities needed for the construction of armaments, and the disastrous effects of unprecedented droughts upon our own exporting capacity.

One would look in vain, in the mass of statements and appeals with which those who seek to destroy the trade-agreements program have flooded the farmers, for any reference to these undisputed and important benefits secured, through trade agreements, for the farmers themselves and for the Nation as a whole. In their unholy zeal, they deliberately suppress and withhold all material facts favorable to the trade-agreements program. It is high time for the farmers of our Corn-Hog Belt, our Wheat Belt, our Cotton Belt to ask why such opponents of the trade-agreements program—professing, as they do, to have the interests of the farmers at heart—do not give them all of the facts essential for informed judgment on this issue, which is so crucial to their welfare.

The agreements we have concluded are with countries which account for a little over 60 percent of our total imports. Among these are such important agricultural producers as Canada and some of the Latin American republics. To these countries we have granted carefully considered and carefully safeguarded tariff adjustments on some of their characteristic products, designed to permit a moderate increase of their sales to us in exchange for increased outlets for our products.

Much has been said in recent years about imports of agricultural products, by persons who have sought to persuade farmers that such imports are highly detrimental; and efforts have been unceasing to make it appear that trade-agreement concessions have been seriously harmful in this connection. It has even been falsely asserted that the bulk of the concessions granted by us in trade agreements have been on farm products. Repeated exposure of the utter hollowness of such unfounded assertions has not prevented their endless repetition.

The facts with regard to concessions on farm products are that, while duties have been adjusted on more than a fifth of our nonagricultural imports, in the case of agricultural imports the tariff adjustments now in effect apply to only about 8 percent of the total. It is clear that these adjustments in duties on farm products could not possibly have been a factor of any considerable importance in the recent situation as regards imports of agricultural products.

It needs to be understood just what these agricultural imports are and what is the true explanation of the changes in their volume in recent years. In all of the vast array of misleading literature put out on this subject, there is not the slightest suggestion as to the true character or the true significance of these imports.

For example, if we examine the figures for 1938—the last full year available, and a year in which most of the abnormality in the import figures arising from the cumulative effects of the droughts of 1934 and 1936 had disappeared—what do we find? We find that, of the total imports of agricultural, or so-called agricultural, products, amounting to $956,000,000, more than half consisted of things like rubber, coffee, silk, etc., which are not even produced in the

United States. Among these items were $138,000,000 worth of coffee; $130,000,000 of crude rubber; $89,000,000 of raw silk; $29,000,000 of bananas; $20,000,000 of cocoa beans; $18,000,000 of tea; $13,000,000 of carpet wool; and $10,000,000 of sisal and henequen (mostly for the farmer's binder twine). This was the situation, notwithstanding that the relatively low business and industrial activity in the United States in 1938 resulted in much smaller importation of industrial raw materials than takes place in more prosperous years. For example, in 1937 our imports of products of this type, not produced in the United States, amounted to $711,000,000.

With respect to the remainder of our 1938 imports of agricultural products (amounting to slightly less than half of the total), we find that sugar alone accounted for $130,000,000, or well over a fourth; and sugar imports have been regulated by quota restriction until quite recently when the quotas were removed and the tariff duty on Cuban sugar reverted to the pre-Cuban-trade-agreement rate. So far as concerns the rest of these imports, two things are to be noted: First, that they consist—as in the case of sugar—of commodities of a type which we do not produce in sufficient quantities, despite high tariffs on most of them, to meet our own requirements; and second, that, in very considerable part, they consist of products imported because of seasonal, quality, or other special factors.

The significance of changes in the volume of imports of agricultural, or so-called agricultural, products from year to year is equally in need of clarification. It is easy to attach a completely false significance to the rise of such imports from $668,000,000 in 1932 to $956,000,000 in 1938, meanwhile conveniently ignoring the fact that farm income, after reaching its lowest ebb in 1932, had increased between 1932 and 1938 by almost $3,000,000,000. It is easy to neglect pointing out that in 1929 we brought in from abroad $2,218,000,000 of such products, so that, on the theory that the volume of farm imports governs farm prosperity, agriculture should have reached the very bottom of depression in 1929, instead of which—after 2 years of Hawley-Smoot embargoes—it reached bottom in 1932. It is easy to make utterly false use of import figures which are, in a large degree, abnormal. For example, a large part of the greatly increased volume of agricultural imports in 1937 was, as every informed person should have known, the direct result of severe domestic shortages caused by the droughts of 1934 and 1936. A considerable part of the increase was also, of course, the result of the marked economic improvement in 1937, which led to increased imports of agricultural and other raw materials, in large part noncompetitive and essential for the operation of our industries.

That our agriculture has not been injured by these imports of agricultural products may be clearly seen from an examination of the income received by farmers in recent years and from the movement of prices of the principal agricultural commodities. What the figures show, on the contrary, is that agricultural imports and farm income have tended generally in the past to move up and down together.

The total cash income from the marketing of all farm products, exclusive of Government payments, was $4,606,000,000 in 1932, $5,248,000,000 in 1933, $8,621,000,000 in 1937, and $7,538,000,000 in 1938. The latest estimated income for 1939 is $7,600,000,000. All major groups of producers participated in these increases, just as in the preceding 3 years they all shared in the calamitous decline of farm income from the level of $11,221,000,000 which was received in 1929.

The contrast between the two periods is striking. During the first, the Hawley-Smoot tariff was in full operation; during the second, the trade-agreements program was increasingly being put into effect.

When the Hawley-Smoot tariff was enacted in 1930 the farmers were promised a period of great prosperity, under the slogan "the American market for the American farmer." Instead, during the 3 years which followed, the cash income from the marketing of crops fell by $1,355,000,000, while the income from the marketing of livestock and livestock products dropped by $2,338,000,000. This latter figure included a decline of $1,252,000,000 in the income from meat animals alone and a decline of $641,000,000 in the income from dairy products.

When the Trade Agreements Act was passed, and periodically since then, as trade agreements were negotiated, irresponsible and terrifying predictions were made in some quarters that the effect would be to "ruin" our agriculture. Yet between 1933 and 1938 the income received from the marketing of crops increased by $716,000,000, and the income received from the marketing of livestock and livestock products increased by $1,574,000,000. This latter figure includes an increase of $952,000,000 in the income from meat animals and of $408,000,000 in the income from dairy products.

The movement of prices of farm products since 1932 tells essentially the same story. In 1932 the average index of farm prices (1909–14=100) was 65; in 1938 it was 95. In 1932 the average farm price of wheat was 38.8 cents a bushel; in 1938, 66.1 cents; and on September 15, 1939, 72.7 cents. For corn the figures for these same respective dates were 28.1, 49.0, and 56.2 cents a bushel. For hogs, the figures were $3.34, $7.74, and $7.06 a hundred, respectively. For beef cattle the figures were $4.25, $6.53, and $7.07 a hundred. For butterfat the figures were 17.9, 26.3, and 24.7 cents a pound. For wool the figures were 8.6, 19.1, and 24.3 cents a pound.

While there was a considerable rise in prices of some of these products after the recent outbreak of war in Europe, inspection of the earlier figures reveals that, before that time, the prices received by farmers for beef cattle, hogs, corn, and wheat had risen one and one-half times as compared with 1932; those for butterfat, by nearly one-third; and those for wool, to three times their 1932 level.

The data for income and prices with respect to beef cattle and dairy products are particularly significant. It is in connection with these commodities that the loudest prophecies of doom and the most reckless claims of injury have been occasioned by the tariff adjustments made in the trade agreements. Yet both of these branches of our agriculture have shown substantial improvement during recent years. It is in the face of such facts as these that some lobbyists in and out of Washington purporting to speak for dairy and livestock interests carry on their unceasing efforts to mislead not only the public but the very industries for whom they pretend to speak.

The record recited above shows all too clearly that the whole idea that farmers have anything to gain by supporting a policy of airtight embargo tariffs on farm products is shot through with fallacy. It shows, as already stated, that this leads to embargo tariffs all around, destroying both foreign and domestic markets and resulting in disaster to agriculture, as to other branches of our economic life. It proves conclusively that statements to the effect that our farmers are being injured by the trade agreements can only be based either upon ignorance of the facts, for which there is little excuse, since all of the data given above are regularly published and are easily available; or else upon a deliberate attempt to mislead the farmers and the public in general. It is an incontrovertible fact that no agricultural tariff adjustments have been made in our trade agreements without the utmost care to see to it that those branches of our agriculture affected were left with ample safeguards.

I feel that I must emphasize once more the point that those who now attack the trade-agreements program on the alleged ground that the proposed Argentine agreement will injure our agriculture assume that this agreement, or any single agreement, can be weighed in complete dissociation from the remainder of the entire program. They would have us ignore completely the moderate nature of the concessions made in other trade agreements and the beneficial effects of other agreements upon agriculture, through expansion of market outlets for farm products both at home and abroad. They even assume that the tariff adjustments which we may make in the Argentine agreement can be appraised independently of the benefits obtained in the way of safeguarding and expanding our exports to Argentina.

Far from injuring farmers, the trade agreements have made a twofold contribution to their economic welfare. Increased foreign markets for agricultural products have eased the burden of our surpluses and have placed greater purchasing power in the hands of the producers. Increased foreign markets for industrial, as well as agricultural, products—and in the trade agreements negotiated to date valuable concessions were secured from foreign countries for one-quarter of our nonagricultural exports—have expanded domestic demand for all types of farm products.

The accomplishment of both of these aims—that is, expansion of both the domestic and the foreign demand for our products at fair prices—is among the paramount purposes of the trade-agreements program. Neither is possible in a satisfactory measure without the establishment throughout the world of conditions under which mutually profitable trade, based upon the essential principle of equal treatment, can be given the greatest practicable scope of operation. And experience has shown that no more effective method of promoting such conditions of trade has been devised than that embodied in our trade-agreements program.

We have taken a position of leadership in this field, not only because a healthy development of foreign trade is necessary to the economic stability and welfare of this country and is an indispensable foundation of enduring peace, but also because the alternative to the type of policy which we pursue is a growth of national economic isolation, with all its disastrous results for the peace and prosperity of nations. That alternative means, within nations, increasing regimentation in all phases of economic life, beginning with the surplus-producing industries and steadily extending to all other branches of production and distribution. It means the dole in an expanding and more and more aggravated form, and a decline in the general standard of national well-being. Even before the outbreak of the present war, excessive trade barriers were predominantly responsible for the piling up of huge surpluses in some countries, while millions of people throughout the world were compelled to subsist on short rations. Internationally it means growing animosities, bitter resentments, and, in the end, the anarchy of violence through the unbridled use of armed force.

When the present unfortunate period of hostilities is over, this and other important nations will be confronted with the choice of either furnishing an increased measure of leadership in bringing the world back to a sane and healthy economy, both domestically and internationally, and thus in building the foundation of enduring peace; or of undergoing a steady deterioration in their economic life, with all the evil consequences of such a downward course for stability and prosperity within nations and for peace among nations.

At the present time, the best interests of this Nation require the greatest possible effort in the direction of maintaining the results of our unremitting work in the field of trade-agreement negotiations during the past 5 years and of extending the area of nego-

tiations wherever possible. The negotiations now in progress with such countries as Argentina are a part of this vital effort. Here we have an opportunity to place the trade relations between this country and the nations to the south of us on a basis of greater mutual advantage, to the benefit of both sides, and at the same time to strengthen the ties of friendship and solidarity in the Western Hemisphere, which are so vitally important to our common security in a world harassed by war.

In view of all these circumstances, I earnestly hope that those, like yourself, who have been apprehensive concerning the pending negotiations will give the whole matter further thought. It seems to me that it is due the Nation, and the farmers themselves, that premature judgments with respect to these negotiations be suspended and that, when the negotiations are completed, appraisal of the results be based upon all of the relevant facts. I am confident that, if this is done, the only reasonable verdict will be that the interests of the farmers will have been promoted, rather than hurt. I am confident that, in consequence of both direct and indirect benefits arising from the Argentine agreement itself and of the further impetus that conclusion of this agreement will give to a program which is basically in their interest, farmers will share with the rest of the Nation the manifest advantages to be gained from the improvement of our trade relations with an influential and a friendly nation in the Western Hemisphere.

Sincerely yours,

CORDELL HULL.

Neutrality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, November 3, 1939

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, under permission granted on November 3, 1939, page 1358, I wish to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD two proclamations issued by the President of the United States, as provided under House Joint Resolution 306, passed at the extra session of Congress, relating to neutrality, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
November, 1939.

PROCLAMATION OF A STATE OF WAR BETWEEN GERMANY AND FRANCE; POLAND; AND THE UNITED KINGDOM, INDIA, AUSTRALIA, CANADA, NEW ZEALAND, AND THE UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA

By the PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES:

A PROCLAMATION

Whereas section 1 of the joint resolution of Congress approved November 4, 1939, provides in part as follows:

"That whenever the President, or the Congress by concurrent resolution, shall find that there exists a state of war between foreign states, and that it is necessary to promote the security or preserve the peace of the United States or to protect the lives of citizens of the United States, the President shall issue a proclamation naming the states involved; and he shall, from time to time, by proclamation, name other states as and when they may become involved in the war."

And whereas it is further provided by section 13 of the said joint resolution that—

"The President may, from time to time, promulgate such rules and regulations, not inconsistent with law, as may be necessary and proper to carry out any of the provisions of this joint resolution; and he may exercise any power or authority conferred on him by this joint resolution through such officer or officers, of agency or agencies, as he shall direct."

Now, therefore, I, Franklin D. Roosevelt, President of the United States of America, acting under and by virtue of the authority conferred on me by the said joint resolution, do hereby proclaim that a state of war unhappily exists between Germany and France, Poland, and the United Kingdom, India, Australia, Canada, New Zealand, and the Union of South Africa, and that it is necessary to promote the security and preserve the peace of the United States and to protect the lives of citizens of the United States.

And I do hereby enjoin upon all officers of the United States, charged with the execution of the laws thereof, the utmost diligence in preventing violations of the said joint resolution and in bringing to trial and punishment any offenders against the same.

And I do hereby delegate to the Secretary of State the power to exercise any power or authority conferred on me by the said joint resolution, as made effective by this my proclamation issued thereunder, which is not specifically delegated by Executive order to some other officer or agency of this Government, and the power to promulgate such rules and regulations not inconsistent with law as may be necessary and proper to carry out any of its provisions.

And I do hereby revoke my proclamations Nos. 2349, 2354, and 2360 issued on September 5, 8, and 10, 1939, respectively, in regard to the export of arms, ammunition, and implements of war to France, Germany, Poland, and the United Kingdom, India, Australia, and New Zealand, to the Union of South Africa, and to Canada.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the United States of America to be affixed.

Done at the city of Washington this fourth day of November, in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred and thirty-nine, and of the independence of the United States of America the one hundred and sixty-fourth.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

By the President:
CORDELL HULL,
Secretary of State.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
November, 1939.

USE OF PORTS OR TERRITORIAL WATERS OF THE UNITED STATES BY SUBMARINES OF FOREIGN BELLIGERENT STATES

By the PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

A PROCLAMATION

Whereas section 11 of the joint resolution approved November 4, 1939, provides:

"Whenever, during any war in which the United States is neutral, the President shall find that special restrictions placed on the use of the ports and territorial waters of the United States by the submarines or armed merchant vessels of a foreign state, will serve to maintain peace between the United States and foreign states, or to protect the commercial interests of the United States and its citizens, or to promote the security of the United States, and shall make proclamation thereof, it shall thereafter be unlawful for any such submarine or armed merchant vessel to enter a port or the territorial waters of the United States or to depart therefrom, except under such conditions and subject to such limitations as the President may prescribe. Whenever, in his judgment, the conditions which have caused him to issue his proclamation have ceased to exist, he shall revoke his proclamation and the provisions of this section shall thereupon cease to apply, except as to offenses committed prior to such revocation."

Whereas there exists a state of war between Germany and France; Poland; and the United Kingdom, India, Australia, Canada, New Zealand, and the Union of South Africa; and

Whereas the United States of America is neutral in such war;

Now, therefore, I, Franklin D. Roosevelt, President of the United States of America, acting under and by virtue of the authority vested in me by the foregoing provision of section 11 of the joint resolution approved November 4, 1939, do by this proclamation find that special restrictions placed on the use of the ports and territorial waters of the United States, exclusive of the Canal Zone, by the submarines of a foreign belligerent state, both commercial submarines and submarines which are ships of war, will serve to maintain peace between the United States and foreign states, to protect the commercial interests of the United States and its citizens, and to promote the security of the United States;

And I do further declare and proclaim that it shall hereafter be unlawful for any submarine of France, Germany, Poland, or the United Kingdom, India, Australia, Canada, New Zealand, or the Union of South Africa to enter ports or territorial waters of the United States, exclusive of the Canal Zone, except submarines of the said belligerent states which are forced into such ports or territorial waters of the United States by force majeure; and in such cases of force majeure, only when such submarines enter ports or territorial waters of the United States while running on the surface with conning tower and superstructure above water and flying the flags of the foreign belligerent states of which they are vessels. Such submarines may depart from ports or territorial waters of the United States only while running on the surface with conning tower and superstructure above water and flying the flags of the foreign belligerent states of which they are vessels.

And I do hereby enjoin upon all officers of the United States charged with the execution of the laws thereof the utmost diligence in preventing violations of the said joint resolution, and this my proclamation issued thereunder, and in bringing to trial and punishment any offenders against the same.

And I do hereby revoke my proclamation No. 2371, issued by me on October 18, 1939, in regard to the use of ports or territorial waters of the United States by submarines of foreign belligerent states.

This proclamation shall continue in full force and effect unless and until modified, revoked, or otherwise terminated pursuant to law.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the United States of America to be affixed.

Done at the city of Washington this fourth day of November in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred and thirty-nine, and of the Independence of the United States of America the one hundred and sixty-fourth.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

By the President:
CORDELL HULL,
Secretary of State.

Inter-American Relations in the Field of Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, November 3, 1939

ADDRESS OF HON. CORDELL HULL, SECRETARY OF STATE, TO BE DELIVERED AT THE CONFERENCE ON INTER-AMERICAN RELATIONS IN THE FIELD OF EDUCATION, HOTEL MAYFLOWER, NOVEMBER 9, 1939

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, under permission granted me on November 3, 1939, page 1358, I wish to submit an address to be delivered by Secretary of State Hull for insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

At the outset let me express the thanks of the Department of State for your willingness to lay aside your duties and join us today. We are peculiarly in need of the kind of assistance which you can give. We are seeking to examine certain aspects of international relations in which education and educators may make a unique contribution; and we are endeavoring, through common counsel, to find the methods and means by which that contribution may be made most effective.

The greatest triumph of this hemisphere thus far has been the establishment of the peace of the Americas, peace by cooperation instead of by conquest or by balance of power. This has been built through many experiments and many phases; it has had setbacks, but in the main, the Western Hemisphere has succeeded in marked degree in making itself free from the militarism of the Old World, and free from the idea that only through successive wars can its civilization be maintained.

All of us are, I am sure, familiar with the diplomatic and governmental aspects of the work which the 21 American republics have endeavored to carry on, and to which this Government has tried consistently to contribute. Over many decades, the principal problems affecting inter-American development, and bearing on the peace of the Americas, were primarily within the American continents. We were interested particularly in the relationships between the countries of this hemisphere. It was necessary to place those relationships firmly on a basis of law, rather than force; and to bring about recognition of the juridical equality of every nation on this hemisphere, irrespective of size or numerical strength. It was necessary to work out a sort of inter-American national bill of rights, which would include complete respect for the sovereignty of every country, the elimination of intervention, the perfecting of mechanisms by which disputes could be solved through reason. At the Conference of Montevideo in 1933, substantial agreement was reached on these essential principles.

Three years later, in 1936, the danger of warfare overseas became apparent; and with it a very real danger that much of the world might slip back into the anarchy of international relations based purely on force. It was the firm resolve of this Government, as indeed of the other American governments, that the New World must be kept free of that tragedy. The Conference for the Maintenance of Peace, at Buenos Aires, in 1936, was called and held for the specific purpose of endeavoring to set up methods and agreements which would prevent the rising tide of anarchy from invading this hemisphere. In consequence, the 21 American republics concluded certain agreements designed to make possible common action by all of the 21 republics in the event that peace was threatened.

During the next 2 years, the trend of affairs in other parts of the world continued to worsen; and signs were not wanting that certain overseas governments had interested themselves in the affairs of the American continent. In that atmosphere the Eighth International Conference of American States met at Lima in December of last year. The Conference rightly appraised its task as that of setting up the principles and the mechanics for defending the peace of the New World against any attempt to subvert it by any outside power or force. The result was the declaration of Lima, by which the 21 American republics agreed that they would defend and maintain the integrity of the republican institutions to which the New World is committed; that they would regard an attack on any one of these nations as an attack on all; and that they would consult together to take measures for the common defense in the event of a threat to peace, or attack on any one of the American family. With the outbreak of war last September, the mechanics thus set up were promptly brought into action at the recent consultation held at Panama.

At all these conferences, vigorous efforts were made, by discussion and agreement, to place the economic relations of the American nations—and of each of them with the rest of the world—upon a sound basis of mutual benefit. We have sought to lay the foundation for an elimination or reduction of excessive trade barriers and for the establishment of the vital principle of equality of commercial treatment. In the relations of government to government, we have striven to implement these ideas through appropriate action—for the sake of promoting the economic well-being of each of us, as well as because of our firm conviction that sound and healthy economic relations among nations constitute an indispensable foundation of enduring peace.

This is a bare outline of diplomatic and governmental steps. Those of us who have most to do with measures of government are fully aware of the fact that governmental action can never rise higher than its source, and that the source is the moral and intellectual structure which lies behind and beneath the formal governmental action. Bad mechanical arrangements may be successful when there is common understanding, when men's minds march together, and when none of the parties are strangers to each other's ideas and ideals. On the other hand, the best technical arrangements in the world are futile if there is not underlying them the foundation of that understanding. For this reason we, in common with our neighbors, are especially interested in buttressing the economic and political relations which we have by broad understanding between peoples. The creation and continuance of this understanding is, I am convinced, the peculiar contribution which education can make to inter-American relations and to the security, peace, and welfare of the Americas.

The present moment is unusually happy for developing to the fullest the contributions which each of us in the American family can make to the other. Never have relations between the American republics been more cordial. Never has there been greater realization that each of us has much to contribute to the other; never has there been greater mutual respect or greater comprehension. For that very reason it is clearer to all of us than ever before that the relations among our nations must not rest merely on the contacts between diplomat and diplomat, political leader and political leader, or even between businessman and businessman. They must rest also on contacts between teacher and teacher, between student and student; upon the confluence of streams of thought as well as upon more formalized governmental action and constructive business activity.

Understanding, trust in each other, and friendliness are the foundations of those close relations of cooperation upon which the progress of all depends. Education, exchange of information, earnest effort to learn from each other and to understand and respect each other's point of view are among the greatest factors in promoting these essential objectives.

In the American republics, the intellectual plays a part of first importance in the national life. The poet, the scholar, and the teacher are likely to be found not only in universities and in cultural circles but in places of diplomatic and political responsibility. No less than in the United States, the American republics lying to the south of us make active use of their intellectual resources, and their men of learning and letters and arts stand high in the national respect of their peoples. Our own country can afford to learn many lessons in this respect. In asking you today to consider the problem of educational and cultural relations, I am certain that out of that relationship we shall receive as much as we give. It is within our power to make our own splendid educational resources available to our neighbors, as well as to draw upon them for ideas and inspiration which may be of great use to us.

You are more familiar than I with the technical avenues for accomplishing the result which we have in mind. You realize, I am sure, how much our own country needs to learn of the civilization of other American peoples, and of the possibility of disseminating this knowledge through our schools, our colleges, our universities, and our technical journals; and in like measure, the possibilities which these institutions afford for making the tools of our own civilization available to our neighboring countries.

The process of making available the fruits of our intellectual work in the other American republics and of bringing the fruits of their work to the United States properly ought to be carried on by the private and semipublic educational agencies which are already in existence. Mechanically, the Department of State is able to give you very considerable help. It is my hope that we may place at your disposal the facilities of this Government so that we may assist you in contributing the wisdom which you have to our neighbors who seek it; and that, in like manner, we may assist you in finding contact with the scholars and scientists and institutions of learning outside the United States which have something to say to us.

Let me close by saying that, in my judgment, this work in which we are all engaged is of the highest importance. None can forecast the future in world affairs. It is possible that the great shadow which lies heavily over Europe may become a long twilight. It is not inconceivable that many of the lights of western civilization may there be dimmed or altogether put out. It may even be that for a time the New World may have to guard and maintain the achievements of that civilization, holding them in trust for a time when they can once more be general throughout the world.

Though governments can help, this is not a task for government alone but for all of us. The teachers, the men of science and learning throughout the New World, must resolve to work together to accomplish that function which is rightfully theirs—to guard, to enrich, and to forward the civilization which, in the high calling of education, all of us must seek to serve.

Our Prince of Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM I. SIROVICH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, November 3, 1939

ARTICLE BY HARRY H. SCHLACHT

Mr. SIROVICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article entitled "Our Prince of Peace," from the East Side News, of New York City, September 23, 1939:

[From the East Side News of September 23, 1939]

OUR PRINCE OF PEACE

(By Harry H. Schlacht)

Justice and humanity are America's greatest contributions to the world. She stands today as a temple of peace and liberty in the world aflame—a sanctuary where the lamp of civilization illuminates the earth. Like Washington and Lincoln, who guided our country through epochal testing times, President Roosevelt truly reflects the sentiments and feelings of our people. His doctrine of sympathy, which has been the foundation of his administration; his unbounded faith in humanity; his profound philosophy and his deep-rooted belief in the ultimate triumph of liberty and justice are strikingly expressed in all his international dealings and constitutes the greatest contribution to the progressive thoughts of mankind.

America must preserve, under the guidance of President Roosevelt, her national ideal and her national soul. The thirst for this ideal is so closely woven into the warf and woof of our life that to tear it out now would unravel the very thread of our existence.

The civilization that we know is being torn by the mightiest struggle in all history. Sparks of Europe's conflagration are beginning to blaze into our own skies and echoes of her strife are sounding at our very doors. In a dramatic and historic address President Roosevelt is determined to "keep us out of war." The policies of his administration will not be written in the ruins of American homes, not in the wrecks of American industry, and not in the destruction of American families. From every whirling wheel in America, from every factory that turns, from every growing thing that breathes its prayer of plenty, from every quiet schoolhouse, from every crowded market, from every peaceful home goes up a song of praise and thanksgiving to hymn a nation's tribute for the statesmanship that will bring these things to pass.

In the bloodiest crucible of all history the President will keep the stainless banner of the Republic flying with peace and honor. In spite of the complications crowding upon each other like waves of an angry sea, with enemies powerful from within and without, he will emerge as a majestic and powerful mountain after a storm. Let us behold a free and fruitful America under smiling skies, a potent force in world's peace.

Why Cannot Texas Tax Crude Oil?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. R. POAGE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, November 3, 1939

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, the State of Texas produced 39.2 percent of all the petroleum produced in the United States during the year of 1938, and as the United States produced in the same year 61.3 percent of the petroleum of the world, my State accounts for 24 percent of the entire world's production of this vital mineral.

No natural resource is of greater importance to modern civilization than petroleum. It is the lifeblood which gives movement and vitality to the products of steel. Not only does it make possible the daily use of the automobile and the modern streamlined trains, not only is it vital to our everyday lives and existence of our peaceful civilization, it is equally indispensable to the prosecution of modern warfare. Without gasoline every bomber would be grounded and every tank would be stalled. Oil is essential not only to America but to the world. And that means that Texas oil is essential to the world.

It is little wonder then that a resource of such importance should be a source of relentless intrigue and overreaching. Throughout the old West there was a saying that "Wherever there is gold there is hell." This is likewise true of oil. Not only do we find that wherever there is oil there is the turmoil and violence of the frontier camp—not only is there an ever-present likelihood of personal violence—there is a much more dangerous and far-reaching background. The lawlessness of the boom days is always brought under control by the forces of law and responsible government. The opportunity for the gunman or the gangster is short lived, but the opportunity for those who can shape the forces of government itself are unlimited. The oil industry was the first to fall into monopolistic hands. The Standard Oil was the first of a whole series of trusts that have successively ravaged one after another of the business interests of America. While its manipulations have of late years been less obvious, it cannot be doubted that in all too many instances Standard Oil has exercised an unwarranted influence on legislation in a number of our States. With the discovery of some of the great Texas oil fields, there sprang up a group of independents. For a time these independent oil operators seemed likely to give the trust some real competition, but all too soon the old tactics of ruthless destruction of all competitors had decimated the ranks of the independents. Today the major companies probably control the production of nearly 90 percent of all oil produced in Texas, and refine approximately the same percentage of all gasoline. The independent operators have been forced in the oil industry, just as in so many other industries, into the marginal fields, and the eastern-owned major companies control not only the bulk of oil production but through their financial ramifications they are heavily interested in, if not in control of, the sulfur and natural-gas production of the State as well. Their community of interest in the field of taxation with the public utilities, the railroads, the insurance companies, and other large interests of the State and Nation has made it relatively easy for them to protect their properties to a very large degree from the hand of the tax collector, which has been laid so heavily on most of their less influential neighbors.

And it is to this matter of taxation of natural resources that I wish to direct your attention. I have heretofore discussed this problem both here and in Texas. I have discussed it in Texas because I believe, and have long believed, that the resources of my State were being removed and the capital wealth of my State depleted for the enrichment of residents of other jurisdictions without any just return to the sovereignty that made possible these transitory but distinctly profitable operations. I have discussed this problem here because I recognize, as you do, a growing insistance on the part of many for Federal control of the great oil industry. Certainly such action on the part of the Federal Government is to be avoided if possible, and I believe that it is possible if the several States will but awake to their own powers and responsibilities. Most of the States have evidenced a full recognition of responsibility for the control of oil production. I wonder if this could be due to the fact that all major companies have in this instance joined with the independents to keep production control in local hands? In any event, there has been no such energetic and uniform State action in the field of taxation of natural resources.

There was a time when all our Federal taxes came from sources like the tariff and the income tax, which taxes did not directly conflict with State levies, which were then largely confined to ad valorem taxes on tangible property. However, in recent years the Federal Government has expanded its taxing base so as to include many, if not all, of the special taxes—as the gasoline tax and admission taxes. These special taxes have at the same time become more and more

important in the scheme of State financing as the ad valorem tax has become less and less productive. Today we have a situation where it seems to me to be apparent that the ad valorem tax must be released to the local agencies of government—cities, counties, and school districts.

This will leave to the States only the special-privilege, severance, and sales taxes. While I do not believe in the sales tax as a just tax policy for any unit of government, it can certainly be more fairly administered as a Federal tax than as a local tax. The income tax is probably the most equitable of all taxes, but this field is already occupied by the Federal Government. Let us, then, divide the field of tax revenue and save the tremendous cost of overlapping and duplicating taxation. Let us leave to the Federal Government the right to collect the tariff and all income and sales taxes, and to the State governments the collection of all other special taxes, reserving to local governmental agencies the ad valorem revenue. It is much more expensive to require the States to collect $50,000,000, for instance, from the income tax and an additional $50,000,000 from gasoline taxes and have the Federal Government duplicate the process as to both taxes than it is to allow the States to collect their full $100,000,000 from the gasoline tax and the Federal Government to collect its full $100,000,000 from the income tax. The return to each government is just as great under the last plan as under the first. The burden to the taxpayer is not increased and at least one-half of the cost of collection is saved.

Furthermore, the income tax can be more equitably collected by the Federal Government than by any one or more States. The large incomes of the present day are not ordinarily produced in any one State. They are more likely to be the result of the exploitation of the resources of some "raw material" or "colonial" community than to be properly attributable to the locality where they are taxable.

We have developed to an appreciable degree the customary set-up of an economic empire. The fact that we are all living in one contiguous territory has tended to obscure the colonial-empire relationships. Certain great industrial and financial centers have assumed tremendous and, in my opinion, unwarranted importance in the control of the economic ife of the outlying communities.

As Dr. R. H. Montgomery, of the University of Texas, has often remarked, "Texas is the largest and incomparably the richest foreign colony owned by Manhattan." We are under the same flag. We exercise certain rights of political citizenship. We are, it is true, tremendously proud of our heritage of independence, of liberty, and of individual opportunity in Texas. But this cannot obscure the further fact that our economic, political, and social lives are to a very appreciable extent dominated by our colonial status, just as they are in most of the Southern and Western States.

It is of little significance that within our State is found by far the world's richest deposits of oil, natural gas, and sulfur. The ownership rights are vested in giant holding companies in the financial centers. The profits flow to these centers. If we are to have a satisfactory and smoothly functioning economic system, money income must be so distributed in the colonies that we may be able to buy the products and services of the industrial and financial centers.

In any great free-trade area, under our traditional economic order, money income tends to flow into the great financial centers from the outlying raw material producing areas. We must devise means for pumping this money back into the colonies if the system is to function. Obviously an income tax levied by the State of Texas would not touch the tremendous profits of our great natural-resources industries. The properties are in Texas. The cash profits are translated into income in New York and Pittsburgh.

The relationship between the physical properties of corporations engaged in the production of natural resources and the realization of profits therefrom and the problem of determining an equitable basis of taxation thereon when the one is so widely separated from the other in geographical distance is well illustrated by three classic examples from our own State.

Texas has an almost complete monopoly of sulfur. For a decade we produced about 98 percent of the American supply. In 1938 Texas produced 86 percent of the total sulfur produced in the United States, or 64.3 percent of all the sulfur produced in the world. Two companies controlled that production—both, of course, "foreign" owned and managed—both closely related by affinity, if not by consanguinity, not only with each other but each with one, although not the same, giant oil company, and all together exercising a tremendous political influence in Texas; nor have the Texas Co., a Delaware corporation, and Mr. Mellon's Gulf Co., interested themselves in brimstone simply because the process of production was interesting. It has paid a fair profit.

According to its own books, Texas Gulf Sulphur Co. had invested in its company in Texas—at least, it had common stock outstanding—to the amount of $6,350,000 in 1921. Entirely aside from the unnumbered millions which have been "plowed in" since that time, the company during the next 16 years paid in cash dividends on that common stock over 100 percent per year, a total of $103,952,500, and for one company alone; and in 1938 Texas collected only $1,766,288.04 from its sulfur tax on all companies.

Texas also owns the world's greatest reservoirs of natural gas—I should say the world's greatest reservoirs of natural gas are within the boundaries of Texas. The pieces of paper representing ownership lie in other jurisdictions. In 1938 Texas produced 1,099,678,000,000 (trillion) cubic feet of natural gas, of which 68 percent is reported to have been used in Texas; but when we consider that a large part of this gas was used in the manufacture of carbon black, which was ultimately sold in the industrial East, we realize that in the final analysis Texas' citizens and Texas' industry used relatively little of this great resource. In times past there was far more gas blown into the air in Texas than was produced in any other State, but since the great gas companies came to the conclusion that it would be self-serving to prevent this waste the State has passed conservation laws; but this wealth, as reflected in the profits, still escapes the Texas tax collector, and 137,196,000,000 (billion) cubic feet of natural gas was blown off into the air as waste last year. That is another tragic consequence of the "foreign" ownership and control of the industry.

There are 75 gas-pipe lines serving the industry from Texas. About half of these, all very tiny ones, are more or less owned in Texas. The others handle Texas gas in the interest of the stockholders of eastern corporations. The 20 largest lines, all foreign owned, handle in the neighborhood of 90 percent of the total production. The Lone Star Gas Corporation, of Delaware, owns 6 of these and does an annual business of nearly one-third of the total; Electric Bond & Share Corporation, of New York, owns 5 and does a little more than one-third of the business. Although the large foreign-owned lines have for years shown tremendous profits ranging well in excess of $25,000,000 per year, the State of Texas in 1938 collected only $631,191.97 in gross-receipts taxes from all natural and casinghead gas produced in the entire State.

Gas and sulfur fade into insignificance when compared with the value of the products of the Texas oil fields. Texas produces approximately 40 percent of the entire output of crude oil in the United States and almost one-fourth, 24 percent, of the world's total supply. And this in the face of the fact that the actual daily production as of October 1, 1939, was only 2,100,000 barrels, out of a potential daily production of more than 35,000,000 barrels.

Last year the value of Texas oil was more than three times, nearly four times, the value of her cotton crop and I am sure that you all know that Texas is the greatest of all cotton-producing States. The value of our oil at the well—approximately half of a billion dollars—was 60 percent greater than the total value of all our agricultural products, and Texas ranks first in the Union in the production of agricultural crops. We have over half a million individual farms. Over 2,700,000 people live on those farms. Over a million more live off those farms. The oil industry employs in Texas in

all capacities, including the lobby at Austin, only about 200,000 people.

As in the case of natural gas, we have become entirely too efficient in producing oil. We are in danger of being drowned in a veritable flood of it, and we are still paying 18 cents a gallon for gasoline in Texas that sells for 15 cents in Washington, D. C. Of course, we are doing what we can to protect ourselves.

By choking down our flood of oil to a tiny trickle we have increased the price at the well by approximately $1 per barrel. We are producing 500,000,000 barrels per year. This means that the State of Texas has added around half a billion dollars per year to the income of the owners of these oil wells by governmental action. Would it be unreasonable for the State that created such values to ask the owners to share, say, 10 percent of their extra values with the Government that creates and maintains these values? I do not think this is an unfair request; yet back in 1936 when the Texas Legislature—of which I was then a member—increased the tax on crude oil to 2¾ cents per barrel, or to about 2¾ percent of its value, the oil lobby all shouted "confiscation." Yet the average farm will pay approximately this much on its value each year, and city property will pay twice that much. I own a little real property in Texas, and I would gladly pay a tax of 10 percent of its value at one time if I could thereby exempt it from all further taxation for all time to come, and that is just what the oil industry would be doing if it paid four times the production tax it is now paying. Under these circumstances, can it be said that a 10-percent tax on the value of crude oil, gas, and sulphur is inequitable? Certainly it is not out of line when compared with the tax bill of the masses of our people.

But the oil industry of Texas is not owned, Mr. Speaker, by the citizens of Texas. It is difficult to get a satisfactory figure on the ownership of oil wells. There are still a number of individual producers in Texas, and some of them are Texans, it is true, but their number is undoubtedly decreasing rapidly. It would not be understating it to say that 90 percent of all oil-producing properties of our State are owned by citizens of other jurisdictions.

When we consider pipe lines we have more adequate figures. There are 41 common carrier oil pipe lines serving Texas fields, almost all of them foreign-owned. The 18 largest companies handled approximately three-fourths of the total oil run. Yet one of these companies, which alone made a net income of $8,800,676 in 1 year, paid, according to the Governor's message to the Texas Legislature, only $95.77 taxes for the privilege of operating in Texas that year. These companies have been making around 25 percent yearly return on their investment, but the return is payable as income in Delaware or New York and Texas collected only a few thousand dollars as franchise tax from all of them.

Long ago the industrial States learned the gentle art of passing their taxes on to those communities, such as Texas, which produce raw materials and buy manufactured articles. It is true that those of you who have recently purchased automobiles found in the bill for your car no mention of a tax to the State of Michigan, but it was included in the manufacturer's costs and you paid it nevertheless. For years General Motors, Ford, and Chrysler have been very efficient tax-collecting agencies for the State of Michigan, and the taxes they have collected, while levied by that State against those companies, have been paid by the people of Texas and other "raw-material" States. The tax on automobile manufacturers is but an example—the same principle is followed by all of the manufacturing States of the world and we pay the bill. Nor can we of the "raw-material" States protect ourselves by the adoption of a like tax, because we do not manufacture any appreciable quantity of world necessities, but we do produce great quantities of indispensable basic natural resources that these same industrial States must have. Nor is there any good reason why the State of Texas should not constitute the exploiters of these resources, tax-collecting agencies for our own State, to collect from the people who finally use these resources a small sum to compensate our State for the loss of these irreplaceable assets.

A man may cultivate a farm for a hundred years, and, though he pays taxes each year, it will, if properly handled, lose none of its value. Not so with oil, gas, or sulphur. When taken from our soil these resources pay taxes in our State only one time, and the State then loses their value and is forever that much poorer. Once removed, these resources move into other States and may enrich New York stockholders, but never again will they contribute to the support of our Texas institutions.

In this connection it is interesting to note the difference between the farmer and the miner. These two are often carelessly spoken of together as being producer of raw materials or new wealth. It is true that both farmers and miners make new wealth in the form of raw material available to industry, but only the farmer and stockman "produce" new wealth. The farmer creates usable goods, and if he is a good farmer, repeats the process over and over again on the same land. The miner and well driller create nothing that did not already exist in the soil. He merely removes the minerals that God placed there. Neither the oil nor the sulphur drawn off this year can be grown again next year on the same land as could a crop of cotton or corn. The cultivation of our farms adds to the total wealth of the world. The operation of our oil wells but depletes our reserves.

Not all States, Mr. Speaker, have the opportunity to care for their local needs by a reasonable tax on natural resources, as does the State of Texas. A tax of only 10 percent of the value of oil, gas, and sulfur would, at present prices and at the present rate of production, produce well over $50,000,000 per year. With that amount of money Texas could and should abandon her State ad valorem tax entirely, pay the existing State deficit, and care for a reasonably liberal system of old-age pensions. Everyone familiar with the financial condition of the State knows that some such source of revenue must be found, and if we do not levy a natural-resource tax we will very probably fall victim to a general sales tax, which will take the full amount of the tax levy out of the channels of trade, which will burden the people least able to pay, reduce the purchasing power and employment, and subject honest Texas dealers to unfair out-of-State and mail-order competition, and involve the State and Federal Governments in additional and needless disputes.

On the other hand, if we collect the money by a natural-resource tax, we will actually bring new money into Texas. A natural-resource tax must obviously either be paid by the producers and be taken out of profits—stockholders' dividends—or it must be added to the cost and passed on to the ultimate consumer of the product. The oil and sulfur companies claim that the stockholders would have to absorb the tax. If this were true—and I do not think anyone believes it is—it must be admitted that most of the stock is owned beyond the borders of the State, and therefore the tax would be paid by foreign stockholders. If, however, the tax is added to the cost of the retail product, as it will undoubtedly be the final consumer will pay the bill; and where does this consumer live? More than 85 percent of all Texas oil and probably around 99 percent of all Texas sulfur is ultimately consumed outside of the State, so even if every dollar of tax is passed on to the ultimate consumer, as it will be, the citizens of Texas will only pay approximately $5,000,000 of the $50,000,000 which a 10-percent natural-resource tax would produce. On the other hand, it would bring in $45,000,000 of outside money into the State. The tax should be imposed for this reason if for no other.

Let me pause here, Mr. Speaker, to answer the two objections that have undoubtedly already suggested themselves to your mind. They are, of course, first, the question, Will not such a tax result in a loss of markets for Texas oil to oil produced elsewhere, particularly in Oklahoma and California?, and, second, Will not such a tax seriously cripple the small or marginal producer? These questions are both pertinent and both deserve a fair answer. Taking the second question first,

my answer is that we should probably give the marginal producer an advantage in tax. This was done in the natural-resource tax bill which I introduced in the Texas Senate while a member of that body in the fall of 1936. In that bill I proposed to tax oil produced from marginal wells only 5 percent of its value, as compared with a general tax of 10 percent. The term "marginal well" has long been defined by our Texas laws and our courts have upheld the right of the legislature to classify these wells and to impose different requirements on large and small producers. These marginal wells include all small producers, the maximum production varying with the depth of the well. The tax I proposed would have abolished all State ad valorem taxes on all property, including, of course, property used in production, as the well and the lease, which in some counties of the State exceeds 5 cents on each barrel of oil produced.

The increase in production tax on marginal wells would only be approximately 2¼ cents per barrel, so that the small producers would actually get a reduction of net as well as of gross taxation. According to the Railroad Commission of Texas, there were on October 1, 1939, a total of 88,934 oil wells in the State. Of this number, 35,758, or 40.18 percent, were marginal, and while they were allowed to produce to capacity while some of the other wells were restricted to a small fraction of their potential production, the entire number of marginal wells produced only 125,093 barrels daily in the year of 1938, or 5.9 percent of the total of the State's production. Therefore we could give these small producers an actual reduction in their taxes and at the same time we would not materially jeopardize the total revenue to the State by extending a 5-percent rate to the marginal wells. These marginal wells are the ones that are most generally owned locally and are entitled to a preferential treatment in order that they may not be abandoned and the ultimate recovery reduced and laborers thrown out of employment.

The answer to the question of loss of markets merely requires that we consider the location of our oil reserves with reference to the markets of the world. Three States produce more than three-fourths of all of the oil of the United States. They are: Texas, with a production of 39.2 percent of the Nation's total; Oklahoma, with 14.4 percent; and California, with 20.6 percent. There is no other State that could supplant these three in supplying the Nation's need because no other State produces enough oil. Not only does Texas produce more oil than both of her two nearest rivals combined, but our production is so located with reference to the markets of the world that Texas oil can reach these markets more cheaply than oil produced from either of our competitors.

We must bear in mind that the cost of a barrel of oil, when delivered in the markets of the world, either on the Atlantic seaboard or in Europe, includes not only the cost of production—drilling, leases, royalty, and so forth—but it includes as well the transportation charges incurred in getting it to market. There is no difference in production costs in the three States that can be related to State lines. Of course some wells cost more than others, but this difference in cost exists within each State and not between States.

We must then look at the cost of transportation to determine whether Texas oil could stand a higher tax than it now carries. Mr. Speaker, oil moves, as does any other commodity, most cheaply by deep water, and it is by deep water that Texas oil reaches the markets of the world. Both Texas and California enjoy the benefits of ocean rates at their very doors or wells. The cost of putting oil to shipside is about the same in the two States, but according to the American Petroleum Institute it has heretofore cost approximately 46 cents per barrel to move a barrel of oil by tanker from the port of Los Angeles to New York, while the same authority quotes the rate from Port Arthur, Tex., to New York at 14 cents. The Department of Commerce advises me that since the outbreak of the European war the shipping charges have increased to around 30 cents per barrel from any Gulf port to New York, and that there is now no movement of oil from Los Angeles. This means, under normal conditions, that Texas oil can be delivered in New York for approximately 32 cents per barrel less than California oil, and that even with a 10-cent tax Texas oil could be sold in New York at 22 cents per barrel less than California oil with no tax.

As to Oklahoma, the difference is equally striking. Oklahoma oil must move through Texas ports, and while it is, of course, true that after reaching the port the cost of transportation to the world markets is the same as that of Texas oil, there is a very decided difference in the cost of putting it to the port. I have in my office the published tariffs of several of the large common-carrier pipe-line companies, who operate in both Texas and Oklahoma. These tariffs show that it costs a minimum of 25 cents per barrel pipe-line charges to move a barrel of oil from any Oklahoma field to Port Arthur or Houston. There is also a minimum gathering charge of 10 cents per barrel on all Oklahoma oil. To this must be added a tax of 5 cents per barrel now levied and collected by the State of Oklahoma. This makes a total of 40 cents overhead on each barrel of Oklahoma oil before it starts its ocean voyage. On the other hand, these same tariffs show that in the East Texas field, which represents the bulk of Texas production and a fair average of transportation costs in our State, the pipelines rates are 12½ cents per barrel, plus a 5-cent gathering charge, which, with a 10 cents per barrel tax, would make a total overhead at shipside of only 27½ cents per barrel, or 12½ cents per barrel less than for Oklahoma oil.

The only other American State that can possibly compete with Texas is Louisiana, which only accounts for 7.8 percent of American production, and, while their freight rates compare favorably with our own—they are now identical—their production is small and they now levy a tax on oil production ranging up to 11 cents per barrel, dependent upon the gravity of the oil, and averaging in excess of 8 cents per barrel. And this tax has not destroyed the oil industry of Louisiana.

Another favorite criticism of the oil lobby to this tax is their long-whiskered plea that "the oil industry pays half the taxes of Texas anyway." In arriving at these figures they take credit for the $40,000,000 realized from the 4-cent gasoline tax which my State collects, just as most of other States do, and of which every cent is paid by the ultimate consumer. In fact, in their own reports to their stockholders these great oil companies do not claim to pay any gasoline tax, but simply report it as "gasoline taxes collected for States." When this item is eliminated it is readily seen that the great oil industry, which takes so many multiplied millions from Texas, leaves a very meager sum in Texas in the form of taxes. Nor do the financial reports of the companies to their stockholders show that they are paying any great amount of tax to any State. The annual report of Standard Oil Co. of New York—now known as Socony Vacuum Oil Co.—issued to its stockholders in May 1939 shows that the assets of that giant corporation were last year $923,428,918.30, but the same report shows that it paid in taxes of all kinds the sum of only $23,643,001.30, including both Federal and State income and property and miscellaneous taxes, or about 2.5 percent on the value of its assets. It hardly bears out the claim that the oil companies are overtaxed. Other great oil companies show even smaller taxes paid. The Texas Corporation, which is Texas only in name, shows assets of $605,360,644.26, and "taxes for the year 1938, excluding State gasoline and Federal excise taxes, were $13,484,654.44," or 2.2 percent total tax on the property owned, including all income taxes. The figures for the Gulf Oil Corporation are about the same. I cannot understand, Mr. Speaker, how any citizen of Texas who is paying around 5 percent of the value of his property in ad valorem taxes can for a moment ever consider the advisability of further burdening himself and his neighbors with a sales tax, while these great foreign-owned corporations are escaping with such an insignificant levy; but we have many unexplainable inconsistencies in our tax system in Texas. It is, however, interesting to note that none of the mistakes of our taxing system have ever been made against the interests of the oil companies. I take it that is a tribute to the ability and industry of the oil lobby that fills the hotels of Austin.

Under our present laws, Mr. Speaker, Texas takes from her own citizens from 30 to 45 times as much in the way of taxes

if they consume or use a barrel of Texas oil as the State takes in taxes if the same barrel of oil is used beyond our borders. If the oil is produced in east Texas and shipped to Washington, D. C., in either its crude or refined condition, the State of Texas receives a gross-production tax of approximately 2¾ cents and no more. If, on the other hand, the same oil should be refined in Texas, that barrel will give labor to Texas citizens and will produce under average conditions 19 gallons of gasoline. If the most modern methods of refining are used, a barrel of oil may produce 29 gallons of gasoline. If the gasoline is sold in Texas by Texas dealers to Texas citizens, the State takes not only the 2¾ cents production tax but a tax of 4 cents per gallon on the gasoline, or a total of from 78¾ cents to $1.22¾.

The major portion of the value of our Texas resources is the gift of Providence augmented by the action of the State, and only a very small portion of this value can be attributed to the ingenuity or industry of the great corporations which appropriate the profits. A natural resource, or any other commodity, the major portion of which is consumed outside the State, should carry all the tax it can without putting it at a disadvantage in the markets of the world. It does not cost any more to produce a natural resource in Texas than elsewhere; therefore capital invested here can return to the State a large part of the profits accruing from our favorable location and still enjoy greater profits than in other States.

It is trite to say that our present social, economic, and political structure is characterized by continual change. It is self-evident that these changes call for new solutions of old problems. We can defer our thinking on these things for a time, but the responsibility remains. Only real statesmanship can enact adequate legislation. The answer that undoubtedly suggests itself to many minds is "Federal control"—"Federal taxation"—and I must confess that I can see no other possibility if the greatest oil-producing State in the Union is to continue to "break the market" with its tax system and to "undersell" its competitors. Not for long can the oil companies, powerful though they are, continue to play one State against the other and prevent any of the great natural resource producing States from subjecting them to fair tax burdens. If the oil companies persist in their present policy of forcing a sales tax on States like Texas in lieu of a reasonable natural resource tax, they cannot long expect the support of States like Louisiana or even Oklahoma where severance taxes are two or three times as great as in Texas in their fight against Federal control. And with Federal control will come Federal severance taxes.

Mr. Speaker, for years the oil companies have had things very much their own way as far as taxation was concerned in my State, but I believe that I can see the light of a new day in the eastern sky. As that day dawns those exploiters of our natural resources must choose whether they will cooperate with the people of Texas in the support of our State government, of our schools, of our aged, or whether they will continue to insist on the special privileges and tax exemptions that they have so long enjoyed, and subject themselves to the rigors of Federal control and taxation which will not enrich our State, but which will leave them poor, indeed. The choice, Mr. Speaker, is with those who have grown great and rich on the resources of my State. I hope that their choice may be one of cooperation with the people who have done so much for them.

The Reciprocal Trade-Agreements Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 3, 1939

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, restoration of our trade with foreign countries was one of the vital problems affecting our domestic economy when the present administration in Washington came to power. Secretary of State Cordell Hull had pioneered zealously for a more liberal commercial foreign policy, and his efforts bore fruit in the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act passed by the Congress of the United States on June 12, 1934, after careful study of all pertinent facts. The act authorizes the President to negotiate with foreign governments for the reciprocal modification of excessive and uneconomical tariff rates. By such a procedure freer access to the markets of the world is provided for the products of our agriculture and industry, while at the same time our American markets for domestic products are safeguarded with adequate tariff protection. Our domestic prosperity is so closely related to foreign trade that permanent rehabilitation of our agriculture and industry is in a very great degree dependent upon restoration of our international trade.

The exigencies of the World War stimulated the building of our productive capacity far in excess of our normal peacetime requirements. Europe, whose production was greatly curtailed as a result of the war, was left heavily burdened with billions of dollars in foreign debts and the urgent necessity of obtaining by a redevelopment of their former foreign markets the foreign exchange necessary for the servicing and the payment of those debts, as well as for the rehabilitation of its own productive facilities. During the period of reconstruction following the war, we were able for a time—during the 1920's—to maintain our foreign markets by lending billions of dollars to European governments to pay for our products instead of increasing our imports from Europe as a means of payment for our exports. The prosperity which resulted from such a trade was artificial and fundamentally unsound. Trade cannot continue to flow in one direction indefinitely.

Proponents of excessively high tariff barriers fail to recognize the far reaching disruptive effect that a policy of economic nationalism has on domestic prosperity. The United States has experienced the bitter results of such a policy. Under the Hawley-Smoot Tariff Act, enacted in 1930, tariff rates were raised to embargo levels. Foreign countries with which we normally carried on prosperous trade finding our markets barred to them and seeing their gold reserves gradually being depleted in a degree to seriously affect the stability of their currency quickly retaliated with such restrictive trade measures as import quotas, import licenses, compensation agreements, foreign-exchange control, and clearing agreements.

In the period following enactment of the Hawley-Smoot Tariff Act our foreign trade dropped to a fraction of its former level. Exports of American products dropped from $5,241,000,000 to $1,611,000,000 between 1929 and 1932. The economic repercussions resulting from such a severe loss of trade adversely affected the well-being of every community in the Nation. Industries, finding their sales in our customary foreign markets dropping off to a mere driblet, took the only escape open to them—curtailed production, lay-off of workers, and reduction in salaries. In the case of agriculture the adjustment in the face of a weakened and restricted demand for its products was made in drastically lowered prices, although substantially maintaining its volume of production. Agriculture was thus adversely affected in two ways—first, by restricted exports, and, second, by severely reduced industrial pay rolls undermining effective demand for farm products in home markets.

Since our capacity to produce has been developed to an extent to meet the requirements of world markets and since our high standard of living has been largely due to that fact, restoration of world trade is absolutely essential to our domestic prosperity. In pursuance of that objective, the Government is seeking, through the medium of reciprocal modification of the barriers which in the past few years have blockaded foreign markets, to open the avenues to foreign markets. This is being accomplished by direct negotiation with foreign governments.

Revival of world trade securely planted on a firm foundation of permanent stability cannot be accomplished with spectacular speed. The difficult and complex problems arising in

connection with the reciprocal modification of trade barriers require considerable time for negotiation. Negotiation is essentially a long, slow process. Intricate problems arising in the course of negotiation require careful examination and analysis.

Restoration of foreign commerce and the benefits resulting from the increased marketing opportunities obtained through reciprocal-trade agreements are not enjoyed alone by those branches of our agriculture and industry dependent on foreign markets but, because they result in a net increase in trade and stimulate increased production, are also shared by all the other enterprises making up our national economy.

In a world in which certain countries are struggling to establish economic nationalism and attain self-sufficiency, the United States is demonstrating that the way to economic prosperity is through more abundant foreign trade. The progress being made by the reciprocal trade agreements program in restoring our foreign markets is clearly indicated by the following study recently made by the Department of Commerce.

United States foreign trade with trade-agreement countries and with all others, 1937–38 compared with 1934–35

[Value in millions of dollars]

	1934 and 1935 average value	1937 and 1938 average value	Change	
			Value	Percent
UNITED STATES EXPORTS, INCLUDING REEXPORTS				
Total, all trade-agreement countries [1]	759.8	1,224.8	+465.0	+61.2
Total, all nonagreement countries	1,448.0	1,996.8	+548.8	+37.9
Total, all countries	2,207.8	3,221.6	+1,013.8	+45.9
UNITED STATES GENERAL IMPORTS				
Total, all trade-agreement countries [1]	793.9	1,073.6	+279.7	+35.2
Total, all nonagreement countries	1,057.4	1,448.5	+391.1	+37.0
Total, all countries	1,851.3	2,522.1	+670.8	+36.2

[1] Including the 17 countries (and colonies) with which agreements were in operation during the greater part of the last 12 months. Only 1 of the agreements was in operation throughout 1935, 6 throughout 1936, 12 by the middle of 1936, 15 by the middle of 1937, and 18 by the end of 1938. The last (with Ecuador) only came into force on Oct. 23, 1938, and is therefore not yet included in the above calculations as an agreement country. The new agreement with Canada, and the agreement with the United Kingdom (including Newfoundland and non-self-governing British colonies) which became effective Jan. 1, 1939, and the agreement with Turkey, effective on May 5, 1939, bring the number to 20.

Common Sense Wins

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SOL BLOOM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 3, 1939

EDITORIAL BY FELIX MORLEY

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I have heard and read many speeches and editorials on the different phases and aspects of neutrality, but I believe that the editorial of November 3, 1939, by Mr. Felix Morley, editor of the Washington Post, entitled "Common Sense Wins," is one of the most lucidly informative I have yet had the pleasure of reading. It is one of the very best that Mr. Morley has written on neutrality, and because of its interest and value at this time I desire to call it to the attention of the House. I quote:

[From the Washington Post of November 3, 1939]

Those who wished to see the arms embargo retained set great store by the House vote. In spite of the smashing Senate verdict for repeal they were optimistic right up to the balloting yesterday afternoon. It was argued that the House, subject to complete replacement every 2 years, would be more responsive to propaganda than the Senate. And nobody knows the strength of the propaganda against repeal better than those who were made its victims.

The large majorities by which the bill was yesterday hastened to final passage therefore possess a significance even greater than that of the legislation now happily on the verge of enactment. They show that the House is no less a deliberative body than the Senate. They show that Congress as a body cannot be stampeded by feverishly whipped-up pressures. Those ballots yesterday show, in short, that the American system of representative government is still functioning. Our democracy has not yet degenerated into mob rule.

Unquestionably the great majority of those who opposed embargo repeal did so with perfect sincerity. But the arguments used by this side were for the most part emotional rather than rational. Without a scintilla of effective evidence it was asserted that repeal is of itself likely to involve the United States, to prolong the war, to "put the blood of millions on our heads," as a group of self-styled "peace organizations" asserted no later than yesterday. This sort of outcry is virtually hysteria.

What the legislation actually does has been almost lost to sight amid the shrieks and shouts, the groans and moans, with which it has been enveloped. Actually the United States is about to put into effect a sweeping self-denying ordinance, scrapping the doctrine of the freedom of the seas, abandoning traditional and unquestionable neutral rights, all for the sake of strengthening the safeguards against war. As a small offset to this wholesale surrender the administration is mildly reasserting the right of American nationals to sell munitions, provided they are bought for cash and shipped in foreign bottoms.

Because there is a point at which the country does not propose to surrender its sovereignty in behalf of belligerents a furious and wholly emotional storm has been whipped up by organizations whose antecedents are in some cases of dubious character. The pacifist propaganda is understandable. There are some people, and they are wholly honest, who would rather see the United States destroyed than take arms to defend it. The complete isolationist viewpoint is also understandable. But these and other honorable groups alone did not account for all the sound and fury of the embargo advocates.

Included in the strange line-up against repeal were all the Communists, all the bund adherents, all the quasi-Fascist groups, all the professional Anglophobes. Together they made a formidable if chaotic assortment, sufficiently numerous to bring to their side many of the disillusioned, the ignorant, the credulous, and the self-seeking. Not by reasoning, but merely from its own momentum, the embargo movement gained many adherents who could not have advanced a single cogent argument against repeal.

Like "ham and eggs" in California a movement of this sort, partly emotional, partly wishful, and partly self-seeking, can easily become a serious problem for a democracy. The effective arguments—legal, moral, patriotic, and economic—always favored repeal. But it almost seemed for a time that common sense might be overwhelmed and the vital congressional function of analysis subordinated to an essentially ridiculous mass emotionalism.

That danger has happily been averted. But, it was more threatening to the United States than any of the bogies conjured up by the opponents of repeal.

Proposed Neutrality Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WADE H. KITCHENS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 3, 1939

Mr. KITCHENS. Mr. Speaker, it is said that the decision we are to make on whether or not to lift the embargo on arms, munitions, and implements of war in the present Neutrality Act is most important. In my opinion, it will be a momentous decision.

Are we to decide that every nation, both great and small, is to isolate itself and be self-dependent for means of defense? If so, the only alternative is for every nation hereafter to devote its energies, resources, and the ingenuity of its people to building up a great military machine for self-defense. Japan, Russia, Italy, and Germany today are military nations, and are aggressor nations, and have millions and millions of their citizens armed for the purpose of aggression. They are devoting all of their energies and resources to the formation of absolute dictatorial and aggressive military nations under military lords and masters. If the neutral nations are to surrender their rights to furnishing each other supplies and means of defense, then we have the most serious situation confronting us today, and the most

important that was ever presented to the American people or to the people of any other peaceful nation, or to mankind since the time of recorded history.

It certainly is understood that the United States Government will not sell one dime's worth of arms, munitions, or implements of war to any nation, nor will it loan or furnish one dime for any nation to purchase arms and munitions.

It was Stephen Decatur, a little more than a century ago, who said:

> Our country! In her intercourse with foreign nations may she always be in the right; but our country, right or wrong!

There is nothing wrong with the statement of Stephen Decatur when it comes to patriotism or love of country. However, I prefer to quote at this time one of America's distinguished statesmen, a former member of the Senate of the United States, a man born of German parents near Cologne, Germany. I refer to Hon. Carl Schurz, who, in 1872 in the Senate in this Capitol, said:

> Our country, right or wrong! When right to be kept right; when wrong, to be put right!

Not a single Member of this House has ever said that he favored aggressor nations or their dictators. On the contrary, all of those who oppose repeal of the arms-embargo provision of our Neutrality Act state they hate dictators, militarists, and aggressors and love peace and peaceful people.

Some Members oppose repeal, not upon the merits, but on the ground that after war starts, to repeal the embargo provision would be an unneutral act. In other words, we have been caught with a domestic enactment that works wrongfully and unjustly, but due to circumstances over which we have no control we are not to correct a wrong or to "put ourselves right," as Carl Schurz would say. They state that it will be unneutral to change the rules of the game after the game starts. The trouble about this reasoning is it is not our game, we are not a party thereto, and had nothing to do with the origin of the game. We were not consulted as to rules nor asked to make rules for the game of war that is now being played. If we should venture to suggest some rules to govern the conduct of the war or game, if you like, it would be deemed impertinent by the parties playing the game. That war is not our war, and we are merely making rules to govern our own conduct, and not the conduct of others, so we can be fair and honorable and not be wrongfully aiding by law the perpetration of injustice.

Mr. Speaker, I stated we were not responsible for this war in Europe. However, I feel that our arms embargo encouraged the beginning of the war.

The leader of those opposing repeal—and I refer to the gentleman from New York, Hon. HAMILTON FISH—has vigorously fought repeal on the ground that it would make us a party to the war and put us immediately into the war. He was so sincere in his belief that he organized, in May of this year, a sort of rump congress composed of 36 Republicans and 1 Democrat. This select committee and, so far as most of the Members are concerned, a secret committee placed themselves upon a high pedestal of morality and patriotism and took an attitude, possibly innocent, against all the other Members of Congress. It is well known that the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] has an unquenchable hatred of the President. He is ranking member of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House and chairman of the delegation to attend the Interparliamentary Union at Oslo, Norway, this year.

He went to Europe on his way to Oslo and there assumed and arrogated to himself the functions of our State Department and of our President in foreign affairs. He nominated and appointed himself, it seems to me, as a sort of Ambassador Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary, and proceeded to seek consultations and conferences with the Nazi leaders of Germany. Notoriety and publicity hampered his negotiations. He advised them that the Versailles Treaty should be scrapped and that Germany should have Danzig and the corridor to Prussia. He no doubt assured these leaders of his position and of the great efforts he would make to prevent any nation, great or small, which Germany might attack from obtaining arms, munitions, or implements of war from the United States. In other words, he had organized to hold the embargo in our law. In my opinion, these Nazi leaders were encouraged to proceed and take Danzig and destroy Poland. Therefore unofficially the war might be called, in a way, of our own making. The gentleman from New York and his committee of 36 was going to ask funds from every source available with which to defeat a repeal of the arms embargo and, as they claim, prevent America from becoming involved in any war. I sometimes wonder why the lone Democrat was induced to become a member, but probably for the purpose of prestige and making it bipartisan or nonpartisan, as the case may be.

Mr. Speaker, I have studied international law. I am fairly familiar with the great work of Hugo Grotius. He is recognized by all nations and by all men of legal learning as the founder of international law. As a basis for neutrality 300 years ago, Hugo Grotius set forth the following premise:

> It is the duty of those who profess neutrality in war to do nothing toward increasing the strength of a party maintaining an unjust cause, nor to impede the measures of a power engaged in a just and righteous cause.

It is my humble opinion that the provision in our neutrality law for an embargo on arms and munitions, admitted to be in derogation of the common law of nations and contrary to the policies of peaceful nations for 300 years, increases the strength of militaristic nations and helps them to maintain an unjust cause. It must be admitted that the embargo provision of our Neutrality Act impedes the measures of any peaceful, nonaggressize power or powers engaged in a just and righteous cause. On the floor of this House it is almost unanimous that Germany is engaged in an unjust cause. It must be admitted that England and France are impeded while engaged in a just and righteous cause of defense against military aggressors engaged in destroying nations.

I have listened to many speeches made upon this proposed Neutrality Act. I have listened to the opponents of repeal denouncing the Versailles Treaty—denouncing our entrance into the World War. I have listened to them as they have detailed the horrors of war. I have listened to them wail and almost weep while describing the destruction of human beings, the mangling of men, and the killing of women and children, and of towns plastered with brains and blood—of men running in all directions, wildly, insane, with eyes bulging from their sockets. I have listened to them describe wounded men lying on the ground, biting their nails and the ground. I have listened to them tell of little children holding up whimperingly the stumps of their arms in appeal to their mothers who were dead. I have listened to such nauseating yet true descriptions, and wondered why people do not stop and think—why some of us in Congress do not think.

Mr. Speaker, from 1914 to 1918, 1,357,000 fine young Frenchmen were killed by being shot down, blown to pieces, or poisoned with gas; over 900,000 young Englishmen were shot down or blown to pieces; over 650,000 fine young Italian men were destroyed; 1,700,000 young Russians were shot to death; 335,000 young Rumanian men were slaughtered; 126,000 fine young Americans were killed or died of disease; 44,000 of them were mangled, arms and legs shot off, eyes shot out, face disfigured; and our hospitals today are filled with thousands of these young Americans. Hospitals of England, France, Italy, Russia, Rumania are likewise filled with men disabled by rifles, machine guns, bombs, and poison gas. Belgium was overrun and thousands upon thousands of her people were killed. The homes of millions were blown from the face of the earth. Mr. Speaker, I ask you, Who killed all of those millions of young men of France, England, Italy, Russia, Rumania, and the United States? I ask you, Who caused all the misery, suffering, and heartaches of millions of young men who have been languishing in our hospitals for the last 25 years? Do I need tell you it was a dictatorial Germany? Yet I hear Members of Congress denouncing the Versailles Treaty. Who caused the Versailles Treaty? In proportion to the horrible crimes and injustice committed by Germany from 1914 to November 11, 1918, that treaty was too benevolent.

Mr. Speaker, during the present war in Europe I have seen the pictures, read accounts, and know that millions of little children, women, sick people, and old people have been forced from their homes and country. I ask you, Who caused that? Germany has even now destroyed her former ally, Austria, murdered her premier and thousands of Austrians, and took by force the Austrian Government and destroyed it; and yet Austria sacrificed 1,200,000 of her young men to aid Germany in the killing and destruction I have mentioned. Germany has recently, by force and threats of destruction, due to her great military might, destroyed Czechoslovakia, a peaceful country, a democratic country. Germany likewise has destroyed Poland and thousands upon thousands of her citizens unjustly. Women and children were bombed and slaughtered and hundreds of thousands of the citizens of Poland were forced to flee their country with a few belongings, and are now in refuge in other countries.

Mr. Speaker, the man at the head of Germany recently celebrated the German victory over the Poles, a nation of 35,000,000 people. After the destruction of Poland, Herr Hitler went in triumphant procession to the city of Warsaw, the capital of Poland, and there boasted of his might and power and, in the presence of the mortified bodies of women and children in the ruins of Warsaw, boasted that other nations would receive the same fate if they did not submit to his dictation and subjugation.

Mr. Speaker, it is said that only England and France will be able to purchase arms and munitions from the United States. It is said that these arms, munitions, and planes will be used to kill innocent children and women. No; I cannot be convinced they will purchase arms and munitions for any such purpose. I believe they will purchase arms and munitions to stop aggressors, vandals, and murderers. I believe they will purchase arms and munitions to prevent women and children, and the women and children of small countries, from being bombed and murdered and their countries overrun by military aggressors. I know when we were in France in 1917 and 1918 we were not engaged in killing babies, children, or women, but madmen. We were engaged in stopping the wanton killing of millions of human beings, and the preservation of our civilization.

Mr. Speaker, I am not going to vote to repeal the arms embargo in our Neutrality Act because of sentiment. I am going to vote to repeal it so that this country of ours will do nothing toward increasing the strength of a party maintaining an unjust cause, and so that this country may not impede the measures of a power or powers engaged in a just and righteous cause.

Hugo Grotius, in his great work on international law, further said:

> It frequently happens that it is an act of greater piety and rectitude to yield a right than to enforce it.

From the foundation of this Government until the present time this Nation has insisted upon the freedom of the seas. We went to war in 1917 because Germany ruthlessly destroyed, without warning or mercy, many of our ships engaged in lawful commerce under international law. Our hospital ships bearing medical supplies to the wounded, diseased, and sick were wantonly sunk. We fought to prevent such destruction of our rights on the high seas. Today we are yielding for the present some of our rights on the seas, and, according to Grotius, we are doing an act of piety and rectitude rather than plunge our country into war again. We are today, under the proposed act, preventing any American ship carrying any supplies or any article whatsoever, of any kind or description, to any of the fighting nations, and we are preventing them from going into danger zones. There can be no more sinking of American ships, as was done in 1916 and 1917, for the reason our ships will bear no arms, no munitions, and no supplies to either of the belligerents, and our ships will not go into any war or danger zones. We will even cease allowing our ships to go to neutrals like Holland in the sincere desire to avoid war.

Mr. Speaker, I shall cast my vote so as to enable peaceful nations to defend their homes, liberty, people, and prevent the killing of their citizens. I do not want our Nation to become a military nation and be burdened hereafter with four or five million soldiers and an enormous fleet. I do not wish other peaceful nations to be forced to become militaristic and be burdened with the cost of armaments; but, as surely as we live, unless dictators are checked in their efforts to dominate the world, it will be necessary for each nation to become militaristic. All small nations will be destroyed. Belgium, Holland, Finland, Denmark, Norway, Sweden, and Switzerland are today in great terror. They are gravely threatened and forced in order to defend their homes and people to bare their breasts at their borders against the greatest military machine on this earth.

I shall vote upon this proposed measure, as I see it, to prevent the spilling of innocent blood and the ruthless destruction of human beings, their homes, churches, liberty, and peaceful nations. I shall vote in the interest of the people of the United States, of the people of the American Continent, and of all peaceful, Christian nations in this world. My vote will be against militarism and dictators, and in favor of Americanism and the American form of government.

The Town That Wouldn't Admit Defeat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT G. ALLEN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 3, 1939

ARTICLE FROM NATION'S BUSINESS

Mr. ALLEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under authority given me to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to insert a story from Nation's Business with the title "A Town That Wouldn't Admit Defeat." This town of Scottdale lies in my congressional district, and I am naturally proud that the fight which our citizens have waged against overwhelming economic obstacles has merited the attention of such a publication as Nation's Business. I am proud of Scottdale and of what it has accomplished. The following story clearly indicates that the morale of our people is high, and that they are determined to solve their own problems locally insofar as they are able. After all, it is such spirit as this which will preserve our country as the greatest democracy in the world and which will insure to succeeding generations the same blessings which have been ours.

The article follows:

[From Nation's Business for November 1939]

A TOWN THAT WOULDN'T ADMIT DEFEAT

(By Francis McQuillin)

"What would you do if you were a businessman in a community where industrial inactivity has caused 90 percent of the population to be unemployed for 3 years; where 40 percent of the available business sites are vacant; where a Federal Emergency Relief Administration representative classed us as being the second hardest hit town in the United States?"

Such was the opening paragraph of a letter signed by the Scottdale (Pa.) Board of Trade and sent to President Roosevelt April 20, 1934.

When a board of trade reaches the point where it publicly acknowledges that its community is economically next to the worst in the country, its plight must be desperate. In April 1934 Scottdale's plight was desperate.

Founded in 1873 as a rural outpost on the newly constructed southwest branch of the Pennsylvania Railroad, whose president, Col. Thomas A. Scott, it was named for, the borough of Scottdale soon became an active shipping point for a rich agricultural section. With the development of the surrounding bituminous coal fields and the growing beehive coke industry centered at Connellsville a few miles away, Scottdale quickly became a thriving industrial center.

Scottdale's earliest industry was the McKinney blast furnace, which turned ore from a nearby mine into pig iron, using coke from the local ovens. In 1877 Scottdale citizens organized a steel sheet mill which was later destined to become an important unit in the American Sheet & Tin Plate Co. In 1882 Henry Clay Frick founded the H. C. Frick Coal & Coke Co., which became a subsidiary of the United States Steel, with headquarters at Scottdale. The Foundry & Supply Co. was established in 1884. Two years later local interests organized the United States Pipe & Foundry Co. Although the population was never more than 10,000, Scottdale became a miniature boom town.

During the prosperous war years and the lean years which followed, Scottdale's industries continued to flourish and new ones sprang up. The original sheet mill was supplemented by a more modern and larger plant, and the two mills became important units in the American Sheet & Tin Plate Co. From its small beginnings, the pipe foundry developed into the world's largest manufacturer of cast-iron pipe. A modern Y. M. C. A. building was constructed, many new churches were established, new streets were laid out and quickly lined with modern houses, schools were built, bank deposits swelled to $9,000,000, and a country club was started. In 1928 a progressive group of businessmen formed the Scottdale Board of Trade. That same year 43 high-school graduates out of a class of seventy-three went on to college. Scottdale's future seemed assured.

PAY LINES REPLACED BY BREAD LINES

Then came the crash. The Scottdale sheet mill closed, leaving 1,200 men jobless. Another 1,000 workers were left without a source of income when the pipe foundry closed. Managements of both companies had done all they could to keep these plants going. They had built up huge stock piles to make work, they had reduced prices, but orders had ceased to come in. After the plants closed they transferred as many workers as possible to other plants.

Long lines of workers waiting for pay envelopes soon gave place to bread lines. Banks closed, businesses failed, among them some of Scottdale's pioneers. One of two movie houses was boarded up, the other played to a half empty house 2 nights a week. The bright lights of Pittsburgh Street, the borough's principal thoroughfare, faded. In their place appeared an ever lengthening row of darkened store windows framing "for rent" signs. A padlock hung from the doors of the Y. M. C. A. In June Scottdale High graduated 106, but only 12 could afford to go on to college. Eight out of every ten Scottdale citizens were on relief.

Members of Scottdale's Board of Trade spent many hours in conference with officials of closed plants in efforts to get these plants reopened. Representatives called on Congressmen, wrote to Gen. Hugh Johnson, who then headed the N. R. A.

The pipe company's executives were sympathetic but powerless to help. They had another plant in the South which could produce at lower cost than the northern plant. A change in freight rates also favored the southern foundry. Anyway, there was little market for cast-iron pipe. From the Steel Corporation officials the board heard a similar story:

"We would like to help Scottdale, but there is only enough business to operate two or three of the corporation's smaller mills. Scottdale's sheet mill is large and unfitted to supply hand-to-mouth buyers. If national prosperity were restored, then the plant would be reopened."

As the depression dragged on, conditions grew worse. Tax collections which had reached $200,000 in 1929, dwindled. There was not enough money in the borough's cash drawer to meet the bills for essential public services. Street lights were reduced to a minimum, fire protection was severely curtailed, while the handful of citizens who could still afford automobiles bounced and jolted over streets long in need of repair. Having exhausted every resource, the board of trade dissolved.

Scottdale had in truth become a ghost town.

For the country at large, business revival seemed to start slowly but surely late in 1935 but not for Scottdale which had two huge white elephants on its hands. In 6 years of disuse, the sheet mill and pipe foundry had grown obsolete. Continued maintenance had kept up the outward appearance but technological advances had made the machinery inside obsolete. Local efforts to reopen them met with discouragement.

Spirits were at a low ebb when a group of the most determined local businessmen and civic leaders met with the industrial development representative of the West Penn Power Co., which supplies Scottdale's electric service, to plan for Scottdale's rehabilitation. After some discussion, they decided to abandon all efforts to get the former mills reopened and devote their energies toward getting new industries for Scottdale.

First step was to compile an inventory of what Scottdale had to offer prospective industries. Even the most sanguine were surprised at the results of this inventory. With all the facts assembled, Scottdale seemed to offer a veritable paradise for certain types of industry.

To begin with, Scottdale had an abundance of workers skilled in the metal-working trades, predominantly native-born and with a long record of friendly relations with management. In addition Scottdale was a good place to live, with no crowded slums, many modern homes, broad, shaded streets, first-class schools, churches of many denominations, small bonded indebtedness, and low taxes. Production of iron, steel, aluminum, brass, alloys, glass, and plastics centers around Pittsburgh, which is only an hour's drive from Scottdale. Two-thirds of all United States families live within reach of an overnight train ride.

To top it off, Scottdale had two plants suitable for many types of manufacture all ready for some industry to move into. Most important of all, every Scottdale citizen stood ready to help new industries get off to a good start, because everyone realized that the whole future of his community depended on industrial development.

Strangely enough, Scottdale's first good break resulted from another community's misfortune. After the Ohio River flood of 1937, the rumor reached the Scottdale committee that a steel company in a neighboring State had tired of trying to keep the river away from its door. The committee sent a representative to confer with the steel company's officials and interest them in a Scottdale location.

After talking with officials of the Duraloy Co., manufacturers of special analysis steel castings, the representative learned that they were definitely in the market for a new plant location. In fact, they were already considering several locations. The Scottdale representative outlined the advantages of a Scottdale location and finally elicited a promise that the officials would make no decision until they had seen Scottdale. A date was set for a trip to Scottdale with the suggestion that the officials bring their wives.

SHOWING THE TOWN AS IS

Members of the Scottdale committee were overjoyed when their emissary returned with this news. Then the question arose, What could be done to make a favorable impression? Though they were aware that their community presented anything but a prosperous appearance, the committee decided against any suggestion of window dressing. They had the vacant cast iron pipe foundry which could be obtained at a reasonable price and easily converted to the needs of a modern steel foundry. They had many natural advantages such as cheap fuel, electric power, skilled labor, and good transportation. They could offer good housing and good living conditions. Above all, they would show a friendly spirit of willing cooperation.

The crucial day arrived. After being greeted by a committee composed of the borough manager, council members, and leading businessmen, the Duraloy officials visited the vacant property. Meantime a group of local women accompanied the officials' wives on a tour of the community, pointing out the desirable houses available, the schools, churches, and places of interest. This tour ended with a luncheon in the home of one of the welcoming committee.

Apparently the Duraloy representatives and their wives were impressed because they immediately started negotiations for the vacant plant. Owners of the plant, eager to aid Scottdale's comeback, made their terms particularly attractive.

Duraloy took over the plant.

It was Scottdale's first good break. The Independent-Observer, Scottdale's newspaper, got out a special edition to commemorate the occasion. The Scottdale committee took a new lease on life and set out to find more industries.

Next prospect was the Calvin Manufacturing Co., which had developed an automobile distributor cap made of glass. This concern was now about ready to place its product on the market, but needed a larger plant and additional capital to get into production.

The committee suggested a vacant plant on the outskirts of Scottdale which could be converted for the production of glass products. When the proposal was accepted, the committee launched a campaign to raise money by public subscription to repair and remodel the plant for the new tenant.

With two new industries to its credit, the committee decided that even greater accomplishments might be possible if a larger group participated. Accordingly, a meeting was called, to which many of Scottdale's most capable and influential citizens were invited. At this meeting the Scottdale Civic and Industrial Association was formed. S. B. Bulick, superintendent of schools, was chosen as chairman, and Ernest Overholt, a banker was named secretary. The directors included many leading businessmen.

The newly formed association's first achievement was to obtain title to the only large industrial plant remaining vacant. This was the old American Sheet & Tin Plate Co.'s works which was owned by the United States Steel Corporation. Steel company officials deeded the entire property over to the association for $1. Only provision was that the property could not be resold, but was to be held in trust for the people of Scottdale and rented to industries which would employ local citizens.

Early in 1939 the association learned that a manufacturing concern then located in a congested industrial center was considering expansion.

Representatives of the association called on officials of this concern and arranged for them to visit Scottdale. A week later the visitors arrived and were given a reception similar to that previously provided for the Duraloy officials. They agreed to rent a section of the vacant plant on condition that it was repaired and remodeled. The association undertook that job, believing that rental income would soon retire the obligation. Work was started immediately, and early in 1939 the R. E. Uptegraff Manufacturing Co., manufacturers of electric transformers, moved into its new home.

As this is written the association is negotiating with several small but wide-awake industries in the hope of finding tenants for other buildings in the vacant steel-mill group.

While rehabilitation is not complete, the Scottdale of today is quite different from the ghost town of a few years ago. "For rent" signs have almost disappeared on Pittsburgh Street, smoke curls from factory chimneys, both movie houses play to full houses nightly, the padlock no longer hangs from the Y. M. C. A. door, tax collections have almost doubled, and streets are being resurfaced.

A number of smaller companies which tottered on the brink of failure during the long lean years have made striking come-backs.

Credit for reviving Scottdale should go to the pioneering spirit of its people, and particularly to that handful of determined men who refused to admit they were licked—the fellows whose efforts laid the ground work for the Scottdale Civic and Industrial Association. It is this same spirit which assures the future of the new Scottdale.

The American Farmer Pays Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 3, 1939

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that there must be what amounts to a gigantic conspiracy against the American farmer, and that repeal of this embargo is just another evidence of its existence.

There is not the least doubt but what United States farmers have been sold down the river with respect to the reciprocal-trade treaties now in force or to become operative in the very near future. In my opinion, the whole theory of trade reciprocity, as envisioned by this administration, is a fallacy. To my mind we are doing nothing more than trying to buy our neighbor's friendship every time we negotiate one of these trade treaties.

I realize that the ideal situation in foreign trade is where such trade between countries closely balances and I also realize that in order to make one of these treaties show even a small semblance of sanity, it is necessary to give and take. But what I object to most strenuously is that in every such treaty negotiated by the Department of State so far, the American farmer has been required to do most of the giving, while eastern industrialists have taken nearly all the gains accruing from the trade.

Why is it, may I ask, that during the first 9 months of this year a very large gain has been shown in agricultural imports to the United States, while at the same time there has been a very large decrease in exports of agricultural products from the United States? Certainly it cannot be because the United States is unable to produce enough farm products for our own use.

Do you know that during the first 9 months of this year we have bought $794,700,000 worth of foreign-produced farm products? Do you realize we bought almost as much for the comparative period a year ago?

I am inclined to believe that the whole idea of reciprocal-trade treaties as practiced by this administration is nothing more than a bribe. I cannot see where the country as a whole is gaining anything from them. What we gain from the sale of industrial products is lost through letting down the tariff walls so that foreign agricultural products grown by what virtually amounts to slave labor can come into this country and undersell those same products raised here.

As a matter of fact, from the agricultural standpoint, the United States is almost 100 percent self-sufficient. But I would not object to these trade agreements so strongly if they did not pit class against class. Yes; you can call it class legislation, for that is exactly what it boils down to in the last analysis. Mr. Hull draws up a treaty with Argentina, another with Chile, still another with Canada and more than a dozen more. And what happens? He agrees to let all sorts of foreign farm products come into this country under a "most favored nation" agreement.

To be sure the countries on the other end of the pact agree to take certain quotas of American-manufactured goods and raw materials. But that is a poor way to get business, I think. What American industry can and should do is make such superior products for export that buyers from all the world would be eager to take them in preference to all other goods of the same nature. No one can tell me that American industry cannot turn out better goods at lower prices than any of our industrial competitors.

If American industry has fallen to such a low state that this Government has to buy business for them abroad, then it is about time somebody performed a rejuvenation operation on it. I cannot believe such harsh remedies are required, but I do not believe industry will continue to take all it can get in the way of governmental aid just so long as such aid is forthcoming.

If I were an exporter, though, I would not count too strongly on building up my foreign trade through the benign efforts of this administration. I would want my business to stand on its own feet and not be propped up by the Federal Government. And I do not believe I would be able to retain a clear conscience if I knew that whatever profits I might make were largely gained through the losses incurred by my fellow citizens.

It was suppressed until after the embargo repeal was assured, but then it was revealed authoritatively that the mid-west farmer stands to lose rather than gain out of the new law. It is true that England and France plan on buying many millions of dollars' worth of arms, ammunition, and implements of war in this country. It is equally true they are going to take these materials away in their own boats and pay cash for them.

But while they are doing that they are going to cut down on the amount of other goods they buy in this country. They do not intend to buy much in the foodstuff line here. They are going to try to supply all their needs in that respect from their own possessions. Therefore United States exports of corn, wheat, meat products, and so forth, appear certain to be doomed for even further reduction. That hits Midwest farmers right square in the pocketbook and basically puts these same dollars in the hands of their competitors in other parts of the world, along with their transfer to war-munitions makers in domestic industrial centers.

It means that what little export business the American farmer had has been virtually wiped out. The first estimate indicates that about $150,000,000 worth of normal export trade will be lost, but the new dealers figure that will be all right, for France and England will buy several times that amount of war planes here. The trouble with that theory is that only a few manufacturing companies will participate in that business. They do not stop to think that many thousands of farmers shared in the $150,000,000 worth of export business that is now reliably reported to have been lost to them.

But the real danger does not lie in the temporary curtailment of demand for our surplus products by France and England. The Allies have announced that they are going to try to produce all the food supplies they need at home or in their colonies. If they can do that, then the American farmer may as well kiss his export market good-bye, for if they can get all the food supplies they want elsewhere, particularly their own colonies, then it stands to reason they will continue to do so after the war is over.

Mr. Speaker, these are the economic aspects of proposed repeal of the arms embargo from the agricultural viewpoint. But that is not the main reason why I am voting against it. My first motive is that I firmly believe the repeal to be a very unneutral act, and one that is certain to have unfavorable repercussions later on, if not immediately. I am against repeal for the reason I do not want this Nation to aline itself on either side in this European war, for I am certain if it does we will eventually find ourselves all the way in it. I do not think we can go half in and stay half out. We tried that before the World War, and what did we get? Mr. Speaker, the American people know the answer.

Thomas Brackett Reed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM B. BANKHEAD

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 3, 1939

LETTER FROM ARTHUR CHARLES JACKSON

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to print granted to all Members, I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the letter addressed to me as Speaker by Mr. Arthur Charles Jackson, president of the Thomas Brackett Reed Association, as follows:

[The International Longfellow Society. The Portland Historical Society. President: Arthur Charles Jackson, LL. D., president, Longfellow University. Secretary: Marshall W. Pickering, Portland, Maine, and Washington, D. C.]

NOVEMBER 3, 1939.

W. B. BANKHEAD,

Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Thomas Brackett Reed Centennial Association and the Portland (Maine) Historical Society wish to most heartily thank you, Mr. Speaker, and the House of Representatives, for the very notable tributes by yourself and other Members of the House in memory of Thomas Brackett Reed on the occasion of the recent centennial anniversary of his birth.

Most sincerely yours,

ARTHUR CHARLES JACKSON,

President, the Thomas Brackett Reed Centennial Association and the Portland (Maine) Historical Society.

Elizabeth Cady Stanton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEPHEN BOLLES

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 3, 1939

TRIBUTE BY ALMA LUTZ

Mr. BOLLES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and give therein a tribute to Elizabeth Cady Stanton, pioneer woman leader not only in the movement for woman suffrage but for the whole position of women in America.

This article is from the pen of Alma Lutz, author of a life of Mrs. Stanton. The extracts follow:

On November 12, the birthday of Elizabeth Cady Stanton, a tablet will be unveiled at 250 West Ninety-fourth Street, New York City, where Mrs. Stanton lived from 1898 until her death on October 26, 1902.

The tablet is being erected by the New York State Education Department and the National Woman's Party. It bears the following inscription:

"ELIZABETH CADY STANTON
Nov. 12, 1815—Oct. 26, 1902
Lived From 1898 on This Site
Called the First
Woman's Rights Convention
Seneca Falls, N. Y., July 19–20, 1848
And Made the First Public
Demand for Woman Suffrage
And for Equal Rights."

Mrs. Stanton's daughter, Harriot Stanton Blatch, well known for her own work for woman suffrage and the advancement of women, has been asked to be the speaker at the unveiling, but as illness makes it impossible for her to be present, her place will be taken by her daughter, Nora Stanton Barney, who lived with her grandmother at 250 West Ninety-fourth Street, when she was preparing to enter Cornell University to study architecture and engineering. Rhoda Barney, Mrs. Stanton's great-granddaughter, a student of architecture and engineering at the University of Pennsylvania, will unveil the tablet.

Jane Norman Smith, vice chairman of the Woman's Party and chairman of its New York City committee, will preside. Persons prominent in Government, members of Mrs. Stanton's family, and active workers in the feminist movement have been asked to participate in the ceremonies, scheduled for 3 o'clock in the afternoon. Members of the National Woman's Party, friends of equal rights, and admirers of Mrs. Stanton are urged to be present to pay tribute to this great pioneer for the emancipation of women.

Mrs. Stanton lived in an apartment at 250 West Ninety-fourth Street at the end of a very active life. Even at 84 she was writing magazine and newspaper articles. Editors regarded her as an interesting personality and sought her comments on a variety of subjects. Somehow or other, no matter what her subject, she always smuggled in a word or two on woman's emancipation. She was a steady contributor to the Sunday edition of the New York Journal and American and was featured as "the grand old woman of America." In 1901, when she was 86, she wrote in her diary: "I am writing articles long and short all the time. Last week I had something in seven different papers. The December number of the North American Review contains an article of mine, and so does the Cosmopolitan. In a word, I am always busy, which is perhaps the chief reason why I am always well."

Although at that time she no longer took an active part in the work of the National American Woman Suffrage Association of which she had been president for many years, she still sent her speeches to its conventions and her suggestions regarding policy to Miss Anthony. She wrote Miss Anthony in 1899: "To my mind our association cannot be too broad. Suffrage involves every basic principle of republican government, all social, civil, religious, educational, and political rights. It is therefore germane to our platform to discuss every invidious distinction of sex in the college, home, trades, and professions, in literature, sacred and profane; in the canon as well as in civil law. At the inauguration of our movement, we numbered in our declaration of rights 18 grievances covering the whole range of human experience. On none of these did we talk with bated breath. Note the radical claims we made, and think how the world responded. * * * In short, in response to our radicalism, the bulwarks of the enemy fell as never since. * * * But at present our association has so narrowed its platform for reasons of policy and propriety that our conventions have ceased to point the way."

Keen, interested, planning until the very last, she wrote a letter to President Roosevelt on October 25, 1902, asking him to immortalize himself by bringing about the complete emancipation of his countrywomen. The next afternoon she passed away quietly in her chair.

The world's estimate of her in 1902 in newspapers, magazines, and memorial meetings was that she was "the mother of woman suffrage," "the great statesman of the woman's rights movement," "the greatest woman the world has ever produced."

When Elizabeth Cady Stanton was born in Johnstown, N. Y., on November 12, 1815, the world offered a very limited career to a woman. Educational opportunities for girls were meager, for it was generally believed that their minds were capable of absorbing little beyond the reading, writing, and arithmetic of the elementary schools. A woman did not earn her living. She was supported by her father, her husband, or her nearest male relative. Therefore, marriage, which meant a husband to protect her and a home to shelter her, was the one great event toward which the hopes of every young girl were directed. That this event might not prove adequate to protect, shelter, and support was disregarded. In fact, to be born a woman was to live under the shadow of a "defect of sex," as Blackstone expressed it in his Commentaries.

As the daughter of an able lawyer, Elizabeth Cady was confronted very early in life with Blackstone's interpretation of woman's status. She rebelled instinctively even before she knew how laws were made or what it all meant, and when she grew to womanhood, she dedicated herself to the task of freeing women from the bonds which custom and common law had fastened upon them.

She made the first public demand for woman suffrage in 1848 at the first Woman's Rights Convention, held at her instigation in Seneca Falls, N. Y., by proposing this resolution: "That it is the duty of the women of this country to secure to themselves their sacred right to the elective franchise." This bold action was heralded far and wide by the press, ridiculed, and bitterly criticized; but from then on every woman's rights convention demanded the ballot for women. All her life Elizabeth Cady Stanton worked for woman suffrage, making speeches, writing tracts and articles, editing The Revolution, and acting as president, first, of the New York State Woman's Rights Association, then of the National Woman Suffrage Association, and, lastly, of the National American Woman Suffrage Association.

But her interest in the emancipation of women went far beyond woman suffrage to equal rights for women under the law and in all human relationships. She saw what women suffered under prevailing marriage laws, and in spite of the fact that divorce was a forbidden subject for a good woman to discuss, she publicly advocated more liberal divorce laws. She asked for equal rights for women in the church and for equal educational opportunities. She recognized women's needs for economic independence and rejoiced when they entered new fields in business and the professions.

She also saw that before women could be completely liberated there must be a great change in their own thinking. She urged them to discard false traditions, to be wary of cultivating so-called womanly qualities which had been held up as virtues and as substitutes for equality. She urged them to question the edicts of the church regarding woman's sphere. It often took more courage

to denounce women's foibles than to ask for the ballot, but Elizabeth Cady Stanton was equal to the task, and all through her life she waged war against women's self-inflicted frailty and inferiority.

She believed in women and was confident that with education, training, and a new outlook, with the power that the ballot would give them, they would contribute much to their country and the world.

Neutrality Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH L. PFEIFER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 2, 1939

Mr. PFEIFER. Mr. Speaker, no question since the World War has been more widely and seriously considered by all classes of people than that of the present legislation before the House, the repeal of the embargo provision of the present Neutrality Act.

The people of my district, a cosmopolitan one, abhor war, therefore, desire to remain neutral. Of the thousands of letters and telegrams that I have received, 83.7 percent favored retention of the embargo provision and 16.2 percent favored repeal.

The crux of this extraordinary session is to repeal the embargo provision of the present Neutrality Act.

WHAT IS NEUTRALITY?

Literally it means not taking sides. From a legal viewpoint permit me to quote Mr. S. A. Baldus, managing editor of the Extension Magazine. I quote:

In international law neutrality is defined as "the complete abstention of a state from giving material aid or encouragement to either belligerent in an existing war. Legally, a neutral state is a friend to both belligerents and endeavors to maintain peaceful relations with each * * *."

"Among the obligations of a negative character resting upon neutrals may be mentioned the duty of abstaining from furnishing money, ships, troops, or munitions to either belligerents * * *." (The New International Encyclopedia.)

How do the commentators on international law define neutrality?

Let it be understood that I am not posing as one deeply versed in the subject of international law. I have some volumes dealing with the subject in my library, and every now and then when a question arises which makes it necessary that I consult such books I give whatever time I can to their perusal and study. Thus I have gone over some of the volumes of John Bassett Moore, LL. D., who is rightly considered one of the ablest and most scholarly American commentators on international law. I have before me as I write volume VII of his monumental Digest on International Law. This one volume alone contains 1,109 pages and is an exhaustive treatise on all questions involved in the present "neutrality" legislation: War, maritime war, contraband, blockade, neutrality, etc.

Another work that has intrigued me is the Treatise on International Law, by L. Oppenheim, M. A., LL. D., Whewell professor of international law in the University of Cambridge, a member of the Institute of International Law and honorary member of the Royal Academy of Jurisprudence at Madrid. The volume before me as I write is volume II (710 pages), entitled "War and Neutrality" (2d ed.), published in 1912. (I understand that a later edition (revised) has been published. But, even so, I prefer the earlier work, for the reason that it was written before the League of Nations tried to create a new world order and establish new principles of international law.)

Oppenheim's definition of neutrality makes a nice distinction between international law and international politics:

"Such states as do not take part in a war between other states are neutrals. The term 'neutrality' is derived from the Latin *neuter*. Neutrality may be defined as *the attitude of impartiality adopted by third states toward belligerents and recognized by belligerents, such attitude creating rights and duties between the impartial states and the belligerents.* Whether or not a third state will adopt and preserve an attitude of impartiality during war is not a matter for international law, but for international politics" (p. 361). [Italics Oppenheim's.]

"The question of remaining neutral or not is, in the absence of a treaty stipulating otherwise, one of policy and not of law" (p. 362).

(Parenthetically, it may be stated here that much of the confusion that has arisen over the subject of neutrality could be cleared up if, instead of prating about international law, we would call the thing by its right name—"international politics." That is the crux of the whole question and should be insisted upon by all debaters.)

Generally speaking, in international law the act of supplying arms and munitions of war to the parties to an armed conflict is considered an unneutral act. The following few passages from John Bassett Moore's Digest of International Law not only stress the unneutrality of selling war materials of whatever kind to belligerents, but also set forth that individuals engaging in such traffic place themselves beyond the pale of the law and forfeit the protection of their governments.

"The supply of materials of war, such as arms and ammunition, to either party to an armed conflict, although neutral governments are not obliged to prevent it, constitutes on the part of the individuals who engage in it a participation in hostilities, and as such is confessedly an unneutral act. Should the government of the individual itself supply such articles, it would clearly depart from its position of neutrality. The private citizen undertakes the business at his own risk, and against this risk his government cannot assure him protection without making itself a party to his unneutral act. * * *

"Says Kent: 'The principal restriction which the law of nations imposes on the trade of neutrals is the prohibition to furnish the belligerent parties with warlike stores and other articles which are directly auxiliary to warlike purposes.'

" 'If the neutral (government),' says Woolsey, 'should send powder or balls, cannons or rifles, this would be a direct encouragement of the war, and so a departure from a neutral position * * *.'" (vol. VII, p. 749).

ORIGIN OF THE NEUTRALITY BILL

Its birthright was the result of the committee "to take the profits out of war," and became enacted August 31, 1935, to expire March 1, 1936. The President signed it and issued the following statement:

I have given my approval to Senate Resolution 173—the neutrality legislation which passed the Congress last week.

I have approved this joint resolution because it was intended as an expression of the fixed desire of the Government and the people of the United States to avoid any action which might involve us in war. The purpose is wholly excellent, and this joint resolution will to a considerable degree serve that end.

Shortly thereafter war broke out between Italy and Ethiopia, and the President applied the provisions of the law to the strife between these two nations. He said:

In these specific circumstances I desire it to be understood that any of our people who voluntarily engage in transactions of any character with either of the belligerents do so at their own risk.

Supplementing the statement of the President, Secretary Hull made the following remarks at a press conference when asked for elaboration of the President's statement of October 5 regarding transactions with belligerents:

As I said to you gentlemen heretofore, the language of the President's statement has thoroughly well-defined meaning, and every person should be able to grasp its meaning and its implications. Technically, of course, there is no legal prohibition—apart from the proclamation governing the export of arms—against our people entering into transactions with the belligerents, or either of them. The warning given by the President in his proclamation concerning travel on belligerent ships and his general warning that during the war any of our people who voluntarily engage in transactions of any character with either of the belligerents do so at their own risk were based upon the policy and purpose of keeping this country out of war—keeping it from being drawn into war. It certainly was not intended to encourage transactions with the belligerents.

Our people might well realize that the universal state of business uncertainty and suspense on account of the war is seriously handicapping business between all countries, and that the sooner the war is terminated the sooner the restoration and stabilization of business in all parts of the world, which, infinitely more important than trade with the belligerents, will be brought about.

This speedy restoration of more full and stable trade conditions and relationships among the nations is by far the most profitable objective for our people to visualize, in contrast with such risky and temporary trade as they might maintain with belligerent nations.

I repeat that our objective is to keep this country out of war.

Again, on October 30, 1935, the following statement came from the President:

In dealing with the conflict between Ethiopia and Italy, I have carried into effect the will and intent of the neutrality resolution recently enacted by Congress. We have prohibited all shipments of arms, ammunition, and implements of war to the belligerent governments. By my public statement of October 5, which was emphasized by the Secretary of State on October 10, we have warned American citizens against transactions of any character with either of the belligerent nations except at their own risk.

This Government is determined not to become involved in the controversy and is anxious for the restoration and maintenance of peace.

However, in the course of war, tempting trade opportunities may be offered to our people to supply materials which would prolong the war. I do not believe that the American people will wish for abnormally increased profits that temporarily might be secured

by greatly extending our trade in such materials; nor would they wish the struggles on the battlefield to be prolonged because of profits accruing to a comparatively small number of American citizens.

And to this statement the Secretary of State appended the following:

It is my opinion that our citizens will not be disposed to insist upon transactions to derive war profits at the expense of human lives and human misery. In this connection I again repeat that an early peace, with the restoration of normal business and normal business profits, is far sounder and far preferable to temporary and risky war profits.

By the time Congress met on January 4, 1936, the President was so pleased with his neutrality legislation that he stated in his annual message the following:

As a consistent part of a clear policy the United States is following a twofold neutrality toward any and all nations which engage in wars not of immediate concern to the Americas: First, we decline to encourage the prosecution of war by permitting belligerents to obtain arms, ammunition, or implements of war from the United States; second, we seek to discourage the use by belligerent nations of any and all American products calculated to facilitate the prosecution of a war in quantities over and above our normal exports to them in time of peace.

Thereupon the act of 1935 was amended and strengthened as requested by the President, and on February 29, 1936, the President, in approving this legislation, stated the following:

By the resolution approved August 31, 1935, a definite step was taken toward enabling this country to maintain its neutrality and avoid being drawn into wars involving other nations. It provided that in the event of the Executive proclaiming the existence of such a war thereupon an embargo would attach to the exportation of arms, ammunition, and implements of war destined to any belligerent country. It also authorized the Executive to warn citizens of this country against traveling as passengers on the vessels of any belligerent except at their own risk.

By the resolution I have just signed the operation of the August resolution is extended and strengthened until May 1, 1937. A new and definite step is taken by providing in substance that when an embargo becomes effective obligations of any belligerent government issued after the date of the proclamation shall not be purchased or sold in this country, and no loan or credit extended to such government; but with authority the Executive, if our interests require, to except from the prohibition commercial credits and short-time loans in aid of legal transactions. * * *

The policies announced by the Secretary of State and myself at the time of and subsequent to the issuance of the original proclamation—Italy and Ethiopia—will be maintained in effect. It is true that the high moral duty I have urged on our people of restricting their exports of essential war materials to either belligerent to approximately the normal peacetime basis has not been the subject of legislation. Nevertheless, it is clear to me that greatly to exceed that basis, with the result of earning profits not possible during peace, and especially with the result of giving actual assistance to the carrying on of war, would serve to magnify the very evil of war which we seek to prevent. This being my view, I renew the appeal made last October to the American people that they so conduct their trade with belligerent nations that it cannot be said that they are seizing new opportunities for profit or that by changing their peacetime trade they give aid to the continuation of war.

At Chautauqua, N. Y., August 14, 1936, the President said:

Nevertheless, if war should break out again in another continent, let us not blink the fact that we should find in this country thousands of Americans seeking immediate riches—fool's gold, blood money—would attempt to break down or attempt to evade our neutrality.

They would tell you—and, unfortunately, their views would get wide publicity—that if we could produce and ship this and that other article to belligerent nations the unemployment of America would all find work.

I might call attention to the fact that this provision, arms embargo, in 1937 was approved in the Senate by a vote of 63 to 6, and in the House by a vote of 376 to 13; almost unanimous.

Thus you see that we have had a Neutrality Act since 1935 which has been highly praised by the President, the Secretary and Under Secretary of State, and by Senator PITTMAN, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. The latter on March 3, 1937, in the Senate said:

Undoubtedly if anything on earth would arouse unfriendliness on the part of a belligerent against us it would be discrimination by our Government in favor of its enemy. We are speaking of a time when war exists, not of peacetime, and if Canada were engaged in war with a foreign country, and we were at peace with both of them, we would certainly arouse the intense anger and probably the unfriendly disposition of any country against which we discriminated in favor of any other country.

Again, on April 7, 1937, before the Academy of Political Science, he said:

Our Government, in my opinion, undoubtedly has the legal right to place an embargo upon the export of any commodity. No one has seriously opposed the placing of an embargo upon the export of arms, ammunition, and implements of war to belligerents.

I shall now quote from the President's message to Congress, September 21, 1939:

I have asked the Congress to reassemble in extraordinary session in order that it may consider and act on the amendment of certain legislation which, in my best judgment, so alters the historic foreign policy of the United States that it impairs the peaceful relations of the United States with foreign nations. * * *

Beginning with the foundation of our constitutional government in the year 1789, the American policy in respect to belligerent nations, with one notable exception, has been based on international law. * * * The single exception was the policy adopted by this Nation during the Napoleonic wars, when, seeking to avoid involvement, we acted for some years under the so-called Embargo and Nonintercourse Acts. That policy turned out to be a disastrous failure. * * * Our next deviation by statute from the sound principles of neutrality and peace through international law did not come for 130 years. It was the so-called Neutrality Act of 1935. * * * I now ask again that such action be taken in respect to that part of the act which is wholly inconsistent with ancient precepts of the law of nations—the embargo provisions. * * *

I give to you my deep and unalterable conviction, based on years of experience as a worker in the field of international peace, that by the repeal of the embargo the United States will more probably remain at peace than if the law remains as it stands today.

Now, why this sudden right about face? Why the demand of the President for the repeal of the embargo provision? It is needless for me to state why. You know as well as I. Of course, to help England. Senator AUSTIN in a recent address said—and I quote:

We must make it possible for Great Britain and France to get supplies.

We do not need to ask whether the bill is neutral.

No matter how much we may hate Hitler and despise all dictatorships, let us not deceive ourselves into believing a fundamental change in our neutrality policy now would be anything but an unneutral act which may lead us into war.

What do the leading international lawyers say?

Dr. John Bassett Moore, America's leading international law authority, said:

As regards the impartial prohibition of the export of arms, ammunition, and implements of war to belligerent countries which is taken over from the neutrality resolution of last year, I have no objection to make on legal grounds. The question of prohibition is one of policy.

Dr. Edwin M. Borchard, professor of law at Yale University, appearing before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on January 29, 1936, urged reenactment of the joint resolution of August 1935, which contained mandatory embargo on arms, ammunition, and implements of war:

The bulk of that act merely confirms existing international law. The embargo on arms, munitions, and implements of war is a measure which has been adopted by various countries from time to time, and is not in the least revolutionary. Dr. Moore has indicated some of the objections to that provision by way of policy, but there is none on grounds of law.

Dr. Edward S. Corwin, professor of jurisprudence at Princeton University, in a letter to the Washington Post dated October 1, 1939, discussing President Roosevelt's contention that "repeal of the embargo and a return to international law are the crux of this issue," asserted:

The fact is that the above argument rests on a mistaken assumption, namely, that neutrals are under a positive obligation to trade with belligerents. The international law to which the President constantly appeals knows no such rule. It does require that a neutral shall not prohibit trade with one belligerent which it permits with the other. It also subjects neutral trade to the hazards to which the rules concerning contraband and blockade shall give rise. But it no more requires a neutral to stand ready to sell to belligerents than it requires a neutral to produce for them. The President's argument subjects neutral interests to an utterly unheard-of servitude in favor of the belligerents, and in the instance it quite gratuitously presents the naval powers with a grievance made up out of whole cloth.

Father Edmund A. Walsh, vice president of Georgetown University, regent of the Georgetown Foreign Service School, and well-known authority on international law and international relations, in a talk reported in the Washington Post October 3, 1939, page 6, characterizes as absolutely false the contention in the Foreign Relations Committee report which I have heretofore quoted. He said:

I protest, as one who has given some attention to international law, against the falsity of the statement in the committee report that any belligerent has the right under international law to purchase any article in any neutral country. That is a misstatement. It is absolutely false. I regret to see the truth abused by people in high places who ought to know better—and probably do know better. If the embargo is to be repealed, let it be done on the merits of the case and not on the basis of any such Machiavellian skulduggery.

Again, testifying before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on May 3, 1939, reported at page 491 of hearings on Senate Joint Resolution 21 and other measures, Father Walsh engaged in this colloquy with Senator BORAH:

Senator BORAH. There is no doubt in your mind but what we had the right to withhold the sale of arms?

Father WALSH. Yes; very decidedly. It has been a highly debated question, and I take issue with the school that gives to all belligerents a right to purchase, creating a corresponding obligation to sell. The correlative of the right to purchase is not an absolute obligation on any government to sell, because to sell or not to sell, being a subject of national determination, is a subject for the Government, and there is no public-utility idea by which it has to exercise its franchise and sell or give service. There is no such thing in international law. Therefore I did not mention any international law which would be violated by an arms embargo, though some people hold that. The only obligation is to sell impartially if you sell at all.

Dr. Thomas H. Healy, dean of the Georgetown Foreign Service School and former professor of international law at The Hague, testifying before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on April 27, 1939, at page 340 said:

Today neutrality, as I see it, is strictly domestic legislation, and that comes under the prerogative of the Congress of the United States. It has little to do with international law and has nothing to do with treaties, except by indirection it might violate one. It is traditional international practice. If a nation feels it is being hurt, it may not question your right, but it may say that, independently of your right, they are going to take action.

Dr. Herbert Wright, professor of international law at Catholic University, testifying before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on May 2, 1939, at pages 404 and 405 declared:

There is nothing in international law, however, to prevent a neutral state, by domestic legislation, from temporarily waiving the exercise of some of its admitted neutral rights to make more remote the possibility of being drawn into a foreign war.

Profs. Charles Cheney Hyde and Philip Jessup, of Columbia University, former legal advisers to the State Department and outstanding authorities on international law, in a letter jointly signed by them in the New York Times on October 6, 1939, had the following to say:

We must challenge the suggestion that international law has ever imposed any duty on a neutral to permit the exportation of munitions of war from its territory, and that accordingly the retention of the embargo is contrary to the precepts of international law. That is not the case and never has been. It is fantastic to call the present arms embargo a violation of international law, and it is misleading to intimate that it represents a departure from that law.

Mr. Green H. Hackworth, Solicitor and Legal Adviser of the State Department, testifying before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on February 5, 1936, at page 298 of the 1936 hearings, declared:

This section has to do with the placing of embargoes on the exportation of arms, ammunition, and implements of war to belligerent countries. There appears to be little or no serious objection to this from any quarter, even from those who tell us that we should have no domestic legislation but should constantly rely on international law. The sentiment of the people seems to be opposed to the furnishing of finished implements of war to belligerent countries.

Secretary Hull, a well-known and ardent champion of international law, championed such a provision when he proposed the draft of a treaty to the Buenos Aires Pan American Conference in 1936, article VIII of which contained this provision:

Upon the determination of the existence of a state of war between two or more American republics those of the high contracting parties remaining neutral shall not permit, during the continuance of hostilities, the exportation from their respective territories of arms, ammunition, or implements of war to any of the belligerents, or to any neutral country for transshipments to, or for the use of, any of the belligerents.

WHAT DOES THE ORDINARY CITIZEN THINK?

I, as one, am of the same opinion as the 83.7 percent of my constituents. I believe repeal of the arms embargo is a definite and certain step toward war. I believe our chances of staying out of the present war will be much better if we leave the existing arms-embargo provision of the Neutrality Act remain as is. I also believe, from the conversations with my colleagues, that the American people are overwhelmingly opposed to the United States becoming involved. Some of my colleagues fear the administrative whip, which again cracked during this extraordinary session. Insofar as I am concerned, America shall remain at peace, and remain absolutely neutral, thus friendly to all powers on the face of the earth.

This is not our war. Therefore, I am opposed to the United States taking any part in this European conflict. Certainly, as the eminent international lawyers have stated, repealing the embargo provision is an unneutral act, short of war, and is very apt to lead us into war. Why take those chances for fool's gold?

The sacrifice of one American youth, disregarding his race, color, or creed, is not worth all the mercenary gain involved. Why then repeal the embargo provision? As I have stated at a previous time on the floor of Congress, let us legislate for the security of America, and not for the security of any foreign nation. We are Americans. We should neither be pro-British, pro-French, pro-German, nor pro for any other nation, but solely pro-American. If we are to be real patriots, let us radiate true Americanism. Let us first make this country safe for democracy. Let us protect and preserve these United States for ourselves and our children.

WILL HISTORY REPEAT ITSELF?

The people of the United States are asked again to accept the false philosophy that we can end Europe's round of wars. History gives us no grounds to believe that we can do any such thing. Europe has been torn with strife for centuries, and it seems that there is a war for every generation. A war every 20 years.

In 1917 Woodrow Wilson asked the question, "Is the present war a struggle for a just and secure peace, or only a new balance of power?"

Believing that the struggle was for a lasting peace, a war to end all wars, the United States went into that war. Today the cycle of revenge has spun around again. A new crop of cannon fodder has matured, and Europe is again at war.

Shall we now, with our unselfish effort of 1917 so clearly proved in vain, be fooled again?

Reread your American history. Reread the great State papers of America—the Declaration of Independence, George Washington's Farewell Address, Lincoln's second inaugural, the statement of Thomas Jefferson.

Our first and fundamental maxim should be never to entangle ourselves in the broils of Europe; our second, never to suffer Europe to intermeddle with cis-Atlantic affairs.

President Monroe wrote:

In the wars of the European powers in matters relating to themselves we have never taken part, nor does it comport with our policy to do so. * * * Our policy in regard to Europe, which was adopted at an early stage of the wars which have so long agitated that quarter of the globe, remains the same, which is not to interfere in the internal concerns of any of its powers; to consider the government de facto as the legitimate government for us; to cultivate friendly relations with it, and to preserve those relations by a frank, firm, and manly policy.

Daniel Webster, referring to this foreign policy adopted by our young Republic for the purpose of keeping us out of European embroilments, said:

Sir, I look on the message of December 1823 as forming a bright page in our history. I will help neither to erase it nor tear it out; nor shall it be, by any act of mine, blurred or blotted.

If every citizen were to read this group of documents, we would have a revival of true Americanism. We would cease to worry about Europe and would set ourselves to solving our own problems.

Let us not be too nationalistically inclined. Let us, since we have made America our home, inculcate reverence for our laws, ideals, and institutions, and preserve it for our children. I recall, 22 years ago when my dad, thinking the liberty of America was at stake, voluntarily urged his three sons to fight for this country, even though against the land of his birth.

I have the greatest admiration for the Polish people who so valiantly fought to maintain their independence.

It is with sympathy that we look at the geographical area that was known as Poland. But certainly the United States cannot be expected to police the world, nor is there any justified reason for her becoming the arsenal of the world.

Neutrality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD K. CLAYPOOL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 3, 1939

Mr. CLAYPOOL. Mr. Speaker, I desire at this time to discuss briefly the reasons that impelled me to vote for the pending neutrality bill that prohibits the shipment of American goods in American ships to nations engaged in war, prohibits the travel of American citizens in the war zones, and provides that all goods purchased here by the warring nations must be paid for in cash and repeals the existing arms-embargo provision of our law.

At the outset I should like to state that when it first became apparent that the repeal of the arms embargo would become an issue I immediately began an effort to ascertain the views of my constituents on this proposal. They cooperated fully, and none hesitated to give me their sincere opinion. As a result of an extensive survey throughout my district I came to the conclusion that a vast majority were of the opinion that the peace of the United States could best be preserved by the repeal of the mandatory arms embargo. In voting for repeal I have been guided, more than anything else, by the wishes of the people of my district. History demonstrates that the opinion of the people on most national problems is sound. I have found it so during my experience in private and public life.

THE PURPOSE OF THIS BILL IS TO KEEP US OUT OF WAR

The neutrality bill is not designed to help any nation or group of nations. The bill is designed to keep the United States of America out of war. As stated several weeks ago by a prominent American, "Our sympathies are not confined to the people of any one nation or of any one group of nations engaged in the conflict. Our sympathies are with the common men and women of all nations for we know that they all want peace and liberty, not war and domination." During these times of stress and high tension we must not allow ourselves to be influenced by emotional outbursts and propaganda, whatever the source. We must keep cool heads and exercise calm and deliberate judgment. Our one objective must be: "Keep the United States at peace."

UNITED STATES WILL NOT BECOME INVOLVED

In considering this bill some thoughtless Members have sought to create the impression that the passage of this bill was a step toward war. War can be declared only by Congress and, far from being a step toward war, this bill is a step toward permanent peace. Congress will never declare war unless the American people demand it to do so. The American people will never demand that Congress declare war unless they become the victims of a series of acts of violence that violate their rights and jeopardize their national safety.

Under this legislation our ships cannot travel in the war zones—our citizens cannot travel in the war zones—the warring nations must pay cash, and hence we have no credits to protect. Therefore, under this bill, those acts of violence that arouse the people, such as the sinking of our ships and the loss of American lives, cannot occur. If these acts of violence do not occur, the people of the United States will never ask that Congress declare war. We know that the Congress, the President, and the American people fervently desire peace. If we hold fast to this desire and remain cool and dispassionate and act only for the best interests of our own country, there is no danger of our involvement in the European war.

Throughout the consideration of this measure in both the House and Senate there has been no doubt as to the sincerity of the members of both parties regardless of the position they adopted. Partisanship has been avoided, and the final vote finds that Members voted according to their honest convictions and best judgment. I voted for this bill because I believed its enactment was desired by the majority of my constituents, because I believed this bill to be a sound and realistic approach to the problem, and because after a consideration of all the circumstances I believed it would best preserve the peace of the United States. With the cooperation of the people and of the Government we can make it work.

Chester C. Bolton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 30, 1939

EDITORIAL FROM THE CLEVELAND (OHIO) NEWS

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Cleveland News, October 30, 1939, dealing with the character and career of our beloved colleague, CHESTER BOLTON:

[From the Cleveland (Ohio) News of October 30, 1939]

CHESTER C. BOLTON, 1882–1939

CHESTER CASTLE BOLTON had the religion of true public service. He believed solemnly that any American of means and culture owed a great deal to the nation which made means and culture available; and he spent a busy life demonstrating this.

At 57, he has left a career which will be a monument to him, which is the chief consolation his city finds for his being cut off from a later part of it which promised rare, old-time statesmanship.

The opportunity was close at hand for a seat in the United States Senate. There a man of his convictions and honor might have won back for the toga a great part of the respect for a Sherman, a Payne, or a Hanna.

Few Clevelanders in his generation have accomplished so much with such modesty, so great an indifference to all except the responsibility. In peace or war, there was the State and the Nation, to be served with diligence and patriotism by the citizens whose services would count the most—this was the essence of CHESTER BOLTON'S creed.

Under his creed, it was not enough to be a donor to philanthropy and the arts, as most persons of his talents content themselves with being. He must also be a leader and a worker. And hardly an institution in Cleveland but had him as a friend available every day in the year.

It was typical that he was at the first citizens' training camp at Plattsburg in 1916, to help the examples of preparedness. His business experience placed him on the first War Industries Board when America entered the World War; then he was aide to the Assistant Secretary of War. But a Washington service was not his ideal. He reentered the Army as a field officer and rose to colonel and assistant chief of staff of the One Hundred and First Division.

There was service to be done in the Ohio Legislature, and, unlike many in his position, he did not disdain but embraced it. In three of the best State assemblies of modern times, he was a reflective, conscientious senator and president pro tempore. It was his senate which effected the last noteworthy reform of the Ohio tax structure, in which he voted and acted with impersonality and against interest.

He was elected to Congress in 1928 to succeed a great Congressman, Theodore E. Burton, but he was of such caliber that this important district never noticed the change; it became more famous for its leader-like representation.

In fact, his constituency came to take for granted from him a service on rivers and harbors (so important to Cleveland's business life) and on the Appropriations Committee, which, in a lesser man, would have caused national comment. One incident of his congressional career shows his fineness of principle. All the Twenty-second's Congressmen had used the appointments to West Point and Annapolis as desirable patronage, and this was accepted. That was not good enough for CHESTER BOLTON. He created impartial examinations open to every boy in the district and made his appointments rigidly on the outcome of the exams. His choices at the military schools have done him honor by their work there.

This idealism, born partly of his descent from pioneer Cleveland families, he carried into everything he touched. His close association with Cleveland's great metals business showed it; his duties as a banker were important; his work as a churchman and as an administrator and guide of charities brought strength to his church and charities.

And, above all, he was shy and retiring and escaped the limelight whenever it approached. There was a right noble Spartan strain in him. Alas, it has almost disappeared from public life in America. But his approach to this nobility will not leave his fellow citizens uninspired to preserve it.

America Can Keep Out of War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 3, 1939

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, the Congress of the United States has spoken on our neutrality legislation and on our foreign policy. I fervently hope and pray it will turn out for the best and that America will now settle down to a solution of our perplexing domestic problems. I want the United States to remain at peace and not be dragged through the devastating experiences of another war on foreign soil in a second futile attempt to reshape human nature in Europe by force of American arms.

Regardless of whether we approved or disapproved of the changes in our neutrality laws, which now permit us to sell arms and munitions to nations at war, we can all take solace and find heart in the fact that in the final analysis the people still govern this country and that America can keep out of war. After all, no neutrality law can be good enough to keep a reckless and impetuous Government from involving us in war and no neutrality law can be bad enough to force a wise and prudent government to entangle us in foreign strife. So whether it is good or bad, our new neutrality legislation cannot involve us in war nor will it insure us against war. That is the job of the common people—that is the task for folks like you and me, who by vigorous activities toward peace on the home front, in the immediate future, can prevent the heartaches and sorrow coming from sacrifices on the war front in some sorry tomorrow.

FIRST CASUALTY OF WAR WOULD BE SELF-GOVERNMENT

I am sure it is unnecessary to enumerate the horrors and heartaches of modern war. The first casualty of the last war was truth; the first casualty of another war involving America would be self-government. In the short time in which England has been involved in the present European war, for example, many of the rights for which free men have struggled in that country for seven centuries have already been denied to them. Wars are largely fought by the common people, but the government officials whose errors in judgment and impetuous actions involve nations in war invariably seize the occasion to tighten their grip on government and to take unto themselves the powers of dictators and absolutists. It is as true today as it was in the days of Franklin that "there never was a good war nor a bad peace." America can keep out of the European war if the people will unite in an intelligent and unyielding determination to pursue the path of peace.

It is important that our national leadership be guided by a spirit of strict neutrality and absolute impartiality; in the pursuit of such a policy, I am sure it will have the prayerful support of every patriotic American.

THE PEOPLE HAVE A RESPONSIBILITY IN MAINTAINING PEACE

However, there is an even greater responsibility and opportunity for the people of America. The people in America are the authors of public opinion and the backbone of government. At least until and unless we are at war, the people of the United States have the destiny of our national policies—national and international—in their own hands. They can have the kind of government they desire; in the long run, they receive the kind of government they deserve. Close attention to the acts of government and the activities of Government officials retain for the people the rights and the blessings of self-rule. Inattention to these sacred rights soon results in officials, elected to serve the people, reaching out for more power for themselves in the delusion that they were elected to rule the people. If we are to have peace, the people of America must not let up in their determination to stay out of the present conflict in Europe. If that determination remains strong enough and vocal enough, officialdom in America will not, cannot, involve this country in war.

Mr. Speaker, may I submit for the consideration of the Nation a few suggestions for the people and the Government to consider in doing their part to maintain the peace of the United States?

1. WE SHOULD BE TOLERANT

We should remain calm. We should avoid voicing prejudices. We should practice tolerance and the art of giving due respect to the opinions of our fellow Americans, whether we agree with those opinions or not. We should refrain from hurling charges of pro-British, or pro-German, or pro-Russian, or pro-French against those who disagree with us and as pro-Americans, all, disagree as Americans should and then strive to unite on a common program of keeping America American, which we can all support. The throttling of free speech, and of a free press, and of truth are steps toward war and not toward peace, but we should remember that war news reaching us from Europe must all pass through censors which are established not for the purpose of relaying the truth but of distorting it so as to make the best possible sympathy-winning plea for the Nation involved. We should therefore be slow to form judgments on the basis of such news as can come to us from Europe via either foreign or American newspapers or radio stations.

2. WE SHOULD CURTAIL ALL UN-AMERICAN "ISMS"

We should stamp out the existence of un-American "isms" in the high places of influence in America. While our Constitution protects all people in their rights to organize and to criticize it does not imply that members of such organizations as the Communist Party, the bund, fascistic groups, and similar un-American sects should be permitted to hold responsible appointive positions in the executive department of Government. The Dies investigating committee has presented the Attorney General's office with irrefutable evidence that many such disciples of un-American movements now hold such positions. The President and/or the people should insist that the executive department of our Government be cleaned out of all such officeholders at once. Instead of criticizing the revelation of these conditions as a "sordid procedure," the President should stamp out the "sordid policies" which these practitioners of un-Americanism are attempting to preach from behind the mantle of respectability given them by appointment to positions of Federal authority.

3. WE SHOULD REQUIRE FOREIGN PROPAGANDISTS TO REGISTER AS SUCH

Freedom of speech is an American right guaranteed under the American Constitution. However, when in wartime foreign nations send us lecturers, journalists, and professional lobbyists to win sympathy for their cause and to stir up prejudice against their enemies they should be compelled to register as propagandists so that the American citizens would be forewarned as to the unreliability of their statements. America should not become an open forum for the foreign

propagandists of the world to use in an effort to entice us into entering either side of a European war.

4. WE SHOULD HEAR A RENUNCIATION OF THIRD-TERM AMBITIONS

President Roosevelt should avail himself of an early opportunity to make a straightforward statement to the effect that he is not a candidate for a third term and that he would decline such a nomination if it were tendered him. In that way he could effectively dissolve any suspicions that he is using the war situation as a device for furthering his personal political fortunes and greatly increase national confidence in his leadership in these critical days. The time has not come in this country when there is only one American big enough or wise enough to be President. There are many capable leaders in both the Democratic and Republican parties who can guide the destiny of America, in war or in peace, and at a time when we are indirectly giving assistance to the curtailment of one-man government in Europe we should studiously avoid making any further approach to the adoption of one-man government in America. The maintenance of representative government in our Republic transcends the personal ambitions of any man or the political aspirations of any group of political appointees. The great value of our two-term tradition for American Presidents takes on new value and new significance in the light of the last 5 years of European history.

5. WE SHOULD SELF-IMPOSE AN EMBARGO ON HATE SPEECHES

We should have a self-imposed embargo on hate speeches in this country. It is especially unfortunate and unwise when people in high places of influence such as our Chief Executive, Cabinet members, Senators and Representatives, editorial writers, and newspaper and radio commentators permit themselves to render a distinct disservice to the cause of American peace by venting their spleen against the governments of other peoples. In the final analysis, our traditional concept of the Monroe Doctrine demands that we do not meddle in the internal political affairs of Europe as a counterpart of our demand that Europeans do not meddle in the internal political affairs of the Western Hemisphere. The people should protest with vigor against any individual in public or private life who by the influence of his rank or ability brings America closer to the brink of war through the prostitution of his position by stirring up passions at home and stimulating anti-American prejudices abroad. If the people protest effectively enough against such practices, these peddlers of prejudice will slink back into the obscurity from whence they came, and to which they should be consigned for the general welfare until the clouds of war have once again cleared away so their poison shafts can no longer endanger starting an epidemic of public opinion which might lead to war.

6. WE SHOULD STRENGTHEN OUR GENERAL PREPAREDNESS

America should tighten its program of preparedness. This means not only adding what military strength we may require for permanent security but it means, with equal importance, retrenching our national fiscal policies to give us strength to meet any emergency. It means, too, a determined drive to make democracy work at home by giving American farmers the right to supply our own markets at a fair price, by giving American labor steady employment at a respectable annual wage, and giving American business an opportunity to make a fair profit. It means removing some of the political parasites who are now sapping the lifeblood of the farmer, the worker, and the businessman, and it means developing an American program of prosperity and fair play which will provide "a fair chance for a free people" throughout America. These objectives cannot be obtained if we permit our attention to be diverted from domestic problems by sly political strategists who seek to focus attention on Europe. Truly these days we must "See America('s problems) first."

7. WE SHOULD BE ISOLATIONISTS FROM WAR—INSPIRATIONISTS FOR PEACE

Finally, Americans can remain at peace and resist the cries to go to war in good conscience that by so doing they are making their maximum contribution to the advancement of civilization. In the war we would become but another belligerent faced with the final necessity of imposing a hard peace upon a vanquished foe. Out of the war, we become a great beacon of hope to the war-weary people of all the world. We make it possible for belligerents on both sides to call upon our good services when the passions of war have burned low and to request us to help them work out a just and a fair peace which may become a permanent agreement of amity rather than the vengeance-stimulating prologue to another war. By making democracy work so well in the United States that its advantages will beckon to people everywhere, we can by our example, rather than by our arms or our armies, hurry the day when other people will throw off oppression and discard unworkable theories to voluntarily accept and adopt the blessings of self-government as a means of bringing greater happiness to greater numbers. Thus by being isolationists from war, we can become the world's greatest inspirationists for peace and best play our part in the restoration of peace and the advancement of Christian civilization to the four corners of the world.

SOLDIERS OF 1917 ARE PEACE SALESMEN OF 1939

I am strengthened in my conviction that America can keep out of war by still another factor. I refer now to the important influence being exerted by the veterans of the last war in the program to keep America at peace during the present war. The correspondence which I have received from South Dakota indicates that members of the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and the unorganized veterans are united in a determination to prevent the necessity of sending their sons to a bloody death on foreign battlefields to fight for a cause which they so vaguely understand and which the record since the World War clearly reveals to be impossible of attainment by force of arms. Self-government, christianity, and peace are causes which people must seek from the depths of their hearts; they are not causes which can be forced upon people with bombs and bayonets. This simple lesson in human understanding has been dearly learned by present-day Americans, and we can take courage from the fact that the soldiers of 1917 in this country have become our leading salesmen for peace in 1939. The heroes of our last war are marching again—this time volunteers in the battle to maintain America's peace.

WITH GOD NOTHING IS IMPOSSIBLE

The American people should pray as they have never prayed before that the God of Peace will give them power to guide the destiny of America away from the war shoals of Europe. With God nothing is impossible. He alone can melt the hearts of the war mongers and bring justice and order out of the chaos which is Europe's.

Mr. Speaker, again I say, America can keep out of war. Yes; America must keep out of war if civilization and Christianity are to be preserved. I want to record it here and now that my vote will always be cast on the side of peace unless and until such a black hour might come that we be called upon to defend our own people, our own shores, and our own Government. Such an eventuality is happily not now within the realm of the most remote probability. Let us therefore rededicate ourselves, each and all, in private life or in public office, to the practices and purposes of the Prince of Peace to the end that the torch of American liberty and human tolerance may continue to point the way of hope and of life to all the peoples of the world.

Promotion of the Cultural Arts in New York City and the Exhibitions in the Riverside Museum, Master Institute of United Arts, Inc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SOL BLOOM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 3, 1939

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

On my last trip home to New York City, just before consideration of the pending neutrality legislation was begun, it

was my pleasure and privilege to see a large and representative collection of Polish art that left the port of Gdynia during the last week of August. Owing to the present situation, it is probably the last shipment of such art objects which we will see for some time.

This interesting collection comprises a part of a large exhibition of paintings, prints, and sculpture by 270 outstanding women artists of Australia, Czechoslovakia, France, Greece, Hungary, Italy, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Sweden, and Switzerland to be seen at the Riverside Museum, 310 Riverside Drive, at the corner of One Hundred and Third Street, in New York City.

The Riverside Museum is a unit of the Master Institute of United Arts, Inc., established in 1922. The latter is a corporation organized under the educational laws of the State of New York.

The Riverside Museum has become a vital part of the city's educational and cultural life. It affords the 200,000 permanent residents of the neighborhood, the students of Columbia College, Barnard College, Teachers College, New York University, and the thousands of visitors to Riverside Drive an exceptional opportunity for the study and appreciation of contemporary American and European art as well as ancient examples of the far eastern cultures.

It is the only museum of its kind on the upper west side of Manhattan and supplements the permanent collections of the American Museum of Natural History at Seventy-ninth Street, the New York Historical Society at Seventy-seventh Street, the Museum of the American Indian at One Hundred and Fifty-fifth Street, and the Cloisters branch of the Metropolitan Museum of Art at One Hundred and Ninetieth Street.

The principal and primary purpose of the Riverside Museum is to encourage contemporary American art and its artists by holding large and important exhibitions representative of the various trends in painting and sculpture throughout the country, as well as to import representative collections of merit from Europe, Asia, and the Latin American republics. It is the intention of the trustees to augment the permanent collection of the museum with acquisitions of outstanding excellence in the departments of painting, sculpture, and the graphic arts.

The importance of the Riverside Museum in this densely populated section of New York City cannot be overestimated. Some comments by leading New York metropolitan newspapers bring this out most forcefully.

Carlyle Burrows, art critic of the New York Herald Tribune, comments:

> Prospects of increased patronage for American art and a resurgence of cultural and educational activities in New York's upper West Side have been definitely improved by the Riverside Museum's venture.

Howard Devree, art critic of the New York Times, comments:

> The initial exhibition gives promise of a progressive policy and further interesting events.

Emily Genauer, art editor of the New York World-Telegram, comments:

> A new and important museum devoted to contemporary American art. Culture comes to the upper West Side. A new institution has been founded which in time may equal in importance, as a constructive force in American art, the Whitney Museum.

And again, when the Silvermine Guild held its first New York exhibition here:

> Doing a "mountain and Mohammed" for the benefit of the general public and art critics who found it inconvenient to trek to Silvermine, Conn., the Riverside Museum has brought the show to New York.

At this time it may be of general interest to point out the important work the Riverside Museum has accomplished since its establishment. Housed in a modern skyscraper building, it has filled a long-felt need as a cultural center on the upper West Side of the city, where over a quarter million persons reside in an area of 3 square miles.

Concurrent with the New York World's Fair this summer, the United States New York World's Fair Commission, which is headed by our honorable Secretary of Agriculture, Henry A. Wallace, sponsored by a Latin American exhibition of fine and applied arts in these galleries. Paintings, prints, and sculpture from Brazil, Argentina, Chile, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Guatemala, Ecuador, Mexico, and Paraguay were sent by these Governments and effectively displayed through June, July, August, and September. The large attendance of thousands of visitors in these few months proved the wisdom of the commission's decision to sponsor this good-will gesture toward our Latin American neighbors.

Other exhibitions held in the Riverside Museum since its founding have been: Group shows of Chicago artists, Buffalo artists, New York City artists, Silvermine, Conn., artists, New York women artists, American abstract artists, and a large retrospective exhibition of documentary photographs of social significance. During this period the permanent collection of the museum, comprising one of the outstanding oriental exhibitions to be seen in this country, was occasionally placed on view. A Tibetan library of 300 volumes is one of two in the United States, the other being in the Congressional Library in this city. The Riverside Museum is open free to the public every day in the year excepting some holidays and on Mondays.

As many of you know, most of the great museums in the United States are repositories for collections of ancient art and their exhibition programs seldom reach beyond the narrow spheres of community interest. Great stress has been made on bringing to New York art exhibitions from foreign countries and out-of-the-ordinary collections gathered here. To enumerate a few exhibitions held in this building that were outstanding contributions to our knowledge of art the following partial list is impressive: Finnish arts and crafts, Tibetan paintings, exhibitions of old masters, collection of seventeenth and eighteenth century Russian icons, Austrian graphic show, American Indian water colors, docks and rivers of New York, parks and playgrounds of New York, and many other exhibitions. A number of these exhibitions were loaned to other museums and institutions and others are still being circulated.

Since 1922, when the Master Institute of United Arts was incorporated as an educational institution, the president, Mr. L. L. Horch, has unselfishly devoted his time and money to the progress of this cultural center, surrounding himself with trustees and officers who have assisted in this noble undertaking.

The Master Institute program, aside from its activities in the Riverside Museum unit, has embraced the establishment of a school of fine arts, dedicated to the pursuit of art education and the correlation of the arts in one building. Classes have been conducted in music, opera, drama, dance, sculpture, painting, and drawing, in large attractive studios overlooking the Hudson River. Noted instructors have given students their elementary and advanced training in their respective fields. A department was inaugurated for the blind where instruction was given in music with gratifying results. A number of scholarships have been awarded annually to worthy and talented students.

In addition to the above school activities approximately 300 events are given annually which include lectures, forums, travelogues, dramatic and operatic performances, concerts, recitals of the dance and opera, most of which have been free to the public. It has also given its cooperation and facilities to the Federal music project, where thousands of students have enjoyed the privilege of attending classes and lectures and concerts. The institute has also given valuable assistance to the W. P. A. adult-education project under the Board of Education of New York City. Hundreds of lectures and discussions on current events, world literature, play writing, psychology, and public speaking have been given. Also elementary, intermediate, and advanced courses have been made available in French, Italian, and Spanish. The success of this program is best evidenced by the attendance of 57,000 during the year 1938–39.

Incorporated within the Master Institute Building is a modern theater seating 300 persons which has witnessed a succession of notable concerts, recitals, plays, lectures, and symposiums by internationally known groups and persons;

a public library devoted to the arts, sciences, and literature and large lecture halls for intimate affairs. Among the residents of the building are many students, professors, instructors, and other personalities prominently identified with the city's life. Much effort has been expended in collaborating with museums, colleges, educational institutions, elementary, high, and private schools, libraries, women's clubs, and associations, both in the city and out of town.

It is indeed gratifying to realize that in these troubled times there is an institution that not only serves the cultural needs of the community but endeavors to promote international good will through its diversified program of activities.

How Will Belligerents Pay Cash?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEWIS D. THILL

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 3, 1939

Mr. THILL. Mr. Speaker, the credit clause in the neutrality bill created a lot of unfavorable comment. That particular clause was stricken from the Senate bill, but it has not absolutely eliminated the extension of credit to belligerents. Under the present Neutrality Act any individual can borrow money in America, purchase any of our goods except war materials, and take them to a warring nation. Foreigners are not prevented from negotiating loans with international bankers in this country, and they can purchase such materials and sell them to a private concern in the belligerent countries. These materials may go into munitions, and it will be difficult to prove that such materials went to a belligerent government. This is the loophole which may again result in American money financing European wars. It has been stated that the Federal Reserve banks have already been given the "go" sign to furnish the credits by which belligerents may purchase war materials in this country. This is not reassuring to the American people, who so painfully remember the disastrous consequences brought about by extending credit to those warring nations over 22 years ago. The American Ambassador in London, Walter Hines Page, on March 5, 1917, sent a telegram to Woodrow Wilson which contained the following information:

> She (England) cannot continue her present large purchases in the United States without shipments of gold to pay for them, and she cannot maintain large shipments of gold for two reasons: First, both England and France must retain most of the gold they have to keep their paper money at par; and, second, the submarine has made the shipping of gold too hazardous, even if they had it to ship. * * * France and England must have a large enough credit in the United States to prevent the collapse of world trade. If we should go to war with Germany, the greatest help we could give the Allies would be such credit. Perhaps our going to war is the only way in which our present preeminent trade position can be maintained and a panic averted.

Every informed individual must realize that the extension of credit to the Allies paved the way for our entrance into the last war.

The action of Congress in enacting so-called cash-and-carry legislation assumes that we will get cash from belligerents who are in a most deplorable economic and financial condition. These nations cannot pay the principal upon debts incurred as a result of the last war; they cannot even pay the interest upon sums which total billions of dollars. When whatever cash can be supplied by belligerent nations is used up, then the same arguments that brought about the so-called cash law will be used to bring about a law extending credits. Added to the voices of those who wish to see us embroiled in the European war will be the voices of those Americans who have accepted employment on a temporary basis to make munitions for warring nations. They will argue that, unless credit is extended, thousands will be thrown out of work. Another depression will visit America. Certainly the munitions maker will get his compensation. But who will pay him? In the last analysis, will not the people of the United States foot the bill? Will not the American taxpayer be required to pay for these war materials shipped to belligerents, even as he did during the last war?

When we speak of getting cash for war materials shipped to belligerents, what do we mean? It is not as simple as going to the grocery store and paying 50 cents for a pound of butter. The grocer and you both live in America, and you give him an American 50-cent piece, which is considered cash. The grocer gets value received for his goods. He can take that 50-cent piece and buy other goods. But when a foreign country buys materials from us, it can pay either through barter; through selling holdings of American investments and securities, thereby obtaining cash or through the payment of gold. Barter can be used very little during time of war. To dump holdings of American investments and securities will depress our markets for a while, and it will raise only a small amount of the money necessary to finance a war. The chief way in which we might be paid is through gold.

This Nation now has approximately 65 percent of all the gold in the world. Our credit system is already surfeited with gold. After we get if, we bury the gold at Fort Knox, Ky. This country is buying gold at $35 an ounce, approximately $14 an ounce more than it is worth on the world market. We are giving other nations who sell us gold a premium at the expense of the American taxpayer. Other nations on the globe are quickly losing all of their gold. They might dump all the yellow metal into our lap and then go off gold entirely. We would then be sitting with all the gold and no one to sell it to. Even now, if we should attempt to sell our gold, who would buy it? What amount would he buy? How much would we get for it? Until we can sell back to foreigners the gold we are now buying from them at a premium we are not receiving any real value for our goods. Until we can resell the gold abroad, our laborers, farmers, and the rest of our people must pay for the war supplies we send to belligerent nations. The gold which we get in exchange for our American goods is in fact unlawful for us to use and must be buried in the earth, and is practically useless to us. So we can really say that by selling goods to belligerents we Americans are again financing a great part of the war in Europe.

Vicious and Misleading Propaganda in America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 3, 1939

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, each day our desks are covered with an avalanche of propaganda emanating from various sources. Some of the printed matter comes from well-intended, though sadly misinformed, patriotic individuals; more often from organizations, some having the highest purpose as a basis of their very existence.

In many instances—too many, in fact, to overlook—we receive propaganda in the form of books, regularly issued periodicals, and newspapers. In these, often in fact, nearly always, facts are ignored or brazenly twisted, when not misrepresented. At the present time two powerful and well-organized sources of propaganda, functioning through individuals and respectably clothed organizations, are polluting the stream of American public opinion. Our newspaper editors and radio commentators, being too clever in their methods of detection as a rule, refuse to print or announce as news most of the filth of fiendish propagandists. Because of this close scrutiny and attendant blue-penciling and rejection, it becomes necessary for these purveyors of falsehoods and misrepresentations, through which it is intended to twist or at least sway American public opinion, to resort to their

own methods of distribution, with little regard for ethics and less for fact and fairness. Among the chief violators of our freedom and broad tolerance is that recently wedded-in-sin combination of communism and nazi-ism, with emphasis upon the latter. It is as nothing to have nazi-ism commit rape, robbery and mass murder upon Poland, a peaceful and defenseless neighbor and then to despoil the victim of her reputation by propaganda to show that after all, she was deserving of such bestial treatment because she was defloured and degenerate. It is the simplest matter of explanation for nazi-ism, insulting as it is base, to say that the fiendish, scab paper-hanger ordered a counter attack in self defense against a neighboring nation and further to misstate that nazi-ism was not mobilized for the stroke of treachery and death which was delivered in violation of nonaggression treaties to the third successive victim.

The invaded territories of Poland, as well as those of Czechoslovakia, are proclaimed "ancient crownlands of Germany" returning to the Reich. Brazen expressions of shameless propagandists enjoying our American hospitality contemptuously give out information insulting to our American intelligence and fairness right here at the swastika-controlled embassy in Washington. Deliberate falsehoods were circulated to the effect that Prague was an ancient German city and, like its university, founded by a Teuton king or prince on soil that was always German. The gallant and brilliant Col. Vladimir Hurban, Minister of Czechoslovakia, silenced the falsifier as he crushed the slander at one bold stroke.

The western Polish provinces of Poznan, Pomerania, and Silesia now temporarily overrun by the Godless and fiendish forces of nazi-ism are claimed as territories of Germany. Our American people were not expected to know that these lands, and even territory which was never restored by the treaty of Versailles, extending far to the west of Poland's recent boundaries and peopled by 1,800,000 Poles who were forced to goose-step to Hitlerism, always belonged to Poland. Propagandists would have Americans believe that German boundaries extended to the Vistula River, if not further east. These same Nazi radio commentators and spokesmen, highly paid for their services, have the gall to state that nazi-ism "has no interest in changing the sovereignty of any American territory, most certainly not to its own benefit." Who in America does not remember the red-handed capture in the act of Von Bernstorff and Von Papen who promised Mexico the sovereign States of Texas, New Mexico, and Arizona, in return for military aid against the United States. There is no more difference between nazi-ism and the madmen of Wilhelm's day than there was difference between the schemers of 1914 and Bismarck. This same source of propaganda, with even more brass, stated that "only on two occasions German troops ever fought in the Western Hemisphere"; one of these times "to help Washington throw off British despotism." Seemingly this short-eared ass does not know that the mercenary Hessians who fought the Continental Army in a war that was no concern of theirs and who burned Trenton, bringing disgrace to the people of Germany were worse enemies than the British red coats and were, for a fact, the same breed of hydrophobic intruders and assassins of freedom as are their modern Nazi brothers.

And so the propaganda goes on and on. The persecution and imprisonment on false charges of priests and nuns of the Catholic Church, are justified by spurious charges against them. In fact, the same barbaric treatment is given to the Lutheran Church along with other Protestant denominations. Faked charges against churchmen of sedition, sex crimes, and illegal money export is justified by clever and repeated propaganda. Trade-unionism ruthlessly destroyed and labor enslaved as truly and completely as were the unfortunate Negroes of our own shameful era. Masonry given a death blow by nazi-ism and its leaders jailed, Jews of Nazi Germany, loyal, patriotic and productive are persecuted by the most fiendish and systematic methods ever devised by the degenerate minds of the hated Gestapo, blood purges and mass murder of the flower of Germany's people, charged with nonconformism, become routine and beyond the aid of the masses. The liberty loving people of Germany despoiled of every vestige of freedom and independence are doomed to bestial servitude until nazi-ism is either destroyed or dies of its own venom. Still there are some people in America, Mr. Speaker, who wink at, yea, even condon this wave of bigotry, intolerance, and misrepresentation.

They say the suffering of the Catholic Church in Germany is none of our business. The treatment accorded the Protestants is, so I have heard said, no concern of ours. The persecution of the helpless Jewish minority and confiscation of their properties, like the abolition of Masonry and trade-unionism, is purely a domestic problem for the Nazis to solve as they see fit. The fiendish deportations of millions of Polish citizens from the occupied western provinces of Poland, stripped of all their earthly possessions, and their replacement with unwilling Germans, forced to return as expatriates from neighboring states, excite no compassion in the hearts of some of our indifferent Americans.

That is not what my faith has taught me as regards suppression of religion, free love, confiscation of churches, and the imprisonment of priests and nuns. That is not my understanding of the attitude of American trade-unionism, militant, aggressive, fraternal, and free to express itself, as we know it here in America. That certainly is not approved by the great Masonic fraternity in the United States, and surely cannot hope to have the nod of approbation of the great American public when these varied and base persecutions are all summed up and added to the sad fate of the Jews.

So, as an American, I protest against this wave of propaganda which seeks by misrepresentation and self-justification to corrupt our sense of moral values and disrupt our sense of fairness. I will not lend myself to any aggregation or combination of degenerates who by their propaganda seek to justify fiendish acts of aggression, repression, lust, and persecution, because it is foreign, un-American, it is base and perverted. To me, Americanism means something that is pure, wholesome, unsullied, fearless, impartial and, like truth, unchangeable and deathless.

The One-Act Session

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. RICH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 3, 1939

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker and Members of Congress, this is the last opportunity I will have to address you during the second session, or special session, of the Seventy-sixth Congress, which was called by the President of the United States, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, for the purpose of enacting neutrality legislation. After we were called here the leaders of the party refused the Members of Congress the privilege of discussing or considering any other legislation but neutrality. This was a travesty on justice, because there is important legislation that needs attention, and especially there are many bills which have been passed during Franklin D. Roosevelt's administration which should be changed. We were in session 6 weeks and most of the time doing nothing—a waste of time to Congressmen and anxiety and expense to the taxpayers and general public.

The most outstanding of these are the Wagner Act and the act creating the National Labor Relations Board. These two acts, instead of helping the workers of this country, are doing the laboring man a great injustice. The majority of labor does not have an opportunity to assert itself. The men who are ruling in the labor war today are the radical labor leaders, and I dare say that 10 percent or less of labor is permitted to rule the other 90 percent, especially in the case of the C. I. O. unions. They are closing up more business en-

terprises, creating more strikes, and causing more disturbance and more bitter feeling between employer and employee, between capital and labor, than at any time in the history of America.

If the results were that labor was given better opportunities and greater wages, more satisfaction, then I should not make this protest, but when I am confident that labor is being injured, manufacturers are being wrecked, and the country at large is suffering, I feel it is my duty as a public servant to raise my voice in protest in order that I may make this country a better place to live. When the C. I. O., with its communistic, radical tendencies, controls the labor situation, to the detriment of all labor, when they head Labor's Non-Partisan League—a political propaganda agency for the welfare of the radical labor leaders—in order that they may get the labor vote to work and assist in the election of radicals to public office, it is time the American people wake up.

I want to call your attention to an article published in the Washington Star of November 4 concerning the fact that Kolb's Dairy and Kolb's Bakery, in Baltimore, closed their doors and went out of business because they were not able to meet the demands of the radical labor leaders. I herewith insert the article:

BALTIMORE FIRM CLOSES WHEN UNION ASKS RAISES

BALTIMORE, November 4.—Kolb's Dairy and Kolb's Bakery, in business in Baltimore since 1921, were shut today—closed, President John G. Kolb asserted, because union employees demanded increased wages he couldn't pay.

Not only was he closing the plants, Mr. Kolb said, but he was also going out of business.

He announced customers of his 2 companies were being taken over by other concerns in the city, and his 80 employees would have to find other jobs.

A contract signed with American Federation of Labor unions last year upped his pay roll $835 a month, he asserted, and the business was operating at a loss. When union representatives sought a new contract, involving certain wage increases, "we decided to go out of business."

"Eventually, if present conditions continue," Mr. Kolb added, "there will be more doing what we have done—close up."

I know of many businessmen today who are trying to figure out what they can do to wind up their business, salvage all they can, and quit business forever because the difficulties in operating are so great that they realize they are going in the "red" every day, and the only thing for them to do is to close up and get out. Why is it that more people are trying to secure Government jobs today than ever before? Just because we are taking opportunity away from the American businessmen who were the creators of jobs. It is not the politician or the man who is looking after labor in order to get votes who make jobs—no, indeed; it is the man who is out in the world trying to do something and to be fitted for more than just work with a pick and shovel; it is the man who wants to go ahead who is the fellow who creates the jobs and gives the opportunity of work to the other fellow. He is the man who creates jobs.

Much has been said about the businessman of this country making too much money. Well, it is the easiest thing in the world for the Members of Congress to adjust the income and inheritance taxes so that we can keep the businessman in his earnings to any level we so desire. We can regulate how much money he can receive net in salary by means of the income-tax law; then why worry about anyone making too much money? If, by chance, he has already made his money and has it salted down, as it were, is it not the easiest thing to adjust the inheritance tax so that when he dies the Federal Government can get any part of it it may want? He will have no opportunity to take it with him, regardless of his destination.

Why do we not have sensible, sane legislators who will give practical thought to, and put into practical application, laws that are just—laws that will continue to build up our country and continue to make it the greatest country on the face of the earth? It seems to me that we are very shortsighted, and that many of the laws that have been passed during this administration should be changed, and changed at once before it is too late.

WHERE ARE YOU GOING TO GET THE MONEY?

Where are you going to get the money to operate this Government under conditions such as we have now? The Treasury statement shows that we are in the "red" over a billion and a half dollars since the 1st of July and that we will be $4,000,000,000 in the "red" by next June 30; we are practically up to the borrowing capacity of our Government of $45,000,000,000; and look at the contingent liabilities, which now total over $5,356,000,000, and which is not considered part of the public debt. We have set this Government up in more business enterprises under Mr. Roosevelt's administration, despite the fact that he promised in his preelection campaigns that he would consolidate Government departments and eliminate bureaus, and has, instead, increased them more than any five Presidents who have been in the chair. The national deficit of this administration has been greater than any other administration, and will be even greater than that of Mr. Wilson during the time of the World War. When will Mr. Roosevelt carry out his promises that we will make our income equal our outgo; when will he simplify Government operation so that the cost will be greatly reduced—or, in other words, when will we balance the Budget? He promised it to us why does he not make good his promises? It seem to me that a man who promises something to the American people should be as good as his word.

WHERE ARE YOU GOING TO GET THE MONEY?

Let me call your attention to the deficit of Mr. Roosevelt's administration:

Mar. 4, 1933, to June 30, 1933	$892,600,000
June 30, 1934	3,409,000,000
June 30, 1935	2,938,000,000
June 30, 1936	4,361,000,000
June 30, 1937	2,707,000,000
June 30, 1938	1,459,000,000
June 30, 1939	3,685,000,000
June 30, 1940 (estimated)	4,000,000,000
	23,451,600,000

How can Mr. Roosevelt look this country in the face and appease his own conscience with the statement that he made on March 4, 1933, in his inaugural address? He stated—and I quote:

Through this program of action we address ourselves to putting our own national house in order and making the income balance outgo.

That was a wise statement then; it is just as wise, and more so, today. When he looks back over his record of spending, it is the most shameful record that has ever stood out for the American people. Instead of trying to economize in government, he and the Congress that represents him have been thinking only about spending, spending, spending. They are not spending the money of this generation and of our people today; they are hoarding up a great national debt for our children, our children's children, and our children's children's grandchildren to pay. It is anything but wise, and it certainly is not a good heritage for our children, and only men without any ability whatever would permit a thing of that kind to go on. No two or three generations can carry on the Government of this country and assume this great obligation. We cannot tear them down by exorbitant taxation, for let me quote what Mr. Franklin D. Roosevelt said at Pittsburgh on October 19, 1932:

Taxes are paid in the sweat of every man who labors. If excessive, they are reflected in idle factories, tax-sold farms, and, hence, in hordes of the hungry tramping the streets and seeking jobs in vain. Our workers may never see a tax bill, but they pay in deductions from wages, in increased cost of what they buy, or (as now) in broad cessation of employment. Our people and our business cannot carry its excessive burdens of taxation.

Today we find ourselves in a most terrible situation. I have heard Members of Congress say that we are never going to pay these debts; that we will repudiate them. Has it occurred to you that if we do we will lose our form of government, because no nation under the face of the sun has ever repudiated its debts and maintained its form of government? Should not we buckle our belts and get down to work, try to be sensible, pay off this debt, and maintain the form of government that our forefathers worked so hard for and, in 1776,

shed so much blood that we might have liberty; that we might have freedom of religion, freedom of the press, and freedom of speech? Are we going to lose all this and take the form of a dictatorship? God forbid that such a thing will ever happen to America. But I say to you now that unless you stop the present administration and the present way of doing things, it will happen to you just as sure as the sun will rise tomorrow morning. Five or six years more and it will be all over. We will lose our present form of government.

The American people do not know, or at least they do not realize, the seriousness of this situation. It is a serious thing, in my mind. It is terrible to contemplate, and the American people will think the same when it happens. The philosophy of our forefathers, of trying to work and earn a living and save a few dollars for a rainy day, seems to have been lost sight of by this administration. All they think about is spend, spend, spend. They encourage people to do nothing; they encourage them to receive money from the Federal Government and State; they encourage them to think that it is the Government's business to take care of all people, whether they want to work or whether they do not. The old philosophy was that we must take care of our Government if we wish to have law and order, and I am sure that is the sensible solution. If we get back, and get back at once, to trying to aid and assist in the perpetuation of our Government by having good, sound, and sensible laws, the better it will be for our country and for the citizens of this country, and the better it will be for all political parties.

Mr. Speaker, majority leader, chairmen of the various committees, why do you not get together with the committees of the Senate, formulate some plan that will keep our country from going on the rocks? If you do that before it is too late, it will be the very best possible thing that you can do. Here is hoping that you will take this advice, that you will call your men together before the 3d day of January 1940, and that you will not permit the spending spree that has been going on during the past 8 years to continue in 1940. I beg of you to do this, and if you do you will have the undying gratitude of the American children yet unborn. You will have the support of all good sound-thinking American citizens of today. Internal revolution is all too often the result of overburdened people.

The administration is advocating spending an additional $1,200,000,000 on the Navy next year. Do they realize when we complete the present additional Navy of about 100 new fighting craft that our annual war burden of Navy, $770,473,241; Army military, $499,876,686; and Army nonmilitary of $306,182,464 for 1940, making a total of annual appropriations of over $1,576,542,000 for the year will be increased over and above this sum about $500,000,000 additional. A tremendous burden, and yet the instrumentalities for war become obsolete in a few years. I am for adequate defense, but we are permitting a war-minded administration to run wild at this time under the guise of neutrality and keep America out of war. Let us keep our feet on the ground and not be stampeded into bankruptcy. For thus we are surely headed. Where are we going to get the money? Let the administration answer.

Farm Imports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK CARLSON
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, November 3, 1939

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Speaker, I am submitting for the RECORD a table giving the comparison of imports of foodstuff and farm raw materials for the first 9 months of 1938 and the first 9 months of 1939.

Import item	Unit	9 months ended September—	
		1938	1939
FOODSTUFFS			
Cattle, except for breeding	Head	296,000	604,000
Wheat for milling and export	Bushels	1,203,000	8,091,000
Meat products	Pounds	112,177,000	124,803,000
Cheese	Pounds	37,405,000	37,613,000
Fish (canned, prepared, etc.)	Pounds	107,915,000	129,974,000
RAW MATERIALS			
Hides and skins	Pounds	112,093,000	237,542,000
Flaxseed	Bushels	10,944,000	13,849,000
Tobacco, unmanufactured	Pounds	54,679,000	57,820,000
Cotton, unmanufactured	Pounds	85,488,000	73,595,000
Wool, unmanufactured	Pounds	54,437,000	177,194,000
Flax and hemp, unmanufactured	Tons	1,432	4,613

Source: U. S. Department of Commerce figures (Oct. 26, 1939).

United States exports of crude foodstuffs, 8 months, 1938 and 1939, by principal classes and countries

Export items and countries	8 months ended August—	
	1938	1939
Total crude foodstuffs	$199,067,000	$79,880,000
Wheat	68,018,000	32,364,000
Corn	82,102,000	11,132,000
Vegetables (fresh and dried)	5,421,000	6,419,000
Fruits (fresh)	28,292,000	24,108,000
Other products	15,234,000	5,857,000
Principal export markets:		
Belgium	14,017,000	6,320,000
Canada	54,706,000	16,514,000
China	53,000	2,407,000
Cuba	938,000	1,228,000
Denmark	3,975,000	160,000
France	3,431,000	3,182,000
Germany	10,145,000	762,000
Greece	2,272,000	24,000
Ireland	16,873,000	2,654,000
Italy	1,241,000	61,000
Mexico	3,626,000	2,449,000
Netherlands	20,638,000	8,739,000
Norway	2,284,000	696,000
Portugal	1,860,000	
Sweden	1,541,000	565,000
United Kingdom	55,400,000	27,716,000
Total, all countries	199,067,000	79,880,000

Source: U. S. Department of Commerce figures.

Neutrality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENT E. KELLER
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, November 2, 1939

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, in the presence of the rampant totalitarian onslaught against insufficiently armed peoples it has become a question whether any weak nation, whether weak in numbers or weak in armament, can hope to survive. Unless they are so protected by sufficient treaties of assistance, in case of attack the weak nations are doomed.

We had a right to believe that the era of the walled city, with all the abuses which that condition enforced, had passed by for all time. But this present period of retrogression has brought the walled nations. The Maginot line and the Siegfried line are impregnable walls of defense—expressions of fear between two peoples that ought to and would, left to themselves, be friends and competitors only in serving their fellow men. Walls of fear. Where will it end?

Behind walls of fear democracy cannot grow and develop and bless, as it has in the past. All the growth of democracy has come from the free, open lands of the world. This present destruction of weak nations by totalitarian governments may

well be the beginning of the inevitable struggle of democracy to exist in spite of these tyrannies.

Russia, under the cloak of ultra democracy has grown to great power. From recent events it appears the present leaders of that great people have suddenly turned Czarist again. A new set of self-constituted nobility has apparently thrown off the cloak of democracy and blossomed forth in a new military uniform.

The German people are a great people. They do not want war. The Russian people are great people. They do not want war. But neither people appear able to resist the orders of their masters. Time shall surely bring them both into the actual acceptance of democracy. But whether that shall be in 50 years, a hundred years, or 500 years may depend largely on the liberty the present regimes of Germany and Russia are permitted to exercise in destroying the faith of the people in the right to self-government.

We are not going into this war. But the retrogression toward one-man or one-group government rampant in the world today ought to warn America against sleeping sickness for democracy.

We are not going into this war. But unless we be as unwise as the unwise virgins, we are going to prepare fully against the day when this present war is over, so that we may be so strong in preparedness that whatever combination of totalitarianism may emerge from the present war—if such a combination does emerge—they shall not dare to attack us. That is our road to safety. There is no other.

Any man of intelligence who has read the news reports of the many appearances of oceangoing submarines along our shores ought to see that the 3,000 miles of trackless waters between America and Europe might well be a hiding place for the enemies of our country instead of her defense against them. A sufficient number of oceangoing submarines of present efficiency might come so near to destroying our Navy as to greatly limit its ability to protect our shores against invasion by a powerful enemy. We must not overlook the tremendous improvement in these national concealed weapons in the last few years. Nor can we fail to consider the very much greater improvements and development that may reasonably be expected of them in the near future. And in that quite possible case the United States would be open to invasion, because, fine as its personnel is, we have no army adequate to meet a powerful, highly trained, well-equipped, well-provisioned enemy army.

Therefore, in view of this possibility, we will be back to that primitive condition which has existed in most wars—the necessity of a military force sufficient in numbers, in training, in equipment, and supplies to completely and certainly repel every attempt at invasion of the land endangered.

If we are to understand what walled nations may mean, we have only to get a clear understanding of what the walled city meant to civilization, and multiply that condition into national proportions and note honestly what it meant to human liberty and human progress for the thousand years of the Dark Ages. The growth and retention of liberty requires the open, free sunshine under all conditions. The ability of any army to defend our country, and every country, depends on wartime supplies as well as on ships and soldiers, and the best equipment available. As science is applied to equipment and military supplies, this requirement will become constantly more and more important.

If we are to grasp what unpreparedness means, let us look for a moment at what is happening at the present time in China. The Chinese people are a great peace-loving nation. Man for man they are equal to or superior in manhood, courage, and industry to the Japanese. China is a great country, rich in natural resources. There are four times as many of the Chinese as there are the Japanese. The Chinese had little military preparedness, but the Japanese are thoroughly developed in military training, mechanized army equipment, and fully supplied with arms, ammunition, and airplanes. They have overrun half of the great Chinese Republic. They have bombed the cities and already destroyed hundreds of thousands of Chinese old men, women, and children. And for the first time in centuries, the Japanese armies are encouraged to do that utterly defenseless thing which every other army in modern times has punished by death. It is a part of the invasion of China that the Japanese soldiers are directed to rape the Chinese women and young girls wherever the Japanese armies appear.

Hundreds of thousands of young girls have been raped—not in the dark and lonely places only, but in broad daylight in the open streets, in front of the girls' schools and colleges, where our civilization has provided these institutions.

In proportion as the Chinese had arms and ammunition they have defended their women and children bravely. But the lack of military supplies is permitting the constant repetition of these horrors. The cries of thousands of Chinese women and girls go up every day against the merciless assault of Japanese rapists. A small nation turned bandit is destroying a numerous pacifist nation because that pacifist nation lacks trained men, equipment, and especially arms and ammunition.

I call attention to this condition because I am hopeful that through contemplation of it by those among us who have reached the conclusion that both sides in all wars are wrong should be awakened to the facts of history—that there are two kinds of armies in all wars—armies of aggression and armies of defense. Armies of defense have for all these centuries stood for the defense of the mothers of their countries and the girls who are to become mothers. The men in the defending armies of the world have deemed it an honor and a glory to give their lives in defense of these mothers and mothers to be. Without these defending armies, without men willing to die for the security of womanhood, there would be no civilization and no security in the world today. But it must be pointed out that these defending armies have often been destroyed for lack of training and equipment, arms, and ammunition. That the enslavement of the people by armies of invasion, even where rape has been forbidden, has nevertheless enforced conditions upon conquered people as bad in the long run as China is now undergoing.

All of us Americans must wake up to our own state of unpreparedness to the fact that it takes time to train armies, it takes time to provide equipment, it takes time to provide the means for making arms and ammunition. It takes time to build our airplanes in sufficient numbers to meet the requirements of future wars. We should, therefore, miss no opportunity to provide these fundamentals, which require time in providing proper defense of our own interests.

We ought to remember that we were thrown into the World War because Germany knew we were woefully unprepared. She gambled with destiny in the belief that we could not prepare in time to be effective. And those who know the inside know the tremendous difficulties we had to overcome and the terrible costs we had to bear before we were effective in that war. In short, if we had had a good army and a good navy we would not have been compelled to go into the World War. The several billions it would have cost to provide an adequate army and navy would have saved the vast number of billions we spent in the war and the vaster number of billions yet to be spent as the result of that war. We would have saved the usefulness of the large number of young Americans who died or were incapacitated in that war. If we are not entirely lacking in wisdom we will not be caught again in such a condition.

The opportunity to prepare against such a condition is before us to take it or leave it without endangering our own peace or without any danger of participation in this war. If we repeal this arms embargo we can and will establish munitions factories and learn how to make military supplies for our own armies, which we have always neglected and will likely go on neglecting in time of universal peace. We shall learn to apply mass production to building airplanes and be able to supply sufficient numbers for full protection in case we are attacked. But if we provide all these things sufficiently no nation will be foolish enough to attack us, and we are not going to attack our neighboring nations.

It will incidentally put many men to work, and after the present war passes the chemical plants will be diverted to the manufacture of other products, as most of these were after the World War.

It is our national interest to build, or have built, these chemical plants ready for our own use in case of necessity. It is fundamentally to our national interest to put men to work learning our own needs in case war be forced upon us. It is a national necessity to gain the widest possible experience in building and using airplanes.

These three elements of preparedness will be a valuable contribution toward discouraging any nation from attacking us. Let us understand perfectly that whatever feeling we may have on the subject, American money is going to make and sell war supplies in this war. If we fail to remove the embargo, there are some billions of dollars of American money ready to build airplane, chemical, and ammunition plants in Canada. I am in favor of keeping that money at home, giving our own idle men the work it will afford, and learn how and be prepared to make our own military supplies in America for the safety and security of America. Of course, if we lived in a civilized world all this military preparation could and would be dispensed with. We could and would beat our swords into plowshares; we would learn to do away with poverty; we would turn our energies to the service of our fellow men; we would bless the fathers and mothers of our children, and set the feet of their wee tots in the paths of opportunity; we would provide universal employment; and we would provide full security for every man and woman in our country as the fires of life waned. But so long as the armies of armed nations march and murder their neighbors, destroy weak nations, and brazenly defend all the crimes their armies commit, this great beacon republic must train armies, build navies, plan ahead against the marauding nations of the world, who only understand force and themselves only obey fear.

We passed the present law in the hope that our example of willingness to forego wartime profits would tend to prevent war in Europe. But last year it had become evident that it was to exert no such influence. It had become evident that by favoring one side in a possible war, as it evidently did and does, it might, indeed, induce rather than prevent war. We, therefore, started a fight to repeal that law. We gave notice we were going to change that law to comport with our American tradition along that line throughout our entire history. It was our contention then, during peacetime, that if the arms embargo were repealed it would be a powerful deterrent, if not a preventive, against war in Europe. That that was a well-justified hope has been freely admitted by some of the opponents of the pending bill here on the floor of the House. The justification of that conclusion lies in this fact: That at the present time the success or failure of war depends on equipment and supplies for carrying on a war. If one side has abundant supplies and the other has not, regardless of numbers or training, the side which lacks military supplies is bound to lose, no matter how just its cause may be.

There is not a man on the floor of this House who has given unprejudiced thought to this subject who believes for one minute that the repeal of this arms embargo will under any possible chance throw us into this war. It has been, and still is, a crime to put forth perfervid statements telling the mothers of this country that the lives of their sons are in danger. That if we repeal the Embargo Act it will be sure to lead us into war. Whether put forth from ignorance or willful misrepresentation, that has been shameless beyond measure.

This House itself has the full say as to whether we shall ever enter into any war. To pretend anything else is to belie the plain fact. To pretend for a moment that we are under any circumstances to enter this war is to say that the majority of this House is going to vote to enter into this war. When everyone knows that not a single Member of this House can be found who for a moment would even consider voting for such a measure. Where, then, is the excuse for proclaiming that we are in danger of entering this war? In all honesty, there is no excuse at all. Who is there here that will deny this? Then why should anyone proclaim it?

I am against war; I am against crime; I am against inhumanity in all its phases; I am against greed; I am against tyranny in high places and low; I am against poverty. I am for peace; I am for obedience to law and order; I am for mercy and protection of the weak; I am for unselfish cooperation among men nationally and individually; I am for equality among men; I am for plenty for all, and I know it can be provided. I regret that civilization seems to be so far away; I regret that nations engage in murder and robbery against other nations. But in so topsy-turvy a world I know my country must of necessity seek first its own security under the law of nations. It must with intelligence and ever-present courage go straight forward, regardless of the influences and intrigues of other countries. It has always done that, and always must. When Russia makes a treaty to sell war supplies to one belligerent, we should know that her attempt at preventing this country from selling war supplies also is purely selfish and ought to point clearly and unmistakably to our right and duty in this matter.

I am not against Germany, I am not against Russia, I am not against Great Britain, I am not against France; neither am I for Germany, nor am I for Russia; neither am I for Great Britain, nor am I for France; but I am irretrievably and eternally for the United States of America. I am for its free institutions and its free people. I shall cast my vote that way on this bill in the sole interest of our country, whatever be the result to any other country. Wherever and whenever the interests of America are at stake, I shall have an eye single for those interests. I shall refuse to consider any influence that may be brought to bear in behalf of any other country or any other interest than the interests of America. And I accept full responsibility for all my acts in carrying forward neutrality.

It has been and still is a question whether any country should tie its own hands in any manner tending to prevent freedom of action as the unforeseeable conditions may arise. But in this as in all things where the American people express a universal sentiment on a well-considered subject, I defer to their sentiment and decision. The American people have shown a hundred percent desire to stay out of this war. I join most heartily in that sentiment, believing that the sacrifices made in the Senate bill providing for keeping American ships and American citizens out of the war zone is the best, if not the only, means of keeping us out of this war. I shall give my full support to that measure. If this provision had been put into the law last summer during peace, as many of us attempted to do, the international question and the international danger involved in the capture of the American ship *Flint* would not be a subject for America to worry over. It necessarily follows that if we keep our ships out of the war zone, this incident cannot be repeated. If we keep out of the war zone, we will keep out of war.

The warring nations of Europe have declared a very extensive war zone over the waters surrounding Europe in which they declare themselves free and justified in destroying any commerce that may enter that zone. In view of that action, the nations of the American Continent feel themselves free and justified in announcing the establishment of a peace zone over the waters surrounding this western continent which shall be free of any and all war activities. As we recognize the war zone established by the nations at war, they must in turn recognize and respect this American peace zone.

The formation of this peace zone around the American Continent is the result of an agreement between all the countries which make up this continent. It is a universal cooperative acceptance of the Monroe Doctrine which this Nation put forth 116 years ago. We must therefore not only stand ready and willing to defend it as we always have, but we are obligated to put ourselves in military position to defend it successfully. That will be our best guaranty of peace.

Contraband of War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEWIS D. THILL

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 3, 1939

Mr. THILL. Mr. Speaker, in response to my letter of September 26, the Secretary of State, Cordell Hull, sent me a translation of a note of September 19 from the German Embassy in Washington which indicates the policy of the German Government concerning articles which will be regarded by it as having the status of contraband. The letter from the German Embassy, dated September 12, 1939, reads in part as follows:

In its endeavor to spare as far as possible peaceful maritime trade, the German Government, in the prize law of August 28, declared as unconditional contraband only such articles and materials intended for enemy territory or enemy armed forces as serve directly the land, sea, or air armament. However, since the Brtiish Government has issued a list of unconditional contraband far exceeding that limitation, the German Government feels compelled likewise to enlarge the scope of unconditional contraband.

The German Government has therefore adopted the following law, which is hereby proclaimed:

ARTICLE 1. The following articles and materials are considered as contraband (unconditional contraband) if they are intended for enemy territory or for enemy armed forces:

1. Weapons of all kinds, and parts and accessories thereof.
2. Ammunition and parts thereof; bombs, torpedoes, shells, and other kinds of projectiles, contrivances for shooting or throwing such projectiles; powder and explosives, including detonators and igniting materials.
3. Warships of all types, their parts and accessories.
4. Military aircraft of all kinds, their parts and accessories, airplane motors.
5. Armored cars, tanks, and armored trains, armor plate of all kinds.
6. Chemical combat materials and contrivances and machines used to throw or blow such chemicals.
7. Military uniforms and equipment.
8. Means of communication, signaling and military illumination, and parts thereof.
9. Transportation and communication equipment and parts thereof; draft animals, beasts of burden, and animals for riding.
10. Materials of all kinds for producing energy and heat; lubricating oils.
11. Gold, silver, currency, certificates of debt.
12. Implements, tools, machines, and material for the production or use of the articles and products enumerated under figures 1 to 11.

PROCLAMATION REGARDING CONDITIONAL CONTRABAND OF SEPTEMBER 12, 1939

Since the British Government has issued a list of conditional contraband and has included therein foodstuffs and other necessities of life, the German Government now feels compelled also on its part to proceed in a corresponding manner. The following is therefore proclaimed:

Under the conditions of article 2 of the prize law of August 28, 1939, the following articles and materials are considered as contraband (conditional contraband):

Foodstuffs (including live animals), luxuries, feeding stuffs and clothing, articles and materials used for their production.

This proclamation becomes effective on September 14, 1939.

The Neutrality Act Passes—What Then?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER M. PIERCE

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 3, 1939

Mr. PIERCE of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, the 71 majority in the final vote in the House of Representatives on November 3, 1939, for the change in the Neutrality Act was the result of the desire to keep peace and followed a careful study of all phases of a most vexing question. Many Congressmen who voted for the original Neutrality Act in 1935 have deeply regretted such action, because the act has, in operation, materially assisted the aggressor nations and has worked to the decided detriment and disadvantage of the struggling weaker nations. It certainly so proved in the case of China and Japan, as the law has never been invoked during their struggle ostensibly because neither nation had declared war. The Neutrality Act of 1935 did help totalitarian states to overthrow the democratic government of Spain, and that act has recently been operating to make the United States an ally of Hitler and Stalin as against the democracies of western Europe.

After most detailed discussion, it was decided that it would not be possible to enforce a law which would allow shipments to belligerents of parts for weapons and then refuse to allow the sale of the finished product. No distinction could be found between shipping parts of an airplane unassembled and shipping to and selling to belligerents the assembled planes. After consideration from every angle, it was also decided that there was no clear line which could possibly be drawn between offensive and defensive weapons.

A reasonable majority of the Members of Congress became convinced that a revision of the Neutrality Act was necessary and would aid our Government in keeping out of the present war in Europe. It must always be remembered that Congress acts through majority rule, and that any bill passing both Houses must have some merit in the eyes of representatives who are also patriotic American citizens. In the Neutrality Act passed on the 3d of November, our country made tremendous and far-reaching sacrifices. The act curtails use by the American merchant marine of the high seas in the North Atlantic. Not only are American ships barred from trading with belligerents, but vessels of United States registry are also prevented from entering the ports of the neutral nations of northern Europe. Many ships which have been in the trade in the Atlantic are now being tied up because American-owned ships can no longer enter the danger zones. This will undoubtedly bring to the fore many serious problems in connection with our shipping. So far as Members of Congress, shipping interests, and the Maritime Commission could foresee consequences, and consistent with the spirit of the act, the interests of American shippers, carriers, and seamen were protected.

Many believed that credit extended prior to 1917 was one of the potent causes of our participation in the World War. It is therefore provided that belligerents must pay cash on the barrel head for all articles or commodities purchased, and that said articles or commodities must be taken away from our ports in their own bottoms. We fought one war, in 1812, for freedom of the seas, which we have now partially surrendered. We have made sacrifices in the present Neutrality Act which would have startled our fathers had they been proposed to those rugged nationalists—all for the purpose of keeping our country out of the European war. We have certainly made our first appeasement.

There will be no war profits in this country. Early in the second regular session of the Seventy-sixth Congress the Ways and Means Committee of the House will be asked to present a war-profits tax bill for an act which will channel into the Treasury all the excess earnings of munitions makers and manufacturers of war materials engaged either directly or indirectly in such business. The Congress has had no evidence that our industries greatly desire munitions business, which would require remaking plants and plans for the uncertainties of war business with nations financially handicapped. The manufacturers also realize the hazards of post-war readjustments. Clearly, there will be no new crop of American millionaires coming out of this European war.

WAR'S ECONOMIC RESULTS WILL BE FELT HERE

While we are not again going to send our soldiers overseas, we are, nevertheless, deeply concerned over the outcome of the contest of arms in Europe. Whatever the results, we shall be most seriously affected. If the war is fought to exhaustion and a stalemate, then we will probably have increased our gold hoard from the present more than 60 percent of the

world's monetary gold to 85 percent. National credit will be exhausted, not only in Europe but elsewhere throughout the world. Repudiation of obligations is sure to follow, for England and France cannot pay in case of a prolonged struggle. They must go the same way Germany, Russia, and Austria went after the first World War, when they repudiated national debts.

Our industrial and agricultural prosperity for a century and a half has depended upon our ability to sell in foreign markets—mostly in Europe—our surplus from farm and factory. After a war of exhaustion in Europe, the nations cannot buy, for they will have neither gold, silver, credit, goods, nor services to give in exchange.

The changed world situation will require in our country a more drastic control of farm and factory—wages, hours, interests, profits—than our producers and manufacturers have ever faced or considered possible. Should England and France again be able to dictate terms of peace, even then the economic conditions will be bad. In this event the democracies of western Europe might be able to reconstruct and rebuild their economic life on some sort of a semi-socialistic plan of organization. Should Hitler and Stalin be able to dictate the peace terms, then the picture cannot be drawn too black. Communism in some form would then reach clear to the English Channel and envelop all of Europe. Surely Stalin and Hitler would take the British Navy. Did not England and France take the navy of Germany in 1918? Would the conquerors, Hitler and Stalin, take the gold reserves? Did not Hitler take to Berlin the metal money of Austria, Czechoslovakia, and Poland?

Should Stalin and Hitler sit at the peace table as dictators, the last flickering lamps of liberty—free speech, free assembly, free religious worship—will go out forever on the continent of Europe. The totalitarian states would rule supreme not only in Europe but in Asia as well. Hitler and Stalin and their associates, cruel to the last degree, would enforce every condition they stipulated. Compared to their action, England and France after Versailles would appear to have been actually faint-hearted and weak-kneed.

Would the conquerors invade the United States? I do not think any sane person believes for a single minute that they would do so, but they might drive us from the high seas, making it necessary for us to make further appeasement, retiring not only from the North Atlantic but probably from the South Atlantic and possibly from the Pacific. Must we give up Pearl Harbor, or perhaps Alaska, or our friendly trade relations with South America, in order to avoid a naval war? Readers of Mein Kampf, Hitler's own book, see clearly that he aims at world domination. And that book, in which he outlines his plans, followed so far without a change, is not only a classic in Germany but it is taught there in every school.

In any event, it appears that the so-called capitalistic civilization, with its dividends and profits, under which we have made such tremendous strides in the arts of peace as well as in wealth, is in serious danger. The people of Italy and Germany traded off their liberties for bread. In England and France they have temporarily traded off their liberties for the possible chance of saving their governments and cities from annihilation.

OUR NATIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES

The United States, with its constant affirmations of belief in democratic government and maintenance of peace, and its powerful preparation for defense of its ideals, is the hope of the world. Together with its neighbors on the American Continent, it will stabilize and strengthen the efforts of smaller and weaker nations to maintain freedom. But what a herculean task lies ahead of us. Can we, with our own subversive elements, especially in the big cities, with our national debt of more than forty billions, with our factories running today nearly 100 percent of capacity while more than 8,000,000 remain unemployed, with foreign markets practically gone—can we now, or could we after the war, under such circumstances as we might face, maintain our economic stability and continue to prosper? Can we make the wheels go round and divide up the profits so that all who live in the United States may prosper as they have every right to expect to do?

We and our children have a mighty task ahead. Coming years will require the coolest and calmest action, and the most sagacious leadership and the highest statesmanship. If we are to save the capitalistic civilization of which we are so proud, it seems that its privileged beneficiaries, who have become rich and powerful, must give up some of their interest and dividends. I have feared the results of interest exactions which have been so burdensome, especially to farmers. Many times I have said, "Interest on bonds and mortgages should never be greater than the increase of wealth which is 2 percent or less per annum." The future may make great changes in our financial system.

Jobs must be provided for all, and the Government must continue to accept the responsibility of unemployment, with its horrible results. Prevention rather than relief should be the watchword. We have yet to learn the method, but we must formulate a permanent plan of meeting such emergencies and abandon the folly of spasmodic action consisting only of making huge appropriations for some agency to expend. We agree, however, that all must have a chance to earn food, clothing, and shelter, and to enjoy satisfactory lives. I know America has seen dark days before, and when I get really depressed I recall some of the dark days of our past. Since living in Washington I have often wondered what the conditions must have been here after the bloody battle at Antietam, 40 miles north; after the terrible 3 days at Gettysburg. Who could then have guessed that the sons and grandsons of the heroes of those days would now sit in the same legislative halls, working together for the common good of their country? I do have faith that in some manner we shall, under our democratic institutions, solve the problems which today appear so difficult. We must not yield to the delusion that we shall not, as a nation, be influenced by wars between nations. We are resolved to hold aloof from them, but we must prepare to face the consequences of political and economic changes which inevitably result from wars and their concluding peace conferences.

Adequate National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEWIS D. THILL

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 3, 1939

Mr. THILL. Mr. Speaker, America is advantageously situated between two seas and separated by thousands of miles of ocean from the conflict now raging in Europe and the war now being waged in China. It is my firm belief that we can defend our land against any invasion of a foreign foe for generations to come. To that end, America must be prepared for any emergency. We can well adopt the words uttered by President Roosevelt on November 11, 1935:

> Defense against aggression by others—adequate defense on land, on sea, and in the air—is our accepted policy; and the measure of that defense is and will be solely the amount necessary to safeguard us against the armaments of others.

In providing for the defense of this country we must not forget to develop our research laboratories. This Nation must always be ahead of other nations in new developments of defense instruments. It was shown to the Congress during the last session that, all things being equal, an airplane with a speed advantage over another airship, can 9 times out of 10 beat the slower ship in battle. Accordingly, we should develop in this country the fastest pursuit planes in the world.

We are distorting our national economy more than is desirable in providing for national defense through gigantic orders given to munitions, shipping, and airplane factories during this armament period in history. Now that the arms

embargo has been repealed our munitions production will be stepped up still further to disturb our economy. During the period from 1914 to 1917 we were supplying war materials to foreign countries. Our factories were tooled up for foreign governments. When our Government wanted rifles we found that it would take so long to change over for the tooling necessary for a Springfield rifle that this Government had to take Enfield rifles. although they were inferior. It has been stated that it would be impossible to meet our own needs for airplanes in less than 14 months with our own aircraft industry geared up as it is.

We have taken a serious step toward war by repeal of the arms embargo. Our fortunes to a large extent are now tied up with Europe. We took this step knowing full well that no neutral nation in the world sells arms and munitions or implements of war to any belligerent nation. Switzerland has a permanent law which prohibits the sale of arms and ammunition to belligerents. Norway, Sweden, and Denmark have licensing laws which accomplish virtually the same thing. The sole reason given by the ambassadors and ministers of these countries for such action is that they wanted to stay neutral in the present European war.

The President, in his annual message to Congress on January 3, 1936, indicated definitely that we were discouraging the prosecution of war by preventing belligerents from obtaining the instruments to prosecute a war. He said in part:

We decline to encourage the prosecution of war by permitting belligerents to obtain arms, ammunition, or implements of war from the United States. Second, we seek to discourage the use by belligerent nations of any and all American products calculated to facilitate the prosecution of a war in quantities over and above our normal exports of them in time of peace * * * through a well-ordered neutrality to do naught to encourage the contest, through adequate defense to save ourselves from embroilment and attack.

Further on October 4, 1936, the President stated:

Nevertheless, if war should break out again in another continent, let us not blink the fact that we would find in this country thousands of Americans who, seeking immediate riches—fool's gold—would attempt to break down or evade our neutrality.

They would tell you—and, unfortunately, their views would get wide publicity—that if they could produce and ship this and that and the other article to belligerent nations the unemployed of America would all find work.

That was Roosevelt speaking in 1936. But on September 21, 1939, in his special message to Congress he said:

From a purely material point of view what is the advantage to us in sending all manner of articles across the ocean for final processing there when we could give employment to thousands by doing it here?

Our strong defender of neutrality in 1936 is now in the forefront of those who want to break down neutrality in 1939, and the reason advanced is material gain and reduction of unemployment, just as Roosevelt in 1936 predicted would happen.

Let me quote from his speech at Chautauqua, N. Y.:

It would be hard to resist that clamor; it would be hard for many Americans, I fear, to look beyond, to realize the inevitable penalties, the inevitable day of reckoning that come from a false prosperity. To resist the clamor of that greed, if war should come, would require the unswerving support of all Americans who love peace.

This country is now definitely a munitions depot for the warring nations of Europe. It is suggested that there might be sabotage in the munitions industry of this Nation, just as there was from 1914 to 1919. There will now no doubt be unrestricted submarine warfare. Many ships will be sunk and many lives will be lost on the high seas. We Americans must remain calm in spite of those war incidents which are certain to arise.

DARE ANY NATION ATTACK THE UNITED STATES?

Many people have heard arguments to the effect that when Hitler subdues England and France he will attack America. No authoritative statement from any military expert has come to my attention which presents the thesis that Germany will be victorious. On the contrary, many naval and military experts indicate that the Allies will win this war. Germany has few resources and about 86,000,000 people. Great Britain has vast resources and an empire consisting of about 500,000,000 people. France, with its great Army, will be a tremendous factor in the war. All three nations are well prepared to carry out a long and devastating fight, and if the war continues for 2 years or longer, those nations will end up prostrate. They will be wrecks morally, physically, and financially. They will be ruined for years to come. They could not successfully attack this Nation and we need never fear them. Even if all the nations in the world leveled their full might against us, they would have little chance of overcoming our resistance.

Gen. Smedley D. Butler stated recently:

It will take not less than 1,000,000 soldiers to invade the United States with any hope of even getting ashore.

These million men must come all at once.

They must bring not less than 7 tons of baggage per man—1,000,000 men—7,000,000 tons of food, ammunition, and what not.

They must bring 400,000 motor vehicles. They've got to find room for 50 gallons of gasoline per day for each vehicle.

Why, there are not enough ships in the whole world to carry that kind of an expedition. And, remember, those ships have to have enough fuel to get back with—to make the round trip. * * * They're got to have harbors to land in; docks to get their stores ashore; * * * and don't forget that we happen to have a navy, and it's the best in the world.

Now, what about an aerial invasion?

Well, Colonel Lindbergh and Eddie Rickenbacker, the two foremost flyers we have, already have told you it's ridiculous to talk or to think about bombing New York from Berlin.

And don't forget that we have an air force of our own.

From this it is clearly evident that the European powers now at war could not successfulliy attack this Nation. The United States can and must stay out of the present European war. We Americans can perform a more noble task for civilization by making this Nation a better place to live in and by making democracy work here.

Anent the Dies Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. SHANLEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 2, 1939

LETTER FROM HELEN WOOD

Mr. SHANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein a letter from Miss Helen Wood, acting administrative assistant in the United States Department of Labor, Wage and Hour Division, anent her inclusion in the list published by the Dies committee. The letter speaks for itself and comes from a woman whose friends and coworkers in my own State have been of the best. They as well as I relish this chance to afford her the best medium of defense she has at this time.

The letter follows:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
WAGE AND HOUR DIVISION,
Washington, October 26, 1939.

Hon. JAMES A. SHANLEY,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SHANLEY: I am enclosing a copy of a letter which I have today written to Congressman MARTIN DIES regarding the publication of my name as a member of the League for Peace and Democracy.

As you undoubtedly are aware, for the past 8 years I was in the employ of the State of Connecticut as deputy labor commissioner and later as executive director of the unemployment compensation division. I feel that the erroneous connection of my name with the activities of the Dies committee is not only a reflection on me personally, but upon the State of Connecticut for having had on its staff someone reputed to have been connected with un-American activities.

You may use this letter in any way you see fit to correct the abuse which innocent people are experiencing at the hands of the Dies committee.

Very truly yours,

HELEN WOOD,
Acting Administrative Assistant.

Neutrality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD A. KELLY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 3, 1939

Mr. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, in the general debate that has ensued for the past few months over the most controversial matter that has been brought before Congress to decide since our entrance into the last World War the question in every American's mind today is, Shall we retain the present Neutrality Act as defined by law or whether we shall repeal certain provisions of it?

Mr. Speaker, one thing is certain; the minds of the American people have been aroused as they never have been before. In my 9 years as Representative from the Third Congressional District of Illinois I have received thousands upon thousands of letters, telegrams, and telephone calls when certain legislation was pending before Congress for consideration. Many of these letters were from people who were sincere in their expressed thoughts of mind; many, however, came from organized propaganda agencies, handed out in form letters for people to sign and send on to Washington for the purpose of preventing the enacting of legislation that is beneficial for the public welfare. People who signed these letters allowed their names to be used without ever knowing what the legislation was about and the purpose for its consideration. Many were compelled to sign them by coercive methods of employers, with the threat—if they did not—of the loss of their positions. These, of course, are old methods used by those in gaining their objective in life.

Mr. Speaker, of all the legislation that came before Congress for consideration, never have I experienced the flood of letters and telegrams from people in and out of my district, instructing me how to vote. Some were letters that had been well thought by the minds of those who sent them and were of a sincere nature; others by the language and phraseology and contents came from propaganda sources, for comparing these letters, hundreds of them have the same wording. I have no quarrel with the persons who sent them on to me, I thank them for the interest they have taken in their Government, and of the special interest in counseling me as their representative. But I feel sorry for them for not having the proper knowledge of the pending legislation upon which they so sincerely expressed themselves. Mr. Speaker, leaders of propaganda agencies never enlighten the minds of people with the truth, that is not their purpose, for their purpose is bent upon one object and that is to gain their own objective by holding back the truth. Judging from some of the communications I have received there seems to be a great deal of confusion upon their part in not having the truth explained to them. For instance, most of them are under an impression that by repealing the arms-embargo provision of the present law, we declared a declaration of war upon Germany.

I have heard that statement conveyed to them over the radio; that is not so, and those who made that statement know it is not so.

Mr. Speaker, as an ex-soldier and a member of the American Expeditionary Forces of the last World War, I sympathize with the American people and know that they do not want war. For the futility of the last war is too fresh in all of our minds, and God forbid that I ever cast a vote that would send a mother's son to fight a war on foreign soil that we were not of the making.

I, as a father, have two sons, one who would become eligible for military service in a few years, an athlete of the finest type, one who received a gold medal last year from the school which he attends. He is to me as all the sons of mothers and fathers in America are to them, fine young men, symbolic of real American manhood; therefore, I am activated by the same motives as they are, fearing that the day would come to send them off to war.

My vote will be cast with a clear conscience and with one purpose only, and that will be to keep America out of war.

Mr. Speaker, how are we going to keep out of war? No man's mortal mind can answer that, but we can best prepare to keep out, and that is for this Nation to remain neutral.

With the provision of the present Neutrality Act we can never hope to keep out and remain a neutral Nation. With our ships owned by American shippers, manned by American seamen, sailing into ports of belligerent nations, loaded down with steel ingots, copper tubing, cotton, metals, and raw materials to make arms, but we cannot sell the arms themselves. We can sell belligerents the metals and other material to make arms, and we can deliver them in our own ships, but we cannot sell arms, we can under the present law sell tractors, but not armored ones; airplanes, but not armed ones; foodstuffs and all the implements of war, that help make war, but we cannot sell manufactured arms and ammunitions, but we can sell everything that is used for that purpose to countries that manufacture arms and ammunitions from our raw materials; it has no sense or justification.

And above all things under the present law our ships take these materials of war to ports of belligerents, that is where the danger lies. Overt acts are bound to happen to these ships just as it happened in 1917 when this country, under the rules of international law, was finally brought into the war by Germany paying no attention to international law and the freedom of the seas by neutral nations, began blowing up our ships. The American people rose in indignation then, they will do it again unless we change the law and make it possible for those things never to occur again.

Mr. Speaker, I am not worrying about any of the belligerent nations committing overt acts against this Nation that might be serious. I do not think any of them would try deliberately to commit such an offense, for history is too young in the memories of those that tried before, and lost.

Neither do I subscribe to organized cowardice that prevails today in America by those who subscribe to the thought—innocently perhaps—that the belligerent nations or those nations in Europe that are tearing down democracies every day, that they should write the foreign policy of our Nation, and tell us as a neutral what we shall do. God forbid that day will ever come.

Are we to forsake our traditional rights inherited by us through great men like Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln? Are we, as a neutral nation, going to forsake men like Commodore Barry; men like Perry, when engaged in battle on Lake Erie shouted, "Don't give up the ship."

Are we going to forsake and forget men of Commodore Stephen Decatur's caliber, who said, "Our country, in her intercourse with foreign nations, may she always be in the right, but our country, right or wrong."

O Mr. Speaker, we cannot forget the above quotation, uttered by a man like Decatur, that smashed the Barbary pirates when England could not, to establish the United States doctrine of freedom of the seas.

Mr. Speaker, if this Nation wishes to remain neutral, she can do it now, she can prevent that which occurred in 1917, she can at least prevent serious overt acts being committed against her on the seas and especially in war zones, by repealing the arms-embargo provision of the Neutrality Act and by accepting the Senate bill as amended.

I wish to quote at this time remarks of Hon. GEORGE W. NORRIS, Senator from the State of Nebraska, in a radio address he delivered over the blue network of National Broadcasting Co. on October 3, 1939, at Washington, D. C., in which he said, "No man can tell with absolute certainty whether it is possible for us to keep out of the war. No one can foresee the changes that may occur in the immediate future. The course for us to pursue is the one least liable to get us in—the course to avoid is the one which in all probability would take us into the war."

The proposed changes in the present neutrality act will in all probability eliminate us from getting entangled in any controversial matters that may get us in.

Adopting the cash-and-carry plan where all countries will have the same privileges of coming here and purchasing all materials, including food, by paying cash for them, all rights, title, and interest must be transferred to some foreign government, agency, institution, corporation, or national before they leave our ports, and above all they must be carried in their own ships. And when these ships sail from American they are on their own, we are not responsible for any danger they might incur.

It also is proposed to make it "unlawful for any American vessel to carry passengers or articles or materials" to any port of a belligerent nation.

Therefore, when American citizens will have no interest in any property that may be destroyed on the seas, they will not then be calling on this Government for protection.

Mr. Speaker, I hope we will be guided by the mistakes of the past. I know the President is doing all he possibly can to maintain peace in the world; the American people do not want war, and above all else, the Members of Congress do not want war.

In my concluding remarks I wish to quote the remarks of the late George Cardinal Mundelein, archbishop of Chicago, delivered by the Most Reverend Bernard D. Shiel, D. D., auxiliary bishop of Chicago, over the National Broadcasting Co.'s network on the evening of October 2, 1939, referring to America's Catholic youth and Europe's war:

Thank God for our spiritual tradition of mutual tolerance.

But thank God most of all that in these crucial revolutionary years in Europe we have had the matchless political leadership in foreign affairs of President Roosevelt.

To have lived through a few months of Europe is to have known as never before what a precious thing that gift of political leadership is. This tragedy of miserable common peoples, helpless and hopeless to know where their leaders are taking them or what to do about it, is not a tragedy of the natural gifts which God has given to Europe. It is a tragedy of human leaders who, blinded by their materialism and their conscious or unconscious selfishness, have over a whole generation, in every country, committed a crime of false stewardship against humanity and against God.

For the materialistic philosophy of political diehards, morally and intellectually bankrupt, an entire continent is to pay the price of moral and material anarchy.

In the face of all the teachings of Christianity, those diehards in all European nations were determined to prolong or achieve the exploitation of others.

The end result has been the unconscious instigation of a merciless revolutionary movement, which, like all great revolutions in history, will feed on itself and burn blindly on until it has burned itself out.

Mr. Speaker, by enacting a law proposed by the Senate bill, within our legal rights as universally recognized, we will enact a law which will more likely keep us out of war, and put us on the side of humanity and civilization, for civilization seems to be the one object of destruction by the totalitarian states of Europe.

The American School Army

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENT E. KELLER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 3, 1939

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the permission granted me by the unanimous consent of the House of Representatives, I take great pleasure in inserting the bill "to establish and maintain the American school army, and to organize and equip the American Reserve Army," together with as full a statement as possible concerning the idea, its inception, development, and action thereupon.

This statement may aid somewhat in setting forth the broader objects sought by the bill, which are difficult to inject into a legislative measure.

A bill to establish and maintain the American school army, and to organize and equip the American Reserve Army

Be it enacted, etc., That annually on the first Monday in April, or as soon thereafter as may be, the President of the United States shall issue a proclamation calling for 21,850 volunteers for enlistment in the American school army to serve actively for a period of 3 years and as reservists for a further period of 20 years.

This proclamation shall set out the number of volunteers for each congressional district, the qualifications of volunteers, the services to be rendered by them, and the advantages to be derived from the service. It shall state how, when, and where volunteers' applications and general information may be obtained.

Copies of this proclamation shall be posted in every post office and upon every rural free delivery route, and upon every free mail delivery route in cities throughout the United States, and in addition thereto such other publicity shall be given as may be found necessary to make the proclamation of general knowledge.

SEC. 2. That right to enlist as volunteers shall be apportioned in equal numbers to each congressional district throughout the United States, and States having the right to representation at large in Congress shall be considered as extraterritorial districts and shall have the right to the same number of volunteers for each Representative at Large to which it is entitled as are the regular congressional districts. The District of Columbia shall, for the purposes of this act, be considered as two congressional districts.

SEC. 3. That proper blanks for the use of volunteers in offering to enlist, to be known as volunteers' applications, and all necessary general information shall be printed by the Secretary of War and be placed in the hands of each postmaster for free distribution upon written application and to be sent in official free envelopes to any applicant within the official jurisdiction of his post office, and to be delivered free upon oral request at each post office. With each volunteer's application there shall be furnished a proper envelope addressed to the Secretary of War for the transmission of the volunteer's application.

SEC. 4. That volunteers shall be males between the ages of 15 and 18 years, morally clean and of good repute, physically without defect which military training and methodical living may not reasonably be expected to correct, of sound mind and ordinary intelligence: *Provided, however,* That no educational test shall be required.

SEC. 5. That volunteers' applications shall set out clearly the name, address, and age of the volunteer and the number of the congressional district in which he resides. It shall contain a provision giving the consent of the parents or parent or guardian to the enlistment of the volunteer, which shall be signed and witnessed. If neither parent is living and no guardian has been appointed, this fact shall be so shown and no "consent" shall be required. The volunteer's application shall be signed by two householders who vouch for the honesty and good character of the applicant, their addresses being given. The volunteers' applications shall be mailed to the Secretary of War within 60 days from the date of the proclamation.

SEC. 6. That upon receipt of these volunteers' applications the Secretary of War shall cause to be issued to each volunteer a permit for examination which shall set forth the places and dates within the congressional district in which each volunteer resides, where and when the examinations for admission into the American school army shall be held.

SEC. 7. That within 15 days of the close of the period for volunteering the Secretary of War shall cause to be issued a statement showing the number of volunteers by States and the congressional districts thereof, with the number apportioned to each.

SEC. 8. That a board of examiners to consist of one Regular Army officer, who shall be ex officio chairman of the board, two physicians, and two citizens interested in education shall be appointed for each congressional district. No member of the board of examiners shall be a resident or a former resident of the district for which he is appointed.

SEC. 9. That the board of examiners shall repair to the points where the volunteers have been directed to assemble on the days specified, and conduct an examination of each volunteer presenting a permit for examination under the qualifications provided for in this act.

SEC. 10. That all volunteers who are found qualified shall receive a certificate of acceptance from the board of examiners properly signed by them. All permits for examination shall be signed by the board of examiners showing the acceptance or rejection of the holder and shall be returned to the Secretary of War.

SEC. 11. That upon completion of all examinations in each congressional district, if the number accepted be equal or less than the number apportioned to the district, then all who have been accepted shall receive certificates for enlistment.

SEC. 12. That if upon completion of examination of all volunteers in any congressional district it be found that the number accepted exceeds the number apportioned to the district, then the board of examiners, in public view, shall cause the names of all those accepted to be written separately on slips of paper which shall be placed in unmarked opaque envelopes and the whole number of envelopes shall be thoroughly mixed in a proper receptacle, and a child blindfolded shall draw forth one envelope at a time until a number equal to the number apportioned to the district be drawn.

The envelopes drawn out shall then be opened and the names of those found therein shall receive certificates for enlistment.

SEC. 13. That if any congressional district, or districts, in any State fail to provide their apportionment, then the names of all accepted volunteers within the State who have not been awarded certificates of enlistment shall be prepared and drawn by the method provided in section 12.

SEC. 14. That in States having Representatives at large all the names of accepted volunteers within the State who have not been awarded certificates of enlistment shall be prepared and drawn by the method provided in section 12.

SEC. 15. That if any State or States fail to provide its full apportionment, then the names of all accepted volunteers from all States who have not been awarded certificates of enlistment shall be prepared and drawn by the method provided in section 12.

SEC. 16. That in case of permanent disability, or dismissal during the first 3 months of enlistment, the unit from which the cadet came shall be drawn upon for a substitute, provided there be any volunteer holding a certificate of acceptance; if not, then the next larger unit, until a substitute be drawn. For all who, for any reason, leave the service before the next annual drawing substitutes shall be drawn as a part of the regular apportionment for the next year.

SEC. 17. That certificates for enlistment shall entitle the holders to enlistment in the American school army.

SEC. 18. That it shall be the duty of the Secretary of War to provide proper school camps for the American school army, using such Army posts, reservations, and military tracts already owned by the United States as may be suited to the requirements of the American school army, by addition thereto, by lease, or purchase, or by leasing or purchasing new sites.

SEC. 19. That the Secretary of War shall cause to be made proper plans for the mobilization of all volunteers to whom certificates of enlistment have been issued into such school camps as may be necessary for the military and educational instruction contemplated in this act. In this grouping into camps volunteers shall be so assigned as to thoroughly mix them into a nationally homogeneous whole, insofar as may be.

SEC. 20. That the volunteers shall be assigned to military units, and an oath of allegiance and service administered pledging each to obey all rules and regulations promulgated for the American school army, to practice good morals, to study, drill, and work diligently for 3 years, and at the end of that time to become military Reservists, subject to military duty for a further period of 20 years. After taking this oath they shall be designated as cadets.

SEC. 21. That the Secretary of War shall furnish necessary uniforms, clothing, subsistence, arms, and accouterments for military training, tents, and camp equipage.

SEC. 22. That cadets shall devote 3 hours per day to military training, physical education, sanitation, and prevention of disease.

SEC. 23. That the cadets shall live under the military discipline usual in Regular Army camps, so far as the same may be applicable to the objects sought in this act. They shall do and perform any and all labor necessary to self-sustained camp life.

SEC. 24. That a careful record of grades shall be kept so as to show the military efficiency and qualifications for military leadership of each cadet, and the special aptitude for technical development along constructive lines of engineering.

SEC. 25. That the Vocational Board shall consist, ex-officio, of the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Labor, and the Commissioner of Education, and shall have full power over the education, vocational training, and vocational labor of the cadets. The Vocational Board shall have the power to employ civilian teachers, lecturers, demonstrators, and assistants. It shall be the duty of the Vocational Board to provide proper curriculum, to the end that every cadet shall at graduation be industrially self-sustaining and thoroughly proficient in at least one vocation. The school year shall be 9 months in length.

SEC. 25. That the vocational earnings shall be put into a common fund and be distributed equally to all cadets of the same class or year's enlistment under the direction of the Vocational Board. Out of the common fund of the school army the Vocational Board shall apportion equally to all cadets of the same class or year a sum for incidental expense not to exceed $1 per week to each cadet.

SEC. 27. That in cases where there are relatives dependent upon the labor of cadets it shall be the duty of the Vocational Board to ascertain that fact and to ascertain the net cash value of the services of the cadet to the dependents and cause to be remitted that amount to the dependents every 3 months thereafter until the end of the active service of the cadet.

SEC. 28. That it shall be the duty of the Vocational Board to cause to be kept a careful system of grades indicating the proficiency in general and vocational education and training. The completion of the 3 years of active service shall be known as graduation, and every graduate shall receive a certificate setting out his grades and his military classification for Reserve Army and Volunteer Service.

SEC. 29. That the War and Navy Departments shall jointly publish or cause to be published monthly a journal on military and naval affairs, which journal shall be sent free to all Reservists during their full Reserve period of 20 years.

SEC. 30. That the oath of allegiance and service shall be held to have removed every disability as to the American citizenship which might have existed, and no declaration or naturalization or other act shall be necessary to full citizenship upon the cadet arriving at his majority.

SEC. 31. That upon reaching proficiency in any vocation any cadet may, after his first year's active service, provided vacancy exists, be transferred to the Navy for the remainder of his active service, and thereafter shall be a naval reserve for a period of 20 years.

SEC. 32. That at graduation every cadet shall be a Reservist for a period of 20 years, and shall be subject to bear arms in the service of the United States. He shall, during his Reserve period, be subject to the regulations applicable to Reservists.

SEC. 33. That for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act the Secretary of War is hereby authorized and directed to make all necessary and appropriate regulations.

SEC. 34. That it shall be unlawful for any person or persons to in any way, directly or indirectly, defraud, cheat, or deceive, for the purpose of preventing the carrying out of the provisions of this act, and whoever shall so do shall be guilty of conspiracy.

SEC. 35. That any dishonesty, indecency, or immorality on the part of any cadet shall be cause for dismissal without honor.

SEC. 36. That the War Department shall furnish list of cadets upon enlistment, notifications of dismissals, resignations and deaths of cadets, and the names of graduation of all Reservists to all postmasters from whose territory they originally came. It shall be the duty of postmasters to keep permanent records of this information and to furnish such information as may be required of them by the Secretary of War.

SEC. 37. That at the end of the school year the American school army shall, for a period of 3 months, engage in general military maneuvers under the direction of the Secretary of War.

SEC. 38. That it shall be the duty of the Secretary of War to provide for the proper grouping of reservists into military units, to assign reservists into given units, to provide proper arms and equipment for each unit as formed, and to prepare plans for mobilization.

SEC. 39. That at the graduation of cadets it shall be the duty of the Secretary of War to select from those cadets whose grades indicate the highest qualification for military leadership and the greatest technical ability along engineering lines such number, according to grades, as may be deemed necessary for higher positions of command, and these shall be permitted to enter West Point Military Academy, or such other military or technical institution as may be designated by the Secretary of War, under the same conditions and with the same rights and privileges as other appointees to West Point may have.

SEC. 40. That the necessary appropriations for carrying out the provisions of this act, to be determined from estimates by the Secretary of War, are hereby made out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated.

My 5 years of military training under West Point graduates—2 years of it under Maj. Gen. J. F. Bell, who became Chief of Staff of the United States Army—made it my particular interest while studying at Heidelberg to observe the methods of the German officers in training their great reserve armies. I made it a point to associate much with the young officers and induced them to discuss their work. When I felt I had absorbed all that they had to give, I made it a point to associate with the petit officers and the privates under training. I found that the training of these latter continued for 2 years for infantry and 3 years for cavalry and artillery; that this training is intensive from the beginning to the end of those periods. The soldier is given no time for any mental development and precious little for recreation. But he is kept at a constant grind, drilling and working at purely military problems. By that method he is made into a very perfect machine, but without the mental development which in my judgment and observation might be given to him during this time without impairing his military fitness.

Anyone who has seen the 3-year men at West Point drill, knows that no soldiers in the world can excel them in pure military exercises; nor can I believe that any soldier under any European reserve system can approach them in intelligence. Our West Pointers spend not exceeding 2 hours a day on actual drill, and spend the rest of their time in proper study and recreation.

I therefore conceived the idea that a proper combination of physical and military training, study, and recreation, proportioned along the lines of West Point training, over a period of 3 years, would build men and would produce an organization equal in physical training and far superior in mental grasp to any European reserve army. I therefore wrote out that idea. These writings afterward became a series of articles on the subject of The American School Army.

In 1907, on a visit to my teacher, Maj. Gen. J. F. Bell, then Chief of Staff of the United States Army, I laid this plan before him. He insisted very strongly that I offer the article for publication at once, to which I replied that it had been my observation that America would prepare for war only in

the actual presence of war and since that was an era of profound peace, I did not believe that there would be any reaction to the proposition at that time.

But on November 20, 1915, Harpers Weekly published The American School Army with a broad editorial heading, and with a dramatic illustration of the idea. Immediately letters began coming to me from all of the United States and a few foreign countries. Ex-President Theodore Roosevelt wrote very powerfully endorsing the idea.

President Wilson referred to the article many times in his western campaign for preparedness during the early months of 1916 as the "long look ahead for American preparedness."

The State Senate of Illinois, of which I was a member at that time, passed a resolution—Senate Resolution No. 16, second special session Forty-ninth General Assembly of Illinois—calling the attention of the Congress to the idea. It was a part of an editorial from Harpers Weekly under date of March 11, 1916, printed on page 247:

DEFENSE

The great fear about the defense program is that too much reliance may be made on a State militia, with incomplete federalization, and a bill passed with no sufficient provision for a first line of reserves. A measure has been prepared that has a great deal of intelligence, but it is probably too novel to have much chance in a piece of rush legislation. We quote from the proceedings of the Illinois State Senate, January 21, 1916:

"Whereas the question of preparedness for the national defense has become and is a vital issue in our country; before final determination of the appropriate policies the question should receive the most careful and exhaustive consideration. Only the most meritorious plan should be adopted. Among other well-considered plans is one which has been suggested by an able member of this body, the Honorable KENT E. KELLER, of Ava, Ill., whose well-founded views were admirably set forth in an article entitled 'An American School Army,' which article was published in a recent issue of Harpers Weekly and elicited unusual interest throughout the country; and

"Whereas, together with the other plans suggested by students of the question, this plan should be considered by the National Congress; believing this admirable plan should receive, as well it merits, the careful consideration of the Federal Congress: Be it

"Resolve, therefore, That, anxious to have the best plan adopted, and with that sole end in view, we beg to call the attention of the members of the National Congress to the article in question and most respectfully solicit its careful consideration."

Congressman KELLER is now in Washington working at the idea, and he it was who drew the bill to which we have already referred. As it will be inconvenient for Members of Congress and for readers in general to get at Congressman KELLER'S article in our issue of November 20, 1915, and as the present emergency is so great, we shall reprint it in our issue of next week.

In February 1916 I met Senator George Earle Chamberlain, of Oregon, then chairman of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs, whose attention had been called to the article in Harpers Weekly. He asked me to draft a bill providing for the mechanics to put this idea into practice. This I did. The bill was introduced by Senator Robert R. Owen, of Oklahoma, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs. I have quoted this bill because it expresses the fundamentals very clearly. Our entrance in the World War—1917—bringing the necessity for quick action, prevented proper consideration and hearings on the bill at that time.

Senator Owen reintroduced this bill in 1928, because he believed it the one best method of providing an army for the people of the United States.

At the request of Editor Norman Hapgood, of Harpers Weekly, I wrote another article on this subject, which was published in two installments. And I am here in this statement quoting the essential points as I wrote them in those articles. With intelligent observation of what is happening in the world at the present time, it seems to me that the United States ought now to be willing to take up earnestly, and work out carefully, a thorough-going system that will in due course provide 2,000,000 thoroughly trained, thoroughly educated American soldiers ready on call.

Because of the great importance that Mr. Hapgood and his editorial staff attributed to this plan for the American school army, he reprinted the original article in March. On May 6 and May 13 the two installments of the second article appeared. It must be borne in mind that, although these articles were written during the World War, there are so many references that are apropos at the present time that I have not seen fit to change the original, but quote those parts which still give a clear picture of the entire idea.

In the consideration of the American school army, it must be held constantly and powerfully in mind that the entry into the American school army is entirely voluntary. It is not enforced military service; it imposes no additional obligation on the part of the man so trained for military service when called upon above that which every man already has to serve when called, whether trained or not.

[From Harper's Weekly of November 20, 1915, p. 484]

AN AMERICAN SCHOOL ARMY

(By KENT E. KELLER)

It can only be hoped that now, while the necessity for a defensive army is clear to the very great majority of Americans, we may develop some rational system for providing and maintaining one. It must not be an army founded on present emergencies, but one that will justify its existence and continuance even throughout the long years of peace to come. If we are to have an army, it must be an American army in every sense of the word. It must be the most efficient army in the world. Its organization and maintenance must be in harmony with our best traditions and highest ideals of liberty and equality. It must appeal to the common sense of the people generally as not only an efficient weapon of defense, but as well an army beneficial to the country in time of peace; an army around which the Nation can grow without any of the fears which our ancestors had about large standing armies.

Sufficient preparedness to defend ourselves against attack appears to be a prime necessity under present world development, because the same reason which induced European nations to make war on one another will lead them to make war on us if they think they can win. How to prepare most effectively and at the least cost in money and the least loss of industrial energy is the question. An army we may form must be and remain a volunteer army. No form of conscription will be found necessary, nor would be tolerated. We must not adopt bodily some system from some other country that may appear excellent for that country, but that has not been tried out in actual warfare. We ought rather to originate some plan of our own, suited to our own conditions, the fundamental principles of which have been thoroughly well proven in actual conflict of arms.

An army is a development. To be a soldier is to have made a growth. Soldiering today is a business which requires thorough preparation. It is not founded on patriotism and enthusiasm alone. The technique of soldiering reaches to almost every branch of science today, and in the future this tendency will be greatly extended. The soldier who does not know his duties and know well how to perform them in conjunction with his comrades may, in case of a conflict, be in the way rather than helpful against a well-trained enemy. It is easy enough to get shot for one's country. It is difficult to shoot the enemies of one's country and live.

Military drill a few minutes each week in schools; a few weeks' outing in summer camps; a businessmen's army league to drill when they can spare a little time; a 3-weeks' militia encampment, with occasional evenings at drill between times; a summer school for officers that can neither make actual officers of them nor soldiers of the boys back home; and all the other kindred attempts at soldiering are good and inspiring in many ways. But a little study of the European conflict will show any thoughtful man what a grim and terrible thing warfare is, and that it is impossible to prepare for it too well. We must face the matter with open eyes at least. And it is no less than the truth to say that to send these fine, courageous militia boys, these enthusiastically patriotic summer soldiers, against 3-year men would be little better than murder. Only 3-year men can meet 3-year men on equal terms.

Germany required the men who are making these astounding drives to serve, working 2 years constantly in the infantry and 3 years in the cavalry and artillery. France tried out a shorter time of service for her soldiers to her heart's content. She was compelled to admit the inferiority of these short-service men and adopted the same period of service as the Germans. A short period would not do. A shorter period of service will not make soldiers of Americans. We must see this plainly or suffer dearly for our folly if the test ever comes. The necessity for this long preparation is fully understood and appreciated by all military men. It must also be fully accepted by the people of this country generally before we can have a real army. The hope that any makeshift will do ought not to be indulged in at all in any quarter. To rely on summer soldiers is to court disaster. It is training that makes the soldier; it is training that makes the officer—plenty of training and plenty of time. It takes trained soldiers and trained officers both to make an army.

West Point takes plain American boys with only fair education, without any proof of soldierly qualities, aptitude for war, or native ability to command, and in 4 years' constant training and educating hammers them not only into soldiers of the first class but into officers and gentlemen—commanders and leaders of soldiers—the equal of any military men in the world.

The plan here offered to meet our requirements makes no pretensions to completeness. It is set out, rather, as a basis for discussion in the hope that rational direction may be given the present general desire for some adequate means of national defense.

THE PLAN

1. Let 100,000 boys between the ages of 16 and 18, apportioned among the States, volunteer each year into the American school army for a period of 3 years.

2. Let these devote from 2 to 3 hours (about the time used in West Point) daily to military drill, army exercises, study of military science, and physical training and education, including sanitation, prevention of disease, and like broad general information.

3. The remaining time to be devoted to study along general educational lines, devoting especial attention to agriculture, manual training, and the useful arts, trades, and sciences that are best adapted to fitting men for the practical work of life.

4. These boys to live constantly under the strictest military discipline, and to maintain a standard of morals equal to the best secular military schools.

5. The United States to pay all costs of maintenance, food, clothing, instruction, medical attendance, and a small allowance for "spending money." The boys themselves to do all the labor of every kind and character, the same as soldiers do under conditions of war. This will not only train them in actual soldiering but the expense of maintenance will be so low that the number suggested in this plan will prove no burden to the country.

6. The boys, in return for this 3 years of schooling and methodical growth, are, upon graduation, to become reservists for a period of 20 years, subject to call to the colors, classified so as to let the oldest be callest last in case of war.

7. These schools should be distributed in large units, probably not less than 10,000 in a unit, in localities best suited to their work. The school should continue for the ordinary school year. Then for 10 weeks the boys should break camp and march under the usual conditions of war to central points where large armies should meet for the maneuver. This would give the officers every opportunity to learn the handling, moving, and supplying of large bodies of soldiers. It would give the men every experience in actual soldiering under all the conditions of war. It was these great maneuvers that perfected both the European men and officers for these immense strategic moves.

8. In this school army leadership would be encouraged among the men from the very beginning. The natural leaders would come to the front. They would, of course, supply their own officers for this school army, as well as grade and classify for future use all who aspired to leadership. At graduation, from among those who had shown the best leadership and fitness for command and for special technical service would be selected as many as should be required for higher officers. These ablest men—these strongest natural leaders—would be sent for 4 years to a greater West Point, or West Points, where they would very certainly develop into the world's best military men.

9. The Government would establish an Army and Navy Journal for the use of all Army and Navy men. After graduation, all the men would receive this paper free during the entire 20 years wherever they went. The journal would keep every reservist constantly in touch with military and naval development all over the world. Their training and experience would enable them to at once understand and use intelligently every new invention or method of warfare in case war was thrust upon us. It would make American reservists the most intelligent in the world. It would stimulate inventive genius among a vast number of trained, resourceful men. It would keep up interest, encourage individual growth, and aid team intelligence.

10. This system would result in giving the United States 2,000,000 men constantly ready, the best trained, the most intelligent and resourceful soldiers in the world; not machines, but men who would grow as military invention and practice grow. It would put us in position to say to all nations, "We will do no wrong; we will suffer no wrong."

From this school army idea would naturally develop an American school navy system, either as an independent or coordinate establishment, as should be found most practicable.

Aside from military purposes, this school army system would give the country each year 100,000 graduates in usefulness. It would offer to every boy, who had for any reason been denied an education, an opportunity for 3 years of the best schooling possible. It would set a physical standard for all American men outside the school army as well as in it. This would lead ultimately to an American ideal of physical manhood, so much needed and so much neglected.

Every locality would get back some boy grown to inspiring manhood, skilled in industry, schooled in patriotism, able to think, clean, knowing sanitation for himself and for his community; the making of a broad-gaged American whom his country had educated and who would owe his best service to his country—fit to father the coming race of better men.

The thorough mixing in the school army of these boys from all the various States and sections of the country would nationalize the school and through it the Nation. The hyphen would disappear from our citizenship as naturally as ripened leaves fall to give place to a newer growth.

This school army system would stimulate and make permanent the heroic American man. It would let us hark back to the simple Spartan life. It would recognize the real, the necessary. It would make efficiency the natural thing. The reservists would know the reason for obedience to law, which our young men today do not know, and which our schools do not teach. The total lack of system is the thought of our youth—the resulting chaos of mind and act would of necessity give way to the methodical competition of these efficient reservists.

The system would make organization of industry in the broadest sense a part of our natural development, a thing now quite impossible. The young men who spend 3 years in this school army will be further along industrially, 3 years after his graduation, than if he had spent the whole 6 years in industry without the training. For all the years to follow he would do proportionately as well, whether working for himself or some one else. This training would always, because of his largely increased intelligence, open many doors of opportunity to him which without it would have remained closed.

None of the plans to form an army of adult citizens is feasible, simply because no sufficiently large body of full-grown Americans will ever consent to the conditions of army life for the length of time necessary to form an efficient army, except in the immediate presence of war.

* * * * * * *

There would be no waste in the school army. It would simply be taking boys before they are ready for industry and using the intervening time to educate and fit them for better service, at the same time making soldiers of them. This saving of the wages of the adults and the enormous gains in efficiency of the school army reservists are most important considerations. It is easy for boys to adapt themselves to the discipline of military life—it is difficult for men.

There would be no lack of volunteers for this school army. With strict moral discipline most parents would want their boys to have the training, and most boys would certainly want the experience and growth.

There would always be an abundance of reservists at graduation willing and ready to join the Regular Army to keep that branch of the service splendidly fitted for doing its great work.

And, not the least among the advantages to be gained, these reservists who had studied and drilled and soldiered for 3 years, and marched and maneuvered in great armies, would not only furnish officers for their own body of reservists, but would abundantly supply the very best officers for all the lower grades, at least for as many volunteer soldiers as the country could procure in case of such dire necessity.

Editorial head of this article is as follows: "The problem of national defense will attract more attention during this fall and winter (1916) than any other question before Congress. Enlightened and responsible discussion of it is therefore necessary. The following article by an Illinois State senator seems to us to contain points of very real interest."

Harpers Weekly of March 18, 1916, page 281, contained the following editorial head, after which the original article on the American school army was republished.

AN AMERICAN SCHOOL ARMY

(By KENT E. KELLER)

* * * * * * *

And now arises a situation in which we think public education will be increased by the reprinting of a more recent article. When President Wilson was touring the West, talking about preparedness, he quoted an article that appeared in Harpers Weekly on November 20. Last week we quoted a resolution from the Illinois Senate referring to this same article, and asking the United States Congress to give attention to the plan therein proposed. The question of preparedness being so urgent at the present moment, and this article making such a significant contribution, we have felt that to Congressmen and the public it ought to be made easily accessible.

In Harpers Weekly of May 6, beginning page 489, the following article occurred with the title and editorial head as follows:

AN AMERICAN SCHOOL ARMY—BY KENT E. KELLER

In our issue of November 20 we published an article on preparedness by Mr. KELLER, Illinois State senator, which has since received wide attention. The question of preparedness being so urgent at the present moment we are glad to present this amplification of Mr. KELLER's plan.

This is the first installment of the second article:

There is no such thing as a regular army in any of the countries of Europe except England. France, Germany, Russia, and all the rest have studied war and made war for many, many years. Their long experience has enabled them to reduce it to a science. They know what it takes to make the best soldier and the best army. The enormous cost of their wars has compelled the most careful investigation into the economy of making and up-keeping their armies.

It was observed that any effective veteran soldier after leaving the army and entering into the ordinary industries for long periods, even 20 or 30 years, could take up arms and in a very short time enter into the soldier's life and again be an effective fighter.

The length of time necessary for making a permanently effective soldier was noted carefully and discussed fully for many years in all those countries. This element of time meant millions of money. Financial necessity compelled the time to be reduced to the very minimum without loss in efficiency. It was finally learned that 2 years is the shortest time in which average men can become really efficient soldiers.

The conclusion was inevitable that to thoroughly train men for 2 years and class them as reservists, soldiers subject to call, is far the cheapest method of creating and maintaining an efficient army. All the fighting is being done by these carefully trained reservists, and all the countries of Europe, except England, follow this plan. Her foreign possessions seemed to justify her regular army, but apparently influenced her to neglect the other and more economical one.

To provide an efficient defensive army is the national program. It is a great undertaking and deserves thorough consideration. It should not be done as rush legislation. It is new and offers the opportunity of a generation in constructive thought. To begin right will be to serve greatly. To do less would be inexcusable folly.

Our strongest generals and the best military authorities all agree we need 2,000,000 men to make the United States safe against all attack. Congress should provide a plan looking toward securing that number at the earliest possible moment. That is not too many for so large a country as ours. If done economically the expense will not be burdensome to so rich a country. A less number would not constitute a rational defensive army.

All the experience necessary for our guidance is open to us. The principal lessons of the greatest war of history are before us. If we are willing to use this information, there is no room for any great mistakes.

We are to have an Army. That is settled. What kind of an Army it is to be is the matter in hand. Soldiers, officers, and equipment properly organized, constitute an army. Any one of these lacking, there is no army. Any one of these of poor quality will reduce the others to its own level of inefficiency. It takes the best soldiers, the best officers, and the best equipment—all three—to make up the best army. An army of thoroughly trained soldiers and officers properly equipped is superior to 10 times its number of poorly trained soldiers and inexperienced officers with insufficient or poor equipment. In no other line of human endeavor is complete preparedness so vitally necessary. In no other is thoroughness in every detail so absolutely essential. In war the highest efficiency means the greatest economy in its broadest possible sense.

Our Army-to-be must be equal or superior, man for man, to any army in the world all the time. If we are not to have that kind of an army it might be better to have none at all. For we may delude ourselves about our Army, but every other nation in the world will know exactly what we have and what it is really worth in fighting ability. A paper army will fool nobody but American citizens, and they are the ones who ought not to be deceived. The facts should be given to them without fear or favor.

The plain truth must be told about some present illusions: A soldier cannot be made by wishing it onto him. A commission and shoulder straps do not make an officer. Ninety-day men are not soldiers at all. Six-months men are not, either, no matter how "intensively" they may have been trained. One-year men as a class are not real soldiers. A few men are natural soldiers. One year's training will make these individually fit. But armies are made up of average men, and even these unusual ones would be much better soldiers with another year's training. If this is not true, why do the Germans train all their soldiers full 2 years?

If France could have matched these German soldiers with men drilling a few weeks or months, what sense would there have been in France drilling her men most diligently full 2 years, as the Germans do? There can be and is but one answer, and that is that out of the vast military experience of all the European countries it has been made plain that no less a period than 2 years is sufficient for training an army for real warfare.

The nations which did not know enough to give their soldiers 2 years' training are having to learn the necessity of it at an awful cost.

* * * * * * *

Now, what must we conclude from all this? That we cannot prepare after we are attacked. We have no neighbor behind whose skirts we can hide till we drill for 2 years. We certainly must see that our own soldiers to be equal to the best must have training equal to theirs. It takes just as much time, as much training, and as good equipment to make an effective soldier of an American as it does of a German, Frenchman, or Englishman. The men who think at all must see this. The legislator who does not grasp this point clearly is not capable of suggesting adequate legislation, because this is the very heart of the matter.

The idea that Americans "can lick all creation," just because they are Americans; that they are so much braver and smarter than anybody else; that because we "licked the Injuns" we are unbeatable and so on to the end of the chapter, ought to be laid tenderly away with the other things of childhood. We should see that we have no monopoly of patriotism and courage. All the European armies are showing a loyalty that has never been excelled. They are displaying as great bravery as any men who ever gave battle. The reservists of all the countries are doing as good fighting as any men of any time. The marvels of military achievement ought to stir us into seeing what veritable babes in arms we are, and what a vast way we must go in preparation before we could defend our country against such onslaughts.

There are at the present time three bills before Congress representing three distinct military systems. The Hay militia pay bill, to nationalize the militia; the Chamberlain bill to reorganize and enlarge the Regular Army, and the Owen bill "to establish and maintain the American school army, and to organize and equip the American Reserve Army." The provisions of the first two bills have been fully discussed in the public press.

The Hay militia pay bill is in many regards an excellent measure. If the nonessentials are carefully eliminated, it will probably do as much for the improvement of the militia as the natural limitations of the militia system will permit. If the provisions of the Hay bill are lived up to requiring physical fitness of the men, thorough instruction of the officers, rigid compliance with the requirements for drill and the general improvement in the quality of training, it will greatly benefit the militia. If these things are not done the pay will be thrown away, though pay is proper and just if the militia is to be used nationally. If these requirements are strictly enforced, however, it is very questionable whether the enlistments will greatly increase, as the organized militia officers assured the congressional committee it would do.

The one really great danger we are facing is that we are apt to get the notion that when we have 424,000 militia (if we ever do) that we shall then have a real army of that size. Nothing will be further from the truth, as every soldier knows, our own as well as those who might oppose us, and as everybody else may plainly see, for that matter. It is the time actually put in at soldiering that counts. Having a name on the company roll for 40 years won't make a soldier of a man.

There is excellent, fair, and poor militia, as militia goes. The militia is made up of men who are doing things in the world—busy, active men, who find a little time once in a while to do some military training. But they are not soldiers and never will be under the militia system, because they have not had and are not going to have the time for the training required to make soldiers of men. It is not fair to the militiaman to expect him to do what nobody else can do. And they very generally know this. It is only the perfervid politician hunting votes who can take a busy man, drill him 72 hours in broken doses, camp him out 2 weeks in summer, and hand him back to the American people a soldier who can "lick his weight in wildcats." Americanism ought to include common sense and common honesty.

As a means of making soldiers ready for instant use, the militia system is economically wasteful. But, properly organized, with all the men fit, it would, at the first sign of danger, go into training at once, and would be ready many months before a volunteer army. It would constitute a valuable second line of defense. This is its sphere of usefulness. It cannot rationally be considered for any other purpose in serious warfare. But that justifies its cost so long as a second line of defense shall be necessary.

* * * * * * *

The one necessity not met in either the Hay or Chamberlain bills is provided for in the Owen bill. The absolute necessity is a large reserve army of thoroughly trained soldiers. The Owen bill provides this. This bill, the first year, calls for 50 youths from each congressional district to enable the working out of the details of the system in practice. But as soon as this is done, it is contemplated to increase this number to 230 from each congressional district, or a total of 100,000 from the country at large, to enter and graduate each year after a 3 years' course.

The American school army system consists in education of the youth of our land along broad general lines, with especial attention to everyday practical living-making; at the same time it makes soldiers of them. The youths actually earn their way by being reservists for 20 years after graduation. It is a fair exchange, most advantageous to both them and the country.

The American school army plan goes on the idea that a youth from 15 to 18 years of age, who lives constantly under strict discipline 3 years; who shall drill and study military science from 2 to 3 hours a day every day in the school year, the same as at West Point, devoting the remaining time to education; who spends 3 months each summer in great army camps in drill and maneuvers as in actual war for 3 summers, or a total of 9 months; that such a young man will be the equal as a soldier of the French and Germans, who spend 2 years in military training without the education.

German and French reservists never come back for drill after their time is up. They are so thoroughly saturated with discipline and methodical thinking that they don't need it. They are always soldiers on call. The same would unquestionably be true of the American school army reservists at the end of 3 years' training.

In Harpers Weekly of May 13, page 530, there appeared the second installment of the second article:

AN AMERICAN SCHOOL ARMY

(By KENT E. KELLER)

[The first installment of [State] Senator KELLER's article appeared in last week's issue.]

The American school army would in 23 years provide 2,000,000 reservists ready on call. These graduates in usefulness would be men any nation would be proud of. They would be in every walk of life, in every locality, engaged in the pursuits of peace, wanting to remain so, at home with their families, surely no menace to anyone except the foe who might want to attack us, but would not. And every dollar of our war money would be expended for education mostly on boys who need it sorely.

Now what will it cost? This is not only the natural question, but one that is of the substance of the thing. Because if any system is attempted which is not fundamentally right economically, it cannot be permanent. Any system which is wasteful should only be continued so long as necessity requires it, and until the economic—the efficient—can be substituted for it.

The nationalized militiamen under the Hay militia pay bill will cost the Federal Government $87 per year in addition to more than

$50 per year for each man now expended by the States, communities, and individuals, or for each militiaman a total of $137 per year ($11,250,000 for 129,000 militiamen and to increase proportionally).

Under the provisions of the Chamberlain bill, each regular soldier costs $950 per year, a reduction of $50 under the present law.

The most careful investigation of costs in schools of agriculture, electrical, mechanical, and civil engineering, and the trades and general and industrial education has been made for the purpose of getting a reasonable estimate of the cost of each cadet of the American school army per year. The average for a 12-month period where uniforms and clothing are furnished is $411. But the head of one of the largest educational institutions in the country involving the total expense of students says, "The expense ought not to exceed $300 per year for each cadet, and no less than a full hundred thousand boys ought to be enlisted from the start." It is thought best, however, to allow $500 per year for 3 years, or $1,500 for the 3-year school period, so as to make the school of the highest standard. This will make the cost to the United States Government $65 per year for the American school army reservist, because he remains a reservist 20 years after graduation, or a total period of 23 years. It will be observed that in the militia, Regular Army, and American school army, the cost and service are both calculated from the day of enlistment. The cost of maintaining one regular soldier for a 23-year period is $21,850; one militiaman, $3,151; one school army reservist, $1,500.

The Regular soldier spends 12 months in training constantly under Army camp discipline. The nationalized militiaman spends half a month under like conditions and drills 72 hours during the remainder of the year, which may be fairly reckoned as equal to 2 more weeks of Regular Army training—or a total of 1 month actual training each year. A Regular Army soldier costs 6.9 times as much per year as a nationalized militiaman and spends approximately 12 times as much time in actual soldiering.

The Regular Army soldier costs 14.6 times as much per year as the American school army reservist and they are equal in efficiency.

The militiamen costs 2.1 times as much per year as the American school army reservist and compares in efficiency the same as the Regular.

Considered as a whole army for a 23-year period, we get a still clearer view of the matter.

* * * * * * *

Tabulation

(This table gives the comparative costs)

COST PER MAN, 23-YEAR PERIOD

Regular Army man	$21,850
Nationalized militiaman	3,151
School army reservist	1,500

COST PER MAN PER YEAR

Regular Army man	950
Nationalized militiaman	137
School army reservist	65

COST PER ARMY, 23-YEAR PERIOD

Regular Army (178,000 men, 75,000 Reserves)	3,910,000,000
Nationalized militia (424,000 men, 100,000 reserves)	1,336,024,000
American school army (2,000,000 reservists, 300,000 cadets)	3,450,000,000

COST PER ARMY PER YEAR

Regular Army (178,000 men, 75,000 Reserves)	170,000,000
Nationalized militia (424,000 men, 100,000 reserves)	58,088,000
American school army (2,000,000 reservists, 300,000 cadets)	150,000,000

If at any given time all expenditures on our Military Establishment should cease, even under the Reserve provisions of the Hay and Chamberlain bills, at the end of 4 years there would not be a soldier left. But if this should occur under the American school army plan, at the end of 17 years we would still have a considerably larger and better Army than we now have.

* * * * * * *

It would be scientifically correct to charge half at least of the entire school-army cost to education, but it seems simpler to present that as a free gift to America, as no other country has it.

All this at first seems a staggering sum of money, and it is, but the United States is spending in this year—A. D. 1916—for purely educational purposes $900,000,000. This item will, at the present rate of increase, pass the billion-dollar mark in 1918. And with all, it is the best investment we are making. It is permanent.

The latest figures available from the Office of Education is that we spent $1,968,898,198 on public, elementary, and secondary schools in 1936.

There is much talk about educating officers for our Army. There is the same illusion about this that there is about the summer soldiers who are not soldiers. It seems to be the idea that if a student drills twice a week for a bare 45 minutes he is, upon graduation in academic studies, at once suspected of being an Army officer. It seems not to matter at all that this "officer" never pitched a tent, never saw an army, never saw an army camp, never heard a cannon, never fired an army rifle, never marched enough to get the wobble out of his legs, does not know what discipline means, is entirely innocent of sanitation, and has no idea of anything military beyond the most rudimentary company drill. A fitting officer he would be for the verdant summer soldier.

* * * * * * *

There are literally thousands upon thousands of youths in this country wanting an education, wanting to do something, but not knowing how to set about it. There are other thousands who have certain opportunities but will not accept what they have; they want action. There are other thousands and thousands who have partial opportunity but would embrace the chance of betterment with great enthusiasm. There are thousands who want a chance at being Army officers. There are two and three-quarter million boys in the United States between the ages of 15 and 18 years all the time. These boys are seldom fit for industry before they are 19 or 20, and never as a class. The years up to that time should be given to education and growth. From 15 to 18 is the empty space in the lives of boys. They who are idle suffer shamefully, and much of our crime starts here. The high school, from no faults of its own, holds only about 2 percent of them. This is the age when the love of adventure and romance is greatest. It is the plastic, formative time in which they are most easily directed along proper lines of growth. They long to do things.

* * * * * * *

Let Uncle Sam say, "Boys, here is your chance. Uncle Sam offers you 3 years of the best education and physical development to be had anywhere in the world, and it doesn't cost you a cent. You can get a good general education; you can learn any trade or calling you want to, under the best teachers and most practical conditions. If you make good, plenty of places will be waiting for you when you graduate. You will be able to make your way anywhere you go. You can hold down a job in the front ranks. You will have a fair chance to go to West Point and become an Army officer if you like that life. The door of opportunity is standing open to you. At the end of 3 years you will come out straight and upstanding as a West Pointer. You will be as good a soldier as walks the earth.

"Your obligation for all this is to take up arms for your country in case of war within 20 years of your graduation. But you are under this same obligation whether you are trained and educated in the American school army or not. So, do you want a good education, a fine healthy body, and the ability to be independent in the world—free?" And the volunteers would by far exceed the hundred thousand contemplated. And this is the solution of recruiting. Give the boys of America what they so much need and desire and they will fill the ranks to overflowing. It is the rational thing to do.

"Intensive training" talked about as a way of making soldiers quickly, is simply "speeding up." It is excusable only in the face of dire necessity. It is like the other speeding-up processes so righteously condemned in our industries. Our Army men must recognize this and know that the final results will not justify it. The whole idea that by any hocus-pocus a soldier can be "made while you wait," must be discarded as unworthy of serious consideration. We have the time and the money both to permit our soldiers to develop along right lines—to grow into soldiers. We cannot afford to rush. To make haste slowly, to persist along right lines, is our next national lesson. It is a good place to learn it in growing an army. The best army can only be made that way.

If it is objected that 23 years is a long time to wait for an army, let it be noted that our two present systems require 5 years for working out. That at the end of 10 years the American school army plan will provide more soldiers than the other two and of much higher efficiency, and if thought necessary, the number at any time may be increased.

So far the American school army has been considered purely on its merits as a military proposition. It is, as clearly demonstrated, by far the cheapest and most efficient army for this country purely as an army.

But its greatest importance lies in its enormous usefulness educationally. If it is adopted, it will be the most important addition to our vast general education ever made or possible to make at one time. Because our difficulty industrially lies just here. Our fathers very largely knew trades, and knew them exceedingly well. Our artisans, except machinists, today do not compare favorably with those of 50 years ago as to skill and artistry. Our fathers knew what we only half know, or know not at all. That is, that every man is better for knowing a trade, whether he uses it or not; that educating hands greatly helps to educate the brain. We arrived where we are in civilization by our hands. Our enormous natural wealth as a nation has enabled us to idle too much. It has paid better to exploit our resources than to labor. Idleness put on a paper collar and enticed us. We have forgotten how to work. We have got to learn again. We will be infinitely the better for it.

Senator Hoke Smith, of Georgia, asked unanimous consent for the printing of this article in the RECORD. The following quotation is from the issue of March 11, 1916, page 3939:

AN AMERICAN ARMY SCHOOL

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I have a copy of an article written by Mr. KELLER, State senator of Illinois, which appeared in Harpers Weekly November 20, 1915, in which he discusses and makes certain suggestions about educational advantages which might be extended to private soldiers. This is a very important question and we are now considering it in the Senate. I ask that it be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

There being no objection, the matter was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

During all of the years since the World War our fine, far-seeing Army men have realized the necessity for an Army and reserves. They have been doing their best to keep alive a spirit of a real American Army—the best they were permitted to do by the Congress of the United States. Not only are they to be highly commended for this effort and for all that the Reserve Officers' Training Corps is hoping to do, but the members of the R. O. T. C., every one of them, deserves full credit for the sacrifices that they have made from purely patriotic motives. There ought not be any question nor any possible criticism of this struggle for the development of a competent American Army. Perfectly clearly, the good parts of the R. O. T. C. may be saved in this bill. But we must not overlook the primary objective, and that is to provide soldiers of the highest type for an actual American Army, in which all the men who have devoted so much time and so much care and consideration to the R. O. T. C. will be only too happy to have their opportunity for service extended and to participate in making the best possible Army.

Congress at Present Stands for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEWIS D. THILL

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 3, 1939

Mr. THILL. Mr. Speaker, I have spoken to very many Members of the House of Representatives and I have yet to find one who advocates putting the United States into the present European war. Many of the Members saw service in France 22 years ago. They know the real meaning of war. They came face to face with the dreadful forces of modern warfare. Many of them are battle-scarred. Their minds cannot forget war's fury; their ears still echo with the dying prayers of their brothers in arms; their eyes cannot be dimmed to the sight of falling shrapnel, wounded and dying men. In the hands of these ex-service men lies our greatest guaranty of peace. These veterans would be the first to shoulder arms in defense of our country if our Nation were attacked. But they will have no part in sending the youth of America to fight Europe's battles. Though the minds of Members of Congress were poisoned by the insidious propaganda preceding the World War and this country was led into the last slaughter, I earnestly hope that this Congress will not succumb to strong emotional appeals that pave the way to entrance into foreign wars.

The Great American Desert Has Vanished as a Myth of Our Forefathers—Let Us Not Bring It Back as a Result of Trade Agreements With South America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 1, 1939

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of thousands of miners and mining men in the West, as well as a host of other citizens, I want to express a great fear of a possible fatal injury to the mining industry of this country. Under the Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act of June 12, 1934, extended again last Congress to 1940, the State Department is now suggesting a pact with Chile including copper for study. It would be the sheerest folly to include copper in such a trade agreement and thus subject the American copper industry to the destructive competition of South America, Canada, and Africa, but knowing the State Department's theory favoring the trade-agreement program and also our special objective now of cementing friendly commercial relations with Latin America, I know it will take a great deal of light, both political and economic, to induce the Department to leave copper out of such an agreement. I have already taken the matter up with the Department and shall do so further. Permit me in this manner to shed a little further light to the country on this problem.

POLITICAL CONSEQUENCES MAY BE INVOLVED

I like to think of the welfare of my country—my whole country—as the first consideration, and I usually put political considerations, unless they are identical with the consideration of general welfare, in second place. However, in this matter I would not only be derelict to my people but derelict to my political party, if I did not speak out what is in my mind. I believe that there is great likelihood of proposed trade agreement programs alienating some of the States of the West from the Democratic Party. Political leaders today should not count too much upon some big majority piled up lately in some of the Western States for the Democratic Party in recent elections. It may be that personal popularity of candidates accounts for those majorities more than voters' support of party principles. It is a well-known fact that the Democratic State of Arizona has gone Republican in Presidential elections about as often as it has gone Democratic. If thousands of miners, hundreds of cattlemen, other hundreds of wool growers, many farmers, together with thousands of business and professional men who are dependent upon these other producers, feel that they are being hurt by a system of trade agreements, they are very apt to express themselves at the ballot box.

Of course, it might be thought that the farmers, through great reclamation programs, through recent agricultural acts and soil-conservation benefits, and through rural credit arrangements in an effort at parity farm prices, would be so wedded to the administration as to overlook everything else and continue loyal to the administration regardless. Certainly this administration has done much for the farmer and very much for the laborers, and especially for the unemployed. In some of our great mining camps as many as 60 percent of our people have been on relief, many of them have been literally kept from starving by this administration's humane program. All of that is greatly appreciated, but what my self-reliant, self-respecting people of Arizona want is not Government aid in charity, but jobs at good wages in the normal course of things. From a low of 2,000 employed at meager wages in the depth of the depression, Arizona has now reached a comparative high in excess of 15,000 employed at good wages in the copper mining camps. This has come about through an increase in the price of copper of 2 cents per pound. A decrease of 2 cents per pound would reverse that situation and do much more besides, as I shall later explain.

The point I am trying to make is this: That if the miners, the livestock men, and the lumbermen feel their interests hurt, and large numbers of other citizens dependent upon these industries forced out of private employment and back upon W. P. A. rolls, they will undoubtedly express their dissatisfaction through their ballots. The burden of proof in this matter is upon the Department and the administration, first, to see that these citizens are not hurt by the trade program and convince them then to that effect before 1940.

PROPOSAL NOW IN STUDY STAGE

Of course, Mr. Speaker, I know that this proposal, which has sent the shudder of fear over so large a portion of the mining West, is merely a tentative suggestion for study. However, on every hand I hear it said, "What's the use of arguing; the cards are stacked against us. They've got a theory and they're going to put it through, regardless." Now, I do not entertain such lack of confidence, but it is entertained by many recent supporters of the administration out west. It is one thing to list copper for study in an agreement

with Chile, since it is one of Chile's most important exports and would need to be studied or at least listed in any pretense of covering the whole field.

Nevertheless, American citizens in the copper-mining camps of the West cannot be blamed for being apprehensive when they know that one of the largest American copper-producing companies has three times the holdings in Chile that it has in the United States. In fact, two American companies own the copper mines of Chile. It is also stated that millions of pounds of foreign copper are in bond in the United States awaiting a reduction of duty to be thrown on our market. To these American citizens in the copper camps of this country it seems apparent that somebody else—that is, two American companies—have a chance to profit by a lowering of duties besides the citizens of Chile.

ARIZONA, THE COPPER STATE

The flag of Arizona has a copper star in the center of it. This signifies that copper is our greatest mineral production. Statistics prove such to be the case. It is beyond my power to portray adequately just what part copper has played in the development of Arizona. What I am about to say concerning copper in Arizona will, of course, apply to copper in several other States, but perhaps to a lesser degree. During the quarter of a century which I have known Arizona, I have seen with my own eyes how much the price of copper spells in the development, the prosperity, the welfare, and the happiness of the people of Arizona.

Even before the World War, copper production was increasing rapidly in Arizona because of the rapid strides in the electrical industry calling for the red metal. Of course, during the World War, the price of copper went up and up and wages increased accordingly, and the merchants, the farmers, and the professional class all experienced a reign of prosperity. Arizona mining companies which 4 years before had paid only a fifth of the total local taxes toward the support of Arizona's government, came to pay more than half of local and State taxes. Million-dollar highways were paved between mining camps and smelter towns, or between farming communities and mining centers. Imposing courthouses were built, fine public-school buildings were erected, and frontier towns were modernized with paved streets, electric lights, and all of the modern conveniences. Many comfortable homes were owned by the professional and working class who formed the very backbone of our citizenry. Let it be kept in mind that virtually all of this material progress, making possible the cultural and spiritual progress as illustrated by our schools and churches, rested upon the production and sale of copper.

Fortunately, the continued growth of the electrical industry, as well as the war demands, kept the price of copper fairly well up for a short while, but the unparalleled war boom had thrown the whole mining economy into confusion, and that, with the coming of the great depression, reduced Arizona and its many erstwhile thriving communities to desperate straits. At one time during the last quarter of a century the assessed valuation of Arizona was above $800,000,000. By 1932 it had dropped below $400,000,000. Although this terrible deflation reached almost everybody, it was the mining industry and communities that suffered most. During the worst of this period I traveled through a dozen great mining camps in Arizona and found huge properties idle, pay rolls all but discontinued, and a few former office executives hanging on as caretakers of the deteriorating mines and smelters.

AGRICULTURE AND MINING MUTUALLY SUPPORTING

Frequently I am reminded by easterners that Arizona has been rather well taken care of by the National Government in matters of reclamation, which is quite true. Out in Arizona the name of Theodore Roosevelt has been attached to the first great dam constructed by the Bureau of Reclamation to bring into being the premier reclamation project of our country. Likewise, the name of Franklin D. Roosevelt is coming to be held in high regard for other great reclamation projects started during this administration through the kindly assistance of the present occupant of the White House. Although Theodore Roosevelt fathered the cause of reclamation, it has remained for another Roosevelt to push this great constructive program very much farther along the way in the past half dozen years. Arizona is grateful and has been greatly helped in this constructive task which would otherwise have been impossible—the task of converting the burning deserts into Gardens of Eden.

There is a close connection, however, between agricultural developments and mining developments in Arizona. One cannot succeed fully without the other. For instance, why was such an expensive highway built from Superior over forbidding mountains to Miami and Globe, mentioning only one of these million-dollar highways? It was not built so much to get mineral products out of those three mining camps, for all had rail outlets at an earlier date, but it was to get farm products from the agricultural valleys into those teeming mining camps. There is an intricate interdependency of all these mining camps and agricultural centers, although they may be from 50 to 100 miles apart. The merchants in our larger towns, especially in such cities as Phoenix and Tucson, have modern stocks and stores and as up-to-date business as can be found in eastern cities, but the volume of their trade depends absolutely upon, and the degree of their prosperity coincides with, the price of copper. Let the mining camps close down and its effects are at once felt by farmers, merchants, and the professional classes, and also reflected in the tax rolls throughout the entire State.

WELFARE OF PEOPLE TO BE CONSIDERED FIRST

I am not here pleading for the mining companies, although I am anxious that they prosper. Certainly I am not now pleading for the sake of those American corporations who have three-fourths of their productive capacity in South America or in foreign holdings. I do think, however, that a great American corporation which is willing to take long risks, as, for instance, the Phelps Dodge, in its operations at Morenci, Ariz., as in several other instances, where many millions of dollars have been spent to move an entire mountain before getting out a pound of copper, ought to be given the most sympathetic consideration by lawmakers. This operation in Greenlee County alone has furnished much employment and created an entirely new community before the darkness of this depression began to break. Such business vision and courage deserves well of this Government. However, it is for the 15,000 miners now employed in Arizona and for all their family dependents and for their economic dependents that I urge the retention of the slight protective duty which has made the recent come-back in copper mining possible.

I have received letters, telegrams, and even long distance telephone calls from Arizona, imploring me to do everything humanly possible to protect our copper industry. From whom have these come? From the Governor, other State executive officers, members of the State legislature, half-dozen different kinds of service clubs, in each of a dozen cities, from almost every one of the chambers of commerce in the State from practically every one of the 50 councils of small-mine operators and from individual, classroom teachers and even ministers of the gospel. Perhaps it is because I have been a school man so long in Arizona that even the classroom school teachers write me about it—for among my school friends, I hear not merely from the president of the university and heads of various colleges. Believe me, clothing, dental work, medical care, professional services—all in Arizona hinge upon the price of copper.

Of course, I know that we must consider the consuming public in all of these trade-agreement matters, and that is exactly what I am thinking about for Arizona, as well as the copper and agricultural producers of the State. When the copper camps are flourishing in Arizona, there is very little agricultural produce or meat shipped outside its borders. For us to have an integrated economic society in that intermountain country means that both mining and agriculture must be encouraged, so that they will be mutually supporting, in order that each may make its distinctive contribution for the rest of the country, the leading mineral production being

copper for use outside Arizona and the leading agricultural production being lettuce, melons, garden, and grove products of which Arizona has a surplus. This mutually helpful integration cannot take place unless mining prospers along with agriculture, and both to the same degree. A reduction in the protective duty on copper, forcing a reduction in miners' wages, will be equally hurtful to the agricultural and livestock interests of that part of the West.

CONSERVATION NOT AN ISSUE HERE

It is said by some that we ought to conserve our exhaustible mineral wealth, or any form of natural wealth, which is not easily reproducible. That sounds logical; but let us examine it. In 1934, when Congress laid excise duty on the four products coal, copper, lumber, and oil, no doubt the elements of protection and conservation were considered. I am convinced from a rereading of the debates in Congress, especially in the Senate on June 4, 1934, and again the debates in the Senate on October 31, 1939, by Senators VANDENBERG, HAYDEN, KING, and others who remembered the enactment of the provision 5 years before, that it was not the intent of Congress that the executive department should have any power to modify these revenue duties. The fact that the State Department has recently lowered the duty on lumber and on oil and has gotten away with it thus far is no proof of the constitutionality of their including these in a trade agreement. Perhaps the constitutionality awaits a test in the high Court, and I doubt not but that the coal, lumber, and oil interests will hasten to have such a test. I think that the State Department is on pretty thin ice in any attempt to change these duties fixed by Congress as a part of the revenue system.

And now a word as to conservation. I favor conservation, if it is a sensible type of conservation. I know that we have been wantonly wasteful of natural resources all through American history. We set up the Government of this Republic partly for the benefit of our posterity, but we have not managed our soil fertility, our forests, and many other of our exhaustible blessings for the benefit of our posterity. That which we cannot replace, we certainly ought to be careful about exhausting. Certainly such would apply to coal and oil, and to a certain extent to our forest products, because it took millions of years for Nature to produce certain of these supplies.

But merely because it took a hundred million years to produce a part of the earth is no reason why we ought by law to arrange that that thing shall not be touched for another hundred million years. There is such a thing as carrying conservation to absurd extremes. I recently heard an Army officer declare that we had little or no manganese in the United States and what we have we ought to conserve for the future. On the other hand, I heard an intelligent man say that there is enough manganese in one State alone to match all the iron ore in this country. Now if that be true, what becomes of the argument for conserving our manganese ore?

My contention is that it is irrelevant to talk about the needs of conserving copper. We might just as well talk about the conservation of the gold that is in our hills and plan to leave it there. Copper is practically indestructible. We do not destroy it by taking it out of the ground, unless we make it into munitions or ship it abroad for war. Every pound of copper taken out of the ground adds perpetually to our national wealth. If we want to leave it in the ground to conserve it, it can lie buried for another million years while some substitute such as aluminum may be imported into the country to take its place. That is about what the conservation of our American copper amounts to. I have never heard any sensible man express the fear that we might exhaust our American copper supplies in the same way, for instance, the fear has been expressed that we might exhaust our oil supplies. There is absolutely no cause for our shipping in copper from abroad in the name of conservation.

SHALL WE BLIGHT THE YOUNGEST PART OF OUR LAND?

A reduction of the duty by 2 cents per pound on copper would benefit no one in Chile, excepting, possibly, two American copper companies. It would merely mean that more foreign copper would enter from Canada than from South America, and it is very likely that there would be little or no increased export trade with Chile because of it. A possible effect for American citizens at home might be cheaper raw copper for the fabricators. It is extremely doubtful whether there would be any lowering of prices of finished products made from this copper. Fewer American laborers in manufacturing plants would be benefited than the number of laborers who would be thrown out of employment or reduced in wage scales throughout the copper-mining States.

Reduce the price of copper 2 cents per pound and no more bronze doors will be ordered for courthouses, university libraries, capitol buildings, or city halls in my State. Instead, the bronze doors that are there would probably be removed for wooden substitutes. Fifty years ago our grandfathers looked upon all the country west of Kansas City as the Great American Desert, and so marked it on the maps. Since then the enterprising pioneers have carved a dozen great States therein containing a virile population and a fourth of the wealth of this Nation, thus belying the old geography label. However, I honestly believe that a program of reciprocal-trade agreements among ourselves and South American countries could be negotiated with a view of pleasing the latter, which would have the effect of bringing back the Great American Desert and thus verifying the old label. I have too much confidence in American statesmanship to think that such is likely to happen.

The Speaker is a Representative, Too

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS H. CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 3, 1939

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I am a Republican. I am a northerner—the only southern thing about me is that I come from South Dakota. I am under no obligation to speak a word for any southern Democrat. I have had occasion recently, however, to observe such an outstanding example of service to his constituents by a southern Democratic Representative that I am moved to mention it for the RECORD.

That service was your own, Mr. Speaker, in taking the leadership in the movement to secure needed aid for distressed people in the drought and flood areas. The comprehensive program announced within the past few days is the evidence of its effectiveness.

In announcing "the plan for handling the situation in rural areas, which has been developed jointly by four Federal agencies," Dr. Will W. Alexander, Administrator of the Farm Security Administration, has said:

> As you know, this plan was worked out at the request of the President as a consequence of discussion and conference with him by interested Senators and Representatives.

And, as one of the Representatives who met with the President and the Federal agencies, I want to add that the conferences and the results are directly attributable to the leadership and interest taken by you in your capacity as Representative of an Alabama district.

It was the Representative from Alabama who called the meeting of Representatives from States that had suffered droughts and floods. It was the Representative from Alabama who was asked by them to name a committee. It was the Representative from Alabama who "dropped in" at the office of his brother, the distinguished Senator from Alabama, and gave an encouraging word as the committee of Representatives met with a like committee of Senators. It was the Representative from Alabama who greeted us at the White House and gave us a helpful introduction as he left us to discuss the problem with the President.

The average Member of Congress, Mr. Speaker, sees you only as Speaker of the House. We know you honor that position by your fairness and your faithfulness and your ability. We seldom think of the fact that you, too, have a district to represent—a district with problems and needs such as the others have. But I wish to say, with this opportunity for personal knowledge and observation, that it is evident that, with all your other duties and responsibilities, you have never overlooked that fact and that you give to its representation the same diligent and effective service that has made you such an outstanding Speaker of the House of Representatives.

National Defense Preparation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. BUELL SNYDER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 3, 1939

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to be one of the guest speakers on October 27 last, before the National Guard Convention, which was being held in the city of Baltimore. My remarks on that occasion follow:

General Dozier, General Marshall, General Drum, friends of the National Guard:

We are gathered here today at a most crucial time. Long-disturbed conditions beyond our shores have taken a turn which is a matter of very grave concern to every citizen of our country.

War, with all its hellishness and aftermath, has again befallen much of Europe. It is a matter of very grave concern to America and to every other neutral nation in the world.

Why this new outbreak or what brought it about is not of paramount importance at this time. While we may have our own convictions or opinions, we may leave that job to the historians. What concerns us chiefly now is that, with the lessons of the war to end wars fresh in the minds of all who have a responsibility in the leadership of nations, there still survives in places the doctrine of force, of bloodshed, of wanton destruction of life and property, for settling international issues or gratifying national ambitions.

Long since it became apparent that the world was not ready for a Kellogg Pact. I cannot bring myself to believe, however, that the principles of that noble instrument are dead. I, for one, believe that the peoples of all nations, independently of their leadership, overwhelmingly are in favor of the renunciation of the use of war as an instrument of national policy, and I, for one, shall continue devoutly to hope that the will of this great majority will in the end prevail, but the saddening truth is that today national tranquillity must still look to a ready and adequate defense establishment "as the most effectual means of preserving peace."

Neither as to extent nor direction can it be prophesied as to how this new outburst will affect the United States, its security, and its policies. Despite our will for peace, however averse we may be to taking up arms, prudence leaves no course but to be prepared for any eventuality.

In my position as chairman of the subcommittee which handles military appropriations for the House of Representatives I propose to continue, more vigorously than ever, to use my office to build up our military and naval arms to a state of perfection and readiness which no nation would dare challenge.

If such a course be the path to national security, to the preservation of our institutions, to saving from soldiers' graves the flower of our youth then I say all of us, here and now, should pledge ourselves to employ all ways open to us speedily to accomplish a proper measure of preparedness.

It is a source of much gratification to me, as I know it is to you, that we do not have to start from scratch. Very substantial progress has been made within the past few years. I became a member of the subcommittee of which I am now the chairman at the beginning of the Seventy-fourth Congress back in 1935. Therefore, I have had either a direct hand in, or the direction of, the preparation of five annual appropriation measures. My first bill, for the fiscal year 1936, appropriated a total of $341,000,000. For the present fiscal year, including supplemental appropriations, the total exceeds $732,000,000—well, more than double.

The year before my connection with the committee the National Guard appropriations amounted to $27,950,000. For the current year the National Guard total is $53,200,000, an increase of about 90 percent, and that excludes, of course, the extent to which the National Guard will share in the munitions of war appropriated for in the Supplemental Military Appropriation Act passed at the last session.

It will be of interest to you to know, I am sure, that during the 5-year period I have mentioned my committee has added to Budget estimates for the National Guard a total of, roundly, $8,000,000. To the extent that you have been helped by that unbudgeted amount you should be grateful to the splendid officers you have been sending to Washington each year to make known to us your needs, and, possibly I should say, to the one whom you seem to have delegated as your chief negotiator. I refer to Gen. Milton Reckord.

He has long held the respect, the esteem, and admiration of my committee.

I am glad to have an opportunity to pay him that compliment right here in his own home town.

I shall continue, with your permission, with a few more comparisons—not of money, but of men and materials.

During my period of responsibility:

The enlisted strength of the Regular Army has jumped from 118,750 to 203,616.

The officer strength has increased from 12,000 to 13,417.

The strength of the National Guard has been stepped up from 190,000 to 210,000.

Of course, I am referring to increases which our appropriation measures have provided for. I am not including the increases being made in consequence of Presidential action induced by the existing emergency.

Now, continuing, in addition to manpower, the national matches have been restored.

A consolidated appropriation for field exercises, initiated the year before my taking hold, has been increased from $156,000 to $382,000 for the Regular Army, and provision has been made for the National Guard's participation in such exercises and separate appropriations made therefor.

When I took hold our airplane objective was 2,320. We had less than 1,500 planes of all kinds. The present objective is 5,500 planes, and appropriations or contractual authority have been made available to provide us with that number.

Substantially larger appropriations have been provided for motorization, for mechanization, and for guns and ammunition. I do not feel at liberty to disclose the details, but I think if I should contrast just two or three appropriations for you, you will be able to form some opinion of the expansion that has occurred and is occurring.

For ordnance service and supplies the appropriation for 1936 was $15,000,000. For the current year the total is $115,000,000, exclusive of contractual authority of $56,000,000.

For the Signal Corps the 1936 figure was $4,830,000, and for the current year the total is $16,475,000, exclusive of contractual authority of $1,160,000.

As to this arm it is only fair to say that Air Corps equipment is responsible for a sizeable part of the increase.

For seacoast defenses, maintenance and improvement, the 1936 total was $1,284,970. For this year there has been made available $12,993,000 and contractual authority of $1,061,000.

I have not burdened you with amounts for the intermediate years. There has occurred a gradual climb right up to the present year, when the jump became very marked.

Obviously, the aggregate only can mean very substantial progress toward an M day state of readiness. I wish I might disclose to you how ready.

To me two of the biggest accomplishments with which I have been associated are the promotion of field exercises and maneuvers and the protective mobilization plan.

I stand ready to support whatever amount we may be asked to provide for field exercises. Irrespective of the present emergency, I think it is vital that we should capitalize to the utmost upon the experience of those of you whose knowledge of the conduct of modern warfare was gained from actual participation in the World War.

The protective mobilization plan made available to the Congress for the first time a more or less stable goal at which to shoot and check by and program a course of accomplishment. With its adoption our needs became quite definitely fixed and deficiencies became readily ascertainable.

As I have told you, the deficiencies are being rapidly wiped out. I have in mind antiaircraft equipment, small arms, field-artillery matériel, combat vehicles, special vehicles, railway artillery, modernization of equipment, ammunition, engineer equipment, signal equipment, chemical equipment, etc.—in fact, practically everything in the matériel category.

It would surprise you to see the great number of items that have been completely provided for, and I want you to know that they are not alone for the Regular Army but for issue to those units of the National Guard which have accommodations for their custody and maintenance. My committee took particular pains to assure itself on that score.

We have not been marking time, my friends. We have made very great strides, and I want to say to you that we shall not stop until in men and matériel and training those of you upon whom we must depend for guidance shall indicate that we have gone as far as prudence demands.

Of very great concern to every nation when war clouds hover is leadership. We need not look beyond this hall to be at ease on that score. The Nation is fortunate, indeed, in having available and ready such peerless soldiers, tried and proven on many battlefields, as Gen. George Marshall and Gen. Hugh Drum.

As I look about this hall, I see many others whose World War records stand as monuments to the traditional qualities of leadership, courage, and valor displayed by American soldiers since the dawn of the Republic.

I pray God, however, that none of you may be called upon again to take up arms in the Nation's defense.

In conclusion, my friends, it impresses me as particularly fitting that you should have chosen to hold your convention this year

in this beautiful and hospitable city of Baltimore. It was here, but a few short weeks ago, that a celebration was held of the one hundred and twenty-fifth anniversary of the writing of the words of our national anthem. Something akin to the inspiration which guided the penning of those immortal lines wells up in all of us in this hour of threatened peace. Whatever the turn of events, my faith is unshakable that our Star-Spangled Banner will continue in triumph to wave "o'er the land of the free and the home of the brave."

The Farm Security Administration and the Migrant Labor Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 3, 1939

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, the problem of America's homeless families arises out of three sources: First, the American spirit of "moving on" whenever conditions become too difficult in the home country; second, the industrialization of agriculture in large areas of the South and Southwest; and, third, generally depressed conditions in agriculture and industry with consequent unemployment and distress.

The only real solution of this problem lies in improved economic conditions for the whole Nation including full use of productive capacity, vastly improved distribution of income, and a consequent balance between production and consumption of goods at an abundance level. To say this is impossible is not only to say that American democracy is licked, but also to say that we must expect to have a permanent class of homeless families in our Nation. Nobody, I believe, is willing to say either of these things. For that reason we cannot for one single instant, be content with the economic and social progress so far made under the New Deal. We must press relentlessly forward with a program that will banish unemployment, unnecessary poverty, and homelessness from our great Nation.

As the St. Louis Post-Dispatch puts it editorially in commenting on this problem of family transiency:

> This is more than a matter of humanitarianism. Considering the political dynamite in the situation unless we find jobs for the jobless our traditional idea of the American way of life will be only a souvenir of a happier day.

We cannot, however, expect to work out the complete solution to the unemployment problem in a short space of time. Meanwhile this problem of our homeless families demands immediate attention. The Farm Security Administration, which knows more about the real situation than any agency in America, estimates there are 350,000 families in the Nation today wandering from place to place and job to job, without a home. This is no mere proposition of a couple of hundred thousand unattached men drifting about the country on freight trains. It is a problem of uprooted, bewildered families. Along the roads and in the camps babies are being born—and dying. Young people are marrying—or having children without marrying. People are suffering from disease, exposure, malnutrition. They are religious people of old American stock. But their present plight makes them wonder about America and maybe about God.

To bring the story right down to the present let us see what Governor Olson's cotton wage board recently had to say—not about wages, but about living conditions among the migrants in the San Joaquin Valley.

The general report stated:

> Although there are acceptable camps, too many workers continue to occupy shacks and tents devoid of comfort, in overcrowded camps badly lacking in adequate sanitary accommodations, lacking in decent drinking water, and, for the most part, unprotected from flies and mosquitoes.
>
> Such a situation tends to create a permanency of rural slums. The expansion of the Farm Security Administration camp system or of some similar program would therefore seem to be the direction in which camp conditions can be best improved. Most of the witnesses who testified agreed that the migratory labor camps maintained by the Farm Security Administration are superior to the average private camp.

And then the committee, still unanimously, summed up something of what both Steinbeck and McWilliams were trying to say in their books:

> Where conditions of squalor, extreme privation, absence of privacy and lack of security are encountered little real home life is possible for the children of agricultural workers in this area.
>
> Because of their unsettled mode of living, they must move from school to school. Their education is frequently interrupted and cut short. Although the more fortunate go to high school, they go handicapped by the environment in which they are forced to live.
>
> Under such circumstances, the hindrances to mental and moral growth are considerable. The threatening long-time social results of a continuance of these conditions are obvious and alarming.

The magnitude of this problem can be guessed at when a few figures are given. Over the past 10 years an average of 100,000 people in families described as "in immediate need of employment" have migrated to California alone. Many of them have been needed as agricultural workers at certain times of the year. But total available jobs in California agriculture vary from about 50,000 in January to nearly 500,000 at the peak of the fall harvest. The same story could be told of many other States.

Quite naturally, under these circumstances, wage scales become low. They are a little better in California than elsewhere, but at that the average annual income of a migrant family will not be over $300 or $400. Nor is this always the fault of their employers. As Governor Olson recently put it:

> I believe the growers find themselves in a difficult spot on wage scales. They are under contract to gin owners and are unable to pay higher picking prices. They are willing to pay higher wage scales, but are unable to come out and do so themselves.
>
> A strike under these conditions is really a strike through the growers at the financial interests controlling cotton.

The Governor's words are true, but the possibility of conflict between hard-pressed farmer employers and still harder pressed ex-farmer laborers remains a constant threat.

Throughout all history it has been a convenient device of secure and comfortable groups of people to excuse their failure to find a decent solution for the problems of outcast people by calling them by ugly names and attempting to stamp upon them the label of foreigner. The homeless people of America today have been widely treated in exactly this way. A demand for better wages or more decent conditions on their part has been the signal to start calling them "reds." Each State into which they have migrated has been glad to have them only so long as there was seasonal work to be done. Thereafter, they were told they should "go back where they came from." Driven out by the action of one group of landlords, these native American Christian people have all too often been received with ill-concealed hostility by the landlords and communities of the States where they have gone.

This is not American. And it cannot be allowed to go on.

What is to be done about it? Most immediately effective is the work of the Farm Security Administration in rehabilitating farm families on their own places in their own States. This is stopping migration at its source. Working almost alone in this field in the whole Nation, and working on a tragically inadequate budget, Farm Security has, in my judgment, done a magnificent job. A half million families have received rehabilitation loans and with the loans advice and guidance, and out of the two a better standard of living, a larger net worth, and a return of hope. These loans made to people utterly without security are, I understand, 80 percent current in repayments today. The first thing I would recommend, therefore, is more money for Farm Security rehabilitation work. But unless our general agricultural problem is solved, the dike cannot, of course, be held forever.

The second thing that must be done to the greatest possible extent is the opening up of new lands and new farming opportunities for these people. Most of them are former farmers, and most of them want to get back to the land again. Moreover, there are some areas of the Nation from which we are told a considerable emigration must take place

if we are not to turn more and more of our Nation into "dust bowls." One of the reasons I so deeply regreted the defeat of the so-called lending bill by the House at the last session was the fact that it would have made available for the first time a really large sum of money with which to make loans to get homeless farmers back to farming again. These loans should be made at a nominal interest rate and should be used, in part at least, to reduce that great group of 350,000 homeless families and to make some of them homeless no more. The importance of reclamation projects and of a national program of land-use planning in this connection is obvious.

But clearly this ideal solution will take time and money. Meanwhile, there is a great human need to be met—these people are sick, ill-housed, underfed, and we have not yet anywhere near an adequate program to meet their need. Nor, in my opinion, can there possibly be such a program until the Federal Government fully recognizes this problem of interstate migration as essentially a national and not a local problem. The States which are on the receiving end of this great interstate migration simply cannot, as their spokesmen put it, take care of their own unemployed and those of other States as well.

Their schools are overburdened and overcrowded, their hospitals in many cases overrun, and their relief agencies swamped with appeals they cannot meet. Inevitably, under these circumstances, the blame for the situation is wrongly placed. It is placed on the migrants who in most cases, I am convinced, do not deserve the blame at all. Some blame should attach, no doubt, to a few selfish people who deliberately seek to keep an oversupply of labor available near the fields. But mainly the blame rests upon the great national conditions I have described.

Housing, health, and food are the minimum requirements right now in connection with these problems. One answer to the housing problem is provided by the Federal camps of the Farm Security Administration. A brief description of these camps and the results of their work may be interesting.

They are simple affairs, consisting of series of camp sites, 30 feet square, arranged around central and stationary wash trays, with hot- and cold-water faucets. Several of these groupings are constructed to each camp. Board floors are provided on which tents can be pitched. Fast-growing shade trees are planted throughout the camps, and pending the time when the trees will be large enough to furnish shade, ramadas are provided as protection from the direct rays of the sun. A central community house serves as a meeting place where gatherings of all kinds are held. A baseball diamond and horseshoe courts provide recreational outlets for the men. Playgrounds are provided for the children. Sewing machines in the community house enable the women to mend their clothes. All is managed in a democratic fashion by camp committees, which take the responsibility of keeping the camps in running order. No feature of the camp program has proved to be more startling than has the working of these committees. If a family is destitute or in want, the camp welfare committee sees that the essential needs are provided.

There is a Government supervisor in charge of each of these camps and a nurse is on duty as well, supplied by the Public Health Service. People have opportunity to keep clean. They have a place where they have an unquestioned right to camp and live and are no longer forced to camp on someone else's property, along a roadside, or on the banks of a canal. Health can be supervised and cared for. Self-respect has returned. Ten cents a day rent is paid for the accommodations and camp committees take a major share of the responsibility for the upkeep of the place.

Improvement of the living standards of agricultural workers, such as takes place among those living in the Resettlement camps, has several very constructive consequences. First, it removes the worst menaces to health and morals; second, it improves the spirit and morale of the people; third, this not only places them in a position to ask for better wages but enables the ranchers and farmers to be able to afford to pay them better wages; fourth, certain of the farmers are said to be developing a tendency to mingle socially with the workers in the camps, which makes, of course, for far better feeling and greater understanding between the two groups; finally, under circumstances like these, a more capable class of workers is attracted to these farm-labor jobs, which in turn sets in motion another upward spiral of conditions like the one already described.

The only fault I have to find with these camps is that there are not enough of them. I wish we might have enough such camps so that, taken together with such really adequate housing facilities as some farm operators have provided, every migrating family could live under conditions of decency. Had we such a system of camps throughout the Nation, the problem of bringing workers and jobs together would be greatly simplified.

Another approach to the problem, and one offering perhaps even more hope for a permanent solution, is the settling of some of the migrant families on small tracts of land in regions where there is considerable seasonal wage labor required. Thus they can become residents of a community again, supplementing their small acreage which they can be enabled to purchase over a period of time.

There remain the immediate problems of health and the provision of necessary relief. It is in connection with these matters that I have introduced and reintroduced legislation on which I hope to gain hearing when Congress reconvenes in January.

The approach of this legislation is simple. It provides for Federal grants-in-aid to States to reimburse the States for moneys expended by them or their local agencies in the relief of out-of-State people. Administration is to be handled locally but subject to plans approved by either the Public Health Service or the Social Security Board. In other words, the Federal Government would be saying to the States: "We recognize that this is a national problem and we propose to help you meet it. If you will be responsible for seeing to it that the health and relief needs of these people from other States are met, then Uncle Sam will help you pay the bill."

I would be the last to suggest that the passage of such legislation offers any real answer to this great national problem. All it would do would be to meet an immediately present need. For a final solution we must, as I said in the beginning, work upon such measures as will restore our whole agricultural population to its rightful economic position and bring about a condition where constant, steady demand on the part of consumers will bring about a full use of our productive capacity and a full employment of all our people.

Saving Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUSH D. HOLT

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 31, 1939

LETTER FROM HON. RUSH D. HOLT, OF WEST VIRGINIA

Mr. HOLT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter written by me on the topic "Saving Democracy."

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A LETTER TO WEST VIRGINIANS ON SAVING DEMOCRACY

DEAR FRIENDS: It is quite common to hear the expression "Save democracy." Most of the talk about saving democracy, however, is for us to save it across the ocean. I am interested in saving it here.

We have the greatest democracy on earth. Our involvement in war will be its greatest danger. The first casualty of war will be our freedom. To hear many Government spokesmen, one would think their duties call for them to look after the entire world. They talk about the poor citizens of this country and that country. If they

would devote half as much attention to the poor citizens of our own country they would be rendering more service.

War will not solve our domestic problems. It will aggravate them. Prosperity will not result from the conflict. War does not and will not bring prosperity. It will bring depression. It will be a "penny wise and pound foolish" course.

I wrote an article for Investor America, in which I state, in part:

"Save democracy! Yes; now is the time to save it. Not 'over there,' but right here in a nation where democracy has worked and will work if given an opportunity to do so. We hear about the terrible atrocities in Europe. No one doubts that they are terrible, but we have atrocities in hunger and desolation right here in our own country. While some persons are worrying about the furnishing of materials to the warring nations others of us are worried about the furnishing of food and clothing to the American people. While some folk are regretting the terrible desolation in European cities where factories are closed because of the hostilities of war, we must also realize that we have a problem here where factories are closed because of the hostilities of political fakers.

"Have we forgotten our Federal debt? It will have passed $41,000,000,000 before this article is in print. That debt is continuing to climb, but if we get into war it won't climb; it will jump—jump to heights that will threaten, if not destroy, the financial stability of our own country. We cannot continue to allow this mounting debt to go on unless we are willing to face inflation or repudiation, either of which will be destructive to all investments in this country; yes—investments in stocks and bonds; yes—investments in factories; but, all important, investments in the homes and farms of this country.

"We worry about the danger of an invading army when our real danger is the army of officeholders here. By the time the armistice was signed in 1918 the Government had recruited thousands and thousands of persons in the progress of the war. But today there are more persons on our Federal pay roll than there were then, and, under the name of national emergency, we are going to see this list continue to grow.

"While the national emergency continues to grow in intensity, according to the administration's spokesmen, it is interesting to note that the 1940 election looms closer and closer.

"Also, under the name of national emergency, we can expect to see many spending projects brought back into Congress.

" 'Watch out or some big, bad man from across the sea will get you,' we are warned. And while we look at Europe we forget that the depression is still with us. Those who would divert our attention from domestic affairs say, 'Think of the million men on the western front,' when they know our greatest problem is the ten to twelve million unemployed here on our home front. These unemployed want jobs in private factories, mines, and mills; not public jobs in the trenches of France.

"I am glad that businessmen have found out what 1 month's war has done to the taxes of England. That is important. But let us not forget our tax crisis here. England's overhauling of its taxes is significant. We have been promised an overhauling of our own domestic tax problem; but now under an excuse of an emergency it is completely in the background.

"Yes; I see bad signs for democracy. But the difference between my sight and that of the administration is that the administration is looking across the ocean while I am looking at the situation here in America. Our challenge is here—with the depression, with our tax policies, with our failure to solve the unemployment problem. Let's begin by saving democracy in America. Let's keep the greatest country in the world as a democracy, not place it under dictatorship in an M-day under the false guise of 'saving democracy' somewhere else."

European nations did not solve their economic problems. We must not fail in our solution. America wants peace and prosperity. This can best be accomplished by "saving democracy" here in our own country.

Sincerely,

RUSH D. HOLT.

Happiness and Salvation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 3, 1939

ADDRESS BY MERLE SIDENER

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, although happiness is intangible and elusive to those who have not discovered the approach to it, there is a sure way to find it through service to others, and the road that leads to true happiness is the road to salvation.

Because I believe that an excellent talk on this subject, which was delivered by Merle Sidener to Christian Men Builders on October 15, 1939, has in it the seeds of potential helpfulness to thousands upon thousands of people if they will read and ponder over it, I present it for publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

QUALITY HAPPINESS

After I selected this subject, Quality Happiness, and began to study it I discovered that I had the wrong subject; there isn't any such thing as quality happiness. There are no degrees of happiness. You are either happy or not happy; you can't be half happy. I think that we either find happiness, genuine enthusiastic happiness, or we don't find it. I am not going to try to set up various phases of happiness or pick out a quality happiness. What I am going to talk about is just happiness, and I hope you and I will get something out of this discussion that will let us more nearly enjoy happiness.

There are a variety of definitions of happiness. Maybe that's why so many of us fail to recognize happiness when we meet it. There are too many different angles to it—too many different approaches to happiness. Mr. Webster, known for the one book he wrote, said that "happiness is a state of pleasurable content in one's condition of life."

Socrates, the old Greek philosopher, said, "Happiness is unrepentant pleasure."

Rousseau, the French social philosopher, had this definition, "Happiness consists of a good bank account, a good cook, and good digestion." He probably came nearer to defining it as you and I would. We look for something in the physical as happiness.

Arthur Brisbane, editorial writer for many years says this: "There are two kinds of happiness; the lesser consists of finding the work for which you are fitted and then doing it, and the greater, reserved for a few, is working for others."

Jesus Christ, the greatest teacher of all time, the only really successful man who ever lived, the only one you and I can listen to and accept without qualification—Jesus as he went about teaching and doing good, telling men how to get the most out of life, laying stress on the fact that the great motivation of life is love, friendship, doing to others as we would like to have them do to us. That was the theme of the teaching of Jesus, and Jesus says, "If ye know these things, happy are ye, if ye do them." Another point Jesus brought out—"These things have I spoken unto you that my joy might remain in you and that you might be filled with joy."

I have given those definitions to help us all here this morning, to get a better understanding of what happiness really is and therefore have a reason for trying to get happiness. We will never get it if we don't understand it; if we have a wrong perspective we don't enjoy happiness.

Henry Drummond sums it up like this: "Half of the world is on the wrong scent in the pursuit of happiness. They think happiness consists of having and getting, and in being served by others. It really consists solely of giving and serving others." Let's get that—because there is the contrast—the place where you and I will get on the wrong side of this thing. Half the world is on the wrong scent—thinks in terms of happiness as getting possessions—of getting from other people—of having people do things for you. Now Mr. Drummond, the wise man, says, "Not at all, it consists entirely in giving and in serving others."

Therefore, fellows, if we'll stop to think about it, that's about all there is in life. What does everybody want? They want happiness, sure. Some people want money, some want health; they ask for different things; but what they mean is they want happiness. If you and I will get into our minds that happiness is not a selfish possession, that happiness hasn't any relation to selfishness, that if we center on ourselves we never will be happy. But only as we open ourselves up to others, only as we find the means of making others happy are we going to get true happiness. Selfish possession just does not give happiness. This is very elementary, rather silly, to say to a group of intelligent men, as it seems so obvious, but you can't have happiness at the expense of other people. You just can't ignore their interests merely to satisfy yourself at the particular minute when you want to be satisfied.

There is a popular song that I have always liked—Frank Crummit sings its—"I want to be happy, but I can't be happy until I make you happy, too." It's a pretty good song—it's good philosophy. I'll be happy if you are happy, then we'll both be happy. There is an expression of real happiness we can all enjoy.

Happiness is something you give away. The more you give away, the more you get back. That's somewhat of a paradox—the more you give away, the more you get back. It's about the only thing I know of, of which that is absolutely true; the more you distribute, the more come back to you. It is like casting bread on the water. A lot of people say it gets soggy and sinks, but that is because they are too literal and do not understand the spiritual side. It is true that you cast your bread on the waters in kindness, in thoughtfulness, in courtesy; and it comes back—you get benefit from it in some fashion.

I read this week a book by Channing Pollock, called The Adventures of a Happy Man. In the preface he says that he never had an unhappy hour in his life—I looked out of the corner of my eye at that one. But in this book he pretty nearly proves it, because he, early in life, found the right perspective on happiness.

His formula is to be happy with what you have—not always to be reaching, and hoping, and expecting something else. You know, fellows, if you just stop to think about it, there is a lot of common sense in that—be happy with what you have. I'll make a confession—I've missed a lot of happiness in my life because, instead of enjoying what I've had to be happy with, I have been hoping, and reaching, and expecting something else, and not recognizing the blessings which I have enjoyed, but seeing somebody else with something more, and then thinking when I get to that point—then I will be happy, too. You have probably done that all your life too, reaching, always looking beyond, thinking of the green pasture across the road. If you and I, today, were just to sit down and count our blessings, just sit down and actually become conscious of the good we are enjoying, ignoring that which we have not, but appreciating that which we have—we would be happy.

I am reminded of the story of the man who had the worn-out shoes and felt so sorry for himself about not having any shoes, until he saw a man with no feet, and then he forgot to be sorry for himself and was thankful for the fact he had feet. You and I should do that—look around us constantly and find those who are worse off than we. If we would stop, men, to think of what we have, we would be happy. This, then, is the key of what I want to say, "Happiness is for today—not tomorrow." Happiness is enjoying that which we have, making the best of what we've got, using the abilities we have.

I went out to call on Thelma Johnson, a friend of Christian Men Builders, who has been ill. She has been very sick. Lately she has been suffering a great deal. Her mother took me up to her room; there she was with a great big smile on her face. I think Thelma Johnson is listening this morning, and I want to tell her and you that I didn't go out to see her last Sunday morning just to be cheered up; but things hadn't been going right; I wasn't accomplishing some things that I wanted to accomplish; I was feeling sorry for myself; but when that great big smile of yours shone out from your face I had a feeling of happiness. Just to think that you, in spite of everything, making the best of everything, could be happy and smiling made my troubles seem very small.

There are a lot of folks doing the same thing. If you and I could see them enjoying the portion of health they have in spite of their ills, could just look into those rooms, see these friends of ours who are now listening, see them smile, I'm telling you, fellows, it would give us a jolt. It would make us stop and wonder why we are going around with long faces. Well, all right. I just want to get that into your mind and mine. I hope you do go out of here this morning knowing what you have to be happy about and then start being happy because you have the ability to make other people happy. A man stood back here this morning and told me with tears in his eyes about Marshall Harvey's driving 60 miles out of his way across country because of the death of this man's mother. Harvey didn't think he was doing anything special. He had the ability to go, he used this ability, and he gave happiness. He couldn't help but get happiness from it.

Do you think the officers and members of the C. M. B. Century Club are getting happiness from their work? Just start talking to any one of them—see their faces light up when they tell you how they have placed glasses on the faces of needy children with impaired vision. Somebody came in and handed Jesse McClure a couple of pairs of glasses. There is an example of true, genuine happiness coming as a reaction from serving others. The members of this organization can tell about approximately 1,400 pairs of glasses being donated—the figure gets so big we can hardly appreciate it. Let's just take one single case—that of a little girl who had been excluded from school because she couldn't see the blackboard and they thought she was dumb. The little girl didn't know she couldn't see the blackboard and there was no way for the teacher to know what the trouble was. * * * "Sarah, what is the answer to that problem?" the teacher would say. Sarah would look blank and say, "I don't know." Finally the little thing was asked not to come to school, for she was in the way. Then along came our Century Club. They worked with the school nurses to find the children that needed glasses. One of the nurses remembered Sarah and wondered if that might be a case of impaired vision. The child was taken to the clinic and they found the worst case of astigmatism on the records. Following treatment, the Century furnished the glasses. Within 3 months she was the brightest child in her class. * * * Happiness—how could anyone get more happiness than the person who provided that $3 for a pair of glasses, or the nurse that aided the child, or the Century Club—all giving happiness, and therefore finding happiness. This illustration will show you what I mean by the fact that you get it only if you give it.

You can't catch up with happiness, you can't grab happiness, you can't buy happiness—you have got to entice happiness so that happiness will come to you voluntarily. You can't buy it, you can't steal it, you just have to win it, and you win it by your attitude, by your appreciation of your relationship to other human beings; you win it by a consciousness that you can't live by yourself. It is only as you come into contact with others that finally you get benefit from it; as some of these other people have to whom I have referred this morning.

Abraham Lincoln said, "Most folks are about as happy as they make up their minds to be." That's another one of those typical Lincoln sayings that you have to stop and read a second time to get the real significance of it.

Envy and covetousness—desiring what somebody else has—envious because somebody else has something that you haven't; that brings nothing but unhappiness. * * * Prejudice and hatred result solely in unhappiness. When you hate, there is something that drives away the possibility of happiness. The whole situation in Europe today is one of hatred, with a complete disappearance of happiness. I don't suppose there is a happy soul in all of Europe today. But if there had been love, tolerance, friendliness, the whole of Europe could be happy. These things I speak of never produce anything but unhappiness. Conflict and contention and resistance—this thing we have today which we call class consciousness, where there seems to be an effort to set one group of us against the other; trying to make us feel, "Well, I'm going to get ahead of him; I'm going to take advantage of him; I'm going to get the best of him"—it can't produce anything but unhappiness. Let these same groups get together and say, "How can we come to an understanding of each other?" and thereby coming to the point of mutual understanding, and they have mutual happiness.

The unhappiest people are the people who possess the most. The most unhappy people are those who get to the place where they don't want anything—they've got everything. Just stop to think about that a moment. Once you get to the place where there isn't anything to reach for, then you are dissatisfied—you have everything. There is nothing else for you to reach for—to get. You can't be happy in that state of mind. But so long as we need to struggle a little, to work a little, to strive a little to get the things we want—then we have happiness while we are getting them.

Happiness is not found in the pursuit of what we call pleasure, either. Stop and think about that a moment. The pursuit of what you and I call amusement, pleasure, self-indulgence, does not result in happiness, because they are selfish things. * * * That spirit of, "I want what I want, when I want it," regardless of everybody else, so that I can be happy, won't work. If I pursue an idea that is intended just to give me personal pleasure it will not be pleasure but turns to ashes in the mouth. Whoopee parties for happiness! Huh! * * * Look at them next morning! Now I'm certainly in favor of recreation and enjoyment, but these must be of such a nature that other people enjoy them also—and no one gets hurt as a result of what I enjoy.

Well, that's the whole thing; that's the story. Happiness and righteousness are absolutely inseparable. Put that down in your little book. Happiness and righteousness. * * * What is righteousness? * * * Just what I have said so many times—right living. Finding God's way—loving the other fellow as ourselves—treating the other fellow as we want to be treated, therefore being fair. That is right living. This alone results in happiness and nothing else will produce it—for that is God's plan.

The Folklore of Fatalism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. T. V. SMITH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 3, 1939

Mr. SMITH of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks upon the subject The Folklore of Fatalism, I submit the following observations upon the superiority of the American way of life to all present competitors:

Let us consider this peculiar feeling, the fear of some that our peaceful nation may get into war against its will. That is fatalism, at least middle-size fatalism. For fatalism is the darksome faith that what will come, will come—no matter what we want or will. As an American fatalist once put it to me, "The fated will happen whether it ever comes to pass or not!" Now, fatalism has its own folklore—a lore that flourishes to its full wherever fatalism grows full-size today.

I. COMMUNISM, A FULL-FLEDGED FATALISM

Take communism, for instance. It is a full-sized fatalism. It was brooded long ago of German speculation. Turned upside down, that speculation became the revolution in Russia. And now the horrid hybrid is come home to Germany for an ugly roost. Communism is fatalism with a folklore Germanic, then, as well as Russian. To understand this is to begin to avoid both its idealistic and its materialistic folly.

From the gospel, according to their St. Marx—Karl Marx, a German while living, a Russian when dead—we are supposed to learn the inevitability of human brotherhood without caste or class. This side of Utopia, however, the rich and the poor are always fighting. The poor, so Marx teaches, have been made poor by the rich, and so the rich must be made poor by the poor; a nose for a thumb and a thumb for

a nose, you see—just like the communistic comrades we see in the world today. This process is the "class struggle," death dealing among neighbors and even between friends, with everybody informing the secret police on everybody else. Such is war at its very worst, this death dealing among neighbors and friends. Yet it is a war so sacred, the "class war" is, that the faithful must create it, if they do not find it thriving, for the folklore of Marxist fatalism claims it to be inevitable—a war utterly necessary to the outworking of what they call "dialectical materialism."

This high-sounding phrase, "dialectical materialism," is meant by Marxists to name the cosmic power that guarantees the bright blessedness resulting from dark fate. It differs from plain barnyard materialism in being more deadly. Believe it or not, this new-fangled materialism guarantees classless peace from the class war, comradeship from suspicion and hate, human welfare from universal ill-fare. It will take more than trumped-up fate to bring this paradox to pass on earth, for among men like still produces like—not good bad, nor bad good. The actual results of this dark faith we see already. Comrades exile or murder comrades in a frenzy of friendliness. Trotsky, big comrade to the big comrade, rusts now in exile—or, as a wag has said, "sulks in his tenets." And ten thousands more—from generals to the generality of peasants—rest in violent graves as tribute ironic to their faith in cosmic fatalism. Now, no doubt—

> The grave's a fine and private place,
> But there I think none do embrace.

The embrace of comradeship is murdered by the comrades.

II. NAZI-ISM, A FULL-FLEDGED FATALISM

Murdered also is friendliness by the German faith in fate. "Reaching for the stars," as Nora Waln so pathetically puts it in her beautiful book on Germany, the Germans fall into the same well with their erstwhile enemies but present allies, the Russians. In the dank of fatalism they there embrace. Comrades and kamerads embrace each with a dagger concealed against the other's heart.

With the Germans the doctrine of inevitability runs to idealism rather than to materialism and depends upon the group rather than upon the universe to guarantee its outcome. Race rather than class is the magic word. The Nordics are destined to rule the world. Let all other races accept this verdict—or accept anyhow. Willy-nilly fate must fulfill itself. If inferiors will not accept the Nordic superiority "willy," they must accept it "nilly."

As instrument of this faith in fate the Nordics must regiment themselves in order to regiment others. The folk, which is to say the pack, must stand close together, each subordinating his will to the will of the leader. Whoever is not willing to be damned for the glory of the folk does not belong to the fold; and so is damned into a concentration camp. This idealism of folkiness in which men nuzzle each other to death, dooms individual men to the futility of fate just as much as does the materialism of Marx. Turn fatalism right side up or up side down and for the human individual it is still wrong side out just the same. For in neither form of it can the individual man do what he would, unless he would do what he must.

Whether, then, the dictator of the proletariat speak in the name of a materialistic universe that rolls on its relentless way or the fuehrer of the folk speak in the name of a race that drives relentlessly to dominate, both are ways of war—of war fated to be because believed to be fated. Freedom of men is lost in the fatalism of either the physical universe or the social order. Such are the fanaticisms of Russia and Germany today. Leaving these two frauds to their fateful embrace of each other, let us return to a land where there is roomy sanity enough to engulf even the half-size fatalism which some Americans profess to feel about war. Why here in America fate itself wears the flowing robes of freedom. Note what our sense of humor has done to the very notion of fate, in these words credited to an American aviator during the World War:

> When you're up in the air, you'll either be flying straight or turning over. If you're flying straight, there's no cause to worry. If you're turning over, you'll either right the plane or you won't. If you right the plane, there's no cause to worry. If you don't one of two things will happen—you'll either be injured or you won't be injured. If you're not injured, there's no cause to worry. If you are injured, you'll be either slightly or seriously injured. If you're slightly injured, there's no cause to worry. If you're seriously injured, one of two things will happen—you'll either die or you'll recover. If you recover, there's no cause to worry—and if you die, you can't.
>
> Why worry?

III. AMERICANISM IS FREEDOM FROM ALL FATALISMS

Let our first act of freedom as Americans be, as our great thinker, William James, suggested, to celebrate our freedom. Nationally we have done just this by passing the wisest Neutrality Act upon which Congress could agree. This is our ancient method of freedom, to talk out our differences and compromise upon what results from the talking. "Democracy is what can be arrived at democratically and not another thing."

The Neutrality Act which resulted from the process of free discussion frees our ships from danger zones and yet saves our farms and factories the right to sell for cash whatever the nations will buy from us in our own marts. By this extension of our trade and this limitation on our traders, we have done what can be done through law to preserve our peace. While doing this at home, we have in our homeland of the Americas agreed with our neighbors to the south that isolation from Europe shall hereafter mean insulation with one another. By converting isolation thus into insulation, we may well turn our previous oscillation in and out of Europe into all-American cooperation. It is easier to live alone and like it when we have plenty of good company.

Thus, at home and throughout our western neighborhood, our only folklore is that of friendliness. The free practice of friendliness, rather than its cosmic prospectus in Russia and its present perversion in Germany—the free practice of friendliness, I repeat, is what has made "just plain folks" in America of those whose ancestors were ancient enemies in Europe. By forbearance of what we do not like in each other and by celebration together of what we do like, we have made this a friendly land of peace among neighbors. The absence of secret police and concentration camps tells us negatively, and the noise of elections on "ham and eggs" and what not else tells us positively, that our American folklore is not of fatalism.

Of what, then, are we Americans now afraid? Of war? But war would come with or without our wills. It could hardly come without our wills. Each warring nation is looking for allies, not one for enemies. We are certainly not likely, then, to be deliberately provoked into this war. That would be the madness of a lunatic who does not know our size, not the madness of a cowardly dictator who picks only upon the weak. No; it is not through that door that we see, or even think we see, the specter of war.

Enemies disposed of, are we afraid of our friends? Of our friends, yes, and of ourselves. Even such fear, however, is hardly fatalistic. There might, indeed, arise conditions in which we would go to war. We know that in advance. We know, for instance, two conditions under which we would will war: (1) Defense of our homeland, and (2) defense of our neighborland of the two Americas. But against those two possible events we have no fatalistic fear. Such fear as we do have we would gladly face down if the hour struck for defense. For that very reason it is not likely to strike.

It is up to us to see to it that other friends do not call us into war—friends beyond our homefolk, I mean, and beyond our American neighbors. These friends we have, of course: of blood, of culture, of religion—friends, in short, of free ways of life more or less like our own. Such friendship, however, is consistent with our permanent independence from war. So long as we believe what we do now clearly believe, that we can be worth more to ourselves and to humanity by staying out, we will stay out of the war. If anything happens to beget this belief in the great majority of us, we will commit ourselves like freemen, not like slaves ordered to a change of heart. Freemen keep themselves of open mind to face changing events without metaphysical fear. We cannot legislate

against unpredictable events, and we cannot as freemen insulate ourselves from events that may arise. Freedom means to face what comes, with open eyes and courageous hearts.

What we need most to remember as we turn now together toward the future is this: There is no "little man" on the stairs that is not there. If he comes, we will see him. There is no overpowering cosmic purpose lurking in the crevices of the physical world to subvert us to our doom. That is communistic superstition. Nor is there any malign mischief of malevolence hidden in the folds of the folk to subvert us to an equally witless doom. That is Nazi superstition. Dangers there are, without a doubt, but they all have human carriers recognizable to our wit and so open to denial by our will. Among these dangers are, of course, our own emotions, since legislated neutrality cannot produce psychological impartiality. But we in America still dare the danger of trusting our hearts. While we do not with the Commu-Nazis think with either our blood or our spleen, we do think for our hearts with our heads. Whatever danger there be in this, it is the price we pay to be civilized men.

For civilization itself is sentiment made as wide as man and run as deep down as knowledge. Blind sentiment—sentimentality—would ally us with fate. Sentimentality leads men to do what they think they want to do, only to let them discover in the light of wider knowledge that they really did not want to do it at all. But far-sighted sentiment is not allied with fate; it is the true servant of civilized freedom. It leaves men to do what they want to do with large assurance that they will keep on wanting to have done it. It yields as its precious legacy something worth dying for when life proves impossible with honor; and it yields men something worth living for in trying days like these. Forsaking all fatalisms, then, let us formulate this faith in freedom as our American folklore:

We believe in friendliness to all, that in our life together even the humblest may share in the mystery of morale.

We believe in tolerance for even enemies, that our friendliness may remain roomy and free from both sterility and stickiness.

We believe in competition, that cooperation itself may have and hold its point of growth.

We believe in privacy, that the well-springs of public life may be vital and diverse.

We believe in liberty for all, that fools may get corrected by their own folly, that fanatics may be frustrated by their own narrowness, and that the wise and good may inherit the earth, leading mankind along the high road of peace which like the path of the just is as a shining light that shineth more and more unto the perfect day.

America Must Choose

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH O. BREWSTER

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 3, 1939

SPEECH OF HON. RALPH O. BREWSTER, OF MAINE

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech I delivered before annual banquet, Maine Universalist Convention, at Winthrop Street Universalist Church, Augusta, Maine, Monday evening, September 18, 1939:

In accordance with democratic traditions, America is now engaged in a great and solemn referendum. Every citizen has a right and an obligation to study all phases of this problem and express to his elected representative his individual views.

Some who talk most earnestly of the democratic front in Europe seem sometimes most anxious to discard democracy here in the United States.

Let us deny to none the right of free discussion of an issue upon the right decision of which may depend the future not only of America but of the world.

In particular America wishes to know the views of the young men who must carry on the battle, and of their mothers and fathers and wives and sweethearts. After all, they must pay the price.

No one questions the desire or the determination of America to keep out of war until we are convinced our safety is actually at stake. No one has a right to ask American boys to lay down their lives except in defense of America.

The overshadowing issue is whether or not this is or will become America's war. Has the time arrived when America should adopt the doctrine of "collective security"? Is America's frontier on the Rhine? Or is it out in the broad and stormy Atlantic, where George Washington placed it a century and a half ago?

The most subtle propaganda in the current crisis is the suggestion that America must inevitably be involved. That suggestion denies American independence of action. Whatever we do, let us do it as Americans and not because we are compelled to a course of action by influences in other lands.

Whether or not any modification of the existing embargoes is a step toward war is a matter for debate. Until I am persuaded that the safety of America and of American institutions is at stake, I shall labor without ceasing to keep America out of this European holocaust.

That means the question of embargoes is secondary to the main issue of keeping America out of war with or without embargoes.

Let us approach this tragic problem without passion or partisanship of any character. Let us see the problem clearly and let us see it whole.

Let us reach a decision after full and careful discussion and deliberation with an eye single to the future not only of America but of the civilization that we boast.

America may yet be the lost horizon where civilization shall survive. America is obviously now the focus of all the forces that are loosed upon this earth. America once again must face a supreme test. In the churches of America our grandfathers found the answer to their prayers.

Russia closed 25,000 churches by governmental fiat. Christendom was aghast at such a Godless act. Yet America has closed 25,000 churches, not by governmental fiat, but by the indifference of a people who did not choose to go.

Before America goes forth to save the world let us be very sure that we have sought and found the same guidance that has carried America in three centuries to a position of preeminence among the nations of the earth.

New Deal War on Business Goes On

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 3, 1939

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, rumbles of cannon from abroad, talk of appeasement, fear of American participation, nothing interferes with the New Deal's struggle against American businessmen. For reasons which are utterly inexplicable to the Nation's industrial leaders, President Roosevelt's assistants are waging a relentless warfare against the very enterprises which they must depend upon in any national emergency. There is no threat in the talk of businessmen, but there is deep and ever-widening resentment. They have grown tired of the scapegoat role, bearing labels they consider unjustified.

For 7 years they found themselves the victims of a peculiar process. Laws passed by Congress have dealt with business so frequently that it has become the rule rather than the exception to hear industry bewailing the activities of Capitol Hill. When Congress is in session, with the large Democratic majority still in power, New Deal legislation has made devastating inroads into freedom of private enterprise. But even when Congress has adjourned the process steadily goes on. For the "brain trust" of the White House has created agencies which function day and night throughout the year. They grind out regulations, they lay down rulings, they issue instructions. Like the mail, they work in season and out, good weather and bad.

What they have been doing in the last few months has gone almost completely unnoticed in the horrors of the new war shaping itself in Europe. But, whether it be publicly observed or not, the bureaucracy of the New Deal has been grinding the faces of businessmen just as heavily in the dust as in the days of the first crack down. Today your shop owner must keep posted on congressional legislation, of course. He must employ a trained lawyer to digest the statutes and to keep posted on the daily rulings of the 50 agencies created in Washington since 1933. Changes in the interpretation placed upon legal phrases may hit him crushing blows in the pocketbook. They may affect his advertising slogans; they may destroy his personal arrangements.

In fact, this is precisely what has been happening since last July. Economic planning, so fondly spoken of by our Government officials, has become synonymous with rigid governmental control. The methods of operation, the amounts of production, the prices which may be charged are being so largely determined by governmental activity today that the fiction of economic freedom has been virtually scrapped. Yet, amazingly inconsistently, while Federal governmental bureaus are undertaking these rigid regulations of industry, any effort by industry itself to do the same things is sharply deterred by an omnipresent, omniscient host of sleuths.

Within the last 60 days the Department of Justice, in cooperation with Professor-Assistant Attorney General Thurman Arnold, has indicted fifty-odd manufacturers and trade association officers for a series of offenses. They have been charged with endeavoring to cooperate in the interest of eliminating throat cutting. They have been indicted on the criminal charge of conspiracy to violate the antitrust laws by agreeing on uniform trade practices. Everything for which they are being tried was publicly praised and hailed with loud hosannas by the New Deal itself only a short time ago. In the heyday of N. R. A., the blue eagle floated bravely over the smokestacks now condemned so freely.

Not to be outdone, the Federal Trade Commission has accused cosmetics manufacturers of violating the Robinson-Patman Act and the Federal Trade Commission Act as well. The grievous offense with which they are charged may result in throwing at least 10,000 men and women out of work. They are alleged to have employed sales agents to act as demonstrators in department stores to the great damage of the Republic. Though every man, woman, and child in America, no matter how small the town in which he lives, knows that in stores throughout the country there are folks who demonstrate new appliances, cosmetics, vacuum cleaners, washing machines, and a thousand other devices, the Federal Trade Commission has just discovered the sordid truth. To them a grave deception is being practiced by these demonstrators, for they do not sell on behalf of the department store, but rather on behalf of the manufacturer. For some reason this constitutes a vicious evil, which must be extirpated at the roots. In the extirpation procedure a substantial prison sentence and a juicy fine may be imposed by the overzealousness of our Federal bureaucracy.

Even more irksome to businessman and consumer alike must be the recent ruling of the Trade Commission on another serious issue. A large food manufacturer was found guilty of violating the law because he had sold to one of his biggest customers at a price lower than that which he was charging smaller purchasers. The F. T. C. insists that no differential may be permitted in price for the purpose of inducing purchases in large quantities. The only justification for reducing prices which will satisfy the Commission is a difference in actual costs which can be attributed definitely to the size of the order. Every company selling in interstate business which reduces its charges to any customer takes its future existence in its hands under this ruling. Cost-accounting techniques become a prime factor in determining the result, and if the Commission's methods are different from those used by the company woe betide the company.

It is a fine kettle of fish, indeed, which the bureau chefs are boiling for industry. Hamstrung, discouraged, annoyed, it is no wonder that it requires a war abroad to give us hope of a business revival which will break the bonds that chain us.

No one urges unrestricted, bitter-end industrial individualism these days, though its proponents will always be able to set forth a noble argument in the history of America. But we are rapidly reaching the conclusion that we must have sanity in our regulation—that we must make compromises between State control and individual enterprise in the interest of our future.

The New Deal refuses to compromise. America's voters must write the compromise of 1940 for them.

Correction of Vote on Neutrality Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 3, 1939

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to correct the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for Friday, November 3, 1939, page 1389 where the roll call on the adoption of the conference report shows my name listed with the "nays." Mr. Speaker, I voted "aye" on that roll call, and voted it so loudly that I feel sure everyone in the Chamber heard my "aye." I ask, therefore, that the permanent RECORD be corrected to show that I voted "aye" on the adoption of the conference report.

Trade Agreement With Venezuela—Helps Big Oil Companies—Hurts Independent Producers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 3, 1939

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, for several years past the American oil industry has faced a very depressing situation. In addition to the general business depression it has had also the problem of overproduction. In order to stabilize the industry, producers in a number of States have voluntarily agreed to proration, whereby the actual output of the industry has been held down to a small percentage of potential production.

This program, while undoubtedly helpful in stabilizing production and prices, has worked a great hardship upon independent producers as well as landowners and farmers in the oil-producing States.

As an example of the extent to which proration has gone, I might cite what has happened in some of the oil fields in my own district. In the Geneseo field, in Rice County, the potential production is 242,030 barrels per day, according to the figures of the Kansas Corporation Commission. Under proration the field is permitted to produce 3,400 barrels per day, or 1¼ percent of its potential. In the Silica field, in Barton and Rice Counties, the potential production is 424,272 barrels per day. The amount permitted to be produced is 13,650, or 3.2 percent of the potential. In the Wherry field, in Rice County, the potential is 78,319 barrels. The allowable is 4,000 barrels, or 5.1 percent of the potential. Substantially the same situation obtains in other fields in central and western Kansas. In some of the older producing

fields the percentage is higher, but in every State practicing proration the amount permitted to be produced is only a small percentage of possible production.

This being the case, it is difficult to find any logical excuse for the action of the State Department in concluding the recent trade agreement with Venezuela reducing excise taxes on imported crude petroleum and fuel oil, including gas oil, to one-fourth cent per gallon. This reduction applies to a quota in any calendar year which is not in excess of 5 percent of the total quantity of crude petroleum processed in refineries in continental United States during the preceding calendar year. Imports in excess of this quota are subject to the full tax of one-half cent per gallon, but by the terms of the treaty our Government binds itself not to increase this tax.

Thus, at a time when domestic producers need more protection and a greater share of the American market, the State Department makes a trade agreement which takes away a large part of the inadequate protection which they already had. That, however, is not all. What I want to bring to the attention of the American people, and particularly those who are interested in oil production as independent operators and landowners, is that the oil industry as a whole suffers while two big companies benefit. In 1938, 58.4 percent of all our oil imports were brought in by the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey. The Gulf Co. brought in 22.6 percent. The remaining 19 percent was brought in by other importers in comparatively small quantities. Furthermore, in 1938 oil constituted 74.6 percent of all our imports from Venezuela. Thus it clearly appears that these two great oil companies get practically all of the benefits of this trade agreement as far as concessions to the United States are concerned. The effect of the agreement is to give these two great companies an increased opportunity to control the domestic oil market and to take it away from the domestic producer. It is going to hurt the independent producer and landowner in two ways. First, it reduces the market for American oil; second, it gives these two great oil companies an opportunity to use the Venezuelan oil supply as a weapon to beat down the price they pay for domestic oil.

Another concession will inure to the benefit of these two great oil corporations and to the disadvantage of domestic producers, and that is that Venezuela agrees to permit the free importation of machinery to produce Venezuelan oil, thus keeping down the cost of production and making competition with our producers more severe.

Surely it cannot be argued that it was necessary to reduce the excise tax in order to stimulate our export trade with Venezuela. As a matter of fact, the figures show that our exports to that country have been constantly increasing since the one-half-cent excise tax was imposed, and that for the year 1938 they were the largest in our history. In short, it is most difficult to discover any reason for taking away a large part of the protection of the American oil industry contained in the excise tax as imposed by Congress except an apparent desire to be of assistance to two colossal oil corporations. Whatever the intent may be, that is the result, and the little independent producer and the farmer getting a small income from oil leases and rentals will be the sufferers.

What Goes on With Our Money, Mr. President?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 3, 1939

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, it is many years since the Supreme Court of the United States declared that emergencies do not justify illegal activity. No doctrine of law would seem to be more firmly established. Yet President Roosevelt has recently undertaken a course of conduct which seems to flout the best-established principles of our law most brazenly.

From the reports which have appeared in newspapers from every section of the land comes the undenied assertion that Mr. Roosevelt has ordered our War and Navy Departments to ignore statutory safeguards against unauthorized expenditures for Army and Navy housing, hospitalization, and reconditioning obsolete vessels. Every one of these items may represent a necessary and salutary expense, but this is not the cause of our quarrel with the White House. We are appalled at the potential consequences of any step taken by our President which transgresses upon our laws.

Title II, section 665, chapter 11, of the United States Code declares that—

> No executive department or other Government establishment of the United States shall expend or involve the Government in any contract or other obligation for the future payment of money in excess of such appropriations unless such contract is authorized by law.

What the President has done is simply this: He has decided for himself that since Congress has authorized him to increase the strength of the Army, Navy, and marine forces of the Nation, and to recondition 100 vessels, he has acquired the additional authority to authorize such incidental expenditures as may be required for housing, hospitalization, and reconditioning operations.

It is conceivable to every one of us that "incidental expenditures" may sometimes exceed those to which they are appended. But no matter what may be the amount of these "incidentals" there is no authority whatever vested in any executive officer to multiply appropriations on his own volition. The Constitution requires appropriations to originate in the House of Representatives. Congress is given control of the Nation's purse strings, and no one may loosen them without congressional approval.

We are perturbed at this unprecedented usurpation of power by the White House. We are no less perturbed by the subtle methods employed in achieving it. According to the information before the Nation, the President discussed his proposed technique with Comptroller General Fred H. Brown "informally." Mr. Brown begged the President not to require a "formal ruling." Subsequently Supreme Court Justice Stone and Supreme Court Justice Frankfurter joined the President on a week-end cruise, at which time Mr. Roosevelt told his friends what he intended to do. Their replies are not recorded.

Whatever may be our political faith, there is something here which should not be lightly dismissed. Democrat or Republican, every American citizen, must be deeply concerned when the Nation's Chief Executive begins spending money without the specific authorization of the one governmental unit entrusted with the power to give it.

Congress is in session. Any emergency appropriation could be speedily enacted. Any real need for funds to keep our military forces prepared would find a ready response in the present state of world affairs. Why must our President choose this roundabout approach to a legitimate need?

Yes, Mr. President, what goes on with our money? No less important, what goes on with our constitutional processes of government?

Ludlow Resolution for Referendum on Foreign Wars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 3, 1939

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, when Congress reconvenes in January there will be a revival of efforts to secure the

enactment of House Joint Resolution 89, a resolution introduced by me which proposes to amend the Constitution so as to give the people of America who have to do the dying and suffering in war and to bear war's unspeakable griefs and costs, a right to vote on the question of sending our boys overseas to participate in foreign wars.

This resolution is coming up for national attention again in January, perhaps supported by more general and widespread favorable opinion and interest than ever before, because it is so everlastingly right and just that, like Banquo's ghost, it will not stay put down.

During the recent perfervid discussion of the neutrality issue, thousands upon thousands of our citizens were saying that they wished from the bottom of their hearts that the Ludlow amendment had been written into the Constitution when it was prominently before Congress last year, as they would have then felt secure that, with the people having a right to vote, there would be no danger of our country being dragged into an overseas war. For many weeks my mail has been flooded with letters asking, and even pleading, that this proposed constitutional amendment be revived and pushed with all possible vigor when the regular session starts in January.

The demand that the people shall have a right to say when our boys shall be sent to fight outside of the Western Hemisphere has been strengthened by the repeated demonstrations of the willingness of Congress to yield to the other end of the Avenue in respect to war and its makings. There is a very widespread belief that the Ludlow amendment would have been adopted and sent on the way to the States for ratification in 1938 if the sledge-hammer blows of the administration had not beaten down a favorable majority into a minority.

SWITCH OF 46 MEMBERS

Then there is the object lesson of what happened in the House the other day when 46 Members who had voted for the munitions embargo switched and voted to repeal the embargo.

A plain fact that should be obvious to everybody is that the existing war-declaring mechanism is undependable in registering the popular will in regard to international relations. Another plain fact is that any President of the United States with the power over international relations which the Constitution now gives him can lead the country into war any time he chooses. The unreliability of Congress as a register of public opinion in emergencies was demonstrated the other day when the embargo on munitions was repealed notwithstanding 80 percent or more of the American people wanted it retained. In crises like these Congress is strangely sensitive and responsive to the Executive will. Before a Nero, a Napoleon, or a Hitler gets in the White House the war power should be transferred by constitutional amendment to the people, where it ought to be in a democracy, for that is where sovereignty abides.

It has been demonstrated, so the advocates of the Ludlow amendment say, that although the Constitution nominally places the war-making power in the Congress, so great is the President's war power over Congress that many Members are always ready to flop and vote as the President wishes them to vote on international affairs.

It is pointed out that this may be all right so long as we have a peace-minded President in the White House, but suppose that some time we have a President who wants war? This question is being asked: If there is so much power inherent in the Presidency that the Chief Executive can prevent the war-referendum resolution from even being discussed on the floor of Congress, and if 46 Members of the House can be induced by Executive persuasion to switch and vote against an embargo provision which he himself once signed and praised, what reason is there to doubt that any President of the United States, at any time in the future, could lead the country into war whenever he may choose to do so, notwithstanding the letter of the Constitution purports to give the war-making power to the Congress alone?

NO CRITICISM OF MR. ROOSEVELT

To thousands—I believe even millions—of good, honest, sincere American citizens there seems to be something wrong with this picture. They have no criticism of President Roosevelt, but they know that we will not have our present peace-loving President always. Most of them have the warmest affection for him, but it does seem to them that in the interest of posterity, even more than in the interest of the present generation, this picture should be changed by substituting for the congressional right—always subject to Executive influence—to declare war, a hard and fixed provision in the Constitution that when it comes to deciding whether we shall send the flower of our manhood to die in slaughter zones overseas the people shall have the say, with women having equal voting rights with men, and with a provision that every boy old enough to be conscripted shall have a right to vote.

What could be more elementally just than that?

TEXT OF LUDLOW AMENDMENT

For the information of those who are not familiar with the Ludlow amendment, House Joint Resolution 89, I set forth its text, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as a part of the Constitution when ratified by conventions in three-fourths of the States as provided in the Constitution:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. Except in case of invasion by armed forces, actual or immediately threatened by an approaching military expedition, or attack upon the United States or its Territorial possessions, or by any non-American nation against any country in the Western Hemisphere, the people shall have the sole power by a national referendum to declare war or to engage in warfare overseas. Congress, when it deems a national crisis to exist in conformance with this article, shall by concurrent resolution refer the question to the people.

"SEC. 2. Congress shall by law provide for the enforcement of this section.

"SEC. 3. This article shall become operative when ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by conventions in the several States, as provided in the Constitution."

FORTY-EIGHT MEMBERS SIGN

Forty-eight Members of the House, representing collectively more than 12,000,000 American citizens, have signed a discharge petition, now at the Speaker's desk, to bring this worthy measure out of the Judiciary Committee, where it is being chloroformed, to the floor of the House for debate and a vote. The discharge petition will not become effective unless or until it is signed by 218 Members, a majority of the House, and the task to which we shall have to address ourselves when Congress reconvenes will be the securing of 170 additional signatures to the discharge petition. In this task all of the peace-loving people of the Nation can help by contacting their Members of Congress. Four separate Gallup polls have found a majority of the American people to be in favor of my proposal and there is no doubt that it has the approval of public opinion.

FUNDAMENTAL ARGUMENTS FOR BILL

Now a few words as to the fundamental arguments in support of this proposed change in the Constitution and I am done.

We boast that we are the world's greatest democracy.

What is the meaning of democracy? It means the right of the people to rule themselves—a right which we who subscribe to the faith of the founding fathers believe comes from God Himself.

The Constitution of the United States is the arch stone of our democracy. To round out that immortal charter of freedom, the so-called Ludlow war-referendum amendment is proposed as an addendum and capsheaf of the Bill of Rights.

This proposed constitutional amendment—House Joint Resolution 89—would give the people who have to suffer and, if need be, to die and to bear the awful burdens and costs and griefs of war the right to say whether we shall participate in wars overseas. If the United States or any country in the Western Hemisphere is attacked by a non-American nation, the referendum would not apply, so that this democratic proposal would not in any way, shape, or degree limit or impair our national defense.

When the Bill of Rights was adopted, the means of communication were so slow and imperfect that a referendum on war was obviously not only impractical but impossible. Quick, modern means of communication, including the telegraph, telephone, fast trains, airplanes, and radio, annihilating time and distance, have made a referendum on war practicable.

This proposed plebiscite on foreign wars is the very substance of democracy and would be a proper twentieth-century extension of the Bill of Rights. Our present form of government is a democracy only in reference to domestic affairs. Our democracy stops at the water's edge. In its foreign relations our Government is not a democracy at all, but a pure autocracy. The citizen can vote for constable or dog catcher, or on the location of a water works or pesthouse, but he has no vote on the greatest and most tragic question that can possibly affect him and his loved ones—the question which is to decide whether the manhood of America is to be regimented and sent into the slaughter pens of foreign wars. If our democracy means anything at all, it should apply not only in trivial situations but in matters of transcendental importance involving the breaking up of homes, the severing of family ties, and the hurling of our fine young manhood into the hell of foreign conflicts to settle the disputes of other nations. To contend that the citizen should have a right to vote only on relatively minor and inconsequential things, but not on these great tragic issues, is to confess the weakness and impotency of our democracy.

There are defense wars and there are policy wars. If our country were threatened by a foreign foe, our people would rise en masse to defend it, and no referendum would be expected or required under my proposal, but when it comes to deciding whether it is the best policy to participate in overseas wars of alien origin over boundary disputes and the like, surely those who have to suffer and die and pay the costs ought to have something to say about it. This proposal is not only elemental justice but it is the very essence of democracy and in complete harmony with our American philosophy and traditions.

Declare War on Unemployment and Money Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. OLIVER

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 3, 1939

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the request granted me by unanimous consent on November 3 last to extend my own remarks and to include therein certain excerpts from the speeches of the President with reference to the subject of unemployment, and also certain excerpts with reference to an interview which was given by Thomas Edison and Henry Ford in 1921, I submit the following:

Mr. Speaker, America should declare war now. There is not a Member of this great body who is not fully aware of and disturbed by the economic impasse in which we now find ourselves in this tremendously wealthy Nation of ours. There is not a person in this country who is not fully cognizant of the fact that want in the midst of plenty is a paradox upon which we all should declare uncompromising warfare until economic insecurity and uncertainty shall forever be banished from our land. Foreign affairs are of tremendous import to us at this particular juncture of world history, and this extraordinary session of the Congress must, of course, pay attention to the ways and means whereby this Nation may be insulated against the impact of that foreign madness; but at the same time our domestic problem of unemployment, which is partaking of the nature of a persistent and permanent malignant cancer in our body politic, must be eradicated completely. The failure to declare war now in this direction will inexorably and inevitably lead to an economic civil war among ourselves. Pressure groups, which are increasing in size and demands, are absolute proof and evidence that the first stages of a political protest are now under way and may very well develop into an aggressive rebellion against needless and involuntary unemployment, with its consequent ravages on our social, economic, and physical systems. The surges and impacts of these groups will become stronger and more frequent. We must declare war now and continue war on this unemployment crisis or war will be declared against us by our own people. We, in this great deliberative assembly, are more keenly aware of this than others who constantly call on us for corrective measures.

In this present atmosphere of war hysteria it is most pertinent to consider what causes wars. It is, in the final analysis, that most unnecessary economic dislocation, namely, unemployment. Unemployment means dissatisfaction, suffering, fear, crime, and a longing on the part of the dissatisfied for a Moses, a Hitler, a Lenin, or, as in our own case, in fact, another Washington. Unemployment caused the American Revolution. Had Great Britain given the colonists the privilege of an adequate circulating medium so the colonists could trade with each other without largely using barter, there would have been no Revolutionary War.

In this connection Henry Ford started a campaign to educate the people of this country in a method for the prevention of unemployment and war. He asked the Government to give him a contract to develop Muscle Shoals and loan him $30,000,000 with which to do it, the same to be paid back and the dam to revert to the Government.

Mr. Ford contends that unemployment can be wiped out through the use of enough money to move goods and services in abundance. He contended that if the Government would loan him $30,000,000—which he did not need—he would demonstrate two things: First, that we can produce great public wealth without bonds and bondage, and that when the people once knew that they could complete Muscle Shoals without the expenditure of a dollar of tax or bond, the idea would expand until the flood and power waters of the Nation were harnessed and every idle man would be employed, and that with full employment labor could and would demand and secure its full rights with peace and economic freedom.

For America to make such an example the world would be led to a new conception of life, which would eventually compel an ample monetary supply the world over, with resulting full employment and contentment of the people and the ending of wars.

At Muscle Shoals Mr. Ford, in company with Thomas Edison, gave an interview on the subject of ending wars.

Closely connected with the war and unemployment question there is the matter of the volume and the quality of the money. Excerpts from the interviews of Ford and Edison, which I asked leave to have included in my remarks, refer to these questions. These interviews were published in the New York Times on Tuesday, December 6, 1921, and are as follows:

Mr. Ford said:

"The essential evil of gold, in its relation to war, is the fact that it can be controlled. Break the control and you stop war. The only way to break the control of these international bankers, the way to end their exploitation of humanity forever, is to smash gold as a basis for the currency of the world.

"What did they do a hundred years ago without a gold standard? The idea of gold as a money basis is nothing more nor less than a conception of the bankers. They knew that if they could establish, by law, gold as the basis of currency they could then control the capital of the world because by combining interests to control the world's gold."

"But what have you to substitute?" he was asked.

"That's just where Muscle Shoals comes in," said Mr. Ford; "see what a spectacle we have. Army engineers say it will take $40,000,000 to complete the big dam. But Congress is economical just now and not in a mood to raise the money by taxation. The customary alternative is 30-year bonds at 4 percent. The United States, the greatest Government in the world, wishing $40,000,000 to complete a great public benefit, is forced to go to the money sellers to buy its own money. At the end of 30 years the Government not only has to pay back the $40,000,000, but it has to pay 120 percent interest, literally has to pay $88,000,000 for the use of $40,000,000 for 30 years.

"And all the time it is the Government's own money. The money sellers never created it. They got it from the Government originally. The Government first gave credit, now it must pay for the use of what it gave. Think of it. Could anything be more childish, more unbusinesslike?

WOULD SIMPLY ISSUE CURRENCY

"Now, I see a way by which our Government can get this great work completed without paying a nickel to the money sellers. It is as sound as granite, and there is but one thing hard about it. It is so simple and easy that, maybe, home folks can't see it.

"The Government needs $40,000,000. That is 2,000,000 $20 bills. Let the Government issue those bills and with them pay every expense connected with the completion of the dam. The dam completed, we can set the whole works running, and in a shorter time than you would suppose, the entire $40,000,000 issued can be retired out of the earnings of the plant."

"But suppose the contractor would be unwilling to accept that kind of currency in payment?" he was asked.

"There is not that kind of suppose in the situation at all," said Mr. Ford, smiling. "He would take Government bonds in payment, wouldn't he? Certainly. Here," said the manufacturer, pulling a $20 bill from his pocket, "he wouldn't hesitate about taking that kind of money, would he? Of course not. Well, what is there behind a bond or this bill that makes it acceptable? Simply this, the good faith and credit of the American people, and $20 bills issued by the Government to complete this great public improvement would have just as much of the good faith and credit of the American people behind them as any bond or other American currency ever issued. You see it is just a question of faith in the American people."

"But your plan would upset the money system of the world and might work incalculable harm," he was told.

"Not necessarily, not at all. We need not abolish anything. We need not even abolish the gold standard. Simply forget that there is any such thing as gold standard, and whenever the Government needs money for a great public improvement, instead of thinking of bonds with heavy interest charges think of redeemable non-interest-bearing currency. Do you really see what the interest charges of our Government mount up to? Do you appreciate that 80 cents of every dollar raised by taxation is spent in the payment of interest? The national debt is nothing more nor less than the Nation's interest liability pile. Every public improvement this country makes means an increase to the national debt. Here is a way to get the improvements without increasing the debt. The interest load is breaking down our whole financial system. We've got to stop somewhere."

"But, in a sense, there would be no security behind this kind of money," it was suggested.

"There would be the best security in the world. Here you have a river capable of furnishing 1,000,000 horsepower. It has been here for, say, 100,000,000 years. It will be here as long as there is rain and mountains to shed the rain into the rivers. This energy is wealth in a productive form. Now, which is the more imperishable, the more secure, this power site and its development or the several barrels of gold necessary to make $40,000,000? This site, with its power possibilities, will be here long after the Treasury Building is a ruin."

"But have you worked out a plan of values?"

WOULD USE POWER AS MONEY UNIT

"Yes; we have. We have that ready when Congress wishes to hear about this plan. The standard American dollar is approximately one-twentieth of an ounce of gold. Under the new currency system a certain amount of energy exerted for 1 hour would be equal to $1. It is simply a case of thinking and calculating in terms different than those laid down to us by the international banking group to which we have grown so accustomed that we think there is no other desirable standard. We should change our minds on that question. The only difference between the currency plan and the bond plan is that there is no interest to be paid, and the Wall Street money merchants, who do nothing to build the dam and deserve nothing, will get nothing."

"But how is all this going to stop war?"

"Simply because if tried here at Muscle Shoals this plan will prove so overwhelmingly and amazingly successful that the American people will never again consent to issuance of an interest-bearing bond for a national improvement. When the Government needs money it will raise it by issuing currency against its imperishable natural wealth. Other countries, seeing our success, will undoubtedly do likewise. The function of the money seller will have disappeared."

"What would be the attitude of other countries about accepting this money based on Muscle Shoals?" he was asked.

"There need be no difficulty about that. Some of our currency, even today, is not acceptable to foreign countries in payment of debts; gold is the international basis. Muscle Shoals is a national, not an international, matter. This money would only be for use at home."

"Do you expect that Congress will act favorably on your suggestion?"

"Well, I don't know as to that. Maybe they won't, but I'll bet that the average American citizen will see the righteousness, the soundness, and the common sense of this thing. But, no matter what becomes of this suggestion, I shall act so that no money speculator will make anything out of Muscle Shoals. Even if I have to take up the whole bond issue myself, I will see that the interest goes toward lowering the cost of the product. Understand that I am suggesting how this project can be financed in a better way, but if this is not done, we stand ready to do our utmost to save the people from the enormous interest charges by taking it ourselves and turning it back.

"My ambition is not to own Muscle Shoals but to complete it, develop it, get it working, and then fix it so that it can never be exploited for private ends but shall always remain in the service of all the people, their own property, operated for their own benefit."

SUPPORT OF FORD'S CURRENCY PLAN

On the point of Mr. Ford's suggestion to the Government for financing the completion of the dam, Mr. Edison reiterated his belief, expressed yesterday, that it was a good plan, and that if once the currency method is tried in raising money for public improvements the country will never go back to the bond method.

"Gold is a relic of Julius Caesar and interest is an invention of Satan," Mr. Edison continued. "Gold is intrinsically of less utility than most metals. The probable reason why it is retained as the basis of money is that it is easy to control. And it is the control of money that constitutes the money question. It is the control of money that is the root of all evil."

"How can this system be improved or changed?" Mr. Edison was asked.

"It can come about in several ways. One way would be to produce so much gold that its psychological hold would be broken. If we all had mines in our back yards or if synthetic gold could be made and sold for 10 cents a pound, you would soon see gold disappear as the basis for money. And we are nearing just that; only a few days ago a scientist developed that lead, one of the basic metals, and heretofore an element by itself, is actually a compound. We do not know how near we are from finding that gold, too, is a compound. All the wealth in the world, according to our present standards, may be rendered worthless by the discovery that gold can be made synthetically.

"In that case people could no longer have confidence in it. Money ought to be plentiful and gold is not plentiful. It would be plentiful if it were mined in as large quantities as it could be, but an artificial scarcity is maintained by those who use gold to monopolize money.

"That is one way to do it—make it so plentiful that it drowns its fictitious value and drowns the superstition of the people along with it.

WOULD FORGET ABOUT GOLD

"Then there is another way—the method my friend Ford proposed the other day. He proposes just to go along and forget about gold. He says tha' the Government can finance Muscle Shoals without applying to money brokers for permission, and I think he is absolutely right about it.

"Of course, as long as the world is on the gold basis, we shall have to recognize it as an element in international trade, but it is not necessary for commerce within our own borders. In internal business we can forget it. And we do forget it. If everybody in the United States suddenly demanded gold for their money, there would not be enough gold.

"Gold and money are separate things, you see. Gold is the trick mechanism by which you can control money.

"Gold is not money until the people of the United States and other nations put their stamp on it. It is not the gold that makes the dollar. It is the dollar that makes the gold. Take the dollar out of the gold, and leave it merely yellow metal, and it sinks in value. Gold is established by law, just as silver was, and gold could be disestablished, demonetized by law, just as silver was. When silver was demonetized the former so-called dollar became worth about 50 cents."

"But would not Mr. Ford's suggestion that Muscle Shoals be financed by a currency issue raise some objection?" Mr. Edison was asked.

"Certainly. There is a complete set of misleading slogans kept on hand for just such outbreaks of common sense among the people. The people are so ignorant of what they think are the intricacies of the money system that they are easily impressed by big words. There would be new shrieks of 'fiat money' and 'paper money' and 'greenbackism,' and all the rest of it—the same old cries with which the people have been shouted down from the beginning.

"Maybe they can't shout down American thinkers any longer. The only dynamite that works in this country is the dynamite of a sound idea. I think we are getting a sound idea on the money question. The people have an instinct which tells them that something is wrong and that the wrong somehow centers in money. They have an instinct, also, which tells them when a proposal is made in their interests or against them.

BASED ON SOIL AND ENERGY

"Now, as to paper money, so-called, everyone knows that paper money is the money of civilized people. The higher you go in civilization the less actual money you see. It is all bills and checks. What are bills and checks? Mere promises and orders. What are they based on? Principally on two sources—human energy and the productive earth. Humanity and the soil—they are the only real basis of money.

"Don't allow them to confuse you with the cry of 'paper money.' The danger of paper money is precisely the danger of gold—if you get too much, it is no good. They say we have all the gold of the world now. Well, what good does it do us? When America gets all the chips in a game the game stops. We would be better off if we had less gold. Indeed, we are trying to get rid of our gold to start

something going. But the trade machine is at present jammed. Too much paper money operates the same way. There is just one rule for money, and that is to have enough to carry all the legitimate trade that is waiting to move. Too little or too much are both bad. But enough to move trade, enough to prevent stagnation on the one hand and not enough to permit speculation on the other hand is the proper ratio."

"Then you see no difference between currency and Government bonds?" Mr. Edison was asked.

"Yes; there is a difference, but it is neither the likeness nor the difference that will determine the matter; the attack will be directed against thinking of bonds and currency together and comparing them. If people ever get to thinking of bonds and bills at the same time, the game is up.

"Now, here is Ford proposing to finance Muscle Shoals by an issue of currency. Very well; let us suppose for a moment that Congress follows his proposal. Personally I don't think Congress has imagination enough to do it, but let us suppose that it does. The required sum is authorized—say $30,000,000. The bills are issued directly by the Government, as all money ought to be. When the workmen are paid off they receive these United States bills. When the material is bought it is paid in these United States bills. Except that perhaps the bills may have the engraving of a water dam instead of a railroad train and a ship, as some of the Federal Reserve notes have. They will be the same as any other currency put out by the Government, that is, they will be money. They will be based on the public wealth already in Muscle Shoals, and their circulation will increase that public wealth; not only the public money but the public wealth—real wealth.

"When these bills have answered the purpose of building and completing Muscle Shoals they will be retired by the earnings of the power dam; that is, the people of the United States will have all that they put into Muscle Shoals and all that they can take out for centuries—the endless wealth-making water power of that great Tennessee River—with no tax and no increase of the national debt."

"But suppose Congress does not see this, what then?" Mr. Edison was asked.

"Well, Congress must fall back on the old way of doing business. It must authorize an issue of bonds. That is, it must go out to the money brokers and borrow enough of our own national currency to complete great national resources, and we then must pay interest to the money brokers for the use of our own money.

OLD WAY ADDS TO PUBLIC DEBT

"That is to say, under the old way any time we wish to add to the national wealth we are compelled to add to the national debt.

"Now, that is what Henry Ford wants to prevent. He thinks it is stupid, and so do I, that for the loan of $30,000,000 of their own money the people of the United States should be compelled to pay $66,000,000—that is what it amounts to with interest. People who will not turn a shovelful of dirt nor contribute a pound of material will collect more money from the United States than will the people who supply the material and do the work. That is the terrible thing about interest. In all our great bond issues the interest is always greater than the principal. All of the great public works cost more than twice the actual cost on that account. Under the present system of doing business, we simply add 120 to 150 percent to the stated cost.

"But here is the point: If our Nation can issue a dollar bond, it can issue a dollar bill. The element that makes the bond good makes the bill good also. The difference between the bond and the bill is that the bond lets the money brokers collect twice the amount of the bond and an additional 20 percent, whereas the currency pays nobody but those who directly contribute to Muscle Shoals in some useful way.

"If the Government issues bonds, it simply induces the money brokers to draw $30,000,000 out of the other channels of trade and turn it into Muscle Shoals; if the Government issues currency, it provides itself with enough money to increase the national wealth at Muscle Shoals without disturbing the business of the rest of the country. And in doing this it increases its income without adding a penny to its debt.

"It is absurd to say that our country can issue $30,000,000 in bonds and not $30,000,000 in currency. Both are promises to pay; but one promise fattens the usurer, and the other helps the people. If the currency issued by the Government were no good, then the bonds issued would be no good either. It is a terrible situation when the Government, to increase the national wealth, must go into debt and submit to ruinous interest charges at the hands of men who control the fictitious values of gold.

"Look at it another way. If the Government issues bonds, the brokers will sell them. The bonds will be negotiable; they will be considered as gilt-edged paper. Why? Because the Government is behind them, but who is behind the Government? The people. Therefore it is the people who constitute the basis of Government credit. Why then cannot the people have the benefit of their own gilt-edged credit by receiving non-interest-bearing currency on Muscle Shoals instead of the bankers receiving the benefit of the people's credit in interest-bearing bonds?"

SAYS PEOPLE MUST PAY ANYWAY

"The people must pay anyway; why should they be compelled to pay twice, as the bond system compels them to pay? The people of the United States always accept their Government's currency. If the United States Government will adopt this policy of increasing its national wealth without contributing to the interest collector—for the whole national debt is made up of interest charges—then you will see an era of progress and prosperity in this country such as could never have come otherwise."

"Are you going to have anything to do with outlining this proposed policy?" Mr. Edison was asked.

"I am just expressing my opinion as a citizen," he replied. "Ford's idea is flawless. They won't like it. They will fight it, but the people of this country ought to take it up and think about it. I believe it points the way to many reforms and achievements which cannot come under the old system."

The ideal money advocated by Messrs. Ford and Edison would have been wealth money issued against the newly produced wealth which would have been created at Muscle Shoals and could have been extended likewise to every other great productive project. This wealth money would have been paid into circulation as the projects advanced and would have been retired as financial returns came in from the completed project. In the case of nonproductive projects the same money procedure could be followed, but the retirement of the money issued to complete such would necessarily come from tax receipts.

Mr. Ford proposed to complete the Muscle Shoals project for $30,000,000 in new paper money. The Norris-Roosevelt project at Tennessee Valley has cost the United States in bonds $231,066,000, of which $99,358,380 has been in the form of direct bond issues and $131,707,620 in indirect issues. This statement is based on the present Federal financial practice of paying its expenses through the medium of borrowed money to the extent of 43 percent and the balance of 57 percent by cash revenues. If there were not any T. V. A. then our total expenses would be that much less; therefore our contention that it may be considered that T. V. A., which had its inception in the Muscle Shoals plant, has cost the United States at the present time nearly a quarter of a billion dollars in bonds. With another $40,000,000 authorized and appropriated and still more to come, we realize that the interest charges under our present obeisance to the bond method of finance will double the principal cost of this wealth-producing project.

The debt-money system employed in the T. V. A. project, against which Ford and Edison both enveighed, is largely responsible for the unemployment and war problems of this Nation and the world. As a matter of fact, it is my considered judgment that the present European conflict is being waged and continued because of the determination of the money lenders that the unconventional internal money system of Germany shall not be extended to the orthodox and status quo nations of the world. It is my sincere belief that the President is not unaware of the potent influence which unemployment exercises in the business of war. It is interesting and timely to call attention to the importance which Mr. Roosevelt places on this problem of unemployment. Let me quote several of the "57 varieties" of statements which he has made in this connection.

In the Presidential campaign address in Detroit, October 2, 1932, I read:

> The problem in the long run—and I am not talking about the emergency of this year but the problem of unemployment in the long run—can be and shall be solved by the human race.

With ten to twelve millions who want work still idle, the question has not been settled by the human race 7 years later, nor has there been a dent made in the solution.

In a campaign address of October 13, 1932, he said:

> I have recounted to you in other speeches, and it is a matter of general information, that for at least 2 years after the crash the only efforts made by the national administration to cope with the distress of unemployment were to deny its existence. When finally this year, after attempts at concealment and minimizing had failed, when they were at last forced to recognize the fact of suffering among millions of unemployed, appropriations of Federal funds for assistance to States were finally made.

Candidate Roosevelt more or less justly criticized President Hoover, but after 6 years of new dealism we still have the ten millions to twelve millions who want work still unemployed, with an administration minimizing and concealing the gravity of the situation.

Again, in the Presidential campaign address in Atlanta, Ga., October 24, 1932, he says:

I believe that we can restore prosperity here in this country by reestablishing the purchasing power of half of the people of the country; that when this gigantic market of 50,000,000 people is able to purchase goods industry will start to turn and the millions of men and women now walking the streets will be employed.

Bravo! Great! Great, Mr. President! Wonderful campaign belief. Yet with ten to twelve million idle who would work if they could, after 6 years of your administration you have proved that you either cannot give or are unwilling to give those 50,000,000 purchasing power.

In another Presidential campaign speech at Baltimore, Md., October 25, 1932, we note:

Mr. Hoover apparently has come to believe that 10,000,000 people of the United States must remain unemployed unless the Government provides employment for all of them. The exact meaning of his statement is, if I understand the English language correctly, that there is no hope for a restoration of normal employment for these 10,000,000 people.

Despair is written all over this statement of the President. A despairing cry which says to the 10,000,000 American unemployed that normal employment is not in sight. * * * He apparently feels that the way to restore the spirit of the American people is to tell the unemployed—the vast, weary army of unemployed—that they are going to remain unemployed.

Candidate Roosevelt told the idle—that vast, weary army of unemployed—they would have employment, but after 7 years there are still ten to twelve million unemployed, all of whom want work, but the President has no relief for them unless it be at war.

Speaking of President Hoover's faith that something would turn the tide of unemployment, Candidate Roosevelt, at the Metropolitan Opera House, New York City, November 3, 1932, said:

Faith and hope are splendid things, but the hunger and suffering of millions of unemployed men are too insistent to justify a governmental policy that pins its faith on such a mere remote possibility.

Yet President Roosevelt, too, asks ten to twelve million unemployed to have faith today.

In President Roosevelt's annual message to Congress, January 4, 1935, we read:

But the stark fact before us is that great numbers still remain unemployed.

A large proportion of these unemployed and their dependents have been forced on the relief rolls. The burden on the Federal Government has grown with great rapidity. * * * Work must be found for able-bodied but destitute workers.

The Federal Government must and shall quit this business of relief.

I am not willing that the vitality of our people be further sapped by giving of cash, of market baskets, of a few hours of weekly work cutting grass, raking leaves, or picking up papers in the public parks. We must preserve not only the bodies of the unemployed from destitution but also their self-respect, their self-reliance and courage and determination. This decision brings me to the problem of what the Government should do with approximately 5,000,000 unemployed now on the relief rolls.

Those pledges are still unfulfilled, with ten to twelve millions unemployed.

Another time, in informal remarks to State Works Progress administrators, Washington, D. C., June 17, 1935, President Roosevelt says:

I stress the need of making clear to the people in your own States the common objective, the congressional intent and mine to put these unemployed to work during the coming year for a given sum of money. This sum is not elastic, but definite, a fixed appropriation of the Congress. We all hope there is going to be a very definite and distinct pick-up all over the United States. We are working slowly but very surely toward the elimination of the major unemployment problem we have had during these past few years. Of course, we always will have a certain number of unemployed with us, but nothing like the present scale, we hope. And this year, I believe, is going to be the beginning of the picking up of the greater part of this unemployment slack from which we have been suffering.

What a tumble the President's "hopes" took in 1937 and also today with ten to twelve millions still unemployed. "Of course," says the President, "we will always have a certain number of unemployed with us." Very consoling is that in a Nation which guarantees life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness to all its citizens. We all know that this guaranty means nothing to people who are unemployed, and we further know that this great guaranty for those who are employed is seriously jeopardized with millions out of work.

In an address at San Diego, Calif., October 2, 1935, the President said:

In the midst of the greatest and most disastrous of these depressions, the very foundation of individual life was crumbling in the spring of 1935 because of the appalling increase in suffering and destitution due to the fact of unemployment.

And 4 years later the disastrous effects go on, with ten to twelve millions unemployed and a war boom now relied upon as the only hope of giving work to a few.

In a message to Congress the President, recommending an appropriation for relief of unemployment, March 18, 1936, stated:

There are at present approximately 5,300,000 families and unattached persons who are in need of some form of assistance—3,800,000 families and unattached persons on the works program and 1,500,000 on local and State relief rolls. Every thinking person knows that this problem of unemployment is the most difficult one before the country.

It is, indeed, proving to be a difficult one with ten to twelve millions unemployed who want work today.

In an address before the Young Democratic Club of Maryland, at Fifth Regiment Armory, Baltimore, Md., April 13, 1936, the President said:

You and I know the simple fact that, while production was increasing and profits were increasing in 1928 and 1929, unemployment was growing at an astounding rate. * * * Because the practices of employment definitely affect the problem of unemployment the Government must give and will give consideration to such subjects as the length of the working week, the stability of employment on an annual basis, and the payment of at least adequate minimum wages. A government doing that is a government that is working actively at the answers to your problem.

Why does the President not end the disgrace of ten to twelve million unemployed?

Again, in his first annual message to Congress, January 3, 1936, the President declared:

In other words, let action be positive and not negative. The way is open in the Congress of the United States for an expression of opinion by yeas and nays. * * * Shall we say to the several millions of unemployed citizens who face the very problem of existence—yes, of getting enough to eat—"We will withdraw from giving you work; we will turn you back to the charity of your communities and to those men of selfish power who tell you that perhaps they will employ you if the Government leaves them strictly alone"? Shall we say to the needy unemployed, "Your problem is a local one except that perhaps the Federal Government, as an act of mere generosity, will be willing to pay to your city or to your county a few grudging dollars to help to maintain your soup kitchens"?

Ten to twelve millions unemployed desire work, still testifying to your ungenerous hand-outs.

Again, in a speech accepting Democratic nomination for President, in Philadelphia, June 27, 1936, Candidate Roosevelt stated:

We are poor, indeed, if this Nation cannot afford to lift from every recess of American life the dread fear of the unemployed that they are not needed in the world. * * *

But, Mr. President, ten to twelve millions of unemployed are looking for your "lift."

From a radio address from the White House, September 6, 1936, we have these words:

We do not surrender our responsibility to the unemployed. We have had ample proof that it is the will of the American people that those who represent them in National, State, and local Government should continue as long as necessary to discharge that responsibility.

Step up, Mr. President. There are still ten to twelve millions who want work.

In a Presidential campaign address at Forbes Field, Pittsburgh, Pa., October 1, 1936, the following appears:

When the new management (Roosevelt administration) came to Washington we began to make our plans—plans to meet the immediate crisis and plans that would carry the people of the country back to decent prosperity.

We saw the millions out of work, the business concerns running in the red, the banks closing.

You can still see ten to twelve millions wanting work. We have just taught them to half starve, to be illy housed and illy clothed, and not to complain.

In a Presidential campaign address at Kansas City, October 13, 1936, Mr. Roosevelt said:

We no longer believe that human beings hit by flood, drought, unemployment, or other national disaster should be left to themselves with the sole help of such charity as may be locally available to them.

Then we should do something about the ten to twelve millions of unemployed who want work.

President Roosevelt's speech in Casper, Wyo., September 24, 1937, is illuminating:

There is nothing like the unemployment today that existed when I came into office.

Still ten to twelve millions who want work.

In another annual message to Congress, January 6, 1937, President Roosevelt remarks:

Of course, the most far-reaching and the most inclusive problem of all is that of unemployment and the lack of economic balance, of which unemployment is at once the result and the symptom. The immediate question of adequate relief for the needy unemployed who are capable of performing useful work I shall discuss with the Congress during the coming months. The broader task of preventing unemployment is a matter of long-range evolutionary policy. To that we must continue to give our best thought and effort. We cannot assume that immediate industrial and commercial activity which mitigates present pressures justifies the National Government at this time in placing the unemployment problem in a filing cabinet of finished business.

The names of the ten to twelve millions of unemployed who want work and cannot find it are in the President's filing cabinet.

In a radio address from the White House, prior to unemployment census, November 14, 1937, the President declared:

Enforced idleness, embracing any considerable portion of our people, in a nation of such wealth and natural opportunity, is a paradox that challenges our ingenuity. Unemployment is one of the bitter and galling problems that now afflicts mankind.

Why not end unemployment and put the ten to twelve millions of unemployed to work? You promised to, Mr. President. Take the question out of the filing cabinet and act.

In another radio address from the White House, prior to unemployment census, November 14, 1937, we have:

I am confident that this Nation of ours has the genius to reorder its affairs and possesses the physical resources to make it possible for everyone, young or old, to enjoy the opportunity to work and earn. There is neither logic nor necessity for one-third of our population to have less of the needs of modern life than make for decent living.

It is my opinion that the genius of the New Deal does not want the ten to twelve millions of unemployed to have work; otherwise they would provide it.

In his Presidential campaign address at Forbes Field, Pittsburgh, Pa., October 1, 1936, Roosevelt says:

[In 1936] on top of having to meet the ordinary expenses of government, I recognize the obligation of the Federal Government to feed and take care of the growing army of homeless and destitute unemployed.

The President still has ten to twelve millions who need "feed" and work.

In a radio address from the White House—prior to unemployment census—November 14, 1937, he shows his passing interest:

This unemployment problem is one in which every individual and every economic group has a direct interest. It is a problem whose discussion must be removed from the field of prejudice to the field of logic. We should find the solution only when we have the facts and, having the facts, accept our mutual responsibilities.

Here the President is in want of the facts. He found them to be in his census of unemployment of eleven millions and over. In a press conference he admitted there were probably three and a half millions more, making a total of fourteen and a half millions. Remember the President's claim, "We planned it that way."

Extemporaneous remarks at Poughkeepsie, N. Y., November 2, 1936:

We cannot reach a millennium or Utopia in any 4 years, or 8 years, but at least I have felt that people in responsible positions ought to start the ball rolling; that they ought to make an effort, through legislation and through public opinion, in a perfectly normal, sane, sensible way, to provide security—security for people within themselves, so that they would not individually worry; security for their families; security for their homes; and a greater security for their jobs. And, incidentally, a greater security for the people who employ them.

Opportunity for work can be guaranteed without war when this administration or some succeeding one determines to put into practice the money suggestions made by Henry Ford and Thomas Edison. Such attempts to this end, however, as have been presented in the form of printed bills have been definitely committed to the doghouse by the brain advisers of the President and in their place have been enacted the patchwork legislation with which the industry of this Nation is struggling today.

In a radio address from the White House—prior to unemployment census—November 14, 1937, the President states:

The report card, which the postman will leave at your door on Tuesday, is a double post card, larger than the customary card. It is addressed especially to those who are unemployed or partly unemployed, and who are able to work and are seeking work. This card carries a message to you from me, carrying the assurance that if you will give me all the facts, it will help us in planning for the benefit of those who need and want work and do not have it now.

You now have the facts, Mr. President, of from ten to twelve millions of unemployed today.

In an address to annual meeting of Mobilization for Human Needs March 11, 1938, the President said:

But when, in 1933, we faced the fact that nearly one out of every three able-bodied workers in America had no job, we had to face the added fact that it was the system which was out of gear.

We ask of you, Mr. President, that you lead the way in a real attempt to fix the system which is now out of gear in order to give every person work who wants work, without resorting to war.

President Roosevelt's address to annual meeting of Mobilization for Human Needs March 11, 1938, asserts:

The importance of these employable millions may be fully understood, perhaps, when it is realized that approximately one-third of them are under 25 years of age and will be either assets or liabilities for many years to come, depending upon public policies toward them. If we do not give them a chance at something like normal living, it is inevitable that they will become millions of individual problems. For these able-bodied unemployed, I am definitely committed to the giving of jobs instead of relief.

The President seems to realize the gravity of these ten to twelve millions being unemployed. Why does he not act? Is he waiting for a war just around the corner?

In the Presidential address in Covington, Ky., July 8, 1938, we have:

I will not go into the story of these 6 years. You know that your bank deposits are safe; that the problem of unemployment is far less serious; that more wheels of industry are turning; that the farmers are better off in a hundred ways; and, most important of all, that our people are not half-clothed or half-starving.

We know, Mr. President, that nothing is settled with ten to twelve millions of unemployed, and that nothing is better off. Let us consider the tables of unemployment from 1917 to this date:

1917	60,000
1918	50,000

The above figures are compiled from careful research.

From the A. F. of L. we secure the following figures:

1919	75,000
1920	1,401,000
1921	4,270,000
1922	3,441,000
1923	1,532,000
1924	2,315,000
1925	1,775,000
1926	1,669,000
1927	2,050,000

1928	2,220,000
1929	1,864,000
1930	4,770,000
1931	8,738,000
1932	13,182,000
1933	13,723,000
1934	12,095,000
1935	10,052,000
1936	9,395,000
1937	10,933,000
1938:	
Census	11,032,000
President Roosevelt's personal figures	14,532,000
1939 (A. F. of L. figures, approximate)	10,335,000

From these figures we can figure an average unemployment of 396,000 under Wilson's last term and average unemployment under succeeding Presidents as follows:

Harding-Coolidge	2,889,500
Coolidge	1,924,750
Hoover, with Republican Congress	3,317,000
Hoover, with Democratic Congress	10,960,000
Hoover (complete term)	6,167,000
Roosevelt, average, first term	11,466,250
Roosevelt, average second term (approximate)	12,000,000

The cold figures of any reputable agency, even the President's own agencies, show average unemployment to be greater under Roosevelt than under Hoover from two to four times.

I am not trying to defend Hoover's watchful waiting "around the corner." He failed to end unemployment but using the same scoreboard President Roosevelt, with all the latter's bluster and 57 declarations against unemployment, has more signally failed than did President Hoover.

In his Presidential message to Congress on recovery and relief April 14, 1938, Roosevelt says:

> During the processes of overspeculation and overproduction—in the twenties—millions of people had been put to work, but the products of their hands had exceeded the purchasing power of their pocketbooks, with the result that huge surpluses, not only of crops but also of buildings and goods of every kind, overhung the market. Under the inexorable law of supply and demand, supplies so overran demand which would pay that production was compelled to stop. Unemployment and closed factories resulted.

Possibly the President thinks he is doing his best, but his best is not good enough when ten to twelve millions are unemployed.

In a consultation with President Hoover, Henry Ford answered the question of "inexorable law of supply and demand" which President Roosevelt mentions in the paragraph above. Ford's solution which was given the widest publicity at the time is given in part as follows:

> Another reason is that American production had come to equal and to surpass not our people's power to consume but their power to purchase. This is not the same thing as the overproduction of goods; it is undersupply of purchasing power.
>
> Overproduction can never occur until every need is supplied, but the first need is the need of money. Money in the people's hands represents purchasing power. In this country the purchasing power of the people has been practically used up and still they have not been able to buy all that they must have. I, therefore, suggest the need of increasing the purchasing power of our principal customers—the American people.
>
> This may be done in two ways, first, by putting additional value into goods or reducing prices to the level of actual values; and, second, starting a movement to increase the general wage level. Nearly everything in this country is too high-priced. The only thing which should be high-priced in this country is the man who works. Wages must not come down; they must not even stay on their present level; they must go up.
>
> And even that is not sufficient of itself—we must see to it that the increased wages are not taken away from our people by increased prices that do not represent increased values. The country gains no benefit by letting the workingman earn an extra hundred dollars and then taking it away from him again in increased rents and a rise in prices generally.

Following the White House conference, a dispatch from the Detroit office of the Ford Motor Co. confirmed the Ford policy in the following words:

> The increase in wages for Ford employees which Henry Ford announced at Washington today is soon to be made effective has been under consideration for several weeks, it was said in the company's offices here today. * * *
>
> A minimum wage in the Ford organization of $5 a day was established by Henry Ford in 1914. His philosophy that lower price levels and higher wages are the greatest stimuli to good business is well known in industrial circles.

The President was told by the greatest practical economist in American history, an outstanding American of demonstrated ability, how to end unemployment and disaster.

President Hoover, however, did not heed these wise words of the richest man in the world, whose philosophy of putting everyone to work and preventing even the possibility of war was to raise the purchasing income of the producing worker and reduce the price of fabricated merchandise.

Even a sixth-grade school child could understand that if you lower the price of fabricated merchandise people can and will buy more, and in buying more will put more people to work, and that if the prices go low enough, every person would be employed.

In this day you hear many say: "Prices must go up. We must at least advance to the 1926 price level," with its millions of unemployed. Henry Ford says: "No; you must lower the prices of fabricated merchandise."

If you raise the wage and do not raise the price of fabricated merchandise, the people will have more to spend, and in spending more they will consume more goods, which will require the unemployed to go to work to produce the needed goods. That is simple, and that is the Ford philosophy to end unemployment. In other words, the spread between labor cost of fabricated merchandise and consumer's price is too great.

You may say that you cannot raise the wage of the laborer and income of the farmer without raising the consumer price of fabricated merchandise. Henry Ford all but says you must if you would end unemployment.

While Mr. Ford does not say just how he would raise wages and lower the price of fabricated merchandise, it is evident, from his known opposition to interest and taxes, that he would wipe out interest and taxes in the purchase price of fabricated merchandise.

With an interest and tax bill in the Nation of $32,000,000,000 and a production of wealth—wholesale—of sixty billion, it is evident that 50 percent of the average cost of fabricated merchandise is interest and taxes. Eliminate these items and pass the benefits to the laborer and consumer.

Mr. Ford's plentiful supply of money, as advocated, would as it passed into circulation start to lower the interest rate as money thawed out the hoards. This new supply of wealth-money would flow into circulation until money, which now, as Prodhon, celebrated French economist, says, blocks the door to commerce like a tollgate would become the mover of goods and services, unhindered, unafraid.

Then take all the taxes off of industry—off the produce of the smallest farmer to the greatest—from the smallest shoe-repair shop to the largest shoe factory. From every stock or store of merchandise, unfetter it from the tax burden laid on industry and the consumer from the consumer's tax. Then and only then can you lower the price of fabricated merchandise and raise the income of the producing farmer and worker.

President Hoover's watchful waiting at the corner failed.

President Roosevelt's fanfare, bluster, and "brain trusters" have also failed.

Probably Roosevelt's former Secretary of the Treasury, Woodin, expressed the thought and desired position Candidate Roosevelt wished to take, when giving an inspired interview on the Roosevelt candidacy in 1932, said:

> The big owner and the small consumer to him are just like himself—each entitled to a fair treatment and a square deal.

Well, the President has given the big owner his biggest dividends. The idle-money holders have been given their biggest and best investment in $25,000,000,000 of United States bonds which pay to the big boys at the top a net return of from two to four times the usual net dividends of industry. Real nice for those in the upper brackets to get Government-bond returns equaling 14 percent in private industry. The

President has taken care of the big boys with prosperity for the few—

Prosperity, that lives in opulence
Upon another's toil,
Prosperity, that takes the cream of earth
From those who till the soil,
Prosperity that dries the mother's breast
That robs the babe unborn,
Prosperity that functions at its best
When countless thousands mourn.

Recently there appeared in a partisan newspaper a large cartoon depicting the evils of foreign war and containing an outline of our domestic problems which its editor terms as unemployment, industrial strife, low standards of living, hunger, and sickness. A wonderful cartoon it was, showing these problems in the form of men as grim enemies of society and pitted against these six foes stood Uncle Sam with clenched fist. But read in vain; not one word was given as to the method or the weapon which might be used to combat these evils and win the struggle for capitalistic democracy, which, in my opinion, comprises the issue with which we are faced. Today, all acknowledge the evil of unnecessary and involuntary unemployment, but nobody faces it or offers a real basic solution. Ford offered a realistic approach some years ago.

How can Roosevelt give prosperity to the ten or twelve millions of unemployed and at the same time give away the birthright of the farmers and laborers in the form of Government debt money to the bondholders to own and collect on as their property. It just is not in the cards. Both cannot be done. But we can pay off those who now hold the present debt of the Government by making possible honest work for the unemployed on a real earning and productive basis. Debt will never be met unless this country goes back to work. Furthermore, people will not go back permanently to work under the present practice of creating additional debt money through the medium of nonproductive governmental operations.

Are we to drift along until the unemployed find a leader like a Hitler, who arises on the injustices meted out to millions of people and who arouses their prejudices against some bogey as a target until, in a position of power, he gives work to all in the business of distributing death and destruction? Shall we wait until the growing army of the unemployed, because of its very misery and desperation, welcomes such a tyranny in this country?

Mr. Speaker, this is our problem, and if the present leadership will do nothing about it except indulge in more promises and high-sounding words of futuristic hope, then we are challenged to move in with the combined intelligence of the membership of this body and offer the money reform which this great Nation of ours must adopt.

Foreign wars are not the answer. Wars anywhere which take the lives of a single man, woman, or child are not the answer. But a war on the combined enemies of unemployment, low standards of living, industrial strife, hunger, and sickness is the answer. To win such a war we must adopt the tactics which those great generals of industry and science, Ford and Edison, have recommended, namely:

(1) Put new wealth and interest-free money, redeemable in goods, services, and taxes, into circulation.

(2) Make production the basis of our money system in the place of debt.

(3) Stop all bond issues for nonproductive and destructive purposes.

(4) Raise the incomes of all labor to an annual standard commensurate with capacity to produce.

(5) Lower the price of fabricated merchandise to the consumer.

An aggressive war waged along these lines will forever end involuntary unemployment and destructive wars.

Whether Henry Ford does or does not practice what he preaches is beside the question. He made a rule to correct the evil 10 years ago, and it is the only method that can correct the evil. With interest and taxes each appearing a thousand times in the construction of an automobile, and in some instances pyramided, it might be possible that Mr. Ford could not do what he wants to do. On the other hand, we need an economic policy which will both allow and compel Mr. Ford and every other producer of fabricated merchandise to follow the Ford rule.

O. K., Let's Adjourn Politics—No Third Term

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, November 3, 1939

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, President Franklin Delano Roosevelt has proposed that the Members of Congress adjourn politics in the interests of national safety during these trying days. He has wisely and forcefully pointed out the dangers which may be contained in any partisan attitude toward international affairs. European governments may interpret our American tradition of vigorous debate as an evidence of disunity. They may erroneously construe our desire for a thorough airing of every issue as an indication of weakness. To avoid these possibilities we are all ready to adjourn politics on foreign affairs.

But while we are on the subject, Mr. President, it appears to us that the adjournment of politics which you propose might be best achieved by one unequivocal statement from you. To eliminate all the political unrest within the Democratic Party, to give the Nation an opportunity to stop fretting over its next candidates for the Presidency, to present us with a breathing spell during which we may all devote our attention to solving our major problems, instead of framing futile guesses over your own aspirations, a simple "I do not choose to run" would be of inestimable value.

All that is required of you is a decision to uphold the unwritten tradition of our American Government, the tradition which has placed an irrevocable taboo on a third term for our American Presidents. With the third-term bogey out of the way, both the Republicans and the Democrats in our Congress would be ready to talk freely and frankly with you, Mr. President. They would not insist, as they so frequently do, that your foreign policy is prompted by a desire to make yourself a strong candidate for reelection in 1940. Your motives would no longer be suspect, and the Nation would be willing to ascribe your efforts in the field of international affairs to statesmanship rather than showmanship.

As matters stand now, it is all too evident that a good deal of your program, no matter how nobly it may be prompted, is calculated to heighten your personal prestige rather than to solve international problems. A gesture toward the mediation of European crises would carry more weight both abroad and at home if it were known that you were not being guided by a desire to win another election. If all of our people were certain that you were seeking nothing personal, we should be far more solidly united in our efforts to solve impersonal problems impersonally.

Here is your opportunity to declare a real adjournment of politics, Mr. Roosevelt. The technique is simple. It requires no more than a brief sentence. The Nation is waiting for you to speak that sentence.

The Honor of Representing a Great District in the Congress of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS LUDLOW
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, November 3, 1939

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I am immensely proud of the fact that I am privileged to represent a great district in the Congress of the United States, which to my mind is the premier law-making body in the world. There is no district in the United States that is more typically American, more

genuinely and truly devoted to the home as the basis of society or more sincerely consecrated to our institutions of equality and freedom than the Twelfth Congressional District of Indiana, the capital district of our splendid Hoosier Commonwealth. Ours is an American district all the way through. It is free from the subversive influences which the Dies Committee has found to exist in so many other places. It has no glamorous ultra rich "four hundred." It is composed of good, honest-to-God people, the same warp and woof that brought about the birth of this Nation out of the travail of Old World oppression, and in the fullness of time made it great beyond comparison among the nations of the earth.

When our people elect a man to do a job they expect him to make the best use he can of the heart and brain that God gave him, to think the problem out as best he can, and then to act in accordance with the dictates of his judgment and his conscience in the light of the information his watchfulness and energy have enabled him to accumulate.

As I survey the recent neutrality fight retrospectively, I can truthfully say that, vital as was the issue involved, no one, either in Washington or at home, sought by undue pressures or influences to sway my judgment. It is a source of satisfaction to me to know that all seemed to give me credit for sincerity and to accept as a foregone conclusion that I would do what I thought was best for my district and my country, and that, Mr. Speaker, is what I did.

I may have been wrong—I hope I was wrong. I believed that repeal of the munitions embargo would expose us unnecessarily to entanglements and probably to ultimate involvement in the war. Now that Congress has acted, though I still fear the outcome, I hope and pray that we may escape being drawn in, and I pledge to our President my very best support in every effort he may make to keep America out of war.

Typical of other letters I received from home while the fight was on was one in verse which I appreciate so much that I am taking advantage of the unanimous consent of the House to insert it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The writer, Clarence C. Deupree, is an excellent businessman and a splendid citizen of Indianapolis. His poetic effusion, addressed to "My Dear Congressman and Friend," was as follows:

While folk may argue, con and pro,
Through the press, o'er 'phone or radio;
It seems to me, on facts at hand,
Constituents should not command
Their Senators and Congressmen
Just what to do—just how or when.

You men are there, with information
That can't be broadcast o'er our Nation,
And you want war no more than they—
Which is the reason why I say:
Use your judgment what best will be
The way to maintain our neutrality.

You may be wrong—you might be right;
If wrong, our sons may have to fight.
But being honest and sincere
Your judgment is better than ours out here,
And less confused than we who strive
To keep business and industry alive.

You're serving not some small group now—
You're serving a nation, and must somehow
Find courage, strength, and vision clear
To overcome selfishness and fear.
Our peace, our fate, rest in your hand;
Use your best judgment, is my command.

Recreational Aroostook

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH O. BREWSTER
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, November 3, 1939

SPEECH OF HON. RALPH O. BREWSTER, OF MAINE

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech I delivered before the Rotary and Lions Clubs, of Fort Fairfield, and Frontier Fish and Game Club at the joint banquet Thursday evening, August 10, 1939:

Maine's two biggest crops have long been "taters" and tourists. Aroostook may easily and profitably excel in the second crop as well as the first.

Aroostook may well remember that 20 percent of the area of Maine is witnin Aroostook County. Less than one-third of this marvelously fertile area is required to produce nearly 20 percent of the potatoes in America.

The remaining two-thirds comprises over 4,000 square mile of forest and lakes and streams that might easily entertain 100,000 visitors for a 2 weeks' vacation each year. Ten million dollars would be distributed by these paying guests for the privilege of roaming over this imperial domain with no danger of crowding since a square mile of territory would be available for every pair of visitors.

Conserving and restoring our recreational resources in a great cooperative program is simply Yankee common sense. This program must be built on the fullest cooperation of all agencies concerned, public and private, State and Federal, but must be based primarily on the awakened interest of individual citizens who appreciate what this precious heritage means to the youth of the United States.

The Federal Bureau of Fisheries has shown the keenest understanding of what this greatest piece of unspoiled wilderness in the East may mean to millions of Americans within a day's travel. As a part now of the Interior Department the Bureau is associated with the greatest organized travel agency in the world as this department has been designated to introduce America and all its marvels not only to Americans but to world travelers from everywhere.

Among the trophies of the hunt in the Bath Club in London hangs one of the largest moose heads in the world taken in the woods of Maine.

Maine may well cultivate the most cordial relations with the Department of the Interior as we seek to develop both our commercial and sporting fisheries and as we seek to attract the 15,000,000 visitors that Hiram Ricker always claimed was easily the capacity of Maine.

1940

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH O. BREWSTER
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, November 3, 1939

ADDRESS OF HON. RALPH O. BREWSTER, OF MAINE, AT MEETING OF BELFAST LIONS CLUB, MONDAY EVENING, AUGUST 14, 1939

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered at meeting of Belfast Lions Club, Monday evening, August 14, 1939:

The twinkling twenties have had their day. The terrible thirties are now nearly past. The forties lie before.

Soon we enter on a new decade. Soon we elect a President, mindful of the fact that the Presidents of the even decades have always faced terrific tasks.

One returns from Washington filled with confidence and hope. There is growing realization that America is not to be saved by law. More and more Members of the Congress are getting ready to let nature—or at any rate human nature—have a hand. People have an irresistible urge to get well, and this is true also of our economic problems.

After waiting a while for George or Franklin to do it, the average American finally decides to take hold for himself and see if the sorry mess in which we have been mired for a decade cannot be straightened out by the doctrine of self-help.

This tells the story of the America that is to be in this next decade. One needs not a gazing globe.

The travesty of want in the midst of plenty is coming to an end.

The potato growers of Aroostook are a classic example at this time. Special subsidies for cotton, wheat, and corn have left the farmers of the South and West with unparalleled surpluses and prices rapidly receding to record lows. These special aids were denied potato growers because the volume production of potatoes is confined to narrow areas.

Yet today the potato grower without these aids is infinitely better off than the cotton and wheat farmers of the South and West. Aroostook County and eastern Maine faces one of the most promising prospects in a decade for the prosperity of its major crop. Nature has smiled on Maine while withholding its blessing from many of our neighbors in the South and in the West. An increased crop in Maine this year finds the country with a steadily diminishing crop estimate elsewhere. This spells opportunity for Maine, but opportunity of which full advantage must be taken if Maine growers are to profit. America is getting ready once again to go ahead. The pessimists will be fooled who have sold America short and sailed off for foreign shores.

Neutrality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, November 3, 1939

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, the peace and security of the citizens of the United States is assured as far as it is humanly possible for the Congress to do so by the passage of the new Neutrality Act. I supported it because it was my firm conviction that only the act of a madman can now draw us into this conflict.

The concessions this country makes in this law go far beyond any law ever placed on the statute books of our Nation. Search the history of this country, and nowhere will you find where we have ever denied the right of our ships and our citizens the freedom of the seas.

Under the terms of this law American ships cannot carry contraband to a neutral or belligerent port, and American citizens travel on their own responsibility if they enter the combat zone. That part of the law in itself should assure us peace with the world.

It was the destruction of our ships, with the consequent loss of American life that finally brought us into the World War in 1917, with the result that hundreds of thousands of our youth never returned, or became disabled for the rest of their lives. Until everyone who participated in that war and his or her dependents have gone to their reward the cost in dollars and cents will never be known. You know and I know no benefits accrued either to our Nation or its citizens as a result of our participation.

It was our duty to prevent a recurrence of what happened from 1914 to 1918; and although many disagree with my view, I think the passage of this act will accomplish it.

Another feature of the law worthy of special mention is that part which says to every person in this country, and that, of course, includes partnerships and corporations, you cannot extend credit to a belligerent. I know some claim this will soon mean credit and carry instead of cash and carry, but that change can only be made by Congress, and it is my opinion Congress will never make such a change. This is the first time in our history such a provision has been written into law.

We do not want the Government nor any agency of the Government or the citizens of this country to ever extend credit to a belligerent. If there is any one feature of the new law upon which the Congress is united it is this.

That this was not a partisan question is evidenced by the speech of one of the leading Republicans of the country, the gentleman from New York, Representative JAMES W. WADSWORTH, a former United States Senator from that State and one who has been prominently mentioned as the Republican candidate for President. The gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] in his speech, after showing the embargo had not accomplished what those originally advocating it thought it would accomplish, and who spoke against the embargo and voted against it when it was proposed several years ago, said in part Thursday:

> Under this legislation as now proposed in the cash-and-carry provision, overt acts cannot be committed against our ships, because our ships will not be permitted to carry anything to the belligerents in Europe. What overt acts, then, can be committed? I have heard it suggested that sabotage would be instigated here in the United States in the form of explosions and outrages of one sort and another, and that in the face of that possibility we would better pass a law which might keep us free from sabotage. Mr. Speaker, if we are ever to frame the foreign policy of the United States upon the theory that we cannot keep order in our own Government, in our own country, then, by heaven, we would better crawl into a hole and pull the hole in after us.
>
> It may be that madmen are loose in Europe; but as America stands today, in all her might and with all her potential power, I cannot conceive of any man so mad as to invite the United States to be his enemy. So I have never been panicky about our being drawn into this conflict, because I cannot conceive that any of the belligerents wants us to get in there and be its enemy. It would spell their ruin, and they all know it.

I want to say a word in reference to propaganda. You, Mr. Speaker, expressed my sentiments when in your speech of Thursday you said:

> Despite statutes, and despite proclamations, thank God we are still entitled to think at least as we please, although in some governments of the world men cannot act as they please under their systems of regimentation.

The right of the American people to think as they please, to petition their members of Congress and to express their views cannot and must never be denied. Regardless of whether letters and telegrams are inspired is beyond the point; I say no one should be criticised for free expression of their views, so long as they remain within the limits of the Constitution. I have no sympathy with those who would criticize. Whether expressions are in sympathy with my views or in contrast, I welcome them.

I have never attempted to misrepresent or mislead in order to accomplish an objective. The charge that the Members of the House were gagged is not supported by the facts. For 45 hours and 21 minutes the House of Representatives was in session before the resolution was messaged from the Senate. During that period four-fifths of the time was used to debate the question. Not once was a Member denied the right to speak and the House did not adjourn for the day until all who desired had been recognized. Millions of words were recorded on both sides of the question. Aside from this, day after day Members were permitted not only to place their own remarks in the RECORD but to include as part of their remarks the speeches of others, as well as newspaper articles and editorials in support of or in opposition to the pending question. So far as the leaders on both sides were concerned, politics were adjourned, and this likewise applied to almost every Member of the House. There were but few exceptions. When the resolution came from the Senate no attempt was made to fix debate. Finally, when it was evident that both those for and against had no additional speakers, a vote was taken. In my years of experience I have never seen a more liberal rule on a conference report. Under the regular rules of the House, a vote could have been forced after 1 hour's discussion, but no attempt was made to enforce the rule.

Mr. Speaker, only time will tell whether or not this new law will keep us out of war. Feeling that it will be more helpful than the 1937 law, I could do nothing and retain my self-respect but to vote for it.

The 1940 Republican

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH O. BREWSTER
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, November 3, 1939

SPEECH OF HON. RALPH O. BREWSTER, OF MAINE, AT THE WISCONSIN REPUBLICAN PICNIC AND FIELD DAY AT MILWAUKEE ON AUGUST 13, 1939

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech I delivered at the Wisconsin Republican picnic and field day at Milwaukee on August 13, 1939:

> The 1940 Republican is not a New Dealer. Neither is he an "old dealer." He believes in a square deal for everyone. That is the spirit that brought Wisconsin, Minnesota, and Michigan back into the Republican column in 1938. That is the spirit that will bring the United States back into the Republican column in 1940.
>
> Maine is happy and proud to have kept the faith. Maine and Vermont for some years have been the official spokesmen of 17,000,000 Americans. Now we welcome Wisconsin back into the great

galaxy of States that subscribe still to the principles of Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln.

The 1940 Republican is neither a radical nor a reactionary. In the past 2 decades each alike has had his opportunity and each has tried and failed.

No challenge is necessary of their sincerity of purpose in recognizing that the next decade belongs to the new spirit that is now abroad. America is once again on the march to the American way of life.

The world may well take notice of the American way during the next decade as we rededicate America to American ideals.

A square deal for everyone will spell peace, progress, and prosperity for America and for the world as well.

Article on Propaganda for War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUSH D. HOLT

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 31, 1939

Mr. HOLT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article prepared by me, on propaganda for war.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senator BENNETT CLARK introduced the following resolution, which was never reported from the Foreign Affairs Committee:

"*Resolved*, That a special committee of seven Senators, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation of the activities of any person, firm, or corporation acting for or on behalf of any foreign nation, by way of propaganda or otherwise, having as their ultimate goal or tending to cause, directly or indirectly, a change in the neutral position of the United States in the conflicts now being waged abroad. The committee shall report to the Senate the results of its study and investigations, together with its recommendations, if any, for necessary legislation.

"For the purpose of this resolution the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-sixth and succeeding Congresses, to employ clerical and other assistance, to require by subpena, or otherwise, the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents; to make such investigations, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to incur such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed $25,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee."

Foreign propaganda should be exposed, not after involvement but before. We waited 20 years for the exposure of the World War propaganda. The price of not knowing it was terrific. Let us not pay the terrible penalty again.

An English writer wrote, "Can we rope them in again?"

That very process is going on now, and will continue to be an important factor until the conclusion of the war.

I have heard Senators say that no one in the United States wants war. That is not a completely true statement of fact. There are persons in the country who desire our entrance into the war. I dare say most every Senator has received letters from individuals saying we should go into the war in order to destroy Germany. Public-opinion polls taken on a Nation-wide scale or those taken in separate communities show some persons want war. We are glad that the number is small, but around that nucleus may come more and more individuals who would want our country to go to war.

The French historian Hanataux described a conversation of Robert Bacon before the American entrance into the World War. This conversation was as follows:

"In America there are 50,000 people who understand the necessity of the United States entering the war immediately on your side. But there are 100,000,000 Americans who have not even thought of it. Our task is to see that the figures are reversed and that the 50,000 become the 100,000,000. We will accomplish this."

It is a known fact that the 50,000 had their number increased day by day until the United States went to war. It was not done overnight. It was a gradual process, in which propaganda played a tremendous part.

You may say that we have been assured by the President that there will be no war. May I quote President Wilson less than 3 months before the World War declaration? He said: "There will be no war. This country does not intend to become involved in this war. We are the only one of the great white nations that is free from war today, and it would be a crime against civilization for us to go in."

Yet we went in.

You may say that the people are aroused to the danger of war and that we won't participate. President Wilson, speaking in New York City in 1916, made this statement:

"I get a great many letters, my fellow citizens, from important and influential men in this country, but I get a great many other letters. I get letters from unknown men, from humble women, from people whose names have never been heard and will never be recorded, and there is but one prayer in all of these letters: 'Mr. President, do not allow anybody to persuade you that the people of this country want war with anybody.' "

Today the people are writing, saying: "Keep out of war." Will their voice be more emphatic and more influential than before?

A Canadian paper, the Windsor (Ontario) Daily Star, in its September 21, 1939, issue said:

"The arms-embargo clause of the Neutrality Act will be repealed for a starter, and the United States of America will be in the war along about the middle of next January."

Reports in Europe have sent back the news that many Europeans expect America to get into the conflict. Those of us who were in Europe before and after the declaration of war know that there is the general talk that the United States of America would become an ally. There seems to be a feeling that somewhere there has been an understanding.

Propaganda has to be successful before we enter the conflict.

President Roosevelt once gave us some good advice on this subject. It is important to watch those "small decisions." The President said:

"At this late date with the wisdom which is so easy after the event, we find it possible to trace the tragic series of small decisions which led Europe into the Great War in 1914 and eventually engulfed us and many other nations. We can keep out of war if those who watch and decide make certain that the small decisions of each day do not lead toward war, and if, at the same time, they possess the courage to say 'no' to those who selfishly or unwisely would let us go to war."

It is there the task lies. To make certain that those who watch and decide possess the courage to say "No" to those who selfishly or unwisely let us go to war.

But while we may be asleep, those who want us to go in are working to see that those who have the power of making those decisions say "yes" to the question. In 1914, 100,000,000 would have said "no" while 50,000 would have said "yes." In 1917 the final verdict was "yes."

The Montreal (Canada) Gazette for October 24 has an interesting article relating the story of a speech before the Canadian Club of Montreal. It follows:

[From the Gazette, Montreal, Canada, October 24, 1939]

"UNITED STATES HELD ANTINAZI BUT MORE ANTIWAR—WHITNEY H. SHEPARDSON SAYS 90 PERCENT OF AMERICANS OPPOSE PARTICIPATION—HE RIDICULES LINDBERGH—TELLS CANADIAN CLUB AVIATOR'S SPEECH WORSE THAN 'EVEN INSANE OR ILLITERATE' WOULD UTTER

"Ninety percent of the people of the United States, or more, are actively hostile to the reactionary philosophy, brutal methods, and Napoleonic ambitions of Adolph Hitler and his gangsters. Ninety percent of them hope that he and his outfit will be obliterated. They reckon there is an even chance that this will happen as a result of the war which he, and he alone, has started. Nevertheless, some 90 percent of them—not necessarily the same individuals—feel that the United States should not enter the war under present conditions; and popular polls indicate that 75 percent of them now believe—and I emphasize the word 'now'—that the United States should not enter the war even to save Great Britain and France from defeat.

"This statement was made before the Canadian Club of Montreal at its luncheon meeting yesterday in the Windsor Hotel by Whitney H. Shepardson, formerly assistant to the late Colonel House, and now vice president of International Railways of Central America, who was discussing some aspects of American foreign relations."

The important thing in that article is one little word. It has the same number of letters as the word "war"; that is, three. The word I refer to is "now." He said that the sentiment is against going to war now, and he desired to emphasize the word "now." I, likewise, want to emphasize it because it is in that situation we face the great danger. It is important we have the sentiment in America not alone now but always for our staying out of the wars in Europe.

Mr. Raymond Moley, former close associate and policy consultant of President Roosevelt, relates in his book, After Seven Years, how the process of education was going to be used. I refer to the following quotation from his book in which he discusses the aid to be given to England and France. The quotation follows:

"Observers recognized in these dramatic maneuverings signs of a State Department campaign to 'educate' the American people to the need for a 'stronger' foreign policy."

ROGERSON TELLS OF PRESENT-DAY PROPAGANDA

It is bad enough to be the victim of propaganda, but it is worse when we know how it is to be accomplished and yet be the sufferer. In a book entitled "Propaganda in the Next War," Sidney Rogerson tells how the English are going to use the technique of propaganda in the United States. This

book was written and published in England as a part of a series edited by Capt. Liddell Hart entitled "The Next War." It was not written for American consumption.

In order that there will be a full understanding of the matter, I quote his writings:

There remains the United States—the great neutral. In the next war, as in the last, the result will probably depend upon the way in which the United States acts, and her attitude will reflect the reaction of her public to propaganda properly applied. During the Great War the efforts of the rival propagandists in the United States almost stagger belief. The Germans were the more amazing and their activities amounted to a degree of interference in American domestic affairs which will surely never be tolerated again. They entered the field of United States labor politics, organizing their own unions. They set up all sorts of propagandist bodies, whether supposedly pacifist organizations which adroitly blamed the Allies for keeping the war going or bureaus to work upon and inflame Negro opinion. They appealed to university-trained and professional men. They reached women by forming such bodies as the League of American Women for Strict Neutrality, and workingmen through Labor's National Peace Council. They even bought a New York daily paper. We were almost as thorough, though less blatant in our methods. Among our multifarious activities was the supply of a regular British news sheet to no fewer than 360 smaller American papers.

"For some time the issue as to which side the United States would take hung in the balance, and if the final result was a credit to our propaganda, we were helped by the carelessness of the Germans. They continually overreached themselves and, with all their native tendency to overorganization, forgot to cover up their tracks. Their propaganda was as obvious as it was energetic. I repeat, it is unthinkable that such a dog fight between non-Americans will again be permitted in the United States. The American peoples have progressed a long way since those days, when foreign politics were hardly touched upon in any but a few of the greater newspapers. Nowadays the American foreign correspondent is one of the most resourceful and best informed in the world. They have what amounts almost to a passion for "debunking" foreign aims and ideas, but while they have encouraged Americans to interest themselves in politics overseas, they have not yet succeeded in transferring their own objective outlook to their readers. Excellently served though the Americans are by their news gatherers and reporters abroad, they can perhaps hardly be expected, in the security of their own detached hemisphere, to see European affairs realistically. For one thing the American is the great champion of the oppressed—and frequently of the soi-disant oppressed—which may explain why he is so frequently taken in by the hard-luck story of London confidence tricksters. Secondly, the American peoples are still under the influence of much of the Great War propaganda. They are more susceptible than most peoples to mass suggestion—they have been brought up on it—and since 1918 they have shut themselves off from reality. Thirdly, they are at this moment the battleground of an active propaganda of labels.

"There is no sense in refusing to recognize that there has always been a substratum of suspicion of Great Britain in the United States. The American people may admire some of our traits and hold others in contempt, but they periodically tend to suspect our motives. During the Great War we were particularly vulnerable to indirect propaganda in the United States, and the Germans were able to work up a fierce feeling for the miserable Irish, struggling to get home rule; for the oppressed Indians, writhing under a British military despotism; for the fleasome fellaheen in Egypt, kept on the bare subsistence line; and for the poor Jew whose brethren were periodically beaten up or burned by Britain's Allies. It is good to feel that in the next war those horses will not run; certainly not in the same colors. The bestowal of more than dominion status on Ireland, the Indian constitution, and the recognition of the Kingdom of Egypt have removed these dangerous centers of propaganda infection. Whatever, if anything, we may have lost by these concessions, they have made us so much the less vulnerable to enemy propaganda attack in America. It will be difficult again to rally American feeling against us on these counts. There remain the Jews. It has been estimated that of the world Jew population of approximately 15,000,000, no fewer than 5,000,000 are in the United States. Twenty-five percent of the inhabitants of New York are Jews. During the Great War we bought off this huge American Jewish public by the promise of the Jewish national home in Palestine, held by Ludendorff to be the master stroke of allied propaganda, as it enabled us not only to appeal to Jews in America but to Jews in Germany as well. Since then our attempts to implement our undertaking have landed us in difficulties with the indigenous Arabs, agitated by Italian propaganda, without satisfying the Jews. We have not satisfied the educated British Jews. How much less have we satisfied the more remote Jew community on the other side of the Atlantic? In addition, the recent realist policy of the British Government has been worked up into a propaganda of significant extent and intensity which represents Great Britain as being 'half Fascist'—excuse the label—all ready and prepared to 'sell the democratic pass' and go 'all Fascist' at the first convenient opportunity. This is being developed by the intense Jewish hatred of Germany and from her of all dictator countries, and backed by the influence of the Catholic Church and undenominational liberals.

"At the moment we have a strong section of American opinion against us, but if war were to break out tomorrow between England and Germany this mass of opinion would have to come down on one side or the other and it will be marvelous indeed if German propaganda could succeed in bringing it down on theirs.

"In general the situation in the United States is more favorable to Great Britain than in 1914, in that the obvious centers of infection have been removed; but less favorable in that we have temporarily at any rate lost caste as a "democratic" state because of the propaganda which represents us as truckling to, or at least having truck with "dictators." Though we are not unfavorably placed, we shall require to do much propaganda to keep the United States benevolently neutral. To persuade her to take our part will be much more difficult, so difficult as to be unlikely to succeed. It will need a definite threat to America, a threat, moreover, which will have to be brought home by propaganda to every citizen, before the Republic will again take arms in an external quarrel. The position will naturally be considerably eased if Japan were involved, and this might and probably would bring America in without further ado. At any rate, it would be a natural and obvious object of our propagandists to achieve this, just as during the Great War they succeeded in embroiling the United States with Germany.

"Fortunately, with America our propaganda is on firm ground. We can be entirely sincere, as our main plank will be the old democratic one. We must clearly enunciate our belief in the democratic form of government and our firm resolve to adhere to it.

"Our minor propaganda will aim at attaching the support of important sections, such as the Jews, probably by the declaration of a clear-cut policy on Palestine and of our intention if victorious to put an end to anti-Semitic persecution, and of the Roman Catholic community in similar terms. These should not be difficult to pursue, nor to put over to the American public.

"We shall as before send over our leading literary lights and other men with names well known in the United States to put our point of view over the dinner table. Our trouble here will be to find men with equally commanding reputations to step into the shoes of such as Kipling, Barrie, Shaw, Galsworthy, and Wells. Conversely, we should exploit to the full the views and experiences of American nationals who might be serving in our forces or those of our Allies. We should make much of them, decorate them, signal them out for mention in dispatches and in the press and use their stories as propaganda material to their own people. This was a form of propaganda very ably developed by the French during the Great War. American newspapermen in London are of approved mettle and, though impervious to any obvious propaganda, should nevertheless represent a valuable propaganda force on the strength of the day-to-day news they send over, quite apart from the fact that many of them like this country. In an experience of knowing many of them over a period of 18 years I can echo Admiral Brownrigg's words praising 'their absolute reliability, their honesty in preserving secret information which I had been compelled or perhaps had thought wise to impart to them, and their loyalty in never making use of it until I give them the word "go."'

"We shall see that they are given every facility for observing and reporting and that their messages are censored sympathetically. Similarly with their news-reel men. They should be the first to be allowed to 'shoot' pictures of air raids in order that a proper volume of pictorial 'horror' will be available in one of the few great countries where 'atrocity propaganda' will still be operative.

"Our cables and wireless telegraph services will be available for less urgent or secret messages. Our radio propaganda should also be working at full pressure, but there must be a great improvement upon the present lackadaisical outlook. I can best illustrate this by the following personal experience. On the evening that the world was standing expectantly to hear the Prime Minister's pronouncement on Great Britain's attitude if the Germans followed their coup against Austria by one against Czechoslovakia, I ran into a friend who is possibly our best-known radio commentator. 'Tell me what I'm going to tell America,' he asked me. 'I've got to do my weekly talk on British affairs over the American "network" in half an hour and I haven't made up my mind what I ought to say.' 'But surely you're in touch with the Government,' I replied. 'Haven't they given you a line, knowing that you regularly reach hundreds of thousands of American listeners?' 'Not a word,' was his surprising answer. 'I'm not in touch with any governmental source of information. They have never tried to get in touch with me, though someone must know what I'm doing. Still I've tried to get in touch with them.' And he explained how he had previously been down to a certain Government department where he was permitted to see a junior member of the press office who could not be of any real service to him. This is a sober fact, and illustrates as well as may be how much our authorities are doing to counteract the anti-British radio propaganda which is growing in the United States.

"I must not, however, give the impression that we are doing absolutely nothing at present to direct propaganda toward foreign countries. That would be unfair to that esoteric body, the British Council, which occupies itself in what it calls 'cultural propaganda,' or more succinctly, in spreading a 'knowledge and appreciation of our language, literature, art, science, and education.' It has numerous committees composed of politicians, civil servants, manufacturers and merchants, and educationists, and sends out British lecturers and musicians, gramophone records, periodicals, and literature to various foreign countries, entertains editors and

educationists visiting England, and generally encourages the young idea, whether in Latvia or Uruguay, to learn and appreciate the English language. Although it has practically no permanent staff, it claims to discharge the onerous duties of coordinating the propaganda activities of other bodies, excellent in their own spheres, like the travel association (the old 'Come to Britain' organization) and the film institute (a body which exists primarily to foster the educational and documentary film), and of linking these up with the British Broadcasting Co.'s vague operations.

"Much of the council's work is no doubt excellent in its way, but it is emphatically not propaganda. In the present situation it is rather like trying to interest a working-class mother in fancy needlework when other energetic people are instructing her how to make her family budget go further. Cultural propaganda is a dilettante vision. It advances nothing constructive and, despite its hosts of committees, it is not unified. Moreover, it is not controlled either by experts or a permanent staff, but by a collection of enthusiastically minded amateurs. The worst that can be said about it is that it spends thousands of pounds of public money which might be more profitably applied; the best is that it can do no harm and may even wring a tear out of some aged native of Bulgaria or Peru who can recall the days before Great Britain thought it necessary artificially to stimulate an interest in her national culture. Also, it may provide a skeleton which strengthened in the caliber as well as the numbers of its personnel and animated by a propaganda spirit, might be padded out as part of the ministry of propaganda in a future war."

As Rogerson stated:

"We shall, as before, send over our leading literary lights and other men with names well known in the United States to put our point of view over the dinner table."

Many instances of this could be shown but two news reports show the parade. They follow:

[From the New York Times of October 13, 1939]

"ONE THOUSAND FIVE HUNDRED AND THIRTY-FIVE ARRIVE HERE ON THE 'WASHINGTON'—LINER DELAYED AT LE VERDON AND SOUTHAMPTON—MEETS STORMS ON CROSSING—BRINGS FIFTY-FOUR BLOODED DOGS—LORD MARLEY, A PASSENGER, SEES LONG WAR, WITH THE ALLIES FINALLY 'BREAKING GERMANY'

"The United States liner *Washington*, with 1,535 passengers from Southampton and Le Verdon arrived here yesterday after a prolonged voyage caused by delays in both ports. In addition to a number of notables, the vessel carried a large cargo of Bordeaux wines and French cheeses, and 54 dogs, including several champions shipped here from England to prevent their possible destruction in the war.

"One passenger was Lord Marley, deputy speaker of the British House of Lords, who is here to fulfill a lecture engagement arranged several months ago. He predicted a long war, but one that eventually would "break Germany.' The present conflict he described as 'a war of machines—not men,' and said that Britain would settle only for 'a peace with honor.' "

[From the New York Times of October 23, 1939]

"DUFF COOPER SEES REVOLT ENDING WAR—EX-LORD OF BRITISH ADMIRALTY, HERE, PREDICTS CONSERVATIVE INSURRECTION IN REICH—HOLDS MONARCHY LIKELY—OTTO VON HAPSBURG MAY RULE, HE SAYS UPON ARRIVAL ON THE 'MANHATTAN' TO LECTURE—ASTONISHED AT SUBMARINE FEAT

"He was accompanied by his wife, the former Lady Diana Manners, who, as an actress, played the virgin in 'The Miracle.' They will stay at the Hotel Ambassador and will go to the west coast before beginning their tour. He will speak here on 'The Survival of Liberty' and 'The World We Live In.'

"S. K. Ratcliffe, British writer and lecturer, another passenger, said that fear of public opinion was dominating the strategy of all commands. 'All governments are afraid of launching a great air war,' he said. 'They can't see what it will lead to and neither side wants the responsibility for starting it.'

"Besides Mr. Duff Cooper and Mrs. Ratcliffe, there were four other visiting British lecturers aboard the Manhattan. The others were Cecil Roberts, former war correspondent and novelist; I. O. Richards, lecturer at Cambridge University; R. Ellis Roberts, journalist and author; and Miss Phyllis Bottome, novelist.

"NOT SENT BY GOVERNMENT

"All refused to discuss what course the United States should take in regard to the war. They had agreed in advance among themselves not to do so, as a course of conduct out of place for a visiting alien. Mr. Ratcliffe, who will lecture on 'Why Britain Went to War,' said that while most of them would discuss war issues, none had been sent by the British Government. 'The British Government isn't sending any speakers,' he added. 'They are all coming on their own steam.' "

Do you doubt that Mr. Ratcliffe will tell Why Britain Went to War is because of their desire to preserve democracy? Do you doubt that Mr. Ratcliffe will not compare the English and American people so that their interest will be our interest; Do you doubt Mr. Ratcliffe will create the impression that United States will be invaded if England loses? Do you doubt that Mr. Ratcliffe hopes we will go to war for the same reasons he will say England went to war?

But how careful they will be?

Lord Lothian, the British Ambassador now in Washington, wrote in the London Observer as follows:

"If American sentiment became persuaded that the United States was being maneuvered into commitment to war by foreign intrigue, or for reasons of politics or finance, it might swing back violently to the ultraisolationism of the Ludlow amendment requiring a referendum before the United States entered a war."

Speaking of the significance of the British influence, the magazine News Week says:

"But if Lothian's strategy is sound as well as subtle, the same guaranty cannot be given for all the British and French spokesmen now in this country or on the way. Among these may be listed Lord Marley, Deputy Speaker of the House of Lords; Vladimir Poliakoff, famous as the 'Augur' of the London Times and the New York Times; Alfred Duff-Cooper, former First Lord of the Admiralty; and a perfect Franco-British team calculated to win the movie fans' vote—Charles Boyer and his English wife, Pat Paterson, both cinema actors.

"The greatest propaganda potential lies with those Americans who already are committed to the Anglo-French point of view. Already these people are busy in Washington, New York, and many other cities, pointing out that security for this country entails seeing to it that the Allies win—whatever that might ultimately involve. And among their number Lothian himself lists the President of the United States."

"IF JAPAN WERE INVOLVED

Rogerson states:

"The position will naturally be considerably eased if Japan were involved and this might and probably would bring America in without further ado. At any rate, it would be a natural and obvious object of our propagandists to achieve this, just as during the Great War they succeeded in embroiling the United States with Germany."

Let us pick up the recent newspapers and note the great increase of interest in Japan. For weeks the news from the Far East was placed in the want-ad page. Now take a look. Here are front-page headlines from the New York Times:

Japan defies the United States to curb China war—Civilians in Tokyo hail United States warning; military angered—Tokyo seeks talks with Grew on rift—Japanese declare peace asked by United States in East impossible—United States warns Japan of economic pressure if she persists on her course in China.

This story from the New York Times of October 20, 1939, is the background:

"WARNING BY GREW JARS THE JAPANESE—INTIMATION OF UNITED STATES MOVE OR CHECK TO TOKYO MILITARISTS SEEN IN REMARKS ON CHINA

"TOKYO, Friday, October 20.—Official and diplomatic circles were rocked today by the speech of United States Ambassador Joseph C. Grew, in which he asserted frankly that American opinion deeply resented the 'bombings, indignities, and manifold interference with American rights' in China at the hands of the Japanese Army.

"Japanese and foreign observers who said they were 'astounded' at the outspoken address, one of the strongest ever made by a diplomat in Japan, expressed the belief that it had two possible meanings:

"1. That the United States was preparing definite action to oppose further Japanese 'interference' in China.

"2. A strong indication that public opinion in Japan itself had turned against Japanese militarists.

" 'The ground in Japan must have been prepared in advance for such a powerful statement,' well-informed sources said. 'A year ago it would have done more harm than good, therefore it would not have been made.'

"Ambassador Grew, who said his words came 'straight from the horse's mouth,' spoke yesterday before an audience of Japanese notables at a luncheon of the American-Japan Society, often a sounding board for authoritative discussion of American-Japanese relations."

Of this I shall make no comment.

"SAVE DEMOCRACY

Rogerson stated in his work: "Fortunately with America, our propaganda is on firm ground. We can be entirely sincere, as our main plank will be the old democratic one."

We are flooded with this type of propaganda. A great amount is coming from Americans. Even high Government officials are active in spreading it. They call the war "our war" and speak of the Allies fighting "our fight." They speak of the war as another war "to save democracy."

As I have said, propaganda is not labeled such. Sometimes the best propaganda is that that accomplishes two or more purposes. For instance, the exhibits in the British building at the World's Fair. The Magna Carta, a great document, drew—and should have drawn—much attention. It coupled in the minds of many England and liberty. This is a very valuable impression to have created at this time. Also at the exhibit there was found the lineage of George Washington, and how he was related to the English rulers. This was to create the good-will type of propaganda.

Remember the visit of the King and Queen? Remember the pictures and statements about how democratic they were?

One Washington paper headlines the visit to the Capitol by the King and Queen with this line:

"Standing on floor stained by burning of 1814, English rulers retake Capitol by charm."

A Congressman told the King that his State had never been at war with England; to which the King replied, "Fine."

The United Press on June 8 comments about the visit:

"BRITAIN HOPES VISIT WILL WIN BACK UNITED STATES SUPPORT

"Behind the pomp and glitter of British majesty's first visit to the United States diplomats saw today the prospect of a new era in Anglo-American relationship, with possible far-reaching effects upon a war-clouded world.

"High diplomatic stakes are involved for both nations.

"For Britain there lies the hope that the visit of the King and Queen will win for modern England—beset on every side with threats to its traditional power and prestige—both moral and material sympathies of the Nation which threw off British rule a century and a half ago.

"For the United States there is the hope that friendly feeling engendered by the visit might win closer allegiance by Britain to those policies which America believes necessary if the world is not again to be plunged into general conflict.

"Veteran internationalists see in the occasion a friendly personal gesture by the British rulers to recapture for Great Britain the interest and cooperation of this country lost by past blunders of British statescraft.

"Constitutional limitations surrounding the British throne prevent the occasion from being more than a friendly gesture. The British King is prohibited by law from personal diplomatic activity.

"Both the American and British Governments hope, however, that the brief visit will make possible closer relations generally between both Governments and peoples.

"It marks an effort by the British, with the benevolent consent of the American Government, to bring closer together the parallels which the two Governments have followed in foreign policies.

"Most diplomats agree that it is the British policies which have wavered and which must now come closer to the parallel of American policy."

Anthony Eden, who was given quite a fanfare of publicity when he came to the United States, told Parliament:

"We are constantly and daily in close consultation with the Government of the United States. Over and over again we have taken either parallel or similar action, and that in itself is an indication of the closeness of such collaboration."

It will be recalled in his speech in New York (placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, January 4, 1939, by Senator PITTMAN) that his main thesis was that spoken of by Rogerson as "the old democratic plank."

How shall the British propaganda be used in motion pictures? Rogerson states: "Similarly with the news-reel men. They should be the first to be allowed to 'shoot' pictures of air raids, in order that a proper volume of pictorial 'horror' will be available in one of the few great countries where 'atrocity propaganda' will still be operative."

If you doubt the English are allowing these news reels to be sent to America with their official approval, just stop by the movie house a couple of times and see the scenes of bombing.

Why the great number of films aimed at generating hate?

Why the increase of films aimed at arousing our sentiments to take sides?

One of the best ways to locate the 1939 propaganda efforts is to look how the propaganda was used before the last World War. There are a number of excellent books and articles on this subject. I shall quote from some of these.

Fredrick Lumley, in his book The Propaganda Menace, deals with use of atrocity propaganda and how it was used in 1914–18. The part referring to the "house of propaganda" is very interesting. Under the heading "The appeal to fear," he says:

"THE APPEAL TO FEAR

"One of the most successful ways of making people afraid is to overwhelm them with atrocity stories, the while they are quietly informed that their confidence and affection have been misplaced. The Americans were certainly flooded with atrocity stories. A book by a French chief editor gives us some light on the origin of these stories. The house of propaganda and prostitution in Paris is described. 'Its principal work consisted in making photographs and cuts of wooden figures with cut-off hands, torn-out tongues, gouged-out eyes, crushed skulls, and brains laid bare. The pictures thus made were sent as unassailable evidence of German atrocities to all parts of the globe, where they did not fail to produce the desired effect. In the same rooms fictitious photographs were made of bombarded French and Belgian churches, violated graves and monuments, and scenes of ruins and desolation. The staging and painting of those scenes were done by the best scene painters of the Paris grand opera.'

" 'During the late war,' says Lasswell, 'innumerable schemes for the classifying of enemy outrages were invented. As a random sample one may select the first large and important atrocity brochure put out by the French Government. German sins were sorted into bins which were labeled thus:

" '1. Violation of the neutrality of Luxemburg and Belgium.

" '2. Violation of French frontier before declaration of war.

" '3. Killing of prisoners and wounded.

" '4. Looting, arson, rape, murder.

" '5. Use of forbidden bullets.

" '6. Use of burning liquids and asphyxiating gas.

" '7. Bombarding of fortresses without notice and of unfortified towns; the destruction of buildings consecrated to religion, art, science, and charity.

" '8. Treacherous methods of warfare.

" '9. Cruelties inflicted on civil population.'

"This fare was concocted and intended primarily for home (French) consumption. It was issued to awaken the French people and frighten them into maddened action against the Germans. It was designed to make them over into not only willing but eager tools of the government and the military. And there can be no doubt of its effects.

"But, since France needed help from outside, these atrocity stories were eagerly and generously put into the hands of the Allies and neutrals to show them plainly what was in store for them if Germany were allowed to win. This stuff was designed to convert opponents and sway neutrals, to make the people who might be gathered against Germany afraid—afraid of inaction, afraid of any other ending of the war than a crushing victory over Germany.

"The quantitative methods of modern social science were applied to the atrocity problem as the war went on. In a report prepared for the Serbs about Austro-Hungarian atrocities the first plate, which summarizes the investigation is entitled 'Statistics of Atrocities.' It is limited to the districts of Potzerie, Matchva, Yadar, and certain others. Women and children are recorded in parallel columns, and the number of cases relating to each item is recorded. The items are:

" 'Executed or otherwise shot, bayoneted or knifed, throats cut, killed, burned alive, killed in massacre, beaten to death with rifles or sticks, stoned to death, hanged, disembowelled, bound and tortured on the spot, missing, carried off as prisoners, wounded, arms cut off or broken, legs cut off or broken, noses cut off, ears cut off, eyes gouged out, sexual parts mutilated, skin torn in strips, flesh or scalp removed, corpses cut into small pieces, breasts cut off, women violated.'

"Certain special items, such as the use of explosive bullets, which were not susceptible to statistical treatment, were dealt with in qualitative terms. To the impact of the quantitative method is added the dramatization of the individual case. The book is copiously embellished with horror photographs of mutilated corpses and devastated villages.

"For the awakening of their own population the Germans drew up a long list of Allied sins. For the further stiffening of the nationalist backbone against the English the Indian National Congress published a long report on the Peshawar affair of 1930, and this report contains the inevitable atrocity stories and pictures.

"Says Lasswell: 'The cult of satanism thus arises and feeds on hate, Vengeance is Mine, saith the Lord, and the Lord is working through us to destroy the Devil. The stirring stanzas of Lissauer's famous Hymn of Hate expose this in its pristine nudity:

" 'Hate by water and hate by land;
Hate of the heart and hate of the hand;
We love as one, we hate as one;
We have but one foe alone—England.'

"And so citizens were made afraid; they were terrorized; in all countries they were frightened into feverish activity and every needed sacrifice. The methods were everywhere the same; to some extent the content was the same. But the differences in the propaganda of the several countries or the two sets of opposing forces gather mainly about the content."

AUTHORITIES TELL HOW PROPAGANDA WAS USED IN 1914–17

Sir Gilbert Parker, who was in charge of the English propaganda before and during the World War, wrote in Harpers:

"Perhaps here I may be permitted to say a few words concerning my own work, since the beginning of the war. It is in a way a story by itself, but I feel justified in writing one or two paragraphs about it. Practically since the day war broke out between England and the Central Powers I became responsible for American publicity. I need hardly say that the scope of my department was very extensive and its activities widely ranged. Among the activities was a weekly report to the British Cabinet on the state of American opinion, and constant touch with the permanent correspondents of American newspapers in England. I also frequently arranged for important public men in England to act for us by interviews in American newspapers; and among these distinguished people were Mr. Lloyd George, the present Prime Minister, Viscount Grey, Mr. Balfour, Mr. Bonar Law, the Archbishop of Canterbury, Sir Edward Carson, Lord Robert Cecil, Mr. Walter Runciman, the lord chancellor, Mr. Austen Chamberlain, Lord Cromer, Will Crooks, Lord Curzon, Lord Gladstone, Lord Haldane, Mr. Henry James, Mr. John Redmond, Mr. Selfridge, Mr. Zangwill, Mrs. Humphry Ward, and fully a hundred others.

"Among other things, we supplied 360 newspapers in the smaller States of the United States with an English newspaper, which gives a weekly review and comment of the affairs of the war. We established connection with the man in the street through cinema pictures of the Army and Navy, as well as through interviews, articles, pamphlets, etc.; and by letters in reply to individual American critics, which were printed in the chief newspapers of the State in which they lived, and were copied in newspapers of other and neighboring States. We advised and stimulated many people to write articles; we utilized the friendly services and assistance of confidential friends; we had reports from important Americans constantly, and established association, by personal correspondence, with influential and eminent people of every profession in the United States, beginning with university and college presidents, professors and scientific men, and running through all the ranges of the population. We asked our friends and correspondents to arrange for speeches, debates, and lectures by American citizens, but we did not encourage Britishers to go to

America and preach the doctrine of entrance into the war. Besides an immense private correspondence with individuals, we had our documents and literature sent to great numbers of public libraries, Y. M. C. A. societies, universities, colleges, historical societies, clubs, and newspapers.

"It is hardly necessary to say that the work was one of extreme difficulty and delicacy, but I was fortunate in having a wide acquaintance in the United States and in knowing that a great many people had read my books and were not prejudiced against me. I believe that the American people could not be driven, preached to, or shoved into the war, and that when they did enter it would be the result of their own judgment and not the result of exhortation, eloquence, or fanatical pressure of Britishers."

To amplify the statement of Sir Gilbert Parker, the following quotation from British Propaganda at Home and in the United States, by James Duane Squires, is interesting:

"According to David Lloyd George, almost the first thing that Parker did after assuming his new duties was to make a careful analysis of American press opinion on the war, following that with an equally thorough investigation into American opinion in the colleges and universities. From other sources we know that on the basis of these investigations and on a careful reading of the American Who's Who a mailing list was prepared. It was this mailing list containing thousands of names which was the basis for the distribution of Wellington House propaganda in the United States. The list was complete about the middle of December 1914, and mailing operations began immediately.

"To the persons on this mailing list, and to others whose names were subsequently added, there was sent the propaganda literature which the men in Wellington House believed would be most useful. Sometimes the books and pamphlets had enclosed with them suave and skillfully phrased letters. The enclosure cards which came with the books carried only Sir Gilbert's name and address, never any mention of Wellington House. The whole appearance was that of a kindly, friendly Englishman, who more or less was doing only his simple duty by his many American friends in sending them this literature, and inviting their observations on it or on the war in general. Sometimes, to vary the thing, the enclosure cards apparently came from the authors of the books and pamphlets, especially when the authors were well-known men like J. W. Headlam, Viscount Bryce, or John Buchan. But this was generally a ruse de guerre. They usually came from the same place—Wellington House.

"Twice, at least, prior to 1918 Sir Gilbert alluded to his work in an indirect way. In April 1915 he declared in a public address:

" 'I have watched American opinion; I have read scores of American newspapers steadily; I have received vast numbers of letters from prominent Americans of all professions and positions in the United States since this war began * * *.'

"If people perhaps wondered then why Parker's correspondence should have been vast, there is no need to wonder at it now. With most of the American Who's Who among his correspondents it is hardly surprising that he had an immense amount of mail. A few weeks later he wrote in similar vein:

" 'Since the beginning of the war I have had a very large correspondence with American citizens and have watched closely the trend of opinion in the United States through a great number of newspapers which come to me regularly. The United States being the most important of all the neutral nations, and with a scheme of government and with ambitions for civilization differing only in color and detail from our own, its opinion and judgment are of deep importance to all other nations engaged in the war.'

Of this list, the Times History of the War, XXI, says:

"The Wellington House mailing list contained over '200,000 names of influential people throughout the Union.' This seems much exaggerated; in any event, not every pamphlet was sent to every person. An examination of some of the early pamphlets sent over by Parker will disclose at the bottom of the first page certain figures which are presumably printers' directions; e. g., on Julian Corbett's pamphlet, The Spectre of Navalism (London, 1915), these figures appear: "Wt. 6907—G 4619. 13,500,6/15 D&S." The present writer would translate this as follows: Wellington House pamphlet with its file numbers, published in June 1915, in a quantity of 13,500, by Darling & Son, printers. If this surmise is correct, then the number distributed of that particular document is obviously much less than the figure given by the Times History. After 1915 these figures are no longer printed in the pamphlets, and therefore no estimate can be made of their circulation."

Prof. H. C. Peterson, of the University of Oklahoma, in his excellent book, Propaganda for War, gives the following information as to the use of propaganda:

"PROPAGANDA 'IN AMERICAN CLASSROOMS AND PULPITS, FACTORIES, AND OFFICES'

"The British campaign to induce the United States to come to their assistance affected every phase of American life; it was propaganda in its broadest meaning. News, money, and political pressure each played its part and the battle itself was fought not only in London, New York, and Washington, D. C., but also in American classrooms and pulpits, factories, and offices. It was a campaign to create a pro-British attitude of mind among Americans, to get American sympathies and interests so deeply involved in the European war that it would be impossible for this country to remain neutral.

"The first problem confronting the directors of any such campaign was that of winning the sympathy of the general public. When Lord Northcliffe visited this country he remarked of Americans: 'They dress alike, they talk alike, they think alike. What sheep.' Although he was not entirely correct, he was right in that the American public, like any public, demands uniformity of thought and conformity of action. Insofar as Americans were sheep, they had to be reached through their emotions. Although every public thinks with its hopes, its fears, and its affections, the pre-war American public was especially sentimental, excessively turbulent in comparison with European, and, finally, was subject to waves of emotion, apathy, interest, and boredom. The work of the British propagandist was to harness these feelings and put them to work for the Allies.

"USE OF WHO'S WHO FOR PROPAGANDA PURPOSES

"In September 1914 Charles Masterman was authorized by the British Foreign Office to form a war-propaganda bureau. Installed in Wellington House, the office of an insurance firm, it began to issue the propoganda which was soon to flood the United States. Developing by leaps and bounds, it became the principal outlet for books, pamphlets, and other instruments of British propaganda. Each branch of the work was controlled by a separate department under the direction of some individual of considerable prominence. Mr. Eric Maclagan was in charge of propaganda for France; Mr. William Archer directed the department for the Scandinavian countries; while Sir Gilbert Parker supervised the one which took care of propaganda for the United States—the American ministry of informatian. Parker had as his assistants Prof. Macneile Dixon, of Glasgow University; Mr. A. J. Toynbee, of Balliol College; and others. Starting out with 9 men, by 1917 he had 54.

" 'The mailing list of Wellington House (as a whole) being carefully compiled was expanded till it contained 260,000 names of influential persons throughout the Union.' Sir Gilbert Parker's list was made after consulting the American Who's Who. From this compilation he made separate groupings of prominent Americans, according to their profession, supposed intelligence, or standing in the community.

"Nicholson has stated that 'Wellington House was * * * concerned with the production, translation, and distribution of books, pamphlets, Government publications, speeches, etc., dealing with the war, its origin, its history, and all the varied and difficult questions which arose during its development; the production and distribution of special pictorial papers; assisting in the placing of articles and interviews designed to influence opinion in the world's newspapers and magazines, especially in America; the wide distribution of pictorial matter, cartoons, pictures, and drawings, photographs for insertion in newspapers and periodicals and for exhibition; the production and distribution of cinematograph films; personal correspondence with influential people abroad, especially in America; arrangements for the interchange of visits, of personal tours to neutral and allied countries, and of visits of distinguished neutrals and of representatives of the Allies to this country; the production and distribution of maps, diagrams, posters, lantern slides, and lectures, pictures, post cards, and all other possible means of miscellaneous propaganda.'

"Sir Gilbert Parker has remarked that 'besides our private correspondence with individuals we had our literature sent to a great number of public libraries, Y. M. C. A. societies, universities, colleges, clubs, and newspapers.'

"Among the authors who wrote for Wellington House were many distinguished people, such as James M. Beck, William Archer, James Bryce, G. K. Chesterton, Conan Doyle, Sir Edward Cook, J. W. Headlan, Cardinal Mercier, E. J. Trevelyan, A. Maurice Low, Mrs. Humphrey Ward, Alfred Noyes, Hilaire Belloc, and J. M. Robertson. The naval censor tells of calling on Joseph Conrad, Rudyard Kipling, Alfred Noyes, and many others to popularize the British cause, and in one way or another they all responded.

"KEEP OPERATIONS SECRET

"The operations of Wellington House were kept amazingly secret from Englishmen as well as Americans. When the Prime Minister was asked about the activities of Mr. Masterman, he replied that the latter was 'continuing certain work which he was requested by the Government to undertake at the beginning of the war. The work is of a highly confidential nature, and much of its efficiency depends upon its being conducted in secret * * *.' Even many officials in the English Government did not realize that there was such a thing as British propaganda.

"Although most of the formal propaganda came from Wellington House, there was a large amount produced by scores of unofficial or voluntary groups and organizations. One list of them is as follows: (1) The faculty of the Oxford University issued the Oxford pamphlets 'often distinguished by authentic information.' In 'the majority of cases the authors were able to give a patriotic bias to the apparently objective presentation of material; (2) the Parliamentary Recruiting Committee; (3) the Cobden Club; (4) a nameless group of Anglican clerics; (5) the Council of Loyal British Subjects of British, Austrian, or Hungarian Birth; (6) the United Workers; (7) the Atlantic Union; (8) the Victoria League; (9) the Union of Democratic Control; (10) the Central Committee for National Patriotic Organizations.'

"This last organization was a good example of the volunteer propagand groups. It was located at 8 Carlton House Terrace, London, and was established by G. W. Prothero and Harry Curl. It started work in August 1914, was formally organized November 21, 1914, and soon had voluntary local organizations in England with subcommittees to take care of propaganda in other parts of the British Empire and throughout the world. Its report states: 'The

supply of literature and information to the United States of America was early in the war transferred, for special and imperative reasons, to a separate committee.' It had affiliated societies in all neutral countries. In the words of their report, 'other channels * * * have been the numberless national and international societies, associations, leagues, unions, and alliances * * * public reading rooms, social clubs, workingmen's clubs, officers' messes, seamen's institutes, hotels, and casinos.' British chambers of commerce were used as distributing centers.

"PROPAGANDA IN SCHOOLS

"Students from neutral countries and British nationals abroad were exploited in the same manner. They had 250 speakers who had by 1916 conducted 15,000 meetings. They distributed 850,000 leaflets to school children and 900,000 to industrial districts through libraries. They sent 250,000 pamphlets, booklets, and other publications to the neutral world.

"Perhaps the most interesting procedure of this particular organization was its system of exploiting the friendships and business connections of leading Britishers. It obtained lists of important Americans who had dealings with people in England and sent propoganda to them. The Americans naturally thought the material was from their friends in England. The committee's report states that by 'this means very many important communities—philosophical, educational, religious, scientific, philanthropic, artistic, legal, medical, commercial, industrial, mining, agricultural, engineering, banking, athletic, etc.—have been reached.'

"USING AMERICANS TO CHECK VALUE AND EFFECTIVENESS OF PROPAGANDA

"A vital part of the British propaganda organization was its information service. The traditional information agents, ambassadors, and consuls, naturally sent in regular reports. In addition the Morgan firm kept British officials informed as to conditions in the United States. At one time the British Chancelor of the Exchequer requested that Mr. Davison keep him acquainted with the state of American opinion. One or two of the resulting reports were made available to the Munitions Investigation Committee.

"Special means of obtaining information in order to assist in the development of propaganda appeals were evolved by Sir Gilbert Parker. He 'utilized the friendly service and assistance of confidential friends' to secure reports from important Americans on American opinion. In other words, he secured reports on the reactions of Americans as to what propaganda was succeeding and what was not succeeding, what would probably succeed better, and what measures of repression could be safely pursued. All unfriendly statements were carefully reported and measures were taken to counteract them, or to win their authors to the cause of the Allies. In addition long and detailed analyses of the American newspapers were made each week. In these special attention was paid to unfriendly remarks.

WATCHING THE NEWSPAPERS

"Each division of the propaganda ministry kept a separate record of events in its own field, and used select arguments in its propaganda to be distributed. The daily review of the foreign press which was the comprehensive report of the entire ministry, contained little more than condensations of foreign news. This was probably a result of the fear that this widely circulated report might reach the public. Its confidential supplement, on the other hand, contained material intended only for information of high officials. There were also more detailed, localized reports, such as: Summary of the British press (1916–17); summary of the Provincial press and British papers published abroad (1916 to 1917); summary of the weekly press (September 13 to December 31, 1916); report on Austrian papers (October 23, 1915, to April 1916); report on the French press (June 3, 1915, to January 16, 1916); weekly report on German papers (May 8, 1915, to December 1916).

"One report, much more important than any of the above, as far as the United States was concerned, was the American Press Résumé. It was issued weekly or biweekly from April 12, 1915, to August 8, 1917. The Résumé was printed on blue paper, as was the confidential supplement of the Daily Review of the foreign press, and varied from 6 to 25 pages in length, with occasional supplements of equal size. Although 'printed for the use of the cabinet,' it was also probably distributed to a few of the more important propagandists. It was stamped 'confidential' or 'strictly confidential.' The American Press Résumé was prepared by Sir Gilbert Parker's American Ministry of Information, the department of Wellington House which took care of propaganda for the United States. It was apparently the central report upon which all efforts to educate American opinion were based.

"The weekly analyses of opinion in the Résumé were of especial importance insofar as they revealed the range and influence of propaganda within the United States. One column in the Résumé was headed 'Influencing the American press.' It varied from week to week, but the following excerpts are typical: 'Amongst the thoroughly satisfactory articles upon the British offensive may be mentioned Mr. Frederick Palmer's article in Collier's Weekly'; 'The Literary Digest published long extracts from Dr. Taylor's report on the "Wittenberg camp"'; 'Articles by the following writers have appeared: Mr. Archibald Hurd, Alfred Noyes, Gilbert Murray, and James M. Beck'; 'The pro-Ally Philadelphia Public Ledger writes an editorial upon the pamphlet Treasury Romances, prepared by Wellington House.'

"Besides the weekly tabulation of American newspaper opinion, the Résumés contained reports of individuals in the United States. Parker has told how he secured 'reports from important Americans,' and how 'by personal correspondence with influential and eminent people of every profession' he 'built a backing for the British cause.' The Résumés are a detailed account of these maneuvers, as well as an analyses of the American press.

"The letters of wide interest which Parker received were printed in the Résumé, in which form they served as a guide for the propagandists. As an example, after a particular group of atrocity stories were favorably received, the Résumé of a few weeks later revealed that efforts were made to expand this attack. Then the Résumé reported that 'atrocities are again widely discussed in the United States.' When there was received a statement such as 'The American mind shows signs of being almost surfeited with atrocities,' the ensuing reports evidenced a change of emphasis to the evil war aims of the Germans, or to the illegality and brutality of German naval policy. One letter commented on the fact that the American newspapers were dissatisfied because British leaders would not give out statements to the press. In succeeding issues there were reports of a veritable flood of interviews with British officials.

"MOST EDUCATED ENGLISHMEN ARE SOCIALLY DELIGHTFUL

"Just as they used natives in Africa and Asia, the British did all in their power to enlist Americans as propagandists to overcome the resistance of Americans. One distinguished English expert in this field wrote: 'Better than any pumped-in propaganda abroad was (the) * * * method of making the leaders of the imperial, neutral, or allied press themselves the propagandists when they returned home.' In doing this the British did not attempt bribery. Instead, the 'method chosen was that of direct personal approach.' Most educated Englishmen are socially delightful and in this phase of propaganda they were able to put their charm to work to good advantage. There is a compulsion in friendship which makes disagreement very distasteful and before long the British had eliminated 'disagreement' from their American friends.

"Sir Gilbert Parker has stated that he 'advised and stimulated many people to write articles' and 'asked * * * friends and correspondents to arrange for speeches, debates, and lectures by American citizens.' Especially did he utilize the 'friendly services and assistance of confidential friends.' Here was the real genius of British propaganda organization. In other circles this procedure would be called a 'confidence game.' Eventually, as a result of the propaganda and the campaign to get the friendship of American leaders, almost all articulate Americans were taken into the Allies' camp, to become crusaders for England.

"GIVING TEAS AND DINNERS FOR PROPAGANDA PURPOSES

"Back in England, 'American journalists, publicists, authors, statesmen, greeters, and munition makers' were courted assiduously. 'Clubs were open to them, teas, and dinners were given for them.' 'The American wives of Englishmen, who had already given their proof that blood is thicker than water, led by Lady Astor, formed a battalion of solicitude lest Americans in London become homesick.'

"John St. Loe Strachey had a meeting of American correspondents each week at his home in London. There reporters were given the opportunity to meet some important personage, such as a Cabinet member or a military leader. Men formerly aloof and inaccessible to reporters became very cordial. The personal contacts established at these meetings made censorship less distasteful to the correspondents, and also made it more difficult for those attending to give any but a British interpretation of news—even if it had been possible to get such a version past the censor. The same type of meeting was held by the foreign editor of the London Times.

"CATALOGING AMERICANS

"But newspaper people were not the only Americans who were enlisted to fight Britain's battles. Appeal was systematically made to all classes. One discussion of this problem divided Americans first as to 'particular faiths'; second, 'particular nationalities'; third, 'labor'; fourth, 'intellectuals'; and fifth, the 'average man.' In all these cases it should be remembered that the motive was to secure the active support of the leaders of that particular class.

"PROPAGANDA FOR 'INTELLECTUALS'

"It was in the group known as 'intellectuals' that the best body of propagandists was enlisted. Sir Edward Grey wrote Theodore Roosevelt in September 1914 that he was sending over J. M. Barrie and A. E. W. Mason 'to meet people, particularly those connected with the universities, and explain the British case as regards this war and our view of the issues involved.' Later, with the same purpose in mind, many other writers were sent over. John Masefield was one of the 1916 contingent. Masaryk also 'got in touch with the universities, particularly with historians and economists.' The Central Committee for National Patriotic Organizations kept up the attack on the professors, reporting that 'practically every professor of every faculty has received * * * private packets of literature in his own language.' The result of this work was the enlistment of most of the leaders of intellectual life in America. Headed by such men as Lowell of Harvard and Hibben of Princeton, it was an imposing propaganda group. Dutifully bringing up the rear were the intellectual proletariat, the American school teachers.

"In making an appeal to the 'average man' it was found that this meant an appeal to the politicians. Among these, naturally, the President was the most important. Some difficulty was encountered in attempting to reach Mr. Wilson. But it was accomplished by gaining the friendship of his personal adviser, Colonel House, who was early enlisted in the cause of the Allies. The first to insinuate himself into the confidence of House was the British naval attaché,

Capt. Guy Gaunt. Another was Sir William Wiseman. Both of these men were agents of Admiral Hall, chief of British naval intelligence. Sir Edward Grey also captivated the mysterious colonel and hence, indirectly, President Wilson. In addition, he developed friendships of convenience with House, Page, and Roosevelt.

"HIDING BRITISH PROPAGANDA UNDER AMERICAN NAMES

"Among the groups which dealt exclusively with propaganda was the Pilgrim's Society in England under Harry Brittain. This organization fostered the 'hands-across-the-sea' movement, which made a very strong appeal to Americans. The Pilgrims Club was similarly effective and received the commendation of Sir Gilbert Parker. An example of the local organizations was the British-American League in southern California. A traveling agent of the British propaganda ministry reported that when this was started it 'brought forth such a stormy campaign from the Germans that it forced these good British-Americans to seek immediate cover.' However, this did not mean discontinuance of the work. The agent informed Parker that 'the purpose and activities of the earlier organization are now concealed and conducted under the guise of an Allies Aid Association, an avowedly philanthropic body, of which Mr. Edmund Mitchel is the prime and ardent mover.'

"The great success of British propaganda in the United States should not be attributed to a professional group of propagandists, but to native Americans—volunteer propagandists. These were individually enlisted in some cases, but in the main were regimented into 'soldiers of the king' by a process of eliminating, or at least curtailing, enemy interpretations of the war and by dominating the news with exaggerated and warped pro-Ally accounts of what was happening or had happened. Once these natives had acquired the 'correct' frame of mind they were enlisted for the 'duration of the war.' The formal propaganda groups acted merely as connecting and reinforcing elements of the British propaganda organizations. The real propagandists were Americans—our preachers, teachers, politicians, and journalists.

"MAKING THE WAR 'OUR WAR'

"The attempt to identify the interests and ideals of the United States with those of England dominated all British propaganda. Every possible effort was made to make Americans feel that the war was 'our fight.' Every possible point of similarity between the two countries was stressed and restressed. The news and other printed matter released in the American press was so written that the reader would feel that his interests and hopes were in some way involved in the war. The British propaganda ministry always gave great prominence in their reports to such American headlines as 'England's defeat our defeat.' At one time it was cheerfully reported that the pro-Ally newspapers 'believe that Great Britain is fighting America's battle; that the future of democracy is at stake; and that the United States will have to fight for it, if not now, then hereafter * * *.' The implications are clear. A vital part of these arguments was the contention that Great Britain and the United States were sister democracies. This later developed into the argument of democracy versus autocracy. Eventually the idea became current that for an American to be pro-Ally was patriotic, and for him to be pro-German was to be anti-American. In other words, the British captured the American flag and waved it in front of themselves.

"Aided by the realities of submarine warfare, the contention was made that the United States was actually menaced by Germany. The success of this argument is demonstrated in the statement of Senator Lawrence Y. Sherman, who remarked, 'I do not think we embarked in the war in a humanitarian crusade. It was for self-defense.' The 'our fight' idea culminated in the assertion that the Monroe Doctrine would be violated if the Germans were victorious.

"PROPAGANDA IN THE SCHOOLS

"Starting as early as August 1914 prominent men of America hastened to join a cause that was intellectually fashionable. Industrialists and financiers, one by one, took up the cudgels for the belligerents with whom they were doing so much profitable business. Preceding them came the imposing array of American society women. They swung into action with great gusto—at long last finding a cause worthy of their talents. Politicians, with the instinct of the chameleon, caught and reflected the popular shades of opinion. College professors and school teachers repeated with a great show of wisdom the arguments which had originated in Wellington House or in la maison de la presse. Close behind the educators came the ministers, and before long the American clergy was preaching a holy war, enlisting God and the Bible in the cause which newspapers told them was righteous. Just as strange as the enlistment of the clergy was the enlistment of liberals throughout the country. Usually such individuals spend most of their time talking about the value of peace. When it came down to hard realities, a large number of these people was found on the popular side assisting in establishing a climate of opinion favorable to war.

"By February 1916 Sir Gilbert Parker was able to report that the articulate people throughout the United States had joined the Allies. The success of the British propagandists corroborates the statement that there are no limits to the field of propaganda. The only restrictions are on the manner of approach. The wealthy can be persuaded to support a cause by getting them to invest their money in it; educators can be controlled simply through controlling their reading matter; liberals and preachers are the easiest of all to enlist by the mere introduction of an idealistic flavor to the propaganda.

"It must not be assumed, however, that Americans who became adherents of the Allies were insincere. They honestly believed the interpretations of the news which were presented to them. They were convinced that here was something worth fighting for and that they would be unworthy of American ideals if they did not advocate the defeat of the Central Powers. Indeed, some of them were ashamed because the United States was not already in the war.

"COMPARISON OF ACTION ON GORE-M'LEMORE RESOLUTION WITH 1939

"In the Senate the Gore resolution met the same fate. Although there were some rather devious political maneuvers in connection with the vote, they only served to confuse an otherwise clear issue. Senator Vardaman has stated: 'If the resolution proposed by the Senator from Oklahoma had been adopted by the Congress as it was originally introduced, in my judgment, the probabilities of war would have vanished as a nightmare from the troubled brain of innocence.' With the failure of these two resolutions there disappeared the last hope for American peace.

"Sir Gilbert Parker reported to the British Cabinet that if the President of the United States had not fought the measure it 'might have turned out most unfavorably to Great Britain.' Others agree that without Wilson's support the Anglophiles could not have defeated these resolutions. As Senator Gore has remarked when Wilson gave the word, those in command of the two Houses ran the steam roller over the opposition. The McLemore resolution was defeated by 276 to 142. There were 183 Democrats and 93 Republicans who voted against the bill while 35 Democrats and 107 Republicans voted for it. The vote tells almost the entire story. In spite of the fact that most of the jingoistic comments in Congress were coming from the Republican side of the House, these advocates of war still could not command a majority of their own party. On the other hand, although these resolutions were Democratic in origin, and had had the support of most of the Democratic leaders, when the vote was taken it was the Democrats who defeated them. It was only by forcing the members of his own party into line that Wilson was able to defeat the measures.

"It is impossible to read the speeches in connection with the debates in Congress over these measures without feeling that the sentiment there was decidedly against entering the war. Unfortunately, only a few Members of Congress had a full realization of the meaning of the resolutions. They closed their eyes to the fact that failure of the bills meant the end of American peace.

"Champ Clark said at the time of the McLemore debate that the true feeling of the House was 2 to 1 against travel by Americans on armed ships. A recent writer has stated that all the Democratic leaders and two-thirds of the Members of both Houses favored such a resolution, while a newspaperman of that day remarked that the advantage was about 4 to 1 in favor of the measure. The truth of the matter was that Congress, as well as the public, wished steps to be taken which would eliminate the possibility of the United States being involved in the European struggle. But Wilson and the newspapers were shouting against unpatriotic people who were willing to surrender American rights. The President and the press were not reflecting the will of the public, and by waving the flag managed to defeat that will.

"After these two bills had been defeated, Robert N. Page, a Member of Congress, issued an open letter stating, 'Where your treasure is, there will your heart be also. The loan of $500,000,000 to England (sic) by American capitalists, to say nothing of the profits of munitions manufacturers, has destroyed the semblance even of neutrality in the United States and will probably lead us into war.' A few days later the New York Times ran a cartoon in which Page appeared as a 'shade of Benedict Arnold.' The logic is not clear, but at least it explains the position of the Times.

"The individuals in the United States who were espousing the cause of American entrance into the war said that the people opposing Wilson in the armed-ship controversy were pro-German. But the British propagandists did not think so. One of them reported: 'It is quite untrue to say that this opposition to the President is mainly pro-German. * * * It is the more or less representative expression of the "pacifist" sentiment which is a genuine American article, and is very prevalent both in the agricultural districts of the Middle West and in the far West as a whole.'

"AROUSING OUR PEOPLE

"By the middle of 1916 the principal propaganda work in the United States was in the hands of Americans. Anglo-Americans and ordinary Anglophiles from New Haven to San Francisco were doing all in their power to assist the British cause. One of the many American visitors to Europe who had been under Parker's supervision, wrote to him as follows: 'Since my return to Richmond I have been kept busy making speeches' to give Americans 'a proper appreciation of the aims of the Allies. I hope that my efforts * * * may do some good.' One worker for the Allies wrote to a prominent publisher: 'I do appreciate the excellent work you are doing in arousing our people and wish you could go to Denver and San Francisco. They need light in the West badly.'

"USES OF PICTURES FOR PROPAGANDA

"It is interesting to note here as well as in other phases of propaganda, the most effective work was done by Americans. The motion picture entitled 'The Battle Cry of Peace,' which has already been mentioned, was, in the opinion of Ambassador Jusserand, more effective than an army of conferences.

"Cartoons, always popular with the public, were issued in great numbers. Raemakers, the Hollander, immortalized the atrocity

stories, and other cartoonists of much less fame contributed their bit toward objectifying the Allies' cause. More dignified drawings were turned out by Muirhead Bone, who was the first of many official artists at the front appointed by Wellington House.

"A tremendously important department of the American Ministry of Information was that which issued photographs. These were 'distributed through the International Film Service, the American Press Association, and other agencies.' One propagandist wrote: 'Opportunities for utilizing official photographs seemed to increase every day. In addition to supplying the necessary illustrations for all our official books and pamphlets and our own lavishly illustrated publications, either conducted or subsidized by Wellington House, we sent forth countless thousands of prints for reproductions in newspapers, magazines, and periodicals outside Great Britain in neutral and allied countries, and in the British Empire.'

"This pictorial department of Wellington House supplied the American press very liberally with photographs. It issued 'a monthly illustrated magazine called The War Pictorial, which was sent out every month in * * * (a) bewildering variety of languages * * *.' In his report of August 16, 1916, Parker was able to say that 'pictures supplied by Wellington House to the American papers are conspicuous in the Sunday editions, and on front pages of papers of every locality.' The following week he gave a tremendously long list of weeklies and dailies which carried photographs emanating from Wellington House.

"FIGHTING OUR FIGHT

"British propaganda of the last year of neutrality was characterized by continued attempts to establish the conviction in the minds of Americans that their interests and aspirations were directly involved in the Allies' cause. The native propagandists were contending that the war was 'our war,' that the Allies were fighting 'our fight.' It was hoped by Parker that the activity of the *U–53* near the American coast would be very helpful in this propaganda. He felt that it destroyed some of the remoteness of the war for Americans, stating: The 'startling proximiity of the occurrence is bound to be of far-reaching and beneficial influence. It frightened a good many people rather badly, which * * * was a most desirable result. I wish (the Germans) had thought of doing something of the sort long ago.' Unfortunately, he had to admit a little later that the *U–53's* exploits had not produced the reaction for which he had hoped.

"An Anglo-American friend of Sir Gilbert Parker, and also of Theodore Roosevelt, thought he was being original when he suggested that Wellington House should 'publish an article by a well-known British authority * * * on the subject of Anglo-American relations in order to show that the interests of the United States and of the British Empire run parallel in most parts of the world.' In April Bonar Law gave an interview, at the instigation of Parker, on the danger of a German invasion of the United States. It will be remembered that this was the tenor of the motion picture, The Battle Cry of Peace. In May Lord Cromer gave an interview entitled 'England's Defeat Our Defeat.' In order to establish a belief in the identity of interests of Great Britain and the United States, John Masefield even suggested: 'A big application of the idea of the Rhodes scholarships' along with public mark of thanks to Yale or Harvard for their sons who have served the Allies might be of great value. He commented, 'Some few scraps of autograph by famous English writers would be ample for the purpose.'

"EDUCATIONAL WORK

"Both the Morgan firm and Wellington House did their utmost to get the proper educational material before the American public. On November 24 Morgan cabled to Paris: 'We want you to know that we are engaged in steady educational work' to prepare the way for another French loan.

"STOP THE PEACE TALK

"Wellington House also gave expression to the anxiety caused by these rumors of peace. As early as August 6, 1915, it was stated: 'In the near future a serious effort will become necessary to counteract the peace propaganda in the United States. The task may be difficult.' There is 'a very great danger in this peace talk with its consequent stimulation of the peace longing.' Regularly after this time additional warnings were made until the report of November 29, 1916, which stated: 'Peace talk is vastly upon the increase. If, therefore, it is desired to prevent or counteract the further growth of peace sentiment in the United States, it may be necessary to take timely and definite steps.'

"CALL THEM PRO-GERMAN

"By the spring of 1917 the reluctance of the American people to enter the war was no longer of great importance. Those individuals who opposed entrance into the conflict were labeled unpatriotic or pro-German; consequently their influence was eliminated. Only the war hawks dared speak out without restraint. Under such circumstances the Government could enter the war without paying much attention to the public. In actuality this meant that the President alone would make the decision for the Nation."

In a book, The Road to War, that opened the eyes of many, Walter Millis did an excellent job. Quotations from this book follow:

"IN 1914 IT WAS CALLED 'OUR WAR'

"As early as the first week of the war the great London Times had made the peculiar but satisfactory discovery that 'Americans are now beginning to appreciate that the rise of Germany to the power and influence hitherto enjoyed by Great Britain would be a development inimical to American interests and a menace to the freedom of the United States as a world power.'

"H. G. WELLS ON WORLD WAR

"* * * On August 5 the New York Times published a column and a half justification of the British entry into the war under the signature, oddly enough, of no less a liberal and a pacifist than Mr. H. G. Wells:

" 'That trampling, drilling foolery in the heart of Europe that has arrested civilization and darkened the hopes of mankind for 40 years—German imperialism and German militarism—has struck its inevitable blow. * * * Never was a war so righteous as is the war against Germany now. * * * [The military outcome] will be more or less definitely decided within the next 2 or 3 months. By that time, I believe, German imperialism will be shattered, and it may be possible to anticipate the end of the armaments phase of European history. France, Italy, England, and all the smaller powers of Europe are now pacific countries. Russia * * * will be too exhausted for further adventure. Shattered Germany will be revolutionary. * * * The way will be open at last for all these western powers to organize peace. That is why I, with my declared horror of war, did not sign any of these "stop the war" appeals. * * * Now is the sword drawn for peace.'

"Mr. Wells, like the rest of us who were to adopt his argument, is now aware of the baseless character of that reasoning. Yet one can hardly accuse him of seeking, on August 5, 1914, deliberately to mislead American opinion; rather it was himself whom he was misleading in a passionate effort to reestablish his own intellectual integrity. The effect, however, was the same; and the 'war to end war,' like the war to end 'autocracy,' had entered the American ideology long before President Wilson had even thought of endowing it with the great power of his rhetoric. Mr. Wells' contribution, moreover, was but the first wavelet of the flood which was to roll in without interruption for 2½ years thereafter—from the Allied side. But not from the German. On August 5 the British Navy dredged up and cut the German cables, and on August 6 there was not a single Berlin or Vienna date line in the American press.

"LENDING THE PEN FOR THE BRITISH CASE

"From the very first the best propagandists of all were the Americans who gave their passionate and vocal sympathies to the Allied cause. Second only to them were the great men of British letters, who had been read and revered throughout the United States, and whose sincerity was never, of course, in question. Sir Edward Grey, in his first letter to Mr. Roosevelt after the outbreak of the war, introduced 'J. M. Barrie and A. E. W. Mason, some of whose books you have no doubt read,' and who were already on their way to the United States. 'Their object is, as I understand, not to make speeches or give lectures'; it was merely 'to meet people, particularly those connected with universities, and explain the British case as regards this war.' Lord Bryce, that distinguished liberal, that great authority on American politics, that friendly pillar through so many years in the American scene, threw himself into a patriotic correspondence with Americans from the outset. He 'lent his pen readily to the development of the British case,' as his biographer observes, and sought by every kind of high-minded suggestion to embroil the American people in its defense.

"MAKING IT APPEAR A STRUGGLE FOR FREEDOM

" 'Instinctively,' Sir Cecil believed, Americans felt that 'our struggle is the same as their old ones for personal freedom.'

"PROPAGANDA OF FEAR: DANGER OF INVASION

"* * * At a dinner given by the Pilgrim Society in New York to Mr. Alfred Noyes and Sir Walter Raleigh, the eminent poet solemnly warned his hearers that Germany was contemplating establishing colonies in South America in contravention of the Monroe Doctrine. 'I have in my possession,' said the author of The Barrel Organ, 'an atlas published in Germany. * * * This contains a map of South America upon which 25 or 30 places are inscribed in red as German colonies'; and the listeners were amazed at this crushing proof of the perfidy of the Teuton. As Dr. Butler (he was again presiding) gracefully put it, Americans who had long striven to be neutral, though intelligent, had gathered there that day 'to show how to be intelligent, though neutral.'

"USE OF THE PUBLISHED WORD FOR PROPAGANDA

"* * * They appreciated, no less than Sir Gilbert Parker, the importance of getting native Americans to present their case; but where the Allies could command their thousands of devoted American propagandists, the Germans could find scarcely a handful. A list they drew up of possible native spokesmen contained only 33 names—a pitiful showing. The Allied propaganda, moreover, enjoyed the inestimable advantage of being self-financing. Our public clamored for the books, articles, and motion-picture films which conveyed it. Old-established American publishing houses found it profitable, and did not think it unpatriotic, to enter into agreements with the Entente governments for the distribution of propagandist war books, and there was a huge trade in volumes on trench life from the French and British standpoint. Those who voiced the German side of the case found no such markets. The German representatives in the United States were led, not unnaturally, to supply them secretly with assistance."

WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS

George Washington, in his Farewell Address, predicted the danger of those who would stand in the way of foreign influence. He said:

"Real patriots who may resist the intrigues of the favorite are liable to become suspected and odious; while its tools and dupes

usurp the applause and confidence of the people to surrender their interests."

When persons speak of atrocity stories, cite them to the book, Johnny Got His Gun, or just read part of the review of the book by Bruce Catton:

" 'Johnny' blasts his way into your consciousness with the same explosive and horrifying reality as the shells that claimed Johnny's arms, legs, his hearing, his sight, and finally his face. When war had finished with him, only a shell of the original Johnny remained—a helpless torso housing a fully conscious, remembering mind.

"Listen to Johnny's appeal tapped out painfully in Morse code. Imagine, if you can, his half head beating out these words against his pillow:

" 'Let me out of here, let me out. I won't give you any trouble. * * * Take off my nightshirt and build a glass case for me and take me down to the places where people are having fun, where they are on the lookout for freakish things. * * *

" 'I am the dead-man-who-is-alive. I am the living man-who-is-dead. * * * I'm the man who made the world safe for democracy. * * *

" 'Believe it or not, this thing thinks and it is alive and it goes against every rule of Nature, although Nature didn't make it so. You know what made it so. Look at its medals, real medals, probably of solid gold. * * * It stinks of glory. * * *

" 'Take me wherever there are parliaments and diets and congresses and chambers of statesmen. I want to be there when they talk about honor and justice and making the world safe for democracy, and 14 points, and the self-determination of peoples. I want to be there to remind them I haven't got a tongue to stick into the cheek I haven't got either.

" 'Put my glass case on the speaker's desk. * * * Then let them speak of trade policies and embargoes and new colonies and old grudges. Let them debate the menace of the yellow race and the white man's burden and the course of empire. * * *

" 'But before they vote * * * before they give the order for all the little guys to start killing each other, let the main guy rap his gavel on my case and point down at me and say, here, gentlemen, is the only issue before this house, and that is, are you for this thing or are you against it.' "

If propaganda is successful, the 50,000 will change place with the 100,000,000, and again we will have another A. E. F.

Don't be afraid to do your duty because somebody will call you names. Your obligation is to America. Let's whip the propagandists—those here and those abroad—and keep out of war.

It will be recalled those who tried to keep the United States out of the World War were called pro-Germans. Public opinion had been whipped into this rage by propaganda. Let's be careful we do not duplicate the trip down the same road.

This foreign propaganda is a road to war. Americanism calls for the road to peace. Let's investigate all of the foreign propaganda—German, French, English, and all other nations. Let's expose those who are trying to poison the springs of information. We owe that duty to the boys of America who will pay the penalty if we do not "make certain that the small decisions of each day do not lead toward war." The purpose of propaganda is to get us in. The purpose of exposing propaganda is to keep us out.

The Three-Quarter Century Club

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH O. BREWSTER

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 3, 1939

SPEECH OF HON. RALPH O. BREWSTER, OF MAINE

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech I delivered at the annual meeting of the Three-Quarter Century Club at Dover-Foxcroft, Maine, Thursday afternoon, August 31, 1939:

The thirteenth birthday anniversary of the Three Quarter Century Club of Maine comes most appropriately in the home town of Dr. E. D. Merrill who, as president of the Maine Public Health Association, first conceived the idea of this unique association and presided at its birth.

Research had disclosed that Maine had a higher percentage of long-lived people than any other State. The State of Maine was then inaugurating its official activities in publicizing Maine's attractions and possibilities throughout the United States and the Three Quarter Century Club seemed to have a unique appeal in presenting Maine as a great State in which to live in contrast to some of our sister States who were then emphasizing their inheritance tax advantages as offering a location in which it was most advantageous to pass on.

The first meeting was held on the statehouse grounds at Augusta, and was an instant and country-wide success in its publicity appeal. The response of our senior citizens was overwhelming and their cooperation has continued these annual gatherings and reveals each year new possibilities far exceeding the dreams of its founders.

Maine presents to everyone the realization that we should place no limits upon life.

It is a great pleasure here in his own home town to join with people of all ages in paying tribute to the founder of the Three Quarter Century Club and to one who may sometime be old enough to be its president, Dr. E. D. Merrill, of Dover-Foxcroft.

The Special Session

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KNUTE HILL

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 3, 1939

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, the special session of Congress convened and is about to adjourn. The purpose declared by the President in his call for the special session was to repeal the arms embargo and so modify our so-called neutrality law as to most likely keep our country from involvement in the present conflict in Europe. It has been charged that the administration brought pressure for repeal to bear on Members. This certainly was not true as to me. I was not urged by any of the leadership for repeal; not only this, but the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, after repeatedly promising me 15 minutes in which to give my reasons for voting for the Pittman bill closed the debate without granting me that privilege. So I voted my own convictions in the matter and according to my best judgment. It is only fair to myself and to the people of the State of Washington, however, that I state my reasons for so voting, and I, therefore, am using the privilege granted to all Members to extend their remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

During the extensive debate in the Senate and in the House of Representatives and even over the radio by Members, much was said about war. War! A last relic of barbarism and savagery. Conceived in greed, born and nurtured in hatred, carried on by the lusts and ruthlessness of man's lower nature and always ending in a Machiavellian truce—not a permanent peace. An overwhelming majority of men and women everywhere abhor and hate war. The President hates war. The Members of the Senate and the House hate war—they have said so time and again on the floor. We all hate war and will do our utmost to keep our country out of the present World War. General Sherman wisely said: "War is hell." The close of the last World War is too recent to permit any of us to soon forget its sufferings and tragic aftermath.

But war was not the issue during the special session and much oratory was beside the point. The real and only issue was what can Congress do to most likely keep our country from becoming entangled. It was a matter of method. Both sides to the controversy claimed their method was neutral. As a matter of fact regardless of either legislation we are neutral until we actually declare war. However, in neither case could we be impartial. Under the law of 1937 we were favoring Germany, a land power; under the enacted law we are favoring England and France, sea powers. Why deny a palpable fact? But since we are not participating in this terrible game of war who is there to deny us the right to change our own domestic laws in such a way as to lessen our chances for entrance into a game not of our making? Certainly not Germany which has violated in both these World Wars every rule of international law, raped Belgium in the first one and Poland in this one. I hold no brief for England.

It is true that she "comes into court with soiled hands." Oh, such guilty hands! The Revolution, the War of 1812, the early incitements to Indian massacres in the Mississippi Valley, opium trade in China, India, the Boers, Ireland! But add all these atrocities up and the total sum is infinitesimal as compared to the ruthless reign of Hitlerism.

England respects religion and defends democracy and loves liberty; Hitlerism crucifies Christ anew every day in mass murders of men and women and children of all denominations, rapes religion, denounces democracy, and challenges civilization. For my part, if legislation results in partiality, I want to favor those nations which have, at least, a semblance of democracy and Christianity. Should the repeal have failed the Nazis and Communists would have rejoiced. How the gentleman from New York, the gentle author of The Man Nobody Knows and The Book Nobody Knows, and the gentleman from Missouri, the one-time minister of the gospel, could see fit to lend comfort to Hitler and Stalin is beyond my comprehension. No one questions the sincerity of these two Members, but they must be held responsible for the results of their votes favoring Russia and Germany.

The debate in both Houses was, on the whole, not partisan, nor was there, for the most part, any question of motives. That there were exceptions cannot be denied. Some voted for repeal because they hated Hitler. Hitlerism is diabolical and should be obliterated from the face of the earth. But let us remember that Stalin, Mussolini, and Hitler are effects, not causes. Had there been no Czars, there could never have been a Lenin or Stalin. Had there been no Versailles, with its crafty and cunning Clemenceau and Lloyd George, there could never have been a Hitler. Some voted against repeal because they hate Roosevelt. I heard one Member say: "The President is deliberately planning to get us into this war." Such an unfair and biased accusation deserves only one rejoinder—that it is a base falsehood. I have at times differed with the President, and shall, no doubt, do so in the future. But to charge him or any other responsible public official today with deliberately planning to plunge us into war is so palpably prompted by malice that it deserves rebuke. Others voted against repeal because they hate the Jews. Let me remind them that, although that race still has its Shylocks, far too many of them—nevertheless it gave us the Great Master, the Lowly Nazarene, whose life and ideals will make the world safe for Christianity. It gave to us the Book of Books. It gave to this Nation two of its greatest Supreme Court Justices, Brandeis and Cardozo.

Much antirepeal propaganda based on misinformation and misleading reports from Washington, D. C., flooded both the Senate and the House. I will cite just one instance. The following item was from a syndicated article in my home paper by a Washington, D. C., reporter:

> Here is something that doesn't make sense: According to newspapers, polls taken in the Pacific Northwest show that 75 percent of the people are for repeal of the mandatory embargo on weapons of war but the ratio of letters received by Oregon-Washington Members of Congress run 80 to 90 percent against repeal. Even dismissing the engineered propaganda such as printed postal cards the letters run 65 percent or more to retain the embargo. There is difficulty in reconciling the wide discrepancy.

What are the facts? I contacted both the Oregon and the Washington delegations. The former had been interviewed and two of the delegation said the statement was correct. I quote from the letter of the third:

> Letters received at this office are strongly for the repeal of the present so-called Neutrality Act and for the enactment of the cash-and-carry law, but if we include the printed postal cards and other communications which are clearly propaganda then the preponderance of letters and postal cards is decidedly against any change in the present law.

On the other hand, not one of the Washington delegation was contacted by the reporter at all. Our mail is at least 60 to 40 percent and in one instance 80 percent prorepeal and 20 percent against repeal.

Just why did this reporter misinform our people back home? Had he made it a partisan issue and contacted only Oregon Members, or did he merely ignore the majority Members from these two States and consider the State of Washington below his dignity to interview and correctly report?

The effect of such misinformation was to spur antirepealists in their charges that we did not reflect the sentiment at home. From constituents coming into our offices and from reliable reports it can be truthfully stated that more than 75 percent of the people of the State of Washington, all of whom abhor war, favored the Pittman bill.

Most of the letters and telegrams opposing repeal were sincere protests, and I regretted the necessity of voting against their wishes. But as the question of which method was most likely to keep us out of war was one of judgment and not of principle, I felt bound to reflect the judgment of a majority of my constituents on this issue.

However, although I voted in the last session to retain the arms embargo, I was convinced after hearing the debates and reading both sides of the issue that the Pittman bill was preferable.

Under the 1937 act Mussolini secured war materials with which to conquer Ethiopia; Japan has been purchasing scrap iron with which to devastate helpless China; General Franco—through Mussolini and Hitler—was able to defeat the de facto government in Spain. I am not here discussing the merits of the contending forces in Spain. I merely state the fact that the law permitted a rebel in a friendly country to overthrow a legal government set up by the people of that country. And, by the way, the junior Senator from North Dakota at that time urged lifting the arms embargo against Spain because he sympathized with her governing authorities but now vociferously opposes lifting it in favor of England, France, and Poland. Moreover, if it is wrong to sell arms to the belligerents, why is it not wrong also to sell them food, clothing, steel, gas, oil, and numberless articles which are absolutely necessary for warfare?

The distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] pictured a devastating scene in the wake of a bomber over a defenseless village. It was truly terrible. But could that bombing plane have rained down upon that village that destructive hell fire if it had been without the gas and oil we so readily furnished? Some gentlemen like ex-President Hoover and Colonel Lindbergh attempt to distinguish between defensive and offensive weapons. The same weapons may be used either for defense or offense. As a matter of fact practically all kinds of materials shipped to a belligerent are sent to the front to sustain the army; that is why it is declared and seized as contraband of war. So to be consistent we should either refuse to sell all materials to all belligerents or else sell all materials to all belligerents. Personally I would favor the first.

Under the 1937 act our ships can carry contraband of war upon the seven seas to be seized or sunk as in the World War, and our citizens may sail aboard belligerent vessels as they did on the *Lusitania*. That led to our entrance in the last war and would eventually lead to the same in this war. Only a few weeks ago the sinking of the *Athenia* with Americans aboard and the seizure of the *Flint* because of carrying contraband tended to promote war hysteria and caused the State Department anxiety. The Pittman Act provides for cash and carry with title passing to purchaser before leaving port and prohibits our vessels or citizens from entering war zones. If they do so, it is at their own risk. The law just enacted prohibits also any credit to foreign countries—a somewhat prolific cause for entry into the World War.

Although there are estimable and sincere Members on opposite sides of this issue, let us compare just a few. Senators BORAH and JOHNSON are outspoken isolationists. Senator NORRIS is for the Pittman bill. Mr. BORAH and Mr. JOHNSON voted for entrance into the World War; Mr. NORRIS voted against it.

Mr. BORAH and Mr. JOHNSON with the late Senator Lodge defeated the League of Nations, the first proposed great step to punish aggressors and guarantee permanent world peace.

I know it is said the League is a farce. But had President Wilson insisted on his 14 points he could have succeeded. And with that as a basis and the powerful United States a member the League would have functioned and Mussolini and Hitler could never have bluffed their way through to conquest. Again, Mr. BORAH and Mr. JOHNSON only last spring insisted on the outworn doctrine during a world war of "the freedom of the seas." Senator LUNDEEN is an outspoken isolationist and advocate of peace; yet he proposed a real provocation to war—the seizure of the Bahamas and Bermuda on the flimsy excuse that Great Britain is too busy elsewhere now. For my part, rather than join with Mr. BORAH and Mr. JOHNSON and Mr. NYE and Mr. LUNDEEN in this crisis, I would follow the leadership of that matchless statesman of the past three decades, Senator NORRIS, who in spite of threats and ridicule and persecution risked his political future and voted against entering the last holocaust. He has lived to see himself vindicated and also to see his dreams of constructive development of our country come true. He favored the Pittman bill because he still opposes war and believes that is the safest way.

The coming year will make evident whether this policy was the wisest to pursue. Should this prove to be true, then we who won should be thankful, not boastful.

Lastly, although we consistently and persistently refuse to take part in Europe's or Asia's wars, we must be ready to aid in the building of a lasting peace, based on fairness and justice. We as the most powerful and wealthy nation can and ought to send a nonpartisan commission at the close of this war to consult and advise and even insist on a treaty of peace—not another truce—which shall unite the whole family of nations to plan for constructive not destructive activities, on waging war not on each other but on poverty, injustice, intolerance, and ignorance, and for truth, cooperation, and progress.

To better lay claim to this intercession and to better accomplish these ends we as a nation should bend every effort to make this Western Hemisphere, and especially our country, safe for democracy and Christianity. Our United States could well be a model for a United States of Europe. But we need to "set our own house in order." I voted against adjournment because we have such a multitude of pressing domestic problems demanding consideration and early solution. To my mind it was bad enough to sit with folded hands in the House while the Senate for a month debated the embargo issue. As long as we were convened in session there was no legitimate reason why our committees could not have been meeting and laying plans for necessary legislation. At least after the chief cause for our convening had been disposed of it would seem that we could have profitably taken up such matters as unemployment, more acute than ever; farm cost-of-production; a sane system of marketing and distribution of the products of both farm and factory; a simple yet workable and efficient monetary system; the broadening of the tax basis and the enactment of tax legislation to more equitably place the burden on the shoulders of those best able to pay; the drafting and enactment of such a tax on excess profits as to forever discourage the mania for war profits; the liberalizing of our old-age-pension system so as to drive from the minds of all in the sunset of life the dread specter of fear, want, and misery. These and other serious matters—fully as serious to our people as the war in Europe—can ill await the coming of the regular session. For several weeks in the coming session there will be, as usual, the delay customary to the opening of a new session. Then the call of the coming party conventions and the exciting campaign will be upon the Congress. Politics will again be in the saddle and promises will outrun and outride performances. It would seem more in keeping with our past promises, both of Republicans and of Democrats, that matters concerning the very lives and employment and comfort and happiness of our people should be our first concern this fall, this winter, and next spring. It is my firm belief and contention that promises fulfilled become the best politics.

Thomas Brackett Reed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. OLIVER
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 18, 1939

MEMORIAL EXERCISES COMMEMORATING THE ONE HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BIRTH OF THOMAS BRACKETT REED

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks I am most happy to incorporate a summary of exercises held in the Bowdoin College Chapel, Brunswick, Maine, at 3 p. m. Wednesday, October 8, 1939, in commemoration of the centennial of Thomas Brackett Reed, of the Bowdoin Class of 1860, broadcast over station WGAN, Portland.

The services were opened with the singing of America, led by the Bowdoin College Chapel Choir, Frederic E. T. Tillotson, director. The presiding officer, President Kenneth C. M. Sills, LL. D., of Bowdoin College, then read the following telegram from Senator WALLACE H. WHITE, Jr., of the Bowdoin Class of 1899:

In character and public service Thomas B. Reed was an example and an inspiration. Brilliance of mind, extraordinary power of incisive speech, industry in study and in legislative task, keen judgment of men and events, and an intellectual honesty and courage that knew no compromise with right, all contributed to universal respect and brought recognition of him as one of the country's outstanding figures of his generation. May I join with you in honoring his memory.

WALLACE H. WHITE, Jr.

President Sills then spoke as follows:

Bowdoin College joins the State of Maine today in honoring a great American. Thomas Brackett Reed once said, "The glory and dignity of a college are not fixed by the number but by the quality of those who come out of it." Bowdoin is proud of its contribution to the Nation, when toward the close of the last century three Bowdoin graduates presided over three great Federal bodies: Melville W. Fuller, of the class of 1853, was Chief Justice of the United States; William P. Frye, of the class of 1850, was President pro tempore of the Senate; Thomas B. Reed, of the class of 1860, was Speaker of the House of Representatives. Speaker Reed, by his integrity, by his intellectual courage and independence, by his wit, by his wide knowledge of books and men, by his devotion to the public service, is a fine model for all of our American youth today. He was very much of a party man; he believed in his party; he was a hardy opponent. Some remember his famous retort when he was asked if he knew the meaning of the word "paleontology": "Indeed I do," he replied, "it is the scientific history of the Democratic Party." But strong Republican though he was, he opposed our entrance into the Spanish War and later resigned his high office of Speaker because he could not support the imperialistic policy of the McKinley administration. He had, too, the philosophy of a man of affairs.

It is not only the great and well-known men who bring credit to a college or a State. "Fame," he told us once at a commencement dinner here, "Fame is a curious thing; fame is largely a matter of accident; you happen to be in a place where you do a thing well, or people think you do it well, and you get the fame others might just as well have had under slightly different circumstances." But fame aside, he rendered a great service to American life by making the House function; he was a great political figure who never trimmed his sails to any passing breeze, nor ever flew a doubtful flag. We need men of his stature, his ability, his independence, his rigorous intellectual honesty, in all walks of public life today.

And from his centennial address at Bowdoin in 1902 these words have a timely and timeless message:

"Survival of the strongest may be new to science but it is not new to religion. The strong remorseless arm striking down the weak and possessing the earth, the unpitying tramp of the horses' hoofs devastating the lands are well known to the years that have gone and they filled the thoughts of men; but they are no longer supremely prevalent on earth. Whatever contribution any man makes to humanity and justice will not be lost but will be gathered up and be among the treasures of the Almighty."

The second speaker was Fulton J. Redman, of the Bowdoin Class of 1907, introduced by President Sills as newspaper

commentator and one of the leaders of the Democratic Party in Maine, whose remarks follow:

President Sills, distinguished guests, and friends of the college, it is sometimes true of individuals who have attained distinction in life that they are lacking in the loyalties which humbler men so often possess.

There is strong proof to indicate that Thomas Brackett Reed, distinguished son of Bowdoin, and for a number of years in his lifetime the "first citizen" of our State, could have had the nomination for President in 1888, when his party carried the country. His loyalties prevented him from accepting united support, which was tendered to him as a compromise candidate during the Republican Convention deadlock in that year.

Thomas B. Reed attended as a delegate from Maine, and in the convention city of Chicago shared a modest hotel suite with the late John W. Simpson, prominent New York lawyer and head of a law firm with which Reed himself became associated after leaving Congress some years later. It will be recalled that James G. Blaine had been the Republican nominee 4 years previously, in 1884; and Blaine had been beaten by Grover Cleveland in the "rum, Romanism, and rebellion" campaign. In the Chicago convention of 1888 there were 14 favorite sons on the convention's first ballot; but many observers believed that the nomination of Mr. Blaine would be the probable outcome of the contest. A Blaine stampede was the ultimate event which the whole country expected. Reed was among a group of delegates, from Maine and elsewhere, who had gone to Chicago with the intention of being for Blaine right through to the end.

The convention lasted from Tuesday through the remainder of the week and on Saturday was hopelessly deadlocked. Conferences were held over the week end and in the early morning hours—about 3:30 a. m. on Monday—a group of delegates came to Mr. Reed's hotel room. It contained, among others, Chauncey M. Depew and Tom Platt, of the New York delegation—Depew himself had received over 90 votes on each of the first 3 ballots; it also contained leaders from the Pennsylvania delegation and a number of leaders from other pivotal States. The spokesmen told Reed that the group in the room represented enough delegates and had promises of votes sufficient in number to nominate him for President.

It was further stated that James G. Blaine could not possibly be nominated, and those present urged Reed to consent to let them nominate him, he being the compromise candidate upon whom they could all agree.

Thomas B. Reed, a son of this college, replied that he had come to the convention pledged to be for Blaine "first, last, and all the time"; that he intended to live up to the spirit and letter of this, and under no circumstances would he countenance a movement in his own favor, such as they proposed.

The convention balloted three times later in that same day, and on the third ballot Benjamin Harrison, of Indiana, was nominated. On this final ballot Thomas B. Reed was 1 of 5, out of 830 delegates, who voted for James G. Blaine, of Maine, thus living up to the pledge of "first, last, and all the time."

Harrison was elected President of the United States in the following November.

The foregoing, insofar as it had to do with the conference in the hotel room, was related to me by the late John W. Simpson, who was in the room at the time, a man of keenest discernment and emphatically of the opinion that Reed, but for the loyalties of his make-up, could have had the nomination for President in 1888 and would have been elected.

Again in 1896 Reed, then Speaker of the House, was prominently mentioned for the Presidency, standing second to William McKinley in the balloting at the national convention of his party.

But he passed up his real opportunity by a decision rendered in the early morning hours of Monday, June 25, 1888, a day on which he could have been nominated for President of the United States by a party that was subsequently victorious in the November election. Or shall I say that he accepted an opportunity in those early morning hours to make imperishable his position among the really great?

Following Mr. Redman's remarks the chapel choir sang Discovery, by Grieg, the solo part being taken by Thomas A. Brownell, of the junior class. Hon. RALPH O. BREWSTER, of the Bowdoin class of 1909, was next introduced to speak, as follows:

Second only to the Presidency in power is the justified characterization of the Speaker of the House. No small part of that preeminent position is properly attributable to the service of Thomas Brackett Reed.

In the galaxy of American political statesmen "too great for the Presidency," Reed stands upon the heights.

Reed found the House sunk in the morass of minority control—a "government of the people" paralyzed by the whim of a willful few.

Reed brought order out of the reconstruction chaos and vindicated representative democracy by virtue of his iron will. He enabled a majority to govern and lived to see his rule adopted by the opposition when they returned to power.

The orderly procedure of the House today is in no small measure a tribute to the parliamentary genius of Thomas Brackett Reed.

Time lends luster to his career. The good that he did lives on. It is profitable, however, to remember that his life was not devoid of scars.

In his first contest for the Speakership his biographer reminds us that "From the most powerful political leaders of his own State, Reed could count on little support."

Yet he triumphantly won the Speakership for the little State of Maine over William McKinley, of Ohio, and Joseph Cannon, of Illinois. Here was, indeed, a tribute to his leadership in a forum of which Garfield said, "There is no place where a man finds his true level so certainly and so speedily."

Today Reed's vision seems likely to be vindicated as the United States retires from the Philippines. His concept of America could not embrace a colonial empire far across the seas.

Saddened and embittered by the disillusionments of democracy, he retired from public life. Yet the orderly functioning of the House of Representatives stands as an enduring monument to his insight into parliamentary government and democratic processes.

America is a better place because Tom Reed lived and served. Maine and Bowdoin may well be proud that they have been privileged to train and contribute so great a figure to American public life. His career may properly inspire many another American youth in humble circumstances to recognize the power of principle in the daily walks of life.

Mr. BREWSTER's remarks were followed by the presentation of me as of the Bowdoin class of 1917, and occupying the seat in Congress once held by Congressman Reed. My remarks were as follows:

President Sills, undergraduates of Bowdoin, and ladies and gentlemen, with extreme humility and with a deep sense of the complete inadequacy of words to express in any worthy manner a fitting tribute to the memory of Thomas Brackett Reed, I approach the responsibility of participating even in a small way in this program today. A man who was a great patriot, an unexcelled statesman, and an American of the highest possible type really needs no extended verbiage to extol his works or his memory. But it is especially worthy for us today, in the light of world and domestic conditions, to pause and in the passing flight of time record again the character and genius of this noted man.

Today all over the world parliamentary and legislative processes and principles of government are on trial. Man is denying to man the fundamental and basic rights of liberty, freedom, and justice. Nations are denying to nations similar rights. As we look back upon the life of Thomas Brackett Reed we realize that his example shines for us like a star. We realize that his integrity, his honesty of purpose, his morality, and his strength of conviction indicate for us a true illustration of the path which men and nations today must travel if the destiny of mankind is to develop into that type of Christian civilization in which the greatest good is to be the order for the greatest number. Tom Reed was honest and upright in all his dealings with his fellow man. Never was his strong position nor his great power as Speaker of the House of Representatives used for his personal gain. Never did he strike a single mighty blow on any side but the right. When he did strike he was always felt. In Reed the cause of right had a champion of champions. Maine, America, and the entire world will find in the life of this man the ultimate of those qualities and those characteristics so sadly needed in the public life of this modern civilization. Today we need leaders, leaders who in thought and action will make sincerity of purpose their beacon light. This man whose birth we commemorate here today based every act on the fundamental truth that lack of sincerity is the basest and most reprehensible of all failings of mankind.

At the time when memorial services were being held for him in the Hall of Representatives in Augusta on Wednesday, January 28, 1903, Hon. Harold M. Sewall, then representative to the State legislature from Bath, said: "Reed hastened the coming of another day, a day when public service shall be emancipated from the stigma too often attaching to it, the stigma of selfishness, of unworthy motives, and corrupt methods. * * * It shall be a day of intrepidity of intellect." Then again, at these same services we find these words of Hon. Forrest Goodwin, senator from Somerset County: "Mr. Reed was a kind and a lovable man; genial and generous, sympathetic and loyal. * * * He was intensely independent, absolutely self-reliant. Brave and courageous, he never weakened in the face of opposition. He was honest and he was incorruptible."

Having scanned with some care the record of Reed's character and his life, it is my considered judgment that a Reed of today would deprecate in the strongest language applicable the injustices now existing in the family of nations; that he would call a spade a spade in the most forceful words at his command, in connection with our domestic problems; that he would be partisan, but would temper that partisanship with the sense of justice which was so inherently a part of his make-up.

To me a study of Reed's life indicated a complete abhorrence for that type of status quo which entailed a stoppage of justice, fairness, and equal opportunity for the large majority of the people of this Nation of ours. Certainly he would not tolerate parliamentary status quo and by the same token I cannot conceive of him enduring a type of economic status quo which entails a continuing unem-

ployment paradox in a land where there is such great need for work. Is it conceivable that such a man, believing in the extension of right and justice to all, would long endure without strong protest the continuing existence of a financial status quo which hangs a burden of debt and a load of economic uncertainty and insecurity over millions of our people? Most assuredly his disdain for party pressure toward a course against his better judgment would impel him to a position of leadership against that status quo rather than an abject continuing along the road of the past just because it was the past. Tom Reeds are needed today as never before in the history of this country. New problems require new answers and men who merely approach the type of Reed must not and will not long endure these continuing conditions which deny—I repeat, which deny the fundamental and basic rights of liberty, freedom, and justice, both civil and economic.

As long as parliamentary and legislative assemblies convene in this country may we never let the life and memory of Thomas Brackett Reed become in the least forgotten or tarnished. Let the youth of today and tomorrow read and study the character and the works of this great man, a true Christian and a great American.

The exercises were closed by the singing of Beethoven's The Heavens Proclaim Him by the chapel choir and by the general singing of The Star-Spangled Banner.

Preparedness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH O. BREWSTER

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 3, 1939

ADDRESS OF HON. RALPH O. BREWSTER, OF MAINE

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address I delivered at the laying of the cornerstone of the post office at Dexter, Maine, on Saturday, October 21, 1939:

In 5 years five post offices have been built here in eastern Maine. Numerous schoolhouses have been built with the aid of Federal funds. These structures represent preparedness for the expanding pursuits of peace.

Now America must turn to a proper preparedness for defense. This does not mean any more adventures overseas in either Europe or Asia but an adequate preparation to defend the Americas.

Hangars and airplanes and mechanically trained youth are the products to which America must now turn its genius.

The work-experience schools at Eastport and at Dexter—developing mechanical aptitudes in nearly 600 young men—are rapidly being recognized as models for youth training throughout the United States.

Poland shocked the world into a realization that today military activity is almost entirely mechanized.

Yet most American mechanics are not of military age. In two decades craft training for American boys has been almost negligible. Apprenticeship is largely a forgotten job.

The assembly line and the very perfection of modern motors under peacetime conditions on our rapidly improving highways has, curiously enough, reduced the call for mechanical aptitude.

Motorized military units, however, on land or sea or in the air, call once again for Yankee skill. Garages are not just around the corner when an army is in the field. An enemy also is likely as not to leave the beaten path.

Henry Ford recently pronounced New England the greatest reservoir of mechanical genius the world had ever known. This means that New England in the next decade will once again come into its own. Maine boys and Maine industries will find their great opportunity in an America that is once again upon the march.

Our domestic difficulties may rapidly be solved by what all will agree is worth-while work in preparing America for any trouble in an increasingly troubled world.

All the alphabetical agencies may be coordinated this winter for American defense. Integration is the order of the democratic day.

Meanwhile the financial problems of the Federal Government may be solved by the resultant revival of business activity and by a willingness on the part of all patriotic Americans to bear their proper share.

Let us always remember that a sound domestic economy is the cornerstone of any national structure that shall have enduring strength.

Neutrality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GUY L. MOSER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 3, 1939

Mr. MOSER. Mr. Speaker, supplementing my remarks in the Committee of the Whole on June 29 last, I desire to make the following observations:

This is the year of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the founding of the Government of the United States of America. During the initial 146 years of its existence, our Government managed to get along without any neutrality act and remain neutral in other people's controversies, and declaring war according to international law only when the people of our Nation demanded it.

Delivering his second inaugural address in 1793, President Washington said the world was "in an uproar," and the difficult task of the United States was "to steer safely between Scylla and Charybdis." Recognizing perpetual peace could never come while the spirit of injustice remained, he solemnly warned his Nation "not to indulge in a persuasion that, contrary to the order of human events, they will forever keep at a distance those painful appeals to arms and with which the history of every nation abounds." He solemnly added:

There is a rank due the United States among nations which will be withheld, if not absolutely lost, by the reputation for weakness. If we desire to avoid insult, we must be able to repel it; if we desire to secure peace, one of the most powerful instruments of our rising prosperity, it must be known that we are at all times ready for war.

Speaking "as an old and affectionate friend," Washington, in his Farewell Address, not to his generation alone but to all that were to follow in the tide of time, advised his people not to implicate themselves "in the ordinary vicissitudes of European politics of the ordinary combinations and collisions of her friendships and her enmities" and "against the insidious wiles of foreign influence, I conjure you to believe me, fellow citizens, the jealousies of a free people ought to be constantly awake; since history and experience prove, that foreign influence is one of the most baneful foes of republican government."

In his first inaugural address, President Jefferson proclaimed: "Equal and exact justice to all men, of whatever state or persuasion, religious or political; peace, commerce, and honest friendship with all nations, entangling alliances with none."

Mr. Speaker, with these landmarks and traditions passed to posterity by our Founding Fathers, this generation of Americans in its rendezvous with destiny, through its Representatives in Congress, enacted in 1935 the present Neutrality Act. The President of the United States on September 21 last came before the Congress and said: "I regret that the Congress passed that act. I regret equally that I signed that act."

Mr. Speaker, though that act was passed and approved before the honor of becoming a Member of the Congress was bestowed upon me by my constituency, I have never liked the present Neutrality Act and have publicly stated that I would vote to repeal it. I was glad to learn the President and myself are in agreement, for after following the forewarning of Washington, and the fundamental democratic philosophy of Jefferson for 146 years, the last 16 years of which were devoted to tie our Nation into the League of Nations, or its back-door entrance through the World Court, without alliances we entangled ourselves to the degree of mandating our President to do by proclamation of embargo exactly what the League of Nations has been privileged to do by agreement on economic sanctions. These are the entangling alliances of this generation of Americans' rendezvous with destiny. To undo

the mischief as far as possible, and practicable under present existing circumstances, in keeping with the President's regret vouchsafed for the Congress and equally for himself, is our present problem.

The resolution before the Congress is a commitment on the part of the American people to Europeans and Asiatics that we are definitely determined to remain noncombatants in their wars, and that the Allied Governments must understand clearly and definitely that the United States will send them neither men, ships, nor credit. They dare not count on any more supplies than they can pay for out of their own funds and carry away in their own ships manned by their own crews and without Americans as passengers to entangle our Nation in buttressing claims in the event of casualties.

Mr. Speaker, because this resolution is so much more in keeping with the landmarks and traditions left to posterity by our Founding Fathers and so much more American than our position prior to the World War, and is such a decided improvement over the Neutrality Act of 1935, it wins my support.

Will Propaganda Lead Us to War?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEWIS D. THILL

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 3, 1939

Mr. THILL. Mr. Speaker, it is true that Congress, under the Constitution, must declare war, but one cannot be blind to the fact that the exercise of this power by Congress is greatly influenced by forces which might bring Congress to a set of circumstances or into a situation that would find Congress with no honorable alternative but to declare war.

Senator SHIPSTEAD, in a statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 3, 1939, alleges that this country has engaged in various wars without a declaration of Congress:

> We made war on Mexico in 1916. We took Veracruz. We invaded Mexico with an army without a declaration of war by Congress.
>
> We made war on Russia in 1918 without a declaration of war by Congress and without even a proclamation by the President. We conducted that war for more than a year after the signing of the Armistice growing out of the World War.
>
> Together with the British Navy, we bombarded Nanking, I think, in 1926.
>
> We took charge of Haiti without a declaration of war, conducted war there, and took charge of the Government for many years.
>
> We did the same thing in Nicaragua.
>
> We did the same thing in the Dominican Republic without a declaration of war by Congress.

Senator NYE, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 3, 1939, shows how propaganda was used with telling effect prior to the last war in order to get the United States into it. The Right Honorable Sir Gilbert Parker, baronet, in an article in Harper's magazine for March 1918, states his propaganda activities in America practically from the day war broke out between England and Germany. Publicity was given in favor of the English cause in the following manner:

First. A weekly report to the British Cabinet on the state of American opinion.

Second. Constant touch with the permanent correspondents of American newspapers in England.

Third. Arrangements for important public men in England to act for England by interviews in American newspapers. Examples: Lloyd George, Viscount Grey, Mr. Balfour, Mr. Bonar Law, the Archbishop of Canterbury, Sir Edward Carson, Lord Robert Cecil, Walter Runciman, Austen Chamberlain, Lord Cromer, Will Crooks, Lord Curzon, Lord Gladstone, Lord Haldane, Henry James, John Redmond, Mr. Selfridge, Mr. Zangwill, Mrs. Humphrey Ward, "and fully a hundred others."

Fourth. Supplying 360 newspapers in the smaller States in the United States with an English newspaper.

Fifth. Establishing a connection with the man in the street through the cinema, through interviews, articles, pamphlets.

Sixth. Individual replies to American critics printed in the chief newspaper of the State in which they lived and copies in newspapers of neighboring States.

Seventh. Advising and stimulating people to write articles.

Eighth. Utilizing the friendly services and assistance of confidential friends.

Ninth. Receiving reports from important Americans.

Tenth. Establishing associations.

Eleventh. Personal correspondence with influential and eminent people of every profession, beginning with university and college presidents, professors, and scientific men, and running through all the ranges of population.

Twelfth. Arranging for speeches, debates, and lectures by American citizens, and supplying public libraries, Y. M. C. A. societies, universities, colleges, historical societies, clubs, and newspapers with literature.

Similar propaganda to that has now been unloosed in this country. Already many British speakers are on a lecture tour in the United States. Is it any wonder that some of us worry about what the consequences might be?

It is stated that there is only one copy in the United States of a book entitled "Propaganda in the Next War," written by one Sidney Rogerson; this is one volume in a series entitled "The Next War," edited by Capt. Liddell Hart. It was intended to be a handbook for British propaganda and was not to reach the American public. Another book, entitled "Falsehood in Wartime," by Arthur Ponsonby, M. P., shows the lying campaigns of propaganda calculated to inflame a people to war.

Congress is made up of 531 human beings, subject to the same emotional appeals as are any other human beings in the world. The power of suggestion, the influence of hatred, childhood antipathies, and other emotions disturb their logical thought processes. Their minds become inflamed as do those of others. They are swayed by subtle, insidious propaganda, by lies, error, and falsehoods, as are other Americans. That is the danger.

Our foreign policy has recently been changed from one close to isolation to one which brings us nearer the conflagration in Europe, and one which will lead us as close to the fire as possible without being burned; we are tending toward the adoption of methods short of war.

We are walking a dangerous road. We have taken footsteps which parallel the first fatal footsteps along the road which led this country into the World War. We can and must stay out of the present war. We can do so by steeling ourselves against that propaganda which tends to lead us into war. All Americans must make it their sacred duty to talk peace, disregard vicious propaganda, and keep this country out of war.

How Reciprocal-Trade Agreements Hurt Midwestern Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 3, 1939

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, in the Appendix of the RECORD, page 627, I answered, in part, the attacks made upon me by the gentleman from Kentucky, Congressman VINCENT, in the Appendix of the RECORD, volume 84, pages 4026 and 4120, because of my opposition to the trade-agreements program. I also included in my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, page 627, a statement from the American Good Government Society, in which they effectively refuted the attack made upon them by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. VINCENT], when I used some of their enlightening satistics as a part of my opposition to the trade-agreements program.

Mr. Speaker, the fallacies and sophistries indulged in by those who favor trade agreements remind me very much of the haunted woods at Westbury Manor which are described in a book recently called to my attention, Knight's Intimate Glimpses of Old Saint Mary's, published by the Lincoln Press, 994 National Press Building, Washington, D. C. Page 41 of this pleasantly written book on American history describes haunted woods in these words:

The woods are said to be unsafe for the traveler. The trees have grown extremely tall, and the woodland is very thick with undergrowth. So the sun, even at high noon, does not penetrate to the earth through the thickly massed foliage. A legend is told about the haunted woods to this effect: If a traveler is caught in these woods during a storm, the road will disappear. The stranger will become lost, and, weary from searching the way out, will eventually die from hunger and thirst. Late at night when there is no moon, the spirits are said to be out looking for victims.

EVIL SPIRITS OF TRADE AGREEMENTISM AFFLICT FARMERS

Mr. Speaker, the woods of international trade are indeed unsafe for the traveler. The tall trees of trade agreements and the thick undergrowth of false claims of their benefits have indeed prevented the healthful sun of publicity from piercing the thickly massed foliage cultivated by Secretary Hull and his assistant cultivators of good-neighbor benefits to foreigners at the expense of our own cattle raisers and farmers.

Uncle Sam has been caught in these woods during a storm of internationalism, and the road of safe and sane protection for the United States producer is fast disappearing. Undercut by the products of foreigners living on rice and rats, our own farmers will become lost, and, weary from searching the way out, as Mr. Knight put it, will be foreclosed off their own farms to eventually die from hunger and thirst, or at least from inadequate and unbalanced diets.

There was no moon of sanity shining in 1934 when the Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act was put over, and ever since the spirits of the Hull program have been out looking for victims. Their looking has unfortunately been successful, and our own farmers, miners, and factory workers, having lost much of their tariff protection, have become true victims, just as did the three children who, according to the legend reported by Mr. Knight, "were gobbled up by the evil spirits of these black woods."

If the Congress will sit tight next year when the trade-agreement program comes up for renewal, the "evil spirits and black woods" of the program will sink out of sight in its own quicksands, and by Independence Day, 1940, we shall be free of the "evil spirits" of extra-constitutional trade agreementism.

INFLUENCE OF TRADE AGREEMENTS ON PRICES OF EGGS

In the Appendix of the RECORD, volume 84, page 4120, Congressman VINCENT claims mistakenly that eggs sold for more under the trade agreements than under higher tariff policies, following his same erroneous line of reasoning as in the Appendix of the RECORD, volume 84, page 4026 The statements by the American Good Government Society, which I quoted in the Appendix of the RECORD, page 628, effectively demolish Mr. VINCENT's arguments as applied to the United States as a whole, but they do not specifically refute the Vincent claims as applied to eggs and to my own State of South Dakota. I have, accordingly, asked the president of the society, Richard A. Staderman, whether the society's extensive research facilities had this additional information available. In response to my request a special supplement to their magazine has been issued, including this special data and a summary of some previous data. I quote it at this point:

[From supplement to the American Good Government Review, of Washington, D. C., November 2, 1939]

HISTORY PROVES HIGHER TARIFFS BENEFIT SOUTH DAKOTA—EGGS, LIKEWISE, FETCH BETTER PRICES

(By Richard A. Staderman, president, the American Good Government Society, Washington, D. C.)

In response to the request of the capable Congressman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] for statistics relating to his own State, we take pleasure in publishing the attached tables and discussion:

TABLE I.—*National income of all persons in United States following the tariff increases under the Dingley Act of 1897 and under the Fordney-McCumber Act of 1922*

Year	Total national income of all persons in United States	Total income of all persons in South Dakota	Per capita income of all persons [1]	
			In United States	In South Dakota
Under Dingley tariff:				
1899	$15,600,000,000	$52,000,000	$209	$130
1900	16,200,000,000	54,000,000	213	135
1901	18,300,000,000	61,000,000	235	153
1902	20,800,000,000	69,000,000	262	172
1903	21,100,000,000	70,000,000	261	171
1904	21,600,000,000	71,000,000	262	172
1905	25,100,000,000	84,000,000	298	191
1906	27,600,000,000	91,000,000	322	198
1907	28,200,000,000	92,000,000	322	201
Increase from 1899 to 1907, under the higher tariffs of the Dingley Act	12,600,000,000	40,000,000	113	71
Increase [1] percent	81	77	54	55
Under Fordney-McCumber tariff:				
1922	61,700,000,000	236,000,000	562	369
1923	69,800,000,000	273,000,000	626	408
1924	69,600,000,000	272,000,000	615	406
1925	77,100,000,000	308,000,000	671	443
1926	78,500,000,000	315,000,000	674	449
1927	77,200,000,000	312,000,000	653	448
1928	80,500,000,000	337,000,000	671	477
1929	83,000,000,000	352,000,000	683	511
Increase from 1922 to 1929, under the higher tariffs of the Fordney-McCumber Act	21,300,000,000	116,000,000	121	142
Increase [1] percent	34	49	22	38

[1] With the population of the United States growing year by year, the per capita figures do not increase as rapidly as the actual ones. There are several methods of calculating national income which vary on such matters as accruals, etc. Alternative methods do not change the conclusions to be drawn, however.

Source of statistics: American Good Government Society, compiled from published data of National Industrial Conference Board, of Dr. Warren M. Persons, of National Bureau of Economic Research, and of various Federal Government departments. Data are authenticated estimates, including income both in cash and in kind; "in kind" amounted to $3,000,000,000 in 1929.

TABLE II.—*Higher income from eggs when tariffs are higher*

United States average price of eggs under Fordney-McCumber and Hawley-Smoot Acts, a period of higher tariffs lasting from 1923 through 1934 cents per dozen	23.8
United States average price of eggs under Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, a period of lower tariffs: Data for period Jan. 1, 1935, through June 30, 1939, or 4½ years cents per dozen	21.1
United States loss per dozen during 4½ years of reciprocal-trade agreements, Jan. 1, 1935, through June 30, 1939 cents per dozen	2.7
United States egg production during 4½ years of trade agreements, Jan. 1, 1935, through June 30, 1939 dozens	11,230,000,000
Loss to United States farm families on eggs during the 4½ years of trade agreements dollars	303,000,000
South Dakota egg production during 4½ years of trade agreements dozens	173,000,000
Loss to South Dakota farm families on eggs during the 4½ years of trade agreements dollars	4,700,000

Source of statistics: The American Good Government Society, Washington, D. C., compiled from various reports of the U. S. Department of Agriculture.

We suggest this question to reciprocal-trade advocates:

If high tariffs were unfavorable to the prosperity of our great United States, how could it have possibly happened that in two long periods of more than 7 years following a raising of tariff rates, that we should have prospered? Certainly no one can deny that a rising national income denotes a rising average prosperity.

In our study in the Appendix of the RECORD, volume 84, page 3762, we felt it was a true and equitable test to compare the 7 years, 1933 through 1939, under the present administration and its policies, with the 7 years preceding, 1926 through 1932, and the policies followed then. Both these 7-year periods included years that were better and years not so good. We did not, for example, try to compare the boom period, 1923 through 1929, with the 1933 through 1939 period, though such a comparison would have shown up the recent period to be even poorer in farmers' national incomes than shown by our study.

The tables presented by Mr. VINCENT in the Appendix of the RECORD, volume 84, pages 4027 and 4121, conveniently take the 4 best years under New Deal policies, namely 1935 through 1938, and compare them with the 4 lowest years that can be found, namely 1930 through 1933. Although 1933 was primarily a New Deal year, the justification given by Mr. VINCENT for combining it with 3 pre-New Deal years is that 1930 through 1933 represents the period under "Hawley-Smootism," as compared with the trade agreements years 1935 through 1938.

HONEST STATISTICS NEEDED

It is true that the national income and farmers' income during 1935 through 1938 was greater than 1930 through 1933. But does the Vincent comparison really prove anything? As a former teacher of statistics, I challenge the Vincent comparison on several grounds.

In the first place, the Hawley-Smoot tariff did not become law until June 18, 1930. As a practical matter, due to inventories on hand, the practical results of the tariff did not come into full operation until the end of 1930. At most, one might theoretically claim the last half of 1930 as part of the Hawley-Smoot period, though from the standpoint of honest statistics the year 1930 would have to be considered too mixed and indecisive to be an accurate Hawley-Smoot measure.

In the second place, the Vincent comparison conveniently omits 1934. This was the year the Trade Agreements Act was passed. However, no actual trade agreements were signed that year except the relatively minor Cuban one toward the end of 1934. As a practical matter, every unbiased student of the subject would admit that there were no effects of the Cuban agreement sufficient to substantially affect our national income or farmers' incomes in 1934. Therefore, it is correct to say that the Hawley-Smoot law was practically in full operation in 1934. If Hawley-Smoot were bad, then why is it that the national income rose from some $42,000,000,000 in 1933 to about $48,000,000,000 during 1934?

The two preceding points are merely negative. We show that the Vincent comparison is defective, but we still haven't explained that 2 years of lowered national income and depression followed the Hawley-Smoot Act. According to table I, we ought to expect economic prosperity to follow an increase in our tariff protection, just as followed the Dingley tariff of 1897 and the Fordney-McCumber tariff of 1922.

SPECULATION THE REAL MISCHIEF MAKER

The explanation is this: In the latter twenties we witnessed various booms, principally in the stock market. Farmers were selling their homes on Main Street and moving into big cities to watch Wall Street tickers. City workers and businessmen were spending more time in sitting in customers' rooms in brokerage offices than in acquiring more skill in their trades or in managing their productive businesses. Swindlers like the suicide Kreuger were on the loose, and many unsound houses of cards, like the Insull companies and the Hulswitt group, were destroying the real wealth of our people. Small wonder it was that smashes occurred in October and November 1929 and that severe depression followed.

With our entire financial house and economic system in chaos, no one measure could prevent a drastic liquidation and readjustment. The Hawley-Smoot Act was no exception. If we had had normal conditions, the increased tariff would have given a sound lift to our economic system and enabled us to prosper on a firmer fundamental basis of freedom from the whims of foreign politicians, foreign peons, and foreign sweatshops.

By the time the Hawley-Smoot tariff was signed in June 1930, the depression had been in full swing for over 8 months, since October 1929. By the time the results of the tariff were fully felt, the depression had been tobogganing full blast for at least a year. With these facts at hand, is there any fair-minded person who can say the Hawley-Smoot tariff caused the depression?

HAWLEY-SMOOT TARIFF SAVED SOUTH DAKOTA FROM WORSE DEPRESSION

As a practical matter, the Hawley-Smoot tariff of 1930 proved to be an unexpected blessing in preventing the depression from becoming still worse. Britain and other countries depreciated their currencies in 1931, which amounted to destroying part of our protection from the products of foreign sweatshops. The British currency depreciation worked in this way. A British merchant can make a profit if he sells an article for, say, 1 British pound sterling. When the pound was at $4.86 before 1931, this meant that if the South Dakota price of the article was $6 and our tariff $2, the article would not be imported because all the Britisher would get back would be the British equivalent of $4, or less than pound sterling needed to make a profit. The $4 equivalent would really in most cases be less than the Britisher's cost of production.

But what of this case in 1931, after Britain went off the gold basis and depreciated its currency? The pound dropped to below $3.50, and the British merchant could ship the product over here, say into South Dakota, pay the $2 duty, take the $4 and trade $3.50 of it for the pound sterling needed to cover costs and give him a normal profit. In addition, he could take the remaining 50 cents as an extra speculative profit at our expense.

Let us assume that the above is what would have happened if there had been no Hawley-Smoot tariff, but just the previous $2 tariff. Let us further assume that the Hawley-Smoot Act has raised the tariff on the hypothetical item to $3.10. After paying this $3.10 the Britisher would find that he had only $2.90 left from our $6 selling price. This $2.90 would bring him less than a pound sterling, he would not make a profit, therefore the item would not be imported to undersell a South Dakota farm or factory and perhaps cause foreclosures, thereby throwing its owners and workers out of employment. Many of the tariff raises under "Hawley-Smootism" prevented just this and so prevented the 1932 depression from being still worse, a worsening which might have endangered our very Government of, for, and by the people.

STRAIGHT THINKING REQUIRED

What has so confused the public about the trade-agreements program has been the tendency for its sponsors to point out each year a select group of commodities on which our exports may have happened to have increased. The increase may have had nothing to do with any reciprocal agreement, but it is dressed up and paraded in front of the public just the same. The drastic decline in grains exported in recent years is toned down as much as possible by proponents of the agreements.

Nevertheless, the public is awakening. What is the national income for the periods under discussion? What is the income of all the people in South Dakota for years back?

In so doing, people are using the technique of logic instead of emotion—the sort of logic advocated by Robert H. Thouless in the current book How to Think Straight, published by Simon & Schuster. "A really educated democracy, distrustful of emotional phraseology and all the rest of the stock in trade of the exploiters of crooked thinking," says Dr. Thouless on page 170, "could destroy these plagues of our civilizations—war, poverty, and crime—if it were determined that nothing should stand in the way of their removal."

The present Trade Agreements Act expires in June 1940. If the people of the United States "think straight," they will write the Senators and Congressmen who represent them in Washington that the act should be allowed to expire. In that way the dying reciprocal trade agreements program will have its corpse decently interred.

Mr. Speaker, the increased tariffs under the Dingley Act of 1897 caused the national income of all persons in the United States to rise from $15,000,000,000 in 1899 to $28,000,000,000 in 1907, and in South Dakota to rise correspondingly from $52,000,000 in 1899 to $92,000,000 in 1907. Between these same years prices of hogs, steers, wheat, corn, eggs and other farm products rose from 50 to 100 percent, as old-timers will remember.

The results were similar after tariffs were boosted under the Fordney-McCumber Act of 1922. Our national income increased from $62,000,000,000 in 1922 to $83,000,000,000 in 1929, and the income of all people in South Dakota increased from $236,000,000 in 1922 to $352,000,000 in 1929. During that same period prices of beef cattle rose from $5 a hundredweight to over $9, hogs from $6 to $9 and $10. The United States average price of wheat was 96 cents a bushel for 1922; by 1925 higher tariff policies had brought this up to an average of $1.44 for 1925.

As a matter of fact, if we want to go back to the earliest days of our independence, we find that it was the period 1808 to 1816 that both farm and factory got a great boost. During that period, imports into the United States were almost stopped by various wars, and our iron-making, cotton-manufacturing, wool-making, and many other industries sprang up. With previous imports of cotton and other agricultural products cut off there was a great stimulation given to our farmers to raise the crops we needed for food or manufacturing. In 1816 the war blockades were over and imports began to flood the United States, demoralizing prices for farm and factory. Some protective tariffs were then passed, but they were not high enough, and it was only after further tariffs were enacted in the 1820's that prosperity really came back.

EMBARGO REPEAL MAY FURTHER AGGRAVATE FARM PROBLEMS

Mr. Speaker, I would like to add a final word of caution here that American farmers do not permit the present war psychosis, which has unfortunately gripped this country, to lull them into believing that the war in Europe will automatically solve our American farm problem. It is also imperative that Members of Congress realize that the European war has not obviated the need for us to work out a wise and honest farm program, because if we fail in this duty, the basic raw products of this country are going to continue to fail to bring their producers the decent income to which they are entitled. It is, therefore, as important as ever that the reciprocal-trade policies of Secretary Hull and the New Deal be terminated and that the American farmer be given an American opportunity to supply the markets of his own country at a price which will enable him once again to enjoy the American standard of living.

The repeal of the arms embargo by this special session of Congress may work an additional hardship on the American

farmer, according to early reports reaching us from England. Now that the American munitions makers are once again free to solicit business from warring nations and to sell them for cash—all the supplies of guns, airplanes, poison gases, flame throwers, ammunition, and other industrial devices and mechanical contraptions for human slaughter—the American farmer may find that this industrial competition for the belligerents' dollars is so great that he can no longer export as much foodstuff, tobacco, and cotton as formerly. With only so much cash to spend, it seems logical to assume that nations at war will buy for cash primarily the means of taking the lives of their enemies and rely upon their colonies and nonmanufacturing nations to supply them with the life-preserving supplies from farm, ranch, and plantation. If such an eventuality develops, it will mean that repeal of the arms embargo was just another device for selling the farmer down the river by giving his best foreign customer to the industrialists and depriving him of that outlet for his own products, while importations of farm supplies continue to come into this country from South America and elsewhere, because of the lowered tariff protection foisted upon him by the trade pacts.

ENGLISH SAY THEY WILL NOW BUY FEWER AMERICAN FARM PRODUCTS

An early indication that the curtailment of the foreign market for American farm products will be one of the results of repeal of the arms embargo, is seen in the United Press report emanating from London on November 2, the day embargo repeal was ratified in the House. This news report stated, "A canvass of importers resulted in one estimate that British importation of American products other than war needs might drop off $150,000,000 annually." The report goes on to state that there was general agreement in England that the import of American war materials would increase but that the purchase of "non-essential industrial and agricultural products would decline."

FARM REPRESENTATIVES ALMOST 100 PERCENT AGAINST EMBARGO REPEAL

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, it might be noted in passing that the vast majority of Representatives from the farm States of the Middle West and the Northwest voted against the repeal of the arms embargo and so cannot be charged with any curtailment of foreign demand for American farm products which may follow this unique method of shifting European buying power from the sales markets of our farmers and inviting it to buy American industrial supplies such as arms and munitions instead.

An interesting revelation comes from an analysis of the way in which Representatives from the strictly farm States of America voted on the question of repealing the arms embargo. A study of the RECORD for November 2 shows that the House vote from the farm States of the West and Middle West was almost unanimous against repeal, regardless of party affiliation, and one reason frequently given was the fear that "from a purely materialistic point of view" such action would prove a boomerang rather than a boon to American agriculture. The Representatives of the 10 farm States of Minnesota, Wisconsin, Iowa, South Dakota, North Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas, Wyoming, Idaho, and Montana, for example, voted 46 to 3 against repeal of the arms embargo. Even when adding such agricultural States as Indiana, Ohio, Michigan, Illinois, and Pennsylvania, which contain four of America's largest cities—whose Representatives were almost unanimous for repeal—the total vote from these four States was 70 to 38 against repeal, making the total antirepeal vote from the whole bloc of northern farm States 116 compared with 41 in favor of repeal.

It is possible that a long war in Europe might strengthen American farm prices despite the demand-increasing effects of embargo repeal, but our Government should immediately increase tariff protection for American producers to the point where they will not have to compete with foreign farmers for American markets on any products which can be raised in this country in sufficient quantities to supply domestic demands. When this happy situation is brought about we shall have taken the first big step toward restoring the agricultural prosperity which is basic to any sound and permanent national prosperity in this country.

Stuffed-Shirt Committees in the Wage-Hour Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GUY L. MOSER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 3, 1939

Mr. MOSER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, supplementing those made in the Committee of the Whole on March 28, last, I desire to take occasion to note the newest activities in the direction of influence exerted on a bureau of Government by Earl Constantine, in his caapcity as president of the National Association of Hosiery Manufacturers.

It is believed that my contest with Milo Perkins, of the Farm Security Administration, over his having entered into a contract to divert funds appropriated for farm relief under the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, to the uses of the Dexdale Hosiery Mills, of Lansdale, Pa., are rather well known.

When the matter of appropriations to Farm Security Administration was under debate in the House, as a Committee of the Whole on March 28, I discussed this racketeering very pointedly, but the limit on my time and apparent lack of necessity prompted my omission of the names of outside influence with whom Milo Perkins had been dealing. Mr. Perkins, having pointed out that he had a bear by the tail, because Resettlement Administration had effected the building of homes that became too costly under the self-help conceived idea, and the hope that industry would be attracted thereby to these communities having failed to materialize, prompted his seeking industry for these Resettlement-sponsored communities. He stated that Arthur Paul, of the Dexdale Hosiery Mills, inventor of a knitting machine that would knit a complete stocking in one operation without looping to complete the operation of knitting leg and foot on different machines, made him the initial offer. Earl Constantine visited Mr. Perkins along with Mr. Paul and in his official capacity vouchsafed the approval of the industry, and approval of the American Federation of Hosiery Workers was won through Emil Rieve and Mr. Hoffman, when the latter was tentatively engaged as technical adviser in the transplanting and establishing of the industry to the homesteads. Mr. Hoffman was left high and dry when wired at Philadelphia to be present at the Cumberland Homestead the next morning for the stated purpose and could not possibly make it.

Mr. Speaker, when the wage-hour bill was before the Congress, I signed the first discharge petition and voted against the recommittal of the bill, and when the second petition was placed on the Speaker's desk, I again signed it, again voted against the bill's recommittal, and for its passage, as it is now the law. Since the Wage-Hour Administration was set up in the Department of Labor every constituent of mine seeking endorsement for employment thereunder was given scant consideration and all were rejected. A stenographer in the employ of another bureau of the Government in Washington, qualifying by experience and within the classified civil service by the honest method of open competitive examination, was assured of assignment at Philadelphia, through my intercession and recommendation, that a separated family might be reunited, but was rejected and kept in Washington.

Mr. Speaker, in last year's general election my leading opponent was one who attacked the administration by all known propaganda. He waged a vigorous campaign to accomplish

my defeat and, vaunting his own position as an educator, disparaged my humble beginning as a down-country dirt farmer. In so doing he honored, without wishing to do so, my youthful environments. In his paid advertisements he was equally personal, untruthful, and callow. His own record shows descent from the faculty of a university to a college whose training thus far has not established that its students have been able to pass the qualifying entrance examination to either the United States Military or Naval Academy at West Point, N. Y., and Annapolis, Md., and while he was advertising my lowly beginning, he neglected to point out that the college whose faculty he now has vaunted as gracing, formerly and in its most humble beginnings occupied a building now used as a chicken house. This cad and stuffed shirt is the first foe I have vanquished in an election who lacked the sportsmanship to congratulate the victor at the polls.

Mr. Speaker, imagine, if you can, my personal reaction to the appearance in an evening daily newspaper in my district, the picture of my late rival at the polls captioned "Appointed," with headlines "Professor wins recognition * * * Named on two wage and hour boards." The other, a morning newspaper published in the same city, the next morning, carried headlines "* * * Put on two more committees." These news items appeared September 29 and 30, 1939, respectively.

Mr. Speaker, on last Saturday the same morning newspaper carried first-page headlines "* * * To attend wage-hour hearing." Each press item referred to correctly embodies the knitted outerwear industry committee, where he is one of six to function as representing the public, and the knitted underwear and commercial knitting committes as one of eight to function as representing the public.

Mr. Speaker, this multifold appointee is a newcomer to my home county and district, and a carpetbagger in every sense of the term since he carried out the endeavor to become a Member of Congress. His name has been deleted, as well as the name of his college. Since the voters of my district did not see fit to put either of them into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I shall not do so.

Significant unto itself, however, the record at the Wage and Hour Division, United States Department of Labor, shows that he was recommended by Earl Constantine and a Dr. George W. Taylor, otherwise unidentified, but suspected to be another professor. It is pointed out that he has served as impartial chairman in the Reading district on questions involving collective agreements of the hosiery industry. Officials of the Wage and Hour Division assure me that the professor serves on a committee of 45 members, amounting to a stuffed-shirt aggregation and of no more relative importance from the standpoint of importance than on a committee to arrange for an inaugural ball; that no salary is attached thereto, and a per diem for expenses is only involved when the committee meets in the Capital City; but they, too, state that he must have a very good press agent at home to thus vaunt the importance of the headlines given in the press clippings they have examined in my office.

Having functioned "as impartial chairman in the Reading district on questions involving collective agreements of the hosiery industry," which won for him the support of Labor's Non-Partisan League in the last election, he has adroitly flirted with the outstanding success in having Earl Constantine, president of the National Association of Hosiery Manufacturers, recommend him for the appointments to the committees under the Wage and Hour Administration, which made possible the press headlines vaunting the importance of the recognition.

Mr. Speaker, anyone may contrast my record on the Wage and Hour Act, and battle against Farm Security Administration's generosity with funds appropriated to farm relief in diverting them to the establishment of additional hosiery mills in competition with those privately financed and already established, at the instance of the same Earl Constantine, all to the prejudice of the farmers and the thousands of hosiery workers in my district, all of whom are purchasers of the farmers' produce. This is the public record of "the down-country dirt farmer" whose defeat for reelection to Congress was sought by the stuffed-shirt professor sitting on committees to represent the public, but recommended by the president of the National Association of Hosiery Manufacturers.

World War Veterans Demand Neutrality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 3, 1939

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, President Roosevelt called Congress into special session to deal with the "national emergency" arising from the war in Europe. When the President appeared in person to address the joint session of Congress, which convened on September 21, he asked only for revision of the Neutrality Act to meet this "national emergency."

Since that time there has been manifest an overwhelming opinion in the country that Congress should stay on the job until the regular session convenes in January to meet this "national emergency." I share the general and widespread opinion and the sound reason upon which it is based.

This sentiment for a continuation of the special session does not spring from any partisan motives. It does not come alone from those who disagree with the President on the repeal of the arms embargo. Stanch Democratic newspapers, which frequently reflect the views of the New Deal, as well as a section of public opinion, are among the strongest advocates of continuing the session until it merges with the regular session of Congress in January.

Naturally, the chief reason for this desire to have Congress remain in session is to keep this country out of the European war. No mere change in the American neutrality law can remove the dangers of our involvement in the war. On the contrary, the dangers remain, and, in the opinion of many authorities on international law, the danger of involvement will be increased by reason of the change in the law, in the midst of the war.

Unforseen emergencies, incident to the war, not only are likely to arise, but certainly will arise as the war in Europe progresses. Congress should be in session to deal with such emergencies without delay.

On the eve of the outbreak of hostilities in Europe and anticipating that eventuality, the Fortieth National Encampment of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, at Boston, Mass., August 27–September 1, 1939, ordered a telegram sent to the President, reading as follows:

> Acting upon reports of the European situation received today and having in mind the welfare of our country, the Fortieth National Encampment of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States assembled at Boston, Mass., suggests and urgently requests that you immediately call the Congress of the United States into session to convene forthwith that all branches of our constitutional government may be functioning in this time of stress and uncertainty.

Aside from the emergency arising directly from the European war, Congress should stay in session to consider the Nation's many pressing domestic problems, many of which have been complicated and aggravated by the war situation. With that in view, Otis N. Brown, the newly elected commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, expressed his views, as follows:

> Inasmuch as there are so many issues of national importance crying for attention, and inasmuch as practically the same overhead expense will be incurred, even though Congress is not in session, as if it were to remain in session, it would seem reasonable that the people of our Nation are justified in asking Congress to continue in session for the purpose of making progress toward the solution of such matters. Moreover, the so-called national emergency incident to the present war in Europe, makes it desirable that Congress remain in session.

The American Legion, which also voices the sentiment of a complete cross section of American citizenship, expressed the view that Congress continue in session, as follows:

The American Legion views with gravest concern the apparently widespread belief that this Nation must inevitably become involved in the present European conflict. We not only believe that this Nation need not become involved, but insist and demand that the President of the United States and the Congress pursue a policy that, while preserving the sovereignty and dignity of this Nation, will prevent involvement in this conflict.

The American Legion is not a law body. It has often recommended to the Congress the enactment of legislation establishing a permanent or fixed policy on important national problems. The American Legion has always strenuously advocated that this Nation pursue a policy of neutrality and peace. In the present world crisis conditions may change so rapidly that a pronouncement by the American Legion at this time on specific legislation might be wholly inadequate in the near future.

Therefore, with full confidence in the President and the Congress, we demand that the Congress continue in session during the present grave crisis and that appropriate action be taken to preserve the peace, sovereignty, and dignity of this Nation, and that our armed forces be expanded immediately to maintain our neutrality.

An All-American Navy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH O. BREWSTER
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, November 3, 1939

ADDRESS BY HON. RALPH O. BREWSTER, OF MAINE

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address I delivered before Norway-South Paris Kiwanis Club October 26, 1939, at Norway, Maine:

Americans everywhere may heartily welcome the new naval program as exclusively designed for American defense. This is the significance of the emphasis on craft other than battleships.

This does not mean the battleship is done or that all possibility of carrying naval conflict across the seas is ended. But it does mean that the proposed 25-percent increase in other types than battleships and particularly the 100-percent increase in naval aircraft signifies a primary concern for the defense of the American hemisphere.

To carry naval warfare across 3,000 miles of ocean requires a 2-to-1 superiority in the aggressor. That goes both ways. All naval authorities agree there is a loss of at least 40 percent in long-distance fleet operations and the remaining 10 percent is desired as a safety factor.

This explains the 5-to-3 ratio desired to meet the Japanese in Asiatic waters.

In the rebuilding of our $5,000,000,000 fleet in the last decade prime emphasis was placed upon the battleship to what seemed to many the neglect of the destroyer and the submarine and aircraft.

Only recently the naval program was in arrears to the number of 56 destroyers and 20 submarines and it was proposed to limit naval aircraft arbitrarily to 3,000.

The new naval program would indicate that strenuous efforts would now be made to overcome these shortages and to increase these types by from 25 percent to 100 percent.

This incidentally means much to Maine. This program should practically guarantee full steam ahead at Kittery and Bath for the next decade, although Maine has never conceived of national defense in terms of private gain.

The stress upon the battleship, whose cost is now approaching $100,000,000, led many to fear the Navy was being developed primarily for overseas warfare in either European or Asiatic waters. Some years ago some of us in Congress protested vigorously against the United States becoming involved in war as a result of American trade being carried on in war zones.

That was the chief cause of our involvement in 1917. The loss of American lives and American ships in the war zones inflamed American opinion. Today that is no longer possible. Such commerce is forbidden in the law just passed.

The almost irreparable injury to the American merchant marine through the recent neutrality legislation is sufficient answer to the suggestion of Communist Commissar Molotov that this act was "simply a mask to cover our struggle for profit."

America has weighed in the balance the freedom of the seven seas and the sacrifice of American boys in defense of this century-old doctrine and has decided in favor of American youth.

No more convincing indication can be found of this reorientation of American policy than in the character of the billion-dollar addition that is proposed to the American Navy. Every line breathes the spirit of an adequate defense—and nothing more.

We must realize that this will give us a $6,000,000,000 navy. The operation and maintenance and replacement of such a naval establishment must exceed a billion dollars a year. Yet America is ready to pay billions for defense, but not one cent for tribute to involvement in any foreign wars.

This means, however, that to support this burden America must put its domestic house in order. Sound national finances are the backbone of any adequate defense. Germany is far more likely to be beaten by an internal break-down of its economy than by any foreign foe. Commissar Molotov would desire nothing more than disorder and chaos in our domestic economy as a prelude to his approaching call to revolution.

This naval program involves no final conclusion upon the argument between the battleship and the airplane and submarine. We shall still have a battle line equal to any in the world. Yet it is obvious that events cast their shadow. Everyone in America has undoubtedly heard of the sinking of the *Royal Oak* by a submarine. A proposal to add 3,000 aircraft to our naval forces and not to add any more battleships to existing authorizations at this time indicates a most gratifying change of policy and opinion. Incidentally 3,000 aircraft will cost little more than one modern battleship.

The proposal to add 40 destroyers and 16 submarines guarantees further the defensive purpose of this proposal by Chairman VINSON and the Navy Department. Commerce raiders of any character can be cared for within this authorization in this hemisphere.

The new naval program is one of the most reassuring developments in a decade to all those millions of Americans who are determined to see America kept out of war.

Assistance for Distressed Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. RANKIN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, November 3, 1939

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago I introduced a joint resolution asking for an appropriation to aid the distressed farmers in the rain- and flood-stricken areas in north Mississippi and northwestern Alabama.

I pointed out at the time that crop conditions in that section were the worst they had been in a hundred years, due to conditions over which the people had no control.

I have before me the ginners' report showing the number of bales of cotton ginned in each county in the district which I represent prior to October 18, 1938, and also the number of bales ginned in each county prior to October 18, 1939. The figures are as follows:

County	Number bales ginned prior to Oct. 18, 1938	Number bales ginned prior to Oct. 18, 1939
Alcorn	9,750	2,564
Clay	8,035	2,501
Itawamba	7,563	3,145
Lee	22,198	7,792
Lowndes	12,306	6,632
Monroe	19,974	11,959
Noxubee	12,292	7,734
Oktibbeha	4,603	1,442
Prentiss	8,449	2,260
Tishomingo	6,769	3,070

Thus it will be seen that the average for 1939 is about one-third of a normal crop; whereas the expense of making it was even greater than that of 1938, for the reason that many farmers planted several times and invariably bought fertilizer each time.

The corn crop was even shorter than the cotton crop. It is estimated that throughout the district the corn crop will not average more than 20 percent of a normal yield.

I give you these facts to let the Congress and the country know that in pressing my demands for assistance for these

distressed farmers I was actuated by a condition the like of which the people in that section have never seen before.

I was asked by the leaders not to press this question on the floor, for the reason that this session of Congress was convened to consider changes in our neutrality laws. I pointed out to them, and to the Members of the House, that while I did not want to interfere with the administration's program I considered the condition of the people in these distressed areas just as serious as if they were themselves engaged in a war.

Other Members who had flood or drought disasters in their respective districts joined me and we appealed to every department of the Government that even had the power to offer assistance, with the result that arrangements have finally been worked out to take care of the situation.

Four Federal agencies have completed a joint plan for meeting drought and flood emergencies which have affected more than 115,000 farm families in 34 States. The plan was drafted at the request of the President after consultation with us Members from the stricken areas.

Loans, direct relief, and emergency food supplies will be provided for these needy families by the Farm Security Administration, the Farm Credit Administration, the Disaster Loan Corporation, and the Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation, beginning immediately. Funds of the first three agencies available for emergency use total $33,500,000. In addition, Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation expects to increase considerably its shipments of surplus foodstuffs into the distressed areas.

The Farm Security Administration has available $8,500,000 for emergency rehabilitation loans and direct relief to farm families which cannot obtain adequate help from any other source.

The Farm Credit Administration will provide up to $20,000,000 for emergency crop and feed loans to farmers who can give a first lien on their crops or livestock. Security of this type is required by the law governing Farm Credit Administration operations.

The Disaster Loan Corporation has available not more than $5,000,000 for loans to eligible farm borrowers in those counties in Mississippi, Alabama, Florida, and Tennessee which have been stricken by floods during recent months, as were large numbers of farmers in every county in my district. Legal limitations restrict its operations to the flood area. The other agencies, however, are free to operate in both flood and drought regions.

As the need develops, the Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation will increase its shipments of surplus foodstuffs to drought and flood States for distribution through the public welfare departments to supplement other forms of aid.

Farm families needing the services offered by any of the four agencies may apply to the county offices of the Farm Security Administration or the Farm Credit Administration crop and feed loan offices, or may obtain information from County Agricultural agents. Applications then will be routed to the proper agency for immediate action.

The Disaster Loan Corporation is arranging to send examiners into the flood area and will open an office in Montgomery, Ala., for the review of loan applications. Its present offices in Birmingham, Ala., Little Rock, Ark., Nashville, Tenn., and Jacksonville, Fla., also will assist in this work.

This, together with the various work-relief projects that have been released within the last few weeks, will aid greatly in carrying these people through the winter months. If it is not sufficient to meet the demands, then I shall renew my request for the passage of adequate legislation when Congress convenes in January.

Our first duty is to the people we represent, and especially when it comes to dealing with a disaster of this kind, with which they have been overwhelmed as a result of conditions over which they have no control.

I am sure that if every Member of the House understood this situation, as many of you are bound to understand it, they would realize that I was amply justified in pressing this claim for assistance for the distressed farmers of the district I have the honor to represent as well as for the distressed farmers in other stricken areas throughout the Nation.

This is an agricultural country. When the farmers fail or when agricultural prices sink below the cost of production, the entire Nation suffers. Therefore when such conditions prevail it is perfectly right and proper for the Federal Government to come to the assistance of those farmers who, as a result of no fault of their own, find themselves the victims of a disaster of this kind.

I have done my best to secure assistance for them, regardless of the protests from certain Members who were more interested in the affairs of Europe than they were in the welfare of these distressed farmers, and I have no apologies for it. Under similar circumstances I would do the same thing again.

The Money Question

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNN J. FRAZIER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, November 3, 1939

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article on the money question.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

The following is a statement attributed to Salmon P. Chase, the Secretary of the Treasury under President Lincoln:

> My agency in procuring the passage of the National Bank Act was the greatest financial mistake of my life. It has built up a monopoly that affects every interest in the country. It should be repealed. But before this can be accomplished, the people will be arrayed on one side and the banks on the other in a contest such as we have never seen before in this country.

If that was true just after the Civil War, it is doubly so when we speak about the Federal Reserve System at the present time. The trouble with our monetary system is that there is not a proper distribution of money so that people can buy the necessities of life. Thus we now have too much to eat and wear, and, at the same time, we have from ten to twelve million persons without money to buy these products which they need. The Government is supposed to be run for the benefit of all of the people. The issuance of money is one of the Government's most important functions. Money is the lifeblood of trade. Without it, there can be families in actual want because the wage earner cannot get a job, and, at the same time, there may be bumper crops and an abundance of manufactured products throughout the Nation.

The reason for this strange paradox is the turning over by the Government of the issuing and control of its money to the privately owned Federal Reserve banking systems. Being privately owned, they are run for a profit and it behooves them to see that there is a scarcity of money in circulation because then there is more of a demand for it and they can collect higher rates of interest for it. Money is supposed to be a medium of exchange, but the bankers have turned it into a commodity in which they can deal and make a profit at the expense of the public who really own or should own the money in the first place.

The Government prints and coins our money. The only reason that it has any value is that the Government says that it has a certain value, and that the taxing power of the Government is back of it. Any piece of money is merely a promise to pay made by the Government. This money is put into circulation, however, not for the use of the public but for the use of the bankers.

Does the Government charge any interest on the money they hand over the bankers? Not at all. The bankers pay for the actual cost of the paper and the printing. The average cost of paper money is approximately 30 cents per thou-

sand dollars. The bankers then loan the people the Government money. And if the Government does not collect enough in taxes to pay running expenses, tax-exempt, interest-bearing bonds are issued and sold to these same bankers, who, on buying them, thus loan the Government some of the money which was turned over to them free. The banks, in turn, deposit the Government bonds as collateral and receive their par value in new Government money—with which to buy more Government bonds.

There are a great number of people in the United States who believe that we will never have permanent prosperity until the control of our money and credit is taken out of the hands of the financial interests. There is wide difference of opinion, however, on the best way to accomplish this end. In an effort to unite the many monetary reformers so that something can be accomplished through a united front, the following resolution was introduced, first, by Congressman BURDICK, of North Dakota, and in its present form by Congressman VOORHIS of California and myself. We feel that most of the monetary reformists will agree that this is a step in the right direction. If passed, it will require Congress to use its constitutional prerogatives of coining money and regulating the value thereof.

Hearings will be held by the committee provided for by this resolution, and every plan will be heard before a final decision is made. Every group will have a chance to present its plan to the committee. This will be fair to everyone having a monetary theory, and all will have a chance to be heard.

To show that the monetary-minded can and will unite on this, I am submitting two letters from the many encouraging words I have received since the introduction of Senate Joint Resolution 188. From the office of Money, the only newspaper in the United States devoted exclusively to the money issue, located at 280 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y., I have received this letter:

DEAR SENATOR: I wish to thank you for the part you are playing to get all monetary reformers to unite in abolishing the Federal Reserve System's unconstitutional privilege of issuing money.

The following organizations have written us they will back you up in the fight: Capture Congress Committee, American Women's Civil League of Manhattan, Salem (Oreg.) Money Club, Better World Foundation, Boston New Economics Group, Dollar-an-Hour Club, New York New Economics Group, Perry County (Ind.) Money Club, Crusaders for Economic Liberty, National Reform Associates.

We have received word from many large organizations that they will submit it to their membership for endorsement with the hope there will be no dissention. We will do all in our power to assist you.

Very truly,

(Signed) JOHN G. SCOTT, *Editor.*

Mr. FRAZIER. The following letter was received from the Dollar-an-Hour Club, a national organization advocating labor-hour-wealth money, located at 53 C Street SE., Washington, D. C.:

DEAR SENATOR: Our National Board of Control has unanimously voted to support Senate Joint Resolution 188 and House Joint Resolution 391. We believe you have, by the introduction of this measure, done more to unite the monetary reformers of the Nation and lead a real battle against money merchants than anything else which has happened in 75 years. We will do everything in our power to aid in getting congressional support.

Very truly,

(Signed) E. W. MASON,
Chairman, National Board of Control.

Senate Joint Resolution 188, as introduced, reads as follows:

Joint resolution to restore to Congress the sole power to issue money and regulate the value thereof

Whereas the national banks of the United States from and since 1863 have been operating contrary to the provisions of the Federal Constitution; and

Whereas the Federal Reserve System has, since 1913, been operating contrary to the provisions of the Federal Constitution, and that both of the aforesaid institutions have unconstitutionally used the power of Congress to issue and regulate the value of money contrary to the Constitution; and

Whereas the constitutional provision referred to is section 8 of article I, which reads as follows: "The Congress shall have power to coin money, regulate the value thereof, and of foreign coin, and fix the standard of weights and measures"; and

Whereas said constitutional provision has never been modified, amended, or repealed: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That said national banks and said Federal Reserve Board, and the member banks of the Federal Reserve System, be, and they are hereby, declared to be operating without any constitutional authority; be it further

Resolved, That said institutions and each of them shall not, after 18 months from the passage of this resolution, be permitted to issue any money or have any control over any of the money and credits of the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That if said institutions, or either of them, obtain credit from the Government of the United States, it shall be on the same terms and conditions as the credits extended by the Government to other institutions and individuals; and be it further

Resolved, That a joint committee of both Houses of Congress be appointed to formulate a plan to be presented to Congress for the future regulation of money.

Tanks Over Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH O. BREWSTER

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 3, 1939

SPEECH BY HON. RALPH O. BREWSTER, OF MAINE

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech I delivered before campaign meeting of Model Government League of National Youth Administration School at "Quoddy" village, Eastport, Maine, preliminary to model city elections in self-government on Thursday evening, October 5, 1939:

Twenty years without apprentices have tremendously weakened the industrial backbone of America in this era of increasing mechanization. Stop and think how many boys in any town in Maine have learned a trade in the last two decades.

Bath and Kittery are now a market for all the competent mechanics we can produce. Bath has prudently undertaken to train boys with an industrial background to supply its needs. On my desk was a call from the Boston Navy Yard for boys with 4 years of mechanical training. A week later came a notice that 2 years would be accepted as shortages pressed.

Suddenly the world realizes that all defense is now mechanized—on the sea, in the air, and, as poor Poland shows, on the land.

The automobile-assembly lines and prefabricated houses seemed at first to indicate the day of the skilled artisan had passed. Now, peace as well as war evidently requires more and more industrial skill.

The Poles were as helpless before the mechanized divisions of the German Army as the Mexicans before Cortez.

As America moves this winter into a program of more adequate preparedness on land and sea and air, the first shortage will be found in the trained mechanics that are required to make the modern military machine anything but a sorry joke.

A sandlot ball team might as well try to play the Yankees as to pit the heroes of Bunker Hill against a modern tank.

Today here at "Quoddy" 400 boys are determining their preliminary aptitudes for industrial training. At Dexter 100 N. Y. A. boys, drawn from all over Maine, are working alongside 150 mechanics in the foundry, at the lathes, and in the drafting rooms. From these schools must be recruited the boys that Maine will soon very urgently require to supply the demand for artisans in shop and field as American preparedness for peace or war gets fully under way.

Has Congress Abdicated Its Solemn Responsibilities?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 3, 1939

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I was one of those who voted today against the resolution which adjourned Congress sine die.

I did so because I have a very firm conviction that Congress ought to remain at its post of duty and share with the Chief Executive the responsibility for keeping this country out of war.

This is not a new idea on my part, as the RECORD will show. On May 8, 1939, during the first session of the Seventy-sixth Congress, I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 22, which reads as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the first session of the Seventy-sixth Congress shall adjourn on January 2, 1940.

If Congress had adopted the resolution I offered last May, it would not have been necessary for the President to call an extra session, as the national lawmaking body would have remained in continuous session. It costs about three-quarters of a million dollars to hold an extra session of Congress—in mileage and other expenses. If my resolution had been adopted, that money would have been saved to the taxpayers.

And if my resolution had been adopted, the people of America would now feel the security that would come from having Congress in session during the 2 months that will intervene before the next regular session will begin. With the world aflame and kaleidoscopic changes taking place in international relations every day, almost anything may happen during the next 2 months.

The Constitution of the United States vests the war-making machinery in the lawmaking branch. With the world on fire, Capitol Hill is deserted. It is a tragic thought that at a time like this Congress is shirking its solemn responsibilities.

Projected Kidnaping of a Member of Congress By W. P. A. Workers and Workers Alliance Members

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GUY L. MOSER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 2, 1939

Mr. MOSER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD to supplement those made in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union Friday, June 16, 1939, I desire to submit the following:

When sworn testimony supported by affidavits was submitted to the W. P. A. Subcommittee on Appropriations May 11, 1939, disclosing the plotting of my projected kidnaping if I returned home to attend the cornerstone laying at the new post-office and Federal building in Reading, Pa., May 13, no Member of Congress could have been more amazed than myself. That same afternoon of May 11 when radio broadcasters, on into the night continued to announce it on Nation-wide hook-ups, my amazement turned to astonishment that such bold and rash procedure could have been plotted in my home and native county, which sent its representative to the First Continental Congress and has continued to be represented at the seat of National Government ever since that initial step. Four of the county's native sons had signed the Constitution of the United States, and of the First Congress, four Members had been born in the county and immediately adjacent thereto when native parents sojourned over the county line.

Most amazing of all was the disintegration of this traditionally patriotic background to a degree when a deserter from the Loyalist Army in Spain could boldly enter and in his communistic environs, as blatantly, as rashly advocate the kidnaping of the Congressman for refusal to bow to the Workers Alliance's mandates and blackmailing threats of being held personally responsible if the Congressman did not vote for the appropriation of the taxpayers' money as these racketeers and rowdies demanded.

The manner in which the press of the Nation took this matter up by publishing the account and commenting editorially clearly indicated the editors of the country felt the Nation's pulse in this situation. Summarizing, some of these, selected at random, are listed as follows:

"Alliance cause of strikes on W. P. A., affidavits charge; plot on Congressman bared." (Cincinnati Enquirer, May 12, 1939.)

"Witness in W. P. A. hearing tells of plot by workers; says Alliance men sought to keep Congressman from cornerstone laying by force." (St. Louis Post-Dispatch, May 11, 1939.)

"Accuse W. P. A. group of plot on lawmaker; says Workers Alliance eyed manhandling of Pennsylvanian." (Morning World-Herald, Omaha, Nebr., May 12, 1939.)

"Inquiry bares 'plotting' of W. P. A. workers; strikes laid to action of Alliance." (Salt Lake Tribune, May 12, 1939.)

"W. P. A. inquiry bares plot on official; witness says Workers Alliance plotted attack upon MOSER." (The Tribune, Great Falls, Mont., May 12, 1939.)

"Congress; threat to manhandle House Member disclosed to W. P. A. probe committee." (San Francisco Chronicle, May 12, 1939.)

"Reliefers' plot bared in House." (Denver Rocky Mountain News, May 13, 1939.)

"Target; Representative GUY L. MOSER, of Pennsylvania, reported to have incurred displeasure of Communists by voting against increased relief appropriations." (Denver Rocky Mountain News, May 17, 1939.)

"Workers Alliance charged with coercion at hearing; agitation by Workers Alliance members for use of violence to prevent Representative MOSER from speaking at Reading post office cornerstone laying next Saturday." (The Helena Independent, Helena, Mont., May 12, 1939.)

"W. P. A. union said to have talked of 'bouncing MOSER'; accused of debating whether to 'remove' Congressman at ceremony." (St. Louis Star-Times, May 11, 1939.)

"W. P. A. workers' plot to eject Representative MOSER from town told." (Chicago Daily News, May 11, 1939.)

"W. P. A. workmen coerced by Alliance men, probers told; Representative GUY L. MOSER, Pennsylvania, said he would attend cornerstone laying despite a plot to prevent his appearance on the platform." (The Courier Journal, Louisville, Ky., May 12, 1939.)

"Workers Alliance attacked at session of House committee investigating W. P. A.; caused strikes; investigator says physical attack on Congressman plotted by W. P. A. union." (The Daily News, Greensboro, N. C., May 12, 1939.)

"W. P. A. methods hit at House hearing; Alliance accused of coercing workers, planning to toss out solon." (The Macon Telegraph, Macon, Ga., May 12, 1939.)

"Workers Alliance accused of causing strikes on W. P. A. work; use of violence to prevent Representative MOSER speaking urged; Ben Rubin, classed as educational director of Alliance, sought adoption of resolution to remove MOSER bodily from cornerstone laying if he appeared." (The Savannah Journal, Savannah, Ga., May 12, 1939.)

"New sensation at W. P. A. inquiry; Representative MOSER's removal bodily from platform plotted; affidavit Ben Rubin introduced resolution submitted." (The Evening Press, Savannah, Ga., May 11, 1939.)

"Plot against Congressman charged." (Fort Worth Star-Telegram, May 11, 1939.)

"Coercion charge against Workers Alliance heard; Alliance members advocate violence to present Representative MOSER from speaking." (San Antonio Express, May 12, 1939.)

"W. P. A. Alliance attacked at House probe; accused of trying to prevent solon from attending ceremony in Pennsylvania." (The Lincoln Star, Lincoln, Nebr., May 11, 1939.)

"Committee hears W. P. A. evidence; investigator produces Workers Alliance members' affidavit Ben Rubin sought resolution's adoption for Congressman MOSER'S bodily removal from cornerstone laying Saturday; Communist members of Alliance withdrew from meeting in protest on rejection of resolution." (Wichita Daily Times, Wichita, Kans., May 11, 1939.)

"Worker group faces charge; Alliance planned to keep Congressman from ceremony." (Sioux City Journal, May 12, 1939.)

"W. P. A. union's activities told to committee; investigator says violence against Congressman urged." (The Arkansas Gazette, May 12, 1939.)

"Workers Alliance plot is revealed." (Milwaukee Sentinel, May 12, 1939.

"W. P. A. coercion charges filed; strikes, unrest, and plotting Congressman's kidnapping laid to Workers Alliance. (Fort Wayne Journal Gazette, May 12, 1939.)

"Workers Alliance given blame for W. P. A. coercion; Congressman threatened; Educational director of Alliance advocates violence to prevent Representative MOSER from speaking at cornerstone laying of Reading, Pa., post office." (The Milwaukee Journal, May 12, 1939.)

"W. P. A. rapped at House quiz; plot to remove Representative MOSER from platform bodily if appearing at cornerstone laying of post office bared; educational director of Workers Alliance, Ben Rubin, sought adoption of resolution to resort to violence if Congressman attempts to speak." (Buffalo Courier Express, May 12, 1939.)

"Politics in W. P. A. is aired; testimony reveals Alliance strike agitation; plot to kidnap Congressman MOSER bared." (The Wheeling Intelligencer, May 12, 1939.)

"Congressman is disclosed as victim of kidnap plot." (Pittsburgh Press, May 11, 1939.)

"Kidnap plot charged to 'red' group; Congressman who voted for W. P. A. cuts seen as victim; snatch hinted planned during dedication of post office; 'reds' insistent, is claim." (Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, May 12, 1939.)

"W. P. A. probers hear plan to attack MOSER; committee told of proposal to oust legislator in Reading next Saturday." (Washington Times-Herald, May 11, 1939.)

"Anti-MOSER plot laid to Alliance; violence threats voiced at meeting, House W. P. A. probers are told." (Washington Times-Herald, May 12, 1939.)

"W. P. A. probers hear Alliance coerced workers; resolution to kidnap Congressman defeated; Communists leave Alliance meeting in protest." (Richmond Times-Dispatch, May 12, 1939.)

"Probe is told Workers Alliance runs W. P. A. as it pleases in Berks County, Pa.; Group drove foreman away for balking at dictation, says witness—guilty fired, but taken back on roll again; created such terror that some projects were dropped, investigator relates—bosses plead lack of authority; plot to drag Representative MOSER from speaker's platform and kidnap him at post-office cornerstone laying bared." (The Evening Sun, Baltimore, Md., May 11, 1939.)

"Alliance threat bared in probe; House told W. P. A. union plotted action on foe in Congress; Representative MOSER, of Pennsylvania, is target for voting against increased demands." (The Brooklyn Eagle, Brooklyn, N. Y., May 11, 1939.)

"W. P. A. probers told of plot on MOSER; 'reds' planned to kidnap legislator at Reading, is charge; Communists offer resolution; MOSER 'not surprised'." (Philadelphia Inquirer, May 12, 1939.)

"Threat to Congressman charged to W. P. A. union; failure of W. P. A. workers at Alliance meeting to adopt Communist resolution to kidnap Representative MOSER, of Pennsylvania, prompts Communists to withdraw in protest to hold meeting of their own." (New York Journal and American, May 11, 1939.)

"Threat revealed against MOSER; W. P. A. probe told of plan to evict Congressman at Reading." (New York Post, May 11, 1939.)

"W. P. A. Alliance unit debated assault on Congressman; bodily removal of MOSER discussed, investigator says." (New York World-Telegram, May 11, 1939.)

"W. P. A. inquiry is told of plot to punish Member of Congress; hears 'red' element quit when W. P. A. workers in Alliance meeting rejected scheme to bar Representative from ceremony." (New York Sun, May 11, 1939.)

"Alliance blamed for W. P. A. strikes; Congressman threatened with violence; investigator saw threat of violence; Representative MOSER, of Pennsylvania, plotted victim for voting against increased relief appropriations." (The Providence Journal, May 11, 1939.)

"Reprisal threat laid to Alliance; W. P. A. inquiry hears Congress Member faces picketing at Reading post-office rites; MOSER tells of vain efforts to stop beatings of foremen on Pennsylvania projects; MOSER backs W. P. A. charges." (New York Times, May 12, 1939.)

Mr. Speaker, the press in Reading, Harrisburg, York, Lancaster, Camden, Trenton, Newark, Norristown, Allentown, and Pottsville, covering areas near my district as well as many other parts of the Nation similarly abounded with comment on this plotting by Communists among W. P. A. workers to resort to physical violence if necessary to prevent my appearance on the platform to speak on the occasion of the cornerstone laying at the new post office in Reading, Pa. This plotting followed closely the threat by persons registered as Communist voters as well as of other parties on dodgers sent by mail and constituting blackmail under the statutes, reading as follows:

Mr. Congressman, either you support request for an additional $150,000,000 for W. P. A. or I will hold you personally responsible if W. P. A. workers are laid off; if unemployment increases, which means more taxes for relief; if business suffers and recovery is crippled in the district you represent.

Fill out the above form. Mail it immediately to your Congressman and our Senators in Washington, D. C.

WORKERS ALLIANCE OF BERKS COUNTY,
Collective Bargaining Agency for Unemployed and W. P. A. Workers, 11 North Eighth Street, Reading, Pa.

Reading, Laureldale, Birdsboro, New Jerusalem, and Kutztown.

Knowing that all appropriations have been ample and that not one single regularly sponsored application has been turned down or rejected on account of insufficient funds available, and that the excessive appropriations have been conducive to the extravagances, wanton and wasteful practices and expenditures in violation of existing law, rules, and regulations, I refused to be bulldosed or intimidated and voted with the Committee on Appropriations on its recommendations and findings. The foregoing enumeration herein set forth can therefore only be construed as one reprisal that can properly be laid to the Workers Alliance, aptly set forth in the uninspired but well-chosen headlining in the New York Times, Reprisal Threat Laid to Alliance.

There are indications and reverberations that their reprisals are to be carried into the next election. Whether this be effected or not, I shall follow the trail blazed by the illustrious men who preceded men from the First Continental Congress, through the founding of our Government, on down through the level of time to the present one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the launching of the First Congress under the Constitution into the present Seventy-sixth Congress.

Spiritual Preparedness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH O. BREWSTER
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, November 3, 1939

SPEECH OF HON. RALPH O. BREWSTER, OF MAINE

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech I delivered at the banquet of the Bangor Masonic Club in honor of Hon. William M. Brown, president of the National League of Masonic Clubs, and Arvid V. Swaningson, past president of the National League of Masonic Clubs, Saturday evening at 6:30 o'clock, October 21, 1939, at Bangor, Maine:

Religious undernourishment is at the root of our social and economic ills. The world is starved for God. Too many churches have been closed in America as well as Russia by the indifference of a people who do not choose to go.

Order will emerge from the current chaos as individuals submit themselves once again to the guidance of an Almighty God—a God that is neither Aryan nor pagan—a God that embraces all humanity, including Slav and Teuton, in one great brotherhood.

Let us keep always in mind that Tolstoi and Luther were products of Russia and Germany as well as Stalin and Hitler.

America is an alloy of all races and religions. Atheism alone has never found here a fertile soil. In the crucible of this world convulsion America may be melted and then beaten into a metal that may be stronger than any the world has ever known.

Like the Crusaders of old, Americans must first purge themselves of every selfish thought. Then they will be ready to serve in meekness and yet in might as an example for the salvation of a weary, struggling world.

America is gathering its resources to be ready to fill an ever greater role. Domestic peace and substantial unity of thought and action are essential before we can speak wisely to the world.

An America properly prepared, spiritually and materially, may lay the foundation for a new world order in which old things shall pass away.

Soon we shall recognize that God alone can guide America in the maelstrom of this new day.

A new golden age for America and humanity may emerge from this terrific holocaust if Americans everywhere shall live worthily of the heritage that is so obviously ours.

Run-Around the Government Departments Give to Inquirers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GUY L. MOSER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, November 2, 1939

Mr. MOSER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I take occasion to recount an experience I had in calling one of the great Departments of our great Government on the telephone from the House cloak room yesterday afternoon, November 1, 1939. I called and obtained the Bureau desired, asked for the branch of the Bureau wanted, and obtained it. I was then switched from that to 3 different extensions and

answered by as many persons, each of whom referred me to the next extension. I was then on the fifth turn right back with the first extension, namely, 300, which I had originally obtained on getting the desired Bureau. This was after in each instance mentioning my identity and official purpose. I gave this last person a lecture on the vaunted efficiency of the Department, and succeeded in having my wants accepted, whereupon the information sought was obtained and telephoned to my secretary in my office while I remained on the floor of the House. The person telephoning avoided disclosing his identity to my secretary.

Last evening when I looked over the Evening Star my gaze fell upon the single paragraph I have asked unanimous consent to include in my remarks. It is from the column of Frederick William Wile, and is captioned "Run-Around at Agriculture," and as I have personally had the same experience with a Bureau at Agriculture, the fact a columnist had this experience and wrote about it, publishing same on the very day of my most recent experience, prompted my unanimous-consent request.

RUN-AROUND AT AGRICULTURE

Have you ever tried to telephone someone at Republic 4142, the Department of Agriculture? If not, there's an experience ahead of you. Secretary Wallace's bailiwick has such a reputation for giving 'phone callers (and occasionally visitors) the "run-around" that orders were once issued to stop the buck-passing practice. This column recently tried to reach an employee in the Department library. Switchboard imparted that Agriculture has five libraries. Then the name of the desired party was given. For some weird reason, the call was switched to "Retirement," whatever division of the bucolic branch that may be. "Retirement" had never heard of the person. Patience personified, the columnist asked for "Personnel." That division was presently heard in animated conversation over something or other, except the business in hand, for the ensuing 3 or 4 minutes. Then suddenly a voice out of the somewhere chirped: "This is the Maloney Concrete Co." Nothing daunted, we tried Agriculture's number all over again, and asked for the Secretary's office. Thereupon an obviously competent young woman named Martin came to the rescue. She identified the particular library required and established the contact instantly. It's costing Uncle Sam $1,550,000,000 this year to maintain Agriculture activities in Washington, including 11,935 employees. As Mr. Wallace's domain extends over 1,532,066 square feet, the cost per square foot works out at about $1,000. If the Department's telephone service is any criterion, it's no wonder the farmer still needs relief.

Mr. Speaker, as these experiences are the same to all Members, it is doubtful that this notation in the RECORD will have other effect than lifted eyebrows and tilted noses in snobbery on the part of the petty subalterns gracing the Federal pay roll. It is hoped Members may note it, and analyze the smug complacency of these employees of the classified civil service, whose only objectives are, first, to be placed; secondly, to advance in grade; and lastly, attain retirement eligibility, but retention on indispensability, having reached that point. All Members should remember this when asked to favor legislation to freeze people into the classified service by noncompetitive examinations, especially before voting for H. R. 960, when that time arrives.

Completing the Record on Agricultural Exports and Imports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEVERLY M. VINCENT

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 3, 1939

Mr. VINCENT of Kentucky. On page 56 of the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD there appeared a statement by the gentleman from New York, Representative DANIEL A. REED, in which he compares exports of selected agricultural commodities or groups of commodities for the first 8 months in 1939 and in 1938, and then, without further analysis, hastily concludes that instead of expanding foreign markets for our agricultural products the reciprocal trade agreements program seems to be working in reverse. Data showing the foreign trade of the United States for the first 9 months of 1939 were released a few days ago by the Department of Commerce. Anticipating a new burst of partisan political attacks on the reciprocal trade agreements program by the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] or some other opponent prompted by the same desire to confuse the unsuspecting farmers and turn them against the administration's efforts to provide profitable markets for farm commodities both at home and abroad, I feel that the farmers of our country are entitled to a full exposition of the facts.

Impartial critics recognize that a comparison of trade data covering only a few months cannot yield a fair appraisal of the trade-agreements program because such comparisons do not show the effects of special factors which tend, in a short period of time, to direct the flow of trade. One example of this is the abnormal nature of foreign trade throughout most of 1939. Foreign nations facing the grim necessity of preparing for national defense were obliged to make unusually large purchases of certain industrial products which can be used for defense purposes. The necessity of these purchases reduced the power of our foreign customers to buy certain other types of American products—notably agricultural products—and their purchases of these commodities inevitably declined. Moreover, the nightmare of the impending probability of war made it necessary for the nations likely to become involved in armed conflict to press expansion of home agricultural production in order to insure adequate food supplies and thereby cushion, as much as possible, the first impacts of general hostilities. Other special factors operated, at the same time, within this country. A degree of industrial recovery took place, increasing the demands of American industry for imports of agricultural raw materials, and the ability of our industrial population to buy imported specialty and luxury products.

These were only some of the factors—totally unrelated to the trade-agreements program and entirely beyond the effects of that program, which were influencing the short-term trends in agricultural exports and imports that the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] has tried to ascribe wholly to the trade-agreements program.

The gentleman would have us and the farmers of this country believe the obvious absurdity that breaking down foreign trade barriers against our agricultural exports has had the effect of curtailing our exports.

Moreover, any comparison of trade data which seeks to appraise the effectiveness of the trade-agreements program in restoring our foreign markets should be made against the stalemated condition of our foreign trade which the program was designed to correct. It is not reasonable to expect that even the lowering and removal of barriers to our exports can bring about, year after year, progressive increases in volume of our exports of every commodity to every trade-agreement country, regardless of what other factors may be operating. In other words, comparisons should be made with some preagreement period such as 1933, the last full year preceding adoption of the trade-agreements program.

The following table makes such a comparison:

United States exports of agricultural products

Export items	9 months ending September—		Increase (+) or decrease (−) 1939 over 1933
	1933	1939	
Cotton, unmanufactured	$250,917,000	$121,964,000	−$128,953,000
Tobacco, unmanufactured	40,723,000	61,317,000	+20,594,000
Corn	1,705,000	12,253,000	+10,548,000
Wheat	1,900,000	34,199,000	+32,299,000
Wheat flour	9,929,000	18,534,000	+8,605,000
Oil cake and meal	5,262,000	6,595,000	+1,333,000
Vegetables and preparations	5,628,000	11,863,000	+6,235,000
Fruits:			
Fresh	17,315,000	26,336,000	+9,021,000
Dried and evaporated	10,296,000	13,069,000	+2,773,000
Canned	10,776,000	17,635,000	+6,859,000
Meat products	17,512,000	24,392,000	+6,880,000
Lard, including neutral lard	25,115,000	15,397,000	−9,718,000
Dairy products, except fresh milk	3,054,000	5,104,000	+2,050,000

It will be noted that there were only two decreases between 1933 and 1939. There were extraordinary domestic and foreign reasons for this condition. Space here does not permit a detailed analysis of the reasons which caused this decrease. Suffice it to say at this time that trade agreements had nothing whatever to do with this decrease.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] called attention to an increase of imports in so-called agricultural products during 1939 over 1938. The following table lists in detail the items which account for the increase in value of imports of agricultural commodities:

United States imports of agricultural products

Import items	9 months ending September—		Increase 1939 over 1938
	1938	1939	
Crude rubber	$94,163,000	$119,074,000	$24,911,000
Raw silk	61,372,000	75,489,000	14,117,000
Cocoa	16,548,000	20,330,000	3,782,000
Tea	13,345,000	15,154,000	1,809,000
Hides and skins	19,133,000	33,671,000	14,538,000
Flaxseed	14,656,000	15,738,000	1,082,000
Unmanufactured wool	12,590,000	34,595,000	22,005,000
Wheat for milling and export	968,000	4,464,000	3,496,000
Total of items listed above	232,775,000	318,515,000	85,740,000
Total agricultural imports	711,647,000	794,700,000	83,053,000

Note that whereas the total increase in value of imports of the items listed in the table is $85,740,000, the increase in value of imports of all agricultural commodities was only $83,053,000. These figures mean that total imports of such commodities as can be and ordinarily are produced in this country—even in quantities not large enough to meet domestic requirements—actually decreased in 1939 as compared with 1938. On the other hand, the increase that did occur was in imports of things farmers and city consumers alike want and buy, and in things that our industries, undergoing a measure of recovery in 1939, demand as raw materials.

It may be recalled that in 1932, under the effects of Smoot-Hawleyism, that so-called import balance, concerning which the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] seems so concerned, was only $4,000,000; but it will also be recalled that farm cash income in 1932 was only four and one-third billion dollars. Compare this situation with 1937, when our agricultural import balance of $800,000,000 was the highest in recent years and farm cash income was eight and one-fourth billion dollars. Does the gentleman from New York hope to make farmers believe they were better off in 1932 than in 1937?

When trade data showing imports of agricultural commodities are examined in more detail, and when the increase in imports in 1939 over 1938 is analyzed in terms of commodities, we discover—contrary to the impression that the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] most obviously wishes to leave in the minds of our farmers—that the increase is nearly three-fourths accounted for by increases in imports of such so-called agricultural commodities as crude rubber, raw silk, cocoa, and tea, which must come altogether from foreign countries; the more than one-quarter is accounted for by commodities which under normal domestic requirements must be imported to supplement deficient domestic supplies.

Since the opposition has raised criticism against trade agreements during this special session, called for the purpose of neutrality legislation, we might briefly review some of the factors which made this program necessary. If we bear these facts in mind, they may help us when the present European conflict ends to avoid the committing of the same errors in our foreign commercial policy that we committed after the last war and by which we helped to deepen and lengthen the world-wide depression.

After the cessation of hostilities in 1918 the countries of Europe were prostrate and devastated. They faced a hard reality—the necessity for reconstruction. The United States had developed and expanded its agricultural and industrial productive capacities during the war to meet the exigencies of the conflict, and we occupied a favorable economic position to profit from the demands of reconstruction.

During the 1920's we protected our interests in foreign markets by loaning to foreign governments billions of dollars, which they could use to pay for our farm and factory products. To that extent we postponed resolving the manifold economic problems that had arisen from the war.

As life gradually returned to normal, the countries of Europe set about recouping their former foreign markets in order to stabilize their economies and rehabilitate their productive capacities. In our own interest we should have employed our national energies at that time to aid in restoring international commerce to normal peacetime levels. Our post-war tariff acts, however, failed to recognize the far-reaching, disruptive effects that excessive rates of duty would have on our own domestic prosperity. The Hawley-Smoot Tariff Act, adopted in 1930, enacted sweeping measures to prevent, as far as possible, foreign merchandise reaching our markets. Foreign countries quickly retaliated with measures restricting American products in their markets. Result: Collapse of our export trade and economic misery throughout the Nation.

Congress in 1934 adopted the Trade Agreements Act, authorizing the President to seek, through negotiation with foreign countries, to restore our foreign trade by mutual undertakings to reduce trade barriers. Because of the obvious success of the trade-agreements program in helping to restore our foreign trade, opponents of the program tend to forget the extent to which trade with foreign countries declined after 1930 and glibly blame the program for failure when the slightest fluctuations occur. In their misguided zeal, opponents never lose an opportunity to misrepresent the effects of the program.

The American Legion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH O. BREWSTER

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 3, 1939

REMARKS BY HON. RALPH O. BREWSTER, OF MAINE

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following remarks I made at a banquet meeting of Hancock County Council of the American Legion in honor of the new State commander, Llewellyn C. Fortier, at Ellsworth, Tuesday evening, October 10, 1939:

The American Legion now faces its supreme test. Whether or not those who fought the last war will be able to guide America clear of the current world convulsion is to be determined by the events of the next few months.

None love war less nor love peace more than the veterans of the World War who suffered disillusionment in France.

More than 100 veterans of the World War in the Congress of the United States are resolved to keep America in the path of peace for the good not only of America but of the world. This was the mandate of the American Legion in its great convention at Chicago.

Experience is still the best if not the only teacher. The veteran is desirous that his son shall fight only in defense of America. For that defense he is most anxious that America shall be adequately prepared.

The leaders of the American Legion in State and Nation in this year of crisis face a challenge and an opportunity to help America in its hour of greatest need. Let a love of America and of American institutions purge every lesser hate and fear. This alone will suffice to unite America to go forward to its manifest destiny under the guidance of Almighty God in accordance with the Legion creed.

War Prices and Winter for W. P. A. Workers Debunk Democratic Brag of Relief Cuts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 3, 1939

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, immediately after the new wage schedules for the Work Projects Administration became effective on September 1, 1939, under General Order No. 1 of the W. P. A., I began to receive numerous protests and appeals from the people of my district. I venture to say that every Member of Congress whose constituents have been affected adversely by the new wage scale has been getting similar protests and appeals from their own districts.

Many of the protests against the sharp slashes in already meager wages have come to me from other citizens besides the W. P. A. workers, who are affected directly by the cuts. Many other citizens have appealed for a restoration of the wage cuts as a matter of simple justice. This readily can be understood after a glance at the schedule of wages fixed for Blair, Centre, and Clearfield Counties, Pa., which comprise the Twenty-third District of that State. I wish to place in the RECORD at this point a comparative table of the old and new wage schedules:

Pennsylvania

	Unskilled		Intermediate	Skilled	Professional and technical
Blair County, Altoona, 82,054 (25,000 to 100,000):					
Wages established by Executive order in 1935	*B*	*A* $52.00	$60.00	$75.00	$83.00
Prior to Sept. 1, 1939		57.20	66.30	75.40	83.20
New rates	$48.10	52.00	62.40	81.90	84.50
Centre County, Bellefonte, 4,804 (under 5,000):					
Wages established by Executive order in 1935		40.00	45.00	55.00	61.00
Prior to Sept. 1, 1939		53.30	61.10	70.20	78.00
New rates	39.00	42.90	52.00	67.60	68.90
Clearfield County, Du Bois, 11,595 (5,000 to 25,000):					
Wages established by Executive order in 1935		44.00	50.00	63.00	69.00
Prior to Sept. 1, 1939		53.30	61.10	70.20	78.00
New rates	42.90	48.10	57.20	74.10	76.70

Naturally, I began an inquiry into this matter at once. One glance at that table would convince anyone of the sound reason for the protests and the real merit of the appeals. No one could examine that wage schedule without finding glaring inequities, if not downright injustices in it. Not the least shameful is the fact that unskilled W. P. A. workers, who receive the least pay, suffered the deepest cuts and therefore bear relatively the greatest hardships.

Since that time I have striven without success to bring about a fair adjustment of the wages in my district. That effort has led to an extensive exchange of correspondence and a series of conferences with high officials of the W. P. A. in Washington and in Harrisburg, Pa.

In fairness, I must say that the officials of the W. P. A. with whom I have conferred on this matter and with whom I have corresponded have shown for the most part a sympathetic attitude and a disposition to cooperate. But a sympathetic attitude and a disposition to cooperate is not enough unless satisfactory results are forthcoming. Results are what count with W. P. A. workers and their needy families.

Primarily, of course, the inequitable and unjust wage cuts go back to the amendment to the relief bill, sponsored by the Democratic gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER]. That amendment was designed to penalize the more prosperous States of other sections. As it has turned out, I understand the manner in which the law has been administered has resulted in no gain for the South, as it was intended. I understand that protests against the new W. P. A. wage schedules are just as vigorous in the South as they are in other sections of the country. But the fact that this ill-conceived provision proved to be a boomerang does not help W. P. A. workers anywhere.

The mere fact that the Tarver amendment was enacted into law is one of those strange things that happen once in a while in Congress. When it was presented to the House, during consideration of the relief bill last summer, the House voted to kill it. And, naturally, when the House votes decisively against a proposition, we all assume it is definitely dead. But on this matter, we reckoned without the Senate.

After the House had killed the amendment, the bill went to the Senate for action. While the measure was in the Senate, the old Tarver amendment was slipped back into the bill and it was in there when the measure passed the Senate. But the Members of the House were denied another chance to kill the objectionable amendment. If they had been given the opportunity to vote again, that provision to penalize W. P. A. workers never would have been written into law.

When the relief bill came back to the House with the Senate amendments, including the Tarver amendment, there was no opportunity to vote on any separate provisions of the bill. The vote came on the straight question of accepting or rejecting the entire bill. It was a question of "whole hog or none." Members of the House were placed in the position of taking the bill just as it stood, Tarver amendment and all, or voting against all relief. The question came on June 30, the last day of the fiscal year. On that day, all appropriations for W. P. A. activities stopped. If the House had defeated the conference report, W. P. A. workers all over the country would have been out of jobs. The funds to pay them were exhausted. There was no time to offer a new bill and get it through the House and Senate. So the Members of the House did the only thing they could in the face of those circumstances. They accepted the report and the Tarver amendment became law the moment the President signed the bill.

Out of that provision grew General Order No. 1 of the Work Projects Administration, effective September 1, 1939. That order provides "that the schedule of monthly earnings applicable to any county shall be based upon the 1930 population of the largest municipality within the county." That provision is not an act of Congress. It is the act of the W. P. A. Administrator at Washington, but it operates under the law and is just as binding so far as W. P. A. workers are concerned.

After some correspondence and conferences with W. P. A. officials in Washington, I was advised to take up this question of adjusting the wage schedules for the twenty-third district of Pennsylvania with Col. Philip Mathews, State administrator of Federal Work Projects Administration at Harrisburg. I did so at once.

Colonel Mathews' reply was delayed pending the decision of Col. F. C. Harrington, Commissioner of the Work Projects Administration at Washington, on Colonel Mathews' recommendation for adjustment of the warge schedules for certain areas in Pennsylvania. Colonel Mathews' recommendations were rejected. I want to quote from Colonel Mathews' letter to me, in which he explained what he had recommended and what was rejected. Colonel Mathews stated:

> In requesting adjustments in the schedule of earnings, I based my recommendations on the 1937 population of certain municipalities as estimated by the State planning board, which are the most recent figures available.
>
> Recommendations were made only in those instances where the estimated 1937 population of the largest municipality indicated a sufficient growth to warrant the inclusion of the county in the next higher wage group. I have received advice from our Washington office that after thorough consideration of my recommendations it was deemed inadvisable to authorize the proposed adjustments.
>
> In making my recommendations for adjustments in earnings, it was necessary to limit the substantiating data to population figures, since the method of applying the Schedule of Monthly Earnings contained in General Order No. 1 to wage areas is predicated exclusively on population figures.

General Order No. 1 prescribes the following Schedule of Monthly Earnings for Wage Region I:

	Wage class				
	Unskilled		Intermediate	Skilled	Professional and technical
Area: Counties in which the 1930 population of the largest municipality was—	*B*	*A*			
Group 1. 100,000 and over	$52.00	$57.20	$68.90	$89.70	$94.90
Group 2. 25,000 to 100,000	48.10	52.00	62.40	81.90	84.50
Group 3. 5,000 to 25,000	42.90	48.10	57.20	74.10	76.70
Group 4. Under 5,000	39.00	42.90	52.00	67.60	68.90

The schedule of earnings shown in group No. 2 above was applied to Blair County, since Altoona, the largest municipality within the county, had a 1930 population of 82,054. Clearfield County (Du Bois population, 11,595) was placed in wage group No. 3. Centre County (Bellefonte population, 4,804) was placed in wage group No. 4.

Prior to the effective date of General Order No. 1, the State administrators were authorized to make adjustments to the schedule of monthly earnings within the range of 10 percent, and by virtue of this authority the schedule of monthly earnings for the unskilled and intermediate wage classifications were increased by 10 percent in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. It was also within the authority of the State administrator to adjust the schedule of monthly earnings on the basis of contiguity of counties. Under this authority Clearfield and Centre Counties were included in that group in which the 1930 population of the largest municipality was 25,000 to 50,000. Blair County was not contiguous to a higher-rate county and, therefore, was left in that group in which the 1930 population of the largest municipality was 50,000 to 100,000.

The above-mentioned adjustments were rescinded by general order No. 1 and, to a great extent, accounts for the reduction in the schedule of earnings for these three counties.

Very truly yours,

PHILIP MATHEWS,
State Administrator.

As I have stated, Colonel Mathews was disposed to do what he could to ease the lot of the W. P. A. workers in Pennsylvania, but his recommendations were turned down by the W. P. A. Commissioner in Washington. After that there was only one thing left to do in my effort to bring about an equitable, fair, and just adjustment of the wage scale—that was to make a direct appeal to the President. The Work Projects Administration is an independent Federal agency coming directly under the President. He is the real "boss." So I wrote to the President, as follows:

The PRESIDENT,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I wish to appeal to you on a matter of vital concern to several thousand men, women, and children in my congressional district and many more thousands throughout the country.

My plea is for an equitable adjustment of the new wage scale for W. P. A. workers in Blair, Centre, and Clearfield Counties, Pa., which comprise the Twenty-third District of that State. I most earnestly urge you to take the steps necessary to bring about a review of General Order No. 1 of the Works Projects Administration, effective September 1, 1939, to the end that W. P. A. workers may be paid wages more in keeping with the actual cost of living.

While the welfare of the people of my district is my primary concern, I am informed that W. P. A. workers in other Pennsylvania districts, as well as those in other States, are suffering from similar inequities as a consequence of the wage schedule, and a general adjustment may be as desirable as it is urgent.

Without burdening you with more than the essential details, I may say this matter has been taken up "through channels." It seems that you, Mr. President, are the "court of last resort," and therefore I appeal to you now to take the proper action to save the people dependent upon W. P. A. wages from unnecessary hardships this winter.

Acting upon protests and appeals immediately after the new wage schedules became effective I presented the matter to W. P. A. officials at the Washington office. I was advised that the initiative for a review and recommendations for any modifications must come from the State administrator. Accordingly, I presented the matter to Col. Philip Mathews at Harrisburg, Pa. After some delay, occasioned by the consideration of his recommendations for adjustments in the schedules for several Pennsylvania areas, he advised me that they had been rejected as "inadvisable" by the Washington office.

I am unwilling to permit the matter to rest there and take this next and last step in the hope of preventing any further hardship among the W. P. A. workers and their families during the winter. I feel sure that no one could examine the wage schedule fixed for my district without finding glaring inequities, if not injustices in it. No one who responds sympathetically to human needs could fail to be moved by the fact that relatively the deepest cuts and the greatest hardships fall upon the lowest-paid workers. And many of those who receive the least have the most mouths to feed.

As you know, General Order No. 1 provides: "That the schedule of monthly earnings applicable to any county shall be based upon the 1930 population of the largest municipality within the county." I contend it is impossible to justify the relatively wide difference in wages paid to W. P. A. workers in the three counties in my district when there is only a slight difference in actual living costs.

As I have told W. P. A. officials in Washington and in Harrisburg, I realize the magnitude of the task imposed upon them and the difficulty of making hasty and sweeping changes in wage schedules to meet the requirements of an ill-conceived provision of the new law, which I opposed in the House. Nor do I question the good faith of officials in attempting to fairly administer an unfair and unwise provision of the law. While my efforts to bring about adjustments in the wage scales have met with sympathy, the results have been wholly unsatisfactory.

Let me also impress upon you the fact that the new wage schedules were fixed before the outbreak of war in Europe and became effective simultaneously with the beginning of hostilities. The outbreak of war, as you have noted, produced a sharp rise in food and clothing prices. This is shown by reports of the United States Department of Labor, as well as a study of living costs made by Pennsylvania State College in my district.

Winter, which already has begun in my district and all the Northern States, imposes further hardships on these W. P. A. workers, whose already meager wages have been slashed. Most of these families depend upon their gardens for a part of their food supply and that source is no longer available. Fuel for heating is another seasonal drain on their small wages.

In view of the fact that Colonel Mathews' recommendations for adjustments in the schedule of earnings, based upon the 1937 population of certain municipalities as estimated by the State planning board, which are the most recent figures available, have been rejected by the Washington office, it now appears to be necessary to establish a new standard. It seems to me that a less rigid and less arbitrary standard, which takes into consideration the actual cost of living, might be established within the law.

I feel sure, Mr. President, that you would prefer to have inequities adjusted by administrative action rather than permit them to continue until Congress can correct them by legislative action.

Very truly yours,

JAMES E. VAN ZANDT.

Now, I await the President's reply. He is indeed the court of last resort in this matter just now. If any action is to be taken at this time, the President must take it. Congress can do nothing until it convenes for the next session in January, in the midst of the snows of winter.

It is unfortunate but true that in the past we have witnessed relief—human misery—used as a political football. I must await the final word before I am prepared to say that relief again has become a political football. I make no such charge now, but I do insist upon justice for the W. P. A. workers and their needy families in my district. Justice in this case consists of W. P. A. wages somewhat in keeping with the cost of living in the Twenty-third District of Pennsylvania—not wages fixed by false and arbitrary standards.

Now, let us take a look at the cost of living since the outbreak of the war in Europe. Mr. Isador Lubin, the Commissioner of Labor Statistics of the United States Department of Labor, has advised me that his bureau is following the weekly price changes in Pittsburgh and 11 other large cities for 15 staple foods. Mr. Lubin stated:

> Prices of certain food items advanced sharply following the outbreak of the war in Europe. This was particularly true of sugar, flour, lard, and navy beans. These price advances were maintained until the third week in September when the upward trend was largely checked. After September 26 there was a slight downward trend, which has leveled off. Almost no change was reported during the weeks ending October 17 and 24, and a slight decline was reported for the week ending October 31.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that when a W. P. A. worker goes to the grocery store to buy the necessities of life for himself and his family, he does not need a statistician to tell him how much prices have gone up since the outbreak of war in Europe. He can tell that by taking one glance at his slim pay envelope when he goes in the store, and he does not need an adding machine to count the pennies when he comes out. And if his children are weak and sick he does not need a doctor to tell him their condition comes as a result of a starvation diet.

I wanted to be fortified with the facts, so I asked President R. D. Hetzel, of the Pennsylvania State College, to have

a survey made of living costs in the vicinity of State College, Pa., since the outbreak of the war. I wish to incorporate that statement in my remarks. It follows:

STUDY OF LIVING COSTS IN THE VICINITY OF STATE COLLEGE SINCE THE OUTBREAK OF THE EUROPEAN WAR, 1939

(Prepared by A. H. Reede and C. S. Wyand, under the direction of C. W. Hasek, of the department of economics of the Pennsylvania State College)

Spectacular rises in both wholesale and retail prices of certain commodities early in September have led to much speculation as to how general the upward movement was and its influence on the cost of living. Unfortunately, no agency collects data on costs of living for the State of Pennsylvania as a whole and the figures of the United States Department of Labor and the National Industrial Conference Board are for selected cities, only a few of which are in Pennsylvania. In any case, they have as yet released no figures on the war period, for much time is required to tabulate an immense volume of data, weigh it, and reduce it to index numbers. The chief reason for the selection of a city as the unit to be analyzed is the tendency to marked variations in prices and living standards. It has proved possible to secure considerable information on prices at retail in State College, and prices at wholesale in Centre and adjoining counties. The data secured allow a reasonably close estimate that the cost of living in this area has risen about 2 percent, and the wholesale price level nearly 10 percent. The weighted average of retail food prices, the most sensitive items in the cost of living, has risen about 2½ percent. Rents have naturally shown little tendency to rise, since they are arranged in advance, commonly for a period of a year. Light and fuel prices have remained constant, and retail prices of clothing have changed but little. It appears, then, that the war has so far produced little bouyant effect on living costs in this section, and that retail prices have tended as usually to respond slowly if at all to changes in wholesale prices. If the war continues, however, and anticipated shortages of certain materials are realized, the upward movement of wholesale prices will be accelerated, and a sharp rise in the cost of living may be expected.

Changes in the cost of living are relatively easy to determine. Ascribing these changes to specific factors is much more difficult. Thus the price of canned pears increased about 10 percent from September 1 to November 1, due in part to the fact that the 1939 crop of California pears was poor. Since pears tend to soften in the can, carry-over of a portion of the 1938 pack could not compensate for a short crop. Hence prices rose. Conversely, the retail price of lamb dropped between September 1 and November 1 largely through a softening of consumer demand for such meat. Other items registered similar changes that could not be ascribed directly or indirectly to the war.

On a few items price changes may reflect wartime forces. Thus canned pink salmon and canned corned beef registered increases of 20 and 25 percent respectively in price after September 1. All canned meats rose an average of 10 percent in the same period. It is probable that the extensive use of such foods in the army diet contributed to these price changes. Wool, silk, and leather registered the sharpest increases of all of the items in the clothing category, a fact which probably has military significance. Other categories in the cost of living show no price increases that are clearly attributable to the war. Fuel prices have remained constant, as have rents, and the principal sundries.

The price of numerous foodstuffs (e. g., pork, sugar, and certain cereals) did rise rather sharply during the first 2 weeks of the war, but these increases have been in large measure, offset by a subsequent softening of prices. As of November 1, the retail price of food was no more than 2½ percent above the pre-war level, whereas the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics reports about a 4½-percent increase in the average cost of food between August 15 and September 15. The subsequent decline to current levels apparently took place soon after the middle of September and was virtually completed by October 1.

As might be expected, wholesale prices have risen more sharply than retail prices, the increases in food prices ranging from 5 to 65 percent and averaging 10.4 percent. The weighted average increase, however, is only slightly over 6 percent. Outstanding increases affected wheat flour, up 23 percent; pink canned salmon, up 65 percent; potatoes, up 50 percent; and prunes, up 20 percent. Thus far wholesale prices of dairy products have remained remarkably stable, as have most fresh fruits. Reflecting the increase in the wholesale price of wool, silk, and leather, articles of clothing prepared from these materials are being sold to retailers at prices from 5 to 10 percent higher than 2 months ago. As is true of retail items, the movement of wholesale prices is spotty, but the rising tendency is both sharper and more general. It is still too early to say whether this tendency will continue or to what extent it will gradually be reflected in higher living costs.

Most assuredly, as the European war continues—and some military experts say it will continue for anywhere from 5 to 10 years—the demand for food and all sorts of war materials is bound to create shortages. When demand exceeds supply, there always is a sharp rise in the cost of living. And in that event, it will require more than mere threats to prosecute profiteers to protect W. P. A. workers and their families.

God forbid that the lot of the W. P. A. workers and their families should grow any harder than it is now, but if the cost of living continues to go up I want the responsibility for this relief program and the refusal to fairly adjust W. P. A. wages to rest where it belongs. That is squarely upon the bosom of the Democratic Party. I would hesitate to inject a partisan note into the debate on such a nonpartisan issue as relief if partisanship had not been tossed into our faces by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM], the Democratic leader in charge of this bill. The gentleman from Virginia is an amiable man. He points with partisan pride very gracefully. Let me quote what he had to say when he called up the conference report on the relief bill in the House on June 30 last.

First, the gentleman from Virginia boasted about the refusal of the Federal Government to carry the entire relief load. He then took a crack at some of the chiseling by the theatrical industry, which never should have been permitted to rebuild itself with Government subsidies. Then he bragged about the tardy recognition of the fact that too many highly paid W. P. A. officials would be disappointed because the bill did not carry large increases for them as it usually did. He crowed over the fact that at this late date, his committee had finally cracked down on the unlimited traveling expenses of high-paid W. P. A. officials and administrative expenses also had been cut somewhat. Then he pointed with party pride. Here is what the gentleman from Virginia said:

But this bill will please and it will be heartening to millions of American citizens who are willing to have their Government stretch forth a helping hand to the needy and unfortunate portion of our citizenship, but who wants to see it done in a decent and clean way, and, if I may speak to my own side of the aisle for a moment and be pardoned, I hope I may not be unduly partisan: This bill will please hundreds of thousands of Democrats who have taken great pride in the accomplishment of their party, which stepped into a great emergency and helped the unfortunate people of this country. They can in the future look forward to its program, hold up their heads, and not find things of which to be ashamed.

Naturally, this partisan appeal brought applause from the Democratic side of the House Chamber.

Just the other day, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] announced with complete assurance, that there would be no funds appropriated at the next session of Congress to take care of any deficiency for W. P. A. workers and their families. In other words, no matter what happens, no matter whether the current funds are exhausted long before the end of the fiscal year on June 30, 1940, there will be no deficiency appropriation for the W. P. A. Yes, sir; the gentleman from Virginia pronounced the bill as perfect when it came back from the Senate with the Tarver amendment restored. Come what may, no further funds can be expected for the W. P. A. until after the first of July 1940. Come war, come higher living costs, the administration stands pat on its relief program. No matter what happens through the hard winter, the spring, and the first months of summer, the gentleman from Virginia and the Democratic administration stand pat on the present relief program.

I quote from a Washington dispatch sent out by the United Press on November 7. The headline states, "No deficiency bill for W. P. A., says WOODRUM." Now I quote the body of the story:

Chairman CLIFTON WOODRUM, Democrat, of Virginia, of the House deficiency appropriations subcommittee, served notice today that there would be no deficiency appropriation for the Work Projects Administration at the next session of Congress.

"It is thoroughly understood that there will be no deficiency incurred and no reason whatever for asking for any deficiencies next session."

WOODRUM also indicated that his committee's investigation of W. P. A., which resulted in stringent restrictions in the appropriation bill for this year, would not resume its investigation until January. He said the investigation now was quiescent, although field men have been sending in reports.

WOODRUM disclosed that W. P. A. officials had been warned that they were expected to "make ends meet" on their current appropriations, and that they had agreed to keep within their budget.

Expanding business, it was pointed out, should help W. P. A. to accomplish this job. Last month several hundred thousand additional workers were employed by industry. This should lead, deficiency committee members believe, to a lighter relief load.

W. P. A. was given the full Budget allowance of $1,475,000,000 for this year after a bitter legislative fight last spring between Congress and President Roosevelt. Restrictions were written into the program to make the money go as far as possible.

Now, let us see what has been happening in Pennsylvania under the W. P. A. Let us see what the failure of the W. P. A. in the State to maintain the quota allotted has cost the Commonwealth. That story can best be told by the Honorable Howard L. Russell, secretary of the department of public assistance, at Harrisburg. In a letter to me on November 3, Mr. Russell stated:

The Honorable JAMES E. VAN ZANDT,
House of Representatives, Congress of the United States, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. VAN ZANDT: The failure of the W. P. A. Administration in this State to maintain the quota allotted to Pennsylvania has caused us much concern. For the months of August, September, and October, Pennsylvania has been allotted a quota of 150,000 workers.

There is attached hereto, a report by weeks, showing the quota and the number of persons employed on the W. P. A. by weeks, as well as the extent to which the program has been undermanned. This report covers the period from August 1 to the last report submitted by the W. P. A. on October 25.

The last column on the report shows the potential cost to the State due to the failure of the W. P. A. to maintain their quota. The total of figures in this column amounting to $1,491,039.28 is an estimated figure and is subject to some variation. During August and September, the average weekly relief payment to general assistance cases amounted to $7.33, and we used this average payment in our estimate. The interpretation of this potential cost to the State is based on the fact that we retained on the State relief rolls the number of cases shown in the column "Undermanned" that could have been assigned to the W. P. A. program.

The W. P. A. administration in Pennsylvania has advanced several reasons for their failure to maintain their quota of 150,000. They state that the order to enforce the 18-month lay-off did not erach Harrisburg until August 5. There were approximately 65,000 to be laid off due to this ruling and we were given to understand that this had to be completed by September 1.

It was also stated that the W. P. A. administrative allowance was cut 47 percent, which necessitated reducing the number of area offices in the State from 16 to 10. In this curtailed position they succeeded in getting the required number of men laid off, but did not make replacements fast enough by using other available relief recipients to maintain the quota.

The report shows a marked decline in the number of persons employed on the W. P. A. during August and on September 6, the low point was reached when only 117,169 persons were employed. The trend then rises, but it is noted that on October 25 the employment shows 145,177, which is still 4,823 below the quota.

The Governor appointed a committee of five to represent the State in cooperating with the W. P. A. in an endeavor to reach the quota and maintain it. This committee was appointed in August and found that there were enough projects approved to provide employment for enough men to fill the quota, and there were plenty of available employable workers on the State relief rolls.

When the W. P. A. failed to make very much progress during September in reaching the quota, the Governor appointed another committee of three to investigate the conditions in certain counties where there seemed to be no valid reason for the failure of the W. P. A. to have the required number of men working on projects operating and those projects approved but not started. This committee was comprised of two men representing the Commonwealth and one man representing the W. P. A.

The committee investigated the conditions in Luzerne, Lackawanna, and several smaller counties in that vicinity. The conclusions reached after this investigation showed no valid excuse for the failure of the W. P. A. to have the number of men at work who were needed to man the projects. There were sufficient projects and a large number of available relief recipients who could have been assigned.

Sincerely yours,

HOWARD L. RUSSELL, *Secretary.*

I now wish to present a table furnished to me by Mr. Russell, which tells the story in figures:

Work Projects Administration employment in Pennsylvania, Aug. 1, 1939, to Sept. 25, 1939

Week ending	Work Projects Administration quota	Work Projects Administration employment	Undermanned	Potential cost to the State
Aug. 2, 1939	150,000	140,898	9,102	$66,717.66
Aug. 9, 1939	150,000	137,849	12,151	89,066.83
Aug. 16, 1939	150,000	140,186	9,814	71,936.62
Aug. 23, 1939	150,000	135,885	14,115	103,462.95

Work Projects Administration employment in Pennsylvania, Aug. 1, 1939, to Sept. 25, 1939—Continued

Week ending	Work Projects Administration quota	Work Projects Administration employment	Undermanned	Potential cost to the State
Aug. 30, 1939	150,000	130,034	19,966	$146,350.78
Sept. 6, 1939	150,000	117,169	32,831	240,651.23
Sept. 13, 1939	150,000	121,634	28,366	207,922.78
Sept. 20, 1939	150,000	125,488	24,512	179,672.96
Sept. 27, 1939	150,000	130,863	19,137	140,274.21
Oct. 4, 1939	150,000	138,113	11,887	87,131.71
Oct. 11, 1939	150,000	140,737	9,263	67,897.79
Oct. 18, 1939	150,000	142,551	7,449	54,601.17
Oct. 25, 1939	150,000	145,177	4,823	35,352.59
Total				1,491,039.28

Judging from those figures, it would seem to be necessary for the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to always maintain some form of a vigilance committee to stimulate the W. P. A. toward maintaining the quota. The State certainly should not have to assume this responsibility now when the records show that in November 1938 the W. P. A. employed 286,000 persons. At the present time the State relief rolls are much larger but the W. P. A. seems to be encountering great difficulty in placing only half of that number of persons on work relief projects.

There also is much speculation as to what the W. P. A. will do about increasing the Pennsylvania quota and the number of persons actually put on relief work during the winter months when the quota for the entire country increases. The W. P. A. figure for the country is 1,800,000 persons for November. That jumps to 2,000,000 for December. If W. P. A. gives the Commonwealth its just quota and fills it, from 16,000 to 20,000 more persons in Pennsylvania should be eligible for W. P. A. in December. Pennsylvania should be due for another big boost in January and in February when the total for the country reaches 2,400,000. But will Pennsylvania get a fair share of relief and work relief? We will have to wait and see.

Now let us return to the gentleman from Virginia again. We have heard him claim all the credit for the Democratic Party with respect to this relief measure. Now let me cite some of the things we tried to do to perfect this measure. If the Democratic majority in the House had not voted down the amendments I offered, relief would have been extended to some entirely worthy persons, who really are entitled to relief, but who are ineligible under the present bill.

First, let me say that Republican votes in the House maintained in the bill the $1,475,000,000 requested by the President. The President said that was sufficient, and I for one voted for the full amount. I also voted for proposals to give more money to the rank and file of W. P. A. workers. And I voted for the proposals to keep the high salaries of the head men of the W. P. A. within reason and to hold down their unlimited expense accounts.

Two of the amendments I offered would have served to cushion the hardship to persons dropped from the W. P. A. rolls. One provided 60 days' notice to persons before severance from the service. That was voted down by a storm of "noes" from the Democratic side of the House. An amendment to give 3 weeks' notice before severance met a similar fate.

Another amendment offered by me would have given small-home owners an opportunity to save their homes from going under the sheriff's hammer for delinquent taxes.

Americanism begins in the American home. The American home and its owner is entitled to the protection of the Government he upholds. Under my amendment, a small percentage of W. P. A. jobs would have been available to home owners who were unable to pay their taxes. Half of their wages would have gone for their back taxes. But the gentleman from Virginia and his Democratic cohorts had the bit in their teeth, and that amendment was voted down.

In another amendment I sought to protect the World War and Spanish-American War veterans, their wives and widows,

but to no avail. My amendment, supported by several veterans' organizations, which were denied an opportunity to appear before the Appropriations Committee, also was voted down.

I was among those who supported amendments to protect veterans and persons of 45 years and over in their W. P. A. jobs. Those also were lost in another storm of Democratic "noes."

It may seem unkind to keep harping on the genial gentleman from Virginia, but the gentleman asked for it. He gloated over the fact that the bill "provides every dollar that the Democratic President has asked for relief." He boasted of the fact that the measure had the support of the Democratic leader, Mr. RAYBURN, of Texas, and even the distinguished gentleman from Alabama, Speaker BANKHEAD.

These gentlemen had better make the most of their self-congratulations now, for the W. P. A. workers and their families may not be so quick to forget the winter of their discontent. It is doubtful whether these gentlemen will receive any very hearty congratulations from W. P. A. workers on reduced pay and scanty rations due to rising living costs during the long, cold, cheerless winter.

For myself, I am proud to have been on the losing side. The W. P. A. workers and their families were entitled to the warm-hearted, generous support given them by Republican Members who offered liberalizing amendments, only to be swept aside by the Democratic steam roller. If I had not gone down to defeat with that loyal band, I would not be able to say, "I kept the faith with those who needed help the most."

For God and Country

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH O. BREWSTER

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 3, 1939

ADDRESS BY HON. RALPH O. BREWSTER, OF MAINE

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address I delivered before the State convention and aeronautical field day of the American Legion at Oshkosh, Wis., August 13, 1939:

The first four words of the preamble of the constitution of the American Legion contain the cornerstone for sound recovery. "For God and country we associate ourselves together." Filling again our churches we shall breathe the spirit of the pioneers. We went to war to find the peace that passeth understanding.

History is strewn with the wrecks of great civilizations that have perished when they have deserted their early God. Materialism run rampant is the story of the soviet way of life. At every point it is opposed to the democratic concept of the individual as more important than the state.

The life and spirit of each citizen of a democracy is recognized as the supreme concept. The difficult process of reconciling the clashing of individual wills is yet essential if democracy is to be preserved.

We have passed through the valley of the shadow. We have tottered on the brink of the abyss. But there are now not lacking indications that America is once again upon the march to a better way of life.

No sacrifice of the essential principles of democracy is to be required. No totalitarian ideology of any character needs, in America, to be enthroned.

The veteran sometimes seems brusque in dealing with symptoms of civic unrest. When a comrade wanders unwittingly in range of an enemy machine gun it is sometimes necessary first to slap him down and later to make explanations. Such at least is the spirit in which the veteran seeks to preserve the precious heritage of America.

Freedom to voice honest convictions embraces no tolerance of dishonesty and stealth. The purity of our motives must ask the pardon for any suggestion of excess in zeal.

Love of God and country may well guide and guard America in the future as in the past. The *Mayflower* may still continue constant on its voyage toward the port of an ordered liberty and a religious freedom that distinguishes America in the history of the world.

Young America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH O. BREWSTER

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 3, 1939

ADDRESS BY HON. RALPH O. BREWSTER, OF MAINE

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address I delivered before students of Beal Business College at Bangor, Maine, on October 25, 1939:

The Communist Commissar Molotov and Herr Hitler insist that democracy has failed. They maintain that the intricacy of modern mechanical civilization necessitates a centralized control.

The answer is not to be found in reciting either the Declaration of Independence or the Constitution of the United States but in demonstrating the capacity of a self-governing democracy to put 10,000,000 idle Americans back to work.

The answer is to be found in opening once again the door of opportunity to 10,000,000 young Americans who in the last decade have poured out of our schools ready and willing and anxious to get a job.

This is the challenge to Americans, old and young, and the next decade is going to furnish the answer as to whether the American system is going to continue as a better way of life.

Putting our domestic house in order is the first step in a sound national defense. This winter is going to witness a great campaign of preparedness and in that campaign we shall give consideration not only to adequate armaments but also to proper education of our youth in both mechanical and technical lines.

Making our internal economy function so that there is work for willing hands and that our distributing mechanism is not clogged by lack of purchasing power is everywhere recognized as imperative.

A balanced Budget and a pay-as-you-go policy must soon be achieved if our national economy is not to break down. It is the responsibility of young people with a business education and with a great stake in the future of America to give the attention necessary to think this problem through.

Congress responds most readily to the intelligent interest of those who are active in community affairs.

The opportunity for young Americans to pioneer in solving the problems of this new day within the framework of our democratic institutions is as thrilling as any situation that has tested the spirit of our ancestors in the 10 generations that have brought America to its present position of preeminence among the nations of the earth.

America has a great destiny as it enters its golden age. That destiny is going to be realized in full measure in this generation by solving our domestic problems and keeping America at peace.

Neutrality Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. KING

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, October 27 (legislative day of Wednesday, October 4), 1939

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. WILLIAM H. KING, OF UTAH

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I had intended to discuss the bill under consideration and had prepared some notes and memoranda as a basis for such discussion. However, so much time has been consumed in the consideration of the bill, I shall content myself by requesting that there be inserted in

the RECORD a copy of an address which I delivered over the radio entitled "Neutrality, by Law and in Practice," through the National Broadcasting Co.'s radio system on the evening of July 17 of this year. But since then the bill which I then discussed has been slightly modified, but is essentially the same as the measure now under consideration. I also ask permission to have inserted in the RECORD a statement which I prepared as the basis for an address dealing with the broad question of neutrality.

The matter to be printed in the RECORD is as follows:

NEUTRALITY, BY LAW AND IN PRACTICE

Conflicting views are dividing the American people with respect to the course which our Government should pursue in its international relations.

It is insisted by some that the present Neutrality Act shall be continued. Others insist that it shall be strengthened, and by that they mean that greater restrictions shall be imposed upon our Government and upon our nationals. Others urge that the present Neutrality Act has proven most unsatisfactory and will endanger the peace of our Republic; and, under these circumstances, the demand is made that the Neutrality Act of 1937 be repealed and that our Government chart its course by the principles of international law.

There are those who contend that international law is inadequate to meet situations which international conflicts, particularly if they eventuate in war, develop. In other words, they insist that international law, notwithstanding its importance and pervasive influence, is silent in periods of stress and storm and when the fires of war are lighted.

DISAPPROVED OF DEPARTURE

I was opposed to the Neutrality Act of 1935, which was amended by the act of 1937. I believed it to be a departure from the traditional attitude of our Government with respect to the principles of neutrality. I insist that it was not in harmony with the principles that were announced by Washington and Jefferson, and by which this Nation was governed in its international relations during the intervening years.

The act, as I believed, not only was a restriction upon our Government, but it was an interference with the freedom and liberty of our nationals. I believed then, as I believe now, that it was unneutral and would therefore prove not only unsatisfactory, but might provoke international criticism and possibly international difficulties.

Certainly it was an attempt at isolation, and was a surrender of American rights for which the act itself afforded no compensation.

Briefly, the act provides that the President, whenever he shall find that a state of war exists between two or more foreign states or that civil strife of sufficient magnitude exists in a foreign state, shall proclaim such fact. Thereafter, it shall be unlawful to export arms, ammunition, or implements of war from the United States to any of the belligerents; to purchase, sell, or exchange bonds or other obligations of any belligerent government; to arm any merchant vessel of the United States beyond the extent necessary to preserve discipline aboard such vessel; or for any citizen of the United States to travel on any vessel of a belligerent. It was further provided that the law should not apply to American republics engaged in war against a non-American state, if the American Republic was not cooperating with a non-American state in such war.

RESTRICTED ARMS SHIPMENT

The so-called cash-and-carry provisions of the act, which expired on May 1 last, prohibited the shipping in American vessels of articles, specified by the President, in addition to arms, ammunitions, or implements of war, and allowed their export in foreign ships only after all right, title, and interest had been transferred to a foreign government or agency.

It is to be noted that the act is not to be operative unless and until the President shall find that a state of war exists. In other words, it is entirely within the discretion of the Chief Executive to determine whether or not arms and munitions may be sold to a country engaged in hostilities, whether or not a citizen may purchase bonds of such a government or travel upon her ships. The dangers that inhere in this unfettered discretion—with no standard of any kind to guide the President in making the determination, with no definition of what constitutes a "state of war," with no requirement that a state of war be recognized even though it in fact exists—become apparent.

Criticisms have been leveled against our Government because of its interpretation of the Neutrality Act, as well as the interpretation which has been placed upon its provisions. It is believed by many that under the principles of international law a different course would have been required by our Government in dealing with the Spanish situation and in its dealings with the devastating and tragic war which Japan has waged against China.

Certainly conditions which have existed since the Neutrality Act of 1937 have demonstrated the futility of legislating in advance to meet conditions in a turbulent and changing world.

EITHER ALTERNATIVE RISKY

The discretion resting with the Executive, it is believed by many, is inimical to the interests of the American people and may result in placing the Government in an unneutral position. The moment hostilities occur in any part of the world the President must determine whether or not the resources of this Nation shall continue to flow to the belligerents. If an embargo is laid, it is inconceivable that it would affect both belligerents alike, and the country disadvantageously affected would have grounds for complaint, whereas if the act is not invoked the other belligerent might be injured. Even though the President exercises this discretion solely for the welfare of the United States, the belligerent that is adversely affected can look upon it only as a hostile act on the part of this country. Placing the Government in such an unneutral situation, where it will likely incur disfavor from one side or the other, cannot be cited as an aid in keeping America out of war.

The regulating of foreign commerce is one of the powers entrusted to the Congress by the Constitution, and any discretion to be exercised should be by Congress and not by the executive branch of the Government.

The difficulty in applying the act is further aggravated by the time element. Should it be invoked at the moment the first shot is fired, or should there be an interval during which peace negotiations may be attempted, or until it appears that the war will be of such proportions as to present a threat of involvement to America? If the act be not invoked at once, a belligerent might quickly obtain sufficient arms and other essentials before it is applied. The delay will be regarded by the other belligerent as a hostile and unneutral act toward it.

Another ground for my opposition to the act is that it offers an incentive for aggressive nations to declare war against other nations that are less prepared and less aggressive, for so long as there is peace, arms, ammunitions, and implements of war may be secured from the United States and some other nations. Walter Lippmann states that by repealing the Neutrality Act we shall take away from them (referring to Germany and Italy) the hideous inducement to start a war in order to deprive their opponents of supplies that they can obtain only as long as there is no war.

INFLUENCES WORLD TOWARD PEACE

In the troubled conditions prevailing throughout the world today this Republic, with its great material and moral strength, should lead in the movement toward international peace and friendly cooperation among the family of nations. Dedicated to the high principles of justice and freedom, it has ever sought the settlement of disputes by pacific means. The spiritual force of this democracy has elevated the concept of government in many lands, and its devotion to peace has had its influence upon the world.

The act of 1937 is illogical and, in my opinion, should be repealed. There is no basis for placing an embargo on the sale of arms, ammunitions, and implements of war, and not including in that embargo other articles, such as oil, food, and clothing, that are as essential, if not more so, to the conduct of modern warfare. Surely there is no greater risk in shipping armaments than there is in transporting other articles needed in carrying on military activities. The arbitrary distinction is unfair to certain nations, and, again, places the United States in an unfavorable situation. Industrial countries do not need arms and munitions if they can import the raw materials with which to manufacture them; but some countries that are primarily agricultural are in dire need of the manufactured articles themselves; and their embargo, while permitting the exportation of scrap iron and other essential raw materials from which they are made, operates to the disadvantage of nonindustrial nations.

In this troubled world condition, legislation in advance concerning our foreign policy cannot be planned intelligently. Our short experience under the present act has demonstrated the impossibility of formulating a rule that will guide the United States in international conflicts that may arise. We cannot foresee who will be at war, or the cause of the same. We cannot divine the issues that will be involved, nor can we give expression to what the public sentiment in this country will be 6 months from now, or 1 year, or 5 years.

SURRENDERS CONCEDED RIGHTS

The act of 1937 is a surrender of conceded neutral rights even before war breaks out. In the event of a conflict, having surrendered certain rights, I fear we shall have to enumerate rights which we intend to hold fast. Belligerents are not concerned in the details of local legislation. They are at war, and admit restraints grudgingly—restraints imposed by the principles of international law, as they have come to be accepted through centuries of warfare.

There is no justification for the surrender of our neutral rights. There is no requirement for such self-denial. Dulles and Armstrong, in their work entitled "Can We Be Neutral?" have pointed out the source of a great deal of the confusion in formulating a neutrality policy. In restricting our shipping and giving up other rights during times of war, what is our purpose? Are we trying to keep out of war or are we trying to prevent war? If the former, then clearly we should surrender these rights only when there is danger to our peace in not surrendering them; that is, during a war when the belligerents have substantial control of the sea. If this is the purpose, it is obviously futile to legislate on the subject in advance of knowing whether the peace interests of the United States are at stake.

If the purpose is to prevent war, concerted action by several great powers would be the only effective curb. The futility of one nation attempting a partial or general embargo against belligerents in order to prevent war has been demonstrated throughout history. It is

too clear for argument that if the United States refuses to sell certain articles to countries at war, others producing the same articles will gladly supply the warring nations. The restriction on our own trade is merely a deprivation for the benefit of our foreign competitors. And it must be remembered that Americans, by nature, will oppose restraints upon their rights and freedom unless the justification therefor is clear.

But, regardless of the purpose, so long as the ultimate end is to avoid being drawn into a war, the Neutrality Act presents dangers to American peace interests; and any neutrality measure must be carefully and skillfully drawn because of the almost certain danger of its operating as an unneutral measure.

The United States has not often been a belligerent, and, therefore, has been primarily interested in determining the rights of neutrals, particularly with reference to matters affecting trade and commerce. This has resulted in announcing, as an international policy, the freedom of the seas. Our Nation has been foremost in championing the freedom of the seas, and I am unwilling to favor a policy, adopted in the act of 1937, which, in effect, is an attempt to seek isolation by the abdication of our rights at sea, if not on land.

It is apparent that we cannot be isolated from all possible dangers of international conflicts, and no policy of alleged neutrality should be adopted which narrows the rights of our country or weakens international law. The rights of neutrals and belligerents should rest on recognized principles of the law of nations. This does not mean that treaties should not be entered into between nations for the purpose of promoting peace and widening the opportunities for trade and commerce and cultural and economic development.

It is impossible to determine what course governments will pursue in the near or in the distant future. When the World War broke out, neutral nations did not know, and neither did the belligerents, what the lines of battle would be, or what instrumentalities of death and destruction would be employed. The announcement by a nation of the course it will pursue in the event of an international conflict probably would prove impotent in averting war or preventing the nation in question from being drawn within the field of international conflict. If our Nation announced to the world in advance what our policy would be, and what inhibitions will be imposed upon our Nation and upon our nationals, it might prove advantageous to aggressive nations now preparing to enter the field of war. A unitary declaration of policy may give belligerents an opportunity to formulate their plans with reference to the announced policy of the nation making such a declaration. Moreover, the unilateral announcement of a policy imposes some restrictions, so that when the conflagration comes it would be prohibited from adopting different plans and different regulations when the exigencies of the situation demanded a change. To alter the announced plan might prove advantageous to one or more of the belligerents, to the disadvantage of other belligerents, and thus subject the United States to the charge of favoring one belligerent over another.

As indicated, in the event of an international conflict, regulations which one nation may promulgate, hoping to prevent its being drawn into the conflict, would not be accepted by belligerents if advantages might be derived by ignoring them, so that if we surrender, as the law of 1937 provides, some of our neutral rights, we need not expect that belligerents will be more constrained to regard conceded neutral rights or national territory.

FREEZES UNITED STATES ACTION

As I have indicated, the act of 1937 seeks to deprive Americans the freedom of action in the event of a foreign war. It serves notice in advance that our Government will draw no distinctions between the violators of international law and the victims of such violation.

I opposed the act of 1937, believing that it would encourage armament at home, if not abroad, and that the American people would be called upon to increase their already heavy appropriations for military and naval purposes. This prediction has come true, and the appropriations for so-called preparedness, which will be made by the present Congress for the next fiscal year, will exceed $2,000,000,000.

It is believed that the American people will not collaborate with other nations to enforce peace. Accordingly, we should not approve legislation which ties the hands of the Government and thus deny us an opportunity to act for our own best interests if and when the fires of war spread throughout the world.

For the reasons stated, and others that might be mentioned, the neutrality legislation, in my opinion, should be repealed, and we should take our stand upon the foundation and precepts of international law.

It is contended, however, that these principles were violated during the World War, that treaties and solemn pacts are ignored and broken with impunity, and that therefore international law is dead.

Assuming the above contention to be true, if the alternative to international law—the Neutrality Act—offered a guaranty of peace, there would be validity in the argument that we should rely upon the Neutrality Act to keep us out of war; but since it is admitted that there can be no guaranty of peace, it becomes our duty to follow such a course as will give the United States the most security in its intention to remain at peace. The grave complications that are likely to result from tying the hands of Government by declaring a policy in advance of circumstances that cannot be predicted, may not be minimized. I have adverted to a few of the embarrassments that the United States will face in the event of an international conflict if our course is charted by the act of 1937, and these will tend to involve the country in war far more than situations that may arise under the rules of international law.

WORLD LAW STILL LIVES

I cannot subscribe to the view that the law of nations is dead. Dr. John Bassett Moore, the eminent authority on international law, who was for 6 years a judge of the Permanent Court of International Justice, insists that it has not ceased to exist merely because its principles have been violated. He declares:

"It has never heretofore been supposed that when belligerents violated international law they believed that they were destroying it or depriving it of its obligatory force."

Has it ever been suggested that, because people are from time to time murdered, there is no criminal law forbidding homicide? Is it not true that the laws exist whether the criminal is apprehended and punished or not? A violation of municipal law has never been regarded as a destruction of that law; and so it is with international law.

International law is recognized among all nations. It is a term applied to that body of rules and regulations of states and other bodies possessing international personality.

It is more than policies adopted in diplomatic relations; it finds expression in comity among nations; it is a part of the law of the land, recognized by the courts and by judicial tribunals in all civilized nations. It has been implemented and strengthened by agreements, treaties, customs, and concrete and ordered dealings among states. International law was recognized in ancient Greece, but it declined under the Roman Empire. It has been said that the birth of international law is traceable to the Peace of Westphalia.

MULTILATERAL IN APPLICATION

It is not unilateral but multilateral, and is in part due to compromises among nations under the terms of which selfish state laws or international policies are modified in the interest of better relations among nations. It is a recognition of the importance of higher moral standards among nations and a broader spirit of tolerance and justice. Grotius, and other great writers on international law, sought to mitigate the spirit of fierce nationalism and to secure a recognition by nations of what might be called "natural justice." They sought to modify the doctrine of exclusive sovereignty of nations and to bring about a certain amount of collectivity of action among nations. Various international conferences have been held for the purpose of codifying international law and formulating broader policies for the promotion of world peace.

There is an international law of war and an international law of peace. The former was the more important in the first centuries of the development of international law, and it developed rules of neutrality, including blockades, contraband, visits and search, and policies to mitigate the sufferings of the people in time of war. Prize courts were developed under international law and arbitrations of international disputes encouraged and recognized. As nations advanced in civilization, a higher ethical concept was developed, and the principles of international law became more firmly established and more generally recognized.

More recently efforts have been made to develop international machinery for the purpose of outlawing war and to make more effective the principles of international law. In the evolution of the principles of international law, emphasis was early laid on impartiality toward belligerents, but more recently methods are being sought to determine the justice of war and who are the aggressors. Neutrals are to aid in bringing pressure upon wrongdoers.

This undoubtedly is a modification of the accepted principles of international law, and may effect the accepted principles of neutrality. International law is concerned not alone with international conflicts, but it has to do with international peace and the promotion of those policies which make for world peace.

DOES NOT COMPEL SILENCE

And so the view is being developed that international law, with its emphasis upon neutrality, does not compel neutral nations to be silent in the face of assaults by powerful states upon weak and unoffending peoples. In other words, in determining the course to be pursued by neutrals, consideration is being given to the question of justice and ethics and morality which arise or grow out of international conflicts; and the conduct of belligerents is being weighed by neutral nations, and the course of the latter is influenced by the verdict as to which of the belligerents was the aggressor, and whether its conduct calls for universal condemnation. This, as I have indicated, may result in profound changes in the law of neutrality and affect the application of international law.

Bainbridge Colby, former Secretary of State, has stated:

"It is a well-known principle of international law that the measure of a nation's neutral obligations is to be found in the rules of international law and nowhere else. As a result of centuries of wars, this group of principles was evolved by which belligerents and neutrals achieved some reasonably definite guides to the conduct of their reciprocal relations on land and sea. The adoption of these rules has been regarded throughout the civilized world as a victory for civilization over brute force, for law over anarchy."

International law is comprised of a great body of custom and precedent, of treaties and conventions, of weighty opinions and authoritative court decisions, of arbitral awards and instructions issued by civilized nations for the guidance of their diplomatic and other organs, of historic state papers, and the texts of historians and jurists.

WARNS OF ECONOMIC LOSSES

Mr. Colby warns that the principles of international law, despite the opinion in some quarters that it is a thing of the past, may nevertheless be tellingly invoked to show the unneutrality of the act of 1937. "If we assume the nonexistence of international law because of its unpunished violations during the last war, we may find ourselves confronted by it in all its rigor when our conduct is challenged under its ancient and established rules. We may find that we have consigned our shipping to disuse, transferred the trade of our citizens to foreign competitors and undermined fatally our domestic economy, discovering too late that our new and ingenious formulas have not worked as expected."

The rules of international law may not prove in themselves a source of complete protection. But we shall know what our rights are and we can determine in each instance what degree of self-restraint or forbearance we can afford to practice.

Our present Neutrality Act does not lend to the strengthening of the principles of international law; rather, it is a renunciation of those principles. This Nation, occupying a high place among the countries of the world, with its material and spiritual strength, should take the lead in bringing about international cooperation and peace.

Mr. President, I intend to vote for the pending measure, but will do so with considerable reluctance, because it contains some provisions with which I am not in accord and which I believe will prove disadvantageous to our country. The President in his message calling Congress into extraordinary session points out the importance of repealing the embargo provision of the act of 1937. I share the view of the President and believe that I am warranted in supporting his position, even though in so doing I must vote for a bill which contains provisions which I regard as harmful to our country.

As indicated in the radio address to which I have referred, I was opposed to the act of 1937, and particularly to the embargo provisions found therein. The present measure repeals the act of 1937, including, of course, the obnoxious embargo provision. Many of the provisions of the act of 1937 are found in the pending bill, and though I was opposed to that act, the measure before us, notwithstanding its objectionable features, has sufficient merit to justify me in voting for it. The pending measure, if enacted into law, will prove disappointing to the American people. It will be but a slight deterrent to the United States being involved in the present European conflict. It certainly does not immunize the United States against the flames of war and will not insulate this Republic against the dangers of war. It will prevent some of the dangers which will attend the European conflict, but it will not, in my opinion, afford any guaranty that this Republic will be immune from the war germs which are now infecting many countries. Certainly the bill before us can scarcely be called a neutrality act; it is, rather, a measure to repeal some of the accepted principles of international law, and to that extent to shackle the hands of this Republic.

It is a waiver, if not a repeal, of many of the accepted and well-established principles of international law—principles for which this Republic contended for more than 150 years; it is a unilateral attack upon international law, and, as I have indicated, is an attempt to repeal vital and important principles of the law of nations which have received the approval of civilized nations. We propose to enact a law under the terms of which we abandon or waive rights which have been molded into canons of international law and which have been a bulwark for the protection of states weak and strong. It is proposed that we enter upon this course upon the belief that it will prevent the United States from being drawn into the maelstrom of the present world conflict. As stated, it abandons what our country has always contended for—freedom of the seas and the right of the Americans to engage in trade and commerce with the nations of the world. It will drive many of our ships from the seas, close American ports, throw tens of thousands of persons out of employment, and injure, if not destroy, at least for the present and the near future, American shipping.

The losses, not only to American shipping but to American people, will aggregate billions of dollars, and, in my opinion, the Federal Government will be asked to reimburse shipping interests to the extent of hundreds of millions of dollars.

As stated, by statute we propose deliberately to limit our maritime trade and to drive scores of American vessels from the seas, with consequent losses, not only to the owners of ships but to millions of American citizens. The American people will learn that this Republic, with all of its wealth, is not self-contained, that it is still a part of the world, and that its interests, material as well as moral and spiritual, are intertwined with the interests of millions of people in all parts of the world. A great sacrifice is being demanded of the American people and, indeed, of the peace-loving peoples of the world in the passage of this bill. And yet so great is the desire of the American people to prevent the United States from being drawn into war they apparently are willing to make the great sacrifice which I have so imperfectly indicated.

Some of the notes which I indicated it was my purpose to present in this address deal generally with the importance of international law and its application to the present world situation. Though I shall vote for the bill, I shall criticize some of its provisions as unsound and unnecessary to the realization of the desired objective.

The proposals for neutrality are nothing more than suggested methods by which a common end is sought, namely, to keep the United States out of war. A discussion of legislation designed to keep us out of war is futile unless it is agreed at the outset that the country's prime objective is to remain at peace. The overwhelming sentiment of our citizens and the administration is such that it is safe to assume, as a common ground for the consideration of this legislation, that the United States wants peace.

Peace being the objective, the question remains: What course can best be pursued by our Government to keep it free from involvement in a foreign war? Is it best that we absolutely prohibit the shipment of arms and munitions to belligerents? Should a general embargo on all goods be applied? Is the so-called cash-and-carry plan sound as an instrument in securing American peace? If so, should it be extended to arms and munitions? Should the United States choose aggressor nations and apply sanctions against them alone? Or are the peace interests of our people best served through having no neutrality legislation at all?

These are questions that should be answered before an intelligent course may be charted. And the logical method of attacking the problem is to consider carefully the advantages and disadvantages of each proposal. For, let it not be misunderstood, the legislation cannot be conceived that will absolutely immunize this country against going to war. Such, in the very nature of things, is an impossibility.

The problem, then, is one of choice. As between the conflicting methods, which is the most likely to assure American peace?

As I have indicated, for 150 years our Government has been guided by the principles of international law as they were developed and received recognition. It is now proposed, as I have stated, to abandon rights which have been written into the law of nations.

It may be said that the so-called neutrality law, as now stated by some supporting this measure, was not known to us before the World War. As I have indicated, we were dependent upon the rules of international law for the protection of our interests as a neutral. Because we were engulfed in the World War, it is claimed by some that in periods of conflict international law is not adequate.

I do not accept this view. Dr. John Bassett Moore, the leading authority on international law of today, insists that international law has not ceased to exist merely because its principles have been violated. He states:

It has never heretofore been supposed, that, when belligerents violated international law, they believed that they were destroying it or depriving it of its obligatory force. It is a maxim of

the common law that in the midst of arms the laws are silent; but this does not mean that the laws cease to exist. On the contrary, the maximum merely recognizes the fact that, in an armed struggle, the exertion of force is likely to be carried beyond ordinary legal bounds.

Has it ever been suggested that, because people are from time to time murdered, there is no criminal law forbidding homicide; or that, larcenies are committed, we are no longer to abide by the laws against larceny? And, is it not true that the laws exist whether the criminal is apprehended and punished or not? Indeed, no one will contend that there is no law of contracts simply because contracts have been and are being breached.

A violation of municipal law has never yet been regarded as a destruction of that law. Citizens of the United States have certain rights that are protected from invasion. Life is one of those rights—inalienable under our Declaration of Independence. Yet a person who is murdered is surely deprived of that right. The fact that murderers are at large today is no basis for concluding that there is no law in the United States, or that our inalienable rights are nonexistent.

So it is with international law. It is as binding upon nations and their actions as is municipal law upon nationals. True, there is no enforcing agency such as maintains the integrity of local law; but it is none the less binding. Law—whether State, National, or international—is dependent upon the will of the governed for its existence. As former Secretary of State Bainbridge Colby states:

> It is a well-known principle of international law that the measure of a nation's neutral obligations is to be found in the rules of international law and nowhere else. As a result of centuries of wars, this group of principles was evolved by which belligerents and neutrals achieved some reasonably definite guides to the conduct of their reciprocal relations on land and sea.
>
> The adoption of these rules has been regarded throughout the civilized world as a victory for civilization over brute force—for law over anarchy. Belligerents had an incentive to observe them in order to hold down claims and to avoid the risk of adding to the list of their enemies; neutrals, in order not to expose themselves to legitimate criticism, damages, and attack, and not to risk plunging their people into a war.

We cannot assume the nonexistence of international law because of its unpunished violations during times of war, or because of its want of a sovereign enforcing power. It is comprised of a great body of custom and precedent, of treaties and conventions, of weighty opinions and authoritative court decisions, of arbitral awards and instructions issued by civilized nations for the guidance of their diplomatic and other organs, of historic state papers, and the texts of historians and jurists.

These constitute the safest guide for our foreign policy. Despite their shortcomings, there is no other code of international conduct and procedure—none that is so embedded in the consciousness and practice of mankind, and which it is impossible to replace with anything better.

Has international law ceased to exist? An answer to this question—and what seems to me to be the only tenable answer—is given by Judge Moore, who served for 6 years as a judge of the Permanent Court of International Justice. His was the honor to preside over an international conference, held at The Hague during 1922–23, to promulgate rules for the regulation of the activities of aircraft and radio in time of war. Parties to this conference were the United States, Great Britain, France, Italy, Japan, and the Netherlands.

Dr. Moore, speaking of this conference in his article, An Appeal to Reason, published in Foreign Affairs for July 1933, states:

> The delegates acted under the instructions of their respective governments. An examination of our unanimous report [which will be mentioned later] will show that it was largely devoted to the definition of the rights and duties of belligerents and of neutrals in time of war, and that it treated as still existing the Land War Neutrality Convention, the Convention for the Adaptation of the Geneva Convention to Maritime Warfare, and the Convention Concerning Neutral Rights and Duties in Maritime Warfare, all made at The Hague in 1907. The idea that the law of neutrality had become obsolete never was broached.
>
> So far as I am aware, not a single party to the Versailles Treaty or a single member of the League of Nations has ever taken the position that the law of neutrality is a thing of the past. The principal powers in the League have on occasion taken precisely the opposite position. All the judges of the World Court, in the *Kiel Canal case*, unhesitatingly concurred in the view that the law of neutrality remained unmodified; no one thought of doubting its continuing force. Up to the time of my resignation from the Court, in 1928, no such doubt had been whispered; nor am I aware that any has since been suggested. In the war between Greece and Turkey in 1922, Great Britain decided to remain neutral in the conflict, into which Canada and perhaps some of the other self-governing dominions unequivocally announced that they would not be drawn without their consent. In the statement made in the House of Commons by Sir John Simon, as Secretary for Foreign Affairs, on February 27, 1933, concerning the embargo (soon revoked) on the shipment of arms to China and Japan, Sir John expressly spoke of Great Britain as a neutral government, and of the necessity, for that reason, of making the embargo apply to China and Japan alike. In other recent wars Great Britain has pursued a neutral course. France and other governments have done the same thing. On the recent declaration of war by Paraguay against Bolivia, the Governments of Argentina, Chile, and Peru immediately issued declarations of neutrality, thus showing [as they intended to remain neutral] an intelligent respect for international law, to the literature of which some of their publicists have ably contributed.

As indicating the recognition by the United States and other governments of international law, I call attention to the treaty signed at Washington on February 6, 1922, and ratified by the Senate in March of the same year. That treaty expressly recognizes the force and effect of the principles of international law. France, Italy, Great Britain, and Japan joined with the United States in that treaty, which declares that the signatory powers "desiring to make more effective the rules adopted by civilized nations for the protection of the lives of neutrals and noncombatants at sea in time of war, have determined to conclude a treaty to this effect."

It declares that these rules adopted by civilized nations are the rules of neutrality which have come to be recognized as guides through centuries of war, and are "an established part of international law."

It is not necessary to further indicate the provisions of the treaty, but it is clear that the purpose was to reaffirm the acceptance by the signatory powers to the same, of the vitality and authority of international law.

It is claimed by some that the rules of international law may not be enforced. Though conceding that some belligerents may disregard the obligations under international law, it cannot be denied that, notwithstanding these lapses from the path of duty, international law still remains as a guide and protection to nations and is unimpaired in its authority and power. Experience has shown that the law of nations is judicially administered in the courts, not only of the United States but in all civilized lands. We all know that the courts of admiralty in the United States and elsewhere are in a true sense courts for the administration of the law of nations.

Ex-Secretary of State Colby has said:

> As for the opinion that nations are bound by the law of treaty only and that there is no other law of nations, Lord Stowell rejected it as fit only for Barbary pirates, and I may add that American opinion, whether expressed in judicial decisions, in Presidential messages, and other domestic acts of state, or in diplomatic intercourse, has been invariable in the same sense ever since we became a nation.

Dr. Moore's position in the field of international law and jurisprudence generally is recognized among all civilized nations, and for that reason I bring to the attention of the Senate his clear and unequivocal statements upon this matter:

> I have been wont to remark that international wars will cease when civil wars end. Within the state there is legal organization and sanction beyond anything yet proposed in the international sphere, while the very phrase "civil" implies that the war is outlawed. Nevertheless, when obliged to characterize the civil strife then raging in the United States, our Supreme Court, after observing that a civil war was "never solemnly declared," but became such "by its accidents—the number, power, and organization of the persons who originate and carry it on," learnedly declared that "the laws of war, as established among nations, have their foundation in reason, and all tend to mitigate the cruelties and misery produced by the scourge of war," and that in consequence, "the parties to a civil war usually concede to each other courtesies and rules common to public or national wars." And the Court then

adopted from Vattel, renowned for his learning and humanity, this profoundly illuminating passage:

"The common laws of war—those maxims of humanity, moderation, and honor—ought to be observed by both parties in every civil war. Should the sovereign conceive he has a right to hang up his prisoners as rebels, the opposite party will make reprisals; * * * should he burn and ravage, they will follow his example; the war will become cruel, horrible, and every day more destructive to the nation."

I have referred to efforts by unitary action to modify international law. May I add that it should be clear that the duties of neutrality, as well as the rights of neutrals, according to the rules of international law, cannot be expanded or contracted by national legislation, and a nation attempting to avoid entanglement cannot shelter itself under the plea that its own unilateral legislation either permits or enforces acts or omissions not recognized by international law as pertaining to the proper conduct of a neutral.

Though it may be conceded that the law of nations may be violated, we are not justified in assuming its nonexistence. If we adopt that view, our Government might find itself confronted by demands made upon it for the enjoyment of those rights established and guaranteed by the law of nations. Mr. Colby has stated that—

We may find that we have consigned our shipping to disuse, transferred the trade of our citizens to foreign competitors, and undermined fatally our domestic economy, discovering too late that our new and ingenious formulas have not worked as expected.

In my opinion, no public official of standing has ever had the temerity to declare that he or his government were not bound by the law of nations and its principles. The provisions of international law may not prove in themselves, either through a dispute as to their application or through a defiance of them on the part of belligerent states, a source of complete protection. But we shall know what our rights are, and we can determine in each instance what degree of self-restraint or forbearance we can afford to practice.

As I have stated, our Government, for more than 150 years, has followed the principles of neutrality developed under international law. It is said that this form of neutrality provides that neutrals at all times shall enjoy freedom of trade in all commodities with belligerents and the latter similar trade with neutrals subject only to such restrictions as one belligerent may, under international law, place upon another by blockade or otherwise.

As we know, in many periods of conflict nations have maintained their neutral status and continued their peaceful pursuits. Under a different policy of neutrality they have attempted to prescribe rules to determine relations among nations even before it was known or could be anticipated what the conflicts might develop. If I interpret the law of 1937, its provisions were regarded as representing a hazardous departure from the established principles of international law. My recollection is that executive officials indicated that its wholly inflexible provisions might, under unforseeable conditions, have exactly the opposite effect from that which was intended. In other words, the inflexible provisions might drag us into war instead of keeping us out. We cannot close our eyes to the nature and extent of the conflict in Europe. Russia and Germany, with similar ideologies and apparently with ambitions for extension of their territory and dominion, may widen their fields of operation and multiply the engines of destruction upon sea and upon land and in the air. Their efforts for conquest may not be halted or limited by the most conciliatory course pursued by European or other nations, and the enactment of laws by the United States limiting and restricting the rights of its nationals may not restrain the governments referred to from military and naval activities violative of the rights of American citizens.

Our present neutrality law of 1937 is predicated upon the belief that it will keep us at peace where the rules of international law failed us, that the law is calculated to remove the causes that were instrumental in getting us into the last war. It is said that the sinking of the *Lusitania*—the loss of American lives upon belligerent vessels—was one factor which led us to participate. Hence, the present law forbids the traveling of United States citizens upon belligerent ships. The loaning of American money to the Allies was another factor which it is said contributed to our entering the war. Therefore, the present law forbids such loans to belligerent governments. The sinking of American ships and the destruction of American property were other factors. Under the cash-and-carry plan which has expired, materials essential to war, as listed by the President, could not be shipped to belligerents in American vessels; nor could they be shipped at all while a United States citizen had any right, title, or interest in the goods.

The conclusion is inevitable that our neutrality law is based upon the belief that the loss of American lives and the destruction of American property were the principal factors which led to our participation in the World War. As a result, the act proceeds upon the theory that if the possibility of the destruction of American property and the loss of American lives is reduced to a minimum in any future war, there is less likelihood of our Government's becoming involved in that war. And the bill before us contains the same provision as the act of 1937.

As Gen. Hugh S. Johnson stated before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, page 277, hearings:

What public opinion in this country decided—what made the original neutrality laws possible as I see it—was a very simple thing. It was that, in view of the great burning we had just had at the roasting of other people's chestnuts, we didn't think that our commercial rights as neutrals at international law were worth fighting for. That as I see it is what the original neutrality laws said and that was all they said.

They were not intended as a way to get us into any war on the earth's surface—for or against anybody. They were the exact reverse of that. They were intended as a sacrifice of age-old rights on the ocean—not to get us into war, but to keep us out of war. They said, in effect, that neither American-owned goods nor American-owned ships shall venture into waters where their destruction or seizure might lead us into war.

In considering this legislation, we must remember the force of man's emotions. Walter Hines Page has said that "A government may be neutral, but no man can be." We all recall that—

Even when war broke out in a region as remote as Ethiopia, the majority of Americans took sides. This was not due to any direct attack upon our national interest; and the fact that many of them favored the Ethiopians was not because the Ethiopian propaganda machinery was more active than that of Italy, or because our material interests were bound up in an Ethiopian victory—quite the contrary.

The plain fact is that our sentiments will become engaged in almost any conflict, especially if it is prolonged and involves general principles in which we are interested. Possibly this shows our naïveté. Possibly it is to our credit. In any event the characteristic is an American one of long standing. We cannot rely for the maintenance of neutrality on the calm and measured judgment of our press and people. Any serious incident which seemed to involve our national honor would find us again ready to fight, despite our devotion to peace in the abstract and despite the activities of peace societies or the churches. (Can We Be Neutral?—Dulles and Armstrong.)

The Neutrality Act is designed to prevent these "incidents"—loss of American lives and property—which will arouse public sentiment in our country to the point of a willingness to fight. It is termed a "Neutrality Act." That this is a misnomer is recognized, since the act, though perhaps neutral in terms, may operate in an unneutral manner. And, it is apparent that so long as the act operates advantageously as applied to nations with whom we sympathize, the American people do not object. It is also true that when its operation will favor a nation that is regarded by us as an aggressor, the policy will break down. No more vivid illustration of this can be cited than the present Japanese-Chinese War.

What, then, are the relative merits of the divergent proposals? Is any one of them better than having no neutrality legislation at all.

WHEN DOES A STATE OF WAR EXIST?

One of the most perplexing problems in the operation of the neutrality law lies in the very act of making the law applicable to particular situations. The present act and all the proposed

amendments run into this difficulty. If war is formally declared, of course, there is no problem. But if there is no declaration someone must determine whether a state of war does exist. If Congress is to make that determination, there is no need for a neutrality bill in advance, for Congress, when it finds that the state of war exists, can easily adopt the course that this Nation will pursue in remaining neutral insofar as that particular war is concerned. But, under the present law, and under all the suggested amendments thereto, it is left to the President to ascertain and proclaim when a state of war exists. There is nothing to guide him in making this determination, nor is there a requirement that he find that a state of war exists, even when it is common knowledge that a war of vast proportions is actually being fought.

Prof. Charles A. Beard has criticized the provision conferring discretion upon the Executive; he contends that such authorization is violative of the principles upon which our Government is founded and confers too great authority upon the Executive. Without assenting to Professor Beard's views, the question posed is one of importance considered constitutionally or from other points.

It is the opinion of some that the discretion already vested in the Chief Executive under the Neutrality Act is excessive, and, therefore, there should be no enlargement of discretion such as is sought in some pending measures. I say this with no implication that this discretion would be abused by any Executive, but it is too great a burden to be carried by any individual.

When the framers of the Constitution declared that Congress should have the exclusive power to declare war, I think it was their intention to confide the decision of this momentous issue to the representatives of the people. I doubt if any member of the Constitutional Convention envisioned the growth of the Presidential discretion, or had the slightest realization that the determination of the question of peace or war for the Nation might grow out of Executive acts before Congress had an opportunity to consider or debate the question or even to sense the danger of impending war. Many years after the adoption of the Constitution during the administration of President Polk, we had a painful illustration of the consequences of Executive improvidence in the preliminaries which led to the Mexican War.

I am calling attention to these views merely for the purpose of indicating the difference of opinion with respect to the act of 1937, as well as to the measure before us. Doubtless many believe that the Chief Executive should possess the discretion referred to. They entertain the view that no Executive would abuse such discretion or adopt a course which would be harmful to the Republic.

The futility of advance legislation on neutrality has been clearly shown in the short history of the present act. There were no strong interests opposed to the placing of the act in operation during the war between Italy and Ethiopia. The latter did very little trading with this country, and so it was correctly believed that an embargo placed upon Italy and Ethiopia would not injure Ethiopia, and would injure or, at least, inconvenience Italy, which was regarded as an aggressor by our people. Hence, the act went into operation.

But the hostilities in the Orient presented an entirely different picture, just as every conflict must be different from every other one. American sentiment was strongly in favor of China, and yet the operation of the act would have done her damage while benefiting Japan. Therefore it was not recognized that a war existed.

It is strange that one reason advanced by the proponents of neutrality legislation is that international law slumbers during times of war. The neutrality legislation can be validly attacked upon the same ground; surely it has slumbered during the Sino-Japanese War.

Legislation in advance regarding our foreign policy has been condemned as impractical. Our experience under the present act has demonstrated the impossibility of attempting to establish a rule that will guide our country in every international conflict that may arise. We cannot foresee who will be at war and what they will be fighting for in any given instance. If the act is to be applied in some situations and not in others, where lies the virtue of establishing such a policy? If the Government is to formulate its policy to govern each individual conflict as it arises, what is the reason for promulgating a rule ostensibly to apply to all future troubles, when it is known that the rule will be followed or not, as the exigencies of the particular situation demand? If the act is to be invoked in some wars and not in others, according to whether American sympathies would approve the results accomplished by such action or nonaction, it seems clear that certain nations involved in conflict will naturally regard the affirmative or negative action by our Government as being hostile to them. When we refuse to apply the act the nations harmed by such refusal will look upon it in an unfriendly manner.

It is worthy of note that in determining whether a state of war exists, the time element is brought into the equation. Should the act be applied at the moment the first gun is fired, or should there be an interval during which peace negotiations may be attempted or the policy of other neutrals ascertained? If the act be not invoked at once, one country might be able to obtain arms and munitions and other essential war materials quickly, before it is applied. The delay will be looked upon by the other country as a hostile act toward it.

The very unneutrality of the choice that must be made under the act, and the grave complications that may easily result therefrom are arguments against the neutrality legislation but not necessarily controlled.

THE ABSOLUTE EMBARGO ON ARMS, MUNITIONS, AND IMPLEMENTS OF WAR

An embargo upon all trade with belligerents would meet with strenuous protest by American business interests, as well as by all Americans, inasmuch as it would seriously affect our entire economic system. The sacrifice would be too great, despite the danger to American interests in continuing trade unabated.

But an embargo only upon arms, munitions, and implements of war meets with slight opposition in this country, and for various reasons. The consequent restriction in the munitions industry would not imperil our national prosperity. And then there is the natural abhorrence of death-dealing material which dictates that America should not denounce war as barbarous on the one hand, and on the other supply the nations engaged therein with the means of carrying on the barbarities. Then, too, there is the feeling that if the United States does not sell arms and munitions to countries at war the conflict might come more quickly to an end, especially if other nations follow the course of this country and apply like embargoes.

The argument in favor of an embargo upon munitions, and so forth, lies in the fact that American vessels carrying such articles to a belligerent are likely to be sunk by the other belligerent. The validity of this argument cannot be denied. Other than the likelihood of the loss of American lives and property, however, there is no good reason why the sale of arms should be any different than the sale of other articles which are essential to the conduct of modern warfare. Food, clothing, and raw materials are perhaps more needed today in the successful conduct of a war than are the actual means of battle. It is this fact which no doubt has led some Senators and others to urge the removal of the absolute embargo upon the sale of arms, munitions, and implements of war, and to place them in the same category as other articles essential to a country engaged in war. That is, upon the cash-and-carry plan. The belief is that if the United States has no interest in the ship that carries the goods, nor in the arms, munitions, and implements of war themselves, there is nothing in the mere sale of these articles which will lead to American entanglement. At least, no more so than in the sale of other war essentials.

It has been pointed out that during the World War the list of contraband goods was so extended as to include practically every item of any commercial importance in world trade. Great Britain regarded a great many articles other than arms, munitions, and implements of war as essential in the conduct of the war, and her list of contraband became so large that to observe it would have meant in reality to stop our export trade to the Central Powers. Starving a nation into submission in this day and age would perhaps be far

more effective and quicker than to compel her surrender through depriving her armies of guns and shells. It was repeatedly brought out in the hearings before the Senate Foreign Affairs Committee that there is no valid distinction today between arms and other goods which are essential in time of war. These goods being regarded as contraband, there is as much danger to American peace in shipping them as there is in shipping arms and munitions. The arbitrary classification, therefore, would appear untenable under modern warfare conditions.

Nothing in international law prevents neutrals from exporting arms to belligerents. There are reasons why nations should not bind themselves in advance to refrain from such exports unreservedly and in all cases. Many believe that the United States should not in advance surrender all its liberty of action in future wars, and thereby find itself unable to negotiate with other neutral nations to help terminate conflicts.

To the industrial countries of Europe, raw materials are far more important than arms and munitions; and if the United States should place an absolute embargo upon the shipment of arms, such action would not hurt those industrial nations, so long as raw materials could still be shipped. On the other hand, a country that is not industrial, as, for example, most of the South American countries, is in dire need of arms and munitions when faced with war.

The operation of an absolute embargo upon arms and munitions is regarded by many as unfair in that it necessarily favors countries which already have the arms or which can easily manufacture them or buy them elsewhere. It should be remembered that aggressor nations do not "aggress" until they are well prepared, and that an arms embargo is more likely to affect adversely the country which has our sympathies than the other. As stated, it is unfair; it is undesirable, in that the effect will generally be contrary to popular opinion in this country, and the United States should not flatly announce its course in advance, which eliminates this Nation from any negotiations dealing with peace.

THE CASH-AND-CARRY PLAN

The plan is fine theoretically. It has two praiseworthy objectives. Its operation does not prohibit our exports and, at the same time, it reduces the possibility of the sinking of American ships and the destruction of American property. I am unable to perceive in this plan the virtues claimed for it and do not regard it as free from objections.

Under it certain goods considered as essential in war may be sold to belligerents. There is not the devastating effect upon our export trade that would result from an absolute embargo upon such goods. And, in order to prevent destruction of American ships and property, the proposal forbids the shipping of these goods in American vessels; and it also provides that title to the goods must be transferred to a foreign organization or government before the goods leave the United States.

Thus "contraband" that is specified by the President as coming within the terms of the plan may be purchased by belligerents. But they must come and get it in their own ships; and they must take title to the goods before departing our shores, which presumably means that the goods will be paid for prior to sailing. In the event the ship is destroyed by its enemy, the United States suffers no loss; it was not an American vessel nor was it carrying American property.

The plan, in practice, however, must operate to the advantage of some belligerents and to the disadvantages of others. Its policy definitely helps the countries which happen to have the ships and the money. China did not have these, while Japan, on the other hand, having a strong marine fleet and resources enough—at least at the beginning of the war—could have continued to obtain American goods after the plan went into effect. The act, therefore, was not invoked, for its practical effect would have been to embargo China while not hampering Japan. This would have been an unpopular course for our Government to pursue, because American sentiment was very much on the side of China.

Aside from the fact that it is theoretically undesirable for the United States to adopt a policy which in reality helps nations that are strong on the sea, it has been shown that the policy of the neutrality law in this respect will not prevent the United States from doing what the sentiment of its citizens demands.

As Dulles and Armstrong state:

Americans are apt to resist when their liberty is curtailed. In addition, then, to the requirement that our trade restrictions plainly form an essential part of a definite program for keeping the country out of trouble, they must be as modest as possible. A chance to negotiate before embargoes were imposed might be of assistance in keeping them as painless as possible. A mere threat to close our resources to a belligerent country might be so weighty that in order to avoid the danger the country in question would make concessions as regards our trade with the other belligerent or with neutrals (p. 101).

If the neutrality legislation will be invoked, or not, as each particular situation requires, where is the benefit of establishing a neutrality law? It has been said that the declaring of our foreign policy through neutrality legislation is like placing one's hand on the table in a poker game where all the other hands are concealed. This is as undesirable in foreign affairs as it is in poker, and our Government should not place itself in this position, especially when the act will not be a guide in future circumstances that cannot be even imagined at the present time.

General Johnson has said:

I understand that it is being proposed to embargo shipments to Japan to favor China. That seems to me to be a perversion of both essential ideas of this legislation as I think the country understands them—that this law is either for "neutrality" or "keeping out of war."

War has changed tremendously in our time. There was a day when kings fought each other and their people were largely spectators. War was a fencing match or rather a football game between professional teams aiming for the goal of the enemy's capital. Then military arms and adroitness were the principal factors. Prussia against Napoleon invented the idea of the "nation in arms." The World War perfected it. War is now a struggle to the death, not between armies merely but between whole economic systems—an impact of civilizations. The economic struggle has become even more important than the military collision. In 1918 we beat the Central Powers by economic strangulation rather than on the western front.

No nation is blind to this. If, as a neutral, we attempt for any reason to discipline a belligerent nation by economic strictures, we have committed an act of war against her. She will know it poignantly. The world will know it. We shall have entered war. We seem to be proceeding on a theory that we can wage economic war on certain nations and escape the onus of having adhered to their enemies, giving them aid and comfort.

It has been said that we must be careful not to be misled by the ease of formulating abstract programs for the relinquishment of American rights. Such programs may sound satisfactory enough and may even find wide acceptance, until the shoe begins to pinch. But when the time comes actually to try to stop a certain class of exports, whether by moral suasion or by embargo, then we will realize that what is theoretically sound as a war-avoidance policy may be quite unacceptable to hard-pressed agricultural and industrial interests. If that happens, we shall have received one more demonstration that the United States is not yet an economically independent unit, that its prosperity is tied up with the markets of the world, and that voluntarily to step out of international trade may take more fortitude than is possessed by the political powers then in control of our national destinies.

The conclusion must be that—

We should reserve independence of judgment and refuse to commit ourselves in advance regarding our course of action in individual situations.

Hugh Johnson states:

I do not favor legislation that freezes our foreign policy on some attempt to foresee the nature and extent of any war. In other words, I do not like war legislation which comes into being automatically, even though we do not know what a particular war will look like, where it will be fought, by whom, or what seas will be dangerous and what seas safe.

I think the whole country is ready to sacrifice some of its neutral rights in order not to create a situation in which a belligerent

can force us to fight by violating them. But I do not see why we should surrender all our sea-borne commerce in order to surrender some neutral rights.

We should have a policy that would leave our commerce unimpaired elsewhere on the globe, and that would permit blockade running to adventurous spirits—and that is a right recognized by international law since the beginning.

There appears to be a good deal of confusion as to what the restriction upon our own trading in our own vessels is to accomplish. Are we trying to keep out of war or are we trying to prevent war? If the former, we should prevent exports in American vessels only where a continuance to do so would likely get us into war. In practically every case where none of the belligerents had substantial control of the sea it would seem that there would be no great danger to the United States in carrying on its regular neutral trade in its own ships. If this test is adopted, it is obviously futile to legislate upon a subject where the legislation will not be needed in every circumstance. In those cases where our trade could safely continue in our own bottoms, such isolated instances of interference as might occur would fully be covered by our adopting a policy of "trade at the trader's risk."

If, on the other hand, we are trying to prevent war, a restriction upon trade should be imposed as the result of concerted action by the United States and the other great powers of the world which are important producers and exporters of the materials essential to war. This, of course, is not at present the policy of our Government; and the futility of one nation attempting a partial or general embargo against a belligerent has been demonstrated. It is too clear for argument that if the United States refuses to sell certain articles to countries at war, other nations producing the same articles will gladly supply the warring nations. The restriction upon our trade is merely a deprivation of our export interests, to the benefit of one of our competitors. The United States should not make this sacrifice of its interests, especially when the continuing of trade in our own ships is not likely to involve the United States in war.

Can we really presume to determine in 1939 what will be the wise policy to follow in any and every international situation which may confront the United States in, say, 1942? To attempt it would be to make, in advance and in the dark, momentous political decisions which might have the effect of changing the map of the world.

There is much to be said in favor of the proposition to allow our trade to continue during times of war, and under the rules of international law, for destruction of American property and loss of American lives will be provided against if our Government and our citizens follow the laws of contraband and blockade. And if the citizens will insist upon taking risks, our Government will be justified, as President Roosevelt did 2 years ago, in proclaiming that such risks will be taken by the traders themselves. It is interesting that this is the position which was taken by President Washington at the beginning of our country.

President Washington, after a full discussion of the matter with his Cabinet, issued his neutrality proclamation of April 22, 1793. This brief and simply worded document does not even mention the word "neutrality," but it is generally regarded by students of international law as a highly important step in the development of a new phase of the doctrine of neutrality. For, instead of emphasizing neutral rights, the proclamation urged that citizens of the United States should with sincerity and good faith adopt and pursue a conduct friendly and impartial toward the belligerent powers, and avoid all acts and proceedings whatsoever, which may in any manner tend to contravene such disposition. Americans were warned that by aiding or abetting hostilities against any of the belligerents or by carrying to any of them those articles which are deemed contraband by the modern usage of nations, they would forfeit their rights to the protection of the United States.

What other incentive is needed to protect the interests of the United States for peace? The proclamation of Washington represented a distinct advance over the previous attitude of other governments toward the duties and obligations of neutrals. And its basic principles have since been generally accepted as the proper code of conduct for nonbelligerent nations in time of war.

President Roosevelt, during the Ethiopian-Italian War, established the same standard for the guidance of this country. After referring to the situation which has unhappily developed between Ethiopia and Italy, he concluded with the following warning:

In these specific circumstances I desire it to be understood that any of our people who voluntarily engage in transactions of any character with either of the belligerents do so at their own risk.

Of this attitude Dulles and Armstrong say:

Some observers who knew what a break this announcement made with the past have said that the American public did not comprehend the momentous decision which lay hidden in that one sentence. Probably this was true. The freedom of the seas now had disappeared not only in fact, it was gone in name also; American trade with nations at war was no longer to enjoy the protection of the American Government; and this loss of what Jefferson had called "inalienable right," what Wilson had called "acknowledged rights," had been accepted by the public almost unnoticed and almost without complaint.

The authors of the book above quoted recommend that this policy become permanent; and they indicate an important fact, namely, that there is no need of legislation in adopting this policy:

We believe that the "trade at your own risk" policy should become a permanent part of American neutrality policy. No legislation by Congress is required. To adopt such a policy lies clearly within the province of the Executive, which is authorized to conduct American foreign affairs. It would be a logical continuation, in the Executive field, of the legislation which Congress in its own proper field of action adopted in August 1935. Nevertheless, if Congress by a bipartisan vote should express approval of this policy, the action would tend to establish it as a national policy rather than as an expedient applied to a particular situation by one administration.

Bernard Baruch, in testifying before the Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs, while advocating the so-called cash-and-carry plan, indicated that there was a good deal of merit in the proposal to allow American trade in American vessels under the doctrine of trade at the traders' risk. He said:

I believe that certainly in some circumstances we should say to Americans: "Well, if you want to go and take the risk, you can do it, but you sail on the ship and you send those goods at your own peril. The flag won't follow you or protect you." I think we ought to give grave consideration to such an attitude. And especially because of this, sir—suppose the war that we are thinking about in Europe occurs. Suppose we say that the English fleet bottles up the German fleet in the North Sea, and that the Italian fleet is bottled up through the Suez Canal and Gibraltar, and an American says, "I want to take some goods over from San Franfrisco or Los Angeles to Australia"—who are now on the side of England—and he says, "I do not think there are any submarines, I am not afraid of any danger there. Can't I do that?" I think some sort of discretion ought to be given our official policy on this point. That is one step forward toward yours. I do not want to see our American enterprise entirely given up. I do not want to see our liberty of action wholly impaired. * * * I am not certain about it myself. I do not want to advocate it yet; I want to give it a good deal more thought (p. 79).

It is believed by many persons that our Government should take its stand under the rules of international law and play the game with common sense as the problems arise, rather than lay down a rigid rule which all belligerents may take into calculation before the war begins. If one belligerent issues a warning, as Germany did in the last war, that it intended to sink its enemy's ships which it believes are carrying munitions or contraband, and warns neutral citizens to refrain from traveling upon such vessels, the Government would be warranted in taking the position that the citizens knowing of the belligerent's warning assumed risks incident to sea voyages. Our Government should further warn them not to do so, and if they insist upon such travel, they have no right to complain to our Government.

Recurring to the question of the delegation of authority to determine what articles, if any, are to be placed upon the cash-and-carry plan, it has been suggested that this amounts to a regulation of commerce with foreign governments which is in conflict with the Constitution which provides that—

The Congress shall have the power to regulate commerce with foreign nations.

Those who scoff at outright repeal of the neutrality legislation point to the fact that international law is dead. Upon

what basis, then, are trade agreements promulgated and upheld? It is said that international law slumbers during times of war. What of the slumbering of the neutrality legislation during the pending war in the Orient? It must be remembered that the compromise of neutrality—whether it be based upon the unitary action of a single nation through legislation, or upon international law principles—must be drawn within two limits. It must afford reasonable protection to neutrals in their commerce; and at the same time allow to belligerents a sufficient freedom for the conduct of warlike operations. These limits canot be settled by one single nation. Nor are they inflexible. They changed during the World War. They will change again in future wars. But the fact of change does not warrant the charge that the change destroys the law.

The compromises of international law regarding commerce with belligerents are in effect today as formerly. The compromises, to be true, have changed, but the fundamental principles are present. The belligerent would like to treat all commerce with its enemy as an unneutral act. But it is too much to expect—and belligerents do not expect—a neutral merchant to accept this viewpoint and to refrain from all commerce after the outbreak of war. International law has been worked out, and the rules define what commerce shall be considered permissible to neutrals. These rules permit—and the rules are as applicable today as they ever were—merchants to carry on with belligerents all commerce which is not contraband nor an attempt to violate a blockade. The neutral merchant or shipowner may not furthermore perform any unneutral service for either belligerent without forfeiting his neutral status.

The resultant of the sum total of these conflicting interests in the course of the centuries has led to the adoption of the so-called law of contraband, blockade, and unneutral service; and to this must be added the important provisions in regard to the determination of what is enemy property, so as to subject vessels and their cargoes to confiscation. These various provisions taken as a whole constitute the law of neutrality. Each one of them was the product of a long historical evolution based upon precedents, which represented in each case a compromise between what the belligerent wished to exact and what his consideration for his own future neutral position, or the possibility of irritating the neutral, inclined him to accept. The products considered to be contraband have constantly changed. They are changing today. But the principles remain. A neutral carrying contraband goods to a belligerent is subject to having these goods confiscated.

Much has been said in favor of the repeal of the act of 1937 and the reliance by our Government upon international law. That argument I presented in the radio address herein presented. It was advanced by Mr. Walter Lippmann, who stated that—

> The only real way to disentangle ourselves is to repeal the legislation and take our stand once more on the principles of international law. This is much the safest course, the most easily defensible, the most consistent with the sentiments and the interest of the American people. If we return to international law, we do not have to intervene in the Far East by changing our policy in the middle of the war. We do not have to challenge Japan at a time when Japan is inevitably in a desperate mood. We shall be able to take the neutral position. We shall not be entangled in the extremely dangerous consequences that would result from applying an embargo in the middle of a war. We shall remove from Japan the provocation and the inducement to sign a military alliance with the axis and to precipitate a world war.

And then he indicates a very important factor, which is rarely mentioned in connection with the operation of the present neutrality legislation:

> In regard to Germany and Italy, we shall be taking a position which is legally and morally unassailable. On the other hand, we shall take away from them the hideous inducement to start a war in order to deprive their opponents of supplies that they can obtain only as long as there is no war. The act of repeal, on the other hand, would not only remove the inducement to strike quick, which we now offer to the axis, but it would be profoundly deterrent because it would be construed as making it possible for the coalition to resists successfully.
>
> Above all, repeal would protect the United States against finding itself in a horrible dilemma once war broke out. For then, with public sentiment what it is, with America's national interest what it is, we should at the outbreak of a war, after air raids on London and Paris and the overrunning of Holland and Switzerland, find ourselves compelled to refuse arms to the nations that engaged the overwhelming sympathy of the Nation. * * *
>
> The safest course, I repeat, is to repeal the act and return to the elementary principle of international law. This is the only solution that can still be adopted which is legally neutral and can therefore be defended; it is the only solution which can enable us to escape the worst of all the entanglements of a neutral, the entanglements of changing his policy after war breaks out.

The fact that the decision which the Congress must make is one between relative advantages and disadvantages was clearly shown at the hearings before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. While Mr. Baruch was testifying—pages 66–67—it was stated that if we repeal the neutrality legislation, we "refer back to international law, and are back where we were in 1917, and are in the same danger of involvement as we were in then." This was admitted, and recognized as a disadvantage. But Senator JOHNSON of California pointed out that there are disadvantages to the Neutrality Act—to the provisions of the so-called cash-and-carry plan—which have been indicated above. Then he stated:

> I am not clear on the matter, but I think it is likely that we should go back and we should take international law as it exists today and, if we can, pursue what remedy we have, because under your system (the cash-and-carry plan) you at once get into difficulties with the belligerent nations—those that are not able to come and get and pay for the goods that they take, and the title will then rest as the chairman has said.
>
> Mr. BARUCH. We want to keep out of war, but I am just wondering. A great many people feel that we have to do something to get away from the position we occupied before the World War, and that is the reason they advanced the present so-called Neutrality Act. The question is, If we go back to where we were, do we take a greater chance than to try a new law?

Senator JOHNSON of California then stated:

> That is right. It is a weighing of the advantages and disadvantages, as you weigh a lawsuit or anything else—are the advantages greater in this sort of thing or that sort of thing? But you do not relieve yourself of pursuing one thought you suggest—of taking sides. That is the obstacle. You take sides by doing that because you know when you are beginning about those things.

The question, then—and such was stated at the beginning—is whether our peace interests will be better served through our returning to international law, not as it existed in 1914 or 1917, but as it exists today, and as it will exist if another war of great proportions breaks out or by adopting and continuing some form of neutrality legislation. In my opinion, our country should not act alone by declaring its policy in advance of circumstances that cannot be predicted. There is no basis for the claim that international law is dead. And, while it is not a guaranty of peace, it does not involve the serious difficulties that are inherent in neutrality legislation.

Farmer Sold Out by the War Lords

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTON J. JOHNSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 3, 1939

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, at the beginning of consideration of the neutrality bill we were told that the repeal of the arms embargo would be a neutral act.

As we drew into the last few days of the debate we were told from the floor of the House a different story, not from one but many Members, that this was a holy war, that this was a religious war, that this was a war against totalitarianism, that this was a war to save democracy. Seems as though we heard that some years back.

So we heed not the lessons from the last war and are ready to announce from the floor of this House to the world that we hate Hitler and want to wipe him from the face of the earth and publicly proclaim our assistance to the Allies.

According to the United Press reports from London, England will immediately purchase $150,000,000 of war munitions from us, but will reduce purchases of farm commodities and other manufactured goods. The war lords will get the cash while the American farmer will see the Allies purchase, probably on credit, from other nations cotton, wheat, and meat products.

Not a neutral nation in the world today is selling war arms and munitions to any other nation at war, yet we assume the great risk of active participation in the great slaughter of human lives by supplying the means for slaughter, including poison gas.

The farmer has been sold out by the war lords.

As I View Our Neutrality Stand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 3, 1939

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, when the second World War broke out in Europe some weeks ago, alarming millions of people throughout the earth, I cast about in my own mind to see what appeared to be the best course, both in general and in detail, for this country to follow, in view of all the circumstances. At that moment I was attending a State American Legion convention at Tucson, Ariz. The news of the declaration of war was only a few hours old; the Legionnaires were singing many of the old songs of the earlier struggle. I gave them my feeling that the emphasis should be shifted from "over there" to "over here." That night in their closing function I reminded banquet guests and radio audience that our thought twenty-odd years ago was—

Over there, over there,
We're going over,
And we won't come back
Till it's over, over there.

Regardless of how well or how poorly we performed that task then, our thought today, in my opinion, should be:

Over here, over here,
We're staying over,
And we won't stop work
Till it's over, over here.

The two devastating wars we have had during the past quarter-century—the military war of 1914–18 and the economic war of 1929–39—have left us forty-odd-billion dollars in debt as a nation and with only a partial victory won. It must, indeed, be a most imperative military need to take us "over there" and thus force us to abandon and lose the economic struggle "over here."

It has been my feeling from the outbreak of hostilities that this country must keep out of war and, in order to do so, I felt that the existing neutrality law should be modified in such a way as to minimize our chances of getting into this war. To that end I felt that, although it hurt, we must remove our ships from certain portions of the open seas, even where, under international law and the freedom of the seas, they should have a right to go. I felt that our citizens should be recalled from abroad and forbidden to travel on belligerent ships or even on American ships in danger zones. I further felt that we must extend no credit to any warring nation, but should sell any and all kinds of goods recognized by international law to the warring nations who could pay cash for them. In this category I would include guns and ammunition and such implements of war recognized by international law, but not poisonous gases and some of the other newer, deadlier means of destruction having no standing in the eyes of international law.

I knew, of course, a change in the so-called neutrality law would be condemned by some as "a change in the rules of the game after the game had started." I have never so regarded it, for a modification was recommended by the President 8 months before the outbreak of hostilities, and the legislative process was begun on it by one Chamber 2 months before the outbreak of hostilities. The completion of it was merely delayed last summer by the other Chamber until the next session of Congress. I knew, of course, that there would be some who would say that the proposed change of existing law would aid those belligerents who control the high seas. Quite true, but the proposed change would be of no greater advantage to England and France than no change at all would be an advantage to Germany and Russia. Since my sympathies are more with England and France than with Germany and Russia, I certainly was not opposed to shifting the advantage. Neither the law as it was, nor the proposed new measure, may be said to be actually and really neutral. Each may be said by lawyers to be technically neutral, but it seems to me that the proposed measure has a greater degree of technical neutrality than has the measure which is on the books.

I am unwilling to pull England's chestnuts out of the fire or to spill American blood to guarantee English or French imperialism, but I have even a greater reluctance to aid and abet the dictators of Europe and to encourage the spread of communism, atheism, and antichristian forces throughout the world. Accordingly I have thought and voted in such a way as seemed most effective to contribute our services in measures short of war toward supporting the forces of world law and order; toward continuing our efforts at home in the great struggle against poverty over here; and especially toward a course that seems most likely to keep us out of war. I do not believe that this bill is so nearly perfect as Senator PITTMAN seems to regard it, but it is beyond my power to change it. It is much better than what we had, therefore it has my support.

INDEX

NAMES AND POST-OFFICE ADDRESSES

OF MEMBERS OF THE

UNITED STATES SENATE

IN THE

SECOND SESSION OF THE SEVENTY-SIXTH CONGRESS

JOHN N. GARNER, Vice President, Uvalde, Tex.

KEY PITTMAN, President pro tempore, Tonopah, Nev.

Name	Home post office
Adams, Alva B	Pueblo, Colo.
Andrews, Charles O	Orlando, Fla.
Ashurst, Henry F	Prescott, Ariz.
Austin, Warren R	Burlington, Vt.
Bailey, Josiah W	Raleigh, N. C.
Bankhead, John H., 2d	Jasper, Ala.
Barbour, W. Warren	Locust, N. J.
Barkley, Alben W	Paducah, Ky.
Bilbo, Theodore G	Poplarville, Miss.
Bone, Homer T	Tacoma, Wash.
Borah, William E	Boise, Idaho.
Bridges, Styles	East Concord, N. H.
Brown, Prentiss M	St. Ignace, Mich.
Bulow, William J	Beresford, S. Dak.
Burke, Edward R	Omaha, Nebr.
Byrd, Harry Flood	Berryville, Va.
Byrnes, James F	Spartanburg, S. C.
Capper, Arthur	Topeka, Kans.
Caraway, Mrs. Hattie W	Jonesboro, Ark.
Chandler, A. B.[1]	Versailles, Ky.
Chavez, Dennis	Albuquerque, N. Mex.
Clark, Bennett Champ	LaDue Village, St. Louis County, Mo.
Clark, D. Worth	Pocatello, Idaho.
Connally, Tom	Marlin, Tex.
Danaher, John A	Hartford, Conn.
Davis, James J	Pittsburgh, Pa.
Donahey, Vic	Huntsville, Ohio, R. F. D.
Downey, Sheridan	Atherton, Calif.
Ellender, Allen J	Houma, La.
Frazier, Lynn J	Hoople, N. Dak.
George, Walter F	Vienna, Ga.
Gerry, Peter G	Warwick, R. I.
Gibson, Ernest W	Brattleboro, Vt.
Gillette, Guy M	Cherokee, Iowa.
Glass, Carter	Lynchburg, Va.
Green, Theodore F	Providence, R. I.
Guffey, Joseph F	Pittsburgh, Pa.
Gurney, Chan	Yankton, S. Dak.
Hale, Frederick	Portland, Maine.
Harrison, Pat	Gulfport, Miss.
Hatch, Carl A	Clovis, N. Mex.
Hayden, Carl	Phoenix, Ariz.
Herring, Clyde L	Des Moines, Iowa.
Hill, Lister	Montgomery, Ala.
Holman, Rufus C	Portland, Oreg.
Holt, Rush D	Weston, W. Va.
Hughes, James H	Dover, Del.
Johnson, Edwin C	Denver, Colo.
Johnson, Hiram W	San Francisco, Calif.
King, William H	Salt Lake City, Utah.
La Follette, Robert M., Jr	Madison, Wis.
Lee, Josh	Norman, Okla.
Lodge, Henry Cabot, Jr	Beverly, Mass.
Logan, M. M.[2]	Bowling Green, Ky.
Lucas, Scott W	Havana, Ill.
Lundeen, Ernest	Wayzata, Minn., R. F. D.
McCarran, Pat	Reno, Nev.
McKellar, Kenneth	Memphis, Tenn.
McNary, Charles L	Salem, Oreg., R. F. D.
Maloney, Francis T	Meriden, Conn.
Mead, James M	Buffalo, N. Y.
Miller, John E	Searcy, Ark.
Minton, Sherman	New Albany, Ind.
Murray, James E	Butte, Mont.
Neely, Matthew M	Fairmont, W. Va.
Norris, George W	McCook, Nebr.
Nye, Gerald P	Cooperstown, N. Dak.
O'Mahoney, Joseph C	Cheyenne, Wyo.
Overton, John H	Alexandria, La.
Pepper, Claude	Tallahassee, Fla.
Pittman, Key	Tonopah, Nev.
Radcliffe, George L	Baltimore, Md.
Reed, Clyde M	Parsons, Kans.
Reynolds, Robert R	Asheville, N. C.
Russell, Richard B	Winder, Ga.
Schwartz, H. H	Casper, Wyo.
Schwellenbach, Lewis B	Neppel, Wash.
Sheppard, Morris	Texarkana, Tex.
Shipstead, Henrik	Miltona, Minn.
Slattery, James M	Chicago, Ill.
Smathers, William H	Margate, N. J.
Smith, Ellison D	Lynchburg, S. C.
Stewart, Tom	Winchester, Tenn.
Taft, Robert A	Cincinnati, Ohio.
Thomas, Elbert D	Salt Lake City, Utah.
Thomas, Elmer	Medicine Park, Okla.
Tobey, Charles W	Temple, N. H.
Townsend, John G., Jr	Selbyville, Del.
Truman, Harry S	Independence, Mo.
Tydings, Millard E	Havre de Grace, Md.
Vandenberg, Arthur H	Grand Rapids, Mich.
Van Nuys, Frederick	Indianapolis, Ind.
Wagner, Robert F	New York City, N. Y.
Walsh, David I	Clinton, Mass.
Wheeler, Burton K	Butte, Mont.
White, Wallace H., Jr	Auburn, Maine.
Wiley, Alexander	Chippewa Falls, Wis.

[1] Appointed on Oct. 9, 1939, to fill the vacancy caused by the death of M. M. Logan.

[2] Died Oct. 3, 1939.

NAMES AND POST-OFFICE ADDRESSES

OF MEMBERS OF THE

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

IN THE

SECOND SESSION OF THE SEVENTY-SIXTH CONGRESS

WILLIAM B. BANKHEAD, Speaker, Jasper, Ala.

REPRESENTATIVES

Name	Home post office	Name	Home post office
Alexander, John G.	Minneapolis, Minn.	Burch, Thomas G.	Martinsville, Va.
Allen, A. Leonard	Winnfield, La.	Burdick, Usher L.	Williston, N. Dak.
Allen, Leo E.	Galena, Ill.	Burgin, W. O.	Lexington, N. C.
Allen, Robert G.	Greensburg, Pa.	Byrne, William T.	Loudonville, N. Y.
Andersen, H. Carl	Tyler, Minn.	Bryns, Joseph W., Jr.	Nashville, Tenn.
Anderson, C. Arthur	Lemay, Mo., R. F. D.	Byron, William D.	Williamsport, Md.
Anderson, John Z.	San Juan Bautista, Calif.	Caldwell, Millard F.	Milton, Fla.
Andresen, August H.	Red Wing, Minn.	Camp, A. Sidney	Newnan, Ga.
Andrews, Walter G.	Buffalo, N. Y.	Cannon, Clarence	Elsberry, Mo.
Angell, Homer D.	Portland, Oreg.	Cannon, Pat	Miami, Fla.
Arends, Leslie C.	Melvin, Ill.	Carlson, Frank	Concordia, Kans.
Arnold, Laurence F.	Newton, Ill.	Carter, Albert E.	Oakland, Calif.
Ashbrook, William A.	Johnstown, Ohio.	Cartwright, Wilburn	McAlester, Okla.
Austin, Albert E.	Old Greenwich, Conn.	Case, Francis H.	Custer, S. Dak.
Ball, Thomas R.	Old Lyme, Conn.	Casey, Joseph E.	Clinton, Mass.
Bankhead, William B.	Jasper, Ala.	Celler, Emanuel	Brooklyn, N. Y.
Barden, Graham A.	New Bern, N. C.	Chandler, Walter	Memphis, Tenn.
Barnes, James M.	Jacksonville, Ill.	Chapman, Virgil	Paris, Ky.
Barry, William B.	St. Albans, N. Y.	Chiperfield, Robert B.	Canton, Ill.
Barton, Bruce	New York City, N. Y.	Church, Ralph E.	Evanston, Ill.
Bates, George J.	Salem, Mass.	Clark, J. Bayard	Fayetteville, N. C.
Bates, Joe B.	Greenup, Ky.	Clason, Charles R.	Springfield, Mass.
Beam, Harry P.	Chicago, Ill.	Claypool, Harold K.	Chillicothe, Ohio.
Beckworth, Lindley	Gilmer, Tex.	Clevenger, Cliff	Bryan, Ohio.
Bell, C. Jasper	Kansas City, Mo.	Cluett, E. Harold	Troy, N. Y.
Bender, George H.	Cleveland Heights, Ohio.	Cochran, John J.	St. Louis, Mo.
Blackney, William W.	Flint, Mich.	Coffee, Harry B.	Chadron, Nebr.
Bland, Schuyler Otis	Newport News, Va.	Coffee, John M.	Tacoma, Wash.
Bloom, Sol	New York City, N. Y.	Cole, William P., Jr.	Towson, Md.
Boehne, John W., Jr.	Evansville, Ind.	Cole, W. Sterling	Bath, N. Y.
Boland, Patrick J.	Scranton, Pa.	Collins, Ross A.	Meridian, Miss.
Bolles, Stephen	Janesville, Wis.	Colmer, William M.	Pascagoula, Miss.
Bolton, Chester C.[1]	Lyndhurst, Ohio.	Connery, Lawrence J.	Lynn, Mass.
Boren, Lyle H.	Seminole, Okla.	Cooley, Harold D.	Nashville, N. C.
Boykin, Frank W.	Mobile, Ala.	Cooper, Jere	Dyersburg, Tenn.
Bradley, Fred	Rogers City, Mich.	Corbett, Robert J.	Bellevue, Pa.
Bradley, Michael J.	Philadelphia, Pa.	Costello, John M.	Hollywood, Calif.
Brewster, Ralph O.	Dexter, Maine.	Courtney, Wirt	Franklin, Tenn.
Brooks, Overton	Shreveport, La.	Cox, E. E.	Camilla, Ga.
Brown, Clarence J.	Blanchester, Ohio.	Cravens, Fadjo[2]	Fort Smith, Ark.
Brown, Paul	Elberton, Ga.	Crawford, Fred L.	Saginaw, Mich.
Bryson, Joseph R.	Greenville, S. C.	Creal, Edward W.	Hodgenville, Ky.
Buck, Frank H.	Vacaville, Calif.	Crosser, Robert	Cleveland, Ohio.
Buckler, R. T.	Crookston, Minn., R. F. D.	Crowe, Eugene B.	Bedford, Ind.
Buckley, Charles A.	New York City, N. Y.	Crowther, Frank	Schenectady, N. Y.
Bulwinkle, Alfred L.	Gastonia, N. C.	Culkin, Francis D	Oswego, N. Y.

[1] Died Oct. 29, 1939. Vacancy not filled during this session of Congress.

[2] Elected Sept. 12, 1939, to fill the unexpired term caused by the death (in preceding session) of Ben Cravens.

Names and post-office addresses of Members of the House of Representatives—Continued

Name	Home post office
Cullen, Thomas H	Brooklyn, N. Y.
Cummings, Fred	Fort Collins, Colo.
Curley, Edward W	New York City, N. Y.
Curtis, Carl T	Minden, Nebr.
D'Alesandro, Thomas, Jr	Baltimore, Md.
Daly, J. Burrwood [1]	Philadelphia, Pa.
Darden, Colgate W., Jr	Norfolk, Va.
Darrow, George P	Philadelphia, Pa.
Delaney, John J	Brooklyn, N. Y.
Dempsey, John J	Santa Fe, N. Mex.
DeRouen, René L	Ville Platte, La.
Dickstein, Samuel	New York City, N. Y.
Dies, Martin	Orange, Tex.
Dingell, John D	Detroit, Mich.
Dirksen, Everett M	Pekin, Ill.
Disney, Wesley E	Tulsa, Okla.
Ditter, J. William	Ambler, Pa.
Dondero, George A	Royal Oak, Mich.
Doughton, Robert L	Laurel Springs, N. C.
Douglas, Fred J	Utica, N. Y.
Dowell, Cassius C	Des Moines, Iowa.
Doxey, Wall	Holly Springs, Miss.
Drewry, Patrick H	Petersburg, Va.
Duncan, Richard M	St. Joseph, Mo.
Dunn, Matthew A	Mount Oliver, Pittsburgh, Pa.
Durham, Carl T	Chapel Hill, N. C.
Dworshak, Henry C	Burley, Idaho.
Eaton, Charles A	Watchung, Plainfield, N. J.
Eaton, Thomas M. [2]	Long Beach, Calif.
Eberharter, Herman P	Pittsburgh, Pa.
Edmiston, Andrew	Weston, W. Va.
Elliott, Alfred J	Tulare, Calif.
Ellis, Clyde T	Bentonville, Ark.
Elston, Charles H	Newtown, Ohio, R. F. D.
Engel, Albert J	Muskegon, Mich.
Englebright, Harry L	Nevada City, Calif.
Evans, Marcellus H	Brooklyn, N. Y.
Faddis, Charles I	Waynesburg, Pa.
Fay, James H	New York City, N. Y.
Fenton, Ivor D	Mahanoy City, Pa.
Ferguson, Phil	Woodward, Okla.
Fernandez, Joachim O	New Orleans, La.
Fish, Hamilton	Garrison, N. Y.
Fitzpatrick, James M	New York City, N. Y.
Flaherty, Thomas A	Boston, Mass.
Flannagan, John W., Jr	Bristol, Va.
Flannery, J. Harold	Pittston, Pa.
Folger, Alonzo D	Mount Airy, N. C.
Ford, Aaron Lane	Ackerman, Miss.
Ford, Leland M	Santa Monica, Calif.
Ford, Thomas F	Los Angeles, Calif.
Fries, Frank W	Carlinville, Ill.
Fulmer, Hampton P	Orangeburg, S. C.
Gamble, Ralph A	Larchmont, N. Y.
Garrett, Clyde L	Eastland, Tex.
Gartner, Fred C	Philadelphia, Pa.
Gathings, E. C	West Memphis, Ark.
Gavagan, Joseph A	New York City, N. Y.
Gearhart, Bertrand W	Fresno, Calif.
Gehrmann, Bernard J	Mellen, Wis., R. F. D.
Gerlach, Charles L	Allentown, Pa.
Geyer, Lee E	Gardena, Calif.
Gibbs, W. Ben	Jesup, Ga.
Gifford, Charles L	Cotuit, Mass.
Gilchrist, Fred C	Laurens, Iowa.
Gillie, George W	Fort Wayne, Ind.
Gore, Albert	Carthage, Tenn.
Gossett, Ed	Wichita Falls, Tex.
Graham, Louis E	Beaver, Pa.
Grant, George M	Troy, Ala.
Grant, Robert A	South Bend, Ind.
Green, Lex	Starke, Fla.
Gregory, Noble J	Mayfield, Ky.
Griffith, John K	Slidell, La.
Griswold, Harry W. [3]	West Salem, Wis.
Gross, Chester H	Manchester, Pa., R. F. D.
Guyer, U. S	Kansas City, Kans.
Gwynne, John W	Waterloo, Iowa.
Hall, Leonard W	Oyster Bay, N. Y.
Halleck, Charles A	Rensselaer, Ind.
Hancock, Clarence E	Syracuse, N. Y.
Hare, Butler B	Saluda, S. C.
Harness, Forest A	Kokomo, Ind.
Harrington, Vincent F	Sioux City, Iowa.
Hart, Edward J	Jersey City, N. J.
Harter, Dow W	Akron, Ohio.
Harter, J. Francis	Eggertsville, N. Y.
Hartley, Fred A., Jr	Kearny, N. J.
Havenner, Franck R	San Francisco, Calif.
Hawks, Charles, Jr	Horicon, Wis.
Healey, Arthur D	Somerville, Mass.
Heinke, George H	Nebraska City, Nebr.
Hendricks, Joe	De Land, Fla.
Hennings, Thomas C., Jr	St. Louis, Mo.
Hess, William E	Cincinnati, Ohio.
Hill, Knute	Prosser, Wash.
Hinshaw, Carl	Pasadena, Calif.
Hobbs, Sam	Selma, Ala.
Hoffman, Clare E	Allegan, Mich.
Holmes, Pehr G	Worcester, Mass.
Hook, Frank E	Ironwood, Mich.
Hope, Clifford R	Garden City, Kans.
Horton, Frank O	Saddlestring, Wyo.
Houston, John M	Newton, Kans.
Hull, Merlin	Black River Falls, Wis.
Hunter, John F	Toledo, Ohio.
Izac, Ed. V	San Diego, Calif.
Jacobsen, William S	Clinton, Iowa.
Jarman, Pete	Livingston, Ala.
Jarrett, Benjamin	Farrell, Pa.
Jeffries, Walter S	Margate, Atlantic City, N. J.
Jenkins, Thomas A	Ironton, Ohio.
Jenks, Arthur B	Manchester, N. H.
Jensen, Ben F	Exira, Iowa.
Johns, Joshua L	Algoma, Wis.
Johnson, Anton J	Macomb, Ill.
Johnson, George W	Parkersburg, W. Va.
Johnson, Jed	Anadarko, Okla.
Johnson, Luther A	Corsicana, Tex.
Johnson, Lyndon B	Johnson City, Tex.
Johnson, Noble J	Terre Haute, Ind.
Jones, Marvin	Amarillo, Tex.
Jones, Robert F	Cairo, Ohio.
Kean, Robert W	Livingston, N. J.
Kee, John	Bluefield, W. Va.
Keefe, Frank B	Oshkosh, Wis.
Kefauver, Estes [4]	Chattanooga, Tenn.
Keller, Kent E	Ava, Ill.
Kelly, Edward A	Chicago, Ill.
Kennedy, Ambrose J	Baltimore, Md.

[1] Died Mar. 12, 1939. Vacancy not filled during first and second sessions of this Congress.

[2] Died Sept. 16, 1939. Vacancy not filled during this session of Congress.

[3] Died July 4, 1939. Vacancy not filled during first and second sessions of this Congress.

[4] Elected Sept. 13, 1939, to fill the unexpired term caused by the death (in preceding session) of Sam D. McReynolds.

Names and post-office addresses of Members of the House of Representatives—Continued

Name	Home post office
Kennedy, Martin J.	New York City, N. Y.
Kennedy, Michael J.	New York City, N. Y.
Keogh, Eugene J.	Brooklyn, N. Y.
Kerr, John H.	Warrenton, N. C.
Kilday, Paul J.	San Antonio, Tex.
Kinzer, J. Roland.	Lancaster, Pa.
Kirwan, Michael J.	Youngstown, Ohio.
Kitchens, Wade.	Magnolia, Ark.
Kleberg, Richard M.	Corpus Christi, Tex.
Knutson, Harold.	St. Cloud, Minn.
Kocialkowski, Leo.	Chicago, Ill.
Kramer, Charles.	Los Angeles, Calif.
Kunkel, John C.	Harrisburg, Pa.
Lambertson, William P.	Fairview, Kans.
Landis, Gerald W.	Linton, Ind.
Lanham, Fritz G.	Fort Worth, Tex.
Larrabee, William H.	New Palestine, Ind.
Lea, Clarence F.	Santa Rosa, Calif.
Leavy, Charles H.	Spokane, Wash.
LeCompte, Karl M.	Corydon, Iowa.
Lemke, William.	Fargo, N. Dak.
Lesinski, John.	Dearborn, Mich.
Lewis, Earl R.	St. Clairsville, Ohio.
Lewis, Lawrence.	Denver, Colo.
Lord, Bert [1]	Afton, N. Y.
Luce, Robert.	Waltham, Mass.
Ludlow, Louis.	Indianapolis, Ind.
McAndrews, James.	Chicago, Ill.
McArdle, Joseph A.	Pittsburgh, Pa.
McCormack, John W.	Boston, Mass.
McDowell, John.	Wilkinsburg, Pa.
McGehee, Dan R.	Meadville, Miss.
McGranery, James P.	Philadelphia, Pa.
McKeough, Raymond S.	Chicago, Ill.
McLaughlin, Charles F.	Omaha, Nebr.
McLean, Donald H.	Elizabeth, N. J.
McLeod, Clarence J.	Detroit, Mich.
McMillan, John L.	Florence, S. C.
McMillan, Thomas S.[2]	Charleston, S. C.
Maas, Melvin J.	St. Paul, Minn.
Maciejewski, Anton F.	Cicero, Ill.
Magnuson, Warren G.	Seattle, Wash.
Mahon, George H.	Colorado, Tex.
Maloney, Paul H.	New Orleans, La.
Mansfield, Joseph J.	Columbus, Tex.
Mapes, Carl E.	Grand Rapids, Mich.
Marcantonio, Vito.	New York City, N. Y.
Marshall, L. L.	Euclid, Ohio.
Martin, John A.	Pueblo, Colo.
Martin, John C.	Salem, Ill.
Martin, Joseph W., Jr.	North Attleboro, Mass.
Martin, Thomas E.	Iowa City, Iowa.
Mason, Noah M.	Oglesby, Ill.
Massingale, Sam C.	Cordell, Okla.
May, Andrew J.	Prestonburg, Ky.
Merritt, Matthew J.	Malba (Flushing), N. Y.
Michener, Earl C.	Adrian, Mich.
Miller, William J.	Wethersfield, Conn.
Mills, Newt V.	Monroe, La.
Mills, Wilbur D.	Kensett, Ark.
Mitchell, Arthur W.	Chicago, Ill.
Monkiewicz, B. J.	New Britain, Conn.
Monroney, A. S. Mike.	Oklahoma City, Okla.
Moser, Guy L.	Douglassville, Pa., R. F. D.
Mott, James W.	Salem, Oreg.
Mouton, Robert L.	Lafayette, La.
Mundt, Karl E.	Madison, S. Dak.
Murdock, Abe.	Beaver, Utah.
Murdock, John R.	Tempe, Ariz.
Murray, Reid F.	Waupaca, Wis.
Myers, Francis J.	Philadelphia, Pa.
Nelson, William L.	Columbia, Mo.
Nichols, Jack.	Eufaula, Okla.
Norrell, W. F.	Monticello, Ark.
Norton, Mrs. Mary T.	Jersey City, N. J.
O'Brien, Joseph J.	East Rochester, N. Y.
O'Connor, James F.	Livingston, Mont.
O'Day, Mrs. Caroline.	Rye, N. Y.
O'Leary, James A.	West New Brighton, N. Y.
Oliver, James C.	South Portland, Maine.
O'Neal, Emmet.	Louisville, Ky.
Osmers, Frank C., Jr.	Haworth, N. J.
O'Toole, Donald L.	Brooklyn, N. Y.
Pace, Stephen.	Americus, Ga.
Parsons, Claude V.	Golconda, Ill.
Patman, Wright.	Texarkana, Tex.
Patrick, Luther.	Birmingham, Ala.
Patton, Nat.	Crockett, Tex.
Pearson, Herron.	Jackson, Tenn.
Peterson, Hugh.	Ailey, Ga.
Peterson, J. Hardin.	Lakeland, Fla.
Pfeifer, Joseph L.	Brooklyn, N. Y.
Pierce, Wallace E.	Plattsburg, N. Y.
Pierce, Walter M.	La Grande, Oreg.
Pittenger, William A.	Duluth, Minn.
Plumley, Charles A.	Northfield, Vt.
Poage, W. R.	Waco, Tex.
Polk, James G.	Highland, Ohio.
Powers, D. Lane.	Trenton, N. J.
Rabaut, Louis C.	Grosse Pointe Park, Mich.
Ramspeck, Robert.	Atlanta, Ga.
Randolph, Jennings.	Elkins, W. Va.
Rankin, John E.	Tupelo, Miss.
Rayburn, Sam.	Bonham, Tex.
Reece, B. Carroll.	Johnson City, Tenn.
Reed, Chauncey W.	West Chicago, Ill.
Reed, Daniel A.	Dunkirk, N. Y.
Rees, Edward H.	Emporia, Kans.
Rich, Robert F.	Woolrich, Pa.
Richards, James P.	Lancaster, S. C.
Risk, Charles F.	Saylesville, R. I.
Robertson, A. Willis.	Lexington, Va.
Robinson, J. W.	Provo, Utah.
Robsion, John M.	Barbourville, Ky.
Rockefeller, Lewis K.	Chatham, N. Y.
Rodgers, Robert L.	Erie, Pa.
Rogers, Mrs. Edith Nourse.	Lowell, Mass.
Rogers, Will.	Oklahoma City, Okla.
Romjue, Milton A.	Macon, Mo.
Routzohn, Harry N.	Dayton, Ohio.
Rutherford, Albert G.	Honesdale, Pa.
Ryan, Elmer J.	South St. Paul, Minn.
Sabath, Adolph J.	Chicago, Ill.
Sacks, Leon.	Philadelphia, Pa.

[1] Died May 24, 1939. Vacancy not filled during first and second sessions of this Congress.

[2] Died Sept. 29, 1939. Vacancy not filled during this session of Congress.

Names and post-office addresses of Members of the House of Representatives—Continued

Name	Home post office	Name	Home post office
Sandager, Harry	Cranston, R. I.	Taylor, Edward T	Glenwood Springs, Colo.
Sasscer, Lansdale G.	Upper Marlboro, Md.	Taylor, J. Will	Knoxville, Tenn.
Satterfield, Dave E., Jr	Richmond, Va.	Tenerowicz, Rudolph G	Hamtramck, Mich.
Schaefer, Edwin M	Belleville, Ill.	Terry, David D	Little Rock, Ark.
Schafer, John C	Milwaukee, Wis.	Thill, Lewis D	Milwaukee, Wis.
Schiffler, Andrew C	Wheeling, W. Va.	Thomas, Albert	Houston, Tex.
Schuetz, Leonard W	Chicago, Ill.	Thomas, J. Parnell	Allendale, N. J.
Schulte, William T	Hammond, Ind.	Thomason, R. Ewing	El Paso, Tex.
Schwert, Pius L	Buffalo, N. Y.	Thorkelson, J	Butte, Mont.
Scrugham, James G	Reno, Nev.	Tibbott, Harve	Ebensburg, Pa.
Seccombe, James	Canton, Ohio.	Tinkham, George Holden	Boston, Mass.
Secrest, Robert T	Caldwell, Ohio.	Tolan, John H	Oakland, Calif.
Seger, George N	Passaic, N. J.	Treadway, Allen T	Stockbridge, Mass.
Shafer, Paul W	Battle Creek, Mich.	Van Zandt, James E	Altoona, Pa.
Shanley, James A	New Haven, Conn.	Vincent, Beverly M	Brownsville, Ky.
Shannon, Joseph B	Kansas City, Mo.	Vinson, Carl	Milledgeville, Ga.
Sheppard, Harry R	Yucaipa, Calif.	Voorhis, Jerry	San Dimas, Calif.
Short, Dewey	Galena, Mo.	Vorys, John M	Columbus, Ohio.
Simpson, Richard M	Huntingdon, Pa.	Vreeland, Albert L	East Orange, N. J.
Sirovich, William I	New York City, N. Y.	Wadsworth, James W	Geneseo, N. Y.
Smith, Clyde H	Skowhegan, Maine.	Wallgren, Mon C	Everett, Wash.
Smith, Frederick C	Marion, Ohio.	Walter, Francis E	Easton, Pa.
Smith, Howard W	Alexandria, Va.	Ward, David J	Salisbury, Md.
Smith, J. Joseph	Waterbury, Conn.	Warren, Lindsay C	Washington, N. C.
Smith, Joe L	Beckley, W. Va.	Weaver, Zebulon	Asheville, N. C.
Smith, Martin F	Hoquiam, Wash.	Welch, Richard J	San Francisco, Calif.
Smith, T. V	Chicago, Ill.	West, Milton H	Brownsville, Tex.
Snyder, J. Buell	Perryopolis, Pa.	Wheat, William H	Rantoul, Ill.
Somers, Andrew L	Brooklyn, N. Y.	Whelchel, B. Frank	Gainesville, Ga.
South, Charles L	Coleman, Tex.	White, Compton I	Clark Fork, Idaho.
Sparkman, John J	Huntsville, Ala.	White, Dudley A	Norwalk, Ohio.
Spence, Brent	Fort Thomas, Ky.	Whittington, William M	Greenwood, Miss.
Springer, Raymond S	Connersville, Ind.	Wigglesworth, Richard B	Milton, Mass.
Starnes, Joe	Guntersville, Ala.	Williams, Clyde	Hillsboro, Mo.
Steagall, Henry B	Ozark, Ala.	Williams, George S	Millsboro, Del.
Stearns, Foster	Hancock, N. H.	Winter, Thomas D	Girard, Kans.
Stefan, Karl	Norfolk, Nebr.	Wolcott, Jesse P	Port Huron, Mich.
Sullivan, Christopher D	New York City, N. Y.	Wolfenden, James	Upper Darby, Pa.
Sumner, Miss Jessie	Milford, Ill.	Wolverton, Charles A	Merchantville, N. J.
Sumners, Hatton W	Dallas, Tex.	Wood, Reuben T	Springfield, Mo.
Sutphin, William H	Matawan, N. J.	Woodruff, Roy O	Bay City, Mich.
Sweeney, Martin L	Cleveland, Ohio.	Woodrum, Clifton A	Roanoke, Va.
Taber, John	Auburn, N. Y.	Youngdahl, Oscar	Minneapolis, Minn.
Talle, Henry O	Decorah, Iowa.	Zimmerman, Orville	Kennett, Mo.
Tarver, Malcolm C	Dalton, Ga.		

DELEGATES

Dimond, Anthony J	Valdez, Alaska.	King, Samuel W	Honolulu, Hawaii.

RESIDENT COMMISSIONERS

Elizalde, Joaquin M	Manila, P. I.	Iglesias, Santiago	Santurce, P. R.

INDEX TO THE PROCEEDINGS

SEVENTY-SIXTH CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION, SEPTEMBER 21, 1939, TO NOVEMBER 3, 1939

ABE LINCOLN FERRY PARK, IND., address delivered by T. A. Dicus at dedication of (Appendix, 330).

ABERDEEN (WASH.) DAILY WORLD (newspaper), editorial entitled "I Am War" appearing in (Appendix, 66)

"A COUNTRY SICK OF STRIKES," article from the Philadelphia Inquirer entitled, 483.

ACTS OF CONGRESS, list of acts relative to the arms embargo, 703.

ACTS OF STATE LEGISLATURES, amend the Judicial Code relative to intervention by States and direct appeals to the Supreme Court of the United States in certain cases involving the constitutionality of (see bill H. R. 7599).

ADAMS, ALVA B. (*a Senator from Colorado*).
Attended, 3.
Radio address by Hon. Edwin C. Johnson on neutrality (Appendix, 145).
Radio address by Hon. Edwin C. Johnson on neutrality (Appendix, 61).
Amendments offered by, to
Neutrality (H. J. Res. 306): to amend, 1020.
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 802, 860, 917, 968, 1019.
Neutrality Act 1939, 171, 292.
Reciprocal trade agreements, 1090.
Stabilization fund, 917.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

ADJOURNMENT, adjourn November 3, 1939, sine die (see S. Con. Res. 31*).
Remarks in House relative to the vote on the adjournment resolution, 1396.

"ADJUSTING YOUR BUSINESS TO WAR," excerpts from book by Leo M. Cherne entitled, 716, 744.

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW BILL, statement in article by Richard A. Staderman relative to (Appendix, 628).

AGAR, HERBERT, article concerning the second radio address by Charles A. Lindbergh (Appendix, 405).

AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ADMINISTRATION, statement concerning the domestic pork market issued by (Appendix, 234).

AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES, letter from the Secretary of Agriculture transmitting the draft of a proposed bill to authorize deduction of expenses from proceeds of sales of surplus, 14, 29.

AGRICULTURAL DEPARTMENT. *See* DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE.

AGRICULTURAL EXPORTS, letter from Edward E. Kennedy on the subject of (Appendix, 783).

AGRICULTURAL EXTENSION WORK, letter from the Secretary of Agriculture transmitting report of receipts and expenditures in connection with, 14, 29.

AGRICULTURAL PRICES, remarks in House and statistics relative to, 18, 19.

AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS, remarks in House and statistics relative to exports of (Appendix, 520).
Remarks in House relative to imports and exports of (Appendix, 868).
Text of bill (H. R. 7590) to forbid importation of products until the comparable domestic article attains the parity price, 626.
Table showing exports, imports, and trade balances of (Appendix, 737).

AGRICULTURAL PROJECTS, forbid importation in certain cases (see bill H. R. 7624).

AGRICULTURE, cooperate with States in carrying out operations against plant and animal diseases and insect pests affecting (see bill S. 2986).
Remarks in House relative to the effect of reciprocal trade agreements on (Appendix, 435).

AID FOR THE ALLIES, letter from Leonard Rogers proposing (Appendix, 56).

AIKEN, GEORGE D. (Governor of Vermont), address on Abraham Lincoln delivered by (Appendix, 278).

AIR CARRIERS ENGAGED IN FOREIGN AIR TRANSPORTATION, letter from the Civil Aeronautics Authority transmitting report concerning further regulation of rates, fares, and charges of, 29.

AIR CORPS. *See* ARMY.

AIRCRAFT, amendment in Senate to prohibit issuance of licenses to export aircraft constructed for carrying and dropping bombs, 911.
Article by Edward E. Bomar relative to the sale of airplanes to Great Britain and France, 1372.
Editorial from the Chicago Tribune relative to the labor strike in the plants of the Bohn Aluminum & Brass Corporation at Detroit, Mich., 1159.
Estimated backlog of unfilled orders for, 323.
Letter from the Secretary of the Navy transmitting report of purchases of, 14, 29.
Letter from the Secretary of War transmitting report of designs, aircraft parts, and aeronautical accessories purchased by the War Department, 772.
Statistics relative to values of domestic exports of, 1267.
Tables showing expenditures for naval (Appendix, 727, 728).

AIR MAIL. *See* POSTAL SERVICE.

ALABAMA, making an appropriation for loans and relief in (see H. J. Res. 386, 392).
Remarks in House relative to crop conditions in, 39.
Remarks in House relative to providing aid to farmers in the flood-stricken areas of (Appendix, 863).
Text of House Joint Resolution 386 making an appropriation for loans and relief in, 40.

ALABAMA JOURNAL (newspaper), editorial relative to Senator John H. Bankhead and Speaker William B. Bankhead, appearing in (Appendix, 460).

ALASKA, article by Clark Squire relative to the transfer of Alaska to the United States (Appendix, 465).
Bill to amend act for protection of the fisheries of (see bill H. R. 7542).
Bill to transfer funds to the town of Wrangell in (see bill H. R. 7612).

ALEXANDER, JOHN G. (*a Representative from Minnesota*).
Attended, 8.
Affidavit of Attilio Castigliano relative to Argentine trade treaty (Appendix, 211).
Letter from St. Paul (Minn.) Association of Commerce relative to Argentine trade agreement (Appendix, 210).
Letter from the American Scrutineers, Inc., opposing repeal of arms embargo, 1137.
Bills and joint resolutions introduced by
Public buildings: to provide for alternate structural designs (see bill H. R. 7568), 222.
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 1137, 1259 (Appendix, 769).
Bituminous coal: price-fixing plan for (Appendix, 179).
Neutrality, 1137, 1259 (Appendix, 109, 769),
——— correspondence with constituent (Appendix, 109).
United States of the World (Appendix, 769).
World peace (Appendix, 769).
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES

ALEXANDER, WINNIE, increase pension (see bill H. R. 7555).

ALIENS, provide for deportation of certain (see bill H. R. 7569).

ALLEGHENY RIVER IMPROVEMENT ASSOCIATION, resolution adopted by (Appendix, 532).

ALLEN, A. LEONARD (*a Representative from Louisiana*).
Attended, 8.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES

ALLEN, LEO E. (*a Representative from Illinois*).
Attended, 8.
Remarks by, on
National Committee to Keep America Out of War, 215.
Woodrum, Clifton A.: war service, 215.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES

ALLEN, ROBERT G. (*a Representative from Pennsylvania*).
Attended, 8.
Article from the Nation's Business on the town of Scottdale, Pa. (Appendix, 796).
Editorial from Washington Post on Neutrality (Appendix, 660).
Radio address by Gifford Pinchot on repeal of arms embargo (Appendix, 520).

ALLEN, ROBERT G.—Continued.
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 210, 211, 1122, 1123, 1124, 1125, 1189, 1209, 1254, 1259, 1973, 2356.
Neutrality, 526, 528, 529, 1122, 1123, 1124, 1125, 1189, 1209, 1254, 1259.
Subversive activities, 875, 876.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES
ALTERNATE STRUCTURAL DESIGNS, providing for (see bill H. R. 7568).
ALTSCHWAGER & SON, WM., letter relative to importation of mink pelts, 1280.
"AMERICA," editorial from the Saturday Evening Post entitled (Appendix, 236).
Joint resolution requesting the President to appoint a committee on celebration of the four hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the discovery of (See H. J. Res. 390).
Remarks in House relative to the proposed celebration of the four hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the discovery of, 336.
Remarks in House relative to observance of the four hundred and forty-seventh anniversary of the discovery of (Appendix, 287).
"AMERICA CAN KEEP OUT," editorial from the Wilmington (Del.) Journal-Every Evening entitled (Appendix, 135).
"AMERICA CAN KEEP OUT OF WAR," remarks in House entitled (Appendix, 804).
"AMERICA IN THE KEY POSITION," article by Kurt Bloch entitled, 1373.
"AMERICA LOVES PEACE AND HATES WAR," address delivered by Representative Martin J. Kennedy at Oslo, Norway, entitled (Appendix, 68).
"AMERICA MUST CHOOSE," speech delivered by Representative Brewster at the annual banquet of the Maine Universalist Convention held at Augusta, Maine, entitled (Appendix, 832).
"AMERICA NEEDS AN INCREASED AIR FORCE," address delivered by Charles F. Horner entitled (Appendix, 332).
"AMERICA TAKES THE CASH," article from the Timber Trades Journal of London, England, entitled (Appendix, 511).
AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION, report on the subject of neutrality and arms embargo submitted by the section of international and comparative law of (Appendix, 508).
AMERICAN BEEF MARKET, statement issued by the Department of Agriculture concerning (Appendix, 152).
AMERICAN BUSINESS, address delivered by Representative Osmers at the New York World's Fair entitled "The War and American Business" (Appendix, 766).
AMERICAN DEFENSE SOCIETY, INC., letter concerning deficiencies in the United States Army, 1361.
"AMERICAN FARMER PAYS AGAIN!" remarks in House entitled (Appendix, 798).
AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR, address delivered by Senator Taft to the convention at Cincinnati, Ohio (Appendix, 504).
AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY, address delivered by Edwin Borchard on the subject of (Appendix, 415).
Address delivered by Alfred M. Landon relative to (Appendix, 720).
Chronology of (Appendix, 552).
AMERICAN FOREIGN TRADE, address delivered by Edmund A. Walsh on the subject of (Appendix, 743).
AMERICAN FOREIGN TRADE IN WARTIME, address delivered by James A. Farrell on the subject of (Appendix, 510).
AMERICAN-GERMAN YOUTH MOVEMENT, remarks in House relative to, 537.
AMERICAN GOOD GOVERNMENT REVIEW, articles from (Appendix, 627, 859).
AMERICAN GOOD GOVERNMENT SOCIETY, article compiled by (Appendix, 859).
Editorial from the Henry County (Ohio) Signal containing references to Richard A. Staderman, president of (Appendix, 468).
Statement in article by Richard A. Staderman relative to magazine of (Appendix, 628).
AMERICAN HUMANE ASSOCIATION, statement entitled "What War Really Means to Animals" prepared by (Appendix, 598).
AMERICAN INDUSTRY, article concerning the status of (Appendix, 722).
AMERICANISM, address delivered by Representative Bradley of Michigan, at Rogers City, Mich., on the subject of (Appendix, 23).
AMERICAN JEWISH CONGRESS, address delivered by Representative Dingell before (Appendix, 214).
AMERICAN JOURNAL OF INTERNATIONAL LAW, statement of principles concerning neutrality appearing in, 1114, 1118.
AMERICAN LABOR. *See* LABOR.
AMERICAN LAW ENFORCEMENT, address delivered by J. Edgar Hoover on the subject of (Appendix, 113, 283, 499).
AMERICAN LEAGUE FOR PEACE AND DEMOCRACY, editorial from the Washington Post relative to publication by the House Committee on Investigation of Un-American Activities of the names of the members of (Appendix, 530).
Letter from Helen Wood remonstrating against the inclusion of her name as a member of (Appendix 815).
Remarks in House relative to the publication of the names of Government employees who are members of, 878, 1033, 1051 (Appendix, 697).
AMERICAN LEGION, address delivered by Representative Brewster at Ellsworth, Maine, relative to (Appendix, 869).
Inaugural address of Raymond J. Kelly, national commander of (Appendix, 115).
Resolution on neutrality adopted by the twenty-first national convention of (Appendix, 437).
AMERICAN MERCHANT MARINE. *See also* VESSELS.
Article by Frank L. Kluckhohn relative to the sinking or capture of American ships by belligerents, 787.
Article by Mark Sullivan relative to the effect of proposed neutrality legislation on (Appendix, 264).
List of merchant vessels sunk or attacked by Germany during the World War, 667.
Memorandum of March 9, 1917, from the Secretary of the Navy to the President relative to arming merchant vessels with naval gun crews and a naval officer, 738, 739.
Statement concerning the effect of proposed neutrality legislation on (Appendix, 262).
AMERICAN MUNITIONS PLANTS, list of explosions and fires occurring in, 476, 596.
AMERICAN NEUTRALITY AND ALIEN IDEOLOGIES, radio address by Representative Dickstein on the subject of (Appendix, 71).
AMERICAN RED CROSS, letter from the Secretary of War transmitting the annual report of, 1058.
AMERICAN REPUBLICS, joint resolutions relating to the improvement of economic, commercial, and cultural relations among (see S. J. Res. 187; H. J. Res. 394).
Letter from the Secretary of State relative to conferences on inter-American cultural relations, 540.
AMERICAN RESERVE ARMY, remarks in House relative to (Appendix, 817).
AMERICAN RIGHTS UPON THE HIGH SEAS, letter of February 25, 1916, from President Wilson to Senator Stone relative to (Appendix, 698).
AMERICAN SCHOOL ARMY, remarks in House relative to (Appendix, 817).
AMERICAN SCRUTINEERS, letter from Agnes Rosa, corresponding secretary, favoring retention of the arms embargo (Appendix, 1137).
AMERICAN SHIPPING IN WARTIME, address delivered by W. K. Jackson on the subject of (Appendix, 291).
AMERICAN VESSELS, list of torpedoed, 606, 607.
AMERICAN YOUTH. *See* NATIONAL YOUTH ADMINISTRATION.
AMERICA'S ATTITUDE TOWARD THE WAR, address over the radio delivered by President Franklin D. Roosevelt on the subject of (Appendix, 40).
"AMERICA'S CATHOLIC YOUTH AND EUROPE'S WAR," address over the radio delivered by Bernard D. Shiel entitled (Appendix, 131).
AMERICA'S CHANCE OF PEACE (book), article from the Washington Evening Star commenting on (Appendix, 696).
AMERICA'S DAIRY LAND, letter from Fred R. Zimmerman referring to the State of Wisconsin as (Appendix, 440).
"AMERICA'S DESTINY," advertisement of Continental Mills, Inc., of Philadelphia, Pa., entitled (Appendix, 94).
Sermon preached by C. J. Gunnell entitled (Appendix 120).
"AMERICA'S PARLOR PINKS ARE INDIGNANT," editorial from the Bergen Evening Record, Hackensack, N. J., entitled (Appendix, 683).
AMERICA'S WORK FOR PEACE, remarks in House on the subject of, 1060.
AMPLUS STORAGE BATTERY CO., relief (see bill S. 2978).
ANDERSEN, H. CARL (*a Representative from Minnesota*).
Attended, 8.
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 1290.
Neutrality, 1290.
Pan American Conference, 263.
Poison gas: action of Senate relative to shipment of, 961.
Reciprocal trade agreements, 943, 944, 958.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.
ANDERSON, C. ARTHUR (*a Representative from Missouri*).
Attended, 8.
Address by Hon. Chester Thompson on regulation of bituminous-coal industry (Appendix, 549).

ANDERSON, C. ARTHUR—Continued.
Letters and telegrams from constituents, 1195, 1196.
Poem by John W. Dodd entitled "The Crimson Trail" (Appendix, 517).
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 1172, 1195, 1196.
Neutrality, 1172, 1195, 1196.
New Deal propaganda, 297, 298.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

ANDERSON, JOHN Z. (*a Representative from California*).
Attended, 8.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

ANDRESEN, AUGUST H. (*a Representative from Minnesota*).
Proposal by Jay C. Hormel for Domestic Recovery (Appendix, 68).
Bills and joint resolutions introduced by
Sarazin, Frank L.: for relief (see bill H. R. 7561), 80.
Remarks by, on
Argentine trade agreement, 940, 941, 942, 943, 944, 945, 949.
Arms embargo, 1209, 1228, 1229, 1230.
——— conference report, 1387.
Farm conditions, 940–944.
Gold reserve fund, 1228, 1229, 1230.
Neutrality, 528, 530, 1209, 1228, 1229, 1230.
——— conference report, 1387.
——— printing of pamphlet, 255.
New Deal farm program, 940, 941, 942.
Permission to address the House, 620.
Reciprocal trade agreements, 532, 1054, 1055.
Special session and partisan politics, 940, 941, 942.
Wallace, Henry A.: statement relative to third term, 940.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

ANDREWS, CHARLES O. (*a Senator from Florida*).
Attended, 3.
Address by Martin Caraballo before meeting of Foreign Trade Committee, Tampa, Fla. (Appendix, 617).
Bills and joint resolutions introduced by
Sarasota Pass, Bradenton, Fla.: to bridge (see bill S. 3002) (Appendix, 1281).
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 126, 679.
Neutrality, 126, 679.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NQY VOTES.

ANDREWS, WALTER G. (*a Representative from New York*).
Attended, 8.
Statement by a constituent concerning neutrality (Appendix, 660).
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

ANGELL, HOMER D. (*a Representative from Oregon*).
Attended, 8.
Article from the Spectator (Portland, Oreg.) on neutrality (Appendix, 326).
Editorial from Portland (Oreg.) Shopping News on neutrality (Appendix, 11).
Editorials on reciprocal trade agreement program (Appendix, 435).
Editorial by Charles F. Davis on importation of foreign pulp (Appendix, 468).
Editorial from Oregon Sunday Journal on munitions manufacturers (Appendix, 758).
Letter from Edward E. Kennedy on farm problems (Appendix, 699).
List of wars engaged in by France and England since 1778, 1223, 1224.
Statement of a conference of Western interests on the effect of neutrality law on Pacific Coast States (Appendix, 296).
Statement entitled "What War Means to Animals" (Appendix, 392).
Telegram from Ross McIntyre, Portland, Oreg., concerning neutrality (Appendix, 702).
Bills and joint resolutions introduced by
Foreign trade agreements: to require ratification by Senate (see bill H. R. 7592), 772.
Petitions and papers presented by from
Citizens and individuals, 1279, 1397.
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 1221.
England and France: wars of (Appendix, 1223).
Neutrality, 1221 (Appendix, 392).
Reciprocal trade agreements (Appendix, 435, 773).
Uruguay: trade treaty with (Appendix, 773).
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

ANIMAL DISEASES, combat (see bill S. 2986).
Bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with State and local agencies in carrying out operations against (see bill H. R. 7605).

ANIMALS, remarks in House and a statement relative to the effects of war on (Appendix, 392).
Statement prepared by the American Humane Association entitled, "What War Really Means to Animals" (Appendix, 598).

ANNIVERSARIES OF EVENTS IN ENGLISH AND AMERICAN HISTORY, remarks in House relative to certain, 611, 612.

"ANOTHER INSTANCE OF THE ADMINISTRATION'S DUPLICITY", remarks in House entitled (Appendix, 639).

ANTISEMITISM, address delivered by Representative Gavagan on the subject of (Appendix, 448).

APACHE INDIANS. *See* INDIANS.

APPROPRIATIONS, remarks in House relative to propaganda expenditures, 257.
Remarks in House relative to the use of unauthorized appropriations by the executive departments (Appendix, 834).
Statistics relative to appropriations for the Air Corps and the Ordnance Department of the Army, 1267, 1268.

ARCHIVIST OF THE UNITED STATES.
Letters transmitting lists of useless papers in
Treasury Department, Navy Department, Department of the Interior, the Civil Service Commission, the Federal Communications Commission, and W. P. A., 30, 41, 706, 815.

ARENDS, LESLIE C. (*a Representative from Illinois*).
Attended, 8.
Remarks, by on
Arms embargo, 1251.
Neutrality, 1251.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

ARGENTINA, article by Richard A. Staderman relative to the proposed reciprocal trade agreement with (Appendix, 628).
Brief before the Federal Trade Commission relative to the effect on domestic cheese of proposed concession in the trade agreement with (Appendix, 371).
Brief by Fred Brenckman relative to the trade agreement with (Appendix, 532).
Editorials from the Washington Daily News, the Washington Evening Star, and the Washington Post relative to the trade agreement with (Appendix, 382).
Letter from Senator Wiley to John P. Gregg relative to the proposed reciprocal trade agreement with, 1279, 1280.
Letter from the St. Paul (Minn.) Association of Commerce, and an affidavit sworn to by Attilio Castigliano relative to the proposed reciprocal trade agreement with (Appendix, 210).
Remarks in House relative to the proposed trade agreement with, 532, 538, 569, 610, 625, 955, 1054.
Statement by Representative Carlson relative to the proposed reciprocal trade agreement with (Appendix, 339).
Statement by Representative Case concerning the proposed trade agreement with (Appendix, 356).
Statement by Representative Coffee of Nebraska relative to the proposed trade agreement with (Appendix, 323).
Statement by Representative Crawford before the Committee for Reciprocity Information opposing the proposed reciprocal trade agreement with (Appendix, 395).
Statement by Representative Ferguson relative to the proposed trade agreement with (Appendix, 328).
Statement by Representative Hope relative to the proposed reciprocal trade agreement with (Appendix, 336).
Statement of Representative Horton before the Committee for Reciprocity Information concerning the reciprocal trade agreement with (Appendix, 378).

ARIZONA, remarks in House relative to highways in (Appendix, 1, 65).

ARIZONA STATE ELKS ASSOCIATION HOSPITAL, for sale of certain lands to (see bills S. 2980; H. R. 7571).

ARKANSAS, editorials on the subject of neutrality written by various editors of (Appendix, 663).

ARKANSAS RIVER, report of Secretary of War on survey of Salt Fork of (H. Doc. 480), 24.

"ARMAGEDDON AGAIN," article by Raymond Clapper entitled (Appendix, 4).

ARMS, AMMUNITION, AND IMPLEMENTS OF WAR, amendments and remarks in Senate relative to prohibiting the export to belligerent nations of, 914, 925.
Article by Lowell Limpus entitled "Arms a Fraction of War Goods Exports" (Appendix, 77).
Bill to prohibit all officers and employees of the United States from receiving any remuneration with respect to the manufacture or sale of (see bill S. 3001).
Bill to tax transactions in (see bill H. R. 7557).
Excerpts from letters from foreign embassies relative to exportation of, 1153.
Proclamation by the President, of May 1, 1937, enumerating, 56.
Remarks in House relative to the sale to England and France of, 1371.
Table showing values of domestic exports of munitions and aircraft from the United States to selected foreign countries, 1266.

ARMS EMBARGO. *See also* NEUTRALITY.
Address over the radio delivered by Senator Austin entitled "Changing Embargoes for National Defense," 490.
Address over the radio delivered by Senator Borah relative to, (Appendix, 461).
Address over the radio delivered by Senator Capper on the subject of (Appendix, 87).

ARMS EMBARGO—Continued.
Address over the radio delivered by Senator Danaher relative to repeal of (Appendix, 717).
Address over the radio delivered by Senator Thomas of Utah on the subject of, 466.
Address delivered by Senator Thomas of Utah before the American Academy of Political and Social Science on the subject of (Appendix, 311).
Address over the radio delivered by Representative Fish on the subject of (Appendix, 700).
Address over the radio delivered by Representative Kee relative to (Appendix, 451).
Address over the radio delivered by Representative Luther A. Johnson favoring repeal of (Appendix, 573).
Statement by Representative Mundt concerning effect of repeal of (Appendix, 860).
Address over the radio delivered by Smedley D. Butler opposing the proposed repeal of, 567.
Address by William J. Gross on the subject of (Appendix, 636).
Address delivered by Herbert Hoover on the subject of (Appendix, 497).
Address over the radio delivered by Gifford Pinchot relative to (Appendix, 520).
Address over the radio delivered by John A. Ryan concerning (Appendix, 313, 513).
Address over the radio delivered by Alfred E. Smith on the subject of (Appendix, 78, 106).
Address over the radio delivered by Alvin C. York relative to (Appendix, 331).
Amendments in Senate to House Joint Resolution 306 relative to the proposed repeal of, 443, 492, 589, 678, 707, 773, 774, 775, 816, 889.
Amendment and remarks in Senate relative to the cash-and-carry provision of, 1009.
Amendment and remarks in Senate relative to, 1022.
Analysis of principal provisions of House Joint Resolution 306 relative to, 822.
Article by Henry T. Gorrell relative to effects of repeal of (Appendix, 759).
Article by W. B. Hesseltine entitled "History of Embargo Policy" (Appendix, 463).
Article by Ernest Lindley entitled "Matters of Fact"—The Embargo and International Law (Appendix, 92).
Article from the Washington Post relative to the attitude of Senator Caraway toward repeal of (Appendix, 228).
Conference report on House Joint Resolution 306 relative to repeal of (H. Rept. 1475), 1352, 1381, 1397.
Copy of a Gallup poll on the subject of, 504.
Editorials from the Gaelic American concerning (Appendix, 282).
Editorial from the Jackson (Mich.) Citizen-Press entitled "Embargo and the *City of Flint*" (Appendix, 656).
Editorial from the Saturday Evening Post entitled "Embargo History" (Appendix, 536).
Excerpts from laws and decrees of foreign nations relative to (Appendix, 351).
Excerpts from laws and decrees of the United States relative to (Appendix, 355).
Letter from the Secretary of State relative to the proposed repeal of the arms embargo against Spain (Appendix, 597).
Letter from Senator McKellar on the proposed repeal of (Appendix, 148).
Letter from Representative Fish opposing repeal of (Appendix, 210).
Letter written by Representative Kee on the subject of (Appendix, 215).
Letter of April 21, 1915, from W. J. Bryan, Secretary of State, to the German Ambassador (Bernstorff) on the subject of, 696.
Letter from the American Scrutineers favoring retention of, 1137.
Letter from Hiram Bingham relative to the effect of the proposed repeal of the arms embargo on the relations of the United States with Japan, 1255, 1256.
Letter from Henry Breckinridge on the subject of (Appendix, 174).
Letter from Edward S. Corwin relative to the proposed repeal of, 283.
Letter from Charles Cheney Hyde and Philip C. Jessup on the subject of, 283 (Appendix, 103, 170).
Letter from Edward E. Kennedy relative to (Appendix, 699).
Letter from Cloyd Laporte on the subject of (Appendix, 393).
Letters from John Bassett Moore and others relative to repeal of (Appendix, 761).
Letter from Jacob Panken relative to (Appendix, 70).
Letter from Gifford Pinchot favoring repeal of (Appendix, 746).
Letters from J. J. Rousseau relating to, 637.
Letter from W. B. Swaney relative to (Appendix, 640).
Letter from James W. Tisdale to Charles A. Lindbergh on the subject of (Appendix, 673).
Letter from James E. Watson, former Senator from Indiana, favoring repeal of (Appendix, 606, 663).
ARMS EMBARGO—Continued.
List of acts of Congress relative to, 703.
List of names of citizens of the Southeastern States who favor repeal of (Appendix, 257).
Poem by Grace Marie Piper relative to (Appendix, 388).
Radio discussion participated in by Senators Schwellenbach, Overton, Holt, Minton, Pepper, and Representative Van Zandt on the subject of (Appendix, 407).
Remarks in House and correspondence concerning the Gallup poll on (Appendix, 285, 502).
Remarks in House on House Joint Resolution 306 to repeal, 34, 35, 78, 136, 140, 141, 142, 209, 255, 260, 302, 337, 344, 350, 384, 473, 479, 522, 533, 585, 616, 758, 763, 767, 810, 864, 865, 866, 875, 961, 1036, 1044, 1219 (Appendix, 5, 9, 16, 29, 46, 47, 91, 99, 104, 107, 109, 118, 122, 137, 140, 171, 183, 221, 223, 231, 233, 319, 358, 365, 375, 381, 383, 438, 488, 502, 530, 632, 694, 700, 710).
Remarks in Senate on House Joint Resolution 306 relative to, 47, 48, 49, 65, 83, 95, 104, 110, 173, 224, 234, 266, 309, 355, 397, 443, 490, 541, 590, 628, 678, 708, 741, 820, 889, 965 (Appendix, 128, 129, 262).
Remarks in House on conference report on House Joint Resolution 306 relative to repeal of, 1105, 1275, 1284, 1324, 1325, 1330, 1337, 1386 (Appendix, 752, 754, 763, 764, 767, 794, 800, 803, 810, 813, 817, 844, 857, 862, 884).
Remarks in Senate on conference report on House Joint Resolution 306 relative to repeal of, 1354.
Remarks in Senate relative to the status of Great Britain with reference to, 1350.
Report of the American Bar Association concerning (Appendix, 508).
Statement by Thomas Hewes relative to repeal of (Appendix, 540).
Statement by Rembert Gilman Smith on the subject of (Appendix, 483).
Telegram from pastors of the New England Conference of the Lutheran Augustana Synod remonstrating against repeal of (Appendix, 712).
ARMY, address delivered by Louis Johnson, Assistant Secretary of War, entitled "The Challenge to the American Army" (Appendix, 670).
Address delivered by Maj. Gen. Hugh A. Drum at the opening conference of the First Army maneuvers (Appendix, 237).
Remarks in House and a letter from the American Defense Society, Inc., relative to criticisms of, 1361.
Air Corps: statistics relative to appropriations for new aircraft, 1267.
Lieutenant general: bill providing for rank and title of (see bill H. R. 7611).
Ordnance Department: Statistics relative to appropriations for, 1268.
ARMY AND NAVY JOURNAL, editorial relative to the Woodring-Johnson feud appearing in (Appendix, 277).
ARNOLD, LAURENCE F. (*a Representative from Illinois*).
Attended, 8.
Article by David Lawrence relative to neutrality legislation (Appendix, 64).
Remarks by, on
Pennsylvania: Republican administration in, 657.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.
AROOSTOOK COUNTY, MAINE, speeches delivered by Representative Brewster at Fort Fairfield and Belfast, Maine, extolling the attractions of (Appendix, 842, 843).
ASHBROOK, WILLIAM A. (*a Representative from Ohio*).
Attended, 8.
Bills and joint resolutions introduced by
Porter, Mary E.: to increase pension (see bill H. R. 7572), 222.
Petitions and papers presented by, from
Citizens and individuals, 354.
Societies and associations, 14, 1279, 1397.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.
ASHURST, HENRY F. (*a Senator from Arizona*).
Attended, 3.
Appointed on funeral committee, 81.
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 777.
Neutrality, 777.
Wilson, Woodrow, 777.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.
ASIA (magazine), article entitled "The Month in the Orient" appearing in (Appendix, 600).
ATHENIA (steamship), remarks in Senate and a newspaper article relative to the sinking of, 689.
ATKINSON, ELA H., relief (see S. Res. 193*).
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES.
Communications from
Executive powers under national emergency proclamation: report concerning (S. Doc. 133), 109.
Pernicious political activities: interpreting the act to prevent (S. Doc. 135), 1351 (Appendix, 712).

ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES—Continued.
Communications from
Special assistant attorneys: relative to employment of, 14, 29.
Orders to
Executive powers under national emergency proclamation: to inform Senate relative to (S. Res. 185), 32.
AUCHINCLOSS, GORDON, letter relative to E. M. House written by (Appendix, 334).
AUSTIN, ALBERT E. (*a Representative from Connecticut*).
Attended, 8.
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 1296.
Neutrality, 1296.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.
AUSTIN, WARREN R. (*a Senator from Vermont*).
Attended, 3.
Address before Executives Club, Chicago, Ill., on foreign policy of United States, 1003.
Appointed on funeral committee, 81.
Article from Washington Daily News relative to statement on repeal of arms embargo by, 267.
Letter from Eastern Steamship Lines relative to shipping to Nova Scotia, 787.
Radio address by Hon. W. Warren Barbour entitled "The Path to Peace" (Appendix, 506).
Radio address on subject, "Changing Embargoes for National Defense," 490.
Radio address by Hon. Chan Gurney on drafting wealth in time of war (Appendix, 464).
Report on neutrality by national affairs committee of the National Republican Club, 806.
Amendments offered by, to
Neutrality Act, 1939 (H. J. Res. 306): to amend, 492, 999, 1000.
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 201, 203, 230, 231, 267, 490, 492, 599, 600, 601, 778, 786, 788, 789, 798, 800, 893, 894, 1000, 1001, 1002, 1003.
——— aircraft production, 798, 799, 800.
Neutrality Act, 1939, 201, 203, 230, 231, 267, 490, 492, 599, 600, 601, 778, 786, 788, 789, 798, 800, 893, 894, 1000, 1001, 1002, 1003.
Nova Scotia, 787.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.
AUSTRIA, excerpts from arms-embargo laws of (Appendix, 351).
BABSON, ROGER W., article relative to effect of war on United States trade written by (Appendix, 373).
Statement concerning conditions in China written by (Appendix, 699).
BAILEY, JOSIAH W. (*a Senator from North Carolina*).
Attended, 3.
Address by Admiral Emory S. Land at American Merchant Marine Conference, New York City (Appendix, 368).
Letter addressed to the people of North Carolina relative to pending neutrality legislation (Appendix, 184).
List of neutral ships lost in European War from September 3 to October 23, 1939 (Appendix, 454).
List of American ships sunk prior to entrance of United States into World War (Appendix, 454).
Memorandum from Civil Aeronautics Authority on the effect of proposed neutrality legislation on American air carriers (Appendix, 267).
Statement on the effect of pending neutrality legislation on the merchant marine (Appendix, 262, 267).
Statistics on the effect of pending neutrality legislation on American merchant marine (Appendix, 269, 270, 271, 272).
Tables showing imports of strategic commodities (Appendix, 272–275).
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 244.
Neutrality Act 1939, 244, 247.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.
BALDUS, S. A., article and an editorial on the subject of neutrality written by (Appendix, 469, 569).
BALDWIN, ERNEST R. (mayor of Berkley, Mich.), article entitled "It's Glorious To Be an American These Days," written by, 757.
BALL, THOMAS R. (*a Representative from Connecticut*).
Attended, 8.
Remarks by, on
Neutrality, 1136.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.
BALTIMORE CITY COLLEGE, address delivered by Senator Schwellenbach at the centenary celebration of (Appendix, 455).
BALTIMORE SUN (newspaper), editorial entitled "Mr. Roosevelt Argues for a Real Neutrality Program (Appendix, 174).
Editorial on Aubrey Williams appearing in (Appendix, 259).
Editorial on the subject of neutrality appearing in (Appendix, 459).
BANCROFT, GEORGE, statement concerning Andrew Jackson and the French spoliation claims written by, 427.
BANKHEAD, JOHN H. (*a Senator from Alabama*).
Attended, 173.
Address by Harold L. Ickes to the National Coal Association at New York (Appendix, 537).
Editorial from Alabama Journal on the Bankheads of Alabama (Appendix, 460).
Editorial from Birmingham News on permanent crop control (Appendix, 316).
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 649.
Neutrality, 649.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.
BANKHEAD, WILLIAM B. (*a Representative from Alabama*) (Speaker of the House of Representatives.)
Attended, 8.
Editorial from Alabama Journal on the Bankheads of Alabama (Appendix, 460).
Letter from Arthur Charles Jackson, president of the Thomas Brackett Reed Association (Appendix, 799).
Remarks by Representative Francis H. Case relative to effective work for drought- and flood-stricken areas by (Appendix, 825).
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 1340, 1341.
Martin, Joseph W.: birthday, 1379.
Neutrality, 1340, 1341.
Reed, Thomas Brackett, 572.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.
BANSHEES, letter from John J. O'Connor on the subject of (Appendix, 208).
BARBOUR, W. WARREN (*a Senator from New Jersey*).
Attended, 1.
Radio address on subject, The Path to Peace, by (Appendix, 506).
Resolution from New Jersey Legislature relative to war profiteering, 223.
Statement by Council Against Intolerance in America—sesquicentennial reaffirmation of the Bill of Rights, 46.
Bills and joint resolutions introduced by
Horvath, John: for relief (see bill S. 2995), 965.
Public works: to authorize Secretary of the Navy to proceed with construction of (see bill S. 3000), 1281.
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 638.
Neutrality, 638, 891.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.
BARDEN, GRAHAM A. (*a Representative from North Carolina*).
Attended, 8.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.
BARKLEY, ALBEN W. (*a Senator from Kentucky*).
Attended, 3.
Address by Hon. A. B. Chandler at Disciples of Christ, Richmond, Va. (Appendix, 458).
Address by J. Edgar Hoover before International Chiefs of Police at San Francisco, Calif. (Appendix, 248).
Address by Hon. Cordell Hull before conference on Inter-American relations in the field of education (Appendix, 788).
Address by Louis Johnson at White Sulphur Springs, W. Va., on subject, Lessons From Poland (Appendix, 425).
Appointed on committee, 706.
Appointed on committee to wait upon the President, 4.
Appointed on committee to conduct the President, 9.
Appointed on funeral committee, 81.
Foreword by Louis Johnson to book by Leo M. Cherne on business and war, 744.
Letter from Senator Tobey relative to procedure to be followed in debating arms embargo resolution (H. J. Res. 306), 105.
Letter from Civil Service Commission relative to appointments excepted from civil service in public exigencies, 1349.
Proclamation by President Roosevelt relative to use of territorial waters of the United States by submarines of belligerent states (Appendix, 787).
Proclamation by President Roosevelt on the state of war in Europe (Appendix, 787).
Radio address by Hon. Edward R. Burke on neutrality and national defense (Appendix, 82).
Radio address by Hon. Tom Connally on neutrality (Appendix, 226).
Radio address by Hon. Clyde L. Herring on neutrality (Appendix, 74).
Radio address by Hon. Scott W. Lucas on neutrality (Appendix, 290).
Radio address by Hon. Key Pittman on the Neutrality Act as passed by the Senate (Appendix, 603).
Radio address by President Roosevelt on America's attitude toward the European war (Appendix, 40).
Radio address by President Roosevelt in the New York Herald Tribune Forum (Appendix, 560).

BARKLEY, ALBEN W.—Continued.
Radio address by Hon. Lewis B. Schwellenbach on arms embargo (Appendix, 81).
Radio address by Alfred E. Smith on arms embargo (Appendix, 78).
Radio discussion between Senators Pepper and McNary on neutrality (Appendix, 418).
Statement relative to so-called excise taxes on copper, 1350.
Amendments offered by, to
Logan, Della (H. J. Res. 384): to amend, 224.
Neutrality (H. J. Res. 306): to amend, 894.
Motions and resolutions offered by
Adjournment sine die (S. Con. 31), 1357.
Logan, M. M.: death of (S. Res. 190), 81.
Logan, M. M.: Funeral expenses (see S. Res. 192), 355.
Notification of the President (see S. Res. 182), 4.
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 75, 107, 174, 193, 202, 204, 205, 206, 207, 228, 229, 232, 233, 241, 249, 291, 323, 375, 402, 403, 404, 416, 437, 439, 440, 460, 514, 515, 516, 558, 603, 640, 678, 679, 703, 713, 717, 718, 727, 728, 729, 731, 732, 733, 734, 737, 744, 745, 747, 748, 752, 754, 755, 779, 780, 782, 783, 792, 793, 797, 798, 801, 802, 834, 835, 843, 857, 858, 860, 890, 891, 892, 893, 894, 905, 914, 917, 924, 937, 938, 968, 972, 973, 989, 992, 993, 994, 1000, 1002, 1009, 1010, 1012, 1016.
——— address favoring bill, 603.
——— offensive and defensive weapons, 415.
——— procedure, 678, 679.
——— statement by Newton D. Baker, 605, 606.
——— statement by Senator Borah on prospects of war, 640.
——— statement by Secretary Hull, 604.
——— vessels sunk, 1915–17, 606, 607.
Chandler, A. B.: appointment to committees, 889.
——— credentials of, 234.
Committee on Foreign Relations: authority to file report, 31.
Committee service, 889.
Congressional Record: to print matter after adjournment, 1357.
Executive powers under national emergency proclamation, 31.
Final adjournment, 1357.
Great Britain: seizure of possessions of, 437.
Interpretation of Hatch Act by Department of Justice: to print as Senate document, 1351.
Johnson, Louis, Assistant Secretary of War, 718.
Lindbergh, Col. Charles A.: address by, 6.
Logan, M. M.: tribute to, 81.
Motion-picture propaganda, 713.
Neutrality Act, 1939, 75, 107, 174, 193, 202, 204, 205, 206, 207, 228, 229, 232, 233, 241, 249, 291, 323, 375, 402, 403, 404, 416, 437, 439, 440, 460, 514, 515, 516, 558, 603, 640, 678, 679, 703, 713, 717, 718, 727, 728, 729, 731, 732, 733, 734, 737, 744, 745, 747, 748, 752, 754, 755, 779, 780, 782, 783, 792, 793, 797, 798, 801, 802, 834, 835, 843, 857, 858, 860, 968.
——— appointment of conferees, 1281.
——— cash-and-carry, 514, 515.
——— order of procedure, 49, 775, 776.
——— preamble, 1029, 1032.
Order of business, 5, 335.
——— neutrality message from House, 1281.
Procedure following passage of neutrality bill by Senate, 1023.
Reciprocal trade agreements, 1087, 1088.
Report of committee to notify the President, 4.
Roosevelt, Franklin D.: church service attended by, 727, 728.
Stabilization fund, 917, 918, 921, 923.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.
BARKSDALE FIELD, LA., address delivered by Representative Brooks at the dedication of the chapel at (Appendix, 381).
BARNES, HARRY ELMER, article entitled "When Last We Were Neutral," written by (Appendix, 578).
BARNES, JAMES M. (*a Representative from Illinois*).
Attended, 8.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.
BARRY, W. B. (*a Representative from New York*).
Attended, 8.
Address of James A. Farley at dedication of North Beach Airport, New York City (Appendix, 359).
Excerpt from book by W. E. Woodward on the history of the World War, 1125.
Letters to constituents stating views on neutrality (Appendix, 329).
Remarks by, on
Neutrality, 340, 341, 1107, 1126.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.
BARTON, BRUCE (*a Representative from New York*).
Attended, 8.
Radio address on cash and carry and the embargo (Appendix 592).
Petitions and papers presented by, from
Citizens and individuals, 24.
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 1162, 1163.
Neutrality, 1107, 1162, 1163.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.
BATES, GEORGE J. (*a Representative from Massachusetts*).
Attended, 8.
Letter from Acting Secretary of the Navy relative to cost of doubling the size of the present fleet, 1064, 1065.
Tables showing naval strength of various countries, 1065, 1066.
Tables showing national-defense expenditures of the world, 1932–39, 1245.
Bills and joint resolutions introduced by
Naval defenses: to investigate (see H. J. Res. 396), 1158.
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 1244.
Navy of the United States, 1065.
Neutrality, 1244.
Reciprocal trade agreements, 959, 960.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.
BATES, JOE B. (*a Representative from Kentucky*).
Attended, 8.
Appointed on funeral committee, 148.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.
BAYOU LAFOURCHE, LA., legalize a bridge across (see bill S. 2999).
BEAM, HARRY P. (*a Representative from Illinois*).
Attended, 8.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.
BEAR BUTTE NATIONAL MONUMENT, set aside certain lands for (see bill H. R. 7619).
BEARD, CHARLES, statement concerning Presidential war powers written by, 329.
Statement concerning President Roosevelt's foreign policy written by, 1140.
BEASLEY'S FARM AND HOME WEEKLY, editorial on the subject of neutrality appearing in (Appendix, 207).
BEAVERBROOK, LORD, article relative to the proposed military alliance of the United States and Great Britain written by, 302.
BECK, JAMES M., remarks in House relative to, 664.
BECKLEY, JOHN L., article concerning the commercial air-transport industry written by (Appendix, 536).
BECKMAN, F. J., address over the radio on the subject of neutrality delivered by (Appendix, 666).
Plea for Christianity and Americanism submitted by (Appendix, 614).
BECKWORTH, LINDLEY (*a Representative from Texas*).
Attended, 8.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.
BEDFORD (IND.) ROTARY CLUB, letter conferring on Representative Crowe honorary membership in, 473.
BEEF, statement issued by the Department of Agriculture concerning the American beef market (Appendix, 152).
Statistics of imports of (Appendix, 340).
BEET SUGAR, letter from the Consumers' Counsel commenting on the quality of (Appendix, 602).
BEET-SUGAR CULTURE, remarks in House relative to, 387.
BELGIUM, excerpts from arms embargo laws of (Appendix, 351).
BELL, C. JASPER (*a Representative from Missouri*).
Attended, 8.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.
BELLE GLADE, FLA., examination and survey at (see bill H. R. 7549).
BELLIGERENT NATIONS. *See also* FOREIGN COUNTRIES; WAR.
Amendment in Senate to prohibit loans by the Government designed to assist the export of goods to, 924.
Bill to provide sound payment for goods sold to (see bill H. R. 7544).
Memorandum concerning entry into ports of the United States by armed merchant vessels of, 967.
Telegram of August 15, 1914, from W. J. Bryan to J. P. Morgan & Co., relative to loans to, 369.
BENDER, GEORGE H. (*a Representative from Ohio*).
Attended, 8.
Appointed on funeral committee, 1081.
Telegram from Michael Volin relative to arms embargo bill, 1268.
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 1268.
Arnold, Thurman, Assistant Attorney General (Appendix, 832).
Bolton, Chester C.: tribute to, 1076.
Constitutional government (Appendix, 747).
Emergency expenditures by the President (Appendix, 834).
Neutrality (Appendix, 585, 1268).
New Deal war on business (Appendix, 832).
Pound, Roscoe (Appendix, 747).
President of the United States: emergency expenditures by (Appendix, 834).
——— third term tradition (Appendix, 842).
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

BERGEN EVENING RECORD, HACKENSACK, N. J., editorial on the subject of neutrality appearing in (Appendix, 95).
Editorial favoring deportation of Fritz Kuhn appearing in (Appendix, 652).
Editorial entitled "America's Parlor Pinks Are Indignant" appearing in (Appendix, 683).

BIEHL, GEORGE, article on the World War (1914–18) written by, 418.

BIGOTRY, address delivered by Representative Gavagan relative to the menace of (Appendix, 448).

BILBO, THEODORE G. (*a Senator from Mississippi*).
Attended, 3.
List of supporters of pending neutrality legislation compiled by Keener C. Frazier (Appendix, 228).
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

BILL OF RIGHTS, address delivered by Representative Bloom on the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the passage of (Appendix, 11).
Statement concerning the sesquicentennial reaffirmation of, 46.

BINGHAM, HIRAM, letter relative to the effect of the proposed repeal of the arms embargo on the relations of the United States with Japan, 1255.

BIRMINGHAM (ALA.) NEWS, editorial entitled "Crop Control Is Here to Stay" appearing in (Appendix, 316).

BITUMINOUS COAL. *See* COAL.

BLACKNEY, WILLIAM W. (*a Representative from Michigan*).
Attended, 8.
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo (Appendix, 107).
Neutrality, 1139 (Appendix, 107).
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

BLAND, SCHUYLER OTIS (*a Representative from Virginia*).
Attended, 18.
Remarks by, on
Neutrality: conference report, 1388.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

BLISSELL, JIM, article on the subject of neutrality written by (Appendix, 550).

BLOCH, KURT, article entitled "America In the Key Position" written by (Appendix, 1373).

BLOCK NEWSPAPERS, editorial entitled "It is Time That Congress Took Back the Many Powers Granted to the President" appearing in (Appendix, 640).

BLOOM, SOL (*a Representative from New York*).
Attended, 8.
Address on the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the Bill of Rights (Appendix, 11).
Address by Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler entitled "Toward a Federal World" (Appendix, 341).
Address by Hon. Cordell Hull at Pan American Day, New York World's Fair (Appendix, 60).
Address of Rev. Edmund A. Walsh on neutrality and American foreign trade (Appendix, 743).
Appointed conferee, 1345.
Appointed on Supreme Court Celebration Committee, 939.
Editorial from Washington Post on neutrality (Appendix, 516).
Editorial by Felix Morley on the passage of the Neutrality Act (Appendix, 794).
Radio address by Alfred E. Smith on arms embargo (Appendix, 106).
Bills and joint resolutions introduced by
Savage, Mary: for relief (see bill H. R. 7580), 307.
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 1116, 1119, 1242, 1243, 1254, 1255.
——— conference report, 1386, 1387, 1388.
General leave to extend remarks, 1142.
Master Institute of United Arts, Inc. (Appendix, 805).
Neutrality, 340, 1116, 1119, 1242, 1243, 1244, 1254, 1255.
——— printing of pamphlet, 255, 256, 1060.
——— conference report, 1386, 1387, 1388.
——— explanation of Senate action, 1119.
Riverside Museum, New York City (Appendix, 805).
Reports made by, from
Committee of conference:
Neutrality (H. J. Res. 306, Rept. 1474), 1381, 1397.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

BODDY, MANCHESTER, editorials urging creation of a peace college written by (Appendix, 327).
Statement on the subject of war submitted by (Appendix, 431).

BOEHNE, JOHN W., JR. (*a Representative from Indiana*).
Attended, 8.
Letter from James E. Watson relative to arms embargo (Appendix, 663).
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

BOER WAR, list of arms and ammunition sold to Great Britain by Germany and Austria-Hungary during, 127.

BOHN ALUMINUM & BRASS CORPORATION, remarks in House and correspondence relative to the labor strike in the plants of, 299, 1069, 1159.
Resolutions of inquiry relative to the strike in the plant of (see H. Res. 313, 314).

BOLAND, PATRICK J. (*a Representative from Pennsylvania*).
Attended, 8.
Remarks by, on
Bethlehem Steel Co., 1365.
Reciprocal trade agreements, 957.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

BOLLES, STEPHEN (*a Representative from Wisconsin*).
Attended, 8.
Address on the national debt by (Appendix, 235).
Address before Illinois Press Association on the newspapers in this crisis (Appendix, 493).
Letter from Henry A. Friede regarding neutrality (Appendix, 54).
Letters from constituents relative to mink furs (Appendix, 465).
Letter from Edward E. Kennedy, of the Farmers' Washington Service relative to the farm problem (Appendix, 783).
Tribute by Alma Lutz to Elizabeth Cady Stanton (Appendix, 799).
Petitions and papers presented by, from
Citizens and individuals, 14, 265.
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 1250.
——— list of poison gases in the President's proclamation, 1251.
Loans to belligerents by Federal agencies, 1250.
National Committee to Keep America Out of War, 297, 298.
Neutrality, 1250.
——— printing of pamphlet, 255, 256, 257.
New Deal propaganda, 297, 298, 299.
Permission to address the House, 257.
Woodrum, Clifton A.: reply to speech by, 297.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

BOLTON, CHESTER C. (*late a Representative from Ohio*).
Announcement of death of, 1074, 1091.
Article from the Cleveland Plain Dealer on the death of, 1076.
Editorial from the Cleveland (Ohio) News on the life of (Appendix, 803).
Resolution of respect in the House (see H. Res. 319), 1079, 1080.
Resolution of respect in Senate (S. Res. 194), 1091.
Tributes in House to, 1074, 1080 (Appendix, 803).

BOMAR, EDWARD E., article relative to the sale of airplanes to Great Britain and France, 1372.

BONNEVILLE POWER PROJECT, OREGON, remarks in House relative to, 613, 668.
Address delivered by Paul J. Raver on the subject of (Appendix, 153).

BORAH, WILLIAM E. (*a Senator from Idaho*).
Attended, 3.
Address by Prof. Edwin Borchard on American foreign policy (Appendix, 415).
Appointed conferee, 1282.
Article by Frank L. Kluckhohn on freedom of the seas, 787.
Excerpts from speech on neutrality quoted by Senator Elbert D. Thomas, 468, 469.
Excerpt from speech delivered in 1917, 51.
Letter to Miss Helen McPherson, Alberta, Canada, relative to relations between United States and Canada, 819.
Radio address on neutrality, by (Appendix, 461).
Radio address on proposed neutrality legislation (Appendix, 79).
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 65, 68, 69, 70, 89, 156, 232, 233, 492, 600, 601, 640, 718, 784, 792, 819, 836, 839, 998, 1001.
——— cash-and-carry proposal, 72.
——— reply to Senator Barkley, 640.
——— shipments to neutral ports, 784, 792.
Bermuda: trade with, 785.
Cherne, Leo M., 718.
Eden, Anthony, 554.
Executive powers under national emergency proclamation, 32.
Final adjournment, 1356, 1357.
Neutrality, 65, 68, 69, 70, 89, 156, 232, 233, 492, 600, 601, 640, 718, 784, 792, 819, 836, 839, 998, 1001.
——— cash-and-carry proposal, 72, 784.
——— excerpt from London Times, 73, 74.
——— letter by Secretary Lansing to Ambassador Penfield, 71, 72.
——— preamble, 1028, 1032.
——— statement by Bernard M. Baruch, 71.
——— statement by John Bassett Moore, 67.
——— statement by Alfred E. Smith, 67.

BORAH, WILLIAM E.—Continued.
Remarks by, on
President of the United States: proclaiming state of war by, 839.
Reciprocal trade agreements: constitutionality of, 1086, 1087, 1088.
Sherman, Lawrence Y.: death of, 4.
War debts, 410.
War referendum, 998.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

BORCHARD, EDWIN, address on the subject of the American foreign policy delivered by (Appendix, 415).
Letter favoring exclusion of armed merchant vessels from American ports, 969, 970.
Remarks in Senate relative to, 929.

BORCHARD, EDWIN M., letter concerning repeal of the arms embargo, written by (Appendix, 762).

BOREN, LYLE H. (*a Representative from Oklahoma*).
Attended, 8.
List of salaries of certain motion-picture actors and actresses (Appendix, 364).
Remarks by, on
Motion-picture industry (Appendix, 364).
Mr. Smith Goes to Washington (motion picture) (Appendix, 780).
Motion-picture industry (Appendix, 780).
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

BOSTON EVENING TRANSCRIPT (newspaper), editorial entitled "Close the Doors," appearing in, 107.
Editorial relative to the Dies committee appearing in (Appendix, 678).

BOSTON HERALD (newspaper), editorial entitled "Keeping Youth in Trim," appearing in (Appendix, 779).

BOSTON POST (newspaper), editorial entitled "Clothes Make the Soldier" appearing in (Appendix, 601).

BOWERS, EATON J. (late a Representative from Mississippi).
Announcement of death of, 1091.
Editorial from Gulfport-Biloxi Daily Herald on the death of, 1091.

BOYKIN, FRANK W. (*a Representative from Alabama*).
Attended, 8.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

BRADDOCK'S DEFEAT, excerpt from Beveridge's Life of John Marshall describing, 187.

BRADENTON CO., allow them to bridge Sarasota Pass, Fla. (see bills S. 3002; H. R. 7615).

BRADLEY, FRED (*a Representative from Michigan*).
Attended, 8.
Address before American Legion, Rogers City, Mich., on Americanism (Appendix, 23).
Elected to Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, 1390.
Letters from Michigan Social Welfare Commission relative to proposed trade agreement with Chile (Appendix, 625).
Resignation from committee, 1390.
Bills and joint resolutions introduced by
Forest lands: to acquire certain lands adjacent to public roads (see bill H. R. 7617), 1397.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

BRADLEY, MICHAEL J. (*a Representative from Pennsylvania*).
Attended, 8.
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 1242, 1243.
Neutrality, 1242, 1243.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

BRADY, PAUL G., letter relative to importation of mink pelts, 1280.

BRANCH, HARLLEE, address concerning civil aeronautics delivered by (Appendix, 511).

BRATTON, SAM G. (a former Senator from New Mexico).
Address on neutrality by (Appendix, 362).

BRAZIL, excerpts from arms-embargo laws of (Appendix, 351).

BRECKINRIDGE, HENRY, letter on the subject of the repeal of the arms embargo written by (Appendix, 192).

BRENCKMAN, FRED, brief on the subject of the trade agreement with Argentina, prepared by (Appendix, 532).

BREWSTER, RALPH O. (*a Representative from Maine*).
Attended, 8.
Address before students of Beal Business College, Bangor, Maine (Appendix, 874).
Address before Rotary and Lions Clubs, Fort Fairfield, Maine (Appendix, 843).
Address delivered at meeting of Belfast Lions Club, by (Appendix, 843).
Address at the meeting of the Three-quarter Century Club at Dover-Foxcroft, Maine (Appendix, 853).
Address at Wisconsin Republican picnic, Milwaukee, Wis., by (Appendix, 844).
Address at Norway-South Paris Kiwanis Club on subject of an All-American Navy (Appendix, 863).

BREWSTER, RALPH O.—Continued.
Address at memorial services for Thomas Brackett Reed, Bowdoin College, Maine, by (Appendix, 856).
Address at the laying of the cornerstone of the post office at Dexter, Maine, by (Appendix, 857).
Address before Model Government League of National Youth Administration School, Eastport, Maine (Appendix, 865).
Address before Bangor Masonic Club, Bangor, Maine, by (Appendix, 867).
Address before Hancock County Council of the American Legion, Ellsworth, Maine (Appendix, 869).
Address at American Legion field day, Oshkosh, Wis., by (Appendix, 874).
Address before Maine Universalist Convention, Augusta, Maine, by (Appendix, 832).
Petitions and papers presented by, from
Citizens and individuals, 15.
Remarks by on
Arms embargo, 1323.
Neutrality, 1323.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

BRIDGES.
Bayou Lafourche, La.: bill to legalize a bridge across (see bill S. 2999).
Sarasota Pass, Fla.: bills to allow the Bradenton Co. to bridge (see bills S. 3002; H. R. 7615).

BRIDGES, STYLES (*a Senator from New Hampshire*).
Attended, 3.
Address before Indianapolis Association of Credit Men, Columbia Club, Indianapolis, Ind. (Appendix, 748).
Article by Mark Sullivan on the effect of proposed neutrality legislation on the merchant marine (Appendix, 264).
Article from New York Herald Tribune on effect of pending neutrality legislation on the merchant marine (Appendix, 264).
Editorial from the Army and Navy Journal on Secretary of War Woodring and Assistant Secretary Johnson (Appendix, 277).
Radio address on drafting wealth in wartime, by (Appendix, 460).
Amendments offered by, to
Neutrality (H. J. Res. 306): to amend, 443, 1021.
Remarks by, on
Neutrality, 1021.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

BRIDGES, HARRY (alien British Communist), remarks in House relative to, 660, 661.

BRITISH EMPIRE. *See* GREAT BRITAIN.

BRITISH ISRAEL ORGANIZATION, LONDON, ENGLAND, remarks in House relative to, 304.

BRITISH POSSESSIONS IN THE WESTERN HEMISPHERE, remarks in House relative to the proposed United States guardianship over (Appendix, 289).

BRITISH PROPAGANDA IN THE UNITED STATES, article by Porter Sargent on the subject of (Appendix, 681).

BRITISH WAR AIMS, editorial from the Minneapolis Morning Tribune relative to George Bernard Shaw's inquiry concerning (Appendix, 720).

BROOKS, OVERTON (*a Representative from Louisiana*).
Attended, 8.
Address at dedication of chapel at Barksdale Field, La. (Appendix, 381).
Letter from the American Defense Society, Inc., New York City, relative to national defense (Appendix, 1361).
Petitions and papers presented by, from
Societies and associations, 1058, 1158.
Remarks by, on
American Defense Society, Inc., New York City, 1361.
Army and National Guard: reply to critics of, 1361.
Dies committee (Appendix, 697).
Neutrality, 666.
Un-American activities (Appendix, 697).
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

BROPHY, JOHN, remarks in House relative to, 218.

BROTHERHOOD OF LOCOMOTIVE FIREMEN AND ENGINEMEN'S MAGAZINE, article by D. B. Robertson relative to the celebration in honor of Senator Wheeler, of Montana, at Hudson, Mass., appearing in (Appendix, 376).

BROUN, HEYWOOD, article on communism written by (Appendix, 625).
Article entitled "It Seems to Me," written by (Appendix, 182).
Article on neutrality written by (Appendix, 630).
Remarks in House relative to, 133.

BROWDER, EARL, remarks in House relative to, 661 887.

BROWN, CLARENCE J. (*a Representative from Ohio*).
Editorial from the McConnelsville (Ohio) Herald on Neutrality (Appendix, 326).
Bills and joint resolutions introduced by
McArthur, Esta M.: to pensions (see bill H. R. 7583), 354.
Remarks by, on
Bolton, Chester C.: tribute to, 1076.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

BYRNES, JAMES F.—Continued.
Motions and resolutions offered by
McMillan, Thomas S.: death of (S. Res. 189), 76.
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 437, 441, 730, 731, 732, 749, 803, 987.
Lindberg, Charles A.: speech on neutrality by, 642.
McMillan, Thomas S.: death of, 76.
Munitions industry, 731, 732, 803, 804.
National Munitions Control Board, 803, 804.
Neutrality, 730, 731, 732, 987, 991, 992, 993.
Reports made by, from
Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:
Atkinson, Ela H. (S. Res. 193) (Appendix, 1281).
Hearings before Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate (S. Res. 195) (Appendix, 1281).
Logan, M. M. (S. Res. 192), 396.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

BYRNS, JOSEPH W., JR. (*a Representative from Tennessee*).
Attended, 8.
Excerpts from Commerce Reports of August 19, 1939, relative to results under reciprocal trade agreements (Appendix, 139).
Tables showing United States trade with leading countries (Appendix, 139, 140).
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

BYRON, WILLIAM D. (*a Representative from Maryland*).
Attended, 8.
Address at laying of cornerstone of National Youth Administration Building, Lonaconing, Md. (Appendix, 256).
Editorial from Baltimore Sun on neutrality (Appendix, 174).
Remarks by, on
Shoe industry (Appendix, 166).
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

CALDWELL, MILLARD F. (*a Representative from Florida*).
Attended, 8.
Appointed on funeral committee, 80.
Bills and joint resolutions introduced by
Edrehi, J. Montrose: for relief (see bill H. R. 7608), 1058.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

CALENDAR OF CUPIDITY, article from the Madison (S. Dak.) Daily Leader known as (Appendix, 232).

CALVIN COOLIDGE BRIDGE, NORTHAMPTON, MASS., address delivered by Senator Walsh on the occasion of the dedication of (Appendix, 482).

CAMP, ALBERT SIDNEY (*a Representative from Georgia*).
Attended, 8.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

CANADA, article by Walter Lippmann entitled "Canada and the United States (Appendix, 370).
Excerpts from arms-embargo laws of (Appendix, 352).
Letter from Senator Borah to Helen McPherson concerning relations between the United States and Canada, 819.
Letter from Raymond Moley to the President, dated November 30, 1935, relative to the reciprocal trade agreement with, 1237.

CANNON, CLARENCE (*a Representative from Missouri*).
Attended, 8.
Table on wage scales, 22.
Tables on agricultural prices, 20.
Telegram to Representative Martin on anniversary of birth of Thomas Brackett Reed, 570.
Remarks by, on
Agricultural prices during war emergencies, 18, 20, 21, 22, 23.
——— statistics, 20.
——— letter from President Roosevelt, 23.
Antiprofiteering legislation, 18, 22.
Permission to address the House, 17.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

CANNON, PAT (*a Representative from Florida*).
Attended, 8.
Bills and joint resolutions introduced by
Belle Glade, Fla.: to survey (see bill H. R. 7549), 41.
Miami, Fla.: to authorize Secretary of the Navy to accept certain land at (see bill H. R. 7543), 24.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

CANTWELL, JOHN J., funeral sermon in memory of George Cardinal Mundelein preached by (Appendix, 224).

"CAN WE KEEP OUT OF WAR?" address delivered by Representative Sumner of Illinois at Crescent City, Ill., entitled (Appendix, 14).

CAPPER, ARTHUR (*a Senator from Kansas*).
Attended, 3.
Address by John Hamilton before New York County Republican Committee, New York City (Appendix, 190).
Address by Alfred M. Landon at First Methodist Church, Shenandoah, Iowa (Appendix, 720).
Address by Gov. Charles A. Sprague, of Oregon, paying tribute to Senator Charles L. McNary (Appendix, 304).
Address by Dr. Wilmer Souder before the International Convention of the Disciples of Christ, Richmond, Va. (Appendix, 723).

CAPPER ARTHUR—Continued.
Address by Harry H. Woodring before National Guard Association, Baltimore, Md. (Appendix, 612).
Article by Ernest Lindley relative to statements by Secretaries Wallace and Woodring on neutrality (Appendix, 613).
Editorial from Emporia (Kans.) Gazette paying tribute to, 109.
Editorial by victor Murdock on neutrality (Appendix, 573).
Letter from Robert L. Johnson relative to selection of census employees from civil-service list, 589.
Letter from Secretary of State replying to criticism of foreign trade agreements program (Appendix, 784).
Petitions from organizations and individuals concerning neutrality, 45.
Radio address on arms embargo, by (Appendix, 87).
Radio address by Col. Theodore Roosevelt on neutrality (Appendix, 567).
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 461.
Census employees: selection from civil-service list, 589.
McNary, Charles L.: tribute to, 396.
Neutrality Act, 1939, 461.
Neutrality and peace—petitions, 45.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

CARABELLO, MARTIN, address delivered before the Foreign Trade Committee of the Chamber of Commerce of Tampa, Fla., by (Appendix, 617).

CARAWAY, HATTIE W. (*a Senator from Arkansas*).
Attended, 3.
Article from Washington Post giving statement on repeal of arms embargo, by (Appendix, 228).
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

CARIBBEAN AREA, excerpt from the Philadelphia Record relative to the absence of submarines in, 589.

CARLSON, FRANK (*a Representative from Kansas*).
Attended, 8.
Article by Henry T. Gorrell on effects of arms embargo repeal (Appendix, 759).
Statement on proposed Argentine trade agreement, by (Appendix, 339).
Table showing imports and exports of foodstuffs in 1938 and 1939 (Appendix, 810).
Remarks by, on
Arms and munitions trade with England and France, 1370.
General leave to extend remarks, 472.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

CARROLL, JOHN (Catholic bishop), prayer delivered by, 1315.

CARTER, ALBERT E. (*a Representative from California*).
Attended, 8.
Eaton, Thomas M.: death of, 13.
Bills and joint resolutions introduced by
Members of Congress: to grant franking privilege to air mail (see bill H. R. 7588), 540.
Motions and resolutions offered by
Eaton, Thomas M. (H. Res. 301), 13.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

CARTER, BOAKE, address over the radio on the subject of neutrality, delivered by (Appendix, 776).
Article entitled "Second Surrender?—European 'Friends' Legion Reaction," written by (Appendix, 329).

CARTWRIGHT, WILBURN (*a Representative from Oklahoma*).
Attended, 8.
Address before American Association of State Highway Officials, Richmond, Va. (Appendix, 441).
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

CASE, FRANCIS H. (*a Representative from South Dakota*).
Attended, 8.
Article by William Tyler Page on legal holidays (Appendix, 113).
Radio address on neutrality, by (Appendix, 28).
Statement relative to Argentine trade agreements (Appendix, 356).
Statement by the American Humane Association on what war means to animals (Appendix, 598).
Telegram from R. P. Harmon relative to Dies committee (Appendix, 602).
Bills and joint resolutions introduced by
Bear Butte National Monument: to set aside lands for (see bill H. R. 7619), 1397.
Holidays: to legalize the last Thursday in November (see bill H. R. 7556), 80.
Remarks by, on
American merchant marine: effect of war on, 668.
Arms embargo, 148, 345, 950, 952, 953, 954, 1092, 1177, 1254, 1292.
Bankhead, William B.: efforts to relieve drought- and flood-stricken areas (Appendix, 825).
Great Britain: sale of war materials to, 1370.
Holidays (Appendix, 112).
Independence of the United States, 950.
Johnson, Luther A.: speech on neutrality, 344.
Monroe Doctrine, 950.
Nash Motor Car Co., strikes, 659.
Neutrality, 144, 145, 148, 214, 869, 950, 1092, 1177, 1254, 1292.

BROWN, GEORGE ROTHWELL, article entitled "Political Parade" written by, 919 (Appendix, 674).
Editorial concerning the late Thomas B. Reed (Appendix, 655).

BROWN, PARKE, article entitled "Reign of Terror in Pre-War Arms Deals" written by (Appendix, 756).

BROWN, PAUL (*a Representative from Georgia*).
Attended, 18.
Motions and resolutions offered by
Cox, Alice Everett: for relief (see H. Res. 304), 24.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

BROWN, PRENTISS M. (*a Senator from Michigan*).
Attended, 3.
Article by William Allen White reviewing book on Hon. George W. Norris (Appendix, 423).
Radio address on neutrality, by (Appendix, 188).
Radio address by Hon. Theodore F. Green on neutrality (Appendix, 563).
Amendments offered by, to
Neutrality (H. J. Res. 306): to amend, 707, 778, 779.
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 640, 642, 643, 644, 645, 706, 711, 778, 779, 780, 978, 1018.
——— trade with Canada and Mexico, 706.
Canada: friendly relations with, 641, 642, 643.
Canada and Mexico: trade with, 778, 779, 780.
Lindbergh, Charles A.: speech on neutrality by, 640.
Monroe Doctrine, 640, 641.
Motion-picture propaganda, 711, 712, 713.
Neutrality, 640, 642, 643, 644, 645, 711, 712, 778, 779, 780, 979.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

BRUNO, JOSEPH J., remarks in House relative to his original suggestion of a date for Navy Day (Appendix, 767).

BRYAN, W. J. (former Secretary of State), letter dated April 21, 1915, and addressed to the German Ambassador (Bernstorff) relative to the arms embargo, 697.
Telegram of August 15, 1914, to J. P. Morgan & Co., relative to loans to belligerent naticns, 369.

BRYSON, JOSEPH R. (*a Representative from South Carolina*).
Attended, 18.
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo (Appendix, 233).
Neutrality Act, 1939 (Appendix, 233).
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

BUCHMAN, FRANK N. D., radio address on the world movement for moral rearmament delivered by (Appendix, 608).

BUCK, FRANK H. (*a Representative from California*).
Attended, 8.
Table showing the share of the domestic market supplied by the American farmer (Appendix, 167).
Remarks by, on
Agriculture: American farmer and the domestic market (Appendix 167).
De Vries, Marion: death of, 12.
Reciprocal trade agreements, 957, 958.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

BUCKLER, RICHARD T. (*a Representative from Minnesota*).
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 1300.
City of Flint, merchant ship, 1300.
Neutrality, 1300.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

BUCKLEY, CHARLES A. (*a Representative from New York*).
Attended, 8.
Bills and joint resolutions introduced by
Natko, Franc: for relief (see bill H. R. 7586), 488.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

BULOW, WILLIAM J. (*a Senator from South Dakota*).
Attended, 3.
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 309, 310, 311, 312, 314, 315.
Neutrality, 310, 311, 312, 314, 315.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

BULWINKLE, ALFRED L. (*a Representative from North Carolina*).
Attended, 8.
Remarks by, on
Neutrality, 476, 478.
Printing matter in the Record, 297.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

BURCH, THOMAS G. (*a Representative from Virginia*).
Attended, 8.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

BURDICK, USHER L. (*a Representative from North Dakota*).
Attended, 8.
Bills and joint resolutions introduced by
Monetary system of the United States: to revise (see bill H. R. 7600), 888.
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 1321.
Bureau-made criminal law (Appendix, 296).

BURDICK, USHER L.—Continued.
Remarks by, on
Miller, William V.: conviction for selling sugar (Appendix, 296).
Neutrality, 1321 (Appendix, 16).
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

"BUREAU-MADE CRIMINAL LAW," remarks in House entitled (Appendix, 296).

BUREAU OF MARINE INSPECTION AND NAVIGATION, investigate (see S. Res. 196).

BURGIN, WILLIAM O. (*a Representative from North Carolina*).
Attended, 8.
Editorial from Beasley's Farm and Home Weekly, Charlotte, N. C., on neutrality (Appendix, 207).
Letter from secretary of Southern Council of International Relations and list of citizens of Southeastern States favoring repeal of arms embargo (Appendix, 257).
Letter by Gifford Pinchot on neutrality (Appendix, 746).
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

BURKE, EDWARD R. (*a Senator from Nebraska*).
Attended, 3.
Address by Paul V. McNutt at testimonial dinner to Francis P. Matthews, Omaha, Nebr. (Appendix, 413).
Appointed on Special Committee on Taxation of Governmental Securities and Salaries, 173.
Appointed on funeral committee, 81.
Article by Jacques Maritain on European war (Appendix, 316).
Radio address on neutrality and national defense (Appendix, 82).
Radio address by Rt. Rev. Msgr. John A. Ryan, D. D., on neutrality (Appendix, 313).
Amendments offered by, to
Neutrality (H. J. Res. 306): to amend, 678.
Bills and joint resolutions introduced by
Soulek, Joseph: for relief (see bill S. 2994), 888.
Motions and resolutions offered by
Ohio: relief of State of (H. R. 5118)—to recommit, 1090.
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 285, 286, 287, 288, 290, 291, 292, 310, 311, 459, 598, 645, 647, 648, 679, 779.
Neutrality Act 1939, 159, 279, 282, 285, 286, 287, 288, 290, 291, 292, 310, 311, 459, 598, 645, 647, 648, 679, 779, 973, 1012.
Ohio: relief of State of, 1089, 1090.
Social Security funds for Ohio, 1090.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

BUSINESS AND TAXES, address delivered by John W. Hanes, Under Secretary of the Treasury, on the subject of (Appendix, 390).

"BUSINESSMAN LOOKS AT CRIME," editorial written by Representative Crawford entitled (Appendix, 232).

BUTLER, NICHOLAS MURRAY, address entitled "Toward a Federal World" delivered by (Appendix, 341).

BUTLER, SMEDLEY D., address over the radio opposing the proposed repeal of the arms embargo, 567.
Article by John T. Flynn commenting on the radio address concerning neutrality delivered by (Appendix, 286).
Interview on the subject of neutrality, given by, 409.

BYRD, HARRY FLOOD (*a Senator from Virginia*).
Attended, 3.
Address by John W. Hanes before Bond Club of New York on subject Business and Taxes (Appendix, 390).
Address by Lewis W. Douglas on subject The Challenge to Civilization—Cost of Government (Appendix, 726).
Letter by Col. Henry Breckinridge on the subject of Repeal of Arms Embargo (Appendix, 192).
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

BYRD, RICHARD E., radio address on the world movement for moral rearmament delivered by (Appendix, 611).

BYRNE, WILLIAM T. (*a Representative from New York*).
Attended, 8.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

BYRNES, JAMES F. (*a Senator from South Carolina*).
Attended, 3.
Article by Walter Lippman entitled "Canada and the United States" (Appendix, 370).
Article from Washington Post on the attitude of Senator Caraway toward repeal of arms embargo (Appendix, 228).
Letter from Hon. Josiah W. Bailey stating his position on pending neutrality legislation (Appendix, 184).
Radio address on neutrality by (Appendix, 551).
Radio address by Hon. George W. Norris on American neutrality (Appendix, 128).
Radio address by Hon. Key Pittman on foreign wars and neutrality legislation (Appendix, 38).
Statement by President Roosevelt August 31, 1935, upon signing of Neutrality Act, 652.
Telegram from William Allen White and list of members of the National Nonpartisan Committee for Peace Through Revision of the Neutrality Law (Appendix, 619).

CASE, FRANCIS H.—Continued.
Remarks by, on
Reciprocal trade agreements, 945.
Reconstruction Finance Corporation: disaster relief by, 1392.
Thanksgiving Day, 488 (Appendix, 112).
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.
CASEY, JOSEPH E. (*a Representative from Massachusetts*).
Attended, 8.
Address before Conference on War Prices, by (Appendix, 676).
Appointed on Special Committee to Investigate Un-American Activities, 9.
Radio address by Rt. Rev. Msgr. John A. Ryan on neutrality (Appendix, 661).
Remarks by, on
Neutrality, 1243.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.
CASH-AND-CARRY BASIS, remarks in House relative to proposed sale of munitions of war on, 585.
CASH-AND-CARRY LEGISLATION, resolution of the Thirty-sixth Division Association endorsing (Appendix, 661).
CASH-AND-CARRY POLICY, article by John T. Flynn concerning (Appendix, 407).
CASH-AND-CARRY PROPOSAL. *See also* GOLD; NEUTRALITY.
Letter from James H. Pou on the subject of (Appendix, 773).
CASTIGLIANO, ATTILIO, affidavit relative to the proposed reciprocal-trade agreement with Argentina sworn to by (Appendix, 210).
CELLER, EMANUEL (*a Representative from New York*).
Attended, 8.
Address by Hon. Alexander Holtzoff at judicial conference for the third judicial circuit, Atlantic City, N. J. (Appendix, 728).
Address by Harold G. Moulton on subject Industrial Price Policies in This Emergency (Appendix, 494).
Radio address replying to Senator Borah on neutrality (Appendix, 183).
Radio colloquy between Hon. Emanuel Celler and Dr. Max Winkler on subject "A Comparison, Germany Today—and in 1914" (Appendix, 317).
Statement on the subject "Shall We Make Free Speech Responsible?" (Appendix, 684).
Bills and joint resolutions introduced by
Defamation of groups: remedies for (see bills H. R. 7603, 7604), 1058.
Remarks by, on
Poland: American investments in (Appendix, 344).
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.
CEMETERIES, authorize acquisition of land at New Orleans, La., for (see bill H. R. 7578).
Memorandum from the War Department relative to the establishment of permanent American cemeteries in Europe (Appendix, 394).
CENSUS, letter from Robert L. Johnson to the President of the United States urging selection of census employees from civil-service lists, 589.
CENTRAL CONSTRUCTOR (newspaper), article relative to the P. W. A. and the special session appearing in (Appendix, 287).
"CHALLENGE TO AMERICA," address delivered by Senator Bridges entitled (Appendix, 748).
"CHALLENGE TO CIVILIZATION," address delivered by Lewis W. Douglas entitled (Appendix, 726).
CHANDLER, A. B. (*a Senator from Kentucky*).
Address on neutrality before convention of Disciples of Christ, Richmond, Va. (Appendix, 458).
Appointed to committee to investigate phosphate resources (Appendix, 396).
Appointed to committees, 889.
Credentials, 234.
Sworn in, 234.
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 400, 413, 422, 567, 649.
Breathitt County, Ky.: World War volunteers from, 400.
Kentucky tobacco, 565.
Neutrality, 422, 649.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.
CHANDLER, WALTER (*a Representative from Tennessee*).
Attended, 8.
Letter from Cloyd Laporte on neutrality published in New York Times (Appendix, 393).
Bills and joint resolutions introduced by
Judicial code: To recodify (See H. J. Res. 388), 148.
Perkins, Gins, Memphis, Tenn., for relief (see bill H. R. 7573), 222.
State legislatures: to provide for direct appeal to Supreme Court in cases involving constitutionality of acts of (see bill H. R. 7599), 888.
Remarks by, on
Income tax (Appendix, 669).
Judicial Code: to recodify (Appendix, 576).
McMillan, Thomas S.: tribute to (Appendix, 217).
Revenue laws (Appendix, 669).
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.
"CHANGING EMBARGOES FOR NATIONAL DEFENSE," address over the radio delivered by Senator Austin entitled, 490.
CHAPMAN, VIRGIL (*a Representative from Kentucky*).
Attended, 8.
Appointed on funeral committee, 148.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.
CHAPPLE, ALICE, essay entitled "Why One American Boy Didn't Go to War" written by, 1380.
CHASE, STUART, statement concerning resources and production of the United States, 333.
CHATTANOOGA, TENN., report of Secretary of War on survey of (H. Doc. 479), 24.
CHATTANOOGA TIMES (newspaper), editorial entitled "Nothing to Mediate, Yet" appearing in (Appendix, 280).
Editorial entitled "Hitler's Boasting to Bolster Nazi Courage Offers No Basis for Peace Except Surrender" appearing in (Appendix, 280).
CHAVEZ, DENNIS (*a Senator from New Mexico*).
Attended, 3.
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 316, 317, 318, 319, 592, 678, 679, 728, 820.
——— statement by Senator Norris in 1917, 319.
Excise tax on copper, 1084.
Neutrality, 182, 316, 318, 319, 592, 678, 679, 728, 820.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.
CHEESE, brief before the Federal Trade Commission relative to the effect of proposed concession in the Argentine trade agreement on domestic (Appendix, 371).
Remarks in House relative to the Italian cheese industry (Appendix, 434).
CHEMICAL WARFARE, statement by General Pershing condemning, 899.
CHEMICALS, article from the Washington Times-Herald on the subject of (Appendix, 692).
CHERNE, LEO M., excerpts from book entitled "Adjusting Your Business to War" written by, 716, 744.
CHEROKEE INDIANS. *See* INDIANS.
CHICAGO DAILY NEWS, editorial entitled "'Red' Milkmen" appearing in (Appendix, 548).
CHICAGO DAILY TRIBUNE (newspaper), editorials entitled "The War Parties" and "Dying for Danzig" appearing in (Appendix, 86).
Editorial relative to the labor strike in the plants of the Bohn Aluminum & Brass Corporation, at Detroit, Mich., appearing in, 1159, 1160.
Editorial entitled "Roosevelt Versus Roosevelt" appearing in (Appendix, 140).
CHIEF EXECUTIVE. *See* PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.
CHILE, excerpts from arms-embargo laws of (Appendix, 352).
Letters from Walter F. Gries concerning the proposed reciprocal-trade agreement with (Appendix, 625).
Remarks in Senate relative to the proposed reciprocal-trade agreement with, 1083.
CHINA, excerpts from arms-embargo laws of (Appendix, 352).
Statement by Roger W. Babson concerning conditions in (Appendix, 699).
CHIPERFIELD, ROBERT B. (*a Representative from Illinois*).
Attended, 8.
Remarks by, on
Neutrality Act, 1939, 528, 1124.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.
CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR, article by Roger Babson relative to effect of war on United States trade appearing in (Appendix, 373).
CHRYSLER CORPORATION, editorial from the Washington Post relative to the strike at the factory of (Appendix, 440).
CHRYSLER MOTOR CAR CO., remarks in House relative to, 610, 660.
CHURCH, RALPH E. (*a Representative from Illinois*).
Attended, 8.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.
CHURCH AND THE UNDERPRIVILEGED, address delivered by Senator Maloney, at Denver, Colo., on the subject of (Appendix, 565).
CHURCHILL, WINSTON, article by Carl W. McArdle entitled "Churchill Decries Lies," 686, 687.
Remarks in House relative to the book While England Slept, written by (Appendix, 157, 161).
Report of an interview between Mr. Churchill and William Griffin relative to participation by the United States in the European War, 685.
"CITADEL OF CIVILIZATION," editorial from the Washington Times-Herald entitled (Appendix, 280).
CITY OF FLINT (American freighter), editorial from the Jackson (Mich.) Citizen-Press relative to seizure by the Germans of (Appendix, 656).
Remarks in House relative to the capture of, 863.
CIVIL AERONAUTICS, address delivered by Harllee Branch on the subject of (Appendix, 511).

CIVIL AERONAUTICS AUTHORITY, letter from the chairman transmitting report of investigation of (H. Doc. 478), 14.
Report concerning pending neutrality legislation (Appendix, 267).

CIVILIAN CONSERVATION CORPS, letter from the Administrator of the Federal Security Agency transmitting the draft of a proposed bill to amend the act establishing, 14.
Letter from the Administrator of the Federal Security Agency transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to confer general powers of notaries public on certain officers and employees of, 29.

CIVILIAN NAVAL TRAINING, provide for (see bill S. 3007).

CIVIL LIBERTIES, address delivered by J. Warren Madden, Chairman, National Labor Relations Board, entitled "Old Liberties and New" (Appendix, 399).
Address over the radio delivered by Frank Murphy, Attorney General of the United States, on the subject of civil liberties in America (Appendix, 321).
Remarks in House relative to (Appendix, 433).

CIVIL RIGHTS AND LIBERTIES, address over the radio delivered by Senator Thomas of Utah on the subject of (Appendix, 299).

CIVIL SERVICE, letter from the President of the Civil Service Commission explaining Executive Order No. 8257 relative to appointments excepted from, 1349.

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION, letter from the Archivist of the United States transmitting list of useless papers in, 30, 41.

CLAPPER, RAYMOND, article entitled "Armageddon Again?" written by (Appendix, 4).

CLARK, BENNETT CHAMP (*a Senator from Missouri*).
Attended, 3.
Article from Readers Digest on mobilization plans, 724.
Articles from New York Times relative to armed merchant ships, 927.
Editorial by William Hirth, president of the Missouri Farmers' Association, on neutrality (Appendix, 311).
Excerpt from book by Leo M. Cherne on business and war, 716, 719, 720.
Letter from Maj. Gen. Sir Leonard Rogers relative to United States aid to the Allies (Appendix, 56).
Letter from Edwin Borchard relative to armed merchant ships, 969.
Radio address by Col. Charles A. Lindbergh on neutrality (Appendix, 301).
Radio address by Gen. Smedley D. Butler on neutrality, 567.
Amendments offered by, to
Neutrality Act, 1939 (H. J. Res. 306): to amend, 104, 444, 800, 806, 820, 860, 925, 926, 1021, 1022.
Motions and resolutions offered by
Foreign agents: to investigate certain activities of (see S. Res. 186), 32.
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 247, 252, 266, 267, 271–274, 278, 279, 280, 323, 416, 417, 436, 437, 438, 439, 444, 515, 516, 517, 547, 548, 549, 553, 554, 556, 557, 564, 597, 603, 715, 717, 718, 719, 720, 722, 725, 726, 727, 728, 730, 732, 746, 747, 748, 750, 790, 799, 800, 801, 802, 803, 804, 805, 806, 829, 830, 847, 860, 861, 890, 925, 926, 965, 971, 972, 990, 991, 992, 993, 997, 1000, 1013, 1014, 1021, 1022, 1024.
——— letter by Edward S. Corwin, 284.
——— loans to Allied Powers, 380.
——— Louis Johnson, Assistant Secretary of War, 282.
——— statements by authorities, 277.
——— statement by Senator Austin, 267.
——— statement by Professors Jessup and Hyde, 284.
——— statement on plans of draft boards, 284.
Armed merchant ships, 926, 927, 928, 929, 931, 965, 968.
Armed merchantmen: letter by Secretary Lansing, 932, 933.
British-Russian trade treaty, 546.
Cherne, Leo M.: book on Business and War by, 716, 717, 718, 719, 720, 721, 722.
Detzer, Dorothy, 752.
Foreign vessels: use of American flag by, 860, 861, 893.
Great Britain: trade treaty with Russia, 330.
Johnson, Louis, Assistant Secretary of War, 716.
——— statement on neutrality by, 282.
Lindbergh, Charles A.: address by, 415, 416.
National Munitions Control Board, 800, 801, 802, 803, 804.
Neutrality Act, 1939, 252, 266, 267, 271–274, 278, 279, 280, 282, 283, 323, 380, 402, 406, 407, 416, 417, 436, 439, 444, 515, 516, 517, 547, 548, 549, 553, 554, 556, 557, 564, 597, 603, 715, 717, 718, 719, 720, 722, 725, 726–728, 730, 732, 746, 747, 748, 750, 790, 799, 800–806, 829, 830, 847, 860, 861, 925, 926, 965, 971, 1022.
——— mobilization plans, 719, 720, 721, 722.
——— order of procedure, 75, 776, 777.
——— preamble, 1027, 1029, 1031, 1032.
——— statements by Secretary Hull, 276.
Roosevelt, Franklin D.: church service attended by, 727, 728.
Russia, 438.
War propaganda, 543.
War referendum, 991, 992, 993.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

CLARK, D. WORTH (*a Senator from Idaho*).
Attended, 3.
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 444, 445, 564, 565, 650, 651.
Cotton exports to Great Britain, 564, 565.
Neutrality Act, 1939, 182, 227, 444, 445, 564, 565, 650, 651, 1016.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

CLARK, EFFIE J., increase pension (see bill H. R. 7547).

CLARK, J. BAYARD (*a Representative from North Carolina*).
Attended, 8.
Remarks by, on
Neutrality, 1099.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

CLARK, WILLIAM, address over the radio delivered by Harry H. Woodring, Secretary of War, concerning (Appendix, 100).

CLASON, CHARLES R. (*a Representative from Massachusetts*).
Attended, 8.
Letter from commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars and resolution adopted by national encampment, Boston, Mass. (Appendix, 69).
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 264.
——— table showing exports 1910–39, 264.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

CLAWSON-TROY NEWS, article entitled "It's Glorious To Be an American These Days" appearing in, 757.

CLAYPOOL, HAROLD K. (*a Representative from Ohio*).
Attended, 8.
Bills and joint resolutions introduced by
Freeman, Bert and Marie: for relief (see bill H. R. 7625), 1397.
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo (Appendix, 803).
Neutrality (Appendix, 803).
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, communication announcing the receipt of a message from the Senate agreeing to the conference asked by the House on House Joint Resolution 306 entitled "Neutrality Act of 1939," 1359.
Letter transmitting credentials of Representatives-elect Fadjo Cravens and Estes Kefauver, 9.

CLEVELAND PLAIN DEALER, tribute to the late Chester C. Bolton appearing in, 1077.

CLEVENGER, CLIFF (*a Representative from Ohio*).
Editorial from Chicago Daily Tribune entitled "Roosevelt against Roosevelt" (Appendix, 140).
Editorial from the Henry County (Ohio) Signal on the New Deal and the farmer (Appendix, 468).
Editorial from Henry County (Ohio) Signal referring to Richard T. Staderman, president of the American Good Government Society (Appendix, 468).
Remarks by, on
Bolton, Chester C.: death of, 1078.
Sugar, 389, 390.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

"CLOSE THE DOORS," editorial from the Boston Evening Transcript entitled, 107.

"CLOTHES MAKE THE SOLDIER," editorial appearing in the Boston Post entitled (Appendix, 601).

CLUETT, E. HAROLD (*a Representative from New York*).
Attended, 8.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

COAL, address delivered by Harold L. Ickes, Secretary of the Interior, relative to (Appendix, 537).
Address delivered by Chester Thompson relative to the regulation of the bituminous-coal industry (Appendix, 549).
Remarks in House relative to the proposed price-fixing plan for bituminous (Appendix, 179).

COAST GUARD, reimburse certain members or former members for loss of personal property during a hurricane in New England (see bill H. R. 7596).

COBB, THOMAS SPENCER, letter relative to the European war written by, 762, 763.

COCHRAN, JOHN J. (*a Representative from Missouri*).
Attended, 8.
Address by Rt. Rev. Msgr. John O'Grady on neutrality (Appendix, 658).
Excerpt from speech by Representative Wadsworth on neutrality (Appendix, 844).
Letter from Gen. John J. Pershing relative to graves of American soldiers in France (Appendix, 262).
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 1210, 1211 (Appendix, 844).
——— loans to belligerents, 1211.
Coughlin, Father, 620, 621.
Freedom of speech, 620.
Neutrality, 1210, 1211 (Appendix, 47, 844).
Permission to address the House, 568.
Radio broadcasting: restrictions on, 620.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

COFFEE, HARRY B. (*a Representative from Nebraska*).
Statement before Committee for Reciprocity Information on proposed Argentine trade agreement (Appendix, 323).

COFFEE, HARRY B.—Continued.
Bills and joint resolutions introduced by
Foreign trade agreements: to require ratification by Senate (see bill H. R. 7589), 626.
Poultry industry: relating to statistical information relating to (see bill H. R. 7616), 1397.
Remarks by, on
Argentine trade agreement, 610.
Crop conditions in Nebraska, 40.
Foreign-trade agreements, 940, 941.
Neutrality, 343.
Poultry industry: need of statistical information (Appendix, 745).
Reciprocal-trade agreements, 958, 959.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

COFFEE, JOHN M. (*a Representative from Washington*).
Attended, 8.
Article from Boston Evening Transcript relative to Dies committee (Appendix, 679).
Article by Jay Franklin relative to Dies committee (Appendix, 679).
Editorial from Washington Post on Dies committee on un-American activities (Appendix, 530).
Petitions and papers presented by, from
Citizens and individuals, 540.
Remarks by, on
American League for Peace and Democracy, 878, 879, 880, 881, 883, 884.
Broun, Heywood, 880, 881.
Dies committee on un-American activities, 878, 879, 880, 881, 882, 883, 884, 887 (Appendix, 678).
Labor organizations, 1039.
Lewis, John L., 881.
Neutrality Act, 1939, 262.
Permission to address the House, 866.
Sit-down strikes, 1039.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

COLE, W. STERLING (*a Representative from New York*).
Attended, 8.
Bills and joint resolutions introduced by
Kenyon, Clarinda E., to pension (see bill H. R. 7594), 772.
Latimore, Flora: to pension (see bill H. R. 7579), 265.
Shriay, Rachib: for relief (see bill H. R. 7552), 41.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

COLE, WILLIAM P., JR. (*a Representative from Maryland*).
Attended, 8.
Address before Independent Petroleum Association of America, Fort Worth, Tex. (Appendix, 442).
Bills and joint resolutions introduced by
Stansbury Creek, Baltimore, Md.: to construct dike across (see bill H. R. 7564), 148.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

COLLINS, PATRICK, relief (see bill H. R. 7613).

COLLINS, ROSS A. (*a Representative from Mississippi*).
Attended, 8.
Bills and joint resolutions introduced by
Cotton: to cancel certain expenses against loans on (see bill H. R. 7609), 1081.
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 1172.
Neutrality, 1172.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

COLMER, WILLIAM M. (*a Representative from Mississippi*).
Attended, 8.
Appointed on funeral committee, 80.
Editorial from Gulfport-Biloxi Daily Herald on the death of Eaton J. Bowers, 1091.
Remarks in the House on subject of neutrality, 1936, 1096, 1097.
Remarks by, on
Bowers, Eaton J.: death of, 1091.
Neutrality, 1096.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

"COLUMBIA'S PEACE PRAYER," poem by Jens K. Grondahl entitled (Appendix, 534).

COLUMBUS DAY, remarks in House relative to observance of (Appendix, 287).

COMMERCIAL AIR TRANSPORT INDUSTRY, remarks in House and an article by John L. Beckley relative to (Appendix, 536).

COMMISSIONS, appointment in House of members of the Commission on the Celebration of the One Hundred and Twenty-fifth Anniversary of the Writing of the Star-Spangled Banner, 9.
Authority granted the Speaker of the House to fill vacancies on commissions notwithstanding the adjournment of the second session of the Seventy-sixth Congress, 1390.

COMMITTEE ON ACCOUNTS (House).
Reports by
Cox, Alice Everett (H. Res. 304; H. Rept. 1474), 1367, 1397.

COMMITTEE ON ANNIVERSARY OF COMMENCEMENT OF THE FIRST SESSION OF THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES (joint).
Appointed, 939.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS (House).
Mr. Hare elected, 1358.
Mr. Keefe elected, 1358.
Remarks in House in defense of, 258.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS (Senate).
Reports by
Expenses incident to the second session of the Seventy-sixth Congress (H. J. Res. 384), 224.

COMMITTEE TO AUDIT AND CONTROL THE CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE SENATE (Senate).
Resolution to authorize them to hold hearings (see S. Res. 195).
Reports by
Atkinson, Ela H. (S. Res. 193), 1281.
Funeral expenses of M. M. Logan (S. Res. 192), 396.

COMMITTEE ON CENSUS (House).
Mr. Kefauver elected, 33.

COMMITTEE ON CLAIMS (House).
Mr. Cravens elected, 33.
Mr. Gathings elected, 1283.
Mr. Keefe excused, 1379.
Mr. Kefauver elected, 33.

COMMITTEE ON COINAGE, WEIGHTS, AND MEASURES (House).
Mr. Kefauver elected, 33.

COMMITTEE ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS (joint).
Members appointed in Senate on, 30, 76, 706.

COMMITTEE ON ELECTION OF PRESIDENT, VICE PRESIDENT, AND REPRESENTATIVES IN CONGRESS (House).
Mr. Hare excused, 1379.

COMMITTEE ON ELECTIONS NO. 2 (House).
Mr. Hare excused, 1379.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS (Senate).
Authorized to report certain proposed legislation during any recess or adjournment of the Senate, 31.
Reports by
Neutrality (S. Rept. 1155), 46, 58.

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS (House).
Mr. Bradley of Michigan excused, 1390.

COMMITTEE ON INSULAR AFFAIRS (House).
Mr. Hare excused, 1379.

COMMITTEE ON INVESTIGATION OF ADEQUACY AND USE OF PHOSPHATE RESOURCES (joint).
Mr. Chandler appointed in Senate on, 396.

COMMITTEE ON INVESTIGATION OF THE CIVIL SERVICE SYSTEM (Senate).
Mr. Truman appointed, 489.

COMMITTEE ON INVESTIGATION OF UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES (House).
Editorial from the Richmond (Ind.) Palladium-Item eulogizing the work of (Appendix, 182).
Editorial from the Skipper relative to (Appendix, 662).
Editorial from the Washington Post relative to publication of the list of names of members of the American League for Peace and Democracy, by (Appendix, 530).
Letter from Helen Wood, acting administrative assistant, Wage and Hour Division, Department of Labor, remonstrating against the inclusion of her name as a member of the League for Peace and Democracy by (Appendix, 815).
Mr. Casey appointed, 9.
Remarks in House and correspondence relative to, 878, 879, 884, 885, 886, 1033.
Remarks in House, an editorial from the Boston Evening Transcript, and an article by Jay Franklin on the subject of (Appendix, 678).
Telegram from R. P. Harmon urging support of (Appendix, 602).

COMMITTEE ON IRRIGATION AND RECLAMATION (House).
Mr. Cravens elected, 33.

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES (House).
Mr. Bradley of Michigan elected, 1390.
Mr. Keefe excused, 1379.

COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS (Senate).
Mr. Chandler assigned to, 889.

COMMITTEE ON MINES AND MINING (House).
Mr. Cravens elected, 33.

COMMITTEE ON MINES AND MINING (Senate).
Mr. Chandler assigned to, 889.

COMMITTEE ON PRINTING (House).
Reports by
Hearings before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations on the subject of neutrality (S. Con. Res. 30; H. Rept. 1472), 336, 353.

COMMITTEE ON PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS (Senate).
Mr. Chandler assigned to, 889.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS (House).
Mr. Bradley of Michigan excused, 1390.
Mr. Hare excused, 1379.

COMMITTEE ON REVISION OF THE LAWS (House).
Mr. Kefauver elected, 33.

COMMITTEE ON RULES (House).
Reports by
Neutrality Act of 1939 (H. Res. 320; H. Rept. 1473), 1059, 1080.
COMMITTEE TO STUDY UNITED STATES STATUTES (House).
Resolution to appoint (see H. Res. 316).
COMMITTEE ON TAXATION OF GOVERNMENTAL SECURITIES AND SALARIES (Senate).
Mr. Burke appointed on, 173.
COMMITTEE ON TERRITORIES (House).
Mr. Cravens elected, 33.
COMMITTEE ON WORLD WAR VETERANS' LEGISLATION (House).
Mr. Hare excused, 1379.
COMMITTEES OF HOUSE, authority granted the Speaker to fill vacancies on committees notwithstanding the adjournment of the second session of the Seventy-Sixth Congress, 1390.
COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION, text of bill (H. R. 7591) to limit the powers of, 622.
"COMMON SENSE," article by John T. Flynn, entitled (Appendix, 286).
"COMMON SENSE WINS," editorial from the Washington Post, entitled (Appendix, 759, 794).
COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934, amend so as to permit communication utilities to contribute free services to the national defense (see bill S. 3018).
COMMUNISM, article by Heywood Broun on the subject of (Appendix, 625).
Editorial from the Wichita (Kans.) Beacon entitled "Fire All Communists From United States Pay Roll" (Appendix, 597).
Remarks in House relative to the outline of the Communist International contained in the book entitled "The Red Network," 810.
Remarks in House on the subject of the C. I. O. and communism, 883, 1052 (Appendix, 471).
Remarks in House on the subject of, 1393.
COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES, report on claim of Robert E. Newton, 30, 41.
Report on claim of O'Brien Bros., Inc., 41, 44.
CONFERENCES ON INTER-AMERICAN CULTURAL RELATIONS, letter from the Secretary of State concerning, 540.
CONGRESS. *See also* HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES; SENATE.
Address delivered by Representative Gross at Chambersburg, Pa., on the achievements of the Republican Minority in the Seventy-sixth (Appendix, 450).
Address delivered by Representative Plumley entitled "Congress Means Business" (Appendix, 175).
Article by Walter Lippmann entitled "The Duty of Congress in World War Crisis" (Appendix, 119).
Concurrent resolution to provide for holding a joint meeting of the Senate and House of Representatives (see H. Con. Res. 36*), 4, 9.
Concurrent resolution to hold continuous session until January 3, 1940 (see H. Con. Res. 37).
Editorial from the Newark (N. J.) Sunday Call entitled "Congress Should Stay" (Appendix, 171).
Joint resolutions to restore to Congress the sole power to issue money and regulate the value thereof (see S. J. Res. 188; H. J. Res. 391).
Joint resolution making provision for certain expenses incident to the second session of the Seventy-sixth Congress (see H. J. Res. 384*).
Joint resolution for amendment to the Constitution relative to convening extra or special sessions of (see H. J. Res. 395).
Proclamation by the President of the United States convening in extra session on September 21, 1939, 3, 7.
Remarks in House relative to the one-act session of the Seventy-sixth (Appendix, 808).
Remarks in House relative to the desirability of considering legislation for tax revision, national defense, and other matters during the extra session of, 807, 808.
Remarks in House entitled "Congress at Present Stands for Peace" (Appendix, 823).
Remarks in House relative to the special session of the Seventy-sixth (Appendix, 853).
Remarks in House opposing sine die adjournment on November 3, 1939, of (Appendix, 865).
Remarks in House favoring holding Congress in session (Appendix, 865).
Remarks in House urging Congress to remain in session until the regular session in January 1940, 1379.
Remarks in House relative to the proposed constitutional amendment giving Congress the power to meet in special session in its own discretion, 1057, 1058.
Remarks in House relative to the special session and partisan politics, 940.
Text of the first prayer delivered in (Appendix, 368).
CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS, remarks in House relative to, 217, 218, 299, 351, 352, 484, 660, 661, 1070, 1359, 1360.
Remarks in House on the subject of the C. I. O. and communism, 883, 1052 (Appendix, 471).
CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, orders of House granting general leave to print remarks in, 18, 132, 337, 472, 1345, 1390.
Order of House granting general leave to print remarks concerning the late Thomas B. Reed, former Speaker of the House of Representatives, 569.
Remarks in House relative to the printing of extraneous matter in, 808, 809.
Remarks in House relative to unauthorized changes made in, 1370, 1392.
Remarks in Senate relative to printing of data on the work of the extra session, 1358.
CONNALLY, TOM (*a Senator from Texas*).
Attended, 3.
Appointed conferee, 1282.
Discussion of neutrality on American Forum of the Air by Senators Nye, Pittman, Connally, Danaher, Lundeen, and Van Nuys (Appendix, 243).
Editorial by Peter Molyneaux on neutrality (Appendix, 426).
Radio address on neutrality legislation by (Appendix, 226).
Amendments offered by, to
Neutrality Act, 1939 (H. J. Res. 306): to amend, 602, 781, 784, 789, 889, 971, 1020, 1021, 1027.
Remarks by, on
Adjournment procedure, 5.
Armed merchant ships, 966, 968, 969.
——— memorandum relative to, 967.
Arms embargo, 83, 84, 85, 87, 88, 90, 106, 158, 194, 200, 201, 203, 204, 205, 206, 233, 234, 405, 416, 435, 436, 437, 438, 439, 440, 441, 461, 508, 644, 648, 652, 654, 720, 731, 732, 733, 748, 779, 781, 782, 783, 784, 786, 789, 790, 791, 793, 803, 835, 836, 893, 902, 966, 971.
——— amendment relating to shipments to certain ports, 781, 782, 783, 786, 790.
——— list of ships sunk prior to entry of United States in World War, 90, 91.
——— motion of Mr. Tobey to recommit, 234.
——— reply to Senator Lundeen, 435.
——— sale of poison gases, 902, 904, 905.
Ethiopia, 437.
Final adjournment, 1358.
Ghost writers, 754.
Great Britain: seizure of possessions of, 436, 437.
Hoovert, Herbert, 440, 441.
Lindbergh, Charles A.: speech by, 6, 416, 440, 441.
Mobilization plans, 720, 731.
Munitions: offensive and defensive weapons, 440.
Neutrality: appointment of conferees, 1282.
——— preamble, 1027, 1029, 1030, 1031, 1033.
Neutrality Act 1939, 75, 76, 83, 84, 85, 87, 88, 435, 436, 437, 438, 439, 440, 461, 508, 644, 648, 652, 654, 720, 731, 732, 733, 748, 779, 781, 782, 783, 784, 789, 790, 791, 793, 794, 803, 805, 835, 836, 893, 901, 902, 928, 929, 966, 967, 971, 972, 992, 1015, 1016.
Order of business, 5.
President of the United States: proclaiming state of war by, 836.
Reciprocal trade agreements, 1086, 1087.
War debts: collection of, 436, 437, 438, 439, 440, 441.
War referendum, 992, 993.
Votes of. *See* YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.
CONNERY, LAWRENCE J. (*a Representative from Massachusetts*).
Attended, 8.
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 1256.
Neutrality, 1256.
Relief problems (Appendix, 738).
Votes of. *See* YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.
CONSCRIPTION, address over the radio delivered by Representative Harness concerning conscription of wealth in times of war (Appendix, 500).
CONSTANTINE, EARL, remarks in House relative to (Appendix, 861).
CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES, remarks in House relative to Government revision of (Appendix, 747).
Joint resolution for amendment to
Congress: relative to convening extra or special sessions of (see H. J. Res. 395).
"CONSTITUTION SUNDAY," address over the radio delivered by Senator Davis entitled (Appendix, 43).
CONTINENTAL MILLS, INC., advertisement entitled "America's Destiny" issued by (Appendix, 94).
CONTRABAND OF WAR, letter from the German Embassy relative to (Appendix, 813).
Lists of British and German articles classified as, 124.
List of materials considered as contraband by Great Britain during the World War, 1271.

COOKE, S. B. (lieutenant commander, U. S. Patrol Squadron 51), statement concerning absence of submarines in the Caribbean area, 590.

COOLEY, HAROLD D. (*a Representative from North Carolina*).
Letter from James H. Pou relative to cash-and-carry feature of Neutrality Act (Appendix, 773).
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 1161, 1232 (Appendix, 773).
——— cash and carry (Appendix, 773).
Neutrality, 1161, 1232 (Appendix, 773).
——— printing of pamphlet, 257.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

COOPER, JERE (*a Representative from Tennessee*).
Attended, 8.
Address by John W. Hanes on the revenue problem (Appendix, 589).
Motions and resolutions offered by
Election to committees (see H. Res. 307, 308), 33.
Election of Mr. Gathings to Committee on Claims (see H. Res. 322), 1283.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

COPPER, remarks in Senate relative to the excise tax on, 1083.
Statement submitted by Senator Barkley concerning excise taxes on, 1350.
Table showing exports of (Appendix, 728).

CORBETT, ROBERT J. (*a Representative from Pennsylvania*).
Attended, 8.
Editorial by the president general of the Sons of the American Revolution on subject of neutrality (Appendix, 489).
Permission to address the House, 862.
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 961, 1299.
Embargo and Nonintercourse Acts of 1807, 527.
Jeffersonian Embargo and Nonintercourse Acts, 961.
Neutrality, 961, 1098, 1299.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

CORN, statement by Representative Mondt concerning prices of (Appendix, 860).

CORWIN, EDWARD S., letter relative to the proposed repeal of the arms embargo, written by, 283.

COST OF GOVERNMENT, address delivered by Lewis W. Douglas relative to (Appendix, 726).
Statement by Senator Holt to the citizens of West Virginia concerning (Appendix, 726).

COST OF WAR, statistics relative to, 414.

COSTELLO, JOHN M. (*a Representative from California*).
Attended, 8.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

COTTEN, FELIX, article on the prospective increase in trade with (Appendix, 732).

COTTON, amend the act of January 29, 1937, providing loans to farmers for crop production and harvesting (see bill H. R. 7609).
Statistics relative to exports of, 1268.

COTTON RESEARCH AWARD FUND, establish (see bill H. R. 7623).

COUGHLIN, CHARLES E., remarks in House relative to, 620.

COUNTRY GENTLEMAN, editorial entitled "That These Shall Not Perish" appearing in (Appendix, 400).

COURTNEY, WIRT (*a Representative from Tennessee*).
Attended, 8.
Remarks by, on
National Committee to Keep Us Out of Foreign Wars, 479.
Neutrality, 479.
Permission to address the House, 353.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

COURTS OF THE UNITED STATES.
Special assistant attorneys: letter from the Attorney General relative to employment of, 14, 29.

COX, ALICE EVERETT, relief (see H. Res. 304*).

COX, E. E. (*a Representative from Georgia*).
Attended, 8.
Address by Hon. John W. McCormack at National Convention of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Boston, Mass. (Appendix, 178).
Remarks by, on
Argentine trade agreements, 955, 956.
Arms embargo, 143, 144, 145, 147, 215, 534, 535.
Crop conditions in Georgia and Alabama, 40.
Extension of remarks, 77.
Foreign-trade agreements, 942, 943, 955, 956.
League for Peace and Democracy, 880, 881, 1043, 1044.
National Labor Relations Board, 771.
Neutrality Act, 1939, 142, 210, 215, 761, 1094.
Neutrality bills: comparative print of, 1060.
Permission to address the House, 72, 772.
Reciprocal trade agreements, 955, 956, 957, 958, 959.
——— tables, 959, 960.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

CRAVENS, FADJO (*a Representative from Arkansas*).
Credentials, 9.
Elected to committees, 33.
Sworn in, 9.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

CRAWFORD, FRED L. (*a Representative from Michigan*).
Attended, 8.
Article by Witt Bowden, Bureau of Labor Statistics, on American Labor in the World War (Appendix, 710).
Editorial on crime suppression by (Appendix, 232).
Letter from D. E. Montgomery on the quality of beet sugar (Appendix, 602).
Statement opposing proposed reciprocal trade agreement with Argentina (Appendix, 395).
Motions and resolutions offered by
Congress: calling for continuous session until January 3, 1940 (see H. Con. Res. 37), 1278.
Secretary of the Treasury: requesting him to furnish certain information relative to Japanese demands that United States customs officer salute a Japanese sentry at Honolulu (see H. Res. 323), 1347.
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 144, 147, 148, 347, 352, 353, 872, 873, 874, 1130, 1210, 1230, 1231.
——— financial involvement, 1230.
Beet sugar: quality of (Appendix, 602).
Consumer's Guide—article on ice cream, 387.
Extension of remarks, 1157.
Fleming, Lt. Col. Philip (Appendix, 665).
Foreign trade: effect of war on, 532.
Foreign-trade agreements, 942, 944, 945.
Gold reserves, 1230, 1231.
Great Britain: investments in United States of citizens of, 623.
Industrial-mobilization plan (Appendix, 665).
Labor disorders, 301.
Labor legislation and preparedness, 349.
Military officers: appointment to Government posts (Appendix, 665).
Neutrality, 264, 1130, 1210, 1230, 1231.
Neutral zones, 305, 306.
New Deal propaganda, 299.
Permission to address the House, 384.
President of the United States: emergency powers of (Appendix, 665).
Radio broadcasting, 621.
Reciprocal trade agreements, 532.
Sugar: beet versus cane, 387, 388, 389, 391.
——— Government specifications for ice cream, 387, 388.
Wage earners during war booms (Appendix, 710).
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

CRAWFORD, KENNETH G.: remarks in House relative to the book entitled "The Pressure Boys," written by, 809.

CREAL, EDWARD W. (*a Representative from Kentucky*).
Attended, 8.
Appointed on funeral committee, 148.
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo (Appendix, 488).
Neutrality, 1038 (Appendix, 488).
Permission to address the House, 940.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

"CRIME—THE CHURCH MUST AND CAN MEET IT," address delivered by Wilmer Souder entitled (Appendix, 723).

CRIMES, editorial written by Representative Crawford entitled, "The Businessman Looks at Crime" (Appendix, 232).

CRIMINAL LAW, remarks in House concerning Bureau-made (Appendix, 296).

CRIMSON TRAIL, poem by John W. Dodd entitled (Appendix, 517).

"CROP CONTROL IS HERE TO STAY," editorial from the Birmingham (Ala.) News entitled (Appendix, 316).

CROSSER, ROBERT (*a Representative from Ohio*).
Attended, 8.
Appointed on funeral committee, 1081.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

CROWE, EUGENE B. (*a Representative from Indiana*).
Attended, 8.
Address before American Association of State Highway officials, Washington, D. C. (Appendix, 325).
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo (Appendix, 502).
Neutrality (Appendix, 502).
Purnell, Fred S.: tribute to, 757.
Rotary Club, Bedford, Ind., 472, 473.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

CROWTHER, FRANK (*a Representative from New York*).
Attended, 8.
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 1218.

CROWTHER, FRANK—Continued.
Remarks by, on
Neutrality, 1218.
Sanford, John: death of, 33.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.
CRUSADE FOR PEACE, address over the radio delivered by Edward Lodge Curran on the subject of (Appendix, 275, 374).
CULKIN, FRANCIS D. (*a Representative from New York*).
Attended, 8.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.
CULLEN, THOMAS H. (*a Representative from New York*).
Attended, 8.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.
CUMMINGS, FRED (*a Representative from Colorado*).
Attended, 8.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.
CURRAN, EDWARD LODGE, address over the radio concerning the crusade for peace delivered by (Appendix, 275, 374).
CURTIS, CARL T. (*a Representative from Nebraska*).
Attended, 8.
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 341, 954, 1134 (Appendix, 9, 758).
Lindbergh, Charles A., 954.
Neutrality, 341, 954, 1134 (Appendix, 9, 758).
Permission to address the House, 758.
Tolerance, 954.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.
CURTISS-WRIGHT EXPORT CORPORATION, statement by the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of, 838.
CUSTOMS OFFICERS, resolution of inquiry relative to Japanese demands that the United States customs officer salute a Japanese sentry at Honolulu, Hawaii (see H. Res. 323).
CUSTOMS SERVICE, promotion of employees in the field service (see bill H. R. 7620).
CZECHOSLOVAKIA, remarks in Senate relative to the destruction of, 550.
DABNEY, VIRGINIUS, article concerning the poll tax written by (Appendix 115).
DAIRY INDUSTRY, letter from Fred R. Zimmerman relative to production of dairy products in Wisconsin (Appendix, 440).
DAIRY PRODUCTS, memorial of Legislature of Wisconsin urging passage of bill (H. R. 6500) to provide for the promotion of sound dairy practices, 30.
D'ALESANDRO, THOMAS, JR. (*a Representative from Maryland*).
Attended, 8.
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo (Appendix, 763).
Columbus Day (Appendix, 287).
Neutrality (Appendix, 763).
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.
DANAHER, JOHN A. (*a Senator from Connecticut*).
Attended, 3.
Article from Washington Star on neutrality legislation, 107.
Article from Baltimore Sun relative to purchases by Great Britain and France in the United States (Appendix 348).
Discussion of neutrality on American Forum of the Air by Senators Nye, Pittman, Connally, Danaher, Lundeen, and Van Nuys (Appendix, 243).
Editorial from Boston Evening Transcript on neutrality legislation, 107.
Radio address by Maj. Al Williams on neutrality (Appendix, 314).
Radio address on proposed repeal of arms embargo (Appendix, 717).
Amendments offered by, to
Neutrality (H. J. Res. 306): to amend, 794, 899, 900, 911, 1009, 1021.
Remarks by, on
Airplanes: filling foreign orders, 794, 795, 796, 797, 798.
Arms embargo, 200, 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 226, 227, 228, 229, 230, 231, 232, 238, 292, 411, 412, 505, 508, 509, 512, 513, 514, 516, 517, 518, 519, 520, 713, 779, 782, 784, 794, 795, 796, 798, 834, 858, 899, 900, 1009.
——— cash-and-carry provision, 1009, 1010, 1011, 1012, 1018.
——— sale of poison gases, 899, 900, 901, 904.
Great Britain trade agreements, 1350.
Motion-picture propaganda, 713.
Neutrality Act 1939, 107, 193, 200, 201, 226, 227, 228, 230, 231, 232, 238, 505, 508, 509, 512, 513, 514, 516, 517, 518, 519, 520, 713, 779, 782, 784, 794, 795, 796, 798, 834, 858, 889, 899, 900, 910, 911, 1009, 1021.
——— cash and carry, 513, 514, 515, 516, 517, 518, 519, 520, 521.
——— exemptions of certain cargo, 784.
Order of business, 335.
Trade agreements and the arms embargo, 1350.
War debts—comments in British newspapers, 520.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.
DARDEN, COLGATE W., JR. (*a Representative from Virginia*).
Attended, 8.
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 1243, 1244.
Naval vessels: construction of, 587.
Neutrality, 1243, 1244.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.
DARROW, GEORGE P. (*a Representative from Pennsylvania*).
Message stating position on neutrality legislation, 1345.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.
DAVIS, CHARLES F., editorial relative to importation of foreign pulp written by (Appendix, 468).
DAVIS, FRANK S. (manager), letter relative to the Neutrality Act of 1939 written by (Appendix, 531).
DAVIS, JAMES J. (*a Senator from Pennsylvania*).
Attended, 3.
Address at Pastorius Day celebration, Philadelphia, Pa. (Appendix, 196).
Article on neutrality published in the Philadelphia Inquirer by (Appendix, 185).
Letter from Joseph Kohn, president, Universal Dental Co., Philadelphia, Pa., regarding cash-and-carry amendment to neutrality bill, 627, 628.
Letter from Herbert Hoover to Woodrow Wilson relative to role of the United States in Europe (Appendix, 719).
Radio address on Constitution Sunday by (Appendix, 43).
Amendments offered by, to
Neutrality Act 1939 (H. J. Res. 306): to amend, 175, 911.
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 726, 911, 912.
Canada: friendly relations with, 642, 643, 644.
Foreign seamen, 974, 975.
National Neutrality Commission, 175, 911, 912.
Neutrality, 175, 227, 911, 912.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.
DEATHS ANNOUNCED.
Senator
Logan, M. M., 81 (Appendix, 174).
Representatives
Bolton, Chester C., 1074.
Bowers, Eaton Jackson, 1091.
Eaton, Thomas M., 13.
McMillan, Thomas S., 79 (Appendix, 217).
Former Senator
Sherman, Lawrence Y., 4, 12.
Former Representatives
De Vries, Marion, 12.
Johnston, Ronald L., 33.
Mondell, Frank W., 134.
Pollard, Ernest Mark, 16.
Purnell, Fred S., 755.
Sanford, John, 33.
DEBT MONEY AND TAXES, eliminate (see bill H. R. 7600).
DEBT OF THE UNITED STATES, address delivered by Representative Bolles to the Wisconsin Bankers' Association on the subject of (Appendix, 235).
Remarks in House relative to, 1371 (Appendix, 654).
DEFICITS, statistics of, 1363.
DELANEY, JOHN J. (*a Representative from New York*).
Attended, 8.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.
DEMOCRACY, address delivered by Frank Gannett on the subject of (Appendix, 490).
Address delivered by Edward J. McCormick entitled "Democracy at the Crossroads" (Appendix, 517).
Address delivered by Ernest H. Wilkins entitled "Democracy at Bay" (Appendix, 136).
Article by David S. Muzzey entitled "All Is Not Lost in the Fight for Democracy" (Appendix, 570).
Letter written by Senator Holt on the topic, Saving Democracy (Appendix, 828).
DEMPSEY, JOHN J. (*a Representative from New Mexico*).
Attended, 8.
Excerpt from official record of Dies committee on un-American activities, 1034.
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 878.
Dies committee on un-American activities, 878, 1033.
——— publication of members of League for Peace and Democracy, 1033.
League for Peace and Democracy, 878, 1033, 1041, 1042, 1053, 1054.
——— letter from Mrs. B. G. Lamberton, 1033.
——— letters from Helen Wood, 1034.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.
DENMARK, excerpts from arms-embargo laws of, 352.
DENNIS, WILLIAM C., letter concerning the repeal of the arms embargo written by (Appendix, 763).
DENTON, FRANCES, letter concerning E. M. House written by (Appendix, 334).

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE. *See also* SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE.
Remarks in House relative to the run-around at (Appendix, 867).
Statement concerning the American beef market issued by (Appendix, 152).

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE. *See also* SECRETARY OF COMMERCE.
Letters from the Secretary of Commerce relative to the sale of waste paper in, 13.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR. *See also* SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR.
Letter from the Archivist of the United States transmitting list of useless papers in, 30, 41.

DEPORTATIONS, remarks in House and statistics relative to, 1376.

DETROIT, MICH., remarks in House relative to labor strikes at (Appendix, 1359).

DETROIT FREE PRESS (newspaper), editorial entitled "Why Be Foolish Again?" appearing in (Appendix, 320).
Editorial on the subject of neutrality appearing in (Appendix, 594).

DE VRIES, MARION (*late a Representative from California*).
Death of, 12.

DICKSTEIN, SAMUEL (*a Representative from New York*).
Attended, 8.
Letter from Jacob Panken on arms embargo (Appendix, 70).
Radio address on American neutrality and alien ideologies, by (Appendix, 71).
Radio address by Prof. Charles Hodges on the European crisis (Appendix, 51).
Radio address on the European crisis, by (Appendix, 51).
Radio address on neutrality, by (Appendix, 709).
Remarks by, on
Alien youth movements, 536.
American-German Youth Movement, 536.
——— articles relative to, 536, 537.
Arms embargo, 536.
Dies Committee to Investigate Un-American Activities, 537.
Foreign agents, 524.
Immigration: investigation of matters relative to, 136, 137, 138, 139.
Kuhn, Fritz, 537.
Mexico: smuggling of aliens from, 137.
Permission to address the House, 522.
Un-American activities, 136, 537.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

DICUS, T. A., address at dedication of the Abe Lincoln Ferry Park, Ind., delivered by (Appendix, 330).

DIES, MARTIN (*a Representative from Texas*).
Attended, 8.
Editorial from Washington Post relative to work of Mr. Dies on un-American activities committee (Appendix, 530).
Radio address on investigation of un-American activities, by (Appendix, 634).
Motions and resolutions offered by
Special Committee on Un-American Activities: for continuation of (see H. Res. 321), 1278.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

DIES COMMITTEE. *See* COMMITTEE ON INVESTIGATION OF UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES (House).

DIMOND, ANTHONY J. (*a Delegate from Alaska*).
Bills and joint resolutions introduced by
Alaska: to amend act to protect fisheries of (see bill H. R. 7542), 24.
Wrangell, Alaska: to transfer funds to town of (see bill H. R. 7612), 1158.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

DINGELL, JOHN D. (*a Representative from Michigan*).
Attended, 8.
Address before American Jewish Congress, New York City, by (Appendix, 214).
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo (Appendix, 683).
Nazi propaganda (Appendix, 807).
Neutrality (Appendix, 683).
Propaganda in America (Appendix, 807).
Strikes in Michigan, 1359, 1360.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

DINGLEY TARIFF OF 1897, table showing results of (Appendix, 859).

DIRKSEN, EVERETT M. (*a Representative from Illinois*).
Attended, 8.
Article by S. A. Baldus on neutrality (Appendix, 469).
Permission to address the House, 815.
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 1044.
Neutrality, 1044.
Order of business, 17.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS OF THE WORLD WAR, legislative program of (Appendix, 10).

DISNEY, WESLEY E. (*a Representative from Oklahoma*).
Attended, 8.
Address by Gov. Leon C. Phillips of Oklahoma on regulation of oil production (Appendix, 543).
Review of book by Duncan Aikman and Blair Bolles entitled "America's Chance of Peace" (Appendix, 696).
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 1321.
Neutrality, 1321.
Tulsa University—Catholic University football game, 1371.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

DITTER, J. WILLIAM (*a Representative from Pennsylvania*).
Attended, 8.
Advertisement of Continental Mills, Inc., entitled "America's Destiny" (Appendix, 94).
Summary of the emergency powers of the President (Appendix, 507).
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 1303.
Neutrality, 1303.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

DODD, JOHN W., poem entitled "The Crimson Trail" written by (Appendix, 517).

DOLLAR STEAMSHIP LINES, INC., LTD., letter from the Vice Chairman of the United States Maritime Commission transmitting a special report concerning, 14, 29.

"DOMESTIC PROBLEMS SHOULD HAVE ATTENTION OF CONGRESS," remarks in House entitled (Appendix, 452).

DONAHEY, A. V. (VIC) (*a Senator from Ohio*).
Attended, 3.
Appointed on funeral committee, 1091.
Letter to the president of the American Federation of Labor (Appendix, 81).
Remarks in House relative to statement on arms embargo by, 1314.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

DONDERO, GEORGE A. (*a Representative from Michigan*).
Attended, 8.
Article by Mayor Ernest R. Baldwin, Berkley, Mich., entitled "It's Glorious to Be an American These Days," 757.
Petitions and papers presented by, from
Citizens and individuals, 307, 1398.
Societies and associations, 307.
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 529, 1128.
Neutrality, 762, 769, 770, 1128, 1163.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

DOUGHTON, ROBERT L. (*a Representative from North Carolina*).
Attended, 8.
Appointed on Committee to Conduct the President, 9.
Appointed on Committee to Notify the President, 8.
Motions and resolutions offered by
Election of Mr. Hare to committee (see H. Res. 324), 1358.
Notification of the Senate (see H. Res. 299), 9.
Speaker pro tempore of the House: election of (H. Res. 303), 18.
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 1192.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

DOUGLAS, FRED J. (*a Representative from New York*).
Attended, 8.
Article by Ed Sullivan in the New York Daily News entitled "Soliloquy" (Appendix, 598).
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

DOUGLAS, LEWIS W., address on the cost of Government delivered by (Appendix, 726).

DOWELL, CASSIUS C. (*a Representative from Iowa*).
Attended, 8.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

DOWNEY, SHERIDAN (*a Senator from California*).
Attended, 3.
Address by Senator McCarran before American Federation of Labor (Appendix, 429).
Excerpt from Beveridge's Life of John Marshall, 187.
Excerpt from Spengler's, The Decline of the West, 190, 191.
List of wars fought by England and France, 189.
Radio address by Hon. Robert M. La Follette, Jr., on pending neutrality legislation (Appendix, 143).
Amendments offered by, to
Neutrality (H. J. Res. 306): to amend, 773, 889, 914.
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 159, 162, 165, 166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 175, 176, 178, 179, 180, 181, 182, 183, 190, 191, 192, 278, 725, 728, 833, 852, 914, 915.
England: wars of, 179, 180.
Export Control Board, 852.
Industry: effect of war, 852.
Monroe Doctrine, 178.
Neutrality, 159, 162, 176, 725, 728, 833, 852, 914, 915.
——— article by Bruce Cotton, 193.
——— article by George Bernard Shaw, 190.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

DOXEY, WALL (*a Representative from Mississippi*).
Attended, 8.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

DRAFT BOARDS, statement concerning the training of, 284.

DRAFTING OF MONEY IN TIME OF WAR, address over the radio delivered by Senator Lee on the subject of (Appendix, 428).

DRAFTING OF WEALTH IN TIME OF WAR, address over the radio delivered by Senator Bridges on the subject of (Appendix, 460).
Address over the radio delivered by Senator Gurney relative to (Appendix, 464).

DRAPER, ERNEST G., article entitled "Small Business and Its Credit Problem" written by (Appendix, 200).

DREWRY, PATRICK H. (*a Representative from Virginia*).
Attended, 8.
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 1193.
Neutrality, 1193.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

DROUGHTS, remarks in House relative to the opinion of attorneys of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation that droughts are not disasters, 1391, 1392, 1393, 1396.
Remarks in House relative to providing immediate relief for drought- and flood-stricken areas (Appendix, 662).

DRUM, HUGH A. (major general, U. S. Army), address delivered at the opening conference of the First Army maneuvers by (Appendix, 237).

DUNCAN, RICHARD M. (*a Representative from Missouri*).
Attended, 8.

DUNN, FREDERICK S., letter concerning the repeal of the arms embargo written by (Appendix, 763).
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

DUNN, MATTHEW A. (*a Representative from Pennsylvania*).
Attended, 8.
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 1324.
Neutrality, 1324.
Roosevelt, Franklin D.: reply to critics of, 1369.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

DURHAM, CARL T. (*a Representative from North Carolina*).
Attended, 8.
Petitions and papers presented by, from
Citizens and individuals, 588.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

DWORSHAK, HENRY C. (*a Representative from Idaho*).
Attended, 8.
Address by Hugh S. Johnson before American Legion Convention, Chicago, Ill. (Appendix, 95).
Table showing civil employees in executive branch of the Government (Appendix, 655).
Remarks by, on
National Committee to Keep America Out of War, 215.
National debt (Appendix, 655).
Neutrality Act 1939, 813, 215 (Appendix, 95).
New Deal economy (Appendix, 655).
Reciprocal trade agreements, 959.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

"DYING FOR DANZIG," editorial from the Chicago Daily Tribune entitled (Appendix, 87).

EATON, CHARLES A. (*a Representative from New Jersey*).
Attended, 8.
Address before Good Government Club, Somerville, N. J., by (Appendix, 546).
Appointed conferee, 1345.
Remarks by, on
Neutrality, 342.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

EATON, THOMAS M. (*late a Representative from California*).
Amendment to resolution (H. J. Res. 384)—to pay widow of, 224.
Announcement of death of, 13.
Resolution in House upon death of (see H. Res. 301), 13.
Resolution in Senate on death of (see S. Res. 187), 33.

EBERHARTER, HERMAN P. (*a Representative from Pennsylvania*).
Attended, 8.
Article from Pittsburgh Press on Gov. Arthur H. James, 808.
Remarks by, on
James, Arthur H., 808.
Rich, Robert F.: printing matter in Record by, 808.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

ECONOMIC ASPECTS OF GOLD PAYMENT IN THE CASH-AND-CARRY PROPOSAL, remarks in House concerning (Appendix, 72).

EDISON, CHARLES (Acting Secretary of the Navy), address entitled "Navy Day," delivered by (Appendix, 599).
Article on the subject of national defense, written by (Appendix, 18).

EDISON, THOMAS A., excerpts from interviews in 1921 on the subject of unemployment (Appendix, 836).

EDMISTON, ANDREW (*a Representative from West Virginia*).
Attended, 8.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

EDMONSON COUNTY NEWS, BROWNSVILLE, KY., editorial on the death of M. M. Logan appearing in (Appendix, 361).

EDREHI, J. MONTROSE, relief (see bill H. R. 7608).

EDUCATION, address delivered by Representative Smith of Illinois relative to (Appendix, 750).

EGGS, statement by Representative Mundt concerning prices of (Appendix, 859).
Statistics of imports and exports of (Appendix, 340).

ELECTRICITY, remarks in House relative to rates for, 670–673, 674–676.
Remarks in House relative to light and power rates in New England (Appendix, 626).

ELLENDER, ALLEN J. (*a Senator from Louisiana*).
Attended, 3.
Statistics on foreign trade of United States, 635–637.
Amendments offered by, to
Neutrality (H. J. Res. 306): to amend, 444.
Bills and joint resolutions introduced by
Bayou Lafourche, Galiano, La.: to legalize bridge across (see bill S. 2999), 1082.
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 444, 632.
——— letter from Rt. Rev. J. J. Rousseau, 637.
Neutrality Act 1939, 444, 632.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

ELLIS, CLYDE T. (*a Representative from Arkansas*).
Attended, 8.
Remarks by, on
Neutrality (Appendix, 663).
——— statements by Arkansas editors (Appendix, 663, 664).
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

ELSTON, CHARLES H. (*a Representative from Ohio*).
Attended, 8.
Remarks by, on
Bolton Chester C.: death of 1077, 1078.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

ELVIN, HERBERT H., radio address on the world movement for moral rearmament delivered by (Appendix, 611).

EMBARGO. See ARMS EMBARGO; NEUTRALITY.

EMBARGO ON LEGISLATION, remarks in House urging the raising of (Appendix, 357).

EMBARGO TARIFF, letter from Secretary of State to Senator Capper relative to (Appendix, 784).

EMERGENCY POWERS OF THE PRESIDENT, address delivered by Senator Taft at Indianapolis, Ind., on the subject of (Appendix, 713).
Summary prepared by the National Committee to Uphold Constitutional Government (Appendix, 507).
Telegram from Frank Gannett on the subject of (Appendix, 464).

EMPLOYEES OF THE UNITED STATES, article by David Lawrence relative to Government employees affiliated with Communist Party activities (Appendix, 547).

EMPLOYMENT, remarks in House on the subject of, 770.

EMPORIA (KANS.) GAZETTE (newspaper), editorial paying tribute to Senator Capper, appearing in, 109.

ENGEL, ALBERT J. (*a Representative from Michigan*).
Attended, 8.
Article from Los Angeles Examiner by George Rothwell Brown on Thomas Brackett Reed (Appendix, 655).
Letter from a Polish Catholic priest relative to arms embargo (Appendix, 546).
Table showing American vessels reported to Department of State to have been detained by belligerents since September 1, 1939, 1333.
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 758, 761, 762, 1174, 1330.
Grey, Sir Edward, 759.
Hyde, Charles Cheney, 760.
Neutrality, 758, 761, 762, 1174, 1330.
Permission to address the House, 533.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

ENGLAND. *See also* GREAT BRITAIN.
Article by Lord Beaverbrook entitled "Military Alliance With England," 302.
List of wars of, 189, 1223, 1224.
Remarks in House relative to the book, While England Slept, by Winston Churchill (Appendix, 157, 161).

ENGLEBRIGHT, HARRY L. (*a Representative from California*).
Attended, 8.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

ERICSON, LEIF, address delivered by Senator Wiley concerning (Appendix, 388).

ESSARY, J. FRED, article relative to payment by Great Britain and France for purchases of goods and materials in the United States, written by (Appendix, 348).

EULOGIES. *See* MEMORIAL EXERCISES IN HONOR OF DECEASED SENATORS AND REPRESENTATIVES.

EUROPE, article by Jacques Maritain entitled "Europe Is Already Saved" (Appendix, 322).
Memorandum from the War Department relative to the establishment of permanent American cemeteries in (Appendix, 394).
Tables showing relative power of Europe's armies, navies, and air corps, 1245.

EUROPEAN COUNTRIES, table showing reciprocal-trade agreements concluded with certain, 531.

EUROPEAN CRISIS, address over the radio delivered by Representative Dickstein relative to (Appendix, 51).

EUROPEAN SITUATION AND NEUTRALITY, address over the radio delivered by Representative Fish on the subject of (Appendix, 66).
Joint resolution to create a joint committee to consult with the President on problems relating to (see H. J. Res. 387).

EUROPEAN WAR (1939), article by Jacques Maritain concerning (Appendix, 316).
Article by Richard L. Neuberger entitled "We Were There Once Before" (Appendix, 326).
Interview with Herbert Hoover concerning, 366.
Letter from President Roosevelt to Adolph Hitler urging the termination of, 198.
Letter from Thomas Spencer Cobb relative to, 762, 763.
Report of an interview between Winston Churchill and William Griffin relative to participation by the United States in, 685.
Resolution in Senate urging an immediate armistice in (see S. Res. 191).
Statement by Senator Bailey concerning neutral ships lost from September 3 to October 23, 1939 (Appendix, 454).
Statement by David Lloyd George suggesting that America invite peace-solution parley in connection with (Appendix, 204).
Text of diplomatic correspondence concerning (Appendix, 142).

EVANS, MARCELLUS H. (*a Representative from New York*).
Attended, 8.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

EXCISE TAXES, statement submitted by Senator Barkley concerning taxes on copper, 1349.

EXECUTIVE POWERS UNDER NATIONAL EMERGENCY PROCLAMATION, inquiry relative to (see S. Res. 185*).
Report of the Attorney General concerning (S. Doc. 133), 109.

EXPENDITURES OF THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT. *See also* RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES.
Bill to limit (see bill H. R. 7606).

EXPLOSIONS. *See* AMERICAN MUNITIONS PLANTS.

EXPORT CONTROL BOARD, amendment and remarks in Senate relative to the proposed establishment of, 841.

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF WASHINGTON, text of bill (H. R. 7591) to limit the powers of, 622.

EXPORTS. *See* IMPORTS AND EXPORTS.

EX-SERVICE MEN, article from the Washington News concerning veterans who have not applied for bonuses, 563.
Bill to extend time granting preference right of entry to veterans (see bill S. 2989).
Bill to provide Government protection to widows and children of deceased World War veterans (see bill H. R. 7593).
Bill to equalize the extra compensation payable to certain veterans for loss of hands or feet (see bill H. R. 7558).
Bill to provide for employment and retention preference to wives of disabled veterans and to the widows of deceased veterans (see bill H. R. 7559).
Bill to restore certain service-connected benefits to World War veterans (see bill H. R. 7560).

EXTENSION MAGAZINE, editorial on the subject of neutrality appearing in (Appendix, 569).

EXTRA SESSION. *See* CONGRESS.

EZEKIEL, MORDECAI, remarks in House relative to, 1275.

"FACTS VERSUS FOLKLORE—AN ADVENTURE IN DEMOCRACY," address delivered by Josephine Wilkins entitled (Appendix, 740).

FADDIS, CHARLES I. (*a Representative from Pennsylvania*).
Attended, 8.
Poem by Joseph Mills Hanson entitled "The Flag on Ehrenbreitstein" (Appendix, 438).
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 1200.
Neutrality, 1200.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

"FAIR FARM POLICY," article by Hugh S. Johnson entitled (Appendix, 111).

FARLEY, JAMES A. (Postmaster General), address concerning postal affairs delivered by (Appendix, 292).
Address delivered at the dedication of the North Beach Airport, New York City, by (Appendix, 359).
Remarks in House relative to the autographed biography of, 809.

FARMERS, provide for loans to (see bill H. R. 7622).
Bill to amend act of January 29, 1937, providing loans to (see bill H. R. 7609).
Remarks in House relative to the share of the domestic market supplied by (Appendix, 167).
Remarks in House relative to providing relief for (Appendix, 401).
Remarks in House and an article by Richard A. Staderman concerning the reciprocal-trade agreements and their effect upon (Appendix, 858).
Remarks in House relative to providing aid to farmers in the flood-stricken areas of Mississippi and Alabama (Appendix, 863).
Remarks in House entitled "Farmer Sold Out by the War Lords" (Appendix, 883).

FARMERS UNION CONVENTION, GLASGOW, MONT., address delivered by M. W. Thatcher to (Appendix, 620).

FARM IMPORTS, statistics relative to (Appendix, 810).

FARM-MACHINERY BUSINESS, investigate (see H. Res. 317).
H. Res. 317).

FARM POLICY, article by Hugh S. Johnson relative to (Appendix, 111).

FARM PRICE EQUATION, address delivered by Representative Robertson on the subject of (Appendix, 580).

FARM PRICES. *See* AGRICULTURAL PRICES.

FARM PROBLEM, remarks in House relative to, 625.

FARM RELIEF, remarks in House on the subject of, 1393.

FARM SECURITY ADMINISTRATION, remarks in House relative to (Appendix, 827).

FARRELL, JAMES A.: address on the subject of American foreign trade in wartime (Appendix, 510).

FATALISM, remarks in House relative to folklore of (Appendix, 830).

FATHERS' DINNER OF THE JUNIOR CAVALRY OF AMERICA, address delivered by Representative Vreeland at (Appendix, 466).

FAY, JAMES H. (*a Representative from New York*).
Attended, 8.
Bills and joint resolutions introduced by
Gonzalez, Ramon Fraguas: for relief (see bill H. R. 7587), 488.
Migliore, Caterina, Anthony, and Rose: for relief (see bill H. R. 7565), 149.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

FEDERAL ADMINISTRATORS (PUBLICATION), excerpt concerning efficiency in Government administration, appearing in (Appendix, 63).

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION, letter from the Archivist of the United States transmitting list of useless papers in, 30, 41.

FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE CORPORATION, letter from the Secretary of the Treasury transmitting report of finances of (S. Doc. 132), 29.

FEDERAL FUNDS, to limit expenditure of (see bill H. R. 7606).

FEDERAL LAND BANKS, memorial of legislature of Wisconsin urging passage of bill (S. 2877) to postpone the payment of loans of, 30.

FEDERAL RESERVE BANKS, remarks in House relative to proposed extension of credits to belligerents by, 1374, 1375.

FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY, letter from the Administrator transmitting the draft of a proposed bill to amend the act establishing the Civilian Conservation Corps, 14.

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION, summary and conclusions of the inquiry into the motor-car industry by (Appendix, 473).

FEHR, JOSEPH CONRAD, article relative to the work of the Mixed Claims Commission, written by (Appendix, 349).

FELLINGER, PHILIP L., remarks in House relative to a letter requesting postmasters to purchase Postmaster General Farley's autographed biography, written by, 810.

FENTON, IVOR D. (*a Representative from Pennsylvania*).
Attended, 8.
Petitions and papers presented by, from
Societies and associations, 488.
Remarks by, on
Neutrality and national defense (Appendix, 319).
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

FERGUSON, PHIL (*a Representative from Oklahoma*).
Attended, 8.
Statement relative to proposed trade agreement with Argentina (Appendix, 328).
Remarks by, on
Agricultural prices, 20.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

FERNANDEZ, JOACHIM O. (*a Representative from Louisiana*).
Attended, 8.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

FINANCIAL INVOLVEMENT, remarks in Senate relative to, 368.
FINLAND, editorials relative to the Russian threat against, 224, 225, 253.
Excerpts from arms-embargo laws of (Appendix, 353).
Remarks in House on the subject of, 482.
FINNEGAN, LES, article urging prevention of a war-trade boom, written by (Appendix, 394).
FIORE'S INTERNATIONAL LAW CODIFIED, excerpts on the subject of neutrality appearing in, 1319.
FIRST ARMY MANEUVERS, address delivered by Maj. Gen. Hugh A. Drum at the opening conference of (Appendix, 237).
FISH, HAMILTON (*a Representative from New York*).
Address at the Interparliamentary Union's Conference, Oslo, Norway, on the refugee problem (Appendix, 205).
Address before Interparliamentary Union Conference, Oslo, Norway, on subject Peaceful Settlement of International Disputes (Appendix, 8).
Appointed conferee, 1345.
Letter to constituents relative to arms embargo (Appendix, 210).
Letter to Westbrook Pegler in reply to an article in the Washington Post (Appendix, 213).
Letter signed by Charles Cheney Hyde and Philip C. Jessup relative to arms embargo (Appendix, 103).
Permission to address the House granted to, 76.
Radio address entitled "Keep America Out of Foreign Wars" (Appendix, 19).
Radio address broadcast from Chicago, Ill., on neutrality (Appendix, 66).
Radio address on subject, Repeal of the Arms Embargo—Road to War (Appendix, 700).
Remarks by Mr. Woodrum relative to, 210, 211.
Remarks in House relative to National Committee to Keep America Out of War sponsored by, 523, 533.
Motions and resolutions offered by
Secretary of the Treasury: requesting certain information from (see H. Res. 305), 24.
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 209, 210, 1102, 1105, 1127, 1144, 1162, 1170, 1173, 1204, 1205, 1255, 1338.
——— conference report, 1386, 1387, 1388.
Germany: purchases from United States by, 1162.
Great Britain: sale of farm products to, 1387, 1388.
McMillan, Thomas S.: death of, 79.
National Committee to Keep America Out of War, 221, 222.
Navy Day, 1058.
Neutrality, 209, 210, 211, 221, 1038, 1102, 1105, 1127, 1144, 1162, 1170, 1173, 1204, 1205, 1255, 1338.
——— action of Rules Committee, 1102.
——— comparative print of bills, 1060.
——— conference report, 1386, 1387, 1838.
——— plea for free debate, 209.
——— reply to Mr. Woodrum, 221.
——— sale of munitions by foreign countries, 1127.
——— statement by Mr. Martin of Colorado, 1144.
Order of business, 16, 17, 1074.
Permission to address the House, 39.
Van Zandt, James E., 1309.
Von Ribbentrop, Joachim: German Foreign Minister, 221.
Woodrum, Clifton A.: reply to speech of, 221.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.
FITZPATRICK, JAMES M. (*a Representative from New York*).
Attended, 8.
Bills and joint resolutions introduced by
Schlessinger, George: for relief (see bill H. R. 7614), 1279.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.
"FLAG ON EHRENBREITSTEIN," poem by Joseph Mills Hanson entitled (Appendix, 438).
FLAHERTY, THOMAS A. (*a Representative from Massachusetts*).
Attended, 8.
Petitions and papers presented by, from
Citizens and individuals, 888.
Societies and associations, 888.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.
FLANNAGAN, JOHN W., JR. (*a Representative from Virginia*).
Attended, 8.
Remarks by, on
Neutrality (Appendix, 383).
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.
FLANNERY, J. HAROLD (*a Representative from Pennsylvania*).
Attended, 8.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.
FLINT GLASS WORKERS' UNION OF NORTH AMERICA, letter relative to the attitude toward reciprocal trade agreements on the part of (Appendix, 616).
FLOODS, remarks in House relative to providing immediate relief for flood-stricken areas (Appendix, 662).
FLYNN, JOHN T., article entitled "Common Sense" written by (Appendix, 286).
Article concerning the cash-and-carry policy written by (Appendix, 407).
Article relative to neutrality legislation by (Appendix, 505).
Statement concerning war propaganda written by, 330.
FOLGER, ALONZO D. (*a Representative from North Carolina*).
Attended, 8.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.
FOODSTUFFS, memorial of Legislature of New Jersey urging legislation to prevent profiteering in, 82.
"FOOL'S GOLD?" editorial from the Livingston (Mont.) Enterprise entitled (Appendix, 170).
FORD, AARON LANE (*a Representative from Mississippi*).
Attended, 8.
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 1318.
Neutrality, 1318.
——— position of veterans' organizations, 1318.
Van Zandt, James E., 1318.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.
FORD, HENRY, excerpts from interviews in 1921 on the subject of unemployment (Appendix, 836).
FORD, JOHN ANSON, letter on the subject of peace written by (Appendix, 230).
FORD, LELAND M. (*a Representative from California*).
Attended, 8.
Resolution adopted by the National Association of Real Estate Brokers on the preservation of property rights (Appendix, 675).
Statement by Manchester Boddy relative to attitude of National Association of Manufacturers of the United States toward war industry (Appendix, 431).
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 526, 527.
Neutrality, 763.
——— printing of pamphlet, 256.
Permission to address the House, 610.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.
FORD, THOMAS F. (*a Representative from California*).
Attended, 8.
Article by Jacques Maritain on the Russo-German alliance (Appendix, 322).
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 1197.
Neutrality, 1197.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.
FORDNEY-McCUMBER ACT OF 1922, table showing results of (Appendix, 859).
"FOREBODING," poem by Mabel Freer Loveridge entitled (Appendix, 641).
FOREIGN AGENTS, resolution to appoint a special committee to investigate activities affecting neutrality of the United States with regard to the European war (see S. Res. 186).
FOREIGN COUNTRIES, article from the Washington Times-Herald relative to the indebtedness to the United States on the part of certain, 418.
Excerpts from letters from embassies relative to exportation of arms, ammunition, and implements of war from, 1152, 1153.
Resolutions of inquiry relative to extension of credits to belligerent nations (see H. Res. 305, 306).
FOREIGN POLICY OF THE UNITED STATES, address delivered by Senator Austin in 1938 before the Executive Club of Chicago on the subject of, 1003.
Address delivered by Alfred M. Landon relative to (Appendix, 720).
Chronology of (Appendix, 522).
Editorial from the Washington Post on, 545.
FOREIGN PROPAGANDA, prevent spread in the United States of (see bill H. R. 7546).
FOREIGN TRADE AGREEMENTS. *See* RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS.
FOREIGN TRADE CONVENTION IN NEW YORK CITY, address delivered by Cordell Hull, Secretary of State, before, 295.
FOREIGN WARS, providing for adherence by the United States to the policy of nonparticipation in (see S. J. Res. 189).
FOREST LANDS, authorize acquisition of (see bill H. R. 7617).
FOREST PRODUCTS, letter from the Secretary of the Interior transmitting the draft of a proposed bill to authorize the sale of lumber and other forest products on Indian reservations, 14, 29.
"FOR GOD AND COUNTRY," address delivered by Representative Brewster at Oshkosh, Wis., entitled (Appendix, 874).
FORTUNE (magazine), excerpts from an article concerning milk in Chicago, Ill., appearing in (Appendix, 735).
Report of investigation relative to operation of the price-pegging system (Appendix, 539).
FORUM FOR VIEWS ON NEUTRALITY, correspondence on the subject of (Appendix, 356).
FOSDICK, HARRY EMERSON, sermon relative to the attitude of the Christian church in the present world situation preached by (Appendix, 337).
FOX FURS, memorial of Legislature of Wisconsin relative to importation of, 541 (Appendix, 365).

FRANCE, article by Edward E. Bomar relative to the sale of airplanes to, 1372.
Article by J. Fred Essary relative to payment for goods and materials purchased in the United States by (Appendix, 348).
Data concerning the indebtedness to the United States on the part of, 414.
Excerpts from arms-embargo laws of (Appendix, 353).
Letter from Gen. John J. Pershing denying the allegation that the United States pays rent for ground used for cemetries of American soldiers in (Appendix, 262).
List of wars of, 189, 1224.
Proclamation by President Roosevelt declaring that a state of war exists between Germany and France and certain other countries (Appendix, 787).
Statement by Herman F. Reissig and an address by Leonard Covello on the occasion of the celebration of the fifty-third anniversary of the gift of the Statue of Liberty, New York Harbor, to the United States by (Appendix, 675).
Statistics of United States trade with, 635.
Tables showing selected economic statistics for, 423, 424, 425, 426.

FRANCES WILLARD CENTENNIAL TOTAL ABSTINENCE SOCIETY, statement by Arthur Charles Jackson relative to (Appendix, 44).

FRANKLIN, JAY, address over the radio on the subject of neutrality delivered by (Appendix, 775).
Article relative to the Dies committee written by (Appendix, 679).

FRASER, HENRY S., address on the subject of neutrality delivered by (Appendix, 590).
Letter concerning the repeal of the arms embargo written by (Appendix, 763).

FRAZER, KEENER C., list of supporters of pending neutrality legislation compiled by (Appendix, 228).

FRAZIER, LYNN J. (*a Senator from North Dakota*).
Attended, 3.
Address by John B. Trevor, Jr., on America's attitude toward European conflict (Appendix, 312).
Appointed on funeral commitee, 81.
Editorial by John G. Scott on monetary control (Appendix, 864).
Letter from Hon. Vic Donahey to the President of the American Federation of Labor (Appendix, 81).
Letter from the Dollar-an-Hour Club favoring monetary reform bill (Appendix, 864).
Radio address by Hon. Gerald P. Nye on neutrality (Appendix, 89).
Statement by Dr. A. C. Jackson on the Frances Willard Centennial Total Abstinence Society (Appendix, 44).
Text of resolution (S. J. Res. 188), monetary reform (Appendix, 864).
Bills and joint resolutions introduced by
Money: to restore to Congress the sole power to issue and regulate value of (see S. J. Res. 188), 223.
Munitions of war: to prohibit employees of the United States from receiving any remuneration with respect to manufacture or sale of (see bill S. 3001), 1281.
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 397, 400, 402, 403, 404, 405, 406, 407, 685, 737, 853, 994.
——— article by John T. Flynn, 400.
——— statement by Mark Twain, 397.
Churchill, Winston, 558, 685.
——— article from Philadelphia Evening Bulletin, 686.
Export Control Board, 853.
Griffin, William: statement relative to Winston Churchill by, 685.
——— telegram from Winston Churchill, 686.
Lusitania: sinking of, 404, 405.
Munitions industry, 406.
Neutrality Act of 1939, 273, 281, 397, 400, 402, 403, 404, 405, 406, 407, 685, 737, 853.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

FREASE, HARRY, article on the subject of police powers for the League of Nations written by (Appendix, 241).

FREEDOM OF SEAS, article by Joseph A. Conry on the subject of (Appendix, 519).

FREEDOM OF SPEECH, remarks in House relative to violations of the right of, 620, 882, 1038.
Statement by Representative Celler entitled "Shall We Make Free Speech Responsible?" (Appendix, 684).

FREEMAN, BERT AND MARIE, relief (see bill H. R. 7625).

FREIGHT RATES. *See* RAILROADS.

FREMONT, JOHN, address over the radio delivered by Harry H. Woodring, Secretary of War, concerning (Appendix, 100).

FRENCH SPOLIATION CLAIMS, statement by George Bancroft relative to, 427.

FRIANT, JULIEN N., resolution adopted by the Missouri delegation in Congress on the death of (Appendix, 694).

FRIEDE, HENRY A., letter on the subject of veterans and neutrality written by (Appendix, 54).

FRIES, FRANK W. (*a Representative from Illinois*).
Attended, 8.
Address by Hon. Aubrey Williams before National Conference of Catholic Youth Organizations, Cincinnati, Ohio (Appendix, 211).
Editorial from Washington Times-Herald entitled "Citadel of Civilization" (Appendix, 280).
Letters from William B. Barry on neutrality (Appendix, 329).
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

FULMER, HAMPTON P. (*a Representative from South Carolina*).
Attended, 8.
Appointed on funeral committee, 80.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

GAELIC AMERICAN (New York newspaper), editorials concerning the arms embargo appearing in (Appendix, 282).

GALLUP POLL, copy of a poll on the subject of the arms embargo, 504.
Remarks in House and correspondence concerning the arms embargo (Appendix, 285, 502).

GAMBLE, RALPH A. (*a Representative from New York*).
Attended, 8.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

GANNETT, FRANK, address on the subject of democracy delivered by (Appendix, 490).
Telegram on the subject of emergency executive powers, received from (Appendix, 464).

GARD, WAYNE, article entitled "The Poll Tax" written by (Appendix, 360).

GARNER, JAMES W., statement concerning neutrality written by, 122, 129.

GARRETT, CLYDE L. (*a Representative from Texas*).
Attended, 8.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

GARTNER, FREDERICK C. (*a Representative from Pennsylvania*).
Attended, 8.
Radio address of Theodore H. Hoffman at Pastorius dinner of the German-American Federation of Lackawanna County, Pa. (Appendix, 208).
Resolution of citizens of northeast Philadelphia regarding neutrality (Appendix, 140).
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

GATHINGS, E. C. (*a Representative from Arkansas*).
Attended 8.
Elected to Committee on Claims (H. Res. 322), 1283.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

GAVAGAN, JOSEPH A. (*a Representative from New York*).
Attended, 8.
Address on the subject, The Menace of Bigotry (Appendix, 448).
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

GAY, MARY S., relief (see bill S. 2976).

GEARHART, BERTRAND W. (*a Representative from California*).
Attended, 8.
Address of Gen. Hugh S. Johnson at American Legion Convention, Chicago, Ill. (Appendix, 366).
Article by Paul C. Smith on subject, The Way Out For America (Appendix, 586).
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

GEHRMANN, BERNARD J. (*a Representative from Wisconsin*).
Attended, 8.
Essay by Alice Chapple entitled "Why One American Boy Didn't Go to War," 1380.
Letter to constituents on neutrality (Appendix 13).
Remarks by, on
Agricultural prices, 21.
Arms embargo, 864 (Appendix, 118).
Chapple, Alice: essay by, 1380.
Neutrality, 864 (Appendix, 118).
——— statement by Smedley D. Butler, 866.
Permission to address the House, 584.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

GENERAL LEAVE TO PRINT REMARKS. *See* CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

GEORGE, DAVID LLOYD, remarks in Senate relative to, 382.
Remarks in House relative to, 663.
Statement suggesting that America invite peace-solution parley in connection with the European war (Appendix, 204).

GEORGE, WALTER F. (*a Senator from Georgia*).
Attended, 3.
Appointed conferee, 1282.
Amendments offered by, to
Neutrality (H. J. Res. 306): to amend, 977, 978.
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 735, 783, 836, 977, 978, 1011, 1017.
——— cash-and-carry provision, 1017, 1018.
Neutrality, 735, 783, 836, 968, 977, 978, 1011, 1017.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

GERLACH, CHARLES L. (*a Representative from Pennsylvania*).
Attended, 8.
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 1288, 1289.
Neutrality, 1288, 1289.
Roosevelt, Franklin D.: foreign policy of, 1288, 1289.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

"GERMAN-AMERICAN ANTIREPEALISTS NOT NECESSARILY PRO-NAZI," article by David Lawrence entitled (Appendix, 64).

GERMAN BUND, remarks in House relative to, 537.

GERMAN EMBASSY, WASHINGTON, D. C., remarks in House relative to contraband of war, received from (Appendix, 813).

GERMANY, excerpts from arms-embargo laws of (Appendix, 353).
Proclamation by President Roosevelt declaring that a state of war exists between Germany and France, and certain other countries (Appendix, 787).
Radio colloquy between Representative Celler and Max Winkler on the subject of (Appendix, 317).
Statistics of United States trade with, 635.

GERRY, PETER G. (*a Senator from Rhode Island*).
Attended, 3.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

GEYER, LEE E. (*a Representative from California*).
Attended, 8.
Article from New York Times entitled "Shall the South's Poll Tax Go?" (Appendix, 115).
Article from York (Pa.) Gazette and Daily entitled "Joint Labor Committee Recommends Geyer Plan" (Appendix, 282).
Article from Christian Century relative to poll tax in the South (Appendix, 360).
Book review of The Pressure Boys (Appendix, 760).
Editorial from Washington Post on strikes in automobile industry (Appendix, 440).
Editorial from Chicago Daily News relative to list of alleged Communists published by Dies Committee on Un-American Activities (Appendix, 548).
Letter from Charles H. Stalker relative to relief situation (Appendix, 225).
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 526.
Girdler, Tom, 810.
Labor: strikes since 1928, 301.
League for Peace and Democracy, 884, 887.
Minneapolis, Minn.: W. P. A. strike in (Appendix, 700).
National Labor Relations Board, 659, 660.
Neutrality Act 1939, 260, 306, 813.
Pressure Boys, book by Kenneth G. Crawford, 809.
Relief appropriations (Appendix, 225).
Subversive activities, 875, 876.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

GIBBS, W. BEN (*a Representative from Georgia*).
Attended, 8.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

GIBRALTAR, excerpts from arms-embargo laws of (Appendix, 352).

GIBSON, ERNEST W. (*a Senator from Vermont*).
Attended, 3.
Address by George D. Aiken on Abraham Lincoln (Appendix, 278).
Appointed on committee, 706.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

GIFFORD, CHARLES L. (*a Representative from Massachusetts*).
Attended, 8.
Letter from A. Lawrence Lowell regarding neutrality (Appendix 466).
Permission to address the House, 616, 656.
Bills and joint resolutions introduced by
Coast Guard: to reimburse certain members for losses as result of hurricane (see bill H. R. 7596), 815.
Petitions and papers presented by, from
Citizens and individuals, 1398.
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 870, 872, 873, 874, 875, 1179, 1180.
League for Peace and Democracy, 1044.
Mellon, Andrew W.: reply to critics, 1371.
Neutrality, 666, 762, 812, 813, 870, 872, 873, 874, 875, 1179, 1180.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

GILCHRIST, FRED C. (*a Representative from Iowa*).
Attended, 8.
Permission to address the House, 950.
Remarks by, on
Argentine trade agreement, 1054.
Reciprocal trade agreements, 1054, 1055.
Sugar, 391.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

GILES, WILLIAM BRANCH, excerpts from speech delivered in the Senate on November 24, 1808, on the subject of foreign aggressions, by, 823.

GILLESPIE, INEZ, relief (see bill S. 2973*).

GILLETTE, GUY M. (*a Senator from Iowa*).
Attended, 3.
Address by Dr. Maurice S. Sheehy on the subject, Challenge of Nihilism (Appendix, 151).
Amendments offered by, to
Neutrality Act 1939 (H. J. Res. 306): to amend, 47, 679, 978.
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 127, 287, 456, 457, 458, 459, 460, 461, 679, 780, 793, 978, 980.
——— article by Dorothy Thompson, 807.
Neutrality, 456, 457, 458, 459, 460, 461, 679, 780, 793, 978, 980, 991.
Quaker Oats Co., 679.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

GILLIE, GEORGE W. (*a Representative from Indiana*).
Attended, 8.
Address by William J. Gross before Allen County Republican Club, Fort Wayne, Ind. (Appendix, 636).
Radio address on neutrality and the Constitution (Appendix, 638).
Petitions and papers presented by, from
Citizens and individuals, 41, 80, 149, 265, 354, 395, 489, 815.
Societies and associations, 888.
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 1220.
——— petitions, 135.
Neutrality, 1220.
Purnell, Fred S.: tribute to, 757.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

GILSOUL, EUGENIE, pension (see bill H. R. 7566).

GINSBERG, SAMUEL, remarks in House relative to, 351, 887.

GLASS, CARTER (*a Senator from Virginia*).
Attended, 3.
Statement expressing views on Neutrality Act, by (Appendix, 605).
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

GLASS WORKERS. *See* FLINT GLASS WORKERS' UNION OF NORTH AMERICA.

"GOD, THE FATHER."
Address delivered by Representative Ludlow to the Christian Men Builders, Inc., at Indianapolis, Ind., entitled (Appendix, 49).

GOFF, KENNETH, remarks in House relative to certain testimony of, 219.

GOLD, editorial from the Livingston (Mont.) Enterprise entitled "Fool's Gold?" (Appendix, 170).
Letter from the Secretary of the Treasury relative to certain problems concerning, 826.
Remarks in House concerning the economic aspects of gold payment in the cash-and-carry proposal (Appendix, 72).

GOLD RESERVE, amendment and remarks in Senate relative to, 916.

GOLD STAR MOTHERS' DAY, address delivered by Senator Walsh at observance of (Appendix, 535).

GONZALEZ, RAMON FRAGUAS, relief (see bill H. R. 7587).

GOOSE-STEPPING IS NOT THE AMERICAN WAY, remarks in House on the subject of (Appendix, 1665).

GORE, ALBERT (*a Representative from Tennessee*).
Attended, 8.
Address by Cordell Hull before National Foreign Trade Convention, New York City, 295.
Remarks by, on
Agricultural problems, 942.
Arms embargo, 1203.
Ezekiel, Mordecai, 1275.
Hull, Cordell, 295.
Neutrality, 1203.
Reciprocal trade agreements, 958 (Appendix, 542).
——— tables (Appendix, 542).
Subversive activities, 884.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

GORRELL, EDGAR S., address delivered at the dedication of the North Beach Airport, New York City, by (Appendix, 412).

GORRELL, HENRY T., article relative to effects of repeal of the arms embargo written by (Appendix, 759).

GOSSETT, ED (*a Representative from Texas*).
Attended, 8.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

GOVERNMENT ADMINISTRATION, excerpt from the publication Federal Administrators on the subject of efficiency of (Appendix, 63)

GOVERNMENT COSTS, address delivered by Lewis W. Douglas relative to (Appendix, 726).
Statement by Senator Holt to the citizens of West Virginia concerning (Appendix, 726).

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES. *See* EMPLOYEES OF THE UNITED STATES.

GOVERNMENT INSURANCE, extend the period for filing claims on insurance contracts under the World War Veterans' Act of 1924 (see bill H. R. 7607).

GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES, resolution adopted by the United Rubber Workers of America condemning attempts to weaken or abridge the principles of (Appendix, 781).

GOVERNMENT RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES, statistics relative to, 135, 259.

GOVERNMENTAL SECURITIES AND SALARIES, Mr. Burke appointed in Senate on special committee on taxation of, 173.

GRADY, R. ARMISTEAD, statement entitled "Let Us Make Democracy Safe in America" (Appendix 51).

GRAFTON, W. VA., authorize acquisition of lands for cemetery purposes at (see bill H. R. 7618).

GRAHAM, LOUIS E. (*a Representative from Pennsylvania*).
Attended, 8.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

GRAND CANYON NATIONAL MONUMENT, restore to the public domain a portion of (see bills S. 2981; H. R. 7570).

GRANIK, THEODORE, address over the radio on the subject of neutrality delivered by (Appendix, 774).

GRANT, GEORGE M. (*a Representative from Alabama*).
Attended, 8.
Address by J. Edgar Hoover at graduation exercises of the F. B. I. National Police Academy (Appendix, 113).
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

GRANT, ROBERT A. (*a Representative from Indiana*).
Attended, 8.
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 1219.
Neutrality, 1219.
Purnell, Fred S.: tribute to, 757.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

GRAVES OF UNITED STATES WAR DEAD IN FRANCE, article by Lorenzo Martin concerning (Appendix, 481).

GREAT BRITAIN, article by Lord Beaverbrook relative to the proposed military alliance of the United States with, 302.
Article by Edward E. Bomar relative to sale of airplanes to, 1372.
Article by J. Fred Essary relative to payment for goods and materials purchased in the United States by (Appendix, 348).
Excerpts from arms-embargo laws of (Appendix, 352).
List of materials considered as contraband during the World War by, 1271.
Record of aggression by the British Empire, 1213.
Remarks in Senate relative to the status of Great Britain with reference to the arms embargo, 1350.
Statistics of United States trade with, 635.

GREEN, LEX (*a Representative from Florida*).
Attended, 8.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

GREEN, THEODORE FRANCIS (*a Senator from Rhode Island*).
Attended, 3.
Radio address on neutrality by (Appendix, 563).
Bills and joint resolutions introduced by
Quonset Point, R. I.: to authorize Secretary of the Navy to proceed with public works at (see bill S. 2975), 47.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

GREEN, WILLIAM, letter from Senator Donahey outlining the seven wonders of American government (Appendix, 82).

GREENLEE COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS, relief (see bill S. 2997).

GREENVILLE MEMORIAL COMMISSION, to establish (see H. J. Res. 385).

GREGORY, CHARLES NOBLE, list of arms and ammunition sold to Great Britain by Germany and Austria-Hungary during the Boer War, prepared by, 127.

GREGORY, NOBLE J. (*a Representative from Kentucky*).
Attended, 8.
Appointed on funeral committee, 148.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

GRIES, WALTER F., letters concerning the proposed reciprocal-trade agreement with Chile, received from (Appendix, 626).

GRIFFIN, WILLIAM, report of an interview with Winston Churchill relative to participation by the United States in European wars, 685.

GRIFFITH, JOHN K. (*a Representative from Louisiana*).
Attended, 8.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

GRONDAHL, JENS K., poem entitled "Columbia's Peace Prayer" written by (Appendix, 534).

GROSS, CHESTER H. (*a Representative from Pennsylvania*).
Attended, 8.
Address on the achievements of the Republican minority in the Seventy-sixth Congress, at Chambersburg, Pa. (Appendix, 450).

GROSS, CHESTER H.—Continued.
Address at Caledonia State Park, Pa., on subject of American Youth, 1035.
Editorial from the Washington Post on Martin Luther (Appendix, 638).
Letter from Aubrey Williams in reference to certain statements by (Appendix, 710).
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 1291.
Neutrality, 1291.
Wallace, Henry A., 1035.
Williams, Aubrey, 1035, 1372.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

GROSS, WILLIAM J., address on the subject of the arms embargo delivered by (Appendix, 636).

GROSVENOR, HOWARD E., letter on the subject of neutrality written by (Appendix, 175).

GROUPS (CIVIL REMEDIES), relative to defamation of (see bill H. R. 7603).

GROUPS (CRIMINAL REMEDIES), relative to defamation of (see bill H. R. 7604).

GRUEN, EUGENE AND KATE, relief (see bill H. R. 7595).

GUFFEY, JOSEPH F. (*a Senator from Pennsylvania*).
Attended, 3.
Address by W. K. Jackson on American shipping in wartime (Appendix, 291).
Address on technical research at Agricultural Research Laboratory, Wyndmoor, Pa., by (Appendix, 405).
Article by Herbert Agar commenting on Colonel Lindbergh's radio address on neutrality (Appendix, 405).
Article by Heywood Broun replying to charges that he was formerly a member of the Communist Party (Appendix, 625).
Article from Washington Post on conditions in the steel industry (Appendix, 722).
Editorial from Pittsburgh Press on the administration of Gov. Arthur H. James (Appendix, 482).
Bills and joint resolutions introduced by
Hardy, Ralph C.: for relief (see bill S. 3003), 1348.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

GUMMASSON, HENRY HANS JACOB, admit permanently to the United States (see bill H. R. 7581).

GUNNELL, C. J., sermon entitled "America's Destiny" preached by (Appendix, 120).

GURNEY, CHAN (*a Senator from South Dakota*).
Attended, 3.
Address by Hon. Robert A. Taft before American Federation of Labor Convention, Cincinnati, Ohio (Appendix, 504).
Radio address by Hon. Styles Bridges on drafting wealth in wartime (Appendix, 460).
Radio address on drafting wealth in time of war (Appendix, 464).
Petitions and papers presented by, from
Citizens and individuals, 150.
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 1008.
Neutrality, 1008.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

GUYER, U. S. (*a Representative from Kansas*).
Attended, 8.
Appointed on Supreme Court Celebration Committee, 939.
Poem by Mabel Freer Loveridge entitled "Foreboding" (Appendix, 641).
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 1257.
Neutrality, 1257.
Reed, Thomas Brackett: tribute to, 570.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

GWYNNE, JOHN W. (*a Representative from Iowa*).
Attended, 8.
Sermon by Rev. C. J. Gunnell on America's Destiny (Appendix, 120).
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

HAINES, MARK P., editorial entitled "Who Opposes Neutrality?", written by (Appendix, 121).

HAITI, excerpts from arms-embargo laws of (Appendix, 353).

HALE, FREDERICK (*a Senator from Maine*).
Attended, 3.
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 898.
Neutrality, 898.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

HALL, LEONARD W. (*a Representative from New York*).
Attended, 8.
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 1329.
Neutrality, 1329.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

HALLECK, CHARLES A. (*a Representative from Indiana*).
Attended, 8.
Petitions and papers presented by, from
Citizens and individuals, 42, 80, 149.
Societies and associations, 588.

HALLECK, CHARLES A.—Continued.
Remarks by, on
Neutrality, 1096.
Purnell, Fred S.: death of, 755.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.
HAM, HORACE LOTHROP, relief (see bill H. R. 7584).
HAMILTON, CLAUDE, JR., remarks in House relative to, 1396.
HAMILTON, JOHN (chairman, Republican National Committee), address entitled "Our Duty as Americans" delivered by (Appendix, 190).
HANCOCK, CLARENCE E. (*a Representative from New York*).
Attended, 8.
Address by Hon. Charles A. Eaton before Good Government Club, Somerville, N. J. (Appendix, 546).
Bills and joint resolutions introduced by
Congress: relating to calling of special sessions of (see H. J. Res. 395), 1058.
Petitions and papers presented by, from
Societies and associations, 772.
Remarks by, on
Bolton, Chester C.: death of, 1078.
Congress: calling of special sessions, 1057.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.
"HANDS OFF THE U. S. A.!" article by J. G. Johnston entitled (Appendix, 478).
HANES, JOHN W. (Under Secretary of the Treasury), address on the subject of business and taxes, delivered by (Appendix, 390).
Address entitled "The Revenue Problem," delivered by (Appendix, 589).
HANSON, JOSEPH MILLS, verses entitled "The Flag on Ehrenbreitstein," written by (Appendix, 438).
"HAPPINESS AND SALVATION," address delivered by Merle Sidener on the subject of (Appendix, 829).
HARDY, RALPH C., relief (see bill S. 3003).
HARE, BUTLER B. (*a Representative from South Carolina*).
Attended, 8.
Elected to Committee on Appropriations, 1358.
Resignation from committee, 1379.
Motions and resolutions offered by
Farm machinery: to investigate manufacturers of (see H. Res. 317), 677.
McMillan, Thomas S.: death of (H. Res. 310), 79.
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 347, 534.
McMillan, Thomas S.: death of, 79.
Protective tariff, 532.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.
HARMON, R. P., telegram urging support of the Dies committee received from (Appendix, 602).
HARNESS, FOREST A. (*a Representative from Indiana*).
Attended, 8.
Address on subject, Conscription of Wealth in Times of War (Appendix, 500.
Radio address on reciprocal-trade agreements, by (Appendix, 653).
Remarks by, on
Purnell, Fred S.: tribute to, 756.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.
HARRINGTON, VINCENT F. (*a Representative from Iowa*).
Attended, 8.
Article by William Wilmoth on American peace and neutrality (Appendix, 693).
Editorial from Sioux City (Iowa) Tribune entitled "Put Control of Rivers Under Maritime Board" (Appendix, 108).
Editorial from Iowa Legionnaire on neutrality (Appendix, 13).
Sermon by Rev. Edward W. Stinson, Sioux City, Iowa, on neutrality (Appendix, 97).
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 1196.
Neutrality, 1196.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.
HARRISON, PAT (*a Senator from Mississippi*).
Attended, 223.
Remarks by, on
Neutrality: appointment of conferees, 1282.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.
HART, EDWARD J. (*a Representative from New Jersey*).
Attended, 8.
Petitions and papers presented by, from
Societies and associations, 1398.
State legislatures, 149.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.
HARTER, DOW W. (*a Representative from Ohio*).
Attended, 8.
Remarks by, on
Bolton, Chester C.: tribute to, 1077.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.
HARTER, J. FRANCIS (*a Representative from New York*).
Attended, 8.
Petitions and papers presented by, from
Societies and associations, 149, 1158.
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 1291.
Iroquois (steamship) (Appendix, 286).
Neutrality, 1291.
St. Lawrence Waterway Treaty, 1292.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.
HARTFORD COURANT, remarks in House relative to the one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of, 1071.
HARTLEY, FRED, JR. (*a Representative from New Jersey*).
Attended, 8.
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 1227.
Neutrality, 1227.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.
HARVARD UNIVERSITY, statement in article by Richard A. Staderman concerning (Appendix, 630).
HASKIN, FREDERIC J., article entitled "Air-Mail Pick-Up to Cover All United States," written by (Appendix, 229).
HATCH, CARL A. (*a Senator from New Mexico*).
Attended, 3.
Address by Hon. Jerry Voorhis before Washington Teachers' Union (Appendix, 564).
Address by Hon. Sam G. Bratton on neutrality (Appendix, 362).
Article by David S. Muzzey on democracy (Appendix, 570).
Statement by the Attorney General giving interpretation of Hatch Political Activities Act (Appendix, 712).
Statement by Paul V. McNutt relative to Social Security funds for State of Ohio, 1090.
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 440, 441, 509, 745, 746, 754, 802, 803, 991.
Neutrality, 509.
Ohio: relief of State of, 1090.
War referendum, 997, 998.
——— letter from Harry H. Woodring, 997.
——— letter from Cordell Hull, 997.
——— statement by National League of Women Voters, 998.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.
HATCH ACT. *See* PERNICIOUS POLITICAL ACTIVITIES.
HAVENNER, FRANCK R. (*a Representative from California*).
Attended, 8.
Bills and joint resolutions introduced by
Lower California: to acquire (see H. J. Res. 389), 222.
Western Hemisphere: joint resolution authorizing acquisition of certain territory in (see H. J. Res. 393), 964.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.
HAWAIIAN ISLANDS.
Letter from the Governor transmitting the journal of the House of Representatives of, 13.
Letter from the Secretary of the Interior transmitting a copy of the Journal of the House of Representatives of, 29.
Resolution of inquiry relative to Japanese demands that the United States customs officer salute a Japanese sentry at Honolulu (see H. Res. 323).
HAWKS, CHARLES, JR. (*a Representative from Wisconsin*).
Attended, 8.
Address by Hon. Styles Bridges before Indianapolis Association of Credit Men (Appendix, 748).
Editorial from Saturday Evening Post entitled "America" (Appendix, 236).
Permission to address the House, 864.
Bills and joint resolutions introduced by
Schucktanz, George Matthew: to admit permanently to the United States (see bill H. R. 7553), 41.
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 1048.
Labor organizations, 302.
Labor strikes, 659.
Lewis, John L., 349.
Neutrality, 869, 870, 1048, 1115, 1116.
Reciprocal trade agreements, 949.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.
HAWKS' NEST BEACH, OLD LYME, CONN., letter from the Secretary of War transmitting report of investigation of beach erosion at, 14.
HAWLEY-SMOOT ACT, statement in article of American Good Government Society concerning (Appendix, 859).
Statement in article by Richard A. Staderman relative to (Appendix, 629).
HAYDEN, CARL (*a Senator from Arizona*).
Attended, 3.
Bills and joint resolutions introduced by
Arizona State Elks Association Hospital: to provide for sale of certain lands to (see bill S. 2980), 150.
Grand Canyon National Monument: to return a portion to the public domain (see bill S. 2981), 150.

HAYDEN, CARL—Continued.
Bills and joint resolutions introduced by
Greenlee County Board of Supervisors: for relief (see bill S. 2997), 1082.
San Francisco Mountain Scenic Boulevard Co.: for relief (see bill S. 2979), 150.
Sharrah, Mrs. Bessie: for relief (see bill S. 2988), 541.
Motions and resolutions offered by
Foreign Relations Committee hearings, Seventy-fourth Congress: to print (see S. Con. Res. 30), 46.
Foreign Relations Committee hearings: to print (see S. Res. 188), 46.
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 795, 796, 802, 971, 1027.
Congressional Record: extraneous matter in, 6.
Copper: excise tax on, 1084.
Excise taxes and reciprocal trade agreements, 1084.
Lindbergh, Col. Charles A.: address by, 6.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

HAYWARD INDIAN SCHOOL, WISCONSIN, convey to the State of Wisconsin (see bill S. 2984).

HEALEY, ARTHUR D. (*a Representative from Massachusetts*).
Attended, 8.
Petitions and papers presented by, from
Citizens and individuals, 772.
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 1269.
Neutrality, 1269.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

HEINKE, GEORGE H. (*a Representative from Nebraska*).
Attended, 8.
Remarks by, on
Pollard, Ernest Mark: death of, 16.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

"HE IS AN AMERICAN," editorial from the New York Sun entitled (Appendix, 23, 86).

HENDRICKS, JOE (*a Representative from Florida*).
Attended, 8.
Tables relative to trade with Latin America, 1368.
Bills and joint resolutions introduced by
American republics: to improve relations between (see H. J. Res. 394), 1058.
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 810, 812, 813.
Latin-American trade relations, 1368.
Neutrality, 810, 812, 813.
Permission to address the House, 578.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

HENNINGS, THOMAS C., JR. (*a Representative from Missouri*).
Attended, 8.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

HENRY COUNTY (OHIO) SIGNAL (newspaper), editorial entitled "The New Deal and the Farmer" appearing in (Appendix, 468).

HERRING, CLYDE L. (*a Senator from Iowa*).
Attended, 3.
Radio address on neutrality (Appendix, 74).
Radio address by Hon. Prentiss M. Brown on neutrality (Appendix, 188).
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

HESS, WILLIAM E. (*a Representative from Ohio*).
Attended, 8.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

HESSELTINE, W. B., article entitled "History of Embargo Policy" written by (Appendix, 463).

HEWES, THOMAS, statement relative to repeal of the arms embargo, submitted by (Appendix, 540).

HIGGINS, E. WORTH, letter on the subject of neutrality written by (Appendix, 218).

HIGHWAYS. *See* PUBLIC ROADS.

HILL, KNUTE (*a Representative from Washington*).
Attended, 8.
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 530 (Appendix, 853).
Congress: work of the special session (Appendix, 853).
Foreign trade agreements, 943.
Neutrality (Appendix, 853).
Un-American activities, 887.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

HILL, LISTER (*a Senator from Alabama*).
Attended, 3.
Article from the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen's Magazine on Burton K. Wheeler (Appendix, 376).
Articles by Harlan Miller on President Roosevelt's background on foreign affairs (Appendix, 294).
Editorial from Alabama Journal on the Bankheads of Alabama (Appendix, 460).
Editorial from Washington Post on trade with Latin America (Appendix, 369).

HILL, LISTER—Continued.
Remarks by, on
Airplanes, 796, 797.
Arms embargo, 769, 797, 829.
City of Flint steamship, 829.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

HILLES, CHARLES D., letter on the subject of neutrality written by (Appendix, 111).

HINSHAW, CARL (*a Representative from California*).
Attended, 8.
Article by Hermann Rauschning on policies of Hitler in Germany (Appendix, 20).
Article by Kurt Bloch relative to conditions in the Orient, 1373.
Article from Asia (magazine) on conditions in the Orient (Appendix, 600).
Letter from Hiram Bingham relative to repeal of the arms embargo, 1255.
Letter to the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on House Joint Resolution 306—neutrality, 1346.
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 1116, 1253, 1254.
——— effect of repeal on Japan and China, 1373, 1378.
Conditions in the Orient, 1373.
Neutrality, 342, 1116, 1253, 1254.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

HIRTH, WILLIAM, editorial entitled "If This Be Treason" written by (Appendix, 311).

HITLER, ADOLF, article by Hermann Rauschning entitled "Hitler Could Not Stop" (Appendix, 20).
Comments in Winston Churchill's book relating to (Appendix, 157).
Editorial from the Chattanooga News entitled "Hitler's Boasting to Bolster Nazi Courage Offers no Basis for Peace Except Surrender" (Appendix, 281).
Editorial from the Manchester Guardian Weekly entitled "The Forces Against Hitler" (Appendix, 280).
Letter from the President of the United States urging termination of the European War addressed to, 198.

HITLER, FRITZ, communication concerning the American Army received from, 471.

HOBBS, SAM (*a Representative from Alabama*).
Attended, 8.
Remarks by on
Absence of Mr. Jarman, 9.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

HOFFMAN, CLARE E. (*a Representative from Michigan*).
Attended, 8.
Editorial from New York Herald Tribune on neutrality (Appendix, 16).
Editorial by Mark P. Haines, Sturgis, Mich., on neutrality (Appendix, 121).
Editorial from Chicago Tribune on Communists in the C. I. O. (Appendix, 471).
Editorial from Somerset Daily American relative to qualifications of President Roosevelt for handling foreign affairs (Appendix, 358).
Editorial from Chicago Tribune relative to C. I. O. strike at Bohn Aluminum & Brass Corporation, 1159.
Editorials relative to C. I. O. 1361.
Statement by Acting Secretary of the Navy relative to interference by labor unions of delivery of Navy orders at Bohn Aluminum & Brass Corporation, 1069.
Text of resolution (H. Res. 313), Bohn Aluminum & Brass Corporation, 335, 336.
Text of bill relating to un-American activities of Government employees, 1042, 1043.
Bills and resolutions introduced by
Employees of United States: relating to un-American activities of certain (see bill H. R. 7606) 1058.
Interstate and foreign commerce: to prevent interference with (see bill H. R. 7582), 354.
Motions and resolutions offered by
Bohn Aluminum & Brass Corporation: resolution of inquiry relative to (see H. Res. 313, 314), 354.
Remarks by, on
Adjournment over, 135.
American League for Peace and Democracy, 882, 883, 884.
Argentina trade agreement (Appendix, 639).
Arms embargo, 769, 1283, 1284 (Appendix 141).
——— statement by Mr. Lanham, 1283, 1284.
Baldwin, Stanley: statement on German rearmament, 1283, 1284.
Beall, Jack, 1283, 1284.
Bohn Aluminum & Brass Corporation: labor strikes at, 299, 349, 350, 657, 658, 1069, 1359.
——— resolution of inquiry concerning, 335.
Broun, Heywood, 133.
Chrysler Corporation: strikes, 484, 610, 660.
Churchill, Winston, 1283, 1284.
Coffee, John M.: statement on sit-down strikes by, 1038, 1039.

HOFFMAN, CLARE E.—Continued.
Remarks by, on
Communist activities, 579, 810.
Congress for Industrial Organizations, 484, 659, 660, 1069, 1359.
——— Communists in, 217, 218, 299, 352 (Appendix, 471).
——— free speech, 1038.
——— strikes in plants filling Government orders, 299, 348.
——— strike at Bohn Aluminum & Brass Corporation, 1069, 1070, 1359.
Congressional Record: reply to Mr. Hook relative to changes of text of, 1392.
Dies Committee on Un-American Activities, 882, 883, 884.
Farley, James A.: sale of biography to postmasters, 809.
Frankensteen, Richard T., 658.
Great Britain: defense program of, 1284.
House, Col. E. M., 580.
House of Representatives: days of meeting, 220.
Labor legislation and preparedness, 350, 351.
Labor strikes in critical industries, 659, 660, 1359.
League for Peace and Democracy, 1040, 1041, 1043, 1053, 1054.
Legislation during special session, 626.
Lewis, John L., 217, 218, 349, 350, 659, 660, 1359 (Appendix, 471).
Loans to belligerents, 624.
Murphy, Frank, 219, 299.
National Committee to Keep America Out of War, 218, 523, 524.
National debt and future generations (Appendix, 654).
National defense efforts of Communists in New Deal to weaken, 657, 659.
National Labor Relations Board, 218, 219, 610, 659, 660, 770, 771, 1360 (Appendix, 31).
National Labor Relations Act: failure of Congress to amend (Appendix, 31).
Navy: strikes in plants filling orders for, 1069, 1159, 1359, 1360.
Neutrality, 348, 761, 869, 870, 872, 1180 (Appendix, 141).
——— reply to Mr. Woodrum, 217, 218.
——— printing of pamphlets, 255.
New Deal "pressure boys," 809.
New Deal propaganda, 297.
New Deal: solicitation of funds by, 217, 218.
Permission to address the House, 260, 384, 483, 771, 866.
Printing matter in the Record, 336, 337.
Privilege of the House: changes in text of the Record, 1392.
Red network—book on communism, 809.
Roosevelt, Franklin D.: attitude toward C. I. O., 1070.
——— foreign policy of, 657, 658.
Roosevelt, Mrs. Franklin D., 218.
——— Communist guests of, 661, 662.
Secretary of the Navy, 1159.
Sit down strikes, 1039, 1040.
Unemployment compensation, 770, 771.
Woodrum, Clifton A.: war record of, 217.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

HOFFMAN, THEODORE H., radio address delivered at the Pastorius Day dinner, Scranton, Pa., by (Appendix, 208).

HOGS, statement by Representative Mundt relative to prices of (Appendix, 860).

HOLIDAYS, making the last Thursday in each year a public legal holiday (see bill H. R. 7556).
Data concerning (Appendix, 112).

HOLMAN, RUFUS C. (*a Senator from Oregon*).
Attended, 3.
Article from the Timber Trades Journal on American neutrality (Appendix, 511).
Article from Oregon Voter on effect of reciprocal trade agreements (Appendix, 391).
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 545, 556, 609.
Bombing civilian populations, 609.
Neutrality, 545, 556, 609.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

HOLMES, JOHN HAYNES, address entitled "Getting America Into War Has Started Again" delivered by (Appendix 199).

HOLMES, PEHR G. (*a Representative from Massachusetts*).
Attended, 8.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

HOLT, RUSH D. (*a Senator from West Virginia*).
Attended, 3.
Article on propaganda for war, by (Appendix, 845).
Excerpts from letters by Col. E. M. House relative to use of American flag by foreign vessels, 897.
Letter outlining position on neutrality legislation (Appendix, 41).
Letter from M. J. Gilloly on the effect of reciprocal trade agreements on glass industry (Appendix, 616).
Letter to citizens of West Virginia on saving democracy (Appendix, 828).
Poll of public opinion conducted by Wheeling Intelligencer on neutrality (Appendix, 431).

HOLT, RUSH D.—Continued.
Radio discussion on neutrality (Appendix, 407).
Statement on the cost of government by (Appendix, 726).
Petitions and papers presented by, from
Societies and associations, 706, 888, 1082, 1279, 1348.
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 513, 515, 541, 545, 546, 547, 548, 549, 556, 557, 560.
——— article by Hilaire Belloc, 542.
——— article from Time magazine, 547, 548.
——— editorial from Washington Post, 545.
——— sale of poison gas, 905.
Biddle, Anthony, 560.
British propaganda, 543.
Bullitt, William C., 552, 560.
Churchill, Winston, 554, 558.
Eden, Anthony, 552.
English atrocities, 549, 550.
Ghost writers, 754.
House of Lords: air raid on, 557, 558.
Munitions industry, 561, 562.
Neutrality Act of 1939, 180, 181, 182, 402, 404, 405, 418, 513, 515, 541, 545, 546, 547, 548, 549, 556, 557, 560, 744, 904.
Page, Walter Hines, 555.
Reciprocal trade agreements, 1089, 1090.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

HOLTZOFF, ALEXANDER, address entitled, "Twelve Months Under the New Rules of Civil Procedure" delivered by (Appendix, 728).

HOLY GHOST RECTORY, ST. LOUIS, MO., letter opposing the repeal of the arms embargo received from, 1195.

HONDURAS, excerpts from arms-embargo laws of (Appendix, 352).

HONG KONG, excerpts from arms-embargo laws of (Appendix, 352).

HONOLULU. *See* HAWAIIAN ISLANDS.

HOOK, FRANK E. (*a Representative from Michigan*).
Attended, 8.
Address at Finland Day celebration, New York World's Fair, 482.
Address by Attorney General Murphy upon the sesquicentennial of the Department of Justice (Appendix, 110).
Statement on effect of proposed Argentine trade agreement on domestic cheese (Appendix, 371).
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 1172.
Congressional Record: corrections of, 1370.
Finland and the United States, 482.
Italian cheese industry in the United States (Appendix, 434).
Neutrality, 215, 482, 1172.
New Deal propaganda, 297.
Permission to address the House, 384.
Reciprocal trade agreements, 958.
Subversive activities, 877.
Un-American activities, 1043.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

HOOVER, HERBERT, address concerning the arms embargo delivered by (Appendix, 497).
Article entitled "We Must Keep Out" written by (Appendix, 557).
Interview concerning the European war, 366.
Letter to Woodrow Wilson, dated April 11, 1919, concerning the role of the United States in Europe (Appendix, 719).
Statement concerning the pending legislation on neutrality written by, 320.

HOOVER, J. EDGAR, addresses on the subject of American law enforcement delivered by (Appendix, 113, 248, 283, 499).

HOPE, CLIFFORD R. (*a Representative from Kansas*).
Attended, 8.
Article by John T. Flynn on neutrality (Appendix, 286).
Statement on proposed Argentine trade agreement, by (Appendix, 336).
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 1298.
Neutrality, 1298.
Oil industry and the Venezuela trade agreement (Appendix, 833).
Reciprocal trade agreements (Appendix, 833).
Venezuela: trade agreement with (Appendix, 833).
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

HORMEL, JAY C., proposal for a permanent domestic recovery presented by (Appendix, 68).

HORNER, CHARLES F., address entitled "America Needs an Increased Air Force" delivered by (Appendix, 332).

HORSES, remarks in House relative to the effects of war on (Appendix, 392, 733).

HORSTMAN, LOUIS, letter relative to imports of mink pelts, written by, 1280 (Appendix, 465).

HORTON, FRANK O. (*a Representative from Wyoming*).
Attended, 8.
Address by Herbert Hoover on the arms embargo (Appendix, 497).
Editorial from Saturday Evening Post on neutrality (Appendix, 288).

HORTON, FRANK O.—Continued.
Statement on proposed Argentine trade agreement by (Appendix, 378).
Motions and resolutions offered by
Rules of the House: to amend rule XXI (see H. Res. 318), 888.
Remarks by, on
Mondell, Frank W.: death of, 134.
—— tribute to, 134.
Neutrality, 1095.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.
HORVATH, JOHN, relief (see bill S. 2995).
HOSPITALS, construct the Royal C. Johnson Memorial Veterans' Hospital (see bill H. R. 7550).
HOSTILE NATIONS, requesting a peace conference between (see H. J. Res. 382).
HOUR OF MEETING, resolution in Senate to meet at 12 m. daily (see S. Res. 184*), 4.
Resolution in House to meet at 12 m. daily (see H. Res. 300*), 9.
HOUSE, E. M., correspondence and an editorial concerning (Appendix, 334).
Letters to President Wilson dated February 5 and February 6, 1915, relative to the use of the American flag on foreign vessels during the World War, 897.
Remarks in House relative to a certain letter allegedly written by, 522, 579, 585, 611, 663 (Appendix, 554).
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES. *See also* YEA-AND-NAY VOTES IN HOUSE.
Communication from the President congratulating the Members on conclusion of the work of the extra session, 1397.
Communication from the Clerk of the House announcing the receipt of a message from the Senate agreeing to the conference asked by the House on House Joint Resolution 306 entitled "Neutrality Act of 1939," 1359.
Election of Mr. Rayburn as Speaker pro tempore of, 18.
Joint resolution making an appropriation for mileage in connection with the second session of the Seventy-sixth Congress (see H. J. Res. 384*).
Letter from the Clerk of the House transmitting credentials of Representatives-elect Fadjo Cravens and Estes Kefauver, 9.
Remarks relative to the order of business during the period September 26–October 9, 1939, 16.
Remarks concerning the order of business in anticipation of sine die adjournment, 1358.
Remarks relative to unauthorized changes in the Congressional Record, 1370, 1392.
Resolution to meet at 12 m. daily (see H. Res. 300), 9.
Resolution to meet on Mondays and Thursdays of each week until October 9, 1939 (see H. Res. 302*).
Resolution to procure a marble bust of Thomas Brackett Reed (see H. Res. 315*).
Resolution to pay Alice Everett Cox (see H. Res. 304*).
Roll calls on question of quorum in, 8.
HOUSTON, JOHN M. (*a Representative from Kansas*).
Attended, 8.
Article by Ernest K. Lindley on the War and Navy Departments (Appendix, 545).
Editorial from Bergen Evening Record on neutrality (Appendix, 95).
Editorial from Kansas City Journal entitled "Missouri River Follies" (Appendix, 498).
Editorial from Washington Post on arms-embargo repeal (Appendix, 759).
Editorial from Wichita (Kans.) Beacon on Communists in the Government service (Appendix, 597).
Excerpt from book, Federal Administrators, by Arthur W. Macmahon and John D. Millett (Appendix, 63).
First prayer delivered in Congress, 1777 (Appendix, 368).
Remarks by, on
Argentine beef, 539.
Arms embargo, 352, 353.
Ginsberg, Sam, 579.
Neutrality, 529 (Appendix, 381).
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.
HOW TO THINK STRAIGHT, statement in American Good Government Society's article showing (Appendix, 860).
HUGHES, JAMES H. (*a Senator from Delaware*).
Attended, 3.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.
HULL, CORDELL (Secretary of State).
Address concerning the significance of the pan-American movement delivered at the New York World's Fair by (Appendix, 60).
Address delivered before the Foreign Trade Convention in New York City by, 295.
Address on the subject of inter-American relations in the field of education, delivered by (Appendix, 788).
Statement on the subject of neutrality made at a press conference by, 340.
Statement by Representative Mundt relative to (Appendix, 859).
HULL, MERLIN (*a Representative from Wisconsin*).
Attended, 8.
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 1246.
Neutrality, 1246.
——— letter by W. J. Bryan, 1247.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.
HUNTER, JOHN F. (*a Representative from Ohio*).
Attended, 8.
Address by Dr. Edward J. McCormack before Michigan State Medical Association on subject, Democracy at the Crossroads (Appendix, 517).
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 1144, 1145.
Neutrality, 1144.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.
HYDE, CHARLES CHENEY, letter relative to the arms embargo written by, 284 (Appendix, 103, 170).
"I AM WAR," editorial from the Aberdeen (Wash.) Daily World entitled (Appendix, 66).
ICKES, HAROLD L., address on the subject of coal, oil, gas, and electricity delivered by (Appendix, 537).
IDEOLOGIES, remarks in House on the subject of, 485.
IGLESIAS, SANTIAGO (*a Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico*).
Remarks by, on
Pan American Federation of Labor (Appendix, 397).
International affairs (Appendix, 397).
IMMIGRATION, remarks in House and statistics relative to, 136, 1376, 1377.
IMPORTS AND EXPORTS, remarks in House relative to agricultural (Appendix, 520, 868).
Remarks in House on the subject of (Appendix, 56).
Resolutions of inquiry relative to extension of credits to belligerent nations to facilitate exports of supplies (see H. Res. 305, 306).
Statistics of United States trade with the British Empire, France, and Germany (Appendix, 635).
Statistics relative to foreign trade of the United States, 1937–38, compared with 1934–35 (Appendix, 794).
Statistics relative to farm imports (Appendix, 810).
Statistics of United States peacetime exports, 241, 242, 264.
Table showing total imports of dutiable goods, 1913 and 1919, 531.
Table showing exports, imports, and trade balances of agricultural products (Appendix, 737).
Table showing exports of copper (Appendix, 727, 728).
Tables showing exports of iron and steel and cotton, 1268.
Tables showing total exports of merchandise from the United States to specified countries, 845.
Table showing values of domestic exports of munitions and aircraft from the United States to selected foreign countries, 1266.
INCOME TAX, address over the radio delivered by Representative McCormack urging reduction of surtaxes (Appendix, 156).
Remarks in House relative to requiring certain persons over 18 years of age to file returns of (Appendix, 669).
Table showing comparison of British and United States taxes, 135.
INDEPENDENCE OF THE UNITED STATES, remarks in House relative to maintenance of, 950.
INDIANA, remarks in House praising the Twelfth Congressional District of (Appendix, 842).
INDIAN RESERVATIONS, authorize the sale of lumber from the forests on (see bill S. 2983).
Letter from the Secretary of the Interior transmitting the draft of a proposed bill to authorize the sale of lumber and other forest products on, 14, 29.
INDIANS.
Cherokee: bill for relief of Eastern or Emigrant (see bill S. 2982).
——— letter from Robert L. Owen transmitting petition for adjudication of claims of, 355.
San Carlos Apache: bill to pay them for certain lands ceded to the United States (see bill H. R. 7551).
INDUSTRIAL INVOLVEMENT, remarks in Senate relative to, 368.
INDUSTRIAL LOAN CORPORATION, establish a permanent (see bill S. 2998).
INDUSTRIAL MOBILIZATION, editorial from the Washington Times-Herald on the subject of (Appendix, 336).
INDUSTRIAL MOBILIZATION PLAN, revision of 1939, approved jointly by the Acting Secretary of War and the Acting Secretary of the Navy (S. Doc. 134), 775.
INDUSTRIAL PRICE POLICIES, address by Harold G. Moulton on the subject of (Appendix, 494).
INDUSTRIES, remarks in House on the subject of industry and employment, 770.
INSECT PESTS, combat (see bill S. 2986).

INTER-AMERICAN RELATIONS IN THE FIELD OF EDUCATION, address delivered by Cordell Hull, Secretary of State, on the subject of (Appendix, 788).

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT. *See* DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR.

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS, remarks in House concerning (Appendix, 397).

INTERNATIONAL LAW, excerpts from Fiore's International Law Codified on the subject of neutrality, 1319.
Statement of principles concerning neutrality appearing in the American Journal of, 1113, 1114.

INTERPARLIAMENTARY UNION CONFERENCE, address delivered by Senator Wiley at Oslo, Norway, before (Appendix, 85).

INTERSTATE COMMERCE, define and punish interference with (see bill H. R. 7582).

"INTIMATE GLIMPSES OF OLD ST. MARY'S," statement by Representative Mundt relative to history entitled (Appendix, 859).
Statement in article by Richard A. Staderman relative to history entitled (Appendix, 629).

INVESTMENT TRUSTS AND INVESTMENT COMPANIES, letters from the chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission transmitting reports on study of (H. Docs. 279, 476, 477, 482), 13, 29, 41, 355, 395.

IOWA LEGIONNAIRE (newspaper), editorial on the subject of neutrality appearing in (Appendix, 13).

IRELAND, excerpts from embargo laws of (Appendix, 352).
Remarks in House relative to conditions in, 1214.

IRON AND STEEL, article concerning steel production (Appendix, 722).
Statistics relative to exports of, 1268.

IROQUOIS (steamship), remarks in House relative to (Appendix, 286).

ISOLATION, address over the radio delivered by Charles A. Lindbergh on the subject of, 7.

ITALIAN CHEESE INDUSTRY, history of (Appendix, 434).

ITALY, excerpts from arms-embargo laws of (Appendix, 353).

"IE SEEMS TO ME," article by Heywood Broun entitled (Appendix, 182).

"IT'S GLORIOUS TO BE AN AMERICAN THESE DAYS," article from the Clawson-Troy News entitled, 757.

IZAC, ED. V. (*a Representative from California*).
Attended, 8.
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 1160, 1161, 1173, 1174.
Hitler, Aloph, 1160.
Neutrality, 1160, 1161, 1173, 1174.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

JACKSON, ANDREW, statement by George Bancroft relative to, 427.

JACKSON, ARTHUR CHARLES (president World Safety Council), letter relative to the celebration of the centennial anniversary of the birth of Frances E. Willard, written by (Appendix, 782, 799).
Statement relative to the Frances Willard Centennial Total Abstinence Society, written by (Appendix, 44).

JACKSON, W. K., address on the subject of American shipping in wartime, delivered by (Appendix, 291).

JACOBSEN, WILLIAM S. (*a Representative from Iowa*).
Attended, 8.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

"JAMES RUNS FOR PRESIDENT AT PUBLIC EXPENSE," editorial from the Pittsburgh Press entitled, 808 (Appendix, 482).

JAPAN, excerpts from arms-embargo laws of (Appendix, 353).
Letter from Hiram Bingham relative to the effect of the proposed repeal of the arms embargo on the relations of the United States with, 1255.

JARMAN, PETE (*a Representative from Alabama*).
Leave of absence, 9.
Remarks in House relative to activities in behalf of flood sufferers in Alabama of, 40.
Remarks by, on
Neutrality, 1124.
Neutrality hearings: to print, 132.
Reports made by, from
Committee on Printing:
Neutrality hearings (S. Con. Res. 30), 336, 353.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

JARRETT, BENJAMIN (*a Representative from Pennsylvania*).
Attended, 8.
Petitions and papers presented by, from
Citizens and individuals, 43, 149, 588, 1081.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

JEFFERSON, THOMAS, excerpts from remarks by, 1071.
Remarks in House relative to the St. Louis memorial to (Appendix, 433).

JEFFRIES, WALTER S. (*a Representative from New Jersey*).
Attended, 8.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

JENKINS, EMORY N., relief (see bill H. R. 7602).

JENKINS, THOMAS A. (*a Representative from Ohio*).
Attended, 8.
Appointed on funeral committee, 1081.
Motions and resolutions offered by
Bolton, Chester C.: death of (see H. Res. 319), 1081.
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 1286.
Bolton, Chester C.: death of, 1074.
General leave to extend remarks, 1076.
Neutrality, 1286.
Personal announcement, 1074.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

JENKS, ARTHUR B. (*a Representative from New Hampshire*).
Attended, 8.
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 1248.
Neutrality, 1248.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

JENSEN, BEN F. (*a Representative from Iowa*).
Attended, 8.
Remarks by, on
Agriculture: effect of trade agreements upon (Appendix, 798).
Fact-finding Committee on Reciprocal Trade Treaties, 1056.
Neutrality, 215, 1100.
Reciprocal trade agreements, 1056 (Appendix, 798).
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

JESSUP, PHILIP C., letter relative to the arms embargo written by, 284 (Appendix, 103, 170).

JEWISH CONGRESS. *See* AMERICAN JEWISH CONGRESS.

JOHNS, JOSHUA L. (*a Representative from Wisconsin*).
Attended, 8.
Joint resolution of Wisconsin Legislature on the fur-raising industry (Appendix, 365).
Petitions and papers presented by, from
Citizens and individuals, 80, 149, 1058.
Remarks by, on
American securities held by foreigners, 624, 625.
Arms embargo, 616, 769, 1287.
Neutrality, 616, 1287.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

JOHNSON, ANTON J. (*a Representative from Illinois*).
Attended, 8.
Petitions and papers presented by, from
Citizens and individuals, 307, 772.
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo (Appendix, 883).
Neutrality (Appendix, 883).
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

JOHNSON, DOUGLAS, excerpt from article concerning the proposed repeal of the arms embargo, 684.

JOHNSON, EDWIN C. (*a Senator from Colorado*).
Attended, 15.
Article by David Lawrence on subject of negotiated peace in European conflict (Appendix, 718).
Newspaper articles on repeal of arms embargo, 252.
Radio address on neutrality by (Appendix, 61).
Radio address on neutrality by (Appendix, 145).
Statement relative to resolution (S. Res. 191)—urging nations at war to enter into an armistice, 82.
Amendments offered by, to
Neutrality Act 1939 (H. J. Res. 306): to amend, 492, 589, 830, 840.
Bills and joint resolutions introduced by
Noxious weeds and insects: to aid States to combat (see bill S. 2986), 443.
Motions and resolutions offered by
European war: favoring an armistice of (see S. Res. 191), 82.
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 174, 175, 252, 492, 777, 830, 832, 833, 834, 835, 854.
Neutrality Act 1939, 174, 175, 252, 492, 777, 830, 832, 833, 834, 835, 854, 916.
Peace: favoring negotiations for, 174, 175.
President of United States: proclamation when state of war exists, 830, 831, 832, 833, 834.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

JOHNSON, GEORGE W. (*a Representative from West Virginia*).
Attended, 8.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

JOHNSON, HIRAM W. (*a Senator from California*).
Attended, 3.
Appointed conferee, 1282.
Letter from Hiram Bingham regarding repeal of arms embargo, 237.
Letter from Hiram Bingham relative to repeal of arms embargo, 1255.

JOHNSON, HIRAM W.—Continued.
Radio address by Philip F. La Follette on pending neutrality legislation (Appendix, 189).
Radio address by Rev. Edward L. Curran on subject the Crusade for Peace (Appendix, 275).
Radio address on neutrality by (Appendix, 561).
Amendments offered by, to
Neutrality (H. J. Res. 306): to amend, 889, 1009.
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 514, 628, 744, 745, 1009.
——— conference report, 1356.
——— opposing repeal of, 628.
Neutrality Act 1939, 172, 194, 195, 203, 204, 205, 206, 514, 628, 901, 924, 1009, 1014, 1015, 1018.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

JOHNSON, HUGH S., address on the subject of neutrality delivered by (Appendix, 95).
Address on the subject of the World War delivered by (Appendix, 366).
Article entitled "Fair Farm Policy" written by (Appendix, 111).

JOHNSON, JED (*a Representative from Oklahoma*).
Attended, 8.
Resolution from Farmers' Union of Oklahoma relative to relief for drought- and flood-stricken areas (Appendix, 662).
Resolution by the Thirty-sixth Division Association on neutrality (Appendix, 661).
Remarks by, on
Disaster relief, 1391, 1393 (Appendix, 662).
Reconstruction Finance Corporation: disaster relief by, 1391.
Relief for drought- and flood-stricken areas, 1391, 1393 (Appendix, 662).
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

JOHNSON, LOUIS (Assistant Secretary of War), address on the subject, Lessons from Poland, delivered by (Appendix, 425).
Address entitled "The Challenge to the American Army" (Appendix, 670).
Remarks in Senate relative to an address made recently by, 282.
Remarks in Senate and an editorial from the Army and Navy Journal relative to (Appendix, 277).

JOHNSON, LUTHER A. (*a Representative from Texas*).
Attended, 8.
Appointed conferee, 1345.
Excerpts from speech on neutrality by, 344.
Lists of contraband issued by British and German Governments, 343.
List of American ships sunk or attacked 1915–17, 667.
Permission to address the House, 217.
Radio address on subject of neutrality (Appendix, 573).
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 337, 340, 341, 535, 536, 666, 667, 1107, 1163, 1197, 1204, 1205, 1284.
——— conference report, 1388.
Extension of remarks for Mr. Patman, 809.
Neutrality, 212, 213, 337, 340, 341, 666, 667, 769, 1107, 1163, 1197, 1204, 1205, 1284.
——— conference report, 1388.
——— statement by Cordell Hull, 340.
Panama Canal defenses, 524.
Permission to address the House, 656.
Woodrum, Clifton A., 218.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

JOHNSON, LYNDON (*a Representative from Texas*).
Attended, 8.
Editorial from Baltimore Sun on Aubrey Williams (Appendix, 259).
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

JOHNSON, NOBLE J. (*a Representative from Indiana*).
Remarks by, on.
Purnell, Fred S.: death of (Appendix, 760).
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

JOHNSON, ROBERT L., letter to the President of the United States urging selection of census employees from civil-service lists, written by, 589.

JOHNSTON, J. G., article entitled "Hands Off the U. S. A.!" (Appendix, 478).

JOHNSTON, RONALD J. (*late a Representative from Missouri*).
Announcement of death of, 33.

JOHNSTOWN (PA.) DEMOCRAT (newspaper), editorial on the subject of neutrality appearing in (Appendix, 531).

JOINT COMMITTEE RELATING TO THE EUROPEAN SITUATION, to create (see H. J. Res. 387).

JOINT MEETING OF THE SENATE AND HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, to provide for (see H. Con. Res. 36*), 4, 9.

JONES, MARVIN (*a Representative from Texas*).
Attended, 8.
Remarks by, on
Agricultural prices, 21.
Purnell, Fred S.: tribute to, 756.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

JONES, ROBERT F. (*a Representative from Ohio*).
Attended, 8.
Article from Lima (Ohio) News on neutrality (Appendix, 550).
Bills and joint resolutions introduced by
Greenville (Ohio) Memorial Commission: to establish (see H. J. Res. 385), 41.
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 1325.
Neutrality, 1325.
Bolton, Chester C.: tribute to, 1077.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

JUDICIAL CODE, to establish a joint committee to revise (see H. J. Res. 388).
Remarks in House on House Joint Resolution 388 to establish a joint committee to prepare a revision of (Appendix, 576).

JUNIOR CAVALRY OF AMERICA, address delivered by Representative Vreeland at the fathers' dinner of (Appendix, 466).

KANSAS, excerpts from petitions from various organizations on the subject of neutrality, 45.

KANSAS CITY JOURNAL (newspaper), editorial entitled "Missouri River Follies" appearing in (Appendix, 498).

KAUFMANN, RUDOLFO AND ELLINOR T., relief (see bill H. R. 7562).

KAUFMANN, SALOMON GEORG, DORIS, AND MICHAEL PETER, relief (see bill H. R. 7563).

KEAN, ROBERT W. (*a Representative from New Jersey*).
Attended, 8.
Remarks by, on
Stabilization fund, 625.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

KEE, JOHN (*a Representative from West Virginia*).
Attended, 8.
Appointed conferee, 1345.
Appointed on Star-Spangled Banner Commission, 9.
Letter to K. B. Thomas, Bluefield, W. Va., on arms embargo (Appendix, 215).
Radio address on repeal of arms embargo (Appendix, 451).
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 1215, 1217.
——— conference report, 1388.
Neutrality, 1215, 1217.
——— conference report, 1388.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

KEEFE, FRANK B. (*a Representative from Wisconsin*).
Attended, 8
Elected to Committee on Appropriations, 1358.
Resignation from committees, 1379.
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 1181, 1189.
——— excerpts by authorities, 1181.
Neutrality, 1181, 1189.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

"KEEP AMERICA OUT OF FOREIGN WARS," address over the radio delivered by Representative Fish entitled (Appendix, 19).

"KEEP AMERICA OUT OF WAR," article by Charles Brooks Smith entitled (Appendix, 500).

"KEEP AMERICA SAFE FOR AMERICANS IN AMERICA," address over the radio delivered by Representative Woodrum entitled (Appendix, 3).

KEFAUVER, ESTES (*a Representative from Tennessee*).
Credentials, 9.
Editorials from Chattanooga Times on neutrality (Appendix, 280).
Editorials from Washington Daily News, Washington Star, and Washington Post on proposed Argentine trade agreements (Appendix, 382).
Elected to committees, 33.
Letter from W. B. Swaney relative to arms embargo (Appendix, 640).
Sworn in, 9.
Remarks by, on
Table showing United States foreign trade with trade-agreement countries and with all others (Appendix, 794).
Hawley-Smoot Tariff Act (Appendix, 793).
McReynolds, Sam D.: tribute to (Appendix, 676).
Reciprocal trade-agreements program (Appendix, 793).
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

KELLER, KENT E. (*a Representative from Illinois*).
Attended, 8.
Address delivered in the House Feb. 24, 1936, on the national debt, 1365.
Articles from Harper's Weekly relative to establishment of an American school army (Appendix, 819).
Text of bill to establish the American school army (Appendix, 817).
Bills and joint resolutions introduced by
Gummasson, Henry Hans Jacob: to admit permanently to the United States (see bill H. R. 7581), 307.

KELLER, KENT E.—Continued.
Remarks by, on
American school army (Appendix, 817).
Arms embargo (Appendix 810).
Extension of remarks, 1369, 1392.
Income-tax refunds under Republican administration, 1365.
Neutrality (Appendix, 810).
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

KELLEY, JAMES F., address delivered at the dedication of the new gymnasium building at Seton Hall College, N. J. (Appendix, 260).

KELLY, EDWARD A. (*a Representative from Illinois*).
Attended, 8.
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo (Appendix, 816).
Neutrality (Appendix, 816).
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

KELLY, RAYMOND J. (National Commander, American Legion), inaugural address of (Appendix, 115).

KENNEDY, AMBROSE J. (*a Representative from Maryland*).
Attended, 8.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

KENNEDY, EDWARD E., letter relative to the farmer and neutrality written by (Appendix, 692).
Letter relative to the arms embargo, written by (Appendix, 699).
Letter on the subject of agricultural exports, written by (Appendix, 783).

KENNEDY, MARTIN J. (*a Representative from New York*).
Attended, 8.
Address delivered at Oslo, Norway, by (Appendix, 68).
Article by Arthur Krock on arms embargo, 677.
Editorial from the Saturday Evening Post on European controversies (Appendix, 492).
Editorial and article from New York World-Telegram on neutrality (Appendix, 630).
Letter to Speaker Bankhead suggesting a forum for views on neutrality (Appendix, 356).
Letter to Senator Wagner suggesting a conference of New York State Members of Congress to discuss neutrality (Appendix, 70).
Letter to Vice President Garner suggesting that the Senate use the House chamber during neutrality debate (Appendix, 205).
Bills and joint resolutions introduced by
Peace Conference: requesting hostile nations to join (see H. J. Res. 382), (Appendix, 14).
Petitions and papers presented by, from
Societies and associations, 627.
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 963.
Browder, Earl: statement by, 963.
Dies committee on un-American activities, 963.
Electric power rates, 669, 670, 671.
Immigration problems, 137, 138.
Lavelle, Michael J.: tribute to, 587.
Neutrality, 963, 1095.
New York City: housing program in, 253.
United States Housing Authority, 253.
——— article from New York Herald Tribune, 255.
——— letter from Alfred Rheinstein, 254.
——— New York City Housing Authority, 254.
Subversive activities, 963.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

KENNEDY, MICHAEL J. (*a Representative from New York*).
Attended, 8.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

KENTUCKY, appointment of A. B. Chandler as Senator from, 234.

KENYON, CLARINDA E., pension (see bill H. R. 7594).

KEOGH, EUGENE J. (*a Representative from New York*).
Attended, 8.
Appointed on Supreme Court Celebration Committee, 939.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

KERR, JOHN H. (*a Representative from North Carolina*).
Address at Wake Forest College by (Appendix, 58).
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 1339.
Bolton, Chester C.: death of, 1078.
Neutrality, 1339.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

KIDNAPING, remarks in House and excerpts from editorials relative to the projected kidnaping of a Member of Congress (Appendix, 866).

KILDAY, PAUL J. (*a Representative from Texas*).
Attended, 8.
Bills and joint resolutions introduced by
Revenue Act, 1936: to amend (see bill H. R. 7601), 964.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

KING, WILLIAM H. (*a Senator from Utah*).
Attended, 44.
Radio address on neutrality by (Appendix, 265).

KING, WILLIAM H.—Continued.
Radio address on the subject Neutrality, by Law and in Practice" by (Appendix, 874).
Statement by Carter Glass expressing views on neutrality (Appendix, 605).
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 157, 177, 228, 836, 855, 975, 980, 981, 985, 1024, 1027, 1028 (Appendix, 874).
Copper: excise tax on, 1085.
Excise taxes and reciprocal trade agreements, 1085.
Neutrality (Appendix, 874, 875).
Reciprocal trade agreements, 1085.
Tariff, 1085.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

KINZER, J. ROLAND (*a Representative from Pennsylvania*).
Attended, 8.
Petitions and papers presented by, from
Citizens and individuals, 43, 80, 308, 627, 1058.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

KIRWAN, MICHAEL J. (*a Representative from Ohio*).
Attended, 8.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

KITCHENS, WADE H. (*a Representative from Arkansas*).
Attended, 8.
Resolution adopted at Little Rock, Ark., protesting against unjust freight rate discriminations (Appendix, 179).
Statement issued by Agricultural Adjustment Administration on the domestic pork market (Appendix, 234).
Statement by Department of Agriculture relative to beef producers (Appendix, 152).
Table showing percentage of domestic pork market supplied by the American producer (Appendix, 234).
Table showing United States exports of agricultural products (Appendix, 520).
Remarks by, on
Agricultural products: exports of (Appendix, 520).
Arms embargo, 526, 1180 (Appendix, 794).
National Committee to Keep America Out of War, 523.
Neutrality, 1180 (Appendix, 215, 794).
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

KLEBERG, RICHARD M. (*a Representative from Texas*).
Radio address on neutrality, by (Appendix, 64).
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

KLUCKHOHN, FRANK L., article relative to the sinking or capture of American ships by belligerents, written by, 787.

KNIGHT, GEORGE MORGAN, JR., statement by Representative Mundt relative to (Appendix, 859).
Statement in article by Richard A. Staderman relative to (Appendix, 629).

KNIGHTS OF COLUMBUS, address delivered by Paul V. McNutt in honor of the election of Francis P. Matthews as supreme knight of (Appendix, 413).

KNOX, FRANK, statement entitled "Partisanship in War Crisis," written by (Appendix, 45).

KNOXVILLE (TENN.) JOURNAL (newspaper), editorial entitled "Cash-and-Carry Neutrality" (Appendix, 171).

KNUTSON, HAROLD (*a Representative from Minnesota*).
Attended, 8.
Article by Raymond Clapper entitled "Armageddon Again?" (Appendix, 4).
Letter from Secretary Hull, May 12, 1938, relative to arms embargo (Appendix, 597).
Bills and joint resolutions introduced by
Gilsoul, Eugenie: to pension (see bill H. R. 7566), 149.
Remarks by, on
Agricultural prices, 944.
Argentine trade agreement, 941, 942.
Arms embargo, 952, 1202 (Appendix, 597).
Extension of remarks, 1391.
Ezekiel, Mordecai, 942.
Neutrality, 1202, 1375.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

KOCIALKOWSKI, LEO (*a Representative from Illinois*).
Attended, 8.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

KOHN, JOSEPH, letter relative to the cash-and-carry section of the Neutrality Act, 629.

KRAMER, CHARLES (*a Representative from California*).
Attended, 8.
Article from the Central Constructor entitled "P. W. A. and the Special Session" (Appendix, 287).
Sermon by Most Rev. John J. Cantwell at funeral of George Cardinal Mundelein (Appendix, 224).
Bills and joint resolutions introduced by
Gruen, Eugene: for relief (see bill H. R. 7595), 772.
Kaufmann, Rudolfo, and wife: for relief (see bill H. R. 7562, 80.
Kaufmann, Salomon Georg, and others: for relief (see bill 7563), 80.
Petitions and papers presented by, from
Societies and associations, 489, 540.

KRAMER, CHARLES—Continued.
Remarks by, on
Neutrality hearings: to print, 132, 337.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.
KRIVITSKY, WALTER G., remarks in House relative to, 351, 537.
KROCK, ARTHUR, article entitled "National Safety and Economy Forced Cash-Carry Revisions" written by, 677.
KUHN, FRITZ, editorial from the Bergen Evening Record, Hackensack, N. J., favoring deportation of (Appendix, 652).
Remarks in House relative to, 537.
KUNKEL, JOHN C. (*a Representative from Pennsylvania*).
Attended, 8.
Remarks by, on
Argentine beef, 539.
Arms embargo (Appendix, 358).
Neutrality, 1204.
Radio broadcasting, 621.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.
LABOR, address by Senator McCarran entitled "Labor and Neutrality" (Appendix, 429).
Address delivered by Senator Schwellenbach entitled "Labor and Agriculture" (Appendix, 300).
Article by Witt Bowden concerning American labor in the World War (Appendix, 710).
Article from the Philadelphia Inquirer entitled "A Country Sick of Strikes," 483.
Remarks in House relative to strikes in the plant of the Bohn Aluminum & Brass Corporation, Detroit, Mich., 299.
Remarks in House entitled "Labor Legislation and Preparedness," 348.
Resolution of inquiry relative to the strike in the plant of the Bohn Aluminum & Brass Corporation (see H. Res. 313), 335.
Statistics relative to strikes in the United States, 301.
LA FOLLETTE, PHILIP F., address over the radio on the subject of neutrality delivered by (Appendix, 189).
LA FOLLETTE, ROBERT M., JR. (*a Senator from Wisconsin*).
Attended, 3.
Address by Hon. Burton K. Wheeler at homecoming celebration, Hudson, Mass. (Appendix, 227).
Address by Dr. Ernest H. Wilkins on the subject Democracy at Bay (Appendix, 136).
Radio address on pending neutrality legislation by (Appendix, 143).
Radio address by Hon. William E. Borah on neutrality (Appendix, 461).
Tables relative to exports from United States to leading countries, 845.
Testimony by Cordell Hull relative to increase of shipments of key war materials during state of war, 855.
Amendments offered by, to
Neutrality (H. J. Res. 306): to amend, 773, 841, 986.
Remarks by, on
Airplanes: sale of, 324, 325.
Arms embargo, 320, 323, 324, 327, 331, 466, 515, 841, 842, 843, 844, 853, 856, 987, 998.
——— article by Raymond Clapper, 324, 325.
——— article by Edward B. Corwin, 321.
——— article by Ludwell Denny, 324.
——— article by John T. Flynn, 330.
——— article by Hugh Johnson, 328.
——— article from Wall Street Journal, 323.
——— article by Frederic William Wile, 325.
——— excerpt from Plan Age, 334.
——— statement by Robert N. Page, 322.
——— table showing orders for aircraft, 323.
Export Control Board, 842, 843, 844, 853, 856.
Foreign policy of United States, 325, 326.
Morgan, J. P.: loans to Allied Powers by, 322.
Munitions industry, 322.
Neutrality, 321, 323, 324, 327, 331, 466, 515, 841, 842, 843, 844, 853, 856, 987, 998, 1018.
War: advisory referendum on declaration of, 987, 998.
World War of 1914: factors leading to entry of United States, 321, 322.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.
LAGE, WILLIAM P., letter concerning the repeal of the arms embargo written by (Appendix, 762).
LAMBERTON, MRS. B. G., letter denying membership in the American League for Peace and Democracy, 1034.
LAMBERTSON, W. P. (*a Representative from Kansas*).
Attended, 8.
Petitions and papers presented by, from
Citizens and individuals, 222.
Societies and associations, 149.
Remarks by, on
Jefferson Memorial, St. Louis, Mo. (Appendix, 433).
Neutrality, 955.
Printing matter in the Record, 866.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.
LAND, EMORY S. (rear admiral, U. S. Navy), address on the subject of the Maritime Commission delivered by (Appendix, 368).
LANDIS, GERALD W. (*a Representative from Indiana*).
Attended, 8.
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 1225.
Neutrality, 1225.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.
LANDMAN, S., article concerning world Jewry written by, 583.
LANDON, ALFRED M., address relative to the American foreign policy delivered by (Appendix, 720).
LANHAM, FRITZ G. (*a Representative from Texas*).
Attended, 8.
Remarks by Mr. Hoffman relative to statement on arms embargo by, 1284.
Remarks by, on
Neutrality, 1126, 1127.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.
LANSING, ROBERT (Secretary of State during the World War), letter dated August 12, 1915, addressed to the Ambassador of the United States in Austria-Hungary, on the subject of neutrality, 71, 146.
Letter to President Wilson, dated September 6, 1915, relative to the proposed flotation of Government loans for the belligerent nations in the World War, 851.
Memorandum of a conversation with President Wilson on October 23, 1914, relative to loans and bank credits to belligerent governments, 371.
Remarks in House relative to, 385.
Remarks in Senate relative to, 929.
LAPORTE, CLOYD, letter relative to neutrality in warfare written by (Appendix, 303, 393).
LARRABEE, WILLIAM H. (*a Representative from Indiana*).
Attended, 8.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.
LATIMORE, FLORA, pension (see bill H. R. 7579).
LATIN AMERICA, article by Felix Cotten on the prospective increase in trade with (Appendix, 732).
Editorial from the Washington Post relative to trade with (Appendix, 369).
Remarks in House relative to trade with, 1368.
Table showing value of trade with the United States and certain foreign countries, 960.
LAVELLE, MICHAEL J., remarks in House on death of, 587.
LAW ENFORCEMENT, addresses delivered by J. Edgar Hoover on the subject of (Appendix, 113, 283, 499).
LAWHORN, ISABEL, pension (see bill H. R. 7577).
LAWRENCE, DAVID, article concerning Government employees affiliated with Communist Party activities, written by (Appendix, 547).
Article entitled "German-American Antirepealists Not Necessarily Pro-Nazi" written by (Appendix, 64).
Editorial proposing a plan for an honorable negotiated peace written by (Appendix, 718).
LEA, CLARENCE F. (*a Representative from California*).
Attended, 8.
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 1198.
Neutrality, 1198.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.
LEAGUE OF NATIONS, article by Harry Frease on the subject of police powers for (Appendix, 241).
LEAGUE FOR PEACE AND DEMOCRACY. *See* AMERICAN LEAGUE FOR PEACE AND DEMOCRACY.
LEAVES TO PRINT REMARKS. *See* CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.
LEAVY, CHARLES H. (*a Representative from Washington*).
Attended, 8.
Address by Hon. Frank Murphy at Conference on Civil Liberties, New York City (Appendix, 321).
Bills and joint resolutions introduced by
Insect pests: to aid States in eradicating (see bill H. R. 7605), 1058.
Petitions and papers presented by, from
Societies and associations, 1081.
Remarks by, on
Agricultural prices (Appendix, 21).
Dies Committee on Un-American Activities, 886.
House, Col. E. M.: alleged letter to Lloyd George (Appendix, 554).
——— excerpts from Congressional Record (Appendix, 554).
——— letter from John Shaw (Appendix, 554).
Neutrality Act, 1939, 262, 263.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.
LE COMPTE, KARL M. (*a Representative from Iowa*).
Attended, 8.
Bills and joint resolutions introduced by
Clark, Effie J.: to increase pension (see bill H. R. 7547), 24.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.
LEE, JOSH (*a Senator from Oklahoma*).
Attended, 8.
Address by Hon. Elbert D. Thomas on repeal of arms embargo (Appendix, 311).

LEE, JOSH—Continued.
Radio address on subject of drafting money in time of war (Appendix, 428).
Radio address on neutrality by (Appendix, 344).
Statement by Rev. Rembert Gilman Smith on subversive activities in United States (Appendix, 483).
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 70, 717, 718, 728, 730, 734, 749, 750, 1007, 1031.
Neutrality, 717, 718, 728, 730, 734, 749, 750, 1007, 1031.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

LEECH, S. HOWARD, article on the subject of national pensions, written by (Appendix, 324).

LEGAL HOLIDAYS. *See* HOLIDAYS.

LEGISLATION, letter written by George Washington, September 30, 1786, relative to the advisability of organizing minority groups for the purpose of influencing (Appendix, 548).
Remarks in House urging the raising of the embargo on (Appendix, 357).

LEMKE, WILLIAM (*a Representative from North Dakota*).
Attended, 8.
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 1306 (Appendix, 357).
Embargo on legislation (Appendix, 357).
Farm problems (Appendix, 357).
Neutrality, 1306.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

LESINSKI, JOHN (*a Representative from Michigan*).
Attended, 8.
Petitions and papers presented by, from
Societies and associations, 308.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

LETTER CARRIERS' CONVENTION, MILWAUKEE, WIS., address delivered by Representative Sweeney at (Appendix, 734).

LETTERS PATENT. *See* PATENTS.

"LET US MAKE DEMOCRACY SAFE IN AMERICA," statement by R. Armistead Grady, entitled (Appendix, 51).

LEWIS, EARL R. (*a Representative from Ohio*).
Attended, 8.
Article from Reader's Digest entitled "How Scio Licked Hard Times" (Appendix, 297).
Permission to address the House, 610.
Poem by Grace Marie Piper on the arms embargo (Appendix, 388).
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 866, 867, 869, 870.
Bolton, Chester C.: tribute to, 1079.
Neutrality, 477, 866, 867, 869, 870.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

LEWIS, FULTON, JR., remarks in House relative to, 255, 256, 257, 626.

LEWIS, JOHN L., remarks in House relative to activities of, 217, 218, 299, 484, 660, 661, 883, 1070, 1359, 1360 (Appendix, 472).

LEWIS, LAWRENCE (*a Representative from Colorado*).
Attended, 8.
Address by Louis Johnson at New York Herald Tribune Forum on subject of national defense (Appendix, 670).
Remarks by, on
Neutrality bills: comparative print, 1059, 1060, 1074 (Appendix, 641).
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

LEWIS, MERIWETHER, address over the radio delivered by Harry H. Woodring, Secretary of War, concerning (Appendix, 100).

LIBERIA, excerpts from arms-embargo laws of (Appendix, 353).

LIBERTY (magazine), article entitled "Stay out, America" appearing in (Appendix, 306).

LIBRARIES IN THE CONTEMPORARY CRISIS, address delivered by Archibald MacLeish, Librarian of Congress, on the subject of (Appendix, 423).

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS, address over the radio delivered by Archibald MacLeish concerning the dedication of the Hispanic Room in (Appendix, 319).

LIMPUS, LOWELL, article entitled "Arms a Fraction of War Goods Exports" written by (Appendix, 77).

LINCOLN, ABRAHAM, address delivered by George D. Aiken, Governor of Vermont, on (Appendix, 278).
Address delivered by T. A. Dicus at dedication of the Abe Lincoln Ferry Park, Ind. (Appendix, 330).
Address delivered by Ross F. Lockridge on the boyhood of (Appendix, 133).
Address delivered by James M. Tucker, Secretary of State of Indiana, on Abe Lincoln, the Ferryman (Appendix, 180).

LINCOLN, G. GOULD, article entitled "The Political Mill," written by, 107.

LINCOLN PRESS, statement by Representative Mundt concerning (Appendix, 859).
Statement in article by Richard A. Staderman relative to publication of (Appendix, 629).

LINDBERGH, CHARLES A., address over the radio on the subject of isolation delivered by, 6 (Appendix, 15).
Address over the radio on the subject of neutrality delivered by (Appendix, 301).
Article by Herbert Agar relative to the second radio address delivered by (Appendix, 405).
Remarks in House relative to, 767.
Request in Senate to print a radio address delivered by; objected to and subsequently agreed to, 4, 6.

LINDLEY, ERNEST K., address over the radio on the subject of neutrality delivered by (Appendix, 774).
Article entitled "Matters of Fact"—The Embargo and International Law (Appendix, 92).
Article entitled "Our Army and Navy" written by (Appendix, 545).
Comments on the address delivered by Harry H. Woodring, Secretary of War, at the dinner of the National Guard Association (Appendix, 612).

LINHART, WILLIAM H, relief (see bill H. R. 7628).

LIPPMANN, WALTER, article entitled "Canada and the United States" written by (Appendix, 370).
Article entitled "The Duty of Congress in World War Crisis" written by (Appendix, 119).
Article entitled "Today and Tomorrow" written by, 1114.

LITTLE ROCK, ARK., resolution concerning freight rates adopted at a meeting at (Appendix, 179).

LIVENS PROJECTORS AND FLAME THROWERS, amendment and remarks in Senate relative to prohibiting issuance of licenses for export of, 899.

LIVINGSTON (MONT.) ENTERPRISE (newspaper), editorial entitled "Fool's Gold?"

LOANS TO BELLIGERENT NATIONS, telegram of August 15, 1914, from W. J. Bryan to J. P. Morgan & Co., relative to, 369.

LOCKRIDGE, ROSS F., address on the boyhood of Abraham Lincoln (Appendix, 133).

LODGE, HENRY CABOT, JR. (*a Senator from Massachusetts*).
Attended, 3.
Address at homecoming celebration for Senator Wheeler, Hudson, Mass. (Appendix, 457).
Address by Hon. David I. Walsh at dedication of Calvin Coolidge Bridge, Northampton, Mass. (Appendix, 482).
Radio address on neutrality, by (Appendix, 553).
Amendments offered by, to
Neutrality (H. J. Res. 306): to amend, 786.
Petitions and papers presented by, from
Citizens and individuals, 82, 772, 816, 888.
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 249, 251, 281, 324, 513, 786, 831, 832, 833, 846.
Export Control Board, 846.
Neutrality Act 1939, 196, 249, 251, 281, 513, 786, 831, 832, 833, 846, 1011, 1015.
Nova Scotia, 786.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

LOGAN, DELLA, amendment in Senate to pay, 224.

LOGAN, JOHN A., funeral address on M. M. Logan delivered by (Appendix, 367).

LOGAN, M. M. (*late a Senator from Kentucky*).
Attended, 3.*
Address by John A. Logan at funeral of (Appendix, 367).
Announcement of death of, 81.
Editorial from Edmonson County News paying tribute to (Appendix, 361).
Resolution of respect in Senate (S. Res. 190), 81.
Resolution of respect in House (see H. Res. 311), 148.
Resolutions from order of Odd Fellows paying tribute to, 355.
Resolution to pay funeral expenses (S. Res. 192), 355.
Statement in article by Richard A. Staderman relative to (Appendix, 628).
Tribute in House to (Appendix, 174).
Tribute in Senate to, 81.

LONACONING, MD., address delivered by Representative Byron at the laying of the cornerstone of the N. Y. A. Building at (Appendix, 256).

LONG BEACH DEMOCRATIC CLUB OF CALIFORNIA, resolution endorsing the cash-and-carry amendment to the Neutrality Act (Appendix, 784).

L'OSSERVATORE ROMANO (newspaper), editorial relative to the peace proposals of Pope Pius XII and President Roosevelt appearing in (Appendix, 1615).

LOTHIAN, LORD (British Ambassador), mentioned in debate in House, 1314, 1315.
Referred to in article by Porter Sargent (Appendix, 681).

LOVERIDGE, MABEL FREER, poem entitled "Foreboding" written by (Appendix, 641).

LOWELL, A. LAWRENCE, letter on the subject of neutrality written by (Appendix, 466).

LOWER CALIFORNIA, to negotiate for acquisition of (see H. J. Res. 389).

LUCAS, SCOTT W. (*a Senator from Illinois*).
Attended, 3.
Article from New York Times referring to address by Bishop Sheil (Appendix, 155).
Radio address by Bishop Sheil on subject, America's Catholic Youth and Europe's War (Appendix, 131).
Radio address on neutrality by (Appendix, 290).
Statement by Hon. Frank Knox on partisanship in war crisis (Appendix, 45).
Amendments offered by, to
Neutrality (H. J. Res. 306): to amend, 774.
Remarks by, on
American ships destroyed prior to entry into World War, 375.
Arms embargo, 192, 201, 202, 203, 229, 324, 375, 376, 512, 513, 514, 518, 645, 647, 648, 649, 650, 651, 652, 837.
Draft boards: mobilization plans, 646, 647, 648.
Neutrality Act 1939, 512, 513, 514, 518, 645, 647, 648, 649, 650, 651, 652, 837.
President of the United States: proclamation of war by, 837.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

LUCE ROBERT (*a Representative from Massachusetts*).
Statement by Roger W. Babson on conditions in China (Appendix, 699).
Bills and joint resolutions introduced by
Ham Horace Lothrop: for relief (see bill H. R. 7584), 354.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

LUDLOW, LOUIS (*a Representative from Indiana*).
Address before the Christian Men Builders, Inc., of Indianapolis, Ind. (Appendix, 49).
Address by T. A. Dicus at dedication of Abe Lincoln Ferry Park, Ind. (Appendix, 330).
Address by Merle Sidener on the subject Quality Happiness (Appendix, 829).
Correspondence with Departments of State and Commerce relative to sale of horses to belligerent nations (Appendix, 733).
Letter from R. G. Patton, national welfare officer, Military Order of the Purple Heart, relative to war referendum (Appendix, 472).
Poem by Clarence C. Deupree entitled "My Congressman and Friend (Appendix, 842).
Resolution adopted by Junior Chamber of Commerce, Indianapolis, Ind. (Appendix, 150).
Sermon by Harry Emerson Fosdick on subject The Christian Church's Message to America Today (Appendix, 337).
Text of Ludlow war referendum resolution (Appendix, 834).
Bills and joint resolutions introduced by
Aliens: to deport in certain cases (see bill H. R. 7569), 222.
Remarks by, on
Abe Lincoln Ferry Park (Appendix, 330).
Arms embargo, 140, 485 (Appendix, 842).
Boonville (Ind.) Press Club (Appendix, 330).
Congress: need of remaining in session (Appendix, 865).
Horses: sale to belligerents (Appendix, 733).
Ideologies in America, 485.
Immigration problems, 138.
Junior Chamber of Commerce, Indianapolis, Ind. (Appendix, 150).
Monroe Doctrine, 1137.
Neutrality, 346, 1137.
Neutrality legislation, 485.
Purple Heart Military Order (Appendix, 472).
Purnell, Fred S.: tribute to, 755.
Twelfth Congressional District of Indiana (Appendix, 842).
War referendum (Appendix, 834).
Young men and war (Appendix, 150).
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

LUMBER, letter from the Secretary of the Interior transmitting the draft of a proposed bill to authorize the sale of lumber and other forest products on Indian reservations, 14, 29.

LUNDEEN, ERNEST (*a Senator from Minnesota*).
Attended, 3.
Article from Chicago Tribune showing expenditures of defaulting nations, 414.
Article by George Biehl relative to treatment of American soldiers by the French, 418.
Article from Washington Times-Herald on war debts, 418.
Article from Washington Post relative to sale of war materials to France, 415.
Article from Denver Post on war debts, 427.
Discussion of neutrality on American Forum of the Air by Senators Nye, Pittman, Connally, Danaher, Lundeen, and Van Nuys (Appendix, 243).
Economic statistics on French Empire, 423.
Radio address by Hon. Gerald P. Nye on proposed neutrality legislation (Appendix, 83).
Resolution from Minnesota State Federation of Labor favoring referendum on war, 409.
Resolution from Minnesota Federation of Labor relative to safety devices on merchant ships, 1349.
Statement by Charles A. Lindbergh on national defense, 413.

LUNDEEN, ERNEST—Continued.
Statement by Smedley D. Butler on arms embargo repeal, 413.
Statement by Senator Reynolds on collection of war debts, 427.
Statement by George Bancroft relating to Andrew Jackson and the French spoliation claims, 427.
Table showing amount of war debts due United States in 1938, 418.
Bills and joint resolutions introduced by
Foreign wars: declaration of nonparticipation in (see S. J. Res. 189), 1348.
Motions and resolutions offered by
United States Maritime Commission: to investigate administration of safety laws by (see S. Res. 196), 1349.
Remarks by, on
Adjournment of special session, 1351.
American Ambassadors, 560.
American Merchant Marine: protection of, 1348.
Arms embargo, 87, 88, 90, 127, 128, 129, 162, 165, 166, 184, 190, 191, 279, 333, 361, 362, 365, 366, 367, 368, 369, 408, 411, 412, 413, 415, 416, 421, 422, 436, 437, 547, 550, 560, 565, 566, 594, 652, 858, 860.
——— article by Frederic William Wile, 165, 166.
Churchill, Winston, 365.
Congress: need to remain in session, 1351.
Foreign policy of United States, 408.
France: war debt, 413.
Great Britain: trade treaty with Russia, 414.
Great Britain's war debt, 860.
Jackson, Andrew, and the French war debt, 443.
Monroe Doctrine, 1348.
Morro Castle (steamship), 1348.
Neutrality Act 1939, 408, 411, 412, 413, 415, 416, 417, 421, 422, 547, 550, 560, 565, 566, 652, 858, 860.
Passenger ships, protection of lives aboard, 1348.
United States Maritime Commission, 1348.
War debts: methods of collecting, 408, 411, 412, 413, 415, 416, 417, 435, 436, 437.
Washington's Farewell Address, 1348.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

LUTHER, MARTIN, editorial from the Washington Post concerning (Appendix, 638).

LUTHERAN AUGUSTANA SYNOD, telegram from pastors of the New England Conference remonstrating against lifting the arms embargo received from (Appendix, 712).

LUTZ, ALMA, article in memory of Elizabeth Cady Stanton (Appendix, 799).

MAAS, MELVIN J. (*a Representative from Minnesota*).
Attended, 8.
Arms embargo, 1173, 1174.
Remarks by, on
Neutrality, 1173, 1174.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

McADOO, WILLIAM G. (former Secretary of the Treasury), remarks in Senate relative to, 370.

McARDLE, CARL W., article entitled "Churchill Decries Lies," written by, 686, 687.

McARDLE, JOSEPH A. (*a Representative from Pennsylvania*).
Attended, 8.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

McARTHUR, ESTA M., pension (see bill H. R. 7583).

McCANDLESS, AFFIE W., pension (see bill S. 2996).

McCARRAN, PATRICK (*a Senator from Nevada*).
Attended, 3.
Address by Hon. Harllee Branch on civil aeronautics (Appendix, 511).
Address before American Federation of Labor on the subject "Labor and Neutrality" (Appendix, 429).
Address by Col. Edgar S. Gorrell at dedication of North Beach Airport, New York (Appendix, 412).
Editorial from Elko (Nev.) Daily Free Press on the sinking of the *Royal Oak* by Commander Guenther Prien (Appendix, 456).
Letter from Edwin Barchard relative to armed merchant ships, 969.
Press release by Fortune Magazine relative to pegging of milk prices (Appendix, 539).
Radio address by the Most Reverend F. J. Beckman entitled "A Plea for Christianity and Americanism" (Appendix, 614).
Text of bill S. 91—Senate approval of trade agreements, 1089.
Amendments offered by, to
Neutrality (H. J. Res. 306): to amend, 816.
Remarks by, on
Armed merchant ships, 968, 969, 971, 975.
Arms embargo, 169, 590, 592, 594, 598, 599, 600, 601, 795, 938, 968, 969.
——— list of explosions in munitions plants, 596.
Copper: excise tax on, 1088.

McCARRAN, PATRICK—Continued.
Remarks by, on
Industrial Mobilization Plan: to print as a Senate Document (S. Doc. 134), 775.
Neutrality Act, 1939, 590, 592, 594, 598, 599, 600, 601, 795, 938, 968, 969.
Reciprocal trade agreements, 1088.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

McCONNELSVILLE (OHIO) HERALD, editorial on neutrality appearing in (Appendix, 326).

McCORMACK, JOHN W. (*a Representative from Massachusetts*).
Address at National Convention of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Boston, Mass., by (Appendix, 178).
Article by Joseph A. Conry on Freedom of the Seas (Appendix, 519).
Editorial from the Boston Herald entitled "Keeping Youth in Trim" (Appendix, 779).
Letter from Frank S. Davis on neutrality (Appendix, 531).
Radio address advocating reduction of surtax rates (Appendix, 156).
Bills and joint resolutions introduced by
Customs field service: providing for promotion of employees in (see bill H. R. 7620), 1397.
Navy yards: to adjust compensation of guards and guard officers at (see bill H. R. 7610), 1157.
Petitions and papers presented by, from
Citizens and individuals, 489.
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 1169, 1170.
Neutrality, 1169, 1170.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

McCORMACK, EDWARD J., address entitled "Democracy at the Crossroads" delivered by (Appendix, 517).

McCOY, ALICE CATELL, pension (see bill H. R. 7597).

McDOWELL, JOHN (*a Representative from Pennsylvania*).
Attended, 8.
Editorial from New York Herald Tribune on emergency powers of the Chief Executive (Appendix, 501).
Permission to address the House, 578.
Resolution of Allegheny River Improvement Association (Appendix, 532).
Motions and resolutions offered by
United States statutes: to authorize appointment of special committee to study (see H. Res. 316), 588.
Remarks by, on
Attorney General, 814.
President of the United States: emergency powers of, 814.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

McGEHEE, DAN R. (*a Representative from Mississippi*).
Attended, 8.
Essay by James Magee on neutrality (Appendix, 325).
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

McGRANERY, JAMES P. (*a Representative from Pennsylvania*).
Attended, 8.
Table showing list of British possessions and method of acquisition, 1213, 1214.
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 1213.
Great Britain: conquests of, 1213, 1214.
Ireland: treatment by Great Britain, 1214.
Neutrality, 1213.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

MACIEJEWSKI, A. F. (*a Representative from Illinois*).
Attended, 8.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

McINTYRE, ROSS, telegram on the subject of neutrality received from (Appendix, 702).

McKELLAR, KENNETH (*a Senator from Tennessee*).
Attended, 3.
Address by Hon. James A. Farley to National Association of Postmasters, Washington, D. C. (Appendix, 292).
Address by President Roosevelt to Postmasters' Convention, Washington, D. C. (Appendix, 291).
Appointed on funeral committee, 81.
Article by James G. Stahlman in the Nashville Banner on preparedness (Appendix, 295).
Letter on subject of Arms Embargo Act by (Appendix, 148).
Letter from Hon. Edward T. Taylor relative to appropriation to pay widows of deceased Representatives, 224.
Letter from Secretary of State to Senator Capper in reply to criticism of reciprocal-trade agreements program (Appendix, 784).
List of Embargo Acts of Congress, 1794–1937, 703.
Newspaper articles relating to improved business conditions, 707, 708.
Amendments offered by, to
Eaton, Mrs. Thomas M. (H. J. Res. 384): to amend, 224.
McMillan, Thomas S. (H. J. Res. 384): to amend, 224.
Bills and joint resolutions introduced by
Sellwood Station, Portland, Oreg., post office: to reform the lease for (see bill S. 2987), 443.

McKELLAR, KENNETH—Continued.
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 652, 653, 654, 655, 752.
Arms Embargo Act of 1807, 654.
Business conditions, 707.
Expenses of special session, 224.
Neutrality, 172, 286, 292, 652, 653, 654, 655, 752, 989, 996, 997.
Signs of prosperity, 707.
War referendum, 996, 997.
Reports made by, from
Committee on Appropriations:
Expenses of second session of the Seventy-sixth Congress (see H. J. Res. 384), 224.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

McKEOUGH, RAYMOND S. (*a Representative from Illinois*).
Attended, 8.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

McLAUGHLIN, CHARLES F. (*a Representative from Nebraska*).
Attended, 8.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

McLEAN, DONALD H. (*a Representative from New Jersey*).
Attended, 8.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

MacLEISH, ARCHIBALD, address over the radio concerning the dedication of the Hispanic Room in the Library of Congress delivered by (Appendix, 319).
Address on the subject of libraries in the contemporary crisis (Appendix, 423).

McLEOD, CLARENCE J. (*a Representative from Michigan*).
Attended, 8.
Resolutions of the National Small Business Men's Association (Appendix, 449).
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 1308.
Neutrality (Appendix, 1308).
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

McMILLAN, JOHN L. (*a Representative from South Carolina*).
Attended, 8.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

McMILLAN, THOMAS S. (*late a Representative from South Carolina*).
Attended, 8.
Amendment to resolution (H. J. Res. 384): to pay widow of, 224.
Death of, 79.
Resolution of respect in House (H. Res. 310), 79.
Resolution of respect in Senate (S. Res. 189), 76.
Tributes in House to, 79 (Appendix, 217).

McNARY, CHARLES L. (*a Senator from Oregon*).
Attended, 3.
Address by Gov. Charles A. Sprague, of Oregon, urging nomination of Senator McNary for President (Appendix, 304).
Address by Hon. Robert A. Taft at Vienna, Ill., on neutrality (Appendix, 75).
Appointed on committee to wait upon the President, 4.
Appointed on committee to conduct the President, 9.
Editorial from the Emporia (Kans.) Gazette paying tribute to Senator Capper, 109.
Radio address on neutrality by (Appendix, 307).
Radio discussion with Senator Pepper on neutrality (Appendix, 418).
Remarks by Senator Capper relative to speech by Gov. Charles A. Sprague urging nomination for President of, 396.
Motions and resolutions offered by
Atkinson, Ela H.: to pay compensation to (see S. Res. 193), 1082.
Bolton, Chester C.: death of (see S. Res. 194), 1091.
Eaton, Thomas M.: death of (see S. Res. 187), 33.
Notification to the House of Representatives, 4.
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 703, 744, 778, 781, 787, 805, 890, 891, 914, 924, 937, 938, 978, 979.
——— trade with Nova Scotia, 787.
Congressional Record: printing matter after adjournment, 1358.
Eaton, Thomas M.: death of, 33.
Excise taxes and trade agreements, 1084.
Neutrality Act, 1939, 50, 75, 76, 150, 151, 172, 193, 194, 206, 207, 249.
——— appointment of conferees, 1281, 1282.
Order of procedure, 5, 31.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

McNUTT, PAUL V., address to the Social Security Board Post 142 of the American Legion, Department of Maryland, delivered by (Appendix, 309).
Address in honor of Francis P. Matthews delivered by (Appendix, 413).
Statement concerning the proposed payment of public-assistance money to the State of Ohio submitted by, 1091.

McQUILLIN, FRANCIS, article entitled "A Town That Wouldn't Admit Defeat" written by (Appendix, 796).

McREYNOLDS, SAM D. (*late a Representative from Tennessee*).
Tribute in House to (Appendix, 676).

MADDEN, J. WARREN (Chairman, National Labor Relations Board), address entitled "Old Liberties and New" delivered by (Appendix, 399).

MADISON (S. DAK) DAILY LEADER, article described as "Calendar of Cupidity," referring to European nations, appearing in (Appendix, 231, 232).

MAGNUSON, WARREN G. (*a Representative from Washington*).
Article by Clark Squire on transfer of Alaska to the United States (Appendix, 465).
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

MAHON, GEORGE H. (*a Representative from Texas*).
Attended, 8.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

MALONEY, FRANCIS T. (*a Senator from Connecticut*).
Attended, 3.
Address at National Conference of Catholic Charities, Denver, Colo., by (Appendix, 565).
Gallup poll of public opinion on the arms-embargo question, 504.
Letter by William Allen White and joint statement by prominent clergymen regarding neutrality legislation (Appendix, 685).
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 499, 630, 844, 899, 900.
——— list of Senators with sons of military age, 502.
Export-Import Bank, 925.
Neutrality Act, 1939, 172, 499, 630, 844, 899, 900, 1009, 1010, 1028, 1032.
Stabilization fund, 922.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

MALONEY, PAUL H. (*a Representative from Louisiana*).
Bills and joint resolutions introduced by
New Orleans, La.: to acquire certain land at (see bill H. R. 7578), 265.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

MANCHESTER GUARDIAN WEEKLY, editorial entitled "The Forces Against Hitler" appearing in (Appendix, 279).

MANSFIELD, JOSEPH J. (*a Representative from Texas*).
Radio address by Richard M. Kleberg on neutrality (Appendix, 64).
Table showing number of ocean-going tankers by countries, 768.
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 767, 769.
Neutrality, 767, 769.
Permission to address the House, 621.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

MAPES, CARL E. (*a Representative from Michigan*).
Attended, 8.
Address by Hon. Forest A. Harness on conscription of wealth in time of war (Appendix, 500).
Motions and resolutions offered by
Reed, Thomas Brackett: to acquire marble bust of (see H. Res. 315), 577.
Remarks by, on
Great Britain: investments in United States of subjects of, 623.
Mondell, Frank W.: tribute to, 134, 135.
Neutrality, 1092, 1093, 1104.
Neutrality bills: comparative print of bills, 1060.
Order of business, 16, 17.
Permission to address the House, 383.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

MARCANTONIO, VITO (*a Representative from New York*).
Attended, 8.
Statement by Rev. Herman F. Reissig, chairman, American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born (Appendix, 675).
Remarks by, on
Theodore Roosevelt—Navy Day (Appendix, 767).
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

MARINE NEWS, editorial entitled "No Time to Show the Yellow Feather", appearing in (Appendix, 447).

MARITAIN, JACQUES, article entitled "Aspects of War in Europe" written by (Appendix 316).
Article entitled "Europe Is Already Saved", written by (Appendix, 322).

MARITIME COMMISSION, address delivered by Emory S. Land, rear admiral, United States Navy, on the subject of (Appendix, 368).

MARSHALL, L. L. (*a Representative from Ohio*).
Attended, 8.
Appointed on funeral committee, 1081.
Remarks by, on
Bolton, Chester C.: death of, 1077.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

MARTIN, JOHN A. (*a Representative from Colorado*).
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 1049, 1134, 1142, 1240.
——— reply to Mr. Fish, 1240.

MARTIN, JOHN A.—Continued.
Remarks by, on
House, Col. E. M.: alleged letter by, 662.
Neutrality, 1049, 1134, 1142, 1240.
Permission to address the House, 656, 939.
Thorkelson, J.: alleged letter by Col. E. M. House inserted in Record of, 662, 663.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

MARTIN, JOHN C. (*a Representative from Illinois*).
Attended, 8.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

MARTIN, JOSEPH W., Jr. (*a Representative from Massachusetts*).
Attended, 8.
Appointed on Committee to Conduct the President, 9.
Appointed on committee to notify the President, 8.
Message from George P. Darrow giving position on neutrality bill, 1345.
Remarks in House on birthday of, 1379.
Motions and resolutions offered by
Election of Mr. Bradley to committee, 1390.
Election of Mr. Keefe to Committee (see H. Res. 325), 1358.
Remarks by, on
Bolton, Chester C.: tribute to, 1075.
Final adjournment, 1358.
Fish, Hamilton: permission to address the House, 76.
General leave to extend remarks, 569.
Members of House: expression of thanks for birthday felicitations by, 1379.
Neutrality, 1103.
——— order of procedure, 613.
Order of business, 1074.
Permission to address the House, 862.
Reed, Thomas Brackett: tribute to, 569.
——— telegram from Clarence Cannon, 570.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

MARTIN, LORENZO, article relative to the graves of United States war dead in France, written by (Appendix, 481).

MARTIN, THOMAS E. (*a Representative from Iowa*).
Attended, 8.
Article by George Rothwell Brown on arms embargo (Appendix, 674).
Articles relative to sale of war implements, 1372.
Memorandum from War Department regarding American cemeteries in Europe (Appendix, 394).
Tables relative to value of domestic exports of munitions and aircraft from United States to selected foreign countries, 1266.
Table showing United States Air Corps appropriations for new aircraft, 1267.
Table showing total appropriations for United States Ordnance Department compared with total appropriations for the military activities of the War Department, fiscal years 1910 to 1939, 1268.
Table showing United States exports of heavy iron and steel products, 1268.
Tables relative to neutrality and national defense (Appendix, 727).
Table showing exports of cotton, 1929–38, 1268.
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 1263.
Loftus Day, 1263.
Munitions of war: sale of, 1372.
National defense, 1263.
Neutrality, 1263.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

MASON, E. W., letter on the subject of money, written by (Appendix, 865).

MASON, NOAH M. (*a Representative from Illinois*).
Attended, 8.
Article by David Lawrence relative to affiliation of Government empoyees with Communist Party activities (Appendix, 547).
Article on neutrality legislation by (Appendix, 640).
Editorial from the Skipper, Columbus University magazine, relative to the Dies committee (Appendix, 662).
Remarks by, on
Correction of vote on neutrality (Appendix, 833).
League for Peace and Democracy, 1042, 1051, 1052.
Permission to address the House, 939.
Reciprocal-trade agreements, 947.
Ward, Dr. Harry, 1052.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

MASSINGALE, SAM C. (*a Representative from Oklahoma*).
Attended, 8.
Article by Hugh S. Johnson entitled "A Fair Farm Policy" (Appendix, 111).
Remarks by, on
Agricultural prices, 20, 21, 22, 23.
Agriculture: fair policy for (Appendix, 111).
Arms embargo, 1121 (Appendix, 767).
Neutrality, 1121 (Appendix, 767).
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

MATTHEWS, FRANCIS P., address delivered by Paul V. McNutt in honor of (Appendix, 413).

MATTHEWS, JOHN A., letter on the subject of neutrality written by (Appendix, 168).

MATTHEWS, MARK A., plea to uphold the President submitted by (Appendix, 614).

MAY, ANDREW J. (*a Representative from Kentucky*).
Attended, 8.
Address by Secretary of War Woodring on neutrality (Appendix, 633).
Appointed on funeral committee, 148.
Editorial from Washington Times-Herald relative to Secretary of War Woodring (Appendix, 634).
Radio address by Harry H. Woodring on the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the establishment of the Army of the United States (Appendix, 100).
Remarks by, on
Order of business, 16.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

MEAD, JAMES M. (*a Senator from New York*).
Attended, 81.
Address by Ernest G. Draper on small business and its credit problem (Appendix, 200).
News release relative to peace proposals of Pope Pius XII and President Roosevelt (Appendix, 615).
Radio address by Hon. Robert F. Wagner on neutrality (Appendix, 203).
Radio address by Rt. Rev. Msgr. John A. Ryan on arms embargo (Appendix, 513).
Report of the American Bar Association on the legal aspects of neutrality problem (Appendix, 508).
Statement on the life of the late Cardinal Mundelein, by (Appendix, 607).
Bills and point resolutions introduced by
Loans to small industry: to provide (see bill S. 2998), 1082.
Remarks by, on
Loans to small industry, 1082.
Mundelein, Cardinal (deceased) (Appendix, 607).
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

MECHANICS, address delivered by Representative Brewster at Eastport, Maine, relative to the training of (Appendix, 865).

MELLON, ANDREW W., remarks in House relative to, 1371.

MEMBERS OF CONGRESS, grant air mail franking privilege to (see bill H. R. 7588).
Remarks in House relative to the duty of, 1369.
Remarks in House and excerpts from editorials relative to the projected kidnaping of a Member (Appendix, 866).

MEMORIAL EXERCISES IN HONOR OF DECEASED SENATORS AND REPRESENTATIVES.
Addresses on
Reed, Thomas B., 569 (Appendix, 398, 401).

MENCKEN, H. L., editorial entitled "Sham Battle" written by (Appendix, 459).
Editorial entitled "Notes on a Moral War" written by (Appendix, 534).

MERCHANT MARINE. *See* AMERICAN MERCHANT MARINE.

MERRITT, MATTHEW J. (*a Representative from New York*).
Attended, 8.
Petitions and papers presented by, from
Citizens and individuals, 395.
Societies and associations, 395, 1279.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

MESSER, MOLLIE, pension (see bill H. R. 7585).

MEYER, ERNEST L., article entitled "As the Crow Flies," written by (Appendix, 568).

MIAMI, FLA., authorize acceptance of certain real estate granted to the United States by the city of (see bill H. R. 7543).

MICHENER, EARL C. (*a Representative from Michigan*).
Attended, 8.
Appointed on Supreme Court Celebration Committee, 939.
Editorial from Detroit Free Press on neutrality (Appendix, 320).
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 353, 1175.
Great Britain: sale of munitions, 1375.
Lewis, John L., 349.
Neutrality, 342, 476, 1175.
——— comparative print of bills, 1060.
New Deal propaganda, 298.
Purnell, Fred S.: tribute to, 756.
Reciprocal trade agreements, 947.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

MIGLIORE, CATERINA, ANTHONY, AND ROSE, relief (see bill H. R. 7565).

MIGRANT LABOR PROBLEM, remarks in House relative to (Appendix, 827).

MIGRATORY BIRD CONSERVATION COMMISSION, Mr. Cochran appointed on, 771.

MILEAGE. *See* HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES; SENATE.

"MILITARY ALLIANCE WITH ENGLAND," article by Lord Beaverbrook entitled, 302.

MILITARY OFFICERS APPOINTED TO CIVIL POSITIONS, remarks in House relative to (Appendix, 665).

MILITARY ORDER OF THE PURPLE HEART, letter from the national welfare officer relative to providing a referendum on war (Appendix, 472).

MILITARY ORDER OF THE WORLD WAR, address of the commander in chief, Col. E. M. Wentworth, at Roanoke, Va., relative to (Appendix, 485).

MILK AND CREAM, excerpts from an article in Fortune magazine concerning milk in Chicago, Ill. (Appendix, 735).
Memorial of legislature of Wisconsin urging passage of bill (H. R. 6500) to provide an adequate and balanced flow of, 30.

MILLER, HARLAN, articles entitled "Roosevelt on Foreign Affairs" written by (Appendix, 294).

MILLER, JOHN E. (*a Senator from Arkansas*).
Attended, 3.
Address by Henry S. Fraser before New York State Republican Clubs, Ithaca, N. Y. (Appendix, 590).
Appointed on funeral committee, 81.
Article by Roger Babson on effect of war on United States trade (Appendix, 373).
Letters from foreign legations relative to arms embargo laws in their respective countries, 1153.
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 522–530, 536, 870, 1152, 1337 (Appendix, 700).
——— petition from citizens of Wethersfield, Conn. (Appendix, 700).
Hartford Courant (newspaper): 175th anniversary, 1071.
House, Col. E. M.: alleged letter to Lloyd George from, 522, 523, 580, 581.
Loans to belligerents, 623.
National Committee to Keep America Out of War, 523, 524.
Neutrality, 522–530, 536, 667, 763, 812, 1152, 1337 (Appendix, 700).
Panama Canal defenses, 524.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

MILLER, WILLIAM J. (*a Representative from Connecticut*).
Attended, 8.
Letter from Charles Cheney Hyde and Philip C. Jessup on arms embargo (Appendix, 170).
Radio address on neutrality, by (Appendix 218).
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo (Appendix, 223).
Neutrality, 341 (Appendix, 46, 223).
Permission to address the House, 335.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

MILLS, NEWT V. (*a Representative from Louisiana*).
Attended, 8.
Remarks by, on
Neutrality and arms embargo (Appendix, 99).
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

MILLS, WILBUR D. (*a Representative from Arkansas*).
Attended, 8.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

MINK PELTS, correspondence relative to importation of, 1280, 1281 Appendix, 465).
Memorial of Legislature of Wisconsin relative to importation of, 541 (Appendix, 365).

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., article concerning the one hundredth birthday of the city of (Appendix, 93).
Remarks in House relative to the Works Progress Administration in (Appendix, 700).

MINNEAPOLIS MORNING TRIBUNE, editorial entitled "Mr. Shaw Asks a Question" appearing in (Appendix, 720).

MINNEAPOLIS STAR-JOURNAL (newspaper), editorial entitled "Our Expensive Government" appearing in (Appendix, 404).

MINNESOTA, resolution of the State Federation of Labor relative to protection of lives of passengers on vessels, 1349.

MINTON, SHERMAN (*a Senator from Indiana*).
Attended, 3.
Address by Ross F. Lockridge on the boyhood of Abraham Lincoln (Appendix, 133).
Address by Paul V. McNutt before Social Security Board Post 142, of the American Legion, Baltimore, Md. (Appendix, 309).
Address by Senator Pepper on neutrality at mass meeting held in National Press Auditorium, Washington, D. C. (Appendix, 194).
Address by Sergeant York on neutrality and the arms embargo (Appendix, 331).
Appointed on funeral committee, 81.
Article by Lorenzo Martin on subject of graves of United States war dead in France (Appendix, 481).
Associated Press dispatch on improvement of business conditions (Appendix, 722).
Letter from Hon. James E. Watson favoring repeal of arms embargo (Appendix, 606).
Radio address by Hon. Elbert D. Thomas on civil rights and liberties (Appendix, 299).
Radio discussion on neutrality (Appendix, 407).
Radio address by Hon. Josh Lee on drafting money in time of war (Appendix, 428).

MINTON, SHERMAN—Continued.
Resolution and remarks by Senator Nye on the Spanish embargo, 753.
Motions and resolutions offered by
Hour of daily meeting of the Senate, 4.
Petitions and papers presented by, from
Citizens and individuals, 31, 173.
Societies and associations, 443.
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 323, 402, 457, 459, 653, 654, 717, 718, 719, 720, 734, 735, 752, 753, 754, 797.
Cherne, Leo M., 718.
Detzer, Dorothy, 752, 753.
Munitions industry, 745, 746, 747, 748, 749.
Neutrality, 84, 87, 251, 252, 290, 292, 323, 324, 457, 459, 653, 654, 717, 718, 719, 720, 734, 735.
Spanish civil war: attitude of Senator Nye toward, 752, 753, 754, 797.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

"MIRACLES," articles by the late Lawrence Yates Sherman entitled (Appendix, 10).

MISSISSIPPI, making an appropriation for loans and relief in flood-stricken areas of (see H. J. Res. 386, 392).
Remarks in House relative to crop conditions in, 39.
Remarks in House relative to providing aid to farmers in the flood-stricken areas of (Appendix, 863).
Text of House Joint Resolution 386 making an appropriation for loans and relief in, 40.

MISSOURI, resolution adopted by the Missouri delegation in Congress on the death of Julian N. Friant (Appendix, 694).

MISSOURI RIVER, editorial from the Kansas City Journal entitled "Missouri River Follies" (Appendix, 498).

MITCHELL, ARTHUR W. (*a Representative from Illinois*).
Attended, 8.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

MIXED CLAIMS COMMISSION, article by Joseph Conrad Fehr relative to the work of (Appendix, 349).

MOBILIZATION FOR PEACE, address over the radio delivered by Senator Wiley on the subject of (Appendix, 345).

MOLEY, RAYMOND, excerpts from book entitled "After Seven Years," written by, 546.
Letter to the President dated November 30, 1935, relative to the reciprocal trade agreement with Canada, and certain other matters, 1237, 1238, 1239.

MOLYNEAUX, PETER, editorial on neutrality written by (Appendix, 426).

MONDELL, FRANK W. (*late a Representative from Wyoming*).
Announcement of death of, 134.
Tribute in House to, 134.

MONETARY SYSTEM, establish a scientific (see bill H. R. 7600).

MONEY, address over the radio delivered by Senator Lee concerning the drafting of money in time of war (Appendix, 428).
Article by John G. Scott and a letter from E. W. Mason on the subject of (Appendix, 865).
Joint resolutions to restore to Congress the sole power to issue money and regulate the value thereof (see S. J. Res. 188; H. J. Res. 391).
Text of Senate Joint Resolution 188 to restore to Congress the sole power to issue (Appendix, 865).

MONEY, GEORGE P., editorial tribute to the late Eaton J. Bowers written by, 1091, 1092.

MONKIEWICZ, B. J. (*a Representative from Connecticut*).
Attended, 8.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

MONRONEY, MIKE (*a Representative from Oklahoma*).
Attended, 8.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

MONTGOMERY, D. E., letter commenting on the quality of beet sugar (Appendix, 603).

MOORE, JOHN BASSETT, letter concerning repeal of the arms embargo written by (Appendix, 761).
Statement concerning the fundamental principles of neutrality written by, 122.

MOREY, WILLIAM C., statement concerning the sale of munitions written by, 123.

MORGAN, HARCOURT A., radio interview concerning the T. V. A. agricultural program (Appendix, 780).

MORGAN, JAMES, article entitled "One Sure Way to Keep Us Out of War," written by (Appendix, 404).

MORGAN & CO., J. P., remarks in Senate relative to, 369, 370.

MORLEY, FELIX, editorial entitled "Common Sense Wins," written by (Appendix, 794).

MOSER, GUY L. (*a Representative from Pennsylvania*).
Attended, 8.
Article by Frederic William Wile on inefficiency in Government departments (Appendix, 868).
Newspaper headlines relative to plot by Workers Alliance to kidnap Mr. Moser (Appendix, 866).

MOSER, GUY L.—Continued.
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo (Appendix, 857).
Constantine, Earl (Appendix, 861).
Farm Security Administration (Appendix, 862).
Government departments: inefficiency (Appendix, 867).
Neutrality (Appendix, 857).
——— printing of pamphlet, 256, 257.
Perkins, Milo (Appendix, 861).
Wage and Hour Administration (Appendix, 861).
Workers Alliance: threats upon Mr. Moser by (Appendix, 866).
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

MOTION PICTURES, remarks in House relative to the industry (Appendix, 780).
Remarks in House and a list of names of actors and executives, showing salaries received by them (Appendix, 364).
Remarks in House relative to the picture Thunder Afloat, 393.

MOTOR VEHICLES, summary and conclusions of the Federal Trade Commission in connection with the inquiry into the motor car industry (Appendix, 473).

MOTT, JAMES W. (*a Representative from Oregon*).
Attended, 8.
Bills and joint resolutions introduced by
Nelson, Willie D.: to pension (see bill H. R. 7574), 222.
Van Natta, Marion: to pension (see bill H. R. 7575), 222.
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 1262.
Neutrality, 813, 1262.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

MOULTON, HAROLD G., address on the subject of industrial price policies delivered by (Appendix, 494).

MOUTON, ROBERT L. (*a Representative from Louisiana*).
Attended, 8.
Remarks by, on
Neutrality (Appendix, 583).
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

MUNDELEIN, GEORGE CARDINAL, address over the radio delivered by Bernard D. Shiel relative to the death of (Appendix, 131).
Eulogy by Senator Mead and comments by various persons concerning (Appendix, 607).
Funeral sermon preached by John J. Cantwell in memory of (Appendix, 224).

MUNDT, KARL E. (*a Representative from South Dakota*).
Attended, 8.
Article by R. Armistead Grady entitled "Let Us Make Democracy Safe in America" (Appendix, 51).
Article from American Good Government Review by Richard A. Staderman on subject of foreign trade (Appendix, 627).
Article by Richard A. Staderman, president, the American Good Government Society, on the effect of high tariffs on agricultural commodities (Appendix, 858).
Article from Madison Daily Leader relative to trickery of European nations (Appendix, 231).
List of Congressmen reported opposed to Argentine trade agreement (Appendix, 628).
Open letter to the Gallup Poll (Appendix, 285).
Permission to address the House, 132.
Bills and joint resolutions introduced by
South Dakota: to construct a veterans' hospital in the First Congressional District of (see bill H. R. 7550), 41.
Petitions and papers presented by, from
Societies and associations, 149.
Remarks by, on
American Good Government Society (Appendix, 627, 859).
Arms embargo, 141, 1315 (Appendix, 231, 804).
Dies Committee on Un-American Activities, 882.
Eggs: effect of trade agreements on price of (Appendix, 859).
Gallup poll on public opinion (Appendix, 502).
Gallup poll correspondence with Dr. Gallup (Appendix, 502).
Neutrality, 141, 1143, 1315 (Appendix, 804).
Presidential third term (Appendix, 804).
Reciprocal trade agreements (Appendix, 627, 859).
——— reply to Mr. Vincent (Appendix, 859).
Staderman, Richard A. (Appendix, 627, 859).
Un-American activities (Appendix, 804).
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

MUNITIONS PLANTS IN THE UNITED STATES, list of explosions and fires occurring in, 476, 596.

MURDOCK, ABE (*a Representative from Utah*).
Attended, 8.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

MURDOCK, JOHN R. (*a Representative from Arizona*).
Attended, 8.
Bills and joint resolutions introduced by
Alexander, Winnie: to increase pension (see bill H. R. 7555), 41.
Arizona State Elks' Association Hospital: to sell certain lands to (see bill H. R. 7571), 222.

MURDOCK, JOHN R.—Continued.
Bills and joint resolutions introduced by
Arms and munitions of war: to tax sale of (see bill H. R. 7557), 80.
Grand Canyon National Monument: to return a portion to the public domain (see bill H. R. 7570), 222.
San Carlos Apache Indians: to pay for certain lands (see bill H. R. 7551), 41.
San Francisco Mountain Scenic Boulevard Co.: for relief (see bills H. R. 7554, 7576), 41, 222.
Remarks by, on
Argentina: proposed trade agreement with, 538.
Arizona highways (Appendix, 166).
Arms embargo, 529, 1136, 1243 (Appendix, 884).
Mexico: smuggling of aliens from, 137.
Neutrality, 874, 875, 1136, 1243 (Appendix, 884).
Permission to address the House, 536.
Reciprocal trade agreements, 538, 539, 949, 950.
Trade agreement: effect on American farmers (Appendix, 823).
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

MURPHY, FRANK (Attorney General of the United States), address over the radio entitled "Civil Liberties in America" delivered by (Appendix, 321).
Address entitled "Our Heritage of Justice" delivered by (Appendix, 110).
Address entitled "The Test of Patriotism" delivered by (Appendix, 672).

MURRAY, JAMES E. (*a Senator from Montana*).
Attended, 3.
Address by James A. Farrell at National Trade Convention, New York City (Appendix, 510).
Letter to constituents giving position on neutrality legislation (Appendix, 149).
Radio address by Hon. Robert F. Wagner on the national health program (Appendix, 453).
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 906, 911, 1030.
Neutrality, 906, 911.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

MURRAY, REID F. (*a Representative from Wisconsin*).
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

MUZZEY, DAVID S., article entitled "All Is Not Lost in the Fight for Democracy," written by (Appendix, 570).

MYERS, FRANCIS J. (*a Representative from Pennsylvania*).
Attended, 8.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES, annual report of, 1348.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF BROADCASTERS, remarks in House relative to the curtailment of free speech over the radio pursuant to the decision of the code committee of, 620, 621.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF MANUFACTURERS, editorials by Manchester Boddy urging creation of a peace college (Appendix, 327).
Statement on the subject of war submitted by (Appendix, 431, 432).

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF REAL ESTATE BROKERS, resolution on the subject of preservation of property rights adopted by (Appendix, 675).

NATIONAL BUREAU OF ECONOMIC RESEARCH, source of information in article of American Good Government Society given as (Appendix, 859).

NATIONAL CITY, CALIF., authorize acceptance on behalf of the United States of certain lands at (see bill S. 2991).
Letter from the Secretary of the Navy transmitting the draft of a proposed bill to authorize acceptance of donation of certain lands at, 15.

NATIONAL CITY BANK OF NEW YORK, remarks in Senate relative to, 370.

NATIONAL COMMITTEE TO KEEP AMERICA OUT OF FOREIGN WARS, letter requesting contributions of funds to pay expenses of, 213.
Remarks in House relative to (Appendix, 221).
Resolution to investigate (see H. Res. 312).

NATIONAL COMMITTEE TO UPHOLD CONSTITUTIONAL GOVERNMENT, summary of emergency powers of the President prepared by (Appendix, 507).

NATIONAL DEBT. *See* DEBT OF THE UNITED STATES.

NATIONAL DEFENSE, address over the radio delivered by Senator Burke on the subject of (Appendix, 82).
Address over the radio delivered by Representative Smith of Washington on the subject of (Appendix, 335).
Address delivered by Representative Snyder before the National Guard Convention held in the city of Baltimore, Md., on the subject of (Appendix, 826).
Address delivered by Harry H. Woodring, Secretary of War, on the subject of (Appendix, 612, 633).
Article by Charles Edison, Acting Secretary of the Navy, on the subject of (Appendix, 18).
Remarks in House relative to, 299, 657 (Appendix, 814).
Resolution of inquiry relative to preparedness of the United States for (see H. Res. 309).

NATIONAL DEFENSE—Continued.
Tables showing expenditures for aircraft and munitions (Appendix, 727, 728).
Tables showing expenditures of the world for, 1245, 1246.

NATIONAL FEDERATION OF POST OFFICE CLERKS, address delivered by Representative Randolph before (Appendix, 216).
Address delivered by Representative Sweeney at Houston, Tex., in connection with the twenty-first convention of (Appendix, 738).

NATIONAL FOREIGN TRADE COUNCIL, address delivered by Chairman James A. Farrell on the subject of American foreign trade in wartime (Appendix, 510).

NATIONAL FORESTS, letter from the Secretary of Agriculture transmitting the draft of a proposed bill to facilitate and simplify the administration of, 41.

NATIONAL GUARD, remarks in House relative to criticisms of, 1361.

NATIONAL GUARD ASSOCIATION, address by Harry H. Woodring, Secretary of War, and comments thereon by Ernest K. Lindley relative to (Appendix, 612).

NATIONAL HEALTH PROGRAM, address over the radio delivered by Senator Wagner on the subject of (Appendix, 453).

NATIONAL INCOME OF UNITED STATES, tables of American Good Government Society stating (Appendix, 859).

NATIONAL INDUSTRIAL CONFERENCE BOARD, article by American Good Government Society relative to (Appendix, 859).

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT, remarks in House relative to, 660, 661 (Appendix, 31).

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD, remarks in House relative to, 301, 302, 484.

NATIONAL LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS, statement concerning war-referendum legislation submitted by, 998.

NATIONAL NEUTRALITY COMMISSION, amendment and remarks in Senate relative to the proposed establishment of, 175, 911.

NATIONAL NONPARTISAN COMMITTEE FOR PEACE THROUGH REVISION OF THE NEUTRALITY LAW, telegram from William Allen White inviting participation in (Appendix, 619).
List of names of members of (Appendix, 619, 620).

NATIONAL PARKS, amend rule XXI relative to bills concerning (see H. Res. 318).

NATIONAL POLICE ACADEMY, address delivered by J. Edgar Hoover concerning (Appendix, 113).

NATIONAL REPUBLICAN CLUB, report on neutrality prepared by the national affairs committee of, 806.

"NATIONAL SAFETY AND ECONOMY FORCED CASH-CARRY REVISIONS," article by Arthur Krock entitled, 677.

NATIONAL SMALL-BUSINESS MEN'S ASSOCIATION, resolutions adopted by (Appendix, 449).

NATIONAL YOUTH ADMINISTRATION, address delivered by Representative Gross at Caledonia State Park, Pa., on the subject of, 1035.
Editorial from the Boston Herald entitled "Keeping Youth in Trim" (Appendix, 779).
Letter from Aubrey Williams relative to (Appendix, 710).
Remarks in House relative to, 1372.

NATIONS AT WAR, questions and answers with regard to, 304.

NATKO, FRANC, relief (see bill H. R. 7586).

NAVAL ACADEMY, increase number of midshipmen appointed at large at (see bill S. 3005).

NAVAL ARMAMENTS, letter from the Secretary of the Navy relative to the estimated cost of doubling the size of the fleet, 1065.
Remarks in House relative to the proposed increase in, 1065.
Statistics concerning the naval strength of the seven great powers, 1065, 1066.

NAVAL WAR COLLEGE, statement concerning the sale of munitions of war submitted by, 1113.

NAVY, address delivered by Representative Brewster at Norway, Maine, relative to (Appendix, 863).
Remarks in House relative to the delay in delivery of United States property caused by labor strike in the plants of the Bohn Aluminum & Brass Corporation, 1069, 1070.
Aerial surveys: bill to amend act to authorize payment of a per diem in connection with (see bill S. 3013).
Aircraft: table showing expenditures for (Appendix, 727, 728).
Defenses: joint resolution requiring the Secretary of the Navy to appoint a board to investigate (see H. J. Res. 396).
Enlisted men: bill to amend act relative to payment of commuted rations of (see bill S. 3012).
Vessels: bill to amend act limiting expenditures for repairs or changes to (see bill S. 3011).
Warrant officers: bill to amend act relative to promotion to chief warrant rank of (see bill S. 3016).
Yards and stations: bills to adjust compensation of guards and guard officers at (see bills S. 2990; H. R. 7610).

NAVY CROSS, present to Frank N. Roberts (see bill S. 3009).

"NAVY DAY," address over the radio delivered by Representative Van Zandt entitled (Appendix, 596).

NAVY DAY, address over the radio delivered by Charles Edison, Acting Secretary of the Navy, on the subject of (Appendix, 599).
Remarks in House relative to observance of, 1058.
Remarks in House relative to the original suggestion by Joseph J. Bruno of a date for the observance of (Appendix, 767).

NAVY DEPARTMENT. *See also* SECRETARY OF THE NAVY.
Bill to amend act to provide uniformity in the pay of all civilian employees appointed for duty beyond the continental limits of the United States (see bill S. 3014).
Letter from the Secretary of the Navy transmitting report of designs, aircraft, and aeronautical accessories purchased by, 14, 29.
Letters from the Archivist of the United States transmitting list of useless papers in, 30, 41, 706, 815.

NAVY EXPEDITIONARY MEDAL, present to certain Army and civilian personnel (see bill S. 3010).

NAZI BUND, remarks in House relative to, 537.

NEELY, MATTHEW M. (*a Senator from West Virginia*).
Attended, 3.
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 895.
Executive powers under national emergency proclamation, 32.
Neutrality, 895.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

NELSON, WILLIAM L. (*a Representative from Missouri*).
Attended, 8.
Remarks by, on
Agricultural prices, 20.
Neutrality (Appendix, 696).
Thankful for fine folks of Missouri (Appendix, 696).
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

NELSON, WILLIE D., pension (see bill H. R. 7574).

NEUBERGER, RICHARD L., article entitled "We Were There Once Before," written by (Appendix, 326).

NEUTRALITY, address delivered by President Franklin D. Roosevelt before a joint session of the Senate and House of Representatives on the subject of, 10.
Address over the radio delivered by Senator Borah on the subject of (Appendix, 79, 461).
Address over the radio delivered by Senator Brown on the subject of (Appendix, 188).
Address over the radio delivered by Senator Burke on the subject of (Appendix, 82).
Address over the radio delivered by Senator Byrnes on the subject of (Appendix, 551).
Address over the radio delivered by Senator Capper on the subject of (Appendix, 87).
Address delivered by Senator Chandler at Richmond, Va., on the subject of (Appendix, 458).
Address over the radio delivered by Senator Connally on the subject of (Appendix, 226, 246).
Address over the radio delivered by Senator Danaher on the subject of (Appendix, 245).
Address over the radio delivered by Senator Danaher relative to repeal of the arms embargo (Appendix, 717).
Address over the radio delivered by Senator Green on the subject of (Appendix, 563).
Address over the radio delivered by Senator Herring on the subject of (Appendix, 74).
Address over the radio delivered by Senator Johnson of California on the subject of (Appendix, 561).
Address over the radio delivered by Senator Johnson of Colorado on the subject of (Appendix, 61, 145).
Address over the radio delivered by Senator King on the subject of (Appendix, 265, 874).
Address over the radio delivered by Senator La Follette on the subject of (Appendix, 143).
Address over the radio delivered by Senator Lee on the subject of (Appendix, 344).
Address over the radio delivered by Senator Lodge on the subject of (Appendix, 553).
Address over the radio delivered by Senator Lucas on the subject of (Appendix, 290).
Address over the radio delivered by Senator Lundeen on the subject of (Appendix, 246).
Address by Senator McCarran entitled "Labor and Neutrality" (Appendix, 429).
Address over the radio delivered by Senator McNary on the subject of (Appendix, 307).
Addresses over the radio delivered by Senator Nye on the subject of (Appendix, 83, 89, 243).
Address over the radio delivered by Senator Overton on the subject of (Appendix, 246).
Address delivered by Senator Pepper on the subject of (Appendix, 194).
Addresses over the radio delivered by Senators Pepper, McNary, Burke, Frazier, Holt, and Thomas of Utah, on the subject of (Appendix, 418–423).
Addresses over the radio delivered by Senator Pittman on the subject of, 57 (Appendix, 38, 243, 246).

NEUTRALITY—Continued.
Address over the radio delivered by Senator Reynolds on the subject of (Appendix, 552).
Address delivered by Senator Schwellenbach, at Seattle, Wash., on the subject of (Appendix, 185).
Address over the radio delivered by Senator Schwellenbach on the subject of (Appendix, 81, 193).
Address delivered by Senator Taft at Vienna, Ill., on the subject of (Appendix, 75).
Address over the radio delivered by Senator Thomas of Utah on the subject of (Appendix, 466).
Address over the radio delivered by Senator Tobey on the subject of (Appendix, 147).
Address delivered by Senator Truman at Caruthersville, Mo., on the subject of (Appendix, 202).
Address over the radio delivered by Senator Van Nuys on the subject of (Appendix, 246).
Address over the radio delivered by Senator Wagner on the subject of (Appendix, 203).
Address over the radio delivered by Senator Wiley on the subject of (Appendix, 308).
Address over the radio delivered by Representative Barton on the subject of (Appendix, 592).
Address over the radio delivered by Representative Dickstein on the subject of (Appendix, 709).
Address over the radio delivered by Representative Dickstein entitled "American Neutrality and Alien Ideologies" (Appendix, 70).
Address over the radio delivered by Representative Fish on the subject of (Appendix, 66).
Address over the radio delivered by Representative Gillie on the subject of Neutrality and the Constitution (Appendix, 638).
Address over the radio delivered by Representative Kee on the subject of (Appendix, 451).
Address over the radio delivered by Representative Kleberg on the subject of (Appendix, 64).
Address over the radio delivered by Representative Miller on the subject of (Appendix, 218).
Address over the radio delivered by Representative Oliver on the subject of (Appendix, 258, 582).
Address over the radio delivered by Representative Osmers entitled "Why Should We Be Neutral?" (Appendix, 766).
Address over the radio delivered by Representative Randolph on the subject of, 1180, 1181.
Address over the radio delivered by Representative Van Zandt on the subject of (Appendix, 298).
Address over the radio delivered by F. J. Beckman on the subject of (Appendix, 666).
Address delivered by Sam G. Bratton on the subject of (Appendix, 362).
Address over the radio delivered by Edward L. Curran on the subject of (Appendix 275).
Address delivered by Henry S. Fraser on the subject of (Appendix, 590).
Addresses over the radio on the American Forum of the Air participated in by Theodore Granik, Dorothy Thompson, Ernest K. Lindley, Jay Franklin, and Boake Carter, on the subject of (Appendix, 774).
Address delivered by Hugh S. Johnson on the subject of (Appendix, 95).
Address over the radio delivered by Philip F. La Follette on the subject of (Appendix, 189).
Address over the radio delivered by Charles A. Lindbergh on the subject of (Appendix, 301).
Address over the radio delivered by John O'Grady on the subject of (Appendix, 277, 653).
Address delivered by James W. Ryan on the subject of (Appendix, 250).
Address over the radio delivered by John A. Ryan on the subject of (Appendix, 313, 513, 661).
Address over the radio delivered by Alfred E. Smith on the subject of the arms embargo (Appendix, 78, 106).
Address over the radio delivered by Henry L. Stimson, former Secretary of State, on the subject of (Appendix, 198).
Address delivered by Edmund A. Walsh on the subject of, (Appendix, 743).
Address over the radio delivered by Al Williams on the subject of (Appendix, 314).
Address over the radio delivered by Alvin C. York on the subject of (Appendix, 331).
Amendments in House to House Joint Resolution 306 to provide for, 1342, 1343, 1344.
Amendments in Senate to House Joint Resolution 306 to provide for neutrality of the United States in the event of foreign wars, 47, 443, 492, 589, 678, 707, 773, 774, 816, 817, 889.
Amendment in Senate to establish a national neutrality commission, 175.
Analysis of principal provisions of House Joint Resolution 306 relative to, 822.
Article by Senator Davis on the subject of (Appendix, 185).
Article by Senator Thomas of Utah on the subject of (Appendix, 195).

NEUTRALITY—Continued.
Article by S. A. Baldus on the subject of (Appendix, 469).
Article by Jim Blissell on the subject of (Appendix, 550).
Article by John T. Flynn on the subject of (Appendix, 505).
Article by J. G. Johnston entitled "Hands Off the U. S. A.!" (Appendix, 478).
Article by Paul C. Smith entitled "The Way Out for America" (Appendix, 586).
Article by Adolph Starr entitled "Patriotism Versus Neutrality" (Appendix, 537).
Article by Mark Sullivah relative to the effect of proposed neutrality legislation on the merchant marine (Appendix, 264).
Article by William Wilmoth on the subject, American Peace and Neutrality (Appendix, 693).
Article from the New York Herald Tribune on the subject of (Appendix, 45).
Article from the Times-Picayune of New Orleans, La., relative to (Appendix, 325).
Communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives announcing the receipt of a message from the Senate agreeing to the conference asked by the House on House Joint Resolution 306 on the subject of, 1359.
Comparative print of neutrality bills (Appendix 641–652).
Concurrent resolution to print additional copies of hearings before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations during the Seventy-fourth Congress, second session, on bill (S. 3474) relative to (see S. Con. Res. 30*).
Conference report on House Joint Resolution 306 on the subject of (H. Rept. 1475), 1351, 1352, 1381, 1397.
Correspondence between Representative Randolph and E. Worth Higgins on the subject of (Appendix, 218).
Editorials on the subject of, 195, 224, 225, 252, 253 (Appendix, 207).
Editorials by various editors of Arkansas on the subject of (Appendix, 663).
Editorial by S. A. Baldus on the subject of (Appendix, 569).
Editorial by William Hirth on the subject of (Appendix, 311).
Editorial written by Mark P. Haines entitled "Who Opposes Neutrality?" (Appendix, 121).
Editorial written by Peter Molyneaux on the subject of (Appendix, 426).
Editorial by Victor Murdock on the subject of (Appendix, 573).
Editorial from the Baltimore Sun on the subject of (Appendix, 459).
Editorial from the Bergen Evening Record, Hackensack, N. J., on the subject of (Apepndix, 95).
Editorial from the Iowa Legionnaire on the subject of (Appendix, 13).
Editorial from the Knoxville (Tenn.) Journal entitled "Cash-and-Carry Neutrality" (Appendix, 171).
Editorial from the McConnelsville (Ohio) Herald on the subject of (Appendix, 326).
Editorial from the New York Herald Tribune on the subject of (Appendix, 16).
Editorial and an article from the New York World-Telegram on the subject of (Appendix, 630).
Editorials from the Parsons (Kans.) Sun on the subject of Appendix, 41).
Editorial from the Portland (Oreg.) Shopping News on the subject of (Appendix, 11).
Editorial from the Quarterly Bulletin, National Society, Sons of the American Revolution, written by the president general on the subject of (Appendix, 489).
Editorial from the Saturday Evening Post relative to (Appendix, 288, 347).
Editorial from the Washington Post on the subject of (Appendix, 659).
Excerpts from the speech by the President on August 14, 1936, on the subject of, 1247.
Excerpts from testimony by Cordell Hull, Secretary of State, in support of the pending joint resolution on the subject of (Appendix, 855).
Excerpts from Fiore's International Law Codified on the subject of, 1319.
Excerpts from petitions from various organizations in Kansas on the subject of, 45.
Interview by Smedley Butler on the subject of, 409.
Joint resolution to provide for neutrality of the United States in the event of foreign wars (see H. J. Res. 306*).
Letter from Senator Bailey to the people of North Carolina on the subject of (Appendix, 184).
Letter written by Senator Holt on the subject of (Appendix, 41).
Letter from Senator Murray on the subject of (Appendix, 149).
Letter from Representative Gehrmann to citizens of Wisconsin relative to (Appendix, 13).
Letter from Representative Hinshaw to the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on House Joint Resolution 306 to provide for, 1346.
Letter from Representative Martin J. Kennedy to Senator Wagner entitled "Neutrality Minus Partisanship" (Appendix, 70).

NEUTRALITY—Continued.
Letters from William B. Barry on the subject of (Appendix, 329).
Letter from Frank S. Davis, manager, relative to the act providing for (Appendix, 531).
Letter from Howard E. Grosvenor on the subject of (Appendix, 175).
Letter from Charles D. Hilles on the subject of (Appendix, 111).
Letter from Robert Lansing, Secretary of State during the World War, dated August 12, 1915, and addressed to the Ambassador of the United States in Austria-Hungary, on the subject of, 71, 146.
Letter from the Secretary of State relative to the proposed repeal of the arms embargo against Spain (Appendix, 597).
Letter from Edward E. Kennedy on the subject of the farmer and neutrality (Appendix, 692).
Letter from Cloyd Laporte on the subject of (Appendix, 303, 393).
Letter from A. Lawrence Lowell on the subject of (Appendix, 466).
Letter from John A. Matthews on the subject of (Appendix, 168).
Letters from John Bassett Moore and others relative to Appendix, 761).
Letter from William Allen White, and a joint statement by prominent clergymen, on the subject of (Appendix, 685).
Letter from the Universal Dental Co., relative to the cash-and-carry section of the act providing for, 627, 628.
Letter and resolution received from the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States on the subject of (Appendix, 69).
List of supporters of the pending legislation concerning (Appendix, 228).
List of names of citizens of the southeastern States who favor repeal of the arms embargo (Appendix, 257).
List of articles considered as contraband by Great Britain during the World War, 1271.
Motion in Senate to recommit House Joint Resolution 306 providing for, 233.
News letter by Representative Mason on the subject of (Appendix, 640).
Poll taken by the Wheeling (W. Va.) Intelligencer on the neutrality issue (Appendix, 431).
Proclamation by President Roosevelt declaring that a state of war exists between Germany and France and certain other countries (Appendix, 787).
Proclamation of President George Washington establishing the principle of (Appendix, 121).
Radio discussion participated in by Senators Schwellenbach, Overton, Holt, Minton, Pepper, and Representative Van Zandt on the subject of (Appendix, 407).
Remarks in House on the subject of, 1066, 1067, 1378 (Appendix, 583, 585, 594, 631, 632).
Remarks in House on House Joint Resolution 306 to provide for, 33, 35, 78, 135, 139, 140, 142, 209, 255, 260, 302, 337, 344, 350, 384, 473, 479, 522, 533, 585, 616, 758, 763, 767, 810, 864, 865, 866, 875, 961, 1036, 1044 (Appendix, 5, 9, 16, 29, 45, 46, 47, 91, 99, 104, 107, 109, 118, 122, 137, 141, 172, 183, 221, 223, 231, 233, 319, 358, 365, 375, 381, 383, 438, 488, 502, 530).
Remarks in House relative to the pamphlet printed by the House Committee on Foreign Affairs on the subject of, 255.
Remarks in House relative to the proposed printing of the Neutrality Act of 1937, the House Joint Resolution 306 as it passed the House, and the same resolution as amended and passed by the Senate, 1059.
Remarks in House on motion to instruct conferees on House Joint Resolution 306 on the subject of, 1104, 1160, 1208, 1241, 1284 (Appendix, 668, 680, 683, 687, 694).
Remarks in House on conference report on House Joint Resolution 306 to provide for, 1275, 1284, 1324, 1325, 1330, 1337, 1386, 1387 (Appendix, 752, 754, 763, 764, 767, 787, 794, 800, 803, 810, 813, 816, 844, 857, 862, 884).
Remarks in House on House Resolution 320 to take from the Speaker's table House Joint Resolution 306, disagree to Senate amendments, and request a conference with the Senate (Appendix, 583).
Remarks in Senate on House Joint Resolution 306 providing for, 47, 50, 65, 66, 83, 95, 104, 110, 150, 173, 224, 234, 266, 309, 355, 397, 443, 490, 541, 590, 628, 678, 708, 741, 775, 820, 889, 965, 1281, 1354, 1355 (Appendix, 128, 129, 262).
Report of the American Bar Association on the subject of (Appendix, 508).
Reports of the Civil Aeronautics Authority and the Maritime Commission on the subject of (Appendix, 267).
Report of the Committee on Foreign Relations in Senate on House Joint Resolution 306 providing for neutrality of the United States in event of foreign wars (S. Rept. 1155), 46, 58.
Report of the national affairs committee of the National Republican Club on the subject of, 806.
Resolution to appoint a special committee to investigate activities of foreign agents affecting neutrality of the United States with regard to the European war (see S. Res. 186).

NEUTRALITY—Continued.
Resolution to take House Joint Resolution 306 from the Speaker's table, disagree to Senate amendments, and request a conference with the Senate (see H. Res. 320*).
Resolution to print additional copies of hearings before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations on the subject of (see S. Res. 188*).
Resolution adopted by the twenty-first national convention of the American Legion on the subject of (Appendix, 437).
Resolution of the Long Beach Democratic Club of California endorsing the cash-and-carry amendment (Appendix, 784).
Resolution of citizens of northeast Philadelphia on the subject of (Appendix, 140).
Sermon preached by Edward W. Stimson on the moral basis for (Appendix, 97).
Statement by Senator Bailey relative to neutrality and the merchant marine (Appendix, 262).
Statement by Senator Glass, appearing in the New York Times, on the subject of (Appendix, 605).
Statements by Senator Walsh on the subject of (Appendix, 571).
Statement by Representative Mundt concerning (Appendix, 860, 861).
Statement made by Cordell Hull, Secretary of State, at a press conference on the subject of, 340.
Statement of principles concerning neutrality appearing in the American Journal of International Law, 1113, 1118.
Statement by Herbert Hoover on the subject of, 320.
Statements by John Bassett Moore and James W. Garner concerning, 122, 129.
Statement by William C. Morey concerning the sale of munitions, 123.
Statement of a conference of western interests relative to the effect of section 2 (A) of the proposed neutrality law on Pacific Coast States (Appendix, 296).
Tables showing expenditures for naval aircraft and munitions (Appendix, 727).
Telegram from Ross McIntyre on the subject of (Appendix, 702).
Text of the act as it existed on April 30, 1939, relative to, 63.
Text of House Joint Resolution 306 on the subject of, 1024.
Text of Senate Report 1155 on House Joint Resolution 306 providing for neutrality of the United States in event of foreign wars, 58.

NEUTROLOGY AND NEUTRALITY, address over the radio delivered by Representative Smith of Illinois on the subject of (Appendix, 26).

NEWARK (N. J.) SUNDAY CALL (newspaper), editorial entitled "Congress Should Stay" (Appendix, 171).

NEW DEAL, editorial from the Henry County (Ohio) Signal entitled "The New Deal and the Farmer" (Appendix, 468).
Remarks in House entitled "New Deal War on Business Goes On" (Appendix, 832).

NEW DEAL ECONOMY, remarks in House relative to (Appendix, 655).

NEW ENGLAND, remarks in House relative to light and power rates (Appendix, 626).

NEW JERSEY, memorial of legislature urging legislation to prevent profiteering, 82, 223.

NEW ORLEANS, LA., authorize acquisition of land for cemeterial purposes at (see bill H. R. 7578).

NEW ORLEANS (LA.) TIMES-PICAYUNE, article on the subject of neutrality appearing in (Appendix, 325).

NEWSPAPERS, address by Representative Bolles delivered at the University of Illinois on the subject of (Appendix, 493).
Editorials on the subject of neutrality appearing in certain, 195, 223, 224, 252, 253 (Appendix, 227).
Excerpts commenting on signs of prosperity, 707.

NEWTON, ROBERT E., report of the Comptroller General of the United States concerning the claim of, 30, 41.

NEW YORK (city), address delivered by James A. Farley, Postmaster General, at the dedication of the North Beach Airport at (Appendix, 359).
Address delivered by Edgar S. Gorrell at the dedication of the North Beach Airport at (Appendix 412).
Remarks in House relative to the promotion of cultural arts and the exhibitions in the Riverside Museum in (Appendix, 805).
Remarks in House relative to the police department of, 537.

NEW YORK DAILY NEWS, article by Ed Sullivan entitled "Soliloquy" appearing in (Appendix, 598).

NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE, article on the subject of neutrality appearing in (Appendix, 16, 45).
Editorial favoring appointment of a special committee to investigate the emergency powers of the Chief Executive (Appendix, 501).

NEW YORK SUN (newspaper), editorial entitled "He Is an American" appearing in (Appendix, 23, 86).

NEW YORK TIMES (newspaper), articles concerning the arrival at New York of American refugees from Europe, 927.
Article entitled "The Poll Tax as a Restriction on Suffrage" appearing in (Appendix, 115).

NEW YORK TIMES—Continued.
Article commenting on Bishop Sheil's radio address on neutrality appearing in (Appendix, 155).
Editorial concerning E. M. House appearing in (Appendix, 334).

NEW YORK WORLD-TELEGRAM, editorial and an article concerning neutrality appearing in (Appendix, 631).

NICARAGUA, excerpts from arms-embargo laws of (Appendix, 354).

NICHOLS, JACK (*a Representative from Oklahoma*).
Attended, 8.
Remarks by, on
Neutrality, 1101.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

NIHILISM, address over the radio delivered by Maurice S. Sheehy on the challenge of (Appendix, 151).

NORRELL, W. F. (*a Representative from Arkansas*).
Attended, 8
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

NORRIS, GEORGE W. (*a Senator from Nebraska*).
Attended, 3.
Editorial from Manchester Guardian Weekly on the forces against Hitler (Appendix, 279).
Radio address by Rt. Rev. Msgr. John O'Grady on neutrality (Appendix, 277).
Radio address on American neutrality, by (Appendix, 128).
Review of book on the life of (Appendix, 423).
Statement made in 1917 on America's entry into World War, 319.
Bills and joint resolutions introduced by
Gay, Mrs. Mary S.: for relief (see bill S. 2976), 47.
McCandless, Affie W.: to pension (see bill S. 2996), 1082.
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 798, 799, 840, 841, 857, 900.
——— sale of poison gases, 900, 901.
Neutrality, 172, 202, 203, 367, 840, 841, 857, 861, 900, 901, 994 1002, 1003, 1006, 1008, 1032.
President of the United States: proclaiming a state of war by, 840, 841.
War referendum, 1002, 1003.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

NORRIS, J. GILBERT, article concerning preparedness written by, 415.

NORTH BEACH AIRPORT, NEW YORK CITY, address delivered by James A. Farley, Postmaster General, at the dedication of (Appendix, 359).
Address delivered by Edgar S. Gorrell at the dedication of (Appendix, 412).

NORTHERN LAKES STATES REGIONAL COMMITTEE, remarks in House relative to the report of (Appendix, 373).

NORTON, MARY T. (*a Representative from New Jersey*).
Attended, 8.
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 1191.
Neutrality, 1191.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

NORWAY, excerpts from arms-embargo laws of (Appendix, 354).

"NOTES ON A MORAL WAR," editorial by H. L. Mencken entitled (Appendix, 534).

"NO TIME TO SHOW THE YELLOW FEATHER," editorial from the Marine News entitled (Appendix, 447).

NYE, GERALD P. (*a Senator from North Dakota*).
Attended, 3.
Address by Hon. William E. Borah on proposed neutrality legislation (Appendix, 79).
Address by Dr. John Haynes Holmes on neutrality (Appendix 199).
Address at Carnegie Hall, New York City, October 11, 1939, on neutrality, 741.
Article by Herbert Hoover entitled "Defeat of the Allies Impossible," 365.
Article by John T. Flynn on neutrality (Appendix, 505).
Article by Porter Sargent on British propaganda in the United States (Appendix, 681).
Chronology of American foreign policy from July 1937 prepared by (Appendix, 522).
Discussion of neutrality on American Forum of the Air by Senators Nye, Pittman, Connally, Danaher, Lundeen, and Van Nuys (Appendix, 243).
Editorial from Saturday Evening Post on neutrality (Appendix, 347).
Editorial by H. L. Mencken on neutrality legislation (Appendix, 459).
Editorial by H. L. Mencken on subject Notes on a Moral War (Appendix, 534).
Editorial from Saturday Evening Post on European conflicts and arms embargo (Appendix, 534).
Letter from former Secretary of the Treasury McAdoo to President Wilson relative to loans to Allied Powers, 373.
Letter from Robert Lansing to President Wilson regarding loans to foreign governments for purchase of munitions, 851.

NYE, GERALD P.—Continued.
Radio address on proposed neutrality legislation (Appendix, 83).
Radio address entitled, "Save American Neutrality" (Appendix, 89).
Radio address on pending neutrality legislation, by, 741.
Radio address by Hon. John A. Danaher on proposed repeal of arms embargo (Appendix, 717).
Radio address by Hon. Hiram W. Johnson on neutrality (Appendix, 561).
Radio address by Hon. John H. Overton on neutrality (Appendix, 247).
Remarks in Senate relative to resolution and remarks on Spanish Civil War by, 747, 748, 749, 751, 752.
Statement in 1938 relative to Spanish Civil War, 753.
Table showing American merchant ships sunk from January 27, 1915, to April 4, 1917, 381.
Telegram from Frank Gannett on emergency executive powers (Appendix, 464).
Text of S. J. Res. 288: arms embargo on Spain, 753.
Amendments offered by, to
Neutrality (H. J. Res. 306): to amend, 816, 889, 980, 981, 982.
Remarks by, on
Allied powers: loans to, 368, 369, 370, 376, 378, 379, 380.
——— letter from Secretary Lansing, 373.
Arms embargo, 112, 113, 360, 361, 362, 365, 366, 367, 374, 375, 376, 653, 654, 678, 728, 729, 730, 731, 732, 734, 735, 736, 737, 738, 755, 846, 854, 980, 981, 985.
——— article by Hugh S. Johnson, 360, 361.
——— article by Arthur Krock, 360, 361.
——— article from London Times, 360, 361.
——— destruction of American ships 1917, 737, 738, 739.
——— excerpts from munitions hearings, 370, 371, 372.
——— letter from W. J. Bryan to J. P. Morgan, 369.
——— loans to Allies, 368.
——— statement by George Bernard Shaw, 382.
Baker, Newton D., 730.
Du Pont Co., 731.
Export Control Board, 846–851.
Lansing, Robert: communication to Allied governments from, 378.
Midvale Steel Co., munitions manufacturers, 736, 737.
Morgan, J. P. & Co., 733, 734, 735, 736, 738, 739.
——— war loans, 368, 369, 370, 376, 377, 378, 379.
——— list of munitions bought for Great Britain by, 733, 734.
——— purchase of rifles for Great Britain by, 846, 851.
Munitions industry during World War, 730, 731, 732, 735, 736, 737, 738, 739, 747, 751, 753.
Neutrality, 112, 113, 163, 192, 360, 361, 362, 365, 366, 367, 368, 369, 374, 375, 376, 728, 729, 730, 731, 732, 734, 735, 736, 737, 738, 747, 748, 750, 751, 755, 846, 854, 980, 981, 985.
——— reply to Mr. Minton, 775.
——— statement by President Roosevelt on Japan, 163.
Page, Walter Hines, 851.
——— cables to State Department from, 376, 377, 380.
Spain: civil war in, 747.
Stettinius, E. R., 737.
Warburg, Paul M.: letter regarding foreign credits, 378.
Wilson, Woodrow, 380.
——— statements prior and during World War, 380, 381.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

O'BRIEN, JOSEPH J. (*a Representative from New York*).
Attended, 8.
Address by Frank Gannett at Indiana State Fair, Indianapolis, Ind. (Appendix, 490).
Address by J. Edgar Hoover at San Francisco, Calif. (Appendix, 283).
Address by J. Edgar Hoover at New York Herald Tribune Forum (Appendix, 499).
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

O'BRIEN BROS., INC., report of the Comptroller General of the United States concerning the claim of, 41, 44.

O'CONNOR, JAMES F. (*a Representative from Montana*).
Attended, 8.
Editorial from Livingston (Mont.) Enterprise on the arms embargo (Appendix, 170).
Remarks by, on
Agricultural prices, 21, 22.
Arms embargo, 144, 952, 953, 954, 1134, 1135, 1136, 1257 (Appendix, 764).
Farm prices, 943, 944.
Kelly, R. J., 1136.
Neutrality, 813, 955, 956, 961, 1134, 1135, 1136, 1257 (Appendix, 764).
Permission to address the House, 350, 578.
President of the United States: emergency powers of, 1135.
Reciprocal trade agreements, 955, 956, 957.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

O'CONNOR, JOHN J. (*a former Representative from New York*)
Letter to the editor of the New York Sun on subject of banshees (Appendix, 208).

O'DAY, CAROLINE (*a Representative from New York*).
Attended, 8.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

O'GRADY, JOHN, address over the radio concerning neutrality problems delivered by (Appendix, 277, 658).

OHIO, relief of the State of (see bill H. R. 5118*).

OIL, address delivered by Representative Cole of Maryland before the Independent Petroleum Association of America on the subject of (Appendix, 442).
Address delivered by Harold L. Ickes, Secretary of the Interior, relative to (Appendix, 537).
Address delivered by Leon C. Phillips, Governor of Oklahoma, concerning regulation of production of (Appendix, 543).
Bill to amend act relative to the processing tax on certain oils imported from island possessions of the United States (see bill S. 3004).
Remarks in House relative to production of crude oil in Texas (Appendix, 789).
Remarks in House relative to the effect of the trade agreement with Venezuela on the United States oil industry (Appendix, 833).

O'LEARY, JAMES A. (*a Representative from New York*).
Attended, 8.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

OLIVER, JAMES C. (*a Representative from Maine*).
Attended, 8.
Address at Thomas Brackett Reed memorial services, Bowdoin College, Maine, by (Appendix, 855, 856).
Memorial exercises at Bowdoin College commemorating the one-hundredth anniversary of the birth of Thomas Brackett Reed (Appendix, 855).
Radio address on arms embargo by (Appendix, 258).
Radio address on subject of domestic problems and the war crisis (Appendix, 582).
Remarks at Bowdoin College, Maine, on the life of Thomas Brackett Reed (Appendix, 401).
Statement by Henry Ford on the relation of gold to war (Appendix, 836).
Statistics on unemployment (Appendix, 840, 841).
Remarks by, on
Money shortage and unemployment (Appendix, 836).
Reed, Thomas Brackett: birthday anniversary of, 383.
Unemployment and money shortage (Appendix, 836).
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

OLSON, R. A. (president, Minnesota State Federation of Labor), telegram favoring referendum on war received from, 409.

O'MAHONEY, JOSEPH C. (*a Senator from Wyoming*).
Attended, 3.
Address at the New York Herald Tribune forum on controlling war profits by (Appendix, 479).
Radio address by Senator Byrnes on neutrality (Appendix, 551).
Text of resolution (S. Res. 69)—Senate confirmation of reciprocal trade agreements, 1086, 1087.
Remarks by, on
Reciprocal trade agreements, 1086, 1087.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

"ONCE BURNED," editorial from the Saturday Evening Post entitled (Appendix, 12).

O'NEAL, EDWARD A., letter relative to the agricultural program of the Tennessee Valley Authority written by (Appendix, 780).

O'NEAL, EMMET (*a Representative from Kentucky*).
Attended, 8.
Appointed on funeral committee, 148.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

"ONE HUNDRED-PERCENT PROTECTION AGAINST COMPETITIVE IMPORTS PRODUCED BY ALIEN PEONS AND SWEATSHOPS," article by Richard A. Staderman entitled (Appendix, 627).

ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT, statistics relative to appropriations for, 1268.

OREGON, article from the Oregon Voter relative to the effect in Oregon of reciprocal trade agreements (Appendix, 391).

OREGON SUNDAY JOURNAL (newspaper), editorial on the subject of power control by captains of munitions and political leaders appearing in (Appendix, 758).

ORIENT, article from the magazine Asia entitled "The Month in the Orient" (Appendix, 600).

OSMERS, FRANK C., JR. (*a Representative from New Jersey*).
Attended, 8.
Address at the American Small Business Day, New York World's Fair, on the subject of war and American business (Appendix, 765).
Radio address on neutrality (Appendix, 765).
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

O'TOOLE, DONALD L. (*a Representative from New York*).
Attended, 8.
Petitions and papers presented by, from
Citizens and individuals, 43.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

"OUR DUTY AS AMERICANS," address delivered by John Hamilton, chairman of the Republican Nation Committee, entitled (Appendix, 190).

"OUR EXPENSIVE GOVERNMENT," editorial from the Minneapolis Star-Journal entitled, 404.

"OUR HERITAGE OF JUSTICE," address delivered by Frank Murphy, Attorney General of the United States, entitled (Appendix, 110).

"OUR MIDDLE CLASS STATESMAN—DEMOCRACY'S NORRIS," review by William Allen White of the article entitled (Appendix, 423).

"OUR PRINCE OF PEACE," article by Harry H. Schlacht entitled (Appendix, 789).

OVERTON, JOHN H. (*a Senator from Louisiana*).
Attended, 3.
Radio address on neutrality by (Appendix, 247).
Radio discussion on neutrality (Appendix, 407).
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 120, 779, 832, 1022.
Neutrality, 55, 56, 115–120, 779, 832, 1002, 1022.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

OWEN, ROBERT L., letter transmitting petition for adjudication of claims of the Cherokee Indians received from, 355.

PACE, STEPHEN (*a Representative from Georgia*).
Bills and joint resolutions introduced by
Jenkins, Emory N.: for relief (see bill H. R. 7602), 964.
Remarks by, on
Great Britain: sale of cotton to, 1388.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

PACIFIC COAST STATES, statement of a conference of western interests relative to the effect of section 2 (A) of the proposed neutrality law on (Appendix, 296).

PACIFIC NORTHWEST DEFENSES, address over the radio delivered by Representative Smith of Washington on the subject of (Appendix, 335).

PAGE, ROBERT N. (*a former Representative from North Carolina*).
Statement on neutrality by, 322.

PAN-AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR, remarks in House concerning (Appendix, 397).

PAN AMERICAN MOVEMENT, address delivered by Cordell Hull, Secretary of State, at the New York World's Fair, concerning the significance of (Appendix, 60).

PANKEN, JACOB, letter concerning the arms embargo written by (Appendix, 70).

PARKERSBURG (W. VA.) NEWS, article entitled "Keep America Out of War" appearing in (Appendix, 500).

PARSONS, CLAUDE V. (*a Representative from Illinois*).
Attended, 8.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

PARSONS (KANS.) SUN (newspaper), editorials on the subject of neutrality appearing in (Appendix, 41).

PARTISANSHIP IN WAR CRISIS, statement by Frank Knox relative to (Appendix, 45).

PASTORIUS DAY, address delivered by Senator Davis at Philadelphia, Pa., in connection with the celebration of (Appendix, 196).
Address over the radio delivered by Theodore H. Hoffman in connection with the celebration of (Appendix, 208).

PATENTS, letter and exhibits from Bernard C. Whitman concerning certain applications for letters patent in re Irving A. Whitman, as trustee of Vincent I. Whitman, 1279.

"PATH TO PEACE," address over the radio delivered by Senator Barbour entitled (Appendix, 506).

PATMAN, WRIGHT (a *Representative from Texas*).
Attended, 8.
Summary and conclusions of Federal Trade Commission in recent motor-car industry inquiry (Appendix, 473).
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

PATRICK, LUTHER (*a Representative from Alabama*).
Attended, 8.
Discussion of neutrality: during the American forum of the air program (Appendix, 774).
——— Boake Carter (Appendix, 776).
——— Jay Franklin (Appendix, 775).
——— Ernest K. Lindley (Appendix, 775).
——— Dorothy Thompson (Appendix, 775).
Bills and joint resolutions introduced by
Public lands: providing for disposal of (see bill H. R. 7621), 1397.
Remarks by, on
Agricultural prices, 20.
Arms embargo, 342, 526, 533, 534, 535, 536, 868, 869, 870, 1125, 1161, 1173, 1240.
——— effect on China and Japan, 1378.
China: effect of neutrality law on, 1378.
Electric power, 673.
National Committee to Keep America Out of War, 533.
Neutrality, 342, 533, 534, 535, 761, 762, 769, 812, 869, 870, 1125, 1161, 1173, 1959.
——— effect on China and Japan, 1378.
Permission to address the House, 488.
Silver Shirts, 876.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

PATRIOTISM, address delivered by Frank Murphy, Attorney General of the United States, entitled "The Test of Patriotism" (Appendix, 672).

"PATRIOTISM VERSUS NEUTRALITY," article by Adolph Starr entitled (Appendix, 537).

PATTON, NAT (*a Representative from Texas*).
Attended, 8.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

PATTON, R. G. (national welfare officer of the Military Order of the Purple Heart), letter relative to providing a referendum on war (Appendix, 472).

PAYNE, MARY PAULINE, pension (see bill H. R. 7126*).

PEACE, address over the radio delivered by Senator Barbour entitled "The Path to Peace" (Appendix, 506).
Address over the radio delivered by Senator Pittman entitled "Peace Assured Through Senate" (Appendix, 603).
Address over the radio delivered by Senator Wiley relative to mobilization for (Appendix, 345).
Address over the radio delivered by Edward Lodge Curran relative to the crusade for (Appendix, 275, 374).
Article from the Washington Evening Star commenting on the book entitled "America's Chance of Peace" (Appendix, 696).
Article by William Wilmoth on the subject of American peace and neutrality (Appendix, 693).
Article from the York (Pa.) Gazette and Daily relative to preservation of peace and democracy (Appendix, 282).
Editorial by David Lawrence proposing an honorably negotiated peace (Appendix, 718).
Editorial appearing in the Titan News of Bellefonte, Pa., on the subject of (Appendix, 32).
Editorial from L'Osservatore Romano relative to the peace proposals of Pope Pius XII and President Roosevelt (Appendix, 615).
Letter from John Anson Ford on the subject of (Appendix, 230).
Remarks in House on the subject of (Appendix, 9).
Remarks in House entitled "After the War, Peace" (Appendix, 769).
Remarks in House entitled "The Task of the People in Maintaining Peace" (Appendix, 758).
Speech delivered by Representative Fish before the Interparliamentary Union Conference at Oslo, Norway, on the subject of (Appendix, 8).

"PEACE, BE STILL," remarks in House entitled (Appendix, 79).

PEACE COLLEGE, editorials by Manchester Boddy urging creation of (Appendix, 327).

PEACE CONFERENCE. *See* HOSTILE NATIONS.

PEARSON, HERRON (*a Representative from Tennessee*).
Attended, 8.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

PENNSYLVANIA, editorial from the Pittsburgh Press entitled "James Runs for President at Public Expense," 808 (Appendix, 482).
Remarks in House relative to the Democratic and Republican administrations in, 656.
Report of a study of living costs in the vicinity of State College (Appendix, 872).
Statistics relative to W. P. A. employment in (Appendix, 873).

PENSIONS, article by S. Howard Leech on the subject of (Appendix, 324).

PEPPER, CLAUDE (*a Senator from Florida*).
Attended, 3.
Article from New York Herald Tribune on neutrality (Appendix, 45).
Article by Felix Cotten on Latin-American trade (Appendix, 732).
Excerpts from address on neutrality at mass meeting in National Press Auditorium, Washington, D. C. (Appendix, 194).
Radio discussion with Senator McNary on neutrality (Appendix, 418).
Radio discussion on neutrality (Appendix, 407).
Tables relative to Latin-American trade (Appendix, 733).
Amendments offered by, to
Neutrality (H. J. Res. 306): to amend, 1020.
Bills and joint resolutions introduced by
American republics: to improve relations between (see S. J. Res. 187), 150.
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 179, 289, 291, 324, 331, 517, 518, 519, 739, 747, 748, 1001, 1020.
——— aircraft parts, 1020.
Neutrality, 179, 180, 181, 182, 289, 291, 324, 331, 517, 518, 519, 739, 747, 748, 1020.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

PERKINS, FRANCES (Secretary of Labor), remarks in House relative to, 661.

PERKINS, MILO, remarks in House relative to (Appendix, 861).

PERKINS GINS, OF MEMPHIS, TENN., relief (see bill H. R. 7573).

PERNICIOUS POLITICAL ACTIVITIES, order of Senate to print opinions by the Attorney General interpreting the act to prevent (S. Doc. 135), 1351.
Text of interpretations and summary of the so-called Hatch law relating to (S. Doc. 135) (Appendix, 712).

PERSHING, GEN. JOHN J., letter denying the allegation that the United States pays rent for ground used for cemeteries of American soldiers in France (Appendix, 262).
Statement condemning chemical warfare, 899.
PERU, excerpt from arms-embargo laws of (Appendix, 354).
PETERSON, HUGH (*a Representative from Georgia*).
Attended, 8.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.
PETERSON, J. HARDIN (*a Representative from Florida*).
Attended, 8.
Bills and joint resolutions introduced by
Sarasota Pass, Bradenton, Fla.: to bridge, 1347.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.
PFEIFER, JOSEPH L. (*a Representative from New York*).
Attended, 8.
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 1141, 1142 (Appendix, 800).
Neutrality, 1141, 1142 (Appendix, 800).
——— statements by S. A. Baldus and others (Appendix, 800).
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.
PHILADELPHIA, PA., remarks in House relative to the Democratic mayoralty campaign dinner at $100 a plate held at, 808.
PHILADELPHIA EVENING BULLETIN (newspaper), article by Carl W. McArdle entitled "Churchill Decries Lies," appearing in, 686, 687.
PHILADELPHIA INQUIRER (newspaper) article entitled "A Country Sick of Strikes" appearing in, 483.
PHILADELPHIA RECORD (newspaper), statement concerning absence of submarines in the Caribbean area, appearing in, 590.
PHILIPPINE ISLANDS, amend act relative to the processing tax on certain oils imported from (see bill S. 3004).
Message from President Quezon to the legislature recommending that the Philippine Government pledge its loyalty to the United States in the present emergency, 898.
PHILLIPS, LEON C. (Governor of Oklahoma), address concerning the regulation of the production of oil, delivered by (Appendix, 543).
PIERCE, WALLACE E. (*a Representative from New York*).
Attended, 8.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.
PIERCE, WALTER M. (*a Representative from Oregon*).
Attended, 8.
Address by Dr. Paul J. Raver on subject of the Bonneville power project (Appendix, 153).
Book review by Carl D. Thompson of book entitled "Who Gets the Money," 863.
Remarks by, on
Agricultural prices, 23.
Arms embargo, 529, 530, 612, 613, 1300 (Appendix, 813).
Bonneville power project, 613 (Appendix, 153).
——— statement by Dr. Paul J. Paver, 613.
Electric power rates, 669, 670, 673.
Neutrality, 485, 613, 1300 (Appendix, 813).
Permission to address the House, 383.
Portland General Electric Co., 614.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.
PIKE, ZEBULON MONTGOMERY, address over the radio delivered by Harry H. Woodring, Secretary of War, concerning (Appendix, 100).
PINCHOT, GIFFORD, address over the radio concerning the repeal of the arms embargo delivered by (Appendix, 520).
Letter on the subject of repeal of the arms embargo (Appendix, 746).
PIPER, GRACE MARIE, poem relating to the arms embargo written by (Appendix, 388).
PITTENGER, WILLIAM A. (*a Representative from Minnesota*).
Attended, 8.
Article by Walter Lippmann on neutrality (Appendix, 119).
Remarks by, on
Agricultural prices, 21.
Argentine trade agreement, 569.
Arms embargo, 1239.
Communist activities, 659.
Congress: urgent legislation, 40.
Dies Committee on Un-American Activities, 886.
Domestic problems should have attention of Congress (Appendix, 452).
Finland: threatened attack by Russia, 253.
Foreign trade agreements (Appendix, 941).
Logan, M. M.: tribute to (Appendix, 174).
Neutrality Act, 1939, 147, 394, 525, 873, 1239 (Appendix, 119).
Northern Lakes States Regional Committee (Appendix, 373).
St. Lawrence Waterway (Appendix, 671).
Un-American activities, 1375.
Uncompleted legislation, 302.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.
PITTMAN, KEY (*a Senator from Nevada*).
Attended, 3.
Appointed conferee, 1282.
Appointed on Committee to Conduct the President, 9.
PITTMAN, KEY—Continued.
Article by Hon. Elbert D. Thomas on neutrality (Appendix, 195).
Discussion of neutrality on American Forum of the Air by Senators Nye, Pittman, Connally, Danaher, Lundeen, and Van Nuys (Appendix, 243).
Letters from President Roosevelt to President of Poland, King of Italy, and Adolf Hitler relative to bombardment of civilians (Appendix, 142).
List of articles of war issued by the German Government, 65.
List of articles of war issued by Great Britain, 65.
Proclamation of President Roosevelt enumerating arms, ammunition, and implements of war, 56, 57.
Radio address during American Forum of the Air program on subject of neutrality, 56, 57.
Radio address on foreign wars and neutrality legislation (Appendix, 38).
Radio address on the Neutrality Act as passed by the Senate (Appendix, 603).
Radio address by Hon. Henry L. Stimson on neutrality (Appendix, 198).
Radio address by Hon. William H. King on neutrality (Appendix, 265).
Statement by Hon. Josiah W. Bailey on the effect of pending neutrality legislation on the Merchant Marine (Appendix, 262).
Statement by Secretary of State on neutrality at press conference September 14, 1939 (Appendix, 142).
Text of Senate report 1155 on House Joint Resolution 306—Neutrality Act of 1939, 58.
Text of Senate Joint Resolution 51, Seventy-fifth Congress—arms embargo law, 63.
Text of resolution (H. J. Res. 306)—Neutrality Act 1939, as reported by Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, 59.
Text of amendment to House Joint Resolution 306—Neutrality Act of 1939, 443.
Amendments offered by, to
Neutrality (H. J. Res. 306): to amend, 443, 603, 645, 777, 778, 780, 781, 788, 789, 1020, 1023.
Remarks by, on
Acts of Congress: effect of concurrent resolution on, 225, 226.
Armed merchant ships, 965, 966, 969.
Arms embargo, 50, 52, 68, 69, 89, 112, 116, 117, 118, 120, 127, 128, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 169, 171, 172, 180, 194, 204, 226, 227, 228, 230, 231, 233, 234, 272, 273, 274, 293, 314, 315, 318, 319, 438, 439, 441, 443, 460, 602, 603, 650, 651, 652, 746, 776, 777, 778, 779, 780, 781, 785, 786, 787, 788, 789, 791, 792, 829, 830, 835, 836, 854, 903, 904, 916, 931, 965, 966, 971, 972, 979, 980, 981, 986, 1005, 1006, 1007, 1017, 1018, 1024.
——— Canadian trade, 779, 780.
——— cash-and-carry amendment, 777, 778.
——— conference report, 1355.
——— sale of poison gases, 903, 904.
——— shipments to neutral ports, 785, 786, 787, 791, 792.
——— text of cash-and-carry amendment, 443.
Bermuda, 785, 786.
City of Flint (steamship), 830.
Extension of remarks, 4.
Great Britain: trade treaty with Russia, 651, 652.
Johnson Act: credits to defaulting nations, 53, 54.
Lindbergh, Col. Charles A.: address by, 6, 441.
Neutrality Act 1939, 50, 52, 68, 69, 89, 112, 116, 117, 118, 120, 127, 128, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 169, 171, 172, 180, 194, 204, 226, 227, 228, 230, 231, 233, 234, 272, 273, 274, 293, 314, 315, 318, 319, 438, 439, 441, 443, 460, 603, 650, 651, 652, 777, 778, 779, 780, 781, 785, 786, 787, 788, 789, 791, 792, 829, 830, 834, 835, 854, 903, 904, 965, 981, 982, 989, 990, 966.
——— appointment of conferees, 1282.
——— conference report, 1355.
——— explanation of bill, 50, 52, 56.
——— meeting of conferees, 1282.
——— motion of Mr. Tobey to recommit, 233, 234.
——— order of procedure, 776.
——— preamble, 1027, 1028, 1029.
——— proclamation by the President enumerating munitions of war, 56, 57.
——— statement by Senator Borah in 1917, 51.
Obligations of foreign governments, 460.
Reciprocal trade agreements, 1088.
Reports made by, from
Committee on conference:
Neutrality (H. J. Res. 306, Rept. 1474), 1352.
Committee on Foreign Relations:
Neutrality Act, 1939 (H. J. Res. 306, Rept. 1155), 46.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.
PITTSBURGH PRESS, editorial entitled "James Runs for President at Public Expense" appearing in, 808, 809 (Appendix, 482).
PLANT DISEASES, combat (see bill S. 2986).
Bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with State and local agencies in carrying out operations against (see bill H. R. 7605).

PLUMLEY, CHARLES A. (*a Representative from Vermont*).
Attended, 8.
Address before New Hampshire Manufacturers Association, Manchester, N. H. (Appendix, 175).
Article by Herbert Hoover on European war (Appendix, 557).
Statement by Thomas Hewes on neutrality (Appendix, 540).
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 1164, 1339.
Bolton, Chester C.: tribute to, 1080.
Neutrality, 1164, 1339.
Reed, Thomas Brackett: tribute, 575, 576.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

POAGE, WILLIAM R. (*a Representative from Texas*).
Attended, 8.
Bills and joint resolutions introduced by
Cotton research award fund: to establish (see bill H. R. 7623), 1397.
Farmers: to provide loans for soil-conservation purposes to (see bill H. R. 7623), 1397.
Remarks, by on
Arms embargo, 35.
Foreign policy of United States, 35.
Neutrality, 35, 341, 342.
Oil industry (Appendix, 789).
Texas: tax on oil in (Appendix, 789).
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

POISON GASES, amendment and remarks in Senate relative to prohibiting the export of, 899.
Category VI and category VII of the President's proclamation of May 1, 1937, relative to, 1251.
Remarks in House on the subject of, 961.

POLAND, address delivered by Louis Johnson, Assistant Secretary of War, entitled "Lessons from Poland" (Appendix, 425).
Remarks in House protesting against the looting of the assets of (Appendix, 344).

POLICE ACADEMY. *See* NATIONAL POLICE ACADEMY.

"POLITICAL MILL," article by G. Gould Lincoln entitled, 107.

"POLITICAL PARADE," article by George Rothwell Brown entitled, 919, 920 (Appendix, 674).

POLK, JAMES G. (*a Representative from Ohio*).
Attended, 8.
Bills and joint resolutions introduced by
McCoy, Alice Catell: to pension (see bill H. R. 7597), 815.
Woods, Sarah E.: to increase pension (see bill H. R. 7598), 815.
Petitions and papers presented by, from
Citizens and individuals, 43, 223.
Remarks by, on
Bolton, Chester C.: death of, 1078.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

POLLARD, ERNEST MARK (*late a Representative from Nebraska*).
Announcement of death of, 16.

POLL TAX, article by Virginius Dabney relative to (Appendix, 115).
Article by Wayne Gard on the subject of poll tax (Appendix, 360).

POPE PIUS XII, editorial from L'Osservatore Romano relative to the peace proposal of (Appendix, 615).
Text of the encyclical delivered by (Appendix, 702).

PORK, statement by the Agricultural Adjustment Administration concerning the domestic pork market (Appendix, 234).

PORTER, MARY E., increase pension (see bill H. R. 7572).

PORTLAND, OREG., reform the lease for the Sellwood Station of the post office at (see bill S. 2987).
Letter from the Postmaster General transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to reform the lease for the Sellwood Station of the post office at, 396, 488.

PORTLAND (OREG.) SHOPPING NEWS, editorial on the subject of neutrality appearing in (Appendix, 11).

PORTUGAL, excerpts from arms-embargo laws of (Appendix, 354).

POSTAL SERVICE, address delivered by President Franklin D. Roosevelt to postmasters (Appendix, 291).
Address delivered by James A. Farley, Postmaster General, concerning (Appendix, 292).
Air mail: article by Frederic J. Haskin relative to the test of the pick-up and delivery service (Appendix, 229).
——— article from the Wilmington (Del.) Morning News relative to the test of the night mail pick-up (Appendix, 711).
——— bill to grant franking privilege to the Vice President and Members of Congress (see bill H. R. 7588).
——— remarks in House relative to the proposed demonstration of the night mail pick-up-and-delivery device, 336, 337.

POSTMASTER GENERAL.
Communications from
Portland, Oreg.: transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to reform the lease for the Sellwood Station of the Post office at, 396, 488.

POU, JAMES H., letter of June 5, 1934, on the subject of embargoes written by (Appendix, 773).

POULTRY, letter from the Secretary of Agriculture transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to prevent dissemination of diseases of, 29, 41.

POULTRY INDUSTRY, enable the Secretary of Agriculture to furnish additional statistical information and marketing service for the benefit of (see bill H. R. 7616).
Remarks in House relative to furnishing additional statistical information and marketing service for the benefit of (Appendix, 745).

POWER CONTROL BY CAPTAINS OF MUNITIONS, editorial from the Oregon Sunday Journal on the subject of (Appendix, 758).

POWERS, D. LANE (*a Representative from New Jersey*).
Attended, 8.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

PRAYERS, text of the first prayer delivered in Congress (Appendix, 368).
Text of a war prayer written by Mark Twain, 688.

PREPAREDNESS. *See also* NATIONAL DEFENSE.
Address delivered by Representative Brewster at Dexter, Maine, on the subject of (Appendix, 857).
Article by James G. Stahlman entitled (Appendix, 295).

PRESERVATION OF AMERICAN LIBERTIES, address delivered by Representative McCormack in Boston, Mass., on the subject of (Appendix, 178).

PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES, address over the radio delivered by President Franklin D. Roosevelt on the subject, "The War's Challenge to the United States" (Appendix, 560).
Address delivered by President Franklin D. Roosevelt before a joint session of the Senate and House of Representatives on the subject of neutrality, 10.
Address delivered by President Roosevelt on the subject of America's attitude toward the war (Appendix, 40).
Address delivered by Senator Taft at Indianapolis concerning emergency powers of (Appendix, 713).
Article by W. B. Hesseltine entitled "How Much History Does Franklin Roosevelt Know?" (Appendix, 463).
Editorial from the New York Times Herald favoring appointment of a special committee to investigate the emergency powers of (Appendix, 501).
Editorial from the Somerset Daily American relative to qualifications of President Franklin D. Roosevelt for handling the foreign affairs of the United States Government (Appendix, 358).
Editorial from the Baltimore Sun entitled "Mr. Roosevelt Argues for a Real Neutrality Program" (Appendix, 174).
Editorial from the Block newspapers entitled "It Is Time That Congress Took Back the Many Powers Granted to the President" (Appendix, 640).
Editorial from L'Osservatore Romano relative to the peace proposal of (Appendix, 615).
Excerpts from President Roosevelt's speech on August 14, 1936, on the subject of neutrality, 1247.
Excerpts from speeches on the subject of unemployment delivered by (Appendix, 838, 839).
Letter from President Roosevelt to Adolf Hitler urging termination of the European war, 198.
Letters addressed to the President of Poland, the King of Italy, the Chancelor of the German Reich, and certain other governments relative to the European war (Appendix, 142).
Message from President Roosevelt to the King of Sweden concerning the conference at Stockholm, 590.
Proclamation convening the Congress in extra session on September 21, 1939, 3, 7.
Proclamation declaring that a state of war exists between Germany and France, and certain other countries (Appendix, 787).
Remarks in Senate relative to President Roosevelt's attitude toward war, 541.
Remarks in Senate relative to the prerogatives of the President in the conduct of foreign relations of the United States, 838, 839.
Remarks in House relative to President Roosevelt's alleged encouragement of Communists in their subversive activities, 661.
Remarks in House relative to the emergency powers of, 814, 815.
Remarks in House relative to granting additional powers to, 1362.
Remarks in House declaring that "the American people do not trust the President in the White House," 1371.
Remarks in House opposing a third term for President Roosevelt (Appendix, 842).
Report of the Attorney General concerning executive powers under national emergency proclamation (S. Doc. 133), 109.
Resolution of inquiry relative to executive powers made available to the President under his proclamation of national emergency (see S. Res. 185*).
Resolution to appoint a committee to investigate the emergency powers of (see H. Res. 316).
Statement by Charles A. Beard concerning President Roosevelt's foreign policy, 1140.

PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—Continued.
Statement in article by Richard A. Staderman relative to (Appendix, 628, 630).
Summary of emergency powers of the President prepared by the National Committee to Uphold Constitutional Government (Appendix, 507).
Telegram from Frank Gannett on the subject of emergency executive powers (Appendix, 464).
Communications from
House of Representatives: congratulating the Members on conclusion of the work of the extra session, 1396, 1397.
Senate: congratulating the Members on conclusion of the work of the extra session, 1357.

PRESS ASSOCIATIONS AND THE PRESS, remarks in House relative to, 665.

PRESSURE BOYS (book), written by Kenneth G. Crawford, 809. Review by W. F. Shelton of (Appendix, 760).

PRICE MOVEMENT, remarks in House relative to (Appendix, 166).

PRICE PEGGING, report of investigation by the magazine Fortune relative to (Appendix, 539).

PRINTING AND BINDING. *See* PUBLIC DOCUMENTS.

PRIVILEGE OF THE HOUSE, remarks in House relative to unauthorized changes in the Congressional Record, 1370, 1392.

"PROBLEMS OF LAW ENFORCEMENT," address delivered by J. Edgar Hoover entitled (Appendix, 248).

PRODUCTION STANDARDS, editorial from the Washington Post relative to (Appendix, 440).

PROFITEERING. *See also* WAR MUNITIONS.
Address delivered by Senator O'Mahoney entitled "Controlling War Profits" (Appendix, 479).
Article by Les Finnegan urging prevention of a war-trade boom (Appendix, 394).
Memorial of Legislature of New Jersey urging legislation to prevent, 82, 223.

"PROFITS VERSUS PEACE," remarks in House entitled (Appendix, 403).

PROPAGANDA, PEACE, PREPAREDNESS, address delivered by Senator Walsh at Holyoke, Mass., on the subject of (Appendix, 483).
Article prepared by Senator Holt on the subject of propaganda for war (Appendix, 845).
Remarks in House relative to vicious and misleading propaganda in America (Appendix, 807).
Remarks in House entitled "Will Propaganda Lead Us To War?" 2329.

PROPAGANDA EXPENDITURES, remarks in House relative to, 257.

PROPERTY RIGHTS, resolution of the National Association of Real Estate Brokers on the subject of preservation of (Appendix, 675).

PROPOSAL FOR DOMESTIC RECOVERY, statement by Jay C. Hormel presenting (Appendix, 68).

PROSPERITY, excerpts from newspapers commenting on signs of, 707, 708.

PUBLIC BUILDINGS, bill providing for alternate structural designs for (see bill H. R. 7568).

PUBLIC DOCUMENTS,
Orders to print.
Industrial Mobilization Plan: order of Senate to print the Revision of 1939, approved jointly by the Acting Secretary of War and the Acting Secretary of the Navy (S. Doc. 134), 775.
Neutrality: resolution to print additional copies of hearings before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations on the subject of (see S. Res. 188*).
——— concurrent resolution to print additional copies of hearings before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations during the Seventy-fourth Congress, second session, on bill (S. 3474) relative to (see S. Con. Res. 30*).
Pernicious political activities: order of Senate to print interpretations by the Department of Justice of the act to prevent (S. Doc. 135), 1351.

PUBLIC HOLIDAY, making the last Thursday in November of each year (see bill H. R. 7556).
Data concerning public legal holidays (Appendix, 112).

PUBLIC LANDS, provide for disposal of certain (see bill H. R. 7621).
Entries: bill to extend time granting preference right of entry to veterans (see bill S. 2939).

PUBLIC POWER, remarks in House relative to distribution of, 668.

PUBLIC ROADS, address delivered by Representative Cartwright at Richmond, Va., relative to the twenty-fifth anniversary of highway building (Appendix, 441).
Address delivered by Representative Crowe relative to highway improvement (Appendix, 325).

PUBLIC VESSELS. *See* VESSELS.

PUBLIC WORKS, authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with construction of certain (see bill S. 3000).

PUBLIC WORKS ADMINISTRATION, article from the Central Constructor relative to the P. W. A. and the special session (Appendix, 288).

PULASKI, CASIMIR, remarks in House in memory of (Appendix, 254).

PULP AND PAPER MILL NEWS, editorial relative to importation of foreign pulp appearing in (Appendix, 468).

PURNELL, FRED S. (*late a Representative from Indiana*).
Tributes in House to, 755, 756, 757 (Appendix, 760).

PUTTY, HENRY, excerpts from an article concerning the selective-service experience of, 724.

QUANTICO, VA., exchange lands with the Richmond, Fredericksburg & Potomac Railroad Co. at (see bills S. 2992, 3017).
Letter from the Secretary of the Navy transmitting the draft of a proposed bill to authorize exchange of lands with the Richmond, Fredericksburg & Potomac Railroad Co. at, 13.

QUEZON, MANUEL L. (President, Philippine Commonwealth), message to the legislature recommending that the Philippine Government pledge its loyalty to the United States in the present emergency, 898.

QUINN, F. LAURENCE, letter relative to importation of mink pelts, written by (Appendix, 465).

QUONSET POINT, R. I., authorize certain public works at (see bill S. 2975).

QUORUM ROLL CALLS. *See* HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES; SENATE.

RABAUT, LOUIS C. (*a Representative from Michigan*).
Attended, 8.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

RADCLIFFE, GEORGE L. (*a Senator from Maryland*).
Attended, 3.
Address by Hon. Lewis B. Schwellenbach at Baltimore City College (Appendix, 455).
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 934, 935.
Neutrality, 934, 935.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

RADIO COMMUNICATIONS, remarks in House relative to violations of the right of free speech with regard to, 620, 621.
Report of a survey of (Appendix, 514).

RAILROADS, resolution adopted at a meeting in Little Rock, Ark., relative to unjust freight-rate discriminations (Appendix, 179).

RAMSPECK, ROBERT (*a Representative from Georgia*).
Attended, 8.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

RANDOLPH, JENNINGS (*a Representative from West Virginia*).
Attended, 8.
Address at convention of post-office clerks, Houston, Tex., by (Appendix, 216).
Address by Charles F. Horner at air-progress rally, Elkins, W. Va. (Appendix, 332).
Article by John L. Beckley on commercial aviation (Appendix, 536).
Article in Liberty Magazine on religious freedom by (Appendix, 556).
Article from Wilmington (Del.) Morning News on night-mail pick-up tests (Appendix, 711).
Correspondence concerning neutrality legislation (Appendix, 218).
Radio address on neutrality, 1180, 1181.
Remarks by, on
Air mail—automatic pick-up and delivery, 336, 337.
Air transport industry (Appendix, 536).
Arms embargo, 1180, 1181.
Neutrality, 1180, 1181.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

RANKIN, JOHN E. (*a Representative from Mississippi*).
Attended, 8.
Address of Hon. Raymond J. Kelly, national commander of the American Legion (Appendix, 115).
General leave to extend remarks, 209.
Legislative program of the Disabled American Veterans of the World War (Appendix, 10).
Statement by George Bernard Shaw on the war situation (Appendix, 206).
Statement by David Lloyd George on proposed peace solution of war in Europe (Appendix, 204).
Statement by Millard W. Rice outlining 1940 objectives of Veterans of Foreign Wars (Appendix, 656).
Table on power rates in T. V. A. area, 670.
Table showing cotton ginned in certain counties, 1938 and 1939 (Appendix, 863).
Tables showing electric rates by States, 674, 675.
Text of joint resolution (H. J. Res. 386)—relief for flood-stricken areas of Mississippi and Alabama, 39, 40.
Bills and joint resolutions introduced by
Mississippi and Alabama: for relief in flood-stricken areas of (see H. J. Res. 386), 41.
——— making appropriation for loans and relief in flood-stricken areas of (see H. J. Res. 392), 627.

RANKIN, JOHN E.—Continued.
Bills and joint resolutions introduced by
Veterans: to amend Relief Act relative to employment of wives and widows of (see bill H. R. 7559), 80.
——— to restore certain benefits to (see bill H. R. 7560), 80.
——— to equalize benefits to those who suffered loss of one or more feet or hands (see bill H. R. 7558), 80.
——— to protect widows and children of (see bill H. R. 7593), 772.
Remarks by, on
Anniversaries of events in English and American history, 612.
Arms embargo, 1092, 1104, 1106, 1115, 1116, 1170, 1171, 1172.
——— effect on China and Japan, 1378.
Assistance for distressed farmers, 1393 (Appendix, 863).
Bolton, Chester C.: tribute to, 1080.
Bonneville power project, 668, 669, 670, 673.
Communism, 1393.
Congressional Record: extension of remarks, 16.
Crop conditions in north Mississippi and northwestern Alabama, 39, 40.
Electric power rates, 668, 669, 670, 673.
General leave to extend remarks, 18, 78, 132, 337, 472.
McMillan, Thomas S.: death of, 79.
Mellon, Andrew W.: income-tax refunds by, 1364.
Meyer, Eugene, 1365.
Mondell, Frank W.: tribute to, 135.
National debt, 1364.
Neutrality, 476, 761, 762, 1092, 1104, 1106, 1115, 1116, 1170, 1171, 1172.
——— conference report, 1387.
New England light and power rates (Appendix, 626).
Pennsylvania: Democratic and Republican administrations in, 657.
Permission to address the House, 657.
Relief of drought- and flood-stricken areas, 1393 (Appendix, 863).
Republican Party: income-tax refunds, 1364, 1365.
Tacoma Electric Light & Power Co., 670.
——— financial statements, 670, 671, 672.
Tennessee Valley Authority, 668, 669, 673, 674.
Undesirable aliens, 1170, 1171.
War and communism, 1393.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

RAUSCHNING, HERMANN, article entitled "Hitler Could Not Stop" written by (Appendix, 20).

RAVER, PAUL J., address on the subject of the Bonneville power project delivered by (Appendix, 153).
Remarks in House relative to, 613.

RAYBURN, SAM (*a Representative from Texas*).
Attended, 8.
Appointed on committee to conduct the President, 9.
Appointed on committee to notify the President, 8.
Elected Speaker pro tempore of the House, 18.
Motions and resolutions offered by
Adjournment sine die, 1397.
House of Representatives: order of business (see H. Res. 302), 16.
Joint session of the House and Senate (H. Con. Res. 36), 9.
Logan, M. M.: death of (see H. Res. 311), 148.
Notification of the President (see H. Res. 298), 8.
Remarks by, on
Adjournment over, 135.
Arms embargo, 1305.
Congressional Record—extension of remarks, 16.
——— extension of remarks after adjournment, 1390.
Disaster relief, 1393.
Final adjournment, 1358, 1359.
General leave to extend remarks, 1345.
Great Britain: sale of farm products to, 1388.
Hour of meeting, 1241.
Mondell, Frank W.: tribute to, 134.
Neutrality, 667, 1102, 1103, 1105, 1124, 1204, 1305.
Neutrality Act, 1939: order of procedure, 612, 613.
Order of business, 16, 1071, 1157.
Reciprocal trade agreements, 959.
Reconstruction Finance Corporation: disaster relief by, 1393.
Reed, Thomas Brackett: tribute to, 571.
Reference of President's message, 12.
Report of committee to notify the President, 8.
Speaker of the House—authority to appoint committees after adjournment, 1391.
Thanksgiving Day, 488.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS, address over the radio delivered by Representative Harness (Appendix, 653).
Article from the Oregon Voter relative to the effect in Oregon of (Appendix, 391).
Article by Richard A. Staderman on the subject of (Appendix, 628, 859).
Bills to provide for Senate ratification of (see bills S. 91; H. R. 7589, 7592).
Brief by Fred Brenckman relative to the agreement with Argentina (Appendix, 532).

RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS—Continued.
Editorials from the Washington Daily News, the Washington Evening Star, and the Washington Post relative to the agreement with Argentina (Appendix, 382).
Letter from Senator Wiley to John P. Gregg relative to the proposed agreement with Argentina, 1280.
Letter from the Secretary of State to Senator Capper relative to (Appendix, 784).
Letters from Walter F. Gries concerning the proposed agreement with Chile (Appendix, 625).
Letter relative to the attitude of the Flint Glass Workers' Union of North America toward (Appendix, 616).
Remarks in House concerning, 530, 531, 538, 539, 569, 610, 611, 625, 626, 944, 1054 (Appendix, 542, 793).
Remarks in House relative to the effect on American agriculture of (Appendix, 435).
Remarks in House relative to trade agreements with South America (Appendix, 823).
Remarks in House relative to the agreement with Uruguay (Appendix, 773).
Remarks in Senate relative to the proposed agreement with Chile, 1082, 1083.
Remarks in Senate relative to the constitutionality of, 1086, 1087.
Resolution relative to ratification by the Senate of (see S. Res. 69).
Results of the program during first half of 1939 (Appendix, 138).
Statement by Representative Carlson relative to the proposed agreement with Argentina (Appendix, 339).
Statement by Representative Case concerning the proposed agreement with Argentina (Appendix, 356).
Statement by Representative Crawford before the Committee for Reciprocity Information opposing the proposed agreement with Argentina (Appendix, 395).
Statement by Representative Hope relative to the proposed agreement with Argentina (Appendix, 336).
Statement by Representative Horton before the Committee for Reciprocity Information concerning the agreement with Argentina (Appendix, 378).
Statement by Representative Mundt relative to (Appendix, 860).
Statement in article by Richard A. Stoderman concerning (Appendix, 630).
Table showing agreements concluded with certain European countries, 531.
Text of certain subparagraphs of article XVI of the trade agreement of November 17, 1938, with the United Kingdom, 1350.

RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION, letter from the Chairman transmitting report of operations of (H. Docs. 475, 483, 494), 14, 30, 41, 964, 1080.
Text of bill (H. R. 7591) to limit the powers of, 622.
Remarks in House relative to the opinion of attorneys of the R. F. C. that droughts are not disasters, 1391, 1392, 1393.

RED CROSS. *See* AMERICAN RED CROSS.

"'RED' MILKMEN," editorial from the Chicago Daily News entitled (Appendix, 548).

RED NETWORK (book), remarks in House relative to the outline of the Communist International contained in, 810.

REECE, B. CARROLL (*a Representative from Tennessee*).
Attended, 8.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

REED, CHAUNCEY W. (*a Representative from Illinois*).
Attended, 8.
Bills and joint resolutions introduced by
Thanksgiving Day: to legalize (see H. J. Res. 383), 14.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

REED, CLYDE M. (*a Senator from Kansas*).
Attended, 3.
Editorial from the Parsons (Kans.) Sun on neutrality (Appendix, 41).
Radio address on neutrality legislation by (Appendix, 129).
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 1020.
Neutrality Act, 1939, 280, 1020.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

REED, DANIEL A. (*a Representative from New York*).
Attended, 8.
Excerpts from newspapers relative to effect of repeal of the arms embargo on business, 1313.
List of major explosions in American munitions plants, 1914–17, 476, 477.
Table showing imports, 1913–19, 531.
Table showing fluctuation of foreign exchange since beginning of hostilities in Europe, 531.
Table showing agricultural exports, imports, and trade balances, 9 months ending September 1938 and 1939 (Appendix, 737).
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 348, 870, 1312.
Cash-and-carry provision of Neutrality Act, 474, 475, 476.

REED, DANIEL A.—Continued.
Remarks by, on
Foreign trade: effect of war on, 530, 531, 532.
Neutrality legislation, 473, 474, 475, 476, 477, 478, 1312.
Order of business, 384.
Permission to address the House, 257, 383.
Reciprocal trade agreements, 530, 944, 949 (Appendix, 56).
——— statistics (Appendix, 56).
South America: trade with, 532.
War—description of scenes in 1917, 473, 474.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

REED, THOMAS BRACKETT (*late a Representative from Maine*).
Article from Los Angeles Examiner by George Rothwell Brown relative to (Appendix, 655).
Letter from Arthur Charles Jackson to Speaker Bankhead expressing thanks for memorial service in the House to (Appendix, 799).
Memorial exercises commemorating the one-hundredth anniversary of the birth of (Appendix, 855).
Memorial service in House on the anniversary of the birth of, 569.
Remarks in House on birthday anniversary of, 383.
Remarks at memorial service, Bowdoin College, Maine, to (Appendix, 401).
Resolution to acquire bust of (see H. Res. 315), 577.
Tribute in Maine Legislature to (Appendix, 398).

REES, EDWARD H. (*a Representative from Kansas*).
Attended, 8.
Brief of the National Grange relative to proposed trade agreements (Appendix, 532).
Editorial from the Country Gentleman on Americanism (Appendix, 400).
Bills and joint resolutions introduced by
Joint congressional committee to consult with the President; to create (see H. J. Res. 387), 80.
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 1066, 1098, 1241.
Extra session of Congress: work of, 807, 808.
Joint committee to meet with the President during present emergency, 78.
National debt, 1363.
Neutrality, 1066, 1098, 1241.
Permission to address the House, 950.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

REFERENDUM ON WAR, remarks in House and the text of House Joint Resolution 89 to amend the Constitution to provide for (Appendix, 834).

REFUGEE PROBLEM, speech delivered by Representative Fish at Oslo, Norway, on the subject of (Appendix, 205).

REGULAR VETERANS' ASSOCIATION, program adopted at the third annual convention of (Appendix, 402).

"REIGN OF TERROR IN PRE-WAR ARMS DEALS", article by Parke Brown entitled (Appendix, 757).

RELIEF AND WORK RELIEF, remarks in House relative to (Appendix, 738).

RELIEF PROBLEM, remarks in House concerning, 24 (Appendix, 225).

RELIGIOUS FREEDOM, article by Representative Randolph on the subject of (Appendix, 556).

REPUBLICAN NATIONAL COMMITTEE, statement in article by Richard A. Staderman relative to (Appendix, 628).

REPUBLICAN PARTY, address delivered by Representative Gross at Chambersburg, Pa., on the achievements of the Republican minority in the Seventy-sixth Congress (Appendix, 450).
Speech delivered by Representative Brewster at Milwaukee, Wis., relative to (Appendix, 844).

"REQUIRED READING FOR EUROPEANS," editorial from the Saturday Evening Post entitled (Appendix, 492).

REVENUE ACT OF 1934, amend relative to the processing tax on certain oils imported from island possessions of the United States (see bill S. 3004).

REVENUE ACT OF 1936, amend section 907 (c) of (see bill H. R. 7601).

REVENUE PROBLEM, address delivered by John W. Hanes, Under Secretary of the Treasury, on the subject of (Appendix, 589).

REVISED STATUTES.
Bill to repeal sections
3744, 3745, 3746, 3747: public contracts (see bill S. 3006).

REYNOLDS, ROBERT R. (*a Senator from North Carolina*).
Attended, 3.
Article from Liberty magazine on neutrality (Appendix, 306).
Article by John T. Flynn on effects of cash-and-carry policy (Appendix, 407).
Newspaper articles relative to sabotage by foreign agents, 981, 982.
Radio address on subject of neutrality, by (Appendix, 552).

REYNOLDS, ROBERT R.—Continued.
Statement on war debts, June 19, 1939, in the Senate, by, 427.
Table showing indebtedness of foreign governments to United States, 428.
Amendments offered by, to
Neutrality (H. J. Res. 306): to amend, 1021.
Remarks by, on
Aliens: illegal entry of, 974, 975, 976.
Arms embargo, 312, 412, 413, 416, 553, 554, 555, 557, 558, 559, 563, 564, 598, 687, 688, 974, 975.
——— editorial on What Are the Allies War Aims? 691, 692.
——— statement by Hugh Gibson, 691.
——— statement by Capt. Eddie Rickenbacker, 699.
Athenia: sinking of, 688, 689.
——— article from Washington Times-Herald, 689.
Canada-to-Mexico highway, 413.
Christianity: assaults upon since 1918, 563.
Churchill, Winston: statement on war debts by, 558.
Communists: Government positions held by, 555, 564.
Cotton exports, 563, 564, 565.
Eden, Anthony, 559.
Foreign seamen, 974, 975, 976.
France: war debt, 412, 413.
Gold, 687, 688.
Great Britain: sale of oil to Italy, 559.
——— treatment of South American countries, 700.
——— war debts, 412, 413.
Griffin, William, 687.
Guatamala: territory held by Britain, 700.
Monroe Doctrine, 700.
Neutrality, 312, 553, 554, 555, 558, 559, 563, 564, 598, 687, 974, 975, 1021.
——— prayer by Mark Twain, 688.
Poland, 415.
Refugees, 981.
Russia: activities in war crisis, 689, 690, 691.
War debts: methods of collecting, 412, 413.
West Indies, 412.
World War veterans: unpaid bonuses to certain, 563.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

RHEINSTEIN, ALFRED, letter relative to Nathan Straus, United States Housing Administrator, and the Bedford-Stuyvesant section of Brooklyn, N. Y., 253, 254.

RIBBENTROP, JOACHIM VON (German Foreign Minister), remarks in House relative to, 212, 220, 221.

RICH, ROBERT F. (*a Representative from Pennsylvania*).
Attended, 8.
Article comparing the Democratic and Republican administrations in Pennsylvania, 656.
Article from Philadelphia Inquirer entitled "A Country Sick of Strikes," 483, 484.
Table showing comparison of income tax in England and United States, 135.
Tables showing deficit during Roosevelt administration, 1363 (Appendix, 808).
Remarks by, on
Appropriations: extravagance of departments, 257, 258, 259.
——— table showing expenditures since 1790, 259.
Chrysler Corporation: labor strikes, 483, 484.
City of Flint: steamship, 863.
Congress: "one-act session" (Appendix, 808).
Congress for Industrial Organizations, 484 (Appendix, 808).
Congressional Record: extension of remarks, 132.
Democratic Party: $100 dinners, 808, 809.
Final adjournment, 1358.
General leave to extend remarks, 472.
George, David Lloyd, 208.
Industry and employment, 770, 771.
Labor: strikes since 1928, 300, 301, 302, 483, 484.
——— strikes table, 301.
National debt, 135, 585, 586, 1362, 1364 (Appendix, 808).
National Labor Relations Board, 300, 301, 770 (Appendix, 808).
Naval vessels, construction of, 587.
Neutrality, 212, 214, 476, 478, 769, 1362.
——— comparative print of bills, 1059.
——— printing of pamphlet, 256.
New Deal expenditures, 257, 258.
——— fiscal policies, 585, 586, 587.
——— laws (Appendix, 808).
——— propaganda, 257, 258, 298.
Permission to address the House, 569, 766.
President of United States: delegation of power to, 610.
Printing matter in the Record, 809, 862.
Reciprocal trade agreements, 610.
Roosevelt deficits, 1362, 1363.
Seventy-sixth Congress: payment of expenses of, 17.
Social Security reserve funds, 770, 771.
Steamship companies: carriage of contraband by, 863.
Taxes in England and United States, 135.
Treasury statement, 1362, 1364.
Unemployment compensation, 770, 771.
War profiteering, 478.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

RICHARDS, JAMES P. (*a Representative from South Carolina*).
Attended, 8.
Appointed on funeral committee, 80.
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 1301, 1302.
Neutrality, 1301, 1302.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.
RICHMOND, FREDERICKSBURG & POTOMAC RAILWAY CO., exchange lands at Quantico, Va., with (see bill S. 2992).
Bill to amend act to allow exchange of lands at Quantico, Va., with (see bill S. 3017).
Letter from the Secretary of the Navy transmitting the draft of a proposed bill to authorize exchange of lands at Quantico, Va., with, 13.
RICHMOND (IND.) PALLADIUM-ITEM (newspaper), editorial eulogizing the work of the Dies committee, appearing in (Appendix, 182).
RICKENBACKER, EDDIE, address over the radio on the subject of the cost of war (Appendix, 116).
RIGHTMIRE, GEORGE W., article on the subject of war written by (Appendix, 101).
RISK, CHARLES F. (*a Representative from Rhode Island*).
Attended, 8.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.
RIVERS AND HARBORS, editorial from the Sioux City (Iowa) Tribune entitled "Put Control of Rivers Under Maritime Board" (Appendix, 108).
RIVERSIDE MUSEUM. *See* NEW YORK (city).
ROBERTS, FRANK N., present the Navy Cross to (see bill S. 3009).
ROBERTSON, A. WILLIS (*a Representative from Virginia*).
Attended, 8.
Address before Virginia State Grange, Winchester, Va., on subject of farm prices (Appendix, 580).
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.
ROBERTSON, D. B., article relative to the celebration in honor of Senator Wheeler of Montana at Hudson, Mass., written by (Appendix, 376).
ROBINSON, J. W. (*a Representative from Utah*).
Attended, 8.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.
ROBSION, JOHN M. (*a Representative from Kentucky*).
Appointed on funeral committee, 148.
Bills and joint resolutions introduced by
Messer, Mollie: to pension (see bill H. R. 7585), 354.
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 1293.
Congress: need to remain in session, 1379.
Credit to belligerents by Government agencies, 1379.
Martin, Joseph W.: birthday of, 1379.
Neutrality, 1293.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.
ROCKEFELLER, LEWIS K. (*a Representative from New York*).
Attended, 8.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.
RODGERS, ROBERT L. (*a Representative from Pennsylvania*).
Attended, 8.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.
ROGERS, EDITH NOURSE (*a Representative from Massachusetts*).
Attended, 8.
Editorial from New York Sun entitled "He Is an American" (Appendix, 23).
Editorial from the Boston Post on subject of Army uniforms (Appendix, 601).
Telegram from New England conference of the Lutheran Augustana Synod relative to the arms embargo (Appendix, 712).
Motions and resolutions offered by
National defense: requesting information relating to (see H. Res. 309), 41.
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 1319.
Army uniforms (Appendix, 601).
Final adjournment, 1358.
Neutrality, 1310.
Reed, Thomas Brackett: tribute to, 572, 573.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.
ROGERS, LEONARD, letter proposing aid to the Allies written by (Appendix, 56).
ROGERS, WILL (*a Representative from Oklahoma*).
Attended, 8.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.
ROLE OF THE UNITED STATES IN EUROPE, letter from Herbert Hoover to Woodrow Wilson, dated April 11, 1919, relative to (Appendix, 719).
ROLL CALLS ON QUESTION OF QUORUM. *See* HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES; SENATE.
ROMJUE, MILTON A. (*a Representative from Missouri*).
Attended, 8.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.
ROOSEVELT, FRANKLIN D. *See also* PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.
Address to postmasters delivered by (Appendix, 291).
Articles by Harlan Miller entitled "Roosevelt on Foreign Affairs" (Appendix, 294).
Letter felicitating Monsignor Lavelle on the sixtieth anniversary of his priesthood, 588.
ROOSEVELT, MRS. FRANKLIN D., remarks in House relative to, 219, 661.
ROOSEVELT, JAMES, letter from Representative Fish to Westbrook Pegler relative to payment by the Federal Government of the cost of alterations to the Hyde Park, N. Y., home of (Appendix, 213).
ROOSEVELT, THEODORE, remarks in House relative to observance of the birthday anniversary of, 1058 (Appendix, 767).
ROOSEVELT, THEODORE, JR., address over the radio on the subject of neutrality delivered by (Appendix, 567).
ROOSEVELT'S DEFICITS, statistics concerning, 1363.
"ROOSEVELT VERSUS ROOSEVELT," editorial from the Chicago Daily Tribune entitled (Appendix, 140).
ROSA, AGNES, letter favoring retention of the arms embargo written by, 1137.
ROSSVILLE, GA., report of Secretary of War on survey of (H. Doc. 479), 24.
ROST, LAWRENCE, letter opposing repeal of the arms embargo received from, 1195.
ROTHSTEIN, ARNOLD, remarks in House relative to, 537.
ROUSSEAU, J. J., letters concerning the embargo law received from, 637, 638.
ROUTZOHN, HARRY N. (*a Representative from Ohio*).
Attended, 8.
Remarks by, on
Bolton, Chester C.: tribute to, 1075.
Neutrality (Appendix, 29).
——— excerpts from speeches by President Roosevelt (Appendix, 29).
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.
ROYAL C. JOHNSON MEMORIAL VETERANS' HOSPITAL, construct (see bill H. R. 7550).
ROYAL OAK (British battleship), editorial from the Elko (Nev.) Daily Free Press relative to German decoration of the submarine commander who is responsible for the sinking of (Appendix, 456).
RULES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, amend rule XXI relative to bills concerning national parks (see H. Res. 318).
RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION, statement in article by Richard A. Staderman concerning (Appendix, 628).
RUSSELL, RICHARD B., JR. (*a Senator from Georgia*).
Attended, 44.
Remarks by, on
Neutrality, 1032, 1033.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.
RUSSIA, editorials relative to the Russian threat against Finland, 224, 225, 253.
Excerpts from arms-embargo laws of (Appendix, 355).
RUTHERFORD, ALBERT G. (*a Representative from Pennsylvania*).
Petitions and papers presented by, from
Citizens and individuals, 308, 815, 1058.
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 1261.
Neutrality, 1261.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.
RUTTER, JOSEPHINE, pension (see bill H. R. 7548).
RYAN, ELMER J. (*a Representative from Minnesota*).
Remarks by, on
Peace for United States (Appendix, 9).
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.
RYAN, JAMES W., address on the subject of neutrality delivered by (Appendix, 250).
RYAN, JOHN A., address over the radio on the subject of neutrality delivered by (Appendix, 313, 513, 661).
SABATH, ADOLPH J. (*a Representative from Illinois*).
Attended, 8.
Article by Parke Brown relative to terroristic activities during 1914–16 era (Appendix, 756).
Motions and resolutions offered by
Hour of meeting of the House of Representatives (see H. Res. 300), 9.
Remarks by, on
American vessels sunk by German submarines (Appendix, 757).
Arms embargo (Appendix, 668).
Ecks, Ten (Appendix, 755).
German-American National Alliance (Appendix, 755).
Neutrality, 1092, 1093 (Appendix, 668, 754).
Silge, Walter (Appendix, 755).
White, William Allen, 1093.

SABATH, ADOLPH J.—Continued.
Reports made by, from
Committee on Rules:
Neutrality bill (H. J. Res. 306; H. Res. 320, Rept. 1473), 1059, 1081.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.
SABOTAGE, articles from the Washington News on the subject of, 981, 982.
SACKS, LEON (*a Representative from Pennsylvania*).
Attended, 8.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.
ST. LAWRENCE WATERWAY, remarks in House relative to (Appendix, 671).
ST. LOUIS MEMORIAL TO THOMAS JEFFERSON, remarks in House relative to (Appendix, 433).
ST. PAUL (MINN.) ASSOCIATION OF COMMERCE, letter relative to the proposed reciprocal trade agreement with Argentina received from (Appendix, 210).
SAN CARLOS APACHE INDIANS. *See* INDIANS.
SANDAGER, HARRY (*a Representative from Rhode Island*).
Attended, 8.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.
SAN DIEGO, CALIF., exchange lands with the city of (see bill S. 2993).
Bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant certain land to the city of (see bill S. 3015).
Letter from the Secretary of the Navy transmitting the draft of a proposed bill to authorize exchange of lands with the city of, 14.
SANFORD, JOHN (*late a Representative from New York*).
Announcement of death of, 33.
SAN FRANCISCO MOUNTAIN SCENIC BOULEVARD CO., relief (see bills S. 2979; H. R. 7554, 7576).
SARASOTA PASS, FLA., allow the Bradenton Co. to bridge (see bills S. 3002; H. R. 7615).
SARAZIN, FRANK L., relief (see bill H. R. 7561).
SARGENT, PORTER, article on the subject of British propaganda in the United States written by (Appendix, 681).
SASSCER, LANSDALE G. (*a Representative from Maryland*).
Attended, 8.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.
SATTERFIELD, DAVE E., JR. (*a Representative from Virginia*).
Attended, 8.
Appointed on Star-Spangled Banner Commission, 9.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.
SATURDAY EVENING POST (magazine), editorial entitled "Once Burned," appearing in (Appendix, 12).
Editorial entitled "America," appearing in (Appendix, 236).
Editorial on the subject of neutrality appearing in (Appendix, 288, 347).
Editorial entitled "Embargo History," appearing in (Appendix, 536).
SAVAGE, MARY, relief (see bill H. R. 7580).
"SAVE AMERICA FIRST" (book), excerpts relative to acquisition of gold from foreign countries appearing in Jerome Frank's book entitled, 852.
SAVING DEMOCRACY, letter written by Senator Holt on the topic (Appendix, 828).
SCHAEFER, EDWIN M. (*a Representative from Illinois*).
Attended, 8.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.
SCHAFER, JOHN C. (*a Representative from Wisconsin*).
Attended, 8.
Article by Heywood Broun on communism (Appendix, 182).
Article by Boake Carter on our European Friends (Appendix, 329).
Article from Saturday Evening Post on the European situation (Appendix, 12).
Article by Ernest Lindley on arms embargo (Appendix, 92).
Radio address by Rev. Edward Lodge Curran on the Crusade for Peace (Appendix, 374).
Radio address by Eddie Rickenbacker on the Cost of War (Appendix, 116).
Remarks by, on
Agricultural prices, 21.
American League for Peace and Democracy, 884.
Arms embargo, 144, 535, 536, 875, 1202, 1204, 1230, 1275 (Appendix, 221).
Beaverbrook, Lord, 302.
Bridges, Harry, 660.
Congress of Industrial Organizations, 351, 352.
Congress—need of remaining in session, 1396.
Daladier, Premier of France, 262, 263.
Extension of remarks, 939.
Ezekiel, Mordecai, 942, 1275.
Ginsberg, Samuel, alias General Krivitsky, 579, 887.
Gold reserves, 624.
House, Col. E. M., 581, 584, 585.
Immigration problems, 139.
Krivitsky, Walter G., 351, 352.
National debt, 1364.
SCHAFER, JOHN C.—Continued.
Remarks by, on
National Committee to Keep America Out of War, 523.
Neutrality Act, 1939, 210, 212, 213, 260, 261, 393, 1202, 1204, 1230, 1273 (Appendix, 221).
——— conference report, 1388.
——— comparative print of bills, 1060.
——— printing of pamphlet, 256.
New Deal and communism, 1277.
New Deal propaganda, 298.
Permission to address the House, 344.
Roosevelt, Franklin D.: international banking connections of, 1276.
Subversive activities, 875, 876, 881.
Sugar, 390, 391.
Two-Percent McNutt Clubs, 218.
Un-American activities—investigation by Dies committee, 351, 352.
War debts, 624, 1275.
——— data on, 350.
Welles, Sumner, 350, 476.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.
SCHIFFLER, ANDREW C. (*a Representative from West Virginia*).
Attended, 8.
Excerpts from Fiore's International Law Codified on the rights and duties of neutrals, 1319.
Bills and joint resolutions introduced by
Grafton, W. Va.: to acquire land for cemetery purposes at (see bill H. R. 7618), 1397.
Petitions and papers presented by, from
Citizens and individuals, 25, 44, 80, 308, 489, 588, 772, 1058.
Societies and associations, 1081.
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 1319 (Appendix, 375).
Neutrality, 1319 (Appendix, 375).
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.
SCHLACHT, HARRY H., article entitled "Our Prince of Peace," written by (Appendix, 789).
SCHLESSINGER, GEORGE, relief (see bill H. R. 7614).
SCHNEIDER, WILLIAM, letter opposing the repeal of the arms embargo received from, 1196.
SCHUCKTANZ, GEORGE MATTHEW, admit permanently to the United States (see bill H. R. 7553).
SCHUETZ, LEONARD W. (*a Representative from Illinois*).
Attended, 8.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.
SCHULTE, WILLIAM T. (*a Representative from Indiana*).
Attended, 8.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.
SCHWARTZ, H. H. (*a Senator from Wyoming*).
Attended, 3.
Remarks by, on
Neutrality, 892.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.
SCHWELLENBACH, LEWIS B. (*a Senator from Washington*).
Attended, 3.
Address before American Federation of Labor, Cincinnati, Ohio, on subject Labor and Agriculture (Appendix, 300).
Address before Seattle Bar Ascsociation on the subject What Shall We Do Now? (Appendix, 186).
Address at Baltimore City College by (Appendix, 455).
Address by Frank Murphy at National Conference on Civil Liberties, New York City (Appendix, 672).
Address by James W. Ryan at Columbia University on neutrality (Appendix, 250).
Address by Hon. Harry S. Truman at Caruthersville, Mo., on neutrality (Appendix, 202).
Editorial from New York Sun entitled "He Is an American" (Appendix, 86).
Letter by Cloyd Laporte replying to Professor Jessup's letter on neutrality (Appendix, 303).
Letter by Rev. Mark A. Matthews urging support of President Roosevelt's foreign policy (Appendix, 614).
Newspaper articles on the threatened attack on Finland by Russia, 224.
Radio address on arms embargo by (Appendix, 81).
Radio address on pending neutrality legislation (Appendix, 193).
Radio discussion on neutrality (Appendix, 407).
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 121, 122, 123, 124, 126, 127, 128, 129, 154, 168, 201, 202, 205, 416, 417, 418, 436, 439, 458, 643, 654, 655, 736, 749, 750, 754, 797, 843, 844, 858, 917.
——— cash-and-carry, 1015, 1016, 1017.
——— German exports of munitions to England, 1899, 127.
——— lists of contraband by England and Germany, 123.
——— statement by James W. Garner, 122, 129.
——— statement by John Bassett Moore, 122.
Finland: threatened attack by Russia on, 224.
Great Britain: seizure of possessions of, 436.
Neutrality, 121–129, 416, 417, 418, 458, 643, 655, 736, 749, 750, 797, 843, 844, 858, 990, 1000, 1012, 1015.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

SCHWERT, PIUS L. (*a Representative from New York*).
Attended, 8.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.
SCIO, OHIO, article by Webb Waldron entitled "How Scio Licked Hard Times" (Appendix, 297).
SCOTT, JOHN G., article on the subject of money, written by (Appendix, 865).
SCRUGHAM, JAMES G. (*a Representative from Nevada*).
Attended, 8.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.
SECCOMBE, JAMES (*a Represenative from Ohio*).
Attended, 8.
Address by Col. Charles A. Lindbergh on neutrality (Appendix, 15).
Address by Hon. Stephen Bolles on the national debt (Appendix, 235).
Article by Harry Frease on the police powers of the League of Nations (Appendix, 241).
Article from Cleveland Plain Dealer on the death of Chester C. Bolton, 1077.
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 1287.
Bolton, Chester C.: tribute to, 1077.
Neutrality, 1287.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.
"SECOND SURRENDER?—EUROPEAN 'FRIENDS' LEGION REACTION," article by Boake Carter entitled (Appendix, 329).
SECREST, ROBERT T. (*a Representative from Ohio*).
Attended, 8.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.
SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE.
Communications from
Agricultural commodities: transmitting the draft of a proposed bill to authorize deduction of expenses from proceeds of sales of surplus, 14, 29.
Agricultural extension work: transmitting report of receipts and expenditures in connection with, 14, 29.
National forests: transmitting the draft of a proposed bill to facilitate and simplify the administration of, 41.
Poultry: transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to prevent dissemination of diseases of, 29, 41.
SECRETARY OF COMMERCE.
Communications from
Department of Commerce: relative to the sale of waste paper in, 13.
SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR.
Communications from
Hawaiian Islands: transmitting a copy of the Journal of the House of Representatives of, 29.
Indian reservations: transmitting the draft of a proposed bill to authorize the sale of lumber and other forest products on, 14, 29.
Virgin Islands: transmitting copies of legislation passed by the legislature, the Council of St. Croix, and the Council of St. Thomas and St. John in, 13, 29.
SECRETARY OF THE NAVY, authorize him to proceed with construction of certain public works (see bill S. 3000).
Communications from
Aircraft: transmitting report of purchases of, 13, 29.
Bohn Aluminum & Brass Corporation: relative to delay in delivery of United States property caused by labor strike in the plants of, 1069.
National City, Calif.: transmitting the draft of a proposed bill to authorize acceptance of donation of certain lands at, 14.
Naval armaments: relative to the estimated cost of doubling the size of the fleet, 1064.
Richmond, Fredericksburg & Potomac Railroad Co.: transmitting the draft of a proposed bill to authorize exchange of lands at Quantico, Va., with, 13.
San Diego, Calif.: transmitting the draft of a proposed bill to authorize exchange of lands with the city of, 14.
SECRETARY OF STATE.
Statement concerning the subject of neutrality delivered at a press conference September 14, 1939, by (Appendix, 143).
Communications from
Conferences on inter-American cultural relations: announcing the holding of, 540.
Excerpts from testimony of Secretary Cordell Hull in support of the pending neutrality bill, 855.
Spain: relative to the proposed repeal of the arms embargo against (Appendix, 597).
Vessels: relative to the deceptive use of the American flag on British merchant vessels during the World War, 892.
War referendum: relative to Senate Joint Resolution 84 to provide for, 997.
SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY.
Communications from
Federal Crop Insurance Corporation: transmitting report of finances of, 29.
Gold: relative to certain problems concerning, 827.
Stabilization fund: relative to operations of, 921.
Tennessee Valley Associated Cooperatives, Inc.: transmitting report of finances of (S. Doc. 132), 29.
SECRETARY OF WAR.
Communications from
Aircraft: transmitting report of designs, parts, and aeronautical accessories purchased by the War Department, 772.
American Red Cross: transmitting the annual report of, 1058.
Chattanooga, Tenn.: report on survey of (H. Doc. 479), 24.
Hawks Nest Beach, Old Lyme, Conn.: transmitting report of investigation of beach erosion at, 14.
River and harbor surveys and examinations: Arkansas River (H. Doc. 480), 24.
——— Willapa Harbor, Wash. (H. Doc. 481), 24.
Rossville, Ga.: report on survey of (H. Doc. 479), 24.
War referendum: relative to Senate Joint Resolution 84 to provide for, 997.
SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION, letters from the Chairman transmitting reports on study of investment trusts and investment companies (H. Docs. 279, 476, 477, 482), 13, 29, 41, 355, 394.
SEGER, GEORGE N. (*a Representative from New Jersey*).
Attended, 8.
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 1302.
Neutrality, 1302.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.
SEIZURE OF AMERICAN SHIPS, article by Ernest L. Meyer relative to (Appendix, 568).
SELLWOOD STATION. *See* PORTLAND, OREG.
SENATE. *See also* YEA-AND-NAY VOTES IN SENATE.
Communication from the President congratulating the Members on conclusion of the work of the extra session, 1357.
Correspondence relative to the feasibility of holding the Senate debates and proceedings on neutrality in the Chamber of the House of Representatives (Appendix, 205, 206).
Joint resolution making an appropriation for mileage in connection with the second session of the Seventy-sixth Congress (see H. J. Res. 384*).
Remarks concerning the order of business, 5.
Resolution to meet at 12 noon daily (see S. Res. 184*), 4.
Resolution to pay Ela H. Atkinson (see S. Res. 193).
Resolution to pay funeral expenses of M. M. Logan (see S. Res. 192*).
Roll calls on question of quorum in, 3, 5, 44, 66, 82, 95, 108, 115, 121, 149, 159, 173, 184, 224, 233, 237, 239, 240, 244, 265, 272, 279, 285, 309, 316, 321, 354, 360, 396, 442, 456, 466, 489, 499, 500, 505, 540, 556, 589, 594, 602, 627, 645, 646, 678, 685, 706, 715, 722, 772, 781, 794, 805, 815, 830, 833, 890, 897, 902, 914, 964, 970, 982, 1009, 1027, 1351, 1356.
SENATORS.
List of Senators by States, 4.
List of those having sons of military age, 502, 503.
SETON HALL COLLEGE, N. J., addresses delivered by Thomas J. Walsh and James F. Kelley at the dedication of a new gymnasium building at (Appendix, 260).
Correspondence concerning the dedication of the Physical Education Gymnasium Building at (Appendix, 57).
SEVEN WONDERS OF AMERICAN GOVERNMENT, letter from Senator Donahey to William Green outlining (Appendix, 82).
SEWARD, LILLIAN R., pension (see bill H. R. 7567).
SEWARD, WILLIAM H. (*late a Senator from New York*).
Address delivered in the Senate March 11, 1850, on slavery question (Appendix, 533).
SHAFER, PAUL W. (*a Representative from Michigan*).
Attended, 8.
Editorial from the Jackson (Mich.) Citizen-Press relative to capture of steamship *City of Flint* (Appendix, 656).
Editorial from the Marine News on freedom of the seas (Appendix, 447).
Memorandum on illegalities of the administration's policy of neutrality (Appendix, 632).
Petitions and papers presented by, from
Citizens and individuals, 354.
Societies and associations, 489.
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 1143.
National Committee to Keep America Out of War (Appendix, 221).
Neutral zones in Western Hemisphere, 305 (Appendix, 289).
Neutrality, 762, 1143.
——— letter from Thomas Spencer Cobb, 762, 763.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.
"SHAM BATTLE," editorial by H. L. Mencken entitled (Appendix, 459).
SHANLEY, JAMES A. (*a Representative from Connecticut*).
Attended, 8.
Address by Maj. Gen. Hugh A. Drum at First Army maneuvers, Plattsburg, N. Y. (Appendix, 237).
Article from American Journal of International Law on neutrality, 1117.
Article by Walter Lippmann on neutrality, 1114.
Letter from Helen Wood relative to Dies Committee on Un-American Activities (Appendix, 816).

SHANLEY, JAMES A.—Continued.
Statements by authorities regarding repeal of arms embargo (Appendix, 761).
——— Edwin M. Borchard (Appendix, 761).
——— William C. Dennis (Appendix, 763).
——— Frederick S. Dunn (Appendix, 763).
——— Henry S. Fraser (Appendix, 763).
——— William P. Lage (Appendix, 762).
——— J. B. Moore (Appendix, 761).
Bills and joint resolutions introduced by
Columbus, Christopher: to celebrate anniversary of the discovery of America by (see H. J. Res. 390), 354.
Motions and resolutions offered by
Neutrality (H. J. Res. 306) instruct conferees, 1104, 1344.
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 1104, 1105, 1107, 1115, 1116, 1117, 1205, 1217, 1337 (Appendix, 761).
Columbus, Christopher, 336.
Dies investigating committee (Appendix, 815).
Neutrality, 1104, 1105, 1107, 1115, 1116, 1117, 1205, 1217, 1337 (Appendix, 761).
——— history of American policy, 1107.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

SHANNON, JOSEPH B. (*a Representative from Missouri*).
Attended, 8.
Address by Hon. William H. Seward, March 11, 1850, entitled "The Higher Law" (Appendix, 533).
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 139, 140.
Neutrality, 139, 1071.
——— excerpts from Jefferson and Washington, 1072.
Permission to address the House, 78.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

SHARRAH, BESSIE, relief (see bill S. 2988).

SHAW, GEORGE BERNARD, article entitled "The War is Over" written by, 197 (Appendix, 206).
Editorial from the Minneapolis Morning Tribune entitled "Mr. Shaw Asks a Question" (Appendix, 720).
Remarks in Senate relative to, 382.

SHEIL, BERNARD J., article from the New York Times commenting on Bishop Sheil's radio address on neutrality (Appendix, 155).
Address over the radio entitled "America's Catholic Youth and Europe's War" (Appendix, 131).

SHELTON, W. F., review of the book The Pressure Boys, by (Appendix, 760).

SHEPPARD, HARRY R. (*a Representative from California*).
Attended, 8.
Resolution by the Long Beach Democratic Club, California, regarding neutrality (Appendix, 784).
Petitions and papers presented by, from
Societies and associations, 1398.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

SHEPPARD, MORRIS (*a Senator from Texas*).
Attended, 3.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

SHERMAN, LAWRENCE Y. (*late a Senator from Illinois*).
Announcement of death of, 4, 12.
Articles written by (Appendix, 10).
Eulogy in the House to, 12.
Poem entitled "We Call This Life," by, 13.

SHIPS. *See* VESSELS.

SHIPSTEAD, HENRIK (*a Senator from Minnesota*).
Attended, 3.
Editorials from Chicago Daily Tribune on the European crisis (Appendix, 86).
Editorial from Minneapolis Morning Tribune relative to George Bernard Shaw (Appendix, 720).
Poem by Jens K. Grondahl entitled "Columbia's Peace Prayer" (Appendix, 534).
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 449, 858.
Neutrality, 449, 858.
Stabilization fund, 919, 923.
Treaty of Versailles, 453.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

SHOE INDUSTRY, remarks in House relative to (Appendix, 166).

SHORT, DEWEY (*a Representative from Missouri*).
Attended, 8.
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 1166.
Neutrality, 1166.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

SHRIAY, RACHIB, relief (see bill H. R. 7552).

SIDENER, MERLE, address on the subject Happiness and Salvation, delivered by (Appendix, 829).

SIMPSON, RICHARD M. (*a Representative from Pennsylvania*).
Attended, 8.
Bills and joint resolutions introduced by
Collins, Patrick: for relief (see bill H. R. 7613), 1158.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

SIOUX CITY (IOWA) TRIBUNE (newspaper), editorial entitled "Put Control of Rivers Under Maritime Board," appearing in (Appendix, 108).

SIROVICH, WILLIAM I. (*a Representative from New York*).
Attended, 8.
Article by Harry H. Schlacht entitled "Our Prince of Peace" (Appendix, 789).
Text of Pope Pius XII's Encyclical (Appendix, 702).
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 1107, 1108, 1145, 1150.
Hamilton, Claude, Jr.: general counsel of Reconstructnon Finance Corporation, 1396.
Neutrality, 1107, 1108, 1145, 1150.
Order of business, 16.
Permission to address the House, 1074.
Philosophies of leading nations of the world, 1145.
Reconstruction Finance Corporation—disaster relief, 1396.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

SKIPPER (school publication), editorial concerning the investigation of un-American activities appearing in (Appendix, 662).

SLATTERY, JAMES M. (*a Senator from Illinois*).
Attended, 3.
Article by James Morgan on neutrality (Appendix, 404).
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

SMALL BUSINESS AND ITS CREDIT PROBLEM, article by Ernest G. Draper on (Appendix, 200).

SMALL-BUSINESS MEN'S ASSOCIATION. *See* NATIONAL SMALL-BUSINESS MEN'S ASSOCIATION.

SMATHERS, WILLIAM H. (*a Senator from New Jersey*).
Attended, 3.
Bills and joint resolutions introduced by
Amplus Storage Battery Co.: for relief (see bill S. 2978), 47.
Remarks by, on
Wilson, Woodrow, 777.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

SMITH, ALFRED E., address over the radio entitled "Repeal of the Embargo Act" delivered by (Appendix, 78, 106).

SMITH, C. W., letter relative to importation of mink pelts, 1280, 1281.

SMITH, CHARLES BROOKS, article entitled "Keep America Out of War" written by (Appendix, 501).

SMITH, CLYDE H. (*a Representative from Maine*).
Attended, 8.
Remarks in the Maine Legislature paying tribute to Thomas Brackett Reed (Appendix, 398).
Statement by Arthur Charles Jackson on the centennial anniversary of the birth of Frances E. Willard (Appendix, 782).
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

SMITH, ELLISON D. (*a Senator from South Carolina*).
Attended, 15.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

SMITH, FREDERICK C. (*a Representative from Ohio*).
Attended, 8.
Excerpts from arms-embargo laws and decrees of other nations (Appendix, 351).
Permission to address the House granted to, 217, 767.
Statistics on cost of World War, 1036, 1037.
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 344–348, 1036, 1038, 1270, 1346.
Export-Import Bank, 1346.
Gold payments under proposed neutrality law (Appendix, 72).
Loans to belligerents by Federal agencies, 1346.
Neutrality, 344–348, 813, 1036, 1038, 1270, 1346.
Neutrality bill: cash-and-carry feature (Appendix, 72).
Stabilization fund, 624, 625, 1346.
Sugar—beet versus cane, 389, 390.
Treasury statement, 1371.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

SMITH, HOWARD W. (*a Representative from Virginia*).
Attended, 8.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

SMITH, J. JOSEPH (*a Representative from Connecticut*).
Attended, 8.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

SMITH, JOE L. (*a Representative from West Virginia*).
Attended, 8.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

SMITH, MARTIN F. (*a Representative from Washington*).
Attended, 8.
Editorial from Aberdeen (Wash.) Daily World on war (Appendix, 66).
Excerpts from book by Winston Churchill entitled "While England Slept" (Appendix, 157, 161).
Radio address on national defense by (Appendix, 335).
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 1189.
Domestic problems, 1190.
Neutrality, 1189.

SMITH, MARTIN F.—Continued.
Remarks by, on
Pulaski, Gen. Casimir: tribute to (Appendix, 254).
While England Slept—book by Winston Churchill (Appendix, 157, 161).
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.
SMITH, PAUL C., article entitled "The Way Out for America" written by (Appendix, 586).
SMITH, REMBERT GILMAN, statement favoring repeal of the arms-embargo, submitted by (Appendix, 483).
SMITH, THOMAS V. (*a Representative from Illinois*).
Attended, 8.
Address at inauguration of Dr. Harry D. Gideonse as president of Brooklyn College, New York, by (Appendix, 750).
Address by Josephine Wilkins, Atlanta, Ga., on economic conditions in the South (Appendix, 740).
Radio address entitled "Neutrology and Neutrality," by (Appendix, 26).
Remarks over the radio during discussion of neutrality on the American Forum of the Air program (Appendix, 778, 779).
Remarks by, on
Folklore of fatalism (Appendix, 830).
Nazi-ism, a full-fledged fatalism (Appendix, 830).
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.
SNYDER, J. BUELL (*a Representative from Pennsylvania*).
Attended, 8.
Address before National Guard convention, Baltimore, Md. (Appendix, 826).
Bills and joint resolutions introduced by
Army: to provide for the rank and title of lieutenant general (see bill H. R. 7611), 1158.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.
SOMERS, ANDREW L. (*a Representative from New York*).
Attended, 8.
Bills and joint resolutions introduced by
Unger, Ernest: for relief (see bill H. R. 7626), 1397.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.
SOMERSET DAILY AMERICAN, editorial relative to qualifications of President Franklin D. Roosevelt for handling the foreign affairs of the United States Government appearing in (Appendix, 358).
SOMMERER, MRS. WILMA, letter opposing repeal of the arms embargo received from, 1196.
SONS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION, editorial written by the president general of the national society on the subject of neutrality (Appendix, 489).
SOUDER, WILMER, address entitled "Crime—the Church Must and Can Meet It" delivered by (Appendix, 723).
SOULEK, JOSEPH, relief (see bill S. 2994).
SOUTH, CHARLES L. (*a Representative from Texas*).
Attended, 8.
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 261, 262, 263, 342, 347, 348, 536.
Neutrality, 342, 347, 348.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.
SOUTH AMERICA, remarks in House relative to the trade agreements with (Appendix, 823).
SOUTH DAKOTA, statement by Representative Mundt concerning (Appendix, 859).
SPAIN, excerpts from arms-embargo laws of (Appendix, 354).
SPARKMAN, JOHN J. (*a Representative from Alabama*).
Attended, 8.
Letter from Edward A. O'Neal and radio interview with Dr. Harcourt A. Morgan relative to T. V. A. agricultural program (Appendix, 780).
Remarks by, on
Crop conditions in Alabama, 40.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.
SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES. *See also* WILLIAM B. BANKHEAD.
Appointment of committee to notify the President, 8.
Appointment of funeral committee, 79, 80, 148, 1081.
Appointment of Members to conduct the President, 8.
Appointment of Member to Special Committee to Investigate Un-American Activities, 8.
Appointment of Member to Migratory Bird Conservation Commission, 771.
Appointment of Members on committee to plan celebration for the celebration of the first session of the Supreme Court, 939.
Appointment of Star-Spangled Banner Commission, 9.
Authorized to appoint commissions and committees after adjournment, 1390.
Communication from the President prior to adjournment, 1397.
Presentation of the President of the United States, 9.
Petitions and papers presented by, from
Citizens and individuals, 15, 28, 1081, 1398.
Societies and associations, 15, 28, 44, 223, 265, 489, 568, 888.
State legislatures, 15, 149, 223, 540.
SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE—Continued.
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 1340.
Leave of absence, 18.
Martin, Joseph W.: birthday, 1379.
Neutrality, 1340.
——— comparative print of bills, 1066.
——— rules of procedure, 1104, 1105.
SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE, Mr. Rayburn elected, 18.
SPECIAL ASSISTANT ATTORNEYS. *See* COURTS OF THE UNITED STATES.
SPECIAL SESSION. *See* CONGRESS.
SPECULATION THE REAL MISCHIEF MAKER, statement in article of American Good Government Society relative to (Appendix, 860).
SPENCE, BRENT (*a Representative from Kentucky*).
Appointed on funeral committee, 148.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.
SPIRITUAL PREPAREDNESS, address delivered by Representative Brewster at Bangor, Maine, on the subject of (Appendix, 867).
SPRAGUE, CHARLES A. (Governor of Oregon), tribute to Senator McNary by (Appendix, 304).
SPRINGER, RAYMOND S. (*a Representative from Indiana*).
Attended, 8.
Address by James M. Tucker on Abraham Lincoln (Appendix, 180).
Article by Adolph Starr on neutrality (Appendix, 537).
Editorial from Richmond (Ind.) Palladium-Item relative to Dies committee (Appendix, 182).
Editorial from Washington Times-Herald on industrial mobilization (Appendix, 336).
Editorial from the Block newspapers on the powers of the Chief Executive (Appendix, 640).
Resolution adopted by American Legion on neutrality (Appendix, 437).
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 1154 (Appendix, 365, 403, 437).
Neutrality, 1154 (Appendix, 365, 437).
Purnell, Fred S.: tribute to, 756.
War profiteering (Appendix, 403).
——— article from Washington Star (Appendix, 403, 404).
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.
SQUIRE, CLARK, article relative to the transfer of Alaska to the United States written by (Appendix, 465).
STABILIZATION FUND, amendment and remarks in Senate relative to expenditures from, 916, 917.
Letter from the Secretary of the Treasury relative to operations of, 921.
STADERMAN, RICHARD A., article entitled "One Hundred Percent Protection Against Competitive Imports Produced by Alien Peons and Sweatshops" written by (Appendix, 627).
Article concerning reciprocal trade agreements, written by (Appendix, 853).
Editorial from the Henry County (Ohio) Signal containing references to (Appendix, 468).
STAHLMAN, JAMES G., article entitled "Preparedness" written by (Appendix, 295).
STALKER, CHARLES H., letter concerning the experience of persons on relief (Appendix, 225).
STANSBURY CREEK, BALTIMORE, MD., authorize construction of a dike or dam across (see bills S. 2977; H. R. 7564).
STANTON, ELIZABETH CADY, article by Alma Lutz relative to (Appendix, 799).
STARNES, JOE (*a Representative from Alabama*).
Attended, 8.
Radio address by Hon. Martin Dies on investigation of un-American activities (Appendix, 634).
Remarks by, on
American League for Peace and Democracy, 883, 886.
Broun, Heywood, 881.
Subversive activities, 881, 883, 886.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.
STARR, ADOLPH, article entitled "Patriotism Versus Neutrality" written by (Appendix, 537).
STAR-SPANGLED BANNER (national anthem), appointment in House of members of the commission on the celebration of the one hundred and twenty-fifth anniversary of the writing of, 9.
STATE OF THE NATION, address delivered by Representative Eaton, of New Jersey, at Somerville, N. J., relative to (Appendix, 546).
STATES, amend the Judicial Code relative to intervention by States and direct appeals to the Supreme Court of the United States in certain cases involving the constitutionality of acts of the legislatures of (see bill H. R. 7599).
STATISTICS.
Aircraft orders, 323.
American farmers and the domestic market (Appendix, 167).

STATISTICS—Continued.
Arms and ammunition sold to Great Britain by Germany and Austria-Hungary during the Boer War, 127.
Army aircraft appropriations, 1267.
Deficits, 1363.
Expenditures for naval aircraft and munitions (Appendix, 727).
Exports, 243, 244.
Exports, imports, and trade balances of agricultural products (Appendix, 737).
Exports of agricultural products (Appendix, 520).
Exports of American munitions and aircraft, 1266.
Exports of copper (Appendix, 728).
Exports of merchandise from the United States, 845.
French economic statistics, 423, 424, 425, 426.
Government spending, 135, 259.
Income taxes in Great Britain and the United States, 135.
Labor strikes, 301.
Latin American trade, 960.
Naval armaments of the seven great powers, 1065, 1066.
Neutral ships lost in the European War (Appendix, 454).
Ordnance Department appropriations, 1268.
Strategic commodities (Appendix, 272, 273, 274, 275).
Unemployment (Appendix, 840, 841).
W. P. A. employment in Pennsylvania (Appendix, 874).
World War (Appendix, 544).

STATUE OF LIBERTY, NEW YORK HARBOR, statement by Herman F. Reissig and an address by Leonard Covello on the occasion of the fifty-third celebration of the anniversary of the gift to the United States by France (Appendix, 675).

"STAY OUT, AMERICA," article from Liberty entitled (Appendix, 306).

STEAGALL, HENRY B. (*a Representative from Alabama*).
Attended, 8.
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 1210.
——— loans by Federal agencies, 1210.
Loans to belligerents by Federal agencies, 1210.
Neutrality, 1210, 1211.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

STEARNS, FOSTER (*a Representative from New Hampshire*).
Attended, 8.
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 1324.
Neutrality, 1324.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

STEEL. *See* IRON AND STEEL.

STEERS, statement by Representative Mundt concerning prices of (Appendix, 860).

STEFAN, KARL (*a Representative from Nebraska*).
Attended, 8.
Articles written by the late Senator Lawrence Y. Sherman (Appendix, 10).
Bills and joint resolutions introduced by
Agricultural products: relating to imports of (see bill H. R. 7624), 1397.
Remarks by, on
Disaster relief, 1391.
Sherman, Lawrence Y.: death of, 12.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

STEWART, TOM (*a Senator from Tennessee*).
Attended, 44.
Address by Hon. Joseph F. Guffey at agricultural research laboratory, Wyndmoor, Pa. (Appendix, 405).
Letter by Hon. Kenneth McKellar on subject of arms embargo (Appendix, 148).
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 828, 829.
Neutrality, 828, 829.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

STIMSON, EDWARD W., sermon entitled "The Moral Basis for Neutrality," preached by (Appendix, 97).

STIMSON, HENRY L. (former Secretary of State), radio address on the subject of neutrality delivered by (Appendix, 198).

STOCKHOLM, SWEDEN, message from the President of the United States to the King of Sweden concerning the conference at, 590.

STONE, WILLIAM J. (*late a Senator from Missouri*).
Letter from Woodrow Wilson relative to American rights on the high seas, addressed to (Appendix, 698).

STRATEGIC COMMODITIES, statistics relative to (Appendix, 272, 273, 274, 275).

STRATEGIC MATERIALS, statement concerning the principal uses of, 637.

STRAUS, NATHAN (U. S. Housing Administrator), letter from Alfred Rheinstein concerning relations with, 254.

STRIKES. *See* LABOR.

SUBMARINES, excerpt from the Philadelphia Record relative to the absence of submarines in the Caribbean area, 590.

SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES IN THE UNITED STATES, remarks in Senate and a statement by Rembert Gilman Smith relative to (Appendix, 483).

SUGAR, letter from D. E. Montgomery commenting on the quality of beet sugar (Appendix, 602).
Remarks in House relative to beet-sugar culture, 387.

SULLIVAN, CHRISTOPHER D. (*a Representative from New York*).
Attended, 8.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

SULLIVAN, ED, article in the New York Daily News entitled "Soliloquy," written by (Appendix, 598).

SULLIVAN, MARK, article relative to the effect of proposed neutrality legislation on the merchant marine, written by (Appendix, 264).

SUMNER, JESSIE (*a Representative from Illinois*).
Attended, 8.
Address before Republican League of Women on neutrality (Appendix, 91).
Address at Camp Gilman, Crescent City, Ill., on neutrality (Appendix, 14).
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 345, 1258.
Neutrality, 1258.
——— printing of pamphlet, 256.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

SUMNERS, HATTON W. (*a Representative from Texas*).
Attended. 8.
Appointed on Supreme Court celebration committee, 939.
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 1207.
Neutrality, 1207.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES, appointment in House of members of the joint committee on anniversary of commencement of the first session of, 939.
Statement in the case of the Curtiss-Wright Export Corporation, 838.

SURTAXES, address over the radio delivered by Representative McCormack urging reduction of (Appendix, 156).

SUTPHIN, WILLIAM H. (*a Representative from New Jersey*).
Attended, 8.
Radio address by Charles Edison on Navy Day (Appendix, 599).
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

SWANEY, W. B., letter relative to the arms embargo, written by (Appendix, 640).

SWEDEN, excerpts from arms-embargo laws of (Appendix, 354).

SWEENEY, MARTIN L. (*a Representative from Ohio*).
Attended, 8.
Address before convention of the National Federation of Post Office Clerks, Houston, Tex., by (Appendix, 738).
Address at Letter Carriers' Convention, Milwaukee, Wis. (Appendix, 734).
Appointed on funeral committee, 1081.
Article by J. G. Johnston in magazine Canadian Business entitled "Hands Off the U. S. A." (Appendix, 478).
Editorials from the Gaelic American on the arms embargo (Appendix, 282).
Letter from John J. O'Connor to the New York Sun on the subject of banshees (Appendix, 208).
Prayer by John Carroll, first bishop of the Catholic Church in America, 1314, 1315.
Tables showing result of radio survey (Appendix, 515, 516).
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 1313, 1314.
Bolton, Chester C.: tribute to, 1074, 1075.
British propaganda, 1313, 1314.
Great Britain: conquests of, 1314, 1315.
Lindbergh, Charles, 1314.
Neutrality, 1314.
——— comparative print of bills, 1060.
Radio broadcasting industry (Appendix, 514).
——— results of survey (Appendix, 514).
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

SWITZERLAND, excerpts from arms-embargo laws of (Appendix, 354).

TABER, JOHN (*a Representative from New York*).
Attended, 8.
Bills and joint resolutions introduced by
Seward, Lillian R.: to pension (see bill H. R. 7567), 149.
Remarks by, on
Bolton, Chester C.: tribute to, 1076.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

TAFT, ROBERT A. (*a Senator from Ohio*).
Attended, 15.
Address at Vienna, Ill., on neutrality (Appendix, 75).
Address before American Federation of Labor convention, Cincinnati, Ohio (Appendix, 504).
Address before Indianapolis Bar Association on emergency powers of the President (Appendix, 713).

TAFT, ROBERT A.—Continued.
Appointed on funeral committee, 1091.
Poll of public opinion conducted by Cleveland (Ohio) Press on neutrality, 541.
Remarks in House relative to amendment to neutrality bill offered by, 1210, 1211, 1250.
Text of amendment to neutrality bill offered by, 1250.
Amendments offered by, to
Neutrality (H. J. Res. 306): to amend, 443, 790, 791, 916, 917, 924.
Motions and resolutions offered by
Bolton, Chester C.: death of (S. Res. 194), 1091.
Petitions and papers presented by, from
Societies and associations, 109.
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 355, 779, 782, 783, 786, 790, 791, 792, 793, 794, 916, 924.
Export-Import Bank, 924, 925.
Neutrality, 355, 779, 782, 783, 786, 790, 791, 792, 793, 794, 892, 900, 916, 924, 1017.
Stabilization fund, 916, 917, 918, 919, 923.
War zones, 790, 791, 792, 793, 794.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.
TAGGART, A. V., retirement of (see bill H. R. 7627).
TALLE, HENRY O. (*a Representative from Iowa*).
Attended, 8.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.
TAMPA, FLA., address delivered by Martin Caraballo before the Foreign Trade Committee of the Chamber of Commerce of (Appendix, 617).
TANKERS, data relating to world ocean-going tankers of 2,000 gross tons and over as of June 30, 1939, 967, 968.
TARIFF COMMISSION, letter relative to domestic production and the importation of wood pulp, 82.
TARIFFS, American Good Government Society's plans for scientific tariffs, 1853 (Appendix, 629).
Article by American Good Government Society concerning the benefits of (Appendix, 859).
TARVER, MALCOLM C. (*a Representative from Georgia*).
Attended, 8.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.
TASMAN SEA, amendment in Senate relative to transportation by American vessels of mail, passengers, or articles to any port on, 787.
TAUSSIG, FRANK W., statement in article by Richard A. Stoderman relative to (Appendix, 630).
TAYLOR, EDWARD T. (*a Representative from Colorado*).
Attended, 8.
Letter to Senate Appropriations Committee relative to payment of funds to widows of deceased Members, 224.
Bills and joint resolutions introduced by
Congress—payment of expenses incident to the second session of the Seventy-sixth Congress (see H. J. Res. 384), 16.
Remarks by, on
Appropriations: efforts of committee to reduce, 258.
Expenses of special session, 260.
Reed, Thomas Brackett: tribute to, 572.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.
TAYLOR, J. WILL (*a Representative from Tennessee*).
Attended, 8.
Editorial from Knoxville Journal on cash-and-carry neutrality (Appendix, 171).
Letter by Charles D. Hilles regarding neutrality (Appendix, 111).
Tables relative to aliens in United States, 1376.
Bills and joint resolutions introduced by
Lawhorn, Isabel: to pension (see bill H. R. 7577), 222.
Remarks by, on
Aliens in United States, 1375.
American Committee for Protection of Foreign-Born, 1375.
Arms embargo, 34.
Dies Committee on Un-American Activities, 1375.
Neutrality, 34, 1093.
——— editorial from Washington Herald, 34.
Reed, Thomas Brackett: tribute to, 573.
Tennessee Valley Authority, 669.
Un-American activities, 1375.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.
TENEROWICZ, RUDOLPH G. (*a Representative from Michigan*).
Attended, 8.
Petitions and papers presented by, from
Citizens and individuals, 81, 223.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.
TENNESSEE VALLEY ASSOCIATED COOPERATIVES, INC., letter from the Secretary of the Treasury transmitting report of finances of (S. Doc. 132), 29.
TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY, letter from Edward A. O'Neal and a radio interview with Harcourt A. Morgan concerning the agricultural program of (Appendix, 780).
Remarks in House relative to, 668.
"TEST OF PATRIOTISM," address delivered by Frank Murphy, Attorney General of the United States, entitled (Appendix, 672).
TEXAS, Remarks in House relative to production of crude oil in (Appendix, 789).
THANKSGIVING DAY, joint resolution legalizing (see H. J. Res. 383).
Remarks in House relative to observance of (Appendix, 112).
THATCHER, M. W., address delivered to the Farmers' Union convention at Glasgow, Mont., by (Appendix, 620).
"THAT'S WHAT OLD CAESAR DID," poem relating to good roads entitled (Appendix, 442).
"THAT THESE SHALL NOT PERISH," editorial from the Country Gentleman entitled (Appendix, 400).
THILL, LEWIS D. (*a Representative from Wisconsin*).
Attended, 8.
Article from Parkersburg (W. Va.) News on neutrality (Appendix, 500).
Article from Washington Times-Herald on the chemical industry (Appendix, 692).
Letter from Fred R. Zimmerman regarding Wisconsin dairy industry (Appendix, 440).
Letter from German Embassy relative to contraband of war (Appendix, 813).
Statistics on cost of World War (Appendix, 544).
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo (Appendix, 594, 807).
Cash-and-carry neutrality (Appendix, 807).
Congress—need of remaining in session, 1371 (Appendix, 779).
Great Britain—war propaganda (Appendix, 858).
National defense (Appendix, 814).
——— statement by Smedley D. Butler (Appendix, 814).
Neutrality (Appendix, 594, 807).
Peace—attitude of Congress (Appendix, 823).
Propaganda (Appendix, 858).
——— by Great Britain (Appendix, 858).
World War: cost of (Appendix, 544).
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.
THIRTY-SIXTH DIVISION ASSOCIATION, resolution endorsing cash-and-carry legislation adopted by (Appendix, 661).
THOMAS, ALBERT (*a Representative from Texas*).
Attended, 8.
Address by Hon. Jennings Randolph at convention of post-office clerks, Houston, Tex. (Appendix, 216).
Address by Hon. Martin L. Sweeney before National Federation of Post Office Clerks, Houston, Tex. (Appendix, 738).
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.
THOMAS, ELBERT D. (*a Senator from Utah*).
Attended, 3.
Address before American Academy of Political and Social Science, Philadelphia, Pa., on subject of repeal of arms embargo (Appendix, 311).
Article on neutrality by (Appendix, 195).
Article by Joseph C. Fehr on the work of Mixed Claims Commission (Appendix, 349).
Letters received following radio address on neutrality, 469, 470.
Radio address on civil rights and liberties (Appendix, 299).
Radio address delivered September 11, 1939, on subject of neutrality, 466, 467.
Radio address by Frank N. D. Buchman on moral rearmament (Appendix, 608).
Radio broadcast by Hon. Harry S. Truman on moral rearmament (Appendix, 608).
Amendments offered by, to
Neutrality Act (H. J. Res. 306): to amend, 916, 938, 939, 973, 974.
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 151, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 167, 168, 466, 803, 916, 974, 975.
——— speech by Senator Borah, 468.
Foreign seamen, 974, 975, 980.
National Munitions Control Board, 803, 832.
Neutrality Act, 1939, 151, 154, 159, 167, 466, 803, 832, 916, 938, 974, 975, 980, 994, 1002.
Neutrality editorials, 468, 469, 470.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.
THOMAS, ELMER (*a Senator from Oklahoma*).
Attended, 3.
Article from Boston Traveler on air-mail pick-up (Appendix, 229).
Letters from President Roosevelt to Adolf Hitler, 198.
Bills and joint resolutions introduced by
Eastern or Emigrant Cherokees: for relief (see bill S. 2982), 223.
Indian reservations: to authorize sale of forest products from forests on (see bill S. 2983), 223.
Remarks by, on
Hitler, Adolf: German expansion under, 196.
Neutrality Act, 1939, 193, 194, 196, 973.

THOMAS, ELMER—Continued.
Remarks by, on
Peace: proposed negotiations for, 196, 198, 199.
Peace negotiations: editorial from Washington Star, 198, 199.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.
THOMAS, J. PARNELL (*a Representative from New Jersey*).
Attended, 8.
Editorial from the Bergen Evening Record favoring deportation of Fritz Kuhn (Appendix, 652).
Editorial from the Bergen Evening Record on the Dies committee (Appendix, 683).
Petitions and papers presented by, from
Citizens and individuals, 25.
Societies and associations, 15.
State legislatures, 265.
Remarks by, on
New Deal propaganda, 257.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.
THOMASON, EWING (*a Representative from Texas*).
Attended, 8.
Editorial from New York Times relative to alleged letter from Col. E. M. House to Lloyd George (Appendix, 334).
Letter from Gordon Auchincloss relative to alleged letter from Col. E. M. House to Lloyd George (Appendix, 334).
Letter from Frances B. Denton relating to alleged letter from Col. E. M. House to Lloyd George (Appendix, 334).
Remarks by, on
Adjournment over, 384.
Bohn Aluminum & Brass Corporation, 335.
House, Col. E. M.: alleged letter to Lloyd George from, 391, 392, 393, 523, 580, 581, 584, 585.
Order of business, 383, 384.
Permission to address the House, 337.
Printing matter in the Record, 297.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.
THOMPSON, CARL D., book review entitled "Who Gets the Money?" by, 863.
THOMPSON, DOROTHY, address over the radio on the subject of neutrality delivered by (Appendix, 775).
THORKELSON, J. (*a Representative from Montana*).
Attended, 8.
Article by Lord Beaverbrook on subject A Military Alliance With England, 302.
Article from American Mercury entitled "When Last We Were Neutral" (Appendix, 578).
Correspondence between the United States and belligerent countries prior to World War relating to neutral rights and commerce, 1721–1724.
Excerpt from Senate Document 346 on subject Who Are Responsible for the World War (Appendix, 33).
Excerpt from World Jewry, 392.
Excerpts from biographies of Cecil Rhodes and Andrew Carnegie, 579, 580.
Excerpt from maiden speech in House, 578.
Letter from the State Department replying to questions concerning the rights of neutrals, 304.
Letters and editorial concerning alleged letter from Col. E. M. House to Lloyd George inserted in Congressional Record by (Appendix, 334).
List of contraband proclaimed by Great Britain during World War, 1271.
Radio address by Rev. F. J. Beckman on neutrality (Appendix, 666).
Remarks in House concerning letter by Col. E. M. House inserted in Congressional Record by, 522, 523, 662 (Appendix, 554).
Secret report of the Balfour Declaration, 583.
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 260, 261, 262, 263, 264, 352, 353, 875, 876, 1067, 1140, 1270 (Appendix, 104, 172, 221, 438, 752).
——— effect of repeal (Appendix, 752).
———letter from Canadian citizen (Appendix, 753).
Balfour declaration, 392.
Beaverbrook, Lord, 302, 303.
Beckman, Rev. F. J. (Appendix, 666).
Betrayal of America: Senate action on neutrality, 1067.
Bill of Rights (Appendix, 438).
C. I. O. and communism, 352.
City of Flint (steamship), 876.
Commonwealth Federation of New York, 880.
Constitutional government, 578.
Frankfurter, Felix: statement on neutrality by (Appendix, 5).
Germany: exploitation after World War (Appendix, 37).
Ginsberg, Sam, 579.
Great Britain: propaganda of, 262, 302.
——— treatment of neutrals by, 1274.
House, Col. Edwin M., 579, 580, 581, 582, 584.
——— alleged letter to Lloyd George from, 391, 392, 393.
——— letter to Lloyd George from, 523.
——— telegram from Seward Collins, 585.
——— withdrawal of letter by, 611.
International bankers (Appendix, 37).
Invisible government, 392.
Japan: sale of planes to (Appendix, 221).
THORKELSON, J.—Continued.
Remarks by, on
Neutrality, 260, 302, 304, 305, 306, 341, 342, 352, 353, 393, 813, 875, 876, 1038, 1067, 1140, 1270 (Appendix, 33, 54, 172, 221, 438, 752).
——— analysis of bill, 260, 261, 262, 263.
——— analysis of Senate amendments, 1068.
——— letter by W. J. Bryan (Appendix, 54).
——— statement by Secretary of State (Appendix, 221).
——— styles 1935 and 1939 (Appendix, 5).
——— to instruct conferees, 1140.
Neutral countries: rights of (Appendix, 104).
Neutral zones for North and South America, 305, 306, 345, 352, 353 (Appendix, 172).
Panama Conference: establishment of war zone by, 260, 261, 262, 263.
Permission to address the House, 344, 384, 473, 862, 939.
Pittman, Key: reply to article by (Appendix, 104).
Printing matter in the Record, 862, 863, 866.
Rhodes, Cecil, 579, 580, 585.
Silver Shirts, 875, 876.
Spanish-American War: action of Great Britain during, 304.
Subversive activities, 875, 876.
Treaty of Versailles (Appendix, 37).
Voice of the people versus war mongers (Appendix, 54).
War propaganda (Appendix, 33).
War zones, 876, 877.
World War: responsibility for (Appendix, 33).
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.
THREE-QUARTER CENTURY CLUB, speech delivered by Representative Brewster at Dover-Foxcroft, Maine, relative to (Appendix, 853).
THUNDER AFLOAT (motion picture), remarks in House relative to, 393.
TIBBOTT, HARVE (*a Representative from Pennsylvania*).
Attended, 8.
Appointed on Star-Spangled Banner Commission, 9.
Arms embargo (Appendix, 530).
Neutrality (Appendix, 530).
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.
TIMBER TRADES JOURNAL OF LONDON, ENGLAND, article entitled "America Takes the Cash," appearing in (Appendix, 511).
TINKHAM, GEORGE HOLDEN (*a Representative from Massachusetts*).
Attended, 8.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.
TISDALE, JAMES W., letter to Charles A. Lindbergh on the subject of the arms embargo (Appendix, 673).
TITAN NEWS, BELLEFONTE, PA., editorial on the subject of peace appearing in (Appendix, 32).
TOBEY, CHARLES W. (*a Senator from New Hampshire*).
Attended, 3.
Address by Hon. Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., on neutrality (Appendix, 553).
Address by Archibald MacLeish at Carnegie Institute, Pittsburgh, Pa. (Appendix, 423).
Article by G. Gould Lincoln relative to neutrality proposal of, 107.
Correspondence with the State Department relative to use of American flag by foreign governments, 892.
Editorials bearing on the cash-and-carry feature of the neutrality bill, 194, 195, 196.
Letter to Hon. Alben W. Barkley relative to procedure to be followed in debating the arms embargo resolution (H. J. Res. 306), 105.
Radio address on neutrality by (Appendix, 147).
Radio address by Col. Charles A. Lindbergh on American neutrality, 6.
Amendments offered by, to
Neutrality (H. J. Res. 306): to amend, 708, 856, 890, 891.
Motions and resolutions offered by
Neutrality Act, 1939 (H. J. Res. 306): to recommit, 107, 232, 233.
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 104, 105, 106, 107, 110, 235, 708, 856, 857, 858, 859, 890, 891, 892, 893.
——— article by Raymond Clapper, 110.
——— articles from New York Times, 110, 111.
——— editorial by Bruce Bliven, 235.
——— motion to recommit, 235.
Foreign vessels: use of American flag by, 856, 857, 858, 859, 890, 891, 892, 893.
Lindbergh, Col. Charles A.: address on neutrality, 6.
Neutrality, 75, 104, 106, 110, 207, 235, 708, 856, 857, 858, 859, 890, 891, 892, 893, 894.
Neutrality Act, 1939: article by David Lawrence, 110.
Permission to extend remarks of Colonel Lindbergh, 4.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.
"TODAY AND TOMORROW," article by Walter Lippmann entitled, 1114, 1115.

TOLAN, JOHN H. (*a Representative from California*).
Attended, 8.
Article from Liberty magazine by Charles Edison on national defense (Appendix, 18).
Remarks by, on
Edison, Charles (Appendix, 18).
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.
TOLERANCE, remarks in House on the subject of, 954.
TOMAH INDIAN SCHOOL, WISCONSIN, convey to the State of Wisconsin (see bill S. 2985).
Memorial of Legislature of Wisconsin urging transfer to the State of Wisconsin of, 44.
TOWNSEND, JOHN G., Jr. (*a Senator from Delaware*).
Attended, 3.
Address by Hon. Robert A. Taft before Indianapolis Bar Association on subject of emergency powers of the President (Appendix, 713).
Article by George Rothwell Brown on gold stabilization fund, 919.
Editorial from Wilmington (Del.) Journal-Every Evening entitled "Keep America Out of War" (Appendix, 135).
Radio address by Hon. Charles L. McNary on neutrality (Appendix, 307).
Remarks by, on
Gold, 918, 919.
Neutrality, 918, 919.
Stabilization fund, 918, 919.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.
"TOWN THAT WOULDN'T ADMIT DEFEAT", article by Francis McQuillin entitled (Appendix, 796).
TRADE AGREEMENTS. *See* RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS.
TRADE OF THE UNITED STATES, article by Roger Babson relative to effect of war on (Appendix, 373).
TREADWAY, ALLEN T. (*a Representative from Massachusetts*).
Attended, 8.
Remarks by, on
Argentine trade agreement, 942, 944, 947.
Arms embargo, 1177.
Bolton, Chester C.: tribute to, 1080.
Gold reserves, 624.
Neutrality, 1177.
Permission to address the House, 656.
Reciprocal trade agreements, 944, 945, 947, 948, 949.
——— statistics, 945, 946.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.
TREASURY DEPARTMENT. *See also* SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY.
Letter from the Archivist of the United States transmitting list of useless papers in, 29, 41, 706, 815.
TREASURY STATEMENT, remarks in House concerning, 1362, 1371.
TREVOR, JOHN B., JR., address entitled "America's Attitude Toward European Conflict" (Appendix, 312).
TRIMBLE, SOUTH (Clerk of the House of Representatives), letter transmitting credentials of Representatives-elect Fadjo Cravens and Estes Kefauver, 9.
TRUMAN, HARRY S. (*a Senator from Missouri*).
Attended, 3.
Address at Caruthersville, Mo., on neutrality (Appendix, 202).
Appointed on funeral committee, 81.
Appointed on Special Committee to Investigate the Administration and Operation of Civil Service Laws, 489, 490.
Radio address by Hon. Lewis B. Schwellenbach on neutrality (Appendix, 193).
Radio address on moral rearmament, by (Appendix, 608).
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.
TUCKER, JAMES M. (Secretary of State of Indiana), address on Abe Lincoln, the Ferryman, delivered by (Appendix, 180).
TULSA UNIVERSITY VERSUS CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY FOOTBALL GAME, remarks in House relative to, 1371.
TURKEYS, statistics of imports of (Appendix, 340).
TWAIN, MARK, text of the war prayer written by, 688.
"TWELVE MONTHS UNDER THE NEW RULES OF CIVIL PROCEDURE", address delivered by Alexander Holtzoff entitled (Appendix, 728).
TYDINGS, MILLARD E. (*a Senator from Maryland*).
Attended, 3.
Message of President Quezon to special session of the Second National Assembly of the Philippine Commonwealth, 898.
Bills and joint resolutions introduced by
Stansbury Creek, Baltimore, Md.: to construct dike across (see bill S. 2977), 47.
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 122, 231, 232, 797, 840, 861, 904, 1006, 1007.
——— sale of poison gas, 904, 905.
Neutrality, 122, 231, 232, 797, 840, 861, 904, 1006, 1007.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.
UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES, address over the radio delivered by Representative Dies relative to the investigation of (Appendix, 634).
UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES—Continued.
Editorial from the Skipper relative to the investigation of (Appendix, 662).
Remarks in House relative to the proposed publication of the names of Government employees who are members of the Washington branch of the American League for Peace and Democracy, 878, 879.
Remarks in House relative to the investigation of, 1375.
Resolution to continue the Special Committee on Investigation of (see H. Res. 321).
UNEMPLOYMENT, excerpts from speeches by President Roosevelt, Thomas A. Edison, and Henry Ford on the subject of (Appendix, 837).
Statistics from 1917 to 1938 concerning (Appendix, 840, 841).
UNGER, ERNEST, relief (see bill H. R. 7626).
UNITED KINGDOM, text of certain subparagraphs of article XVI of the trade agreement of November 17, 1938, with, 1350.
UNITED RUBBER WORKERS OF AMERICA, resolution condemning attempts to weaken or abridge the principles of the United States Government adopted by (Appendix, 781).
UNITED SPANISH WAR VETERANS, report of proceedings of the Forty-first Encampment at Atlantic City, N. J., of (H. Doc. 498), 1397.
UNITED STATES, remarks in House relative to maintenance of the independence of, 950.
UNITED STATES COURTS. *See* COURTS OF THE UNITED STATES.
UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION. *See also* MARITIME COMMISSION.
Letter from the Vice Chairman transmitting a special report relative to the Dollar Steamship Lines, Inc., Ltd., 14, 29.
Report concerning pending neutrality legislation (Appendix, 267).
Resolution to investigate (see S. Res. 196).
UNITED STATES STATUTES, resolution to appoint a special committee to study (see H. Res. 316).
UNITED STATES TARIFF COMMISSION, statement in article by Richard A. Staderman relative to (Appendix, 630).
UNIVERSAL DENTAL CO., letter relative to the cash-and-carry section of the Neutrality Act received from, 627, 628.
URUGUAY, excerpts from arms-embargo laws of (Appendix, 356).
Remarks in House relative to the reciprocal trade agreement with (Appendix, 773).
VANDENBERG, ARTHUR H. (*a Senator from Michigan*).
Attended, 3.
Letter from Secretary of the Treasury regarding certain aspects of gold-purchasing policy, 827.
Statement by Herbert Hoover on repeal of arms embargo, 320.
Text of President's message to the Stockholm Conference of Nordic States, 590.
Motions and resolutions offered by
National emergency proclamation: to determine powers of the President under (see S. Res. 185), 32.
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 95, 230, 397, 599, 600, 679, 777, 787, 788, 834, 853, 854, 902, 903, 920, 921.
——— excerpts from speeches by President Roosevelt 102.
——— sale of poison gases, 902, 903.
——— statement from Windsor (Canada) Daily Star, 397.
Caribbean Sea: submarines in, 590.
——— article from Philadelphia Record, 590.
Excise taxes and reciprocal trade agreements, 1083.
Executive powers under national emergency proclamation, 32.
Gold: influx into United States, 687.
——— telegram to Secretary of the Treasury, 687.
——— purchase by the Treasury, 826, 827, 828.
Neutrality, 95, 230, 397, 599, 600, 679, 777, 787, 788, 834, 853, 854.
Order of business, 5.
Reciprocal trade agreements, 1083, 1087, 1088.
Roosevelt, Franklin D.: message to the Stockholm conference, 590.
Stabilization fund, 920, 921, 922.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.
VAN NATTA, MARION, pension (see bill H. R. 7575).
VAN NUYS, FREDERICK (*a Senator from Indiana*).
Attended, 3.
Discussion of neutrality on American Forum of the Air by Senators Nye, Pittman, Connally, Danaher, Lundeen, and Van Nuys (Appendix, 243).
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.
VAN ZANDT, JAMES E. (*a Representative from Pennsylvania*).
Attended, 8.
Editorial from the Titan News on the futility of war (Appendix, 32).
Letter from Edward E. Kennedy on farm conditions (Appendix, 692).
Letter to President Roosevelt relative to W. P. A. wage rates (Appendix, 870).
Radio address on neutrality by (Appendix, 298).

VAN ZANDT, JAMES E.—Continued.
Radio address on Navy Day by (Appendix, 596).
Radio discussion on neutrality (Appendix, 407).
Statement by Howard L. Russell regarding W. P. A. workers in Pennsylvania (Appendix, 873).
Study of living costs by department of economics, Pennsylvania State College (Appendix, 872).
Table on W. P. A. wage rates in Pennsylvania (Appendix, 870).
Bills and joint resolutions introduced by
Rutter, Josephine: to pension (see bill H. R. 7548), 24.
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 136, 526, 1309, 1318 (Appendix, 687, 862).
Congress—need of remaining in session (Appendix, 862).
Neutrality, 136, 526, 1309, 1318 (Appendix, 687, 862).
Relief workers and living costs (Appendix, 870).
World War veterans demand neutrality (Appendix, 862).
Works Progress Administration (Appendix, 870).
——— statement by Philip Mathews (Appendix, 871).
——— wage rates (Appendix, 870).
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

VEAL, statistics of imports of (Appendix, 340).

VENEZUELA, remarks in House relative to the effect on the United States oil industry of the trade agreement with (Appendix, 833).

VESSELS. *See also* NAVY.
Amendment and remarks in Senate relative to fixing punishment for fraudulent marking of foreign vessels in order to make it appear that such vessels are American vessels, 890.
Bill to authorize the President to dispose of certain (see bill S. 3008).
Data relating to world oceangoing tankers of 2,000 gross tons and over as of June 30, 1939, 768.
Letter from the Secretary of State relative to the deceptive use of the American flag on British merchant vessels during the World War, 892.
Letter from Edwin Borchard favoring exclusion of armed merchant vessels from American ports, 969, 970.
Letters from E. M. House to President Wilson dated February 5 and February 6, 1915, relative to the use of the American flag on foreign vessels during the World War, 897, 898.
List of torpedoed American vessels, 607.
List of United States merchant vessels sunk or attacked by Germany during the World War, 667, 668, 757.
List of American vessels reported to have been detained by belligerents since September 1, 1939, 1333.
Memorandum concerning entry of armed merchant vessels of belligerent nations into ports of the United States, 967, 968.
Remarks in Senate relative to protection of lives aboard passenger vessels, 1348.
Resolution to investigate the failure of the United States Maritime Commission and the Bureau of Marine Inspection and Navigation to comply with legislation for protection of lives of passengers and crews on (see S. Res. 196).
Resolution of the Minnesota State Federation of Labor relative to protection of lives of passengers and crews on, 1349.

VETERANS AND NEUTRALITY, letter from Henry A. Friede on the subject of (Appendix, 54).

VETERANS' HOSPITALS. *See* HOSPITALS.

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF THE UNITED STATES, letter and resolution on the subject of neutrality received from (Appendix, 69).
Outline of details of the 1940 objectives of (Appendix, 656).

VETERANS OF THE WORLD WAR. *See* EX-SERVICE MEN.

VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.
Appointment of committee to wait upon the President, 4.
Appointment of committee to conduct the President, 9.
Appointment of funeral committee, 81, 1091.
Appointment of conferees on neutrality bill, 1282.
Appointment of Member to Special Committee to Investigate the Administration and Operation of Civil Service Laws, 489, 490.
Appointment of Members to Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, 30.
Appointment of Member to Special Committee on Taxation of Governmental Securities and Salaries, 173.
Appointment of Member to Committee to Investigate Phosphate Resources, 396.
Bill to grant air-mail franking privilege to (see bill H. R. 7588).
Felicitations from the President prior to final adjournment, 1357.
Letter from Martin J. Kennedy suggesting that the Senate use the House Chamber during the neutrality debate (Appendix, 205).
Letter from Secretary of State inviting Senators to attend conferences on inter-American cultural relations, 540.
Resolution from New Jersey Legislature relative to profiteering in foodstuffs, 82.
Resolution from Wisconsin Legislature relative to promotion of sound dairy practices, 30.

VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—Continued.
Resolution of Wisconsin Legislature relative to Federal land bank and Commissioner loans, 30.
Resolution from Wisconsin Legislature relative to transfer of former Indian school at Tomah, Wis., 44.
Resolutions from Order of Odd Fellows paying tribute to the late Senator Logan, 355.
Petitions and papers presented by, from
Citizens and individuals, 31, 82, 109, 540, 541, 589.
Societies and associations, 4, 30, 44, 109, 173, 223, 355, 396, 490, 540, 541, 888, 964, 1082.
Remarks by, on
Motions to reconsider and lay on the table, 806.

VINCENT, BEVERLY M. (*a Representative from Kentucky*).
Appointed on funeral committee, 148.
Editorial from Edmonson County News on the late Senator M. M. Logan (Appendix, 361).
Funeral address of John A. Logan at Brownsville, Ky. (Appendix, 367).
Tables relative to imports and exports of agricultural commodities (Appendix, 868).
Remarks by, on
Reciprocal trade agreements (Appendix, 868).
——— reply to Mr. Reed (Appendix, 868).
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

VINLAND (Danish steamship), correspondence relative to pursuit by a British cruiser during the World War, 1274.

VINSON, CARL (*a Representative from Georgia*).
Attended, 8.
Bills and joint resolutions introduced by
Ex-service men: to extend time for filing claims on insurance contracts (see bill H. R. 7607), 1058.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

VIRGIN ISLANDS, letter from the Secretary of the Interior transmitting copies of legislation passed by the legislature, the Council of St. Croix, and the Council of St. Thomas and St. John in, 13, 29.

VOICE OF THE PEOPLE VERSUS WAR MONGERS, remarks in House on the subject of (Appendix, 54).

VOORHIS, JERRY (*a Representative from California*).
Attended, 8.
Address of J. Warren Madden on civil liberties (Appendix, 399).
Address before Washington Teachers Association on subject of American democracy (Appendix, 564).
Article by Les Finnegan on war profiteering (Appendix, 394).
Article by S. Howard Leech on national pensions (Appendix, 324).
Editorials by Manchester Boddy, Los Angeles Daily News (Appendix, 327).
Letter from John Anson Ford, Los Angeles, Calif., on neutrality (Appendix, 230).
Letter to members of House Appropriations Committee relative to relief appropriations (Appendix, 678).
Letter from Aubrey Williams to Representative Chester H. Gross (Appendix, 710).
Radio address by Archibald McLeish at dedication of the Hispanic room in the Library of Congress (Appendix, 319).
Resolution by the United Rubber Workers of America (Appendix, 781).
Statement by National Association of Manufacturers on neutrality (Appendix, 327).
Text of bill (H. R. 7545)—tax on war profits (Appendix, 122).
Bills and joint resolutions introduced by
Belligerent nations: relating to payment for goods sold to (see bill H. R. 7544), 24.
Civil Service Retirement Act: to extend (see bill H. R. 7627), 1397.
Foreign propaganda: to prevent spread in United States of (see bill H. R. 7546), 24.
Money: to restore to Congress the sole power to issue and regulate value of (see H. J. Res. 391), 395.
War munitions: to prevent profiteering in (see bill H. R. 7545), 24.
Petitions and papers presented by, from
Citizens and individuals, 25.
Remarks by, on
American League for Peace and Democracy, 883, 884, 885, 886, 887.
Arms embargo, 1242, 1243, 1369, 1370.
California: migrant labor problem (Appendix, 827).
Civil liberties (Appendix, 433).
Consolidated Steel Co., 1369.
Communist Party (Appendix, 433).
Currency expansion, 1365.
Dictatorship and democracy, 1060.
Dies committee on un-American activities, 885, 886, 887.
Economic recovery: proposed program for, 1062, 1063.
European war, 1060.
Farm Security Administration (Appendix, 827).
German-American Bund, 433.
Members of Congress: duty of, 1369.
Migrant labor problem (Appendix, 827).

VOORHIS, JERRY—Continued.
Remarks by, on
Money: purchasing power of the dollar, 1062.
Munitions industry, 1369.
Neutrality, 260, 1242, 1243, 1369, 1370 (Appendix, 122).
——— printing of pamphlet, 256.
Permission to address the House, 866.
Relief problem, 24.
Subversive activities, 885, 886, 887.
Treaty of Versailles (Appendix, 122).
Unemployment: real threat to democracy, 1061.
War: attitude of America toward (Appendix, 122).
War profiteering (Appendix, 124).
W. P. A. furloughs, 24.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

VORYS, JOHN M. (*a Representative from Ohio*).
Attended, 8.
Article by Dr. George W. Rightmire entitled "Keep Us Out of War" (Appendix, 101).
Amendments offered by, to
Neutrality (H. J. Res. 306): to amend motion to instruct conferees, 1204, 1205, 1343.
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo (340, 347, 869, 1101, 1124, 1204, 1205, 1318.
——— amendment relating to lethal weapons, 1204.
Bolton, Chester C.: tribute to, 1075.
Neutrality, 340, 347, 869, 1101, 1124, 1204, 1205, 1318.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

VREELAND, ALBERT L. (*a Representative from New Jersey*).
Attended, 8.
Address at annual fathers' dinner of the Junior Cavalry of America (Appendix, 466).
Address by Rev. Dr. James F. Kelley at Seton Hall College (Appendix, 260).
Address by the Most Reverend Thomas J. Walsh at Seton Hall College (Appendix, 260).
Dedication of gymnasium at Seton Hall College, South Orange, N. J. (Appendix, 57).
Editorial from Newark (N. J.) Sunday Call urging Congress to remain in session during war crisis (Appendix, 171).
Letter from Howard E. Grosvenor on neutrality (Appendix, 175).
Letter from John A. Matthews on neutrality (Appendix, 168).
Petitions and papers presented by, from
Societies and associations, 149, 588, 1158.
State legislatures, 149.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

WADSWORTH, JAMES W. (*a Represenative from New York*).
Attended, 8.
Appointed on funeral committee, 1079.
Excerpt from speech on neutrality by (Appendix, 844).
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 1310.
Neutrality, 1310.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

WAGES AND HOURS ACT, remarks in House relative to (Appendix, 31).

WAGE AND HOUR ADMINISTRATION, remarks in House relative to (Appendix, 861).

WAGNER, ROBERT F. (*a Senator from New York*).
Attended, 3.
Appointed conferee, 1282.
Article and statistics by Lowell Limpus on exports of war goods (Appendix, 77).
Letter from Martin J. Kennedy suggesting a conference of New York State Members of Congress to discuss neutrality (Appendix, 70).
Radio address on neutrality by (Appendix, 203).
Radio address on the national health program by (Appendix, 453).
Tables on exports of war goods (Appendix, 77, 78).
Amendments offered by, to
Neutrality (H. J. Res. 306): to amend, 786.
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 240, 241, 784, 920.
——— tables showing peacetime exports, 243, 244.
Bermuda: trade with, 784, 786, 789.
Gold, 920.
Neutrality, 193, 194, 240, 241, 784, 786, 789, 920.
Stabilization fund, 920, 921, 922, 923.
——— correspondence with Secretary of the Treasury, 921.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

WALDRON, WEBB, article entitled "How Scio Licked Hard Times" written by (Appendix, 297).

WALLACE, HENRY A. (Secretary of Agriculture), comments by Ernest K. Lindley on the address delivered to the Commonwealth Club of San Francisco by (Appendix, 613).

WALLGREN, MON C. (*a Representative from Washington*).
Legislative program of Regular Veterans' Association (Appendix, 402).
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

WALSH, DAVID I. (*a Senator from Massachusetts*).
Attended, 3.
Address at Labor Day celebration, Holyoke, Mass., on subject Propaganda, Peace, Preparedness (Appendix, 483).
Address at dedication of Calvin Coolidge Bridge, Northampton, Mass., by (Appendix, 482).
Addresses by Hon. Burton K. Wheeler and Hon. Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., at Wheeler homecoming celebration, Hudson, Mass. (Appendix, 457).
Address delivered at Gold Star Mothers' Day observance, Washington, D. C., by (Appendix, 535).
Editorial from Extension magazine on neutrality (Appendix, 569).
Statements on neutrality legislation issued by (Appendix, 571).
Amendments offered by, to
Neutrality (H. J. Res. 306): to amend, 888, 1033.
Bills and joint resolutions introduced by
Civilian naval training: to provide (see bill S. 3007), 1348.
Communications Act: to amend (see bill S. 3018), 1348.
National City, Calif.: to authorize Secretary of the Navy to accept certain land at (see bill S. 2991), 888.
Naval Academy: to increase number of midshipmen allowed at (see bill S. 3004), 1348.
Navy: to amend act making appropriations for naval service 1903 (see bill S. 3012), 1348.
——— to amend law relative to pay of all civilian employees of the Navy Department serving outside of the United States (see bill S. 3014), 1348.
——— to amend law relative to warrant officers (see bill S. 3016), 1348.
Navy Expeditionary Medal: to issue to certain Army and civilian personnel (see bill S. 3010), 1348.
Navy yards: to adjust pay of guards and guard officers at (see bill S. 2990), 888.
Oils: to amend law relative to processing tax on certain oils imported from the Philippines (see bill S. 3004), 1348.
Quantico, Va.: to amend act authorizing exchange of lands between the Richmond, Fredericksburg & Potomac Railroad Co., and the United States at (see bill S. 3017), 1348.
Revised Statutes: to repeal sections 3744, 3745, 3746, 3747 (see bill S. 3006), 1348.
Richmond, Fredericksburg & Potomac Railroad Co.: to authorize exchange of certain lands at Quantico, Va. (see bill S. 2992), 888.
Rivers and harbors: to amend act authorizing certain public works on (see bill S. 3013), 1348.
Roberts, Frank N.: to present Navy Cross to (see bill S. 3009), 1348.
San Diego, Calif.: to authorize exchange of certain land at (see bill S. 2993), 888.
——— to grant certain lands to city of (see bill S. 3015), 1348.
Vessels: to amend act limiting expenditures for repairs or changes to (see bill S. 3011), 1348.
——— to authorize the President to dispose of certain (see bill S. 3008), 1348.
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 492, 786, 900, 1003, 1007.
Bermuda and Nova Scotia: trade with, 786.
Neutrality Act of 1939, 472, 786, 900, 915, 1003, 1007.
——— preamble, 1031, 1032, 1033.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

WALSH, EDMUND A., address on the subject of neutrality and American foreign trade delivered by (Appendix, 743).

WALSH, THOMAS J., address delivered at the dedication of the new gymnasium building at Seton Hall College, N. J. (Appendix, 260).

WALTER, FRANCIS E. (*a Representative from Pennsylvania*).
Attended, 8.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

WALTMAN, FRANKLYN, statement in article of Richard A. Staderman relative to views of (Appendix, 628).

WAR. *See also* ARMS EMBARGO; EUROPEAN WAR; NEUTRALITY.
Address delivered by Representative Osmers at the New York World's Fair entitled "The War and American Business" (Appendix, 766).
Address over the radio delivered by Eddie Rickenbacker on the subject of the cost of (Appendix, 116).
Article prepared by Senator Holt on the subject of propaganda for (Appendix, 845).
Article by James Morgan entitled "One Sure Way to Keep Us Out of War" (Appendix, 404).
Article by George W. Rightmire on the subject of (Appendix, 101).
Article by Ed Sullivan appearing in the New York Daily News entitled "Soliloquy" (Appendix, 598).
Editorial from the Oregon Sunday Journal on the subject of power control by captains of munitions (Appendix, 758).
Joint resolution providing for adherence by the United States to the policy of nonparticipation in foreign wars (see S. J. Res. 189).

WAR—Continued.
Letter from the national welfare officer of the Military Order of the Purple Heart relative to providing a referendum on (Appendix, 472).
Lists of wars of England and France, 189, 1223.
Proclamation by President Roosevelt declaring that a state of war exists between Germany and France, and certain other countries (Appendix, 787).
Remarks in House on the subject of, 1393.
Remarks in House entitled "How Will Belligerents Pay Cash?" (Appendix, 807).
Remarks in House entitled "Will Propaganda Lead Us to War?" (Appendix, 858).
Remarks in House and a statement of the effects of war on horses (Appendix, 392, 733).
Resolution in Senate urging an immediate armistice in the European war, 82.
Statement by Manchester Boddy on the subject of (Appendix, 431).
Statistics relative to the cost of, 414.
Text of diplomatic correspondence concerning the war in Europe (Appendix, 142).

WAR BOOM, article by Les Finnegan urging prevention of (Appendix, 394).

WAR DEBTS. *See* FOREIGN COUNTRIES.

WAR DEPARTMENT, memorandum concerning the policy of the Department with regard to the establishment of permanent American cemeteries in Europe (Appendix, 394).
Statistics relative to appropriations for, 1268.

WAR MUNITIONS, prevent profiteering in (see bill H. R. 7545).

"WAR PARTIES," editorial from the Chicago Daily Tribune entitled (Appendix, 86).

WAR PRAYER, text of the prayer written by Mark Twain, 688.

WAR PRICES AND THE COST OF LIVING, address delivered by Representative Casey before the Conference on War Prices (Appendix, 676).

WAR PROFITS, address delivered by Senator O'Mahoney relative to control of (Appendix, 479).

WAR REFERENDUM, amendment in Senate to provide for, 986, 987.
Letters from the Secretary of State and the Secretary of War on the subject of, 997.

WARREN, LINDSAY C. (*a Representative from North Carolina*).
Attended, 8.
Motions and resolutions offered by
Cox, Alice Everett: to pay compensation (see H. Res. 304), 1367.
Remarks by, on
Neutrality, 1101.
Reports made by, from
Committee on Accounts:
Cox, Alice Everett (H. Res. 304, Rept. 1474), 1397.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

WAR'S CHALLENGE TO THE UNITED STATES, address over the radio delivered by President Franklin D. Roosevelt on the subject of (Appendix, 560).

WAR WITH GREAT BRITAIN, excerpt from Beveridge's Life of John Marshall describing Braddock's defeat (Appendix, 187).

WASHINGTON, GEORGE, excerpts from remarks by, 1071.
Letter relative to the advisability of organizing minority groups for the purpose of influencing legislative action written September 30, 1786, by (Appendix, 548).
Proclamation establishing the principle of neutrality, issued by (Appendix, 121).

WASHINGTON NEWS (newspaper), articles on the subject of sabotage and antidemocratic propaganda, 981, 982.
Editorials relative to the trade agreement with Argentina appearing in (Appendix, 382).

WASHINGTON POST (newspaper), article relative to the attitude of Senator Caraway toward repeal of the arms embargo (Appendix, 228).
Editorial relative to trade with Latin America appearing in (Appendix, 369).
Editorial relative to the Argentine trade agreement appearing in (Appendix, 382).
Editorial on foreign policy appearing in, 545.
Editorial relative to the strike at the Chrysler factory (Appendix, 440).
Editorial entitled "The Debate Reviewed," appearing in (Appendix, 516).
Editorial relative to publication by the House Committee on Investigation of Un-American Activities of the names of the members of the American League for Peace and Democracy, appearing in (Appendix, 530).
Editorial on Martin Luther appearing in (Appendix, 638).
Editorial on the subject of neutrality appearing in (Appendix, 659).
Editorial entitled "Common Sense Wins," appearing in (Appendix, 759, 794).

WASHINGTON STAR (newspaper), article commenting on the book entitled "America's Chance of Peace," appearing in (Appendix, 696).
Editorial relative to the Argentine trade agreement appearing in (Appendix, 382).

WASHINGTON TEACHERS' UNION, address delivered by Representative Voorhis before (Appendix, 564).

WASHINGTON TIMES-HERALD (newspaper), article relative to the indebtedness to the United States on the part of certain foreign countries appearing in, 418.
Article on the subject of chemicals appearing in (Appendix, 692).
Editorial entitled "Citadel of Civilization," appearing in (Appendix, 280).
Editorial on the subject of industrial mobilization appearing in (Appendix, 336).

WATSON, JAMES E. (*a former Senator from Indiana*).
Letter favoring repeal of arms embargo, by (Appendix, 606).
Letter to Representative Boehne relative to arms embargo (Appendix, 663).

WEALTH, address over the radio delivered by Senator Bridges relative to drafting of wealth in time of war (Appendix, 460).
Address over the radio delivered by Senator Gurney relative to the drafting of wealth in time of war (Appendix, 464).
Address over the radio delivered by Representative Harness concerning conscription of wealth in times of war (Appendix, 500).

WEAVER, ZEBULON (*a Representative from North Carolina*).
Attended, 8.
Letter from James W. Tisdale to Col. Charles A. Lindbergh relative to arms embargo (Appendix, 673).
Petitions and papers presented by, from
Citizens and individuals, 1398.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

"WE CAN STAY OUT OF THIS WAR," address over the radio delivered by Representative Case, entitled (Appendix, 28).

WELCH, RICHARD J. (*a Representative from California*).
Attended, 8.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

WEST, MILTON H. (*a Representative from Texas*).
Attended, 8.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

"WE MUST KEEP OUT," article by Herbert Hoover, entitled (Appendix, 557).

WENTWORTH, E. M. (commander in chief of the Military Order of the World War), address delivered at Roanoke, Va., by (Appendix, 485).

WESTERN HEMISPHERE, authorize negotiations for acquisition of certain territory in (see H. J. Res. 393).

"WHAT IS YOUR ATTITUDE TOWARD YOUR GOVERNMENT?", address delivered by Representative Kerr at Wake Forest College, N. C., entitled (Appendix, 58).

WHEAT, statement by Representative Mondt concerning prices of (Appendix, 860).

WHEAT, WILLIAM H. (*a Representative from Illinois*).
Attended, 8.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

WHEELER, BURTON K. (*a Senator from Montana*).
Attended, 149.
Address at homecoming celebration, Hudson, Mass., by (Appendix, 227, 457).
Address by M. W. Thatcher before Farmers Union Convention, Glasgow, Mont. (Appendix, 620).
Article from the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen's Magazine on homecoming celebration at Hudson, Mass., for (Appendix, 376).
Article from the New York Evening Post on the seizure of American ships (Appendix, 568).
Bills and joint resolutions introduced by
Veterans: to extend time granting preference right of entry to (see bill S. 2989), 589.
Motions and resolutions offered by
Neutrality (H. J. Res. 306)—to reconsider Clark amendment, 856, 971.
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 271, 276, 278, 279, 282, 288, 311, 856, 860, 971.
National Neutrality Board, 973.
Neutrality, 856, 860, 971, 972.
——— preamble, 1027, 1028, 1029, 1030.
Stabilization fund, 922, 923.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

WHEELING (W. VA.) INTELLIGENCER (newspaper), poll on the neutrality issue appearing in (Appendix, 431).

WHELCHEL, B. FRANK (*a Representative from Georgia*).
Attended, 8.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

"WHEN LAST WE WERE NEUTRAL", article by Harry Elmer Barnes entitled (Appendix, 578).

"WHILE ENGLAND SLEPT" (publication), remarks in House entitled (Appendix, 157, 161).
WHITE, COMPTON I. (*a Representative from Idaho*).
Proclamation by George Washington on neutrality (Appendix, 121).
Telegram to constituents giving views on neutrality (Appendix, 641).
Bills and joint resolutions introduced by
Linhart, William H.: for relief (see bill H. R. 7628), 1397.
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 1338.
Immigration problems, 139.
Neutrality, 1210, 1338 (Appendix, 121).
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.
WHITE, DUDLEY A. (*a Representative from Ohio*).
Attended, 8.
Letter from Raymond Moley to President Roosevelt relative to foreign affairs, 1237.
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 1236.
Bolton, Chester C.: death of, 1078.
Loans to belligerents by Federal agencies, 1236.
Neutrality, 1236.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.
WHITE, WALLACE H., JR. (*a Senator from Maine*).
Attended, 3.
Telegram read at Thomas Brackett Reed memorial services, Bowdoin College, Maine, from (Appendix, 855).
Amendments offered by, to
Neutrality (H. J. Res. 306): to amend, 787.
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 56, 786, 787, 793, 891, 967, 974, 976, 977, 1007, 1008 (Appendix, 293).
Neutrality, 56, 786, 787, 793, 794, 891, 967, 976, 977, 1007, 1008 (Appendix, 293).
Nova Scotia, 786, 787.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.
WHITE, WILLIAM ALLEN, article entitled "Our Middle-Class Statesman—Democracy's Norris" reviewed by (Appendix, 423).
Editorial paying tribute to Senator Capper written by, 109.
Letter on the subject of neutrality written by (Appendix, 685).
Telegram inviting participation in the National Nonpartisan Committee for Peace Through Revision of the Neutrality Law received from (Appendix, 619).
WHITMAN, BERNARD C., letter enclosing complaint and exhibits concerning certain applications for letters patent in re Irving A. Whitman, as trustee of Vincent I. Whitman, 1279.
WHITTINGTON, WILLIAM M. (*a Representative from Mississippi*).
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo (Appendix, 680).
Neutrality (Appendix, 680).
Order of business, 17.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.
"WHO GETS THE MONEY?" book review by Carl D. Thompson entitled, 863.
"WHY ONE AMERICAN BOY DIDN'T GO TO WAR," essay by Alice Chapple entitled, 1380.
WICHITA (KANS.) BEACON (newspaper), editorial entitled "Fire All Communists from United States Pay Roll" appearing in (Appendix, 597).
WIGGLESWORTH, RICHARD B. (*a Representative from Massachusetts*).
Attended, 8.
Editorial from the Cleveland (Ohio) News on the life of Chester C. Bolton (Appendix, 803).
Remarks by, on
Bolton, Chester C.: tribute to, 1071 (Appendix, 803).
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.
WILEY, ALEXANDER (*a Senator from Wisconsin*).
Attended, 3.
Address before Interparliamentary Union Conference, Oslo, Norway (Appendix, 85).
Address before Leif Ericson Society, Chicago, Ill., by (Appendix, 388).
Article by W. B. Hesseltine on the history of embargo policy (Appendix, 463).
Article from Fortune Magazine entitled "Milk in Chicago" (Appendix, 735).
Correspondence with fur dealers relative to importation of mink pelts, 1280.
Letter to the Committee for Reciprocity Information relative to proposed Argentina trade agreement, 1279, 1280.
Radio address on neutrality by (Appendix, 308).
Radio address on subject Mobilization for Peace (Appendix, 345).
Resolution from Wisconsin Legislature relative to fur-raising industry, 541.
Bills and joint resolutions introduced by
Hayward Indian School, Wis.: to transfer title to the State of Wisconsin (see bill S. 2984), 309.
WILEY, ALEXANDER—Continued.
Bills and joint resolutions introduced by
Tomah Indian School: to transfer title to the State of Wisconsin (see bill S. 2985), 309.
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 130, 154, 374, 375, 415, 708, 709, 711, 712, 713, 714, 755, 856, 996, 1016, 1017.
Neutrality Act 1939: 130, 154, 374, 375, 415, 421, 422, 437, 708, 709, 711, 712, 713, 714, 856.
War referendum, 996.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.
WILKINS, ERNEST H., address entitled "Democracy at Bay" delivered by (Appendix, 136).
WILKINS, JOSEPHINE, address entitled "Facts versus Folklore—An Adventure in Democracy" delivered by (Appendix, 740).
WILLAPA HARBOR, WASH., report of Secretary of War on survey of Bay Center channel of (H. Doc. 481), 24.
WILLARD, FRANCES E., correspondence and a statement concerning the celebration of the centennial anniversary of the birth of (Appendix, 782).
WILLIAMS, AL, address over the radio on the subject of neutrality delivered by (Appendix, 314).
WILLIAMS, AUBREY, address delivered before the National Conference of Catholic Youth Organizations at Cincinnati, Ohio, by (Appendix, 211).
Editorial from the Baltimore Sun relative to (Appendix, 260).
Letter relative to the National Youth Administration written by (Appendix, 710).
Remarks in House relative to, 1373.
WILLIAMS, CLYDE (*a Representative from Missouri*).
Attended, 8.
Remarks by, on
Johnston, Ronald J.: death of, 33.
Neutrality, 1211.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.
WILLIAMS, GEORGE S. (*a Representative from Delaware*).
Attended, 8.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.
WILMINGTON (DEL.) JOURNAL EVERY-EVENING, editorial entitled "America Can Keep Out," appearing in (Appendix, 135).
WILMINGTON (DEL.) MORNING NEWS, article relative to the test of the night air-mail pick-up appearing in (Appendix, 711).
WILMOTH, WILLIAM, article on the subject of American peace and neutrality written by (Appendix, 693).
WILSON, WOODROW, letter to Senator Stone dated February 25, 1916, relative to American rights upon the high seas, written by (Appendix, 698).
Statement in article by Richard A. Staderman relative to concept of (Appendix, 630).
WINKLER, MAX, colloquy with Representative Celler on the subject of Germany (Appendix, 317).
WINTER, THOMAS D. (*a Representative from Kansas*).
Attended, 8.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.
WISCONSIN, convey the Hayward Indian School to the State of (see bill S. 2984).
Bill to convey the Tomah Indian School to the State of (see bill S. 2985).
Letter from Fred R. Zimmerman relative to production of dairy products in (Appendix, 440).
Memorial of legislature urging passage of bill (H. R. 6500) to provide for promotion of sound dairy practices, 30.
Memorial of legislature relative to importation of fox furs and mink pelts, 541 (Appendix, 365).
Memorial of legislature urging passage of bill (S. 2877) to postpone the payment of Federal land bank and commissioner loans, 30.
Memorial of legislature urging transfer of the former Indian school at Tomah to the State of, 44.
WOLCOTT, JESSE P. (*a Representative from Michigan*).
Attended, 8.
Remarks in House relative to amendment to Neutrality Act by, 1346.
Text of bill relative to loans to belligerents, 621, 622.
Text of proposed amendment to neutrality bill (H. J. Res. 306), 1157.
Amendments offered by, to
Neutrality (H. J. Res. 306): to amend, 1209, 1342.
Bills and joint resolutions introduced by
Loans to belligerents: to limit powers of certain agencies with respect to (see bill H. R. 7591) ,627.
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 621, 622, 623, 624, 1157, 1208, 1209, 1210, 1213.
——— Export-Import Bank, 1209.
——— Reconstruction Finance Corporation, 1209.
Credit to belligerents by Government agencies, 1374, 1375.
Great Britain: investments in United States of, 623, 624.
Loans by Federal agencies to belligerents, 621, 622, 623, 624, 625, 1208.

WOLCOTT, JESSE P.—Continued.
Remarks by, on
National debt, 624, 625.
National Committee to Keep America Out of War, 215.
Neutrality, 215, 621, 622, 623, 624, 625, 1157, 1208, 1209, 1210, 1213.
——— conference report, 1387, 1388.
Permission to address the House, 473, 578.
War debts, 624, 625.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

WOLFENDEN, JAMES (*a Representative from Pennsylvania*).
Attended, 8.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

WOLVERTON, CHARLES A. (*a Representative from New Jersey*).
Attended, 8.
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo (Appendix, 631, 694).
Neutrality (Appendix, 631, 694).
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

WOOD, HELEN, letter denying membership in the American League for Peace and Democracy, 1034 (Appendix, 815).

WOOD, REUBEN T. (*a Representative from Missouri*).
Attended, 8.
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo (Appendix, 137).
Neutrality (Appendix, 137).
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

WOOD PULP, letter from the Tariff Commission relative to domestic production and the importation of, 82.

WOODRING, HARRY H. (Secretary of War), address over the radio concerning Zebulon Montgomery Pike, Meriwether Lewis, William Clark, and John Fremont delivered by (Appendix, 100).
Address on the subject of national defense delivered by (Appendix, 612, 633).
Article by Ernest K. Lindley relative to (Appendix, 545).
Remarks in Senate and an editorial from the Army and Navy Journal relative to (Appendix, 277).

WOODRUFF, ROY O. (*a Representative from Michigan*).
Editorial from Detroit Free Press on neutrality (Appendix, 594).
Editorial from Detroit News on neutrality, 1236.
Text of bill (H. R. 7590) limiting imports of farm products, 625, 626.
Bills and joint resolutions introduced by
Agricultural imports: to limit importation of (see bill H. R. 7590), 626.
Remarks by, on
Arms embargo, 384, 1233.
——— statement by Cordell Hull, 1233.
——— statements by Harold Ickes, 1235.
Farm problem, 625, 626.
Farmers: relief for (Appendix, 401).
Lansing, Robert, 385.
Legislation during special session, 626.
Military equipment, 349.
Morgan, J. P. & Co., 385.
Neutrality Act, 1939, 384, 525, 526, 617, 1233 (Appendix, 594).
Page, Walter Hines, 385.
Permission to address the House, 217, 620.
World War: events preceding, 385.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

WOODRUM, CLIFTON A. (*a Representative from Virginia*).
Attended, 8.
Address by Col. E. M. Wentworth at convention of Military Order of World War, Roanoke, Va. (Appendix, 485).
Letter from George Washington to Bushrod Washington on the question of influence of minority groups on legislative action (Appendix, 548).
Letter by Woodrow Wilson relative to American rights upon the high seas (Appendix, 698).
Radio address on subject Keep America Safe for Americans in America (Appendix, 3).
Remarks in House concerning neutrality speech of, 218, 219, 297.
Motions and resolutions offered by
National Committee to Keep America Out of War: to investigate (see H. Res. 312), 222.
Remarks by, on
Fish, Hamilton: activities of, 211, 212, 213.
——— excerpts from foreign news dispatches, 212.
National Committee to Keep America Out of Foreign Wars, 211, 212, 213, 523, 524.
——— literature of, 213.
Neutrality, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215.
Neutrality bills: comparative print of bills, 1059.
Permission to address the House, 76.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

WOODS, SARAH E., increase pension (see bill H. R. 7598).

WORKS PROGRESS ADMINISTRATION, letter from the Archivist of the United States transmitting list of useless papers of, 706, 815.

WORK PROJECTS ADMINISTRATION, remarks in House relative to the new wage scale for workers under (Appendix, 870).
Remarks in House relative to conditions at Minneapolis, Minn. (Appendix, 700).
Statistics relative to employment in Pennsylvania under (Appendix, 873).

WORKERS ALLIANCE, remarks in House relative to, 218, 219.

WORLD BROADCAST ON MORAL REARMAMENT, radio addresses by Senator Truman, Frank N. D. Buchman, Richard E. Byrd, and Herbert H. Elvin on (Appendix, 608).

WORLD CONDITIONS AND NEUTRALITY, remarks in House relative to, 810.

WORLD EXPENDITURES FOR NATIONAL DEFENSE, statistics relative to, 1245.

WORLD JEWRY, article by S. Landman concerning, 583.
Excerpts concerning the Zionist movement appearing in, 392.

WORLD WAR (1914–18), address delivered by Hugh S. Johnson on the subject of (Appendix, 366).
Article by George Biehl relative to, 418, 419.
Article by Witt Bowden concerning American labor in (Appendix, 710).
Article by Parke Brown entitled "Reign of Terror in Pre-War Arms Deals" (Appendix, 756).
List of American vessels sunk by German submarines during, 90, 91, 667, 668 (Appendix, 757).
Remarks in House and data concerning, 384 (Appendix, 33).
Remarks in House and statistics of cost of (Appendix, 544).
Remarks in Senate relative to, 360.
Statement by Senator Bailey concerning American lives lost and ships sunk prior to entry of the United States into (Appendix, 454).
Table showing American merchant shipping losses in, 382.

WORLD WAR VETERANS. *See* EX-SERVICE MEN.

WORLD WAR VETERANS' ACT OF 1924, extend the period for filing claims on insurance contracts under (see bill H. R. 7607).

WRANGELL. *See* ALASKA.

WYNDMOOR, PA., address delivered by Senator Guffey at the laying of the cornerstone of the Agricultural Research Laboratory at (Appendix, 405).

YEA-AND-NAY VOTES IN HOUSE.
Adjournment: on Senate Concurrent Resolution 31 to adjourn November 3, 1939, sine die, 1389, 1390.
Arms embargo: on conference report on House Joint Resolution 306 relative to repeal of, 1389.
Neutrality: on amendments to House Joint Resolution 306 to provide for, 1343, 1344.
——— on conference report on House Joint Resolution 306 on the subject of, 1389.
Order of business, 1103.

YEA-AND-NAY VOTES IN SENATE.
Adjournment: on Senate Concurrent Resolution 31 to adjourn November 3, 1939, sine die, 1389.
Arms embargo: on conference report on House Joint Resolution 306 for repeal of, 1356.
Neutrality: on amendment to House Joint Resolution 306 declaring that all waters within 300 miles of the continent of Europe, of Great Britain, of Ireland to be a combat area, 790, 794.
——— on amendment concerning the issuance of licenses for the export of aircraft, 794, 800.
——— on amendment relative to appointment of members of the National Munitions Control Board, 800, 804.
——— on amendment requiring the President to issue a proclamation naming the foreign states engaged in a state of war, 830, 840, 841.
——— on amendment to promote the security or preserve the peace of the United States or to protect the lives of citizens of the United States, 840.
——— on amendment concerning the proposed establishment of an export control board, 856.
——— on amendment to prohibit the issuance of licenses for export of Livens projectors and flame throwers, 906.
——— on amendment to prohibit export of arms, ammunition, and implements of war except to nations on the American continents, 915, 916.
——— on amendment relative to expenditures from the stabilization fund, 923.
——— on amendment to prohibit loans by the Government designed to assist the export of goods to belligerent nations, 925.
——— on amendment to exclude submarines and other armed merchant vessels of a foreign state from ports of the United States, 970.
——— on amendment relative to export of arms, ammunition, or implements of war, 986.
——— on amendment to provide for a war referendum, 999, 1000.
——— on amendment concerning the cash-and-carry provision of the Embargo Act, 1019.
——— on amendment concerning the arms embargo, 1023.
——— on motion to recommit House Joint Resolution 306 providing for, 237.

YEA-AND-NAY VOTES IN SENATE—Continued.
Neutrality: on passage of House Joint Resolution 306 on the subject of, 1024.
——— on conference report on House Joint Resolution 306 on the subject of, 1356.
Order of business, 974.

YLAGAN, ANASTASIO A., letter relative to a claim against the United States by, 1279.

YORK, ALVIN C., address over the radio concerning neutrality and the arms embargo delivered by Appendix, 331).

YORK (PA.) GAZETTE AND DAILY, article on the subject of preservation of peace and democracy appearing in (Appendix, 282).

"YOUNG AMERICA," address delivered by Representative Brewster at Bangor, Maine, entitled (Appendix, 874).

YOUNGDAHL, OSCAR (*a Representative from Minnesota*).
Attended, 8.
Editorial from Minneapolis Star-Journal on Government expenses (Appendix, 404).
Statement on the Minneapolis, Minn., centennial (Appendix, 93).

YOUNGDAHL, OSCAR—Continued.
Remarks by, on
Minneapolis, Minn.: history of (Appendix, 93).
Neutrality, 1099.
——— reaction in Europe to Senate action, 1099, 1100.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

YOUNG MEN AND THE WAR, remarks in House relative to (Appendix, 150).

YOUTH ADMINISTRATION. *See* NATIONAL YOUTH ADMINISTRATION.

ZACK, JOSEPH, article by Heywood Broun concerning (Appendix, 182).
Remarks in House relative to, 133.

ZIMMERMAN, ORVILLE (*a Representative from Missouri*).
Attended, 8.
Resolution by Missouri congressional delegation on the death of Julien N. Friant (Appendix, 694).
Remarks by, on
Agricultural prices, 20, 22.
Neutrality, 341.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

ZIONIST MOVEMENT, excerpts from World Jewry concerning, 392.

HISTORY

OF

BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

HISTORY OF BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

SENATE BILLS

S. 2973—For the relief of Inez Gillespie.
Referred to the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, 24.

S. 2975—To authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with certain public works at Quonset Point, R. I.
Mr. Green; Committee on Naval Affairs, 47.

S. 2976—For the relief of Mary S. Gay.
Mr. Norris; Committee on Claims, 47.

S. 2977—Authorizing the construction and maintenance of a dike or dam across Stansbury Creek in Baltimore, Md.
Mr. Tydings; Committee on Commerce, 47.

S. 2978—For the relief of Amplus Storage Battery Co.
Mr. Smathers; Committee on Claims, 47.

S. 2979—For the relief of the San Francisco Mountain Scenic Boulevard Co.
Mr. Hayden; Committee on Claims, 150.

S. 2980—Providing for the sale of certain lands to the Arizona State Elks Association Hospital.
Mr. Hayden; Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, 150.

S. 2981—To return a portion of the Grand Canyon National Monument to the public domain.
Mr. Hayden; Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, 150.

S. 2982—For the relief of the Eastern or Emigrant Cherokees.
Mr. Thomas of Oklahoma; Committee on Indian Affairs, 223.

S. 2983—To authorize the sale of lumber and other forest products obtained from the forests on Indian reservations by Indian enterprises.
Mr. Thomas of Oklahoma; Committee on Indian Affairs, 223.

S. 2984—Authorizing the transfer of title of the Hayward Indian School to the State of Wisconsin.
Mr. Wiley; Committee on Indian Affairs, 309.

S. 2985—Authorizing the transfer of title of the Tomah Indian School to the State of Wisconsin.
Mr. Wiley; Committee on Indian Affairs, 309.

S. 2986—To authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with State and local agencies in carrying out operations against plant and animal diseases and noxious insects and other pests affecting agriculture.
Mr. Johnson of Colorado; Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, 443.

S. 2987—To reform the lease for the Sellwood station of the Portland, Oreg., post office.
Mr. McKellar; Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, 443.

S. 2988—For the relief of Bessie Sharrah.
Mr. Hayden; Committee on Claims, 541.

S. 2989—To extend the time granting preference right of entry to veterans.
Mr. Wheeler; Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, 589.

S. 2990—To provide for adjusting the compensation of persons employed as guards and guard officers at navy yards, and for other purposes.
Mr. Walsh; Committee on Naval Affairs, 888.

S. 2991—To authorize the Secretary of the Navy to accept on behalf of the United States certain lands in the city of National City, Calif.
Mr. Walsh; Committee on Naval Affairs, 888.

S. 2992—To authorize an exchange of lands between the Richmond, Fredericksburg and Potomac Railroad Co. and the United States, at Quantico, Va.
Mr. Walsh; Committee on Naval Affairs, 888.

S. 2993—To authorize an exchange of lands between the city of San Diego, Calif., and the United States, and acceptance by gift of certain lands from the city of San Diego, Calif.
Mr. Walsh; Committee on Naval Affairs, 888.

S. 2994—For the relief of Joseph Soulek.
Mr. Burke; Committee on Claims, 888.

S. 2995—For the relief of John Horvath.
Mr. Barbour; Committee on Immigration, 965.

S. 2996—Granting a pension to Affie W. McCandless.
Mr. Norris; Committee on Pensions, 1082.

S. 2997—For the relief of the Greenlee County Board of Supervisors.
Mr. Hayden; Committee on Claims, 1082.

S. 2998—To establish a permanent industrial loan corporation to assist financing institutions in making credit available to commercial and industrial enterprises.
Mr. Mead; Committee on Banking and Currency, 1082.

S. 2999—To legalize a bridge across Bayou Lafourche at Galiano, La.
Mr. Ellender; Committee on Commerce, 1082.

S. 3000—To authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes.
Mr. Barbour; Committee on Naval Affairs, 1281.

S. 3001—To prohibit all officers and employees of the United States from receiving any remuneration with respect to the manufacture or sale of arms, ammunition, or implements of war.
Mr. Frazier; Committee on the Judiciary, 1281.

S. 3002—Authorizing the Bradenton Co., its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across Sarasota Pass where Manatee Avenue, Bradenton, if extended, would cross Sarasota Pass, county of Manatee, State of Florida.
Mr. Andrews; Committee on Commerce, 1281.

S. 3003—For the relief of Ralph C. Hardy.
Mr. Guffey; Committee on Claims, 1348.

S. 3004—To amend paragraph (a) of section 602½ of the Revenue Act of 1934, as amended, relating to the processing tax on certain oils imported from the Philippine Islands or other possession of the United States, so as to provide uniform treatment for Guam, American Samoa, and the Philippine Islands.
Mr. Walsh; Committee on Finance, 1348.

S. 3005—To increase the number of midshipmen allowed at the United States Naval Academy appointed at large.
Mr. Walsh; Committee on Naval Affairs, 1348.

S. 3006—To repeal sections 3744, as amended, 3745, 3746, and 3747 of the Revised Statutes.
Mr. Walsh; Committee on Naval Affairs, 1348.

S. 3007—To provide for civilian naval training, and for other purposes.
Mr. Walsh; Committee on Naval Affairs, 1348.

S. 3008—To authorize the President of the United States to dispose of certain public vessels, and for other purposes.
Mr. Walsh; Committee on Naval Affairs, 1348.

S. 3009—Authorizing the President to present the Navy Cross to Capt. Frank N. Roberts, United States Army.
Mr. Walsh; Committee on Naval Affairs, 1348.

S. 3010—Authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to issue the Navy Expeditionary Medal to certain Army and civilian personnel.
Mr. Walsh; Committee on Naval Affairs, 1348.

S. 3011—To amend the act entitled "An act limiting expenditures for repairs or changes to naval vessels," approved July 18, 1935 (49 Stat. 482; 5 U. S. C. 468a), so as to increase the limit on expenditures for repairs and changes to any naval vessel during the second half of its life.
Mr. Walsh; Committee on Naval Affairs, 1348.

S. 3012—To amend the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes," approved July 1, 1902 (32 Stat. 662), relative to the payment of the commuted rations of enlisted men.
Mr. Walsh; Committee on Naval Affairs, 1348.

S. 3013—To amend section 5 of the act entitled "An act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1925 (43 Stat. 1190; 34 U. S. C. 893), so as to authorize the payment of a per diem in connection with naval aerial surveys and flight checking of aviation charts.
Mr. Walsh; Committee on Naval Affairs, 1348.

S. 3014—To amend the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes," approved July 1, 1902 (32 Stat. 662), so as to provide uniformity in the pay of all civilian employees of the Navy Department appointed for duty beyond the continental limits of the United States and in Alaska.
Mr. Walsh; Committee on Naval Affairs, 1348.

S. 3015—To authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant to the city of San Diego, for street purposes, three parcels of land situate in the city of San Diego and State of California.
Mr. Walsh; Committee on Naval Affairs, 1348.

S. 3016—To amend the act approved February 15, 1929, entitled "An act to permit certain warrant officers to count all active service rendered under temporary appointments as warrant or commissioned officers in the Regular Navy, or as warrant or commissioned officers in the United States Naval Reserve Force, for purpose of promotion to chief warrant rank," so as to permit service in the National Naval Volunteers to be counted for purposes of promotion.
Mr. Walsh; Committee on Naval Affairs, 1348.

S. 3017—To amend the act entitled "An act to authorize an exchange of lands between the Richmond, Fredericksburg & Potomac Railroad Co. and the United States at Quantico, Va.," approved June 24, 1935 (49 Stat. 395), so as to permit the removal of certain encumbrances on the lands concerned.
Mr. Walsh; Committee on Naval Affairs, 1348.

S. 3018—To amend section 210 of the Communications Act of 1934, approved June 19, 1934 (48 Stat. 1073; 47 U. S. C. 210), so as to permit communication utilities to contribute free services to the national defense.
Mr. Walsh; Committee on Naval Affairs, 1348.

187–189 SENATE JOINT RESOLUTIONS

S. J. Res. 187—Relating to the improvement of economic, commercial, and cultural relations among American republics.
Mr. Pepper; Committee on Foreign Relations, 150.

S. J. Res. 188—To restore to Congress the sole power to issue money and regulate the value thereof.
Mr. Frazier; Committee on Banking and Currency, 223.

S. J. Res. 189—Providing for adherence by the United States to the policy of no foreign entanglements or participation in foreign wars, and for other purposes.
Mr. Lundeen; Committee on Foreign Relations, 1348.

30–31 SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS

S. Con. Res. 30—Authorizing the printing of additional copies of the hearings held before the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate during the Seventy-fourth Congress, second session, on the bill (S. 3474) relating to neutrality.
Mr. Hayden; considered and agreed to in Senate, 46.—Referred to the House Committee on Printing, 148.—Reported back (H. Rept. 1472), considered, and agreed to, 336.

S. Con. Res. 31—Providing for final adjournment of the second session of the Seventy-sixth Congress.
Mr. Barkley; considered and agreed to, 1357.—House concurs, 1389.

182–196 SENATE RESOLUTIONS

S. Res. 182—Notifying the President that a quorum of each House has assembled.
Mr. Barkley; considered and agreed to, 4.

S. Res. 183—Notifying the House that a quorum of the Senate has assembled.
Mr. McNary; considered and agreed to, 4.

S. Res. 184—Fixing the hour of daily meeting of the Senate.
Mr. Minton; considered and agreed to, 4.

S. Res. 185—Calling on the Attorney General for a report on extraordinary powers available to the President during a national emergency or state of war.
Mr. Vandenberg; considered and agreed to as amended, 32.

S. Res. 186—Authorizing an investigation of the activities of agents of foreign nations affecting the neutrality of the United States.
Mr. Clark of Missouri; Committee on Foreign Relations, 32.

S. Res. 187—Relative to the Death of Representative Thomas M. Eaton of California.
Mr. Johnson of California; considered and agreed to, 33.

S. Res. 188—Authorizing the printing of additional copies of the hearings held before the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate during the current Congress on the bills and resolutions relating to "Neutrality, Peace Legislation, and our Foreign Policy."
Mr. Hayden; considered and agreed to, 46.

S. Res. 189—Relative to the death of Representative Thomas S. McMillan, of South Carolina.
Mr. Byrnes; considered and agreed to, 76.

S. Res. 190—Relative to the death of Senator M. M. Logan, of Kentucky.
Mr. Barkley; considered and agreed to, 81.

S. Res. 191—Favoring efforts by the United States and other neutral nations to bring about an early termination of the European conflict.
Mr. Johnson of Colorado; Committee on Foreign Relations, 82.

S. Res. 192—To pay certain funeral expenses of the late Senator M. M. Logan, of Kentucky.
Mr. Barkley; Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, 355.—Reported back, considered, and agreed to, 396.

S. Res. 193—To pay a gratuity to Ela H. Atkinson.
Mr. Austin; Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, 1082.—Reported back, considered, and agreed to, 1281.

S. Res. 194—Relative to the death of Representative Chester C. Bolton, of Ohio.
Mr. Taft; considered and unanimously agreed to, 1091.

S. Res. 195—Authorizing the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate to hold hearings during the Seventy-sixth Congress.
Mr. Byrnes; considered and agreed to, 1281.

S. Res. 196—To investigate the alleged failure of certain governmental agencies to comply with legislation for the protection of persons on passenger vessels.
Mr. Lundeen; Committee on Commerce, 1349.

5118–7545 HOUSE BILLS

H. R. 5118—For the relief of the State of Ohio.
Recommitted to Committee on the Judiciary, 1090.

H. R. 7126—Granting a pension to Mary Pauline Payne.
Mr. Johnson of West Virginia; reference changed to Committee on Pensions, 394.

H. R. 7542—To amend section 6 of an act of Congress entitled "An act for the protection of the fisheries of Alaska, and for other purposes," approved June 6, 1924.
Mr. Dimond; Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, 24.

H. R. 7543—To authorize the Secretary of the Navy to accept real estate granted to the United States by the city of Miami, Fla., and for other purposes.
Mr. Cannon of Florida; Committee on Naval Affairs, 24.

H. R. 7544—To provide sound payment for goods sold to belligerent nations.
Mr. Voorhis of California; Committee on Foreign Affairs, 24.

H. R. 7545—To prevent profiteering in war munitions.
Mr. Voorhis of California; Committee on Ways and Means, 24.

H. R. 7546—To prevent the spread of foreign propaganda in the United States.
Mr. Voorhis of California; Committee on the Judiciary, 24.

H. R. 7547—Granting an increase of pension to Effie J. Clark.
Mr. LeCompte; Committee on Invalid Pensions, 24.

H. R. 7548—Granting a pension to Josephine Rutter.
Mr. Van Zandt; Committee on Invalid Pensions, 24.

H. R. 7549—Providing for an examination and survey at Belle Glade, Fla.
Mr. Cannon of Florida; Committee on Rivers and Harbors, 41.

H. R. 7550—Authorizing the construction of a new veterans' hospital and diagnostic center in the First Congressional District of the State of South Dakota to be known as the "Royal C. Johnson Memorial Veterans' Hospital."
Mr. Mundt; Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, 41.

H. R. 7551—Authorizing payment to the San Carlos Apache Indians for the lands ceded by them in the agreement of February 25, 1896, ratified by the act of June 10, 1896, and reopening such lands to mineral entry.
Mr. Murdock of Arizona; Committee on Indian Affairs, 41.

H. R. 7552—For the relief of Rachib Shriay.
Mr. Cole of New York; Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, 41.

H. R. 7553—To admit George Matthew Schucktanz permanently to the United States.
Mr. Hawks; Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, 41.

H. R. 7554—For the relief of the San Francisco Mountain Scenic Boulevard Co.
Mr. Murdock of Arizona; Committee on Claims, 41.

H. R. 7555—Granting an increase of pension to Winnie Alexander.
Mr. Murdock of Arizona; Committee on Invalid Pensions, 41.

H. R. 7556—Making the last Thursday in November of each year a public legal holiday in the District of Columbia and in all places within the jurisdiction of the United States.
Mr. Case of South Dakota; Committee on the Judiciary, 80.

H. R. 7557—To impose taxes on transactions in arms, ammunition, and implements of war.
Mr. Murdock of Arizona; Committee on Ways and Means, 80.

H. R. 7558—To equalize the extra compensation payable to certain World War veterans who suffered the loss of the use of one or more feet or hands.
Mr. Rankin; Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, 80.

H. R. 7559—To amend Public Resolution No. 24, Seventy-sixth Congress, entitled "Joint resolution making appropriations for work relief and relief, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940," so as to grant employment and retention preference to the wives of disabled veterans and to the widows of deceased veterans.
Mr. Rankin; Committee on Appropriations, 80.

H. R. 7560—To restore certain service-connected benefits to World War veterans and for other purposes.
Mr. Rankin; Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, 80.

H. R. 7561—For the relief of Frank L. Sarazin.
Mr. August H. Andresen; Committee on Claims, 80.

H. R. 7562—For the relief of Rudolfo Kaufmann and his wife, Ellinor T. Kaufmann.
Mr. Gramer; Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, 80.

H. R. 7563—For the relief of Salomon Georg Kaufmann, his wife Doris Kaufmann, nee Stern, and their child Michael Peter Kaufmann.
Mr. Kramer; Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, 80.

H. R. 7564—Authorizing the construction and maintenance of a dike or dam across Stansbury Creek in Baltimore, Md.
Mr. Cole of Maryland; Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, 148.

H. R. 7565—For the relief of Caterina Migliore and Anthony and Rose Migliore.
Mr. Fay; Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, 149.

H. R. 7566—Granting a pension to Eugenie Gilsoul.
Mr. Knutson; Committee on Invalid Pensions, 149.

H. R. 7567—Granting a pension to Lillian R. Seward.
Mr. Taber; Committee on Invalid Pensions, 149.

H. R. 7568—Providing for alternate structural designs.
Mr. Alexander; Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, 222.

H. R. 7569—To provide for deportation of certain aliens who do not make declaration of intention to become citizens, and for other purposes.
Mr. Ludlow; Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, 222.

H. R. 7570—To return a portion of the Grand Canyon National Monument to the public domain.
Mr. Murdock of Arizona; Committee on the Public Lands, 222.

H. R. 7571—Providing for the sale of certain lands to the Arizona State Elks Association Hospital.
Mr. Murdock of Arizona; Committee on the Public Lands, 222.

H. R. 7572—Granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Porter.
Mr. Ashbrook; Committee on Invalid Pensions, 222.

H. R. 7573—For the relief of Perkins Gins, formerly Perkins Oil Co., of Memphis, Tenn.
Mr. Chandler; Committee on War Claims, 222.

H. R. 7574—Granting a pension to Willie D. Nelson.
Mr. Mott; Committee on Invalid Pensions, 222.

H. R. 7575—Granting a pension to Marion Van Natta.
Mr. Mott; Committee on Invalid Pensions, 222.

H. R. 7576—For the relief of the San Francisco Mountain Scenic Boulevard Co.
Mr. Murdock of Arizona; Committee on Claims, 222.

H. R. 7577—Granting a pension to Isabel Lawhorn.
Mr. Taylor of Tennessee; Committee on Pensions, 222.

H. R. 7578—To authorize the acquisition of land for cemeterial purposes in the vicinity of New Orleans, La.
Mr. Maloney; Committee on Military Affairs, 265.

H. R. 7579—Granting a pension to Flora Latimore.
Mr. Cole of New York; Committee on Pensions, 265.

H. R. 7580—For the relief of Mary Savage.
Mr. Bloom; Committee on Foreign Affairs, 307.

H. R. 7581—To admit Henry Hans Gummasson permanently to the United States.
Mr. Keller; Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, 307.

H. R. 7582—To define, to prevent, and to punish interference with interstate and foreign commerce.
Mr. Hoffman; Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, 354.

H. R. 7583—Granting a pension to Esta M. McArthur.
Mr. Brown of Ohio; Committee on Pensions, 354.

H. R. 7584—For the relief of Horace Lothrop Ham.
Mr. Luce; Committee on Naval Affairs, 354.

H. R. 7585—Granting a pension to Mollie Messer.
Mr. Robsion of Kentucky; Committee on Invalid Pensions, 354.

H. R. 7586—For the relief of Franc Natko; his wife, Margaret Natko; and their infant child, Margaret Natko.
Mr. Buckley of New York; Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, 488.

H. R. 7587—For the relief of Ramon Fraguas Gonzalez, also known as Jose Ganzalez, also known as Ramon Gonzalez.
Mr. Fay; Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, 488.

H. R. 7588—Granting to the Vice President and Members of Congress the privilege of franking official correspondence not exceeding 1 ounce in weight by air mail.
Mr. Carter; Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, 540.

H. R. 7589—To require ratification by the Senate of foreign trade agreements.
Mr. Coffee of Nebraska; Committee on Ways and Means, 626.

H. R. 7590—To forbid the importation of certain agricultural products into the United States from foreign countries until the comparable domestic article attains the parity price.
Mr. Woodruff of Michigan; Committee on Ways and Means, 626.

H. R. 7591—To limit the powers of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, Commodity Credit Corporation, the First Export-Import Bank of Washington, the Second Export-Import Bank of Washington, and for other purposes.
Mr. Wolcott; Committee on Banking and Currency, 626.

H. R. 7592—To require ratification by the Senate of foreign trade agreements.
Mr. Angell; Committee on Ways and Means, 772.

H. R. 7593—To provide Government protection to widows and children of deceased World War veterans.
Mr. Rankin; Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, 772.

H. R. 7594—Granting a pension to Clarinda E. Kenyon.
Mr. Cole of New York; Committee on Invalid Pensions, 772.

H. R. 7595—For the relief of Eugene Gruen and his wife, Kate.
Mr. Kramer; Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, 772.

H. R. 7596—To provide for the reimbursement of certain members or former members of the United States Coast Guard (formerly the Bureau of Lighthouses) for the value of personal effects lost in the hurricane of September 21, 1938, at several light stations on the coast of Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, and New York.
Mr. Gifford; Committee on Claims, 815.

H. R. 7597—Granting a pension to Alice Catell McCoy.
Mr. Polk; Committee on Invalid Pensions, 815.

H. R. 7598—Granting an increase of pension to Sarah E. Woods.
Mr. Polk; Committee on Invalid Pensions, 815.

H. R. 7599—To amend the Judicial Code by adding a new section thereto, designated as section 266a, to provide for intervention by States and direct appeals to the Supreme Court of the United States in certain cases involving the constitutionality of acts of State legislatures, and for other purposes.
Mr. Chandler; Committee on the Judiciary, 888.

H. R. 7600—To eliminate debt-money and taxes; to set up an honest, scientific monetary system based on the potential productivity of the country, and which shall reflect the needs of consumers as well as producers; and for other purposes.
Mr. Burdick; Committee on Banking and Currency, 888.

H. R. 7601—To amend section 907 (c) of the Revenue Act of 1936.
Mr. Pace; Committee on Military Affairs, 964.

H. R. 7602—For the relief of Emory N. Jenkins.
Mr. Pace; Committee on Military Affairs, 964.

H. R. 7603—Relating to defamation of groups.
Mr. Celler; Committee on the Judiciary, 1058.

H. R. 7604—Relating to defamation of groups.
Mr. Celler; Committee on the Judiciary, 1058.

H. R. 7605—To authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with State and local agencies in carrying out operations against plant and animal diseases and noxious insects and other pests affecting agriculture.
Mr. Leavy; Committee on Agriculture, 1058.

H. R. 7606—To limit the expenditure of Federal funds.
Mr. Hoffman; Committee on the Judiciary, 1058.

H. R. 7607—To extend the period for filing claims on insurance contracts under the World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended.
Mr. Vinson of Georgia; Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, 1058.

H. R. 7608—For the relief of J. Montrose Edrehi.
Mr. Caldwell; Committee on Claims, 1058.

H. R. 7609—To authorize the foregoing of the accumulated expense account on loan cotton still in the ownership of the original borrower.
Mr. Collins; Committee on Agriculture, 1081.

H. R. 7610—To provide for adjusting the compensation of persons employed as guards and guard officers at navy yards, and for other purposes.
Mr. McCormack; Committee on Naval Affairs, 1157.

H. R. 7611—To provide for the rank and title of lieutenant general of the Regular Army.
Mr. Snyder; Committee on Military Affairs, 1158.

H. R. 7612—For the transfer of funds to the town of Wrangell, Alaska.
Mr. Dimond; Committee on the Territories, 1158.

H. R. 7613—For the relief of Patrick Collins.
Mr. Simpson; Committee on Military Affairs, 1158.

H. R. 7614—For the relief of George Schlessinger, also known as H. George Westpfal.
Mr. Fitzpatrick; Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, 1279.

H. R. 7615—Authorizing the Bradenton Co., its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across Sarasota Pass where Manatee Avenue, Bradenton, if extended, would cross Sarasota Pass, county of Manatee, State of Florida.

H. R. 7615—Continued.
Mr. Peterson of Florida; Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, 1347.

H. R. 7616—To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to furnish additional statistical information and marketing service for the benefit of the poultry industry, and for other purposes.
Mr. Coffee of Nebraska; Committee on Agriculture, 1397.

H. R. 7617—To authorize the acquisition of forest lands adjacent to and over which highways, roads, or trails are constructed or to be constructed wholly or partially with Federal funds in order to preserve or restore their natural beauty, and for other purposes.
Mr. Bradley of Michigan; Committee on Agriculture, 1397.

H. R. 7618—To authorize the acquisition of land for cemetery purposes in the vicinity of Grafton, W. Va.
Mr. Schiffler; Committee on Military Affairs, 1397.

H. R. 7619—To set aside certain lands for Bear Butte National Monument and to authorize their administration as such.
Mr. Case of South Dakota; Committee on the Public Lands, 1397.

H. R. 7620—Providing for the promotion of employees in the Customs Field Service.
Mr. McCormack; Committee on Ways and Means, 1397.

H. R. 7621—Providing for disposal of public lands in certain cases.
Mr. Patrick; Committee on the Public Lands, 1397.

H. R. 7622—To provide for loans to farmers for soil-conservation purposes.
Mr. Poage; Committee on Agriculture, 1397.

H. R. 7623—To establish a cotton research award fund.
Mr. Poage; Committee on Agriculture, 1397.

H. R. 7624—To forbid the importation of certain agricultural products into the United States from foreign countries until the comparable domestic article attains the parity price.
Mr. Stefan; Committee on Ways and Means, 1397.

H. R. 7625—For the relief of Bert and Marie Freeman.
Mr. Claypool; Committee on Claims, 1397.

H. R. 7626—For the relief of Ernest Unger.
Mr. Somers of New York; Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, 1397.

H. R. 7627—Extending the provisions of the act entitled "An act to amend the act entitled 'An act for the retirement of employees in the classified civil service, and for other purposes,' approved May 22, 1920, and acts in amendment thereof" to A. V. Taggart.
Mr. Voorhis of California; Committee on the Civil Service, 1397.

H. R. 7628—For the relief of William H. Linhart.
Mr. White of Idaho; Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, 1397.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTIONS

H. J. Res. 306—To preserve the neutrality and the peace of the United States and to secure the safety of its citizens and their interests.
Reported with amendments (S. Rept. 1155), 46.—Debated, 47, 83, 110, 150, 173, 174, 224, 266, 309, 355, 397, 443, 490, 541, 590, 628, 679, 708, 775, 820, 889, 965.—Amended and passed Senate and title amended, 1024, 1033.—Debate in House (H. Res. 320), 1059, 1092–1104, 1160, 1208, 1284.—House disagrees to Senate amendments; asks conference with Senate, 1059, 1786, 1345.—Conferees appointed, 1282, 1345.—Senate insists upon its amendments; agrees to conference, 1282.—Conference report submitted in Senate, 1352; agreed to, 1352–1356.—Conference report submitted in House (H. Rept. 1475), 1381.—Agreed to, 1389.—Examined and signed, 1357, 1396.—Presented to the President, 1396.—Approved [Public Resolution No. 54], 1397.

H. J. Res. 382—Requesting a conference between the hostile nations to secure peace.
Mr. Martin J. Kennedy; Committee on Foreign Affairs, 14.

H. J. Res. 383—Legalizing Thanksgiving Day.
Mr. Reed of Illinois; Committee on the Judiciary, 14.

H. J. Res. 384—To make provision for certain expenses incident to the second session of the Seventy-sixth Congress.
Mr. Taylor of Colorado; Committee on Appropriations: Passed House, 16.—Referred to Senate Committee on Appropriations, 28, 29.—Reported back, passed Senate, amended, 224.—House concurs in Senate amendment, 260.—Examined and signed, 265, 295.—Presented to the President, 295.—Approved [Public Res. No. 53], 1396.

H. J. Res. 385—Establishing a Greenville Memorial Commission to formulate plans for the construction of a memorial building to commemorate the Treaty of Greene Ville at Greenville, Ohio.
Mr. Jones of Ohio; Committee on the Library, 41.

H. J. Res. 386—Making an appropriation for loans and relief in flood-stricken areas of Mississippi and Alabama.
Mr. Rankin; Committee on Appropriations, 40, 41.

H. J. Res. 387—To create a joint congressional committee to consult with the President on problems relating to the present European situation.
Mr. Rees of Kansas; Committee on Rules, 80.

H. J. Res. 388—To establish a joint committee to prepare a revision and recodification of the Judicial Code and other provisions of law relating to the judiciary.
Mr. Chandler; Committee on the Judiciary, 148.

H. J. Res. 389—Authorizing negotiations for the acquisition of Lower California.
Mr. Havenner; Committee on Foreign Affairs, 222.

H. J. Res. 390—Requesting the President to appoint a committee to prepare suitable ceremonies and celebration for the four hundred and fiftieth anniversary on October 12, 1942, of the discovery of America by Christopher Columbus.
Mr. Shanley; Committee on Foreign Affairs, 354.

H. J. Res. 391—To restore to Congress the sole power to issue money and regulate the value thereof.
Mr. Voorhis of California; Committee on Banking and Currency, 395.

H. J. Res. 392—Making an appropriation for loans and relief in flood-stricken areas of Mississippi and Alabama.
Mr. Rankin; Committee on Appropriations, 627.

H. J. Res. 393—Authorizing negotiations for the acquisition of certain territory in the Western Hemisphere.
Mr. Havenner; Committee on Foreign Affairs, 964.

H. J. Res. 394—Relating to the improvement of economic, commercial, and cultural relations among American republics.
Mr. Hendricks; Committee on Rules, 1058.

H. J. Res. 395—Proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States with respect to convening extra or special sessions of Congress.
Mr. Hancock; Committee on the Judiciary, 1058.

H. J. Res. 396—Requiring the Secretary of the Navy to appoint a board to investigate naval defenses and to report to the House.
Mr. Bates of Massachusetts; Committee on Naval Affairs, 1158.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS

H. Con. Res. 36—Providing for a joint session of Congress for the purpose of receiving the President's message.
Mr. Rayburn; considered and agreed to, 9.—Senate concurs, 4.

H. Con. Res. 37—Calling for the continuous session of Congress until January 3, 1940.
Mr. Crawford; Committee on Ways and Means, 1278.

HOUSE RESOLUTIONS 298–326

H. Res. 298—Notifying the President that a quorum of both Houses is assembled.
Mr. Rayburn; agreed to, 8.

H. Res. 299—Informing the Senate that a quorum of the House of Representatives has appeared.
Mr. Doughton; agreed to, 9.

H. Res. 300—Setting the daily hour of meeting.
Mr. Sabath; agreed to, 9.

H. Res. 301—Relative to the death of Hon. Thomas M. Eaton, late a Representative from the State of California.
Mr. Carter; agreed to, 13.

H. Res. 302—Setting days of meeting of the House of Representatives.
Mr. Rayburn; agreed to, 16.

H. Res. 303—Electing Hon. Sam Rayburn Speaker pro tempore in the absence of the Speaker.
Mr. Doughton; agreed to, 18.

H. Res. 304—For the relief of Alice Everett Cox.
Mr. Brown of Georgia; Committee on Accounts, 24.—Reported back (H. Rept. 1474), considered, and agreed to, 1367, 1397.

H. Res. 305—Requesting certain information from the Secretary of the Treasury.
Mr. Fish; Committee on Ways and Means, 24.

H. Res. 306—Requesting certain information from the Export-Import Bank.
Mr. Fish; Committee on Banking and Currency, 24.

H. Res. 307—Electing Representative Kefauver a member of various standing committees.
Mr. Cooper; agreed to, 33.

H. Res. 308—Electing Representative Cravens a member of various standing committees.
Mr. Cooper; agreed to, 33.

H. Res. 309—Authorizing the Committee on Foreign Affairs to obtain various information in regard to the preparedness of the United States for its national defense.
Mrs. Rogers of Massachusetts; Committee on Rules, 41.

H. Res. 310—Relative to the death of Hon. Thomas S. McMillan, of South Carolina.
Mr. Hare; agreed to, 79.

H. Res. 311—Relative to the death of Senator Marvel M. Logan, of Kentucky.
Mr. Rayburn; agreed to, 148.

H. Res. 312—To investigate the National Committee to Keep America Out of Foreign Wars.
Mr. Woodrum of Virginia; Committee on Rules, 222.

H. Res. 313—Requesting certain information from the Secretary of War.
Mr. Hoffman; Committee on Military Affairs, 335, 354.

H. Res. 314—Requesting certain information from the Secretary of the Navy.
Mr. Hoffman; Committee on Naval Affairs, 354.

H. Res. 315—Authorizing the payment of the sum of $2,500 from the contingent fund of the House for the procurement of a marble bust of Thomas Brackett Reed.
Mr. Mapes; agreed to, 577.

H. Res. 316—Authorizing the appointment of a special committee to study various United States statutes.
Mr. McDowell; Committee on Rules, 588.

H. Res. 317—Authorizing an investigation of the farm machinery business.
Mr. Hare; Committee on Rules, 677.

R. Res. 318—Amending Rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.
Mr. Horton; Committee on Rules, 888.

H. Res. 319—Relative to the death of Hon. Chester C. Bolton, late a Representative from the State of Ohio.
Mr. Jenkins of Ohio; agreed to, 1081.

H. Res. 320—Requesting a conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on H. J. Res. 306.
Mr. Sabath; referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed, 1059.
From Committee on Rules (H. Rept. 1473), 1059.—Debated, 1092.—Agreed to, 1104.

H. Res. 321—For the continuation of the Special Committee to Investigate Un-American Activities.
Mr. Dies; Committee on Rules, 1278.

H. Res. 322—Electing Representative E. C. Gathings, of Arkansas, a member of the Committee on Claims.
Mr. Cooper; agreed to, 1283.

H. Res. 323—Requesting the Secretary of the Treasury to report to the House all the facts within the knowledge of his Department relative to Japanese demands that a United States customs officer salute a Japanese sentry at Honolulu.
Mr. Crawford; Committee on Ways and Means, 1347.

H. Res. 324—Electing Butler B. Hare to the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.
Mr. Doughton; agreed to, 1358.

H. Res. 325—Electing Frank B. Keefe, of Wisconsin, to the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.
Mr. Martin of Massachusetts; agreed to, 1358.

H. Res. 326—(Not printed), 1390.

○